APR 16 1957

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 102—PART 7

MAY 22, 1956, TO JUNE 11, 1956
(PAGES 8643 TO 10092)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1956

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 22, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, May 7, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, with whom there is no shadow that is caused by turning, whose throne standest steadfast and sure: Into Thy hands of love we commit ourselves and our troubled world. In this great day of challenge and opportunity Thou hast set us tasks which test all our courage and fidelity. May we be strong to do the things which need to be done and to put aside the things which are unworthy or belittling or base. Grant us the steadfastness to follow in faith and confidence Thy ways of love and truth until our lives become Thy revelation and Thy spirit touches into the beauty of holiness our thoughts and deeds.

As those into whose fallible hands have been placed the crying needs of stricken humanity, may the thoughts of our minds and the sympathies of our hearts, the words of our lips, and the decisions of our deliberations, be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. SMATHERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 21, 1956, was dispensed with.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of May 18, 1956,

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10721) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, reported it favorably, with amendments, on May 21, 1956, and submitted a report (No. 2034) thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 460. An act to amend section 4482 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U. S. C. 475), relating to life preservers for river steamers;

S. 743. An act to authorize biennial inspection of the hulls and boilers of cargo vessels, and for other purposes;

S. 1378. An act to clarify and consolidate the authority to require the establishment, maintenance, and operation of aids to maritime navigation on fixed structures in or over navigable waters of the United States;

S. 1790. An act to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize more liberal propelling power allowances in computing the net tonnages of certain vessels;

S. 1791. An act to amend section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940 (54 Stat. 164), relating to the lights required to be carried by motorboats;

S. 2151. An act to provide for the segregation of certain funds of the Fort Berthold Indians on the basis of a membership roll prepared for such purpose;

S. 2327. An act for the relief of Takako Iba;

S. 2562. An act to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended;

S. 3237. An act to provide for continuance of life insurance coverage under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, in the case of employees receiving benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act;

S. 3315. An act to amend section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; and

S. 3524. An act to give effect to the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries signed at Washington September 10, 1954, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 415. An act for the relief of Ernest B. Sanders; and

S. 2822. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer approximately 9 acres of land in the Hualapai Indian Reservation, Ariz., to School District No. 8, Mohave County, Ariz.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1026. An act for the relief of Nihat Cengiz; and

S. 1244. An act for the relief of Eva Gershbein Rubinstein.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 76) amending Senate Concurrent Resolution 67, favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3350. An act to provide for the sale by the Secretary of the Interior of certain public lands of the United States which have not been used for the purpose for which acquired;

H. R. 3351. An act to provide for the sale by the Secretary of the Interior of certain public lands of the United States which have not been used for the purpose for which asquired;

H. R. 3489. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to bring employees of Gallaudet College within its coverage;

H. R. 4031. An act to consider residence in American Samoa or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands by certain employees of governments thereof, and their dependents, as residence in the United States for naturalization purposes;

H. R. 4137. An act for the relief of Mitsuko A. Hachita;

H. R. 4456. An act for the relief of Cpl. Oscar H. Mash, Jr.;

H. R. 5591. An act for the relief of the Ohio Casualty Insurance Co.;

H. R. 5808. An act for the relief of Judith Kao;

H. R. 6029. An act for the relief of Robert D. Grier (individually, and as executor of the estate of Katie C. Grier) and Jane Grier Hawthorne;

H. R. 6742. An act for the relief of Rumiko Fujiki Kirkpatrick;

H. R. 7896. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land in the city of Hogansville, Ga., to the city of Hogansville;

H. R. 8008. An act for the relief of Mrs. Warren D. Cooper and her son, Teddy Devere Cooper;

H. R. 8102. An act to provide for the disposition of moneys arising from deductions made from carriers on account of the loss of or damage to military or naval material in transit, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8110. An act to incorporate the National Music Council;

H. R. 8643. An act for the relief of the Knox Corporation of Thomson, Ga.;

H. R. 8709. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended;

H. R. 9052. An act to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 2 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports;

H. R. 9085. An act to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to members of the civilian faculties of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School;

H. R. 9371. An act for the relief of John R. Henry;

H. R. 9475. An act to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 9810. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the State of Indiana;

H. R. 9956. An act to amend subdivision e of section 58, Notices, of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

H. R. 10108. An act to amend section 314 and section 374 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 10230. An act to amend sections 3526 and 3528 of the Revised Statutes relating to the coinage of subsidiary silver coins and minor coins of the United States;

H. R. 10368. An act to amend the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, so as to require that certain reports and other communications of the executive branch to Congress contain information pertaining to the number of civilian officers and employees required to carry out additional or expanded functions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10374. An act to amend the act to incorporate the Oak Hill Cemetery, in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 10417. An act to amend the Federal Register Act, as amended, so as to provide for the effectiveness and notice to the public of proclamations, orders, regulations, and other documents in a period following an attack or threatened attack upon the continental United States;

H. H. 11124. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges;

H. R. 11205. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Roy Cowan and others arising by reason of the flooding of land in the vicinity of Lake Alice, N. Dak.;

H. J. Res. 456. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens;

H. J. Res. 569. Joint resolution to provide for a medal to be struck and presented to each surviving veteran of the War Between the States;

H. J. Res. 607. Joint resolution to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 611. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 2284. An act for the relief of Maj. Robert D. Lauer;

H. R. 3268. An act for the relief of Comdr. George B. Greer;

H. R. 3366. An act for the relief of Mary J. McDougall; and

H. R. 3964. An act for the relief of Kingan, Inc.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED OR PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 3350. An act to provide for the sale by the Secretary of the Interior of certain public lands of the United States which have not been used for the purpose for which acquired; and

H. R. 3351. An act to provide for the sale by the Secretary of the Interior of certain public lands of the United States which have not been used for the purpose for which acquired; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3489. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to bring employees of Gallaudet College within its coverage;

H. R. 9085. An act to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to members of the civilian faculties of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School; and

H. R. 10368. An act to amend the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, so as to require that certain reports and other communications of the executive branch to Congress contain information pertaining to the number of civilian officers and employees required to carry out additional or expanded functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4031. An act to consider residence in American Samoa or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands by certain employees of the governments thereof, and their dependents, as residence in the United States for naturalization purposes;

H. R. 4137. An act for the relief of Mitsuko A. Hachita;

H. R. 4456. An act for the relief of Cpl. Oscar H. Mash, Jr.

H. R. 5591. An act for the relief of the Ohio Casualty Insurance Co.;

H. R. 5808. An act for the relief of Judith Kao;

H. R. 6029. An act for the relief of Robert D. Grier (individually, and as executor of the estate of Katie C. Grier) and Jane Grier Hawthorne;

H. R. 6742. An act for the relief of Rumiko Fujiki Kirkpatrick;

H. R. 8110. An act to incorporate the National Music Council;

H. R. 8643. An act for the relief of the Knox Corporation of Thomson, Ga.;

H. R. 9371. An act for the relief of John R. Henry;

H. R. 9810. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the State of Indiana;

H. R. 9956. An act to amend subdivision e of section 58, Notices, of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

H. R. 11205. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Roy Cowan and others arising by reason of the flooding of land in the vicinity of Lake Alice, N. Dak.;

H. J. Res. 456. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens; and

H. J. Res. 611. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7896. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land in the city of Hogansville, Ga., to the city of Hogansville; and

H. R. 10417. An act to amend the Federal Register Act, as amended, so as to provide for the effectiveness and notice to the public of proclamations, orders, regulations, and other documents in a period following an attack or threatened attack upon the continental United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 8102. An act to provide for the disposition of moneys arising from deductions made from carriers on account of the loss of or damage to military or naval material in transit, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8709. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9052. An act to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 2 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports;

H. R. 10230. An act to amend sections 3526 and 3528 of the Revised Statutes relating to the coinage of subsidiary silver coins and minor coins of the United States;

H. J. Res. 569. Joint resolution to provide for a medal to be struck and presented to each surviving veteran of the War Between the States; and

H. J. Res. 607. Joint resolution to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 9475. An act to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H. R. 10108. An act to amend section 314 and section 374 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 10374. An act to amend the act to incorporate the Oak Hill Cemetery, in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 8008. An act for the relief of Mrs. Warren D. Cooper and her son, Teddy Devere Cooper; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 11124. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges; placed on the calendar.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour, for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, and that statements in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Knowland	Schoeppel
Bush	Laird	Scott
Carlson	Lehman	Smathers
Dirksen	McClellan	Wiley
Fulbright	Murray	Williams
Goldwater	Payne	Young
Johnston, S. C.	Russell	

Mr. SMATHERS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be instructed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GORE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JENNER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERR, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THYE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. WOFFORD entered the Chamber and answered to their name.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED DONATION BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF CERTAIN BOATS TO UNITED STATES VOLUNTEER LIFE SAVING CORPS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the United States Volunteer Life Saving Corps has requested the Navy Department to transfer certain boats for use in rescue work and training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, to establish in the Department of Defense an Office of Under Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, for the first quarter, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR TARIFF COMMISSION TO SUBMIT REPORT ON CUSTOMS LAWS

A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 101 (c) of Public Law 768, Eighty-third Congress, so as to provide additional time for the Tariff Commission to review the customs tariff schedules (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

CHARGE FOR SPECIAL SERVICES TO PURCHASERS OF TIMBER FROM INDIAN LANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to charge for special services to purchasers of timber from Indian lands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTIONS OF WOODROW WILSON POST, NO. 1491, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two recent resolutions adopted by the Woodrow Wilson Post, No. 1491, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Minneapolis, Minn., be printed at this point in my remarks, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Finance:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
WOODROW WILSON POST, NO. 1491, INC.,
Minneapolis, Minn., May 17, 1956.

ADJUTANT, DEPARTMENT OF MINNESOTA, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS.

DEAR COMRADE: At the regular meeting of the Woodrow Wilson Post, No. 1491, Veterans of Foreign Wars, held May 1, the following resolution was presented and passed:

"Whereas the Commission on Veterans' Benefits (Bradley Commission) has recommended veterans' pensions be minimized and gradually eliminated by tying them in with social-security payments; and

"Whereas the pension recommendation, if adopted, would fundamentally reduce and/or eliminate many of the veterans' benefits now being granted, including disability compensation, widow's pension, GI insurance, survivors' benefits, and readjustment payments; and

"Whereas these recommendations are merely another method of amputation of veterans' rights, and will, if adopted, eliminate any veterans' rights whatsoever in the future: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the members of Woodrow Wilson Post, No. 1491, Veterans of Foreign Wars, do hereby go on record opposing this diabolical Bradley report as wholly unjustifiable, unfair, and discriminatory toward all veterans, and respectfully urge all-out efforts toward the defeat of this Commission's report and to prevent any legislation toward these ends; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution shall be sent to the following: Senators THYE and HUMPHREY; Congressmen WIER and JUDD; Seventh District, Veterans of Foreign Wars; Department of Minnesota, Veterans of Foreign Wars."

Yours in comradeship,
DONALD D. KAMMER,
Adjutant.

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
WOODROW WILSON POST, NO. 1491,
Minneapolis, Minn., May 17, 1956.

ADJUTANT, DEPARTMENT OF MINNESOTA, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS.

DEAR COMRADE: At a regular meeting of the Woodrow Wilson Post, No. 1491, Veterans of Foreign Wars, held May 15, 1956, the following resolution was presented and passed:

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration is scheduled to close the veterans' hospital annex at Fort Snelling; and

"Whereas closing the annex will create an acute shortage of much needed facilities, thereby denying many veterans entitled to, and in need of hospitalization, the hospitalization they should have;

"Whereas the closing of the annex is just another step toward freezing out the rights of the veteran; and

"Whereas the need for retaining the use of the hospital annex at Fort Snelling is urgent: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the members of Woodrow Wilson Post, No. 1491, Veterans of Foreign Wars, do hereby go on record favoring, and do urge that action be taken immediately to keep this annex open; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution shall be sent to the following: Senators HUMPHREY and THYE; Congressmen JUDD and WIER; Seventh District, Veterans of Foreign Wars; Department of Minnesota, Veterans of Foreign Wars."

Yours in comradeship,
DONALD D. KAMMER, *Adjutant.*

REDUCTION OF FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—RESOLUTION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the American Warehousemen's Association, at its 65th annual convention at Los Angeles, relating to a reduction of Federal expenditures.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Federal Government has continued on a course established several decades ago of tremendous deficit spending and high taxes to support evergrowing governmental bureaucracy; and

Whereas such spending and taxing will ultimately result in destruction of America's free enterprise economic system and democratic political structure: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That our industry again warns the Nation of this great danger and prays Congress to make every effort to reduce Federal expenditures while at the same time lowering taxes on individual citizens and business enterprise.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

H. R. 3255. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to preserve in certain cases the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees whose positions are placed in lower grades by virtue of reclassification actions under such act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2035).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1893. A bill for the relief of Harold D. Robison (Rept. No. 2036).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 8225. A bill to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Pipestone National Monument in the State of Minnesota (Rept. No. 2037).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance:

Russell A. Stuart, of Virginia, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board, vice Frank L. Roberts, resigned.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3904. A bill for the relief of Thomas P. Quigley; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3905. A bill for the relief of Mr. Polychronis Paschalidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3906. A bill to implement a treaty and agreement with the Republic of Panama, by transferring certain property to the Republic of Panama, adjusting the fiscal obligations of the Panama Canal Company, and by other provisions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

S. 3907. A bill to amend section 345 of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 3908. A bill for the relief of Peter Jocher Webb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 117, ENTITLED "A HANDBOOK FOR AMERICANS"

Mr. EASTLAND submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 79), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary 75,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 117, A Handbook for Americans.

IMPLEMENTATION OF TREATY AND AGREEMENT WITH REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Bureau of the Budget I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to implement a treaty and agreement with the Republic of Panama, by transferring certain property to the Republic of Panama, adjusting the fiscal obligations of the Panama Canal Company, and by other provisions.

The Bureau of the Budget also has recommended the enactment of additional legislation to implement the treaty and agreement by amending the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. Inasmuch as that is a matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I understand the chairman of that committee, the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] will introduce the bill relating to the Classification Act of 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3906) to implement a treaty and agreement with the Republic of Panama, by transferring certain property to the Republic of Panama, adjusting the fiscal obligations of the Panama Canal Company, and by other provisions, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REVISION OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2875) to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PROVISION AND IMPROVEMENT OF HOUSING—AMENDMENTS

Mr. PAYNE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3855) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. HILL, and Mr. SPARKMAN) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 3855, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CAPEHART submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3855, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INVESTIGATION OF TEXTILE IMPORTS BY TARIFF COMMISSION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on April 11, 1956, I submitted Senate Resolution 236, to direct the United States Tariff Commission to make an immediate escape-clause investigation of textile imports. Subsequent to the submission of this resolution, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] indicated his desire to cosponsor it.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] be included as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 236, the next time the resolution is reprinted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER:

Maritime Day address delivered by Senator SALTONSTALL before Propeller Club of Baltimore, Md., on May 22, 1956.

TRIBUTE TO AMERICAN FAIRS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, summertime is county fair time, and throughout all America, preparations are being made for local and State fairs.

It may not generally be appreciated how important a role—particularly in cities—the fair plays in American life.

In my own State, America's Dairyland, the fair is a particularly honored and valued occasion, in both rural and urban areas.

During these coming months, it is my personal intention to visit as many Wisconsin county fairs as possible, and of course to take in our State fair, as well.

I have prepared a statement on the subject of the importance of fairs, and I am pleased to ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Throughout the 71 counties of Wisconsin, local fairgrounds are now being spruced up for the grand openings.

Newly appointed fair officials and supervisors are knee-deep in planning and coordination of the thousands of submitted entries. Before we know it, Wisconsin county fairs and the State fair will be drawing Wisconsinites from far and wide. Town and countrymen alike will be out to see quality crops, dairy produce, livestock, and the tops in farm equipment and machinery.

Tourists will be pouring in to enjoy the festivities. Merchants will have their best wares on display, and women's and youngsters' groups will be proudly busy.

The county fair has long taken its place as a cherished institution in this country, every bit American as the visiting circus, or as football or baseball. This annual exhibition of the year's best hybrid corn, prize steer, and mother's choicest strawberry preserves, is looked forward to by rural folks all over the Nation. And, while the fair is primarily for the benefit of our farm population, the urban dweller can be equally excited over the prospect of seeing "the biggest and best" of his State's products, the colorful displays, and entertainment events.

1954'S $792 MILLION OF BADGER FARM INCOME

The local fair does more to portray the agricultural accomplishments of a State than perhaps any other means. The great productive capacity of Wisconsin has certainly been proved through displays, demonstrations, and exhibits—all positive evidence of the skill, spirit, and ingenuity of our Wisconsin people. The quantity and quality of products presented before the public view, have always served to inspire confidence in our continuing prosperity and economic progress. In 1954, the value of Wisconsin farm products surpassed three-fourths of a billion dollars from our 168,000 farms—certainly an enormous achievement.

Reflecting that achievement we have come a long way from the old English country fair or its 19th century counterpart—a time when "a journey to the fair" meant days of travel for the whole family and months of preliminary planning. Then, only the local agricultural products were up for inspec-

tion and appraisal. Today, the modern fair calls for participation of the merchants and tradesmen from a broad surrounding area in furnishing exhibits. For example, what better market could we have for our Badger craft and wood-working industries?

Yet, the essential spirit of the fair will forever remain the same—an annual event sparked with fun, frolic, learning, and good healthy living.

And participation still means a year's worth of time and effort in the required grooming and care of prospective prize-winning entries.

DEVELOPMENT OF FAIR IN WISCONSIN

Wisconsin with its marvelous agricultural resources and thriving dairy industry naturally gave early attention to the development and improvement of "that what it produces best." This was first done through the early county agricultural society, designed to step-up farm methods in line with newer trends; to improve the quality of crops and dairy produce; and to inform other States of our agricultural potential.

The "fair" as we know it today was thus a creation of the county society. And the friendly competition among these local societies inevitably led to vying between counties for honors in area produce. Consequently, each succeeding county fair would try to top the preceding event in exhibits, quantity and quality of items displayed, as well as in innovations. Each spurred the other on with additional improvements and new contributions in the public interest.

I doubt if there are many other events which offer so much to our material and spiritual wealth, as the fair. We see prosperous grains in the cross-the-counter sales made between display owner and buyer—when the latest certified seed potato of Langlade or Portage counties finds a profitable market; when a further refinement of U. S. grade A Cheddar cheese brings in more dollars to the Marathon County Cheese Factory.

THE INTANGIBLE VALUES

At the same time, we see the more immeasurable contributions to good living, in the enjoyment of the truly good and simple things of life: the glowing pride of a 4–H clubber showing off his prize calf; the excitement of a child's first ferris wheel ride; or warm fellowship among farmers, engrossed over the latest time-saving addition to the milking machine.

These are the basic qualities which add up to make America what it is today. Individual initiative, pride in one's hard-earned efforts, healthy competition and sportsmanship, a zeal for learning—all these characteristics come out during fair-time and are part and parcel of our democratic society.

FARM INCOME HAS DECLINED UNFORTUNATELY

Economically, of course, the county fair has marked the steady agricultural development of Wisconsin. And it is the most concise indication of our State's progress in this field. Now, when farm income has dropped unfortunately and when the farmer is caught in a serious cost-price squeeze, the fair is particularly important.

The fair itself has served to foster concrete advances in dairying, production of our cash crops, and improved livestock breeding. How could we have refined the flavor, texture, and color specifications of our famous Wisconsin cheeses without constant research and experimentation?

Of course, many things accelerated development of the Nation's finest cheeses and the many types of milk manufacturing from processing to condensing. After all, as America's dairyland, Wisconsin had to take the lead in developing top-quality standards. Nonetheless, we needed central seedbeds for ideas, which the fair has certainly given us.

What better place to stimulate advances in scientific farming, to show the latest improvements in farm machinery, or introduce better cultural and breeding fundamentals?

BLUE RIBBONS SPUR ADVANCES

Nor could we find a greater incentive to farmers in forging ahead in their industry. Demonstrations of new ways of doing things, display of the new hybrid corn or giant potato or tastier peas or cabbage or cherries, and showing of purebred livestock, serve to inspire the farmer and dairyman. And the blue ribbon element is a special boost to improvement and innovation. Fair prizes and rewards for the best in produce, livestock, foods, clothing, and the hundreds of other category entries, accelerate lively competition among county farmers. Such contributions to farm prosperity are what make agricultural progress tick, and recognition for these deeds is an important incentive factor.

Also, the grand exhibition of goods provided by the fair is a valuable advertisement for Wisconsin. It brings out visitors and buyers interested in the latest of local wares. Certain counties have earned the reputation of topnotch displays and exhibition standards which may furnish a special market for the farmer. Counties compete for top-grade entries in hopes of finding new outlets for marketing of their district produce.

Thus, one of the best ways of increasing the use and consumption of dairy products is through the fair. The 4–H Club milk sales, cheese parties, milking contests, and all the milk you can drink for 10 cents booths are typical of what fairgoers can take part in so as to cut the dairy surplus.

The county fair could be termed a sort of educational symposium. This is obvious from the practical instruction available for better crops and livestock. The simple learning of a few new methods can literally change the volume and character of the farmer's yearly output. He might never have discovered these improvements, nor been able to realize so fair a profit had it not been for his attendance at the fair. Moreover, there is no greater impetus to modernizing methods than to see the actual results of what can be done and what is possible in improved farming. There is, in fact, scheduled as part of most fairs a kind of daily farmers' institute, usually in session every morning throughout the event. Here the farmer can get the details of what he has seen among the entries, and obtain more information on the displays which interest him the most.

WOMEN'S ACHIEVEMENTS

No less important are the fair accomplishments rendered by our womenfolk. The novel recipe and tangy new preserves are not only important to the ladies, but are major morale builders to the "men of the house." Production goals are nothing without the energy food value of that prize apple cobbler and fruit preserves during the long, cold winter months. Farm and town housewives eagerly compete for honors from the food line to home-made clothing, handicraft accomplishments, and flower arrangements. They themselves will be introduced to new household products to ease their burdens.

YOUNGSTER'S CONTRIBUTIONS

The fair is a site of the young and old alike. Especially important is its role as a meeting place for members of such leading organizations as the Junior Fair, Future Farmers, and 4–H Club. Their own active participation in the exhibits and entries prepares them for outstanding leadership in their farm communities. New methods acquired in farming, conservation, and homemaking give the young man or woman a fuller understanding of the many problems faced in the fields, in farm kitchens, and rural meeting place.

I have long been closely acquainted with the project achievements of our Wisconsin 4–H Clubbers and know the high quality entries which they submit. The young lady who is a 4–H member adds to the comfort and happiness of her family through her demonstrated skills in meal planning and sewing, as does the boy versed in the care and management of farm machinery or familiar with modern methods of crop raising. All of these talents are basic services which meet home, farm, and community needs, and make for increased standards of living.

WHOLESOME FUN

A point not to be overlooked is that the fair provides entertainment and fun besides its tremendous educational value. Picnic lunches, games and contests, sociability with old friends, all afford need relaxation for both fair goers and the participants themselves. In this era of constant hustle and bustle, it is a rare and wonderful thing to have an opportunity to enjoy the companionship and reunion with true friends. The county fair gives us a meeting place for acquaintances and neighbors to get together, talk over mutual interests, find out the latest news about people of the county, the farm situation, national and world affairs. It represents the freest exchange of thought and assembly.

It is typical of the spirit of mutual help and cooperation which has always characterized civic and community spirit. It is a prime example of individuals getting together for their common interests and common good. The county fair is Democracy in action.

ELIMINATION OF UNNECESSARY GOVERNMENT REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the frustrations of redtape have long been among the most depressing and confusing characteristics of the Federal Government. The Second Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, the Hoover Commission, recognized this problem of modern government and recommended that the President, with the assistance of the Bureau of the Budget and the General Services Administration, "give increased emphasis in their reports program to the need to protect the public from unnecessary reporting burdens."

Through the elimination of confusing, duplicating, and unnecessary reporting, the Commission estimated that sums amounting to millions of dollars could be saved for both private persons and the Government.

I was pleased to see that the President just recently sent a letter to Mr. Percival F. Brundage, the Budget Director, stating his endorsement of the Hoover Commission's recommendation and authorizing and directing the Bureau of the Budget to earnestly pursue its implementation.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement issued by the White House, including a copy of the President's letter to Mr. Brundage, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The President, in a letter to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, has called for a stepped-up campaign to eliminate Government reporting requirements which impose unnecessary paperwork on the public and industry.

The President's letter endorsed a Hoover Commission recommendation that "increased

emphasis" be given to protecting the public from excessive reporting burdens. The President also expressed gratification at "substantial progress already made" in this area by the Budget Bureau and its Advisory Council on Federal Reports.

The Budget Bureau has made a vigorous effort to cut the paperwork required in the Government's official business with the public, in keeping with instructions issued by President Eisenhower at the outset of his administration. This is in line with the Bureau's broad responsibility for coordination and improvement of Government statistics and for promotion of better business management throughout the executive branch. The Federal Reports Act of 1942 gave the Bureau the specific function of reviewing and approving the public-use forms of all Federal executive agencies excepting the Internal Revenue Service, the Comptroller of the Currency, Bureau of Public Debt, Bureau of Accounts and Division of Foreign Funds Control in the Treasury Department, and bank supervisory agencies.

In carrying out its responsibilities under the Federal Reports Act, the Bureau of the Budget has the help of the Advisory Council on Federal Reports, composed of representatives of seven national business organizations. The Advisory Council applies its collective experience through specialized committees in recommending the elimination or consolidation of reports, changing the frequency of reporting, eliminating ambiguities in questions, and otherwise simplifying and standardizing requirements. Sponsors of the Council since 1943 are: American Chamber of Commerce Executives, American Retail Federation, American Trade Association Executives, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Controllers Institute of America, National Association of Manufacturers, National Industrial Council.

Typical improvements during the past 2 years in the Government's reporting and record-keeping procedures which have brought substantial savings in time and money to the public generally and cut clerical costs, filing requirements and warehouse needs of Government follow:

(1) As part of an examination still underway all of the public-use forms promulgated by the State offices of the Selective Service System have been reviewed. In this project some 60 different forms used to determine dependency status were consolidated into a single form; forms used by physicians to report on medical conditions, and those used by employers to report on occupational deferments were greatly simplified.

(2) Small-business establishments were particularly benefited when final plans were made for the last Census of Business. More than 1 million small-shop keepers, those having no paid employees, were relieved from having to file a report to the Bureau of the Census. As a substitute, arrangements were made for the transcription of the required information by the Internal Revenue Service to the Census Bureau.

(3) Cooperative arrangements have been made between Federal agencies and trade associations for the use of identical forms, as in the case of the Rubber Manufacturers Association; or for the use by the Government of trade association statistics, as in the case of Bureau of Mines' requirements for data on aluminum.

(4) Passport application forms and procedures have been revised and simplified by the Passport Division of the State Department; report forms used by regulatory agencies, such as Federal Power Commission, Federal Communications Commission, and Civil Aeronautics Board, have been simplified and revised.

(5) Substantial savings to industry resulted from revisions in the forms used by the Department of Defense in its industrial-security program. One industrial company estimated that the savings to it alone were approximately $75,000. Many other forms used by the Department of Defense and its services, particularly those used in connection with procurement, have also undergone material revision.

The President's letter to the Budget Director follows:

"DEAR MR. BRUNDAGE: The recent report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government entitled 'Paperwork Management, Part II, the Nation's Paperwork for the Government' directs attention to the problem of Government requirements which impose unnecessary paperwork on the public. The report recommends: 'That the President direct the Bureau of the Budget, together with its Advisory Council on Federal Reports and in cooperation with the General Services Administration, to give increased emphasis in their reports program to the need to protect the public from unnecessary reporting burdens by continuing the method of cooperation between industry and government pursued by our task force as outlined above.'

"I endorse the Commission's recommendation that increased emphasis be placed on actions to reduce unnecessary reporting burdens on industry and the public. In recognition of the responsibilities for the improvement of Government statistical activities and for the promotion of economy and efficiency in executive branch operations already assigned to the Bureau of the Budget, I believe the Bureau is the logical agency to assume leadership in such activities. A significant portion of the paperwork required of the public is associated with Government forms and related reporting requirements which require your approval under the Federal Reports Act, and I am gratified as the substantial progress already made in this program by the Bureau and its Advisory Council on Federal Reports.

"I wish you to give increased emphasis in this program to the elimination of reporting requirements which impose unnecessary paperwork on the public. With respect to matters not subject to review under the Federal Reports Act, I want you to proceed with the development, in cooperation with the affected executive agencies, of plans for eliminating unnecessary public reporting requirements and for simplifying related procedures and systems in such agencies.

"In carrying out this program I assume that you will make maximum use of the advisory services of the Advisory Council on Federal Reports and its various specialized committees. You will also wish to consult freely with the affected Federal agencies and when appropriate with the General Services Administration. You are authorized and directed to issue such circulars or other instructions as you may find useful in carrying out this assignment.

"I should like to receive from you by September 30, 1956, a report of your progress together with any recommendations you may have as to further steps required for the effective control of the paperwork burden on the public.

"Increased efforts to reduce the reporting burden on the public, together with actions being taken by the General Services Administration and other executive agencies aimed at solution of paperwork problems within the Government, will go far toward attaining the desirable objectives of the Hoover Commission's recommendations for improvement of paperwork management. They form a logical and valuable part of the broader responsibility and program of the Bureau of the Budget to bring about better internal business management throughout the executive branch.

"Sincerely,

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER."

REA PROGRESS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, last Sunday, May 20, the dedication service was held for the new office building of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in Washington. This modern, million-dollar building, a milestone on the path of progress, should be brought to the attention of the entire Nation, for it symbolizes the most outstanding single act of legislation for the benefit of rural America.

Twenty years ago, a relatively short time so far as history goes, electricity on the farm was only a dream in the minds of almost 90 percent of farm families.

Night after night, farm families would crowd around the kitchen table, turn the lamp a little higher, and try to read the news and farm magazines by its light. Can you now, you who lived in rural America those few short years ago, look without nostalgia on the evening chore of filling the kerosene lamp, the polishing of the chimney, or the burning down of a new mantle on that wonderful invention, the gas light?

In those days the hiss of the gas mantle light was audible, for the only other sounds on a farm were muted in the stillness of the evening. The radio was turned only for news broadcasts, in order to save the battery. Perhaps, then, the only other sound was the steady drip of water from the ice box as the ice melted away in its vain attempt to provide refrigeration.

The advances that have been made in the standard of living of the farm family have been tremendous in the past 20 years. Not only in the home where the modern conveniences of electrical appliances have eased the work of the housewife, but over the entire farm where electricity has been put to work in hundreds of jobs that were formerly left to manual labor or were not done—pumping water, running the grindstone, running the drill, welding, and the hundreds of other uses.

Not only has the Rural Electrification Administration brought untold advantages for the farm family, but the advances in technology have further increased the time- and labor-saving devices now in common use.

While no figures have been presented, there is no doubt in my mind that the opening of this vast new field of rural America to the manufacturers of electrical goods brought out many of the machines and techniques that we enjoy today.

This tremendous new market, opened to our great competitive system, brought forth the new and improved appliances and new techniques that are now shared by town and country alike.

Statistics can be quoted for hours on the number of farms now electrified, the number of kilowatts being used. Figures can show how much money has been loaned to rural cooperatives, how much has been paid back, how far ahead of schedules the repayment programs are. But these figures are cold, blind facts that might lead us into a statistical analysis of the situation instead of paying credit to the advances that have been made in our standard of living—a

case, once again if you please, of the farmer pulling the entire Nation ahead by his own bootstraps.

Today, America's farm families are current. They hear the news on their radios and television sets as soon as do their city cousins. They have running water, both hot and cold, in their homes, and they enjoy the cool efficiency of a modern kitchen with its electrical refrigerator and deep freezer. A flick of the switch brings light into any room or floods the farmyard while chores in the outbuildings move swiftly and easily under the help from electric motors and pumps.

Yes, Mr. President, the past 20 years has brought a revolution to the farm family that is nothing short of fantastic. Today more than 90 percent of farms are electrified, as against the 90 percent that were without electricity 20 short years ago.

This means we have reached the turning point in our progress, and now activities are in order to bring about the stabilizing of the movement, the increased education in more and better uses of electrical equipment on the farm and in the home.

Under the leadership of the Rural Electrification Administration, the many individual rural electric cooperatives across the length and breadth of the land, this transition is proving a smooth and profitable operation for the farm family.

Let us then, on this 20th anniversary, pay tribute not only to the Rural Electrification program and its founders, but also to the farm families themselves, who through their own efforts have made this program into a true milestone of progress in America's history.

THE TREND OF SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "Action by Congress Sought," ably written by Arthur Krock, and published in the New York Times of Sunday, May 20, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTION BY CONGRESS SOUGHT

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 19.—The most determined effort since 1938 is now being pressed to check and reverse the trend of Supreme Court decisions. In 1938 President Roosevelt pursued this objective through a statute to enlarge the Court's membership and put an age limit on the tenure of the justices. In 1956 12 Senators, former Associate Justice James F. Byrnes, and the sponsors of about 70 legislative proposals led the attack.

Roosevelt was not the first President, and probably he will not be the last, to seek by one method or another to impose curbs on the Supreme Court. The usual Presidential resort has been to article III of the Constitution. This leaves the number of Justices to Congress, and also subjects the power of the Court to review appeals (except in specified legal areas) to "such exceptions and under such regulations as Congress shall make." But this is perhaps the first period in American history when a former member of the Supreme Court has joined in an appeal to Congress to put new and severe limits on the appellate jurisdiction of the highest tribunal. Some proposals include a requirement of prior judicial service for membership on the Court.

INDIRECT CONGRESS ACTION

Ever since Chief Justice Marshall established judicial supremacy over the other two branches of the Government and over the laws and constitutions of the States there have been attempts of the same nature. But only twice, though State governments and inferior courts (State and Federal) have at times refused to enforce Supreme Court decisions, has Congress responded. This was by the indirect route of decreasing the number of Justices from 10 to 8 in 1801 and increasing it from 8 to 9 at the request of President Grant in 1870.

The purpose in 1801 was to prevent the incoming President, Jefferson, from making an appointment to the Court. The purpose in 1870 was to get a ruling that the Legal Tender Act was constitutional. A few hours before the Senate confirmed the 2 new Justices, Bradley and Strong (a resignation had given the President another place to fill), the Supreme Court ruled against the act, 4 to 3. In 1871, however, thanks to the 2 new members, the decision was reversed, 5 to 4.

But public opinion, reflected, as Mr. Dooley noted, in the election returns, has checked and reversed the judicial trend of the Supreme Court and this public opinion is what President F. D. Roosevelt appealed to in 1938, and Byrnes and Members of Congress are appealing to now, for support of legislative curbs proposed. Roosevelt failed to get his "packing" bill, but the public-political pressure he invoked swung the Supreme Court the other way on New Deal legislation. The current effort is to bring about a repetition of this history.

OBJECTORS CITE TRENDS

The trends of the Supreme Court that have brought about this situation are classified by the objectors as follows:

An ever-broadening concept of federalism as contrasted with that of a Republic of sovereign states; decisions on the basis of what the Court majority thinks the law ought to be as contrasted with what the law is; growing adherence to the "preemption doctrine" by which the Court excludes the States from any legislative area occupied by Congress without any clear proof of such congressional intent; the use of psychological and sociological research as guides to decision when the Constitution and the statutes provide no specific authority.

The final charge derives from the references to this research in the unanimous Supreme Court opinion that held racial segregation in the State public schools to be unconstitutional as violative of the "equal protection" clause of the 14th amendment. And this decision in particular accounts for the southern uprising against the Court. But the protest is much wider and deeper, as Senator BYRD revealed when, with 11 other Senators and a number of Representatives, he asked Congress to overrule the preemption doctrine. It is proposed to do this through a statute giving this instruction to the judiciary:

"When Congress intends a Federal law to invalidate all State laws in the same field it will say so; otherwise no court is to presume such an intention."

STATE LAW STRUCK DOWN

The provocation of this bill, first introduced in 1954 before the school decision, consists of a line of Supreme Court rulings since 1940. But it came to a head recently when the Court struck down the Pennsylvania antisedition law on the ground that a Federal act invalidated similar State laws. This ruling was made despite the fact that Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia, author of the Federal law, assured a questioner in the House debate there was no such intent in his legislation, and despite the further fact that the Smith Act was incorporated in title 18 of the Federal Penal Code which states in its preamble that no part of it invalidates State laws to the same purposes.

In 1941 the preemption doctrine was applied to an Alabama statute dealing with inspection and regulation of stock butter in commerce. Justice Reed, on a 5-to-4 decision, held that Congress by law had preempted this field. Chief Justice Stone, hotly dissenting, said Congress should "not be deemed to have intended to strike down a State statute unless it conflicts with the Federal statute and palpably infringes on its policy." Since then, in other close rulings, dissenting justices have encouraged the current movement for curbs by harsh criticisms of the majority.

OPINIONS IN DISSENT

Justice Harlan, dissenting from the majority ruling that due process was lacking in the dismissal of a New York City schoolteacher and therefore the dismissal could not stand, asserted that the right of dismissal was basic when a teacher refused to answer questions about his official conduct. When the majority, 5 to 4, ruled that the equal-protection clause required Illinois to furnish a free transcript of his trial to a convicted burglar on his statement he could not afford to buy one, Justice Harlan said the case "contained none of the elements heretofore regarded as essential to justify action by this Court under the 14th amendment."

Thus, as in 1938, the Supreme Court is under fire from without and within. But this time the Department of Justice and 42 State governments are arrayed against it on the preemption doctrine; 30 States and Congress resentfully remember that it overruled Congress' exemption of intrastate natural gas gatherers; and a sectional group of States is resisting the school desegregation decision.

NATIONAL MARITIME DAY

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, today is National Maritime Day. Throughout the country the Merchant Marine and allied industries are being honored for their long service and devotion to the commerce and defense of America. I should like to join today in paying tribute to the accomplishments of those men "who go down to the sea in ships."

Since colonial times American men and vessels have sailed the trade routes of the world. They have been one of the greatest moving forces in the economic development of the United States and in the fostering of international understanding and good will.

Down through the years in time of war the merchant marine has been the mainstay of our overseas forces in action, and indeed, the very lifeline of our allies. Throughout the dark days of World War II, American merchant ships carried on under almost impossible odds, bringing hope and strength to Europe and Asia. Economic development and rehabilitation of the war-torn countries could never have been accomplished without the aid of the American merchant marine.

Coming from a State which has a rich seafaring history, I have long been concerned with maritime interests and problems. The work which the various Maritime Associations, and especially the contributions which the Maritime Academies, both State and Federal, have

made to promote this time-honored and important industry, are worthy of note by all Americans. It is fitting today that we salute the American merchant marine for its outstanding contributions in both war and peace.

PERCENTAGE OF PARITY RECEIVED BY AMERICAN FARMERS

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, some weeks ago, in a controversy on the floor of the Senate in connection with the farm bill, I made certain statements as to the percentage of parity being received by the American farmer for what he sold. My statements were questioned by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. It is my purpose in a little while again to obtain the floor and document the accuracy of the statements which I made.

I wished to make this statement so that if the Senator from Indiana desired to be present at the time, he would have notice of the fact that I intend to submit for the RECORD evidence of the accuracy of the statements which I made and with reference to which the Senator from Indiana made certain remarks.

FEDERAL INDIAN POLICY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for approximately 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on occasion during this session of Congress I have discussed Federal Indian policy in general terms as it affects Indians throughout the Nation, and more specifically I have referred to Hill 57, a settlement of off-reservation Indians, living in the most squalid of conditions. As my colleagues may recall, the main topic of discussion with respect to these Indians is their need for welfare assistance and rehabilitation, and where does the responsibility lie—at the Federal, State, or county level

There are many varying degrees of opinion on this matter. As my colleagues in the Senate know, I feel that the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Indian Affairs have been too severe in determination of aid for those Indians on the reservation and those who have moved off the reservation.

With respect to the situation at Hill 57 in Great Falls, Mont., I wish to present some more detailed information. I am in receipt of a report on Hill 57 prepared by students of the College of Great Falls and presented at the Montana State University Institute of Indian Affairs, April 11, 1956. This lengthy report is very complete and presents the situation as they found it among the off-reservation Indians on Hill 57, including historical, social, and educational background material.

Mr. President, in view of the length of the study I ask that portions of the panel report be printed at this point in my remarks, including a letter dated May 17 from Francis Mitchell of the College of Great Falls, giving credit to those who have done so much work in behalf of the Indians on Hill 57; an introduction, and background material, prepared by Angela Kenfield; and the sociology staff's conclusions and recommendations.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLLEGE OF GREAT FALLS,
Great Falls, Mont., May 17, 1956.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: In light of your recent efforts on the Senate floor as regards Hill 57 here in Great Falls, we are sending you the panelists' reports on the subject, which were given at the Montana State University Institute on Indian Affairs, April 11, 1956.

Our panel from the College of Great Falls was titled "A Census of Hill 57 for 1954–55," and it was delivered the first day of the institute at Missoula after the opening talks of Dr. Leslie Fiedler, Mr. Joseph Garry, president of the National Congress of American Indians, and the remarks of Dr. Harold Tascher, the university's director of the institute.

As chairman of the panel group, I opened the census report with an introduction of the student panelists. These were Mrs. Andree Deligdisch, a Fulbright scholar from Holland and a sociology senior at our college, Miss Angela Kenfield; Mr. James Sibert; Mr. Richard Charles, post graduate, University of Wisconsin; and two special consultants from the audience whom we invited to join us.

These consultants were Mr. Joseph Marino, Cascade County social worker in charge of Hill 57's relief clients, Mr. Paul Eagleman of the Rocky Boy's Reservation where most of the Hill 57 families originate, and Mr. Bernard King, college president of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. It was the confraternity that began the first work on the hill from our school.

The order of the panel reports and the contents, as we are sending them to you have been revised somewhat to meet the discussions and questions concerning Hill 57 which have been raised since. We are now limiting our number to the 12 months between July 1 and June 30, rather than the previous listing from those people on the hill from January 1954 to July 1955. This recasting has been done with the advice and the assistance of our project's director, Sister Providence, FCSP, a master of arts in sociology from the Catholic University of America and on the faculty of the college, and with the help of other advisers like Dr. Catherine Nutterville, Mr. John Gedeon, and Max Gubatayao.

Before closing I would like to add a personal view in regard to the Hill 57 situation. I do not feel that the hill is or should be considered an isolated case or something entirely apart from the reservation picture. Others with whom I have talked seem to feel as I do, that Hill 57 is a part of the whole Indian question, and that the Indians of Hill 57 and their problems are related to the problems of all American Indians.

The other members of the panel and myself hope that these papers will be an aid to you in your work for Hill 57 and all other American Indians.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS MITCHELL,
College of Great Falls,
Great Falls, Mont.

PANEL INTRODUCTION: THE CHIPPEWA OF HILL 57

(By Angela Kenfield, College of Great Falls)

Hill 57 received its name from a Heintz 57-variety sign which stood on the eastern slope many years ago. The Indians live in 2 villages, 1 on the western side and 1 on the top of the hill, approximately 5 miles from the city center of Great Falls.

The permanent residents of Hill 57, numbering continually more than 300 people, are identified as Chippewa Indians, many of whose families have traditions leading back five generations to the shores of the Great Lakes. Some of the families have a Canadian background, and a few have never had relations with the Federal Government on a reservation, for their grandfathers were members of little lost bands of Chippewa wandering into Montana more than 100 years ago. Most of the families, however, are truly off-reservation Indians, and not nonreservation Indians of no particular identity. The fathers or grandfathers of the children now on the hill were driven off their reservations by military action or more recently by economic pressures.

Hill 57, therefore, is not a reservation. It is not a temporary labor camp. The Federal Government's Indian Bureau has no contact with the Hill people, nor does it provide, as is falsely presumed for all Indians, a monthly payment of tax money for them. Hill 57 is a permanent fringe area of Indian settlement adjacent to the city of Great Falls for more than 20 years.

It is reached from the city center by crossing the Missouri River and driving west toward a rim of hills which half-encircle Great Falls. A turn onto a gravel road will lead to the section of a city where there are railroad yards, trailer courts, and small houses, a people who are half-rural, half-urban.

Beyond these about a mile is the first of two Indian settlements, referred to as the camp; the other on the top of the Hill is called Mount Royal.

THE CAMP

In dismal array, six clusters of cabins are situated over 10 or more acres of prairie land. Only 7 of the families in these cabins are owners of them. Only 4 families own land in the camp. Citizens of the nearby non-Indian neighborhoods are the owners. Instead of trees there are overturned, wrecked cars, and numerous outbuildings all in need of repair. Instead of streets there are wandering automobile tracks from one cluster of paper-covered shacks to the other. Instead of the usual indications of modern social living that the usual residential area may have; street signs, bus-stop signs, telephone and electric wires, water hydrants, mail boxes and house numbers, there is only the red arm of a single pump handle over the well amid the central cluster of abodes, as George Engstrom calls them.

STAYING ALIVE ON HILL 57

The men of the camp walk or drive from one-half to 5 miles for work sporadically, according to season and the demand. Some of the common labor is had at the nearby railroad yards, where the men clean boxcars which carry sheep and cattle to market from Montana ranches. The contractor pays them a dollar or a dollar and a half to clean cars sometimes 32 feet in length, sometimes double-tiered. In season, there is work at the cement plant or the brickyard, or at the stockyard, but it is seasonal. Out of season, the men and their wives, frequently, drive to the city dump grounds to salvage food, furniture, and scrap iron which may be sold for a few cents to buy the gasoline without which there would be no hauling of water or wood to the isolated cabins.

MOUNT ROYAL

By continuing past the camp in a 3-mile circle to the top of the hill, the observer will come upon a more orderly row of cabins, erected and rented to Hill Indians by a non-Indian landowner. This is Mount Royal. There is a mud street of sorts and some evidences of a city's utilities, such as electricity, and a cold-water faucet in each house. However, there is no indoor plumbing. Beyond

these two-room houses made of discarded lumber from railway boxcars, there are more tar-paper shacks scattered about in the manner of the camp below. Some of the Indians own the land where these are situated, Indians like the Damons who have been residents of the hill since the 1920's. The State of Montana owns many acres on top of the hill.

THE NEIGHBORS

Mount Royal has a more progressive air than the camp. Some construction workers live here. There is even an antennae of a television from the one man who holds a steady job at the Anaconda smelter. The incentive to own may come from close proximity to the upper-class homes of the city's non-Indians which line the approaches to Mount Royal on the southern slope. None are more aware than the Indians at the top of the hill that their shacks are situated on one of the finest residential sites of the city, and they watch uneasily the housing development below them. Stories still burn in their minds of forced removals from the ancient camping grounds by the Missouri River to these windy heights above the city.

MORE THAN ONE HILL 57

If the observer looks from Mount Royal toward the great smokestack of the smelter on another hill, he will see another shack village. Once there were five such settlements in Great Falls, and the students have learned that other Montana cities have such Indian city colonies. They have many characteristics in common: (1) there are too many school-age children not in school; (2) there is disorder, lack of sanitation and the most primitive conveniences; (3) there is polite but unmistakable rejection of every non-Indian who steps into the area; (4) there is evidence of widespread malnutrition and poor health; (5) there is no spokesman, no evidence of social organization, no sign of any other value than that of survival.

It is true that closer acquaintance has shown the Ah-On-Te-Ways Chippewa band to have a procedure of election for ceremonial purposes, that there is a secret cycle of culture ways involving sweat lodges and peyote. On Mount Royal among the members of yet another band of Chippewa until recently there were no signs of religious life or any contact with a church group in the city, except the presence of religious symbols in the homes.

On the positive side of a Hill 57, there are remarkable family ties, a sharing and a suffering together. The grouping of the houses have indicated a sort of clan arrangement without any clan organization, but even in this area of social relationships, when the crisis periods develop and food is to be fought for, the residents of the Buckskin Fringe are individualized to the point of sacrificing every loyalty. It is dangerous at such times to venture to the dump grounds and to grub about for scrap iron. Barriers of silence and hostility are erected; outrageous prices are charged one's brothers and sisters for rides or errands to the city. On Hill 57 when relief orders are cut off, and men and women "get the shakes" from hunger, then the dream of the individualized, nontribal Indian comes true for all enthusiastic proponents of termination.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(By members of the sociology staff, College of Great Falls)

CONCLUSIONS

1. The facts of the study of the Hill 57 population bear out the estimates of Dr. John McGregor, Great Falls physician, that the Hill people are less than 1 percent of the city's population, but that they make up 10 percent of the welfare caseload, and 25 percent of the Cascade County's welfare medical load.

2. The census indicates that the averge family size exceeds that of the average city dweller, and that kinship ties bring added members.

The social climate on Hill 57 is marked by fear and hostility, and that personality disorder is the rule rather than the exception, as was indicated in the difficulties experienced in collecting research data.

4. There is nearly a total lack of normal material goods necessary for pursuit of the American way of life.

5. There is a high mobility rate in the population, and a close tie between Indian urban areas and the reservation areas.

6. The Indians are one as a social unit of the American population, whether residing off or on the reservations. There is interchange, there is impact of personalities and events between the two areas. A crisis on the Rocky Boy's Reservation brings new families to Great Falls' Hill 57. A period of good times on the reservation such as the CCC program sees many families returning there.

7. The Federal Government is giving nothing by way of services except through the categorical services of the Social Security Act.

8. The State of Montana is doing nothing by way of rehabilitation.

9. Cascade County is meeting only part of the need part of the time.

10. Private agencies within Great Falls provide sporadic and feeble resources when stimulated by various crises on the Hill.

11. The types of families of whom 36 are more or less stable father-mother-child families, the number of children being raised by grandparents and the proportion of 1-parent families should do away with the facile local dismissal of fringe Indian colonies: "They won't help themselves. Why should we?" The fact that permanently beyond the outskirts of the city there are 193 undernourished children should change the approach to discussions of Hill 57.

12. Institutional contacts between the city and the Hill are at a minimum as indicated by the fact that only 10 of the 79 Indian families on the Hill during 1954–55 had all their school-age children in school.

RECOMMENDATION

Standardize research and provide some beginning for planning at all agency levels by a registration of Indians everywhere in the United States.

Let there be application blanks provided at such places as the post offices of this country which any Indian so desiring could fill out:

My name _____.
My residence _____.
My tribe _____.

Past recognition of my family as an Indian family by the United States Government _____.

Present recognition from the Government that I have Indian tribal membership or rights _____.

I would like a certificate testifying to my position with the Federal Government.

Let such a certificate be issued by the appropriate office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs which would state:

This is to certify that John Doe-Child is an American Indian of the _____ Tribe. His reservation is _____ and he is/or is not entitled to service there.

Signed _____
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in recent months there has been considerable discussion about the relocation program available to Indians on reservations as provided by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The general idea is commendable, but there is considerable dispute as to its success, and the state of affairs that many of the Indians find themselves.

In April I received a letter from Sister Providencia, F. C. S. P., of the College of Great Falls, a tireless worker in behalf of the distressed Indian. She has presented a moving picture of the problems that must be faced by the off-reservation Indians on Hill 57. It is a pathetic picture that Sister Providencia paints for us. I hope that interested Senators will take time to read this letter.

Sister Providencia wonders if Hill 57 is atypical. I doubt it. I suspect that there are a number of concentrations of off-reservation Indians who find themselves in a similar situation.

I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point, Sister Providencia's letter of April 22, and a copy of my letter to the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, at which time I forwarded to him the conclusions drawn from the report sent to me by the students.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLLEGE OF GREAT FALLS,
Great Falls, Mont., April 22, 1956.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: In my last letter I told you that we had not pursued our research of the Hill 57 population as far as the ages of the children, that we had only the total number under 21 years of age. Yesterday, Joseph Marino, the Cascade County caseworker for the Hill spent 2 hours with us on the ages of the children from his records, and the school attendance which the students had gained for the year 1954–55 from the county offices of education. The school bus list and a list of Hill children attending the West Side Junior High School seemed most conclusive about attendance.

We concluded that there were 92 children in the permanent population of Hill 57 between the ages of 6 and 18 years, computed from November 1, 1949, for those 6 years old in the fall of 1954, and from June 1, 1937, for those who were 18 years old or less. The school bus list showed 50 children in attendance for the year chosen, of whom 11 were in junior high school. We would therefore have a percentage of 54.3, for this sample off-reservation population.

On the basis of this, I think the Indian Bureau progress is to be commended as regards the reservations, and the tribal council scholarship programs even more. The Blackfeet Tribe, for instance, has educated 49 college graduates since 1951. Hill 57 has not even produced 1 high school graduate during the same period.

I have both good and bad to report about the Hill for this month. From a little loan fund maintained here at the college by some women like Mrs. George Roberts, and town Indians like the Thumms, we have helped six men from Hill families to retain or to acquire union cards which will permit them to join the city's construction crews. The fee at present is $15 for a downpayment, for the Trades and Laborers' Union. We are trying to help every man who comes down from the Hill to seek aid, because the unemployed from other places will soon be attracted here by new projects, and up will go the fee. It is only right that the Great Falls men who have maintained the payment of dues all winter should have protection of employment services by the union.

We also helped 4 out-of-town Indians, 2 from Canada whom we aided to the border. From there the Canadian Government will take over for its needy natives, who may be stranded far from their reserves. One of

the Canadians said to us, "I was down here looking for work, but I am going back. My people are going crazy with this enfranchisement business. Seventeen wells on our land, you know."

The other two men were from the Havre dumps. One had a wife and child in an $8-a-week hotel room, and we are trying to keep them there until he finds work. These people had their shacks leveled to the ground by the steam shovels of the Army engineers a few weeks ago, the Federal men being intent on opening a flood-control project. Some Indian families, who had suffered all through the winter without a bit of help at the edge of the city there, had not even time to remove their belongings from the makeshift dwellings.

Now for the good again—two men of the Hill who received their first pay checks last week returned a total of $25 to the loan fund, and other families were helped to solve the cash problem. When a man has been 6 months on food and fuel orders from the county general relief program—more than 30 families on the Hill—the $15 union fee is hard to come by. There were two such families at the college yesterday, father, mother, babe in arms, to ask if we knew of any rock-picking jobs.

"Cleaning boxcars is no good," one man said, an enrolled Fort Belknap Indian. "We worked 6 hours and only got a dollar and a half. When they are double deckers, we have about 3 feet to work in cleaning out the manure, and then we throw the sand in on the floor of the car. This is as high as your head from the ground."

All general relief clients of the county were told last week, April 11, that there would be no more food orders until next winter. So a sign of spring for us here in the Falls is an automobile waiting at the hospital kitchen door for food. The other day I counted 11 children under 7 years of age belonging to the young mothers in the front seat of 1 car. "Yes," they said, "they all belong to us. Yes; this is Martin. He hasn't rustled money for a union card yet."

The look on Martin's face set me to meditating on the English poor-law policy of the State and county welfare boards. It goes something like this: Spring is the season for common labor on farms and construction jobs. There must be work. Therefore, there is work. The able-bodied can look for it, and feed their own families.

During April we may observe the process, better known at Institutes on Indian Affairs as the Indian finding his rightful place in our society. The union agent meets his application for work with the words, "Find the price of a union card." The employment office tells him, "There is a rock-picking job 30 miles from here. Find the money for gasoline." The farmer tells him when he has stolen or begged his way to the farm, "You can pick for $2 an acre, but find yourself a place to live." His wife says upon his return, "Leave town for that job and find yourself another wife."

She will be left on the Hill, you see, to keep the children in school, it may be, but without food, water, or fuel for a week, or the means to get them. The old tribal law of sharing, still left to these detribalized Indians, breaks down during such crisis periods. It is each man for himself. Consequently the process culminated for some families in school withdrawal for the children. Everybody went out to pick rocks on the Great Plains.

I wonder about them this morning. There is snow on the ground.

Sad to say, more serious alternatives developed from the announcement by the county caseworker that the last food order had been dispensed. One Hill mother left her three small children and her husband and ran away to relatives in a distant town. I know this girl. I know it could only be a kind of frenzy. She is devoted to her family. For an Indian woman to desert her children is the final word in disorganization. Another mother sought employment on the southside to the shame of everyone.

We need more research, Senator. Perhaps life on Hill 57 is atypical. Dr. Nutterville suggests a request to the Bureau of the Census for figures on the concentrations of off-reservation Indians. The college students brought home a remark by an official attending the Missoula Institute that there were 5,000 of them at Rapid City, S. Dak. How do they fare in the spring?

God bless you for your thankless efforts in behalf of the distressed.

Sincerely yours,

Sister PROVIDENCIA, F. C. S. P.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., May 21, 1956.

Hon. WESLEY A. D'EWART,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. D'EWART: I am sending the attached conclusions and recommendations prepared by members of the sociology staff of the College of Great Falls concerning Indians on Hill 57, Great Falls, Mont., for your comment.

The students at the College of Great Falls have spent a great deal of time over the past year studying conditions among off-reservation Indians, particularly on Hill 57. The complete report is very thorough and more than substantiates the need for some sort of Federal assistance for these destitute Indians.

The conclusions drawn from the report merit serious consideration by the Department of the Interior. A program of registration of Indians in the country, as recommended by the students would be most beneficial.

Please return the attached copy with your reply.

With best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

PROSPECTIVE COLLAPSE OF SCIENCE ATTACHÉ PROGRAM IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate for approximately 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on May 9, 1956, I called the Senate's attention to the fact that the 5-year-old science attaché program in the State Department was on the verge of collapse. I would now invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that this program is on the verge of being dissolved and completely forgotten at the very time when our country is hard pressed in the scientific race with the Soviet Union.

A competent staff reported of the Washington Post and Times Herald, Mr. Warren Unna, has recently written a column concerning the same problem, entitled "State's Science Program Dying." This column appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on May 13, 1956, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIPLOMATIC SNUB?—STATE'S SCIENCE PROGRAM DYING

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 13, 1956]

(By Warren Unna)

The State Department's 5-year-old science attaché program is now down to two small rooms in a condemned tempo with a roster consisting of exactly 1 acting science adviser and 2 secretaries.

The minute, punched-out beaverboard quarters in State Department Annex No. 3 are due for demolition in a month or so. The last four science attachés came home from United States Embassies in Paris, Stockholm, Tokyo, and London last December and January. There hasn't been a departmental science adviser since 1954.

The program's acting adviser, Walter M. Rudolph, is an economist who now spends his days assorting scientific inquiries from other Washington agencies and seeing that they get into the right regional mailbox at State.

Rudolph explains that he can't do anything about the attaché program until a reappraisal study, informally begun in 1953, comes from the Secretary's office. He concedes that with all the science attachés now home from their foreign posts, there isn't much activity to reappraise.

"We've got a backlog of scientific applicants but we're not recruiting at all," Rudolph observes. "We're not permitted to. It's the feeling in the Department that it wouldn't be advisable to send science attachés out until a decision was reached on the kind of program we're to have."

(The Soviet apparently is not bothered by such decision problems. A recent dispatch from Stockholm declared that the Russians, aware of their tendency to underrate western science and technology, had already assigned a scientific counselor to their Swedish Embassy and would extend the program to Embassies in all major capitals.)

The attaché program is an outgrowth of State's 1949 reorganizational activities. It was set up to keep the diplomatic service informed on scientific and technical matters affecting foreign relations.

Explains Rudolph: "More and more, scientific activities are affecting our foreign relations. It is not only what a guy does in a lab, but what a foreign government appropriates for a scientific program. This can affect our foreign policy, our diplomatic relations. If you want to spot these activities, you better get a scientist who can recognize them."

In 1952 the program had 10 scientists attached to 5 United States Embassies. Joseph B. Koepfli, a prominent organic chemist from the California Institute of Technology, was the program's science adviser.

The program, even in its brief existence, fell somewhat short of expectations. University scientists proved reluctant to forsake their campus research and academic tenure for more than a sabbatical year plus a summer at either end; a total of 18 months instead of the 4 years attachés usually sign up for.

But American scientists reported the program a success. Rudolph says the attachés helped set up international scientific conferences, selecting and briefing delegates; helped in the international exchange of scientific personnel, and helped in the early planning of next year's International Geophysical Year.

When the Eisenhower administration took office in 1953, it began a reappraisal of embassy attachés. Agricultural attachés were put on the Department of Agriculture's payroll.

But the science attachés were left on a limb. The Hoover Commission last year recommended that they be made responsible to the Central Intelligence Agency.

Chemical & Engineering News reported in its January edition: "The science attachés view this recommendation with alarm. Some believe that, at best, such a transfer would enervate the work of the science attachés and, at worst, would create downright resentment abroad to the detriment of our foreign relations."

The attachés were set up to handle unclassified scientific information. They saw a direct conflict in being attached to an intelligence agency.

Similarly, there has been little enthusiasm for putting them under the Office of Naval Research, whose interests are maritime; or the National Science Foundation, whose interests are the promotion of fundamental science.

Comments Rudolph: "If you place a science attaché in any other agency you change his function. This would not be carrying out scientific relations with foreign countries."

Once State comes to a decision on its science attaché program, Rudolph foresees no difficulty in attracting the right men. He says the salaries provided are comparable to the full and associate professorship salaries at leading American universities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in reading the report as written by the staff reporter of the Washington Post and Times Herald, one is struck with the fact that a program which was well underway some years ago and subject to reevaluation and analysis in 1953 is still today without any report as to its activities, and without any analysis being made available by the Department of State as to its further activities, its continuance or discontinuance. Apparently the Department has not as yet made up its mind what it is going to do about having scientific attachés at our respective Embassies in some of the major countries of the world. I would have my colleagues note that the Soviet Union is not quite so definite. Only this past week the Kremlin announced that they were assigning a special scientific counselor to their Swedish Embassy and that they would extend the program of having scientific attachés to Embassies in all the major capitals.

The attaché program in this country is the outgrowth of the State Department's 1949 reorganizational activities. It was established to keep the diplomatic service informed on scientific and technical matters affecting foreign relations.

Concerning what is left of this service, Mr. Walter M. Rudolph had this to say:

More and more scientific activities are affecting our foreign relations. It is not only what a guy does in a lab, but what a foreign government appropriates for a scientific program. This can affect our foreign policy, our diplomatic relations. If you want to spot these activities, you had better get a scientist who can recognize them.

Mr. President, in 1952 this program had 10 scientists attached to 5 United States Embassies. At the present time I believe it is down to the acting director, and I believe that is all; namely, Mr. Walter M. Rudolph.

The program, even in its brief existence, fell somewhat short of expectations. University scientists proved reluctant to forsake their campus research and academic tenure for more than a sabbatical year plus a summer at either end—a total of 18 months, instead of the 4 years attachés usually sign up for. But American scientists reported the program a success.

I would hope, Mr. President, that the State Department would give its final judgment as to what is to happen to the program.

It appears to me that at a time when we are deeply concerned about the scientific progress of the Soviet Union and the vast amounts of money which are hidden away in the Soviet Union's budget for science the presence of scientific attachés at our Embassies in the major capitals of the world might be very desirable.

Furthermore, the scientists, if attached to the Embassies, could do much to seek cooperation among scientists of the free nations, and to correlate or to bring together some of the most important scientific work that has been done and that needs to be done. This is apparently one of those "minor problems" that affect our Government, and it appears to have rather long term and serious consequences.

I noted in the press only the day before yesterday that the American representatives who are visiting in the Soviet Union and examining some of the developments in the field of nuclear science have been very much impressed by the laboratories which they have seen, the quality of the work which has been undertaken, and the very, very generous—indeed, extravagant—allocations of funds on the part of the Soviet Union in the field of nuclear science. If these things be true, it appears to me that the State Department would do well to implement its program of scientific attachés.

SOVIET ANNOUNCEMENT OF DEMOBILIZATION OF A MILLION SOLDIERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an article entitled "Another Soviet Initiative," written by Walter Lippmann, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 17, 1956.

Mr. Lippmann has recently returned from Europe and has written an incisive analysis of the effect in Europe of the new Soviet announcement that a million Soviet soldiers will be demobilized. It appears to me that this matter, like that of the scientific attachés, requires the most careful analysis and consideration on the part of our Government.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

ANOTHER SOVIET INITIATIVE

Returning to Washington after 2 weeks in London and Paris, I cannot help feeling that we may be missing one of the main points of the Soviet decision to demobilize about a million men. "I do not think," said Mr. Dulles at his press conference on Tuesday, that "what the Soviet Union is here doing * * * is calculated appreciably to alter their military power." Mr. Dulles was implying that for this reason the Soviet move had no bearing upon the military policy of the NATO countries. Since the Soviet military power will be just as great as before the reduction, the menace to be guarded against will be just as great as ever.

This is not, I believe, the way the Soviet announcement will be read in Western Europe. The question there is more likely to be this: If the Soviet Union can demobilize something like a quarter of its men under arms and still be just as powerful as ever, how many men could be demobilized—or, in the case of the Germans, not conscripted—without making Western Europe less secure?

The more it is proved by Mr. Dulles that the Soviets have lost nothing by economizing military manpower, the more impressive will be the example they have set. For Britain, France, and Germany are short of industrial manpower. Military service is regarded as a wasteful and tiresome thing. The action of the Soviets will be judged not so much as a gesture for peace but to see whether it is an example of military realism.

The question is whether in the revolution of military technology amidst which we are living, the Soviet Union is seizing the initiative in the strategical thinking about that revolution. There has been much discussion here in Washington as to whether the Soviet Union has a lead in certain fields—as for example guided missiles. But what we need to ask ourselves also is whether the Soviet Union is adapting its high policy more quickly than we are to the new military developments.

The Soviets have been ahead of us in realizing the political consequences of what happened in 1949 when they broke our monopoly and began to develop nuclear weapons. They saw, as our official policymakers for so long refused to see, that the unavoidable consequence would be the growth of neutralism in all countries that do not themselves possess nuclear weapons. It could not have been otherwise. When a country is unarmed for modern nuclear warfare, when it has no deterrent power and no defensive power, it must move toward a neutral position between the nuclear powers.

The Soviets saw this and very promptly made their own the encouragement of neutralism. This piece of military realism on their part has increased enormously their political influence in Asia. We have just begun to come around to it in the past few months. In the visit of President Sukarno of Indonesia and the coming visit of Pandit Nehru, we are beginning to try to repair the damage of an ill-judged policy.

Thanks to Churchill's genius, the West was ahead of the Soviets in realizing the political consequences of the second military revolution, that of the hydrogen bomb. This second revolution has led us to the acknowledgment at the summit meeting in Geneva that the great nuclear powers themselves are in a military stalemate and that they cannot contemplate war as an instrument of their policies.

We are now in a third phase of this evolution in strategical thinking. It has to do primarily with the adaptation of Western European military policy to the military stalemate which was acknowledged at Geneva. The NATO army is in trouble because of a growing skepticism as to whether it reflects a right estimate of the coming military situation. I was surprised to find how far this skepticism has gone, how deep is the questioning in high quarters abroad as to the true military value of much that never has been questioned before. As an example of how drastic the reexamination is, there is serious thought being given in Great Britain to the abolition of Fighter Command, of the glorious service which in 1940 won the Battle of Britain. The argument today is that Britain cannct be defended successfully by interceptors against the modern supersonic bombers. The reexamination does not stop there. It has begun

to reach out toward the ground forces in Western Germany.

It is against this background, I believe, that the Soviet action needs to be interpreted. The question is not really whether the Soviets are beguiling and deceiving us but whether they are going to persuade Western Europe that they know how to show the way to security and prosperity. Certainly in this matter of reducing military personnel, the door on which they are pushing is already ajar.

REPORTED DISCONTENT IN COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT SECURITY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, when I sponsored Senate Joint Resolution 21 last year, and when Congress adopted the joint resolution, I was hopeful that within a reasonable period of time we would have a comprehensive report from the bipartisan Commission on Government Security which was to be created. To date, there have been few reports about the Commission's progress, and those that have appeared have been pessimistic about the likelihood of early results.

One such article was written by Murrey Marder, a staff reporter of the Washington Post and Times Herald, and was published in that newspaper on May 19, 1956. Mr. Marder's article was entitled "Bipartisan Security Study Discontent Reported, but Group's Chief Denies It." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIPARTISAN SECURITY STUDY DISCONTENT REPORTED, BUT GROUP'S CHIEF DENIES IT

(By Murrey Marder)

There is considerable grumbling behind the scenes of the slow-moving Commission on Government Security over the pace and direction it is taking.

While there has been no public talk about it, within and outside of the Commission, there is growing skepticism that it will attain the "reforms" envisioned when Congress authorized it last August over the Eisenhower administration's opposition.

Chairman Lloyd Wright, in an interview, expressed surprise at the idea of any discontent within the group.

The 12-member bipartisan Commission, he recalled, was not named until November 10, and did not organize until December 14.

"We didn't get our offices until January," said Wright. "We didn't really get started until February."

TELLS OF TASK'S MAGNITUDE

He added: "We had all of $50,000 to start to study all of Government—167 departments, agencies, divisions, sections.

"We've got to analyze, study, and digest every Executive order, law, and regulation of all branches of Government in this security field, plus all of the Government's prime and subcontractors handling sensitive work—between 1,000 and 1,200 of them."

When Congress created the Commission, it was thought it would take off from where congressional studies of much of the background had left off.

But Wright said: "We're not supposed to take somebody else's recommendations. We've got to take a look-see ourselves. It takes more time than appears at first blush."

Wright, a past president of the American Bar Association and a right-wing Republican, said neither his own nor the Commission's view has "jelled" on appraising the present personnel security programs.

SEE HONEST JOB DONE

Later in the interview, however, he indicated some fairly jelled views about his approach.

"The overall program that I've studied so far," he said, "indicates that the Government people handling the (security) work are doing an honest, fearless, sincere job.

"That there have been honest mistakes of judgment, of course, goes without saying.

"But you only hear," he said, "of the cases that have been mishandled. You never hear of the vast majority of cases that have been properly handled."

That should be music in the ears of Federal security officials; they frequently have expressed the same view.

Wright, who was active in urging legal aid for those accused in security cases, said, "I think there are some corrections that have got to be made. * * * As long as you have humans handling things you will have human mistakes."

He said he thought it significant that "since the Commission was organized, the British came out with their White Paper that advocated the security procedure we have been following for years."

(A British commission advocated broadening their security program to Communist sympathizers and employees with character defects; in operation, however, the British security program still has many differences.)

Asked if he felt there was any solution to the stigma borne by the term, "security risk," Wright replied:

"Every time you get a ticket for a traffic violation you have broken the law—but no 'stigma' attaches."

When asked whether the Commission will study qualifications of (Federal) security personnel, Wright said, "at first glance, I don't see that that is within our province."

The Commission has received pleas to step into individual security cases "from a whole slew of individuals—poor devils—who feel they are being questioned," he said, but "that's not within our jurisdiction. We can't clear anybody. We can only examine cases that suggest weaknesses or strengths of procedure."

Wright said the Commission is receiving, "I am happy to say, full cooperation from Government," through conferences with agency heads and interdepartmental groups.

The Commission's original $50,000 was quickly spent, and Congress has just allotted $200,000 more—some of which already is spent in delayed salaries and expenses. Last February, Wright caused considerable surprise when he told a House committee the whole job should cost "at least $3 million" and could not be done by the deadline of December 31, 1956. Now, he said, "I'm hopeful we will be able to get through by the first quarter of next year, or not to exceed the second quarter—and do a bangup job."

Since its organization meeting, the Commission has met only twice, he said, but will again meet "very shortly—within 30 days."

One Commission member, Senator NORRIS COTTON, Republican, New Hampshire, an Eisenhower Republican, when asked yesterday if he was satisfied with the Commission's progress, said:

"I am hopeful that this Commission will be able to get down to brass tacks. I think there is a lot of work to be done and I am not going to say that I am entirely happy about the progress so far."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to encourage the members of the Commission to proceed forthwith to this all-important study. It appears to me that it is one of the most important tasks which has ever been assigned to a Government commission.

It was the wish of Congress that the task be performed rather expeditiously and, at the same time, thoroughly and objectively. I hope that before the end of this Congress, we may have an interim report as to some of the observations made by the Commission, together with some of their interim recommendations and findings.

It should be recognized that the life or the term of the Commission extends until the end of 1956. It was felt that that would allow ample time for a rather extended and complete report on the Government security and loyalty program.

UNFAIR TREATMENT OF CERTAIN SUPPLIERS OF SUGAR

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have prepared remarks concerning the conference report on the sugar bill, which was approved by the Senate last week and sent to the President. I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

Last week the Senate approved the conference report on the sugar legislation that we considered earlier in this session and sent it to the President. I wish I could have been present when the conference report was taken up. I had a number of observations to make in connection with that legislation which I would have liked to see become part of the legislative history.

However, I was not on the floor at the time. I hasten to say that I would not have voted against the conference report in any event since I know the difficult job it was to arrive at even the formulation that is included in the bill now pending before the President.

That bill has its defects, from my point of view, and, I am sure, from the viewpoint of others.

My purpose in rising at this time is to speak for those of our suppliers of sugar who in my judgment were not fairly treated in the sugar legislation and who deserve more consideration, or at least more equitable consideration than they did in fact receive. I refer to Puerto Rico and to the Philippines. I want to speak of each of these two sugar-producing areas separately because they present different problems in connection with the sugar legislation. Today I shall speak of the Philippines and of the unwise manner in which the sugar legislation overlooked the legitimate interests not so much of the Philippines but of the United States in our relations with the Philippines.

My views on this matter are based on the assumption and the conclusion that we have a tremendous stake of interest in the Philippines and in the maintenance of Philippine-American relations on the closest possible basis. The Philippines is the showcase for democracy in the Far East. This is often said but much too frequently the words are uttered without reference to substance and meaning. The substance and meaning lies in the fact that the Philippines is the staging ground in the Far East for our type of democracy. Thus it is to our highest interest to see to it that Philippine democracy works and that the economy upon which this democratic form of government rests is given every proper and possible assistance. It is also essential that we show the Filipino people the special favor of our special concern.

Now in this sugar legislation we made available to many producing areas a share in whatever growth and expansion there is in our sugar consumption. As we consume more sugar, we will distribute, under the terms of the sugar legislation, more or less

equitable shares of that growth increment among the various producing areas, both domestic and foreign. In the sugar bill we give the Philippines not a single pound of that increment.

It is true that the Philippines already have a large share of the American sugar market. This is guaranteed to them by mutual compact between our two countries. But that is not the matter at issue. The Philippines have had that share of our sugar market for a long time, and as our sugar consumption increases, I believe that the Philippines should be given an equitable share of the increment * * * or at least a token share. We should constantly show to the world and to the Filipino people that we consider them among our most-favored allies.

I am aware that there were certain problems connected with Philippine-American trade which this year effectively prevented the careful consideration, on its merits, of the case for granting the Philippines a share in the growth increment of our sugar consumption. I wish that had not been so.

However, I should like to make part of the record at this point the State Department's recommendation which was given to the House Committee on Ways and Means when the sugar legislation was before that committee in reference to the Philippine quota:

"The Department does not recommend an increase in the Philippine quota at this time. The Department believes, however, as it indicated in its report on H. R. 5406, that consideration should be given to allowing the Philippines to share an increased consumption when sugar legislation is next amended, and after sugar from the Philippines begins to pay a tariff."

I should also like to take note, in the course of these remarks, of the communication addressed to the State Department by Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo on this subject, a communication which Senator MANSFIELD inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the course of the debate on sugar legislation on February 9 of this year.

Under the terms of the sugar legislation we sent to the President last week, the Philippines is the only major sugar-producing area denied any participation at all in future increases in United States sugar consumption. I think this is unwise and unfair. I think this is repugnant to the interests of the United States. I hope that Congress will, at the earliest possible time, make the necessary adjustment in the apportionment of the increment of increased sugar consumption in the United States so as to give the Philippines an equitable share. I know it will help the Philippines and I firmly believe that by so doing it will help the United States.

As I have said, I expect to make some further observations on this subject, in connection with Puerto Rico, on another occasion.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE FIELDING L. WRIGHT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in the recent and untimely passing of the Honorable Fielding L. Wright, late a governor of my State, the State of Mississippi as well as the Nation lost one of its most loyal and devoted public servants.

Governor Wright served as Mississippi's chief executive for almost 6 consecutive years. He brought to that high office many outstanding qualities which combined to make him one of the most effective and constructive governors in the entire history of our State. Prior to serving in this position of highest trust, he had served Mississippi as lieutenant governor, as a member of the State senate, and as a member of the State house of representatives, later becoming speaker of that body. Along with this fine background of experience and training, Fielding Wright was a man of firm purposes, with a strong mind and a courageous heart, one who consistently and untiringly worked in a quiet but effective way for the principles of government in which he believed.

Governor Wright began his tenure as Governor of Mississippi soon after the end of World War II. He approached postwar problems, both at home and on the national front, with a constructive and forward-looking view. Under his leadership, Mississippi made great strides forward in public-school education, in industrial development and the development of our natural resources, and in highway transportation, including our secondary highways and farm-to-market roads. Our people prospered and our State became a better place in which to live.

In 1948, Governor Wright was recognized as a national leader. He was earnest, sincere, and effective in his leadership in the fight for the preservation of the principles of States rights in government. He sincerely and steadfastly believed in this principle of government because he realized that this great Nation of ours, with its vast area and diversity of people, must have the powers of the State broken up into many units, in order to meet varying local conditions. He also clearly saw that long, continuing centralization of power in Washington would ultimately completely destroy the States as units of government. Fielding Wright was sincerely fighting for a cause, and he did not seek to create a circumstance where he would be in demand for a high position of power and responsibility. He deliberately stood aside, and would not let himself be considered for what was to be the first position in a political movement for States rights in 1948. Through it all, Fielding Wright constantly kept his eye and his mind on the single purpose of what was best for the people and the Nation. He had not the slightest thought of personal advancement and personal gain.

Governor Wright was a man of the very highest integrity, not only in public affairs, but also in his personal affairs. He enjoyed the respect and confidence of those associated with him in public affairs, and the esteem and love of those privileged to know him intimately and to observe his real qualities.

Without the unselfish services as such men as Fielding L. Wright, our form of government could not long continue in existence. The State of Mississippi and the entire Nation will long reap the benefits of his unselfish and constructive service, always sincerely dedicated to the public good. God grant that more such men and women will answer the clarion call of duty, in being willing to serve on the same high plane that Fielding Wright did, so that our freedom and liberties will be preserved and protected, and the blessings of constitutional government can be enjoyed by successive and future generations.

REVISION OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2875) to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the various terms used throughout the existing law are accompanied either by definitions or by reference to a section which defines them. In other instances, regulations and administrative rulings are relied upon for the meaning of the terms used.

For the first time, all general terms are brought together and defined under one section. It was not intended that this orderly presentation would result in any change in meaning of the various terms except as specifically noted in the report on the bill.

It has been brought to my attention that section 1 (K), which defines the term "Government," might be construed as either limiting or extending coverage under the act. That is not the case, the term as defined in the bill is intended to apply to exactly the same employees—no more, no less—covered under present law. This has been checked with the Civil Service Commission, and the Commission agrees that the wording of section 1 (K) which defines the term "Government" neither extends coverage to anyone not now under the act nor denies coverage to anyone now under the act. In other words, it makes absolutely no change with respect to a person's coverage under the act.

Mr. President, I have made this statement because I feel that some persons are fearful that changes might be made on account of these definitions.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Inquiries have been addressed to me by persons who might be called half-time or part-time employees of the Federal Government, such as those employed in the Extension Service, and agencies of that type. As I understand, they are not included in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They are not included in the bill. At one time the committee considered including them, but the subject is controversial, and the committee at present is considering the introduction of a separate bill to cover such persons.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is such a bill now pending before the Senator's committee?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The committee has not introduced such a bill, but the same staff which has been working on the bill which is now under consideration is making a study of the other subject. The coverage of those persons was stricken from this bill, although at one time the committee considered including them.

Mr. HAYDEN. Were they excluded by the unanimous action of the committee?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As well as I remember, that action was unanimous on the part of the committee, because it was thought best that that matter be considered as a separate item.

I should like to read two paragraphs from the committee report, on page 8, which I think will answer the question asked by the Senator from Arizona.

A number of present Federal employees are denied retirement service credit for past periods of service under a number of Federal-State cooperative programs because they were not designated as Federal employees through the usual formal appointive procedures. The committee does not believe that one employee should receive retirement-service credit and another should be denied retirement-service credit, who worked side by side on the same program, merely because the first was appointed in one manner and the second in a different manner.

In order that equity might be accorded to all groups, the committee directed that the matter be studied with the view to appropriate action next session.

The committee wanted to do something in this field, but did not know exactly how far to go at this time.

Mr. HAYDEN. I take it from the committee report, and from what the Senator has said, that there is merit in the representations which have been made to me by constituents of mine.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There was so much merit in the bill that the committee reported it last year, and the Senate passed it. The House passed the bill, it went to the President, and the President vetoed it. That is one reason why we wish to work out a bill that can be enacted into law.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have at the desk, one amendment to the committee amendment, which is just a perfecting amendment. I do not think any Senator wishes to disagree to it. I should like to dispose of that first. It merely corrects errors throughout the bill. There are several of them. It is just a perfecting amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire that it be read at the desk, or merely printed in the RECORD?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I ask to have it printed in the RECORD. It makes merely grammatical changes. For instance, it may change the word "as" to "a." Such changes are made all through the bill by the perfecting amendment. The amendment is known as "5-18-56-A."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous request of the Senator from South Carolina that the amendment to the committee amendment be printed in the RECORD?

There being no objection, the amendment to the committee amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 41, line 14, strike out "employe" and insert in lieu thereof "employee."

On page 42, line 4, strike out "military pay."

On page 42, line 6, after *"Provided,* That" insert the following: "the term 'basic salary' shall not include military pay for persons who enter upon active military service after the effective date of this act: *And provided further,* That."

On page 44, line 20, strike out "srevice" and insert in lieu thereof "service."

On page 45, line 13, after the word "as" insert "a."

On page 46, lines 20 and 21, strike out ", of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, or of the Library of Congress" and insert in lieu thereof "; and the Architect of the Capitol and the Librarian of Congress are authorized to exclude from the operation of this act any employees under the Office of the Architect of the Capitol and the Library of Congress, respectively, whose tenure of employment is temporary or of uncertain duration."

On page 47, line 7, after "employee" insert "or Member."

On page 47, line 9, after "employee" insert "or Member."

On page 47, line 16, strike out ". A Member" and insert in lieu thereof ", except that for purposes of section 9 (c) (1), a Member (1)."

On page 47, line 17, after the word "credit" insert the word "only."

On page 47, line 22, strike out the period at the end of the line and insert "and (2)."

On page 47, line 23, strike out "A Member."

On page 48, line 1, strike out "member" and insert in lieu thereof "Member."

On page 49, line 10, after the word "as" insert "a."

On page 52, line 25, after "employee," insert the following: "to the Architect of the Capitol or any employee under the Office of the Architect of the Capitol."

On page 53, line 7, after "Canal" insert "Company" and in lines 7 and 8 strike out "Panama Railroad Company" and insert in lieu thereof "Canal Zone Government."

On page 55, line 2, after "Member" insert "or survivor of a Member."

On page 55, line 23, strike out "wthin" and insert in lieu thereof "within."

On page 57, line 17, strike out the semicolon and insert in lieu thereof a comma.

On page 58, lines 24 and 25, strike out "or transferred to a position not within the purview of this act" and insert in lieu thereof "as a Member."

On page 59, lines 3 and 4, strike out "or transferred to a position not within the purview of this act" and insert in lieu thereof "as a Member."

On page 60, line 9, strike out "such" and insert in lieu thereof "his."

On page 60, line 11, strike out "such" and insert in lieu thereof "his."

On page 63, line 5, after "election," insert the following: "excluding any increase because of retirement under section 7."

On page 68, lines 3 and 4, strike out "a present or former employee or Member not retired" and insert in lieu thereof "an employee or Member."

On page 68, line 6, after "filed," insert the following: "or if a former employee or Member not retired dies."

On page 71, line 15, strike out "list" and insert in lieu thereof "record."

On page 71, line 17, strike out "list" and insert in lieu thereof "record."

On page 76, line 16, after "annuitant" insert "heretofore or hereafter retired."

On page 76, line 23, strike out ", is" and insert in lieu thereof ") hereafter becomes."

On page 77, line 11, after the period insert the following: "If an annuitant under this act (other than (1) a disability annuitant whose annuity is terminated by reason of his recovery or restoration of earning capacity, or (2) a Member retired under this act) hereafter becomes employed in an appointive or elective position not subject to this act, annuity payments shall be discontinued during such reemployment and resumed in the same amount upon termination of such employment."

On page 77, line 12, after "Member" insert "heretofore or hereafter."

On page 77, line 12, strike out "is" and insert in lieu thereof "hereafter becomes."

On page 84, line 4, after the period insert the following: "If the deposit is made, such service shall be held and considered to be service during which the employee was subject to this act."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I cannot let this opportunity pass without complimenting the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina. A short time ago I was chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and I know the detail and the hard work that must be engaged in by the chairman of that particular committee. There is a terrific amount of detail connected with the work of the committee. The chairman of the committee is besought continuously in his office by Federal employees not only from the city of Washington, but, as the distinguished Senator knows, from all over the United States. Delegations come to Washington from Los Angeles, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and from every State in the Union.

I particularly desire to commend the distinguished Senator for the judicious way in which he has presided at the meetings of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I think I have attended every meeting of the full committee during this session and the last session. If there is any committee in the Senate which works harmoniously, it is the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and that is largely due to the way in which the fine chairman takes his time about every bill. He goes into each bill in the minutest detail. If any Senator has any question, every precaution is taken that his question is answered completely.

The chairman of the committee has been courteous, not only to members on his own side, but to members on the minority side.

We have been helped in our work by having a magnificent staff, one of experience, headed by Mr. Brawley, who has been very helpful in assisting Senators on the Republican side.

I wish to repeat that I do not know of any chairman of any committee who could have done better than has the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, I recall when the first retirement bill was passed. At that time the outlook for it was rather hopeless, but because of the way in which the Democrats, who were in the minority at that time, cooperated with the Republicans, a fine bill resulted.

I think the bill now pending is an outstanding measure for the benefit of Federal employees who may retire, as well as for those who have heretofore retired. In great measure, that is due to the untiring work of the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, sometime ago I made a speech on the floor of the Senate in which I asked the people of South Caro-

lina to send the distinguished senior Senator back to the Senate. I called on every Republican in the State of South Carolina to vote for him. I thought I was doing the Senator a service, and one can imagine my surprise when a short time later a newspaper writer, while commending me on the speech, pointed out that the total number of Republicans in the State of South Carolina was only 125. He pointed out the total population and the fact that, after all, the Republicans in that State represented only a minor fraction of 1 percent.

Mr. President, I cannot resist also paying a compliment to Bob Johnson, who for a long time has been on the staff, and who has been assigned to represent the minority. He has been most helpful to the minority members. At the request of our distinguished chairman, Mr. Brawley has also been helpful to us. These gentlemen not only help us when there are meetings of the committee, but they willingly come to a Senator's office after hours to explain any question a Senator may have to raise, so that he may fully understand the matter.

I want to extend the highest commendation to the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina. I know that Federal employee organizations all over the country feel they have a friend in the Senator. They may not always get all they are asking for, but they know they can get a fair hearing whenever they have a complaint, and that is all the organizations ask for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). The Senator from South Carolina has a number of technical amendments to present. Does he desire that they be considered en bloc?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Just the technical ones.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from South Carolina asked unanimous consent that the amendments may be considered at this time. I reserve the right to object until such time as I may be able to get a clearance, through the minority leader, relating to the disposition of one particular amendment at this time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, while the Senator from Maine, who is presently acting as minority leader, is trying to get clearance, I should like to say that I appreciate everything the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] said about me, the committee, the committee staff, and the work which the committee has done in the past. I wish also to say that since I have been a Member of the Senate he has been on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and he has been a faithful worker at all times, and has acquitted himself excellently, both as chairman and as ranking minority member. After the Senator was off the committee for a brief period he returned, and he is working just as faithfully on the committee as he ever did. I wish to thank him for his cooperation.

I desire also to thank all the Democratic and Republican members of the committee for working faithfully with me, and trying to have reported from the committee what I believe to be a bill which will result in a much better civil-service retirement law being put on the statute books.

If the bill should be passed and enacted into law it will, in my opinion, mean much to the Federal Government and employees who work for the Federal Government, because it will provide a greater incentive for Government employees to remain in Government service. One thing that has hindered the departments in the past has been that after a person has entered the Government service, and has just about become familiar with the duties of his office, he has started looking around for greener fields. We think that a better retirement system will deter so many employees from leaving.

Mr. President, at this time I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina to the committee amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 11177 making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 11177) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Georgia.

Does the bill contain emergency funds for the FHA?

Mr. RUSSELL. This bill increases the loan authority for FHA rural farm ownership loans by $5 million. It also increases loan authorizations under the production and subsistence program.

Mr. LANGER. Can the distinguished Senator tell me how this loan authority would operate?

Mr. RUSSELL. It does not involve farm housing. That subject is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I understand that in the near future there will be before the Senate a bill dealing with that subject.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture—Title I—Regular Activities—Agricultural Research Service—Salaries and Expenses," on page 3, line 7, after the word "stations", to strike out "$49,972,000" and insert "$49,676,400", and in line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,300,000" and insert "$1,900,000."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the chairman will recall the letter which I wrote him and with which I enclosed some communications calling attention to the fact that there were more requests in many counties with reference to the rotation practice, under which grass and legumes are planted, than there were funds to honor them. Funds for the Department were allocated last year to the several States, and it developed, I think, that some twenty States are finding that there is an insufficient amount of funds to meet all the requests received. Since these requests all referred to good soil-conservation practices, it occurred to me that it would be well if an increase in funds could be made available, and I so stated in a letter to the chairman. It came after the hearings were concluded.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the appropriation to which the Senator refers is made to carry on the agricultural conservation program. It was suggested that a revolving fund be set up with a reserve of $5 million to take care of these practices. The committee examined into the matter and concluded that $5 million was not adequate for the purpose, and we have made an increase in the appropriation of $25 million, which makes the total appropriation for that purpose $250 million. In addition, there is a carry-over from the 1954 program of $25 million.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the chairman and to the committee for the action which they have taken. It seemed to me that particularly since the so-called soil-bank program would be limited in its application this year, at best, it was highly desirable that these conservation practices, particularly in the field of rotating crops and getting out of surplus crops into grass and legumes, should be encouraged.

The action of the committee, as I understand, will make the additional $25 million available for apportionment among the States, so that they can meet their extraordinary requests for these other practices.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is the hope of the committee that the sum will be entirely

adequate to provide for the condition which the Senator from South Dakota has described, which is more or less acute in a number of States.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I should like to inquire about the appropriation shown on page 7 of the report, title 1, with reference to the animal disease laboratory facilities. As I understand, the House approved $10 million for this item. The Budget request was for about $18,900,000. The Senate deleted the entire amount.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Wyoming is correct. This is a very important program, one in which the committee is very much interested. But the committee did not approve of the location of the proposed laboratory at Beltsville, Md., in the very environs of the city of Washington. A provision was included in the report directing the Department to confer with the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as to the location of the laboratory.

If an agreement can be reached as to the location of the laboratory at some suitable place, somewhere near the location of the large animal population of the country, and where the animals can be treated and be easily subject to the cures which may be found for animal diseases, I do not think the Senate conferees will insist on this provision.

We are not satisfied that the location of the proposed laboratory shall be at Beltsville. The committee over a period of years has undertaken to restrict the concentration of all types of agricultural research at Beltsville. This is a great country. Different conditions exist in different areas. The committee felt that some of the research work to be done on diseases of animals should be carried on in the areas where the animals are infested with the diseases. Certainly Beltsville, Md., is not a central point of the cattle population of the United States.

Mr. BARRETT. I certainly agree with that particular statement. I should like to ask if any money has already been spent for the building of the proposed facility at the Beltsville station.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not to my knowledge. Congress made an appropriation to prepare plans for the laboratory, but at that time no indication was given to the committee that it was proposed to locate the laboratory at Beltsville. A very comprehensive set of plans has been prepared. The plans were submitted to the committee. They seem to be completely adequate for what we had in mind, namely, to have the greatest research center for animal disease in the entire world.

But there was some waste in the plans. Taking cognizance of the fact that Washington would be one of the first targets of atomic attack, several hundred thousand dollars were provided for strengthening the walls of the buildings so as to reduce the effect of possible bomb explosions over Washington. That and similar matters make it most important to locate the proposed laboratory at some other place.

If Washington is to be the target of an atomic attack, we do not want to have the animal diseases released to follow in the wake of death and devastation by atomic attack, by reason of having such a laboratory located near the Capital City.

Mr. BARRETT. The committee, then, believes that the location of the laboratory is the determining factor at present, does it?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall read from the committee report, in which there was unanimous agreement:

> The committee supports the establishment of adequate facilities for research on animal diseases, but does not approve the budget request for building the laboratory, and further concentrating this work, at Beltsville, Md. The committee believes that before it recommends an appropriation for the establishment of a national animal disease research facility, the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should approve the project, including its location.
>
> In connection with the long-range research program the committee requests the Department to make a study of its needs for research facilities and report to the committee.

We are heartily in favor of the laboratory; all we ask is that the Department and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry come to an agreement as to where the laboratory shall be located.

Mr. BARRETT. Will the effect of the action by the committee be to hold the matter in abeyance for 1 year?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not necessarily. It was generally understood in the committee that if the Department saw fit to consult with the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry before the conference was held on the bill, the Senate conferees might even recede in this bill. But if a decision has not been reached by that time, there will still be several supplemental and deficiency appropriation measures to be considered before the adjournment of Congress, and that will give the Department of Agriculture adequate time to consult with the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and for Congress to make an appropriation this year. If the Department is diligent, there should be no cause for delay in the construction of the laboratory.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BEALL. Is it not true that Beltsville is better equipped for research than any other place in the country?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Department testified that the facilities needed did not exist at Beltsville; that the existing facilities could not be used, and that new ones must be constructed. Undoubtedly there are a number of scientists at Beltsville.

Mr. BEALL. Beltsville has the personnel with which to do the work.

Mr. RUSSELL. The testimony before the committee indicated that the Department would be compelled to hire 300 new experts in science to conduct the research. They are not now at Beltsville; they would have to be recruited for this work.

Mr. BEALL. But there are scientists working in hospitals in the vicinity of Baltimore and Washington, and land is available at Beltsville. Why not utilize Beltsville for this purpose? Beltsville has a research plant.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. I can understand the diligence with which the Senator seeks to further the purposes of the Department of Agriculture in concentrating everything at Beltsville. But Congress has gone rather far in that direction already. A large amount of research has been conducted at Beltsville on plants which are not indigenous to Maryland and this area. A great deal of research is done at Beltsville on animals. Although Maryland is a great agricultural State, it does not stand preeminent among the cattle-producing States of the Nation.

Mr. BEALL. But there must have been a reason for establishing the research station originally at Beltsville.

Mr. RUSSELL. It was for the same reason which is given every time any new research project is created. The Department wants it located at Beltsville, where it will be convenient for the Secretary of Agriculture and the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in charge of research to ride out in an automobile and look things over.

Also, very naturally, the scientists who are already employed here like Washington—or Maryland, if they happen to reside in Maryland. Therefore, they have every reason to want to continue to reside in Washington or in the great Free State of Maryland; they dislike to move somewhere else. For that reason, research has been pyramided upon research at Beltsville.

A great deal of the research, I say in all candor, cannot be done as effectively at Beltsville as it could be done in areas where the plants are more afflicted by disease, or where the large herds of cattle are infested. There are other areas which have a scientific interest in these conditions. Many States have excellent colleges for veterinarians. I observed the Senator from North Dakota rise to ask me some questions. I visited an excellent college for veterinarians at Fargo, in his State. It is one of the best in the Nation. There are many other places where the proposed laboratory could be located.

While I appreciate the zeal of the Senator from Maryland in protecting his State, I must say that the committee does not feel that Beltsville is an appropriate location for the proposed laboratory.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I rose for the very reason which the distinguished Senator from Georgia mentioned. We have a very fine laboratory at Fargo, N. Dak. It is perhaps the last place in the United States which would be bombed. That is one reason why the proposed laboratory should be located there. I hope the

chairman and the other members of the Senator's committee may see fit to have the laboratory located at Fargo, N. Dak.

Mr. RUSSELL. That will be up to the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The testimony before the committee, given by Assistant Secretary Peterson, who was very frank, was to the effect that they could locate the laboratory almost anywhere where there was a veterinarians' school. I knew at that time that there was such a school in North Dakota. Also, there is one in Georgia; a very excellent school.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator state how much money is appropriated for REA, and how the amount compares with the appropriation of last year?

Mr. RUSSELL. The total amount available for the Rural Electrification Administration for electrification loans, for fiscal 1957, including a reserve of $68.7 million, is $214 million, as compared with a total for 1956 including the reserve of $260 million.

But it must be pointed out that there was a considerable carryover from 1956, and the Rural Electrification Cooperatives requested $214 million, which is the amount which is made available in the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Could the distinguished Senator give us similar information about the telephone program?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. For the telephone program there is available, including the reserve, the sum of $100 million for fiscal 1957. I might say the representatives of the Rural Electric Cooperatives, who also spoke for the telephone program, requested that amount of the committee.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator tell us approximately the amount that was spent last year for the telephone program?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have the figures somewhere in my papers, but I do not recall them at the moment.

Mr. LANGER. I want to say, in passing, that that program has not been carried out as well as has the REA program, at least in the Northwestern part of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, it has not moved forward as rapidly, because in some sections the cooperatives have been rather slow about submitting their applications for loans. In addition, there is a great deal of difference between the telephone program and the rural electrification program as pertains, for example, to the distances between houses and the standards that are fixed in the bill. I do not know whether in the administration of the program the tendency has been to restrict it, but it has not been for lack of money that it has not gone forward faster. We have made available more money than has been expended.

Mr. LANGER. There does not seem to have been the "push" behind the telephone program on the part of the administration that there was behind the REA program.

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot answer as to that.

I might say to the Senator from North Dakota, in response to the question he previously asked, that the carryover for the telephone program in unexpended funds for this fiscal year is $33,556,176.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to direct the chairman's attention to the item for agricultural research, which begins on page 3 of the report. The item I have in mind is in the middle of page 4 and refers to the payments to States.

To get my question before the chairman, I should like to make a statement and ask a question. The statement is rather lengthy, and contains factual background.

Mr. President, the amount of funds made available for agricultural research and education by our agriculture subcommittee is indeed gratifying. I consider this as one of the best and most forward-looking programs that the committee has ever approved. I visualize the appropriations made available for fiscal year 1957 as a step in the right direction and one which will lead to an expanded long-range program. Our committee increased Federal research funds by $9,471,245 over fiscal year 1956, and increased research payments to States by $6 million over last year. We also provided an increase of $5,625,000 for the Cooperative Extension Service Program.

Our committee made one important change in the budget recommendations by transferring $1,250,000 from Federal research to research payments to States. The committee did not include a statement in the report as to how the Department should handle this transfer. I understand that the Department of Agriculture plans to handle this transfer by making an across-the-board cut on all Federal research projects to make up for this transfer.

I do not believe that this was at all the intent of the committee. It was my understanding that the committee desired the transfer of $1,250,000 to the States to be used according to the justification of special research projects by the land-grant college representatives to our committee. This procedure would not interfere with the overall research program, but would mean a transfer of a part of Federal projects and funds to States to be used for the same purpose. In other words, State justifications indicate that if they had $1,250,000 more funds, they would use $344,000 of this total for animal production research.

In this case, I visualize this as a reduction of $344,000 for animal production research at the Federal level, and an increase of $344,000 for animal production research at the State level. It would seem logical to apply the same procedure to all of the items mentioned in the State justification. This would appear to be a far more logical way of taking care of this transfer rather than an across-the-board transfer of funds for all Federal research projects.

I should like to ask the Senator, based on the facts which I have outlined as a background, if I have correctly stated the intention of the committee in transferring the funds from the Federal to the State level.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am quite sure I can answer that question categorically. That was the intention of the committee. The Senator from Mississippi knows, of course, that the question of the Federal-State research has been a matter of great concern to the committee for several years. It has been felt that when States have a problem immediately at hand, and have a staff of experts, they are better qualified to deal with problems of sectional or local character than is the United States Department of Agriculture.

I have in my hand a table relating to the estimated distribution of increases in payments to the States, which includes the entire $1,250,000, to which the Senator from Mississippi has referred. The first item indicates that the estimated distribution of the increase in payments under the Senate bill would bring $344,000 to animal production research. It was felt that, instead of this being done by the Federal Government, that instead it be done by the States.

I also hold in my hand a table which gives the estimated distribution of the increase in payment to States, which shows how the transfer affects each State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two tables to which I have made reference may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated distribution of the increases in payments to States for 1957 by subject-matter fields

Field of research	Estimated distribution of budget estimates, House bill	Estimated distribution of increase (+) under Senate bill	Estimated distribution of total
Animal production	$250,000	+$344,000	$594,000
Animal diseases	440,000	56,000	496,000
Grass and forage crop production	337,000	46,000	383,000
Field crop production	135,000	189,500	324,500
Horticulture and forest crop production	221,000	206,000	427,000
Plant diseases and insects	598,000	76,000	674,000
Soils	205,000	23,000	228,000
Water use and conservation	322,000	36,000	358,000
Farm mechanization and structures	322,000	40,000	362,000
Economics of production	459,000	51,000	510,000
Marketing and utilization	1,025,500	115,000	1,140,500
Foods, human nutrition, and home economics	293,000	30,000	323,000
Administration	142,500	37,500	180,000
Total	4,750,000	1,250,000	6,000,000

Estimated distribution of the increase in payments to States for 1957

	Estimated distribution of budget estimates	Estimated distribution of increase under Senate bill	Estimated distribution of total
Alabama	$105,400	$27,737	$133,137
Alaska	20,803	5,474	26,277
Arizona	29,977	7,889	37,866
Arkansas	87,486	23,023	110,509
California	95,026	25,007	120,033
Colorado	39,618	10,426	50,044
Connecticut	32,034	8,430	40,464
Delaware	23,012	6,056	29,068
Florida	51,770	13,624	65,394
Georgia	109,077	28,704	137,781
Hawaii	27,648	7,276	34,924
Idaho	34,501	9,079	43,580
Illinois	100,771	26,519	127,290
Indiana	87,314	22,977	110,291
Iowa	88,774	23,362	112,136
Kansas	61,256	16,120	77,376
Kentucky	109,055	28,699	137,754
Louisiana	74,237	19,536	93,773
Maine	35,098	9,236	44,334
Maryland	44,063	11,595	55,658
Massachusetts	39,461	10,384	49,845
Michigan	95,411	25,108	120,519
Minnesota	86,241	22,695	108,936
Mississippi	108,851	28,645	137,496
Missouri	96,104	25,290	121,394
Montana	32,859	8,647	41,506
Nebraska	53,985	14,207	68,192
Nevada	20,834	5,483	26,317
New Hampshire	26,301	6,921	33,222
New Jersey	39,057	10,278	49,335
New Mexico	32,878	8,652	41,530
New York	95,929	25,244	121,173
North Carolina	147,815	38,899	186,714
North Dakota	41,531	10,929	52,460
Ohio	114,871	30,229	145,100
Oklahoma	70,809	18,634	89,443
Oregon	45,819	12,058	57,877
Pennsylvania	123,182	32,416	155,598
Puerto Rico	101,607	26,739	128,346
Rhode Island	21,997	5,789	27,786
South Carolina	83,721	22,032	105,753
South Dakota	41,078	10,810	51,888
Tennessee	110,779	29,152	139,931
Texas	147,975	38,941	186,916
Utah	28,469	7,492	35,961
Vermont	28,072	7,387	35,459
Virginia	94,592	24,893	119,485
Washington	52,116	13,715	65,831
West Virginia	68,450	18,013	86,463
Wisconsin	87,555	23,041	110,596
Wyoming	24,731	6,508	31,239
Total	3,420,000	900,000	4,320,000
Regular reserve fund	1,187,500	312,500	1,500,000
Administration	142,500	37,500	180,000
Total	4,750,000	1,250,000	6,000,000

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia very much for his very complete reply, which I think makes very explicit the intention of the committee on this problem. I should like to express the hope that the chairman, insofar as he can, will maintain that position in the conference on the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. That certainly would be my position, and I hope that if we can get the House to accept the Senate amendment, that matter can be clearly stated in the report of the conferees.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I may say to the Senator that the people in the West are very much interested in some experiments which have been carried on at the Colorado A. and M. College at Fort Collins, Colo., with reference to sealing irrigation canals with bentonite. I appeared before the committee and urged that an item be inserted in the bill to carry on those experiments. I may say the House report indicates that the committee was in favor of the provision, but, referring to page 6 of the House report, I find this statement:

Another has to do with the need for further research on colloidal sediments for sealing irrigation canals. The committee has not dealt separately with each of these because the Department, within the large amounts provided in this bill for research, has ample authority and funds to meet these and other similar research problems.

I take it that the Senate committee takes the same position, and that these same experiments can be carried on. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. As I understood the testimony of the Senator from Wyoming, it was that he was supporting the House provision. We did not touch it. It is in the bill just as it came to us. It certainly is the position of the Senate committee that it approved the research to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I am very much interested in the question of the livestock research laboratory. In the House bill there are funds provided in the amount of $10 million. In the Senate committee bill there are no funds provided. I regret that I was not present in the Appropriations Committee at the time this particular item was up for discussion by the committee.

Therefore, I was not then able to plead my cause, so to speak.

I suggest to the chairman of the subcommittee that we consider amending the bill in such a way as to provide for appropriation of the $18,915,000 which was called for in the Bureau of the Budget's recommendation for this research laboratory, because I believe it would be a mistake for us to permit a lag to develop in this research activity into animal diseases. That is evident because annually we suffer a loss of almost $800 million as a result of animal diseases of various sorts. In addition, there is the danger that humans will be contaminated by many of those diseases. Therefore we should proceed to take steps to make progress in this research activity, rather than permit it to come to a standstill—whether for 6 months or for a year or for a longer period—because of a lack of appropriations.

I believe that if we include a provision for the necessary funds in the bill, then the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Senate Appropriations Committee can request representatives of the animal husbandry division of the Department of Agriculture to testify before them and to make known the needs in connection with such a research laboratory, including the ground space necessary for the protection of the workers and the citizens who reside near the laboratory. In that way, the proper determination can be made.

That is the procedure that was followed in connection with the establishment of the research laboratory dealing with the hoof-and-mouth disease. The Congress appropriated the necessary funds, and instructed the executive agency to decide on the proper location. That was done, and today some very excellent work is being done in the hoof-and-mouth disease laboratory.

In this case I believe we could well proceed in a similar manner, and I am sure that it is important that we do so. As evidence of that fact, let me state that I have received telephone calls from Dr. West, executive secretary of the Minnesota State Livestock Sanitary Board; and Dr. West tells me that if any lag were permitted to develop in connection with this activity, it would have a most serious effect upon the livestock industry of the Midwest.

I realize that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], is vitally interested in agriculture, and is an apt student in that field, and that as chairman of the subcommittee he was only endeavoring to obtain as soon as possible the opinion of the Department of Agriculture in regard to the most suitable location for the research laboratory. In my opinion, the absence of such a statement was the reason why this item was not provided for in the Senate committee's version of the bill.

I believe we can safeguard ourselves in this connection by writing in the report or stating during the present colloquy that we wish to be sure that both the Department of Agriculture and the research technicians working in such a laboratory will present us with their recommendations.

I might suggest that the laboratory be located in the Midwest; but if I were to do so, I would seemingly be acting on the basis of a selfish interest. Therefore, I shall not make a recommendation that the laboratory be established adjacent to my own State.

I believe that in the pending bill we should provide the necessary funds; and then we should urge that representatives of the Department of Agriculture testify before the Appropriations Committee and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and make their recommendations to those committees. In that manner, I believe we could assure the approval within the next 6 months of a research laboratory.

I believe that the establishment of such a laboratory is a necessity, particularly in view of the fact that it was necessary to suspend some of the activities in the Department of Agriculture because of the fear of contamination of the employees in the Department of Agriculture building where a spread of the disease through the corridors of the building was threatened as a result of improper ventilation within the laboratory.

As I understand, the necessary facilities do not exist at the Beltsville plant, and the work in this field cannot be expanded there. I further understand that the facilities and site at Denver are inadequate, and that the employees there are being endangered. Therefore, this entire research activity is threatened with being brought to a standstill or with being shut down.

In connection with this matter, I should like to refer to an amendment I have had drawn. My amendment provides that, on page 6, the matter pro-

posed to be stricken out in lines 17 through 21 be restored, and that in line 20 the figures "$10,000,000" be stricken out, and that there be inserted in lieu thereof the figures "$18,915,000."

Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk, so that it may be available at the appropriate time, as we proceed to act on the bill.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia for yielding to me, in order to permit me to make this explanation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have been glad to yield, and I shall discuss the Senator's amendment when it is reached in its proper place in the bill.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have already undertaken to explain that the committee was not indifferent to this subject. We had very lengthy hearings on this matter, and we tried to obtain from the Department a statement as to where it would locate the laboratory. In its report, the House committee stated that they did not favor locating the laboratory at Beltsville. However, the Department indicated a disregard for that view of the House committee, and the Department, in its appeal letter, did not state that it would consider locating the laboratory at any other place.

The Senator from Minnesota is a little more confident of what the Department would do than the committee was at the hearings. We went very fully into all these matters, including the diseases and the personnel requirements.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to add—and let me say that I was reluctant to do so earlier, for fear that the distinguished Senator from Georgia would believe I was taking a selfish attitude if I proposed that the project be established in my own State——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I will say unhesitatingly that it is my opinion, after dealing with these research programs over a period of 24 years, that I think it would be better to locate the laboratory somewhere other than at Beltsville. I do not know where the laboratory should be established. I do not say it should be established in Minnesota. But I know that Beltsville is not the proper place for the laboratory; I know that.

Mr. THYE. In Minnesota, a site comprising more than 800 acres is now only partly in use.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not undertaking to say where the laboratory should be located.

Mr. THYE. But I should like to make an explanation for the RECORD. The Gopher ordnance plant and ammunition plant was established at Rosemont, in Minnesota, during the war, and the plant is still intact. The building and roads have been installed. The site is now being operated by the University of Minnesota, in connection with its research work. That plant has sufficient land, sewerage, water, and highways to accommodate such a research laboratory; and I should like to call that site to the attention of the Congress, because the Government owns that property, and the facilities there have been developed in such a way that only a minimum of expense would be involved if the research laboratory were located there.

I refer to that site only for the information of the Members of Congress; I am not taking a selfish attitude in that connection, for I believe that at this time the most important consideration is to have provision made at once for establishment of the research laboratory, and that should be done by having such an item included in this appropriation bill. Thereafter, the best location for the project can be determined, as we proceed to discuss the matter with representatives of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Congress votes to include this money in the pending bill, the books will be closed, I may say, insofar as this matter is concerned, and the laboratory will be established at Beltsville. We have done everything within our power to get the Department of Agriculture to show that it is even aware of the fact that Congress has any say-so in connection with the location of the laboratory.

We have asked them, in the committee report, to come before the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and discuss the question. So far as I am aware, the Department has not lifted its hand. If the Senate wishes to vote to establish the laboratory at Beltsville and close the door on any sensible and logical location, all it has to do is to adopt the amendment proposed by my friend from Minnesota. I have tried in every way to persuade the Department to discuss with the standing committee the very important matter of the proper location for perhaps the most important laboratory the Department of Agriculture will operate.

Mr. THYE. I absolutely agree with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that Beltsville is not the best place to locate the research laboratory, because the Department is already short of space at that location. It is in a densely populated area. It is not desirable to have the research laboratory in the Department of Agriculture facility at Beltsville, because of the danger of contamination. Certainly we should not place the research laboratory adjacent to all the cattle and other livestock which, for several decades, we have been developing and building up through research and breeding. Certainly we should not locate the research laboratory, where animal diseases are confined for purposes of research, in such a location as Beltsville, because the result might well be to contaminate all the livestock which we have at that location in research projects. So I definitely share the conviction of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that the labortory should not be located at Beltsville. I have been there several times, and I know exactly the area which the Department has. I am familiar with the number of livestock concentrated in that area as research livestock. For many decades we have been engaged in the development of various breeds. The proposed laboratory should be at a place where it could be isolated, and where it would not be a source of constant danger of contamination to livestock which might be carriers of various diseases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3, line 8.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a very brief question, and a request for an observation on the part of the chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In the bill as passed by the House, in connection with the subject of soil conservation and water resources, I note that the Bureau of the Budget recommended $1,055,000, and I believe the House added another $386,000 or $387,000, making a total of $1,441,910.

My question to the chairman of the subcommittee is this: Does the bill, as reported by the Senate committee, carry the amounts proposed to be appropriated by action of the House?

Mr. RUSSELL. As it appears from the bill before us, the Senate committee affirms the action of the House in making this increase, which I think is completely justified, because of the importance of the work. If the bill as now before the Senate shall be passed, this item will not even be in conference. The appropriation will be $1,441,910.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief statement which I have prepared on the subject of the soil and water conservation programs.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The committee in its usual manner of thoroughness and wisdom has done a highly commendable job. The bill presented to us reflects the committee's knowledge that it is providing not merely for the operations of an important department of the Government, but is, in fact, dealing with many practical matters that affect the welfare of all farm families.

I particularly like and appreciate the emphasis placed by the committee on soil and water conservation.

I take my stand with the committee in favor of accelerated operations by the Soil Conservation Service in locally organized locally controlled Soil Conservation Districts and in the watershed programs, including the pilot watersheds mentioned by the committee report, and in favor of accelerated scientific studies by the Agricultural Research Service on problems of soil and water conservation. On this last matter, I should like to ask a question. It is not entirely clear to me how the funds in this bill compare with the amount for conservation research recommended by the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts and how it compares with the amount voted by the House of Representatives.

The National Association of Soil Conservation Districts which has no axes to grind and no interests to promote except public-spirited interest in the preservation of our resources for the good of present and future generations, has wisely called our attention to the many problems that need scientific study and has estimated that research in this field

should be increased at the rate of about $3 million a year for several years. This is a small amount of money in relation to the value of the resources we are seeking to protect and in relation to the amounts of money being appropriated for action programs.

I was happy to note that the bill as recommended by the House Appropriations Committee and passed by the House included not only the $1,055,000 recommended in the budget but a considerable amount in addition. I am informed that the increase for soil- and water-conservation research as the bill passed the House was $386,910 above the budget estimate or a total increase of $1,441,910. I trust that the bill as it is now presented to the Senate includes no less than that amount, and I should be happy to learn that it includes as much as was recommended by the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts. Would the chairman of the subcommittee please reassure me on this important matter?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee one further question, in reference to the REA funds. The Senator from Georgia may recall that last year we changed the formula relating to the allocation of Rural Electrification Administration funds. As I understand the bill, there is an item of $214 million for the REA, of which $145,300,000 is in regular funds, and the balance is held in what is known as the contingency fund. That action was taken by the House, and I gather that the Senate committee has done exactly the same thing.

Mr. RUSSELL. We did not disturb the appropriation made by the House. The total was $214 million, which was the amount requested by the rural electric cooperatives.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. The point which the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association raises is in connection with the necessity of having a substantial share of the $214 million plus, in what might be called a contingency fund. The reason is that the formula was altered by Congress in 1955.

I shall read a letter dated May 21, 1956, addressed to me by the president of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association:

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., May 21, 1956.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: By resolution adopted by our national board of directors meeting here in Washington today, I am writing you this urgent letter about the electric loan funds in the pending agricultural appropriations bill.

Based on NRECA's annual survey, our elected national legislative committee requested the committees of both Houses to authorize not less than $214 million in regular electric loan funds for fiscal 1957.

The House has authorized $214 million in electric funds, but only $145.3 million is in regular funds. The Senate committee has recommended $214 million but, like the House, has placed all of this in the contingency fund except the $145.3 million.

The significance of the House and Senate committee action is that REA schedules a loan program based on regular funds—and in the past has used contingency funds only to get around the State allocation formula. This situation would not arise under the new formula enacted by the Congress last year as an amendment to the Rural Electrification Act.

Since that formula was altered by Congress in 1955, we fear that the drawdown of contingency funds would not be held justified on this basis as in the past. Indeed, between the new law and Bureau of the Budget regulations, we do not know what the status of contingency funds is.

We believe most strongly that the whole $214 million should be scheduled in the month-by-month loan allocations by REA—if and as required—or, we fear, the program will suffer.

We urge most strongly that the Senate mark the entire $214 million as regular loan funds.

We sincerely hope that our fine friends on the House and Senate committees and our friends in the House as a whole will not take this request as a reflection upon them. Our confidence and faith in our friends is complete and unshakeable, but we fear there is misunderstanding of the significance of this action.

Whether the funds authorized are regular or contingency funds, they will in neither case represent an expense to the Government until or unless they are loaned and advanced to the rural electric systems. We are urging this change in the bill only to protect the program—not to increase the cost of the program.

Please make the full $214 million available as regular funds.

Sincerely,

J. E. SMITH,
President
(For the board of directors).

My question to the chairman of the subcommittee is this: In the light of the change in formula, and in view of the fact that the contingency funds were frequently used to bypass limitations upon certain State allocations, the formula having been removed from the law, why should there be any necessity of having a so-called contingency fund, particularly when it might be interpreted as being so much money set aside which could not be used at all under existing law?

Mr. RUSSELL. I received a letter similar to the one which the Senator has read. Frankly, I could not understand how it could be applied to what has been done in this case.

The bill does not establish any contingency fund. It merely divides the appropriation into two parts, one of $145,300,000 which was the amount of the budget estimate, and a second item of $68,700,000, for the rural-electrification program. The bill does not say anything about a contingency. It says that the money may be borrowed under the same terms and conditions, to the extent that such additional funds are required during the fiscal year 1957, under the then existing conditions, for the expeditious and orderly development of the program.

The action of the House merely divided the appropriation into two parts. First, it set up the fund which the Bureau of the Budget requested and then it made an additional appropriation of $68,700,000, making a total of $214 million.

So far as I can understand from a reading of this authorization, it does not put any of the money into a contingency fund. It merely divides the appropriation into two parts, and says that, if it is needed for the expeditious development of the program, the entire $214 million is available.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So, as the Senator understands, for all practical purposes the $214 million is appropriated without any limitations, except as the needs of the program may require the use of such funds.

Mr. RUSSELL. Exactly. I think the $68,700,000 is just as much available to be loaned under the program as is the $145,300,000. I think the same is true of the rural-telephone program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So there is no justification for assuming the existence of a contingency fund, since it is not found in the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think so. There is merely a division of the appropriation into two parts. Heretofore, the language referred to emergency contingency funds.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. That language had a definite meaning, because such a fund was provided for in the basic law. However, this bill merely divides the appropriation into two parts.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In the light of the fact that the formula and the law have been changed, the change would obviously mean that the previous understanding, or the previous definition of contingency funds, would no longer apply. For all practical purposes, this would be one appropriation, but divided into two parts.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. One, to recognize the Bureau of the Budget request, and apparently the other to recognize the good judgment of the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the construction I place upon it. I would have no objection to making it all one item, but I believe that this provision makes the total appropriation available. It is now in such form that it could not be changed one iota in conference.

I would ask the Senator from Minnesota to read that language very carefully, and to consider whether it does not lead him to the conclusion that no contingency fund is involved.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I ask the Senator from Georgia whether the House committee report contains any explanatory language in respect to this item?

Mr. RUSSELL. That I cannot say.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder what the House report says in that connection.

Mr. RUSSELL. It does mention a contingency fund. I read from page 15 of the House committee report:

Loan authorizations: The budget for 1957 included the sum of $145,300,000 for rural electrification loans, together with a contingency fund of $25 million. The budget also included the sum of $49,500,000 for the rural telephone program. In view of strong representations from the REA co-ops throughout the country that total funds of $214 million will be required for rural electrification loans, instead of $170,300,000 included in the budget, the committee has increased the contingency fund by the sum of $43,700,000. Also, in view of indications that $100 million may be required for the rural telephone programs in lieu of the sum of $49,500,000 included in the budget, the committee has

included a contingency fund of $50,500,000 for loans under that program.

The figures included in the bill for loan purposes are merely limitations on the amounts which may be borrowed from the Treasury to meet loan applications approved by REA under its regulations. Money is not drawn from the Treasury until loans have been finally approved and an advance of funds has been authorized. Therefore, the authorization of amounts for this purpose in the appropriation bill does not affect Treasury balances until funds are actually required.

That seemed to be the reason for dividing it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would say most respectfully that perhaps the use of the language results from habit more than anything else, inasmuch as over a long period of time we have always had two categories, one the regular loan fund and the other the contingency fund. However, last year, as the Senator from Georgia may recall, we modified the formula in the REA Act, and it is now unnecessary to have a contingency-fund allocation.

Mr. RUSSELL. All of the funds are made available for loans wherever needed under the terms of the act we passed last year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Under the language used, it seems to me that the appropriation is divided into two parts. There is no contingency-fund provision now on the statute books. Certainly this language does not create a contingency fund, even though it is so referred to in the House report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Has there been any question raised thus far with respect to this item, as reported by the committee?

Mr. RUSSELL. We are still dealing with committee amendments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What I hope will happen is that in the Senate we will make one fund of the $214 million; that we will put that money into one figure or fund. Then, if there is to be a conference for any reason, the matter can be ironed out. In that way there could be a meeting of all minds. I say that because otherwise we may get into a situation in which either the Comptroller General or the REA may put a different interpretation on the language than we have in mind.

Mr. RUSSELL. In my judgment, it would be very difficult to make an interpretation of this language which would be taken to mean that a contingency fund had been set up, when such a fund is not even mentioned in the bill, and when such a provision was expressly repealed by Congress at the last session.

However, speaking only for myself, I would have no objection to a lumping of the appropriation. At the same time, I believe it would be better to leave the matter stand as it is, because the sum of $214 million is undoubtedly available for any loan that is approved by the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator. I will bow to his judgment, because I know of his dedication to this subject.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator has any difference of opinion or any doubt on it, I will not resist an amendment along the line he suggests. In my opinion, however, when we get a matter that is satisfactorily taken care of and approved by both Houses of Congress, nothing can possibly happen to it. It is not in conference, and it is all buttoned up.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The only thing I worry about, may I say to my good friend from Georgia, is that there is in the minds of the staff of the REA and other offices in the Department of Agriculture, a long continuity of separation of this fund. Such a separation has enjoyed a long background. As we know, a large amount of money was tied up in some States, and that money could not be used. Now, under the changed formula, it has been made available for use. I do not want to see any technicality in this connection. I know it takes some lawyers a long time, sometimes, to come up with an interpretation that turns out to be the proper one. Therefore, it seems to me it would simplify matters a great deal if we could clearly express our point of view, so that there would be no doubt whatever as to what is meant by the $214 million fund.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the Senator's point of view. I would suggest that we proceed with the consideration of the committee amendments. If, later, it seems desirable to the Senator that we proceed along the line of his suggestion, I will have no objection to an amendment. I say that, even though I am not sure that that would be a wise course to follow.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I shall go into the matter a little more.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Georgia with respect to the Soil Conservation Service item, mentioned at page 4 of the committee report. I read from the report as follows:

The committee recommends that the Department complete the pilot watershed program as rapidly as local conditions permit. It understands that the planned 5-year period originally contemplated will be exceeded and the original Federal cost estimates may in some cases be slightly larger than originally estimated.

What is the present situation with regard to that program; and are sufficient funds available with which to carry on and complete the program?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is familiar with the fact, of course, that in an appropriation bill at one time we authorized 60 small pilot watersheds for improvement and protection. There was no attempt at limitation in any way with respect to the time within which the program should be completed, or within which time the projects authorized should be completed, even though some members of the committee were told that the program could be completed within a 5-year period, as referred to in the committee report. It has been found that some of the projects could not be completed within the 5-year period, and not all of them within the amounts originally estimated, due to increased costs. Therefore the language to which the Senator has referred was inserted in the committee report, merely as indicating the congressional intent, and as a clarification of the original program.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to state to the chairman of the committee that I think that that is very helpful, because some of the projects under construction will not be completed, and we do not want to give the impression that we do not intend to complete them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly the committee has no such intention, and it makes it perfectly clear that it has no such intention. To construe the language otherwise would seem to me to reach a rather strange construction of the original appropriation act for these projects, because that act does not refer to a 5-year period. In the discussion of the program on the floor of the Senate it was stated that the program could be completed within that period of time, but the language in the report clears up any question that may have existed on that point, particularly as to the congressional intent; and the language we put in the report will allow the construction to take longer than 5 years and, in some cases, to slightly increase the original cost estimates.

Mr. CARLSON. In the State of Kansas we have some very fine pilot projects, and I know that there are others in other States also. I sincerely hope that they can serve as pilot projects, and I should like to see this work greatly expanded. I certainly hope the committee will keep that in mind as it goes into that program.

Mr. RUSSELL. As the Senator knows, these programs are carried on now under three different categories. One is under the Flood Control Act of 1944. That act has 11 projects in it. Then there are the 60 pilot watersheds. In addition, there are a large number of projects which are being approved almost daily under the watershed protection program. The amounts carried in the bill are over and above the budget estimates for all three categories of projects.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia for the increases which the House and Senate committees made in the upstream projects. I refer to all three categories the Senator has described. I feel that something must be done, however, in the near future to impress not only upon the Budget Office of the President but also upon the Soil Conservation Service, which administers these programs, that the need for more adequate financing is upon us.

I know the committee has well recognized the large number of projects which are coming in under the general upstream flood control program voted by the Congress approximately 2 years ago.

Little money is available even for a comprehensive survey to get final planning so that we can put the projects in work. Certainly, the 65 pilot projects are important.

I am tremendously interested in the 11 original upstream flood control dams. While they were in the Flood Control Act of 1944, they were originally authorized in 1940. It was only because of the war and the need for conserving funds and human effort that they were delayed that long. I had hoped that the committee would see fit to advance some funds for those original projects so that we could complete them at an early date for at least 1 or 2 watersheds.

It has been recommended by the national soil conservation organization as being necessary to give a permanent demonstration of how upstream flood control can eliminate floods on many of our major river systems.

Does not the Senator from Georgia think it will be possible to secure any further funds for any of those projects during this session?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I well know the great interest of the Senator from Oklahoma in these projects; and he well might be interested in them, not only from the standpoint of conservation on a national level, but one of them is the largest and most spectacular of the projects, the Washita project, which is located in the State of Oklahoma.

The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has given the committee and the Senate a liberal education with reference to that project over the past several years.

The total for the 11 projects has been increased by $1,300,000, and the Senator's project receives approximately $400,000 out of the $1,300,000 increase. While I know the Senator would like to have $3 million appropriated for Washita, the committee could not approve an amendment which would make that great a disparity between these projects. But I think I can assure the Senator that his arduous labors in connection with his project have not gone for naught. I anticipate that we shall continue to increase appropriations for this work next year and the year following, and that Washita will receive substantial increases. But I could not approve of any amendment at this time that would increase the total.

Mr. MONRONEY. I fully realize the situation, and I wish to express my appreciation of the assurances the Senator has given the Senate that other increases will be most seriously considered next year and the year after that, so that we may hope that in the not too distant future we shall be able to complete one of these projects as a demonstration of what upstream flood control can accomplish.

The reason why they were originally set up was to demonstrate the practicability of holding the water where it falls, in many small reservoirs.

It is with pleasure that I have received these assurances, and we shall be around next year doing our level best to get a more adequate amount of money for all three types of upstream flood control.

At this point, Mr. President, I would ask the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget to be more realistic with reference to the money necessary to carry out the program authorized by the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont, under Public Law 566, of which I was a cosponsor. More funds will be needed in the program created by his bill, or it will die of starvation because of inadequate appropriations. At the present rate from 50 to 75 years will be required to get sufficient appropriations to make a substantial impact on the applications which are coming in in large numbers.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to observe that I do not know whether the Senator from Oklahoma has inspired the directors of the conservation district involved, or whether the directors have inspired the Senator, but, certainly, no project has been more diligently prosecuted before the committee and on the floor of the Senate than has the Washita project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment is agreed to.

PERCENTAGE OF PARITY RECEIVED BY AMERICAN FARMERS

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on April 24 the Senate was deliberating on the farm bill, and I made the statement that farm products generally were being sold by farmers on an average of not to exceed 70 percent of parity.

The statement provoked quite a little debate. The distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] took issue with my statement in rather positive and vigorous language. In fact, Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana went so far as to use language which, in effect, amounted to calling the Senator from Oklahoma a liar. The Senator from Indiana said the statement made by the Senator from Oklahoma was false and that the Senator from Oklahoma knew it was false.

On April 25 the Senator from Indiana introduced for the RECORD certain statements from the Department of Agriculture which purported to give the prices which farmers are receiving in relation to parity.

It is my purpose at this time to document the accuracy of the statement I made with reference to farmers selling their products for an overall average of not to exceed 70 percent of parity.

Mr. President, I have here a letter from a Mr. Ivan M. Druley, of Milton, Ind., dated April 26, 1956, which reads as follows:

> DEAR SENATOR KERR: During the debate on the farm bill I read where you made the statement that many farm products were selling below 70 percent of parity and that beef cattle prices are below 60 percent of parity at present and hog prices below 50 percent of parity.
>
> I was glad to learn that you had made the statement in the Senate so it could be recorded, that people take a good look at it. I produce both beef and pork on my Indiana farm and I don't care how efficient an operator you are you will most certainly lose if you sell under present prices. With the philosophy that we are getting from the White House I can see no hope for the farmer. Things will not get better until some organized program comes along to raise the products the farmer sells for consumption to 100 percent of parity.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wonder if the Senator will permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum without his losing the floor.

Mr. KERR. I yield for that purpose, with the understanding that I shall not lose the floor.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, reading from the communication of a young farmer, I find that he, having sold one-fourth of a million pounds of pork last year, certainly would be in a position, at firsthand, to know the price he was receiving for his farm products.

So I say to the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] that when he accuses me of making statements falsely in saying that farmers have been selling their products at an average of not to exceed 70 percent of parity, he is making the accusation against the farmers of his own State.

I have another letter, this one from Mr. Lawrence Dorrell, of Greenwood, Ind. Mr. Dorrell says:

> Congratulations on your recent skirmish with Senator CAPEHART. If he made all of his living farming, he would have a better picture of the farm situation.
>
> We sold our hogs this winter for $12; or less than 60 percent parity. Could Senator CAPEHART live on 60 percent of the cost of living?
>
> Maybe we can keep him home for the next 6 years. We sure don't need him in Washington promotin' supply and demand for farmers.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> LAWRENCE DORRELL.

When the Senator from Indiana accuses me of making false statements knowingly, when I say that farmers have been selling at less than 70 percent of parity, he is branding as liars the farmers of his own home State, particularly Mr. Lawrence Dorrell, of Greenwood, Ind., who says that he has been selling at less than 60 percent of parity.

I have a letter from Esta William Theobold, dated April 27, 1956. Mr. Theobold says:

> DEAR SENATOR KERR: Your recent debate on the Senate floor was of a great deal of interest to me. Being a farmer from Indiana, I was very interested when you took our Senator CAPEHART to task. His statement that farm parity is not 70 percent leaves a great deal of room for debate.
>
> I would say that 70 percent is an optimistic estimate, as I feel it is probably lower.
>
> I am enclosing sales slips that would point conclusively to this. Maybe they will be of some help in proving your point.
>
> Very truly yours,
>
> ESTA WILLIAM THEOBOLD.
>
> SHELBYVILLE, IND.

I say to the Senator from Indiana that there is another farmer from his own

home State who says that, in his judgment, the value of farm products or the price of farm products has been below 70 percent of parity; and he speaks from the standpoint of one who has had the experience of selling.

I have a letter from Mr. Philip Cole, of Pittsboro, Ind., dated April 27, 1956. He says:

I read with a great deal of interest the report in the paper of your recent debate with Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana. Of special interest to me, since I am a farmer, was Senator CAPEHART'S denial that farm parity now averages 70 percent.

I am enclosing sales slips which I received from the recent sales of hogs. These slips speak for themselves in proving your point. I hope they will be of help to you in backing up your statement.

Very truly yours,

PHILIP COLE.

PITTSBORO, IND.

I do not say that the Senator from Indiana knowingly and willfully made a statement which was false. All I say is that the Senator from Indiana simply did not know what he was talking about. What I am saying is that he has permitted himself to be misled by the propaganda of the Department of Agriculture, rather than take the trouble to find out from the labors and experiences of his own Indiana farmers what the reality was.

In his burst of enthusiasm for and devotion to a department which is unworthy of either, he got himself so hypnotized with his devotion to them and their devotion to error that he made statements which not only violated the rules of the Senate, but which violated the truth. I am proving it in the RECORD by the testimony of farmers from whom I have heard by the hundreds since the date of the debate. Without a single exception, they support and approve the statement which I made on the floor of the Senate.

Under date of April 28, 1956, I received from Robert E. Wilson, director of the Parmer County Grain Sorghum Association, of Bovina, Tex., the following telegram:

Following telegram sent Secretary of Agriculture Benson on 23d:

"We request that you please give some consideration to the grain-sorghum farmer. Grain sorghum is as basic to us as corn to the corn farmer. We have no appreciable acreage for any of the basic crops. The expense of producing grain sorghums is approximately the same as for corn, and the feed-value equivalent is no less than 95 percent of corn. We cannot believe that you can consider it fair to have a national average loan on corn of $2.68 per hundred plus support prices for overplanted acres, which I understand you are now working on, and, at the same time, support grain sorghums at only $1.80 per hundred, which means only about $1.55 to the farmer in this area. The 25-percent cut on grain sorghums last year put grain sorghum down to just about the cost of production, and many farmers lost their shirts. Actually, the grain-sorghum parity is so out of line with corn parity that instead of 70 percent of parity we only received approximately 48 percent of parity last year, based on the parity for corn. Do not think I am trying to get corn down; but we do think grain sorghum should not be discriminated against as compared with any other crop. The banks are refusing to loan us the money we must have to farm with, and we consider it imperative that some relief be given. I am practically a 100-percent grain-sorghum farmer myself, Mr. Benson, and I am convinced you are receiving a lot of bad advice somewhere along the line, as I cannot believe you can be the kind of man to permit such discrimination to exist as is now the case with grain sorghums if you are totally familiar with the facts."

Under date of April 27, 1956, I received from Mangum, Okla., the following telegram from Mr. Henry W. Worthington, secretary of the Greer County Farmers' Union:

Checked with 75 farmers and businessmen. All said that prices received by farmers were 5 percent below 1955 and that all farm commodities sold by farmers including livestock was from 65 percent of parity to 70 percent of parity. The cost of living is rising daily. Prices for what farmers have to buy are 5 to 6 percent higher than year ago.

Under date of April 27, 1956, I received from Max D. Carriker, box 545 Roby, Okla., the following telegram:

Understand Senator CAPEHART belatedly seeks information on 1955 farm income. I sold my grain sorghums for $1.35 per hundredweight and beef cattle for less than 14 cents average. Realized return of one and six-tenths percent net on investment in 1955 and nothing for labor. Had begun to think of myself as Benson's and Harper's inefficient country slicker until I learned Ike thought enough of us farmers that he would give us over $110 apiece through his advance payment soil bank in exchange for our vote and a good share of next year's crop. The general still remembers how to recruit, don't he? Two days furlough for four years reenlistment.

P. S.—FHA hesitated to finance this telegram without Benson's approval, so neighbors chipped in 25-cent-a-dozen egg money.

Let the Senator from Indiana go and talk to the farmers in that part of Texas, if he is in doubt as to their receiving less than 70 percent of parity for the products they sell.

I have in my hand a telegram from Bovina, Tex., which is dated April 28, and reads as follows:

BOVINA, TEX., *April 28, 1956.*

Senator ROBERT S. KERR,
Washington, D. C.:

For my livelihood I farm 640 acres of grain sorghums. I have 4 irrigation wells with an average lift of about 200 feet. Last fall I received $1.54 per hundred for my crop as compared with $2.14 in the fall of 1954 and $2.31 in 1953. My loss at this $1.54 price from my farming was $12,000 for the year. This $1.54 I received figures approximately 48 percent of parity based on corn parity since both grain sorghums and corn have about the same feed value and cost about the same to produce. The 70 percent from the administration we received last fall is very misleading as the parity they are using for grain sorghums is not a true parity when compared with other crops, namely, corn. Also the so-called $1.78 they said we received only figured $1.54 to us since they say we are below the national average. It seems to me the administration is very inconsistent making their pious talks about the huge surpluses and at the same time going into the commercial-corn areas and creating a support price of $2.68 per hundred on all corn on allotted acres plus a support of $2.23 per hundred on all corn produced over their allotted acres and still leaving grain sorghums at the same $1.54. It seems to me this $2.23 per hundred price on all corn produced should also be the minimum support price for grain sorghums if there is any such thing as a semblance of justice in the thinking. In 1952 grain sorghums at our local elevator during harvest were bringing $3 per hundred. Since Mr. Eisenhower has been in office this price has declined to their $1.54 figure. We will appreciate anything you might be able to do to help us as you can see we are in quite a squeeze. I can furnish you proof of these 1952 prices if you need it.

JACK SMITH.

LAZBUDDY, TEX.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a telegram from Hereford, Tex., which reads as follows:

HEREFORD, TEX., *April 28, 1956.*

Senator ROBERT S. KERR:

On my farming operation this year I was forced to take $1.54 per hundred for my grain-sorghums crop. This is the support rate as set by Mr. Benson and is in contrast to a price of $2.85 to $3.20 received in 1952. I had 330 acres of grain sorghums and my loss for the year was $5,000. If something is not done to put grain sorghums up we are all going to have to quit farming. The so-called largest farm organization in the United States which states the farmers are in favor of the sliding scale does not represent the thinking of the farmers, in my opinion, and it should be referred to as an insurance company instead of a farm organization.

LEON GRISSOM,
Farmer.

FARWELL, TEX.

I now read from a letter dated April 26, 1956, which was sent from Colorado City, Tex.:

I read of your debate with Senator CAPEHART concerning the farm prices and thought these figures might be of help to you in your further debate.

Last fall I received $1.40 per hundredweight for grain sorghum and $53 per ton for cottonseed and an average of approximately 28 cents per pound for cotton.

Mr. President, the farmer does not give the degree of parity, but $1.54 was described by one farmer as 43 percent of parity.

I now read from a letter written to me by Arch Thornton, of Chalk, Tex.:

I read of your fight on Senate floor with Senator CAPEHART, who I believe is one of the big-business Republicans.

Mr. President, I want to say he is a pretty smart farmer. If the rest of his letter is as accurate as is that conclusion, it is worthy of our confidence.

I appreciate your courageous fight for us farmers. I know we don't have a chance as long as we have Ike, Benson, and the other big business boys in Washington. I thought you could use the following information: I received less than 70 percent of parity last year for the crops grown on my farm. I received $1.40 per hundredweight for grain sorghum, $12.50 for hogs, calves $13.50, cottonseed $49 per ton, cotton $25.15.

Keep up the fight against the Farm Bureau Republican farm program; it will bankrupt all of us farmers.

Thanking your for your efforts.

Very truly yours,

ARCH THORNTON.

CHALK, TEX., COTTLE COUNTY.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter from Vance H. Gilbreath, county judge, Motley County, Tex., which has about the same line of information.

I read a letter from J. E. Church, Wagoner, Okla.:

There seems to be some misunderstanding as to what the farmers get for their products, other than the basic crops.

This is to advise you that I sold 1,645 bushels of No. 2 oats on November 4, 1955 for 70 cents per bushel, which I hauled approximately 50 miles and after deducting 10 cents per bushel for delivering, I received 60 cents per bushel net, which is below 70 percent of parity.

Trusting this information will be helpful to you for your fight for parity prices for farm products.

Sincerely yours,

J. E. CHURCH.

ROUTE 1.
WAGONER, OKLA.

I have a statement from Ira J. Cook, of Snyder, Okla., which reads:

I had 218 acres of milo on my farm last year and sold 600,000 pounds at $1.54 per hundredweight.

I have a statement from Ray Hill, Kiowa County, Okla., which reads:

I had 35 acres of milo on my farm last year and sold 30,000 pounds at $1.50 per hundredweight.

I have a letter from Ray E. Aldrich, of Eads, Colo., which reads:

I understand you are having a difficult time to convince some of our eastern Senators and Congressmen that the farmer sold some of his agriculture commodities at prices below 72 percent of parity.

I would like to pass on to you some of my unpleasant experience in farming last November of 1955.

We have been plagued with drought for the past 5 years. I had a light sorghum crop which I had to sell at $1.65 per 100 pounds.

I also had to sell my cattle due to drought last fall at 8 cents a pound per 100 pounds for good Hereford cows; 12 cents to 13 cents a pound for steers.

I have come to the conclusion that as long as parity is that low a farmer just can't win for losing.

Most of the farmers will have to quit unless we can get a fair price for our farm commodities. By the farmer, I mean the family-sized farmer and not large corporation type farmers.

When the Senator from Indiana made the accusation that the one making the statement that farmers were receiving less than 70 percent of parity was guilty of willful falsehood, he addressed his remarks to the Senator from Oklahoma, but, in reality, they applied to the farmers on the land, whether they are in Texas, Oklahoma, Colorado, Indiana, or Illinois.

I have a letter from an Illinois farmer which reads:

My attention has recently been called to a statement reportedly made by Senator HOMER CAPEHART, of Indiana, that hog prices in the Midwest during the past fall and winter season did not reach a low of 70 percent of legal parity.

Then he pays me some compliments, Mr. President, which my modesty prevents me from putting into the RECORD.

Hog prices——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Oklahoma permit the Senator from Oregon to have them inserted into the RECORD?

Mr. KERR. Under pressure, I so permit.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

There being no objection, the portion of the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since you are one of the great persons fighting both honestly and intelligently for the preservation of the farm family, I thought you would be interested in getting the real facts so that you might acquaint Mr. CAPEHART with what is going on back at and near his own home. The information is as follows:

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I now continue to read from the letter:

Hog prices (as reported by the Illinois Department of Agriculture, Crop Reporting Service) November, 1955 average price received by farmers was $12.20 hundredweight, December 1955 was $10.60 hundredweight, January 1956 was $11 hundredweight, February 1956 was $12 hundredweight, and March 1956 was $12.10 hundredweight. They report that the April figure is not available but will be soon.

According to the United States Department of Agriculture during this time the legal parity price for hogs was $21 hundredweight. The average of these 5 months, which constitute the heavy selling period of the Midwest hog market, was $11.60. Simple arithmetic—

Which I must say is not very persuasive to the Senator from Indiana. I do not know that he is allergic to it, but I do know he is either unfamiliar with it or uninfluenced by it. This farmer says:

Simple arithmetic will show this to be 55 percent of parity. These prices, I might add, were taken from the legitimate established hog markets. Many purchases were made for chain stores through small sale barns, and in many cases the price was from $1 to $2 hundredweight lower.

The Illinois hog farmer has surely taken a beating during this period, and frankly he is not taking it lying down. Many of them have lost thousands of dollars in their operations during this past year, especially those in the corn-hog farm belt.

If Mr. CAPEHART or anyone else should wish names and addresses of real farmers who have lost thousands of dollars on hogs, I can supply them upon request.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

RALPH S. BRADLEY,
President.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that since I was placed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], in the category of being a liar, I have found that I am in some very distinguished company. I have received a letter from an Indiana farmer by the name of John C. Raber. I wish to say that this Indiana farmer went to the trouble of going to a very respected authority on farm prices and farm conditions; he went to the great land grant agricultural college of the State of Indiana, at Purdue University. I wish the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] were on the floor, in accordance with the request made of him. I should like to see his face when he finds out that—by inference—he branded the agricultural research division of his own State university as being a liar.

I read the letter from Mr. Raber:

INDIANA FARMERS UNION,
Indianapolis, Ind., April 26, 1956.

Senator ROBERT S. KERR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KERR: I understand that Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana, was quite put out with you for stating that farm prices averaged 70 percent of parity and that he disputed you on the floor of the Senate yesterday, April 25.

I don't know where Senator CAPEHART gets his figures, but the last report I have from the United States Department of Agriculture Agriculture Marketing Service at Purdue University shows farm prices in Indiana to be exactly 70 percent of parity. Those are the only official figures we have here in Indiana. I am sending the report along in case you need proof of your statement as it applies to Senator CAPEHART'S own State.

It's worth noting too that corn and hogs, which are the bread-and-butter crops for Hoosiers, have been even below that. The United States Department of Agricultural Statistical Summary shows that the average price for hogs on January 15 was $10.90 a hundred pounds, which is about 50 percent of parity, and in February the average price had climbed to $12, or 57 percent of parity. The last average price I have on corn is $1.18 per bushel, or 68 percent of parity.

More recent figures may reflect a different price picture, but you can be sure that as far as parity of income—which is the thing that counts—is concerned, farmers in Indiana are not receiving anywhere near as much as 70 percent of parity.

The things a lot of Senators have been saying on the floor of the Senate have not been improving income on the farms back here in Indiana.

Very truly yours,

JOHN C. RABER,
President, Indiana Farmers Union.

Mr. President, I now wish to submit for the RECORD a report headed "Indiana Crops and Livestock—United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, Agricultural Estimates Division, Cooperating With Purdue University, Agricultural Experiment Station, Department of Agricultural Statistics, West Lafayette, Ind." The portion of the report which I should like to have placed in the RECORD is that shown on the last page of the bulletin, where we find indexes and ratios for Indiana farm prices. In that connection, I wish to emphasize this statement which appears in the bulletin:

Indiana purchasing power of farm products—

In other words, showing the percentage of parity—

February 1955, 81 percent of parity.
January 1956, 70 percent of parity.
February 1956, 70 percent of parity.

Therefore, Mr. President, I submit again the statement I made on the floor of the Senate on April 24, namely, that as of that time, the farm people of our country were selling their products for an average not to exceed 70 percent of parity.

I have documented the matter by letters from farmers in many States—letters which I have selected from the hundreds that have come to my office since that date, the last of the exhibits being a report by the research department of the agricultural division of Indiana's great land-grant agricultural

college at Purdue University; and the report concludes with the finding that in January and February 1956, Indiana farmers' purchasing power for the crops they produced, and figured on the basis for which the crops were sold by them, was 70 percent of parity.

Mr. President, I challenge the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] to go back home and tell the Purdue University officials that they are making false statements. I challenge him to tell the farmers in his own home State—farmers who have been writing to me—that they are making false statements.

It is only in the protected sanctuary of the United States Senate, Mr. President, that ignorance can attain such heights, and stupidity promote and inspire men to make such unfounded statements as those made by the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART subsequently said: Mr. President, on April 24, and again on April 25, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain information. On April 24 the able Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and I had quite a colloquy on the floor of the Senate in respect to a statement he made, namely, that farmers were receiving, on an average, 70 percent of parity or less for the things they sold. At the time I questioned the statement because it did not sound to me as if the able Senator from Oklahoma had been given the proper figures and the proper facts.

Today the able Senator from Oklahoma made a speech in which he took me to task, and he quoted a number of letters he had received from farmers, some of them in my State of Indiana and some in other States. Then he placed in the RECORD a report by the great Purdue University, of Indiana. He said:

> The portion of the report which I should like to have placed in the RECORD is that shown on the last page of the bulletin, where we find indexes and ratios for Indiana farm prices. In that connection, I wish to emphasize this statement which appears in the bulletin:
>
> "Indiana purchasing power of farm products"—
>
> In other words, showing the percentage of parity—
>
> "February 1955, 81 percent of parity.
> "January 1956, 70 percent of parity.
> "February 1956, 70 percent of parity."

Of course, Mr. President, I think we should be absolutely fair in this entire matter, and I intend to be fair. What the able Senator from Oklahoma placed in the RECORD was what Purdue University reported as the parity prices in January and February, whereas he and I were discussing the prices which existed as of April 24.

I referred to the parity prices as reported by the Department of Agriculture on April 15. I shall now refer to the April 15 report, and I shall read the figures for 14 items, because on April 25 I myself placed in the RECORD the figures for the same 14 items. On April 15, the prices the farmer received were as follows

Eggs, 93 percent.
Wholesale milk, 87 percent.
Barley, 71 percent.
Oats, 73 percent.
Flaxseed, 77 percent.
Grain sorghums, 75 percent.
Peanuts, 89 percent.
Cotton, 92 percent.
Butterfat, 81 percent.
Soybeans, 91 percent. That was on April 15. All of us know that since then, soybeans have risen in price possibly 50 cents a bushel.
Corn, 76 percent. All of us know that the price of corn has gone up 15 or 20 cents a bushel, I believe, since April 15.
Wheat, 85 percent.
Cattle, 70 percent.
Hogs, 67 percent. On April 15, hogs were selling for between $13 and $14 a hundred. On yesterday they sold for over $18 a hundred. So since April 15 the price of hogs has risen anywhere from 20 to 25 percent.

On April 15, the average parity price for those 14 items was approximately 81 percent, not 70 percent, and not less than 70 percent.

I shall not question the Purdue University figures for January and February, because I have not gone back and examined the prices for farm products in January and February. As a farmer, I know they were too low, because I was selling then, and I do sell almost every month. I do not know what the prices were then.

Therefore, in all fairness, I think the RECORD should show that I was speaking of the prices as of April 24 and April 25. I am certain that the able Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] was speaking of prices as of April 24 and 25. I think the RECORD is crystal clear that the average prices that farmers received on April 15 for these 14 major products amounted to approximately 81 percent.

Soon the report giving the parity prices the farmer received on May 15 will be out. I do not think there is any question but that the report will show a decided increase. I am only speculating now, but my best judgment is that the report will show probably as much as 84 percent, and perhaps 85 percent.

So, Mr. President, I feel that in all fairness to both myself and the able Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the RECORD should show that he was using figures for January and February, whereas I was using actual figures given to me by the Department of Agriculture as to the prices as of April 15. The figures I prophesy today are the ones which will be shown in the report for May 15.

I do not like to confuse the people. I do not like to confuse the RECORD. Above all, I do not want to confuse the farmers. I know that they are having enough trouble. Their prices have been entirely too low. Their prices are too low now. No one knows it any better than I do. But I do not feel that we ought further to confuse and irritate the farmers by giving them figures which, though they may not be incorrect, apply to dates which do not relate to the situation which we are discussing in this instance.

The able Senator from Oklahoma quotes a letter from Mr. Raber, of Indiana. I know Mr. Raber. He is a good friend of mine. He is president of the Indiana National Farmers' Union. As we all know, Mr. Raber has been very active in advocating 100 percent of parity. He has recently organized the State of Indiana for the National Farmers' Union. I do not happen to know the other two or three gentlemen whose letters or telegrams were placed in the RECORD. I am certain that they are all very fine farmers in the State of Indiana. However, I doubt very much if any of them knew what the parity price ought to be. Of course, they do know exactly what they are selling their products for.

I believe that in all fairness one must take into consideration, when he uses any farm price or existing parity price, the fact that farm prices vary at different elevators and different markets. In a given county, one elevator may be paying today a cent or 2 cents more a bushel for corn, wheat, or soy beans. One market may be paying a cent a pound more on a given day for certain types of livestock—for hogs or cattle. So prices vary from day to day. They vary among markets. So it is almost impossible to have the exact facts at any given time.

Also, as we all know, there are various grades of cattle. There are prime cattle, choice cattle, utility cattle, and commercial cattle. Some types of hogs bring higher prices than others. Today the hog market prefers the so-called bacon hog, weighing 200, 210, or 220 pounds. Today the bacon hog brings an average of 50 cents a hundred more.

I wish to keep the record straight. I believe that the May 15 figures will be out in a few days. When they are issued, I shall place them in the RECORD. I wish to say, in all fairness to the able Senator from Oklahoma, that I believe, as I said in my speech of April 25, someone handed him some figures and facts which were possibly true 2 or 3 months ago, but did not apply on April 25, because we all know that the farm prices are gradually working themselves up. For example, in Indiana today the farmer can get $3.12 for his beans. He can get something like $2.15 for wheat. As I stated a moment ago, in Indiana hogs were selling yesterday at better than 18 cents a pound. The price of cattle is off a little. It is too low, particularly as relates to choice and prime cattle. At the moment the prices of cattle are dragging.

With respect to corn, in Indiana an elevator in my county of Daviess, which was paying as low as 97 cents a bushel last December, is now paying $1.47 a bushel for corn. So the price of corn has risen, along with the prices of soybeans and hogs. The prices of cattle are dragging at the moment, but, generally speaking, the general average of farm prices is going up. My best judgment is that they will continue to go up. I believe that before the end of the year we shall find farm prices, considering all the items, will be up to 90 percent of parity, or better. That is my judgment, based upon the present trends. They ought to be 90 percent of parity. In fact, they ought to be 100 percent of parity. The farmer ought to receive 100 percent of parity, but we would like to have him receive it in the market place if he possibly can.

The only way he will receive it in the market place, in my opinion—and I

shall speak at greater length on that subject later—is through finding new uses for farm products. Along with many other Senators, I have introduced a bill on this subject. We must find new uses for agricultural products in industry. We must find new markets for the farmer.

Over the past many years we have literally spent billions of dollars teaching the farmer how to grow more and more and more. We have a county agricultural agent in every county in the United States. We have our great universities. We have our Department of Agriculture. We have industry searching for chemicals to kill weeds, in order that the farmer may grow more. We have our 4-H Clubs. I am glad that we have them. I am not complaining on that score. I am simply pointing out that over the years we have spent millions of dollars teaching the farmer how to produce more. The result is that farm production is high, and the farmer's market is low. In other words, the farmer's market is below the level of his production ability.

This is not a political question at all. It is an economic problem. What we should do is to spend whatever money is necessary, and whatever man-hours are necessary, to find new uses for farm products and new markets, thereby bringing the farmer's market up to the level of his productive ability. When we do that, we shall do something real for the American farmer. We shall make him prosperous. We shall never make American farmers prosperous by cutting back their production.

In my opinion, we should attack this problem from a business standpoint, from an economic standpoint. We ought to pass the bill which I have introduced, calling for $100 million for research in the next 12 months. I understand that the able senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] will begin hearings on the proposed legislation about June 1.

I know many agricultural college people who wish to testify on that bill. It offers the only permanent solution to the farm problem. I hope we can make progress on that program, and that we can find new uses and new markets for the farmer's products, so that he may receive 100 percent or more of parity, but receive it in the open market, because there is a demand for his products. We should make the demand so great that he can produce more per acre, and produce on all his acres, rather than being restricted.

Instead of continually getting into arguments over parity, which fray our tempers, let us do something real for the farmer. Let us find new uses for his products and new markets for that which he grows.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I have enjoyed listening to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. I wish to commend him for the moderation of his approach today. If his approach on April 24 had been as moderate, the speech of the Senator from Oklahoma today would not have been made. What caused the Senator from Oklahoma to make the speech that he made today, aside from documenting in the RECORD the facts as to what the parity actually was prior to the time of the speech on April 24, was the statement made by the Senator from Indiana that the Senator from Oklahoma had made a false statement on the floor of the Senate, and that the Senator from Oklahoma knew it was a false statement when it was made.

Mr. President, those statements were not accurate. The Senator from Oklahoma made statements which he not only sincerely believed to be true, but which he had abundant evidence to support, and which he supported with evidence that he placed in the RECORD today.

For instance, at that time, the Senator from Indiana, as recorded on page 6868 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, said:

> The Senator from Oklahoma made the statement, and he knew when he made it that he was not telling the truth.

I do not believe that statement was justified. I deeply regret that the Senator from Indiana made it on the basis on which he founded it. When he did make it, the Senator from Oklahoma had no recourse other than to place in the RECORD the facts which substantiated the statement the Senator from Oklahoma had made at the time.

On April 25, the distinguished Senator from Indiana, as recorded at page 6906 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, made the statement to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]:

> Mr. CAPEHART. No; I did not say that. I say that the general average of all farm products, even during the depression days of the 1930's, never went below 70 percent.

The thesis of the Senator's statement at that time was that prices then were above 70 percent, and that never, not even in the depression, had they gone below 70 percent. The Senator was mistaken, just as he was mistaken a little while ago when he referred to a farmer from Indiana as being the president of the National Farmers Union.

I know that the Senator from Indiana gets enthusiastic in his statements. However, I do not feel that that should justify attacks by him on the integrity of another Senator, when the Senator himself, in his calmer moments, I believe, would be glad to acknowledge—although he has not done so as yet—that the Senator from Oklahoma not only sincerely believed what he said on the date in question, but had a basis in fact for saying it.

The Senator gave the average overall parity figures for that time. In the first place, his average is based on information given to him by the Secretary of Agriculture. I believe that any Senator is poverty stricken for information if he depends upon the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, for information. I believe a man is crippled who is armed only with statistics provided by Ezra Taft Benson or his Department of Agriculture. The Department is not realistic. It is not accurate. I do not believe it is sincere. I believe it publishes statistics seeking to justify a position taken and seeking to confuse the record, instead of reporting the record. For that reason I say that the statistics depended upon by the Senator from Indiana were undependable and inaccurate. I remind him that he who leans on such a broken reed is surely doomed to a heavy fall.

In the next place, the Senator from Indiana averages the figures without regard to the quantity of the products sold at the price. He admits in his statement on April 25 that hogs were at 74 percent of parity and cattle at 74 percent of parity. Those were his own figures, based upon the report of the Secretary of Agriculture for that date. I presume it was for the date of April 25, because that is the date on which the distinguished Senator from Indiana inserted the figures in the RECORD.

The fact is that neither hogs nor cattle, on an overall average on that date, were bringing to the farmer 74 percent of parity at the place where the farmer was compelled to sell either.

However, even if they were, and if the distinguished Senator had given effect to the quantities of hogs and cattle sold at that percentage of parity, he would have realized that he could not have added 74 for hogs and 74 for cattle and 97 for eggs, and divided the total by 3 and obtained the average percent of parity received by the farmer for his products. I say that because the farmer sells so much more in quantity of hogs and cattle than he does in eggs.

It reminds me of the story of Mutt and Jeff entering into a partnership on a 50–50 basis. One of them came forth with a horse, and the other came forth with a rabbit. The one with the rabbit insisted upon a 50 percent interest in the combined assets of the two. It is impossible to average them on that basis and get accurate information with reference to a situation which, so far as the farmer is concerned, is a reality, not a theory; is a condition, not a hoped for or assumed state of facts, as speculated about or as talked about on an unrealistic and unfounded basis by the Department of Agriculture.

I did not seek this controversy with the Senator from Indiana. I have enjoyed a relationship with him which I have cherished. While not agreeing with him on many issues, it had never occurred to me that the necessity would arise for me to defend before the United States Senate my integrity of purpose under the slashing and infuriated attacks of the Senator from Indiana, alleging that the Senator from Oklahoma had made a false statement, and knew it was false.

I was persuaded then, and I am persuaded now, that the Senator from Indiana, being short on facts, resorted to abuse, and that the Senator, being unable to justify the position he had taken by the realities and the facts as they applied at the grassroots, in anger took refuge in accusations against the character and purpose of the Senator from Oklahoma.

I resented it then, and I resent it now.

For the sake of the RECORD, Mr. President, I have established today the basis upon which I made my statement. In my judgment, what I have submitted proves beyond a shadow of a doubt, by the words of the farmers themselves,

that the statements made by the Senator from Oklahoma on the 24th day of April were correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong this debate, but I should like to have the RECORD straight.

I intended to say that Mr. Raber was president of the Farmers Union of Indiana. If I did not say "Indiana" I wish the RECORD to show that I meant Indiana. I am sure the able Senator from Oklahoma agrees with me that Mr. Raber is president of the Farmers Union of Indiana.

Mr. KERR. The gentleman of whom the Senator speaks is the president of the Farmers Union of Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the figures which the able Senator from Oklahoma placed in the RECORD and which he used as authority I understand were for the months of January and February, and not for the month of April which he and I were discussing on April 25. I am not going to vouch for their correctness, because I have not looked at them, but I must stand on the facts.

I do not know where else we can get information on this subject than from the Department of Agriculture. I have an idea that Secretary Benson does not see any of the figures. They are worked out by statisticians in the Department who have been there for years. They are civil-service employees. Until the figures are published, I do not suppose Mr. Benson or any of his assistants would have the slightest idea what the figures were going to be. I suspect that, if the truth were known, the persons who figure out the statistics are men and women who have been in the Department for many years. The Secretary of Agriculture does not make the figures; he does compile the statistics; he does not make the record in that respect.

If the Senator from Oklahoma had stated on April 25 that he was talking about parity figures of last January and February I would never have questioned him at all. But we were speaking on April 24 and 25, and I knew, or at least I thought I knew, what I was talking about, and the figures bore me out.

I placed the figures in the RECORD on April 25, and again today. I not only placed them in the RECORD, but I placed them in the RECORD by categories. There was but one which was less than 70 percent on April 17. We know that today hogs are up to possibly 80 percent or more. On April 15 the figures were available to the Senator from Oklahoma. The only place I know of to get the figures is the Department of Agriculture. There was only one item in all the categories which was below 70 percent. There was one which was 70 percent, and that was cattle. Hogs were 67 percent. All the others were above 70 percent, the highest item being eggs at 93 percent and the next highest being cotton, at 92 percent. Wheat was 95 percent.

If we cannot rely upon figures of the Department of Agriculture, I do not know where to go to get more accurate figures. I do not suppose there is one farmer out of a thousand who can tell us what the parity price should be. I do not wish to embarass the able Senator from Oklahoma by asking him what the parity is on cotton, corn, or any of the other items. I could look it up, but I do not know from memory. I doubt that there is any Senator who knows what the parity should be.

The able Senator from Oklahoma said a moment ago that I was all wrong when I said that during the depression parity prices never got below 70 percent. I still stand on that statement. It is a true statement. But that does not mean that corn did not get down to 20 cents or 25 cents a bushel. It did. But, at the same time, labor, and everything else on which parity is based, was equally low.

If we take the same formula we have today for figuring parity, and figure on the prices during that period, I think the Senator from Oklahoma will find that my statement that even during the depression prices did not get below 70 percent of parity was correct. They got way down, and everything the farmer bought was down.

Mr. President, I believe my statement to be a true statement. At least, I was told by reliable sources that it was correct. I have no way of figuring everything the farmer bought. In those days we did not have a parity formula. It seems to me that the entire debate, Mr. President, stems from dates rather than from figures or from facts. I was thinking in terms of April 25 as reported by the Department of Agriculture on April 15, and the Senator from Oklahoma was thinking in terms of the facts in January and February. So, Mr. President, we may both have been right.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the last statement of the Senator from Indiana illustrates his capacity for confusion. The Senator says he was thinking in terms of parity figures as they were on April 25 as disclosed by reports of the Secretary of Agriculture on April 15. That illustrates the Senator's difficulty.

He says, "Where can we get the facts except from the Secretary of Agriculture?" Almost any place in the world would be a better place to get the facts than to get them from the Secretary of Agriculture. If the Senator is really sincere, I can tell him that he can get the facts from the farmers of Indiana. The facts are available to them. The farmers of Oklahoma gave me the facts. If I were to say to them, "I do not know what you are talking about; I take my facts from the Secretary of Agriculture," I know I could not get back within the boundaries of Oklahoma.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, one of the reasons why I made my statement on April 25 is that I deal in farm products every day. I am a farmer. I sell hogs practically every month in the year, and I buy and sell cattle. I raise corn. I do not suppose there is ever a time when I do not have corn on my farm. I pay all the bills on my farm. I sign the checks, and deposit checks for that which is sold. So I was basing my position on April 25 on what I actually knew, because I had just recently sold soybeans, wheat, and hogs, and had recently bought some cattle. So I am one of those Indiana farmers about whom the able Senator from Oklahoma has spoken. If I know anything, I know that much.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, pending before the Senate is the bill to amend the Retirement Act. I wish to make a very brief statement on the bill tonight, and to place in the RECORD certain information for the benefit of the Senate tomorrow. Before doing so, I wish to say something to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], not as a mediator, because I well appreciate the fact that when one seeks to step into such a role he is usually the one who becomes the victim of his intercession.

But I know both Senators very well, and I have listened to the altercation between them. I say most kindly and most respectfully that it seems to me the Senator from Indiana has not touched upon the real cause of the difference. I think it is a cause which we ought to take into account in our relationships with one another in the Senate.

I refuse to believe that the Senator from Indiana really believed what he said in the language he used on April 24 to the Senator from Oklahoma. I know the Senator from Oklahoma very well. I do not know of anyone for whom I could have a greater respect when it comes to the matter of integrity. The word of the Senator from Oklahoma, in my judgment, can always be relied upon, so far as his intentions and his motivations are concerned. I have found him at all times to be exceedingly intellectually honest. I have found him to be a man of great morality. I may say, without, I hope, causing him any embarrassment, that since the two of us have been Members of the Senate, I have had the opportunity to be associated with him as a Member of a group in the Senate which devotes itself once a week, at a breakfast meeting, to a discussion of spiritual values and the relationship of those values to our work in the Senate. Therefore, I know him to be a deeply religious man. The RECORD will show that I have disagreed with him on some issues in the Senate, but our disagreements have been on the merits of the issues.

What pains me in this discussion is that it seems to me my friend from Indiana still has not faced up to the cause of the hurt which he inflicted on the Senator from Oklahoma, when he said, in effect, on April 24, that the Senator from Oklahoma made a false statement, and knew it was false. The Senator from Indiana, in my judgment, has presented no evidence whatsoever which supports that evaluation of the motivation of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The Senator from Indiana and I have been in hot debates in the Senate in our terms here. He and I know that sometimes in the heat of debate one says things which he immediately regrets, and he proceeds to make amends for the statements made in the heat of debate. I think the entire matter could have been cleared up if the Senator from Indiana had said, as I think he should have said, on the basis of the integrity of the Senator from Oklahoma, that he regretted that he left the implication that he thought the Senator from Oklahoma was deliberately, knowingly, and intentionally falsifying to the Senate in any statement he made on the floor.

The Senator from Indiana could very well disagree with the conclusions reached by the Senator from Oklahoma; but I think it is regrettable, in our relationships in the Senate, on either side of the aisle, or between Members on opposite sides of the aisle, if we reflect upon the integrity and the honesty of our colleagues. I think that is what this is all about; and knowing the Senator from Indiana as I do, knowing that he does not ordinarily, so far as I know from my experiences with him, desire intentionally to hurt anyone, I still wish that I could hear from his lips a statement to the effect that he did not mean to reflect upon the integrity, the honesty, and the truthfulness of the Senator from Oklahoma.

It is one thing to say, "I think my colleague is mistaken. I think he has presented information which further analysis will show does not measure up to a sound analysis of the fact." But it is a quite different thing to leave in the historic RECORD of this body a charge that one believes a colleague has knowingly and intentionally made a false statement.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Oregon has said some kind things about the Senator from Oklahoma. I presume that, in all fairness, he has not made such comments about the Senator from Indiana——

Mr. MORSE. I have not finished.

Mr. CAPEHART. In the last hour, the able Senator from Oklahoma made a statement about the Secretary of Agriculture from which one could draw the inference that the figures supplied by the Secretary could not be believed; that they were unreliable. That statement means only one thing to me, because I think I have commonsense. It means that the Secretary of Agriculture puts out dishonest figures. If one can read anything else into what the able Senator from Oklahoma said—if the able Senator from Oregon can read anything else into his statement—he is perfectly at liberty to do so.

All I can read into his comment is that anyone who relies upon the figures published by the Department of Agriculture had better beware, because those figures are dishonest. If anyone can make anything else out of the statement by the Senator from Oklahoma than that the figures given by the Secretary of Agriculture are dishonest, let him do so.

Let me say about the able Senator from Oklahoma that he can dish it out on the floor of the Senate. He has a great habit of dishing it out. He makes very cutting and unkind statements about his colleagues. I am not complaining about that. I merely say that he can dish it out here; and he has been dishing it out in the last hour against the Secretary of Agriculture.

No one in his right mind could come to any other conclusion than that the able Senator from Oklahoma wanted to leave in the RECORD and leave with the persons who listened to him the inference that one could not believe the figures published by the Department of Agriculture; that the officials of that Department were a bunch of misguided crooks; and that they are putting out a lot of figures designed to fool the American farmer.

If anyone can make anything else out of it, Mr. President, let him go ahead, because I am standing on the record. I will continue to stand on the record.

Mr. MORSE. I want to finish what I was going to say about the Senator from Indiana, and I give him my word that I am still going to say what I was going to say, without a word changed as a result of anything he has said in the last 2 minutes.

I was going to say, before he interrupted me, that I served with the Senator from Indiana on the Banking and Currency Committee, and I served on that committee with great pleasure in my relationships with the Senator from Indiana. On that committee, he and I did not agree on some issues, although on some other issues we worked shoulder to shoulder. We have had some very hot debates in the committee, as well as on the floor of the Senate. In none of our relations, no matter how warm those debates may have been, have I heard the Senator from Indiana reflect on the integrity of any of his colleagues on the committee; and some of the sessions were very warm ones. That is why it pains me to have the Senator leave the record with the personal attack on the Senator from Oklahoma, which caused the altercation in the first place. The Senator has made it clear he intends to leave the record stand that way. I am sorry. I think it is regrettable. I hope the time will come when he will change his mind about that record.

As to what the Senator from Oklahoma said about the Department of Agriculture this afternoon, my interpretation of what he said is that, on the basis of his experience, as he has compared the reports of the Department of Agriculture under Secretary Benson with reports he has obtained from other sources, he has reached the conclusion that the Department of Agriculture under this administration is presenting statistical reports and is presenting substantive reports to bear out an agricultural policy.

I want to say that has been my experience, too. I find great difficulty in reconciling reports of the Department of Agriculture with reports on agriculture which come from scientific bureaus and agricultural colleges. I think the Senator from Oklahoma was quite right in pointing out that was the conclusion he had reached or to reports being put out by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I shall yield in a moment. What I have stated is the conclusion I have reached, I desire to say, to my great disappointment. I have found, as I have read these agricultural reports from the Department of Agriculture, that I have needed to ask myself the question, "What have they left out? How much of the story are they not telling?" because too frequently what they put in the reports is not the full story.

That is the interpretation I made of the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma, and I think the interpretation can be borne out by a comparison of the reports put out by the Department of Agriculture with reports on the same subject put out by scientific and agricultural bureaus in this country.

I now yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, first I wish to thank my distinguished friend for his very kind and generous remarks about the senior Senator from Oklahoma. I shall cherish them as one of the finest experiences I have had in the United States Senate.

Secondly, I should like to ask the Senator if he is familiar with the report put out by Purdue University which the Senator from Oklahoma introduced into the RECORD this afternoon.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator knows, after he introduced it into the RECORD, I asked to have the privilege of reading it, and I sat at my desk and read it.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator recall that for January and February the overall average price Indiana farmers were receiving for their products was 70 percent of parity?

Mr. MORSE. That is what the report stated.

Mr. KERR. I do not know what the reports of the Secretary of Agriculture would indicate for the same period of time, but I wonder if the Senator from Oregon shares my belief that the reports of the Secretary of Agriculture would indicate that farmers in the country were receiving an overall average of more than 70 percent of parity during the months of January and February.

Mr. MORSE. I intend to make that comparison, in light of the debate this afternoon, to see whether or not a suspicion of mine will be borne out.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma is going to do likewise. If it should develop, as I think it will, that the reports of the Department of Agriculture would indicate that farmers in the country were getting more than 70 percent of parity in January and February 1956, then it would seem there are other authorities than the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Oklahoma who do not agree with the statements made by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MORSE. That would be the inescapable conclusion.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11177) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 3, at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "$22,594,000" and insert "$25,165,000"; and in the same line, after the word "which", to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$2,965,000."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have advised the distinguished chairman

of the subcommittee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], that I have amendments which apply to three different portions of the bill, the first being the committee amendment which has just been stated. If my amendments are acceptable to him, I believe this would be the appropriate time for us to consider them. If acceptable to him, I ask that my amendments be reported en bloc. They are submitted by me on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. SMATHERS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendments of the Senator from Florida to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 3, in line 17, in lieu of "$25,165,000," it is proposed to insert "$26,665,000."

On page 3, line 17, in lieu of "$2,965,000" it is proposed to insert "$4,465,000."

On page 3, line 24, after "conditions", it is proposed to insert *"Provided further,* That $1,250,000 of such $4,465,000 shall be immediately available for expenditure for control and eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in the first instance, I should like to repeat that these amendments are proposed by me on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague [Mr. SMATHERS].

Mr. President, this item has come forward from the Bureau of the Budget and the President in a communication shown as Document No. 407, dated May 19, as a supplementary budget request. It amounts to $1,500,000. It is for an emergency fund for the treatment of the Mediterranean fruitfly infestation in the neighborhood of Miami.

It would appear that the scientists of the Federal and State governments have decided that much money will be saved in the final analysis, in their opinion, if a kind of blitz program be conducted at this time, not only consisting of the ordinary ground operations, but also supplemented by air dusting operations while the infested area is relatively small. Evidently the Bureau of the Budget has agreed with the scientists, because it has approved the item in the shortest time in which any such item that I can recall since I have been in the Senate has been approved; and the President has supported the finding of the Bureau of the Budget by sending the item to Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I enthusiastically support the Senator's amendment, and if he will yield to me briefly I should like to say why.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I point out that this is not a Florida problem at all. It is a national problem. The first infestation has affected certain acreage in Florida, but it could spread, as the Senator from Florida and other Senators well know, very quickly to other fruit-growing areas of the United States, in California, Oregon, Washington, and the Middle West.

This is a problem which confronts us all. The threat should be stamped out as quickly as possible. We should immediately go to the assistance, not of Florida, but of the entire agricultural economy of the country. Such an amendment as this, if it receives our approval, will make possible a frontal attack on the Mediterranean fruitfly, which is now affecting Florida.

By way of analogy, I recall what we did a few years ago when, in my judgment, we had a similar problem. In that case, we did not even spend our money in our own country, but in Mexico. Senators will recall that there was a serious threat of the hoof-and-mouth disease. There waited upon us in the Senate—and rightly so—representatives of the entire cattle industry. I well remember the argument which they presented to us, that if that disease got started in Texas, or in any of the other States on this side of the Mexican boundary, in no time it would spread from coast to coast.

What did we do? Immediately, as we should have done, on an emergency basis we appropriated a large sum of money to be spent in Mexico, on Mexican herds, both by way of confiscation and extermination, and payment to the Mexican owners of the herds for the cattle exterminated. It was money well spent. We stopped the threat of the hoof-and-mouth disease to the cattle farms of America.

In my judgment, the analogy is complete. We had better get busy in the Senate and give the two Senators from Florida a unanimous vote, in the public interest, in favor of their amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

As Senators know, the Mediterranean fruitfly is a scourge which attacks many fruits and vegetables. It travels with great speed, and is highly destructive. It is so greatly feared that one could not overstate the damage which it could do if it ever got out of hand.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I intend to support the amendment of the distinguished Senators from Florida.

My experience has taught me that insect damage or plant disease cannot be limited to a narrow area. I have seen the chestnut blight strike chestnut trees in New York State and parts of New England, and wipe out all the trees in that area. It spread to many other sections of the country. The Dutch elm disease has destroyed a great many trees. The white pine blister rust has spread. Many insect infestations and plant diseases have spread.

I believe fully in what the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Oregon have said. It is not possible, without a concerted national effort, to keep in check some of these very devastating plant diseases and insect infestations.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend from New York, who has spoken with his customary generosity and national-mindedness.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not desire to interfere with the statements being made in behalf of this very important estimate. I do not think its importance could be exaggerated. The subject was discussed in committee, and I was authorized to accept the amendment on the floor of the Senate. I am glad to accept it in all three of its phases.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. It is true that, because we thought this estimate would reach us shortly, the subject was discussed in the committee. I am glad to hear that the Senator from Georgia will accept the amendment.

I should like briefly to describe a certain feature of the amendment which is unusual. The amount to be appropriated is $1,500,000, but $1,250,000 will be funds to be spent in the remaining part of this fiscal year, under the wording of the amendment. I want that to be clearly in the minds of Senators. That is the reason I am stating that fact. The other quarter of a million is to be spent shortly after July 1. There are already some funds in the bill now pending applicable to the period after July 1.

Without speaking longer, I ask unanimous consent that a communication to the President from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, setting forth the facts in this matter rather clearly, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., May 18, 1956.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration proposed supplemental appropriations in the amount of $1,250,000 for the fiscal year 1956 and $250,000 for the fiscal year 1957 for the Department of Agriculture, as follows:

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

"AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount, fiscal year 1956, for 'Salaries and expenses' for plant and animal disease and pest control, $1,250,000.

"For an additional amount, fiscal year 1957, for 'Salaries and expenses' for plant and animal disease and pest control, $250,000."

In the 1957 supplemental now pending before the Congress (H. Doc. No. 403) an amount of $1 million is included for this item, of which $675,000 was provided for the Mediterranean fruitfly work in Florida. However, within the past few days it has been ascertained that the situation is critical and that a vigorous eradication program should be started as quickly as possible.

The current proposal of $1,500,000 would finance the eradication work needed to be done at once on approximately 250,000 acres in the Miami area, the program to be developed under the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 148–148e), and the act of August 13, 1954 (7 U. S. C. 148). It is believed that treatment of these acres immediately could easily save the treatment of

several times that amount a few weeks from now.

Of the total amount of funds being recommended of $1,500,000, $1,250,000 would become available in fiscal year 1956 and the remaining $250,000 would become available in 1957 in addition to the funds proposed in House Document No. 403.

I recommend that the foregoing proposed supplemental appropriations be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

PERCIVAL BRUNDAGE,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wish to take one moment to say how pleased I am to be able to join with my distinguished senior colleague from Florida in offering this amendment. I do not know of any appropriation which could mean more to our State at this particular time than the provision incorporated in this amendment.

As the senior Senator from Florida has so well pointed out, the Mediterranean fruitfly is the greatest scourge we confront. If it is not quarantined and stamped out immediately, it may destroy our entire agricultural economy.

This provision not only means a great deal to our State, but it means a great deal to the Nation. As the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] have so well pointed out, insects of this type do not recognize State lines. If we do not stamp out the infestation now, it is conceivable that it may affect other Southern States, and possible Western States, thereby destroying the agricultural economy and harming the economy of the Nation.

So I am pleased that the President of the United States, the Bureau of the Budget, and now the very able chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], have all been willing to join hands and appropriate this money in order that we may stamp out this very great evil.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. It would be appropriate for the RECORD to show that the Governor of Florida and the regulatory authorities of Florida have been in telephone communication with the Senators from Florida today, assuring us, and giving us the authority to assure the Senate, that the State is not only spending very freely of its own funds at this time, but will continue to do so, and that a special session of the legislature is to be called, either for the 1st of June or shortly thereafter—not later than July 1—as soon as the facts are clearly apparent, so that the State may do its fair share in meeting this emergency.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator. That demonstrates again the wholeheartedness and unanimity with which this problem is being met, not only in our State, but by the officials of the Federal Government as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments, en bloc, offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] for himself and the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], to committee amendments on page 3, lines 17 and 24.

The amendments to the committee amendments were agreed to.

The amendments, as amended, were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 17, after the word "butter", to strike out "$15,500,000" and insert "$15,745,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 24, after the word "Agriculture", to strike out "$29,003,708" and insert "$30,253,708", and on page 5, line 2, after the word "all", to strike out "$29,503,708" and insert "$30,753,708."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 16, to strike out:

ANIMAL DISEASE LABORATORY FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Animal disease laboratory facilities", for establishment of such facilities, including construction, $10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] has indicated to me that he wishes to be heard on this amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if it is in order, I should like to touch briefly on this question a little further.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am perfectly willing to consider the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota now.

Mr. THYE. I will not press for the acceptance of my amendment, because I recognize that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee has made a very careful study of the entire question. If we make the funds available in this appropriation bill, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee is very much concerned lest we lose control over the decision as to where the research laboratory should be located.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will indulge me for a moment, I am much more concerned about its being located in Beltsville than anywhere else. I want the Department to consult with the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as to the location of the laboratory. If they will come into agreement, I am certain that no Member of the Senate will fight more strenuously to provide the necessary funds than I will; and I am sure those funds will be provided in the first supplemental appropriation bill that comes before the Senate. I might say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that that is not only my own view, but that it is the unanimous opinion of the subcommittee which considered this question at some length.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in view of the strong conviction the chairman of the subcommittee has on this question, and with the positive assurance that we can have funds added to the bill, perhaps even before it comes out of conference, if need be, if the Department of Agriculture can come before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and justify its request, or make known to us where the laboratory should be located, and provided that is acceptable to the Committee on Appropriations, I shall not press my amendment. With that assurance, I shall not press my amendment, but shall urge the Department of Agriculture to make known to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry its recommendation.

I definitely share the conviction of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that Beltsville is not the proper location for the laboratory. Beltsville is a very densely populated area. In the first place, it would be very expensive to acquire the necessary property. In the second place, there would be the danger of contamination to the livestock in the research center.

Furthermore, in that densely populated area, there would be the danger of disease communication, because livestock diseases can be communicated to human beings. Therefore, I share the chairman's conviction, and I shall withdraw my amendment, in the hope that we can get an expression of opinion from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I concur in the opinion voiced by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I, too, agree that it would be very inadvisable to locate the laboratory in Beltsville.

I am a little concerned about the legislative situation. If I understand correctly, the maximum amount the committee could insert in conference for this item would be $10 million, not the total budget request of $18,400,000.

Mr. THYE. The Senator is correct. It could add only $10 million. However, the full obligation would not be entered into during the first calendar year. Therefore, we could authorize it and, if necessary, we could add the necessary funds in a supplemental bill or other appropriation bill before the end of the year. I agree with the Senator that in conference we could not raise the figure above $10 million, because that is all the conferees would have before them. However, we could authorize the item and the amount could be appropriated in a supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. BARRETT. I hope the Department will proceed expeditiously in this matter, and that they will come before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and before the Committee on Appropriations with a recommendation that is acceptable, so that we may proceed with this work during the next fiscal year.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a telegram which I received from the American National Cattlemen's Association.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DENVER, COLO., *May 21, 1956.*

HON. EDWARD J. THYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We understand that you are considering making an effort to reinstate the $19 million appropriation for a livestock research laboratory in the agriculture appropriation bill

with provision for a five-man committee to study and select a satisfactory location for it. We believe the early construction of this laboratory to be of utmost importance to the livestock industry. Delay will be costly and we therefore hope you will do everything possible toward a start on the construction of this laboratory this year. The following is a resolution approved at our 1956 convention:

"Whereas, our research committee has determined a critical need for expanded research in the field of livestock diseases: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to appropriate and make available to the Department of Agriculture adequate funds for the establishment and operation of a livestock disease research laboratory someplace in the range cattle producing area of the United States."

Regards.

AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the justification of the need of the research laboratory and a report of distribution and estimated annual losses due to the diseases on which research work would be conducted in the proposed animal disease laboratory facility.

There being no objection, the statement and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUSTIFICATION

New facilities are urgently needed for the animal disease research and control programs.

In June 1955 three widely known research workers from outside the Department were asked to inspect animal disease research and control facilities located at Washington, D. C.; Beltsville, Md.; Auburn, Ala.; and Denver, Colo., to determine whether (1) the facilities and procedures were adequate for proper safeguarding of working personnel from the hazards of infection; (2) safeguards were sufficient to protect workers in other parts of the building and the public utilizing the corridors; and (3) facilities were adequate to protect experiments from cross contamination. Many of the diseases under study at these points were transmissible to man, including tuberculosis, brucellosis, anthrax, erysipelas, rabies, equine encephalomyelitis, Newcastle disease, and others.

The committee reported that facilities in use were not adequate to safeguard workers and other persons in the buildings from exposure to disease or the experimental work from cross contamination. Moreover, the committee reported that in most cases basic building structures were not adaptable to the modifications which would be necessary to provide modern safety measures, and also that they were inadequate for the fundamental disease research program underway. Following this report it was necessary to discontinue all research in Washington, D. C., and all that portion at Auburn, Ala., and Denver, Colo., on animal diseases infectious for man. This has resulted in curtailment of much important work and the suspension of other lines of research because of a lack of suitable space. Overcrowded quarters at Beltsville have been temporarily made available for certain of the work discontinued at other points. Provision for adequate laboratory facilities is essential not only to the conduct of a comprehensive animal disease research program but also to animal disease control programs.

The new facilities would provide space for comprehensive research on animal diseases and for diagnostic and testing work for control and regulatory activities. These facilities have been designed for experimental work with safety to the livestock industry and the health of workers.

Investigations would cover methods for diagnosis, cause, mode of transmission, and methods of prevention, treatment, and control of infectious diseases of all classes of livestock, including poultry, which exist in this country. Bacteriological, serological, pathological, immunological, and animal inoculation studies would be made. Research would cover diseases caused by bacteria, fungi, viruses, rickettsia, and pathological conditions.

Diagnoses of diseases would be made as they are encountered in animal disease control and eradication work in the field and in meatpacking plants. Tests would be made of animal biologics produced commercially to determine their purity and potency as required under the Virus-Serum-Toxin Act. The laboratory would contain facilities for pilot-plant development of production methods for biologics and diagnostic agents based on research findings. Chemical analyses and bacteriological examinations would be made of dips and disinfectants to determine their efficacy and reliability for use in control and eradication programs, and of germicides to determine conformity with the Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act.

REPORT OF DISTRIBUTION AND ESTIMATED ANNUAL LOSSES DUE TO THE DISEASES ON WHICH RESEARCH WORK WOULD BE CONDUCTED IN THE PROPOSED ANIMAL DISEASE LABORATORY FACILITY

Anaplasmosis: Cattle, $9,500,000.

Prevalent in most Southern and some Northern States—includes all States of the southern half of the United States. Incidence higher than previously supposed.

Anthrax: Cattle, $104,000; horses, $1,000; swine, $9,000; sheep, $1,000.

Tends to appear in river valleys. San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys of California, southeastern North Dakota, northeastern Nebraska, delta region of lower Mississippi, and Mississippi Valley in Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana. Tranmissible to man—occupational disease among individuals working with animal hides, skin, or hair.

Atrophic rhinitis: Swine, $14,058,000.

Disease is spreading, particularly in major swine-producing States. Increased incidence in 10 States last year.

Bluetongue: Sheep, no estimate available.

Primarily in California, Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, Colorado, and Texas. Also diagnosed in Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri. Cattle are carriers of this disease.

Brucellosis: Cattle, $87 million; swine, $10 million; and goats, $100,000.

Prevails wherever domestic animals and man cohabit. B. abortus, throughout United States; B. melitensis, primarily southwestern United States; B. suis, endemic in Midwest swine-raising States. Transmissible to man, prevalence depending on prevalence of disease in animals.

Chronic respiratory disease (air sac infection): Poultry, $10 million.

In all major poultry-producing areas, deaths in excess of 14 million birds annually. Affects all ages.

Ecthyma: Sheep, swine, cattle; no estimate available.

Primarily in sheep-raising areas of the West, with sporadic outbreaks in Eastern States. Man infected at rare intervals.

Encephalitis: Horses, $50,000.

Mortality rate in United States has increased recently. Diagnosed equine encephalomyelitis in 30 States last year, particularly Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, Idaho, Nebraska, Illinois, and Florida.

Erysipelas: Swine, $24 million; turkeys, $1,687,000.

Generalized throughout United States, particularly in swine- and poultry-producing areas. Disease in swine has increased to 15 States last year, particularly in swine-producing States.

Foot rot: Cattle, $195,000; sheep, $13,000.

Recent survey indicates this condition to be a definite problem in 17 States, principally in Southern and range States.

Hog cholera: Swine, $48,628,000.

Generalized in United States. Incidence greatest in major swine-producing States. Incidence of disease has remained unchanged in 20 States and decreased in 22 States. No increases in past year.

Infectious bronchitis: Poultry, $7,055,000.

First diagnosed in North Dakota. Affects primarily susceptible growing and laying stock. Infection throughout United States, particularly in poultry-producing areas.

Infectious keratitis: Cattle, no estimate available.

Common ailment of cattle, especially in the range country. Sporadic outbreaks occur among dairy herds. Recent survey indicates disease to be a real problem in 11 States, particularly range States.

Infectious sinusitis: Turkeys, $3,034,000.

Disease found in all turkey-raising areas, runs a chronic course, and while death rates are low, failure to gain weight causes great losses.

Johnes' disease: Cattle, $194,000.

Reported incidence of 2.5 percent among cattle, found in both beef and dairy cattle throughout United States. Tests indicate that incidence is much greater than previously thought. Particularly high incidence in Southeastern United States.

Leptospirosis: Cattle, $112 million.

Has been diagnosed in all States; areas of greatest concentration are the warm, humid Southern and Southeastern States and the Corn Belt States. Concentration of human cases appears to be in California, Michigan, Ohio, Louisiana, and Washington, D. C.

Listerellosis: Cattle, $85,000; sheep, no estimate available.

Widespread distribution, sporadic outbreaks in recent years, particularly Illinois, Colorado, Wyoming, Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Ohio.

Mastitis: Cattle, $225 million.

An extremely serious problem among dairy cattle. Economically the most important disease of cattle. Losses are great in all States, particularly those with greatest concentrations of dairy cattle.

Mucosal disease: Cattle, no estimate available.

Includes extensive outbreaks in New York, Indiana, Iowa, California, and Colorado. Several forms of this disease have been diagnosed in at least 20 States. Disease on the increase over the past 8 years.

Mycotic infections: Cattle, no estimate available; turkeys, $494,000.

Includes mycotic infections of skin, such as ringworm, and mycotic infections of the internal organs and aspergillosis of turkeys. Mycotic infections are more extensive than previously supposed and are identified throughout the United States.

Newcastle disease: Poultry, $24,012,000.

Disease is found in all States—a major problem among poultry producers, encountered at any time during the year. Particularly serious where poultry is concentrated—as broiler raising.

Ornithosis: Poultry, no estimate available.

Sources of infection include psittacine birds, pigeons, chickens, and turkeys. As a disease of domestic fowls, has been diagnosed in 11 States—Texas, New Jersey, Michigan, Minnesota, California, Oregon, Arizona, Massachusetts, Colorado, Iowa, and New York. Outbreaks have occurred in Texas, California, and Oregon. A hazard to human health.

Pasteurellosis: Cattle, $25 million; swine, $258,000.

A major problem in the cattle industry; results in high losses during shipping of livestock; appears in all parts of United

States. Losses greatest among young animals. Pasteurella infections produce infectious abortion in sheep which causes considerable economic losses.

Pox: Poultry, $1,400,000.

Uncontrolled outbreaks of fowl pox result in large economic losses to poultry producers. Disease more prevalent in areas of heavy poultry production.

Rabies: Cattle, $62,000; swine, $304,000; sheep, $5,000.

Knows no geographic boundaries; general throughout United States; eradication complicated by infection being present in foxes, skunks, bats, and other wild animals. Fatal disease in man.

Salmonellosis: Poultry, $16,494,000.

S. pullorum primarily results in high mortality among chicks. Areas of greatest incidence in poultry-producing areas. Incidence has decreased in recent years; decrease of 2.4 to 0.38 percent reactors from 1943 to 1953.

Swine influenza: No estimate available.

Disease is widespread in United States, but more prevalent in the Midwest, generally occurring in fall and winter.

Tuberculosis: Cattle, $1,914,000; swine, $801,000; poultry, $3 million.

In United States extensive eradication program has resulted in disease in cattle becoming a relatively uncommon disease. It is less than 1 percent in cattle now. Infection is general throughout United States and as long as any cases exist, the disease remains a hazard to human health.

Vesicular exanthema: Swine, $887,000.

Low incidence of disease at present, but extensive outbreak in 1952 resulted in spread of infection to nearly all States. Primarily a disease of swine fed raw garbage. Eradication program has been quite successful.

Vesicular stomatitis: Cattle, $44,000; swine, $50,000.

Disease appears to spread from a reservoir of infection in the Southeastern States, particularly Georgia, Florida, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Louisiana. Apparently more widespread than previously thought. Extensive outbreaks have occurred throughout United States. Transmissible to man.

Vibriosis: Cattle, $137,734,000; sheep, $8,350,000.

Widespread among cattle and sheep. Greater awareness of problem has resulted in an increase in numbers of reported cases. Incidence is highest where movement of cattle is great. May be transmitted to man.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 6, after line 16.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARRETT. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a telegram which I have received from the Wyoming Livestock Sanitary Board on the matter of the location of the laboratory.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHEYENNE, WYO., *May 21, 1956.*

Hon. FRANK A. BARRETT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge your support passage $18,915,000 new laboratory for protection livestock industry. Congress determine site for construction later.

THE WYOMING LIVESTOCK
SANITARY BOARD,
G. H. GOOD, *State Veterinarian.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next committee amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there are a large number of additional committee amendments, all dealing with changes made by the committee in amounts to be appropriated for various items in the bill. I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered and approved en bloc, with the understanding that if any Senator wishes to offer an amendment to any one of them, the committee will consent to have such committee amendment reconsidered for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. Without objection, the remaining committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc were as follows:

Under the subhead "Extension Service—Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico," on page 7, line 2, after "(69 Stat. 683–4)", to strike out "$48,120,000" and insert "$48,620,000", and in line 5, after the word "all", to strike out "$49,615,000" and insert "$50,115,000."

Under the subhead "Federal Extension Service", on page 7, line 19, after the word "possessions", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$2,035,000."

Under the subhead "Agricultural Conservation Program Service", on page 11, line 22, after the word "States", to strike out "$217,500,000" and insert "$250,000,000"; on page 12, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$24,500,000" and insert "$24,698,000", and in line 9, after the word "than", to strike out "$4,600,000" and insert "$4,773,800."

Under the subhead "Agricultural Marketing Service—Marketing Research and Service", on page 16, line 9, after the word "estimates", to strike out "$13,000,000" and insert "$13,265,000."

On page 16, line 22, after the word "States", to strike out "$13,000,000" and insert "$13,020,000."

On page 17, line 11, after "(7 U. S. C. 1623 (b))", to strike out "$1,100,000" and insert "$1,200,000."

Under the subhead "Foreign Agricultural Service", on page 18, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$25,000"; at the beginning of line 2, to insert "and for extending courtesies to representatives of foreign countries"; in line 3, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$3,600,000" and insert "$3,750,000", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That not less than $400,000 of the funds contained in this appropriation shall be available to obtain statistics and related facts on foreign production and full and complete information on methods used by other countries to move farm commodities in world trade on a competitive basis."

Under the subhead "Commodity Exchange Authority", on page 18, line 12, after "(7 U. S. C. 1–17a)", to strike out "$780,000" and insert "$787,400."

Under the subhead "Commodity Stabilization Service—Agricultural Adjustment Programs", on page 18, line 18, after "(7 U. S. C. 1301–1393)", to strike out "$41,000,000" and insert "$41,200,000", and in line 19, after the word "than", to strike out "$6,000,000" and insert "$6,343,100."

Under the subhead "Sugar Act Program", on page 19, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "$62,600,000" and insert "$67,600,000", and in line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,700,000" and insert "$1,873,000."

Under the subhead "Rural Electrification Administration—Salaries and Expenses", on page 20, line 7, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$8,500,000" and insert "$8,700,000."

Under the subhead "Farmers' Home Administration—Loan Authorizations", on page 21, at the beginning of line 14, to strike out "$19,000,000" and insert "$24,000,000"; in line 20, after the word "amended", to strike out "$140,000,000" and insert "$180,000,000", and in line 21, after the word "amended", to strike out "$5,500,000; and additional amounts, not to exceed $50,000,000, may be borrowed under the same terms and conditions to the extent that such additional amounts are required during the fiscal year 1957, under the then existing conditions, for the expeditious and orderly conduct of these programs" and insert "$10,500,000."

Under the subhead "Salaries and expenses," on page 22, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "$26,405,000" and insert "$26,805,000."

Under the subhead "Office of the General Counsel," on page 22, line 20, after the word "service", to strike out "$2,700,000" and insert "$2,762,700."

Under the subhead "Library," on page 24, line 10, after the word "members", to strike out "$725,000" and insert "$773,000."

Under the heading "Title V—General Provisions," on page 30, line 18, after the word "vehicles", to insert "of which 622 shall be."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, lines 7 and 8, it is proposed to strike out the figure "$49,676,400" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$49,736,400."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I discussed this amendment with Representative CHARLES GUBSER, who represents the 10th District of California, and I received a letter from him, in which he says:

The California prune advisory board, San Francisco, advises me that the prune industry is vitally interested in obtaining funds to develop mechanical harvesting equipment. I have also been informed that the sum of $584,375, included in the House version of the Agriculture appropriation bill, includes funds for a number of research projects to develop mechanical harvesters for apples and cherries.

The board estimates that about $100,000 would be required over a 3-year period to carry out the research in this field. Although I recognize that time is short, I should appreciate anything you could do to insert at least a token payment allocation for the prune harvester research in the Agriculture appropriation bill.

It is for that reason that I am offering the amendment, to add $60,000 to the item in the bill. I hope the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee will accept the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there seems to be considerable merit to the contention that mechanical harvesters should be applied to the harvesting of prunes. I have no objection to accepting the amendment and taking it to conference, to try to get an appropriation for it in conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the action of the Senate by which the committee amendment on page 3, lines 7 and 8 was agreed to, is reconsidered. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to strike out the figure "$49,676,-

400" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$49,736,400."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the appropriation for the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, as shown on pages 22 and 23, amounts to $2½ million. During the past 2 years the President has asked for certain appropriations to enable the Department of Agriculture to carry out a rural development program. There seems to be no general objection to the program being carried out. However, the House has substantially cut the appropriation for that purpose. As I understand, the Senate Committee on Appropriations has restored all of the cuts except $10,500 for an assistant to the Secretary, who would direct the rural development program.

I would move, Mr. President, that $10,500 be added to the $2,500,000 which is now in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Vermont send his amendment to the desk.

Mr. AIKEN. I have no written amendment, Mr. President, but in line 8, page 23, of the bill, I would add $10,500 to the $2,500,000 provided for in the bill. We have appropriated enough for the Secretary's office to hire half a man as an assistant in charge of the rural development program. I am simply asking that we add $10,500 to that appropriation.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I concur in the proposal submitted by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who is the ranking Republican member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I think there is a need for us constantly to develop in the field of research in agriculture. It is through research that we shall broaden the scope of our agricultural economy and also broaden the opportunity of farm families. If we assist farm families to broaden their income, we shall do a great deal for agriculture.

For that reason, Mr. President, I wish to join my colleague from Vermont in favor of the proposed increase.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it has been a long time since an appropriation of $10,500 has been discussed on the floor of the Senate. In the old days that sum of money might have justified a few minutes talk. I would not quibble with the distinguished Senator from Vermont about the amount of $10,500, but it so happens that the Committee on Appropriations went into this subject. The House committee allowed an increase of $10,195 for the Office of the Secretary. The total amount appropriated for the Office of the Secretary is $2,500,000. That is a considerable sum, Mr. President.

The committee, however, after considering the matter, placed this language in the committee report:

> The committee believes that the increase allowed by the House should make it possible to provide leadership for the rural development program.

The committee is in favor of the rural development program. We have allowed increases throughout the bill, running into a substantial sum, I would say, of several million dollars for the rural program. But it seemed to the committee, Mr. President, that an efficient Secretary of Agriculture, a man who was able to save money and to place much stress upon economical administration, should be able to absorb $10,500 out of an appropriation of $2,500,000. I am, therefore, committed to oppose this proposed increase, small though it may be, because the committee has considered the question, and it does seem that we should not feel constrained in every case to allow the full amount of the budget estimate, even though it be for the office of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Under the instructions of the committee, and after considering the matter and discussing it in the committee, I would say that I hope the Senator from Vermont will not press his amendment. He was in the committee when the matter was discussed. The Secretary of Agriculture can certainly find some way to save $10,500. If he would cut down on the number of subscriptions to newspapers, which, doubtless, he does not have time to read thoroughly, he could save $10,500 and hire a man who would be his liaison man with the rural development program. It is an important program, it is true. We have appropriated money where requested for several subdivisions of the Department of Agriculture. We have given money to research, to extension, and to the marketing service which used to be the BAE, and all the committee asks is that the Secretary cooperate by saving a few dollars here and there out of a $2,500,000 appropriation so as to hire this man for $10,500, if he feels he has to have one. Personally, I do not think it is absolutely necessary to have a man of that kind in the office of the Secretary. But if it is necessary, the Secretary can hire him out of this large appropriation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to correct one statement of the Senator from Georgia. This item is doubtless the only one taken up when the Senator from Vermont was not present. He was called out at that time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I apologize to the Senator from Vermont. I should have known better, because having seen how valiantly the Senator has followed the Secretary of Agriculture in every course he has pursued, I would have known that if the Senator had been present, he would have made a Herculean fight for the item.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator from Georgia satisfied that any of the $2½ million appropriated to the Office of the Secretary is available for the purpose of employing an assistant to be in charge of the rural-development program?

Mr. RUSSELL. I know there is no legislative authority necessary for the Secretary to hire an assistant. All the Secretary has to do is to save $10,500 out of the $2,500,000 appropriated, and employ a man.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator is satisfied that the Secretary can use that money out of the appropriation, I will withdraw my suggested amendment. I simply did not want to make an appropriation for a program without being sure the Secretary has the means of hiring someone to head it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the amendment of the Senator from Vermont has been withdrawn.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I have discussed earlier with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations. It relates merely to the reallocation of funds under the rural-electrification loan authorization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 19, in lines 17 through 24, it is proposed to strike out the following: "$145,300,000; and rural telephone program, $49,500,000; and additional amounts, not to exceed $68,700,000 for the rural electrification program and $50,500,000 for the rural telephone program may be borrowed under the same terms and conditions to the extent that such additional amounts are required during the fiscal year 1957 under the then existing conditions, for the expeditious and orderly development of the program" and to insert in lieu thereof "$214 million; and rural telephone program, $100 million."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as stated earlier in the day when this matter was brought up, I think it is merely a play on figures. It does not affect the total amount available for the purpose. I accept the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I have vast respect for the judgment of the Senator from Georgia, but I believe there is a question on these REA funds as to what the Bureau of the Budget would do. The regular appropriation has to be budgeted at the beginning of each year, and if REA needs more than the regular budget later, it has to get consent from the Bureau of the Budget to use these other funds. There really appears to be no necessity now, since the formula has been changed, to have a contingent fund at all. I appreciate the Senator's accepting this amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no contingent fund. The words "contingent fund" do not appear in the bill.

I have accepted the amendment, but it is wholly unnecessary. It is my opinion that these loan funds are not divided into 12 equal installments. Sometimes they may loan $30 million in one month and $5 million in another month. This is merely a play on figures. But I have accepted the amendment.

If the Senator will read the language on page 19 he will see that the words "contingent fund" are not used at all.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was only because of the language in the House committee report that I was concerned about it, and also because of the fact that the association was concerned about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota is agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier this afternoon the Senate considered House bill 11177, the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture. I ask unanimous consent that just prior to the passage of the bill, there be printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report of the House committee; I refer to page 9 of the report, the part relating to the Soil Conservation Service. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that in that report on the bill, the following appears:

In the opinion of the committee, most of these additional responsibilities should be handled by this organization—

In other words, the Soil Conservation Service; and in this instance the committee was referring to the soil bank—

to assure satisfactory results. It is apparent that this organization must be strengthened to handle this additional responsibility.

Mr. President, the State Foresters' Association has drawn my attention to that statement. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD section 118 of the Soil Bank Act as it has been passed by both Houses of Congress and which states quite clearly the intention of Congress as to how these responsibilities shall be handled.

Section 118 of the Soil Bank Act outlines the manner in which the Secretary of Agriculture shall carry out the conservation aspects of the soil-bank program, the Secretary is required to adhere to these guidelines contained in it and make the fullest possible use of all available technical resources. For example, in the field of forestry and tree planting, the resources of both the United States Forest Service and the State foresters should be used.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 2148, 84th Cong., 2d sess.) and section 118 of H. R. 10875 were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

The Soil Conservation Service assists soil conservation districts and other cooperators in bringing about physical adjustments in land use that will conserve soil and water resources, provide economic production on a sustained basis, and reduce damages from floods and sedimentation. The Service also develops and carries out special drainage, irrigation, flood prevention, and watershed protection programs in cooperation with soil conservation districts, watershed groups, and other Federal and State agencies having related responsibility. It is expected that the new soil-bank legislation will increase the work of this agency in these fields.

Conservation operations: The committee recommends an appropriation of $67,500,000 for 1957, an increase of $4,557,255 over the 1956 appropriation and an increase of $2,285,000 in the budget estimate.

The committee has substantially increased funds for soil conservation technicians to enable this organization to meet the additional responsibilities which will result from the new soil-bank program. In the opinion of the committee, most of these additional responsibilities should be handled by this organization to assure satisfactory results. It is apparent that this organization must be strengthened to handle this additional responsibility.

It has come to the committee's attention that the soil technicians in this agency are frequently required to devote a considerable amount of time to routine clerical duties. The committee recommends that a portion of the increase provided for the next year be used to employ clerical personnel to relieve these technicians of clerical work so as to better use their technical training and abilities.

In view of the terrific demand for vegetative covering and seedlings which will develop from the new soil-bank program, the Soil Conservation Service should take proper steps to see that this need is met. Since the total supply of such seedlings apparently will be far short of that necessary to meet the full demand which will grow out of the expanded program, it is apparent that the combined efforts of the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, State and local agencies, and private nurseries will be called upon to the fullest extent. Therefore, the committee feels that this organization should review its conservation nursery program to make certain that all of the nurseries formerly operated by this Service are available to meet this need. These nurseries should either be operated directly by the Soil Conservation Service, or should be handled on a cooperative or contract basis with State, local, or private organizations.

UTILIZATION OF OTHER AGENCIES

SEC. 118. With respect to conservation aspects of any program under this title, the Secretary shall consult with the soil conservation districts, State foresters, State game and fish agencies, land-grant colleges, and other appropriate agencies of State governments, and with the Fish and Wildlife Service, in the formulation of program provisions at the State and county levels. The technical resources of the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, the land-grant colleges, the State foresters, State game and fish agencies, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and other appropriate technical services shall be utilized, so far as practicable, to assure coordination of conservation activities and a solid technical foundation for the program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 11177) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. MUNDT conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States, submitting a nomination, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Frederick G. Hamley, of Washington, to be United States circuit judge, ninth circuit, vice Homer T. Bone, retired, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10875) to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10875) to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 5, 11, 36, 46, and 48.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 50, and 51; and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On page 8, line 10, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "April 15" and insert in lieu thereof "May 1"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"STUDY OF PRICE TRENDS FOR FOREST PRODUCTS

"SEC. 402. The Secretary of Agriculture shall make a study of price trends and relationships for basic forest products such as sawlogs and pulpwood and within one year from the date of enactment of this Act shall submit a report thereon to the Congress."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
EDWARD J. THYE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
GEORGE M. GRANT,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am very much pleased to state that the conferees on H. R. 10875 met yesterday afternoon and this morning and unanimously agreed to the report just read by the clerk. I shall not go into details about the report, but shall merely give a summary of the report's provisions.

First, the acreage reserve program would become effective in 1956. The Senate amendment, which had provided for a 1956 program to the extent deemed practicable by the Secretary, was rejected by the House, and the Senate receded from its amendments in this respect. In connection with this amendment, it was agreed that the House would have in its report the following statement:

The conference agreed to make the soil bank effective immediately as provided in the House bill. It was recognized, however, the larger part of this year's plantings have already taken place and it is not expected that any large part of the crop planted will be plowed up or otherwise removed from production as authorized by section 103. The committee recognizes that the Secretary cannot be expected to accomplish the impracticable or to secure any large part of the beneficial results hoped for the soil bank in 1956, but it also recognizes that certain farmers have heretofore planned to participate this year and it is felt that they should be assured of the opportunity to do so.

I understand that the distinguished Senator from Vermont has received from the Secretary of Agriculture a letter which he wishes to place at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the letter may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate.

DEAR GEORGE: This is in response to your request for my comments on the possibility of getting a soil bank into operation on the 1956 crops.

H. R. 10875 contains the following language in section 103: "* * * the Secretary of Agriculture * * * is authorized and directed to formulate and carry out an acreage reserve program for the 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959 crops * * *"

Section 103 further provides that "Reserve acreage of a commodity may include acreage whether or not planted to the production of the 1956 crop of the commodity prior to the announcement of the acreage reserve program for the 1956 crop if the crop thereon, if any, shall be plowed under or otherwise physically incorporated into the soil, or clipped, mowed, or cut to prevent maturing so that the reduction in acreage of the commodity below the acreage allotment occurs within 21 days after the enactment of this title, or by such later date as may be fixed by the Secretary."

It is now the second week of May. Wheat will soon be ready for harvest in the Southern Great Plains. Winter oats and barley in the southern half of the country will soon be ripening. Much of the cotton is planted. Spring grains are mostly seeded. Corn is being planted. By the end of May, 1956 plantings will be virtually completed.

I would not be discharging my responsibility if I failed to point out the grave difficulties associated with trying, at this late date, to get a soil bank operating on 1956 spring seeded crops.

Inclusion of feed grains in the acreage reserve requires the establishment of base acreages for these crops: oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, and corn in the noncommercial area. This means the assembling of data and the determination of bases on 100 million acres. We presently operate programs on 170 million acres. This provision would require an expansion of almost 60 percent in the scope of our operations. It would be necessary for local committeemen to establish for every farm a normal yield for every crop in the acreage reserve. In order to be equitable, one farm with another and one area with another, these yields would have to weigh out to county check yields.

Even though we would do our utmost, we could not have this tremendous task accomplished, together with the necessary writing of contracts and checking of compliance, prior to the harvest date for many of these feed crops.

We have gone as far as we could go in making ready for the administration of this program, taking into account the many uncertainties as to its eventual form. But obviously we cannot write procedures before the law is passed, and questions of major importance regarding the legislation are still being debated.

Some may contend that we should omit the established procedure of determining bases and proceed on the basis of unverified data. Our experience is that unless historical data are used, the reported acreage figures may be in error by as much as 30 or 40 percent.

To launch a program like the soil bank at this late date, for 1956 spring seeded crops, with inadequate data and hastily developed administrative machinery, would have these adverse effects:

1. Participation would be low. Farmers, with their crops already planted and with their investment already made in seed, fertilizer, and labor, would be reluctant to enter the program.

2. The intended reduction in production would not be accomplished. Since participation would be low and since the farmers most likely to come into the program would be those whose crops were likely to turn out below average in yield, the intended purpose of the program—reduction of surpluses—would not be satisfactorily achieved.

3. Costs would be excessive. The inducement necessary to cause a farmer to enter the program would be greater after he has made his outlay of money for production expenses than it would be if contracts could be made before planting.

4. It would be difficult to make the program properly effective in later years. If the program is launched hastily, precedents are established which prevent proper administration for the following years.

5. The program would be discredited in the minds of farmers and the public generally. The soil bank has much promise if it can be properly operated. If, in the first year of its operation, farmers do not participate fully and the program is demonstrably ineffective and expensive, then the program may be erroneously judged a failure. This would be especially true if it becomes a plow-up program. This program should be given a fair chance to operate.

On several occasions, the critical time element in this program has been referred to.

In his discussion before the Senate committee on February 6, Under Secretary Morse submitted a summary which contained this statement: "If legislative action is not taken prior to April 15 it will be extremely difficult to get a program this year except for wheat seeded in the fall of 1956." This statement was made with respect to the program recommended by the administration, which embodied an acreage reserve program intended to apply only to wheat, corn, cotton, and rice. Since then the program has been made more complex and has been extended to feed grains, tobacco, and peanuts, thereby adding substantially to the workload. Grazing lands are added in the House bill.

In his April 16 message regarding his action on H. R. 12, the President said: "The long delay in getting this bill makes it too late for most farmers to participate in the soil bank on this year's crops."

In my appearance before the Senate Committee on Agriculture on April 19 I said: "Farmers should know as promptly as possible the terms of the acreage reserve so as to plan for fall crops. Plowing will be underway within 90 days—then comes liming, fertilizing, and seeding in rapid succession."

It will take all the time available to prepare properly for a program on crops planted in the fall of 1956. Farmers would be helped far more, in my opinion, by a constructive program beginning on fall crops than by a hasty, ineffective program on 1956 spring crops.

In view of the impracticability of getting a program into operation this year for both spring seeded and fall seeding crops, it is recommended that this bill be amended so that the soil bank program will commence with the crops planted in the fall of 1956.

Sincerely yours,

EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the second agreement reached was on the Senate amendments which eliminated the acreage-reserve programs for corn outside the commercial area, grain sorghums, barley, rye, oats, field crops to be designated by the Secretary, and grazing lands. No acreage allotments are in effect for any of these commodities, or for grazing lands, so that acreage-reserve programs for them would have caused serious administrative problems, particularly in 1956. Consistent with this agreement, the conferees agreed to leave the overall limit on the acreage-reserve program at $750 million, as provided by the Senate amendments.

Third, the feed-grain provisions of the Senate amendments were adopted with one minor technical change. The 1956 support prices would be fixed on the basis of the May 1 parity price instead of the April 15 parity price. This was the original intention of the amendment, and the change was designed to make that purpose clear. As amended by the Senate and agreed to by the conferees, the bill provides for (A) support of the 1956 crop of grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats at 76 percent of parity as of

May 1, (B) support—in any year in which base acreages are applicable for corn—for corn in the noncommercial area at 82½ percent of the level applicable in the commercial area, and (C) support for the 1957 crop of grain sorghums, barley, rye, oats, and corn outside the commercial area at not less than 70 percent of parity as of the beginning of the marketing year, if price support is made available to corn producers not complying with acreage and soil-bank participation requirements. Support for feed grains would not be dependent in either 1956 or 1957 upon compliance with acreage or soil bank participation requirements, or upon whether there is an acreage-reserve program for corn.

In other words, what the conference did was to adopt the so-called Holland amendment, with one exception, in that we changed the date from April 15 to May 1.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The minor change just mentioned by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, who was also chairman of the conference committee, came about in this way: The data is to be brought together as of the 15th of the month. But the figure compiled and based upon that data will govern the next calendar month, which in this case would be the month of May, or the month beginning May 1. So the change is, as described by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, a purely technical one, and not one of meaning in any way.

Mr. ELLENDER. Fourth, the Senate amendment assuring that a base acreage of 51 million acres would be established for corn for 1956 was agreed to and remains in the bill.

Fifth, the Senate amendment imposing price support forfeiture as an additional penalty for grazing lands in the acreage reserve—that was the so-called O'Mahoney amendment—was rejected, the conferees being of the opinion that adequate penalties were provided by sections 103 (a) (i), 103 (a) (ii), and 123. The Senate amendment specifically including the prohibition of grazing on conservation acreages in section 107 (a) (6) (A)—that was the second O'Mahoney amendment—was agreed to. That prohibition would have been covered by that section whether the additional language had been inserted or not. The specific inclusion of that language in section 107 (a) (6) (A) should not be taken to indicate in any way that the violation of grazing prohibitions are not included in other penalty provisions of the bill just because they are not specifically mentioned in those provisions.

It will be recalled that when the first bill was considered by the conferees, we struck from the bill the amendments introduced by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and several other western Senators. There was a provision in the original bill which was vetoed by the President, that would have imposed an additional penalty for violation of grazing rights equal to 50 percent of a year's acreage reserve compensation. That provision was retained in the bill. It appears now in section 123 as it was in the original bill.

Sixth, the Senate amendments which made the prohibition of section 125 on the leasing of lands for agricultural production applicable to "price supported crops" instead of "agricultural commodities," and which specifically exempted wildlife refuges in certain cases, were adopted. The first of these amendments made it clear that grazing lands were not covered by section 125.

Seventh, the Senate amendment providing for the sale by Commodity Credit Corporation of cotton, for export, at world prices or, during the 1956 marketing year, at the minimum prices accepted under the August 12, 1955 program, if lower, was agreed to.

The conferees agreed to the following language to be inserted in the report to be submitted by the House:

Section 203 directs the CCC to use its existing powers and authorities to encourage the exportation of cotton by offering to make it available at prices based on sales under the so-called million-bale program (announced August 12, 1955), and even lower if necessary, in order to be competitive with foreign countries exporting cotton in substantial quantities. The principal difference in the program required by this provision as contrasted with the million-bale program and the program now in effect (announced on February 28, 1956) will be in the price level at which bids are accepted.

This provision directs that such quantities of cotton be offered and sold as will reestablish and maintain the fair historical share of the world market for United States cotton, the quantity to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary has indicated that he considers 5 million bales to be the fair historical share based on the present level of world trade in cotton. This committee believes this to be reasonable in view of the history of United States exports.

It is hoped that the Secretary can regain the historical American share of the world market without unnecessarily lowering the level of world prices for cotton, and it is not intended that he shall be required to drastically reduce the price of cotton far below the level of prices received at the sale announced August 12, 1955. On the other hand it is intended that he shall have ample authority to reduce prices to whatever level he finds necessary to accomplish this result.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the committee of conference accepted section 203 of the farm bill, H. R. 10875, in the form added by the Senate. As indicated in the conference report and statement of managers on the part of the House, the committee of conference was in complete agreement as to the intent and purpose of this section. The legislative history as developed in the Senate and the statement contained in the conference report clearly expresses the intent of the legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Eighth, the Senate amendments providing for the sale of 100 million bushels of wheat annually for feed at feed prices, and exempting wheat grown for feed or seed on the farm where produced from marketing penalties, were rejected by the House and omitted from the bill.

Ninth, the Senate amendments providing for minimum National and State cotton and rice acreage allotments for 1957 and 1958 were agreed to.

Tenth, except for subsection (d), the section added by the Senate to provide for forest products price reporting and research was rejected. Subsection (d), which remains in the bill, provides for a study of price trends and relationships for basic forest products. The conferees also agreed to an amendment to this subsection to require the Secretary to report on his study within 1 year after the enactment of this bill, instead of 2 years.

I wish to say to my good friend, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the conferees on the part of the Senate did their best to retain his provision. I brought it to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House, Mr. COOLEY, who had indicated he no longer had any objection to the amendment. Unfortunately, Mr. COOLEY stated to the conferees he had received many objections to it, and that the House conferees could not agree to the amendment in full, but agreed to retain subsection (d).

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First of all, I wish to thank the chairman of the committee for his diligence in this matter. I regret exceedingly that the full text of that section of the bill was not included in the final conference report. I am grateful for the tidbits of accomplishments of progress. I realize that the importance of the study has been recognized, and that the time for reporting has been reduced from a 2-year period to a 1-year period, which would give us a great deal of factual information that would be of vital help and important assistance, not only to Congress, but to the timber farmers.

I think it ought to be noted that the main opposition, insofar as the junior Senator from Minnesota knows, to the so-called price reporting section on timber, comes from the Lumbermen's Manufacturers Association, from the large manufacturers or processors of timber products, and from the large owners of forest lands and purchasers of timber from the small timber farmers. For the life of me, I cannot understand this opposition except on the basis that some persons like to have an opportunity to purchase in a market which was beclouded by a lack of information.

Mr. President, I shall be very persistent. I intend to ask the committee to process the amendment in terms of a bill. There are more and more timber farmers all over the United States, and they are growing an important part of our agricultural production. I want the RECORD to be clear that they are the only producers of food and fiber in the United States of America who are today excluded from the price reporting services of the Department of Agriculture. They are set apart by exclusion, and it appears to me we are confronted by a powerful lobby on the part of the large timber barons. I shall call them that because I know of them in my State. They have

taken out the best timber in Minnesota, and in many other States they have taken out the best timber.

I regret that we have had to lose this amendment. But again I wish to commend the Senate conferees. I know they supported me in the committee and I know they supported the proposal here on the floor. I am very grateful for what they have done.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I also wish to refer to what the committee did regarding this matter. I endorse every word our chairman has said. The Senate conferees urged the inclusion of this amendment, and tried their best to have it included. We ran against a solid brick wall, so far as the House conferees were concerned. They would not yield on this point.

This matter was one of the very last ones we had to handle in the conference. I was the one who offered the compromise, in an effort to get the House conferees at least to agree to such reporting 1 year from now; and finally they agreed to that.

I wish to say, further, that they argued with us that at the present time the Department has a right to have these reports made. However, they are not being made at the present time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], who has been exceedingly helpful all the way along in connection with this agricultural program, and has been very helpful to me, personally. So I am duly grateful.

It is true that the Department could do this reporting. In view of the fact that twice the Senate has voted in favor of such a provision, I hope the Department will proceed to do the reporting.

A few minutes ago the Senate passed the agricultural appropriation bill, which carries ample funds for this service. In fact, if the Department wishes to do so, it can transfer some of the funds from its propaganda branch—which, believe me, has been overloaded with funds—to this informational work for the benefit of the farmers. I think that would help.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, it will also be found that the Department opposed this amendment, as other Senators know. I cannot understand why the Department opposed it, for in the next breath the Department does not deny that it has the right to make such investigations. Why it does not make them, I cannot understand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is interesting that the Department opposes this particular provision, when the Department spends substantial sums of money in gathering information of much less merit than this information, in terms of the economics of the producers of fiber in the United States. In fact, the Department spends considerable sums of money in gathering information on foreign production of items not even in competition with American products.

I regret that the Department opposes this item. However, to my mind, at times opposition by the Department is almost an asset, rather than a liability.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to thank the Senator from Louisiana for his very able attempt to be of assistance to those of us who are so vitally concerned with the Humphrey amendment, and I wish to thank him for the progress which has been made.

I regard the compromise amendment the Senator has brought back to us as a step forward.

But for the RECORD I wish to say that the failure to obtain acceptance by the House of Representatives of the Humphrey amendment is a serious blow to the small lumber operators in my State and, in my judgment, to the small lumber operators in all the other States. I wish the RECORD to show why that is so.

Let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that I am not surprised that the Department is opposed to his amendment, because the policies of this Department under the administration have been the policies of the big lumber operators, not those of the small lumber operators. What his amendment sought to do was to give the small lumber operators the information they need regarding the value of their timber. That is what the "big boys" do not want the small lumber operators to have. As the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has pointed out, the large operators want to keep this situation a confused one.

I think this administration is clearly guilty of a serious dereliction in the performance of its public duty, when it does not have the Department carry out the power it really has in respect to this price reporting.

I wish to say that, so far as I am concerned, we have just begun the fight on this matter; and at every opportunity we shall offer again the Humphrey proposal, because the small lumber operators are entitled to this price-reporting service from their government. In my judgment, they pay taxes for it, just as the recipients of other price-reporting services pay taxes for them. There is no sense in our trying to fool ourselves about this situation; it is a serious blow to the small lumber operators of this country, and it is a great favor to the designs of the big lumber operators.

Mr. President, what I am saying is in no way a criticism of our conferees, because I have been a conferee, too, and I know that there are times, after conferees have put up the best possible fight, when it is necessary that there be some give and take.

I wish to compliment the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] for saving as much as he did by way of his compromise proposal.

But I wish to serve notice on the big lumber operators in my State that I am not going to stop my fight to have the small lumber operators receive the service to which they clearly are entitled.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wish to join the Senator from Louisiana, [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and my colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in urging the necessity if instituting price-reporting in regard to timber. Actually, Mr. President, such reporting is even more important in the case of timber than it is in the case of cotton or similar field crops which are grown and harvested each year, because timber takes many years to mature; and when a timber owner fails to receive a fair price for his timber, that certainly means more to him and to his family than failure to receive a fair price for a crop of cotton or some other crop, which matures more rapidly than does a crop of fir timber or a crop of pine timber. It requires 60 or 80 years for timber to mature to commercial size and quality.

In my opinion, one of the main groups to suffer as a result of the failure to include the Humphrey amendment in the conference report is the group of 3,400,000 American farmers who own farm woodlots, because they do not have the necessary resources or facilities of their own to enable them to find out what their timber is worth. They will be the chief victims if such a Federal price-supporting system is not established.

I wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana for his very valiant efforts to bring back the compromise amendment which all of us hope may in the next year or so produce a bona fide, genuine Government price-supporting system within the field of timber products.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to add my word of appreciation to those of the Senator from Minnesota regarding the Senators who have worked so hard on this matter. I desire to state that I shall join the Senator in his efforts to get some such measure as this one written into law. In fact, I think the Congress will be derelict in the performance of its duty and will be in direct violation of its oath if it fails to make this provision for the producers of pulpwood and other wood on the farms. It is tragic that they are left without the benefit of this service, in the case of the timber that is grown on family-sized tracts and on

other woodlands which such farmers own.

I come from a State which once was a great timber-producing State, and some day it will again be a great timber-producing State, although it is not at the present time. I know that in the past, when the timber produced in my State was sold, those who sold it received far, far less than its actual value.

At the present time, piecemeal, and in places, they are learning how to market their product, which requires so long to grow. In my area it grows faster than it does in the area of Minnesota. I know that the producer has obtained 2 or 3 or 4 or 5, or even 6 or 7 times as much in certain areas after he has learned how to value and market his product.

I hope we shall not allow another session to pass without an effective bill of the right kind being included as permanent policy and a permanent activity of our Department of Agriculture, which is capable of doing such a fine job in this field.

Mr. ELLENDER. I assure my good friend from Minnesota and all other Senators who are interested in the subject that, if and when the bill comes before the Senate the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which I am chairman, I shall make every effort to see that such a bill is reported to the Senate and enacted into law.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Continuing with the items of agreement:

Eleventh. The Senate amendments providing for a discretionary two-price plan for rice, redefining "normal yield" for rice, providing competitive support levels for cottonseed and soybeans, and freezing the transitional parity price for corn, wheat, and peanuts were agreed to by the conferees.

I do not know that I wish to go further into detail. However, I believe that the agreements reached in conference are fair, and I hope the Senate will adopt the conference report.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, although I do not blieve that the bill as reported from the conference, and which is covered by the conference report which is now before us, will be nearly as effective as some of its advocates hoped, I believe it is probably the best bill which could be obtained during this session of Congress. There are some things in the bill which I would have preferred to leave out. There are other things, which have been left out, which I would have preferred to see remain in the bill. However, that is now water over the dam. We have the best result which the conferees were able to obtain.

We have included provisions in the bill for a soil bank. I believe that probably too much is expected from the acreage-reserve program, and that in the long run the conservation reserve program, which would take marginal land out of production to build up its fertility, or put it to producing that for which it is best suited, will probably prove to be the most beneficial part of the bill. There will not be so much in the form of immediate returns from it. however.

The provisions of the bill relating to feed grains are the best upon which we could reach agreement. I believe that the four feed grains, noncompliance corn, and corn grown in noncommercial areas, are on as equitable a basis as possible.

The part of the bill which relates to the reforestation program is left intact. That may prove to be very beneficial, indeed.

Mr. President, I had no objection to the Humphrey amendment, which was stricken out at the instance of the House conferees. I should have been very glad to see it remain in the bill. I agree that a great many small landowners do not receive anywhere near the price for their timber that they ought to receive. However, when any Member of Congress says that the fact that the Department is authorized to issue market reports on forest products, but does not do so, is something which should be charged against the present Department of Agriculture. I must point out that in not issuing such market reports on forest products the Department of Agriculture is simply carrying out the policy which has been in existence for many years. I also point out that no appropriations committee during my service in this body has ever recommended an appropriation for that purpose. The Department does have the authority, but such market reports have never been issued during my term of service and neither has an appropriation been made for that purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is entirely correct. I am pleased that he has corrected the RECORD in those terms, because it is true that this situation has gone unnoticed—if not unnoticed, at least uncared for. I hope that as a result of the discussion relating to this subject, we can proceed, in due order, to get what seems to be the objective of both the Senator from Vermont and myself, as well as of other Senators who have spoken.

I am very grateful and pleased that the section in the bill relating to reforestation was continued. I think this will be one of the truly great contributions to our long-term agricultural program.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from Vermont with respect to the conservation reserve program. He has referred to two long-range programs which will mean a great deal to the country. Acreage reserve has its short-term duration as a means of correcting production problems, and at the same time providing some replacement income where production cutbacks must take place.

The efforts which have been made to strengthen our forestry program have cut across the aisle. I hope we shall continue to make efforts on that basis.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I am glad he appreciates, as I do, that the conservation reserve part of the bill is, in the long run, by far the most important part of the bill. The other provisions are temporary. Some may never go into effect at all. Some may last 1 year, some 2 years, and some 3 or 4 years, but the conservation reserve program is something to which we must pay attention if we are to preserve our soil, water, and forest resources, as they should be preserved.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Vermont for his contribution to the conservation program. Many times I have expressed my appreciation for the conservation work he has done. In my judgment, he has acted in accordance with the highest traditions of Teddy Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot, the great forerunners in the conservation movement. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his conservation record.

I hope the Senator from Vermont will see his way clear, in due time, to be of assistance to us on the point we were discussing a few moments ago, namely, the need for price reporting on timber prices. I happen to believe that that is also a part of a sound conservation program. We shall conserve our timber better, and make better use of that timber, when producers of the timber are given the facts which I think they need in the matter of prices. That is why I think the price-reporting service is so essential.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter under date of May 22, addressed to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, dealing with the matter of price reporting on our timber resources.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 22, 1956.

The Honorable ALLEN ELLENDER,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is just a short note to give you my views concerning the importance of the forest products price reporting provisions of the farm bill, H. R. 10875, as it was reported by the Senate Agriculture Committee. Section 402 relative to such price reporting would provide a service to timber growers and tree farmers. There is one thing that is going to get better forestry on our farm woodlands—real knowledge that raising timber pays.

The Federal Government spends almost $15 million a year to help fight forest fires, plant trees, and give timber-cutting advice to small woodland owners under the Clarke-McNary Act. The States spend double this amount in matching funds. These are sound programs but I feel something has been lacking in getting better forestry on our farm woodlands. They are in bad shape, as the recent timber resources review of the Forest Service points out.

Our farmers do not have a real dollar incentive to grow trees. The price reporting section of H. R. 10875 will provide this incentive. If our farmers can get up-to-date information on what stumpage, logs, and pulpwood are worth, they will quickly see the value of growing trees.

The lumber associations have been lobbying against this section. They talk about better forestry but they overlook the fact that better forestry will come only when the man who owns timber can get a fair deal when he sells his trees. In the South, for example, 74 percent of the timberland is in the hands of farmers and small landowners while only 13 percent is owned by the

forest industries. These small owners often do not know the value of their timber, making it possible for the sawmill to take advantage of them. The small income the farmer gets from the timber does not encourage him to grow trees.

We can help the farmers, the small landowners and the forests of our country if we retain section 402 in the bill that is now in conference. Senator HUMPHREY has done a grand job in providing a measure of real value to the farmer. We all come from timbered States that will benefit from this section and if it is retained in the bill we can tell the people of our States about another real accomplishment by Democratic leadership in the Congress.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his remarks. I know how keenly he feels, not only about our forests, but the conservation of our natural resources generally. I feel that there is nothing more important that we could do and bear in mind at all times than the preservation of the wonderful natural resources which we possess.

My own State is a small State. We have made a great deal of progress, I think, in the right direction. Every county in the State has an extension forester. I believe my State was the first State to inaugurate such a program. We can operate such a program because there are only 14 counties in the State. I hope the time will come when every county in the country which has any appreciable amount of forest will be able to give full service to the farmers and forest owners, in a manner comparable to what we are able to do in my State at present.

I realize the need for forest landowners to be properly informed as to the value of what they may have to sell. At the present time only five States perform this service. I do not remember the names of all of them. There is New Hampshire, in the East; Michigan, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, and I believe one of the States in the Northwest—possibly Washington. At any rate, it is some State in another part of the country. Those States already perform this service.

It could be a valuable service. I can also appreciate the difficulties involved in getting up quarterly reports, because all of us must realize that trees in one place may have an entirely different value from trees located only 2 miles away. There may be a mountain ridge between them, for example. Therefore, I appreciate the difficulties which the Forest Service might have in publishing these reports. However, we have left in the bill a mandate for the Department to determine what can be done in that respect and to report on their investigations to Congress within the next year.

I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Vermont merits all the praise he has received in connection with the conservation reserve program. However, I should like to ask him one question. I ask him if it is not true that it is completely accurate, as the Senator from Vermont has stated, that there has been no timber price reporting in the past, regardless of the administration in office.

Mr. AIKEN. Not on a Federal basis.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Not on a Federal basis. However, there has been no appropriation made for that purpose. Is that not correct?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. But is it not also a fact that never before has this service been so urgent, because few natural resources have had such perilous and dangerous inroads made upon it in recent years as is the case with our timber resources?

I say that because timber resources are now so threatened and so much in danger of diminution that I know of areas in the Pacific Northwest, for example, where fir timber is being sold for from $30 to $45 a thousand board-feet, which only a relatively few years ago brought $3 or $4 a thousand board-feet.

When a man sells a substantial amount of timber for $4 a thousand board-feet, which might, under proper competitive bidding, if he were advised by his Government of prices, yield him as much as $30 or $45 a thousand board-feet—and there is a substantial amount of timber involved—it is a serious thing, indeed.

Therefore, although a Federal price-reporting system might not have been needed 8 or 10 years ago, it is urgently required today, in view of the diminution of our timber resources.

I am sure that the Senator from Vermont, with his background in forestry and farming, surely must realize that fact.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I realize that the conservation of our natural resources was of extreme importance even before the Senator from Vermont was born. Our failure to recognize that fact years ago now is one of the reasons that we have a reduction in our resources today.

I believe that Members of the Senate will be interested to know that only this winter Canadians have been coming over the border into Vermont and buying logs out of our mill yards and paying $10 a thousand board-feet more than some of our local purchasers were willing or able to pay. I do not say that all of them were able to pay that much more, and probably not all of them were, but, at any rate, the price was boosted by about $10 a thousand for our softwood lumber. That is a considerable amount. It is due, of course, to the rapidity with which the Canadian economy is expanding. Therefore, we have had a substantial increase in the price of forest products.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from North Dakota was detained in a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations this afternoon, and therefore did not hear the report of the chairman of the committee or of the distinguished Senator from Vermont. I should like to ask him whether the O'Mahoney amendment was retained in the conference report.

Mr. AIKEN. The second O'Mahoney amendment was retained. The first O'Mahoney amendment was stricken out. Judging from the telephone conversation with the Senator from Wyoming, I got the impression that it was the second O'Mahoney amendment which he was particularly eager to have retained in the bill.

Mr. LANGER. The amendment deals with livestock, as I understand.

Mr. AIKEN. It deals with livestock and grazing. The first amendment provided that in the case of violation of acreage reserve contracts, the Secretary could deny price supports if he determined such violations warranted such a penalty.

Mr. LANGER. Which amendment was retained?

Mr. AIKEN. The second one, the short amendment. I do not recall on which page of the bill it was.

Mr. LANGER. It dealt with livestock, however; is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. It is the one which the junior Senator from Wyoming particularly wanted to have retained in the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Are there any limits applied on the amount of money?

Mr. AIKEN. No; because there was no limit on soil-bank payments to an individual contained in either bill, and the matter did not come into conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the conference report is agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, did the Chair announce that the conference report had been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announced that, without objection, the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Chair to withdraw that announcement. I have not finished my statement.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Vermont has not completed his statement. He has not yielded the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thought the Senator from Vermont had yielded the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. No; I have not yielded the floor. I hope the Chair will withhold the announcement until I have concluded my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair withdraws the announcement.

Mr. AIKEN. I will be able to complete my statement in a few minutes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Kansas. I do not wish to have the conference report agreed to until I have had an opportunity to complete my statement.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont if there is anything contained in the conference report which would permit farmers to take advantage of the acreage reserve program by taking land out of production, in a wheat or corn area, by plowing under acreage.

Mr. AIKEN. The bill requires an acreage reserve program for 1956, but the committee report states that the Secretary is not expected to do what is impracticable; and if he finds that he can put acreage reserve programs into

effect this year in any part of the country, he has full authority and direction to do so now.

However, we do not expect him to do the impossible. We also do not expect to have much acreage of growing crops plowed under for the purpose of getting into the acreage reserve program. I believe there would be widespread public resentment if that were done.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate that there are areas in this country, particularly in the Middle West, where corn has not been planted. Would farmers in such areas be eligible to enter the acreage reserve program, provided the Secretary placed it into effect and provided Congress voted the funds for that purpose?

Mr. AIKEN. Technically, they would be eligible, provided it is physically possible for the Secretary to get the program working in time.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the conferees for retaining the amendment I had sponsored on the floor, which continues the practice, in our national wildlife refuges, wherever we can continue it, for sharecroppers to raise on Federal land price-supported crops, provided a part of it is left standing for bird feed. I have checked the matter with the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and he has told me that that amendment has been retained. I appreciate the fact that it has been retained. I wish to mention it at this point in the RECORD primarily because yesterday I saw on the news ticker in the Senate lobby an item suggesting—and it did not say specifically—that the Department of Agriculture was about to order that practice discontinued.

Therefore I wish to have it clear in the RECORD, and to have it buttoned down, that the report on the legislation before the Senate and the action of the conference committee make it clear that Congress intends that the present practice shall prevail with respect to wildlife refuges.

Mr. AIKEN. So far as I know, the Department does not contemplate any such action.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure it does not.

Mr. AIKEN. The President yesterday issued an order to the various departments to stop leasing great acreages of publicly owned land for the production of price supported crops which are in surplus. I understand that it may result in about a million acres being taken out of production.

I may say that the small farmers who have traditionally depended upon some of that land to complement their own holdings will not be deprived of that land, and that the present leases will not be canceled. However, it is believed that there are about a million acres, which are now used by—shall I call them promoters?—who do a good business by raising crops on Government lands and turning them over to the Government. That is what we are trying to stop. There is a provision contained in the conference report which is designed to prevent such a practice.

Mr. MUNDT. It is perfectly sound legislation to get away from that kind of practice. I merely wish to be sure that the record is clear and that there is no conflict between the action of Congress and the order issued yesterday, because otherwise the result would be either to eliminate the usefulness of our wildlife refuges altogether, or to impose upon the taxpayers of our country the additional burden of approximately $5 million a year in order to secure what we are now getting without any charge at all.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the statement issued yesterday carries out the intent of the bill on which we are working today. As a matter of fact, the question was taken up with the administration some weeks ago, and it has been worked out. I believe the language which is in the bill was suggested by either the Department of Agriculture or by the White House.

Mr. MUNDT. By the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Mr. AIKEN. There is no intention on the part of the committee to do away with the production of feed for wildlife on public lands.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Following the same thought which the Senator from South Dakota expressed regarding the use of land which the Government owns and operates, that is, which is leased out to private individuals, I think the Presidential order was certainly timely. I have received complaints from persons in my own State not only in connection with the production of crops, but as to whether the land comes under the soil-conservation provisions. I think it is something to which we should give some thought, because there are millions of acres of such land, and a farmer can be seriously damaged by some of the land adjoining his farm. The Government does not pay any attention to the handling of the soil or the impounding of water. I think the Department should not only follow through on that part, but should give some consideration to the soil-conservation part of it. A farmer may have his land completely spoiled by adjacent Government land.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Watershed Act which is now on the books but which needs implementing, extension of the Water Facilities Act to the entire country, and now the bill which we are putting through the Senate today should take care of the situation. There should be ample authority on the books for the Government not only to discontinue the production of surplus crops on its lands, but actually to put them into soil-conserving crops, or, at least, to take action to make the facilities available for future use.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I do not like to let this opportunity pass, as we are about to conclude action on the farm bill, without paying my sincere respects to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and to the members of the committee for the fine work they have done. I know some of the problems which confronted them. In fact, I have been responsible for some of the problems. I am indebted to the committee. I am very pleased that the bill contains a provision for domestic parity on one commodity. I think it is a program which we must come to in the course of time. I should have liked to see it tried out. There are problems connected with it, but I wish to advise the chairman and the Members of the Senate that I do not think we have solved the wheat problem. I think it must be solved on a domestic parity basis. We cannot ask the farmers of this Nation to produce wheat and sell it on the world market at world market prices when they have to buy their commodities, pay their taxes, pay labor, and buy farm machinery on a domestic market.

I am indebted to the committee for bringing forth what I would call a pilot program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to thank my good friend from Kansas and to say that I hope he will talk to the Secretary and try to have him initiate a program, because what we have in the bill is only discretionary.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Kansas for his remarks.

Mr. President, I should like to make one last statement in order to make clear one point in the bill which has not been referred to so far, so far as I know.

The bill approved by the conferees with respect to the soil bank program makes it clear that the reason for the program is that excessive supplies of agricultural products which have been built up over the years are depressing farm prices and incomes. Accordingly it authorizes programs to assist farmers to retire cropland from the production of excessive supplies in order to cut down on the burdensome surpluses. It is clearly the intention of the conferees and of the Congress that this bill should be administered in such a manner as to cut down on the surpluses which are the main factor in keeping farmers from more fully participating in this country's unprecedented prosperity.

I wish specifically to invite attention to the fact that while the acreage reserve program can be entered into on the basis of a 1-year contract, nevertheless the bill provides, on page 12, line 19 to 21, as follows:

> The rates of payment offered under this section—

Which is the payment section of the acreage reserve program—

> shall be such as to encourage producers to underplant their allotments for more than 1 year.

The reason why this provision is in the bill is that 1-year contracts could result in increased rather than decreased production. Accordingly it is provided that the rates of payment may be adjusted so as to encourage withdrawal of acreage for a number of years rather than for 1 year only.

Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] agrees that we do not want to get into a program to reduce production which would have the effect of increasing production. That is why we have placed this provision in the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to join with the Senator from Kansas in his remarks, and I wish to thank the chairman of the committee [Mr. ELLENDER] most sincerely for the great assistance he has been to us throughout the many weeks in which the farm bill has been under consideration.

I particularly wish to thank him for the assistance he has been to the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Oregon with respect to the domestic parity program for wheat. I wish the RECORD to show that, in my judgment, the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Oregon were successful in the inclusion of the domestic parity program for wheat in the first farm bill as it passed the Senate because of the sympathetic understanding of the Senator from Louisiana. I am glad there is a domestic parity program, because it can be a pilot-plant operation, so to speak.

Mr. President, I certainly think those of us who supported the domestic parity program for wheat owe it to the Senator from Louisiana to use our good offices in urging the Secretary of Agriculture to exercise the discretion which the final bill has given to him to try out a domestic parity program.

On the record, I should like to refresh the recollection of the Secretary of Agriculture with reference to the statement he made in Portland some months ago in speaking before the Oregon Wheat League. The question was raised as to a domestic parity program for wheat, and he, for the first time, indicated that it had great merit to it but that he felt consideration should be postponed for a year. He, in effect, said to the Oregon Wheat League that he hoped they would continue to present their views in regard to it so that the fullest consideration could be given to the subject during the coming year.

I think the Senator from Kansas certainly would have no objection to my saying for the RECORD this afternoon that when the original bill was vetoed and we came to the problem of considering the second bill and what we, as representing two great wheat States, should do in respect to the wheat problem, we consulted with our colleagues in the Senate, including the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and other Senators representing great wheat constituencies.

So far as I am concerned, I consulted with the representatives of the Oregon Wheat League and the National Grange. It was their judgment that, so far as this particular bill was concerned, we should not attempt, by way of amendment, to include a domestic parity program for wheat.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The senior Senator from Oregon has stated correctly the fact that we consulted with one another and discussed the question. It was our general understanding and agreement that this was not an opportune time to try again to include domestic parity for wheat in the farm bill.

We were very much pleased by the cooperation and results we had received from other Members in the previous effort, in view of the situation that developed in connection with the farm bill as a whole.

The senior Senator from Oregon is entirely correct in his statement that we mutually agreed not to take action at this time.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I joined with my colleague the senior Senator from Oregon in consulting with the groups which supported the domestic parity plan for wheat and in asking them for the benefit of their counsel as to what should be done about the so-called second time around with the farm bill.

They seemed to think, almost unanimously, that, despite their disappointment over the veto of the original bill, another effort should not be made at this particular time to include the domestic parity plan for wheat. However, I know that they take some slight degree of satisfaction in the fact that a so-called two-price plan will be given a fair trial—at least, we hope it will be a fair trial—with respect to rice, and that it will perhaps furnish a precedent which will hasten the adoption of a domestic parity plan for wheat.

I must admit in all candor that the Oregon wheatgrowers have waited a long time, because many of them were active in the 1920's, when the late Senator Charles McNary sponsored the McNary-Haugen bill, which was passed in 1927 and vetoed by President Coolidge. It must be conceded that those people have waited a long time for the trial of a domestic parity plan for wheat; and if they have to wait much longer, the normal span of life may run out.

I join with the senior Senator from Oregon and the junior Senator from Kansas in expressing the very fervent hope that by next year, at the very latest, the great American staple basic, wheat, will receive a fair trial under the domestic parity program.

Mr. MORSE. I thank my colleague. I say through the RECORD today to my entire constituency that his statement on this matter is but additional evidence of the consistent support which he has always given since he has been in the Senate to the interests of the Oregon wheat producers.

I wish to complete the record by saying that in the last few days I have received communications from some wheat producers in Oregon, who are not, apparently, fully aware of the legislative policy which we have followed in regard to this matter, and who are not aware of the fact that the two Senators from Oregon have been in close and, I may say, almost constant contact with representatives of the Oregon Wheat League, particularly Mr. Taylor, and Mr. Floyd Root. I say to them on the record today that I communicated with Mr. Taylor when he was here, and also with Mr. Root in long-distance telephone conversations on several occasions, while the second farm bill was pending; and on the basis of their advice we decided upon a course of action of not offering the domestic parity program for wheat as an amendment to this bill. I say quite frankly that I think by not doing so we will probably demonstrate that we are in a stronger position for the support of such legislation independently next year.

Some of the letters have raised the question why I supported the domestic parity program for rice, but did not insist, in this bill, upon such a program for wheat. I want to say, good naturedly, because I am very objective in the performance of my duties in the Senate, that I think by supporting a domestic parity program for rice I performed a good service for the Oregon wheat producers, and for this reason:

We were satisfied that we would not be successful in offering as an amendment to this bill a two-price wheat program. I must exercise discretionary judgment as to how best I can serve my constituency in a matter such as this. I am satisfied that by giving support to the principle of a domestic parity program as applied to rice, and giving it an opportunity to work—and I feel certain that the result of its working will be successful—I have greatly enhanced the likelihood of the final success of a domestic parity program for wheat.

To my constituency on this matter, I say they can be certain that I will continue to press in the future, as I have in the past, for the domestic parity principle, which, as my colleague has just pointed out, was one of the objectives of the great Charles McNary, of Oregon, and was written into the McNary-Haugen bill.

I agree with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] that we will not do economic justice to the wheat growers, justice to which I think they are entitled, until we adopt, at least in some form, the principle of the old McNary-Haugen bill in respect to the domestic parity program for wheat.

In closing, I wish to thank not only the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and his colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but also the representatives of the Grange and the Oregon Wheat League, who have come to Washington, sat down with us, and presented us with the information, the facts, and the evidence we have needed in order to present for the approval of the Senate a program for a domestic parity-price system for wheat, and the Senate approved it when the first farm bill was before it.

We hear so much criticism of legislative representatives who come to Washington to lobby, so-called, the elected representatives of the people. I wish to raise my voice in the Senate again in support of honest, legitimate lobbying, because there is not a Senator in this body, in my judgment, who could perform the services for his constituency which they are entitled to receive from

him unless he obtained the information from legitimate and honest legislative representatives of the various economic groups in this country which are vitally concerned with the legislative policy of Congress.

It is not a question of whether we are lobbying; it is a question of what we do, as honest men and women in the Senate, with the facts which are presented to us from the different sources from which we receive them. In the last analysis, the facts speak for themselves.

I say again, as I said when I was discussing the domestic-parity program, that I was functioning as a legislative counsel for the wheat producers of my State. I thought they were entitled to my counseling service. I presented to the Senate the evidence which they had presented to me, on the basis of which I had become convinced that they had a sound legislative proposal. That evidence stood up. As a result, we passed their program in the first bill.

I serve notice now that, come the next session of Congress, I intend to press again for the adoption of a domestic parity program for wheat, because I think it will bring economic justice to the wheat producers not only of my State, but of the Nation.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to my friend, the Senator from North Dakota, but before doing so, I wish to thank him for the great service which he, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, has performed for the American farmers, and also for the many fine services he has performed for the farmers of my State.

As he knows, I always go to him for advice and counsel on agricultural problems, and he has never let me down. I have found that I could rely upon the advice and counsel which he has given me, just as I have been able to rely upon the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] in connection with the wheat problem. We have worked together in a cooperative effort to reach a common objective and have tried to do justice to the wheat producers of the country.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to the senior Senator from Oregon for his very kind comments. He has always maintained a sincere and sympathetic interest in the problems of farmers. It has been a pleasure to work with the senior Senator from Oregon and the junior Senator from Kansas, and also with the representatives of the Oregon Wheat League, the Grange, and other organizations on the domestic parity plan for wheat. To me, such a plan represents a far better program than the flexible price-support program.

Although we lost this year, we will continue to fight another year.

There is another matter which I think is very important. We are going to have to have a better parity formula. The modernized parity formula is completely wrong in principle. I think by continuing transitional parity, as provided in the bill, we shall have a chance next year to enact a fair parity formula.

Mr. President, in closing, I wish to say that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and I cannot make a too long-term commitment on the farm program, because of certain events which will take place later this year. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. We shall have to take out chances on that.

In closing, Mr. President, I wish again to thank the Senator from Kansas, and I wish to say to the wheat growers of my State that they need only read the statements in the RECORD today to be doubly reassured that they can count at the next session on a continued fight for a domestic parity program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

PART-TIME UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the evidence is growing almost every day that we are witnessing the administration of a part-time foreign policy by Mr. Dulles and his aides in the State Department. Only today two of the administration's most friendly and distinguished newspaper correspondents, Mr. James Reston, of the New York Times, and Mr. Joseph Alsop, a columnist for the New York Herald Tribune and other newspapers, in separate articles, have declared that there is little inspiration, little original thinking, and little recognition of the need for a vitalized foreign policy, a policy brought up to date and changed in the face of the Communist peace-and-smile offensive.

Mr. Alsop's article states rather clearly that our lack of policy, our lack of unity, our lack of decision in many of the incidents which are occurring in the Middle East have caused our friends to be undermined and undercut by the propaganda offensive which is being waged throughout the Middle East by the Prime Minister of Egypt, Mr. Nasser. Mr. Alsop is most critical of the administration's failure to have a strong policy in the Middle East.

Mr. Reston's article, entitled "Confusion in Capital," was published in the New York Times of today. He summarizes the reactions which have occurred to the Soviet arms cut. Mr. Reston, in all possible charity, points out that, although the United States was well advised of the announcement of a reduction of 1,200,000 men in the Communist Army, no attempt was made by the State Department to coordinate those reactions, and that the leaders in three separate groups have published, for the benefit of the diplomats of the world who are stationed here, their reactions to it.

If American foreign policy is to be conducted on such a part-time basis and is to be so confusing to our friends, I think it is time for the Nation, and especially the Senate, to take a long look at the leadership of the administration on this most important phase of our world policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two articles may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 22, 1956]

CONFUSION IN CAPITAL—A SUMMARY OF INCIDENTS THAT HAVE LED TO THREE UNITED STATES REACTIONS ON SOVIET ARMS CUTS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, May 21.—It is now 6 days since the Soviet Union announced that it planned to cut its armed forces by 1,200,000 men, but the official reaction in the Capital is still confused.

James C. Hagerty, the President's Press Secretary, and Secretary of State Dulles took a skeptical and broadly negative attitude of the announcement as soon as it was made. Mr. Dulles expressed doubt as to its value and said he would rather have the 1,200,000 Soviet soldiers standing around doing guard duty than making atomic weapons.

Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense, described the Moscow announcement as "a step in the right direction." He conceded he did not know precisely what it meant, but in general he was positive rather than negative.

Last Friday, however, Harold E. Stassen, President Eisenhower's assistant in charge of disarmament questions, was much more hopeful about the announcement than either Secretary Dulles or Secretary Wilson. He said the Soviet decision indicated that Moscow wanted to proceed with disarmament talks and that it was "an initiative we wanted them to take." The talks have been held by the United Nations Disarmament Subcommittee consisting of representatives of the United States, Britain, France, Canada, and the Soviet Union.

WHITE HOUSE CHECK MADE

There is reason for saying that Mr. Stassen went before the public 3 days after the 2 Cabinet Secretaries because he thought the official reaction had been unnecessarily negative. Also, he did not move until he had checked at the White House. He then announced that a Government committee was being assigned to the task of analyzing what the Moscow announcement did mean.

As a result of these three different reactions, the diplomatic corps in Washington, representing most of the nations in the world, has been reporting back to the various capitals that the United States Government is divided on the meaning of the Soviet move.

Oddly enough the administration set out to avoid precisely this kind of reaction by establishing 3 weeks ago a committee for the specific purpose of coordinating the Washington reaction.

This was an unusual situation. By a fluke, the administration had ample warning that the Moscow announcement was coming. The Soviet leaders told Mr. Stassen during a party in London, April 24, that they were going to make the move. Mr. Stassen reported this at once to the President.

It was realized here that such an announcement out of Moscow would bolster the Soviet disarmament line, and if not handled adroitly in Washington would appear to put the United States in the position of opposing a reduction in armies.

It was also realized that advance knowledge of the Moscow decision gave the United States a chance to discount the Soviet propaganda by cataloging Washington's far more dramatic postwar troop reductions before Moscow made its announcement.

THREE REACTIONS DEVELOPED

The Washington interdepartmental committee worked on all this to no avail, however. Every member of the committee was supposed to get the same signals, but the result was not 1 reaction, but 3.

This gave the Soviet Union the opportunity, which it immediately seized, not only to charge Mr. Dulles with being against re-

ducing the size of armies but to contrast the differences within the Eisenhower Cabinet on the Soviet move.

Meanwhile, the Voice of America was left in the embarrassing position of having to send out to the world the conflicting estimates of the Cabinet officials.

It was quoting Mr. Dulles, Thursday, as having said that the proposed Soviet troop reduction "might very well result, not in a weakening but in a strengthening of the Soviet military capacity." Later it was broadcasting Mr. Stassen's much more optimistic views.

All kinds of moves have been made here in the past to avoid this sort of thing. The National Security Council was intended to help coordinate policies. Theodore C. Streibert, head of the United States Information Agency, was put on the Operations Coordinating Board to see that the Voice of America made policy questions clear. Nevertheless, the generals, the admirals, and the airmen go on squabbling in public, and the Cabinet members take different lines on the same subject.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times of May 22, 1956]

IRAQ'S STRONG MAN

(By Joseph Alsop)

BAGHDAD, IRAQ.—When this reporter called on the famous Nu Al Said, the strong man and perennial prime minister of Iraq, it was rather alarmingly like disturbing an owl in the daylight hours.

Forty-odd years have passed since this remarkable man became one of the founders of the Arab independence movement as a young officer in the Turkish imperial army. He has lived hard through all the subsequent decades. He is 67. That morning he sat huddled in his dressing gown, his piercing eyes hooded as though against the light, and really looking remarkably owlish.

One sensed at once, too, that he was quite justifiably embittered by the fantastic choppings and changings of American policy toward the Baghdad Pact, on which he has gambled Iraq's future. Hence he was cynical about the usefulness of any message he might address to the United States. So he came to life only once, when he was asked about the venomous propaganda aimed at him and his government by Egypt's Gamal Abdel Nasser, who is Nuri's presently successful rival for leadership of the Arab world.

Then the deep eyes flashed, and Nuri declared firmly that he had been risking his life for the cause of Arab independence before Nasser was out of swaddling clothes. For the rest: No, he was not disturbed by Syria's closeness to Egypt; no, he was not disturbed either because most of the other Arab States stayed out of the Baghdad Pact.

In a way, the situation here in Iraq rather resembled this curious meeting, so reassuring on the surface, yet not without its disquieting side. On the surface all is well in Iraq. Nuri's government is strong. The Iraqi development program is bringing a bustling new prosperity.

Even today, moreover, the dictatorship here is far less severe than in Egypt. From the social welfare standpoint, this is Utopia compared to Egypt's strange ally, Saudi Arabia, whose oil dollars finance Egypt's policy. Outwardly, therefore, it seems perfectly reasonable to hope that pro-Western Iraq will serve as an example and a magnet to attract the other Arab States toward a policy less hostile to the West.

This theory of Iraq's magnetism is important, because it is held in many quarters in Washington and is the declared basis of British Middle Eastern policy. But the theory is not working out in practice. Iraq's virtual isolation from the rest of the Arab world is in truth increasing with every passing week.

Furthermore, the failure of the theory is having serious effects within Iraq.

The truth is that all the nationalist emotions that have gripped the rest of the Arab world are powerfully surging beneath the surface here in Iraq. The impulse toward Arab unity is only one of these emotions, but it is particularly strong here because so many Iraqis blame the western-sponsored Baghdad Pact for Iraq's isolation. In the Middle East pure emotion is often decisive.

If present trends continue, one can predict rather positively that the theory of Iraq's magnetism will never become valid. If present trends continue, in truth, one can predict eventual and bad internal trouble here in Iraq—and if Iraq abandons her present prowestern orientation, nothing but naked force will cure the situation in the Middle East.

The point is, however, that present trends do not need to continue unless the American Government is permanently wedded to its present line of blandly hoping for the best and blindly refusing to prepare for the worst. In the Middle East as in the Far East, strength is respected, and nothing succeeds like success.

What is needed to reverse present trends is simply a firm, clear and united American-British policy, and immeasurably more positive and determined than the curious mixture of aimless drift and adman's slogans that now passes for a Middle Eastern policy in Washington.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the majority leader wishes to have announced the program for the Senate tomorrow. Since we shall not conclude action this evening on the civil service retirement bill, we shall continue work on it tomorrow, and, if it is then completed, take up Calendar No. 2022, S. 3855, the housing bill, for discussion. It is expected that the housing bill will be completed on Thursday, and that on Friday the Senate will take up Calendar No. 2056, H. R. 10721, the appropriation bill for the Departments of State and Justice, and the Judiciary.

In addition, it is possible that Calendar No. 1975, S. 746, returning mineral rights to the former owners of certain lands acquired in connection with the Garrison Dam project, and Calendar No. 2040, S. 3275, to create a United States Fisheries Commission and establish a comprehensive national policy for fisheries resources, will be taken up on Wednesday.

Mr. BUTLER. What was the last measure to which the Senator from Florida referred?

Mr. SMATHERS. I said it is possible that the fisheries bill may be taken up on Wednesday. It is Senate bill 3275.

Calendar No. 1896, Senate bill 3108, relating to the construction of modern Great Lakes bulk cargo vessels—and a measure in which the Senator from Maryland also is interested—has been scheduled for several days now, and that bill may also be considered on Wednesday, if time permits.

TRADING IN ONION FUTURES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEUBERGER AND OTHER EVIDENCE BEFORE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FUTURES TRADING

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, this morning, May 22, 1956, I appeared before the House Agriculture Committee to testify in support of members of the Malheur County Onion Growers Association who favor H. R. 7920, as well as a companion Senate bill.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that my statement to the committee; a telegram from George Schmidt, onion broker in the Labish area of Marion County; a statement of Clarence Lee, of Ontario, Oreg., representing the Malheur County Onion Growers Association; a statement from the National Onion Association; two letters from Mr. Joe Y. Saito, president of the Malheur County Onion Growers Association; a letter from Mr. C. H. Burns, of Nampa, Idaho, with his statement entitled, "Trading Onion Futures Versus Sale of Physical Onions"; a resolution of the Malheur County Onion Growers Association; a letter from Mr. Lawern King, vice president of the Malheur County Onion Growers Association; a letter from Mr. Roger R. Kauffman, Administrator, Commodity Exchange Authority, commenting on Mr. King's letter; and a copy of a letter from Paul T. Rowell, chief of the division of market development, Oregon State Department of Agriculture, be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

These documents will help to demonstrate effectively why trading in onion futures should be forbidden, in order to serve the best interests of the families who grow onions for a livelihood.

There being no objection, the statements and documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, OF OREGON, IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 7920 BEFORE THE HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE, MAY 22, 1956

Mr. Chairman, I want to say the privilege that has been extended to me to present my brief statement in person is, indeed, appreciated. I know you have already heard from a great many, and there are quite a few more to be heard from, so I will take but 2 or 3 minutes of your time.

You heard this past week from representatives of the onion growers of my State when Mr. Clarence Lee, of Ontario, Oreg., testified for the Malheur County Onion Growers Association.

Mr. Chairman, Oregon has a greatly diversified agriculture. Onions, one of the many small row crops grown in the State, are produced in a volume to be considered a major crop in Malheur and Marion Counties. There is no need to repeat statistics previously given before the committee to emphasize that fact.

I want to go on record in support of my constituents in their request that trading in onion futures be stopped.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the farmer who prepares his land, plants the onions, and at last harvests them is the one who should have the deciding voice in ending or continuing a system of trading in futures. I am informed, however, by the National Onion Association that onion growers have no voice and are denied any part or influence in formulating rules and regulations to govern futures trading. This is a strange anomally, Mr. Chairman, at a time when farmers have taken an ever-increasing part, through their own marketing organizations, in the trading and processing of more and more commodities.

The onion growers have observed the results of this business of trading in futures since it began in 1942. If, after all these

years, their verdict is one of condemnation, I am willing to accept that verdict.

A great deal of criticism in recent months has been leveled at anything tending to stimulate the production of surpluses.

I would like to quote Mr. Joe Y. Saito, president of the Malheur County Onion Growers Association. In a letter written to me May 8, 1956, he said, "Our first objection is to the fact that over-planting of onions results from sales on the futures market. The November contract is opened almost a full year ahead of delivery time, and in order to sell onions the trader goes out and contracts acreage to give him something to trade." Mr. Saito goes on to point out how the plantings for futures trading can always be over and above the acreage that would be planted to move into regular market channels.

Last year growers in Malheur County lost 50 cents to $1 per 50-pound bag on all their medium onions. Mr. Chairman, we shouldn't expect the onion grower to subsidize the middleman and the consumer.

The National Onion Association condems the futures trading on the commodity with this statement: "By artificially produced situations, possible only with onion futures, unscrupulous, professional speculators with large pocketbooks and small consciences have bled the industry of millions of dollars yearly while contributing only financial disaster and ruin to growers."

Some may suggest that regulation is the solution. The growers tell me that as of May 1 there was no law or regulation in effect to control adequately the manipulation and wild fluctuation of onion futures. They say manipulation is a strong word, probably impossible to prove in a court of law, but they insist it does exist and is being done today. They believe, and refer to Administrator Kauffman's reference to the limited authority of the Commodity Exchange Authority to support their belief, that the manipulation, or whatever you may please to call it, can and will be stopped permanently only when futures trading in onions is permanently stopped.

Again, I say, Mr. Chairman, I will accept the verdict of the grower. That is why I urge the approval by your committee of H. R. 7920. Along with my statement I would like to include a supporting telegram received May 16 from one of the biggest shippers in the rich Lake Labish area of Marion County, Mr. George Schmidt of Brooks, Oreg. Also, Mr. Chairman, I would submit the May 8, 1956, letter from Mr. Saito, whom I previously quoted, and a letter to Mr. Rodger Kauffman, administrator of the Commodity Exchange Authority from Mr. Paul T. Rowell, Chief of Division of Market Development for the Oregon State Department of Agriculture.

Let me just say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that when we enjoy those delicious rings of crisp french fried onions with our top sirloin we like to think that the onion grower and the cattleman who have contributed so much to our pleasure, receive their fair share of the payment that completes the transaction.

STOCKTON, CALIF., *May 16, 1956.*

Senator NEUBERGER,

Senate Office Building:

Am sending wire in reference to onion hearing now going on. I grow 150 acres and ship 8 to 9 hundred cars per year and in talking to growers in our area feel it very important to do away with onion futures.

LABISH BROKERAGE CO.,
GEORGE SCHMIDT.

BROOKS, OREG.

STATEMENT OF CLARENCE LEE, ONTARIO, OREG., REPRESENTING MALHEUR COUNTY ONION GROWERS ASSOCIATION, TO THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FUTURES TRADING, MAY 16, 1956

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I am Clarence Lee of Ontario, Oreg. It is with a profound sense of responsibility that I appear before this committee today in behalf of the onion growers in my district. I bring the message of growers in Malheur County, Oreg., a message which has been heartily endorsed also by onion growers of districts in western Oregon. Growers in these parts of Oregon, along with the part of our producing district that is located in southwestern Idaho, produce about one-eighth of all the late summer and storage onions grown in the United States.

These growers feel that trading of futures in a perishable crop such as onions can add nothing to the industry, but instead creates difficulties that are harder to overcome than any of the natural hazards of growing a crop of onions.

One major difficulty is the excess acreage that is planted year after year at the instigation of speculators, for trading on the futures board. The trades are made far ahead of planting time, and the trader then contracts to get onions grown to meet his commitments. A grower holding a contract from a speculator, or one who has hedged his onions directly, is commonly thought to be protected on his production risks. He is, to the extent of the contract onions. But for the industry as a whole these contracts encourage excess acreage because the grower does not have to look to the consuming market to dispose of this part of his commodity. So he plants both contract onions, and his normal acreage for fresh market.

How do I know this happens? Twenty-five years' experience as an onion grower has taught me that when an onion producer can make sure of a little profit through contracting, he assumes that there will be more profit through greater volume, so he just increases his acreage by the amount of the contract.

Then when the time comes to dispose of these onions committed on the futures, what happens? Many are never delivered on the board. The contracts are bought in by the speculator who probably is in some other business than onions, and he has already either made or lost his money and is through with the onions, but they still have to find their way into produce channels on top of the normal supply grown for the consuming market.

Some are delivered to the board speculators. These are the real jokers.

They arrive in bunches, all at one terminal, at the close of each trading month. They can't be anything but salvage. There's no place in the produce trade channels for them, because these channels are kept supplied by regular commercial deliveries.

The don't even belong to people who know how to sell onions. They are not governed in price by the need to meet packing and shipping expenses, because these have been met as a part of the speculative deal before they were delivered.

Our growers couldn't compete in the markets last season with these futures deliveries of onions. Such onions supplied a good part of our usual markets for medium onions in the Midwest at prices about the same as our freight cost.

But I think these facts are pretty generally recognized, and have been supported by substantial testimony in previous hearings of this committee. So I won't belabor them further; but what to do?

It has been suggested that regulation of the futures trading practices could correct these and the many other difficulties. Let's see what the record is so far on regulations, and what further ones might be possible.

In February the Exchange put in certain rules. They fixed a limit of 300 contracts a trader could hold at one time, presumably to keep anyone from controlling enough contracts to engage in price manipulation. Does the Exchange believe these traders aren't smart enough to work together, or that any trader couldn't rustle up enough relatives to become traders so he could control as many contracts as he wanted?

Then the Exchange fixed a 25-cent markoff for any onions delivered from storage in Chicago, I'm not quite sure why. But if these onions were distress merchandise and demoralized the cash market when the holder had some choice as to when he sold them, what will they do when all receivers are forced to dispose of their delivered onions at once by this markoff?

There were some regulations imposed to help maintain quality, but I'd say on the whole the score for regulation up to now is pretty low. We might think of what further regulations could be imposed.

One regulation that would help, our association proposed to the Commodity Exchange Authority last fall. We felt that delaying opening of trading in futures contracts until onion planting was completed would stop the planting of excess onions just for speculation. The answer we got from Administrator Kauffman was that it was beyond the legal authority of the CEA to impose such a regulation.

If the law won't allow realistic regulation, and if the piecemeal ones that are imposed haven't a chance to change anything for the better, why experiment with regulation and leave the onion grower still saddled with the problems created by the futures?

The futures market doesn't market any onions. I'd like to read you a quote—

"Speculators trade to make a profit from price changes and in most cases would find it costly and troublesome to become involved in the delivery process. Merchants and processors use the futures markets as a means of hedging price risks and usually do not look upon the futures markets as a source of supply or as a merchandising outlet for cash commodities. The reason, of course, is that in buying and selling cash commodities merchants and processors prefer to deal in the cash markets, contracting for the specific grades and quantities required for their needs and for the preferences of their customers. Since deliveries on futures contracts in most commodities may be made in a variety of grades, and at seller's option, merchants and processors with long hedging positions in futures usually do not wish to run the risk of receiving unwanted grades that might be involved in standing for delivery."

Do you know who makes those statements that futures speculators can't and don't want want to market onions? That was from the 1954–55 report of the Commodity Exchange Authority, legal godfather of trading operations on the Mercantile Exchange.

As long as this thing serves no purpose to the onion industry, but instead acts as a millstone around the grower's neck, we respectfully ask you people as our representatives if you won't take steps to legislate it out of existence.

THE CAUSES AND EFFECTS OF FUTURES OF THE ONION INDUSTRY—COMPILED BY THE NATIONAL ONION ASSOCIATION

There is probably no problem in agriculture today so serious, certainly there is none so difficult to control, as futures trading of onions. Continuance poses a great threat to the future of fruit and vegetable agriculture, and presents very real and hidden dangers. If the onion industry fails to rid itself of this parasite, merchantile exchanges may very well list other commodities for future trading. As in the case of onions, this can and

will be done without consent or approval of producers and handlers of these commodities. While there is no positive confirmation, there have been rumors that Texas onions, Washington apples and Florida and California citrus are being considered as futures trading possibilities. Not a pleasant prospect for those engaged in the production and marketing of those commodities.

In the case of onion futures, the industry is being forced against its will to play another man's game, by his rules, on his field. He furnishes the ball and hires the umpire and permits no objection or complaints. That hardly qualifies either as a "democratic process" or "free enterprise."

There are several basic reasons why onion futures trading is opposed. Listed below are major points of objection with detailed explanations of each. It will be noted that each point of objection to futures trading has a variety of causes and complaints, many of which are closely interrelated. The following summary explains and clarifies each in its cause and effect on the onion industry.

1. Onion growers have no voice and are denied any part or influence in formulating rules and regulations to govern futures trading.

2. Onions, a small, perishable crop, do not lend themselves to futures trading.

3. No laws or regulations adequately cover or control futures trading of perishables.

4. Any rule or benefit of futures is designed for the trader and speculator with onion growers never considered.

5. Normal marketing on the basis of supply and demand is impossible.

6. Futures "benefits" are really detriments which further complicate onion marketing.

Point 1. In the case of every commodity produced in agriculture, the grower is, and rightly should be, the primary and major concern. The commodity he produces provides every excuse and reason for the existence of all related and connected phases of the industry. Obviously there can be no industry without the grower, but futures disregards that fact and ignores the onion grower. Instead of running his industry, the grower has become the victim who no longer controls either production or marketing of his own commodity.

In 1942 officials of the Chicago Mercantile Exchange met with National Onion Association members in Kenton, Ohio to discuss the merits of onion futures. A large majority of National Onion Association members and most of those in the industry rejected futures as detrimental and vigorously opposed listing onions on the Board. Despite this opposition and because no law prevents it, the Chicago Mercantile Exchange listed onions; and trading in onion futures began in September, 1942. The years since have not altered industry opinion but, instead, have only broadened and intensified opposition. It has been clearly demonstrated how unnecessary futures are.

The industry, particularly growers, denied any voice and influence in either operation or regulation of futures, are powerless to prevent or control this evil which has been forced upon them. Yet there is no law to assist the grower in the case of futures. Even though many have been driven out of business by disastrous years caused by futures trading and many are even now near bankruptcy, there is not one thing the grower can do to correct this intolerable situation.

People in the onion industry neither ask for nor want marketing agreements, subsidies or supports. They want only to be left alone to operate on the sane and solid principles of supply and demand. That, the industry believes, is true free enterprise.

Point 2. Perishable fruits and vegetables, particularly onions, are not logical or reasonable items for futures trading. The history of onion futures clearly demonstrates that fact for all to see. The crop is too small and too perishable and has neither manufacturing value nor storage stability. These facts make it an ideal commodity for manipulation and enforced false fluctuation.

Being a small crop, supply and demand are delicately balanced and easily upset by overproduction, false rumors and manipulation. Also contributing is the practice of opening the November contract 11 months before delivery, 4 months before planting and 8 months before harvest. The high opening price causes growers to become falsely optimistic and overplant. Increased planting causes futures price declines which lead to cash market declines. Growers dislike to sell on a falling market and as a result hold stocks too long, waiting for price recovery. Movement and disappearance is curtailed and orderly marketing disrupted. A surplus is created, and this drives the cash price down still further. This is only one way futures causes overproduction.

Professional speculators have developed a theory and system of trading in onions to guarantee themselves profit. With the small crop, sensitive and maneuverable and with no limitation or enforceable regulation to control manipulation, the system is almost guaranteed successful. The whole theory is based on heavy short selling on a created oversupply. Applying the fact that markets decline easier than they advance, the professional speculator is almost always on the short side.

To insure their success, some professional speculators finance huge acreages only for delivery to the board. Some maintain offices and buying agents in producing sections to contract and buy crops of onions. These onions, contracted for by the professional speculator, or rather manipulator, are not intended for market and consumption. They are intended only for delivery to the board, with the planned intent to break the market and force prices down. Thus the manipulator guarantees himself profit on extensive short speculations. During contract months these heavy deliveries hit Chicago with terrific impact. A gigantic accumulation on track and in storage is the result. That accumulation, ranging from 350 to 800 cars, creates a chaotic condition and utterly destroys any semblance of normal marketing. Many traders, doctors, dentists, etc., forced to take delivery of these cars, offer them at prices far below current cash levels in a desperate effort to be rid of them. This causes lowering of prices. Most of the cars are either poor quality or borderline stock and this further damages markets because the fresh trade will not buy them. Many are consigned to terminal markets where, because of quality and condition, they sell far below normal market prices. Thus having demoralized the market, started a trend of declining prices, caused heavy holding of poor quality and created an artificial oversupply, the professional futures speculator is happy. His operation has fouled up the deal for weeks, but this was necessary. How else can he guarantee his own profit?

This is possible only because of futures and because of the nature and size of the onion crop. The Chicago Mercantile futures contract designates Yellow Globes, U. S. No. 1, 1½" min., 65 percent 2" or larger, not more than 15 percent may be 3" or larger. The late summer onion crop averages only about 30 million sacks a year. The crop is broken down to show approximate volume eligible for futures trading. Numbers indicate 50-pound sacks.

	Million
Shrink and handling loss	4.5
Variety disqualification	6.0
Prohibitive grade and size	2.0
Prohibitive locality	3.5
Shipments prior to Nov. 1	11.0
Total	27.0

Obviously the remaining 3 million sacks could be reduced by possibly half for other reasons. However, we allow a conservative 2.5 million sacks, about 4,000 cars, as being eligible and possibly involved in futures deals. That is less than 10 percent of the total late summer crop. However, Commodity Exchange Authority officially records Chicago Mercantile onion transactions average almost 80,000 yearly, for the past 7 years, indicating that eligible cars for trading average 20 transactions each during the year. With a brokerage fee of $22.00 per car the return to Mercantile Exchange brokers is a considerable sum. It is entirely possible that accumulated brokerage was as much as $400 on some of the very March contract cars which sold at 10 cents per 50-lb. sack on March 15, 1956. By artificially produced situations, possibly only with onions futures, unscrupulous, professional speculators with large pocketbooks and small consciences have bled the industry of millions of dollars yearly while contributing only financial disaster and ruin to growers.

Point 3. There is no law or regulation in effect today, May 1, which will adequately control the manipulation and wild fluctuation of onion futures. Manipulation is a strong word. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to prove in a court of law; but there is no question that it does exist and is being done today. Manipulation can and will be stopped permanently only when futures trading in onions is permanently stopped.

Mr. Douglas B. Bagnell, Deputy Administrator of the Commodity Exchange Authority, admitted publicly at the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association convention in New Orleans, January 30, that CEA is powerless to prevent manipulation. As a regulatory agency CEA has power to act only in cases of actual violation. Even so, it may take several years to convict and punish a guilty operator, but they have no authority to prevent it before it happens. In the meantime these speculators are free to continue raids on onion growers' pocketbooks.

Obviously Mercantile Exchange operators know these conditions have existed all along even though they have denied it for years. It is just as obvious they will not take action against the guilty persons because those individuals are, of course, exchange members. Any disciplinary action would be an admission of shortcomings in onion futures. They do not like that kind of publicity.

A survey indicates the onion industry is composed of approximately the following divisions: growers, 12,000; shippers, 1,500; receivers, 5,000; others, 1,500; a total of 20,000. However, there are additional thousands who are directly touched by the onion industry and whose lives are affected. It would be difficult to place the number exactly, but it would be near 100,000. If everyone connected with futures were included, the total could hardly exceed around 2,500 persons. The comparison indicated complete unbalance relative to influence and effect.

Figures and details of the CEA report, as of September 30, 1955, indicate a total of 813 futures traders on the Chicago Mercantile Exchange. This includes all groups of traders, large and small. Only 15 men, 2 percent of all futures traders, held 47 percent of all positions: long, short, speculative and hedges. Ten held 200 contracts or more. Seven hundred and ninety-eight persons, 98 percent of all futures traders, held the remaining 53 percent of all contracts. Considering numbers involved and the great influence and effect of futures on the onion industry that is not many traders. It rather conclusively shows how easily a few men control the market and proves manipulation.

Much has been made of that point in the report which shows onion growers the largest group of speculators. It should be asked

what other group should be? Should onion growers stay out and let those in other fields operate onion futures? Aren't futures for the onion industry? If so, who has a better right to speculate than the producer? Just what is expected of the grower in this case?

The report reveals only 141 actual onion growers were involved, 71 speculators and 70 hedgers. However, one thing the CEA report does not show, despite arguments to the contrary, is that the 15 men who held all these contracts are not growers. They are professional speculators who financed and contracted onion acreage and so called themselves growers. Ordinary hedging operations could hardly justify any grower, regardless of size, holding 100 to 200 contracts. Further proof of manipulation.

Point 4. For years, leaders of the industry have bombarded the Merchantile Exchange with requests and pleas for rule changes to alleviate futures evils and equalize the imbalance between futures and cash markets. There have been several conferences of industry and exchange representatives in the last few years. However, no constructive or corrective changes came as a result. The repeated requests for rule changes have been answered by such statements as "You've got it and you've got to learn to live with it." "Growers need an education in the economic functions of a commodity market." The attitude of future operators has been "To hell with growers, let 'em squawk. We're making plenty of money. Why doctor a healthy horse?"

In December 1955 the National Onion Association overwhelmingly passed a resolution asking for national legislation to prohibit futures trading in onions. For the first time a national organization took action in an open and public stand. Support of that move has been overwhelming throughout every phase of the industry. Repercussions from mercantile operators were expected and were not surprising. However, the attitude of injured innocence of some is reminiscent of the kid caught in the cookie jar, who said, "I didn't take 'em and besides I put them back."

With so much strong, unfavorable, national publicity and pressure of pending legislation in Congress, mercantile exchanges were forced to make concessions and institute some changes. Drastic changes, for them, in view of previous attitude. A study of these changes, however, will disclose no real, constructive improvements. Nothing has been accomplished with regard to protecting growers. The real effort has been to protect futures operators and brokers and to stimulate and extend trading volume while making concessions to pacify the industry. The industry is neither satisfied nor fooled. There is no confidence that commodity exchanges can or will satisfactorily regulate their business or enforce their regulations. For one thing, the exchanges have no control over nonmembers. It should be emphasized that exchanges were forced to make changes. It was not voluntary. Ninety-five percent of the industry remain firmly convinced the only real solution to the intolerable situation is to eliminate and abolish futures trading in onions permanently.

Point 5. Mercantile exchange operators claim futures do not make, but only reflect markets and price levels. Last September March futures reflected March prices at around $2.65 to $2.70. Texas onions generally start to move in late March and that is big money for Texas onions. On that reflection Texas acreage increased and only weather prevented even heavier planting. On March 15, 1956, the March futures contract closed at 15 cents, which is a ridiculous reflection. Onion bags cost more than that. The Texas onion market is, today, just beginning to be normal. Actually onion futures markets neither reflect nor make markets, they only destroy.

Terminal markets are seriously affected by futures. When futures prices are higher than cash markets, terminal buyers act cautiously to avoid the uncertainty of declines which occur rather violently through futures fluctuations. A futures decline kills demand because buyers, to avoid being caught with high-priced cash merchandise, hold off. When cash markets are above futures levels, buyers try to buy at the lower futures price. This suppresses demand and results in more uncertainty and chaos. The repeated, falsely induced, rapid declines and advances in futures markets destroy cash market stability and buyer confidence.

Statistics furnished by the Department of Agriculture indicate per capita consumption of commercial dry onions averaged almost 12 pounds per person per year since 1940. Bureau of Census figures show population in 1955 was 10 percent greater than in 1940. Yet for the first time in history a late summer onion crop of less than 30 million bags failed to bring a profit to growers. In fact, the season ended disastrously for most.

Supply and demand are no longer factors because supply and demand cannot function in the futures controlled markets of today. Futures trading invites the gamble of professional speculators who stop at nothing to prove the guaranty their judgment is correct. As a result there is increased acreage and production. Distribution is unbalanced with unnecessary accumulation of tremendous stocks. Price fluctuations are so violent, the entire industry is in a state of shock for weeks after a price break.

This is what growers are faced with today. They can no longer simply plan to grow onions for a supply and demand market.

Point 6. Futures operators have long preached the great benefits of futures to growers. College professors have even visited growing areas to preach it, but analysis proves it is the grower who pays for everything, takes the risk and all the loss. Only the futures broker really profits. In past years when onion speculators speculated on the actual onions, they moved through onion areas buying and contracting onions from growers. The grower held the onions in his storage until ordered to deliver. To bind the contract the speculator advanced a standard sum, generally $300 per car, which gave growers operating cash. In the future system the beneficial hedge deal of futures is different. To hedge a crop on the board the grower must post $300 per car plus $22 brokerage for the privilege. If the market advances beyond his hedge level, he is required to post additional money for margin calls. There have been cases where growers were sold out at great loss; and, in some cases, actually put out of business when they could no longer meet required margins. Of course, growers can finance their hedging. In such instances the broker provides money to cover all margins, etc. However, the broker controls all movement, etc. For this great benefit and insurance growers must pay 10 cents per sack, or $60 per car. That is a considerable sum for so little.

Some brokers who provide financed hedging developed a system to protect themselves in case of grower default. When the grower sells on a financed hedge deal, the broker, through his agent, buys a car. If the grower lifts his hedge, the broker sells a car. However the market moves the broker, being right on the floor, is protected; and, in most cases, has insured himself of a profit in any position in which the market moves. This protection costs futures brokers a very small fee per car while the grower must pay $22 per car. By financing hedges through mercantile brokers the grower actually places himself at the tender mercies of manipulators who use every method to maneuver the market to their advantage and the grower's detriment.

The progressive features of futures trading do not simplify but really complicate unreasonably the already complicated problems of marketing onions. To use futures is complicated in itself and it takes time and money. The grower actually is paying outrageously for this great protection and insurance which is wrecking his industry. It should be noted that this association knows of no banks, building and loan or other financial institutions which will loan onion growers money to finance a hedge on his crop. In every case the grower must either finance his own hedges or finance through a brokerage house which provides that service.

History proves the real profit in futures is made by speculators and in practically every case these profits were made in a declining market. That being true, futures can never benefit the onion industry because it is ridiculous to assume the industry can make money on a constantly declining market. Futures can never benefit the onion industry because most growers are small. Those producing one to ten cars obviously can only hedge one to five cars. To hedge more would be outright speculation. Very few growers are able to finance their own hedges and so must be financed by brokers or such organizations performing that service. They pay for this and the cost is 10 cents per bag which comes off the top of the onion's cash value. The cost of financing protective hedges is in many cases the difference between profit and loss to the grower.

Because it requires more money to trade high the bull or high side is always vulnerable to the bear or low side attack. Bull markets never become as strong advancing as bear markets declining. Thus by the constant pressure of bear attacks, the bull is made overcautious. He attempts to cover and protect his position by selling and so contributes to his own downfall, and the deal goes into another bear or decline cycle with short selling prevailing throughout. the only sure thing is that the onion grower takes the loss again.

For 8 months CEA has accumulated statistics and data on onions and potato futures trading. Recent letters indicate they do not feel they yet have sufficient evidence to ask for or recommend passage of H. R. 7920 and S. 3204, bills which would eliminate onion futures entirely. On April 10 CEA held a hearing in Chicago to determine limitations on the number of speculative contracts in onions. Many of their statistics were presented there. That hearing brought out interesting statistics and opinions by CEA's own economists.

Onion growers do not have the mountainous data and statistics to prove each point of their contentions beyond question. The industry is scattered throughout 75 sections in 26 States of this Nation. Some areas are rather isolated, and some are quite small. It would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to secure detailed statistics of the same technical nature as those collected by CEA. Growers do not have this, but they do have 14 years' practical experience, and they do have empty pockets. No person or group is better qualified to state the growers' case better than they, and no one knows better what they need. Such statistics as have been collected, prove beyond doubt that growers are overwhelmingly, at least 95 percent, opposed to futures and want futures abolished. No technical tabulations or data can change that fact. If onion growers, as a part of this Nation's agriculture, are to be served fairly, then there can be little question of the final result. A point of great importance is the United States Department of Agriculture letter of April 3, which recommended deferment of congressional action on bills H. R. 7920 and S. 3204. Such action ignores and opposes the established opinion of the onion grower and the onion industry in

favor of a few futures operators, persons who are not really a part of agriculture. Upon close examination it will be found the futures operator is neither flora nor fauna, neither fish nor fowl. He does not grow, ship, receive, buy, sell or package onions. He does not qualify for a Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act license as a produce man. It is difficult to find a word, but parasite seems to fit adequately.

Should there arise the question of an invasion of free enterprise in eliminating onion futures, it must be remembered the onion industry did not and never has wanted futures trading. Futures were forced on them against their will and judgment. Since that time, having no other recourse, they have tried to live with them. The results are plain for all to see. The years have only strengthened the opinion that futures trading in onions should be prohibited permanently.

Another important factor to be considered is this: The record clearly establishes that the onion industry is not alone in the fight. Other related agriculture industries have given their support willingly. The American Farm Bureau Federation, Vegetable Growers Association of America, United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, Texas Citrus & Vegetable Growers & Shippers Association, Western Growers Association and numberless other agricultural organizations have joined the attack spearheaded by the National Onion Assocation. Voluntarily they have formally passed resolutions and gone on record as opposing onion futures and advocating immediate and permanent elimination of trading in this community. Many banks in onion areas, chambers of commerce and civic groups have taken similar action. By way of contrast not one agricultural organization, either national or local, large or small, or other group for that matter, has approved, endorsed or supported onion futures trading. This, in itself, clearly indicates the overwhelming opinion and belief that the onion industry must be freed of this evil.

The foregoing statements have been assembled by the National Onion Association to cover the entire situation in brief points. A complete statement would be much too long. For detailed supplements it is suggested records of subcommittee hearings at Presque Isle, Maine, December 6 and 7, 1955, the Chicago hearing March 24, 1956, and the CEA hearing in Chicago April 10, 1956, be consulted.

MALHEUR COUNTY ONION
GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
Ontario, Oreg., March 12, 1956.

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: I believe that Lawern King, of Ontario, who is vice president of our local onion growers association, has had some correspondence with you regarding the trading in onion futures and wishes of growers here in regard to it. He has asked if I would write you with some background on this matter, inasmuch as Senate bill 3204 has been introduced to prohibit futures trading in onions.

The trading in onion futures is a long way from Malheur County, and the Sweet Spanish onion, which is the chief variety here, is not even traded on futures contracts. The fact that these things are true, and that the futures market still depresses the price on onions in this district, constitutes the major reason for growers here wanting the futures trading eliminated.

Several things take place as a result of speculation in onion futures that work to the detriment of the industry at the grower level. In the first place, there is the matter of the time of contracting delivery on the futures board. November 1956 onions could be bought or sold on the board in December of last year, 11 months ahead of delivery. This time interval is explained as giving growers a chance to hedge against price drops ahead of any of the current year's growing expenses. The actual effect is for speculators, with more funds than onion growers have in the spring, to enter into these November contracts, and then contract in turn with growers to plant the acreage for delivery.

The onion market is very sensitive to total supply, and it is always necessary for each grower to watch the national picture on plantings, and for all growers to attempt to plant so the total production can move to market. Consider the effect, then, of a few thousand, or tens of thousands, of acres of onions planted for the sole purpose of being sold on the board, and somebody else being stuck with their delivery into consuming channels. The effect invariably is plantings above the potential use of the product, as the onions for futures contract delivery are planted with no consideration of outlet other than the price that can be written into the futures contract.

Then consider the effect of onions contracted on the futures board when they are delivered. Only about 1½ percent of onions traded on the futures are ever delivered, but when trading runs to 150,000 carlots on 1 crop, even this small percentage becomes a sizable total.

Onions are not bought or sold on the futures board for delivery. They are bought and sold for the profit that can be derived from buying and selling contracts as prices change prior to delivery date. But the delivery time eventually comes, and some unwary investor holds the purchase contract and must take delivery of the onions. Does he have outlets in the produce trade to move onions into consumption channels? Probably not, because people in the onion business rather than the speculating business usually keep these channels pretty well located and supplied. So he is stuck with the onions. One guess as to what will be done with them will hit right on the nose. Salvage. Take a loss, but get what you can. Sell enough below the onion market to get them sold. And so the market price to the producer who tries to make his living by selling onions is cut in half by a mere by-product of an operation to make profits from speculation. This situation is not theoretical. Medium onions from our district have been unable to move into many of our customary markets in the Midwest this season. Why? Medium Yellow Globe onions delivered on futures contracts to Chicago were selling in these markets at a price slightly above what our freight cost would be to deliver onions there.

The total onion crop is a perishable, with supplies varying greatly at different times during the marketing season. The total crop is not so large but what a few investors can buy or sell a large enough percentage of the crop to actually manipulate prices. We feel that these factors make onions unsuited to futures trading practices that might be all right for a stable, high-volume crop such as cotton or wheat.

We could enumerate further, but we believe these points will show why we wish to see the onion futures trading abolished, and why we hope you will support for us the bills introduced to accomplish this result. We have only given you one side of the futures trading story, and in doing this we have not meant to be biased. However, it is likely you will hear the pro side of the case of futures trading from persons interested in the Mercantile Exchange, as the onion trading over the last season or two has meant about $3½ million annually in brokerages and exchange fees.

If we can discuss this further, or furnish any information that will be helpful to you in considering the merit of abolishing onion futures trading, we will be glad to do so. In the meantime, we express the wish of our 175 onion-growing association members that you help us get rid of the influence of futures trading on the onion-growing industry.

Sincerely yours,

JOE Y. SAITO,
President, Malheur County Onion Growers Association.

MALHEUR COUNTY ONION
GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
Ontario, Oreg., May 8, 1956.

Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Onion growers of Malheur County are concerned that the bills in the House and Senate that would prohibit futures trading in onions are having slow going in committee, and apparently are felt to be premature by the Department of Agriculture.

The House bill (H. R. 7920) is the subject of a hearing before a subcommittee of the House on May 16, and we would like to have your help at this hearing if possible. We are asking Representative COON if he could help also. If time would permit, we would appreciate your stating our case at this hearing, or if you could not make the hearing, a letter in support of the prohibition of futures trading in onions sent to the subcommittee would be most helpful.

The matter of futures trading in onions and its effect on marketing the fresh crop is a complicated one. As a quick reference on the problem, we would like to outline the thinking of growers and shippers here as to how we feel the futures trading affects this district.

Our first objection is to the fact that overplanting of onions results from sales on the futures market. The November contract is opened almost a full year ahead of delivery time, and in order to sell onions the trader goes out and contracts acreage to give him something to trade. Commercial onion growers continually watch the total plantings in relation to outlets, and keep their plantings as large as they think they can sell. The speculators watch nothing except the prices November futures will bring, and the contract operator who grows the onions is concerned only with his contract price. You can well see how these plantings for futures trading can always be over and above the onion acreage that commercial growers, or even these same contract growers, would plant to move into regular market channels.

The Commodity Exchange Authority has been considering regulations of the futures market to stop abuses, but when we suggested to Administrator Kauffman that one of the most necessary regulations would be to hold off the opening of futures contracts until onion planting was completed, he informed us this was beyond the authority of CEA. Thus, it appears if regulation is the answer, there will have to be broader powers given the Authority.

Another result of the futures trading that has been a detriment to our marketing is the sale of onions delivered on futures contracts. These have been delivered in batches of anywhere from 100 to 500 carlots, rolled into Chicago at one time at the close of each option month. Attempt has then been made to work these into produce channels along with the normal supply of commercial onions. The result has been surplus track holdings and reduction in prices, because these onions were packed and on wheels and had to be delivered somewhere. The CEA, in attempting to regulate against this difficulty, has assessed a penalty of 25 cents a sack on onions held in cold storage in Chicago after futures board delivery. We fail to see how this can in any way help the

situation. Instead, it appears to us this markdown will make these onions even more of a distress item by forcing quicker liquidation.

Last year growers here lost from 50 cents to $1 per 50-pound bag on all their medium onions because the Yellow Globe variety delivered to the future were sold into the Midwest markets at salvage prices. Malheur growers or those of any other district must get packing, loading, and shipping costs out of their onions or they will not even send them to market. These futures onions are under no such limitation, as these costs are paid by the speculative holder, in anticipation of profits from speculation. Thus, onions delivered on futures contract will sell and be delivered for as little as 10 cents a 50-pound bag, because after delivery the distribution becomes a salvage deal rather than an economic one.

We have no quarrel with the principle of futures markets. We feel in a storable commodity where stocks can be held over from year to year that such markets can have a stabilizing effect. We had no quarrel with onion futures either—because trading is done at such great distance from us, and the Sweet Spanish variety grown here is not traded as futures—until the economic effects we mention recurred season after season after season to the detriment of our own marketing.

Attempts are being made at regulation of futures trading, and no doubt further restrictions will be proposed as means to let futures trading continue with less serious effects on the industry. Because of the basic perishable nature of onions, and the delicate balance that must be maintained between production and markets, we do not believe that even severe regulation can cure disruptions to the cash market. We believe onions should be removed entirely from futures trading.

We will appreciate anything you can do through this hearing or later to bring the Senate measure S. 3204 on this matter to vote and get it passed.

Sincerely yours,

JOE Y. SAITO,
President.

BURNS BAY IDAHO,
Nampa, Idaho, March 12, 1956.

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing herewith copy of information that I have gathered with reference to this trading of onion futures on the Chicago and New York Merchantile Exchanges. I have taken the liberty of sending this same information to all members of the House Agriculture Committee, the Senate Agriculture Committee, in addition to all Representatives and Senators from the various onion-growing States, such as Oregon.

Oregon has become one of the most important States in the country during the past few years as far as growing onions is concerned. Western Oregon, of course, has grown onions for many years which are eligible for delivery on the future exchange and have been traded at times to considerable extent. Eastern Oregon, of course, generally grows the Spanish-type onions which are not eligible for trading on the mercantile exchange. However, regardless these Spanish onions are seriously affected by prices on the future exchange. Due to the extremely low prices on this future exchange at this time it is quite possible that many of the medium sized onions will have to be dumped in western Oregon as well as eastern Oregon. We feel sure that the effect that this trading has had on prices is solely responsible for this tragic situation.

Wish to mention that since writing the enclosed information that the onion market is more demoralized than ever. In fact Friday, March 9, they were able to drive March futures down to a new season low of the ridiculous low price of 25 cents, closing at 30 cents. This means only additional disaster for those onion growers who still have onions in parts of Oregon as well as throughout the entire Nation.

Track holdings in Chicago have been averaging well over 100 cars a day since February 27 at which time they started to arrive in Chicago to be delivered on March contracts March 1.

I understand that the mercantile exchange is in the process of making certain changes in their contracts for future trading, but this is not what the onion growers want. They want this onion trading completely abolished, which is in line with the King House bill 7920 which was introduced in the House January 2, 1956, and Dworshak-Welker Senate bill 3204 which was introduced in the Senate February 16, 1956. In order to help the onion growers of your State, as well as onion growers and the industry throughout the United States, we urge your support of these two bills when they come before the Senate. If this future trading is allowed to continue, it will mean only further disaster for the onion growers of the Nation. We are sure that the passage of these two bills will help tremendously in stopping this decline in farmers' income.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. BURNS.

TRADING ONION FUTURES VERSUS SALE OF PHYSICAL ONIONS

As you know, Hon. Congressman KING introduced House bill 7920 in the House January 3, 1956, which would abolish the trading in future onions on any board of trade in the United States, which would include the Chicago and New York Mercantile Exchanges. Also, on February 16, 1956, the Honorable Senators DWORSHAK and WELKER introduced Senate bill 3204 in the Senate asking for the abolishment of this future trading, or a very similar bill to the one introduced by KING.

This future trading was established some 14 or 15 years ago, and during the war years this trading was more or less limited due to ceiling prices. After the war we had 2 or 3 short crop years throughout the United States and this future trading did not cause any serious trouble. However, during the past 3 years the onion growers and the entire industry have been greatly affected because of heavy trading in onion futures.

In 1953, 113,143 cars of onions were traded, while the actual deliveries of these commitments throughout that year only amounted to 1,300 cars, or only about 1½ percent. In 1954 there were 136,885 cars traded, while there were only 1,475 cars actual deliveries, or just a fraction over 1 percent. In 1955 there were 147,835 cars traded with 2,397 cars actual deliveries, or about 1½ percent. During January 1956 there were 16,612 cars traded with only 173 delivered. We do not have the figures yet for the entire month of February trading. During the first 10 days of February there were 6,875 cars of onions traded, while there were actually only 100 cars delivered. It will be noted from these figures that this trading has increased immensely during the past 3 years. It is ridiculous to think that this many onions could be traded in 1 year, whereas statistics will show that there are only 15,000 to 16,000 cars of onions grown in the United States that are eligible for delivery on the exchange. This heavy trading can mean nothing but heavy track holdings during each option or delivery month, causing a very demoralized market.

Delivery months have been November, January, February, and March of each year. These heavy commitments, as mentioned, mean nothing but heavy track holdings during these delivery months. For example, November being a delivery month, for 18 days, taken from the United States Government track holdings report, there was an average of 104½ cars on track every day through those days. December was not an option or delivery month, and for 20 days during December the track holdings averaged 26½ cars per day. Through January 1956, this being a delivery month, the track holdings averaged 71⅓ cars per day throughout the entire month. February again being a delivery month, through February 10 track holdings averaged 70½ cars per day. On February 10 all February commitments had been cleaned up, so starting February 13 and through February 24 our track holdings immediately dropped materially and for the 9 days reported by the Market News Service during that period, track holdings averaged slightly under 30 cars per day. March, being another delivery month with heavy commitments, track holdings immediately started building up on February 27 to 29, averaging 96½ cars per day.

March 1 showed 107 cars on track. These track holdings were all on the Chicago market. The general trade figures that around 30 cars on track in Chicago is normal track holdings, but, when track holdings double and triple, it can mean nothing but a depressed and demoralized market. The Chicago market is a key market for the United States as cars can be diverted to most any market in the United States out of there on through rates. It is easy to understand that these heavy commitments on this future trading are entirely responsible for these heavy track holdings in the key market of the United States. Abnormal supplies mean only one thing—a demoralized market with disastrous prices.

The National Onion Association, which consists of many growers and members of the onion industry who were suffering greatly from effects of this unscrupulous trading on the future board, passed a resolution on December 2, 1955, at their annual meeting in Chicago, against the trading of onion futures and went on record asking that steps be taken to have this future trading abolished. The resolution was passed unanimously except for 24 votes against, which were by association members who were also members of the Chicago Mercantile Exchange. It was expected that these would vote against it. Since then, several other associations have passed similar resolutions such as the Malheur Oregon Onion Growers Association, the Southwest Idaho Growers Association, the New York State Farm Bureau, Owego Vegetable Growers Association, Oakfield & Elba Growers, the Colorado Potato Growers, Empire State Potato Club, and the Genesee-Orleans Vegetable Growers Cooperative Association. These associations represent 95 to 99 percent of the actual onion growers that have been growing onions for many years for a livelihood.

We feel sure that it can be proven that trading members or brokers on the Chicago Mercantile Exchange have financed growers or had onions grown by many new growers as well as additional acreage by old growers strictly for hedging purposes. These extra onions planted for hedging only have caused large surpluses of onion acreage to be planted during the past few years. The Chicago Mercantile Exchange and the New York Mercantile Exchange of course do not consume the actual onions. They have to be eventually consumed by the public.

We believe it developed in one investigation that they found 813 traders, both long and short positions, and it was found that only 15 traders, or 2 percent of the 813 traders, held 47 percent of all speculative hedges. Of these 15 traders, we understand 10 held over 200 contracts each, 5 of them held over 100 contracts each, and the remaining 798 traders, or 98 percent, held only 53 percent of all positions. Might mention that there are approximately 18,000 persons who are actually growing, packing, shipping, and selling onions, yet the commodity ex-

change authorities have found only 813 traders of which 15 traders, or 2 percent of them, controlled 47 percent of the trading. It is a sad story when 15 individuals can hold almost half of these contracts and destroy the efforts of the entire industry.

It has been the practice of the exchange to open trading on future onions several months in advance of delivery time and several months ahead of planting time. For instance, November futures for 1956 were opened for future trading December 1, 1955, which is 11 months ahead of delivery time and 4 to 5 months ahead of planting time.

It has been the practice in previous years to open January trading for the next year on February 1. However, this year as far as we know, this trading has not been opened. These contracts opening up for the following year so far ahead of planting time encourages extra acreages and this is especially true by those board members who have onions grown strictly for hedging purposes and large acreages mean surplus crops. We are sure that this hedging has not proven of any value whatsoever to the actual onion grower who has been growing onions for a livelihood.

It is the opinion of many that the exchange has resorted to fictitious advertising in trying to encourage the trading on this future trading on this future board. We point out as an illustration an ad which appeared in the Packer (a national trade and growers paper) and placed there by the Chicago Mercantile Exchange in the issue of January 28, 1956, quoting a grower by the name of John R. Jones, of the Jones Onion Farms, Smithville, N. Y. On investigation it developed that Smithville, N. Y., was a crossroads post office in the mountainous country in Jefferson County, New York State. It further developed that there was no such person as John R. Jones or the Jones Onion Farms in or around Smithville or in Jefferson County. This grower, according to the ad, was praising the use of the exchange for profits he had made by being able to hedge his onions, later selling his hedges and still sell the physical onions through market channels. Apparently the exchange was questioned about the correctness of the ad and A. M. Harris, of the Chicago Mercantile Exchange came out with a rebuttal statement in the next issue of the Packer stating that he simply used the name of Jones as a symbolic figure, the same as Santa Claus or Paul Bunyon and that he thought that anyone reading it would not figure it was an actual grower or actual transaction. We are sure that the average person reading the ad would think that it was taken from an actual transaction. The ad, of course, should have so stated, but it seems that they have had to stoop pretty low to resort to this kind of false and misleading information in order to bolster trading of onions on the exchange. It has been shown that statistics mean nothing as far as trading on future exchanges are concerned. In the year 1955 there was a surplus of onions planted in the United States, but due to heavy damage to the onion crop growing in Orange County, N. Y., flood and rain damage in western Oregon, and freezing damage in western Colorado, our actual production on this large acreage turned out to be considerably less than normal production. Yet by operations on the board, prices have been driven down to disastrously low levels and to a point much below production costs.

The National Onion Association has at various times during the past several years asked the exchange to make certain rules and changes whereby they thought the growers and industry might be able to survive and live with its existence. The exchange has at various times admitted that there were changes that should be made but they failed to make such changes.

Onions are a perishable item and since it has been proven that the future trading of these onions on the future board has been a great detriment to the onion grower and the onion industry as a whole, the growers of the Nation are requesting that this future trading be abolished. It has been found that it has no value whatsoever to the onion growers and the onion industry and, instead, it has disrupted orderly marketing causing a wide fluctuation in prices.

At this time the destiny of the onion grower lies in the hands of our Congress in passing legislation that will prohibit what is called vicious, unscrupulous trading by a comparatively few professional gamblers and manipulators. It is felt certain that additional hearings by the Agriculture Committee will demonstrate that this trading has been very disastrous for the onion growers throughout the United States. It is the earnest wish of the onion grower and members of the industry that King's House bill 7920 and the Dworshak-Welker Senate bill 3204 be expediently passed, both through the House and Senate without any amendments. It is a very serious problem now facing the onion growers. We sincerely urge all of our Senators and Representatives to support this legislation. We are sure that this will be one big way to help this gradual decrease in the farmer's income which has been declining at an alarming pace during the past couple of years.

Respectfully submitted in order that you may have some condensed facts with reference to the evils and effect that this future trading has on the onion growers of the Nation.

BURNS & BAY,
C. H. BURNS.

NAMPA, IDAHO.

RESOLUTION OF MALHEUR COUNTY ONION GROWERS ASSOCIATION

1. Whereas onions to be delivered on the mercantile exchange are permitted to be traded 5 months ahead of planting (11 months before delivery); and

2. Whereas this early trading tends to increase plantings which lead to increased production and depressing prices at harvesttime; and

3. Whereas most onion growers cannot use the futures market for hedging because they do not have sufficient funds available to put up the original margin and meet possible margin calls; and

4. Whereas it has been possible for a trader on the exchange to corner practically all physical onions delivered on the exchange, thus creating a depressing effect on the market; and

5. Whereas these practices in the futures trading of onions has disrupted the orderly marketing of the crops and resulted in financial loss to growers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Malheur County (Oreg.) Onion Growers Association take immediate action for national legislation to secure permanent abolishment of onions from futures trading.

Joe Y. Saito, President; Lawern King, Vice President; S. Muraham; A. E. Nagaki; Roy Luce; M. F. Barlon; Tah Kewahara; Wm. Hepworth; Warren Farmer.

ONTARIO, OREG., *December 20, 1955.*

MALHEUR COUNTY
ONION GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
Ontario, Oreg., February 4, 1956.

The Honorable RICHARD NEUBERGER,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Onion growers of Malheur County are very interested in measures to curb or prohibit the speculative trading of onion futures on the commodity exchanges. They have long felt that the speculative activity of the gamblers in these dealings worked to the detriment of the growers who were trying to sell some onions. This past marketing season has practically proven this to be the case, and growers in this district feel they have sacrificed 50 cents to $1 on every bag of the 1,800,000 bags sold from the 1955 crop.

It looks from here like time to do something, and that is the point of our letter to you. We understand legislation has been introduced into the House by Representative KARL KING that would ban futures trading in onions. Folks interested in the onion industry in western Idaho have asked Senators from there if they might not start similar action in the Senate. We do not know how much has been done, and hesitate to suggest to you what to do, but we do earnestly request your support toward the ultimate objective of taking these gamblers out of the onion business.

As a statement of our reasoning in this request I enclose a resolution passed some time ago by our growers association, and circulated within the industry. We would be glad to assemble further information on the problem for you if it would be helpful. We would greatly appreciate your taking whatever action you can see from there is feasible toward stopping the trading in onion futures.

Sincerely yours,

LAWERN KING,
Vice President.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY,
Washington, D. C., March 6, 1956.

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: There have been several developments in connection with futures trading in onions since Mr. Lawern King's letter to you of February 4. On February 23 the Chicago Mercantile Exchange amended its rules relating to the delivery of onions on futures contracts to provide a penalty of 25 cents per bag for onions delivered from warehouses in Chicago, and also tightening up the grading and delivery requirements in certain other respects. These amendments were apparently designed to at least partially meet the general feeling in the industry that large quantities of onions were pulled into Chicago for delivery on the futures markets with a consequent depressing effect on prices. Whether or not the changed rules will result in any improvement remains to be seen.

Onions were brought under the regulatory provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act, effective September 24, 1955. We have given much attention to futures trading in this commodity since that time and have about completed the compilation of material which we intend to present to the Commodity Exchange Commission with a recommendation for the establishment of limits on the size of speculative operations in onions similar to those which are in effect on grains, cotton, and certain other commodities.

There has been widespread dissatisfaction among producers and others connected with the onion industry over the extremely erratic price movements which have been registered on the futures markets. The Marketing Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture is currently conducting an inquiry into futures trading in onions and also in potatoes. Hearings relating to potatoes were held at Presque Isle, Maine, on December 6 and 7, 1955, and we understand there will be a hearing somewhere in the onion producing area within the next few weeks, perhaps to be followed by hearings in Washington. We believe that the information developed at these hearings, together with that which we expect to present in hearings on the proposed limits on speculative operations will be of value in considering the legislation mentioned by Mr. King to prohibit futures trading in onions.

In addition to the question of further legislation we are now investigating recent price movements in onion futures for the purpose of determining whether there is evidence of manipulation which could be the subject of action under the Commodity Exchange Act. The March 1956 future, which is the last old crop future for the current season closed yesterday at a price of 44 cents per 50-pound bag. This represented a decline since March 1 from 79 cents per bag and from a high of $2.75 per bag for this future which was registered last August 22. Trade interests indicate this decline may have been at least partly the result of large quantities of onions being brought into Chicago last November for the purpose of fulfilling futures contracts at that time. A substantial portion of these onions are still in store in Chicago warehouses and are said to be having a depressing influence on current futures contracts.

While these price movements are of course rather extreme, we are faced with the fact that onions have historically been subject to wide price swings even before there was futures trading in that commodity.

We can only take action under the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act if we find evidence of manipulation. You may be sure that if our current inquiry develops such evidence we will proceed as authorized by the act.

We appreciate your bringing Mr. King's comments to our attention and will be glad to furnish you or him with any further information available to us.

Sincerely,

RODGER R. KAUFFMAN,
Administrator.

STATE OF OREGON,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Salem, May 16, 1956.

Mr. RODGER R. KAUFFMAN,
Administrator, Commodity Exchange Authority, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KAUFFMAN: Leading onion growers and shipper in Malheur County of eastern Oregon and in the Willamette Valley here have called our attention to features of and facts surrounding futures trading in onions which they feel have depressing effects on the market and prices for their onions.

Directors of the Malheur Onion Growers Association advise us that some regulations on trading in onion futures were put into effect during the past year by the Chicago Mercantile Exchange, but that these have not accomplished the desired results. They state that some added restrictions are proposed for which they find no greater prospects for success.

Upon looking over the problems faced by Oregon growers and shippers in marketing their onions, we find considerable indication of detrimental effects of futures trading on their markets and on prices received, even though that trading is on onions grown in other States.

While futures trading may have a stabilizing effect on the marketing of many storable commodities, the reverse may be true of a perishable commodity with normal fluctuations in yearly plantings which can be increased by preseason futures trading.

Onions in my opinion are the most perishable commodity traded on the commodity exchanges. Any increase in United States plantings due to preseason futures trading accentuates the overall supply problem on this perishable commodity with a consumptive marketing period more limited than that of other commodities on the exchanges.

Prior to the advent of futures trading on onions, suplus production in 1 year normally was followed by smaller plantings and some market improvement in the next season or two. However, under futures trading this normal effect appears to have been disrupted by preseason contracts providing financing for plantings in addition to those which in any case would be and are planted for later marketing in the normal channels of trade.

The Malheur Onion Growers Association advises that they proposed last fall that the opening of futures trading be delayed until onion plantings were completed, but that you advised this would be beyond the legal authority of the Commodity Exchange Authority.

Figures for track holdings in Chicago this past season appear to bear out contentions of Oregon and Idaho growers and shippers that futures trading in onions has contributed to heavy truck loadings during option or delivery months compared to those during the nondelivery month of December. Oregon growers advise also that in an effort to discourage storage and additional speculation on onions delivered there, the Chicago Mercantile Exchange added a 25-cent markoff for onions delivered from storage there. It appears that instead of aiding market stability this may have increased sales and depressed prices on the Chicago market further during periods of heavy arrivals in option or delivery months.

With no relief apparent from those regulations which it has been found possible to apply to futures trading in onions, Oregon growers feel the only means of relief from its influence on plantings and surplus production and marketings is through the enactment of H. R. 7920 or S. 3204 to eliminate onions from futures trading. It appears to us that they have good grounds for this stand, and in consideration of the data and information provided as referred to herein, advice as to your position in this important matter will be much appreciated.

Thanking you in advance for your careful attention and consideration, we are,

Very truly yours,

PAUL T. ROWELL,
Chief, Division of Market Development.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO TOMORROW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

REVISION OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2875) to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement on the civil-service retirement bill, because I find a controversy exists in connection with this bill between the Federal employees now in active service and employees already retired.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two bills that really deal with this problem, which I am about to discuss, a bill known as S. 3725, introduced by my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER] for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. LAIRD, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. PASTORE; and the second bill, S. 3731, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, for himself, Mr. JENNER, and Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I ask unanimous consent that the bills be printed at this point in my remarks, because what I shall have to say will relate to those bills.

There being no objection, the bills were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[S. 3725, 84th Cong., 2d sess.]

Be it enacted, etc., That (a), subject to the provisions of section 2, the annuity of any employee who, before the date of enactment of this act, was retired and is receiving or entitled to receive an annuity under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, shall be increased by $100 plus $10 for each 2 full months elapsed between the commencing date of the annuity and the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That such increase in annuity shall not in any case exceed $300.

(b) Subject to the provisions of section 2, the annuity of any survivor, except a child covered by subsection (c), who, on the date of enactment of this act is receiving or is entitled to receive an annuity under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, based on the service of a former employee, shall be increased by $80.

(c) Subject to the provisions of section 2, the annuity of any child who, on the date of enactment of this act, is receiving or is entitled to receive an annuity under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, based on the service of his parent, shall be increased by $50.

SEC. 2. No increases in annuities shall be payable under section 1 of this act until, and except to the extent that, an appropriation made for the specific purpose of paying such increases is available for such purpose. Any such increase shall become effective on the first day of the first month for which such appropriation is available, and shall terminate on the last day for which such appropriation is available.

SEC. 3. Section 8 (d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by striking out the next to the last sentence in paragraph (1) thereof.

[S. 3731, 84th Cong., 2d Sess.]

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the annuity of any employee who, before the date of enactment of this act, was retired and is receiving or entitled to receive an annuity from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, shall be increased, effective on the first day of the second month following the enactment of this act, by $100 plus $10 for each 2 full months elapsed between the commencing date of annuity and the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That such increase in annuity shall not in any case exceed $300.

(b) The annuity of any survivor of such retired employee, except children covered by subsection (c) of this section, who, on the date of enactment of this act is receiving or is entitled to receive an annuity based on the service of a former employee, shall be increased, effective on the first day of the second month following the enactment of this act, by $80.

(c) The annuity of any child of such retired employee who, on the date of enactment of this act, is receiving or is entitled to receive an annuity based on the service of his parent, shall be increased to $50, effective on the first day of the second month following the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That the annuity of each such child shall not at any time exceed $1,200 divided by the number of children then receiving annuity.

(d) The increases in annuity provided by this section shall be paid from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and shall terminate, without subsequent resumption, on June 30, 1959, or on an earlier date under any one of the following conditions, whichever may first occur:

(1) At the end of the second month following the third consecutive month for which

the Consumer's Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics is less than 169.9, the index for the month of April 1948. In the event that the Bureau of Labor Statistics revises the basis of calculating the Consumer's Price Index, it shall immediately furnish to the Commission a conversion factor designed to adjust to the new basis the index figures of 169.9 described herein, and such adjusted index shall be used for the purposes of this section.

(2) On June 30, 1958, unless an appropriation is made to the civil-service retirement and disability fund in the applicable annual appropriation act for the fiscal year 1959, or in any prior appropriation act, for the specific purpose of compensating said fund for the cost, as determined by the Commission, of increases provided by this section during the fiscal years 1958 and 1959.

(e) The widow or widower of any retired employee mentioned in the first paragraph of section 8 (a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, who died prior to February 29, 1948, or the widow or widower of any retired employee mentioned in the third paragraph of such section 8 (a) who died prior to April 1, 1948, if such widow or widower is not entitled to an annuity under any other provision of such act and has not remarried, shall be entitled to receive an annuity equal to one-half of the annuity of her husband or his wife, but not to exceed $600 per annum. Any annuity granted under this subsection shall commence on the first day of the month following the month in which application therefor is filed with the Civil Service Commission, and shall cease upon the death or remarriage of the annuitant.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 8 (d) (1) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by striking out: "Such increase in annuity shall not exceed the sum necessary to increase such annuity, exclusive of annuity purchased by voluntary contributions under the second paragraph of section 10 of this act, to $4,104."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall take effect on the first day of the second month following the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, these two bills seek to do justice to a group of people in our citizenry who have some justice coming, namely, the annuitants, the retired civil-service employees. There is not any doubt about the fact that they have been placed at a great economic disadvantage. After all, the annuitant dollar, the retirement dollar, which they obtained when they first went into retirement, was worth much more than the dollar is worth today, so far as the cost of living is concerned.

So what do these retired employees have to say to us? They are saying, with complete justice, in my opinion, that they are entitled to some consideration in any retirement act, which would at least give them a more adequate retirement allowance than they get under the present arrangement.

I cannot furnish any better proof of that than a letter, which I shall read shortly, which I received from Mr. Clarence G. Davis, secretary-treasurer of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees, Oregon chapter.

In an attempt to do economic justice to them, my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER], with the cosponsors of the bill I have already enumerated, introduced in the Senate, on April 24, S. 3725, seeking to increase the retirement benefits for these already retired employees. It happens that section 2 of the bill is the section which has created some controversy among the retired employees, and I wish to read the language:

No increases in annuities shall be payable under section 1 of this act until, and except to the extent that, an appropriation made for the specific purpose of paying such increases is available for such purpose. Any such increase shall become effective on the first day of the first month for which such appropriation is available, and shall terminate on the last day for which such appropriation is available.

The Carlson bill—and I want to say I may vote for the Carlson bill when the debate is over—seeks to have the increase in payments to the already retired employees come out of the retirement fund itself. The retired employees prefer that, as will be seen from the correspondence I shall read, to the provision of Senate bill 3725 which will require a special appropriation. Also, the Carlson bill makes provision for the widows of retired employees. I certainly think that any measure we pass, whether Senate bill 3725 or Senate bill 3731, should clearly have in it a provision carrying out the principle of the Carlson bill in respect to widow allowances, because I think we have been very parsimonious. I think we have not been fair and just to the widows of retired civil-service employees.

I want the RECORD this afternoon to show that, I am advised by the sponsors of Senate bill 3725, the reason for calling for a special appropriation is the legislative reason that the probabilities of obtaining at this session of Congress the passage of a bill calling for benefits to come out of the existing retirement fund are not good. This is a delicate matter, but I never hesitate to discuss delicate legislative matters when there is a conflict among groups.

Mr. President, there is no question about the fact that the active civil-service employees today are in opposition to any retirement bill which would seek to lay a heavier charge on the existing retirement fund. I have asked them, as I want the RECORD to show, this question: "Are you showing the appreciation that you ought to show to the already retired civil-service employees for the great service they have rendered you in the past in getting on the statute books, in the first instance, provision for civil-service retirement benefits?"

I wish to say to the active civil-service employees that it is very easy to take the position that our retired civil-service employees are somewhat free riders, when now they ask to have additional benefits paid out of the retirement fund, because at the present time they are not paying into that retirement fund.

I wish to say to the active civil-service employees that they should face the fact that in years gone by, the group of civil-service employees now retired made the great legislative fight, in the first instance, for retirement-benefits legislation.

So, Mr. President, I think every reasonable effort should be made by the Congress at this session to provide the retired civil-service employee with increases in their benefits, including a provision for widow benefits. Whether that can be done under the existing retirement fund, or whether it has to be done by special legislation by way of appropriation, only time will tell. But I want the RECORD to show that so far as I am concerned, as a Member of the Senate, I shall try to work out, either by way of amendment to the pending measure or by way of quick action on newly proposed legislation, a legislative provision which will do justice to civil-service employees who already are retired.

At this point I wish to read into the RECORD the letter to which I have previously referred. I received the letter from Mr. Clarence Davis, under date of May 5. His letter reads as follows:

OREGON FEDERATION OF CHAPTERS,
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
RETIRED CIVIL EMPLOYEES,
Portland, Oreg., May 5, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Oregon Federation of Chapters, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, met in annual convention at Eugene, Oreg., on May 4, 1956, and adopted the following motion:

"That the Oregon Federation of Chapters, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, meeting in third annual convention at Eugene, Oreg., on this 4th day of May 1956, does hereby endorse Senate bill 3731, introduced in the 84th Congress, 2d session, by Senator CARLSON, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and the secretary of this federation is hereby instructed to communicate this action to the president of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and to the two United States Senators from Oregon, and to all of the Members of Congress from Oregon in the United States House of Representatives, with the request that such Senators and Representatives do their utmost to have said bill, S. 3731, enacted into law."

This action was taken after thorough study of the two bills, S. 3725, introduced by Senator NEUBERGER (for himself, yourself, and other Senators), and S. 3731. We feel that section 2 of S. 3725 utterly defeats the purpose of the proposed legislation, rendering the bill but an empty gesture. We believe that the men and women who have been retired from the Federal Government service and who have contributed to the civil service retirement and disability fund throughout the years, and have a sort of contract with the Government to the effect that the establishment of said retirement act is part and parcel of remuneration for services rendered by them, are entitled to receive annuities therefrom in full dollar value—not a depreciated dollar. We also believe that an appropriation to implement S. 3725 (if enacted) would have very little chance of enactment by an economy-minded Congress and administration.

In addition, we are mindful of the injustice that has been done widows of retired employees who died prior to February 29, 1948, and of those who died prior to April 1, 1948, by not providing any survivor annuities for them, when in many cases their husbands served 40 years, or more, faithfully, giving the best years of their lives in Government service. We want to have this omission corrected. S. 3731 does provide a very moderate annuity for them.

Sincerely yours,
CLARENCE G. DAVIS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

I shall omit the last paragraph of the letter, because it does not deal with

either Senate bill 3731 or Senate bill 3725.

Mr. President, I do not share the conclusion that Mr. Davis and his associates have reached, namely, that an approach by way of an appropriation renders Senate bill 3725 an empty gesture. If I had thought so, my name would never have gone on the bill in the first place; and if my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER] had thought so, the bill would never have been introduced in the first place, because the Senators from Oregon do not engage in empty gestures. But there can be among us an honest difference of opinion as to the legislative strategy, as to whether we have a better chance of getting economic justice for the retired employees by way of a special appropriation of funds to be added to the retirement fund for civil service employees, or by way of the approach in the Carlson bill, namely, to have the benefits paid out of the retirement fund already in existence.

I want the RECORD to show that so far as my personal conclusion is concerned, I have to be shown two things: first, whether the present retirement fund is adequate to meet the needs of the employees who already are retired; second, whether the employees who already are retired have in the fund an equity for an amount over and above the amount of money to which they were entitled at the time when they retired.

In my judgment, one of the strongest points Mr. Davis makes in his argument is based on the fact that the dollar has depreciated; that the employees who already have retired actually put into the fund, over the years during which they made payments, dollars worth more than the dollars they are getting back today, and that in a sense that fact creates an equity on their part for an additional amount out of the existing fund.

I bring that out because it is a point which I hope will be discussed by the members of the committee who are certainly much better versed in this subject, as members of the committee, than I have been able to become as a result of any study of it to date.

I do not agree with Mr. Davis and his associates that there is little or no chance of having S. 3725 passed by way of an additional appropriation. I refuse to believe that my colleagues in the Senate would be unwilling to pass a bill which would do justice to the people already retired, who have been in the Government service. At least I want to try it. I say to those employees that if the legislative situation makes it clear that there is no hope, they will find the senior Senator from Oregon then proposing another approach to the problem.

I also wish to say, as I pointed out to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] this afternoon in the conference I had with him, that I think it is very important, in the debate on the retirement bill, that we have a full discussion of the money in the fund, and the adequacy of that money to meet the needs of the retired employees, as well as a full discussion of whatever equity the retired employees may have in that fund, in view of the fact that over a period of years they paid into it dollars which were worth much more than a dollar is worth today.

Also I wish to say for the RECORD that in my discussions in the cloakrooms this afternoon I found very little support for adding to the pending measure, S. 2875, any amendment which would take care of the needs of the retired employees. The consensus of opinion among the colleagues with whom I have talked seems to be that it should be done by way of a separate piece of legislation. I have gone to the chairman of the committee, and I have been told by him that there is no question about the fact that when S. 2875 is disposed of the committee will give early consideration to hearings on both S. 3725 and S. 3731, the Neuberger bill and the Carlson bill.

I wish to make clear to the retired employees that what I shall do is to work for a final piece of legislation aimed at giving those retired employees, in this session of Congress, the economic benefits to which I think they are entitled. If it develops that S. 3725 is the bill which will receive the greatest amount of support in the Senate, I shall offer—if it is not offered by the committee as a result of the committee hearings—an additional section to the bill, which would provide benefits, as does the Carlson bill, for the widows.

I also wish to say to the active civil service employees, who, I am informed, are in opposition to any additional funds being paid out of the retirement fund to the retired employees, that they will have to assume the burden of proof, in my judgment, for their position that we should not seek to be of some further assistance to employees already retired.

I understand that S. 2875 would increase the payments on the part of the active employees from 6 percent to 7 percent. In my judgment, what we ought to do, as a Congress, is to add to those payments an out-and-out appropriation by Congress to take care of the employees who have already retired. I think those employees are entitled to such treatment, and I think such a course of action would remove the entire controversy as to whether or not we are discriminating unfairly against either the active employees or the retired employees. We, as a Congress, ought to face up to the fact that the existing fund apparently is not sufficient, without an additional appropriation, to take care of the retired employees to the extent I think they ought to be taken care of.

I have made this statement for the RECORD because I want retired employees to know that, although I have cosponsored S. 3725, and still stand on my cosponsorship of S. 3725, that does not mean that I would not look with favor on any modification of S. 3725 which would arrive at a satisfactory solution of this problem.

Once again we in the Senate find ourselves on this issue, in the middle, between two groups of employees who have not gotten together themselves in a satisfactory adjustment of their differences. Therefore there falls upon us the duty to devise the most equitable program possible.

If it develops that S. 3731 is the program we should undertake in this session of Congress, I will not hestitate to vote for it merely because one group of employees happens to be against it. If, on the other hand, S. 3725, or a modification of it, is the approach we should adopt, I will not hesitate to vote for it merely because one group is of the present opinion that it constitutes an empty gesture. I deny that.

In my opinion, the soundest approach would be by way of an additional appropriation, recognizing the obligation that we owe to the retired employees and to their widows.

I have made this statement because tomorrow in the debate I intend to ask the chairman of the committee—and I told him so before he left the Chamber, and he said he would be very delighted to discuss the subject with me tomorrow—a series of questions involving S. 2875, as to why S. 2875 does not contain any provisions with respect to the retired employees; and also questions dealing with the question of how best to take care of the retired employees in connection with providing them the additional benefits they need.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a series of communications which I have received from retired employees in Oregon dealing with the problems I have just discussed.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 16, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

HON. WAYNE MORSE: Greetings and salutations. Many thank for all the correspondence I received from your office this past month or so. Last time I wrote you for the support of S. 3725. Somebody goofed on that one. Now we are asking for your support of Senator CARLSON'S bill, S. 3731. We are told that this bill is more encouraging to us and that will bring the increases this year if brought out of committee. We think that you will be able to muster all the force required in that direction.

Read an article in the paper where some young blood organization in Wisconsin endorsed Adlai for President and Wayne for Veep. Those are my sentiments too. Anyway we are sure of enough votes for you, whichever position you go after.

Thanking you for all past favors, I remain,
Yours truly,

VICTOR B. GOTHE.

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 17, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

We have just received word that bill S. 3731 has been introduced and has favorable chances of passing. This increase to our annuity will come out of our own retirement fund and does not require special appropriations.

Will you support this bill, S. 3731?

Respectfully yours,
ZELLA Z. SCHLOTTMANN.

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 18, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully request your vote and support S. 3731 for annuity increases from our own retirement fund.

HARRY J. STRAWBRIDGE,
Portland Chapter, National Association Retired Civil Employees.

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 9, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thanks for your recent letter and a copy of bill S. 3725 introduced by Senator NEUBERGER, yourself and others.

But I don't like it personally for it provides for no appropriation of cash to help us out in the way we need to be helped.

I understand another bill, introduced by Senator CARLSON, S. 3731, covers practically the same ground but does provide that immediate payments be made from the immense surplus now on hand in the pension fund. Thats what we want and was what the NARCE amendment to S. 2875 provided for.

If you really want to help out myself and the tens of thousands other retirees also the 20,000 widows and widowers (not now provided for) please work for S. 3725.

Thanking you, I am

STEPHEN A. ALLEN.

SHERWOOD, OREG., *May 8, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR FRIEND AND BENEFACTOR: I received you very fine letter of April 26, and thank you very much. I appreciate, as do thousands of others, the fine help you have rendered us in the past and are now doing for NARCE. I would like to do my little bit in helping retain you as our Senator from Oregon and any boost I can give you will be a great pleasure to me.

I would like permission to send a copy of your April 26 letter to each one of the chapters in Oregon.

Thanking you very much I am,

ALFRED G. LEE,

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 15, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your letter of April 26 with copy of S. 3725. Be assured that I appreciate your keeping me in mind in connection with this matter which is of vital interest to me.

Those of us who are interested consider that S. 3725 is a step in the right direction but that it does not go far enough as we feel that section 2 renders it innocuous.

The matter was discussed at the NARCE meeting May 9 in comparison with S. 3731 which would make the increase payable from the civil service retirement fund. It is our information that the latter is sufficiently sound to carry the increase without a special appropriation and, of course, would be much more acceptable to those on the retirement rolls.

Encouraged by the last paragraph of the above-cited letter, I am asking that you use your best efforts to secure enactment of S. 3731 as soon as reasonably possible.

Cordially yours,

LEROY A. PALMER.

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 17, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: May I ask you to support and work for Senator CARLSON'S bill, S. 3731? This would be effective this year with payment from civil service retirement fund.

Thanking you for your courtesy.

Very truly yours,

Miss DORA CLAPPER.

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 16, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As our senior Senator from Oregon, will you please help the old retirees here to get an increase in annuities, by working for the passage of S. 3731, or 3725, amended by the Senate committee. The NARCE has been working hard for this and we hope, with your influence along with Senator NEUBERGER, you can put it through.

My husband was struck blind while a deputy clerk in Judge Solomen's office, and after many loyal years for the Government, now only gets $65 per month, and it's not enough to try to live on, as you well know. We're not complaining. We had a home to sell, but there are so many others who don't even have that. We are told that the money is held by the civil service retirees fund, and so with proper legislation it can be paid out this year. Even a little will help.

This is election day here, we just came back from voting. I hope it all turns out all right.

We trust you will have success with the bill. Thanking you most kindly, and the best of luck (if you put this over, it will help you a lot in Oregon).

Kindest regards,

SALLY P. GATES
(Mrs. Robert J.).

EUGENE, OREG., *May 16, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building.

DEAR MR. MORSE: We wrote you some time ago asking you to again help us get a better increase this year. We know you are a very busy man, and didn't expect an answer soon. Now, we are going to ask you to please support the bill S. 3731, else help get the bill S. 2875 passed promptly. Those bills as you know, would be paid from the civil-service retirement fund. We do need the increase this year. There's been illness in the family.

With sincere thanks.

Mr. and Mrs. GEO. G. RODMAN.

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 21, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The plight of the retired civil service employee is deplorable. Little has been done to alleviate his condition. His earning days are past, he is faced with the same high and rising cost of living as is everyone.

Senator CARLSON has introduced S. 3731. This bill covers annuity increases in accordance with the amendments that we proposed on S. 3725. It would become effective this year as no special appropriation is required as the proceeds will come from the civil-service retirement fund.

May I ask you in the name of justice to the retired civil service employee to lend this bill (S. 3731) your wholehearted support?

Sincerely yours,

JOS. B. BRADY.

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 16, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator for Oregon.

DEAR SIR: It has been asked of me that I write you and call your attention to the following: Senator CARLSON has introduced bill S. 3731. This bill is a forward step, encouraging to retired members. It covers annuity increases. It would be effective this year, as payments for this year would be made from civil-service retirement fund. This bill appears to be satisfactory and warrants your strong support. I have further been asked to urge you to work for this bill that would provide payment from our own retirement fund.

Dear Mr. WAYNE MORSE, please do something. Every day wages and living goes up, it is no sinecure to make both ends meet. For myself I don't want nothing. I am 82 years old, and due for the call of death any time. But there are others.

Sincerely yours,

P. J. HANSEN,
Lieutenant Commander, USNR
(honorably retired).

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 17, 1956.*

DEAR MR. MORSE: What do you think of Senator CARLSON'S bill for retired Federal employees, S. 3731? Can you tell me what is in the minds of our legislatures when they are against or indifferent to such help to these older folks?

Have they forgotten their own generous raise to themselves to meet the higher living costs?

You are doing all right, we think. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. H. R. RICHARDS.

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 17, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

FRIEND: On behalf of S. 3731, introduced by Senator CARLSON, we are asking for your favorable support. You have been very kind to our group of retirees, and we're not forgetting that tomorrow at our primary election.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN S. and Mrs. CLAUDIA DAWSON.

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 17, 1956.*

The Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Please get behind S. 3731 (introduced by Senator Carlson). This bill covers annuity increases in accordance with the amendments proposed by the National Association Retired Civil Employees. The bill would be effective this year, as the payment for this year would be made from the Civil Service Retirement Fund, and does not require that a special appropriation be obtained to cover our increase, until later years.

This bill is satisfactory to us and we urge your strong support, of this bill or one like it, that would provide payment from our own retirement fund. At last accounts, our two Senators were supporting S. 3725, but section 2 of that bill requires separate appropriation bill to pay the increase, something NARCE thinks is impossible of accomplishment this year.

Will appreciate your strong support of S. 3731 as above.

Very sincerely,

BLANCHE SIMMONS,
Member, Chapter 29, NARCE.

THE LINVILLE AGENCY,
Hood River, Oreg., May 17, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The purpose of this letter is to urge your active support of pending legislation designated as S. 3731, providing for an increase in annuity payments to retired civil service employees.

As a retired Government worker, I am more fortunate than many in that I have some other income than my retirement pay, but I am sure you fully realize the very difficult situation many retirees face with living costs as they are at this time, because of the low purchasing power of dollars.

I am fully aware of the many pressures for the Congress to "do something" about the problems confronting people today, and as a group I am also sure civil service retirees are most appreciative of the increases in retirement pay that has been provided in recent years, but now, again, the need is great. We ask you support of the pending bill.

With best wishes and kind regards to yourself and Mrs. Morse, I am,

Most sincerely,

CLYDE LINVILLE.

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 17, 1596.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I hope you will give your support to S. 3731, introduced by Senator CARLSON. This bill provides increased annuities to retired Federal employees in line with increases granted active employees, and payable from the civil service retirement fund.

Very sincerely,

M. L. MERRITT.

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 18, 1956.*
The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am the widow of Ben A. Campbell, retired superintendent of mails of the Portland post office, who passed away in 1946 after serving 46 years in the United States mail service.

I have never received any annuity. I hope this bill, S. 3731, will include the widows whose husbands passed away prior to 1948.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. BEN A. CAMPBELL,
Member of Chapter No. 29, National Association of Retired Civil Employees.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on April 9, 1956, I addressed a letter to each member of the committee. I wish the RECORD to be perfectly clear, so that the retired employees will know the position I have taken on this question. I read the letter which I sent to each member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate, under date of April 9, 1956:

DEAR SENATOR: It is my understanding that on April 11 the Retirement Subcommittee of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which you are member, will vote on S. 2875 and on the amendments to it that have been offered.

I want to express to you my hope that the proposals to extend increases in retirement benefits to those presently retired will be approved. I am aware of the fact that retirees received an increase in their annuities last year; however, Congress did not include survivors' benefits in the increase, and the average annuity still amounts only to $1,600 a year, with no minimum. Half of all annuitants receive less than $100 a month, and half the survivors receive less than $50 a month. Surely you will agree that a decent living is just about impossible today on such meager amounts. I believe you will also agree that men and women who have spent their lives in the service of the United States Government deserve better treatment than that.

The National Association of Retired Civil Employees has proposed a series of amendments to extend moderate increases to all on the retired roll. I ask that they be given favorable consideration, and that improved benefits for retirees and survivors be added to S. 2875. The retirement fund appears well able to accommodate them, and while I appreciate that S. 2875 is aimed at improving benefits for those still employed by the Government, it is my hope that retirees and survivors will also be aided in their struggle to meet the cost of living.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. President, I also wish to read into the RECORD at this time a letter I wrote to a group of constituents under date of April 9, 1956:

DEAR SIR: Thank you very much for writing to me about S. 2875 and the amendments that have been proposed to include those already retired in the increases in retirement benefits. I am informed that the retirement subcommittee of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee will meet soon to vote on the provisions of S. 2875 and that the full committee will take it up immediatedly thereafter.

Because the retired employees received an increase in their annuities only recently, the extension of S. 2875 to them faces tough going. However, I feel personally that their retirement benefits do not enable them to maintain a decent living standard and that they are entitled to further increases. The average annuity for retirees amounts only to $1,600 a year and there is no provision for a minimum annuity. Congress did not make provision for survivors in last year's increase and I believe that retirees and survivors should be included in S. 2875.

I am going to discuss this matter with subcommittee members, and urge that they amend S. 2875 to provide additional increases for civil-service employees presently retired. These fine people who have worked for Uncle Sam are not receiving the retirement benefits they deserve, and I shall work for the most favorable treatment possible for them.

The bill requiring that salary increases for civil-service employees include increases in retirement benefits is before the House of Representatives. I believe we should include a statement of this principle in S. 2875, though it cannot be more than a declaration of intent, since this Congress cannot bind future Congresses to specific legislative provisions.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. President, in closing I wish to say that as of now I believe our best chance of getting needed economic benefits for the retired employees is by way of separate legislation.

If the information I received today proves to be the case tomorrow, there seems to be little chance of getting it done by way of an amendment to S. 2875, because the members of the committee with whom I have talked on the subject have said, "This is a bill that we intend to limit to so-called active civil-service employees, those presently in the employ of the Government, and who are presently paying a certain percentage of their salaries into the retirement fund."

The members of the committee with whom I have talked have also said that they agree with me that additional legislation is needed to meet the needs of the retired employees. I have the feeling that it will have to be by way of an equitable compromise or adjustment between S. 3725 and S. 3731.

To that end I shall devote my attention in the debate tomorrow and in the days to come to the further consideration of those two pieces of separate legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

RECESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 23, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 22 (legislative day of May 7), 1956:

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Frederick G. Hamley, of Washington, to be United States circuit judge, ninth circuit, vice Homer T. Bone, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 22, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. William H. Andrew, pastor, First Baptist Church, Bryan, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the Heavenly Father, ruler of the destinies of men and nations, we thank Thee for Thy love, Thy goodness to this Nation, and Thy blessings in giving each of us life for this one day. Grant that today may be blessed with the full realization of Thy presence, Thou living God.

May each citizen, in lowly estate and high office, be guided by Thy wisdom. May the decisions made today be according to Thy will. May the people of this Nation have courage to live as well as to die for that which is just and righteous today.

We pray for our President and for the humblest citizen. May Thy love reign worldwide. In our Lord's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 18, 1956:

H. R. 1488. An act for the relief of Mrs. Esther Reed Marcantel;

H. R. 1989. An act for the relief of George D. Hopper;

H. R. 2338. An act for the relief of Charles F. Bullette;

H. R. 2717. An act for the relief of Giles P. Fredell and wife;

H. R. 2736. An act for the relief of Roy M. Butcher;

H. R. 2924. An act for the relief of David J. Dazé;

H. R. 3526. An act for the relief of the estate of Neil McLeod Smith;

H. R. 3638. An act for the relief of Joseph H. Washburn;

H. R. 3639. An act for the relief of Ralph Bennett and certain other employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

H. R. 4051. An act to provide for the relief of certain Army and Air Force nurses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4536. An act for the relief of John J. Cowin;

H. R. 4634. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. George H. Cronin, United States Air Force;

H. R. 4902. An act for the relief of Martin F. Kendrigan;

H. R. 5495. An act for the relief of Arthur H. Homeyer;

H. R. 5633. An act for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr.;

H. R. 5787. An act to authorize settlement of claims for residential structures hereto-

fore erected at the expense of patients on the grounds of the Public Health Service Hospital, Carville, La.;

H. R. 5951. An act for the relief of Samuel E. Arroyo;

H. R. 6395. An act for the relief of Thomas W. Bevans and others;

H. R. 6622. An act for the relief of certain rural carriers;

H. R. 6769. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to increase the amounts authorized to be expended;

H. R. 7114. An act for the relief of Frank G. Gerlock;

H. R. 7513. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to grant an extension of time to the Matanuska Valley Lines, Inc., and to Russell Swank and Joe Blackard within which to apply for patent to certain lands in Alaska;

H. R. 8187. An act for the relief of Wright H. Huntley;

H. R. 8306. An act for the relief of Eugene Gardner, Byron M. Barbeau, John R. Reaves, and Jackson L. Hardy;

H. R. 8307. An act for the relief of Nathan A. Kahn.

H. R. 8308. An act for the relief of Arthur E. Weeden, Jr.;

H. R. 8310. An act for the relief of Chief Warrant Officer George C. Carter;

H. R. 8311. An act for the relief of Daniel O. Hulse, Jr.;

H. R. 8547. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y.";

H. R. 8807. An act to extend for an additional 3 years the time within which the State of Michigan may commence and complete the construction of certain projects heretofore authorized by the Congress; and

H. R. 9132. An act to provide for the approval of the report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project.

On May 19, 1956:

H. R. 2423. An act for the relief of the city of Sandpoint, Idaho;

H. R. 4633. An act for the relief of Crosse & Blackwell Co.;

H. R. 6706. An act for the relief of Gay Street Corp., Baltimore, Md.; and

H. R. 10004. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

On May 22, 1956:

H. R. 3738. An act for the relief of Roy M. Hofheinz and wife Irene.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1471. An act for the relief of William J. Robertson;

H. R. 1779. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Juniper division of the Wapinitia Federal reclamation project, Oregon;

H. R. 3054. An act for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives;

H. R. 4604. An act relating to the issuance of certain patents in fee to lands within the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 4656. An act relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina;

H. R. 5047. An act to increase the compensation of trustees in bankruptcy;

H. R. 5478. An act to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 5652. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army and Air Force, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6084. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians, California, to the Palm Springs Unified School District;

H. R. 6374. An act to repeal legislation relating to the Gallup-Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navajo Indian Reservation;

H. R. 6623. An act to amend the act of July 1, 1952, so as to obtain the consent of Congress to interstate compacts relating to mutual military aid in an emergency;

H. R. 6990. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America;

H. R. 7540. An act to provide for the sale of a Government-owned housing project to the city of Hooks, Tex.;

H. R. 8309. An act for the relief of Colonel Henry M. Zeller;

H. R. 8810. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, equip, maintain, and operate a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Miles City, Mont.;

H. R. 8904. An act to amend certain laws relating to the grade of certain personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps upon retirement;

H. R. 9207. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands;

H. R. 9257. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the punishment of persons who assist in the attempted escape of persons in Federal custody; and

H. Con. Res. 230. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on H. R. 5550 for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 483. An act to amend the Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947, as amended, so as to provide for appointment of doctors of osteopathy in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy; and

H. J. Res. 261. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to make such transfers of supplies and equipment as may be available to The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 510. An act for the relief of Mary A. Mouskalis;

S. 806. An act to amend sections 3182 and 3183 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to authorize the use of an information filed by a public prosecuting officer for making demands for fugitives from justice;

S. 875. An act for the relief of Angel Marie Olaeta-Goitia;

S. 1245. An act for the relief of Agnes V. Walsh, the estate of Margaret T. Denehy, and David Walsh;

S. 1273. An act to amend sections 1, 3, and 4 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 1637. An act to extend the time limit within which awards of certain military and naval decorations may be made.

S. 1895. An act for the relief of Anna Maria Fuller;

S. 1961. An act to provide for the conveyance of part of Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Colchester, Vt., to the State of Vermont, and for other purposes;

S. 2226. An act to authorize the Attorney General to dispose of the remaining assets seized under the Trading With the Enemy Act prior to December 18, 1941;

S. 2341. An act for the relief of Gertrude Heindel;

S. 2352. An act for the relief of Maj. Luther C. Cox;

S. 2379. An act to promote the fishing industry in the United States and its Territories by providing for the training of needed personnel for such industry;

S. 2690. An act for the relief of William G. Jackson;

S. 2722. A act for the relief of Fai Hoo;

S. 2930. An act for the relief of Eladio Ledesma-Gutierrez;

S. 2937. An act to increase from $50 to $75 a month the amount of benefits payable to widows of certain former employees of the Lighthouse Service;

S. 2967. An act to amend the act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568), and for other purposes;

S. 3011. An act for the relief of Chan Lee Nui Sin;

S. 3040. An act for the relief of Gertrud Charlotte Samuelis;

S. 3058. An act for the relief of Javier F. Kuong;

S. 3101. An act to authorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Crooked River Federal Reclamation project, Oregon;

S. 3147. An act for the relief of Elsie M. Kenney;

S. 3332. An act to amend the Employment Act of 1946, as amended;

S. 3412. An act to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, relating to war risk insurance for an additional 5 years;

S. 3547. An act to amend section 1 of the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 555), authorizing the sale of certain land by the Pueblos of San Lorenzo and Pojoaque;

S. 3844. An act to amend the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for urban renewal assistance to disaster areas;

S. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution to direct the Secretary of the Interior to determine the best means of eliminating the hazards within the city of Klamath Falls, Oreg., caused by a canal under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; and

S. Con. Res. 77. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of parts 6, 7, and 8 of the hearings on the study of the antitrust laws of the United States.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill, H. R. 10875, the farm bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

RED HAT DAY

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, approximately 1 year ago I addressed remarks to the House calling attention to the launching of a unique experiment in the State of Oregon known as Red Hat Day. At that time I described the objectives which this educational program hoped to achieve and suggested that the idea merited adoption by other States of the Union.

The suggestion for Red Hat Day originated with the Portland chapter of the division of Oregon, Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., and was officially adopted by the State of Oregon with sponsorship throughout the State by groups interested in conservation, recreation, and by numerous sportsmen's organizations. The general purposes were to promote better sportsmanship practices; prevent fires in timber and range area; encourage caution and safety in hunting; bring about better relationships between sportsmen and landowners; and to encourage observance of game laws.

The results of this experiment have just been made available in a report by the Governor's Red Hat Day committee. The value of the program is abundantly evident from the results which were achieved throughout the State. Enforcement officers of the game division of the Oregon State Police found fewer complaints regarding the conduct of hunters and there were fewer trespass complaints. In some instances, the no-trespassing notices in the local press were substantially reduced. The number of domestic animals killed during the hunting season was the smallest for any similar period on record within the State.

Violations of the game laws were fewer during the early days of the deer hunting season than for any similar period in recent years, although the number of hunters during the year increased by 6 percent.

The United States Forest Service reported about half the average number of fires known or assumed to have been started by hunters. The acres burned as a result of these fires was about one-ninth the previous annual average acreage.

Although more hunting accidents were reported in 1955 than for the previous year, the report indicates that hunters were more careful with firearms when actually hunting. Such accidents arising from individuals being mistaken for game were one-third to one-fourth of such percentages in recent years.

While much improvement can still be made over 1955, the desirability and benefits of the Red Hat Day program has been demonstrated. The public was made generally more aware of the seriousness of the problems facing hunters, landowners, and Government agencies. Succeeding years will bring further improvement as this program continues. Other States may well study the experience of Oregon for improving the protection of life and property and bringing about a higher regard for conservation activities and for the recreational facilities in those States.

INDIANA TOMATO AND VEGETABLE JUICE

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under the auspices of the Indiana Canners' Association and with the compliments of the Naas Foods, Inc., of Portland, Ind., I have the privilege of presenting cans of Indiana tomato juice and vegetable juice to all Members of the House of Representatives.

Indiana is justifiably proud of its canned foods and especially of its tomato products which are being shipped to all parts of the United States and to many foreign countries.

It was in Indiana where the first tomato juice was prepared and canned commercially approximately 30 years ago. It was in Indiana, likewise, where the process was developed for separating the color of tomatoes for juice purposes. Later it also was in Indiana where the homogenizing process was developed for the manufacture and canning of tomato juice.

The natural tang and taste of Indiana tomato juice is derived from the natural balance of chemicals in the Hoosier soil, and it is this genuine flavor that affords such a satisfying and healthful drink.

Indiana is one of the larges producers of tomatoes and tomato products in the United States. The Fifth Congressional District that I have the privilege to represent happens to have a great concentration of these tomato farms and canning factories producing tomato products. This industry provides employment and an economic livelihood for thousands of factory workers and farmers. Modern agricultural methods provide constantly improved tomatoes, and the sanitary and approved processing and canning plants combine in the continuous efforts to provide the public with these delectable Indiana tomato products.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. I want to congratulate my colleague upon this very fine endeavor and the effort to inform our colleagues of the House of the very fine products of our State of Indiana.

Mr. BEAMER. I thank the gentleman. I know tomatoes come from his district. All of you will enjoy the tomatoes that come from Indiana.

T. COLEMAN ANDREWS

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to call the attention of the Members of the House to a recent attack on the income tax in the U. S. News & World Report by T. Coleman Andrews, former Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Mr. Andrews, now employed by The American Fidelity & Casualty Insurance Co., against which company the Government has a $5 million income-tax claim pending, attacks in particular the effect of the income tax on high-income groups. This kind of an attack is valid and proper by any citizen but the persistent nature of this attack by a former Commissioner of the Service is certainly indiscreet and revolting.

The grave error in Executive decision was the administration's design in appointing a person to administer the tax laws of the land who did not believe in the law. This seems to be a basic policy of this administration. For the top job in the Housing and Finance Agency the administration selected the most ardent foe of public housing. It appears now that the Executive judgment in appointing T. Coleman Andrews as Commissioner of Internal Revenue was about as sound as would be the appointment of Khrushchev as Secretary of the United States Department of Defense.

T. Coleman Andrews has used his title as former Commissioner of Internal Revenue to undermine public respect for our income-tax laws. His persistent attacks raise grave doubt as to the quality of his administration of the laws which he so vehemently attacks now. T. Coleman Andrews should be called before congressional committees and give the benefit of his judgment and opinion so that they can be placed on the record. Then every phase of his work should be carefully reviewed to see how extensively his opposition to income taxes for the high-income groups was manifested through his administration acts.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to apprise the Members of the House of the fact that the conferees on the farm bill have just come to a unanimous agreement and we hope to have the bill before the House tomorrow. We also hope that there is not going to be any fight on it. The bill is not what anybody wants. Therefore it must be a pretty good bill.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the

Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to not more than 1 hour, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] and one-half by myself.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I had understood that there was to be 1 hour on each side. That was the understanding which I had.

Mr. CANNON. In view of the insistence of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], Mr. Speaker, I amend my request. I ask unanimous consent that general debate on this bill be limited to not more than 2 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11319, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the committee submits to the House today the 12th appropriation bill of the session. It is a rather notable bill in that it establishes something like five exceptional records.

In the first place, it is presented considerably earlier than this bill was presented in the last Congress.

As a matter of fact, all appropriation bills have now been submitted with the exception of the legislative bill, which has already been "marked up," the mutual assistance appropriation bill, on which we are awaiting the action of the legislative committee, and the final deficiency appropriation bill. All of the annual supply bills are far in advance of the general appropriation bills in any Congress since the Congress of 1950, when we submitted them in a one-package bill and when we were far in advance of previous records. And what was more important, saved more money than had ever been saved relatively before or since.

Another feature of our appropriation bills this year is that all of them, with the exception of one bill, are below the budget estimates. In past years we have always taken pride, and the efficiency of a subcommittee chairman was always judged by the amount he cut the estimates.

However, that appears to be no particular cause for self congratulation this time for we also find that all but 2 of these 12 bills are above the appropriation for the current year. Of course, that is the real criterion of economy. Not a comparison with the budget estimates but a comparison with same for the current fiscal year.

And as further cause for regret—and directly connected with our failure to cut below current expenditures—I am sorry to have to report that in these bills we break another record in that we have made fewer cuts and saved less money—a smaller percentage—in these 12 appropriation bills, than has ever been saved on similar bills in recent years—as a matter of fact—since I can remember. It is a real record but one of which we can hardly be proud. The total amount we have actually saved on the bills that have been submitted to the House and an estimate on the remaining three bills aggregates less than half a billion dollars. Out of a budget of more than $50 billions we have saved only half a billion dollars, the lowest retrenchment for many years.

We have in fact been able to reduce the budget only a little more than 1 percent of all of the more than $50 billions which have passed through our hands, and that is all the more impressive in view of the fact that the budget this year is the loosest budget, it is the largest peacetime budget ever submitted to Congress by any administration in the history of the United States.

I noticed in one of the leading editorials in this morning's Washington Post a very interesting comment on this situation in which they make this statement:

> The Federal budget will be in balance when the fiscal year ends June 30.

It is in balance for the first time in the last 5 years and for the fourth time since the Hoover depression.

The editorial then goes on to say:

> This is a notable achievement for which the administration deserves much credit. It has taken a herculean effort to bring the budget into balance.

I regret I have to dissent from both those statements, because this budget has not been brought into balance by any act of economy on the part of the administration at all. This administration has been spending, and is now spending more money than ever spent by any administration in time of peace.

And the editorial contradicts itself in the next paragraph when it says:

> Government expenditures have been increasing in the last year.

That is true, and Government expenditures have been increasing in the last year.

It further says:

> In January expenditures were estimated in advance at $64.3 billion; now the estimate is $65.9 billion.

They have not only spent more money than has ever been spent before, but they are spending it at a progressive ratio. They are spending more than they expected to spend last January.

This expenditure has been in the face of the fact that we have had the largest revenues in our history. The revenues this year have been in excess of the revenues of any previous year in the peacetime history of the United States or in the history of any other country in the annals of time. That is what has balanced the budget. It is not economy. It is not a decrease in expenditures. It is through no effort on the part of the administration. It is solely due to the unexpected increase in revenues.

That increase in revenues is due to the increase in population and to the great prosperity of business and I am willing to make any concession on that count to the administration. But the glamor of that prosperity is dimmed by the destitution of the American farmer, the hardest workers and most indispensable class in America today.

If the farmer had his old time purchasing power, if he had the money he has honestly earned but not received, they would be recruiting more labor in Detroit instead of slowing production and discharging workmen. Every farmer in America needs a new car—and needs new buildings on his farm. The slowdown which has overtaken the automobile industry and the housing industry and is already spreading to national industry generally is due to this administration. No nation can live and prosper half bloated and half busted.

The high revenues which have balanced the budget are temporary. These money trees cannot bloom indefinitely, the few at the top enriched at the expense of the farmer at the bottom. And the policy of the administration in increasing expenditure when they should be retrenching and in increasing its budget simply because more money is coming in is heading toward a day of reckoning.

The administration has not contributed a dollar's worth of economy or retrenchment to the balancing of the budget. The truth is that whereas the surplus by which the budget will be balanced the 30th of June next is $1,800 million it should have been balanced by billions of dollars that are being sunk without a trace.

And the Congress has been of no help whatever in that respect. Congress is not cutting the budget estimates. Congress is not economizing on its own account. And this bill is an example.

As we witness the stampede across the adjoining corridor to the Committee on Appropriations and listen to the demands recorded in these voluminous hearings for millions of dollars for States and districts, we like to remember that day in 1792 when Washington rode horseback from Mount Vernon to this Hill to select the location of the Capitol Building. It was perhaps a junketing trip but he paid his own expenses. And when the blueprints were being drawn Thomas Jefferson came to this Hill and said to the architect "I want to give something to the United States. I want to give something for this Capitol Building. And the Architect said Mr. Jefferson here in the foyer at the front entrance are six stone columns. You can give those if you wish. And Jefferson out of his slender purse gave the six columns which you see today as you enter through that foyer. Washington refused to accept pay as President. Franklin refused to accept money due him. Many patriots of that day contributed whenever possible and as much as possible to this wonderful new Government—this Government of free men. Even in our

day Herbert Hoover refused to accept pay as President.

They wanted to give something to the United States.

Today everybody seems to be trying to get all they can out of the United States. And they beleaguer the Committee on Appropriations like packs of wolves.

Here we have a bill giving something to everybody. And I voted for it. A year ago we thought we had a very reasonable bill. I collaborated with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and the committee reported out a bill we thought was liberal.

But the boys held a little caucus over in the caucus room in the Old House Office Building. Both sides of the aisle got together and they agreed "You scratch my back and I'll scratch your back," and they came over here and ran over us like a bunch of wild steers. You know, 2 or 3 experiences are enough. So I am going to "jine 'em." I am going to vote with them today. Let us make this bill so bad that the people will finally take note.

But I seriously doubt whether that can ever be accomplished now that the tiger has his taste of blood. What we really need is a complete revamping of the budgetary laws of the Nation which will protect Congressmen from themselves. It can be done but I doubt whether the professional spenders will ever permit it to be done.

It is more serious than we realize and it is becoming more serious every year. When men organize and gang up on the committee and the Treasury they confess the poverty of their cause. If their project had any merit it would not be necessary to trade and traffic.

We do not inveigh against any man in this House, or any man to be in this House in the future, for coming before the Committee on Appropriations and requesting an appropriation for a project in his district. That is what he is here for. He is merely performing his duty to his constituents who send him here. But I do say the rest of us ought to consider every application made by everybody from every district and say, "Now, my boy, you are on the right track, but let us be a little reasonable. We are going to have to cut you down a little bit to serve the whole country and put what little taxes are paid in where it will best benefit the most people."

Now, in this connection, may I refer to another article in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald. This article is about and by the Vice President of the United States, Vice President NIXON, for whose philosophy all of us on this side have the highest regard. Here is what Vice President NIXON said; and I want to commend it to the Members of this House and the Members of the other House and to the people of the United States as words of the soundest wisdom in this time of great national peril. The Communists have more planes than we have. They have better planes than we have. They are making them faster than we are. If anybody has any doubt about what would happen to this country if one of those hydrogen bombs exploded in the Pacific a couple of days ago should strike this city, he is certainly a man with little perspective or imagination. One bomb would wipe out this Government right now, and destroy the District of Columbia and parts of Maryland and Virginia with it.

Here is what the Vice President said:

> The Communists have said over and over again that they may not have to defeat the United States and the western nations in war; that they may be able to force us to destroy ourselves from within in our efforts to defend ourselves from without, that they may force us to spend ourselves into bankruptcy.

But I want you to remember, Mr. Chairman, that when that time comes, when Russian planes are bombing every major city in the United States what comfort it will be to remember that in our home districts great expenditures of money have gilded forgotten rivers and therby made Congressmen famous for life.

In this bill, we have something for everybody; we have something for every section in the United States, and the appropriations that are made in this bill are but the beginnings, the entering wedges, which will cause this bill to cost us increasingly more every year until the bulk of the projects are completed. Bills like this are increasing inflation.

Here is a tabulation showing that the dollar in 1939 was worth 101 pennies; it would buy one dollar and one cent's worth of commodities. I do not have to tell you that it will buy today a little bit less than 52 cents worth. So while we are watching this great prosperity, these big dividends, these high wages remember that you must cut them all in two; the country is just half as prosperous as it looks, and the man who earns his bread by the sweat of his brow is getting half the wages he is supposed to get and you have only half of what you had a few years ago. That has been brought about through this kind of spending.

Oh, there is many a gentleman here who has life insurance in multiples of $10,000. You think you have $10,000 worth of insurance; when you check out your family will be taken care of. But do you know that you have lost money on that insurance policy you bought back in 1939 or at a later date. It is worth only half as much as you paid for it, and when you check out and your administrator settles your estate your widow and children get half as much as you thought they would get. That is due to the character of bill we are passing here today.

But let us turn to another section of the bill and take up the provision for TVA. TVA is the greatest engineering project ever successfully projected by any people in the annals of the human race. In its effect upon the American people and upon our wealth and prosperity and upon the world, the Tennessee Valley Authority is the greatest achievement of modern civilization. Practically every visitor from abroad before he returns to his own country wants to visit the TVA development. If it had not been for TVA you would not have the atomic bomb. If it had not been for TVA we would not have been able to extract the aluminum necessary for the wings of our planes. When in the last world war we squared off to take Tokyo, when the Japs at last were fighting with their backs to the wall on their own hearthstone, when the expenditure of thousands of boys and billions of dollars seemed inevitable, one bomb from TVA delivered by one plane, the wings of which were made from aluminum made possible by TVA, ended the war with complete victory for America.

There are hundreds of thousands of young men walking the streets of our cities today who would not be here had it not been for TVA.

And yet there is a sinister group in this country today who want to destroy TVA, who want to destroy REA, who want to destroy municipal ownership. Why? Solely because they want to put more money in their already bulging pockets and thereby deprive the people of the country of a reasonable price for power. That includes the farm women, the farm mothers, in areas that would not have this advantage but for the public power policy which this group is trying to destroy.

TVA does not take a single customer away from private industry, it does not duplicate any service rendered by private industry, it does not cut the income or the profits of private industry because due to TVA all of them are making more money today than they ever made before and the records will show that.

Mr. Chairman, let us take, for example, page 2 of the report, referring specifically to the last paragraph on that page. Here, Mr. Chairman, the committee recites the immediate situation just as it is. I want to say emphatically at this time, and with the concurrence, I am certain, of the majority of the committee, that this is in no way intended and shall not be construed to limit in any way the authority and the responsibility of the TVA to meet the needs of the TVA service area nor to require any payment in excess of that required by law.

Here is the interesting thing about TVA. It is a source of profit to the Government. The Government has not lost a penny on it, the Government has not given it anything. Every cent is being paid back with interest. It is to be amortized by 40 annual payments. It has made every one of these payments up to this time and is in advance of the requirements. The Government does not lose a penny on it.

The budget estimate came to us with a decrease in appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority of $21,696,000 below what we spent there for the current year, but they returned to the Federal Treasury this year $186,500,000.

The same can be said about the Department of the Interior and the Southeastern and Southwestern Power Administrations. They also are being amortized by annual payments with interest. They also are cut down by this budget. Southeastern is cut $1,978,000. But the revenues from its sales are in excess of $15 million. It is a profitable investment for the United States, and nobody loses a cent. They pay their own way.

The same thing is true of the Southwestern Power Administration. The budget cut their appropriation $1 million. They received only 80 percent of what they had in this bill last year, although it was a paying concern and their revenues are estimated at $12,575,000 for the fiscal year 1957.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I again find myself in a role which I very much dislike. I do not enjoy the responsibility of being a critic with respect to this bill which I have felt to be my responsibility in the course of the past 2 years. But, I do believe that it is a role that must be fulfilled and a role that the public interest requires.

Mr. Chairman, I am not happy with the bill which is before us. I can share in the criticisms that were voiced of it by the chairman of the full committee who just preceded me. But, I can say very sincerely that I do not believe that this is a decent or honorable appropriation bill and I say that meaning no disrespect whatsoever to the members of the subcommittee, for certainly there are members of that group for whom I have the greatest respect, and in whom I have the greatest confidence. But, I do think that anyone who will attempt in an objective manner to examine this bill will find that it is a hodgepodge as it stands today. It was not a good, well-rounded proposal when it came to the committee in the first place, and it has grown worse in its stages as it has progressed through the committee and come here to the floor of the House.

I think that we can start right at the beginning or the intiation of this proposal and say that in my opinion the Bureau of the Budget submitted a much too expansive program in view of all the circumstances that confront the country today.

Over the years, this bill has had its ups and downs. We have not had a regular, stable program of appropriations for this public-works program. There have been some pretty good reasons for that. During World War II the program was brought almost to a halt. We came from that and just resumed the program again, and then came the Korean war and again the program was greatly cut back. But now the time has come when many people feel that we are in a position to go forward with a rather expansive program. But, as I see it, the submitted program was too expansive in view of the other competing programs of the Federal Government at this time. These programs are looking for the same dollars, the same manpower, and the same materials that are necessary in this public-works program. Right now the subcommitttee on defense appropriations, for instance, is considering a military construction program in excess of $2 billion in the fiscal year that covers the same period as this bill does.

This House has passed and the Senate is now reaching the final stages of action on a long-term expanded highway program. Both of those bills, the military construction bill and the highway program, have been given a position of priority by both the executive and legislative branches of this Government, overall, that is probably higher than that of the program we now have before us.

The Corps of Engineers came before us in the course of the hearings, and aside from these two programs, the highway program and the military construction program, complained, I think with justification, about their inability properly to handle the appropriation which Congress made for the public-works program last year. They are short of engineers; they are short of general overall supervisory personnel to do the job that was foisted upon them by the Congress in the appropriation bill last year, in the manner which the chairman of the full committee has described.

So we are here today to provide the money, but I do not think we are providing the means, for properly executing, carrying out, the program for which funds are included in this bill.

When the bill came to the consideration of the subcommittee of 15 that handled the hearings, there were a number of additions made. There was no formula by which the additions were made. We sat down early in the consideration of the bill and worked out a few basic ground rules, but I must say in all candor that those rules were honored much more in their breach than they were in their observance in the course of the markup of the bill. But not all the blame rests on the members of the subcommittee in that respect, either. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] who has worked so often with this bill in the past—for 6 years at least I have had the pleasure of working with him on it—I think it is fair to say just threw up his hands when we found time and time again, where we had written evidence that individual Members of Congress had been told by representatives of the Corps of Engineers that really for economical construction they ought to have more money than had been approved for them by the Bureau of the Budget. That put the subcommittee on the defensive and in a most embarrassing position from the start in attempting to act in accordance with the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget.

That was not confined to the Corps of Engineers. There is at least one instance, when we were trying to pay some adherence to what the Bureau of the Budget, the President's financial right arm, had recommended, where testimony was read into the record that somebody from the White House told a Member of Congress, "Well, this has not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, but if you see fit to put it in, we won't object to it."

So the responsibility for what has happened here will have to fall probably more in terms of lack of leadership on some people in the executive department, at least as much as it would on the committee which had the job of handling this bill. If we had had the kind of backing from the executive department that we should have had, things might have been different. This is a difficult enough job with all the help we can get from the executive department. But as I said, we really did not have that backing that we should have had this year. I suppose that strong leadership in the committee could have overcome some of those difficulties. But here we were in a position where we had unsatisfactory testimony in many cases but a desire on the part of many members of the subcommittee to put in projects which had not been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. So we have that kind of a bill here today. The bill may not exceed the dollar amount of the budget this year but actually the reductions that have been made, at least in the Corps of Engineers part, do not represent any cut in the overall program. Mostly they represent the picking up of unobligated or unused funds in the past.

In contrast to that, we do have great commitments of money in the years that are ahead. For instance, you will find some additions in construction money in projects that total this year between $5 and $6 million, but they represent something over $300 million in terms of commitments of dollars in the year ahead. There is about $800,000 for increases in planning, and that represents commitments of well over $150 million in the years ahead.

There was one transfer of $180,000 from planning in order to get complete evaluation of a project so the committee could know what it was doing in the future. That has been transferred to construction. That is $49 million to which we are committed without the proper backup information.

In the full committee there was an addition of construction money for 2 projects, totaling less than $200 million in those 2, but they represent the beginning of navigation on a large waterway the estimated cost of which at this date is well over $1.2 billion. So we have continued to develop a program which represents huge commitments in terms of next year's appropriations and the years after that. That is without the funds for investigation and survey which have been added, which are the first step in getting us committed to millions of dollars in the years ahead. We have no way of knowing what the total amount of commitments will be for those additional funds for investigation and survey.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman has made two excellent points here, insofar as I see, in what he has had to say. From what was said in the first portion of his remarks it appeared to me that he was emphasizing that there are many other public projects being undertaken by various agencies of the Government which compete for the money and the manpower and all the rest that goes with it. I refer to page 1 and the top of page 2 of the report:

> These funds are allocated to 300 projects with a total estimated Federal cost of approximately $12 billion.

I take it that is the projected-ahead figure of all of these figures that are

under consideration in this bill. Is that correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I would say that that would be those for which there are funds for planning or construction, because there is no way of estimating the commitments involved or the total estimated Federal cost of projects which are included just for investigation and survey.

Mr. SPRINGER. My question is this: With the highway program, with this $2 billion which he has said is being undertaken by the armed services and some other agencies, is it the feeling of the gentleman that many of these projects could be undertaken more economically at other times?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is my feeling—that we are impinging upon programs which have greater urgency and greater priority in the national interest than many of these which are included in this appropriation.

Mr. SPRINGER. My second question refers to page 8 of the report, at the top of the page, the first paragraph in this statement:

> The committee has again reduced the operation and maintenance estimate in an effort to force some action on the part of the Bureau to turn the operation and maintenance of irrigation projects over to the local interests. Lethargy on the part of the Bureau and the failure of irrigation districts to promptly assume their responsibilities with respect to completed projects continues to be of principal concern to the committee. Until some evidence is given of a change in the attitudes existing with respect to this problem, the committee has no other alternative than to reduce the amount of funds requested for operation and maintenance.

I take it from what the gentleman said there that there is a lack of interest here on the part of both the Bureau and local interests which are supposed to supervise these irrigation projects. Is that true?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think to some extent that might be true. It is a very natural situation where the local interests do not want to take over that responsibility any sooner than someone requires them to do it, and as long as the Bureau of Reclamation has funds with which to carry on the operation it will not have the incentive to put the pressure on in order to get it turned over to the local interests.

Mr. SPRINGER. The effort of the committee is to exert pressure on the local interests to take the responsibility for these projects?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. My second question is: Is that provided by law? I am not familiar enough with that to know. Does the legislation so provide that it shall be assumed by the local interest that recommended the project?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is the general reclamation law; yes. That language refers to the Bureau of Reclamation, when a project is completed.

Mr. SPRINGER. At that point the local interest is supposed to assume the responsibility? Does that mean that they are supposed to assume the financial responsibility as well?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. They have contracts for repayment with the Government; yes.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BEAMER. I ask the gentleman to refer to page 11 of the committee report referring to the area for Indiana. I notice there is no inclusion of the upper Wabash River Valley flood-control program. I would like to know whether or not this was reported to your committee by the Committee on Public Works or the Bureau of the Budget and why it is not included or was there any discussion of it within the committee?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The only way I can answer that is to say it was not brought before the committee for its consideration this year. I do not know what overall status of that project might be. But, the Bureau of the Budget did not submit it to our committee for consideration in connection with this year's appropriation.

Mr. BEAMER. I might explain that I think the Army engineers have placed it in class B, which I understand has their approval and there are certain things that have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget although the Army engineers have informed me that they have been pushing the Bureau of the Budget for approval. Do I understand that then it goes to the Committee on Public Works for approval before it goes to your subcommittee or your committee?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I could not answer that without knowing what stage the project is in.

Mr. BEAMER. I am asking the question because as the gentleman will note in volume 2 of the hearings, I appeared along with other Members, and together with members of the Indiana Flood Control Water Resources Commission on behalf of this particular program. The gentlewoman from Indiana [Mrs. HARDEN] appeared on behalf of the Mansfield Dam which is included. Of course, this other program is a $43½ million program which entails the construction of three very large dams. But I wonder whether or not the gentleman or any member of the committee or the staff could probably inform me as to the status of that particular program at the present time.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not in a position to inform the gentleman. I do not know if any of the other members of the committee have any up-to-date information on that. You understand, of course, in addition to this $12 million that is mentioned here, included in this program there is a huge backlog of billions of dollars of other projects in various stages of examination or survey or planning, or some huge backlog of projects for which the planning has been completed and which are awaiting construction. It amounts to several billions of dollars. And I do not know at what particular stage this project might be.

Mr. BEAMER. I would like to explain that I have received a letter from the Army engineers indicating that there are 37 of these projects which they have classed as class A. I think most of them are probably in your recommendations for appropriations. However, they also said they have 43 projects of varying sizes that are in what they consider class B that have been approved by the Army engineers, but which have not yet received the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. I believe the Wabash River flood-control project, which is part of the Ohio River Valley program, is in that. I can secure the information, I think, probably from other Members.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. If it has a favorable benefit to cost ratio, I assume it will be brought before the committee next year or some year soon.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is that the project on the Wabash River Basin?

Mr. BEAMER. That is right.

Mr. TABER. Above the White River? There is $20,000 in this bill for a general investigation.

Mr. BEAMER. No; there is another one. This is the upper Wabash including the Peru, the Mississinewa, and the Salamonie River dams.

Mr. TABER. Then this is not that one.

Mr. BEAMER. This is a $43½ million proposal. You may not have reached that.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if it is authorized by law. Maybe it would have to go to the Committee on Public Works first.

Mr. BEAMER. That may be the explanation. It may not have been authorized by the Committee on Public Works. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. When the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], made his statement, he indicated that he placed everything in the bill that anyone had wanted almost, and that he was going to vote for all the others that might be presented. I am concerned about not seeing the 230 TV transmission line, Fort Randall, Grand Island, Nebr., in the bill. It was approved by the President and the Bureau of the Budget and the Interior Department. That does not quite jibe with the statement the chairman made that they had placed everything in the bill that everyone had asked for. The Bureau of the Budget had asked for it. Can the gentleman tell me what happened to the budget request for funds for Fort Randall?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think the chairman was speaking in general terms when he said there was everything in this bill. I think in general terms that his was an understatement. With respect to this specific project, all I can tell the gentleman is that it was considered by the subcommittee and a majority of the members felt that there was a question about the use of Federal funds to provide transmission lines for a purely public power facility.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. But it was approved by the Bureau of the Budget and the Interior Department, and ap-

parently the subcommittee in their wisdom saw fit not to include it and recommend it to the full committee.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I expect to offer an amendment later on to restore the amount and will have some additional remarks at that time on that section of the bill.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I wish to commend the committee for the recognition that has been given to the improvement of the Delaware River Valley, by an appropriation of $6 million contained in this bill for that purpose.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I would say that the gentleman should not feel that there is anything unique about that sort of recognition in this particular appropriation bill.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I realize it is something the committee should be commended for.

The Delaware River Valley is the fastest growing area in the United States from an industrial and population standpoint. It is therefore gratifying to realize that the Appropriations Committee has recognized its importance by providing an appropriation of $6 million to commence deepening the Delaware River from the Camden-Philadelphia area to Trenton, N. J.

The Delaware River has become one of the principal arteries of commerce in the entire country. Its shores on both the New Jersey and Pennsylvania sides of the river are lined with numerous and varied industries. Many of them are known throughout the world by their products. Plans are already made for additional industries to be located on either side of the river.

A United States Army engineer's report, in recognizing the importance of the Delaware River as a means of facilitating waterborne commerce, has said:

> The area tributary to the Delaware contributed the products of agriculture, mining, and a widely diversified field of processing and manufacturing industries. The local area is almost entirely industrial. It contains numerous manufacturing and processing plants that are of national importance in the character and volume of their products. In addition, a great number of smaller industries contribute a large volume and diversity of commodities.

It is astounding to realize the magnitude of the number and capacity of the manufacturing plants that are located along the shores of the Delaware River, and that utilize this waterway. There are more than 8,600 different manufacturing plants, most of which are located in the highly industrialized cities of Wilmington, Del., Camden and Trenton, N. J., and Philadelphia, Chester, and Bristol, Pa.

Deep water all the way to Trenton will make available to industry upward of 60 miles of shoreline that can be utilized for a tremendous industrialization in the Delaware River Valley. Without the deepening of the river channel there can be no such development as is now planned. Already, with the mere prospect that the river channel was to be deepened, great industries have taken options on land on either side of the river and plan to build immense plants that will give employment to thousands of workers.

The present channel is inadequate. It is not of sufficient depth to properly serve the industries that are already located in the upper Delaware Valley, and, until assurance is given that there will be increased depths, we cannot expect that there will be any great additional industrial expansion beyond what already exists.

As an illustration of what can be expected in the way of growth, the National Gypsum Co. is planning a multimillion-dollar plant in the Burlington, N. J., area, where it will manufacture building products for this area of the country. The company selected the Delaware River site because of the advantages the river, at a proper depth, provides for the transportation of the great quantities of raw material that are necessary in the conduct of the business of the company.

And, on the Pennsylvania side of the river is the beginning of what when completed will be the largest steel mill in the world. Already the Fairless Works of the United States Steel Co., in which has been invested $500 million, is capable of producing 2,200,000 tons of steel per year. Present plans call for the expansion of this plant to double its present capacity. If present plans are carried out, it may be expanded to produce 10 million tons per year. To accomplish this will require great quantities of raw material to be delivered in large seagoing vessels that will require a deep channel. When we consider the value of such a plant to our country in a time of emergency, we certainly should not refrain from providing a river channel deep enough to enable it to operate at its greatest capacity and with the greatest efficiency.

Illustrations of the need of a deeper channel to enable large oil tankers and other vessels of deep draft to use the upper Delaware could be given in great number and variety. At the present time in many instances it is necessary to transfer the cargoes of these larger ships to barges to enable the delivery of such to industries located on the upper Delaware. It can be readily seen that this is an impediment to commerce and deters industries from locating in the area not served by a channel of sufficient depth to permit oceangoing vessels to deliver their cargoes.

The commercial expansion that is taking place along the Delaware River is evident from the figures contained in the official records of the United States Corps of Engineers. Their records show that there has been a 41-percent increase in cargo tonnage from the year 1952 to the year 1954—latest year available—for the Delaware River between Philadelphia-Camden and Trenton. The tonnage for 1952 was 6,949,933; the figure for 1954 was 9,828,355 tons. Not only is this a substantial gain, but the indications are it will continue and become greater with an assurance upon the part of the Government to proceed with the deepening of the river. The above figures are all the more significant when it is realized that during the same period both the ports of New York and Baltimore suffered a decline in cargo tonnage.

In this connection it is also well to realize the extent to which a deep waterway increases tonnage. For instance, the tonnage on the lower Delaware between Philadelphia and the sea is six times greater than that on the river above Philadelphia to Trenton. And, of course, it is easy to understand that the lesser volume on the upper Delaware is the direct result of the insufficiency of water depth in the upper Delaware. Therefore, the necessity of increasing the channel depth on that portion of the river is apparent.

If time permitted, it would be appropriate and beneficial to consider the extent of the improvements and expansion in industry that is taking place all along the shores of the upper Delaware, both on the New Jersey side and the Pennsylvania side of the river. Suffice it to say that the Federal Reserve bank has issued statistics showing that manufacturing industries in the Philadelphia-Camden area plan to spend $228 million for plant expansion and modernization of equipment during 1956.

It would also be instructive, as well as interesting, to study the advantages that have come to our country where there has been development of deeper waterways. The particular areas where such have taken place give unmistakable evidence of the wisdom from an economic standpoint of the expenditure of Government funds in the development and improvement of our rivers and harbors.

I can predict with assurrance, and no fear that the future would show otherwise, that the expenditure of the $6 million in the present bill as a starter and following it the full amount to complete the deepening of the Delaware River will show results of increased income to the Federal Treasury from the business expansion that will follow, as to make it one of the best investments the Federal Government has ever made. I ask that favorable action be taken on the pending bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I rise to ask the gentleman a question which affects my district. I am asking this question because I have discussed it with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], chairman of the subcommittee, and others, to get information. On page 175 of the civil functions hearings, it shows under the heading of "Ohio" a tentative allocation of $27,500 for survey work by the Army engineers in the matter of Mad River Hoffman Dam. Then, on page 5 of the bill, there is a general appropriation for this kind of work, a lump-sum appropriation; and on page 9 of the report these appropriations for general investigation work are referred to again. Can the gentleman tell me if the $27,500 for that survey is still in the bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], who is perhaps more familiar with it.

Mr. RABAUT. The Mad River Hoffman Dam is in the bill, $27,500.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is in that general estimate?

Mr. RABAUT. That amount will complete the study, as the gentleman has referred to, and that is the proper place, page 175 of the hearings.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank both gentlemen.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Under your itemization of projects in California you have an item "Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbors, $485,000 for construction." Is that reimbursement to the city for dredging the east basin, or is that for the removal of the bridge on the west basin?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. My recollection is that that is the bridge, but I would like to ask the clerk of our subcommittee if that is correct. Is that for the bridges at Los Angeles and Long Beach?

Mr. RABAUT. We did not get the question.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The question is that under California, Los Angeles, Long Beach Harbor, there is the figure $485,000. It does not state whether it is for the dredging of the east basin or the removal of the bridge on the west basin. There are two projects there. We would like to know which this is for.

Mr. RABAUT. It is for reimbursement for dredging, and the bridge item is $245,000.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I notice a statement about it on page 17 of the report: Removal of West Basin Bridge, California, and the statement that the Federal Government will assume 90 percent of the cost of the removal of the bridge. Is that 90 percent of the cost represented in the $485,000 under the California itemization? There are two items and I am trying to ascertain which this represents.

Mr. RABAUT. The total amount of $245,000 is carried as an item for the removal of the bridge.

Mr. McDONOUGH. And the $485,000 is for reimbursement of the city for dredging the east basin?

Mr. RABAUT. That is right.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. There are two items listed there; that is correct.

Mr. Chairman, if I may resume for a couple of minutes, I think this bill will put us in the same position with respect to this program as we are in during the current year, and that is that there simply will not be the required supervisory personnel to do the kind of job Congress expects to be done in the handling of a public works program of this size and scope. I do not think the Corps of Engineers have the skilled personnel or perhaps the necessary funds under general expenses to handle a program which has been expanded much beyond what was contemplated at the time it was submitted to the committee.

I have no illusions about this bill. Even though I feel that there are many items in it that should not be in it, I know that any effort to cut them out on the floor of the House would be unsuccessful; in fact, I think most of the members of the committee are on rather poor moral grounds in denying anyone the inclusion of his particular project because he can point to projects in the bill which are of less justification than most of those which could be offered from the floor.

I think the problem will be to hold the line to the present figures rather than attempt to reduce those figures.

I do not propose to get into any argument of philosophy with respect to the Tennessee Valley Authority. I think that Congress is entitled to be assured that there are no duplication of facilities between the TVA and other Federal agencies. I think Congress is entitled to retain supervisory financial control over this or any other agency of the Federal Government so that we do not let them run wild in the use of funds which rightfully belong to the people of the United States. I think the same statement applies to any of the other agencies that are included in the scope of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has consumed 23 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

REMARKS IN COMMITTEE OF WHOLE ON PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise to compliment the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], for the manner in which he handled this bill in committee. I want to express the gratitude of the people of the New England area for the cooperation the subcommittee has given to the matter of flood control for that locality.

This public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1957 gives a total of some $18 million for the New England area. This amount, coupled with more than $2 million appropriated in the urgent deficiency bill last February, brings that total for the calendar year to more than $20 million. This figure represents the largest amount ever appropriated in any one calendar year for flood control in New England. The cost of the authorized projects for flood control in New England total some $351 million. Since 1936 the Federal Government has expended about $70 million on these projects. The appropriation and expenditure this year of $20 million is greater than any amount appropriated in any 1 year for the New England area. Mr. Chairman, I am privileged to have some responsibility for this action. As a member of the Public Works Subcommittee, I listened to the testimony of the Corps of Engineers and all other witnesses concerning adequate flood protection in New England and the North Atlantic States.

When the devastating floods of August and October 1955 struck New England, I saw at first hand the havoc that was wrought. I visited all of the communities in western Massachusetts and in northern Connecticut to view the terrible destruction to property. As I recall, there were some 135 lives lost.

The Congress some years ago declared it to be a national policy to give assistance to areas that have experienced the ravages of torrential rains and unleashed waters from small streams and large rivers. On that basis, a general overall flood-control program was established for New England. Due to World War II and the Korean conflict, progress has been agonizingly slow. We are now in a position where this program can and must be accelerated. The action that the Public Works Subcommittee has taken insures that acceleration. When Major General Itschner, Assistant Chief of Engineers, and Brigadier General Fleming, chief of the New England division, appeared before my subcommittee, I questioned them on the amount of money that could be reasonably used in fiscal 1957. Their reply was that the funds requested, plus some additions, would be all that could be reasonably used and which would tax the capabilities of the New England division to the utmost. This bill provides the necessary amounts plus the additions.

CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN

Since the Connecticut River flows through my district, I have a keen interest in adequate flood-control protection for the Connecticut River Basin. I am satisfied that the Corps of Engineers is now on its way in providing that program. This bill carries moneys for construction on the Barre Falls, Otter Brook, Ball Mountain, North Hartland, North Springfield, and Townshend Reservoirs. These are all on the Connecticut River Basin. The Corps of Engineers has testified that planning and construction on these reservoirs is all that it could handle during fiscal 1957. These projects greatly accelerate completion of the program designed to give adequate flood protection to the Connecticut River Basin. It is my hope that for fiscal 1958 recommendations will be made for appropriations for additional reservoirs so that the program will be completed.

This bill carries an additional $400,000 for hurricane studies. It also includes an additional $100,000 for planning for West Hill Reservoir; an additional $400,000 for flood protection in Woonsocket, R. I.; $640,000 for the Thomaston Reservoir in the Naugatuck River in Connecticut; $500,000 additional for the East Brimfield Reservoir on the Quinnebaug River. The Subcommittee on Public Works, in its wisdom, added these amounts when the bill was marked up.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat the gratitude that the New England delegation and the inhabitants of the locality have for the treatment accorded us. Damages caused by last year's floods in New England were the greatest in the history of this Nation, totaling $700,000 million. Our area has come a long way in rehabilitating itself. This has been done by the cooperation of Federal, State, and local authorities. Particularly do I single out the Corps of Engineers and specifically the New England division for the magnificent job it accomplished.

This committee, like all other committees of the Congress, has a very heavy responsibility. This is one place where money can be saved. There is no ques-

tion but that there is a considerable waste of money involved in many of the projects that have been recommended and undertaken by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

This is particularly so in reference to navigation projects. I have some very firm convictions on moneys that are spent on navigation projects. It would seem to me this Congress and the Bureau of the Budget as well as the Corps of Engineers are getting pretty far afield in the matter of recommending navigation projects for every single tributary and river in the United States. I have no difficulty at all with navigation on the main stems, the Mississippi, the Tennessee, the Missouri, the Ohio, and other of the great rivers of the Nation. But I do have some difficulty in justifying certain navigation projects on the smaller rivers of this Nation.

It would seem to me that when the original framers of the Constitution sat down and wrote into the Constitution the commerce clause they did not intend that navigation be on every single waterway as this Congress, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Corps of Engineers seem to indicate. There ought to be a reappraisal by the Corps of Engineers; there ought to be a reappraisal by the Bureau of the Budget in the matter of navigation projects, for the cost of navigation projects is paid by all of the taxpayers all over the United States. I have no difficulty with the flood-control projects. Those projects are also paid for by all the people all over the Nation. Where there is the question of the saving of lives, where there is the question of the protection of property, in my opinion, that money is justified for all of those projects that have anything to do with flood control. I have gone along with them, and I have gone along, too, with navigation projects that are feasible.

Let me say that I echo some of the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS]. He is and has been, at least from the time I have been here, for 4 years, the voice of conscience so far as this public works bill is concerned. The Congress needs a voice of conscience in matters of this kind. If we provided all of the money for projects that have been recommended or authorized by the Public Works Committee, the expenditure would run to some $7 billion. There ought to be a reappraisal on some of the projects that have been authorized.

Mr. Chairman, this is a committee where you do not win friends and influence people. You lose friends and disrupt people. But it is a job that has to be done. It is a job that some do not like, but it is a job that Members of Congress have to do.

Again I express my gratitude to the chairman for the way he handled the committee and also to the other committee members.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, only the fear of a national catastrophe impels me to take the time of the committee and my colleagues of the House to discuss one item in this appropriation bill. I refer to the Sutton Reservoir on the Elk River in West Virginia. This was first authorized by the Congress in 1941. Initiated in 1946, it was temporarily halted in 1950 due to the Korean war emergency. It was revived again last year with an appropriation of $1,300,000. The present item in the budget calls for $4,500,000.

Let me give you just a little reason why I personally as a Member of this Congress and as a Representative of that district in the Congress of the United States do not want to take the responsibility for what might happen. I remind you that during World War II the Government built two huge gas lines from the Southwest.

It just so happens that in the valley of the Elk River just below this reservoir are located two of the world's greatest natural-gas compressor stations. One belongs to the Hope Gas Co., and the other one belongs to the United Fuel Gas Co. Are you aware of the fact that compressor station belonging to the Hope Gas Co. has a capacity of 17,000 horsepower? It handles 335 million cubic feet of gas each day. The other station handles approximately 235 million cubic feet of gas each day. After the Government sold those pipelines to private industry, they extended gas lines to Richmond, Washington, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and to western New York. They have over 18 million domestic consumers using gas that passes through that one station. The other station has 4.5 million domestic consumers, it has 181 industrial consumers, and it supplies gas to 61 other gas companies for retail to the public and an additional 10 million consumers. So, if a flood accident should happen in this valley, which has happened several times in the last 30 years, enough to damage the John Cornwell station of the Hope Gas Co. $3.1 million since the station was built, and you let another flood catastrophe hit that valley and find this storage dam not constructed, you are going to cut off the fuel supply of more than one-fourth of the people of this country. Think of it, gentlemen. I know you, as Members of this Congress, do not want to take that responsibility. I certainly do not want to take the responsibility of letting that situation longer exist in the district.

It was good business that you add $2.2 million, to the $4.5 million which the Bureau of the Budget cleared for that project, for this simple reason, that the contractors who were prepared to bid on it would have to bid $2 million more for the project if there was not enough money to carry on the operation for a full year. They do not want it closed down for 4 months. It is a good business proposition. I am at a loss why the members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, being businessmen as they are, could not see the business advantage involved in this proposition.

I would like to inquire of the chairman of the subcommittee at this time as to why you did not put this item in here. No I am not going to inquire into your reasons. I want to ask you just one thing. If the Army Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget clear a supplemental item for consideration in the first supplemental appropriation bill, I want to know what the attitude of the committee is going to be. I can better govern my action here today if I can get an answer on that.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, naturally, if it was put in by the Bureau of the Budget, we would have to consider it.

Mr. BAILEY. Could I hope that it would have favorable consideration?

Mr. RABAUT. Well, it would have to have the consideration of the committee. I can talk for myself only. I certainly would look with favor on a budget item in a supplemental bill which showed necessity for the project in that connection. I cannot speak for the whole committee. You know that as well as I do.

Mr. BAILEY. May I inquire of the ranking minority member? In case the Army engineers and the Bureau of the Budget clear a supplemental request to be handled in the first supplemental bill, will the committee look with favor on an item of the kind I have been talking about?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Well, I could not make any commitment of that kind. And, besides, as far as I personally am concerned, I would have to judge the project by the information that was furnished to the committee and by the witnesses that came before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, when the Congressman representing the First District of Kansas takes the floor in debate on the public works appropriation bill, I think probably every Member knows that he is going to refer to the project that has been turbulent in the First District of Kansas for some 15 years now, more commonly known as the Tuttle Creek Reservoir. My position in regard to the construction of Tuttle Creek is the same as it has been ever since its original authorization in 1938.

From a realistic point of view, however, since Congress in its wisdom decided to make a further appropriation in the first session in 1955 and since the Committee on Appropriations saw fit to include $9 million in the bill before us today, I am not extremely optimistic of deleting that item. However, I do say, to make my position clear, that I am going to offer such an amendment later today.

I do not want to use the few minutes I have been given here today to discuss the merits of Tuttle Creek Reservoir. However, I should like to point out to the Congress some gross injustices that result to displaced persons when a Federal project is built. I am not blaming the Corps of Engineers for these injustices because they work only at the directive of the Congress. I wonder how many Members on the floor today who are attorneys know, if they happen to reside in one of these reservoir areas and the land is condemned, and they are

completely displaced, moved clear away, that they are given no reimbursement at all except a small amount of moving expense, perhaps a few hundred dollars. I wonder how many Members know that. I have talked to 2 or 3 today who have been here for 30 years, and they did not know it. There is no reimbursement to a businessman who is displaced because of a Federal public-works project. I do not think it is right, I do not think it is equitable. I think it is the responsibility of this Congress to reappraise its whole policy on displaced persons in public-works projects.

Another matter has to do with the capital gains tax. Mr. Chairman, if you were 60 years of age and were a forced seller to the Federal Government under the threat of eminent domain, would you feel that you were being treated properly if you had to pay a full capital-gains tax, just as though you were a speculator dealing in land? Do you think that is right?

I have a bill pending in the Ways and Means Committee to readjust the capital-gains tax to unwilling sellers who are displaced because of public works projects. I sincerely solicit the support of every Member of Congress to look at that bill and I urge its favorable consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means. Let me say to the Members, do not forget that a project could be located in anyone's district at almost any time.

Even a more unjust practice has developed in the last 3 or 4 years in regard to land acquisition, known as the easement policy. At least, in prior projects, when the Federal Government took over real estate, and displaced persons in order to construct a Federal project, the land was acquired in fee title. The original owner got his money and was able to relocate his business at a place of his own choosing. That policy has been revised to the point where only a certain portion of a man's land is taken in fee title and paid for. The rest is taken under easement, if it is above a certain level on a reservoir project. What does that mean? It means that the property owner recovers a portion of his capital investment. Then part of it, a second portion he cannot recover and he does not have that money available with which to relocate, and maybe a third portion is above the water level, in a high area, maybe only 25 or 30 acres, and he gets a mere severance damage on that. He is not in a position to relocate his farming operation.

There is so much enthusiasm, I might call it sometimes blind enthusiasm, for Public Works projects.

I sincerely ask that every Member of Congress familiarize himself with the overall policy of land acquisition and cooperate with me or whoever may be directly involved in this matter in urging a more just consideration for displaced persons.

It has been said rather loosely that in the public interest these individuals just have to give way. If it is in the public interest that they are going to to be deprived of their property by the right of eminent domain, they should be reimbursed by the public for the national good, too.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In respect to this project the gentleman has just been discussing, known as the Tuttle Creek project, over which there has been a lot of controversy through the years, the gentleman could very well, if he cared to do so, go into the terrible situation that exists because of the displacement of these people. There is the moving of 4 or 5 cemeteries, as I recall it.

Mr. AVERY. I think it was 13.

Mr. REES of Kansas. There are 13 cemeteries that will have to be moved. They will have to remove the bodies and take them somewhere else. Then, how many towns are there involved here?

Mr. AVERY. Five towns. There are about 100 businessmen involved in the five towns.

Mr. REES of Kansas. You are moving them out to just wherever they can go, leaving them to do the best they can?

Mr. AVERY. They are just being shoved out, reimbursed moderately for the real property that they owed, plus a slight moving cost that does not amount to very many dollars, but they are not allowed anything for their business interests, what have been described by the courts as consequential damages.

Mr. REES of Kansas. You would think from the testimony that appears in the record that there was not much opposition to this project, but there is a terrific amount of opposition to it. I realize that you cannot pay these people in dollars and cents what they are being damaged and what they are entitled to, but I agree with the gentleman that the situation is much worse than it is pictured here on the floor of the House. How much land is being taken over?

Mr. AVERY. Roughly 55,000 acres. That is the total amount of land. If they would buy all that land it would be more acceptable, but now they are not going to buy it, all they are going to do is take an easement on roughly 25 percent of it. The land is tied up, the farmer can use it, but he cannot get his capital out to locate himself in a place where he can pursue his normal operations.

Mr. REES of Kansas. This is outside my congressional district, but I have received a great deal of correspondence and had a great many people call upon me to suggest that what we should have done was provide a watershed program first and following that, if it is necessary, build dams to carry out the project, but not use a dam such as is proposed here, Tuttle Creek.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it takes no economics genius or certified public accountant or even a political science expert to be critical of this legislation. Unfortunately, however, buildings are not built by sidewalk superintendents, nor is beneficial legislation produced by critics.

Last evening I was reading a history of the Erie Canal. At that time a number of people proclaimed, "What is the idea of building this canal through a wilderness?" Yet the Erie Canal resulted in the settling of the West, made the State of New York an empire within itself. The critics of that public-works project are lost in the oblivion of history, while the man who championed that legislation occupies a distinguished niche in our history.

I would like to thank the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works, the Appropriations Committee, its members—both majority and minority—for making my committee assignments most enjoyable as well as interesting and informative.

If a survey were made as to what in Congress impresses a freshman Member of Congress most, I think that I would have to select as my answer the experience of observing men like the fair and affable chairman of our subcommittee, LOUIS RABAUT, and the distinguished minority member, sagacious JOHN TABER, laying aside partisan politics in an attempt to legislate in the best interest of the entire Nation. Observing them, and the other members of the committee—both majority and minority—men from all walks of life, who could undoubtedly earn a great deal more material rewards in private life than in public life, overcoming sectional influence and appropriating for the benefit of the entire Nation, proves the merit of representative government.

The testimony before the committee by various administrative officials, public officers, and interested private individuals and organizations concerning the present and proposed public works of our country, discloses a bequest to the Nation that has to find its source in divinity.

After hearing the testimony presented to the committee, it would take a very narrow and completely unimaginative mind not to acquire an even greater devotion to our country. In the committee one is awed when he hears of the striking natural beauty of the United States—the Grand Canyon, the Rocky Mountains, Niagara Falls, and many other places of world renown. One is amazed when he hears evidence in the committee of the sources of the inexhaustible natural wealth of this country, vast stretches of farming and grazing lands, lakes, rivers, oilfields, mine regions, and vast forests. Facts presented to the committee concerning the great industrial centers, with their extensive manufacturing plants, the high buildings, great bridges, and vast projects for supplying power, light, and irrigation, give eloquent evidence of the genius of our people.

It is fitting to recall that the instant appropriation is more than an expenditure of taxpayers' funds. It is the investment of taxpayers' funds in the development of the assets of the people. No other Federal expenditure of funds produces more economic good to our people than does the expenditure that is involved in this appropriation.

As I sat on the committee I wondered where this country would be and what would be the economic condition of our citizens if our Congress had not entered into the field of investing the taxpayers' money in the development of the natural resources of our country? It would take

no historian to come to the conclusion that the Nation would not have had its ports, the complete electrification of our country, lands made fertile by irrigation, and its inland waterway system.

We are at the point in our history of facing the responsibility of not only paying for the just demands of our people upon their Government, but also paying for the greatest defense expenditure any Nation has had to bear. The only conceivable way to meet this great burden upon the people of this country is for their Government to prudently develop the great gift God gave this country in its natural resources, its oil fields, its mines, its farm and grazing lands, and the rest.

Of course, in carrying out this responsibility one realizes that the investment in the natural resources of the country—like any other investment—must be made in contemplation of present income. I think that in this proposed appropriation the members of the subcommittee and the Appropriations Committee have done a fair job in prudently viewing the annual income with respect to the amount of annual investment that ought to be made in the development of our resources. Although the amount of the appropriation is a staggering sum, when one stops to consider that the amount we are appropriating for our investment in the development of our resources represents less than one sixty-fifth of the total budget for this fiscal year, he realizes that the committee is most frugal in its appropriations for the public works of our country.

To those who might feel disappointed that some project in which they were interested is not included in the appropriation, or who might feel the committee was remiss, I would like to recall that no board of directors of any private corporation in the world, no trustees of any trust fund, regardless of their size, has ever had the responsibility or authority to make the annual investment that this committee was required to recommend in the instant appropriation.

In helping the subcommittee and committee in effectuating its powers and responsibilities, the committee staff, various administrative officials from the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and others were of invaluable assistance.

As the guide in assisting this subcommittee in making the largest investment any investor ever embarked upon, is the Bureau of the Budget. One would assume, and in a large measure this assumption is correct, that the Bureau of the Budget in making its recommendations, after the accumulation of all supporting data concerning the public projects of the Nation, would recommend those public projects that will most benefit the entire Nation for the amount of money that it appears the Nation might be able to expend for such purposes during the fiscal years.

I was disappointed in some of the recommendations made by the Bureau of the Budget because it appeared to me that its recommendations were not predicated upon criteria based upon the economic welfare of the country but rather upon sectional favoritism. I would like to point out one particular and documented illustration.

Testimony before the committee in the northwest area discloses a serious situation with respect to power. As a matter of fact, evidence before the committee discloses that there is a power shortage in the northwest area. Plans of the administration or plans of private utilities fail to disclose the possibility that this power shortage will be overcome in the years to come. The northwest area has as a natural resource one of the greatest power producing waterways in the world—the Columbia River. To meet its power shortage the Northwest area has a combination of power companies including public and private utilities that have been described as one of the most efficient power combinations in the world.

The Bureau of the Budget, or other administrative agencies, have failed to recommend to the Congress any plans or suggested appropriation to meet the increasing critical power shortage situation in this area. If the failure to request funds to meet the power shortage situation in the northwest area were predicated upon the lack of available funds or an absence of plans, one could well appreciate and concur in the Bureau's budgetary views.

However, in another area where there is no shortage of power one observes the Bureau of the Budget recommending vast appropriations for a power project.

It seems to me that the recommendation of a power project in one area where the supply is available, and denying it to another area where the supply is inadequate, is not a budgetary practice based on sound fiscal principles.

In making its recommendations to the Congress, the Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Engineers use a formula in which they determine the benefits to be derived from the proposed project as related to its costs, calling this ratio the benefit to cost-ratio. All of the projects appropriated in the instant appropriation have a benefit to cost-ratio which guarantees some return on the investment this appropriation represents.

In determining benefit-to-cost ratios, the various administrative agencies allocate the cost of the projects to the various features of the project, including power, water, irrigation, and the like. In March of 1954, an agreement was made between the Department of the Interior, the Corps of Engineers, and the Federal Power Commission with respect to allocations of cost in connection with multiple-purpose projects which included power.

Under this agreement power features in a proposed multiple-purpose project are considered after a determination of the factor of taxes foregone. The feature of taxes foregone is an arithmetic computation to determine the amount of taxes which a private utility of like power-generating potential would have paid. On some projects, such as the McGee Bend Reservoir in Texas, it was represented to the committee that the power features of the dam predicated upon the criteria which utilized the aspect of taxes foregone, is not economically justified. However, in two other cases the various administrative heads, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, have represented to the committee the economic feasibility of multiple-purpose dams with power predicated upon allocations to power which do not include the criteria of taxes foregone.

It may be good politics but I think it is bad budgetary logic, or lack of coordination to utilize one method of cost allocation for a dam in one section and another method for some other multiple-purpose project.

I was particularly impressed before the subcommittee with the presentation made in connection with the Calumet-Sag project in the city of Chicago and the Great Lakes connecting channels.

CAL-SAG PROJECT

The Cal-Sag project lies in south Cook County, Ill., and at present has a 60-foot channel, 9 feet deep, connecting the Illinois Waterway system with the Lake Calumet industrial area in the city of Chicago.

This area produces more steel than any other area in the world and is one of the world's principal industrial centers. The committee has authorized $8.5 million for the continuation of the proposed program of widening this channel to a channel of 225 feet in width. The present 60-foot channel has an efficient capacity of 1 million tons of commerce. The present commerce in the channel is three times its present efficient capability.

An excellent case was also made in connection with the Great Lakes connecting channels which, with the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway will improve navigation in the Great Lakes area to a point where vessels with drafts of 25.5 feet can safely use the Great Lakes connecting channels as opposed to the current limiting drafts of 21 feet upbound and 25 feet downbound. Completion of this project will allow free and safe movement of the large vessels presently used in Great Lakes commerce, including those vessels anticipated to move into the area as a result of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The long overdue improvement of the Great Lakes connecting channels and the Cal-Sag project will make Chicago the crossroads of the world's commerce. It is appropriate to recall the words of a prominent Philadelphian who, after viewing the phenomenal rise of the city of New York as a result of the Erie Canal, wrote in a letter in 1851: "Transportation is king. Neither cotton, coal, nor any other product is sovereign. Conditions that fix the cost of transportation to market fix the amount in value of the products and their place in the commerce of the country."

These words are as true today as ever before.

One can well appreciate the reason one of our great local newspapers in the city of Chicago—the Chicago Tribune—recently stated that within 25 years after the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway system Chicago will be the greatest city in the world. For with the completion of this waterway system Chicago will have achieved the distinction of

being the transportation center of the world.

One disappointing feature in this appropriation is the failure to include amounts for deferred maintenance. Unless we maintain our existing projects, our national investment is in jeopardy. The postponement of essential maintenance in order to initiate new projects is, at best, a poor policy. An example of what happens if maintenance is deferred or postponed over a long period of time is accurately disclosed in connection with the Lake Calumet project near my own district. This project was completed in 1937 at which time the harbor at Lake Calumet at the end of the Cal-Sag Canal was dredged to an authorized depth of 21 feet. Since that time no maintenance was had on the harbor. As a result of the lack of maintenance, the 21-foot depth decreased to 15 feet.

In the past 2 or 3 years considerable traffic has developed in Lake Calumet harbor and a great amount of local interest has been generated in the harbor.

As a matter of fact, the Chicago Regional Port District has recently sold, and sold very quickly, bonds in the amount of $27 million to develop this port. Obviously, we must be assured that our present projects and proposed projects are maintained in such a manner that at the period of their greatest use they have not been left in such a neglected state as to render them unusable.

Although I understand there are adequate funds in order to complete the deferred maintenance in Lake Calumet, I hope that the Senate will include adequate amounts to begin the deferred maintenance upon our other national projects.

I urge the enactment of this appropriation.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to my California colleague.

Mr. YOUNGER. As the gentleman knows, we have a project in my district known as the Redwood City Harbor.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I have heard of it.

Mr. YOUNGER. There was one authorization in 1945 which called for no local cooperation and one in 1950 which called for local cooperation. In the 1955 budget a million dollars was provided for that project. The Appropriation Committee took it out on the ground that local participation was not available, yet all of the money asked for was for the 1945 authorization. That leaves the project in such shape that the Bureau of the Budget will not consider it because of the position taken by the committee, and the committee will not consider it because it is not in the budget. I want to know from the committee if it is necessary to combine authorization requirements when an appropriation is made which is limited to the work in only one authorization.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman has asked a rather difficult question. The best thing I can do is to read to him that part of the report made by the engineers on the project, at the request of the subcommittee. And I read:

A substantial proportion of the tonnage through Redwood City Harbor is carried by deep-draft vessels requiring 30-foot depths within the harbor and approach channels. Such vessels are subject to the hazardous condition of maneuvering in channels limited to 200 feet in width and 27 feet in depth. In addition, vessels cannot safely enter or depart under full load except at time of extreme high tide. Such conditions are very detrimental to efficient movement of cargo and limit harbor development.

Then there is a note:

NOTE.—There is no local cooperation required for the modification contained in the 1945 River and Harbor Act. Local interests, however, have voluntarily provided the necessary spoil-disposal areas and impounding works required for that dredging.

That would answer the gentleman's question, that the gentleman's project could be cleared for action sometime in the future.

Mr. YOUNGER. If the Bureau of the Budget put the item in, the committee would consider it?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think without question I should say definitely it would be considered.

Mr. YOUNGER. The fact that the local participation was not available for the second authorization would not deter action on the appropriation for the first authorization, which did not require local participation?

Mr. PHILLIPS. It seems to have been straightened out, from the engineers' report.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. LOVRE. I note on page 7 of the report that the sum of $451,000 which was programed by the Bureau of Reclamation and budgeted for the Oahe unit in South Dakota has been eliminated. Can the gentleman tell me why this amount was eliminated?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am in a difficult position, as the gentleman knows, because I was ill during a part of the time the hearings were held. I was not there when this matter was taken up, but the record shows, as the gentleman knows, that the Congress has already appropriated over $5 million for the investigation of that project, which would seem, I think, to be adequate before a report is made. The committee has instructed the engineers to finish and submit that report and to take the necessary money out of the general investigation fund. I think the gentleman will agree that that should be the next step before any further money is appropriated.

Mr. LOVRE. Then it is the intent of the committee that the Bureau should make a full report of its findings now before any additional money is appropriated?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I so understand.

Mr. LOVRE. In the gentleman's opinion, will there be sufficient unobligated balances in connection with the basin investigations program to carry out the instructions of the committee?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes. There are funds on hand for completing such an investigation.

Mr. LOVRE. I would like to know how many acres can be irrigated in the James division of the Oahe unit and where; what can be expected in the way of returns on the irrigated lands; how much will it cost the Federal Government; how much will it cost the farmers for participation, and if the project is economically feasible. Will we be able to get this information from the report that is contemplated by the committee?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman talks like a member of the subcommittee. Those are the things we should like to know, too.

Mr. LOVRE. If additional funds are necessary in order to accomplish this job so that we can have this information, will your subcommittee give this project further consideration at the proper time?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The committee gives all projects full consideration as far as it can, and I would say very liberal consideration.

Mr. LOVRE. In other words, if the gentleman will yield further, as far as the action of this subcommittee is concerned on withholding funds this year it was done without any prejudice to the project itself.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Certainly none on the part of this member and I think I may say none on the part of any member of the subcommittee.

Mr. LOVRE. If it should be discovered that the Bureau needs additional money to carry this project to its logical conclusion before the other body acts on this bill, would be the gentleman object?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No; speaking as one member of the subcommittee, I would not object.

Mr. LOVRE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, as a Member of Congress, as a taxpayer and as a citizen of South Dakota, I want to know just how many acres of land can be irrigated in this project. I want to know what the costs will be and certainly want to know that the entire project is engineeringly feasible. I am in hopes that the preliminary reports to be completed this year will show these things.

At the end of this fiscal year, approximately $5,042,729 will have been expended on this report. It is anticipated that the entire report will cost in the neighborhood of $8 million. I do not believe that it is the intent of this committee to leave the project only five-eighths completed, which would be a very unfortunate waste of money. On the other hand, the committee has a right to know, and I want to know, just what progress has been made with the $5 million already expended.

The farmers and townspeople in my district have questions, and lots of them, in regard to the feasibility of irrigation. For over 8 years they have been going to the Bureau trying to get answers to the questions and even after all this time the answers have not been available. Farmers and others have asked me many questions and invited me to meetings to

discuss irrigation, but I just haven't been able to answer their questions because the Bureau has not released any substantial authoritative information.

Mr. Chairman, if this project is not feasible, I do not want it in my district. If the costs per acre are too high or if the land will not take the water, the project should not be started. I do, however, insist that the people of South Dakota have a right to the answers to their questions and if the project is feasible, I want the project started. I hope that the action of this committee will spur the Bureau officials into much faster action than we have had in the past. The Congress and the people of South Dakota are entitled to this information as soon as possible.

I have been led to believe that the action of the committee will not prejudice this project, but is merely an effort to check on a Bureau which seemingly has been negligent about keeping the Congress and the people advised as to where the previous appropriations have been spent. I should like to include here a telegram I received today from Mr. Bruce Campbell, managing editor of the Huronite and Daily Plainsman, of Huron, S. Dak., in regard to this project:

HURON, S. DAK., *May 22, 1956.*

Representative HAROLD LOVRE,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Justification for $451,000 for Oahe unit is primarily that money is needed to assure that a specific project proposal is given to people of South Dakota. That sum is needed to make sure that previous $5 million in 10 years isn't wasted since interim report is synthesis of previous work. Field work on report may be done by target date of July 1, but probably not. In any event, after field work completed, all additional work of evaluating, analysis and cost figuring must be done by successive echelons of Bureau. If given approval after few months, Oahe unit needs maintenance of planning unit to prepare detailed report. Sum of $451,000 is $100,000 less than $550,000 allotted this current fiscal year because Bureau realized that it would be in transition period for few months and could get by on less than this year's amount, although it may pinch, year ago Bureau had panel of three experts conduct soils test, they found large area drainable. But Bureau still has never told people of South Dakota what specific area would be irrigated, what project proposals are exactly, has never given explanation of economics and feasibility of project. Until Bureau does this, people of South Dakota have not been treated fairly. This planning money of $451,000 is sums which will assure South Dakotans of getting clear, definite picture of project proposal, area, costs. Mere report resting on bureaucratic desk somewhere won't do people of South Dakota any good or help Congress which has financed preparation of data. Money needed to make sure report is completed in all phases, then that project proposal is explained to public. South Dakotans agree with committee that Bureau has dragged its feet on making decision, but believe that this $451,000 is necessary to get that decision, then get it explained and applied to big Great Plains area where rainfall is less than 19 inches.

Pattern follows same report pattern that obtained in North Dakota on Missouri-Souris.

South Dakotans don't need to be sold on irrigation; they are turning to it steadily on their own. But they want action on such a big program that would help stabilize agricultural production.

In 1949 there were only 12 sprinkler irrigation systems in State. End of 1955 there were 225 sprinkler irrigation systems, mostly in central South Dakota area, generally believed to come within scope of Oahe unit.

In 1880 were 189 irrigators on 15,715 acres, mostly western South Dakota, in 1930 were 763 on 59,361 acres, in 1950 were 807 on 78,069 acres.

This week in Onida, group of farmers ranchers that area plan to hold second such grassroots meeting to see if they can organize any kind of a district to encourage Bureau to get going faster on irrigation plans. It generally understood that 80,000 acres may be in that general area.

Foregoing is information from our background, from local Bureau people, from State water engineer Joe Grimes.

Can't get statement from any Bureau official. Regional director Frank Clinton, who definitely has favored project, is somewhere in Arizona unreachable on vacation.

BRUCE CAMPBELL,
Huron Daily Plainsman.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Would the gentleman explain to me the reason the committee cut the request of $8 million for the Colorado project as requested by the Budget to $3,500,000?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes; I would be glad to, because I do not want the gentleman, or any of my colleagues, to have any misunderstanding on the subject.

It is the policy of the committee, and I concur in the policy, not to appropriate money for construction during a fiscal year if it can be avoided when that money will not be spent during that fiscal year.

It appeared from the record, and from the testimony which I think I should say to the gentleman was rather limited, the testimony on the subject, it appeared to the committee that this money for actual construction would not be needed during fiscal 1957; therefore, the committee gave all of the money requested, as we understood, for planning and preparation of plans, all of that money, but did not allow money which we understood was requested for actual construction and not needed in fiscal year 1957.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Certainly.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I believe there was some testimony to the effect that money would be needed for the construction of access roads and dam-site housing.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think the gentleman is right, and I think that that was overlooked in setting the figure at $3,155,000.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I assume if that information is supplied to the other body there would be no objection to restoring that amount.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Certainly not from me, and I feel there would not be from any other member of the subcommittee. I may say, however, that we would want, so far as possible, to determine the actual amount of money needed for the construction of roads and housing before we set the figure or appropriated for it. The money for access roads I think is justifiable, but I think we should be very careful in appropriating money for housing that we do not run into some of the problems we did in building so-called model housing units such as that at Boulder City and Hanford. We should let the contractor supply his housing, and we should supply only the housing necessary, possibly of a more permanent character, for Federal employees. It is my belief that is what the bureau is requesting.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. That is exactly what the request was from the bureau.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think we should be careful.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I notice funds for the Missouri River Basin transmission division program are allowed with the exception of $5,500,000 for the Fort Randall-Grand Island line, which is a 230,000-kilovolt line which was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Could the gentleman give me any light as to why that was left out?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I wish I could. I did not know that I was to become an authority on the entire public works bill as seems to be the case this afternoon. As the gentleman knows I was not present at all the hearings because I was ill, and I did not hear all the testimony. My understanding is that the item was probably removed because Nebraska has chosen to be a self-reliant and a self-financing State on power. Is that right?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. We are a public power State.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Is that what the gentleman is saying in other language?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No. We have to come to the Federal Government for money for our light plants and our REA's. This is a feasible project that was recommended to the Bureau of the Budget and every dollar will be paid back.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I just cannot answer it. I wish I could.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. CRETELLA. Can the gentleman give me some information with reference to the Quinnipiac River project at New Haven?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I cannot pronounce it, let alone give the gentleman any information on it.

Mr. CRETELLA. It is an Indian name.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I understand that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear in behalf of the people of Connecticut and New England on matters which are of vital importance to their welfare and protection from the ravages of floods, erosion, and storms.

Connecticut is still digging out from the ruins left in the wake of the August and October storms of last year. In emergency session the State Legislature appropriated $73 million for assistance to those faced with the burdensome tasks of rebuilding their homes and their businesses.

You have heard a joint statement from all 12 New England Senators and from those in the State of Connecticut who work very closely with the problems of floods and are well acquainted with our needs in this regard. I want to subscribe wholeheartedly to these statements and ask that they be carefully and sincerely weighed.

Congress has wasted little time up to now in providing financial aid in the urgency deficiency bill so that a program could be initiated for the construction of dams and reservoirs and other projects.

This Committee now has before it President Eisenhower's request for additional funds which would accelerate the flood-control program in the northeast region in addition to hurricane studies under Public Law 71 and projects for shore protection and improvement.

There is no doubt that millions would have been saved in Connecticut alone if the various dams and projects had been completed in time to bear the forces of our storms last year. It was estimated by the State that the $207 million loss in the Naugatuck Valley could have been reduced by $90 million if the Thomaston Dam had been built. The Naugatuck Valley is one of the most vulnerable in the entire Northeast area to floods and the losses in property and the human misery which occurred there last year should provide ample incentive for Congress to appropriate additional funds as sought by the President.

Although the United States Army engineers have taken active interest in New England flood-control projects, the overall results have been more or less disappointing. This can be attributed to the neglect of Congress in failing consistently to appropriate funds for vital authorized projects. Of the many projects authorized since 1938 only 5 structures have been built thus far although the present budget includes funds for additional work.

New England appears to be increasingly prominent in the paths of recent hurricanes and floods. If we are to have an accelerated program of flood control, Congress must take into consideration the greater and greater jeopardy to which the residents of Connecticut and the Northeast are being subjected. Appropriations of several million dollars even over and above that figure recommended by the President would be put to good practical use. It is expected the Corps of Engineers will recommend new and additional projects to be undertaken as a result of further studies which are being made to come up with a sound program of flood control. Increased funds for fiscal 1957 could be very economically put to use for such expansion.

A project which has been authorized since 1945 in the 79th Congress is the deepening of the Quinnipiac River. The completion of this project would greatly help in lessening the needs of business and commerce in the area which depends on adequate channels for shipping. Industry has grown in New Haven and a good portion of the population depends on the success of companies established on the Quinnipiac River. The great majority of these businesses have indicated their desire to expand their facilities when the deepening of the river is completed. In the original House Document 517 the tonnage shown was 480,000. The present tonnage is 946,141.

Maintenance dredging in New Haven Harbor is to be undertaken soon. Considerable economy could be effected by deepening the adjacent Quinnipiac River at the same time. It would be first necessary, of course, for this committee to appropriate the necessary funds for the Quinnipiac River project. I hope in the interest of a stronger economy in New Haven and the State of Connecticut that these funds will be made available immediately for this purpose.

One of the shore-erosion projects for which funds of $42,000 were appropriated for fiscal 1956 was Woodmont, in the district I represent. The start of construction, however, has been delayed and it appears no work will begin before the deadline of July 1. I urgently request that this appropriation of $42,000 be included in the 1957 budget so the project can be carried out. State and local interests have contributed $150,000 toward the costs. There is a real need in Woodmont for shore-erosion protection and I trust the committee will see fit to include this item in the budget.

Connecticut has continually demonstrated her energy and initiative in defense against the threats of storms, and erosion, and the willingness to help provide suitable navigation and harbor facilities. I hope the interest in these matters as displayed by the citizens of our State will be fairly recognized by the committee and that sufficient funds will be made available so that we can go forward with an accelerated program as a means of protection to the residents of Connecticut from the forces of nature which have thus far taken such a ghastly toll of lives and personal property.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. I understand that these two dams, the Glen Canyon Dam and Flaming Gorge Dam are a considerable distance from highways.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We quite often build dams some distance from highways.

Mr. HILL. You have to in that rugged, mountainous area. But when I discovered that the fund had been reduced from $8 million down to $3 million for this particular year the question occurred to me: How can we ever expect to get these highways constructed?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is the point just made by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON]. I concur that there should have been some money put in for access roads, whatever we actually need in the fiscal year. I am not for appropriating money that will not be spent in this fiscal year.

Mr. HILL. This Glen Canyon Dam is 135 miles from the nearest town or a good highway.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The upper basin States are going to do something about these roads also.

Mr. HILL. I understand there is to be a cooperative arrangement between the States and the Bureau; at the same time the State is not very apt to start these highway programs unless they know funds from the Government will be forthcoming.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Can the gentleman tell me how much the other States are to contribute to those roads?

Mr. HILL. In my own State, we have always contributed percentagewise somewhere near 50–50. At the same time that is not the answer. What would be the attitude if the other body should decide to replace this $5 million? That is not a small sum because $5 million is a lot of money.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It is a lot of money to the gentleman and myself but sometimes I think it is not considered to be a lot of money when we bring this bill to the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, the President submitted a budget request for $8 million for the upper Colorado River storage project for fiscal year 1957. This request included plans and specifications for 2 of the dams—Glen Canyon and Flaming Gorge—as well as advance planning money for some of the other authorized units.

Both of the dams are some distance from any present highway and roads need to be built immediately for access to the sites. The access road from United States Highway 89 to the Glen Canyon Dam site is in very rugged mountains and is estimated to cost about $4½ million. I understand the Bureau of Reclamation expects to have specifications ready to award a contract for this road as soon as construction money is available. The Bureau is required to state in its specifications the amount of money available for contract earnings at the time it advertises. It seems essential, therefore, that construction money be available July 1 for this work to get underway.

Glen Canyon Dam site is 135 miles from the nearest town and therefore re-

quires construction housing and some permanent housing for operation employees. The Bureau plans to use trailers and portable houses so far as possible, but it is impossible at present to even get a trailer to the site because no roads exist. Contracts would be awarded within a few months for some housing, office space, warehouses, and so forth.

I am advised that a contract for diversion tunnels is planned to be let about April 1, 1957, and construction funds in the amount of at least $1 million should be available in January 1957 so that the estimated amount of contract earnings can be included in the specifications when they are advertised.

A similar situation prevails at Flaming Gorge Dam site where roads, construction camp, and diversion tunnel contracts will be ready for advertising shortly after January 1, 1957, and construction funds for payments under these contracts should be made available to the Bureau of Reclamation now.

The advance planning money is, of course, essential to complete the planning on other units so that an orderly development can proceed on this project, which was overwhelmingly approved by the House a few months ago.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Does the gentleman want a road or a dam?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I have studied this record quite carefully and I can understand how the gentleman from California and the members of the committee might have some reservations here.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I hope the gentleman will understand that I am not arguing the merits of this project either in the committee or here. I have done the same thing with a project in my own district. I have approved taking out money that could not be spent in the fiscal year.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I understand and I commend the gentleman for that. I was trying to get an idea of what would be expected in the way of further information to justify this appropriation.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think the information would be, what actual work is to be done, the contributions of the States and how much will be needed in the fiscal year 1957. Incidentally, there is the matter of when the construction contracts actually will be ready to be let.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Yes, as to contracts for construction of the diversion tunnels, there is the difference as appears in the hearings between April 1, 1957, and February 1, 1957. If I understand the gentleman correctly, if the information mentioned is supplied in acceptable form, the committee would be inclined to look kindly on it?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Speaking for one Member, yes.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. The gentleman would be inclined to?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Speaking for one Member, I would not object. The gentleman also realizes a statement that the money might be used in the last quarter is not definite enough.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I understand that. It should be pinpointed.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I have about exhausted my time. I just wish to say that I took the floor, Mr. Chairman, to point out a few facts regarding the expenditures of TVA, for example, that TVA, while it has been referred to on the floor as being a self-reliant and self-financing agency, actually it has not even returned to the Federal Government the amount of money which the Federal Government has paid in interest for TVA's money over the same period of years, or less. I just think that this is neither the time nor the place to attempt to discuss that subject fully.

I would like to say in the remaining minute that I have been on the subcommittee which makes that budget for 10 years, but I have never in that time heard anyone say they wished to destroy the TVA. I have heard them say they wished the TVA would recognize the fact that it has in itself the inherent strength to conduct itself as an independent agency, self-financing, self-operating, and to act as if it were grown up. I think that is a subject for which time should be taken on the floor of the House to exhaust the subject thoroughly so that we would not be subjected to a statement like the one I referred to, which said that the TVA was not costing the taxpayers 1 cent. The records of the Congress show that that is not so, nor is it true that the TVA is returning all the money it should return to the Congress, when the records show it returned less than the interest paid by the taxpayers on the money advanced to the TVA. The TVA paid back $127.5 million, and simple interest alone on the money advanced TVA for power construction alone, would be more than $200 million, both figures to June 30, 1955.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, wish to commend the chairman of the committee and members and the subcommittee hearing these proposals on their splendid action in providing for needed flood control projects. The amounts provided for Success and Terminus Dams in my district by this bill represent a start on construction of two worthwhile projects—a construction which has been delayed for various reasons over a period of years.

In order that you might have a complete picture of these projects I will summarize certain major aspects thereof as follows:

SUCCESS RESERVOIR, TULE RIVER, CALIF.

AUTHORIZATION

The Success project is a unit in the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Basin. The Flood Control Act of 1944 authorized construction and operation of the project under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the recommendations contained in House of Representatives Flood Control Committee Document No. 1, 78th Congress, 2d session—also see House Document 559, 78th Congress, which contains the latest published map.

LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

Success project consists of a dam and reservoir for flood control, irrigation, and related purposes in the Tule River and Tulare Lake areas. The dam is to be located on Tule River about 5 miles east of the town of Porterville, Tulare County, Calif., and will be an earth-fill structure 146 feet high and 3,430 feet long across the Tule River, with an auxiliary earth-fill dam or dike 40 feet high and 6,300 feet long across Frazier Valley about 3½ miles northwesterly from the main dam. It will create a reservoir of 75,000-acre-foot capacity. The spillway will be located on a natural rock saddle about 1,000 feet northwesterly from the main dam, and will be ungated. The total estimated cost of the project, based on 1955 price levels, is $13,900,000.

PROJECT OPERATION

The storage capacity of 75,000 acre-feet will be operated in the combined interest of flood-control and water conservation. In general, the storage capacity would be evacuated to the extent necessary in advance of the winter and spring floods. After danger of floods has passed in the spring, the reservoir would be filled gradually to provide water for irrigation use. The storage and release of water for conservation purposes will be consistent with water rights established by State law and with the desires of the local interests owning such rights. Prior to use of the reservoir for conservation purposes, however, a contract with local water users will be necessary providing, among other things, for payment for the use of the reservoir storage capacity.

PROJECT BENEFITS

The Success Reservoir project will provide full flood protection to about 60,000 acres of agricultural and suburban lands along the Tule River and its tributaries and to the Porterville urban area, which has a population of about 10,000. It will also improve the irrigation water supply by providing about 10,000 acre-feet of new water through reduction in evaporation losses in Tulare Lake, and will provide means for regulating the present irrigation supply. Most of the area to be protected is highly developed farmland, devoted primarily to the production of fruits, truck crops and cotton, and to alfalfa and irrigated pasture for stock feed. In conjunction with the constructed Pine Flat and Isabella Reservoirs and the authorized Terminus Reservoir on Kaweah River, the Success project will help to provide flood protection to about 260,000 acres of highly productive agricultural land in the Tulare Lake area. Data on major floods and flood

damages from rain floods in the Tule River area and from snowmelt floods in the Tulare Lake area are given in the following tabulation:

Date	Peak flow at Worth Bridge		Flood damages below dam site from—	
	Natural (cubic feet per second)	Modified by project (cubic feet per second) [1]	Natural flow [2]	Modified flow
RAIN FLOODS				
February 1936	14,000	1,200	$1,000,000	0
February 1937	13,000	3,200	800,000	0
February–March 1938	14,000	1,000	1,130,000	0
March 1943	21,100	3,200	2,060,000	0
November 1950	28,000	500	1,340,000	0
January 1952	5,500	500	31,000	0
December 1955–January 1956	17,000	500	2,600,000	0
SNOW-MELT FLOODS				
March–June 1938	[3] [4] 85,000	[3] [4] 5,000	1,650,000	[5] $100,000
April–June 1952	[3] [4] 30,000	[4] 0	620,000	[5] 0

[1] Controlled to nondamaging flows along channels of Tule River below dam site.
[2] Based on 1955 prices and development. Actually the historical damages of the earlier floods were much smaller because the area was not developed.
[3] Acre-feet.
[4] Estimate of volume of Tule River inflow to Tulare Lake under present conditions of development.
[5] Damage in Tulare Lake area; assigned in proportion to damaging flow from each tributary stream.

The city of Porterville has been flooded several times in the past, most recently in November 1950. A repetition of the 1950 flood with current conditions of development and prices would cause damages of $1,340,000 in the Tule River area below the dam site, of which about $130,000 would occur in the Porterville urban area. Damages in the Tulare Lake area, caused by flooding from the Kings, Kern, Kaweah, and Tule Rivers, have approximated $39 million since 1937. On the basis of 1955 prices and stage of development, such damages would amout to about $76 million. The flood of April–June 1952 inundated about 70,000 acres in the Tulare Lake area, causing damages to growing crops and preventing the farming of other croplands, and resulting in damages estimated at $7 million (current prices) of which about $620,000 could be assigned to Tule River flow, on the basis of volume of inflow. The December 1955 and January 1956 floods had lower peak flows than the flood of 1950 but they flooded 44,000 acres of agricultural land below Porterville and caused far greater damage than the flood in 1950. Considerable land was badly eroded and other lands were covered with sand and silt. Orchards, crops, and improvements were severely damaged. In Tulare Lake, damages attributable to Tule River water were estimated at $200,000. The Success project would provide adequate flood protection to the Tule River area below the dam site and would assist materially in reducing damage in Tulare Lake. The project would also improve the annual irrigation water supply to the highly water-deficient Tule River area and would provide means for regulating the present irrigation supply.

The average annual benefits are as follows:

Flood control	$659,000
Irrigation	68,000
Total	727,000

The average annual charges are $590,000 and the benefit-to-cost ratio is 1.2 to 1.

LOCAL COOPERATION

Payment is to be made to the United States by local interests when use is made of the stored water for conservation purposes, but no local cooperation is required for the construction of the reservoir project. Costs for the conservation features of the project have not yet been allocated. Improvement by local interests of the maintenance of existing channels and diversions under project conditions will be necessary in order to increase the capacity for disposal of excess waters, (primarily by channel percolation and over-irrigation) in the Tule River area. Cost of additional maintenance of channels and diversions is estimated at $18,000 annually. General assurances have been furnished by local interests that they would meet the requirements for local cooperation.

STATUS

Design studies are about 80 percent complete. Construction plans and specifications are about 30 percent complete. By the end of the current fiscal year the design studies should be about 85 percent complete and construction plans and specifications should be about 35 percent complete. Planning required to initiate construction will be completed with funds currently available. Construction work has not been initiated.

TERMINUS RESERVOIR, KAWEAH RIVER, CALIF.

AUTHORIZATION

The Terminus project is a unit in the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Basin. The Flood Control Act of 1944 authorized construction and operation of the project under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the recommendations contained in House of Representatives Flood Control Committee Document No. 1, 78th Congress, 2d session—also see House Document No. 559, 78th Congress which contains the latest published map.

LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

Terminus project consists of a dam, reservoir, and spreading works for flood control, irrigation, and related purposes in the Kaweah River and Tulare Lake areas. Terminus Dam is to be located on Kaweah River about 20 miles east of the city of Visalia, Calif. The spreading works are to be constructed in the valley below the reservoir. The dam will be an earthfill structure 220 feet high and 2,680 feet long across Kaweah River and will create a reservoir of 145,000 acre-foot capacity. The spillway will be located in a natural saddle about one-half mile south of the dam and will be gate controlled. The spreading areas will range in size from about 300 acres to about 2,000 acres, and will be for the purpose of spreading floodwaters to assist in flood control and to replenish the ground-water basin for subsequent pumping for irrigation. The absorptive capacity of the spreading works will be about 60,000 acre-feet per month. The reservoir will provide about 34,000 acre-feet of new water a year through reductions in evaporation losses and will provide means for regulating the present irrigation supply. The total estimated cost of the project, based on the 1955 price levels, is $18,600,000.

PROJECT OPERATION

The storage capacity of 145,000 acre-feet will be operated in the combined interest of flood control and water conservation. In general, the storage capacity would be evacuated to the extent necessary in advance of the winter and spring floods. After danger of floods has passed in the spring, the reservoir would be filled gradually to provide water for irrigation use. The storage and release of water for conservation purposes will be consistent with water rights established by State law and with the desires of the local interests owning such rights. Prior to use of the reservoir for conservation purposes, however, a contract with local water users will be necessary providing, among other things, for payment for the use of the reservoir storage capacity.

PROJECT BENEFITS

The Terminus Reservoir project will provide full flood protection to about 110,000 acres of agricultural lands in the Kaweah River area and for the city of Visalia and adjacent urban area with a population of about 20,000. It will provide about 34,000 acre-feet of new water annually for irrigation through reductions in evaporation losses in Tulare Lake and will provide means for regulating the present irrigation water supply. The spreading works portion of the project will assist both flood control and water conservation by recharging the ground-water basin with floodwaters, and will have an infiltration capacity of about 60,000 acre-feet per month. The agricultural lands to be served by the project are particularly well adapted to the production of fruits, nuts, truck crops, cotton, and stock feeds. In conjunction with the completed Pine Flat and Isabella Reservoirs and the authorized Success Reservoir on Tule River, the Terminus project will help to provide adequate flood protection to 260,000 acres of croplands in the Tulare Lake area.

Data on major rain floods and flood damages in the Kaweah River area, and snowmelt floods in the Tulare Lake area are given in the following tabulation:

Date	Peak flow at McKay point		Flood damages below dam site from—	
	Natural (cubic feet per second)	Modified by project (cubic feet per second)[1]	Natural flow[2] (dollars)	Modified flow (dollars)
RAIN FLOODS				
February 1937	19,000	1,200	720,000	0
December 1937	35,000	1,000	1,030,000	0
March 1938	15,000	1,900	620,000	0
January–March 1943	17,000	1,900	930,000	0
February 1945	15,000	1,200	595,000	0
November 1950	54,000	1,100	1,340,000	0
December 1955–January 1956	73,000	5,500	12,500,000	0
SNOW-MELT FLOODS				
March–June 1938	[3][4] 240,000	[3][4] 10,000	[5] 4,350,000	[5] 210,000
March–June 1952	[3][4] 145,000	[4] 0	[5] 1,960,000	[5] 0

[1] Controlled to nondamaging flows along channels of Kaweah River below dam site.
[2] Based on 1955 prices and development. Actually the historical damages of the earlier floods were much smaller because the area was not developed.
[3] Acre-feet.
[4] Volume of inflow to Tulare Lake.
[5] Damages in Tulare Lake area; assigned in proportion to damaging flow from each tributary stream.

The city of Visalia has been flooded by the Kaweah River several times in the past. The most serious flooding in recent years was during December 1955 and January 1956. These floods had the largest peak flow of record with 73,000 cubic feet per second and a 5-day volume of about 130,000 acre-feet. Nearly three-fourths of the city of Visalia was flooded by the December flood and about half of the city was flooded by the January flood. Most of the city area covered by the January flood had been damaged by the December flood, but some of the area had escaped the December flood. Damages caused by these floods are being surveyed and only tentative estimates are available at this time. Damages in the city of Visalia are in the order of $3 million, and damages in the Kaweah River area, including the city of Visalia, are estimated at $12.5 million. The Kaweah River flood plain is an outwash cone formation with the riverbed usually on the high part. The flood washed out river control structures and cut new channels, thus damaging roads, utilities and nearly 200,000 acres of agricultural lands. Some lands were severely eroded and others were left buried under a heavy deposit of sand, silt, and debris. About 9,000 acres were flooded in Tulare Lake with damages of $500,000 attributable to Kaweah River water. Flood damages in the Tulare Lake area, caused by flows from the Kaweah, Kings, Kern, and Tule Rivers, have approximated $39 million since 1937. On the basis of 1955 prices and stage of development, such damages would amount to about $76 million. The flood of March-June 1952 inundated about 70,000 acres in the lake area, causing damages to growing crops and preventing the farming of other croplands, and resulting in damages estimated at $7 million (current prices) of which about $1,960,000 could be assigned to Kaweah River flow on the basis of volume of inflow; $1.9 million of this damage would have been prevented with the project in full operation. The Terminus Reservoir, with the other reservoirs of the plan, would assist in preventing such damages from occurring in the future. The removal of the flood hazard will stimulate larger growth of industry in the city of Visalia and in the remainder of the Kaweah River flood plain. The reservoir and spreading works will improve the supply of water irrigation.

The average annual benefits are as follows:

Flood control	$1,662,000
Irrigation	253,000
Total	1,915,000

The average annual charges are $855,000 and the benefit-to-cost ratio is 2.2 to 1.0.

LOCAL COOPERATION

Local interests are required to make payment to the United States for the conservation features of the project and to operate and maintain the spreading works after completion. The amounts to be repaid for conservation features of the project have not yet been allocated. Estimated annual cost of operation and maintenance of the spreading works is $22,000. Assurances have been furnished by local interests that they would meet the requirements. Local interests have constructed and are operating some of the spreading works contemplated by the project.

STATUS

Planning accomplished to date consists primarily of field explorations and surveys required for definite design studies. Preparation of the design memorandum to be used as a basis for the construction plans and specifications is about 30 percent complete and is expected to be about 50 percent complete with funds currently available. Except for plans prepared as part of the definite design studies, no construction plans and specifications have been prepared. Construction work has not been initiated.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, on page 14 of the report on the public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1957, funds have been recommended and allocated for the improvement of the Delaware River, one of our country's major lanes of commerce.

An allocation of $1,060,000 has been recommended for the improvement of the Delaware River from Philadelphia to the sea. The other allocation is for $6 million and authorizes the deepening of the Delaware Channel from 25 to 35 feet.

The foresight of the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations has made it possible for me and my colleagues from Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware to appear on the floor today and request that these two allocations be favorably voted upon and passed without further delay.

As most of you know, we have battled tirelessly during the past year and a half to obtain the approval of these projects by the Congress. We have been particularly concerned about the $6 million allocation needed to initiate the deepening of the channel inasmuch as it was contained in the budget recommendations to the Congress in January.

In March of this year my colleagues and I appeared before the House Appropriations Committee in support of this allocation for construction. At that time I pointed out the obsoleteness of the Delaware Channel and emphasized the fact that our continued growth and prosperity depended largely upon the building of a more modern channel to adequately accommodate the present ocean traffic. I believe I was, to a degree, successful in proving to the committee that the Delaware River today is outmoded and instead of providing a vital link in our transportation system, it is a hindrance to profitable trade. I further pointed out the need for an improved channel in the interest of national defense.

We Members from Philadelphia and our colleagues from New Jersey and Delaware have presented every possible argument in favor of the deepening of the Delaware River.

We realize these projects will greatly enhance our valley's prosperity—and this I am for—but my main concern is safety to ships and the saving of human lives, which cannot be measured in dollars and cents.

Since the deepening of the channel will provide greater safety to all vessels calling at the port of Philadelphia and make our port facilities more attractive to foreign trade; and since the deepening of the channel will minimize the navigational hazards and thereby insure the lives of all seamen; and since the deepening of the channel will assure increased prosperity for the Delaware Valley and guarantee greater employment through the establishment of new industries along its banks, I sincerely urge that this body vote unanimously for the immediate passage of the public works appropriation bill for 1957.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I gladly embrace this opportunity to thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and its able members as well

as the entire Appropriations Committee for so expeditiously considering and reporting this most constructive bill.

The measure involves extremely complex engineering matters requiring long intensive study and I congratulate the committee for its patient, laborious, able work which has been so conspicuously crowned with success.

In my opinion this bill is not only unique with regard to the speed with which it has been reported to the House in view of its complex subject matter, but from the standpoint of my district, State and area, it represents the greatest step forward in Federal flood-control legislation since the inception of this government.

In behalf of all my people, in behalf of the people of Massachusetts and the members of our special Massachusetts Delegation Committee on Flood Rehabilitation and Relief and, of course, in my own behalf, I desire publicly to express my deeply felt appreciation to all the members of the committee, its staff and the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget and all others who have contributed to the formulation and presentation of this highly meritorious measure.

The presence of this bill here on the floor today is living proof of the adaptability of this body, and the ready response that can usually be found here, to great public emergencies such as confronted us in the great, devastating floods which ravaged the Northeast last summer and fall.

This measure has laid a speedy and indeed sound foundation for many projects of extreme urgency. It will go a long way in affording the kind of protection which our area will require in the future. It will go a long way toward preventing the recurrence of the great disasters that have been periodically visited upon us during torrential equinoctial storms and hurricanes by raging waters in our river valleys and in other places sweeping everything before them and causing great loss of life and tremendous damage to property and creating havoc, confusion and privation in our communities.

The committee action is unique in another way. In its commendable zeal to meet these problems speedily, for one of the few times in the history of this Government, the committee has cut the red-tape and bureaucratic delay that frequently attends the development of these matters, and has acted across a broad front and in a courageous way to extend relief and provide flood prevention.

We understand, of course, that as splendid and constructive as this bill is, further action will be required by the Congress as we go along in order to assure adequate safeguards and complete protection. The major projects have been, in the main, very well established and should go forward with all practicable promptness. To be sure, there remains a great deal of work still to be authorized and still to be achieved before our area will be adequately protected against floods.

Some of this work can be accomplished by the Federal Government acting alone and some of it will be the subject matter for joint action between the Government, the States, and the local communities.

As to that part of it which is the legitimate concern of the Federal Government, extensive surveys, reviews and studies which the Congress has already authorized are now proceeding. The end results of these activities will enable the Congress to know from an engineering and operational viewpoint as well as in complete detail where additional work is required, its nature, character and scope, and by what feasible means it can be accomplished.

Some of this work can be done under existing authority. For much more, additional authority is being sought. The McCormack bill, H. R. 9554, and its companion, the Philbin bill, now pending before the House Public Works Committee and already approved in principle by the Secretary of the Army reflecting the view of the Corps of Engineers, will greatly broaden the amount of work that can be done by the engineers without coming back to Congress for additional authority. They would raise the limit up to $500,000 for any one such project, and it will readily be seen that this figure more realistically approximates current needs and would promote greater speed and efficiency in coping with emergencies.

It is measures like these which will be the answer to the alleviation of a large variety and number of water resources and water flowage conditions, not only in the northeast area, but throughout the Nation.

In my own district, for example, the basic projects established in the Quinebaug, French, Blackstone, and Ware Rivers will be of infinite flood protection help. There are still many conditions that have come about, and which periodically come about, as a consequence of floods which can only be dealt with by smaller local projects and engineering and construction of a preventive nature in and along these river channels, having to do with removal of rubbish and debris, diking, straightening, deepening and widening of the channels and general rehabilitation work affecting also the tributaries and feeding sources of these rivers which will have to be done independent of and regardless of the construction of major dams and reservoirs.

The Quaboag River is an illustration of this type of need. The recent floods necessarily altered the plans of the engineers for a major project to control the waters of this river at West Brookfield. However, the engineers having already done considerable remedial work along this stream are carefully studying ways and means to effectuate complete control to prevent recurrent damage along its course and particularly at the confluence of the Quaboag, Ware and Swift Rivers with the Chicopee River at Three Rivers where throughout that entire area real control problems exist.

The Nashua and Assabet Rivers are other types where this type of control could be effectual and this is also true of the streams in the Milford area where the State is already going forward with coordinated projects. In fact, in all the river basins in Massachusetts a great deal of work of this character is needed and must be performed. It is my purpose to continue to apply my most vigorous efforts to all these needs and I will earnestly seek the cooperation of the House regarding these additional authorizations and appropriations. These many projects and required public works will certainly have my constant and unflagging attention.

It is true that the local communities and the States in the exercise of their primary responsibilities over streams and waterways will undertake a portion of this work. But a considerable portion of it lies beyond their resources and much of it falls under authority of current Federal mandates already given by the Congress. In the event that some of the projects are completed by State and local governments—many have been—there is still a very wide area for the implementation of the general, overall surveys in river basins and the efficient coordination of this work with soil erosion and soil utilization, antipollution, recreational uses, improvement of public water supplies and other projects looking toward the fuller control and utilization of water resources.

For these reasons, the Congress must and will, I am sure, continue its interest and very substantial support of these objectives by Federal planning and grants for the actual work. I think that we must take a broad, long-range view, not only of the more urgent, immediate needs, but also of the many desirable objectives of community development, area and regional development by the States under the overall guidance of the Federal Government, which will so manifestly promote increased prosperity, economic and social advancement as well as greater safety against disasters of the Nation as a whole.

While we can all feel a real sense of satisfaction with our progress to date, there are still serious and difficult problems to be solved, which will call, not only for steadily expanding operations by the Corps of Engineers, but also require for their solution the adoption of a suitable plan for disaster and flood insurance.

I think such a plan is of the utmost importance. On several occasions I have elaborated my views respecting disaster and flood insurance before the House, and before committees of both branches of the Congress. I do not wish to go into the matter extensively here, but by way of emphasizing this reference to the question, I would most respectfully suggest and urge that our House committee continue to give its diligent attention to pending bills including my own, providing for disaster insurance, and particularly flood insurance, and exert every effort to consider, and if deemed desirable, which I hope it will be, to broaden and extend the measure already adopted by the other body, in any event to report some suitable bill at a very early date.

Before I conclude, I am very anxious also, as chairman of the Massachusetts delegation flood committee, to extend my

sincere and deep thanks to the press and its representatives in my district and State and, in fact, in many other places, for their very valuable assistance in presenting our urgent needs arising out of the terrible floods to the people. This warm interest and wide coverage on the part of the press of the disaster, its aftermath and the emergency character of the need for relief, rehabilitation, and permanent protection has been one of the truly effective instrumentalities contributing greatly to the results achieved up to this time.

Let me say to you, my friends and colleagues, that I will ever be grateful for your many expressions of sympathy for my stricken people, for your warm interest and your whole-hearted cooperation and for your most helpful efforts which have brought the power and resources of our great Federal Government in such substantial degree to the assistance of so many distressed peoples and communities and which are bringing the reality of complete protection against such disasters closer day by day. If we but continue this vital work, many lasting benefits are bound to flow from it and our entire Nation—its well-being and welfare—will be the better for what this Congress has done and will do in the time ahead.

Control of floods in Massachusetts, particularly in the Worcester County area, is a step nearer reality today with House action on the flood-control appropriation bill.

The engineers asked for $340,000 for the beginning of construction work on the East Brimfield Dam and Reservoir during the fiscal year 1956–57, which starts July 1. The committee increased this amount by one-half million to $840,000.

In addition, the committee advanced flood control in the Blackstone Basin by providing $100,000 in planning funds subject to State concurrence for the West Hill Dam and Reservoir on the West River below Upton.

The committee's action is almost unprecedented in approving the West Hill planning funds because of a standing congressional rule of not providing Federal funds for projects which lack State concurrence or approval. In addition, the engineers in testimony before the Appropriations Committee indicated that inclusion of West Hill in this year's budget would tax the ability of the Corps to do the planning work because of the heavy workload involved by other New England projects.

A public hearing has been called for May 24 in Upton by the Massachusetts Department of Commerce on the West Hill project. The department in turn submits recommendations to the Governor, who concurs or withholds approval of Federal flood-control projects in the State.

Following is a breakdown of the $4½ million Federal allocations for central Massachusetts:

East Brimfield, $840,000; Hodges Village, $360,000; Buffumville, $1,200,000; Barre Falls, $1,150,000; and Worcester diversion, $840,000; all construction projects.

West Hill, $100,000, for the preparation of engineering plans and specifications.

Blackstone Basin, $10,000 for a continuing survey at a total cost of $40,000. Last year $20,000 was provided to begin the survey.

The Massachusetts delegation urged the Appropriations Committee to provide planning funds for the Westville project near Southbridge. The engineers, however, placed a higher priority on the East Brimfield project, also designed to protect Southbridge, because that construction will cut down on the difficulties of building Westville, since a cofferdam will not have to be built at the Westville site.

The Buffumville project is located on the Little River in Charlton about 5 miles above Webster. The engineers have set June 1958 as the target date of the $2,820,000 job, all of which will be borne by the Federal Government, including land taking.

Closure of the rolled-earth fill-type dam, which will be 66 feet high and 3,255 feet long upon completion, will take place in May, 1957, when the Little waters will begin to be impounded in the reservoir area. A 220-foot concrete spillway for overflow will be provided.

Land acquisitions for the reservoir will not be completed until June, 1958, under present engineer estimates. Upon completion, the reservoir will permit permanent storage of 1,400 acre-feet of water behind the dam, which amount can be raised to 12,700 acre-feet in time of heavy rains, an increase of 11,300 acre-feet over the reservoir's normal storage.

Hodges Village, to be completed in February, 1959, will cost $4,350,000, all in Federal funds, including land taking costs. It is on the French River in Oxford about 6 miles above Webster. The dam, with height of 55 feet, running 1,140 feet along its length, will be closed in May 1958. The entire project will be completed in February, 1959, under present engineer estimates.

Land acquisitions for the reservoir will not be completed until November 1958. Upon completion, the reservoir will provide a water storage area of 13,000 acre-feet in time of heavy rains.

Buffumville and Hodges Village are 2 of 7 flood control projects authorized by Congress in the Thames Basin. Only one has been built, the Mansfield Hollow Dam, above Willimantic, Conn. This year, construction will start on Buffumville, Hodges Village, and East Brimfield. The latter project is located on the Quinebaug River in Sturbridge and is designed to furnish flood protection for Southbridge.

With the $100,000 provided by Congress in February in a supplemental appropriation for Buffumville, the engineers plan the following work:

Initiation of road relocation, $89,500; engineering and design, $1,000; supervision and administration, $9,500.

Beginning July 1 the $1,200,000 appropriation for the project will be used for the following work:

Land acquisition, $150,000; relocate pipeline and utility, $53,200; continuation of road relocation, $150,800; initiate construction of outlet works and dam, $739,000; engineering and design, $15,400; supervision and administration, $91,600.

The $360,000 appropriation for Hodges Village will be used for:

Initiation of railroad relocation, $179,000; engineering and design, $152,500; supervision and administration, $28,500.

WARE RIVER JOB

The completion date for the Barre Falls project is November 1957. It is located on the Ware River in Barre and will cost $2,680,000, all of which will be borne by the Federal Government, including land taking.

Closure of the earth and rock fill dam, which will be 62 feet high and 885 feet long, is scheduled for August 1957, when the Ware waters will begin to be impounded in the reservoir area. A concrete weir and chute-type spillway, capable of discharging water at the rate of 16,300 cubic feet per second, will be provided in the construction.

Land acquisitions for the reservoir are expected to be completed this month, under present engineer estimates. Upon completion, the reservoir will provide 24,300 acre-feet of water storage in time of heavy rains.

The Barre Falls project is designed to protect Ware, Three Rivers, and downstream points on the Chicopee River as it flows into the Connecticut.

With the $300,000 provided by Congress in February in a supplemental appropriation for Barre Falls, the engineers plan the following work:

Land acquisition in reservoir area, $2,000; initiation of construction of the outlet works of the dam, an access road and utility buildings, $271,000; engineering and design, $4,000; supervision and administration, $23,000.

Beginning July 1, the $1,150,000 appropriation for the project will be used for the following work:

Road relocation, $25,100; reservoir clearing, $30,000; continuation of dam construction, $986,400; permanent operating equipment, $1,500; engineering and design, $10,000; supervision and administration, $97,000.

The West Hill project is located on the West River above Uxbridge. Its estimated cost is $2,730,000, all of which would be borne by the Federal Government, including land taking. The proposed reservoir would control a 28 square-mile drainage area and would have a storage capacity of 11,900 acre-feet. It would provide a high degree of protection to points on the lower West River and would have considerable flood-reducing effect at downstream points on the Blackstone.

The East Brimfield project, which has June 1959 as the target date for completion, will cost about $5,700,000. It is located on the Quinebaug in Sturbridge. All costs will be borne by the Federal Government, including land taking.

Closure of the earthen fill type dam, which will be 55 feet high and 510 feet long upon completion, will take place in August 1958, when the Quinebaug waters will begin to be impounded in the reservoir area. A 140-foot concrete spillway

for overflow will be provided. Land acquisitions for the reservoir will not be completed until June 1959, under present engineer estimates.

Upon completion, the reservoir will permit permanent storage of 1,200 acre-feet of water behind the dam, which amount can be raised to 30,000 acre-feet in time of heavy rains, an increase of 28,800 acre-feet over the reservoir's normal storage.

The East Brimfield project is 1 of 7 flood-control dams authorized by Congress in the Thames Basin. Only one has been built, the Mansfield Hollow Dam, above Willimantic, Conn. This year, construction will start on three others in the basin: East Brimfield, Hodges Village Dam in Oxford and Buffumville Dam in Charlton. The latter two projects will provide flood protection for Webster.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, the city of St. Louis is the only metropolitan city on the Missouri or Mississippi Rivers that lacks adequate flood control protection. Four times within the last decade my city has been visited by disastrous floods. The last was the Kansas-Missouri flood of 1951 which resulted in losses exceeding a billion dollars. During the last session of the Congress a bill was passed authorizing $130 million for a project to control the floods in and around St. Louis. That bill was passed unanimously. There was not a vote against it.

In the current appropriation bill there is an item on page 13—and I call the attention of the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member of the committee to it—for the planning of this flood control project in the amount of $551,000. The total cost of the planning work will be $1.2 million. Actually this is about $649,000 short of the total cost. If the Bureau of the Budget could be persuaded to submit a supplemental request for an additional $649,000 to complete these plans, I wonder if the committee would look with favor on that request.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman's inquiry on the item for St. Louis flood protection, the budget estimate was $551,000, with which it is proposed to protect an area of something like one-third of a million acres and 600 business firms and business enterprises against destructive floods, and particularly in view of the imperative nature of the menace of the situation I will say that the committee will be glad to consider any further estimates the Bureau of the Budget may send up. As a matter of fact, such estimates would be not only imperative, but mandatory.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to yield to the ranking minority member if he would care to comment on that.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not going to be in a position to say whether I, as an individual Member, would look with favor on any proposition until it has been submitted to the committee. It would be giving a blank check, and, as I have said very frequently on this floor with respect to appropriations, I do not favor that.

Mr. KARSTEN. I might say to the gentleman that he has already committed himself to $551,000 and I was wondering if he would be willing to go the rest of the way.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not in a position to make that kind of commitment without knowing all of the facts.

Mr. KARSTEN. The fact of the matter is the Committee on Appropriations has, in this bill, committed itself to providing funds for the planning of the St. Louis flood wall. Funds for only half of the flood wall are of no value in preventing a flood. It would appear to be uneconomical to plan a flood wall on a piecemeal basis. It would seem a more desirable procedure for the Bureau of the Budget to request sufficient funds to complete all of the planning work within the next year in order that the construction work can be started.

As the chairman of the committee has indicated he will be glad to consider other estimates which might be sent up by the Bureau of the Budget, I propose to ask the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to review the matter to see if a supplemental request could be submitted for $649,000 which is the balance that will be needed to complete the plans for the flood wall. If the Bureau of the Budget and the Corps of Engineers can be persuaded to do this, I hope the request will receive favorable consideration by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the whip of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, this bill as brought to you today by the House Committee on Appropriations, contains $500,000 to begin construction of a tremendously important project to Oklahoma and Arkansas—the Eufaula Dam. It contains a like amount for the very important sister project—the Dardanelle project in Arkansas.

The Eufaula Dam, which is a key unit in the comprehensive Arkansas Basin development program, would be on the Canadian River 27 miles above the confluence of the Canadian and the Arkansas. Because of the great silt-retention capacity it would have, the Eufaula Dam is an essential element in the development of the Arkansas River for navigation purposes.

You perhaps recall that Congress voted $450,000 last year to complete engineering plans and to make a start on construction of Eufaula. Thus far this administration has seen fit to impound these funds so that there has been no construction at all. It is my opinion that in this case the executive set itself above the expressed legislative will of Congress; and, in my opinion, the executive branch exceeded the authority it has under the Constitution. We have reason to believe if Congress again acts in this matter, the executive will allow the Corps of Engineers to proceed with construction.

I regret that the committee did not see fit to provide more than $500,000 for Eufaula in the next fiscal year. I think more money might be spent wisely on this project in the next 12 months. However, I am going to accept the committee's figure because I am so anxious to get this program started that I don't want to quibble over the amount.

Since an element of controversy has been introduced in connection with construction of this dam, I would like for a moment to review its history.

It was authorized by Congress in 1946. The improvement plan provides for flood control, hydroelectric power, and sediment control. This is one of those rare projects that can be justified even under the policy of this administration regarding hydroelectric-power dams.

The concrete and earth-filled dams will be 3,180 feet long and will rise 112 feet above the streambed. The reservoir will have a storage capacity of 1,428,000 acre-feet for flood control; 1,379,000 acre-feet for the generation of power; and it will provide a permanent pool of 897,000 acre-feet for sedimentation reserve, recreation, and preservation of wildlife, a total of 3,074,000 acre-feet. The estimated cost of the project is $153 million. It will take about 6 years to complete.

Mr. Chairman, as has been said before, the Arkansas is the last great river basin in the United States which has not been developed. We in Oklahoma and Arkansas are proud of the great developments along other major streams in this country—the Mississippi, the Missouri, the Ohio, the Tennessee, the Columbia, and many others. We feel that the time has arrived and is even overdue when the 4 million citizens of the great States of Arkansas and Oklahoma should begin to enjoy the fruits of river development.

This is a region blessed with tremendous resources, many of them as yet untapped. The greatest coal reserve in the midcontinental area of the United States is the Arkansas Basin. Some of the greatest oil- and gasfields in the world are in this area.

One of the chief deterrents to development of these resources to date has been the high cost of transportation. When the Arkansas River is open to navigation, I foresee the dawn of a new day for those who live in this area. Our people then will be in a far stronger competitive position; our area will be far more attractive to great and expanding industries.

Eufaula Dam will help meet the growing requirements for electricity in this area; it will help meet the ever-increasing demands for water for industrial and municipal purposes. It will help control the floods that almost every year exact a heavy toll from farmers and others who have property along the banks of the Canadian River.

Finally, some of the great defense establishments of our country are located in the valley of the Arkansas and its tributaries. Development of this basin will

be an investment in the security of our country, and in the security of the free world.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I should like to express my gratification over the inclusion of items for the Dardanelle and Eufaula Dams in the pending bill. As part of the comprehensive development plan for the Arkansas Basin, the Appropriations Committee has voted $1 million for the sister projects of Dardanelle and Eufaula. This marks the continuation of congressional policy to promote the multipurpose development of the Arkansas River, a program which received initial approval in the 1946 act authorizing construction. Last year the Congress appropriated $450,000 for Dardanelle in fiscal 1956, and with new funds for 1957 I am confident that the Corps of Engineers will be able to proceed with its construction.

It is only just and right that the last major river in the United States to remain undeveloped is at last to receive its fair attention. The Army engineers' plan for multipurpose utilization of this water resource was authorized 10 years ago. In 1950 there was an appropriation of $1 million to start construction of the Dardanelle Dam, but the Korean conflict intervened and all work on the project was suspended. Some of the $450,000 appropriated last year was used to complete planning, and the Army engineers are ready and able to carry forward the construction work. While under the Budget Bureau's old formula the benefit-cost ratio was impressively favorable; the ratio is still favorable even under the rigid new formula A–47. Thus these projects are a real investment for the United States and will bring the Nation rich dividends in the course of time.

The Dardanelle Reservoir will be located on the Arkansas River about midway between Little Rock and Fort Smith. The project is a major unit of an integrated system to serve navigation, develop hydroelectric power, stabilize river banks, provide flood control, and other related purposes. Hydroelectric power facilities at Dardanelle Dam will consist of 4 units with a total installed capacity of 120,000 kilowatts. The storage capacity would be 495,000 acre-feet, of which 70,000 is for power and 425,000 for navigation. The total estimated cost of the project is $94,600,000. Not only would this money provide these benefits, but it would also contribute to the realization of the vast potentialities of the Arkansas Valley. Such realization will obviously be accelerated by the availability of cheap transportation and electrical energy. Industrial development will be based on utilization of vast quantities of coal, oil, timber, bauxite, and rare minerals in the region. The 4 million people in the Arkansas Valley will then be able to contribute more substantially to the economic prosperity of the Nation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee [Mr. CANNON], and other members of the committee who have preceded me, have fully covered the major items in the pending public works appropriation bill. This bill carries recommended overall appropriations in the amount of $787,453,000 to speed the work and services of the various agencies for which the funds are needed in the public interest.

It is always stimulating and refreshing to work with the members of the Public Works Appropriation Subcommittee. Service on the Appropriations Committee, at times is taxing and arduous, but it is also rewarding and I would like to take this opportunity to again express my thanks and appreciation to our chairman, Mr. CANNON, and to our subcommittee chairman, Mr. RABAUT, and all of the members of the committee for their kindness and helpfulness. In fact, I should like to commend all members of the subcommittee, in addition to Mr. CANNON and Mr. RABAUT, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURRAY], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the minority members of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

This bill, as reported, carries funds for the management and operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Bonneville Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, and the civil-works program of the Corps of Engineers. This bill can truly be called an all-American measure because of the diversity of the projects included in this appropriation. The public-works development of our Nation will move forward and as a result of the money provided in this bill our country will be made stronger and our national defense strengthened.

Mr. Chairman, having heard the testimony throughout the hearings on this bill, one cannot escape without being impressed with the great public-works program of the Corps of Engineers and other agencies.

Our committee has heard testimony and sympathetically considered projects for all areas of the country—the New England basin, the South Atlantic basin, the upper and lower Mississippi River basins, the Ohio River Basin, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway basin, the Missouri Basin, the Rio Grande and Southwest area, the upper Colorado River Basin, the Columbia River Basin, the Central Valley of California, and, in fact, projects in all areas of our great Nation.

I was particularly impressed with the program to be undertaken in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin. The plan there is to dredge a canal from the St. Lawrence River which will extend more than 250 miles into the heartland of our country and connect the great city of Chicago, making it a port city.

In addition, plans are underway to build 32, I repeat 32, hydroelectric power-producing units within this project on the St. Lawrence River, 16 on the American side and 16 on the Canadian side. These are in addition to the 5 major power projects—2 privately owned and 3 Government owned—in this great area.

Similar public works projects are planned in the upper Colorado Basin, the Columbia Basin, in the great Northwest, and in other areas of our country.

In the past the appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority has been a controversial item of the public works appropriation bill. However, this year, the appropriation for this great agency should not be controversial because there is no money included in the appropriation for expansion of TVA's power facilities or steam plants.

Not a dime is included in this bill for new power-producing projects for this agency.

The appropriation further should not be controversial because it is by far the smallest appropriation submitted to Congress in the 23-year history of TVA. The 1957 appropriation of $5,357,000 is 20 percent less than the $27,053,000 appropriated for the current fiscal year. The amount of new funds for fiscal 1957 represents a 77 percent reduction or cut in appropriations for this agency since 1955.

Notwithstanding these cuts and reductions, critics of TVA continue to harass and attempt to curtail TVA's operations.

The critics of TVA say that TVA should stand on its own feet. If there was ever an indication that TVA is standing on its own feet, it is signified in this meager appropriation request. It is a further indication that this agency is being operated in a most efficient and economical manner. As indicated, the budget for TVA for next year does not carry one dime of new money for additional power—for new starts for the system. The funds recommended herein are for navigation, flood control, and general operations—not for power.

The TVA power program is standing on its own feet. It is paying its own way—and it is paying dividends—big dividends into the Treasury. Annual payments into the Treasury through 1957 will have exceeded $285 milion. The navigation and flood-control programs of TVA are also paying dividends—in the form of increased river traffic and commerce and the saving of human lives and property.

Yes; the history of TVA is a wonderful story of joint partnership between the people of a vast region and their Government—the Federal Government—a partnership which has combined the industry and ingenuity of the citizens of a great 7-State area into harnessing rivers and streams—working for the betterment of the economic standards of our Nation.

TVA power was used to build the first atomic bomb—there was no place else in the United States prepared and ready to meet the gigantic requirements for the Oak Ridge project. Today, with the atomic and hydrogen age bearing more

heavily on us, TVA is still in the forefront—meeting the defense demands of this Nation with its power supply.

While TVA critics continually harp on TVA's power achievements, little is ever mentioned by these critics of this agency's great flood-control program which has saved millions of acres of valuable farmlands from the upper reaches of the Tennessee River—into the Ohio Valley and to the lower basins of the Mississippi.

Nothing is said of the lives saved by TVA's control of floods which once ripped through the southeast with almost the same consistency as the spring rain.

Little, if anything, is said of the economic benefits derived from improved river traffic and commerce.

Nothing is said of its soil-testing program which has resulted in untold benefits not only to the farmers of the valley but to farmers in more than 20 other States participating in TVA's farm test demonstration programs.

TVA's chemical research aids not only agriculture, but industry as well and the national defense. It should be pointed out that TVA's chemical research and production facilities are an important segment of the national defense program.

During World War II, TVA supplied more than 60 percent of the elemental phosphate used by our Armed Forces.

It delivered for munitions production more than 97,000 tons of anhydrous ammonia and ammonium nitrate and ammonium crystal.

For almost a year during the Korean fighting, TVA supplied the entire elemental phosphorus requirements of the Department of Defense.

Resources development in the area supplements but does not duplicate similar programs of the Department of Agriculture and other areas of Government service.

Included in TVA's resource development program is a great reforestation program, tributary watershed development, topographic mapping and agriculture conservation—the promotion of our Nation's resources.

There is recommended in this bill $1,150,000 for this work—with only $400,000 to be provided by new appropriated money. The amount is small, the return is great.

Efforts are being made to attack this portion of TVA's appropriation on the ground that these services are duplications of programs carried out by the Department of Agriculture. The TVA's resource development program, I repeat, does not duplicate the Department of Agriculture programs.

During hearings on this portion of the bill, our distinguished subcommittee chairman, Mr. RABAUT, asked Chairman Vogel if there was duplication by the TVA and the Department of Agriculture. Chairman Vogel answered that TVA does work in close cooperation with the Department of Agriculture just as in the field of navigation and flood control TVA works with the Corps of Engineers.

In all cases—

Chairman Vogel testified—

we are trying to bring in local organizations to the maximum extent, utilizing the agencies of the States and the colleges in the region, hoping thereby to develop a sense of local responsibility and hoping that this feeling will be transmitted to adjacent regions. (Public works appropriation hearings for 1957.)

Later, Mr. RABAUT asked Chairman Vogel the specific question:

Does TVA duplicate the work of the Department of Agriculture in this area?

Chairman Vogel replied:

No; I do not think there is any duplication. (TVA hearing, 1956, p. 230.)

Mr. A. J. Wagner, General Manager of TVA, further answered this question when he said:

This activity of TVA in the Tennessee Valley is a kind of activity that is not generally available in the rest of the country. But it does not mean that there are greater Federal expenditures in the Tennessee Valley than there are in the rest of the country as a whole. We have looked into that question and satisfied ourselves about it. So that if the question you had in mind that this is something special in addition resulting in greater total expenditures than in the rest of the country, I believe the answer to that is "No." (Public works appendix, hearings, supra.)

Later in the hearings, Chairman Vogel again testified concerning TVA's cooperation with other agencies such as the Soil Conservation Service and again stated:

I do not believe there is any overlapping of consequence.

As we all know, the President and the Department of Agriculture recently recommended the extensive soil-bank program. Legislation to implement this program has been adopted. The appropriations committee has approved appropriations in excess of $1 billion to finance authorized payments under this program. Embraced within this idea is to take land out of production and plant seedlings. Such a program will require the fullest utilization of TVA seedling production. TVA's seedling nursery is capable of producing 15 million seedlings a year. While the Clinton nursery is in operation, the Muscle Shoals, Ala., plant has been closed for several years because of lack of funds.

This work could greatly augment the soil-bank program because of the definite shortage of seedlings needed for reforestation in taking lands out of production. Commercial nurseries cannot, I am advised, supply the present market—not considering the future demands. This is a vital and needed program and, therefore, should not be curtailed but expanded and continued.

Mr. Chairman, with the reaffirmation of TVA's authority to use needed surplus funds and with approval of the pending bill—modest though it is with new appropriated funds—TVA will be able to continue to contribute to resource development and conservation, promote navigation and flood control of the area and keep step with the needs of vital defense installations dependent upon TVA as an essential source of power supply.

Mr. Chairman, it should be pointed out that any threatened power shortage will strike at the very foundation of the atomic defenses of our Nation. The atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge is entirely dependent on TVA power. The Atomic Energy Commission installation at Paducah, Ky., requires more than 60 percent of its power from the TVA system. Other defense installations such as the Arnold Air Engineering Development Center in Tennessee, and the great guided missile center at Huntsville, Ala., are also totally dependent on TVA power. More than 60 percent of TVA's power now goes for defense needs and it is reasonable to expect that their needs will be increased by more than 20 percent in the next 2 or 3 years. TVA must keep step with our defense requirements—our national defenses must not be weakened.

When we come to the question of TVA's power demands, all concerned agree that there is a shortage of power. On this there is no dispute.

As the majority report indicates, the TVA's power revenues have provided it with sufficient funds for the construction of such additional units as TVA now requires and balances are available for the construction and acquisition of power assets.

The Congress has directed TVA to pay into the Treasury over a 40-year period the total appropriated funds for power purposes. Through 1955, TVA has paid into the Treasury $127,500,000. Through the current year and 1957, additional payments in the amount of $134 million will have been made. These payments, together with the payment of $24 million into the Treasury prior to the enactment of legislation requiring such repayments, makes a total of $285,500,000, which TVA will have repaid into the Treasury through 1957. This amount is far in excess of the minimum required for annual repayments.

TVA is far ahead of its repayment schedule. It is, therefore, only reasonable and proper that TVA should be permitted to exercise its authority to use its surplus funds after having met its statutory requirements by payments into the Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, this bill should be passed without the repeated criticisms leveled at this great agency.

This bill, I repeat, is an all-American measure and its enactment will go far toward developing our own country and strengthening the defense of our Nation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the House Appropriations Committee for including a $4,000 appropriation to make a preliminary survey of the Trempealeau River in the 1957 public works appropriations bill before us today. The project, Docket No. 566, was approved by the Corps of Engineers on March 10, 1955, and by the House Public Works Committee on July 14, 1955. Unfortunately, this project was not included by the Bu-

reau of the Budget in the 1957 funds for preliminary surveys.

Before discussing the need for flood-prevention control in the Trempealeau River Valley, I want to touch briefly on the importance of speedy action on completing the preliminary survey. County agents in the area and the erosion control agent of the Wisconsin State Soil Conservation Service have been doing a lot of work in organizing watershed along the creeks flowing into the Trempealeau River. The Corps of Engineers have informed me that, in their preliminary survey, they will consider cooperation by local watershed groups. Since the local groups are being organized or are already organized, once the overall survey is completed, work can go ahead under Public Law 566, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954, on the small creeks.

There is a crying need for this proposed flood-control project in the Trempealeau River Valley. Through the years, flood conditions have caused severe, and in several instances, irreparable damage to farms, communities, and other areas in the Trempealeau Valley.

The Army engineers, in approving the review study, has this to say:

> The Trempealeau River, a tributary of the Mississippi River, is located in west central Wisconsin and drains an area of about 630 square miles. The watershed is located in a region that is primarily farming, and includes the communities of Hixton, Taylor, Blair, Whitehall, Independence, Arcadia, and Dodge. The stream has a fall of 330 feet in a distance of 75 miles. There is no existing Federal flood-control project in the basin.

For some time, I have been working with M. W. Torkelson, director of regional planning of the bureau of engineering, State of Wisconsin; Peter Bieri, county agent of Trempealeau County; Antone Chucka, county agent of Jackson County, and with others on compiling damage figures. The Weather Bureau at La Crosse, Wis., in a letter of February 12, 1955, stated that—

> On the average there is a frequency of about three damaging floods in the Trempealeau Valley per year. In the year 1954 there were four damaging floods with an estimated total loss of $438,000.

The dates of these and the damage costs of these disastrous floods are as follows: May 2–5, $118,000; June 20–24, $250,000; July 4, $10,000; October 4, $60,000.

In addition, I have a detailed report compiled by the Trempealeau County Highway Department listing damages to 47 bridges, 7 culverts and 51 roads, at a total cost of $218,992 for the 4 floods of 1954.

For the year 1953, there were 3 major floods, in March, July, and August with a total estimated loss of $35,000. This figure does not include erosion loss which would add greatly to the total figure.

In April 1955, the river again went on a rampage, causing untold damage to homes, business establishments, farmers, livestock, highways, bridges, and railroad and communication lines in the area.

I do not wish to go into a lengthy recital of recent damages, but would like to outline briefly the major effects of the April floods. Final estimates of total damages are not available, but conservative figures run into the hundreds of thousands of dollars.

At Blair, the dam was damaged, and flood waters inundated farmlands and commercial establishments. Some residents were evacuated from their homes. When the water main supplying the city with water broke, residents were asked to boil drinking water as a precautionary health measure. Estimated flood damage at Blair amounted to $35,000.

At Whitehall, another dam broke and the raging waters flooded highways, farmlands, and homes. Telephone service was interrupted and the community was without mail. Estimated flood damage at Whitehall amounted to $11,000.

Severe flooding of farmlands at Independence caused an estimated flood damage of $10,000.

At Dodge, livestock had to be moved from the lower lands by boat. Estimated flood damage in this community amounted to $25,000. Pigeon Falls reported damages amounting to $7,500.

Arcadia bore the brunt of the flood. In this community, the water was higher than at any time since the disastrous flood of 1919. More than 20 blocks in the business and residential area were under water at the height of the flood and the community was under 3½ feet of water in some spots. The National Guard was called out to assist in sandbagging operations, but floodwaters broke through in the early hours of April 4. A 400-foot bridge was wiped out and railroad service was halted. Total damage at Arcadia is estimated at $105,000, according to figures sent me by Peter Bieri, Trempealeau County agent, This is in addition to $50,000 estimated cost to repair railroad tracks.

The county agent has set a figure of $10,000 as estimated damage to rural areas along the river in Trempealeau County.

In my home county, Jackson County, the village of Hixton suffered the greatest damage. The village clerk has estimated damage to property owners in the area amounted to almost $16,000 while farmers in the area reported damages of about $2,000. The community of York, according to Jackson County Agricultural Agent A. J. Chucka, suffered damages of over $1,000.

The above figures cannot begin to cover the loss in terms of topsoil; nor can they speak for the misery and heartache suffered by those in the river basin. Observers present on the scene commented: "A complete watershed soil conservation program could have prevented all this."

I am able to cite facts and figures on floods back as far as 1919, when two lumberyards were nearly demolished and thousands of dollars of damage was suffered by homeowners and businesssmen in the city of Arcadia. But I believe I have presented enough evidence to show the tragic conditions resulting from the Trempealeau River floods over the years.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully urge the passage of H. R. 11319.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to in general commend the Appropriations Committee for its work on H. R. 11319. They put in many long hours considering the almost countless projects presented and deserve the gratitude of us all. I was disappointed, however, to note that in final form the legislation omits a provision of some $250,000 for Mathews Canyon Reservoir contained in the budget for fiscal year 1957. This sum was for the purpose of constructing an access road and acquisition of lands at the dam site of what is known as the Mathews Canyon Reservoir in southern Nevada. This reservoir together with Pine Canyon Reservoir comprises an overall plan for flood control for Meadow Valley Wash and its tributaries in southeastern Nevada. Construction of this project would provide protection to many miles of the main line of the Union Pacific Railroad, to numerous miles of county roads along narrow canyons, much of the town of Caliente, Nev., and an important national highway going through this region.

Reoccurring floods in the past have caused considerable damage and impeded traffic. At one time, the railroad traffic was interrupted for more than 6 months as a result of flood damage.

I am informed that the Mathews project appropriation was excluded because the principal beneficiary would be the Union Pacific Railroad. This seems to me to be an inadequate excuse for removing this project from the recommendations of the executive branch. It is true that the Union Pacific will benefit, but benefits will, also, flow to the city of Caliente, one whose primary industries for many years has been the railroad passing through this area.

Mr. Chairman, is the town of Caliente to be penalized because one of its major industries is a railroad? Are the floods to be permitted to continue threatening both life and property merely because there is not a greater variety of economic activity in this region? Is the State to be discriminated against merely because a substantial part of the benefits will flow to a transportation system instead of to large industrial or farm areas?

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the committee has erred in omitting this worthwhile project and I am hopeful that this item will be restored as presented by the executive branch when considered by the other body.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, it is a severe disappointment to the people of southeastern Ohio that the public-works appropriations bill does not contain provisions for the resumption of the construction of the Dillon Dam in Ohio. I share this disappointment since I am convinced that this project is sound and

that it is urgently needed if the Muskingum River Valley is to obtain the flood-control benefits it requires and the Ohio Basin is to be spared the devastation wrought in flood periods by the waters of this major tributary.

For many years, the Congress has heard discussions of this worthy project and has already appropriated sums aggregating nearly $9 million for the construction of this dam. Today, the Dillon Dam stands one-third completed. Flood control, however, cannot be obtained from an uncompleted dam. The uselessness of such a considerable expenditure has been called to the attention of each member of the House of Representatives and the Senate. Earlier this year, I wrote to each Member providing copies of a special brochure prepared by the Zanesville (Ohio) Chamber of Commerce in cooperation with the McConnelsville and Marietta Chambers of Commerce. This excellent publication outlined the urgency of the flood-control problem in the Muskingum Valley and presented technical and statistical information obtained from the United States Corps of Engineers.

I wish to point out that the Corps of Engineers regards this project as entirely meritorious and necessary for the control of floods in the Muskingum and Ohio River Basins. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, has stated that "Dillon Reservoir is necessary for the adequate control of Muskingum River floods" and the engineers have indicated their belief that the Dillon project is "one of the higher priority ones for completion."

I also wish to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives that after a careful evaluation of all factors involved, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has endorsed the Dillon project, placing it in its first classification. In taking this action, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress stated its conviction that "the project is sound, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status, and should be promptly constructed in the public interest."

The Dillon Dam also has the support of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association. In a recent letter Mr. William J. Hull, chairman of this association's legislative committee stated, "This association has, of course, included the important Dillon Reservoir in its program. While we did not specify in our presentation to the Bureau of the Budget the amount which we believe needed for the Dillon Reservoir in fiscal 1957, we do expect to recommend an appropriation of $2,500,000 on that project for that fiscal year when we present our program to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees."

Within the past several months, it has been gratifying to me to read in the Cleveland Plain Dealer a series of articles ably and carefully analyzing the technical aspects of the Dillon project, the use to which it would be put, and such arguments as have been advanced against it. Following the publication of this series, the Plain Dealer on Saturday, April 14, published a strong editorial urging the completion of the dam. Summarizing its findings, the newspaper stated, "The public interest, in the largest sense would be served by the completion of Dillon Dam. But whatever the decision, something should be decided and decided now. Further dallying only threatens to make the major investment to date quite useless."

So that there may be no question as to what is involved here, I want to provide a brief statement outlining the background, present status, and future needs of this project.

The Dillon Dam and Reservoir project, authorized in the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, provides for the construction of an earth-fill dam on the Licking River 5.8 miles above the confluence of the Licking and Muskingum Rivers at Zanesville, Ohio. Its chief purpose is for urgently needed flood control. The maximum height of the dam will be 118 feet with a top length of 1,350 feet. An uncontrolled concrete-lined spillway will be provided in the left abutment and the outlet works will consist of two gate-controlled conduits near the right abutment. Four dikes will need to be constructed for the reservoir. The project also includes the relocation of 19.5 miles of tracks of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, 12.2 miles of highways, 32.7 miles of powerlines, 17.2 miles of pipelines, and 34.2 miles of telephone and telegraph lines. It also includes the relocation of 360 graves and the acquisition of 15,180 acres of land.

The estimated cost of the entire project is $28,800,000, of which $8,825,300, or nearly $9 million, has been appropriated thus far. No additional funds are required for further planning—all that has been done. The Corps of Engineers has now estimated that it could profitably utilize $2,600,000 during the first fiscal year in which construction is resumed.

This sum would provide for the construction of track work and appurtenances on the relocated alinement for the railroad. The grading work was all completed prior to suspension of work during the Korean emergency. All preconstruction planning has been completed and contract for the track work could be awarded in August 1956. The recommended funds would also provide for land acquisition and utility and county road relocations, thereby permitting initiation of actual construction of the dam early in the fiscal year 1958. Relocation of State highways could also be initiated in fiscal year 1958 and the entire project could be completed during the fiscal year 1960.

According to information I have received, the funds would be applied as follows:

Continued land acquisition	$190,000
Continued county road relocation	30,000
Initiate and complete track work and appurtenances, Baltimore and Ohio RR relocation	2,045,000
Continued utility relocations	60,000
Engineering and design	105,000
Supervision and administration	170,000
Total	2,600,000

This project will serve as an essential supplement to the 14 existing reservoirs in the Muskingum River basin and a meritorious unit in the system of reservoirs for reduction of floods on the Ohio River. The reservoir will control approximately 29 percent of the presently uncontrolled area above the highly industrialized city of Zanesville, Ohio. It will greatly decrease the hazards of heavy damage from extreme floods that still exist in the Muskingum River Valley. The benefits to be obtained will accrue largely along the Muskingum River below the mouth of the Licking River, including the cities of Zanesville, McConnelsville, and Marietta, Ohio. Zanesville, with a 1950 population of 40,517, has many varied industries and manufacturing plants including iron and steel and products thereof, chemical, and electrical equipment. The area below Zanesville includes two large steam electric plants—Philo, capacity 500,000 kilowatts and Muskingum River, 400,000 kilowatts—and expanding chemical and industrial developments.

In addition, benefits will be provided by the project to the rapidly expanding industrial developments, cities and towns, valuable farmlands, and railroads and highways along the Ohio River from Marietta, Ohio, to Cairo, Ill. A new unit of the Carbide & Carbon Chemical Corp. was recently completed on the Ohio River bank immediately below Marietta. Large steam electric plants were also recently completed on the Ohio River, at Graham Station, W. Va., about 50 miles below Marietta and at Cheshire, Ohio, to provide power for the Atomic Energy Commission's Portmouth, Ohio, project. Benefits will also accrue to the project by operation of the conservation pool to provide increased low-water flow during dry periods.

The Corps of Engineers has estimated the benefit-cost ratio to be 1.31 to 1 as of July 1955. The Corps has also estimated the average annual benefit from the project at $1,570,000 broken down as follows:

Flood control	$1,464,000
Conservation and public use	61,500
Water supply and sanitation	40,500
Navigation	4,000
Total	1,570,000

However, considering the funds already expended as of no benefit until completion of the project, the cost-benefit ratio on the funds yet needed would be 1.83 to 1.0. Even if we were to consider the entire project as a whole as though no work had already been done, the benefit-to-cost ratio would be 1.31 to 1.

There are 104 projects with flood control benefits in the 1957 budget request. For five of them no benefit-to-cost ratio has been determined. However, 70 of the other 99 have a benefit-to-cost ratio of less than 1.83 to 1, and 30 projects have a ratio of less than 1.31 to 1. Therefore, as it has been pointed out, even if the immeasurable element of human misery is not considered, the Dillon Dam's relative economic benefits still justify its completion.

Additional data has been provided by the Corps of Engineers as follows:

As presently planned, a permanent conservation pool will be maintained at elevation 734 mean sea level, extending up Lick-

ing River 10.3 miles, with a surface area of 1,500 acres. The volume of this conservation pool is 15,000 acre-feet. The net storage of 279,000 acre-feet which is available between the conservation pool and the spillway crest elevation 790 mean sea level, is required for flood control.

Curves showing the frequency of filling of Dillon Reservoir have been prepared and the following tabulation lists pool elevation versus frequency of occurrence for various pool elevations in the reservoir:

Pool elevation, feet, mean sea level:	*Frequency years*
734	Permanent pool
750	2
765	10
780	57

Of the estimated 800 tracts of land required for the project, 131 tracts have been acquired consisting of 3,921 acres acquired in fee, and 531 acres for which flowage easements have been obtained. There remains an estimated 1,730 acres to be acquired in fee and 4,924 acres on which it is contemplated that flowage easements be secured. An estimate made in 1947 indicated that approximately 1,200 people would be displaced as a result of the construction of the dam.

The bridge, superstructure, and railroad steel which was purchased in connection with the relocation work prior to suspension of the project is still in storage. The small steel is stored in a depot in Marietta; the big steel is stored in Zanesville.

In explanation of the part the Dillon Dam will play in the comprehensive flood-control plan for the Muskingum Valley, the engineers have furnished the following information:

The communities along the Muskingum River from Zanesville to Marietta, although protected to a considerable degree by the 14 existing reservoirs, remain subject to a flood hazard because of the large uncontrolled watershed area and the possibility of a flood on the Licking River. The uncontrolled drainage area above Zanesville, including the 780 square miles of the watershed of the Licking River, is 2,572 square miles, or 37.6 percent of the total area above Zanesville. Although the existing reservoirs are adequate to reduce all but major floods on the Muskingum River below damage stage at the more important communities upstream from the influence of backwater from the Ohio River floods, heavy damage will result from extreme floods until additional protection is provided.

It is estimated that the present average frequency of damaging floods at Zanesville, as modified by the existing reservoirs is equivalent to one occurrence in 10 years and that if the Dillon Reservoir were constructed this frequency could be reduced to one recurrence in 50 years. Should a flood equivalent to that of the maximum of record (March 1913) occur, it is estimated that the crest at Zanesville as modified by the 14 existing reservoirs could be reduced by the operation of the Dillon Reservoir an additional 4 feet, or from a stage of 37.8 feet to 33.8 feet. Flood stage at Zanesville is 28 feet. Flood reductions along the Ohio River would be significant during major floods. During a flood equivalent to that of 1913, the Dillon Reservoir could hold out a peak flow of 32,000 cubic feet per second at the dam site and an average flow of 11,300 cubic feet per second during a period of 3 days before and 3 days after the Ohio River crested at the mouth of the Muskingum River. These estimates of holdout flow are considered conservative, in that they were made on the assumption that a bankfull stage of 7,000 cubic feet per second would be maintained at the proposed Dillon Dam during flood periods.

Since the authorization of the Dillon Dam several floods have occurred which might have been controlled and their damaging effects greatly reduced, had the Dillon Dam been completed. In 1952 such a flood poured into the Muskingum Valley largely from the uncontrolled Licking River. Some persons opposed to the dam have charged that this flood was caused by the faulty or careless operation of such dams as already exist in other parts of the Muskingum watershed area. Gen. E. C. Itschner explained what occurred and what might have been prevented:

The flood on the Muskingum River in January 1952 was caused, not by incorrect operation of the reservoirs in the Muskingum River Basin, but by heavy rainfall on areas not controlled by dams. The areas of the upper Muskingum below the dams and the watershed of the Licking River are completely uncontrolled. The reservoirs were operated so as to produce the greatest possible reduction consistent with the requirement that the corps be prepared for the maximum possible flood. This requirement prevents some storage in the early stages of a flood and limits the reduction of moderate floods, while producing the greatest possible effect on more severe floods. The total runoff stored during the flood of 1952 by the 14-reservoir system amounted to 423,485 acre-feet or approximately 70 percent of the total storm runoff from the controlled drainage area, thereby reducing the flood stage at Zanesville by 2.7 feet. Since the heaviest rainfall occurred on the uncontrolled areas nearest to Zanesville, only limited reduction of the crest stage at Zanesville was possible. The area on the Licking River that would be controlled by Dillon Reservoir was subjected to the heaviest rainfall. Control of this area would have completely prevented any flood at Zanesville and below on the Muskingum River upstream of Ohio River backwater.

Operation of the Muskingum reservoir system was initiated promptly in accordance with standard operation procedure as soon as it became apparent that high stages would prevail at downstream points. The storage of virtually all runoff from the controlled areas indicates that there was no tardiness in effecting operation. A review of the reservoir operations confirms efficient operation.

Certain other questions have arisen which have been fully explained in testimony before the Congress during the past decade. One deals with the suggestion that the flood-control problem in this case might be more effectively dealt with if a series of smaller dams were constructed on streams tributary to the Licking. Such a plan has been fully explored by the Corps of Engineers. This study leads to the conclusion that the plan would require a greater Federal expenditure, would take more land, and dislocate many more families than the single larger dam.

Another issue in the past has raised the fear that if the Dillon Dam were built, the city of Newark, upstream on the Licking River, might be flooded. Dealing with this question, a spokesman for the Corps of Engineers has stated:

That simply is not a fact. The elevation of the river at the approach to this dam was determined by levels, and it was actually determined and even if we assume that at some future date there will be a flood in the Licking River 25 percent in excess of what has ever occurred in the records of the river, the water would still lack something like one and a half miles of reaching the city of Newark.

Some apprehension has arisen that 10,500 acres of agricultural and other lands might be taken out of farm production as a result of this project. In explanation of the baseless character of this fear, the engineers have provided the following information:

Actually there will be really taken out of cultivation only 1,500 acres. The remainder of the acreage up to the spillway level will be affected only intermittently, and if the experience in the Miami Conservancy District, or in the remaining dams in the Muskingum Conservancy District, is any criteria, only a small percentage of the acreage will be covered. In fact in the 14 reservoirs the United States does not own much of the land within the reservoir area; there is only an easement to flood at certain irregular and unknown periods; and for that easement and for the damage which might result from such floods the proper owner has been paid in the form of an easement agreement; so that the permanent area that is taken out of cultivation is 1,500 and not 10,500.

Another question has charged that the city of Zanesville is anxious that the Dillon Reservoir, created so that it might serve as a source of a municipal water supply. In response to this argument, I wish to quote a letter which I received this morning from Mr. W. A. Keslar, president of the Zanesville City Council. The letter is as follows:

MAY 19, 1956.

Hon. JOHN HENDERSON,
15th District, Ohio,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You are aware of my interest in the Dillon project on the Licking River near Zanesville.

At various times in the past certain opponents of this flood-control project have said that Zanesville wanted it for future city water supply.

In order that you may advise any interested parties I want to refer you to the fact that on May 8 the people of Zanesville voted a bond issue for $2,500,000 in order that we may improve and enlarge our waterworks. The engineering plans call for taking the water from the Muskingum River and not the Licking River so that for the next hundred years demand for water would not require us to use the Licking River.

Many thanks for your continued efforts to secure funds for this much-needed flood control project.

Very truly yours,

W. A. KESLAR,
President, Zanesville City Council.

Mr. Chairman, there has been some local opposition to this project. I had thought that such opposition as had once existed had greatly declined. However, it has become apparent that, while the opposition has diminished, it has not disappeared. It is, however, a vocal and powerful minority, a situation common to any flood control project.

As a result, the Dillon Dam has been subjected to the closest scrutiny over the years—far closer than that accorded virtually any other project now pending. The disclosure of the full facts in the case has always shown the project to be fully justified and necessary. The arguments against it have been shown to be ill-founded or completely unsupportable in view of the facts in the case. Despite the most careful exposition of the facts on many occasions, one still hears some

of these bankrupt arguments repeated with incredible monotony. If such minority opposition were allowed to deter Federal action, there is grave doubt that any flood control projects would ever be authorized or completed. Proponents of Dillon wish only that the project be considered entirely on the basis of need, the benefits it would bring, and the favorable benefit to cost ratio.

I must state in all respect, that the failure of the Congress to provide the funds needed for the Dillon Dam has caused dismay and consternation to the people of southeastern Ohio. Residents of the Muskingum Valley find it difficult to believe that there is an intention to abandon such a valuable project. I share their consternation. However, I am positive that there is no intention on the part of the Federal Government to turn its back on either the recognition it has already given of the necessity for the project or the $9 million it has already spent at the Dillon site.

The long delay in resuming construction of the dam which was suspended during the Korean emergency is a source of great and continuing concern to me. In this my feeling is shared by both of our Ohio Senators as well as the Governor of our State. These eminent spokesmen for the people of Ohio have taken strong and unequivocal positions in urging that the Dillon project be completed without further delay.

The Corps of Engineers clearly put the people of the Muskingum Valley on notice that flood control is impossible unless the Dillon Dam is completed. Already this year there have been threats of floods from the uncontrolled Licking River. It is, therefore, not difficult to understand the impatience which the potential flood victims feel, particularly when in the course of normal weather, disaster might strike at any time and particularly when the means for preventing such an occurrence has been so clearly defined and approved many years ago by the Congress.

It is my most earnest hope that the Muskingum Valley will be spared the havoc of floods until the Dillon Dam can be completed and the rampaging waters of the Licking River brought under control. I must state in all sincerity that the responsibility for failure to finish this dam could prove to be a heavy one.

I have received petitions containing the names of thousands of Muskingum Valley residents urging that favorable action be taken in the Congress. Many letters from community leaders have also been received. Some of these letters are as follows:

THE GREINER DAIRY CO.,
Zanesville, Ohio, March 30, 1956.

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As you know, much interest has again been shown the Dillon Dam project near Zanesville. You are familiar with all the details. You are also probably familiar with the fact that about 15 years ago some 15 dams were constructed to control the Muskingum River and its tributaries. This has meant much to Zanesville, and we have not had the great floods that threatened our community heretofore. However, after heavy rains, the Licking River still rampages and causes much damage to Zanesville. For this reason, I urge you to make every effort to have funds allocated to complete this project, which, of course, was started several years ago.

Very truly yours,

EUGENE C. GREINER, Sr.

DUTRO BROS.,
Zanesville, Ohio, March 29, 1956.

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In regard to the Dillon Dam. We have been here in business for 11 years and have been washed out 3 times. We feel as though we have paid taxes long enough here—and as the Dillon Dam project already has been started, we feel as though our money has been wasted, it costs a lot of money and hardship on everyone in this locality every time it floods, which doesn't take too much rain. We are threatened again this spring—please help us. Our money we have paid for taxes is being wasted if the project is not finished.

Yours truly,

DUTRO BROS.

OXFORD OIL CO.,
Zanesville, Ohio, March 29, 1956.

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We urge you to support additional appropriations to cover the completion of the Dillon Dam above Zanesville, Ohio.

It seems to us only common sense to protect the investment already made in this project.

Very truly yours,

J. W. STRAKER, *Vice President.*

THE UNITED FUND OF ZANESVILLE AND MUSKINGUM COUNTY, INC.,
Zanesville, Ohio, March 30, 1956.

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: We in Zanesville as a community are very much interested in seeing enough money appropriated by your Congress to start work again on the Dillon Dam project.

The same principle is certainly involved in this delayed project as applied to all of the other Muskingum conservancy dams, and a great many communities, including Zanesville, will benefit by this work being reactivated.

Having spent most of my 60-plus years in Muskingum County, I feel that this Zanesville protection is a "must" at some early date.

Thanks for your cooperation and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

E. ROYAL CRAWMER,
Executive Director.

MARCH 30, 1956.

JOHN E. HENDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am taking this means to thank you for the support given in reawakening interest in the ultimate completion of the Dillon Dam.

I urge you to continue with your efforts to have funds allocated for the completion of this most vital project.

Very truly yours,

R. E. EMERY,

ZANESVILLE, OHIO.

THE ZANESVILLE STONEWARE CO.,
Zanesville, Ohio, March 29, 1956.

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: Here in Zanesville we are very much concerned over the reluctance of Congress to place in the appropriations bill a reasonable sum for the reactivation of the Dillon Dam flood-control project on the Licking River.

This writer well remembers the disastrous 1913 flood in Zanesville. Although this plant is on high ground and the flood waters of 1913 did not reach it, the company was out of business for over a month following that flood and suffered that year a manufacturing loss. The plant was first open to refugees from the flooded areas and later was the barracks for National Guard troops sent into the area. We don't want anything like that to happen again.

It seems to a businessman unjustifiably wasteful to allow approximately $8 million of work to be gradually washed away down the Muskingum Valley. In my estimation, if the advice of the Army engineers is accurate, and if there was basis for the approval of the project originally, there is every reason for this Congress to fulfill an obligation of the United States Government to complete this Dillon Dam.

In all progress there is some opposition, but it is the good of the majority which should prevail.

Very truly yours,

V. B. LINN.

BONIFIELD HARDWARE CO.,
Zanesville, Ohio, March 28, 1956.

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In the interest of flood control for the city of Zanesville and the entire Muskingum Valley, I sincerely would appreciate your support in seeing that funds are allocated for the Dillon Dam project as authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1938.

Yours sincerely,

J. W. BONIFIELD, Jr.

ROYAL CLEANING CO.,
Zanesville, Ohio, March 28, 1956.

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A note to express our interest in future work on Dillon Dam.

We wish to urge you to your best efforts to obtain the proper allocation of funds for the completion of the Dillon Dam project.

Sincerely,

E. E. TALLEY, *President.*

MUTUAL FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION OF ZANESVILLE,
Zanesville, Ohio, March 28, 1956.

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We in this community appreciate the sympathetic interest you have so far shown in the completion of the Dillon Dam project. We want to urge upon you that the matter be pressed to a successful conclusion when it comes up shortly for decision.

As designed by the Government engineers when the Muskingum watershed flood-control plan was conceived, location of a dam on the Licking River, to be known as Dillon Dam, was to play not only an integral but a prime role in accomplishment of the area objectives. Failure of the Congress to provide sufficient funds for completion of the Dillon Dam after it had been started was most unfortunate and wasteful of public funds, not only from the standpoint of ensuing erosion but by increase in subsequent cost. And it has resulted in the watershed conservancy project falling short of realizing the full benefit possible and necessary.

So, whatever impetus you can give the promotion of this most worthy enterprise to

a successful conclusion will earn the lasting gratitude of countless people in the Muskingum River Valley.

Very truly yours,

MYRON BUKER,
Assistant to the President.

THE CITIZENS NATIONAL BANK,
Zanesville, Ohio, May 8, 1956.

Mr. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: I want you to know that I personally appreciate very greatly your efforts to rejuvenate the Dillon Dam portion of the Muskingum River flood-control project.

As an active businessman in Zanesville, I feel that the $9 million which have been spent on this project would be a great waste of public funds if it is not continued to the completion of the recommendations of the United States Army engineers, as a control of floodwaters in the Muskingum Watershed. I have been a resident of Zanesville for 25 years and know that there is a definite threat of floods from the Licking River, if Dillon Dam is not completed.

I am thoroughly convinced that the headwaters control is the only reasonable solution to the flood-control program of the United States Government. As a public-works program, this type of conservation of our natural resources will be the most beneficial to the country as a whole.

I sincerely hope for your continued efforts on the Dillon project, and pledge my support to any actions which you take.

Very truly yours,

W. D. MURPHY, *President.*

BURNHAM CORP.,
Zanesville, Ohio, March 29, 1956.

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I note that a decision will be reached within the next few weeks regarding the future work on the Dillon Dam. We here in Zanesville are vitally interested in the completion of this project. The writer is vitally interested in the completion of the project, because the last time we had a flood in Zanesville the Licking River caused the writer to move from his residence, lose a week's work, and approximately $500 damage to his residence.

Let me urge you to exercise every bit of political power you have to see that funds are allocated for the project.

Also, let me suggest that this letter be shown to the eastern panel of Public Works Subcommittee.

Yours very truly,

L. E. SHRIGLEY,
Manager, Electric Appliance Department.

THE NATIONAL CASH REGISTER CO.,
Zanesville, Ohio, March 28, 1956.

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It's raining today. I noticed the creek running past my place. It is just ready to go over its banks. This creek runs into the Licking River. The Licking River runs into the Muskingum and the Muskingum runs into the Ohio. Now I also note that all the other creeks are as full as mine which means there will be high water again; which means it will get out of control and many a nice property along the Muskingum will be damaged. We had some nice weather early in March and I noticed that when I went down Route 77 most everyone was out renovating their places but now this is all for naught. All because we do not have a Dillon Dam to control this surplus water.

I was reading the other night that the United States Government plans to build a big dam in Egypt. I for one and many of my friends think it is high time to discontinue this foreign spending and do something at home. Yes, we are believers that charity begins at home.

I was a United States Army Engineer officer in World War I and after the armistice, it was necessary to get a release from various French cities in which and through which our forces had stopped and traveled. We did many unnecessary things such as resurfacing tennis courts, resurfacing bridges over which we had not traveled, renovating cemeteries merely as goodwill builders, but it was my observation we didn't get the goodwill we anticipated and they thought us fools.

I do not care to relive those moments because it stirs up my ulcers but the purpose of this letter is to ask that you put forth your best efforts to secure the necessary funds for the completion of Dillon Dam which is so necessary for the prosperity of this community.

Sincerely yours,

A. R. HEIZMAN, *Branch Manager.*

LINE MATERIAL CO.,
Zanesville, Ohio, March 28, 1956.

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: The work that you are doing on the Dillon Dam project is commendable.

As we all know this has been one of those regrettable jobs on which a large amount of money has been spent with no benefits. Completion of the project would seem to be a logical answer whereby benefits would result.

Certainly completion of the Muskingum flood-control program would be realized. Conservation of water alone would be justification for completion.

May I encourage you to continue your efforts.

Very truly yours,

L. L. BLACK.

WINSOR'S STEAK HOUSE RESTAURANT,
South Zanesville, March 29, 1956.

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please do something for the appropriation of funds to complete the Dillon Dam in Zanesville, Ohio, it is understood to help everyone concerned in this part of Ohio State. To help us and our business.

Respectfully yours,

EVANGELOS GEORGE ARGYROPAIS,
Manager, Winsor's Steak House, Inc.

THE H. WEBER SONS & CO.,
Zanesville, Ohio, March 22, 1956.

Mr. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: I received the photograph of the group from Zanesville and McConnelsville, and I want to thank you for it. It was kind of you to think of me, and I just want to go on record as saying that I personally am very much impressed with the work that you are doing in regard to the Dillon Dam.

It is most inspiring to know that you have made this one of your active interests. I again want to thank you, and when you are in Zanesville I would love to have you drop in and say hello.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH E. WEBER.

ZANESVILLE, OHIO, *April 2, 1956.*

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to urge you to bend every effort toward securing an appropriation of funds to continue construction on the Dillon Dam project on the Licking River near Zanesville, Ohio.

The money already expended on this project indicates that the merit of the project has been fully realized. It would seem unwise, indeed, to allow the value of the previous expenditures to be dissipated by erosion, thereby increasing greatly the eventual total cost of the project.

The increased public interest in flood control resulting from widespread disasters in 1955 should greatly increase the support you need to get favorable consideration given to this very worthy public improvement.

Very truly yours,

MARVIN H. RUTHERFORD.

ZANESVILLE, OHIO, *March 28, 1956.*

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
Eastern Panel of Public Works Subcommittee, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: I am writing to add my opinion to that of others of this district in hoping you will do everything possible to bring about completion of the Dillon Dam. In addition to the factor of flood control, the waste of the several million dollars already spent on the project is hardly defensible.

Very truly,

DONALD A. URBAN, M. D.

SEARS, ROEBUCK & CO.,
Zanesville, Ohio, March 29, 1956.

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: It seems sacrilegious not to complete the Dillon Dam project. To invest $9 million and let it go to waste on an obvious flood-control need is not good judgment businesswise or politically. Please pass any measures necessary to complete it.

Sincerely yours,

K. T. KEEFE, *Manager.*

THE TIMKEN ROLLER BEARING CO.,
Zanesville, Ohio, April 2, 1956.

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am wholeheartedly in favor of the Dillon Dam project. It would not be sound economics not to continue, considering the expenditures that have already been made on this. This dam is also needed for the protection of the Muskingum Valley inhabitants.

Your continued support of this project will be very much appreciated.

Yours very truly,

E. J. SCHWEITZER.

STARR'S,
Zanesville, Ohio, April 5, 1956.

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is being written to you to urge you to do your part for residents of Muskingum County toward allocating Government funds for the completion of the Dillon Dam project. As you must well know, this project has been at a standstill for quite some time, and unless additional funds are appropriated soon, all of the money already spent in this very worthwhile project will have been wasted and the efforts already expended will have been in vain. This project should be completed for many reasons, but particularly in the interest of much needed soil conservation and flood control. Please do all you can for us.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN STEINBERG.

DAVID DAVIES, INC.,
Zanesville, Ohio, April 3, 1956.

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of David Davies, Inc., and myself I wish to encourage you to favor that funds be allocated to resume work on the Dillon Dam.

Communities along the Muskingum River from Zanesville to Marietta, although protected by existing reservoirs to an appreciable degree, today are still subject to great flood hazards as long as the watershed area to be controlled by Dillon Dam poses the ever present possibility of a flood down the Licking and Muskingum Rivers.

R. S. ROBERTS.

I am certain that the justification and value of the Dillon Dam is recognized. I also feel certain that this recognition will be reflected in future appropriations to continue its construction. However, until these funds are made available I shall continue my efforts in behalf of the Dillon Dam, so that it may confer upon southeastern Ohio the flood-control benefits which are so sorely needed there.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise further to inform the House of the importance of several projects included in the bill before us today. They are recommendations for construction by the United States Army Engineers in Tampa Harbor, St. Petersburg Harbor, and the Anclote River. All are in the First District of Florida and all are of great economic importance to the immediate communities affected by this work. I appreciate the long study and the unqualified recommendation of these projects made by the Appropriations Committee of the House and their approval this year of amounts requested of them. I feel certain of their justification in this action. I would further call to your attention several factors that still further qualify such a program as is now being considered by this body.

In the case of the Tampa Harbor project a great new development is now begun. Work, since last year, is well under way with an appropriation of $977,000, $477,000 of which was reinstated on my appeal by the House last year. The benefits that will result through the widening and deepening of this channel are already in evidence. One very important feature of the work-progress program has now developed and I would call this to your attention at this time. Certain additional funds beyond the $2.5 million recommended by the committee which, I am sure, will be recommended by the House today, are now needed for an orderly and economical progress of this work. In the Senate hearings subsequent to those of the House the request for funds was raised to $4 million. The contemplated overall cost is estimated at $11 million. I would outline for you the developments that brought this current increase about.

In the preliminary planning of this project first consideration was given to the dredging of the channel and increase of depth from 27–30 feet to 34 feet and widening to 400 feet from the present 300-foot width a distance of some 50 miles. The United States Army engineers let contracts for the dredging in 1955 and work has been under way in a contracted amount of $3.1 million. Progress on this portion of the dredging has proceeded at a greater pace than anticipated by the engineers. In a report just made on April 21, 1956, by the Corps of Engineers, and subsequent to both the preparation of the budget and hearings before the Public Works Subcommittee of the House it is now revealed that this contract can and will be completed early in 1957 if the present rate of progress is maintained. The original appropriation of $977,000 and the earlier budget requested funds of $2.5 million as reported to the House today will not be sufficient to carry on this reasonable rate of work and the entire project would have to be called to a halt in early 1957 unless additional funds are provided at this time. The truth of the matter is that the work is well ahead of the money. Should present funds be depleted early in 1957 and no work continued until money is available in fiscal 1958 the cost of reactivation of the dredges themselves would be heavily reflected in the bids received which bids are expected to run an additional $600,000. These substantial savings should not be overlooked in the efficient progress of this project.

Because of the rapid development of the dredging work on these channels that segment known as Egmont and Mullet Key Channels, where work will be done by the United States Army engineers' hopper dredge, should also be gotten under way in 1957. Anticipating 5 months' work in each of the fiscal years 1957 and 1958 an additional $625,000 will be needed in fiscal 1957.

Activation of both of these dredging portions of the project at the same time and to thus complete in the year 1958 the Hillsboro channel project will see even more and substantial benefit savings. Figures now available clearly show that with the completion and the use of the Hillsboro-Tampa channel portion of the project as herein proposed $1.5 million per year will be saved at that time. Therefore the additional amount requested above the earlier request will be fully justified by this additional saving. Estimates of the benefit-cost ratio have now been placed at 3.38 to 1 on this segment of the channel and I feel sure that this is a conservative figure.

I include a chart of these needs and costs justifying this increase for your information at this time.

Fiscal 1956 appropriation for Tampa Harbor project	$977,000
Actual expenditures:	
Hopper dredging	280,000
Hydraulic dredging	785,000
Engineering	130,000
Supervision and engineering	87,000
Total expenditure	1,282,000
Advanced by U. S. Army engineers (to permit contract performance)	305,000
Total	1,282,000
Funds required, fiscal 1957:	
Repayment of advance by U. S. Army engineers to project	$305,000
U. S. Army engineers (supervision and administration	174,000
Payment to Standard Dredging Corp. to complete work on $3.1 million contract covering dredging on cuts A–F Tampa Bay channels ($785,000 of contract will be completed in 1955–56). Full contract to be completed in early 1957	2,315,000
Subtotal	2,794,000
Request 1957 budget	2,500,000
Additional required	294,000
Pro rata portion of second contract and required in early 1957 to permit work on dredging to continue without extra cost of activation and deactivation which would raise this estimated bid. 4 months' work to June 30, 1957	600,000
5 months' work by U. S. Army engineers hopper dredge on Egmont and Mullet Key channels. Includes supervision and administration cost	625,000
Total additional funds required over budget request of $2.5 million for 1957	1,519,000
Total recommended as appropriation for 1957	4,000,000

NOTE.—These figures are as prepared by the U. S. Army engineers and are consistent with testimony by them before the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Senate Appropriations Committee. They include figures not available prior to April 21, 1956.

It is my intent to ask that the Senate Appropriations Committee recommend additional funds above the House figure to be approved today and upon conference on the bill I shall urge this revised figure of $4 million be approved by the House conferees as well. In such manner the request will be in the interest of the savings that will be realized for both the Government and the public. Any orderly advancement of the day when, through these new harbor facilities, annual savings of a conservatively estimated $2,230,000 can be brought about certainly should be encouraged. I hope you will act favorable both at this time and at a later date when opportunity will exist to revise upward the amount of the request for Tampa Harbor.

Since 1899 the Anclote River project has served a unique community and important section of the west coast of Florida. The city of Tarpon Springs, only sponge fishing community in the United States, is located some 5.6 miles from the deep water of the gulf. It is situated on the Intracoastal Waterway for which completion plans are well under way.

The channel has been developed under authorizations over a period of years and Federal funds have been expended in the amount of $244,921 since inception. The Appropriations Committee recommends an expenditure of $68,000 for deepening of the channel and for a turning basin. This will complete the balance of the projected development which is now 86 percent complete. The

proposal consists of a channel 9 feet in depth and a turning basin adjacent to the wharves.

I urge that the House complete this project of such long standing and provide for this community a channel and turning basin both for the economy and safety factors that now exist as a most justified appropriation.

At St. Petersburg, Fla., the rapid growth of pleasure craft use and the great recent increase of small business population has antiquated the facilities of the harbor. Over a period of years Bayboro Channel and the channel in Salt Creek have filled from silt. Both commercial and pleasure craft have found that the harbor is unsatisfactory for use. In cooperation with the United States Army Engineers, the chamber of commerce, city officials, and many other interested parties I have been successful in reaching satisfactory agreement on the improvements that have been so badly needed. The committee has recommended some $22,000 for the purpose of clearing and deepening the Bayboro Channel and providing an entrance channel to Salt Creek. I feel their convictions of the necessity of this project have been well developed and I assure you of the great need for this project.

Thank you.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to talk for a long time. I feel that this bill, and most of the other bills that we have considered, have been higher than they should be, but I have recognized that the sentiment seems to be in favor of spending money.

Projects were loaded onto us last year on the floor that will ultimately cost three or four billion dollars. This year the committee started on one set of projects alone that will cost $1,200,000,000. The committee has started a large number of other projects. Now we have to provide for a certain amount of flood control. We have to provide for real navigation, but we should be very particular to see that none of those projects is approved unless we have absolute evidence that they will serve a good purpose. The more times we provide for more money than is needed, just so many times is it necessary to go back a long way when things go bad.

In this particular case the appropriation for the Corps of Engineers is down by $26,000. I can remember when they have been cut by a great deal more. The appropriation for construction, general, is down $953,000. Other appropriations are up. The appropriations for reclamation are down $31 million. I am hoping that the Congress will have a sense of responsibility as it approaches the reading of this bill. I understand it is going to be read in the next few minutes, and I am hoping that the Congress will not increase the amounts that are provided here, because I believe the committee itself has been fully as liberal as it ought to be right down the line. If we go ahead and put more money into the bill all the way through, we are just going to create a very difficult situation for the Treasury to meet in the days to come. All of us have got to the point where we feel the pressure of taxation. Taxation has gone up, and personal exemptions have gone down as the result of inflation. That has produced large increases in tax revenues.

The result of all that sort of thing is a very great feeling of unrest. Some people have actually come out and started a drive with very considerable behind them to get rid of the income tax. I do not see how they can get rid of the income tax. On the other hand, it represents the feeling that has been generated by too liberal expenditure on the part of the Government, and I am hopeful that this Congress today and tomorrow if consideration of this bill lasts that long, will exercise its correct judgment in considering any attempt that may be made to raise this bill. I hope that for once this Congress will do a job.

Statements have been made as to the Southwest Power Administration and the Southeast Power Administration. Actually the Southeast Power shows a loss of $7,919,000 for 1956 according to their own estimates. Southwest Power shows a loss of $7,570,000 for 1956 according to their own estimates.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16 U. S. C., ch. 12A), including hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, not to exceed $2,000 for entertainment of foreign visitors, and purchase (not to exceed 211, for replacement only) and hire of passenger-motor vehicles, $5,357,000, to remain available until expended, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against prior appropriations: *Provided*, That no part of funds available for expenditure by this agency shall be used, directly or indirectly, to acquire a building for use as an administrative office of the Tennessee Valley Authority unless and until the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, following a study of the advisability of the proposed acquisition, shall advise the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives and the Tennessee Valley Authority that the acquisition has his approval: *Provided further*, That there shall be available for resource development activities pursuant to the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, not to exceed $1,150,000, of which $400,000 shall be derived from this appropriation and $750,000 shall be derived from proceeds of operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against certain language in the Tennessee Valley Authority paragraph as follows:

First. In lines 8 and 9, the clause "Not to exceed $2,000 for entertainment of foreign visitors."

Second. In lines 11 through 13 ", to remain available until expended, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against prior appropriations."

Third. Lines 13 to 22, the proviso reading: "That no part of funds available for expenditure by this agency shall be used, directly or indirectly, to acquire a building for use as an administrative office of the Tennessee Valley Authority unless and until the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, following a study of the advisability of the proposed acquisition, shall advise the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives and the Tennessee Valley Authority that the acquisition has his approval: *Provided further*."

Fourth. On page 3, lines 1 to 3 ", of which $400,000 shall be derived from this appropriation and $750,000 shall be derived from proceeds of operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority."

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that all of the language to which I have referred is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] desire to be heard?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the language read by the gentleman is unquestionably legislation on an appropriation bill and I therefore concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] makes a point of order against the language appearing in four different provisions of the paragraph of the pending bill referred to. The gentleman from Missouri, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, concedes the point of order.

It is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAKER: On page 3, line 3, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided, further*, That none of the funds provided herein may be used to acquire a building for or as an administrative office of the TVA."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAKER) there were—ayes 79, noes 58.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and development plans; formulating plans and preparing designs and specifications for authorized Federal reclamation projects or parts thereof prior to initial allocation of appropriations for construction of such projects or parts; and activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial adjustment, or extension of existing projects; to remain available until expended, $5,270,000, of which $4,560,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and $500,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River development fund: *Provided*, That none of this appropriation shall be

used for more than one-half of the cost of an investigation requested by a State, municipality, or other interest.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask of the committee handling the appropriations relative to construction funds for the Bureau of Reclamation 2 or 3 questions. I notice on page 6 of the report in reference to the Collbran project that the committee has denied the $1 million which was included in the budget for the beginning of construction of such project with this statement:

> Funds requested for starting this project amounting to $1 million have been disallowed since the repayment contract has not yet been executed.

I wish to ask some member of the committee whether or not it is their policy and has been their policy to require that contracts be executed before the committee recommends funds for construction of reclamation projects?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes; that is the regular procedure of the committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. In the budget for fiscal year 1956 and in the apropriation bill for such year, funds were set aside and recommended and approved by the Congress and the bill was signed by the President for the Palo Verde project, the Santa Maria project, the Michaud Flats project, and the Owl Creek project; and, that there were no contracts let or no contracts executed until months after the funds were allowed.

Mr. RABAUT. Those projects were all going on. This is a policy that the committee has adopted because we have had some trouble with some of them in the past and we are now trying to protect the taxpayers.

Mr. ASPINALL. The Collbran project was authorized 4 years ago. The gentleman from Colorado, together with one of the citizens of his district, appeared before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for reclamation appropriations some 2 years ago and recommended that the then budgeted amount of $1 million be not authorized until a contract had been entered into. The gentleman from Colorado is presently advised that the repayment contract will be signed within the next few months and it undoubtedly will be signed in time that construction can start within the fiscal year 1957.

Mr. RABAUT. When and if it is done we will be very glad to consider it in so much as you have had it in, you can get it in the budget again, and in the supplemental we will be very glad to consider it and take it up. But to anticipate what is going to be done, some sad experiences of the past made the committee feel that in justification to the people who have huge funds invested in these types of projects, there should be a firm commitment on the part of those who are going to get the benefit from the project.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I ask my good friend the gentleman from Michigan this question? If before the other body considers this legislation and makes its final decision the contract should be executed, could the gentleman from Colorado expect then that this committee and the conference committee might go along with the other body's decision?

Mr. RABAUT. I can only speak for myself, of course, but inasmuch as the committee deleted the project because the repayment contract had not been signed, I see no reason why, if the contract is executed in time for the project to be included in the bill by the other body, that we would not go along.

Mr. ASPINALL. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks, and I congratulate the committee upon the position that it takes in wanting to know where the money is going before they make a recommendation. The gentleman from Michigan and his committee know that I have appeared before their committee and have made such suggestions for sound business procedure from time to time.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to say to the gentleman that he is a very worthy Representative of his district and the people of his district should be proud to have him as their Representative.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify the situation regarding the appropriation for the Collbran project in Colorado. This project was authorized for construction on July 3, 1952. In the budget for 1955, an authorization for $1 million for this project was included. However, at that time, there was some uncertainty over the project and the necessary repayment contract and I appeared before the committee with James Groves, attorney for the water users, and we advised the committee that the appropriation should wait until the repayment contract was assured.

In the budget for fiscal 1957 the $1 million appropriation was reinstated. On March 19, I appeared before the committee and again advised of the developments in the area. It was my wish, and the opinion of the local people, that we should keep the committee fully informed. At that time, the actual signing time of the repayment contract was uncertain and my suggestion was that the appropriation be conditional on the signing of the repayment contract, or actually that the construction should not begin prior to the execution of the repayment contract.

When representatives of the Bureau were before the committee in April, testimony was offered to indicate definite progress in the repayment contract and in preparation for actual construction. At that time, the committee was advised that the contract, agreed to as to form, was in Washington for approval by the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Secretary of Interior and that its actual signing could well take place prior to the end of the present fiscal year and therefore in ample time for the initiation of construction in fiscal 1957.

I was somewhat surprised then to note in the committee report that the funds for Collbran had been disallowed due to the fact that no repayment contract was in hand. The record shows that it is expected to be executed in ample time for work in the fiscal year under consideration, and that being the case, we should not unnecessarily delay this project.

The people involved, including myself, have made every effort to keep the committee fully advised and we have made no effort to obtain funds in order to start construction of the Collbran project prior to the execution of a repayment contract. We feel now that we are amply justified in requesting that the funds for Collbran be allowed to stand with no more restriction than that no construction be undertaken until the actual signing of the repayment contract has occurred. We have attempted to play fair with the committee and have advised the committee of all developments. It is too bad that this effort at fairness should rise up to strike down the appropriation just when the long effort to get this project underway is about to come into fruition.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, on page 6 of the report there is a statement relative to the Helena Valley unit:

> Helena Valley unit, Montana: The new funds requested for this project have been disallowed, in view of the fact that there is no repayment contract with either the city of Helena for municipal water supply or with the supplemental water users in the irrigation project area.

That language adds additional conditions to be met before this project can start. The Helena Valley unit was started because of an agreement in the act for Canyon Ferry Dam that land in the area would be put under irrigation using Canyon Ferry water in order to replace some of the irrigated land inundated by Canyon Ferry Reservoir. On the 13th of April in 1954, a meeting of Helena Valley water users and attended by the representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation was held in Helena.

More than 17,000 acres of land in Helena Valley was represented. At that time it was agreed that owners of some 4,600 acres who had decreed water rights and who only needed to use water on an auxiliary and supplemental basis would not come into any district to be formed.

The supplemental water users were adamant that they would never participate in any repayment contract except on a sales basis. The Bureau of Reclamation at that time and all times since has known that the supplemental water users would not participate in any repayment contract.

When the irrigation district was formed the district judge who presided over the proceedings made findings in which he said:

> That the Bureau of Reclamation expected and thought that after the project was in operation, owners of additional lands not included as a part of the Helena Valley Irrigation District, would seek to purchase water from the district and that the plans for construction made allowance for such additional users, but that it was not a necessary part of, or essential to, the feasibility of the project that such contemplated additional users be a part of the Helena Valley Irrigation District.

It was never contemplated that these supplemental users could come in on a contract basis or that it would be necessary for them to come in.

When Mr. Dexheimer testified before the Appropriations Committee of the House on May 2, 1955—hearings, part 1,

pages 282–285, 295–297—he discussed the Helena Valley unit. He said:

We have 13,000 acres in the district being formed now.

Mr. Clinton said:

When they started to canvass the landowners to find out how many of them would be willing to come into the new district, the people on the 4,600 acres of supplemental water lands decided that they did not want to come into the district along with the full lands. They preferred to deal with the Bureau separately for their supplemental water.

Yet Mr. Dexheimer at the same time and at the same hearing said:

The next step after the district is formed will be for the Bureau to proceed to negotiate a contract with the Board of Commissioners of that district, and we are anticipating that that step can be completed by August of this year (1955).

When that is done it will permit us to start construction either late August or early September of this year.

Note that Mr. Dexheimer says the Bureau will negotiate a contract with the district and when that is done construction will start.

Later on, in response to a question from Congressman PHILLIPS, Mr. Dexheimer assured him:

We will not start any construction work on that unit until we have an executed and firm repayment contract from the district.

No mention of a contract with supplemental users and, of course, nothing about the city of Helena.

The second part, that there be a contract with the city of Helena, was never a part of the plan.

The Bureau of Reclamation admits that the negotiations with the city of Helena started after "submittal of a definite plan report" of the Helena Valley project and negotiations only started last winter for Helena Valley.

It was estimated that about $700,000 additional to apply on construction cost would be paid by the owners of the approximately 4,600 acres of irrigable lands outside of the Helena Valley Irrigation district for a supplemental water supply, but this $700,000 is to be on a voluntary sales basis rather than a repayment contract and the Bureau of Reclamation knew that it was to be that since the first meeting with the Helena Valley water users.

In addition, it was contemplated that the city of Helena may repay with interest as much as $942,000 of the cost of construction of the Helena Valley unit but the city of Helena came in after the preparation of the original plan and, therefore, is a potential additional market for water above and beyond the market originally contemplated. The interest of the city of Helena, therefore, in this additional water, makes the project even more feasible than the project as originally planned.

Mr. RABAUT. If the gentleman will yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Of course the gentleman is quoting from various sources. We have to meet the rules about the money that is spent by Congress. There is an unobligated carryover balance, as reported on page 6, for this Helena Valley unit in Montana of $2,250,000. It is available for the beginning of construction, but they are not going to go ahead and do that construction unless there is an outlet for this water. We have to have some form of commitment. In other words, this project is not going to stand on the basis of its own. They are going to make a commitment for water or they do not need construction.

Mr. METCALF. Let me say to the gentleman that last year your committee wrote into the bill that "no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate construction of the Helena Valley unit until a repayment contract has been executed." At that time it was contemplated that the repayment contract would be executed with the Helena Valley Irrigation District, the main water user. That has been the plan since 1954, with the approval of the Bureau of Reclamation. The Helena Valley water users have complied with the condition imposed last year. This year you come in and add another qualification that not only must there be a contract with the irrigation district but that there be a contract with the city of Helena or supplemental water users, which is changing the rule after the people of the district have organized the district and performed their part of the agreement.

Mr. RABAUT. You have got a contract for about half——

Mr. METCALF. Not half; 13,000 out of 17,000 acres.

Mr. RABAUT. We will be glad to release this money if the water users will make a contract.

Mr. METCALF. I say to the gentleman that we have complied with every qualification and every condition put in last year, and the committee now is coming in and adding additional qualifications.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inquire of the chairman of the committee relative to another phase of the bill. I have been a bit disturbed about certain items not being in the bill. I notice in your report on page 7 "Transmission Division":

Funds amounting to $5,500,000 which were programed for the Fort Randall-Grand Island 230-kilovolt transmission line have been disallowed.

This item was allowed for this purpose by the Bureau of the Budget and the Interior Department and I am wondering whether anyone can shed any light on the real reason why the amount was not included in the bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. I will try to answer the gentleman. In the committee, I made the motion to take the money out of the bill for that transmission line.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is not a reason; I know the gentleman made the motion, but I wondered what the real reason was for taking it out.

Mr. KIRWAN. I will give you the reason. That was for a transmission line from that dam——

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. For the Fort Randall-Grand Island transmission line, from Fort Randall in South Dakota.

Mr. KIRWAN. Into Nebraska. In the 82d Congress in presenting the Interior bill to that Congress I had 7 rollcalls in 1 day.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; in 1 day.

Mr. KIRWAN. More rollcalls I believe in 1 day than had ever been had on 1 bill before.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What does that have to do with this?

Mr. KIRWAN. I will tell you why. On those rollcalls the Members from Nebraska voted against public power in the Northwest; they voted against public power in the Southwest; they voted against it in the Southeast and they voted against it in the Missouri Basin.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is enough. It was a political reason. That is the answer I expected. It was a political reason. I cannot yield further to the gentleman unless he can get me more time. Now I will reply to that. On those five rollcalls——

Mr. KIRWAN. No; there were seven.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Every man voted as he had a right to do. I say this is a challenge to every man and woman in this House that if you do not go along with the chairman of the subcommittee and vote as he thinks you ought to vote, then 4 or 5 years later he is going to come along and chastise you because you followed the dictates of your conscience.

And let me say to you, sir, that the Congress was a Democratic Congress. I checked on that when I saw your press release on this subject. One amendment that was offered to cut the Southeast power project was offered by a Democrat from Virginia, and the Democratic Congress agreed with the Members of the Nebraska delegation and went along with them.

The other amendment to cut Southwest power was offered by a Democrat, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], who is a Member of this body. It cut them from $3,900,000 to $3,200,000; and the House did not agree with you, Mr. KIRWAN, they agreed with the Nebraska delegation. A Democratic House went along and did not agree with you.

The other cut was one offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], as I remember, to cut $2,960,000, and that was agreed to by a Democratic House. Another amendment, offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], cut the reclamation fund 5 percent. That hurt Nebraska but I voted as did the Democratic Congress to go along. There was a need for economy.

That was at a time when the Government budget was out of balance $14 billion and Mr. Truman, after the Congress got through, froze all of these new projects; he did not permit any project to go forward.

Another amendment was on the Bonneville power project. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] offered an amendment to reduce that from $67 million to $62 million; and I remind you that a Democratic chairman and those under your own leadership did not go along with you; they went along with the Republican delegation from Nebraska of which I happen to be the surviving member in the House.

I will say again to you that if it is going to be the purpose of a subcommittee chairman to move to take out of a bill an item which was approved by the Bureau of the Budget, approved by the President of the United States, approved by the Interior Department, because some Member of the House 5 years ago happened to vote against him on 5 or 6 votes in 1 day in a Democratic House and the Democratic House voted, as the record shows, as the delegation from Nebraska voted. When he says because you did not vote right 5 years ago we take this item out of the bill today, I say that is purely a political reason and in bad taste.

Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I shall move to reinstate this item.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the gentleman from Nebraska that I have been here for a long time. The gentleman tossed a challenge out to Members of the House here. But in my time I have never pointed the finger of suspicion to anybody or said anything about politics. There is no public power in Ohio. However, Nebraska is 100 percent a public-power State. Nebraska is the only State of the 48 States that has 100 percent public power. There are no private utilities out there. I am for private utilities and I am for public power. They can both work together.

When the Interior bill was on the floor in the Truman administration every one of the items that the gentleman helped to cut out of the bill involved public power, and now he is hollering about it. Those items were all budgeted in the Eighty-second Congress.

Let me read them to you. The Truman administration made certain recommendations. You know, I only happened to be presenting that bill to the House. As I stated, there is no public power in my district or in the State of Ohio.

First, you voted to reduce funds for Southeastern Power Administration. The four Members from Nebraska did that.

On the second rollcall you voted to reduce by $550,000 the funds for Southeastern Power Administration.

On the third rollcall you voted against the western Missouri project. The four Members from Nebraska voted against the Bonneville Dam operation. You voted to cripple Bonneville Dam with a war going on.

I am reading what the record shows now.

No. 5, you voted against the Bureau of Land Management.

Sixth, you voted to reduce the funds of the Bureau of Reclamation for construction of transmission lines. You voted against the construction of transmission lines. You voted to reduce TVA by $13 million.

As I said, Nebraska is the only 100-percent public-power State in the Union. The United States Government has spent a huge sum of money in delivering this power. We built a transmission line out there for 150 miles in northern Nebraska. We did that for you after you voted against every State in the Union having public power. Now you come in here and you want to spend a total of $9 million on Nebraska for another line.

Some 70 years ago when I came to this earth my parents taught me to have a little reciprocity in me, to treat your neighbors kindly. You have ben hollering about foreign relations and other things, but I do not know of any State of the 48 States in the Union that would do what Nebraska has done, vote as a unit, right to a man, to cut public power out of every State that had it, yet they have it 100 percent. Do you call that fairness? Anything fair about that?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman tell me, did the House that was Democratic at that time go along with the gentleman?

Mr. KIRWAN. I do not care about the House. I am not interested in politics, whether there was a Democratic group here in charge or who it was. I am interested in America and in fairness to all the States, not whether the House was Democratic or Republican. I do not care what it was. I only presented the bill to the House at that time and I am telling the gentleman the way Nebraska voted against every State that wanted public power. I do not believe Nebraska should get a Federal appropriation for this transmission line when it has been in opposition to appropriations for public power in its sister States.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there are certain facts that should be brought out in this debate relative to the item under consideration. About 5 years ago after the Department of the Interior requested hundreds upon hundreds of miles of transmission lines to be built in many sections of this country, the Democrat controlled subcommittees for the Interior appropriation bill of the House and Senate decided there must be a stop put to many of those requests for transmission facilities. So sort of an unwritten yardstick for the building of Federal transmission lines was established. It is quite simple. We agreed that where private utilities and/or REA and/or municipalities already have adequate power producing and transmission facilities to furnish power and to transmit power to preferred customers and others from hydroelectric dams and would enter into contracts to wheel power from hydroelectric dams to preferred customers and others at reasonable rates, than the Congress was not justified in appropriating tax dollars to build such facilities. Since that time—and the record will prove it—the Congress has appropriated money to build transmission lines just to the closest load centers into the different States where the people could then come and connect onto the substation and get the power. Now, that is why the committee denied this appropriation for the building of a transmission line into the State of Nebraska from Randall Dam on the Missouri River in South Dakota costing over $9 million. Even though Nebraska were not a 100 percent public power State from which the Federal Treasury receives not one single red penny of tax from power revenues from that State, the committee would still, I am sure, have denied the term which our good friend and able colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] will ask to be reinserted in the bill.

Now, those are the facts. It would make no difference who was asking for it or what Member of the House asked for such a line as the gentleman from Nebraska is asking for. The treatment would be the same by the Committee on Appropriations. We have treated Nebraska as good so far as building transmission lines into that State as we have in many other States of the Union. For instance, 2 years ago I myself was instrumental in appropriating funds to build a short line from Gavins Point Dam in South Dakota to Lawton, Nebr., because the REA's in that area were in great need of electric energy.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

For construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects or parts thereof (including power transmission facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, $125,900,000, of which $63,083,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for other than the completion of field engineering, survey work, and preliminary designs of the Southwest Contra Costa County Water District System and no repayment contract shall be executed or construction begun until plans have been submitted to and approved by the Congress through its legislative and appropriation procedures, after submission of a report to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior (1) on the cost and feasibility of said project, including the necessary distribution system and (2) on the rates required to be charged to the ultimate consumers: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $208,000 of this appropriation shall be available for the construction of fish protective facilities at Savage Rapids Dam, Oreg., to be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $200,000 of this appropriation shall be available for lighting the spillway of Grand Coulee Dam and shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers, except those transmission facilities for which construction funds have been heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities for which the Secretary of the Interior finds the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer: *Provided further*, That no part of this or prior appropriations shall be used for construction, nor for further commitments to construction of Moorhead Dam and Reservoir, Mont., or any feature thereof until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed, by the States of Wyoming and Montana, and approved by the Congress.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: On page 7, line 22, after "Congress.", insert "*Provided further*, That $5,500,000 shall be programed and remain available until spent for the Fort Randall-Grand Island 230-kilovolt transmission line."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks made by the gentleman from Iowa because they were not political. I think what he said is correct, but I believe that transmisison lines have been built into or to Iowa and into or to Minnesota and into and to other States. This line was approved by the Bureau of the Budget. It was approved by the Department of the Interior.

Now, as to the merits of my amendment. The 230 kilovolt line is needed to bring electrical power from the Fort Randall Dam, on the Missouri River, to Grand Island, Nebr., which is the load center in central Nebraska. During the summer months, water must be discharged through the dam down the channel of the Missouri River for navigation purposes, and it is only good business, at the same time, to produce power with this water. The navigation time corresponds with the time when this power is urgently needed by Nebraska farmers to operate their irrigation pumps. Nebraska is fortunate in having a great amount of underground water. What we lack in rainfall, and we are seriously lacking there, we could make up substantially by drawing from this tremendous underground reservoir. In recent years, the number of irrigation wells has been increasing at a rate of about 2,000 per year, so that we now have about 15,000 irrigation wells, and as many more farmers have indicated an interest in drilling more wells in coming years. The power that could be carried on this line is desperately needed if we are to continue to grow and to stabilize our agriculture.

Yes, Nebraska is a public power State. All power is sold and distributed by REA's, municipalities, or subdivisions of the State. All our power customers are preference customers. I can take little credit for this method of power distribution. That was a choice made by the voters of my State. They held elections out there years ago, and a great majority voted to have a public ownership system; so, I do not see how it can be within the province of the gentleman from Ohio to comment or to criticize the power structure of my State.

These REA's, and these public bodies that supply the farms and towns of Nebraska desperately need the power from Fort Randall Dam. We have a drought condition to combat, and the best way I know to do it is by making more irrigation possible.

We are not asking for a handout. Funds for the construction of this line would be in the nature of a loan. Every dime would be repaid to the Federal Treasury, and with the benefits that would come through increased and stabilized incomes, greater taxpaying ability, and a more secure agricultural economy, the return to the Treasury would be actually manifold.

This request I am making in this amendment should be permitted to stand or fall on its merits and strictly on its merits. I ask nothing more, because I am sure that after the House has examined the amendment they will find it is meritorious. But the gentleman from Ohio has not seen fit to permit such action. His action was based on narrow, vindictive, and political grounds.

I am more than a little surprised and shocked at the attitude that has been taken by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]. He has been quoted quite widely in the press, and if he was quoted accurately, this is the reason why the 230-kilovolt line from Fort Randall to Grand Island, Nebr., was deleted from this appropriation bill, and I quote from press release:

KIRWAN told a reporter that apparently the philisophy of the Nebraska House Members was not to give anything to any other State but to grab everything they could for Nebraska. He said that while representing a public-power State the Nebraskans generally were against public-power projects for other States.

If that's the philosophy of the voters in Nebraska and the men they send to Congress, then I'm going to use every opportunity I have to be against this project they want.

Now, to prove his point he has reached back to 1951 and 1952 and selected 6 or 7 rollcall votes that he interprets as votes against public power by myself and Hon. CARL T. CURTIS, then a Member of this body, and now the junior Senator from Nebraska. There is nothing in any of these votes that would by any reasonable stretch of the imagination permit the gentleman from Ohio to make such an accusation, and I do not intend to let this go unchallenged. I would like at this point to point out the votes that Mr. KIRWAN has irresponsibly charged as being votes against public power:

First. One vote was to strike out $3.4 million from the Southeastern Power Administration for power lines in the State of Virginia. A Virginia Congressman offered this amendment because they would duplicate existing lines now serving the area.. Although the Democrats controlled the Congress, a majority agreed with the Nebraskans and passed the amendment.

Second. Another amendment complained of by Mr. KIRWAN was offered by Congressman HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas. It was to reduce the appropriation for the Southwestern Power Administration from $3,925,000 to $3,775,000. It was not a vote against the Southwestern Power Administration. It was an amendment for a small economy cut in wartime. You must remember that at this time the United States was in the so-called "police action" in Korea, and the budget was running along at a $14 billion deficit for that fiscal year. Is it Mr. KIRWAN'S philosophy that every Member of this Congress must vote every penny requested by the Bureau of Reclamation, or the Southwestern Power Administration, or the International Cooperation Administration? Does he mean to say that if I vote for a little commonsense economy in Government, that conclusively proves I am against public power? Here again the majority—Democratic—voted as I did, and against Mr. KIRWAN.

Third. Another amendment was to strike out $2,936,000 for the western Missouri project for the Southwest Power. This amendment was offered by a Missouri Congressman, Mr. DEWEY SHORT, for the reason that the lines, if built, would duplicate and run parallel to existing lines serving the territory. Again the majority of the Democratic controlled House voted for the cut, just as I did.

Fourth. Mr. KIRWAN next criticizes my vote on an amendment offered by the Congressman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] to reduce Bonneville Power Administration funds from $67,550,000 to $62,000,000. In thinking back over this vote, I recall that this amendment was also approved by a majority of the House Members, and still the House was controlled by Mr. KIRWAN'S party. If this vote is to be construed as a vote against public power, the gentleman from Ohio, who is the astute chairman of the Democratic campaign committee, should certainly begin rewriting his party's policies on public power because so many Democrats went against him again on this one.

Fifth. Next the gentleman complains that the Nebraskans voted to reduce the appropriation for the Bureau of Land Management from $7.7 million to $6.9 million, or a cut of $800,000. Again let me remind the gentleman that this reduction was made, that his party was in control of the Congress, and that if he would choose to be fair he would certainly have to admit that this vote was not even remotely connected with public power, private power, or any other kind of power—except possibly a curb on the power of one of the bureaus of Government.

Sixth. The next vote to come under the fire of the gentleman is the one that caused a blanket 5 percent reduction in the total amount for reclamation projects. This motion was made by Mr. TABER, of New York, to reduce the total from $207,109,000 to $197,000,000. I again voted with the majority, but in so doing let me remind the gentleman my vote also reduced irrigation project appropriations in Nebraska by the same 5 percent. This again was another attempt to economize during time of war.

Seventh. The seventh vote Mr. KIRWAN has singled out was on an amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], providing that funds should not be used to start new power lines within areas covered by wheeling service contracts. This meant that if there were lines over which the electricity could be carried, the taxpayers should not be required to build new and duplicating lines. Again the majority of the House agreed with the Nebraskans, and disagreed with Mr. KIRWAN.

Now, just a word of caution to my colleagues in this House who have reclamation or power projects that are vital

to their people at home. Your record had better be spotless, it had better be unblemished—and by that I mean that it had better be right down the line with Mr. KIRWAN or he is going to kick you in the teeth.

I would challenge anyone in this body to show me that he has worked any harder for the development of land and water resources than I have, or who has voted any more consistently for power and reclamation developments whenever the opportunity has arisen. In the debate on the Interior appropriation bill on March 27, 1952, I took the floor to make some remarks which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 3, pages 3066 and 3067. In these remarks I criticized the policy of the administration and the policy of Congress, as well as the bill, because no new power or irrigation starts were provided for. I said this:

> I have not always approved of the method and policies of the Department of the Interior relative to irrigation projects, or the building of powerlines, but in this country it seems to me it is imperative that we look after some of our own resources. Electric power makes irrigation feasible.

And again on page 3067 I said:

> I repeat, these new irrigation projects plus the electric energy adds new wealth, brings in more business, taxes, and security to our Nation. These resources must be developed to meet the needs of our expanding population.

Now, in this appropriation bill we are now considering, there has been deleted at the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] a request for funds to build power-transmission facilities in my State, admittedly not on the merits of the project, but for purely political and individual reasons. Merely because Mr. KIRWAN said "MILLER hasn't voted like I wanted him to vote in the past." I do not believe I have encountered such an attitude during my 14 years in this House. Let me say just a word or two more about this project: The total cost is approximately $9 million, and we are asking approximately $5.5 million of the project cost this year. This $5.5 million is not a new appropriation, it does not involve new funds. We simply requested authority from the Congress to transfer the funds appropriated last year for the 115-kilovolt line from Fort Randall Dam to Neligh, Nebr., and other Bureau of Reclamation funds previously authorized. The request was in the nature of a transfer, and not an appropriation. The balance would be requested at a later time.

This line was carefully studied by the Bureau of Reclamation last year. It was found to be feasible, its construction was requested by the Department of the Interior, it was approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and President Eisenhower saw fit to request that it be constructed.

It now appears that the recommendations of the departments and the President himself are being thwarted and blocked by one man, the gentleman from Ohio.

Now, it is true that I have voted "nay" many times in this House, but let me say that I always vote the way my conscience dictates and I always try to vote the merits of the legislation. I hold no grudge against any Member of this House, and I respect the right of each Member to vote as he sees fit, regardless of whether he may agree or disagree with me. I hope Mr. KIRWAN can explain his action to his colleagues.

Let me remind the gentleman that if I had voted on these matters as Mr. KIRWAN would have me vote, I am quite sure my constituents would have stopped sending me back here to Congress some years ago.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we are constrained to insist upon our point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I concede that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] makes a point of order; the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] concedes it and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND

For payment to the "Upper Colorado River Basin fund," authorized by section 5 of the Act of April 11, 1956 (Public Law 485), $3,155,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEMPSEY: On page 9, line 4, strike out "$3,155,000" and insert "$6 million."

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment to correct what I think is an inadvertent oversight on the part of the Committee on Appropriations. The bill as it now stands calls for $3,155,000 for this project. There is much work to be done in the building of roads and electric lines. In one instance the shortest route to the town is 135 miles. I think we should have had the entire amount that was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, which was $8 million, but I decided to make it an amount which certainly I could justify and for which I think every Member of this House could vote. I do not believe there is a desire on the part of anyone here to unnecessarily delay progress in the upper Colorado River project.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Recalling the colloquy that took place here a few hours ago between myself and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], I think that it is conceded, is it not, that the item for construction of access roads and housing facilities was perhaps overlooked. Certainly the $6 million would go a long way toward covering that amount.

Mr. DEMPSEY. They were entirely overlooked; and to the extent their construction was needed on the Glen Canyon unit, $5 million, and the Flaming Gorge unit, $1,300,000, and the Navajo Dam came into this, I decided to bring the amount down to $6 million. I hope the committee can see its way clear to approve this amendment.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I would like to associate myself with the gentleman from New Mexico in offering and supporting this amendment. We both know that the full $8 million, as requested by the President, has been justified in detail to the satisfaction of the Bureau of the Budget. However, the committee obviously has not relied and should not rely upon this. They should and have considered the request on the basis of the record made by the Bureau of Reclamation at the hearings before the subcommittee.

I have studied the record of those hearings pertaining to the justification of expenditures for the upper Colorado River storage project very carefully, as I know has the very able gentleman from New Mexico. I think the gentleman will agree with me that the record made there by the Bureau of Reclamation as to justifications for all of the money requested leaves much to be desired in satisfying the criteria of the committee, as set forth by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] a few minutes ago; that is with regard to stating the actual work that is to be done and how much will be needed for the specific types of work in fiscal year 1957. The record does not present a clear-cut justification for each of the various items of the general program. The committee in its report indicates that it has allowed the amount requested for preconstruction work in the aggregate of $3,155,000.

I think that the bill, the committee report, and the record of the hearings show that the committee has given this very complex appropriation legislation generally fair and careful consideration. Members of the committee have, in most commendable fashion, indicated that in regard to this specific appropriation, some items with regard to funds for construction of housing facilities and access roads were sufficiently justified but were inadvertently overlooked in computing the amount of the appropriation to be recommended. If all of the reasonable inferences from the testimony are considered, the amount of $6 million proposed by this amendment is, I believe, justified. I sincerely hope that the committee members will agree with that and will accept the amendment. If so, I think that I can fully agree with the members of the committee that the burden is squarely on the Bureau of Reclamation to further specifically justify the additional funds in the hearings before the other body. By letter and by telephone information, the Bureau of Reclamation has presented to me, as I am sure they have to the gentleman from New Mexico, information which would justify a minimum of the full $8 million requested. But that information was not presented to the committee for their consideration as shown by the hearings. The Bureau can and should furnish with particularity the amount of additional funds over and beyond $6

million that they will need for construction of additional access roads, camp site facilities, and for construction of the diversion tunnels. If this is done in making their presentation before the committee of the other body, then I believe it has been indicated by at least some members of the House committee, here today, that they would be inclined to look with favor on the granting of such additional funds when the matter was before a conference committee for consideration. I think that this is a very fair approach to the problem. On the basis of the ex parte information I have, I am confident that the Bureau can justify the additional amounts, but the committee is justified, I believe, in expecting them to do just that in the regular order of proceedings before the committee of the other body.

I again urge the adoption of this amendment and express the sincere hope that the members of the committee, in line with the previous very commendable expressions that have been made, will accept the amendment of the gentleman from New Mexico to increase the appropriation to $6 million on the basis of that which can reasonably be justified from the testimony of the Bureau representatives before the House subcommittee.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I was rather confused, too, until I got a letter this morning from Mr. Dexheimer, who I think is a very able man.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If the gentleman will yield to me, since my name was brought into this, I am constrained to say that on the basis of $6 million I would not argue against it, I would be constrained to accept the amendment, because I think more than the $3,155,000 will be needed if the roads and the proper construction in the way of housing is to be done. I think we might have difficulty, as the gentleman says, in justifying more than the $6 million, but certainly that can be justified. I would suggest, if the other members of the committee would agree, that on this side of the House we would accept the amendment.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I would appreciate that very, very much. I hope that the chairman on this side will see his way clear to accept the amendment. I am addressing myself to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the gentleman has reduced this amendment to $6 million, I accept the amendment and ask for a vote.

Mr. JENSEN. As another member of the committee, I will say, as did the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], I feel the $6 million which the gentleman requests is completely justified.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, no other reclamation project ever authorized by Congress has received the study and attention that the upper Colorado River storage project has. Despite well-financed opposition, Congress this year supported President Eisenhower and the Department of the Interior and authorized this multimillion dollar, long-range development of an entire river basin by a vote of 256 to 136.

The administration has requested an initial appropriation of $8 million for this project. This amount would enable the Bureau of Reclamation to bring its plans for Glen Canyon and Flaming Gorge Dams up to bid stage. It would also provide funds for the construction of access roads to the dam sites and for the building of construction camps for Bureau personnel. In short, the requested appropriation would get this project underway.

The House Appropriations Committee has cut this amount by nearly $5 million. Members of the committee in granting planning funds have recognized the need for this project. But we cannot save water now wasting in the Pacific Ocean with plans. This project contemplates a 25-year development and construction period. It is of prime importance that we begin storing water at the earliest possible date. I commend the Members for their support of this amendment to restore at least $3 million of the amount cut but by the Appropriations Committee and I want to serve notice that we will continue our fight for all of the funds requested by the President for this project which is so vital to the area and to the Nation as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses necessary for the collection and study of basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects, and when authorized by law, preliminary examinations, surveys and studies (including cooperative beach erosion studies as authorized in Public Law No. 520, 71st Cong., approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented), of projects prior to authorization for construction, to remain available until expended, $7,962,000.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABERNETHY: On page 15, line 16, strike out "$7,962,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,122,000."

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment adds $160,000 to this particular item. The object is to have a resurvey of the Tennessee Tombigbee Waterway. This project was authorized in 1946. It had approval of the Army engineers and the Congress. But in 1951, the Committee on Appropriations through a special subcommittee chairmaned by Mr. Kerr, of North Carolina, made a special investigation of the project. Based on information, which committee members felt to be sound, they found that the project was not at that time economically justified. The committee issued this particular statement in the report as follows:

This project cannot be justified by the statutory criterion of a favorable benefit-cost ratio unless economic conditions in the area drastically change.

Mr. Chairman, that was 5 years ago. It is our contention that over that period of 5 years, there has been a drastic change in the economic conditions of that particular area. Through this amendment it is our object to carry out the specific directions of the Committee on Appropriations, that is, to determine whether or not the project is economically sound. This can be done only by a resurvey by the Army engineers. Actually that was about what the Appropriations Committee directed. But we cannot have a resurvey without financing. The amount of money which the Army engineers contend will be required to finance the resurvey is $160,000. That is what I seek.

I hope the members of the committee will see fit to accept this amendment. It simply carries out the directions which the committee itself ordered 5 years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] has expired.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] that will provide the sum of $160,000 to be used for a restudy of the proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway.

Although this proposed waterway was authorized by Congress in 1946, no construction funds have ever been appropriated. After making a study of the proposal, the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Army Civil Functions issued on September 18, 1951, a report which concluded that the "proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway cannot be justified by the statutory criterion of a favorable benefit-cost ratio unles economic conditions in the general area of the project undergo a drastic change."

No further efforts were made until this year to obtain funds for the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, although the conclusions reached in the subcommittee's report were contrary to those reached as a result of studies made by the United States Corps of Engineers.

In March of this year, however, I appeared with several of my colleagues before the Subcommittee on Public Works of the House Appropriations Committee to request that they include in the bill now under consideration the necessary funds for a restudy of this project. We made this appearance because we were convinced that "economic conditions in the general area of the project" have undergone the "drastic change" referred to in the report issued by the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Army Civil Functions.

The growth of industry in the area which would be served by the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway and in the two areas which would be connected by it, plus the growth of the waterborne commerce of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and the Tennessee River—the two waterways to be connected by the project—indicates that such a change has taken

place in the 4½-year period since the subcommittee made its report.

Since 1951, five integrated chemical plants have been built and put into production on the reaches of the Tombigbee River between Mobile and Jackson, Ala. Two multimillion-dollar paper mills are now under construction on the reaches of the Tombigbee River between Jackson, Ala., and its confluence with the Warrior River at Demopolis, Ala. The development of new industry and the growth of established industries in the Mobile area and along the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway between Mobile and New Orleans are among the greatest taking place in the entire Southeast.

At the other terminus of the proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway on the Tennessee River, similar industrial development has been going forward and continues to go forward.

This industrial growth, coupled with the tremendous attraction which the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and the Tennessee River have demonstrated for commerce, indicates that a restudy of the proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee project is in order.

The movement of commerce on the Tennessee River in 1954 totaled 8,415,769 tons. In the same year, we moved on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway between Mobile and New Orleans 6,149,064 tons. Only a careful survey will determine what portion of the commerce moving over these two existing waterways would move over a link between them. But from my knowledge of the commerce that has been and is being attracted to the Warrior-Tombigbee waterway in Alabama by the improvements that are now being made on the project, I am confident that some portion, possibly a substantial portion, of the 13½ million tons of the commerce moving over the two waterways we propose to connect would move over the connecting link.

I do not think we have to depend upon the divergence of commerce that now moves over the Mississippi River system as such to find commerce for the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. Of course, commerce will be diverted for various reasons, but it is my opinion that commerce will also be generated when this project is accomplished. I am not in a position to know what commodities would move over this waterway. Only a careful study will establish this information, but certainly there is a strong demand in Alabama for grains from the midcontinent area of the United States which lend themselves to movement by barges.

There is also a growing demand throughout the entire Southeastern area for petroleum products including petrochemicals. This is true of the area served by the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and the Tennessee River, and there is every reason to believe the same would be true of the area which would be served by the link between these established waterways. In addition, an abundant coal reserve exists in north and central Alabama, and with the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee project, the coal from this region would become readily available to the areas served by the Tennessee River.

In addition to the economic changes that have taken place in the period following the committee's report of September 1951, time has proved incorrect several assumptions made in this report. As part of its adverse comments, the report suggested that the Corps of Engineers had not included in its cost estimate the rebuilding of three locks and dams which now exist on the lower reaches of the Tombigbee River. The report pointed out that these existing low dams, with their lock chambers of approximately 52 feet by 285 feet, would have to be rebuilt at what the report estimated to be a cost of $51 million. On March 6, 1956, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors approved a project report on the proposed Jackson Lock and Dam as a replacement for these three existing locks and dams on the Tombigbee River. The estimated cost of the Jackson Lock and Dam is $23.6 million. Assuming that the replacement of these three locks and dams should be included as a part of the cost of the Tennessee-Tombigbee project (and there are good reasons why this should not be done), the 1951 estimate in the subcommittee's report is in error by approximately $28 million, and this error lowered considerably the committee's estimate of the cost-benefit ratio on the Tennessee-Tombigbee project.

In criticizing the estimate made by the Corps of Engineers of benefits to be derived from the Tennessee-Tombigbee project, the report contended that hazardous and uneconomical operating conditions exist between the ports of Mobile and New Orleans. While I am not thoroughly familiar with the operating conditions over this section of the intracoastal waterway, I do know that the equipment which is used to move commerce on the Warrior-Tombigbee system in Alabama is also used on the intracoastal waterway between these two ports. It is also true that standard operating equipment from the Mississippi River system moves without difficulty across this intracoastal waterway system. The fact that over 6 million tons of commerce moved between Mobile and New Orleans over the waterway in 1954 is certainly an indication that the operators of barges and towboats transporting the commerce find no unusual difficulties.

Although the appropriations committee states in its report that the request for the inclusion of funds for a resurvey of the Tombigbee and Tennessee Waterway was given serious consideration, action on appropriations for the resurvey was deferred until the next session of Congress.

Those of us who realize the importance of this development are confident that a restudy of the proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway is thoroughly justified by rapidly changing economic conditions in the Southeastern States. I therefore respectfully urge the Members of this body to approve today, rather than postpone, the small appropriation necessary for this restudy.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I support the Abernethy amendment, to provide $160,000 for a new survey of the economic feasibility of construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. I believe this to be a great project, one that will make America stronger, one that will make America more certain to achieve her economic destiny.

Evidently, the Congress of the United States thought right well of this project at one time, because in 1945 it authorized its construction.

About 1951 an investigating group of the Committee on Appropriations of the United States House of Representatives purported to find that the project was not justified. This investigating group raised a doubt in the minds of many Members of Congress. In justice to them, and in justice to all the people of America, this Abernethy amendment should be adopted so that we can again get a thorough appraisal of this project by the Corps of United States Engineers.

Not only has this project been authorized, but our Government has spent nearly a million dollars for planning the works on the Tombigbee River which crosses Pickens County, Ala., in the district which I have the honor to represent. We should go this step further. The cost is relatively very small. It will be a good investment for building a stronger America.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that this is merely planning money, money for a resurvey, and in view of the fact that the committee has repeatedly expressed itself in favor of the resurvey, I accept the amendment and ask for a vote.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I suppose perhaps it is like spitting into a strong gale, but I do feel there should be somewhere we should draw the line in adding additional commitments to this bill today. It is not as if this were an original proposition that we were asked to evaluate to the tune of $160,000 in order that we might be properly advised as to whether future planning and construction funds should be allotted to this project. This is one of the oldest of the old chestnuts that we have in the multi-billion-dollar backlog of authorized projects that are waiting their turn on the list to get into the appropriation program. I do not know how well some of you who have been here some time will recall this project, but it used to be the pet project of another gentleman from Mississippi who is no longer here. I think most of you will recall the fact, and I think it is a fact, and not being unkind about it at all, that it got to be a kind of laughing stock on the floor of this House. I have a rather strong feeling that if we now pour another $160,000 into this well-traveled, well-recognized pathway to huge expenditures, perhaps we will be the kind of laughing stock that this project used to be when it was brought up so frequently by a former Member of this House from Mississippi.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I understand that this particular project requires an enormous investigation over miles and miles and that the project, if approved, probably would cost in the neighborhood of three

or four hundred million dollars. Does the gentleman feel that we are in the kind of shape in this country where we can embark upon such a project.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think my views have been pretty well expressed both here today with respect to this amendment and I think I have also expressed myself on other occasions in relation to other projects. This is a dream. The Corps of Engineers time and time again has found that it was not a practical dream. I feel that this is one place where we ought to draw the line, and I hope you will reject this amendment.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FISHER offers a substitute amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. ABERNETHY: Strike out "$8,122,000" and insert "$8.172,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FISHER) there were—ayes 54, noes 86.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 106, noes 87.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ABERNETHY and Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 123, noes 92.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, the public-works bill before us today contains one item of great interest to many of my constituents in southeastern Oklahoma. It allocates $15,000 for a new survey looking toward relocation of the previously authorized Hugo Reservoir on the Kiamichi River.

The district engineer at Tulsa, Okla., has assured the Oklahoma Senators and me that $15,000 will be sufficient to do this resurvey.

The Hugo Reservoir, as originally authorized in 1946, was limited to the single objective of providing flood protection on the Red River below Denison Dam. The State of Oklahoma and the residents of my congressional district opposed the initially authorized project because it did not contain multipurpose features. It made no provision to meet local needs for industrial and municipal water supplies. It would inundate some of the richest farmland in Oklahoma, but it would provide precious little flood control for us.

We do not disagree with the engineers in their view that additional flood-control measures are essential to protect the Red River. However, we do insist that the reservoir be tailored more to the needs and the demands of the people in the area where it is to be located.

I am deeply grateful that the committee has seen fit to include this relatively small item in the bill it has reported to the House. I trust the engineers will proceed to make the resurvey promptly once the money becomes available.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRAY: On page 15, line 16, after the figure "$8,122,000", add the following: "$75,000 for a study of the canalization of the Big Muddy River, Ill., $50,000 for a study of flood control of Cache River, Ill., and $25,000 for study of flood control in Harrisonville and Ivy Landing District No. 2, Monroe County, Ill."

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment on the ground that the figure which this amendment seeks to change has already been changed and that a second amendment to the same figure is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. This amendment provides for an addition following the sum, which does not affect the sum previously adopted. This is in addition to. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It would allow $150,000 for the Army engineers to start two flood-control survey studies in my congressional district amounting to $75,000 and one navigation study in the amount of $75,000. A breakdown is as follows: $75,000 for the canalization of Big Muddy River in southern Illinois from the proposed dam site of the Rend Lake in Franklin County, Ill., to the Mississippi River.

The next item would allow $50,000 for a survey of the flood control problem existing on the Cache River and tributaries in the extreme tip of southern Illinois.

The third item would provide $25,000 with which to study an internal drainage problem in the Harrisonville and Ivy Landing Drainage District No. 2 in Monroe County, Ill.

Mr. Chairman, I have a map before me, and I would like to show the Members my congressional district in southern Illinois, which is bounded on both sides by two of the greatest navigable streams in the world, the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. There has been very little done to meet the internal drainage problems of the tributaries draining into the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. I, of course, will not have time to discuss each of these projects in detail, however, I would like to impress upon you the fact that thousands of acres of good farmland is being inundated due to floods and has been resulting in great losses in property and money. The two flood-control studies would certainly be a step in the right direction in order that we may be able to get to the bottom of this problem with a sound and justifiable solution.

The other remaining item concerning navigation would allow the continuation of a study of the Big Muddy River with a view toward canalizing that stream.

I have here in front of me a complete story of the 15-county congressional district which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, telling of the economic chaos in the coal fields of southern Illinois. We are trying to get on our feet. We do not want any handouts, but we would like the Federal Government to give us an opportunity to canalize some of these streams so that we will be able to barge this coal and compete with residual oils and other fuels that are displacing these coal mines.

My people are up in arms. They want at least a study made of these problems.

They do not mind me voting for worthy projects all over the United States, but I can tell you, I am not much to look at, but unless I get some money to be spent down in southern Illinois, to study some of these problems you may not be seeing me here next year. I hope all of the Members will go along with me and vote for my amendment. I am asking here only for the small sum of $150,000. Will you please go along with me? They are good projects. Thanks very much.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] on as frank and straightforward a statement as I have ever heard on the floor of this House. That is one of the reasons I was constrained to rise in support of his amendment.

I have heard this bill which has been brought to the floor of the House today, this public works bill, described as calling for a tremendous sum of money, a great appropriation. Well, there was a time in my life when I would have considered this a tremendous sum of money, but it is only a little less than eight-tenths of a billion dollars. Just the other day I was on the floor of this House and helped pass a bill calling for $34 billion plus. Perhaps it was needed. It was for national defense.

One of these days we are going to have before us a bill asking us to appropriate $4.9 billion to give away to folks whom I have never seen and probably never will; to be perfectly frank, folks in whom I have not too much interest. I do not want them to starve or live submarginally, or anything like that. But still I do not like to bankrupt the United States in order to feed them and clothe them, send them implements and tools and build dams for them so that they can irrigate the Sahara Desert and raise long staple cotton to sell in the world market in competition with what we raise.

So I am inclined to support the gentleman's amendment and support this bill. I would have been glad to pass it exactly as it was brought to the House, but if there is anything done to it, I would rather add a little to it than take something away from it.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to know here just a little bit the direction in which we are going. Just a moment ago, we adopted an amendment which

related to a project which was specifically referred to in the committee report. The committee report is the responsibility of the majority members of the subcommittee and is signed by the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee. It gives reasons why funds for some particular project were not put in the bill. But when it came time for a teller vote, it seems as if there had been a change of heart between the time when they wrote the report, on which Members of the House are supposed to rely in their consideration, and the time for them to express their personal preference as to whether or not the funds should or should not come in. I do not profess to take the responsibility alone for holding this bill in line. That ought to be and is properly the responsibility of the majority party, which brought the bill to the House.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. I am sure the gentleman would not deny me an opportunity to present my case either to the committee or the House? As I have said I was not permitted to attend the Public Works Subcommittee on Appropriations hearings because as a member of the Committee on Public Works we had under consideration the highway bill, and on that day I could not attend the hearing. There was not a chance offered me on a subsequent date. I do not think the gentleman in his fairness would deny me an opportunity at least to present a worthy project to the House. I do not think it would apply to the statement the gentleman is reading from the record. They were not referring to those projects which they had not had under consideration.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not referring to the amendment which the gentleman offered. I was referring to the previous amendment and the vote on that particular amendment.

I do not profess to take the responsibility of opposing this amendment. If the majority members of the committee will not undertake the responsibility of holding the line on the bill which they reported, that certainly is not my responsibility as a minority member of the committee. I place the responsibility where it rightfully belongs, on the majority members of this subcommittee, to do so.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I desire recognition in order to reply to the gentleman from Illinois. The Corps of Engineers testified to us that they could use the $150,000 for the drainage work, and we have allowed that. Some of the gentleman's projects are in that category and naturally would be considered. We are not certain that the others are even authorized.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. The $150,000 to which the gentleman refers is for the Army engineers to use in making studies at their discretion. I am sure the gentleman is aware that when they send down to the Bureau of the Budget a list of projects that are worthy, that need to be studied, the Bureau of the Budget approves only a small majority of those. The rest of them, of course, go begging. I am hopeful that the Congress will go ahead and earmark the money for these particular studies because I know exactly what is going to happen if I go to the engineers and say, "Will you take care of my particular project?" They will say, "Well, it is worthy, but we have one of a little higher priority." Consequently, no money.

Mr. RABAUT. We have put in all the money they said they could use. They asked for $150,000 more and we gave them that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

The Committee divided; and on a division (the Chairman being in doubt) there were—ayes 93, noes 111.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin and Mr. GRAY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 111, noes 120.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Chairman, I am greatly disappointed that funds were not included for the Quinnipiac River project in my district in the 1957 public-works appropriations. This project was authorized in House Document 517, 79th Congress, to provide for the deepening of the Quinnipiac River, in view of the increased shipping and economic conditions in the area. Documentation has been clearly provided by various businesses along the river to show that an increased depth to 22 feet would result in greater volume and improved commerce, all of which would accrue to the benefit of the New Haven area residents.

Funds of $3 million have been appropriated by Congress to deepen the main New Haven Harbor in 1948, 1949, and 1950 as a result of the authorization in House Document 517. Yet the 11-year-old authorization for the Quinnipiac River, which flows into the harbor and is essential for adequate shipping, has had no action. The United States Army Corps of Engineers has shown that 1 year after completion of the main harbor project the benefits were in ratio of 13 to 1, and that the savings were $1,661,000. Proportionate benefits could be derived from the completion of the Quinnipiac River project. Fill from dredging the river could have been used very conveniently in the construction of the Greenwich-Killingly Expressway through the State of Connecticut. In addition, fill would have been used in adjacent swamp areas, thereby developing the land for industry and other useful purposes through which the city would derive great potential tax benefits and enjoy increased employment.

Every year of delay in the completion of this project involves considerably more money. In 1945, the original project was authorized at a cost of $262,000 and has risen in the past 11 years to $512,000. Besides, records show that the tonnage in the main harbor and the Quinnipiac River has increased from 430,000 tons in 1945 to 946,141 tons today.

New England, and specifically Connecticut, has been greatly discouraged by the seeming lack of interest shown by the appropriations committees, now and in the past, in the need for river and harbor development and beach erosion control in our States. As evidenced by the recent committee report, Connecticut has had but one project recommended for construction this year, amounting to a mere $1 million. This is out of a total of $421,734,000 recommended for general construction in the public works appropriations for 1957.

Since 1952, when I was elected to Congress, I have worked arduously with my colleagues from the State and those in my district who are intensely interested in projects such as the Quinnipiac River. The results of these efforts are indeed frustrating and while I am aware of the fact that Congress is perennially faced with lack of funds in this category, I think serious and favorable consideration should have been given to this most worthy authorized project in the Quinnipiac River. For myself, I can say that my efforts will not cease nor, do I believe, will those who have have striving for the same objectives.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by law; detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects (including those for development with participation or under consideration for participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction); and not to exceed $1,400,000 for transfer to the Secretary of the Interior for conservation of fish and wildlife as authorized by law; to remain available until expended, $421,734,000: *Provided*, That funds appropriated herein may at the discretion and under the direction of the Chief of Engineers be used in payment to the accounts of the Confederated Tribes of the Yakima Reservation; the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation; the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation; or other recognized Indian tribes, and those individual Indians not enrolled in any recogized tribe, but who through domicile at or in the immediate vicinity of the reservoir and through custom and usage are found to have an equitable interest in the fishery, all of whose fishing rights and interests will be impaired by the Government incident to the construction, operation, or maintenance of The Dalles Dam, Columbia River, Wash., and Oreg., and must be subordinated thereto by agreement or litigation: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $2 million of the funds provided herein shall be available for the construction of small authorized projects selected by the Secretary of the Army the cost of which is not in excess of $150,000 and any such proj-

ect shall be completed within the funds herein appropriated.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 16, line 4, strike out "$421,734,000" and insert "$422,734,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, the additional $1 million which would be provided by this amendment of the amount at line 4 on page 16 of the pending bill would furnish sufficient funds for the completion of the plans and the first year's construction of what is known as Davenport Center Dam, a proposed authorized flood-control dam in New York State which is needed for the protection of the Triple Cities area of Binghamton, Endicott, and Johnson City. As the New York member of the majority of the House Committee on Appropriations it becomes my duty to offer this important amendment.

The Triple Cities area of New York State—I have in my hand a Corps of Engineers map—is represented here in the House by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], who favors and will support this requested appropriation.

The area which would provide the reservoir for Davenport Center Dam is located in the district of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE]. In the vicinity is the district of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY], in Otsego County, and the district of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], in Chenango County. You will see from the map that Chenango County is quite a distance away from Davenport Center.

The granting of this appropriation would affect the property rights of the owners of 49 properties in their entirety, and 59 pieces of property would be partially affected.

The status of the project at the moment is this: The plans have been 92 percent completed, and the allowance of this $1 million would supply the money needed for the completion of the remaining 8 percent of the plans and the first year's construction.

In this area there were 7 flood control dams originally authorized by law, 2 of which have been built. The Davenport Center Dam is one of the 5 remaining. These dams were authorized as a result of the loss of 35 lives and $70 million property damage from floods in the year 1936. Every year we have the same thing happen in this area, recurrent damaging floods, even as recently as March and April of this present year.

The allowance of this appropriation would not only help to protect the cities of Binghamton, Endicott, and Johnson City from floods—and I want to tell you very frankly there is in this bill previously approved by the committee $1,030,000 for construction of levees to help protect these cities, but it would also help to protect communities downstream on the Susquehanna River in Pennsylvania and on into Maryland where the Susquehanna meets the Chesapeake.

Who is in favor of this requested appropriation? Not only is the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. COLE], who represents the Triple Cities area which has a population of 200,000 people, but we also find among its proponents the mayor of the city of Binghamton; the State senator from that area, Mr. Warren M. Andersen; the president of the well-known Endicott-Johnson Corp. which manufactures shoes; the director of public relations of the International Business Machines Corp.; Assemblyman Black of the New York State lower house and chairman of the New York State Flood Control Commission. We also find the president of the Binghamton Chamber of Commerce vigorously in favor of it. I think it is fair to say that everybody in the area of the Triple Cities is vitally interested in the completion of these plans, which, as I said a while ago, are now 92 percent completed and in commencement of the first year's construction of this very, very important flood control dam.

In opposition we find some owners of farmlands. I repeat there are 49 pieces of property to be affected in their entirety and 59 partially affected. The entire area affected is only 1,800 acres. Thirty acres of these 1,800 acres involve residential, commercial, school and church property, the remainder being rural.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. CANNON) Mr. ROONEY was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, in the past century there have been 16 major floods in this area. In the month of August last year if the Hurricane Diane had just swished her tail a degree or two you would have had the same holocaust in the Triple Cities area of south central New York, a very, very important industrial community, that occurred in the Connecticut Valley.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that as this vitally affects a populous area of 200,000 people, the amendment should be agreed to. Of course, in every event where land is to be taken for flood control reservoirs, somebody has to kick; but in this instance only 49 pieces of property are directly affected and about some 47 or 48 partially affected. It is in the interest of good government to protect an industrial area such as the Triple Cities containing important defense production plants such as those I mentioned a while ago.

It would seem that as the result of the protests of these few farm owners this matter has been delayed to the extent that it is becoming dangerous. Mr. Chairman, I ask favorable consideration of the proposed amendment which would add, and I repeat again for the sake of emphasis, but $1 million to this bill to complete plans already 92 percent completed and to start the first year's construction of Davenport Centre Dam.

The following testimony was presented last May 8 to the House Committee on Appropriations by the distinguished Governor of the State of New York:

TUESDAY, MAY 8, 1956.

FLOOD CONTROL IN BINGHAMTON, N. Y., AREA

STATEMENT OF HON. AVERELL HARRIMAN, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. CANNON. I will ask the gentleman from New York, Mr. ROONEY, to take the chair.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am indeed honored to be given the opportunity to preside during the course of the reception of this testimony. I am grateful to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] as well as to all the members of the subcommittee.

We are indeed honored to have with us this morning the great Governor of the State of New York, the Honorable Averell Harriman, who wishes to address the committee with regard to a matter which concerns the people of the State of New York.

Governor Harriman, we are pleased to have you with us and now look forward to what you have to say.

Governor HARRIMAN. I want to express my appreciation to Chairman CANNON and to the members of the Committee on Appropriations for this opportunity to appear before this distinguished subcommittee of the United States House of Representatives. I appreciate the courtesy you have extended me in arranging this special meeting in order that I might testify on a matter which you have already considered at an earlier date.

I have come here because the issues under consideration are of vital importance to the south central part of New York State, and in an important way to the State as a whole. It is worth noting also that areas of Pennsylvania downstream along the Susquehanna River will benefit materially from the appropriations I am requesting.

Here with me today are a number of distinguished citizens of Broome County who are members of the flood protection council, and some of whom represent industries exposed to the risk of severe flood damage:

Hon. Donald W. Kramer, mayor of Binghamton;

State Senator Warren M. Anderson;

Mr. Charles F. Johnson, Jr., president of the Endicott-Johnson Corp.;

Mr. Robert H. Austin, director of public relations, International Business Machines Corp.;

Assemblyman Jerry Black, chairman, State flood-control commission;

Horace Evans, director of the State flood-control commission;

George E. Knowlton, Jr., chairman, public relations committee, Broome County Flood Protection Council.

Mr. Howard E. Orton, division manager of the New York State Electric & Gas Corp.;

Mr. John Bruner, secretary-treasurer of the Endicott Lumber & Box Co.;

Mr. Edgar E. Severson, secretary-treasurer of the Binghamton Container Co.; and president of the Binghamton Chamber of Commerce;

Mr. Heath D. Andrews, staff executive of the chamber of commerce;

Mr. George G. Coughlin, chairman of the flood protection council; and

Commissioner John F. Donnelly of the New York State Department of Taxation and Finance, and chairman of the Democratic Committee of Broome County.

I can say I speak for them as well as myself, and they have submitted briefs to the committee on the matter before you.

Flood damage to Triple City area of Binghamton, Johnson City, and Endicott

The Triple City area of Binghamton, Johnson City, and Endicott has a population of 200,000. It is one of the industrial centers of the northeastern United States. It possesses an unusual combination of skilled workmen and creative management.

Its products are vital to our Nation's prosperity and, particularly, to our national defense.

It is a correspondingly alarming fact that these cities have suffered recurrent flood damage that has reached disaster proportions and may in the future suffer even greater damage unless vigorous and immediate preventive action is taken.

The Susequehanna River and its tributary, the Chenango, meet at the center of the city of Binghamton, Johnson City adjoins Binghamton on the downstream side, and Endicott is located a short way down from there. They are thus doubly exposed to flood conditions.

Along the course of these streams and in low-lying areas are many industrial plants, large and small, and thousands of homes.

Sixteen major floods have, in fact, occurred during this century alone. In July 1935, and again in March 1936, catastrophic floods took place with a heavy loss of life and with direct property losses of over $70 million.

I understand at that time it was nearly 25 percent of the assessed valuation of the area affected.

History of flood-control measures

Following the 1935 flood, and again in 1936, Senator LEHMAN, then our governor, was most active in pressing for flood-control measures. In July 1936, he wrote to President Roosevelt urging the Federal Government to move ahead rapidly on the program which the Corps of Engineers was planning for the southern tier. He said that this program "if successfully carried forward will be of the greatest possible benefit to the southern tier counties and, as a matter of fact, to the States a whole."

Following the 1935 flood, Congress authorized the construction of seven dams upstream from Binghamton. Of these, two have been completed—at Whitney Point on the Otselic River in Broome County and at East Sidney on the Ouleout Creek in Delaware County. None of the remaining five has been built, or even wholly designed.

Last summer's floods brought home to us once again the folly of efforts to economize at the expense of effective flood control measures. Aside from the human factors involved, these dams pay for themselves with surprising speed. Whitney Point (completed in 1942) has already prevented more damage than it cost, according to Corps of Engineers estimates.

I hardly need to detail to this committee the devastation—to business, to homes, to farms—that occurred in some areas in 1955. The point I want to make is that it was sheer chance that it did not happen in Broome County.

If Hurricane Diane had switched her tail a degree or two on her course last August and not taken a right-angle turn before Philadelphia, we would have had 1935–36 or worse all over again.

This close brush with disaster, and the terrible reality of the havoc wrought in Connecticut and other neighboring States, have pointed up to all of us in New York the critical importance of flood-protection measures.

This year, in March and April, heavy rains in the Susquehanna and Chenango drainage basins caused considerable flood damage in low-lying areas below Binghamton. The damage would have been more severe if the gates at Whitney Point and East Sidney had not been closed. But it would have been reduced had the Davenport Center Dam or any of the other projects been completed. Such flood damage occurs in this area almost every year.

We have already suffered much; we have been warned of even more.

We feel there can no longer be any excuse for further delay. The fact that we have been lucky so far should not blind us to the risks we have taken or the disasters which may yet occur before the program is completed.

You will understand, therefore, the degree of our disappointment when we learned that the President's budget for the civil works program for the Department of the Army for the fiscal year 1957 did not recommend the appropriation of funds for any of the uncompleted dams.

I assume that the omission was either an oversight or stemmed from a lack of understanding of the importance of this flood control program to south central New York and parts of Pennsylvania.

In fact, all the way down the Susquehanna River which runs over 400 miles these flood-control dams which I speak of will be of assistance right straight down to where the Susquehanna hits the Chesapeake.

Davenport Center Dam

The United States Army Corps of Engineers and the New York State Flood Control Commission have assigned the highest priority to the dam at Davenport Center on Charlotte Creek, a Susquehanna tributary in Delaware County, for which plans are 92 percent complete.

Accordingly, this year we are asking particularly for an appropriation of $1 million for the completion of these plans and the first year's construction. The total cost of this dam is estimated at $12,100,000. It will have a reservoir capacity of 52,500 acre-feet, and will reduce the flood discharge of the Susquehanna at Binghamton by more than 7 percent above the Chenango confluence, and by 4 percent below the Chenango. At flood stage such margins can, and often do, spell the difference between safety and disaster.

In addition to the Tri-City area, the Davenport Center Dam will benefit Owego in Tioga County and a number of communities above Binghamton, including Oneonta, Unadilla, Sidney, Bainbridge, Afton, Wellsbridge, Otego, and Conklin-Kirkwood, and also a number of areas in Pennsylvania, both above and below Binghamton.

The remaining 4 dams of the approved program are estimated to cost about $43 million. In order of priority, they are Genegantslet on the stream of that name in Chenango County, West Oneonta on Otego Creek in Otsego County, South Plymouth on the Canasawacta in Chenango County, and Copes Corners on Butternut Creek in Otsego County. Eventually these dams should all be built to provide adequate protection both above and below Binghamton, but we are not pressing for construction funds this year as the plans are not sufficiently advanced. I am, however, asking for an appropriation of $168,000 for additional planning on these 4 dams.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, our requests are indeed modest in light of the dangers that confront our industries and homeowners in south central New York.

In making these requests, I have tried to take account of the problems you face in the total Federal budget and in balancing our needs against the demands of other areas.

Knowing of the pressure of time that is upon the committee, I will not outline the specifics of the products for which we are seeking appropriations. The briefs filed by the State Flood Control Commission and the Broome County Flood Protection Council set forth the details.

Again may I express my appreciation to the committee for its courtesy to me in setting this special hearing.

Mr. ROONEY. In behalf of the committee, may I express our thanks to you for a highly interesting and informative statement.

Are there any questions?

Mr. JENSEN. Governor, what does the local participation amount to? What do the local people intend to put up in the way of contribution to the costs?

Governor HARRIMAN. It is entirely a Federal project in accordance with the programs that the Federal Government has assumed in other flood-control measures. The State, as I understand it, purchases the land subject to repayment by the projects when they are approved.

To specifically answer your question, this is entirely part of the flood control program as developed in accordance with congressional legislation and plans developed by the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. JENSEN. Then it is 100 percent flood control?

Governor HARRIMAN. One hundred percent Federal. I may say, and I think I am right in saying this, the Susquehanna River runs over 400 miles, rising in Pennsylvania, coming into New York State, again going into Pennsylvania and down south into Chesapeake Bay, and all those living on the Susquehanna River will benefit from this project, although the immediate urgent need is for this important industrial area.

I might state to this committee that there is in the budget, which I hope the committee will approve, the sum of $1,030,000 for additional walls and levees along the river below Binghamton, Endicott, and Johnson, and the small community of Vestal which will help control the flood waters. The amount is $1,030,000.

Mr. JENSEN. Do you know whether or not the Army engineers made a request of the Bureau of the Budget for any funds for any of these projects?

Governor HARRIMAN. I think these requests have been up before the Bureau of the Budget, but I don't know exactly concerning the presentation made to the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. EVANS. At one time $100,000 was added to the bill for this but later was lost in conference.

Mr. JENSEN. So you do not know what went on between the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget?

Governor HARRIMAN. I am not familiar with that. I do know that all these dams are on the program of the Corps of Engineers. The total program for the State as originally outlined was over $90 million, of which about half has been completed, 2 in this part of the State and 2 in another part of the State.

The program was developed at the time of the floods in 1935–36. Twenty years have gone by, and much damage has been suffered by these communities.

As you well know, sir, the urgency of flood control comes just after there has been terrible damage, and then we are apt to forget about it.

We had this very close shave this year, with considerable damage in spite of what has been done, so I feel that this 20-year-old concept should now be carried out before it is too late.

May I say that as I understand it, requests to the Budget are usually kept confidential, so I cannot inform you as to what happened there. There is no doubt as to the position of the Corps of Engineers on these projects. They have been approved, authorized by the Congress back in 1936, some of them, and I think two were added at a subsequent date.

Mr. JENSEN. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. Thank you very much, Governor Harriman.

Governor HARRIMAN. There is a small amount of local objection. I have had a few letters on this. Local farmers in the communities affected, as always, whether it is a road or flood control, object to it. However, the main body, as I get the situation and know the situation, of the people living in this area are strongly in favor of this project.

We have had a few letters from particular farmers there. There are 49 pieces of property entirely affected by this in these 1,800 acres, and about 59 are partially affected.

I mention this only in case some of you get a few letters suggesting that this appropriation be postponed.

Mr. KIRWAN. As you stated, the length of the Susquehanna is 400-and-some miles?

Governor HARRIMAN. That is right.

Mr. KIRWAN. You can follow the river all the way down to Chesapeake Bay. They have built or are now building levees at many points all along that river. They have them all through Wilkes-Barre and down through that area.

We have apparently not learned much from the Mississippi. On the Mississippi we built levees for years and years instead of building dams at the headwaters. Now they realize the importance of upstream control. They have been building dams in recent years all along the tributaries of the Mississippi.

If they would build more dams like you are proposing they would make some of these levees unnecessary and it would be a much better means of protecting these cities and communities and the whole area, including farmlands, roads, and so forth. Is that not correct?

Governor HARRIMAN. Mr. KIRWAN, as I understand it, these levees are probably wise in themselves, but none of them are sufficient unless we combine them with the flood-control dams. The work asked for in the $1,030,000 I mentioned is to build levees in the area below Binghamton. It will keep normal flood water in the channels and it will increase the flow, for instance, from 42,000 cubic feet per second to 75,000 cubic feet in the Chenango and 80,000 cubic feet in the Susquehanna River. But that is not enough.

Mr. KIRWAN. The levees are not enough to stop the floods?

Governor HARRIMAN. They are enough to check a small flood but not a big one.

Mr. KIRWAN. But the dams will?

Governor HARRIMAN. Combined with the others they will.

Mr. KIRWAN. Combined with the levees they will check the floods at these cities and towns but the dams will offer some degree of protection all the way down the river.

Governor HARRIMAN. The two combined have been worked out by the Corps of Engineers.

I cannot speak as to the area below here, whether the dikes would be necessary, or the levees, if we complete all these dams. I would not be able to answer that.

Mr. Chairman, some of the gentlemen who by their presence have come with me to indicate their interest in this proposal would like to have the privilege of submitting supplemental briefs in addition to those already submitted. May that be done?

Mr. ROONEY. Such supplemental briefs may be inserted at this point in the record.

(The information referred to follows:)

"A BRIEF FROM THE BROOME COUNTY FLOOD PROTECTION COUNCIL IN THE MATTER OF APPROPRIATIONS TO CONSTRUCT FIVE RETENTION DAMS ON THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER—REQUEST FOR FLOOD PROTECTION ON THE (UPPER) SUSQUEHANNA RIVER

"(Communications with respect to this brief may be addressed to George G. Coughlin, acting chairman, Broome County Flood Protection Council, 66 Chenango Street, Binghamton, N. Y.; Howard E. Orton, chairman, governmental relations committee, Broome County Flood Protection Council, 66 Chenango Street, Binghamton, N. Y.)

"I. LOCAL PROTECTION FOR ENDICOTT, JOHNSON CITY, AND VESTAL

"It is to be assumed the Appropriations Committee will recommend that the first phase of the construction of dikes, levees, and pumping stations for local protection for Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal will go forward as recommended by the Director of the Budget. If this is not so, or if there is any doubt as to this project being recommended by the committee, then we would like an opportunity at a proper time and place to present facts showing the urgent need for such construction to protect the important industrial communities of Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, N. Y.

"II. ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTED

"The group appearing before the committee today represents the Broome County Flood Protection Council, which is a unit of the chambers of commerce of Binghamton, Johnson City, and Endicott in Broome County, consisting of representatives of those chambers of commerce, mayors of the city of Binghamton, villages of Johnson City and Endicott, representatives of the governmental bodies of rural communities bordering on the Susquehanna and Chenango Rivers, the Broome County Planning Board, the Upper Susquehanna Watershed Association, and other agencies vitally concerned with the problem of flood protection in the southern tier. Present at today's hearing are Mr. Charles F. Johnson, president of Endicott-Johnson Corp., Mr. Arthur L. Becker, general manager of International Business Machines Corp. plant at Endicott, N. Y., Mr. Robert Ford, chairman of the Board of Supervisors of Broome County, Hon. Donald W. Kramer, mayor of the city of Binghamton, Mr. Raymond Fairbrother, acting mayor of the village of Endicott, Mr. Heath D. Andrews, secretary of the Broome County Flood Protection Council and member of the managerial staff of the Binghamton Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Howard E. Orton, chairman of the governmental relations committee of the Broome County Flood Protection Council and manager of the Binghamton district of the New York State Electric & Gas Corp., and George G. Coughlin, who appears in a dual capacity as chairman of the flood-protection committee of the Binghamton Chamber of Commerce and acting chairman of the Broome County Flood Protection Council.

"III. COMMUNITIES AFFECTED

"In Broome County are Binghamton, Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, the largest industrial communities in the State of New York, directly affected by the five dams on the Susquehanna and Chenango Rivers authorized by Congress in 1936 and 1944, moneys for the construction of which have not been appropriated. The approximate population of the area to be benefited by the construction of the 5 retention dams is 200,000.

"IV. VITAL INDUSTRIES

"Three great industries are directly represented here today; two of them by resident managers, International Business Machines Corp. by Mr. Becker, New York State Electric & Gas Corp. by Mr. Orton, and the other, Endicott-Johnson Corp. by Mr. Charles F. Johnson, its president. It is not casual interest in the problem which brings these men here today. They are vitally interested in the welfare of upward to 50,000 area workers in the plants and in the protection of the plant properties themselves.

"V. LOSSES

"In the 1935 Susquehanna River flood, 35 lives were lost. In the 1935 and 1936 floods on the Susquehanna, direct property losses were estimated at over $7 million. In 1936 Congress authorized the building of the Davenport Center Reservoir, the West Oneonta Reservoir, and the Copes Corner Reservoir, on the Susquehanna River. In 1944 Congress authorized the building of the South Plymouth Reservoir and the Genegantslet Reservoir, but these projects were held up presumably due to the war. We are reliably informed that the 5 reservoirs, 3 on the Susquehanna and 2 on the Chenango, are the only reservoirs in the State of New York authorized by Congress but not completed.

"VI. ADDITIONAL PROTECTION REQUIRED

"We do have flood walls and dykes in Binghamton alone, but these are only part of the program. We need upstream reservoirs for the Army engineers tell us that an increase in protection at Binghamton is necessary since the protective works there would be overtopped by a recurrence of the July 1935 storm transposed eastward in the basin.

"VII. URGENT NEED

"The torrential rains associated with Hurricane Diane pointed up the need for additional flood protection not only for southern New York, eastern Pennsylvania, and northern New Jersey, but also for southeastern New York. It is true that the sections worst hit by the floods caused by Hurricane Diane were in New England, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, but a study of the data submitted by the United States Weather Bureau indicates that the course of Diane was headed northward past Raleigh, N. C., and west of Washington, D. C., and when it reached the point opposite Philadelphia it took almost a right angle turn and headed for Long Island and New England. An inspection of the Weather Bureau's map showing the total storm precipitation during the period from August 17, to August 20, 1955, indicates that if Diane had continued its course northward or veered slightly to the west, Broome County, N. Y., would have been one of the worst victims of the storm. We were just plain lucky.

"VII. LOCAL RELIANCE

"We submit that the dams already authorized by Congress should be constructed before new dams are authorized. People in a community are entitled to rely on the authorization and approval of dams by Congress. The five dams in question should be beyond the controversial stage. They have already been approved by Congress. All that is needed is the appropriation by Congress to carry out its good faith commitment. Two examples of the reliance by the people in Binghampton on the commitment of Congress are to be found in: (1) the plans for erection of a $4 million hotel by the Sheraton Hotel Corp. The hotel is to be built in an area unprotected by walls and dykes. Sufficient protection, however, would be afforded by the building of the authorized dams; (2) a large shopping center is being constructed between Johnson City and Endicott in an area which could be inundated by a flood of the 1935 proportion. The authorized dams would help protect that area.

"IX. COST

"Latest estimate for construction costs of the 5 dams is $47,665,000. The building of these dams authorized in 1936 and 1944 is long overdue. We respectfully submit that considering the fact that New York State pays over 18 percent of the tax burden of the Nation, it is not unreasonable to ask for an appropriation of $47 million for the 5 dams.

"There should be no compromise with the proposition that dams already authorized should be built before new dams are authorized. There is no justification for piecemeal construction. It should be noted, however, that the Army engineers are talking about redesigning the dam at Copes Corner on the Susquehanna. If any one project should not be acted upon this year it probably would be the Copes Corner project. However, we believe the construction of the remaining 4 dams should be authorized this year. That would give 2 on the Susquehanna, the Davenport Center and the West Oneonta Dams, and 2 on the Chenango, the Genegantslet and the South Plymouth Dams.

"Respectfully submitted.

"THE BROOME COUNTY FLOOD PROTECTION COUNCIL."

"IN THE MATTER OF APPROPRIATIONS TO CONSTRUCT FIVE RETENTION DAMS ON THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER—REQUEST FOR FLOOD PROTECTION ON THE (UPPER) SUSQUEHANNA RIVER

"SUPPLEMENTARY BRIEF OF BROOME COUNTY FLOOD PROTECTION COUNCIL

"The following representatives will appear before the committee in Washington on March 8, 1956:

"Hon. Donald W. Kramer, mayor, city of Binghamton, N. Y.

"Senator Warren M. Anderson, State senator, 47th District, New York State.

"Edgar E. Severson, president, Binghamton Chamber of Commerce.

"John Brunner, vice president, Greater Endicott Chamber of Commerce, and vice chairman, Broome County Flood Protection Council.

"Charles F. Johnson, Jr., president, Endicott Johnson Corp.

"Robert H. Austin, director of public relations, International Business Machines Corp.

"John Donnelly, deputy commissioner of motor vehicles, State of New York.

"George G. Coughlin, chairman, Broome County Flood Protection Council.

"Howard E. Orton, chairman, governmental relations committee, Broome County Flood Protection Council.

"Heath D. Andrews, staff executive, Binghamton Chamber of Commerce and secretary treasurer, Broome County Flood Protection Council.

"INTRODUCTION

"On March 28, 1956, we filed a brief urging appropriations to construct the five retention dams authorized in 1936 and 1944.

"Because inclement weather prevented the airplane flights from New York State to Washington, we were unable to appear before your committee at the scheduled hearing on March 28. Thereafter, we requested another opportunity to be heard.

"Today Gov. Averell Harriman, of New York State, appears before your honorable committee in support of our request that appropriations be made to further the work on the construction.

"I. NEW INFORMATION RECEIVED FROM THE UNITED STATES CORPS OF ARMY ENGINEERS

"Under date of April 20, 1956, the undersigned council received the following information from Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Assistant Chief of the Army Engineers for Civil Works:

" 'Based on the status of planning for these projects the following amounts could be economically used during the fiscal year when funds may next be appropriated for these projects: $1 million to complete planning and initiate first year construction on Davenport Center Dam; $168,000 for continuing the next year of planning on Genegantslet Dam; and $100,000 for similar planning of each of the South Plymouth, West Oneonta and Copes Corners Dams. The status of planning on these projects would preclude use of the larger construction funds you suggest.'

"We, therefore, request that your committee recommend to the Congress the appropriations for the coming fiscal year of the following sums for the five uncompleted retention dams on the Susquehanna watershed:

"Davenport Center Dam to complete planning and initiate first year construction—$1 million.

"Genegantslet Dam for continuing the next year of planning, $168,000.

"South Plymouth Dam for continuing the next year of planning, $100,000.

"West Oneonta Dam for continuing the next year of planning, $100,000.

"Copes Corners Dam for continuing the next year of planning, $100,000.

"II. ADDITIONAL COMMUNITIES HEARD FROM

"As pointed out in the brief filed on March 28, the undersigned council represents the largest industrial communities in the State of New York directly affected by the five unbuilt dams on the Susquehanna and Chenango Rivers.

"Subsequently, the following communities in New York State and Pennsylvania have filed letters with your committee urging that the authorized dams be constructed: Owego, Tioga County, N. Y.; Plymouth, Luzerne County, Pa.; Sayre, Bradford County, Pa.; Sunbury, Northumberland County, Pa.; Danville, Montour County, Pa.; Terrytown, Bradford County, Pa.; Athens, Bradford County, Pa; Bloomsburg, Columbia County, Pa.; Wilkes-Barre, Luzerne County, Pa.

"The mighty Susquehanna River is over 400 miles long and the retention reservoirs on tributaries in New York State would benefit scores of communities in New York State and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, thus justifying the relatively minor expenditure of money in an interstate project, compared to the hundreds of millions which have been spent in other States.

"III. PROMPT ACTION NECESSARY

"The history of building of flood-control reservoirs shows that with the inflationary trend of our times every year's delay means more in the cost of the building of the dams.

"To date, according to reliable advice from the Army engineers, over $500,000 has been spent in the design, planning, field work, and preparation of data by the Corps of Engineers. Any rejection of the dam would be a wasteful throwing away of valuable manhours and materials spent on the projects.

"IV. THE QUESTION OF 'LOCAL OPPOSITION' HAS BEEN CONSIDERED BY THE CONGRESS AND DISPOSED OF

"Prior to the enactment of the 1936 and 1944 acts by which Congress authorized and approved the 5 remaining unbuilt dry reservoirs, hearings were held and the usual 'local opposition' was considered. Congress used the following language:

" 'The projects "are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted in the order of their emergency as may be directed by the President under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, etc." '

"No 'newly discovered' opposition has been presented beyond that which was originally presented. The same type of 'local opposition' is encountered in every public works project whether it be a highway, a bridge, or a dam.

"V. 'THERE ARE NO ALTERNATIVE METHODS'

"Some misguided zealots try to stir up local opposition by saying that there are other methods by which large communities can be protected from excessive flood damages, such as soil conservation and forest management.

"Responsible supporters of the soil-conservation program of the Department of Agriculture do not claim that the development of small watersheds will play a major part in waterflow retardation on the main rivers. Every flood-control measure helps, but soil erosion and harnessing of small streams are minor factors. Soil conservation promotional groups have done such a good job of publicizing their program that now the Department of Agriculture is issuing the warning that soil conservation is not major flood protection.

"Mr. Hugh M. Wilson, soil conservationist of Cornell University, stated: 'While it is not expected that headwater measures will control major floods, they will help reduce damages. However, most of the benefits will be in the immediate vicinity and, until work has been done on all tributaries, cities downstream can expect little benefit.'

"VI. BOTH URBAN AND RURAL POPULATIONS WOULD BENEFIT FROM THE DAM

"It is true that the population of the communities represented by the undersigned council, according to the 1955 New York State Department of Commerce census, is 197,462. It is true that we are an industrial community; that we have a total of 181 industries in Broome County including such outstanding nationwide industries as: Endicott Johnson Corp.; International Business Machines Corp.; Link Aviation, Inc.; Ansco and Ozalid Divisions of General Aniline & Film Corp.; Kroehler Manufacturing Co.; General Electric Co., Aeronautics Division.

"But farmers too will benefit from the proposed dams.

"The following are excerpts from letters received from farmers whose lands are below the proposed dams:

"Excerpts from letter No. 1

" 'We own 80 acres in the Susquehanna Valley which has in the last 3 days been about 70 percent under water.'

" 'The East Sidney dam kept back sufficient water to prevent a serious situation. Any dam or dams east of our property would greatly relieve the ever-present threat of summer as well as winter or spring flooding.'

" 'Another foot of water above the recent high point would have flooded our barn and required the movement of cattle and other property.'

"Excerpt from letter No. 2

" 'Received your letter concerning the Davenport Center of West Oneonta Dam project. In regard to myself I would undoubtedly be benefited by it. Each year at flood time I lose a good many feet along the river bank of my river flat. Eventually, without control, there will be no river flat at all. I'm sincerely in favor of this project.'

"Excerpt from letter No. 3

" 'I lost all the manure on my land and it also washed about 30 feet of land away. We had some benefit by the East Sidney Dam, but I would be benefited just as much or more by the two other dams.'

"Excerpt from letter No. 4

" 'On the other hand the high water here does damage the property of several of my neighbors and I would be in favor of any dam that might prevent the flooding.'

"Excerpt from letter No. 5

" 'I don't like to see people lose their homes, but if they live by the river they sure think as I do, what if we get a bad flood in the night as we did some years ago. East Sidney took a lot of farms and homes, but it has helped a lot.'

"Excerpts from letter No. 6

" 'I have 10 acres of flatland along the river which about 75 percent of it is flooded. Before the East Sidney Dam was built and also the dam removed below Harpursville my flat was completely flooded. This meant washing of the riverbank and the flat also. It always meant a late start for oats, too.'

" 'I certainly believe something has to be done and done soon. If we ever get a flood like Pennsylvania had, it will be pretty hard on Binghamton. I haven't helped you much, I know, only to say I agree with a proposed dam on the river.'

"What better proof can we have that farmers below the dams who would be benefited thereby are in favor of the project?

"Respectfully submitted.

"BROOME COUNTY FLOOD PROTECTION COUNCIL,

"By the following officers:

"GEORGE C. COUGHLIN,
Chairman.

"JOHN BRUNNER,
Vice Chairman.

"HEATH D. ANDREWS,
Secretary-Treasurer."

Governor HARRIMAN. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Thank you, Governor; thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. STERLING COLE. I appear today to show I am a strong supporter of the recommendation advanced by the Governor.

Mr. ROONEY. We are indeed honored to have the distinguished gentleman from New York with us this morning.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], and in view of the facts brought out in the hearings held by this committee on the subject, I accept the amendment.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. GEORGE]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, first of all may I say that I am quite amazed at this amendment and at my very dear friend who is proposing it. I had no idea he was so interested in my district and in that part of the State. I was happy to see that he had a map so that he could really find out exactly where these places are.

Now, of course, we have been talking about this project for many years. This is nothing new at all. The people in Delaware County, the farmers in Davenport Center that my dear friend brushes aside so lightly as being 49 parcels of property or some such thing, constitute a very prosperous farming area of over 300 inhabitants. That, of course, may seem nothing to the House of Representatives. We deal daily in billions of dollars and in millions of population. The people of this part of my district have no intention of penalizing or hurting their good friends in the triple cities. They go there constantly and they have their interests at heart. I go to this district constantly. I have never seen these horrible floods and these holocausts that have been mentioned today. Yes, there has been some flooding, certainly, and there has been some damage but, thank God, nothing like the damage that there has been in other parts of the State where so far absolutely nothing has been done. Already a great part of the property of the farmers of Delaware County has been sacrificed to the Downsville Dam.

Now, what the Delaware County people want—and I support them in their wishes, which I think are perfectly fair and natural—is the opportunity to determine by professional surveys whether or not protective measures, at least as great as those believed to be possible from the construction of this tremendous project, cannot be achieved through a series of small dams and through soil and forest conservation. And, there are many experts who believe this can be done. As against this sensible approach, the construction of the Davenport Center Dam would cost, according to the last estimate I have had from the Army engineers, $12.1 million. It would completely inundate 2,175 acres of good farmland—this is not just scrub land; it is good farmland, the best dairy county in the State of New York—a figure the Corps of Engineers gave me in a letter dated April 7, 1954. It would involve relocating 4 miles of railroad, constructing a railroad station, relocating 2 miles of State highway and various other very costly enterprises. What is most devastating, it would completely take out of operation some of the best dairy country in the East and would mean the loss of livelihood for the entire population of the area. In fact, it has been calculated that the loss of income, if this dam is built, to the people of the area would be $1 million per annum.

Mr. Chairman, I have received hundreds of letters concerning this dam. I have put these letters in the hearings, and may I say to my good friend, I wish he would read them. There are 32 pages of them. I have also included resolutions from the towns and from the supervisors of that entire district. They are all the same. They come from neighboring towns, from Oneonta, from Harpersville, East Meredith, all of whom will suffer if this enormous, gigantic dam is constructed. The people of Delaware County, in opposing this costly venture, are in no sense promoting their own selfish interests. They are as anxious as anyone to see that the people of Binghamton are protected, but they believe it can be done without this tremendous cost and without interfering with the welfare of the residents of that entire area. They belong, I am sorry to say, to that very small segment of the population of our country—and it is unfortunate that it is so small—that believes results can be accomplished without adding still another huge burden to the already overburdened taxpayers.

I respectfully urge this House to give these local people the time to complete their studies before adding to this appropriation bill an item which the Bureau of the Budget has not included and which, to my mind, is completely unnecessary. This item does not appear in the bill. It seems that my good friend in his kindheartedness has gone out and pulled it out of the air. Why not let it go over for the present at least?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I assure the gentlewoman that I did not pull this project out of the air. Perhaps the gentlewoman does not know that the highly distinguished Governor of the State of New York, accompanied by 20 highly responsible citizens of the area, testified in its behalf before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. May I say to my friend that I am fully aware of that fact, but is my friend aware of the fact that I testified also? That may be very unimportant to him, but I testified with 40 people from my district. I can assure the gentleman that my testimony, although it was given less attention, was quite as good as that given by our mutual friend, the Governor of the great State of New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the kindly gentlewoman yield further?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my kindly friend, always.

Mr. ROONEY. I assure the gentlewoman that I read every word of her testimony. After having read it, I admire her more than ever, but I disagree with her as much as ever.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank my friend. May I say that I also read the testimony. I would not want my friend to think that I did not know what the Governor had said. I am fully cognizant of it. But I still think it is an unfortunate proceeding to give the people of a district something that they do not want, something for which they will have to pay. And I have always understood that it was rather an unusual proceeding on the part of a congressional committee, that as a general rule that is not the case. And I would like to quote to my friend something that was said at the hearing by my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. He said, at the end of my testimony:

> I might say, Mrs. ST. GEORGE, that we have enough requests for dams for which the people are unanimous in the localities involved and personally I do not intend to go along with any project to which there is local opposition.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, would the lady yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my friend.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am still of that very decided opinion. I was present as a member of the subcommittee and I listened very carefully to the lady and her group; and I was also present when the Governor of New York, Mr. Harriman, was present and testified. In my opinion, the Governor and his group made a very poor presentation.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank my friend.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. My sympathies are entirely with the people up above who are going to lose their homes because, as the lady has well stated, this is an unnecessary project. It will not help the city of Binghamton because, after all, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] will explain later, the testimony will show that the flood control wall itself will amply protect Binghamton. Certainly the whole project is unjustifiable. The lady is to be complimented for the splendid and courageous fight she has made to defeat this project.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I can tell my friend that the flood wall has already helped the city of Binghamton and that the experts of the Corps of Engineers of the Army have told us that the best that the city of Binghamton may expect from the construction of this dam is a maximum control of 2 inches; that will be the maximum and, of course, the minimum will be considerably less.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we expect to complete this bill tonight.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes, that

time to be allotted to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER and Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN objected.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. If we adopt a request to limit debate, and I am constrained to go along with such a request, of course, will it prevent me from offering an amendment which in effect might change the amount of the figure which we now have under discussion?

The CHAIRMAN. If an amendment is adopted changing the figure, that freezes the figure.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the 20 minutes to be consumed by the four Members who are standing.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN was permitted to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. KEARNEY.)

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I oppose in principle the amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] to provide for the construction of a dam at Davenport Center, Delaware County, N. Y., a county which adjoins one in my own 32d Congressional District, namely Otsego County.

For many years past I have spent considerable time before boards of Army engineers with reference to several flood-control projects not only in my own district but also in areas adjoining my district which projects were directed at districts of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE]. Over the strenuous opposition of the entire three congressional districts of my colleagues named above and myself, we find ourselves in the position of year in and year out opposing projects which would cost at least $45 million—remember, at least $45 million—and which would be of no practical or economic value.

Let me picture to you some data from the United States Geological Survey concerning the Davenport Center project on Charlotte Creek, Delaware County, N. Y.—the one in issue under the present amendment. The report from the Geological Survey shows the maximum streamflows of record on the Susquehanna River at Binghamton above the Chenango River was 61,600 cubic feet per second. The recently constructed floodwalls and other local protection facilities are reported to provide for a flood flow of 80,000 cubic feet per second, or over 30 percent greater than any flow of record. The flood of record—61,600 cubic feet per second—occurred on March 18, 1936, and the next largest of record—60,500 cubic feet per second—occurred on March 22, 1948. Since both those record flows, the East Sidney Reservoir has been constructed which is expected to reduce the flood potential at Binghamton.

The flood flows of record on the Susquehanna River at Vestal just below Binghamton and below the confluence of the Chenango River are reported as 107,000 cubic feet per second in March 1936 and as 114,000 cubic feet per second in 1865, the latter being based on reported high-water marks of that time. The Whitney Point Reservoir in the Chenango River Basin was completed in 1942 and reportedly will reduce flood flows of the Chenango at Binghamton by over 16 percent. The presently authorized local flood protection works for Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, for which construction funds are budgeted for 1957, are to provide for flood flows of 125,000 cubic feet per second or 10 percent greater than flows of record before construction of the two existing flood-control reservoirs.

It is also of interest to note that the Chenango River contributes from 30 to 45 percent of the major flood flows of the Susquehanna at Vestal. The Davenport Center Dam, of course, would have no effect on the Chenango River flows.

The drainage area of Charlotte Creek at Davenport Center is only 164 square miles or slightly over 7 percent of the drainage area of the Susquehanna River at Binghamton above the Chenango River and slightly over 4 percent of the drainage area of the Susquehanna River at Vestal below the confluence of the Chenango River. The Charlotte Creek flows at Davenport Center at the time of flood flows of record at Binghamton were around 5,000 cubic feet per second or less.

Summarizing, it is readily apparent that the Davenport Center Dam would have almost negligible effect on the stage height and flood flows of the Susquehanna River at Binghamton and Vestal.

It should also be noted that based on present estimated cost of $12,100,000, the cost per acre-foot of flood-control storage at the proposed Davenport Center Reservoir is extremely high. If, as has been indicated, the actual cost may be nearly double the present estimate of cost, then the actual cost per acre-foot of storage would be astronomical.

Davenport Center Dam is over 90 miles away from Binghamton and a flow of 5,000 cubic feet per second would have no effect at all upon the situation in Binghamton. It is too far away. If all the water that the stream produces came down and was impounded, it would make no difference. On the other hand, the reservoir at Whitney Point was set by the engineers to reduce the flood flow of the Chenango at Binghamton over 16 percent. This would reduce any flood waters down to a point that would be less than 90,000 cubic feet per second on the Susquehanna. This is a 35,000-feet-per-second margin against the 125,000 cubic feet per second of flood protection at Vestal, Endicott, and Johnson City provided in the bill according to the testimony given by the Corps of Engineers and would not make a difference of over 2 inches. Is the cost of this project worth the amount of money requested in this amendment?

Let me go further, if you will, please.

In rallying to the aid of those persons who are pleading for the abolition of the Davenport Center project, I do so with the firm conviction that the carrying out of this planned undertaking would be illogical and economically unsound. The idea of holding back floodwater in enormous dams might be entertained where it is possible to utilize canyons and barren land of little or no value, but in locations such as the Davenport Center area, there are other measures which are much better or equally adequate at a cost which is not prohibitive.

Flood protection for the triple cities, Binghamton, Endicott, and Johnson City, could be had for a very few dollars by impounding basins in the upper regions of the North Susquehanna River and its branches and by developing reforestation in the hills. This kind of procedure would result in no substantial property loss, no requirement of building bridges, and very little land to acquire. It would cost only about 10 to 15 percent of the dam project, and the reforestation program would also help to replenish our fast-disappearing forests.

The advantages of small basins or reservoirs in flood-control protection are:

First. Speed of construction.

Second. Safety to lives and property.

Third. Flexibility of operations: An acre-foot of suitably apportioned multiple storage—small reservoir—will have an effective control value of 4 acre-feet in a single large reservoir located downstream.

Fourth. Erosion control.

The economic benefits expected, if the dam is built, will be considerably less than the actual losses which are easily determined. Never, except on very rare occasions, have the flood waters of the Susquehanna reached such proportions as to cause more than slight inconvenience to the areas of the Susquehanna. Therefore, it seems that a less drastic method of flood control than the one planned by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, would adequately take care of the situation.

The area involved under this amendment is a rich farming and residential section of New York State. It is dotted with small communities, closely related and interdependent in matters of milk production, school, church and business. It contains the usual network of highways, and a railway which serves the valley. It doesn't take much imagination to realize the hardship that would be caused by the complete and final destruction of a large section of the area to construct a huge flood control dam. In planning such projects, perhaps the Army engineers do not include the sentimental aspects involved. Yet they are important. Consider what it will mean to render several hundred people homeless, the breaking of family ties and friendship, the destruction of ancestral homes, the desolation of cemeteries, the frustrated plans for the future and the necessity to start over somewhere else.

Even if sentiment has no place in the picture, the financial cost of the Davenport Center Dam is sufficient to justify

dropping the plans at once. In addition to construction costs, there is the matter of compensating the farmers, homeowners, and business concerns for their property taken. We should consider the financial problems that would result from the disruption of central school districts, the cost of building new highways, the perpetual cost of maintaining the dam and many other costs which cannot be assessed in advance.

For some time the threat—the dam project—hanging over this area has been doing much damage. Real estate values are affected, public officials and private citizens hesitate to make improvements and are at a loss to know how to plan for the future. I am sure that the Army engineers understand the amount of damage that will be done if the dam is constructed as well as the damage being done by a delayed decision. I therefore suggest that this amendment be defeated.

Only 2 years ago, after several years of hearings, the Army engineers reporting on the north branch of the Susquehanna River and tributaries, New York and Pennsylvania, said, and I quote, "the reporting officers gave further consideration to the matter of a reservoir at Mount Upton on the Unadilla River but in view of the intense local opposition, they do not recommend authorization of a project at this location."

The engineers know that by building small dams and ponds on feeder streams it will save millions of dollars to the taxpayers without the entailing loss of thousands of acres of the best farmland in the State of New York—upheaval of homes—destruction of businesses—resultant loss of taxes—communities wiped out—and people made to start life all over again after having lived in this area for many, many years as their ancestors did. No, my colleagues, the building of a flood-control dam at Davenport Center, in the words of one citizen, "Would be a tragedy of major proportions."

Since March 27, when the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the former chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, and myself appeared before the Subcommittee on Public Works, I have been bombarded with hundreds of letters protesting the erection of this dam, and these letters, my colleagues, come from parts of my own district as well as from Davenport Center. This in view of the fact that high officials of the State of New York say that only a few people are against this project. Why are the people of my district opposed to this particular project? For the reason that they fear for the rest of their own areas—fear that once one project is voted by this committee, many others of the same nature in the adjoining areas will be voted and the result, as I have said before, will be chaos—loss of homes—valuable farmland—uprooting of complete communities, and a new start in life somewhere else—the building of unnecessary and expensive projects—and I ask you to vote the amendment down.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I understood that I was to have 5 minutes to close the debate on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was not of that understanding. It is the understanding of the Chair that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] would have 5 minutes to close the debate.

Mr. COLE. The request was that the gentleman from New York will close the debate. I also qualify under that characterization, being in support of the amendment; and, under the rules of the House, it is my understanding that I would be recognized to close the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman from New York that a member of the committee is entitled to close the debate if he so desires.

Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] desire to be recognized to close the debate?

Mr. TABER. I desire to close.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, it is a rather unusual and unique experience for me to rise in support of an amendment offered by my colleague the gentleman from New York, [Mr. ROONEY], appropriating additional funds for flood control. It is unique because very rarely do I take the floor or vote for amendments to increase appropriations. However, in view of the fact that the people I represent will be benefited by this appropriation, and further in view of the fact that a great percentage of the money to support the appropriations made by this Congress comes from the taxpayers of New York State. I do not mind getting up once in a while and asking for a little aid for the people of New York State.

Then the other reason why this is unique for me is to find myself in such diametric opposition to my good friends and colleagues, Mrs. ST. GEORGE, Mr. FABER, and Mr. KEARNEY, whose districts surround me geographically in New York and who personally surround me this afternoon on the floor with their guns pointed toward me and my people.

I was somewhat amazed by an expression made by one of those who have already spoken. It is understandable that people whose land is being taken away from them for the dam site should protest. It is understandable that they should protest to their Representatives in Congress and that their Representatives should voice here in the House the protests of their constituents. What I do find it hard to understand is that in the expression of such protests they should lose sight of the broader picture; in expressing a view which is narrow and borders on provincialism they lose sight of the benefits and the savings of life and property of thousands and thousands of people who live downstream. They say leave us alone who live upstream and let the people downstream take care of themselves. What crass selfishness!

I was here in Congress and assisted when the authorization for these dams was made 20 years ago, and we did not hear a single protest made by the landowners then. As a matter of fact, 4 or 5 dams have actually been constructed since then and not a word of protest or complaint has been made by the owners of the lands that were used for those dams. It just so happens in the last 2 years because of the recurrence of these floods the people living downstream, the victims of this short, this narrow, this provincial attitude are beginning to be awakened to the danger under which they are constantly living and are asking for the completion of this program laid out by the Army engineers 20 years ago, and asking that the remaining dams be built.

I shall not argue the technical aspects of the engineers' recommendations but am ready to be guided by their advice; in fact I prefer their engineering advice to that given me by Faber, St. George & Kearney, Inc. Whether their specifications ask for 2 inches of flood protection, or half an inch, or even it may be a quarter of an inch, if it is enough to protect the properties of these people from being flooded or being silted up and to save their lives, then I say it is money well invested.

It has been said that it will cost $45 million to complete this project. The truth is that the Corps of Engineers says it will cost only $14 million. And this appropriation today is for $1 million.

But it does seem that after 20 years of patient waiting the people who are to be benefited by this improvement ought not be brushed aside by the selfish attitudes of narrow people.

I would also call your attention to the fact that these are what we call dry dams. All that the Government acquires is the flowage rights, the right to inundate the land in question in case of excessive rainfall. For long periods of time the land is available for use just as it has always been used for centuries. Occasionally, maybe 1 year out of 10, the land is inundated to a depth of some considerable feet for a limited period of time. Eventually that water runs off and the farmer comes back in, he plows his land and sows his crop the same as he has in the past. We are not confiscating valuable dairy land permanently. We are simply buying the right to flood that land with excessive rainwater in order to protect the poor, innocent, helpless victims who live downstream. I do not blame my colleagues for getting up and arguing about the protection of the folks living high and dry on the mountaintops but the rest of us should give attention and consideration to the people living downstream, not only in the Triple Cities area but all the way down the Susquehanna River.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to commend the gentleman for the highly interesting and important statement which he is making and for bringing out his point with regard to the fact that the reservoir land is not taken permanently. May I for the sake of emphasis ask him to answer this question: Is it not the fact that the State of New York in connection with projects such as this does

not take the landowner's title in fee simple away from him?

Mr. COLE. That is my understanding. All the Government acquires is the flowage right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to close debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this particular dam, the Davenport Center Dam, is 90 miles upstream from the city of Binghamton. It cannot possibly be of value to the people of the city of Binghamton. The flood walls which this committee is providing in the pending bill before us today will protect the city of Binghamton against 126,000 cubic feet per second. The highest water of record was away back in 1865 when they had 114,000 cubic feet per second recorded at that point.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish the gentleman would repeat those figures for the benefit of the Committee.

Mr. TABER. One hundred and twenty-six thousand cubic feet of water would be protected against by the flood wall.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Just what was the previous high?

Mr. TABER. The previous high was 114,000 in 1865.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In other words, this would be just squandering money?

Mr. TABER. That is all. On top of that since the reservoir at Whitney Point was put in, it has really been effective in holding back water because it will hold back 82,000 acre-feet. It has not resulted in a single high-water period in Binghamton anywhere near the old record; 92,000 is the highest record and that was in 1948.

Mr. Chairman, the picture is just simply this: The damage which would be done as the result of each 1 of these 5 dams that some of these promoters, and that is what it is, want to put across would run a million dollars a year as to each one of these setups. They have had surveys made and estimates made, so they know what they are talking about. The result of the thing would be that these people upstream would have 10 times as much damage as could possibly result to the city of Binghamton.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. Does the gentleman agree with me that this is the opening wedge and once the Army engineers get their foot into the Davenport Center Dam, there are to be at least 2 other dams constructed with a resultant cost of between forty-five and sixty million dollars?

Mr. TABER. Well, it will be at least as much as that. But, these dams are absolutely unnecessary and will not serve a good purpose. Now, why should we go ahead and vote for something that will do no good at all and which is backed by a group of promoters who are stirred up by a little fellow from Binghamton?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE. I do not care to have the gentleman disclose the identity of this little fellow from Binghamton who is stirring it up, but I would like to have him assure me that he will identify the individual to me at a later time.

Mr. TABER. Why, certainly I will. No doubt about that. Everybody in New York State knows who it is and knows what he is doing. I think he is a great promoter.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this Congress will not go overboard and vote to start in on this program. There are three projects in my district, in Chenango County, that they want to put in. The cost of those would be over $50 million. There is one in the district represented by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY], that they want to put in. The cost of that would be enormous. This particular one, before they get through with it, would run to $20 million. Let us not do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 87, noes 117.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ROONEY and Mrs. ST. GEORGE.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 80, noes 122.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we are very anxious to finish this bill tonight. I ask unanimous consent that on all further amendments to this section, and all amendments thereto, time for debate on each amendment be limited to 5 minutes, to be consumed by the proponent of the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that there be 5 minutes on a side, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. CANNON. In concurrence with the suggestion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] I amend my request, Mr. Chairman, and ask unanimous consent that on all further amendments to this section and all amendments thereto debate on each amendment be limited to 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be allotted to the proponent and 5 minutes to the committee.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Reserving the right to object, by that the gentleman means the opposition on the committee; does he not?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOGGS: On page 16, line 4, strike out "$421,734,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$422,034,000, of which $300,000 shall be for the project 'Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet, Louisiana.'"

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I am quite certain that this amendment would have been adopted in the committee on yesterday had our Louisiana Member not unavoidably been absent in Louisiana.

This amendment makes it possible for the Army engineers to do necessary initial work on the Mississippi River Gulf outlet, which is a continuation of the channel from the port of New Orleans to the Gulf of Mexico, shortening the distance by approximately 40 miles. This is supported by every area and every group throughout the midcontinent of the United States.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. This project, as my colleague knows, is located entirely within the district which I represent in the city of New Orleans.

Mr. BOGGS. That is correct.

Mr. HÉBERT. However, the fact that it is in the district which I represent does not indicate that it is a strictly local proposition. It is one of community and nationwide interest, as I believe the gentleman indicates by the fact that he offers the amendment now to have the planning money put into this bill at this time.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I might add in connection with what the gentleman has said that to the best of my knowledge every governor in the midcontinent area of the United States has approved this project. This means that if an explosion or an eruption should occur at the mouth of the Mississippi River, which serves the second port of the United States and the greatest trading area in the midcontinent area of the United States, if that delta area should explode, as has happened in the past in the case of the River Nile and other great rivers in the history of the world, then this great trading area would not be blocked out from the commerce of the world.

May I add that this project has been under active study and consideration by the Army engineers since 1943. It was naturally and unfortunately suspended during World War II. It has now been unanimously approved by both our body and the other body. By the approval of $300,000 today, the work should be able to go forward within the next several years.

Mr. HÉBERT. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman is coauthor of this bill. I think it would be wise at this time to inform the House as to the benefit ratio.

Mr. BOGGS. It is very high. I think it is 1.54 to 1. I am certain the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the committee, is familiar with this project. I discussed it with some of my good colleagues here and hope that the chairman of the committee will see fit to go along with this amendment, which is so vitally important to the

whole midcontinental area of the United States.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I shall not oppose this amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, here is another case. I am not going to take the responsibility that properly belongs to the majority members of this subcommittee who presented this report to the House. I do think the Members of the House should know that this is an $88 million project which was just authorized in March of this year. There are a lot of other projects with just as favorable benefit to cost ratio which have been authorized for a much longer period of time than this project which are waiting their turn for appropriations by the Congress. I do not find any evidence of the urgent nature of this project which would push this $88 million project ahead of a great many other projects located in other parts of the country, which have been authorized, as I said, for a much longer period of time than this one has been authorized. But, as I said, if the majority members of the subcommittee will not take their responsibility, I do not know why I should be the goat and say, "No." If they are willing to accept it, it is up to them.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman and I think that when the gentleman has time to study the project he will find that this project is of equal importance to the people of Wisconsin, Missouri, Nebraska, Kansas and all of the other great midcontinental area States of our Nation as it is to those of us who happen to live at the mouth of the great Mississippi River.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I merely want to say that I favored this project in the committee.

Mr. BOGGS. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman favored this project.

Mr. RABAUT. The benefit-cost ratio is 1.54 to 1 which is a pretty good benefit ratio.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, unless someone decides to use the last 5 minutes, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: On page 16, line 5, preceding the word *"Provided"*, insert the following: "In addition the sum of $300,000 for engineering, planning and designing for the Overton-Red River Waterway."

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, this project was originally approved in 1946. Since then there have been appropriations by the Congress in several separate instances. Last year, we approved $175,000 for planning money. This amendment would simply add the sum of $300,000 for planning and that is for the purpose of bringing the planning up-to-date so that the project will be tangible from the point of cost and ability to execute. The project, as I say, was approved by the Army Engineers. It was approved by the Congress in 1946. At one time, Mr. Chairman, we actually had this money for planning appropriated, but the war in Korea came along and we had to surrender the money and turn it back. Since then there have been appropriations of almost $400,000 for planning and this is simply an addition to that amount to bring the planning up-to-date. The Bureau of the Budget approved this project. I think it was overlooked by the committee because the hearings were before two different subcommittees.

But this project is at the point if you do not go forward with it you will lose some of the investment you have already in the planning. It is extremely important that we do this. It provides for a waterway in the Red River Valley—not the Mississippi Valley. It is in the Red River Valley. It would start below the city of Shreveport and follow the valley in a southeasterly direction to the Atchafalaya River; and, when completed, that waterway would provide navigation for the great empire in the southwest. It would cover, for instance, the cities of Texarkana, Shreveport, Marshall, Tex., and parts of south Arkansas and all of north Louisiana. As I say, our purpose in asking for these funds is simply to go ahead with the planning which has been approved by the Bureau of Engineers, the Budget, and everybody. We ask for the $300,000 because that would bring the planning down to the point where the engineers can say exactly what the cost of the whole thing will be. The original cost ratio was 2 to 1. Now we have had the Korean war in the meantime. We want to be fair, so we want to have that cost-benefit ratio reestablished, and this will reestablish that figure.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if he will not accept this amendment.

Mr. CANNON. I will say to the gentleman that I regret on account of certain features in this that I cannot agree to it.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Then I want to use the remainder of my time. This matter has been before the committee and the committee has approved it and Congress has approved it time and time again. The amendment is in order because it proceeds with the planning. It is a most worthwhile project. In that valley, 300 miles west of the Mississippi River, 40 miles south of Arkansas, and 12 miles east of the State of Texas there are many, many cities that are badly in need of navigation. We have found that these cities will provide a million dollars' worth of transportation every year for oil and gas alone in that area. It will provide for millions of dollars of freight from our lumber industry and for other industries in that great area.

It is an extremely important project, and I hope that this committee will go along and give us the planning funds that we need so badly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Much as I regret to go against my good friend from Louisiana, nevertheless here we have the beginning of a project costing at least $88½ million dollars and perhaps considerably more. We have here a project to which there is local opposition, as exemplified by Congressman LONG being against it. We have a project designed for navigation purposes, yet you have three important railroads paralleling that particular route. We have a project which will take a considerable amount of good farmland out of production, and a project to which many local people down there are opposed.

I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Let me say to the gentleman that in the matter of surveys I will read from a letter I have, sent by Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner:

You will note from the record of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, that on page 552 et seq. that General Hardin, in discussing this project, pointed out that due to the long interval between authorization of this project and the many changes that have taken place in the economy of the region, it is felt necessary and desirable to review the economics of this project before construction funds are requested. The planning funds included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1957 would review the engineering and economics of this project in order to establish current construction costs and benefits.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding as much as he did.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I want to quote from the testimony of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], which appears at page 912 of the hearings. He states this:

The proposed Overton-Red River project is to be a canal cut parallel to the Red River largely through my congressional district. It is proposed to pump the water out of the Red River into this canal to float barges to Shreveport. It was authorized in 1946.

The land in this area is good farming land and a great many of the farmers, constituents of mine, are objecting to having their farms cut into two separate pieces with probably no bridges to give them access to their divided property. In addition, they complain that they will have to pay taxes on their property to provide the funds the local area must provide for land acquisition, changes in highways and new bridges for existing highways.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, there is no provision at present for local interests in any way to have the necessary taxing authority to permit local contribution, and I certainly hope this amendment will be rejected.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. In confirmation of what the gentleman from Minnesota said, I quote the following statement by General Hardin during the course of the hearings on this project:

General HARDIN. The Waterways Commission study has gotten to the point where they

are getting set up so that they can have the taxing authority which will be necessary to carry their share of the undertaking. The legislature which is coming up will consider the enactment of those provisions in the laws of Louisiana.

It seems to me that for this Congress to appropriate money without the necessary authorization and assurance of local participation that is required would be setting a precedent that would come back to haunt us in the years ahead.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. There is a letter guaranteeing local participation. I do not know whether it is in the hearings or not but there is such a confirmation.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. But no legislative authorization of the State of Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. But a State commission has been set up known as the Overton-Red River Waterway Commission which is a State commission and which is now participating. So in reference to this project the State is participating.

Mr. Davis of Wisconsin. Not to the extent of being authorized to provide their financial share of the undertaking.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. There is a letter of commitment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PERKINS: On page 16, line 5, preceding the word "Provided," insert the following: "and in addition the sum of $1,000,000 for construction funds on Buckhorn Reservoir."

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, the Kentucky River is navigable for approximately 250 miles subject to frequent floods. There is not a single reservoir or flood-control project in the headwaters of this stream. The Comprehensive Flood Control Act of 1938 authorized the Buckhorn Reservoir on the middle fork of the Kentucky River. The planning survey of this reservoir has been completed and a district Army engineer's office at Louisville, Ky., is preparing the necessary data to advertise for construction contract.

The budget included an item of $1 million for the initiation of this contract work during the coming fiscal year. This amount was deleted by the Appropriations Committee. The sole purpose of this amendment is to restore the amount included in the recommendation of the Budget Bureau for construction purposes. There is no objection to this reservoir in the area in which it is located. The down-river communities are hoping that it will be completed at the earliest possible date as they face repeated flood damage that is ofttimes disastrous. Beattyville alone has suffered more than a half-million dollars' damage from Kentucky River floods.

This reservoir will not only lower the flood crest in the entire Kentucky River Valley from this point northward, but would also have immeasurable effect upon the Ohio River flood stage.

I urge this Committee to approve this amendment so that an early start may be made on the construction of this essential flood-control reservoir.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. Chairman, the committee adopted by unanimous vote, as I recall it, a very salutary provision under which we determined at the beginning of the hearings not to accept any proposal on which there was a poorer ratio than 1.3 to 1. The ratio on this is 1.2 to 1. That means we did not and cannot consider it.

Furthermore, as a result of additional estimates, within this last year the total cost has gone up from $7,020,000 to $9,990,000, a 40-percent increase in the estimate.

And the corps has already spent $70,000 to complete plans for the current year.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has the floor.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PERKINS) there were—ayes 84, noes 116.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALEXANDER: On page 16, line 24, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided further,* That no funds appropriated in this act shall be used for the planning or construction of the Wilkesboro Reservoir, N. C."

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. Actually I had intended to strike out the figure "$25,000" which is shown on page 14 of the report for the Wilkesboro Reservoir, but due to the fact that the figures on page 16, line 4, have been amended, it is impossible to do that. The only thing I am asking by this amendment is that no funds in this bill be used for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 11319 provides an appropriation of $25,000 for advanced planning to determine the feasibility of constructing a dam or dams on the Yadkin River, which is in Wilkes County, N. C.

My predecessor, the late Honorable Robert L. Doughton, for many years fought the construction of these dams, due to the fact that it would adversely affect the people living in Caldwell County, N. C., which is in the congressional district I represent, by inundating their homes, schools, churches, and much fertile, agricultural land.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I certainly would not want to be put in the position of being against flood control or soil conservation. I am not. I think, however, that this particular project would do more damage than it would rectify and that the proposed dam is not economically feasible.

It is my understanding, according to the reports of the Corps of Engineers, the proposed dam or dams are calculated to cost approximately $12 million and would partially protect only $5 million worth of agricultural and industrial property below the dams, while requiring $466 thousand annual upkeep.

I have in my possession a petition signed by some 400 Wilkes and Caldwell County farmers, as well as letters from the board of county commissioners and the Lenoir Chamber of Commerce of Caldwell County, and many others, vigorously opposing any further appropriation for the planning or construction of the proposed dam or dams, for which I understand there has already been expended, by the Corps of Engineers, approximately $165,000.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think the gentleman is completely justified in the position he has taken on the basis of the record which was made in our committee and I hope his amendment will be adopted.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ALEXANDER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GEORGE: On page 16, line 4, after the sum named, insert "and in addition $100,000 to be utilized for additional planning of Strawn Reservoir, Kans."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, this is 1 of 4 key dams located on the upper reaches of the Arkansas River Watershed. This project was originally approved in 1949 and in 1951 extensive planning money was granted. In 1953, after the expenditure of part of the planning money, in core drilling for the dam site it was discovered that there was a fault under the proposed dam. That compelled the Army Engineers to move downstream, to hunt for a new dam site. Fortunately they found one that will cut $10 million from the proposed cost.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to my colleague from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I am in accord with the thinking of the gentleman and I trust that his amendment will carry. Because of the delay encountered we can save at least a year in the construction of this much-needed installation.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman. We people who live on the Arkansas River Upper Watershed are asking you people to pick up the amount of money granted to us this year, the year that we lost due to no fault of the Army engineers and no fault of the people who live in this river valley. I have

been informed by the Army engineers that this will complete the planning of this one key dam that is located in the State of Kansas. I want to say that water and water conservation in our State is our No. 1 problem. Frankly, in my congressional district I have 4 counties with 12 percent of unemployment. The reason we cannot get large industry to come in there and take up the unemployment is the fact that we do not have an assured water supply for a large industrial development.

Up until 1951 this river valley on an average had two floods a year. So you can see that it is imperative that we go ahead as fast, as expeditiously as we can.

This project has been approved. The Army engineers ask for a budget of $50,000 and I am asking that we have enough money to complete the planning so that we can get into construction if the Committee on Appropriations sees fit to grant us construction money next year.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is another case where there is some money in the budget for it. There is still some lingering local opposition to the project, as the committee has been informed. That raises the question as to whether the planning ought to be rushed to completion by an additional $100,000 this year.

I think it is completely proper that there be the $50,000 that the Bureau of the Budget has already recommended in order that the planning can proceed in an orderly fashion, but I would be afraid of rushing this thing through to completion of the planning until such items as the lingering local opposition and the rather marginal benefit-to-cost ratio on the basis of the present plans have been cleared up.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GEORGE) there were, ayes 37, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AVERY: On page 16, line 24, strike the period and insert a colon and add the following: *"Provided further,* That none of the funds in this section be used for the construction of Tuttle Creek Reservoir in Kansas."

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I was on the floor much earlier this afternoon to discuss this amendment I have now offered. I do not want to present any false illusions about this. This is not a new project, as most of you know. The dam is under construction. Nevertheless, I feel constrained to offer this amendment as my district has decided on three different occasions that this project was not to the best interest of the First District of Kansas.

I have been very much interested in the discussion here this afternoon, especially the exchange of remarks between the various Members from the State of New York. In this instance, the name could have been changed from Davenport City Dam to Tuttle Creek Dam. I think all those arguments have been used a good many times on the floor of this House relative to the particular project I am addressing myself to this afternoon. Despite the fact that this was recommended by the subcommittee and included in the bill by the full committee. I am still offering my amendment for the consideration of the committee this afternoon. As I pointed out earlier this afternoon, not only do I think this project is not justified, but I think the House should take another look at the treatment given to displaced persons affected by Federal reservoir projects. That does not apply only to the Tuttle Creek Reservoir in Kansas, but it applies to every reservoir that we have discussed on the floor this afternoon. Mr. Chairman, I am particularly grateful that you are in the chair this afternoon not only because the members of this committee may have the benefit of your wisdom in presiding over the Committee of the Whole but also I have a bill pending before your committee which I think will take care, to a large extent, of part of the inequity that exists in relation to the land acquisition program and displaced persons relative to a Federal project. I am referring specifically to the capital-gains tax angle.

As I said earlier this afternoon, land owners are forced off their land by Federal projects and are treated just the same as speculators in real estate in any State of the Union. I do not think that is fair and I do not think it is fair in the minds of the Congress, if they would stop to consider that point. We are told that land owners must yield to a Federal project in the national interest. I repeat, if it is to the national interest to build these projects, it is certainly to the national interest to reimburse these people justly for the property that is taken away from them by right of eminent domain. As I mentioned earlier this afternoon, there is also a new policy as to land acquisition that was adopted in 1953. The proposition of an easement instead of acquisition of fee title. Under the easement policy, the displaced person cannot get all of his capital out of his investment to relocate elsewhere but is just sort of half choked, I believe is the way to say it. His operations are disrupted, but nevertheless he is still confined to his original site and he cannot relocate to another area. I want to make it clear that this is not the fault of the Army engineers. It is the fault of the Congress because the engineers are only able to operate the land acquisition policy as it is laid down by the law of the Congress and as it is administered by the administrative branch of the Government of the United States. These are two inequities which exist. The third one is that there is no provision for the reimbursement of businessmen who are displaced by a project. Farmers are reimbursed to the extent of the appraised value of their farm. In the case of a merchant who has been in business for 40 years, he is only reimbursed to the extent of the real value of his business. In other words, there is no value attached to what we may call the intangible or what the courts have described as consequential damages. If these projects are as good as we have been told on the floor this afternoon, certainly, a few more thousand dollars for displaced persons would not greatly alter the cost-benefit ratio of any individual project. I certainly implore you, Mr. Chairman, to consider the bill before your committee, and I also hope that the Committee on Public Works will consider the bill pending before their committee to authorize reimbursement to businessmen. There are about 100 of them who are displaced by this project.

As I stated previously, my opposition to the Tuttle Creek project remains unchanged, notwithstanding the unfavorable action of the 1st session of the 84th Congress in appropriating an additional $7,500,000 to continue its construction. I do not have to remind the committee that this action was taken without a favorable report from this subcommittee. There is considerable doubt in my own mind if this reservoir, or all proposed reservoirs, would have materially alleviated the results of the 1951 flood.

Not one independent survey has ever recommended the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam. In 1951 three independent consulting engineers were employed by the State of Kansas to resurvey this dam. The engineers concluded that the project was not economically feasible as a flood-control project. The Missouri Valley Survey Committee, appointed by President Truman, expressed grave doubt relative to the economic justification.

As you no doubt know from the hearings conducted last session of Congress, the Kansas State Legislature in 1953 passed a resolution requesting that no further funds be appropriated for the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam. This resolution still stands.

Water conservation and water shortage have always been a topic in this controversy. I want to again emphasize that we are not opposing water conservation, nor are we attempting to say that water shortage is not a matter of serious consideration. On our watersheds we have provided storage for 513,690,012 cubic feet of water, and this was done before the passage of the Hope-Aiken bill by the 83d Congress. The operation of this bill has implemented the storage of water in northeast Kansas, and H. R. 8750, passed by the House, will greatly accelerate upstream water conservation, as it liberalizes the authority of the Department of Agriculture in the cost sharing of upstream water conservation works.

In my district is the only such proposed concentration of dams that I know of in the whole Missouri River Basin. Rainfall cannot be the deciding factor as the rainfall is heavier east of the Missouri and virtually no projects proposed there. It is planned to keep the Missouri River controlled without reservoirs from South Dakota to its junction with the Mississippi at St. Louis, but the Kansas River draining a smaller watershed must be controlled by reservoirs only a few miles from its confluence with the Missouri.

In other words, it appears to me that my district has been designed as expendable for downstream benefits without any cost to them or any negative factor on their economy. I think if they were assessed for a proportion of the cost, their urgent support for these reservoirs would materially diminish.

Since President Eisenhower took this item out of the proposed budget in 1953, omitted it from the budget in 1954, and again in 1955, and no appropriation was made until the public works bill came out of the Appropriations Committee in June of last year, this project is historically and still is today a creature of a Democratic controlled Congress. If it is not, my amendment will be adopted and this item deleted from this bill today. If my amendment is not adopted, you—Democrats—are giving your tacit sanction to the project and are taking full responsibility for it, as your party controls the important Appropriations Committee recommending this project and are in control of this House.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas, on one thing; namely, that there should be more equitable treatment given to many of these people who are displaced by these flood-control projects, particularly those businessmen who do not get what they should. I disagree with him, of course, upon the value of Tuttle Creek and its necessity. General Potter, district engineer, who is now going to be the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone, no more than 72 hours ago stated that the Tuttle Creek Reservoir was a key project in all flood control in the Kansas River Valley. Construction is already well underway. However, Mr. Chairman, I hesitate at this hour in the evening to impose upon the House again to relate the tragic events of Black Friday, July 13, 1951, which was the darkest day in the history of my hometown of Kansas City, Kans. I have told the story repeatedly here on the House floor and before congressional committees.

Congress has spoken out favoring Tuttle Creek Reservoir on numerous occasions.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOLLING. I do not like to take the time of the Committee, but I would like to take this opportunity to say that I join with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] in strong opposition to the amendment to strike funds for the continuation of the construction of this most important dam.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. KARSTEN. I also wish to join with the distinguished gentleman from Kansas in opposition to striking out this fund. I might say that at the time of the flood of 1951 I was chairman of the subcommittee that went out there. Our unanimous recommendation was for the construction of the Tuttle Creek Dam. The subcommittee's report was unanimously approved by the Committee on Government Operations. Tuttle Creek is a vital link in the flood-control program. I certainly hope the work will continue.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, there has been some talk about the churches, schools, homes and farms that this reservoir will displace. Let me tell you this, that these floods on the Kansas River come frequently, almost every year, except that for the last 3 or 4 years we have not had one. Some day we are going to wake up and find a gulley-washer, a frog-strangler coming down that stream, that is going to again raise havoc.

We have lost fertile fields even more fertile than those in the Blue Valley, we have lost factories, we have lost more homes, we have lost more schools, we have lost more churches in these floods than those in the Tuttle Creek area but nobody compensates us; we must rebuild, and redo, and restore at our own cost. Every person to whom Mr. AVERY has referred will be adequately compensated for all the loss they sustained, with the exception, as he pointed out, of some merchants.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the point the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] has brought out about reimbursement in proper value is certainly one that Congress should look into, but not in this particular bill.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I agree there are some inequities that should be corrected, and I trust such legislation will be enacted.

Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of this amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement this week by Dr. Rusk on foreign aid before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Dr. Rusk is the recognized authority in prosthetic rehabilitation both in this country and abroad. He is not only one of the distinguished physicians of his time but is a writer and author of note and serves on the staff of the New York Times.

FORMAL STATEMENT OF DR. HOWARD A. RUSK BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, MAY 18, 1956

My name is Howard A. Rusk. I am a physician and chairman, department of physical medicine and rehabilitation at New York University-Bellevue Medical Center; director, Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, New York University-Bellvue Medical Center; associate editor, the New York Times; consultant in Rehabilitation to the United Nations, and president of the International Society for the Welfare of Cripples. I am appearing before you today as a private citizen whose primary interest is the rehabilitation of the disabled.

It is my belief that rehabilitation of disabled children and adults is one of the sharpest tools and most effective instruments which we in the United States have for making friends—a tool which can penetrate any iron or bamboo curtain to reach the minds and the hearts of men. It is natural for all of us to take improved agriculture industry and utilities for granted but men often regard these developments as somewhat remote from their immediate problems. Rehabilitation, however, makes a personal and significant impact not only upon the disabled person himself and his family but on those with whom he comes in contact. This as well as all international activities in the field of health are one aspect of our foreign assistance program which meets all yardsticks of economic soundness, simple humanitarianism and political expediency.

In his report to the Congress on our mutual security program covering July-December 1955, John Hollister, Director of the International Cooperation Administration, wrote: "The people of the United States recognize the value—economic, social, and moral—of health and the fact that health is a common need. We are also coming to recognize the vital relationship of health programs to any hopes we may have of helping to create conditions of economic progress, political stability, and democratic social development in the many areas of the world outside the United States, where our future national security is deeply involved."

Mr. Hollister then cited estimates from competent authorities that until recently the economic loss from malaria alone in India was $224 million a year, from bilharziasis in Egypt $57 million a year, from malaria and tuberculosis in the Philippines $660 million a year. Also, that we in the United States pay a hidden 5 percent additional cost for our imports from malarious countries because of disease-affection production.

It is, therefore, surprising that our contribution to bilateral health programs was reduced from $43 million in the 1955 fiscal year to $33,767,000 in fiscal year 1956, and that of this amount less than $50,000 was spent on all types of rehabilitation services throughout the world.

From the economic aspects alone, it would seem logical that our investment in international health would be increased rather than decreased. Over and beyond the economic implications, there are great social, moral, and political values in our support of international health activities.

These values are well illustrated by international activities in the field of rehabilitation. In this country and in the other developed parts of the world we have seen a remarkable growth of interest in rehabilitation in the last decade. This interest has not been prompted by humanitarian motives alone. It has resulted from the growing incidence of physical disability resulting from prolongation of the life span, increased public assistance costs because of disability, and our need for manpower in our expanding economy.

But what lies behind the interest of Indonesia, Korea, the Philippines, Mexico, India, Burma, and Thailand in the provision of rehabilitation services for their handicapped? It is not the need for manpower, for these nations have far more manpower than they can profitably utilize in their present stage of industrial development. It is not to reduce public assistance costs, for few of these nations have any social schemes whereby the disabled become a responsibility of the state. It is not to reduce demands for medical, hospitalization, and social services, for the chronically ill and disabled in most of these nations are wards of their families rather than of the state.

The real reason is that many of these nations, particularly those of the Africa-Asia

area, have, after years of colonization, recently achieved the long-sought dream of political independence. Now they are desperately looking for ways of proving to the world, and more importantly to themselves, that they have the political and social maturity to justify their political independence.

Long before the Government became concerned with international health projects, the Rockefeller Foundation, W. B. Kellogg Foundation, China Medical Board, and other private groups had years of experience in the administration of such programs. As a result, we have more know-how in the conduct of international health projects than in some other forms of technical assistance and are able to administer such projects more effectively.

Health projects are welcomed by the nations in which they are undertaken, for such projects are initiated only at the request of host countries. They are cooperative projects involving both joint planning and administration.

Host countries furnish a part, frequently the major part, of the funds for such projects. The $6 million contributed in 1955 to joint health projects in Latin America by the United States was expanded by $19 million.

Since our Federal technical cooperation health programs, known popularly as point 4 projects, began more than 13 years ago, they have cost our citizens less than a penny a month a person.

It is reported that last year Russia graduated 27,000 physicians from their medical schools and 20,000 the previous year. At the present time we are graduating slightly more than 7,000 in the United States per year. It is granted that the level of education of these physicians is far below that of our physicians, but, even so, the health services they are providing to the country are so superior to those ever before available to the people to them it is considered a miracle.

It has also been reported that at the present time there are more doctors than can be readily absorbed in the health services of Russia, and the physicians are being used for the kind of job that we would ordinarily assign to nurses and technicians. If the production continues and the excess increases, it is rather obvious what the physicians will do. They will carry the skills they have learned along with the concepts of communism to the backward parts of the world. We must meet this challenge, and we can, for our physicians are better trained. By using total professional personnel, therapists, sanitary engineers, public-health administrators, and educators we can do a better job. But time is running out.

Here is one example of what could be done. The Veterans' Administration has, since 1946, conducted an extensive artificial-limb research program which is carried out by nonprofit contracts with universities. The Army and Navy cooperate by supporting prosthetic-research laboratories within their medical services. Work in the universities and armed services has been coordinated by the Prosthetics Research Board (formerly the Advisory Committee on Artificial Limbs) of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council under a contract between the Veterans' Administration and the Academy.

The need for a research program in artificial limbs became apparent early in 1945 when, at the request of the Surgeon General of the Army, the National Research Council brought together a group of scientists, engineers, surgeons, and prosthetists for the purpose of establishing standards for procurement of prostheses. At this meeting it was soon learned that the development of artificial limbs had proceeded through the years without the benefit of a scientific approach, whereupon it was recommended that the Government support a research program in this field.

As the result of this program our own disabled veterans have prosthetic devices far superior to those found anywhere else in the world.

Just as we are interested in sharing the technical advances in nuclear energy for peaceful purposes with the rest of the world, we could make a significant contribution to the effective understanding of American ideals of democracy and the value we place on human worth and dignity, if through an appropriation of one or two million dollars a year we could share our advances in artificial limbs with the world. Through demonstration centers, consultants, mobile clinics, and the training of foreign personnel in the United States, a magnificent program could be established. With the sum of $1 million a year for 2 years both the administrative and professional overhead cost of such a project could be met; highly qualified American consultants could visit all parts of the world and survey what is available and what is needed; 4 completely equipped mobile prosthetic shops, each staffed by a qualified American prosthetic technician and physical therapist, could be sent to southeast Asia, the Near East, north Africa, and South America to spend 4 to 8 weeks in a given community rendering direct patient services in fitting prosthetics and training wearers in their use; permanent demonstration prosthetic shops and training centers could be established in key parts of the world; and the components to provide modern artificial limbs could be made available to over 40,000 amputees; over 100 trainees could be brought to the United States for training in prosthetics; and all of the available technical literature and visual aids in prosthetics here in the United States could be translated and published in various languages for international distribution.

These prosthetic trainees would then join the 400 health workers receiving advanced training in the United States under the auspices of the International Cooperation Administration. They and hundreds of others trained under the auspices of private foundations, their own governments and their own resources, are permanent ambassadors of our democratic ideals. Such persons make particularly effective proponents for democracy because as professional people they work intimately with their handicapped patients and have their confidence and trust.

Somewhere within the spectrum ranging from direct relief to long-range economic projects, there is a need for significant, tangible short-range projects that can be seen and easily understood. The Russians produced such a project when they paved the main street of Kabul in Afghanistan. Our foreign-aid projects there have been of economic importance, but their impact on the daily lives of the people will not be felt for many years. In contrast, several times each day the residents of Kabul have reason to be grateful to Russia.

This is the kind of an imaginative, constructive project which can be easily seen and understood. There are many hundreds and thousands of disabled persons throughout the world, each of whom could also become a living, dynamic example of American democracy. To illustrate their potential contributions, I should like to tell you the story of a little Bolivian boy, age 10. He was born without arms and legs with 4 little, sensitive fingers coming out of each shoulder and 2 normal feet coming from the hip joint but with no bony connection. When he was a year old, he was abandoned by his father, who then deserted the family and has not been heard of since. The boy spent the next 8 years of his life in an American mission in La Paz, where he had love and kindness but could not walk. To get from one place to another, he rolled like a little ball. He was seen there by a young physician from the United States who called me and said he had met this little boy, who was exceedingly bright and who, if he had a chance, he felt, could be a great force in the world. Pictures and case reports were sent and by coincidence seen by the secretary of one of our distinguished citizens. She made possible his trip to the United States.

Two weeks before he arrived, I had the Vice President of Bolivia and the Bolivian Ambassador to the United Nations for luncheon. They knew all about Juanito and were excited about his coming. In the middle of the meal, I said to them, "You know, if we bring Juan here it is going to cost you a very large fee."

In consternation, they said, "How much?" I said, "The fee is this. First, that when he returns, you must promise him the best education your country affords; and second, if we can demonstrate in the most severely disabled child you will ever see what can be done, you will establish a national rehabilitation program in Bolivia."

Without hesitation, the Vice President said, "You take the boy; we pay the fee."

When he arrived, he spoke no English. Within a month, he had a vocabulary of more than 300 words. Special prostheses were designed and he now is walking. He has grown more than twice his height. He is doing well in school and one day soon will be ready to go back and take his place in his own country.

Several months after he was in the United States, the story was published in a national magazine. A few weeks later, a letter came to the editors, which read as follows:

"Congratulations on a brilliant piece of reporting. Am referring to your (February 21) on Juanito Yepez, the congential quadruple amputee from Bolivia. * * * For those of us who are in and out of Central and South America we found your article on Juanito gained us more friends (and respect) than all the millions our government is pouring into these countries. We noted no sudden pro United States of America feeling in Brazil as a result of the $75 million donation (given Brazil by the United States), but we were pleasantly surprised with the many compliments for what the United States of America is doing for Juanito. I do not know what your circulation is in Latin America but can tell you the peons in the backwoods knew all about Juanito within 24 hours after the issue was on the streets. * * *

"E. E. BUTLER, *Master.*

"TAMPICO, MEXICO."

What we need in the United States are friends like Juanito Yepez all over the world, with the recognition that in the United States we believe in the dignity of the individual and because of that belief want to share the things that we have learned in our country. We are not doing this to make friends—we are doing this to give service. If the service and the spirit are there, then we can't help but have their friendship.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

M'GEE BEND DAM

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take just a few minutes at this point to outline briefly some pertinent facts about the McGee Bend Dam project in east Texas. An appropriation of $4 million is proposed in this public-works bill so that orderly and economical construction can be carried on in the next fiscal year.

There is no other single project in the entire Second Congressional District that is more important to the welfare of this country and to the people of east Texas

than McGee Bend Dam. This dam—a multipurpose project to be located on the Angelina River—was authorized by Congress in 1945 to be the major part of a two-dam system to efficiently control the fresh-water resources of both the Angelina and Neches Rivers. A smaller reregulating dam was authorized to complete the system.

Public hearings were held in November 1945 at Jasper, Tex.—just 10 miles from the actual dam site—and the overwhelming majority of people from every part of the area went on record in favor of the project to provide the entire watershed with adequate flood control, additional electric power, vital fresh-water storage, and, of course, the untold benefits from recreation that a project of this type will offer.

The Corps of Engineers has estimated this project has a benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.39 to 1, and the vast majority of people in east Texas—both Democrats and Republicans—have continued to support McGee Bend Dam, and they are supporting it now.

During the Korean emergency, the United States Army engineers stated before the House Appropriations Committee that McGee Bend Dam was one of the nine most necessary projects for the Nation's defense and essential civilian economy and the engineers urged the rapid completion of planning so that construction could start.

The smaller reregulating dam was completed in 1951 and last year $1.5 million in initial construction money for McGee Bend Dam was put in the public works appropriations bill in the House committee. This action was taken after the Federal Government had received assurances from the Lower Neches Valley Authority that a total of $15 million would be contributed to the overall authorized project by this local State agency. Congress approved the $1.5 million and the President signed the bill.

This year the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget recommended that the $4 million appropriation now pending before us be included in the budget so that orderly and economical construction of the project could be carried on during the next fiscal year. The Bureau of the Budget has approved clearance for the Engineers to begin work on McGee Bend Dam immediately.

Members of the House, McGee Bend Dam is not a new project. It was taken under study more than 10 years ago and since that time a great deal of money from both local agency and the Federal Government has been spent toward completion of this critically needed project.

I would respectfully ask that the House consider these facts about McGee Bend Dam as we vote on the public works appropriation bill:

First. The Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, the President, and the Congress have approved the completion of McGee Bend Dam as authorized.

Second. Initial construction money has already been appropriated by the Congress and this money is being obligated by the Government at this time.

Third. In spite of the opposition from a handful of timber and paper mill interests, the overwhelming majority of the people in east Texas—representing industry, labor, small-business men, county and city officials, chambers of commerce and civic leaders throughout the area are solidly behind this effort to preserve the precious fresh water resources of our country.

In 1946 Congress appropriated money to begin work on the smaller reregulating dam after receiving assurances from the Lower Neches Valley Authority—a nontaxing, nonprofit, State agency—of local contributions totaling $5 million for the overall, authorized project. The smaller dam was completed in 1951 and the LNVA paid the Federal Government $2 million in cash. In the meantime, initial planning money for the larger, multipurpose dam had been appropriated.

The Neches-Angelina watershed is the sole fresh water supply of the giant petro-chemical industry in Jefferson County, Tex. We have five of the world's major oil refineries, synthetic rubber plants, and many other vital defense industries depending on a guaranteed annual supply of fresh water—and our defense program is depending on these industries being able to produce at full capacity at a moment's notice.

While we are considering this project, the low streamflows of the Neches and Angelina Rivers are allowing salt water to back upstream toward the water intakes of these refineries and the city of Port Arthur. If salt water reaches these intakes the entire production would be shut down. These refineries produce 700,000 barrels of oil per day and since the approval by Congress of initial construction money for McGee Bend Dam, $100 million in expansion of these industries has been authorized by their owners. And it is interesting to note that we pay $80 million per year in excise taxes on petroleum products alone in Jefferson County.

There is opposition to McGee Bend Dam from a handful of timber interests who would stifle and hamstring the future of a half million people in this great east Texas area. After 10 years of public hearings and study by Congress, the Bureau of the Budget and the Corps of Engineers, this tiny but powerful group has suddenly at this late date proposed an alternate plan for McGee Bend Dam that would reduce the size of the project and take the authorized powerplant completely out. This plan is strangely similar to one which the Public Works Committee held hearings on in 1954 and has already been set aside by the Corps of Engineers, set aside by the Bureau of the Budget, and set aside by the Congress.

While these powerful interests are attacking the inclusion of power in this authorized project, let's look briefly at the facts. The Federal Government has already received two bids for the electric power to be generated at McGee Bend Dam, each of which will more than pay for the incremental cost of installing a powerplant in the dam. If that is not a clear-cut case pointing out the need of additional electric power in east Texas, I would like to hear one. These people have their money on the line.

And I think it is only fair to bring to the attention of the House that both the REA co-ops and the private utilities in east Texas and southwest Louisiana are both cooperating in 100 percent support for McGee Bend Dam with power included.

I believe you would agree with me that it would be unthinkable to break faith with us in east Texas after beginning this vital project, having the reregulating dam already completed, and having appropriated initial construction money last year. The petro-chemical industries, side by side with the smaller communities upstream, are waiting for sufficient fresh water so the rich natural resources which surround them can be developed to their maximum degree. It takes 40,000 gallons of water to produce a ton of paper. It takes 18 barrels of fresh water to refine a barrel of oil. We must have more fresh water.

These communities, as they grow, need fresh water and electricity for their homes and businesses. If we fail to keep faith with these people now we will be locking the door on the future of 500,000 people living in the Second Congressional District.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation bill includes among the general construction items, as listed on page 13 of the committee report, the sum of $500,000 for construction on the Kalamazoo River flood-control project at Battle Creek, Mich.

This item, which has the approval of the Corps of Engineers and which was included in the President's budget, is the initial request for actual construction funds for a project which had its inception in 1947 with original authorization of engineering studies. The project itself was authorized by Congress in 1954 in substantial measure as a result of the efforts of my able and distinguished predecessor, the late Congressman Paul W. Shafer.

The project, involving a total estimated cost of $7,741,000, has a cost-benefit ratio of 1 to 1.53, and also an unusually high local participation of 40 percent. One striking evidence of the high degree of local interest and support is a recent outright gift to the city of Battle Creek by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation of $400,000 to permit expediting necessary land acquisitions for flood control. The city of Battle Creek last year also advanced $125,000 to the Corps of Engineers with the approval of the Secretary of the Army to make the definite project studies.

Besides assuring relief from a dangerous flood hazard in this major city in my district, this program—and the $500,000 appropriation included in this bill—triggers a $25 to $30 million master plan for Battle Creek, encompassing consolidation of two major railroads within the city, elimination of grade crossings, highway improvements and extension, slum clearance, and parking-area developments, all of which hold tremendous import for the future of this community.

I would be remiss were I to fail to acknowledge the excellent cooperation of the Department of the Army, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, and particularly the House Committees on Public Works and Appropriations in bringing this project to this present advanced stage. Particularly I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairmen of these two committees; to the ranking minority members of the committees, Mr. DONDERO and Mr. TABER; to Mr. MACK of Washington, former Public Works Subcommittee chairman; to Mr. RABAUT, present chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee; and to Mr. MARSHALL, of the same subcommittee; and to my colleague from Michigan, Mr. FORD, for this assistance and cooperation.

A genuinely bipartisan interest in the public welfare and in the benefits to be gained by this community and my district has made possible expediting this legislation for the protection and improvement of Battle Creek.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, construction of the important Warrior lock and dam, located in the district which I have the privilege to represent, was begun in the fall of 1954 with an initial appropriation of $1,800,000. Congress approved an additional $4,100,000 last year, and I am informed that construction is progressing on schedule. The Corps of Engineers has indicated that $4,580,000 will be required during the coming fiscal year if the lock is to be completed on schedule.

The Bureau of the Budget, the President, and the House Appropriations Committee have approved the $4,580,000, and that amount is included in the bill under consideration by the House of Representatives today.

The Warrior lock and dam is a modern navigation structure that will replace two 50-year-old installations which are now dilapidated, obsolete, and in danger of partial, if not complete, failure. In fact, the present structures are in such condition that they pose serious danger not only to navigation but to the safety of the persons operating towboats and barges on the river. The importance of completing the new structures at the earliest possible date cannot be overemphasized.

The great majority of the people of my district favor the construction of the Warrior lock and dam. The towboat and barge operators, as well as the shippers of commerce on the river, regard the completion of this installation as urgent. The people of the State as a whole recognize the need for it, and in their behalf I earnestly urge the members of this body to approve the full amount of $4,580,000, already in the bill under consideration, so that the orderly construction of the Warrior lock and dam may continue on schedule.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am particularly interested in this appropriation bill as it contains, among many other things, an item for general construction, under the Corps of Engineers, in the amount of $421,684,000. Within this figure, the committee has recommended the amount of $6 million for a channel-deepening project in the Delaware River, from Philadelphia to Trenton.

The district in Philadelphia which I represent borders on the Delaware River from South Street to Frankford Creek. This area is highly industrialized, but its further growth is stymied until an adequate waterway from Philadelphia to Trenton is a reality. Such development will mean more than prestige and monetary return to the city of Philadelphia. It will have far-reaching consequences which will affect the people of the whole country. Consider its strategic value as a bulwark of our national-security program. The tidal reach of the Delaware River at no point between Delaware City and Trenton is closer to the shore than 40 miles. Thus, it enjoys a nominal and natural security in the event of hostile action against our country. It provides a natural fortress for the loading of supplies and the embarkation of personnel. Our military and naval installations, including the Philadelphia Naval Base at the lower end of the Delaware, and the Frankford Arsenal toward the upper end, will be less accessible to enemy attack. Further, the Delaware Valley is centrally located within the northeast industrial quadrant, the vital heart of the Nation's productive capacity.

One of the most important results of this channel project will be an increase in employment. Many of my constituents reside along or near the waterfront and a great number of them make their livelihood in the shipping industry. At the present time, there are a great number of seamen in this area who cannot get employment. With the increase in foreign and domestic trade which is sure to follow the deepening of the channel in the Delaware River, these men will have much better opportunities for employment.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I note by the report that this bill includes $205,000 in planning money for the Carlyle, (Ill.) Reservoir. I am not opposing this appropriation as I feel that it is time to proceed on the Kaskaskia River Valley Basin as this is one of the most important rivers in the State of Illinois. Furthermore, I have no objection to the Carlyle Reservoir as such, but I do feel constrained to report to the House that the Corps of Engineers has been working on a supplemental survey report which is scheduled to be approved later this year. This report recommends that two reservoirs be constructed on the Kaskaskia River. One at Shelbyville, Ill., and the other at Carlyle, Ill. This report was referred to by General Hardin in the hearings when he said:

> Mr. Chairman, this project is associated with a review of the Kaskaskia Basin, and the Kaskaskia Basin report has not been completed.
>
> As an interim measure the Carlyle Reservoir, of course, being an adopted project and having planning funds on it, has been carefully reviewed in conjunction with the Kaskaskia Basin report, and some modifications in the Carlyle Reservoir have been felt to be advisable on account of the overall basin problems which this Kaskaskia report has made obvious.

I realize that the Shelbyville Reservoir cannot be included in an appropriation bill until it has been authorized by law, but I do believe it should be called to the attention of the committee at this time since it appears that the Shelbyville Reservoir will be more than justified by the Kaskaskia River Basin report.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this report by the Corps of Engineers is approved at an early date so that the authorization can be expanded to include authorization of a dam and reservoir on the Kaskaskia River at Shelbyville, Ill., in accordance with this report now being completed by the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to compliment the committee for their long and arduous work incident to the presentation of this bill and urge your approval of the appropriations herein for power, reclamation, flood control and flood relief projects that will, when achieved, undoubtedly promote the national welfare.

All of the items and provisions of this bill are, of course, important, and it would be indeed difficult to place one before another. However, the appropriations recommended under the civil functions section, which includes flood-control and flood-protection projects within my area and the Nation, are, in my judgment, of paramount value to the country.

Flood control and protection has, indeed, these past several years become one of our most pressing domestic problems, and the responsibility of the Federal Government to assist the various States and municipalities of the Nation in solving that problem is great. The imperative necessity of Federal legislation for assistance in flood control has been projected to the height of national and congressional consciousness because of the extraordinary and unfortunate rapidity with which the ruinous visitations of the wildest elements of nature have followed one upon another throughout the country and particularly in New England.

Right here I would like to take but a moment to most sincerely thank the chairman and members of the committee, on behalf of my own people and I am sure the people of the country, for devoting so much of personal and committee time, well beyond the usual hours, to patiently and earnestly study this flood disaster subject in order to conscientiously recommend the appropriation of sufficient Federal money to grant financial help where it is most needed. It is a trying and difficult job as we, your colleagues, well know, and you have been and are now discharging your obligation in an inspiring manner.

You and I, and all our colleagues here, are, of course, sympathetic with the representatives and to the people of all sections of the country whose homes and industries, and in too many tragic instances lives, have been lost through the sudden eruption of uncontrolled natural elements. Quite naturally and humanly, we are, of course, primarily concerned with the problems and difficulties following these disasters within our own areas and States. Within these past 3 years Massachusetts and New England have been visited in quick succession with an unprecedented series of unparalleled

natural disasters. First it was tornadoes, after which came hurricanes, then raging floods, and finally, 3 of the greatest blizzards in our history within 10 days. Hundreds of families lost loved ones, many businesses were almost wholly wiped out, and thousands of persons thrown out of work for periods of several months. In our area we suffered most particularly and severely from the raging floods. The people and the businesses in the area of my home city of Worcester, Mass., underwent tremendous personal hardships and great financial losses because of the repeated floodings and inadequate control barriers during extraordinarily heavy rainfall and excessive downward flow from upland rivers.

It is most encouraging and heartening, then, to these American taxpayers to realize that some steps are being initiated by the Federal Government to assist them in the construction of projects designed to prevent such terrible disasters from again happening.

In my particular city, the most efficient Corps of Engineers had long recognized the vital necessity of a flood-protection tunnel and they recommended the participation of the Federal Government in the achievement of such a project for local protection. Last January 18 I appeared before the committee to present a detailed explanation of the need and urgency of this particular project for the safety of the people of my city and area, and there was then approved in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill a sum of $60,000 to permit the Army Corps of Engineers to complete their resurvey of this Worcester diversionary tunnel flood-control project. I am not, of course, going to repetitiously recite these details again or unnecessarily intrude upon the time of this House, as all my testimony is contained in the printed hearings, available to you and, of course, to the committee.

It was a matter of modest personal gratification to me that the committee approved the initial resurvey sum and further recommended in this present bill the additional sum of $840,000 to begin construction of the tunnel in this next fiscal year. The engineers testified that this project is of superior justification economically because the benefits that will derive are far greater than the cost and the ratio of annual benefit to annual cost is high above the average that is required. That is the criterion that has been aplied by the committee as the basis for recommending the projects contained in this bill, and that is why I earnestly urge the unanimous approval of the bill by this House so that projects of imperative importance, such as the Worcester diversionary tunnel in my area, and similar projects throughout the country, may soon have a beginning, primarily in protection of the lives of American citizens.

To extend Federal aid in this manner for this purpose is not contrary to any congressional tradition or precedent. In my sincere judgment, the whole history of congressional action in relation to water control and waterpower impressively reveals the continuing legislative conviction and intent that our water resources should be developed and controlled in a manner to assure their greatest contribution to the national economic growth, strength, and general welfare.

In pursuit of that policy and intent the Congress has repeatedly demonstrated their belief that in any regional water-control problem the Federal Government should assume a major share of responsibility when Federal participation is necessary to safeguard the national interest or to accomplish broad regional objectives of national import, where projects, because of size, complexity, or potential multiple benefits, are beyond the means of local communities and private enterprise. Within these principles of Federal Government activity, I believe the great regional New England and national water-control problem lies; and the Federal Government must, with promptness, assume their moral, patriotic, and financial obligation in granting assistance for the solution of the problem.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress has granted in the past and will soon be called upon again to consider the granting of billions of dollars to assist and encourage the desperate people in foreign lands all over the world. Such reasonable and controlled assistance is certainly a Christian gesture, and in accord with what the American taxpayer can reasonably afford, it is at least a gamble on the side of the Almighty.

However, I submit that the willing, patriotic and burdened taxpayers of our own country have a prior and predominant claim on the resources of this Government, and it will be a national disgrace if the imperative and immediate needs for construction of such flood control projects as the Worcester, Mass., tunnel and other projects throughout New England and the Nation are not provided for through adequate Federal assistance and participation before such disaster strikes again. For the saving of countless American lives, for the prevention of untold economic loss, for the certain promotion of the national welfare, I earnestly urge the adoption and approval of this bill without further delay.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to include as part of my remarks on the pending legislation the statement I prepared for the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Civil Functions of the Army during hearings conducted on flood-control projects:

STATEMENT OF HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS BEFORE THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL FUNCTIONS OF THE ARMY

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen; you have already received the necessary factual information concerning the flood control needs in my congressional district. The purpose of my statement is to emphasize the fact that this fast growing area needs special attention at this time. I particularly wish to emphasize the West Covina situation where recent heavy rains cause considerable hardship on thousands of new residents of that area. I wish to include a resolution passed by the West Covina City Council in this regard. The resolution is attached.

I urge that this committee visit my congressional district and survey the flood hazards in person. It is difficult for those in other parts of the country to realize what tremendous growth has taken place in the eastern section of Los Angeles County. I am convinced that if the members of this committee could see the need at first hand, quick approval for full and complete flood protection would be authorized.

I wish to thank the committee for the assistance you have given the people of my congressional district in the past, particularly in the completion of San Antonio and Whittier Narrows Dams. These dams, together with flood control channels now under construction, will help to make it possible for nearly 500,000 people in California's 25th Congressional District to live, work and plan their futures without fear of disastrous floods.

"Resolution No. 750

"Resolution of the City Council of the City of West Covina, county of Los Angeles, State of California, requesting the Congress of the United States to budget the necessary funds for the immediate construction of Walnut Creek system of the comprehensive plan for control and conservation of floodwaters in the said county of Los Angeles, Calif.

"The City Council of the City of West Covina does resolve as follows:

"'SECTION 1—

"'Whereas the cities of the East San Gabriel Valley and various interested civic groups have studied the comprehensive plan for the control and conservation of floodwaters in the county of Los Angeles, State of California; and

"'Whereas the Whittier Narrows Reservoir Basin will be completed this year; and

"'Whereas the entire East San Gabriel Valley is now developing as a metropolitan community at a phenomenal rate; and

"'Whereas the present washes are entirely inadequate to discharge the runoff from capital storms and are thus endangering human lives and property; and

"'Whereas a comprehensive plan for control and conservation of floodwaters for the county of Los Angeles was approved and authorized by the Congress of the United States in 1941; and

"'Whereas the Walnut Creek system is a portion of said comprehensive plan and the early improvement thereof is vital to the safety of the East San Gabriel Valley: Now, therefore, be it

"'*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully requested to appropriate the necessary funds for the construction of the Walnut Creek system of said comprehensive plan at the next regular session of said Congress.

"'SEC. 2. The city clerk shall certify to the adoption of this resolution."

"I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted at an adjourned regular meeting of the City Council of the City of West Covina, held on the 5th day of July 1955, by the affirmative vote of at least three councilmen, to wit:

"Ayes: Councilmen Kay, Van Horn, Brown, Sperline.

"Noes: None.

"Absent: Mayor Hurst.

"ROBERT FLOTTEN,
'City Clerk of the City of West Covina.

"Signed and approved this 5th day of July 1955.

"JOE HURST,
"Mayor of the City of West Covina.

"Attest:

"ROBERT FLOTTEN, *City Clerk.*"

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be

agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the Chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Abernethy amendment on page 15, line 16; and I ask for a separate vote on the Boggs amendment, page 16, line 4.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABERNETHY: On page 15, line 16, strike out "$7,962,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,122,000."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 179, nays 170, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

YEAS—179

Abbitt	Chelf	Friedel
Abernethy	Chudoff	Garmatz
Addonizio	Clark	Gary
Albert	Colmer	Gathings
Alexander	Cooper	Gordon
Andrews	Davis, Ga.	Grant
Anfuso	Davis, Tenn.	Gray
Ashley	Delaney	Green, Oreg.
Ashmore	Dempsey	Griffiths
Aspinall	Denton	Hagen
Bailey	Dies	Hardy
Baldwin	Dodd	Harris
Barrett	Dollinger	Harrison, Va.
Bass, Tenn.	Donohue	Hays, Ark.
Bennett, Fla.	Dorn, S. C.	Hayworth
Blatnik	Dowdy	Healey
Blitch	Edmondson	Hébert
Boggs	Elliott	Herlong
Bolling	Evins	Holifield
Bonner	Fallon	Holland
Boykin	Feighan	Holtzman
Boyle	Fernandez	Huddleston
Brooks, La.	Fisher	Hull
Brooks, Tex.	Flood	Ikard
Brown, Ga.	Flynt	Jarman
Burleson	Fogarty	Jennings
Burnside	Forand	Johnson, Wis.
Byrne, Pa.	Forrester	Jones, Ala.
Cannon	Fountain	Jones, Mo.
Carnahan	Frazier	Karsten
Kee	Murray, Ill.	Rogers, Tex.
Kelley, Pa.	Murray, Tenn.	Rooney
Kelly, N. Y.	Natcher	Rutherford
Keogh	Norrell	Selden
Kilday	O'Brien, Ill.	Shelley
Kilgore	O'Brien, N. Y.	Sisk
King, Calif.	O'Hara, Ill.	Smith, Miss.
Kirwan	O'Neill	Smith, Va.
Klein	Perkins	Spence
Kluczynski	Pfost	Staggers
Knutson	Philbin	Sullivan
Lanham	Pilcher	Thomas
Lankford	Poage	Thompson, N. J.
Lesinski	Polk	Thompson, Tex.
Long	Powell	Trimble
McCormack	Preston	Tuck
McDowell	Price	Tumulty
McMillan	Priest	Udall
Machrowicz	Rabaut	Vanik
Mack, Ill.	Rains	Walter
Madden	Reuss	Whitten
Magnuson	Rhodes, Pa.	Wickersham
Mahon	Richards	Wier
Metcalf	Riley	Williams, Miss.
Mills	Rivers	Williams, N. J.
Mollohan	Roberts	Willis
Morgan	Robeson, Va.	Yates
Moss	Rodino	Zablocki
Moulder	Rogers, Colo.	Zelenko
Multer	Rogers, Fla.	

NAYS—170

Alger	Fenton	Nicholson
Allen, Ill.	Ford	Norblad
Andersen, H. Carl	Fulton	O'Konski
	Gavin	Ostertag
Andresen, August H.	Gentry	Patterson
	George	Pelly
Auchincloss	Gross	Phillips
Avery	Hale	Pillion
Ayres	Halleck	Poff
Baker	Hand	Prouty
Bass, N. H.	Harden	Radwan
Bates	Harrison, Nebr.	Ray
Baumhart	Harvey	Reece, Tenn.
Beamer	Heselton	Reed, N. Y.
Becker	Hess	Rees, Kans.
Belcher	Hiestand	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bennett, Mich.	Hill	Riehlman
Bentley	Hillings	Rogers, Mass.
Betts	Hinshaw	Sadlak
Boland	Hoeven	St. George
Bolton, Frances P.	Holmes	Saylor
	Horan	Schenck
Bosch	Hosmer	Schwengel
Bow	Hyde	Scott
Bray	Jackson	Scrivner
Brown, Ohio	James	Seely-Brown
Brownson	Jenkins	Short
Broyhill	Jensen	Siler
Budge	Johansen	Simpson, Ill.
Burdick	Jones, N. C.	Simpson, Pa.
Bush	Kean	Smith, Kans.
Byrnes, Wis.	Kearney	Smith, Wis.
Canfield	Keating	Springer
Carrigg	Kilburn	Taber
Cederberg	King, Pa.	Talle
Chase	Knox	Taylor
Chenoweth	Krueger	Teague, Calif.
Chiperfield	Laird	Thompson, Mich.
Church	Latham	
Clevenger	LeCompte	Thomson, Wyo.
Cole	Lipscomb	Tollefson
Coon	Lovre	Utt
Corbett	McConnell	Van Pelt
Coudert	McCulloch	Van Zandt
Cramer	McDonough	Vorys
Cretella	McGregor	Vursell
Cunningham	McIntire	Wainwright
Curtis, Mass.	McVey	Weaver
Curtis, Mo.	Marshall	Wharton
Dague	Martin	Widnall
Davis, Wis.	Meader	Wigglesworth
Dawson, Utah	Merrow	Williams, N. Y.
Derounian	Miller, Md.	Wilson, Ind.
Devereux	Miller, Nebr.	Withrow
Dixon	Miller, N. Y.	Wolcott
Dondero	Minshall	Wolverton
Dorn, N. Y.	Morano	Young
Ellsworth	Mumma	Younger

NOT VOTING—84

Adair	Chatham	Eberharter
Allen, Calif.	Christopher	Engle
Arends	Cooley	Fascell
Barden	Crumpacker	Fino
Bell	Davidson	Fjare
Berry	Dawson, Ill.	Frelinghuysen
Bolton, Oliver P.	Deane	Gamble
	Diggs	Granahan
Bowler	Dingell	Green, Pa.
Buckley	Dolliver	Gregory
Byrd	Donovan	Gubser
Carlyle	Doyle	Gwinn
Celler	Durham	Haley
Hays, Ohio	Mason	Shuford
Henderson	Matthews	Sieminski
Hoffman, Ill.	Miller, Calif.	Sikes
Hoffman, Mich.	Morrison	Steed
Holt	Nelson	Teague, Tex.
Hope	O'Hara, Minn.	Thompson, La.
Johnson, Calif.	Osmers	Thornberry
Jonas	Passman	Velde
Judd	Patman	Vinson
Kearns	Quigley	Watts
Landrum	Robsion, Ky.	Westland
Lane	Roosevelt	Wilson, Calif.
McCarthy	Scherer	Winstead
Macdonald	Scudder	Wright
Mack, Wash.	Sheehan	
Mailliard	Sheppard	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Winstead for, with Mr. Arends against.

Mr. Landrum for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Fascell for with Mr. Kearns against.

Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Fjare against.

Mr. Durham for, with Mr. Dolliver against.

Mr. Cooley for, with Mr. Sheehan against.

Mr. Barden for, with Mr. Johnson of California against.

Mr. Deane for, with Mr. Adair against.

Mr. Carlyle for, with Mr. Henderson against.

Mr. Shuford for, with Mr. Mason against.

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Osmers against.

Mr. Gregory for, with Mr. Frelinghuysen against.

Mr. Watts for, with Mr. Gwinn against.

Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Allen of California against.

Mr. Engle for, with Mr. Scherer against.

Mr. Hays of Ohio for, with Mr. Westland against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Mailliard against.

Mr. Doyle for, with Mr. Mack of Washington against.

Mr. Granahan for, with Mr. Fino against.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Gamble against.

Mr. McCarthy for, with Mr. Holt against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Judd against.

Mr. Byrd for, with Mr. Berry against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Velde against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Wilson of California against.

Mr. Bowler for, with Mr. Hope against.

Mr. Haley for, with Mr. Gubser against.

Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. Crumpacker against.

Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton against.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Nelson against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Scudder against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Passman with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Quigley with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.

Mr. Davidson with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Jonas.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ALBERT, Mr. MAHON, and Mr. O'HARA of Illinois changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 16, line 4, strike out "$421,734,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$422,034,000 of which $300,000 shall be for the project Missouri River-Gulf Outlet, Louisiana."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 174, noes 148.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations for more careful and responsible consideration.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill just passed may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10875) entitled "An act to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956."

A DAY OF DESTINY

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, today is a day of destiny for the people of Oklahoma and Arkansas.

Today, the House has reaffirmed the faith which it expressed last year in the great multipurpose plan for development and navigation of the Arkansas River.

For the first time during my service in the House, the great House Committee on Appropriations has initiated appropriations for three major projects in this plan: Oologah Dam, on the Verdigris River, Eufaula Dam, on the Canadian River, and Dardanelle Dam, on the Arkansas River.

Although the funds provided for each of these projects are modest and below requests of the Army engineers, they serve the significant purpose of continuing construction—and they provide an unmistakable green light by this body to the Army engineers, to go ahead with the great plan for the Arkansas Valley which has been authorized since 1946.

Although the overall cost of this program is substantial, its benefits are likewise substantial, from the national point of view.

Engineering estimates in 1955 have placed the annual benefits of the multipurpose program at more than $60 million. Estimated annual tonnage is in excess of 13 million tons, and there are great resources of coal, oil and other minerals awaiting development when the benefits of water freight become available.

There has been some comment today on the floor about the difference between navigation development on so-called "main stems" and "lesser streams."

Let no one question the right of the Arkansas River to classification as a "main stem." It is the greatest undeveloped water artery in the United States, and is recognized as such by the Mississippi Valley Association.

The estimated future tonnage of 13,000,000 tons annually compares very favorably with the 1980 estimate for the Missouri River, of 5,000,000 tons. Yet the projected cost of the Arkansas River multipurpose plan is only a small fraction of the overall cost scheduled for the Missouri River in future years.

During the 19th century the Arkansas River was a great channel of trade and commerce for our Nation, and under this plan it will become an even greater channel in the future.

Nor should the other great benefits of the program be overlooked.

In flood control alone, the program has great significance for 4,000,000 people in 2 States, who have suffered multimillion dollar floods in 21 of the last 35 years. We are going to reduce that damage substantially under this program.

We are going to provide water conservation, and a great and stable supply of water for municipal, industrial and irrigation use—in a valley where annual water waste has been calculated to cost as much as $80,000,000.

We are going to provide opportunities for recreation, and for industrial growth, the benefits of which are impossible to calculate, but which assuredly mean the dawning of a new day in the valley of the Arkansas.

On behalf of the people of Oklahoma, who have long assisted in bearing the great burden of navigation and multipurpose plans in other parts of our country, I want to express my deep appreciation to the Committee on Appropriations for its recognition and endorsement of the Arkansas Basin program.

We are also deeply grateful to the Army engineers, whose careful restudy of the Arkansas program led to its renewed justification last year, and whose capable officers will direct the building of these great projects.

Finally, I want to express my heartfelt appreciation and gratitude to the Members of this House, for generously and fairly responding to our plea for justice in the Arkansas Basin.

With your help, we thus embark on our great undertaking, with confidence that the entire Nation will rejoice in our progress and share in the benefits of basin development under the sound plan of the Army engineers.

Once again, we extend our thanks to the farsighted Members of this House, and to the Divine Providence guiding all our thoughts and actions, for this day of destiny in the Arkansas River Valley.

RABBI BERMAN'S 30TH ANNIVERSARY IN THE RABBINATE

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday in the city of Chicago at a great banquet in the grand ballroom of the Standard Club Rabbi Morton M. Berman will be honored on the occasion of his 30th anniversary in the rabbinate. It will be my privilege and my honor to be present on that memorable occasion. Rabbi Berman, whose fame is international and who is held in warmest affection among the people of Chicago of all faiths, is one of my most distinguished constituents.

I am extending my remarks to include an article in the Chicago Sun-Times of May 21, 1956, entitled "Looking Back 30 Years, Rabbi Berman See Peace Ahead," which I am sure all my colleagues will wish to read. The article follows:

LOOKING BACK 30 YEARS, RABBI BERMAN SEES PEACE AHEAD

(By Hoke Norris)

The ancestors of the salami man of Okinawa are buried on the Mount of Olives, a quarter of a mile from the Garden of Gethsemane.

He's now the rabbi of Temple Isaiah Israel, 1100 East Hyde Park, and holds office or membership in 19 religious and civic organizations and is a past officer or member of 18.

At 56 he's a slim, vigorous, graying, 5-foot-7, 160-pound lieutenant commander in the Navy Reserve, and he's about to celebrate his 30th year as a rabbi.

Such is the mixture that makes up Rabbi Morton M. Berman, the descendant of many rabbis and Chicago's most active and articulate advocate of that Jewish homeland, Israel.

"Where do we start?" he asks a visitor bent on learning something about the man and his work.

USES THIRD PERSON

At the beginning, the rabbi then suggests, and talks and paces for an hour or more, often lapsing into the third person, as if dictating a biography of somebody else.

"Rabbi Berman commented that his most enthusiastic recipients of kosher salami and gefüllte fish on Okinawa were the non-Jewish men."

Very well, then, at the beginning:

He was born in Baltimore, August 23, 1899. His great-grandfather was Rabbi Wolf Samuelson, of Kovno, Lithuania, and there'd always been a rabbi in the house as far back as the great-grandparents' memory and family stories reached into the past.

ANCESTRY TRACED

Rabbi Samuelson had two daughters. Rachel married Rabbi Zvi Hirsch Berman, a native of Volozhin, Lithuania, later rabbi of the Pratt St. Synagog, Baltimore. They had a son, Morris Berman. The other daughter, Bertha, married Rabbi Jacob Aban Frommer, who had served in Riga, Latvia, and later in New Haven, Conn. He had a daughter, Rose Mary.

Morris and Rose Mary were married. They had 5 children, of whom 2, including Morton, became rabbis. Morris Berman is now a retired businessman.

The five children were raised in New Haven. Young Morton went to Yale University on a scholarship, graduating Phi Beta Kappa with his class in 1921 despite 1 year as a private in the Student Army Training Corps during World War I.

ATTENDED SEMINARY

He spent an unhappy year at the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York (it lacked, he has said, "any clear direction in its program"). Next, he came under the influence of a man who was profoundly to influence the rest of his life.

Dr. Stephen S. Wise, the great Zionist leader, had just founded the Jewish Institute of Religion. Morton Berman was graduated in its first class, 1926, and was ordained a rabbi. As the recipient of the institute's Guggenheimer Fellowship, he studied in Germany and France and at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

He became rabbi of Temple Emanuel in Davenport, Iowa, serving until 1929. He returned then to Rabbi Wise, first as a director of the institute's field activities, later as assistant rabbi at the Free Synagog.

Hitler was rising in Germany, and would slaughter 6 million Jews before his death. Rabbi Berman helped organize the great anti-Nazi protest meetings and parades in New York.

RECALLS EUROPE TRIP

In 1938 he went to Europe on behalf of the joint distribution committee (now part of the United Jewish Appeal). He also visited Russia. "I came away," he said, "sick at heart as I saw the rapid disappearance of Jewish communal and religious life in that land."

But he had been able to visit the old Lithuanian and Latvian synagogs where his grandfathers had been rabbis. And he went to Palestine. Arab riots had been renewed, and he was prevented from visiting the family graves on the Mount of Olives.

Great-grandfather and great-grandmother Samuelson were buried there, in a family plot, just north of the old city, and so were their ancestors and their two daughters and their rabbi husbands.

Again in 1948 and once more last summer, Rabbi Berman was unable to view the graves when he went back to what had become Israel. In 1948 the land was already occupied by Jordan Arabs, and by last summer it had become part of the Jordan kingdom.

CONFIDENT OF PEACE

"My sense of attachment," the rabbi says, "is not just to the State of Israel but is enriched with deep personal ties and associations. * * * Some day, I hope—I am confident—that peace will come between Jordan and Israel and I may be able to make that pilgrimage."

In 1939 he got out of Europe just as the war began, and in May 1943, he became a Navy lieutenant. Eventually he was assigned as a chaplain to the 6th Marine Division, and earned one of his many titles.

He had landed with the troops on Okinawa on April 1, 1945, aged 45—one of the oldest chaplains in the Pacific. In his jeep he carried the Bible of his religion and the kosher salami and gefüllte fish that were gifts from the National Jewish Welfare Board.

In June 1945, Herman Kogan, then a Marine Corps correspondent, now Sun-Times book and drama critic, reported Rabbi Berman's words:

"You've no idea how kosher salami boosts morale, whether the boy who eats it is named Kinkelstein or Riley."

WINS BRONZE STAR

The rabbi was decorated with the Bronze Star on Okinawa. "Often under fire and always an example to the men with whom he came in contact," read the citation, "Chaplain Berman's conduct was in keeping with Army traditions."

Later he went with the 6th Marine Division to Tsingtao, China. He helped reestablish the Jewish community there and provide it with a synagog. Until the Communists occupied the city, he often heard from the friends he had made there.

Rabbi Berman had come in 1937 to Temple Isiah Israel then 85 years old. There he returned after the war, active again in Zionist, welfare and civic affairs.

FATHER OF THREE

His first wife, Grayce Sunshine Hoffeimer Berman, of Richmond, Va., died in 1949, They had one son, John Simon, whose first child, Ronald, is now 2 years old.

In 1950 Rabbi Berman married Elaine Ruth Siegel Levy, and they have a son, 2, and a daughter, 4.

At his synagog, next Friday night, a special service will celebrate his 30th anniversary in the rabbinate. Sunday night he will be the guest of honor at a banquet in the Standard Club.

Then he'll go to St. Louis for 2 weeks of active duty in the Navy.

"I'll tell the story of religion in the Armed Forces," he says. "I'll speak to university, civic, and religious groups to help parents and young people appreciate what the chaplaincy can do and is doing to serve our military youth."

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, shortly we will have before us the proposed 1957 mutual security program to continue our military and economic aid to friendly, free governments.

In considering our efforts to assist friendly, foreign nations, and particularly the underdeveloped areas, to strengthen and stabilize their economies to enable them more effectively to resist aggression, we should not overlook the role of private capital investment overseas. This thought is very well expressed in an editorial appearing in the April 1956 issue of Fortune entitled "The American Game."

In appraising the economic contest between Russia and America in promoting trade, capital investment, and technical assistance in underdeveloped regions of the world, this editorial says:

The fact is, however, that Government aid, while having a place in the American response to Moscow, is a side show, not the main show. The real source of America's strength lies in its own flexible and dynamic system of private enterprise, and in the projection of that system abroad. What is needed is not another Government plan, by which the Soviets set so much store, but rather a foreign economic policy that will enlist the support of the American people and capitalize on American assets.

Mr. Speaker, I expressed much the same thought in a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives entitled "An Affirmative American Foreign Policy"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 3, pages 4209–4214. I then urged that a commission be created with the sole task of identifying artificial barriers to trade and investment abroad and recommending specific measures for eliminating or minimizing those barriers. That problem has not been solved, and the need for a thorough-going study of the character I recommended is as great, if not greater, today than it was then.

Nevertheless, as the Fortune editorial points out, great strides have been made by American private capital in overseas investments since the end of World War II notwithstanding the fact that our Government has not done all it could to create a climate favorable to the investment of private capital overseas, particularly in underdeveloped areas. At the end of World War II, the overseas investment of private capital was about $13½ billion, whereas by 1955 it had reached $26 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to direct the thinking of leaders both in Congress and in the administration to the great potential contribution which private American citizens and United States business can make toward assisting friendly, free countries through private enterprise principles, to develop their resources, to enhance their economic strength and stability and to improve the standard of living of their citizens.

I hope all Members of the Congress will take the time to read the Fortune editorial which I incorporate at this point in my remarks.

THE AMERICAN GAME

Can Stalingrad turn out better and cheaper tractors than Peoria, Ill.? Can Leningrad do a faster and more efficient job of building electric turbines than Schenectady? "Yes," the Russians seem to be saying, as they push forward their much-publicized economic offensive. In their loud offers of trade, capital, and technical assistance to the underdeveloped regions of the world, the Russians, as Secretary Dulles recently put it, seem to be playing the American game. And, added Mr. Dulles significantly, "If we cannot beat them at our own game we ought to be ashamed of ourselves."

We should indeed. Unfortunately neither Mr. Dulles nor other spokesmen for the administration have been too clear as to what the American game is or should be. Nor have the Democrats, who have gone into a

great election-year flip over recent Soviet maneuvers. As a result, most United States discussion of how to meet the new Russian line has centered on the somewhat tired topic of United States foreign aid. The administration believes such aid should be made more flexible (to back projects like the Aswan Dam in Egypt) but should be held to about $4.3 billion in the fiscal year of 1957. Chester Bowles, however, wants a new Marshall plan for Asia. And only the other day former Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., turned up in India advocating an immediate $500 million loan to that country.

Mr. Morgenthau is not usually a fountainhead of wisdom, but in one sense he has a point. If the real answer to the Soviet offensive were simply the pouring out of Government money, then the present aid program would indeed be small for a $400 billion economy. The fact is, however, that Government aid, while having a place in the American response to Moscow, is a side show, not the main show. The real source of America's strength lies in its own flexible and dynamic system of private enterprise, and in the projection of that system abroad. What is needed is not another Government plan, by which the Soviets set so much store, but rather a foreign economic policy that will enlist the support of the American people and capitalize on American assets.

O. K., LET'S TRADE

Those assets are already considerable. In his speech to the 20th Communist Party Congress 6 weeks ago, which touched off the current debate on United States foreign policy, Mr. Khrushchev proposed the slogan: "Let us trade." As it happens, the United States does do some trading and that on a considerable scale. In 1955 commercial exports of United States goods and services ran to $19.6 billion, or about 4½ times prewar levels, and imports ran to $17.6 billion. The famous dollar shortage, which so troubled monetary experts after World War II, has to all intents and purposes disappeared; European nations have been accumulating gold and exchange; and world commerce has been rapidly gaining ground. Total world exports outside the Soviet bloc ran last year to about $80 billion, and on the basis of present trends could reach $150 billion in the next 25 years. While no reliable figures exist for Russia's trade with its satellites, the total of Communist exports to the outside world ran in 1954 to only $1.5 billion. It will always be possible for Moscow to engineer highly publicized deals, but such deals are no substitute for a true multilateral system of exchange wherein individuals and corporations expand their own markets.

The main drive of American policy, therefore, should continue to be the reduction of trade barriers, elimination of quotas, and the further promotion of currency convertibility. Such convertibility would not only free up the channels of trade but accelerate capital investment, which is the true key to raising the productivity of other nations. Here again the United States and the West have an advantage that is all too easily overlooked. Of a promised $500 million of economic credits and grants to outside countries, the Communists have thus far delivered only about $23 million in aid. But year in year out United States business invests between $1 billion and $2 billion abroad. And at the end of 1955 its total long-term commitments overseas stood at nearly $26 billion.

Through such investment the American oilman has transformed Venezuela and Saudi Arabia. The steel industry has tapped the iron-ore reserves of South America and Labrador. On the completion of present expansion programs General Motors and Ford will have poured over $1 billion into foreign plants since World War II. And in addition to these major moves, thousands of smaller ones are swelling the stream. Thus Caterpillar Tractor is currently building one of the largest plants in Scotland. Pfizer has spent $30 million in the past 5 years, notably in England and France. The Container Corp. is making a $6-million bid in Germany. Borden Co. recently announced it will build a $3,500,000 methanol plant in Brazil, and B. F. Goodrich International is spending some $6 million in the Philippines.

TIMID DOLLARS?

It is true, of course, that American private long-term investment tends to go where the going is safest, and that some 80 percent of such investment is concentrated in Canada, South America, and Western Europe. Except in oil, private commitments tend to be small in the Middle East, and Far East, where communism is making its most vocal bid. But this fact scarcely argues for pouring Government funds into those areas without seeking to deal with the fundamental causes that impede normal capital flow. These are political instability, a disregard for sound money, and, in the case of India, laws that make private investment subject to confiscation at the whim of the state.

In these underdeveloped and undercapitalized countries, the American answer should be a determined campaign, pressed by diplomatic means, to create a more receptive climate for free enterprise. In support of such a campaign the United States can rely on at least two instrumentalities that have proved their worth. One is the Export-Import Bank, which has helped in capital development chiefly in Latin America. The second agency is the World Bank, which, through loans now amounting to $2.5 billion, has helped set in motion projects worth over $5.5 billion. Thus by lending $10 million to the Industrial Credit & Investment Corp. in India, the bank has sparked a $35 million undertaking. Its loan of $16 million to the Tata Hydro-Electric Power Supply Co. is building a $27,500,000 electric-power installation. And it is now considering a further loan to the Tata Iron & Steel Co. for a new mill at Jamshedpur. This kind of lending involves intergovernmental negotiation, but it works within the framework of accepted business procedure. And precisely because the World Bank has stuck to hardheaded business rules, it now finds itself in the enviable position of being able to float its own bonds in world markets. Thus it acts as a kind of bridge between capitalism and countries that are unwilling or unable to open their doors wide to the private entrepreneur. Such a bridge is well worth maintaining so long as it is viewed as a means of inducing normal capital development rather than as a substitute for it.

AID VERSUS POLICY

Once due emphasis has been placed on what the United States is already doing abroad, the question of further Government aid falls into perspective. In the present fiscal year the United States is giving other nations some $2.4 billion for arms and $1.7 billion for economic assistance. Much of this economic aid is really military in character since it goes to countries like South Korea, Formosa, South Vietnam, and Turkey, which are maintaining relatively large armies in the field. Such countries clearly need and deserve United States help since they are holding a line against Communist advance that would otherwise have to be held by United States troops or given up entirely; and the support of such armies is something that cannot be done by private means and must be done by governments. Likewise justified are expenditures for technical assistance, which has proved itself one of the more successful of Washington's ventures.

Far more debatable are proposals for greatly enlarging the scope of direct government grants for development purposes. Irrigation projects, harbors, and roads can contribute to a backward country's advance, but there are limits to what can be absorbed, and the conditions laid down are all-important. The building of the Aswan Dam across the Nile will benefit Egypt only if inflationary forces are held in check (see Business Globe, p. 78) and certainly United States funds for such undertakings will be dissipated unless other means of financing—public and private—take hold. Indeed, to call what the Government grants in these cases "seed money" is in a way an inversion of terms. For the true seed money of economic advance is not what governments do but rather what private individuals are allowed to do for themselves.

Economic aid, in short, makes sense only within the framework of a much larger policy. Such policy should be to project outward the principles that have built this country from a struggling colonial dependency to the world's foremost power. Those principles are in the first instance moral and political, and are rooted in a deep attachment to freedom and justice. But the necessary corollary to political freedom is economic freedom as opposed to State-imposed controls, and the necessary corollary to justice is respect for private property and the sanctity of contract. In an age of central planning it is not easy to reassert these truths, but unless they are reasserted the inherent power of the United States will never be harnessed to the task that now faces the country. Communism comes before the world with vast promises of economic betterment, which in the end turn out to be an invitation to tyranny. The American mission is to demonstrate by deed as well as word that there is an alternative to this subversion of all human values. The mission will be fulfilled as donation diplomacy gives way to adherence to the basic political and economic philosophy that animates our own flexible and humane society.

DEPENDENTS' MEDICAL CARE ACT

Mr. KILDAY submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 9429) to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

ADJUDICATION OF CERTAIN CLAIMS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. FRAZIER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5862) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees.

MASS TRANSPORTATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 3073) to provide for an adequate and economically sound transportation system or systems to serve the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause]. The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HARRIS, WILLIAMS of Mississippi, MACK of Illinois, ROGERS of Texas, WOLVERTON, HINSHAW, and DOLLIVER.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF SEDGWICK COUNTY, KANS.—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 410)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning without my approval H. R. 1835, for the relief of the Board of Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans.

This bill would have the United States accept as a binding obligation and agree to pay to Sedgwick County, Kans., $259,925.09 as the unpaid balance of taxes for the tax year 1947 against certain real property formerly owned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This payment is contingent upon enactment by the Kansas Legislature of a law authorizing and directing acceptance of this amount as payment in full and as a release and forgiveness of all interest, penalties, liens, and charges connected with the taxes.

The property in question was acquired in 1942 by the Defense Plants Corporation, a wholly owned subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Effective July 1, 1945, the Defense Plants Corporation was liquidated, and the property involved was transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Subsequently, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation declared the property surplus, and on April 16, 1947, the War Assets Administration accepted responsibility and authority for the property. On February 25, 1948, the War Assets Administrator, acting on behalf of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, deeded the property to the United States, and custody and accountability was thereupon transferred to the Department of the Air Force, which has retained jurisdiction ever since.

The Federal Government is constitutionally immune from taxation by States upon property owned by the United States. The Congress may waive that immunity, and by general legislation it did so on real property of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. With respect to the property involved here, however, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation took the position that the laws of Kansas themselves exempted the property from taxation. To settle this and other issues, the Congress enacted Public Law 5, 82d Congress, which gave the Court of Claims jurisdiction to determine the claim of Sedgwick County for taxes on this property for the tax years 1944, 1945, 1946, and 1947. Under this authority the Court of Claims, by decision dated July 15, 1952, determined that there was liability for taxes for the years 1944, 1945, and 1946, but not for the year 1947. The court considered separately the question of taxes for the year 1947. It concluded, in reliance upon decisions of the Kansas Supreme Court, that there was no 1947 tax due prior to the effective date of levy, which under the law then applicable was November 1. Since the transfer from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the War Assets Administration took place in April, no tax could become due for 1947 because the constitutional immunity had revived upon the date of the transfer, April 16.

The transfer of the property from the War Assets Administration to the Department of the Air Force in February 1948 has continued the tax immunity. However, as an interim measure, the Congress last year enacted legislation (Public Law 388, 84th Cong., approved August 12, 1955) which is designed specifically to furnish temporary relief for the calendar years 1955 through 1958 for taxing authorities which have suffered an unexpected loss of revenue as a result of the Court of Claims decision in the Sedgwick County case. The Government is now making payments under that legislation, and I am informed that Sedgwick County has already filed its application for payment in lieu of taxes for the year 1955.

In the light of the foregoing facts, I believe that in considering this bill, which relates exclusively to the year 1947, I must also consider whether a claim for taxes for that year can be differentiated from a claim for the succeeding years up to 1955. The record in the case says that the Government applied for tax immunity for 1948 and subsequent years. Any such application has no bearing on the constitutional immunity. Therefore, I find no basis of distinction. I believe that to approve this bill would be a precedent for approving legislation for the other years, should claim be made. I also believe that to approve a bill for one piece of property, for one particular taxing jurisdiction, and for one particular year, would be to discriminate against other jurisdictions which are known to be similarly situated because of transfers of property from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or because of the Sedgwick County decision.

Furthermore, I believe that approval of H. R. 1835 would be contrary to the principles pertaining to payments in lieu of taxation which this administration has recommended to the Congress following study of the report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. That Commission recommended "that the National Government inaugurate a broad system of payments in lieu of property taxes to State and local governments," with particular reference to commercial and industrial property. After careful consideration of this general recommendation, I came to the conclusion that the magnitude and complexity of the problem is such that only a strictly limited program would be warranted at this time. Accordingly, it was recommended that any legislation should be restricted in application to communities which are able to demonstrate financial hardship directly attributable to Federal removal of real property from the tax rolls. It was further suggested by the administration that this limited program be applied prospectively and then only to properties removed from the local tax rolls subsequent to June 30, 1950.

In addition to these general objections to the bill, I believe that the contingency proviso also is objectionable. Approval of any such provision, in my judgment, would imply acceptance of the principle that the United States Government is not immune from interest and other penalties. Federal immunity in these respects does not depend upon State law.

Fairness of treatment, and the same treatment for all similarly situated State and local taxing jurisdictions, must be the rule in any proposal for adjustment or imposition of tax liability upon the United States. Of course, we must also strive to relieve the hardship which may result from unnecessary inflexibility in the law. However, I believe that the enactment of individual, piecemeal bills does not serve the long-run best interests of either local jurisdictions or the Federal Government. If statutory relief is to be granted, the legislation authorizing such relief should be limited as I have indicated and should be of general applicability.

For these reasons, I return H. R. 1835 without my approval.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 22, 1956.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and message be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

NATIONAL SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill designed to help meet two of the most critical problems facing our Nation today: The growing shortages in the teaching and science professions.

Today, as we cross the threshold into the nuclear era, we must face the fact that our future strength as a nation rests with the children who are now being educated and who will be educated in the next generation.

Recent magazine and newspaper articles have focused attention on the critical shortage of teachers, but I seriously doubt if the real implications of this scarcity have been realized. When schools opened in September 1955, the United States Office of Education estimated that there was a shortage of more than 140,000 teachers. The projected figures over the next 10 years give us even greater cause to stop and think—and act. The Ford Foundation has pointed out that to maintain the present teacher-student ratio, teaching staffs will have to be increased in the next 10 years more than they have increased over the past 35 years. Colleges and universities will have to add more teachers in the next 15 years than in all previous United States history combined. We will need 1,906,889 new teachers by 1965

to replace those who die or leave the profession, and to meet increased enrollments. If this need is to be met, one-half of all college graduates expected during the next decade will have to enter the teaching field. In past years, only one-fifth of all college graduates have entered this profession.

We all know that when there are not enough teachers to go around, something has to give. What gives, of course, is the quality of our teaching, for class sizes become swollen and unqualified teachers must be hired. Today, 35 percent of all public elementary teachers have had less than 4 years of college, and 6 percent have had less than 2 years.

There are many factors involved in the teacher shortage, which deserve the fullest consideration and study. Not the least of these is the salary scale. Many semiskilled laborers receive better pay than the men and women who teach our children. The problem is not that the salary scale of the workers is too high, but simply that our teachers receive too little. Small wonder that many of them, especially those with families to raise, find that they must leave the profession if they are to make ends meet.

Another factor affecting the scarcity of teachers is that too few of our high-school graduates go on to college at all. More than half of the top quarter in intelligence of our high-school-age youth never go on to college. Surveys indicate that the majority of these students simply cannot afford to continue their education. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that such a waste of good minds is one which our Nation cannot afford.

There has been an increase in the number of scholarship programs developed by industry, philanthropic institutions, and the like. Unfortunately, however, they do not meet the demand—nor the critical need which faces us today and which bears so directly upon our national life. That is why I feel that Government must act now to help meet the emergency.

One of the provisions of my bill would create 50,000 scholarships a year for the next 10 years for students entering the field of education. Before the bogey of Federal control of education is raised, let me point out that this is often only a smokescreen raised by those who are reluctant to act. We have seen during the administration of the GI bill of rights that Federal financing of a student's college education has not resulted in Government control over the policies or curriculum of our colleges and universities. To administer the program of scholarships, there would be created in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the position of Director of Scholarships and a Board of 16 drawn from the professional field who would set standards for the recipients of scholarships, making tuition payments direct to the various institutions, and make subsistence payments direct to the qualifying students. Scholarships would be divided on a statewide basis in proportion to the number of high school graduates in each State.

Directly related to the teacher shortage is the equally critical shortage in trained personnel in the scientific fields. The reason for this is not difficult to find. Twenty-three percent of our Nation's public high schools offer no courses in physics and chemistry. During 1954–55, a total of 7,900 science teachers were needed, but only 3,600 were trained, and of these only 1,700 actually entered the teaching field. According to the National Education Association, the output of science teachers has declined 57 percent from 1950 to 1955. This at a time when science and technology are the very cornerstones of our security and our hope for peacetime prosperity. Yet, how can we expect our young people to become interested in the further study of science when they have been given no chance of becoming acquainted with it.

The second provision of my scholarship bill provides for 20,000 undergraduate scholarships a year for 10 years for qualified students in the field of science.

The president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, J. R. Killian, Jr., stated in a recent article for Life magazine that our shortage of scientists has become the "best advertised shortage of our time" because of the well-known fact that Russia has been producing more trained scientists than has the United States. Mr. Killian went on to propose a series of national scholarships to meet our emergency needs. He did prefer to have these scholarships financed by private sources, but he also felt that until private funds were available the Federal Government should do something to fill the partial vacuum. I certainly agree with Mr. Killian.

Because quality is as important as quantity, my bill also sets up 5,000 post-graduate scholarships a year in the field of science. This should enable some of our gifted students to continue their education rather than face the necessity of having to accept positions after receiving their B. S. degree. Mr. Speaker, we have every reason to be proud of the men and women whom we entrust today with the education of our children. They are doing an extraordinary job under difficult circumstances. But they need help—and the help of tomorrow must be trained today.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, we must face squarely the fact that the scientific demands of our Nation in this highly technological era are falling upon too few shoulders. It may be no exaggeration to say that the outcome of the cold war and America's continued leadership may well depend upon how squarely we face the challenging task before us. For this reason, I sincerely hope that the House Committee on Education and Labor will consider my proposals as soon as possible. In the life of both people and nations, there comes a time for decision and action. With respect to our future teachers and scientists, that time is now.

REBUILDING THE BRAIN-WASHED, FLOUNDERING SUPREME COURT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, at the time this statement is being prepared, 2 years have passed; 2 summers, with the length of 2 long winters—to paraphrase the poet Wordsworth—since the epochal decision of the Supreme Court overturning a decision that had been followed for 75 years declaring that the doctrine of separate but equal facilities was not a violation of the Constitution.

This decision overturned all precedents and actually amounted to an amendment of the Constitution by one of the coordinate branches of our Government that has no right under the Constitution to amend it. It sought at one fell swoop to destroy the way of life and the social institutions of a great segment of the American people. But only now is the full import of the decision being realized. During the 2 years the determination of the people most vitally affected by the decision has been hardened and its thinking crystallized on the solution of the problem.

Sometimes it is said that the decision of the Supreme Court is the law of the land whether we believe the decision to be legally right or wrong. This is not an accurate statement of the situation. It is true that the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States is binding upon all persons who were parties before it in the litigation of that particular case until it is reversed or made ineffective by legislation by the Congress. This is the extent of the authority of the Supreme Court to enforce its decision. It is upon this basis that the South will oppose the destruction of its school system until the people of the United States and every section of this great country come to realize the enormity of the error which the Supreme Court has committed in this civilization-shaking decision.

Many have claimed that we have no right to criticize the Supreme Court or to oppose an application of its unwarranted and erroneous decisions. However, the right of free speech in America extends to the right to criticize even the Supreme Court and its members.

In the first place, by its decision in the school case, the Supreme Court ignored a warning of George Washington in his Farewell Address. I have previously inserted this warning in the RECORD but it is so important that I want to repeat it here. It is as follows:

> If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the Constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed.

Recently my own colleague from Georgia, the Hon. E. L. FORRESTER, in a learned and convincing statement to the House referred to and quoted Lincoln's criticism of the Supreme Court after the Dred Scott decision. President Franklin D. Roosevelt on March 9, 1937, commenting on a decision of the Supreme Court said:

> The Court in addition to the proper use of its judicial functions has improperly set itself up as a third house of the Congress—a superlegislature, as one of the justices has called it—reading into the Constitution words and implications which are not there.

We have, therefore, reached the point as a Nation where we must take action to save the Constitution from the Court and the Court from itself * * *.

Our difficulty with the Court today rises not from the Court as an institution but from human beings within it.

I call your especial attention to the last paragraph of the quotation, to wit:

Our difficulty with the Court today rises not from the Court as an institution but from human beings within it.

But the purpose of my statement today has not been to discuss the question of segregation. It is rather to bring to your attention a fact that has been cited by many of my colleagues including some from the Northern States as well as from the South and that is that the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, is not the only decision that shows the determination of the Supreme Court to ignore precedents, to usurp the field of legislation and the power to amend the Constitution. One of the strongest indictments against the Supreme Court is that voiced in a masterly fashion by a former Justice of that Court—James F. Byrnes of South Carolina. In an article in U. S. News & World Report, entitled "The Supreme Court Must Be Curbed," he brings a strong indictment against the Supreme Court for its refusal to follow precedent, and for its invasion not only of the legislative branch of our Government but of the rights of the States to determine their own internal affairs.

In this connection, Mr. Byrnes says:

Tragic as may be the consequences in destroying the public school system in the South, more frightening are the consequences of the trend of the present Court to destroy the powers of the 48 States.

He then quotes the case of *Pennsylvania* v. *Steve Nelson*, decided April 2, 1956, which invalidated the laws of 42 States prohibiting the knowing advocacy of the overthrow of the Government of the United States by violence as long as there is a Federal law against sedition. As criticism of the other members of the Court, Justices Reed, Burton and Minton rendered a vigorous dissenting opinion. Only 1 week later, the Court in the Slochower case held unconstitutional a New York City charter provision requiring dismissal of employees who refused to answer questions asked by legally constituted bodies.

The Wall Street Journal in an editorial which appeared in that daily newspaper on Thursday, May 17, said that the decision "threw a cloud over similar laws elsewhere, as well as a protective cloak over teachers who choose to be less than honest and forthright." On the Natural Gas Act ruling of several years ago, the minority of the Court wrote that the majority had transgressed the exemption granted producers and that good faith required the Court to interpret the act as "its terms read, and as we have, until today, declared it." There are other minority opinions which criticize the court for its failure to determine the intention of the Congress in framing its legislation and in actually ignoring express statements of the congressional intent. There are also other recent decisions that show the determination of the Court to overstep the functions assigned to it. These have been discussed on the floor of this House during the past few weeks and I do not need to refer to them. A very influential official of the American Bar Association has stated that 90 percent of the lawyers in America have lost faith in our present Supreme Court because of its tendency to ignore precedents, to forget the rule of stare decisis and to arrogate unto themselves the powers and duties imposed by the Constitution upon the Congress as well as because of its effrontery to attempt to rewrite the Constitution and to reinterpret it on grounds other than legal precedent and the laws which express the will of the Congress in any particular field. Not only does former Senator and Justice Byrnes bitingly criticize the Supreme Court but there are many other former jurists of brilliant intellect who are disturbed and alarmed at the tendency of the present Court to upset long established precedents and sally forth upon the uncharted seas of pseudosociology, neo-Freudian psychology and the political and sociological feelings of the present members of the Supreme Court. In this connection, I am including in my statement a letter recently written me by an honored former justice of the Fifth United States Circuit Court of Appeals, that grand old jurist, Samuel H. Sibley, who would have served with distinction on the United States Supreme Court. At 90 years, he is still vigorous and his mind is as clear as ever. His letter to me reads as follows:

MARIETTA, GA., *December 9, 1955.*

Congressman HENDERSON LANHAM,
Rome, Ga.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have noticed with interest your recently expressed opinion that the decisions of the Supreme Court were not judicial action, but legislative, and in undertaking to regulate the conduct of the schools both in the States and in the District of Columbia, and consequently are not within the competency of the Court to make. I note this morning that the same view was argued last night by Georgia's attorney general at Yale. I feel that this is the true question of all the argument, and not the merits or demerits of segregation itself. I have seen it this way all along, and as a member of the country's high judiciary, I am concerned at the action of our High Court in this matter, adding the capstone to a series of legislative decisions made by the Court in the past 10 years. We old judges, so far as I know, all feel that the Court is ceasing often to act as lawyers declaring the law what it is, and seeking to make the law what they think it ought to be. This is, of course, legislation, no matter who does it. It is forbidden by the first sentence of the Constitution to all branches of the Federal Government except the Congress. "All legislative power herein granted shall be vested in the Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives." The Supreme Court has no part in it. Its intrusion into that field is a violation of the Constitution. Yet I have seen no discussion, and no quotation even of this first sentence of the Constitution that stands wholly unchanged. The 14th amendment has no purpose to alter this, for its concluding words are "The Congress shall have power to enforce this amendment," not the Supreme Court.

But supposing that this is otherwise, the 14th amendment has nothing to do with the District of Columbia, and the Court so admits in its decision on the District's schools. The Congress has, as is well established, plenary government over the District, including the right to establish public schools. The Congress exercised that right, and enacted in the original and subsequent laws about that the races had best be segregated. If the time has come to deal otherwise with the schools, the question is so plainly a question for the Congress which established them, that I can see no basis to think otherwise. Congress alone may legislate about it, in those schools.

The judges of the Supreme Court are no doubt sincere men and think they have done right, but they have acted as reformers rather than judges, and exceeded their authority, most plainly in dealing with the District of Columbia. It seems to me that the Congress ought at least to strongly protest this invasion of their powers. I do not think it is a case for impeachment, but it is a case for a strong assertion of congressional prerogative, as expressed in the first sentence of the Constitution, that we all have sworn not only to respect, but also to support. As I am a judge, in commission though retired, I urge that the Congress by some appropriate action assert itself. It has a public duty to do this. It may give pause to those who have not seen the matter in that light.

Let the State schools stand apart for the present. I am talking about the duty of our Senators and Congressmen. They may leave the States and their schools to fight it out as best they can, but can they in duty shut their eyes to a very plain invasion of the rights and obligations of the Congress in respect to the Government of the District? Full thought and discussion of this point may well aid to clarify the whole question of the propriety of segregation, and the need to deal with it by Federal power, and how that need ought to be expressed.

Six months ago I publicly expressed my views on this subject in an address in Atlanta. The last part of it alone deals with the particular matter I am now arguing, but this is my only copy and I don't wish to dismember it. Read and use any of it which you may wish, and then return to me, please. I send it in what I take as the line of a judge's public duty.

With high personal regards.

Yours sincerely,

SAML. H. SIBLEY.

To show the utter confusion in the present Supreme Court and the inability of its members to construe and apply the Constitution and the laws of the land, my own colleague from Georgia, the Honorable PRINCE PRESTON, recently emphasized the present situation in the Court as exemplified in its recent decision in the case of Cahill against New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad. Mr. PRESTON brought the glaring light of publicity upon the hesitation and confusion of the Court, by introducing a bill to pay the plaintiff in the cited case the $90,000, that had been awarded him by the lower court and approved by the United States Supreme Court by an order which was later vacated after the defendant in the original suit had paid the judgment to the plaintiff in that suit who, in turn, had already spent much of the money he thought he had won by the original Supreme Court order.

There is no doubt but that the present situation is a most serious one. As former Senator Byrnes has so cogently said, even the destruction of public schools in the South may not be as injurious to the Nation as the uncertainty that prevails

as a result of the vacillation of the Supreme Court and its tendency to forsake the law as it has stood for years and substitute its own whims and vagaries for the established law of the land. No longer does an attorney know how to advise his clients. The law as announced by the United States Supreme Court may be one thing today and directly the opposite tomorrow. Confusion grows worse confounded. As former Justice Byrnes says, the Court must be curbed.

That the Congress does have the right to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and prevent its entering into fields reserved to the States by the Constitution is asserted by Mr. Byrnes in his excellent discussion of the whole problem. In recent days, I have received a most-learned and well-authenticated opinion from the Honorable Eugene Cook, the attorney general of Georgia, establishing without a doubt the fact that the Congress may limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and prevent its overstepping the bounds set by the Constitution and invading the rights of the sovereign States.

Quite often the constituents of southern Congressmen are clamorous in their demands that we do something to overrule the decision in the school cases. Of course, that is a present impossibility due to the fact that the 100 Members of the Congress who signed the recent much-discussed manifesto or statement of our position, just about represents the votes that we would get for any such effort on our part.

Neither do we have the votes today that would be necessary to impeach the present members of the Supreme Court although our people in the South feel so intensely antagonistic to the Court that they demand that we resort to this harsh remedy for the present situation.

But I come before you today not to insist upon any of these impossible remedies but to discuss with you what can be done not to reverse the Court on the matter of segregation but to bring it back into its field of the interpretation of the Constitution and the laws of Congress according to the intention of the Congress and the precedents and established rules of construction of the Constitution.

It is said that more than 70 bills have been introduced into Congress to try to limit the Supreme Court and insist that the Court exercise its own functions and not trespass upon those of the Congress and the States.

One of these bills is H. R. 3, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I think this legislation is demanded and that it is the first step we should take in the effort to force the Supreme Court to consider the intent of Congress and not to flout that intent and treat it with contempt. As Mr. SMITH himself has said, his bill has nothing whatsoever to do with the question of segregation of the races in our public schools. I am heartily in favor of this bill and hope that the people of our country will demand its enactment when they come to realize that more and more the Supreme Court is invading the province of their own States and of their Representatives in the Congress.

There may be other remedies that we can apply and they may be embodied in the more than 70 bills that have been introduced for this purpose. I have not had the time to study all of these bills or to formulate one for myself which would properly limit the powers of the Court.

I believe fundamentally that President Roosevelt was right when he stated that "Our difficulty with the court today rises not from the court as an institution but from the human beings within it." President Roosevelt's remark was probably a prelude to his sinister court packing idea. Apparently he wanted to fill the court with subservient political hacks so that he might dominate it. Fortunately, his court packing idea was defeated but, nonetheless, he did, in a sense, pack the court with the kind of people he wanted on it because of the death and retirement of so many of the justices during his era. Certain it is that we cannot hope for the proper decisions from the Supreme Court if the members of that court are not learned in the law and its precedents. If our court is made up of political hacks as Vice President NIXON has charged, insofar as the Chief Justice is concerned, then we cannot expect sound legal decisions to come from that body. So the fundamental problem is the problem of reconstituting the court. This will be a long and perilous project but, nevertheless, we must undertake it. Recently when I was at home, a friend of mine stated it this way. He said that it had taken 35 years to corrupt the Supreme Court and that it would take that long to clean it up and fill it with men who have had judicial experience and who have the temperament and training to make them render sound legal decisions. I am sure my friend did not mean "corrupt" in the sense that the present members of the court are morally corrupt. In my opinion, the trouble is not political corruption but the corruption of their ideas and concepts of justice. Frankly, I think its members have been brain washed. The brain washing has been done by the alleged sociologist and psychologist, Dr. Karl Gunnar Mydral and his associates. It was in his book, the American Dilemma, that Dr. Mydral stated that the American Constitution was outmoded; and the other dabblers in the field of sociology and psychology to which the Supreme Court turned instead of to legal precedents in the school cases were of like mind with Dr. Myrdal that the Constitution is outmoded. Consequently, the Supreme Court, after its brain washing by this man, Myrdal, and his shocking pink, if not Red, associates—some of them indeed are included as members in Communist front organizations named by our Department of Justice as such—overturned legal decisions by such giants of previous Supreme Courts as Justices Holmes, Taft, and Brandeis. I will not try to document this statement further since it has been done so ably by the distinguished lawyer, my good friend from Dalton, Ga., the Honorable Carter Pittman. To show you that this man Pittman is a distinguished lawyer himself and recognized as such in his profession, the United States Supreme Court has on several occasions used and quoted as authority a study Mr. Pittman made 25 years ago on the history of the privilege against self-incrimination. Mr. Pittman is at present the president of the States Rights Councils of Georgia and has written an article for the American Bar Association Journal entitled "Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow," which will appear in the next issue.

As confirmation of my assertion that the Court has been brain washed by these wild Communist-inspired pseudo-scientists not in the field of law but in the uncharted field of psychology and sociology, I refer you to an article written by this same distinguished lawyer, the Honorable Carter Pittman, introduced by me into the daily RECORD of February 28, 1956, at page A1858. To say that the Court has been brain washed is the softest impeachment I can command to designate the present members of the Court.

How, then, is the Court to be reconstituted and cleansed of its aberrations and flights into esoteric fields foreign to the law? Even Mr. Byrnes in his excellent article does not attempt to answer this question, but I am convinced that it must be done by writing into the law qualifications for persons proposed by the President to become Justices of the United States Supreme Court. I know that some have questioned the power of the Congress to in this way circumscribe the President's right to appoint political hacks or other incompetents if he so sees fit. In the other body, the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] has introduced a bill to require 5 years' judicial experience before appointment to the Court. Senator STENNIS has introduced a similar bill, but, recognizing that some question has been raised as to the right of the Congress to limit the President's power of appointment, he has introduced a bill which would set up standards for the Senate to follow in confirming members appointed by the President to the Supreme Court.

There are absolutely no qualifications laid down either in our Constitution or in the laws of our land for appointment of members of the Supreme Court who have the right to "slap down," so to speak, even the President of the United States, as was indicated in the rebuke to President Truman when he seized the steel industry to end a nationwide crippling strike in that industry. The Constitution does say in article I, section I, that—

> No person except a natural-born citizen, or a citizen of the United States, at the time of the adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the office of President; neither shall any person be eligible to that office who shall not have attained to the age of 35 years and been 14 years a resident within the United States.

It is passing strange that no such qualifications for appointment to the Supreme Court have ever been written into the law of our land. Surely if the President must be a natural born citizen, the members of the Supreme Court should at least meet that qualification. Consequently, I have prepared a bill which does set up qualifications up to

which persons must measure before they are confirmed to serve on the United States Supreme Court. Not only do I include in this bill, which I have today introduced into the House, a requirement that Supreme Court justices must be native born, must be at least 35 years of age and have been 14 years a resident within the United States, the identical requirements for the President, but in addition, my bill provides that such intended appointees must have been graduated by a law school approved by the American Bar Association or admitted to the bar of a court of general jurisdiction in any State, Territory, possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia. Such appointee must have practiced law for a total of not less than 5 years after having been admitted to the bar of any court of general jurisdiction as referred to above or must have had a total of not less than 5 years' judicial service.

These requirements may, of course, be changed after hearings by the committee to which it is referred. It will at least form a basis for legislation that will actually do something about the present intolerable situation in the highest court of our land to curb its aberrations, its discursions from the field of law into those of psychology, sociology and mythology and will make sure that its members are well grounded in the law, its precedents and its standards of legal ethics. My bill is the most comprehensive and, I believe, the best considered approach to the long-range rebuilding of the Court.

As the Wall Street Journal said in its excellent editorial on the subject in its issue of May 17, 1956, "There is only a need to curb the use of the Court as a reward for political service or a sinecure for political friends." This excellent newspaper has certainly put its finger upon the very essence of the matter. Vice President NIXON's boast that it was a Republican political Chief Justice who had brought about the infamous school decision has cast a shadow upon the entire Court. All in all, the people of America are not going to be satisfied until the Congress does something to eliminate political hacks from our Supreme Court and fill it with men of legal background and training, of ability, and of such integrity and character that they can rise above the winds of politics, of wild-eyed Socialists, pinkos, and their dreamworld doctrines of social laws, psychology, and even mythology. Perchance by the introduction of this bill I have at least made a start toward the long and uphill battle to restore the Supreme Court to the confidence of our people and the legal reliance of the lawyers of America.

DR. RAYBURN AND DR. MARTIN AT SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have been delighted to learn from the lips of our able colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN], that in Syracuse, N. Y., on Monday, June 4, it will be Dr. RAYBURN and Dr. MARTIN.

The announcement that Syracuse University would on the date indicated confer honorary degrees on these two great American legislative leaders has been hailed by the public and the press. Members of the House and Senate concur in the feeling it is a most timely and deserved tribute.

"What a natural to honor SAM and JOE in this way. What a picture both will make as speakers on that platform at Archbold Stadium at Syracuse," was one Member's comment.

Speaker RAYBURN, Texas Democrat, has had 42 years of service in the House, and former Speaker MARTIN, Massachusetts Republican, can count 32 years of such service. RAYBURN's service as Speaker is a record. The two have contributed much to the legislative history of our country during periods of great crises and every student of the American way of life knows them for their love and devotion to their country.

In scoring this first, I desire to salute the great University of Syracuse on the June 4 honors it plans for the great leaders of this body. In a very true sense Syracuse is honoring the American Congress.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania, for a period beginning Thursday, May 24, and ending July 19, on account of official business, attendance as a congressional adviser to the International Labor Organization to be held in Geneva, Switzerland.

To Mr. VINSON, for 10 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. GRANAHAN (at the request of Mr. DEMPSEY), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

To Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), today and tomorrow, on account of illness in the immediate family.

To Mr. DIXON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for the week of May 28, on account of official business.

To Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, for 7 days, on account of official business.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. CHUDOFF), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. VURSELL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HENDERSON to revise and extend the remarks which he will make in the Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WIER on the matter of the recent directives of the Postmaster General.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and to include extraneous material.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EVINS in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and to include testimony before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LOVRE to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTION, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 510. An act for the relief of Mary A. Mouskalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 806. An act to amend sections 3182 and 3183 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to authorize the use of an information filed by a public prosecuting officer for making demands for fugitives from justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 875. An act for the relief of Angel Marie Olaeta-Goitia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1245. An act for the relief of Agnes V. Walsh, the estate of Margaret T. Denehy, and David Walsh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1273. An act to amend sections 1, 3, and 4 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1637. An act to extend the time limit within which awards of certain military and naval decorations may be made; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1895. An act for the relief of Anna Maria Fuller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1961. An act to provide for the conveyance of part of Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Colchester, Vt., to the State of Vermont, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2226. An act to authorize the Attorney General to dispose of the remaining assets seized under the Trading With the Enemy Act prior to December 18, 1941; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2341. An act for the relief of Gertrude Heindel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2352. An act for the relief of Maj. Luther C. Cox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2379. An act to promote the fishing industry in the United States and its Territories by providing for the training of needed personnel for such industry; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2690. An act for the relief of William G. Jackson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2722. An act for the relief of Fai Hoo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2930. An act for the relief of Eladio Ledesma-Gutierrez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2937. An act to increase from $50 to $75 a month the amount of benefits payable to widows of certain former employees of the Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2967. An act to amend the act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3011. An act for the relief of Chan Lee Nui Sin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3040. An act for the relief of Gertrud Charlotte Samuelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3058. An act for the relief of Javier F. Kuong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3101. An act to authorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3147. An act for the relief of Elsie M. Kenney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3412. An act to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, relating to war risk insurance for an additional 5 years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3547. An act to amend section 1 of the act of August 9, 1955, (69 Stat. 55), authorizing the sale of certain land by the Pueblos of San Lorenzo and Pojoaque; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3844. An act to amend the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for urban renewal assistance to disaster areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution to direct the Secretary of the Interior to determine the best means of eliminating the hazards within the city of Klamath Falls, Oreg., caused by a canal under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. Con. Res. 77. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of parts 6, 7, and 8 of the hearings on the study of the antitrust laws of the United States; the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1016. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ida Bifolchini Boschetti;

H. R. 1471. An act for the relief of William J. Robertson;

H. R. 1779. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Juniper division of the Wapinitia Federal reclamation project, Oreg.;

H. R. 2284. An act for the relief of Maj. Robert D. Lauer;

H. R. 2904. An act for the relief of Maj. Orin A. Fayle;

H. R. 3054. An act for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives;

H. R. 3268. An act for the relief of Comdr. George B. Greer;

H. R. 3366. An act for the relief of Mary J. McDougall;

H. R. 3964. An act for the relief of Kingan, Inc.;

H. R. 4026. An act for the relief of James C. Hayes;

H. R. 4162. An act for the relief of Kahzo L. Harris;

H. R. 4604. An act relating to the issuance of certain patents in fee to lands within the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 4640. An act for the relief of James M. Wilson;

H. R. 4656. An act relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina;

H. R. 5047. An act to increase the compensation of trustees in bankruptcy;

H. R. 5478. An act to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 5652. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army and Air Force, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6084. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians, California, to the Palm Springs Unified School District;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of Lt. P. B. Sampson;

H. R. 6374. An act to repeal legislation relating to the Gallup-Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navaho Indian Reservation;

H. R. 6623. An act to amend the act of July 1, 1952, so as to obtain the consent of Congress to interstate compacts relating to mutual military aid in an emergency;

H. R. 6990. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America;

H. R. 7540. An act to provide for the sale of a Government-owned housing project to the city of Hooks, Tex.;

H. R. 8309. An act for the relief of Col. Henry M. Zeller;

H. R. 8810. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, equip, maintain, and operate a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Miles City, Mont.;

H. R. 8904. An act to amend certain laws relating to the grade of certain personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps upon retirement;

H. R. 9207. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands; and

H. R. 9257. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the punishment of persons who assist in the attempted escape of persons in Federal custody.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 23, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1881. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report relative to the Department of the Navy proposing to donate certain small craft to the United States Volunteer Life Savings Corps to be used in rescue work and training, pursuant to the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 898; 34 U. S. C. 546k); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1882. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 35th Quarterly Report on Export Control, pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1883. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, and for other purposes,' approved May 18, 1910"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1884. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the government of the Virgin Islands of the United States for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67), and the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (48 U. S. C. 1632); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1885. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to charge for special services to purchasers of timber from Indian lands"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1886. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 101 (c) of Public Law 768, 83d Congress, so as to provide additional time for the Tariff Commission to review the customs tariff schedules"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6332. A bill to amend the act of October 11, 1949, to specify the fee which will be paid for services performed by United States commissioners with respect to the commitment of individuals to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 2193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee of conference. H. R. 10875. A bill to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956 (Rept. No. 2197). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. VINSON: Committee of conference. H. R. 9429. A bill to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2195). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee of conference. H. R. 5862. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation (Rept. No. 2196). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 615. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 2191). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 616. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 2192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 617. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 2194). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 11356. A bill to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 11357. A bill to establish a program of scholarships for students in science and education at institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BAUMHART:

H. R. 11358. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 11359. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 11360. A bill to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States, in order to balance the power now heavily weighted in favor of automobile manufacturers, by enabling franchise automobile dealers to bring suit in the district courts of the United States to recover twofold damages sustained by reason of the failure of automobile manufacturers to act in good faith in complying with the terms of franchises or in terminating or not renewing franchises with their dealers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11361. A bill to cancel certain bonds posted pursuant to the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. R. 11362. A bill for the relief of the Vermont, Ipava, and Table Grove Unit School District No. 2, in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHER:

H. R. 11363. A bill to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 11364. A bill to promote the progress of medicine and to advance the national health and welfare by creating a National Library of Medicine to be located in Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 11365. A bill to authorize deferment of repayments of certain emergency loans by the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 11366. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the central west coast area of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 11367. A bill to amend section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide an additional period for World War II veterans to obtain guaranteed loans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 11368. A bill to provide for a Veterans' Administration general medical and surgical hospital of 1,000 beds at Bay Pines, Fla.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 11369. A bill to amend section 4 (a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 11370. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 11371. A bill to establish the principle of a basic single salary wage scale in the Canal Zone for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 11372. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1952, with respect to the crediting for civil service retirement purposes of certain service performed by civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 11373. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 11374. A bill establishing certain qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H. R. 11375. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to further extend the special school milk program to certain institutions for the care and training of children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 11376. A bill relating to certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines (excluding coal and lignite mines) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 11377. A bill to amend section 504 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to specify certain terms that must be contained in contracts for the purchase or construction of residential property; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 11378. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide that certain warrantors of housing sold under guaranteed, insured, or direct loans shall procure a performance bond; to authorize the Administrator to refuse to appraise certain residential property; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 11379. A bill to provide that the next cruiser commissioned in the United States Navy shall be named the *Brooklyn*; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 11380. A bill to readjust postal rates and to establish a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 11381. A bill to provide for the sale of certain lands now required for community development adjacent to Cascade Reservoir, Boise Federal reclamation project, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 11382. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 11383. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 11384. A bill to establish the principle of a basic single salary wage scale in the Canal Zone for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 11385. A bill to validate certain payments in settlement of unused accrued leave heretofore or hereafter made to certain members of the Army and the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 11386. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, to establish in the Department of Defense an office of Under Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 11387. A bill to establish the principle of a basic single salary wage scale in the Canal Zone for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 11388. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 11389. A bill to amend section 4232 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain places where no instrumental music is provided shall not be treated as cabarets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 11390. A bill for the relief of Josephine Elenora Ambrose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11391. A bill for the relief of Miss Maria Luisette Vilela Gomes de Almeida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 11392. A bill for the relief of Jose Trinidad Maldonado Ortiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALLECK:

H. R. 11393. A bill for the relief of Petros Ioannou Calengas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 11394. A bill for the relief of Wladyslaw Burawski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 11395. A bill for the relief of Amabile Vella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 11396. A bill for the relief of Sister Maria del Rosario G. Arocena, Sister Maria Aranzazu A. Mendizabal, and Sister Maria Dolores O. Goyenechea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 11397. A bill for the relief of Simon Brill, et al.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 11398. A bill for the relief of Michele De Bellis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 626. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 627. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1063. By Mr. BURDICK: Petition of Frank White, Jr., and 44 other residents of Jamestown, N. Dak., and surrounding communities, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and

orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1064. Also, petition of Fred Sjoblom and 38 other residents of Bismarck, N. Dak., and vicinity, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1065. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Clyde J. Jones and 44 other residents of Renovo, Pa., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1066. By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. Albert E. Blasingame, Little Rock, Ark., and others urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1067. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of Wendle Bros., Inc., and 45 veterans of Spokane County, Wash., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1068. Also, petition of William Tinsley and 44 other veterans of Spokane and Stevens County, Wash., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1069. Also, petition of Mrs. Joan Bull and 20 other veterans of Spokane County, Wash., urging immediate enactment of separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1070. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of World War I veterans of Chariton, Iowa, urging the adoption of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1071. By Mr. SADLAK: Petition of the Pulaski Democratic Club of Hartford, an organization of Americans of Polish ethnic origin, to extend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 beyond its expiration date of August 6, 1956, to enable persons escaping from behind the Iron Curtain to find in the United States a haven of peace, freedom, and liberty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Many Notable Dignitaries From Foreign Countries Have Visited the TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, throughout the years many heads of state, important personages and foreign dignitaries from many lands have visited the TVA. Foreign visitors to our country, as well as our own citizens, have come to look upon TVA as a superior example of government at work in the field of resource development and conservation of national resources. Certainly the TVA is a symbol of success of what a great government can do to protect lives and property, advance commerce, industry, and agriculture through cooperative endeavor between the people of a great region and the Federal Government. Because of this achievement and success TVA has become a great national and international asset. It is an international symbol of American engineering achievement—and TVA is visited annually by many notable visitors.

Among the distinguished dignitaries visiting TVA the following are included:

Prince Albert of Liege, Belgium, November 1955.

Prime Minister U Nu of Burma, July 1955.

Ambassador Gaganvihari Mehta, of India, May 1954.

Queen Juliana and Prince Bernhard, of the Netherlands, in April 1952.

Ambassador and Mrs. Eban, of Israel, in May 1953.

Muhammed Khuda, Minister of Defense, of Pakistan, in December 1952.

Ambassador and Mrs. Feridun C. Erkin, of Turkey, in October 1952.

Adm. Renato Guillobel, Secretary of the Brazilian Navy, in September 1952.

Former Prime Minister Hans Hetoft, of Denmark, and Ambassador Henrik de Kauffmann, of Denmark, in July 1952.

Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion, of Israel, in May 1951.

Prime Minister Joseph Pholien, of Belgium, in April 1951.

President Gabriel Gonzales Videla, of Chile, in April 1950.

Dr. Franz Bluecher, Vice Chancellor of West Germany, in February 1950.

Prime Minister Pundit Jawaharlal Nehru, of India, in October 1949.

President Enroco Gaspar Dutra, of Brazil, in May 1949.

Right Honorable Hector McNeil, British Minister of State, in April 1949.

The Khan of Kalat, Ruler of Kalat, Pakistan, in April 1949.

Prince Charles, Regent of Belgium, in April 1948.

The Egyptian Minister of Public Works, in July 1947.

President Miguel Aleman, of Mexico, in May 1947.

Maritime Day Address by Hon. Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, today is that outstanding occasion which, unfortunately, occurs but once a year. It is Maritime Day.

I have just returned from a luncheon given by the Propeller Club, port of Baltimore. While there, I had the great privilege of introducing the guest of honor, our friend and distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Of course, in looking about for an outstanding authority on maritime matters, it was only natural that the Propeller Club would give serious consideration to requesting the Senator from Massachusetts to deliver the Maritime Day address. During that time he did me, the Port of Baltimore Propeller Club, and the State of Maryland the great honor of delivering one of the finest Maritime Day addresses I have ever been privileged to hear. Accordingly, and for the purpose of sharing his remarks with the Members of the Senate and the people generally, I send to the desk a copy of his speech, with a request for unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, MARITIME DAY LUNCHEON, PROPELLER CLUB OF BALTIMORE, MAY 22

Since I certainly don't want to sail into any port, especially Baltimore, under false colors, I think I should say right here and now that you fellows are competitors, strong competitors, of ours in Boston. This rivalry is one of the painful yet stimulating facts of Atlantic port life, and I want you to know that we recognize it as such.

Despite our rivalry, however—and it's a healthy one fundamentally—you in Baltimore and we in Boston have an equal and vital interest in maritime affairs as a whole. It is therefore essential that, as Baltimoreans and Bostonians, but even more importantly as Americans, we do everything within our power to see to it that a dynamic and progressive national maritime policy is maintained and implemented with commonsense, vigor, and foresight. Although we all recognize it, I think we can never overemphasize the dual importance of our merchant marine and our maritime industries to a healthy American economy and to our national defense.

Nearly 100 years of trial and error, marked in great part by the failure to recognize this dual importance of our merchant marine, failed to provide America with a stable maritime policy until Congress drafted the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. This act is agreed to be a fundamental piece of maritime legislation, for it establishes a workable basis for maintaining a strong American merchant marine as a private enterprise venture, and at the same time strengthening the merchant marine and the shipbuilding industry as an essential arm of our national security and as an indispensable auxiliary of our armed services in event of national emergency.

In time of peace, reliable shipping service at reasonable rates requires that the United States carry a substantial part of its waterborne foreign commerce in American-flag vessels. During periods of economic depression, such as all nations have known in their history, the seafaring people have tended to give priority to their own commerce and their fleets have been instruments of national policy and trade promotion. But even in times of peace and prosperity such as we enjoy today, it is clear that if the strength of our American merchant marine is reduced or, indeed, if we were ever to be without it, foreign maritime powers would be in a posi-

tion—which they are ever ready and eager to occupy—of carrying our goods at times and from ports of their own choosing and at whatever prices the American traffic could be forced to bear. Needless to say, those prices would be boosted sky high. We could not argue, since we could not compete.

Of even greater consequence, however, is the vital role of the merchant marine and the shipbuilding industry as instruments of national defense and security. Regardless of ordinary economic considerations, the maintenance of a vigorous merchant marine, available for service as a military auxiliary, simply must be regarded as a necessary cost of national defense to the extent that an adequate merchant fleet and shipbuilding industry cannot, in the light of crippling foreign competition, be self-supporting.

The Congress is repeatedly reminded of these facts by those of us who, by reason of the maritime States from which we come, have a great awareness and knowledge of United States maritime history, policy, and requirements. Fortunately, through the vigorous and unflagging efforts, on a wholly bipartisan basis, of such Senators, among others, as your JOHN BUTLER, Washington's WARREN MAGNUSON, Maine's FREDERICK PAYNE, and this occasionally seagoing Yankee now speaking, the Senate has been regularly persuaded that certain legislation just had to be placed at the top of the Senate's must list of legislation to be enacted. We have not achieved all that we hope to, all that we should—but we refuse to give up the ship!

Most recently, through the spirited bipartisan effort to which I have referred, we were able to record in the Senate a defense of the Cargo Preference Act, the 50–50 law, which we believe in so wholeheartedly and which we feel must be maintained. The very existence of a United States-flag fleet is our only protection against the kind of situation as that in which foreign maritime powers would be enabled, without such cargo preference restrictions, to take arbitrary and costly action where our American cargoes are concerned. Public Law 664, the Cargo Preference Act, is one of those pieces of legislation which prevents such foreign monopoly and yet at the same time fairly provides our friends from abroad with an opportunity to participate in the interest of healthier world trade. Previously, on nine such occasions since 1948, Congress has written this 50–50 provision into various aid programs. Now the Cargo Preference Act has made it unnecessary to repeat that procedure. It has become a part of our general law.

In another area of merchant marine interest and activity, it is pleasing to report that with the approval of Public Law 415 of this Congress, the Secretary of Commerce has been authorized to maintain the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., on a permanent basis.

In a word, we are strengthening the sinews of our merchant marine for the purpose of attracting the best of our young men to the merchant marine and encouraging them to remain in it as career officers.

These actions are typical of the maritime legislation for which we are determined to fight hard in every session of every Congress, and yet these are but a part of a larger effort, a wider program, that must be given effect continuingly if the American merchant marine is, economically and in the national interest, to achieve the goals it seeks.

I have had occasion from time to time to list six specific suggestions as to how our maritime problem may be seen clearly and implemented successfully. The suggestions are these:

1. A full cooperation among the Maritime Board, the shipping industry, and Government based upon confidence and mutual understanding.

2. The prompt determination of reliable indices for construction and operating participation by the Government.

3. The institution and maintenance of an orderly replacement program by appropriate planning and legislation.

4. The common-sense gearing of our maritime policy equally to defense and to peacetime needs.

5. The initiation of a vigorous and comprehensive program of public information and enlightenment.

6. The effective administration of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, together with a periodic review of that act to see how it may be better implemented from time to time in order that its purposes may be more effectively achieved.

It has always seemed to me very necessary that our citizens realize that the beneficiaries of a strong national maritime policy are not solely the shipowners and operators or those who man the vessels. The beneficiaries of such a policy are all the people of all the States, for every single region in this country contributes to and shares in the benefits which flow from the construction, the maintenance, and the operation of our merchant fleet in time of peace and in time of war.

As a member of the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, I have worked hard for years to try to help overcome the feast or famine practices that have characterized us in maritime affairs over the years. In time of peace we have, characteristically, been foolishly content to wallow in the trough of the maritime wave. Then hurriedly and apprehensively in time of emergency we have built, at tremendous expense and with no little risk, to achieve a crest of production adequate to those emergency needs.

We hear much these days, particularly as regards airpower and the new era of guided missiles, of research and development, the work of our scientists in private laboratories and in Government installations designed for one purpose: the more rapid and effective improvement of weapons, ships and aircraft. We have had it dramatized spectacularly for men who go down to the sea in ships by the atomic-powered submarine *Nautilus*. This same emphasis upon research and development must be applied to America's merchant marine, to the conception, designing, and building of newer, better, more efficient and more economical commercial vessels and gear.

During World War II, Mrs. Saltonstall was invited to christen the first LST built in the shipyard at Hingham, Mass. That yard was barely a year old and had been created almost from scratch on the Massachusetts shoreline. Just as Mrs. Saltonstall was about to break the bottle on the vessel's bow, the superintendent of the yard said to her, "This ship will go down the ways at a speed of 16 knots and it will never move as fast as that again." That statement often makes me think of the advances that have been made in marine design and engineering in the last decade and of the grim significance of that progress in today's world.

Finally, may I say that, if we intend to keep an effective merchant marine afloat, it is inescapable that our merchant marine will have to be helped financially to compete with foreign-flag vessels. Therefore, a program of Government participation seems to be the only answer to our dilemma. Only through such Government participation can American shipowners maintain up-to-date, high-speed vessels which they can operate on a competitive basis with foreign-flag fleets.

For the same reasons we must continue with the construction subsidy program, which enables American shipyards to retain that vital core of shipyard labor without which we could not build vessels in time of war. A New Englander certainly doesn't spend money he doesn't have to spend. Nevertheless he paints his barn regularly. This is an expenditure, but it is a long-term economy. It is exactly in that sense that we must look upon expenditures where our national security and the merchant marine are concerned.

Let me conclude with these words of President Eisenhower's: "We were caught flat footed in both World Wars because we relied too much upon foriegn owned and operated shipping to carry our cargoes abroad and to bring critically needed supplies to this country.

"America's industrial prosperity and military security both demand that we maintain a privately operated merchant marine adequate in size and of modern design to insure that our lines of supplies for either peace or war will be safe.

"I consider the merchant marine to be our fourth arm of defense and vital to the stability and expansion of our foreign trade."

These are sentiments of a far sighted and clear-thinking leader with which we all agree and toward the realization of which we are determined to work everlastingly hard together.

Soybeans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with a bumper crop of 372 million bushels of soybeans produced in 1955, now selling around $3 a bushel, so far above parity that it hardly can be computed, is the best proof that supply and demand gives the farmer greater profit than can be brought to him by support prices and we are not plagued by any surpluses.

I would like to point out Illinois leads all States, producing 77 million bushels and the total crop of 372 million which brought the farmers about $1 billion.

Research scientists in the United States Department of Agriculture through the years by plant breeding have developed 16 new varieties—all producing 20 percent more oil and 10 percent more beans that the varieties they have replaced.

At this time when we have billions of bushels of surplus wheat, corn, and other products which are depressing farm prices, may I point out that this huge soybean crop is selling far above price supports and we are not plagued with any surplus. One of the reasons is that the research scientists have found many new industrial outlets for this farm crop in addition to feed and food uses.

Today, soybeans provide 70 percent of all vegetable oils used in margarine and 54 percent of all vegetable shortenings.

Marketing research has opened outlets for 221 million pounds of soybeans annually for use as drying oil products, for acids, special resins, in printing inks and paper, textile sizing and automobile tire cord sizing. In plastics alone including linoleums, tile and like products it is estimated 200 million pounds of soybean oil are used annually. Markets in

industry are steadily being expanded which helps to keep the demands for the farmers' soybeans strong in our domestic market.

From July last year to February this year, 55 million bushels of soybeans were exported—40 percent more than a year before.

By finding new markets for this farm product, research has again proven that the small amount of money our committee appropriates for finding new uses for farm products is paying tremendous dividends to agriculture and the economy of the Nation.

Post Office Department Tries Union Busting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, recent directives of the Postmaster General that have been issued and sent to the major post offices of the Nation for posting appear to be followups on his declarations of the past 2 years that any form of collective bargaining or unionism in the postal service under his administration must be his kind of unionism or suffer the consequences.

Worse than that is the denial to any postal worker the right to express or convey to his Representative or Senator any grievance or complaint without first submitting it to the Department. This order savors very much of real "slave labor."

In addition to the recent directives issued, the Department has served notice that rules and regulations of bygone days will now be dusted off, or better yet, may we say, resurrected and rigidly enforced.

I submit that the new directives enumerated below and the strict enforcement of age-old directives surely do not in any manner display friendly relationship but to the contrary only express and lay the groundwork for a declaration of dictatorship upon each of the postal unions and their officers.

As to myself, I want no part of this type of Government administration and take this means to express my deep resentment and opposition.

Following are a couple of the latest directives that have been broadcast by the Department and clearly make known to the employees its hostile attitude:

Issue 57 of the Postal Manual, dated March 28, 1956. Section 744.442, captioned "Engaging in Campaigns for Changes in the Service," reads as follows:

"(a) Information relating to the policies and decisions of the Post Office Department will be released only through official channels. Employees shall not actively engage in campaigns for or against changes in the service, or furnish information to be used in such campaigns unless prior approval has been obtained from higher authority.

"(b) If an employee has justifiable reasons for favoring or opposing changes in the postal service, he shall contact the proper officials and await specific instructions before engaging in local hearings or activities."

The Postal Bulletin for Thursday, April 19, 1956, reads:

"ALL POSTAL INSTALLATIONS—EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION IN CONTESTS

"While on duty employees of the postal service may not participate in any contest sponsored by private concerns, associations, or other private organizations, nor accept any prizes from such concerns, associations, or organizations, unless participation is approved specifically by the Department.

"Office of the Deputy Postmaster General."

Warren G. Harding Council, No. 372, Junior Order United American Mechanics, Altoona, Pa., Celebrates 103d Anniversary of the Junior Order, May 19, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, 1956, it was my privilege to address the 103d anniversary banquet of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, sponsored by the Warren G. Harding Council, No. 372, Altoona, Pa.

The address follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE 103D ANNIVERSARY BANQUET SPONSORED BY THE WARREN G. HARDING COUNCIL, NO. 372, JUNIOR ORDER UNITED AMERICAN MECHANICS, ALTOONA, PA., MAY 19, 1956

It is a privilege to be invited to deliver the principal address at this banquet commemorating the 103d anniversary of the Junior Order United American Mechanics.

One hundred and three years is a long time, but when you look back over the many accomplishments of the junior order in the field of Americanism it is only proper to say that the 103 years represent over a century of progress in the building of a better America.

It is an honor for me as a member of Pride of Mountain City Council, No. 472, to be asked to deliver the address on this occasion.

In choosing a subject, I have decided to talk to you of loyalty to one's country and an adequate national defense as twin weapons in the struggle against world communism.

Before discussing the subject of my discourse, I wish to assure you that I have not changed my position as a strong supporter of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

There are many in Congress who share my views. Thus, I am confident that the effort being made to nullify the present law will not succeed.

Loyalty to our country is one of the virtues of every red-blooded citizen prompting him to utter the prayerful exclamation, "Thank God I am an American."

It is typical of men and women who belong to such a patriotic organization as the Junior Order United American Mechanics to promote love of country, and in so doing warn of the existing dangers at home and abroad.

At the same time we must stress the importance of constant vigilance against those forces seeking to destroy the American way of life.

As a Nation, this year we are celebrating the 250th birthday anniversary of the immortal Benjamin Franklin.

An inventor, statesman, and diplomat, Franklin was well aware of the problems which a young Nation was about to face.

He was a firm believer in national preparedness, which is so strongly advocated by the Junior Order.

It is well to recall what Benjamin Franklin had to say on this subject.

Speaking of preparedness, Poor Richard, as he was known in printing circles, had this sage advice—and I quote:

"Let us beware," said Franklin, "of being lulled into a dangerous security; and of being weakened by internal contentions and divisions; of neglect in military exercises and discipline, and in providing stores of arms and munitions of war; for the expenses required to prevent a war are much lighter than those that will, if not prevented, be necessary to maintain it."

How right Ben Franklin was—and is to this day.

Do we not all remember Pearl Harbor—and how difficult it was for us to get our war effort underway?

Today, we are in the atomic age—and time will work against us.

Preparedness, therefore, is a matter of top priority.

For years the Junior Order United American Mechanics has urged that greater attention should be given in our public schools to the teaching of American history—to let our children know exactly how hard-won were the liberties which we enjoy.

These youngsters should be made aware that they have an inheritance—that is priceless—and they should be training in their early days to be ready to take over that precious gift when they reach manhood and womanhood.

It was Franklin again who had these wise words to say in connection with our youth, and I quote:

"I think with you, that nothing is of more importance for the public welfare, than to form and train up youth in wisdom and virtue.

"Wise and good men are, in my opinion, the strength of the State far more than riches and arms."

Franklin was old and wise enough to know that if children are well trained in their heritage, they will be able to advance it through the arts and sciences and bring even greater glory to the Nation.

The Junior Order United American Mechanics is aware, too, of the evils of communism, and constantly has raised a loud voice about this menace to the welfare of our land.

With some other patriotic organizations, it was a voice in the wilderness because little heed was given until recent years, when communism reared its ugly head publicly by showing itself openly in parades and demonstrations.

The Junior Order had an answer for these public demonstrations and that answer was to emphasize the objectives of this patriotic group by urging greater love of country and loyalty to the Constitution of the United States.

The plea for an alert and educated citizenry must be heeded because it is the only solution to the problem of attacking and defeating subversive elements in our midst.

This positive expression of confidence in our way of life actually has caused public consternation in the ranks of the Communists—and, as a result, their public

demonstrations have faded into obscurity.

But we are not fooled.

The Commies in this country have not disbanded—the threat of communism is still with us and at times becomes arrogant beyond belief.

Wasn't it Mr. Khrushchev who recently said, although he smiled while he said it, that "Communism would one day capture the imagination of the entire world"?

So we must be on guard.

We must continue to teach the American way of life as opposed to a life of slavery and degradation which communism brings.

We must make every American citizen awaken to his civic responsibility to combat this menace.

And we must urge our citizens to take full part in their own Government processes.

That is the message we have for our membership in commemoration of the 103d anniversary of the Junior Order.

Once more let us turn to wise and aged Ben Franklin, a man who was years ahead of his time in his thinking.

The words I quote now could have been uttered yesterday, since they fit so well into our international situation at this time.

Franklin had this to say on the question of world leadership—listen clearly as I quote:

"Europe is on our side of the question, as far as applause and good wishes can carry them—those who live under arbitrary power do nevertheless approve of liberty, and wish for it; they almost despair of recovering it in Europe; 'tis a common observation here, that our cause is the cause of all mankind, and that we are fighting for their liberty in defending our own."

Truer words were never spoken in Franklin's day and can be uttered again today.

We are without a doubt the hope of the world if a way of life in which we believe is to be preserved for ourselves and extended to other people.

So we must be vigilant.

We must question those who would foist upon us ideas such as are found in UNESCO education pamphlets, which urge that we rescind our citizenship and join a world organization.

We must guard against those who feel we should sacrifice much of our sovereignty in order to allay the fear of other nations.

None of this need be done.

What we must continue to try to do is to give assistance to those who need it most.

In giving that assistance, we must tell them where it came from, and why we, as American citizens, are able to share our good fortune with others.

If this story can be gotten across in foreign lands, we have no doubt that in time, the people in Communist countries and their satellites will rise in their own wrath and destroy that system before it wholly destroys their precious countries.

Each nation cherishes its own way of life just as much as we do.

No one wants to be dominated by a power whose language and customs it cannot understand.

But there can be a common denominator, where respect for each other will be paramount, and where by an exchange of the necessities of life, we can actually turn swords into plowshares.

Instead of fearing an atomic explosion, we can benefit by the use of nuclear power for the good of all people.

We know that we are in a year in which much will be heard in the way of political propaganda as our two great parties in the United States strive for power.

And though we hear charges and countercharges, we are not alarmed.

When the chips are down, Americans will unite as no other people in the world.

Franklin knew that in his day.

For late in life he said:

"Do not believe the reports you hear of our internal divisions. We are, I believe, as much united as any people ever were, and as firmly."

Ladies and gentlemen, as we observe this 103d anniversary of the Junior Order, let us take to heart the words of Benjamin Franklin.

No matter what one hears, we are a united people working for a better place for each of us in which to live and rear our families in peace.

But we must keep our guard up.

For it is only by constant vigilance on the part of such organizations as the Junior Order that we as a nation can protect the American form of government and thus preserve our cherished legacy of liberty and freedom purchased with the blood of American patriots.

Therefore, let us resolve to continue our efforts to keep the United States strong and free and thus help to guarantee for our children—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness which are their rightful heritage.

TVA Repayments Into Treasury Exceed Statutory Requirements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee Valley Authority has been regarded for many years—by those who are fair-minded—as one of the most efficiently operated Government agencies in our entire Federal system.

This great agency which has contributed so much to our national-defense effort has diligently been repaying into the Federal Treasury the investment in its power operations.

Today, TVA is far ahead of its regular payment schedule and we can only conclude that this has been brought about by efficient management and operation.

Through 1957, a total of $261,500,000 will have been repaid into the Federal Treasury by TVA. The following table of repayments shows accurately the annual revenues and other payments paid by TVA into the Federal Treasury.

The schedule of payments follows:

Payments made by TVA into the United States Treasury as repayment of investment in its power program

Fiscal year	Payment	Total payment
1948	$10,500,000	$10,500,000
1949	5,500,000	16,000,000
1950	5,500,000	21,500,000
1951	9,000,000	30,500,000
1952	12,000,000	42,500,000
1953	15,000,000	57,500,000
1954	20,000,000	77,500,000
1955	50,000,000	127,500,000
1956 (estimated)	59,000,000	186,500,000
1957 (proposed)	75,000,000	261,500,000
Repaid into Treasury prior to enactment of statutory requirements prior to 1948		24,000,000
Total payments through 1957		285,000,000

Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting at this point in the RECORD the results of a poll conducted among my constituents on questions pertinent to present issues. I am sure that the Members will find the results of this poll quite interesting:

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS FROM CONGRESSMAN LAWRENCE H. SMITH, SUPPLEMENT TO ISSUE NO. 191 IN THE MILL AT WASHINGTON, MAY 22, 1956

1. President Eisenhower is asking for $4.9 billion in foreign aid:

(a) Do you favor continued military aid? Yes, 976; no, 1,242.

(b) Do you favor continued economic aid in dollars? Yes, 574; no, 1,564.

(c) Do you favor continued technical aid as self-help? Yes, 1,475; no, 668.

(d) Do you favor a 10-year aid program. Yes, 642; no, 1,589.

2. Should our immigration laws be liberalized to permit increased immigration? Yes, 679; no, 1,595.

3. Should the free-world nations supply Communist countries with strategic materials: copper, machine tools, etc.? Yes, 44; no, 2,205.

4. Do you think East-West trade should be permitted? Yes, 983; no, 966.

5. Do you think the free world can coexist with the Communist world, under existing conditions? Yes, 796; no, 1,338.

6. Do you think Red China should be admitted to the United Nations? Yes, 112; no, 2,101.

7. Should the United States vote against Red China's admission to the United Nations? Yes, 1,834; no, 302.

8. Do you think the new Russian attitude indicates a desire to live at peace with the free world? Yes, 86; no, 2,024.

9. Do you think United States aid is stopping the spread of communism? Yes, 737; no, 1,333.

10. Should the United States share its knowledge of atomic energy with other countries? Yes, 688; no, 1,439.

11. Do you favor the soil-bank plan for agriculture? Yes, 1,028; no, 987.

12. Do you approve of the flexible price-support idea? Yes, 1,201; no, 807.

13. Do you approve of 90 percent of parity for all agricultural commodities: milk, corn, cotton, wheat, tobacco, peanuts, etc.? Yes, 151; no, 1,936.

14. Do you think a self-help program is advisable for the dairy farmer, with some aid from the Federal Government? Yes, 2,295; no, 291.

15. Do you believe that Congress can solve the farm problem? Yes, 692; no, 1,364.

16. The Federal Government proposes aid to education:

(a) Do you favor the Federal Government providing school-construction funds to States on a matching basis, but under strict State control? Yes, 964; no, 1,128.

(b) Do you approve the Federal Government making long-term, low-interest loans for school construction? Yes, 1,138; no, 673.

(c) Are you against Federal aid to schools in any form? Yes, 965; no, 1,129.

17. Do you approve Federal funds for local library purposes? Yes, 562; no, 1,635.

18. The Federal Goverment proposes a long-range highway program:
(a) Do you think we should pay for it as we go by a gas-tax increase? Yes, 1,162; no, 799.
(b) Should we finance it by bonds? Yes, 858; no, 913.
(c) Should we delay this program to a later date, in view of existing deficits? Yes, 869; no, 1,040.

19. Do you favor a right-to-work law? Yes, 1,921; no, 163.

20. Do you think labor unions should enter political contests, as such? Yes, 96; no, 2,107.

21. Do you think that union funds should be used for political purposes without consent of members? Yes, 21; no, 2,195.
(a) Or with the consent of members? Yes, 281; no, 1,785.

22. Do you favor requiring registration of pension and welfare funds collected by unions? Yes, 2,138; no, 82.

23. Do you favor reduction of taxes before balancing the budget? Yes, 592; no, 1,645.

24. Do you favor an increase in postal rates to meet postal deficits? Yes, 1,474; no, 670.

25. Do you favor lowering the social-security age limit for women from 65 to 62 years? Yes, 1,241; no, 961.

26. Do you approve extending social security to all groups of workers not presently covered by this plan? Yes, 1,316; no, 820.

27. Do you approve Federal funds for research in the field of health? Yes, 1,396; no, 770.

28. Do you favor appropriations for public housing? Yes, 401; no, 1,715.

29. Do you favor appropriations for housing for elderly people on a modest basis? Yes, 1,183; no, 982.

30. Do you favor granting pensions to war veterans 65 years of age or older, on the basis of need? Yes, 1,318; no, 878.

31. Please check the 6 issues you think most important today:
Government spending, 1,649.
Maintaining peace, 1,512.
Control of communism in America, 1,460.
Balancing the budget, 1,416.
Taxation, 1,387.
Communists or fifth amendment people in Government, 1,372.
Reduction of debt of Federal Government, 1,330.
Farm prices and policies, 1,254.
American foreign policy, 1,240.
United States foreign-trade policies, 1,205.
Defense and war preparedness, 1,190.
Labor policies, 1,176.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 23, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, May 7, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Douglass Carroll, pastor, Central Assembly of God Church, Biloxi, Miss., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we lift up our prayer to Thee for faith and courage. We pray that we may never fail nor forsake Thee. As the watchman waits for the morning so we wait for divine guidance. We thank Thee for this great Republic of ours. May Thy blessings continue upon all peoples of the world. May love become the desire of all mankind. O spirit of the living God, give us love and power, with righteousness and peace. May the power of this love cover the earth. Gather up our desires and motives and harmonize them with Thy will, blending them into a volume of spiritual power. Help us in this desire to continue in peace and safety. O loving God, bless, we beseech Thee, the President of the United States, Members of the United States Senate, and all who exercise duly constituted authority in our land, for we ask it in the name of our dear Redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. SMATHERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 22, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 3073) to provide for an adequate and economically sound transportation system or systems to serve the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi, Mr. MACK of Illinois, Mr. ROGERS of Texas, Mr. WOLVERTON, Mr. HINSHAW, and Mr. DOLLIVER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 1016. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ida Bifolchini Boschetti;

H. R. 1471. An act for the relief of William J. Robertson;

H. R. 1779. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Juniper division of the Wapinitia Federal reclamation project, Oregon;

H. R. 2904. An act for the relief of Maj. Orin A. Fayle;

H. R. 3054. An act for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives;

H. R. 4026. An act for the relief of James C. Hayes;

H. R. 4162. An act for the relief of Kahzo L. Harris;

H. R. 4604. An act relating to the issuance of certain patents in fee to lands within the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 4640. An act for the relief of James M. Wilson;

H. R. 4656. An act relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina;

H. R. 5047. An act to increase the compensation of trustees in bankruptcy;

H. R. 5478. An act to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 5652. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army and Air Force, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6084. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians, California, to the Palm Springs Unified School District;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of Lt. P. B. Sampson;

H. R. 6374. An act to repeal legislation relating to the Gallup-Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navaho Indian Reservation;

H. R. 6623. An act to amend the act of July 1, 1952, so as to obtain the consent of Congress to interstate compacts relating to mutual military aid in an emergency;

H. R. 6990. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States of the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America;

H. R. 7540. An act to provide for the sale of a Government-owned housing project to the city of Hooks, Tex.;

H. R. 8309. An act for the relief of Col. Henry M. Zeller;

H. R. 8810. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, equip, maintain, and operate a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Miles City, Mont.;

H. R. 8904. An act to amend certain laws relating to the grade of certain personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps upon retirement;

H. R. 9207. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands; and

H. R. 9257. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the punishment of persons who assist in the attempted escape of persons in Federal custody.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. SMATHERS, and by unanimous consent, the Armed Services Subcommittee investigating the Air Force and the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. O'MAHONEY, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee

on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to hold a hearing this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour, for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, and that statements in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REGULATION OF MOVEMENT FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES OF PLANT PESTS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to regulate the movement from foreign countries into or through the United States, and the interstate movement, of plant pests, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

GRANTS TO CERTAIN PERSONS WHO ARE INJURED OR WHOSE PROPERTY IS DAMAGED BY AIRCRAFT OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize grants of not more than $500 to certain persons who are injured or whose property is damaged by aircraft of the Armed Forces of the United States (with accompanying papers), to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN FEMALE MEMBERS OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide relief of certain female members of the Air Force, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUNISHMENT FOR KILLING OR ASSAULTING EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to include, within the provisions of law providing punishment for killing or assaulting Federal officers on official duty, officers and employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare engaged in enforcing the food and drug or public health laws of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Maui County, Hawaii, relating to the funds for the establishment by the Small Business Administration of an office in Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Schenectady Builders' Exchange, of Schenectady, N. Y., signed by John A. Donnelly, secretary, embodying resolutions adopted by that exchange, relating to surtaxes, and so forth; to the Committee on Finance.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—PETITIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present petitions signed by 150 citizens of the State of California, and sundry citizens of the State of New York, favoring the enactment of legislation to prohibit liquor advertising in interstate commerce. I ask unanimous consent that one of the petitions, without the signatures attached, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, one of the petitions, without the signatures attached, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the States under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages. At a time when one out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic there should be no encouragement to increasing the use of such beverages. Children and youth are being misled to consider them harmless, especially by the powerful audio and visual suggestions of radio and television.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES APPRECIATION WEEK—PROCLAMATION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, without question our Federal employees have made, and are making, substantial contributions toward the economy and welfare of our Nation. It is with pride that I point out that the State of Florida is the first State to officially recognize the invaluable services which they have rendered, and are continuing to render by designating the week of June 10 in their honor.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a proclamation issued by the Honorable LeRoy Collins, Governor of the State of Florida, proclaiming the week of June 10 to 16, 1956, as Federal Government Employees Appreciation Week.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF FLORIDA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Tallahassee.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Federal Government has a minimum of 40,000 employees throughout the State in both civil and military agencies; and

Whereas the payroll exceeds millions yearly and operations, purchase of various types of supplies, and maintenance costs involve many millions of dollars more; and

Whereas Federal contracts let to industries in Florida mean several millions of dollars more for Florida's economy; and

Whereas the Government of the United States is one of the major industries in this State and a most important factor in a stabilized economy because of the consistency of the money spent; and

Whereas these thousands of employees as permanent residents—paying various Florida taxes and supporting their homes and raising their families here—represent through the selective and elective processes of Federal service highly desirable citizens; and

Whereas growth of this State will necessitate at an increasing rate expansion of Federal activity here.

Now, therefore, I, LeRoy Collins, by virtue of the authority vested in me as Governor of the State of Florida, do hereby proclaim the week of June 10–16, 1956, as Federal Government Employee Appreciation Week in Florida.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Florida to be affixed at Tallahassee, the capital, this 5th day of April A. D. 1956.

LEROY COLLINS,
Governor.

Attest:

R. A. GRAY,
Secretary of State.

FLUORIDATION OF PUBLIC WATER SUPPLIES—MEMORIAL

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorial signed by a number of my Connecticut constituents, dated May 18, 1956, regarding the fluoridation of public water supplies, which is representative of a great deal of mail I am receiving on the subject.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

MAY 18, 1956.

Senator PRESCOTT BUSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUSH: Some years back, according to our recollection, public funds were openly appropriated by the Congress for fluoridation purposes. Although this no longer happens, we do find millions in tax money earmarked for dental disorders, and we furthermore find that fluoridation continues to be relentlessly pushed on a nationwide scale.

May we, therefore, recommend that, as our voice in Congress, you make every effort to omit, or at least curtail, general appropriations which may be diverted to finance this experiment in compulsory medicine.

We would further request that a joint House and Senate committee be established to investigate this un-American movement in order to expose the propelling force behind it, whether originating with the Public Health Service, the American Dental Association, or certain commercial interests, and thereby effect a return to the ethical administration of medicine on a voluntary and an individual basis.

Please accept our thanks for your kind attention.

WESTINGHOUSE PLANT STRIKE, LA CROSSE, WIS.—TELEGRAM

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] received a wire today from John P. Madgett, general manager, Dairyland Power Cooperative, La Crosse, Wis., in which Mr. Madgett asked that the wire be placed in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

The Senator from Wisconsin left for Wisconsin, and the wire came in subsequent to his leaving. His office has asked me to put it in the RECORD for him and I am happy to do so.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LA CROSSE, WIS., *May 22, 1956.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: A general strike at the various manufacturing plants of the Westinghouse Electric Corp. was started on October 17, 1955, and after many weeks of negotiations, the strike was apparently settled and this seems to be the common understanding. This is not so. The south Philadelphia works of Westinghouse is still on strike and management has been deadlocked in negotiations with UE Local 107, apparently on the issue of management's right to establish production standards. It is true that the main strike has been settled and that the various Westinghouse plants have gone back to work, except this one, which is very vital not only to Dairyland Power Cooperatives, but to the entire utility industry. This plant manufactures turbines for generation of electrical energy. Westinghouse, General Electric, and Allis Chalmers have a virtual monopoly in the manufacture of turbines. As a result of the continued work stoppage at south Philadelphia, a 50,000-kilowatt turbine scheduled for delivery last January is still being held up. When we consider that orders for turbines of this size must be placed 30 months before expected delivery, and because of the few manufacturers making this type of equipment, Dairyland Power Cooperative and other utility industries in similar unenviable positions have no place to turn. Dairyland Power supplies electrical energy to 93,000 farm families and rural businesses in the States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and Illinois. We urgently need delivery of this turbine in order to provide us with capacity to meet early winter peak loads. If this turbine is not delivered, it will mean additional hardship to our thousands of farmers who are already otherwise hard pressed.

Dairyland stands to lose untold thousands of dollars with this continued delay. It jeopardizes our commitments and may result in the breaking of contracts of long standing. In the end, it will seriously jeopardize our financial position. It seems peculiar, indeed, that the many Westinghouse plants which manufacture items which can be supplied by many other manufacturers have gone back to work but that the strike in the division which is virtually monopolistic and ties up critical production in many parts of the country cannot be settled.

We do not point a finger at either Westinghouse or UE Local 107, but no progress is being made toward a solution. This, indeed, seems to be a most deplorable example of democracy in action, especially when we consider that thousands of innocent people are being hurt and can do nothing about it. May I respectfully suggest that you call this situation which is becoming progressively critical to the attention of the Senate. May I suggest that the matter be referred for immediate action to the proper Senate committee for review, that every effort be made to employ the services of all Federal agencies who in any way can be of assistance. May I further suggest that the top management and top labor leaders concerned be called in to have the overall situation reviewed by impersonal and objective conciliators. Because of the monopolistic aspects of this type of manufacture and because it concerns vital services to great masses of the public, it is definitely against the public interest to permit this type of work stoppage to continue. Failing all else, you and your Senate associates might wish to consider the enactment of proper Federal legislation which will prohibit strikes in strategically placed industries which are so vitally against the public interest.

JOHN P. MADGETT,
General Manager, Dairyland Power Cooperative.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for Mr. ERVIN), from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

H. R. 9822. An act to provide for the establishment of a trout hatchery on the Davidson River in the Pisgah National Forest in North Carolina (Rept. No. 2038).

By Mr. HOLLAND, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H. R. 10899. An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2039).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3909. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 3910. A bill for the relief of Joseph Louis Brockley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 3911. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide safeguards against mergers and consolidations of banks which might lessen competition unduly or tend unduly to create a monopoly in the field of banking; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DANIEL (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 3912. A bill to incorporate the State Guard Association of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 3913. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Potomac Electric Power Co. for the construction of a dam on the Potomac River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS) (by request):

S. 3914. A bill to amend sections 801, 802, and 1102 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 3915. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, as amended, and the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 3916. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to handling of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

The following concurrent resolution was submitted, considered, and agreed to:

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution providing for the return to the Senate of House bill 4656, relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he submitted the above concurrent resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT RELATING TO CERTAIN BANK MERGERS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to require the Federal banking supervisory authorities to give consideration to competitive and monopolistic factors in approving bank mergers.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the bill and the following items:

First. A memorandum explaining the provisions of this bill;

Second. A letter from Mr. Percival Brundage, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to the Secretary of the Treasury stating that this legislation would be in accord with the program of the President;

Third. A letter from Mr. W. Randolph Burgess, Acting Secretary of the Treasury, to the President of the Senate recommending the enactment of this legislation;

Fourth. My letter of May 16, 1956, to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], acting chairman of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation, setting forth my views on bank merger legislation pending before his subcommittee; and

Fifth. A copy of the resolution adopted by the American Bankers Association at its spring meeting last month in support of the principles embodied in my bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and other matters referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3911) to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide safeguards against mergers and consolidations of banks which might lessen competition unduly or tend unduly to create a monopoly in the field of banking, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (c) of section 18 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act is amended by striking out the third sentence thereof and substituting in lieu thereof the following: "No insured bank shall merge or consolidate with any other insured bank or, either directly or indirectly, acquire the assets of, or assume liability to pay any deposits made in, any other insured bank without the prior written consent, (1) of the Comptroller of the Currency if the acquiring, assuming, or re-

sulting bank is to be a national bank or a district bank, or (ii) of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System if the acquiring, assuming, or resulting bank is to be a State member bank (except a district bank), or (iii) of the corporation if the acquiring, assuming, or resulting bank is to be a nonmember insured bank (except a district bank). In granting or withholding consent under this subsection, the Comptroller, the Board or the corporation, as the case may be, shall consider the factors enumerated in section 6 of this act. In the case of a merger, consolidation, acquisition of assets or assumption of liabilities, the appropriate agency shall also take into consideration whether the effect thereof may be to lessen competition unduly or to tend unduly to create a monopoly, and, in the interests of uniform standards, it shall not take action as to any such transaction without first seeking the views of each of the other two banking agencies referred to herein with respect to such question; and in such a case the appropriate agency may also request the opinion of the Attorney General with respect to such question."

The memorandum, letters, and resolution presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT are as follows:

MEMORANDUM RE PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO REQUIRE THAT CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN TO COMPETITIVE AND MONOPOLISTIC FACTORS IN APPROVING BANK MERGERS

A variety of causes have resulted in an increased number of bank consolidations or mergers since the end of World War II, and particularly during the last 5 years. This has given rise to some apprehension that desirable levels of competition in banking might not be maintained unless steps were taken to enact legislation requiring that full consideration be given to the competitive aspects of such transactions prior to being approved by the Government official having jurisdiction. It will be noted later that the President in his Economic Report recommended that legislation be enacted with respect to this matter.

The consolidation and merger of banks or the absorption of banks by the purchase of their assets and the concurrent assumption of their deposit liabilities by other banks, are invariably in the form of asset acquisitions rather than stock acquisitions and do not come within the prohibitions and limitations of section 7 of the Clayton Act which is applicable, so far as banks are concerned, only to stock acquisitions. Section 7 of the Clayton Act prohibits corporate mergers where there may be a substantial lessening of competition or a tendency to create a monopoly. That section and other sections of the Clayton Act are administered by certain named boards and commissions with concurrent enforcement authority in the Department of Justice; but the last paragraph of section 7 of the Clayton Act expressly provides that that section shall not apply to transactions in certain regulated industries which are duly consummated pursuant to authority given by the Civil Aeronautics Board, Federal Communications Commission, Federal Power Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, United States Maritime Commission, and the Secretary of Agriculture. In the field of banking, limited solely to stock acquisitions which occur only when bank-holding companies acquire the stock of a bank (banks may not legally acquire stocks except in nominal amounts under the laws of some States) the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System administers section 7 of the Clayton Act with concurrent jurisdiction in the hands of the Department of Justice.

There have been introduced in the Congress several bills designed to insure that asset acquisitions in the form of bank consolidations, mergers or purchases may not substantially reduce competition or tend to create monopolies in banking. At least two of these bills, H. R. 2115 and H. R. 6405, would achieve this goal through an amendment to the banking statutes with jurisdiction in the hands of the three Federal bank supervisory agencies. One of the bills, H. R. 5948, recently approved by the House of Representatives, would achieve this goal by amending section 7 of the Clayton Act to bring asset acquisitions by banks within its scope. If enacted into law, the initial jurisdiction and administration would be vested in the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to determine whether in any proposed bank consolidation, merger or purchase there may be a substantial lessening of competition or a tendency to create a monopoly. Concurrent jurisdiction would vest in the Department of Justice.

The Treasury Department does not favor the technical method or jurisdictional scope that would be achieved by H. R. 5948. Banking is a supervised and regulated industry, and our dual banking system is one composed of well-designed checks and balances that have been the outgrowth of long and, at certain periods in our history, unhappy experience. They are complicated to the uninitiated, but these checks and balances that comprise our dual banking system in the form of (1) a national banking system under the Comptroller of the Currency, but with the requirement that all national banks must be members of the Federal Reserve System and of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; and (2) 48 separate and distinct State banking systems under the supervision of State officials and whose banks may or may not choose to apply for membership in the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, assure an aggressive and progressive climate for banking which redounds to the benefit of the public. State banks which are accepted for membership in the Federal Reserve System must be insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and are examined and supervised by the Federal Reserve banks in addition to the primary supervision given by the respective State government officials. State banks which are not members of the Federal Reserve System but are members of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation are examined and supervised by that corporation in addition to the primary supervision of the State government officials. Only the State banks that are not members of either the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and there are only 481 of such institutions in the United States with less than 1½ percent of the country's commercial banking resources, have no form of Federal bank supervision.

It will be appreciated that the powers of the three Federal bank supervisory agencies as between themselves, and the powers of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in relation to those of the 48 State banking departments, require delicate balance plus a fair measure of cooperative good will to function with complete effectiveness. That is the present status.

Under existing statutes, the Comptroller of the Currency is required to approve or deny all consolidations, mergers, and purchases where the continuing or acquiring bank is a national bank. The 48 State banking departments occupy a similar position where the continuing or acquiring bank is a State chartered institution. However, if the continuing or acquiring State chartered bank is a member of the Federal Reserve System, and a diminution is to occur in the combined total of the merging banks' capital or surplus, the approval of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is also required to the transaction. If the continuing or acquiring State chartered bank is not a member of the Federal Reserve System, but is insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the combined total of the merging banks' capital or surplus will be reduced, the approval of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is also required to the transaction.

H. R. 5948 would cut across all of these fields of authority without distinction and vest in the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, with concurrent jurisdiction in the hands of the Department of Justice, the entire responsibility of determining in every type of bank consolidation, merger or purchase whether the competitive aspects are such that it must be disapproved. We do not believe that this can fail to have injurious and far reaching effects on our dual banking system. It gives the Federal Reserve System complete dominance in this field of banking supervision, a position it has publicly stated it does not desire, and adds the Department of Justice as an additional Federal agency with which the 48 State banking departments would have to coordinate in their supervisory duties. H. R. 9424, recently reported out by the House Judiciary Committee, would, in this respect, have the same effect as H. R. 5948.

The proposed legislation accompanying this memorandum and letter would achieve the desired goal of safeguarding the preservation of competition in banking by an amendment to the banking statutes requiring that all asset acquisitions by insured banks in the form of consolidations, mergers, or the absorption of banks by purchase of assets and the concurrent assumption of deposit liabilities, receive the prior written consent of (1) the Comptroller of the Currency, if the continuing or absorbing bank is a national bank; (2) the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, if the continuing or absorbing bank is a State bank member of the Federal Reserve System, such approval to be necessary even though the transaction does not involve a reduction in the aggregate capital or surplus of the affected banks; and (3) the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, if the continuing or absorbing bank is a State bank that is not a member of the Federal Reserve System but is insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, such approval to be necessary even though the transaction does not involve a reduction in the aggregate capital and surplus of the affected banks.

The proposed legislation would require that these three Federal supervisory agencies carefully consider whether the effect of each such asset acquisition may be to lessen competition unduly or to tend unduly to create a monopoly. It would require, in the interests of achieving uniform standards, that the Federal bank supervisory agency having jurisdiction in a particular case shall seek the views of each of the other two supervisory agencies on the competitive and monopolistic aspects of such asset acquisitions. It would permit, but would not require, the bank supervisory agencies to request the opinions of the Attorney General. This will, in our opinion, assure uniform standards and observance in the weighing of the various competitive factors by the three bank supervisory agencies.

As previously stated, the proposed legislation would amend the banking laws rather than section 7 of the Clayton Act. This takes cognizance of the fact that banking is a supervised and regulated industry and that important banking factors must receive appropriate consideration and weight in conjunction with the purely competitive factors to achieve well rounded and sound decisions in the best interests of banking and the public. This can be done to the best advantage by the three Federal bank supervisory agencies whose officials are intimately

familiar with banking in all its phases, including the competitive factors, throughout the United States.

Under the proposed legislation the opinion of the Attorney General may be sought by any one of the three Federal bank supervisory agencies. Thus the knowledge of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice would be available to the banking agencies. However, we think it is wholly appropriate and necessary, based on what appears in the above paragraph, that the final decisions should be made by the respective bank supervisory agencies rather than the Department of Justice.

The noninsured State banks in the United States would not be covered by this legislation unless one were to be acquired in a merger or absorption by a national bank, or a State bank member of the Federal Reserve System, or a State nonmember bank insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. If two noninsured State banks were to merge or consolidate, the provisions of this legislation would not be applicable. However, this is a matter of small moment as there are only 481 of such banks located in 39 States, and it is inconceivable that a merger of any two, or even several, of such banks could even remotely infringe on the maintenance of adequate banking competition as the entire group have less than 1½ percent of the commercial banking resources of the country.

Under the proposed legislation the competitive factors to be considered would be whether the effect of a particular merger or other form of asset acquisition might be to lessen competition unduly or to tend unduly to create a monopoly. It is the view of the Treasury Department that the use of the word unduly is desirable because its interpretation is slightly broader than that of the word substantially and its use would give the banking agencies needed flexibility. Under certain circumstances, a bank merger may be highly desirable in the entire public interest even though it may incidentally result in a substantial but not an undue lessening of competition.

We believe the proposed legislation is consistent with the recommendations contained in the President's Economic Report that Federal legislation should be extended to the mergers of banking institutions. It is our opinion that the proposed legislation will adequately safeguard against any future tendencies in banking to lessen competition unduly or unduly create monopolies, and that it represents the best method to achieve this goal.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., May 16, 1956.

The honorable the SECRETARY
OF THE TREASURY.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This will acknowledge the receipt of Mr. Scribner's letter of April 3, 1956, transmitting a draft of a bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide safeguards against mergers and consolidations of banks which might lessen competition unduly or tend unduly to create a monopoly in the field of banking.

You are advised that there would be no objection to the presentation of the draft legislation to the Congress for its consideration and that enactment of legislation for this purpose would be in accord with the program of the President. In connection with this advice, however, I believe it is important for the appropriate committees of the Congress to know that the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission have raised questions as to whether such mergers should be subject to the Clayton Act. Accordingly, it is requested that a copy of this letter accompany your transmittal to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

PERCIVAL BRUNDAGE,
Director.

MAY 16, 1956.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill "To amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide safeguards against mergers and consolidations of banks which might lessen competition unduly or tend unduly to create a monopoly in the field of banking."

The proposed legislation would require that all asset acquisitions by insured banks in the form of consolidations, mergers, or the absorption of banks by purchase of assets and the concurrent assumuption of deposit liabilities, receive the prior written consent of the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency. It would require that these agencies fully consider whether the effect of each such asset asquisition may be to lessen competition unduly or to tend unduly to create a monopoly. It would require, in the interests of achieving uniform standards, that the Federal bank supervisory agency having jurisdiction in a particular case shall seek the views of each of the other two supervisory agencies on the competitive and monopolistic aspects of such asset acquisitions. It would permit, but would not require, the bank supervisory agencies to request the views of the Attorney General.

The Federal agencies are not now required by statute to consider the competitive or monopolistic aspects of the merger transactions requiring their approval. Bank asset acquisitions of this type are not under the jurisdiction of the Attorney General except as they may conflict with the Sherman antitrust laws. There are no instances in which the latter have been successfully applied in bank assets acquisition cases.

The proposed legislation would amend section 18 (c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act rather than section 7 of the Clayton Act. This takes cognizance of the fact that banking is a supervised and regulated industry, and that important banking factors must be weighed in conjunction with purely competitive factors in arriving at sound decisions. This can best be done by placing the responsibility in the hands of the three Federal bank supervisory agencies whose officials are intimately familiar with banking in all its phases throughout the United States.

The Treasury Department favors the proposed legislation and urges its enactment. In our view this bill represents the best approach to dealing with any future tendencies in banking to lessen competition unduly or unduly create monopolies. There is enclosed a memorandum which more fully sets forth the views of this department. It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress. The Bureau of the Budget has requested that a copy of its clearance letter accompany this transmittal, and accordingly a copy is attached.

Yours very truly,

W. RANDOLPH BURGESS,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

MAY 16, 1956.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Acting Chairman, Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: I appreciate your advising me of your subcommittee's plans to begin consideration on May 23 of legislation dealing with bank mergers, and your invitation to attend these hearings. I shall be out of the city on that date and am, therefore, writing you this letter for the record.

I enclose, for your convenience, copies of letters which I wrote the chairmen of the Committee on the Judiciary, the late Senator Kilgore and Senator EASTLAND, dated February 18, 1956, and March 12, 1956, respectively. I also enclose a copy of Senator EASTLAND'S reply, dated March 20, 1956.

The purpose of my letters, as they show, was to call attention to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency over legislation relating to banking under Senate rule XXV and to protect and reserve that jurisdiction.

For some time the staff of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency has been working with representatives of the Federal bank supervisory authorities and banking organizations with a view toward placing legislation before this committee dealing with the problem of bank mergers. I am informed that a proposal is now being considered by the Bureau of the Budget which represents the views of the Treasury Department, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Federal Reserve Board, and that it may be transmitted to the Congress within the next few days. If so, I intend to introduce it. If not, I may ask the Federal Reserve Board for its recommendation in the form of a draft bill. I am sure such a bill would be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Briefly, it would amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require the prior approval of bank mergers by (1) the Comptroller of the Currency if a national bank is involved; (2) the Federal Reserve Board if a State member bank is involved; or (3) the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation if a nonmember insured bank is involved. These agencies would be required to take into consideration whether the effect of the merger may be to lessen competition unduly or tend to create a monopoly, as well as other factors peculiar to banks.

There may well be circumstances (and there have been in the past) in which a bank merger may substantially lessen competition and yet in which the merger may be desirable from the point of view of sound banking and the public interest. Illustrative examples of such circumstances are listed below.

1. Where there is a reasonable probability of the ultimate failure of the bank to be acquired.

2. Where because of inadequate management the acquired bank's future prospects are unfavorable.

3. Where the acquired bank is a problem bank with inadequate capital or unsound assets and its acquisition by another bank would be the best practical means of dealing with the problem.

4. Where the acquired bank has no adequate provision for management succession or its management is incompetent.

5. Where the acquired bank is an uneconomic unit or is too small to meet the needs of its community by providing loans of sufficient size or by providing needed banking facilities.

6. Where several banks in a small town are compelled by an overbanked situation to resort to unsound competitive practices which may eventually have an adverse effect upon the condition of such banks and the merger of two or more of the banks would, therefore, be in the public interest.

It has been pointed out to me that these circumstances, and other factors peculiar to banking institutions, are within the cognizance of bank regulatory agencies, rather than the Department of Justice.

I am not now in a position to say that I should favor the above-described bill over those pending before your subcommittee, al-

though I am inclined to that belief at present. However, I certainly believe that point of view should be considered by the Congress, and by the committee charged with responsibility for banking legislation.

Therefore, I should oppose the final enactment of the bills pending before your subcommittee, insofar as they relate to bank mergers, unless and until the committee of which I am chairman has an opportunity to consider this question. I would hope that this could be done at this session, although I cannot say positively at this time that that will be possible.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

Whereas there are proposals pending in Congress in the form of two bills, H. R. 5948 and H. R. 9424, which would bring bank mergers consummated through acquisition of assets within the scope of section 7 of the Clayton Act and thereby lodge with the Justice Department concurrently with the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System jurisdiction to determine the impact of such mergers on competition; and

Whereas the banking industry is subject to as strict supervision by the Federal and State bank supervisory authorities as are the other Federally regulated and supervised industries in which merger transactions are excluded from the application of section 7 of the Clayton Act when consummated under the authority given by the administering commission or board; and

Whereas there are many important banking factors aside from purely competitive factors entering into merger decisions which must receive appropriate consideration and weight and the bank supervisory agencies which are intimately familiar by reason of historical background and long experience with banking in all its phases, including the competitive factors, are best qualified to weigh these factors and reach decisions which are in the best interests of banking and the public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Bankers Association reaffirms its opposition to H. R. 5948, and to H. R. 9424 to the extent that it applies to bank mergers; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Bankers Association recommends to Congress that if legislation be enacted it should be by amendment to the Federal banking laws to place the final responsibility for approval or disapproval of bank mergers in the appropriate bank supervisory authorities as to the banks subject to their respective jurisdiction and supervision.

PROVISION AND IMPROVEMENT OF HOUSING—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUSH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3855) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

IMPROVEMENT OF GOVERNMENTAL BUDGETING AND ACCOUNTING METHODS AND PROCEDURES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 21, 1956,

The name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 3897) to improve governmental budgeting and accounting methods and procedures, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and other Senators) on May 21, 1956.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON BRUSH CREEK, PRINCETON, W. VA. (S. DOC. NO. 122)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated March 20, 1956, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on Brush Creek, Princeton, W. Va., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works of June 1, 1948. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate Document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON GULFPORT HARBOR, MISS. (H. DOC. NO. 123)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated January 19, 1956, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of report on Gulfport Harbor, Miss., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works of June 21, 1952. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with an illustration, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

Statement by him on the occasion of Polish Constitution Day, May 3.

By Mr. JACKSON:

Address on the subject "Tomorrow's Merchant Fleet," delivered by Senator MAGNUSON at the Propeller Club dinner in Washington, D. C., May 22, 1956.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON VARIOUS CIVIL-RIGHTS PROPOSALS BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the committee hearings on the various civil-rights proposals set for 2:30 p. m., Thursday, May 24, 1956, have been canceled.

In their place, hearings have been set for 1:30 Friday, the following day, in the committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building.

Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee in order that a schedule of witnesses may be prepared.

DEPORTATION OF ARCHBISHOP MAKARIOS — MEMORANDUM OF THE ETHNARCHY OF CYPRUS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, we are all concerned about the tense situation in Cyprus. In support of Senate Resolution 229, of which I am a cosponsor, I wish to call the attention of the Congress to a memorandum of the Ethnarchy of Cyprus. The Ethnarchy consists of the elected hierarchy of the church and a group of lay leaders of the Greek community chosen as advisers.

The memorandum sets forth the Ethnarchy's position on the developments which have led to the present crisis in Cyprus.

I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM OF THE ETHNARCHY OF CYPRUS ON THE DEPORTATION OF HIS BEATITUDE, ARCHBISHOP MAKARIOS OF CYPRUS, AND THREE OTHER GREEK CYPRIOTS

The sequence of events that led to the arrest and deportation, by the British authorities of Cyprus, of His Beatitude, Archbishop Makarios, of Cyprus, the Most Reverend Bishop Kyprianos, of Kyrenia, the Reverend Papastavros Papagathangelou, and Mr. Polykarpos Joannides, Secretary to the Bishopric of Kyrenia, is the following:

1. As is generally known, by virtue of a very old tradition, the Archbishop of Cyprus is the recognized religious and national leader (Ethnarch) of the Greek people of Cyprus, who constitute four-fifths of the island's total population. In this capacity, the Archbishops of the island have always given expression to the natural wish of the Cypriot people to be allowed to decide their own political future. In accordance with principles internationally recognized, in recent years this wish of the Cyprus people has taken the form of a demand for the application in Cyprus of the principle of self-determination. In conformity with this desire of the people and in his position as Ethnarch, Archbishop Makarios has been leading, ever since he was elected to his throne in 1950, a peaceful campaign for self-determination.

2. An unfortunate, though foreseeable consequence of the persistent refusal of the British Government, until the summer of 1955, even to admit the existence of the Cyprus question has been that a section of the Greek people of Cyprus despairing of the efficacy of persuasion, resorted, since April 1955, to violence, as the only means for obtaining their freedom.

3. After the London Tripartite Conference, which was called to discuss the Cyprus question, ended in failure in September 1955, the Archbishop, in his desire that the island should be spared the evils of bloodshed, submitted to the British Government in October 1955, a plan regarding the political future of Cyprus, in which he proposed an agreement on the following terms:

"I. Recognition by the British Government of the right of the Cyprus people to self-determination constitutes the indispensable basis for the solution of the Cyprus question.

"II. After this official recognition, the Archbishop would be willing to cooperate with the British Government in framing a constitution of self-government and putting it into immediate operation.

"III. The time of the application of the principle of self-determination should constitute a subject for discussion between the British Government and the representatives of the Cyprus people who will be elected on the basis of the constitution."

It will be noticed that this plan represented an immense concession on the part of the Greek people of Cyprus, as it abandoned the demand for a fixed time limit regarding the application in Cyprus of the principle of self-determination.

4. This offer was followed by a long period of negotiations between the Archbishop and the British Government, during which the maximum offer of the latter was expressed in the formula set forth in the "statement of policy" on page 3 of the British White Paper (Cyprus: Correspondence Exchanged Between the Governor and Archbishop Makarios, Cmd. 9708, March 1956). Although this formula was far from being satisfactory—as can be seen by comparing it to the Archbishop's proposals—and in spite of strong protests directed against it by important sections of Greek Cypriot opinion, the Archbishop made a further concession by deciding to accept it, in the interests of the pacification of the island, on the sole condition that the constitution offered by the British should be one of genuine self-government (His Beatitude's letter of February 2, 1956, British White Paper, p. 6).

5. There followed a further period of negotiations in February of this year concerning the form of the constitution and the measures that should be taken on both sides for bringing violence to an end. In the course of these negotiations two more letters were exchanged (British White Paper, pp. 8–12).

Faithful to the conciliatory spirit which he had exhibited from the beginning of the negotiations, the Archbishop went a long way toward meeting the British position. As examples of the concessions he made—always in the face of heavy criticism from many of his own followers—we can cite:

(a) His agreement that in addition to foreign affairs and defense, the responsibility for internal security should also remain, for a certain period of time, with the Governor.

(b) His agreement that the more serious categories of political offenses should be excepted from the amnesty that was to be granted as a means and encouragement for the return of all sections of the people to peace and normality.

(c) His agreement that the dictatorial emergency regulations now in force should be repealed only gradually.

(d) His acceptance of the participation of representatives of the Turkish minority in the Council of Ministers, in spite of the general democratic principle according to which the majority of an assembly have the right to form a cabinet of their own.

6. By the end of February, thanks to the conciliatory attitude of His Beatitude, agreement had been reached on all points but three:

(a) Amnesty: The final British offer can be seen from the statement by the Right Honorable Alan Lennox-Boyd, member of Parliament, to His Beatitude (British White Paper, p. 12).

I. The British made the granting of the amnesty conditional on the prior restoration of law and order, which, as the Archbishop pointed out, carried the danger of creating a vicious circle: many an armed outlaw, for instance, would very probably hesitate to surrender as long as he did not know for certain whether all the other outlaws would do the same, thus fulfilling the condition of an amnesty, and, by thus hesitating, would perpetuate the anomalous situation. The Archbishop proposed, as a compromise, that the timing of the amnesty should be conditioned by the words "as soon as there was clear evidence of response (i. e., to his appeal for pacification)" but that, too, was rejected by the British.

II. The British excepted such wide categories of offenses from the amnesty that the latter would practically be applicable only to schoolboys imprisoned for painting nationalist slogans on walls or having participated in illegal processions. The Archbishop had admitted the exception of "offenses directed against human life and having resulted in death or bodily harm."

III. The British refused to undertake that the future assembly, which would represent the people of Cyprus, would have the right to deal with such categories of offenses as would be excepted from the present amnesty.

(b) Security: The British insisted that all powers in this field should be reserved to the governor for "as long as he thinks necessary." In the opinion of all Greek Cypriots, it was unacceptable that an important field of internal affairs should be left for an indefinite period of time out of the sphere of competence of the legislative assembly and the Cypriot ministers responsible to it. It was pointed out that there was hardly any precedent for such a clause. Even in Malaya, where civil war is still going on, the British Government has recently agreed to hand over to the local government not only internal security, but defense as well, within a fixed, short-time limit. It was further pointed out that the revolutionary groups now operating in Cyprus did not consist of fundamentally antisocial elements but of young men, with previously clean records, who had thought it their national duty to use violence against the colonial regime. Once the political question had been settled by mutual agreement, there was no reason to fear further disturbances, and the "terrorists" of today would only be too happy to return to normal life. Therefore, there was no reason for the people of Cyprus to accept a humiliating and unjustifiable curtailment, ad infinitum, of their right to look after their internal affairs, it being kept in mind that, according to reluctantly given British explanations, the field of "internal security" was understood by them in a very wide sense, and included, inter alia, all legislation "connected with security" as well as the administration of criminal justice.

In his effort to achieve an agreement, the Archbishop ultimately went very far indeed: he proposed that security should remain entirely under British control not only until law and order had been reestablished, but for a further year after the constitution had come into operation. Moreover, he proposed that, after that period, the transfer of powers in this field would be gradual and not immediate; last but not least, he proposed that, even after that, Cypriot authorities would cooperate with the Governor in all matters concerning the security of British troops stationed in the island. All these conciliatory proposals, however, were rejected by the British.

(c) Composition of legislative assembly: The British steadfastly refused to make it clear that the assembly would indeed represent the will of the people in that it would have a majority of elected Greek members. This issue was perhaps the most characteristic of the lack of sincerity of the whole British attitude; where the Archbishop demanded a few clear statements of democratic principles, he met with evasion and ambiguity. The British were reluctant to explain their constitutional plans, on the thin pretext that details should be discussed at a later date, after the agreement had been reached, and decided by a constitutional commissioner. Their argument was: "We cannot undertake any commitments about the form of the constitution without consulting the Turkish minority and we cannot tie in advance the hands of the constitutional commissioner."

Now this argument is obviously spurious because:

I. There was nothing to prevent the British from consulting the Turkish minority at any time and finding out what their views on the constitution were. In fact, their views are already known and have been given sufficient publicity. The Turkish minority (18 percent of the island's total population) demands equal representation in the assembly, i. e., half the seats. One does not see why the British could not make up their minds now whether they were going to adopt this curious Turkish view, or a similar one, or to accept the democratic principle of proportional representation advocated by the Greek element.

From the decision of the British once enunciated, it would be easy for the Greek majority to know whether the British were in good faith in their talk about "democratic self-government" or not, and they would accordingly accept or reject the British offer.

II. A constitutional commissioner is only a technician who can invent adequate legal formula for any given political principles. He can also, at best, exercise a conciliatory influence on opposing views over minor details of a constitution. He cannot, however, assume the power of deciding on the basic political principles that will be embodied in the constitution. Such a role was all the more unacceptable to the people of Cyprus in this particular case, since it was known that the constitutional commissioner would be a Briton and it could not be presumed that he would be uninfluenced by the interest of his own country. The assertion, therefore, of the British that they "could not tie in advance the hands of the constitutional commissioner" can hardly be taken seriously. The constitutional commissioner was to them merely a pretext for demanding what amounted to an unconditional surrender of the rights of the Greek Cypriots, who would have to sign, as it were, a blank agreement, after which the British Government, in the disguise of an allegedly "independent" constitutional commissioner, would dictate their constitutional terms.

The Archbishop was faced throughout the period of the negotiations with the same lack of good faith on the part of the British. The few elucidations he succeeded in getting, over other points of the constitution, were gained at great pains; the usual technique of the British was to coin phrases and formula that could be interpreted in many different ways, and every time clarification was sought they gave it in such manner as to obscure the issue even more. It must be noted, however, that all these difficulties only sprang into existence where demands concerning the application of democratic principles were concerned; the British could be very clear when it came to defining points and principles that were to their advantage.

7. Such were the reasons for the final breakdown of the negotiations, which were ascertained on the 29th of February, during a discussion between His Beatitude and Mr. Lennox-Boyd, British colonial secretary. We have dealt at length with the events preceding it and with the points of disagreement, in order to make it clear to all fair-minded people that the Archbishop tried his best to reach an agreement and went to the very last limits of concession, which neither his own national conscience and dignity, nor the will of his people could allow him to overstep. Responsibility for failure lies solely, therefore, with the British Government, who not only refused the Cypriots an unequivocal promise of self-determination within a reasonable time limit, but also the right to run their own affairs. In the meanwhile it is these refusals that the British masters in the art of euphemism, term "a

new and constructive approach to the island's political problem."

It might be asked why the Archbishop refused, pending a full agreement, to denounce violence and call upon his flock to refrain from it. The same question might be asked of a high dignitary of the Church of England, who recently blessed the arms of British troops departing for Cyprus in order to fight the Greek Cypriots who are struggling for their freedom; it might be asked of all churches in time of war. In this particular case, however, the answer is a simple one: Archbishop Makarios was prepared to appeal to his flock in the above spirit after an agreement had been reached, because only then could his appeal have been effective; before that, if he had called for the cessation of violence while he had no satisfactory British promise to offer to his people in return, his appeal would have failed, as it would have conflicted with the will and determination of the people, who have elected him to represent them. Such a failure would have seriously impaired his power to play any future role in the pacification of Cyprus and his action would therefore have been not merely useless, but positively harmful.

8. After the deadlock had been officially admitted, Cyprus found itself once more caught in the vicious circle of oppression, revolt and repression, military dictatorship and concentration camps, detention without trial, with every human right violated. The Archbishop then made a statement on the 5th of March, which made it clear that he would always be prepared for an agreement, if only the British changed their mind and showed at least a fraction of the spirit of concession which the Greek Cypriots had shown. Meanwhile, His Beatitude prepared to go to Athens for the purpose of consulting with the Greek Government about bringing the Cyprus question to the United Nations, in an attempt to find a peaceful solution to it through the agency of this international body.

The departure had been fixed for the 9th of March. Two days earlier, a British official called at the archbishopric and ascertained the exact date of the departure, in order—as he said—"that full facilities be arranged for His Beatitude's car to reach the airfield without being bothered by roadblocks".

9. At 2 p. m. on March 9, the Archbishop was arrested at the entrance of the airfield, and without having been allowed to communicate with anybody he was taken to an airplane and sent into exile to the Seychelles islands, together with the other men mentioned in the first paragraph of this memorandum, who had been arrested at the same time. On the same day, the archbishopric was occupied by troops, and several new dictatorial measures (censorship, etc.) were adopted for the purpose of preventing the people from expressing their feelings of grief and indignation. However, the latter found a way of powerful, though peaceful demonstration; quite spontaneously, all work ceased in the island; factories and shops closed and were still closed a week later, in spite of the existing ban on strikes.

10. On the same day a communique and a lengthy statement were issued by the Governor of Cyprus, in which he attempted to justify his unprecedented action. The substance of the arguments used is the following: it had already been found out, long ago, that the Archbishop was connected with the nationalist revolutionary group known as EOKA, which is regarded as responsible for most of the anti-British violence in Cyprus; in spite of that knowledge, British authorities had willingly closed their eyes to the evidence related to it and had pursued the negotiations for the sake of pacification; when, however, they came to the conclusion that the Archbishop did not really want a peaceful settlement, they decided to deport him, hoping that his removal would help to bring about pacification.

The argumentation is so weak that it hardly requires much refutation. However, it may be remarked:

(a) That the allegations concerning the Archbishop's connivance with violence are not supported by any proof that would be acceptable to any court of justice. That, perhaps, explains why exile was preferred to fair trial.

(b) Quite apart from the above, and assuming for a moment that the British allegations were true: the belated moral indignation and self-righteousness of His Beatitude's accusers sound hollow in view of the fact that, as they themselves say, they had known all about what they call his "shameful record" during the period when they sat at the same table and negotiated with him, treating him as an equal party and with the respect due to his dignity. That attitude of the British during the negotiations implies that, by realistically giving preference to expediency over legality, they treated the Archbishop, in fact, as the leader of a people fighting for its freedom and tried to reach an agreement with him, instead of instantly charging him with his "crimes" as they should have done if the fighting Greek Cypriots had been the mere "gang of common criminals" which British officialdom usually calls them (an argument which, incidentally, had been used by the British against the granting of an amnesty).

(c) Once the argument of formal legality has been proved hypocritical—because it cannot fairly be forgotten one moment and remembered the next—there only remains, as a possible justification for the action of the British on the grounds of pure expediency, the argument that the Archbishop had proved "unwilling" to reach an agreement. If that means that he was unwilling to surrender his people unconditionally to British plans, that is true, and it is an accusation that honors him. If it means, however, that he was averse to any reasonable compromise, it is blatantly untrue, and we hope to have proved as much in the preceding pages. It is incredible that an argument which the British did not use 6 months ago—when His Beatitude was still demanding immediate self-determination—is being used now that he has made all the concessions enumerated above.

(d) The argument that the Archbishop "personally constitutes a major obstacle to the return to peaceful conditions" is equally untrue. On the contrary, the evidence concerning his conciliatory attitude, combined with his unique position, admitted by the official communique, as the "traditional leader of the Greek Cypriot community" points to the obvious conclusion that, by sending him into exile, the British Government has destroyed—or, at least, postponed until his return—the only existing chance for a peaceful solution of the Cyprus question, a solution compatible with human dignity, honor, and freedom. For it is not genuine peace that reigns under a regime of military dictatorship, a regime unwanted by four-fifths of the people living under its rule. Even if the British managed to destroy all external symptoms of unrest in Cyprus and to reestablish "order," they will never succeed in vanquishing the passive resistance of the Greek people of Cyprus, who will never forsake their love of freedom or accept any agreement before the return of their Ethnarch. The "order" which will reign in Cyprus will be the same as that which is to be found in totalitarian countries, and the fate of its clergy the same.

11. We have endeavored to show how, in their effort to put an end by force to the struggle of the Greek Cypriots for freedom, the British Government has not stopped at an outrage reminiscent of medieval tyranny; they have violently deprived a Christian people, of ancient civilization and faith, of their leader, and one of the most venerable Christian churches of its Head.

Readers may form their own opinion on this example of the age-long struggle between might and right, and act in accordance with their conscience.

CYPRUS, *March 25, 1956.*

ADDRESS BY HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am taking this means to call to the attention of the Senate a speech delivered by the distinguished and highly competent Ambassador of the United States to Italy, the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce, at the American Assembly. In my opinion, this is a document well worth our consideration, because of its lucidity, its interest, and its understanding.

While the whole speech is very interesting and worth while, I should like to have my colleagues scan that part dealing with The Ambassador and Relations With Visitors. It is my hope that we shall recognize that what used to be an extracurricular activity in our missions abroad has now become a part of their regular format. Let us treat it accordingly, and see to it that enough personnel and appropriations are provided for this new and increasingly important part of our Foreign Service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address of Ambassador Luce be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

INTRODUCTION

When, earlier this year, Dr. Wriston invited me to address the ninth session of the American Assembly on "The Role of the Modern Ambassador," my pleasure in accepting was exceeded only by my trepidation. I was aware of the high importance of this gathering and so of the honor done me in asking me to join it. But I was also aware of the significance of your expert discussions and the impact your ensuing recommendations were bound to have on the conduct of our foreign relations. And I feared, as a relative newcomer to diplomacy, that my own contribution could not be very noteworthy. Secondly, I feared to disappoint you by not being able to come at the last moment. Unhappily, this last fear has been justified. But fortunately for me, most of you are experts in the field of foreign service. So you know that when any conflict arises between an ambassador's out-of-country speaking engagements and his duties at his mission, the main role of an ambassador is to remain at his post. So, I know I can count on your understanding. But I also beg your sympathy. For, while you have lost little by my unavoidable absence, it has deprived me of much inspiration, information and guidance.

THE COORDINATION OF FOREIGN ACTIVITIES

The theme of your conference—the coordination of the foreign activities of the United States, deals with one of the most urgent problems in the conduct of our foreign relations. Today, the field of diplomacy has broadened to cover virtually every phase, every aspect, every activity of human society, politics, economics, social welfare, commerce, trade, industry, agriculture, shipping, transport, and communications; education, culture, art, science, and religion; finance, investment, wages, incomes, standards of living, and indexes of productivity. Modern diplomacy has to concern itself with all these

things and many more. You can understand that not all, or even a large part of these varied activities can be carried on by the State Department and the Foreign Service alone. So the United States is represented in Italy by people from many departments and agencies of our Government.

All these activities, new and old, familiar and unfamiliar to classic diplomacy, must be coordinated if they are to be a success.

I have the honor to be Chief of Mission in the land where the idea-word "coordinate" was first uttered. In Caesar's lexicon, "co-ordinatus" meant "regulate together." Is it an oversimplification of ancient history to say that when the imperial Romans began to concentrate too much on regulating their allies and enemies, and too little on "regulating themselves together," the decline and fall of Rome was inevitable?

America, too, may be defeated—or rather self-cheated—in the prodigious task of world leadership to which destiny has called it, unless we, her servants, soon find better ways of coordinating our evermore complicated and every proliferating foreign functions.

Indeed, speaking from 3 years of an intense and sometimes painful personal experience, I can say that coordination is not a problem; it is the problem a modern American ambassador must wrestle with daily.

In this connection, may I draw to your attention the background paper Lincoln Gordon has prepared for this conference. In it, he has brilliantly and comprehensively covered our worldwide problem of coordinating United States overseas representation. But I especially urge your consideration, in discussion periods, of Mr. Gordon's 15 pages on the role of an ambassador. They are so full of fact, so meaty in commentary, so rich in suggestion, that I feel I can add nothing to his wide and complete analysis beyond some small and necessarily incomplete personal documentation.

Mr. Gordon has seen, with a clarity and a sympathy which may mercifully move you to recommendations of relief, that the coordinator role of a modern American ambassador, especially in a large capital, is a singular role—singular because of the staggering plurality of its functions.

On paper, an ambassador's first job is to coordinate his own embassy. This prime role as coordinator—or to use more familiar language—as captain of his country's team—is assigned to him under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and its implementing Executive order. But in practice, an ambassador's first job is to coordinate himself.

In a large post, such as London, Paris, Rome, Berlin, Tokyo, this self-coordination alone is an endless and exhausting task. But, unless he performs it efficiently, no ambassador can hope to play successfully his major role of captain coordinator of the multitudinous activities, duties, responsibilities, programs, and policies of his embassy.

THE ROLES OF A MODERN AMBASSADOR

First, there is the essentially diplomatic role an ambassador assumes as his President's personal envoy. This centers about his personal relation to the prime minister, the foreign minister and top government characters. But it inevitably extends in the atom age to many other political figures, both in and out of the government; and to the country's leaders, economic, social, labor, religious, cultural.

There is also, naturally, his personal relation to his colleagues—the other ambassadors of the diplomatic corps.

And finally there is, if not his personal relation, at least the relation of his person to the people of the country—the general public.

Then, there is his relation to his own Government in all its branches; and America's traveling officials, businessmen, VIP's, and distinguished or important visitors.

And there is also his relation—a somewhat unique one in the eyes of ambassadors of other countries—to American tourists.

Last, but not least, there is his relation with the press, both American and foreign.

The mere recital of this list of ambassadorial relations should convince any student of foreign affairs that no atom-age ambassador can hope to perform his basic duty—which is to further good relations between the United States of America and the country to which he is accredited—unless he can effectively coordinate these many roles. Each of them demands much time and strength. He must, consequently, give much thought and careful judgment to which, in any given day, will be given priority. And having decided, he must be prepared to change his decision at an hour's notice if his performance in some other role should suddenly seem to serve his country's interest better.

Let me, as I say, in the documentary spirit, enlarge a little on some of the activities generated by these manifold but inescapable ambassadorial roles, as I have tried to assume them in Rome.

RELATIONS TO THE HOST GOVERNMENT

For centuries, the role of an ambassador consisted chiefly in maintaining friendly, as well as official, relations with a few highplaced key government figures of the host country: the ruler or president, the prime minister or foreign minister. This is still true today. But in a democracy—such as modern Italy— in addition to knowing—and entertaining—these "top characters" he must also be on a basis of friendship with literally dozens of other government personalities. Nor can he neglect cultivating the acquaintance of important members of the opposition. For in democracies the "outs" today have a most disconcerting way of becoming the "ins" tomorrow. And an ambassador's country suffers, if, without good reasons of policy, he has neglected or ignored the "outs" in their hours of eclipse.

Accordingly, in Rome, over and beyond the official exchanges of view that I have with the foreign office, the prime minister's office and with various ministries, I must make frequent efforts to see—or as American politicians put it—to "visit" with the leaders and some of the parliamentarians of every party which can be considered favorable to our overall American policy objectives. I must do this to keep my own Government informed of developing political trends. But I must also do it to inform Italians who are today, or may be tomorrow, in positions of authority, of how the United States Government feels about the many and complicated issues which mutually afflict us in a painfully complex and interdependent society.

Such contacts, made in offices, over informal luncheon or dinner tables, at private receptions or public functions, consume many hours. Many more are consumed by the consequent necessity of writing messages, reports, letters, on the information gathered from them. But this gathering and reporting of information is only one-half of the purpose of these conversations. The other half—to quote the immortal American phrase—is "to win friends and influence people."

At a Washington social function not long ago—a retired ambassador was overheard handing a young diplomat the key to success. "Always report what the Prime Minister told you," he said, "but never," he added with a twinkle, "report what you told the Prime Minister."

So far as the writing of reports to one's own government goes, this is excellent advice. Your Government assumes that what you say will be the official United States line. And, the line is already known to those reading your reports. (At least, if there is coordination at the other end, it is.) But the fact is, an ambassador must not only listen and seek to learn and understand—he must often talk and persuade, even argue with his diplomatic clients. He must do so, of course, with tact and prudence and in a spirit of friendship. As a distinguished American ambassador now retired put it to me "You must never call a spade a spade. You must call it a useful artifact for the levitation of the soil, with a somewhat less than aesthetic appearance if left in the drawing room."

THE EFFECT OF COMMUNICATIONS ON THE DIPLOMAT'S ROLE

A hundred years ago—even less—sailing ships brought emissaries their messages and instructions every 3 or 6 months, or even a year. Then came cable, telephone, airplane, and radio. And with their advent, there was born the fiction that the speeding up of communications made the diplomat's job little more than that of a glamorized errand boy who delivers "canned messages" from his own government to the host government. Popular opinion sometimes holds that a modern ambassador is a lucky fellow. He never needs to think for himself. He receives detailed instructions every hour on the hour about what to say, where, when, how, and to whom.

Nothing could be less like the truth.

Here is what the well-known British diplomatist, Harold Nicolson, had to say on this subject only 3 years ago, in his Chichele Lectures, delivered at the University of Oxford:

"An ambassador at a foreign capital must always be the main source of information, above all the interpreter, regarding political conditions, trends, and opinions in the country in which he resides. * * * It must always be on his report that his government bases its decision upon what policy at the moment is practicable and what is not. * * * But the ambassador also remains the chief channel of communication between his own government and that to which he is accredited. He alone can decide at what moment and in what terms his instructions can best be executed. It is he who, as Demosthenes remarked, is 'in control of occasions' and therefore, to a large extent events. Moreover, he remains the intermediary who alone can explain the purposes and motives of one government to another. * * *

"Nor is this all. An ambassador should possess sufficient authority with his home government to be able to dissuade them from a course of action which, given the local circumstances, he knows will prove disastrous. Governments represented in foreign capitals by ambassadors to whose judgment and advice they pay no attention are wasting their own time and public money."

Modern communications in some ways actually make an ambassador's job harder. The facility of transmission of messages necessarily increases the volume of words, the variety of their content, and the numbers of their sources. (All that is signed "Dulles" is not Dulles.) And easy communications also sometimes incline the personnel of a government with its many agencies to send hastily written or conflicting advice to our overseas representatives.

Because communication is so swift there is also the temptation to say too much too soon and often without interdepartmental coordination. The embassy, comprised of many missions, also suffers the same temptation. But I doubt that it succumbs as often as the homefront agencies.

Again, the growth of understanding between countries—their awareness of one another's current necessities—has just not kept up with the speed of modern communications and the growing penchant for using them. Often, because of this lag between the speed with which his instructions

from the homefront arrive, and its incomprehension of some new problem that has developed in the ambassador's country, he must argue back with his government, asking them for a change in instructions more suitable to what Nicolson calls the policy that is practicable at the moment.

Plainly, in view of the many other roles an American ambassador must play, to give all day (which he could easily do) to his political relations would be bad self-coordination. Also it would be bad diplomatic technique and organization. For a well-coordinated ambassador relies heavily on his embassy officers, especially the Foreign Service men of his political section who have been trained and organized for the day-in and day-out gathering, reporting, and evaluating of information.

My own rule of thumb for coordinating myself in this role of information gatherer or purveyor is never to undertake any task which they can properly do as well, or better. And 9 times out of 10, a professional career diplomat can do the latter.

In this connection, I would like to suggest that the numbers of career Foreign Service officers, assigned to any given country, should take into account not only the size or importance of the country, but the form and stability of its government. Fluid internal political situations, especially in modern democracies that are hosts to Communists and fellow-traveling parties, unbelievably multiply the professional demands and strains on every member of an embassy, especially in the political section.

RELATIONS TO OTHER AMBASSADORS

As you know, protocol calls for the exchange of visits between foreign chiefs of mission within a short time after arrival at the capital of the country. In Italy, there are 64 ambassadors and ministers accredited to the Italian Republic. Consequently, I have made and received over 250 protocol calls. In case the discrepancy in my addition bothers you, the explanation is that an outgoing envoy also pays a farewell call. And the double dating then commences anew with his successor. In all, I have spent upward of 300 man-hours in making and receiving these protocol visits.

In passing, on your visit it is customary for an ambassador to offer you cakes, sweets or tidbits, with a cup of coffee, tea, or his native liqueur. After 3 or 4 such calls in the course of a morning, followed by an official lunch, several receptions, and an official dinner, you understand better the grim humor of the remark made by an ambassador who resigned from his post with the explanation: "I had only one liver to give for my country."

But my relations to my diplomatic colleagues go well beyond these calls. There are our meetings at functions where our attendance is obligatory. For example, it is the general custom on the national holiday of his country, for an ambassador to give a reception to which the whole diplomatic corps is invited. Some ambassadors "cut" these functions because they are too busy. But the presence of the American ambassador is, if I may be Irish, virtually demanded by the effect created by his absence. I have attended a hundred such functions.

Furthermore, we ambassadors have professional interests, in common with regard to the conduct of international affairs. It is essential for me to devote an appropriate amount of my time to meetings and conferences with my colleagues on such matters of mutual interest as for example, NATO, disarmament, and European integration. Large events or changes in the international situation, such as the summit meetings, the recent visit of Khrushchev and Bulganin to London, or the Near East and Algerian disorders—send us all automatically scurrying about to one another's embassies, sounding out other emissaries for their reactions. At such times the large "cocktails," dinners, or receptions, so much condemned by the layman, are often tremendous time-saver devices: they provide a ready market place for these exchanges of views with a whole "pride" of one's colleagues.

Moreover, it is important that we mission chiefs of the Western countries work closely together in order to understand fully the foreign policies of each other's governments, so we may act in concert when the occasion requires. And what these days is sometimes more important, we must work together in order to understand differences in our points of view, and to try to find common grounds of accord or compromise. If found, needless to say they are hastily and happily reported to our governments.

THE AMBASSADOR AND HIS RELATIONS WITH THE ITALIAN PUBLIC

One of America's continuing responsibilities is to show in words and deeds that we desire to recognize all the legitimate necessities and aspirations of friendly nations.

It is therefore my duty to show that the United States has a lively interest in the welfare of the Italian people.

For example, just several days ago I made my annual visit to Milan to represent our country at the American Day ceremony of the annual trade fair.

As you know, the Milan Trade Fair is the largest of its kind in Europe, with more than 600 private American firms displaying their products this year. I also visited our United States Government exhibit there.

Again, in passing, a powerful lot of coordinating had to be done by myself and the Embassy country team to secure our Government's entrance into this great fair last year and this.

In Milan I also delivered the traditional yearly speech before the American Chamber of Commerce in Italy.

From Milan, footsore, overdined and somewhat winded from toasting and impromptu and promptu speechmaking, I flew on to Turin where the annual international automobile show was being held.

My attendance at these events was spread over 4 crowded days and nights of official and semiofficial functions. They were typical of an ambassador's role vis-a-vis the Italian public.

These appearances were arranged for and publicized by Americans working in the consulates and USIS offices in the two cities, and the success of my appearances was guaranteed by their tireless efforts to make them so.

During my 3 years in Italy, I have made more than a hundred public appearances. And almost all of them required speechmaking.

I have appeared, for example, in the newsreels and have been heard on the radio; to thank the people for their many warm and sincere messages of concern for the health of our President; to tell them of our Christmas food gifts; to inform them of our child-feeding programs. I have taken part in the launching of Italian ships constructed with United States aid; awarded medals to high-ranking officers of Italy's armed forces; visited children's hospitals at Christmas time; handed relief packages to victims of national disasters.

As you know, Italy was stricken by the cruel blizzards of this winter. Thousands of communities were isolated, and in desperate need of food, medicine and clothing. Our country team, plus the voluntary relief agencies in Italy, worked around the clock those stormy days to make thousands of tons of essential supplies available to snowbound sufferers. It took time to coordinate these efforts; they involved long truck convoys from Leghorn, a great United States airlift from Germany, supplies from various elements of our Army. And in the end, of course, I personally was there to hand over to our Italian Red Cross friends, symbolic relief packages, and to thank our own crews of the airlift.

In the fall of 1954, the Amalfi-Salerno coast was devastated by flashfloods that arose in the night, destroying homes and crops, drowning people. On the second day after the disaster, the Embassy's economic adviser, military attachés and I flew to Salerno. All day we made on-the-spot plans for relief to persons and for reconstruction of flood-destroyed property, and public works. We visited food depots, hospitals. Later that year, in December, I flew to Sardinia to initiate the distribution of 15,000 tons of feed for drought-stricken cattle.

I have attended the inauguration of new housing developments in Bari and Reggio Calabria; and toured through Sicily, Sardinia and the Mezzogiorno inspecting land reform projects. These visits are interesting and instructive in themselves, of course, but their attendant publicity reminds Italians in a friendly way of the extent of United States aid. This is a most necessary thing to do, in a country where the Communists allege that all aid and reconstruction works have been undertaken only as a result of their pressure on the Italian Government. This necessity lies beyond many of the public efforts I must make, and in a sense all American Ambassadors are making around the globe these days.

Then there are the cultural events I participate in. On Washington's Birthday, 1955, for example, I spoke at the inauguration of the Bologna Center of Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies. I have taken part in opening ceremonies at the University of Perugia for American Fulbright grantees studying in Italy, attended art shows in Rome and Venice, the Opera in Naples and Milan, the film festival in Venice, ballets, symphonies, theatres and lectures by the score.

Altogether, in 3 years I have visited 27 cities and traveled over 25,000 miles inside Italy. And, on each of these trips I have called upon the local mayor and prefect, and other leading figures in the community. (Footnote: Each of these visits generates the necessity to write thank you notes of such a nature that the recipients can, if they will, publish them in local papers as a further proof of the good will of America, as expressed through the appreciation of the Ambassador!)

In addition to a modern Ambassador's contact with government and diplomatic figures, and with the public, he is also expected to keep in touch with the leading social, business, and economic leaders of the country. I will not weary you with an account of the time and effort consumed in meeting them too, at diners, receptions and, of course, in my office at the Embassy.

THE AMBASSADOR AND RELATIONS WITH AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND PEOPLE

It is sometimes charged that in an Ambassador's efforts to assume his many roles overseas, he loses touch with his own government. A common charge is that foreign envoys "don't know what goes on at home." This is certainly not true of the Rome Embassy.

As you know, the Ambassador and the Embassy-consular posts operate under the guidance and supervision of the Department of State—and are informed by the flood of cabled and pouched communications to which I have already referred.

In addition, the Assistant Secretary's office passes information, policy guidance, briefing papers, and summaries of legislative decisions that affect American policy in Italy. Weekly reviews of economic development arrive from ICA, the Departments of Commerce, Treasury, and Agriculture.

The United States Information Agency keeps the Embassy informed of public affairs

developments, providing—to aid departments—that information which is pertinent in this field.

Naturally I could not keep my head above this avalanche of news about "what goes on at home" if I had to plow through it personally. Here again the members of the country team exercise their all-important staff function of keeping me informed of papers essential for my guidance. At weekly staff meetings we discuss the latest national or international developments. I receive internal papers on significant legislation affecting the United States in Italy. I have weekly meetings with individual division heads, such as the Minister for Economic Affairs and the head of USIS.

My country team officers have the responsibility of receiving, analyzing and synthesizing incoming information for my attention, but I have the responsibility of giving much of my attention to it.

I have had my eyeglass prescription changed three times—all for the worse, since arriving in Italy.

But there are other means for me and my staff to keep up to date on what is going on at home. The American press is one important source of information. Discussions with visiting officials and leaders from the United States also give me the current flavor of United States whither-awayness.

I have followed the practice of returning to the United States for consultation on the average of twice each year. While in Washington I talk with the President, confer with congressional leaders of both parties and keep in touch with business and industrial executives. I have accompanied Prime Minister Scelba and President of the Republic Gronchi on their trips to the United States. These visits, apart from their diplomatic and political significance, have provided me special opportunities to contact leaders on the American scene, and incidentally put them in touch with many American leaders who didn't always know what goes on in Italy.

I have emphasized the inflow of guidance from the Department of State. There is also the outflow. Embassies and consulates have the responsibility of collecting information, of analyzing it and of relaying it back to Washington. This is done by using all modern means of communication, and much of the material is classified. In substance, however, this flow of information from Rome to Washington is the basic official channel by which I and my staff report to the Department, and through it to the American people. This traditional function of the Foreign Service builds the foundation upon which American foreign policy is constructed.

THE AMBASSADOR AND RELATIONS WITH VISITORS

During the 3 years that I have been in Italy, approximately a million and a half Americans have visited the country. Many of these were official visitors—military and Government leaders, Congressmen, distinguished persons from private life traveling on Government-sponsored projects, and so on. The vast majority of these expected to contact the Embassy.

Perhaps it would be well to give some detail about these official visitors. There are a number of categories. Congressmen, personal representatives of the President, high-ranking military officers and important non-Government VIP's fall into one category. Men and women in this group are naturally given the full, deep-piled, freshly beaten red carpet treatment. They receive detailed briefings on the Italian scene from the various elements of the country team. Social engagements, shopping and sightseeing tours are arranged for them and their wives; tourist, ticket and hotel-booking services are provided. Certainly, on these latter services, only the American Express Co. could do better. (It is a pity our visitors are not often more aware of this fact.)

Another category of visitors are semiofficial. There are, for example, tour groups, such as groups of newspaper editors, teachers, and so on. They, too, receive a great deal of personal attention from our officers. Embassies have learned (sometimes the hard way) that certain groups of private citizens can be very important in forming American public opinion, not only in American foreign policy but on the Foreign Service.

If the visitors happen to be military, the Embassy attachés and the Embassy military components work closely with them.

If publicity is appropriate for any of these visitors, the United States Information Service arranges for press, radio, TV, and newsreel coverage. (And sometimes they use these Embassy-arranged platforms to attack us.) If the visitor needs guidance in economic fields, the Economic Division (including USOM) make suggestions. Matters of trade are handled by the commercial attaché and his staff. If the visitor is interested in immigration or shipping information, the proper consular officers offer the benefit of their experience and knowledge.

I am obliged to report that most of these visitors expect not only the services I have described, but they also expect to see me, and that I see, however briefly, most of them.

What this means you can imagine when I tell you that last year, during the peak months of September and October, I and my staff played hosts to 416 members of congressional parties and 69 official visitors.

However, the majority of the visitors to the Rome Embassy are of another category. They are the plain, ordinary, garden-variety American tourists, who are discovering Italy in ever-increasing numbers.

Last fall I told Art Buchwald, feature writer for the New York Herald Tribune, that most visitors to Rome want to see three things—(1) the holy father, (2) the Colosseum, and (3) the American Ambassador.

Now, to see the pope is a difficult matter for Americans, as the United States has no diplomatic relations with the Vatican. Nevertheless, however much this fact may please many Americans in America, they seem to lose sight of it in Rome. Even Congressmen who grow wrathful at home at the very suspicion that the United States of America might ever give diplomatic recognition to the Vatican suddenly grow unaware of the fact that there is no such diplomatic contact and call on the Embassy to arrange papal audiences for them. The Embassy naturally directs all these requests to the proper place—the North American College in Rome. But this is one time-consuming feature other American Embassies are spared.

At the Villa Taverna, in the 3 years I have been in Rome, I have felt obliged to give tea, dinner, or lunch to more than 5,000 people, far more than half of them Americans. Incidentally, most of these unofficial visitors come armed generally with personal letters of introduction to me from Congressmen, Cabinet members, State Department officials, and even the White House. I well understand the political and personal heat put upon them for these gracious missiles. But I could wish their authors would take full cognizance of the strain this flood of friends of important people (and friends of friends of important people) puts upon an Ambassador and an Embassy in a busy capital.

During August, September, and October of last year, it was conservatively estimated that 2 man-years of the time of substantive officers was taken up with visitors. And this was in addition to thousands of hours of work time expended by administrative personnel in processing them.

We have recently set up a Visitors' Bureau to ease this burden. It has one overworked officer and needs at least another plus a secretary before it can be considered barely adequate. I might add, last-strawwise, that the peak period for visitors to the American Embassy and Consulates in Italy is during the months when most other foreign embassies virtually cease operations, since the Italian Parliament usually goes home in early July, and all government bureaus slow down during the summer. Many foreign embassies in Rome, actually shut down operations for several months. But in the summer there is no rest for the hard-worked American Embassy.

The summer is the time when the Embassy must summarize the Italian legislative scene just past, and plan for the season coming up in the fall. But being human, our officers and their assistants, also like to snatch a bit of vacation during the fierce heat of a Roman summer. But because the summer is the happy hunting season of the American visitor, those who don't snatch fast must not only bear the burden of the work of absent officers, they must also absorb the ever-increasing tourist traffic. What is the result? The summer months comprise one of the most wearing periods of the year for nearly all elements of the country team, especially in Rome.

The American taxpayer, who naturally likes to feel that his Government's workers are suffering as much as he is, can be certain that the men and women in his Foreign Service are really sweating things out for him in more ways than one.

Now I would be the first to tell you that seeing and talking with American visitors is a useful experience. As I say, through these visits, I can keep up with trends and opinions in the United States, a basic necessity in my dealing with the Italian Government. And it gives me a chance to explain what I and my hard-working country team are doing in Italy. My complaint, however, is that in a post already charged with many heavy responsibilities this is the one chore that in certain months of the year tends most to interfere with the others.

Indeed, I wish to bring respectfully to your attention that if some technique is not found to control these extracurricular activities, they can well prevent the Ambassador and the Embassy staff from doing their main job—which is to represent the United States to the Republic of Italy.

The most effective personal technique I have found is to be absent from Rome as much as possible in these summer months when my real duties are lightest. But this is not a technique open to the rest of my staff, and it increases of course the load on my minister-counselor. It is, I realize, a load the whole Embassy must continue to bear until some genius finds a democratic way of lightening it.

Sometimes, I reflect that if I should stay in Rome during many more tourist seasons, the American tourist will still be asking to see the pope; but as to his other two favorite sights, after seeing them he may find it difficult to tell whether he has just seen me—or the Colosseum. I will be the ruin that is crumbling faster.

ROLE OF THE MODERN AMBASSADOR: RELATIONS WITH THE PRESS

This exhausting list of roles carried out by the modern Ambassador concludes with the envoy's relations with the press.

The press—taken here to mean all media of modern mass communications—is the channel through which the Ambassador and the Embassy directly reach, inform, and influence public opinion both in the United States of America and in the country he is working in.

Under the country-team concept as practiced in Rome, the Ambassador's relations with the press are handled by the Public Affairs Officer, who heads the United States Information Service.

In this 3-year period, more than 1,000 requests for personal interviews, statements, articles, broadcasts, and press conferences by me have been made in Rome. These re-

quests emanate mostly from American and Italian media, with whom USIS officers are in constant contact.

Keeping public opinion informed through interviews with responsible newsmen also requires Embassy teamwork. It is the task of the Press Attaché to screen these interviews, and often this means first interviewing the would-be interviewer. He informs me before I see the press man of the questions that may be asked, the line of thought that the interviewer may try to develop, and he supplies me with condensed Italian facts and figures that may be asked for.

A sometime journalist myself, I have worked with great harmony and ease with my staff in the field of Embassy press relations.

I know that a free press, informed insofar as the strictures of diplomacy permit, but always informed truthfully, can make all the roles an Ambassador must play easier to bear, if not lighter to carry, and can help the Embassy greatly in its prime task—creating better international relations.

I fear I have exhausted you by this overlong recital of the many roles of a modern Ambassador. The more so since I am aware that this job description of my personal functions in Rome is rather better done in Mr. Gordon's paper. There he says, "In sheer variety and demand on time and energy, although, of course, not in responsibility for decision, the ambassadorial task is comparable only to the President of the United States." And then he comes to the heart of the matter. He adds "It can be carried out only with effective and properly organized staff support."

THE COUNTRY TEAM

Throughout this paper I have made reference to the "country team" which is the very cornerstone of a modern American mission. Once again, I refer you, for a detailed description of its workings, to Mr. Gordon's article.

The United States Mission to Italy comprises some 45 agencies and 9 consulates employing 1,200 Americans and 1,100 nationals. Compare this with the agencies under Ambassador Phillip's direction in Italy in 1939: 4 agencies and 9 consulates employing 130 Americans and 235 nationals. If there ever was need for a coordinated device, these figures certainly illustrate it.

The country team concept, as I have already pointed out, has a legal basis. Executive Order No. 10575 spells out the duties of the Chief of the United States diplomatic mission who, as the representative of the President, serves as the channel of authority on foreign policy and provides foreign policy directions to all representatives of United States Government agencies.

My country team is composed of the Embassy's top echelons—the minister-counselor, representatives of the political section of the Embassy, the heads of the ICA and USIS missions to Italy, and, of course, the Ambassador. Its representatives correspond to the four major elements of United States foreign policy, namely: the political, economic, military, informational and cultural (the last are grouped together under USIS).

These four major elements of United States foreign policy cover, roughly, all those other aspects of diplomacy I have listed at the beginning of this paper, and which really run the whole gamut of organized human society.

Every policy received affecting Italy, every policy recommendation of major nature, every important program designed to supplement policy, whether it be of an economic, military, informational, or political nature, is discussed within this body before acted upon.

Once policy is decided, calling for supporting programs, heads of operational agencies develop those programs and bring them back for discussion, revisions, and agreement before putting them into action. Thereafter, of course, implementation becomes routine.

Besides the country team there are, of course, the usual coordinative efforts of a broader nature that are part of every business: operational groups, staff meetings, and conferences. In other words, in Rome, we try to do as the ancient Romans did—we "regulate together."

But country teams and coordination are not enough by themselves to assure that an ambassador and his mission will operate at optimum efficiency. No Ambassador, however hard working and however executive minded he is, can do a better job than his staff lets him do. If his officers, his advisers, form a good team, his job will be well done; if his officers do not form a good team all the best devices of modern executive direction are of little avail.

Many specialists, generalists, and technicians are required on the Embassy country team and not all of them are regular Foreign Service officers, that hard core of professionals who have made foreign affairs their life study, their life discipline, and their life work. But regardless of which branches of Government they represent, we must have a Foreign Service made up of officers of the highest caliber to carry out our Nation's foreign policy. My observation, for what it is worth, is that our present Foreign Service lacks nothing in quality but it is too small for its manifold tasks, it is not adequately paid, and it doesn't always receive the moral support it deserves of the Amercian people.

Whatever I have told you today about the complexities of modern diplomatic functioning, of the diverse roles of today's emissary, of the absolute need for coordinative teamwork, let me again emphasize the necessity for an embassy team of hard working, well trained, dedicated officers who make it possible for a modern chief of mission to sometimes clamber atop the notes verbales and the protocol books and be what his country asked him to be—an Ambassador.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN MICHIGAN

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, just 2 years ago, when unemployment in my State of Michigan was rising to new heights, we were favored with a curious Republican administration attitude toward the plight of our laid-off workers.

Mr. Charles E. Wilson, the Secretary of Defense, and former president of General Motors, remarked that he liked "bird dogs" who went out and scrounged for their food, rather than those who sat in the kennel and waited to be fed.

Today, as unemployment in Michigan climbs above 190,000 persons, we have another reflection of the administration's attitude. This time it is given by Mr. Howard Pyle, special administrative assistant to President Eisenhower. Addressing a Republican women's meeting in Detroit, Mr. Pyle is quoted in the Detroit Times of May 22 as saying this about Michigan's unemployment problems:

> The right to suffer is one of the "joys" of a free economy, just as the right to prosper is. But Michigan will come out of it, just as the farmers are doing now.

That is what Mr. Pyle said. I do not think our 190,000 unemployed workers are very happy about this "right to suffer."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article appearing in the Detroit Times of May 22.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE JOBS ASSURED STATE

Detroit and Michigan should have "encouraging news before long" in the form of Government defense contracts to counteract the slump in auto sales and production, Howard Pyle, special administrative assistant to President Eisenhower, said here yesterday.

Pyle gave this opinion before addressing 750 members of the women's division of the Oakland-Wayne Republican finance committee at the Sheraton-Cadillac Hotel. He said:

"The Michigan auto layoffs are being thoroughly studied in Washington. The answer is to feed defense contracts to the slumping areas."

EARLY CONTRACTS

While pointing out the bidding must be competitive, Pyle made it clear that, with Michigan a key State in an election year, a number of contracts would shortly be made available for this area.

He added smilingly:

"The right to suffer is one of the 'joys' of a free economy, just as the right to prosper is. But Michigan will come out of it, just as the farmers are doing now.

Pyle, 50, is a personable former newspaper and radio executive from Arizona. After failing in his bid for reelection as governor in 1954 he was named to his present position. His particular assignment is Federal-State relations.

CONFIDENCE IN IKE

In this capacity he travels widely and he reports:

"The confidence that people everywhere have in the President is phenomenal. It transcends all normal party lines, economic strata and geographical areas.

"As for Mr. Eisenhower's health, I never saw him look as sharp as he did when I last saw him. Actually, he is putting in more time on Government than he ever did, even before his illness. That is possible because we have cut out so many time-consuming odds and ends for him."

I am sure my colleagues from the farm States would be quick to challenge Mr. Pyle's comment that the farmers are coming out of their difficulties.

The Labor Department apparently does not agree that the right to suffer belongs in our Bill of Rights, because just today it has declared the Detroit and Flint areas of Michigan as labor-surplus areas. Now it will be up to Mr. Wilson to see to it that our idle Michigan plants receive Government contracts.

THE STAKES IN KOREA—LETTER OF REV. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, some days ago I inserted in the RECORD an editorial on Korea which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald. In the course of the remarks which I made about the editorial, I enumerated a series of questions which I thought ought to be answered in regard to America's Korean policy, and in respect to disturbing allegations as to conditions within Korea.

I pointed out that, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I had received a number of communications with respect to the Korean situation, and that I had been briefed rather thoroughly by a distinguished citizen of my State, Stanley Earle, a member of the City Council

of Portland, who had spent a considerable amount of time in Korea, and who had brought back some very disturbing reports as to the situation in Korea.

As the Senate knows, I always believe in having the other side of a problem put into the RECORD after one side has been presented. Since my speech a few days ago, I read a letter to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald written by the Chaplain of the Senate, the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris. I shall ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the body of the RECORD, and I want to say I suppose there is no man in America who knows President Rhee as intimately as does the Chaplain of the Senate. When President Rhee was living in our country he was a member of Reverend Harris' congregation, and a very close bond of friendship and understanding, I know, exists between these two men. In fact, I may say I think no more able representative of the United States could be sent to Korea, in the position of Ambassador or in any other position, than the Chaplain of the Senate, so far as concerns taking to Korea America's point of view and bringing back from Korea, for the benefit not only of the State Department but of all Americans, an understanding of Korea and its problems.

Therefore, Mr. President, because I think Dr. Harris' point of view is so deserving of our consideration, I ask unanimous consent that his letter to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STAKES IN KOREA

To one who often reads your editorials, so ably written, with satisfaction and admiration and "with the sound of a great amen" in his heart, the editorial in the issue of May 8, on the Stakes in Korea comes as a distinct shock. That pronouncement in its ethical and factual standard is far below, in accuracy and manifest antagonism to Korean's great president, Syngman Rhee, the usual tone of your editorial page.

The personal spleen of the writer is evident in almost every paragraph which is smeared with anti-Rheeism. Even compliments grudgingly given regarding this great leader, one of the outstanding statesmen of these troubled days, are qualified by the word "but."

The highest representatives of the United States diplomatic and defense departments, who recently have spent time not in writing slanted editorials 7,000 miles away, but actually in Seoul and other parts of Korea in counseling with President Rhee and talking with people of that nation which in valor will stand in history with the heroes of Thermopylae, have again and again come back to Washington with the highest esteem of Dr. Rhee as a man, as the leader of his people, and as a world statesman.

His so-called intractability grows out of the fact that seeing communism in action as we in America cannot, he recently declared, "The free world was never in such dire danger of being absorbed by communism as it is at the present time."

The charge that Dr. Rhee has held back the development of new leadership could not be further from the truth. Entering into a situation where for 40 years Japan had given no chance for Koreans to be trained in any way to govern themselves, Dr. Rhee has done wonders in these few short years in encouraging in every possible way his countrymen, so long denied freedom, to prepare themselves for future leadership.

The charge that he tried to frustrate the so-called truce is of course historically ridiculous. What do you mean by referring to "the supervisory commission" as composed of "neutral" nations? That commission has refused to supervise the present armed truce in North Korea and because of the Communist agents who are a part of it has become nothing less than a spy ring in South Korea reporting all that goes on there to their Soviet masters.

This so-called neutral supervisory commission has turned its back and looked in the other direction while North Korea in violation of the truce terms has built dozens of air fields from which hostile planes can rain death and devastation on South Korea in a matter of minutes. Rhee's efforts to extract such a festering thorn from the body politic of Korea ought to be applauded by all who really are on the democratic side.

His adamant stand in the fishery dispute with the power which so long used Korea for its own selfish aggrandizement and whom he thoroughly believes still has designs on his country, was the only stand a leader of Korea with her present economy in such peril, could possibly take. The fact is that the stakes in Korea are also the stakes in America.

Such unfair, unjust, and untrue pronouncements as are sent out in this editorial do our common cause no good and really give aid and comfort to Syngman Rhee's enemies and to ours. Those enemies plot Korea's destruction and ours also. We stand or fall together.

FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE WILLIAM FREDERICK FOSHAG

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, I wish to pay a word of tribute to one of our staff, a distinguished scientist, who died on the 21st of May.

Dr. William F. Foshag, Head Curator, Department of Geology at the United States National Museum, of the Smithsonian Institution, of Washington, D. C., and world renowned mineralogist, died suddenly of a heart attack at his home early Monday morning, May 21. His loss will be widely felt among his friends and colleagues all over the world.

Dr. Foshag was born in Sag Harbor, N. Y., on March 17, 1894. At an early age young Foshag moved to California. There he attended the University of California and received a bachelor's degree in chemistry in 1919. At that time he joined the staff of the United States National Museum, of the Smithsonian Institution. While on educational leave from the museum, he took up studies for a doctor's degree, not in chemistry, but in mineralogy and geology, to which he had transferred his interest. The doctor of philosophy degree was conferred by the University of California in 1923. From this time on, mineralogy became his major concern.

In September 1923, Dr. Foshag married Merle Crisler, and they had one son, William Frederick, Jr. The wife, son, and a sister, Mrs. Leroy Bolt, of California, survive.

Since 1919 Dr. Foshag has been connected with the Department of Geology at the National Museum for the first 10 years as Assistant Curator in the Division of Mineralogy, then as Curator until 1948, when he was appointed head Curator of the Department of Geology. During this long period of 37 years Dr. Foshag has been the author of nearly 100 papers in mineralogy, petrology, meteoritics, vulcanology, and collateral subjects. He has named many new minerals and made studies of minerals and geology in many parts of the United States and Mexico.

Dr. Foshag's early work was on borax deposits in Death Valley, Calif.; his later efforts devoted to the mineralogy and geology of parts of Mexico. He became very well informed on the geology of that country, and came to have a great influence on his Mexican colleagues. His latest work describes the Paricutin volcano, which arose from a cornfield in 1943. Dr. Foshag studied and described this volcano from its birth to its death. He leaves unfinished his analyses of the fumarolic gases and new minerals taken from the volcano.

Dr. Foshag was a lover of fine minerals. During his custodianship of the national collection of minerals he added many unusual and colorful specimens. Through his custodianship of the collection and two private funds supporting it, the mineral collection has become the most scientifically complete in the world, and one of the show collections of this country. Dr. Foshag's work with minerals naturally took him into the study of gems. He was one of the country's foremost gem experts, whose opinion was much sought. Besides his scientific writings, Dr. Foshag was the author of several popular articles on gem stones.

In 1946 Dr. Foshag spent more than 4 months in Japan supervising the grading, classifying, and appraising, for the United States Government, of diamonds worth $25 million, captured from the Japanese during World War II. In 1949 Dr. Foshag made a study, for the Government of Guatemala, of ancient jade objects found in Central America.

Dr. Foshag was a Fellow of the Geological Society of America; president of the section of volcanology, geochemistry, and petrology of the American Geophysical Union; member of the Society of Economic Geologists, Washington Academy of Sciences; Society for Research on Meteorites; and an honorary member of the Geological Society of Mexico. He was a past president of the Mineralogical Society of America, and received the Roebling Medal in 1953 for his distinguished contributions to mineralogy.

In addition to his many-sided scientific achievements, Dr. Foshag found time to grow azaleas and to take up painting, a hobby shared with his wife.

I am sure that I speak for all the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution when I extend our deepest sympathies to Dr. Foshag's wife, his son, and his sister.

TRIBUTE TO UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN EXTENSION DIVISION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to note in the May 18, 1956, issue of the Christian Science Monitor the reprint of an important Associated

Press dispatch describing the outstanding work performed by the University of Wisconsin extension division.

I send to the desk the text of this article, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN CAMPUS RIDES IN MAIL POUCH

MADISON, WIS.—The world's oldest and largest State-operated intellectual mail-order business has reached the half-century mark.

It is the University of Wisconsin extension division which since its establishment in 1906 has become the living embodiment of the Wisconsin idea—that a State university should give itself to all citizens.

It has fulfilled this slogan:

"The boundaries of the campus are the boundaries of the State—if you can't come to the university, the university will come to you."

And it is looking forward to even greater accomplishments in the next half-century.

AIMS DISCUSSED

"We have only scratched the surface in helping people to a better way of life," says the division's director, L. H. Adolfson.

He describes the Wisconsin idea as "interplay between people and the university, between life and learning, to release the resources, the skills and facilities of the State university to all Wisconsin citizens."

The division is planning programs throughout the State and Nation this spring and summer to call attention to the growth of the Wisconsin idea in adult education.

From a modest start with a $2,500 appropriation in 1906 the extension division has grown to a bureau with a $3½ million annual budget, a faculty and employee staff of 507, field offices in 11 Wisconsin communities and a half-dozen offices in Madison.

FIVE CORE PROGRAMS

This year it will extend services, and provide educational needs to more than 150,000 persons throughout the world.

The university extension division has five core programs—correspondence study, its original and main function; special classes; extension center day-class instruction; institutes; and special services.

In correspondence study the division offers more than 450 courses, including 275 that carry university credit. An enrollment of more than 8,000 people receive and return their lessons by mail.

The division also grades papers for about 80,000 members of the armed services who take correspondence courses from the United States Armed Forces Institute which has its headquarters here and started out with the division's help.

The correspondence courses were taken last year by thousands who sought university credit as well as those who wanted to complete high school work. In addition there were courses for aliens seeking citizenship papers, for hospitalized men and women, and for those in penal institutions. Hundreds of teachers, librarians, businessmen, and technicians also were served through the mail order educational business.

The special classes include more than 250 courses, taught by extension faculty members who conduct them in some 30 communities throughout the State, usually one night a week. Last year attendance at such classes was more than 7,000.

Institutes conducted by the division are held for the most part at Madison and are the school's fastest growing adult-education offering. They include school for workers, retail sales conferences, drama workshops, music clinics—in fact every kind of a workshop in every professional, cultural, or educational field for which there is a need or a request.

EDUCATIONAL TV PLANNED

About 30,000 persons participated in the 250 institutes on the campus last year.

The special services reach about 700 communities annually, with the bureau providing information, brief classes, and help or instructions on almost any subject.

Educational television is in the planning stage by the division, through use of the university's new ultrahigh frequency experimental station.

The university first tried extension work in the 1890's but it got little support and was dropped. It was revived again in January 1906.

The real push came in 1907 when the Wisconsin State Legislature appropriated $20,000 for extension work.

The program soon gained national attention and President Theodore Roosevelt added his contribution, stating "in no other State in the Union has any university done the same work for the community that has been done in Wisconsin by the University of Wisconsin."

The division at the start stressed vocational training, later switched to broader fields.

Among 72 schools operating extension courses in the United States today the University of Wisconsin stands first, followed by the Universities of California and Pennsylvania.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for the purpose of considering the new report on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Joseph A. Kerrins, for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the Coast Guard;

Thomas Edward Staken, Jr., of Virginia, to be member of the Federal Maritime Board, vice G. Joseph Minetti; and

G. Joseph Minetti, of New York, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the Secretary will state the new report on the Executive Calendar.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Russell A. Stuart, of Virginia, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

KIM BOKSOON

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1970) for the relief of Kim Boksoon, which were, on page 1, line 7, strike out "months, if" and insert "months: *Provided*, That"; on page 1, line 7 strike out "(1)"; on page 1, line 10, strike out "(2)"; on page 2, after line 11, insert:

SEC. 2. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anke Naber, the fiancée of 1st Lt. Jack B. Stewart, United States Air Force, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Anke Naber is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Jack B. Stewart and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Anke Naber, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Anke Naber, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Anke Naber as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Kim Boksoon and Anke Naber."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President on March 19, 1956, the Senate passed S. 1970, to provide for the admission into the United States, for the purpose of marriage, of the fiancée of a United States citizen. On May 7, 1956, the House of Representatives passed S. 1970, with amendments to include the beneficiary of one similar Senate bill, and to make several minor changes in the language of the bill.

The amendments are acceptable; and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 1970.

The motion was agreed to.

PIETRO RODOLFO WALTER STULIN

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1883) for the relief of Pietro Rodolfo Walter Stulin, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Renate Karolina Horky, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sfc. Chester M. Zentner, a citizen of the United States.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Pietro Rodolfo Walter Stulin and Renate Karolina Horky."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on March 19, 1956, the Senate passed S. 1883, to provide for the admission into

the United States as a nonquota immigrant of a minor child to be adopted by a United States citizen serviceman, who is married to the child's mother. On May 7, 1956, the House of Representatives passed S. 1883, with amendments to include the beneficiary of one similar Senate bill.

Inasmuch as the House amendments make no substantive changes, but merely group two cases into one bill, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 1883.

The motion was agreed to.

ERIC A. CUMMINGS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1111) for the relief of Eric A. Cummings, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sarah Kleidermacher may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be obtherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Audrey Jean Younkers and Robert Geoffrey Hunt may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That suitable and proper bonds or undertakings, approved by the Attorney General be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

SEC. 3. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Charlotte Muhlefeldt, the fiance of Hans Jahnke, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Charlotte Muhlefeldt is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Hans Jahnke and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigation laws, other than the provision of section 212 (a) (4) of the said act: *Provided further*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Charlotte Muhlefeldt, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occure within 3 months after the entry of the said Charlotte Muhlefeldt, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Charlotte Muhlefeldt as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, John Joon Sik Chung, Cesare Picco, Regina M. Knight, Jenny Antionette V. Ingrum, and Paula Edith Reynolds may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eric A. Cummings may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provision of that act.

SEC. 6. The exemptions provided for in this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immgration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on March 19, 1956, the Senate passed S. 1111, to waive the grounds of inadmissibility in behalf of the beneficiary. On May 7, 1956, the House of Representatives passed S. 1111 with amendments to include the beneficiaries of 9 similar individual Senate bills. One case included in S. 1111 passed the Senate to provide only for a waiver of the excludable ground, but has been amended by the House of Representatives to also provide for the beneficiary's admission into the United States for the purpose of marrying her United States citizen fiance.

The amendments are acceptable; and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 1111.

The motion was agreed to.

ANDREW ROSNER

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 767) for the relief of Andrew Rosner, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Andrew Rosner, Giuseppe Ventura, Johann Antonius Tudhope, Walda Fedor Tudhope, Maria Guadalupe Shockley, Evangelina Vega Shockley, Helen Agnes Blais (Junko Furakawa), and Harold Manley Stewart shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Charles F. Garriz, Benjamin Baruch Mintz, Tchia Mintz, Shulamit Mintz, Shalom Boaz Mintz, Mikie Woodard, Hildegard Silvonen, Howard Seeming Liang, Lai Yen Mark Liang, Howard Seeming Liang, Jr., John Shalam, Claude Shalam, Fu-Chuan Chao (also known as Fuk Kun Chiu), Chiu Lai Yuk (also known as Lai Yuk Chao), Yvonne Mary Florescu (Sister John Baptist), Peter Chou-Yuen Tchen, Carmen Aguado, Adele Knoff, Hans Knoff, Jose Torres, Thomas H. Ros, Wei-Chi Liu, Domingo Lim (also known as Lim Eng Kok and Domingo Lim Chay Seng), and Pilar A. Garcia shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this section of this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

SEC. 3. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding orders and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bonds, which may have issued in the case of Panteles Kerkos. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Panteles Kerkos shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of certain aliens."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on March 19, 1956, the Senate passed S. 767, to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to the beneficiary. On May 7, 1956, the House of Representatives passed S. 767 with amendments to include the beneficiaries of 22 similar individual Senate bills. One case included in S. 767 passed the Senate, to grant permanent residence to the beneficiary, but has been amended to provide only for cancellation of outstanding deportation proceedings in behalf of the beneficiary. In addition, one minor change was made in the language of the bill.

The amendments are acceptable; and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 767.

The motion was agreed to.

REVISION OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of the pending business, Senate bill 2875.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2875) to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPENDENTS' MEDICAL CARE ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9429) to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9429) to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recom-

mend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: That this act may be cited as the "Dependents' Medical Care Act."

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The purpose of this act is to create and maintain high morale throughout the uniformed services by providing an improved and uniform program of medical care for members of the uniformed services and their dependents.

SEC. 102. (a) As used in this act—

(1) The term "uniformed services" means the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Commissioned Corps of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service.

(2) The term "member of a uniformed service" means a person appointed, enlisted, inducted or called, ordered or conscripted in a uniformed service who is serving on active duty or active duty for training pursuant to a call or order that does not specify a period of 30 days or less.

(3) The term "retired member of a uniformed service" means a member or former member of a uniformed service who is entitled to retired, retirement, or retainer pay or equivalent pay as a result of service in a uniformed service, other than a member or former member entitled to retired or retirement pay under title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 who has served less than 8 years of active duty as defined in section 101 (b) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952.

(4) The term "dependent" means any person who bears to a member or retired member of a uniformed service, or to a person who died while a member or retired member of a uniformed service, any of the following relationships—

(A) the lawful wife;

(B) the unremarried widow;

(C) the lawful husband, if he is in fact dependent on the member or retired member for over one-half of his support;

(D) the unremarried widower, if he was in fact dependent upon the member or retired member at the time of her death for over one-half of his support because of a mental or physical incapacity;

(E) an unmarried legitimate child (including an adopted child or stepchild), if such child has not passed his 21st birthday;

(F) a parent or parent-in-law, if the said parent or parent-in-law is, or was at the time of the member's or retired member's death, in fact dependent on the said member or retired member for over one-half of his support and is, or was at the time of the member's or retired member's death, actually residing in the household of the said member or retired member; or

(G) an unmarried legitimate child (including an adopted child or stepchild) who (i) has passed his 21st birthday, if the child is incapable of self-support because of a mental or physical incapacity that existed prior to his reaching the age of 21 and is, or was at the time of the member's or retired member's death, in fact dependent on him for over one-half of his support, or (ii) has not passed his 23d birthday and is enrolled in a full-time course of study in an institution of higher learning as approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and is, or was at the time of the member's or the retired member's death, in fact dependent on him for over one-half of his support.

(b) Except as otherwise provided in this act, the Secretary of Defense shall administer this act for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps and for the Coast Guard when it is operating as a service in the Navy, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall administer it for the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Public Health Service, and for the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy.

SEC. 103. (a) Whenever requested, medical care shall be given dependents of members of a uniformed service, and dependents of persons who died while a member of a uniformed service, in medical facilities of the uniformed services subject to the availability of space, facilities, and the capabilities of the medical staff. Any determination made by the medical officer or contract surgeon in charge, or his designee, as to availability of space, facilities, and the capabilities of the medical staff, shall be conclusive. The medical care of such dependents provided for in medical facilities of the uniformed services shall in no way interfere with the primary mission of those facilities.

(b) In order to provide more effective utilization of medical facilities of the uniformed services, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall jointly prescribe regulations to insure that dependents entitled to medical care in a medical facility of a uniformed service under the provisions of this act shall not be denied equal opportunity for medical care because of the service affiliation of the service member.

(c) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall establish fair charges for inpatient medical care given dependents in the facilities of the uniformed services, which charges shall be the same for all dependents.

(d) As a restraint on excessive demands for medical care under this section, uniform minimal charges may be imposed for outpatient care but such charges shall be limited to such amounts, if any, as may be established by the Secretary of Defense after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, under a special finding that such charges are necessary.

(e) Any amounts that are received in payment for subsistence and medical care rendered dependents in facilities of the uniformed services shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation supporting the maintenance and operation of the facilities furnishing the care.

(f) Medical care under this section shall be limited to the following:

(1) Diagnosis;

(2) Treatment of acute medical and surgical conditions;

(3) Treatment of contagious diseases;

(4) Immunization; and

(5) Maternity and infant care.

(g) (1) Hospitalization under this section is not authorized dependents for domiciliary care.

(2) Hospitalization under this section is not authorized dependents for nervous and mental disorders, chronic diseases, or elective medical and surgical treatments, except that the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, by regulation, may provide in special and unusual cases for hospitalization of not to exceed 12 months for dependents for such disorders or such diseases, or for such treatments.

(h) Dependents shall not be provided under this section—

(1) prosthetic devices, hearing aids, orthopedic footwear, and spectacles, except that outside the continental limits of the United States and at remote stations within the continental limits of the United States where adequate civilian facilities are not available, those items, if available, from Government stocks, may be provided to dependents at prices representing invoice cost to the Government;

(2) ambulance service, except in acute emergency;

(3) home calls, except in special cases where it is determined by the medical officer or contract surgeon in charge, or his designee, to be medically necessary;

(4) dental care, except—

(A) emergency care to relieve pain and suffering but not to include any permanent restorative work or dental prosthesis;

(B) care as a necessary adjunct to medical or surgical treatment; and

(C) outside the continental limits of the United States, and in remote areas within the continental limits of the United States where adequate civilian dental facilities are not available.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. (a) In order to assure the availability of medical care for the spouses and children who are dependents of members of the uniformed services, the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall contract for medical care for such persons, pursuant to the provisions of this title, under such insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans as he deems appropriate, which plan or plans shall, subject to the provisions of section 204 hereof, include the following:

(1) Hospitalization in semiprivate accommodations up to 365 days for each admission, including all necessary services and supplies furnished by the hospital during inpatient confinement;

(2) Medical and surgical care incident to a period of hospitalization;

(3) Complete obstetrical and maternity service, including prenatal and postnatal care;

(4) Required services of a physician or surgeon prior to and following hospitalization for a bodily injury or for a surgical operation;

(5) Diagnostic tests and procedures, including laboratory and X-ray examinations, accomplished or recommended by a physician incident to hospitalization.

For each admission the plan shall also provide for payment by the patient of hospital expenses incurred under paragraph (1) hereof in the amount of either (1) $25 or (2) the charge established pursuant to section 103 (c) of this act multiplied by the number of days hospitalized, whichever is greater.

(b) Subsection (a) shall be subject to such reasonable limitations, additions, exclusions, definitions, and related provisions as the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem appropriate, except that medical care normally considered to be outpatient care shall not be authorized by this subsection.

(c) The dependents covered under this section may elect to receive medical care under the terms of this act in either the facilities of a uniformed service under the conditions specified in title I of this act or in the facilities provided for under such insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans as may be provided by the authority contained in this section, except that the right to such election may be limited under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, for such dependents residing in areas where the member concerned is assigned and where adequate medical facilities of a uniformed service are available for such dependents.

SEC. 202. Any insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans which may be entered into by the Secretary of Defense with respect to medical care under the provisions of this act shall contain a provision for a review, and, if necessary, an adjustment of payments

by the Secretary of Defense or Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare not later than 120 days after the first year the plan or plans have been in effect and each year thereafter. Within 90 days after each such review, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives a report covering the payments made during the year reviewed, including any adjustment thereof.

SEC. 203. In order to effectuate the purposes of this title, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to establish insurance, medical service, and health plan advisory committees to advise, consult, and make recommendations to the Secretary of Defense, provided that the Secretary issues regulations setting forth the scope, procedures, and activities of such committees. These committees shall consist of the Secretary of Defense or his designee, who shall be chairman, and such other persons as the Secretary may appoint. Their members shall be, to the extent possible, representative of insurance, medical service, and health plan or plans, and shall serve without compensation but may be allowed transportation and per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses.

SEC. 204. The scope of medical care provided under this title shall not exceed the maximum care provided under title I of this act.

TITLE III

SEC. 301. (a) Medical and dental care in any medical facility of the uniformed services shall, under regulations prescribed jointly by the Secretaries of Defense and Health, Education, and Welfare, be furnished to all persons on active duty or active duty for training in the uniformed services.

(b) Medical and dental care in any medical facility of the uniformed services may, under regulations prescribed jointly by the Secretaries of Defense and Health, Education, and Welfare, be furnished upon request and subject to the availability of space, facilities, and capabilities of the medical staff, to retired members of the uniformed services.

(c) Medical care in any medical facility of the uniformed services may, under regulations prescribed jointly by the Secretaries of Defense and Health, Education, and Welfare, be furnished upon request and subject to the availability of space, facilities, and capabilities of the medical staff, to dependents of retired members of the uniformed services and dependents of persons who died while a retired member of a uniformed service, except that any such care furnished such dependents shall be limited to the care authorized dependents of members of the uniformed services under title I of this act.

(d) When a person receives inpatient medical or dental care pursuant to the provisions of this act in a facility of a uniformed service that is not the service of which he is a member or retired member, or that is not the service of the member or retired member upon whom he is dependent, the appropriation supporting the maintenance and operation of the medical facility furnishing the medical care shall be reimbursed at rates established by the Bureau of the Budget to reflect the average cost of providing such care.

SEC. 302. Commissioned officers and warrant officers, active and retired, shall pay an amount equal to the portion of the charge established under section 103 (c) of this act that is attributable to subsistence when hospitalized in a medical facility of a uniformed service. Retired enlisted personnel, including members of the Fleet Reserve and the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, shall not be charged for subsistence when hospitalized in a medical facility of a uniformed service.

SEC. 303. Where a person who is covered under an insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans, as provided in this act, requires hospitalization beyond the period of time provided under such plan or plans, if such hospitalization is authorized in medical facilities of a uniformed service, such person may be transferred to a medical facility of a uniformed service for the continuation of such hospitalization. Where movement to such medical facility is not feasible, the expenses for such additional hospitalization required by such person in a civilian facility are authorized to be paid, subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Defense after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, may prescribe.

SEC. 304. All determinations made under this act by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to dependency shall be conclusive for all purposes and shall not be subject to review in any court or by any accounting officer of the Government except for cases involving fraud or gross negligence. Such determinations may at any time be reconsidered or modified on the basis of new evidence or for other good cause.

SEC. 305. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 306. The following laws and parts of laws are hereby repealed:

(1) So much of the act of July 5, 1884 (ch. 217, 23 Stat. 107), as is contained in the proviso under the heading "Medical Departments";

(2) The act of May 10, 1943 (ch. 95, 57 Stat. 80), except section 4 of such act, and except that part of section 5 which relates to persons outside the Naval Service mentioned in section 4 of such act;

(3) Section 326 (b) of the Public Health Service Act, except as it relates to dependent members of families of ships' officers and members of crews of vessels of the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

(4) Section 710 (a) of the act of July 1, 1944 (ch. 373, 58 Stat. 714), as amended;

(5) Public Law 108, approved June 20, 1949, to the extent it authorizes hospital benefits for dependents of members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces;

(6) Section 207 of the act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1180).

SEC. 307. This act shall become effective 6 months after the date of its enactment.

And the Senate agree to the same.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
HARRY F. BYRD,
By R. B. R.
LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
By R. B. R.
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
STYLES BRIDGES,
By L. S.
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CARL VINSON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
DEWEY SHORT,
L. C. ARENDS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement dealing with the provisions of the conference report be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR RUSSELL

I desire to explain briefly the features of the conference agreement on the dependents' medical care bill that are different from the version of this measure as it passed the Senate.

Reservists retired under title III of Public Law 810, 80th Congress, were included within the definition of a retired member of a uniformed service under the Senate amendment and, thus, they and their dependents were eligible for medical care in service facilities. The House bill had excluded these reservists from the definition of the term "retired member of a unformed service." Under the conference agreement, reservists retired under title III of Public Law 810 after having served on active duty for at least 8 years will qualify as retired members and, consequently, such reservists and their dependents will be eligible for medical care in facilities of the uniformed services. A precedent for the 8-year delineation exists in the disability provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949. These provisions require that, in time of peace, a member of the uniformed service who is disabled must establish, in addition to the other prerequisites, that his disability is the proximate result of the performance of active duty. A member with more than 8 years of service is not required to establish that his injury was the proximate result of the performance of active duty.

The Senate version of the bill did not include parents and parents-in-law as dependents eligible for medcal care in service facilities, while parents and parents-in-law would have been eligible under the House bill if they were dependent on the member for more than one-half of their support. The conference agreement includes parents and parents-in-law if they are in fact dependent on the member for more than one-half of their support and if they actually reside in the household of the member. Again there is a precedent in the Career Compensation Act for the residence requirement. Although this provision is waived for the duration of the Dependents' Assistance Act, a permanent provision of the Career Compensation Act requires that for parents to qualify as a dependent for quarters allowances, the parent must be in fact dependent on the member for more than one-half of his support and must actually reside in the household of the member.

On the suggestion of the Bureau of the Budget, the Senate bill contained an outright prohibition against hospitalization in service facilities for domiciliary care and for elective medical and surgical treatments, while treatment of chronic diseases and nervous and mental disorders would have been authorized only in special cases for not more than 12 months under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. The House bill would have allowed hospitalization for domiciliary care and elective medical and surgical treatments, in addition to hospitalization for chronic diseases and nervous and mental disorders, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. The conference agreement involves a prohibition against hospitalization for domiciliary care, but chronic diseases, nervous and mental disorders, and elective medical and surgical treatments may qualify for hospitalization not to exceed 12 months in special and unusual cases under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

The next change that I shall discuss relates to the principal new authority that this measure would grant, namely, the authority to enter into a medical service, health insur-

ance, or health plan to provide medical care for the spouses and children of active-duty personnel. The House bill enumerated several items that were required to be included in any such plan, but these enumerated items were minimums rather than maximums under the House provisions. The Senate bill converted the minimums into maximum items. Under the terms of the conference agreement, the items enumerated in both bills must be included in the civilian-care plan and the Secretary of Defense is authorized to provide such reasonable additions, exclusions, limitations, and related provisions as he and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare consider appropriate, except that the civilian-care plan may not include what is commonly referred to as outpatient care.

I believe that these are the principal changes in the bill approved earlier by the Senate.

NEED FOR ADDITIONAL PUBLIC RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the need for providing public recreational facilities increases in direct proportion to our Nation's burgeoning population growth. Americans now own more than 50 million automobiles. The call of the open road is heard in both mansions and cottages from coast to coast. The widespread ownership of motorcars has widened the urge for travel and enjoyment of the outdoors. This is a condition that exists in every American household, without respect for economic status.

Pressure on our recreational resources was never greater, and all signs indicate that this is only the beginning. For this reason, it is increasingly important that governmental agencies adhere to forward-looking policies for the multiple-purpose use of land and water resources. The requirements of travel- and outdoor-conscious America must be met.

In the past, Federal agencies charged with development of water-resource conservation projects have attempted to include in their planning of dams and reservoirs arrangements for public recreational use of adjacent lands. Impoundment of water by Federal dams has created fishing, boating, hunting, and camping opportunities in many sections of the country. In some areas, these manmade lakes provide the only water sports in otherwise arid locations. The wisdom and benefits of this policy are illustrated by what has occurred at Lake Mead, behind Hoover Dam, where thousands of visitors enjoy a watery playground, although none existed before the Federal development was undertaken.

Because of our increased needs for outdoor recreational facilities, I was interested in a report in the Outdoor News Bulletin, published by the Wildlife Management Institute, which indicated a new land-acquisition policy of the Department of the Army was ignoring the concept of coordinated land and water uses in handling of some existing and projected reservoir projects. It would be most unfortunate if a favored-few policy were to be substituted for the public-use program which has been followed in the past. It is my hope that Congress will exercise direction so that adequate provision will continue to be made for installing public-recreation facilities in land areas adjacent to Federal water-impoundment projects.

Mr. President, I ask consent to include in the body of the RECORD an article from the Outdoor News Bulletin of the Wildlife Management Institute, dated May 18, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMY ENGINEERS' NEW LAND POLICY BESTOWS SPECIAL PRIVILEGES

By refusing to consider anything other than its own interpretation of what constitutes public purposes, the Department of the Army now is making the Corps of Engineers' new favored-few land policy on water development projects in different parts of the country retroactively beneficial to only a few former landowners, according to the Wildlife Management Institute.

Under its present acquisition policy, the corps is acquiring flowage easements and is purchasing only those lands at reservoir sites that actually will be flooded. This will enable the few landowners around those large Federal developments to own and control most of the shoreline. The small number of fortunate property owners that happen to have land where large reservoirs are created at public expense will have monopolistic control of all the shoreline sites for summer homes, private beaches, real-estate development projects, and commercial businesses. The general public will have little space for park, recreational, or fish and wildlife purposes.

Federal reservoir projects in many parts of the country offer prime wildlife management opportunities for State and Federal wildlife agencies. Their potential was recognized when provision was made in sections 3 and 4 of the Coordination Act (Public Law 732, 79th Cong.) for use by these agencies of peripheral reservoir lands for such public purposes. Under this authority, and the parallel authority in flood-control legislation, 30 States have established public hunting and other wildlife management areas at 37 reservoirs of the Corps of Engineers. These areas aggregate hundreds of thousands of acres of land that are dedicated to enhancing outdoor recreation.

By law, the general public will have only a few small access landings to the water surface. Prior to the adoption of this new policy, the Federal Government was acquiring practically all of the shoreline around such water impoundments. In some cases, too much land obviously was acquired, causing this reversal to the opposite extreme.

Whenever the Army decides that any of the peripheral lands around its flood-control and navigation projects are not needed, the surplus can be sold at the fair market value. The conservationists believe that some of the reservoir lands should be retained in public ownership, and that if any are sold, all interested parties should be able to enter competitive bids for the attractive residential and commercial sites that have been created at public expense. This is not being done, however.

When it became known that the corps' new policy called for the reconveyance of the boundary lands to private ownership, a number of similar bills were introduced in Congress to let the former owners have the land at special prices. There should be no objection to letting the former owners have prior repurchase privileges, but the land values have been enhanced tremendously by those large developments. Frequently, those reservoirs are the only water areas available to whole communities.

The first of those bills was drafted by the Corps of Engineers. Two have become law, three are pending, and others are sure to follow. Each of the bills stipulate that the Secretary of the Army should first determine "that such land or interest is not required for public purposes," before any reconveyance is made to the former owners.

Because the Secretary of the Army is refusing to make this finding, the public lands needed for fish, wildlife, and recreational purposes around corps' projects in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, and Texas are in danger of being returned to the former owners. This arbitrary decision jeopardizes all of the Federal lands that are being developed and maintained by the State fish and game agencies under the general plans that have been approved by the Army engineers.

In the case of the Jim Woodruff Reservoir along the Florida-Georgia boundary, the Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission has a license and a general plan for the development and management of 7,000 acres of land. Under Public Law 300, which authorizes reconveyance of the Jim Woodruff lands to the former owners at the bargain price, the Secretary of the Army should have decided that this small part of the shoreline is needed for public purposes. His refusal to make this determination means that the Army now is contending that the public purposes specified in its approved general plan and license to the Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission are not public purposes.

In sticking to this questionable interpretation of the meaning of public purposes and reneging on its approved general plan, the Army is overruling the urgent pleas of Gov. Leroy Collins, of Florida, the Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission, and local conservation and civic groups. Public purposes is not defined in Public Law 300, and the Army is choosing to disregard the following precise wording in section 209 of the Flood Control Act of 1954 "that preference shall be given to Federal, State, or local agencies, and licenses, or leases where appropriate, may be granted without monetary considerations to such agencies for the use of all or any portion of a reservoir area for any public purposes * * *: *Provided*, That in such lease or license to a Federal, State, or local governmental agency which involves lands to be utilized for the development and conservation of fish and wildlife, forests, or other natural resources, the licensee or lessee may be authorized to cut timber and harvest crops as may be necessary to further such beneficial uses."

Because the Secretary of the Army, Wilber M. Brucker, is refusing to budge from his unpopular position, and is not complying with the directive that several prominent attorneys agree is in Public Law 300, Congressman BOB SIKES, of Florida, has found it necessary to introduce another bill which will mandate the Army engineers not to reconvey the lands desired for public purposes by the Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission.

Many people regard this as another case of where the only protection that the public has from such administrative decisions is in the Congress.

FINE IMPOSED ON COMMITTEE REPORTER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a few days ago while presiding as chairman of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency I found it necessary to fine the committee reporter $20 for being 20 minutes late. The Greensboro (N. C.) Record, on May 18, 1956, published an editorial on the subject. It is a very fine editorial. Among other things, it suggests that Senators should be fined, too,

once in a while. I wish to say that I am inclined to agree. When a committee is scheduled to have a meeting and Senators do not appear for 20 or 30 minutes, it is an imposition on other Senators.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON NOTE

We note that a stenographer has been fined for being late at a Senate subcommittee hearing.

The United Press reported from Washington that Senator WILLIAM LANGER imposed the fine of $20 because the stenographer was 15 minutes late for the hearing. (That's nearly a buck a minute, and that's good pay on that basis for even an influence peddler.) It was directed that the fine be deducted from the compensation due the reporting firm employing the tardy stenographer.

Having been warned, it is not inconceivable that the stenographer's employer will protect itself and its hired hand. That could be easily done by simply padding the subcommittee's bill, we suspect. But who are we to be telling anybody in Washington how to do a thing like that?

Now, wouldn't it be something if taxpaying citizens had a way of sticking members of Congress with fines for being late about the public's business?

REPORT OF PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON VETERANS PENSIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a few days ago I gave a talk in connection with the report of the Bradley Commission in which I very severely criticized the report, which dealt with compensation, or pensions, as some people call it, for veterans, both disabled war veterans, some who are not disabled, and some who are receiving other aid. This morning I had the pleasure of being present at a breakfast as a guest of the New York and New Jersey disabled war veterans organization.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech delivered by Joseph F. Burke, vice commander, Disabled American Veterans, be made a part of my remarks and printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRADLEY COMMISSION OR INTELLECTUAL DISHONESTY

(Speech of Joseph F. Burke, national vice commander, Disabled American Veterans)

My first reaction on reading the report of the President's Commission on Veterans Pensions was one of double shock. The first shock arose from the fact that Gen. Omar N. Bradley could affix his signature to a report which, if implemented, would shatter many of the benefits and principles for which the DAV has fought so long and so arduous a battle. General Bradley has heretofore been known and deservedly so as the "soldier's general." By his concurrence in this report he will never be known and deservedly so—as the veteran's friend.

The second shock arose from what seems to me to be the patent intellectual dishonesty which shows itself in so many parts of the report. As our national director of legislation, Omer W. Clark, remarked in his statement to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee concerning recommendation 11: "In this recommendation as in some others, it is noted that the Bradley Commission opens with a fair statement and then proceeds to use the word but followed by proposals that are not acceptable to this organization." The general effect of such a type of statement in the report is confusing. The reader reading a sentence which starts with a statement of agreement on a principle accepted by veterans is apt not to scan too closely the second half of the sentence which then carries the bombshell which blows to bits some of what we disabled veterans feel to be the self-evident benefits which flow from the application of that principle.

The more carefully I examine the recommendations the more they seem to reveal to me a deliberate effort to confuse the veteran. I say that because the report seems to be trying to convince the partially disabled that from just and humane reasons he should surrender some of his benefits to provide correspondingly greater benefits for his more seriously disabled comrade. But a still more careful examination reveals those supposedly greater benefits to be only half-promises of a false utopia. That is strong language and may I say that though it would be easy to get very strongly emotional about this report, I prefer the strength of my criticism to be rooted in reasons. For that reason, let me point out to you some of the recommendations and let me analyze with you their meaning, their immediate effect, and their end result.

Before proceeding on that analysis, however, I would like to mention one statement in the report which touched a sore spot in me, as it will touch and anger every veteran. The report states that military service in time of war or peace is an obligation of citizenship and should not be considered a basis for future Government benefits. The duties of citizenship cannot be expected to be painless or free from sacrifices. As an American citizen and as a disabled American veteran, I resent the inclusion of that statement in the report. As an American and a DAV, I do not feel it necessary for the Commission to inform me that my military service should be viewed as an obligation of citizenship. I instinctively knew and believed that truth, and I have acted in conformity with that truth ever since I experienced the first glow of patriotism in my young heart as I pledged allegiance to our flag on my first day in school. But I also believe, as did George Washington, his compatriots, and every succeeding generation of Americans, that those disabled by war should be adequately cared for, and should be insured against a life of impoverishment and neglect. The kind of care and consideration given those who have been disabled in their country's service is a pretty good index of true patriotism and love of country of those who have been spared that kind of suffering.

Now to the report—its inconsistency, its confusion, its intellectual dishonesty can be illustrated as follows: "The service-connected compensation and death benefits should be liberal, even generous." Another passage reads, "The rate of compensation payable to veterans who are totally disabled should be two-thirds of the average earnings in the base series selected to serve as a standard." The first statement speaks of liberality, even generosity, to the disabled; the second suggests that he receive two-thirds of the average income selected as standard. Note that statement. I should like to hear the committees' definition of liberality and of generosity. If the average income determines the basic standard of living in America, where does that leave the totally disabled with his two-thirds income? It leaves him neatly suspended between a bare existence eked out by handouts from friends or relatives and life in the almshouse. Perhaps others than veterans ought to be reminded that the duties of citizenship cannot be expected to be painless and free from sacrifice.

Something worse than inconsistency and confusion can be illustrated by another recommendation in the report which, when applied to the seriously disabled, is particularly appalling. It states: "The rate in any case should not be set so high that it will undermine incentives for productive activity." How could that recommendation be implemented practically? How does the Commission propose to determine the potentiality for productive activity in every case which is the task it has set for itself by stating, "the rate in any case?" Does it pretend to be able to fathom the almost incomprehensible variety of human personalities and the actual incomprehensible depths of human personalities that it can determine in any given case what would be the magic incentive and the consequent productivity which would relieve the rest of the citizenry from some of the duties and sacrifices which attend the care of the disabled. Or does it propose the application of psychiatric techniques and treatment in each case of serious disability? That would penalize those who obtain income through some extraordinary or heroic effort by subjecting them to guinea pig treatment so that their heroism could be used against their weaker or more human brethren. Before using the heroic veterans as a measure for the average veterans, the Commission ought to be reminded that heroism is, by definition, an act over and above the call of duty. And the Commission ought to be reminded that if we demand heroism in the earning of his livelihood from each seriously disabled veteran, then we must demand heroism from every single citizen in our country. Such a demand might result in asking Congressmen and Senators, Supreme Court Justices and Cabinet officers to serve their country each in his respective branch, without any monetary reward—out of simple heroic love of country, and out of simple heroic love for the taxpayer's pocketbook. It might even result in demanding a further heroism from generals and admirals. It might even demand, out of heroic love for country and the taxpayer's pocketbook, that they relinquish their retirement pensions, especially when they are gainfully employed by private industry at not mean salaries. Does the Commission further propose to use psychiatric treatment for each disabled veteran whose production does not come up to what the Commission feels his capacity should be? What a reward for his service to torment for his disability the one who was disabled that the rest of us might be able to fulfill our own capacities in a free world. Before we leave this particular statement, may we ask whether, since psychiatric analysis would seem to be the only possible and partial way to implement this recommendation, the Commission has considered that the cost of determining the individual differences would not far outweigh the amount paid to the veteran himself? This would be a veritable jumping from the frying pan into the fire.

Now for a contradiction in the report. After the statement which I have just analyzed, comes this one, "No individual should be penalized for overcoming his handicap but in preparing the overall rating schedule, achievements of modern medicine, prosthesis, rehabilitation, and the changing nature of our economy need to be considered in establishing the criteria for the average case." Just how the part of this statement before the "but" can be reconciled with the part after it, I cannot quite figure out.

The Commission deplores the statutory awards made to the blind, the paraplegic, and the amputee as being excessive. It states that these awards were "based largely on emotional reactions, provoked by the sight of a veteran with a visible mutilation, such as a missing arm or leg, and that there are other equally disabling conditions which are not so compensated." I for one refuse to

believe that the statutory award is a product of hysteria or a lapse in the mental facilities of an entire nation. I refuse to believe that the combined intelligence of the Congress of the United States of America suffered simultaneous shock at the sight of an amputee to the extent that they were without the power to recognize whether the need for statutory awards existed. I refuse to believe that the Congress of the United States of America will rescind the benefits achieved through the statutory awards—awards which were obtained after proof of their need had been established to the satisfaction of the American people and through legislation adjudicated by Congress.

The maximum rates provided by the statutory award attempt to compensate for the total disability, for the continuous pursuit of medical treatment, for the frequent periods of hospitalization, for the ever-present spectre of death, for the daily struggle to maintain life, for the added burdens thrown on the families of the disabled, for the mental anguish accompanying such disabilities, for the cost of extra and special furnishings used in every-day life and necessitated purely by the disability. It is indeed a thoughtless commission which would attempt to declare any award for these intangibles an excessive award.

But the Commission does not stop with deploring the excessive statutory awards. The language employed tends to imply to those who are 100 percent ratings that, by reducing the compensation of the statutory awards, then they, the totally disabled will receive greater monetary benefits. This seems to me the perfect application of the "divide and conquer" philosophy. If an equalization of benefits is to be obtained it must be obtained positively, by adding to the deficient rather than by subtracting from those who, although higher, have not reached a barely adequate stage themselves. For some time, the DAV has stressed the need for increasing compensation rates, pointing to the fact that the $181 monthly compensation to the totally disabled service-connected case will permit him only a substandard existence, even with the addition of a small dependency allowance, when the basis for the compensation is to recompense for the loss of earning capacity.

Were it not for the heroism of the wives of many of the totally disabled veterans in seeking and gaining employment, many of the totally disabled would be unable to subsist off their compensation.

We must be equally diligent in preserving the benefits of those who are rated at 10 and 20 percent for their disabilities. The Commission recommends that "special consideration should be given to disabilities rated at 10 and 20 percent to determine whether significant economic impairment exists" and "Consideration should be given to discharge of the Government's obligation in static cases rated at 10 and 20 percent by an appropriate lump sum or short term settlement." This is a short sighted and arbitrary dismissal of a disability which may remain only 10 percent disabling for an indeterminate period but yet may eventually cause death during an exacerbation. Such disabilities termed "minor" by the Commission, are just as real, in lesser severity, as those termed "totally disabling." In many cases, the 10 percent disability becomes the totally disabling condition with the passing of years. In many cases the 10 percent or 20 percent disability requires the same continuous medical attention, to maintain a static level, as does the 100 percent disability. The Commission need not fear that such disabilities may be overpaid, for the present legislation and Veterans' Administration regulations contains sufficient restraint, too much in fact. However, the same legislation and regulations provide for re-evaluation in the event of increased severity now, not like the Bradley Commission weakly speaking of the future.

Another baseless and heartless recommendations provides "the presumption of service connection for chronic diseases, tropical diseases, psychosis, tuberculosis, and multiple sclerosis as now listed should be withdrawn." It is further stated, "There is otherwise in the law sufficient protection for the veteran to establish service connection for any and all disases." Here again the Commission fails to consider that laws providing service-connection for certain diseases when diagnosed within a regulatory period after discharge, were enacted only after due deliberation by Congress who were advised by Veterans' Administration authorities and medical opinion. The regulatory periods were determined by the incubation periods of certain diseases and because the insidious onset and progress of the disability cannot be detected in the early stages. If medical authority cannot identify the disease in the initial stages, how can the disabled veteran be expected to perfect a claim for service connection when evidence of the disability during service, which would be required otherwise under the law, is nonexistent. In many instances, the diagnosis of such a disease is or was a short prelude before early death, and in other cases total incapacity is certain to come in a relatively short period of time. If not for the present regulations, the great majority of these cases would become dependent upon local welfare agencies for monetary aid. May I ask what would be the essential difference to a taxpayer if his tax dollar went to the local or State authorities for the relief of an indigent veteran or if that same tax dollar went to the Federal Government to pay out in the form of compensation directly to the disabled veteran? Financially, there is no difference; from the point of the civic and moral health of America, there is a difference too tremendous to be computed.

What I have said so far is only part of my objections to the Bradley Commission's intellectual dishonesty. There are other points such as their now attempting to relate all through the report that need is the primary basis for compensation, and please remember that I am not talking about pensions. That is not now or has never been so. I am proud to know our organization was aware of what the Bradley Commission was seeking. Capt. Cicero Hogan our national director of claims asked in an editorial back on January 12, in our newspaper, this question as to why the Bradley questionnaire was sent out to disabled veterans: "Every veteran intelligent enough to answer this questionnaire is bound to ask this very reasonable question of the President's Commission: 'Why must you have all this information with regard to my financial status and the financial status of those near and dear to me? How can this information be of help to the Commission unless it contemplates a change in the law which determines entitlement to compensation and make proof of need a requirement?' "

"The DAV has no quarrel with the President's Commission, but we just cannot believe that the questionnaire will serve any useful purpose * * * useful or helpful as far as America's wartime disabled are concerned."

How prophetic this was. There are many other important points I wish I had the allotted time to cover fully but in general let me say this:

I will be charitable and attribute the Commission's zeal to lessen the deficiency in our national budget as the motivating force which caused them to recommend a reduction in our benefits. However, that budget also provides for the expendtiure of great sums of money for the rehabilitation of foreign countries who suffered economic disability as a result of war. This assistance is given purely from a humanitarian aspect, cultivating friendship and forestalling the progress of the mental disease, communism. Foreign aid to distressed nations is a good and worthy thing. It is in the best traditions of American open-heartedness and service to mankind. Through aid to foreign nations we help to rehabilitate them with our God-given wealth. By doing so, we may help to avoid having to help them with the power of the life and health of our young men. I certainly believe in this program, but can we as a nation express such human kindness to foreign countries yet deny it to our disabled veterans? Can we justly spend $4,900,000,000 on foreign aid and at the same time withdraw our aid from those disabled in our country's service? That would be like feeding our next door neighbor while our own children starved. Charity should not end at home but justice certainly should begin there. I hope it will not be necessary to make a choice, but if we must, then the Nation's obligations to the disabled veteran must be the determining factor.

The Commission condemns the present structure of veterans' programs on the premise that it is not a system. They further state: "It is an accretion of laws based largely on precedents built up over 150 years of piecemeal development. The public at large has taken little interest and the laws have been enacted in response to minority pressures." I wish to point out that any blanket law such as is proposed in the report would, because of attempted universality, produce a rigidity of application which would result in inequities. These would then require remedial amendments in the form of additional legislation. This was last attempted in the enactment of Public Law 2, 73d Congress, and when expediency required remedial amendments they were provided by subsequent laws, guided by experience and only after considerable research and hearings before Congress. If this action is what is haughtily referred to as "piecemeal development," then I am in favor of it, for it is proof that we are not backward looking but keep up to date with changes in society. If the Commission can so lightly dismiss an accretion of laws based largely on precedents built up over 150 years of piecemeal development, I wonder what the Commission thinks, for example, of the British Constitution which could be defined almost in those same terms, and which is an admittedly flexible and workable document, and on which, in some measure, our own Constitution and Bill of Rights are based. I mention this because the Bradley Commission was not averse to using British studies on our disabled veterans. Evidently, their admiration of the British way of doing things stops with what British findings fit in with their own preconceived notions of what veteran benefits should be.

I deeply resent the statement, and Congress should deeply resent the statement, that the public at large has taken little interest and the laws have been enacted in response to minority pressures. That statement, in effect, says that the Congress of the United States instead of acting for the common good has betrayed its trust by acting for the good of a class. First, the Congress, representing the public at large is primarily charged with the promulgation of laws which are beneficial to the majority and any pressure that they may succumb to would be from the latter group. Secondly, Congress recognizes the minority when represented by an organization such as the Disabled American Veterans because it is evident that an injustice would occur unless the voice of all people could be heard. I strongly resent the Commission's attempt to label the Disabled American Veterans a congressionally chartered organization, as a minority group. If it is now popular to label groups, then I wish to refer to the

Bradley Commission as the "Brashly Commission" since they, with 1 year's experience brashly intend to destroy the programs sponsored by the Disabled American Veterans, a group with more than 30 years' experience in tending to the needs of the disabled veteran.

I will conclude by stating the Bradley Commission wishes to be liberal even generous so they say remove presumption, remove statutory awards, remove 10 and 20 percent disabilities. This is not my idea of being liberal and generous. I ask one final question. If this were done how many will be left to benefit by their generosity?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, only yesterday I received newspapers from Guam and Puerto Rico commenting on a speech which I made upon the Senate floor against the Bradley report, which has received universal comment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, the morning business is closed.

REVISION OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2875) to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE NEW FARM BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate adopted the conference report on the agricultural bill. Perhaps even as I address the Senate the bill is on its way to the White House, awaiting the President's action. I am hopeful that the action will be affirmative and that the President will sign the bill. Perhaps even as I speak he may very well be signing the bill.

Mr. President, I did not speak on the farm bill yesterday because I did not wish to delay the Senate's action on the matter. It is an important subject. It is of the utmost significance to our farmers and to our whole economy. Therefore today I should like to make a few observations on the bill which was passed, and to compare some of the provisions in the bill with other proposals which had been adopted by Congress and vetoed by the President, and with provisions of other bills that were introduced as administration measures.

I would note that there is considerable difference between the administration bill introduced in January and the one which ultimately will go to the White House, or which may be at the White House at this moment.

At long last we have taken final action on a new farm bill. Never in the Senate's history has Congress worked harder in developing some constructive agricultural legislation; never has so much time been devoted both in committee and on the Senate floor to working out a satisfactory bill; never has the urgency for action been more widely recognized in giving farm legislation the green light above anything else before the Congress.

Again I pause to pay tribute to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and to the Senators and Representatives who are members of the Committees on Agriculture in the Senate and House, for what I believe to be a conscientious and diligent effort to perfect suitable agricultural legislation which would meet the need of the current economic situation in our agricultural economy.

As the bill now stands, or as it left the Senate, it is a bill which leaves much to be desired. Yet at the same time it provides many improvements and safeguards for agriculture which would not have been provided if we had followed alone the guidance and recommendations of the administration.

The bill does not go as far as the majority of the Democrats and a smaller number of Republicans felt and still feel was necessary. It does go further than Republicans and the administration want it to go. It is obviously a compromise, but it is the best we can get enacted with an executive branch that has shown an unwillingness to abide by the considered judgment of the majority of Congress with respect to farm policy.

The long farm fight and the long deliberations in Congress have provided some amazing spectacles—some amazing examples of administration lobbying and usurpation of the responsibilities of the Congress, and what I believe to be some amazing distortions of fact in presentation of what has happened and is happening, as far as press reports and editorial comment in leading newspapers of the country are concerned.

We have heard dinned into our ears the broad generalities of "bad bill" and "good bill," with strange standards apparently used to determine the difference.

Anything that came from a Democratic source, apparently, automatically made the measure a bad bill.

Anything that came from the Eisenhower administration, apparently, was automatically assumed to be a good bill.

That parallel was so strongly drawn that even when a majority of Republicans finally got around to accepting many of the Democratic improvements in the measure, the phrase suddenly shifted from "bad bill" to "good bill."

The truth is that a serious, bipartisan, constructive effort has been made by the Democratic leadership and Democratic-controlled Senate Committee on Agriculture right from the start to enact the best possible bill.

I submit, Mr. President, that anyone who will examine the proceedings in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, particularly the statements of the chairman, will find that a determined and considered effort was made to discuss agricultural policy from an economic point of view, not a political point of view; not from a bipartisan point of view.

I regret to note again that while that kind of activity was taking place in a spirit of bipartisanship, repeatedly the Secretary of Agriculture made speeches throughout the country. Those speeches were noted in the press, and from time to time were commented upon in the Senate.

Despite all the hullabaloo in the press about deliberately seeking a veto, about deliberately delaying the farm bill, and about deliberately "loading" it with unworkable amendments, any close examination of the record will show that simply is not true.

I recall, for example, that some of the local newspapers in my State, which receive a weekly bulletin from the Republican central committee entitled "Trunk Line," carried comments to the effect that the junior Senator from Minnesota had taken up so much time in addressing the Senate that the passage of the farm bill had been delayed.

Many of the editors printed the Republican propaganda as if it were Scripture. They said, "Of course, this is the truth." That publication is known as the Trunk Line, and it is indeed a line. So far as the trunk is concerned, it is jampacked with many things that should have been discarded long ago from the political attic.

Speaking for myself, I did address the Senate at length on the farm bill, and I am happy that I did so. I felt it was something that needed to be done. I reviewed agricultural policy for the past 22 years. I went into all aspects of agricultural policy, from price supports to soil conservation, to rural electrification, to farm credit. I also cited a number of statistical tables which I thought were worthy of the attention of the Senate. I regret that most of my speaking had to be done in the late hours of the night, but I did that in order to accommodate some of my colleagues who preferred to speak earlier in the day. I believe I made a record, at least in terms of my own observations and attitude, on agricultural policy. I did it because the State I am privileged to represent in part in the Senate is deeply concerned about agriculture. It has a deep and abiding interest, both economically and socially, in a prosperous and progressive and modern agriculture.

As I said, there was a great hullabaloo in the press about Democrats deliberately seeking a veto. In that connection I should like to say that there were a limited number of Republicans from the Midwest, where agriculture is important, as it should be all over America, who had the courage to stand up against their own party leadership and to stand up against the President and the Secretary of Agriculture, and to join with us, vote for vote and amendment for amendment, on the farm bill.

That hullabaloo said we were seeking a veto, deliberately delaying the farm bill and deliberately loading it with unworkable amendments. The partisanship in this fight has been on the other side. It was a bipartisan majority which reported the original bill, and a bipartisan majority which enacted it prior to the veto.

It was the Democratic committee that raced for early action on the bill, and had to prod the Department of Agriculture into making up its mind on many questions it had not resolved itself about how the proposed soil bank would work. I repeat, Mr. President, that it had to prod the administration and the Department of Agriculture to get action on the proposals.

I wish the record to be clear that as late as the middle of January the administration did not have a workable soil-bank proposal. In fact, it was not made available to us in terms that were understandable until the last week in January and into the first week of February.

There were as many amendments offered on the Senate floor by Republicans as by Democrats to prolong the fight on the bill's passage. The Republicans were unsatisfied with the administration's recommendations, knowing they would not adequately meet the problem of farmers of their areas. They could not face the farmers with the recommendations presented by the administration. Therefore, Republican Senators, responsive to the needs of their States and of their people, offered amendment after amendment to the farm bill.

Contrary to impressions which have been deliberately created, it was administration-backed Republican amendments that opened the door to attempts to rewrite the bill on the floor each time it was reported with bipartisan support from our committee.

I refer particularly to the so-called corn amendments and to some of the cotton amendments which opened up a Pandora's box of trouble. Frankly, the amendments relating to corn took more time than did any other single amendment or combination of amendments. Yet, they were Republican-sponsored and were Republican administration efforts in connection with the farm bill.

Many contradictions have marked this historic fight, contradictions which the administration will have to face up to sooner or later.

For example, the administration took sharp exception to the efforts of the junior Senator from Minnesota with reference to the set-asides, in trying to improve the administration price-support level. They said it was a kind of legislative hocus-pocus, legislative trickery. After having condemned the successful efforts of the junior Senator from Minnesota to amend the bill by reducing the set-asides of surplus commodities, thereby raising the price-support level, and after having sharply and bitterly condemned the effort, the administration did exactly the same thing, and it became "wonderful." It became "a courageous act on the part of the President."

Mr. President, I would have the Senate know that the price-support levels are almost identical with the price-support levels which the President ultimately announced following his veto of the farm bill, with the same amount of surplus in storage as the Senator from Minnesota had recognized when he introduced his amendment.

My amendment was roundly and bitterly assailed and condemned by the administration spokesmen, but when the President did exactly the same thing, when the Secretary of Agriculture announced new price-support levels for corn, cotton, wheat, and butterfat, it was proclaimed as an act of courage, an act of principle.

I think that pretty well reveals that it is not exactly what one does that counts; it is who does it. Apparently, this administration has a monopoly upon such attributes as courage, honor, integrity, and all the other so-called virtues of life. But I repeat that the price-support levels which the administration ultimately announced, having to face up to the great volume of surpluses, were almost identical with the price-support levels which were the result of the Humphrey amendment. Yet the Humphrey amendment and its sponsors were literally pounced upon and condemned as an evidence of political chicanery and trickery. But when the President does the same thing, it is noble, courageous, honorable, and an exemplification of integrity.

I submit, Mr. President, that if we could put away partisanship for a moment, and look at the matter objectively, it would appear that the President was following some relatively good advice by following the amendment which was sponsored here. He saw what the facts were and proceeded to overrule his own Secretary and announce new support levels.

Talk about playing politics with the farm program, Mr. President, with the price support on wheat 76 percent of parity, just before Easter, and 80 percent immediately after Easter, with not one bushel of wheat gone, it would appear that someone was playing politics; and the one who was playing politics was the one who jiggled the price supports without any change in the supply situation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The administration has followed the advice of the Senator from Minnesota on a series of agricultural proposals. The Senator will recall that he was the one who first introduced a bill in the Senate providing for a soil bank, and it was, to use the Senator's own words, pounced upon by the administration as being a very unsound idea for partial solution of the farm program. Recently, last September 1955, as I recall, there was an adverse report on the soil bank which came to the Senate from the Department of Agriculture. But when the administration heard from the farmers, what did it do? It proposed a soil bank. But it did not call it the Humphrey soil-bank proposal. It was not big enough to give credit to the source of the idea which was already in legislative form.

I think a very interesting document would be one which set forth the specific proposals of the Senator from Minnesota on agricultural problems during the past 6 years and traced those proposals into what has now become some of the major proposals of the administration, and we would see that the Senator from Minnesota really had been a brain trust for this administration when it came to solving agricultural problems.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank my friend from Oregon for his very generous comments—much undeserved, but very much appreciated.

Mr. President, after the bitter fight against boosting the support level for hard-pressed dairymen, the administration accepted the same support level voluntarily, and boasts about its eagerness to help dairy farmers.

Yet, I should like to have every farmer look at the record of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and see what the administration spokesmen from the Department of Agriculture had to say about our attempts to raise the support level, the very same support level which the President ultimately announced.

The Under Secretary of Agriculture and other representatives of the Department of Agriculture criticized, condemned, and assailed the amendments we offered to raise the support level for dairy products. Yet, later, when the President announced the same identical level, it became an act of courage, it was noble, it was honorable; not only that, it was constructive and sound.

I may say that I am delighted that the President has done this; but sometimes it would be good to be on the right side earlier. It is getting a little tiresome always to have to convert, cajole, persuade, and figuratively twist the political arm of the administration to get it to do what it ought to have done in the first place.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I agree with what the Senator from Minnesota is saying. We serve together on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I think the Senator from Minnesota will verify the statement that at no time during the last 3 years has the Secretary of Agriculture offered any suggestions which would have increased the price which the farmer might receive for any commodity. Is not that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. To my knowledge, the Senator's statement is accurate.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. At no time has the Secretary advised the committee to raise the parity price on any commodity.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Except on wool. I wish to correct the record as to that. The administration adopted the compensatory production payment principle of the Brannan plan and used it for wool.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I had forgotten wool; but we know the reason in that instance. The Secretary may know a little something about wool, but I fear he does not know anything about any other agricultural products which are grown.

I call the attention of the Senator from Minnesota also to the fact that I was a member of the committee of conference twice—on the first bill, which was vetoed by the President, and also on the recent conference on the agricultural bill. We were trying to make it possible for the farmers this year to participate in the soil bank, something which the President himself has been advocating, since he

finally woke up, after 3 years, to its value. He did not agree to it the first year, the second year, or even this year until it was too late, so the Secretary says, for the farmers to get any benefits.

My reason for making that statement is that the Secretary wrote a letter to the conferees in the last conference and said that he feared it was too late for the farmers to benefit by the soil bank this year. Then we included something in the report to give the farmers the right to try to help themselves, if they could.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I recall that.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The provision was worded so that the House conferees could include it in their report.

It is easy for the farmers to participate this year. The farmers of South Carolina will read what I am saying, and they will vouch for my statement that the soil-bank program can help the farmers in my State. The farmers who are not planting cotton this year can receive next year their benefits for not planting this year. But what is planted this year will become surplus next year. However, the Secretary says that cannot be done. I have received inquiries this morning already asking if the soil-bank program was going forward, because the farmers want to participate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have received similar calls in my office.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If the Secretary does not come forward and propose a plan, it will be too late.

I also wish to ask the Senator if Secretary Benson has not been asleep on the job with regard to the soil bank.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If he has not been sleeping on the job, he has been apparently oblivious of the benefits which can come from a soil bank. As I said in a talk about 2 weeks ago, the administration opposed the soil-bank proposal because when it was first introduced it was called a soil conservation and reserve program. That language indicated an intention to conserve soil and to place it in a reserve. Of course, the administration rejects those basic concepts.

But when we selected the nickname "soil bank," and when President Eisenhower, George Humphrey, and Ezra Benson saw the word "bank," then they became interested. They simply got the political quivers. They just shook.

They said, "A bank. This must be good."

I am happy we used the nickname "soil bank," because by so doing we attracted the interest of the administration. I only hope now that they do not forget the first part of that phrase. The bank is a "soil bank." If one wants to have this administration's affection, simply let him use the word "bank." Right away the administration will automatically respond. It will be as if they received an electrical charge. When the word "bank" was first used, in the expression "soil bank," the administration became so enthusiastic that they made their announcement of their approval of the soil bank in the Wall Street Journal—a great agricultural publication. I have said this before. It is not new, it is not original, but it is true.

As I said, Mr. President, the price-support level on dairy products was bad when the Democrats wrote it into law—"bad" in quotation marks, according to the administration and the editorial comments—but it suddenly becomes "good" when the administration itself adopts it under pressure.

After all the cries about "surplus" production, the administration vetoed and later blocked attempts of the Democrats to provide a means for cutting back production of feed grains by making feed grain producers eligible for participating, in the soil bank, which the administration says is aimed at that very purpose.

I shall note for the RECORD that it is in the area of food grains that the surpluses have been piling up. Yet the feed-grain proposition does not provide for any controls.

After all the protest about raising the price support for feed grains, even though production controls were provided, the administration turned its back on all the historic principles of our farm programs by voluntarily providing a special support level for corn produced beyond acreage limitations, thus rewarding a man not to comply with his allotments on corn, which competes with the other feed grains which the administration refused to support.

After all the howls of anguish against mandatory support for these feed grains, the administration did a flipflop and agreed to such support on unlimited production, instead of on the limited production which Congress had proposed in the vetoed bill. Mandatory support for limited production was "bad"; mandatory support for unlimited production now becomes "good."

After all the bitter fight against further decline in the parity formula, pending a study proposed to establish a new formula, the administration now belatedly accepts a 1-year "freeze" on transitional parity pending that study; and its spokesman on the floor of the Senate says that such a study is needed; that neither of the present formulas, "old" or "new," is adequate. This is exactly what we have contended all the time.

Mr. President, I ask, How do we break through this paper barrier, this propaganda barrier? How will the American people ever get the truth of this matter? I say most respectfully that I feel certain that those who write the news have reported again and again that the so-called dual parity amendment to the farm bill which was vetoed included a provision for a study, a demand for a study, to be made by the Department of Agriculture with respect to a new formula for parity. Yet, not a word, apparently, has gotten through to the American people. I say that there is a solemn responsibility to report this information accurately to the American people.

The people of Minnesota are concerned about agriculture. They are alive to the problems involved in agricultural economics. They are a literate, intelligent, able people. Yet they do not know that the farm bill which was vetoed by the President provided for a study of a new parity formula, so that there could be an up-to-date, fully comprehensive formula for determining what parity prices should be.

It was "bad," when the Democrats wanted such a study, because the dual parity formula was roundly and soundly condemned. It is now "good," because the administration has agreed to it. What the administration agreed to do was to stop the downward decline in the transitional period pending the study.

Well, now, that is what was in the original bill with one exception. The original bill did not have a year's limitation. But next year the Congress could have revised the parity structure, because the original farm bill required that the Secretary report back by January 1957, the new parity formula, which was an implicit instruction to the Congress to take that into consideration in terms of price support levels.

Out of all the editorial comments objecting to the existing parity formula and protesting what we had in the original bill, not one, to my knowledge, ever mentioned that our provision even included the study the administration's spokesman now belatedly says is needed to provide a new standard for measuring farm prices and farm income. All we asked was that prices not be depressed further until that study was made. That was viciously attacked in the President's veto, without any reference to the study. It was bad then. When I say "bad" I am underlining that word and putting it in quotation marks. It is "good" now because the administration has backed down.

We could go through this bill, line by line, with much the same story. Every improvement we have made, now that improvements appear inevitable, suddenly switches from "bad" to "good," as the administration not only accepts them, but "steals" them as their own—just as they did the soil bank in the first place.

Any newspaper reader would gather the impression that after defeat of the Democratic farm bill, all we are now enacting was what President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson wanted.

I submit, Mr. President, if you look over the lead stories, particularly the editorials—more so the editorials—you will find that apparently what we passed in the Senate, and what the House adopted and sent to the President, was a farm bill just exactly as President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson had outlined, point by point, meticulously. If that were the practice, the taxpayers could save a great deal of money by not having Congress around at all. If we are going to have the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture design legislation, why have the Congress? But the truth is that the bill which will go to the President is not the bill the President and Secretary Benson outlined point by point. First of all, they did not outline a bill point by point. They had a broad outline, a general outline, one that was so general in some of its provisions that it was almost indescribable in terms of detail. The present bill has some 65 or more significant changes from what the administration hastily submitted to this Congress.

On the day the Senate passed the farm bill, Friday last, I submitted for the RECORD, and I now call to the attention of the reporter that at this point in my remarks I should like to have printed, an analysis of the bill as passed by the Senate, as compared to the bill, S. 2949, originally presented by the administration. The bill numbers are listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In fact, I have a copy of the RECORD of Friday last, and I ask unanimous consent that the changes in the bill recently passed, as compared to the bill as proposed by the administration, be listed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Herein is a list of the differences between S. 2949, which was prepared by the Department of Agriculture, and H. R. 10875 as reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture. The differences are as follows:

1. The declaration of policy in H. R. 10875 takes wildlife conservation interests into account.

2. H. R. 10875 includes in the acreage reserve program, along with the commodities covered by S. 2949, the following: Corn produced outside the commercial area, grain sorghums, barley, rye, oats, peanuts, flue-cured tobacco, burley tobacco, Maryland tobacco, dark air-cured tobacco, fire-cured tobacco, Virginia sun-cured tobacco, cigar binder tobacco types 51, 52, 54, and 55, and Ohio cigar filler tobacco types 42, 43, and 44.

3. H. R. 10875 permits reserve acreage to be grazed, if necessary, to relieve disaster.

4. H. R. 10875 provides specifically for inclusion in the acreage reserve program of lands on which the 1956 crop is plowed under, or the reduction in acreage otherwise made, within 21 days after enactment of the act.

5. Provisions for the control of noxious weeds have been specifically included in the acreage and conservation reserve programs by H. R. 10875.

6. H. R. 10875 prescribes acreage reserve contracts containing penalties for violation.

7. H. R. 10875 provides for a base acreage of 51 million acres for corn in lieu of an acreage allotment for 1956 and for 1957, 1958, and 1959 if producers vote for discretionary price support in lieu of acreage allotments and mandatory price support.

8. H. R. 10875 contains price-support provisions for corn and feed grains.

9. H. R. 10875 makes participation in the soil-bank program a requirement for price-support eligibility for corn and feed grains, and provides a base acreage similar to an acreage allotment for feed grains.

10. H. R. 10875 restricts acreage-reserve payments in kind to payments made with respect to grains, limits the amount of grain which may be used for payments in kind, restricts the time for making payments in grain with respect to the normal harvesting season, provides that payments shall be such as to encourage underplanting allotments for more than 1 year, and requires the Secretary to make adjustments in yields for abnormal conditions in establishing rates of compensation.

11. H. R. 10875 requires acreage-reserve compensation to be paid as soon as compliance with acreage-reduction requirements have been determined.

12. H. R. 10875 imposes an annual limitation of $750 million upon the overall acreage-reserve program and individual annual limits on acreage-reserve programs for each commodity.

13. Section 106 of S. 2949, which authorized the sale of certain quantities of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks at market prices without regard to the sales price limitations of section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 is omitted from H. R. 10875.

14. H. R. 10875 provides for soil, water, wildlife and forest conserving uses on conservation reserve lands.

15. H. R. 10875 extends the conservation reserve program to lands devoted to such soil-conservation crops as tame hay which do not require annual tillage.

16. H. R. 10875 permits harvesting of timber and wildlife or other natural products from conservation reserve lands.

17. H. R. 10875 provides for inclusion in conservation reserve contracts of a prohibition against diversion of lands from conservation, woods, grazing, or other use to any use specified by the Secretary as one which would tend to defeat the purpose of the contract.

18. The penalty provisions applicable to soil-bank contracts have been substantially modified to provide special penalties for grazing or harvesting, to provide different forfeitures for more serious violations, and to provide administrative and court review of contract terminations for serious violations.

19. H. R. 10875 permits the Secretary to use advertising and bid procedure in determining lands to be covered by conservation reserve contracts.

20. H. R. 10875 provides for the establishment of a conservation reserve goal and for its distribution among States on the basis of the needs of the country and of the various States.

21. H. R. 10875 provides for annual reports to Congress on the conservation reserve program.

22. The limitation of $5,000 on annual conservation reserve payments to any person with respect to land in any State is omitted from H. R. 10875.

23. H. R. 10875 authorizes 15-year conservation reserve contracts for tree cover.

24. The annual conservation reserve program would be limited to $450 million by H. R. 10875.

25. H. R. 10875 authorizes the Secretary to produce, as well as purchase, conservation materials and services for the conservation reserve program.

26. H. R. 10875 requires compliance with acreage allotments as a condition of eligibility for soil bank participation.

27. H. R. 10875 prohibits the reapportionment of acreage allotments diverted from production as a result of soil bank participation.

28. Section 1118 of H. R. 10875 provides for utilization of a number of Federal and State agencies.

29. Section 119 of H. R. 10875 provides for the utilization of land use capability data.

30. H. R. 10875 provides for the use of appropriated funds in carrying out the soil bank after June 30, 1957.

31. Provisions for the protection of tenants and sharecroppers have been consolidated and substantially modified in H. R. 10875.

32. H. R. 10875 prohibits the leasing of Government lands for the production of surplus price-supported crops.

33. H. R. 10875 provides for pooling of conservation-reserve land.

34. H. R. 10875 provides for the orderly liquidation of CCC stocks and submission to Congress of surplus disposal, food stamp, and food stockpiling programs.

35. H. R. 10875 brings cotton stapling 1 11/16 inches and longer within the quota applicable to cotton stapling 1⅛ inches or longer, and requires CCC to sell its current stocks of extra long staple cotton.

36. H. R. 10875 provides for an export sales program for cotton.

37. H. R. 10875 authorizes agreements limiting exports by foreign countries to the United States.

38. H. R. 10875 authorizes $500 million to be appropriated annually to supplement section 32 funds.

39. H. R. 10875 provides for transfer to the supplemental stockpile of other materials acquired through barter, as well as strategic materials so acquired, and authorizes appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for materials so transferred.

40. H. R. 10875 increases the amount authorized to be appropriated under title II of Public Law 480 to $500 million, and authorizes payment by CCC of ocean freight costs on donations under title II of Public Law 480 and section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

41. H. R. 10875 provides for a bipartisan commission to recommend legislation for the increased industrial use of agricultural products.

42. H. R. 10875 provides for food donations to certain penal institutions.

43. H. R. 10875 prohibits extension of certain benefits to crops grown on certain Federal irrigation or drainage projects.

44. H. R. 10875 authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay the cost of processing donated food commodities.

45. The provision of S. 2949 for extension and enlargement of the special school milk program is omitted from H. R. 10875, having been taken care of by other legislation.

46. The provision of S. 2949 changing the base grade of cotton for purposes of parity and price support is omitted from H. R. 10875.

47. The provision of S. 2949, reducing CCC's minimum general sales price for basic and storable nonbasic commodities to the current support price plus carrying charges, is omitted from H. R. 10875.

48. H. R. 10875 provides for extension to the 1956 and 1957 wheat crops of the surrender and reapportionment provisions applicable to the 1955 crop.

49. H. R. 10875 provides for minimum national and State acreage allotments for cotton for 1957 and 1958.

50. H. R. 10875 provides mandatory minimum cotton farm acreage allotments in all counties (including those on a historical basis) and provides 100,000 additional acres.

51. H. R. 10875 provides minimum State rice acreage allotments for 1956 and minimum national and State rice acreage allotments for 1957 and 1958.

52. H. R. 10875 increases peanut marketing penalties to 75 percent of the support price.

53. H. R. 10875 imposes interest at 6 percent on peanut marketing penalties, and imposes a lien upon the crop until the penalty is paid.

54. H. R. 10875 provides for the preservation of the acreage history of unused allotments where proper notice is given to the county committee.

55. S. 2949 contains special durum wheat provisions similar to those of Public Law 431 of this Congress.

56. S. 2949 would have reduced the size of the commercial wheat area.

57. S. 2949 would have repealed the peanut minimum national acreage allotment provision.

58. H. R. 10875 provides for assistance to States for tree planting and reforestation.

59. H. R. 10875 provides for forest products price reporting and research.

60. H. R. 10875 provides for a 2-price plan for rice.

61. H. R. 10875 provides for support at competitive support levels for cottonseed and soybeans whenever the price of either is supported.

62. H. R. 10875 freezes the transitional parity price of corn, wheat, and peanuts at 95 percent of old parity in 1957 and 1958, and provides for a study of the parity formula.

63. S. 2949 provides for a gasoline tax refund. This has been passed by other legislation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If it is now a good bill, as the administration spokesmen

say, it is good because the Democrats, with a handful of Republicans, would not give up our fight to write something good in it—even if we could not get all that was needed.

There is much in this bill that the administration never thought of, or, if it thought of it, refused to sponsor. Now suddenly it wants credit for the whole pie we baked just because they threw our first pie out the window.

It was action of the Democrats that kept support prices from being dropped as low as the administration obviously wanted to drop them.

It was action of the Democrats that compelled a higher support level for dairy products this year.

I do not want to make that as an assertion only. I challenge any person in the United States of America or elsewhere to examine the record of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. He will find that Secretary Benson and Under Secretary True D. Morse and the other representatives of the Department of Agriculture vigorously opposed raising the support level on dairy products and changing the formula for obtaining a better price for dairy products.

Mr. President, it was the action of a majority of Democrats that brought that about. I see present at this time my good friend, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. He was one of the stalwart champions in this fight. It was the action of men like the Senator from North Dakota, and, if I may say so, those of us on this side of the aisle, that froze the transitional parity formula from falling still lower, pending a study by the Department of an entirely new formula. In fact, the amendment covering that provision was offered by the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and cosponsored by myself.

I am pleased that both the parity study and the higher dairy supports in the original form were my own amendments in committee. They have been kicked around and abused, but their merit has been recognized in the end.

I am proud, too, that at least part of my amendment providing for marketing research and price studies on timber products has been kept in the bill. I regret it did not come back from conference with all its provisions about a marketing research and price study in regard to timber products.

I am proud that I sponsored or cosponsored amendments such as one to protect the normal competitive relationship of soybeans and cottonseed—the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] was instrumental in great part, in making that amendment possible—and an amendment to expand funds for using voluntary agencies in overseas relief distribution of surplus commodities; to authorize payment of ocean freight on such commodities; to authorize processing of surplus foods into form suitable for relief distribution; to give a greater local voice by soil-conservation districts and State foresters in administration of the soil bank; and to expand the corn allotment this year to 51 million acres, instead of the 43 million acres as proposed by the administration.

All these amendments have been adopted and are in the bill. None of them had administration support. None of them were recommended by this administration.

Many other constructive changes have been made in the bill from the limited program this administration proposed.

We have taken wildlife conservation interests into account, and provided for soil, water, wildlife, and forest conserving uses on conservation reserve lands, instead of limiting it to soil conservation. We have lengthened the time of conservation-reserve contracts to 15 years to encourage tree planting, and increased by $100 million the funds for this phase of the soil-bank program.

We have expanded the list of commodities covered by the acreage-reserve program, tightened safeguards for cattlemen and dairymen against use of new pastureland to graze additional livestock, and provided for control of noxious weeds.

All of these were not in the administration's program. All were added in committee or on the floor of the Senate.

We have improved safeguards for tenant farmers, under the soil-bank program. We have provided a vastly stepped-up surplus disposal program, including calling for specific recommendations on setting up a food-stamp plan and a program of strategic defense reserves of food and fiber. The administration has opposed both. It has opposed the food-stamp plan. It has opposed telling the people of America what we should have as a reserve of food and fiber.

Mind you, Mr. President, when we asked one of the representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Defense Mobilization as to whether or not this Government of ours had ever tried to evaluate or estimate how much food and fiber we should have in reserve for national emergencies, the answer was they had not given it a thought. They had not even considered it. Yet, Mr. President, everyone in this land knows that food and fiber are as vital to the defense of the United States as are thermonuclear weapons, and perhaps more so. Yet the administration had not even given thought to how much food and fiber we should have in reserve. The Office of Defense Mobilization had not even discussed it, much less given any thought to it.

Mr. President, in the bill we have provided something to shake them up a little. They will have to do a little thinking about that matter, because they will have to report to Congress on a workable food-stamp plan to utilize our God-given abundance of food for the benefit of those in need and, second, in order to have the necessary reserves of food and fiber for this country.

We have provided for expanding the barter program, by authorizing transfer to the supplemental defense stockpile, strategic materials as well as other materials acquired by the CCC in barter for surplus farm products.

Mr. President, is it not interesting that we constantly have to prod the administration into utilizing and selling the farm products we have? For example, consider our surplus supplies of cotton.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that last year we had before the committee witnesses in regard to the matter of disposal of the surplus cotton, and time and time again that subject was discussed in the committee?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed it was.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. And we had a hard time to get the administration to make any sales. Finally the Secretary announced he would make some sales on the first of August. Does the Senator from Minnesota remember that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do. Was not that the million bale sale?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes, although the cotton was not sold then, actually. But when the Department issued the report that it would sell a million bales of cotton on August 1, just at the time when the cotton farmers were preparing to gather their cotton, that announcement had a very adverse effect on the price the farmers received in August for their cotton. I can vouch for that.

Then, later on, the Department did sell some cotton. The big manipulators bought the cotton at the low price, and of course could dispose of the cotton later on. That is what happened in that instance.

My plea is that when the Department says it is going to sell 5 million bales, for God's sake and for the farmers' sake the Department should sell the cotton all during the year, and not sell all of it on August 1, just at the time when the cotton farmers are gathering the cotton.

That is what I have criticized—namely, the date when the Department was going to dispose of the cotton. I have criticized the Department for issuing such a report every time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from South Carolina has indeed criticized the Department for that; and in connection with this matter he did a very excellent and effective job in the committee, and made his point well. I am pleased that today he makes it again, because what he was saying to the Department was, "Yes, sell the cotton, but have a year-round disposal program. Do not dump all the cotton at once. Do not announce that all the cotton will be sold on one date, and thereby depress the entire price on the cotton market"—which is what happened before.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I make this statement because some persons have criticized me, and have said that I do not want the cotton disposed of. They have misinterpreted the situation. I want to have the cotton disposed of all during the year, and I want the Department to get busy and dispose of the cotton. On the average we have about 5 million more bales than we can use in the United States each year. If that cotton is not disposed of, the surplus will

increase. Then what will happen? When we have more cotton than is needed, the price goes down. I do not have to tell anyone who has studied economics or has taken any course in economics that that is true. In that case, the law of supply and demand steps in.

A few years ago we were selling on the foreign market between 5 million and 6 million bales of cotton. But last year we sold a little more than 1 million bales on the foreign market.

Mr. LANGER. A similar situation exists with respect to hogs.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, to continue to state some of the changes which we have made, which were not advocated by the administration—in fact, many of them were objected to by the administration—let me say that we have limited the use of Government-owned lands in producing price-supported crops competing with those of other farmers. We have authorized an additional $500 million to supplement section 32 funds for purchases of perishable products, such as pork and beef. We have provided a bipartisan commission to recommend legislation for the increased industrial use of agricultural products. We have provided for food donations to certain penal institutions. We have authorized a trial of the two-price certificate plan on rice. We tried to authorize it in the case of wheat, and I was happy to vote for that proposal, because I think it was deserving of a trial.

With all these changes, and many, many more, this then is the bill Congress is enacting—a bill the media of communication would have the public believe is just what President Eisenhower asked the Congress to enact.

These are the changes worked for and fought for, item by item, to strengthen and improve this bill within the narrow limits set by a willful President and a stubborn Secretary of Agriculture unwilling to recognize that any Member of Congress, either Democrat or Republican, might have constructive ideas better than their own. These are the changes that the press has attacked at one time as turning the bill into an irresponsible hodgepodge.

With all due fairness to the press, let me say the press was reporting in the news columns what certain spokesmen for the administration had said. The spokesmen for the administration had repeatedly said the bill was a hodgepodge; and the editorial writers picked up what the spokesmen for the administration said, and then said, in turn, "This is the voice from on high. This must be the truth." Then the editors began to interpret that statement by the spokesmen for the administration, and wrote glowing editorials as if that was the last word in veracity and authenticity.

Mr. President, as I have said, charges were made, and were repeated and reiterated, that the original farm bill, which the Senate passed in the latter part of March, had been turned into an irresponsible "hodgepodge" impossible for the President to accept. But now, suddenly, the members of the press themselves accept the bill and hail it as a "good bill"—after we have done all the work, over consistent administration opposition and consistent press attack.

Down in their hearts, most Republican Members on the other side of the aisle know as well as I know that many of these changes and refinements were urgently needed. As a matter of fact, several of them were sponsored by Senators on the other side of the aisle. They know that the bill, as sent to Congress by the President, back in January—I refer to the original administration farm bill—was not a well-thought-out bill, and that it contained many bugs which had to be removed.

They know that our obligation to American agriculture required that we try our best to get into the bill something that faced the major question of collapsing farm income; and, to their credit, many of them worked with many of us on this side of the aisle to perfect a bill that would do more than the administration seemed willing to have done.

Yet the great spirit of they-can-do-no-writing still surrounds this administration like a halo, even though a somewhat tarnished halo.

When the administration assails something the Democrats try to do for agriculture, the administration is praised for standing on principle and for refusing to be budgeted by political expediency. I think the statement made by the majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], in regard to this matter, was the last word. He said that when President Eisenhower came out for 86 percent of parity, that was principle; but when the Democrats came out for 90 percent of parity, that was demagoguery. Apparently the difference between principle and demagoguery is 4 percent.

One of our friends in the House of Representatives said that when President Eisenhower first took office, he was a man who had firm principles and flexible prices. By the time he got around to vetoing the farm bill, he had flexible principles and firm prices. They were firm, but a little bit lower than the ones we had advocated in our bill.

The administration's motives are never questioned by the idealists. Yet it seems unthinkable for major segments of the press to consider that Democrats could have anything other than political motivation.

When we come out for 90 percent of parity, that is politics, but when the President comes out for 86 percent of parity, that is principle. When we came out for 90 percent of parity for corn, with limited acreage, acreage allotments, and restrictions upon planting, that was politics; but when the President comes out for 86 percent of parity for corn, with unlimited acreage, plus price supports for the noncooperators and the noncompliers in the commercial corn area, something that has never been done before—no one would have dared try it before—that is principle.

I will say that it is mighty good politics. It is undoubtedly politically very acceptable. I repeat, our motives have been impugned, yet the very same writers, editors, and spokesmen who have impugned our motives—and, indeed, administration leaders themselves—now accept our improvements, adopt our ideas, and clamor for the credit, they shove and push to get at the head of the line and say, "These are our ideas."

When the administration tosses principles to the winds for sheer election-year expediency, the press does not blink an eye in adjusting its praise to the great concern being shown by the administration for farmers—its sudden interest in bolstering farm income that it has helped to depress.

Where are the principles involved, when an administration that has complained about flexible support prices not yet falling low enough to really work—and that is what the administration has said—suddenly turns around and administratively—and arbitrarily, with an eye on Corn Belt votes—fixes prices at higher levels than even their own law would provide?

Where are the principles involved, when an administration complaining constantly about surpluses decided to offer election-year supports to farmers who plant acreage in addition to their allotments?

Where are the principles involved, in view of the vast expansion of feed grain production that has followed administratively lowered support prices, when the administration spurns higher support levels linked to controls but accepts such increases without any controls, on unlimited production?

An administration which has said that we should have cross-compliance to make sure that farmers do not plant too much suddenly throws the entire program out the window and says, "Plant all you wish to plant, plow up the land, put in the grain, and we will give you better price support this year than we gave you last year."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Did the Senator notice where the commercial corn area happened to be, from a political standpoint?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is very cognizant of it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. And the differential between the commercial area and the noncommercial area?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The junior Senator from Minnesota knows a little about the Midwest, and about some of the political developments in the Midwest. He comes from a State which has a large production of corn.

I have never known of a farmer to ask the Government to do what this administration did. Farmers have been worried lest there might be overplanting, thereby ultimately depressing their prices a year from now. That is exactly what is going to happen.

These shifts and conflicts and contradictions in administration position emphasize for anyone unbiased enough to take a serious look, the total failure of this administration's farm policy guidance.

We in Congress have given the administration all it asked for, and more. We

have accepted their refusal to go along with further steps we felt necessary, and have tempered our legislation to fit their narrow views of the Government's role and responsibility. They now say they accept it as a "good bill." Let us hope they administer it that way.

I think it is fair to say that during the consideration of the second farm bill the junior Senator from Minnesota restrained himself almost to the point where no amendment whatever was offered. I had offered my amendments earlier. I had fought what I considered to be a good and just fight on the major farm bill reported from our Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I intend to take this fight to the only place where it can be decided. I intend to take it to the people. The Secretary has announced a wheat referendum under our production control program. There will not only be a wheat referendum, but there will be a total political referendum, a total political checkup. I intend to take my part of the case, the case to which I have given much thought, hard labor, and years of work, to the constituency of my State. I am happy to say that in this instance both Senators from Minnesota, with very few exceptions, are agreed upon farm policy. Why? Because I think we know our people and their needs.

Properly administered this measure could still help check the dangerous decline in farm income.

Improperly administered, or administered reluctantly by those who do not really believe in farm programs at all, no legislation can offer much help.

Only recently the Secretary of Agriculture said that he really was not very much in favor of the soil-bank program, and never had been. He was honest about it. Likewise, he said he did not really believe that purchases of hogs or pork products would do much good, even though he was compelled to make them, not by Congress in that instance, but by the facts of the situation.

My appeal is for sympathetic administration—for stretching every point in favor of the hard-pressed farmer, for trying to protect our entire economy—now—by halting this deplorable situation in agriculture.

I am afraid such an appeal might ordinarily fall on deaf ears in the Department of Agriculture today. Similar appeals have met with little response before.

But in light of election-year awareness this administration has already shown in its juggling and haggling over this bill, I am hopeful that concern over preelection farm prices, if nothing else, will encourage sympathetic administration that will produce some results.

An election is a wonderful thing. Not only does it provide an opportunity for the people to make their choices as to representation, but in an instance such as this, they can provide for some better results in the entire economic structure.

For my part, I am not going to object to this administration trying to "buy votes" in an election year by any action they can think of to bolster farm prices. I want them to. I want them to do everything they can to bolster farm prices. Farm income is more important than partisan victories. I want to see farm people helped, regardless of who gets credit for it. I have worked long and hard on this farm bill in that spirit. I shall continue to work in that spirit.

I am convinced that I am fighting for the protection of our entire economic system when I fight for the protection of agriculture.

I am convinced that agriculture has been shamefully neglected as the rest of our economy has been given one break after another in public policy.

And, too, I am convinced that time will justify every position I have taken in this long farm fight—and time will eventually see enacted into law and public policy many of the efforts to improve conditions in agriculture which this administration has scorned and successfully sidetracked.

Mr. President, I conclude by expressing my commendation of the Committee on Appropriations, particularly the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, for a job well done. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has given unceasingly and untiringly of his great ability and energy and service to bring out a good agricultural appropriation bill, which we passed yesterday.

In that bill there is a recommendation for a research laboratory relating to animal and livestock diseases. I did not comment on it yesterday because other Senators were making the RECORD adequately clear on that subject.

However, I should like the RECORD to show at this point that on August 16, 1955, I wrote to the American Veterinary Medical Association, and on August 26, 1955, to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, with respect to an expansion of research activities in regard to agricultural diseases.

I did that because the American Veterinary Medical Association held its annual convention in Minneapolis, Minn., and at that convention certain resolutions were adopted which were called to my attention, and which I brought to the attention of appropriate Government officials.

In my letter to Dr. Quin, the president of the American Veterinary Medical Association, I said, in part:

> I have read the press reports of your address at the opening general session. Your proposal for the establishment of adequately staffed regional laboratories for animal and poultry research by the Department of Agriculture has my wholehearted approval.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter to Dr. Quin be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 16, 1955.

Dr. A. H. QUIN,
President, American Veterinary Medical Association,
Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR DR. QUIN: It is an honor for the city of Minneapolis to have the American Veterinary Medical Association hold its 92d annual convention in our community. I ask you to convey my greetings and best wishes to the delegates assembled. I have read with considerable interest your splendid program and note that you were privileged to hear from one of our most outstanding and distinguished citizens, Dr. Charles W. Mayo.

I have read the press reports of your address at the opening general session. Your proposal for the establishment of adequately staffed regional laboratories for animal and poultry research by the Department of Agriculture has my wholehearted approval. As a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I shall urge the Department of Agriculture to give favorable consideration to your proposal. I would deeply appreciate receiving a copy of your address so I may discuss your suggestions in more detail with the Department.

We in Minnesota are proud of our own veterinarians and the Minnesota Veterinary Association. I count many friends amongst its membership.

My kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, later I received a letter from the assistant executive secretary of the American Veterinary Medical Association, dated August 26, 1955. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN VETERINARY MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., August 26, 1955.

The Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. HUMPHREY: Your warm expression of greetings and best wishes for a successful meeting in Minneapolis was sincerely appreciated by all who attended the 92d annual convention of the American Veterinary Medical Association. As was anticipated, this was the largest number of veterinarians ever to convene for a scientific program. The twin cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, the veterinarians and veterinary associations of Minnesota were charming hosts.

There can be no doubt regarding the immediate value of this meeting to the public, the livestock industry and to the profession. Of equal importance are the ultimate benefits that will result as the recommendations initiated at this meeting are fully implemented. Your offer of assistance in accomplishing these objectives is quite encouraging and may we assure you of our earnest desire to cooperate in this endeavor to our fullest extent.

Specific recommendations contained in the presidential address of Dr. Quin will soon be available for distribution and will also be referred to appropriate committees for their consideration. Copies wil be furnished your office as soon as they become available. Dr. Quin asked that I transmit this information to you and express his sincere appreciation for your interest and cordial expression of friendship.

Sincerely yours,

H. E. KINGMAN, Jr.,
Assistant Executive Secretary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That letter, of course, relates to my interest in the research program on animal diseases.

On August 26, 1955, I sent a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, in which I said:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The American Veterinary Medical Association is now holding its 92d annual convention in Minneapolis. During his opening address to the convention Dr. A. H. Quin, of Kansas City, Mo., president of the association, voiced a strong and effective appeal for expansion of research

funds and activities in regard to animal disease.

I want to strongly support his sentiments, and urge you to consider the guidance of this group in the preparation of your next year's budget.

I am enclosing for your information a newspaper clipping summarizing Mr. Quin's proposals. I would appreciate the reaction of your Department.

Under date of September 16, 1955, I received a letter from the Department of Agriculture, signed by E. L. Peterson, Assistant Secretary. In that letter, I am happy to note, Mr. Peterson expressed his interest in substantial increases in the animal research field, particularly in a laboratory program.

I ask unanimous consent that that letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., September 16, 1955.

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Thank you for your letter calling attention to the recommendations made by Dr. A. H. Quin in his presidential address to the American Veterinary Medical Association. Dr. Quin has for many years been a vigorous supporter of animal disease research. We are glad to have further evidence of his attitude.

The Department recognizes the importance and necessity of animal disease research. In fiscal year 1955 this program has been strengthened by additional increases provided by the Congress which amounted to $2,093,835. Of this amount, $1,900,000 was made available for initiating research on foot-and-mouth disease at the Plum Island Laboratory in New York. In addition, substantial increases were made available for strengthening the cooperative animal disease research programs at the State agricultural experiment stations through Federal-grant funds.

In the fiscal year 1956 this research was further strengthened. Increases were provided in the amount of $505,000 for expansion of research work by the Department. Of this amount, $250,000 was made available for preparing plans and specifications for the construction of facilities for animal disease research and control. Substantial increases were again made available to strengthen the cooperative research programs at the State agricultural experiment stations.

Your interest in this part of our research program is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. PETERSON,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a letter which I sent to Mr. Byron T. Shaw, Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture, under date of May 22, 1956, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 22, 1956.

BYRON T. SHAW,
Administrator, Agricultural Research Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. SHAW: As you have no doubt noted, the Senate Appropriations Committee omitted from the agricultural appropriation bill an item previously approved by the House for establishment of animal disease laboratory facilities, including construction.

The Senate committee's objection was to further concentrating this work at Beltsville, Md., and it was recommended that the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should approve the project, including its location, before making the proposed $10 million appropriation.

As a means of bringing this before the Senate Committee on Agriculture, I would like to introduce legislation authorizing establishment of such a facility, and proposing that it be located in Minnesota. I believe a good case can be made for having such a facility out in the Midwest, where we are substantial producers of hogs, beef cattle, and dairy cattle. I am sure cooperation of the University of Minnesota and State officials could be obtained in providing an adequate site.

For that purpose, I would appreciate receiving your Service's justifications for establishment of such a facility, together with suggested language for a bill authorizing its establishment in my State. I understand, of course, that such language would be provided as a service and would not convey, in any sense, the endorsement by your agency or Department as to the eventual location of this facility. However, I believe immediate introduction of such legislation would expedite obtaining a decision from the Senate Committee on Agriculture at this session, both as to the desirability of such a facility and as to where it should be located.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was in that letter that I made note of the fact that I objected to the laboratory being located at Beltsville, Md. I concur with the expressions made yesterday on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and other Senators, with respect to the importance of locating this vital facility in an area where there is adequate space, and where it would be very conveniently located in terms of animal population and the economy of our country relating to livestock production.

Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement which I prepared on this subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, revealed today he intended to introduce legislation calling for establishment of a $10 million animal disease research laboratory in Minnesota.

Proposals for earmarking $10 million for such a laboratory at Beltsville were eliminated from the agricultural appropriation bill by the Senate yesterday, on the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee that such facilities should not be concentrated at Beltsville, Md.

"As soon as I learned of the Appropriations Committee action," Senator HUMPHREY told the Senate today, "I wrote to Dr. Byron T. Shaw, Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service in the Department of Agriculture, asking his cooperation in preparation of an independent bill authorizing establishment of such a facility in Minnesota."

Senator HUMPHREY said the bill would be introduced as soon as the information requested was received from the Agricultural Research Service.

He placed in the RECORD his letter to Dr. Shaw, which said, in part:

"As a means of bringing this before the Senate Committee on Agriculture, I would like to introduce legislation authorizing establishment of such a facility, and proposing that it be located in Minnesota. I believe a good case can be made for having such a facility out in the Midwest, where we are substantial producers of hogs, beef cattle, and dairy cattle. I am sure cooperation of the University of Minnesota and State officials could be obtained in providing an adequate site.

"I believe immediate introduction of such legislation would expedite obtaining a decision from the Senate Committee on Agriculture at this session, both as to the desirability of such a facility, and as to where it should be located."

The Appropriations Committee had opposed granting the budget request until the Committee on Agriculture had studied the need for such a facility and the best location for it.

Senator HUMPHREY said he had been working for expansion of animal disease research facilities and funds ever since the convention of the American Veterinary Medical Association in Minneapolis last summer, at which the urgent need was emphasized by Dr. A. H. Quin, president of that group. He presented for the RECORD a letter written to the Secretary of Agriculture last August calling attention to the recommendations of the American Veterinary Medical Association, and urging expansion of such research activity.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10875) to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 460. An act to amend section 4482 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U. S. C. 475), relating to life preservers for river steamers;

S. 743. An act to authorize biennial inspection of the hulls and boilers of cargo vessels, and for other purposes;

S. 1378. An act to clarify and consolidate the authority to require the establishment, maintenance, and operation of aids to maritime navigation on fixed structures in or over navigable waters of the United States;

S. 1790. An act to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize more liberal propelling power allowances in computing the net tonnages of certain vessels;

S. 1791. An act to amend section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940 (54 Stat. 164), relating to the lights required to be carried by motorboats;

S. 2151. An act to provide for the segregation of certain funds of the Fort Berthold Indians on the basis of a membership roll prepared for such purpose;

S. 2327. An act for the relief of Takako Iba;

S. 2562. An act to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended;

S. 3237. An act to provide for continuance of life-insurance coverage under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954,

as amended, in the case of employees receiving benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act;

S. 3315. An act to amend section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

S. 3524. An act to give effect to the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries signed at Washington September 10, 1954, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10875. An act to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 23, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 460. An act to amend section 4482 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U. S. C. 475), relating to life preservers for river steamers;

S. 743. An act to authorize biennial inspection of the hulls and boilers of cargo vessels, and for other purposes;

S. 1378. An act to clarify and consolidate the authority to require the establishment, maintenance, and operation of aids to maritime navigation on fixed structures in or over navigable waters of the United States;

S. 1790. An act to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize more liberal propelling power allowances in computing the net tonnages of certain vessels;

S. 1791. An act to amend section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940 (54 Stat. 164), relating to the lights required to be carried by motorboats;

S. 2151. An act to provide for the segregation of certain funds of the Fort Berthold Indians on the basis of a membership roll prepared for such purpose;

S. 2327. An act for the relief of Takako Iba;

S. 2562. An act to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended;

S. 3237. An act to provide for continuance of life insurance coverage under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, in the case of employees receiving benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act;

S. 3315. An act to amend section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; and

S. 3524. An act to give effect to the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries signed at Washington September 10, 1954, and for other purposes.

REVISION OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2875) to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. Is there objection to the consideration of the amendments en bloc?

Mr. CARLSON. I shall not have any objection to the consideration of the amendments en bloc, but I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether he would have any objection to having a quorum call first.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should be glad to have a quorum call.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair would ask if there is any objection to considering en bloc the various amendments under the letter "A" offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, there is a perfecting amendment which I should like to offer, which can be amended. The same is true with regard to another amendment which I am offering, which is identified as "B." I should like to have it understood that the bill can be amended in any way regardless of the adoption of the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the desire of the Senator from South Carolina that these amendments included under "A" be considered en bloc?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then they will be open to amendment as original text?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina that the amendments incorporated under "A" be considered en bloc? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the amendments incorporated under the letter "A" which have been offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 65, beginning with line 24, to strike out all through line 15 on page 66 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(d) If an employee dies after completing 5 years of civilian service or a Member dies after completing 5 years of Member service, or an employee or a Member dies after having retired under any provision of the act, and is survived by a wife or by a husband who is incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical disability and who received more than one-half of his support from such employee or Member, each surviving child shall be paid an annuity equal to the smallest of (1) 40 percent of employee's or Member's average salary divided by the number of children, (2) $600, or (3) $1,800 divided by the number of children. If such employee or Member is not survived by a wife or husband, each surviving child shall be paid an annuity equal to the smallest of (1) 50 percent of the employee's or Member's average salary divided by the number of children, (2) $720, or (3) $2,160 divided by the number of children. The child's annuity shall begin on the first day of the month after the employee or Member dies, and such annuity or any right thereto shall terminate upon (1) his attaining age 18 unless incapable of self-support, (2) his becoming capable of self-support after age 18, (3) his marriage, or (4) his death. Upon the death of the wife or dependent husband or termination of the annuity of the child, the annuity of any other child or children shall be recomputed and paid as though such wife, dependent husband, or child had not survived the employee or Member.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, from the amendment, it will be noted that a provision is being placed in the bill which will reduce the amount to $600 a child, or a maximum of $1,800, to be divided by the number of children affected, if such employee or Member is not survived by a wife. The amendment reads:

If such employee or Member is not survived by a wife or husband, each surviving child shall be paid an annuity equal to the smallest of (1) 50 percent of the employee's or Member's average salary divided by the number of children, (2) $720, or (3) $2,160 divided by the number of children.

In other words, more will be paid if the children have no mother or father to look after them; but the amount is limited all the way through.

It will be noted that the amendment places a limitation in case there are several children, because it should not be possible for them to draw more than perhaps their father was drawing as his annuity. The amount would be limited all the way through.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared concerning the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The proposed amendment establishes a threefold ceiling on the amount of annual benefits which may be paid to surviving children.

First. The amount to any one child may not exceed $600.

Second. The total benefit to 1 or more children may not exceed 40 percent of the deceased employees' average salary.

Third. The total may not exceed $1,800, irrespective of the fact that 40 percent of the deceased employee's salary might be in excess of such an amount.

The above limitations apply in the case of surviving children with one parent still living. In the case of children with neither parent living, the ceilings are approximately 20 percent higher.

In no event could total family benefits (widow plus children) exceed 80 percent of a deceased employee's average salary. The earned annuity of an employee cannot exceed 80 percent of his average salary. In the event of his death, his widow receives 50 percent of his earned annuity, thus in no case could her benefits be in excess of 40 percent of the employee's average salary, which, together with the 40-percent limit on benefits to children, would make a total not in excess of 80 percent. It should be appreciated that it would take a combination of (1) long years of service on the part of the deceased employee, and (2) a large number of surviving children for the total family survivorship

benefits to even approach the 80-percent figure.

Also submitted is a second amendment to S. 2875 which I request be printed and lie on the table. The latter amendment is of a perfecting nature to correct typographical, grammatical, and other errors of a like nature.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand, the bill as reported by the committee provided $600 for each child without a limitation on the number of children. Assuming an extreme case, if there were 10 children, the amount payable might have been $6,000, even though the father had been drawing $4,000 during his lifetime.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The amendment would set an over-all limit of $1,800.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It would; or the amount might be even lower than that. In the case of some salaries, the amount would be limited to 40 percent of what the employee was drawing.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I concur in the amendment offered by the distinguished chairman. I think it strengthens the bill, and places a limitation on an item which I think probably should have been done earlier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I do not want the opportunity to pass without expressing my commendation of the chairman of the committee for staying with this problem and reporting the bill to the Senate. A large amount of work is always entailed in preparing bills affecting the civil service retirement system and Federal workers. I commend the distinguished chairman for his statement and his explanation of the bill.

When the committee unanimously reported the bill, I made a reservation that should I find some provision of the bill which if stricken might improve the bill, or which might be improved by a modification, I would exercise my right to oppose it. The chairman, of course, understands that that is the privilege of any Senator. I reserved my right because I was concerned about 2 or 3 provisions which I had not had an opportunity to study completely and did not want to impede the legislative processes on the bill.

The hearings on the bill were conducted by a subcommittee composed of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD]. The hearings were extensive, and the committee heard many witnesses representing the employees and the departments. I commend the subcommittee for the work which it did in reporting the bill.

Mr. President, in addition to what I have said about the chairman of the committee, I commend the other members of the committee for their diligent work on the bill.

The initial Civil Service Retirement Act, passed in 1920, developed a strong staff retirement system for Federal employees—a system that was established long before recognition of the necessity for pension plans by many private employers. This advancement stood for many years. However, in the past 20 years a remarkable growth and improvement in private pension plans has developed. In 1935 there were but about 1,000 private pension plans covering some 2 million workers. In 1955, in contrast, there were about 20,000 covering 13 million workers. These workers are covered by old-age and survivors benefit insurance and supplemented by their own private pension plans.

The last major amendment to the 1920 act was made in the 80th Congress of 1948, where it was recognized that the need for survivors benefits to widows and children of employees was a must. S. 2875, which we are considering today, vitally extends these benefits. This bill, as reported here, is twofold in its scope. First, it reaffirms the principles such as in the 83d Congress when we passed the so-called fringe-benefits bill, establishing that Government employees should be on a par with those employees in private industry when dealing with fringe benefits. Secondly, the bill contains a policy wherein the enhanced and extended benefits hereunder are strictly dependent upon the Government to meet their burden on an annual basis, paid into the fund by appropriations to each agency. Any deviation from this proposed policy on the part of future Congresses will cause and accelerate a weakening in the civil service retirement system and bring about a destruction of our now sound staff retirement system, and the future recipients of the benefits of this bill will have little to look forward to but disillusionment and breach of promise on the part of their Government.

The action here today on the proposed legislation cannot be taken lightly. It directly affects some 2 million Federal employees—and, indirectly, some 5 million persons, taking into account their families and dependents, all relying upon the potential benefits to come. It is, and should be, a fixed cost to the employee and to the Government. The bill will increase the cost of retirement benefits some $466 million a year.

One of the major problems of our staff retirement plan is that none of its benefits accrue to the majority of the Federal employees who are in Federal service for only brief periods and then leave. At the end of 1955 some 250,000 employees were drawing benefits from this system, while our turn-over in employees was about 500,000 a year. To these people moving in and out of the Government retirement and survivor protection is inadequate. This has been partly—but only partly—alleviated in allowing the optional transfer of credits from retirement to social security in certain cases under S. 2875. This, in my opinion, is a totally inadequate solution. The standard industrial practice of covering employees under social security and supplementing those benefits by a staff retirement plan, does a far better job for short-term employees.

This Congress is at present considering amendments and changes in the social-security benefits for our Nation's senior citizens. This Congress must also be aware of the 250,000 employee annuitants across this great land of ours with an average monthly annuity of about $120. And of these, more than 25 percent were retired for disability. Survivor annuitants number close to 75,000 with an average monthly annuity of about $49. Nearly half of the employee annuitants get less than $100 a month, and more than half of the survivor annuitants get less than $50 a month. None of the benefits in S. 2875 will accrue to these folks. Their plight is not unlike other annuitants and should be given early consideration in this Congress. One of the provisions which I hope to see stricken from the bill is that section dealing with social security. I think it is a problem which should be dealt with by the Committee on Finance, because that committee deals with such problems.

Mr. President, early this year I introduced a bill, S. 3041, designed to carry out the recommendations of the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel.

Congress created this committee in 1952, and directed it to study all retirement systems for all Federal personnel. The committee was headed by Mr. H. Eliot Kaplan, a recognized expert in the field, whose appointment was made by President Truman and continued by President Eisenhower. The ex officio members of the committee were the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

The Kaplan committee worked for nearly 2 years and spent $217,000 making the studies and recommendations directed by the Congress. The great majority of its time was devoted to civil service retirement. The bill before the Senate today, S. 2875, largely bypasses this important work.

The committee found that the major Federal employee retirement problem existing today is a lack of coordination between the civil-service retirement system and the old-age and survivors insurance system. It recommended that social-security coverage be extended to employment subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act, with the civil-service retirement system modified to take into account that old-age and survivors' insurance benefits would be payable.

The committee agreed that a plan of coordination should meet these specifications:

1. Establish a rational relationship between retirement benefits and service for those whose work-lifetime may include employment in both the Federal service and private industry, taking into account the advantages to Federal employees by extending old-age and survivors' insurance coverage to Federal employment;

2. Maintain complete independence of the civil-service retirement system;

3. Assure continuance of the civil-service retirement system as the primary means of providing adequate protection for career employees, while placing some of the cost on the old-age and survivors' insurance system for providing coverage—particularly for those shifting between Federal and private employment;

4. Provide at least the present level of retirement benefits based on Federal employment;

5. Maintain the total employee contribution at approximately the present level;

6. Maintain simplicity of formula and administration.

S. 3041 would put into effect a plan of coordination meeting these specifications, and would achieve the following results:

First. Retirement benefits payable after age 65 would be increased.

Second. Survivor protection would be greatly improved.

Third. Continuous social security protection would be provided for the many thousands of employees who move between Government and private employment.

Fourth. Opportunities for unwarranted dual benefits, now available through accident or design because of lack of coordination, would be eliminated.

Fifth. Both Government and employee contributions could be somewhat reduced in the immediate future.

S. 2875 will not of course achieve these results. It proposes in section 12 a transfer of credit provision, whereby an employee leaving Federal service has the option of acquiring social security wage credits for his Federal employment. However, it does not make social security coverage available to employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act during their Federal employment. It does not prevent the dilution and loss of social security protection to the employee entering Government from private industry. Its optional feature would still allow windfall benefits in some cases, and in others would result in a choice detrimental to the best interests of the employee.

The Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel considered this approach and rejected it. The committee reported:

Methods of supplementation based on transfer of employment credits, rather than full old-age and survivors' insurance protection for Federal employees, would offer no advantages to career employees. Many serious inequities would continue to occur. Moreover, the adoption of a transfer-of-credit method would give rise to administrative complexities between the two systems and tend to infringe upon the independence of the civil service retirement system.

The Kaplan Committee also strongly recommended that the retirement system be soundly financed. S. 2875 recognizes the need for sound financing by providing that employees shall support the system by a 7 percent contribution rate. S. 2875 further provides that Government agencies shall also contribute 7 percent. However, S. 2875 departs from the principles of sound financing by requiring a fixed 3½ percent interest rate on the retirement fund.

This is totally unrealistic. No present average interest rate on long-term Government securities is less than 3 percent. The difference represents a hidden and unwarranted subsidy. In my judgment, the Secretary of the Treasury should invest this fund in securities which will provide an interest income equal to that provided under long-term securities. This is on all fours with the recommendations of the Finance Committee regarding the investment of the social security trust fund.

Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment which would provide for an average rate of interest. I submit an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed in section 18, page 82, to strike out all of lines 16 through 25 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(c) The Secretary of the Treasury shall immediately invest in interest-bearing securities of the United States, such currently available portions of the fund as are not immediately required for payments from the fund, and the income derived from such investments shall constitute a part of the fund.

(d) The purposes for which obligations of the United States may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are hereby extended to authorize the issuance at par of public-debt obligations for purchase by the fund. Such obligations issued for purchase by the fund shall have maturities fixed with due regard for the needs of the fund and bear interest at a rate equal to the average rate of interest computed as to the end of the calendar month next preceding the date of such issue, borne by all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt that are not due or callable until after the expiration of 5 years from the date of original issue; except that where such average rate is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 percent, the rate of interest of such obligations shall be the multiple of one-eighth of 1 percent nearest such average rate. Such obligations shall be issued for purchase by the fund only if the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the purchase in the market of other interest-bearing obligations of the United States, or of obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States on original issue or at the market price, is not in the public interest.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the amendment, in simple language, not only authorizes, but directs, the Secretary of the Treasury to invest these funds in bonds that will provide an average interest rate.

The bill before the Senate provides for a 3½-percent rate. Previous to that time there was an average rate of 3 percent. Last year, 1955, the Government appropriation to the Civil Service fund was $33,678,729.94. The interest on the total investment was $234,377,235.52.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Lest someone be misled by that last statement with regard to interest, I have been informed the interest had accumulated, and that in 1 year there had been the payment of accumulated interest at the rate of 3 percent. It will be noticed that the interest for the 3 years of 1952, 1953, and 1954, really amounted to more than it did in previous years, although the same amount of principal was involved. The Government was paying only 3 percent interest, whereas 4 percent interest had been paid prior to that. The reason for the large amount of interest is that it had accumulated over the years.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the statement of the chairman of the committee is correct, but regardless of what the reason was, there are Federal bonds that pay interest at the rate of 4 percent, 3½ percent, and 3 percent. I think it is good, sound business judgment to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the average interest rates on bonds. I would say that with respect to several other funds which the Government has. When the social security bill comes from the committee, it will contain the same provision.

Mr. President, I think the amendment is a sound amendment, and I sincerely hope it will be adopted.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I wish to say I also noticed the figure of $117 million in dividends, representing the difference in yield between 3 and 3½ percent interest. I suppose these figures are from the Civil Service Commission. I do not know who arrived at the figure of $117 million. It will be found that that figure should be only $30 million, rather than $117 million. Somebody calculated the figures incorrectly.

So far as I am concerned, I do not think the changing of the interest rate will make much difference. The whole retirement system is set up with the understanding that the Government will match the funds contributed by the employees. If that is to be done, and if we should run into trouble in years to come, I think the Government would have to come to the rescue of the fund.

The amendment refers only to the interest rate. An interest rate was fixed which was thought to be right and just. In the long run, it will not amount to much.

For that reason, Mr. President, I raise no objection to the Senator's amendment. The facts, as well as the conclusion which will eventually be reached in years to come, can readily be ascertained.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, with me, this is a matter of sound government practice. I am not here trying to just save a dollar. I do not know that my amendment would. But the bill proposes to go in the back door, and have the Government pay a certain interest rate on investments.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Four percent interest was received until

1953. Then when everybody else's interest rates went up, the Government decreased its interest rates. It was felt that the interest rate should be put between the highest and lowest bidder.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator's amendment is a sound one. I think it is a policy which should be followed in dealing with other funds where investments are made. The Government should pay the average rate.

Furthermore, while I agree with both the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from South Carolina that in dollars and cents this amendment will not save a single penny, I think it makes for a better fiscal policy, because it clearly lays before the Congress and the employees what the costs are, and if there is any amount to be made up, it will have to be from funds out of appropriations which will be made by the Congress, rather than by a hidden subsidy.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Unfortunately, I have not been able to devote the time and study to the bill that I should like to have, but in effect, will the interest rate proposed in the bill provide a subsidy? Is it possible it could provide an indirect subsidy to the retirement fund?

Mr. CARLSON. Well, it could only in this way: That the Federal Government would have to sell bonds at 3½ percent interest and place that in this fund.

Mr. AIKEN. I was wondering if it would have a tendency to increase the rate of interest generally. Would it press in that direction?

Mr. CARLSON. It could do that, but with the average interest rate provided, if interest rates are 3, 3½, and 4 percent, and they continue to go higher—they are high now; they may go higher—the fund would get the average interest rate. The Secretary of the Treasury is required to pay that, under the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to answer the Senator's question on that point. Since the beginning the Government was paying 4 percent, but since the Government has lowered its interest rate to 3 percent all the way through, the Government has been paying much cheaper rates than private institutions are paying.

Mr. AIKEN. The other question which comes to my mind is this: If we utilize this indirect method of contributing to the retirement fund, would it possibly lead to efforts to use the same method in other fields?

Mr. CARLSON. We are using it in some other fields, but I sincerely hope we can return to the average interest rates for all the funds.

Mr. AIKEN. Then the bill as written does not establish a precedent, does it?

Mr. CARLSON. No; I think not.

Mr. AIKEN. In other words, it does not establish a precedent by giving an indirect subsidy through the rate of interest paid?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As I see it, the bill does not provide a subsidy. The Government needs money for this program, and the Government borrows some of the money, and pays a rate of interest somewhere in keeping with the rate of interest which must be paid in ordinary commercial transactions.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. I am simply finding out now what I would have discovered long ago if I had had an opportunity to do so. But I have been rather busy with other legislation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield to me?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator is to be complimented upon his amendment. If it develops that the average rate of interest rises to 3½ percent, then the language in the bill as now written is not necessary; but if the rate of interest does not rise that high, then we not only have a hidden subsidy, but we are in the position of not giving all the information about the true cost of the program. Sometimes we think of the retirement programs in the light of the persons who already have retired or in the light of those who are about to retire. But the employees who will continue to work for the Government for 20, 30, or more years, pay these heavy contributions; and the public in general, particularly the taxpaying public that must pay the Government's part of the program, certainly is entitled to have the simplest and clearest statement possible regarding the cost of the program. But that is not obtained when hidden devices are used.

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. On page 3 of the report I notice the following two sentences:

> During the first 30 years of the program, moneys in the fund were invested in securities of the United States, bearing interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum. In 1953, the interest rate was reduced by action of the Secretary of the Treasury to 3 percent per annum.

Is that statement in the report absolutely correct?

Mr. CARLSON. I think it is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. However, was not that at a time when the interest rate in other fields was actually rising?

Mr. CARLSON. I am not certain about that. But originally we had in this program many 4 percent interest-bearing bonds, and today we have them in the Veterans' Admnistration. Many of them are short-term bonds, which pay 4 percent at the present time. So it is not unusual.

My point is that if we are getting into this fund some short-term bonds at 4 percent and some of the regular ones at 2⅞ percent, the average will be 3 or 3½ percent.

Mr. NEUBERGER. My point is—if my understanding is correct—that when the interest rate on the retirement funds was reduced, the interest rates elsewhere were rising substantially.

Mr. CARLSON. That may be correct. We are told that at the present time we have $6,984,496,000 in the fund. But I think it well to call attention to the fact that on page 38 of the hearings we find the following statement by Mr. Lawton, a member of the Civil Service Commission—and I think it well that the employees and the Congress know about it:

> Mr. LAWTON. There is currently an unfunded deficiency of $13,400 million as of July 1, 1955.

In other words, we have that accrued liability, which I think we must keep in mind when we are dealing with this problem.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask a question on that point. This is a technical matter; and as a layman, I certainly am not as familiar with it as I should like to be. But with that deficiency, to which Mr. Lawton referred in the hearing—and, being on the subcommittee, I recall his testimony—would it have existed if the Government's contributions over the years had matched the employees' contributions?

Mr. CARLSON. I think it would have, for the reason that once a program is begun, a great number of persons are taken under the program, and it is necessary to make a number of payments immediately. So a funded obligation is created. That was done in the case of the social-security program. It takes some years to get the program on a sound basis.

I think it would have been impossible to have had both the Government and the employees contribute at rates sufficient to have cared for the needs of the program. I do not say the program is unsound. But it does constitute an obligation on the part of the Government. We must take care of the obligation; there is no question about that.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is it not true that after the present administration came into office in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, the Government's contribution to the fund was greatly diminished—to about 10 percent of what it had been in the previous fiscal year?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct. In 1954, the Government contributed $35,303,259 and some cents. In 1955, the Government contributed more than $33 million.

Mr. NEUBERGER. But in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, the Government's contribution had been approximately $325,304,000, or nearly 10 times the amount the Government contributed during the fiscal year 1954; is not that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Oregon is absolutely correct.

I am not a member of the Appropriations Committee, but I am advised that at that time Congress created the Kaplan committee and appropriated funds for that committee to use in studying the entire civil-service program. For that reason, Congress waited to see how much additional money would be needed.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Inasmuch as the distinguished Senator has mentioned the obligation in connection with the fund, or the so-called indebtedness, to which Mr. Lawton referred when he appeared before the committee, I think

it well to point out that the Government's contribution to the fund dropped extremely sharply after the present administration took office; and that could be said to be something of a factor in the case of the existing obligation.

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct. However, even if the Government had been contributing the amount contributed 2 or 3 years before, there would still have been a very substantial indebtedness because the Government has failed to meet its annual obligation since the 1930's.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, is it not also true that during the past few years the Government has failed to match the employees' contributions in the way it did in the previous years, and that during the last 3 years it has been over $1 billion behind in matching the employees' contributions to this fund? If the Government had matched the employees' payments, there would be in the fund at the present time $1 billion or more—money on which we are now paying interest.

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct, in that during the last 3 years the contributions by the Government have not been substantial. The result has been, of course, to add to the funded indebtedness. But even prior to that time, the payments have always been behind, as is shown by the table based on the contributions by the Government and the contributions by the employees. Using your computation, the fund was $12,400,000,000 in arrears prior to 1952.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I grant that is true. In most years we have been rather close to paying the Government's share. But over the term of years we find that the employees' contribution, as is shown in the table on pages 8548–8549 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, has totaled $4,989,927,747.20. If we compare the figures, we find that the Government appropriations were approximately $1,500,000,000 behind, so far as matching was concerned. The Government appropriated $3,396,298,559.57. It will be noticed that the difference is more than $1,500,000,000.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, to supplement what the distinguished chairman of the committee has pointed out, during the late 1930's, and prior to the outbreak of the World War II defense emergency and our participation in World War II, the administration then in office made an effort to catch up by actually contributing as the Government's share a substantial contribution each year greater than the employees' share.

For example, in the fiscal year 1936 the Government contributed $40 million, as compared with an employee contribution of $32 million.

In the fiscal year 1938, the Government ment contributed $46 million, as compared with an employee contribution of $34 million.

In the fiscal year 1938, the Government contributed $73 millnon, as compared with an employee contribution of $37 million. The Government's contribution was twice that of the employees. In the fiscal year 1939, the Government contributed $75 million, as compared with $39 million for the employees.

In the fiscal year 1940, the Government's contribution was $87 million, as contrasted with $42 million for the employees, or more than twice as much.

Even in the fiscal year 1941, the Government's contribution was $91 million, as compared with $55 million for the employees.

In the fiscal year 1942, the Government's contribution was $101 million, compared with $86 million for the employees. Then, when we were in full-scale participation in World War II, with the necessarily heavy expenditures for our military equipment and operations in that great emergency, the Government did fall behind. The Government's contribution was $106 million, as contrasted with $226 million for the employees in 1943; but it is well to emphasize that before World War II was in full combat, the Government was making a conscientious effort to do more than catch up. I think it is wise and pertinent for the RECORD to show that fact.

Mr. CARLSON. I suggest that the table to which the Senator has referred be made a part of the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is already in the RECORD, at pages 8548–8549. It was made a part of my opening remarks.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to accommodate myself to the pleasure of the Senator from Kansas. I have a few questions on the bill which I wish to ask both the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from South Carolina. Does the Senator think this is an appropriate time?

Mr. CARLSON. I have no objection. The Senator from Oregon may ask his questions at this time. I am glad to yield for that purpose at any time.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to express my appreciation to both the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from South Carolina. The Senator from Kansas is the ranking minority member of the committee, and the Senator from South Carolina is chairman of the committee. I wish to express my appreciation for what I think is a remarkably fine job which the committee has done on Senate bill 2875, even though there may be within the committee—as these amendments show—some difference of opinion still. But certainly there is no difference of opinion with respect to the objectives of this very much needed piece of legislation. I congratulate both Senators for the fine service they have rendered the Senate by their work in the committee.

My questions are directed to the subject of the retired employee. Am I correct in my understanding that Senate bill 2875 is limited in its provisions to so-called active employees, that is, those now on the Federal payroll, and who at the present time are contributing to the retirement fund?

Mr. CARLSON. Senate bill 2875 makes no provision for increasing the annuities of our retired annuitants. There are pending in the committee two bills which will increase retired employees annuities.

The junior Senator from Kansas has introduced a bill, S. 3731, with Senator JENNER and Senator MARTIN of Iowa. The subject has been discussed in committee, with a view to holding hearings. However, the pending bill does not provide any increase for retired annuitants.

Mr. MORSE. I will come to the two bills which the Senator has mentioned in just a moment. I wished to make a little legislative history, if the Senator will permit. As the Senator has pointed out, the pending bill relates to the so-called active employees. Does the pending bill contain provisions in respect to the widows of active employees?

Mr. CARLSON. Senate bill 2875 does not provide any compensation or benefits in the way of retirement benefits, to widows or retired annuitants. They would have to be taken care of in additional or new legislation.

Mr. MORSE. However, the bill does make provision for active employees.

Mr. CARLSON. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has referred to two bills pending before the committee. One is the Carlson bill, Senate 3731, and the other is the Neuberger bill, cosponsored by the chairman of the committee and a group of other Senators. It is Senate bill 3725. These two bills seek to do economic justice to the retired Federal employees, that is, those already on retirement.

The Carlson bill has two provisions in it which distinguish it from the Neuberger bill, as I understand. First, the Carlson bill proposes to have the retired employees receive increased benefits, according to the provisions of the bill, out of the existing retirement fund.

It also provides a special section for benefiting the widows of presently retired employees. On the other hand, the Neuberger bill has no provision as to the widows, and it provides that the increased benefits to the retired employees shall come by way of a special appropriation by the Congress, to be added to the present retirement fund.

Does the Senator from Kansas share my view as to the differences between the various bills?

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator is correct. My bill also includes annuities for those widows whose husbands died prior to 1948. There are not too many in this group.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in my understanding that the consensus of opinion within the committee is that no attempt should be made at this time, in connection with our consideration of Senate bill 2875, to amend it so as to seek to increase benefits to the retired employees; but rather that the opinion of the committee is that we should try to accomplish that purpose by a separate piece of legislation?

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Oregon is correct. The subject was discussed in committee. We felt that it was in the interest of all concerned—both the retired annuitants and present civil-service employees—to keep the bills separate, and to try to enact the pending bill first. There was discussion in the committee to the effect that we should try to

obtain hearings on the subject at an early date.

Mr. MORSE. On that point I should like the attention of the chairman of the committee.

The Senator from Kansas has stated that it is his understanding that it is the present intention of the committee to hold early hearings on the two bills to which reference has been made, the Neuberger bill and the Carlson bill, Senate bill 3725 and Senate bill 3731. Can the Senator from South Carolina state to me whether or not it is contemplated that at an early date hearings will be held on those two bills?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We intend to hold hearings on them as soon as possible. The committee thought it was advisable not to include such provisions in the pending bill, but to hold hearings on that particular phase of the subject.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I may say to the chairman and to the ranking minority member of the committee that I appreciate very much the assurance they have given, because I believe we should have hearings forthwith, and I believe we should have legislation in form for action at this session of Congress. I say that because I believe a great number of the retired employees will get the impression that we have failed to do justice to them unless we supplement the bill we are passing today with a bill that will do economic justice to those retired employees. As Senators know, we are apparently confronted here with a conflict between the active employees and retired employees as to how any increased benefits are to be paid. The active employee representatives with whom I have discussed the subject say they are glad to have benefits going to the retired employees, but they do not want the benefits to come out of the existing fund.

The retired employees say "We started the fund in the first place, and we put into the fund a dollar that was worth much more than the dollar that is going into the fund today. The dollar today is a depreciated dollar, and we think we have an equity in that fund and are justified in asking that the amount of the retirement be increased in order to offset the depreciation in the dollar that we put into the fund when the fund was first set up."

We in the Senate are in the middle between the two conflicting groups of employees. That is no new experience for us. I believe the only question we must answer is, "What is justice for the retired employees?"

I wish to say to the active employees today that if the hearings before the committee on the two bills we have discussed today show that the fund is sufficiently sound financially to take care of additional benefits to the retired employees, I believe in the interest of fair play, they are entitled to some additional benefits. If, on the other hand, the evidence adduced before the committee shows that an additional appropriation needs to be added to the retirement fund, let us do it that way.

I am not committed irrevocably to the bill of which I am a cosponsor, if it can be improved. I certainly wish to say that I think there should be added to S. 3725 a new section on widow benefits corresponding to the provision that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] has in his bill. I believe it is a very sound provision. We might find, when all the evidence is in, that we will need to work out a new committee bill that represents a sort of halfway point between the Carlson and the Neuberger bills, in that some additional payments can be taken out of the retirement fund and, in return, the retirement fund can be supplemented with some additional appropriations.

However, I do not believe we should let any difference of opinion between these two groups of employees cause us to fail to bring out a sound retirement program for civil-service employees. We must not fail to do justice to those employees. I should like to see a civil-service retirement bill passed at this session of Congress which will benefit all retired employees.

I believe we find ourselves somewhat in the position of where we were with respect to the railroad retirement bill last year, when we found different brotherhoods holding different points of view in regard to railroad retirement legislation. At that time I said to the groups, "If you cannot get together, I will make a decision for myself, and what I will do will be based on evidence that you put in before the committee." That is what we did. Although the legislation that was passed was not completely satisfactory to either group, it was in the public interest.

All I plead for today is that we hold early hearings on this subject and that we get a bill before the Senate which will be judged on the basis of whether it is in the public interest, in trying to get for retired employees some additional benefits, including benefits for their widows. That should be done at this session of Congress. I say that because when we get through with S. 2875 today, we will have a bill which will do justice to the widows of the active employees. We have a large group of retired employees—I think there are about 250,000— the great majority of whom are in their seventies and eighties. There are also a large number of widows. As to these people I believe that we have not fulfilled our social responsibilities as a Congress.

I happen to believe that this great Government of ours is big enough and strong enough financially to do justice to the people all over the country who have served us as public servants, as these retired employees have served us.

If we were to take this problem to the taxpayers of the country and present it to them, I am sure they would say, "What are you waiting for? Of course, we believe justice ought to be done to these employees. We believe that reasonable annuities ought to be paid to them on the basis of the value of the dollar today, and we certainly think that legislation ought to be passed containing the section in the Carlson bill benefiting widows."

I wished to make this statement today because I know there is a great deal of interest in the subject among our retired employees. I believe they are entitled to an explanation as to why we are not including in S. 2875 any benefits for retired employees.

I believe they will appreciate the fact that they have the statement of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], whose word is always their bond, that hearings will be held and that the committee at a very early date will do its best to report a bill to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon has expressed views on this subject on the floor of the Senate which he has also personally expressed to me on several occasions. Those are the views with respect to what we should do for retired annuitants and the benefits that ought to be paid to widows. There are about 250,000 retired annuitants and 75,000 survivor annuitants on the rolls at the present time. From the studies I made before I introduced my bill, particularly of private pension funds—and I could mention several of them—I felt that it was sound to include these widows, and that based on the contributions made by the people who started the fund, they were entitled to consideration.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Oregon—and of course I share his views—and the Senator from Kansas agree that something is needed to be done for employees who are presently in a retirement status.

It is my understanding—and I have talked this matter over with the staff of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service—that the Civil Service Commission has been asked for its opinion on both the so-called Carlson bill and the so-called Neuberger bill, and that relatively soon the committee will have the benefit of that information from the Civil Service Commission, without which neither bill could be considered intelligently, because we would not have the actuarial facts which are necessary to consider with respect to retired employees and present employees. Inasmuch as the Senator from South Carolina, the distinguished chairman of the committee, has stated we will have hearings when the committee gets that information, I do not believe there is any doubt at all that hearings will be held on those bills.

Does not the Senator from Kansas agree with me?

Mr. CARLSON. I agree with the Senator from Oregon, and I, too, wish to congratulate the Senator from South Carolina for the way he conducted the hearings on S. 2875. He did a fine job.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to call attention to the fact that in 1947, in the Langer-Chavez bill, there was a provision which was the same as the one that has been discussed today by the senior Senator from Oregon and other Senators. When the bill came to the floor of the Senate, it met with the opposition of the then Republican leader. We lost by 3 votes. At that time we had the same promise that has been given today, that we

would have hearings on the matter to take care of the widows. We were told that we would have hearings on that subject in a short time. We met in committee and reported a bill, but we could not get it through the Senate. It was objected to on the call of the calendar, and we could not get it passed in the Senate.

I agree with the Senator from Oregon that we should have early hearings on the bills, and I hope that the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from South Carolina, working together, will assure us of hearings on the bills.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from North Dakota is a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and I am sure he will not let the chairman of the committee or the ranking minority member of the committee forget the statements made on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to commend the able Senator from Kansas and other members of the committee, including, of course, the very able chairman, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], not only for bringing forth the pending bill, but also for the thorough consideration they have given to the problem that has been raised by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and other Senators, with respect to retired employees. It is always a problem when we try to adjust the benefits of active personnel and try to include in the adjustment a provision to take care of retired employees.

I am delighted to have the assurance which has been given by the distinguished Senator from Kansas that the subject is being given active consideration, and that it is likely that some action will be taken during this session of the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I offer another amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all of section 12, pages 69 to 74, and renumber the subsequent sections 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19 to read 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18, respectively.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, what this amendment does is to strike from the bill the section which deals with social security, and in a certain way combines civil service retirement legislation and social security. It is my contention that this is a matter which should go to the Finance Committee, and I believe it should be considered by the committee in view of the fact that we dealt with that problem. I could go into detail, but I would hope that the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service would accept the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I shall not object to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas, but I think the amendment now at the desk is improperly drawn. I think this section of the bill should be referred to the Finance Committee for consideration.

I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas, which I believe will accomplish the same object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina will be considered as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I shall have no objection to the Senator's amendment, provided it does accomplish the same objective which I have in mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 66, line 18, beginning with the word "before," it is proposed to strike out down through the period in line 22 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "after he has completed 5 but less than 20 years of service, and any Member who is separated after he has completed 5 but less than 20 years of Member service, shall upon application therefor be paid the lump-sum credit. Any employee who is separated or transferred to a position not within the purview of this act before he has completed 5 years' service, and any Member who is separated before he has completed 5 years of Member service, shall be paid the lump-sum credit."

On page 69, beginning with line 4, strike out through line 12 on page 74.

Renumber sections 13 to 19, inclusive, as 12 to 18, respectively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In section 6 (b), page 53, line 17, after the word "who", insert the words "attains the age of fifty-five years and".

In section 9 (d), page 62, line 13, strike out all after the words "reduced by" and add the following: "one-fourth of 1 per centum for each full month such employee is under the age of sixty years at date of separation."

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the amendment deletes the section of the bill which provides for optional retirement before the age of 60.

The present civil-service law permits an employee with at least 30 years of service to retire between age 55 and age 60. The annuity computed on his salary and service is reduced by one-fourth of 1 percent for each month he is under age 60.

Senate bill 2875 changes the law by permitting a 30-year employee to retire at any age with the annuity reduced by one-twelfth of 1 percent for each of the first 30 months under age 60; by one-eighth of 1 percent for each of the next 30 months; and by one-sixth of 1 percent for each additional month.

The amendment would encourage a Federal worker who had worked 30 years to retire regardless of his age. In other words, if a person were employed as a messenger at the age of 18, he could retire with these benefits at the age of 48. I do not see how that can be justified, in view of the situation as we deal with persons who are covered under social security. Seventy million persons are affected by social security.

It seems to me that the adoption of the amendment would accomplish 2 or 3 things. Without an age requirement for optional retirement, the Government would lose the services of many of its most efficient employees who are in the prime of life. The provision would be most attractive to those capable employees desiring to seek a new career, with annuity supplementing salary rather than being retirement income.

I can readily understand that many of our fine employees who have served 30 years and are experts in their fields would be encouraged to leave to obtain added salary outside the Government service. But when they do so, I do not think they should be allowed to draw retirement pay, even though they have served 30 years and would be far below the age of 60. I think we shall be setting a precedent which should not be established.

The present reduction in annuity payable after optional retirement or voluntary separation before age 60 is quite generous. The reduction is already less than half that required on an actuarial basis by the law in effect from 1942 to 1948.

Another point is that lower reductions make early retirement more attractive, and thus result in the Government's loss of more employees at the peak of their usefulness. Optional retirements below age 60 have tripled—and this is worth noting, Mr. President—since the reduction was liberalized in 1948, and the fur-

ther liberalization proposed by S. 2875 could be expected to produce a further increase.

Another, while earlier optional retirement with lower annuity reductions would be very attractive from an employee viewpoint, the Government as the employer could not expect to derive any benefit which would justify the added cost of the liberalization.

I expect to be on the Senate floor when the social security bill is discussed during the next 2 or 3 weeks. It will be rather difficult for me at that time to speak about the reduction in the retirement age of women to 62, on the theory that the present trend in private industry is toward longer employment. I wish to protect myself in this position today on this bill.

I sincerely hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I shall certainly have to oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas. I have not found a single Government employee who does not approve the bill in this particular form, so far as the feature relating to retirement after 30 years of service is concerned.

I call attention to the fact that at present Government employees may retire at the age of 55 after 25 years of service.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas would eliminate from the bill the provision which would permit optional retirement at any age after the completion of 30 years of service, subject to a reduction in the earned annuity by a percentage for each month the employee was under the age of 60 at the time of his retirement. He would not receive as much if he were younger. If he retired at the age of 48, there would be deducted from his annuity 20½ percent of what he would have received, in order to pay his annuity.

The present law, as I said a few minutes ago, permits optional retirement at the age of 55 after the completion of 30 years' service.

The bill eliminates the age requirement and permits optional retirement after 30 years' service at any age. So it will be noted that between age 55 and whatever age the employee might be younger than that, if he started at the age of 18 and worked 30 years, the important period would be between the age of 48 and the age of 55.

If an employee retired at the age of 48, his annuity would be reduced for every year he was under 60 years of age. This means he would receive a smaller annuity.

Optional retirement after the completion of 30 years' service is a feature completely endorsed by all employee organizations. No other provision of the bill has been so long sought and earnestly desired. Certainly all employees who complete 30 years of service before age 60 will not retire. There will be only a certain percentage who will retire. If an employee wants to earn more money and build up his retirement fund, he will continue to work. This is proved by the fact that a great majority of employees having 30 years of service, and who have attained the age of 60, do not retire then.

The provision is sought by employees more as an insurance feature than as a provision to be taken advantage of when the requirements have been met. Employees are particularly anxious for its adoption at this time because of their fear of replacement due to automation or for other reasons.

I urge the Senate to retain this feature in the bill. The reduction in annuity will last for the remainder of the employee's life. Let us remember that. If he draws a reduced annuity, he will draw it even after reaching the age of 60. The amount will not be restored when he reaches the age of 60.

The provision of the bill merely gives employees the right to retire after they have served 30 years. The Army allows all of its personnel to retire with full benefits after 30 years' service. If they retire after 20 years' service, they draw a smaller annuity.

The same is true of a great many employees in the Foreign Service. They can retire on a reduced annuity after having served much less than 30 years.

I believe the provision in the bill will be very beneficial and will help to protect persons who might be laid off, so to speak, through no fault of their own, because they can then begin to draw their annuity. In many instances, if they have served the Government for 30 years, it would be hard for them to obtain new employment in civilian life.

It is surprising to reflect on the number of people with 30 years of service who have been laid off.

So I urge the Senate to vote down the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment to the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. CURTIS addressed the Chair.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I was going to suggest the absence of a quorum, but I shall withhold that request temporarily and yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to speak in favor of the Carlson amendment. I think it is quite important that we keep in mind what is the purpose of a retirement system. I believe that it means just what it says—retirement. Now, we are not talking about the disabled. There is a provision pertaining to persons retiring from the civil service because of disability. We are talking about able-bodied persons, those who are physically and mentally equipped to carry on.

We need only take the hypothetical case of someone who is 18 years of age to illustrate what would happen under this provision as written into the bill. If someone should enter the Government service at 22 years of age, he would, under the terms of the provision in the bill, draw retirement benefits at age 52.

Mr. President, we are not rendering a service to anyone by contending that people should retire at age 52. Somehow, we have more or less arbitrarily fixed the retirement age at 65. Actually, since that age has been fixed, through advances in medicine, diet, and other factors, the life span has increased. The average retirement age under social security is 69 years.

If we write a principle into the civil-service retirement law that persons aged 48, 49, 50, 52, 55, and 58 can retire, we are certainly abusing the concept of a retirement system because of age.

I seriously doubt if we would be doing the individual involved a favor. Life is built upon activity and work and the rendering of service, and all about us we know of those persons who have lost so much when they have ceased to do those things.

Again I remind you, Mr. President, that there is a provision under which the disabled may retire. To extend the principle to able-bodied civil-service workers cannot be done on the ground that it has already been done for our military personnel. We have always held our armed forces to be in a different category—a hazardous service, a service that takes people away from home, a service that involves risk, and many other things.

As the Senator from Kansas has said, what is proposed would be an invitation to individuals in the prime of life to leave the Government service, begin a new career, which may last for 20, 25, or more years, and all the time receive a benefit under the Civil-Service Retirement Law.

Certainly, even if the retirement age were reduced, that would not be retirement. It would become added pay or a bonus for service. We should fix the standards of pay so that the laborer will be worthy of his hire, and do that directly.

Furthermore, Mr. President, in the whole field of retirement benefits, it is not so much a question of how much an individual draws in the way of pay, as what his compensation will buy. If we continue in the field of increasing benefits, we add to the deductions from payroll, we add to the burden of the general taxpayer, and we continue to promote inflation. If the bill S. 2875 becomes law, we shall have a civil service retirement program which the actuaries in the Civil Service Commission estimate will cost 20.62 percent of payroll. In other words, if this bill should become law, and we should pay the whole bill, actuarially Government employees would have to have a deduction of 10.3 percent from their pay checks, and the Federal Treasury would have to make a like contribution.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I shall yield in just a moment.

This item is one of the expensive items in the bill. It is estimated that it will cost $51 million. And that does not settle it. It will cost $51 million year after year. And I do not believe that we can do justice to the workers or to the public or to the taxpayers by taking such an irresponsible attitude toward the retirement law.

Now I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wish to keep the record straight. The Commission has stated that if the bill

passes in the form in which it was introduced and offered to the Senate, it will cost only $10 million the first year. Then the cost will increase for 5 years thereafter, and the cost will go up to $60 million. In 10 years the amount will become $150 million. That is, Mr. President, if everybody remains in the system and draws all the benefits he possibly can. A great many persons will die before retiring, and will draw only the amounts they have contributed to the fund.

Mr. CURTIS. The figures I have from the Civil Service Commission indicate that the total added cost of this proposed legislation will be $466 million a year, and that raising the employees' contribution from 6 to 7 percent will bring in merely $90 million. The rest of the added cost will come from our general Government revenues.

I repeat, on the basis of the percentage of payroll cost, this bill will give us a civil service retirement program that will cost more than 20 percent of payroll.

Keep in mind that if we force such a program, not only on the public, but on those who would work under it, we may not have done them a great favor.

If the future of the retirement program is to mean what those who devised and designed it wanted it to mean, it must be held within reason, and within our ability to pay for it and carry it on, or there may be those who come after us who will say, "We did not create this obligation, and we will not honor it."

Mr. President, by supporting the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], we can reduce the cost of this program $51 million a year; and we shall not take 1 cent away from any Government employee who wishes to retire because of age or because of physical disability.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Kansas, for the reasons stated by him and for the reasons so ably stated by the Senator from Nebraska.

There appears to be some difference of opinion as to the cost of the proposed legislation, as reported by the committee. I suppose there may be honest differences of opinion on that score. However, the figures furnished to me indicate that the added cost as a result of enactment of Senate bill 2875 as reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will be approximately $466 million.

The amendments which have been offered and amendments which will be offered propose to raise the additional cost to approximately $245 million, which still will be a sizable item. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas will bring about a reduction in cost of approximately $51 million.

I think a word should be said for the taxpayers, as well as for the civil-service employees. Certainly all of us agree with the statements made by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and other Senators, to the effect that we want to have a sound civil-service retirement system. We want the system to be actuarially sound. We want the Federal Government to do its full part. But it is very important to the civil-service employees—both those presently working and those already retired—that the Federal Government be kept solvent.

I do not intend to delay the Senate for any prolonged period of time, but I should like to call the attention of any who may have forgotten it to the fact that today the Federal Government has a national debt of $280 billion. If we had a balanced budget and if we could begin to pay on the national debt as much as $1 billion a year, it would take 280 years to retire the national debt. If we were able to pay only $1 million a day on the national debt, it would take approximately 535 years to repay the national debt.

Today we are operating on a budget of approximately $65 billion. I just happened to pick up the budget in brief, which has been available to all Senators, for the fiscal year 1957. On page 52 we find that for 1915, the first year shown in the table, the total receipts of the Federal Treasury, from all sources, amounted to $683 million. Those were the total receipts of the Government, which were used to support the Army, the Navy, the civil functions of the Government, and all other governmental activities.

It so happens that on page 3 of the report dealing with the Civil Service Retirement Act, we find that there went into the total receipts under the retirement fund for the year 1954, $685,957,288.04, which happens to be more than $2 million more than the total receipts of the Government in the year 1915.

At the present time we are paying more than $7 billion annually for interest on the national debt. As late as the year 1941, the total receipts into the Federal Treasury, from all sources—income taxes, corporate taxes, customs, and so forth—amounted to only $7,103,000,000, or less than we are paying today in the form of interest on the national debt. So I think every employee of the Government and every taxpayer has a vital interest in the question of maintaining the solvency of the Government and, of course, in maintaining the solvency of this fund.

I hope the amendment will be adopted, and I hope that certain other amendments which will be submitted will be adopted, so that we can do both justice and equity to the civil-service employees, without doing an inequity to the United States taxpayers.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from California that we want to look after the taxpayers. But if my memory serves me correctly, in a few days we shall have on our desks a request to give $4,900,000,000 to foreign countries. One percent of that amount would more than take care of the increased amount called for in the bill now before us; and half of that is to be contributed by the workers themselves, to match the payments by the Government.

Oh, yes, Mr. President; when it comes to giving something to the working people of the Nation, this administration is always ready to cut back and to make reductions. But when the Government starts to make gifts to foreign nations, we find this administration always ready to give, not only for 1 year, but for 10 years. That is true. So it is that we find that the administration proposes that we give to foreign countries $4,900,000,000—more than 5 times as much as the total of the appropriation bills in 1911.

I know that no Member of the Senate wants to have a return made to the low salaries and the other conditions which existed in 1910, and certainly not to those existing in 1907, when there was a depression. Neither do Senators want a return made to the depression of 1930, when the national income dropped to $39 billion. But we do want to treat our employees in the way that the corporations treat theirs. This bill will not give any better treatment to Government employees than that received at the present time by the employees of the large corporations.

Senators who wish to deny to employees of the Government the rights which the employees of corporations have at this time, should vote for the pending amendment. But I, for one, want to treat the employees of the Government in the same way that the employees of the corporations are treated.

The pending proposal would reduce the retirement annuities of Government employees retiring at less than the age 60. On the other hand, at the present time employees of the FBI are allowed to retire at the age of 50, and it makes no difference how many years they have served.

Under the provisions of the pending bill, a Government employee must work for at least 30 years before he can retire with a reduced annuity. So this bill will not cost so much. How many Government employees will retire at such a reduced annuity, when they can continue to work for the Government, and perhaps have an income twice as large as such a reduced annuity, and then, after reaching age 60, receive the retirement annuity?

What would the average individual do? He would stay on. An individual working for the Government will stay on and work, if he is able to do so, and is not fired. But if a man were fired, he would have the right to receive a reduced annuity based upon the number of years his age lacked being age 60. So I urge the Senate to vote for the amendment. I think it is fair, just, and equitable, and would treat Government employees no better than the average corporation treats its employees.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] yield for a question concerning his remarks on the bill?

Mr. CURTIS. I do not have the floor.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question for information?

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am seeking information.

In the Senator's statement on the bill he said, if I am not mistaken, that the bill would cost $466 million a year.

Mr. CURTIS. That is the added annual cost.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The added annual cost?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. When would that added annual cost accrue? Would it be next year? I should like to know when the increase would take place. I think that is a very important part of the entire controversy.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not know. I know what would be the effective date of the act, but I do not know at what time the maximum effect would take place. Usually there is quite lag.

When we are legislating on retirement programs, we are voting an increase in a program which runs in perpetuity. So whether the increase requires a few years to reach the total additional cost which has been indicated is not so material. The figures were compiled by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The distinguished Senator still has not answered the question. The distinguished Senator told the Senate that the bill would cost $466 million a year additional. In what year would that additional cost take place?

Mr. CURTIS. I intended to answer the question. I do not know at what time the increase would reach that point, but it is rather immaterial, because we are dealing with a program which runs in perpetuity.

Mr. NEUBERGER. If the distinguished Senator could make an argument in perpetuity, although I have not been a Member of this body for very long, it seems to me that the entire manner of debate in the Senate would change. In other words, had I been a Member of this body when the Senate passed the bill reducing the tax obligations of those who receive corporate dividends, I might have risen on the floor and said, "This will cost $4 billion a year." Someone might ask me when, and I might add, "In the year 2010."

It seems to me that when we are talking about what a bill will cost, and the Senator says it will cost $466 million a year additional, and the Senator cannot tell the Senate in what year that increase will take place, his argument becomes a non sequitur.

Mr. CURTIS. These are Civil Service Commission figures. The distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] used the same figures.

One place where we have the right to consider any contingent cost is in connection with a retirement program, whether it be civil-service retirement, social security, or anything else.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon used a tax reduction as an illustration. The Congress may change the tax rate any time it desires. But we are aware that when the people are working under a retirement program, while technically the right of Congress to change it may be preserved, nevertheless, there is a commitment involved. People are working under a retirement program which holds out a promise of certain retirement benefits, and we cannot change it downward after they have worked for many years and are about to retire. For that reason I believe that the future costs should be taken into account in connection with this type of legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have the floor, and I should like to make some remarks on the bill.

I point out that I am told that the committee staff has received word from the actuaries of the Civil Service Commission that in the first year the bill would cost $10 million; in the 5th year $60 million; in the 10th year $150 million; and that 40 years from now, it may cost $466 million. I submit that when the Senator from Nebraska tells the Senate that the bill will cost $466 million a year, it is a very significant fact that this cost will not be reached until 40 years from now.

Also, I am informed that the presumptive cost of $466 million 40 years from now is based upon the assumption that everyone would take advantage of the permissive clause providing for retirement after 30 years' service. There is by no means any certainty that that would be the case. Under existing retirement law, employees may retire after 30 years' service, at age 60. Many employees do not take advantage of that particulr privilege.

With respect to the argument by the able minority leader regarding our great national debt, I remind him—and I am sure he will agree—that this argument could be cited no matter what governmental expenditures were proposed. It could be cited regardless of what was being considered. If we are raising salaries or providing increased benefits for any groups, or providing tax relief for anyone, a Senator who does not happen to agree can cite our vast national debt. It is a valid argument, but it can be made with respect to any proposal for expenditure with which any particular Senator is in disagreement.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. When the Senator is using the figure of $466 million, he is also including the item of $20 million shown on the sheet placed upon the desks of Senators, representing refunds and lump-sum payments due to high employee deductions. We are returning to the employee just what he paid in. So that is included in the $466 million.

There is also included an item of $12 million representing a transfer of credit to social security, which we have just agreed to eliminate from the bill.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the able chairman of the committee.

The able minority leader cited the figure of $685 million which went into the retirement fund in the fiscal year 1954 as being a very large sum compared with the total receipts of the Government a few years ago. I remind the minority leader that approximately 60 percent of that sum, or $425 million, came out of the pockets and the paychecks of the employees themselves.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is entirely accurate in his statement. However, in this particular case the employees receive the pay from the Government, which receives it from the taxpayers. We often hear about the problem of take-home pay, which usually faces us at a time when salary increases are being considered. So the end result is that all the money, of course, comes, in a very real sense, from the taxpayers and the Government of the United States.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I recognize that; but the able minority leader also recognizes that, when reasonable pay is fixed for Federal employees in the classified service, we do not take into consideration the fact that 6 percent—and, under the terms of the bill, 7 percent—is deducted from the pay. That is certainly a factor which is not considered when reasonable levels of pay are sought.

Inasmuch as the distinguished minority leader used the figure of $685 million, I wish to point out that the greater portion of it came from the paychecks received by Federal employees, and that portion was deducted from their take-home pay.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct. One of the complaints which is justifiably made—although I understand the reason for that situation—is that, particularly in recent years, the Federal Government has not kept up its share of payments into the fund. One thing we aim to do under the provisions of the pending bill is to see to it that the employee contributions are matched, so that when the employee puts up 7 percent of his pay, under the new rate, the Federal Government will match that contribution. I think that is as it should be.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The able minority leader will agree with me, I am sure, that fiscal year 1954, which was the year he cited in his argument, happened to be one of the years in which the Federal Government made a very low minimum contribution, rather than a real matching contribution.

Mr. President, I do not wish to presume any more on the time of the Senate. I merely wish to say, in conclusion, that the privilege of retiring after 30 years is the main trunk of the bill before us. If we remove that provision, we have only the branches of the tree left, so far as this piece of legislation is concerned.

The able chairman of the committee has cited for the Senate the fact that members of the FBI can retire at age 50 after 20 years of service, under full retirement, with no deduction; and that under the provisions of S. 2875, which is being attacked by the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], Federal employees who retire after 30 years of service, who have not reached age 60, will accept a commensurate reduction in their retirement pay.

I believe this subject goes to the very root of the bill. If the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Kansas is adopted, there will be comparatively little left in the bill with respect to benefits for Federal employees who, by and large, are not highly paid workers and who are not in the upper-income brackets. The bill will be left a mere skeleton as compared with the thoroughly worked out measure which came from the

committee, and that we have before us at the present time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to call the Senate's attention to the fact that the $117 million it is claimed the Government will have to pay will also earn 3½ percent interest. That is the $117 million that is shown on the sheet that has been placed on our desks.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter sent by Chairman Young, of the Civil Service Commission, to the Senator from South Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. This letter may be found on page 9 of the committee report.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1956.

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Post Office and Civil Service Committee, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: This is in reply to your letter of March 28, requesting a statement of the cost of S. 2875 as modified by a list of amendments enclosed with your letter.

We have since been advised by Mr. Kerlin of your committee staff that another amendment is to be considered in the estimates. A provision of the amended bill would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to invest the retirement fund in securities of the United States bearing interest at the rate of 3½ percent. Investments are now made at 3 percent. This latter rate was used in the cost estimates of the present law and S. 2875 as introduced, which were a part of my statement before the Retirement Subcommittee on February 1, 1956. In accordance with Mr. Kerlin's request, our estimates on S. 2875 as amended, are based on a valuation interest rate of 3½ percent. The resulting costs are compared with costs of the present law and S. 2875 as introduced, based on a 3-percent valuation rate.

In my testimony on February 1, I estimated that S. 2875 as introduced, would result in an annual increase in retirement costs of $521 million, all of which would fall on the Government. We now estimate that S. 2875 as amended, would increase annual retirement costs over those of the present law by $349 million. The provision increasing the employee deduction rate from 6 to 7 percent would increase the employees' portion of the cost by $90 million, leaving an annual increase of $249 million in the Government's retirement cost. This does not include the increased interest cost which would result from the additional one-half of 1 percent paid on the invested fund.

Sincerely,

PHILIP YOUNG,
Chairman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter written by the Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget to me under date of May 3, 1956.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1956.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Reference is made to your request of April 25, 1956, pertaining to S. 2875, a bill "to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act."

Based on data developed by the Civil Service Commission, it is estimated that S. 2875, as reported by the committee, would increase the annual retirement cost to the Government of the civil service retirement system by about $259 million, computed on a level premium basis, as compared with the present provisions of that system. That bill would provide a 3½ percent interest rate, instead of a rate fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, presently 3 percent. The bill would therefore increase the annual interest cost to the Government, estimated by the Commission to be about $117 million, expressed on a level premium basis. Thus the additional cost of the system to the Government, on this basis, would be about $376 million above the present estimated cost of about $843 million, or a total annual cost to the Government of about $1,219 million.

The total annual level premium cost of the system is also a cost to employees, and the present 6 percent employee contribution rate is an employee cost of about $537 million. S. 2875 would increase the annual employee cost by 1 percent or by about $90 million. Thus S. 2875 would raise the total annual cost of the system, in a level premium basis, by about $466 million, to a total of about $1,846 million.

The administration bill to revise the civil service retirement system and to extend the benefits of the old-age and survivors' insurance system to Federal employees under the retirement system, has been introduced as S. 3041. That bill has an estimated annual level premium cost to the Government, on the basis of the present old-age and survivors insurance contribution rate, of about $825 million or a reduction under the estimated present annual civil service retirement cost of about $18 million. In future years, as the old-age and survivors insurance tax rate is increased, this cost to the Government would increase, to a maximum estimated annual cost of about $980 million, after 1974, which would be an ultimate increase of about $137 million over the cost of the present system to the Government. The enactment of S. 3041 would be in accord with the program of the President, and its enactment in lieu of S. 2875 is recommended.

Sincerely yours,

PERCY RAPPAPORT,
Assistant Director.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I place these letters in the RECORD to show that the cost of the bill is exactly what the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] has said it is; namely, $466 million for the Government's part. Mr. Young's letter refers to $349 million, but this is in addition to the extra $117 million interest charges. It is merely a matter of bookkeeping whether the $117 million item be called interest or direct appropriation. I am sure the Senator from South Carolina would not take exception to that statement.

So far as the cost is concerned, it is estimated by the Civil Service Commission that it would be $466 million, and that cost would start as of January 1, 1957.

It is true that the Government would not have to put up the money immediately, but it is a contingent liability, and that contingent liability is an obligation of the Government from the first day of January 1957, the date the bill would go into effect. The committee report substantiates this statement and the cost.

Unless Members of Congress who will vote for the bill intend later to vote the necessary appropriations to meet the cost they are bigger hypocrites than I am sure they are willing to admit.

So as far as the argument of the junior Senator from Oregon is concerned, that the costs next year will be light, means nothing. On that basis there would be some multibillion dollars years later. The $466 million figure is the average annual cost projected over the years, and that average cost begins to be an obligation on the first day of January 1957. We all recognize that the contributions of the employees have more than offset the disbursements thus far, but that proves nothing.

Neither the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], as chairman of the committee, nor the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] can dispute this statement nor these figures as to the cost.

The situation before us is similar to that of an insurance company. A man pays premiums to an insurance company and starts to do so as a young man. He continues to do so over the years. The insurance company could likewise say, "This is all income or profit. There have been no disbursements." However, there does come a time when disbursements must all be made at one time. That is exactly the same as the contingent liability to which we must look forward.

I am not in the least bit interested in any fictitious figures which have been given over the telephone by some unnamed bureaucrat downtown whose primary interest is in seeing the bill passed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I do not understand the figures that have been given here during a part of this debate. I should like to refer to the report of the committee showing contributions and appropriations over the years. In 1954, the employee contributions were $425 million. In that year, the Government appropriated only $35 million. Why it should have been only $35 million, whereas in 1953 it was $325 million, I do not understand, unless it was a part of the effort to balance the budget during that year.

In 1950, the employee contributions were $355 million. The total disbursements during that year were $266 million. The following year, in 1951, the employee contributions were $374 million. The total disbursements were only $268 million.

In 1952, the employee contributions were $414 million. The total disbursements were only $298 million.

In the following year, 1953, the employee contributions were $420 million. The total disbursements were only $360 million. In 1954 the employee contributions were $425 million. The total disbursements were $409 million.

In other words, it is perfectly clear that the total disbursements do not balance the contributions. In other words, it seems perfectly clear to me that this is a contributing system under which the employees put up all the money. Therefore, under those circumstances, I do not understand why we should try to cut the amounts involved.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Perhaps I can ex-

plain the situation to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I have before me the same table to which the Senator from New York referred. Perhaps I can help him with reference to the figures for 1954 and 1955, at which time the Government's contribution was $35 million in one year and $33 million in the other year. The reason for that is that the previous session of Congress authorized the appointment of what is known as the Kaplan committee. The committee was authorized and directed by Congress to make a study of the entire retirement system. We appropriated a quarter of a million dollars for that purpose, of which there has been spent $217,000.

When the matter of contributions to the fund came up, it was felt under those circumstances it would be best to await the committee's recommendation before a decision was reached as to what the appropriation should be. I share the view of the Senator from New York, that the fund should be substantially increased.

Mr. LEHMAN. It is perfectly evident that there was a diminution in the Government's appropriation, from $325 million in 1953 to $35 million in 1954. Of course that fact accounted for some of the reduction. Perhaps it was due to an effort to balance the budget. Quite aside from that fact, it is evident that the employees are doing more than financing their own retirement system; they are putting up more than they are getting out of the system.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is not the fair measure of the cost of legislation the obligations that will be imposed upon the system for payment, not necessarily what has been set aside in the fund to take care of the payments?

Mr. LEHMAN. These are official figures which are contained in the report of the committee.

Mr. CURTIS. The true cost of the program before us is the obligations we shall impose upon it, which must be met, and is not necessarily measured by what we set aside in the fund to take care of the obligations.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I say to the Senator from Nebraska that the figures to which he is referring are merely estimates projected away into the future, not this year or next year, or necessarily in 10 or 15 or 20 years, but away in the future.

Mr. CURTIS. I am not referring to any figures. What I am saying is that the cost of the legislation is the obligations we place on the system, and we do not lower the cost merely by putting less money into the trust fund than we receive.

Mr. LEHMAN. All I can say to the Senator is to quote again from the report which shows that in 1954 the Government appropriations were only $35 million and the contributions of the employees were $425 million. I can not get away from those figures. I do not think the Government has been particularly generous.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not think so, either. But suppose we decrease the employees' contributions from $425 million to $300 million and the Federal Government's contributions from $35 million to $10 million: that would not increase the cost of the program, but it would make a greater deficit in the fund.

Mr. LEHMAN. The State which I had the honor to represent for many years as Governor put up an amount equal to the contributions of the employees. Both were used equally, not in the manner in which this fund is being operated today.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas to the amendment of the committee. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KERR (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—36

Aiken	Curtis	Millikin
Allott	Dirksen	Mundt
Barrett	Dworshak	Payne
Bennett	Flanders	Purtell
Bricker	Frear	Robertson
Bridges	Goldwater	Russell
Bush	Gore	Schoeppel
Byrd	Hruska	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Knowland	Stennis
Case, N. J.	Malone	Thye
Case, S. Dak.	Martin, Iowa	Watkins
Cotton	Martin, Pa.	Williams

NAYS—46

Anderson	Holland	Monroney
Beall	Humphrey	Morse
Bible	Ives	Murray
Butler	Jackson	Neuberger
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Daniel	Kennedy	Pastore
Douglas	Kuchel	Scott
Duff	Laird	Smathers
Eastland	Langer	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Lehman	Sparkman
Fulbright	Long	Symington
George	Magnuson	Welker
Green	Mansfield	Wofford
Hayden	McCarthy	Young
Hennings	McClellan	
Hill	McNamara	

NOT VOTING—13

Bender	Jenner	Potter
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Clements	Kefauver	Wiley
Ervin	Kerr	
Hickenlooper	Neely	

So Mr. CARLSON's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas to the committee amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5862) to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11177) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. DEANE, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. CANNON, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. HORAN, Mr. VURSELL, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 261) authorizing the Secretary of the Army to make such transfer of supplies and equipment as may be available to The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.

AMENDMENT OF MILITARY PERSONNEL CLAIMS ACT OF 1945—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3996) to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3996), "An act to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

Page 1, strike out lines 3, 4, and 5, and insert:

"That section 1 (a) of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 225), as amended, is further amended by striking out '$2,500' and inserting in lieu thereof '$6,500.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

PRICE DANIEL,
JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
HERMAN WELKER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

E. L. FORRESTER,
HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
WILLIAM E. MILLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 authorizes the Secretaries of the various armed services to determine and pay any claim against the United States not to exceed $2,500 for the loss of personal property determined to be reasonable, useful, necessary, or proper to the serviceman under the attendant circumstances. The loss, however, must not have occurred by reason of any negligent or wrongful act on the part of the claimant or his agent. The limitation of $2,500 was imposed by an amendment on the floor of the Senate in the closing days of the 82d Congress. Since the imposition of this limitation, it has become apparent that the ceiling is not realistic, and a substantial number of claims have been submitted to the Secretaries of the various armed services in excess of this limitation. Ultimately, these claims in excess of $2,500 are introduced as private relief bills.

H. R. 3996 as introduced, at the request of the Department of Defense, would have removed the ceiling entirely. The House of Representatives approved the bill in this form. The Senate, however, agreed to the raising of the ceiling from the present figure of $2,500 to $4,000. The House of Representatives then disagreed to the amendment of the Senate and asked for a conference.

The conferees have now agreed on the sum of $6,500 as a reasonable ceiling to be imposed on the authority conferred by the Military Personnel Claims Act. Since the bill provides that the amendment is retroactive to the date of the imposition of the ceiling, adoption of this legislation will enable the military departments to settle in full the claims of 26 out of the 28 individuals who now have claims bills pending in the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

REVISION OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2875) to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

When we read subsection (b) of section 3, on page 47 of the committee amendment, it would seem from that language that credit for service under the civil service would be given to a Reserve officer, let us say, who served in the military and then was discharged for cause other than physical disability, whereas the same credit would seem to be denied a Reserve officer who served under the civil service and was discharged from the military service by virtue of physical disability incurred in line of duty.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I understand the amendment of the Senator from Alabama. I have discussed it with him. I see no objection to the amendment. It merely clarifies what is intended by the bill.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator from Kansas wish to comment on the amendment?

Mr. CARLSON. Would the word "explosion" be stricken out?

Mr. HILL. My amendment strikes out the words, in line 13, on page 47 "combat with an enemy of the United States or resulting from an explosion of an instrument of war," and inserts in lieu thereof, "line of duty."

In other words, he would have to have a service-connected disability incurred in line of duty.

The language at that point in the committee amendment then would read:

Unless such retired pay is awarded on account of a service-connected disability incurred in line of duty or is awarded under title III of Public Law 810, 80th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Alabama send to the desk his amendment to the committee amendment, so it may be stated?

Mr. HILL. Yes, Mr. President; I now send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I think this amendment to the committee amendment is a good one. Under the committee amendment as now written, I think such a person would have to be injured in combat. Such a provision is too restrictive. If the injury were received in line of duty, I think such a case should also be included.

Mr. HILL. Certainly we would not wish to deny to such a person who was injured in line of duty the credit given to a person who was injured under other circumstances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Alabama to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 47, it is proposed to strike out beginning with the word "combat" in line 13, and down to and including the word "war" in line 15, and to insert in lieu thereof the words "line of duty."

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to inquire how far the amendment will go. If, as suggested by means of the amendment, we strike out the word "combat" in line 13, and if in lines 14 and 15 we strike out the words "with an enemy of the United States or resulting from an explosion of an instrument of war", and if in lieu thereof we insert "line of duty" will that mean that a man who was disabled in military combat and who is drawing retirement pay can be injured, for instance, in an automobile accident and can, as a result——

Mr. HILL. Oh, no.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. "Line of duty" means service-connected.

Mr. HILL. Yes; service-connected disability in line of duty.

Mr. CARLSON. A soldier on leave would be in line of duty, would he not?

Mr. HILL. I am not sure about that. As I recall, under the rules of the Veterans' Administration, "service-connected disability in line of duty" is well defined. "Line of duty" means where he is performing some duty under orders or something of that kind, in connection with service in the military, as I understand.

I wish to be perfectly frank. I could be in error, but that is my understanding.

Mr. CARLSON. I will agree with the Senator from Alabama that I think the language of the committee amendment as now written is somewhat restrictive, and it may be that some changes should be made in it. But certainly I do not want the doors thrown open. I want the legislative history in connection with this matter to show that I would be very much opposed to this amendment if it were to cause the doors to be thrown

open and if, under the amendment, dual compensation could be given. In the 83d Congress we passed Public Law 300 to remove the word "explosive," but retained the protection of the other language.

If the amendment is adopted, then when the bill goes to the House I want this provision carefully looked into.

Mr. HILL. It is not my idea to throw open the doors; and I realize that the Senator from Kansas does not want that to be done, either. But when a veteran is disabled in the military service and has a service-connected disability incurred in line of duty, he certainly should receive the same credit for any service rendered under the civil service as that received by one discharged for cause other than physical disability.

Mr. CARLSON. How far the amendment would go would depend a great deal on the interpretation of the words "line of duty."

I am willing to let the amendment be included, but I certainly hope it will be examined further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] to the committee amendment.

Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "5-22-56-D."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from California to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment in section 9 (f), on page 63, it is proposed to strike out the words "10 percent of so much thereof as exceeds $2,400." and to insert in lieu thereof the following "5 percent of so much thereof as does not exceed $1,500, plus 10 percent of the balance of such annuity."

It is proposed to strike out all of section 10 (a), page 64, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 10. (a) If a Member or employee dies after having retired under any provision of this act and is survived by a wife or husband designated under section 9 (f), such wife or husband shall be paid an annuity equal to 50 percent of the annuity computed as provided in subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) of section 9 as may apply with respect to the annuitant.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, under the present law an employee retiring for disability or on immediate annuity after 15 years of service may elect a reduced annuity, and may provide a 50 percent annuity for a surviving wife or husband. The annuity of the retiring employee is reduced by 5 percent of the first $1,500 of annuity, by 10 percent of any annuity exceeding $1,500, and by three-fourths of 1 percent for each year the wife or husband is under age 60. The reduction may not exceed 25 percent.

Under the Senate bill 2875, as reported by the committee, a survivor annuity of 50 percent is automatic and free on the first $2,400 of the annuity of an employee retiring for any reason. The retiring employee may elect to have his or her annuity in excess of $2,400 reduced by 10 percent, and may thus provide a survivor annuity of 50 percent of total annuity.

My amendment would amend section 9 (f), pages 62 and 63, and 10 (a) (1) and 10 (a) (2) on page 64, so as to retain two of the present reductions—5 percent of the first $1,500 of annuity and 10 percent of annuity in excess of $1,500—if a retiring employee elects to provide a survivor annuity for a wife or husband.

The reasons for my amendment are as follows:

First. Adoption of the amendment would reduce the added annual retirement costs resulting from enactment of S. 2875 by approximately $103,000,000.

Second. The present law is already quite liberal. The reductions are not sufficient to compensate completely for the additional costs resulting from payment of the survivor annuities.

Third. Approximately 30 percent of recently-retired employees receive annuities less than $2,400. Accordingly, without the amendment, survivor annuity would be entirely free in the great majority of cases.

Fourth. Very few retiring married women now elect survivor benefits for their husbands. This is consistent with the normal family situation in which the husband is not a dependent of his wife. Unless S. 2875 is thus amended, survivor benefits will be free and automatic in the case of each retiring married woman, even though the husband is neither disabled nor dependent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to the committee amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject the pending amendment.

The amendment would strike out the provision of the bill which grants automatic annuities to surviving widows. Present law permits an employee upon retirement to elect survivorship benefits for his wife. When such an election is made, he—the retiring employee—is required to take a reduction of 5 percent on the first $1,500 of his earned annuity and a 10-percent reduction on such of his earned annuity as may be in excess of $1,500. When he makes such an election, his wife, in the event she survives him, then receives one-half of his earned annuity after his death. If, however, his wife does not survive him, the reduction in his annuity continues so long as he may live. Since this provision was put into the retirement law, between 40 and 50 percent of all employees retiring have not elected survivorship benefits. Why have they not done so? Simply because their annuities have been so low that they could not afford to suffer the reduction in their annuities imposed under present law. This has been particularly true with respect to employees in the low-salary bracket where survivorship benefits are most needed. The result has been that there are now many widows without 1 cent of income, because their husbands, at the time of their retirement, could not afford to make the survivorship election.

I receive many letters on this subject, inquiring why widows do not receive annuities. I am obliged to tell them it is because their husbands, at the time of their retirement, could not afford to make the survivorship election.

The bill proposes to alleviate this situation by removing the penalty on the lower portion of the retiring employee's earned annuity. The bill would eliminate any reduction on the first $2,400 of the employee's earned annuity. Thus, under this provision all surviving widows of retired Federal employees would be assured of at least a modest survivorship annuity upon the death of their husands.

Mr. President, I cannot agree with the proposal to deprive these widows of the modest assured income that would be provided them under S. 2875. I cannot agree with the amendment that would take this benefit from them. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 65, as follows:

YEAS—16

Allott	Dworshak	Schoeppel
Bricker	Flanders	Smith, N. J.
Bridges	Knowland	Watkins
Byrd	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Case, S. Dak.	Millikin	
Curtis	Mundt	

NAYS—65

Aiken	Green	McNamara
Anderson	Hayden	Monroney
Barrett	Hennings	Morse
Beall	Hill	Murray
Bennett	Holland	Neuberger
Bible	Hruska	O'Mahoney
Bush	Humphrey	Pastore
Butler	Ives	Payne
Capehart	Jackson	Purtell
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Kennedy	Russell
Chavez	Kerr	Scott
Cotton	Kuchel	Smathers
Daniel	Laird	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Langer	Sparkman
Douglas	Lehman	Stennis
Duff	Long	Symington
Eastland	Magnuson	Thye
Ellender	Mansfield	Welker
Frear	Martin, Iowa	Wofford
Fulbright	McCarthy	Young
Goldwater	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—14

Bender	Hickenlooper	Neely
Clements	Jenner	Potter
Ervin	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
George	Kefauver	Wiley
Gore	Malone	

So Mr. KNOWLAND's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the Knowland amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I had intended to offer an additional amendment. However, it is obvious, from the vote of the Senate on the last two amendments, that the amendment would not prevail. Therefore I shall not offer the amendment I had intended to offer at this time.

However, I wish to make a brief statement covering the position of the administration and my own position relative to the advantages of covering Federal employees by both the civil service retirement system and the social security system.

The civil service retirement system was established in 1920, well in advance of the recognition of the necessity for pension plans by many private employers, and has proved to be a significant factor in attracting able persons to Federal employment, in encouraging competent, experienced employees to continue in the Federal civil service, in making orderly retirement possible for them and in giving dignity to their years of retirement. I consider the maintenance and continued improvement of a strong, independent civil service retirement system essential to the welfare of Federal employees and to the efficient conduct of the business of Government.

As a result of congressional consideration of old-age and survivors insurance over the years, practically all areas of gainful employment except employment by the United States Government are covered by old-age and survivors insurance. It seems to me that it is not desirable to have one policy for workers and employers in private industry and another for the Government and its employees. There is no reason why the Congress should not treat its own employees on a basis comparable with what it expected of other employers. Has the Congress given this treatment to its civilian employees, problems of employees transferring between private and Federal employment would have been greatly diminished. The Congress has said to private employers and their workers, "You can have any kind of retirement you desire. But every employee must have the basic protection of old-age and survivors insurance."

Not so in Federal employment. The benefits of our present civil-service retirement system, as well as the benefits provided by S. 2875, accrue only to that minority of Federal employees who stay in Federal service for an extended period. Most of us are in agreement, I believe, that benefits under civil-service retirement should be liberalized. At the same time, attention should be given to providing all Federal employees protection that will follow them after they leave the Federal service. This is particularly important for the one-half million persons who enter and leave Federal service annually.

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE AND PRIVATE PENSION PLANS

Many employers in private industry of course have, like the Federal Government, developed staff retirement plans for their employees. These employers strive to set up good private pension plans for exactly the same reasons that the Federal Government is interested in maintaining a strong civil-service retirement system; that is, to attract and retain competent employees. Since virtually all jobs in private industry are covered by OASI, private employers can assure a high level of retirement protection for their career employees by building their retirement plans on top of a foundation provided by old-age and survivors insurance.

This effective relationship that has been developed between old-age and survivors insurance and the private staff retirement plans in industry has completely dispelled fears that were expressed when the old-age and survivors insurance program was established. At that time some people claimed that old-age and survivors insurance would undermine private pension plans. But experience has proved that social security is a great stimulus to the development of staff retirement plans. Old-age and survivors insurance is now recognized as a strong base upon which various forms of additional protection can be built. The benefits it provides are not high enough to preclude the need for supplementation. The moderate level of basic protection under old-age and survivors insurance lends itself to the development of supplementary protection designed to provide a sufficient total of retirement or survivors income. The experience of over 20 years shows a remarkable growth and improvement in private pension plans. In 1935 there were about 1,000 private pension plans covering about 2½ million workers; by 1955 the number of private plans was approaching 20,000 and they covered about 13 million workers.

These 13 million employees, of course, are covered by old-age and survivors insurance as well as by private pension plans. They thus have continuous retirement and survivor protection from old-age and survivors insurance when they, like millions of other American workers, shift from job to job and from one kind of employment to another. Those who make a career or work for a long period with one employer get supplementary benefits under the employer's private pension plan. The private pension plus old-age and survivors insurance makes possible a high level of benefits for employees with one employer in private industry. For example, an employee of Johnson and Johnson who has completed 30 years of service and who has average earnings of $4,200 a year, or $350 a month, would get combined benefits of $216 a month made up of $108 from the private pension plan and $108 from old-age and survivors insurance. In similar situations Armstrong Cork provides a total benefit amounting to $239 a month, including $108 old-age and survivors insurance, and Eastman Kodak $243, again including an old-age and survivors insurance benefit of $108.

PROBLEMS CAUSED BY LACK OF OASI PROTECTION

Like these staff retirement plans in industry, the civil service retirement system is intended to provide mainly for career workers. This concern for the long-service employee is in keeping with the objectives of a staff-retirement plan, but, unlike the arrangement in private industry, in Federal employment there is no base of old-age and survivors insurance coverage to give continuity of protection to the workers who move into and out of Federal employment. This poses a major problem when the over-all retirement and survivor protection of Federal workers is considered because a great many Federal employees are people who work in Federal service for only a part of their working lifetime.

What happens to the retirement and survivors protection of the large number of employees who shift between private industry and the Federal service? The protection they get is largely a matter of chance. Unlike the situation within private industry where a worker's old-age and survivors insurance protection follows him from one job to another, the worker who goes from private industry into Federal employment stops building social security protection.

Some of these employees eventually lose their valuable old-age and survivors' insurance protection and cannot acquire the equivalent in survivor protection under the civil-service retirement system until they have worked in Federal employment for many years. Whether the worker moves into or out of Federal employment, his program of personal security can easily be upset.

For some people whose worklife is divided between the Federal service and private industry, the effects are drastic. Instead of suffering only a temporary or partial loss of protection, some may fail to qualify for benefits under any system. The worker, or perhaps a surviving widow and children, may be left without

any benefits except a return of the contributions that the worker made to the civil-service retirement system. On the other hand, in the present haphazard arrangement, many of the workers who shift between civil-service retirement and old-age and survivors' insurance qualify for benefits under both systems.

The resulting total benefit amount is likely to be unreasonably large in comparison with even the most liberal standards for pension levels. For example, the civil-service retirement annuity provided under S. 2875 plus the old-age and survivors' insurance benefits which some workers would also obtain would, in a number of instances, result in the payment of combined benefits which would be larger than the individual's pay.

S. 2875 includes a provision which is apparently intended to meet some of the problems that occur when employees transfer between Federal employment and private industry. This provision would allow certain employees the choice of transferring credits from civil-service retirement to social security. Instead of solving the problems, this provision would make it possible for some employees to obtain extremely large total benefits by allocating their credits in the most favorable manner under the two systems. Under the provision in S. 2875, these windfall benefits would be subsidized by the Government at a cost of $12 million a year. This provision, as Senators will recall, was recently stricken from the bill, I am pleased to say.

Senate bills 3041 and 3562 would solve these problems. These are the bills introduced by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE].

The solution of the difficulties in the present situation can only come through the extension of old-age and survivors insurance coverage to Federal employees as provided by S. 3041 and 3562. If Government employment were covered under old-age and survivors insurance, Federal employees would have protection under both social security and a strong, independent civil-service retirement system. This is the only approach which, on the one hand, would avoid the inequities and the higher-than-necessary costs that are inherent in the present arrangement and, at the same time, would fill the gaps in protection that now occur. The civil-service retirement system would provide very substantial additional benefits to persons who made a career in the Federal Service.

Furthermore, the fact that a worker is going to get an old-age and survivors insurance benefit could then be taken into account in the provisions of the civil-service retirement system and unreasonable bonuses for those who qualify under both systems could be avoided. The retirement-benefit amounts payable to the worker whose employment is divided between Government and industry would be related to his life-time service instead of being left to chance. A typical career employee with 30 years of Federal Service, whose salary is $4,800 at retirement at age 65, would get retirement benefits of $3,102 a year under S. 3562—about $330 a year more than he would get under S. 2875.

If this employee's pay were $3,600 at retirement, he would get $2,460 a year under S. 3562—about $350 a year more than under S. 2875.

At an $8,400 a year pay level, the employee would get about $4,960 under S. 3562 and about $4,830 under S. 2875.

Moreover, under S. 3562, a retired employee's wife could get social security wife's benefits. Where such wife's benefits were payable, under S. 3562 the total benefit would almost always be substantially larger than under S. 2875.

While the largest increases in benefits under S. 3562 would occur after an employee reaches age 65, the bill would also substantially increase benefits payable upon retirement before age 65.

Let me emphasize that I favor a strong civil-service retirement system for Federal employees, a system which is both financially and administratively independent. I have no desire to establish any relationship between old-age and survivors insurance and civil-service retirement which is any different from that existing between old-age and survivors insurance and some 20,000 private pension plans, or between old-age and survivors insurance and certain State and local government retirement plans.

In the present situation the best method of improving the retirement and survivor protection of Federal employees is to give them the basic protection of social security together with the benefits provided by a strong civil-service retirement system. The extension of social-security coverage to Federal employees would strengthen the civil-service retirement system for career employees by increasing their retirement and survivor benefits. At the same time it would enable the Government to fulfill the responsibility it has, in common with all other employers, to contribute toward retirement and survivor protection for a large number of persons who serve the Government for but a relatively few years.

I hope the Committee on Finance will give some consideration to the suggestion which was made in bills which were not acted upon by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I think the Committee on Finance undoubtedly is the committee which should properly consider the matter.

Some of the amendments which have been adopted today are, I think, beneficial, and helpful to the bill. I am sorry the other amendments were not adopted, because I am more interested in having an effective civil-service law than I am in merely having a bill passed by one House of Congress, a bill which will not, perhaps, become the law of the land. I am very hopeful that perhaps in the other body a bill can be brought into such shape that it will prove to be acceptable. If not, and if the bill which the Senate will pass today should not become law at this session, I hope the matter will be reconsidered at the next session of Congress.

PERCENTAGE OF PARITY RECEIVED BY AMERICAN FARMERS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I hold in my hand photostated copies of four reports issued by Purdue University. The statistics which appear in those four reports were prepared by the Departments of Agricultural Economics and Agricultural Statistics of Purdue University. The reports were compiled from statistics issued by the Department of Agriculture in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the following:

Bulletin No. 215, dated January, 1956, which shows the Indiana farm purchasing power to be 70 percent of parity, and the United States farm purchasing power to be at 80 percent of parity.

Bulletin No. 216, dated February, 1956, which shows the Indiana farm purchasing power to be at 70 percent of parity, and the United States farm purchasing power to be at 81 percent of parity.

Bulletin No. 217, dated March, 1956, which shows the Indiana farm purchasing power to be at 71 percent of parity, and the United States farm purchasing power to be at 82 percent of parity.

Bulletin No. 218, dated April 1956, which shows the Indiana farm purchasing power to be at 76 percent of parity, and the United States farm purchasing power to be at 82 percent of parity.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Indiana farm prices No. 215, January 1956

INDEX OF INDIANA FARM PRICES

1910–14	100	1929	151	1942	165	1955—January	231
1935–39	112.8	1930	130	1943	188	February	230
1947–49	283	1931	92	1944	185	March	224
1919	217	1932	65	1945	196	April	227
1920	198	1933	67	1946	231	May	225
1921	121	1934	81	1947	297	June	233
1922	121	1935	112	1948	305	July	224
1923	123	1936	119	1949	247	August	218
1924	126	1937	130	1950	255	September	219
1925	152	1938	106	1951	299	October	213
1926	150	1939	97	1952	278	November	198
1927	140	1940	96	1953	265	December	[1] 192
1928	148	1941	127	1954	258	1956—January	198

[1] Revised.

Indiana farm prices No. 215, January 1956—Continued

Commodity	Average farm prices used in the Indiana farm price index				January 1956 percent change from—		
	January 1956	December 1955	January 1955	60 months 1910–14	December 1955	January 1955	60 months 1910–14
Hogs	$11.10	$10.70	$17.30	$7.59	+4	−36	+46
Whole milk	4.15	[1] 4.30	3.95	1.73	−3	+5	+140
Cattle	15.50	14.10	17.10	5.69	+10	−9	+172
Corn	1.12	1.10	1.39	.58	+2	−19	+93
Eggs	.43	.43	.27	.21	0	+59	+105
Soybeans	2.23	2.14	2.60	1.07	+4	−14	+108
Wheat	1.92	1.89	2.09	.94	+2	−8	+104
Chickens	.19	.19	.23	.11	0	−17	+73
Calves	22.00	18.00	18.70	7.16	+22	+18	+207
Lambs	17.90	16.70	20.40	5.96	+7	−12	+200
Oats	.61	.60	.78	.38	+2	−22	+61
Turkeys	.30	.30	.28	.15	0	+7	+100
Baled hay	19.30	19.90	25.00	16.98	−3	−23	+14
Potatoes	1.25	1.25	1.40	.76	0	−11	+64
Apples	2.50	2.60	2.70	.97	−4	−7	+158
Wool	.41	.41	.47	.21	0	−13	+95
	Indexed—1910–14=100						
Indiana farm prices	198	[1] 192	231	100	+3	−14	+96
Indiana livestock prices	199	[1] 192	245	100	+4	−19	+99
Indiana grain prices	199	195	235	100	+2	−15	+99
Indiana farm purchasing power	70	[1] 69	82	100	+1	−15	−30
United States farm prices	226	223	243	100	+1	−7	+126
Prices paid by United States farmers	281	[1] 278	283	100	+1	−1	+181
United States farm purchasing power	80	80	86	100	0	−7	−20
United States wholesale prices	251	249	247	100	+1	+2	+151

	Indiana feed ratios, 1930–39 used as normal for hog-corn and November 1946–October 1950 for the others				January 1956 percent change from—		
	January 1956	December 1955	January 1955	Normal	December 1955	January 1955	Normal
Hog-corn	9.9	9.7	12.4	13.7	+2	−20	−28
Whole milk-feed	329	[1] 339	247	294	−3	+33	+12
Butterfat-feed	40	40	32	46	0	+25	−13
Egg-feed	13.5	13.4	7.4	10.7	+1	+82	+26
Chicken-feed	6.0	5.9	6.2	7.6	+2	−3	−21
Turkey-feed	9.4	9.3	7.7	9.7	+1	+22	−3

[1] Revised.

Prepared by Departments of Agricultural Economics and Agricultural Statistics, Purdue University.

Indiana farm prices No. 216, February 1956

INDEX OF INDIANA FARM PRICES

1910–14	100	1929	151	1942	165
1935–39	112.8	1930	130	1943	188
1947–49	283	1931	92	1944	185
1919	217	1932	65	1945	196
1920	198	1933	67	1946	231
1921	121	1934	81	1947	297
1922	121	1935	112	1948	305
1923	123	1936	119	1949	247
1924	126	1937	130	1950	255
1925	152	1938	106	1951	299
1926	150	1939	97	1952	278
1927	140	1940	96	1953	265
1928	148	1941	127	1954	258

1955—February	230
March	224
April	227
May	225
June	233
July	224
August	218
September	219
October	213
November	198
December	192
1956—January	[1] 197
February	197

Commodity	Average farm prices used in the Indiana farm price index				February 1956 percent change from—		
	February 1956	January 1956	February 1955	60 months 1910–14	January 1956	February 1955	60 months 1910–14
Hogs	$11.80	$11.10	$16.30	$7.59	+6	−28	+55
Whole milk	3.95	[1] 4.10	3.90	1.73	−4	+1	+128
Cattle	15.00	15.50	17.50	5.69	−3	−14	+164
Corn	1.14	1.12	1.39	.58	+2	−18	+97
Eggs	.35	.43	.35	.21	−19	0	+67
Soybeans	2.29	2.23	2.61	1.07	+3	−12	+114
Wheat	1.97	1.92	2.05	.94	+3	−4	+110
Chickens	.20	.19	.23	.11	+5	−13	+83
Calves	21.00	22.00	20.00	7.16	−5	+5	+193
Lambs	18.40	17.90	21.00	5.96	+3	−12	+209
Oats	.59	.61	.76	.38	−3	−22	+55
Turkeys	.32	.30	.28	.15	+7	+14	+113
Baled hay	18.90	19.30	25.20	16.98	−2	−25	+11
Potatoes	1.35	1.25	1.40	.76	+8	−4	+78
Apples	2.55	2.50	2.70	.97	+2	−6	+163
Wool	.37	.41	.46	.21	−10	−20	+76
	Indexed, 1910–14=100						
Indiana farm prices	197	[1] 197	230	100	0	−14	+97
Indiana livestock prices	199	[1] 198	239	100	+1	−17	+99
Indiana grain prices	204	199	234	100	+3	−13	+104
Indiana farm purchasing power	70	70	81	100	0	−14	−30
United States farm prices	226	226	244	100	0	−7	+126
Prices paid by United States farmers	280	281	283	100	0	−1	+180
United States farm purchasing power	81	80	86	100	+1	−6	−19
United States wholesale prices	251	251	247	100	0	+2	+151

[1] Revised.

Indiana farm prices No. 216, February 1956—Continued

	Indiana feed rations, 1930-39 used as normal for hog-corn and November 1946-October 1950 for the others				February 1956, percent change from—		
	February 1956	January 1956	February 1955	Normal	January 1956	February 1955	Normal
Hog-corn	10.4	9.9	11.7	13.7	+5	−11	−24
Whole milk-feed	317	[1] 325	244	294	−2	+30	+8
Butterfat-feed	40	40	32	46	0	+25	−13
Egg-feed	11.0	13.5	9.7	10.7	−19	+13	+3
Chicken-feed	6.3	6.0	6.3	7.6	+5	0	−17
Turkey-feed	10.0	9.4	7.7	9.7	+6	+30	+3

[1] Revised.

Prepared by Departments of Agricultural Economics and Agricultural Statistics, Purdue University.

Indiana farm prices No. 217, March 1956

INDEX OF INDIANA FARM PRICES

1910-14	100	1929	151	1942	165	1955—March	224
1935-39	112.8	1930	130	1943	188	April	227
1947-49	283	1931	92	1944	185	May	225
1919	217	1932	65	1945	196	June	233
1920	198	1933	67	1946	231	July	224
1921	121	1934	81	1947	297	August	218
1922	121	1935	112	1948	305	September	219
1923	123	1936	119	1949	247	October	213
1924	126	1937	130	1950	255	November	198
1925	152	1938	106	1951	299	December	192
1926	150	1939	97	1952	278	1956—January	197
1927	140	1940	96	1953	265	February	197
1928	148	1941	127	1954	258	March	201

Commodity	Average farm prices used in the Indiana farm price index				March 1956 percent change from—		
	March 1956	February 1956	March 1955	60 months 1910-14	February 1956	March 1955	60 months 1910-14
Hogs	$12.30	$11.80	$15.50	$7.59	+4	−21	+62
Whole milk	3.80	[1] 4.00	3.70	1.73	−5	+3	+120
Cattle	15.70	15.00	17.10	5.69	+5	−8	+176
Corn	1.17	1.14	1.33	.58	+3	−12	+102
Eggs	.35	.35	.36	.21	0	−3	+68
Soybeans	2.43	2.29	2.55	1.07	+6	−5	+107
Wheat	2.00	1.97	1.98	.94	+2	+1	+113
Chickens	0.22	0.20	0.27	0.11	+10	−19	+100
Calves	18.50	21.00	19.50	7.16	−12	−5	+150
Lambs	19.00	18.40	21.10	5.96	+3	−10	+219
Oats	.58	.59	.73	.38	−2	−21	+53
Turkeys	.32	.32	.28	.15	0	+14	+113
Baled hay	17.20	18.90	24.00	16.98	−9	−28	+1
Potatoes	1.40	1.35	1.35	.76	+4	+4	+84
Apples	2.35	2.55	2.70	.97	−8	−13	+142
Wool	.41	.37	.44	.21	+11	−7	+95
	Indexed, 1910-14=100						
Indiana farm prices	201	197	224	100	+2	−10	+101
Indiana livestock prices	202	[1] 200	229	100	+1	−12	+102
Indiana grain prices	211	204	226	100	+3	−7	+111
Indiana farm purchasing power	71	70	79	100	+1	−10	−29
United States farm prices	230	226	243	100	+2	−5	+130
Prices paid by United States farmers	282	280	284	100	+1	−1	+182
United States farm purchasing power	82	81	86	100	+1	−5	−18
United States wholesale prices	253	251	247	100	+1	+2	+153

	Indiana feed ratios—1930-39 used as normal for hog-corn and November 1946-October 1950 for the others				March 1956 percent change from—		
	March 1956	February 1956	March 1955	Normal	February 1956	March 1955	Normal
Hog-corn	10.5	10.4	11.7	13.7	+1	−10	−23
Whole milk-feed	320	[1] 321	242	294	0	+32	+9
Butterfat-feed	43	40	33	46	+8	+30	−7
Egg-feed	10.9	11.0	10.2	10.7	−1	+7	+2
Chicken-feed	6.8	6.3	7.6	7.6	+8	−11	−11
Turkey-feed	9.9	10.0	7.8	9.7	−1	+27	+2

[1] Revised.

Prepared by Departments of Agricultural Economics and Agricultural Statistics, Purdue University.

Indiana farm prices No. 218, April 1956

INDEX OF INDIANA FARM PRICES

1910-14	100	1929	151	1942	165	1955—April	227
1935-39	112.8	1930	130	1943	188	May	225
1947-49	283	1931	92	1944	185	June	233
1919	217	1932	65	1945	196	July	224
1920	198	1933	67	1946	231	August	218
1921	121	1934	81	1947	297	September	219
1922	121	1935	112	1948	305	October	213
1923	123	1936	119	1949	247	November	198
1924	126	1937	130	1950	255	December	192
1925	152	1938	106	1951	299	1956—January	197
1926	150	1939	97	1952	278	February	197
1927	140	1940	96	1953	265	March	201
1928	148	1941	127	1954	258	April	216

Indiana farm prices No. 218, April 1956—Continued

Commodity	Average farm prices used in the Indiana farm price index				April 1956 percent change from—		
	April 1956	March 1956	April 1955	60 months, 1910–14	March 1956	April 1955	60 months, 1910–14
Hogs	$14.50	$12.30	$16.70	$7.59	+18	−13	+91
Whole milk	3.70	[1] 3.85	3.50	1.73	−4	+6	+14
Cattle	16.30	15.70	18.00	5.69	+4	−9	+185
Corn	1.30	1.17	1.33	.58	+11	−2	+124
Eggs	.35	.35	.31	.21	0	+13	+67
Soybeans	2.69	2.43	2.42	1.07	+11	+11	+151
Wheat	2.14	2.00	1.94	.94	+7	+10	+128
Chickens	.20	.22	.27	.11	−9	−26	+82
Calves	20.00	18.50	19.00	7.16	+8	+5	+179
Lambs	19.30	19.00	20.00	5.96	+2	−4	+224
Oats	.60	.58	.72	.38	+3	−17	+58
Turkeys	.30	.32	.29	.15	−7	+3	+100
Baled hay	17.30	17.20	23.30	16.98	+1	−26	+2
Potatoes	1.60	1.40	2.50	.76	+14	−36	+111
Apples	2.50	2.35	2.50	.97	+6	0	+158
Wool	.40	.41	.44	.21	−2	−9	+90
	Indexed, 1910–14=100						
Indiana farm prices	216	201	227	100	+7	−5	+116
Indiana livestock prices	219	[1] 203	237	100	+8	−8	+119
Indiana grain prices	231	211	220	100	+9	+5	+131
Indiana farm purchasing power	76	71	80	100	+6	−5	−24
United States farm prices	233	230	247	100	+1	−6	+133
Prices paid by United States farmers	284	282	284	100	+1	0	+184
United States farm purchasing power	82	82	87	100	0	−6	−18
United States wholesale prices	256	253	247	100	+1	+4	+156

	Indiana feed ratios, 1930–39 used as normal for hog-corn and November 1946–October 1950 for the others				April 1956 percent change from—		
	Apr. 1956	Mar. 1956	Apr. 1955	Normal	Mar. 1956	Apr. 1955	Normal
Hog-corn	11.2	10.5	12.6	13.7	+7	−11	−18
Whole milk-feed	300	[1] 325	233	294	−8	+29	+2
Butterfat-feed	41	43	34	46	−5	+21	−11
Egg-feed	10.6	10.9	8.8	10.7	−3	+20	−1
Chicken-feed	6	6.8	7.7	7.6	−12	−22	−21
Turkey-feed	9	9.9	8.2	9.7	−9	+10	−7

[1] Revised.

Prepared by Departments of Agricultural Economics and Agricultural Statistics, Purdue University.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the reason why the Indiana figure is less for these 4 months than the national figure is that Purdue University takes into consideration only the items or the products which are produced in Indiana. Indiana produces no cotton or peanuts, and only a very little tobacco. So those items are not taken into consideration.

The point I wish to make is that in January, 1956, the United States parity for all farm products was 80 percent; in February it was 81 percent; in March it was 82 percent, and in April it was 82 percent, the same as it was in March.

The able Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and I have been having colloquies and debates on this subject over a period of time. On April 24 he made a statement that the average parity in the United States was 70 percent or less. I took exception to that statement and said that at the time it was 82 percent. But in the statement I made I said that the able Senator from Oklahoma knew that he was mistaken and that he knew that what he had said was untrue when he made the statement.

I now find, upon checking, that the able Senator from Oklahoma had satisfied himself that he did not know that he had make a mistake; that he thought parity was 70 percent, and that the statistics and figures given to him indicated 70 percent, which was, of course, the correct figure for some items at that time, and was the correct figure for the Indiana prices.

I regret that I said what I did in respect to the able Senator from Oklahoma, because, as I said a moment ago, I have found that while his figure was wrong, he himself did not know it. I desired that the RECORD show this, because I want any Senator, at any time I make a mistake, to call it to my attention. Whenever I use any figures or make any statements which are incorrect, I want to know about it, because I desire that the correct statement appear in the RECORD. I think at all times we ought to have in the RECORD figures which are correct.

All of us make mistakes. I am as susceptible to making mistakes from time to time as is anyone else. It is very easy to use incorrect statistical information, considering the volume of figures we deal with in the Senate.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I express appreciation to the Senator from Indiana for his statement that he has found he was in error when he charged on the Senate floor that the senior Senator from Oklahoma had knowingly made a false statement.

I have always had the highest regard for the distinguished Senator from Indiana. I have always enjoyed debating with him. I appreciate the fact that he is a hard, tough, slugging debater; and I like that. I admire that trait, and do not hold it against any man. I love to stand up, toe to toe, and slug it out with those who want to slug. The Senator from Indiana loves it and is able to do it. I am glad that the situation is now on the basis where he and I can continue to do that.

I thank the Senator from Indiana for what he has done. I was convinced on April 24 that I gave accurate figures as to what the farmers were receiving for what they sold.

On the basis of the information I have received since then from farmers, and from many other sources in which I have the utmost confidence, I am completely convinced that the statement which I made is correct.

I wish to say this to the Senator from Indiana: On the basis of figures he has, I can understand how he can conclude, on the basis of those who have reported—and therefore he is entitled to believe it if he desires to—that payments were received at a higher percentage than that stated by the Senator from Oklahoma. But, Mr. President, I still say that if my distinguished colleague from Indiana will go to the grassroots, where the farmers live, and where they have to sell their products, he will find, on the basis of their take-home money, the Senator from Oklahoma was justified in making the statement he did on the basis of what he believed. He will also find the statement justified, I think, and I know it is true of Oklahoma, on the basis of what the farmers are actually

receiving in the form of take-home pay for their average parity receipts.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have never stated that I believed the prices were not too low. While prices today are much better than they were 90 days ago, I think they are still too low. No one is more familiar with farm prices, except for cotton and peanuts, than I am. I know what things cost on the farm, and I know what farmers receive.

Mr. KERR. I am aware of the fact that the price of hogs is substantially above what it was on April 24. Prices of cattle have improved very little, if any. Prices of grain sorghums have not improved. There are many other products which, until the passage of the agriculture bill and as a result of its effect, were very little improved, so far as price was concerned, from what they were on April 24.

Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Indiana has said he thought farm prices were much too low. I want to say to him I am quite sure that may be the most significant statement he has made insofar as concerns farm people agreeing with the Senator as to his conclusions. I also want to say to him he has made a statement with which I can fully agree, and with which the farm people in Oklahoma can agree, and I am happy we have found a common ground upon which we can agree about the facts.

REVISION OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2875) to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the committee amendment at the desk, which I ask the clerk to state.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 49, lines 17 to 19, to strike out "from each employee's and Member's basic salary an amount equal to 7 percent of such basic salary" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> From each employee's basic salary an amount equal to 7 percent of such basic salary and from each Member's basic salary an amount equal to 8 percent of such basic salary.

On page 51, in last line of the matter preceding line 1, strike out "7" and insert in lieu thereof "8."

On page 59, line 2, change the comma to a period, and strike out all thereafter through line 7.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the amendment which I have proposed deals only with that phase of the bill which affects the retirement of Members of Congress.

The first proposal changes the rate of contribution for Members of Congress from 6 percent, as provided under the existing law, to 8 percent rather than the 7 percent figure mentioned in the bill.

The reason for making that change is that, under the formula as provided, Members of Congress are treated more liberally than any other employees who would be benefited under the bill. I feel it is only fair, if Members of Congress are to have the benefit of a better formula, that they should contribute more for the benefits they will receive.

It is my opinion that the improved formula for congressional retirement should have been stricken from the bill, but by a previous vote the Senate has adopted the more liberal provision. Now, our only recourse is to raise the Member's contribution rate to take care of the added benefits.

The second proposal is to strike out lines 2 through line 7 on page 59, which would give to the Members of Congress the right to retire at the age of 60 with full benefits. I quote the language proposed to be stricken from the bill:

> And any Member who is separated from the service or transferred to a position not within the purview of this act after completing 10 years of Member service may be paid an annuity beginning at the age of 60 years, computed as provided in such section.

Under the existing law, Members of Congress may retire at full annuity only at the age of 62. This bill provides that after 10 years of service a Member of Congress may retire at the age of 60.

Such consideration is not given to other Government employees. The Finance Committee refused to lower the retirement age of other employees under social security. Certainly the Members of Congress are not going to repudiate that action and reduce their own retirement age by 2 years when we have told all employees under social security that we are not going to lower their retirement age.

Mr. President, I cannot conceive of there being too much objection to the amendment. I wonder if the chairman of the committee will consider accepting it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to join with the Senator from Delaware in supporting the amendment.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I also wish to express my approval of the Senator's view on it, and strongly support the amendment. I hope the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I do not accept the amendment. I think Members of Congress and attachés should be treated like every other employee of the Government. I think the same number of years should be used to arrive at the average. The contribution of Members of Congress has been raised from 6 to 7 percent, as has that of other employees. For that reason I do not see why we should make any difference between Members of Congress and other employees.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Under the bill Members of Congress will now get the benefit of the same formula of the 5-year average. Our annuity is computed on the basis of 2½ percent, whereas other employees will now have theirs computed on the basis of 2 percent. Therefore, we would get more out of the bill in proportion to what we pay in than they will. I think it is only fair that we should contribute more, and at the same time certainly we should not be proposing to reduce the retirement age for ourselves when we have rejected a proposal for others.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The situation is different for Members of Congress. There is a law that a person cannot serve in the House of Representatives until he is 25 years of age. A person can become a civil service employee at the age of 18. A Member of Congress reaches civil service status later in life.

Another point is that Members of Congress are elected by the people. We do not see them retiring when they reach the age of 60, 62, 70, or 75. They stay in Congress until they are 80, 85, and 86. Many of them serve as long as they live and are able to work. I think it is one of the safest and soundest funds we have in existence.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I might say to the Senator from South Carolina that I am fully in agreement with a sound congressional retirement system. I think it is a sound part of our Government. On the other hand, the Senator from South Carolina speaks of the fact that men come to Congress and stay until they are 70 or 80 years of age. Maybe that is good, and maybe it is bad, but anyone who stays in service beyond the age of 62 is in no way affected by the second part of the amendment. Why should not the others have to make a living when they leave Congress at an early age, the same as other people? It was never intended that a person should serve in Congress 5 or 6 years and then retire for the rest of his life at the expense of the taxpayers.

Furthermore, if Congress wants a good retirement system they should expect to pay for it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator's amendment would reduce the age from 62 to 60; would it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. The committee amendment would reduce the age from 62 to 60. My amendment would restore the age to that provided by the existing law.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Delaware to the fact that under the provisions of the committee amendment, they cannot retire until they reach the age of 60 and have served 30 years. That provision is the same as the one which, under the committee amendment, applies to other workers. So I see no reason for providing for a different retirement age in the case of Members of Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then why does not the Senator from South Carolina support my amendment? In the first place he is wrong in the statement he has just made.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is the Senator from Delaware attempting to reduce the age of retirement?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; that's what you are trying to do. On page 59 of the committee amendment we find the provision that "any Member who is separated from the service or transferred to a position not within the purview of this act after completing 10 years of Member service may be paid an annuity beginning at the age of 60 years, computed as provided in such section."

My amendment proposes to strike this language out and thereby reject the committee's proposal that the retirement age

for Members of Congress should be lowered.

Under existing law he cannot retire until he has attained age 62.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That applies to all employees.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, I am speaking now only as it affects Members of Congress.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. A Member of Congress who has served only 10 years receives, not a full retirement annuity, but only an annuity computed on the basis of the payments he has made during his 10 years of service.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is not true. The committee bill provides for congressional retirement at the age of 60 with no reduction. Earlier this afternoon the Senate rejected a proposal to strike from the committee amendment the section which would allow earlier retirement for other employees, after 30 years of service. I am not bringing up that issue again. My amendment affects only Members of Congress. It does not even affect employees of Members of the Senate or employees of Members of the House of Representatives, because such employees are not in exactly the same position as are Members of Congress, with respect to retirement benefits.

I say that Members of Congress have no right to receive more from the retirement system than does any other employee inasmuch as Members of Congress pay into the system only the same amount that other employees do. If Members of Congress wish to receive greater benefits, they should make greater payments. However, the committee amendment provides for greater benefits for Members of Congress without requiring that they make these greater payments. That is the inequity which I am trying to correct.

If the Senator from South Carolina would prefer, I am prepared to offer an amendment to strike from the committee amendment all provision for a change in the benefits to be received by Members of Congress. In that way the benefits of Members of Congress would remain as they are at the present time. Frankly, that is what I think should be done, but by an earlier vote the Senate decided otherwise.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The amendment of the Senator from Delaware would increase by 1 percent the contributions made by Members of the House and Members of the Senate and by all legislative attachés, but they would not receive any increase in return.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, Mr. President, it does not affect legislative employees. Under the formula in existing law, the Members of Congress pay 6 percent into the retirement fund. However, when Members of the House and Members of the Senate compute their retirement annuities under the provisions of existing law their annuities are 60 percent higher than those of any other Government employee. The committee amendment would increase by 1 percent the contributions made by both Members of Congress and other employees, but under the committee amendment the Members of Congress would be receiving 25 percent more than would other employees. Therefore, why should not Members of Congress pay into the retirement fund more than other employees?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Would the amendment of the Senator from Delaware increase from 7 percent to 8 percent the contributions made by Senators, Representatives, and attachés of the two Houses of Congress?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; my amendment would increase only the amount that Members of Congress would pay but not the amount that attachés would pay. My amendment affects Members of Congress only.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator from Delaware know that the legislative attachés are under the same system that Members of Congress are under? The Senator's amendment would penalize the Members of Congress, but would give to the attachés benefits which would not be given to the Members of Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, Mr. President; that is not true. If the Senator from South Carolina will study the committee amendment, he will find that under its provisions Members of Congress can compute their retirement benefits on the basis of 2½ percent regardless of the number of years served; but an attaché can compute his highest benefits only on the basis of 15 years of service. There is a difference.

If the Senator from South Carolina wishes to bring the attachés under some other formula, I suggest that he submit such an amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. But that has been the law all the time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; it was passed about 2 years ago.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. How many ideas are included in the Senator's amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Two. One is to increase the rate from 7 percent to 8 percent. The committee amendment as now written proposes a rate of 7 percent, but that rate is applicable to all other employees. Inasmuch as—on the basis of the vote taken a few minutes ago Members of Congress will, under the provisions of the committee amendment, have the benefit of the higher formula. I felt that they should pay more than do the other employees.

The second provision of my amendment will strike out that section of the committee amendment which would give the Members of Congress the right to retire 2 years earlier than they are able to retire under the provisions of existing law. Under existing law a Member of Congress with 10 years of service can retire with full benefits at age 62. Under the committee amendment it is proposed to reduce that age to 60 but still to permit a Member of Congress to receive the full benefits.

Mr. CURTIS. When the Congressional Retirement Act was passed, was the contribution the same as that for civil service employees, or 1 percent higher?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was not here at the time, but I think it was the same. My understanding is that it is the same.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I should like to see whether I understand the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. It is my understanding that the annuities of Members of Congress are computed on the basis of 2½ percent of their salaries. Does the Senator from Delaware say that, for that reason, the Members of Congress should pay at a higher rate?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; and that will be required as a result of the vote taken earlier this afternoon, for the Senate has now approved the part of the committee amendment which provides that in computing their retirement annuities, from now on, the Members of Congress will use their average salary for a period of 5 years, rather than use their average salary for the entire period of their service. Heretofore, we have used our average salary for our entire period of service, but when the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] was rejected, and when the new formula was approved, automatically the retirement benefits of Members of Congress were increased. If the retirement benefits of Members of Congress are to be increased out of proportion, as compared to the others, by the same token I think Members of Congress should pay more.

Mr. BARRETT. Has the Senator from Delaware made an investigation to determine whether his amendment would make the system actuarially sound, in so far as Members of Congress are concerned?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am convinced that my amendment, if adopted, will not make the system actuarially sound. Neither will the system be made actuarially sound as a result of adoption of the provision of the committee amendment calling for 7 percent in the case of employees. As a matter of fact, the Civil Service Commission has said that if the system is to be made actuarially sound, a payroll tax of 20.6 percent will be required—to be divided in some manner between the Government and the employees.

Therefore, my amendment to the committee amendment will not make the system actuarially sound, but it will reduce the inequity which would exist if the Members of Congress were to receive benefits higher than those received by the other employees and yet be paying no more.

Mr. BARRETT. In any event, the Senator's amendment would make the system sounder, would it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; it would.

Mr. BARRETT. Does the Senator's amendment apply to the legislative employees?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, it does not; for the reason that the legislative employees are receiving benefits half way between those provided for civilian employees and those provided for the Members of Congress, in that the legislative employees can use, in the case of 15 years of their service, the same formula used by Members of Congress; and there-

after the legislative employees formula would revert, not to the 2 percent called for by the committee amendment, but to the old 1½ percent formula of existing law for 5 years. Then after 20 years service they could receive the benefits provided under this increase.

Under such circumstances, I felt it would be only fair not to have my amendment apply to the legislative employees. Frankly, as I view the situation, I do not believe they will receive too much benefit from the provisions of the committee amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Delaware for his amendment to the committee amendment. I think his amendment is a fair one; and all along I have had in mind that such a provision should be made.

So I shall support the amendment, and I hope it is agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] does not wish to accept this proposal I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to my amendment to the committee amendment. I am willing to have the vote taken now.

So, Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to my amendment to the committee amendment, I request the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to direct a question to the chairman of the committee, in order to clear up a certain point. I understand that he is willing to reply to it.

In this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, in the last paragraph on page 17, in an article on this subject, I find the following:

> These are among the amendments under consideration:
>
> * * * * *
>
> To limit the amounts that could be paid survivors to $1,800 a year for surviving children or 80 percent of the employee's basic salary, and finally, to reduce the benefits that could be paid Members of Congress under the Johnston bill. After 5 years under the Johnston bill, an eligible Member of Congress could retire on an $18,000 annuity.

It seems to me that one of the things we owe to ourselves and to the public is to keep the record as to what Members of Congress receive absolutely straight and out in the open, so that the public will have a fair opportunity to judge it, and so that no misconceptions may be based upon it. Therefore I should like to direct this question to the chairman of the committee: Is what the statement which I have read apparently purports to say true? The writer may have had something different in mind, but what is the situation?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I read the article this morning, and prepared a statement in that connection, which I shall be glad to present.

Mr. ALLOTT. If it is in order, I should like to yield to the Senator from South Carolina in order that he may present the statement which he has prepared.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. President, it is not my practice to refute inaccurate or even unfair or slanted articles that appear in the public press. However, I feel justified in making an exception to this self-imposed rule of mine on this occasion. I feel it is necessary as a matter of fairness to the members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on both sides of the table who voted unanimously to report S. 2875, the bill which is now before the Senate.

The article to which I refer states that one of the provisions of the Johnston bill which the Republicans propose to scale down relates to Members of Congress. The article states:

> To reduce the benefits that could be paid Members of Congress under the Johnston bill. After 5 years under the Johnston bill, an eligible Member of Congress could retire on an $18,000 annuity.

The facts are that under both the present law and the Johnston bill retirement benefits for both Members of Congress and employees of the Government are based on the length of creditable service. For a Member of Congress to receive the annuity indicated in the article, it would be necessary for the Member to have 32 years of service. That is true under the present law, and it would still be true under the Johnston bill.

After the increase in salary to $22,500, he would have to serve 5 years in order to have his 5 highest years counted. He would have to serve 32 years in Congress. Five of those years would have to be after the increase came about, in order for him to receive an annuity of the amount indicated.

If the article was written to make it appear that the Johnston bill contains any "bundle for Congress provision," it is deplorable. If it was written through ignorance of the present law and ignorance of the provisions of the Johnston bill, it is regrettable. In either case, I wish to have the record stand corrected in order that my colleagues on the committee, Republican and Democrat alike, will not stand falsely accused.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for that explanation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think that answers the Senator's question. My statement shows that the article is unfair when it refers to the period of 5 years. There would have to be a period of 5 years' service after the increase in salary, and there would have to be enough total service in the House or Senate to make up 32 years of service.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator. I do not impute any motive to the writer of the article. It may be a case in which the writer intended one thing, and the information which he conveyed was actually something entirely different. I am sure that a great many people who read the article had to place their eyeballs back in their sockets before they could continue reading it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I noticed the article to which reference has been made. I believe I understand where the writer made his error and I think it was unintentional. Apparently he read the section of the bill which provides that Members of Congress may be permitted to compute their retirement annuity on the basis of an average of 5 years. Under existing law, it is 6 years.

In the same section, a ceiling of 80 percent is placed on the amount which a Member of Congress may draw. So mathematically 80 percent of $22,500 would be the $18,000 to which the article refers. However, if one will read the entire section of the bill he will find that it would require 32 years of service for any man ever to receive maximum benefits and then his average salary would have to have been $22,500, and his full contributions for the entire period would have had to have been paid.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield, in order that we may renew our request for the yeas and nays on the Williams amendment?

Mr. ALLOTT. I shall yield the floor in just a moment.

In closing, let me say that I am sure many Members of this body have had the experience of hearing from a constituent that they were receiving many benefits which they were not actually receiving. It therefore seemed important to me to clear up this question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the committee amendment.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I renew the request for the yeas and nays on the Williams amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment, as amended, is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I shall not delay the vote on the final passage of the bill, but I do wish to point out that the bill is not as fair a retirement bill as some people have pictured it. Much has been said here today about

liberalized benefits for employees in the low-income brackets. In that connection I should like to point out that under the formula provided in the bill, it would give most of the benefits to those who earn in excess of $5,000, and that the employees who earn $2,500 or less get absolutely no benefit whatever under the bill. Those who earn between $2,500 and $5,000 get from zero to 100 percent of the benefits.

The point has been made, "So what? There are not many of those low paid employees in the United States Government who would be adversely affected by the Johnson bill; there are not many employees who earn less than $2,500."

I have asked the Civil Service Commission to supply me with some figures. and the Commission has done so through its Mr. Maurice S. Brown, Chief Actuary, Retirement Division. The figures were submitted to me under date of May 22, 1956. Mr. Brown points out that there are 29,206 employees who earn under $2,500. In no way do those employees get any benefits whatever under the Johnson bill now before the Senate, as far as the liberalized formula is concerned.

They will get some greater survivorship benefit, but that increase is negligible.

In addition to that, there are 983,259 employees whose salary is $4,000 and less. Those employees will benefit to the extent of only about one-half of that which the higher salaried employees get.

Furthermore, there are 1,684,837 employees on the payroll of the United States who do not draw the full benefits of the proposed increased formula extended to those in the upper income brackets by the Johnson bill.

I make this statement so that Senators will know what they are voting for, particularly because we have heard so much said here today about the benefits that will go to the low-income groups. Senators who have expressed so much concern for some of the low-income groups are voting for a bill which in no way affects those who need the benefits the most but does greatly increase their own retirements by the largest percentage of all.

The figures I have quoted were furnished to me by Mr. Brown, the Chief Actuary of the Civil Service Commission. It should be pointed out again that the formula that has been approved for Members of Congress will give the largest benefits of all to the Members of Congress, notwithstanding the fact that the last amendment to be voted on did correct that situation to a substantial degree.

I repeat, under the Johnson bill a $2,500 employee gets no increase in his annuity. A $3,000 employee with 30 years of service gets 7½ percent, while a $4,000 employee gets a 19.2 percent increase, whereas all those with $5,000 salary or over get a flat 27.7 percent increase. The same differential applies to any other age bracket.

This is not a sound and equitable retirement bill, and it should be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill (S. 2875) was passed.

HIGHWAY LEGISLATION

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the legislative calendar, as it has been announced for the end of this week or the first part of next week, contemplates the consideration by the Senate of the so-called highway bill.

The members of the Committee on Public Works, particularly the members of the Subcommittee on Roads, are aware of the fact that one of the major questions that will come before the Senate will concern the formula for the distribution of highway funds, particularly the apportionments to be made to the several States for the so-called interstate system of roads.

The figures are so amazing to those of us who have given the matter some study, that I believe it to be desirable that certain tables be placed in the RECORD, so that Members of the Senate may have an opportunity to examine them and study them and consult them before the bill comes to the floor of the Senate.

Therefore, I have assembled certain data which I shall ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD. As I present the tables, I shall make brief comments.

First, I should like to insert a table which gives the approximate apportionment under H. R. 10660 of interstate system funds for fiscal years 1957 and 1958 combined.

The table, in one column, gives the figures as adopted by the House, and in the adjoining column the figures as reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works. The discrepancies between the two figures are so outstanding that I am sure they will be of interest to every Member of the Senate who examines them.

The apportionment provided in the House version of the bill is stated to represent and reflect an estimate of needs. The apportionment that is provided in the Senate committee version of the bill is that which was set up in the Highway Act of 1954, in which one-half of the money for the interstate fund is apportioned on the basis of population, one-sixth on the basis of area, one-sixth on the basis of mileage, and one-sixth on the basis of population. That is a carryover of the old one-third, one-third, one-third on mileage, area, and population under the regular formula of Federal assistance.

The act of 1954 in section 13 directs the Secretary of Commerce to prepare an estimate of need for the Nation's 2,350,000 miles of roads, streets, and highway.

Mr. George T. McCoy, president, American Association of State Highway Officials, in testifying before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works on February 21, 1955, stated:

> The State highway departments cooperated with the Bureau of Public Roads in this undertaking. Please bear in mind that this is an estimate and not a proposed program, and it is the first time that an attempt has been made to place a dollar value upon the total highway needs of the Nation. The estimate was made on the basis of providing an interstate system for the indicated needs of 1947 and for all other roads and streets for the needs during the next 10 years.

Despite the warning that that estimate was not a proposed program but was based upon an invitation to the several States to indicate how much they would like to have in order to build an interstate system in their respective States, it has been used by the House of Representatives, in the bill as reported, as a basis of apportionment.

The results are so unusual that I decided to ask the Bureau of Public Roads for certain figures. The table I received gives the mileage of the interstate system for the several States and the average cost per mile of the interstate system based upon the formula which the House has used.

I also asked for and received tables which show the construction cost per mile on the interstate system for the urban sections and for the rural sections of the interstate system. The tables are broken down into right-of-way, grading, surface, and structures. The tables also show the total figures.

Accompanying those tables was a letter from Commissioner C. D. Curtiss, of the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads, in which Captain Curtiss says:

> You will see that there is considerable variation as would be expected due to differences in specifications used in different States, as well as differences in terrain, soil types, local materials, wage rates, traffic loads, and many other factors.

In other words, Captain Curtiss says that different specifications were used in the different States.

Then he goes on to say:

> As you know, the Bureau did not edit or otherwise alter the individual State estimates submitted in the above-mentioned study.

Because the Bureau did not edit or otherwise alter the individual State estimates, the formula used by the House of Representatives is what each State thought it could use in building the interstate system, according to the standards they wanted.

At the time the question was submitted to the States, some of them assumed that the interstate system would be built on a 50–50 matching basis; some of them thought it would be built on a 60–40 matching basis; and some of them thought it would be built on a 90–10 matching basis. Consequently, their belief as to what they could get from the Federal Government affected the estimates they made.

To illustrate that, Mr. President, may I point out that in the table which Commissioner Curtis furnished me we find that the State of New Jersey, for example, has used estimates which would make its interstate system draw $6,652,000 per mile.

Pennsylvania, on the other hand, which is much more conservative, made estimates which would draw for the State of Pennsylvania not $6,652,000 per mile, but only $557,000 per mile, which is slightly over half a million dollars per mile, whereas its neighboring State would get $6,652,000.

Other figures are similarly startling. For example, the State of Indiana would draw $812,000 per mile, while its neighboring State of Illinois, with some urban

roads to consider, would draw only $638,000 per mile.

In attempting to find out how this happened, I requested these tables, which show a breakdown of the right-of-way, grading, surfacing, structures, and other factors entering into the computations. A table for the interstate system, urban section, shows that 10 percent in the range in total cost per mile in Indiana runs to $2,356,000 per mile, whereas in Illinois it is only $610,000 per mile.

The State of New York estimated for surfacing, after the right-of-way, grading, and structures had been taken care of, $220,000 per mile, whereas the State of New Jersey estimated $450,000 per mile.

I cite these illustrations to indicate the great variations which exist in the estimates which the House of Representatives formula has used as a basis of need.

I suggest that all Members of the Senate will want to consult these tables to see how unrealistic these estimates were as determining the needs of the several States. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert at this point in the RECORD the tables and the letters to which I have referred, in the order in which I have them numbered.

There being no objection, the tables and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Approximate apportionment under H. R. 10660, of Interstate System funds for fiscal years 1957 and 1958 combined

State	As passed by House (p. 10 of House report) ($2,725,000,000)	As reported out by Senate Public Works Committee (p. 1, committee print) ($2,750,000,000)
*Alabama	$42,782,000	[$55,900,000]
*Arizona	24,525,000	[31,600,000]
*Arkansas	23,707,000	[39,900,000]
California	271,955,000	156,800,000
*Colorado	18,257,000	[37,600,000]
Connecticut	65,127,000	26,500,000
*Delaware	7,630,000	[17,200,000]
Florida	58,042,000	46,800,000
Georgia	82,022,000	64,100,000
*Idaho	12,535,000	[27,800,000]
*Illinois	124,805,000	[129,600,000]
Indiana	101,642,000	66,900,000
*Iowa	32,427,000	[56,100,000]
*Kansas	24,252,000	[49,900,000]
Kentucky	57,770,000	51,600,000
Louisiana	57,770,000	45,400,000
*Maine	17,167,000	[22,100,000]
Maryland	50,957,000	33,000,000
Massachusetts	98,100,000	58,700,000
Michigan	151,782,000	98,900,000
*Minnesota	56,680,000	[61,900,000]
*Mississippi	28,885,000	[43,700,000]
*Missouri	70,032,000	[74,500,000]
*Montana	17,985,000	[39,500,000]
*Nebraska	12,535,000	[39,400,000]
*Nevada	8,720,000	[28,700,000]
*New Hampshire	7,902,000	[17,200,000]
New Jersey	159,140,000	60,200,000
*New Mexico	27,522,000	[33,300,000]
*New York	156,688,000	[195,000,000]
*North Carolina	28,885,000	[70,100,000]
*North Dakota	12,535,000	[30,500,000]
Ohio	159,413,000	117,700,000
*Oklahoma	44,145,000	[49,200,000]
*Oregon	37,333,000	[37,400,000]
*Pennsylvania	89,108,000	[147,400,000]
*Rhode Island	14,443,000	[17,200,000]
*South Carolina	21,528,000	[26,900,000]
*South Dakota	11,173,000	[31,900,000]
*Tennessee	44,418,000	[58,800,000]
*Texas	102,188,000	[158,100,000]
Utah	27,795,000	26,800,000
Vermont	20,710,000	17,200,000
Virginia	66,763,000	55,600,000
Washington	54,773,000	44,200,000
*West Virginia	30,248,000	[32,700,000]
*Wisconsin	37,878,000	[62,700,000]
Wyoming	34,608,000	28,600,000
District of Columbia	17,713,000	17,200,000

*States favored by Senate version, [31].
States which get less under Senate version, 17.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS,
Washington, May 18, 1956.

The Honorable FRANCIS CASE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: It has taken a few days to compile the information requested in your letter of May 10, but it has now been completed and I am transmitting it herewith. The tables are furnished in 15 copies as you requested, except the ones showing construction cost per mile for a complete new facility. These mileage-cost estimates were supplied to us by the States in response to one of the questions asked as a part of the so-called section 13 study.

You will see that there is considerable variation as would be expected due to differences in specifications used in different States, as well as differences in terrain, soil types, local materials, wage rates, traffic loads, and many other factors.

As you know, the Bureau did not edit or otherwise alter the individual State estimates submitted in the above-mentioned study although a manual of instructions was issued to the States as a guide for uniformity. H. R. 10660 provides that after selection of standards for the Interstate System new estimates would be made by the States and these would then be examined and approved by the Bureau for uniformity and consistency of application between States. This provision was included, of course, to rectify any nonuniformity in the present estimates.

With respect to your itemized question No. 2, the general location of all routes of the national system of interstate highways has been approved, and the State highway departments are now proceeding with the selection of detailed and final locations for our approval. All highways or routes included in the national system of interstate highways as finally approved, if not already included in the Federal-aid highway system, become a part of that system without regard to any mileage limitation. Until final locations are established it is not possible to make any firm estimate of the portion of the system which is coincident with the Federal-aid primary system as it existed prior to selection of the final locations of the Interstate System. However, we have estimated that of the 40,000 miles of designated interstate routes, all of which are automatically a part of the Federal-aid primary system, 5,510 miles will be located within the limits of urban areas. The flexibility of the general route designations prevents making acceptable estimates of the rural-urban breakdown of mileage within an individual State at this time.

I shall be glad to discuss these items with you further or, if you prefer, I will have Mr. Turner call on you at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

C. D. CURTISS,
Commissioner of Public Roads.

State	Mileage on interstate system as of September 1955	Total population, 1950	Total cost from report pursuant to sec. 13 of Federal-Aid Act of 1954 [1]	Average cost per mile [1]
			Million dollars	*Thousand dollars*
Alabama	947	3,061,743	366	405
Arizona	1,187	749,587	210	178
Arkansas	547	1,909,511	203	384
California	2,159	10,586,223	2,321	1,222
Colorado	678	1,325,089	157	238
Connecticut	278	2,007,280	555	2,079
Delaware	42	318,085	66	2,538
Florida	1,173	2,771,305	496	437
Georgia	1,171	3,444,578	700	634
Idaho	659	588,637	107	163
Illinois	1,662	8,712,176	1,065	688
Indiana	1,112	3,934,224	867	812
Iowa	736	2,621,073	275	395
Kansas	771	1,905,299	207	284
Kentucky	668	2,944,806	492	750
Louisiana	657	2,683,516	493	814
Maine	313	913,774	147	492
Maryland	355	2,343,001	434	1,607
Massachusetts	415	4,690,514	838	2,415
Michigan	1,098	6,371,766	1,295	1,315
Minnesota	935	2,982,483	483	564
Mississippi	691	2,178,914	246	360
Missouri	1,159	3,954,653	599	557
Montana	1,239	591,024	153	124
Nebraska	503	1,325,510	106	222
Nevada	540	160,083	73	135
New Hampshire	214	533,242	66	310
New Jersey	354	4,835,329	1,357	6,652
New Mexico	1,013	681,187	235	232
New York	1,232	14,830,192	1,336	1,283
North Carolina	714	4,061,929	247	346
North Dakota	517	619,636	107	207
Ohio	1,353	7,946,627	1,361	1,106
Oklahoma	835	2,233,351	377	466
Oregon	757	1,521,341	319	438
Pennsylvania	1,478	10,498,012	760	557
Rhode Island	68	791,896	123	2,617
South Carolina	769	2,117,027	183	244
South Dakota	531	652,740	95	183
Tennessee	1,093	3,291,718	380	366
Texas	2,912	7,711,194	872	315
Utah	716	688,862	238	332
Vermont	344	377,747	178	519
Virginia	1,008	3,318,680	669	627
Washington	632	2,378,963	467	788
West Virginia	226	2,005,552	258	1,167
Wisconsin	482	3,434,575	323	684
Wyoming	1,019	290,529	296	290
District of Columbia	28	802,178	152	8,941
Total	39,990	150,697,361	23,253	617

[1] Costs based on mileage prior to September 1955 of 37,700 miles.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS—FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1954—SECTION 13 PROJECT—HIGHWAY NEEDS STUDY

Construction cost per mile for complete new facility

INTERSTATE SYSTEM—URBAN

[Reported by State highway departments]

State	4-lane construction							6-lane construction						
	Range in total cost per mile		Elements of cost for the average mile					Range in total cost per mile		Elements of cost for the average mile				
	Low 10 percent [1]	High 10 percent [2]	Right-of-way	Grading	Surface	Structures	Total	Low 10 percent [1]	High 10 percent [2]	Right-of-way	Grading	Surface	Structures	Total
Alabama	$800,000	$5,400,000	$375,000	$400,000	$300,000	$525,000	$1,600,000							
Arizona	675,000	725,000	150,000	100,000	100,000	400,000	750,000	$1,100,000	$1,100,000	$200,000	$150,000	$150,000	$600,000	$1,100,000
Arkansas	826,000	826,000	140,000	140,000	360,000	186,000	826,000	6,376,000	6,376,000	2,750,000	210,000	540,000	2,876,000	6,376,000
California	656,000	3,151,000	426,000	347,000	509,000	385,000	1,667,000	1,587,000	14,697,000	1,840,000	707,000	975,000	756,000	4,278,000
Colorado	1,086,307	1,717,595	242,688	112,560	122,230	872,155	1,349,633	1,062,795	3,283,000	254,450	161,264	183,345	941,500	1,540,559
Connecticut	2,000,000	6,000,000	1,000,000	500,000	400,000	1,100,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	8,000,000	1,800,000	600,000	500,000	2,100,000	5,000,000
Delaware								4,700,000	8,125,000	1,000,000	1,196,500	900,000	2,882,300	5,978,800
Florida	1,845,300	4,235,400	1,023,900	890,200	177,600	1,113,600	3,205,300							
Georgia	750,000	1,500,000	500,000	300,000	200,000	150,000	1,150,000	900,000	2,200,000	750,000	450,000	325,000	225,000	1,750,000
Idaho	363,000	1,113,000	156,393	107,635	101,195	285,188	650,411							
Illinois	610,000	2,730,000	200,000	240,000	250,000	800,000	1,490,000	870,000	7,750,000	534,000	1,148,000	302,000	918,000	2,902,000
Indiana	2,356,000	2,764,000	868,000	480,000	325,000	887,000	2,560,000	3,825,000	4,675,000	1,250,000	660,000	430,000	1,950,000	4,290,000
Iowa	196,000	991,000	90,000	75,000	185,000	95,500	445,500							
Kansas	400,000	600,000	50,000	100,000	200,000	80,000	430,000							
Kentucky	1,000,000	2,000,000	400,000	500,000	300,000	300,000	1,500,000	1,300,000	2,500,000	500,000	600,000	400,000	400,000	1,900,000
Louisiana	3,080,000	3,140,000	684,200	155,000	158,610	2,112,190	3,110,000	3,300,000	8,360,000	880,000	170,000	214,600	2,735,400	4,000,000
Maine	480,000	1,910,000	1,000,000	370,000	120,000	250,000	1,740,000							
Maryland	770,000	1,530,000	195,000	65,000	391,000	487,000	1,138,000	880,000	1,314,000	123,000	91,000	521,000	386,000	1,121,000
Massachusetts	950,000	2,650,000	182,000	476,000	210,000	532,000	1,400,000	1,220,000	11,600,000	650,000	1,235,000	455,000	910,000	3,250,000
Michigan	800,000	2,000,000	110,000	210,000	180,000	628,000	1,128,000	1,000,000	9,000,000	1,500,000	1,462,000	442,000	2,346,000	5,750,000
Minnesota	377,000	5,469,000	478,000	362,000	291,000	685,000	1,816,000	3,071,000	6,705,000	2,035,000	1,497,000	670,000	712,000	4,914,000
Mississippi	420,000	1,353,480	91,720	193,410	186,485	215,430	687,045							
Missouri								2,100,000	3,500,000	755,000	498,000	740,000	547,000	2,540,000
Montana	130,000	300,000	50,000	25,000	90,000	100,000	265,000							
Nebraska	300,000	5,500,000	110,000	60,000	135,000	2,095,000	2,400,000							
Nevada	724,715	1,645,833	426,110	382,234	174,966	336,474	1,319,784							
New Hampshire	500,000	1,000,000	174,000	400,000	120,000	150,000	844,000							
New Jersey	2,000,000	5,000,000	750,000	500,000	450,000	1,300,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	7,500,000	1,100,000	850,000	650,000	1,800,000	4,400,000
New Mexico	432,020	2,612,361	420,594	88,983	193,375	669,187	1,372,139							
New York	860,000	2,800,000	170,000	310,000	220,000	540,000	1,240,000	4,400,000	7,300,000	2,500,000	500,000	330,000	2,500,000	5,830,000
North Carolina			470,000	225,000	355,000	100,000	1,150,000							
North Dakota	215,000	800,000	30,000	75,000	140,000	5,500	250,500							
Ohio			1,000,000	800,000	300,000	900,000	3,000,000			2,500,000	1,200,000	600,000	2,700,000	7,000,000
Oklahoma	800,000	2,500,000	400,000	300,000	400,000	300,000	1,400,000	1,800,000	2,800,000	700,000	400,000	500,000	400,000	2,000,000
Oregon	1,500,000	3,000,000	750,000	150,000	150,000	750,000	1,800,000	2,000,000	15,000,000	800,000	200,000	200,000	800,000	2,000,000
Pennsylvania	771,000	1,411,000	178,000	381,000	357,000	330,000	1,246,000	3,916,000	12,000,000	1,121,000	2,441,000	2,740,000	2,349,000	8,651,000
Rhode Island	2,225,000	2,225,000	225,000	1,250,000	150,000	600,000	2,225,000	4,000,000	13,750,000	2,500,000	3,225,000	225,000	1,050,000	7,000,000
South Carolina	1,633,000	2,277,769	1,437,903	396,677	106,129	233,065	2,173,774							
South Dakota	220,000	473,000	60,300	100,000	203,400	97,300	461,000							
Tennessee	500,000	950,000	195,000	145,000	185,000	200,000	725,000							
Texas	800,000	2,000,000	300,000	305,000	320,000	300,000	1,225,000	1,000,000	3,000,000	497,100	347,900	397,800	414,200	1,657,000
Utah	755,000	2,340,000	364,000	200,000	100,000	583,000	1,247,000	1,974,000	2,141,000	440,000	250,000	120,000	1,293,000	2,103,000
Vermont	620,000	2,400,000	70,000	408,000	170,000	347,800	995,800							
Virginia	682,000	1,499,000	294,000	263,000	234,000	252,000	1,043,000	2,582,000	2,582,000	264,000	309,000	271,000	1,738,000	2,582,000
Washington	97,000	1,763,000	263,000	113,000	133,000	166,000	675,000	787,000	5,458,000	1,081,000	353,000	241,000	987,000	2,662,000
West Virginia	1,300,000	3,500,000	623,300	440,300	271,300	876,700	2,211,600							
Wisconsin	450,000	750,000	50,000	185,000	275,000	90,000	600,000	750,000	2,000,000	60,000	445,000	664,000	206,000	1,375,000
Wyoming	416,500	1,092,329	6,000	115,000	300,000	140,330	561,330							
District of Columbia	413,000	3,437,000	22,000	301,000	374,000	1,628,000	2,325,000	1,378,000	8,537,000	2,260,000	1,159,000	461,000	1,579,000	5,459,000
Hawaii														
Puerto Rico														
Averages	861,885	2,290,706	366,002	298,787	233,496	535,732	1,434,017	2,281,386	6,473,321	1,125,674	776,402	522,336	1,348,324	3,772,736

INTERSTATE SYSTEM—RURAL

[Reported by State highway departments]

State	2-lane construction							4-lane construction						
	Range in total cost per mile		Elements of cost for the average mile					Range in total cost per mile		Elements of cost for the average mile				
	Low 10 percent [1]	High 10 percent [2]	Right-of-way	Grading	Surface	Structures	Total	Low 10 percent [1]	High 10 percent [2]	Right-of-way	Grading	Surface	Structures	Total
Alabama	$145,000	$200,000	$35,000	$80,000	$45,000	$25,000	$185,000	$425,000	$750,000	$95,000	$225,000	$145,000	$60,000	$525,000
Arizona	85,000	195,000	6,000	69,000	25,000	25,000	125,000	135,000	300,000	8,000	142,000	50,000	50,000	250,000
Arkansas	186,000	207,000	25,000	40,000	73,000	63,000	201,000	345,000	385,000	25,000	80,000	146,000	123,000	374,000
California	126,000	357,000	31,000	107,000	106,000	32,000	276,000	276,000	1,806,000	81,000	225,000	320,000	47,000	673,000
Colorado	183,419	227,718	58,929	74,926	76,082		209,937	229,271	543,073	23,899	82,607	108,142	91,979	306,627
Connecticut	440,000	440,000		120,000	160,000	160,000	440,000	1,000,000	2,000,000	100,000	500,000	400,000	300,000	1,300,000
Delaware														
Florida								260,900	515,300	14,700	104,200	154,200	76,100	349,200
Georgia	180,000	600,000	30,000	110,000	75,000	65,000	280,000	300,000	1,025,000	30,000	210,000	150,000	110,000	500,000
Idaho	106,520	229,831	7,411	46,411	40,688	16,400	110,910	149,531	338,359	20,523	60,920	60,884	22,755	165,082
Illinois	225,000	447,000	83,000	73,000	96,000	18,000	270,000	328,000	772,000	83,000	95,000	193,000	37,000	408,000
Indiana	335,000	415,000	40,000	60,000	90,000	185,000	375,000	750,000	835,000	87,000	110,000	165,000	432,000	794,000
Iowa	161,500	545,750	60,000	55,000	60,000	12,540	187,540	310,000	936,500	60,000	90,000	132,000	94,250	376,250
Kansas	120,000	200,000	10,000	50,000	80,000	20,000	160,000	230,000	400,000	10,000	80,000	190,000	40,000	320,000
Kentucky	300,000	500,000	40,000	200,000	90,000	70,000	400,000	425,000	825,000	50,000	325,000	150,000	100,000	625,000
Louisiana	328,700	365,000	34,040	50,875	58,660	195,125	338,700	360,000	480,000	34,040	101,750	117,320	206,890	460,000
Maine	265,000	340,000	20,000	145,000	60,000	105,000	330,000	524,000	607,000	40,000	242,000	120,000	150,000	552,000
Maryland								670,000	1,794,000	75,000	76,000	389,000	463,000	1,003,000
Massachusetts								780,000	1,200,000	95,000	418,000	219,000	218,000	950,000
Michigan								650,000	1,800,000	100,000	170,000	140,000	546,000	956,000

[1] Approximate average for the 10 percent of the mileage which has the lowest cost per mile for overcoming critical deficiencies.

[2] Approximate average for the 10 percent of the mileage which has the highest cost per mile for overcoming critical deficiencies.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS—FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1954—SECTION 13 PROJECT—HIGHWAY NEEDS STUDY—Continued

Construction cost per mile for complete new facility—Continued

INTERSTATE SYSTEM—RURAL—continued

[Reported by State highway departments]

State	2-lane construction							4-lane construction						
	Range in total cost per mile		Elements of cost for the average mile					Range in total cost per mile		Elements of cost for the average mile				
	Low 10 percent [1]	High 10 percent [2]	Right-of-way	Grading	Surface	Structures	Total	Low 10 percent [1]	High 10 percent [2]	Right-of-way	Grading	Surface	Structures	Total
Minnesota	165,000	414,000	17,000	89,000	128,000	57,000	291,000	318,000	684,000	17,000	112,000	162,000	115,000	406,000
Mississippi	200,000	265,570	15,000	81,785	62,060	77,235	216,080	390,000	800,000	18,670	126,795	138,765	164,740	448,970
Missouri	265,000	465,000	80,000	101,000	129,000	55,000	365,000	450,000	650,000	120,000	155,000	192,000	83,000	550,000
Montana	55,000	120,000	7,700	35,000	37,000	17,500	97,200	120,000	240,000	7,700	70,000	74,000	33,800	185,500
Nebraska	80,000	160,000	4,500	30,500	63,000	12,000	110,000	190,000	400,000	9,500	66,500	123,000	39,000	238,000
Nevada	13,030	127,341	2,581	19,551	19,256	4,198	45,586	33,561	894,512	31,617	179,029	58,490	39,069	308,205
New Hampshire	186,000	400,000	30,000	120,000	45,000	83,000	278,000	250,000	500,000	30,000	150,000	70,000	110,000	360,000
New Jersey								1,000,000	2,000,000	110,000	350,000	370,000	770,000	1,600,000
New Mexico	93,616	156,625	3,131	45,607	39,539	40,112	128,389	255,834	412,834	13,274	94,959	102,613	104,326	315,172
New York	390,000	450,000	60,000	200,000	110,000	50,000	420,000	750,000	930,000	80,000	330,000	220,000	220,000	850,000
North Carolina	165,000	255,000	50,000	40,000	60,000	55,000	205,000	330,000	485,000	50,000	100,000	170,000	55,000	375,000
North Dakota	100,000	150,000	6,000	40,000	80,000	3,000	129,000	182,000	350,000	6,000	75,000	140,000	5,500	226,500
Ohio			36,606	114,127	86,500	64,936	304,169			90,810	213,990	193,000	148,400	646,200
Oklahoma	190,000	305,000	25,000	67,000	87,000	71,000	250,000	400,000	650,000	25,000	175,000	225,000	102,000	527,000
Oregon	150,000	330,000	30,000	85,000	70,000	45,000	230,000	320,000	550,000	40,000	155,000	140,000	85,000	420,000
Pennsylvania	216,000	346,000	32,000	106,000	87,000	35,000	260,000	508,000	1,010,000	95,000	256,000	246,000	110,000	707,000
Rhode Island								600,000	606,000	100,000	254,000	125,000	125,000	604,000
South Carolina	81,520	121,130	20,908	35,752	33,455	25,394	115,509	164,771	388,913	25,163	67,478	70,135	56,073	218,849
South Dakota	126,000	168,000	15,900	32,900	84,300	5,700	138,800	265,000	308,000	28,300	70,400	170,000	22,300	291,000
Tennessee	142,000	244,000	40,500	62,500	67,500	22,500	193,000	295,000	490,000	67,500	115,000	140,000	70,000	392,500
Texas	80,000	160,000	10,400	28,750	60,850	25,000	125,000	180,000	400,000	21,400	80,270	177,730	69,800	349,200
Utah	70,000	201,000	12,000	34,000	63,000	88,000	197,000	181,000	581,000	20,000	135,000	99,000	219,000	473,000
Vermont	300,000	390,000	24,000	204,000	87,000	21,000	336,000	635,000	690,000	24,000	416,000	179,000	58,000	677,000
Virginia	397,000	681,000	247,000	142,000	104,000	30,000	523,000	324,000	1,077,000	202,000	121,000	137,000	41,000	501,000
Washington	108,000	294,000	16,000	27,000	66,000	23,000	132,000	198,000	440,000	23,000	77,000	122,000	59,000	281,000
West Virginia								600,000	1,200,000	127,100	342,000	247,700	189,100	905,900
Wisconsin								350,000	500,000	30,000	195,000	135,000	65,000	425,000
Wyoming	209,450	273,972	2,176	58,941	150,000	6,529	217,646	416,500	450,441	4,435	125,750	300,000	13,305	443,490
District of Columbia														
Hawaii														
Puerto Rico														
Averages	183,415	309,130	33,442	79,016	75,766	50,241	236,320	388,138	760,869	52,120	169,056	167,595	134,902	523,673

[1] Approximate average for the 10 percent of the mileage which has the lowest cost per mile for overcoming critical deficiencies.

[2] Approximate average for the 10 percent of the mileage which has the highest cots per mile for overcoming critical deficiencies.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from South Dakota this question: What is the total amount involved in the road program which is about to be considered by the Senate of the United States?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the 13-year authorization for the Interstate System contemplates approximately $24,700,000,000.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Where did the Senator get the information on which he based the various items of statistics which he presented to the Senate a moment ago?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The tables giving breakdowns of the unit costs of rights-of-way, grading, structures, surfacing, and so forth, are tables supplied by Commissioner Curtiss, of the Bureau of Public Roads. They were assembled in response to the directive in section 13 of the Highway Act of 1954. The tables as submitted carry with them the identification of the tables.

One table compares the apportionment of the interstate highway fund as between the bill as it passed the House of Representatives and the bill as reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works, which was computed for me by a staff member of the Committee on Public Works. I think he took the figures from the table in the House report for the House portion, and from the table he computed for the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Committee on Public Works, for the Senate column.

There is one other table which gives a breakdown of the cost per mile by States. This is a table which was prepared by the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. The Senate owes a sincere vote of thanks to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for assembling this very important information. Having been a member of the Committee on Public Works since I became a Member of the Senate, I think the tables he has furnished are accurate and of great value to this legislative body.

I hope all Senators, before the road bill is called up in the Senate, will have an opportunity to go over these figures, because it is very important that they be considered before the vote on this important measure.

Mr. President, this is probably the biggest project the United States has ever undertaken, outside of war. The matter of putting our roads in proper condition is of extreme importance from the standpoint of national defense and the economic expansion of our country.

I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for submitting these figures. They will be of great help to us. I hope all Senators will carefully consider them.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the kind words spoken by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, who, as every Senator who has served on the Committee on Public Works knows, has a deep, well grounded interest in the subject of highway construction.

I hope Senators will avail themselves of the opportunity to examine these tables, because they contain a wealth of information which will be useful to them in considering the highway bill next week.

EXTENSION AND AMENDMENT OF LAWS RELATING TO THE PROVISION AND IMPROVEMENT OF HOUSING

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2022, Senate bill 3855.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3855) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, Calendar No. 1896, Senate bill 3108, to encourage the construction of modern Great Lakes bulk cargo vessels, be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is not in order, since Senate bill 3108 was displaced when the Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3855.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] his interpretation of the words beginning on line 20, page 9, of the bill, as follows:

> And (ii) with the approval of the Commissioner shall have determined that adequate housing is not available for such personnel at reasonable rentals within reasonable commuting distance of the installation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I interpret these words to mean that before mortgages can be insured, the Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, acting independently and in addition to the Secretary or his designee, shall have determined that adequate housing is not available for such personnel at reasonable rentals within reasonable commuting distance of the installation.

Mr. BEALL. I should like to ask the Senator his interpretation of the words, beginning on line 24 of page 9 of the bill, as follows:

> And that the mortgaged property will not, so far as can reasonably be foreseen, substantially curtail occupancy in existing housing covered by mortgages insured under this act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. At many of our military installations there are housing projects which have been located and built by authority of the act of Congress of August 5, 1946—title 10, United States Code, section 1270, page 977—and the act of Congress of August 8, 1949—Public Law 211, 81st Congress, chapter 403. The United States, by authority of these laws—Title VIII: Military Housing Insurance Law—have outstanding at the present time several hundred million dollars in insurance on mortgages on those projects. It is my interpretation of the words read that no new projects will be approved by the Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration which will compete with existing Government programed housing, except at places where the Commissioner finds that occupancy of existing houses will not, in his judgment, be substantially affected thereby, and that the Commissioner should fully realize his responsibility in this regard, and safeguard these existing insured outstanding mortgages.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I have but one more question.

What is the interpretation by the Senator from Arkansas of the words, beginning on line 14 of page 10 of the bill, as follows:

> The Commissioner shall report to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate and the House of Representatives each instance in which he has required the Secretary to guarantee the Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund, with reasons therefor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I interpret these words to mean that if the Commissioner, after thorough investigation, cannot agree as to the need for the additional housing then he is to prepare, in writing, a detailed report of what investigation he has caused to be made of the local situation at the subject installation, and what his findings are and also his conclusions, and his reasons therefor, and he shall cause to be delivered one copy of such report to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate and one copy of such report to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives which said reports shall be part of the public records and available to all interested parties.

Mr. BEALL. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

LUMBEE INDIANS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. LAIRD in the chair]. The concurrent resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 80) was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the action of the Speaker pro tempore of the House of Representatives and of the President of the Senate in signing the enrolled bill (H. R. 4656) relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina be, and it is hereby, rescinded, and that the engrossed bill be returned to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 80) was considered and agreed to.

SHORTAGE OF QUALIFIED SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, one of the most alarming conditions facing our country today is the shortage of qualified scientists and engineers, and the threat of even greater shortage in the years to come. As the world becomes increasingly geared to technology, the scientist assumes a role of ever-growing importance in the national and international field.

The disturbing truth is that the United States is not keeping pace with our potential enemy in recruiting and training young persons in the complex fields of science. If this Nation is to hold its place of world leadership and maintain its security, it is essential that we recruit and train more technical personnel.

A year ago, our colleges turned out 23,000 engineers, while Russia was turning out 53,000.

This year, in all sciences including engineering, the United States will graduate about 70,000, while Russia will turn out 120,000. During the critical decade from 1950 to 1960, Russia's total of trained scientists and engineers is expected to reach 1,200,000, compared with 900,000 for the United States.

Unless the trend is halted and reversed, the United States will fall far behind the Soviet Union in this critical field. The United States cannot afford to be second best in any vital sector involving national security. Our very survival is endangered in this creeping deterioration in our technological training program.

The trouble is rooted in the attitudes of our young people, who are too often disinterested in science. They turn elsewhere when choosing a career. Their apathy toward science is partially attributable to low teacher salaries and poor teaching conditions, which have established a scarcity of competent science teachers able to implant in young minds the necessary stimulus and the awareness of the challenge afforded in the technological fields.

But, fortunately for our country, there are leaders in some cities and communities who are stirring public awareness of the gravity of the problem.

Only last month in Tampa, Fla., an example of this awareness was exhibited. One of America's great newspapers, the Tampa Morning Tribune, took the lead in sponsoring the Hillsborough County School Science Fair, designed to stimulate interest in science and thus eventually help overcome the Nation's critical shortage of scientists and engineers.

From the results already apparent, the fair was a huge success. More than 50,000 visitors, including 10,000 school pupils, toured the fair to inspect the handiwork and ingenuity of youngsters from the Tampa area during the 2½ days of exhibition.

The keen interest demonstrated by these young people in the field of science is a healthy portent for the future safety of America's world leadership in technology. The exhibits ran the gamut from simple demonstrations in nature to complicated machines, illustrating chemistry, physics, and electronics laws and principles. All the displays were constructed by students under the supervision of science teachers.

The grand-prize winner was Robert Kriska, a 17-year-old Brandon High School senior from Seffner, Hillsborough County, Fla., who produced the winning exhibit, a gasoline engine. Many of us who are many years Robert's senior know how difficult it is even to keep a gasoline engine running at times, let alone conceive and construct one from scratch.

Robert, the son of Mr. and Mrs. John Kriska, of Seffner, said this engine is the first he ever built, although he has constructed "cannons and some other things." He said he built the engine after innumerable taunts from classmates who said he could not do it. Robert was sure he could, and he did.

Robert's gasoline engine also won first place in the physics section of the fair. It received close competition from the second-place winner, a demonstration of an electrical discharge through a

vacuum—the principle on which television works—prepared by Charles Negin, of Jefferson High School, in Tampa.

Third place in the physics section went to Carl Lineberger for his demonstration of the transmission of sound by a beam of light. In his experiment, Carl operated a radio with a beam from a flashlight.

More than 100 exhibits and displays were entered in competition in the Senior High School Division of the fair. In addition, junior high schools and elementary schools from all sections of Tampa and Hillsborough County entered another 100 exhibits or displays, covering the fields of botany, geology, biology, chemistry, physics, mathematics, conservation, and nature study. The entire fair testified to a keenness of mind seldom credited to elementary and high school pupils.

Rounding out the fair were exhibits by the University of Florida, the Air Force, the Army, Peninsular Telephone Co., and Tampa Electric Co., all of them pointing to the world's application of the scientific principles demonstrated in the pupils' exhibits.

I personally feel great pride in the success of the Science Fair. In keeping with the scientific theme, the fair was opened in an unusual way, in which I had the honor to participate. At Jacksonville, I pressed a button which set in motion electronic machinery opening the door to the fair in Tampa hundreds of miles away.

Plans already are underway for a second Science Fair next year. Robert J. Matthews, science teacher at Hillsborough High School and president of the County Science Council, reported:

> We feel that the fair has fulfilled its purpose—to stimulate interest in science on all levels—and the Science Council is planning a bigger and better fair for next year.

Many persons should be congratulated for their hard work and hours of effort in making the Science Fair a success. A few of these are Mr. J. C. Council, president and publisher of the Tampa Tribune; Mr. V. M. Newton, Jr., managing editor; Mr. J. Crockett Farnell, Hillsborough County school superintendent; Mr. Carl D. Brorein, Sr., president of the Peninsular Telephone Co.; Col. Frank P. Bender, director of operations for the 6th Air Division at MacDill Air Force Base; Mr. G. R. Griffin, chairman of the Florida State Fair's committee on grounds and buildings; and Mr. Clyde Shaffer, staff writer for the Tribune.

Congratulations are also due members of the school section committee, headed by Mrs. Mildred Reed, Phil Rosete, and Miss Ruby Johns. Members were Robert L. Matthews, Mrs. Margie Richardson, Mrs. Nina McLaughlin, Bernard Pritchett, Miss Eva Davis, and Mrs. Ruby Littlefield, all associated with the Hillsborough County school system.

If the Science Fair kindled the spark of interest in only one additional young heart to pursue a career of science, then it has fulfilled a worthy purpose and will result in a stronger and a greater future America.

All free Americans will agree that the answer to our present dilemma of the disappearing scientist definitely does not lie in the Russian method of forced selection and forced study. Rather, the answer for America lies in our traditional freedom of choice, whereby every young American selects his own career and his own way of life.

The Hillsborough County School Science Fair, and others like it throughout the country, will help to provide the solution of one of America's most alarming problems. We in Congress should assist and encourage projects such as this throughout the United States. In this way a great contribution can be made in the interest of our national security and welfare. Every possible encouragement and assistance to our youth is vital to the future of America.

ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 24, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 23 (legislative day of May 7), 1956:

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

Russell A. Stuart, of Virginia, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 23, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Edward J. Hanrahan, S. J., professor of philosophy, Graduate School, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, we acknowledge in Thee the sole source of rightful authority, the fountain whence alone flow the waters of salutary wisdom, and the one sun which diffuses the light of true justice. No creature can exercise legitimate authority, none can be truly wise or promote the cause of justice, unless it be given him by Thee to share in these prerogatives, reflecting in his own life the power, the wisdom, and the justice which are Thine. Look favorably, we pray Thee, upon the Speaker pro tempore of this legislative body and upon every one of its Members. Thou hast invested them with Thine own authority to make laws for the governance of their fellow citizens, Thy children. Do Thou also illumine their understanding with the light of that wisdom which reaches mightily from end to end, disposing all things sweetly. Let the rectitude of Thy holy will be made manifest in their deliberations and enactments. Thus helped by Thee, may they, as Thy vicegerents in our regard, procure for us our common welfare, a suitable sufficiency of the means of living, and substantial peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 11177. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. MUNDT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

AGRICULTURAL BILL OF 1956

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 10875) to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. MCCORMACK]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2197)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10875) to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 5, 11, 36, 46, and 48.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 50, and 51 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 8, line 10, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "April 15" and insert in lieu thereof "May 1"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"STUDY OF PRICE TRENDS FOR FOREST PRODUCTS

"SEC. 402. The Secretary of Agriculture shall make a study of price trends and relationships for basic forest products such as sawlogs and pulpwood and within one year

from the date of enactment of this Act shall submit a report thereon to the Congress."

And the Senate agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
GEORGE M. GRANT,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
EDWARD J. THYE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10875) to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The Senate made 51 amendments to the House bill. Of these, two-thirds were merely clarifying or technical in nature and were generally accepted by the committee of conference. Following are the substantive differences between the bill passed by the House and that agreed to by the conferees and reported herewith.

THE SOIL BANK PROGRAM

Deleted from the bill are two provisions relating to the soil bank which were written into the bill on the House floor: The Albert amendment requiring the Secretary to establish an acreage reserve program for grazing lands and the McIntire amendment requiring the establishment of an acreage reserve program for "other field crops." Also deleted is the provision requiring the Secretary to establish an acreage reserve program for grains and the extensive program worked out by the House committee for establishing a base acreage for feed grains and encouraging, by means of incentive price supports, a reduction of at least 15 percent in the production of feed grains. The total annual authorization for the acreage reserve program was reduced from $800 million to $750 million in conformity with the elimination of the programs just referred to.

In connection with the elimination of the feed grain part of the acreage reserve program, the House conferees agreed to the elimination of this provision chiefly because of a showing that data with respect to feed grain acreage and production on individual farms is not as available as data with respect to other crops included in the acreage reserve and that, therefore, it would have been difficult, if not impossible, at this late date, to set up an adequate acreage reserve program for feed grains for 1956. The action was taken, however, with the assurance that if the experience gained in operation of the soil bank during the coming year should appear to make it more practicable to establish an acreage reserve program for feed grains effective in 1957 or 1958, sympathetic consideration will be given to such legislation at both ends of the Capitol.

No other changes of consequence were made in the soil bank portion of the bill. A Senate amendment emphasizing that the grazing of conservation reserve land is a violation of contract appears merely to underline similar provisions already in both the acreage reserve and the conservation reserve portions of the bill.

A major provision, dealing with the start of the soil bank program was resolved in favor of the House bill. The House bill directed that the soil bank be started with 1956 crops. The Senate bill directed only that the Secretary start the program with the 1956 crop "to the extent he deems practicable." This language, together with the known position of the Secretary of Agriculture on this matter, led to the general assumption that under the Senate provision there would be no serious effort to get the soil bank program under way for 1956 crops.

The conferees accepted the House language with respect to this matter, agreeing to make the soil bank effective immediately, as provided in the House bill. It was recognized, however, that the larger part of this year's plantings have already taken place and it is not expected that any large part of the crop planted will be plowed up or otherwise removed from production as authorized by section 103. The committee recognizes that the Secretary cannot be expected to accomplish the impracticable or to secure any large part of the beneficial results hoped for the soil bank in 1956, but it also recognizes that certain farmers have heretofore planned to participate this year and it is felt that they should be assured of the opportunity to do so.

PRODUCTION ON GOVERNMENT OWNED LANDS

As reported from the Committee on Agriculture, this section (sec. 125) directed the President to restrict insofar as practicable the leasing of government lands for the production of price supported crops in surplus supply. It was amended on the House floor to apply to "agricultural commodities" instead of "price supported crops" and the Senate amendment, adopted by the conferees, returns to the original language of the House committee. The Senate also added an amendment making it clear that the section should not prevent programs designed to provide food for water fowl on wildlife refuges, and similar activities.

EXPORT SALES PROGRAM FOR COTTON

The conferees have accepted Senate amendment No. 26, adding section 203 to the bill. This section directs the CCC to use its existing powers and authorities to encourage the exportation of cotton by offering to make it available at prices based on sales under the so-called million-bale program (announced August 12, 1955), and even lower if necessary, in order to be competitive with foreign countries exporting cotton in substantial quantities. The principal difference in the program required by this provision as contrasted with the million-bale program and the program now in effect (announced on February 28, 1956) will be in the price level at which bids are accepted.

This provision directs that such quantities of cotton be offered and sold as will reestablish and maintain the fair historical share of the world market for United States cotton, the quantity to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary has indicated that he considers 5 million bales to be the fair historical share based on the present level of world trade in cotton. This committee believes this to be reasonable in view of the history of United States exports.

It is hoped that the Secretary can regain the historical American share of the world market without unnecessarily lowering the level of world prices for cotton, and it is not intended that he shall be required to drastically reduce the price of cotton far below the level of prices received at the sale announced August 12, 1955. On the other hand, it is intended that he shall have ample authority to reduce prices to whatever level he finds necessary to accomplish this result.

ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS FOR COTTON FOR 1957 AND 1958

Section 302 of the House bill provided that the national acreage allotment for cotton should not be smaller in 1957 and 1958 than it is for 1956. Amendment No. 37 of the Senate provides additionally that the State allotment for any State in 1957 and 1958 shall not be reduced more than 1 percent per year. Additional acreage allotment received by States for 1957 and 1958 under this section shall not be taken into account in establishing future State acreage allotments. In determining 1957 and 1958 State history of cotton plantings for purposes of future State allotments such acreage history could not exceed the State acreage allotment for such years less the acreage received by the State under sections 302 and 303 (a).

LOANS ON SPOTTED COTTON

In considering the cotton provisions of the bill, the committee discussed the matter of loans on spotted cotton. It is aware that the CCC has refused in the past to reflect in its loan programs the normal trade differential between light and heavy spotted cotton, although the Secretary has complete authority to establish such differentials in the loan program. The committee has proposed no legislation on this matter because it assumes that the CCC will exercise its existing authority in future cotton loan programs and establish a proper differential between light and heavy spotted cotton. It is the desire and intent of the committee that this be done.

MINIMUM ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS FOR RICE

Section 304 of the House bill provided that the State acreage allotments for rice for 1956 should not be less than 85 percent of the final State allotment for 1955. Amendment No. 44 of the Senate provides that the national acreage allotments of rice for 1957 and 1958 shall not be less than the final national allotment for 1956 and shall be apportioned among the States in the same manner as the 1956 final allotment.

PRICE SUPPORTS FOR FEED GRAINS

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 308 (b)) making an increased level of price support available to feed-grain producers in return for a 15-percent reduction in feed-grain acreage. The conference has accepted the Senate amendment which strikes out the House provision and substitutes a subsection containing the following provisions:

(A) Support of the 1956 crop of grain sorghums, barley, rye and oats at 76 percent of parity as of May 1;

(B) Support (in any year in which base acreages are applicable for corn) for corn in the noncommercial area at 82½ percent of the level applicable in the commercial area; and

(C) Support for the 1957 crop of grain sorghums, barley, rye, oats, and corn outside the commercial area at not less than 70 percent of parity as of the beginning of the marketing year, if price support is made available to corn producers not complying with acreage and soil bank participation requirements. Support for feed grains would not be dependent in either 1956 or 1957 upon compliance with acreage or soil bank participation requirements, or upon whether there is an acreage reserve program for corn.

WHEAT

The conferees eliminated from the bill two major amendments of the Senate—amendment No. 36 authorizing the sale of not to exceed 100 million bushels of wheat annually for feeding purposes and amendment No. 48 authorizing production without regard to quota of wheat to be used by the producer on his farm for feed or seed.

FOREST PRODUCTS; PRICE REPORTING; RESEARCH

The conferees accepted Senate amendment No. 49 with an amendment which eliminates from the section everything relating to price reporting and research and preserves only subsection (d) of the Senate amendment requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to make a study of price trends and relationships for basic forest products and submit a report thereon within 1 year from the date of enactment of this act.

CERTIFICATE PROGRAM FOR RICE

The conferees accepted the Senate amendment providing a certificate program for rice (amendment No. 50, title V of the conference bill). This program is identical with that which was included in the final version of H. Res. 12 except that inauguration of the program is discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture and will not be put into effect unless he "determines and proclaims that the initiation of a program under this subtitle is administratively feasible and in the best interests of rice producers in the United States." Included in this amendment is a new definition of "normal yield" for rice which is also identical with a similar provision in H. Res. 12.

PRICE SUPPORT FOR COTTONSEED AND SOYBEANS

The conferees accepted a provision (amendment No. 51), identical with a similar provision in H. Res. 12, which will require that whenever the price of either cottonseed of soybeans is supported, the price of the other shall be supported at a level which will cause them to compete on equal terms in the market.

TRANSITIONAL PARITY

The conferees accepted a provision (sec. 602) which will freeze "transitional parity" for the basic commodities for 1957. This will mean that the parity price of corn, wheat, and peanuts (the only three basic commodities currently affected by the transitional parity formula) will be 5 percent higher in 1957 than they would otherwise have been. The amendment also requires the Secretary of Agriculture to "make a thorough study of possible methods of improving the parity formula" and to report to Congress thereon not later than January 31, 1957, and include drafts of any legislation needed to carry out his recommendations.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
GEORGE M. GRANT,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the second best farm bill that we have before us this year, as some have described it, it is probably the third or fourth best farm bill that we have before us, but it is still probably the best farm bill that has any chance of becoming law, and for that reason your conferees bring you this report.

We recommend that you adopt the report. I am not going to dwell upon all the provisions of the bill although I will hope to outline them to you. Suffice it to say that the House and later the other body expressed our preference for a firm 90 percent of parity support for those farmers who were cooperating by reducing their acreage of supported crops. The President has, however, firmly indicated that he would not under any circumstances approve a bill so firming up supports.

He did, however, go part way to meet our views in that respect. After the Congress had approved the 90-percent supports which he vetoed, he then agreed that his 75-percent support level was too low and raised the entire level of supports from 50 percent of the amount in dispute in the case of cotton to more than 75 percent of the difference in the case of commercial corn. That is, he increased the announced or expected supports on all basic commodities so as to at least approach the levels fixed by Congress. The farmers of the United States have this Congress to thank for that action. It was not taken, and it never would have been taken, had we not passed H. R. 12 and laid it on the President's desk.

I think the President's actions in connection with this farm-price problem show a complete failure to understand the purpose of the program. I believe this same lack of understanding is quite widespread even after years of discussion of the problem. I think this misunderstanding can probably be best illustrated by some of the provisions of this very report that we have before us. But, before going into some of the details, let me point out first just what we did.

The first agreement in the conference was to accept the House provisions as to the effective date of the bill. You will recall that when we discussed this bill on the floor of the House some 3 weeks ago, there was general agreement that we wanted to make the soil bank go into effect without delay. I think I am fair in saying that agreement knew no party line; that we were all agreed it should be effective immediately. When the bill reached the other body, they decided not to require the Secretary to put the bill into effect until next year and to leave to the Secretary the right to put it into effect in 1956 only when, where, if, and as he pleased. In a letter to the Senator from Vermont, Senator AIKEN, Secretary Benson indicated he probably would not put it into effect over most of the country.

Our first effort in the conference was to sustain the House position and I am glad to report that the position of the House was sustained and that we bring you a conference report which places this bill in effect the day the President signs it. That means that for all crops it is in effect this year. I recognize that for a large portion of the United States including the area where I live, most of our crops have long since been planted. I recognize that in most of the United States farmers will find it will be impossible or impractical to proceed with the soil bank at the level at which we had hoped it might be used this year. But that very fact—the fact that only a small percentage of the farmers of America will be able to use this soil bank this year—should make it possible for the Department of Agriculture to make it effective and available to those who do want to use it without delay.

I recognize that the RECORD shows a long letter inserted yesterday by the Secretary of Agriculture explaining how difficult it will be for him to put the soil bank into effect immediately; but the very arguments to the effect that a large part of the farmers of America cannot use the program this year means there will not be a large caseload burden on the Department and it should make it possible for the Department to help these farmers who are able to put land into the soil bank. So I hope there will be no excuses offered for not getting the program into effect promptly. The law says—that is if the President signs the bill it will be the law and it will say—that it is to go into effect this year, and it means in effect for everybody in the United States, including those farmers who for unfortunate reasons of adverse weather were unable to plant or to get their crops up. This bill, in plain words, says that such farmers shall have the right to put their land into the soil bank "whether or not planted to the production of the 1956 crop" if the crop is destroyed or, in the words of the President, if it is "incorporated into the soil." It includes those farmers who have a poor stand, those who do not have a good crop up now. They can take part of that land and put it in the soil bank. It is so intended, and the bill so states in plain words. Probably the number of farmers who will desire to take advantage of those provisions is not large, but the opportunity is clearly provided by the bill. In the drought areas this may be important.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to congratulate the House conferees for succeeding in holding this position which was taken by the House in conference. Only yesterday I received a telegram from a well-known and experienced farmer in the southern part of my district in which he stated that if the soil bank could be assured by June 10 that he was quite confident there would be large numbers of farmers in our section of the country who would take advantage of it in the case of peanuts.

Mr. POAGE. I am sure there are, as most of the peanuts of the country are yet to be planted.

Mr. EDMONDSON. And I certainly want to express my appreciation to the conferees for their part in making this possible.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma. I do however have a question I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas. The gentleman made reference to farmers who did not have a good stand due to weather conditions and other circumstances being able to put a portion of that land into the soil bank this year.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. AVERY. How about the farmer who has not planted within his allotment? I understand he has until June 1 to qualify on his allotment, but suppose he does not come under his allotment, will he be able to come under the allotment reserve of the soil bank?

Mr. POAGE. I would think that he clearly could. I know of nothing in here that would keep him from coming into adjustment even after his plow-up date.

Mr. AVERY. Assume for the sake of the argument that he was not in compliance on June 1.

Mr. POAGE. He does not have to be in compliance. As I understand it, he can come into the soil bank, although

he must be in compliance before he can be paid.

Mr. AVERY. He could come in for full benefits even though he is not under his allotment?

Mr. POAGE. He can come in; but before he is paid he must incorporate his excess acreage into the soil.

Mr. AVERY. And then be treated on the same basis as though he were in compliance in the first place?

Mr. POAGE. Yes; I am sure that is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If the gentleman will yield, was it not the opinion of the conferees that a farmer could put any of his tillable land into the soil bank?

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly right. I think I can explain the point that is troubling the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I am just asking for information, not to be argumentative, but I think we ought to clear this up.

Mr. POAGE. I hope we have cleared it up. I think it is clear that before a farmer can be paid he must be complying with his acreage allotment, but I think it is equally clear that he can come into the soil bank and then come into compliance before he is paid.

Now there are some other places where our efforts at compromise were not so successful. In the case of supports on feed grain and corn and the requirements in connection therewith, the other body insisted on some provisions which I think illustrate very clearly the point I was trying to make a moment ago. There are a great many people who seem not to understand the philosophy of our whole farm program. On feed grains and on corn this House originally included in H. R. 12, the bill which we sent to the President, a proviso that if you were to get the benefits of soil bank payments on corn or on feed grains you would have to make a reduction in your acreage. In the case of corn it would be any of your tillable acreage. In the case of feed grain it had to be acres from your feed grain base. But you had to cut down your productive acres in order to get the benefits of the House bill. I think that was a very sound and salutary provision. It has always been my opinion that we should support farm commodities at substantially high prices and at firm figures. I have supported the 90 percent program. I think it is sound. But we have always connected with such supports the requirement that the individual who got that 90 percent had to contribute to the reduction of any unwanted surplus. I think that has been a good provision, I think it has been a fair trade for the farmer and for society.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, that has been a sound provision. But we have now abandoned that provision. The House did not abandon it, but after the bill H. R. 12 was vetoed the President then abandoned it and offered to growers of corn in the commercial corn area support on every acre of corn they could grow, on every bushel they could produce, without regard to their acreage allotment, without regard to marketing quotas. He said, "Grow all the corn you can and we will give you $1.25 a bushel for it."

Obviously there was nothing this House could do about that, because the President has the right of veto and he has the right under the flexible program that some of you established here 3 years ago, to fix supports at anywhere between 75 and 90 percent of parity and he did fix them between those two figures. We have no veto over that. But that changed the philosophy of the farm program and said, in effect, that we encourage overproduction.

So when this bill got to the Senate that body struck out these feed-grain provisions which we had retained. We had in effect said, "If you are going to get any support on your feed grain, you have got to come into the soil bank and reduce your acreage by at least 15 percent so we will not have so much of this unneeded feed." That is what our bill provided.

The Senate took that out and said, "We do not want to require of those feed-grain growers any kind of a reduction program." Do you know that one-fourth of all the tillable land in the United States is in feed grain? Frankly, I did not realize that until yesterday when the Department of Agriculture told us that 1 acre out of every 4 of tillable land in the United States is devoted to feed grain, far more than there is in commercial corn, far more than there is in wheat, far more than there is in cotton and peanuts combined. One acre out of every four is in feed grain. Yet they offered no program for this great acreage. I think that is a tragic mistake.

When the Senate took the program away from the feed-grain growers they said, and I think fairly, "If we are going to support corn at $1.25 a bushel, even though it is produced in excess of the farmer's allotment, we must, in fairness to the man who grows barley, to the man who grows oats, to the man who grows sorghum, or rye, or corn in the noncommercial areas, say to him that he will get the same kind of support.

So the other body said to the feed-grain producers: "We will give you a support of 76 percent of parity on all the feed grain you can produce, there is no limit."

There were, I believe, 71 Members of the other body who voted for that proviso and not more than possibly some 13 against it. I hope you Members will understand the difficulty of the situation which confronted your conferees. So we cannot come back and as we would like to, claim that we brought you a victory on this item. But I do point out that in this instance we have a clear example of a failure on the part of people who should know better to understand why we have support programs. We are not offering support programs simply for the purpose of providing direct farm income, although that is important. Those of us who believe in adequate fixed supports are offering support programs with the idea of using that payment as a means of balancing our production and our markets, but this Senate provision on food grains, this Presidential idea of supporting unlimited production of corn at attractive prices certainly is far from carrying out that program.

Now, I know that immediately there are those who feel that we should have cheap chicken feed. But I want to call your attention to the basic relation between the price of feed and the price of livestock. There are those who have made the argument—and I think in all sincerity and in all fairness—that we should not support the price of feed grains when we are not supporting the price of cattle and hogs, because they feel we would thereby aggravate the problems of the livestock grower.

My colleagues, ever since I was a small boy I have been closely associated with the cattle business. I have owned some cattle, I think, every day of my life since I was 5 or 6 years old, just a few, but I still am in the cattle business, even if it is in a very small way. I do not remember a single time in the last 50 years when the price of cattle has recovered from a slump while we had large quantities of cheap feed available. Large quantities of cheap feed always keep the price of livestock low. Cheap corn makes cheap hogs and cheap hogs make cheap cattle, and you cannot escape it. If you would seek to bring about a recovery from the disastrous prices which now face the livestock people of America, you are going to have to do something about reducing these vast surpluses of cheap feed, because they are breaking the back of the livestock industry.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I want to ask the gentleman about feed grains. The gentleman from Texas and I differ on the question of flexible and rigid supports. This is a factual question, however. It is estimated that the bill before us, before it went to conference, would have cost the dairy farmers of New York particularly in additional feed prices about $32 million. I assume this bill would be better for them, but I wonder if the gentleman could give me an estimate, if the other bill would have cost $32 million, what this one would cost over the present existing situation.

Mr. POAGE. In the first place, I cannot accept the gentleman's assumption that either bill would cost the dairy farmers of New York State, although, of course, I am not trying to say what is going to happen in your State. But, it does happen that I have been supporting a dairy for several years, or at least I have been paying half of the deficit that it ran, and we buy our feed. But, I do not want widespread cheap feed. Selfishly I do not want it. It destroys the price of dairy products just as it destroys the price of livestock. I want a fair price for feed, although I buy feed. I want to have to pay a fair price for feed.

Now, and I assume the dairy feed bill in New York State is not in large part determined by the price of feed grains, because I am sure he is not fattening those dairy cattle, but he is probably buying a good deal of soybean and cottonseed meal the price of which is not

affected by this bill one iota, one way or the other.

Mr. KEATING. I differ with the gentleman, and I do not want to engage in an argument. What I am trying to find out is, assuming that the other bill would have cost $32 million, how much better is this bill than that bill as far as the price of feed grains is concerned.

Mr. POAGE. I do not know. I cannot assume the things that he assumes. I feel that it is better for the dairyman, the cowman, and the hogman to all pay a fair price for feed.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I want to say this in the beginning, that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], is one of the greatest champions that the American farmer has ever had. History will show that, and it will show it especially in the fight this year for a sound farm bill. I represent a district that grows a tremendous amount of feed grain. The people in my district are not satisfied with what we get out of this bill. We do not think it is fair. I am going to vote for this bill simply because we hope that we can get a little bit of relief for the stricken farmers of that area. The gentleman from Texas, [Mr. POAGE], has told you what is going to happen insofar as the livestock markets are concerned in connection with this feed grain matter. I think history will prove that he is right. But I want to say this to the gentleman from Texas, that the people of my district are deeply grateful for the tremendous fight that he has put up in their behalf and I want to say that they want him to stay in our corner so that we can continue this fight in years to come.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is entirely correct in what he said in response to the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]. It is impossible to answer such a question because, in the first place, the assumption of the gentleman from New York, in my opinion, and I believe in the opinion of the gentleman from Texas, is fallacious.

Mr. POAGE. Yes; I think so.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Because, after all, this is a sectional fight as far as cheap feed is concerned. We might as well recognize that. From the Midwest 23 of the 25 Republican Congressmen and 10 of the 11 Republican United States Senators voted for H. R. 12. Why did we vote for that bill? Because we recognized that it was in the interests of our Midwest States to have a fair price on our feed grains. On the other hand, all 64 Republican Congressmen from the New England area voted against the bill. This argument is simply sectional or geographic, and we might as well recognize it. I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is absolutely correct when he says that if we knock the price of feed grains down, everybody is going to suffer—especially the livestock farmers whose commodity prices will follow the feed-grain prices down as they always do. I commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] for his understanding of this problem. Throughout his many years of distinguished service in the Congress he has demonstrated at all times an awareness of the problems of agriculture and has been eminently fair in his approach to solutions. He has never permitted sectionalism to influence his judgment or his actions.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I want to agree with the gentleman. I think cheap feed means cheap cattle, and so forth. I wanted to ask this question. Is 76 percent parity on feed grains or 84 percent on wheat or corn considered to be cheap feed?

Mr. POAGE. I think it is going to result in cheap feed. I do not think that those figures themselves will offer very much cheap feed. But this thing is going to result this way, if I may be pardoned for saying this. During the month of October these supports are going to be very helpful, because everybody is going to find storage for his grain. Therefore he will be able to get the loans the bill promises. On the 6th day of November everybody is going to be happy. But on the 7th day of November, if we have had a good corn crop, somebody is going to haul a load of corn from Knox County, Ill., into Galesburg, probably, and he is going to be told that there is no storage. So he is going to sell that corn for $1.15. And by Thanksgiving other farmers are going to be selling corn for $1, and by Christmas it is likely to be down to 85 cents. That is going to be cheap feed.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I turn to section 125 in which it is stated that—

> The President shall, with respect to farmlands now or hereafter owned by the Federal Government, restrict insofar as practicable the leasing of such lands for the production of price-supported crops.

In my area we have thousands of acres of land that were taken by condemnation or under threat of condemnation for flood control. Incident to the taking of the land for condemnation or under the threat of condemnation, it was agreed by the Government that these landowners who were pushed off the land would have the right to lease these lands back. It is essential to the economy of those landowners.

I have talked to a number of Members of the House and the Senate on the Committee on Agriculture, and it was their understanding that that prohibition, where it says "insofar as practicable" would not be taken as any directive to prevent the use of those lands in connection with present operations, where it was a part of the oral agreement and understanding when the land was taken by the Government.

Mr. POAGE. I understand the gentleman's question. I am familiar with his problem, and I can say that it and similar situations caused us to use this language. I think the sole intention in inserting the words "insofar as practicable" was to give the Secretary the needed authority to deal fairly with these very people and with others similarly situated. We did not consider it "practical" to break these existing arrangements, and it is for the purpose of allowing exactly that discretion to which the gentleman refers that this language was used.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman, because this is completely different from the Government's owning something and then renting it out for agriculture. It is a case of taking it away from the farmer; and, incidentally, they cover these privileges, which certainly should be carried on.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I am at a loss to follow the gentleman a little bit about this 90-cent corn and 85-cent corn which he said we out in the commercial corn-growing area are going to have to pay for corn next year. Under the regulations set forth the other day, I thought if I went into the program I could get $1.50 a bushel for corn, and if not in the program $1.25 for corn. Now we are going to 85 cents.

Mr. POAGE. You can get the higher supports as long as the storage lasts. I expect there will be plenty of approved storage prior to November 6. After the 6th day of November storage will be hard to find. I am sure the gentleman will find storage if he harvests his corn in October, but if he waits until the last days of November he probably will not find storage.

Mr. ARENDS. I am going to store it myself.

Mr. POAGE. That is fine, if you have storage, but there are lots of farmers who do not have it.

Mr. ARENDS. Tell them the difference between $1.25 and 85 cents, and they will look for storage.

Mr. POAGE. Certainly they will. But many have looked before without success in years of large crops. The farmer who has the wealth to provide his own storage is all right. The one who does not have the ability to provide any storage is going to find himself in bad shape in November.

The gentleman from Mississippi raises a question to which I want to call attention in connection with another provision of this bill. This bill contains what is known as the Eastland amendment. That was one of the most discussed amendments, and probably aroused more widespread interest than any other amendment in the bill. The Eastland amendment attempts, and is intended, to require the Secretary of Agriculture to sell American cotton competitively on the world markets. With the desirability of that course I think I could safely say 98 percent of the Members of this House agree. I frankly do not know of anybody who does not agree with it. I agree with it.

The Secretary has always had that authority. There has never been a day that the present Secretary has not enjoyed that authority, but he has not exercised it. We suggested to him in the past that he exercise the authority he has, but he did not do so. Finally, on August 12, 1955, the Secretary announced that he would sell cotton some 5 or 6 months hence at fire-sale rates, but that during the normally large exporting months of the fall American cotton would not be sold at world prices. No sales were made until in January 1956. At that time most of the foreign cotton had moved. In January the Secretary sold 1 million bales of American cotton without any trouble, and sold it at from 25.5 cents up to a little over 28 cents.

I think this showed rather conclusively that the world market will take American cotton if you make it competitive, but in order to get the Secretary to use his authority to sell cotton competitively, it seems necessary to direct him to do so. This amendment directs him, tells him that he must sell it competitively, and sell enough of it that he can recapture the American share of the world market, which we all agree is about 5 million bales. But we recognize that when you tell the Secretary he must continue to sell as low as anybody in the world will sell, you are doing a very dangerous thing, you are getting down to a point where somebody can bring some cotton on the market at 15 cents or 12 cents or 10 cents and that will set the world price. Obviously no one wants to do that. I am sure no Member of the Senate wanted to do that. We were assured in the conference that that was not the desire. We believe that some of this surplus cotton will sell, that it should sell, and we instructed the Secretary to sell it. Then we wrote into the statement of the managers the statement that the Secretary is not expected to have to sell this cotton so low as to disrupt world trade, or that "it is not intended that he shall be required to drastically reduce the price of cotton far below the level of prices received at the sale announced August 12, 1955." This means the Secretary must sell the cotton low enough to put it on the world market. But, if some isolated country comes along and offers cotton for 13 cents, we do not intend that the United States would have to lower the world price to 13 cents in order to meet that.

But, to make sure that the State Department does not get the Secretary to use that statement as a means of denying the maintenance of the American market, we go on and say in this same report that he retains the authority to meet any competition anywhere where he sees that it is necessary to meet it. Frankly, the language is ambiguous. We wrote it intending it to be ambiguous. No man knows what "drastically reducing" the price is. You do not know, and I do not know, and neither does Secretary Benson. But, we do know that if you are dropping the price of cotton 2 cents or 3 cents to meet world competition that it is not "drastic," but on the other hand we know that if you drop it 15 cents it is "drastic." All I want is to be sure that the Secretary is retaining our share of the world market without destroying that market. It would hardly be worth while to recapture the whole market at a dime a pound. While there are those who fear that under this provision the Secretary may economically murder some cottongrowers in some other countries—in spite of the State Department—we want to be sure that he does not force American growers to commit suicide while he is engaging in removing the possible threat from overseas. This is an amendment which should not have been necessary. It would not have been here had the Secretary been willing to use the authority he has always possessed. It is reported that it was pressure from the State Department through the White House which has made the Secretary so reluctant to act.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Due to the limitation of time, I would like to ask the gentleman a few questions.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman let me finish please and I will yield the gentleman some time for himself.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. But I would like to hear it from the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the 5 minutes I have reserved for the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. This conference report, and I was a member of the conference committee, contains the soil bank proposed by the President, as agreed to in the conference committee on H. R. 12 and it is on a voluntary basis.

Mr. POAGE. That is right, it is voluntary.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And it goes into effect in 1956.

Mr. POAGE. That is right. It goes into effect as soon as signed.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The other features of the bill to which the gentleman has directed himself are mainly outside of the soil bank idea.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What I wanted to bring out clearly is that the soil bank proposal which is contained in this bill is the President's plan and it will go into effect in 1956 on a voluntary basis.

Mr. POAGE. The only question I might raise as to the interpretation placed by my distinguished colleague is that no man knows what the President's plan for the soil bank was. At least I don't know of anyone who knows. The President talked about a soil bank but he never sent us a plan, and I do not believe that anybody can say that he did, unless it is that orphan sent up by the Secretary of Agriculture which our chairman, Mr. COOLEY, spoke about. That proposal is still running around over there in our committee room without anybody claiming it and without anybody putting a name on it. Unless it be that orphan that would be the only plan and the only suggestion that could be called the President's, would it not?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I referred in my original question to the soil bank plan which was agreed to in conference on H. R. 12 and it was and is acceptable to the President.

Mr. POAGE. I hope it is acceptable to the President. He vetoed it once and I do not know whether he will veto it again or not. I hope not.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It is also the same soil bank plan that the administration turned down last year or about 6 months ago; is it not?

Mr. POAGE. Yes; it is the same basic plan.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It is the plan which was introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. POAGE. Yes; it was offered by the gentlemen from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and by several Members here. I do not think anybody can claim to be the parent of this plan. Maybe next fall nobody will want to claim it—I do not know.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The plan the gentleman from Mississippi referred to was introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL]. Now that plan was turned down by the Secretary of Agriculture and not by the President; is that not correct?

Mr. POAGE. I do not think the Secretary of Agriculture turned it down without the consent of the President of the United States.

If you repudiate the President's plan you repudiate the plan of the Department of Agriculture for the President had never sent us any other than the plan he sent through the Secretary. You can either accept the Secretary as the spokesman of the President or you can repudiate him, but you cannot accept him when you want to and then say he is not the President's spokesman when it does not suit you.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I have heard the distinguished and able gentleman from Texas plead the cause of the small farmer very eloquently at times here on the floor of the House and I am wondering if the gentleman can tell me why the conferees knocked out amendment 48 authorizing production without regard to the wheat to be used by the producer on his farm for feed or seed.

Mr. POAGE. Yes; I think I can tell you, and I think the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] told you 2 weeks ago more forcefully than I can tell you.

Mr. GAVIN. You answer it. Then you can give the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] an opportunity.

Mr. POAGE. Yes, I am glad to answer, but I cannot yield further. I am answering, not yielding further. I am answering now, and the reason for it is that it destroys the wheat program. That is the reason.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. If the gentleman from Texas will explain one thing to me I think it would relieve a lot of anxiety on the part of the cotton merchants of the country. As I understand, the Eastland amendment directs the Secretary of Agriculture to maintain and extend the sale of cotton in foreign markets.

Mr. POAGE. I think it does. I tried to explain that a minute ago. I think it does exactly that.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. The responsibility is on the Secretary to work out a practical program?

Mr. POAGE. I think it places the responsibility right where it has always been—on the Secretary of Agriculture—but it says he "must" sell—not simply that he "may."

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. He can either sell through the foreign markets or other means, but it is the intent of Congress that through the provisions of this bill he will restore our traditional foreign markets, without causing a disasterous downward spiral in world cotton prices. Is that correct?

Mr. POAGE. That is the intent of the amendment, and the statement of the managers is intended to prevent this very downward spiral to which you refer. Unless the Secretary uses the utmost discretion, this program could get out of hand and destroy our cotton market, as well as the foreign market.

Two more items of great importance.

This report retains or freezes the present national cotton allotments as a minimum for 1957 and 1958. That means there will be no cut on a national basis. No State can be cut more than 1 percent of its State allotment each year. This is important to all cotton farmers.

The report also freezes for 1957 the present transitional parity price for corn, wheat, and peanuts. This means that the producers of these three products will enjoy substantially higher parity next year than otherwise.

In fairness to producer and consumer alike, it directs a study of the whole definition of parity with a view to trying to get agreement on one formula which can be universally accepted as fair and reasonable.

The Senate has already accepted this report. I believe the President will sign this bill if you will but send it to him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has consumed 35 minutes.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, throughout my long service in the House I have consistently supported sound, progressive farm legislation. The district which I have the honor to represent is a diversified farm area, producing the usual grains, dairy products, fruits, and vegetables. During the past few years I have been greatly concerned about farm commodity surpluses which have naturally brought about a reduced price for the products which the farmer sells. This, combined with the fact that costs for equipment, supplies, and so forth, which he buys have increased has placed the farmer in an unfavorable economic position. As I see it this situation had its beginning in our wartime economy and was not adjusted when the transfer from wartime to peacetime was made.

The present administration under the able leadership of President Eisenhower has urged legislation designed to solve these farm problems. Today we have before the House the final draft of some of the major proposals he has recommended in the form of a conference report. I have studied it carefully and feel that it is good legislation and am supporting it, wholeheartedly. I feel sure that when this program is enacted into law and put in operation the plight of the farmer will be improved and the economy of our country will be improved.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] be allowed to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, this conference report which expresses unanimous agreement between House and Senate conferees brings to an end, for a time at least, the controversy that has been taking place with reference as to what shall be our farm policy.

There can be no doubt of the fact that our prosperity as a Nation depends upon prosperity of the farm as well as of industry. There is much truth in the old saying, "We all go up or we all go down together." Too often there are individuals who think and act on the theory that prosperity in either one or the other activity is sufficient to give full national prosperity. Nothing could be further from truth, and, no greater mistake could be made than to favor one and ignore the other. Our policies must be based on the theory that there must be mutuality of prosperity. Consequently, we cannot ignore either agriculture or industry in our planning for a prosperous America. The greatest care must be observed to make certain that what we do with good intent for the advancement of one will not result in an unintended harm to the other. Thus, it is necessary to maintain a balance as between the two that will work to the advantage of each without harm to the other. To accomplish this has made the consideration of farm legislation one of the most controversial and difficult of solution that has faced the Congress for many years. Of course, added to the usual difficulties of providing a farm policy that will be helpful to the farmer, and not detrimental to the worker in industry, has been the complexities growing out of a national election.

The usual and natural difficulties in determining what is fair and just to all segments of our people in determining a farm policy is enhanced in an election year, particularly in a presidential-election year, because of the political significance attached to it. Both political parties examine all proposals from the standpoint of what will be the effect on the voters. This will, of course, differ in different portions of the Nation according to whether agriculture or industry predominates.

Thus, this year there was an insistence upon the part of some that the farm bill should favor the farmers of the Midwest, South and Southwest because of the importance of the vote in those sections in the coming national election. And, with much truth, illustrations were given that the loss of this vote could be disastrous to one or the other of the political parties, as evidenced by past results.

It is unfortunate that in considering this possibility that too often, and this year was no exception, the greatest consideration was given to the agriculture interest in the Midwest, South and Southwest, with practically no thought of the effect on the industrial East, nor the effect on the farmer of the East. In fact, it seemed that no consideration was given to the farm areas of the eastern portion of our country.

The Agriculture Committees of the House and Senate are predominantly from the West and South. They used their power and wrote a farm bill that would be helpful to them without regard to its adverse effect elsewhere.

The first farm bill as presented to the House was highly beneficial to the western farmer. It was evidently assumed by the Agriculture Committees of both House and Senate that they could go the limit in this respect without incurring a Presidential veto. They considered it as highly unlikely that President Eisenhower would veto the bill even though he might not be in favor of it as drawn. In other words, he would be so conscious of the detrimental effect a veto would have on the votes of the western farmers that he would not dare to veto it. But, they reckoned wrong. President Eisenhower did veto it and in a strong message told the Congress why he did so. He pointed out in detail what was wrong with the bill and the injustices it contained. When he vetoed the bill his opponents thought they had him in a hole from which he could not extricate himself, and that he had lost the support of western farmers in the coming election.

But he soon proved that this sort of reasoning was wrong. When the President explained the circumstances, the

farmers of the West showed in the primary elections subsequently held in their States that they would not be shaken in their allegiance to the President. In State after State they showed that they still were strongly back of his candidacy. All of this brings out two very important points that give a feeling of gratification because they demonstrate that our country is safe when citizens are willing, first, to overlook personal interest and think in terms of our country's good; and, second, admire that type of politcal courage evidenced by President Eisenhower in vetoing a bill he thought was wrong without regard to the detrimental effect it might have on his candidacy. That, in my opinion, is the kind of man to have as President, and the kind of citizenship that gives strength to our Nation.

Now, what is the result? The result is this conference report that brings to us a new bill without the objectionable features in the original bill to which the President objected, and that contains features and policies that are part of the President's plan, namely, and particularly, his soil-bank program. While it does not permit as full use this year as desired, yet, the fact remains the plan is adopted and will prove highly beneficial next year to the farmers who come within its provisions.

Thus, all of us, farmers as well as every other class, can give thanks that we have a President who has the courage to stand up for what he thinks is right, regardless of any danger to his political future.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] be allowed to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I intend, of course, to vote for the conference report which the other body has already approved. It offers the only means of enacting the soil bank into law, and that is an important objective.

Conference reports being based on the resolution of legislative differences between the House and Senate, they invariably involve compromises of one kind or another. This report is no exception. I feel, personally, that the degree to which we have yielded on the feed grain provision is unduly harsh on my section of the country, but we do want the soil bank and this seems to be one of the prices we have to pay for that program.

In voting for this conference report, I am not receding at all in my position that supports at 90 percent of parity on the basic storable commodities would be in the best interests of the Nation. Neither am I conceding that this bill in its present form is entirely acceptable to me. It is not, but I recognize that it is the best we can do under the circumstances and so I am constrained to go along with it.

It has been established by the record and confirmed by those responsible for this legislation that the soil bank had its origin in the Congress at my hands. Had it not been for a legislative stratagem on the part of the majority leadership in the House of Representatives the other week when this very bill started on its way to final approval, a similar bill bearing my name would be before us today. In recognition of my authorship of the original soil-bank proposal, the minority leadership had selected my bill as the administration measure and was prepared to press for its enactment.

As I have said, this bill is far from perfect and falls short of what I had hoped we would finally enact. However, it is a beginning in an important venture which offers much hope to our agricultural economy and we can perfect the basic legislation in the next Congress after we have gained some valuable and necessary experience.

This soil-bank proposal has had an interesting history. Like the pilot watershed program, it actually had its legislative origin in my Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture.

The following is quoted from the hearings on the Agriculture appropriations for 1957:

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to make this comment: I think the gentleman from Minnesota deserves to have this statement made in the record:

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN] was chairman of this subcommittee for several years, and while he was chairman, and upon the initiative of the subcommittee under his chairmanship, the watershed program was started. That program has spread and now has general acceptance and is supported by an overwhelming majority of the whole Congress, and I think of the whole country. Not only that, but the soil-bank idea insofar as I know was first brought to the forefront in the Congress in a bill introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. ANDERSEN, and he was joined in that legislation by his colleague on my right, Mr. MARSHALL.

There has never been any better friend of agriculture than CARL ANDERSEN in many, many ways, and in many, many fields, but insofar as these two particular things are concerned, he was out in the forefront ahead of any other Member of the Congress, and I think it only fair that the record should show that.

I am most appreciative of those remarks by the chairman of my Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], who has followed closely the development of this legislation and has demonstrated his usual sense of responsibility and fairness in the statement just quoted.

Many references have been made to the fact that I first urged the Secretary of Agriculture early in 1954 to give serious consideration to the soil-bank idea. Much has been made of his reluctance to give the idea such consideration, but I think that is all beside the point today.

We again discussed the soil bank on May 1, 1956, when the Secretary appeared before my subcommittee, and he confirmed the fact that I had been the first Member of Congress to ever discuss the soil bank idea with him—even before any bills had been introduced on the subject. On page 1550 of those hearings, you will find the following statement by the Secretary relative to my references to the soil bank:

Secretary BENSON. However, I do not recall having heard any Member of Congress mention the soil bank or soil fertility bank idea before I heard you mention it. I think that was the first official mention I had heard of it from a Member of the Congress, as I recall it.

I am proud, and I believe justifiably so, in the contributions I have made to agriculture in general and to conservation in particular in almost 18 years as a Member of the Congress. As my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has said, two of the most significant measures—the pilot watershed program and now the soil bank—grew out of my efforts. We have seen the pilot program and later the general watershed program prove both their popularity and value in actual practice. It is my most fervent hope that the bill we approve today will mark the beginning of an extensive soil bank program that will prove equally beneficial to American agriculture.

Aside from the relatively minor deficiencies in the soil bank bill itself, Mr. Speaker, my only regret is that we will not see this great conservation and production-balancing program accompanied by a companion measure restoring price supports on the basics at 90 percent of parity. Half a loaf is better than none, and we will take the half a loaf here today.

President Eisenhower has encouraged us greatly by the recognition he has given our cause in his action raising the price supports on corn, for example, to 86.2 percent of parity. After all, we are only 3.8 percentage points apart and he has completely punctured the arguments against our stand. We may hope, at least, that our fortunes have passed their ebb and we now begin the march toward our goal of equality of treatment for the farm families of the Nation.

With good administration and prompt action by the Congress to correct defects as they become apparent, the soil bank will do much to help achieve the balance between production and consumption we seek for agriculture. Once we have achieved that essential balance, I confidently predict that we will have heard the last of these deplorable arguments over price support levels under farm produced commodities. We can then turn our efforts to the fundamental purposes of all price support programs—the orderly marketing of our abundance and the prevention through the loan mechanism of price drops at harvest time below parity.

In good faith, I shall vote for adoption of the conference report. In equally good faith, I remind you that it is far from perfect and we shall persist in our efforts to correct its defects and to enact other sorely needed legislation to bring agriculture to its rightful position where it will enjoy a fair share of our otherwise booming economy. We ask no more than a fair share, but we do insist on that.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the importance and great value of the efforts of some of our colleagues to develop a sound agricultural program in this session of Congress.

Obviously, if any legislation is to become law during this session, compromise of conflicting opinions is essential. No one has done more toward the objective of a sound program than the ranking member of the House committee and of the conferees, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]. I regret very much that he is leaving this House at the end of this year but I am certain that he will continue his keen interest in this vital field of congressional responsibility and that he knows that the respect and admiration of his colleagues will continue in whatever he does.

Consequently, I regret that, out of justice to my constituents, my study of the conference report compels me to vote against it. I cannot outline my reasons in the limited time I have, and which I appreciate, but I have prepared a statement which I shall include with these brief comments in my extension in the RECORD.

I hope there will be a rollcall so that those who may not approve of the conference report will have at least that means of expressing their disapproval. If no one else asks for such a rollcall vote, I shall do so.

The full statement, to which I have referred, follows:

My study of this conference report leads me to the definite conclusion that I cannot support it.

However, I do want to say that in the process of legislation and in making the concessions which are inevitable if a law is to be enacted, most of the conferees have earned the appreciation of Members of this House and of their constituents.

In my judgment, it is regrettable that the conferees from this House could not have included at least one representative of a very important, but unrepresented, segment of agriculture, particularly in the northeastern part of the country, and who could have presented also the point of view of the consumers of this country. That segment of agriculture has benefited little from the agricultural legislation of recent years. Actually it has suffered because of such legislation and I believe it will be injured further by certain provisions in this pending conference report. I refer definitely to the provisions as to price support for feed grains. In my judgment, that will mean a higher, artificial price for feed grains. If so, it will injure all deficit feed areas, including specifically the Northeast.

I am convinced that if agricultural legislation continues to neglect or minimize this segment of agriculture and the consuming public, two very important portions of our population, and to emphasize primarily the interests of that portion of agriculture, which, willingly or unwillingly, has contributed to the overriding problem of unmanageable surpluses, a reaction will be inevitable, even though it may also be unfortunate.

I am certain that most of us recognize that agriculture occupies a vitally important part of our national economy and that, because of the nature of agricultural activities, some national policy and program in this field is most desirable. A complex and difficult problem is involved and both President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson have done their utmost to bring about a sound solution. While it may seem to be popular among certain groups and perhaps politically profitable in certain local areas to have opposed the President and Secretary Benson, it may well turn out to be both shortsighted and highly dangerous. Those who are content to represent and devote themselves solely to the interests of wheat, corn, cotton, rice, peanuts, grain sorghums, barley, rye, oats, and some few other agricultural products, may bring down upon their own heads the ultimate reluctant repeal of a large part of existing agricultural legislation. I am firmly convinced that members of the National Farm Bureau and of their State and local organizations not only recognize this possibility but have made a most significant contribution in an effort to develop a sound program. Some other groups have made some contributions toward this effort but, unfortunately, none of them have even approached the sincerity and vigor of the efforts of the Farm Bureau. A few have taken a most selfish and shortsighted position, which, in my opinion, is a clear disservice to agriculture, as a whole.

I believe that most of the conference report is a marked improvement, not only over the legislation which the President vetoed earlier but over both the House and Senate versions of H. R. 10875. It seems probable that the House this afternoon will join the other body in approving the conference report, and, if this is the case, its enactment into law, for the time being, may be necessary under all the circumstances.

However, because I am personally convinced that the conference report definitely neglects the legitimate interest of important segments of agriculture, particularly in the Northeast, and ignores almost completely the interests of the consumers and general taxpayers, I cannot join in supporting it. I hope there will be a rollcall so those who may not approve of the conference report will have a clear opportunity to express their dissent. In any event, I shall ask for such a rollcall, if no one else demands it.

I cannot conclude this explanation of my personal position without referring to two developments yesterday:

First, there was the bitter and thoroughly unjustified criticism of Secretary Benson. This was highlighted by the resort on the part of some of these critics to mutual admiration and self-congratulation, which was ludicrous, to say the least.

Second, there was the clear notice on the part of a few who have resisted tenaciously and consistently the efforts to make any improvement in agricultural legislation in recent years. It is all summed up in one sentence, as follows: "Although we lost this year, we will continue to fight another year." That declaration of purpose is clear notice that a few are quite willing to burden this Nation with an agricultural program which has been demonstrated as unsound, quite irrespective of the honest efforts by many others to develop a program which can be supported by reasonable and intelligent people, whether they are engaged in agriculture or not. I hope and believe that the good judgment of an overwhelming majority of the farmers of this country will lead them to continue their support of the President and Secretary Benson in their efforts to bring such a program into existence in the near future.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] asked a reasonable question as to how much additional this feed grain provision would cost the dairy farmers of New York State, referring to the estimate of $32 million annually made at the time the legislation, which was vetoed, was before us. I heard no one reply specifically to his question. But I doubt if anyone would deny that this provision in the conference report will impose upon the dairy farmers of New York State several additional millions of dollars each year as long as it prevails as law. It certainly will amount to much more than $32 million added costs annually for such farmers in the States of Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, all deficit feed areas, as is New York.

Beyond that will be millions of more dollars annually for all those who are engaged in poultry raising in New England, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania.

Frequently it is thought by some that agriculture in the Northeast is unimportant.

A few comparative statistics illustrate how fallacious such a conclusion is.

In 1952, the last date availble, there were 3,036,000 milk cows on farms in the Northeast.

At that time, there were 2,316,000 milk cows on farms in the 5 States of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida, or 720,000 fewer than those in the Northeast.

In 1954, the preliminary statistics showed 80,582,000 chickens on farms in the Northeast.

In that year, there were 60,533,000 chickens in the 14 States of Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Oklahoma.

It is not difficult to compare the benefits which have been paid under Federal law in years past in these States or to estimate those which would be paid there under the terms of this conference report.

I regret that there should be any feeling that objections to this report are not valid. But I do believe that those who cannot support it have a clear right to call attention to the inequities involved and to continue to urge that they be removed promptly from the national agricultural program.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has made an excellent presentation of the problem before us. The pending conference report on the farm bill is very inadequate and disappointing. By no means does the bill meet the needs of the American farmer, but this is in no sense a criticism of the House conferees. Of course, there is no time now for the discussion of details.

I fully realize that the House conferees have struggled hard and sought to get a measure that would meet the requirements of American agriculture. However, throughout this long controversy over farm legislation they have met with many obstacles, including a Presidential veto.

I have taken the floor to make particular reference and inquiry as to the feed grain provisions of the bill.

I recognize the difficulties confronting the conferees on the part of the House and I know they share the disappointment which many of the rest of us have in regard to the feed grain provision and in regard to some of the other provisions.

If I might have the attention of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] I would like to inquire as to what the prospects seem to be in regard to the possibility of securing a feed grain provision in the law during the next session? We had felt rather confident of something more permanent at this session. I realize this is speculative but I wonder if the attitude seems to be such that we might hope for some workable control program and a higher support level on feed grains in legislation in the future.

Mr. POAGE. I am afraid I cannot fully answer the gentleman's question. The only information I could probably give the gentleman is as to the attitude of members of the Committee on Agriculture. I think the attitude of the members of that committee would be to provide a feed grain program such as we have hereto approved on two previous occasions this session. I think we would probably approve similar legislation next session. I could not predict the attitude of the other body or the attitude of the public in general. The gentleman has as much information on that as I have. I can only speak for myself—I favor the type of feed grain program which the gentleman supports. I believe my committee feels the same way.

Mr. MAHON. One thing that concerns me and I think concerns the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is that under the feed grain provision the production could possibly be so great this year it would make it more difficult to have a satisfactory feed grain program in 1957.

Mr. POAGE. It is going to make it more difficult, yes, because we will have to start next year with a much larger surplus than we would have had had the House program been put into effect this year. Had it been in effect this year the difficulty next year would be less.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, when the agricultural bill was before the House several weeks ago we brought to the attention of the committee the wheat situation as it pertains to the small farmer, the little farmer, that was restricted to growing 15 acres of wheat even though it was for his own use on his own farm. If he grew more than 15 acres he was penalized. There were some 737 cases in Pennsylvania that were notified that they grew more wheat than permitted and would have to pay a penalty. Six hundred and seventy-five satisfied their penalty either by storage or by the payment of the penalty. There are 62 cases still unsettled, 47 of which are in hands of attorneys of the Department of Agriculture. I want to ask my friend from Texas a question. My very good and able friend is always weeping copious tears on behalf of the little farmer, the small farmer, and over here on my side also, I hear about the little farmer and the need for interest and help for the little farmer. The gentleman from Texas, in reply to a question asked a while ago as to why some relief was not given the little farmer on this matter said it would wreck the wheat program. But I notice here in the report that over in the upper body they did pass an amendment which would have corrected the injustice. It says here:

> Amendment No. 48, authorizing production without regard to quota of wheat to be used by the producer on his farm for feed or seed.

If this would wreck the wheat program why is it that the other House offered and passed the amendment? Evidently the House conferees in conference knocked it out. So my friends, why are you always crying about the need to help the small farmer? You had an opportunity to help the little farmer by the conferees accepting the amendment of the other body but you knocked it out, thereby protecting the big commercial farmer and compelling the little farmer to buy the production of the big commercial farmer to meet the requirements of his little farm.

Now, this amendment had some weight, and it was given every consideration over in the other body. Evidently the other body did not think it would wreck the program. You gentlemen in the House said several weeks ago that you were going to give some consideration to this matter, but when you had a chance to give it some consideration, you blocked it out.

Now, I would like to ask my friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], the ranking minority member of the Agriculture Committee, what he has to say as to reasons for taking out this Senate amendment, so that we have the thinking from the gentlemen on both sides of the aisle. In fact, I want to congratulate this coalition; you certainly look after your own sections. I hold no brief, mind you, for Republicans or Democrats. You have all had your noses in the trough on these subsidies and protective programs, and you like them, and there is no way to secure consideration for the little farmer as long as you are handling the agricultural legislation. I will be glad to have your answer.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I will say to the gentleman that the same rule applies to his farmers that applies to the Kansas farmers as far as wheat is concerned. They are entitled to an acreage allotment based upon their past acreage. If they have grown 100 acres of wheat on their farms in the past, their acreage allotment is based on that just as it is on the Kansas farm, or 50 or 10 or 5. But, in addition to that, we are giving the gentleman's farmers an additional bonus, because if they had never grown an acre of wheat on their farm before, at a time when all other farmers are restricted now, they can grow 15 acres of wheat without any restrictions whatever. So, the gentleman's farmers are being treated better than any other farmers in the country.

Mr. GAVIN. The little farmer says that is not enough wheat to use on his own farm. He wants to raise more to use on his own farm, not to sell in the commercial market but just for his own use on the farm, therefore, I argue that if he accepts no subsidies or gratuities, he does not want to be restricted or regimented as to what he may grow for his own use. If he had accepted subsidies or gratuities from the Government, it would be different. He owes the Government nothing. He just wants to raise enough on his own farm for his own use, and he cannot understand why you put a restriction on him and regulate him. I realize it would disturb the big commercial wheat producers in the West, because the little farmer is now compelled to buy his wheat if he needs it, and therefore you are not going to give him an additional 5 or 10 acres to grow enough wheat to use on his own farm. I think it is unfair. I think an injustice is being done to the small farmer. And why you do not give him an opportunity to prosper along with the big commercial farmer I cannot understand. So in view of the fact that you are always shedding tears about the little farmer and I hear it time and again: "We want to help the little farmer," but when you get a chance to help the little farmer, you certainly do not give him the consideration he is entitled to. He is a little farmer and he is brushed off just as you brushed off the Senate amendment which would have helped him. You tell him the Government will not permit you to grow more than 15 acres, and if you do, you are going to be penalized and you will have to pay the penalty. So, I say, here was a chance to help the little farmer but you turned him down. Somebody in the other body did not think it would wreck the program, because it was a good amendment, but the House conferees evidently said, "No, no. We cannot accept that." So you knocked it out. And, that is the reason I am calling it to your attention today, because I think you have not given the proper consideration to the amendment to which it was entitled. It is an inequitable situation for the little farmer who is just asking to grow enough wheat for his own family use and the matter should be corrected.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it would be right for this discussion to end without pointing out to the House that the original program that was submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture by the feed grain people was in keeping with what the President of the United States said he wanted; that is, to reduce surpluses without additional cost to the Government. The feed grain people offered to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the President of the United States a program, with a voluntary layout of 15 percent for which they received no pay whatever, from any soil bank or any other source. This was turned down by the Secretary of Agriculture or, let us say, he refused to recommend it. Then at our request, the Senate included us on that basis, but this was subsequently changed and we were included in the soil bank, in the acreage reserve. Then we were taken out again and then we were put back in and then the President vetoed us out.

We came back to the House and were included in the new bill. Then we were taken to the Senate and we got kicked again clear out of the bill. We finally got back in for just a small percentage of increase insofar as parity is concerned, which will be a little token this year, just a small token. We were told that there was no limitation on production and that this should help.

The entire proceedings have placed us in a rather difficult position to understand the thinking of this administration when they say they want to stop surpluses and we come in and say we are willing to stop surpluses with no cost to the taxpayer whatever. We are willing to lay this land out voluntarily. But the administration says we are not going to let you do that at all. We want you to plant and produce all you can, even though we know it might create a surplus and cause hardship in feed grain areas and ruin the possibility of a sound program next year.

It appears that someone is not being at all consistent.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, there is need for clarification of this section 125 of H. R. 10875 as changed in the conference. This section relates to the leasing of Government-owned farmland. It says:

> The President shall, with respect to farmlands now or hereafter owned by the Federal Government restrict insofar as practicable the leasing of such lands for the production of price-supported crops.

The words "agricultural commodities" were stricken. I should like to ask the gentleman from Texas why "agricultural commodities" was stricken.

Mr. POAGE. The reason for striking that out and inserting "price-supported" crops was that there was a feeling that if we left the wording as it was, it would be necessary to cancel all of the grazing leases in the West, because there is no question that livestock is in surplus at the present time. But we did not feel that this bill justified canceling all those grazing leases. That is primarily the reason for making the change, but the conferees clearly had no idea of considering wool as a "crop". Wool is indeed price supported, but we were thinking of "crops" as vegetable products—not livestock. Of course, as the provision now stands it means primarily the basic crops, but would include, as the gentleman from Texas has referred to it, grain sorghums, but it will not include livestock products, and it was not intended to do so.

Mr. DIXON. That is what I wanted to hear; it does not include grazing lands on which cattle, sheep, or dairy herds are sustained.

Mr. POAGE. That is the reason for making the change.

Mr. DIXON. Seventy-two percent of our State is Government owned. If more than two-thirds of our State had been wiped out of production for grazing livestock it would have done irreparable harm. I express appreciation of the action of the conferees in making this beneficial change.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute to explain that part of the statement of the managers, which makes reference to what we call spotted cotton. There is nothing to be found in the bill, as agreed on, which directly relates to spotted cotton. The reason for that is that the conferees, after considering it, felt that there was no necessity for putting such a provision in the bill because the Secretary now has adequate authority to make loans on spotted cotton and on the same basis of discounts as those on which the trade buys this type of cotton. It was the intent of the conferees that the Secretary should make loans on the same basis and with the same price differentials between white and spotted cotton as are recognized by the trade. But we felt it was unnecessary to give the Secretary new authority—he has the authority now. On the contrary, we felt that if we called this authority to his attention, and pointed out that we wanted him to use that authority that he would do so without compelling the Congress to write further directive legislation like we were forced to do in the Eastland amendment.

We have made this clear in the statement on the part of the managers in connection with this conference report just as we had previously done in the similar report on H. R. 12. Further, the chairman of our committee made the position perfectly clear on the floor of this House when this bill was before us for consideration.

The Department has in the past reduced its loans on "lights pots" just as much as it has on "heavy spots." This has resulted in unwarranted losses to cotton growers. We expect this practice to be corrected in keeping with the statement of the managers which was agreed to by all of the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has struggled with this farm legislation for a good many months now. We are approaching final action apparently with what I hope will be approval of this conference report which is before us today.

I have asked for this time in order that I might make an inquiry of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], the ranking Republican member of the conference committee, with respect to corn acreage allotments. I recall that in a previous bill which was before us, the acreage allotted for corn was increased from 43 million to 51 million acres. I would like to ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] if that presently is in the conference report.

Mr. HOPE. That provision is in the conference report; that is, it is in the bill. It was not disturbed by the Senate. It is still in this bill and not affected in any way.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Does that acreage allotment apply to all of 1956?

Mr. HOPE. It does apply to 1956.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, referring to page 4 of the report, relating to the export sales program for cotton, as I read it that gives the Secretary of Agriculture the power to dump cotton on the world market. Dumping cotton on the world market is a violation of our reciprocal trade agreements. How can he dump it if we are violating our own agreements?

Mr. POAGE. I am sure the Secretary of Agriculture will not violate any of the agreements of the United States, but I think if the gentleman will read my remarks in the RECORD tomorrow, he will find that I discussed that very matter for about 20 minutes. I believe it will give him full understanding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked a question in regard to the grazing of cattle on lands that belong to the Federal Government. That would apply to sheep as well as cattle, would it not?

Mr. POAGE. Yes; sheep, goats, or jackasses, or any other animals.

Mr. HILL. It also applies to your type of sheep in Texas that produce mohair?

Mr. POAGE. Goats, yes; it applies to them, too.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under date of April 11 the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contained my impression of the farm bill which I characterized as Christmas tree legislation with something hung on it here and there for about every segment of agriculture. Relief for the northeast dairy industry, however, was conspicuous by its absence and the same held true for our fruit and poultry industries.

I sometimes suspect that first impressions of this nature will bear further scrutiny, but in this case my judgment was vindicated by the President's veto of the measure.

On May 3 another farm bill came before the House, practically without notice and certainly without an opportunity for the various farm organizations to examine or comment upon it. Again, the basic commodities seemed to be pretty well provided for with a total disregard for milk, fruit, and poultry. Once more I voted against the proposal under the impression that it was no improvement upon the first attempt.

On even date we have the resulting conference report before the House and I note with considerable interest that the two proposals from the Senate which might tend to give the northeastern farmer a little relief, have been eliminated: First, the sale of 100 million bushels of surplus wheat for low-priced live stock feed; and, second, the growing of wheat to be used on the farm without penalty.

This action on the part of the conferees removes any doubt as to the desirability of the bill and I can claim consistency at least in voting against the conference report.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 305, nays 59, not voting 69, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

YEAS—305

Abbitt	Bonner	Dawson, Ill.
Abernethy	Bow	Dawson, Utah
Addonizio	Boykin	Dempsey
Albert	Boyle	Denton
Alexander	Bray	Devereux
Alger	Brooks, La.	Dies
Allen, Calif.	Brooks, Tex.	Dingell
Allen, Ill.	Brown, Ga.	Dixon
Andersen, H. Carl	Brown, Ohio	Dollinger
	Brownson	Dolliver
Andresen, August H.	Broyhill	Dondero
	Buckley	Dorn, S. C.
Andrews	Budge	Dowdy
Anfuso	Burdick	Edmondson
Arends	Burleson	Elliott
Ashley	Burnside	Ellsworth
Ashmore	Byrnes, Wis.	Evins
Aspinall	Cannon	Fallon
Auchincloss	Carnahan	Feighan
Avery	Carrigg	Fenton
Ayres	Cederberg	Fernandez
Baker	Celler	Fisher
Baldwin	Chase	Flynt
Bass, Tenn.	Chelf	Flood
Bates	Chenoweth	Forand
Baumhart	Chiperfield	Ford
Beamer	Christopher	Forrester
Belcher	Church	Fountain
Bennett, Fla.	Clark	Frazier
Bennett, Mich.	Clevenger	Friedel
Bentley	Colmer	Fulton
Betts	Coon	Gathings
Blatnik	Cooper	Gentry
Blitch	Cramer	George
Boggs	Cunningham	Gordon
Boland	Curtis, Mo.	Grant
Bolling	Davis, Ga.	Gray
Bolton, Francis P.	Davis, Tenn.	Green, Oreg.
	Davis, Wis.	Griffiths
Gross	McConnell	Rogers, Colo.
Hagen	McCormack	Rogers, Mass.
Hale	McCulloch	Rogers, Tex.
Halleck	McDonough	Rooney
Harden	McDowell	Roosevelt
Hardy	McGregor	Rutherford
Harris	McIntire	Sadlak
Harrison, Nebr.	McMillan	Schenck
Harrison, Va.	McVey	Schwengel
Harvey	Machrowicz	Scott
Hays, Ark.	Mack, Ill.	Scrivner
Hays, Ohio	Madden	Seely-Brown
Hayworth	Magnuson	Selden
Healey	Mahon	Sheehan
Henderson	Marshall	Short
Hiestand	Martin	Siler
Hill	Mason	Simpson, Ill.
Hillings	Matthews	Simpson, Pa.
Hinshaw	Meader	Sisk
Hoeven	Metcalf	Smith, Kans.
Holland	Miller, Md.	Smith, Miss.
Holmes	Miller, Nebr.	Smith, Va.
Holtzman	Mills	Smith, Wis.
Hope	Minshall	Spence
Horan	Mollohan	Springer
Hosmer	Morgan	Staggers
Huddleston	Moss	Sullivan
Hull	Moulder	Talle
Hyde	Multer	Thomas
Ikard	Murray, Ill.	Thompson, La.
Jackson	Murray, Tenn.	Thompson, N. J.
Jarman	Natcher	Thompson, Tex.
Jennings	Nicholson	Thomson, Wyo.
Jensen	Norblad	Tollefson
Johansen	Norrell	Trimble
Johnson, Wis.	O'Brien, Ill.	Tuck
Jonas	O'Hara, Ill.	Tumulty
Jones, Ala.	O'Konski	Vanik
Jones, Mo.	O'Neill	Van Pelt
Jones, N. C.	Pelly	Van Zandt
Judd	Pfost	Vorys
Karsten	Pilcher	Vursell
Kearns	Poage	Walter
Kee	Poff	Weaver
Kelley, Pa.	Polk	Westland
Keogh	Powell	Whitten
Kilday	Preston	Wickersham
Kilgore	Price	Widnall
King, Calif.	Prouty	Wier
Kirwan	Quigley	Wigglesworth
Klein	Rabaut	Williams, Miss.
Kluczynski	Rains	Williams, N. J.
Knox	Reece, Tenn.	Willis
Knutson	Rees, Kans.	Wilson, Ind.
Krueger	Reuss	Withrow
Laird	Rhodes, Ariz.	Wolcott
Landrum	Rhodes, Pa.	Wolverton
Lanham	Richards	Wright
Lankford	Riley	Yates
LeCompte	Rivers	Young
Lesinski	Roberts	Younger
Lipscomb	Robeson, Va.	Zablocki
Long	Robsion, Ky.	Zelenko
Lovre	Rodino	

NAYS—59

Bass, N. H.	Hand	Patterson
Becker	Hébert	Philbin
Bosch	Herlong	Phillips
Bush	Heselton	Pillion
Canfield	Hess	Radwan
Cole	James	Ray
Corbett	Kean	Reed, N. Y.
Coudert	Kearney	Riehlman
Cretella	Keating	Rogers, Fla.
Crumpacker	Kelly, N. Y.	St. George
Curtis, Mass.	Kilburn	Saylor
Dague	King, Pa.	Taber
Delaney	Latham	Taylor
Derounian	Macdonald	Teague, Calif.
Donohue	Merrow	Udall
Dorn, N. Y.	Miller, N. Y.	Utt
Fino	Morano	Wainwright
Fogarty	O'Brien, N. Y.	Wharton
Gary	Osmers	Williams, N. Y.
Gavin	Ostertag	

NOT VOTING—69

Adair	Davidson	Green, Pa.
Bailey	Deane	Gregory
Barden	Diggs	Gubser
Barrett	Dodd	Gwinn
Bell	Donovan	Haley
Berry	Doyle	Hoffman, Ill.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Durham	Hoffman, Mich.
	Eberharter	Holifield
Bowler	Engle	Holt
Byrd	Fascell	Jenkins
Byrne, Pa.	Fjare	Johnson, Calif.
Carlyle	Frelinghuysen	Lane
Chatham	Gamble	McCarthy
Chudoff	Garmatz	Mack, Wash.
Cooley	Granahan	Mailliard
Miller, Calif.	Scherer	Thompson, Mich.
Morrison	Scudder	Thornberry
Mumma	Shelley	Velde
Nelson	Sheppard	Vinson
O'Hara, Minn.	Shuford	Watts
Passman	Sieminski	Winstead
Patman	Sikes	Wilson, Calif.
Perkins	Steed	
Priest	Teague, Tex.	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs.

General pairs:

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Jenkins.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Johnson of California.
Mr. Deane with Mr. Wilson of California.
Mr. Shuford with Mr. Velde.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Scudder.
Mr. Carlyle with Mr. Fjare.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Mack of Washington.
Mr. Haley with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Holt.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Donovan with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Priest with Mr. Mumma.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Winstead with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Engle with Mrs. Thompson of Michigan.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Scherer.
Mr. Byrd with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Berry.

Mr. PATTERSON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be granted until midnight, Friday, May 25, 1956, to file a report on the legislative appropriation bill for 1957.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1957

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 11177) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year 1957, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WHITTEN, MARSHALL, DEANE, NATCHER, CANNON, H. CARL ANDERSEN, HORAN, VURSELL, and TABER.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 511) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That WILLIAM C. CRAMER, of Florida, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Standing Committee of the House of Representatives on the Judiciary.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE CITADEL, CHARLESTON, S. C.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 261) authorizing the Secretary of the Army to make such transfers of supplies and equipment as may be available to The Citadel, Charleston, S. C., with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out the preamble.

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert: "That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to donate to The Citadel, the Military College of South Carolina, such ordnance field pieces (tanks and guns) used in World War II or during the Korean conflict and captured enemy materiel as are available and determined by him to be appropriate for use by that college for memorial purposes."

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to donate surplus supplies and equipment for memorial purposes to The Citadel, Charleston, S. C."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. ARENDS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Louisiana if this was not a unanimous report from our committee originally?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It is unanimous.

Mr. ARENDS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE WILLIAM PRICE ELMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow that I announce to the House the passing of one of Missouri's truly great men, William Price Elmer, of Salem, Mo. Death overtook Mr. Elmer on May 11, 1956, and ended the life of Salem's oldest lawyer and one of Dent County's most prominent citizens for more than half a century. Mr. Elmer is a former Member of the House of Representatives and my immediate predecessor. He served the Eighth District of Missouri and the Nation with capable distinction in the 78th Congress.

Greatness in a man, as in a mountain, sometimes requires distance to be seen properly. This, however, was not the case with Bill Elmer. He was one of those rare individuals whose talents and many accomplishments were recognized and highly respected while he was living. Following is an editorial from Bill Elmer's hometown newspaper, the Salem Post, which adequately expressed the deep feeling of loss that pervades the Salem community since he has departed from their midst:

Dent County this week mourns the loss of William Price Elmer, probably the best-known resident of the county as a result of his long political activity and leadership in the Republican Party. Bill Elmer was known to hundreds of Missourians from the Bootheel to the Iowa line as a result of his services in the State legislature, in Congress, and in countless political campaigns.

A man of strong convictions, no one ever had to wonder where W. P. Elmer stood on any matter of public interest. He loved to talk and to express his opinions. Those opinions he backed to the limit. He expected others to fight for their beliefs and a political argument to him was no cause for the disturbance of a personal friendship. The result was that he listed among his friends as many Democrats as Republicans, although he was a stanch Republican and never ceased to fight for his party. * * *

The county has lost a leader in the death of W. P. Elmer. The country has lost a booster and a friend.

I have a very high personal regard for Mr. Elmer. He and I were both seeking election when I first came to Congress. He campaigned hard as he did everything he undertook. Yet everything was above board. The race was so close that a count of the absentee vote was necessary to determine the outcome. No personal attacks were ever injected and Mr. Elmer was the first to extend congratulations and sincerely offer me any possible help in adjusting to the new job.

I came to Washington a few weeks ahead of the opening of the 79th Congress. The office space to which I was assigned was not available since the previous Congress was still in session. Mr. Elmer invited me to share his office. I shall always remember and appreciate this pleasant and helpful association with him.

I join his family and friends in pleasant memories, and extend condolences in their irrepairable loss.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, recently while delivering some commencement addresses in Missouri, I learned of the death of our good friend and former colleague, Hon. William Price Elmer.

Though Mr. Elmer had been ill for several weeks and was 85 years of age, he died very suddenly while having dinner with his family in Salem, Mo. He had lived a long, useful, and fruitful life, but we are never quite prepared to give up those who are near and dear to us.

Bill Elmer was a colorful—and at times a controversial figure. He was colorful because of his versatility and interests in so many human activities, and was controversial because he never hesitated to take a firm and definite stand on any public issue.

Mr. Elmer was admitted to the practice of law before I was born, and tried many important cases in our State. He was admired and respected by members of the bar whether he aided or opposed them. Never did Bill Elmer stultify his conscience, prostitute his mind, or degrade his soul by compromising with principle. Always he was frank and outspoken and no one could doubt as to where he stood on burning questions or controversial issues. Even his opponents respected him for his honest convictions to which he adamantly adhered.

There have been few men in the history of Missouri who possessed more civic pride or public spirit than Bill Elmer. He served not only on the Salem School Board, but was a member of the board of curators of the University of Missouri. He advertised "Salem in Dent County" wherever he went, and loved the people in his home town and county. They also loved him.

He took particular interest in his hometown chamber of commerce and appreciated his membership in that little organization as much or more than he did in the State legislature or the United States Congress.

Mr. Elmer served 6 terms in the Missouri legislature and was author of many important bills. He was a strong backer of State highways and was the author of old-age pensions in Missouri. When a Member of this House, he served faithfully and diligently and never hesitated for one moment to express his opinion or cast his vote on any public issue. He was a staunch Republican—and while loyal to his party and fearless in defending it, he was always courteous to those who disagreed with him.

Members of this body will remember him, but thousands of Missourians all over our great State will forever cherish his memory. He was a loyal Baptist and a true Mason, and gave of his time, effort, and money to the public weal.

He was the father of 9 children, and knew human nature—and because of his human qualities and understanding he knew and loved people, and they will forever remain grateful for his many good and kindly deeds.

I merely want to join his myriad friends in this brief, inadequate, but sincere tribute to a great and good man whom I was privileged to count among my friends.

May God rest the soul of William Price Elmer and may His richest blessings rest upon his family and loved ones to carry on unto the perfect day.

SHOWING OF FILM OF TRIP THROUGH AFRICA

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I sent out little words of invitation to all to come over to the Library of Congress this afternoon at 4:30. To any of you who are interested in seeing the film I made in Africa in a trip of 99 days south and east of the Sahara, may I say that I think you will find it an interesting film. So if any of you can last that long through the day and do not have committee meetings and other meetings out at Dr. Greenfield's, out on the golf links, it will give me very great pleasure to show this film to you.

FEDERAL RECLAMATION AND LIKE PROJECTS

Mr. ASPINALL submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6268) to facilitate the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and like projects.

SUPPLEMENTING THE FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS

Mr. ASPINALL submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5881) to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects.

PERMISSION TO FILE SEPARATE VIEWS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], a conferee on the above bill, to file for printing in the RECORD a separate statement setting forth his opposition views on the action of the conferees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

PAYMENT TO CROW INDIAN TRIBE—YELLOWTAIL DAM UNIT

Mrs. FROST submitted a conference report and statement on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming.

PERMISSION TO FILE SEPARATE VIEWS

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those managers on the part of the House who did not sign the conference report may file for printing in the RECORD a separate statement setting forth their views on the action of the conferees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

TRAFFIC ACCIDENT RESEARCH

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a matter of the greatest urgency to the entire country. I refer to the grim traffic record which this Nation has accumulated. This appalling record has led me to take the initiative in proposing positive action which I believe will be of significant value in combating the alarming upward trend of our rate of automobile accidents.

I am introducing a bill which will authorize the United States Department of Commerce, first, to initiate a program of research into the causes of highway accidents and their prevention, to be implemented through the use of scholarships and fellowships, and grants to qualified nonprofit and private research organizations. A second feature of my proposal provides that the Department arrange for the interchange of knowledge concerning traffic accidents and the steps which should be taken to reduce them.

Concerning traffic accidents, it is an apt comparison to note the number of deaths resulting from them and to note the number of persons killed in military combat. It is apt because both represent a terrible waste of precious manpower, and because both are repugnant to civilized society. The Department of Defense has reported that from the American Revolutionary War through the Korean conflict, about 1,130,000 Americans have been killed as a result of wars. Note that—in contrast to this—the National Safety Council reported that about 1,149,000 Americans died because of traffic accidents since 1900. Thus, in all our wars, 1,130,000 casualties; in all our traffic accidents, 1,149,000 deaths. It is indeed appalling.

During the years immediately following World War II, we were experiencing an annual average of about 32,000 traffic deaths and 1,100,000 injuries due to traffic causes. The total economic costs of such accidents averaged about $2.8 billion per year during these postwar years. During 1955, the traffic death toll reported by the National Safety Council was 38,300, with 1⅓ million persons receiving injuries. That is as if nearly every man, woman, or child in New Brunswick, N. J., were killed, and everyone in the State of Nebraska injured. The economic cost of traffic accidents was estimated at $4.7 billion. Thus, during the short period of 6 or 7 years, annual traffic deaths increased by more than 6,000, injuries increased a quarter of a million, and economic costs of accidents increased nearly $2 billion.

In addition, in the few minutes required to read this statement one person will lose his life, and perhaps 35 others will receive injuries as a result of accidents involving motor vehicles.

As to the economic costs of traffic accidents, here is a brief analysis of the component elements of the $4.4 billion costs estimated by the National Safety Council for 1954. During that year property damage amounted to $1,600,000,000; insurance costs were $1,450,000,000; wage loss amounted to $1,250,000,000; and medical expenses came to $100 million. The total again—$4.4 billion.

The significant thing about all this is that the number of deaths and injuries and the total economic costs not only are distressingly large but are increasing at an alarming rate. The 1955 record represents an 8 percent increase for all 3 factors over the 1954 record. The accident trend involving trucks is even more alarming. Transport Topics for April 2, 1956, reported that for the first 11 months of 1955 truck accidents were up 16 percent over the preceding year, while property damage resulting from these accidents had increased 19 percent, and fatalities had increased 28 percent.

There are two basic considerations involved here. First, as bad as the record is, we must keep in mind that it could be a great deal worse. It is essential that we give full recognition to the splendid efforts being made to hold the line in our endless battle with traffic accidents. Much of what has been accomplished has been credited to the so-called three E's—enforcement, education, and engineering. But in spite of all that is being done, accidents are relentlessly increasing.

Here is the second basic consideration. A recent publication dealing with traffic safety listed a total of 54 national organizations interested in traffic accidents and their prevention. Add to this a countless number of State and local governmental groups, local civic organizations, and local chapters of national organizations acting on their own. The number of government and nongovernment organizations concerning themselves with this problem is substantial, and the volume of material and data emerging therefrom is correspondingly great. And this is important information. And note also, as the number of traffic accidents increases, the number of organizations dealing with such accidents will likewise increase.

The unmistakable warning evident in this situation is that due to the existing large number of organizations, giving rise to a great mass of data concerning traffic accidents, there is an acute need for a clearinghouse for these data. Moreover, the need for such a central interchange function will increase as more groups grapple with the problem and as additional sciences focus their attention on the problem. We must face the fact that we are confronted with the principle of diminishing returns as we increase our efforts to cope with an increasing number of accidents. Only through an effective collection and distribution program will we be able to obtain anything near the optimum benefits possible from our combined efforts.

It is this dilemma confronting us today which has prompted me to make this proposal. I sincerely believe that the answer lies in a vigorous program to

integrate and coordinate our efforts to find a solution to this perplexing problem. If we can save thousands of lives, hundreds of thousands of injuries, and hundreds of millions of dollars, will not this program be essentially an economy measure? I contend that it would be difficult to find an area in which so great a potential for good can be exploited with such a relatively small expenditure.

There has developed what might be described as a void in certain aspects of this field of research, and to the extent that such a void does exist, it is both logical and prudent for the Federal Government to participate in the manner which I have proposed in my bill. The National Science Foundation has made this appraisal of the area of responsibility for the Federal Government in matters of this sort:

It is the function of the National Science Foundation to furnish leadership—not to direct—in the broad effort to promote science and to assess the situation and the need. This it will do through factual inquiry and the mobilization of the judgments of those most competent, including those in the various fields of science and of education. Neither the colleges and universities nor the private foundations could perform, or accept responsibility for this function. It is a function that would have had little meaning 5 years ago, and probably none a century ago. Today, it is clear that responsible, continuing and comprehensive appraisal of our scientific resources, needs and opportunities is an essential element of public policy. (Source: National Science Foundation, Fourth Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1954, p. vii.)

The key to the problem actually is twofold—research, and the coordination of results. Obviously, any well-balanced program must give proper emphasis to both of these elements. When the first President's Highway Safety Conference was convened in Washington in 1946, President Truman warned that—

There is no royal road to highway safety. Only through a balanced program supported by the public can we produce the desired result. Any gap in our program for a united front against the accident enemy is a potential setback. There must be a complete understanding of the problem, the need, the program, and the specific application of the program. (Source: Action Program, President's Highway Safety Conference, 1946, p. 3.)

In 1954, at the opening session of the White House Conference on Highway Safety, President Eisenhower pointed out that there was a definite lack of coordination of the work being done to reduce traffic accidents.

Experts in various subfields connected with highway safety recognize the importance of coordinating research efforts and materials. Speaking as an authority on the subject of driver education, which is a very important aspect of highway safety, Mr. Amos E. Neyhart said:

Continued progress requires the cooperative efforts of research centers and research-minded individuals. The methods and techniques used, for example, in high school driver education courses have undergone few changes during the past 15 years. Very little, if anything, has been done to determine if such methods and techniques have been effective in attaining desired student development. It is only through careful research that we get the real answers to such problems and are able to project our programs intelligently into the future. * * *

Farsighted leaders in the field, including the National Commission on Safety Education, the American Automobile Association, and the Highway Research Board, have developed extensive lists of current research needs in driver education. (Source: Eighth SAE Beecroft Memorial Lecture, delivered by Amos E. Neyhart at the National Safety Congress, October 18, 1954.)

And, speaking of subfields of study, there is fairly widespread acceptance of a theory to broaden the scope of such study to include contributions from the fields of preventive medicine, public health, and related biological and engineering sciences. Such contributions will certainly be valuable aids to the solution of our traffic problems, but they will be quite complex. It will be a wise policy to insure that such data are exploited to the fullest, regardless of how complex. We can no longer leave it largely to chance for a given body of vital intelligence to receive the complete attention which it merits.

Even if there were no precedents for a proposal such as I am making, the seriousness of our traffic experience would clearly and amply justify this legislation. However, there are quite a few precedents in existence at the present time. For instance, the current budget lists expenditures to be made by the National Science Foundation for research and development purposes during fiscal year 1957 of $24.3 million for regular activities, and $18 million for activities concerning the International Geophysical Year, totaling $42.3 million. Other departments of the Federal Government which the budget indicates will engage in research and development activities to a significant degree include the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Agriculture, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Commerce. Surely, the saving of lives and of persons from injury, and the saving of many millions of dollars marks my proposal as being on a par, with respect to national importance, with similar research work being done by these departments.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to demonstrate first, the need for a program of vigorous action to find ways of reducing traffic accidents; second, the most logical manner of meeting this need; and third, ample precedent for this proposal. Let me repeat that it would be difficult to find an area in which so great a potential for good can be exploited with such a relatively small expenditure.

In closing I want to quote a statement which seems to me to summarize best what needs doing in this vital field, and why. Mr. Sidney Williams, assistant to the president of the National Safety Council, has said:

Past researches * * * have been fragmentary, inconclusive, and uncoordinated. If highway transportation is to play its proper part in our national economy without unconscionable cost in lives, suffering, and economic loss, then our road systems as well as our enforcement and educational procedures must be designed in terms of what the driver is and does, not in terms of what someone thinks he ought to be or do.

I am proposing that the clear light of science be brought to bear on a problem which I consider to be a leading menace to the health, safety, and welfare of the people of this Nation.

Appendix—Traffic accident data, 1935–55

Year	Deaths	Injuries	Death rate per 100 million vehicle-miles	Total costs
1935	36,369	1,250,000	15.9	$1,600,000,000
1936	38,089	1,350,000	15.1	1,640,000,000
1937	39,643	1,400,000	14.7	1,700,000,000
1938	32,582	1,150,000	12.0	1,500,000,000
1939	32,386	1,150,000	11.3	1,500,000,000
1940	34,501	1,200,000	11.4	1,600,000,000
1941	39,969	1,400,000	12.0	1,900,000,000
1942	28,309	1,000,000	10.6	1,600,000,000
1943	23,823	800,000	11.5	1,250,000,000
1944	24,282	850,000	11.5	1,250,000,000
1945	28,076	1,000,000	11.3	1,450,000,000
1946	33,411	1,200,000	9.8	2,200,000,000
1947	32,697	1,150,000	8.8	2,650,000,000
1948	32,259	1,100,000	8.1	2,800,000,000
1949	31,701	1,100,000	7.5	3,050,000,000
1950	34,763	1,200,000	7.6	3,100,000,000
1951	36,996	1,300,000	7.5	3,400,000,000
1952	37,794	1,350,000	7.4	3,750,000,000
1953	37,955	1,350,000	7.1	4,300,000,000
1954	35,586	1,250,000	6.4	4,400,000,000
1955	38,300	1,350,000	6.4	4,700,000,000

Source: National Safety Council.

HIDING HIS HEAD IN THE SAND

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, legend has it that the ostrich tries to avoid all his problems by hiding his head in the sand. Obviously our Secretary of State meets his problems the same way.

People who can give him useful information, he will not see. Information forced upon his attention which he does not like, he ignores.

On May 14, by means of an insertion in the RECORD, I asked him whether or not it was a fact that his files indicated the quantity of arms shipped into Egypt by the Communists. I expected and I got no answer.

I have placed in today's RECORD two articles written by Joseph Alsop, one from Baghdad and the other from Damascus.

That distinguished and very able reporter indicates his bewilderment at some of the facts he learns as he travels through the Middle East. The facts that he comments about were learned by me and by other Members of both Houses of Congress last year. Those matters must be the subject of reports in the files of the Secretary of State in Washington.

I ask the Secretary of State, "Mr. Secretary, don't you know these facts? Haven't these facts been fully reported to you over a period of many years last past? Finally, Mr. Secretary, what are you doing about it other than hiding your head in the sand?"

MENTAL ILLNESS: A CHALLENGE TO THE NATION

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the gravest illnesses plaguing our Nation today is mental disease. This scourge, striking as it does 1 in every 160 of our citizens, lowers the national morale, cuts down our industrial efficiency, and presents an enormous burden to our taxpayers. More than that, Mr. Speaker, mental illness reaps a staggering toll in the suffering of its victims, their associates and their loved ones.

There are three-fourths of a million of these mentally afflicted persons confined to a hospital bed on this very day. There are another 400,000 who probably should be hospitalized. The remainder of the 10 million sufferers, perhaps not requiring hospitalization, need some kind of psychiatric therapy because of their disrupted occupational and family lives.

That Congress has a responsibility in this field is clear. Ten years ago, when we passed the National Mental Health Act, and established the National Institute of Mental Health, we indicated the Federal Government's willingness to lead, and not follow, in the fight against the scourge of mental disease.

A time for action has again presented itself.

It is now, when psychiatrists and therapists hold out the great hope of the tranquilizing drugs, that we must not shirk our responsibility. These drugs, chlorpromazine and reserpine, are the subject of optimistic interest on the part of all who are concerned with our mental-health problem. Oddly, one drug, chlorpromazine, is a new synthetic product, first produced in 1950. The other, reserpine, has been used in its natural state for thousands of years by primitive peoples.

But both have been found of great help in calming the mentally disturbed and increasing receptivity to psychiatric treatment. Dr. Winifred Overholser, in speaking of the great successes with the drugs at St. Elizabeths Hospital, reported to the House Appropriations Committee that:

> In a number of cases after administering the drug for perhaps 2 to 3 weeks the patient suddenly has come to the doctor and said, "I've been awfully sick, but I'm all right now." Things apparently seem to clear up overnight. It has been fantastic.

Dr. Nathan Kline, one of the pioneers in the field, has estimated that 5 percent of the chronic schizophrenic patients institutionalized today could be released if the tranquilizers were applied.

In terms of human lives, this means the return of 37,000 mental patients to their homes. In terms of savings, it means almost $38 million less which must be expended for the support of these patients.

And the possibilities for the drugs are almost limitless. Aside from the hundreds of thousands of mentally ill, drug addicts, juvenile delinquents, alcoholics, many types of socially destructive personalities, might also be saved.

Yet, while the use of these drugs is still a relatively new phenomenon, important work must be done. Broad experimentation with the pharmaceuticals will be necessary. This means staffing, equipping, and perhaps enlarging our present psychiatric facilities. Communities must be educated to the problems of the released mental patient. Our citizens themselves must learn the importance of mental health, and, indeed, the importance of proper treatment for mental illness.

This, it seems to me, is where the Federal Legislature must help. If we can, after study and thought, find areas where legislation will facilitate progress, then we must enact that legislation. If we can aid in any way, then we must do so. The defeat of mental disease is a task worthy of our best efforts.

It is a task we must undertake.

PERMISSION TO FILE MINORITY VIEWS ON H. R. 11356

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that several members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs may file separate minority views on the bill, H. R. 11356.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON H. R. 10875, AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill, H. R. 10875, the Agricultural Act of 1956.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DEFENSE OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, in their zeal to grab onto some badly needed votes for the election next November the Governor of the State of Michigan and a Democratic Member of the Michigan delegation in Congress have strayed far afield and as a result have unwittingly stubbed their toes over a Democratic creation.

Gov. G. Mennen Williams and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] recently invaded my hometown of Bay City, Mich., to address the Michigan State Association of Letter Carriers and true to form took advantage of the forum to whoop it up politically.

In brief, both men launched an attack on a Post Office Department regulation dealing with the collective activity of postal workers in matters involving working conditions, etc.

While haranguing the Post Office Department, which is being so efficiently operated by the Postmaster General, Arthur Summerfield, an appointee of President Eisenhower, they didn't tell the postal workers of Michigan that the straw man they were using as the target of their attack against the Republican administration was actually the creation of the previous Democratic administration.

On May 16, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] made highly misleading statements before this Congress about the Post Office Department, which, as a member of the House Post Office Committee, I resent and cannot let go unchallenged.

On May 19, Michigan Gov. G. Mennen Williams, speaking before the Michigan Letter Carriers Association in Bay City, Mich., made similar demagogic statements, which in all fairness, also need to be corrected.

Neither of these gentlemen, by their reckless remarks, have contributed to the welfare of the Post Office Department or its employees and the splendid service they are rendering the American people.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], without any apparent attempt to ascertain the facts, stated before this distinguished body on May 16 that the United States Government, through the Post Office Department, had issued a regulation as bad as any ever issued by Nazi Germany or Communist Russia. Perhaps he does not understand that one of the reasons this is a free country is because the United States Post Office Department is the champion of one of the fundamental principles on which this Nation was established by our Founding Fathers; that is, the sanctity of the mails and the right of uncensored communications. The Post Office Department jealously guards this right which even the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] enjoys, though unfounded and loose charges may be circulated against it by the uninformed persons of this country.

The gentleman from Michigan, apparently through lack of knowledge of the facts, states that section 744.442 of the Postal Manual violates the Constitution and is in open defiance of a law of Congress. This is not true, as he would know by a minute's look into the manual. The Department has clearly explained to those who took the trouble to get the facts that in 1949 the previous administration issued a restriction on campaigns for changes in the mail service on the part of Postal Transportation Service employees. All that has now happened is that the regulation was reprinted recently in a revised chapter of the new Postal Manual. It specifically referred to another part of the manual—section 741.2—which clearly stated the Department's intent and policy to protect fully the rights of employees.

Does the gentleman really believe, as he charged, that the following Post Of-

fice Department regulation is a Communist or Fascist regulation or that it violates the Constitution or the law of 1912? I quote:

Membership in any society, association, club, or other form of organization of postal employees not affiliated with any outside organization imposing an obligation or duty upon them to engage in any strike, or proposing to assist them in any strike, against the United States, having for its objects among other things, improvements in the condition of labor of its members, including hours of labor and compensation therefor and leave of absence, by any person or groups of persons in the Postal Service, or the presenting by any such person or groups of persons of any grievance or grievances to the Congress or any Member thereof shall not constitute or be cause for reduction in rank or compensation or removal of such persons or groups of persons from said service (sec. 6, act of August 24, 1912 (Lloyd-La Follette), as amended by Public Law 623, approved June 10, 1948).

Perhaps it is this regulation that the gentleman thinks is Fascist, Communist, or illegal. Again I quote:

The right of persons employed in the civil service of the United States, either individually or collectively, to petition Congress, or any Member thereof, or to furnish information to either House of Congress, or any committee or member thereof, shall not be denied or interfered with (sec. 741.2).

The Department's regulations go on to say that "consultation with employee organizations concerning mutual problems is not only the sensible course, but also the policy of the Department."

Is this the abusive, autocratic requirement that the gentleman insists it is? Has anyone cited to him any abuses during the previous 7 years in which this regulation has existed?

I wonder if the gentleman has considered the circumstances under which this regulation came to his attention. Has he forgotten that several hundred union representatives held a big rally here a few days ago and descended en masse on the Congress with regulation 744.442 as a battle cry? If employee representatives really believed that this regulation interfered in any way with their proper rights and privileges, how did it happen that so many of them came to Washington on official leave from their jobs and freely contacted Members of the Congress without any interference from anyone?

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] further alleges that the situation is so intolerable that employees are forbidden to put notices of employee organizations on bulletin boards in post offices and that postmasters throughout the country are taking down employee bulletin boards. This is the most inaccurate statement made before this body by a Member of the Congress that I have ever heard. I will let the facts speak for themselves. Here is the Department's policy issued at the same time as part 744.442. Again, this is not a new policy or a change in substance, but a restatement of the 1949 Post Office Department regulation:

Bulletin boards: If both official and unofficial material is posted, separate boards must be maintained. The board for unofficial material shall be placed in employees' swing rooms where they exist and may be used for notices of employee organization or other meetings, social affairs, athletic events, lost and found items, etc. No propaganda or controversial matter shall be posted on these boards. The official in charge of the installation or his designated representative must pass on the suitability of all notices before posting and shall otherwise govern the use of the boards.

I note from the Bay City Times account of Governor Williams' May 19 speech in Bay City that he is under the mistaken impression that postal workers cannot criticize. It is obvious to me that employees have full and sufficient opportunity for criticizing. If Governor Williams would get the facts, it would be obvious to him too. He would also learn that the only reason for the regulation he questions was to try to make certain that information to the public relating to changes in mail service would be prompt and accurate and would give no cause for unnecessary apprehension among patrons because of unfounded rumors concerning mail service changes.

Governor Williams cries out against the heavy burden of mail forced on letter carriers by the postal management. In his ignorance of this subject he ignores the fact that a reasonable limit of 35 pounds is the most a carrier ever has to carry, and that this reasonable limit was established under a previous administration. Any mail in excess of that weight is relayed to him.

By providing carrier carts, light vehicles, and other equipment, this present administration is doing its best to make even lighter the load of the city mail carrier.

Incidentally, it is highly gratifying to note the attitude of the National Association of Special Delivery Messengers, an organization of post office employees. In their Bulletin No. 10, dated May 11, 1956, they discussed this same problem in these words:

The Lloyd-La Follette Act of 1912 specifically grants to postal workers the right to petition Congress for improvements in their benefits, working conditions, grievances, etc. Since that time the act has been administered as applying to all Federal employees. Prior to the enactment of this law the exercise of such prerogatives subjected an employee to immediate dismissal. The question now is: Does the provision in the Postal Manual as quoted above prevent employees from giving detailed information to their national officers on which to base appeals to the Department, or to the Congress for improvements in the service, working conditions, personnel matters or grievances?

The answer to the above question by Department officials is that there is no such intent; that the above regulation has been a part of the Postal Transport Service Manual for years, and in routine revision of the manual this was inserted in the general provisions relating to personnel; that the provisions of the Lloyd-La Follette Act are a part of the manual, and that no change is intended from the manner in which these matters have been administered. Officials also inform me that this portion of the manual will be modified to prevent misunderstanding. (Personnel Transmittal Letter No. 12, pt. 741, relating to employee organizations and covering the provision of the Lloyd-La Follette Act are now in the process of distribution.)

SMALL-BUSINESS RETAILERS AND ANTITRUST

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, in the May 1956 issue of United Business Facts, Pueblo, Colo., is a short article in praise of Judge Stanley N. Barnes, who was appointed by President Eisenhower early in his administration as Assistant Attorney General of the United States in charge of the Antitrust Division. This praise of Judge Barnes is well-deserved and, I believe, is unanimous among those of us who are earnestly and sincerely interested in the protection and welfare of small business.

Judge Barnes, as we are all aware, has recently been nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate as a member of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Judicial Circuit. This important judicial circuit includes the districts of northern California, southern California, Oregon, Nevada, Montana, eastern Washington, western Washington, Idaho, Arizona, Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam.

While we regret the loss of this able and distinguished prosecutor and administrator in his capacity as the head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, we, nevertheless, are gratified that the Federal courts of our Nation are gaining the benefit of Judge Barnes' outstanding ability and wisdom. As the article states, "small business has lost a good friend when we lost Judge Barnes." However, I for one sincerely believe that while small business has lost a good friend in the prosecution of antitrust cases, Judge Barnes' great experience and judicial knowledge will continue to be invaluable to our Nation and the free-enterprise system for which it stands.

The article follows:

SMALL-BUSINESS RETAILERS AND ANTITRUST

This program has been in charge of Assistant Attorney General Stanley N. Barnes, recently confirmed for appointment as judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for Pacific States, Guam, Hawaii, and Alaska.

His appointment is generally regarded as a merited promotion. But it removes from Washington an effective administrator.

Fifty-three new antitrust cases were filed last year, 35 in 1954, 29 in 1953. Fifty-one were disposed of last year, 66 in 1954—second highest number on record.

Despite the filing and disposing of more cases, the number pending has been cut from 147 to 101 in 3 years.

When Judge Barnes took over the Antitrust Division in mid-1953, the 18 oldest cases on the docket were 5½ years old. Today the 18 oldest cases have been kicking around for only 3½ years.

The docket is 2 years closer to being current.

The number of antitrust case investigations under way has gone up from 210 in 1953 to 307 as of January 1, 1956.

The number of antitrust complaints received by the Department of Justice has likewise increased from 600 in 1952 to 1,200 in 1955.

This last may be taken as a sign of more monopolistic practices in the 3 years. Or it can be taken as a sign of increasing public confidence that complaints against big business actions in restraint of trade will now get attention.

Defendants have shown a greater confidence in the Government's willingness to accept settlements of antitrust cases out of court, avoiding long, costly trials. All this increased antitrust activity has been done with a 20-percent budget cut and 24 percent less manpower.

There may not have been as many spectacular cases hitting the headlines. Judge Barnes has preferred to pick and choose precise areas for specific accomplishments in freeing business competition.

Thus the recent suit against Shell Oil Corp. freed one filling station operator in Quincy, Mass., from a forced 1-cent-per-gallon profit squeeze. Shell Oil drew a maximum $5,000 fine. (Now it is $25,000.) But the decision stands to benefit all small-business retailers.

A few big boys have also been tackled.

Suit against Radio Corporation of America, thrown out of court several years ago, was successfully reinstituted on the basis of "Yes, but look what you've been doing since then."

Action was also begun against United Fruit Co. This was recommended in 1913, 1937, and 1952, under the other administrations, but never carried out until 1954. Eleven suits have been filed involving labor unions, previously considered immune from most antitrust actions.

A concerted drive was made at the beginning of 1952 to rewrite completely the Sherman and Clayton antitrust laws for the benefit of big business. Due largely to skillful steering of Judge Barnes in a packed commission of corporation lawyers, this effort was held to 12 recommendations for changes in administration.

Some of these changes have been put into effect and others are still under consideration.

But there will be no general revision of antitrust laws unless—with Assistant Attorney General Barnes elevated to the bench—some new character is moved in to let what has been accomplished slide backwards.

Small business has lost a good friend when we lost Judge Barnes.

FOREST RESOURCES

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, on April 25, 1956, I introduced H. R. 10794, providing for an annual report to the Congress on the administration of our national forests. Since this bill has been introduced, I have received a great deal of correspondence from all sections of the country indicating strong support for this legislation. In this correspondence several suggestions have been made which I believe will improve this legislation.

Conservation groups throughout the country have indicated a desire that in addition to the items which the annual forest report would require, as provided in H. R. 10794, the bill should be amended to require that the Secretary of Agriculture include in the annual report information on the need for reforestation and the extent to which each national forest produces other benefits. Below is the amendment I have drafted as a result of this correspondence which I intend to offer to the Forests Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee when the public hearing is held on H. R. 10794:

Page 3, after line 7, insert the following:

"(11) The area within each national forest in need of reforestation and herbaceous revegetation.

"(12) The extent each national forest produces other benefits, or is used for grazing, recreation, water production, and watershed protection, wildlife, mining, and other nontimber purposes, expressed by such statistical or other means as will most concisely inform the public of their significance."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in three instances at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

H. R. 11366, A BILL TO PROVIDE A NATIONAL VETERANS CEMETERY IN THE FIRST DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced a bill that would provide for an additional national cemetery on the central west coast of Florida. This is known as H. R. 11366.

Florida at the present time has had four cemetery sites recommended by the United States Army. These would include the present location in west Florida, reactivation of the St. Augustine site, a centrally located cemetery, and one in southeast Florida. My bill would provide location, provision for the site, and activation of the project in central Florida that has been recommended.

The veterans population of the State of Florida is increasing at such a tremendous pace that it is imperative we adequately provide for the final resting place of those men who qualify who have served our Nation. In the concentration of veterans on the central west coast of Florida we find that this need is particularly felt. The State, at a conservative estimate, will be the home of 650,000 veterans by 1960. The trend to the west coast will be particularly noticeable in the next few years and the facilities of Bay Pines Veterans Hospital attracts many of these men.

The many veterans associations of the State and particularly in the First District have urged this action after careful and thorough study of the problem as presented by the present influx of veterans. It is the unqualified opinion of the many communities in the area that this need is urgent.

Under the survey conducted by the Quartermaster General, as requested by the Committee on Military Affairs in 1945, it was proposed that a cemetery be established with a 250-mile radius of planned use. In the State of Florida a centrally located cemetery such as requested in my bill would fully meet this recommendation.

The importance and need of such a cemetery in view of the general requirements of 12,394,522 veterans of World War II, 134,415 Spanish War veterans, and 3,897,483 World War I veterans, is clear.

I urge favorable consideration and an early provision by the House of this needed supplement to the care of our veterans and their families.

EXPIRATION OF GI HOME LOAN GUARANTY PROGRAM JULY 25, 1957

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, of utmost importance to the veterans of this Nation is the anticipated expiration of the GI home loan guaranty program on July 25, 1957. Unless there is legislation to the contrary this expiration would be effective January 1, 1957, under plans of the Veterans' Administration.

I have introduced a bill, H. R. 11367, which would provide a maximum additional period of 36 months for World War II veterans to obtain guaranteed loans. This bill would amend section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

This portion of the act has been a prime factor in the readjustment from a war economy and in the continued prosperity of the Nation. This has been accomplished with no burden upon the taxpayer and has provided benefits to the veteran which would be normal in a period without wars.

This act since its enactment has been used by millions of veterans to establish their right to a home in our free land. At the present time, however, some 11 million veterans have not had the opportunity to take advantage of this entitlement. Many of these young men are just now reaching the age and acquiring the income in which they will establish a family and a home and we should in no way cut off their rights and privileges when they are extended to other veterans of the same wars. This large percentage of the men who have qualified for this present privilege but who at an average of 35 years of age will be denied participation unless this legislation passes should receive every consideration at this time.

The bill that I have introduced provides for the termination of the program over a period of 3 years from the present date of finalization through provision of a 1-month—not in excess of 36 months—credit for each 2 full months served on active duty in World War II and also provides a full 3-year extension for disabled veterans. In further assistance to the veteran I have provided that the veteran's sworn oath may serve as satisfactory evidence of his period of service to alleviate the many problems and delay resulting from lost records.

I sincerely hope that this bill or similar legislation will be approved before the adjournment of this Congress, and I strongly urge such action.

JUDGE-MADE LAW

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the Buffalo Evening

News was recently brought to my attention and at request I ask its inclusion in the RECORD. I am heartily in accord with the sentiment of this editorial and with the proposed legislation to restate the intent of Congress in regard to the recent action of the Court in overthrowing the sedition laws of 42 States of the Union. I believe it to be the clear intent of Congress that this body at no time seeks to usurp the rights of the States to provide for the national security as the action of the Court would indicate.

I commend the editor of this paper and hope through inclusion in the RECORD of these remarks that the distinct threat to the rights of the States and their courts will be brought sharply into focus and immediate action taken to correct the interpretation as given in the ruling.

The editorial follows:

JUDGE-MADE LAW

"Nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof." (Sec. 3231, title 18, United States Code.)

In view of the above general provision of the Federal criminal code, which includes the Smith Act and most of the other anti-subversive legislation in the Federal statutes, the Supreme Court had to reach pretty far last month when it outlawed the sedition laws of 42 States and Territories on the theory that Congress intended to take exclusive jurisdiction over national security when it passed the Smith Act.

But this is one case where the Supreme Court may not have the last word after all. Since it handed down its 6-to-3 ruling, overthrowing the Pennsylvania statute under which Steve Nelson was convicted of sedition, a movement to "repeal" the decision has been gathering momentum in Congress. And it has now received the solid support of the Justice Department, and in fact the official top-level blessing of the Eisenhower administration.

In outlawing the State sedition laws, the Supreme Court made no claim that they were unconstitutional, but held rather that the intent of Congress was to "preempt" the field. The three dissenters found no such intent expressed or implied in any law, and the majority even conceded that Congress had not specifically asserted exclusive Federal jurisdiction. Rather, it seemed to be saying that, because many State sedition laws are objectionably vague or arbitrary, it would be better to leave the subject to Uncle Sam.

But the Supreme Court's function is to apply the law as Congress has written it, not to declare what the law should be—and it was this clear intrusion on the legislative function, reading into the mind of Congress something that plainly wasn't there, that has spurred the move in Congress to tell the Court in effect to tend to its own business.

Actually, the bill which the Justice Department has now endorsed would simply restate the intent of Congress—exactly as Congress thought it had already stated it—"that the States may exercise concurrent power" to punish acts of sedition within their border. Passage of this legislation is not only necessary to restore the validity of the various State sedition laws, but under the circumstances it would be a timely and deserved reminder to the Supreme Court that its job is to interpret and apply the laws, not to rewrite them.

POSTAL WORKERS

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could conjure up some sympathy for the gentleman from Michigan who defends so vociferously the actions of the incumbent Postmaster General under whom the deficit of the Department is rising each and every week and who will shortly ask us to increase the rates on first class mail while continuing subsidies on the Republican journals of opinion, Life, Time, News Week, U. S. News, and so forth.

Irefer the gentleman to page 8764 of yesterday's RECORD and to the remarks of my friend and colleague from Minnesota [Mr. WIER] setting forth the regulations which were objected to. The language of these regulations follows:

Issue 57 of the Postal Manual, dated March 28, 1956, section 744.442, captioned "Engaging in Campaigns for Changes in the Service," reads as follows:

"(a) Information relating to the policies and decisions of the Post Office Department will be released only through official channels. Employees shall not actively engage in campaigns for or against changes in the service, or furnish information to be used in such campaigns unless prior approval has been obtained from higher authority.

"(b) If an employee has justifiable reasons for favoring or opposing changes in the postal service, he shall contact the proper officials and await specific instructions before engaging in local hearings or activities."

The Postal Bulletin for Thursday, April 19, 1956, reads:

"ALL POSTAL INSTALLATIONS—EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION IN CONTESTS

"While on duty employees of the postal service may not participate in any contest sponsored by private concerns, associations, or other private organizations, nor accept any prizes from such concerns, associations, or organizations, unless participation is approved specifically by the Department.

"Office of the Deputy Postmaster General."

I might point out that these regulations forbid all postal employees in any way from contacting their Representatives in Congress or anyone else relating to their opinion on working conditions in the Post Office Department. This, if I have ever seen one, is an antilabor, union busting regulation and certainly an alienation of the right of anyone to speak about job conditions.

This administration presently insists that it is not antilabor, but its actions prove the opposite to be true. A few months back, the Nation was startled to discover the vicious antilabor position taken by the firm in which the then Secretary of the Interior had a large interest. That Secretary is no longer a part of the administration. I wonder if a similar fate awaits the Postmaster General. I hope it will, for I feel sure that the working people of Michigan would welcome an opportunity similar to that granted the working people of Oregon to express their feelings about any administration spokesman who is so obviously antilabor.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply touched by my colleague's address on what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] did in his district. In my own district there is a little postal clerk who wrote a letter to the paper in which he thanked "Mr. Winterfield," the postmaster, for the penny an hour raise. The postal clerk was brought up on charges and reprimanded for exercising his right to write a letter to the editor.

As far as I am concerned, I hope that the opposite party will keep "Mr. Winterfield" because he is the Democrats' secret weapon in this coming fall election.

ADJUDICATION OF CERTAIN CLAIMS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5862) to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2196)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5862) to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That, notwithstanding any lapse of time or statute of limitations, and notwithstanding section 1346 (d) (2) of title 28, United States Code, the United States district courts shall have jurisdiction of all civil actions or claims to recover fees, salary, or compensation for official services of employees of the United States which were filed prior to October 31, 1951, and were thereafter dismissed for want of jurisdiction as a result of the amendment made to such section by section 50 (b) of the Act entitled "An Act to amend certain titles of the United States Code, and for other purposes", approved October 31, 1951.

"Such cases which were pending in the district courts or in the courts of appeals on October 31, 1951, and which may have been dismissed by reason of the withdrawal of jurisdiction during their pendency, shall be restored upon petition to the appropriate

court within one year after the effective date of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr.,
WM. M. TUCK,
PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

MATTHEW M. NEELY,
PRICE DANIEL,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5862) to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The language of H. R. 5862 as it passed the House of Representatives and the language of the amendment in the nature of a substitute which was adopted by the Senate are designed to accomplish precisely the same purpose. For that reason there is no disagreement on the purpose that is to be achieved by this legislation. The conferees agreed that the language in the House version so far as it adopted the form of temporary legislation rather than a permanent amendment to title 28 of the United States Code should be adopted. However, the conferees felt that additional language should be supplied to the House version to make clear that cases affected by this legislation may be restored in the courts from which they were dismissed by appropriate petition.

JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr.,
WM. M. TUCK,
PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that tomorrow the bill H. R. 10542, the veterans' widow eligibility benefit bill, will be called up, and also the conference report on Senate Joint Resolution 135.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GARMATZ for Wednesday, May 23, 1956, to Tuesday, May 29, 1956, on account of official business.

Mr. JACKSON for the period June 2 to 8 on account of hearings June 7 in Los Angeles, House Committee on Un-American Activities.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ROOSEVELT, for 30 minutes on Monday, May 28, 1956.

Mr. VURSELL for 15 minutes on Monday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. RAINS (at the request of Mr. HUDDLESTON) and to include an address.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FOGARTY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DODD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. ALBERT and to include an analysis of H. R. 10875, the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Mr. LAIRD and include a resolution.

Mr. BETTS.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

Mr. UTT.

Mr. PHILBIN and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 10875. An act to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 460. An act to amend section 4482 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U. S. C. 475), relating to life preservers for river steamers;

S. 743. An act to authorize biennial inspection of the hulls and boilers of cargo vessels, and for other purposes;

S. 1378. An act to clarify and consolidate the authority to require the establishment, maintenance, and operation of aids to maritime navigation on fixed structures in or over navigable waters of the United States;

S. 1790. An act to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize more liberal propelling power allowances in computing the net tonnage of certain vessels;

S. 1791. An act to amend section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940 (54 Stat. 164), relating to the lights required to be carried by motorboats;

S. 2151. An act to provide for the segregation of certain funds of the Fort Berthold Indians on the basis of a membership roll prepared for such purpose;

S. 2327. An act for the relief of Takako Iba;

S. 2562. An act to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended;

S. 3237. An act to provide for continuance of life insuranace coverage under the Federal Employees' Group Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, in the case of employees receiving benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act;

S. 3315. An act to amend section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; and

S. 3524. An act to give effect to the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries signed at Washington, September 10, 1954, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMFNT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 24, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1887. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to regulate the movement from foreign countries into or through the United States, and the interstate movements of plant pests, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1888. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the relief of certain female members of the Air Force, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1889. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize grants of not more than $500 to certain persons who are injured or whose property is damaged by aircraft of the Armed Forces of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1890. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of M. Sgt. Harold LeRoy Allen"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1891. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of C. W. O. Louis P. Arbour"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1892. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated February 24, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a letter report on Rogue River, Wedderburn to Agness, Oreg., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted December 14, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affiairs. H. R. 6501. A bill to amend the act of July 17, 1914, to permit the disposal of certain reserve mineral deposits under the mining laws of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee of Conference. H. R. 6268. A bill to facilitate the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and like projects; (Rept. No. 2199). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee of Conference. H. R. 5881. A bill to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects; (Rept. No. 2200). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee of Conference. Senate Joint Resolution 135. Joint resolution for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming; (Rept. No. 2201). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 11399. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. AVERY:

H. R. 11400. A bill to authorize the Chief of Engineers to reimburse owners and tenants of land acquired for Tuttle Creek Reservoir, Missouri River Basin, for certain business losses; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 11401. A bill to provide that certain service performed by employees of a tax-exempt organization, where a waiver certificate was erroneously but in good faith thought to have been filed by such organization, shall be considered as "employment" under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 11402. A bill to extend the existing application of the Temporary Promotion Act of 1941, as amended, to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 11403. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 11404. A bill relating to certain mining claims which were eligible for validation under the act of August 12, 1953, but which were not validated solely because of the failure of the owners to take certain action to protect their claims within the prescribed period; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 11405. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase the amounts which may be made available to Puerto Rico as aid to dependent children and under the other public assistance programs in that act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 11406. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase the amounts which may be made available to the Virgin Islands as aid to dependent children and under the other public assistance programs in that act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 11407. A bill to establish the principle of a basic single salary wage scale in the Canal Zone for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 11408. A bill to eliminate in certain cases the performance by rural carriers of relay and parcel-post delivery service on city and village delivery routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 11409. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute a contract with the Tule Lake Irrigation District, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 11410. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts with the States or Territories relating to the confinement, care, or treatment of Indians who have been convicted of penal offenses, or who are juvenile delinquents or offenders; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 11411. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska:

H. R. 11412. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 11413. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 11414. A bill to provide a program of Federal student loans to assist students to pursue programs of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 11415. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to fisheries; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; to establish within the Department of the Interior a Fisheries Division; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 11416. A bill to provide that a bust of Adolph J. Sabath be placed in the rotunda of the Old House Office Building; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 11417. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. RODINO (by request):

H. R. 11418. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 11419. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the tax on certain cigars which do not contain reconstituted or processed tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 11420. A bill to prohibit the keeping of dangerous wild animals and poisonous and dangerous reptiles in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 11421. A bill relating to the income-tax basis, in the hands of a surviving spouse, of certain property previously held as community property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 11422. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 11423. A bill to allow credit or refund of gift tax erroneously paid by reason of treating nontaxable divisions of community property as gifts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 11424. A bill to create a Czechoslovakian claims fund to settle claims of certain United States nationals against Czechoslovakia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. J. Res. 628. Joint resolution providing that the day on which the presidential election is held shall be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 11425. A bill for the relief of Beti R. Abramovici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11426. A bill for the relief of Humberto Pascual Chirichigno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11427. A bill for the relief of Watson D. Gangadean and Vishnu-Devi Gangadean and their minor children, Ramesch Gangadean, Camal Gangadean, Ashoka Gangadean, and Krishna Surnath Gangadean; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 11428. A bill for the relief of the United States National Bank of Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 11429. A bill for the relief of Sylvia Ottila Penyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H. R. 11430. A bill for the relief of Domenico Busetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 11431. A bill for the relief of Takehiko Kikuchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 11432. A bill for the relief of Umberto Devellis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 11433. A bill for the relief of Charles E. and Miriam Glasford; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 11434. A bill for the relief of Athanasios Zias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11435. A bill for the relief of Gertrud Auel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1072. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of J. R. Brown and 44 other residents of Germania and Galeton, Pa., for urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1073. By Mr. CRUMPACKER: Petition of Floyd V. Shupert of Elkhart, Ind., and other residents of Elkhart, Marshall and St. Joseph Counties, Ind., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1074. By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of residents of Massachusetts for separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1075. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Secretary, Schenectady Builders' Exchange Schenectady, N. Y., relative to certain resolutions passed by the Schenectady Builders' Exchange at a meeting held on May 17, relating to certain tax rates, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1076. Also petition of the deputy county clerk, County of Maui, T. H., requesting the appropriation of additional funds for the Small Business Administration to cover the cost of establishing an office in Hawaii as requested by the Honorable Elizabeth P. Farrington, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Federal Employee Health Program Discriminates Against the Field Service, Report by Interagency Committee Shows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, a Federal interagency committee, constituted of both personnel administrators and physicians, submitted a report published by the Civil Service Commission which shows that—

Although adequate employee health services are available in many Federal establishments, inadequate services or no service at all are available to a substantial number of employees. In general, the departmental service provides sufficient health services, but in the field service, except where medical services are already available for other purposes such as in Veterans' Administration hospitals and military establishments, employee health services seldom exist.

It is believed that some heads of agencies neither fully realize the value of such health programs nor realize the extent to which they exist in private employment. There is need for additional means for showing top management the worth of health programs.

All I can say on this is that it seems to me to be simply further evidence of the well-documented viewpoint of the present administration regarding employees; be they Federal employees or employees in private industry. This viewpoint has been summarized for us most ably by Charles "Bird Dog" Wilson and Howard Pyle, both high officials in the Federal Government, who are leading exponents of the joy-of-suffering school of economics.

The recently published report of the Civil Service Commission states that—

Mr. Mac Henry Schafer, Director of Personnel, Department of Agriculture, and formerly vice-president and director of employee relations, Northern Trust Co., Chicago. Ill., states:

"As a relative newcomer to Federal service from private business, I was shocked at the little attention paid to emotional and mental disturbances in people. Practically no organized program exists to care for such human needs among Federal workers. Psychiatric aid is rarely available and trained psychological counseling is almost nonexistent. The Public Health Service is restricted to 'fitness for duty' examinations. No therapy for cases of emotional maladjustment is available. The few private clinics are overloaded and can handle little but emergency and extreme cases.

"Even in a brief experience, an outsider can see the evidences of the need. Insecurity and frustration in the worker is not confined to the ranks of big business. Big government has the same problems—and has taken little leadership in doing something about it. In any serious attempt to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of Federal service, much work remains to be done in providing guidance and competent leadership in this area. The cost would be repaid manyfold in more productive employees."

The interagency committee agreed, as a result of their study, that the costs to the Federal Government for employee casualties are less in those agencies having good health-service programs. This is not an inconsiderable factor, because the total cost for compensation in all Federal establishments rose from $23,371,749 in 1952 to $25,842,889 in 1953. This represents a per capita increase from $9.09 in 1952 to $10.42 in 1953. It can be readily seen that if compensation costs can be reduced only a small percentage through employee health programs, as well as through customary safety measures and safety education, substantial cash savings to the Government will result.

I include as part of my remarks a list of the members of the interagency committee together with the recommendations which they submitted:

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE HEALTH PROGRAM EVALUATION—A REPORT BY A COMMITTEE OF THE INTERAGENCY ADVISORY GROUP

Those who served as committee members and alternate members are named below. In addition to these committee members, scores of other medical officers and personnel officers contributed valuable advice and assistance in the preparation of this report.

Verne K. Harvey, M. D. (chairman), Civil Service Commission.

Roy Albert, M. D., Atomic Energy Commission.

Harry O. Carr, Department of the Air Force.

Barry Casper, Atomic Energy Commission.

Wilton H. Dickerson, Civil Service Commission.

Lt. Col. Gordon F. Fisher, USAF, MC, Department of the Air Force.

George H. Hieronymus, Department of the Army.

S. Preston Hipsley, Government Printing Office.

Col. B. Dixon Holland, USA, MC, Department of the Army.

Howard Jackson, Veterans' Administration.

Melvin T. Johnson, M. D., Department of Agriculture.

Edward Landry, Post Office Department.

Maurice Odoroff, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Denton H. Reed, Veterans' Administration.

MacHenry Schafer, Department of Agriculture.

Capt. Lloyd B. Shone, USN, MC, Department of the Navy.

Donald W. Smith, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Josef J. Weisskopf, M. D., Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

INTRODUCTION

This interagency committee, constituted of both personnel administrators and physicians, has been considering ways and means for determining the value of Federal employee health programs developed in accordance with provisions of Public Law 658, 79th Congress, 2d session. A draft of this report has been reviewed by Federal field personnel councils throughout the Nation and strengthened as a result of their many suggestions.

The Federal employees' health service programs have two major objectives:

1. To serve the Federal employee, by assisting him to maintain optimal health while on the job.

2. To serve the Federal Government, by increasing work capacity through maintenance of optimum health.

Public Law 658 specifically states that authorization is given to establish health service programs for Federal employees "for the purpose of promoting the physical and mental fitness of employees of the Federal Government."

These services shall be limited to:

1. Treatment of on-the-job illness and dental conditions requiring emergency attention.

2. Preemployment and other examinations.

3. Referral to private physicians and dentists.

4. Preventive programs relating to health.

This law provides that "services will be provided, by contract or otherwise," and "health service programs shall be established only after consultation with the Public Health Service and consideration of its recommendations." The Federal Employee Health Branch, Division of Hospitals, is providing both functions of the program, consultative and operational.

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this study is to work out practical means for ascertaining and interpreting the results of the Federal employees health program and to provide agencies of the Federal Government as a whole with feasible guides for evaluation of these programs.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. There is sufficient evidence to indicate a need for further development of Federal employee health programs. On the basis of well-established facts in the experience of private industry, there is ample proof that employee health services have been a valuable asset in the promotion and maintenance of the physical and mental fitness of employees under numerous and varied circumstances. This committee, therefore, recommends strengthening of existing health activities and establishment of additional health services in locations where there are a sufficient number of Federal employees to warrant it.

The committee believes that the long-range benefits in decreased absenteeism, lowered accident rates and compensation costs, increased morale, and higher work efficiency by far outweigh the cost of initiating and maintaining appropriate Federal employee health programs which are already authorized by law.

2. Agencies should designate in their budget estimates the amount of money needed for their employee health programs.

3. More adequate provisions should be made for early detection and referral of mental health problems.

4. Maximum utilization should be made of arrangements whereby groups of one agency's employees who are separated from its medical facilities are attached for health services to medical facilities of other Federal agencies if practicable.

5. In establishing and operating their employee health services, agencies should study and follow the United States Public Health Service publication entitled "Health Services for Federal Employees: A Suggested Plan for a Preventive Medical Program in a Federal Employee's Health Service."

6. This committee believes in utilizing available objective techniques as far as possible to evaluate the worth of health programs; at the same time it recognizes the limitations of current techniques for this purpose. It is necessary, therefore, to supplement statistical analyses now available with informed judgment. An agency which does not have an employee health program, but contemplates establishing one, may gain an approximation of the potential of such a program from other agencies' evaluation reports. Likewise, an agency which has not yet directly evaluated its health program may get some indirect idea of its probable value by studying the returns reported by agencies with similar programs.

7. Agencies should evaluate their employee health programs annually. Central offices should require reports on health programs from all of their component bureaus, offices, and establishments. The format provided in this report may be used as a guide for that purpose. Data from other agencies may be useful for comparisons with other programs. New valid criteria for health program evaluation should be used in the future as they are developed.

8. Provisions should be made for annual reports by each agency to a central agency which in turn should incorporate them into a comprehensive report on Federal employee health programs. This summary report should be prepared in a manner to provide optimum assistance to agencies in comparing their health programs with those of other agencies.

9. One Federal agency should be given the responsibility for conducting a scientific study to develop objective criteria for the evaluation of Federal employee health programs.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on the occasion of Polish Constitution Day, May 3, I was absent from the Senate because of illness. I had intended to make a statement to the Senate on that day, and I regret that I was unable to do it.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement to which I have referred be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

On this 165th anniversary of the Polish Constitution, lovers of freedom can feel new optimism that the chains binding Poland to the Communist tyranny will be broken in our time.

One cause for optimism is the debunking of Stalin by the Communist leadership of Russia. Does this mean that the slavemasters are aware of their monstrous crimes? Do they fear the wrath of the subjected peoples and seek to divert it to the dead leader? There is room for hope.

Another cause for optimism is the assertion by the Communist premier of Poland recently that there is to be more democracy in Poland, that the parliament there is going to be allowed more scope for debate and criticism. Here, again, there is room for hope.

The Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, was a splendid document, closely paralleling our own Constitution—then 2 years old. It is one of the tragedies of history that the brave Polish people have been able to live only a few years under their noble charter of liberty.

We in the free world hope and pray that freedom of the type embodied in the Polish Constitution of 1791 will come again to the people of Poland.

With steadfast resolve on the part of liberty-loving Poles inside and outside of their beleaguered homeland, and with the unrelenting support of free peoples elsewhere, Poland can and will be restored to the ranks of a democracy.

The Great Freedom Crusade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, once again I wish to speak about the great freedom crusade.

I want to ask my colleagues to urge their constituents to join in this movement which has as its objective the release of 13 innocent American citizens who are being held in prison by the Chinese Communists.

I wish each one of my colleagues would make a public statement urging the residents of his district to write a simple airmail letter to Mao Tse-tung in Peiping, China.

In this letter the writer should identify himself by name and by occupation and express his desire to have these Americans released and remind Mao Tse-tung that the Chinese Communist representative in Geneva promised to release these Americans many months ago.

Already thousands of such letters have been mailed to Peiping, China, and those who know the Chinese Communists best tell us that if millions of Americans write similar letters to Mao Tse-tung, there is a strong probability that he will react to this great moral influence.

Certainly it is not much to ask that American citizens take a few minutes and buy an airmail stamp for such a worthwhile purpose.

I have already asked the Members of Congress who have constituents in prison in China to cooperate in this worthwhile endeavor, and I have also asked Governor Ribicoff, of Connecticut, all the State officials of Connecticut, and the entire Connecticut delegation in Congress to urge people to participate in this great freedom crusade.

The Growing Narcotics Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, as an outgrowth of my particular interest in the public health problem, it was my pleasure in the 83d Congress to introduce legislation dealing with apprehension and treatment of narcotics addicts in the District of Columbia. This legislation was subsequently passed by the Congress. It has, I believe, provided a solid framework upon which to build a system of control and eventual eradication of the foul menace of drug addiction.

In retrospect, it is apparent that the pioneer drug-addict law is lacking in several vital precepts. First, it does not provide for sufficient control over the individual once he is singled out for possible commitment as a drug addict, and the time lag between preliminary examination and commitment proceedings permits the addict suspect to drift away from this jurisdiction. Existing law does not provide for an interim detention order.

Second, enforcement officers are seriously handicapped by the strict Federal search-and-seizure rules under which they must operate in the District of Columbia. A suspected dope pusher's residence may not be searched at night except upon a warrant obtained by an affidavit from an officer who can swear that he has positive evidence narcotic drugs are located in the premises to be searched. While the probable-cause rule obtains for daytime searches, the nighttime positivity requirement operates as a serious handicap because practically all traffic in narcotic drugs occurs during the sunset to sunrise hours.

A third glaring weakness is to be found in the police officers' lack of authority to arrest on probable cause for misdemeanor violations under the Uniform Narcotic Act. A valid arrest for such violation may be made only when the officer has a warrant or when the violation is actually committed in his presence.

Similarly, neither Federal agents nor Metropolitan Police are authorized to make wiretaps, or to use wiretap information, in order to corroborate testimony or detect new evidence of narcotic law violations. Admittedly controversial, wiretapping is permitted in a number of States and, because the telephone plays an important role in the drug peddling business, use of the wiretap is highly desirable in illegal narcotics investigations. I am told that drug peddling has been virtually wiped out of Philadelphia because of two recent raids staged successfully by enforcement officers after they had gained the information they needed through wiretapping.

Yesterday I introduced an amendment, in which I am joined by a number

of other interested Members of Congress, which broadens existing dangerous drug laws to include barbiturates and synthetics that are not presently covered. It also attempts to correct many apparent practical weaknesses in the existing statutes which are pointed out above.

I do not anticipate that there should be any substantial opposition to this bill, because all Members of Congress and all citizens who have the interest of our country at heart will want to do whatever is reasonable and necessary to stamp out the growing drug addiction problem in the Nation's Capital. One needs only to consider the fact that drug addiction is responsible for approximately 50 percent of all crimes committed in the larger metropolitan areas and 25 percent of all reported crimes in the Nation to comprehend the seriousness of this problem. Even more shocking is the fact that addiction has grown from a ratio of 1 addict to every 10,000 people, at the end of World War II, to about 1 to every 3,000 people in the United States at the present time, and about 13 percent of the addicts are minors less than 21 years of age.

Drug addiction is a contagious thing, with one addict spreading the habit to members of his family, friends, acquaintances, and associates. It should be treated as such. It is inevitable that this $500 million per year traffic will increase unless sharp measures are taken to remove the supplier and the user from society for appropriate treatment.

I would invite the attention of all my colleagues to the legislation I have introduced, which will provide more effective methods for dealing with this tremendous problem in one of the more troublesome narcotic drug centers of the United States, the Nation's Capital.

The Importance of Small Business in Our National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the importance of small business in our national economy should be of continuing interest to all of us. Many definitions have been given of "small business," but my particular interest, for the moment, is directed to the millions of independently owned and operated small local enterprises found in every community throughout the land.

I am vitally interested in this subject because of my conviction that small, independent business is essential to our free enterprise economy. The Federal Government's function should be to provide a healthful climate wherein our people will be given incentive to take the risks which go with commercial ventures.

Many of us were appalled a few years ago when the Federal Government attempted to seize the steel industry. But it would be next to impossible for a grasping National Government to seize our millions of small enterprises. They are a bulwark in the people's defense against Government domination of free men and private property.

Mr. Speaker, most of my colleagues recognize the big part played by small business in the growth of our country. Several proposals are now before the Congress which would provide varying degrees of tax relief to small corporations. It is my feeling that our present tax laws do not make sufficient allowances for the small unincorporated business operator to plow his profits back into his business. This is especially noticeable in the retail field.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, many small concerns can ill afford the heavy overhead expense made necessary by the numerous tax records required today. I am gratified to note that a study has been proposed to consider the impact of Federal taxes on individual taxpayers, small business, and the national economy.

I have asked a representative group of my small, independent business constituents to give me their views on these matters so that I may report more fully to the Congress the grassroots thinking on this important subject.

Federal Aid To Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an exchange of letters with the Board of Education of the city of Stevens Point, Wis. The letter dated May 16, 1956, from the Board of Education of the city of Stevens Point was signed by each member of the Stevens Point school board. The letters follow:

BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Stevens Point, Wis., May 16, 1956.

The Honorable MELVIN R. LAIRD,
House Office Building,
Washington 25, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LAIRD: We are writing you in regard to H. R. 7535, introduced by Representative KELLEY, and S. 2905, introduced by Senator SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and 14 other Senators). These bills are designed to authorize Federal assistance to States and communities in financing public elementary and secondary school construction.

We oppose the Federal school aid as provided in these two bills for the following reasons:

1. State and local responsibility for schools is clearly established under the Federal Constitution and by the constitutions of the several States; it is deeply embedded in the American tradition.

2. American schools have made spectacular progress under State and local responsibility. Educational opportunities are now greater than ever before and greater than in any other country. School-building activity has established new records in each of the past 5 years. Each year more classrooms are being built than are needed to accommodate the increase in enrollment.

3. School needs can be seen and felt more clearly at the local level than in Washington. Action can be taken in communities and States. The Federal Government cannot give anything to the States unless it first takes it away from their citizens. There are no resources in the United States, no wealth or income which are not located within the borders of the 48 States and which are not subject to their taxing powers. Nor is there any restriction on State support of schools save the willingness of their residents to be taxed.

4. The Federal Government has taken on too many responsibilities, and its taxes and debt have become excessive. This would be made worse if new obligations were forced on the Federal Government. The States are in a better position to take care of school needs than is the debt-ridden Federal Government.

5. The trend of growing centralization is threatening to upset the balance of power between the Federal Government and the States. If continued it will destroy the Federal system, concentrate all power in Washington and turn the States into mere administrative subdivisions. If schools should be added to the responsibilities of the Federal Government, the balance of power would be irretrievably lost.

6. It is naive to expect that Federal control of the school system would not creep in and grow if Federal money were provided for school support. The effect of Federal aid would be to transfer the control of the schools from the communities to the professional bureaucracy.

Local school boards have long arranged for their own construction contracts and they bargain to save school funds. Under one of the proposed laws, even the wage rates paid in constructing local schools would be fixed under Federal law—or no Federal money would be granted. The Secretary of Labor would determine a prevailing wage rate and his decision would be final.

The Board of Education of Stevens Point, Wis., by unanimous decision is not in favor of these bills as proposed and we would respectfully ask that you vote against them.

Very truly yours,

Board of Education: T. G. Holthusen, President; A. E. Anderson, Vice President; Gordon Hanson; Leo Larsen; E. S. Hoppa; Francis Roman; Fred Klingbail; Dr. W. G. Wochinski; L. V. Courtney; M. E. Sorensen.

MAY 21, 1956.

Mr. T. G. HOLTHUSEN,
President, Board of Education,
Stevens Point, Wis.

DEAR MR. HOLTHUSEN: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 16, 1956, signed by all members of the board of education of the city of Stevens Point. I appreciated very much receiving your very explicit views regarding H. R. 7535 introduced by Representative KELLEY of Pennsylvania.

Two separate bills are before the Congress at the present time. The Kelley bill sponsored by the Democrats provides $400 million in direct grants to States for 4 years. Each State would receive the same amount, $11.30 per school-age child regardless of need, ability or present effort. The Eisenhower bill would provide for $250 million a year for 5 years giving more aid to those States with the least income per child and less aid to those States not making an effort in their own behalf, but paying some aid to each State. Regardless of whether the Congress takes the Kelley bill or the Eisenhower bill, the amount of money contained in each of these bills for direct grants is small when compared with the total school construction need of the entire country. Instead of putting this Federal aid out

in dribbles, it should be used in those areas which have made the maximum effort to solve their own school problem but find it impossible to construct needed classrooms without Federal aid. Certainly the Eisenhower bill does an infinitely better job in meeting this need test than the Kelley bill. It is defective, however, in that it pays aid to States which have the ability to finance their own schools and to States which are not making the minimum effort in their own behalf. These two bills must be amended so that they will contain an adequate need requirement. Federal aid must be used where a State, because of inadequate resources, is unable to do the job.

It is wasteful for the Federal Government to give funds to all States, extracting tax money from the rich ones, deducting its administrative expenses and then returning it to the rich and the poor in the form of assistance. The Federal Government is justified in attempting to equalize the ability of States to meet their needs by serving as a medium whereby the richer States can contribute to the poorer States much as we apportion equalization aid to the various school districts in Wisconsin.

I certainly want to commend the Stevens Point Board of Education for making the very thorough study which was made of the Fedral aid to education proposals. Your letter to me of May 16 was evidence of the fact that this legislation had been very carefully and thoroughly considered by your school board. I further want you to know that your views have been and will continue to be given very careful and thorough consideration by me at all times.

With best wishes and kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Member of Congress.

Fluoridation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have here two letters from people who well express some of the arguments against the arbitrary acts of the Public Health Service in forcing the fluoridation of city water supplies upon our citizens. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that these letters be printed in the RECORD as I believe that this program of fluoridation presents a real menace to the health and rights of our people. No one should be forced to submit to this kind of medication against his will.

Immediately following the letters are some remarks of my own concerning the subject of fluoridation.

FARGO, N. DAK., *May 7, 1956.*

Hon. USHER L. BURDICK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Upon learning that Congress has been asked to appropriate almost three million dollars to the United States Public Health Service to combat dental disorders, it becomes clear to me that this money would be used for one purpose and that is propaganda. Fluoridation is always paid for by the cities which put it in, but this agency always sends a team out around the country to wine and dine the dentists, public officials and PTA members. This costs money to be sure and the newspaper advertisements which are all layed out for the newspapers to use cost money too. The "kits" which this department has printed up for use by the American Dental Association and to send to Congressmen are also expensive.

Whenever a court case comes up it is someone from the USPHS who travels across the country to testify against local citizens who do not want to be mediated by public water supplies. In our case here it was Dr. Nicolas Leone, who told us that now fluoridation is considered even good for adults and especially good for women over 40. He did not say in what way.

Please, sir, would you be favorable to a joint congressional investigation by an impartial committee entirely free from promoters of fluoridation? A committee composed entirely of trained statisticians would prove in a hurry that the figures and charts put out by the USPHS are deceiving and deliberately falsified. The whole subject should be traced back to the beginning of the idea and I am sure some very interesting information would be brought out.

With a son in the service I resent the order by some Government agency that all naval and Army bases be fluoridated. Why? Are there so many little children under the age of 8 on any base?

This program stems from the World Health Organization in 1951 and although France, Switzerland, and other countries have held fluoridation to be dangerous, we are forced to submit to it. France has held it to be against individual freedom and is France to be more concerned with such freedom than the United States? We need your help to get to the bottom of this menace and I hope you will do what you can to get such an investigation started. Thanking you for whatever you can do, I am,

Yours very truly,

GLADYS ZUBE
(Mrs. Arnold G. Zube).

SAN MATEO, CALIF., *May 8, 1956.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BURDICK: I am reliably informed that Congress has been asked to appropriate some millions of dollars to the Public Health Service to "combat dental disorders." It is strongly suspect that if such funds are made available they will be used in part or in full to disseminate propaganda in favor of fluoridation of public water supplies.

If it is deemed appropriate to grant the request, I urge the Congress to specifically stipulate that not one penny of it be used to beat the drums in favor of the strongly suspect and highly controversial practice of fluoridation.

I am a graduate of the University of Washington and have taught chemistry for many years. The case against fluoridation is simple and logical. No doctor worthy of his profession would prescribe the same medication for an entire population regardless of whether the individuals were old or young, weak or strong, sick or well and I testify that fluorides in any amount constitute a medication. This is not to say that in some instances such poisonous substances as fluorides may not be beneficial. Strychnine may also be a useful medicine in some cases, but it is highly unscientific to prescribe either of these substances as a mass medication.

The second point against fluoridation is, that it is an invasion of civil rights. Never before in the history of this Nation has an adult been compelled, against his better judgement, to take any medication for the alleged prevention of a noncommunicable disorder. Fluoridation is an entering wedge. If water supplies can be medicated, then individually or in mass, citizens may be forced to take medications they do not need nor desire and they will therefore no longer be secure in their persons.

Fluorides are available in low cost, easy to take, tablet form for those who want and need them. Once water is fluoridated this salt cannot be removed by boiling or any simple means short of distillation, so everyone who drinks the water is being forced to take a medication.

I earnestly request that you read this letter to the Congress and have it, or some similar testimony, inserted in the RECORD.

Yours very truly,

CARL T. RICHARDSON.

Chemical treatment of drinking water is supposed to prevent the decay of teeth—that is what the experts say. This may or may not be true, but the advocates of fluoridation of water cannot say, at this time, what deleterious effects such chemicals have on the general health of the public. There is much evidence that they do have a noxious effect.

If a choice must be taken between sound teeth and life, then I submit that life should take precedence. Teeth can be artificially supplied, but life cannot—at least not yet. Any individual can struggle along with "store teeth" and still be able to conduct his business, profession, or calling with very slight impairment of his natural faculties, but if his life is ended prematurely it will not make much difference whether or not his teeth have been preserved.

Before we go too far with fluoridation the public should know what results the use of these chemicals have on the general health. A man can still be of some use in life with Sears, Roebuck teeth, but he will be considerably handicapped if his liver and other vital organs have been eaten up by chemicals.

United States Membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of floor discussion on H. R. 5550, the bill which would authorize United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation. The arguments, pro and con, are now familiar to us here in the House. There seems no need for me to repeat the arguments. Other distinguished Members have done this eloquently, both before the Ways and Means Committee and on the floor of this House.

In this discussion on H. R. 5550 I believe it to be of utmost importance that we go behind the formal arguments used. Supporters of H. R. 5550 have put forth their arguments with a pronounced air of self-righteousness. They have consistently appealed to questions of high policy to gain support for the measure. They make an argument of national interest for it—as glibly as Elmer Gantry.

I do not doubt that there are some proponents of H. R. 5550 who sincerely believe that such propositions constitute

reasonable supporting arguments for H. R. 5550 and what it represents.

Unfortunately, I feel it my duty to disenchant unselfish and honorably minded supporters of the measure. I cannot sit idly by and see them becoming innocent dupes to a form of naked opportunism which threatens economic security in major areas of this land.

To illustrate my point, I need only cite an incident which occurred recently in our Capital. During the 44th annual meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce some of the more calculating OTC supporters appear to have attempted—and failed—in a complicated maneuver. In the opinion of many informed citizens, their effort was certainly not launched in the best interests of our constitutional system.

At that meeting the chamber delegates were presented with a policy statement on multilateral trade agreements which read as follows:

> The chamber favors participation by the United States in international organizations which deal with international commitments for the relaxation of trade restrictions; provide mechanisms through which arrangements for trade negotiations would be facilitated, and serve as forums for the discussion of trade problems and the amicable adjustment of problems involving commercial rules and commitments mutually agreed upon by the members. Under no conditions, however, shall the United States surrender its sovereignty or submit to control or domination by any supranational organization.

As its proponents admitted after a flood of membership mail, this statement is tantamount to an endorsement of United States participation in the Organization for Trade Cooperation. Once adopted it would surely be used in support of H. R. 5550. OTC supporters could then claim that American business was behind the bill, and that the chamber favored the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade or GATT. But it might also be taken to represent support of an ITO, and economic NATO, or almost any other combination under the sun. Fortunately, alert delegates preparing to go to the chamber's annual meeting detected this. The excellent letter from the Midland, Mich., chamber gave a strong alarm. Delegates realized that they were being railroaded into a position which was certainly not overwhelmingly of their own choosing and which did not express their own feelings. Ten speakers rose to oppose the proposal, and I am happy to report that the delegates voted 227 to 163 for the only opposition proposal—to submit the statement prepared under sponsorship of the Foreign Commerce Department Committee on multilateral trade agreements to a referendum of the whole membership. Now that members have been alerted to the real purpose behind this ill-contrived statement of policy, I feel sure it will be rejected by the chamber's members.

How was such a maneuver possible? In the case of the United States Chamber of Commerce, I think it is attributable largely to the man who chaired the chamber's foreign commerce department committee last year, Mr. John S. Coleman. It was Mr. Coleman who was instrumental in having the statement included in the chamber's proposal policy declarations. And I am certain that Mr. Coleman will play an even larger role in such matters in the forthcoming year as the president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. There can be no mistake that he favors the participation of this Nation in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

Certainly this stratagem within the Chamber was conducted in a rather devious manner. But it is important to note that Mr. Coleman has more than one string for his bow. He is also chairman of the lobbying group called the Committee for a National Trade Policy. This committee was the spearhead of support for H. R. 5550 before the House Ways and Means Committee. If you will recall, Mr. Charles Taft, who represented the National Committee for a National Trade Policy, appealed to the national interest in advocating passage of the bill. For the most part this group consists of, and is financed by, men with extensive foreign business connections. The committee takes a holier-than-thou attitude on foreign trade, trys to smear opponents as self-seeking, and hides or obscures the financial stakes of its supporters.

Do similar considerations motivate the committee's chairman, Mr. Coleman? Just what kind of a man is he?

In this connection I would like to review some testimony given last year before the Senate's Committee on Finance at hearings on H. R. 1, the extension of the Trade Agreements Act. I hasten to add that in addition to the other, shall we say, "public service" duties of Mr. Coleman, he is also president of the Burroughs Corp.—a manufacturer of business machines with far-flung overseas operations. And now I quote from the record of the Senate Finance Committee hearings on H. R. 1:

> This company (Burroughs) manufactures adding machines and other business equipment in five locations in the United States and in the following foreign countries: Canada, 2 plants and 1 plant site; England, 1 plant; Brazil, 2 plants; France, 1 plant.
>
> Marketing corporations exist in 20 countries. The corporate net profit in 1953 was $7,206,655 on sales of $162,035,781, of which over $2,068,978 represented dividends from foreign subsidiaries, or approximately $2,700,000 if taken before a loss of $608,143 which was sustained in remitting dividends from Brazil. This figure of $2,700,000 foreign profit does not include the company's Canadian business, the profit from which is lumped with the United States profit. Hence, even without including the nonsegregated Canadian profits, 37.5 percent of the company's earnings are coming from abroad. The investment in countries other than the United States and Canada is listed as approximately $8.5 million of a total corporate equity of some $70 million. Foreign contingent liabilities additionally are listed as $1,093,000 making the investors' foreign exposure around $9,600,000. (Accounting data is spelled out more fully in the annual report, audited by Price Waterhouse & Co.)
>
> The company appears to have closed down one plant in this country and moved the production and jobs to Scotland.
>
> The tax advantages to Burroughs of the president's proposals cannot be estimated from the data which the company publishes. With such a heavy foreign investment, it might be substantial. Nor is the extent known to which Burroughs ships foreign-made equipment or parts to United States or other markets.

In the light of this report, is it any wonder that the president of the Burroughs Corp. should have supported H. R. 1 with all the means at his disposal?

Must we not acknowledge that his chairmanship of the chamber's foreign commerce department committee and his chairmanship in the committee for a national trade policy are moves which would give the Burroughs Corp. a public forum on foreign-trade matters? And does not this corporation make a large part of its profits through foreign trade? After all, have not both groups, the chamber and the committee been used to promote legislation which is in direct interest of the Burroughs Corp.? Have not they served admirably without establishing a direct connection between the corporation itself and so-called unselfish moves to support H. R. 5550? And would not it be asking too much of the committee on a national trade policy to reveal such information on its own initiative?

But let us move on to H. R. 5550, the legislation under consideration by the Congress. At its least, the passage of the bill would make more secure the program by means of which Mr. Coleman has expanded the interests and profits of his business abroad. Oddly enough, the Burroughs Corp. has not seen fit to outline for the Congress or its shareholders the plan and rationale behind its foreign operations. Its published financial reports do not give adequate data even on its Canadian profits, much less its plants for exporting its manufacturing facilities into areas where cheap foreign labor can cut American prices.

Fortunately for us, news reports on the activities of Mr. Coleman's company help to bring us up to date. Perhaps they also give us a further clue to the reasons why Mr. Coleman is able so nicely to mate idealism and calculated business deals, and why his company finds it convenient to obscure financial reports on its foreign operations.

Here is what Business Week had to report on the Burroughs Corp.:

> Burroughs' new expansion into computers and similar machines is taxing its United States production and research facilities. The company's expansion of facilities hasn't been enough to accommodate both this new line and its old calculator and adding-machine business. That's why it has shifted all production of calculating machines to its plant at Strathleven, Scotland. This plant is now the sole source of Burroughs calculating machines, even for the United States market.
>
> Meanwhile, Burroughs has wanted for years to round out its line by adding cash registers that could compete directly with the products of National Cash Register Co.
>
> Last fall, it found a way to do it without setting up an expensive United States manufacturing operation. Burroughs signed a contract as sole American distributor for Anker, a German firm that is making a line of machines for Burroughs roughly matching National Cash Register's line in the United States market.

On April 10, 1956, the Wall Street Journal suggested that a trend is evolv-

ing in the sales of business machines in this country:

According to the Government's import figures, the number of foreign-made typewriters brought into this country jumped to 15,673 in January 1956, from only 2,210 in January 1951. The dollar value of imported electric adding and calculating machines amounted to nearly $1 million in January 1956, compared with about one-fourth that total 5 years earlier.

These figures don't represent much in the multi-billion-dollar United States office equipment market. But many trade observers believe the steadily rising curve on the imports chart will continue to move skyward.

"I'm betting European typewriters and calculators will account for 25 percent of total sales in their respective lines by 1957," forecasts the sales vice president of one of the leading United States business machine manufacturers.

What do the moves of Mr. Coleman's Burroughs Corp. mean for the individual American? What are the consequences of the national trade policy which he advocates? The testimony last year before the Senate Finance Committee and the news reports I cited supply us with the answer.

Apparently it is the policy of the Burroughs Corp. to move production facilities existing in this country overseas and to acquire additional facilities there. The products manufactured overseas are then imported into this country. That makes lots of money for Burroughs.

In effect, Mr. Coleman and the Burroughs Corp. transfer American jobs to foreign lands where they are open to foreign low-paid labor. In addition, Burrough creates job opportunities overseas which might have been provided here. Moreover, Mr. Coleman's corporation spawns a foreign competition to our domestic products by exporting technical and managerial know-how developed in our own land—again, a foreign competition which is based on low-paid foreign labor.

Is Mr. Coleman content merely with endangering our native business machine industry in this manner? It appears he would make the migration of American industry to foreign lands even more profitable by lowering our slim measures of tariff protection, and binding us forever to it by an international cartel agreement GATT/OTC. I ask how we are to maintain our high level of employment and high wage rates if we continue in the direction that the Colemans of this Nation are taking us? Is this what our national chamber of commerce stands for? I for one, don't think so, and I don't think the chamber's members do either.

These, then, are the blatantly self-seeking consideration which lie hidden behind the high-sounding words which are used by Mr. Coleman and many of his colleagues who support our membership in GATT and the OTC. Once these facts are known, they will spread alarm throughout the Nation.

Yes; those of us who have consistently opposed H. R. 5550 and the foreign trade program which it represents can be called selfish in our own way. We seek to preserve the economic values of the Nation against the unlimited competition of foreign labor, just as Alexander Hamilton, Abraham Lincoln, and others of our forefathers did. We seek to preserve the high levels of employment and wages of this Nation, and to preserve the growth potentials of our own economy, particularly for our ever-burgeoning new industries. If these are selfish motives, then we plead guilty of them.

Tomorrow's Merchant Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on Tuesday evening, May 22, my distinguished colleague [Mr. MAGNUSON] made the principal address before the Propeller Club dinner, Washington, D. C., on "Tomorrow's Merchant Fleet." Because this address was in honor of National Maritime Day, and because of the great importance of the subject involved, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOMORROW'S MERCHANT FLEET

(Address by Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON before the Propeller Club dinner, Washing, D. C., May 22, 1956)

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I consider it a great honor to be with you on National Maritime Day. It is the day Congress has set aside annually to pay tribute to, and reevaluate the progress, of our entire maritime industry. Throughout the day, in this country and abroad, our flag has been flying from all Government buildings in tribute to this great industry. American-flag ships, busy at their trade upon the oceans of the world, have dressed ship for this occasion.

We have gathered here tonight to do our small part and pay our small tribute. While doing so, every one of us should be reaffirming our pledge to do everything within our power to keep the merchant marine of the United States strong. To renew our efforts, during the coming year. To accomplish the tasks which will make the United States merchant marine the most efficient, the most modern, and the best-equipped merchant fleet in the entire world.

I wish that everyone could realize the importance of our merchant marine to them, as Americans, in time of peace as well as in time of emergency and war. Unfortunately, the industry is not of such a nature that it can show off its product. Unlike the air transport industry, it cannot present an impressing air show with echelon after echelon of new equipment passing overhead. Instead, we are limited to deep water areas to display our wares and thus limited in our personal contact with the general public. I am happy to say, however, that our ships are busy plying the trade routes of the world. The few that are resting in United States harbors tonight would be woefully inadequate to convey our message to the American people, and the importance of the health of our industry to them.

I might say here that I am informed on the average our dry cargo vessels spend 60 percent of their time in port and only 40 percent at sea. This condition is directly attributable to the unbelievable lack of progress during the past 50 years in the development of new cargo handling techniques and port facilities. I have mentioned only two of the many problems facing us today. The need for a better informed public as to the requirements of the merchant marine and its value to them. The need for more research and development to devise methods and equipment to improve our antiquated and inefficient cargo handling methods.

Tomorrow's merchant fleet is my topic. It would give me the greatest pleasure to be able to tell you that tomorrow's fleet is here now. As a matter of fact, I would be delighted to be able to tell you that tomorrow's merchant fleet will be here tomorrow. Unfortunately, I can do neither. I can very definitely tell you that it is not here today.

I can also tell you that without the continuing efforts of all of you in the exercise of your daily duties that it will not be here tomorrow.

All of us know that the United States merchant marine is the fourth arm of our national defense, both during a cold war and in time of actual conflict. Unless we continue our efforts to protect it from those who would ignore its needs during peacetime, it will fall into decay and ruin as it did prior to World Wars I and II. We must continue our efforts to improve and modernize this great industry.

Let us suppose a child is born tonight who, upon reaching his 7th birthday asks his father to take him down to the docks to see the new ships flying the flag of the United States. If the father is well enough informed, he could explain that on the night the boy was born 7 years ago, over 70 percent of the United States merchant fleet was in such a condition that the vessels are obsolete in 1963. He could further explain that these were the ships built during World War II and that because the United States did not have a sound, long-range shipbuilding program, very few new vessels were financed, designed and constructed during the intervening 20 years. This condition resulted in the decay of the major part of the merchant fleet. The father then could, and with great difficulty I believe, try to make the child understand that because we did not have an active, healthy, vessel replacement program, our shipyards fell into disuse. With the resultant disintegration of existing facilities, labor skills were lost. There was no opportunity to utilize the skills that had been perfected. He could point out that capital was not available to build ships, because opponents to a strong merchant marine or those who fail to understand this problem, insist that subsidies and aids provided by the Government be on a temporary and piecemeal basis.

Thus, shipowners and investment bankers, as prudent businessmen, could not advocate the necessarily large investment required for new ship construction because of the impermanent nature of our maritime aid program and our lack of a long-range, sound ship construction program.

Then, I am afraid, he would have to tell the boy, rather lamely, something along this line. "You see, son, back in those days we were at peace and we wanted to reduce our taxes and we just couldn't see giving aid to a private industry just so it could meet foreign competition. When the time came and we needed the merchant marine to supply our requirements away from home, we found that ours just wasn't much help." I am afraid all this would be rather complicated for a 7 year old boy. It seems to be too complicated for grown, mature adults, and our record, out of two world wars, proves this. But wouldn't it be wonderful if that father could take his son down to a harbor and point with pride to gleaming streamlined efficient vessels and say with pride, "There you are, son. That's part of the merchant marine of the United States—the finest fleet of any country in the world."

To build, to operate, to experiment requires labor. Our ships are manned by fine American officers and seamen. Each day they are on their jobs swells their fund of experience and knowledge of their particular duty. They become more efficient and better qualified. They are ready for advancement, either at sea or ashore. Such training and experience cannot be purchased anywhere on earth.

The labor problem in the shipyards is acute. It has been 10 years since the end of World War II. During that 10 years, many skilled craftsmen and engineers, who were essential to the success of the World War II shipbuilding program, have left the industry. Who is taking their place? In 1944, the young men were away at war. Yet, in 1964, in case of an emergency, it will be these same men who will be called upon to enter our labor force. Because of our lack of building during this 20-year period, we will not only lack an adequate merchant marine, but we will not have an adequately trained labor force.

Fortunately for us, the rumblings of World War II were loud and ominous enough to give a little time to prepare for the task ahead. We cannot count on a similar preparatory time in the future. In fact, everything that I have read and heard would indicate exactly the opposite. With no time to prepare, untrained labor, inadequate facilities, our position will be materially different than it was in 1940. It is necessary for all of us to do what we can to prevent this dismal picture from ever becoming a reality.

LEGISLATION

Merchant marine legislation, like other types of legislation, is not perfect. Changing times and conditions require amendments and additions to existing law. As chairman of the Senate Committee for Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have personally supervised 34 merchant marine bills in the 84th Congress. Twenty-five of these bills have passed the Senate. Thirteen of these bills have become law. Probably one of the most important bills to the maritime industry in this Congress is S. 2584 which threatens the principle underlying our 50–50 law. That bill is now before my committee. In essence, S. 2584 would amend Public Law 480 and exempt certain cargoes from the provisions of Public Law 664 (50–50), which requires that 50 percent of all cargoes financed or purchased with Federal funds be transported in American-flag vessels. If I may, I would like to digress a moment and give you some background on the origination of this policy.

FIFTY-FIFTY

Historically, the United States has attempted to protect its merchant marine from foreign competition and to prepare it to act as the fourth arm of defense. Initially, such protection was directed to all domestic commerce in support of our overseas Military Establishment. Later it was extended to include all foreign shipments created by loans made by agencies of the United States. The 1936 act reduced this volume to a substantial portion of the United States export and import waterborne commerce. Public Law 664 (50–50) further defined the area as 50 percent of our foreign aid program. As a result, since 1946 foreign-flag vessels have steadily increased their advantage in this field until today they carry 75 percent of the United States foreign commerce. Cargo preference (Public Law 664) has been a great factor in retaining for United States flag vessels the 25 percent that we now carry. In the market place the American owner is at a disadvantage in competing for pure commercial cargo for several reasons. Exchange restrictions, the terms of sales imposed by overseas buyers and most important, the traditional policy of and economic incentives for foreign governments and citizens to patronize vessels of their own national registry, are the primary factors. Now, certain maritime nations are attempting to reduce the American-flag traffic to an even smaller figure by recommending the elimination of 50–50 to certain Government-aid cargoes.

Gentlemen, we should face up to this problem. The United States, to continue as a Nation, must maintain a strong and adequate defense system. An important and essential arm of that system is the merchant marine. To maintain a trained and efficient personnel and to stay abreast of maritime technological developments the peacetime American merchant marine must receive Government aid.

We certainly cannot accomplish this by removing the basic plans upon which our entire policy is founded, or by weakening legislation specifically designed to keep our merchant marine strong. We certainly cannot give our foreign friends a commercial carte blanche in peacetime and still give them adequately staffed and efficient ships in wartime. It merely evolves to the question of whether we desire unlimited free trade in peacetime and an inadequate or nonexistent American merchant marine—or whether we insist upon certain trade advantages for our own ships (which, incidentally, every foreign maritime nation does) and have a strong fourth arm of defense if the need arises.

I have been fighting for the latter principle for many years. I shall continue to fight for it. Changing times and conditions require changes in existing law. It is the function of Congress to determine whether such changes are in the best interest of the people of the United States. Accordingly, in the discharge of my duty, I ordered that hearings be held on the merits of this suggested amendment.

RESEARCH—ATOMIC SHIP

While it is necessary to work with the tools at hand to improve the status of our merchant marine, we cannot ignore the possible tools of the future. Nothing in this world is static. If we do not progress, we are, in effect, retrogressing. The speed of the retrogression is dependent upon how fast our competition is progressing. In the merchant marine field, our failure to devote a proper amount of time, money, and men to research and experimentation has retarded our overall progress. Our generation lives in the age of the atom. The experimental age, to be sure, but nonetheless, it is our lot to be faced with this challenging situation. If we meet the challenge, we can turn it to our advantage. If we fail, the world may go down with us.

I have advocated the construction and operation of a nuclear-powered prototype merchant ship. Certainly the national interest requires that the Federal Government take the lead and bear the brunt of the cost during the experimental and development stages. The full cooperation of the atomic-energy people, the nuclear-reactor manufacturers, and the representatives of the shipping companies would be essential to the success of such an undertaking.

With the reality of nuclear vessel propulsion upon us, I suggest the maritime industry is on the brink of an event of even greater impact than the coming of steam to trans-ocean movement of goods and people. The application of atomic energy to merchant vessels will make all of us hardly recognize this trade in the near future as judged by today's standards.

The potential carrying capacity of each vessel will be so great due to the increase in revenue space per ship and high speed that present trade volume could be handled with far fewer units. Concomitant changes will therefore be necessary in the entire steamship organization. Policy decisions will be rendered by or in close consort with engineers and physicists. Sea speeds will mean trade routes will necessarily be altered as distances shrink in terms of voyage days. Cargo handling time will stand in even greater contrast to present sea time and require courageous and forward-thinking solutions. Terminal facilities will require radical reshaping in order to adapt to the more modern ocean carrier. Port time must be cut to avoid retarding of the rapid movement of vessels.

Purely commercial and private operation of atomic-powered merchant vessels may be a greater distance away than their mere physical existence because of the heavy initial capital investment. Government and industry will have to work hand in hand to reduce the costs so that such a plan is practicable. Regardless of financial considerations, the private ownership of atomic-powered vessels is not so far off that the industry can dismiss the prospect of having soon to recast its total rate structure. With such recasting the true and total impact of atomic vessel propulsion will be felt. Competitive pricing of merchandise will undergo sharp changes worldwide as ocean transportation costs are drastically reduced. With the lower freight costs, goods will be moving across the ocean of a nature and in a volume as cannot presently be visualized. The atomic merchant ship will surely bring dramatically new patterns of international trade. These patterns will affect not our maritime industry alone but the very roots of our domestic economy. I hope the maritime industry stands ready to adjust to and pioneer in these developments. Ultimately, the net benefit thereof will be reaped by the peoples around the world.

The overall project is so vast and overwhelming that all of us could devote the remainder of our lives to this one task, and yet there would still be much to do. The fact that we may fail or encounter prodigious problems along the way should not deter us one single day. Who among you can tell me with accuracy how much time we have left to accomplish these necessities? The answer is obvious. Such research and development is essential to our national welfare and to the well-being of every operator of an American-flag vessel, as well as to the world.

Planning for ships which make up tomorrow's fleet is important. But we must plan ahead for the men to man them, too.

Finally, we are making important headway on the training facilities for the men our fleet will need.

By unanimous action of both the Senate and the House of Representatives the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point became a permanent Federal academy last February.

Ironically while administration spokesmen these days praise the American Merchant Marine, the Defense Department has threatened withdrawal of the Naval Reserve status held by the cadets at Kings Point and at the four State maritime academies. However, the Senate has passed a measure (S. 1748) designed to insure the continuation of this important reserve program and it is to be hoped tht the House will take similar action before they adjourn for the summer.

Personal Explanation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, because of an unavoidable delay in airplane travel

from Hartford to Washington today, I was 1 minute late for the vote on the farm bill. Had I been present, I would have voted for passage.

Address of Hon. Kenneth A. Roberts Before Reserve Officers Association at Remington Hall, Anniston, Ala., April 28, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the speech made by my colleague, Congressman KENNETH ROBERTS, on the occasion of the annual convention of the Reserve Officers Association in Anniston, Ala., April 28, 1956. It is an excellent speech depicting the great contributions which have been made by our Reserve forces, and the important role they play in our national defense today. It is important that in this time of international tension, we all recognize and support the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 as one of our strongest bulwarks of peace.

The speech follows:

This evening we are observing Military Reserve Week. I think it is altogether fitting and proper that this meeting be held here at Fort McClellan as by this coming together, we are in a sense honoring an institution that has contributed in every possible way to the defense of this Nation and to the defense of the free world. I have met many people in other parts of the country who remember the days of World War I and World War II and the training at Fort McClellan which fitted them for the defense of this country.

I am sure all of us know that during World War II, 350,000 troops were trained at McClellan and went on to practically all of the battlefields where American troops were found during World War II. During the years of inactivity at Fort McClellan, which have been few, National Guard and Reserve officers have trained here and have gone on to participate in Korea and, in fact, on every front where democracy is being challenged. We are indeed grateful for the fact that McClellan is again being given its right to prepare not only our men, but also the women of the WAC for their duties throughout the world. McClellan occupies a three-fold position, or I may say, has a three-fold mission. It is the center for the Chemical Corps Training Command, the permanent home of the WAC, and is the center for National Guard and Reserve training in the Southeast. I could not in all fairness pay tribute to this three-fold mission without emphasizing the tremendous contribution which is made by Anniston Ordnance Depot at Bynum. I am sure you know that had it not been for the preparation made there, the readiness and the efficiency of this installation, our troops in Korea would have had no ready supply of armament in that conflict. It has been reported that MacArthur's intelligence told him that heavy tanks could not be used in Korea because of the flimsy bridge structures and narrow roads, but, as you know, those of you who were in the Korean conflict, tanks were used by the Communists and had it not been for the fact that installations like Bynum had prepared for this eventuality, we would have been kicked completely out of the peninsula of Korea. With these two great defense installations, both having a tremendously important mission, certainly Calhoun County has contributed a great share to the defense of democracy.

Now, let me get back to my mission which constitutes a rare privilege in many ways. In the first place, having served in the Navy as a member of the Reserve Corps, I think I have an understanding of the attitude and I might say I know something about the treatment Reserves have received in the past. I suppose there will always be a certain amount of healthy competition between the Regulars and the Reserves, and while we like to talk about the importance of the citizen soldier, I think that without the regular establishment we could never hope to compete with the military of the dictatorship nations. I know that I speak the sentiment of all here when I say that we are all proud of West Point, Annapolis, and the new Air Force Academy. We are grateful for the products of these institutions and you have to admit that these establishments have a great deal on the ball when you consider the fact that from these schools have come men like Robert E. Lee, U. S. Grant, Phil Sheridan, Chester Nimitz, John Towers, Smedley Butler, Dwight D. Eisenhower, James Van Fleet, Lawton Collins and many others who have attained the heights of glory in military achievement. At the same time, however, the great mass of military personnel has always come from the ranks of average citizens and it has been the ability to convert people from the plough handle, the store, the factory, the mine and the forest in a short time which has made them equal or superior to the Nazi storm trooper and the regular soldier of our enemies in arms.

So, you might say that with the leadership provided by the Regular Army, Navy and Air Force, this country will doubtless continue to rely on a highly trained Reserve.

It occurs to me, however, that with the new nuclear weapons and with the crashing of the sonic barrier, the United States will never again have a breathing spell between the time of the first enemy attack and the period of retaliation on our part. I think there is general agreement on this fact and I sincerely believe that upon the success of our military reserve training program may well hinge the outcome of the next conflict. Historically, the subject of trained reserves has been with us since the latter part of the 18th century, but never before has this subject been so well pointed up as it was in the Korean emergency. Never before has the cost of the lack of a military program been so illustrated in terms of human unfairness and military unpreparedness. Between World War II and Korea, about 4½ million men came of military age; about 1,100,000 saw service through induction or enlistment; 3,500,000 did nothing and although about 900,000 of the 3,500,000 would have been 4–F under present military standards, the balance were fit in every way for military service and were required neither to train nor to serve. When the Korean conflict came we had no source of trained manpower except the National Guard and the veterans of World War II who still had a reserve obligation. About 986,000 reservists were recalled for Korea and of this group 70 percent—between 600,000 and 700,000—were veterans of World War II. These men were heads of families, defense workers, scientists, technicians, farmers and just plain citizens earning a living. They were ordered into active Federal service regardless of any of the above situations which might have deferred them from induction, while others younger than they who had never before worn the uniform and who were heads of families, defense workers, scientists, technicians, farmers and just plain citizens earning a living were exempt or deferred from induction on that basis. It was an odd situation that the county would call up a 32-year-old World War II veteran, completely inactive in the reserve, with a wife and 3 children, and yet a young man 19 years old, a college freshman or sophomore taking a campus course could be deferred "in the interest of national safety and welfare" as essential to the civilian economy. Further, if this young freshman or sophomore could do some successful wooing and get himself a wife and become a father while the fighting was going on—and immense numbers of them did—he was given a permanent exemption from service on that basis. In short, some men paid twice for their ticket to freedom while a larger and younger group drew free passes. Such a situation was repeated thousands of times during the Korean conflict. It could not be charged to a lack of patriotism on the part of this younger group, but certainly it demonstrated the lack of a fair system and one might even say the lack of good commonsense. The Korean war began in June 1950 and in 4 short months over 300,000 reservists had been recalled. By the end of the year, 700,000 reservists were on active duty.

Now let's look at the draft. In July not one soldier was inducted. In August about 1,500 were inducted, and in September 50,000 per month. In the following months the draft level was about 50,000. It is crystal clear that the first and most horrible year of the Korean war was fought by regulars brought quickly up to strength by veteran reservists, some of whom were in Korea less than a month after receiving their recall. Aside from the aspect of human suffering, what did this cost the country in terms of dollars? Roughly, before Korea, dependency allowances were about a quarter of a billion dollars a year. After the war began these costs jumped to $1 billion a year, or a grand total of $3 billion for the 3 years of the conflict. Clearly, since men with families were not inducted during this period, the bulk of this money was required because of the recall of reservists, most of whom had families. The older veteran cost the Government more for dependents, housing, and schooling, as well as for other nongovernmental expenditures for emergency needs of wives and families by the Red Cross. No matter who spends the money, the American people pay the bill.

I cannot spend time in this talk trying to convince you of the importance of trained men; your presence here is sufficient proof of your belief. I think most of us know also that it is not weapons alone that wins wars, but the men who handle the weapons. In the final analysis, it is the man, his training, his morale, his courage that determines the survival of nations.

It has been said that from the earliest days of the Republic, a military obligation has been recognized and it will be remembered that the first reservist to serve his country was the minuteman of 1776. Most of the States followed a plan of setting up the office of adjutant general as one of the first provisions in their constitutions. This was natural and proper because before the pioneers could establish homes, churches, and schools, there undoubtedly had to be some semblance of order and security. From Washington's time down to the present, the citizen's obligation to serve in the defense of his country has been legally established. It is sad to note, however, that until last year with the passage of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, no mandatory training had ever been provided for the future soldiers of this country.

I suppose one might say that the reluctance to provide for military training is due in part to the fear of the people of military dictatorship. Having been oppressed for so long by the mother country, by having troops quartered on them without their consent,

the heroes of the Revolution probably transferred their hate of the Red Coats down to successive generations, and I might say that I think this hate has served a good purpose. Today, however, when we are living on the brink of nuclear war; when we are, as Senator Barkley said last Saturday night, attempting to see how close to the brink we can rollerskate without going over; it is well that we officially establish not only military obligation, but mandatory military training. The Congress has determined that since we need military manpower, the best way and the economical way is to have a smaller standing regular force and a large Reserve of 3 million men trained and ready. So it is that the Congress last year, for the first time, passed a universal military training law which will, it is hoped, do much to remedy these weaknesses in the Reserve.

From the moment children are born parents watch over them, protect them, and prepare them for the life ahead. We teach them to be careful in heavy traffic on the way to school and we call the doctor at the slightest sign of sickness. We do without many things we would like to have and sacrifice so that we can give our children the best education within our means so that they will be prepared to meet the challenge of life and the professional or business world, but we have utterly failed to make available to them the military training that will be so essential for their service in the event of war. In previous wars many men lost their lives because of the lack of training. The new 6-months training program at least gives them a chance to learn physical survival.

I will not spend much time trying to explain the details of the new act as I am sure that this group is quite familiar with it. As you know, it provides that young men between 17 and 18½ years of age can join the Army Reserve, the National Guard, or the Marine Corps Reserve, take 6 months of basic training and return home for Reserve service of 7½ years. Going in at this age, these men by the age of 25 or 26 will begin to have family responsibilities or to advance in their civilian jobs and will be completely out of service. The program also provides that young men who are over 18½ years old can enlist in the Reserves for 6 years by volunteering for 2 years' active service and 4 years as a part of a Reserve component. Because he chooses 2 years' active service instead of 6 months, his total Reserve obligation is 6 years instead of 8. In the third category a man has the choice of being drafted instead of volunteering and he would then serve 2 years of active duty.

Generally speaking, we will have 3 categories besides the National Guard; one, the Ready Reserve, consisting of 2.9 millions, of whom 1 million will be available immediately in an emergency proclaimed by the President, the remainder being on call in a national emergency announced by the Congress. This is our fire brigade. Secondly, we will have the Standby Reserve, which can be called only in time of war or a national emergency declared by the Congress. The third group is the Retired Reserve, whose members may be ordered to active duty if the Nation is at war or if Congress declares a national emergency.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of the cooperation of the group this evening in putting this program across. It has advantages to the Nation, to you and me, to every citizen, to every family in this Nation of ours. With the confused and discouraging picture which we face on the international front, we cannot afford to become overconfident nor can we fail to recognize the facts of life. While I have a feeling that things are never as good as painted by the Republicans nor as dark as painted by the Democrats in an election year, I would be less than frank with you if I did not say that we are facing an enemy that has for its goal the complete domination and control of the world. The enemy is resourceful, ruthless, and persistent. In the past we have been assured that we held the advantage in science and technology, but we know that the enemy has the world's largest submarine force in existence. We know that the enemy has the atomic and hydrogen bomb. We know that he is outproducing us in long-range intercontinental bombers. We have been told on pretty good authority that Russia may come up with a long-range ballistics missile which would undoubtedly carry an atomic warhead and would enable him to immobilize and destroy many of the overseas bases, as well as the countries in which these bases are located.

In conclusion, we have our work cut out for us and it may be later than we think. This week—from April 22 to April 28—has been designated as National Reserves Week by the National Security Committee. It has been recognized by the President, the Secretary of Defense, and General Sarnoff, Chairman of the National Security Training Commission. This Reserve program must succeed, and it is our business to see that it does. While today we marvel at the wonders of science, the next war will be won just as have all wars in the past—by the ingenuity and courage of man himself. I do not subscribe to the business of a 1-bomb or 1-rocket war. I believe that we can hold our own in the production of nuclear weapons and the means with which to employ them. If we ever lose a war it will be because of our own lack of decision, our softness, and the lack of a real basic spirit of sacrifice. Let us remember, too, that while we prepare and teach our young men the art of war we hope that in so doing we shall convince the aggressor of the folly of an attack on this Nation and the free nations of the world. Let us hope and pray that there will come about an understanding of men everywhere, and that by continuing to work through agencies such as the United Nations we shall eventually reach that time so desired and so desirable, the time of peace on earth and good will toward men.

Extend Authority for Flood-Protection Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the text of a statement I made this morning before the Davis subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee on H. R. 9554.

The material follows:

EXTEND AUTHORITY FOR FLOOD-PROTECTION PROJECTS

(Remarks of Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN before House Subcommittee on Public Works, May 23, 1956)

I am very thankful to my distinguished friend, Chairman DAVIS, and all the other able members of this committee, for the opportunity to present my views on H. R. 9554 and similar pending measures to provide additional general authorization for small flood-protection work.

The basic bill before you was introduced by our good and able friend the distinguished majority leader, Mr. MCCORMACK. I have a companion bill which relates to the subject matter and I understand that there are several other bills now pending.

Mr. MCCORMACK's bill has already been passed by the Senate and I believe it is here before you.

I am sure that you all appreciate the extreme urgency of these measures not only for my district, State, and area, but also for the entire flood-stricken Northeast as well as other sections of the country, which are visited from time to time with devastating floods.

The objectives of Mr. McCormack's bill and related bills are very well known to all of you and I, therefore, will not take the time now to analyze their provisions.

In effect this measure, which I personally think is one of the best on the subject presented to the Congress in a long time, would greatly facilitate and accelerate urgently needed flood public works by increasing to $500,000 the present cost limitations in small flood control project authority.

As you know, yesterday the House passed the regular public works appropriation bill, which contained many necessary projects that will be very helpful to the States and communities concerned. However, even when these projects get underway there will be large gaps in the overall flood-protection program, which will have to be met by Mr. McCormack's bill and other bills now being considered by this very able committee.

I understand that the bill has been not only passed by the Senate as I stated before, but it is also approved in principle by the Secretary of the Army.

It unquestionably would promote speed and efficiency in carrying forward a number of not only desirable but urgently needed smaller projects and I think that it is imperative for the House to take action on the measure as soon as it possibly can.

In my opinion, it is the answer to the alleviation of a large variety of water resources and water-flowage conditions throughout the Nation. It will afford many necessary protective measures.

So far as my own district and State are concerned—and this is true of the entire Northeast area—the early passage of this bill would be of greatest value in helping us to secure relief and rehabilitation as well as future protection against the floods which have periodically ravaged us and with such terrible results last summer and fall.

I am confident that this capable committee will give this vital matter prompt, careful attention and come up as speedily as possible with the McCormack bill, or a composite bill containing its basic principles, so that it can be reported to and acted upon by the House at an early date.

I earnestly plead with you especially for expeditious action in this matter, and thank you all for your kindness in hearing me at a time when you are so busily engaged.

Thank you for your generous consideration.

Speech by Representative Edna F. Kelly at the 50th Anniversary Banquet of the Tralee Social Club, May 19, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address by the Honorable EDNA F. KELLY, of the 10th Congressional District of New York, at the 50th anniversary

banquet of the Tralee Social Club on Saturday, May 19, 1956.

At the same time, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Congresswoman KELLY for the stanch support she has given to our efforts here in the Congress to secure passage of a resolution urging the elimination of partition in Ireland. Much of the credit for the success we have had in the past rightly belongs to Mrs. KELLY. She has been a great source of strength in the fight and her diligent work and intelligent counseling have been of inestimable help.

The ending of partition has long been a matter of concern to Congresswoman KELLY and she has devoted much energy and attention to it. Mrs. KELLY and I both feel that passage of the resolution would materially aid in bringing about mutual discussions and the eventual amicable settlement of the border problem in Ireland. I am sure that with the continued assistance and untiring efforts of Mrs. KELLY, the day will soon come when we will be successful in securing the approval of the House of Representatives in declaring that all Ireland should be united unless the people of that country, in a free plebiscite, otherwise declare.

The address follows:

I appreciate the honor of being called on to speak at the 50th anniversary banquet of the Tralee Social Club. I am grateful for this opportunity for many reasons. First, to pay tribute to your president, Bryan Sheehy, a constituent of mine, a neighbor, and a personal friend for many years. His loyalty, sincerity, and integrity are some of his characteristics which have contributed to his being an outstanding citizen of our community and of our city.

My second reason is to pay tribute to the Honorable John Joe Sheehy, of Tralee, Ireland. While of no relation to Bryan, I dare say they come from the same clan. John, too, is well known as an athlete and a statesman. He is visiting the United States to attend the Gaelic games next week, as the chairman of the Ballyseedy Memorial Committee.

Another reason for my being here is to rededicate myself and you to the cause which is a united Ireland. It was my responsibility the first year I sat as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, to guide through the committee the Fogarty resolution of which, incidentally, I was cosponsor. I succeeded in seeing the resolution through the committee but it went down in defeat on the floor of the House of Representatives.

We know that Ireland should not remain divided any more than Korea, Germany, and Vietnam. The United States is striving for the unification of these latter countries. Why not Ireland? Ireland, too, must be united for political, economic, social, and moral reasons. In 1918, after years of struggle, Ireland won her independence from England but the six northern counties of Ireland, gerrymandered by England to assure British control, remain under England's rule.

Unification is necessary in order that Ireland may take her rightful place in the community of nations. The principles of the Irish people are well known and are needed now more than ever in the affairs of the world.

History records Ireland's great contribution to western civilization. Let us never forget that when darkness engulfed the hearts and minds of men and the lamps of learning were blown out by the barbarian invasions in Europe, the only light that the eyes of man could and finally did take bearings by was the single strong flame which was kept alive on the little green isle. So powerful was this flame that no assault could cause it to flicker or sink, and it burns today in every achievement of the western world. It burns because it was nurtured by faith in God; His justice, His wisdom, and His mercy.

I renew my sponsorship for unification of Ireland and I need not, I am sure, urge you to do the same. Jointly we will succeed.

The Small Get Smaller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I think we will all agree that the backbone of the American economic system is without question the small-business segment of our economy. Destroy that segment and surely it will result in a controlled economy, or, as has happened more recently in certain European countries—dictatorship.

Mr. Speaker, recently I have observed the operations of a powerful organization, namely, the National Federation of Independent Business. I believe many of my colleagues will agree as to the all-out efforts of that organization in behalf of small business. It is fortunate that we have in our economy a sincere group of leaders such as is typified in the leadership of the National Federation of Independent Business.

Recently they took it upon themselves, in view of the importance of my proposed bill, H. R. 9514, to establish corporate income-tax rates of 22 percent normal tax and 31 percent surtax, to poll their nationwide membership, comprised exclusively of independent business and professional men—all voting members. The National Federation took this action without any prompting on my part, Mr. Speaker. In presenting the question to their members they gave both sides of the proposition, the arguments for and the arguments against, and I think it is well, Mr. Speaker, to note these arguments for and against.

Argument for: To help our Nation stiffen its small-business backbone—that is the aim of these bills. Ability to keep a greater share of gross earnings would help in many ways; supply funds for expansion and modernization, higher salaries to hold key employees. Further, there would be less incentive to merge with larger units. This bill would not cost the United States Treasury a red cent. Surely Congress, which has just given farmers a $60-million tax cut by exempting them from Federal gasoline excises, can spare as much consideration for small-business men who need assistance equally.

Argument against: With many demands being made on Government for spending, we just cannot afford any business tax reduction or any other tax cuts. Our big job is to keep Federal income in line with outgo. Otherwise we promote inflation which cheapens our dollars. This bill does not offer independents much of a saving—just $2,000 yearly at the outside. Are small firms desirous of selling their birthright of a stabilized value currency for this mess of pottage? Why not stop this move for tax cuts until the Federal finances are brought into order, until spending cuts can be made.

I have been advised by the Washington office of the federation through its vice president, Mr. George J. Burger, that the poll, reaching in excess of 100,000, has been completed, the results of which appear in their current Mandate, the official publication of the federation, and the result is as follows: 84 percent for the bill, 12 percent against, and 4 percent no vote.

This poll, Mr. Speaker, should be noted by my colleagues that small business of this Nation, both at the production and distribution level, must have the necessary reserves built up so they can carry on their businesses not alone in the war periods but, more important, under business conditions when they are normal or below normal. A more important aspect of this poll coming from the grassroots is that small business expects this long overdue relief from the Congress.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, a still more important aspect of keeping small business an important segment of our economy is that it will open up the door of opportunity for the youth of this Nation, if they have the efficiency and ability, to enter into their own respective businesses.

It is my hope that the respective committee will take appropriate action on my bill.

I include here the following excerpt from a broadcast over CBS radio by Eric Sevareid:

THE SMALL GET SMALLER
(By Eric Sevareid)

All who read as they run are by now aware that one deep fissure, or fault, endangers the American prosperity structure, which looks so solid on the surface; they know that farmers generally are suffering a recession. But it is not yet widely recognized that there is a second fissure in the structural foundation. That is the condition of American small business, defined as those concerns with less than a quarter of a million dollars in assets. In net figures, they are not disappearing as small farms are disappearing, but neither are they growing in number as the economy grows, and the number of small-business failures has risen to levels that alarm some observers.

While the press gives page 1 spreads to the profit margins of the giant concerns and their expanison plans, little is said about the present or the future where small business is concerned. But the information is there for anybody willing to look trouble in the face in these days of mass hypnotic belief that there is no trouble.

One so willing is the director of the Public Affairs Institute, who bases his argument on the uncontroverted figures of Dun & Bradstreet, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission. For one thing, net growth in the number of business firms stopped in 1953, after growing by 200,000 new concerns in the previous 4-year period. Furthermore, the profit margin of small businesses has not only stopped growing, it has sharply dropped, while that of big business has continued to grow. For

example, the smallest size group of manufacturers last year suffered a tremendous 66 percent drop in profit after taxes, compared with 3 years before; funds available for reinvestment or expansion tell the same kind of story—a 40 percent drop.

The story on small-business failures is quite a tale; the chapter on firms that handle wearing apparel, for example. The number of retail failures increased last year by 7 percent over the year before; the number of wholesale failures increased by 36 percent.

In a report earlier this month, the Senate Small Business Committee reached essentially the same troubled conclusions—unanimously. What deeply troubles them, they said, is that there simply is no evidence that the American small-business man is going to be able to hold his ground, shaky as it is, in the future. They find a direct ratio not only between size and success but between size and survival.

There seems much agreement that what chiefly is choking small business is heavy taxation plus lack of credit. Big business can arrange big, long-term loans; any workingman can buy a house, car, furniture, or what not for about 10 percent down and 3 years to pay. But a small-business man in Los Angeles writes me, what about the modest retailer, jobber, wholesaler, or service man? He has to pay more for rent, labor, supplies, insurance, and taxes, yet his credit situation hasn't changed at all; he still has to pay for his goods in 30 to 60 days. If he applies for extra help to the Federal Small Business Administration, what happens? Well, as the Public Affairs Institute points out, the SBA has received about 11,000 inquiries a month and has granted fewer than 400 direct loans in 2 long years.

So far, hardly a whisper of concern has been voiced by the administration over the profound social fact that the big get bigger while the small get smaller—a fact, concludes the Senate committee, that will ultimately change the fundamental character of the American economy, perhaps beyond easy recognition by the present generation.

The Agricultural Act of 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the House today completed final congressional action on H. R. 10875, the Agricultural Act of 1956, which was introduced by Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture. The measure now goes to the President.

For the convenience of the Members and to answer numerous inquiries from throughout the Nation, I am inserting at this place in the RECORD a concise statement of the major provisions of this legislation.

Major provisions of H. R. 10875, as finally passed by Congress, are:

First. A $1,200,000,000-a-year soil bank, in two parts:

(a) An acreage reserve designed to reduce acreages of wheat, cotton, corn, peanuts, rice, and tobacco. Payments to farmers would be made to reduce their acreages of these crops below their acreage allotments and could be made as soon as the acreage is measured. The Department of Agriculture's present estimates of the payments to be made per acre for this reduction are: tobacco, $100 to $300; cotton, $48 to $60; peanuts, $50 to $70; wheat, $18 to $25; corn, $36 to $50; rice, $60 to $75. A maximum of $750 million a year could be expended on the acreage reserve for the next 4 years.

Deleted from the bill in its final form were three provisions relating to the soil bank which were included in the House bill. These would have provided acreage reserve programs for feed grains, other field crops, and grazing lands.

(b) A conservation reserve designed to remove acreage from crop production on a semipermanent basis, for which payments approximately equivalent to the rental value of the land would be made, with an annual national limit of $450 million.

Compulsory features, proposed in other soil bank legislation, were not included in H. R. 12—vetoed—or in H. R. 10875; limits have been put on the amounts that can be spent on specific crops, thus assuring an equitable distribution of funds; and provision is made for the protection of tenants and sharecroppers.

Second. Corn: The bill authorizes four different programs under which corn farmers may receive price supports on corn in 1956, as follows:

(a) Producers in the commercial area who elect to comply with the acreage allotments previously announced by the Secretary—at the rate of approximately 43 million acres—will be eligible for price supports at $1.50 per bushel—86.2 percent of parity—under that program, without putting land into the soil bank.

(b) For the operation of the soil bank the bill increases the corn acreage allotment for 1956 by 9 million acres to a total of 51 million acres. Corn producers in the commercial producing area may qualify for price supports at $1.50 per bushel—86.2 percent of parity—by planting within their allotment from the 51-million-acre base acreage, provided they put into the soil bank an amount of cropland equal to 15 percent of their base acreage of corn.

(c) Producers in the commercial corn area who do not comply with the regular acreage allotments previously announced nor with the base acreage setup for soil bank purposes will still be eligible for price supports, under the noncompliance program recently announced by the Secretary, at the rate of $1.25 per bushel—about 83 percent of the support level of compliance corn in the commercial area.

(d) Producers outside the commercial area will receive a support at 82½ percent of the level of the support for compliance corn in the commercial area—or about $1.24 a bushel.

Third. Feed grains: The level of price support for the 1956 crop of grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats is set at 76 percent of the parity price for each commodity as of May 1, 1956. Thus, the 1956 supports will be: barley $1.02 per bushel; oats 65 cents per bushel; rye $1.27 per bushel, and grain sorghums $1.97 per hundredweight. These higher level supports thus supersede the 70 percent supports announced by the Secretary. The Secretary had set the supports at 93 cents for barley, 59 cents for oats, $1.16 for rye, and $1.80 for grain sorghums.

Fourth. The bill directs that the soil bank be started with 1956 crops, as provided in the bill as it originally passed the House. The Senate bill directed only that the Secretary start the program with the 1956 crop to the extent he deems practicable. The return to the House language is a clear indication of congressional policy that the fact that some crops have been planted is not to stand in the way of starting the program this year.

Fifth. Appeals procedure: Procedures are provided for appeal by producers whose soil-bank contracts have been canceled because of alleged violation.

Sixth. Production on Government-owned lands: The President is directed to restrict insofar as practicable the leasing of Government-owned lands for the production of price-supported crops in surplus supply.

Seventh. Cotton: (a) A freeze of the 1957 and 1958 national acreage allotments at no less than the 1956 allotment; (b) a provision that no State acreage allotment can be cut in 1957 and 1958 by more than 1 percent below 1956; (c) a special 100,000-acre national reserve is created to add to the allotments of small farmers; and (d) the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to sell Government cotton for export at the price necessary to regain America's traditional world market at around 5,000,000 bales annually.

Eighth. Transitional parity: The bill freezes transitional parity for the basic commodities for 1957. This will mean that the parity price of corn, wheat, and peanuts—the only three basic commodities currently affected by the transitional parity formula—will be 5 percent higher in 1957 than they otherwise would have been. The bill also requires the Secretary of Agriculture to make a thorough study of possible methods of improving the parity formula and to report to Congress thereon not later than January 31, 1957, and to include drafts of any legislation needed to carry out this recommendation.

Ninth. Rice: The bill provides that the State acreage allotments for rice for 1956 shall not be less than 85 percent of the final State allotment for 1955; and that the national acreage allotments of rice for 1957 and 1958 shall not be less than the final national allotment for 1956, and shall be apportioned among the States in the same manner as the 1956 final allotment. The bill provides a certificate program for rice. This is identical with the certificate program provided in the vetoed H. R. 12 except that inauguration of the program is discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture and will not be put into effect unless he determines and proclaims that the initiation of a program is "administratively feasible and in the best interests of rice producers in the United States."

Tenth. Cottonseed and soybeans: The bill requires that whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other shall be supported at a level which will cause

them to compete on equal terms in the market.

Eleventh. Surplus commodities—Other provisions: The bill embraces improvements in the disposal of surplus commodities and other important provisions, some of which are discussed below.

To facilitate surplus disposal in the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to process food commodities, such as grains, into a form—meal or flour—which can be used in the home and is also given authority long sought by both the State and the Federal Government to donate food commodities to certain penal institutions.

To facilitate surplus disposal abroad, the President is given authority to pay ocean freight on surplus commodities donated for use in other countries and to step up disposal under title II of Public Law 480 from $300 million to $500 million.

An attack is made upon the surplus problem affecting long staple cotton by again placing extra long staple cotton, now exempt from quotas, within the quota set up for all cotton longer than 1⅛ inches.

Solution of our surplus problem, particularly in textiles, would be substantially assisted by authority clearly given the President in this bill to negotiate voluntary agreements with representatives of other countries with respect to importations into the United States of competing agricultural commodities or products made therefrom.

An appropriation of an additional $500 million annually is authorized for section 32 funds, for use in surplus removal and disposal operations, particularly for perishable commodities.

The bill authorizes the appointment of a Surplus Disposal Administrator in the Department of Agriculture.

Provision is made for the appointment of a commission to study and make recommendations to Congress on increased industrial use of agricultural products.

In order to encourage further the underplanting of acreage allotments, the bill authorized a producer, for the first time, to plant only a part or even none of an acreage allotment for 3 successive years without losing his history and the right to future allotments. This could eliminate the practice of planting merely to retain history for allotment purposes, which is now required.

To make present production adjustment laws more effective, the bill increases to 75 percent of the support price the penalty for exceeding peanut-marketing quotas.

In addition to these specific new authorizations to deal with the surplus problem—authority which the Secretary of Agriculture does not now have—there are other directives in the bill designed also to deal with the surplus situation.

The Secretary of Agriculture is directed to make a study of proposals for disposing of surplus food commodities domestically through some kind of food-stamp plan. He is directed to report to Congress within 90 days on this important matter. He is directed to make a similar study and report on the matter of establishing strategic stockpiles of agricultural commodities both in the United States and abroad for use in the event of war or similar emergency. He is directed to use existing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of surpluses generally and long-staple cotton specifically.

Failure of Our Foreign Policy in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be permitted to appear before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on May 8, 1956, and present my views to that distinguished committee on the question of the failure of our foreign policy in the Middle East. My testimony on that occasion was as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman and members, I appreciate the opportunity of coming before you again and voicing my opinions for whatever aid they may be to you in connection with the pending bill.

While I appreciate the worldwide importance of the provisions of the bill, and that it does cover many areas of the world, I would like to address myself primarily to the bill as it affects the Middle East, or the Near East, as it is often referred to.

May I by way of preliminary indicate to the committee that I appreciate that in viewing the testimony of any witness you have the right to ask yourself, what is his background and does he have any prejudice or bias in connection with the subject on which he speaks.

When anyone of the Jewish faith addresses himself to the Middle East, you have a right to take that into account. I want to assure the committee at the outset that my first and primary interest is the same as that of every member of this committee, that is, world peace and the security of our own country.

I hope that in assessing the value of my testimony, you will have in mind not only my religious background but also that I was among the first to look with favor upon restoration or resumption of diplomatic relations with Spain. I think that I can justifiably say that my personal report to President Truman late in 1949, after a visit to Spain, together with the information brought back from there by other Members, had at least some bearing upon what I think everybody admits today is a desirable result of resuming diplomatic relations with Spain.

I was among the early advocates of help to Turkey, which, as you know, is a 98-percent Moslem country. Despite the fact that it is quite unpopular among many of my constituents, I have taken the position that the interests of our country require if not a full-fledged ambassador or minister at least a special representative at Vatican City.

With those preliminaries, let me address myself to the Middle East situation.

Chairman RICHARDS. May I add that I can testify to the correctness of the gentleman's statement on those matters.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I trust that the members of this committee will not think that I usurped or impinged upon their authority when during the last recess I made a trip into various countries, and more particularly into the Middle East, where I visited in Lebanon, Egypt, Turkey, and Israel.

I think that we can all agree that the overall problem is the establishment of peace in that area and that anything short of full-fledged peace is obviously a threat to our own security and to world peace.

I think we also agree that the subsidiary problems are the resettlement of the refugees, the lessening of the existing tensions and an agreement about the boundaries.

I think with a period of 8 years of experience behind us now there must be a complete revision of our policy in that area with much more firmness than has heretofore been shown in our treatment of the peoples throughout that area, or more accurately, our treating with the leaders of the governments there.

The tensions have gotten worse and more bitter. We have had no real negotiations which would lead to peace.

You may recall that as early as 1948, before there was a State of Israel, I said that the only way we will have peace in that area is if we go in there and help all the peoples of that area, the Arabs who are living there as well as the Jews, to help them rehabilitate themselves and to improve their economic conditions there.

That directly relates to the refugee problem. We are told time after time that there are 900,000 refugees outside of Israel who must be rehabilitated and must be resettled.

The Arab position has been they will not talk peace until all of those Arabs are returned to the State of Israel. That means never. I think it should be perfectly obvious to anybody and everybody familiar with the situation that you couldn't possibly resettle those 900,000 Arabs in the little State of Israel even if you were going to take all of the State of Israel and give it to them.

Before they left there 90 percent of them were living in poverty. The average annual income was from $15 to $30 per year. Thirty dollars per year was high income for 90 percent of the Arabs living in that area.

To take them and send them back there would be utter folly—how are they going to live? Obviously these people must be resettled in places where you can give them a piece of land or an opportunity to earn themselves a livelihood that doesn't even begin to approach our standards, but which will at least improve their prior standards, or give them an opportunity to live if not decently as we know it, at least better than they had lived when they were unable to eke out a living for themselves and their families.

Today in these refugee camps they are being supported mainly by the bounty of the United Nations and this country, which supports or gives to that fund most of the money that is being used for that purpose.

Why haven't they been resettled? They haven't been resettled because the Arab leaders have refused to permit them to be resettled.

In that connection, our policy must be changed, and I think it must be a condition of further aid going to that area, that something must be done about that situation.

We have talked and talked to the Arab leaders, and we have run up against a stone wall. They will not move in that direction. I think it is high time that our Department of State changes its policy in that regard and makes it known in no uncertain terms that this problem must be solved, that we will no longer continue to permit the Arab leaders to use this as a political problem and to keep those refugees stirred up emotionally against resettlement.

I might say that I have been in that area three times—I was there in 1948, 1949, and again in 1955. After each of my visits there I have been visited at home, unsolicited, by Arabs, Moslem Arabs, and Christian Arabs, indicating that much of the story we get out of there about the unwillingness of the Arabs to be resettled is the talk not of the Arab refugees themselves, but of the leaders of the Arabs.

If we can let those leaders know in no uncertain terms that this problem must be solved, you can begin to move those Arabs out, not en masse but family by family and resettle them. We will then get rid of this emotional problem that has kept that area stirred up all through the years.

You will find back in December 1947 and January and February of 1948 I was urging things such as, as I called it at that time, a Middle East TVA. I had in mind things like the Aswan Dam that they are talking about on the Nile. I had in mind things like the Jordan Valley project that Ambassador Eric Johnston has done so much to bring almost to the point of closing.

Secretary Dulles told the Senate committee in February that all of the details had been worked out except the political agreement. In other words, every last item had been agreed upon, between Syria, Jordan, and Israel, as to how it would be financed, what would be done there, where the power would go, where the water would go, the division of water between Syria and Jordan and Israel. The only thing that stops the project from going ahead is political agreement or assent politically by Syria and Jordan. Both are pressured by the Arab League not to agree politically.

Israel has indicated her willingness to go ahead. She is ready to execute the formal documents. The Arabs refuse. Israel has several times indicated that she would go ahead without the Syrian and Jordanian consent. Of course, each time she has been persuaded that that is not the thing to do.

I say the time has come when our Government must say, and this is probably the place for it to be said, in this bill, or in the report on this bill. Lay down the policy that if the Arabs will not go along with those projects, Israel will be permitted to do it herself, that there will be no aid to that extent to Syria or Jordan as such, but as long as Israel will make the commitment, the firm commitment, that the power and the water generated there will go in agreed portions or ratios into Syria and Jordan, when they are ready for it, that Israel may go ahead and do the job and we will help her do it.

I think if we took that firm attitude the Arabs would have no choice in the matter but to say, "Let's go ahead."

I was told, as your study mission was told, as evidenced by their report that was submitted to you under date of March 14, 1956—I met with some of the members of that study mission while we were in that area—that a lot of the tension there was caused by the Baghdad Pact.

The surprising thing is that we were told by Arab officials our American diplomats tell them that the United States did not bring about the Baghdad Pact. Why they should have been told that, I don't know. But it only irritated the situation rather than help assuage their feelings.

There is no doubt that the fact is Secretary Dulles has taken credit for it and has claimed it was his idea. He says he started some 3 years ago to set up this Baghdad Pact as a northern tier or frontier as a defense measure against possible invasion of that area by Soviet Russia.

I sat down in this building, in the old Supreme Court room, with Gen. Bedell Smith, who was then Under Secretary of State, and with Ambassador Byroade, who was then our Assistant Secretary of State in charge of the Middle East, when we were talking about this plan 3 years ago.

I said to them, I think there were several of the members of this committee present, I said to those two gentlemen, that you are wasting your time and your energy and money in that kind of venture, because if Russia decides to move in there, all of the money that you are now spending for military aid and economic aid, if it was all used there for military aid, you are not going to stop Russia from moving into that area, when she decides to move.

I didn't anticipate that Russia was going to jump over the northern tier once it was set up. She has done that and moved in. Communist arms have been going into the Arab States for years. Something now must be done to strengthen that whole area. We are not going to strengthen it by sending arms into Egypt in competition with Russian arms. I don't know how much of the facts on that question have been stated to you——

Mr. VORYS. You don't mean into Egypt.

Mr. MULTER. Into Egypt.

Mr. VORYS. By sending arms into Egypt in competition with Russia—I thought you meant into Israel.

Mr. MULTER. Into Egypt, in competition, because the record is clear that for some time Egypt has—it goes back, I think, to 1952, when Egypt first sought arms from the United States.

She has gotten small quantities through the years from the United States. But when she sought large quantities of arms, she was asked to sign the usual agreement, that she would not be an aggressor, not use any of these arms as an aggressor against any nation. She refused to do that. Then, as you recall, in the summer of last year the Secretary of State pretended to be very much surprised with the fact that a deal had been consummated between Czechoslovakia and Egypt for the sale of jets and large armaments. Ambassador Byroade told me in Cairo in November 1955 that he had known of the Egyptian negotiations with the Communists for arms for more than a year before the deal was announced.

I think it should have alerted our State Department to the fact that any country that is looking for arms and will not sign an agreement that those arms will not be used as an aggressor or for aggression, doesn't mean well, but intends to be an aggressor.

Let's analyze that a little further. I understand Secretary of State Dulles said to the Senate committee in February of this year, when he was there, that he didn't know what arms had been sent into Egypt by Czechoslovakia.

When I was there, last year, it was known in Turkey, it was known in Israel and it was no secret to Egypt. I am now talking about November 1955 when she had already received at least 40 jets and 6 submarines. She has today, I believe, 18 battle cruisers. When will these battle cruisers and these submarines be used, and against whom will they be used? We are told the only fleet in that area is the United States 6th Fleet. Russia has no fleet there, and Russia is not going to supply Egypt with any of these submarines if they are to be used against Russia. Against whom will the submarines be used? Against Israel? Israel has no navy.

What about this "preventive war" talk we hear? I say to you in all earnestness it has been stirred up in large part by representatives of our State Department, this talk about a "preventive war" by Israel against her neighbors. Let's analyze it.

The little country of Lebanon to the north of Israel is smaller in geographic size and has a population of about a million people, which is just about half of the number of people in the State of Israel.

They say that Israel can muster an army of 250,000 men. Lebanon, when I was there in November 1955, could muster a total police force and army of 5,000 men. If Israel had any intentions to move on her neighbors, I think everyone must concede that Israel could move in on Lebanon and take it over overnight if she had any desires to wage aggressive war against her neighbors. She has not done it and has no intention of doing it. Of all her borders the Lebanese borders have been the most peaceful.

Most of the border incidents coming from the Lebanese side of the border can be traced to infiltrations from Syria and Egypt.

Persons who have had the same advantage as I had of having been in that area as late as 1949, returning again in 1955, are impressed by the fact that Lebanon is making comparatively the same progress as Israel. Her people are prospering, their standards are improving, and they want nothing but to be left alone. Cross the borders into the other Arab countries and you find that they are practically in the same degraded and degrading conditions as existed all through the years up to 1949. There has been little or no improvement in their methods, their means, their standards, or their opportunities to earn a livelihood.

I was interested to find out where this talk about a "preventive war" by Israel comes from. I noticed that Secretary of State Dulles indicated in his testimony before the Senate committee that he believed that there was such talk in Israel of a preventive war against her neighbors.

I found in our Embassies in Lebanon, in Egypt, and in our Embassy in Israel, the talk came from our American officials, that Israel might indulge in a preventive war.

I know that Ambassador Lawson in Israel had no such idea. On the other hand, I know Mr. White in that Embassy made it known to anybody who would listen to him that it was his idea that there will be a preventive war by Israel, and to bolster his position wherever possible he would put you in touch with that minority, that small group in Israel who have been yelling all through the years for such a war and for enlargement of the State of Israel.

That definitely is a very small group in Israel. The large majority of the people, and all the responsible officials in government in Israel, will say that they know that if they were to start any kind of war upon any of her neighbors, they would immediately turn world opinion against them, that they would be cut off from all assistance of any kind from this country and from our allies, and that while they might win the first battle, they would have to lose such a war.

In our Embassy in Lebanon, the same talk was going on. In Egypt I confronted our ambassador, Ambassador Byroade, with the same matter and I asked him pointblank: "Do you think there is a single Arab leader who believes that Israel will wage a preventive war?" and Mr. Byroade said, "They don't believe it, but I, Hank Byroade, believe it."

It is that kind of preachment going on by our American officials there that is keeping this pot stirred up.

Unless our State Department is going to do something about it, to stop it, we are going to have more and more trouble in that area instead of less and less.

You will probably recall that Mr. Dulles has been taxed many times with the situation in that area, and has been asked to give his reasons as to why something can't be done about it, particularly with the situation in Saudi Arabia, where they refused to permit American Jews to serve as part of our Armed Forces. There is nothing wrong with the provision in any of these agreements that anyone objectionable to a local government should not be permitted to remain in that country.

That has been the way of governments ever since we have had civilized governments. Today, in the United States, if our Government finds a diplomat here from a foreign

country who is objectionable, we send him home. We never find anybody objectionable because of his religious beliefs. When the attempt is made to relate Judaism or the Jewish religion to Zionism, then you get this very fine difference that is drawn by the Arabs and by the Moslems, which even our Secretary of State, however, does not try to draw.

They will tell you, the Arabs, the Moslems, that the Jews are our cousins. They say: "We are all Semites. We have all been persecuted together and we want to live peacefully together. But," says the Moslem, "while I do not oppose the Jew, I am opposed to the Zionists, and the Zionist is the fellow who wants a Jewish state."

That cannot be an excuse to our State Department for saying that any American Jew in the armed services of our country may therefore be deemed objectionable to Saudi Arabia or to any of these other countries.

Whether you go to Lebanon or go to Turkey or go to Egypt, you will find that there are Jews living there, and living there peacefully with their neighbors. True, they make no attempt to espouse the Zionist cause in the Arab countries, or the cause of an independent State of Israel. But all this destroys the substance of the charge that the basic difference in that area is a religious difference.

These people can live together and will live together, and will trade together, and prosper together, if given the opportunity.

I think it is up to the Congress to write the directives into a bill such as this, so that our State Department representatives will do the right thing. They talk about trying to establish peace in this area and couple it with talk about the fact that the boundaries must be agreed upon first.

I say to you gentlemen that if our State Department said to the Arab States: "We will not stand for aggression from either side. We will not permit aggression by Israel against her neighbors. We will not permit aggression by the Arab States against Israel," this problem can be settled. It cannot be settled by saying: "We will guarantee your borders if, as, and when you will agree upon the changes," because that may never come. Unless and until we take the firm position that these boundaries will be changed only by agreement or by arbitration (and there is a method of arbitration) we cannot impress upon both sides the imperative need for them to sit down and agree upon a change of boundaries.

But we must first say, "You are not going to fight about these borders and boundaries." Then if they won't sit down and agree upon it, there is a way of making them go to the World Court and submit the matter there.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Haven't we said that?

Mr. MULTER. No, sir, we have not. Mr Dulles has repeated time and time again that we will guarantee these borders and boundaries if, as, and when they agree upon them.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. The State Department made a statement about aggression, and offered their services, the United Nations, and so forth, to work this thing out, didn't they?

Mr. MULTER. They have not taken the firm position I advocate. There have been intercessions, but there has been no firm statement of that policy by our State Department to this day.

Israel asked for a mutual security pact, and in asking for it she suggested for each of the Arab States the same security pact that she asked for. This, too, is a method of smoking out the evil intent of a potential aggressor. Such a nation not only will not ask for, but will reject such a pact.

The State Department has not seen fit to give or even negotiate with the State of Israel about such a security pact.

Chairman RICHARDS. Where would you place the line? There is a dispute about the line.

Mr. MULTER. You say to all sides: The lines remain precisely where they are until you sit down around the peace table and agree upon a change, and, if you can't agree, then either you are going to appoint arbitrators, and, if you don't appoint arbitrators, you go to the World Court and let the Court decide. When the Court makes the decision, it will be binding upon all sides.

This is an international dispute. It is a proper subject to come before the World Court. It is high time that we as leaders of the world will say that we will stand for no fighting about things of this kind which can be settled either by agreement or by a Court decision.

In my opinion, we must take that kind of firm position, and, if we did, we could very quickly settle these problems in that area. If we don't take that firm position, then we are bound to have trouble there. These people will continue to snipe at each other, and it doesn't matter who is responsible for the first sniping. A shot from one side brings forth two from the other side. It doesn't matter whether it comes from Israel or the other side. As long as you have these people stirred up, they will be sniping at each other. The only way to handle it is for us to take this firm position. I do hope that this committee will, as a part of this bill, say that we want to give aid, economic aid, to all of this area but peace, true peace, is the price they must pay.

You have heard many times from our Secretary of State that he hopes this issue of the Middle East will not be made a political issue in this year's election campaign, because it will stir up the Arabs into again voicing the opinion that in this country we depend on Jewish votes and therefore we are more favorably disposed toward Israel than we are to the Arabs.

I was surprised to learn when I met with the Arabs throughout this area, that not one had ever been told that the Jews in this country are a minority, that in the Senate with 96 Members we have only 2 who are Jews, that of the 435 Members of the House the maximum we have ever had is 11.

As I pointed out to them, in the membership of the study mission that was there representing this very committee, not one depended on a Jewish vote in his home district to get himself elected; that this was not a Jewish problem, nor a Christian problem, nor a Moslem problem, that this is a problem of doing the right thing, the humane thing, and making people behave and not fight with one another.

When you talk to some of our Arab friends over there, you find the unfortunate part of it is that our American diplomats have never once taken the trouble to tell these Arab officials that this is not a Jewish problem at home.

They talk here at home about making it a political issue, but they never tell the Arabs it is not a political issue, that neither party needs Jewish votes to elect our President, or our House or our Senate.

The shame of it is that our State Department has not taken the forceful, unequivocal position and said to these people, "You are wrong. This is not a political problem at home."

The same thing goes for the way that they handle some of these other problems there. You travel through the Middle East and you are told by some of the Arabs that we should stop the Jews raising funds here in the United States and sending them to Israel. They don't understand that charity drives are conducted here without the aid or interference of the Government.

Not once has an American diplomat said to the Arab leaders that the Jews have said time and time again in the United States that they will go out and raise as much money to rehabilitate the Arab areas as they raise for Israel, if only there can be peace there; that if the Arabs will sign a treaty, Americans of all faiths will do the same for the Arabs as they are doing for the Jews there.

No one knows better than we people here at home, Jew and Christian alike, that you can't have prosperity in one little corner surrounded by poverty, without creating antagonisms in the poorer areas. You have to build up the whole area and give them all an opportunity to live.

Mr. VORYS. Along the line you just mention, on August 26, 1955, in an important statement by Secretary Dulles, he said, with reference to the plight of the 900,000 refugees:

"Compensation is due from Israel to the refugees. However, it may be that Israel cannot unaided now make adequate compensation. If so, there might be an international loan to enable Israel to pay the compensation which is due and which would enable many of the refugees to find for themselves a better way of life.

"President Eisenhower would recommend substantial participation by the United States in such a loan for such a purpose."

What do you think of that statement?

Mr. MULTER. That is directly in line with what I have in mind. The Israelis would like to have that. Every right-thinking person would like to see that done, and the only reason it isn't done is because the Arab leaders sit back and say, "We won't let you resettle these refugees anywhere except in Israel."

Mr. VORYS. That is not my understanding.

Mr. MULTER. I would like to suggest that if you would give me, Mr. Chairman, an executive session meeting I will bring to you Arab-Moslems who will tell you that when you go into these refugee camps you will be permitted to meet only with the leaders. They will tell you how terrible the situation is, how the people in the camps will not be resettled except in their homeland. These witnesses I can bring to you will tell you that is not so, that the Arab refugees are willing to be resettled, that they want to be resettled. There have been negotiations time and time again between some of them——

Chairman RICHARDS. I would like to say, Mr. MULTER, that we started a little late. Mr. MULTER told us beforehand that he had a meeting with the Banking and Currency Committee, and he has received a notice that they are ready for him.

Mr. MULTER. I will take just a few minutes more. I would like to answer any questions that the members care to address to me either this morning or at any other time you will invite me back.

Mr. VORYS. As you know, the United Nations resolution said it was the duty of Israel either to compensate or repatriate the Arab refugees. Both of those alternatives are open to Israel.

As far as I know, there has never been any offer by Israel to repatriate——

Mr. MULTER. The 900,000—you are right. As I indicated before it would be an impossible task to try to repatriate them in Israel. They have taken Arabs back into Israel. There have been some 100,000 families that have been reunited within Israel, people who had been outside Israel and permitted to return.

Israel has always indicated her willingness to compensate the Arabs for their property that was left behind. She has unblocked the funds within Israel that were left behind by the Arabs. They have made available that to them.

I was about to say, as I got this message, that I can bring to you Arabs, Christians, and Moslems who left Israel, who negotiated with the State of Israel for compensation, and when the Governments of Syria and Jordan where they were living found out that the negotiations were being consummated,

stepped in and threatened their families with annihilation if they dared to go through with the agreements or to accept any of the money offered by Israel.

There isn't any doubt that people who are entitled to the money, if they are left alone, will be fairly compensated and will get the compensation that they are willing to accept, if the leaders of their home governments would let them take it.

I am prepared to bring to you, Mr. Chairman, persons whose names must be protected because their families are still over there and who would be annihilated if it were known they are testifying here. I will bring you Arabs who will testify under oath that what I say to you is the fact.

Mr. VORYS. The home government of the Israeli-Arab is Israel. We all joined in the desire of the Jews to go back to their homeland. The homeland of these Arab refugees is not some other country; it is Israel.

Mr. MULTER. How many of these 900,000 fled from Israel?

Mr. VORYS. I don't know. A lot of them have been born in exile.

Mr. MULTER. Many of them were born in the refugee camps. You will find that in the Arab refugee camps outside of Israel, among the 900,000, you will find thousands and thousands of them who were poor nomads roaming the Arab lands, eking out a living from the countryside, who moved into these camps because there they are supported by the U. N. and the contributions of the United States to the U. N., instead of continuing to roam.

I don't care how they got there. They are human beings who should be rehabilitated. They are human beings who should be given an opportunity to earn a livelihood. Something has to be done for them. But it is impossible to take the 900,000, whether they were ever in Israel or not, and move them into Israel, certainly not until there are firm peace treaties entered into between these Arab countries and the State of Israel.

If the peace treaties were consummated, then you might be in a strong position to say, "Those who came out of Israel have a right to return to their homeland."

But as long as they are at war—as late as January 16, Mr. Nasser said, "From the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf there is but one Arab nation which no one will succeed in dividing again. After World War II part of the Arab heart was snatched from the Arab body"—meaning the State of Israel. "Today Arabs from the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf will cooperate in restoring that part," restoring Israel to the Arab lands.

As long as that condition exists, as long as the Arab leaders join with Mr. Nasser, as they are doing in saying that, surely no one believes that bringing those 900,000 Arabs or any substantial part of them into Israel is going to make for peace.

Chairman RICHARDS. Mrs. KELLY.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment my colleague from Brooklyn, Hon. ABRAHAM MULTER, for his testimony and appraisal of the Middle East situation.

Is there any question in your mind, Mr. MULTER, that if we could get the representatives of all the countries in the Middle East to a peace conference that Israel wouldn't be willing to settle every controversial issue, including the return of a token number of refugees, repayment for their land and return of their bank accounts, trade, boundaries, and so forth.

Mr. MULTER. Mrs. KELLY, there isn't a doubt in the world that the Israeli Government and their officials will sit down at the peace table and talk about all these problems and try to arrive at a solution of them.

But let's be practical about it. As of today, the Arabs will not sit down with the Israelis face to face. But that doesn't mean that you can't commence these negotiations.

As a matter of fact, word was sent home at my instance to the Secretary of State. I know it was received here. I know it was received in our Embassy in Israel. I know it was received in our Embassy in Egypt, that the Arab leaders were ready to sit down and talk, not face to face with Israel, but with American representatives, with United States representatives about the settlement of all of these problems, if the United States will take the initiative and say, "We insist that you sit down and talk about these things."

You could keep the Arabs on one side of the barrier, the Israelis on the other. The United States representative could talk first to one group and then to the other group, and finally consummate an agreement and bring them together to sign it.

It was going to be done, and word was sent back that it would be done, not on the basis of the 1947 partition resolution but on the basis of the 1949 resolution. There is a difference, because now the Arabs say they want to roll everything back to the 1947 boundaries.

The 1949 truce agreements recognized the boundaries set up at that time as armistice boundaries, subject to revision. That word came back, was received here in Washington, was received throughout the Middle East, with the exception of our Embassy in Turkey.

Within 5 days thereafter, Prime Minister Eden of Britain issued the statement that he would be the arbitrator between Israel and the Arabs on the basis of the 1947 partition resolution.

It was an attempt by Mr. Eden to reestablish British prestige in that area. Whether or not he knew that by talking about the 1947 resolution he would blow up the possibility of these negotiations, I don't know, and I won't make that charge against him.

The Arabs sent word that they would talk about the 1949 borders. He wanted to talk on the basis of the 1947, and the whole thing blew up.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask this: I can't understand how there would be any considerable portion of the people of Israel that would advocate a preventive war, because if they fight a preventive war they are going to have to fight the very war that they are going to try to avoid.

It is a good deal like a man committing suicide because he is afraid to die. That would be the case if you fight a preventive war; no one would win.

There is one question that you didn't comment on, and perhaps you didn't do so because you didn't desire to raise that issue; if you do not, do not answer my question.

Do you advocate the United States sending arms to Israel?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, I do, sir. I disagree with Mr. Dulles that to send arms at this time into Israel would be creating an arms race. The arms race is on.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Do you think it would be provocative of war?

Mr. MULTER. No; it would not be. I think it would be preventive of war. I think it is much better to do that than send in 1,800 marines from the 6th Fleet. As Prime Minister Ben-Gurion said, "Don't send your boys over here; send us arms so we can fight your battle." As long as Israel is strong——

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I heard Churchill made that statement.

Chairman RICHARDS. And Roosevelt, too.

Mr. MULTER. I am against an arms race. The State of Israel is against an arms race. I think every sensible person is against an arms race. But I think you must keep these parties on an even balance. If they know that to fight one another will be to annihilate one another, they won't fight.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. We have the status of the forces in all of these countries. We can't make it public, but we do have that information.

Mr. BURLESON. As our able colleague always does, he makes a splendid case, but he starts with present-day conditions. I think many people do, in justifying a great many things related to this issue.

Humaneness is exactly the reason that Israel was created in the first place. But there were some conditions in the Balfour Declaration which are usually forgotten or conveniently ignored.

There is no legitimate reason for anyone to think or to believe that Israel is going to be driven into the sea or to say that it is not a nation and that it is not going to endure from now on. Certainly I have no such concept that Israel will not endure.

Of course, it will. Nevertheless, going back to the historical facts under the Balfour Declaration, the British finally decided after the great influx of illegal entries into Israel to advocate a trusteeship. We went along with that policy and were discussing it when Israel declared herself a nation and then we immediately recognized her as such. In the declaration were safeguards for the Arab majority. The great majority were Arabs in the country at that time. There were only 50,000 Jews, but hundreds of thousands of Arabs. It was agreed that their right should be protected.

It was also agreed that no people of the Jewish faith would be bound by the Zionist concepts to the State of Israel outside of the State of Israel.

That leads me to say this to the gentleman, when he speaks of Israel as related to Zionism: Would you contend, Mr. MULTER, that there is a distinction between Israel as a nation and Israel as a creature of international Zionism? Do you attempt to set one apart from the other?

Mr. MULTER. I think you will concede that Israel, like our country, guarantees freedom of religion. I think you will agree that Israel, like our country, guarantees every one of its citizens the right to vote and to hold office.

There are Arab-Moslems and Arab-Christians in the Israeli Parliament. The point I tried to make is that while most Jews are Zionists, not every Zionist is a Jew. There are many Christians who are Zionists. Zionism is the political concept of a Jewish state. Every Jew is not a Zionist.

You probably know that we have in this country a so-called American Council of Judaism. They have been bombarding the Congress with literature for some time. Actually, they represent less than 2 percent of the Jews of this country. But they were against the establishment of a State of Israel.

Mr. BURLESON. If you will allow me to interrupt, they have vehemently denied that they are opposed to the State of Israel. They definitely deny being either pro-Israel or anti-Israel.

Mr. MULTER. They may take the position now that they are in favor of the State of Israel. They were not in favor of it originally. They were bitterly opposed to its coming into being.

After it did, they accepted the fact, but in accepting the fact they do everything they can to dissuade Christians and Jews from sending money to Israel or aiding it in any way. They are doing what they can to help destroy Israel.

They take the position that we must lean over backward in favor of the Arabs and against the State of Israel, which I say is not good policy. It is not American policy.

I don't say that we should be anti-Arab. My argument all through the years is that we must be just as pro-Arab as pro-Israel. You have to be fair and impartial to both of them.

Mr. BURLESON. Is not impartiality the announced policy of the State Department today?

Mr. MULTER. It may be the announced policy, but they are not doing anything to effectuate that policy. They are doing much that is contrary to that policy.

Mr. BURLESON. In connection with funds collected in the United States, let me ask the gentleman, do you agree that contributions to the United Jewish Appeal for the State of Israel should be a deductible item on the tax account of the American taxpayer as a philanthropic contribution?

Mr. MULTER. To the same extent that they are deductible for the support of the American University at Beirut, to the same extent as they are deductible to help people who are in distress anywhere in the world, to the same extent as they are to the Red Cross, and the like.

Mr. BURLESON. Do you know of any other instances or any precedent where any contribution by United States citizens to any political entity of a foreign government is deductible for income tax——

Mr. MULTER. These funds are not made available to a political entity.

Mr. BURLESON. But I disagree with the gentleman—I do not make a challenge that could not be refuted. Frankly, I don't know, but my information is that the funds collected by the United Jewish Appeal for the State of Israel goes into a common fund and can be used for any purpose the Israeli Government may desire.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. BURLESON, I most respectfully, but just as strongly disagree with you. The evidence is overwhelming that not a penny of that money goes into the coffers of the State of Israel. Not a penny of that money is disbursed by the State of Israel. Every dollar of that money is used—that which goes into the State of Israel; not all United Jewish Appeal money goes to the State of Israel—that which does go in is used for philanthropic purposes, rehabilitating people, making available to them the means for agriculture, to learn to farm, to learn skills for industry, for hospitals, and the like.

There isn't a dollar of that money that is administered by or paid to the State of Israel.

Mr. BURLESON. Our State Department people were very definite in 1954 in saying that those funds collected went into a common fund in the State of Israel, and the expenditures were not traceable, that they would not give us any assurance that tanks, planes, guns, public housing, health, or anything else were not purchased with them; that it was administered by the Israeli Government.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. BURLESON, were they referring to the United Jewish Appeal funds or to Israel bonds?

Mr. BURLESON. They lumped them all together.

Mr. MULTER. You can't lump them together, because the United Jewish Appeal money is not money that is used by the government or administered by the government, while the Israel bonds is a bond issue of the State of Israel and the proceeds go to the State of Israel.

Mr. VORYS. And you pay tax on them?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, you pay the tax on the income.

Mr. VORYS. And you can't deduct it?

Mr. MULTER. There is no deduction for the purchase of bonds or the income therefrom.

Mr. VORYS. I found that out recently at home.

Mr. BURLESON. I know that is true of the bonds.

Mr. MULTER. I assure you, Mr. BURLESON, if any such proof were available, our Treasury Department, the Internal Revenue Service would immediately revoke the tax exemption that is accorded to those gifts.

Mr. BURLESON. They first decided it was not deductible, and then later on they decided it was under an appeals court decision.

Mr. MULTER. I am not familiar with any litigation involving the matter.

I do know very definitely, I have been active in those matters for a long time, on a high level, and I know there isn't a dollar of United Jewish Appeal money that goes to the Israeli Government.

Mr. BURLESON. I hope the gentleman understands I was inquiring. I also hope he is correct and would welcome substantial proof of the correctness of his position.

Mr. MULTER. For more than 50 years the Jewish National Fund, an American organization, has been raising funds here and buying land in Israel, which is then leased on long-term leases, to anyone, to any Jew in Israel who wants to occupy the land. That has been going on for 54 years, to be exact.

Chairman RICHARDS. What is your recommendation about this legislation? You do not want us to include any money for help to any Arab State unless they do what?

Mr. MULTER. Unless they will in good faith enter into peace negotiations, either directly or through the United Nations or an agreed intermediary.

I am not so foolish as to think that you can force these Arabs to sit down face to face with the Israelis. But certainly good faith negotiations should be entered into without delay through an appropriate intermediary.

The United Nations would, of course, be the best intermediary. There are antagonisms there, too. Possibly they could agree upon some other intermediary, who could bring them to the peace table where they could sign the peace agreement.

It is not going to be an easy task. And it will not be accomplished overnight or in a day or week. Certainly we ought to say very firmly, "This is the time to do it."

Chairman RICHARDS. That you have to do certain things or else?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Chairman RICHARDS. If they don't do what we say——

Mr. MULTER. We will know where we stand. We will know whether or not we ought to send in any training tanks to Saudi Arabia at a time when there are reserve tank battalions in this country which haven't been able to get a single tank for training purposes.

Chairman RICHARDS. They agreed in writing to provide those tanks, did they not?

Mr. MULTER. They made the agreement to purchase the tanks in September 1955, and payment was made in November 1955. You and I sitting there would certainly have said, "Well, now, this is not the time to make that kind of delivery."

Mr. JUDD. Was not the basic agreement made in 1951 that they could buy weapons and training tanks, and so on, in this country?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. MULTER, is your suggestion only to this one area or is it your intention that we include such a provision for every area where there is a dispute? For example, do you propose the United States withhold any aid to Greece or Turkey, or Britain, until the Cyprus issue is settled, withhold aid to Pakistan and India until the Kashmir problem is resolved? Further, how about the other areas where there are conflicts?

Mr. MULTER. I say, once you find that the parties refuse to sit down and negotiate in good faith——

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Who would adjudicate the situation as to whether the parties are sitting down in good faith?

Mr. MULTER. Don't you think that the question answers itself, when 8 years have gone by and the parties have not yet sat down and consummated an agreement? Isn't that long enough to determine that they are not trying in good faith to arrive at an agreement?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No, because there is not a settlement over 8 years does not necessarily indicate bad faith on the part of Israel and the Arab States.

Mr. MULTER. That might be the necessary thing. It might be necessary to say to both sides, "You are both intransigent. Neither will talk. We can help neither one of you from here in."

It might be necessary to come to that position. I don't think it will be. But it may be.

I would like to stay on, but if it is agreeable, I will come back at any time you suggest. I must get to my committee, which is in executive session.

Chairman RICHARDS. Thank you, Mr. MULTER.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 24, 1956

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all men, amidst the clamor of busy cares, we seek a quiet cloister of the soul where spirit with spirit may meet. In this convulsive day of the world's passion and pain, we would purge and purify our own hearts as we face the high demands of the public good committed to our keeping.

Fix our eyes this day not just on the evil we vow before Thee to tear down, but upon the good which in Thy name and for the sake of all Thy children we pledge to build up. Forgive us that it has taken the lurid glare of global war and now the awfulness of the split atom with its terror and horror for us to recognize that all peoples must work out the common concerns of the world together, or else go down together into the Red burial of a final suicidal holocaust.

O Thou strong Father of the nations, draw all Thy great family together, with an increasing sense of our common blood and destiny, that peace and justice with equal worth and freedom for all may come at last to a cleansed earth—the home of the holy brotherhood of peoples. We ask it in the name of our Elder Brother for the coming of whose kingdom we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 23, 1956, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the special committee investigating lobbying was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements made during the morning hour be limited to 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and take up nominations on the Executive Calendar under "New Reports."

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Warren Weaver, of Connecticut, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, vice James Bernard Macelwane, deceased;

Laurence McKinley Gould, of Minnesota, and sundry other persons to be members of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation; and

John E. Munzer, and sundry other candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Sidney F. Davis III, midshipman (Naval Academy), to be an ensign in the Navy; and

Theodore R. Hunley and sundry other persons for appointment in the Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar under "New Reports."

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Thomas Edward Stakem, Jr., to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of G. Joseph Minetti to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Joseph A. Kerrins for promotion in the United States Coast Guard to the permanent rank of rear admiral.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the nominations today confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Morning business is in order.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, that there have been no significant developments to report for the month of April relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER LOUIS P. ARBOUR

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of C. W. O. Louis P. Arbour (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MASTER SERGEANT HAROLD LEROY ALLEN

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of M. Sgt. Harold LeRoy Allen (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LOCATION OF NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE—RESOLUTION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago, at a meeting held on May 9, 1956, requesting the United States Congress to designate the city of Chicago as the site for the proposed National Library of Medicine. I would like to add my personal endorsement to the request of the city fathers of Chicago, Ill.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is pending before the Congress of the United States a bill providing for the removal to a more accessible location of the world's largest medical library, an invaluable instrument for medical and scientific research, with its more than 650,000 volumes accumulated since its foundation by the United States Army in Washington, D. C., over 75 years ago; and

Whereas the library is now crowded into a Civil War building, its services handicapped for lack of space and its safety and protection jeopardized by the danger of fire or other natural hazards; and

Whereas the bill provides for the renaming of the library as the National Library of Medicine and most aptly transferred from the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense to that of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and further provides that the new library may and should be moved to a location more readily available to centers of medical research than is its present inadequate site; and

Whereas Chicago is already the Nation's No. 1 medical center, offering unsurpassed facilities for medical treatment, teaching, and research in the fields of medicine and surgery; is also the transportation hub of the United States for air, bus, rail, and automobile travel; and

Whereas, if moved to Chicago and housed in a modern fireproof structure, the new library would be a storehouse of knowledge, enhancing the city's fame as a world medical center, and establishing it as the most acceptable and desirable location for the benefit of all interested parties from all parts of the Nation desiring access to the historic volumes; and

Whereas his Honor, Mayor Daley, is leading the drive to present Chicago's claim for congressional recognition of its preeminent position in the medical field by locating the new library within the confines of the city; and will soon appoint a civic committee to take charge of the campaign: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the City Council of Chicago in regular session does hereby unanimously endorse the campaign for placing Chicago's unmatchable qualifications as a site for the medical library; and respectfully memorializes the Congress to give prompt attention to Chicago's plea; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the United States Senators from Illinois and the Representatives in the Congress from the Chicago area and all other districts of the State, with the request that they give their official and personal support to the nonpartisan civic movement to bring to Chicago the largest and most authentic medical library in the world, in keeping with Chicago's great reputation for education and scientific achievement.

SIZE AND WEIGHT OF PARCEL POST MAIL MATTER—RESOLUTION

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by 250 members of the Crest Shoe Co., favoring enactment of the bill (S. 3635) to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class—parcel post—mail. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the existence of an efficient, economical parcel post system is essential to the pattern of life of our citizens and businesses in both rural and urban areas; and

Whereas the present discriminatory parcel post size and weight limitations seriously disrupt the service once enjoyed by all at great and unnecessary cost and inconvenience; and

Whereas there is no nationwide substitute for parcel post that can and will serve all citizens regardless of address; and

Whereas the present size and weight limitations have been both a financial and an administrative burden to the Post Office Department: Be it hereby

Resolved, That the Crest Shoe Co., comprised of 250 members and representing shoe manufactures businesses in Lewiston, favors immediate enactment of S. 3635 and restoration thereby of uniform parcel post sizes and weight limits.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—PETITIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present petitions, signed by sundry citizens of the State of New York, favoring the enactment of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce. I ask unanimous consent that the petitions may be printed

in the RECORD, without the signatures attached.

There being no objection, the petitions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

To the UNITED STATES SENATE,
(Care of Senator LANGER),
Washington, D. C.:

We your constituents earnestly beg you to help conquer juvenile delinquency now in our midst. We can do this by exercising the powers of Congress to get advertisements of beer and wine off the radio and TV. Senate bill 923 would do this if it became law. We ask you to use your influence with the Interstate Commerce Committee to have this or similar bills brought out for a vote.

We the signers of this as a petition ask you to do all you can to stop sale of alcoholic beverages on airliners or to engineers of railroad trains where people are transported.

PROHIBITION OF SALE OF INDECENT COMICS AND SHOWING OF IMMORAL PICTURES ON TELEVISION—PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a petition signed by sundry ctizens of the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of indecent comics and the showing of immoral pictures on television.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

This petition with signers who ask you to use your influence or vote wherever it can be to stop sale of indecent comics or literature or the putting on TV screen of immoral pictures or murder to influence our children or people.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

S. 3365. A bill to amend section 410 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to change the requirements for obtaining a freight forwarder permit (Rept. No. 2040).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H. R. 9536. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2042); and

H. R. 9739. A bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2041).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

H. R. 2106. A bill to provide that the enlistment contracts or periods of obligated service of members of the Armed Forces shall not terminate by reason of appointment as cadets or midshipmen at the Military, Naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard Academies, or as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2050).

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H. R. 4229. A bill to provide running mates for certain staff corps officers in the naval service, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2044).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

H. R. 4363. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the State of New Mexico (Rept. No. 2051).

By Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H. R. 4704. A bill to provide for the examination preliminary to promotion of officers of the naval service (Rept. No. 2046); and

H. R. 5268. A bill to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the payment of mileage allowances for overland travel by private conveyance outside the continental limits of the United States (Rept. No. 2047).

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H. R. 2216. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1948 (ch. 511, 62 Stat. 489), relating to the retention in the service of disabled commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army and Air Force (Rept. No. 2043); and

H. R. 8477. A bill to amend title II of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, by providing flexibility in the distribution of women officers in the grades of commander and lieutenant commander, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2052).

By Mr. WELKER, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H. R. 4437. A bill relating to withholding for State employee retirement system purposes, on the compensation of certain civilian employees of the National Guard and the Air National Guard (Rept. No. 2045).

By Mr. WELKER, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

S. 2771. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the Fourth National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2048).

By Mr. WELKER, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

S. 2772. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in England in 1957; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2049).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 3917. A bill for the relief of Pao-Wei Yung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 3918. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Cape Cod Canal National Park, in the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 3919. A bill for the relief of John Yung-Fong Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 3920. A bill to authorize the partition or sale of inherited interests in allotted lands in the Tulalip Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 3921. A bill for the relief of Mieko Furukubo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 3922. A bill to improve the usefulness of national bank branches in foreign countries; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 3923. A bill to amend paragraphs (7) and (8) of section 5 (1) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, in order to provide for the payment of survivors' benefits under such act in certain cases; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were submitted or reported and referred as indicated:

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. Res. 270. Resolution to investigate all factors relating to automobile accidents and accident prevention; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 271) providing additional funds for the Committee on Appropriations, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the 84th Congress, $15,000, in addition to the amounts, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, approved August 2, 1946, and Senate Resolution 136, agreed to July 29, 1955.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 9739) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 26, after line 4, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the officer of the Army now serving as Director of the Selective Service System shall, effective upon the day preceding his retirement, be considered to hold the grade of lieutenant general for all purposes, without regard to any limitations on the number of officers in that grade, and shall receive the pay and allowances of an officer of that grade and his length of service, and when retired under any provision of law shall be advanced on the retired list to such grade and shall receive the retired or retirement pay at the rate prescribed by law computed on the basis of the basic pay which he would receive if serving on active duty in such grade."

Mr. MAGNUSON also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by

him, to House bill 9739, making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. POTTER:

Address delivered by him before the Propeller Club of New Orleans on May 22, 1956.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FREDERICK G. HAMLEY TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH DISTRICT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, June 1, 1956, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Frederick G. Hamley, of Washington, to be United States circuit judge, ninth circuit, vice Homer T. Bone, retired.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and myself.

EXPANSION OF NORTHEAST AIRLINES SERVICE

Mr. PAYNE. On Monday, May 21, 1956, there appeared an excellent editorial in the Bangor Daily News, of Bangor, Maine, concerning the opportunity that is available for Northeast Airlines to offer service of an adequate nature to the New England area, and particularly to the three Northeastern States of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont, if favorable consideration is given to the case that will shortly be under consideration by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTHEAST OFFERS MORE

A committee representing New England's congressional delegation is preparing a statement urging the Civil Aeronautics Board to approve Northeast Airlines' petition for a New York-Florida route. The committee will have no trouble in presenting what should be a convincing case. Commonsense and fair play are on the side of Northeast.

The issue is not simply a matter of which airline should be given a chance to share the business of this busy and profitable seaboard air haul. Also involved is the matter of tying in New England with the South by direct plane service. Further, award of the route to Northeast would give New England better regional service, which is something Northeast cannot provide while limited to unprofitable short-haul flights.

CAB Examiner Thomas Wrenn, who has recommended that the South's Delta Airlines get the extra seaboard route, overlooks New England's legitimate desire for improved air service. Delta would simply get another money-making long-haul franchise. New England would be no better off than before.

Wrenn goes out of his way in an unfair attempt to belittle Northeast Airlines in his report. He observed that awarding the route to Northeast would be "almost the same as commissioning a new carrier to enter the highly competitive market."

New carrier? Northeast for 23 years has battled New England's rugged winters and coastal fogs. It has been forced to operate with a minimum of airport facilities and navigational aids. Yet it has done so successfully and with an enviable safety record.

During World War II the able fliers of Northeast extended themselves and their equipment beyond ordinary endurance in order to establish for the Allies the vital North Atlantic air route.

Northeast last year carried 500,000 passengers and probably will carry 750,000 this year, although its flights are confined to regional operation north of New York.

How can an airline with such accomplishments be looked upon as a new carrier?

What the issue boils down to is this: As far as the New York-Florida route is concerned, Northeast would provide the extra service as well as any other bidding airline. In addition it alone would give New England the improved service it deserves.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Pawtucket Times, of Pawtucket, R. I., on Tuesday, May 22, 1956, entitled "A Boost for Northeast Airlines." This editorial is very complimentary to the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and I believe it will be of interest to the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BOOST FOR NORTHEAST AIRLINES

Better air service for New England may be the contribution of Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH. The Maine Senator, the first of her sex to be elected to the United States Senate, was a most telling witness at the Senate hearing on the activities of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Direct evidence growing out of personal experience when related before a Senate committee generally has more effect than a carload of resolutions of protest. Mrs. SMITH told of her distasteful experience in New York where employees of an airport terminal tried to make her the victim of sales practices which should not be countenanced by the CAB.

The CAB officials naturally countered with the obvious admission there was no justification for the treatment to which the Maine Senator was subjected. Too, the CAB said it investigates complaints similar to those lodged by Senator SMITH, but explained it lacked authority to penalize offending airlines.

Rather than seek the power to penalize offenders the CAB has a remedy to command. There is pending in Washington the petition of the Northeast Airlines to extend the scene of its operations southward. Northeast has been serving more than 40 New England communities, including the Blackstone Valley. It is the only air link to other than large centers in New England. Expansion of Northeast's scene of operations, especially to the profitable New York-Florida run, suggests an increase in the services northward from New York, not only to Boston but to Maine which has been getting "pretty poor service" according to Senator SMITH.

Northeast, the only airline which has persisted in its New England service, is operating with Government subsidy, a fact which should suggest to the CAB the desirability of expanding Northeast's traffic potential whose added income should reduce the call for subsidy.

The profit with airlines as with railroads is in the long haul. Those airlines which are operating over long distances, Senator SMITH has found, do not wish nor do they intend to provide the services which the Maine Senator holds should be available, uninterrupted better accommodations for passengers who would fly north of New York into New England.

Other New England Senators, as well as community organizations, have filed lack of service protests. But the pin-pointing of the inadequacies of existing service and the shortcomings of the CAB have given substance to the effort to override a CAB examiner's recommendation to confine Northeast Airlines to New England.

"THE SUPREME COURT MUST BE CURBED"—ARTICLE BY HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

Mr. WOFFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "The Supreme Court Must Be Curbed," which was published in U. S. News & World Report in the issue of May 18, 1956. This article was written by the Honorable James F. Byrnes, former Governor of South Carolina, and a former Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

Governor Byrnes has held many of the highest offices in the Federal Government, and his views should be carefully considered by every American who is interested in the preservation of our constitutional form of government.

In his article, Governor Byrnes has declared that the "Court did not interpret the Constitution—the Court amended it," with reference to the decision on May 17, 1954, declaring segregation in the public schools to be unconstitutional.

He also cited as "more frightening the trend of the present Court to destroy the powers of the 48 States." In this instance he referred to the decision of the Court in the case of Pennsylvania against Nelson on April 2, 1956.

The present trend brings joy to Communists and their fellow travelers who want to see all power centered in the Federal Government because they can more easily influence one Government in Washington than the 48 governments in 48 States—

Governor Byrnes pointed out.

He warned:

You may be unconcerned today. You may "cry tomorrow."

Mr. President, I hope these warnings will be heeded before it is too late.

I wish this article were required reading for every student in the schools of this country. Certainly, I urge every Member of the Senate to give it his earnest consideration.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SUPREME COURT MUST BE CURBED

(By James F. Byrnes, former Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States)

Two years ago, on May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States reversed what had been the law of the land for 75 years, and declared unconstitutional the laws of 17 States under which segregated public-school systems were established.

The Court did not interpret the Constitution—the Court amended it.

We have had a written Constitution. Under that Constitution the people of the United States have enjoyed great progress and freedom. The usurpation by the Court of the power to amend the Constitution and destroy State governments may impair our progress and take our freedom.

An immediate consequence of the segregation decision is that much of the progress made in the last half century of steadily advancing racial amity has been undone. Confidence and trust have been supplanted by suspicion and distrust. The races are divided and the breach is widening. The truth is, there has not been such tension between the races in the South since the days of Reconstruction.

One threatened consequence is the closing of public schools in many States of the South.

A further consequence is the harm done to the entire country by the demonstrated willingness of the Supreme Court to disregard our written Constitution and its own decisions, invalidate the laws of States, and substitute for these a policy of its own, supported not by legal precedents but by the writings of sociologists.

Today, this usurpation by the Court of the power of the States hurts the South. Tomorrow, it may hurt the North, East, and West. It may hurt you.

Though there was no dissenting opinion from any member of the Court, the South dissents. That dissent is reflected in State legislation and in the day-by-day occurrences throughout the South, developments which portray the feeling of the people.

Only now do people living elsewhere begin to comprehend the determination behind the dissent of the South. Only now is an effort being made in the northern press to give thoughtful, balanced and reasonably impartial presentations of what might be called "the southern point of view."

The suppression of that viewpoint outside the South has caused much of the Nation to suppose that such dissatisfaction as existed with the Supreme Court's decision was due to petty prejudice and would soon disappear. That theme has been further developed by the publication of encouraging reports of school-integration experiences here and there below the Mason-Dixon line. Those reports may be true of some border States and of predominantly white areas in mountain sections of the South; it is not true of any section where Negroes constitute as much as 10 percent of the population.

The problem is numerical as well as legal, educational, and—in recognition of the Supreme Court's concern—sociological.

The corruption of the Reconstruction era is a matter of recorded history. The memory of the sufferings endured by the white people of the South is an inheritance. It was during this tragic era that the 14th amendment was literally forced upon the helpless States of the South.

When the white people finally wrested control of the State governments from the carpetbaggers and newly freed slaves, and the army of occupation was withdrawn, the South started on the long road to recovery. Agriculture and industry were gradually restored. A public-school system was developed.

No one then seriously asserted that mixing the races in the schools was contemplated by the 14th amendment. In the constitutions of most of the States of the Union, not just those of the South, provisions were adopted for the segregation of the races in the schools.

In 1896 in a case known as *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, involving a statute providing for segregation of the races on railroad trains, the United States Supreme Court held that a statute providing for separate but equal facilities was not in violation of the 14th amendment to the Constitution. Thereafter, the Supreme Court in several cases involving schools upheld this doctrine.

Later, the Court, when it included such great judges as Chief Justice Taft and Justices Holmes, Brandeis, and Stone, unanimously said that segregation in public schools had been "many times decided to be within the constitutional power of the State legislatures to settle without interference of the Federal courts under the Federal Constitution.

SOUTH'S STAKE IN SEPARATE SCHOOLS

Relying upon the stability of the law of the land, and upon the guaranty of State sovereignty in the Federal Constitution, the people of the South invested hundreds of millions of dollars in separate schools for the races. Under this segregated school system, the southern Negro made greater progress than any other body of Negro people in the history of the world.

The facilities for Negro students in many States were not equal to the facilities provided for white students. The degree of equality differed not only in States, but in counties within a State. The situation in South Carolina was typical of the South. As a rule, the facilities for Negro students in the urban centers were superior to the facilities provided in rural areas. The same was true of facilities for white students. Schools were dependent upon local taxation, and much of the inequality was due to the greater value of industrial property and higher income of the city dweller.

A realization of the inequality that existed between rural schools and urban schools, as well as between the races, influenced me greatly to become a candidate for Governor of South Carolina in 1950.

In my inaugural address, I advocated a bond issue of $75 million and the levying of a sales tax of 3 percent for the purpose of equalizing the school facilities. In presenting this, I said:

"It is our duty to provide for the races substantial equality in school facilities. We should do it because it is right. For me, that is sufficient reason."

Of the $75 million authorized, 70 percent was allocated to Negro schools even though the Negro-school enrollment constitutes but 39 percent of the total school enrollment.

Subsequently, the bond issue was increased until it is now $137.5 million. In every school district there is a high school for Negroes and more than one elementary school. On the whole, the Negro school buildings are superior to the white schools because they are modern. The number of Negroes transported by bus to those schools was increased 450 percent in 3 years.

Similar educational programs have been underway in other Southern States.

In South Carolina, with a Negro population of 823,622, there are 7,500 Negro schoolteachers, whereas in 12 States east of the Mississippi and north of the Mason-Dixon line, with a Negro population of 3,351,402, there are only 7,712 Negro teachers. There is no difference in the scale of pay for white and Negro teachers.

About the time the educational program was inaugurated in South Carolina, there was pending in the United States court a case from Clarendon County, asking equal facilities for Negro schools. Later, that suit was withdrawn, and a suit was brought by the same complainants, asking the court to declare unconstitutional all segregation laws.

The 3-judge court, presided over by Judge Parker, senior judge of the fourth circuit, held that under the decisions of the United States Supreme Court from 1896 to that date, the segregation provisions of the constitution and statutes of South Carolina were not in violation of the 14th amendment. The lawyers for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People appealed the case to the United States Supreme Court.

In that Court, the case for Clarendon County was argued by the late Hon. John W. Davis. He was so convinced of the soundness of the decision of the 3-judge court that he agreed to argue the case and declined to accept compensation for his services.

Had the Court been unanimous in the view that segregation statutes were in violation of the 14th amendment, such an opinion would have been written within a few months.

Instead, after many months, the Court announced that the cases should be reargued, and counsel should direct their arguments to certain questions.

The first question was:

"What evidence is there that the Congress which submitted and the State legislatures and conventions which ratified the 14th amendment, contemplated, or did not contemplate, understood, or did not understand, that it would abolish segregation in public schools?"

Such a question would not have been asked if a majority of the Court was already satisfied that Congress and the State legislatures did contemplate that the amendment would prohibit segregation in public schools.

Attorneys representing the parties involved and the attorneys general of many States having segregation statutes filed briefs. The overwhelming preponderance of the legislative history demonstrated that abolishing segregation in schools was not contemplated by the framers of the 14th amendment, or by the States.

We can only speculate as to how the Court reached its decision. In that speculation, it is interesting to read in the Harvard Law Review of November 1955, an article entitled, "The Original Understanding and the Segregation Decision," written by Alexander M. Bickel, who, according to the Review, was the law clerk to Mr. Justice Frankfurter during the October term, 1952, when the case was first argued. After a lengthy résumé of the evidence, the writer states:

"The obvious conclusion to which the evidence, thus summarized, easily leads is that section 1 of the 14th amendment, like section 1 of the Civil Rights Act of 1866, carried out the relatively narrow objectives of the moderates, and, hence, as originally understood, was meant to apply neither to jury service, nor suffrage, nor antimiscegenation statutes, nor segregation. This conclusion is supported by the blunt expression of disappointment to which Thaddeus Stevens gave vent in the House."

The Court, in its opinion, did not admit, as did Mr. Bickel, the conclusiveness of the evidence that the 14th amendment did not apply to school segregation. The Court said the evidence was "inconclusive."

PREVIOUS DECISIONS WERE REVERSED

Our Constitution is a written instrument. The 14th amendment does not specifically mention public schools. Having decided unanimously that the legislative history was not "conclusive" that the Congress or the States intended it should apply to schools, one would think the Court would have stopped there and upheld the previous decisions of the Court. Instead, it proceeded to reverse those decisions and legislate a policy for schools.

An explanation of this extraordinary decision is offered by Mr. Bickel in his Harvard Review article on page 64, where he said:

"It—the Court—could have deemed itself bound by the legislative history showing the immediate objectives to which section 1 of the 14th amendment was addressed, and rather clearly demonstrating that it was not expected in 1866 to apply to segregation. The Court would in that event also have repudiated much of the provision's 'line of growth.' For it is as clear that section 1 was not deemed in 1866 to deal with jury service and other matters 'implicit in * * * ordered liberty * * *' to which the Court has since applied it."

If this law clerk is correct (and I can assure you the law clerks in the Supreme Court are well informed), it means that the Court, having previously interpreted the 14th amendment to apply to jury service and other matters not specifically delegated by the Constitution to the Federal Government, felt that the soundness of those decisions would be questioned unless the Court held the 14th amendment to apply to schools.

But there was a distinction. Previously the Court had held that State laws providing separate but equal school facilities did not deny a constitutional right. The control of schools had been proposed by some framers of the 14th amendment and rejected. There was no legislation by Congress prohibiting segregated schools. The only change in conditions was that several million Negroes had migrated to the big cities in Northern States and constituted the balance of political power in several States.

Once the Court becomes committed to a course of expanding the Constitution in order to justify previous expansions, there is no turning back. When next the Court is called upon to read into the Constitution something which was never there, another segment of the people may be the victim. It may be you.

The Constitution provides that any amendment submitted to the States must be ratified by three-fourths of the States.

Change was purposely made difficult by the framers, who jealously guarded their liberties. They knew "the history of liberty is the history of limitations on government."

COURT IGNORED A WARNING

In amending the Constitution, the Court ignored the warning of George Washington in his Farewell Address:

"If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

Frequently, the Court has applied a constitutional principle to subjects not specifically mentioned in the Constitution, and not conceived by its framers. That has been done, for instance, in applying the "commerce clause" to congressional legislation affecting forms of transportation and communication not in existence when the "commerce clause" was adopted. Material progress, which could not have been anticipated, justified the Court in applying the principle of the "commerce clause" and sustaining the laws affecting commerce between the States.

Ordinarily, the Court has been controlled by legal precedents. In the segregation opinion, it could cite no legal precedent for its decision because all the precedents sustain the doctrine of separate but equal facilities.

In 23 of the States that ratified the 14th amendment, the courts of last resort held it did not abolish segregation. The Supreme Court itself, in 6 cases decided over a period of 75 years, upheld the doctrine of equal but separate facilities.

The Court ignored all of these legal precedents and the Constitution and said, "We cannot turn the clock back to 1868 when the amendment was adopted, or even to 1896 when *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* was written."

Why not? The function of the Court is to interpret the Constitution, not amend it. Heretofore, whenever in doubt about the proper interpretation of the Constitution or a statute, the Court has turned the clock back to the time of adoption to ascertain the intent of the draftsmen. When the Court states, "We cannot turn the clock back to 1868," will it ever consider the intent of the framers of the Constitution in 1787?

If the age of a constitutional provision is to be held against its soundness, what about the age of our religion? If time invalidates the truth in one field, will it not do so in another?

If the Court could not turn the clock back in these cases, why did it ask counsel for the litigants and the attorneys general of all interested States to file briefs as to the intent of the Congress in 1868, in submitting, and the States, in ratifying, the amendments?

And why were counsel asked to argue whether the Court was bound by its previous decisions, such as *Plessy* v. *Ferguson?*

It is apparent that, when the Court found the legislative history it requested was overwhelming against the conclusion it had reached, it declared the evidence inconclusive, disregarded the Constitution and—invading the legislative field—declared that segregation would retard the development of Negro children.

That was a terrible indictment of the Negro race. Because—whether a person be black, brown, or yellow—whenever the Supreme Court says he cannot develop unless while in school he is permitted to sit by the side of white students, the Court brands that person an inferior human being.

Now mark this well. The Court not only ignored the Constitution and its own decisions, but, in establishing a policy for schools, ignored the record in the case.

In support of its decision, after citing K. B. Clark, who was employed by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, it cited the writings of a group of psychologists who had not testified in the trial court. Counsel for the States had no opportunity to rebut the opinions of these psychologists. In such procedure there lies danger for all of us.

And the Court was guilty of what it has frequently condemned. As late as 1952 in the case of *Beauharnais* v. *Illinois* (343 U. S. 250) the Court said:

"It is not within our competence to confirm or deny claims of social scientists as to the dependence of the individual on the position of his racial or religious group in the community."

Counsel had no opportunity to cross-examine these psychologists as to their qualifications as well as their affiliations. However, in the United States Senate, on May 26, 1955, Senator EASTLAND, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, submitted an amazing record of several of the authorities cited by the Court. He said:

"Then, too, we find cited by the Court as another modern authority on psychology to override our Constitution, one Theodore Brameld, regarding whom the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the United States House of Representatives are replete with citations and information. He is cited as having been a member of no less than 10 organizations declared to be communistic, communistic-front, or Communist dominated."

As to E. Franklin Frazier, another authority cited by the Supreme Court, Senator EASTLAND said, "The files of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the United States House of Representatives contain 18 citations of Frazier's connections with Communist causes in the United States."

In support of its findings, the Court said, "See generally Myrdal, 'An American Dilemma, 1944.'" I have seen it. On page 13, Professor [Gunnar Karl] Myrdal writes that the Constitution of the United States is "impractical and unsuited to modern conditions" and its adoption was "nearly a plot against the common people."

On page 530, Myrdal states, "In the South the Negro's person and property are practically subject to the whim of any white person who wishes to take advantage of him or to punish him for any real or fancied wrongdoing or insult."

Millions of people, white and colored, know this is absolutely false. Members of the Supreme Court know it is false. It is an insult to the millions of white southerners.

Senator EASTLAND also listed some of those who were associated with Myrdal in writing his book. He stated that the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities show that many of Myrdal's associates are members of organizations cited as subversive by the Department of Justice under Democratic and Republican administrations.

I am informed by the Senator that no Member of the Senate and no responsible person outside of the Senate has challenged the accuracy of his statements on this subject. Loyal Americans of the North, East, South, and West should be outraged that the Supreme Court would reverse the law of the land upon no authority other than some books written by a group of psychologists about whose qualifications we know little and about whose loyalty to the United States there is grave doubt.

And loyal Americans should stop and think when the executive branch of the Federal Government brands as subversive organizations whose membership includes certain psychologists, and the Supreme Court cites those psychologists as authority for invalidating the constitutions of 17 States of the Union.

RIGHT TO CRITICIZE COURT

Some advocates of integrated schools shudder to think of anyone's criticizing a decision of the Supreme Court or, certainly, this decision of the Court. Well, whenever a member of the Court dissents from the majority opinion, he expresses his views and criticizes—sometimes in vigorous language—the Court's opinion.

In recent years there are many examples. But a case in point is the dissent of the late Justice Owen J. Roberts, who differed with his colleagues on the Court in the case of *Smith* v. *Allwright*. The Supreme Court in that case reversed prior decisions and declared the Democratic Party in Texas was, in effect, an agency of the State and that its actions (in conducting white primaries) was "State action." Said Mr. Justice Roberts:

"I have expressed my views with respect to the present policy of the Court freely to disregard and to overrule considered decisions and the rules of law announced in them. This tendency, it seems to me, indicates an intolerance for what those who have composed this Court in the past have conscientiously and deliberately concluded, and involves an assumption that knowledge and wisdom reside in us which was denied to our predecessors."

The decisions of the Supreme Court must be accepted by the courts of the United States and the States, but not necessarily by the court of public opinion. The people are not the creatures of the Court. The Court is the creature of the people.

One hundred representatives of the people in the United States Congress have issued a "manifesto" criticizing this decision.

Such criticism is nothing new. There is precedent for criticism by the people.

After the decision in the Dred Scott case, Abraham Lincoln criticized the Court, declaring the decision erroneous and pledging the Republican Party to "do what we can to have it overruled."

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, on March 9, 1937, commenting on a decision of the Supreme Court, said:

"The Court in addition to the proper use of its judicial functions has improperly set itself up as a third house of the Congress—a superlegislature, as one of the justices has called it—reading into the Constitution words and implications which are not there.

"We have, therefore, reached the point as a Nation where we must take action to save the Constitution from the Court and the Court from itself. * * *

"Our difficulty with the Court today rises not from the Court as an institution but from the human beings within it."

ENFORCEMENT OF DECISION

The fifth section of the 14th amendment authorizes Congress to enforce that amendment. Congress never legisiated to require integrated schools because the 14th amendment did not embrace schools. On the contrary, Congress specifically appropriated for segregated schools in the District of Columbia. Now that the Supreme Court has amended the Constitution to embrace schools, Congress could legislate on the subject but the Supreme Court knows the representatives of the people will not legislate. Therefore, it calls upon the States of the South to enforce its new policy for schools.

The people of the South are law-abiding. They do not talk or even think of armed resistance. They realize the United States Government has the power to enforce a decision of the Supreme Court. But they believe the decision will close many schools, and think that the Court that ignored the Constitution and rendered the decision should assume the responsibility for its enforcement.

It is unrealistic to expect local school officials to destroy the public schools. With few exceptions, school trustees in the South are white men. They are highly respected in their communities. They serve without compensation. Do you think they will force the children of their neighbors into mixed schools? Many trustees will resign. Negroes will not be selected to succeed them. The schools will be closed.

When northern newspapers criticize local officials who will not cooperate in the enforcement of this decision, they should recall the prohibition era. There were few northern newspapers clamoring for the enforcement of that law by local authorities.

The so-called best people of many States did not hide their violations of the prohibition law. They regarded it as smart to boast of making gin in the bathtub and carrying whisky in a silver flask to public places. They fought the law until it was repealed.

However, there was this difference: The prohibition law was enacted as a result of an amendment to the Constitution which was adopted in the manner provided by the Constitution. It was not, as in this case, a decision of nine men on the Supreme Court—in effect—amending the Constitution.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, financed by tax-exempt organizations and some well-intentioned but misguided people, for years demanded the reversal of the "separate but equal" decisions of the Supreme Court, even though 40 years ago Justice Charles Evans Hughes, speaking for the Court, said the question could "no longer be considered an open one." Now these same people would deny to the people of the South even the right to criticize the recent decision in the school case.

PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES AHEAD

A statement of some of the practical difficulties certain to follow enforcement of the segregation decision demonstrates the seriousness of the problem.

The case from South Carolina originated in a school district in Clarendon County where there were approximately 2,900 Negro students and 290 white students. The goal of educators is to limit a class of 30 students. In the Clarendon district, all classrooms have more than the standard.

No white student will ask to go to a Negro school. But suppose some Negroes in the 10th grade of a Negro school ask for a transfer to the 10th grade of a crowded white school and the trustees decide it is unwise to further increase the enrollment in that school. Will the Court decide the rejection was on account of race, instead of efficiency, and cite the trustees for contempt?

Suppose the Negroes are admitted: It is agreed that the average Negro child, having had little training at home, does not possess the training of the average white child in the same grade and age group. Shall the white children be held back to help the Negroes progress?

The white parents in the District of Columbia can answer that question. They have had some sad experiences in the last year. As a result, approximately 60 percent of the students in the public schools of the Capital of this Nation are Negroes. Many white families have moved to Virginia; many, though they can ill afford it, have placed their children in private schools.

If the Negro students are not able to do the work of the white students, can the races be segregated in the classroom and assigned different class work? Would not the scars inflicted upon the Negro child by such segregation be far deeper than the harm done him by associating with only Negro students in segregated schools?

Should the races be mixed in a school, will a board of trustees composed of white men in a Southern State employ Negro teachers? If not, what will happen to the Negro teachers now employed in the South?

Today, high schools in the South are more social institutions than in the past. There is a cafeteria where all students lunch together. There is a gymnasium where students of both sexes engage in various sports.

Athletic contests, as a rule, are held at night. Students, following the team, travel in school buses. When the races have been accustomed to separation in buses, who can assure there will not be serious consequences?

These are only a few of the problems.

There is a fundamental objection to integration. Southerns fear that the purpose of those who lead the fight for integration in schools is to break down social barriers in childhood and the period of adolescence, and ultimately bring about intermarriage of the races. Some Negro leaders deny this. Others admit this objective. Because the white people of the South are unalterably opposed to such intermarriage, they are unalterably opposed to abolishing segregation in schools.

Disraeli said, "No man will treat with indifference the principle of race. It is the key to history."

Pride of race has been responsible for the grouping of people along ethnic lines throughout the world.

Race preservation is the explanation of the political unrest in South Africa. In the United States, it is not peculiar to the white people of the South. For many years, fear of the Japanese influenced legislation in California.

Today, in 23 of the States, intermarriage of the races is prohibited by law. These laws reflect the fear of mongrelization of the race. To prevent this, the white people of the South are willing to make every sacrifice.

It is useless to argue whether the racial instinct is right or wrong. It exists. It is not confined to any race or to any country. It cannot be eliminated from the minds and hearts of people by the views of psychologists or by the order of a court.

The degree of tension between the races depends upon the percentage of Negro population. In Vermont, where there are few Negroes, there is little tension. But in Detroit, Chicago, and Washington, where the Negro population is increasing, tension is increasing.

Frequently it has been asked why the white man of the South who owned no slaves fought in the Confederate Army as bravely as the slaveowner. He had no financial interest. It was not greed. It was to preserve the rights of the States and thereby preserve his race. For this he fought and died. His grandchildren have the same racial instincts.

Abraham Lincoln was not charged with racism, but he said, "While the races remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race." He further said, as to political equality, "My own feelings will not admit of this, and if mine would, we well know that those of the great mass of the whites will not. Whether this feeling accords with justice and sound judgment is not the sole question, if indeed it is any part of it. A universal feeling whether well or ill founded cannot be safely disregarded."

Since Lincoln's words were uttered, the Negro living by the side of the white man of the South, under segregation laws, has made great progress, educationally, culturally, and economically. The white man of the South wants to help the Negro continue to progress, first because it is right and second, because it is to his own advantage. Unlike Lincoln, he does not say there must be the position of superior and inferior. He says in State-supported facilities there should be equality, but he also says equal facilities do not mean the same facilities.

"WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?"

Frequently, the question is asked: Where do we go from here? Solomon, with all his wisdom, could not give a positive answer. We do know that the approximately 40 million white southerners will do everything that lawfully can be done to prevent the mixing of the races in the schools.

The hope is for voluntary segregation. As the Negro has progressed educationally and economically, a constantly increasing percentage of them have developed a pride of race. That Negro does not want his children forced into schools where they will not be welcomed. He prefers to have them attend schools for Negroes, taught by Negroes. However, recent events indicate such men will be coerced by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and northern Negroes to demand admission to white schools. Therefore, there is fear for the future.

Plans vary. In some States, the legislature has repealed the statute requiring children to attend schools. When the overwhelming majority of the people of a State are opposed to integrated schools, they could not be expected to enforce laws requiring children to attend mixed schools.

In most States, the law now requires trustees or other school officials to assign children to schools. In the cities where the Negro population is usually concentrated in 2 or 3 areas, schools have been placed in those areas. It is reasonable that Negroes should be assigned to the schools nearest their homes. In the rural districts there is no such segregation of homes. There the problem will be more difficult, and—more dangerous.

In South Carolina and in some other States, laws have been enacted providing that if—by order of any court, State or Federal—a student is assigned to a school different from

that to which he is assigned by school officials, all appropriations for the school to which that student is assigned and all appropriations for the school from which he comes shall immediately cease. Similarly, it is provided that funds appropriated for operation of school buses shall be available only for segregated buses.

The theory of this legislation is that under the Constitution there are three branches of government which shall forever be kept separate. It is the function of the legislative and executive branches of State governments to appropriate for and administer school funds. If a State or Federal court shall arrogate to itself the right to assign children to schools different from the assignment made by the officials designated by the legislative and executive branches of the State government, no funds shall be available for such schools.

It is predicted by counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People that the United States Supreme Court will declare these appropriation laws unconstitutional. In view of the segregation decision, no man can say positively the prediction will not come true.

If the Supreme Court shall declare unconstitutional all State statutes having, in its opinion, the effect of continuing segregated schools, then as a last resort many States will discontinue public schools. Some financial assistance would be provided for parents, white and colored, sending children to private schools. Such a plan is proposed in Virginia.

By an overwhelming vote in South Carolina in 1952, there was eliminated from the State constitution the provision that public schools must be provided for "all children between 6 and 21 years of age." The purpose was to permit the Legislature to be free to discontinue public schools should all other efforts fail.

NEGROES COULD SUFFER MOST

Should this happen, it will be unfortunate for both races. It would be particularly unfortunate for Negroes because they do not have the financial ability to purchase or to build and equip schools. That fact does not deter the reckless leaders of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People from jeopardizing the continued existence of Negro schools as well as of white schools.

Should the public schools close, the white people of the South will see that an education equal to that given white children is available to the Negro children who are being used as pawns by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in an effort to solve overnight a great social problem.

Integration is now demanded in other fields. In South Carolina, for example, there are recreation parks, supported by public funds and equipped with vacation cabins, lakes and other facilities. For the maximum enjoyment of all, and for the preservation of good order, the parks are operated on a segregated basis—some for whites and some for Negroes.

Recently, a suit was brought in a Federal court to force the admission of Negroes to a park set aside for white people. The general assembly, rather than wait for another race-mixing decree, promptly and unanimously ordered the park closed. The suit was dismissed by the court. For the future money is appropriated only for segregated parks. Similar suits have been brought in other States. All parks may soon be closed as a result of litigation inspired by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and some northern sentimentalists who do great injury to their fellow man. Woodrow Wilson once said:

"It will be a bad day for society when sentimentalists are encouraged to suggest all the measures that shall be taken for the betterment of the race."

THREATENED: POWER OF STATES

Tragic as may be the consequences in destroying the public-school system in the South, more frightening are the consequences of the trend of the present Court to destroy the powers of the 48 States.

In the case of *Pennsylvania* v. *Steve Nelson*, decided April 2, 1956, the same Court that declared unconstitutional the segregation statutes of 17 States invalidated the laws of 42 States prohibiting the knowing advocacy of the overthrow of the Government of the United States by violence, as long as there is a Federal law against sedition.

The Department of Justice protested to the Court that the State laws did not interfere with the enforcement of the Federal statute. But the Court struck down the laws of 42 States. Justices Reed, Burton, and Minton vigorously dissented.

One week later the Court declared unconstitutional a provision of the Charter of New York City under which Professor Slochower, an employee, was dismissed for failure to answer a question in an authorized inquiry, on the ground that his answer might incriminate him. It is encouraging to the people that the same three Justices dissented and were joined by Justice Harlan.

Power intoxicates men. It is never voluntarily surrendered. It must be taken from them. The Supreme Court must be curbed.

The Constitution authorizes the Congress to regulate the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. Loyal Americans who believe in constitutional government appeal to the court of public opinion in the hope that you will urge the Congress to act before it is too late.

The present trend brings joy to Communists and their fellow travelers who want to see all power centered in the Federal Government because they can more easily influence one Government in Washington than the 48 governments in 48 States.

But the trend of the Court is disturbing to millions of Americans who respect the Constitution and believe that in order to preserve the Republic we must preserve what is left of the powers of the States.

You may be unconcerned today. You may "Cry Tomorrow".

THE WEATHER BUREAU

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, because we have been convinced that through added appropriations for the Weather Bureau in the Department of Commerce, many of us have pointed to the hurricanes of last year as an example of the possibility in saving life and property through improved weather forecasting techniques.

One of the leaders in this drive has been the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. He submitted a statement before the Senate Appropriations Committee outlining the tremendous possibility available to our citizens through greater accent on the importance of the Weather Bureau and expansion of its activities. In addition to going into the record of the committee, Senator GREEN's statement has evoked the consideration of thoughtful individuals along the entire east coast, and as a direct result an editorial was carried in the Providence Journal of Friday, May 11, which I would like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAS THE WEATHER BUREAU'S 1957 BUDGET QUIETLY AXED?

Senator GREEN's proposal that the Weather Bureau's budget for next year be increased to permit a continuation and expansion of the improved storm and flood forecast and warning programs initiated this year makes excellent sense.

A year ago the weather service's requested appropriation was slashed $16 million by the Department of Commerce (of which the service is a part) and the Bureau of the Budget. Largely through the efforts of Senator GREEN and Representative FOGARTY, however, nearly $7 million of the slash was restored later.

Apparently the meat ax has now been applied to the request for funds for next year. The Senate Appropriations Committee, at Mr. GREEN's request, is moving to find out how much the cuts amount to and who made them. It will do this by comparing the Bureau's original proposed budget total with the figure finally approved by the Commerce Department.

It is the Senator's contention that $3 million more should be provided for the national river flood warning system, $2 million for the expansion of hurricane, tornado, and other storm forecasting, and $2 million to "prevent further and dangerous deterioration" in the weather information provided for aircraft. Money for these purposes, Mr. GREEN suspects, was sought by the Weather Bureau, but denied by budget officers somewhere along the line before the request got to Congress.

It seems a matter of simple logic that if funds already spent or authorized for improving the service rendered by the Bureau are to lead to adequate protection for the public they must be supplemented in the manner proposed. Otherwise, what progress has been made to date may largely be lost.

In this connection, Representative JAMES T. PATTERSON, of Connecticut, another hurricane- and flood-conscious State, emphasizes the need to increase the number of river forecasting centers, establish more radar storm-detection stations, and set up cooperative river and rainfall observation posts in valleys subject to flash flooding. All this could be done and the personnel to operate the expanded facilities provided, he says, from the increase in the flood-warning appropriation that Senator GREEN is seeking.

UNITED STATES-CANADIAN NEGOTIATIONS ON WATER RESOURCES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may speak for not to exceed 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senator from Oregon may proceed for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, at noon on yesterday, May 23, 1956, the Government of Canada and the United States announced their decision to engage in a joint examination, at a high diplomatic level, of the issues arising from the use and development of water resources which cross the boundaries of our two countries. The Senate was told about this decision yesterday by Mr. Marselis C. Parsons, Jr., Director of the Office of British Commonwealth and Northern European Affairs of the Department of State, at a hearing before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on the subject of upper Columbia River storage development in Canada. The announcement itself was in the form of a press release, and I ask unanimous consent that it appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Canadian and United States Governments have decided to examine together the subject of waters which flow across the international boundary between the two countries.

The last time both Governments examined this matter thoroughly together was before the conclusion of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909. During the 46 years which have elapsed since its ratification, the International Joint Commission which was established by the treaty has worked with outstanding success in solving water problems within the framework of this treaty.

It has recently appeared, however, that the development of the resources of such basins as the St. John, the Columbia, and the Yukon, requires, among other things, the solution of various complicated legal, economic, and engineering questions. In agreeing to examine the matter of waters which cross the boundary, the two Governments realize that there may be no easy or quick answer to the problems which are arising today in such areas and that the studies may reveal that the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 is sufficiently broad to meet present problems. The two Governments believe, however, that a full and confidential exchange of views may contribute to the resolution of these problems and it is in this spirit that the discussions have been agreed to. At the same time, the two Governments desire that the International Joint Commission shall press forward its studies under the Columbia River Basin Reference of 1944 and the other similar references which it has under consideration.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am delighted that this step has been taken to make a new start on negotiations between Canada and the United States of these issues, which are of immense economic importance to both nations, and particularly to the Pacific Northwest, British Columbia, and Alaska.

Last October, I visited British Columbia, and specifically the upper Columbia River Basin, on behalf of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, to study at firsthand the vast possibilities of hydroelectric development in that basin and the problems which appeared to be delaying agreement between the Canadians and ourselves as to this development. I was especially disturbed by the fact that in 1954 and 1955, Canadian authorities had moved forward toward serious study and consideration of a plan to divert as much as one-quarter of the combined Kootenay and Columbia Rivers' flow in Canada into the Fraser River. This water would thus be forever lost to the Pacific Northwest, with incalculable damage to the economic future of this region of our own country, including my own State of Oregon.

My study convinced me that much of the impetus for the diversion proposals came from an apparent deadlock within the International Joint Commission, the United States-Canadian groups charged with responsibility for study of such mutual boundary problems. Consequently, when, upon my return, I made my report to the chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], my first recommendation was:

That responsibility within the United States Government for these important negotiations be raised from the level of a purely advisory committee like the United States section of the International Joint Commission and be explicitly assumed by the policy-making executive departments themselves.

When Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent, of Canada, visited President Eisenhower at White Sulphur Springs on March 26, the Prime Minister similarly suggested to the President that the time had come when the problem of the development of rivers crossing the international boundary might best be taken up at a conference of representatives of our two Governments. This suggestion has also been discussed and has received favorable comment in the Canadian Parliament and in the Canadian press.

Mr. President, I repeat that it is a cause for great satisfaction and for renewed hope for everyone in the Pacific Northwest that this recommendation has been accepted by the administration. I must admit that a good part of my misgivings over the status of these vital negotiations resulted from the fact that the Chairman of the American section of the International Joint Commission, former Gov. Len Jordan, of Idaho, has been a consistent and highly partisan enemy of the Federal power program in the Columbia River Basin—the very program which would be enhanced by agreement with Canada for upstream storage, and which would be the victim if Canada were to divert the Columbia and Kootenai Rivers. Needless to say, Governor Jordan was highly critical of my recommendation for high-level negotiations, when I made it last winter, and he thought it did not deserve any attention or consideration. At the hearing of the Interior Committee on yesterday, however, Governor Jordan stated that if this was what the Canadian Government and President Eisenhower wanted, he, too, would be for it.

In view of these promising developments, Mr. President, I hope we may now look forward to early progress toward agreement on the allocation of costs and benefits of future upstream storage developments in the Columbia River Basin, both at the Libby site in Montana and at Canadian sites. This development, if pursued to its fullest extent and at the lowest possible cost, is the key to the future prosperity of British Columbia and the Pacific Northwest, with immense benefits to the rest of both countries.

If this full development comes about, much of the credit will be due to the illustrious chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I am sure even the present first step—that of accepting the recommendation for high-level negotiations—owes much to the active interest and cooperation of the senior Senator from Montana, who, as chairman of this committee, pressed forward with public hearings which brought to the attention of the American people the grave crisis confronting the development of our continent's principal water power river system, which we share with Canada.

Furthermore, the name of Senator JAMES E. MURRAY is inextricably linked with one of the great projects whose fate is at stake in these negotiations. This is the vast Libby Dam, proposed for the Kootenai River in his State of Montana, which requires international approval because its reservoir will inundate Canadian lands north of the border. Libby Dam is one of the finest storage projects for flood control, power, and other multipurpose benefits in all of North America. Its benefit-cost ratio is extremely high. Its construction relies upon the negotiations soon to be started afresh with Canada. It represents a dream and a hope of the two distinguished Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. MANSFIELD], and its eventual completion will be a monument to their faithful and persistent public service in its behalf.

The urgency of progress toward construction of the Libby project and other storage projects in the upper reaches of the Columbia River system has been dramatized again by the floods and the flood threats which constantly imperil sections of the Northwest. Just this weekend, for instance, the Kootenai River is flooding in northern Idaho, downstream from the boundary where the huge Libby reservoir will some day store, as I recall, about 4 million acre-feet of such flood waters.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the United Press wire dispatch covering yesterday's hearing before the Senate Interior Committee; the statement of Mr. Marselis C. Parsons, Jr., of the Department of State, to the committee; and an article from the Oregon Journal of May 21, 1956.

There being no objection, the dispatch, statement, and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The State Department announced that diplomatic discussions will be started with Canada on use of streams, including the Columbia, crossing the international boundary.

The announcement was made as a Senate subcommittee was questioning former Idaho Gov. Len B. Jordan, Chief of the American section of the International Joint Commission, on negotiations involving the Columbia.

Subcommittee Chairman RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, commented the announcement followed a recommendation he made to take the discussions away from Jordan and the IJC. He had accused Jordan, as a supporter of private power development, in effect of dragging his feet on negotiations for Libby Dam in Montana.

The announcement mentioned three streams as being involved in the discussions—the Columbia, the Yukon and the St. Johns. It said there are complicated legal, economic, and engineering problems involved in international development of the streams, and pointed out there have been no diplomatic discussions on them since 1909.

It said that the governments believe that full and confidential exchange of views may contribute to resolution of these problems. It said, however, that the IJC should press forward on matters before it.

Marselis C. Parsons, Jr., director of British Commonwealth Affairs for the State Department, said he believes a deputy assistant director of the Department will head the American group.

An advisory commission including Jordan, Maj. Gen. John S. Bragdon, a special assistant to the President, and officials of the State, Army, Interior and Justice Departments also will be set up, he said.

He also gave the subcommittee a transcript of debate in the Canadian House of Commons in which Prime Minister St. Laurent said the chairmen of the two sections of the IJC had publicly expressed views so diametrically opposed that little progress appeared probable there.

Jordan said in answer to questions by NEUBERGER that special discussions on the streams was a wise move, and he was in complete agreement.

NEUBERGER said Jordan had attacked him for suggesting such a procedure and asked why he had changed his mind.

"The fact the President agreed to this is ample reason," Jordan said.

Jordan had maintained in an earlier appearance that negotiations on the Libby Dam site were stalled because the Canadians wanted time to study a diversion plan on their side of the border.

Two representatives of conservation groups also appeared to oppose construction of Penny Cliffs and Bruces Eddy Dams on the Clearwater River in the Columbia system.

Stewart Brandborg of the National Wildlife Federation said alternate sites should be chosen to protect an invaluable recreation resource. Howard Zahniser of the Wilderness Society said Penny Cliffs would back water 6 miles into a primitive area, and that both dams would affect unspoiled natural country.

NEUBERGER asked Jordan why he had cited possibility of construction of the two dams in deprecating the value of Canadian storage on the Columbia, in view of the controversy over them.

Jordan said there were alternate sites. He added that there was some controversy over nearly every dam site in the basin.

STATEMENT OF MARSELIS C. PARSONS, JR., DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF BRITISH COMMONWEALTH AND NORTHERN EUROPEAN AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, MAY 23, 1956

The committee has expressed special interest in the events relating to the Canadian proposal that there should be discussions between the two Governments concerning waters which flow across the international boundary, such as the Columbia, Yukon, and St. John Rivers.

The Canadian Government made this suggestion shortly before the March 26–27 meeting of the President and the Canadian Prime Minister at White Sulphur Springs. Prime Minister St. Laurent mentioned the subject briefly to the President at that time and on April 9 reported on his conversation to the Canadian House of Commons as follows:

"I also suggested to the President that the time seemed to have come when problems regarding the use of water power on rivers crossing the international boundary might well be studied at a conference between representatives of the two Governments. Here I might perhaps extend this a little to answer a question of which notice was telephoned to my office by the honorable member for Kamloops, Mr. Fulton. There was no discussion of the problem, but merely the suggestion that it would probably be desirable at this time to have it studied by a joint conference representing the two Governments, to try to get at something which would make for the possibility of expeditious use of these water powers to the best possible advantage of the people who might derive advantage from their use. It was left at that, with the understanding that the subject would be further pursued in discussions between our Department of External Affairs and the Secretary of State of the United States."

The committee ask that it be provided with any official explanation or discussion of the Canadian proposal. Accordingly there is submitted a transcript of the Prime Minister's report to the House of Commons and of the ensuing discussion as it appears on pages 2726–2729 of the Canadian House of Commons Debates for April 9, 1956.

The Canadian suggestion received careful study within the United States Government and subsequently we informed the Canadian Government through diplomatic channels that we were agreeable to its proposal. I believe the committee has at hand the text of the press release which is being issued today by the two Governments, announcing this agreement.

The problems connected with waters crossing the international boundary are immensely broad and complex. They encompass an examination of the basic principles which were incorporated in, or omitted from, the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909—and involve technical engineering and economic questions which have developed as geographic areas have become so much more heavily populated and heavily industrialized than was the case in 1909.

It is apparent that the policy under which the Department of State can conduct such discussions must be formulated to accord with the interests of the several affected agencies of the executive branch of the Government. Therefore, prior to further action on the Canadian suggestion, the Department of State consulted with the agencies of the Government having an interest in or responsibility for our water resources. Thereafter, the Department of State suggested to the Bureau of the Budget that it provide for the establishment of an advisory committee on Canadian boundary water problems. It was decided that this could be most appropriately achieved by establishing it as a subcommittee of the existent Interagency Committee on Water Resources to be composed of the following: Governor Len Jordan, Chairman of the United States Section of the International Joint Commission; Maj. Gen. John S. Bragdon, special assistant to the President for public-works planning; and one representative each from the Departments of State, Army, Interior, and Justice, and the Federal Power Commission.

The Chairman of the Interagency Committee on Water Resources is proceeding to set up this advisory committee and it is my understanding that he has already invited the various agencies to designate their representatives.

With the appointment of the advisory committee, the Department of State will be in a position to examine more thoroughly the many complex questions connected with rivers flowing across the border. It has been recognized informally by both the United States and Canadian Governments that it may take a while to formulate our respective national studies and also that during this period it will be helpful to exchange views on the subjects in which each side is likely to be most interested. This will make it possible to coordinate our work more effectively on the various problems and will prepare the way for discussions later in the year.

[From Canadian House of Commons Debates, vol. 98, No. 58, 3d sess., 22d Parliament, pp. 2726–2729, Apr. 9, 1956]

EXTRACTS CONCERNING THE CANADIAN PROPOSAL FOR INTERGOVERNMENTAL DISCUSSIONS ON WATERS WHICH FLOW ACROSS THE INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—STATEMENT ON VISIT OF PRIME MINISTER WITH PRESIDENT OF UNITED STATES

On the orders of the day:

"Hon. GEORGE A. DREW (leader of the opposition). Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Prime Minister if he will inform the honorable members of this House in regard to what was discussed, and, insofar as that is possible, what was achieved at the meetings in Virginia which he attended just before Easter.

"Right Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT. Mr. Speaker, I anticipated that there might be such a question and I prepared a rather brief statement of what took place there which otherwise I would not have inflicted upon the House 10 or 12 days after the visit that has been so fully, although not always as accurately as fully, reported in the newspapers of both countries.

"This visit took place at White Sulphur Springs on March 26 and 27 between the heads of Governments of the United States, Mexico, and Canada. The host at this meeting was the President of the United States who in his invitation and subsequently emphasized that it would be of an informal character without agenda for the purpose of exchanging views on matters of mutual interest and of getting to know each other better.

"In view of the character of the meeting, no decisions were reached and none was expected. It was, however, from my point of view, both helpful and agreeable to be in a position to discuss current international affairs with the presidents of the United States and Mexico in this informal way. There was also an opportunity to bring up 1 or 2 subjects of specific Canadian-United States concern with President Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles.

* * * * * *

"I also suggested to the President that the time seemed to have come when problems regarding the use of waterpower on rivers crossing the international boundary might well be studied at a conference between representatives of the two Governments. Here I might perhaps extend this a little to answer a question of which notice was telephoned to my office by the honorable member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton). There was no discussion of the problem, but merely the suggestion that it would probably be desirable at this time to have it studied by a joint conference representing the two Governments, to try to get at something which would make for the possibility of expeditious use of these waterpowers to the best possible advantage of the people who might derive advantage from their use. It was left at that, with the understanding that the subject would be further pursued in discussions between our Department of External Affairs and the Secretary of State of the United States.

"Needless to say, the President expressed a very warm feeling for this country and gratification at the way in which relations between our two peoples were based on mutual respect and friendship and frank statement of diverging views, when there were diverging views.

* * * * * *

"Mr. FULTON. May I ask the Prime Minister whether his statement that it has been suggested that the problems of the control of the Columbia River should now be discussed directly between representatives of the Governments of the two countries means that the Prime Minister or the Government feel that the situation has got to the point where it is not likely to be solved under the agency of the international joint commission and that it should therefore be discussed at the higher level by direct negotiation between governments?

"Mr. ST. LAURENT (Quebec, east). I would not like to say this was a higher level but there was a feeling that the chairman of the two sections had publicly expressed views so diametrically opposed to each other that there was little probability of their being able to make the kind of progress we would hope would be made in arriving at a solution of these problems.

"Mr. FULTON. If I may ask one further question, has a date, either definite or tentative, been set yet for the meetings?

"Mr. ST. LAURENT (Quebec, east). No. I would not even wish to convey the impression that the President had agreed that there would be meetings. He seemed interested in the suggestion and it was felt that the

matter would be further discussed between our Department of External Affairs and the Department of the Secretary of State."

(Later.)

On the orders of the day:

"Mr. FULTON. May I ask a further question with relation to the matter of the Columbia River development that was referred to earlier? Can the Prime Minister give the house assurance that the surveys and plans for the development of the Columbia River power in Canada will not be interfered with in any way because of the prospect of these negotiations, and that no such undertaking was implicit in the discussions?

"Mr. ST. LAURENT (Quebec, east). There was no undertaking implicit whatsoever. It was merely a suggestion that it might be desirable at this time to have the matter looked into, and the Columbia River was not referred to particularly. It was the rivers that cross the international boundary. The Columbia is one of them, the Yukon is another and the St. John in the east is another. There are several of these rivers. The matter was just referred to. The whole thing probably did not take more than 3 minutes, not as much time as it has taken in the house to answer the questions.

"Mr. FULTON. There is no reason why surveys and studies in Canada should not proceed as before?

"Mr. ST. LAURENT (Quebec, east). My conversation with the President is not a reason why they should not proceed."

[From the Oregon Journal of May 21, 1956]

MEN, EQUIPMENT RUSH TO BATTLE KOOTENAI

BONNERS FERRY, IDAHO, May 21.—Men and equipment were arriving in this north Idaho town today in an all-out effort to prevent the rising Kootenai River from spilling over its dikes onto the town and 36,000 acres of farmlands along the swollen stream.

The Kootenai, fed by a heavy mountain snow pack, stood at 34.30 feet Sunday night, more than 3 feet above the 31-foot flood stage, and was still rising. Dikes protecting the town are expected to hold the river back until it reaches 37 feet.

Col. George Bennett, chief of the Idaho National Guard, said from Boise that 28 five-ton dump trucks would arrive in Bonners Ferry sometime today. From Coeur d'Alene, 21 National Guards men under the command of Maj. Gen. Gordon I. Shores, of Lewiston, and 10 radio equipped jeeps were dispatched to the scene.

Gov. Robert E. Smylie declared a state of emergency in the area and authorized the use of the guardsmen. He also requested Army engineers from Fort Lewis, Wash., as a precautionary measure. Some 300 troops from there are expected to arrive today.

From the flood center here, Charles C. Howard, assistant flood coordinator for Kootenai County, said workers are making satisfactory progress in their fight against the rising waters.

Workers upstream from here at Libby, Mont., were watching the river with anxious eyes also as the river rose to 15.8 Sunday and is expected to hit 16.6 today. Flood stage there is 16. Forecasts predict a crest of 17.2 Tuesday and a fall to 16.7 by Wednesday.

Evacuation is taking place in St. Maries, Idaho, 100 miles to the south, as the St. Joe River nears flood stage. Some 24 families have moved out, but the Weather Bureau does not foresee flood proportions there yet.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate and commend the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] for the splendid and successful efforts he has made in bringing about this new procedure for the handling of boundary problems between Canada and the United States. It is of the greatest importance that these water projects on the border between Canada and the United States be constructed as promptly as possible.

The Libby Dam is a case in point, for in the Libby area we are now threatened with floods, as a result of the failure to construct that dam.

I am sure that as a result of the successful efforts of the able Senator from Oregon, we shall now be able to proceed with our negotiations with Canada, and shall be able to bring about an adjustment and an understanding between the two countries, so as to enable this very important water conservation program to be proceeded with.

I desire to thank the Senator from Oregon personally. He made his trip to British Columbia at my request, and he has done a splendid job.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I assure him that without his active cooperation, I know this important step in the international use of the Columbia River would not be taking place.

It is my fond hope that, when the great Libby Dam project is complete, the senior Senator from Montana will be present to participate in the dedication ceremonies incident to one of the great projects in the history of the Pacific Northwest, of his own State, and of our country. Libby Dam then will be testimony to the effective efforts of the senior Senator from Montana.

ANALYSIS OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, recently I requested the Department of Agriculture to furnish me an analysis of the newly passed farm bill. I have it here in my hand. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTLINE: AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

TITLE I. SOIL BANK ACT

Acreage reserve program (secs. 103–106): Duration of program: 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959. Payments authorized for reducing production of wheat, cotton, corn, peanuts, rice, and tobacco. Program is voluntary, except participation in soil bank required for price support for corn. To be eligible, producer must reduce below his farm acreage allotment or base acreage established for corn. In case of corn the total base will be 51 million acres for 1956, and also for subsequent years if farmers in referendum vote to discontinue acreage allotments and 75-percent to 90-percent price supports; otherwise, acreage allotments after 1957 will be established on old basis. Overall limit on program $750 million per year, with specified maximum limits for each commodity. With respect to applicability of acreage reserve program to 1956, the conference report is to contain the following statement:

"The conference agreed to make the soil bank effective immediately as provided in the House bill. It was recognized, however, the larger part of this year's plantings have already taken place and is not expected that any large part of the crop planted will be plowed up or otherwise removed from production as authorized by section 103. The committee recognizes that the Secretary cannot be expected to accomplish the impracticable or to secure any large part of the beneficial results hoped for in the soil bank in 1956, but it also recognizes that certain farmers have heretofore planned to participate this year and it is felt that they should be assured of the opportunity to do so."

Conservation reserve program (secs. 107–113): Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts with producers for a minimum period of 3 years and a maximum period of 10 years (15 years in the case of tree cover) under which the producer would devote a designated part of his cropland to conserving uses. He would agree not to harvest any crop from the designated acreage and not to pasture it for a specified period except under certain emergency conditions. The Secretary would be authorized to pay a fair share of the costs of establishing the conservation use and, in addition, to make an annual payment to the producer which will provide a fair and reasonable annual return for the land diverted to conservation uses. Overall limit on program of $450 million a year.

General soil-bank provisions (secs. 115–124): As a condition of eligibility for any payment under soil-bank program, the producer must comply with all acreage allotments or base acreages. Civil penalties imposed for violation of prohibition against cropping or grazing.

Funds of CCC may be used for carrying out program until July 1, 1957.

Production on Government lands: President is directed insofar as practicable to prohibit leasing of Government-owned lands for the production of price-supported crops in surplus supply.

TITLE II. SURPLUS DISPOSAL

Program of orderly liquidation (sec. 201): Secretary required to submit to Congress in 90 days detailed program (1) for disposal of all CCC stocks (2) for a food stamp or similar plan, and (3) for strategic stockpiling of agricultural products.

Extra long staple cotton (sec. 202): Cotton having staple length of $1\frac{11}{16}$ inches or longer would be included within import quota under section 22. CCC directed to sell for export at competitive world prices existing CCC stocks of extra long staple cotton.

Export sales of cotton (sec. 203): CCC is directed to sell cotton at prices at which cottons of comparable qualities are being offered in substantial quantities. In any event during the 1956 marketing year bids shall be accepted at a level comparable to the 25.5 cents level at which cotton was sold under the CCC sales program announced August 12, 1955. CCC may accept bids in excess of this price but shall not reject bids at such maximum prices unless a higher bid is received for the same cotton.

Agreements limiting imports (sec. 204): President authorized to negotiate agreements with foreign governments limiting exports to United States of agricultural commodities or products.

Section 32 (sec. 205): Authorizes annual appropriation of $500 million for section 32, with limitation of 50 percent on amount of such funds which may be used for any one commodity.

Transfer of bartered materials to supplemental stockpile (sec. 206): Provides for transfer to supplemental stockpile established by Public Law 480 of materials acquired by CCC under barter program unless such materials were required for regular stockpile or other purposes.

Surplus Disposal Administrator (sec. 207): Authorizes Secretary to appoint Agricultural Surplus Disposal Administrator.

Ocean freight on commodities donated for foreign relief (sec. 208): Authorizes payment of ocean freight charges on commodities donated for foreign relief under Public Law 480 or section 416. Limitation on expenditures for foreign relief increased from $300 million to $500 million.

Commission on Industrial Use of Agricultural Commodities (sec. 209): Five-member bipartisan commission, to be appointed by President, established to make recommendations for increased industrial use of agricultural commodities.

Donations to penal institutions (sec. 210): Authorizes CCC to donate commodities to Federal penal and correctional institutions, and to State correctional institutions for minors.

Federal irrigation, drainage, and flood control projects (sec. 211): Federal farm benefits restricted for 3 years after the enactment of the act for crops in surplus grown on any newly irrigated or drained lands within any Federal project authorized hereafter for crops in surplus grown on such lands.

Processing of donated commodities (sec. 212): Authorizes CCC to pay processing costs on donated food commodities.

TITLE III. MARKETING QUOTAS AND ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Extension of surrender and reapportionment (sec. 301): Extends to 1956 and 1957 crops of wheat provisions whereby wheat producers could release unused portion of allotment, without affecting their future allotment.

Cotton acreage allotments for 1957 and 1958 (sec. 302): National acreage allotment for cotton for 1957 and 1958 shall not be less than 1956 national acreage allotment, provided that the allotment for no State can be reduced in 1957 or 1958 below the allotment for the preceding year by more than 1 percent, the additional acreage required for this purpose to be in addition to the national allotment.

Small farm allotments for cotton (sec. 303): For 1957 and 1958 provides 100,000 acres to establish minimum farm allotments for cotton of 4 acres or highest acreage planted on farm in preceding 3 years, whichever is smaller. For 1956 unused allotted acreage in State may be used for this purpose.

Minimium allotments for 1956 rice crop (sec. 304): Provides minimum State rice acreage allotments for 1956 equal to 85 percent of allotment for 1955. The 1957 and 1958 allotments will be the same as the final 1956 allotments.

Increase in peanut marketing penalties (sec. 305): Increases marketing penalty for peanuts from 50 percent to 75 percent of support price.

Collection of peanut marketing penalties (sec. 306): Provides for 6 percent interest on peanut marketing penalties and for a lien to secure the penalties.

Preservation of unused acreage allotments (sec. 307): During the period 1956 to 1959 permits producer to preserve for future years his unused acreage allotments.

Acreage requirements for price support on corn and other feed grains (sec. 308).

A. Corn for 1956: For 1956, the level of price support for corn in the commercial area would not be affected by the legislation—$1.50 to compliers; $1.25 to noncompliers.

To be eligible for the $1.50 support price announced for compliers, the producer would have to stay within his base acreage and devote to the soil bank an acreage of land equal to 15 percent of his corn base.

The Secretary would, however, have the authority to support the price of corn to producers who do not meet the foregoing requirements, at a level not in excess of the level of price support to producers who meet such requirements.

Corn outside the commercial area would be supported at 82½ percent of the level in the commercial area, with no acreage limitations.

B. Corn after 1956: After 1956, price support for corn in the commercial area would depend on the outcome of a referendum to determine whether producers favor base acreages in lieu of acreage allotments, with price support "at such level as the Secretary determines will assist producers in marketing corn in the normal channels of trade but not encourage the uneconomic production of corn," or whether producers favor acreage allotments, with price support at 75 percent to 90 percent of parity.

If producers vote in favor of base acreages instead of acreage allotments, producers would be required as a condition of eligibility for price support to stay within their base acreages and devote 15 percent of their corn base to the soil bank; support in the noncommercial area would be at 82½ percent of the level for corn in the commercial area.

If producers vote in favor of acreage allotments, acreage allotments would be in effect for purposes of the acreage reserve program, and producers would have to comply with acreage allotments as a condition of eligibility for price support but would not have to participate in the soil bank.

The Secretary would have authority to make price support available to noncompliers in the commercial area.

C. Feed grains for 1956: The level of price support for the 1956 crop of grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats would be 76 percent of parity, with no acreage limitations.

D. Price support on noncompliance corn and other feed grains: If support is made available in 1957 for noncompliance corn, price support would be made available for other feed grains at such levels not less than 70 percent of parity, as the Secretary determines to be reasonable in relation to the level of support for noncompliance corn, and after consideration of specified factors.

The acreage reserve program for feed grains is eliminated.

TITLE IV. FORESTRY PROVISIONS

Assistance to States (sec. 401): Provides for assistance to States for tree planting and reforestation.

Forest products, price-reporting research (sec. 402): Requires Secretary to study price trends and relationships for forest products and make a report thereon to the Congress within 1 year.

TITLE V. CERTIFICATE PROGRAM FOR RICE

Provides discretionary authority for a two-price plan for rice in 1957 and 1958 or in 1958 and 1959 if the Secretary determines it to be feasible and in the best interests of rice producers and the United States.

TITLE VI. PRICE SUPPORTS—COTTONSEED AND SOYBEANS

Section 601: Whenever either cottonseed or soybeans is supported the support price for the other shall be supported at levels enabling them to compete on equal terms.

Transitional parity for basic commodities frozen during 1957 (sec. 602): This freezes transitional parity for corn, peanuts, and wheat during 1957. The Secretary is required to make a thorough study of possible methods of improving the parity formula and report to Congress not later than January 31, 1957.

MASS AIR TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, an address delivered before the Oakland Chamber of Commerce and Oakland Trade Club today by Vice Chairman Joseph P. Adams, of the Civil Aeronautics Board, is informative and will evoke considerable thought among those engaged in commercial aviation both here and abroad.

Adams, a veteran Marine Corps pilot and one of the original and most forceful advocates of low-fare air coach, discusses aviation's present and future in clear, understandable terms, and tells us of the possibilities available if we will but utilize them.

Adams cited some interesting statistics. He pointed out our domestic airline industry last year generated almost 20 billion passenger miles—an increase of more than 65 percent since 1952. He also disclosed that 34 percent of the travelers utilized low-fare air-coach service.

Because of the importance of remarks made by Vice Chairman Adams, I ask unanimous consent of my colleagues to have his address before the Oakland, Calif., group, printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MASS AIR TRANSPORTATION IS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

(Address by Hon. Joseph P. Adams, Vice Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, member, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, before the Oakland Chamber of Commerce and Oakland World Trade Club, May 22, 1956)

Mr. Chairman, members of the Oakland Chamber of Commerce Aviation Committee and the Oakland World Trade Club, greetings.

It is a privilege and an honor, as the Member of the Civil Aeronautics Board from the west coast, to breakfast with you in the international room of the Metropolitan Oakland International Airport. Truly, I cannot imagine a more fitting meeting place in which to observe World Trade Week.

Ten years ago, the pierhead was our point of departure for international trade and travel, but today, only 100 feet from this head table, you can board a postwar aircraft and fly to the far corners of the world. More specifically, I learned from Boeing officials in Seattle yesterday, that their intercontinental 707 jet transport will take off from your airport, circle the world, with five fuel stops, and return to Oakland in less than 40 hours. You in Oakland will be 10 hours and 30 minutes from Copenhagen, Denmark, and 9 hours and 27 minutes from Tokyo, Japan, by jet. You in Oakland, moreover, are doubly fortunate in that your international trade facilities include both the pierhead and the Metropolitan International Airport.

Three years ago, April 15, 1953, it was my pleasure to address the Oakland Chamber of Commerce and the Lions Club on the subject of Mass Air Transportation and the Public Interest. One week later, April 21, 1953, the citizenry of Oakland voted to approve a $10 million bond issue for improving the Oakland airport, thereby reversing a national trend of communities that had voted down similar airport bond issues. You people of Oakland voted for more than a bond issue. You voted to meet the challenge of the advance of civil aviation in the jet age and you voted to provide your community with increasingly improved service.

Today, 3 years later, we meet again in Oakland, at the airport where the voter-approved expansion is now well underway. You are qualifying for the jet transport age with a terminal offering unobstructed, all-weather, over-water approaches at either end of an 8,600-foot runway. In an innovation of planning that merits national acclaim, you are moving your airline operations 1 mile out in the bay, solving noise and safety problems.

Yesterday, your board of port commissioners opened bids for the work that will construct these magnificent new facilities in the bay. Your plans to retain present runways and operations areas for executive and private flying will make Oakland the mecca of the West for general aviation. Your proposal will be hailed as most intelligent and far-sighted planning by the managements of over 7,000 of America's largest corporations that today operate executive type aircraft,

by the members of the National Business Aircraft Association and by the owners of some 61,300 general aviation planes. Your plans recognize that this private fleet of aircraft is some 45 times as large as the civil airline fleet and flew over 3 times as many hours as the civil airline fleet in 1955. Your airport planning is truly cognizant of the giant aviation has become.

This pause to relate what you of Oakland have done in the last 3 years is but a backdrop to my recitation of the advances of commercial air transport in the same period. Your progress, excellent as it is, is being paced by phenomenal gains in civil aviation. My additional period of service on the Civil Aeronautics Board since our last meeting in 1953 compels me to say that it is now my firm conviction that mass air transport is not only related to, but is in the public interest.

In participating in Civil Aeronautics Board decisions, I have learned that a particularly controversial area is that surrounding the principles or motivations for decisions which affect airline profits. As in any other business, the managements of the airlines are interested in providing a service for which people will pay enough to give the stockholders a financial profit.

Now you and I understand the financial profit motive; all of us in all walks of life know this primary economic force. But when you consider the business of Government regulation, the motive of profit rarely involves money alone—instead, the profit motive of Government, and consequently of the CAB, is, broadly speaking, seeing to it that the interests of all our people in civil air transportation are promoted and protected. This means that the CAB must, at all times, keep before it in its decisions, all factors relating to the public interest; that is, your interest. Pinpointing this matter of public interest, I said in 1953, that it means among other things, eliminating subsidy payments to air carriers as rapidly as possible in order to relieve the taxpayer of this financial burden.

CAB MUST CONTINUE TO PROMOTE SOUND ECONOMICS OF AIR CARRIERS WITH RESULTANT FURTHER REDUCTION IN SUBSIDY PAYMENTS

It is with genuine satisfaction, then, that I report to you the substantial progress which has taken place during the last 4 years in the reduction of total subsidy mail payments to our air transportation industry. This record of subsidy reductions is one of which the Civil Aeronautics Board and the airline industry can be justly proud. By the same token, of course, it is a record which should be most gratifying to the taxpayers of the United States. Three years ago I reported to you that only four of our domestic trunklines were at that time still classified as subsidized carriers. By June 1 of this year, 1956, there will remain only one domestic trunkline air carrier still receiving Federal Government subsidy support.

For the entire airline industry—domestic, Territorial, and international—the subsidy bill has been reduced some 32 percent, from a total of $63½ million in 1952 to approximately $43 million for the present fiscal year ending June 30, 1956. Even this sizable cut of more than $20 million during the last 4 years is not really the whole story. During the same period our very important local air service carrier group has so expanded that it is now serving 60 more cities than 4 years ago and is operating approximately 4,000 more route-miles than in 1952. This greatly broadened service to the United States traveling public has, of course, carried with it a greater need for Federal subsidy mail pay. The actual increased subsidy involved in the case of the local service carriers is about $5 million as compared with their 1952 level.

I am sure that the Board and the entire airline industry are agreed that this increase has been required in the interests of the public-service responsibilities of air transportation. We all recognize that in the long run it must be reduced, and I can assure you that it will be reduced if the Board will cooperate with these local service carriers in properly strengthening the route systems operated by them. Suffice it to say that this is a specialized problem in the subsidy field and all of us are cooperatively working on it.

Aside from this special subsidy problem and excluding from consideration the subsidy mail pay for the local carrier group, the record achieved in the last 4 years becomes even more impressive. In the fiscal year 1952 the total subsidy mail pay bill for our domestic trunklines, helicopter operators, and all of our international overseas, and Territorial carriers was $44,500,000. In fiscal 1956, this sum will be reduced to approximately $19 million, or a reduction in a short 4-year period of 53 percent. The Civil Aeronautics Board and the managements of every one of the airlines involved can take great pride, it seems to me, in having reduced by more than half the dependence of these 37 air carriers upon subsidy support.

Because low-fare air-coach development has broadened the air travel base, resulted in phenomenal growth of air travel, and thus reduced subsidies by $25 million, I am convinced that mass air transportation is in the public interest.

CAB MUST CONTINUE TO CREATE FAVORABLE ATMOSPHERE FOR EVER-INCREASING NUMBERS OF NECESSARY AIRLINE INVESTORS AND STOCKHOLDERS

Having referred to the concept that the Civil Aeronautics Board is responsible for the interests of all our people in air transportation, let's leave the classification of taxpayer and proceed to consider the stockholder or investor in airline companies. Under the Civil Aeronautics Act, the Board is charged with developing a sound air transportation system and such a system certainly requires that our investing public have a high regard for the soundness of the air transport industry as an investment.

The corporate finances of our domestic trunkline carriers are in a healthy condition. The managements of these carriers may well be proud of their financial progress, taking in stride the several aircraft fleet changes that have taken place since the inauguration of the DC–3 airplane.

My interpretation of the responsibility of the Civil Aeronautics Board in considering the interests of the investor is that the Board should in the issuance of its regulatory decisions create a favorable atmosphere for the potential air-carrier investor. The Board considers its regulatory actions, taken in the 3 years since I last reported to you, as conducive to such a favorable investor atmosphere, but it is not always sufficient to be simply well intentioned, so let's look at some comments and financial facts of record in appraising the results.

In the January 9, 1956, issue of Aviation Week Alpheus W. Jessup, writing under the headline "Airlines' High Credit Eases Jet Financing," had this to say:

"Finance will not hobble the United States air transport industry during its rapid expansion into the jet age.

"With unexpected speed, arrangements have been completed or are assured to finance payments of $1.5 billion for the Douglas DC–8 and Boeing 707 turbojet and Lockheed Electra turboprop fleets ordered by the airlines in the last 9 months.

"In the past most investors and executives of investing institutions (such as the insurance companies) have considered the air carriers highly speculative. Suddenly they have become aware that air transportation is mass transportation, that the industry is big, vital, and growing, and in need of investment support. They also see that it is backed by a decade of achievement—assets more than doubled to $1.5 billion and net worth tripled to $750 million."

While I as a Board member am necessarily aware of such articles as this that appear in the aviation trade press, I asked myself, "What about the man in the street?" Considering him as a potential airline investor, I thought I would explore what he might experience as financial atmosphere should he enter any one of the thousands of investment houses in this country today in search of information on airline stocks.

Last week I did just that, and availing myself of the library of a typical broker's office which is open to the public, I studied copies of Standard & Poors and Fitch Investors for current descriptions of domestic airline stocks. Here are samples of expressions used in describing five trunkline stocks:

"Backed by the industry's strong growth trend, the common is recommended for purchase."

"Prospects appear bright for the company and the industry; 1956 has started off well for the company."

"Operating revenues have risen steadily since formation of the company, with profits in a strong uptrend."

"Company's gross revenues for full 1955 will be the largest in the firm's history."

"New records were established in revenues and traffic volumes and costs per available seat-mile were reduced substantially."

This brief quote from a trade magazine and these scattered words from financial periodicals represent at best a superficial approach to the selective purchase of airline stocks, but for my purpose in indicating today's market atmosphere surrounding the potential airline investor, I believe it must be concluded that all indices are favorable.

Further, since our last meeting, 3 years ago, the average price of all listed domestic trunkline stocks has increased 75 percent; 3 managements have doubled annual dividend payments; 2 managements have resumed dividend payments; and another has increased the annual dividend.

Because, therefore, low-fare air-coach development has broadened the travel base, resulted in phenomenal growth of air travel and created today's most favorable financial atmosphere for the potential airline investor, I am convinced that mass air transportation is in the public interest.

CAB MUST CONTINUE TO STIMULATE COMPETITION, INITIATIVE, AND INVENTIVENESS IN THE AIRLINE INDUSTRY TO SATISFY THE INSATIABLE DESIRE OF THE PUBLIC FOR MASS AIR TRANSPORTATION

So far I have discussed with you the fine job done by the air transportation industry in the interests of that part of the public represented by our taxpayers and our investors and stockholders in airline securities. The third aspect of the public interest represented by you, the traveling public, has been equally well served by air transportation in the last 3 years.

Some of you may recall that when I was here with you 3 years ago, I pointed with considerable pride to the record achieved even through 1952 by our domestic transportation industry on behalf of the traveling public of the United States. I expressed at that time my keen personal and professional interest in the further development of low-fare air-coach service, particularly within the borders of this country. I pointed to the fact that almost 20 percent of domestic air passenger travel was low-fare air-coach travel in 1952, and I urged that the ratio of 20 percent air coach and 80 percent first-class be reversed. Finally, I made a plea that all of us—the CAB, our air carrier managements, and the forward-looking public itself represented by such people as you here today—join together in a promotion to make low fare air coach increase from 20 percent to 80 percent of all air travel, everywhere.

I take pride in reporting to you how successfully our entire air transport industry has worked on this problem of expanding low-fare air-coach service. The facts are so impressive that I feel sure you will agree with me when I say that the fondest hopes of the most ardent supporters of mass air transportation have either already been realized or are well down the road toward realization.

By the same token, I feel justified in pointing out that the fine record achieved by the air transport industry has exploded once and for all the theories of the gloomy forecasters which I mentioned to you here 3 years ago. These theories, you may recall, expressed the pessimistic view that further development of low fare air coach beyond 1952 levels might well have long-run adverse effects upon the economic health of the industry. These prophets of doom in 1952 and 1953 pointed to the so-called artificial supports of passenger travel volumes of those days, such as the Korean emergency and the crash defense program. The record achieved by the airlines in the last 3 years, however, has, I am sure, forever dispelled whatever doubts the gloomy forecasters may have created as to the healthy effects resulting from the continuing growth of low fare mass air transportation in the overall public interest.

Let's look first at our domestic airline industry. Three years ago I reported that this industry had carried in 1952 about 24 million passengers. Last year this total had jumped to more than 37 million, almost a quarter of this country's entire population. There can be no doubt that this 50-percent increase in air travel in only 3 years is in large part due to the tremendous expansion in low-fare air-coach service provided by our domestic carriers.

Last year our dynamic domestic airline industry generated almost 20 billion passenger-miles, an increase from 1952 of more than 65 percent. Of this 20 billion passenger-mile total, 34 percent of the travelers utilized low-fare air-coach service. In other words, my 20 percent air coach figure of 1952 has in only 3 years jumped to 34 percent.

It looks as though the present increasing low fare coach trend percentage in relation to first-class travel will continue. In the annual air transport progress issue of American Aviation, dated April 23, 1956, Mr. William V. Henzey, a top writer in the aviation field, had this to say:

"The vital ratio statistics of coach passenger-miles to total passenger-miles could come close to the 40 percent mark in 1956. Several years ago, by way of noting a target, CAB Vice Chairman Joseph P. Adams said the industry should aim at a ratio of 80 percent coach and 20 percent first-class or, a complete reversal of the then-existing ratio.

"Several industry carriers are approaching the Adams ratio."

The 34-percent figure for 1955 which I have given you is, of course, an overall industry figure for our domestic airlines. As such, it is weighted downward, of course, by many of our domestic carriers whose route systems, or present equipment situation, or both, have not permitted them to fully develop the low fare air coach field.

The fact that the local service carriers any many of the smaller trunklines are still wrestling with route system and equipment difficulties which can and will be solved, make the future very bright, it seems to me, for even a greater exploitation of low-fare air coach travel. By the same token, these problems which are as yet unsolved make the 1955 figure of 34 percent coach a very impressive figure, in my opinion.

I am sure you will also be interested in knowing, aside from an overall percentage for the industry, how far some of the individual domestic air carriers have gone in the low fare mass air transportation field. In the case of two of our domestic trunklines, low-fair air-coach travel accounted for approximately 55 percent of total air passenger travel in 1955. Another trunkline's percentage reached 44 percent last year.

Our foreign and overseas air carriers have made even greater strides than these which I have just indicated for our domestic industry. In 1955, coach travel for our entire foreign and overseas operations accounted for approximately 62 percent of all air travel. I can also report to you that across the North Atlantic the two United States flag international operators are in 1956 generating just about 80 percent of their total travel as air coach travel. Internationally, then, in the very important and highly competitive North Atlantic area, my goal of reversing the 20–80 to an 80–20 ratio in favor of air coach has already been achieved. It is, in my opinion, most significant that in this particular North Atlantic traffic market where the 80–20 coach first-class ratio has been reached, both our international operators, TWA and Pan American, are operating without subsidy.

Both domestically and internationally then, the traveling public is having a real job done for it by the air transportation industry, and the end is by no means in sight. Relatively speaking, there has been very little development of low-fare air coach travel in the short-haul markets of this country. A cooperative effort by the Civil Aeronautics Board and our domestic airlines will undoubtedly, however, in the next few years, fill this gap in our overall air coach service pattern. I have already mentioned that for obvious reasons our local air carrier industry through 1955 has hardly been in a position to experiment in the low air fare field of service. And while this is true generally so far in 1956, I hasten to add that just last week Southwest Airways, your local service carrier, filed with the Board a coach tariff requesting CAB approval of coach service between the bay area and other important California cities. Since this proposed coast service is subject to CAB approval and has not yet been acted upon, I may not discuss its merits or demerits with you at this time. I feel that the mere fact of its filing is worthy of mention, however, since it is the first short-haul coach tariff ever filed by a local carrier.

I should also like to mention other recent and significant developments which point to an even greater exploitation of the low-fare air travel potential in this country. One airline has only recently announced to the public that 75 percent of its entire service will be devoted to air-coach passengers this year. Today, our domestic trunkline carriers are providing low-fare coach service in their very best equipment—Douglas DC–6, Douglas DC–6B, DC–7, Lockheed 1049G (super-Constellation), and the Viscount Turbo-prop. Such service, providing today's coach passengers with the most modern and fastest airplanes in existence, is simply further tangible evidence of air transportation's benefits to you, the traveling public.

I would be less than fair if I did not also make special mention of the $80 transcontinental air fare offered to you west coast travelers by our three largest transcontinental air carriers our supplemental air carriers. This fare must, it seems to me, be regarded by one and all as the very best travel bargain anywhere in this country, or, for that matter, in the entire world today.

Because, therefore, our low-fare air coach development has broadened the travel base, resulted in phenomenal growth of air travel and today makes possible historically lower fares in the most modern equipment for the air traveler, I am convinced that "mass air transportation is in the public interest."

WHEN WE MEET AGAIN IN THE JET AGE

Today, I have given a report of growth of the civil air transport industry for the period that has elapsed since our last meeting 3 years ago. The reporting period I have used meets no known accepted standard of reporting, but is a personalized one, meant for you Oakland Chamber of Commerce and Oakland World Trade Club members who originally invited me to participate in your aviation program on April 15, 1953.

No mention has been made of the several new route awards to carriers serving Oakland, and we have not discussed the supplemental air carrier decision that affected favorably so many of the carriers that are based at your Oakland airport.

Time does not permit a report, discussion, or prediction on the dynamic possibilities of the all-cargo or airfreight industry which, in the foreseeable future will require a network of terminal airports for its exclusive use.

So, while much must be left for later reports, I would like in summation to look to the future and mention the advancing jet-transport age and my view of it.

My personal flying experience as a pilot in this jet age is quite limited. A guest of the United States Air Force, I graduated from their 1-week course described as "Senior Officers' Jet Instrument Familiarization Course" and the flying was done in the veteran Lockheed T–33 trainer.

This personal experience, brief as it is, was the capstone on some 27 years of Marine Corps Reserve action, flying conventional piston-type aircraft. Relying in this brief jet-flying experience, I believe that, physically, emotionally, and mentally, the jet-age passenger will be invigorated, exhilarated, and stimulated.

It is my belief that jet-age civil aviation cannot be properly described as an advance in travel. It is instead a revolution and a complete break with the past.

Today's designers of the Boeing 707 and the Douglas DC–8 jet transports are fully aware of this complete break with the past. They are designing and building larger and more spacious passenger cabins. These newly designed cabins will have the effect of wrapping the jet-age passenger in a cocoon of comfort—immune from vibration, released from engine noise, and spared weather turbulence.

It is my prediction that the enthusiastic reaction of the jet-age passenger to this luxury, this simplicity, this security, will guarantee profitable jet-air transport operations from the date of their inauguration.

Should we not meet again until we are enjoying this jet age of transportation sometime in 1959, I predict now that presently ordered piston-type transport aircraft will not adequately keep pace with the phenomenal traffic growth and demands for seats that mass air transportation will generate in 1957 and 1958. The jet age of air transportation is not arriving a day too soon.

It is my opinion in summation that the aircraft designers and manufacturers, the airline operators, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and you, the traveling public, are all fit, willing, and able; yes, eager, to enjoy the beneficial consequences of the jet age of transport.

I wish you Godspeed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

HOUSING AMENDMENTS OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3855) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, at the outset of Senate debate on Senate bill 3855, I should like to make a short statement. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, I wish to thank the members of the subcommittee and of the Committee on Banking and Currency for their diligence and cooperation in preparing the housing bill for 1956.

At subcommittee hearings, held from March 20 through March 29, nearly a thousand pages of testimony were recorded. Some 300 reports, statements, and letters were received. Every proposal was carefully considered by the subcommittee during 4 days of executive sessions, and later by the full committee during 2 days of executive sessions.

The bill is divided into six titles. Title I covers the FHA programs established by the National Housing Act. Title II is a major new program for elderly persons housing, and, in my opinion, one of the most important developments in recent years. Title III provides for changes in the operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association. Title IV contains a number of improvements to the slum clearance and urban renewal programs. Title V provides for a comprehensive low-rent public-housing program. Title VI contains a number of miscellaneous provisions, including college housing, research, farm housing, and a number of other subjects which I shall explain in more detail later in this statement.

TITLE I. FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

First, I shall describe the provisions in title I of the bill, which cover the various programs administered by the Federal Housing Administration.

PROPERTY IMPROVEMENT LOANS

The bill would extend the FHA home repair and modernization program for 3 years, until September 30, 1959. The maximum eligible loan would be increased from $2,500 to $3,500 for home improvement and nonresidential loans, and from $10,000 to $15,000 for loans for the improvement of structures housing two or more families. The Commissioner would be authorized to increase the maximum maturity of these loans from the present limit of 3 years up to 5 years. The bill also provides an interest rate ceiling of 5 percent discount for loans us to $2,500, and a limit of 4 percent discount on the portion of any loan over $2,500.

HAZARD INSURANCE ON FHA-ACQUIRED PROPERTIES

This bill adds a new provision to authorize FHA to establish a fire and hazard loss fund for self-insurance purposes. The fund would be available to provide fire and hazard risk coverage on property acquired by FHA by foreclosures or otherwise. The FHA Commissioner would also be authorized to purchase additional insurance protection if he determined it to be necessary, and to provide for the reinsurance of any risk assumed by the fire and hazard loss fund. This proposal was suggested by the General Accounting Office.

COOPERATIVE HOUSING INSURANCE

Under existing law, the maximum amount of a cooperative housing mortgage is 90 percent of the FHA estimate of replacement cost, unless at least 65 percent of the cooperators are veterans of World War II, in which event the maximum mortgage amount may be 95 percent of the FHA estimate of replacement cost. The bill would change the law to permit the higher maximum mortgage amount if at least 50 percent of the cooperators are veterans of World War I or World War II.

The committee believes that the present law is unnecessarily restrictive in its definition of a veterans' cooperative, and feels that these changes are highly desirable.

GENERAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE AUTHORIZATION

The general mortgage insurance authorization for FHA would be increased to make available $3 billion of authorization for the next fiscal year. The balance of the present authorization—estimated to be about $2 billion at the end of this fiscal year—would be included in that amount. The authorization covers all the mortgage-insurance programs except the new military housing program under title VIII and the title I home-modernization program.

HOUSING IN URBAN-RENEWAL AREAS

Section 220 of the National Housing Act would be amended to permit an additional $1,000 per room or per family unit for both garden-type and elevator-type projects in high-cost areas. At the present time, only elevator-type projects are eligible. The committee feels that garden-type apartments can be properly encouraged in high-cost areas in order to provide more desirable neighborhood environment.

LOW-COST HOUSING FOR DISPLACED FAMILIES

The FHA Section 221 mortgage insurance program for housing families moving out of urban renewal areas would be liberalized. Maximum dollar amount would be increased from $7,600 to $8,000 per dwelling, and from $8,600 to $10,000 in high-cost areas. The maximum loan-to-value ratio would be increased from 95 percent to 100 percent except that the purchaser would have to make a cash payment of $200, which amount could include settlement costs. The maximum maturity of these mortgages would be increased from 30 years to 40 years.

COST CERTIFICATION OF RENTAL HOUSING

An amendment to section 227 of the National Housing Act would improve the cost certification procedures. Once the cost certification is approved by the FHA Commissioner, it would be considered final and incontestable, except where there has been fraud or misrepresentation by the mortgagor.

In addition, the bill contains a provision to encourage the production of rental housing in urban renewal areas under section 220 of the National Housing Act. This provision would authorize the FHA Commissioner to allow a profit on such projects of up to, but not exceeding, 10 percent of the actual costs—not including the cost of land. The uncertainties and hazards peculiar to capital ventures invoked in the production of rental housing in urban renewal areas should be recognized by the FHA Commissioner and profit allowances should be made on a basis which will foster greater activity under the slum clearance and urban renewal program.

MILITARY HOUSING

The bill would extend the military housing program for 3 years, through September 30, 1959; widen the coverage of the program to include construction of projects on Midway Island and in the Canal Zone; increase FHA insurance authorization from $1,363,500,000 to $3 billion; increase from $9 million to $18 million the maximum monthly expenditure by the military to amortize military housing mortgages; increase maximum average unit cost from $13,500 to $15,000 for any single project, and set a service-wide ceiling on average unit cost of $14,250; establish maximum limits on net floor area, based upon military rank, for each unit of housing; and would make minor technical and perfecting amendments to existing law.

The bill also contains provisions emphasizing FHA's responsibilities in order to prevent overbuilding in areas surrounding military installations. It requires a determination by the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the FHA Commissioner, that adequate housing is not available for personnel of the armed services at reasonable rentals within reasonable commuting distance of the installation. This determination must be made before a new project can be approved. The bill further provides that the FHA Commissioner shall report to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate and the House of Representatives each instance in which he has disagreed with the military as to need for housing and has required the Secretary of Defense to guarantee the armed services housing mortgage insurance fund against loss.

Existing law is amended to require that plans and specifications prepared for military housing follow the principle of modular measure. This requires that plans be drawn so that military housing can be built by conventional construction, site fabrication, or factory fabrication, whichever the successful bidder may elect. This amendment was recommended to permit economies in design, materials, and construction, and reaffirms the committee's intent that builders of prefabricated homes should have equal consideration in bidding on military housing projects.

TITLE II. HOUSING FOR ELDERLY PERSONS

Title II of this year's housing bill deals with elderly persons, and is one of the most important new housing programs in many years.

Prior to 1955 no real effort had been made to develop a Federal program to provide housing for the elderly. In 1955 the Senate Banking and Currency Committee reported a bill which would have provided an allocation of public housing units for elderly persons. This provision passed the Senate but was not enacted.

Since 1955 there has been an increasing awareness of the need to encourage the building of a more substantial number of adequate dwelling units for older persons. A study by the Senate Housing Subcommittee entitled "Housing for

the Aged" has helped to define the problem and delineate its scope. A number of bills dealing with housing for elderly persons have been introduced in both Houses of the Congress, and almost every witness who testified before the Housing Subcommittee this year indicated that some program to assist elderly persons is needed.

This bill is designed to meet the needs of elderly persons in two ways. First, it would amend title II of the National Housing Act by adding a new section 229 to enable the FHA to insure mortgages with liberal terms for elderly persons. These new mortgage terms would be applicable to both sales and rental housing. FHA insurance is conditioned upon the projects being economically sound.

Sales housing mortgages would be insured up to 100 percent of value where the mortgagor is the owner-occupant, except that the borrower must pay $200 in cash, which may include payment of settlement costs and initial payments for taxes, hazard insurance, and other prepaid expenses. The maximum mortgage would be $8,000—$10,000 in high-cost areas—and the maximum maturity would be 40 years. An elderly person could buy only one house with the benefits of this program.

Rental housing mortgages would be insured up to 100 percent of value if the mortgagor is an acceptable public or private nonprofit organization, and 90 percent of value for all other types of mortgagors. As with sales-type housing, the mortgage amount could not exceed $8,000 per unit—$10,000 per unit in high-cost areas. Maximum maturity would be 40 years.

With respect to sales housing, the bill provides that where a mortgagor is 60 years of age or over, a third party—a person or a corporation satisfactory to the FHA Commissioner—may provide the downpayment required and may cosign the mortgage note. For rental housing, an acceptable third party may contribute a part of the required rental payment and may assist in meeting equity requirements.

An elderly persons housing insurance fund would be established in the FHA to carry out the provisions of the new section 229.

FNMA is authorized to enter into advance commitments to purchase such mortgages up to $50 million outstanding at any one time. A maximum of $5 million would be available in any one State. Both would be revolving funds.

Second, the bill would broaden the opportunities for low-income elderly persons to find shelter in public housing accommodations by initiating a program of 15,000 public housing units for each of 5 years beginning July 1, 1956, and by making elderly persons eligible on a first-preference basis to any suitable units in any other public housing projects, even though they were not specifically designed or built for elderly persons. These 15,000 units would be in addition to other low-rent public housing units authorized by other provisions of the bill.

In order to make elderly persons eligible for public housing, the definition of "families of low income" is amended. The term "families" would include a single person 65 years of age or over, or the remaining member of a tenant family. The term "elderly families" is further defined to mean families the head of which or his spouse is 65 years of age or over. To be eligible for admission to public housing, elderly persons and families need not comply with the requirement that they must come from slum dwellings or be displaced by Government action.

The total authorization for annual contributions by the Public Housing Administration is increased from $336 million to $366 million. This is an increase at the rate of $6 million a year for each of the 5 years.

In order to defray the higher cost of units especially designed for the elderly, the bill authorizes an increase in the cost limit for such units from $1,750 to $2,250 per room.

To ensure that the Federal Government develops and maintains a program to meet the needs of elderly persons, the bill would require the Housing Administrator to establish an advisory committee on matters relating to housing for the elderly.

TITLE III. FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

A number of perfecting amendments to the law governing Fanny Mae operations are made by this year's bill.

The bill provides that eligible mortgages covering property located in Alaska, Guam, or Hawaii could be offered for FNMA purchase, under its special assistance operations, without regard to the present $15,000 maximum amount limitation. Because of higher building costs in Alaska, Guam, and Hawaii, the present restriction prevents the financing of needed housing in those Territories.

Under present law, mortgage sellers must subscribe to FNMA common stock equal to 3 percent of the unpaid amount of the mortgages, or such greater percentage as may from time to time be determined by FNMA. Under this bill, FNMA would have authority to adjust downward as well as upward the percentage of capital subscriptions required, although the contribution could never be less than 1 percent.

This reduction in the required percentage of common stock subscription need not result in a lower total amount of such subscriptions or a consequent delay in the retirement of the preferred stock held by the Treasury. A reduction in the required percentage could result in an increase in the secondary market operations of the association of sufficient proportion to increase the total stock subscriptions.

The bill also revises the method for establishing the purchase prices of mortgages to be purchased by FNMA in its secondary market operations. Under present law, the FNMA is required to establish such purchase prices at the market price for the particular class of mortgages involved. Experience gained by FNMA since this provision became effective, November 1, 1954, has indicated that the pricing factors affecting individual mortgages are so diverse that it is not practicable to comply literally with the requirement that prices be established at the market price. It is practicable, however, to ascertain ranges of market prices from time to time. Accordingly, this section of the bill would prescribe the criterion that the prices to be paid by the association for mortgages purchased under the secondary market operations should be established, from time to time, within the range of market prices for the particular class of mortgages involved, as determined by the association. The purpose of this change is to permit the association to raise its purchase price schedule.

Under the purchase price policies established by the association for its special assistance functions, the Agency has charged discounts up to 2 percent in addition to its regular fees. The committee believes that these policies tend to defeat the purposes for which the special assistance function was created. Consequently, this bill would require that all mortgages purchased under the special assistance functions be purchased at par. This provision would also apply to mortgages on elderly persons' housing.

TITLE IV. SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL

One of the most important programs administered by HHFA is the program for slum clearance and urban renewal. Although legislation on this subject has existed for several years, new problems constantly arise, and it is necessary to clarify and perfect the statute as experience is gained. A majority of these urban renewal provisions are clarifying and perfecting amendments.

One amendment deserves special mention.

Perhaps the most difficult problem associated with clearing and rehabilitating a slum area is the avoidance of personal and financial hardships to families and businesses forced to leave the area. The bill amends the law to alleviate such distress. The amendment provides that individuals, families, and business concerns may be reimbursed for expenses or losses, resulting from their displacement from an urban-renewal area and for which reimbursement or compensation is not otherwise made, on the following basis: First, necessary moving expenses not to exceed $100 for any individual or family; and, second, business losses, including loss of good will and necessary moving expenses, not to exceed $2,000 for any one business. These payments may be made by the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency under such reasonable rules and regulations as he may prescribe.

The committee believes that this amendment will not only relieve unusual distress and suffering of tenants—both residential and business—in urban-renewal areas but will also remove much resistance to urban-renewal planning and execution, thereby fostering the restoration of slum areas all over the country.

TITLE V. LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

The Committee on Banking and Currency has again considered the need for low-rent public housing to help provide adequate shelter for the thousands of

low-income families of the Nation who could not otherwise obtain a decent place to live. The Congress has been confronted with this problem for many years and in 1949 enacted a law authorizing a program of financial assistance for 810,000 low-rent housing units to be built, owned, and operated by local public bodies in communities where such housing is needed. In 1956, 7 years later, this goal is yet to be achieved. The PHA Commissioner advises that by July 31, 1956, approximately 315,500 units will have been placed under contract pursuant to the authorization in the Housing Act of 1949. Thus, 7 years after establishment of a goal, that goal is less than 40 percent satisfied. The committee is aware of no other means for housing the families eligible for this program, and is aware of no reason for reducing the goal established in 1949.

Consequently, this bill authorizes the PHA to enter into new contracts for loans or annual contributions until the 810,000-unit program is completed. The bill establishes 135,000 units as the number to be placed under contract in any one fiscal year, with a condition that the President may vary this amount down to 50,000 units or up to 200,000 units if conditions in the national economy so require.

In order to assist in meeting the housing needs of elderly persons of low income, both families and single persons, this bill amends the definition of "families of low income" as it appears in the United States Housing Act of 1937. Under the new definition, persons 65 years of age or over, whether married or single, are eligible for admission to public-housing projects if they meet other requirements in the law.

Through the years, numerous restrictions placed on the public-housing program have reduced its effectiveness. None of these restrictions is necessary for administration and control of the public-housing program and, therefore, the committee bill would repeal them.

In accordance with the administration's wishes to dispose of as much federally owned property as is feasible, the committee has included in title V of the bill amendments to, first, dispose of farm-labor camps, and, second, dispose of certain Government-owned defense-housing projects.

TITLE VI. MISCELLANEOUS

COLLEGE HOUSING

The college housing loan program authorized by the Housing Act of 1950, and stimulated by the Housing Amendments of 1955, is now functioning to meet the critical housing shortages on the campuses of the Nation's colleges and universities. Applications are already on hand in a volume which would exhaust the present authorization of $500 million. The need for student, student family, and faculty housing was intensified in the fall of 1955, and will become even more acute in the fall of 1956, due to mounting enrollments, further deterioration of temporary facilities, and the increasing shortage of off-campus housing. Enrollments in colleges and universities in the fall of 1955 were the highest in the Nation's history. The projected estimate of enrollments ascends at a rapid rate to more than 3 million in 1960, more than 4 million in 1965, and more than 5 million in 1975.

In the light of these circumstances, the committee bill would increase the authorization for college housing loans by $250 million. This amount should enable this program to continue at a high level of activity and will make a substantial contribution to the educational needs of the country without cost to the Federal Government. The bill also amends existing law by specifically providing that divinity schools would be eligible for college housing loans.

RESEARCH

The bill would authorize and direct the Housing Administrator to undertake a comprehensive research program. The Federal Government's stake in the field of housing involves a contingent liability of many billions of dollars. The housing agencies are required every day to make intelligent economic judgments which can be made only on the basis of adequate factual information.

The bill includes the research subjects which the committee feels require the most urgent attention. Among these are research on the housing market, the operations of Fanny Mae, the field of elderly persons housing, low-income and middle-income housing, and similar lines of inquiry. The Housing Administrator would be authorized to enter into research contracts with private and public research organizations. These contracts could not exceed $500,000 during the fiscal year 1957, and this amount could be increased by an additional $1 million on July 1, 1957, and $1 million on July 1, 1958.

FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

The bill raises from $2,500 to $3,500 the ceiling on property improvement loans which may be made by Federal savings and loan associations. This provision is recommended since another provision of the bill raised to $3,500 the maximum permissible amount of home improvement loans under the FHA title I program. One other change is made that would affect Federal savings and loan associations. It would increase from 15 percent to 20 percent the proportion of an association's assets that could be used to make loans secured by property located more than 50 miles from the association's place of business.

COMMISSION ON NATIONAL HOUSING POLICY

A commission would be established to undertake a study of and report upon the short-term and long-term housing needs of the Nation, housing of low- and middle-income families, the discounting of Government-supported mortgages, the prospects for developing new sources of investment funds, and the extent to which resources of the Federal National Mortgage Association can be used to stabilize the mortgage market.

The committee is concerned with the need for informed opinion on the prospective residential housing needs of the country and the capacity of the economy in general and of the building industry and mortgage market in particular to meet these needs. In an attempt to obtain this informed opinion, this bill establishes a Commission on National Housing Policy to conduct an inquiry on this subject and to report its findings to the Congress and the President by June 30, 1957. Interim reports may also be made.

FARM HOUSING

The Banking and Currency Committee has again carefully considered proposals to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949. These amendments as reported would authorize, first, $450 million for direct farm housing loans to be available during a 5-year period; second, additional $10 million for contributions by the Secretary of Agriculture to prevent defaults in payments on loans for potentially adequate farms; and, third, an additional $50 million, to be available during a 5-year period beginning July 1, 1956, for grants and loans for improvement and repair of certain farms as well as for enlargement and development of farms.

It is believed that these amendments will be especially beneficial to first, capable young farmers with little accumulated money or resources who are finding it more and more difficult to meet the increasing capital requirements of farming in a period of drastic income decline; second, families who have been unable to obtain the credit needed to construct or make changes in existing service buildings to keep pace with changing agricultural patterns; and, third, rural families that are not engaged in farming on a full-time basis because of inadequate land resources or other reasons.

Although these amendments authorize availability of some $500 million over a 5-year period, it is not a new loan authority, but an effort to renew the unused loan authority which has accumulated under title V since its inception in 1949. Despite the fact that more than $100 million was authorized under title V for this fiscal year, no loans have been made thus far, and the administration has only recently requested a supplemental appropriation of $5 million to revive its lending activity under title V.

HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

The bill would revive and extend to June 30, 1957, that portion of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, which authorizes loans or grants for hospital construction. One of the purposes of the act of 1951 was to provide needed community facilities in areas, designated by the President as "critical," in which there was an influx of population caused by defense activities. During the life of this program, the applications of 6 communities were approved, but the applications from 22 other communities were pending at the time the authority under the act expired. The bill extends this portion of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951 for 1 year and authorizes expenditures of Federal funds up to $5 million for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956, and June 30, 1957.

SALE OF HOUSING PROJECTS

The bill contains two routine provisions covering the sale of a Lanham Act project in the city of Alexandria, Va., and

the granting of an additional 12 months within which the housing authority of Glastonbury, Conn., may purchase a war housing project.

CITY PLANNING SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS

In order to help solve the problem of a critical shortage of qualified professional city planners and housing technicians and specialists, the bill contains a provision authorizing the Housing Administrator to conduct a scholarship and fellowship program. These awards would be made by private and public nonprofit institutions of higher education for graduate training. Persons shall be selected for such scholarships solely on the basis of ability. The bill authorizes appropriations of $500,000 annually for a 3-year period, beginning on or after July 1, 1956.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

TITLE I. FHA INSURANCE PROGRAMS

Property improvement loans

Section 101: (a) Amends section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act to extend the title I property improvement program of the FHA 3 years until September 30, 1959.

(b) Amends section 2 (b) of the National Housing Act to: (1) increase the maximum permissible loan for improvement of existing single-family structures from $2,500 to $3,500; (2) permit the FHA Commissioner to increase the maximum maturity to 5 years on loans for improvement of single-family structures; (3) require an interest rate ceiling of 5 percent discount a year up to $2,500 and 4 percent discount on that portion of a loan in excess of $2,500; (4) increase the maximum permissible loan for the improvement of multifamily structures from $10,000 to $15,000, with an average of $2,500 per family unit.

Hazard insurance on FHA acquired properties

Section 102: Amends title I of the National Housing Act by adding a new section 10 to authorize the FHA Commissioner to establish a fire and hazard loss fund for self-insurance of acquired properties.

Cooperative housing insurance

Section 103: Amends section 213 (b) (2) of the National Housing Act to reduce from 65 to 50 percent the proportion of veterans required to qualify the cooperative for a 95-percent mortgage loan and for higher room and unit mortgage amount limits. This amendment would also permit World War I veterans to be counted in determining the percentage of veteran cooperators.

General mortgage insurance authorization

Section 104: Amends section 217 of the National Housing Act to increase the general insurance authorization of the FHA by adding $3 billion to the amount of insurance outstanding as of July 1, 1956.

Housing in urban-renewal areas

Section 105: Amends section 220 (d) (3) (B) (iii) to increase mortgage limits up to $1,000 per room or per unit in high-cost urban-renewal areas. This increase is applicable to both elevator and garden-type apartments.

Low-cost housing for displaced families

Section 106: Amends section 221 of the National Housing Act to: (1) increase the maximum permissible mortgage amount from $7,600 to $8,000 (from $8,600 to $10,000 in high-cost areas); (2) permit insurance of mortgages amounting to 100 percent of the value on both rental and sales housing, except that for sales housing the borrower must pay $200 cash, which may include settlement costs, taxes, etc.; (3) increase the maximum maturity of insured loans from 30 to 40 years on both sales and rental housing.

Cost certification of rental housing

Section 107: Amends section 227 of the National Housing Act to: (1) provide that a cost certification, when approved by the FHA Commissioner, shall be final and incontestable, except for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of the mortgagor; (2) provide that there shall be included in actual cost an allowance for sponsor's profit, in the case of a mortgage insured under section 220, up to but not over 10 percent of all project costs (not including the cost of land).

Military housing

Section 108: (a) Amends section 801 (g) of the National Housing Act to permit construction of projects on Midway Island and in the Canal Zone.

(b) Amends section 803 (a) of the National Housing Act to: (1) Increase the FHA title VIII insurance authorization from $1,363,500,000 to $3 billion; and (2) extend the program for 3 years until September 30, 1959.

(c) Amends section 803 (b) (2) of the National Housing Act to require the Secretary of Defense, in programing additional military-housing units, to determine, with the approval of the FHA Commissioner, that the new units will not substantially curtail occupancy in existing housing covered by FHA-insured mortgages. If the FHA Commissioner does not approve additional units, and he requires the Secretary of Defense to guarantee the armed services housing mortgage insurance fund from loss, he shall report to the Committees on Banking and Currency of the Senate and House of Representatives each instance in which he required such a guaranty.

(d) Amends section 803 (b) (3) of the National Housing Act to increase the maximum average unit cost of military housing from $13,500 to $15,000 for any single project, and sets a servicewide ceiling on average unit cost of $14,250.

(e) Amends section 803 (b) (3) of the National Housing Act and sections 403 (a) and 403 (b) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 to make a number of technical changes.

(f) Amends section 403 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 to clarify the bonding requirements imposed upon contractors who build under this act.

(g) Amends section 405 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 to increase from $9 million to $18 million the total permissible monthly payment by the Armed Forces to amortize military housing mortgages.

(h) Amends section 406 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 to require plans and specifications to follow the principle of modular measure.

(i) Amends section 407 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 to permit the use of military construction funds for purposes other than the amortization of outstanding mortgages.

(j) Amends title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 by adding a new section 410 establishing maximum limits, based on military rank, on net floor area for each unit of military housing.

TITLE II. HOUSING FOR ELDERLY PERSONS

Private housing for elderly persons

Section 201: (a) Amends section 203 (b) (2) of the National Housing Act to permit a third party to pay the required downpayment for a mortgagor 60 years of age or over.

(b) Amends title II of the National Housing Act by adding a new section 229 to enable the FHA to insure mortgages financing the construction or rehabilitation of housing for elderly persons 60 years of age or over, as follows:

(1) On sales housing, mortgage insurance could be up to 100 percent of value, except that the borrower must pay $200 cash, which may include settlement costs, taxes, etc. The maximum mortgage amount is set at $8,000 ($10,000 in high-cost areas). The maximum mortgage amount is set at $8,000 ($10,000 in high-cost areas). The maximum maturity would be 40 years.

(2) On rental housing, mortgage insurance would be available for 2 classes of mortgagors: if the mortgagor is an acceptable public or private nonprofit organization, or a public body of any type, an insured mortgage would be up to 100 percent of value, the maximum mortgage amount would be $12,500,000, with a per unit ceiling of $8,000 ($10,000 in high-cost areas); for all other mortgagors, an insured mortgage would be up to 90 percent of value, the maximum mortgage amount would be $12,500,000, with a per unit ceiling of $7,200 ($9,000 in high-cost areas). The maximum maturity would be 40 years.

(3) On both sales housing and rental housing for elderly persons, third parties may provide financial assistance. On sales housing, a third party may pay the required downpayment. On rental housing, a third party may contribute toward rental payments, and may assist in meeting equity requirements.

(4) An elderly person's housing insurance fund is established as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this new section. A sum of $1 million is authorized to be transferred from the war housing insurance fund.

(c) Requires that mortgages secured by section 229 housing are subject to existing requirements in the National Housing Act covering labor standards, transfer of moneys among insurance funds, availability of FHA appraisals to purchasers, cost certification, and transient occupancy.

(d) Amends section 305 of the National Housing Act to authorize FNMA to enter into advance commitment contracts, up to $50 million outstanding at any one time, on elderly persons housing. A maximum of $5 million of this authorization (revolving) would be available in any one State.

Public housing for elderly persons

Section 202: (a) Amends section 2 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 to permit the admission to public housing of a single person 65 years of age or over.

(b) Amends section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 by adding a new subsection (m) to authorize 15,000 units for elderly persons for each of 5 years beginning July 1, 1956, and increases the authorization provided for annual contributions by $6 million a year for 5 years. This authorization would be in addition to any other authorization for low-rent public-housing units. Elderly persons would be eligible on a first-preference basis for admission to units specifically designed for them and on a first-preference basis to any suitable units in other public-housing projects. The requirement that persons admitted to low-rent public-housing units must come from unsafe and unsanitary dwellings or be displaced by Government action would be waived in the case of elderly persons.

(c) Amends section 15 (5) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 to authorize an increase, from $1,750 to $2,250 per room, in the maximum cost, if the unit is specifically designed for elderly persons.

(d) Amends section 21 (d) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 to increase the total authorization for annual contributions by $30 million.

Elderly persons advisory committee

Section 203: Requires the Housing Administrator to establish an advisory committee on matters relating to housing for elderly persons.

TITLE III. FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Section 301: Amends section 302 (b) of the National Housing Act to remove the $15,000 ceiling on mortgages covering housing in Alaska, Guam, and Hawaii when purchased under the Association's special assistance functions.

Section 302: Amends section 303 (b) of the National Housing Act to reduce the amount of FNMA stock, which sellers of mortgages are required to buy, from a minimum of 3 percent of the unpaid principal of the mortgage to a minimum of 1 percent.

Section 303: Amends section 304 (a) of the National Housing Act to change the criterion for FNMA purchases from "at the market price" to "within the range of market prices."

Section 304: (a) Amends section 305 (b) of the National Housing Act to require FNMA to purchase at par all mortgages acquired under its special assistance functions.

(b) Amends section 305 (e) of the National Housing Act to require that the FNMA $5 million advance commitment limit per State for cooperative housing mortgages be operated as a revolving fund.

Sections 305 and 306: Amend section 305 and 306 of the National Housing Act to correct a printer's error and to eliminate an obsolete provision.

TITLE IV. SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL

Section 401: Amends section 102 (d) of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize HHFA to make urban renewal planning advances to a single local public body acting on behalf of all local bodies having authority for surveys and plans for an urban renewal project.

Section 402: (a) Amends section 105 (a) and section 110 (b) of the Housing Act of 1949 to enable the HHFA to make loans or capital grants on the basis of a local plan covering a general urban renewal area, without requiring the local public agency to identify and submit in advance a plan for the redevelopment of a particular project area.

(b) Amends section 110 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949 to change the definition of "urban renewal project" in two respects. First, the various parts of the definition would be rearranged to consolidate the provisions relating to slum clearance and redevelopment with those relating to rehabilitation and conservation. Second, the requirement that an urban renewal project area be predominantly residential would apply to the entire urban renewal area, including the parts to be rehabilitated.

(c) Amends section 110 (d) of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide that the cost of public facilities financed through special assessments against real property in a project area may be counted as a local grant-in-aid contribution, where the property is to be rehabilitated but not acquired.

(d) Amends section 110 (e) of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize local public agencies that do not pay taxes on land held for urban renewal purposes to include an amount equal to such taxes in computing their gross project costs.

Section 403: (a) Amends section 102 (d) of the Housing Act of 1949 to permit advances for "general neighborhood renewal plans" for urban renewal areas of such scope that urban renewal therein may be carried out in stages rather than in a single project.

(b) Amends section 104 of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide that local grants-in-aid shall be a maximum of one-third of aggregate net project costs.

(c) Amends section 103 (b) of the Housing Act of 1949 to increase the capital grant authorization under the slum clearance and urban renewal program from $200 million to $250 million for the years beginning July 1, 1955, and July 1, 1956.

Section 404: Amends section 106 of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide financial assistance to an individual, family, or business concern displaced from an urban renewal area, as follows: (1) not to exceed $100 for necessary moving expenses for any individual or family; and (2) not to exceed $2,000 for any business concern for business losses, including loss of goodwill and necessary moving expenses.

TITLE V. PUBLIC HOUSING

Low-rent public housing

Section 501: (a) Amends section 10 (i) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 to restore the public housing program to the numbers originally provided in the Housing Act of 1949; i. e., a total program of 810,000 units, to be constructed at an annual rate of 135,000 units. For the fiscal year 1956, the authorization of 135,000 units may be increased by the unused portion of the 45,000 units authorized for the fiscal year 1955 under prior legislation. The President is authorized to increase the 135,000 unit figure by 65,000 units, or decrease it by 85,000, upon a determination that economic conditions warrant such a change.

(b) Amends section 13 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 to authorize the PHA to establish general physical standards covering public housing projects, and requires it to allow local agencies maximum discretion as to size of project, type of dwellings, and project densities and design.

(c) Amends section 21 (d) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 to increase from 10 percent to 15 percent the maximum portion of annual contribution and grant funds for public housing which may be made to any one State.

(d) Repeals certain portions of the United States Housing Act of 1937 and certain provisions in appropriation acts to eliminate restrictions that have been placed upon the original public housing provisions of the Housing Act of 1949.

Farm-labor camps

Section 502: Amends section 12 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 to direct the PHA, upon request, to transfer farm-labor camps to local public housing agencies, without compensation, and within 12 months of enactment. First occupancy preference is given to low-income agricultural workers, and second preference to other low-income workers. Mineral rights are reserved for the United States.

Disposition of defense housing

Section 503: (a) Provides for the transfer of 41 temporary defense housing projects constructed or acquired under the Defense Housing and Community Facilities Act of 1951, and two Lanham Act war housing projects, from the Housing Agency to the Department of Defense, effective July 1, 1956.

(b) Provides that 1951 act defense housing not transferred to the Department of Defense must be disposed of as expeditiously as possible, not later than June 30, 1957, on a competitive-bid basis; project IDA-2D1 at Cobalt, Idaho, to be sold for onsite use only.

(c) Directs the HHFA to convey the Lanham Act Tonomy Hill project (RI-37013) at Newport, R. I., to the Housing Authority of the City of Newport, and the Lanham Act Passayunk projects (PA-36011 and PA-36012) in Philadelphia, Pa., to the Housing Authority of the City of Philadelphia.

(d) Amends the Lanham Act by adding a new section 614 to accelerate the disposition of those projects which must be sold for off-site use or as entire projects.

TITLE VI. MISCELLANEOUS

College housing

Section 601: (a) Amends section 401 (d) of the Housing Act of 1950 to increase the revolving fund for college housing loans from $500 million to $750 million.

(b) Amends section 404 (b) of the Housing Act of 1950 to permit HHFA to make college housing loans to divinity schools.

Research

Section 602: Authorizes and directs the Housing Administrator to conduct a research program covering the supply and demand factors affecting the housing market, mortgage market problems, the need for low-income and middle-income housing, housing for elderly persons, and related subjects. The Administrator is authorized to enter into research contracts with agencies of State or local governments, educational institutions, and other nonprofit organizations, and to make working agreements on a reimbursable basis, with other agencies of the Federal Government. These contracts and working agreements must not exceed $500,000 during the fiscal year 1957, and this amount shall be increased by an additional $1 million on July 1, 1957, and $1 million on July 1, 1958.

Federal savings and loan associations

Section 603: (a) and (b) Amend section 5 (c) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 to permit Federal savings and loan associations to increase their maximum permissible home-improvement loan from $2,500 to $3,500, and to permit them to increase from 15 to 20 percent the proportion of their assets that may be loaned on property located beyond 50 miles from the association.

Commission on National Housing Policy

Section 604: Provides for the establishment of a Commission on National Housing Policy, to make recommendations, by June 30, 1957, relating to the short-term and long-term housing needs of the Nation; the discounting of Government-supported mortgages; the prospects for developing new sources of investment funds; the extent to which the resources of FNMA can be used to stabilize the mortgage market; and ways and means of increasing the supply of adequate housing for families of moderate income. The Commission would consist of 11 members—5 officials from the executive branch of the Federal Government, and 6 persons to be appointed by the President from private life.

Farm housing

Section 605: Amends title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize, for a 5-year period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1961, (1) $450 million for farm housing loans, (2) $10 million for contributions by the Secretary of Agriculture to prevent defaults in payments of loans for potentially adequate farms, and (3) $50 million for grants and loans for improvement and repair of certain farms.

Hospital construction

Section 606: Revives and extends, until June 30, 1957, the authority of the Housing Administrator to make hospital construction loans or grants or other payments under the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, in cases where loans, grants, or payments were denied solely because of the unavailability of funds. For each of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957, the sum of $5 million is authorized to be expended from appropriations.

Sale of housing projects

Section 607: (a) Authorizes the Housing Administrator to sell VA-4431, the Chinquapin Village housing project, to the city of Alexandria, Va., or to the Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority.

(b) Amends section 108 (c) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 to increase from 12 months to 24 months the period of time during which Lanham Act project CONN–6028 may be sold to the housing authority of the town of Glastonbury, Conn.

City planning scholarships and fellowships

Section 608: Authorizes $500,000 annually for a 3-year period, beginning July 1, 1956, to be used by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide scholarships and fellowships in public and private nonprofit institutions of higher education for the graduate training of professional city planning and housing technicians and specialists.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I believe this is a comprehensive and constructive housing bill, and I urge all Members of the Senate to give it favorable consideration.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I rise at this time to say that never before have I had the privilege of being on a committee and enjoying the work as much as I have in serving under the very capable leadership of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who headed up the work in connection with the housing bill. He was eminently fair in giving consideration to every proposal which was brought before the committee, and there was a great deal that was under consideration. He gave full opportunity for everyone to be heard and to have every side of every angle explained over and over again. The bill is a constructive measure, generally, and I should like to ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared in connection with the bill be printed at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to express my appreciation of the kind remarks of the able Senator from Maine. I certainly can reciprocate his expressions, with reference to him and to every member of the subcommittee and of the committee as a whole. I believe I never saw a subcommittee work more smoothly and harmoniously than did our subcommittee. I wish I might have had time, as I went through the bill, to point out who on the subcommittee contributed certain ideas. For instance, there are aspects of the bill which represent the handiwork of the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE]. There are those which represent the work of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. I could go around the committee and point out something in the bill which represents the work of practically every member of the subcommittee.

The Senator from Maine will recall that the subcommittee had before it probably a dozen different bills. The measure now pending is a comprehensive bill which does not represent either the administration bill or any other one bill. I know we have made a conscientious effort to take the best of all the suggestions which have come to us, and the bill represents the work of the entire committee. It is a good bill, and I am glad to have this opportunity, as chairman of the subcommittee, to present it to the Senate.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to be permitted to address a few questions to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield for that purpose. I am ready to yield the floor, but I understood that the Senator from New York wished to ask some questions, and I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, first, I wish to compliment the Senator from Alabama for the superb leadership he has shown as chairman of the subcommittee. Later in my remarks I shall refer to the question of middle-income housing, which I consider a highly important subject.

I wish to ask the Senator from Alabama whether my understanding is correct that he intended to direct the staff of the subcommittee to undertake a full study of the question of middle-income housing during the coming months, so that the subcommittee will give the matter full attention, as a matter of priority, when Congress reconvenes next January. I understand that is the intention.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is my intention; and the Senator from New York will recall that I made that statement in the committee. As a little further background for the interest in this particular subject, I will say that the Senator from New York had a bill pending which was a rather comprehensive bill. Some of the ideas in the pending bill came from that bill. But there is one matter to which he particularly makes reference, namely, a provision for housing to meet the needs of the low- and middle-income group. I have said many times on the floor of the Senate and in the committee that we have a very good overall housing program, but there is one gap in it for which we have never found a solution by providing adequate housing for what we would call the low- and middle-income group.

The Senator from New York may remember that in 1949 I sponsored a bill similar to his. As a matter of fact, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee reported the bill to the floor of the Senate. It was debated, and we lost on a very close vote, by only 2 or 3 votes. The Senator's bill followed pretty closely the plan which was laid down in 1949.

I feel very definitely that we need such a provision. As a matter of further background, the Senator offered his amendment in the committee and it was rejected by a tie vote.

The committee divided evenly for and against it. Some Senators who voted against it stated that they were doing so because they did not believe we had properly prepared for its presentation at this time. That was when I stated to the committee that it was my purpose to instruct the staff to make this its first objective during the adjournment of Congress, just as last year the staff made the very excellent study on the needs of housing for elderly persons. Very largely based on that study, many bills were introduced at the beginning of this session of Congress.

I think a very worthwhile program has been incorporated in the bill. We know housing bills are pending in the House. The outlook is that something certainly will be done for elderly persons. I believe this is the first comprehensive study which has been made of that situation.

I have instructed the staff that during the adjournment of Congress I expect them to make a comparable study on the question of housing to meet the needs of the low- and middle-income groups.

The Senator from New York may remember that I prepared a bill to provide for a National Housing Policy Commission, which was agreed to by the committee. That proposal is contained in the bill now before the Senate. The Senator will remember that the very first item designated to be studied in that connection is the very problem of housing for the low- and middle-income groups.

Mr. President, I express my thanks to the Senator from New York for the very kind remarks he made about me. At the same time, I wish to express openly my thanks to him for the very useful contributions he has made toward preparing the bill now under consideration. No one has given more time, devoted interest, and effort to a piece of proposed legislation such as this than the distinguished Senator from New York has given toward developing an adequate housing program such as we have tried to incorporate in the bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Alabama.

EXHIBIT 1

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency and its Subcommittee on Housing, of which I am a member, have worked for several months to write a housing bill which will meet the housing needs of the Nation. A large part of S. 3855, now under consideration, is essentially in the nature of tightening up existing legislation so that such programs as urban renewal and redevelopment can go forward at a faster pace. S. 3855 reflects a great deal of bipartisan work done both within the Subcommittee on Housing and in cooperation with the administration. And although there are some provisions of the bill with which I cannot personally agree, on the whole the bill is a good one. My distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, is to be highly commended for the excellent work which he has done both in the past and during this session to provide a sound national housing program.

One of the outstanding features of S. 3855 is title II, which provides for a bold new program of housing for the elderly. This is an area of housing which presents special problems. In the past, there has been insufficient recognition given to the special housing needs of elderly people in our population. However, the Senate Subcommittee on Housing devoted a great deal of attention to this problem in its consideration of housing legislation for this year. Taking the best provisions from a variety of proposals with wide bipartisan sponsorship, the bill now provides a full and distinct program of housing for the elderly.

Specifically, title II of S. 3855 would facilitate FHA insured mortgages for elderly housing by guaranteeing mortgages up to 100 percent for elderly owner-occupants in sales housing and in rental housing if the mortgagor is a public or private nonprofit

organization. Further, if a mortgagor is 60 years or over, a third party may provide the downpayment and act as cosigner of the mortgage note.

In public housing, elderly persons with low incomes would be given a first preference for occupancy of existing public housing units and an additional 15,000 low-rent housing units designed especially for the elderly would be constructed annually for the next 5 years.

I do not think that anyone would pretend that title II represents the final solution to the problems of housing for the elderly. But by adoption of title II, this Congress can make a firm and realistic start toward the solution of what is increasingly a major social problem in the United States—that of providing adequate and safe housing for the growing numbers of senior citizens in our population.

Another important field in which S. 3855 takes effective measure is that of military housing. S. 3855 will extend the military housing program for 3 years, an extension of vital importance if we are to continue and expand this very worthwhile program. To my mind, it has been clearly demonstrated that one of the major reasons why men in our Armed Forces fail to make the service a career is the lack of adequate housing for their wives and children. Through a program of military housing, it is possible to provide attractive living quarters for enlisted and officer personnel which will be comparable to the quarters that these men and their families could obtain in civilian life.

The military housing provisions of S. 3588 also contain language designed to take care of the problem which has arisen in regard to Wherry housing projects on or near military establishments. The intent of the military housing program is not to supplant Wherry housing but to supplement it and to satisfy new housing needs of the military. By establishing a clearer and more specific definition of policy and responsibility in regard to occupancy of existing Wherry housing, it is intended that future difficulties will be avoided.

I do not wish to prolong my remarks on S. 3588 at this time. I point out in closing, however that there are many excellent features of the bill in reference to urban renewal, home improvement loans, and FHA-insured mortgages which contribute substantially to the overall soundness of S. 3855.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared on the need for action on middle-income housing, together with a summary of an amendment proposing the creation of a National Mortgage Corporation and the text of the amendment, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FORGOTTEN FAMILIES OF MIDDLE INCOME AND THEIR HOUSING NEEDS

One of the most serious deficiencies in American life, both economic and social, is the lack of proper housing for people of modest means. They are roughly classified as "families of middle income." Specifically we refer to those whose incomes are too high to be eligible for subsidized low-rent public housing but too low to afford available private structures of sound construction in good neighborhoods.

Throughout the hearings of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency the importance of meeting this growing, critical, housing need was pointed up by competent witnesses. In an effort to provide a partial, if not a total answer to this problem, eight of my colleagues and I introduced S. 3158, title II of which would have created an entirely new program of nonsubsidized housing for these people. In the executive sessions of the Banking and Currency Committee this program was submitted in a modified form. It was defeated by a tie vote of 6 to 6. A copy of that amendment will be included at the conclusion of this statement.

I am confident that a majority of the committee, if not all of its members, agreed that an answer must be found to the housing needs of persons of modest means if we are ever to reach our stated national policy adopted in 1949 by the Congress as seeking "a decent home in an adequate living environment for every American family." It is recognized that the problem is complicated, and not easy of solution. Progress has been made, however, in recognizing and defining the problem. I am happy to know that its thorough analysis followed by legislative recommendations will be the next order of business of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Unfortunately, precise information as to the housing needs of these families is scarce. We do know, however, that the 1950 census showed that there are approximately 7 million dwellings in the urban centers of our country that should be demolished. In addition there are some 2 million substandard dwellings subject to rehabilitation. For the purpose of this statement I am excluding an additional 6 million substandard American dwellings located in rural and rural nonfarm areas.

It has long been estimated, and experience with the limited urban redevelopment and renewal programs that are presently under way has confirmed, that approximately half of the persons living in these disgraceful dwellings and neighborhoods have incomes so low that they are eligible for low-rent public housing. The other half fall to a very large degree within the middle income range for which no proper housing is now, or will be available, unless Congress acts to meet this need.

It is an established fact that until ways and means are found to supply nonsubsidized housing for these families at monthly costs within their means, slum clearance and urban renewal programs for which we claim so much will be stopped after the first few pilot projects. The same holds true of an adequate program of low-rent public housing. We cannot stabilize, rebuild and replan our cities, unless the vast human needs of families, people, our fellow Americans who are to be displaced from their present homes are cared for properly. S. 3855, which I hope the Senate will adopt today by an overwhelming majority, takes significant strides in the field of low-rent public housing, if it is adopted as reported by the committee. But it is silent in this other vital area that is of equal importance to our national welfare.

The finest statement that I have seen on middle income housing was contained in a report to Gov. Averell Harriman from Joseph P. McMurray, commissioner, Division of Housing of the State of New York. Most every Member of the Senate remembers Joe McMurray as the able staff director and later special counsel of the Banking and Currency Committee. He is presently giving outstanding leadership in housing in my State. I wish to quote some sections of his report:

"A large gap exists between the rentals for low-rent public housing and rent-controlled housing on the one hand, and the rentals required for unsubsidized new housing on the other. This gap is not being closed but is widening. To preserve New York's vitality, housing must be provided for middle-income families, who make up the heart of the productive working forces of the State. To supply them with medium-rental housing used to be a profitable private business, but it is now a difficult and declining one.

"While the extent of the middle-income housing problem is obvious, substantial study is required to set reasonably exact figures on the need for this type of housing. Certain factors will, however, illustrate the great need which exists for housing for families in this income group, particularly those living under substandard or overcrowded conditions.

"The census of 1950 showed about 732,000 New York State dwelling units dilapidated or lacking adequate plumbing facilities. Large though this figure may appear, it actually understates the problem. Many areas, even though their dwellings might have the required plumbing, are so run down and comprise an environment so detrimental to adequate living that the inhabitants are held captive only because they have no alternative.

"The Federal title I slum clearance areas in New York City are an example of the shortcomings of the Census definition. If the four most substandard of these title I areas are considered, only 40 percent of the dwellings are dilapidated or lack adequate plumbing facilities; yet these areas are considered generally substandard and unfit for decent living, and are slated for demolition.

"While it is generally supposed that families occupying these substandard dwellings are only of low income and thus eligible for subsidized public housing, this is not actually the case. More than half of the families of this State who live in substandard housing are not eligible for public housing projects under present income limitations. Demolition for public and private construction, substandard housing, overcrowding, and obsolescence are not ills which strike only at the very poor. The areas in which these conditions exist contain a substantial number of families in the middle-income group who face an even greater problem of relocation than do the lower-income groups for whom subsidized public housing is available and for which they have legislative preference.

"On title I slum-clearance sites in New York City, for example, surveys have shown almost half as many families in the middle-income range as in the group eligible for low-rent housing. These are the families who face the most serious problem of relocating, and who are being driven, slowly but inexorably, into the remaining slums and into areas which, because of overcrowding and improper maintenance of the property, are likely to become the slums of the future.

"It is estimated that the middle one-third of the families of New York State earn between $3,750 and $5,900 per year. These figures exclude one-person families. Of the 1,458,000 families in the State in this income group, an estimated 140,000 live in units which are dilapidated or lack adequate plumbing facilities. These represent about 10 percent of all families in the middle-income group and about 20 percent of all families in substandard housing. On the basis of spending one-fifth, rents could then range from $63 to $98 per month. Yet little housing is being built at these rental levels, outside of the limited amount of no-cash-subsidy housing in New York City, which does not begin to meet the need.

"The magnitude of the existing need for middle-income housing is shown by the amount of money needed to provide decent housing for this group. Considering only the 140,000 units which are dilapidated or lack proper plumbing, and which are occupied by middle-income families, an expenditure of about $1.8 billion would be required. Yet it is obvious that the actual need for housing families in the middle-income group is far greater than merely the replacement of the 140,000 physically substandard units."

The need as described in the State of New York is repeated to varying degrees in every State and urban center of our country.

Since 1926 we have attacked this problem affirmatively in New York. Only last year the 1955 Limited Profit Housing Companies Act became law. From it we are building a body of knowledge as to construction costs, operating expenses, financing, and operation which will be of material assistance in helping to frame national legislation. It is already obvious that Federal legislation in this vast area of housing needs is essential to supplement all that we can possibly do locally and statewide. There must be a reservoir of Government-guaranteed mortgages, or direct loans to nonprofit corporations or cooperatives carrying longer periods of amortization and lower interest rates than presently charged, if we are to progress toward achieving proper housing for families of moderate income. We envision a program of homes that will be privately built, privately owned and operated, and privately financed, attracting great reservoirs of savings that do not enter the mortgage market at this time.

This is a national problem. No metropolitan area in this country has escaped the flight to the suburbs by families who mortgage their souls, and assume transportation costs to places of employment that cut deeply into their budgets for food, clothing, health, and entertainment, to escape slum surroundings. When families of upper middle income and all who can possibly join them desert the city, it becomes a place for the very rich and the very poor. The best of community leadership is lost. It is a growing disease that must be arrested or our national security and way of life is endangered.

To meet these critical housing needs many of us suggest the following measure for the creation of a housing program to assist families of modest income. When this need is met, then, and only then can we begin to demolish slums effectively and rebuild our communities.

I urge that my colleagues study this proposal. I am delighted that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency plans to make housing for middle-income families its first order of business. I have great hope that when legislation is presented next year, after staff studies and extensive hearings and investigations have been held that even better recommendations than those that I submit for your consideration today, will be forthcoming.

SUMMARY OF AMENDMENT TO S. 3855, HOUSING FOR MIDDLE-INCOME FAMILIES AND FOR ELDERLY PERSONS

The National Mortgage Corporation is created with authority to make and service loans and issue obligations in aid of a program of housing for families of moderate income and for elderly persons. Eligible borrowers under this program include (i) certain private nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporations, and (ii) private corporations authorized to provide dwellings for which charges are agreed upon or for sale to private nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporations. The National Mortgage Corporation is authorized to issue capital stock to be subscribed for by the Secretary of the Treasury up to an amount not to exceed $100 million at any time. The Corporation may issue capital stock for subscriptions by corporate eligible borrowers and each such borrower must subscribe for capital stock in an amount equal to 5 percent of the mortgage loan which it seeks from the Corporation. The amendment prescribes the methods of payment, the terms and conditions of payment for the stock and for mortgage loans. The method of retirement of the capital stock held by the Secretary of the Treasury is described as well as the distribution of the assets upon liquidation of the Corporation. The amendment authorizes the Corporation to make mortgage loans to eligible borrowers or commitments to purchase or participate in loans made by any FHA approved mortgages or to finance the development of a housing project upon certain certifications by the Administrator. Borrowers agree, among other things, to establish a schedule of rents or charges which will permit dwellings constructed to be made available to families of moderate income and to elderly persons. The Corporation is authorized to issue notes or other obligations in an aggregate annual amount not to exceed $500 million except that with the approval of the President this amount may be increased after July 1, 1957, by additional amounts aggregating annually not more than $1 billion. The aggregate amount outstanding at any one time however is limited. Terms and conditions and procedure upon default of these obligations are prescribed. The Corporation is required to carry a reserve account for losses equal to one-fourth of 1 percent of the outstanding balance of mortgage loans. Not more than 10 percent of the funds shall be expended in any one State. Veterans preferences are provided for within other classes of preferences. Provision is made for taxes, protection of labor standards and penalties. The amendment in general is based on title III of S. 2246 introduced in 1950.

[S. 3855, 84th Cong., 2d sess.]

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. LEHMAN to the bill (S. 3855) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes, viz: On page 60, following line 22, insert the following:

"TITLE VII. HOUSING FOR MIDDLE INCOME FAMILIES AND FOR ELDERLY PERSONS

"SEC. 701. The purpose of this title is to provide a means whereby housing of sound standards of design, construction, livability, and size for adequate family life, and for elderly persons in well-planned, integrated residential neighborhoods can be produced and made available for families of moderate income and for elderly persons by making financial assistance available to cooperative housing and other nonprofit corporations, for housing which is of such design and construction as will promote economies, both in construction and in operation and maintenance, which will be fully reflected in reduced rents or charges.

"CREATION AND POWERS OF NATIONAL MORTGAGE CORPORATION

"SEC. 702. (a) To effectuate the purpose of this title, there is hereby created a body corporate to be known as the 'National Mortgage Corporation' (hereinafter referred to as the 'Corporation') with authority, as herein provided, to make and service loans, issue obligations in such amounts, at such times, and on such terms as the Corporation may determine, and to exercise the other powers, and duties prescribed in this title. In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in it by this title, the Corporation, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, may—

"(1) adopt and use a corporate seal;

"(2) sue or be sued in any Federal, State, or local court of competent jurisdiction;

"(3) enter into contracts with regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and make advance, progress, or other payments with respect to such contracts without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, and include in any contract or instrument made pursuant to this title such other provisions as the Corporation deems necessary to assure that the purposes of this title will be achieved;

"(4) foreclose on any property or take any action to protect or enforce any right conferred upon it by any law, contract, or other agreement, and bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or any other sale any project or part thereof in connection with which it has made a loan pursuant to this title;

"(5) pay all expenses or charges in connection with, and deal with, complete, reconstruct, improve, rent, manage, make contracts for the management of, or establish suitable agencies for the management of, or sell for cash or credit, or lease in its discretion, in whole or in part, any project acquired pursuant to this title and to pursue to final collection by way of compromise or otherwise all claims acquired by, or assigned or transferred to, it in connection with the acquisition or disposal of any housing project pursuant to this title, notwithstanding any other provisions of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real or personal property: *Provided,* That any such acquisition of real property shall not deprive the State or any political subdivision thereof of its civil or criminal jurisdiction in and over such property or impair the civil rights under State or local laws of the inhabitants on such property;

"(6) acquire, hold, sell or exchange at public or private sale, or lease, or otherwise dispose of, real or personal property, and sell or exchange any securities or obligations;

"(7) obtain insurance against loss in connection with property and other assets held;

"(8) subject to the specific limitations in this title, consent to the modification, with respect to rate of interest, time of payment of any installment of principal or interest, security, or any other term, of any contract or agreement to which it is a party or which has been transferred to it pursuant to this title;

"(9) utilize and act through, with regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, any Federal, State, or local public agency or instrumentality, or nonprofit agency or organization, with the consent of the agency or organization concerned, and contract with any such agency, instrumentality, or organization for the furnishing of any services or facilities; and may make advance, progress, or other payments with respect to such contracts without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes;

"(10) enter into contracts with any FHA-approved mortgagee to service loans made by such institution; and

"(11) do all things which are necessary or incidental to the proper management of its affairs and the proper conduct of its business.

"(b) The Corporation shall have power, with the approval of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the 'Administrator') to select, employ, and fix the compensation of such officers and employes as shall be necessary for the performance of its duties under this title, without regard to the provisions of laws applicable to the employment, compensation, leave, or expenses of officers and employees of the United States: *Provided,* That the rates of basic compensation of its officers and employees shall be comparable to those established for officers and employees under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. Except as provided in provisions of law relating specifically to mixed-ownership Government corporations, the Corporation may determine the necessity for and the character of its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and accounted for. The business of the Corporation shall not be considered official business of the United States within the meaning of any statute permitting the free use of the United States mails.

"Powers of Administrator

"SEC. 703. The Administrator shall supervise the Corporation, shall perform the other duties prescribed herein, and shall have the power to adopt, amend, and require the observance of such rules, regulations, and orders as shall be necessary from time to

time for carrying out the purposes of this title and for coordinating the activities of the Corporation with the housing functions and actvities administered within the Housing and Home Finance Agency, or any of its constituent agencies, and with the general economic and fiscal policies of the Government, and in carrying out these responsibilities the Administrator shall consult with the Board of Directors of the Corporation who shall, in addition to their responsibilities under section 702 hereof, act as an advisory board to the Administrator in the administration of this title. In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title, the Administrator, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, may exercise any of the powers enumerated in the second sentence of section 702 (a) of this title and shall—

"(a) estimate the need for housing for middle-income families and elderly persons in each housing market area of the country and allocate to each area its appropriate share of the loan funds authorized by this title;

"(b) appoint a director to exercise, under the direction and supervision of the Administrator, the functions, powers, and duties vested in the Administrator by this title, and the basic rate of compensation of such position shall be the same as the basic rate of compensation established for positions of similar responsibility in the Housing and Home Finance Agency: *Provided*, That the Administrator may, in his discretion, delegate any of the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title to any officers or employees under his direction and supervision;

"(c) take such steps as he deems necessary and desirable to assure that the benefits of this program are not dissipated through speculative devices, to assure that the organization of the borrower and its proposed methods of operation are such as will avoid its use for speculative purposes or the payment of excessive fees, salaries, or charges in connection with the housing project, and to encourage borrowers to adopt methods by which occupants of dwellings may be permitted to reduce their rentals or other occupancy charges by occupant maintenance and repair or other means of self-help and methods whereby they may acquire (subject to the right of a cooperative to repurchase) ownership of their individual dwellings where such dwellings are free standing;

"(d) prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended;

"(e) maintain an integral set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, and no other audit shall be required: *Provided*, That such financial transactions of the Administrator as the making of advances of funds and vouchers approved by the Administrator in connection with such financial transactions shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government; and

"(f) make an annual report to the President, for transmission to the Congress, to be submitted as soon as practicable following the close of the year for which such report is made.

"Capital stock

"SEC. 704. (a) The Corporation may issue capital stock from time to time which shall be subscribed for by the Secretary of the Treasury on behalf of the United States, and payments for such subscriptions shall be subject to call in whole or in part by the Corporation: *Provided*, That the total amount of such stock subscribed for and held by the Secretary of the Treasury at any time shall not exceed $100 million. Stock held by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be preferred as to dividends and assets of the Corporation and shall be entitled to cumulative dividends for each year equal to a return on the average amount, at par, of such stock outstanding during such fiscal year at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the probable term of the stock investment and the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the sixth month of such fiscal year. The Corporation shall issue to the Secretary of the Treasury receipts for payments by him for or on account of such stock, and such receipts shall be evidence of the stock ownership of the United States. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the amounts necessary to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to make payments on such stock when called. Such stock or any part thereof may be retired at any time by the Corporation.

"(b) The Corporation may issue capital stock from time to time for subscriptions by corporate eligible borrowers. In order to assure direct financial participation by borrowers, each such eligible borrower shall, as a condition precedent to obtaining any mortgage loan from the Corporation as hereinafter provided, subscribe for capital stock of the Corporation in an amount equal to 5 percent of the original principal amount of such loan. In the case of a borrower of the character described in section 710 (b) (1) hereof, such stock subscriptions shall be paid for in cash at the time of application for the loan, or, at the election of the borrower, one-fourth of the total amount payable shall be paid at the time of application, one-fourth shall be paid when the housing project, for which such loan is made, is completed and ready for occupancy as determined by the Corporation, and the balance shall be paid in installments within 20 years thereafter. In the case of a borrower of the character described in section 710 (b) (2) hereof, such stock subscription shall be paid in installments within 20 years after the receipt of the first proceeds of the loan. Each borrower shall hold such stock in the Corporation until the value thereof shall equal, or be greater than, the unpaid balance of the mortgage loan, and any such unpaid balance shall be paid out of the proceeds of any sale of such stock. Dividends payable on stock paid in by a borrower shall be credited to any payments subsequently due on the stock subscription of such borrower.

"(c) After the amount of capital of the Corporation paid by such subscribers, other than the United States, equals $50 million, the Corporation shall thereafter apply annually to the payment and retirement of the shares of the capital stock held by the Secretary of the Treasury, all sums paid in as capital until all such capital stock held by the Secretary is retired at par plus any dividends which shall have accrued on such stock: *Provided*, That no such capital stock held by the Secretary shall be retired if such retirement would reduce the net capital, reserves, and surplus of the Corporation to an amount less than $150 million.

"(d) Upon any liquidation of the Corporation, all stockholders (including the United States if any of its stock has not been retired) shall share, in proportion to the stock held, in any assets of the Corporation, in excess of the amount necessary to retire all outstanding stock at par, to pay accrued dividends on preferred stock, and to retire, pay, or settle all outstanding obligations and claims.

"Board of directors

"SEC. 705. The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of five directors appointed by the Administrator. The directors who are first appointed shall be designated to serve for terms of 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 years, respectively, from the date of their appointment, but thereafter directors shall be appointed for a term of office of 5 years except that all vacancies shall be filled for the unexpired term. A director shall hold office until his successor has been appointed and has qualified, unless sooner removed according to this section.

"The first, third, and fifth vacancies resulting from the expiration of the initial terms of office shall be filled by the appointment of directors from among the members of stockholding corporations or other persons representative of housing cooperatives, and the successors to each of such directors shall also be appointed from among members of stockholding corporations or other persons representative of housing cooperatives: *Provided*, That after all of the capital stock of the Corporation held by the Secretary of the Treasury has been retired as herein provided, all directors shall be appointed from among members of stockholding corporations or other persons representative of housing cooperatives. The Administrator shall designate a chairman from among the directors. The Administrator may remove a director from office at any time for inefficiency or failure to comply with any applicable provisions of this title or regulations issued thereunder. The Corporation may pay its directors reasonable compensation for their services and necessary expenses, subject to the approval of the Secretary.

"Mortgage loans

"SEC. 706. (a) To assist the production of housing of sound standards of design, construction, livability, and size for adequate family life available for families of moderate income, and for elderly persons, the Corporation, upon application of an eligible borrower (as herein defined) and subject to the terms and conditions of this title, may make a mortgage loan (including advances during the development of the housing project) to such borrower, or to enter into commitments to purchase or repurchase loans or to finance the development of a housing project to be undertaken by such borrower: *Provided*, That no such loan shall be made unless—

"(1) the Administrator shall have certified that—

"(A) the borrower is an eligible borrower of the character described in section 710 (b) hereof and that, in the case of a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation, the membership thereof is comprised predominantly of families of moderate income, or elderly persons (or both) or that, in the case of a nonprofit corporation to operate such housing project, the dwellings in such housing project are to be made available to families of moderate income or elderly persons;

"(B) the proposed housing project will meet a need for housing of families of moderate income or elderly persons;

"(C) the location and physical planning of the housing project will afford reasonable assurance as to the stability of the neighborhood, and the dwellings in the housing project will meet sound standards of design, construction, livability, and size for adequate family life or for elderly persons; and

"(D) the housing project will not be of elaborate or extravagant design or construction, and such design and construction and the proposed methods of construction and of operation and maintenance are such as will promote such economies as are contemplated to be achieved through the nonprofit character of the borrower, increased efficiency in production through the use of new or improved materials and techniques and methods of construction or otherwise, increased efficiency in operation and management, minimum necessary operating services, occupant maintenance, or otherwise; and

"(2) the borrower shall have agreed with the Corporation—

"(A) that it will not incur or pay any excessive fees, salaries, or charges in connection with the housing project;

"(B) to establish an initial schedule of rents or charges for the dwellings in the housing project which will permit such dwellings to be made available for families of moderate income, or for elderly persons, and that such initial schedule of rents or charges and all revisions thereof shall be subject to the prior approval of the Corporation: *Provided*, That the Corporation shall not approve any initial schedule of rents or charges unless the Secretary has certified that such rents or charges will permit the dwellings to be made available for families of moderate income or for elderly persons;

"(C) to give preference in the selection of tenants for the housing project (as among eligible applicants) first, to families displaced by public clearance or enforcement action; second, to families living in substandard homes; and, third, to families living in overcrowded homes, veterans to have preference in each category: *Provided*, That in respect to dwelling units specifically designed and designated for elderly persons, such persons shall have a preference for the tenancy of such housing, without regard to the foregoing preferences.

"(D) to maintain the housing project, including all equipment therein, and all appurtenances thereto, in good condition throughout the life of the mortgage loan, and to establish and maintain adequate reserves for repairs, maintenance, and replacements necessary to so maintain such housing project; and

"(E) to comply with such other terms and conditions as the Corporation finds, prior to the mortgage loan, are necessary or desirable to carry out the purposes of this title; and

"(3) in the case of a borrower of the character described in sectiotn 710 (b) (2), the members thereof at the time of making application for the mortgage loan shall be equal to at least 30 percent of the number of members proposed to be served by such housing project: *Provided*, That, prior to the receipt of any proceeds of such mortgage loan, the members of such borrower shall be equal to at least 80 percent of the number of members proposed to be served by such housing project; and

"(b) The mortgage loan shall involve a principal obligation in an amount (1) not exceeding the development cost (as herein defined) of the housing project as determined by the Secretary, and (2) not exceeding such amount as the Secretary shall have determined to be the maximum within which the project must be constructed in order that it may be made available for families of moderate income at rentals or charges within their means. No loan shall be made under section 710 (b) (1) and (2) unless the mortgagor has agreed to certify the cost in the manner as provided by section 227 of the National Housing Act for Federal Housing Administration mortgage insurance.

"(c) The mortgage loan shall provide for complete amortization within a period of 40 years by periodic payments upon such terms as the Corporation shall prescribe, and shall bear interest, on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time, at a fixed rate, based on the cost to the Corporation of capital investments and borrowings from the private market, plus one-half percent to compensate the Corporation for its estimated overhead and administrative expenses in connection with such loan and for proportionate payments to required reserves. In the event of the refinancing of the loan (within such period as the Corporation shall prescribe), if the cost to the Corporation of capital investment and borrowings from the private market makes necessary an increase in the rate of interest which, pursuant to this subsection, the Corporation is required to charge on the mortgage loan, the amortization period may be extended to a date not later than 50 years after the date of the original mortgage: *Provided*, That no such extension shall be made unless the Corporation determines that the increase otherwise resulting in the rents or charges for the dwellings in the housing project would adversely affect the stability of such housing project. The mortgage loan may, in the discretion of the Corporation, include provisions for the deferment of payments of principal and interest thereunder: *Provided*, That such deferments shall not in the aggregate result in an extension of the maturity of the mortgage for a period of more than 3 years nor shall any such deferments result in an extension of the maturity of the mortgage for more than 3 years beyond the mortgage maturity otherwise authorized herein.

"(d) Subject to the provisions of this section, the mortgage loan shall be in such form, contain such provision as to security, repayment, and redemption, and be subject to such other terms and conditions as the Corporation may determine: *Provided*, That in the case of a borrower of the character described in section 710 (b) (2), the mortgage loan shall contain provisions requiring that such borrower have, to the extent permitted by State and local law, a priority for the purchase of the interest of each of its members in the dwelling of such member in the event of the sale of such interest.

"(e) The borrower may, with the consent of the Corporation, pledge the contract or commitment of the Corporation to make a mortgage loan hereunder as security for a loan of construction funds from other sources.

"(f) The Corporation may charge to the borrower (in addition to any interest charges) an amount not exceeding 2½ percent of the principal amount of the mortgage loan for inspection and other services during the construction of the housing project. Such service charges may be included as a part of the development cost of the project and may be payable from the proceeds of any mortgage loan or advances thereon.

"Obligations of Corporation

"SEC. 707. (a) The Corporation is authorized to issue and have outstanding on and after July 1, notes or other obligations in an aggregate annual amount not to exceed $500 million except that with the approval of the President such aggregate annual amount may be increased at any time or times on or after July 1, 1957, by additional amounts aggregating annually not more than $1 billion upon a determination by the President, taking into account the general effect of any such increase upon conditions in the building industry and upon the national economy, that such increase is in the public interest: *Provided*, That the aggregate amount outstanding at any one time shall not exceed (1) 15 times the aggregate par value of the Corporation's outstanding capital stock and surplus, or (2) the unpaid principal of mortgage loans contracted for or held by it under this title (without regard to amounts of prior advances on such loans), plus the value (as determined by the Corporation) of any acquired properties, the amount of its cash on hand and on deposit, and the amount of its investments authorized herein.

"(b) The failure of the Corporation to make any payment due under or provided to be paid by the terms of any note or other obligation issued by the Corporation pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be considered a default under such note or other obligation, and, if such default continues for a period of 30 days, the holder of such note or obligation shall be entitled to receive debentures (in principal amount equal to the unpaid principal of the defaulted note or other obligation of the Corporation plus any interest due and unpaid on such note or other obligation), as hereinafter provided, upon assignment, transfer, and delivery to the Corporation, within a period and in accordance with rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Corporation, of the note or other obligation in default. Debentures issued under this subsection shall be executed in the name of the Corporation as obligor, shall be signed by the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Corporation by either his written or engraved signature, and shall be negotiable. Such debentures shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Corporation, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, at the time the defaulted note or other obligation of the Corporation was issued, but not to exceed 3 percent per annum, payable semiannually on the 1st day of January and the 1st day of July of each year, and shall mature 3 years after the 1st day of July following the maturity date of the defaulted note or other obligation of the Corporation in exchange for which such debentures were issued. Such debentures shall be paid out of the insurance fund or out of any funds of the Corporation which shall be primarily liable therefor, and shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States, and such guaranty shall be expressed on the face of the debenture. In the event the Corporation fails to pay upon demand when due, the principal of, or interest on, any debenture so guaranteed, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the holder or holders the amount thereof which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and thereupon, to the extent of the amount so paid, the Secretary of the Treasury shall succeed to all the rights of the holder or holders of such debentures. Debentures issued under this subsection (b) shall be in such form and denominations in multiples of $50, shall be subject to such terms and conditions, and shall include such provision for redemption, if any, as may be prescribed by the Corporation with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and may be in coupon or registered form, and shall not be subject to the limitations prescribed by subsection (a) of this section. Any difference between the amount of debentures to which the holder of the defaulted note or other obligation of the Corporation is entitled under this subsection (b) and the aggregate principal amount of the debentures issued, not to exceed $50, shall be adjusted by the payment of cash by the Corporation. The Corporation may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, purchase in the open market debentures issued under the provisions of this subsection (b). Such purchases shall be made at a price which will provide an investment yield of not less than the yield obtainable from other investments authorized by this title. Debentures so purchased shall be canceled and not reissued.

"Reserves, dividends, and investment of funds

"SEC. 708. The Corporation shall carry to a specific reserve account for losses, to be known as the Insurance Fund, semiannually from interest receipts on mortgage loans amounts equal to one-fourth of 1 percent per annum of the then outstanding balance of such mortgage loans. The Corporation shall make such chargeoffs on account of depreciation or impairment of its assets as the Secretary shall require from time to time. In addition to the Insurance Fund reserve account for losses, the Administrator shall require the establishment and maintenance of, and the Corporation shall establish and maintain, such reserve or reserves as he deems necessary. No dividends shall be paid except out of net earnings remaining after all reserves and chargeoffs required under this title have been provided for, and then only with the approval

of the Administrator. Such reserves, including the Insurance Fund, and all other funds of the Corporation not invested in mortgage loans or operating facilities, shall be kept in cash or on deposit or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States.

"Maximum funds for any one State

"SEC. 709. Not more than 10 percent of the funds provided for in this title either in the form of advances or loans, shall be expended in any one State.

"Definitions

"SEC. 710. As used in this title, the following terms shall have the meanings, respectively, ascribed to them below, and unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, shall include the plural as well as the singular number:

"(a) For the purposes of this title 'families of moderate income' means families whose incomes preclude them from purchasing or renting conventionally financed new housing with total monthly housing expenditures of 20 percent of their normal stable income as defined by the Federal Housing Administration.

"(b) 'Eligible borrower' or 'borrower' shall mean (1) any private nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation the permanent occupancy of the dwellings of which is restricted to the members of such corporation, or (2) any private corporation, borrowing directly on a commitment from the National Mortgage Corporation, and authorized to provide dwellings (i) the occupancy of which is to be permitted in consideration of agreed charges, or (ii) for sale to a corporation of the character described in clause (1) of this paragraph.

"(c) The term 'corporation' (except when used to designate the corporation created by section 702 hereof) shall mean either 'corporation' or 'trust' and references to members of such corporations shall with respect to trusts mean the beneficiaries thereof.

"(d) 'Housing project' shall mean a project (including all property, real and personal, contracts, rights, and choses in action acquired, owned, or held by a borrower in connection therewith) of a borrower designed and used primarily for the purpose of providing dwellings: *Provided,* That nothing in this title shall be construed as prohibiting the inclusion in a housing project of such stores, offices, or other commercial facilities, recreational or community facilities, or other nondwelling facilities as are necessary appurtenances to such housing project.

"(e) 'Development cost' shall mean (1) the amount of the reasonable costs incurred by the borrower in, and necessary for, carrying out all works and undertakings for the development of a housing project and shall include the cost of all necessary surveys, plans, and specifications, architectural, engineering, or other special services, land acquisition, site preparation, construction, and equipment, interest incurred during the development of the housing project up to the time of completion, initial working capital for the administration of the housing project, necessary expenses (including any initial operating deficit) in connection with the initial occupancy of the housing project; and the cost of such other items as the Administrator or Corporation shall determine to be necessary for the development of the housing project, or (2) the cost, as approved by the Administrator or the Corporation, incurred by the borrower in, and necessary for the acquisition of, a housing project developed with a loan made under this title.

"(f) 'Mortgage' or 'mortgage loan' shall mean a first mortgage on real estate, in fee simple, or on a leasehold (1) under a lease for not less than 99 years which is renewable or (2) under a lease having a period of not less than 75 years to run from the date the mortgage was executed; and the term 'first mortgage' shall mean such classes of first liens as are commonly given to secure advances on, or the unpaid purchase price of, real estate, under the laws of the State in which the real estate is located, together with the credit instruments, if any, secured thereby.

"(g) The term 'veteran' shall mean a person who has served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time (i) on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to July 26, 1947, (ii) on or after April 6, 1917, and prior to November 11, 1918, or (iii) on or after June 25, 1950, and prior to February 1, 1955, and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable. The term 'serviceman' shall mean a person in the active military or naval service of the United States who has served therein at any time (i) on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to July 26, 1947, (ii) on or after April 6, 1917, and prior to November 11, 1918, or (iii) on or after June 25, 1950, and prior to February 1, 1955.

"(h) The term 'going Federal rate' shall mean the annual rate of interest (or, if there shall be two or more such rates of interest, the highest thereof) specified in the most recently issued bonds of the Federal Government having a maturity of 10 years or more.

"(i) 'State' shall mean the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories, dependencies, and possessions of the United States.

"(j) The term 'Elderly persons' includes a person 60 years of age or over or a family the head of which or his spouse is 60 years of age or over.

"Amendments of other acts

"SEC. 711. (a) The sixth sentence of paragraph seventh of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U. S. C. 24), is amended by inserting before the comma after the words 'or obligations of the Federal National Mortgage Association' the following: ', or notes, debentures, or other obligations of the National Mortgage Corporation.'

"Section 5200 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U. S. C. 84), is amended by adding at the end thereof, the following:

"'(12) Notes, obligations, and debentures of the National Mortgage Corporation shall not be subject to any limitation based upon such capital and surplus.'

"(b) Section 201 of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 856) is hereby amended by striking out the words 'and (4) Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation' and inserting in lieu thereof '(4) Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and (5) National Mortgage Corporation.'

"Taxes

"SEC. 712. All real property and tangible personal property of the Corporation shall be subject to State, county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other similar property is taxed, and any real property shall be subject to special assessments for local improvements. Except as to such taxation of real property and tangible personal property, the Corporation, including but not limited to its franchise, capital, reserves, surplus, income, assets, and other property, shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority. All notes, debentures, and other obligations of the Corporation shall be exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxes (except surtaxes, estate, inheritance, and gift taxes) by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority.

"Protection of labor standards

"SEC. 713. In order to protect labor standards—

"(a) any contract for a loan pursuant to this title shall contain a provision requiring: (1) That not less than the salaries prevailing in the locality, as determined or adopted (subsequent to a determination under applicable State or local law) by the Administrator, shall be paid to all architects, technical engineers, draftsmen, and technicians, employed in the development, and to all maintenance laborers and mechanics employed in the administration, of the housing project involved; (2) that not less than the wages prevailing in the locality, as predetermined by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to the Davis-Bacon Act (49 Stat. 1011), shall be paid to all laborers and mechanics employed in the development of the housing project involved; and (3) that certification as to compliance with the provisions of this subsection be made prior to the making of any payment under such contract;

"(b) the provisions of title 18, United States Code, section 874, and of section 2 of the act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U. S. C. 276c), shall apply to any housing project financed in whole or in part with funds made available pursuant to this title;

"(c) any contractor engaged on any housing project financed in whole or in part with funds made available pursuant to this title shall report monthly to the Secretary of Labor, and shall cause all subcontractors to report in like manner, within 5 days after the close of each month and on forms to be furnished by the United States Department of Labor, as to the number of persons on their respective payrolls on the particular housing project, the aggregate amount of such payrolls, the total man-hours worked, and itemized expenditures for materials. Any such contractor shall furnish to the Department of Labor the names and addresses of all subcontractors on the work at the earliest date practicable.

"Penalties

"SEC. 714. (a) Any person who induces or influences a borrower hereunder to purchase or acquire property or to enter into any contract, in connection with any housing project to be financed, in whole or in part, with a loan made under this title, and willfully fails to disclose any interest, legal or equitable, which he has in such property or such contract, or any special benefit which he expects to receive as a result of such contract, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"(b) No individual, association, partnership, or corporation (except the Corporation established under this title) shall hereafter use the words 'national mortgage corporation,' or any combination of words which might reasonably lead to confuse with the National Mortgage Corporation as the name or a part thereof under which he or it shall do business. Any such use shall constitute a misdemeanor and shall be punishable by a fine not exceeding $1,000.

"(c) Whoever, for the purpose of obtaining any loan under this title, or any extension or renewal thereof or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security therefor, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Corporation under this title, makes any statement, knowing it to be false, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

"(d) Whoever (1) falsely makes, forges, or counterfeits any obligation, in imitation of or purporting to be an obligation issued by the Corporation, or (2) passes, utters, or publishes, or attempts to pass, utter, or publish, any false, forged, or counterfeited obligation purporting to have been issued by the Corporation, knowing the same to be false, forged, or counterfeited, or (3) falsely

alters any obligation issued or purporting to have been issued by the Corporation, or (4) passes, utters, or publishes, or attempts to pass, utter, or publish, as true, any falsely altered or spurious obligation issued or purporting to have been issued by the Corporation, knowing the same to be falsely altered or spurious, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(e) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Corporation, (1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to it or pledged, or otherwise entrusted to it, or (2) with intent to defraud the Corporation or any other body, politic or corporate; or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Corporation, makes a false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Corporation, or without being duly authorized draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other such obligation, or draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(f) All general criminal and penal statutes of the United States relating to public moneys, property, or employees of the United States shall apply to public moneys, property, and employees of the Corporation. No officer or employee of the Corporation shall participate in any matter affecting his personal interests or the interests of any corporation, partnership, or association in which he is directly or indirectly interested."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield for that purpose?

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose, with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will be the understanding.

The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the pending housing bill, as reported by the Banking and Currency Committee, is a sound and supportable measure, representing a program which will truly help to meet the housing needs of the United States, although it does not pretend to be and is not a measure which meets all needs.

I, myself, feel that the bill lacks some essential provisions, such as those needed to stimulate middle income housing, and I would favor an even greater authorization for public housing than is contained in the pending bill.

But the bill presents a program which does move forward, which does measure up, in some degree, to the need, and which does commit the Government to activities which will help not only the housing industry, but also the people who need housing.

Therefore, I am glad to support the measure, whose approval will constitute a very bright mark indeed upon the record of this Congress. I hope and trust that the recommendations of the Committee on Banking and Currency, as contained in the bill, will be affirmed by the Senate, and will not be exposed to stultifying or crippling amendments.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Housing, I listened to long and comprehensive testimony by experts and advocates representing every point of view in regard to the housing program.

There were those who favored a much more radical program. There were those who favored a program confined only to such activities as would help the bankers, the mortgagors, and the builders. The bill steers a middle way. It is a mild and, I may say, a moderate program. It is almost the least that we can support.

For myself and Senators HUMPHREY, DOUGLAS, MORSE, NEUBERGER, MAGNUSON, HENNINGS, KEFAUVER, MURRAY, and MCNAMARA, I introduced a comprehensive omnibus housing bill, S. 3158. My bill went much further than the pending measure. My bill was strongly supported by organized labor and by the National House Conference, for instance. I fought hard to get the provisions of that bill incorporated into the committee measure. Some of these provisions were so incorporated. Some were accepted in part. Some were rejected or put aside for the time being.

The administration also submitted a bill to us. It was a weak bill, a fix-it-yourself bill.

As I shall develop in a moment, it was a bill which paid lipservice to the proved need for public housing, for instance, but would accomplish little, if anything, to meet that need.

It was not a bill, as Administrator Cole frankly testified, adjusted or geared to any estimate of actual need. It was geared to what Administrator Cole said he believed Congress would approve. Instead of recommending what was necessary and letting us in Congress determine what we would do with those recommendations, the administration apparently decided in advance what we would decide after deliberation, and thus gave us a predigested program, based on a crystal ball prediction of what Congress would accept.

This, in my judgment, was a most cynical basis for a recommendation. I hope the Senate will now proceed to demonstrate, as the Committee on Banking and Currency already has, how cynical that recommendation was by approving a program attuned to the need instead of to a political estimate of congressional acceptability.

The committee's bill authorizes 135,000 public-housing units a year for the next 3 years, with the proviso that the President may decrease this amount to 50,000 units or raise it to 200,000 units per year if conditions of the national economy so require.

This is a minimum public-housing program. It is a program which is to be compared with the administration's recommendation of a flat 35,000 units a year for 2 years.

Housing and Home Finance Administrator Cole and Public Housing Commissioner Slusser placed themselves on record before the Housing Subcommittee in terms which clearly demonstrated the lack of justification or logic in the administration's recommended figure of 35,000 units a year.

No attempt was made by the administration's spokesmen to rationalize the 35,000-unit figure. They admitted that this figure had no relationship to the actual needs for public housing for low-income families. The 35,000 figure was arrived at in two very simple ways, first, what the administration thought it would get through the Congress, and second, what was called the demand of our cities.

It was clear from the testimony that the so-called demand from our cities was far above the figure of 35,000 units a year for 2 years. It was clearly shown that 3 or 4 of our major cities alone could utilize this amount of public housing in a very short period of time, if the program were placed on a realistic working basis between the Federal Government and our cities.

But even more arresting was the testimony by the administration's witnesses that some 262,000 families were due to be displaced from urban renewal projects now under way in 53 cities throughout the Nation. It was stated that at least half of those families scheduled to be displaced by urban renewal projects now under way are low-income families who will certainly need low-cost public housing if they are to obtain adequate shelter. This is a total of some 123,000 families. Here, on the record itself, is the undisputed fact that the administration's proposed public housing program would not even begin to meet the needs of even these families I have just mentioned. Moreover, we know that the urban renewal program has not even begun to operate on a scale commensurate with the requirements of scores, and even hundreds, of cities.

In spite of the discouragement, in spite of the very inadequate number of units that were authorized by the Congress in previous years, which discouraged cities from making applications, there were, nevertheless, filed with the Housing Administration requests for more than 550,000 units over a period of years.

Mr. Cole stated frankly before our subcommittee that the 35,000 public housing units was the amount which he believed would be approved by Congress. I say again that it is incumbent upon the administration to give committees of Congress the facts based on the actual need, and not practice crystal-ball gazing in making recommendations based on a so-called realistic estimate of what Congress might or might not approve. That is not the business of the executive branch of the Government, or any of the agencies of the executive branch of the Government.

Despite the nature of the administration's approach, the Banking and Currency Committee has recognized the minimum need for an adequate public housing program and has submitted such a program in this bill.

There are many other constructive features in the pending bill. The committee, under the leadership of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], worked out a pilot plan to help the elder-

ly citizens of our Nation by authorizing 15,000 units of public housing especially designed for elderly persons. There are also provisions for special Government stimulation for the sale and rental of privately constructed housing especially designed to meet the needs of elderly people.

This is the very first time that the Congress has made a real effort to develop a Federal program to provide housing for the elderly. There is no doubt in my mind that the problems of housing the aged citizens of our Nation are just beginning to be understood. The pending bill provides an initial program from which we can learn. I anticipate a much more expanded program of this kind in the near future.

The committee has included, in the pending bill, several important modifications in the urban renewal and slum clearance program. I, myself, have been very disappointed in the lack of progress under the present urban renewal programs.

I am convinced that the provisions included in this bill will go a long way toward establishing the urban renewal programs on a firm basis, in order that more and more of our cities and metropolitan areas will be able to receive assistance for long-range attacks on their blighted and deteriorating housing areas.

Essential to a successful urban renewal or slum clearance program is, of course, an adequate public housing program. There is no doubt in my mind that these two programs go hand in hand, and that it would be utter folly to follow the administration's approach of ignoring public housing needs, while at the same time proclaiming that the urban renewal program can cure our housing problems.

Mr. President, I want to emphasize the fact that there is absolutely no sense in urging slum clearance or urban renewal programs unless we find homes for families who are evicted by slum clearance; and it is essential that the rental of such houses must be within the means of those who have been displaced or evicted.

The one area of an overall housing program which I believe is not adequately covered in the pending bill is the problem of supplying our middle-income families with adequate housing at a price designed to meet their family budget. This is the great neglected group in our federally assisted housing programs.

In respect to this situation, as with the others, the administration witnesses testified that they were unable to supply our committee with any adequate statements or estimate of the housing needs of middle-income families.

I, myself, know that there are millions of so-called middle-income families in the United States which simply cannot afford to meet the burdens imposed upon the family budget as a result of the present high market prices on new homes. These families are not eligible for public housing, but neither can they afford the rents and the payments being asked today for available housing.

There was expert testimony in the record of the hearings that we are actually building in the United States about one-half of the housing units actually needed by our population. There are more than 7 million homes in urban areas that are unfit for human habitation, and yet are being occupied. These homes should be demolished. These houses are being occupied today by low- and middle-income families.

In my bill, S. 3158, there is proposed a middle-income housing program which would operate through a national mortgage corporation, which would stimulate, through credit and other devices, the private construction of middle-income housing. This provision for a middle-income housing program was submitted as an amendment to the pending bill during its consideration by the committee.

This amendment, as the Senator from Alabama has already stated, failed to be approved as the result of a tie 6 to 6 vote. This vital program is thus not included in the pending bill, but the very strong support this proposal had in committee, as it has in the country at large, encourages me to believe that such a program will be approved in the near future. I shall press for it. I am convinced that the direct stimulation of the construction of middle-income housing by means of a national mortgage corporation, as set forth in S. 3158, is the answer to the growing crisis in middle-income housing.

Mr. President, I was very much encouraged to hear the statement of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] that he will direct the staff of the committee to make a study during the remainder of this year on the question of middle-income housing, so that it may be offered before the committee and the Senate at the next session. Whether I shall be in the Senate next year or not, it is my very deep hope that legislation for middle-income housing will be enacted, because I know of nothing in the whole problem of housing that is more important than to provide adequate housing for our middle-income groups.

Mr. President, one of the clearest examples of the need for this type of Government program—a program which should provide the vehicle for bringing the resources of great trust funds, private pension, and retirement funds into the housing finance field—is the situation today in my own State of New York.

In New York State, Mr. President, it has been estimated that the middle one-third of the families earn between $3,750 and $5,900 a year. This, I must point out, is considerably above the national average. On the basis of spending one-fifth of their income for rent or housing payments, these families could afford to pay from $63 to $98 a month. Yet, in my State, very little housing is being built at this rental or sales level, outside of some special no-cash-subsidy housing in New York City.

The Report on Middle Income Housing in New York State, which recently was submitted to Governor Averell Harriman by the New York Housing Commissioner, Joseph P. McMurray, the former staff director of our own Banking and Currency Committee, sets forth one aspect of the magnitude of the problem. I quote from that report:

> The magnitude of the existing need for middle-income housing is shown by the amount of money needed to provide decent housing for this group. Considering only the 140,000 units which are dilapidated or lack proper plumbing, and which are occupied by middle-income families, an expenditure of about $1.8 billion would be required. Yet it is obvious that the actual need for housing families in the middle-income group is far greater than merely the replacement of the 140,000 physically substandard units.

Mr. President, this is only the problem in New York State. Unfortunately, we do not know, and Mr. Cole has frankly stated that he does not know, the situation throughout the Nation. But I believe I am safe in stating that the magnitude of the problem—if we knew all the facts—would be as great, or greater, in other States.

I believe, as I have said, that next year the Congress must adopt a middle-income housing program. It is unfortunate that this could not be done this year. The blame—and I believe the record will bear me out—lies basically with the unwillingness of the present administration to face the realities of the present housing situation, and its failure to supply the Congress with the basic facts and data in this situation.

In conclusion, let me point out that there is one additional area of the housing problem which deserves the most urgent attention of Congress and the President. I refer to the basic supply of adequate housing for minority groups in our population. There is no question that the problem of adequate housing for minority groups is intimately tied in with the adequacy of our overall housing supply. However, the minority groups suffer to a much greater extent.

Some of the provisions in the pending bill will help provide some housing for the minorities.

The committee report points out that one of the major problems confronting members of minority groups who seek to obtain adequate housing is their inability to secure mortgage financing at reasonable rates. For this reason, the committee report strongly urges President Eisenhower to use the authority which he has, and which he has already had for some time, to use for this purpose the special assistance funds of FNMA. I was greatly disappointed to find that the President has not used his authority to make these special assistance funds of FNMA available for the purchase of mortgages on behalf of minority-group members. This is a most unfortunate omission on the part of the President.

I hope the President will now follow the committee's recommendations, and will move swiftly to make this assistance available for minority-group housing.

These special assistance funds are not the entire answer to adequate housing for minority groups. In this instance, as in other instances, we were unable to obtain from Housing Administrator Cole, during the hearings, any legislative recommendations for remedying the situation, although Mr. Cole readily admitted that the problem of minority housing is one of the most pressing problems in the entire housing field.

As I have already said, Senate bill 3855 is a good housing bill. It is a bill which we can be proud to enact into law.

I hope it will be passed, as reported by the committee, without crippling amendments.

Mr. President, at this time I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 80) providing for the return to the Senate of House bill 4656, relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7678) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the 11th Annual Instrument Automation (International) Conference and Exhibit, New York, N. Y., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9429) to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

SLAUGHTER ON OUR HIGHWAYS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the slaughter on our highways continues. Last year more than 38,000 Americans were killed in automobile accidents. More than 100,000 persons were totally disabled, and about 2 million people were injured to a lesser degree. On Christmas weekend alone, over 600 persons were killed. The Memorial Day weekend looms immediately ahead. Estimates of the number who will be killed this year run up to 42,000.

The automobile has outstripped war as a killer of Americans. Since 1900 the automobile has killed about 100,000 more persons than have been killed in all the wars in our history. During a representative period during the Korean war, the armed services discovered that military personnel were sustaining more injuries from motor vehicle accidents than from the war itself.

Much of this slaughter and maiming is unnecessary and can be reduced. It is a problem that can be attacked on two fronts. First, we must endeavor to reduce the number of auto accidents. Much has been done in this direction, and the accident rate per hundred million miles of vehicular travel has steadily declined. But more can be done, and we must do it.

Second, greater safety measures can be incorporated into auto design and in safety equipment. The medical profession is much interested in the second approach, for they have to treat the casualties, many of which could be prevented by constructing safer cars. For example, one-quarter to one-third of all auto fatalities occur because the occupant is thrown out of the car through a sprung door. Many of such deaths would be prevented if door locks were installed to prevent this type of injury. Injuries and deaths caused by knobs and other projections on dashboards, by improperly designed steering wheels and steering columns, and by seats which tear loose can also be reduced by improving the design of automobiles and equipment to make them safer.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I am submitting a resolution authorizing and directing the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, or a subcommittee thereof, to make a full investigation of both methods of attack upon the vital problem of reducing automobile deaths and injuries, including: First, the extent of the danger to life and health occasioned by the incidence of automobile accidents in the United States; second, the degree to which automotive engineering and design is, or can be, a factor in increasing or decreasing the incidence of injury and loss of life resulting from such automobile accidents; third, whether, in order to prevent competitive disadvantages among automobile manufacturers in the adoption of measures and devices designed to promote the safety of occupants of automobiles which are involved in accidents, it is necessary or desirable for the Congress to enact legislation establishing uniform minimum safety standards to be observed by manufacturers in the production of automobiles; fourth, whether it is desirable and possible to formulate and secure the adoption of uniform State standards for driving licenses and the revocation thereof, and of reciprocal arrangements for the enforcement of State laws designed for accident prevention; and, fifth, such other matters relating to automobile accidents and accident prevention as the committee may deem appropriate.

Mr. President, such an investigation should be of great value in helping to further the vital cause of greater automobile safety. I hope the Senate will speedily pass this resolution so that we may proceed.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution and an article on prevention of injuries, from the Journal of the American Medical Association for November 5, 1955, be printed in the RECORD at this point. I also ask consent to have printed an address delivered on this subject at the National Convention of the National Association of Claimants' Compensation Attorneys on August 19, 1955, by a constituent of mine, Harold A. Katz.

There being no objection, the article and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREVENTION, THE ONLY CURE FOR HEAD INJURIES RESULTING FROM AUTOMOBILE ACCIDENTS

(By C. Hunter Shelden)

The physicians of this country are up in arms against the ever-increasing number of fatalities occurring daily on our streets and highways as the result of automobile accidents. The neurosurgeons are seriously involved in this crusade because they are called upon to care for the patients in critical condition with severe head injuries. Head and neck injuries account for nearly 70 percent of all auto crash fatalities. In spite of the frequency of these tragedies, I have never known a neurosurgeon who has become calloused to the distasteful task of caring for a patient with a fatal head injury. Despite the endless repetition, the reaction is always the same—frustration and anger. The feeling of utter frustration stems from the realization of our own therapeutic limitations and the knowledge that the brain, once contused beyond a specific degree, presents an irreversible reaction. General supportive measures and occasionally operative relief of gross hemorrhage will save a few patients whose injury is borderline, but the severe head injury is fatal in spite of our most concerted efforts.

The loss of each patient awakens a deep feeling of anger because we allow this to continue without any concentrated effort being made to prevent its recurrence. Automobile injuries are medical problems, and we should treat them as such. The public is not aroused only because automobile fatalities are accepted as accidental deaths. In reality, there is nothing accidental about them, except that they occur during automobile accidents. Automobile accidents and automobile injuries are not synonymous terms, even though the two are chronologically related. The accidents may occur as the result of speed, inadequate highways, poor judgment, or mechanical failure, but none of these actually causes the passenger injury. The injury occurs primarily as a result of faulty interior design of the automobile. Faulty is actually a gross understatement, as there is almost no feature of the interior design of a car that provides for safety. The doors, seats, cushions, knobs, steering wheel, and even the overhead structure are so poorly constructed from the safety standpoint that it is surprising anyone escapes from an automobile accident without serious injury. The elimination of the mechanically hazardous features of interior construction would prevent approximately 75 percent of the fatalities, or 28,500 deaths each year.

Anyone who doubts this possibility has but to watch the jalopy races throughout the country. People are attracted to these races because of the frequent crashes that occur, and they are seldom disappointed. The accidents are numerous, bizarre, and frequently involve 3, 4, or more cars. Serious injuries are rare, because the potential injury-producing factors present in the average private automobile have been eliminated. Doors are welded shut, seats welded or very rigidly fixed to the frame, all projecting knobs or handles removed, and roll bars, as well as rigid interior supports, installed. The use of seat belts, crash helmets, and shoulder harnesses also protects the driver.

STATISTICAL EVIDENCE

Every driver seems to have the idea that the automobile accident is something that may happen to the other person but never to himself. The possibility of injury or death is even more remote, and he seems to have the faculty of suppressing this unpleasant thought. However, approximately 10 percent of all automobiles on the road last year were involved in an accident—54 million cars and 5,200,000 reported accidents. As the result, approximately 1,500,000 persons were injured; thus, your chances of injury, if involved in any type of accident, are in the neighborhood of 1 in 3. If injured, you have 1 chance in 15 of receiving an injury severe enough to result in permanent total disability. Last year 100,000 persons were totally disabled. Furthermore, if injured,

you run 1 chance in 37 of being killed; last year over 38,000 persons lost at these odds. These are rather lethal statistics to refer to a so-called pleasure car.

At this point one may say that with all the elderly people driving, plus those with poor coordination, plus those with poor vision, it is no wonder that the figures are so high and look so serious. Would you be more apt to believe the statistics if they related only to a select driver group? Last year the United States Air Force lost 700 men killed in aircraft accidents, and during the same period lost 678 killed in automobile crashes. If more statistical evidence were necessary, it might be pointed out that in the past 20 years, since 1934, more than 700,000 persons have been killed in automobile crashes. In the past 50 years many thousands more have been killed in automobile accidents than have been killed in all our wars put together. Campbell[1] states that a life is lost due to the motorcar every 15 minutes around the clock, day and night, and every one-half minute someone is injured here in the United States. These figures may be more significant if the mortality is compared to such publicized diseases as poliomyelitis and tuberculosis. In 1953 the deaths from poliomyelitis numbered less than 2,000, whereas the automobile fatalities numbered some 38,000. In fact, there were more deaths that year from auto crashes than from all forms of poliomyelitis and all forms of tuberculosis put together.

STRUCTURAL DESIGN AND PREVENTION

There is no doubt that the research engineering department of any one of the major automobile companies could offer design changes that would afford greater safety. In fact, the engineers have supplied valuable ideas, but these have been incorporated in present cars only to a limited degree. The reason is that the industry apparently is governed entirely by the cost accounting division. No new idea can be adopted unless it either reduces present costs or affords a sales aspect to offset additional expenditures. The industry does not believe that safety is a sales incentive. However, safety is something we all understand and desire. It is the one feature of the future automobile that the public will accept, if given the opportunity, without the need of propaganda and expensive advertising.

Neurosurgeons are not bent on criticism of the automobile industry. Our purpose is to stimulate greater appreciation of the problem and to recommend and insist upon such design changes as are necessary based upon our clinical experience. We hope our suggestions will serve to point out the structures most in need of change and stimulate automotive engineers to concentrate greater effort on the elimination of the faulty and hazardous features in design.

Doors: From 25 to 35 percent of all automobile crash fatalities occur as the result of persons being thrown out through doors that have sprung open. The average door lock becomes disengaged if there occurs a 9/16 inch separation between the door and door frame. Imagine how trivial the accident need be to spring the body a little more than one-half inch. Inspect your own car door and see what a flimsy mechanism is employed to keep you from being thrown out onto the road. This is particularly true in the two-door hard-top coupe which lacks a center post on each side between the front and back seats. This style is very vulnerable to distortion of the body during a crash. The new four-door hard-top without a center post may prove to be the most lethal of all body styles because of the noticeable lack of structural stability through the midsection of the body.

The development of a method that would rigidly attach both doors to the outside edges of the front seat backs would hold the doors tightly shut and prevent the front seat backs from flying forward. If this door-seat arrangement were expanded to include a tight locking-together of the two front seat backs, a firm, side-to-side, bulkhead-like fixation would be afforded to the midsection of the car. In other words, it would be similar to a solid bar being placed across the midsection and fastened to the door on each side. Such an arrangement of door-seat lock has been developed. There are many ways to accomplish these same safety advantages. Our purpose in designing this method was primarily to illustrate the fact that even a medical research institute can design means of improving passenger safety. If research automotive engineers were to take up this project in earnest, one could hardly imagine the number of ingenious methods they could design for safety. Even the method shown could be installed for less money than the heater or radio, both of which have become accepted extras on most new cars.

Seats: The seats, which serve as the only real contact between passenger and automobile, have been designed purely for comfort. There has been no thought given to safety. The front seats, particularly in the two-door cars, are a disgrace to the combined engineering staffs of the automobile industry. The fixed portion of the seat is fastened to the frame only by four small bolts, which accounts for the frequent occurrence of seat failures. Inspect a few cars that have been in accidents and note the high percentage of front seats that have been torn loose from their mountings.

In addition, the trend has been toward more and more mobility of the seat to allow for adjustment in all four directions. The result is the present "four-way seat." The track on which the seat slides is not constructed to withstand the forces developed during a crash. Front and back adjustment is necessary safetywise, since it allows for better control of the steering wheel and foot pedals. However, methods could be developed that would afford adequate fixation and stability. The Ford "Thunderbird" has an adjustable steering wheel. Possibly this idea could be further developed so that the seat would remain fixed and the adjustment accomplished at the floor. The entire problem of seat fixation and seat adjustment requires restudy and redesign. Seat cushions are not securely fastened, and, during sudden deceleration, they are torn loose and thrown about the interior of the car. A flying seat cushion can cause a fatal injury. It is absurd not to have the cushions bolted in place. They are still designed as in the days when the tools and jack were stored under the seat.

Poor seat design accounts for the thousands of so-called whiplash injuries. This type of cervical spine injury usually occurs when one's car is struck from behind while waiting for a traffic signal to change. As the rear-end crash occurs, one's head is thrown backwards. Since the seat back is low (for better styling), the top of the seat serves as a fulcrum over which the neck is snapped. Terrific tearing of ligaments, muscles, and muscle attachments results. Neck fractures are not infrequent. Whiplash injuries are the most disabling of all nonfatal automobile injuries. Periods of total disability lasting from 1 to 3 years are common. The frequency of whiplash injuries is difficult to estimate, but they probably occur several hundred thousand times each year. The solution is simple. The addition of a small elevated portion directly behind one's head is all that is necessary. It need not be high enough to support the head while driving but merely high enough to give the head support if the neck is suddenly extended. Thus the back of the front seat could not act as a fulcrum, since the occiput would encounter the padded rest as the neck is extended.

Seats could be structurally improved if the backs were divided into 3 sections rather than 2. Thus either outside section could be tilted forward to allow passengers access to the rear seat, and at the same time there would be a rigid middle third section into which the tilting sections could be firmly locked to prevent forward or lateral motion during a crash. In addition to the safety factor, the two outside sections could be tilted forward at the same time to allow passengers to enter from both sides at the same time. Furthermore, this arrangement would afford a middle passenger in the front seat a comfortable seat back instead of having to lean back on the crack between the seats.

Interior projections: There has been evidence of improvement, but every dashboard still has dangerous knobs and buttons that can easily produce serious depressed skull fractures. Few people seem to realize the terrific force with which one is thrown against the dashboard. Even at 30 miles per hour, the force can equal 176 g, which is far beyond the limit of human tolerance. The average rearview mirror is rigid with sharp edges. The armrests on the front doors present a serious hazard. They may appear to be safe, but if one is thrown laterally against the door these projections may produce serious soft tissue injury. The Cadillac has a prominent knifelike projection just above the instrument panel. It was designed to prevent reflection of the instrument lights onto the windshield. To accomplish this minor task, they have produced as lethal a device as is seen on any American passenger car. Chrysler has added a new gearshift lever that projects straight out from the dashboard. This defies all concepts of passenger safety.

Steering wheels: The industry has given this much thought recently, and new designs are presently being tested that should go far toward protecting the driver. The steering-post type of chest injury should become a rare occurrence, provided the styling people do not put beauty before public safety. If these designs are adopted without too much delay, the manufacturers are to be congratulated.

Overhead construction: No stock car, to my knowledge, is equipped with any type of roll bar to prevent crushing of the passenger compartment. Fatalities from this source are not numerous, but this should not prevent the addition of such structures to every car. It would represent a small increase in the cost of the car. Certainly it is an extra that anyone would gladly accept, even at the expense of less exterior glitter. Roll bars could be incorporated in hard-top convertibles, as well as in conventional 2-door and 4-door cars. This would simply amount to the use of a tubular steel portion as the anterior frame of the rear windows. Thus, when the windows were up, this piece would become incorporated into the other portions of the roll bar located in the body and top. This would possibly not be as rigid as a solid bar from frame to frame but far safer than none. If roll bars were of little value, you could be sure that they would not be such a conspicuous feature in every accident-prone jalopy. These cars can be rolled over and over without serious damage to the top structure.

Seat belts: The use of seat belts has long been recognized as a means of passenger safety. The airlines have done much to popularize the use of belts by making them standard equipment on all planes. Recently Chrysler has announced the adoption of seat belts in their new automobiles. Seat belts at present consist of two separate straps securely fastened to the car frame or cross member. The two free ends of the belts are

[1] Campbell, H. E.: Prevention of Injuries in Airplane and Automobile Accidents. Correspondence, J. A. M. A., 157: 945 (March 12) 1955.

fastened across the passenger's lap by means of a strong buckle. When in use, the belts will withstand tremendous forces and prevent the passenger from being thrown forward against the dashboard and windshield or laterally into the tonneau or against the door during a crash. There is no doubt that seat belts in passenger cars will prevent many injuries and fatalities, if only the public will fasten them. Most people will utilize the belts during a long trip, but it is questionable whether they will routinely fasten them when driving in and around town.

Although we are staunch advocates of safety belts for passenger protection, it is likely that the present design will have to be modified before they gain universal acceptance. The use of two separate straps is a disadvantage. The free ends when not in use lie across the seat, and frequently the outside strap falls out the door as one leaves the car or falls onto the floor of the front seat. If the free ends lie on the seat and one enters the car in a hurry, he is likely to sit on the straps and drive off before remembering to fasten them. While driving he must find the two ends and place them across his lap. Then in order to fasten the seat belt he must take both hands off the wheel, and, unless he is very dexterous, he must also take his eyes off the road for a split second. More likely than not, he will decide to forego the use of the safety belt for that particular short trip.

These disadvantages can be corrected with improvement in design. A belt that rolls up when not in use would be an improvement. Possibly a single strap that could be engaged with one hand would improve the situation. At least one can be sure that until improved designs are available the public is not going to take full advantage of this means of safety. Eventually a method must be developed whereby the passenger is automatically and instantaneously restrained during a crash. Such a mechanism can be designed that will become activated by a sudden deceleration.

PUBLIC AND INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Pressure is developing that will bring about adequate improvements. Unfortunately, to date there has been much smoke but no fire. Many articles have been written, much scientific investigation has been carried on, and any number of new ideas have been developed. However, almost no progress has been made, and few new ideas have been adopted. The reason is very simple. The automobile industry states that it cannot make the necessary changes, because of production cost, until such time as the public demands them and makes known that it will accept such changes costwise. The public would gladly insist upon changes, but it is completely unaware of what changes to demand. Basically it is difficult to understand this concept. The automotive people have built their empires on public acceptance of their products. The public has welcomed with enthusiasm every constructive change offered—especially those that lessen the hazard of driving, such as windshield wipers, power windows, safety glass, blowout-proof tires, wrap-around windshield, sealed-in beam headlights, and improved dashboards. These are not purely mechanical features and do not add to the performance of the car, yet the public thinks enough of them to pay the added cost of production.

The medical profession readily agrees that the industry has continually added to the safety of the automobile through development and adoption of improved mechanical devices. Frame construction, power brakes, power steering, improved engine design, and automatic transmission are proved advances that afford greater driving efficiency and safety. Noteworthy as these changes may be, they do not improve the driver's or passenger's chances of survival during a crash. It is the aim of the medical profession to have as much concentrated effort spent on improving the safety design as is spent on the rest of the car. In fact, the need is so urgent that changes must be made immediately and to such a degree that the frightening toll of death and disability will be reduced to a minimum. It cannot be done piecemeal, a little device here and there, just enough to appease the medical profession without adding to the cost of the car.

However, it is recognized that no one company can afford to undertake an immediate and complete safety program for all its cars. Such a step might be disastrous financially if, for some reason, the company's safety methods proved to be less efficient, less pleasing to the buying public, or even more expensive than those developed a few months later by competitors. The automobile industry has an important public health and welfare problem on its hands. If it could be solved effectively by some joint action within the industry, it would prove to be a satisfactory solution of the problem. If the industry cannot rise to its responsibilities, the entire matter should be removed from its jurisdiction and be solved by methods employed in any other urgent public health problem.

The industry could decide the entire matter without outside intervention, but, considering their past performance with regard to safety devices, I doubt seriously if there is any likelihood of such an occurrence. If left to them, a new but minor change would be made each year as fitted their overall plan, as has been done in exterior styling and design. Such a delaying action may be a satisfactory policy in business but not in a matter of health and public safety. Translated into medicine, it would be comparable to withholding known methods of lifesaving value. In medicine the need is recognized and probable solutions to the problem investigated, developed, and tested. If these prove to be effective and nontoxic, they are employed immediately, even though at the moment there may be limitations to their therapeutic value.

In the case of automobile safety devices, the need is recognized and the design changes are known, but there the whole program grinds to a discouraging halt. The known hazards in interior design should be eliminated immediately. Over the years, new and better methods can be developed, tested, and installed to replace the earlier methods. Statistical studies, such as those being carried on at Cornell University by Moore and his group [2] will serve to point out additional hazards that require investigation. Every facet of automotive safety does not have to be statistically proved before improvements in design are made. Every possible source of injury should be considered and some attempts made to eliminate each particular hazard. The change this year may have to be modified in a year or two, but at least during this time the public will have had added protection. There are enough potential sources of injury in every present-day automobile to keep the designers busy indefinitely.

PREVENTION BY NATIONAL CONTROL

It is proposed that a national group be set up by the President of the United States to regulate and approve automobile safety. This group should be granted power to prevent public sale of vehicles that do not meet requirements of safety design. This group should consist of persons in all related fields, appointed on the basis of ability and experience. This arrangement would allow the industry to pool safety ideas and submit to the national committee those ideas that the manufacturers believe would afford the greatest degree of safety with the smallest cost to the public. There would be no competitive aspect to this feature of automobile construction, since adopted measures would be of standard design. There would be no financial risk, for the same production costs would be transmitted by all manufacturers directly to the public.

The protection of the public through legislative control of safety measures is an accepted part of our daily life. One cannot buy food that has not passed inspection. Drugs must be approved before being put on the market. Dangerous drugs cannot be dispensed without prescription by a licensed physician. Airlines and railroads cannot operate without fulfilling safety requirements. A new home cannot be built and occupied without passing numerous safety inspections. Automobiles cannot be driven without adequate lights and brakes, nor can they be operated by drivers who have not passed a State examination. There are countless examples of controls being exerted in behalf of public safety, yet we allow the automobile industry to continue manufacture of a product known to be faulty in safety design.

We can expect, and we will encounter, resistance to the suggestions and recommendations. However, we who see this grim pattern reenacted daily realize that it is our duty to demand that the public be protected as in any national health problem. If this Nation were confronted with an epidemic disease that took the lives of 38,000 persons in 1 year, and the medical profession did not take steps to control the situation, there would be a congressional investigation. Possibly that is the only solution to the problem of automobile deaths. However, let us hope that with concentrated effort we ourselves can effect the cure for the head injury epidemic. The only cure is prevention.

THE LIABILITY IN TORT OR WARRANTY OF AUTOMOBILE MANUFACTURERS FOR THE INHERENTLY DANGEROUS DESIGN OF PASSENGER AUTOMOBILES

(Address delivered by Harold A. Katz, of Katz & Friedman, Chicago, member of the Illinois Bar, at the national convention of the National Association of Claimants' Compensation Attorneys, at Hotel Cleveland, Cleveland, Ohio, August 19, 1955)

We of the negligence bar have been so busy seeing the trees that we have been unable to see the forest. Presented with cases of injuries due to unsafe elevator construction or from the sale of unguarded power machinery, it would immediately occur to us to sue the manufacturer for negligent design. But faced day after day with the No. 1 killer of them all—the automobile—it seems never to have occurred to us wherein lies the major cause of the steady toll of human death and destruction. It is the purpose of this paper to suggest:

(1) The principal cause of the high casualty rate in automobile accidents is to be found in the design of the automobile itself.

(2) Automobile manufacturers have negligently failed in designing automobiles to consider the safety of occupants in the event of crash or sudden stopping.

(3) Because of this negligence, these manufacturers are legally responsible for resulting injuries to occupants under both tort theory and established principles of tort law.

As lawyers, our inquiry in automobile accident cases has been directed toward determining the cause of the accident to the exclusion of the equally pertinent question as to whether the injuries may have resulted from the design of the vehicle in which our client was riding in addition to the fact

---

[2] Moore, J. O., and Tourin, B.: A Study of Automobile Doors Opening Under Crash Conditions: The Relationship Between the Opening of Front Doors and the Area of the Passenger Automobile Sustaining the Principal Impact, New York, Automotive Crash Injury Research, Department of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Cornell University Medical College, 1954.

of the collision. Recent studies by competent medical and technical investigators confirm the fact that it is perfectly possible to have accidents—even serious accidents—without injury if the automobile is designed to protect the occupants not only during customary travel but in a crash as well. The passenger car, however, is designed with little or no regard for the safety of its occupants in the event of a collision. The most recent annual report of the Automotive Crash Injury Research Project of Cornell University Medical Colleges contains the following conclusion:

"It has been found that 15 years of automobile design have produced no improvement as far as their injury potential is concerned, and the data pointedly suggest that the newer model automobiles are increasing the rate of fatalities in injury-producing accidents." [1]

Let us first consider the facts behind the conclusion before proceeding to the question of the liability of the automobile manufacturers.

Each year almost 40,000 Americans lose their lives as a result of automobile accidents, 100,000 persons sustain permanent injuries and an additional million undergo temporary disabilities.[2] One out of every six persons in this country will be the victim of a serious automobile accident.[3] In the half century since the motorcar became a part of our lives, it has caused 64,000 more deaths than all of our Nation's wars combined, including Korea.[4] In 1951, 88 percent of the deaths in the Army Air Force were caused by crash injuries—and about one-half of these deaths were due to automobile accidents.[5] Contrary to popular belief, the danger is not limited merely to speeding automobiles—87 percent of all motorists killed and injured are driving at less than 40 miles per hour.[6] About four times as many injuries occur in automobiles as a result of a crash contact of the occupant against some part of the interior of the car as are the result of an actual crushing of the person.[7] While pedestrian injuries have been steadily declining, occupant injuries have been steadily rising over the years.[8]

The failure of the automobile manufacturers to design an auto with intelligent consideration for the safety of its occupants in the event of a crash is the principal cause of the terrible toll of mortality and injury. In a crash the modern car becomes a vicious instrumentality for the destruction of its occupants, the dashboard projections and glass ready to tear your body, the windshield and rear view mirror waiting to dash out your brains * * *.[9] The way automobiles are designed, the passengers are "as vulnerable to injury as a teacup shipped loose in a barrel." [10] Engineers studying fatal accidents in Indiana in 1951 decided that at least two-thirds of the victims could have survived if the design of the car had been better.[11] Investigators at Cornell have shown that a safety belt, properly anchored to the frame, will prevent about one-half of the fatalities in auto accidents.[12] Ten percent of fatalities and 20 to 30 percent of injuries are caused because the doors pop open in the accident and the victim is thrown out of the car.[13]

The exasperating thing about this death toll is that it is not through ignorance but indifference that it continues. Airplanes have, for years, been produced with safety belts and doors that will not pop open, and the same techniques are readily adaptable to automobile construction. One-half of the deaths are due to skull injuries, yet most cars continue to be made without safety belts and without crash pads. Engineers at Cornell have produced a material, called Ensolite, so energy-absorbing that eggs dropped 150 feet onto it did not break,[14] but most auto manufacturers continue to supply the public with metal dashboards interspaced with sharp projections perfectly designed to fracture skulls. One-fourth of the deaths are due to chest injuries,[15] not surprising when one considers that the driver sits with a spear, called a steering rod, aimed at his heart, yet no real attempt is made in the design of the automobile to anchor the driver in his seat, or protect the driver by placing a crash pad over the steering wheel or by making the steering column retractable in the event of a crash, all relatively simple enginering problems if the industry were genuinely concerned over passenger safety.

Automobile manufacturers utilize their tremendous resources and their brilliant array of engineering talent to enhance the appearance of their product, to boost the horsepower and improve the compression ratio of the engines, and to make driving effortless by power equipment. They do everything except apply the intelligence of the average schoolboy to protecting the lives of the people who ride in their automobiles. This should not be interpreted as any lack of recognition of the tremendous accomplishments of the motor industry. Rather, their brilliant achievements in the field of styling, power, and production methods point up their lack of interest in the area of occupant safety. Each year they improve the acceleration and ignore what happens to the occupants in the event of sudden deceleration. It has fallen by default to interested outside groups to study what does happen in the case of sudden deceleration of an automobile. This is the essence of the safety problem, for the forces to which we are exposed and which do the damage are almost always decelerative forces—the forces that stop the forward motion of our bodies as the car comes to a sudden halt.[16] In abrupt deceleration the occupant continues to move forward at approximately the speed of the automobile in the instant preceding the accident, until being stopped by impact against the steering wheel, windshield, or dashboard.[17]

Exhaustive studies at Cornell University and elsewhere prove conclusively that in most fatal accidents, the forces involved were within the physiologic limits of the body's ability to withstand them without injury.[18]

You will recall that on Monday, John O. Moore, director of automotive crash research at Cornell University Medical College, in his speech to this convention, pointed out that the risk of injury from a blow to the body increased as the area of the blow decreased. He illustrated this by comparing a blow to the head from a relatively large object, such as a wastebasket, to a blow of equal force from an ordinary hammer. He said that the latter might kill the person while the same blow from the larger object, not concentrated into a small body area, might cause no permanent disability. The same principle applies with great pertinency to the automobile steering rod and wheel, which, as has been pointed out, is often struck by the driver with great lethal force in a collision. Ideally the full steering wheel should absorb and spread the impact both because of the medical principle just referred to, and the obvious fact that the steering rod is directly aimed at the vital human organs in the chest which should be protected at all cost. So what do the manufacturers do to protect the driver? The next time you are in an automobile look about you, and you will see the extent to which this elementary medical principle is disregarded in automobile design in an industry which spent $1 million on 1955 models. On one of the "big three" cars in the low-priced field the steering rod is extended approximately 3 inches above the wheel so that the wheel cannot serve to spread and cushion the impact and to act as a guard against the steering rod in the event of a sudden deceleration. In another manufacturer's quality model in the low-priced field, the top of the steering rod is rounded into a pointed end. You visualize what will happen to the driver whose chest, traveling at 30 miles an hour or more, strikes either of those steering rods in a sudden crash.

We come now to the crux of our problem. Suppose that a widow walks into our office, her husband having been the victim of an accident, killed by a steering rod through his chest or by his head having struck a dashboard projection or by having been hurled through a door which opened on impact in the crash. We have not thought in terms of liability of a manufacturer in such situations. The proposition advanced by this paper is that nothing in law or fact insulates the automobile manufacturer from liability not only for defects in construction, which we have long recognized, but as well for the creation of unnecessary risk by the marketing of an automobile not reasonably designed to protect the safety of its occupants.

The danger that we face as specialists in injury litigation is that our very familiarity with rules of law and categories of liability will make us forget the essential principles on which all tort liability rests. It is the interplay of these principles, applied by courts to new facts in an everchanging social scene that has always resulted in expanding areas of liability. The categories of negligence are never closed. We must avoid the temptation of the tyranny of labels, to think of manufacturer's liability only in terms of defective brakes or faulty material or the failure to inspect. These are only evidence of the negligence. The

[1] Annual Report, April 1, 1954, to March 31, 1955, prepared for the Commission on Accidental Trauma of the Armed Forces Epidemiological Board, by the Automotive crash injury research project of the Cornell University Medical School (1955). The Cornell group has done the basic research work in this field over a period of 3 years on an aggregate budget of approximately $880,000.

[2] Journal of the American Medical Association, June 11, 1955, 482.

[3] Wenger, Don S., Must You Die in an Automobile Accident? p. 1. (Speech delivered November 16, 1954, to clinical congress of the American College of Surgeons at Atlantic City, N. J.)

[4] Campbell, Horace E., The Prevention of Injuries in Automobile Accidents, p. 1. (Speech delivered November 16, 1954, to clinical congress of the American College of Surgeons at Atlantic City, N. J.)

[5] Wenger, op. cit. supra, p. 1.

[6] From the findings of the Cornell University Aeronautical Laboratory, as quoted in an advertising folder for the Hickok car crash safety belt, captioned "Death To Take Holiday for Motorists This Year."

[7] Ibid.

[8] Letter from National Safety Council, Chicago, dated June 14, 1955.

[9] Wenger, op. cit. supra, p. 2.

[10] Wenger, ibid., p. 3.

[11] Dye, Edward R., Cornell University tests, etc., Woman's Day (November 1954), p. 85.

[12] See footnote 5.

[13] Dye, op. cit. supra, pp. 86, 89.

[14] Paul, Elmer C., The Prevention of Injuries in Automobile Accidents, p. 1. (Speech delivered November 16, 1954, to Clinical Congress of the American College of Surgeons, Atlantic City, N. J.)

[15] Wenger, op cit. supra, p. 1.

[16] Wenger, ibid., at p. 3.

[17] Livingstone, R. G., Automobile Collision Injuries, Surgery, vol. 36, p. 1059 (December 1954).

[18] Bulletin of the American College of Surgeons, vol. 40, No. 3 (May–June 1955), pp. 157–58.

test is whether the defendant has created an unreasonable risk.[19] The factors which enter into this determination are, first, the likelihood of harm to the plaintiff from the defendant's act or failure to act, including both the chance of harm and the gravity of the harm; and, second, the social utility of the particular act or omission which is challenged as negligent, including the alternatives which were available to the defendant to avoid such liability and the question of whether notice was given to the defendant of such dangerous conditions.[20] It is submitted that applying these criteria to the subject here under discussion, liability should be found to exist. It is obvious that the placing of millions of automobiles on the road by automobile manufacturers without utilizing in the slightest their tremendous engineering resources to design the safest practicable car constitutes the most stupendous creation of risk and neglect of duty in modern times. Put in human terms, based on the estimates of disinterested investigators, this neglect results annually in the unnecessary deaths of 18,000 Americans.

When one considers the value which we place on even a single human life, the enormity of the wrong becomes apparent. Through the peculiar genius of Anglo-Saxon law, however, working through its greatest instrument for the imposition of social responsibility—the damage suit—the automobile manufacturers can be made to do what one leading doctor recently implored them to do—"to get out of the rut worn deep by 50 years of unimaginative thinking."[21] Our brethren in the medical field have recently awakened to this appalling situation, and the American College of Surgeons and the American Medical Association have called upon the automobile manufacturers to devote their attention to making the automobile safer.[22] I commend such action by these medical groups, which, like our own resolution of yesterday which we adopted urging an increased emphasis on accident prevention, represents a real tribute to the unselfishness of our two great professions. While we concede that our medical brethren may understand better than we the cause and effect of injury, we as lawyers are perhaps more cognizant of what motivates the corporation to act. Suffice it to say that, to the modern corporation, a resolution is a far less potent instrument for social persuasion than a lawsuit. We in this organization, embracing as it does the leading personal-injury lawyers in the United States, have it within our power to be the catalytic agent for savings in human life of such magnitude that it staggers the contemplation. History teaches us that there is no greater incentive for eliminating danger to human life and for improving the quality of products than the threat of legal liability. When to this is added plaintiff's attorneys of the caliber of NACCA's membership—several thousand experienced trial lawyers situated throughout the 48 States—the persuasion should be adequate to accomplish the task of securing improvements in automobile design to safeguard human life. It was, after all, the imposition of liability on employers for industrial injuries that gave impetus to the movement for plant safety. In view of the obvious fact that years would be required under any circumstances to replace existing autos, some who have been maimed may be able to place the cost of their injury where it properly belongs.

We have reviewed the factual evidence which must constitute the background of our proof. We have examined the underlying considerations on which tort liability is based. We know, however, that in the lawsuit and in the brief we must depend for our support on actual decisions and rules of law. It is to these that we now turn.

Our title suggests a consideration as to whether liability should be grounded in tort or in warranty. The problem of privity is so limiting in warranty[23] and the problems of proof so technical[24] that, in spite of warranty's limited usefulness in certain situations,[25] we must look principally to the law of torts. In the words of Mr. Justice Cordozo:

"We have put the source of liability where it ought to be. We have put its source in law."[26]

The general rule of a manufacturer's liability has been thus set forth by the Restatement of Torts:

"A manufacturer who fails to exercise reasonable care in the manufacture of a chattel which, unless carefully made, he should recognize as involving an unreasonable risk of causing substantial bodily harm to those who lawfully use it for a purpose for which it is manufactured and to those whom the supplier should expect to be in the vicinity of its probable use, is subject to liability for bodily harm caused to them by its lawful use in a manner and for a purpose for which it is manufactured."[27]

It is clear that the manufacturer's negligence may lie in unsafe design as well as unsafe construction.[28] Moreover, the failure to provide a safety device on a machine or the failure to make it more safely may constitute negligence. Thus, in *O'Connell* v. *Westinghouse X-Ray Corp.* (41 N. E. 2d 177 (1942)), the court held that the question of whether the defendant was negligent in failing to provide a method on the machine whereby amperage could be gradually reduced presented questions of fact for the jury. Even though deciding in favor of the defendant in an action brought against a farm implement manufacturer for injuries suffered when a tractor seat broke, the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals set forth the manufacturer's duty as follows:

"Its duty was to use reasonable care in employing designs, selecting materials, and making assemblies * * * which could fairly meet any emergency of use, which could reasonably be anticipated."[29]

Certainly, it cannot be doubted that the threat of sudden deceleration, either to prevent an accident or because of an accident, is "an emergency of use which could reasonably be anticipated." Nor can it be doubted that automobile manufacturers have not failed "to use reasonable care in employing designs" and "selecting materials" which could fairly meet any such emergency.

The fact that other manufacturers may market products comparable in design has been held not controlling on the question of negligence based on unsafe construction and design.[30]

If the manufacturer concedes that he was aware of safer designs he places himself in a difficult position. If, on the other hand, the manufacturer contends that he was free from negligence because he was not aware of a safer method of design he would appear to be placing himself in an unenviable position. One is reminded of the story told by Lincoln of the young man who murdered his mother and father and then asked clemency from the court on the ground that he was an orphan. The manufacturer cannot rely on a plea of ignorance as a basis for nonliability. Rather, the plea of ignorance is an admission of liability. In the words of the restatement, the manufacturer must make "such inspections and tests during the course of manufacture and after the article is completed as the manufacturer should recognize as reasonably necessary to secure the production of a safe article."[31] Certainly the manufacturer is in a better position than the consumer to make such tests and to use such talent as would be required to market the safest practicable automobile.[32] Moreover, the impracticability of placing the duty of designing safe automobiles on anyone other than the industry is pointed up by the obvious fact that only the manufacturers can change the design of automobiles.

We have sought to suggest a line of approach for holding automobile manufacturers responsible for injuries caused by negligence in the design of passenger cars. We recognize that we have raised more questions than we have answered, but that has been the purpose of the paper. We are aware that some problem of proof may exist in seeking to show the extent to which the injury is a result of the collision and the extent to which it results from negligent design. This, however, would appear to be a problem for the jury in apportionment of damages, not unlike the situations where the jury must decide the extent of injury resulting from each of two accidents occurring moments apart. It is submitted that the negligence of the automobile manufacturers has been so patent, their attitude toward the destructive potential of their product so cavalier,[33]

---

[19] "Every person is negligent when, without intending to do any wrong, he does such an act or omits to take such a precaution that under the circumstances present he, as an ordinarily prudent person, ought reasonably to foresee that he will thereby expose the interests of another to an unreasonable risk of harm." Rosenberry, C. J., in *Obsorne* v. *Montgomery* (203 is. 233, 242, 234, N. W. 372, 379 (1931)).

[20] Fleming, James, Jr., Nature of Negligence, 3 Utah L. Rev. 275 et seq. (1953); Warren Seavey, Principles of Torts, 56 Harv. L. Rev. 72 et seq. (1942).

[21] Campbell, op. cit. supra, p. 1.

[22] The tenor of the response of the General Motors Corp. to the resolution of the American College of Surgeons was that the doctors should stick to medicine and leave auto designing to the auto manufacturers.

[23] *Chanin* v. *Chevrolet Motor Co.*, 89 F. 2d 889 (CCA 7, 1937); *Grant* v. *Australian Knitting Mills* (1936) A. C. 85 (P. C.).

[24] *Murphy* v. *Plymouth Motor Corp.*, 100 P. 2d 30 (Wash., 1940); *Ford Motor Co.* v. *Wolber*, 32 F. 2d 18 (CCA 7, 1929).

[25] *Baxter* v. *Ford Motor Co.*, 168 Wash. 456, 12 P. 2d 409; *G. M. C. Truck Co.* v. *Kelley*, 231 p. 882 (1924); see also Gussin, Manufacturers' Liability—Warranty—Contributory Negligence, in Bell, *Trial and Tort Trends Through 1954*, p. 227.

[26] *MacPherson* v. *Buick Motor Co.*, 217 N. Y. 382, 390 (1916).

[27] *Restatement of the Law of Torts*, sec. 395, p. 1073.

[28] *United States Radiator Corp.* v. *Henderson*, 68 F. 2d 87 (CCA 10, 1933); Cf. *Ford Motor Co.* v. *Wolber*, 32 F. 2d 18 (CCA 7, 1929).

[29] *Davlin* v. *Henry Ford & Son*, 20 F. 2d 317 (CCA 6, 1927).

[30] *United States Radiator Corp.* v. *Henderson*, 68 F. 2d 87 (CCA 10, 1933).

[31] *Restatement of the Law of Torts*, p. 1075.

[32] *Cf. Caudry Motors* v. *Brannon*, 268 S. W. 2d 627.

[33] An anguished father, who wrote General Motors after his young son had lost his front teeth on striking the dashboard in a sudden deceleration, pleading that something should be done to prevent this kind of accident, was solemnly advised by a General Motors' safety official that he had solved the problem in his own family by teaching his children to extend their arms as a brace on command. To expect to achieve safety by relying on youthful arms suddenly to restrain the forward motion of a body accelerating at speeds in excess of 30 miles per hour indicates, to say the least, an unusual approach to safety, which to this author seems in approach to be not unlike designing an automobile without brakes but with openings in the floorboard so that the occupants, on command of the driver, will drag their feet on the ground in order to restrain the forward motion of the car in the event of a sudden need to stop the vehicle.

that if the plaintiff presents enough facts to get to the jury a favorable verdict is to be anticipated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 270), submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation and study of (1) the extent of the danger to life and health occasioned by the incidence of automobile accidents in the United States, (2) the degree to which automative engineering and design is, or can be, a factor in increasing or decreasing the incidence of injury and loss of life resulting from such automobile accidents, (3) whether, in order to prevent competitive disadvantages among automobile manufacturers in the adoption of measures and devices designed to promote the safety of occupants of automobiles which are involved in accidents, it is necessary or desirable for the Congress to enact legislation establishing uniform minimum safety standards to be observed by manufacturers in the production of automobiles, (4) whether it is desirable and possible to formulate and secure the adoption of uniform State standards for driving licenses and the revocation thereof, and of reciprocal arrangements for the enforcement of State laws designed for accident prevention, and (5) such other matters relating to automobile accidents and accident prevention as the committee may deem appropriate. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4656) relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 5862. An act to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation; and

H. J. Res. 261. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to donate surplus supplies and equipment for memorial purposes to The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.

HOUSING AMENDMENTS OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3855) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 49, it is proposed to insert the following after line 25:

(c) Section 401 (c) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) A loan to an educational institution may be in an amount not exceeding the total development cost of the facility, as determined by the Administrator; shall be secured in such manner and be repaid within such period, not exceeding 50 years, as may be determined by him; and with respect to loan contracts entered into after the date of enactment of the housing amendments of 1956 shall bear interest at a rate equal to the total of one-quarter of 1 percent per annum added to the rate of interest then chargeable by the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in subsection (e) of this section."

(d) Section 401 (e) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking the second sentence and substituting the following: "Such notes or other obligations issued to obtain funds for loan contracts entered into after the effective date of the housing amendments of 1956 shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury which shall be not more than the annual rate for each calendar quarter as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury by estimating the average yield to maturity, on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations or prices during the month of February or May or August or November, as the case may be, next preceding each such calendar quarter, on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a maturity date of 15 or more years from the first day of such month of February or May or August or November, and by adjusting such estimated average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent."

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I modify my amendment on page 1, line 8, and page 2, line 1, by striking out the words "contracts entered into after the date of enactment of the Housing Amendments of," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "applications filed on or after May 1."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). The Senator so modifies his amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PAYNE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it the intention of the Senator from Maine, with the amendment, to provide that all applications which are existent are not to be affected?

Mr. PAYNE. That is correct. All applications which were filed prior to May 1 with the Housing Commission under the college housing program, and which are in the process of screening at the present time, would be processed under the existing law.

I shall try to be reasonably brief with my remarks, because I believe the issue is fairly clear.

The college housing loan program has been in operation for 5 years. The merit of this program is unquestionable. Without a program of this type, quonset huts and similar facilities might well be the rule rather than the exception for campus living. The college housing loan program has given tremendous impetus to the construction of proper dormitory housing for the young men and women in our colleges and universities.

Last year in the Housing Act amendments of 1955, the interest rate on Government loans in the college housing loan program was lowered from 3¼ to 2¾ percent. Since that time participation of private funds in the loan program has been negligible. Experience has demonstrated that private financing is not available for bonds bearing 2¾ percent interest regardless of their maturity. Only one issue has been privately financed under this formula.

It is believed that it is appropriate that the Congress at this time determine precisely what role the Federal Government is to play in the college housing loan program. Is the Federal Government to act as the sole supporter of college housing construction, or is the role of the Federal Government to encourage private financing to the greatest extent possible and to fill the gap where private financing is not available or is beyond the financial means of the college or university? In my opinion, the original intent of the college housing loan program was to provide assistance in college housing construction, but not to assume full responsibility for this construction. If it were clearly demonstrated that private capital would not be available at rates the colleges and universities could afford then I would certainly feel that it would be necessary to maintain a direct loan program through the Federal Government.

It is important at this time to point out that private capital would be available for colleges and universities at rates they can afford if the college housing loan program did not provide interest rates so low that private capital has been virtually eliminated from the program. By increasing the interest rate on the loans which the college housing loan program makes available to colleges and universities, it will be possible both to stimulate the flow of private capital into the program and to insure that the construction of college housing continues at a rate commensurate with the demands of our growing college population.

A failure to stimulate the flow of private capital into the college housing loan program will mean a Federal program of a size not contemplated by the Congress when it initiated this program. It has been estimated that by 1965 increased enrollments will require additional housing construction for students,

their dependents, and additional faculty amounting to $4 billion. If private capital is no longer available for financing this construction the Federal Government will have to assume the responsibility for this program in its entirety.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. PAYNE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am unable to understand why, if there is a need for $4 billion, and if the bill is passed providing for $750 million by the Federal program, the balance is not there for private capital to take up.

Mr. PAYNE. The need for the construction, as the Senator from Arkansas well knows, is urgent among many of the colleges and universities. These colleges and universities are often unable to go into the private market at the present time on their own because of the 50-year period in which the loans have to be amortized. Private funds normally are not available for a 50-year term. That is why this program is so valuable; that is why it makes it possible for these educational institutions to be able to get a loan, because the Federal Government takes up the remainder of the 20-year or 30-year maturities the private institutions are unable to float at reasonable rates, and makes up the difference by taking the balance of the long-term maturities.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the program is limited, and is intended to be useful for those who cannot get housing in the open market, I cannot understand why it interferes with those who are limited to $750 million. Why will this interfere with private capital taking up the balance between $750 million and $4 billion?

Mr. PAYNE. Because, under the situation with which we are faced, I am sure the Senator knows very well indeed that if the part of the program on the Federal level is not put on a realistic basis, we are simply going to face the problem in the coming years, when there will be an increased demand upon the Congress of the United States, to expand the entire program in order to facilitate the payments of the educational institutions, and to do it at the Federal level. If that is what Congress wants, then, certainly, that is what we should do, but it has never been the intent of Congress that the Federal Government should completely underwrite this program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will say to the Senator that it certainly is not intended for the Federal Government to do it all, although I see no objection to doing a big part of it, if it does not cost the Government additional money.

Mr. PAYNE. When we freeze the rate at 2¾ percent, and the going market rate for Government money at the present time is higher than that, then, in effect, we are subsidizing in another way.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall have more to say about that in my own speech. At present I think the Senator is in error. We are not subsidizing the program. The cost of money to the Government is included in the program. But I shall discuss that in my own time. I still am unable to understand why the program of $750 million would interfere with the balance. If we should wash the program out completely, what would be the effect?

Mr. PAYNE. Would not the Senator say that if the Government establishes its rate substantially lower than that at which private enterprise is willing to offer money, the pressures are going to be continually laid upon the Congress, and the statement will be made, "You have done it for this, that, or some other university, and we are as much entitled to it as are others."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that observation can be made regarding every program in which the Government participates. In all fields of public works people say, "If you built a dam over there, why not build one here?" I can think of no Government program about which that observation could not be made.

Mr. PAYNE. Under the veterans' housing program and the other housing programs are we going to penalize the veterans of the country and give to educational institutions a far better break in the interest rate——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is private money under Government insurance.

Mr. PAYNE. But it is insured by the Government; otherwise it would not be privately available in some instances.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think the programs are comparable. They were set up on a completely different basis. I think the need and the justification are also on a different basis. The point I wanted to make was with reference to the reason which leads one to say that this must necessarily be a completely federally financed program if we leave the interest rate where it is. That appears to me to be a nonsequitur. There is to be a revolving fund. As the money is paid back it will be reloaned. I do not know whether $750 million is enough. That is for Congress to determine. The only reason why we ask for that amount at this time is that the present funds will be exhausted by the end of 1957. As to the need, no one denies it.

Mr. PAYNE. No one would deny it. No thinking person in the entire Nation would for one moment say that there is not a very immediate need, in the interest of education at universities and colleges, to see that adequate and proper dormitory and housing facilities are constructed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The bill is an effort to accomplish that. If the Senator feels that some institutions which have good credit and can get money in the private market should not be permitted to participate in the program, I would be interested in a program that could apply rationally to these loans on a basis of need. But I do not think we should penalize them all by raising interest rates.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, so long as we have reached this point in the discussion—and I shall try not to take much longer—I hope my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who is on his feet, will permit me to get this particular question taken care of.

Mr. President, I wish to introduce a table, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Bond issues processed by HHFA but sold to other investors

Institution [1]	Date of bond sale	Amount [2]	Term (years)	Interest rate
		Thous.		
January-June 1954:				
Western State College (Colorado)	February 1954	$181	[3] 20	3.60
Wisconsin State College	March 1954	1,650		3.00
Montana State University	do	169	[3] 20	3.20
Western Illinois State College	do	550	35	3.39
Southern State College (Arkansas)	April 1954	515	31	3.50
Bowling Green State University (Ohio)	do	2,350	39	3.37
Central Washington College of Education	do	310	20	3.15
Ball State Teachers College (Indiana)	May 1954	2,856	35	3.48
Arkansas State College	do	460	30	3.19
Arkansas Polytechnic College	June 1954	849	32	3.40
University of Arkansas	do	450	31	3.125
University of Texas	do	3,402	40	2.99
Montana State College	do	4,600	36	2.75–3.75
July-December 1954:				
Eastern Kentucky State College	July 1954	450	25	3.05
New Mexico College of Agricultural and Mechanical Arts	do	1,050	30	3.57
Pueblo Junior College (Colorado)	do	200	20	4.00
University of Michigan	August 1954	2,200	30	2.25–3.25
University of Kentucky	September 1954	447	[3] 30	2.94
University of Idaho	do	395	[3] 20	3.11
Utah State Agricultural College	December 1954	600		3.45
Texas College of Arts and Industries	do	750	40	3.50
January-June 1955:				
Western Washington College of Education	March 1955	461		3.25
University of Maryland	do	1,282	[3] 20	3.14
West Virginia University	do	600	30	2.84
University of New Mexico	April 1955	1,000	30	3.15
Arizona State College	May 1955	1,000		[4] 3.25
University of Arizona	do	1,000		[4] 3.25
July-December 1955:				
Southwestern Louisiana Institute	July 1955	1,875	30	3.50
University of Texas	do	2,512	39	3.29
University of Idaho	October 1955	2,000	20	[4] 2.97
January-June 1956:				
University of Nebraska	February 1956	3,750	30	3.39
Winona State Teachers College (Minnesota)	do	635	30	[4] 3.00
St. Cloud State Teachers College (Minnesota)	do	840	30	[4] 3.00
Mankato State Teachers College (Minnesota)	do	840	30	[4] 3.00

[1] Public institutions of higher learning.
[2] Amount of bonds sold, may include projects not processed by HHFA.
[3] HHFA purchased remaining maturities.
[4] Purchased by State trust funds.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, the table which I have introduced for the RECORD is placed there purposely to show conclusively the fall-off in private participation under the college housing program since the adoption of the unrealistic interest rate of 2¾ percent.

During the calendar year 1954, when the HHFA rate on these loans was on a comparable basis of 3½ percent, 21 bond issues processed by HHFA, totaling $24.4 million, were sold to private investment under the procedures of the program. In the next 7 months, also on the same comparable basis of 3½, another 8 issues totaling $9.7 million, were sold to private investment.

Since the establishment of the unrealistic interest rate of 2¾ percent, an 8-month period, a total of 5 issues were sold, 4 of them to State funds, which means that only 1 issue, that of the University of Nebraska, amounting to $3.75 million, was sold to private investment. Several applications from Oregon State colleges have also been withdrawn, but these are general obligation bonds and when sold are expected to carry a rate of less than 2¾ percent. Oregon is one of the few States which pledge the credit of the State to finance dormitory construction; most State colleges and universities can issue only revenue bonds. The picture is clear that the program of private participation developed by HHFA had made great progress in substantially broadening the market for college housing bonds prior to the establishment of the 2¾ percent rate. The 2¾ percent rate has stifled private participation which means that the much-needed college-housing program will have to be financed almost exclusively by the Federal Treasury.

Now, I shall be very glad to yield to my very good friend from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to ask the Senator from Maine if I am correct in my understanding that the bill now before the Senate provides that the interest rate shall be the average rate on all Government securities, short term as well as long term, plus one-fourth of 1 percent for risk and administration, whereas the Senator from Maine is proposing that it should be the yield on obligations running more than 15 years, plus one-fourth of 1 percent; and that in practice, under the existing rates, this would mean the difference between 2¾ percent under the Fulbright formula and approximately 3⅛ percent under the Payne formula.

Mr. PAYNE. The Senator from Illinois has stated the situation correctly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask my good friend from Maine whether the result of his amendment would not be to make it very difficult for the colleges which are weak financially, whose students are not very affluent and cannot pay very much rent, to take advantage of Federal loans? Is it not true that the colleges of the Ivy League and colleges whose students are well to do can, if they wish, go into the open market and borrow money to finance the building of dormitories, and that the funds so borrowed will be repaid out of rents? Therefore, in effect, would not the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine make it extremely difficult for the financially weak colleges and the colleges which have poor students—when I say "poor," I do not mean poor in academic ability, but poor in purse—to participate in such a program?

Mr. PAYNE. I can truthfully say I do not believe that would be the case at all. I realize, of course, that one can stand up and make a very impassioned plea based on the fact that 90 cents or a dollar a month, which might be the increased amount which would have to be levied against the individuals or students of whom the Senator from Illinois speaks, who would pay the rent, would be a penalty. But I would not say that 90 cents to a dollar a month would seriously prevent any of those young men or women from being able to continue their studies.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Maine was very assiduous in his attendance at the hearings and was most faithful in the performance of his duty. I am certain he remembers the testimony of the vice president of Dartmouth, which is a center of rugged individualism, who testified that the higher interest rate would cost his students from $25 to $30 a year more for room rent. Even at Dartmouth, which, in the main, has wealthy students, 25 percent of the student body are in attendance on scholarships, so such an increase would be a hardship.

Is not that testimony from the rock-bound hills of New Hampshire in favor of a lower interest rate an argument for the Fulbright amendment rather than an argument for the amendment of the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. PAYNE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Is not the philosophy of the Senator's amendment simply to make an adjustment which would provide that the United States in lending the money would not lend it at a rate which would constitute a grant-in-aid to anyone who was able to borrow money below the cost to the United States Government? Is not the purpose of the Senator's amendment to give the Treasury an opportunity to fix the interest rate on a basis at which the Government can come out even? It is not a question of subsidizing education or discriminating among institutions; it is purely a question of protecting the Treasury, is it not?

Mr. PAYNE. The Senator has expressed the purpose very clearly. That is definitely the point.

May I ask my good friend from Illinois, who was speaking of the rugged situation, just what his expression was?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I said the testimony from the rugged, rockbound Republican hills of New Hampshire against the proposal of the Senator from Maine was an eloquent tribute to the proposal coming from the Ozarks in the State of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. PAYNE. The Senator from Illinois, having come originally from one of those rugged, rock bound States of the East; namely, my home State of Maine, knows that we usually look at these things fairly realistically.

While it is true that I recall a statement made by the vice president of Dartmouth, nevertheless, the facts which have been given to me—and I do not claim that they are completely correct; I would not stand here and say to the Senator from Illinois that they are, because I have not had a chance to analyze them countrywide—indicated that the average increased cost which might possibly be incurred—and these figures have been given to me as being probably the top—would be 90 cents to a dollar a month because of the change that might take place in the rate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PAYNE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator is basing his statement on the ground that what is proposed is a subsidy and a grant-in-aid from the Federal Government, I would be very much interested in hearing how he arrives at that conclusion. The cost of money to the Federal Government, as I understand, under the formula in existing law, is to be the average interest rate on Government securities plus one-fourth of 1 percent.

How did the Senator from Maine arrive at the conclusion, in his colloquy with the Senator from Connecticut, that this is a subsidy? Wherein is it a subsidy out of the taxpayers' pocket?

Mr. PAYNE. In the first place, I had no colloquy with the Senator from Connecticut, other than to say that I thought the Senator from Connecticut had stated the facts relatively clearly.

If my good friend, the Senator from Arkansas, has a question in mind relative to the statement made by the Senator from Connecticut, I should be happy to yield to the Senator from Connecticut, in order that he might answer the question of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Maine did not take the responsibility for that erroneous statement.

Mr. PAYNE. I am not positive that it was an erroneous statement. I suggest that the Senator withhold his question until the Senator from Connecticut might have the privilege of answering his question. I am willing to yield for that purpose.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should be very much pleased to have the Senator from Connecticut point out wherein the rate as carried in the bill is a grant-in-aid to the borrower.

Mr. BUSH. I simply say to the Senator from Arkansas, that any time the Government borrows money at one rate and lends it at a lower rate than the cost of the money to the Government, that constitutes a subsidy to some borrower.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think the Senator is talking about this bill. The formula which the bill continues is that the rate to be charged will go up or down according to the average rate which the Government pays on all its borrowing, plus one-fourth of 1 percent.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Arkansas knows perfectly well, I feel certain, he being the chairman of the committee, that the purpose of the amendment under discussion is to identify the

loans contemplated with long-term loans, which they are. The amendment provides that they may run for 50 years.

What we are saying is that Treasury should use loans of 15 years and longer in calculating the average on which they will base the interest rate; that they should use the long-range interest rate as a basis for lending money. The Senator from Arkansas does not consider that unbusinesslike, does he?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Arkansas cannot agree with the Senator from Connecticut as to what the cost of the money is. All the dollars which the Federal Government borrows are indistinguishable. At all times it has money borrowed for long and short periods; and the average cost is to be paid in this instance.

Let me give the Senator another example——

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I cannot accept the premise at all that all loans are of equal interest value. The Senator knows that short-term loans command a larger rate of interest.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not say they were all the same. I said there was no subsidy, from the point of view of the Federal Government. Interest is being said which is equivalent to the average interest on all the money the Government borrows. In addition, to substantiate that very fact——

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a moment, I want to have this cleared up. The rate is based upon the average yield on all the money the Government borrows as the Senator from Arkansas has indicated.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What the pending bill would continue is a formula based upon the average rate on all the money that is borrowed by the Treasury.

Let me give the Senator one further example. The Federal Government borrows, in effect in perpetuity, money from the old-age and survivors insurance fund at the same rate we are going to lend money to the schools; only they will pay an extra one-quarter of 1 percent. There is an amount of $18 billion on which the Federal Government pays about 2½ percent. The formula that is used in arriving at the interest rate we pay to that fund we use in arriving at the interest rate for college housing loans. They also pay an additional one-quarter of 1 percent for administration costs.

I am unable to see where it is any subsidy of the Government in the sense that this is a grant-in-aid of the taxpayers of the country. It is no such thing. Why the Senator from Maine or the Senator from Connecticut would like the Federal Government to make a profit out of loans to educational institutions is beyond me. I do not think the Government should make a profit. We ought to be satisfied if the Government is reimbursed.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, does the Senator from Maine have the floor?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I have the floor. I yielded to the Senator from Connecticut so that he might answer the question of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PAYNE. In order that someone else may get into the discussion, and provided I do not lose my right to the floor, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island, with that understanding.

Mr. PASTORE. With that understanding, I should like to ask a question. Did we not on yesterday do precisely what has been stated, when the Senate adopted the Carlson amendment? The interest the Government pays for money borrowed out of the funds is based on the average rate of interest. We made such provision with respect to the money the Government borrows from the funds being raised by contributions of employees of the Federal Government. We did that yesterday.

Mr. PAYNE. I think that, in some sense at least, further amplifies the fact that the amendment I have offered very closely ties in with what the Senate adopted yesterday.

Mr. BUSH. The question is very simple. It is whether we are going to reimburse the Government at interest rates which are paid for long-term money or not. The amendment of the Senator from Maine provides that for long-term loans, interest rates should be paid which are commensurate with long-term interest rates. The Senator from Arkansas says "No"; that they should be averaged with loans for 2 months, 90 days, 15 or 30 years. That is not the philosophy of the amendment. The philosophy of the amendment is that if long-term money is borrowed, long-term interest rates should be paid. That is in the interest of the taxpayers.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For how long a period are the loans from the old-age and survivors' insurance fund?

Mr. BUSH. I shall not try to answer that question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is for perpetuity, and the interest rate is 2½ percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I yield, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Connecticut was, and perhaps still is, one of the most eminent bankers in the country. May I ask him if it is not true that by far the major portion of Government indebtedness is in the form of short-time issues, such as 30 days, 60 days, 90 days, and 1 year?

Mr. BUSH. I have not checked those figures lately. There has been an effort made to lengthen the maturity date, in order to get away from inflationary trends of the financing, to which the Senator objected so strenuously for many years, and very correctly so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my good friend, the Senator from Connecticut, that the major portion of Government indebtedness is in short-time issues. The administration came into power with a promise that it was going to stretch out the maturity dates. The administration has largely failed to do that. It is still refunding short-time issues. Since the administration has failed in its effort to eliminate short-time debts, and since those kinds of debts constitute the major portion of Government borrowing, is it not reasonable to assume that will continue in the future, and that therefore the cost of one Government dollar which will be borrowed will be approximately the same as another Government dollar which will be borrowed?

Mr. BUSH. If the Senator is addressing that question to me, I say it is not reasonable to assume that. I think the only thing it is reasonable to assume is that if we are going to borrow long-term money, we should pay long-term interest rates. If there are institutions which wish to borrow long-term money from the Federal Government, they should pay what long-term money is worth to the Federal Government, not less. If that difference is to be made up, then it should be made up on the basis of a subsidy of institutions which may be borrowing. That is another issue. This is simply a business issue.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If outright Government grants were proposed to private institutions, they would not be upheld. A great many of the institutions are under church auspices, and such grants would be ruled out under the constitutional principle of the separation of church and State.

Mr. BUSH. I did not say it would be a good idea. I said if the difference were to be made up, that would be the way to do it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is saying he does not believe in grants for housing.

Mr. BUSH. Wait a minute. The Senator does not need to explain what I am saying. I did not say that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the effect of it.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to yield, and I have yielded considerable time, but it is a long distance between where I left off and where I want to carry on. We are all interested in trying to help solve the problem of educational institutions, and one of their most pressing problems is the lack of adequate domiciliary facilities. It does my heart good to see so much interest engendered on the part of so many in the interest of education, and the desire to want to do something about it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. PAYNE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I say to my good friend from Maine that no one questions his good faith. I know he wants to improve educational facilities, but he is taking the wrong approach for doing it by raising interest rates by one-half of 1 percent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield for a question?

Mr. PAYNE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Can the Senator think of any representative of an educational institution who came before the committee with a request for an increase in interest rates? It is very strange that not a single one of them agrees with the Senator about what is good for education.

Mr. PAYNE. During my years of public service, and I am sure the Senator from Arkansas will agree with me on this, I have never heard anyone yet come to me and ask that his retirement benefits might be lowered, or that he wanted

his old-age assistance lowered, or his social-security benefits lowered, or that we should lower the amounts of grants that the Federal Government gives in the way of extension, vocational education, housing construction, or a single other thing.

That is my answer to the question of the Senator from Arkansas.

Now, Mr. President, I shall continue with my statement.

Believing that it is neither the intent nor the desire of Congress to assume complete responsibility for the construction of college housing, I am offering an amendment to Senate bill 3855, the housing bill now under debate, which would, in effect, raise the interest rate of Federal loans to colleges and universities from 2¾ percent to approximately 3⅛ percent, or an increase of about three-eighths of 1 percent.

Mr. Robert Hazeltine, Commissioner of the Community Facilities Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, testifying before the Senate Subcommittee on Housing, pointed out at that time that such an increase in the interest rate would not have an adverse effect on the college-housing-loan program. Commissioner Hazeltine said, in part:

> We have given long and careful study to this proposal, consulting both the borrowers and those who might be expected to participate in lending operations under the program. * * * During the 5 years of the program's operation we have made loans at 2¾, 3.01, 3¼, and 3½ percent. * * * It is this experience which indicates that the proposed rate will not have an adverse effect on the soundness or feasibility of these loans. * * * The increase of three-eighths of 1 percent in the interest rate on the Federal loans * * * would be a small price to pay for again encouraging a flow of private investment funds toward college housing and related facilities.

Mr. President, I urge adoption of the amendment, which has been modified by me to the extent that it now provides that every application for college housing submitted to the Housing Agency prior to May 1 and under consideration by it will be processed under existing law at the rate of 2¾ percent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, before I make my principal statement, I should like to make a few preliminary observations in regard to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Maine, and in particular in regard to his observation that there is no difference in our objectives, in that both he and I wish to assist the educational institutions.

I said that I knew of no educational institution which agreed with the Senator from Maine that the increase he proposes in the interest rate would be of benefit to the educational institutions. That is quite different from saying that those who benefit are customarily requesting adoption of the amendment. Of course, they do not. The question of whether the amendment of the Senator from Maine will be good for them is, it seems to me, one on which their testimony constitutes a very important factor.

The truth of the matter is that all the representatives of educational institutions who testified on this subject before our committee were unanimous in agreeing that the increase proposed by the Senator from Maine in connection with the program would be a severe burden to them in carrying out a building program.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to reject this amendment. The adminstration is proposing a higher interest rate on Federal loans for college housing. This is the same interest rate that the Congress rejected last year.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I wish to be sure that I have the situation correctly in mind. Under the law, as sponsored last year by the Senator from Arkansas and his committee, and as passed by the Congress, what is the interest rate which now is in effect?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Two and three-quarters percent. It is based upon a formula which is the same as that used in arriving at the interest rate the Federal Government pays to the old age and survivors' insurance trust fund. That is the average.

Mr. KERR. What is the interest rate proposed in the amendment submitted by the Senator from Maine?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would be the average yield on bonds 15 years and over.

Mr. KERR. What effect on the interest rate would the amendment of the Senator from Maine have?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would increase the interest rate to 3⅛ percent at the present time.

Mr. KERR. In other words, it would result in an increase of three-eighths of 1 percent?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, as of the moment. Of course, that would vary as changes occur in the future.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, the administration is proposing a higher interest rate on Federal loans for college housing—namely, the same interest rate that the Congress rejected last year. It is the interest rate that was added to the program by the 83d Congress, and which all but killed the program. An increase in this interest rate would be a great disservice to our institutions of higher learning at a time when their need for housing is unprecedented.

In the fall of 1955, enrollment in our higher educational institutions reached approximately 2.7 million—an all-time high. According to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, this enrollment will rise steadily. By 1960, enrollment will reach 3 million—an increase of about 20 percent over 1954. By 1965, it will reach almost 4 million—an increase of about 60 percent over 1954. This increase of prospective students is inevitable, and is attributable to our normal population growth, accentuated by the high birthrate of the 1940's.

Not only is present housing inadequate to meet the need for future enrollment, but it is inadequate for the enrollment in 1956. Old barracks and other temporary structures pressed into use in the late 1940's are deteriorating beyond use. Many of these must now be removed because they are fire hazards, uneconomical to maintain, and because the special permits under which they were erected have expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. To show the need for enactment of the bill as it is now written, in order to give help to the colleges, does not the Senator from Arkansas find that all State institutions of higher learning have, in most instances, doubled their housing capacity in the last few years?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We do not have any testimony on that point, one way or the other. I simply do not know.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. When one examines those institutions, he can observe that they have been doing that.

However, in the case of the private institutions, in particular, we find they are lagging behind, because they do not have the necessary funds. Is not that true?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, I am confident that there is great need for housing.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is what I am saying.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We had much testimony on that point. We did not have testimony as to a great increase or a doubling of the housing in the case of the State institutions. I do not recall any testimony on that point.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In the cases in which the States have been able to give help in that situation—help that is greatly needed, I may say—the colleges have gone forward with the program. But in the case of the private institutions, we find that such assistance is badly needed at this time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator's point is well taken, although in the case of the University of Arkansas, which is located in my home town, I can say that it is very much interested in this program, and has not been able to obtain from the State legislature as much money as it needs for housing.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not think any State institution is overbuilt, as regards housing. Of course, in my own particular State, we have just put on a $100-million program of building for schools. We rushed forward with that program, and it will be found that we have doubled the capacity. I think the same will be found to be true in the case of Maryland. But in my State help is needed in that connection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Help is needed in the case of both the private and the public institutions. But, in particular, I think the pinch on the smaller private colleges is much greater, because their situation in that respect is much worse.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; much, much worse.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They need such assistance even more than do the State-supported institutions.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I know that in my own State, at the present time the small colleges are very much in need of additional housing, and

they have been taking advantage of the law which now is on the statute books.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for the contribution he has made.

Mr. President, in 1955, the 10th national conference on higher education, sponsored by a department of the National Education Association, declared that present housing facilities are entirely inadequate for present and anticipated enrollments. The conference further declared an equally critical need for buildings to house other self-liquidating services, such as cafeterias and dining halls. This position was reaffirmed by the 11th national conference, held in 1956.

Mr. Herbert O. Farber, comptroller of the University of Illinois, made the following statement in testifying before our committee in March 1956:

> Last spring when this committee considered the whole problem, there was general agreement on the urgency of the situation. Today there are very clear signs that the need is even more urgent than anticipated.
>
> Just last week, for example, at a meeting of the constituent members of the American Council on Education, Ronald B. Thompson, registrar of Ohio State University, and a recognized authority in this field stated:
>
> "The proportion of high-school graduates continuing on into college has increased dramatically in the last 4 years. Even those most closely related to the problem have not realized the full impact and significance of this revolutionary change in higher education. An examination of the date reveals that the number of first-time students in our colleges and universities has risen—from 40 percent of the number of high-school graduates in 1951 to almost 50 percent of the number in 1955. Stating this trend in another way, the number of first-time enrollments in our colleges and universities has risen 46 percent in 4 years."
>
> Colleges are confronted with unprecedented demands at a time when their finances are strained almost to the breaking point. It seems clear to us that in the national interest the Federal Government has an unusual opportunity through the college housing loan program, to assist the colleges without expense to the Federal Government and that this is the time for large-scale vision in realizing the potentialities that are available due to the fortunate fact that these large numbers of boys and girls are with us and are seeking further education and training.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield at this point?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on the question of agreeing to the modified amendment submitted by the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I join in the request for the yeas and nays on that question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment submitted by the Senator from Maine. On this question the yeas and nays have been requested. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arkansas for yielding.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly.

Mr. President, enrollment is rising, present buildings are inadequate, and new buildings must be provided. New buildings cost money; and there are only two sources for this money—gifts or loans. Gifts and grants can be made, and are being made, by individuals and by both private and public corporate bodies. But these gifts and grants have not been sufficient in the past, are not sufficient now, and will not be sufficient in the future. This means that a significant portion of the necessary money must be obtained by loans. Borrowed money cannot serve its full purpose in this program unless it can be repaid from the income of the buildings so provided. The record clearly shows that present interest rates are necessary for the liquidation of the loans on these buildings.

It is argued that the 2¾ percent interest presently charged the colleges for these loans is too low, and does not equal the price the Federal Government must pay for long-term money. It is said that these college housing loans run for 40 years and that they should bear the same interest as long-term Government bonds. This statement is not true. As a matter of fact, the college housing loans are repaid gradually over a period of 40 years. If the outstanding principal is averaged for comparison with Government bonds, the term is about the same as 23-year bonds. If the interest rate is determined as proposed in the administration's amendment, the Government would make an unwarranted profit out of our distressed colleges and universities.

It is immaterial to argue that one Federal dollar costs more than another. All Federal dollars are alike. The true measure of the cost of Federal money is the average cost of the Federal debt. If this average goes up, then the charge to colleges will go up. A new average will be computed in June. If the average rate of Federal borrowings is up, the interest charge on new loans will also go up.

There will always be short-term Federal borrowings and long-term Federal borrowings. The college housing loans have no effect on the amount of either kind of borrowing. If colleges pay the average Federal rate plus one-fourth of 1 percent, the program is entirely self-supporting and costs the taxpayers nothing.

If this is a subsidy to colleges, then the Federal Government is shortchanging the old age and survivors insurance fund. The Treasury pays interest on borrowings from this fund at the same rate that colleges must pay for housing loans—except that colleges pay one-fourth of 1 percent extra for Federal administrative expenses. Furthermore, the borrowings from the old-age and survivors insurance fund are not for 30 years or 40 years. They are forever. I understand that a proposal to change the interest rate formula on Treasury borrowings from the OASI fund has been adopted by the Finance Committee. Although this formula is designed to raise the interest payable to the trust fund, the rate would still be lower than the proposed rate now being offered for the college housing program. As a matter of fact, under current market conditions, the OASI interest rate would probably remain unchanged.

It is also argued that the present interest rate has stopped all private loans for college housing and that the only way to stimulate private loans in this field is to raise the interest rate. This cannot be supported. The Housing and Home Finance Agency estimates that $4 billion in college housing construction will be required in the next 9 years. The total Federal fund is only $500 million—proposed to be raised to $750 million by S. 3855. Obviously, private capital must supply the great bulk of funds required.

Why should it be necessary to raise interest rates to all colleges merely to force some colleges out of the Federal program? Is the proposed higher interest rate merely a rationing device to screen out the large publicly supported institutions? If so, why can they not be screened out without raising the interest rate for other schools? If rationing of the Federal funds is necessary, surely the administration can think of a better way than raising the interest rate. It would not help any college to raise the interest rate, solely to make certain schools with better credit standing borrow their funds elsewhere at higher rates.

State institutions in Oregon recently withdrew over $5 million in applications because they can obtain private funds at less than 2¾ percent. The University of Nebraska has financed $3⅓ million with private bonds. The University of Idaho withdrew its Federal application and sold $2 million in bonds to the State pension fund. Three Minnesota teachers colleges withdrew and sold $2.3 million in bonds to the State pension fund. These are random samples recalled by one witness before the committee—but demonstrating that the Federal loan program is not the only source of funds for college housing.

I should like to interject another thought. The figures cited by the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] a moment ago with regard to the participation of private funds relate only—if I understood him correctly—to the instances in which applications for Federal funds were later taken up by private loans, and did not purport to deal with the vast amount of building which is going on without the builders ever having applied, or having anything to do with the Government program. So I submit that it is not conclusive or very persuasive evidence as to what has happened with respect to overall building in the college field.

Furthermore, I think the Senate should recognize the soundness of testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee by Dr. John F. Meck, treasurer and vice president of Dartmouth College. Dr. Meck stated:

> As I have indicated, we wish to point out first that any action which this committee or the Congress may approve on these amendments this spring will be taken in the absence of adequate information. There has been no comprehensive study of college housing in recent years. We simply do not know how many dormitories have been constructed since 1950, how they have been financed, how the total volume of construc-

tion has varied from year to year, or how the proportions of financing from different sources have varied from year to year.

It is easy to produce random examples to show that institutions have undertaken construction with support from other sources such as gifts, borrowings from endowment, State appropriations, and private loans. Hence, the college housing loan program has never been and will never be the sole source of funds for college housing. What we do not know is how large a part this Federal program has played to date or how large a part it may be called upon to play in the future.

I can report to you that the American Council on Education has undertaken a comprehensive study of college housing, including the roles played, in recent years, by Federal loans, private loans, State loans, private gifts, State and municipal appropriations, and other sources of funds. The study, under the direction of Dean Arthur Weimer, of the Business School of Indiana University, will be thorough, factual, and objective. The results will be available before the end of this year.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency alleges that Federal funds are becoming the sole source for financing college housing. This has not been demonstrated. The American Council on Education is now gathering data on the subject, and I think the administration should withdraw this argument until the facts have been assembled and analyzed.

The 83d Congress increased the interest rate and almost killed the Federal loan program, but this did not increase private loans to any important degree.

The following table shows the number and amount of applications approved since the inception of the program, together with estimates of the housing agency for fiscal years 1956 and 1957:

Fiscal year	Number of approvals	Total amount in millions
1952	25	$19.3
1953	71	69.6
1954	41	27.9
1955	63	45.9
1956 (estimated)	110	110.0
1957 (estimated)	220	220.0
Total		492.7

As can be seen, this total would take up practically all of the presently authorized amount.

These figures tell the history of the college housing-loan program. Fiscal year 1952 shows retarded operations because of the necessity to channel productive resources of the Nation toward the Korean emergency. Fiscal year 1953 reflects an increased activity after the Korean emergency and under the reasonable interest rate policy established by the initial law. Fiscal years 1954 and 1955 show a drop in the program caused exclusively by the higher interest rates enacted in the 83d Congress. In the first session of the 84th Congress, when this interest rate was reduced, our committee heard witness after witness state that the interest rate was the cause of reduced activity in the college housing-loan program. The significant increase in activity estimated for fiscal years 1956 and 1957 show that with a lower interest rate, colleges and universities can afford to go ahead with plans for badly needed housing construction.

It is also argued that the higher interest rate would have very little effect upon room rent to students. A judgment on this subject is a very relative matter because $10 means as much to some students as $100 means to others. Dr. Meck testified that this higher interest would cost his students $25 to $35 more rent per year. This can be a very significant factor in the educational budget for the parents of many college students.

Furthermore, this is not a true measure of the effect of a higher interest rate. From the standpoint of the college administrator, this $25 or $30 must be multiplied by the number of students to be so affected, and the aggregate increase in interest charges becomes a very important consideration for those who must decide whether to go ahead with a new dormitory or whether to abandon it. Large numbers of students obtain dormitory rooms at prices below the economic rent, and the deficit is made up from other funds available to the institution. Every dollar added to a student's housing cost is a dollar taken away from some other educational endeavor. Increased interest rates mean an increased drain on scholarship funds and on funds which might otherwise be allocated for teachers' salaries and educational buildings.

Mr. President, I cannot overstate my conviction that this loan program should be continued under the present formula for computing interest charges. This program would not cost the Federal Government anything. Even if it could be demonstrated that a subsidy was involved, I would still argue in favor of current interest rates. I can certainly see no justification for the Federal Government making a profit at the expense of college students at a time when our national survival may very well depend upon the education of these young men and women.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE]. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, has my vote been recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has been recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Chair whether I am recorded as having voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is recorded as having voted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I inquire how I am recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, may I inquire if I am recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, how am I recorded on this yea-and-nay vote?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. HUMPHREY. How?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the negative.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the negative.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the negative.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the negative.

Mr. WOFFORD. Mr. President, may I inquire whether I am recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the negative.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, how am I recorded as having voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the negative.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, if a Senator votes one way, may he change his vote?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have the regular order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is requested.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from California will not insist on the regular order. We have a distinguished colleague, who is now in the radio gallery, who desires to vote. He is on his way to the Chamber.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am always glad to be cooperative. However, we have now gone through the whole list. We on this side of the aisle also have one or two Members who are absent and who are on their way to the Chamber.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas will be glad to cooperate with the Senator from California if a Member of the Senate on the other side of the aisle who wishes to be recorded on this vote is on his way to the Chamber.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, if any Senator on the other side of the aisle does not know how he has been recorded on the vote, I shall be glad to have him make inquiry in that regard.

Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, am I recorded? If so, how am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the affirmative.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the affirmative.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator voted in the affirmative.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the affirmative.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is requested.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the regular order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next step in the regular order will be the announcement of the vote.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. What was the reply of the Chair to the inquiry by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]? The reply was inaudible in the back of the Chamber because of the traffic. I wonder if we might have the reply of the Chair restated.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask for a recapitulation of the vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A recapitulation will not be in order until the vote has been announced.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have the result of the vote announced now?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am afraid the Vice President did not hear my inquiry. Due to the traffic and the noise in the back of the Senate Chamber, it was impossible for Senators to hear the ruling of the Chair on the inquiry of the Senator from Delaware. I wonder if we might have the ruling restated, so that we will know what it is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware requested the regular order. The regular order is the announcement of the vote.

Mr. SMATHERS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN and Mr. SCOTT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted:

YEAS—40

Allott	Bricker	Byrd
Barrett	Bridges	Carlson
Beall	Bush	Case, N. J.
Bennett	Butler	Case, S. Dak.
Cotton	Kuchel	Schoeppel
Curtis	Malone	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Martin, Pa.	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Millikin	Thye
Flanders	Mundt	Watkins
Goldwater	Payne	Welker
Hruska	Potter	Williams
Ives	Purtell	Young
Jenner	Robertson	
Knowland	Saltonstall	

NAYS—41

Anderson	Holland	McNamara
Bible	Humphrey	Monroney
Chavez	Jackson	Morse
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Neuberger
Ellender	Kennedy	O'Mahoney
Frear	Kerr	Pastore
Fulbright	Laird	Russell
George	Langer	Smathers
Gore	Lehman	Sparkman
Green	Long	Stennis
Hayden	Magnuson	Symington
Hennings	Mansfield	Wofford
Hill	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—14

Aiken	Eastland	McCarthy
Bender	Ervin	Neely
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Scott
Clements	Kefauver	Wiley
Dworshak	Martin, Iowa	

The VICE PRESIDENT. The result on this vote is yeas 40; nays 41. So the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] is rejected.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, now I ask for a recapitulation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio has requested a recapitulation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under a request for a recapitulation, no Senator may change his vote, and no Senator who did not vote previously may vote now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Chair anticipated my inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will recapitulate the vote.

The vote was recapitulated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment just voted on was rejected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on that motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I inquire what the motion is which is now before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion on which the Senator from California asked for the yeas and nays was the motion to reconsider the vote by which

the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] was rejected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Was not the motion to lay on the table the one on which the yeas and nays were ordered?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas is correct. The second motion is the one on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I understand correctly that the yeas and nays have been ordered on the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Do I understand the Senator from New York will have the floor following the yeas and nays?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York will be recognized.

The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allott	Green	Millikin
Anderson	Hayden	Monroney
Barrett	Hennings	Morse
Bennett	Hill	Mundt
Bible	Holland	Murray
Bricker	Hruska	Neuberger
Bridges	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Bush	Ives	Pastore
Butler	Jackson	Payne
Byrd	Jenner	Potter
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Purtell
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Russell
Chavez	Kerr	Saltonstall
Cotton	Knowland	Schoeppel
Curtis	Kuchel	Smathers
Daniel	Laird	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Lehman	Sparkman
Duff	Long	Stennis
Ellender	Magnuson	Symington
Flanders	Malone	Thye
Frear	Mansfield	Watkins
Fulbright	Martin, Iowa	Welker
George	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Goldwater	McClellan	Wofford
Gore	McNamara	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] to reconsider the vote by which the Payne amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the vote is on the motion to table the motion to reconsider.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. So if a Senator desires to table the motion to reconsider, he should vote "yea," and if he opposes such action he should vote "nay." Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay." I, therefore, withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. SMATHERS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN and Mr. SCOTT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea" and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

I further announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] would each vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—41

Anderson	Holland	McNamara
Bible	Humphrey	Monroney
Chavez	Jackson	Morse
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Neuberger
Ellender	Kennedy	O'Mahoney
Frear	Kerr	Pastore
Fulbright	Laird	Russell
George	Langer	Smathers
Gore	Lehman	Sparkman
Green	Long	Stennis
Hayden	Magnuson	Symington
Hennings	Mansfield	Wofford
Hill	McClellan	

NAYS—39

Allott	Case, N. J.	Ives
Barrett	Case, S. Dak.	Jenner
Bennett	Cotton	Knowland
Bricker	Curtis	Kuchel
Bridges	Dirksen	Malone
Bush	Duff	Martin, Iowa
Butler	Flanders	Martin, Pa.
Byrd	Goldwater	Millikin
Carlson	Hruska	Mundt
Payne	Schoeppel	Watkins
Potter	Smith, Maine	Welker
Purtell	Smith, N. J.	Williams
Saltonstall	Thye	Young

NOT VOTING—15

Aiken	Dworshak	McCarthy
Beall	Eastland	Neely
Bender	Ervin	Robertson
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Scott
Clements	Kefauver	Wiley

So Mr. FULBRIGHT's motion to lay on the table the motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The Chief Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

SEC. —. (a) The fourth sentence of subsection (a) of section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by striking out "ten" the first time it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "thirteen."

(b) Paragraph (C) of subsection (b) of section 512 of such act is amended by striking out "1957" and inserting in lieu thereof "1960."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will yield to me briefly, I should like to make an announcement to the Senate. There are two amendments, the Lehman amendment and the Bricker amendment, on which we hope we will be able to vote shortly. I am sure a yea-and-nay vote will be requested on the Bricker amendment.

The White House Correspondents Association is holding its dinner this evening, and a number of Senators expect to attend. Therefore, we should like to conclude the session of the Senate today as early as possible. However, if we are to have delaying tactics and quorum calls, and things of that nature, it is possible that we will be here very late this evening. We can proceed expeditiously if we can get Senators to come to the Chamber on time to answer quorum calls and to vote on yea-and-nay votes. I hope Senators will make every effort to answer to their names when a quorum call is had and when a yea-and-nay vote is had.

PAYMENT TO CROW INDIAN TRIBE FOR RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR YELLOWTAIL DAM UNIT — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MURRAY. I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of May 24, 1956, pp. 8953–8954, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in order to save time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement dealing with the subject of the conference report.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY

The adoption of the conference report on Senate Joint Resolution 135 completes congressional action to end a long-standing controversy between Federal agencies and the Crow Indians over the amount of compensation to be paid for right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam, powerplant, and reservoir on the Big Horn River in Montana and Wyoming. When the resolution is signed by the President and the funds transferred to the credit of the Crow Indians, the long-delayed construction of Yellowtail Dam can begin.

The dam was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944, which was piloted through the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. Funds for the construction of the dam were recommended by three Secretaries of the Interior, without an estimate being transmitted to the Congress.

Congress, on its own motion last year, appropriated $4 million to begin construction of the dam. The President, in the fiscal year 1957 budget, recommended $10,850,000 in additional funds for construction, which has been held up by lack of agreement with the Crow Indians on payment for right-of-way for the dam, powerplant, and reservoir.

My able colleague [Mr. MANSFIELD] and I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 135 to accept an offer by the Crow Indians of $5 million for the Yellowtail Dam right-of-way. Payment of this amount is fully justified on firm and unassailable grounds. Testimony at a hearing before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs supported this figure.

In fact, precedent set by Federal agencies in the case of the Kerr Dam of the Montana Power Co. in Montana might have justified higher payment. In the Kerr Dam case, the Federal Power Commission 25 years ago required the Montana Power Co. to pay the Flathead Indians for lease of right-of-way at a rate 1½ times that to be paid the Crow Indians for sale of the Yellowtail Dam right-of-way.

The fairness of the Crow offer is attested by two other factors. One, a part of the Kerr Dam and powerplant is located on Flathead Indian land while all of Yellowtail Dam and powerplant will be on Crow Indian land. Further, the Indian acreage in the Kerr Dam-Flathead instance is only one-third of that required at Yellowtail.

In the House version of Senate Joint Resolution 135, payment of $1,500,000 to the Crow Indians was provided. A majority of the House conferees agreed that the $5 million passed by the Senate was the proper figure. In other essential respects, the few differences between the Senate and House were ironed out and the conference report offers a fair and just settlement of the right-of-way problem. Mineral rights and fishing privileges are reserved to the Crow Indians.

Construction of Yellowtail Dam will provide needed employment for able-bodied Crow Indians. The power to be produced at the dam will be fed into the Missouri River Basin system, which serves eastern Montana, Wyoming, and the Dakotas. The dam will also serve an important flood-control function, and also aid irrigation through the Hardin irrigation unit.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement which I prepared on the subject of the conference report now pending before the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

The Senate is now asked to approve the conference report on Senate Joint Resolution 135, directing the Secretary of the Interior to pay $5 million to the Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, in Montana and Wyoming.

The House has approved the conference report and I sincerely hope that the Senate will approve the report this afternoon so that the resolution can be sent to the White House for the President's signature. The approval of this $5 million payment will be the final step precluding the actual construction of Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir.

Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir was authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1944. Briefly, this project, when completed, will be multipurpose in its benefits. First, this project will help meet the hydroelectric power shortage in the area. The completed dam and reservoir would be invaluable in flood control and irrigation work. A completed Hardin irrigation unit would comprise about 45,800 acres of benchland just downstream from Yellowtail Dam in southeastern Montana. Incidental, but important benefits of the project are silt retention, improvement of fish and wildlife resources and recreation. I cannot stress too strongly the importance of this project to the economical development of the Northwest.

In 1954, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recommended that this project be "immediately programed for construction." All preliminary work, investigations and advanced planning are now complete. The fiscal year 1956 public-works appropriation bill included an initial appropriation of $4 million for this project. When President Eisenhower sent fiscal year 1957 budget to Congress this year, it included a request for an additional $10,850,000 to carry on construction of Yellowtail Dam. There is general agreement between the executive department, the Congress and the local people that the construction of this project should proceed.

However, prior to construction a transfer of right-of-way for some 7,000 acres of Crow Indian tribal lands must be negotiated with the Crow Indian Tribal Council. The dam site is located on tribal lands. Some of their lands will be inundated by the reservoir. Of the 30,857 acres required, 6,997 acres are tribal lands.

The Interior Department has offered $1,500,000 in settlement, but this figure was rejected by the tribe. In a resolution on January 11, 1956, the Crow Tribal Council requested a settlement of $5 million. After due consideration, the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], Montana's Congressman from the First District [Mr. METCALF], and I concluded that the Indian request was equitable and fair to all concerned. The only other course of action was condemnation proceedings, to which I am unalterably opposed.

I might say at this point that we now have an opportunity to treat a segment of our American Indian population as an equal and in a justifiable manner, something that the Federal Government has neglected to do all too frequently in years gone by.

The $5 million figure is not something that was just pulled out of a hat; there is sound justification for it, and it is not without precedent nor is it a giveaway in any sense of the word.

The settlement agreed upon by the Crow Tribe was arrived at as a result of an exhaustive study made by a consulting engineer. The $5 million was an alternative to a proposal of annual payments to the tribe and tribal ownership after 50 years. The $5 million figure is supported by local interests and Montana's Governor Aronson has endorsed the $5-million settlement.

The precedent to this action was set in the 1930's when the Federal Power Commission issued a license to the Montana Power Co., authorizing the construction of Kerr Dam on the Flathead River in Montana. At the time it was necessary to compensate the Flathead Indian Tribe for rights-of-way in connection with Kerr Dam. Montana Power agreed to compensate the Flathead Tribe for power-site values in connection with the right-of-way required for Kerr Dam and Reservoir. Over a period of approximately 20 years payments in the amount of $2,929,000 would be made to the Flathead Indian Tribe as compensation for the use of the land for the power development. Montana Power Co. is required to renew the agreement at the end of 20 years.

In comparison to what the Flathead Indian Tribe is getting for only 2,100 acres of land at Kerr Dam, it is not too much to direct the Secretary of the Interior to pay $5 million for a project which will furnish cheap power, irrigation, flood control, business, employment, and security in eastern Montana and northern Wyoming.

This payment is not based on the estimated actual value of the 7,000 acres of land involved, the site is worth a great deal more than the actual price of the land. The Bureau of Reclamation is paying for the value of the land as a dam site, a sound business venture in view of a multi-purpose project which will be fully repayable with interest.

The Crow Tribe has made an offer that is eminently fair. As I have indicated, there is unanimous feeling that Yellowtail Dam should go forward promptly. If this conference is rejected the negotiations will be thrown into the courts and considerable delay, in addition to unjust treatment of the Crow Indian Tribe, will be the end result. Delay will jeopardize the additional request for funds submitted by the President for fiscal year 1957.

It is my considered judgment that the Senate should reaffirm its support of Senate Joint Resolution 135 and accept without delay the conference report on this legislation directing the Secretary of the Interior to pay the Crow Indian Tribe $5 million for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, reserving mineral and recreation rights for the Indians as desired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter which I wrote to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] under date of May 23, 1956.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., May 23, 1956.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The public-works appropriation bill, fiscal year 1957, as passed by the House Committee on Appropriations, disallows new funds in the amount of $10,850,000 for Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming. I ask that these funds be restored when the bill H. R. 11319 comes before the Senate Committee on Appropirations for final action.

I make this plea in light of more recent developments. I assume that the budget request for funds to begin construction on Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir were disallowed by the House committee because of the uncompleted negotiations with the Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for approximately 7,000 acres of tribal lands at and near the dam site.

Companion joint resolutions were passed by both Houses of Congress directing the Secretary of the Interior to pay the Crow Indian Tribe for the transfer of these lands, allowing certain reservations. The conference committee on these joint resolutions has made its report, recommending a payment of $5 million to the Crow Indian Tribe for the transfer of these lands. This figure is agreeable to the Indians, local interests, Montana officials, and it is the figure approved in Senate Joint Resolution 135 which passed the Senate March 16, 1956. When the conference report is approved and sent to the President for his signature, it will remove the last obstacle to construction on this multipurpose project.

This approach to the settlement of the land negotiations with the Crow Indian Tribe is most satisfactory, as compared with condemnation proceedings which would result in a lengthy court action and a solution leaving a bitterness on all sides.

The settlement of the transfer of right-of-way of these lands appears very near at hand. I recommend and ask that careful consideration be given to the restoration of the budget request of $10,850,000 for Yellowtail unit. These additional funds would provide for construction in fiscal year 1957 above and beyond the limitations of present carryover funds. Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir is essential to the development and economic welfare of eastern Montana.

With best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senators from Montana for the leadership they have given the Senate regarding this issue. The two Senators from Montana for a long time past have been working on a program of justice with respect to this issue. They have done a remarkably fine, statesmanlike job. I extend to them my sincere commendation.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

HOUSING AMENDMENTS OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3855) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have joined with the Senators from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN and Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], in offering this amendment to the Housing Act to amend subsection (a) of section 500 and subsection (b) of section 512 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, so as to extend the veterans' loan program for a period of 3 years.

I should like to state for the record that it is my privilege to be chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. The legislation for the extension of the GI loan program has been pending before my committee, and I have had an opportunity to consider and study it in some detail. The other two cosponsors of this amendment, Senators HILL and SPARKMAN, are, respectively, the chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and the chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee. Thus, this amendment represents the leadership of committees and subcommittees concerned with this subject matter.

The basic purpose of the loan program was to facilitate the readjustment of veterans by the extension of credit to them for the establishment of households, farms, or businesses. It was felt that these veterans, as a consequence of their military service, had been deprived of the opportunity to accumulate savings and establish credit and employment records.

In the years that have passed since the enactment of this measure, almost 4 million veterans have received a guaranteed or direct loan, and these loans have been unusually helpful. But there are 15¾ million veterans entitled to these benefits. Thus, at least over 11 million veterans have not used any GI loan entitlement, and most of the 4 million veterans who have received a guaranteed or direct loan have a substantial amount of entitlement remaining.

But time is running out. The loan program will expire on July 25, 1957 and, because of the time necessary to process loan applications, the program, for all intents and purposes, will expire this coming January. Hence, these 11 million veterans have a scant 7 months to decide whether they will buy a home or a farm or establish themselves in a business. Many of them are not quite ready to do so. Many need more time to make these important decisions which will have profound effects upon their future lives. There is no good reason for rushing these veterans into making such far-reaching decisions. If they need a little more time to chart the course of their lives, after the disruption of their lives by military service, there seems to be no valid reason why that time should not be granted to them.

From the standpoint of cost to the Government, there is no appreciable difference. Since 1944 the Government has stood ready to guarantee these loans. The 11½ million veterans who have not yet exercised those rights, could, at any time during the past years, have taken advantage of them. To give them additional time to do so now seems not only just, but also economical in the long run. It will save many a veteran from taking precipitous action today which he may not be prepared for, economically. Giving him an extension of time to complete his economic readjustment, to get set in his job and community, is in the end economical both for himself and for the Federal Government. The direct loans were authorized at a later date but the principle is the same.

Now originally the substance of this proposal was contained in S. 302, introduced by Senators SPARKMAN and HILL. That bill was referred to the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am chairman. In the ordinary course of events, that subcommittee would have held hearings on the bill, and would have reported it to the full committee, which would then have reported it to the Senate.

The staff working on the housing bill has prepared a thorough and comprehensive analysis of how the veterans housing loan guaranty has worked in practice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, this staff study on veterans housing loans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, very little controversy has developed concerning this bill. The mail received has been overwhelmingly in favor of the provisions for an extension of the expiration date.

My mail, coming not only from the veterans themselves but from the housing industry, has pleaded for a certain settlement of this question. They wanted to know whether and for how long there would be an extension. And it was important that they know—and know now.

The veteran having these rights wants to know whether he must decide to buy a house or a farm or go into business in the next 6 or 7 months, or whether he has adequate time to make these decisions.

The housing industry wants to know whether it will be faced with a disruptive rush within the next 7 months to purchase homes by GI's taking advantage of their expiring rights, or whether the demand for new housing by veterans will be spread over the course of the next few years.

The Veterans' Administration itself has advised that if "an extension of the terminal date of the program is desirable it would seem preferable to authorize it early so that the veteran public could be made aware that no rush would be necessary to avoid losing the opportunity afforded by the GI loan benefits."

As chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, one aspect of this matter has been of the greatest concern to me. I have been afraid that in the final rush for adjournment, this measure, so important not alone to so many millions of our veterans, but to the ailing housing industry itself, might get sidetracked and not enacted. A wild rush in the next 7 months to purchase homes to avoid losing GI loan rights could have a disastrous effect upon the housing industry, not to mention the effects upon the individual veterans who might be tempted to purchase houses before they were financially ready to

assume the obligations which such purchasing entailed.

The proposed amendment is one which, in my opinion, should have the wholehearted support of every Member in the Congress.

It would be hard to visualize any single program which has resulted in more and varied benefits to our American citizenry. Nearly 4½ million veterans and their families have acquired a home of their own with the assistance of a GI loan. No one will dispute the fact that home ownership is a bulwark in the maintaining of the type of living that we strive for in America. While much has been accomplished by way of improving the living conditions of Americans, there still is a tremendous job ahead. We can ill afford to allow the GI loan program, which in the past year accounted for 30 percent of all single family residential units, to come to an abrupt termination.

Aside from the legitimate needs of the individual veterans and the desirability of continuing the program from the standpoint of a benefit to the veterans, we must not lose sight of the fact that this program is playing an extremely important role as a support factor in our national economy. With the sharp curtailment in the manufacture of automobiles, farming equipment and various other industries, it would be foolhardy to allow one of the main props to be knocked out from under the residential construction industry. The first 4 months of this year is witnessing a substantial decline in the number of housing starts. The optimistic words of administration spokesmen on this subject early this year obviously were without foundation in fact. It is now fairly clear that housing starts for 1956 will be between 15 percent and 20 percent lower than starts in 1955. Can we afford a further substantial drop in 1957?

The only thing which a termination of the GI loan program will do will be to retard the efforts which we have made in striving to house the American people. As an unhappy byproduct, it will also place a strain on other segments of our economy due to the need of finding some means for taking up the slack caused by the curtailment in the construction industry.

I hope that the pending amendment will be approved.

EXHIBIT 1

DRAFT REPORT ON GI HOME LOAN PROGRAM—SUBCOMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

INTRODUCTION

The current GI loan program for World War II veterans is scheduled to terminate on July 25, 1957.

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act as originally enacted (Public Law 346, 78th Cong., approved June 22, 1944) provided that application for loan guaranty benefits be made within 2 years after separation from service or 2 years after termination of the war, whichever is later, but in no event more than 5 years after termination of the war.

Public Law 268, 79th Congress, approved December 28, 1945, extended the period of eligibility for loan benefits to 10 years after the termination of the war.

Public Law 239, 80th Congress, approved July 25, 1947, fixed the termination of World War II for the purpose of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act as July 25, 1947.

The GI loan program is a plan to encourage private lenders to make loans on favorable terms to veterans, generally for the purchase, construction, repair, alteration, or improvement of homes, farms, or businesses. The encouragement extended is the guaranty of part of the veteran's debt by the Veterans' Administration, so that in the case of defaults and foreclosures, the exposure of the lender is minimized.

The benefit to the veteran comes in the form of a loan with a relatively low interest rate (currently 4½ percent), a longer maturity period (currently up to 30 years), and a small initial downpayment (currently as little as 2 percent). Private lenders would not, and most investors could not, make loans on such favorable terms without a Government guaranty. The guaranty places GI loans in a preferred investment category. In diversified investment portfolios, the GI loan takes a place alongside other Government obligations, and provides a return of at least 4½ percent less the costs of servicing.

Since the inception of the loan guaranty program as part of the original GI bill in 1944, the great bulk of its activities have been concerned with home loans. Consequently, this report is devoted to the operation, administration, and outlook for the GI home loan. The farm loan and business loan programs have served nearly 300,000 veterans with almost $900 million of advantageous financing. In comparison, however, through April 1956 over 4,700,000 veterans have obtained over $36 billion of home financing.

HOW THE PROGRAM OPERATES

The major steps in the operation of the GI home loan program may be described as follows, in the case of new or proposed construction:

1. A builder or sponsor submits his plans for the development of a tract or subdivision, together with his engineering reports, to the appropriate field office of the Veterans' Administration.

2. After his land development plans are approved, he may then submit his construction plans and specifications for the houses he proposes to build, and request the VA to make an appraisal of reasonable value.

3. Upon completion of the appraisal, the VA issues a master certificate of reasonable value covering the units proposed in the tract. This certificate is subject to the requirement that actual construction must conform to the approved plans and specifications as determined by a compliance inspection made at various stages during construction. Master certificates of reasonable value usually have a validity period of 8 months. They may be extended if market conditions warrant. As a condition to the issuance of a certificate of reasonable value, the VA will determine that the proposed plans and specifications conform to the minimum property requirement prescribed by VA for houses of the particular design and location.

The requirements employed by the VA correspond with those required and used by the FHA for similar purposes. The VA accepts the land planning and compliance inspection findings of the FHA as though they had been made by VA. The legislative provisions requiring the observance of minimum property requirements necessitate the subjection of each unit to compliance inspections during the course of construction. Otherwise the unit is ineligible for VA financing for 1 year following completion.

4. Houses in the tract may be sold to veterans during the course of construction on the basis of the blueprints or a model house, or after completion of the new dwellings. In some cases, builders arrange sources of permanent GI loan financing in advance of construction, and in other cases the buyer may be expected to find a mortgage lender himself. In either case, when a lender is found who will make a GI loan, the lender proceeds to arrange for the loan closing. These lenders who are subject to supervision by an agency or department of a State or the Federal Government may close a GI loan without obtaining prior approval of the Veterans' Administration. Lenders who are not subject to supervision must obtain VA's prior approval before closing GI loans.

5. In preparing a loan for closing, attention must be given to evidence of the veteran's eligibility by virtue of qualifying military service, eligibility of the purpose of the loan, evidence of satisfactory completion of the house, adequacy of the veteran's income and credit status, intention on the part of the veteran that he occupy the property as his home, and a verification that the purchase price does not exceed VA's finding of reasonable value. In addition, the customary title search must be made, in addition to other technical arrangements necessary to complete the settlement.

6. After closing the loan and conveying the title to the veteran, the lender reports the facts of the case to the VA, together with necessary supporting documents. If the file is in order and all requirements of eligibility have been met, the VA will issue a loan-guaranty certificate to the lender. Under the law, except in cases of fraud or material misrepresentation, this guaranty is incontestable by VA.

Where the veteran is buying an existing house that has been previously occupied, rather than a new or proposed house, VA plays a lesser role. Usually the first step is that of arranging for an appraisal, which may be requested of VA by the lender, the seller (or his broker), or the veteran. If the VA appraisal shows that the reasonable value is not less than the proposed purchase price, and the house meets the applicable minimum property requirements for existing construction, the lender to whom the veteran has applied for his loan may arrange for settlement. Non-supervised lenders, as explained above, must have the prior approval of VA before closing. The steps leading to the guaranty of the loan are the same as in the case of newly completed houses.

DIRECT-LOAN PROGRAM

In rural and remote areas where institutional mortgage lenders infrequently operate, veterans have had great difficulty in arranging GI loans. Recognizing this financial void, the Congress has authorized the VA to make direct loans for the purchase or construction (including alternations or repairs) of a home or a farm with a farmhouse where private capital was not available. In such cases, veterans may apply directly to the Veterans' Administration for financing assistance.

Since the Voluntary Home Mortgage Credit program was established, pursuant to the Housing Act of 1954 (Public Law 560, 83d Cong.), to increase the mobility of funds flowing into remote areas, the Veterans' Administration has been referring all veterans seeking direct loans to the appropriate regional committees of that program. If no lender can be found within 20 working days, the veteran may then take steps to arrange a direct loan with the Veterans' Administration. The various eligibility requirements are the same for veterans who buy or build with the aid of a VA direct loan as for those who employ guaranteed loans from private lenders; the only difference being that the Veterans' Administration becomes the lender instead of the guarantor.

PAYMENT OF CLAIMS

In order to protect the interests of both the Government and the veteran, regulations have been established to govern the manner in which settlement will be made with lenders who file claims under their guaranty contract following insoluble defaults by mortgagors. An example of how the guaranty contract operates in a typical case will best serve to explain the method of security liquidation.

Assume that a $10,000 loan was guaranteed by the VA to the extent of 60 percent or $6,000. At the time the holder determines that the default is incurable and that a claim for the guaranty should be filed the loan balance is $9,800. The VA would pay a guaranty claim of $5,880 (60 percent of the loan balance). After receiving the guaranty payment the balance of the indebetedness due the holder would be $3,920 and so long as the value of the property does not decline below this figure plus foreclosure expenses, the holder will not suffer a loss. For purposes of illustration, let us assume further that the foreclosure expenses plus interest to the date of the foreclosure sale would amount to $380 so that the holder would have a total remaining investment of $4,300.

In advance of the foreclosure sale the VA has an appraisal of the property made to determine its current value. On the basis of such appraisal VA specifies the amount which the holder must allow in its final accounting relating to the sale of the property. In the example at hand assume that the VA determines the value of the property is $9,500, and that this figure is specified as the amount for which the holder will be required to account. If the holder acquires the property by bidding no more than $9,500 it may elect to convey the property to VA, and in return it will be paid the balance of the indebtedness due it ($4,300) plus conveyancing expenses. Alternately, it may elect to retain the property and refund to VA the difference between the amount due the holder ($4,300) and the specified amount ($9,500) or $5,200. Since VA paid a guaranty claim of $5,880, its net loss would be $680 if the holder retained the property and a similar amount if it were conveyed to VA and resold for the net amount specified. This loss would represent an indebtedness due the Government by the veteran. In the illustrative case the veteran's indebtedness would be $680.

In the majority of cases, lenders elect to convey security property to the VA, which in turn places them on the market for sale at current price levels. In localities where private real-estate brokers are available, the VA lists its acquired properties with them, and pays the customary sales commission. It is generally VA policy to sell such houses in an "as is" condition, and it is often found expedient to hold them vacant for sale in order to facilitate liquidation.

Since the veteran is credited with the current fair value of the property on the books of the lender at the time of foreclosures, any subsequent profits or losses experienced by the VA in its property management activities are not reflected back on its account with the veteran, who generally remains liable to the Government for the net cost of settlement with the lender under the guaranty contract.

THE RECORD OF THE GI LOAN PROGRAM TO DATE

During the period of almost 12 years that GI home loans have been authorized, more than 4,700,000 veterans have obtained approximately $36 billion of such loans from private lenders. In addition more than 75,000 veterans have obtained over $540 million of direct loans from the Veterans' Administration.

The availability of adequate supplies of funds for GI loans in 1954 and 1955 made it possible for an average of nearly 50,000 veterans per month to make application for the purchase of homes with VA assisted financing. This was the longest sustained period of high level activity in the history of the program. During 1955, nearly 3 out of every 10 new houses started were inspected by VA compliance inspectors. GI loans financed the purchase of about 25 percent of the houses completed. This record is evidence of the vigor of the veterans housing demand and of the attractiveness to lenders of investing in GI loans in substantial amounts.

The repayment record on these loans has been excellent. More than 850,000 home loans have been reported to VA as paid in full. Delayed reporting of others may bring the current total to 900,000 or more. The initial principal amount of the 850,000 paid in full loans was about $4.9 billion. The guaranteed home loans on which VA has been asked to pay a claim as a result of insoluble defaults have been less than 26,000 in number, or about one-half of 1 percent; the net amount of those claims was less than $20 million, or about six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the amount originally loaned.

The direct loans have made as good a record, although on the average, they are less seasoned, since direct loans were not authorized until 6 years after the guaranteed loan program was approved. Thus far, about 7,000 direct loans originally amounting to more than $50 million have been sold to private investors with a VA guaranty, and about 2,100 loans originally amounting to over $17 million have been paid in full. The Veterans' Administration has been required to liquidate the security in only about 250 cases, and the loss or deficiency has amounted to $73,000, or less than two one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total amount loaned to date.

The loan guaranty affairs of the Veterans' Administration are administered by the Department of Veterans Benefits, and guaranty operations are conducted in each of 67 regional offices, with one or more located in each State, plus the Territories of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska. Alaska loan guaranty matters consist of about 70 people in the central office and about 3,350 in the regional offices.

The administrative costs of the loan guaranty program have been small when considered in relation to the large number and amount of loans guaranteed. Since the inception of the program, VA has disbursed about $120 million for salaries and administrative expenses, which include travel costs and appraisals and credit reports ordered by the VA. However, this figure does not include a pro rata share of general overhead costs, such as office space, supplies, communications, etc., which are paid by the agency for all of its programs.

While it is impractical to prorate the total administrative expenditures among the many types of activities performed in connection with the loan guaranty program, the average cost per loan processed and serviced by VA to date would be about $25, or 33 cents for every hundred dollars loaned.

EFFECTS OF THE GI LOAN PROGRAM

Since the termination of World War II hostilities, the loan guaranty program has provided a substantial measure of support to the general economy of the Nation. Because institutional mortgage lenders have found the GI loan to be a desirable investment medium, veterans have been enabled to buy more than $20 billion of new houses. A substantial but undeterminable number of these new home purchases could not have been made without the aid of a GI loan, and a corresponding number of houses would not have been built if veterans had not had the benefit of GI loans.

In recent years particularly, the high level of general economic activity throughout the Nation has been vigorously supported by new home construction, which in turn has depended substantially on the effective demand of veterans using GI loans. For example, in 1955 more than $4½ billion was spent by veterans on new houses purchased with VA-guaranteed loans. This money has in turn been paid by builders to building craftsmen, distributors of building materials and to others, and by them into the diffused general economic stream. Related purchases by the new homeowners of furniture, equipment, and similar items have given additional support to industry, and are indirectly attributable to the GI mortgage financing which started the cycle in motion.

One of the more important and far-reaching problems has been that of controlling the impact of the program on the money markets, the local housing markets and on the overall supply of labor and materials at times of relative scarcity or when the national interest requires a change of pace to avoid inflationary consequences. During the period of hostilities in Korea it was necessary to impose credit controls on many aspects of the economy to avoid diversions of money and materials that would impair the defense effort. These controls extended to the GI loan program, and were adjusted on occasions to meet varying conditions. In mid-1955, the administration imposed credit restraints. These controls required an initial downpayment of at least 2 percent and the limitation of loan maturities to 25 years. The restriction on loan maturities was lifted on January 20, 1956.

OUTLOOK FOR VETERANS HOME LOANS

About 10 million World War II veterans have not thus far used their loan guaranty entitlement. An estimated 800,000 to 1 million veterans may yet seek to do so before their eligibility expires under the present law, on July 25, 1957.

This number measured against the remaining period of eligibility would mean that GI home loans may have to be approved at a rate in excess of any previous peak rate. Last minute efforts of many veterans who have heretofore postponed the purchase of a home may lead to serious administrative difficulties. Some builders and sellers of houses are calling attention to the termination date in their advertising, and an excessive demand from veteran purchasers could develop during the year preceding July 25, 1957.

If it develops, a high rate of demand for GI loans during the ensuing year may place a strain on both the supply of new houses available for sale to veterans and on the amount of money channeled for investment in VA-guaranteed loans. The impetus of the extra demand coming from last-minute veterans may have some inflationary influences, either in the price of housing or in the scale of discounts required on GI loans, or both.

The excellent repayment record that veterans have established on the GI loans made to date will undoubtedly continue as long as generally favorable economic conditions prevail. Eventually millions of veterans should be able to enjoy the benefits of debt-free home ownership for their homes and their families, and the general economy of the Nation would be on a higher plateau both because of their relatively higher standard of living and the extra impetus given to industrial production and capital accumulation by their home purchases.

LEGISLATIVE APPENDIX

A. Enacted legislation concerned with period of GI loan eligibility

1. Public Law 346, 78th Congress, section 500 (a), second sentence:

"Any such veteran may apply within 2 years after separation from the military or

naval forces, or 2 years after the termination of the war, whichever is the later date, but in no event more than 5 years after the termination of the war."

2. Public Law 268, 79th Congress, amended Public Law 346, 78th Congress, section 500 (a), second sentence, to read:

"Any loan made by such veteran within 10 years after the termination of the war for any of the purposes, and in compliance with the provisions specified by this title."

3. Public Law 239, 80th Congress, section 3:

"In the interpretation of the following statutory provisions the date when this joint resolution becomes effective shall be deemed to be the date of the termination of any state of war heretofore declared by the Congress and of the national emergencies proclaimed by the President on September 8, 1939, and on May 27, 1941 * * * section 500 (a) and 507 of the act of June 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 291, ch. 268), as amended."

B. Proposed legislation concerned with GI loan extension

1. To extend World War II loan guaranty entitlement for 3 additional years: S. 302, SPARKMAN; H. R. 10178, REUSS; S. 3602, MCCARTHY; S. 3639, WILEY.

2. To extend loan guaranty and direct loan programs 5 additional years: S. 740, JOHNSTON; H. R. 5477, HOLIFIELD; H. R. 11000, ROGERS.

3. To extend World War II loan guaranty program 1 additional month for each 2 months of active service (up to 3 years). Veterans discharged for disability given 3 additional years: H. R. 10469, FASCELL.

4. To extend World War II loan guaranty program 1 additional month for each month of active service (up to 4 years). Veterans discharged for disability given 4 additional years: H. R. 10530, RAINS; H. R. 10531, O'HARA of Illinois; H. R. 10532, ADDONIZIO; H. R. 10533, BARRETT; H. R. 10534, ASHLEY; H. R. 10884, MURRAY of Illinois.

5. To provide 1 additional year for guaranteeing loans in process on July 25, 1957: H. R. 9260 (as amended on floor prior to passage by House, April 23, 1956).

TABLE 1.—*Closed loans guaranteed or insured (cumulative through Mar. 25, 1956)*

Location	All loans		Home loans		Farm loans		Business loans	
	Number	Principal amount	Number	Principal amount	Number	Principal amount	Number	Principal amount
Total	4,688,321	$35,413,359,430	4,394,171	$34,527,208,507	69,242	$272,397,857	224,908	$613,753,066
Alabama: Montgomery	58,117	413,855,731	54,177	403,053,391	2,862	6,844,458	1,078	3,957,882
Alaska: Juneau	375	2,311,095	284	1,930,657			91	380,438
Arizona: Phoenix	21,713	149,759,454	20,140	145,199,961	281	977,581	1,292	3,581,912
Arkansas: Little Rock	26,294	132,237,655	22,817	123,343,770	1,657	3,905,432	1,820	4,988,453
California:								
Los Angeles	328,667	2,964,431,889	322,289	2,941,823,000	152	1,087,670	6,226	21,521,219
San Diego	27,024	242,248,744	26,410	240,437,578	8	60,925	606	1,750,241
San Francisco	236,241	1,934,126,333	227,944	1,902,481,344	1,083	7,076,948	7,214	24,568,041
Colorado: Denver	55,044	426,635,214	48,685	402,789,010	4,131	17,073,531	2,228	6,772,673
Connecticut: Hartford	67,734	580,343,101	64,197	571,432,094	41	349,204	3,496	8,561,803
Delaware: Wilmington	19,083	176,319,676	18,773	174,842,890	142	810,628	168	666,158
District of Columbia: Washington [1]	72,779	777,175,694	70,566	771,775,164	5	36,000	2,208	5,364,530
Florida:								
Miami	48,958	402,221,690	48,586	400,883,523	7	60,115	365	1,278,052
Pass-a-Grille	59,236	442,742,470	58,266	439,225,396	54	167,210	916	3,349,864
Georgia: Atlanta	86,979	658,535,747	82,383	643,985,880	2,431	7,231,266	2,165	7,318,601
Hawaii: Honolulu	5,860	56,540,928	5,683	56,039,589	1	3,900	176	497,439
Idaho: Boise	13,006	80,964,217	12,032	77,188,416	504	2,001,707	470	1,774,094
Illinois: Chicago	173,573	1,318,477,056	165,344	1,293,260,545	1,904	7,330,081	6,325	17,886,430
Indiana: Indianapolis	91,526	545,375,882	86,710	528,167,631	2,259	9,602,559	2,557	7,605,692
Iowa: Des Moines	63,145	393,707,782	54,141	362,823,580	5,410	19,245,808	3,594	11,638,394
Kansas: Wichita	47,360	298,283,174	43,388	285,590,421	1,559	5,850,129	2,413	6,842,624
Kentucky: Louisville	39,137	265,175,632	35,482	249,917,634	1,974	9,828,111	1,681	5,429,887
Louisiana:								
New Orleans	38,168	301,483,427	37,211	298,964,126	143	373,889	814	2,145,412
Shreveport	17,490	125,445,459	16,761	123,320,457	438	1,088,221	291	1,036,781
Maine: Togus	20,535	98,332,356	18,335	91,808,939	450	1,601,486	1,750	4,921,931
Maryland: Baltimore	74,536	555,749,174	72,568	549,858,100	248	1,499,861	1,720	4,391,213
Massachusetts: Boston	217,809	1,725,298,786	210,022	1,702,438,611	169	1,158,399	7,618	21,701,776
Michigan: Detroit	181,855	1,425,005,739	176,745	1,408,386,962	976	4,054,301	4,134	12,564,476
Minnesota: St. Paul	95,905	748,367,611	86,581	718,782,780	3,398	13,402,241	5,926	16,182,590
Mississippi: Jackson	28,461	179,793,673	25,461	170,798,652	2,498	7,181,452	502	1,813,569
Missouri:								
Kansas City	63,095	439,827,204	56,728	418,033,224	3,272	13,489,038	3,095	8,304,942
St. Louis	46,716	368,460,743	42,562	355,884,832	1,720	6,182,630	2,434	6,393,281
Montana: Fort Harrison	10,434	71,400,785	8,935	66,214,967	488	1,747,955	1,011	3,437,863
Nebraska: Lincoln	24,810	151,197,444	21,928	142,769,024	1,603	4,546,127	1,279	3,882,293
Nevada: Reno	3,045	20,312,850	2,793	19,343,450	74	313,189	178	656,211
New Hampshire: Manchester	25,969	144,073,164	23,844	135,747,207	285	1,487,216	1,840	6,838,741
New Jersey: Newark	235,487	1,939,225,029	213,985	1,894,858,115	108	762,075	21,394	43,604,839
New Mexico: Albuquerque	23,146	163,178,319	22,105	159,312,551	356	1,300,226	685	2,565,542
New York:								
Albany	46,407	308,385,078	42,251	294,158,384	832	4,049,348	3,324	10,177,346
Buffalo	95,166	754,276,835	92,264	741,931,670	765	3,558,566	2,137	8,786,599
New York	334,122	2,582,261,180	261,877	2,420,509,504	66	468,354	72,179	161,283,322
Syracuse	60,641	429,343,283	55,942	412,736,248	1,255	5,733,911	3,444	10,873,124
North Carolina: Winston-Salem	54,690	358,871,855	53,162	352,601,914	482	2,363,994	1,046	3,905,947
North Dakota:								
Fargo	10,850	58,040,198	7,232	47,469,952	2,192	6,164,126	1,426	4,406,120
Ohio:								
Cincinnati	85,190	653,576,045	82,364	641,244,413	1,470	7,450,696	1,356	4,880,936
Cleveland	139,576	1,091,021,790	137,326	1,081,058,791	769	4,648,685	1,481	5,314,314
Oklahoma:								
Muskogee	28,542	171,415,331	26,923	166,883,181	994	2,520,938	625	2,011,212
Oklahoma City	59,802	400,672,426	57,992	393,623,522	918	3,857,475	892	3,191,429
Oregon: Portland	30,694	209,251,972	26,517	195,951,370	742	3,058,084	3,435	10,242,518
Pennsylvania:								
Philadelphia	169,070	1,227,743,450	166,837	1,221,102,313	121	780,178	2,112	5,860,959
Pittsburgh	115,022	782,867,074	108,739	763,013,698	1,086	5,355,540	5,197	14,497,836
Wilkes-Barre	67,099	386,613,987	62,570	367,465,269	1,407	7,098,080	3,122	12,050,638
Puerto Rico: San Juan	4,245	4,168,393	3,935	3,294,880	2	4,300	308	869,213
Rhode Island: Providence	32,993	235,792,850	31,929	231,916,715	5	33,250	1,059	3,842,885
South Carolina: Columbia	34,535	230,605,837	32,877	225,317,059	495	1,495,201	1,163	3,793,577
South Dakota: Sioux Falls	11,057	57,872,887	7,736	48,746,430	1,985	5,034,249	1,336	4,092,208
Tennessee: Nashville	79,129	533,917,046	77,213	525,823,909	1,067	5,087,112	849	3,006,025
Texas:								
Dallas	73,035	484,729,818	69,252	472,319,443	1,506	5,542,460	2,277	6,867,915
Houston	83,424	662,739,641	82,418	659,089,879	333	1,164,531	673	2,485,231
Lubbock	45,765	347,007,528	44,144	340,568,746	918	4,028,146	703	2,410,636
San Antonio	51,683	414,773,297	50,473	409,783,665	393	1,543,152	817	3,446,480
Waco	22,641	160,146,519	20,652	150,827,686	1,323	6,635,515	666	2,683,318
Utah: Salt Lake City	20,713	149,516,414	19,797	146,510,309	190	773,251	726	2,232,854
Vermont: White River Junction	12,689	66,839,975	11,251	60,944,171	734	3,276,558	704	2,619,246
Virginia: Roanoke	63,143	453,809,458	60,757	444,671,553	818	3,913,736	1,568	5,224,169
Washington: Seattle	103,453	717,441,413	99,246	704,756,050	428	2,455,843	3,779	10,229,520
West Virginia: Huntington	20,450	120,283,319	19,413	116,502,723	411	1,438,162	626	2,342,434
Wisconsin: Milwaukee	75,307	579,285,497	68,844	554,201,821	2,690	12,395,914	3,773	12,687,762
Wyoming: Cheyenne	7,876	61,468,107	7,377	59,469,768	154	736,933	345	1,261,406

[1] Reported by veterans' benefits office.

TABLE 2.—*Direct loan program (as of Mar. 25, 1956)*

Location	Loans closed and fully disbursed by VA		Terminated loans				Loans outstanding	Loans in default			Applications in process funds reserved	Applications awaiting VHMCP or VA processing [1]	Loans committed under VHMCP [1]
			Sold		Repaid in full	Foreclosed or voluntarily conveyed		Total	4 or more installments				
	Number	Average amount	Number	Percent of fully disbursed loans					Number	Percent of outstanding loans			
Total	74,876	$7,173	6,993	9.3	2,584	232	65,067	3,295	653	1.0	3,968	444	4,575
Alabama: Montgomery	2,589	7,683	10	.4	59	8	2,512	119	5	.2	137	3	131
Alaska: Juneau	591	8,866	0		25	4	562	0	0		47	0	0
Arizona: Phoenix	521	7,198	3	.6	10	0	508	26	10	2.0	17	7	14
Arkansas: Little Rock	1,965	6,871	168	8.5	36	0	1,761	85	6	.3	71	14	92
California:													
Los Angeles	395	8,481	11	2.8	6	0	378	32	3	.8	15	14	10
San Diego	289	8,551	20	6.9	11	3	255	6	0		0	0	0
San Francisco	993	9,043	0		42	0	951	91	30	3.2	27	0	39
Colorado: Denver	1,021	7,353	22	2.2	40	7	952	43	3	.3	66	7	111
Connecticut: Hartford [2]													
Delaware: Wilmington [2]													
District of Columbia: Washington [2]													
Florida:													
Miami	257	9,123	24	9.3	7	1	225	5	0		8	2	9
Pass-A-Grille	1,020	7,992	59	5.8	28	2	931	18	4	.4	64	11	28
Georgia: Atlanta	2,660	7,049	105	3.9	91	5	2,459	191	21	.9	294	6	177
Hawaii: Honolulu [2]													
Idaho: Boise	782	7,492	337	43.1	15	0	430	30	5	1.2	18	13	104
Illinois: Chicago	2,738	6,909	453	16.5	76	12	2,197	122	20	.9	273	0	325
Indiana: Indianapolis	2,591	6,236	349	13.5	104	9	2,129	110	15	.7	58	16	89
Iowa: Des Moines	1,755	6,505	529	30.1	93	1	1,132	46	5	.4	55	0	143
Kansas: Wichita	821	7,027	292	35.6	13	3	513	25	5	1.0	4	2	91
Kentucky: Louisville	4,047	6,542	16	.4	217	20	3,794	119	15	.4	176	13	309
Louisiana:													
New Orleans	1,364	7,768	21	1.5	51	4	1,288	23	4	.3	79	11	39
Shreveport	976	7,319	0		47	6	923	40	7	.8	46	21	63
Maine: Togus	832	5,561	338	40.6	31	9	454	6	0		20	5	105
Maryland: Baltimore	853	7,823	40	4.7	41	3	769	66	14	1.8	17	0	61
Massachusetts: Boston [2]													
Michigan: Detroit	2,374	7,414	88	3.7	58	4	2,224	196	24	1.1	107	17	195
Minnesota: St. Paul	1,839	6,952	103	5.6	71	9	1,656	61	4	.2	129	22	62
Mississippi: Jackson	2,629	7,677	69	2.6	72	7	2,481	147	35	1.4	163	43	121
Missouri:													
Kansas City	1,268	7,084	6	.5	57	2	1,203	14	1	.1	136	9	139
St. Louis	1,515	6,894	22	1.5	62	2	1,429	39	6	.4	104	4	157
Montana: Fort Harrison	1,256	7,249	131	10.4	78	2	1,045	34	10	1.0	62	0	45
Nebraska: Lincoln	867	6,882	22	2.5	74	0	771	3	0		23	2	62
Nevada: Reno	378	8,564	0		18	0	360	29	5	1.4	14	1	2
New Hampshire: Manchester [2]													
New Jersey: Newark [2]													
New Mexico: Albuquerque	846	7,862	20	2.4	12	0	814	19	1	.1	40	18	61
New York:													
Albany	304	6,811	97	31.9	12	0	195	33	12	6.2	6	2	60
Buffalo	201	6,183	145	72.1	1	2	53	6	0		3	0	14
New York [2]													
Syracuse	138	6,345	110	79.7	2	0	26	9	4	15.4	2	0	2
North Carolina: Winston-Salem	3,900	7,678	216	5.5	70	8	3,606	153	27	.7	227	5	316
North Dakota: Fargo	978	6,014	129	13.2	43	3	803	38	6	.7	57	15	19
Ohio:													
Cincinnati	1,954	6,714	80	4.1	57	1	1,816	49	3	.2	68	1	71
Cleveland	1,608	7,463	91	5.7	72	4	1,441	81	24	1.7	47	17	130
Oklahoma:													
Muskogee	648	6,578	0		26	0	622	13	4	.6	37	5	52
Oklahoma City	597	7,186	57	9.5	11	0	529	26	16	3.0	43	0	64
Oregon: Portland	634	7,426	104	16.4	15	3	512	27	5	1.0	23	2	54
Pennsylvania:													
Philadelphia [2]													
Pittsburgh	1,617	7,239	266	16.5	56	8	1,287	61	17	1.3	103	0	97
Wilkes-Barre	1,484	6,576	170	11.5	100	7	1,207	76	22	1.8	2	0	64
Puerto Rico: San Juan	740	8,417	0		10	0	730	124	4	.5	183	2	29
Rhode Island: Providence [2]													
South Carolina: Columbia	1,684	7,631	84	5.0	31	1	1,568	126	24	1.5	110	25	103
South Dakota: Sioux Falls	1,151	6,712	88	7.6	87	0	976	35	9	.9	60	18	50
Tennessee: Nashville	2,279	6,807	44	1.9	61	22	2,152	87	15	.7	150	0	47
Texas:													
Dallas	910	7,348	42	4.6	11	0	857	10	0		22	0	42
Houston	683	7,579	110	16.1	20	6	547	22	4	.7	24	0	26
Lubbock	830	7,218	0		23	4	803	25	3	.4	37	9	29
San Antonio	323	7,590	112	34.7	5	1	205	15	5	2.4	3	2	11
Waco	860	6,893	17	2.0	25	0	818	4	0		35	3	45
Utah: Salt Lake City	626	7,836	18	2.9	14	0	594	46	11	1.9	102	34	46
Vermont: White River Junction	254	5,419	239	94.1	4	0	11	1	1	9.1	0	0	3
Virginia: Roanoke	3,169	7,345	49	1.5	128	12	2,980	86	19	.6	182	9	98
Washington: Seattle	606	7,543	23	3.8	16	5	562	87	18	3.2	27	0	104
West Virginia: Huntington	2,456	6,673	1	0	75	7	2,373	265	137	5.8	77	0	131
Wisconsin: Milwaukee	1,828	6,839	1,365	74.7	58	15	390	32	4	1.0	61	34	53
Wyoming: Cheyenne	382	8,263	78	20.4	6	0	298	13	1	.3	7	0	31

[1] Direct loan applications received between February and September 1955 were referred to regional committees of the voluntary home mortgage credit program for placement with private lenders before being processed as direct loans. A total of 14,393 such applications were referred to VHMCP and 4,575 loans placed as a result of such referrals.

[2] No portion of region eligible for direct loans.

TABLE 3.—*Number and amount of GI loans guaranteed or insured by the VA*

During fiscal year—	Number of loans				Principal amount of loans (millions of dollars)			
	All types	Home loans	Farm loans	Business loans	All types	Home loans	Farm loans	Business loans
Cumulative total, March 1956	4,688,320	4,394,170	69,240	224,910	35,413	34,527	272	614
1944–46	183,250	161,405	6,295	15,550	846	782	19	45
1947	640,300	562,985	24,690	52,625	3,612	3,346	98	168
1948	520,095	479,335	14,475	26,285	2,962	2,817	59	86
1949	279,230	260,380	6,060	12,790	1,353	1,293	22	38
1950	397,785	380,360	4,975	12,450	2,163	2,113	18	32
1951	538,670	516,940	4,405	17,325	3,693	3,634	19	40
1952	423,940	367,650	2,545	53,745	3,315	3,200	10	105
1953	316,680	300,435	1,565	14,680	2,780	2,735	7	38
1954	332,570	322,155	1,320	9,095	3,224	3,193	5	26
1955	571,150	562,890	1,790	6,470	6,053	6,023	9	21
1956 (9 months)	484,650	479,635	1,120	3,895	5,412	5,391	6	15

TABLE 4.—*Monthly trends in total applications received and loans closed under the VA loan guaranty program*

	Total number of applications	Total loans closed		
		Number	Principal amount	Amount of guaranty or insurance
1947, total	619,317	600,857	$3,489,691,267	$1,642,892,740
Jan. 25	49,654	53,424	307,624,140	144,562,873
Feb. 25	48,308	50,477	291,936,273	138,626,029
Mar. 25	47,036	45,003	257,649,734	119,183,777
Apr. 25	57,977	57,041	323,220,290	152,062,639
May 25	51,476	47,473	270,167,795	127,019,890
June 25	57,695	52,667	311,361,431	146,793,516
July 25	52,899	49,271	293,466,880	139,801,709
Aug. 25	52,539	47,546	277,948,790	130,925,806
Sept. 25	56,949	51,607	306,632,798	144,057,510
Oct. 25	52,539	49,249	292,612,635	135,667,057
Nov. 25	50,444	49,964	287,579,519	137,659,693
Dec. 25	41,801	47,135	269,490,982	126,532,241
1948, total	357,589	378,290	1,982,766,185	967,823,089
Jan. 25	35,816	45,702	267,093,852	126,320,484
Feb. 25	35,969	43,014	246,458,277	117,014,438
Mar. 25	33,439	38,645	214,678,089	102,808,772
Apr. 25	31,904	32,890	178,984,798	85,051,935
May 25	34,108	33,360	171,025,219	83,563,900
June 25	32,418	32,237	160,426,973	81,324,046
July 25	26,798	26,469	137,170,761	67,046,643
Aug. 25	29,564	28,388	143,218,694	69,996,602
Sept. 25	25,739	25,149	124,387,406	62,298,102
Oct. 25	24,864	24,022	114,909,632	57,694,876
Nov. 25	24,602	25,583	118,515,229	60,476,102
Dec. 25	22,368	22,831	105,897,255	54,227,184
1949, total	363,415	293,734	1,473,485,763	743,076,370
Jan. 25	21,088	22,536	105,780,059	54,335,635
Feb. 25	21,093	22,023	101,733,172	52,943,529
Mar. 25	20,583	18,794	86,487,212	44,790,539
Apr. 25	23,309	19,118	90,218,183	45,894,072
May 25	27,149	21,952	110,394,616	55,442,885
June 25	28,864	22,782	117,840,116	58,985,022
July 25	28,698	21,797	111,805,872	56,060,248
Aug. 25	36,394	26,294	135,095,941	67,769,084
Sept. 25	35,383	25,542	134,666,933	66,694,578
Oct. 25	40,839	32,418	166,189,981	8 3110,492
Nov. 25	40,978	32,103	166,233,717	83,344,023
Dec. 25	39,037	28,375	147,039,961	73,706,263
1950, total	642,005	514,573	3,125,040,262	1,680,254,730
Jan. 25	43,580	35,816	186,873,846	94,004,048
Feb. 25	43,046	41,539	222,141,295	111,103,712
Mar. 25	45,726	40,550	226,071,530	111,567,733
Apr. 25	50,786	38,666	222,480,916	109,080,698
May 25	52,133	38,476	224,845,875	108,672,061
June 25	52,768	36,208	218,926,900	109,329,308
July 25	61,295	38,801	237,480,061	126,144,795
Aug. 25	71,010	44,018	272,118,905	151,175,735
Sept. 25	64,979	41,212	261,924,207	148,431,176
Oct. 25	68,445	52,852	337,202,691	194,455,627
Nov. 25	48,224	54,931	360,924,747	209,571,316
Dec. 25	40,013	51,504	354,049,289	206,718,521
1951, total	429,713	493,494	3,713,228,497	2,145,144,315
Jan. 25	41,590	51,891	365,009,215	213,686,488
Feb. 25	35,049	46,712	329,499,744	193,776,554
Mar. 25	36,726	40,940	299,338,372	174,409,607
Apr. 25	41,326	41,495	306,785,017	177,917,085
May 25	37,058	38,895	298,350,298	172,905,769
June 25	35,959	35,420	270,084,228	156,137,899
1951—Continued				
July 25	37,573	42,772	$328,242,204	$189,652,279
Aug. 25	34,303	41,243	324,238,362	188,068,009
Sept. 25	32,835	35,441	279,167,315	160,824,796
Oct. 25	32,284	38,190	304,911,607	175,481,273
Nov. 25	30,408	41,931	322,929,389	182,576,067
Dec. 25	34,602	38,564	284,672,746	159,708,489
1952, total	340,599	339,409	2,793,972,409	1,603,004,573
Jan. 25	30,906	40,182	313,029,569	178,806,140
Feb. 25	28,168	32,454	252,689,525	143,905,043
Mar. 25	27,600	31,355	245,442,612	139,653,634
Apr. 25	29,410	31,361	252,095,762	142,469,216
May 25	24,814	25,918	208,984,547	119,697,691
June 25	26,303	24,863	201,535,820	115,193,774
July 25	24,785	22,892	192,632,711	111,270,745
Aug. 25	27,270	24,601	207,230,283	119,447,610
Sept. 25	29,803	25,641	220,943,703	127,802,301
Oct. 25	30,777	25,949	223,004,036	129,001,298
Nov. 25	32,214	28,132	246,252,425	142,313,966
Dec. 25	28,549	26,061	230,131,416	133,443,155
1953, total	336,139	336,100	3,103,520,302	1,791,085,159
January	25,387	28,126	247,002,946	142,642,701
February	28,466	31,651	278,380,436	161,004,187
March	26,603	25,999	232,012,348	133,437,593
April	28,320	26,944	239,515,613	137,922,547
May	25,238	24,131	219,363,038	126,577,504
June	27,824	26,631	245,436,170	141,627,085
July	26,403	25,975	242,365,200	139,814,859
August	32,445	26,456	250,850,346	144,732,309
September	34,944	33,113	312,119,694	180,463,014
October	26,840	30,709	294,187,662	169,899,611
November	28,959	29,911	287,389,193	166,015,047
December	24,710	26,454	254,897,656	146,948,702
1954, total	536,665	419,372	4,285,059,759	2,448,926,382
January	22,139	25,431	249,903,694	144,302,668
February	27,604	27,218	270,426,135	155,591,271
March	28,738	23,073	228,092,322	131,103,039
April	35,033	25,963	252,380,886	144,364,989
May	42,783	27,532	272,274,387	156,344,625
June	47,040	30,849	311,183,565	178,556,786
July	46,225	29,249	295,577,116	168,833,531
August	60,196	40,902	420,155,918	240,519,918
September	57,844	40,008	412,228,029	235,222,754
October	58,492	49,317	519,899,353	296,003,884
November	57,822	47,236	495,148,135	281,548,726
December	52,749	52,594	557,790,219	316,534,191
1955, total	677,154	657,485	7,188,293,908	4,033,151,305
January	52,600	58,909	624,824,867	354,096,275
February	56,553	53,321	568,816,866	321,578,376
March	51,923	49,978	534,919,101	303,139,173
April	54,544	48,279	518,742,450	288,635,163
May	59,597	50,620	551,371,993	309,812,261
June	59,363	50,844	555,190,461	311,832,475
July	54,913	47,895	522,851,877	293,034,749
August	67,009	56,377	619,741,508	347,370,454
September	55,588	53,378	592,027,140	331,786,681
October	63,335	65,163	720,014,673	403,501,768
November	55,748	66,899	757,221,447	421,751,664
December	45,981	55,822	622,571,705	346,612,266

TABLE 5.—*Trends in average purchase prices of home loans closed*

Date	Existing homes					New and proposed homes				
	Number of loans	Average purchase price	Percent			Number of loans	Average purchase price	Percent		
			Under $10,000	$10,000 to $11,999	$12,000 and over			Under $10,000	$10,000 to $11,999	$12,000 and over
1950—January	10,552	$8,285	76.4	13.0	10.6	11,424	$8,887	77.2	14.8	8.0
February	12,483	8,215	75.1	14.0	10.9	13,476	8,819	78.2	13.8	8.0
March	12,985	8,231	74.9	14.2	10.9	13,615	8,857	77.0	14.8	8.2
April	12,243	8,043	77.0	13.1	9.9	14,314	8,670	79.8	13.1	7.1
May	12,581	8,271	74.3	14.2	11.5	14,235	8,701	79.8	12.8	7.4
June	12,246	8,251	74.8	13.1	12.1	14,389	8,761	79.0	13.4	7.6
July	12,820	8,210	75.6	13.4	11.0	16,203	8,658	80.1	13.1	6.8
August	13,693	8,463	73.4	14.1	12.5	18,837	8,762	80.3	13.1	6.6
September	12,669	8,561	72.5	13.8	13.7	18,624	8,854	79.5	13.3	7.2
October	16,547	8,698	70.6	15.2	14.2	22,901	9,115	76.6	15.2	8.2
November	16,307	8,940	68.3	16.1	15.6	25,164	9,368	73.8	16.6	9.6
December	15,050	9,078	66.7	16.4	16.9	25,675	9,421	73.0	17.2	9.8
1951—January	14,857	9,105	65.7	17.6	16.7	27,168	9,439	73.3	16.9	9.8
February	12,237	8,382	61.6	19.0	19.4	24,875	9,589	71.5	17.8	10.7
March	10,491	9,391	62.2	18.2	19.6	22,833	9,913	65.9	21.1	13.0
April	10,911	9,374	62.2	17.5	20.3	23,101	10,017	62.8	23.5	13.7
May	10,694	9,256	62.1	18.0	19.9	22,837	10,099	61.6	25.6	12.8
June	10,433	9,395	60.9	18.3	20.8	20,067	10,263	57.4	27.4	15.2
July	9,523	9,468	60.7	17.6	21.7	26,448	10,306	59.5	26.7	13.8
August	9,077	9,116	66.4	15.8	17.8	27,155	10,242	57.0	28.3	14.7

TABLE 5.—*Trends in average purchase prices of home loans closed*—Continued

Date	Existing homes					New and proposed homes				
	Number of loans	Average purchase price	Percent			Number of loans	Average purchase price	Percent		
			Under $10,000	$10,000 to $11,999	$12,000 and over			Under $10,000	$10,000 to $11,999	$12,000 and over
September	7,479	$9,335	62.2	17.4	20.4	23,022	$10,403	50.4	33.3	16.3
October	8,796	9,634	59.1	17.5	23.4	21,204	10,680	44.2	36.7	19.1
November	10,064	10,359	51.0	11.0	38.0	23,683	10,859	40.4	37.3	22.3
December	8,292	10,107	53.3	19.9	26.8	21,082	10,911	38.8	41.2	20.0
1952—January	10,010	9,868	56.2	18.6	25.2	23,442	10,845	39.2	40.2	20.6
February	8,799	10,104	52.8	19.6	27.6	18,032	10,896	38.8	37.7	23.5
March	8,927	9,956	53.9	20.8	25.3	17,252	10,796	41.7	37.2	21.1
April	10,472	9,995	53.1	21.0	25.9	16,680	10,792	43.1	36.3	20.6
May	9,250	9,885	54.2	20.4	25.4	13,628	10,808	41.4	33.6	25.0
June	8,704	10,031	52.5	20.2	27.3	13,442	10,915	42.6	33.7	23.7
July	7,858	10,133	52.6	19.9	27.5	13,323	10,929	41.5	32.2	26.3
August	8,385	10,172	52.4	19.3	28.3	14,232	10,919	40.2	32.9	26.9
September	9,019	10,389	48.4	21.0	30.6	14,921	11,024	36.8	34.9	28.3
October	9,513	10,141	51.2	20.9	27.9	14,866	10,945	37.0	34.0	27.0
November	10,985	10,418	48.1	22.2	29.7	16,356	11,102	36.3	34.9	28.8
December	8,474	10,421	49.0	21.3	29.7	16,028	11,045	35.1	41.7	23.2
1953—January	9,628	10,477	49.0	20.7	30.3	16,757	11,017	36.7	35.5	27.8
February	10,521	10,588	47.4	20.5	32.1	19,163	10,975	36.7	36.4	26.9
March	8,588	10,781	44.5	21.7	33.8	15,615	11,113	33.8	38.0	28.2
April	8,995	10,503	47.4	21.8	30.8	16,025	10,932	35.2	38.1	26.7
May	7,574	10,805	45.1	21.4	33.5	14,961	11,122	39.9	39.9	29.2
June	8,845	10,854	44.6	21.6	33.8	16,173	11,348	26.9	40.2	32.9
July	8,830	10,970	43.9	22.0	34.1	15,747	11,378	28.1	39.3	32.6
August	9,117	10,853	42.9	24.1	33.0	16,097	11,626	25.2	38.6	36.2
September	12,637	10,654	45.1	22.9	32.0	19,279	11,504	28.2	36.7	35.1
October	11,057	10,703	43.9	23.9	32.2	18,440	11,676	24.7	36.2	39.0
November	10,262	10,847	42.3	23.8	33.9	18,480	11,622	28.2	34.8	37.0
December	9,181	10,647	44.9	22.6	32.5	16,163	11,750	24.7	36.5	38.8
1954—January	8,023	10,822	43.3	22.0	34.7	16,497	11,893	22.8	36.5	40.7
February	8,702	10,959	43.2	21.8	35.0	17,510	11,853	23.3	35.2	41.5
March	7,200	10,836	43.7	21.2	35.1	14,900	11,742	23.9	33.5	42.6
April	9,276	10,815	43.6	23.1	33.3	15,055	11,747	25.5	33.5	41.0
May	10,647	10,799	45.3	21.4	33.3	15,774	11,733	25.3	34.7	40.0
June	11,649	10,913	43.7	22.9	33.4	18,337	11,753	26.1	33.7	40.2
July	12,110	10,919	44.1	22.4	33.5	16,210	11,905	23.5	34.2	42.3
August	17,469	11,023	41.8	23.3	34.9	22,673	11,940	22.9	34.0	43.1
September	16,332	10,903	43.8	22.6	33.6	22,574	11,987	22.5	35.3	42.2
October	21,284	11,288	39.2	23.0	37.8	27,189	12,077	22.3	33.0	44.7
November	19,322	10,982	42.8	22.9	34.3	26,962	11,995	22.6	35.0	42.4
December	22,170	11,110	40.9	23.2	35.9	29,545	12,119	20.6	34.3	45.1
1955—January	23,288	11,138	40.8	22.7	36.5	33,989	12,165	20.2	33.1	46.7
February	21,180	11,058	41.8	22.1	36.1	30,919	12,195	20.1	31.7	48.2
March	18,732	11,109	41.2	22.2	36.6	30,062	12,036	21.4	33.2	45.4
April	19,440	11,254	39.8	22.8	37.4	27,612	12,106	21.1	33.2	45.7
May	20,643	11,323	38.6	22.5	38.9	28,928	12,357	18.3	30.5	51.2
June	20,430	11,270	39.8	22.4	37.8	29,440	12,475	16.7	30.2	53.1
July	18,714	11,348	39.4	21.8	38.8	28,174	12,494	17.8	29.1	53.1
August	22,752	11,505	37.2	21.9	40.9	32,505	12,559	16.7	28.4	54.9
September	20,748	11,571	36.4	22.3	41.3	31,775	12,561	16.3	28.7	55.0
October	25,450	11,435	37.9	21.8	40.3	38,449	12,663	14.8	28.2	57.0
November	23,803	11,536	35.8	22.0	42.2	41,797	12,894	12.1	26.5	61.4
December	20,399	11,505	36.5	22.2	41.3	33,997	12,935	12.9	26.6	60.5
1956—January	16,388	11,668	34.8	22.4	42.8	32,908	13,026	11.8	27.5	60.7
February	15,840	11,844	33.9	21.4	44.7	30,341	13,103	11.7	25.9	62.4
March	13,441	11,636	35.6	21.8	42.6	27,014	13,041	12.4	25.3	62.3

TABLE 6.—*Characteristics of home loans closed under the VA loan guaranty program, November 1944 to December 1955*

	November 1944 to December 1946	Total, 1947	Total, 1948	Total, 1949	Total, 1950	Total, 1951	Total, 1952	Total, 1953	Total, 1954	Total, 1955	Cumulative total, December 1955
Total number of home loans closed	455,293	541,922	349,934	276,793	497,596	447,373	306,783	322,160	410,778	649,591	4,256,513
TYPE OF LENDER DISTRIBUTION, ALL HOME LOANS (ORIGINATIONS)											
Total, all lenders	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Commercial banks	38.7	39.6	37.3	26.9	21.4	23.2	21.8	17.0	12.6	14.4	25.2
Savings and loan	39.4	31.5	26.9	20.5	21.9	20.0	26.5	28.7	22.4	23.8	26.3
Mortgage and real estate	10.7	15.5	16.6	33.9	39.1	32.6	30.6	32.9	45.5	46.2	30.9
Mutual banks	7.9	6.7	9.9	10.9	9.1	11.5	15.1	17.3	13.3	9.5	10.6
Insurance companies	2.9	6.4	8.6	7.3	8.0	11.9	5.0	2.8	5.3	5.3	6.3
Individual and other	.4	.3	.7	.5	.5	.8	1.0	1.3	.9	.8	.7
PURPOSE OF LOAN DISTRIBUTION, ALL HOME LOANS											
	November 1944 to December 1946	Total, 1947	Total, 1948	Total, 1949	Total, 1950	Total, 1951	Total, 1952	Total, 1953	Total, 1954	Total, 1955	Cumulative total, December 1955
Total, all purposes	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Purchase existing home	83.5	57.6	48.0	39.4	36.3	28.0	35.7	35.9	40.0	39.3	44.8
New and existing construction	16.1	41.3	50.2	59.1	62.8	71.0	62.9	63.0	59.2	59.7	54.2
Alteration and repair	.4	1.1	1.8	1.5	.9	1.0	1.4	1.3	.8	1.0	1.0

TABLE 6.—*Characteristics of home loans closed under the VA loan guaranty program, November 1944 to December 1955*—Continued

DOWNPAYMENT STATUS OF PRIMARY (SEC. 501) HOME LOANS (EXCEPT ALTERATION AND REPAIR LOANS)

Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
100-percent loans	61.1	40.0	23.8	34.3	44.2	21.2	5.2	8.2	28.2	39.6	32.2
Downpayment loans	38.9	60.0	76.2	65.7	55.8	78.8	94.8	91.8	71.8	60.4	67.8

NOTE.—Annual figures in this table are not adjusted for subsequent corrections; therefore they do not always coincide with published cumulative data.

TABLE 7.—*Veteran participation in VA-guaranteed and direct-loan programs in metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties (cumulative as of end of December 1955)*

	Number of counties	Estimated World War II and Korean veteran population, December 1955 [1]	Loans made as percent of veteran population					Estimated number of veterans who have not used entitlement
			Total number guaranteed and direct loans made [2]	Total guaranteed and direct loans	Guaranteed loans		Direct loans	
					Home loans	Farm and business loans		
All United States counties, total	3,074	18,894,000	4,623,716	24.5	22.5	1.6	0.4	14,270,300
Direct-loan counties:								
Wholly eligible	2,362	4,685,100	523,474	11.2	8.0	1.8	1.4	4,161,600
Partially eligible	253	2,861,000	801,516	28.0	26.7	1.0	.3	2,059,500
Non-direct-loan counties	459	11,347,900	3,298,726	29.1	27.4	1.6	[3].1	8,049,200
Metropolitan counties, total [4]	282	11,761,500	3,519,257	29.9	28.3	1.5	.1	8,242,200
Direct-loan counties:								
Wholly eligible	14	132,900	21,199	16.0	14.1	.7	1.2	111,700
Partially eligible	63	1,743,000	566,151	32.5	31.4	.9	.2	1,176,800
Non-direct-loan counties	205	9,885,600	2,931,907	29.6	28.0	1.6	[3].02	6,953,700
Nonmetropolitan counties, medium size, total [5]	148	1,281,000	288,908	22.6	20.9	1.1	.6	992,100
Direct-loan counties:								
Wholly eligible	42	300,500	46,760	15.5	13.3	.9	1.3	253,700
Partially eligible	49	473,200	103,835	21.9	20.6	.8	.5	369,400
Non-direct-loan counties	57	507,300	138,313	27.3	25.8	1.3	[3].2	369,000
Nonmetropolitan counties, small, total [6]	2,644	5,851,500	815,551	13.9	11.0	1.8	1.1	5,036,000
Direct-loan counties:								
Wholly eligible	2,306	4,251,700	455,515	10.7	7.4	1.9	1.4	3,796,200
Partially eligible	141	644,800	131,530	20.4	18.3	1.5	.6	513,300
Non-direct-loan counties	197	955,000	228,506	23.9	21.9	1.8	[3].2	726,500
Small nonmetropolitan counties which are wholly eligible, by veteran population size groups:								
5,000 and over	45	371,200	47,256	12.7	10.8	.6	1.3	323,900
2,500 to 5,000	284	1,199,400	142,721	11.9	9.1	1.3	1.5	1,056,700
1,000 to 2,500	959	1,930,300	201,711	10.4	6.9	2.1	1.4	1,728,600
Under 1,000	1,018	750,800	63,827	8.5	4.4	2.6	1.5	687,000

[1] Includes 14,548,000 veterans of World War II only, 3,503,000 veterans of Korean conflict only; and 843,000 veterans with World War II and Korean conflict service.
[2] Includes 272,510 loans to veterans with Korean conflict entitlement.
[3] Direct-loan status as of Dec. 31, 1955. Some excluded counties were formerly eligible, in whole or part.
[4] Metropolitan counties, as classified by Bureau of Census.
[5] Nonmetropolitan counties where 1950 population of largest city was between 25,000 and 50,000.
[6] Nonmetropolitan counties where 1950 population of largest city was less than 25,000.

TABLE 8.—*Loan guaranty program—Statement of accountability for appropriated funds—Disbursed and collections received (cumulative through Mar. 31, 1956)*

TOTAL FUNDS DISBURSED AND RECEIPTS RETURNED TO TREASURY

Total appropriated funds expended (exclusive of 4-percent gratuities):		
1. For payment of claims	$82,207,315.15	
2. For acquisition of property (additional cost)	70,693,266.37	
3. For acquisition of loans, property management and sale and all other expenditures	22,263,880.40	
Total appropriated funds expended		$175,164,461.92
Receipts returned to general fund of Treasury:		
1. Total general fund receipts deposited	$62,669,887.09	
2. Deposits to general fund pending	15,311.97	
		62,685,199.06
Net expenditures to be accounted for		112,479,262.86

ACCOUNTABILITY FOR NET EXPENDITURES

Assets on hand:		
1. Property owned:		
(a) Property owned in absolute title	$18,737,200.23	
(b) Property in process of acquisition	2,251,269.67	
		20,988,469.90
2. Loans receivable:		
(a) Acquired loans:		
501 loans	1,161,391.51	
505 (a) loans	676,797.49	
FHA loans	1,608,042.74	
Other loans	17,352.65	
		3,463,584.39
(b) Vendee accounts on property sold		68,882,481.65
(c) Mortgage loans in process of liquidation		595,034.23
3. Accounts receivable:		
(a) Veterans' liability accounts [1]	$26,529,905.42	
(b) Advances to VA employees for bidding at public sales	98,983.04	
(c) Due from others	90,464.96	
		26,719,353.42
Total assets on hand		120,648,923.59

RESULT OF LIQUIDATION OF ASSETS AND OPERATIONS

1. Income:		
(a) Gross profit on sales:		
Selling price of property	$107,442,270.69	
Book value of property	98,562,576.83	
		$8,879,693.86
(b) Rental and miscellaneous income		1,425,288.64
(c) Interest income:		
From loans receivable	$10,935,146.07	
From veterans' accounts	359,546.68	
		11,294,692.75
Total income		21,599,675.25
2. Expenses and losses:		
(a) Property expense:		
Management expense	$4,303,540.03	
Selling expense	4,833,777.33	
		9,137,317.36
(b) General expense		343,400.61
(c) Writeoff of assets:		
Veterans' liability accounts	$3,883,789.43	
Acquired security and collateral	65,483.32	
		3,949,272.75
Total expenses and losses		13,429,990.72
3. Difference between income and expenses and losses		(8,169,684.53)
4. Intransit items [2]		23.80
Net expenditures accounted for		112,479,262.86

[1] Includes $16,016,520.56 that has been referred to General Accounting Office as uncollectible.
[2] Represents balance of charges and repayments transferred to other stations which were not recorded by receiving stations at the close of the accounting period.

TABLE 9.—*Status of the direct-loan program, Mar. 31, 1956*

Applications	Number
Applications received to date	136,597
Awaiting preliminary screening before referral to VHMCP [1]	9
Awaiting VHMCP action or VA processing	174
VA processing in progress, total	4,229
Awaiting fund reservation	261
Funds reserve, not yet fully disbursed	3,968
Applications disposed of to date	132,185
VHMCP commitments by private lenders [1]	4,575
Rejected by VA or withdrawn	52,734
Loans closed and fully disbursed by VA	74,876

Direct loan fund allotments	Amount
Total allotments to date	$605,398,735
Net reservations to date	568,290,225
Unreserved balance	37,108,510

Status of direct loans closed and fully disbursed	Number	Initial loan amount	Average loan amount
Total loans closed and fully disbursed	74,876	$537,110,092	$7,173
Loans terminated to date, total	9,809	68,621,577	6,996
By sale	6,993	50,295,310	7,192
By repayment in full	2,584	16,973,066	6,569
By foreclosure	124	736,285	5,938
By voluntary conveyance	108	616,916	5,712
Fully disbursed loans outstanding	65,067	468,488,515	7,200
Loans in default, total	3,295		
4 or more installments	653		
Percent of outstanding loans	1.0		

[1] Direct loan applications received between February and September 1955 were referred to regional committees of the voluntary home mortgage credit program for placement with private lenders before being processed as direct loans. A total of 14,393 such applications were referred to VHMCP and 4,575 loans placed as a result of such referrals.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from New York, who has cosponsored the amendment now before the Senate, that I discussed the matter with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] before he had to leave town yesterday. He told me that he was agreeable to the amendment of the Senator from New York. I know of no objection to it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, with all due respect to what the Senator from Alabama has said, I should like to state that I have a substitute to the amendment, which I intend to offer. The subject matter before the Senate deals with a matter which is now before another committee than the committee from which the pending bill was reported.

I am prepared to offer a substitute which will permit a 1-year extension, so that the appropriate committee may have an opportunity to consider the matter. Therefore, there will be opposition to the amendment in the form in which it was offered by the Senator from New York.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator from New York will yield to me briefly, I should like to say that the Senator from California, I am sure, understands that a bill identical with the pending amendment is before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand that to be the fact.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Alabama is the chairman of that committee. The bill was referred to a subcommittee, of which the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is chairman.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I fully realize that that is the situation. However, that bill has not been reported to the Senate. I understand that hearings have not been held on it, or, perhaps, that hearings on it have not been concluded. In any event, the legislation has not been processed for presentation on the floor. I am not raising any point of germaneness, because we do not have such a rule in the Senate. However, in view of the statement of the Senator from Alabama, and so that there will be no misunderstanding, I am prepared to agree to a 1-year extension; but in view of the fact that other legislation is pending before the appropriate committee, I would have to object to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, so as to curtail discussion on this amendment, I wish to say that I will modify my amendment by striking out, in line 5, the word "thirteen" and inserting in lieu thereof "eleven."

In paragraph (b) I would modify my amendment by inserting the figures "1958" in lieu of the figures "1960."

Mr. KNOWLAND. That would provide for a 1-year extension?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes. I think that would meet the objection of the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I wish to call up my amendment designated "5–22–56–A."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire that his amendment be read in full, or to have it printed in the RECORD?

Mr. BRICKER. It may be printed in the RECORD, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 40, beginning with line 3, strike out all through line 21, on page 42, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 501. (a) Subsection (i) of section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended as of August 1, 1956, to read as follows:

"'(i) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law the Authority may enter into new contracts for loans and annual contributions after July 31, 1956, for not more than 35,000 additional dwelling units, which amount shall be increased by 35,000 additional dwelling units on July 1, 1957, and may enter into only such new contracts for preliminary loans in respect thereto as are consistent with the number of dwelling units for which contracts for annual contributions may be entered into hereunder: *Provided*, That the authority to enter into new contracts for annual contributions with respect to each such 35,000 additional dwelling units shall terminate 2 years after the first date on which such authority may be exercised under the foregoing provisions of this subsection: *Provided further*, That no such new contract for annual contributions for additional units shall be entered into except with respect to low-rent housing for a locality respecting which the Housing and Home Finance Administrator has made the determination and certification relating to a workable program as prescribed in section 101 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended: *And provided further*, That no new contracts for loans and annual contributions for additional dwelling units in excess of the number authorized in this sentence shall be entered into unless authorized by the Congress.'

"(b) Clause (2) of the third proviso appearing in that part of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, which is captioned 'Annual contributions' under the heading 'Public Housing Administration' is hereby repealed.

"(c) Section 101 (c) of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting the following after the first comma therein: 'or for annual contributions or capital grants pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, for any project or projects not constructed or covered by a contract for annual contributions prior to August 1, 1956.'

"(d) Subsection (d) of section 21 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the figure '10' in both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the figure '15.'"

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I request that the yeas and nays be ordered on this amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, this amendment embodies the administration's recommendations on public housing. The amendment consists of two main parts:

First. Authorizes the construction of 70,000 units of public housing at the rate of 35,000 units a year for 2 years. This is a substitute for the fantastic authorization of 510,000 units to be constructed at the rate of 135,000 units a year contained in the pending bill.

Second. The bill would also require local communities which receive Federal assistance for public housing to have a workable program for the prevention and elimination of slums.

I realize there are many public interest and some self-interest groups in this country who apply political pressures in the direction of large numbers of public-housing units. These groups contend that we must engage in a "crash" program of public housing with no relationship to clearing up slums. The threat of reprisal at the polls is the penalty for moderation, or, in this instance, proper planning to meet the

needs and overcome the problems which face us.

In my Senate service of nearly 10 years, I can recall no instance of a Senator's failing of reelection because he opposed unlimited public housing—nor the reelection of one Senator because he supported unlimited public housing. Let us banish the strawman of political expediency and consider this amendment on its merits.

The amendment carries out the President's recommendation that 35,000 units a year for each of 2 years be incorporated in the public-housing section of the pending bill. Those who administer the public-housing program have told Congress that this is the type of program which will best meet the needs of the Nation. This is not a percentage of total annual home construction, as is the formula often advocated by those who give little thought to the total approach to the slum problem. Ten percent is their figure. I cannot agree with those who imagine that 10-percent public and 90-percent private enterprise is only mildly socialistic.

The 35,000 units proposed by the administration are not based upon a percentage of socialism or anything else. They are the number of units of public housing which can be programed, contracted for, and constructed in an orderly administrative manner. They are the number which will be occupied by those now consigned to slum living through no fault of their own. They are the number for which local communities will make application to meet the problem of relocation of families from slum areas being cleared by governmental action. In addition, the units requested by the administration will suffice to house other families needing proper housing by reason of low income rather than relocation caused by governmental action.

There are presently in place and in operation 415,000 public-housing units in the areas of the Nation where they are most needed. Twenty thousand more are presently in construction. Another 55,000 have been contracted and approximately 45,000 more will be put under contract this fiscal year. We are recommending at this time that no more than 70,000 additional be authorized for the next 2 fiscal years. When these authorizations are completely operative we will have available for occupancy more than a half million family units of public housing. Again, Mr. President, I emphasize the fact that this is approximately one-half of the year's construction.

More important to me than sheer numbers in dealing with the problem which confronts us is the portion of the amendment which places a premium on community acknowledgment—rather than neglect—of slums.

If ever the problem is solved, Mr. President, it will have to be done primarily through the interest of the people in the local communities. I know the Federal Government can aid in the program, can accentuate it, and can encourage it, and I have always favored that, but I do not favor the Federal Government's taking over the program entirely.

This provision, known as the workable program, states that any municipality must take certain steps to become eligible for public housing allocations. This is no problem in more than 100 cities of the Nation because they have already done what is required. It is no particular problem to others because the requirement looks not to accomplishment of the goals as stated, but rather to good faith, and a sincere desire on the part of communities to rid themselves of slums with governmental assistance.

In the Housing Act of 1954, Congress expressed its will that urban renewal efforts should be a cooperative partnership between community and Federal Government. This continues, and is coping successfully with urban renewal measures, such as slum clearance, rehabilitation and more favorable mortgage insurance in renewal areas. There is but one inadequacy, and that is the lack of the same cooperative partnership in the public housing program.

The amendment proposes no restriction on public housing, but rather an orderly approach to the problem of providing governmental assistance to municipalities for slum clearance, rehabilitation, relocation of families and redevelopment of the slum areas. Public housing is one spoke in the wheel of urban renewal; it is neither a total program in itself, nor one separate from others assisting in solution of the problem of slums.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to reiterate that the President's recommendation provides an orderly and balanced approach to this problem. I hope Senators will recognize that this is a realistic, commonsense program which deserves the support of every Member of the Senate.

The amendment provides for about as many public housing units as can be constructed, and it is about as much as the Federal Government can aid in the program at present. The initiative in the program ultimately rests in the local communities. This is a program of the administration. It is a program recommended by the housing authorities of the country. I hope it will be sustained by a vote of the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to speak for 2 or 3 minutes in regard to the particular provision of the bill to which the amendment is directed. I shall not speak at length, because the matter has been before the Senate time after time, and on 4 or 5 different occasions the Senate has confirmed and ratified exactly the position which the Senate committee has reported in the bill. No later than last year did the Senate do that.

With reference to the number of units proposed by the administration, I call attention to the testimony of Mr. Slusser, speaking for the administration, in which it is clearly shown that the number of units asked for by the administration will not even take care of the number of persons who will have to have housing, or who will be moved out of slum areas and areas of urban renewal. He said that in the next 3 years approximately 265,000 families would have to be moved, and half of them would require public housing. Therefore, the administration program would not take care of any of the needs of the smaller cities and towns throughout the country, but would be restricted completely to urban renewal, and thereby would be of benefit primarily to the big cities, and the big cities only.

I feel that the program which the committee has recommended is entirely reasonable, just as have been the programs which the committee recommended in the past. The same argument applies to the idea of tying in the program with the urban renewal program or a workable program. We have included proper language and have the assurance that every incentive and encouragement will be given to every locality which asks for public housing or slum clearance assistance, and everything possible will be done to that end. But we do not believe the program should be tied down to those phases. As a matter of fact, only a little more than a year ago, when the program was tied down so closely, the Housing Administration found that it could not make any contracts, so it came to Congress and asked the committees of the Senate and House to release it from that restriction. Congress removed the restriction. Certainly we should not put it back now.

I hope the Senate will reject the amendment, and will adopt the provision exactly as the committee has reported it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, the yeas and nays having been ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I should like to speak for 2 or 3 minutes.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from Ohio will not prevail. I think the number of units provided in the bill, namely, 135,000 for 4 years, is the minimum amount of housing that should be provided. The 35,000 units proposed by the Senator from Ohio will not, as the Senator from Alabama has pointed out, take care of even the persons who will be evicted and displaced by slum clearance projects, and they are persons for whom homes must be found.

In New York City alone, in one project, there will be 7,000 displaced persons for whom homes must be found. The 35,000 units proposed in the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will not take care of the needs of more than 3 or 4 cities out of several hundred throughout the country. What the committee has proposed is a minimum program of 135,000 units a year for each of the next 4 years, whereas the number suggested or referred to by the Senator from Ohio as the building of the Nation as a whole is for 1 year.

We now have a backlog of needs for the poor people and middle-class people which cannot possibly be cared for even remotely unless we adopt the program contained in the bill.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] for the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN and Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are necessarily absent.

On the vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay" and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—38

Allott	Carlson	Goldwater
Barrett	Case, S. Dak.	Holland
Bennett	Cotton	Hruska
Bricker	Curtis	Jenner
Bridges	Dirksen	Knowland
Butler	Flanders	Kuchel
Byrd	George	Malone
Martin, Iowa	Robertson	Thye
Martin, Pa.	Russell	Watkins
McClellan	Saltonstall	Welker
Millikin	Schoeppel	Williams
Mundt	Smathers	Young
Potter	Smith, N. J.	

NAYS—41

Anderson	Hill	Monroney
Bible	Humphrey	Morse
Bush	Ives	Murray
Case, N. J.	Jackson	Neuberger
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Douglas	Kennedy	Payne
Ellender	Kerr	Purtell
Frear	Laird	Smith, Maine
Fulbright	Langer	Sparkman
Gore	Lehman	Stennis
Green	Magnuson	Symington
Hayden	Mansfield	Wofford
Hennings	McNamara	

NOT VOTING—16

Aiken	Dworshak	McCarthy
Beall	Eastland	Neely
Bender	Ervin	Scott
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Wiley
Clements	Kefauver	
Duff	Long	

So the amendment submitted by Mr. BRICKER for Mr. CAPEHART was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arkansas to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AWARD TO SENATOR BUTLER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION MERCHANT MARINE ACHIEVEMENT TROPHY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Maryland, Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, has today been presented by President Eisenhower with the American Legion's merchant marine achievement trophy. This award is given each year to the individual who, in the eyes of the merchant marine committee of the American Legion, has done the most during the preceding year to promote and protect the interests of all segments of the American merchant marine.

I take this opportunity to join with the American Legion and President Eisenhower in paying tribute to our distinguished colleague, Senator BUTLER, for his tireless efforts and magnificent accomplishments in merchant-marine matters. During the last few years, the privately owned American merchant marine, as well as the shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities of this country, have benefited tremendously from the constructive and farsighted maritime policies which have been effected here in Congress. While the credit for an undertaking of such magnitude cannot go to one man, I believe we all recognize that Senator BUTLER has certainly earned by his leadership the high honor which today he has received from President Eisenhower, in behalf of the American Legion.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that the following articles be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point: First, the remarks of Oliver D. Colvin, commander of the Robert L. Hague Merchant Marine Industries Post, American Legion, at the Maritime Day ceremonies held in New York's Rockefeller Center Plaza on May 21, 1956; second, a news release published by the American Legion concerning the award of its trophy to Senator BUTLER; and, third, an article which appeared on yesterday in the Baltimore Morning Sun.

There being no objection, the speech, release, and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY OLIVER D. COLVIN, COMMANDER OF THE ROBERT L. HAGUE MERCHANT MARINE INDUSTRIES POST, AMERICAN LEGION, AT MARITIME DAY CEREMONIES HELD IN NEW YORK'S ROCKEFELLER CENTER PLAZA, MAY 21, 1956

Mr. Secretary of the Navy Thomas, distinguished guests, and friends of the American merchant marine, I am indeed honored to be here today as post commander to represent the Robert L. Hague Merchant Marine Industries Post of the American Legion.

One year ago, on Maritime Day, from this very platform, was announced the creation of a perpetual presidential trophy award by the Hague Post.

It is my pleasant duty today to announce that the trophy committee has made its first selection in recognition of a most significant contribution to the growth of the American merchant marine in 1955.

The first recipient of the American merchant marine award, also known as the presidential trophy, is to be Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, of Maryland. Senator BUTLER has earned the award of this trophy for his outstanding efforts in sponsoring legislation which has triggered the gigantic shipbuilding program in which we are now engaged. He is also the coauthor of the Butler-Tollefson Act, the popularly known 50–50 bill, which has saved our merchant ships during the lean years.

The importance and significance of the Senator's many outstanding contributions to the advancement and preservation of the American merchant marine are indicated by the fact that the Robert L. Hague award will be presented to him by President Eisenhower at the White House on Thursday of this week.

I am sure you feel with me with such gracious supporters, both in and out of Government, that there is fair weather ahead for our merchant navy—our fourth arm of defense.

MERCHANT MARINE AWARD TO SENATOR BUTLER

Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, of Maryland, will be the first recipient of the American Legion merchant marine achievement award trophy. The announcement of the award was made at yesterday's Maritime Day ceremonies held in New York's Rockefeller Center Plaza by Mr. Oliver D. Colvin, commander of the Robert L. Hague Merchant Marine Industries Post, American Legion, the sponsor of the trophy.

Senator BUTLER was awarded the trophy for his outstanding contributions to the growth of the American merchant marine during 1955. As coauthor of the Cargo Preference Act and other shipping legislation, Senator BUTLER has been a leader in enabling the present shipbuilding program to become a reality.

In recognition of these accomplishments, Senator BUTLER has been chosen as the winner of the trophy for the year 1955.

The importance and significance of the Senator's many outstanding contributions to

the advancement and preservation of an American merchant marine are indicated by the fact that the Robert L. Hague award will be presented to him by President Eisenhower at the White House on Thursday of this week.

[From the (Baltimore, Md.) Sun of Wednesday, May 23, 1956]

AWARD GIVEN TO BUTLER—EISENHOWER TO PRESENT TROPHY AT WHITE HOUSE

(By Helen Delich)

Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Republican, of Maryland, was named winner of the Robert L. Hague award yesterday as the person in the United States who contributed the most toward the American merchant marine last year.

President Eisenhower will present the award at 9 a. m. tomorrow at the White House before an audience representing the maritime industry.

The announcement of the award was made in New York in connection with ceremonies marking National Maritime Day, which was observed in every port city of the Nation.

INTRODUCES SALTONSTALL

Senator BUTLER was present at a Maritime Day luncheon in Baltimore to introduce the principal speaker, Senator SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts, with whom he has worked closely on maritime legislation in the Senate.

The trophy which will be given Senator BUTLER tomorrow was designed as a memorial to Robert L. Hague, said to be the man responsible for the "bridge of ships" to Europe in World War I. The award was established by the Robert L. Hague Post of the American Legion.

Senator BUTLER's name will be inscribed on the trophy, which will be recalled next year for the next winner. He will receive a miniature permanent trophy.

After acknowledging the honor conferred upon Senator BUTLER, SALTONSTALL said that the United States can never overemphasize "the dual importance of our merchant marine and our maritime industries to a healthy American economy and to our national defense."

He mentioned the importance of the merchant marine in time of war, then said: "In time of peace, reliable shipping service at reasonable rates requires that the United States carry a substantial part of its waterborne foreign commerce in American-flag vessels.

"During periods of economic depression, such as all nations have known in their history, the seafaring people have tended to give priority to their own commerce, and their fleets have been instruments of national policy and trade promotion.

"But even in times of peace and prosperity, such as we enjoy today, it is clear that if the strength of our American merchant marine is reduced, or, indeed, if we were ever to be without it, foreign maritime powers would be in a position—which they are ever ready and eager to occupy—of carrying our goods at times and from ports of their own choosing and at whatever prices the American traffic could be forced to bear."

CITES NEED OF AID

He spoke of the shipbuilding industry as an instrument of national defense and security and said that, in the face of foreign competition, Government aid was needed both for construction and for the steamship companies.

The Massachusetts Senator called for as much work and research aimed at modernizing the merchant marine as was devoted to the atomic-powered submarine *Nautilus*. Newer, better, more efficient and more economical commercial vessels and gear are important, he said.

The atomic program for the merchant marine was discussed in Washington at the Washington Propeller Club's maritime dinner last night by Senator MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, who was honored there for his merchant-marine work.

"Adapting atomic propulsion to the maritime field promises even greater impact than the coming of steam to transocean movement of goods and people," he said.

"The potential carrying capacity of each vessel will be so great due to the increase in revenue space per ship and high speed that present trade volume could be handled with far fewer units."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President——

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to add a very brief word to what the minority leader has said.

As one who attended a Propeller Club meeting in Baltimore on Tuesday, and who observed the enthusiastic appreciation which the merchant marine and shipping people in Baltimore have for the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], I know that this award is well deserved.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President——

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish to join the minority leader and the senior Senator from Massachusetts in commending our colleague, the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], for the achievement, for the award, and for the recognition which is so very much merited, for the work he has done in the Congress of the United States.

I have a personal pride in this matter, Mr. President, because I was chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at the time when the Senator from Maryland was made chairman of the Subcommittee on the Merchant Marine. I know the diligent and time-consuming labor he devoted to the merchant marine, in his chairmanship of the subcommittee.

Mr. President, in order not to delay the proceedings of the Senate and its vote on the housing bill, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement which I send to the desk.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRICKER

I, too, would like to join with my colleagues in congratulating Senator BUTLER. The fact that the President of the United States has today awarded him the American Legion's merchant marine trophy speaks for itself. This is the highest of maritime honors.

I am confident that when reviewing his record before selecting him to receive this award, the American Legion gave great weight to the leading part he has played in encouraging the construction of ocean-going tonnage in privately owned American yards. However, it doesn't do any good to build vessels unless you have use for them. Said another way, "What's the good of building a lot of new tonnage if it is unable to carry cargoes and compete with the fleets of foreign maritime nations?"

And, so, in paying tribute to Senator BUTLER for his outstanding achievements in the maritime field, I want to single out one accomplishment for which he is due great credit and without which our entire American tramp fleet might today be inactive and rusting at the docks. I refer, of course, to the cargo preference or 50–50 bill.

Senators will recall that during the second session of the 83d Congress after interminable instances of tacking on to foreign aid legislation the provision that 50 percent of the give-away cargoes would be transported abroad on board privately owned American-flag vessels, under Senator BUTLER's leadership as chairman of the Water Transportation Subcommittee, we passed the cargo preference bill. As a result we now have as part of our permanent maritime legislation the provision that at least 50 percent of all Government-financed cargoes must be transported abroad on board privately owned American ships provided they are available at reasonable rates.

However, as we all know, Senator BUTLER's job was not completed when the President signed the bill. Since that time he has devoted a great deal of time and energy to defending this vitally important measure from attempts to amend or repeal it. I will not go into the merits of the attacks which have been made on the cargo preference bill. At the present time, certain of these matters are being considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. However, I will venture to predict that when this committee has completed its deliberations, Senator BUTLER's cargo preference bill will stand, more firmly than ever, as a key plank in our maritime legislative platform.

So, in conclusion, I merely want to take this opportunity to tell my distinguished colleague and friend, the senior Senator from Maryland, that I am extremely gratified to know that his splendid maritime accomplishments have not gone unnoticed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President——

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the senior Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to join my distinguished colleagues in paying tribute to the very able senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] for the well-deserved recognition he has received today in the form of the American Legion's merchant-marine achievement trophy, which is awarded for outstanding achievement in that field. For some years the Robert L. Hague Post of the American Legion, in New York City, has been selecting the person who, during the preceding year, has done the most for the American merchant marine, and has been paying tribute to him through the medium of public acclaim on Maritime Day, May 22.

I am very happy and very much pleased that this honor has come to our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], for whose accomplishments I can personally vouch. Through my association with him in the Senate, I know he has contributed very, very much to keeping alive and in functioning order the merchant marine of this country, which in times of peace is so essential for trade; and, in times of war, for the security of our Nation.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President——

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I wish to join the minority leader and my other colleagues who have just paid tribute to the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], in connection with the award

which has been made to him by the American Legion.

Mr. President, it has been my good fortune to serve with Senator BUTLER on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate. I know of no member of that committee, or, for that matter, no other Member of the Senate, who has been more diligent or more painstaking in his work and his efforts to foster and build up an adequate American merchant marine. I am doubly pleased that this distinct honor has come to Senator BUTLER by way of the great patriotic organization, the American Legion.

Mr. President, in the interest of saving time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement I have prepared on this matter.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCHOEPPEL

I have just learned that President Eisenhower has today presented the American Legion maritime award of the year to my good friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Maryland, Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER. Therefore, I, too, want the record to show that I am very pleased that he has been singled out for this high honor. Certainly his work in this field entitles him to the highest of acclaim and recognition.

It is sometimes said that particular industries have friends here in the Senate. I don't think there is any doubt but that the American merchant marine has a true and effective friend in Senator BUTLER. This does not mean that he is the champion or advocate of any special interest. Actually the American merchant marine is as broad as America herself. The American merchant marine to me, and I am sure to the American Legion, means labor, management, and government. More than that it means shipping companies and their employees; shipbuilding and ship repair companies and their employees; the Maritime Administration and the Department of Commerce. In addition it covers stevedores, freight forwarders, customs brokers, and a host of other groups.

That being the case, I think that Senator BUTLER has every reason to feel that in being selected by the American Legion to receive its highest merchant marine honor, he has earned the respect and admiration of a large and vitally important cross section of our Nation. After all, it is not as though this award were made by a Maryland organization. As I understand it this is the Legion's national award for outstanding service to be given once a year by the President of the United States to the individual who has done the most in the preceding year to preserve, protect, and promote the interests of the privately owned merchant marine of this country.

In closing, I extend to Senator BUTLER my warmest congratulations for his merchant marine accomplishments in general and his receipt of this award in particular.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President——

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I, too, wish to associate myself with the remarks of the minority leader and the other Senators who have spoken in regard to this matter.

I have been very greatly impressed with the work the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] has done, particularly in regard to maritime matters and the United States Merchant Marine. It is not easy to deal with a subject of that kind, with respect to which not many members of the general public are interested.

In order to save the time of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN OF PENNSYLVANIA

I should like to emphasize a fact about Senator BUTLER'S maritime achievements which impresses me more than anything else he has done in this field. That fact is that in 1 term—indeed in less than 6 years—through his tireless efforts to master the complexities of maritime problems, he has not only become an expert in almost all phases of this field but in doing so he has not lost the common touch and has been able to effectively translate much of his learning into sound and constructive commonsense programs which have led to the promotion and protection of our fourth arm of defense, the American merchant marine.

As we all know, in matters as complex as those surrounding our merchant marine it is, by tireless study, not too difficult to become learned in the field. However, it is quite another thing to be able to assist one's less enlightened colleagues to understand the complexities involved and to persuade them as to which is the most effective and appropriate course of legislative conduct to pursue. In this connection I respectfully submit that all Members of the Senate owe to him and to a few other Members on both sides of the aisle, a tremendous debt.

One other fact which I should like to emphasize is that it seems to me that since the President of the United States has seen fit to present this award in behalf of the American Legion, we have here a perfect illustration of the improved state of the American merchant marine. The fact that President Eisenhower has presented this award constitutes positive proof that he and his administration recognize the essentiality of promoting and protecting our American-flag fleet, as well as our American shipbuilding and ship repair facilities. When I think of the low state of merchant marine consciousness to which, after World Wars I and II, this Nation slipped, it is reassuring, indeed, that we have here an incident which illustrates the President's awareness of the critical importance of the American merchant marine to our national economy and to our national defense.

The fact that Senator BUTLER has played such an outstanding role in revitalizing all segments of the American merchant marine should give him great pride of accomplishment. Whether it does or not, I want the record to show that it gives me a feeling of great satisfaction to see that here on Maritime Day, 1956, his splendid contribution has been recognized.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I wish to join with the leaders of the Republican Party who have paid tribute to the outstanding senior Senator from the State of Maryland. I am not a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but I certainly think the American Legion made a wise choice in awarding this recognition to JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, our colleague.

I have served for a number of years with JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, of Maryland, on the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. There I have seen this high-minded gentleman at work. There is not a finer lawyer in this body that JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER of Maryland. While he has rendered great service for his country as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, justifying the award which he has received from the American Legion, he is also doing a great job for his country in the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, as one who sits next to the very able Senator from Maryland, I am in a position to know how alert he is whenever the subject of the maritime industry comes up for legislative action in this Chamber. He is always on the job. He has the facts, and he presents them well. No more deserving Member of the Senate could be selected to receive this particular honor than JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, of Maryland.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues regarding the distinguished Senator from Maryland. I, too, serve with him on the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I have noted the intense application he has given to his work on that committee. I have seen, particularly during my travels in Europe, many of the results of his legislative efforts in connection with legislation having to do with our merchant marine.

I know of no one who is more deserving of the recognition given to the distinguished Senator from Maryland by the American Legion than JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, of Maryland.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, my State of Arizona has no seaports. It has no large shipbuilding industry. Nevertheless, it has an interest in the merchant marine because of its importance to the entire United States.

I should like to acknowledge the indebtedness we in Arizona feel we owe to the Senator from Maryland in this. I am sure I echo the feelings of the people who live in the mining States in connection with the wonderful work which he did in committee and on the floor of the Senate last year in helping to enact the Communist control bill as it relates to unions. That bill was passed largely because of the efforts of the Senator from Maryland. Already the result has been the removal of one of the leading Communists from the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers Union. As a result of the work of the Senator from Maryland, I believe that that union is now well on the way toward becoming a strong American union, free from domination by Communists.

I speak for my people in Arizona in expressing appreciation to the Senator from Maryland for his fine work.

THE SUPREME COURT AND THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, today, before the National Association of States Attorneys General, in my home city of Phoenix, Ariz., Attorney General

Brownell gave some good advice. He said in part:

Our duty to the people is to support each branch of the Government in the performance of its functions. We must continue to discharge this duty if we are to avoid anarchy in all Government.

I agree whole-heartedly with the admonition of the Attorney General. However, recent decisions of the Supreme Court, particularly the recent decision in relation to States rights in the field of labor, causes me some apprehension. I do not criticize the Supreme Court, I think we in the Senate and all other Americans, have a perfect right however—in fact, a duty—to be apprehensive about any branch of Government when we feel that it is infringing on the rights of the States.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks two excellent articles on this subject, written by David Lawrence, and published in the Washington Evening Star of May 23 and May 24, 1956.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of May 23, 1956]

SUPREME COURT AND UNIONISM—DECISION UPHOLDING UNION IN RAILROADS SEEN REVERSING 1935 RULING'S IMPLICATIONS

(By David Lawrence)

The Supreme Court of the United States by unanimous decision has ruled, in effect, that even a system of fascism can be imposed in America by Congress, and the Constitution cannot be invoked to prevent it.

This is just the reverse of what the Court by unanimous opinion ruled in May 1935, when it invalidated the code system of the National Recovery Act as an unconstitutional delegation of power by Congress to an artificial system of government administered by private groups.

The Supreme Court—composed today of a different set of judges—now rules that Congress is within its rights in passing a law permitting a railroad employer to compel a worker to give up part of his earnings to finance a union organization in which he conscientiously doesn't believe. The penalty for nonpayment is the loss of his job.

The Supreme Court says Congress has the power to order such a system of compulsory unionism and that neither the constitutions of the States nor the Federal Constitution can be invoked to prevent the confiscation of a worker's earnings by a private organization for a purpose to which he does not wish to give his assent. There is no limit to the taxes that now can be levied on a worker's wages if only a union and an employer have the right between them to consider what is a beneficial use of a workingman's earnings.

The Supreme Court lately has been solicitous about "civil rights" and there has been a lot of hysterical talk about "due process" and the loss of the "right of dissent," especially for Communist sympathizers. But the High Court was deaf to the plea of the several workmen who petitioned the nine Justices to uphold the right to work as provided in the constitution of the State of Nebraska. The Supreme Court of Nebraska had ruled that compulsory unionism violates both the State and Federal Constitutions.

What the Supreme Court here said, however, was that no State constitution and no State law could be regarded as in force if the Congress passed a contrary law on the subject of regulating trade unions. There are 17 States which have passed "right to work" laws or incorporated such provisions in their constitutions. When the workers pleaded that their rights under the Federal Constitution were being violated, the Supreme Court here simply answered by saying there was no constitutional issue at all before the tribunal. It waved aside what the Nebraska Supreme Court found to be a constitutional issue.

The nine Justices of the Highest Court here refused to listen to the argument that a man who doesn't believe in trade unionism has a constitutional right to that view, and declared that the only issue before the Court is whether he should be forced to pay a part of the expenses of the collective-bargaining process from which theoretically he benefits.

The High Court didn't take cognizance of the fact that the employer could share that expense or could even collect portions from the worker if he agreed to it and that this could be done without forcing him to become a union member. The decision simply affirmed that a worker must join such a union to keep his job—even though for the present under the law he cannot be disciplined for any other reasons by the union.

"Wide ranged problems are tendered under the first amendment," wrote Justice Douglas in behalf of the Court. "It is argued that the union-shop agreement forces men into ideological and political associations which violate their right to freedom of conscience, freedom of association, and freedom of thought protected by the Bill of Rights. It is said that once a man becomes a member of these unions, he is subject to vast disciplinary control and that by force of the Federal act unions now can make him conform to their ideology.

"On the present record, there is no more infringement or impairment of first amendment rights than there would be in the case of a lawyer who by State law is required to be a member of an integrated bar. It is argued that compulsory membership will be used to impair freedom of expression. But that problem is not presented by this record."

What more of a record does the Supreme Court of the United States require than a worker's own argument before the lower court that he doesn't want to join a union because he doesn't believe in it, and that he doesn't want to support it because he doesn't choose to become a member?

As for the statement that membership in a private labor union is analogous to membership in a bar association, this is an astonishing argument. For a lawyer is an officer of the court itself and admission to practice is subject to rules of a court. The court, actually a part of the Government, makes its own rules as to who can practice before it. But no bar association can compel a nonmember to pay dues, nor does it represent him in any fixing of fees for his services.

The Supreme Court lately has been sweeping aside the rights of States to regulate their own affairs and has even held that a State cannot punish sedition or arrest a man suspected of treason.

Certainly, recent decisions are not based on historic precedents of law but on ephemeral concepts of what are supposed to be the dominant "psychological" and "social" factors of the age.

[From the Washington Star of May 24, 1956]

CIRCUMVENTING THE CONSTITUTION—COURT DECISION UPHOLDING RAIL UNIONS SEEN DEPRIVING STATES OF RIGHTS

(By David Lawrence)

The most unspectacular and yet the most sensational news happening of our times is the manner in which the 48 States governments are being deprived of their rights by the Supreme Court of the United States.

The latest decision, rendered this week, takes away from the States their power to regulate employment relations. It takes away from the worker his freedom of association and freedom of expression as an individual—his civil rights—and puts them at the mercy of an intolerant majority in Congress. He must join a union or be deprived of a job with the railroads. Minority rights, which from the foundation of the Republic have been safeguarded by the Constitution, now are to be vested in a political majority in Congress.

Justice Frankfurter, who wrote an opinion concerning in the decision, makes no bones about it—he virtually acknowledges that the Supreme Court is a political body which changes its views with the whims of popular opinion, and he lauds this as a virtue.

In discussing the 60-year history of the fight for and against compulsory unionization, Justice Frankfurter reviews the criticisms against early Court decisions and traces the various opinions handed down. Then he says:

"The change in the Court's understanding of industrial problems, certainly as they affect railroads, in their bearing upon the country's commerce and all that thereby hangs, to no small degree reflected the changed attitude of the railroads toward the role of labor unions in the discharge of the functions of the railroads. As striking evidence as any of this important shift in opinion is the fact that the Railway Labor Act of 1926 came on the statute books through agreement between the railroads and the railroad unions on the need for such legislation."

Here is a confession that the Supreme Court nowadays doesn't consider what the Constitution says but what private interests, powerful in politics, may agree upon as between themselves. The famous "code authority" provision of the National Recovery Act, which permitted agreements to be made between management and labor, was struck down by a unanimous opinion of the Supreme Court in 1935 precisely because the nine Justices believed the public interest was greater under the Constitution than any agreement made between private interests such as labor and management, even though Congress sanctioned those agreements.

Justice Frankfurther feels that if employers in an industry get together with labor unions to form a job monopoly and decide to deprive anyone of a job unless he belongs to a union, this is a worthy objective. He hints that he would uphold the constitutionality of a law on that particular provision if it came before him. But he claims for the record, of course, that the Supreme Court "put to one side" such situations in the case decided this week.

Actually, it was before the Court, but the nine Justices chose technical grounds for shutting their eyes to the issue altogether. It is plain to see the handwriting on the wall—minority rights are vanishing, and whatever law Congress decides to enact hereafter to regulate employment relations will become "the supreme law of the land" in the eyes of the present Court.

In writing the main opinion, Justice Douglas, in behalf of the other Justices, says: "Congress, acting within its constitutional powers, has the final say on policy issues. If it acts unwisely, the electorate can make a change."

But when the Supreme Court endows Congress with greater power than the Constitution bestows and euphemistically calls it just a "policy," the electorate can't change their Supreme Court. Unless, therefore, the Court whose judges now concede that they are influenced by the pressures of popular opinion, takes heed of public criticism, certain constitutional rights will be lost for the period that an unwise or irresponsible Court holds office.

"One would have to be blind to history," says Justice Douglas, "to assert that trade

unionism did not enhance and strengthen the right to work."

This is a frank avowal of the concept of expediency—the Machiavellian doctrine that the end justifies the means. Other Justices, the men who made the Supreme Court the respected institution it has been for decades, did not fall victim to political expediency. They expounded the Constitution in accordance with legal and not political concepts and never allowed Congress to grant permissive power to private economic groups to take away minority rights. It was in May 1935 when a unanimous Court, headed by Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, knocked out the expediency argument by declaring: "Extraordinary conditions do not create or enlarge constitutional power."

And the same Court could properly have added that a change in political or sociological conditions or in the tides of public opinion does not change the Constitution of the United States unless Congress, by a two-thirds vote of both Houses and three-fourths vote of the States of the Union, say so in approving an amendment to the Constitution itself.

FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a short time ago it came to my attention that an important and comprehensive study of our foreign economic policy was conducted in 1954 at the Center for International Studies of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The study was conducted under the auspices of Dr. Max Millikan and Walter Rostow of that center, and was originally requested by responsible officials in the administration. It has come to my attention that this study evoked an enthusiastic response in some quarters of the administration upon its completion in the fall of 1954, but that other equally important administration quarters found the report unpalatable and unacceptable. Constructive and provocative though it is, this report has been gathering dust during the intervening 20 months.

On May 1, 1956, I wrote to Dr. Millikan asking that this report be made available to the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Not only did he most graciously agree to make the report available, but he and Professor Rostow have brought the report up to date. In its present form the report, which has now been made available to appropriate Members of Congress and administration officials, is a 104-page document. Over the past weekend it attracted considerable press commentary, including a detailed analysis by Edwin L. Dale, Jr., in the New York Times of Sunday, May 20, and considerable mention in an article by Chalmers Roberts which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on the same day.

I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 20, 1956]

REPORT BIDS UNITED STATES ALTER AID POLICY—NEW APPROACH TO ECONOMIC HELP IS URGED TO CHECK RED INROADS ABROAD

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, May 19.—Officials at the highest levels of the Government are giving serious study to a privately prepared report on a major aspect of foreign policy.

The reported advocates a completely new approach to the problem of how to use United States foreign aid to prevent the world's underdeveloped countries from succumbing to communism.

The 104-page document was prepared by Max Millikan and W. W. Rostow, economists of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and of the Center for International Studies. It is known to have reached the National Security Council.

Both authors frequently have served as Government consultants and have participated in broad strategic planning.

The first third of the report is an effort to prove that economic assistance can be useful in furthering the main United States political objective: "That the societies of the world develop in ways that will not menace our security."

It calls United States efforts marginal at best. It sharply criticizes much of the past reasoning behind economic aid to underdeveloped countries—reasoning that reportedly has made some of the aid do more harm than good. But it concludes that this aid can be useful in one major sense.

A SENSE OF DIRECTION

This is the fact that such aid, together with local efforts, can give the peoples of the underdeveloped countries a feeling that they are getting somewhere. If they have this feeling, the authors believe, if they are shown that things can and will get better, they are getting somewhere. If they have solutions.

The aid is not going to "win friends" for the United States, the authors contend. Nor is it necessarily going to "foster free enterprises," nor should the United States insist that it do so. Nor is it going to "save" the underdeveloped countries by giving their people a little better living standard.

But it can, they feel, help importantly in giving the crucial "sense of direction" without which the fermenting societies in the backward countries are likely to turn to chaos or totalitarianism.

The last two-thirds of the report is a detailed analysis of the kind of aid program by the United States and the rest of the free world that can, in the economists' opinion, usefully help the underdeveloped countries.

The program would cost the United States a maximum of $2 billion a year and a probable actual disbursement of only $1,500,000,000 a year, of which the bulk would be loans. But the authors insist that the entire package has to go together or the program will do no good.

It is based on an analysis of the three stages of development that all countries go through, and proceeds from there to an analysis of the ability to absorb new capital of specific individual countries.

The essence of the new program is that the industrialized free countries promise to make available for at least 5 years, and probably 10, all the aid that underdeveloped areas request and qualify for. A second essential is that the aid have an international "flavor" and coordination—such as internationally determined standards of eligibility—though the individual aid grants could still be country to country.

The standards of qualification would be far from loose. Underdeveloped countries requesting aid would have to show that their development program was planned, that their people were willing to support it, and that individual projects would be useful. The authors advocate basically a banking concept of the aid.

The program, which could reach a maximum of capital inflow into the underdeveloped countries from all sources of $3,500,000,000 a year, would not have spectacular results, the authors estimate. They think that on the average such an investment might raise standards of living by only 1 percent a year (in the sense of per capita consumption of goods and services).

But this, they believe, is about all the underdeveloped countries can absorb. And they feel it would be sufficient in most cases to demonstrate progress.

A key to the program is the assumption that at a certain stage of development a country goes over the hump and begins to generate all, or almost all, the capital it needs by itself. The report says India is approaching this transition stage now, but is not yet there.

It also points to India as a good example of a country where the energies of the people now are being directed toward economic development and improvement and away from radical political solutions. It notes that India is among the more stable of the underdeveloped countries and implies that such a condition is the best that United States national interests can ask.

The report urges that the United States put up immediately $10 billion to $12 billion for a 5-year period. It believes that not all of this money would be drawn, but argues that it must be available. Other industrial countries would be asked to make available $2 billion to $3 billion.

There should be no strings at all on the aid given, the report urges, except for the original qualifying tests for the recipient countries.

For countries in the very first stage of development, grant aid is recommended, with emphasis on technical assistance. As the economy begins to move forward into the second stage, then loans should be used. At that stage the amounts involved become larger, the report says.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 20, 1956]

SUKARNO SEEN AS VICTOR IN NEUTRAL NATIONS PLEA

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

Indonesia's President Sukarno caught Washington at an opportune moment last week and made the most of it in what may turn out to be a two-way educational process.

But, as of now at least, the importance of the whirlwind Sukarno visit has not altered the radically different plans for the visit of Asia's other leading neutralist leader, India's Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, who arrives in July.

Because Nehru has asked to talk at length with President Eisenhower, present plans call for whisking him off to Camp David, Md., for 3 days of private talks with no public appearances before Congress or such a forum as the National Press Club.

The fact is that American policy toward Asian neutralism is changing and that this change is one of the major new developments on the Western side since Moscow altered its tactics.

Sukarno drove home some of the arguments for respecting the refusal of newly independent nations such as Indonesia and India to take sides in the East-West conflict. Conservative Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle came away, it is now clear, with a new feeling that there is something to be said for such a policy and that America has to respect it.

Sukarno frankly and cleverly tapped the well-springs of American anti-colonialism in making his case. In retrospect, he might have gone even further and talked frankly about his own attitude toward Soviet Russia and Communist China.

Sukarno, of course, was a new personality to Washington though some here had met him at home. Nehru, on the other hand, visited here during the Truman administration and went away depressed at what he felt was the materialistic and militaristic

attitude of this Nation. His public statements and last fall's Khrushchev-Bulganin visit to India have made him a sore point or worse to a good many Members of Congress and to other Americans.

Yet it can be argued that it would serve Nehru's own aims better if he were to take the public platform here and state his case with frankness equal to Sukarno's. If he will suggest that he would like to do so, he can count on adequate forums, it can be said with authority.

The question appears to be whether Nehru is aware of the changes going on in Washington. He cannot, of course, expect the United States to scrap its Middle East and Asian defense agreements which he has strongly and repeatedly criticized. But there is at least the beginning of a new view of India's importance to the United States: that, as Ambassador John Sherman Cooper has said, the important thing is that India be helped to develop economically by democratic processes, however much Americans disagree with Nehru's expressed attitudes toward Russia and Red China.

Undoubtedly there will be hostile criticism toward Nehru when he comes here, but that is just about as likely if he comes for talks with Mr. Eisenhower alone as if he also makes a speech to Congress or the Press Club.

Nehru, for example, might be interested to know that an exhaustive 104-page proposal for a new foreign economic policy is now being circulated within the Government and at the Capitol. Written by Max F. Millikan and W. W. Rostow of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Center for International Studies, it argues that "a much expanded long-term program of American participation in the economic development of the underdeveloped areas can and should be one of the most important means for furthering the purposes of American foreign policy."

This document, expected to reach the President shortly if it has not already, is likely to be an important influence in the restudy of American foreign aid. It calls for playing down military alliances, without reducing American military power, and for making economic aid "an alternative focus."

Millikan and Rostow argue against an exclusively American program, declaring that "if we take the leadership in such a program, we need not fear, and we can even welcome, Soviet participation." Bold and imaginative American leadership, they say, can "actually encourage Soviet contributions without fear that they will dominate the program."

American thinking on foreign aid, like that on Asian neutralism to which it is related, is in flux. The often-contrary actions of the House Foreign Affairs Committee on the foreign-aid bill last week testify to that. It is going to take many months, especially in this election year, to work out new policies regardless of who wins in November.

Sukarno's contribution last week was that he helped make Washington think. Washington hopes Sukarno's visit to America will also generate his thought processes. In today's changing climate, it is hard to see why the same interplay should not apply to Nehru as well. After all, the virtue of democracies is that their leaders can talk it out with each other and that such nations can frankly express their points of view to one another.

HOUSING AMENDMENTS OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3855) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, line 18, it is proposed to insert "(1)" immediately following "(c)."

On page 10, between lines 22 and 23, it is proposed to insert the following:

(2) Title VIII of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 809. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, or of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955, no personnel shall be assigned to, or granted occupancy in, any project which was acquired or constructed under this title, and is situated at or near a military installation, if, at the time it is proposed to make such assignment or grant such occupancy, more than 10 percent of the living accommodations in any housing, acquired or constructed under this title prior to the construction of such project, and situated at or near the same military installation, are vacant.

"(b) As used in this section, the term 'this title' refers to the provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act in effect both prior to and on and after the date of enactment of the Housing Amendments of 1955."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to speak briefly in support of my amendment to Senate bill S. 3855, dealing with procedure of rental in military housing. In order to point up the critical need for legislation of this nature, let me provide you with this information:

As of January 31, 1956, there were 55 projects out of a total of 171 Wherry housing locations which were less than 95 percent occupied, in default or foreclosed. This means that over 20 percent of existing Wherry projects are in trouble. It should be remembered that a Wherry project in trouble, with investment threatened, is not helped by the fact that some other Wherry projects in other locations are occupied. Yet the military does not even acknowledge the existence of vacancies in testimony before Congress, and, further, the military is taking no effective administrative steps to correct the vacancy situation in Wherry housing.

If the military does not have the authorization it needs to correct the vacancy condition, it should be appearing before Congress requesting these authorizations; but the military is strongly silent on these now-existing conditions. Let us remember that the military ordered this housing 5 years ago, entered into these Wherry agreements, and caused $750 million to be spent. Now, 5 years later, the military has the opportunity to get more new housing, and it does not want to make any provisions to protect the existing Wherry housing. Five years from now are we to expect that the military will want additional new housing and then ask Congress to approve the abandonment or condone the failure of both the 82,000 Wherry houses and the 200,000 title IV houses in favor of new housing?

The Department of Defense has testified that the building of 200,000 additional military houses which it wants will not adversely affect existing Wherry housing. The military has, in effect, said that Congress should rely solely on the extra caution the military exercises when programing additional housing at existing Wherry locations. We know that mistakes are always possible even with the best of intentions. Therefore, I urge that legislation should now be provided to protect against mistakes if they do happen, and especially so when the Government is party to agreements and is guarantor of $650 million in mortgages now already invested.

If the military is so sure of its programing of additional housing, then an amendment such as I have offered to help indemnify a Wherry owner against vacancies would only be a safeguard, but by its very existence would encourage fewer mistakes in programing and thus overbuilding at the expense of the taxpayer.

Also, let us remember that all the additional housing requested is financially guaranteed by the Military Department, thereby placing the existing housing in an even more perilous situation.

To my mind, there are only two rightful procedures that can be adopted in the solution of this very serious problem that would do justice not only to the sponsors of now-existing housing but would also save the Government money as well, and they are to pass the legislation that is contained in my amendment as a safeguard, or have the military purchase all existing military housing through Federal court condemnation proceedings, which is the only true and competent way to arrive at correct values.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter dated March 16, 1956, from the Federal Housing Administrator, Albert M. Cole, addressed to the chairman of the committee, Mr. FULBRIGHT, making the suggestion I am offering at this time in my amendment. He says:

> If legislation such as S. 2848 is to be enacted consideration should therefore be given to requiring that the older Wherry housing be given priority in the assignment of personnel up to an occupancy of 90 to 95 percent.

Senators will note that 5 percent was provided when the amendment was originally submitted. I have changed the amount from 5 percent to 10 percent.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish to say that the committee considered the subject at the time the bill was under consideration by the committee. We tried to work out the same thing that the Senator from South Carolina is endeavoring to work out. There is just one factor that presents a problem. I am in favor of the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina in principle. I think it is a sound amendment. I believe there is at least 10 percent of unoccupied Capehart or

Wherry housing for which there ought to be no authorization until it is occupied. However, at SAC, for instance, there is a requirement that the men must be right there at the base. That problem becomes acute, if the distance from the base is not very carefully delineated. The Senator's amendment states "at or near." The question is what is meant by "near." If we could limit the distance from the base, I would have no objection to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I would have no objection to a limit being set in regard to distance.

Mr. BRICKER. Perhaps we can work out the problem in conference, to provide adequate protection in that regard.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I would be willing to have the Senator do that.

Mr. BRICKER. The only problem I know of is in connection with SAC bases. General LeMay emphasized that fact very strongly before our committee. Therefore, if it is satisfactory to the Senator from South Carolina and to the chairman of the committee, I shall be glad to help work out that aspect in committee when we get to conference.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, the Senator from Ohio has correctly stated the situation. We discussed the matter in committee. All of us concerned with the problem wanted to work it out in some way. We tried to work it out with the language we put in the bill. We were afraid of getting a too rigid proposition.

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If sufficient leeway can be had, I shall be perfectly willing to try to work the matter out in conference. Perhaps between now and then we will be able to work out some suitable language.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It would certainly be agreeable to me to have some limitation of distance inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "5-23-56-A."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 41, line 4, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following proviso before the period: "*And provided further*, That no new contract for annual contributions for additional dwelling units shall be entered into except with respect to low-rent housing for a locality respecting which the Housing and Home Finance Administrator has made the determination and certification relating to a workable program as prescribed in section 101 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended."

On page 42, insert the following after line 21:

(e) Section 101 (c) of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting the following after the first comma therein: "or for annual contributions or capital grants pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, for any project or projects not constructed or covered by a contract for annual contributions prior to August 1, 1956."

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. As I understand, the Senator's amendment is practically the same amendment as the second section of the amendment I offered, but it does not contain a limitation on public housing units. Is that correct?

Mr. BUSH. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long, but I should like to make 2 or 3 points with respect to the importance of the amendment.

Adoption by the community of a workable program for the prevention and elimination of slums and blight should again be made a prerequisite for Federal aid to public housing, just as it is a requirement for Federal aid to urban renewal and special FHA mortgage insurance assistance for urban renewal housing.

The removal of this requirement resulted from a misunderstanding. The workable program requirement was repealed last year when it was confused with other provisions which required detailed calculations by the communities concerning displaced families, their incomes, existing low-rent public housing, and the timing of the construction of public housing in relation to the progress of urban renewal projects.

Federal aid to public housing should be given only where the community has an overall plan to prevent and eliminate slums. Public housing is only one of several instruments to be used in the prevention and elimination of slums and blight. A workable program is essential to assure that other available instruments which are appropriate under local conditions will be used by the community for this purpose and will be coordinated with public housing.

The requirement for a workable program is not burdensome. Communities are not expected to undertake protracted and unrealistic slum prevention planning and other activities. Rather, they are merely expected to adopt sensible long-range programs within their capabilities and suitable to thier local conditions. Proof is that as of May 15, workable programs had been approved for over 100 communities. About half of them have populations of less than 50,000. More than 40 percent have populations of less than 25,000. Five communities have populations of less than 5,000 and two have less than 2,000 population.

The workable program does not have to be carried out before a public housing contract can be entered into. What is required is demonstration by the community that it is serious about carrying out its program for the prevention and elimination of slums and that the program will assist in this purpose. It is recognized that it takes time to enact and put into operation housing codes and other actions contemplated by the workable program, and that it would be unreasonable to withhold Federal assistance to public housing until the program is carried out. The program looks only to future action.

The workable program requirement would not preclude communities which do not have urban renewal powers from obtaining public housing. Requiring a workable program means merely that the community must have a plan of action for removing and preventing slums and blight. In some communities a program utilizing the city's normal police powers for rehabilitation and conservation would be sufficient. In other communities the program would be adequate if it coupled police powers with the usual exercise of eminent domain powers to acquire land for public improvement, such as parks, playgrounds, or other public facilities. Even in cities where extensive slum conditions cannot be eliminated without the use of eminent domain under urban renewal powers, this does not preclude such cities without those powers from having approved workable programs. It is only necessary that the city recognize its problems and have a plan for working toward this solution, even if this includes a reasonable plan of action for obtaining necessary State legislation or other legal action.

Mr. President, rather than delay the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks a memorandum entitled "The Seven Elements of a Workable Program."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SEVEN ELEMENTS OF A WORKABLE PROGRAM

In order to fulfill the requirements for approval of the workable program, the locality must commit itself in its workable program to seeking the attainment of essential objectives with respect to the following:

1. Codes and ordinances.
2. A comprehensive community plan.
3. Neighborhood analyses.
4. Administrative organization.
5. Financing.
6. Housing for displaced families.
7. Citizen participation.

The following explains the seven objectives which constitute the ultimate aim of a workable program:

1. Codes and ordinances: The objective is to assure adequate minimum standards of health, sanitation, and safety through a comprehensive system of codes and ordinances which state the minimum conditions under which dwellings may be lawfully occupied.

2. A comprehensive community plan: The objective is the formulation and official recognition of a comprehensive general plan for the community as a whole. A general plan should be developed under procedures provided by State and local legislation, and should be supervised and administered by an official local planning body with adequate resources and authority to insure continuity of planning.

3. Neighborhood analyses: The objective is the identification of the extent and intensity of blight and logical patterns of specific neighborhoods for purposes of developing a basis for planning of healthy neighborhoods of decent homes and suitable living environment.

4. Administrative organization: The objective is a firmly established administrative responsibility and capacity for enforcement

of codes and ordinances, and for carrying out renewal programs and projects.

5. Financing: The objective is the development of means for meeting the financial obligation involved in carrying out urban renewal activities.

6. Housing for displaced families: The objective is to facilitate the rehousing, in decent, safe, and sanitary accommodations, of families displaced by governmental action.

7. Citizen participation: The objective is communitywide participation on the part of individuals and representative citizens' organizations which will help to provide, both in the community generally and in selected areas, the understanding and support which is necessary to insure success.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I shall speak very briefly on the amendment. There are three points I wish to make with reference to it.

First, the Senator's amendment is a part of the Bricker amendment which the Senate voted down a few moments ago.

Second, we had a workable program tied into the legislation until last year. Less than 2 years ago—and I wish Sentors to note this fact particularly—the housing agency people came to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate and to the Banking and Currency Committee of the House and asked to be released from those restrictions. Now we are being asked that the restrictions be reimposed. We ran for half a year with only 213 units accounted for, when there was authorization for 35,000. They asked us to remove the restrictions.

The third point, Mr. President, is this: It is easy to talk about a workable program, and it is easy for a large city to have a workable program. They have their staff; they can plan; they can spend the money necessary to work up a plan such as the Southwest development program in Washington, D. C. But the smaller cities, the towns, the semirural areas, which are just getting started in this program, would be virtually eliminated by any such provision written into the law as has been suggested.

Mr. President, it would handicap the program for which we have voted. It would virtually limit it to the metropolitan areas, and, I believe it would not do the job which Congress desires to have done.

I earnestly ask that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, in response to what has been stated by the distinguished Senator from Alabama, I wish to read a portion of a letter from the Office of the Administrator:

The requirements for a workable program are, of course, much less complex for smaller communities than they are for the larger metropolitan centers. In addition, the smaller communities can make use of special aids provided in the Housing Act of 1954, such as planning grants to State bodies to offer assistance to communities under 25,000 population. As a result, even the smallest communities have been able to meet the planning and other requirements necessary for a well-rounded, workable program and are keeping pace with the larger cities, as the record shows.

A breakdown by population group follows:

Number of cities with approved programs

Population:	
Less than 5,000	5
5,000–10,000	14
10,000–25,000	21
25,000–50,000	8
50,000–100,000	7
100,000–250,000	18
250,000–500,000	7
500,000–1,000,000	11
1,000,000 and over	5

Mr. President, I do not like to hear the smaller communities deprecated on the floor of the Senate as they have been. I think they are just as able to work out their problem as are the larger cities.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered on this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. On this question the yeas and nays have beeen ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN and Mr. SCOTT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] has a general pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—32

Allott	Hruska	Purtell
Barrett	Jenner	Robertson
Bennett	Knowland	Saltonstall
Bricker	Kuchel	Schoeppel
Bush	Malone	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Martin, Iowa	Thye
Carlson	Martin, Pa.	Watkins
Case, S. Dak.	Millikin	Welker
Cotton	Mundt	Williams
Curtis	Payne	Young
Goldwater	Potter	

NAYS—44

Anderson	Holland	McNamara
Bible	Humphrey	Monroney
Case, N. J.	Ives	Morse
Chavez	Jackson	Murray
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Neuberger
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Kennedy	Pastore
Frear	Kerr	Russell
Fulbright	Laird	Smathers
George	Langer	Smith, Maine
Gore	Lehman	Sparkman
Green	Long	Stennis
Hayden	Magnuson	Symington
Hennings	Mansfield	Wofford
Hill	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—19

Aiken	Dirksen	Kefauver
Beall	Duff	McCarthy
Bender	Dworshak	Neely
Bridges	Eastland	Scott
Butler	Ervin	Wiley
Capehart	Flanders	
Clements	Hickenlooper	

So Mr. BUSH's amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arkansas to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show clearly that I regard Senate bill 3855 as bad legislation, and that I shall vote against it.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared relating to the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

I want the RECORD to show clearly that I regard Senate bill S. 3855, the Housing Amendments of 1956, as bad legislation, and that I shall vote against it.

In short, the bill would make even looser the loose law under which Federal housing programs are now operating.

Administration of this loose law for years has been characterized by loose administration. Current audits by the United States General Accounting Office indicate that the administrative elements which breed housing scandals still persist.

Cap the combination of loose law and loose administration with billions of dollars of public credit and money and, in the name of providing homes, you have built an Augean stable for those who exploit the programs.

Since 1933 nearly $70 billion in public credit and money has been made available through Federal housing programs. Of this gross total, $52 billion has been in programs now under the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Of this HHFA total $38 billion has been through the Federal Housing Administration alone.

I cite these gross figures in connection with the loose law and the documented inefficiencies and irregularities in administration to demonstrate the clear invitation to the kind of fraud which exists in Federal housing programs.

As proof, criminal, civil, and tax litigation involving Federal housing programs may be found on the records and dockets of courts across the Nation.

I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. Albert Cole, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated May 22, 1956, in which he says in the 19 months between October 1, 1954 and April 30, 1956 HHFA investigations have resulted in 1,715 individual administrative actions and criminal convictions, including some monetary recoveries. He says also there are 1,178 pending cases currently assigned or receiving investigative attention, and that there are 1,224 cases which have been transmitted to constituent agencies concerned under HHFA, the Department of Justice, the Department of Labor, Internal Revenue Service, Civil Service Commission and other appropriate agencies.

I commend Mr. Cole for the action he has taken. It points up the weaknesses inherent in Federal housing programs.

A special unit in the Department of Justice has been set up to handle housing frauds.

The Attorney General of the United States, in his annual report, said: "The agencies principally concerned with criminal matters under the National Housing Act are Housing and Home Finance Agency, Federal Housing Administration, Public Housing Administration, Federal National Mortgage Association, Community Facilities Administration, Urban Renewal Administration, and Home Loan Bank Board."

He said the criminal offenses which occur as a result of operations under the Housing Act include bribery, perjury, conflicts of interest, and offenses under the false-statement statutes.

There are more than a half dozen huge civil-windfall cases pending in Federal courts at this time.

The famous Gross-Morton Federal tax case is before the United States Court of Appeals, second circuit, on appeal from the United States Tax Court.

Two FHA military-housing cases are pending before the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. Cole has advised me previously that military housing under FHA has been a subject of litigation or opinions by the Attorneys General in at least 40 of the 48 States.

Since the establishment of the special housing frauds unit in the Department of Justice there have been hundreds of indictments and informations. During the past year there were 230 convictions and sentences.

Under this kind of a record, what does this bill do? According to the committee report:

It increases the loans and maturity, and more administrative flexibility is authorized in the title I home repair (suede shoe) program. This is the program where home repair loans were being used to pay alimony, build bird baths, etc.

It lowers the requirements for veterans' occupancy in co-op housing projects.

It adds $3 billion to outstanding insurance under FHA.

It increases the cost of apartments in high-cost urban-renewal areas.

It increases the cost, allows 100 percent mortgaging-out mortgages, and extends the maturity on low-cost housing under section 221 to provide housing for families displaced by the slum-clearance program.

It increases the cost of military housing, raises the insurance authorization to $3 billion, and extends the program to 1959.

It sets up a new program of 40-year mortgages for elderly people, and allows 100 percent mortgaging-out mortgages.

It drives a wedge in the cost certification requirements and adds a 10-percent profit to the actual-cost allowance in multifamily housing projects.

It increases Federal funds for college housing. The Treasury borrows long-term money for about 3 percent and, under this program it lends it to HHFA for 2½ percent. The HHFA lends it to colleges for 2¾ percent.

It discourages payment by local governments of more than one-third of the net costs of urban-renewal projects and increases the capital-grant authorization. The Federal Government pays up to two-thirds of the net cost of local slum-clearance programs.

These pending amendments are examples of what I mean when I say this bill would make even looser the already loose housing laws.

I have tried unsuccessfully in the past to tighten them up. My amendments were adopted by the Senate and deleted in conference. I was told that my amendments for responsibility, full disclosure, and ordinary, orthodox business requirements, such as keeping books and certifying costs, would result in no Federal housing. In other words, those who exploit the programs through windfalls, mortgaging out, tax dodges, etc., would neither cooperate nor participate if they were required to conform to ordinary honest business practice.

I reject such an attitude.

I will not be a party to dumping more billions of dollars into these programs while they are operated under such loose law and loose administration.

I shall vote against this bill which would make the law looser, do nothing to tighten up the administration, and make more money available for those who would exploit the programs.

I shall cast this vote in the interest of the citizens of this Nation who may be double victims in housing scandals. As buyers and renters they may be victimized by exploitation of the programs and as taxpayers they may be victimized through their own responsibility for the public risk incurred through these Government programs for private profit.

On May 3, 1956, I wrote to Mr. Albert M. Cole, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, asking for copies of reports by the investigations divisions of each of the component agencies of HHFA covering investigations of illegalities, irregularities, and infractions investigated, findings and dispositions since August 31, 1954, or a summary of their activities. August 31 was the cutoff date for the so-called McKenna investigation of the 1954 FHA scandals.

I am today in receipt of a letter from Mr. Cole, as follows:

MAY 22, 1956.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,

United States Senate:

Reference is made to your letter dated May 3, 1956, requesting information concerning investigative matters relating to this Agency and its several constituents.

On October 1, 1954, I established within my office a consolidated Compliance Division for the office of the Administrator, Federal Housing Administration, Public Housing Administration, Community Facilities Administration, Urban Renewal Administration, and Federal National Mortgage Association, to investigate any matters relating to the housing programs, as directed by the Administrator or requested by the heads of the constituents; to act as liaison between these agencies and the Department of Justice in criminal matters; and to conduct inspections for the purpose of assuring integrity and effectiveness in the conduct of the operations and performance of activities in accordance with established policy and procedures.

The records of the Compliance Division reflect that during the period from October 1, 1954, to April 30, 1956, investigative action has been completed in 1,746 cases referred to or initiated by the Compliance Division of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

As a result of action taken with respect to the 1,746 matters referred to above, 1,715 individual administrative actions, criminal convictions, and/or monetary recoveries have been effected, as follows:

1. Restrictive or debarment actions:

Eight hundred and twenty-four administrative actions have been taken which resulted in restrictive or debarment measures being applied to an equal number of firms or individuals as their activities relate to the housing programs.

Forty-four restrictive measures previously instituted were rescinded.

2. Department of Justice:

Eighty-seven criminal convictions have been obtained to date out of 574 referrals to the Department of Justice.

NOTE.—To establish an absolute figure as to the status of the criminal referrals still pending in the Department of Justice, you may consider communicating with the Attorney General.

3. Personnel actions:

Fifty-five employees were subjects of action by their respective agencies, as a result of investigations.

4. Monetary recoveries:

One hundred and thirty-seven monetary recoveries and/or savings to constituent agencies, to local public authorities or agencies, amounted to $421,199.25.

5. Miscellaneous actions:

One hundred and forty-nine various actions were taken, such as: Revision of regulations; issuance of cease-and-desist orders; and correction of construction deficiencies.

6. No action warranted:

Four hundred and nineteen matters were reviewed and/or were the subject of preliminary investigation, which resulted in determinations by constituent agencies that no action of an administrative or legal nature was warranted.

In addition to the foregoing investigative actions completed, the Division handled 711 complaints, personnel preemployment checks, etc., which because of their nature, were not set up as individual investigative cases and were not included in the statistical case count.

As of April 30, 1956, there were:

One thousand one hundred and seventy-eight pending cases currently assigned or receiving investigative attention. Of this number, 1,098 related to FHA.

One thousand two hundred and twenty-four pending inactive cases. Investigation has been completed in these cases and reports of investigation have been transmitted to the constituent agencies concerned. Of these cases, 315 referrals have also been made to the Department of Justice, Department of Labor, Internal Revenue Service, Civil Service Commission, or other appropriate department or agency. These cases will be closed in the Compliance Division when report of disposition is received from the constituent and/or other department or agency of the Government as to their final action.

I trust that this information answers your inquiry. If you desire further information, Oakley Hunter, General Counsel, and Lester

P. Condon, Director of the Compliance Division, will be pleased to meet with you or your staff at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT M. COLE,
Administrator.

ABSTRACTS OF REPORTS OF AUDITS CONDUCTED BY THE UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE IN FHA INSURING OFFICES IN NEW YORK, KANSAS CITY, AND CLEVELAND, AND ON 22 SLUM CLEARANCE-URBAN RENEWAL ADMINISTRATION PROJECTS IN 15 CITIES

It should be noted that, although reference is made to some specific projects as examples, these audits are primarily directed to administration, practices and procedures audited in the limited number of FHA and slum clearance-URA operations reached to date.

NEW YORK CITY INSURING OFFICE

The General Accounting Office report on its audit in the New York City insuring office of the Federal Housing Administration under the Housing and Home Finance Agency was forwarded to Mr. Norman P. Mason, Commissioner, FHA, under a letter dated March 23, 1956, following completion of the audit in the field in May 1955.

The report is in two parts: (1) Underwriting operations, and (2) title I home repair loan operations.

Underwriting operations

The report in the underwriting operations section makes the following findings:

Under the heading "Deferment of Amortization of Mortgage Principal":

1. A windfall of 7 months rental in the Park City project; commencement dates for payments on principal were changed twice during construction. (Alfred Kaskel, sponsor of the project, is among those on FHA's own blacklist of 608 sponsors developed as a result of previous Federal housing scandals.)

2. Similar cases have been found in other FHA offices.

Under the heading "Acceptance of Sponsors Plans for Proposed Projects":

1. The New York office did not insist on plan changes to increase the general desirability of insured projects.

2. It is doubtful whether the office has complied with objectives of FHA minimum planning requirements.

3. It is questionable as to whether objectives of the National Housing Act to encourage improvement in housing standards and conditions have been met.

Under the heading "Needless Preparation of Data by the Architectural Section":

1. The Architectural Section's estimates of redecorating costs were not used in estimating annual operating costs and apparently served no purpose; the Valuation Section computed its own estimates of these costs.

Under the heading "Mortgage Credit Processing":

1. Generally, sponsors' financial statements were accepted without verification.

2. Mortgage credit personnel were inconsistent in treatment of sponsors' personal assets.

3. FHA procedures for analyzing sponsors' financial statements were general and did not require specific steps to determine either responsibleness or reliability of statements.

Under the heading "Valuation of Land":

1. It was not until the GAO views were presented to the FHA Commissioner that actual site costs were considered in arriving at fair market value of land for multifamily housing projects.

Under the heading "Reliability of Information in Applications for Mortgage Insurance":

1. Underwriting personnel did not utilize sponsors' estimates of rentals and operating expenses; the chief appraiser said applications for mortgage insurance were loosely prepared and unreliable.

2. Determination of maximum insurable mortgage was based on the estimated net income of a proposed project; the New York City office independently determined anticipated rental income, basing its estimate on rentals charged in existing comparable projects.

3. Procedures did not require that actual rentals charged conform to either the sponsors' estimates or those independently computed by FHA in determining the maximum amount of insurable mortgage.

Under the heading "Rentals for Open-Air Parking Spaces":

1. Underwriting letter No. 866 prescribes that income anticipated from rental of open-air auto-parking spaces of proposed multifamily projects should not be considered as part of estimated net income used in determining estimated value of the project by the capitalization method, and maximum insurable mortgage.

2. The New York office, in certain cases, included anticipated income from rental of such parking spaces in determining estimated net income.

3. The chief appraiser said the New York City office recommended to Washington that inclusion of open air parking space rental as such income be permitted. If this permission was granted, it was not located.

Under the heading "Review of Construction Cost Data":

1. The cost engineers' estimates are basic in determination of estimated replacement costs; in turn the estimate is basic in determination of maximum net return and estimated settlement requirements.

2. As important as these estimates are supposed to be, they were neither reviewed nor verified.

Title I home repair loan operations

The report on the New York City office, in the title I home repair loan operation section, makes the following findings:

Under the heading "Inadequate Personal Contacts":

1. A number of title I debtors have not been personally contacted.

2. The title I, home repair representatives were physically incapable of making personal contacts required of the position.

KANSAS CITY INSURING OFFICE

The General Accounting Office report on its audit in the Kansas City Insuring Office of the Federal Housing Administration, under the Housing and Home Finance Agency, was forwarded to Mr. Norman P. Mason, Commissioner, FHA, under a letter dated January 18, 1956, following completion of the audit in the field in September 1955.

The report is in two parts: (1) underwriting operations, and (2) title I home repair loan operations.

Underwriting operations

The report in the underwriting section makes the following findings:

Under the heading "Capitalization Method of evaluation for multifamily projects improperly used":

1. To a great extent the amount of risk assumed by FHA as insurer of the mortgage is based on the reasonableness of its own estimates of the value of the property offered as security for a loan.

2. Underwriting files for several projects and discussions with responsible personnel disclosed that underwriting personnel of the Kansas City office did not understand the method of establishing value by capitalization for rental property.

3. The chief underwriter said any section 207 (multiunit rental) project accepted by FHA is entitled to the most liberal rate permissible under FHA regulations. Such a statement is without merit and indicates a complete lack of understanding of the theory of capitalized value. A case in point is Benton Gardens, Inc. (Kansas City, Mo.). (I am advised by sources other than the reports that this project has been withdrawn since the audit was made.)

Under the heading "Capitalization of Amenity Income Method of Valuation Improperly Used":

(The report comments on "owner-occupant" (not rental) properties as contrasted with big multifamily rental projects. It says for owner-occupant properties value by capitalization represents present worth, at a predetermined rate of return, of the theoretical income obtainable if the properties were to be rented over the remaining economic life. FHA calls this amenity income.)

1. The amenity income method of valuation of owner-occupied properties as used in Kansas City office was without merit as a valuation method because the monthly rent multiplier was improperly determined. (The monthly rent multiplier is a factor used in computing capitalized value of owner-occupied houses to give effect to the quality and duration of monthly income.)

2. The chief underwriter indicated he did not know how to prepare a table of rent multipliers.

3. Tables of rent multipliers used in the Kansas City office had not been prepared in that office.

4. Tables of rent multipliers used were not prepared as prescribed.

5. Each valuator used his own methods of computing.

6. The question was raised as to whether this method of valuation should be continued in appraising owner-occupant properties.

7. "Improper valuations not only jeopardize the Government's interest in insured property, but, in a broader sense, they could also affect the entire real estate market in a given area in that overvaluation by FHA may tend to cause an upward trend in prices and undervaluation may tend to cause a downward trend."

Under the heading "Failure To Assemble Underwriting Data":

1. Only a limited amount of valuation and mortgage data had been compiled and it was out of date and incomplete.

2. The Kansas City office failed to follow procedures as follows:

(a) Appraisal data and project information forms were not prepared. (FHA describes this information as most important in estimating the value and judging the economic soundness of a project.) Both the director and the chief underwriter said although the form was required it had never been used. Much of the information was not in the files and where it existed it was not readily available.

(b) Income and operating expense analysis forms were not prepared. This form develops actual income and operating expense figures for each insured project—essential in the process of computing capitalized value in subsequent cases. Capitalized value has been the base of maximum mortgages in all recent 207 multiunit rental projects processed by the Kansas City office.

(c) Project inspection and record reports were not used. (These reports log inspections of the project and its progress.)

(d) (When a commitment to insure a 207 multiunit rental project is issued, FHA requires a determination of the obligor's net worth to show his ability to meet liabilities which may arise.) There were no indications that such determinations had been made or that sponsors financial statements had been verified.

Under the heading "Acceptance of Undesirable Sites":

1. Review of case binders and visits to sites revealed 11 section 203 units (1–4 family-housing units) in the same block with substandard housing—decreasing the desirability of the sites.

2. The valuator had rejected several of the units, but upon instructions from the chief underwriter, he reconsidered his appraisal, removed the rejection, and increased his estimate of value.

Under the heading "Need for Closer Review of Underwriting Conclusions and Computations":

1. Many opinions reached in valuation processing were not supported in factual data.

2. Examination of all firm commitments issued in the name of owner-occupants during the 30-day period ended September 12, 1955, disclosed cases where FHA value exceeded selling price.

3. Errors were found in mortgage credit computations, architectural computations, and forms used to compute amounts required to be deposited periodically for replacement of equipment.

Under the heading "Inadequate Supervision by Washington Technical Supervisors":

1. Washington office valuation and mortgage credit specialists had not visited the Kansas City office since 1950.

Title I home repair loan operations

The report on the Kansas City office, in the title I home repair loan operations section, makes the following findings:

Under the heading "Deficiency in Collection Activity":

1. Collection work on defaulted title I loans requires strengthening.

2. Only a small percentage of defaulted accounts were contacted personally, and collection letters were not used with effective regularity.

3. Because the performance of collection personnel was rate by dollars collected, there was a natural tendency to concentrate on current accounts which are easier to collect. Older accounts received least attention and likelihood of recovery tends to diminish as time passes.

Under the heading "Inadequate Supervision":

1. Collection activities of title I representatives were not reviewed as to adequacy, efficiency, or effectiveness.

CLEVELAND INSURING OFFICE

The General Accounting Office report on its audit in the Cleveland Insuring Office of the Federal Housing Administration, under the Housing and Home Finance Agency, was forwarded to Mr. Norman P. Mason, Commissioner, FHA, March 7, 1956, following completion of the audit in the field in September 1955.

The report is in two parts: (1) Underwriting operations and (2) title I home repair loan operations.

Underwriting operations

The report in the underwriting operations section makes the following findings:

Under the heading "Capitalization of Amenity Income Method of Valuation Improperly Used":

1. Estimates of capitalized value of owner-occupied properties were computed erroneously in the Cleveland office and did not provide independent estimates of value.

2. Tables of rent multipliers had not been compiled.

3. Worksheet data from which rent multipliers could be developed had not been maintained.

4. Procedures prescribed for computing estimates of capitalized value were followed in reverse order—capitalized value was determined first arbitrarily, and then a rent multiplier was computed to substantiate the capitalized value.

5. Improper valuations not only jeopardize the Government's interest in the insured property, but in a broader sense they could also affect the entire real-estate market in a given area in that overvaluations by FHA may tend to cause an upward trend in prices and undervaluation may tend to cause a downward trend.

Under the heading "Failure to accumulate underwriting data":

1. Valuation data considered necessary in arriving at sound underwriting conclusions with minimum time and effort either were not maintained or were not correct.

Under the heading "Value of multifamily projects by capitalization of net income improperly determined":

1. Review of files on 2 rental projects indicated value by capitalization was incorrectly determined. They were Babbit Gardens, Inc., Euclid, Ohio, and Forestview Terrace Apartments, East Cleveland.

2. The estimated value by capitalization of these projects was too high and resulted directly in one instance, and indirectly in another, in larger mortgages insured by FHA than conditions warranted. "Because of the several questionable determinations made in both cases we would like to call attention to the coincidence that FHA's computed values by capitalization resulted in mortgage amounts approximating those sought by the sponsors."

Under the heading "Questionable handling of a minority group cooperative":

1. The Warren Co-op Homes, Inc., Warren, Ohio, a minority group cooperative, was approved for insurance by FHA despite evidence that the project was financially unsound. "We believe the evidence normally would have resulted in FHA's rejection of this project for insurance. There are indications in this case, however, of fear of adverse publicity and possible outside pressure."

Under the heading "Mortgage processing deficiency":

1. FHA mortgage credit analysis in the Broad Rock Corp. project, Parma, Ohio, and the Warren Co-op project, Warren, Ohio, and the owner-occupant case No. 543269 are cited as examples of deficient mortgage credit financing.

Under the heading "Training of underwriting personnel":

1. The Cleveland office did not comply with underwriting manual requirements for continuing training of underwriting personnel and annual examinations for all underwriting technical employees below the rank of chief underwriter.

Under the heading "Inadequate Supervision by Washington Technical Supervisors":

1. The Cleveland office had not been visited by FHA headquarters valuation specialists for 5 years, or by mortgage credit specialists for 2 years.

Title I home repair loan operations

The report on the Cleveland office, in the title I home repair loan operations section, makes the following findings:

Under the heading "Deficiencies in Control of Cash Collections":

1. There was no control in effect assuring an accounting of all collections received by mail.

2. A number of delinquent title I debtors were not being contacted personally.

3. Because the performance of collection personnel was rated according to dollar collections, there was a natural tendency to concentrate on current accounts which are easier to collect. Old accounts received less attention and likelihood of recovery diminished with passing time.

Under the heading "Collection Cost Studies of Defaulted Loans":

1. They were not being made.

Under the heading "Reopening of Bankruptcy Cases":

1. The procedure was cumbersome and unnecessarily costly in time, effort, and money.

Under the heading "Exchange of Credit Information":

1. Multiple title I loans to an individual borrower in the Cleveland areas were not disclosed unless they were all processed by the same lending institution. There was no procedure for exchange of credit information among the lending institutions.

SLUM CLEARANCE—URA

The General Accounting Office report on its audit in slum clearance activities of local public agencies, title I of the Housing Act of 1949, under the Urban Renewal Administration, a component of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, was forwarded to Mr. James W. Follin, Commissioner, URA, under a letter dated March 19, 1956, following completion of the audit in the field in August 1955.

The report is based on a review of 26 projects in 15 cities. It is in 6 parts: (1) Introduction, (2) general, (3) eligibility of projects, (4) land acquisition activities, (5) management of properties, and (6) relocation of site families.

General

The report, in the general section, makes the following findings:

1. Weaknesses and deficiencies were found in Local Public Agency activities.

2. One of the principal reasons for weaknesses and deficiencies was the almost exclusive reliance by URA regional personnel on URA-project representatives and HHFA's internal audit staff.

3. The scope of both the URA project representatives and the HHFA's internal audit staff has been too limited.

4. Planning in initial stages of many projects has been inadequate, particularly with respect to (1) financing, (2) assuring adequate suitable relocation housing, and (3) employment of qualified Local Public Agency personnel.

Eligibility of projects

Under the heading "Kansas City, Mo., Northside Project":

1. Federal participation was not justified. Federal funds were not spent in furtherance of the program's objectives, which are improvement of housing conditions, but rather in assisting a local public works program.

Land acquisition

The report, in its land acquisition section, makes the following findings:

Under the heading "Failure To Coordinate Plans":

1. Uncoordinated acquisition programs of the metropolitan district commission and the local public agency resulted in unnecessary acquisition costs in connection with the Linwood Joy project at Somerville, Mass.

Under the heading "Failure To Prepare and Submit Project Parcel Appraisals":

1. Despite requirements St. Paul, Minn., and Kansas City, Mo., local public agencies did not prepare and submit two appraisals for each parcel in their respective projects; eastern and western projects in St. Paul, and Attucks and Northside in Kansas City.

2. Parcel appraisals for the St. Paul projects were not made in the final planning stages for submission with the loan and grant applications.

3. Second appraisals in the Kansas City projects were made on a selective parcel basis instead of on all-inclusive parcel-by-parcel basis.

4. Parcel appraisal at the development stage in the St. Paul projects were made by two appraisers who collaborated instead of working separately and independently.

5. In approving the Federal loan and grant for the St. Paul projects, URA accepted assessed valuation of the parcels instead of appraised valuation, as a basis for estimating project land acquisition costs. (Approval of a project by URA is dependent in part on the relation of estimated cost of acquiring project land to its estimated reuse or resale value.)

Under the heading "proposals for appraisal work":

1. Only 3 of 15 Local Public Agencies solicited proposals from several qualified appraisers before letting contracts for appraisal work.

Under the heading "Prohibited Interest":

1. An appraiser was engaged in the St. Louis Memorial Plaza project to make a land reuse appraisal. He was also a director of a corporation proposing to develop the project. He established the reuse value of the project land at $400,000. Other appraisals placed the reuse value at $1,247,075 and $1,550,000.

Under the heading "Compensation for Appraisal Work":

1. Appraisal fees paid in the Detroit Gratiot project were 33 percent higher than the rates established by the Detroit Real Estate Board.

Under the heading "Payment of Interest on Condemnation Awards":

1. Interest payments at 5 percent were made by the Detroit Local Public Agency on condemnation awards for land acquired for the Gratiot project. Federal loan funds at 2½ percent were not available pending compliance with legislative and administrative requirements. Proper fiscal planning by the city would have provided sufficient funds for prompt payment.

Under the heading "Failure To Negotiate Purchase of Project Lands":

1. Condemnation awards to property owners of 496 contested parcels of land in the Detroit Gratiot project exceeded appraised valuation by $1,007,807 or 25 percent.

Under the heading "Delays in Negotiating Purchase of Project Land":

1. Option negotiations for purchase of land in the Cleveland, Ohio, Longwood project were turned over to the city law division. They were far behind schedule, resulting in costly relocation and demolition delays.

Under the heading "Fees Paid Option Negotiators":

1. At the Chester, Pa., Bethel Court project, the Norfolk, Va., redevelopment project No. 1, and the Perth Amboy, N. J., Willocks and Forbesdale projects, option negotiators were paid fees on all parcels assigned them, irrespective of whether offers to sell were acceptable to the local public agencies.

Property management

The report, in its property management section, makes the following findings:

Under the heading "Inadequate Rental Collection and Accounting Practices":

1. In 7 of the 15 local public agencies, one or both of the following weaknesses existed:

(a) Project employees could not determine from accounting records: (1) Gross rentals due from site tenants each month, (2) site tenants who had or had not paid their rent, (3) delinquent rents outstanding and the period of delinquency, and (4) the basis upon which forgiveness of rents had been approved; and

(b) Procedures for following up on delinquents for collection.

Under the heading "Inadequate Protection of Site Property":

1. Few local public agencies made any effort to protect site property from theft and vandalism, other than to rely on routine police protection.

Relocation

The report, in its relocation section, makes the following findings:

Under the heading "Relocation Plans":

1. The requirement that local public agencies must assure that all families to be displaced from a slum clearance area can be satisfied from decent, sanitary, and safe housing available or to be provided was not met in numerous areas. Those cited as having difficulty were Chester, Pa., (Bethel court project), Detroit (Gratiot project), Cleveland (Longwood project), and Knoxville (Riverfront-Willow Street project).

Under the heading "Qualification of Relocation Staff":

1. The Knoxville, Tenn., local public agency relocation manager had not performed satisfactorily. The URA regional director notified the local public agency May 18, 1955, that unless a qualified person was employed, funds could not be used to pay the salary for that position after June 1, 1955. The regional director's memorandum was based on a relocation adviser's report listing seven specific deficiencies in the relocation managers qualifications.

Under the heading "Prolonged Relocation Period":

1. Relocation at the Birmingham, Ala., Medical Center project was to take 5 years. Quarters vacated by site tenants may be rerented to offsite tenants. "A lengthy period and the practice of rerenting slum site dwellings to offsite tenants do not promote the objective of slum clearance." There is no point in relocating one group of people and rerenting the same slum dwellings to another group. Such a practice doubles relocation costs.

Under the heading "Financial Assistance Policies and Practices":

1. Financial assistance practices of the Jersey City, N. J., local public agency on the Gregory and St. John projects were extremely liberal to site tenants.

Under the heading "Financial Assistance to a Hospital":

1. In Little Rock, Ark., moving expenses were paid for a hospital in connection with the Dunbar project. There was no authority to pay such expenses for a non-family site occupant.

Under the heading "Inspection of Relocation Dwellings":

1. In the Cleveland, Ohio, Longwood project site families were being relocated in October 1954. Provision for formal relocation inspection service was not instituted until May 1955.

Under the heading "Relocation in Public Housing":

1. In certain localities available low-rent public housing was not utilized to the extent desired as a resource for relocation. Little Rock, Kansas City, St. Paul, and Chester, Pa., were cited.

2. This failure was attributed to lack of cooperation between local public agencies and local public-housing authorities, antipathy of families for public housing, and lack of housing units.

Under the heading "Tenant-Landlord Relationship":

1. In Jersey City rentals were not established on 25 site properties in the Gregory project. Avoidance of tenant-landlord relationship was intentional in order to expedite eviction if desired.

Under the heading "Followup on Lost Families":

1. The whereabouts of 278 families formerly living in the Detroit Gratiot project area were unknown and they were considered as lost families. Effort was started to trace them 3 years after relocation was started.

Disposition of project land

The report, in its disposition of project land section, makes the following findings:

Under the heading "Option Agreements of Gratiot Project Lands":

1. In June 1953 Detroit contracted with the Housing Corporation of America for redevelopment of the Gratiot project area. The corporation deposited $92,638 with the city for a 36-week option to purchase project land. In February 1954 the corporation was granted a 28-week extension to obtain mortgage money. In June 1954 the corporation declined to exercise its option and withdrew. The full deposit was refunded.

Under the heading "Local Delays in Approving Final Project Development Plans":

The Detroit Gratiot project was started in 1946. As of December 1955 disposition of the project lands to be developed for residential use had not begun because the mayor and the city council had not approved the final development plan. Delay continually increased the net cost of the project, two-thirds of which was to be paid by the Federal Government. Interest expense and payments in lieu of taxes on this vacant land were being incurred at an annual rate of more than $100,000. Administrative costs were in addition.

Failure to maintain adequate records

The report, in its failure to maintain adequate records section, makes the following findings:

1. At Norfolk, Va., local public agency land data files of 41 parcels acquired for Redevelopment Project No. 1 either could not be located or did not contain complete data.

2. Jersey City, N. J., local public agency was unable to furnish any record showing the basis upon which appraisers and option negotiators were selected for the Gregory and St. John projects.

3. The Perth Amboy, N. J., local public agency did not have on file project surveys or other data which served as a basis upon which the Willocks and Forbesdale projects were found eligible for assistance.

4. The Detroit local public agency did not have a record to support the basis of the fee paid the appraiser of parcels in the Gratiot project.

FAILURE TO IMPLEMENT THE LAW

The Housing Act of 1954 contained provisions for cost and record certifications as a safeguard against windfall scandals.

In 1955, a full year after enactment, I was advised that Federal Housing Administration was not enforcing the law; had not set up procedures for enforcement; had not promulgated regulations for enforcement. I communicated an inquiry to the Comptroller General of the United States.

The Federal Housing Administration promised action.

Recently, nearly 2 years after enactment, I inquired again as to whether Federal Housing Administration was enforcing the law. As of May 8, 1956, I received from the United States General Accounting Office the following self-explanatory advice:

"FHA action on sections 227 and 814 since October 19, 1955

"Section 227 of the National Housing Act requires the Federal Housing Administration to obtain cost certifications from mortgagors of multi-family housing projects prior to final endorsement of a mortgage by the Federal Housing Administration. The purpose of the certification is to preclude so-called windfall profits. Section 814 of the Housing Act of 1954 requires mortgagors to certify that they will keep records as are prescribed by the Federal Housing Commissioner and authorizes the Government to examine and audit such records.

"Since October 19, 1955, the following action has been taken by the Federal Housing Administration with respect to sections 227 and 814.

"On November 22, 1955, the Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration, acknowledged receipt of letter from the General Accounting Office dated June 29, 1955, a copy of which was sent to Senator BYRD on October 19, 1955.

"FHA held meetings on December 12 and 13, 1955, to discuss the feasibility of having cost certifications certified by independent public accountants and suggested in our letter. These meetings were attended by counsel for the National Association of Home Builders, officials of the American Institute of Accountants, and Public Accountants As-

sociation, practicing certified public accountants, members of the General Accounting Office, Division of Audits, and officials of FHA. All present agreed that it was essential for FHA to define "actual costs" and develop a statement of cost principles for use in determining allowable and unallowable elements of cost. Such a statement of cost principles has not yet been developed by FHA.

"Effective December 20, 1955, the Federal Housing Administration amended their Administrative Rules and Regulations to prescribe that, if a project is constructed under a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract, cost certifications must be certified by an independent public accountant, in a form satisfactory to the Commission. Cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts must be used where an identity of interest exists between the mortgagor and the builder. These amendments were transmitted (together with unrelated amendments pertaining to mortgage insurance on existing trailer courts) to FHA field offices and approved mortgagees on January 18, 1956. A member of our audit staff noted that the transmittal letter to field offices specified that the amendments were applicable to Administrative Rules and Regulations for sections 207 and 213, but were silent as to sections 220 and 221. Our representative called this to the attention of an official of FHA on January 24, 1956, and was advised that a revised letter would be issued. Approximately a month later, a corrected letter, also dated January 18, 1956, was issued and specified that the amendment was also applicable to section 220.

"Although project mortgagors under section 221 of the act are required to submit cost certifications neither the corrected letter nor any succeeding letter to field offices has specified that the revision is applicable to this section. This omission has had no adverse effect to date because no section 221 projects have been committed for insurance and because the portion of the Administrative Rules and Regulations pertaining to cost certifications have by reference, been made applicable to section 221.

"In addition to the above action in our opinion further action is required to properly implement the requirement of certifications by independent public accountants. The following has not yet been accomplished.

"1. A revised agreement and certification (FHA form 3305) wherein mortgagors agree to the terms of the submission of cost certifications has not been issued. The revised form should provide for the mortgagor to agree to obtain the independent public accountant's certification. Revision of this form and prompt issuance to field offices is essential because continued use of the current agreement and certification form can result in an avoidance of the provisions of the amended Administrative Rules and Regulations.

"2. With respect to the certification required from the independent accountants, we note that 'a form satisfactory to the Commissioner' has apparently not yet been developed.

"3. Prescribed administrative procedures for field offices regarding cost certifications have not been amended to include references to the requirement for submission of independent public accountants' certification of mortgagors actual cost of construction on cost plus fixed fee contracts. In fact, the Cooperative Housing (sec. 213) letter of instruction number CH 110 was recently superseded by a new letter (CH 146) which made no reference to the new requirement. We have spoken to officials concerned with the issuance of such instructional letters and they indicate that they have not considered, nor are they presently considering, amending cost certification procedural letters.

"4. The underwriting instructions for processing of cost certifications have not been amended to include provision for a review of the certification of the independent public accountants to determine if it conforms to FHA's requirements.

"5. The underwriting instructions pertaining to valuation of proposed multi-family projects have not been amended to provide allowance for reasonable fees for accounting services in FHA's estimate of replacement cost of projects.

"6. Instructions have not been issued to the field officers requiring them to inform the FHA Audit Division of commitments issued subject to the new provision of the Administrative Rules and Regulations. Such information is necessary so that the Audit Division may arrange conferences with the mortgagor and independent public accountant to receive any uncertainties which may exist.

"7. Field offices have not been advised that they have the authority to request the FHA Audit Division to make audits of mortgagors' records in connection with cost certifications submitted under the Administrative Rules and Regulations in effect prior to the December 20, 1955 amendments. We have been informed that currently the FHA Audit Division is only making such audits prior to final endorsement of mortgages for insurance only on special request. To date, the Audit Division has audited cost in approximately 8 cases; most of these audits were made subsequent to final endorsement and incidental to a general examination of the mortgagor's operations.

"Although the number of multifamily housing mortgages committed for insurance is sharply reduced since the enactment of the Housing Act of 1954, this does not, in our opinion relieve FHA of its obligation to effectively implement sections 227 and 814. The fact remains that mortgages on multifamily housing projects are being insured. Approximately 8 mortgages requiring cost certifications have been initially endorsed for insurance between December 20, 1955, the effective date of the amended Administrative Rules and Regulations and March 31, 1956."

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC CREDIT AND MONEY MADE AVAILABLE THROUGH FEDERAL HOUSING PROGRAMS

During the 22 years since 1933 the Federal Government has used public credit and funds to subsidize domestic housing to a gross total of more than $69 billion—$52 billion in programs under the Housing and Home Finance Agency, $17 billion in veterans housing programs, and $1 billion in farm housing programs.

This public credit and money has been in the form of guaranteed, insured, and direct loans, direct appropriations, appropriations for payments in lieu of taxes, appropriations for the purchase of capital stock, etc.

This credit has been made available in the form of contingent debt, and the money has been made available by direct drafts on the Treasury outside of budgetary control and appropriation procedure, as well as through direct appropriations and just about every other conceivable financing device.

There is already a high degree of loss in the money that has gone out through direct appropriations. The loss in insured, guaranteed, and direct loans is impossible to estimate. Most of the loans are for long terms ranging up to 40 years.

Gross reserves from earnings for all the housing programs, exclusive of Federal Home Loan Banks and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, total $405 million against approximately $35 billion in direct, guaranteed, and insured loans outstanding.

Most of the authority to lend directly, purchase mortgages, and insure loans is set up in revolving funds to provide continuing use of the authority.

A summary, in gross figures, of public credit and Federal funds used in HHFA, veterans and farm home programs since 1933 is set forth in a table which follows. The figures in the table are gross and they do not reflect such payments as have been made. The purpose of the table is simply to show the tremendous extent to which public credit and Federal funds have been used to subsidize housing in this country.

The $69 billion total is more than all of the agricultural subsidies in this period; it is more than all of the transportation subsidies, including the postal deficit; and it is more than all the foreign aid.

Summary of public credit and money (gross) which have been made available under Federal housing programs, 1933 to June 30, 1955

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Authority to make loans, grants, purchase mortgages, and insure loans		Authority to expend from public debt receipts			Appropriations		Administrative expenses [1]	Reserves from earnings	Payments to U. S. Treasury (interest, dividends, and capital)
	Total current authority	Cumulated gross total authority used	Total current authority	Gross amount borrowed	Owed to Treasury	Total	Unexpended balance			
HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY										
Authority to make loans, grants and purchase mortgages:										
Office of the Administrator:										
College housing loans	[2] 300,000	81,798	300,000	81,500	81,500			1,337		[2] 2,268
Slum clearance and urban renewal:										
Loans	[2] 1,000,000	80,017	1,000,000	55,000	48,000					
Capital grants	500,000	52,918				67,000	14,083	9,104		
Urban planning grants						1,000	1,000			
Public works planning						1,542	1,486	42		
Federal National Mortgage Association:										
Special assistance functions	300,000		300,000	5	5			5		
Management and liquidating functions [4]	2,656,770	2,904,027	2,656,770	4,151,616	1,965,509			17,097	35,683	[5] 234,532
Secondary mortgage operations (trust fund)	1,092,820	9,162	1,000,000					59		

See footnotes at end of table.

Summary of public credit and money (gross) which have been made available under Federal housing programs, 1933 to June 30, 1955—Con.

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Authority to make loans, grants, purchase mortgages, and insure loans		Authority to expend from public debt receipts			Appropriations		Administrative expenses [1]	Reserves from earnings	Payments to U. S. Treasury (interest, dividends, and capital)
	Total current authority	Cumulated gross total authority used	Total current authority	Gross amount borrowed	Owed to Treasury	Total	Unexpended balance			
HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY—continued										
Authority to make loans, grants and purchase mortgages—Continued										
Home Loan Bank Board:										
Federal home loan banks	[6]	[6]	1,000,000						40,137	[3] [7] 150,917
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation	[8]		750,000					7,746	149,167	[3] [7] 80,680
Home Owners Loan Corporation		3,498,903		3,279,669				272,792		[7] 200,000
Public Housing Administration:										
Administrative expenses						45,407	374			
Annual contributions	336,000	227,308				237,472	16,097	85,691		
Loan authorization	[2] 1,500,000	4,097,556	1,500,000	4,590,256	61,000				2,088	[3] 91,680
Total, authority to make loans, grants and purchase mortgages	7,685,590	10,951,689	8,506,770	12,158,046	2,156,014	352,421	33,040	393,873	227,075	760,077
Authority to insure loans:										
Federal Housing Administration:										
Title I:										
Insurance program, sec. 2 (home improvement)	1,750,000	8,714,081				46,577		31,698	37,778	[7] 8,333
Housing insurance program, sec. 8		199,654						1,932	735	
Title II:										
Mutual mortgage insurance program, sec. 203 (1- to 4-family)		19,700,673				41,994		225,281	190,995	[3] [7] 59,054
Housing insurance program, sec. 207–210 (rental)		428,170				4,170		14,062	1,213	[3] [7] 5,557
Housing insurance program, sec. 213 (cooperative)		416,577								
Rehabilitation and neighborhood conservation, sec. 220								13		
Relocation housing, sec. 221								10		
Servicemen's mortgage insurance program, sec. 222	22,342,863	26,595						13		
Open-end mortgages, sec. 225		10								
Title VI (war housing):										
Sec. 603 (1- to 4-family)		3,645,212								
Sec. 608 (multiple rental)		3,440,034								
Sec. 609		5,316				5,000		70,475	109,860	[3] [7] 6,390
Sec. 610		24,468								
Sec. 611		12,546								
Title VII (housing investment insurance program), sec. 701						1,000		40		[3] [7] 1,108
Title VIII (military housing), sec. 803		661,787				5,000		4,225	11,765	[3] [7] 5,441
Title IX (defense housing):										
Sec. 903		500,445						4,184		
Sec. 908		63,427								
Total, authority to insure loans	24,092,863	37,838,977				103,741		351,933	352,345	85,883
Other:										
Office of the Administrator:										
Revolving fund for liquidating programs:										
Lanham public works						[9] 65,807				
Defense community facilities:										
Loans		3,233				20,625				
Grants		11,012								
Advanced planning, non-Federal public works:								6,093		[3] [7] 33,035
1st advanced planning						65,000				
2d advanced planning						28,607				
Alaska housing program		17,753				19,000				
Loans for prefabricated housing		52,444	[10]	36,170						
Public Housing Administration:										
Public war housing						[9] 1,654,978				
Subsistence homesteads, etc						[9] 62,454				
Veterans' reuse housing						[9] 442,625		119,887		[7] 549,612
Homes conversion program						[9] 90,109				
Total, other		84,442		36,170		2,449,206		125,980		582,647
Total, HHFA	31,778,453	48,875,128	8,506,770	12,194,216	2,156,014	2,905,368	33,040	871,786	579,420	1,428,607
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION										
Guaranteed loans	[11]	15,859,364				637,134		106,138		[7] 51,335
Direct loans	580,215	462,871	491,143	491,143	488,166				14,399	[3] 4,529
Total, Veterans' Administration	580,215	16,322,235	491,143	491,143	488,166	637,134		106,138	14,399	55,864
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE										
Farmers' Home Administration:										
Farm ownership loans:										
Direct loans	[12] 19,000	436,043	19,000	463,446	[13]	30,000		[13]		[13]
Insured loans	[14] 100,000	107,410						[13]		
Title V, Housing Act of 1949:										
Farm housing loans		97,305		97,174	[13]	1,350		[13]		
Farm housing grants		364				1,050		[13]		
Contributions		111								
Total, Department of Agriculture	119,000	641,233	19,000	560,620		32,400				
Grand total	32,477,668	[15] 65,838,596	9,016,913	13,245,979	2,644,180	3,574,902	33,040	977,924	593,819	1,484,471

[1] Includes expenditures from appropriated and agency funds.
[2] Lending authority limited by corporate resources, including authority to expend from public debt receipts (col. 3). Generally, authority is equal to authority to expend from public debt receipts.
[3] Interest.
[4] Cumulative since transfer to HHFA; records while under RFC not available.
[5] Dividends.
[6] Figures excluded; Federal home loan banks now privately owned.
[7] Capital.
[8] No monetary limitation; loans to prevent default of insured institutions.
[9] Represents allocations or reallocations to PHA and predecessors on basis of best information available.
[10] Authority to expend from public debt receipts has expired.
[11] Unlimited, except by maximum to which individual loans may be guaranteed.
[12] Amount authorized by Congress for fiscal year 1955. Authority is granted annually.
[13] Not available.
[14] Annual limitation.
[15] Cumulative gross total of loans and grants, mortgages purchased and loans insured. Excludes repayments.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show clearly that while in general I am in accord with the philosophy of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], to use the public housing programs in connection with slum clearance projects, I voted against the amendment because the supreme court of my State has ruled that, for constitutional reasons, none of the housing authorities of my State can set up slum clearance programs, and that, therefore, the housing authorities of my State would be completely precluded from participating in the public housing portions of the proposed legislation under the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I have sent to the desk an amendment on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD. I desire to explain the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 8, after line 24, to insert a new section, as follows:

"NATIONAL DEFENSE HOUSING

"SEC. 108. (a) Title II of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"'SEC. 230. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, and in addition to mortgages insured under section 203 or 207, the Commissioner may insure and make commitments to insure any mortgage under this section which meets, except as hereinafter provided, the eligibility requirements set forth in such sections: *Provided*, That no mortgage shall be insured under this section unless the Secretary of Defense or his designee shall have certified to the Commissioner that the housing with respect to which the mortgage is issued is necessary in the interest of national defense. Any such certification shall be conclusive evidence to the Commissioner of the need for such housing without regard to any other requirement in this act that the project or property be economically sound or an acceptable risk. If the Commissioner determines, notwithstanding any such certification, that the insurance of any mortgage on such housing is not an acceptable risk, he may require the Secretary of Defense to guarantee the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund or the Housing Insurance Fund, as the case may be, from loss with respect to any such mortgage insured pursuant to this section. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to provide for payment to meet losses arising from such guaranty.

"'(b) Except as otherwise provided herein, the provisions of this title relating to mortgages insured under section 203 or 207, respectively, shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this section which meet the eligibility requirements of such sections.

"'(c) In the case of any mortgage insured under this section meeting the eligibility requirements of section 207, the principal obligation of such mortgage shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 207 (c) (2), not exceed 90 percent of the estimated value of the property or project when the proposed improvements are completed.

"'(d) The Commissioner shall require that each dwelling designed for rental purposes and covered by a mortgage insured under this section shall be held for rental for a period of not less than 4 years after the dwelling is made available for initial occupancy.

"'(e) The Commissioner and the Secretary of Defense shall comply with and carry out the purposes of clause (ii) of section 803 (b) (2) of this act, as amended by the Housing Amendments of 1956, in the administration of this section, and for such purposes any reference therein to the Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund shall be deemed to refer to the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund, or the Housing Insurance Fund, as the case may be.'

"(b) Section 305 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, the Association is authorized to enter into advance commitment contracts, which do not exceed $50 million outstanding at any one time, if such commitments relate to mortgages with respect to which the Federal Housing Commissioner shall have issued pursuant to section 230 a commitment to insure; but of such authorization not more than $5 million outstanding at any one time shall be available for such commitments in any one State.'"

On page 9, line 2, strike out "SEC. 108" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 109."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the amendment is designed to provide a means of supplying privately built defense housing in small amounts, upon rather economical construction plans, the housing to be built by small builders at isolated Army bases, air bases, guided missile test stations, and other places where such bases are being built near small communities.

The two large programs, namely, appropriated housing for the military and the military or Wherry housing, now Capehart housing, still leave a considerable gap in privately built rental housing for military personnel who go to the affected areas when the defense installations are opened.

I have discussed the amendment with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and with the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing [Mr. SPARKMAN]. Both of them feel that the amendment is a step in the right direction, and varies only to an insignificant degree from what can already be done under present titles of the Housing Act.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I ask the Senator from Oklahoma if in the amendment he has offered he has included a modification which was suggested in our conversation?

Mr. MONRONEY. Indeed I have. It insures that the same restrictions which apply to the construction of appropriated housing and Wherry housing, in accordance with the findings of the Commissioner that such housing shall not be constructed unless it is needed, shall apply to this amendment as well as to appropriated housing which the military construct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As I understand, the Senator also has modified his amendment so as to make it conformable with a similar provision in the bill relating to military housing.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is identical.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is, it would require the FHA Commissioner to find that the housing is needed and is economically sound.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is exactly correct, and it is properly safeguarded in that direction. It merely allows the houses, the need for which must be found to exist by the Secretary of Defense, which must be approved by the Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, to be admissible to the National Federal Mortgage Association for purchase at par. So it is the cheapest way for the Government to get needed housing at an early time for bases now being constructed, and when no present means exist to supply the need for housing.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to say that my only hesitancy in agreeing to the amendment was, first of all, that it came to us as a new question, but, following the conversation the Senator from Oklahoma had with me and with the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], he did incorporate the desired modification in his amendment.

One reason why I was a little hesitant about this type of amendment is that our experience with military housing generally has not been too happy. Title 9: Housing, or, at least, military housing generally, has produced the highest percentage of delinquencies. I will admit that we had a program which was hastily gotten together, and perhaps many of the delinquencies resulted because of the haste with which it was prepared.

I do feel that the Senator from Oklahoma is aiming at something which tightens up the looseness which existed in the previous program. I am not sure it does just what is desired. I very frankly said to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, as did the distinguished chairman of the committee, that we would be glad to accept the amendment tentatively—that is, take it to conference—and in the meantime we would check the matter most carefully with the various agencies concerned, and, if necessary, would rewrite the proposal, in order to accomplish the purpose which the Senator from Oklahoma seeks to have accomplished.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate very much the acceptance of the amendment and the agreement to modify it as may need be, in order that small builders may be given a chance to to participate in furnishing absolutely indispensable housing on new bases being built. I thank the Senator for agreeing to take it to conference.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee which has handled the bill whether it would be possible for the Farm Home Administration to grant loans for the construction of modern milk houses and bulk milk-holding tanks. My reason for making the inquiry is that, under health regulations, in order to qualify for producing grade A milk, many producers must construct modern milk houses and cooling tanks, or bulk holding tanks. Such construction involves the outlay of from $2,000 to $2,500.

Many young farmers are unable to secure loans to make such construction. Therefore, they are not able to qualify for the production of grade A milk. Being unable to qualify, they suffer a penalty by not being able to receive the price paid for grade A milk, and they may be denied the right to produce for an association or a certain milk market. That is the reason why I asked the question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in response to the question of the Senator from Minnesota, I should like to answer that the committee took the position that it would be unwise to specify any particular items. In view of the committee action, I could not answer and say that construction of a milk tank would qualify. I call the Senator's attention to page 4 of the report, which I think contains a statement that is actually responsive to the Senator's inquiry:

> In order to serve the needs of homeowners, a program such as that envisioned by title I, which is affected by frequent technological changes in home improvement items, must have sufficient flexibility to permit administrative changes. Consequently, the committee feels that it is now possible to restore considerable discretion to the FHA Commissioner with respect to the eligibility of items. We believe that the statute contains policy guidelines broad enough and yet sufficiently specific to permit a wise administrator to respond to changing circumstances and technology.
>
> We expect the Commissioner to continue the ineligibility of tennis courts, swimming pools, barbecue pits, dog kennels, fire alarm systems, and any other items which in his judgment do not substantially protect or improve the basic livability or utility of properties or which are especially subject to selling abuses. We expect the Commissioner to rely upon the language of the statute in making this insurance program useful to homeowners desiring to repair, improve, or remodel their homes.

As to the specific inquiry of the Senator from Minnesota, I do not think I can add anything to the statement which I have just read. There were a few specific items which the committee said should not be eligible, and which experience in the past developed should not be included for eligibility. I am afraid I cannot go any further than that in answer to the question of the Senator.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I would interpret the discretion of the Administrator to include the granting of such loans, as I have indicated, for the reason that they would improve the earning ability of farmers, and they most certainly would promote the well-being of the community concerned, and would also insure a better product to be marketed by the producer. It would seem to me to be a proper type of loan.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the decision would be up to the Administrator. The committee is not in a position to judge the various sets of circumstances that would confront the Administrator. I think the precise circumstances of the particular applicant would have a very important bearing on the decision of the Administrator. It is difficult to generalize on items such as that mentioned by the Senator. That is why the committee refused to undertake such definition.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senators from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before the Senate proceeds to vote on the bill, I should like to engage in a brief discussion of it, because it is of great importance to the people of my State, as well as to the people of the Nation.

The RECORD will show that over my years in the Senate I have fought for the principles embodied in the pending bill, because I think the provisions of the bill are as good an example as can be cited of efforts to carry out the promotion of the general welfare clause of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, title II of this bill—"Housing for Elderly Persons"—provides for a new approach to one of the most acute problems facing a large number of our fellow Americans.

It is a problem which I hardly need to describe for the Members of this body. We all know the importance of home living. We know, too, that people of all ages prefer to maintain independent households, and, if possible, to own their own homes.

INCOMES OF OLDER PEOPLE ARE INADEQUATE

But for a large number of older people today, Mr. President, housing choices are determined by economic circumstances, rather than by personal preference. According to a recent authoritative study by the Twentieth Century Fund, based on data from the Census Bureau, at least half of Americans 65 and over have incomes inadequate for maintaining minimum standards of living. The study maintains, incidentally, that an adequate minimum income for the country as a whole is $1,900. I should prefer to call such an amount a bare minimum.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Oregon to a chart appearing in the Congressional Quarterly—No. 19—for the week ending May 11, 1956. The chart is entitled "Aged Population Increase." I think the chart is of significance and importance, and I should like to ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, that is an excellent suggestion, and I am glad to have the chart printed at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the chart printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Aged population increase

[In thousands]

	Total	65 and over		Percent change, 1940–50	
		Number	Percent of total	Total	65 and over
United States	150,697	12,270	8.1	14.5	36.0
Alabama	3,061	199	6.5	8.1	46.3
Arizona	750	44	5.9	50.3	83.3
Arkansas	1,910	149	7.8	−2.0	39.3
California	10,586	895	8.5	53.3	61.3
Colorado	1,325	116	8.8	18.0	34.9
Connecticut	2,007	177	8.8	17.4	37.2
Delaware	318	26	8.2	19.1	23.8
District of Columbia	802	57	7.1	21.0	39.0
Florida	2,771	237	8.6	46.1	80.9
Georgia	3,445	220	6.4	10.3	38.4
Idaho	589	44	7.5	12.2	37.5
Illinois	8,712	754	8.7	10.3	32.7
Indiana	3,934	361	9.1	14.8	25.3
Iowa	2,621	273	10.4	3.3	19.7
Kansas	1,905	194	10.2	5.8	23.6
Kentucky	2,945	235	8.0	3.5	24.3
Louisiana	2,684	177	6.6	13.5	48.7
Maine	914	94	10.3	7.9	17.5
Maryland	2,343	164	7.0	28.7	32.3
Massachusetts	4,691	468	10.0	8.7	26.8
Michigan	6,372	462	7.3	21.2	39.6
Minnesota	2,982	269	9.0	6.8	26.3
Mississippi	2,179	153	7.0	−.2	33.0
Missouri	3,955	407	10.3	4.5	24.8
Montana	591	51	8.6	5.7	41.7
Nebraska	1,326	130	9.8	.8	22.6
Nevada	160	11	6.9	45.5	57.1
New Hampshire	533	58	10.9	8.3	18.4
New Jersey	4,835	394	8.1	16.2	41.2
New Mexico	681	33	4.8	28.0	43.5
New York	14,830	1,258	4.5	10.0	36.4
North Carolina	4,062	225	5.5	13.7	43.3
North Dakota	620	48	7.7	−3.4	23.1
Ohio	7,947	709	8.9	15.0	31.3
Oklahoma	2,233	194	8.7	−4.4	33.8
Oregon	1,521	133	8.7	39.5	43.0
Pennsylvania	10,498	887	8.4	6.0	31.0
Rhode Island	792	70	8.8	11.1	29.6
South Carolina	2,117	115	5.4	11.4	42.0
South Dakota	653	55	8.4	1.6	25.0
Tennessee	3,292	235	7.1	12.9	36.6
Texas	7,711	513	6.7	20.2	47.8
Utah	689	42	6.1	25.3	40.0
Vermont	378	40	10.6	5.3	17.6
Virginia	3,319	215	6.5	23.9	38.7
Washington	2,379	211	8.9	37.0	46.5
West Virginia	2,006	139	6.9	5.5	37.6
Wisconsin	3,435	310	9.0	9.5	28.1
Wyoming	291	18	6.2	15.9	38.1

Source: Census Bureau.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to say that the housing provisions for the aged, as carried in the pending bill, are, in my opinion, of great importance. In the case of both the provisions of this housing bill and the liberalized FHA provisions for housing for elderly groups, I desire to compliment the committee for its very fine work.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am proud to have been associated with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for the past several years in the joint endeavor we have continually made to secure the enactment in this field of public housing, of legislation carrying out the principles of this bill.

Another important study recently issued by the Council of State Governments states that in 1952 the average income of older couples was less than $1,500; that of single or widowed males was less than $750; and that of single or widowed females was about $400. All these amounts, the study declares, are "below the income necessary for a 'total

maintenance' budget," while the incomes of 29 percent of the men and 42 percent of the women fall below an "emergency budget" estimated at 70 percent of the "maintenance budget." If the comparable figures for 1955 were available, I am sure they would reveal an even more severe situation.

HOUSING OF OLDER PERSONS IS SUBSTANDARD

Is it any wonder, Mr. President, that the older citizens of America are inadequately housed? Is it any wonder that hundreds of thousands of the most deserving members of our population today live in dwellings which were not designed to meet their needs; in the homes of relatives or in institutions, when their preference is to live alone; in unsafe and dilapidated structures, which both endanger their health and jeopardize their psychological well-being? Nineteen percent of men over 65 and 31 percent of women do not live in their own homes; 16 percent of men and 37 percent of women live with their children or other relatives; 5 percent of men and 3 percent of women live in boarding homes, nursing homes, county homes, homes for the aged, or mental hospitals. In the last-mentioned case, despite the relatively small percentage of persons residing in institutions, experts are agreed both that institutional care is the most unsatisfactory method for accommodating older people and that many of those now confined to institutions—at considerable expense, I may add, to the public—could be more adequately cared for through special services extended to them in their own or a foster home.

HOMES ARE DILAPIDATED

Data from the 1950 census on the condition of housing owned and occupied by persons over 65, as substantiated by the reports of the Twentieth Century Fund and the Council of State Governments, indicate that although these facilities are less crowded than those of younger people, they are also more dilapidated. More homes of older people—36 percent more—lack either a private flush toilet, a bath, or running water—than do homes of younger persons. Heating facilities often are substandard. There are stairs to climb, high cabinets to reach, slippery floors.

For the 32 percent of the population over 65 who rent housing, low income necessitates the use of low-rental properties which—again—are often substandard. Despite the fact that rental rates of housing occupied by persons over 65 are generally lower than those for the entire population of the country, the proportion of income spent on rent by persons over 65 is considerably higher than that for the rest of the population. In a recent study in New York State, for example, the median percentage of rent to income for persons over 65 was found to be 27.8, as compared with 18.4 for the entire population. Whereas only 20.1 percent of total households in the State pay 30 percent or more of their income for rent—an alarmingly high figure, I should add—45.5 percent of households headed by a person over 65 pay 30 percent or more. When we place these figures alongside the differences in income between persons over 65 and those below 65, the predicament of the older person is more manifest.

But while the casual relationship between inadequate income and inadequate housing can be clearly established, and should be more clearly established through further research, the creation of a feasible program through which the Federal Government can help to meet both conditions coordinately is a much more difficult task. No one denies that housing for older persons is inadequate; indeed the groundswell which has developed for this legislation attests to what psychologists would call the "felt-need" of a large part of our population. Differences have, therefore, arisen, not over the need—for the administration has been compelled reluctantly to admit that a need exists—but over the kind of program such a need requires, and the proper role for the Federal Government to perform.

NEEDS AND CAPACITIES VARY

Many older people would be insulted if told that their home, so full of memory and meaning, is not entirely adequate for their later years.

Indeed, it would be a mistake to suggest that simply because a person is over 65, or over 60, a particular dwelling is no longer suitable for his occupancy. Variations in the needs and the capacities of older people permit us to say only that the process of aging produces physical and mental changes which often lead to the need for changes in housing accommodations if health and happiness are to be maximized. Research has also shown that health and happiness can be so maximized by creating conditions of home living consistent with changing physical and psychological conditions. Health and safety can be protected, for example, by nonskid composition flooring, wall-bracket light fixtures to facilitate changing light bulbs, electric stoves to eliminate the danger of asphyxiation from the boiling over of liquids, hand grips around bathtubs. Psychological well-being can be advanced through the elimination of noise, provision of recreational facilities, and the stimulation of participation in group activities.

WHAT KIND OF HOUSING IS SUITABLE?

At this point in my remarks, Mr. President, I should like to congratulate the staff of the housing subcommittee on its excellent roundup of information on housing for older persons, published as a committee print on January 4. I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD two brief sections from that report; they are entitled "A Suitable Dwelling for Older Persons" and "The Individual House for the Older Person." These portions of the report contain a very succinct discussion of approaches toward creating the conditions of home living about which I have been speaking.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SUITABLE DWELLING FOR OLDER PERSONS

A recent popular article, Who Will Build for the Nation's Aged, stated that one of the "most curious facts emerging from 10 years' discussion of how to house the aged is that no one has yet definitely ascertained that there is any difference between a house designed for a sexagenarian and one designed for his grandson."

This is true because the housing needs of older people are not all the same. As Architect Robert Woods Kennedy put it:

"Housing projects must be designed for an entirely hypothetical and theoretical tenant who is at one and the same time completely healthy, and ridden by a variety of characteristic ailments. Housing for the elderly must accommodate the healthy and in this respect is no different from any housing but it must also accommodate the infirm." (Standards of Design: Housing for the Elderly, Massachusetts State Housing Board, Boston, 1954.)

Quantitative standards, other than those for any good housing, are impossible but some of them are considerably more important for the aging who have greater need of an extra margin for comfort and particularly for safety. The gradual but natural decline with age results in limitations of the senses of sight, hearing, and smell, in less prompt muscular coordination, and in reduced ability to adapt promptly to changing situations. It is inevitable that older people will suffer many home accidents, a high proportion of them being disabling. Principal among these accidents are falls, burns, and poisonous gases. The principal reasons for them are improper equipment, badly arranged and poor lighting, accentuated by physical handicaps. The frequency of accidents can be reduced if rooms are well-designed and equipment is properly installed.

The suggestions that follow are not dogmatic standards but rather factors to be taken into consideration in the appraisal of housing suitable for the aging.[1] No one house or apartment could incorporate all features, some of which are mutually exclusive, but each can be balanced against the others for adaptation to a particular locality or some specified housing project. These suggestions are not concerned with institutional living, important though it is, but only with dwellings for the majority of the aging who live independently as individuals, as couples, or in families. They are applicable to an apartment built in or attached to a one-family house or to multi-dwelling unit housing projects.

SITE, ENVIRONMENT, AND LOCATION

1. General: Preferably away from sources of industrial fumes, dusts, and smoke. Experiences with smog, for example, have demonstrated that older people suffer more acutely.

2. The neighborhood: Not an area exclusively for the aging, but a typical residential neighborhood, with shops, churches, libraries, recreation, and established health and welfare services in close proximity.

3. Convenient transportation: One of the most important factors since required services need not be immediately adjacent.

4. Traffic hazards: Heavy traffic is noisy as well as dangerous. Aging people with less ease of movement and with impaired sight and hearing should not be exposed to excessive traffic and dangerous crossings.

5. Topography and approaches: Minimal grades and level approaches to avoid necessity for steep walks and ramps, stairs and high ground floors.

[1] From Factors To Be Considered in Providing Housing for the Aging, prepared for a Connecticut conference on the problems of aging, April 1954, by Daniel G. Lyons, executive director, Hartford Housing Authority; Erie W. Hood, director of environmental sanitation, New Haven Department of Health; Eleanor M. Watkins, secretary, American Public Health Association committee on hygiene of housing; and David C. Wiggin, principal sanitary engineer, Connecticut State Department of Health.

6. All utilities and municipal services established.

7. Available outdoor area: Park, private outdoor sitting area (not directly on the street), small gardens if possible; balconies, if no other available outdoor area.

CONSTRUCTION AND FACILITIES

1. Ground dwelling unit, with handrails at all steps and ramps.

2. Elevators: In multistory apartments if older people are housed above second floor.

3. Fire hazards: Older people who have impaired ability to see and smell and are unable to move rapidly may not be aware of fire or able to escape in case of fire. Fire hazards may be reduced by carefully chosen building materials; thoughtful planning for circulation and exit; sufficient space in front of open fires or stoves; careful installation of any gas appliances.

4. Egress: Two exits to the outside, readily available from within the apartment and easily used by the older person.

5. Orientation for sunshine, light, ventilation, and a pleasant view: Older people spend more time in the home than younger and require direct sunlight. Advantage should be taken also of winter solar heat with protection against excessive summer heat. Windows may well be larger than standard for the locality and properly oriented so that direct sunlight will enter the living area and bedroom at some time during the day. If sill height is less than 30 inches, a guardrail should be installed. Larger windows will also assure more daylight and more adequate ventilation, if oriented for the prevailing breeze. Since older people are as sensitive to overheating as to cold, it is desirable to provide cool, moving air, particularly in sleeping rooms. Air conditioning and mechanical ventilation are desirable not so much for comfort as to prevent heat stress. At least one room, preferably the living area, should face a pleasant view.

6. Lighting: Older people, because of impaired vision, need not only more light but better light than younger people. Glare from large glass areas must be controlled. The need for more and better light holds true for artificial as well as natural light. Illumination should be controlled by readily accessible switches, so located that the way ahead may always be lighted.

7. Heating: Older people as a rule require higher indoor temperatures to compensate for poorer circulation and less efficient heat-regulating mechanisms. The heating system should be capable of providing a temperature, higher than 65° to 70° F., which is comparatively even from floor to ceiling to avoid chilling of the feet.

8. Noise: As with all housing, dwelling units for older people should be located away from sources of excessive noise. Walls and ceilings between apartments should be constructed to reduce airborne sounds and impact noises, not only to protect older people themselves but since many older people are deaf, to protect younger occupants of other apartments.

9. Privacy: The desire for privacy increases with age and privacy is required not only to protect the sedentary preoccupations of older people but also because of the possibility of chronic illness and relative frequency of illnesses.

10. Consideration of the danger of falls: Floors should be smooth but nonslippery, particularly in kitchens and baths. Door thresholds and changes in level are undesirable. If there are stairs, they should slope gently between 30° and 36° with uniform tread and riser dimensions, and be provided with handrails and nonslip tread surfaces. Circulation space should be wide and free from obstructions.

11. Housekeeping facilities: Increased susceptibility to fatigue and decreased ability to do physical tasks make it important that the layout of the dwelling facilitate routine tasks. The unit should be designed to minimize walking and provide easy access to storage spaces without excessive reaching or bending. If furniture cannot be easily moved, there must be sufficient space to permit cleaning. Bedmaking, particularly, may be difficult and beds require considerable open circulation space on either side. The kitchen area, especially, must have well-arranged equipment, adequate and convenient storage and an efficient circulation pattern.

12. Dwelling units: For the most part, small units for 1- or 2-person occupancy. Each apartment to have a living area and dining space readily accessible from the kitchen.

Sleeping areas: When space is at a premium, a sleeping alcove off the living space may be more satisfactory for one person than a separate bedroom, if a curtain or screen is available for privacy and the alcove is well ventilated and large enough for circulation space around the bed. A separate bedroom is essential for two-person occupancy, preferably with space for twin beds so arranged that a curtain or screen may be used between them for privacy. A night light should be at the bedside and the path to the bathroom straight, wide, and free of obstructions.

Bathrooms: Private for each apartment. A wall switch outside the door is preferable. Nonslippery floor. Bathtub or shower must have strategically placed grab bars and the shower-stall floor must be nonslip. Glass or thin metal tubing is undesirable for towel bars.

Kitchen areas: Minimum amount of floor space and maximum wall space for storage cabinets at hand level. Elimination of above-head storage and reduction of low-level storage which should only be used for articles required infrequently. Work counters and sink at convenient height. Electrical appliances are preferable to gas. Hand-height ovens help reduce fatigue and accidents. If the refrigerator has a large frozen-food compartment, marketing problems are simplified and garbage disposal units are helpful for tenants who may be infirm.

13. Wheelchairs: If accommodation for a wheelchair must be considered, ramps are necessary at the entrances. All doors, corridors (public and private), elevators, and bathrooms must be of a size to admit a wheelchair. A width of 3 feet is a minimum.

THE INDIVIDUAL HOUSE FOR THE OLDER PERSON

For many older people, the most desirable solution to their housing problems is a small house situated like any other house in a normal community. Few of these have so far been built, in part, at least, because of the difficulty of securing favorable financing for a one-bedroom house. There is a strong belief that such houses have small resale value. In view of the increasing numbers of older people who would find such houses desirable, this opinion may in time change. It has also been pointed out that the one-bedroom house is equally desirable for many young couples during the early years of marriage before children are born. There is some experience in having such a small independent unit attached to the house of an adult child or other relative, the so-called mother-in-law house. Proposals have been made, also, for duplex lifetime houses. One unit would be the small 1-bedroom house for the early and late years; the other a 3- or 4-bedroom unit for the period of family life. At all times the unit not in use would be available for rental and provide income. The following description of the individual house planned for an elderly individual or couple is paraphrased from the remarks of L. Morgan Yost, Chicago architect, before a meeting of the National Committee on the Aging:

"A house for older people needs to have the same elements of safety, convenience, and livability as housing for all age groups. Preferable construction is a one-story house on the ground, with the elimination of a step through the use of a low-pitched ramp. Since statistics on accidents indicate that about one-fourth are on stairways, it is advisable to eliminate both attics and basements. While it is true that this type of construction eliminates storage space for many of the possessions older people have collected, some of the advantages of this type of housing may make it easier to relinquish some of the unnecessary belongings.

"While some older people may fear that a house without a basement will have cold floors, such a house properly designed can actually be warmer than one with a basement. Some caution needs to be given against radiant heating in climates subject to rapid temperature changes. The utility room, which acts as a substitute for the basement, can easily provide a place to putter which is important for all age groups.

"Housing for older people should of course be well lighted with big windows. Contrary to popular opinion these are not expensive to heat or to install. Since older people spend so much time indoors, it is important the windows should be placed low so that the residents can easily see out of doors. Some caution should be taken that they do not appear too invisible, so that older people may walk through them. This may be accomplished through an etched pattern or dividing bars. It is important that doors should open into a room, never out into the line of traffic. Particular attention should be paid to the kitchen, which should be a pleasant place for eating. A comfortable table by a window with a pleasant view may help to provide an interest in meals, since older people often have small appetites.

"So far as materials are concerned, the important considerations would appear to be good, sound construction with proper wiring, noninflammable paint, and no slippery floors. In many ways, carpet is the most satisfactory floor covering. There should be emergency keys for all rooms in case an older person should lock himself in and become ill or incapacitated. All closet doors should have knobs on the inside to prevent a person from being shut inside with no means of opening the door. As an extra precaution, the bottom of the door should be slightly raised to provide for ventilation in case an older person should become faint or ill while inside a closet. It is again pointed out that many of these precautions apply equally to children as to older people."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is apparent that we are in urgent need of research on a host of questions surrounding the improvement of housing for older people. The subcommittee was fully aware of the lack of adequate data for the formulation of a comprehensive program of housing for older people, and has accordingly included in section 602, which provides for such research as the Housing and Home Finance Administrator may determine to be "necessary and appropriate in the exercise of his responsibilities," provision for research specifically on "housing for elderly persons," section 602 (a) (4). It is my hope, and the hope of the committee, that under this mandate the Administrator will promptly launch a searching inquiry into this important subject. In the Senate Subcommittee on Housing we have an excellent staff, but we should not have to depend exclusively upon its resources for basic information necessary for legislative action.

The development of basic data is a function of specialist staffs within

HHFA. I think it is fair to say, however, that in the discussions on this phase of the housing amendments of 1956, the administration has exhibited a diffidence bordering on unconcern.

Despite deficiencies of data about the nature of an adequate program, however, public interest in Federal assistance to housing for older people is so keen, and the need for such assistance so clear, that action of at least an initial character is urgent. Support for the kind of program contained in this bill, which is based on S. 2790, of which I am a sponsor, has been expressed within the several States by a great variety of committees and commissions on the aging; throughout the country by the overwhelming number of experts in geriatrics and gerontology; and by governors, home builders, social workers, and local and State housing officials. In my judgment, we can no longer ignore this vast body of supporters. We must act affirmatively on title II of this bill, as was done on all its other sections, and must demonstrate that we are responsive to the important needs of our population.

THE POSITION OF THE ADMINISTRATION

Knowing how vital title II is to the amelioration of the housing needs of our older people, I could hardly believe yesterday's announcement that the Administrator of the HHFA—Mr. Cole—is "deeply concerned" with this part of the bill.

Mr. President, on March 9, 1953, I opposed confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Cole. His record to date, as well illustrated by his press release of yesterday, fully supports and justifies my opposition to his appointment in the first place.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD excerpts from my speech in the Senate on March 9, 1953.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 9, 1953]

Mr. MORSE. Cole's opposition to this vital housing program is a matter of record. In his extended speech on the Housing Act in 1949, he stated his condemnation of each and every portion of that measure. * * * His implacable opposition to and overwhelming lack of sympathy with this program renders him incapable of discharging his duties under it in conformity with congressional policy.

He stated unequivocally during the hearings on the confirmation of his nomination that he had not changed his views (p. 16):

"Mr. COLE. Perhaps you misunderstood me. I have not changed my opinion. Have I indicated that I changed my opinion? If so, I beg your pardon. I have not changed my personal opinion about it."

* * * * *

Mr. MORSE. On the record made before the Banking and Currency Committee it seems clear that Mr. Cole cannot be expected to discharge his duties in harmony with the congressional purposes enunciated in the Housing Act of 1949.

Furthermore, the Senate should not invite the emasculation of this program by executive fiat. We want an administrator, not a one-man law revision commission.

The housing needs of the country are chronic. The present program is a vital necessity if we are to have any appreciable progress in slum clearance, low-cost housing, some measure of amelioration in the congestion caused by our immense-defense program.

This is what Cole has to say about this, page 4:

"Mr. COLE. Senator, as conditions warrant it I believe the Government should gradually get out of the housing business. I think Government should support housing and not supplant it—support the housing industry; the people who are building houses. They should support it and not supplant it."

That must be music to the ears of the contractors of the country, Mr. President.

Today I shall not be a party to voting for confirmation of the nomination of a man who has already testified where his interest is—not in the little people, but in those who build houses. The administration proposes to make him the administrator of an act passed by the Congress of the United States which was aimed to help the little people in America who need public housing.

Not only is this nomination shocking, Mr. President, but I shall do my best to help the little people in America remember the blow to their interest which the Eisenhower administration is striking against them today in submitting the nomination.

This nomination is unfortunately similar to the nominations of Wilson, Kyes, Talbott, and Douglas. In each case a man has been proposed whose past activities, associations, or attitudes come into head-on conflict with the program he is supposed to supervise.

I say that such choices as these are dangerous for the little people of America: In my judgment, it is the obligation of the United States Senate today to withhold approval of this nomination. In the interest of the people of America who need public housing, I shall vote against the confirmation of the nomination of a man whose record shows he is not a friend, so far as the housing issue is concerned, of the little people of America, but who admits he is interested in taking care of builders.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, why does Mr. Cole say he is concerned with this part of the bill?

To be completely fair, I should like to read the full comment of that portion of the press release. Mr. Cole stated:

I am deeply concerned with the provisions in the Senate bill regarding housing for the elderly. The administration recommended reasonable and practical FHA aids in financing both rental and sales housing for elderly people. These proposals were rejected by the committee, which substituted recommendations of its own. Paradoxically, under the Senate bill, a married couple over 60 years of age could get an FHA home loan with a smaller down payment and a longer time to pay than could a young couple just setting up housekeeping.

The final sentence, which is more an irrelevant and distractive observation than a reason for concern, hardly bears comment. Of course, the bill allows persons over 60 years of age—and not just couples—more liberal loans than other FHA borrowers. They have less income. They are in a less favorable credit position. They are dependent upon a peculiar type of housing. Is it wrong that people over 60—most of whom sustain themselves through social-security benefits—should be extended loan privileges consistent with their financial circumstances and their need? Of course not. And the Administrator apparently is not prepared to contend that it is.

As for the statement that the administration recommended "reasonable and practical FHA aids in financing both rental and sales housing for elderly people," the Administrator again should know better than to contend that the administration's bill, S. 3302, contained a "reasonable" program for meeting the critical housing needs of persons over 60. Senate bill 3302 was not predicated on meeting the housing needs of older people. It was predicated on mollifying the pressure for Federal assistance through minimal changes in the existing situation. It was another example of the disparity between the sonorous phrases of the President about being "liberal" in relation to people, and the consistent action of the administration in refusing to yield to the legitimate desires of the people.

S. 3302, however "practical," was a wholly inadequate response to a serious and genuine need. It proposed to help older people purchase housing by permitting a third party to make the downpayment and cosign the mortgage note. This is reminiscent, Mr. President, of the administration's proposal for funding the road bill outside the public debt system, which was one of the most irresponsible fiscal suggestions ever to emanate from the White House; and of the proposal for a health reinsurance pool, which was so impractical, if you like, that the insurance companies concerned have recently communicated their conclusion that it would not prove satisfactory.

The bill we are now considering, while incorporating and expanding the third-party provision of Senate bill 3302, recognizes that the problem of rental and sales housing for persons over 60 can be ameliorated only through a dual liberal mortgage insurance—namely, a public-housing program, through which older persons with sufficient income can be enabled to purchase or rent private housing, through which builders can be encouraged to construct private housing specifically designed for older people, and through which older persons with low incomes can be provided adequate quarters in public-housing facilities.

THE PROVISIONS OF S. 3855

In order that the provisions contained in title II may be made perfectly clear, let me quote, Mr. President, from pages 11 and 12 of the committee's report:

The bill is designed to meet the needs of elderly persons in two ways. First, it would amend title II of the National Housing Act by adding a new section 229 to enable the FHA to insure mortgages with liberal terms for elderly persons. These new mortgage terms would be applicable to both sales and rental housing, and FHA insurance is conditioned upon the projects being economically sound.

Sales housing mortgages would be insured up to 100 percent of value where the mortgagor is the owner-occupant except that the borrower must pay $200 in cash which may include payment of settlement costs and initial payments for taxes, hazard insurance, and other prepaid expenses. The maximum mortgage would be $8,000 ($10,000 in high-cost areas) and the maximum maturity

would be 40 years. Mortgagors who are not owner-occupants would be permitted to obtain 85-percent loans to build or acquire and repair or rehabilitate for sale, and to finance pending subsequent sale to elderly persons under purchase contracts or lease-option agreements. An elderly person could buy only one house with the benefits of this program.

Rental housing mortgages would be insured up to 100 percent of value if the mortgagor is an acceptable public or private nonprofit organization, and 90 percent of value for all other types of mortgagors. As with sales-type housing, the mortgage amount could not exceed $8,000 per unit ($10,000 per unit in high-cost areas). Maximum maturity would be 40 years.

With respect to sales housing, the bill provides that where a mortgagor is 60 years of age or over, a third party (a person or a corporation satisfactory to the FHA Commissioner) may provide the downpayment required and may cosign the mortgage note. For rental housing, an acceptable third party may contribute a part of the required rental payment and may assist in meeting equity requirement.

An Elderly Persons Housing Insurance Fund is established in the FHA to carry out the provisions of the new section 229. Through its operation of this and other mortgage insurance programs, the committee expects the FHA to give recognition to the needs of elderly mortgagors in the new housing projects that are constructed with the assistance of FHA insurance.

Fanny May is authorized to enter into advance commitments to purchase such mortgages up to $50 million outstanding at any one time. A maximum of $5 million would be available in any one State. Both would be revolving funds.

Second, the bill would broaden the opportunities for low-income elderly persons to find shelter in public-housing accommodations by initiating a program of 15,000 public-housing units for each of 5 years beginning July 1, 1956, and by making elderly persons eligible on a first-preference basis to any suitable units in any other public-housing projects, even though they were not specifically designed or built for elderly persons. These 15,000 units would be in addition to other low-rent public-housing units authorized by other provisions of the bill.

In order to make elderly persons eligible for public housing, the definition of "families of low income" is amended. The term "families" would include a single person 65 years of age or over, or the remaining member of a tenant family. The term "elderly families" is further defined to mean families the head of which or his spouse is 65 years of age or over. To be eligible for admission to public housing, elderly persons and families need not comply with the requirement that they come from slum dwellings or be displaced by Government action.

The total authorization for annual contributions by the Public Housing Administration is increased from $336 million to $366 million. This is an increase at the rate of $6 million a year for each of the 5 years.

In order to defray the higher cost of units especially designed for the elderly, the bill authorizes an increase in the cost limit for such units from $1,750 to $2,250 per room.

To insure that the Federal Government develops and maintains a program to meet the needs of elderly persons, the bill requires the Housing Administrator to establish an advisory committee on matters relating to housing for the elderly. It is the hope of the committee that the establishment of this advisory committee will help to create and maintain public interest in providing an adequate program for housing our senior citizens. It is anticipated that this advisory committee will work closely with the Housing Administrator and other Federal housing officials in the interest of housing for the elderly and that its recommendations can provide the basis for necessary legislation.

This, I submit, is a beginning—a good, reasonable, practical beginning—toward meeting one of the most perturbing problems of our time. When combined with the provision for research, it should permit us to make important strides toward a richer, more satisfying life for our older citizens. Its approval is a contract with good Government.

COLLEGE HOUSING

I am now constrained, Mr. President, to comment on one additional matter mentioned in yesterday's press release by Mr. Cole. I quote:

I am also greatly concerned over the failure of the Senate committee to recommend an interest rate on college housing loans at least equal to the interest rate which the Federal Government must pay on the money it borrows to finance the program. The college housing program is an excellent program which we have supported strongly. However, the very magnitude of the need for assistance to colleges makes it clear that we will not get the whole job done unless we have the patience and wisdom to design a form of Federal aid which will encourage private financing rather than supplant it. If the interest rate on the Federal direct loans continues at an artificially low level, the Federal loans will greatly curtail, if not eliminate, the ready availability of private investment funds. The end result will be that instead of more capital being available for this type of loan, there will, over the long run, be substantially less capital in the aggregate. In the meantime, if private capital is virtually eliminated from this field, increasing pressures will be placed on the Federal Government to make direct loans aggregating billions of dollars.

This, I submit, is a pristine example of the tortured rationalization with which the Eisenhower administration has sought to conceal some of its most serious biases and shortcomings. We are told by Mr. Cole that the present interest rate on loans for college housing is not equal to "the interest rate which the Federal Government must pay on the money it borrows to finance the program." Yet, as competent witnesses before the Housing Subcommittee asserted, it is not only exceedingly difficult to ascertain at any particular time the actual cost to the Government of money loaned to a college, but it also is a calculation which the authorities of the HHFA have apparently not made to the satisfaction of any of the major educational associations of the country representing institutions involved in such loans.

We are also asked to believe that maintaining at 2¾ percent the interest rate on college-housing loans will in the long run result in less aggregate capital for the financing of college housing. This presupposes two conditions, Mr. President: It presupposes, first of all, that the present interest rate is a serious impediment to the relationship of current private lending to long-term lending prospects. It also presupposes that the interest rate will remain fixed indefinitely at 2¾ percent, and hence will permanently affect the long-term lending prospects of private capital. Neither of these two presuppositions is tenable. No one contends that a rate of 2¾ percent is immutable. Indeed, the law says it shall vary according to a formula based on the interest rates on United States interest-bearing obligations. But the law does not stipulate, Mr. President, that the interest rate on college-housing loans may be raised capriciously, whenever the HHFA Administrator, or the Secretary of the Treasury, may consider it "artificial." Its artificiality must be demonstrated, and it has not been.

THE ADMINISTRATION IGNORES CONSENSUS

As in the case of housing for older people, the administration appears unable to match words and deeds, or even to recognize consensus. It ignores the testimony of the leading educators and educational associations of the country, including such groups as the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities, with 72 member institutions; the Association of American Colleges, with 730 member institutions; the Association for Higher Education, United States of America, representing 18,000 administrators and faculty in over 1,500 institutions; and the American Council on Education, comprising 139 organizations, including 962 institutions, and almost all the important national educational associations. How much evidence, I ask you, Mr. President, how much of a consensus, is required before the administration can be persuaded to follow a course of action consistent with the general welfare?

OREGON EDUCATORS OPPOSE INCREASING THE INTEREST RATE

I want the RECORD also to show, Mr. President, the feeling of leading educators in participating institutions in the State of Oregon toward the Eisenhower administration's bald disregard for educational advancement. When the matter was first raised some weeks ago, I asked the heads of these colleges and universities for their comments.

I ask unanimous consent to insert excerpts from some of the replies at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the letters and telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From Frank L. Griffin, president, Reed College, Portland:

"At a time when every effort is being made nationally to take care of the great flood of students that will reach the colleges within the next few years, it would be constructive statesmanship for the Nation to provide housing loans at as low an interest rate as is feasible * * *. It would be unfortunate to increase the interest rate because our colleges and universities, particularly those which are not tax supported, are already having a severe financial struggle, and, further, because added difficulties in providing new housing will interfere to some extent with the effort of the colleges to take care of the prospective added load of instruction. The need for expanded opportunities for college study is so great as almost to constitute a national emergency in the near future."

From Milo C. Ross, president, George Fox College, Newberg, Oreg.:

"We oppose administration housing bill because increase of interest rate would have

detrimental effect on our future plans for loans it would increase cost of housing to students. We have already increased student cost, cannot go higher. Please register our protest."

From Rev. Howard J. Kenna, C. S. C., president, University of Portland:

"We have been planning to apply for additional loans in order to provide for the expected increased enrollment that should reach us here in Oregon within the next few years. This increased interest rate will certainly have a detrimental effect on these plans.

"The only possible way for private institutions such as ours, with little or no endowment and no subsidization, to pay off such loans is from the student fees. Since fees charged by private institutions are already much greater than those charged by public schools, a further increase could do considerable damage to the enrollment in private schools. I am convinced that you appreciate the role that private schools play in our America way of life, and know that you will do what you can to assist them in continuing to the well-being of our country.

From Dr. Charles J. Armstrong, president, Pacific University, Forest Grove, Oreg.:

"As I see it now there is no question but that an increase in the interest rate would necessitate an increase in housing costs to students on our part.

"In view of the tremendous expansion of housing facilities which is going to be necessary, particularly in the Pacific Northwest, to meet the rising tide of college enrollments, I think it would be extremely unwise for the Congress to increase the interest rate at this time and I hope that you will use all of your influence to prevent such from occurring."

From Morgan S. Odell, president, Lewis and Clark College, Portland, Oreg.:

"In connection with the interest rate for loans to colleges for housing constructed by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, we hasten to urge that the rate be maintained at its present level of 2¾ percent.

"We have one loan in effect on a dormitory for 120 men under the Housing and Home Finance Agency at 3.01 percent. Even with our charges of $105 a semester for room rent we are not able to meet the annual repayment on principal and payment of interest on our 40-year mortgage out of net income. We must seek contributions from interested friends to supplement the net income figure. Liberal arts colleges operate their dormitories not just as boardinghouses but as places for growth of character and scholastic interest. Good resident directors are essential to the counseling of young people in their personal growth. This devotion to a good all around education necessarily increases our dormitory operating costs.

"Lewis and Clark College has been given preliminary approval for the construction of a dining room and another dormitory to house 72 women students. The total amount of funds reserved for us at 2¾ percent is $590,000. We urge that the interest rate be maintained at this figure which will make possible a self-funding program over a 40-year period for these 2 projects. The oncoming flood of students in our Western States throws a great burden upon non-tax-supported colleges in connection with the erection of adequate housing facilities."

Mr. MORSE. I should also like the RECORD to show, Mr. President, the manner of participation of various Oregon institutions in the college housing loan program; and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have a table with such figures inserted at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

College housing loans in State of Oregon from beginning of program to May 8, 1956

Approved loans:	
Lewis and Clark College, Portland (building completed)	$465,000
Reed College, Portland (nearing completion)	230,000
Reed College, Portland (nearing completion)	350,000
University of Portland, Portland (approval January 1956)	480,000
Total	1,525,000
Preliminary approval and reservation of funds:	
Lewis and Clark College, Portland	590,000
Reed College, Portland	390,000
Linfield College, McMinnville	210,000
Pacific University, Forest Grove	550,000
George Fox College, Newberg	145,000
Total	1,885,000
Grand total	3,410,000

(NOTE.—The Oregon State system of higher education withdrew plans to borrow several million dollars for various institutions because, under Oregon law, they can issue general obligation bonds, which they expect to make possible borrowing at an interest rate of no more than 2¾ percent, and perhaps less.)

THE NEED FOR STUDY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in conclusion, I think it is clear that the educational strength of our country, on which our progress, our prosperity, and our very security depend, will best be served by defeating any amendment which proposes that the current interest rate on college loans be raised before an adequate study has been made of the justification and consequences of such a step. The American Council on Education is presently engaged in a research project which, by the end of the year, will yield, among other things, recommendations about the college housing loan program. I should like to suggest that a similar study, specifically directed toward questions concerning the interest rate on such loans, be made in the coming months by the administration, in order that any subsequent proposals for changing the interest rate may be considered in the light of a sound body of evidence.

Mr. President, it was for that reason that earlier this afternoon I opposed the amendment; and I am proud to be able to report to the people of my State that the amendment was defeated.

Finally, Mr. President, let me say that in connection with the handling of this bill, I think the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] are particularly deserving of appreciation by this body for the magnificent leadership they have given us in connection with this bill. This afternoon the Senate of the United States has, in my opinion, once again, in connection with the passage of this very fine housing bill, struck a blow in the interest of promoting the welfare of the people of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 3855) was passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Housing Amendments of 1956."

TITLE I—FHA INSURANCE PROGRAMS

PROPERTY IMPROVEMENT LOANS

SEC. 101. (a) Section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "September 30, 1956," and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1959."

(b) Section 2 (b) of such act, as amended, is amended by—

(1) striking out "made for the purpose of financing the alteration, repair, or improvement of existing structures exceeds $2,500, or for the purpose of financing the construction of new structures exceeds $3,000" and inserting "exceeds $3,500";

(2) striking out "except that" in clause (2) and inserting "except that the Commissioner may increase such maximum limitation to 5 years and 32 days if he determines such increase to be in the public interest after giving consideration to the general effect of such increase upon borrowers, the building industry, and the general economy, and"; and

(3) striking out the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: *"Provided,* That no insurance shall be granted under this section (A) in the case of any obligation in a principal amount of $2,500 or less, representing any loan, advance of credit, or purchase made after the effective date of the Housing Amendments of 1956, if such obligation has a financing charge in excess of an amount equavilent to $5 discount per $100 original face amount of a 1-year note to be paid in equal monthly installments calculated from the date of the note, or (B) in the case of any such obligation in a principal amount in excess of $2,500, if such obligation has a financing charge in excess of (i) an amount equivalent to $5 discount per $100 original face amount of a 1-year note to be paid in equal monthly installments calculated from the date of the note, with respect to that part of the principal amount not in excess of $2,500, and (ii) an amount equivalent to $4 discount per $100 original face amount of a 1-year note to be paid in equal monthly installments calculated from the date of the note, with respect to that part of the principal amount which is in excess of $2,500: *Provided further,* That such charges correctly based on tables of calculations issued by the Commissioner, or adjusted to eliminate minor errors in computations in accordance with requirements of the Commissioner, shall be deemed to comply with the preceding proviso: *And provided further,* That insurance may be granted to any such financial institution with respect to any obligation not in excess of $15,000 (nor an average amount of $2,500 per family unit), having a maturity not in excess of 7 years and 32 days, representing any such loan, advance of credit, or purchase made by it if such loan, advance of credit, or purchase is made for the purpose of financing the alteration, repair, improvement, or conversion of an existing structure used or to be used as an apartment house or a dwelling for two or more families."

HAZARD INSURANCE ON FHA ACQUIRED PROPERTIES

SEC. 102. Title I of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 10. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to establish a Fire and Hazard Loss Fund which shall be available to provide such fire and hazard risk coverage as the Commissioner, in his discretion, may determine to be appropriate with respect to real property acquired and held by him under the provisions of this act. For the purpose

of operating such fund, the Commissioner is authorized in the name of the fund to transfer moneys and require payment of premiums or charges from any one or more of the several insurance funds established by this act and from the account established pursuant to section 2 (f) of this act, in such amounts and in such manner, including any repayments of such moneys, as the Commissioner, in his discretion, shall determine. In carrying out the authority created by this section, the Commissioner and the Fire and Hazard Loss Fund shall be exempt from all taxation, assessments, levies, or license fees now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any Territory or posssion, thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority. Moneys in the Fire and Hazard Loss Fund not needed for current operations of the fund shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of the fund or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States or in bonds or other obligations which are lawful investments for fiduciary, trust, and public funds of the United States.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of this section, the Commissioner is authorized to purchase such other insurance protection as he may, in his discretion, determine, and he may further provide for reinsurance of any risk assumed by the Fire and Hazard Loss Fund."

COOPERATIVE HOUSING INSURANCE

SEC. 103. Section 213 (b) (2) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by—

(1) striking out "65 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "50 percent"; and

(2) amending the last proviso to read as follows: *"And provided further,* That for the purposes of this section the word 'veteran' shall mean a person who has served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time on or after April 6, 1917, and prior to November 12, 1918, or on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to July 26, 1947, or on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to February 1, 1955."

GENERAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 104. Section 217 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by—

(1) striking out "July 1, 1955" in the first sentence and inserting "July 1, 1956";

(2) striking out "$4,000,000,000" in the first sentence and inserting "$3,000,000,000"; and

(3) striking out "section 2" in the first and second sentences and inserting "section 2 and section 803".

HOUSING IN URBAN RENEWAL AREAS

SEC. 105. Paragraph (iii) of section 220 (d) (3) (B) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out in the first proviso thereof all that follows "construction and design" and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided further,* That the Commissioner may, by regulation, increase any of the foregoing dollar amount limitations by not to exceed $1,000 per room or per family unit, as the case may be, in any geographical area where he finds that cost levels so require."

LOW-COST HOUSING FOR DISPLACED FAMILIES

SEC. 106. Section 221 (d) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by—

(1) striking out "$7,600" in clauses (2) and (3) and inserting "$8,000";

(2) striking out "$8,600" in clauses (2) and (3) and inserting "$10,000";

(3) striking out "95 percent of the appraised value (as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance) of a property, upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a single-family residence: *Provided,* That the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property at the time of the insurance and shall have paid on account of the property at least 5 percent of the Commissioner's estimate of the cost of acquisition in cash or its equivalent" in clause (2) and inserting "the appraised value (as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance) of a property, upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a single-family residence, less such amount as may be necessary to comply with the succeeding proviso: *Provided further,* That the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property at the time of the insurance and shall have paid on account of the property at least $200 in cash or its equivalent (which amount may include amounts to cover settlement costs and initial payments for taxes, hazard insurance, mortgage insurance premium, and other prepaid expenses)";

(4) striking out "95 percent of" in clause (3); and

(5) striking out "30" in clause (4) and inserting "40."

COST CERTIFICATION OF RENTAL HOUSING

SEC. 107. Section 227 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by—

(1) inserting the following new sentence between the first and second sentences: "Upon the Commissioner's approval of the mortgagor's certification as required hereunder such certification shall be final and incontestable, except for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of the mortgagor."; and

(2) adding at the end of subsection (c) the following: "In the case of a mortgage insured under section 220, there shall be included in the actual cost an allowance for sponsor's profit of up to, but not exceeding, 10 percent of all other items entering into the term 'actual cost'; except any allowance for builder's profit, land or amounts paid for a leasehold, amounts paid under a general construction contract where the mortgagor is not the builder as defined by the Commissioner, and amounts included under either (A) or (B) of clause (ii) of the preceding sentence."

NATIONAL DEFENSE HOUSING

SEC. 108. (a) Title II of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 230. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, and in addition to mortgages insured under section 203 or 207, the Commissioner may insure and make commitments to insure any mortgage under this section which meets, except as hereinafter provided, the eligibility requirements set forth in such sections: *Provided,* That no mortgage shall be insured under this section unless the Secretary of Defense or his designee shall have certified to the Commissioner that the housing with respect to which the mortgage is issued is necessary in the interest of national defense. Any such certification shall be conclusive evidence to the Commissioner of the need for such housing without regard to any other requirement in this act that the project or property be economically sound or an acceptable risk. If the Commissioner determines, notwithstanding any such certification, that the insurance of any mortgage on such housing is not an acceptable risk, he may require the Secretary of Defense to guarantee the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund or the Housing Insurance Fund, as the case may be, from loss with respect to any such mortgage insured pursuant to this section. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to provide for payment to meet losses arising from such guaranty.

"(b) Except as otherwise provided herein, the provisions of this title relating to mortgages insured under section 203 or 207, respectively, shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this section which meet the eligibility requirements of such sections.

"(c) In the case of any mortgage insured under this section meeting the eligibility requirements of section 207, the principal obligation of such mortgage shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 207 (c) (2), not exceed 90 percent of the estimated value of the property or project when the proposed improvements are completed.

"(d) The Commissioner shall require that each dwelling designed for rental purposes and covered by a mortgage insured under this section shall be held for rental for a period of not less than 4 years after the dwelling is made available for initial occupancy.

"(e) The Commissioner and the Secretary of Defense shall comply with and carry out the purposes of clause (ii) of section 803 (b) (2) of this act, as amended by the Housing Amendments of 1956, in the administration of this section, and for such purposes any reference therein to the Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund shall be deemed to refer to the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund, or the Housing Insurance Fund, as the case may be."

(b) Section 305 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end theerof a new subsection as follows:

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, the Association is authorized to enter into advance commitment contracts, which do not exceed $50 million outstanding at any one time, if such commitments relate to mortgages with respect to which the Federal Housing Commissioner shall have issued pursuant to section 230 a commitment to insure; but of such authorization not more than $5 million outstanding at any one time shall be available for such commitments in any one State."

MILITARY HOUSING

SEC. 109. (a) Section 801 (g) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(g) The term 'State' includes the several States, and Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone, and Midway Island."

(b) Section 803 (a) of such act, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: *"Provided,* That the aggregate amount of principal obligations of all mortgages insured under this title (except mortgages insured pursuant to the provisions of this title in effect prior to the enactment of the Housing Amendments of 1955) shall not exceed $3 billion," and (2) by striking out in the last proviso "September 30, 1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1959."

(c) (1) Section 803 (b) (2) of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out all that follows clause (i) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and (ii) with the approval of the Commissioner, shall have determined that adequate housing is not available for such personnel at reasonable rentals within reasonable commuting distance of the installation and that the mortgaged property will not, so far as can reasonably be foreseen, substantially curtail occupancy in existing housing covered by mortgages insured under this act. The housing accommodations shall comply with such standards and conditions as the Commissioner may prescribe to establish the acceptability of such property for mortgage insurance, except that the certification of the Secretary of Defense or his designee shall (for purposes of mortgage insurance under this title) be conclusive evidence to the Commissioner of the existence of the need for such housing. However, if the Commissioner does not concur in the housing needs as certified by the Secretary, the Commissioner may require the Secretary to guarantee the Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund against loss with re-

spect to the mortgage covering such housing. The Commissioner shall report to the Committees on Banking and Currrency of the Senate and the House of Representatives each instance in which he has required the Secretary to guarantee the Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund, with reasons therefor. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to provide for payment to meet losses arising from such guaranty."

(2) Title VIII of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 809. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, or of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955, no personnel shall be assigned to, or granted occupancy in, any project which was acquired or constructed under this title, and is situated at or near a military installation, if, at the time it is proposed to make such assignment or grant such occupancy, more than 10 percent of the living accommodations in any housing, acquired or constructed under this title prior to the construction of such project, and situated at or near the same military installation, are vacant.

"(b) As used in this section, the term 'this title' refers to the provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act in effect both prior to and on and after the date of enactment of the Housing Amendments of 1955."

(d) Clause (B) of section 803 (b) (3) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(B) not to exceed with respect to any project an average of $15,000 per family unit, and with respect to all projects for any one of the armed services an average of $14,250 per family unit, for such part of the property (including ranges, refrigerators, shades, screens, and fixtures) as may be attributable to dwelling use: *Provided,* That such amounts shall be reduced by the average amount per family unit of the replacement cost, as determined by the Commissioner, of all usable utilities which are owned by the United States, and which are not provided for out of the proceeds of the mortgage, and are within the boundaries of the property or project; and."

(e) (1) Section 803 (b) (3) (C) of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out "eligible builder of" and inserting in lieu thereof "eligible bidder with respect to."

(2) Sections 403 (a) and 403 (b) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 are amended by striking out "eligible builder" wherever the term appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "eligible bidder."

(3) Section 403 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out the term "the builder" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof the term "the mortgagor."

(4) Section 403 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out the term "with any builder."

(f) Section 403 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is further amended by inserting immediately before the last sentence the following: "Any such contract shall provide for the furnishing by the contractor of a performance bond and a payment bond with a surety or sureties satisfactory to the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, and the furnishing of such bonds shall be deemed a sufficient compliance with the provisions of section 1 of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793), and no additional bonds shall be required under such section."

(g) Section 405 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out "$9,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$18,000,000."

(h) The second sentence of section 406 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by inserting after the colon immediately following the first proviso the following: "*Provided further,* That such plans, drawings, and specifications shall follow the principle of modular measure, in order that the housing may be built by conventional construction, on-site fabrication, or factory fabrication, whichever the successful bidder may elect, or, in the case of a negotiated contract, whichever the contracting officer may determine to be in the best interest of the Government."

(i) Section 407 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection (c):

"(c) Any funds heretofore or hereafter authorized to be expended by a military department for military construction or by the Coast Guard for acquisition, construction, and improvements may, within the purposes specified in subsection (a) above, be used for capital expenditures other than the amortization of outstanding mortgages."

(j) Title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 410. (a) In the construction of housing under the authority of this title and title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, the following are the maximum limitations on net floor area for each unit:

"(1) For flag officers and general officers, 2,100 square feet.

"(2) For captains in the Navy and colonels, 1,670 square feet.

"(3) For commanders and lieutenant commanders and for lieutenant colonels and majors, 1,400 square feet.

"(4) For officers below the grade of lieutenant commander or major, 1,250 square feet.

"(5) For enlisted members, 1,080 square feet.

"In this section 'net floor area' means the space inside the exterior walls, excluding basement, service space instead of basement, attic, garage, and porches.

"(b) The maximum limitations prescribed by subsection (a) are increased—

"(1) 10 percent for quarters outside the United States;

"(2) 10 percent for quarters of the commanding officer of any station, base or other installation, based on the grade authorized for that position."

TITLE II—HOUSING FOR ELDERLY PERSONS

AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

SEC. 201. (a) Section 203 (b) (2) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and substituting a comma and the following: "except that with respect to a mortgage executed by a mortgagor who is 60 years of age or older, as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance, the mortgagor's payment required by this proviso may be paid by a corporation or person other than the mortgagor under such terms and conditions as the Commissioner may prescribe."

(b) Title II of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"ELDERLY PERSONS HOUSING INSURANCE

"SEC. 229. (a) The purpose of this section is to aid in the provision of housing for elderly persons and is designed to supplement systems of mortgage insurance under other provisions of this act. The Commissioner shall prescribe such procedures as in his judgment are necessary to secure to elderly persons a preference or priority of opportunity to rent or purchase dwelling units in housing the construction or rehabilitation of which is assisted under this section, and to prevent the benefits of this section from being made available to any such person with respect to the purchase of more than one dwelling unit. Any housing the construction or rehabilitation of which is assisted under this section shall be of such design as to be suitable for occupancy by elderly persons and shall be conveniently located so as to provide to the maximum extent practicable for their comfort and welfare. As used in this section, the term 'elderly person' means a person 60 years of age or over, or a family the head of which or his spouse is 60 years of age or over.

"(b) The Commissioner is authorized, upon application by the mortgagee, to insure under this section as hereinafter provided any mortgage which is eligible for insurance as provided herein and, upon such terms and conditions as the Commissioner may prescribe, to make commitments for the insurance of such mortgages prior to the date of their execution or disbursement thereon.

"(c) As used in this section, the terms 'mortgage,' 'first mortgage,' 'mortgagee,' 'mortgagor,' 'maturity date,' and 'State,' shall have the same meaning as in section 201 of this act.

"(d) To be eligible for insurance under this section, a mortgage shall—

"(1) have been made to and be held by a mortgagee approved by the Commissioner as responsible and able to service the mortgage properly;

"(2) involve a principal obligation (including such initial service charges, appraisal, inspection, and other fees as the Commissioner shall approve) in an amount not to exceed $8,000, except that the Commissioner may by regulation increase this amount to not to exceed $10,000 in any geographical area where he finds that cost levels so require, and not to exceed the appraised value (as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance) of a property upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a single-family residence; less such amount as may be necessary to comply with the succeeding proviso: *Provided,* That the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property at the time of the insurance and such mortgagor (or other person or corporation satisfactory to the Commissioner) shall have paid on account of the property at least $200 in cash or its equivalent (which amount may include amounts to cover settlement costs and initial payments for taxes, hazard insurance, mortgage insurance premium, and other prepaid expenses): *Provided further,* That nothing contained herein shall preclude the Commissioner from issuing a commitment to insure and insuring a mortgage pursuant thereto where the mortgagor is not the owner and occupant and the property is to be built or acquired and repaired or rehabilitated for sale and the insured mortgage financing is required to facilitate the construction or the repair or rehabilitation of the dwelling and provide financing pending subsequent sale thereof to a qualified owner-occupant, and in such instances the mortgage shall not exceed 85 per centum of the appraised value; or

"(3) if executed by a mortgagor (other than a mortgagor referred to in paragraph (4) of this subsection (d)) which, until the termination of all obligations of the Commissioner under this section, is regulated or restricted by the Commissioner as to rents, charges, and methods of operation, in such form and in such manner as, in the opinion of the Commissioner, will effectuate the purposes of this section, the mortgage may involve a principal obligation not in excess of $12,500,000; and not in excess of $7,200 per family unit for such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use, except that the Commissioner may by regulation increase this amount to not to exceed $9,000 in any geographical area where he finds that cost levels so require, and not in excess of 90 percent of the Commissioner's estimate of the value of such property or project when constructed, or repaired and

rehabilitated, for use as rental accommodations for eight or more families eligible for occupancy as provided in this section; or

"(4) if executed by a mortgagor which is a public or private nonprofit corporation or association or other acceptable public body or political subdivision, regulated or supervised under Federal or State laws or by political subdivisions of States or agencies thereof, as to rents, charges, and methods of operation, in such form and in such manner as, in the opinion of the Commissioner, will effectuate the purposes of this section, the mortgage may involve a principal obligation not in excess of $12,500,000; and not in excess of $8,000 per family unit for such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use, except that the Commissioner may by regulation increase the amount to not to exceed $10,000 in any geographical area where he finds that cost levels so require, and not in excess of the Commissioner's estimate of the value of the property or project when constructed, or repaired and rehabilitated, for use as rental accommodations for eight or more families eligible for occupancy as provided in this section; and

"(5) provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such terms as the Commissioner may prescribe, but not to exceed 40 years from the date of insurance of the mortgage or three-quarters of the Commissioner's estimate of the remaining economic life of the building improvements, whichever is the lesser; bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance and service charge, if any) at not to exceed 5 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time, or not to exceed such percent per annum not in excess of 6 percent as the Commissioner finds necessary to meet the mortgage market; and contain such terms and provisions with respect to the application of the mortgagor's periodic payment to amortization of the principal of the mortgage, insurance, repairs, alterations, payment of taxes, default reserves, delinquency charges, foreclosure proceedings, anticipation of maturity, additional and secondary liens, and other matters as the Commissioner may in his discretion prescribe.

"(e) The Commissioner may at any time, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, consent to the release of the mortgagor from his liability under the mortgage or the credit instrument secured thereby, or consent to the release of parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of the mortgage.

"(f) The property or project shall comply with such standards and condtions as the Commissioner may prescribe to establish the acceptability of such property for mortgage insurance. Without restricting the authority of the Commissioner under this act, the Commissioner is hereby authorized (with respect to a mortgagor under paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of subsection (d)) to consider for purposes of mortgage insurance eligibility under this section, any financial arrangement, or guarantee, or endorsement of the mortgage, with respect to such property or project by a person or corporation, other than the mortgagor, acceptable to the Commissioner. No mortgage shall be accepted for insurance under this section unless the Commissioner finds that the property or project, with respect to which the mortgage is executed, is economically sound.

"(g) The mortgagee shall be entitled to receive the benefits of the insurance as hereinafter provided—

"(1) as to mortgages meeting the requirements of paragraph (2) of subsection (d) of this section, as provided in section 204 (a) of this act with respect to mortgages insured under section 203, and the provisions of subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h) of section 204 of this act shall be applicable to such mortgages insured under this section, except that all refernces therein to the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund or the Fund shall be construed to refer to the Elderly Persons Housing Insurance Fund, and all references therein to section 203 shall be construed to refer to this section; or

"(2) as to mortgages meeting the requirements of paragraph (3) or paragraph (4) of subsection (d) of this section, as provided in section 207 (g) of this act with respect to mortgages insured under said section 207, and the provisions of subsections (h), (i), (j), (k), and (l) of section 207 of this act shall be applicable to such mortgages insured under this section, and all references therein to the Housing Insurance Fund or the Housing Fund shall be construed to refer to the Elderly Persons Housing Insurance Fund.

"(h) The provisions of section 221 (g) (3) of this act shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this section.

"(i) There is hereby created an Elderly Persons Housing Insurance Fund which shall be used by the Commission as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this section, and the Commissioner is hereby authorized to transfer to such fund the sum of $1 million from the War Housing Insurance Fund established pursuant to the provisions of section 602 of this act. General expenses of operation of the Federal Housing Administration under this section may be charged to the Elderly Persons Housing Insurance Fund.

"Moneys in the Elderly Persons Housing Insurance Fund not needed for the current operations of the Federal Housing Administrator under this section shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of such fund, or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States. The Commissioner may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, purchase in the open market debentures issued under the provisions of this section. Such purchases shall be made at a price which will provide an investment yield of not less than the yield obtainable from other investments authorized by this section. Debentures so purchased shall be canceled and not reissued.

"Premium charges, adjusted premium charges, and appraisal and other fees received on account of the insurance of any mortgage accepted for insurance under this section, the receipts derived from the property covered by such mortgage and claims assigned to the Commissioner in connection therewith shall be credited to the Elderly Persons Housing Insurance Fund. The principal of, and interest paid and to be paid on, debentures issued under this section, cash adjustments, and expenses incurred in the handling, management, renovation, and disposal of properties acquired under this section shall be charged to such fund."

(c) (1) Subsection (a) of section 212 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting "or under paragraph (3) or (4) of subsection (d) of section 229 of this title," immediately following the phrase "or under section 213 of this title."

(2) Section 219 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting "the Elderly Persons Housing Insurance Fund," immediately following "the Defense Housing Insurance Fund."

(3) Section 226 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting "229," immediately following "222."

(4) Subsection (a) of section 227 of such act, as amended, is amended (1) by inserting "(v) under section 229 if the mortgage meets the requirements of paragraph (3) or (4) of subsection (d) thereof," immediately following "paragraph (3) of subsection (d) theerof," and (2) by redesignating clauses (v) and (vi) as (vi) and (vii), respectively.

(5) Subsection (e) of section 513 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting "under paragraph numbered (3) or (4) of subsection (d) of section 229," immediately preceding the phrase "under section 608."

(d) Section 305 of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the Association is authorized to enter into advance commitment contracts, which do not exceed $50 million outstanding at any one time, if such commitments relate to mortgages with respect to which the Federal Housing Commissioner shall have issued pursuant to section 229 a commitment to insure; but of such authorization not more than $5 million outstanding at any one time shall be available for such commitments in any one State."

AMENDMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT OF 1937

SEC. 202. (a) Paragraph (2) of section 2 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "The term 'families' includes (A) a person 65 years of age or over, and (B) the remaining member of a tenant family. The term 'elderly families' means families the head of which (or his spouse) is 65 years of age or over."

(b) Section 10 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(m) For the purposes of increasing the supply of low-rent housing for elderly families, the Authority may assist the construction of new housing in order to provide accommodations designed specifically for such families, and may, with the approval of the President, after July 1, 1956, without regard to the provisions of any other law, enter into contracts for loans and annual contributions providing for not to exceed 15,000 new dwelling units designed specifically for such families (either as separate projects or as parts of projects), which number shall be increased by 15,000 dwelling units on July 1 of each of the years 1957, 1958, 1959, and 1960, respectively. Such new dwelling units shall be in addition to the dwelling units for which annual contribution contracts are authorized by any other provision of law. The total authorization otherwise provided for annual contributions under this act shall be increased by $6 million per annum on July 1, 1956, and by the same amount on July 1 in each of the years 1957, 1958, 1959, and 1960, respectively: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the provision of dwelling units designed for elderly families under such other authorizations. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection 10 (g), any local public-housing agency, in respect to dwelling units suitable to the needs of elderly families, may extend a prior preference to such families and may waive the provisions of clause (ii) of section 15 (8) (b) with respect to such units: *Provided further*, That as among such families, the 'First' preference in subsection 10 (g) shall apply."

(c) Section 15 (5) of such act is amended by inserting immediately before the colon in the first sentence the following: "or $2,250 in the case of accommodations designed specifically for elderly families."

(d) Such act is further amended by striking the figure "$336,000,000" in subsection 21 (d) and substituting therefor the figure "$366,000,000."

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 203. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall establish, in accordance with the provisions of section 601 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, an advisory committee on matters relating to housing for elderly persons (as defined in section 229 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended).

TITLE III—FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

SEC. 301. Subsection (b) of section 302 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "except that such $15,000 limit shall not be applicable with respect to mortgages covering property located in Alaska, Guam, or Hawaii which are offered for purchase under section 305."

SEC. 302. Subsection (b) of section 303 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting: "The Association shall accumulate funds for its capital surplus account from private sources by requiring each mortgage seller to make payments of nonrefundable capital contributions equal to 2 percent of the unpaid principal amounts of mortgages purchased or to be purchased by the Association from such seller or equal to such other greater or lesser percentage, but not less than 1 percent thereof, as the Association may determine from time to time, taking into consideration conditions in the mortgage market and the general economy."

SEC. 303. Subsection (a) of section 304 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "at the market price" in the second sentence and inserting "within the range of market prices."

SEC. 304. (a) Subsection (b) of section 305 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the price to be paid by the Association for mortgages purchased in its operations under this section shall be 100 percent of the unpaid principal amount thereof at the time of purchase, with adjustments for interest and any comparable items."

(b) Subsection (e) of such section is amended by striking out all that follows the semicolon and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "but of such authorization not more than $5 million outstanding at any one time shall be available for such commitments in any 1 State."

SEC. 305. (a) Subsection (c) of section 305 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out "purchasers" in the clause preceding the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof "purchases."

(b) Subsection (f) of section 305 of such act is amended by striking out "by the Housing Amendments of 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "on or after August 11, 1955."

SEC. 306. (a) Subsection (c) of section 306 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out in the last sentence thereof "and subsection (e) of this section."

(b) Subsection (e) of section 30 of such act is hereby repealed.

TITLE IV—SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL

SEC. 401. Section 102 (d) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding section 110 (h) or any other provision of this title, the Administrator may make advances of funds under this subsection for surveys and plans for an urban renewal project (including general neighborhood renewal plans as hereinafter defined) to a single local public body which has the authority to undertake and carry out a substantial portion, as determined by the Administrator, of the surveys and plans or the project respecting which such surveys and plans are to be made: *Provided,* That the application for such advances shows, to the satisfaction of the Administrator, that the filing thereof has been approved by the public body or bodies authorized to undertake the other portions of the surveys and plans or of the project which the applicant is not authorized to undertake."

SEC. 402. (a) (1) Section 105 (a) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out "(including any redevelopment plan constituting a part thereof)."

(2) Section 110 (b) of such act is amended by striking out clause (3) and the semicolon and the word "and" which immediately precede said clause and by inserting the word "and" after the semicolon at the end of clause (1).

(b) (1) Section 110 (c) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) 'Urban renewal project' or 'project' may include undertakings and activities of a local public agency in an urban renewal area for the elimination and for the prevention of the development or spread of slums and blight, and may involve slum clearance and redevelopment in an urban renewal area, or rehabilitation or conservation in an urban renewal area, or any combination or part thereof, in accordance with such urban renewal plan. Such undertakings and activities may include—

"(1) acquisition of (i) a slum area or a deteriorated or deteriorating area, or (ii) land which is predominantly open and which because of obsolete platting, diversity of ownership, deterioration of structures or of site improvements, or otherwise, substantially impairs or arrests the sound growth of the community, or (iii) open land necessary for sound community growth which is to be developed for predominantly residential uses: *Provided,* That the requirement in paragraph (a) of this section that the area be a slum area or a blighted, deteriorated or deteriorating area shall not be applicable in the case of an open-land project

"(2) demolition and removal of buildings and improvements;

"(3) installation, construction, or reconstruction of streets, utilities, parks, playgrounds, and other improvements necessary for carrying out in the urban renewal area the urban renewal objectives of this title in accordance with the urban renewal plan;

"(4) disposition of any property acquired in the urban renewal area (including sale, initial leasing or retention by the local public agency itself) at its fair value for uses in accordance with the urban renewal plan;

"(5) carrying out plans for a program of voluntary repair and rehabilitation of buildings or other improvements in accordance with the urban renewal plan; and

"(6) acquisition of any other real property in the urban renewal area where necessary to eliminate unhealthful, insanitary or unsafe conditions, lessen density (including measures designed to reduce the vulnerability of metropolitan target zones from enemy attack), eliminate obsolete or other uses detrimental to the public welfare, or otherwise to remove or prevent the spread of blight or deterioration, or to provide land for needed public facilities.

"For the purposes of this title, the term 'project' shall not include the construction or improvement of any building, and the term 'redevelopment' and derivatives thereof shall mean development as well as redevelopment. For any of the purposes of section 109 hereof, the term 'project' shall not include any donations or provisions made as local grants-in-aid and eligible as such pursuant to clauses (2) and (3) of section 110 (d) hereof.

"Financial assistance shall not be extended under this title with respect to any urban renewal area which is not clearly predominantly residential in character unless such area will be a predominantly residential area under the urban renewal plan therefor: *Provided,* That, where such an area which is not clearly predominantly residential in character contains a substantial number of slum, blighted, deteriorated or deteriorating dwellings or other living accommodations, the elimination of which would tend to promote the public health, safety, and welfare in the locality involved and such area is not appropriate for predominantly residential uses, the Administrator may extend financial assistance for such a project, but the aggregate of the capital grants made pursuant to this title with respect to such projects shall not exceed 10 percent of the total amount of capital grants authorized by this title.

"In addition to all other powers hereunder vested, where land within the purview of clause (1) (ii) or (1) (iii) of the first paragraph of this subsection (whether it be predominantly residential or nonresidential in character) is to be redeveloped for predominantly nonresidential uses, loans and advances under this title may be extended therefor if the governing body of the local public agency determines that such redevelopment for predominantly nonresidential uses is necessary and appropriate to facilitate the proper growth and development of the community in accordance with sound planning standards and local community objectives and to afford maximum opportunity for the redevelopment of the project area by private enterprise: *Provided,* That loans and outstanding advances to any local public agency pursuant to the authorization of this sentence shall not exceed 2½ percent of the estimated gross project costs of the projects undertaken under other contracts with such local public agency pursuant to this title."

(2) The first sentence of section 110 (d) of such act is amended by striking out the words "either the second or third sentence" in clause (2) and inserting "the second sentence."

(c) The first sentence of section 110 (d) of such act is amended by striking out the phrase "public facilities financed by special assessments against land in the project area," in clause (3) and adding the following proviso before the period at the end of the sentence: "*And provided further,* That in any case where a public facility furnished as a local grant-in-aid is financed in whole or in part by special assessments against real property in the project area acquired by the local public agency as part of the project, an amount equal to the total special assessments against such real property (or, in the case of a computation pursuant to the proviso immediately preceding, the estimated amount of such total special assessments) shall be deducted from the cost of such facility for the purpose of computing the amount of the local grants-in-aid for the project."

(d) Section 110 (e) of such act is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "Where real property in the project area is acquired and is owned as part of the project by the local public agency and such property is not subject to ad valorem taxes by reason of its ownership by the local public agency and payments in lieu of taxes are not made on account of such property, there may (with respect to any project for which a contract of Federal assistance under this title is in force or is hereafter executed) be included, at the discretion of the Administrator, in gross project cost an amount equal to the ad valorem taxes which would have been levied upon such property if it had been subject to ad valorem taxes, but in all cases prorated for the period during which such property is owned by the local public agency as part of the project, and such amount shall also be considered a cash local grant-in-aid within the purview of section 110 (d) hereof. Such amount, and the amount of taxes or payments in lieu of taxes included in gross project cost, shall be subject to the approval of the Administrator and such rules, regulations, limitations, and conditions as he may prescribe."

SEC. 403. (a) (1) Section 102 (d) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"In order to facilitate proper preliminary planning for the attainment of the urban renewal objectives of this title, the Administrator may also make advances of funds (in addition to those authorized above) to local public agencies for the preparation of general neighborhood renewal plans (as herein defined) for urban renewal areas of such scope that the urban renewal activities therein may have to be carried out in stages, consistent with the capacity and resources of the respective local public agency, over an estimated period of not more than ten years. No contract for advances for the preparation of a general neighborhood renewal plan may be made unless the Administrator has determined that:

"(1) in the interest of sound community planning, it is desirable that the urban renewal area be planned for urban renewal purposes in its entirety;

"(2) the local public agency proposes to undertake promptly an urban renewal project embracing at least 10 percent of such area, upon completion of the general neighborhood renewal plan and the preparation of an urban renewal plan for such project; and

"(3) the governing body of the locality has represented that the general neighborhood renewal plan will be used to the fullest extent feasible as a guide for the provision of public improvements in such area and that the plan will be considered in formulating codes and other regulatory measures affecting property in the area and in undertaking other local governmental activities pertaining to the development, redevelopment, rehabilitation and conservation of the area.

The contract for any such advance of funds for a general neighborhood renewal plan shall be made upon the condition that such advance shall be repaid, with interest at not less than the applicable going Federal rate, out of any moneys which become available to the local public agency for the undertaking of the first urban renewal project in such area: *Provided,* That in the event of the undertaking of any other project or projects in such area an appropriate allocation of the amount of the advance, with interest, may be effected to the end that each such project may bear its proper allocable part, as determined by the Administrator, of the cost of the general neighborhood renewal plan. As used herein, a general neighborhood renewal plan means a preliminary plan (conforming, in the determination of the governing body of the locality, to the general plan of the locality as a whole and to the workable program of the community meeting the requirements of section 101) which outlines the urban renewal activities proposed for the area involved, provides a framework for the preparation of urban renewal plans and indicates generally, to the extent feasible in preliminary planning, the land uses, population density, building coverage, prospective requirements for rehabilitation and improvement of property, and any portions of the area contemplated for clearance and redevelopment."

(2) Section 102 (d) of such act, as amended, is further amended by striking "The Administrator may make advances of funds to local public agencies for" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Administrator may make advances of funds to local public agencies for surveys of urban areas to determine whether the undertaking of urban renewal projects therein may be feasible and for."

(b) Section 104 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 104. Every contract for capital grants under this title shall require local grants-in-aid in connection with the project involved. Such local grants-in-aid, together with the local grants-in-aid to be provided in connection with all other projects of the local public agency on which contracts for capital grants have theretofore been made, shall not be required in excess of one-third of the aggregate net project costs of all projects of the local public agency on which contracts for capital grants have been made."

(c) Section 103 (b) of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out "$200,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$250,000,000."

SEC. 404. Section 106 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The Administrator is hereby authorized to make payments to individuals, families, and business concerns to the extent necessary to compensate or reimburse them for the following expenses or losses, for which reimbursement or compensation is not otherwise made, resulting from their displacement from an urban renewal area included in an urban renewal project with respect to which a contract for capital grant or temporary loan with a local public agency has been executed under this title:

"(1) necessary moving expenses not to exceed $100 for any individual or family; and

"(2) business losses, including loss of good will and necessary moving expenses, not to exceed $2,000 for any business concern.

"The Administrator shall prescribe reasonable rules and regulations for the making of payments in conformity with the purposes of this subsection. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator such sums as may be necessary to make payments under this subsection."

TITLE V—PUBLIC HOUSING

LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

SEC. 501. (a) Subsection (i) of section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(i) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Authority shall not enter into any new contracts for loans or annual contributions for more than 135,000 additional dwelling unit during any fiscal year: *Provided,* That in respect to the fiscal year 1957 such number shall be increased by the difference between 45,000 and the number of units for which new annual contribution contracts for additional units were entered into during the fiscal year 1956: *Provided further,* That (subject to the authorization of not to exceed 810,000 dwelling units) the number of additional dwelling units for which contracts may be entered into under this subsection during any fiscal year may be increased at any time or times by additional amounts aggregating not more than 65,000 dwelling units, or may be decreased at any time or times by amounts aggregating not more than 85,000 dwelling units, upon a determination by the President, after receiving advice from the Council of Economic Advisers as to the general effect of such increase or decrease upon conditions in the building industry and upon the national economy, that such action is in the public interest."

(b) Section 13 of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(f) The Authority shall establish general standards applicable to low-rent housing projects with respect to minimum space requirements and type of construction. The Authority shall allow, subject to the provisions of paragraph (5) of section 15 and consistent with such general standards as it may prescribe, the local public housing agencies a maximum amount of discretion with respect to the size of any housing project, the types of dwellings, and project densities and design."

(c) Subsection (d) of section 21 of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out the figure "10" in both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "15."

(d) There are hereby repealed—

(1) the third proviso and clause (2) of the eighth proviso appearing in that part of the First Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1954, which is captioned "Annual contributions:" under the heading "Public Housing Administration";

(2) clause (2) of the third proviso, and the fourth proviso, appearing in that part of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, which is captioned "Annual contributions:" under the heading "Public Housing Administration";

(3) the fourth proviso appearing in that part of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, which is captioned "Annual contributions:" under the heading "Public Housing Administration";

(4) the sixth and seventh provisos appearing in that part of the first Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1954, which is captioned "Annual contributions:" under the heading "Public Housing Administration", and the fifth and sixth provisos under the same caption in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953;

(5) as of its effective date section 10 (j) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended; and

(6) section 10 (l) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended.

FARM-LABOR CAMPS

SEC. 502. Section 12 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by adding the following at the end of subsection (f): "Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, upon the filing of a request therefor within 12 months after the effective date of the Housing Amendments of 1956, the Authority shall relinquish, transfer, and convey, without monetary consideration, all of its rights, title, and interest in and with respect to any such project or any part thereof (including such land as is determined by the Authority to be reasonably necessary to the operation of such project and contractual rights to revenues, reserves, and other proceeds therefrom) to any public housing agency whose area of operation includes the project, upon a finding and certification by the public housing agency (which shall be conclusive upon the Authority) that the project is needed to house persons and families of low income and that preference for occupancy in the project will be given, first, to low-income agricultural workers and their families and, second, to other low-income persons and their families. Upon the relinquishment and transfer of any such project it shall cease to be a low-rent project within the meaning of this act, and the Authority shall have no further jurisdiction over the same, except that in any conveyance hereunder the Authority shall reserve to the United States of America any mineral rights of whatsoever nature upon, in, or under the property, including the right of access to and the use of such parts of the surface of the property as may be necessary for mining and saving the minerals. Any project or part thereof not relinquished or conveyed or under a contract for disposal pursuant to this subsection shall be disposed of by the Authority pursuant to subsection (e) of section 13 of this act, notwithstanding the parenthetical clause in said subsection."

DISPOSITION OF DEFENSE HOUSING

SEC. 503. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, there are hereby transferred to the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, effective July 1, 1956, all right, title, and interest, including contractual rights and obligations and any reversionary interest, held by the Federal Government in and with respect to all real and

personal property comprising the following housing projects:

Project No:	Location
ALA–1D1	Ozark, Ala.
ALA–1D2	Do.
ALA–2D1	Foley, Ala.
ALA–2D2	Do.
ARIZ–1D1	Yuma, Ariz.
ARIZ–1D2	Do.
ARIZ–3D1	Flagstaff, Ariz.
CAL–3D1	Oceanside, Calif.
CAL–3D2	Do.
CAL–4D1	Miramar, Calif.
CAL–6D1	San Ysidro, Calif.
CAL–7D2	Barstow, Calif.
CAL–9D1	Do.
CAL–9D2	Do.
CAL–10D1	Twentynine Palms, Calif.
COLO–1D1	Colorado Springs, Colo.
FLA–2D1	Green Cove Springs, Fla.
FLA–4D1	Milton, Fla.
FLA–8082	Pensacola, Fla.
FLA–8084	Do.
GA–1D1	Hinesville, Ga.
KAN–3D1	Hutchinson, Kans.
ME–4D1	Brunswick, Maine.
MD–1D1	Bainbridge, Md.
MO–1D1	Waynesville, Mo.
MO–2D1	Do.
MO–4D1	Do.
MO–5D1	Do.
NEV–2D1	Fallon, Nev.
NC–1D1	Camp Lejeune, N. C.
NC–3D1	Do.
NC–4D1	Elizabeth City, N. C.
RI–1D1	Portsmouth, R. I.
RI–2D1	Do.
TEX–2D1	Kingsville, Tex.
TEX–3D1	Hondo, Tex.
TEX–5D1	Beeville, Tex.
TEX–5D2	Do.
TEX–6D1	Mission, Tex.
VA–6D1	Quantico, Va.
VA–10D1	Yorktown, Va.
VA–12D1	Do.
VA–13D1	Williamsburg, Va.

The provisions of title III of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended, and of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, shall not apply to any property transferred hereunder and, except as otherwise provided herein, the laws relating to similar property of the Department of Defense shall be applicable to the property transferred.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other law, any housing constructed or acquired under the provisions of title III of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended, which is not transferred under the provisions of subsection (a) hereof shall, as expeditiously as possible, but not later than June 30, 1957, be disposed of on a competitive bid basis to the highest responsible bidder upon such terms and after such public advertisement as the Housing and Home Finance Administrator may deem in the public interest; except that the Administrator may reject any bid which he deems less than the fair market value of the property and may thereafter dispose of the property by negotiation: *Provided*, That project No. IDA–2D1 at Cobalt, Idaho, shall be sold only for use on the site.

(c) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is hereby directed to convey (pursuant to the provisions of section 606 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended): (1) housing project No. RI–37013 to the Housing Authority of the City of Newport, R. I. *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of that section or of any other law, the agreement required by that section shall permit the use of the project in whole or in part for the housing of military personnel without regard to their income, and shall require the Authority, in selecting tenants, to give a first preference in respect to 360 dwelling units to such military personnel as the Secretary of Defense or his designee prescribes for 3 years after the date of conveyance and to give 30 days advance notice of available vacancies to such designee, and (2) housing projects Nos. PA–36011 and PA–36012 to the Housing Authority of Philadelphia, Pa.

(d) The act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 614. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other law, (1) any housing to be sold on site determined by the Administrator to be permanent, located on lands owned by the United States and under the jurisdiction of the Administrator, which is not relinquished, transferred, under contract of sale, sold or otherwise disposed of by the Administrator under other provisions of this act or under the provisions of other law by January 1, 1957, except housing which is determined by the Administrator by that date to be suitable for sale in accordance with section 607 (b) of this act; and (2) any permanent housing to be sold off site which is not relinquished, transferred, under contract of sale, sold or otherwise disposed of prior to the effective date of this section shall be disposed of, as expeditiously as possible, on a competitive basis to the highest responsible bidder upon such terms and after such public advertisement as the Administrator may deem in the public interest; except that the Administrator may reject any bid which he deems less than the fair market value of the property and may thereafter dispose of the property by negotiation.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other law, all contracts entered into after the enactment of the Housing Amendments of 1956 for the sale, transfer, or other disposal of housing (other than housing subject to the provisions of section 607 (b) of this act) determined by the Administrator to be permanent, except contracts entered into pursuant to subsection (a) hereof, shall require that if title does not pass to the purchaser by April 1, 1957 (or within 60 days thereafter if such time is necessary to cure defects in title in accordance with the provisions of the contract), the rights of the purchaser shall terminate and thereafter the housing shall be sold under the provisions of subsection (a) hereof. For the purposes of this subsection, title shall be considered to have passed upon the execution of a conditional sales contract.

"(c) The dates set forth in subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall not be subject to change by virtue of the provisions of section 611 of this act."

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

COLLEGE HOUSING

SEC. 601. (a) Subsection (d) of section 401 of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out "$500,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$750,000,000."

(b) Section 404 (b) of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out "and (2)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(2) any educational institution (no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual) the courses of which are designed to train persons to carry on the vocation of minister of a religious denomination, and (3)."

RESEARCH

SEC. 602. (a) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized and directed to undertake such programs of investigation, analysis, and research as he determines to be necessary and appropriate in the exercise of his responsibilities, including the formulation and carrying out of national housing policies and programs. Without limiting such authority, such programs shall develop and supply data and information on—

(1) the housing inventory of the Nation and the production, use, and demolition and conversion of residential structures, and such other factors as affect the total supply of housing;

(2) mortgage market problems;

(3) the extent to which adequate housing is available to the low-income and middle-income families of the Nation through public and private means;

(4) housing for elderly persons;

(5) residential design, assembly methods, and materials used in relation to cost, utility, and comfort; and

(6) characteristics of current and prospective housing market demand.

(b) (1) In order to permit the Administrator to carry out the functions vested in him by subsection (a) of this section, he is hereby authorized to enter into contracts with agencies of State or local governments and educational institutions and other nonprofit organizations and into working agreements with departments and independent establishments and agencies of the Federal Government on a reimbursable basis: *Provided*, That the total amount of such contracts and working agreements shall not exceed $500,000 during the fiscal year 1957, which amount shall be increased by further amount of $1 million on July 1, 1957, and July 1, 1958, respectively.

(2) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, including administrative expenses which are hereby authorized, and amounts necessary to make payments pursuant to contracts or working agreements authorized under subsection (b) (1) of this section.

(3) The provisions of the third and fourth sentences of subsection (a) of section 301 of the Housing Act of 1948, as amended, shall apply to contracts and appropriations pursuant to this section.

(c) The Administrator may disseminate (without regard to the provisions of sec. 306 of the Penalty Mail Act of 1948 (39 U. S. C. 321n)) any data or information acquired, or held under this section, including related data and information otherwise available to the Administrator through the operation of the programs and activities of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, in such form as he shall determine to be most useful to departments, establishments, and agencies of the Federal Government or State or local governments, to industry and to the general public.

(d) In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Administrator is hereby authorized to request and receive such information or data as he deems appropriate from private individuals, organizations, and other public agencies. Any such information or data shall be used only for the purposes for which it is supplied, and no publication shall be made by the Administrator whereby the information or data furnished by any particular person or establishment can be identified, except with the consent of such person or establishment.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall limit any authority of the Administrator under title III of the Housing Act of 1948, as amended, or any other provision of law.

HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT OF 1933

SEC. 603. (a) Section 5 (c) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, is amended by striking out "$2,500" in the proviso at the end of the second paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "$3,500."

(b) Section 5 (c) of such act is further amended by striking out "15 percent" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "20 percent."

COMMISSION ON NATIONAL HOUSING POLICY

SEC. 604. (a) The Congress finds that the general welfare and security of the Nation and the health and living standards of the people require a dynamic housing industry and an increasing availability of residential housing and related community development. The Congress further finds that the periodic discounting of Government-supported mortgages demonstrates the lack of an orderly mortgage market and tends to negate public policy, and that it may be desirable to develop new sources of investment funds to meet the housing needs of the Nation. It is the purpose of this section to authorize an intensive study to be made of ways and means of encouraging a flow of investment capital to provide financing, through an orderly and adequate market, sufficient to support a level of residential construction compatible with the housing demands and needs of the population and the capacities of a balanced high-level economy.

(b) (1) There is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on National Housing Policy (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(2) The Commission shall be composed of 11 members as follows:

(A) The Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and the Secretary of the Treasury, all ex officio; and

(B) Six persons to be appointed by the President from private life, such persons to be selected on the basis of their qualifications and experience in the field of housing or mortgage finance.

(3) The Chairman and the Vice Chairman of the Commission shall be selected by the Commission from among its members at its first meeting.

(4) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(5) Six members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(c) (1) The members of the Commission who are serving ex officio shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their other services in the Government, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission. The members of the Commission from private life may be paid transportation expenses and not to exceed $50 per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by section 5 of the act of August 2, 1946, as amended (5 U. S. C. 73b–2).

(2) The Commission may—

(A) appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended;

(B) make such expenditures (including expenditures for travel and not to exceed $15 per diem in lieu of subsistence for witnesses appearing at the request of the Commission) for personal services, printing and binding, rent in the District of Columbia, and for such other matters as are necessary for the efficient execution of its functions under this section; and

(C) procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U. S. C. 55a), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

(3) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

(4) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

(d) The Commission is authorized and directed to conduct an inquiry with respect to the current and prospective residential housing needs of the country and the capacity of the economy in general and of the building industry and mortgage market in particular to meet these needs. The Commission shall formulate recommendations which shall include but not be limited to the following subjects:

(1) The short-term and long-term housing needs of the Nation;

(2) The discounting of Government-supported mortgages;

(3) Long-term prospects for developing new sources of investment funds to meet the housing needs of the Nation, including but not limited to private and semiprivate pension funds and trusts;

(4) The extent to which the resources of the Federal National Mortgage Association can be utilized to stabilize the mortgage market; and

(5) Ways and means of increasing the supply of adequate housing for families of moderate income.

(e) (1) The Commission may, in connection with its inquiries and studies under this section, hold such hearings and hear such witnesses as it may deem appropriate.

(2) All departments and agencies of the Government are authorized and directed to cooperate with the Commission in its work and to furnish the Commission such information and assistance as it may require in the performance of its functions and responsibilities.

(f) The Commission may submit interim reports of its studies under subsection (d) to the Congress and the President at such time or times as it deems advisable, and shall submit its final report with respect to such studies to the Congress and the President not later than June 30, 1957. The final report of the Commission shall include its recommendations (including recommendations for governmental action, either legislative or administrative, as it shall deem necessary) with respect to the matters referred to in subsection (d), and such other related matters as it shall determine to be appropriate. The Commission shall cease to exist 90 days after submission of its final report.

FARM HOUSING

SEC. 605. (a) The first sentence of section 511 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary may issue notes and other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of making loans under this title (other than loans under section 504 (b)). The total principal amount of such notes and obligations issued pursuant to this section during the period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1961, shall not exceed $450 million."

(b) Section 512 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 512. In connection with loans made pursuant to section 503, the Secretary is authorized to make commitments for contributions aggregating not to exceed $10 million during the period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1961."

(c) Clause (b) of section 513 of such act is amended to read as follows: "(b) not to exceed $50 million for grants pursuant to section 504 (a) and loans pursuant to section 504 (b) during the period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1961; and."

(d) This section shall take effect on July 1, 1956.

HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 606. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 104 of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended, the authority under section 304 of such act to make loans or grants, or other payments to public and nonprofit agencies for the construction of hospitals is hereby revived and extended with respect to public and nonprofit agencies which have, prior to June 30, 1953, applied under such section 304 for such loans or grants, or other payments for the construction of hospitals, and have been denied such loans or grants, or other payments solely because of the unavailability of funds for such purpose.

(b) The authority granted by this section shall expire June 30, 1957.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $5 million for the purposes of this section for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956, and June 30, 1957.

SALE OF HOUSING PROJECTS

SEC. 607. (a) (1) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to sell and convey at fair market value as determined by him on the basis of an appraisal made by an independent real-estate expert to the city of Alexandria, Va., or to the Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority, or to any agency or corporation established or sponsored in the public interest by such city, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Chinquapin Village housing project, VA 44131, located in Alexandria, Va. Any sale pursuant to this authorization shall be on such terms and conditions as the Administrator shall determine, and the amount received for the project shall be reported by the Administrator to the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate and the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives.

(2) The provisions of this section shall be effective only during the period ending 6 months after the date of enactment of this act.

(b) The last proviso of subsection (c) of section 108 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out "12" and inserting in lieu thereof "24."

CITY PLANNING SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS

SEC. 608. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $500,000 annually for a 3-year period, commencing on or after July 1, 1956, to be used by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator for the purpose of providing scholarships and fellowships in public and private nonprofit institutions of higher education for the graduate training of professional city planning and housing technicians and specialists. Persons shall be selected for such scholarships and fellowships solely on the basis of ability.

SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

SEC. 609. (a) The fourth sentence of subsection (a) of section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by striking out "10" the first time it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "11."

(b) Paragraph (C) of subsection (b) of section 512 of such act is amended by striking out "1957" and inserting in lieu thereof "1958."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that when the Senate concludes its present business, H. R. 10721, the State, Justice, and Judiciary appropriation bill for 1957, will be made the unfinished business. The bill passed the House on April 26.

Following that, Mr. President, we may take up Calendar No. 2014, S. 3760, the Daniel narcotic bill, reported from the Committee on the Judiciary.

I wanted the Senate to have this information.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thought it was the understanding that when the Senate concluded action on the pending bill it would make the State, Justice, and Judiciary appropriation bill the pending order of business, but temporarily it would be laid aside to take up the so-called fisheries bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I had had no such understanding, but I shall be happy, if we have time, to take up the fisheries bill. Could it not wait until tomorrow? The White House Correspondents Association is having a dinner tonight, and many Senators are planning to attend.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think there will be too many Senators who will want to remain for the bill, anyway, and I shall be glad to remain and take care of my own fish.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let us see how we progress tomorrow.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not expect to be here.

FISHERIES ACT OF 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2040, Senate bill 3275, to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to fisheries resources, and so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3275) to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the development, conservation for preservation management, and use of fisheries resources, to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3275), which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "Fisheries Act of 1966."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that fish and shellfish resources make a material contribution to the food supply, health, recreation, and well-being of our citizens. They are a living, renewable form of national wealth, capable of being maintained and greatly increased with proper attention, but equally capable of destruction if neglected. The fisheries dependent upon them have occupied an important place in the economy of the Nation since its colonial beginnings. They give employment, directly or indirectly, to a substantial number of citizens. They attract all segments of the citizenry to outdoors, healthful, stimulating recreation in every part of the Nation. They furnish a large quantity of protein food. Their by-products have a wide variety of essential uses in the arts, industry, and agriculture. They strengthen the defense of the United States through the provision of a trained seafaring citizenry and action-ready fleets of seaworthy vessels. Properly developed, the fisheries are capable of steadily increasing these valuable contributions to the life of the Nation. The Congress further declares that the provisions of this act are necessary in order to accomplish the objective of such proper development and that this act shall be administered with due regard to the inherent right of every citizen and resident of the United States to engage in fishing for his own pleasure, enjoyment, and betterment, and with the intent of stimulating the development of a strong, prosperous, efficient, and thriving fishery and fish processing industry.

FISHERY REORGANIZATION WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established within the Department of the Interior a division of such department to be known as the Fisheries Division of the Department of the Interior. The administrative functions of such Division shall be administered under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") by the Chairman of the United States Fisheries Commission created by section 4 of this act in his capacity as Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fisheries.

(b) (1) All functions, powers, duties, and authority of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior as are determined by the Secretary to relate primarily to fish, fisheries, whales, hairseals, sea lions, and related matters, together with those funds, liabilities, commitments, authorizations, allocations, personnel, and records of the Fish and Wildlife Service which the Secretary of the Interior shall determine to be primarily related to and necessary for the exercise of such functions, powers, duties, and authority, are hereby transferred to the Fisheries Division of the Department of the Interior, established by this section.

(2) In addition to the functions, powers, duties, and authority transferred to the Fisheries Division under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Secretary shall exercise through such Division all functions, powers, duties, and authority conferred upon him under the provisions of this act.

(c) The Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior shall hereafter be known as the Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior. The Director and Assistant Directors of the Fish and Wildlife Service shall hereafter be known, respectively, as the Director and Assistant Directors of the Wildlife Service.

(d) The Secretary shall conduct continuing investigations, prepare and disseminate information, and make periodical reports to the public, to the President, and to Congress, with respect to the following matters:

(1) The production and flow to market of fish and fishery products domestically produced and also those produced by foreign producers which affect the domestic fisheries;

(2) The availability and abundance of the living resources which support the domestic fisheries;

(3) The competitive economic position of the various fish and fishery products with respect to each other, to competitive foreign-produced commodities, and to other competitive commodities;

(4) The collection and dissemination of statistics on food and recreational fisheries; and

(5) Any other matters which in the judgment of the Secretary or the United States Fisheries Commission created by section 4 of this act are of public interest in connection with any phases of fisheries operations.

(e) There are hereby transferred to the Secretary all administrative functions of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the head of any other department or agency as are determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to relate primarily to the development, advancement, management, conservation, and protection of fisheries; but nothing in this section shall be construed to modify the authority of the Department of State or the Secretary of State to negotiate or enter into any international agreements or conventions with respect to the development, management, or protection of any fisheries resources or with respect to international fisheries commissions operating under conventions to which the United States is a party.

(f) There are hereby transferred to the Department of the Interior so much of the personnel, property, facilities, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds (available or to be made available) as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines to be necessary in connection with the exercise of the functions transferred to the Secretary by subsection (e) of this section.

(g) The Secretary may request and secure the advice or assistance of any department or agency of the Government in carrying out the provisions of this act, and any such department or agency which furnishes advice or assistance to the Secretary may expend its own funds for such purposes, with or without reimbursement from the Secretary as may be agreed upon between the Secretary and the department or agency.

UNITED STATES FISHERIES COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby created within the Department of the Interior, and responsible directly to the Secretary, an agency of the Government to be known as the United States Fisheries Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") which shall be composed of five members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. One of such members shall be designated at the time of nomination as Chairman of the Commission, and shall also administer the Fisheries Division as Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fisheries. Each such member shall hold office for a term of 5 years, except that the terms of office of the members first appointed shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of nomination, as follows: One on January 1, 1957, one on January 1, 1958, one on January 1, 1959, one on January 1, 1960, and one on January 1, 1961. At least two members of the Commission shall be appointed from the area east and two from the area west of the Mississippi River. A vacancy in the membership of the Commission shall not affect the power of the remaining members to exercise the functions of the Commission, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment, except that any person appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of his predecessor. Not more than three members of the Commission shall be members of the same political party. Three members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

The Chairman of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum and each member of the Commission other than the Chairman shall receive compensation at the rate of $18,000 per annum.

(b) Not less than three members of the Commission shall have practical knowledge of fishing conditions and of the problems confronting the fisheries.

(c) The primary responsibility of the Commission shall be the formulation of all policies necessary in the administration by the Department of the Interior, including the Fisheries Division created by section 3 of this act, of the laws relating to fishing and fisheries. The Commission shall also—

(1) develop and recommend measures which are appropriate to assure the maximum sustainable production of fish and fishery products and to prevent unnecessary and excessive fluctuations in such production;

(2) on the basis of reports prepared by the Secretary in the exercise of his functions under this act and other information available to the Commission study the economic condition of the industry, and whenever it determines that any segment of the domestic fisheries has been seriously disturbed either by wide fluctuation in the abundance of the resource supporting it, or by unstable market or fishing conditions from any cause, the Commission shall make such recommendations to the President and the Congress through the Secretary with respect to credit relief and other measures as it deems appropriate to aid in stabilizing the domestic fisheries;

(3) develop and recommend to the Secretary special promotional and informational activities with a view to stimulating the consumption of fishery products whenever it determines that there is a prospective or actual surplus of such products; and

(4) keep under continuous review the activities of the Fisheries Division with regard to development, advancement, management, conservation, and protection of the fisheries and recommend changes, modifications, or variations in such activities to conform to policies developed by the Commission.

(d) The Commission shall cooperate to the fullest practicable extent with the Secretary of State in providing representation at all meetings and conferences relating to fisheries in which representatives of the United States and foreign countries participate. The Secretary of State shall designate at least one member of the Commission to the United States delegation attending such meetings and conferences, and to the negotiating team of any such delegation.

(e) The Secretary of State and all other officials having responsibilities in the fields of technical and economic aid to foreign nations shall consult with the Secretary and the Commission in all cases in which the interests of fisheries are involved, with a view to assuring that such interests are adequately represented at all times.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commission shall be represented in all international negotiations conducted by the United States pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, in any case in which fishery products are directly affected by such negotiations.

(g) The Commission may request and secure the advice or assistance of any department or agency of the Government, and any such department or agency which furnishes advice or assistance to the Commission may expend its own funds for such purposes, with or without reimbursement from the Commission as may be agreed upon between the Commission and the department or agency.

(h) The Commission shall consult periodically with the various governmental, private nonprofit, and other organizations and agencies which have to do with any phase of fisheries with respect to any problems that may arise in connection with such fisheries.

(i) The Commission shall make an annual report to the Congress with respect to its activities under this act, and shall make such recommendations for additional legislation as it deems necessary.

(j) The Commission is authorized to make a report to the President and the Congress through the Secretary concerning the following matters with respect to any fishery product which is imported into the United States, upon a request from any segment of the domestic industry producing a like or directly competitive product—

(1) whether there has been a downward trend in the production, employment in the production, or prices, or a decline in the sales, of the like or directly competitive product by the domestic industry; and

(2) whether there has been an increase in the imports of the fishery product into the United States, either actual or relative to the production of the like or directly competitive product produced by the domestic industry.

(k) There are hereby transferred to the Commission all policy functions of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the head of any other department or agency as are determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to relate primarily to the development, advancement, management, conservation, and protection of fisheries; but nothing in this section shall be construed to modify the authority of the Department of State or the Secretary of State to negotiate or enter into any international agreements or conventions with respect to the development, management, or protection of any fisheries resources or with respect to international fisheries commissions operating under conventions to which the United States is a party.

(l) There are hereby transferred to the Commission so much of the personnel, property, facilities, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds (available or to be made available) as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines to be necessary in connection with the exercise of the functions transferred to the Commission by subsection (k) of this section.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FISHERIES DIVISION AND THE UNITED STATES FISHERIES COMMISSION

SEC. 5. The Fisheries Division shall be an administrative organization and the Commission shall be a policymaking body. Both agencies shall work in close cooperation and the personnel and facilities of the Fisheries Division shall be available for the requirements of the Commission.

THE RIGHTS OF STATES

SEC. 6. Nothing in this act shall be construed (1) to interfere in any manner with the rights of any State under the Submerged Lands Act (Public Law 31, 83d Cong.) or otherwise provided by law, or to supersede any regulatory authority over fisheries exercised by the States either individually or under interstate compacts; or (2) to interfere in any manner with the authority exercised by any international commission established under any treaty or convention to which the United States is a party.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATION

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in view of the lateness of the hour, I have promised the majority leader and the minority leader that I shall be very brief in my discussion of this bill.

This measure is a most important one. It is the result of a great deal of work on the part of many Members of the Senate, on the part of many persons in the fisheries industries, and on the part of many organizations throughout the entire Nation. The bill is the result of many long hearings held on the Pacific Coast and elsewhere throughout the Nation by the subcommittee of which I am chairman. Those hearings were held both last summer and last fall.

The bill is now before us as a result of the existence in all the fisheries industries of a situation that has become increasingly alarming during the past several years.

The bill itself is a genuine effort to meet the needs which have developed as a result of that situation. The bill is in some cases a compromise, for this measure was unanimously reported by the committee, and is sponsored by approximately 35 Senators, on both sides of the aisle, who are conscious of the seriousness of the situation existing in our fisheries industries.

It is hoped that by means of the enactment of the bill, we shall achieve the purpose we have long sought for the fisheries resources and industries in the Nation.

The bill calls for the establishment of a fisheries commission, I may say, to take care of the fisheries policy of the United States. As a result, the bill will remove control over our fisheries from the vicissitudes of changes in the Department of the Interior. That will be done by the establishment of a commission of five members, with 5 year terms, except that the first appointments will be for staggered terms. It is hoped that as the result of enactment of the bill now before the Senate, the commission will establish a permanent fisheries policy for the United States. In the past we have never had such an overall policy. National policies have been established in the case of many of our great industries—and rightly so; but our fisheries have always been neglected in that respect, to the point that today the fisheries of the Nation are in a desperate economic situation.

The bill raises the Government policy level of our fisheries, so as at least to be consistent with their importance to the Nation's economy. It is hoped that, as a result, when the United States engages with other nations in the discussion of treaty rights, the interests of both the United States as a whole, and of the fisheries industries, in particular, will be better protected.

Fisheries are constantly moving more to the high seas, requiring international agreements. We have always been placed in the position of having some representative of the Department or of the Fish and Wildlife Service representing the United States in these negotiations, with someone from another country at Cabinet level. No matter how able our representatives may be, they start with some handicaps against them.

The bill has many other features, but I assure the Senate that the fact that the discussion is brief today does not mean that it has not been well thought out. It required a long time to write it. Com-

promises were made, and we now have unanimous agreement not only among the members of the committee involved, but among 35 or more Senators who cosponsored the bill, and many other Senators who said they would be glad to vote for the bill after seeing its provisions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Washington for his leadership in connection with this measure. As he knows, I indicated to him privately, and in an exchange of correspondence, that the fishing industry in Lake Superior is one which has been conducted without adequate attention. This particular bill will for the first time establish some continuing and orderly concern on the part of our Government for the development of this very vital industry.

A large number of people in the northern section of my State are dependent upon fishing in Lake Superior. It was once a very profitable and important enterprise. It still holds a rather significant position. I am convinced that this legislation will be very helpful. I am delighted to be a cosponsor, and I am particularly pleased to see that the bill has been reported unanimously.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

The bill also applies to the Great Lakes. For the benefit of many other Senators who have a deep interest in this subject, let me say that it also applies to the shellfish industry, and to all other phases of the fisheries industry, including that conducted in the Gulf of Mexico.

Let me cite one example. I do this not because it relates to my area, but we have spent many millions of dollars for conservation of the fisheries of the United States and its Territories. We have passed all kinds of bills based upon conservation, under the method which now exists; yet the Alaskan salmon run this year was the lowest in 45 years, despite all the efforts, because of the year-to-year policy.

There is no real blame to be laid at the door of anyone. Heretofore we have never placed fisheries on the level to which they are entitled. We hope that this legislation will be a first step in that direction, so that we can proceed to help rehabilitate one of our fine industries in the United States. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and other Senators who did yeoman work on this subject know that the industry itself is at its lowest economic ebb. Gloucester, Mass., for example, has become a ghost town. San Pedro, Calif., is about ready to close. Yet the domestic consumption of fish has almost doubled in the past 10 years. That paradox exists. It is hoped that this legislation will go a long way toward remedying the situation. I think we have come a long way with this bill, and I think we shall see some very good results.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. I wish to compliment the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] for their leadership in bringing the bill to the Senate.

In the first place, it raises the Fish and Wildlife Service and the great fisheries resources to the level they deserve to occupy. The fisheries industry has been buried in bureaucracy for years. If we wish to restore the great natural resource of fisheries, we shall have to do it by a bill of this kind.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

Let me add a further observation. Naturally there was some scrutiny by the Fish and Wildlife Service and others with regard to any change proposed in the administration of wildlife. We conferred with all those interested, and worked with them. The Senator from California and I have had some correspondence. I know that the Senator from Maine will agree with me that this bill will strengthen the present operations of the Fish and Wildlife Service in the Department of the Interior. Sportsmen should have no fears whatever. As a matter of fact, a forward-looking policy dealing with all fisheries should be of great help to all sportsmen in the United States.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. First I wish to join my colleagues in paying my respects to the senior Senator from Washington for taking the lead in a job which has been well done, a job which was long overdue. I congratulate him.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks section 2 of the bill, under the heading "Declaration of Policy."

There being no objection, the section was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that fish and shellfish resources make a material contribution to the food supply, health, recreation, and well-being of our citizens. They are a living, renewable form of national wealth, capable of being maintained and greatly increased with proper attention, but equally capable of destruction if neglected. The fisheries dependent upon them have occupied an important place in the economy of the Nation since its colonial beginnings. They give employment, directly or indirectly, to a substantial number of citizens. They attract all segments of the citizenry to outdoors, healthful, stimulating recreation in every part of the Nation. They furnish a large quantity of protein food. Their byproducts have a wide variety of essential uses in the arts, industry, and agriculture. They strengthen the defense of the United States through the provision of a trained seafaring citizenry and action-ready fleets of seaworthy vessels. Properly developed, the fisheries are capable of steadily increasing these valuable contributions to the life of the Nation. The Congress further declares that the provisions of this act are necessary in order to accomplish the objective of such proper development and that this act shall be administered with due regard to the inherent right of every citizen and resident of the United States to engage in fishing for his own pleasure, enjoyment, and betterment, and with the intent of stimulating the development of a strong, prosperous, efficient, and thriving fishery and fish processing industry.

Mr. KUCHEL. There you have a clear statement of the intention of Congress in this proposed legislation. It is in the public interest. It recognizes that fish and the resources of the sea not alone supply us with food, but also contribute to the recreation of our people. It indicates the reason why America's fishermen constitute additional defense strength to our Nation in time of emergency. The fishery commission, proposed to be established in the Department of Interior, shall formulate policy in the national interest, with due regard to the rights of our American sportsmen and with the intent of stimulating a sound American fishing industry.

I invite the attention of the Senate to section 6 of the bill which reads as follows:

THE RIGHTS OF STATES

SEC. 6. Nothing in this Act shall be construed (1) to interfere in any manner with the rights of any State under the Submerged Lands Act (Public Law 31, 83d Cong.) or otherwise provided by law, or to supersede any regulatory authority over fisheries exercised by the States either individually or under interstate compacts; or (2) to interfere in any manner with the authority exercised by any International Commission established under any treaty or convention to which the United States is a party.

Thus, very clearly, we protect our States in their exercising regulation and control over fisheries. That is, I think, important to point out in this discussion. What we seek to do here is to help an industry which desperately needs assistance. We seek to render that help in a way which will be constructive and which will do harm to no one. Sound fisheries policy determined by a presidentially appointed commission, acting in the public interest, seems to me to be unassailable.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared in connection with the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

Until recently there has been a shocking lack of attention by the public, the executive branch of the Federal Government, and the Congress with regard to the American commercial fisheries and the very serious problems that are currently facing this important segment of our economy. At the present time there appears to be growing interest in getting at the roots of these problems and in trying to find solutions that will restore the fisheries to the healthy economic condition that is presently being enjoyed by the majority of industries in the Nation. This recent effort is due in large part to the outstanding effort of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] who has long been the leader in the effort to secure proper governmental attention for the fisheries. During the current session, Senator MAGNUSON has introduced two bills that are designed to benefit the industry through providing for a firm national policy and greatly expanded governmental activity. While there are points of disagreement the bills have served

to focus attention on the need for some form of positive action.

As chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Senator MAGNUSON has been in a position to stimulate activity on fisheries legislation. Recently he conducted a full week of hearings on the two bills I have mentioned as well as on one which I introduced to provide for an education and training program for the industry. The hearings, which Senator MAGNUSON so ably conducted, stirred up a great deal of interest from all sections of the country, and these hearings should prove to be an invaluable source for any future studies of the fisheries.

Before going further let me mention that the 83d Congress did take some definite action to benefit the fisheries when it passed the Saltonstall-Kennedy bill (Public Law 447, 83d Cong.) authorizing the expenditure of $3 million a year for 3 years for research projects. This was the first major fisheries legislation in 20 years and is proving to be of far greater assistance to the industry than was anticipated at the time of its enactment.

The recent fisheries hearings amply demonstrated what many of us have known for some time; that is, that the commercial fisheries are facing very severe problems. But, more important, the hearings revealed that these problems are not simple ones and they will not be solved overnight. Any corrective action is going to require the closest possible cooperation between the industry, the States, and the Federal Government, and no 2 of the 3 can alone take effective action. Finally the hearings forcibly illustrated that something must be done now if we wish to continue to have a vigorous commercial fishing industry.

The commercial fishing industry is one of the oldest and proudest in the United States. Fishing has been one of the principal means of livelihood of the people of this country since the first days of the Jamestown and Plymouth colonies. Indeed, fishing was a common activity in the coastal waters of this land before any settlements were established. From early times the fishing industry has occupied an important role in our national economy, a role which it still occupies today as one of the principal sources of high-protein food products. Today some 160,000 Americans operate over 90,000 commercial fishing craft; another 103,000 people are employed as shore workers by the fishing industry itself; while an estimated 300,000 more are employed by allied industries. The 1954 fishing catch totaled 4,700,000,000 pounds, with an estimated value in excess of $1 billion.

The problems facing the industry are multiple and complex; some are shared by the industry in general; some affect only one group such as the producers or processors; and some relate to a particular geographic segment of the industry. The basic problem, naturally, is financial, that is, the income of the individual member of the industry. The causes of the present low economic level include conservation, management, marketing, technology, education, imports, and so on.

It appears to be the unanimous conclusion of everyone interested in the fisheries that one of the most important steps that should be taken is increased governmental activity at a higher level. This has naturally raised the question of what would be the best governmental organization to administer the fisheries activities of the Government. Many proposals have been made, all of which have some support. One of Senator MAGNUSON'S bills proposed the creation of an independent 5-man fisheries commission. Another proposal is to transfer the Fish and Wildlife Service to the Department of Commerce. Still another is to have the fishery functions in the Department of the Interior but to separate them from the wildlife functions and to elevate the status of the commercial fisheries division by appointing an assistant secretary for commercial fisheries.

The first Hoover Commission appointed a Task Force on Natural Resources which made an excellent report on the Government's administration of natural resources. The report of the task force starting at page 221 contains an outstanding article which clearly sets forth the problems facing the fisheries in a very clear and concise review.

I attach hereto an article on fisheries starting on page 221 of the report of the Task Force on Natural Resources of the first Hoover Commission:

"COMMERCIAL FISHERIES: IMPORTANCE, GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES, AND PROBLEMS

"I. Importance of the industry

"Measured in terms of the number of persons employed or in terms of its contribution to the total national income, the fishing industry appears as a relatively small factor in the total national economy. However, it has great local and regional significance and is of considerable importance in supplying essential foods, vitamin oils, fish meal for livestock and poultry, and byproducts for industrial use. The annual catch of the United States and Alaska is 4.5 billion pounds. The fishery products provided bring more than $250 million in income to the fishermen and are marketed for almost $700 million by wholesalers—1946 data. More than 500,000 people are employed in fishing and allied activities. Including the dependents of those employed, about 1,750,000 of our citizens look to commercial fishing for their livelihood. Fishing is economically as all-important to certain segments of the population living in coastal ports as is farming or lumbering to other communities. In times of national emergency the American fishing industry, the second largest in the world, not only supplies food but also provides vessels and men for defense purposes.

"Commercial fishing is of growing importance. Unused sea resources offer one promising means of increasing food supplies. This possibility is of particular importance, in view of increasing population pressures in the United States and throughout the world. Planning of future Government activities must take cognizance of possible expansion of the fishing industry.

"II. The Federal Government and commercial fisheries

"1. Policy of the Federal Government Regarding Commercial Fishing

"Examination of existing legislation and of executive programs concerning fisheries reveals no discernible well formulated Federal policy with respect to assistance and services rendered the fishing industry. Congress has expressed itself from time to time as desirous of fostering, promoting, and developing the fisheries industry. Whereas the Federal Government, however, provides numerous services to farmers, those to fishermen are less extensive in scope and less adequately supported by appropriations.

"With respect to regulated use of fishery resources, the Federal policy has been more consistent and clear until recent years. The regulation of all fisheries except those of Alaska and a few international fisheries which have shown decline[1] has been left to the States. Each coastal State has its own set of laws applying to 'territorial waters.' In most cases these waters are considered as those within 3 nautical miles of the shoreline. Beyond these limits many fisheries are unregulated. However, in some cases fisheries beyond the 3-mile limit are regulated by a State. In 1945 a new Federal policy concerning jurisdiction of sea fisheries was stated in a Presidential proclamation. Waters of the continental shelf and high seas in which coastal fishing is engaged in were declared subject to Federal regulation through the establishment of conservation zones. To date there has been no implementation of this policy.

"2. Government Assistance to the Industry

"The Federal Government's activities directly relating to the commercial fishing industry are largely those carried out by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior.[2] The functions of the branch of commercial fisheries are as follows:

"1. Technological research: Investigations are conducted to improve practices in the fishing industry. Work in refrigeration indicates means of better storage of fishery products; research on utilization of fishery wastes demonstrates the possibilities in production of byproducts; and bacteriological research points the way toward more nutritious and wholesome products.

"2. Collection of statistics: Annual canvasses are made for securing nationwide statistics on catch, employment, operating units, and processed products. Statistics collected by States are used in many cases and cooperative programs of collection have been arranged between the Federal Government and some of the States.

"3. Market news service: This service provides for the collection, publication, and distribution of information on fish arrivals, fish distribution, and market prices of fish at a limited number of important fishery ports and primary fish markets.

"4. Market development: This service is designed to develop and increase markets for fishery products of domestic origin.

"5. Economic research includes studies on production costs, consumption, transportation, and labor.

"6. Fishery education extends to the industry knowledge of the newest and best operational practices as developed in research work. It acquaints consumers with the nutritive value and the best methods of using fishery products. In carrying out these educational functions the Branch of Commercial Fisheries produces and distributes motion pictures, demonstrates fishing techniques, and publishes and distributes pertinent reports.

"In addition to the work of the Branch of Commercial Fisheries, the Fish and Wildlife Service activities in other branches are of value to the fishing industry. Basic biological research concerning fish populations, migrations, and fluctuations of abundance are of benefit to the industry in planning fishery operations. Restocking work carried on by the Branch of Game Fish and Hatcheries benefits both commercial and sport fishermen.

"3. Evaluation of Present Services

"The Federal Government's operations in relation to fisheries is in general adequate insofar as the scope of work is concerned,[3] but the diverse services which are being performed are inadequately financed. These are being performed on a budget of $450,000 (fiscal 1949). Not only have expenditures been too small to provide adequate services, but the variability of the funds appropriated has reduced the effectiveness of these services. For example, although 8 field

[1] "The halibut fishery of the Pacific coast and the sockeye salmon fishery of the Fraser River system are the two important international commercial fisheries which are regulated at a national level. The fur fishery and whaling are also regulated internationally."

[2] "In addition to this agency, 15 to 20 other Federal agencies have some concern with fishery resources, fish production, or fish as a trade commodity."

[3] "There is one exception to this in the need for extension work somewhat similar to that provided in agriculture. Many technical improvements are not being passed on to the fisherman."

offices were once established for market newswork only 6 are open at present. Of these only 4 have been operated continuously for the past 10 years. Similarly, port reporters stationed at landing ports vary widely in number from year to year. Consequently, the Government's market newswork respecting fishery products has been an unsatisfactory half-measure.

"The work of the Federal Government has also been incomplete in providing statistical surveys of the country's fisheries production. There have been only two complete statistical surveys of the fisheries of the United States since 1880.

"Biological research is similarly deficient. Studies have never been undertaken for many of the major commercial species. Investigations of the condition of some important fishing resources have been initiated only to be dropped in subsequent years. A large portion of the work done has been in response to emergency situations, and therefore, lacks the depth and continuity necessary to provide sound data. For many years prior to 1948 the Fish and Wildlife Service did not have a research vessel suitable for going more than a few miles from shore. Consequently, little is known about the current status of some of our most important species of marine fish.

"III. Present and future fishery problems

"Major fishery considerations of the United States are the development of unused ocean fisheries, management of other sea fisheries, and maintenance of inland fisheries.

"Sizable fishery resources of the world's seas are still unused. Some of these are close to the continent, others are at considerable distance. Some of the possible tuna areas of the Pacific, for example, occur thousands of miles from any American port. With the construction of factory ships capable of operating in distant waters, untapped resources of the Southern Hemisphere can also be brought into production. If unused ocean fishing resources are to be developed by the United States, independently or in cooperation with other nations, there is need for adopting sound policies with respect to their use. Increased Federal participation in scientific exploration and experimental fishing is also essential.[4] Recent vigorous expansion by other nations in high sea fisheries makes the United States policy of comparative inactivity less tenable for the future.

"Some of the older fisheries show signs of being overworked and need to be placed on a sustained-yield basis. In some instances under the present system of jurisdiction this may be considered the function of States or groups of States, but most of the fisheries in serious need of management are in waters beyond territorial limits. Some depleted fisheries involve other nations. Fisheries of the North Atlantic banks, Great Lakes, and Gulf of Mexico are in need of management. These fisheries are clearly the responsibility of the Federal Government since other nations participate in their exploitation. Biological and economic investigations are basic to all management activities. Knowledge of rates and conditions of growth of fish and fish stocks, accurate catch data by areas, and means of producing the greatest quantity of highest quality at the lowest cost are required in order to formulate sound regulation for these depleted fisheries. Data are fragmentary for most of the fisheries which show signs of reduction because there has been little planned biological and economic research organized on a continuing basis.

"Preservation and improvement of inland fisheries is complicated by extensive river basin development programs which do not always sufficiently consider fishery resources, pollution of rivers and coastal waters by industries and urban populations, and exploitation by Indian groups in the Northwest and Alaska. Application of sound conservation and management policies is needed for those species which have been depleted.

"The fisheries industry faces difficult problems in achieving the fullest and most economical use of the resources with which it is concerned. It needs to apply technological improvements in catching fish and in improving its products. It needs to widen its markets and to bring about greater stability in its production. Since it is composed of many small independent enterprises widely scattered along the extensive coastlines, the industry can carry on needed technological and economic research only on a very limited scale.

"IV. Separation of fishery functions from those concerning wildlife

"The committee recommends that the Federal functions dealing with fisheries, now combined with activities concerning terrestrial wildlife, be placed in a Fisheries Service located in a Department of Natural Resources. All activities concerned with wildlife would be continued in a Wildlife Service within the same department. The committee believes that this separation will focus more adequate attention on fisheries problems and will facilitate the further development of sound programs and policies respecting the Nation's fishery resources.

"Fishery and wildlife activities have been administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior since the consolidation of the Bureau of the Biological Survey and the Bureau of Fisheries in 1940. Consolidation of these functions in a Fish and Wildlife Service has not facilitated efficient and economical administration. This administrative combination of dissimilar major functions has resulted in the neglect of the commercial fishery phase of the responsibility.

"Fisheries are predominantly an ocean resource, whereas terrestrial wildlife is predominantly a land resource. Fishery problems deal with important basic industrial and commercial activities. Wildlife problems are largely concerned with recreation and noncommercial activities. The areas of common interest are much less important than the differences.

"The desirability of separating fishery functions from those concerned with terrestrial wildlife is emphasized by the following:

"1. Important fishery problems are increasingly related to ocean resources. The development and management of these resources often involve cooperation with other nations. Problems of this sort are far removed from those of land management and recreation with which most wildlife problems are concerned.

"2. Government functions dealing with commercial fishing, a productive food industry and a provider of trained seamen and ships, should be clearly identified and so organized that prompt authoritative action can be taken to mobilize the industry in times of national emergency.

"3. Except as fisheries and terrestrial wildlife are both of recreational interest, the major functions dealing with each of these resources are of special concern to widely differing private interests and to different Federal agencies. The main functions concerning development, management, and utilization of ocean fisheries require close cooperation with the Departments of State and Commerce, food production and marketing agencies of the Department of Agriculture, and coastal States. Federal wildlife activities are intimately related to those of land use. Close cooperative relationships are maintained with State agencies and sportsmen's groups. Federal relationships are predominantly with land use agencies.

"The committee is fully aware of the significance of the Federal functions relating to the recreational aspects of fishing. It believes that in order to view fishery resources and problems in their entirety the Federal sport fishing functions should be administered by the proposed Fisheries Service. Sport fishing is becoming increasingly dependent upon commercial fishery resources.

"V. Summary

"A fisheries industry occasions problems of development, conservation, and management; problems of a jurisdictional nature, frequently involving other nations; and problems concerning the conduct of business on a sound economic basis. These problems, viewed against a background of restricted biological and technological research, very limited economic studies, and confused jurisdiction over this basic resource, warrant the clarification of Federal policy, and increased and consistent Federal assistance in the field of fisheries. Because the fishery resources are largely beyond "territorial waters" or transcend State boundaries, and because the type of biological, technological, and economic research needed is of a long-term nature, the Federal Government must necessarily play an important role.

"It is the opinion of the committee that the activity of the Federal Government should be more clearly focused on these problems and that there is need for greater efficiency and better service in the protection, development, and use of the Nation's fishery resources. The inclusion of fishery functions in an agency also concerned with terrestrial wildlife has not facilitated adequate attention to fisheries problems. The committee recommends the separation of fishery functions from those of wildlife. It recommends the establishment of both a Fisheries Service and a Wildlife Service in the proposed Department of Natural Resources."

Since 1949 when the task force report was submitted there have not been any significant changes in the fisheries situation, except for a declining economic condition. This economic condition is clearly depicted by the fact that there has been no perceptible change in the price to the fishermen for haddock, hake, pollock, redfish, whiting, and black backs in Portland, Maine, in the 10-year period from 1946 to 1956. Yet in that same period the national economy has risen at an unparalleled rate to an unprecedented level.

For far too many years the American fisheries have struggled along with almost no governmental recognition. As valuable as the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act has been, it alone will not do more than make a dent on the many steps necessary to restore the fishing industry to a prosperous condition. We must remember that while the American fishing industry was operating with no more than Yankee ingenuity the fisheries of other nations were being actively sponsored by the governments of those nations.

This session of Congress has seen an unprecedented focusing of congressional attention on the problems of the fisheries. On Monday, May 21 the Senate passed S. 2379, a bill which I introduced to authorize the use of Federal funds for education and training in the commercial fisheries in colleges, universities, and secondary and vocational schools. Today, the Senate is considering S. 3275 which, if enacted, will be a major step toward restoring vitality to the fisheries.

S. 3275 was introduced in the Senate on February 23 by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. As introduced the bill would have provided for an independent 5-man fisheries commission. The hearings held by

[4] "Recently the Federal Government has authorized funds for some exploratory work and for biological research of Pacific fisheries."

the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee revealed that while the objective of the bill was soundly supported the method of implementation was controversial. After the hearings an amendment in the nature of a substitute was drafted which would have created a 5-man commission within the Department of the Interior, but would have left the commission independent with regard to its major functions. Although the substitute had a great deal of merit I had serious reservations about the desirability of creating a semi-independent commission, to administer the fisheries. The basic concept of governmental organization in recent years has been consolidation and the development of clear lines of responsibility. This view has been the central theme of all the reports of both the first and the second Hoover Commissions. In line with this philosophy I was inclined to favor the proposal introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] that would create a Fisheries Division within the Department of the Interior headed by an Assistant Secretary for Fisheries.

Because of the urgent need for some positive, sound legislation, I prepared an amendment in the nature of a substitute for S. 3275 that brought together what I believed to be the best features of the Kennedy and Magnuson proposals. When S. 3275 was considered by the Commerce Committee in executive session my compromise proposal was substantially adopted. As reported the bill would create a 5-man commission within the Department of the Interior and responsible to the Secretary to formulate fishery policies. The bill would also create a Fisheries Division to administer programs and policies. The chairman of the Commission would also serve as an assistant secretary for fisheries and would head the Fisheries Division.

As I have indicated there has long been a need for greater recognition of our fisheries. We commonly speak of the fishing industry, but we should remember that it is more than an industry in the normal sense of the word. It is also a vital natural resource that if properly treated has an infinite capacity for development. The Federal Government must establish a sound, continuing program and policy for the fisheries. The bill before the Senate today will do just that. The junior Senator from Maine is strongly in support of S. 3275.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I also join my colleagues in paying a well-deserved word of tribute to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, a committee on which I happen to be privileged to serve. As we know, it has devoted a great deal of study to this particular problem. The distinguished chairman of the committee, along with some of us who have worked shoulder to shoulder with him, succeeded in developing legislation which can mean much to the commercial fisheries of the Nation and to the many thousands of people who derive their livelihood from this particular activity.

My compliments to the Senator from Washington. It has been a privilege to work with him on this particular bill, and to have had a part in drafting what I believe will go down in history as the first forward step for commercial fisheries and the fishing industry undertaken in many years.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Maine. All members of the committee did a great deal of work on this problem, and I appreciate the statements of my colleagues.

I have one further amendment to offer, which merely adds fur seals to the section pertaining to sea lions, whales, and other marine mammals.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WARREN G. MAGNUSON, OF WASHINGTON, CHAIRMAN, SENATE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, IN CONNECTION WITH INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL POLICY WITH RESPECT TO MANAGEMENT, CONSERVATION, AND WELFARE OF FISHERIES RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES

It is regarding a sad state of affairs that I come before you Members of Congress today, to offer a form of relief and security for an important segment of our national economy.

It is in the interests of our domestic food fisheries of the United States, of Alaska, other possessions, and on the high seas, that I wish to inform you of and offer a bill which gives our domestic fisheries the rightful recognition they deserve.

During the interim between the last session of Congress and the present, I have conducted hearings of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, along with my esteemed colleague, Senator ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, of Kansas, in Alaska and the principal fishing centers of the Pacific Coast.

At the hearings held in various cities our committee members were joined by other Members of Congress from both the Senate and the House of Representatives including the Honorable Delegate E. L. BARTLETT, of Alaska.

I might say that all the Members of Congress present showed a profound interest in hearing what the various witnesses had to say about conditions prevailing in our domestic food-fisheries industry.

I would like now to briefly summarize the testimony and ideas of more than 200 witnesses engaged in or closely associated with commercial fisheries, who testified at the hearings. Among these witnesses were the Honorable B. Frank Heintzleman, Governor of Alaska, members of State and Territorial legislatures, mayors of cities, members of local chambers of commerce, fishermen, fish packers, shipbuilders, marine supply houses, and other allied industries.

First of all we were informed that our Alaska salmon industry is broke and practically out of business. There are no longer great runs of salmon returning to the 2,000 rivers and streams of the Territory.

The total annual salmon pack for Alaska during the past 10 years has dwindled to less than one-half the average yield maintained for the previous 20 years, with the 1955 season's catch the lowest in 48 years.

This means an annual loss to our fisheries industry of over $45 million and the possibility of a complete curtailment of all salmon fishing in many areas to bring the runs back.

The declining stocks of salmon in Alaska have shown a decided downward trend since 1950, when a sudden drop of 25 percent in production occurred. The decline since indicates fewer salmon are returning to the streams.

From the thoughts expressed by the many interested persons contacted during our Senate investigation, there is but one answer as to how the present crisis in the Alaskan salmon industry came about. We have failed in our management of this valuable resource.

We have harvested too many and allowed too few salmon to ascend unmolested to the spawning streams required by nature to reproduce the runs.

In addition to our robbing the streams of the seed to reproduce the runs, we have done nothing to protect and assist the salmon and their spawn against the natural predators and environmental conditions, which accounts for a 99-percent mortality in the species from the egg status to the seaward migrating stage.

I believe that in addition to the annual losses of millions of pounds of food lost through our careless management in allowing these valuable fisheries to decline, that we have created a far more grievous error, we have not given the whole of our domestic food fisheries resources the rightful attention it should have on a national level in Government.

The land farmers of the Nation, over the past 20 years, have made wonderful progress in increasing the production and quality of food on their farms, with status of an independent and respected agency in our National Government to assist in guiding their affairs.

I am now placing a bill before the Congress that will provide for a more practical manner of managing our domestic food fisheries in cooperation with the States, Territories, and international agencies in which we participate.

In addition to the salmon crisis in Alaska I find, through our lack of sound fisheries management, the Government has inflicted severe handicaps upon our own fishermen and fish handlers, while helping fishermen and producers in other countries.

Through our national policy in permitting duty free fish imports to flood domestic markets in competition with our own fishermen and packers, we have practically forced a major portion of our food fisheries enterprises out of business.

During the period between 1935 and 1954 edible fish imports alone have increased from an annual rate of 325 million pounds to 803 million pounds which comprised 35.2 percent of all fish food available on the domestic market in 1953 with dollar values of $27,500,000 to $203,600,000, most of which is in direct competition with domestically produced fish.

Tunafish imports including processed and unprocessed fish from 1949 to 1954 have increased from an annual rate of 14,500,000 pounds to 170 million pounds, with imports totaling 40.1 percent of all available tuna sold to our domestic market during 1954.

The result of this impact of excessive tuna and other fish imports upon our domestic fisheries has been to deprive United States citizens of their market and the opportunity of fulfilling the fisheries needs of the Nation with supplies available to them on the high seas and coastal areas.

They have been forced to curtail their efforts and sell their catches at prices comparable to those quoted by foreign producers, whose fishermen receive a standard wage of one-fifth to one-tenth the earnings of an average American laborer. During 1954 trawler-caught bottom fish imports amounted to over 52 percent of domestic consumption.

With this open-door policy permitting low tariff and duty-free fish imports to enter our country, every fish-producing nation in the world has their eyes on United States markets to sell its fish. Almost daily we read accounts of them forming trade organizations to promote the sale of their fish. They have been encouraged to do so by our own State Department officials, while our Government fisheries people sit by and say nothing.

I have been concerned some time over the attitude of our State Department and the administration in surrendering our domestic market to foreign fish producers.

There appeared a statement in the United States Fish and Wildlife, May 1951, issue of the Commercial Fisheries Review made by Mr. William C. Herrington, fisheries adviser for the State Department, in which he re-

lates in detail how necessary it is for American support in advancing and building up Japanese fisheries operations to the extent our own fishermen may have to restrict their operations.

In summary of Mr. Herrington's comments, he made the following statement regarding the United States fisheries industry's position in relation to fish imports:

"In face of this situation, what course should the United States fishery industry adopt? With no protection there is very little doubt that the United States tuna fishery would greatly decline if not practically disappear. On the other hand, to ask for complete protection would be attempting to fly directly into the face of basic United States policy, and remember, that there is plenty of evidence that most people believe this policy is in the overall national interest. To find a course which will fit in with United States policy and win public support, it appears that the tuna industry must work out a position intermediate between complete protection and no protection."

There is much evidence today in the tuna industry, 5 years after Mr. Herrington's statement, that he was correct that "with no protection the American tuna industry would disappear," for today they are on the very edge of complete bankruptcy.

During the past 4 years the tuna industry has struggled in vain for a program suggested by Mr. Herrington, some protection between complete protection and no protection of their market.

What puzzles me is why the administration and Mr. Herrington have not made a move to adopt the protective measures they have talked about.

During my 19 years in Congress I have always been sympathetic and interested in helping provide funds to carry out studies and programs advocated by our Wildlife Service people to aid our fisheries.

I have felt any programs or proposal offered to aid fisheries was in the best interest of our people.

Prompted by the unhappy voices of our fishermen over conditions prevailing in the industry during the past 2 years I have decided to investigate matters for myself.

I am of the opinion now that we not only have poorly managed our fisheries, but we are far behind time in applying modern methods of water farming to foster the growth of marine foods.

At our Seattle hearings last fall we heard from one of our Nation's most successful fish farmers, head of the Applied Laboratory at the University of Washington school of fisheries.

Dr. Lauren R. Donaldson gave a very convincing account of how it is possible to increase our Alaskan salmon fisheries to about any productive level we wish through proper regulatory measures, predator control, and stream and lake fertilization. He also stated words to the effect that the concrete results of any fisheries program can only be evaluated in numbers of fish in the water or landed by the fishermen.

Following Dr. Donaldson, Mr. Clarence Pautzke, Chief of the Fisheries Division of the Washington State Game Department, told of how under his direction over 260 lakes in Washington State had been poisoned out, eliminating all forms of undesirable marine life, then restocked with trout from their hatcheries. The net results of this program has been a 1,000 percent increase in available fish for Washington sportsmen over a period of 7 years.

These men are not just fussing around making studies, they are producing fish.

One other factor regarding our Alaska salmon industry is that many fishermen and packers believe the tremendous increase in the Japanese catch of salmon on the high seas has a direct bearing upon the sharp decrease of salmon on our side of the Pacific.

Fishermen claim net marked salmon appearing in their catch in Bristol Bay where no fishing is conducted in front of them is a sure sign the Japanese are catching their fish.

Our scientists assigned the job of finding out about the possibility of Asian and North American stocks of salmon intermingling on the high seas appear to doubt the idea that Japanese fishermen are taking salmon headed for Alaskan streams.

We do know, however, that taking salmon on the high seas, a considerable distance off shore, is a wasteful destructive practice. There is no way under such operations to secure adequate escapement to replenish the runs.

We know that these fisheries studies all take time and a considerable amount of funds. The Government Wildlife Service has given considerable attention to this problem. I hope they find the answers soon.

If the Japanese fishermen are taking North American fish as the fishermen indicate, and our Alaska salmon runs continue to decline as they have in the past 3 years, our Alaska salmon fisheries may be wiped out before our services have determined the cause.

In addition to Alaska salmon, tuna, and other fish problems on the Pacific coast, from Maine to Florida, our Atlantic coastal fisheries are becoming less productive each year on New England banks.

The once proud trawler fishing fleets of New York and Boston is becoming outmoded with the times.

During the past 20 years the annual trawler bottom fish landings at Boston alone have dropped from 300 million pounds to approximately one-half that amount. No new ocean trawlers have been built to continue these operations.

Other nations are expanding this type of fishing operation for the reason they have a market for their fish, a good share of it right here in our United States possible because we are sacrificing our own fishermen's markets by turning them over to foreigners.

Established marine and fishing gear supplies throughout the country are also faced with serious handicaps in their trade through competition of low-priced imports. Some items arriving from factories abroad are financed by American capital to take advantage of low-cost labor in the manufacture of their products which they sell at high United States prices.

There is a peril point in these enterprises by which our industries can be forced out of business. No one seems to be applying the brakes.

The seriousness of the problems of our domestic fisheries that I have outlined today can hardly be emphasized in this brief message.

The astonishing fact brought out at our hearings with the industry is that not one employee in our Government has raised his voice at a national or international level to protect and defend the position of United States fishermen in the security of their market and inherent rights to accustomed fishing areas.

I hope that all the Members of Congress will join with me in their support of this bill and other necessary legislation to follow in the interest of providing relief and averting the crisis that now faces our domestic fisheries.

The United States with our increasing population cannot afford to allow our food fisheries resources and enterprises to deteriorate and become an unimportant segment of our national economy.

We must no longer be content with pretentious stories about the need for continued studies about the life and habits of fish. We must direct our efforts towards farming our streams and water areas to create a healthy condition in all fisheries.

It is in the Nation's best interests that we direct our attention towards giving the food fisheries of the country the recognition they should have and hereafter employ experienced, competent personnel to manage, defend and promote the welfare of our fisheries.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement by the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] before the committee. It so clearly points out the problem that I think it is worthy of repeating in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR KUCHEL BEFORE SENATE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE CONSIDERING PROBLEMS OF FISHING INDUSTRY

Mr. Chairman, the fisheries are a large industry in my State of California, as they are in your State of Washington. In our State they have been going downhill economically at a steady rate for the last several years. While the rest of our economy has been prospering, that section of it that depends on harvesting the sea has been sliding backward. It is to help reverse this trend that I have joined with Senator PAYNE and others in the introduction of S. 2379 and with you in the introduction of S. 3275 and S. 3339. I want to urge the committee to report out all 3 bills favorably and I shall speak with reference to all 3 together because they are each a part of the 1 legislative program.

To arrest the downward trend in the fisheries it has seemed to me that we needed to do three things for the industry:

1. State a clear policy as a guidance to the Executive that it is the intent of the Congress that the domestic fisheries be kept in a healthy economic condition parallel with the rest of the economy.

2. Create within the executive branch of the Government an agency at a policymaking level where all of the Federal functions and responsibilities with respect to the fisheries were concentrated; and

3. Equip that policy level agency with adequate powers to carry out the above-noted policy.

In California we have no grudge against the scientists and technical personnel of the United States Fish and Wildlife who deal with our fishery problems at a scientific and technical level. They are well-trained public servants who do their tasks with generally high efficiency. It is at the policy level of the Government that we have difficulty. The effect of this good work at the scientific and technical level is largely lost because it does not reach to the policymaking level and get translated into actions which would benefit the fisheries.

We have thought that this was largely a matter of governmental organization rather than personalities. The fisheries part of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service is at a low level and becomes smothered in the multitudinous other activities of the Department of the Interior.

Thus, it seems to me, that the first step which needs to be taken is to separate the fisheries function from the wildlife function of Government and lift the fishery function up to the policymaking level. That is the primary purpose of S. 3275 in my mind. I should say that the question of whether this function should be lodged in an independent commission outside a regular governmental department, in a commission inside a regular department of Government, or in an office at the policymaking level of a regular department of Government is perhaps not so important as that the fishery

function should be put on its own two feet at the policymaking level.

Having created such an agency, it is then necessary to give it adequate powers to do its job and S. 2379 and S. 3339 are two companion attempts to start in that direction.

In our fisheries we find a shortage of skilled oceanographers and fishery scientists and technicians on the one hand and on the other hand find little or no effort put out to translate the findings of scientists and technicians to the practical level of the fisherman so that he can put those findings to good effect. S. 2379 attempts to remedy both of these lacks by providing Federal support for fishery education at both of these levels. The funds provided in the section dealing with vocational training are low, but the bill will give a start to a program which has proven useful in other industries.

Fishermen share with farmers the twin vicissitudes of variation in climate and variation in market. When the ocean currents change and for a period of years take the fish away from the area of the fisheries, as has been experienced in the California sardine fishery for the past several years, great financial hardship is brought to the fisherman. Like the farmer under similar circumstances, he needs credit relief at that time to enable him to weather the economic storms. We provide such credit relief liberally to our farmers but to our harvesters of the sea we do not. It is the primary purpose of the first part of S. 3339 to remedy this defect of Federal practice and to begin the process of equalizing the aids given to both sections of our food-producing economy.

Our largest fishery in California, and one of the largest in the country, is for tuna. For 7 long years the tuna fishery has been going steadily downhill. The facts and figures to illustrate this decline are already before the committee in the statements prepared by our several fishery trade organizations, and by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. The reason for this decline has been increasing imports of tuna, first in the canned form, then in the frozen form, and finally in both forms.

The regulations governing the importation of tuna are in a sorry mess. Yellowfin and skipjack tuna frozen have no tariff and are not bound in any trade agreement. Albacore tuna frozen bear no tariff but are bound in a trade agreement with Japan. Tuna canned in oil bears one rate of tariff and tuna canned in brine, which is directly competitive, bears a tariff scarcely one-third as great. The inequalities of these treatments keep the market upset and unstable. The lack of protection given to the producers of frozen fish renders them unable to compete on an even basis with their foreign competitors in their own market.

While I am no expert in fisheries trade and do not pretend to know very much about the fisheries of other States, I am given to understand that others of this country's fisheries, both great and small, are suffering also from the impact of imports. It is the purpose of the second part of S. 3339 to provide a more suitable mechanism of government to control these floods of fish imports.

It is not the desire or intent of the Congress that any industry of the United States shall be made to suffer serious injury, or the threat of serious injury, by reason of increased imports. Nor is it the desire and intent of the fisheries that our foreign trade be disrupted by completely denying to foreign fishermen access to markets in the United States.

Yet serious damage has been done to our fisheries by imports and greater injury is threatened. It is our hope in proposing the measures of S. 3339 that steps will be taken under law to correct these inequities.

Mr. Chairman, this Government has long neglected the welfare of its domestic fishermen. As a consequence, the fishing economy has decayed while the remainder of the economy has prospered. I hope that the committee will see its way clear to report out all three of the bills before it—S. 2379, S. 3275, and S. 3339—with such modifications as it feels proper, so that we may start once more to the rebuilding of a thriving, prosperous, industry based upon well tended resources.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I offer two amendments to the committee amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendments.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, line 22, it is proposed to strike out "whales, hairseals, sea loans,".

On page 13, line 5, it is proposed to insert the following new sentence:

There are also transferred to such Fisheries Division the functions of the Secretary relating to the protection of fur seals and to the supervision of the Pribilof Islands and the care of the natives thereof, relating to the Whaling Convention Act of 1949, and relating to hair seals, sea lions, whales and other marine mammals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments to the amendment.

The amendments to the amendment were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to fisheries; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; to establish within the Department of the Interior a Fisheries Division; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; and for other purposes."

STATE-JUSTICE-THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2056, H. R. 10721, the State-Justice-The Judiciary appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10721) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, after the Senate concludes consideration of the State, Justice, and Judiciary appropriation bill, we may consider Calendar No. 1896, Senate bill 3108, to encourage the construction of modern Great Lakes bulk cargo vessels; Calendar No. 1975, S. 746, to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands, including Indian tribal lands, acquired in connection with the Garrison Dam project of mineral interests in such lands; and Calendar No. 2014, S. 3760, to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other related purposes.

It is expected that tomorrow the road bill will be reported to the Senate by the Committee on Finance. I should like to have all Senators on notice that we will consider the road bill on Monday, and that we hope to conclude its consideration on Tuesday.

If that can be done, we will have a holiday on Memorial Day, Wednesday, next week. On Thursday and Friday of next week we expect to consider 3 or 4 appropriation bills, together with any other bills that may be ready for action by the Senate. The Senate will also consider the social security bill.

I want all Senators to be on notice that we will have to come in early and stay in session late from now on, in order to get all our bills passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wonder whether the majority leader will give consideration to having the Senate meet early on Monday morning so that we might possibly conclude consideration of the highway bill before very late on Tuesday evening.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be very glad to confer with the distinguished minority leader. Perhaps we will be able to follow the Senator's valuable suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 25, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 24, 1956:

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

Thomas Edward Stakem, Jr., of Virginia, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1958.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

G. Joseph Minetti, of New York, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for a term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1961.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Joseph A. Kerrins, for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the United States Coast Guard.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 24, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Chaplain Raymond Charles Hohenstein, United States Navy, Academy chaplain, United States Coast Guard Academy, New London, Conn., offered the following prayer:

O God, at whose word man goeth forth to his work and to his labor until evening come, we invoke Thy blessing and pray for Thy wisdom on behalf of all the leaders of our country, and particularly the Speaker and Members of this House. As they enter upon their day's work, keep them mindful of their many and heavy responsibilities not only to their constituents but also unto Thee, since no truly good thing can be accomplished without Thee. O Lord, do Thou lead them in all their deliberations and to all their decisions may Thy good and gracious will be done, as Thou hast shown Thyself to be a God of peace and a lover of concord through the life and ministry and sacrifice of Thy dear beloved Son, Jesus Christ, for our redemption. So may we all be lovers of peace, working with a will toward a peaceful solution to all our national and international problems. Dearly do we love this country which Thou hast given us and for all its many comforts and pleasures we give Thee thanks. Do Thou make us worthy of all its challenges, grateful for all its opportunities, equal to all its demands and in all things more than conquerors through our Lord, Jesus Christ, in whose name and by whose command we bring these, our humble petitions, to Thy throne of grace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2875. An act to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act; and

S. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution providing for the return to the Senate of House bill 4656, relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 767. An act for the relief of Andrew Rosner.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3996) entitled "An act to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9429) entitled "An act to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes."

LUMBEE INDIANS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 80, providing for the return to the Senate for reenrollment of H. R. 4656, relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the action of the Speaker pro tempore of the House of Representatives and of the President of the Senate in signing the enrolled bill (H. R. 4656) relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina be, and it is hereby, rescinded, and that the engrossed bill be returned to the Senate.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPUBLICAN INCONSISTENCIES

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the inconsistencies and idiosyncrasies of some of our Republican friends are almost beyond belief. Yesterday the local paper in my county carried one headline saying "Ike Defends Armed Forces Right To Feud." The front page story next to it was a criticism by the vice chairman of the Republican Party in my county of the feuding that went on in the Democratic Party during the recent primary. Obviously, when many candidates are running for office you do have a political fight. We had nine candidates for commissioner, for instance, but that is what the direct primary in Ohio is for; it is to give the candidates a chance to run and the people a chance to pick them. The vice chairman of the Republican Party who did all the criticizing and a couple of his cronies hand-picked the Republican slate in Belmont County so there was no contest and consequently there was no feud. This vice chairman went on to complain about the fact that his candidates did not get their names in the paper and about press coverage in general. I am sure everyone on this floor will be amazed to know that a Republican is complaining about press coverage. Why, I did not even complain myself when my opponent for the fall election, the only opponent the vice chairman could dredge up, was fired from his schoolteaching job for incompetence and the local papers carried nothing about it. It was a headline story in many papers in Ohio but the papers in my congressional district ignored it as though it had not happened. It seems to me that the Republican vice chairman is far out of line and his criticisms of the press are unfounded as are, of course, his constant harpings on and criticisms of the Democratic candidates in general and the 18th District Congressman in particular. If the 18th District representation were as bad as the vice chairman would like to have people believe when he is sounding off on street corners, then certainly the Republican Party could have found an outstanding candidate to run for office this fall. This they were unable to do and I am happy to know that the majority of the responsible Republicans have indicated that they will support me in November. I am happy to accept the support of these responsible Republicans. I will continue, Mr. Speaker, to represent all of the people of my district without political prejudice.

SUSPENSION OF DUTIES AND IMPORT TAXES ON METAL SCRAP

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8636) to continue until the close of June 30, 1957, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 2 of the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 869, 81st Cong.), is hereby amended by striking out "June 30, 1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1957": *Provided*, That this act shall not apply to lead scrap or zinc scrap.

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall not be construed to affect in any way the application of Public Law 38, 82d Congress, to copper scrap.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "lead scrap or zinc scrap" and insert "lead scrap, lead alloy scrap, antimonial lead scrap, scrap battery lead or plates, zinc scrap, or zinc alloy scrap; or to articles of lead, lead alloy, antimonial lead, zinc, or zinc alloy, imported for remanufacture by melting."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 8636, as amended, continues until the close of June 30, 1957, the suspension of

duties and import taxes on metal scrap, including such principal types of scrap as iron and steel, aluminum, magnesium, nickel, and nickel alloys. As has similar legislation in the past, the bill contains the proviso that the suspension shall not apply to lead scrap or to zinc scrap. The bill, as amended, makes it clear that the suspension is not to apply to lead alloy scrap, antimonial lead scrap, scrap battery lead or plates, or zinc alloy scrap; or to articles of lead, lead alloy, antimonial lead, zinc, or zinc alloy, imported for remanufacture by melting. The present suspension of these duties and import taxes is scheduled to terminate on June 30, 1956. The suspension of duties and taxes as provided under present law and its proposed extension are of no significance with respect to the tariff treatment of imports of tin and tinplate scrap, because imports of such scrap, along with imports of tin in other manufactured forms, would not be subject to duty or import taxes in any case.

These duties and import taxes on metal scrap have generally been suspended by the Congress since 1942, except for a brief period at the end of 1949 and at the beginning of 1950.

Therefore, the enactment of H. R. 8636 will result in the continued suspension until June 30, 1957, of the duties and taxes on those types of metal scrap presently exempted from duties and taxes under Public Law 869 of the 81st Congress, as amended, with the exclusion of lead scrap and zinc scrap from the suspension and the additional exclusion of lead alloy scrap, antimonial lead scrap, scrap battery lead or plates, or zinc alloy scrap; or to articles of lead, lead alloy, antimonial lead, zinc, or zinc alloy, imported for remanufacture by melting. The rates of duty and import taxes on the principal types of ferrous and nonferrous metal scrap, the suspension of which will be continued by the bill, are set forth on page 2 of the report of the Committee on Ways and Means—House Report No. 2107—accompanying this legislation.

Scrap of the various nonferrous metals, whether imported or of domestic origin, may be considered for most purposes simply as relatively small components in the total United States supplies of the respective metals, although some manufacturers depend wholly on metal scrap as a source of raw material. The relation of iron and steel scrap to the total supplies of iron and steel is somewhat different from that existing with respect to nonferrous metals. This is because the economical production of steel by the open-hearth process requires that part of the iron-bearing materials used consist of heavy melting scrap. Thus, much iron and steel scrap constitutes a material important to the domestic production of steel. Despite the fact that imports of scrap metals have not in the past few years constituted imtant components of the total supplies of the various metals, the imports in some cases have represented important sources of the metals for limited numbers of consumers of such metals in some sections of the country.

The interested executive departments supported the enactment of this legislation. The Departments of Defense, Commerce, Interior, and Labor in reporting to the Committee on Ways and Means in favor of the enactment of H. R. 8636 stated that the types of metal scrap affected are in short supply with many of the metals being subject to export controls. The Departments of the Treasury and State also reported in favor of the enactment of this legislation.

The Committee on Ways and Means voted unanimously to report H. R. 8636 favorably to the House.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 8636, introduced by my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. MCCARTHY, continues until the close of June 30, 1957, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap. The bill was reported with an amendment making it clear that the suspension is not to apply to lead alloy scrap, antimonial lead scrap, scrap battery lead or plates, or zinc alloy scrap, or to articles of lead, lead alloy, antimonial lead, zinc, or zinc alloy, imported for remanufacture by melting.

The bill, as amended, was favorably reported unanimously by the committee, and the committee is unanimous in urging passage.

ELEVENTH ANNUAL INSTRUMENT-AUTOMATION (INTERNATIONAL) CONFERENCE AND EXHIBIT, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7678) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Eleventh Annual Instrument-Automation—International—Conference and Exhibit, New York, N. Y., to be admitted without payment of the tariff, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, after line 7, insert:

"SEC. 7. Any article which is imported from a foreign country for the purpose of exhibition at the Americas' New Frontiers Exposition to be held in connection with the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the admission of the State of Oklahoma into the Union, at Oklahoma City, Okla., from May 1, 1956, to January 1, 1958, inclusive, by the Americas' New Frontiers Exposition, Inc., a corporation, or for use in constructing, installing, or maintaining foreign exhibits at the Americas' New Frontiers Exposition, upon which article there is a tariff or customs duty, shall be admitted without payment of such tariff or customs duty or any fees or charges under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe. Each provision of sections 1 to 6 inclusive of this act shall apply with respect to the Americas' New Frontiers Exposition and all rights and privileges extended by such sections and all duties and obligations imposed thereby and each and every requirement thereof shall extend to the Americas' New Frontiers Exposition, Inc., which shall be deemed, for customs purposes only, to be the sole consignee of all merchandise imported under the authority of this section."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Eleventh Annual Instrument-Automation (International) Conference and Exhibit, New York, N. Y., and the Americas' New Frontiers Exposition, to be held at Oklahoma City, Okla., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been amended in the Senate to add a new section which would provide for the similar free entry of any article imported for the purpose of exhibition at the Americas' New Frontiers Exposition to be held in connection with the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the admission of the State of Oklahoma into the Union, at Oklahoma City, Okla., from May 1, 1956, to January 1, 1958, inclusive.

The amendments carry the same safeguarding regulations, administered under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, as apply to the original bill.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7678, introduced by my distinguished colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania, permits articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the 11th Annual Instrument Automation Conference and Exhibit, to be held in New York City, to be admitted without payment of tariff duties.

This bill was passed by the House on March 22 and is before us in an amended form adopted in the Senate. The amendment adds a new section which would provide for the similar free entry of any article imported for the purpose of exhibition at the Americas' New Frontiers Exposition to be held in connection with the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the admission of the State of Oklahoma into the Union, at Oklahoma City, Okla., from May 1, 1956 to January 1, 1958. This amendment follows the pattern of previous legislation and the committee is unanimous in accepting it.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tomorrow night to file reports on the bills S. 3515, H. R. 7641, and H. R. 11132.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF REHABILITATION

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which will broaden the scope of our rehabilitation program by making these services available to millions of Americans who are now ineligible because they are classified as too old to go back to work. I propose to change the name of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation to the Office of Rehabilitation and to reframe its duties so that the new techniques and knowledge on rehabilitation may be made available to all who need it.

I have the deeep conviction that there is much more to rehabilitation of people than merely retrieving them for employment, desirable as that objective may be. This is a Nation which is founded upon recognition of the rights of the individual. Correspondingly, we must not overlook the needs of the individual. Surely we can no longer deny our older people who are stricken the opportunity for restoration to independence, usefulness, and pride in daily living. Certainly to require employability as our sole standard for rehabilitation will relegate to oblivion people who can be restored to useful life.

I am greatly concerned with this matter, Mr. Speaker, for all evidence shows that we are condemning too many of our senior citizens to a life of loneliness, neglect, and despair. A recent study by the Twentieth Century Fund points to the fact that many older people throughout the country have been stowed away and virtually forgotten in antiquated public infirmaries or in substandard nursing and convalescent homes. In the words of this report "a visit to a nursing home is a sobering experience. There are frequent instances of neglect even among persons able to pay their way. Rehabilitation is seldom attempted though research suggests that 75 percent of chronic diseases are partially or completely controllable."

An important study on the problem of older citizens conducted by the Council of State Governments last year concluded with the challenging statement:

> Enough experience has been accumulated to indicate that imaginative programs of rehabilitation often can accomplish wonders—among persons who previously were acknowledged as hopeless. Increasing numbers are being returned to their communities as active, productive members.

We owe it to them and we owe it to ourselves to give our older people the right to the best care and the understanding which they deserve. We have the knowledge. The need exists. I urge the early adoption of my bill so that we may put this knowledge to work.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House on H. R. 11177, the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for 1957, may have until midnight Friday to file a conference report on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

THE FIFTH FREEDOM OF THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, during the 1952 campaign, the American people acclaimed the fact that the standard bearer of the Republican Party had adopted the philosophy of the four freedoms, not the least of which was the freedom from want. It is most discouraging to note from this morning's newspapers that an Assistant to the President has now added a fifth freedom and he entitles it "The Right To Suffer." Let me quote what he said:

> The right to suffer is one of the joys of a free economy.

I wonder if that is a new addition to the philosophy of this administration—the right to suffer is a joy of a free economy. I do not believe the Democratic Party or the American people will approve that kind of philosophy.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am sure my friend, the gentleman from New York, wants to be fair, and I am sure he must know that in this morning's newspapers there was carried another story, a story to the effect that the gentleman who did make that speech has made apologies for that part of the speech.

Mr. MULTER. The apology, I am afraid, sir, the American people will say comes too late. A man who dares to say those things must really have given them some thought before he said them. He should think about it most seriously, before he utters it rather than apologize for them after stating it.

PREMATURE PUBLICATION OF REPORT OF HOUSE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, on last Monday, May 21, 1956, I made some remarks in the House deploring the premature publication of a report of the Public Works and Resources Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations. In that statement, I clearly indicated that I was not accusing any member of the subcommittee of releasing the report.

The subcommittee staff director has now assured me that neither he nor any other member of the present staff had anything to do with releasing it. Since there are other ways in which the news reporter might have obtained access to the report, I feel that, in fairness to the present members of the subcommittee staff, the record should show that the staff director has assured me that neither he nor any member of the present staff released or authorized the release of the report for publication.

This leaves unsolved the question of how the report became available for publication. I feel that every effort should be made to find the answer so that appropriate steps may be taken to prevent similar action in the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

HONORARY DEGREES TO SPEAKER RAYBURN AND MINORITY LEADER MARTIN

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in Syracuse, N. Y., on Monday, June 4, Syracuse University is conferring honorary degrees on Speaker RAYBURN and our minority leader, JOE MARTIN.

I now desire to ask unanimous consent that our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Syracuse Herald-Journal, of Syracuse, N. Y.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. This editorial was written by Alexander F. Jones, who formerly was the editor of the Washington Post. I wish to read the closing paragraphs. It has to do with the honors

being accorded our distinguished legislative leaders.

These paragraphs read as follows:

It will be fun to hear their speeches. Each will get in his partisan digs but listeners, mainly, will get a good solid dose of Americanism.

Both these men are bachelors.

Their sweetheart is the House of Representatives—Uncle Sam's best looking legislative daughter.

And what a whirl they have given her.

I hope that affair never ends—in my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission just granted, I include the editorial referred to, of May 21, 1956, by Alexander F. Jones, executive editor of the Herald-Journal, Syracuse, N. Y.:

A STELLAR COMMENCEMENT

(By Alexander F. Jones, executive editor, Herald-Journal)

Someone up on the hill at Syracuse University had a real brain wave when Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Minority Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., were chosen as commencement speakers and the recipients of honorary degrees.

Mr. Sam, who has served as Speaker of the House longer than any man in our history, and JOE MARTIN, who has served in that capacity when the Republicans have controlled the House, have been honored by institutions of higher learning before.

But never before as a team.

That is the way I like to think of this priceless pair of public servants—as a team.

Together they represent the smoothest working legislative leadership the House has ever known.

If Mr. Sam, who is now 74 years old, gets in a box he calls on JOE MARTIN for a lift, and he gets it.

And on many occasions when he was Speaker, JOE MARTIN has called on Mr. Sam for help and it has usually been forthcoming.

No one has heard of an insurrection in the House of Representatives against party leadership since these men have been at the helm. They have their organizations too well disciplined for that.

And while they are thicker than a couple of thieves personally, there has never been any charge of political collusion against them.

Mr. Sam is a hot Democrat and JOE MARTIN is an equally torrid Republican.

But they work together so well most of us forget their political labels.

Gov. Allan Shivers, of Texas, will never forget Mr. Sam's political label, however. The Governor supported President Eisenhower in 1952 and wanted to lead the Texas delegation to the Democratic convention in Chicago in August. Mr. Sam really took out after the Governor in the recent primary with the result his boy, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, will be in complete charge of the big Texas delegation, and Mr. Sam will be permanent chairman. They will have a lot to say about the candidates.

Some time ago there was a lot of talk about JOE MARTIN retiring. This is a lot of nonsense. He is only 72 years old.

It is going to be a lot of fun, and satisfaction, to honor this pair in Syracuse.

And I hope no effort is made by the Democrats to drag Mr. Sam off to some party shindig or by the Republicans to do the same with JOE MARTIN.

If anything is done outside the university ceremony to honor them here, it should be on behalf of both.

It will be fun to hear their speeches. Each will get in his partisan digs but listeners, mainly, will get a good solid dose of Americanism.

Both these men are bachelors.

Their sweetheart is the House of Representatives, Uncle Sam's best looking legislative daughter.

And what a whirl they have given her.

I hope that affair never ends, in my time.

JOHNNY McCABE

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana.

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, next week on June 1, John W. McCabe, minority clerk on the Republican side of the House, celebrates his 37th year of service as an employee in the Halls of Congress.

Johnny McCabe came to work in this Chamber on June 1, 1919. He has been a continuous employee of the House of Representatives for 37 years. I am proud to state that he is a resident of Whiting, Ind., one of the great industrial cities located in the First Congressional District of Indiana which I have the honor to represent.

Johnny began his work in this Chamber on June 1, 1919, at the invitation of the late Congressman Will R. Wood, who served for years in this body as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Johnny was not only a great friend of the late Congressman Wood, but was active with the Republican committee organization in Lake County, Ind., as assistant to the county chairman John Killigrew who, in the World War I period and the 1920's was the leader of the Republican Party in the Calumet region of Indiana.

During Johnny's younger years, he gained great experience as an actor playing juvenile parts with such widely known stage productions as Buster Brown and the Squaw Man.

In his younger days, he served as a delegate to the Indiana Republican State conventions. At the Indiana convention in 1916, the Indianapolis papers gave considerably publicity to the fact that Johnny McCabe was not only the youngest and smallest delegate at the convention but possessed more voting power than any of the delegates by reason of four additional proxies entrusted to him by other delegates. Owing to Johnny's youthful appearance in those days he had to present to the convention credentials committee an affidavit as proof that he was 21 years old and a qualified voter in Lake County, Ind.

Johnny McCabe has attended all of the National Republican Conventions from 1916 to 1952 and in later years has acted as assistant sergeant at arms or in some other official capacity.

When Johnny McCabe came to Washington, D. C., in 1919, the First Congressional District of Indiana was composed of Benton, Jasper, Newton, Porter, Tippecanoe, Warren, White, and Lake Counties, and was known as the 10th Congressional District. When the congressional districts were reapportioned in 1930, Lake County which comprises the great industrial district of the Calumet region by reason of its tremendous growth and expansion qualified as a separate district and became what is now the First Congressional District of Indiana.

Only three of our colleagues who were Members of Congress when Johnny McCabe came to Washington on June 1, 1919, are still Members of the body; namely, Speaker RAYBURN; chairman of the Armed Services Committee, CARL VINSON; and former chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, DAN REED.

During these 37 years, Johnny has enjoyed the friendship of several thousand Members of Congress who have come and gone during this period of time and he is proud of the fact that during these years as an employee of this House, he is constantly trying to be of aid and assistance to all Members of Congress, both rookies and veterans so that the work of this body can function more efficiently.

Johnny McCabe has also aided and assisted thousands of pages who have been employed in this House during the last 37 years. He has aided and comforted them in their troubles and with their problems, and cooperated with the pages in carrying out their duties on the floor.

Johnny states that hundreds of boys trained under his supervision and counsel have developed into leaders of business, professions, and other walks of life. His Christmas mail from former Members of Congress and pages who have served in this body is voluminous.

Johnny McCabe, over this period of four decades, has been a great asset to the efficient functioning of the House of Representatives and every member on both sides of the aisles wish him many more years of health, happiness, and service in this Chamber.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from the great First District of Indiana for the splendid and well-deserved things he has said in commendation of Johnny McCabe. I know I speak for myself, and I am sure I speak for every Member on our side of the aisle, when I say to Johnny that we have appreciated through the years the splendid service he has given us, always of assistance, always ready and willing to be helpful not only to the Members on our side of the aisle but to Members on the other side of the aisle.

The gentleman from Indiana referred to the great Will R. Wood, who was my predecessor here in the House. Since coming here I have found many of the tracks of Will R. Wood. He did many things that were helpful to the Congress and to the country. I am absolutely sure one of the finer things he did was to bring John McCabe down here.

I was elected first to the Congress when there were not very many Republicans

serving in the House. I came down here on February 5, 1935, to be sworn in after a special election. To say that I was a pretty green hand is probably the understatement of the year. But I found one person around here who knew enough about what was going on and about the operations of the House of Representatives to be of real assistance to me. That person was John McCabe. So I am happy on this occasion to say that of him, in his presence among those of us who have been so happy to have him here with us.

No employee has demonstrated a greater sense of pride in the privilege of serving his Government and none has been more loyal or more faithful in the discharge of his duties.

Although John is a native and resident of the First District of Indiana I know that he counts many friends among the folks of the Second District.

As he approaches this milestone of service certainly we wish him the best of everything in the years to come and express the fond hope that he shall continue to be with us here on the floor for a long, long time.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, may I obtain the legislative program for next week?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, may I say that Monday is District day. There are two District bills to be considered, namely, H. R. 10670, District of Columbia employees, coverage by Unemployment Compensation Act; and H. R. 8149, United States District Court, transfer of certain actions.

There will also be considered on Monday the legislative appropriation bill for 1957. The conference report on the bill, H. R. 1117, the Agricultural appropriation bill, will also be called up.

Mr. MARTIN. As I understand it, there is no real controversy over the Agricultural Department conference report?

Mr. ALBERT. That is also my understanding. Any rollcalls that may be requested on Monday will go over until Thursday under agreement heretofore reached.

The program for Tuesday is undetermined. Wednesday is Memorial Day and request will be made to adjourn over from Tuesday until Thursday of next week.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday next it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLAND). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. On Thursday there are two bills: H. R. 9852, to extend the Defense Production Act, and H. R. 10285, Agricultural Farm Credit Act of 1956.

There are the usual reservations that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program will be announced later. As I indicated earlier, the leadership has agreed to have rollcalls go over until Thursday of next week.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Perhaps the gentleman has already announced it, but I understand the foreign-aid bill will be called up on June 6.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct. That is in accordance with the agreement heretofore reached, as I understand it, between the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. MARTIN. That is right.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Labor be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

INCOME TAX PREFERMENT

Mr. KEOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include an article appearing in the New York Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, it may have come to the attention of the Members of the House that there are pending before the Committee on Ways and Means two identical bills, one introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] and one by me, which have for their purpose the creation of restricted voluntary retirement funds for the professional and self-employed groups of the country. One of the bills was ordered reported out last July at the close of the first session. Unfortunately, by reason of a number of parliamentary and legislative difficulties, that report has not yet been presented to the House. I take this time to remind the Members that the final figures of receipts and expenditures for this fiscal year, reveal a surplus in excess of $2 billion.

Financial experts are concerned with possible inflationary effects of any tax reductions. This concern may very well be justified but prompts me to call attention to the fact that the enactment of the bill, H. R. 10, would, in fact, be deflationary or disinflationary. Some of these experts have also pointed out that the current decline in savings presents an inflationary trend. This concern was expressed in the Associated Press dispatch of May 8, 1956, quoting Undersecretary of the Treasury W. Randolph Burgess, as follows:

WASHINGTON, May 8.—Undersecretary of the Treasury W. Randolph Burgess said today a decline in saving by Americans presents an inflationary hazard.

A 2-year downtrend has brought the savings rate to about 6½ percent of personal income after taxes, as against 8 percent in previous years, Burgess declared at an annual conference of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks.

"This is disturbing and is a further indication that we are not saving today quite enough to finance the rapid rate of growth of which we are otherwise capable," he said.

Government action, in collaboration with the policies of banks and other financial institutions, has been "reasonably successful in keeping things on an even keel," Burgess said.

Increasing productivity of United States industry will in the long run stabilize prices while permitting higher wages.

But savings are needed to build enlarged production capacity, Burgess added.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that the effect of H. R. 10 will provide a tax action that will meet the fears expressed above for the enactment of the bill will be disinflationary by withdrawing from possible circulation the funds so set aside for retirement purposes and will also have the very definite effect of adding to the current annual savings of our people. Further support of these contentions, particularly with respect to the encouragement to savings resulting from the enactment of the bill, is borne out by the position of the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the British Government. It will be recalled that in his recent budget message he proposed the adoption of the principle of retirement benefits for the professional groups contained in the Millard Tucker Committee recommendations which I have previously inserted in the RECORD. The position of the British Government is clearly set forth in the following editorial which appeared in the Financial Times of London on Wednesday, April 18, 1956:

SAVINGS BUDGET

Mr. MacMillan has produced the most austere budget since Sir Stafford Cripps left the Exchequer. He has budgeted for the largest ordinary surplus since 1950–51, and if he had not brought the nationalized industries into the capital side of the account, he would have had a small overall surplus as well. This will not necessarily by itself be enough to stop inflation. Indeed, Sir Stafford Cripps, for all his austerity, did not manage to do so. Nevertheless it does mean that the Chancellor is playing some part in reducing the Government's need to borrow. Few are likely to criticize this budget for being too lenient or for failing to provide for an adequate ordinary surplus.

This is certainly a substantial achievement, and it will help to reinforce the effect of the rest of the disinflationary policies. It does, of course, leave the need for the Government to find the money for the capital expenditure of the public corporations. The decision to bring them into the budget seems a wise one, though it is surprising when Local Authorities have only recently been put in the market. Last year the public corporations certainly made the credit squeeze more difficult to operate. Yet their investment can only be financed without inflation if there are sufficient private savings.

NEW REVIEW

This is clearly recognized by the Chancellor himself. In his budget speech he laid all of the emphasis on the measures he was taking to encourage savings. These are substantial in themselves. They include a new 4½ percent defense bond, and a new savings certificate with the good tax-free yield of £4 3s 11d percent. They also include a very sensible tax relief on the first £15 of income from the Post Office and Trustee Savings Banks. The Chancellor's decision to issue a premium bond will meet with more opposition—with which one can sympathize—but it should help to give the small-savings movement very useful publicity.

These measures, and the acceptance of the Millard Tucker recommendations on retirement pensions for self-employed people, provide the core of the budget and are its most valuable part. The Chancellor has recognised the overriding importance of encouraging savings and he has done all that could be expected to help them. Almost equally important, however, is his promise of a new review of Government expenditure designed to produce cuts of not less than £100m. Low savings and excessive Government expenditure have been two of the country's main economic weaknesses. This budget makes a serious attempt to deal with both of them. It is to be hoped that the Government will give all possible publicity to its own economy drive, and will announce each saving as it is made.

There are other parts of the budget which are disappointing. Apart from a small concession on family allowances there is nothing for the family. The long overdue reform of graduated children's allowances for tax has again been rejected. At the same time there is nothing in the way of incentives. Many people in the middle classes will feel very disappointed that the sixth Conservative Budget since 1951 has failed to give more than minor recognition to their claims.

ANOTHER MISTAKE

The increase in profits tax is also a mistake, and it is indeed impossible to see how it can be justified. If the argument is that a higher distributed profits tax will encourage savings by companies, then it is all the more wrong to raise the undistributed rate. In any case this is not the moment to discourage the public from investing in British industry. One cannot help feeling that it is the political convenience of raising profits tax, rather than its economic merits, which recommends it to successive Chancellors.

These weaknesses are quite substantial defects. Some other points may be controversial, but are in fact justified. Indeed the increase in tobacco duty is surprisingly small; the Chancellor might just as well have put cigarettes up to 4s for 20 at one step. The removal of the second half of the bread subsidy has everything to recommend it, though the timing of the first reduction seemed inept.

In this budget, however, these are the less important matters. The essential criterion is that this should be a budget which will help to reduce inflation and strengthen the pound. There is now no doubt that last year's April budget greatly weakened the policy of disinflation. This budget will not end inflation by itself, but it will work in with all the other disinflationary measures. The emphasis on saving could also have a considerable impact on inflation, and so will the substantial further cuts in Government expenditure if they are achieved. One hates to have to leave to next year the more dynamic and progressive parts of a Conservative fiscal policy. Encouragement to savings is one barrel of the gun, but incentives to skill and effort should be the other. It is impossible to trust to the budget of 1957 to put the matter right, for by then other difficulties may stand in the way. Yet taking the merits of this budet for what they are, it would be wrong to judge it too harshly by its omissions. High savings, disinflation, and lower Government expenditure would provide the right basis for the British economy this year. The budget should help all three, although it is difficult to see why many, as a result of it, should work any harder.

A very excellent discussion of the British action and its relationship to and bearing upon our consideration of the pending bills has been set forth in the syndicated column of Sylvia F. Porter appearing in many newspapers of the country on May 8, 1956. The article of Miss Porter's which appeared in the New York Post is as follows:

TAX BREAK FOR MILLIONS

(By Sylvia F. Porter)

Tucked into six short paragraphs of the British Government's revolutionary 1956–57 budget is a provision of deepest bread-and-butter importance to all of our Nation's self-employed—small-business men and professionals, shopkeepers and farmers, accountants and artists.

If you are among the 11 million Americans in this category, send a mental "thank you" to Britain—and read on.

For Britain has become the first major nation in the world to accept the principle that under today's tax laws, a corporation employee covered by a pension plan gets a great tax break not available to the self-employed wanting to build his own retirement program. Britain formally has admitted a glaring injustice exists.

And so Britain soon will allow a self-employed person tax-exemption on a limited amount of earnings he puts aside every year in a retirement program.

In our country at least 20,000 corporations have pension plans. Probably 20 million employees pay no taxes on funds placed in the pension pools for them; they pay taxes only when they retire and start drawing their pensions.

But the self-employed gets no similar tax-exemption. Earnings he puts aside in a retirement plan are taxed at today's high rates. The discrimination is clear, undeniable.

For almost 10 years, a group of dedicated citizens has been fighting for a law which would establish some tax equality between the self-employed and the corporation executive or employee covered by a pension plan.

Bill after bill has been introduced into Congress with the sponsorship of both Republicans and Democrats—only to be killed because of protests that the move would cost the Treasury too much in revenue.

Right now, there are bills in the House sponsored by New York Democrat KEOGH and Ohio Republican JENKINS which, in brief, would:

Permit a self-employed person to get a tax deduction on an annual contribution to an approved pension plan up to 10 percent of his earned income or $5,000;

Raise the limit a bit for taxpayers over the age of 55.

Hold the minimum deduction during a lifetime to $100,000.

Tax the funds only when the individual starts drawing on the pension at the age of 65.

In his 1952 campaign, President Eisenhower stated flatly that the self-employed had been "forgotten" in legislation giving tax exemption to pension plans for corporation employees—and he added:

"I think something ought to be done to help these people help themselves by allowing a reasonable tax deduction for money put aside by them for their own savings. * * * If I am elected, I will favor legislation along these lines."

During congressional hearings on the Keogh-Jenkins bills last June, Treasury Secretary Humphrey said he would be "sympathetic" to the proposal "when general tax relief is possible."

If when Humphrey announces the revised budget estimates around May 21 he reveals a substantial budget surplus, a tax-cutting drive will get under way in earnest; and, said KEOGH when I interviewed him on this, "the latest official estimates by Congress' own tax experts indicate the annual cost would be only $320 million a year. It's more likely the cost would be only $100 million a year, because not everybody eligible to take advantage of the law will start putting money in a retirement fund."

KEOGH is confident that if the bill reaches the floor "it will pass." He has over 150 "written promises of support" and many more verbal assurances. "My firm conviction," he told me, "is that sooner or later—and much better sooner—such legislation will be enacted."

Britain's pioneering move is bound to stimulate action here. When what she has done becomes known in our land, it is certain to rally new support for the legislation.

Now, if you—the millions to whom this would mean so much—will wake up and speak up, the moment for translation of theoretical justice into actual justice could be directly ahead.

All of the foregoing, it is submitted, points up the utter necessity of our taking speedy action looking toward the enactment of either H. R. 9 or H. R. 10, and it is hoped that the Congress will shortly be put in a position of registering its approval of this long-delayed and merited consideration of the increasingly difficult economic position of the between ten and eleven million people of this country who are engaged in the professions or who are self-employed.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will act shortly on the enactment of one of these bills.

DEPENDENTS' MEDICAL CARE ACT

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9429) to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement on the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the reort.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2195)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9429) to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Dependents' Medical Care Act'."

"TITLE I

"SEC. 101. The purpose of this Act is to create and maintain high morale throughout the uniformed services by providing an improved and uniform program of medical care for members of the uniformed services and their dependents.

"SEC. 102. (a) As used in this Act—

"(1) The term 'uniformed services' means the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Commissioned Corps of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service.

"(2) The term 'member of a uniformed service' means a person appointed, enlisted, inducted or called, ordered or conscripted in a uniformed service who is serving on active duty or active duty for training pursuant to a call or order that does not specify a period of thirty days or less.

"(3) The term 'retired member of a uniformed service' means a member or former member of a uniformed service who is entitled to retired, retirement, or retainer pay or equivalent pay as a result of service in a uniformed service, other than a member or former member entitled to retired or retirement pay under title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 who has served less than eight years of active duty as defined in section 101 (b) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952.

"(4) The term 'dependent' means any person who bears to a member or retired member of a uniformed service, or to a person who died while a member or retired member of a uniformed service, any of the following relationships—

"(A) the lawful wife;

"(B) the unremarried widow;

"(C) the lawful husband, if he is in fact dependent on the member or retired member for over one-half of his support;

"(D) the unremarried widower, if he was in fact dependent upon the member or retired member at the time of her death for over one-half of his support because of a mental or physical incapacity;

"(E) an unmarried legitimate child (including an adopted child or stepchild), if such child has not passed his twenty-first birthday;

"(F) a parent or parent-in-law, if the said parent or parent-in-law is, or was at the time of the member's or retired member's death, in fact dependent on the said member or retired member for over one-half of his support and is, or was at the time of the member's or retired member's death, actually residing in the household of the said member or retired member; or

"(G) an unmarried legitimate child (including an adopted child or stepchild) who (i) has passed his twenty-first birthday, if the child is incapable of self-support because of a mental or physical incapacity that existed prior to his reaching the age of twenty-one and is, or was at the time of the member's or retired member's death, in fact dependent on him for over one-half of his support, or (ii) has not passed his twenty-third birthday and is enrolled in a full-time course of study in an institution of higher learning as approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and is, or was at the time of the member's or the retired member's death, in fact dependent on him for over one-half of his support.

"(b) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall administer this Act for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps and for the Coast Guard when it is operating as a service in the Navy, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall administer it for the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Public Health Service, and for the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy.

"SEC. 103. (a) Whenever requested, medical care shall be given dependents of members of a uniformed service, and dependents of persons who died while a member of a uniformed service, in medical facilities of the uniformed services subject to the availability of space, facilities, and the capabilities of the medical staff. Any determination made by the medical officer or contract surgeon in charge, or his designee, as to availability of space, facilities, and the capabilities of the medical staff, shall be conclusive. The medical care of such dependents provided for in medical facilities of the uniformed services shall in no way interfere with the primary mission of those facilities.

"(b) In order to provide more effective utilization of medical facilities of the uniformed services, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall jointly prescribe regulations to insure that dependents entitled to medical care in a medical facility of a uniformed service under the provisions of this Act shall not be denied equal opportunity for medical care because of the service affiliation of the service member.

"(c) The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall establish fair charges for inpatient medical care given dependents in the facilities of the uniformed services, which charges shall be the same for all dependents.

"(d) As a restraint on excessive demands for medical care under this section, uniform minimal charges may be imposed for outpatient care but such charges shall be limited to such amounts, if any, as may be established by the Secretary of Defense after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, under a special finding that such charges are necessary.

"(e) Any amounts that are received in payment for subsistence and medical care rendered dependents in facilities of the uniformed services shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation supporting the maintenance and operation of the facilities furnishing the care.

"(f) Medical care under this section shall be limited to the following:

"(1) Diagnosis;

"(2) Treatment of acute medical and surgical conditions;

"(3) Treatment of contagious diseases;

"(4) Immunization; and

"(5) Maternity and infant care.

"(g) (1) Hospitalization under this section is not authorized dependents for domiciliary care.

"(2) Hospitalization under this section is not authorized dependents for nervous and mental disorders, chronic diseases, or elective medical and surgical treatments, except that the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, by regulation, may provide in special and unusual cases for hospitalization of not to exceed twelve months for dependents for such disorders or such diseases, or for such treatments.

"(h) Dependents shall not be provided under this section—

"(1) prosthetic devices, hearing aids, orthopedic footwear, and spectacles, except that outside the continental limits of the United States and at remote stations within the continental limits of the United States, where adequate civilian facilities are not available, those items if available, from Government stocks, may be provided to dependents at prices representing invoice cost to the Government;

"(2) ambulance service, except in acute emergency;

"(3) home calls, except in special cases where it is determined by the medical officer or contract surgeon in charge, or his designee, to be medically necessary;

"(4) dental care, except—

"(A) emergency care to relieve pain and suffering but not to include any permanent restorative work or dental prosthesis;

"(B) care as a necessary adjunct to medical or surgical treatment; and

"(C) outside the continental limits of the United States, and in remote areas within the continental limits of the United States where adequate civilian dental facilities are not available.

"TITLE II

"SEC. 201. (a) In order to assure the availability of medical care for the spouses and children who are dependents of members of the uniformed services, the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall contract for medical care for such persons, pursuant to the provisions of this title, under such insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans as he deems appropriate, which plan or plans shall, subject to the provisions of section 204 hereof, include the following:

"(1) Hospitalization in semiprivate accommodations up to three hundred and sixty-five days for each admission, including all necessary services and supplies furnished by the hospital during inpatient confinement;

"(2) Medical and surgical care incident to a period of hospitalization;

"(3) Complete obstetrical and maternity service, including prenatal and postnatal care;

"(4) Required services of a physician or surgeon prior to and following hospitalization for a bodily injury or for a surgical operation;

"(5) Diagnostic tests and procedures, including laboratory and X-ray examinations, accomplished or recommended by a physician incident to hospitalization.

"For each admission the plan shall also provide for payment by the patient of hospital expenses incurred under paragraph (1) hereof in the amount of either (1) $25 or (2) the charge established pursuant to section 103 (c) of this Act multiplied by the number of days hospitalized, whichever is the greater.

"(b) Subsection (a) shall be subject to such reasonable limitations, additions, exclusions, definitions, and related provisions as the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem appropriate, except that medical care normally considered to be outpatient care shall not be authorized by this subsection.

"(c) The dependents covered under this section may elect to receive medical care under the terms of this Act in either the facilities of a uniformed service under the conditions specified in title I of this Act or in the facilities provided for under such insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans as may be provided by the authority contained in this section, except that the right to such election may be limited under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, for such dependents residing in areas where the member concerned is assigned and where adequate medical facilities of a uniformed service are available for such dependents.

"SEC. 202. Any insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans which may be entered into by the Secretary of Defense with respect to medical care under the provisions of this Act shall contain a provision for a review, and, if necessary, an adjustment of payments by the Secretary of Defense or Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare not later than one hundred and twenty days after the first year the plan or plans have been in effect and each year thereafter. Within ninety days after each such review, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives a report covering the payments made during the year reviewed, including any adjustment thereof.

"SEC. 203. In order to effectuate the purposes of this title, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to establish insurance, medical service, and health plan advisory committees to advise, consult, and make recommendations to the Secretary of Defense, provided that the Secretary issues regulations setting forth the scope, procedures, and activities of such committees. These committees shall consist of the Secretary of Defense or his designee, who shall be chairman, and such other persons as the Secretary may appoint. Their members shall be, to the extent possible, representative of insurance, medical service, and health plan or plans, and shall serve without compensation but may be allowed transportation and per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses.

"SEC. 204. The scope of medical care provided under this title shall not exceed the maximum care provided under title I of this Act.

"TITLE III

"SEC. 301. (a) Medical and dental care in any medical facility of the uniformed services shall, under regulations prescribed jointly by the Secretaries of Defense and Health, Education, and Welfare, be furnished to all persons on active duty or active duty for training in the uniformed services.

"(b) Medical and dental care in any medical facility of the uniformed services may, under regulations prescribed jointly by the Secretaries of Defense and Health, Education, and Welfare, be furnished upon request and subject to the availability of space, facilities, and capabilities of the medical staff, to retired members of the uniformed services.

"(c) Medical care in any medical facility of the uniformed services may, under regulations prescribed jointly by the Secretaries of Defense and Health, Education, and Welfare, be furnished upon request and subject to the availability of space, facilities, and capabilities of the medical staff, to dependents of retired members of the uniformed services and dependents of persons who died while a retired member of a uniformed service, except that any such care furnished such dependents shall be limited to the care authorized dependents of members of the uniformed services under title I of this Act.

"(d) When a person receives inpatient medical or dental care pursuant to the provisions of this Act in a facility of a uniformed service that is not the service of which he is a member or retired member, or that is not the service of the member or retired member upon whom he is dependent, the appropriation supporting the maintenance and operation of the medical facility furnishing the medical care shall be reimbursed at rates established by the Bureau of the Budget to reflect the average cost of providing such care.

"SEC. 302. Commissioned officers and warrant officers, active and retired, shall pay an amount equal to the portion of the charge established under section 103 (c) of this Act that is attributable to subsistence when hospitalized in a medical facility of a uniformed service. Retired enlisted personel, including members of the Fleet Reserve and the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, shall not be charged for subsistence when hospitalized in a medical facility of a uniformed service.

"SEC. 303. Where a person who is covered under an insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans, as provided in this Act, requires hospitalization beyond the period of time provided under such plan or plans, if such hospitalization is authorized in medical facilities of a uniformed service, such person may be transferred to a medical facility of a uniformed service for the continuation of such hospitalization. Where movement to such medical facility is not feasible, the expenses for such additional hospitalization required by such person in a civilian facility are authorized to be paid, subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Defense after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, may prescribe.

"SEC. 304. All determinations made under this Act by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to dependency shall be conclusive for all purposes and shall not be subject to review in any court or by any accounting officer of the Government, except for cases involving fraud or gross negligence. Such determinations may at any time be reconsidered or modified on the basis of new evidence or for other good cause.

"SEC. 305. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"SEC. 306. The following laws and parts of laws are hereby repealed:

"(1) So much of the Act of July 5, 1884 (ch. 217, 23 Stat. 107), as is contained in the proviso under the heading 'Medical Departments';

"(2) The Act of May 10, 1943 (ch. 95, 57 Stat. 80), except section 4 of such Act, and except that part of section 5 which relates to persons outside the Naval Service mentioned in section 4 of such Act;

"(3) Section 326 (b) of the Public Health Service Act, except as it relates to dependent members of families of ships' officers and members of crews of vessels of the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

"(4) Section 710 (a) of the Act of July 1, 1944 (ch. 373, 58 Stat. 714), as amended;

"(5) Public Law 108, approved June 20, 1949, to the extent it authorizes hospital benefits for dependents of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces;

"(6) Section 207 of the Act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1180).

"SEC. 307. This Act shall become effective six months after the date of its enactment."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CARL VINSON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
DEWEY SHORT,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
STYLES BRIDGES,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9429) to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

There were several areas of major difference between the House bill and the Senate amendment.

(1) Under the House bill reservists retired under title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 were excluded from the term "retired member of a uniformed service" and thus neither they nor their dependents were entitled to hospitalization in service facilities under the terms of the House bill. The Senate amendment included title III reservists as well as their dependents. The House and Senate managers agreed to include retired reservists under title III of the Retirement Act of 1948, as well as their dependents, provided such reservists have completed not less than 8 years of active service.

(2) Under the House bill the term "dependent" included parents and parents-in-law of a member of the uniformed services as well as the parent or parents-in-law of a retired member or a person who died while a member or retired member of the uniformed services, if the parents or parents-in-law were in fact dependent upon the service member for over one-half of their support. The Senate amendment excluded parents and parents-in-law as dependents. Since this would have eliminated an existing benefit for a large number of such parents and parents-in-law the House managers insisted that parents and parents-in-law be included under the definition of the term "dependent" but agreed to limit the definition to those parents or parents-in-law who receive more than one-half of their support from the service member and actually reside in the household of the service member, or resided in the household at the time of the member's death.

(3) Under the House bill dependents were not authorized hospitalization for domiciliary care, chronic diseases, nervous and mental disorders, and elective medical and surgical treatments except under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. The Senate amendment denied hospitalization to dependents for domiciliary care or elective medical and surgical treatments, but permitted hospitalization of dependents for nervous and mental disorders or chronic diseases in special cases under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense but limited to hospitalization not to exceed 12 months.

The House and Senate managers agreed to exclude hospitalization for domiciliary care, but also agreed to permit hospitalization for elective medical and surgical treatments as well as for nervous and mental disorders and chronic diseases under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense in special and unusual cases, except that hospitalization for dependents with such illnesses or disease or requiring elective medical and surgical treatments may not exceed 12 months.

(4) Under the House bill the Secretary of Defense was required to contract for medical care for the wives and children of active duty personnel under an insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans. The plan or plans were to include, but not be restricted to, hospitalization in semiprivate accommodations up to 365 days for each admission for medical and surgical care incident to a period of hospitalization, complete obstetrical and maternity service, required services of a physician or surgeon prior to and following hospitalization for a bodily injury or for a surgical operation, and diagnostic tests and procedures including laboratory and X-ray examinations, accomplished or recommended by a physician incident to hospitalization. In addition under the House bill the patient was required to pay the first $25 of hospital expenses incurred for each admission.

The House bill also contained language which allowed the Secretary of Defense to enter into such reasonable limitations, additions, exclusions, definitions, and related provisions as were necessary for such insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans.

The Senate amendment likewise directed the Secretary of Defense to establish an insurance, medical service, or health plan for the spouses and children of active-duty members of the uniformed services, but provided that such plan or plans could not include more than the items previously listed which were identical with the House bill, except that under the Senate amendment the patient admitted to a civilian hospital would pay either the first $25 of expenses or the service charge established by the Secretary for dependents hospitalized in service facilities multiplied by the number of days for which hospitalized, whichever was the greater amount.

The House and Senate managers agreed that the Secretary of Defense will be required to contract for an insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans for the spouses and children of active duty personnel which plan or plans shall include the items previously listed. However, the House and Senate managers agreed to that part of the Senate amendment which requires the patient to pay either $25 for each admission or the service charge multiplied by the number of days for which hospitalized, whichever is greater. In addition the House and Senate managers agreed to that part of the House bill which permits the Secretary of Defense to provide limitations, additions, exclusions, definitions, and related provisions in such insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans, except that he may not contract for what is normally conceived to be out-patient care.

This will permit the Secretary to contract for an insurance, medical service, or health plan which, for example, will authorize surgery to be performed in a physician's office, or X-rays or laboratory tests to be taken in clinics or laboratories other than in hospitals, but will preclude the Secretary from entering into a type of health, medical service, or insurance plan which would permit dependents to go to private doctors for normal treatments that would not, under ordinary circumstances, require hospitalization.

(5) The House bill granted the Secretary of Defense discretionary authority to contract for an insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans to provide medical care for retired members of a uniformed service as well as their dependents and all other dependents other than spouses and children. The Senate amendment contained no similar language. The House managers agreed to the exclusion of this discretionary authority with the knowledge that after the insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans has been in operation for spouses and children for a period of time it may be possible to later extend the plan by law to the other groups that would have been included under the House bill under the discretionary authority provided in the House bill for the Secretary. It is obvious that the program cannot be extended to retired members and other groups until at least a cost and experience level has been obtained as a result of the program which is to be placed in operation for spouses and children.

(6) The House bill authorized the Secretary of Defense to contract for medical care for dependents of active-duty personnel located outside the continental limits of the United States with acceptable local medical sources or in the alternative to contract for medical care for these dependents under an insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans. Since there is authority contained in the amendment agreed to, to provide an insurance, medical service, or health plan for the spouses and children of active-duty personnel wherever located the House managers agreed to the deletion of this part of the House bill. The Senate amendment had excluded the provision.

(7) The Senate amendment also contained a provision that the scope of medical care provided for spouses and children under the insurance, medical service, or health plan or plans contracted for by the Secretary of Defense would not exceed the maximum care provided in service facilities. The House managers accepted this portion of the Senate amendment.

(8) The House bill provided that a retired member of the uniformed services who completed not less than 30 years of service would be furnished required medical and dental care in a medical facility of a uniformed service subject only to the availability of space, facilities, and capabilities of the medical staff in the service facility. The Senate amendment did not contain similar language. The House managers agreed to the elimination of this special provision for members retired with more than 30 years of active service.

(9) All of the remaining differences between the House bill and the Senate amendment were technical in nature and do not affect the substance of the conference report.

CARL VINSON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
DEWEY SHORT,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR PAYMENT TO THE CROW INDIAN TRIBE FOR TRANSFER OF RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR THE YELLOWTAIL DAM UNIT, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the resolution (S. J. Res. 135) providing for payment to the Crow Indian Tribe for transfer of right-of-way for the Yellowtail Dam unit, Missouri River Basin project, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Idaho?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it was our hope that the minority side might be given 15 or 20 minutes, if necessary, to discuss the various phases of the conference report. I ask the lady from Idaho if that will be possible.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I shall yield some time to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, would the lady yield me 5 minutes on this conference report?

Mrs. PFOST. I shall.

Mr. BUDGE. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2201)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House striking the preamble;

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the House amendment to the title; and

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the language following the resolving clause and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That from funds appropriated to the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, for the Missouri River Basin project, there shall be transferred in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, to be available in accordance with the Act of June 20, 1936 (49 Stat. 1543), the sum of $5,000,000 as just compensation for the transfer to the United States as herein provided of the right, title, and interest of the Crow Tribe in and to certain tribal lands required for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Yellowtail unit, Missouri River Basin project: *Provided, however,* That no attorney fees shall be allowed out of the amount paid under the authority of this resolution: *Provided further,* That neither the initial transfer of such funds to the Tribe, as provided herein, nor any subsequent per capita distribution thereof, shall be subject to Federal income tax.

"SEC. 2. (a) Subject to the provisions of this section, there is hereby transferred to the United States the right, title, and interest of the Crow Tribe in and to lands situated in the Big Horn County, Montana, hereinafter described under the headings 'PARCEL A' and 'PARCEL B' and in and to such lands, additional to parcels A and B, as the Secretary of the Interior, hereinafter referred to as the Secretary, determines to be required for the construction thereon of minimum basic recreational facilities for the accommodation of the public visiting the Yellowtail unit.

"PARCEL A

"Lots 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12, northeast quarter of the southwest quarter and the east half of the southeast quarter of section 18; lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter, southeast quarter of the northwest quarter, and the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 19, all in township 6 south, range 31 east, Montana principal meridian, and containing 573.84 acres, more or less.

"A tract of unsurveyed, unallotted Indian land described as follows: Beginning on the westerly side of the Big Horn River at a point on the west line of lot 9, section 18, township 6 south, range 31 east, Montana principal meridian, said point being at elevation 3,675; thence running upstream along a contour line whose elevation is 3,675, to a point of intersection with the east line of the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 22, township 6 south, range 30 east, Montana principal meridian; thence southerly along the east line of said southeast quarter of the northeast quarter to a point on the east line of said southeast quarter of the northeast quarter, whose elevation is 3,675; thence running upstream along a contour line whose elevation is 3,675, to a point of intersection with the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation on the westerly side of the Big Horn River; thence easterly along the said south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation to a point of intersection with the middle of the thread of the Big Horn River; thence running upstream along the middle of the thread of the Big Horn River to a point of intersection with the south line of township 9 south, range 28 east, Montana principal meridian; thence easterly along the south line of said township 9 south, range 28 east, to a point on the south line of said township 9 south, range 28 east, Montana principal meridian, whose elevation is 3,675 feet; thence running downstream along a contour line whose elevation is 3,675 to a point of intersection with the west line of township 6 south, range 31

east, Montana principal meridian; thence northerly along the west line of said township 6 south, range 31 east, to the point of beginning, and containing 4,771.6 acres, more or less.

"Also, a parcel of land lying along the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation, further described as follows: Beginning at a point where the 3,675 foot contour to the left of the Big Horn River intersects the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation, said point being approximately 5,400 feet westerly of the point of intersection of the Big Horn River and the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation; thence running upstream on the 3,675-foot contour to a point where the 3,675-foot contour intersects the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation; thence running easterly along the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation to the point of beginning and containing 5.7 acres, more or less.

"Also, a parcel of land lying along the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation and along Hoodoo Creek further described as follows: Beginning at a point on the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation where the 3,675-foot contour on the east bank of Hoodoo Creek intersects the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation; thence running upstream on the 3,675-foot contour to its intersection with the middle of the thread of Hoodoo Creek; thence running downstream on the 3,675-foot contour to a point where the 3,675-foot contour intersects the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation; thence easterly along the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation to the point of beginning and containing 1.3 acres, more or less.

"The total area above described is 5,352.44 acres, more or less, situated in Big Horn County, Montana.

"PARCEL B

"Lots 1, 5, and 6 of section 18, lots 4, 6, 7, and 8, and the south half of the northwest quarter of section 17, lots 6 and 7, section 16, all in township 6 south, range 31 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 325.50 acres, more or less, and situated in Big Horn County, Montana.

"(b) There is reserved from the right, title, and interest transferred as to parcel B, the Indian Irrigation Service canal and appurtenant facilities, Big Horn unit, Crow Indian Irrigation Department, as now constructed or as they may be hereafter modified, until such time as said canal and appurtenant facilities may be replaced.

"(c) Except as to such area as the Secretary determines to be required for the dam site and the construction and operating camp site, the right, title and interest transferred shall be exclusive of the rights to minerals, including gas and oil, beneath the surface: *Provided*, That no permit, license, lease or other document covering the exploration for or the extraction of such minerals shall be granted by or under the authority of the Secretary except under such conditions and with such stipulations as the Secretary deems adequate to protect the interests of the United States in the construction, operation, maintenance and use of the Yellowtail unit.

"(d) The members of the Crow Tribe of Indians of Montana shall be permitted to hunt and fish in and on the Yellowtail Reservoir and taking area without a license, but they shall be subject to all other applicable conservation laws and regulations.

"SEC. 3. Unless suit to determine whether an additional amount to that specified in section 1 hereof is due as just compensation is brought in the Court of Claims by the Crow Tribe within three years after the effective date of this joint resolution, the sum provided by section 1 hereof shall constitute full, complete, and final settlement of any and all claims by the tribe on account of the transfer to the United States as therein provided of the tribe's right, title, and interest in and to the lands referred to in section 2 hereof. In the event of such suit, the court shall have jurisdiction under section 1505, title 28, United States Code and in determining just compensation shall take into account the sum specified in section 1 hereof and the rights reserved to the tribe by subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 2 hereof. The amount embraced in such judgment, if any, as may be entered against the United States shall be deposited in the Treasury to be available in like manner as the sum specified in section 1 hereof. Review of the judgment entered shall be in the same manner, and subject to the same limitations, as govern in the case of other claims cognizable under the aforementioned section 1505."

And the House agree to the same.

GRACIE PFOST,
LEE METCALF,
STEWART L. UDALL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JAMES E. MURRAY,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
ALAN BIBLE,
GEORGE W. MALONE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to Senate Joint Resolution 135, providing for payment to the Crow Indian Tribe for transfer of right-of-way for the Yellowtail Dam Unit, Missouri River Basin project, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

This legislation authorizes and directs the transfer to the United States of certain Crow Indian tribal lands required for the construction of the Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, and specifies the amount to be paid for such lands.

The Senate and House versions of the legislation, while differing materially in form and language, contain only one major difference in substance—the Senate-passed resolution provided for payment of $5,000,000 for the lands while the House-passed resolution provided for payment of $1,500,000.

The language agreed upon in conference follows closely the language of the House-passed bill but, with respect to the amount to be paid to the Crow Indian Tribe for the required lands, the conference committee agreed upon the figure in the Senate-passed resolution—$5,000,000. Although the Crow Tribe has agreed to accept $5,000,000, the conference committee thought it advisable to retain in the legislation the House language providing for a judicial determination in the Court of Claims in the event the position of the Crow Tribe is later changed.

Two other significant changes to the House-passed resolution were made by the conference committee: First—the payment to the Crow Tribe and any subsequent per capita distribution thereof were exempted from Federal income tax, in accordance with the generally accepted policy for payments of this nature to Indians. Second—for the protection of the Indians, a provision was added prohibiting any part of the amount paid to the Crow Tribe under the authority of the resolution being allowed for attorney fees.

GRACIE PFOST,
LEE METCALF,
STEWART L. UDALL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, Yellowtail Dam was authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1944. It is situated at one of the finest natural dam sites in the entire Missouri Valley. The canyon of the Big Horn River at the site is 800 feet deep and 2,500 feet across at the top. The rock conditions are excellent and the location is such that water from the dam can be carried to irrigate some 44,000 acres of bottom land.

It will be one of the best storage dams on the Missouri, and when built will give complete control of the Big Horn River and will substantially aid in the control of the Missouri and the Mississippi. Approximately 1⅓ million acre-feet of storage will be provided at a point more than 3,600 feet above sea level. A powerhouse will be built with four 50,000 kilowatt units which will produce almost 500 million kilowatt-hours of firm power annually and an additional 175 million to 200 million kilowatt-hours of peaking power.

Last year after a resurvey of the feasibility of the project by the Bureau of the Budget, and after an expenditure of $2½ million for planning, Congress appropriated $4 million to begin construction. The budget this year contained a recommendation for an additional appropriation of $10,850,000. Day before yesterday in the House in the consideration of the public-works appropriation bill, this additional ten-million-dollar-plus was denied, but the report of the Appropriations Committee pointed out pending legislation or a favorable response to the Department's condemnation action would permit entry to the dam site which is on land owned by the Crow Indian Tribe. This is the pending legislation to which the report refers.

The dam site itself and 7,000 acres of the land to be inundated, about 20 percent, belongs to the Crow Indian Tribe. Since 1946 there have been repeated attempts to reach an agreement with the Crow Indian Tribe as to the amount of compensation to be paid for the tribal lands to be taken for the construction of the dam and reservoir. Last year negotiations were renewed and at that time the tribe demanded a rental of $1 million per year for 50 years with a reversion to the tribe of the site and facilities at the expiration of the lease. Such a payment would have increased the annual costs to such an extent that it would no longer be economically feasible.

Therefore, Senator MURRAY, Senator MANSFIELD, and I joined in urging the Bureau of Reclamation to institute condemnation proceedings to secure the land and right of entry necessary to start construction. The necessary pleadings were drawn and proceedings filed in the Federal district court in Montana on February 10 of this year. In the meantime, negotiations continued and the Crow Tribal Council on January 12 of this year rescinded the former resolution demanding a payment of $1 million a year for 50 years and passed a resolution offering to transfer the land and the right-of-way to the United States for $5 million. This was

to be an outright sale, with mineral and recreational rights reserved in the tribe.

This appeared to be a fair price and in order to have the legislative committees of the Congress hear evidence on the justification of the payment of $5 million, the pending resolution was introduced in the other body and I introduced a companion resolution in the House.

Hearings were held at which representatives of the Bureau testified that a payment of $1,500,000 would be justified. The representatives of the Department of the Interior, however, recognized the unique relationship of the Department to its Indian wards. The Interior Department is in a dual position in this transaction. It is the agency of the Government seeking to acquire the land for a public purpose and has an obligation to make the purchase as cheaply as possible. On the other hand, the Interior Department acts as a trustee or guardian over the property of its Indian wards and has an obligation to protect and preserve all the rights of the Indians.

At the hearings the official delegation of the Crow Tribal Council testified in support of the payment of $5 million, another delegation from the Crow Tribe objected that $5 million would be an inadequate compensation, and finally submitted a figure of $8½ million. One witness from this group was opposed to the building of the dam at all.

On behalf of the Crow Tribe a nationally known and recognized engineer justified the figure of $5 million chiefly by comparison with the payments made to the Flathead Tribe for the land and dam site at Kerr Dam by the Montana Power Co. Kerr Dam has a capacity of 180,000 kilowatts, compared to the 200,000 at Yellowtail. The storage capacity of the 2 dams is approximately the same. Two thousand one hundred acres of tribal land were taken at Kerr; 7,000 acres of tribal land will be taken at Yellowtail. At Kerr Dam the Montana Power Co. under its present agreement will pay $2,950,000 for a lease for 20 years; this figure, projected over a 50-year payout period, would amount to $7,375,000 as a payment to the Flathead Tribe for Kerr Dam for less power, less acreage, and a lease instead of an outright sale. In addition, at Yellowtail an irrigation dam built by the tribe and paid for out of tribal funds will be inundated at a loss to the tribe of several hundred thousand dollars. A further item at Yellowtail is that water belonging to the Crow Tribe will be diverted off the reservation for irrigation of twenty to twenty-five thousand acres of non-Indian lands.

In view of this payment by a private utility under analogous circumstances, it was the opinion of a majority of the managers on the part of the House that the Federal Government should deal with its Indian wards at least as fairly, and that a payment of $5 million was justified.

In addition, of course, this action by the Congress resolves the delicate problem confronting the Department of the Interior in its dual relations with the Crow Tribe.

Payment of $5 million for the tribal lands and the dam site will not impair the economic feasibility of the project. The funds for the acquisition are to come from existing appropriations for the Missouri Basin project and are all reimbursable from the sale of power. In this respect, too, it is analogous to the example of Kerr Dam, where the annual rental of approximately $175,000 per year is paid out of power revenues of the Montana Power Co.

The payment of $5 million is a negotiated agreement. It has the approval of the seller, the Crow Tribal Council, and of the purchaser, the Federal Government. It is a fair, just, and adequate compensation for the lands and the damsite, and at the same time, protects the interests of the taxpayer and the feasibility of the project.

The adoption of this conference report will mean that the construction can get underway promptly and that the control of the turbulent Big Horn and partial control of the Yellowstone, Missouri, and Mississippi will be advanced. Power will be available for a power hungry area in Montana and Wyoming, and the Federal Government will promote amicable relations among the Crow Tribe, the Congress, and the Interior Department.

As you drive south on Highway 87 out of Billings, Mont., you come to the town of Hardin. If you turn right, you will drive along the Big Horn River to the site of Yellowtail Dam and over some of the land to be inundated for the reservoir. It is this site and this land that we propose to purchase from the Indians at a price they deem fair and equitable and at a price that is equally fair and equitable to the Bureau of Reclamation. If you turn left at Hardin, you will stay on 87 and drive through the Custer battleground, an area that is symbolic of the results of a policy of force in dealing with the Indians.

We can say to the Crow Tribe, we are going to take your land by legislative fiat, and if you want more than we offer, you can spend your tribal funds and years of time in litigation in the courts to get a just compensation. Under present decisions, even that is problematical. It was that philosophy of force which led to the revolt of the Sioux, culminating in the destruction of Custer and his command on the Little Horn. Unwillingness to meet the Indian tribes on a basis of justice and equity at that time led only to the death of a brave American general and the flower of American cavalry; ultimately the Sioux were subjugated, but nothing was settled and mutual suspicion and distrust was the result. Here is a better way. Accept a fair offer and ratify a bargain openly arrived at that will foster confidence and respect among the members of the Crow tribe and confidence in their future dealings with the Federal Government.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to explain to you why the managers on the part of the House on the minority side did not sign this report. I think we owe you that explanation. I do feel it is important to get a start on this project and if it comes to a rollcall vote will support the measure—although I do not like the policy being set down. We did not have a fair conference or was an attempt really made to compromise the difference in the House and the other body.

We have before us, as the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] has said, the Yellow Tail Dam site, by which, under this legislation, it is proposed to buy less than 6,000 acres for $5 million.

The House bill differed from the Senate version, in that we thought $1,500,000 was the correct amount. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported the bill with that amount, and it carried in this House. A conference committee was appointed. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], and myself were members of that conference committee. We went to the conference committee with the members of the other body, but there was hardly a conference report. We hardly got our seats warmed when the House capitulated and a motion was made to accept. There was no effort to compromise the difference of $1,500,000 and $5 million between the Senate and the House. Of course the other body and the conferees on the majority side of the House had the votes. It was a political vote pure and simple. I understand the Indians vote in Montana. They carry some political weight and many groups back them.

So you have before you a conference report not signed by the managers on the minority side of the House. I am not opposing it, because I think there is merit in getting the dam built. I think it is the wrong principle when you start to make the Indians a special class of citizens, where they do not have to conform to the same principles that you and I must conform to. If this was white man's land there would be no question but what the Government would come in and condemn the land and put it to use. They have a right to appeal to the courts, as they do in this legislation. The $1,500,000 passed by the House was agreed to by the Department of the Interior. The Indians can go into court and let the court decide if additional money should be paid to the Indians. The $5 million also permits them to go into court, but I think it is an excessive amount. The actual value of this land, as was testified before our committee, is probably $35,000 or $40,000. Here we are proposing to pay them $5 million. The Indians should not be super American citizens entitled to special consideration. They should come under the Constitution like all of us and be treated the same way.

One reason why I am unhappy about this report is that I am not sure but what you will court a veto by the President. I know it would go forward with $1,500,000. There is no question about that. That has been agreed upon, but there has been no agreement that it shall go ahead at the $5 million figure. I think we should have given the Indians the right to go into court just as white people do, and they have that right now. Let it be considered by a court of justice. But no; we give them the higher

figure. I think the higher figure makes this project rather questionable as to feasibility. I think the whole project will cost $100 million, or more, when it is completed. There was a power line constructed 5 or 6 years ago under another administration that starts near the dam and runs down into Wyoming that has not any power to run over it and there will not be until we get this dam constructed. But that is another story. I want to deal strictly with this conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 8 additional minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I understand the Indians themselves are quite divided. I received a number of wires from Indians who do not want the project at all, but I think this is an important matter and that it should go forward, that we ought to pass it. I am just fearful that in keeping this $5 million figure in the bill we may well be headed for a Presidential veto, and if it is vetoed, of course, you will have no legislation this year. I think to accept the $5 million figure would be definitely to prejudice it at this time.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wonder if my friend from Nebraska would make some statement to the effect that this $5 million payment, the increase of $3,500,000, would not destroy the feasibility of this particular unit? I am sure my friend did not want to leave the idea with the Members of the House that the feasibility of this unit is tied entirely to the Yellowtail Dam project itself. This is a part of the over-all Missouri River development.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is right.

Mr. ASPINALL. And whatever money is paid whether it is $1,500,000 or $5 million, comes from the Missouri Valley fund and not from the funds of this particular unit, nor does it come from the general funds of the Treasury.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is correct. But it also, in the payment of extra money, does lower the feasibility features of this project.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. Commissioner Dexheimer testified before the Appropriations Committee when the justification for the bill was made that at the end of the 50-year payout period there would be about $14 million left after payment of all costs of development and payment for irrigation. An additional $3,500,000 to the Crow Tribe would still keep the feasibility of the individual project as well as the feasibility of the entire Missouri Basin project.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think that is true but, of course, we have had all sorts of claims for the building of this dam. When Chief Yellowtail was giving us his views he wanted payment of $1 million a year for 50 years. That was agreeable to the Indians and agreeable to some other people interested in the legislation, but not agreeable to the committee; and my interest at this time is to explain why the minority members, at least this minority member, did not sign the report.

I am fearful that we may not be able to go forward with the project this year because of the $5 million figure which was disproved by the Interior Department. They did agree to the $1,500,000. When we wrote the legislation we thought we should do it, but I have always tried to go along and support the Department that has the responsibility of administering the law, that even though it comes back here with a veto we ought then to try and get a sum that will be accepted. In this bill we run the risk of a veto. I think it would be unfortunate for it would mean we would lose a year's time and I think we ought to go forward even though there is some opposition on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I am sure the gentleman from Nebraska will remember that last Tuesday when we had the public works appropriation bill before us I made some rather extensive remarks on the floor of the House in which I tried to state some of the injustices and inequalities in the land-acquisition policy of the administration and of the Congress itself. One of the features I tried to point out was the inequity of applying the capital gains tax to a person selling his land under the threat of eminent domain as compared to the ordinary land speculator, something in which I am sure the committee was quite interested. In this conference report I notice there is a provision that none of the funds distributed in this bill or any subsequent funds shall be subject to the Federal income tax. That is just the point I was trying to make the other day.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The Indian is given special consideration.

Mr. AVERY. I am sorry I do not know this, but let me ask in the first place: Are Indians liable for any income tax, generally speaking?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. They are generally, but in this case we exempted them from the payment of Federal income taxes. If they owe the State any tax or similar taxes elsewhere they are subject to those taxes.

Mr. AVERY. This bill provides that these Indians shall be reimbursed at approximately 300 percent of what the fair appraisal has been established by some persons.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think that is right.

Mr. AVERY. Not only that, but they are being forgiven their capital gains tax on top of that. My people out in the Blue Valley on a project we do not want, a project they have opposed for 20 years, cannot get a sympathetic audience for even those folks over 60 years of age so far as capital gains taxes are concerned.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. We should not always treat the Indians as special citizens and give them special consideration. However, the United States Government is the trustee of the Indian, the United States Government is trustee of this land. We are therefore in a peculiar position. Here is the United States, trustee for the Indian land, and here is the United States on the other hand coming along and saying: We are going to condemn the land. It puts the Government in a peculiar position. I am in sympathy with not requiring them to pay a certain tax. I think a million and a half settlement with the right to go to court should have stayed in the bill, but it did not. What will happen, I do not know.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. This position relative to income tax matters is not a new provision. We have followed that before in our dealings with Indians and payments to them.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Not always. This is some special treatment here.

Mr. AVERY. Because of the long experience of the gentleman from Nebraska with reclamation matters and public works projects, will he not agree with me that the good folks back there in the first district of Kansas should be entitled to equally as good treatment as the Indians in Wyoming or in Montana?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If they were Indians, they would probably get a different treatment.

Mr. AVERY. The statement was made by the gentleman or by the distinguished gentleman from Colorado that Indians become wards of the Government. Did the gentleman state it that way? Would he not further agree that persons displaced under the eminent domain statutes should be considered as leniently as these Indians?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. We are in a peculiar position. The Federal Government—Uncle Sam—has charge of the Indians, the Federal Government has charge of their land. Then the United States Government comes along, on the other hand, and takes the land. I think we have to be liberal in our thinking as far as the Indians are concerned.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In my opinion we are giving most generous treatment to the Indians. They pay no income tax. I feel the amount is too much. It may bring a veto. If so, new legislation may be needed. The need for the dam is great, it ought to be built.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, the situation with which the House is confronted today is simply this: A portion of the authorizing legislation for the Yellowtail project in Montana provided that consent must be gained of the Indian tribes before that project, costing in excess of $100 million, could be built. Two solicitors' opinions were rendered as to whether or not that consent had or had not been obtained; one in the negative and one in the affirmative. Consequently, the Department of the Interior

commenced condemnation proceedings against the Indian tribes, which is the usual and historic procedure when the Federal Government wants to build a project. That condemnation proceeding is now pending in the Federal court in Montana. If it were allowed to proceed the Federal court in Montana with a jury would fix the value of this land.

The Department of the Interior, the agency of this Government charged with determination of the reasonable value of this land, has estimated that value at $36,000. Yet under this bill the House of Representatives is taking from the United States Court the usual condemnation proceedings and is paying not $36,000 but $5 million and exempting that sum from income tax payments, with the further proviso that the Indian tribes can go to the Court of Claims and seek additional compensation.

Mr. Speaker, this project has had a long history. In spite of the legislative prohibition to which I have referred, the Bureau of Reclamation some 5 years back built a transmission line from clear down in Lovell, Wyo., up to the site of this dam in Montana. The transmission line has never served any purpose except as a roosting place for crows, and I do not mean Indians. It has never carried one kilowatt of energy.

Now, it seems to me that the House of Representatives as the guardians of taxpayers of this Nation, as the guardians of the solvency of this country, should look at a thing like this where the land is determined by the responsible executive agency to be worth $36,000, and yet this Congress is about to pay $5 million, exempt from income tax, and with the further proviso that the Crow Indians can get more if they can substantiate it in the Court of Claims.

Nor do I feel that the House of Representatives or the Congress in its entirety should determine the value of that land in Montana. I do not know whether it is worth $36,000, a million and a half dollars as the House passed the bill, or $5 million as the Senate passed the bill. The proper place to have that determination made is in the United States district court in Montana, and that would be the procedure if this bill were not enacted. That condemnation procedure is now pending in the Federal district court of Montana. But, the passage of this bill takes jurisdiction away from the Federal district court in Montana and puts this Congress in the position of saying how much that land in Montana is worth. I challenge any Member of this body to make an accurate determination as to whether those Indians are entitled to $36,000 as the Department says they are, a million and a half as the House previously passed the bill, or $5 million exempt from income tax as the other body passed the bill and the House conferees accepted and which is now the proposition before this House.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot feel that we in good conscience are discharging our responsibility as the guardians of the Treasury of the United States when we permit such a thing to happen. I also feel that we are not giving proper cognizance to the judicial branch of the Government when we remove from the judicial branch of the Government a case pending before that court where the condemnation proceedings are now in progress. Nor should we by congressional edict tell the Indians the value of this land. We in Congress are saying by this bill that we take from the judiciary the power to make this determination; we are going to determine here in Washington how much that land in Montana that the Indians own is worth and how much the Indians are to be paid for it. As Members of the House, we simply are not qualified to make that decision.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal just briefly, as a member of the conference committee, on some of the questions that have been raised here. I first want to compliment my colleague the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], the ranking minority member of our committee, on his temperate statement. I, too, was initially attracted by the argument made by the gentleman from Idaho a moment ago that the proper forum for determination of the value of this power site is in the courts. I changed my mind, however, when I read a case that was decided on January 23 of this year by the United States Supreme Court in which this Court held that power-site value is not cognizable in the courts and may not be taken into consideration as an element of damages. I refer to the case of *United States* v. *Twin City Power Co.* (24 L. W. 4073).

The gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] told you what happened on the Flathead Reservation in his State where a comparable power site was leased out to the Montana Power Co. at a rate in excess of this $5 million. I might state to you also—and it is in the record of the hearings—that the Crow Tribe negotiated with the Montana Power Co. recently and could still negotiate for the lease or sale of this power site. So, were it not for the fact that power-site value would not be taken into account by the courts, I think there might be some validity to the argument of the gentleman from Idaho.

However, it has always been the pattern—and I happen to think it is a good pattern—of our Government, in dealing with the Indian people, to proceed by negotiation wherever possible. The fact of the matter is that the Congress and the people of the United States cannot be proud of the way they have treated the Indians in the past. These Indian citizens were pushed off into the most desolate areas of the United States. That is true of the Crow Tribe; it is true of most of Indian tribes that I know of in the Western States.

These power sites are creations of nature and they are irreplaceable. They represent a major asset of some of these tribes who own desolate areas. I say that we should not take away one of their chief assets without compensating them adequately.

When you consider the great rivers of the country—the Colorado, the Missouri—you can count the remaining big power sites on the fingers of one hand. Here we have one of the few great power sites left on the Missouri. It happens to be on an Indian reservation. The question is whether we should negotiate with these people or whether we should throw them into court where the court would not take into consideration the fact that this power site is one of their chief assets.

That is what convinced me, after I voted in committee for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska, to change my mind. I determined that we should negotiate a settlement with this tribe.

That is my feeling and I think it is the feeling that motivates us on this side of the aisle in our dealings with our Indian citizens. If we err, we should err on the side of charity and on the side of liberality. I think that is the spirit expressed by our colleague from Nebraska a moment ago. And if the President, when this matter is sent down to the White House, approaches it in the same spirit, we will then have this legislation enacted, and this important project will go forward.

Mr. Speaker, those are a few of the considerations that have brought me to the conclusion that this is a fair and equitable settlement. May I make one further comment to show the bipartisan nature of this legislation and the broad spirit that has been brought to bear on it? Within the past week, the Governor of Montana, who is of the Republican Party, sent a wire to members of the congressional committees urging them to approve this settlement. So I think we should approve the conference report.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I asked the gentleman to yield so that I may read the wire that was sent by the Republican Governor of Montana.

Mr. UDALL. I should be glad to have the gentleman do that.

Mr. METCALF. The wire is as follows:

> I give my full support to amount contained in Senate resolution for purchase of Yellowtail Dam site. Believe this amount should be approved by conference committee. It is a fair price considering all that is involved. Our position taken from knowledge of economic benefits Montana and Nation.
>
> J. HUGO ARONSON,
> *Governor of Montana.*

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman for reading that wire. It illustrates the point that I have attempted to make. Admittedly this method of determining value is not very precise. There is nothing very scientific about it. Perhaps Congress would be well advised if in the future it could devise some more exact method of settling these matters, instead of doing it by congressional committees. In any event, this does follow the present pattern in our dealings with our Indian tribes. I happen to think that the settlement in this instance is a fair and just settlement. I feel that the conference report should be approved.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. By the same token, if the gentleman thinks this is a fair arrangement, does the gentleman have any information as to whether or not the payment actually is inadequate? I certainly do not feel, sitting here in Washington, that I can determine how much this land is worth which is out in Montana. I think a Federal jury in Montana should make that determination. How does the gentleman know whether this payment is adequate?

Mr. UDALL. Any negotiated settlement is a compromise. This is the lowest figure we could get. The Indians came down from $50 million to $5 million. They have agreed to accept this. As with any negotiated settlement, we take it—not because we know it is right—but simply because it is the best we can do under the circumstances and we want to go ahead with the project.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. BUDGE. The gentleman speaks about a negotiated figure. Is it not a fact that the Department of the Interior said the property was worth only $36,000, and that they would pay a top of $1,500,000? That is what the House accepted. Then the conferees on the part of the House, at least the majority members, accepted the other body's figure of $5 million. Is that a negotiated settlement?

Mr. UDALL. As the gentleman knows, it takes 2 parties to make an agreement. There was no agreement on $1,500,000. There was no agreement on this ridiculous $36,000 figure the gentleman mentioned. The only agreement that has been entered into is the agreement of the Crow Tribe to accept the $5 million. The Senate committee concurred in that, and passed a $5-million bill.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUDGE) there were—ayes 35, noes 23.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 176, nays 126, not voting 132, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]

YEAS—176

Abbitt	Baldwin	Brooks, Tex.
Abernethy	Bass, Tenn.	Brown, Ga.
Addonizio	Bennett, Fla.	Burleson
Albert	Blatnik	Burnside
Alexander	Blitch	Canfield
Andrews	Boggs	Cannon
Anfuso	Boland	Celler
Ashley	Bolling	Chelf
Ashmore	Boyle	Chenoweth
Aspinall	Bray	Chudoff
Bailey	Brooks, La.	Church
Colmer	Hull	Patterson
Cooper	Jarman	Pfost
Corbett	Jennings	Philbin
Curtis, Mass.	Johnson, Wis.	Poage
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Ala.	Polk
Davis, Tenn.	Jones, Mo.	Preston
Delaney	Karsten	Price
Dempsey	Kean	Priest
Denton	Kee	Rabaut
Dies	Keogh	Rains
Dingell	Kilday	Reuss
Dodd	Kilgore	Rhodes, Pa.
Dollinger	King, Calif.	Richards
Dorn, S. C.	Kirwan	Riley
Edmondson	Knutson	Roberts
Elliott	Landrum	Robeson, Va.
Evins	Lanham	Rodino
Feighan	Lankford	Rogers, Colo.
Fernandez	Lesinski	Rogers, Fla.
Fisher	Long	Rooney
Flood	McCarthy	Roosevelt
Flynt	McCormack	Rutherford
Fogarty	McDowell	Seely-Brown
Forand	Macdonald	Selden
Forrester	Mack, Ill.	Sisk
Fountain	Madden	Smith, Miss.
Frazier	Magnuson	Staggers
Gary	Mahon	Steed
Gathings	Marshall	Sullivan
Gordon	Matthews	Thomas
Grant	Merrow	Thompson, N. J.
Green, Oreg.	Metcalf	Thompson, Tex.
Griffiths	Miller, Nebr.	Trimble
Hagen	Mills	Tuck
Harden	Mollohan	Tumulty
Hardy	Morgan	Udall
Harris	Moss	Vanik
Harrison, Va.	Moulder	Whitten
Hays, Ark.	Multer	Wickersham
Hays, Ohio	Murray, Ill.	Wier
Hayworth	Murray, Tenn.	Williams, Miss.
Hébert	Natcher	Williams, N. J.
Herlong	O'Brien, Ill.	Willis
Holland	O'Hara, Ill.	Wright
Holmes	O'Konski	Yates
Holtzman	O'Neill	Zablocki
Horan	Osmers	Zelenko
Huddleston	Passman	

NAYS—126

Adair	Dondero	Nicholson
Allen, Calif.	Ellsworth	Norblad
Allen, Ill.	Fenton	Ostertag
Andersen, H. Carl	Fino	Pelly
	Ford	Poff
Andresen, August H.	Frelinghuysen	Prouty
	Gavin	Radwan
Arends	Gentry	Ray
Auchincloss	George	Rees, Kans.
Avery	Gross	Rhodes, Ariz.
Ayres	Hale	Robsion, Ky.
Bass, N. H.	Hand	Rogers, Mass.
Bates	Henderson	Schenck
Baumhart	Heselton	Scherer
Beamer	Hess	Schwengel
Becker	Hiestand	Scott
Belcher	Hill	Sheehan
Bennett, Mich.	Hoeven	Short
Bentley	Hosmer	Siler
Betts	Hyde	Simpson, Ill.
Bolton, Frances P.	Jackson	Simpson, Pa.
	James	Smith, Kans.
Bosch	Jonas	Smith, Wis.
Brownson	Judd	Springer
Broyhill	Kearney	Taber
Budge	Kearns	Talle
Bush	Keating	Teague, Calif.
Carrigg	Kilburn	Thomson, Wyo.
Cederberg	King, Pa.	Tollefson
Chase	Krueger	Utt
Clevenger	Latham	Van Zandt
Coon	Lovre	Vorys
Coudert	McCulloch	Vursell
Cramer	McDonough	Wainwright
Cretella	McGregor	Weaver
Crumpacker	McVey	Westland
Cunningham	Mack, Wash.	Widnall
Curtis, Mo.	Martin	Wigglesworth
Dague	Mason	Williams, N. Y.
Dawson, Utah	Miller, Md.	Wilson, Ind.
Derounian	Miller, N. Y.	Withrow
Devereux	Minshall	Wolcott
Dixon	Mumma	Young

NOT VOTING—132

Alger	Bowler	Chatham
Baker	Boykin	Chiperfield
Barden	Brown, Ohio	Christopher
Barrett	Buckley	Clark
Bell	Burdick	Cole
Berry	Byrd	Cooley
Bolton, Oliver P.	Byrne, Pa.	Davidson
	Byrnes, Wis.	Davis, Wis.
Bonner	Carlyle	Dawson, Ill.
Bow	Carnahan	Deane
Diggs	Ikard	Reece, Tenn.
Dolliver	Jenkins	Reed, N. Y.
Donohue	Jensen	Riehlman
Donovan	Johansen	Rivers
Dorn, N. Y.	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers, Tex.
Dowdy	Jones, N. C.	Sadlak
Doyle	Kelley, Pa.	St. George
Durham	Kelly, N. Y.	Saylor
Eberharter	Klein	Scrivner
Engle	Kluczynski	Scudder
Fallon	Knox	Shelley
Fascell	Laird	Sheppard
Fjare	Lane	Shuford
Friedel	LeCompte	Sieminski
Fulton	Lipscomb	Sikes
Gamble	McConnell	Smith, Va.
Garmatz	McIntire	Spence
Granahan	McMillan	Taylor
Gray	Machrowicz	Teague, Tex.
Green, Pa.	Mailliard	Thompson, La.
Gregory	Meader	Thompson, Mich.
Gubser	Miller, Calif.	
Gwinn	Morano	Thornberry
Haley	Morrison	Van Pelt
Halleck	Nelson	Velde
Harrison, Nebr.	Norrell	Vinson
Harvey	O'Brien, N. Y.	Walter
Healey	O'Hara, Minn.	Watts
Hillings	Patman	Wharton
Hinshaw	Perkins	Wilson, Calif.
Hoffman, Ill.	Phillips	Winstead
Hoffman, Mich.	Pilcher	Wolverton
Holifield	Pillion	Younger
Holt	Powell	
Hope	Quigley	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs.

On this vote:

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.

Mr. Donovan for, with Mr. Riehlman against.

Mr. Shuford for, with Mr. Jenkins against.

Mr. Cooley for, with Mr. Wolverton against.

Mr. Davidson for, with Mr. Younger against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Klein for, with Mr. Reed of New York against.

Mrs. Kelly of New York for, with Mr. Bow against.

Mr. Clark for, with Mr. LeCompte against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. McConnell against.

Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Morano against.

Mr. Gregory for, with Mr. Dolliver against.

Mr. Watts for, with Mr. Baker against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Johnson of California against.

Mr. Winstead for, with Mr. Wilson of California against.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Scudder against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Saylor against.

Mr. Shelley for, with Mr. Reece of Tennessee against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Harvey against,

Mr. Byrd for, with Mr. Gwinn against.

Mr. Carnahan for, with Mr. Jensen against.

Mr. Donohue for, with Mr. Holt against.

Mr. Doyle for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Hillings against.

Mr. Friedel for, with Mrs. St. George against.

Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Nelson against.

Mr. Engle for, with Mr. McIntire against.

Mr. Bowler for, with Mr. Gubser against.

Mr. Barrett for, with Mr. Fulton against.

Mr. Granahan for, with Mr. Gamble against.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Hinshaw against.

Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Wharton against.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Van Pelt against.

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Pillion against.

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Phillips against.

Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Dorn of New York against.

Mr. Machrowicz for, with Mr. Chiperfield against.
Mr. Kluczynski for, with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton against.
Mr. O'Brien of New York for, with Mr. Fjare against.
Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Hope against.
Mr. Pilcher for, with Mr. Velde against.
Mr. Healey for, with Mr. Mailliard against.
Mr. Quigley for, with Mr. Lipscomb against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Barden with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Alger.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Johansen.
Mr. Carlyle with Mr. Knox.
Mr. Deane with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Haley with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Scrivner.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mrs. Thompson of Michigan.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Harrison of Nebraska.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Perkins with Mr. Cole.
Mr. Ikard with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Norrell with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. HALE, Mr. REES of Kansas, and Mr. BROYHILL changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL AT BAY PINES, FLA.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced into the House a bill (H. R. 11368) that would provide for a Veterans' Administration general medical and surgical hospital of 1,000 beds at Bay Pines, Fla. Under this bill authorization for construction and the provision of funds necessary for this action are provided.

After a full 2-year study of the requirements of the veterans of Florida and complete research of all figures available to me this appears to be one of the outstanding veterans' needs requirements in the entire Nation. As I shall demonstrate in these remarks there actually exists a shortage of beds in this area. With the future of Florida, and particularly the west coast section of the State, indicating still greater population increases over the next few years with a highly disproportionate increase of veterans population the need will become more acute.

Three VA hospitals serve the State of Florida at this time at Lake City, Coral Gables, and Bay Pines. Recent surveys have been made by the Veterans' Administration and the Subcommittee of Hospital Inspections of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House. These reports, as well as information provided by Bay Pines Hospital Director, the Regional Office of the Veterans' Administration at Pass-A-Grille, the Florida State service office, reports of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, and the many veterans organizations as well as my own personal inspection of the present Bay Pines facility, are the basis of the facts and figures presented here.

The veterans population of the State of Florida has increased tremendously over the years since World War II. In 1946, the permanent veterans population of the State of Florida was 250,000. According to the 1955 figures this population had increased to 417,000 year round veteran residents. It is expected that in 1960 this figure will be even further increased and according to conservative estimates at this time the population will approach the 650,000 mark. In the latest reports, and I am sure that the figure is well under practical application, Florida had over 2 percent of the veterans population of the country. This is also not indicative of the general hospital needs of the State, for Florida also was the residence of 4.4 percent of all Spanish-American War veterans who average 78.2 years of age and 2.2 percent of the World War I veterans who average 62 years of age and who, because of their age, require a higher ratio of hospitalization than the younger men of the last war.

The consideration of new facilities at Bay Pines has long been a study of many sincerely concerned parties. At my request, in August of last year, a survey was made by the Veterans' Administration and a report prepared for the Administrator. I would include in these remarks the letter addressed to me from Mr. John S. Patterson, Acting Administrator, at the time, which is as follows:

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
St. Petersburg, Fla.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: In further reply to your letter of November 18, 1955, concerning the hospital at Bay Pines, Fla., the survey of that station has been completed. The need for additional modern facilities is recognized, particularly for the care of chronically ill patients.

In planning for our needs in this area, every effort will be made to meet these needs. This would, of course, include the move of the regional office medical clinic to the hospital.

Whatever plans are developed must necessarily be developed along with the long-range programing of our regional and nationwide requirements.

Please be assured that every consideration will be given to this hospital in the development of our modernization plans.

Sincerely,

JOHN S. PATTERSON,
Acting Administrator.

Thus, the VA is fully cognizant officially of the needs of the veteran in the First District of Florida.

In further substantiation of the necessity for more facilities in the immediate area is the report of the investigating committee of the Veterans' Affairs Committee that visited this facility and thoroughly studied the problem at Bay Pines. Included in its study was the recommendation of the manager of the Bay Pines Hospital, certainly a qualified and authoritative source of information on the needs as demonstrated by the day-to-day operation of this facility. His letter to the committee included the following comment upon the desirability of new and additional beds:

Excerpts from letter of Dr. K. A. Carroll, director of Bay Pines:

1. An additional modern hospital be constructed to provide not less than 750 beds for the care of General Medical and Surgical hospitalized patients.

2. Each morning we must decide who we may admit from a list of 10 or 15 so-called emergency cases requiring immediate hospitalization. We are able to take 5 or 6 of these patients and all is well. However, those that are delayed and cannot be admitted until the next day or the day following, of course, some of these patients may die before they are admitted to the hospital.

This is substantial evidence of the requirements as seen through the eyes of one who administers to the needs of the veterans of the area at the present time and upon whom lies the responsibility for future plans.

I further believe that the investigating committee of the House fully established to their satisfaction that additional beds are required at Bay Pines. In their report issued January 17 of this year the following statements were made:

1. Florida presents a rather unique situation, in that there has been and is a continuing large influx of population, bringing with it a sizable number of veterans. The fact obviously increases the demand for hospital and medical care.

2. Previous requests for nonbed betterments for Bay Pines have, in the opinion of the manager, largely been canceled due to the consideration which is now being given to the possible erection of a new hospital at this site to take care of the hospital cases and use the present structures for the domiciliary members.

By factual application of presently available figures the present need of additional facilities in the State and particularly the west coast area of Florida can be established as well as a still greater need in the immediate future.

The present general medical and surgical bed availability at Florida hospitals:

Lake City	378
Bay Pines	522
Coral Gables	450

Waiting lists—February 1, 1955—eligible pending patients—service and nonservice connected:

Lake City	160
Bay Pines	594
Coral Gables	97

NOTE.—872 Florida patients at times were hospitalized outside of the State.

From the above figures it can be determined that the Bay Pines service area is without a doubt the heaviest in Florida of concentrated veterans population.

The ratio of veterans per VA bed: 185 to 1.

The ratio of veterans per bed: Florida, 309 to 1.

With the indicated increase of veterans in the State this ratio will continue to be further out of proportion.

Using the figures earlier presented in application to the estimates of the Veterans' Administration we can further

develop the following picture of increased need for additional beds in Florida hospitals:

Estimated 3,752,000 living veterans in 1960 with service-connected disability:	
1955 service-connected patients in hospitals	107,000
1970 service-connected patients in hospitals	115,000
Florida has 2 percent (low) of United States veterans population.	
In 1960 Florida hospitals would need beds for	2,300
Total now available (3 hospitals)	1,350
Florida shortage of beds for service-connected patients in 1960	950

The evidence of the figures presented here already show that Florida VA hospitals are overcrowded with a total waiting list of 851 patients on a given day; that they are strained to capacity at the present time; that the potential veterans load for hospitals in Florida is well above the national average, and that in the immediate future, applying the most conservative estimates, it is indicated that there will be an extreme need for beds, particularly in the Bay Pines service area, even for service-connected disability veterans alone.

It is not extraneous to note at this time that many veterans with service-connected disability come to Florida primarily because of the climate. There they find in the mild weather relief from many of their ailments. In actuality through their better general condition as residents of a State with favorable weather they have saved the Veterans' Administration thousands of dollars annually through a lowering of their hospitalization time. This factor increases with the age of the veteran. Such residence should be encouraged by the VA and at the same time cognizance should be taken of this desirable residence trend and facilities provided to meet the increasing demand.

The Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee report has stated that—

> The Veterans' Administration has an authorized program for 174 hospitals with an ultimate constructed bed capacity of approximately 128,205, according to the plan of December 31, 1954. There is no statutory ceiling on VA bed construction.

The VA reports that all these authorized beds have been committed.

In recognizing that at the present time there are many VA hospitals in the Nation not utilizing their full bed capacity I believe that it is incumbent upon the Veterans' Administration to immediately make a survey of the geographical demands for beds. I feel certain that the results would show that adjustment of allocations to the various areas would be fully justified. Although it has been the policy of the Veterans' Administration in an emergency to suggest that veterans could be hospitalized at remote places from their residence, as we have noted has been done in 872 cases of Florida veterans, this has not proved practical and involves added expense both to the veteran and the Veterans' Administration. The separation of a veteran from his family and his home is not the answer to recovery from his ills. It is my opinion that the VA should meet the veteran demands for hospitalization, and not require the veteran to meet the convenience of that agency. This is the practical and medically sound approach to the problem.

As of this date there is no firm program for nonbed betterment or new bed construction at Bay Pines. The reason for this is that there had been no recent official Veterans' Administration investigation or survey made of the needs of the district and the hospital upon which to base a program. Now that this survey has been completed, I have strongly urged that a program providing for treatment for more veterans be included in the anticipated new long-range hospital improvement program by the Veterans' Administration which I understand is now under consideration and scheduled to start in 1958.

In the results of a survey, as I have suggested, I believe that we will find it advisable to reduce the number of beds in certain areas that are now operated at considerable expense and, under the overall program and within the bounds of the present number of authorized beds, establish new facilities where the need is well demonstrated and as requested in my bill.

Another of the problems facing the Veterans' Administration today is that of staffing the hospitals with trained personnel. Through personal experience I can advise this House of Congress that this problem is not existent at Bay Pines. A continuing waiting list of applicants for residence and service at this hospital is available and employment in the area has been considered highly desirable.

The responsibility of the care of veterans who have served in the defense of our Nation falls directly upon us as representatives of this great and free Nation. When conditions exist in the available services for these men and women as they now do in the west coast area of Florida, it is our great responsibility to correct such inequities. This is in no way a criticism of the Veterans' Administration for they have heretofore cooperated in the research needed for my presentation but their action is hampered by the total bed limitation under which they now operate. For these reasons and the extreme need that I have endeavored to present here I sincerely urge your immediate study in committee and by action in the House support of this bill that would provide relief from dangerous hospital congestion in the district that I am honored to represent.

WIDOW ELIGIBILITY FOR VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION BENEFITS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 506 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10542) to liberalize certain criteria for determining eligibility of widows for benefits. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, and at the conclusion of my remarks, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of debate on the bill.

H. R. 10542 would liberalize certain criteria for determining eligibility of widows for pensions by providing that a widow would be entitled to benefits if she were married to the veteran for 5 or more years, or any period of time if a child were born of the marriage. At the present time the laws vary widely, but this provision would be uniformly applicable to claims of widows of all wars, the Korean conflict and peacetime service.

It is interesting to note that the records show that presently the Federal Government is paying pensions to eight widows of veterans of the Mexican War of 1845.

We are paying 5,100 pensions to widows of veterans of the Civil War.

We are paying 1,202 pensions to widows of veterans of the Indian wars, scattered skirmishes for about a dozen years from the 1870's through into the 1880's.

Currently we are paying 78,725 widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War and the Philippine insurrection.

Section 2 of the bill authorizes the recognition of certain purported marriages as valid if the widow can satisfactorily prove that she entered into the marriage in good faith with no knowledge that any legal impediment existed, and she lived with the veteran for 5 or more years immediately prior to his death. This recognition would not be afforded if a claim were filed by the legal widow of a veteran who is found to be entitled to death benefits. In other words, the bill specifically prohibits duplicate payments.

The Veterans' Administration has no objection to the enactment of this legislation.

I urge the adoption of House Resolution 506.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know of no one opposing the rule. As a matter of fact, I do not know of anyone opposing the bill itself. Therefore I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I take these few minutes to digress from other affairs which are before the House to call to your attention an organization unique in its objectives and operations, and give to this fine organization praise and commendation which it richly merits. I refer to the Civil Air Patrol, the civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force.

For those throughout the country who may not be familiar with the Civil Air Patrol, I will give you a very brief description of its working history.

Founded in December of 1941, its senior members assisted the Armed Forces in the performance of many vital missions within the continental limits of the United States in addition to flying coastal antisubmarine patrol. Since the close of the war the Civil Air Patrol has been serving in many peacetime assignments, such as search and rescue missions ordered by the USAF, forest-fire patrol, disaster relief missions in cooperation with the Red Cross and Civil Defense officials, as well as scores of mercy missions.

The 79th Congress, through Public Law 476, officially recognized the Civil Air Patrol by granting it a charter and assigning as some of its objectives the tasks of providing aviation education and training to both cadet and senior members; of encouraging and fostering aviation in local communities; of providing an organization of private citizens with adequate facilities to assist in meeting local and national emergencies, and to keep alive America's interest in air supremacy.

Its senior members have had the continuing project of serving as educators in CAP's youth aviation program for its cadets while conducting some of the more dramatic assignments on an emergency basis.

Today its ranks are comprised of 91,000 members, more than 51,000 of whom are teen-age cadets. Each year about 15,000 of these young Americans graduate from the organization to assume their place as adult citizens in their respective communities. They are adult citizens who are fully aware of their responsibilities in this air age.

You perhaps wonder why today we are concerned with the Civil Air Patrol which has been in operation for 15 years. The concern we have for CAP is the same concern we have for our airpower. The pages of our newspapers and magazines have been filled with the questions: Are we losing? Are we winning? Or are we maintaining our air supremacy?

We read that Russia is producing long-range jets more rapidly than we. The United States output of 6 planes per month is to be stepped up gradually to 20 planes per month. About 2 years from now the Soviet Air Force—in terms of numbers of planes—will be far ahead of ours. The U. S. S. R. devotes much of its national effort to the production of aircraft. The Soviet also pays much attention to the air education of its youth. Reports reaching us tell of mandatory youth aviation education programs in almost every major school in the Soviet Union.

They offer aeronautical training at little or no cost to their youth. As a result, Russia is outstripping us in the numbers of graduate engineers, technicians, and student pilots.

The American people, on the other hand, have developed an apparent lethargy toward aviation and its problems. There is an alarming lack of motivation among our young people to choose aviation careers as pilots, engineers, technicians, and as members of the Air Force and the air arms of other branches of the services. It is small wonder that the aircraft industry and the Department of Defense are constantly looking for new ideas, new products, and qualified personnel. The Nation's need for technical people and pilots has far outdistanced the supply.

We are making a token effort to compensate for our lag in aircraft production by increasing the rate from 6 to 20 long-range jets monthly. This, at least, is a step in the right direction. But when it comes to the technically trained personnel who will maintain and fly the planes of tomorrow, our steps falter. We are doing too little for too few of our youth in the field of aviation education. As a result, aviation, both commercial and military, will lose a tremendous manpower potential. Members of the NATO countries, seeing the problem clearer than our Nation, have taken definite steps to insure their aviation future. France, England, Canada, Spain, Finland, Sweden, Holland, and Belgium, among others, have an adequate and active air-youth program. We must keep pace or become stragglers. The bond which once existed between the teen-age American and the airplane is almost gone. But I believe that a workable solution to some of these problems can be found within the framework of the Civil Air Patrol.

Certainly the Civil Air Patrol is not the only answer to the need for alert young men and women in America's aviation industry and in our Armed Forces, but it is one of the answers.

This week, as its leaders from across the country meet here in Washington to map the future of CAP, let me urge you to learn, as I have, about the Civil Air Patrol. The members of this volunteer organization are serving America in many ways in an increasing effort to keep our Nation first in aviation.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of Tennessee). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10542) to liberalize certain criteria for determining eligibility of widows for benefits.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10542, with Mr. ABERNETHY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] is recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to briefly explain the provision of H. R. 10542, which was unanimously reported from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on April 24.

This bill seeks to accomplish two objectives—

First. Provide a uniform definition of "widow" as one who was married to the veteran for 5 or more years or for any period in which a child was born of the marriage;

Second. Authorizes the recognition of certain marriages as valid.

The first objective is identical to that contained in section 102 (8) of H. R. 7089 which passed the House unanimously in July of 1955—this bill related solely to compensation cases, while H. R. 10542 would apply to both compensation and pension. Today there is a specific marriage date for each war—

Indian wars: March 3, 1917.

Civil War: January 27, 1905.

Spanish-American War: January 1, 1938—pension.

Spanish-American War: September 1, 1922—compensation.

World War I: December 14, 1944.

World War II: December 31, 1956.

Korean conflict: January 31, 1965.

For widows of World War I or earlier wars there is an alternative provision of being married to the veteran for 10 or more years prior to the veteran's death. The bill, H. R. 10542, would thus provide for greater uniformity in the administration and application of veterans' laws. The cost of this section is estimated at $5,887,000 the first year, involving less than 10,000 widows. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has no objection to this section.

Section 2 of the bill seeks to provide a measure of justice for widows who entered into what they considered to be valid marriages and later discovered that a legal impediment existed to a valid marriage. For example, a woman marries a veteran who believes that he has obtained a valid divorce from his first wife. He neglects to advise his second wife of his first marriage. At the time of the veteran's death the widow or second wife discovers for the first time the real facts concerning her marriage. This bill would provide that where such a widow had lived with the veteran for 5 or more years prior to his death she shall be entitled to pension or compensation if the legal widow does not file a claim. Duplicate payments would not be made. A recent study by the VA has indicated that the present law produces harsh results. The Administrator of

Veterans' Affairs favors this section in principle.

Both sections of this bill were considered in hearings before the full Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this bill may be passed and enacted into law.

Thirty-one and eight-tenths million participants in all wars through Sept. 30, 1955

Revolutionary (1775–83):	
Participants	395,000
Deaths in service	4,000
Last veteran died Apr. 5, 1869, age 109.	
Last dependent died 1906, age 92.	
War of 1812 (1812–14):	
Participants	536,000
Deaths in service	2,000
Last veteran died May 13, 1905, age 105.	
Last dependent died 1946, age (?).	
Mexican War (1846–48):	
Participants	130,000
Deaths in service	13,000
Last veteran died Sept. 3, 1929, age 98.	

DEPENDENTS ON COMPENSATION AND PENSION ROLLS

Widows	8
Children	1
Civil War (1861–65) (Union forces only):	
Participants	2,213,000
Deaths in service	364,000
Living veterans (Oct. 31, 1955)	1

VETERANS AND DEPENDENTS ON COMPENSATION AND PENSION ROLLS

Widows	4,931
Children	1,045
Veterans	1
Indian wars (approximately 1860–98):	
Participants	106,000
Deaths in service	1,000
Living veterans (Oct. 31, 1955)	176

VETERANS AND DEPENDENTS ON COMPENSATION AND PENSION ROLLS

Widows	1,202
Children	23
Veterans	176
Spanish-American War (1898–1902):	
Participants	392,000
Deaths in service	11,000
Living veterans (Oct. 31, 1955)	69,000

VETERANS AND DEPENDENTS ON COMPENSATION AND PENSION ROLLS

Parents	13
Widows	80,860
Children	3,021
Veterans	57,718
World War I (1917–18):	
Participants	4,744,000
Deaths in service	131,000
Living veterans (Oct. 31, 1955)	3,120,000

VETERANS AND DEPENDENTS ON COMPENSATION AND PENSION ROLLS

Parents	21,310
Widows	320,901
Children	104,409
Veterans	730,343
World War II (Sept. 16, 1940–July 25, 1947):	
Participants	[1] 16,535,000
Deaths in service	409,000
Living veterans (Oct. 31, 1955)	[2] 15,395,000

[1] Includes 1,476,000 who served in both World War II and the Korean conflict.

[2] Includes 838,000 with service in both World War II and the Korean conflict.

Thirty-one and eight-tenths million participants in all wars through Sept. 30, 1955—Continued

VETERANS AND DEPENDENTS ON COMPENSATION AND PENSION ROLLS

Parents	263,163
Widows	76,997
Children	183,989
Veterans	1,672,716
Korean conflict (June 27, 1950–Jan. 31, 1955):	
Participants	[1] 6,807,000
Deaths in service	54,000
Living veterans (Oct. 31, 1955)	[2] 4,242,000

VETERANS AND DEPENDENTS ON COMPENSATION AND PENSION ROLLS

Parents	35,530
Widows	10,422
Children	19,977
Veterans	164,373
Total, all wars:	
Participants [3]	31,858,000
Deaths in service	989,000
Living veterans (Oct. 31, 1955)	[4] 22,051,000

VETERANS AND DEPENDENTS ON COMPENSATION AND PENSION ROLLS

Parents	[5] 331,468
Widows	[6] 504,111
Children	[7] 320,249
Veterans	[4] 2,688,582

[3] Persons who served in more than one war are counted as participants in each.

[4] Includes approximately 63,000 former members of the (peacetime) Regular Establishment who are receiving VA disability compensation.

[5] Includes 11,452 parents of deceased former members of the (peacetime) Regular Establishment.

[6] Includes 8,790 widows of deceased former members of the (peacetime) Regular Establishment.

[7] Includes 7,784 children of deceased former members of the (peacetime) Regular Establishment.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. AYRES. I wish to commend the gentleman on introducing this bill and following it through the subcommittee and full Committee on Veterans' Affairs, because in my judgment it will correct many inequities that have occurred regarding the widows of veterans.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman for his excellent support in this matter.

Of course, not only were the members of the committee interested in this particular bill and similar bills correcting some of the harsh treatment that exists under some of the laws, but there were many other Members, I might say, outside of the members on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, who were concerned and who did introduce bills concerning this and similar subjects.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I wish to commend our colleague from California for the very fine presentation he has made on this bill. It was my pleasure to introduce H. R. 5134 which covered one facet of the provisions contained in the piece of legislation presently before us.

My bill provided for the reduction in time that a widow of the World War I veteran would have to be married to be entitled to benefits from 10 to 5 years. That is covered in the bill as discussed by our colleague from California and I wholeheartedly support the gentleman in his statement.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman from Alabama for his support.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I will take no time myself.

I am heartily in favor of the bill. It is so difficult for the widows at best. I think every Member is in favor of it and I hope it will pass quickly. Many Members are going back to their districts today to speak on veteran matters and I think the best way to help the veterans and to speed them on their way would be to pass this bill immediately.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, this bill merely simplifies and standardizes and in some instances liberalizes Government policies with reference to benefits to widows of veterans of the various wars. I am heartily in support of the bill.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. How does this affect widows of Spanish-American War veterans?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They would come under the provisions of the bill. They are very well taken care of now.

The Veterans' Administration is in favor of this bill.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. They would have to be married how many years before the death of the veteran in order to qualify?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Five years, and if there is a child, the length of time is of no consequence, they qualify automatically under this bill. And where there are hardship cases of Spanish-American War widows, for instance a woman who thought she was married only to find out much later that she had not been legally married, she would still receive benefits. There have been many injustices and hardships under the present law. The Veterans' Administration would be glad to see the injustices rectified.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Then I understand if a woman had been married to the veteran 5 years before his death under this bill she would qualify for the widow's pension?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And if there was a child, any time, no matter how short the marriage.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I commend the committee of which the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is such a valuable and beloved member for reporting out this measure. It will be most helpful in a number of cases of widows of Spanish War veterans. I might add that my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN] and I are very much interested in the case of one Spanish-American War widow who lived many years with her husband in marital happiness yet lacks only a few days of qualifying for a

pension under existing law. I am happy that under this bill she and other widows similarly situated will qualify.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this bill and I hope it will receive the favorable consideration of the House.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Gladly.

Mr. KEATING. Three or four instances have been brought to my attention where widows were not able to qualify because of the present provisions of the law. I think it is a very constructive move to have this matter of qualification made uniform and to provide for all widows.

I commend the gentlewoman and this committee on bringing this bill out. I am very happy to support it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There has been a great deal of variance in the interpretation of the law.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I was very pleased to support the bill when considering it in committee and again now. It does tend to make uniform the laws as to the treatment of widows of various wars and would make the benefits more uniform. I urge favorable consideration of the bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the date on which a woman married a veteran shall not disqualify her for pension or compensation under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration if she was married to him—

(1) for 5 or more years; or

(2) for any period of time and a child was born of the marriage.

SEC. 2. Whenever, in the consideration of any claim filed by a woman as the widow of a veteran for gratuitous death benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, it is established by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs that she, without knowledge of any legal impediment, entered into a marriage with such veteran which, but for a legal impediment, would have been valid, and thereafter cohabited with him for 5 or more years immediately before his death, the purported marriage shall be deemed to be a valid marriage, but only if no claim has been filed by a legal widow of such veteran who is found to be entitled to such benefits. No duplicate payments shall be made by virtue of this section.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month which begins after the date of its enactment.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK) having assumed the Chair, Mr. ABERNETHY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10542) to liberalize certain criteria for determining eligibility of widows for benefits, pursuant to House Resolution 506, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

STATEMENT ON H. R. 10542 84TH CONGRESS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 10542, 84th Congress, proposes to liberalize certain criteria for determining the eligibility of widows for certain benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

All laws administered by the Veterans' Administration pertaining to the payment of death compensation or death pension, with one minor exception, include, as an element of entitlement, a requirement that the widow must have been married to the veteran prior to a specified date. There is disparity between the dates applicable to the widows of veterans of the various wars. In addition, some laws include an alternative requirement that the widow must have been married to the veteran 10 or more years prior to the date of his death. Section 1 of H. R. 10542 would not specifically change the existing marriage date requirements, but would preclude the Veterans' Administration from disqualifying a widow for compensation or pension who could not meet such requirements if she was married to the veteran for 5 or more years or for any period of time, if a child was born of the marriage. The proposal has a desirable objective to provide uniformity in this area among widows of veterans.

Under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, a person claiming gratuitous benefits as the widow of a veteran must establish that she is his legal widow. The Veterans' Administration recently conducted a study of this matter which revealed that application of the law has sometimes produced harsh results. Accordingly, the Veterans' Administration recommended the enactment of amendatory legislation. Section 2 of H. R. 10542, embodies in principle the provisions of the Veterans' Administration proposal. It would authorize the recognition as valid of a purported marriage which the woman entered into without knowledge of any legal impediment to the marriage, after which she lived with the veteran for 5 or more years immediately before his death. This would be permitted only if no claim has been filed by a legal widow of such veteran who is found to be entitled to such benefits.

I believe the bill is meritorious and am confident it will be favorably considered by the House.

A recent study revealed that application of the present law has sometimes produced harsh results. The study disclosed a number of cases where a claimant was unable to establish that a prior marriage on the part of either the veteran or herself had been legally dissolved, with the result that benefits were denied, notwithstanding that in good faith she entered into a marriage with the veteran.

Would have no objection to the enactment of section 1, and favor section 2 in principle.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4656. An act relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the bill H. R. 11356.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

LUMBEE INDIANS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4656) relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 16, after "States." insert "Nothing in this act shall make such Indians eligible for any services performed by the United States for Indians because of

their status as Indians, and none of the statutes of the United States which affect Indians because of their status as Indians shall be applicable to the Lumbee Indians."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PURCHASE AND RESALE TRANSACTIONS OF CHEESE AND BUTTER BY COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the house for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objecton.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in July of 1955 the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations conducted hearings with respect to certain purchase and resale transactions of cheese and butter. These hearings received wide publicity in the press. Since that date no report has been filed by the committee though statements by at least one member thereof have been made to the press.

Within the past weeks the Attorney General has filed suits against three of the many firms who entered into the cheese transactions. These suits will permit judicial determination of the issues involved. The subcommittee, yesterday, at a public hearing, again went into certain aspects of these transactions. I am gravely concerned over the propriety of such public hearings and the filing of reports after litigation has been entered into. At such hearing not only were the press present but also counsel for one and possibly more of the defendants in the litigation.

During the hearing yesterday the subcommittee also questioned the announcement of the President and the action of the Secretary of Agriculture in increasing the price support on dairy products on April 18—because it was after the beginning of the marketing year. It seems inconceivable to me that the subcommittee would raise any question about action of this kind in view of the great benefits which would accrue to dairy farmers as a result of it. However, I feel sure the officials of the Department of Agriculture were able to convince the subcommittee that this action was legally and administratively appropriate.

Among other things which the subcommittee inquired into yesterday was with respect to the increase in the support price of milk and butterfat announced by the President on April 18, 1956. The opening statement of the chairman presented a charge that purchases by Commodity Credit Corporation on and after April 18 at the increased prices of dairy products manufactured after April 1 resulted in unjustified windfall through sales of products to the Government which may have been manufactured between April 1 and the 18th. The evidence at the hearing completely refuted this charge. Any increase in dairy support prices results in an increased market price, and since the Government only purchases a small percentage of the entire dairy production, inventories in processors' hands flow into the market at the increased market price. The Commodity Credit Corporation, for the first time in the history of dairy price support, though there have been other increases in the past, placed a manufacturing date—in this instance, April 1, 1956—subsequent to which cheese products had to be manufactured in order to be sold to it at this increased price. This was for the purpose of receiving the fresher stocks of cheese while making its purchases upon the market, since it already held a large inventory of aged cheese. It was a precautionary measure. In the long history of similar price-support announcements the practice has been to accept any products in the hands of the trade at the time the announcement was made.

In response to questioning concerning the novelty of the purchase and resale transactions, attorneys for the Department placed before the committee a brief upholding the validity of these transactions and pointing out a long history of purchase and resale transactions by the Corporation which had been fully reviewed and considered in prior years by the Congress. A copy of this brief is submitted as a part of my statement.

I might add that in any litigation by the Government for recoupment of moneys paid to the offerors a court would arrive at the same conclusion as taken in this brief under the rule of construction that where contracts are in the language of the Government's own officials as the draftsmen, they are to be construed most strongly against the Government—*United States* v. *Bostwick* (94 U. S. 53 (1876); *United States* v. *Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co.* (178 Fed. 194 (4th Cir. 1910)); *Pfotzer* v. *United States* (77 F. Supp. 390, 111 Ct. Cl. 184 (1948); certiorari denied, 335 U. S. 885); *Standard Rice Co.* v. *United States* (531, Supp. 717, 101 Ct. Cl. 85 (1944), affirmed, 323 U. S. 106).

It seems inconceivable that a court would construe this contract—DA–112—as being other than what the parties intended it to be. The parties acted in good faith. The contract achieved the price support objectives for which it was designed. Many of the processors may well claim that they changed their position in reliance upon the contract since they could have sold their products to CCC under its regular purchase announcements—DA–99 and 100—and such products would have been available for repurchase by them under CCC's regular published sales policies at the same resale price as that provided for under announcement DA–112.

The brief follows:

VALIDITY OF PURCHASES AND RESALES UNDER ANNOUNCEMENT DA 112

The purchase and resale transactions of DA 112 do not involve a novel conception of purchase by CCC but, on the contrary, are of a type which has been utilized extensively with full congressional knowledge and approval.

Admittedly, the purchase operations in question were not of a type commonly found in commercial transactions. Since price-support purchases by Commodity Credit Corporation do not have the same aims and objectives and, therefore, do not follow the same techniques as commercial transactions, the validity of these transactions should not be tested by ordinary legal concepts of a commercial purchase. The type of purchase and resale transaction in question has been recognized and given sanction by the Congress.

Beginning in 1942, the Commodity Credit Corporation, under its Delaware charter authority to buy and sell commodities, conducted purchase and resale operations for the purpose of enabling processors to pay producers the desired levels for the farm commodities and to sell their processed commodities within price ceilings which were not sufficient or high enough to cover such raw-product costs. Such purchase and resale operations were conducted with respect to a large number of commodities, including cheese, milk, soybeans, fruits, vegetables, and sugar beets. In these operations, the Corporation entered into a contract with the processor under which the Corporation purchased the product from the processor at one price and immediately resold it to the processor at a lower price level, making a payment to the processor for the difference between the purchase and the resale price. Payments to cheese processors alone amounted to more than $67 million. Under such contract the Corporation obtained title only momentarily. It did not acquire possession, or the right to possession, nor was the commodity at any time withheld from the market. Congress recognized the validity of these purchase and resale transactions and enacted legislation to provide for their continuance.

At the time Congress was considering legislation to extend the life of Commodity Credit Corporation beyond June 30, 1943, the method by which the purchase and resale operations of the Corporation were conducted was set forth in detail in the hearings before the House Committee on Banking and Currency, 78th Congress, 1st session, on H. R. 2725 (superseded by H. R. 2869). See pages 14–17, 22, 64 and following pages, 82–83, 90–97, 103–104, 113–123, 143 and following pages, 157–166, 208, 231–233, 235, 254–257, 260–261, 262–269. Also see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, June 19, 1943, page A3330 and following pages; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 23, 1943, page 6400 and following pages and page 6415; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 24, 1943, page 6471; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 30, 1943, page 6904.

Copies of the forms of contracts used by Commodity Credit Corporation in the purchase and resale operations for cheese and milk were furnished the committee and placed in the hearing record referred to above. See pages 157–166 of the hearings on House Resolution 2725.

The legal authority for the conduct of such operations was explained to exist in the charter authority to buy and sell. See in particular, pages 113–116 of the hearings referred to above. The validity of these purchase and resale transactions were accepted by the Congress. A principal issue in connection with this matter was whether any limitation should be placed upon such operations. See Senator Taft's statements at pages 6476–6477 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 24, 1943, and see page 6542 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 25, 1943, where the following statement by Senator Taft appears:

"Furthermore, entirely apart from the Price Control Act, the Commodity Credit Corporation has the power to buy and sell commodities, and it has bought and sold commodities at a loss before this time."

The life of the Commodity Credit Corporation was extended by this legislation without placing any limitations on the authority of the Corporation to conduct such purchase and resale operations.

The Emergency Price Control Act, as amended by the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944, prohibited any Government corporation after June 30, 1945, from buying any commodities for the purpose of selling them at a loss unless the money required for the sale at a loss had been appropriated by Congress for that purpose. The act of April 12, 1945, as amended, made this provision inapplicable to Commodity Credit Corporation except with respect to specified operations. The Senate Banking and Currency Committee, in reporting this legislation in Senate Report No. 32, 79th Congress, at pages 3 and 4, indicated that the limitations had no effect on payments or losses incident to operations which were not designed to hold price ceilings. The House Banking and Currency Committee, in reporting on the same legislation in House Report No. 58, at page 3, was to the same effect. The conference report on this legislation, conference report No. 395, indicated that the purpose and effect of the legislation, as approved by the conference committee, and the bill, as it passed the Senate, was identical, and that the legislation was not intended to limit payments or losses incident to such operations as * * * loans, purchases, or other price-support operations which do not involve supporting prices to producers at levels above those reflected by price ceilings. Since the expiration in 1947 of the prohibition in the Emergency Price Control Act with respect to the purchase for the purpose of resale at a loss, there has been no limitation upon the authority of Commodity Credit Corporation to conduct such operations.

The fact that in connection with some of these purchase and resale operations the right to possession of the commodities was not obtained by Commodity Credit Corporation has never been considered as invalidating the transaction as one of purchase and resale. The many transactions conducted by the Corporation on this basis have been audited by the General Accounting Office without any question having been raised with respect to this point. These transactions have been the subject of litigation and no question with respect to the necessity of possession by Commodity Credit Corporation of the commodity has been raised. See, for example, *United States* v. *Arkansas Mills* (216 F. 2d 241); *U. S.* v. *Turlock Dehydrating & Packing Co.* (116 F. Supp. 822); *Pelham Oil and Fertilizer Co.* v. *U. S.* (173 F. 2d 888); *Greenwood Products Co.* v. *U. S.* (118 F. 2d 401).

It is apparent, therefore, that the purchase and resale transactions of DA 112 do not involve a novel conception of purchase by Commodity Credit Corporation but, on the contrary, are of a type which has been utilized extensively with full congressional knowledge and approval.

We have been unable to find any authoritative decision which would invalidate, as between the parties to the contract, a purchase and resale transaction of the type undertaken in DA 112. We also note that the Controller General's opinion cites no such authority.

Tested by ordinary rules of law applicable to commercial transactions, the purchases under DA 112 gave Commodity Credit Corporation title to the products and a dominion over such products which effected a removal thereof from the market for a period of time extending from one marketing year into the next.

By announcement DA 112, offers were solicited for the sale of butter and cheese to Commodity Credit Corporation (hereinafter referred to as "CCC"), coupled with agreements to repurchase such commodities from it. Offers were to be submitted between the date of the announcement, March 9, 1954, and March 31, 1954, and were subject to acceptance by the CCC by telegram not later than the second business day following the receipt of the offer but in no event later than March 31, 1954.

Identification of the products covered by the offer and their appropriation to the pertinent contract were covered by paragraph 5 under which the offerer was required to furnish the USDA inspector with a manifest, listing the date of manufacture, the name and location of manufacturing plant, churn, vat, or lot numbers, number of packages in each churn, vat, or lot, and total packages in each carlot to be delivered under the contract. It was on the basis of this manifest that the inspections and the issuance of grade certificates were carried out and appropriations to the contracts effected. Butter was inspected and graded prior to its being offered for sale, which in no event could be later than March 31, 1954. Cheese also was inspected and graded not later than March 31, 1954, except where not feasible due to insufficient aging. In such cases grading was permitted through April 30, 1954, to allow for necessary aging. All inspection and grading was to be performed in the storage facility where the products was to be delivered to CCC, including the offerer's plant.

With respect to butter, delivery and transfer of title to CCC took place at the location at which it was graded, and at the time the offer was accepted—March 9 through March 31, 1954—and only in the case of cheese not sufficiently aged to permit inspection and grading on or before March 31, 1954, did delivery and passage of title to CCC take place after such date. However, with respect to such cheese, in no event could such delivery and passage of title take place later than April 30, 1954. In all cases delivery and passage of title took place where the product had been inspected and graded.

In connection with repurchase of the products from CCC by the offeror, the first sentence of paragraph 11 of the announcement states as follows: "Delivery by CCC to offeror shall be effected on April 1 or upon the date on which the commodity is delivered to CCC (i. e., date of grading), whichever is later." Thus the purchase and resale did not necessarily take place on the same day.

In this connection it is to be noted that, under the second sentence of paragraph 11, the offeror's right of repurchase was subject to his complying with paragraph 9 entitled "Delivery." This paragraph required, among other things, that the offerer, at his own expense hold for CCC the product which he delivered to CCC at the location at which it was graded from the time of delivery until CCC redelivered it to the offerer.

The contract provided that the offeror's failure to do so, "shall render the contract void." The Comptroller General stresses this provision but completely loses sight of the fact that a provision of this sort in a contract automatically does not render the contract a nullity but merely makes it voidable at the option of the injured party. *Stewart* v. *Griffith* (217 U. S. 323); *Bescayne Shores* v. *Cook* (67 F. 2d 144, 145); *Yancy* v. *Jeffreys* (8 P. 2d 774, 775); *Kelp Ore Remedies Corp.* v. *Brooten* (277 F. 716, 720, 129 Or. 357); *Bishop* v. *Hannon Real Estate Exchange* (255 N. W. 599, 267 Mich. 575); *Soeker* v. *Kerr* (213 S. W. 867, 569, 202 Mo. App. 22); *Bernard* v. *Sloan* (84 P. 232, 234, 2 Cal. App. 737); Williston on Contracts, sections 15 and 746 (Rev. Ed., 1936). Accordingly, in the event that the offeror moved the product from the place where it had been graded and delivered to CCC or disposed of a portion of such product, CCC could at its election, retain title to the product, claim possession, refuse to permit the offeror to repurchase, and ascertain action for breach of contract.

In keeping with the more usual type of commercial transaction, the announcement expressly contemplated yet another situation wherein CCC would retain title to the products. The first proviso in paragraph 10 of the agreement stated as follows:

"*Provided, however,* That if the CCC domestic sales price in effect on the date of redelivery to the offeror is greater than the March 31 CCC price support purchase price for the commodity concerned CCC will, at the offeror's request, amend his contract to relieve him of liability to repurchase the commodity and to provide for its sale to CCC under the terms of Announcement DA-99, 100, 101, and 102, as amended."

(As heretofore explained, except with respect to sales of cheese graded after April 1, such domestic sales price would not be known until after title had passed to CCC.) In the event that the offeror elected not to repurchase, the mechanics of the transactions and final payment would be governed by reference to Announcements 99 and 100 with respect to purchases of butter and cheese generally.

Clearly, it was the intention of the parties to consummate two distinct sales, complete in all essentials. In construing any contract it has been held that the intention of the parties to a contract controls its interpretation *In Re Binghamton Bridge* (70 U. S. 51 (1865)); *Ajax Gold Min. Co.* (141 F. 563 (C. C. A. Col. 1905)). Specifically, with reference to the transfer of title under a sales contract it is stated in the Uniform Sales Act, section 18:

"(1) Where there is a contract to sell specific or ascertained goods, the property in them is transferred to the buyer at such time as the parties to the contract intend it to be transferred."

In ascertaining the parties' intention, the Uniform Sales Act further states, in section 19:

"Rule 4: (1) Where there is a contract to sell unascertained or future goods by description, and goods of that description and in a deliverable state are unconditionally appropriated to the contract, either by a seller with the assent of the buyer, or by the buyer with the assent of the seller, the property in the goods thereupon passes to the buyer. Such assent may be expressed or implied, and may be given either before or after the appropriation is made."

The Sales Act thus recognizes that physical delivery of the goods into the hands of the buyer is not necessary to effect a passage of title, provided there has been an unconditional appropriation of the goods to the contract and the parties intend that title pass. This fundamental rule is followed by the Federal courts and is applied generally. See *United States* v. *County of Alleghany* (322 U. S. 174 (1944)); *Briggs* v. *United States* (143 U. S. 346 (1892)); *C. M. Hall Lamp Co.* v. *United States* (201 F. 2d 465 (6th Cir. 1953); 46 Am. Jur. Sales § 424, et seq.).

Such appropriation took place under paragraph 5 when the products were inspected and graded by the USDA inspector on the basis of the manifest furnished by the offerer. Thus, in the case of butter, title was vested in CCC at the time the offer was accepted. With respect to cheese, title passed at the time it was graded or at the time the offer was accepted, whichever was later. In both cases the intention of the parties was to effect a transfer of title to CCC in a manner which accords with rule 4 of the Uniform Sales Act.

Reference to other provisions in the announcement further show that the parties intended that CCC be vested with title to the goods. As previously explained, under the announcement the transfer to CCC and the sale back were never simultaneous transactions in the case of butter and were only simultaneous transactions in the case of cheese where any lot of cheese thereof

was graded after April 1, 1954. The seller was required at all times to store the products in facilities suitable to CCC and maintain the products in such storage until repurchase by the offerer. Compliance was a condition precedent to repurchase and upon a breach CCC was given the right to void the contract and retain the products. Further, the offerer was obligated to act as insurer of the products while stored for CCC. Such requirements could only be consistent with a binding contract and CCC's obtaining title to the products.

While, as we have noted above, failure to hold the products in the location where delivery was made would entitle CCC to treat the contract as void, it cannot be construed to have given the offerer the right to dispose of the product after delivery to CCC or the right not to make delivery where the offer to sell has been accepted by CCC. We stress this point because the Comptroller General, in his opinion, asserts that the announcement contains provisions which expressly relieve the offerer of any obligation to keep cheese offered to CCC off the market until the beginning of the new marketing year.

Further, although the same instrument provides for the sale and resale of the product, such arrangement does not vitiate the transaction. In Mechem on Sales, volume 1, section 688 (1901) it is stated as follows:

"There may also be contracts of present sale reserving to the seller the right to repurchase the goods upon terms agreed upon. In practice it is difficult often to determine whether a given contract having some of those aspects constitutes a pledge, a mortgage, a sale conditioned to be void upon the payment of a certain sum, or a sale with the privilege of repurchase. This is a difficulty to be dealt with in view of the terms of the contract, the circumstances of the case and the evident intention of parties. If it be found to constitute a present sale with a privilege of repurchase, the title passes at once, subject to the right of the seller to regain it upon complying with the conditions."

Stock is sometimes sold by a corporation to its employees with the agreement that the corporation will be entitled to repurchase the stock if the employee leaves the corporate employment within a specified time. The stock may not actually be issued to the employee but held for his account. Such contracts have been upheld as valid by the courts. See 48 A. L. R. 625; 66 A. L. R. 1182; *Harker* v. *Ralston Purina Co.* (45 F. 2d 929 (7th Cir. 1930), cert. denied, 284, U. S. 619); *Fleitman* v. *John M. Stone Cotton Mills* (186 Fed. 466 (5th Cir. 1911), cert. denied, 223 U. S. 723.)

Only by interpreting the contract in accordance with its terms to provide for two separate sales, for a transfer of title from the offeror to CCC and a separate sale of the product back to the offeror could each part of the contract be accorded meaning. Any other interpretation would have the effect of making a nullity of the various provisions referred to above. In this connection it has been held that the principles of general contract law are to be applied in the construction of Government contracts. *Priebe & Sons* v. *United States* (332 U. S. 407 (1947). Under such principles the intent of the parties to a contract must be deduced from the entire context of the contract; every part should be so construed as to be consistent with every other part and with the contract as a whole, and the instrument interpreted so as, if possible, to give a sensible meaning and effect to all its provisions. *Ladd* v. *Ladd* (49 U. S. (8 How.) 10 (1850)); *Roper* v. *Capital View Realty Co.* (107 F. 2d 833 (C. A. D. C., 1939)); *Uinta Tunnel Min. & Transp. Co.* v. *Ajax Gold Min. Co.* (141 Fed. 563 (8th Cir. 1905)).

If one were to take the view that there was no transfer of title from the offeror it would make any payments by CCC to the offeror a gratuity and thus unauthorized under present price support legislation. A court will strain to avoid an interpretation that would produce much a result where another possible interpretation exists. Thus, it was stated in *Great Northern Ry.* v. *Delmar* (283 U. S. 686, 691 (1931)):

"This conclusion is in accord with the principle that where two constructions of a written contract are possible, preference will be given to that which does not result in violation of law. Compare *Wilson* v. *Rousseau* (4 How. 646, 685); *Hobbs* v. *McLean* (117 U. S. 567, 576); *In Re Rose Co.* (275 Fed. 409); *Northern Pac. Ry. Co.* v. *St. Paul & Tacoma Lumber Co.* (4 F. 2d 359)."

Similarly, it was stated in *The Binghamton Bridge* (70 U. S. 51, 74 (1865)):

"It is not the duty of a court, by legal subtlety, to overthrow a contract, but rather to uphold it and give it effect."

UNITED STATES V. TURLOCK DEHYDRATING AND PACKING COMPANY (116 F. SUPP. 822)

In September 1945, the Commodity Credit Corporation entered into contracts with processors in which CCC agreed to purchase processed raisins of the 1945 crop from the processor and immediately to resell them to processors at a lower price. The contracts did not give CCC any rights, or control over the raisins for any length of time. The purpose of such purchase and resale was to assure an adequate supply of standard quality processed raisins for the need of Government agencies and civilian consumption and to assure the ordinary and proper marketing thereof within the OPA maximum ceiling prices. The contracts required the processors to describe the grade, type, quality, and packaging of the processed raisins and to warrant to CCC that they were of standard quality of the grade, type, and packaging described. The contracts provided that resales by CCC were without warranty.

A quantity of raisins sold to CCC and repurchased by the defendants was subsequently seized by the Pure Food and Drug Administration. CCC brought suit for breach of warranty as to the quality of the raisins. The court allowed recovery of the purchase price for the breach of warranty and held that the State law as to limitations, laches, and timely notice with respect to bringing suit as to breach of warranty did not apply.

WHAT PARITY MEANS

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, to my thinking, the freezing of the old parity formula in the farm bill is a decided mistake.

The New York Times for May 17, 1956, contained an excellent editorial entitled "What 'Parity' Means." It reviews the history of why modernized parity was written into the Agricultural Act of 1954, and why the transition from old to modernized parity should not be frozen for 1 year as prevailing farm legislation would do. It is as follows:

WHAT "PARITY" MEANS

Secretary of Agriculture Benson has pointed out several serious flaws in the newest Democratic farm bill. One of these, he said, is the compulsory "freeze" on parity prices.

The provision for "freezing" parity prices would apply to three of the so-called basic commodities—namely, corn, wheat and peanuts. This would revive the provision contained in the original catch-all farm bill, vetoed by the President last month, under which the producer of a commodity would be permitted to choose either the "old" parity formula or the "modernized" formula written into the law as far back as 1948, but against which the high support group has been fighting a stubborn rear-guard action ever since.

Up to 1948, parity was held to have been achieved by any commodity if its percentage increase over its average price in the "base period" (usually 1909–14) equaled the percentage by which the prices paid by farmers had increased above those of the same base period. This implied that the price of every commodity had advanced by the same percentage.

A study of price behavior carried out in connection with the Aiken farm bill of 1948 showed that costs of products had not increased uniformly, and that if the old parity system were continued the production of some commodities would continue to be overstimulated while the production of others would be discouraged. The new formula sought to correct this weakness in the law by revising the base prices of the various individual commodities so they would bear the same relationship to each other as they had borne in recent years.

Though it had been carefully considered and well thought out, the revised formula was not permitted to come into effect with other provisions of the 1948 act. Hijacked by the powerful rigid-support bloc, its effective date was put off until 1950. When, following the reelection of Mr. Truman, the law was rewritten in 1949 this provision for a modernized parity formula was pushed even further into the future. The 1949 act required that until 1954 the parity price for any basic commodity would be the parity price figured by either the new formula or the old, whichever was the higher.

Even in the new farm legislation of 1954 a transition period was provided for introducing the modernized parity formula. It was not to be initiated until 1956, and even then its introduction was to be by a series of short steps, or stages. What Secretary Benson means when he refers to the proposal in the pending legislation to "freeze parity prices" is that the high support group in Congress is still up to its same old tactics—namely, throwing up a road block to prevent the introduction of a basic economic reform that was originally legislated 8 years ago, but which this group has already succeeded, up to now, in preventing from going into effect.

Mr. Speaker, today the Department of Agriculture released its May issue of the Agricultural Outlook Digest. This issue contains good news for farmers in that the outlook for price increases this fall for many problem commodities is favorable.

For example, it indicates that the recent expansion in hog production is near an end, since:

First. Spring pig crop is being reduced more than farmers indicated would be the case last December, nearly 2 percent more.

Second. The peak of the fall hog slaughter should come earlier this year,

shortly after midsummer. Hog prices this fall should not be nearly as severe as last year.

Also it is encouraging to note that farmers are feeding fewer cattle this spring than last and at lighter weights. As a result, prices should continue their gradual upward trend with the peak coming in late summer or early fall.

Dairy farmers, it appears, will receive larger incomes from milk and butterfat sales this year than last. Greater consumption of fluid milk has resulted in increased prices in several major market areas.

Since all Members of the House may not have had an opportunity to see this publication, Mr. Speaker, I include it in my remarks:

[From the Agricultural Outlook Digest of May 1956]

The 2-year expansion in hog production is about ended.

The United States spring pig crop is being reduced more than the 2 percent planned last December, according to reports from farmers in nine States. Reports also point to a smaller crop this fall than last.

Slaughter of hogs will be down to last year's level sometime after midsummer. It will be below a year earlier in the fall when this spring's crop is being marketed. This siuation indicates that hog prices this fall will not drop as low as last year. The decline in the last half of 1955—in dollars or percent—was the sharpest on record.

Fewer fed cattle than last year, more cattle off grass are in prospect the remainder of 1956. Farmers are feeding fewer cattle than last spring and they are likely to sell them at lighter weights. Prices are likely to continue gradually upward, reaching year earlier levels in late summer or fall.

Large supply of feeder stock, low returns from cattle feeding last winter have weakened demand for feeders. Price spreads between the higher and lower grades of cattle in the fall are likely to be wider than last year.

Farmers are selling fewer cows for slaughter than last year. With the breeding herd being maintained, cattle production will continue heavy for some time.

DAIRY PRODUCTS

Farmers will receive more from sales of milk and butterfat this year than last. Production this year is likely to top the 1955 total of 123½ billion pounds by 3 to 4 billion. Prices also will be up. The Government has raised its purchase prices for butter and cheese and class I prices for fluid milk have been raised in several markets.

FATS AND OILS

The market for oil and oilseeds is strong. Soybean prices in mid-May were over a fourth above a year earlier and flaxseed was up about 15 percent. The edible vegetable oils, tallow, and grease are all higher than last year and lard has strengthened. Large exports are the main factor.

EGGS AND POULTRY

The hatch of replacement chicks for laying flocks this spring is showing only a small increase over 1955. Rising feed costs are probably the principle reason why the gain is smaller than indicated earlier. Since farmers have more old hens to replace than last year, the laying flock next January 1 probably will be close to a year earlier. Broiler and turkey production continues to run well ahead of last year.

FEED

Corn and many other feeds reached the highest price levels of the season in recent weeks. Market supplies of corn are likely to become tight before harvest because of the large quantity under the support program. Increased supports for 1956 corn, prospects for reduced acreages, unfavorable weather also have tended to boost feed prices.

WHEAT

Prospects for the winter crop were reduced during April. Estimated crop of 681 million bushels is 25 million bushels less than in 1955. If yields for spring wheat are average on the acreage farmers intended to plant in March, 188 million bushels would be produced. The total of 869 million would be the smallest wheat crop in 13 years and less than is likely to be used in the United States and exported.

FRUIT

The early peach crop in Southern States is again below average but far above last year's near failure. Strawberry production this year is expected to be up 23 percent from 1955. In California, large crops of plums and prunes are expected but the apricot crop will be down sharply from last year.

VEGETABLES

Canners and freezers are planning a larger pack this year than last. Acreage of 9 vegetables, processors intend to contract or plant is up 8 percent. Supplies of most processed vegetables are smaller and prices higher than in 1955.

Early May reports indicate the tonnage of vegetables for fresh market this spring will be up about 2 percent from last spring, 14 percent from average. Prices to farmers probably will average a little lower.

Fewer potatoes will be marketed in late spring and early summer than a year ago and prices are likely to average substantially higher.

COTTON

Prices have been rising steadily for several months. The April average for middling 15/16-inch at the 14 spot markets was 35.50 cents, 2.57 cents above the season's low of October. Domestic consumption continues to run ahead of last year while exports lag far behind.

TOBACCO

Cigarette output in the first quarter of 1956 was ahead of the same period of 1955 by 5 percent. Cigar output also was up but smoking tobacco production was down. Output of chewing tobacco and snuff was about the same.

PRICES

Prices received by farmers moved up an average of 4 percent from last December to mid-April. Livestock products, paced by meat animals, showed the largest increase but crops also averaged higher. Feed grains, potatoes, soybeans, and several other products continued to rise in central markets in the last month.

Prices paid by farmers also have risen a little since December. Farmers' prices in April were 82 percent of parity compared with 80 in December.

Wholesale prices for nearly all major groups of commodities are moving upward. But consumer prices generally continue stable.

INVESTIGATION OF LABOR RACKETEERING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I requested permission to address the House today in order to call the attention of my colleagues to a resolution which I have just introduced. It authorizes and directs the House Committee on Education and Labor to conduct a broad-scale investigation into labor racketeering.

I am sure that all Members of the House have read with concern about Mr. Victor Riesel, a labor reporter, who was blinded by a brutal attack just under 2 months ago.

This attack on Mr. Riesel underlines the importance of a prompt investigation of racketeering in our labor unions. We have known, of course, for some time that there have been powerful and ruthless minorities using certain unions as fronts for extortion, rackets, and graft and these activities have now culminated in the brutal blinding of Victor Riesel. It is high time, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that Congress make a careful study of the adequacy of antiracketeering legislation and enforcement machinery.

It may be of interest to the membership to know that I have received a considerable number of letters from all over the country since I wrote to the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, suggesting that a subcommittee be set up to investigate the possibility of a full-scale investigation. Without any question, the rank-and-file union members seem to be in favor of such an investigation. A number of letters I have received would indicate that. I would like to quote from a few of them.

From Batavia, N. Y., an individual writes:

BATAVIA, N. Y., *May 16, 1956.*

Hon. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, Jr.

ESTEEMED SIR: While I have no vote for your New Jersey representation, you have a vote in representing me and I wish to commend your suggestion that the Labor Committee of the House investigate the inhuman assault on Victor Riesel, and I trust that you may get something enacted that really will give these gangsters a real separation from their usual activities, and give reputable citizenry a chance, at least, for their lives and possible escape from violence.

You are doing good work and thank you for your interest.

Yours truly.

Another one says:

WANTAGH, N. Y., *May 12, 1956.*

SIR: For God's sake let us never forget one thing. Ninety-five percent of all union members want an investigation of labor racketeering by Congress.

The only ones who don't, are the remaining 5 percent, consisting of the labor racketeers themselves and their allies and hangers-on.

These labor racketeers want Congress to believe that they can deliver the votes of their union members.

If the men in Congress are really men; they will stand up and realize that no one delivers the union members vote of today. He delivers it himself; and any way he wants to.

I am a member of two unions. In one they have already gone to jail, and in the other union they are under indictment. We need, we want, and we cry for a congressional investigation.

Though Mr. George Meany cannot say so publicly, I happen to know, that he prays

for an all-out investigation to weed out the bums who have him hamstrung.

Good luck.

I have a number of letters which I should like to include at this point. They again demonstrate this same feeling that the Congress itself should take some action to examine the question of racketeering, and to see whether present legislation is adequate:

CHICAGO, ILL.

Congratulations on your proposal that the House Labor Committee investigate the acid-throwing attack on Victor Riesel.

The American people have been wondering how long our Government would ignore this attack.

CHICAGO, *May 18, 1956.*

Hon. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRELINGHUYSEN: Our Chicago American of May 15, 1956, editorially supports you strongly in your suggestion that a subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee be appointed to investigate thoroughly the whole field of racketeering in some labor unions.

My congratulations to you. Also, my hope that your suggestion may be acted upon quickly and with genuine vigor. It is my considered opinion that such an inquiry, looking to corrective legislation or the unbiased application of existing laws, would have the approval of at least 90 percent of the public including rank-and-file unionists, as well as that of many labor leaders themselves.

With sincere respect, I am,

Cordially yours,

GORDON L. HOSTETTER.

CHICAGO, *May 21, 1956.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you and best wishes for your success in getting a subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee to investigate racketeering in some of the labor unions.

It is most needed and timely.

God bless you and give you health and courage.

PEIO, CALIF., *May 18, 1956.*

Hon. PETER FREYLINGHUYSEN, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The enclosed clipping, an editorial from the Los Angeles Herald Express, refers to our debt to you for sponsoring this investigation of rival practices of constituted labor organizations. This query into the force and threats of these labor groups, up at the policymaking level, has been delayed much too long.

Of course, you need others to back you up in this stand. You just can't do it alone, so I am inserting here a little food for thought. The timid souls who fear labor opposition at election time may well note this fact.

Union policy is very seldom followed inside of a voting booth. That is a well known fact, and to illustrate this point may I recall to your mind the last campaign of Senator Robert Taft from Ohio?

The unions spent their funds, almost without limit, to defeat him. His State was Democratic but he took the issues to the factory towns and spoke from coal tipples to inform the voters about his views. He made it by a very large majority. Those Buckeyes respect intelligence and fair play. We feel the same here in California.

Good luck to you and may you have 400 more in the House with you.

Respectfully.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *May 18, 1956.*

Hon. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, Jr.
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate you for proposing the appointment of a subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee to investigate the field of labor racketeering and the criminal debasement of some sections of the union movement.

Sincerely yours.

NEWARK, N. J., *May 21, 1956.*

Hon. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, Jr.
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FRELINGHUYSEN: Again we are proud of your good work and courage, suggesting an investigation be made into the cruel attack on Victor Reisel, such a good man doing wonderful work, uncovering crime and now showing marvelous courage in his affliction, determined to carry on. The New York authorities certainly failed him.

Sincerely.

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 22, 1956.*

Hon. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRELINGHUYSEN: It was with real hope and certainly satisfaction that I noticed in the editorial of the Chicago American, May 15, your suggestion that a subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee be appointed to investigate the whole field of racketeering as it occurs in some of the labor Unions.

I think it is well past time that the illegal and immoral activities of the labor goons be brought into the spotlight of public opinion.

Respectfully yours.

(Copies to: Hon. WILLIAM E. MCVEY, Hon. MARGUERITE S. CHURCH, Mr. Gordon Hostetter.)

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 23, 1956.*

Hon. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRELINGHUYSEN: The Chicago American recently, in its editorial columns, commended you for your effort to have the House Education and Labor Committee appoint a subcommittee to investigate the racketeering and oppression in some labor unions. May I add my commendations to its?

I hope that your proposal is accepted as it certainly is becoming more and more necessary.

Sincerely yours.

SEATTLE, WASH., *May 16, 1956.*

Mr. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, Jr.,
Representative, of New Jersey,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I for one have been fighting for the same cause, which Mr. Riesel gave his sight. I trust you may find enough Congressmen who will back you without fear of losing the votes of the rank and file labor members, who I might add would back anyone on cleaning organized labor up. I am forwarding you for your guidance some of the rackets they have tried to put over here on the coast.

B. L. MILLIGAN.

DREXEL HILL, PA., *May 12, 1956.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FRELINGHUYSEN: I certainly agree with your view that the sulfuric acid assault on Victor Riesel raised the question whether existing legislation was adequate to combat labor racketeering.

Please press your suggestion that the House Labor Committee investigate this matter.

Very truly yours.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *May 18, 1956.*

Hon. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In case the attached editorial from a recent issue of the Chicago American did not happen to come to your attention, I am enclosing it and also wish to add the observation that I am sure that your efforts along the line indicated in the editorial will meet with the hearty approval, to state it mildly, of not less than millions of Americans. It was high time long ago that we did something about this thing of the tail wagging the dog.

We wish you success and we also wish to thank you for your efforts.

Generally speaking, I think it can be said without hesitation that members of unions are anxious to clean up their unions. They recognize, however, that it is not easy to dislodge racketeers who are willing to employ terror and intimidation—men apparently who are even willing to throw sulfuric acid in a man's eyes. These rank and file members need help. Unfortunately I think we must admit that some law-enforcement officers seem to have favored a hands-off policy with regard to racketeering inside labor unions.

This question is a large one, and it is very difficult to know how to handle it adequately. It is for that reason that I am suggesting that a joint effort be made, that Congress take a direct interest, and that it launch a full-scale investigation of this problem. Such an investigation, I need not add, would not be directed at labor unions as such, but only at certain unhealthy elements which have developed within the labor movement.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the gentleman on his presentation. As a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor on the Democratic side of the aisle, I would say, I think speaking for all of us, that we were shocked by what happened to Victor Riesel. I think that most of us would agree with the suggestion of the gentleman that there are areas in the labor movement in the country where a properly conducted investigation might prove worthwhile and might provide Congress with the facts necessary to enact proper legislation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that an investigation such as I am proposing would receive the wholehearted support of our great labor organizations of the AFL–CIO. I think without question that all loyal, honest union men throughout the Nation will encourage such an investigation. It is a small minority in labor, I think we all recognize, which gives the organized labor movement a bad name. Even though the average union member is anxious to clean house, this minority is difficult to dislodge without Government cooperation.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] and join with him in his suggestion that Congress conduct an investigation such as he is proposing. This was a dastardly act of assault committed on a man who had dedicated himself to exposing racketeers in organized labor. I certainly think that it is in order that we have a congressional investigation to aid and be in addition to what the law-enforcement agencies are doing.

I wanted to express myself in this way to my colleague from New Jersey, at this point.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, what strikes me most forcibly is the fact of Mr. Riesel's enormous courage, his wish to carry on, his concern for other people all the time. I think the proposed investigation is very important because this assault might have been committed by a Communist and not a labor man. I think it is extremely important to have that point cleared up if possible. I know that we all admire Mr. Riesel and I am sure he will be pleased with the gentleman's proposed action.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentlewoman. Speaking of courage, I should like to read an editorial from one of my local newspapers, the Perth Amboy (N. J.) Evening News, entitled "Man of Courage":

MAN OF COURAGE

Those who saw the picture of Victor Riesel on page 1 of yesterday's Evening News must have felt an overwhelming pity for the labor columnist who lost his eyesight when a thug threw acid in his face.

At the same time there was a feeling of indignation that such an inhuman thing could be done to a person who was aiding the forces of decency in this country by exposing racketeers in the labor movement.

Even though he is blind, Riesel is determined to continue his battle against gangsters.

"I have no sensitivity about being blind," Riesel told newspapermen. "I'll continue to go after the mobsters. They haven't scared me. They just haven't. I can't see but that doesn't mean I can't write the same kind of copy."

These are the words of a man of sheer, unadulterated courage. Society needs men like Riesel as a bulwark against the evil men who would plunder and corrupt if they were left to their own devices unopposed.

Mr. Speaker, I feel sure that our responsible union leaders will wish to cooperate in such an investigation. Mr. Meany is already doing a great job in his efforts to get rid of racketeers, but this, it seems to me, is plainly a job for the Government as well as the unions. What is needed is a concerted, all-out effort by the unions and the Government, all levels of Government, the law enforcement agencies as well as the legislative branch. A congressional investigation could help produce this type of an all-out attack on racketeering.

What could a congressional investigation do, you may ask? First of all, I think a primary purpose of an investigation would be to find out if new legislation to prevent racketeering should be enacted. Are our present laws adequate to do the job of preventing violence of this kind, of eliminating the unhealthy elements in our organized labor movement? These elements may be small but they are destructive, and can intimidate thousands of law-abiding citizens. If we could find out, as a result of an investigation whether new enforcement machinery is needed, we would know whether to enact new laws.

Such an investigation, of course, would have more than a simple legislative objective. It would point up to the public our determination to eliminate racketeering in all its forms. It would point to those particular areas where the problem presently exists, and perhaps arouse public opinion behind programs to eliminate it.

We might find out, furthermore, just how these racketeers operate, just what is being done and where. On the basis of these findings we should be able to control them, if we are determined to do so.

I think a very basic purpose of any congressional investigation of the kind that I am proposing would be to stimulate public interest in a very serious national problem. Furthermore, I think the congressional investigation would spur law-enforcement officials into greater action in combating racketeers. I am not suggesting that we should blame anyone because no one has been able to find out the identity of the thug who threw the acid in Mr. Riesel's face. However, if the legislative branch of the Government takes direct action and expresses its interest in this way, I do think it will give the law-enforcement officials greater encouragement to participate directly in fighting these labor racketeers.

A congressional investigation, furthermore, would encourage the rank-and-file union members, who are certainly very much opposed to the racketeering and to the graft and extortion which does exist in some unions. Without any question, also, a congressional investigation would help individuals and businesses in their efforts to oppose racketeers.

Finally, I think a congressional investigation would demonstrate to those corrupt elements in union organizations that the public will no longer continue to tolerate and condone such activities.

On the other hand, if such an investigation does not take place, I wonder what the public would conclude?

[From the New York Times of May 18, 1956.]

RIESEL TO RESUME WORK NEXT WEEK—ACID-BLINDED LABOR WRITER CAN TYPEWRITE BY TOUCH BUT WILL LEARN BRAILLE

(By Will Lissner)

As buoyant and dynamic as ever, Victor Riesel, newspaper labor columnist blinded when an assailant threw acid in his face, held a press interview yesterday at St. Clare's Hospital.

His purpose was to announce that he would return to work next week after leaving the hospital on Monday or Tuesday. But he turned the occasion into an object lesson in medical rehabilitation.

"I'm not sensitive about the fact that I'm blind," he said. "I can't see, but I can hear and I can feel."

He will learn Braille for note-taking "or anything else that will help me," he said. He can dictate, but it turned out that he does not have to.

"When I was in high school I fell in love with the typing teacher and I took her course," he explained. "I learned touch typing and I've used it ever since. I've just typed a statement"—he pulled out of his pocket a page from a yellow legal pad that bore 10 or 12 lines of neat typing—"but we'd better take the corn out of it."

GRATEFUL FOR MEDICAL CARE

"Corny or not, I do want to say a word of thanks to my doctor and the staff here," he insisted. "If it wasn't for them, I wouldn't be going back to work. They rebuilt me.

"Take a look at my face. Nearly perfect, isn't it?"

The eyes were shielded with gauze, but the only mark was a reddish patch in the center of his right cheek.

He no longer has a mustache. But that, he explained, was for surgical convenience. "Acid makes the hair grow," he remarked, feeling at his slightly thinning thatch. "I think I'll patent it as a hair restorer and sell it to bald newspaper men."

"Just my nose a bit scorched," he mused. "And to think that acid bleached the sidewalk. If they hadn't saved my face I wouldn't have been able to walk again in public.

"I can't begin to express my gratitude. That's not news for you fellows, of course. But it's one thing I've got to say—it's important to me."

FAVORS CONGRESS INQUIRY

He said that, "short of miracles," he had no hope of seeing again; the optic nerves are gone. He cannot point the finger at anyone for it. But he is convinced that the attack on April 5 as he emerged from Lindy's Restaurant at 51st Street and Broadway was plotted by underworld labor racketeers. He said he thought the authorities were doing all that could be done to find his assailant.

The police, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the district attorney's and the United States attorney's offices have questioned scores of witnesses in 5 weeks of intensive investigation. Every lead suggested by Mr. Riesel's labor writings has been explored. But, as far as is known, no fruitful line of inquiry has been developed.

He vigorously supported a proposal in Congress that there be an investigation by the Senate or the House of racketeer infiltration of the labor movement.

"It should be by friends of labor, like Senators PAUL DOUGLAS, IRVING IVES, or STYLES BRIDGES, or their counterparts in Congress," he said. "If it is carried on by men of good will it will command the respect of both sides, and the mobs can't cry that they're being persecuted by the Government."

[From the Newark Star-Ledger of May 18, 1956]

RIESEL URGES WAR ON MOBS

(By Jack Lotto)

NEW YORK, May 17 (INS).—Blinded and scarred—but unbowed—plucky Victor Riesel came out of his hospital bed today fighting his old foes, "sleazy labor racketeers."

The labor columnist pleaded emotionally for a thorough congressional investigation of mob rule in labor.

Later, Senator SMITH, Republican, of New Jersey, top GOP member of the Senate Labor Committee, suggested that the Justice Department make a special, sweeping inquiry. He said this would be more effective than the congressional investigation.

His face and hands bearing the ugly red blotches caused by searing sulfuric acid thrown at him 6 weeks ago, Riesel left his bed for the first time to meet fellow newsmen.

OLD BATTLE CRY

In typical fashion, the 41-year-old columnist greeted reporters with this "battle cry":

"These bums—these crumbs—they knocked me out for 6 weeks but that's all. I expect to leave the hospital next Monday or Tuesday, and the day after I will return to my office and my typewriter.

"These racketeers have not succeeded in discuoraging me or my staff. We will continue to fight them—we're going after these mobs that are trying to frighten the community."

Riesel, who dropped 30 pounds during the losing battle to save his eyesight, rose out of his chair and shouted indignantly:

"My heavens, why are they being left alone?"

His ashen face—where the acid had not touched—turned bright red as he pounded his fists and demanded Federal action.

ACT OF ARROGANCE

"What happened to me is a personal misfortune," he said.

"But its significance to the public and community is beyond anything personal. This was an act of arrogance against the community, a challenge to decent elements.

"There's got to be a Federal congressional investigation. Labor racketeers infest unions in the AFL–CIO. Mobs have got important locals in the AFL–CIO under their thumbs and all sorts of power. Yet there has been no thorough, terrific, nonpartisan investigation."

Riesel suggested the investigators should be the most respected Senators and Congressmen who cannot be pressured and who will get all the answers.

He warned that unless something is done soon to challenge what he described as a "second government," the general public faces a grim future.

The columnist told reporters he still feels the acid attack early last April 5 was a paid underworld job to maim him "as a warning to witnesses and others who might send them to jail.

"Without public indigation nothing can happen," he declared, adding:

"These mobs are not only on the waterfront, they are in construction, garment, and food industries. Not only are these crumbs making a living out of unions, they are parlaying themselves into millionaires and powerful influences."

Riesel said he is satisfied local police and the FBI are doing everything possible to catch the goon who hit me.

[From the Newark Evening News of May 18, 1956]

RIESEL BLINDING SEEN CRIME WITHOUT CLUES

(By Guy Savino)

NEW YORK.—The acid hurling which cost newspaper columnist Victor Riesel his vision probably will become another of this city's unsolved mysteries.

As the scrappy little writer prepared to leave St. Clare's Hospital after an unsuccessful 6-week fight for his sight, Riesel agreed with police authorities that tangible clues to the identity of his assailant are nowhere to be found.

Riesel yesterday held his first press conference since he was struck down on Broadway near Lindy's early April 5.

Piloted by a detective and Robert Hall, head of the syndicate for which he writes, Riesel walked to a red leather chair and declared that while he has lost his sight he has not been frightened and will press his fight to clear the racketeers out of labor.

THREE WITNESSES

But Riesel admitted that he could not pinpoint the area from which the attack stemmed. Since he can no longer see, he pointed out, he will not be able to identify his attacker.

Three persons possibly could, he said. Miss Betty Nevins, of Englewood, N. J., an assistant, was with him the morning he was attacked and two policemen questioned the thrower and released him before they knew Riesel had been attacked, he said.

The trio have scutinized hundreds of police pictures. Detectives of the city force and the district attorney's office have questioned hundreds of witnesses. The FBI has had the case under investigation.

But authorities at every level admit they face a blank wall. They have no leads on hand or in prospect, one of them admitted yesterday.

FEDERAL PROBE

His main hope, Riesel declared, is that the acid throwing will touch off a Federal investigation into labor racketeering.

The attack, Riesel contended, while a personal misfortune, "was an act of arrogance against the community, a challenge to the decent elements of the community.

"The mob wanted to scar my face and blind me, to frighten those who might testify against them," Riesel asserted.

LOST 30 POUNDS

Riesel, wearing pink pads over his eyes and a bandage over a slight scar burn on his right cheek, said he lost 30 pounds while in the hospital. He said he hopes to leave the hospital early next week.

"And the day after I leave," he said, "I'm going to my office and get to work."

Riesel is under 24-hour police guard, as is his family. He said the guard will be maintained for some time to come, but that he expects to move freely around the city and across the country.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of May 18, 1956]

RIESEL VOWS HE'S GOING TO "GET THE MOB"

(By Mortimer Davis and Edwin Savelson)

Just 6 weeks to the day since he was blinded by an acid-hurling thug, Mirror Labor Columnist Victor Riesel, in his first press conference, called for a thorough congressional probe of racketeering and an all-out assault on that "second government—the mobs."

"They haven't scared me," the 41-year-old crusader told 50 representatives of newspapers, newsreels, TV and radio assembled in a large waiting room at St. Clare's Hospital.

"I fought them all my life and being blind will not keep me from turning out my column as before. I can't see, but I can hit back and I'm going after the mob.

"Labor and industry face the grimmest kind of future unless this powerful group is exposed and driven from the labor movement."

The crusading columnist was greeted with applause when he walked into the room accompained by Robert M. Hall, president of the Hall Syndicate, which distributes his column, and a detectice bodyguard. His eyes were covered with surgical pads and he said he had lost 30 pounds since the attack April 15.

Hall read a statement which Riesel said he had written just before the interview. It said:

"What happened to me is a personal misfortune. The significance to the public and to the community is beyond anything personal. This was an act of arrogance against the community, a challenge to the decent elements of the community. My newspaper column now will be dedicated to attacking the 'second government'—a fight against mob rule."

Asked if he had any ideas about the perpetrators, Riesel replied:

"It was pretty definite—it was the rackets and the mob—in the underworld parlance they made a hit."

He said he reviewed the attack as "a warning to witnesses and others who might send them (the racketeers) to jail."

"The heat was on," the writer continued. "They did it to cool off the witnesses and as a warning to them to stay away from the investigations. They wanted to make me a walking and living symbol, obviously as a warning to others."

Told that Congressmen are considering an extensive probe of labor racketeering, Riesel said:

"I think there has got to be that kind (extensive) of a Federal investigation of labor racketeering that has infected unions with millions of members."

He was quick to say that "many, many honest union leaders," like AFL–CIO President George Meany, have been crusading against mobsters, but added that underworld elements "have important locals and internationals in the AFL–CIO."

Riesel urged a "nonpartisan" Federal probe by such men as Senators IRVING IVES, PAUL DOUGLAS, and STYLES BRIDGES and said it should have the support of labor and management.

He emphasized there is need for such action against the invasion by racketeers of the construction trades, the operating engineers and the garment and trucking fields.

The columnist said he has exchanged information with United States Attorney Paul Williams, who is now directing two grand jury probes into racketeering in the New York area. However, Riesel said, he is not scheduled to appear before any grand jury and does not believe newsmen should be called to testify because this would involve revealing their source of information.

Asked whether he could pinpoint the "labor mob" responsible for the attack on him, Riesel responded:

"I'm not going to put my finger on any group at this time."

He added the main target of his future writing will be the Operating Engineers Union and the De Koning rule of this union's local on Long Island.

"More than 200,000 men are being held captive in that organization," Riesel asserted.

He said he expects to leave the hospital Monday or Tuesday and will have a police bodyguard for "quite a while." He continued:

"The day after I leave the hospital I will return to my office and my typewriter and will bang out my column as I always have. I will write my column as long as people read it. The same underworld crowd that 'hit me' will be the same crowd I will continue to fight."

In a final plea, he urged the public not to be afraid to come forward and assist all authorities in smashing racketeering.

[From the New Jersey Labor Herald of April 1956]

LABOR OWES GREAT DEBT TO VIC RIESEL

Organized labor of New York City was deeply shocked when a news flash reported the vicious acid-throwing attack perpetrated upon labor columnist Victor Riesel, presently fighting to save his sight in a New York hospital. We have known this courageous newspaperman intimately for a number of years and learned to respect his ability and integrity.

Vic Riesel had one advantage over most labor writers because he had gained the confidence of hundreds of important labor officials who openly or secretly approved his fearless exposé of that small but powerful coterie of gangsters who had wormed their way into control of some local and international unions.

He fully realized the danger involved in focusing the pitiless glare of publicity upon the criminal activities of entrenched underworld characters. When one pointed out the risk that he was taking, he would simply laugh it off. "That's part of the job," he'd say.

There are any number of decent labor leaders throughout this country who are cognizant of the harm constantly being done to the trade-union movement by that "1 percent of rotten apples" mentioned recently at an Atlantic City convention by President George Meany. However, they don't dare speak up and denounce the culprits.

When one prominent union officer complained to us recently about the terrible situation existing in his international organization, we asked: Why don't you do something about it, instead of shutting your eyes to this condition?

His reply was short and to the point: "I have no desire to commit suicide. I have a wife and kids. I can't afford to be a hero. I prefer to live."

These were his exact words, spoken without the slightest inflection in his voice. This man is no coward, but he wasn't kidding. He was in dead earnest. There are hundreds like him who know what's going on * * * but they can't afford to play "cops and robbers" and lay their lives on the line.

That is why the racketeers tried to destroy Riesel. "Vic" had grown up in the labor movement and knew first hand who the crooks were, and he dared print the truth. Honest laborites throughout the land, who freely admitted being afraid to antagonize the underworld moguls because they had to live with them * * * were glad to feed their information to Riesel.

The legitimate trade-union movement leaders are nauseated by some of these conditions over which they have no control. They hope that the law enforcement agencies will eventually catch up with the bad boys, but they can't afford to be dead heroes. It's as simple as that.

That is why men of the "Vic" Riesel caliber are a real asset to organized labor and this country, and that is the reason why this fine journalist is paying the penalty for having the guts to do the job that labor itself should have tackled long ago.

We are confident that we express the sentiment of the entire labor movements of New Jersey, when we condemn those responsible for this dastardly attack upon our free press. We hope that those criminals will be brought to justice, and that "Vic" Riesel's eyes will be saved so that he may continue the good fight for a clean and decent labor movement in America.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 18, 1956]

RIESEL TO FIGHT ON THOUGH BLIND—BIDS CONGRESS PROBE LABOR RACKET

Victor Riesel, seemingly in the best of spirits though blind, held a press conference yesterday, 6 weeks to the day after a thug hurled sulfuric acid into his eyes.

Wearing white surgical pads over his eyes, looking lean and gesturing with great emotion, the Daily Mirror labor columnist called for a congressional investigation of labor racketeers, holding that the mobs have got terrifically powerful in important internationals in the AFL–CIO.

However, he made it plain he was not indicting all unions and he spoke in praise of George Meany, president of the combined labor movement. He reiterated, as he sat in a lounge room of St. Clare's Hospital annex at 9 E. 71st Street, that he was certain that the attack on him stemmed from the underworld of the labor movement, enraged at his biting criticisms of their shady practices.

"There isn't anybody I'm fingering," the 41-year-old writer said, as he kept clenching his hands. He said he had lost 30 pounds since he was ambushed at 3 a. m., April 5, on 51st Street, west of Broadway, around the corner from Lindy's Restaurant. His weight is now 130. He is 5 feet 4 inches tall.

Mr. Riesel said he hopes to leave the hospital next Monday or Tuesday, certainly within a week, and go back to putting copy paper in the typewriter and bang away. "They knocked me out for 6 weeks, but that's all."

At this point, a TV cameraman, about 10 feet away, snapped his fingers and asked Mr. Riesel if he could hear the snap.

"It's true what they say about compensation," the writer said, smiling. "I can hear what they say in the city room of the Mirror."

The attack on him, he said, was a warning to all persons who might have information against racketeers, but he said he would never testify before a grand jury because "They would have to put me in jail first; I do not believe that newspaper men should be called to testify. They would have to give up sources of information."

He said he plans to study braille or anything that will help him get the column out to 193 newspapers across the country.

"I have no sensitivity about being blind," he said flatly, adding, "I'll continue to go after the mobsters. They haven't scared me. They just haven't. I can't see, but that doesn't mean I can't write the same kind of copy."

Without spelling it out, he called for "more help from the public—the kind of indignation when these eyes burned out." He praised the police, District Attorney Frank S. Hogan and J. Edgar Hoover, director of the FBI who are still searching for the youthful thug who hurled the acid. He also praised Dr. Girolamo Bonaccolto, chief eye surgeon at the hospital, as a "reticent genius" who saved his face from disfigurement.

"This acid bleached the sidewalk," he said, and when asked if he thought he might possibly get partial sight back, Mr. Riesel said, "No. I'm blind and, aside from miracles, I won't see again. They don't hold out any hope. You see it was a direct hit. He couldn't have hit me more squarely. If you saw him you would know it's the underworld. I don't know who hired this goon."

"I think," he said, "there's got to be some kind of Federal investigation of labor racketeers. They have all sorts of power. The waterfront is not the only place you have a tough mob." He specifically mentioned the Operating Engineers—it was that union he criticized in a radio broadcast just before the acid was hurled—the construction trade and the garment and teamster industries.

He called for an investigation by a "nonpartisan group" of Democrats and Republicans, mentioning specifically Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, and Senator IRVING M. IVES, Republican, of New York, and Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire. He referred to them as "men of good will," who would "get answers and not be pressured" by "those crumbs who make millions out of certain unions."

CHALLENGE TO COMMUNITY

Robert M. Hall, head of the syndicate handling Mr. Riesel's column, read a written statement which he said had been composed by Mr. Riesel:

"What happened to me is a personal misfortune. The significance to the public and to the community is beyond anything personal. This was an act of arrogance against the community, and a challenge to the decent elements of the community.

"My newspaper column now will be dedicated to attacking the 'second government,' a fight against mob rule."

Just before that statement was read, Mr. Riesel was asked if he touch-types, which most newspaper men cannot do.

"I fell in love with my high school typewriter teacher and have been doing the touch system all my life," he quipped.

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of April 24, 1956]

PORTLAND RACKET PLOT FOLLOWS NATIONAL PATTERN—POLITICAL LINES, USE OF BOYCOTT COMMON TOOLS

The Oregonian's exposure of certain teamster union officials' attempt to establish a racketeering payoff in Portland gives this city a place in a national pattern by which the secondary boycott and political influence have been used, or attempted, to line the pockets of corrupt leaders.

Congress has sought—without appreciable success—to look into the activities of James R. (Jimmy) Hoffa, Detroit, who is considered a principal threat to the leadership of Dave Beck, international president of the teamsters, and who gives hoodlums a prominent part in union operations.

The Chicago Crime Commission has found enough evidence for strong suspicion that the teamsters are tied to the old Capone organization in the Illinois metropolis.

In Manhattan a grand jury recently was preparing to investigate Hoffa's effort to force one of his men in as head of the New York Joint Council of Teamsters.

George Meany, president of the recently combined AFL–CIO, has threatened to expel the teamsters from his organization if a plan is carried through to increase teamster power by lending $400,000 to the International Longshoremen's Association, and teamster-racket operations are under fire there, too.

LABOR DISCIPLINE HINTED

The current Portland exposé of teamster officials' operations could trigger disciplinary action by the AFL–CIO, in the opinion of some local labor leaders.

Life magazine recently printed pictures of a dozen police characters who are subordinates of Hoffa in New York and the Midwest; and Lester Velie, writing in Reader's Digest, has documented teamster racket operations in numerous cities.

The commonest racket employed by teamster leaders is to harness the union to a trade association, as has been done in Portland, and then to use the picket-line power of the union to enforce the association's monopoly.

The Kefauver committee received an affidavit from a Detroit bar owner who patronized a different jukebox operator in order to get a new machine. He received a call by the boss of the jukebox union, who turned out also to be an official of the teamsters' union, and was told to disconnect the new jukebox. "This spot," he said, belonged to another operator.

That afternoon there was a teamster picket in front of the bar owner's place. A beer-truck driver wouldn't cross the picket line to deliver beer. The proprietor went back to his old operator—and his old jukebox.

CLEVELAND SALES RECALLED

George R. Loving, a Cleveland tavern proprietor, made a fruitless effort to buy a jukebox of his own. One dealer was afraid of being bombed if he sold to other than "an operator." One agreed to sell "if you can get it cleared with the union."

An independent Cleveland operator tried to get along without a union connection. His customers' windows were broken, his machines were damaged by bullets and acid.

Two operators of cigarette-vending machines in Detroit were bombed. They testified to investigators that they had refused to pay dues to the town's jukebox union. The damage to the two added to $10,000.

Another independent operator in Cleveland told a congressional committee that two sticks of dynamite were hurled onto

his lawn. They failed to explode—but he got out of the jukebox business.

Investigation in Cleveland has shown that the teamsters and the puppet jukebox associations not only monopolize the business, they take an exorbitant share of the profits, the proprietor getting only $12 out of $50 that customers put into the machine.

GRAND JURY LEARNS PACTS

A county grand jury in Detroit ran onto one way that teamster union officials take money from the jukebox operation.

The jukebox union was affiliated directly with AFL. It had no teamster charter. But on its payroll were the wives of two teamster union officials—Hoffa and Bert Brennan. They did no work, never went to the union hall, but they had received $6,000 at the time the grand jury convened.

The jukebox union president said he gave the women the money because their husbands were big men. They could help him. There was no questioning that these payments were the price of union officials putting a picket on a place at the jukebox union's request.

Teamster union officials are as ruthless with their own members who demur at knuckling down as they are to rivals in racket operations.

In Joplin, Mo., members of a teamster local came to the end of their patience with a president who was looting the union treasury. They hired a lawyer and got a court order to see the union records. Then the court ousted the president and asked teamster international headquarters to send a trustee to take charge of union affairs.

HOFFA FAVORS OUSTED MAN

Hoffa became the trustee. He began by urging the men to reelect the president they had thrown out. They drew up their own slate, but Hoffa ruled their candidates off the ballot on a technicality.

Their dues had not been paid by the first of the month. The dues were withheld from their checks, but the normal transfer from the employer to the union took a few days. This technicality would make most members ineligible.

When the members then threatened to go to court again, Hoffa called off the election. A year later the election had not been held, and the old president was running the union as business representative, through appointment by Hoffa's assistant.

A Joplin woman said her husband was beaten unconscious for seeking investigation of union affairs. The assailant, she averred, was paid by the president with union treasury funds.

At Pontiac, Mich., Hoffa used the first-of-the-month technicality to keep his men in power over a local for 8 years. Finally they were indicted for conspiracy and extortion, and pleaded guilty to accepting bribes from employers. The next thing the members knew, the old officers were on the payroll as business representatives.

HOFFA CLINGS TO REINS

Members at Pontiac got no place when they tried to get rid of Trustee Hoffa by petition to the international. They were intimidated by thugs. Then they defied Hoffa in a protest meeting. From Detroit came a caravan of 20 cars loaded with men carrying lead pipes and heavy wrenches.

Then the members went to court, chipping in to build up a fund of $3,000 against the bottomless treasury of the international union. The court ruled it had no jurisdiction. The members planned to appeal, but Hoffa continued as trustee.

Why can't rank and file membership put a stop to such domination, as other union members have rebelled against autocratic leadership?

The primary answer is the teamster constitution, which gives top leadership a firm hand on control of union affairs.

An international representative can take up the union card of any husband and father belonging to one of the locals in his jurisdiction, and the man will not drive a truck without that card. Who wants to attract attention by opposition to a leader?

I. R. CAN WIELD CLUB

The I. R. can order up pickets to halt delivery of food or fuel oil—or the delivery of beer to a tavern that might be using a rival organization's juke box. The proprietor has to get along with the teamsters.

If a teamster local fails to knuckle at knuckling time—as at Joplin, Pontiac, and elsewhere—it can be put into receivership by the international. The international representative becomes virtually a dictator of the local. It had happened several times in Oregon.

The organization technique of Dave Beck is credited partly by a Portland longtime labor leader, who did not wish to be quoted, for the plight of members of one of the Nation's most undemocratic labor unions.

Many a businessman has marveled at—and appreciated—the fact that labor should have such an out and out "businessman" as Dave Beck as a powerful leader. Other labor leaders think this is something like President Truman's favorable comment on "Old Joe" at Eugene during the 1948 campaign.

The reason for their appreciation, said the labor leader mentioned earlier, is that Beck traded "working conditions" for a closed shop agreement in contracts with employers. This wasn't so good for the men, but it was good for Beck, who built his presidency into a constantly more lucrative position.

WORKER CAUGHT IN BIND

"Now," said the labor leader, "the man has to have the union card to get a job, and he has to be subservient to leadership to keep his card."

Generally speaking, there is no love lost between teamster and other union representatives. That is largely because teamsters are frequently independent in the matter of crossing other unions' picket lines. The teamsters were the only participants in the AFL–CIO merger who refused to sign a no-raid pact.

Can't there be legal curbs on undemocratic use of power by union leaders?

Politically, teamster leadership has done very well—on both sides of the fence.

Washington Senator WARREN MAGNUSON came to Portland in October, 1954, to campaign for District Attorney William Langley, who was backed by the teamsters in the election that year. MAGNUSON'S picture was taken with Langley and Mrs. Langley and furnished to newspapers by the Oregon Teamster, the union's newspaper.

Apparently the teamsters can stop congressional investigations, according to Velie in the Reader's Digest.

HOUSE PROBE STOPS

A House committee started to investigate Hoffa last year, said Velie, but suddenly stopped the investigation. Said Representative WINT SMITH, Kansas Republican:

"Pressure came from so high that I can't even discuss it."

The teamsters, said Velie, had approached key figures in the trucking industry to urge Republican party leaders to end the hearings.

The late President Roosevelt was credited with a political master stroke in making a speech at a teamster banquet.

Beck was named president of the board of regents of the University of Washington.

Is there any way that teamster union members can get more democratic leadership and then keep out the racketeers?

Yes, says the earlier-quoted labor leader.

"If the leadership of the newly organized AFL–CIO has any guts," he said, "it can be done. All they would have to do is to expel the teamsters union from AFL–CIO, start a new union for the same kind of workmen, and teamster rank and file would flock to it."

George Meany, president of AFL–CIO, has already taken some hard looks at the teamsters. That is probably one of the subjects that will be discussed at a meeting of the AFL–CIO board on May 1.

[From the Commonweal of May 18, 1956]

RACKETEERS IN LABOR

Public sentiment against racketeering in the guise of union activity is growing. The tragic case of Victor Riesel has brought much of this indignation to a head, even though a direct connection between the labor columnists antiracketeering activities and the brutal attack on him has yet to be proven. But the most striking thing about the whole picture is that the strongest cries for action are coming from within the ranks of organized labor itself.

This is certainly as it should be, of course, for the cause of honest unionism is most seriously hurt by the encroachment of racketeers. But in years gone by there was some tendency among union men to shy away from the whole subject. This reluctance to discuss racketeering frankly was due in large measure to the fact that the enemies of labor used such discussions to condemn legitimate union activity as well as illegitimate abuses.

It is, of course, hard to carry out a meaningful discussion of the problem of racketeering in labor with someone who simply regards all union activity as racketeering; there was always Westbrook Pegler, but union leaders regarded his comments about the way the GOP would view advice from Harry Truman, and for the same reason. Neither man could be regarded as a nonpartisan observer. As a result, decent labor leaders for years discussed the problem of racketeer-invasion only behind closed doors. This is, we think, a fact; whether it was wise or not is now an idle question.

Right now, however, things are looking up, and much of the credit for the improvement has to go to the recent AFL–CIO merger and to the strong leadership of Mr. George Meany. The CIO never had too much of a problem with racketeering; the AFL, in part because of its greater stress on autonomy, did. Now, although Mr. Meany and Walter Reuther may not see eye to eye on India and foreign aid, on racketeering they seem to be in harmony, and in recent months Mr. Meany has been taking an increasingly firm line, backed by strong support from his executive board.

Some idea of the attraction unions have for racketeers can be had by considering the size of union welfare and pension funds alone. Although comparatively recent developments, at least on their present scale, these funds now have assets of more than $30 billion and make very inviting targets.

Recently a Senate subcommittee headed by the respected Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, carried out an investigation of union welfare and pension funds. Most of them, it found, are honestly and wisely administered. But there are others which have suffered from manipulation, abuse, and downright embezzlement. To eliminate such practices, Senator DOUGLAS recommends compulsory Federal registration, with each fund required to file detailed accountings. Corrective action in this area is certainly needed, and the Douglas proposal looks like a good way to start.

The need for governmental intervention in the field of welfare problems, however, illustrates a larger problem. If it is true that labor leaders have to admit, openly and honestly, that racketeers have moved into some unions, it is also true that the job required is too large for labor alone. Sometimes the problem is discussed as if it were comparable to that of Communist infiltration in a union, but it is not. Where

the Communists are concerned, the membership can be alerted and the Communists outvoted. But racketeers do not usually gain control of a union by ballots, and once they are in command they cannot normally be ousted by votes alone.

Until recent months, at least, many law enforcement officers have been inclined to a hands-off policy when it came to racketeers in labor's ranks. But all concerned must face up to the fact that racketeers, whether hiding behind a business front or a labor front, have to be dealt with primarily by the forces of law and order. Racketeering has to be seen for what it is, a resurgence of plain, ordinary gangsterism, and it has to be dealt with accordingly, by the police and by elected officials, as well as by labor leaders. Then it will be possible to eliminate what Mr. Meany recently described as the one percent that is giving all of organized labor a bad name.

Resolution to authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to investigate and study racketeering and related activities within labor unions

Whereas Victor Riesel was brutally attacked in April of 1956, and permanently blinded by sulphuric acid thrown in his eyes; and

Whereas it appears that the assault on Victor Riesel was caused by his exposure of labor racketeers and extortionists in his newspaper column and on his radio broadcasts; and

Whereas there is increasing evidence that racketeers and extortionists occupy powerful positions in certain labor unions and are attempting to infiltrate and control other labor unions; and

Whereas at the present time it does not appear that an effective and concerted effort is being made to expose the activities of these racketeers and extortionists; and

Whereas the existence of such racketeers and extortionists present a serious threat to the well-being of thousands of American citizens both within and outside the membership of labor unions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the activities of officers, members, and representatives of labor unions, acting singly or in combination with others, which have as their purpose the extortion of money or other advantages by means of violence, threats of violence, intimidation, or any other improper interference with normal business operations in interstate or foreign commerce, with specific reference to but not limited to—

(1) attempts to deter or prevent any person from speaking, writing, or testifying with respect to racketeering and related activities in connection with labor unions;

(2) whether such racketeering and related activities result in the misuse or misappropriation of labor union funds;

(3) the measures which have been adopted by labor unions to prevent such racketeering and related activities, and the effectiveness of such measures;

(4) the measures which can be adopted by labor unions to prevent such racketeering and related activities;

(5) whether existing laws, and the enforcement procedures with respect to such laws, are adequate to effectively combat such racketeering and related activities; and

(6) whether additional legislation is necessary to prevent such racketeering and related activities.

The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any matter which is under investigation by another committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

GARY, IND., CELEBRATES GOLDEN JUBILEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Gary, Ind., is the largest-youngest metropolitan city in America. Great preparations have been underway for months by Gary's city officials, industrial leaders, labor leaders, civic organizations, churches, schools, and all citizens to make the jubilee celebration which begins Saturday, June 9, the most outstanding event ever held in any Hoosier city.

On Saturday, June 9, a mammoth parade headed by the United States Army Band will inaugurate 9 days of celebration to which everybody is invited, including the Members of Congress.

Fifty years ago the great steel-producing city of Gary, Ind., was a wasteland of sand dunes and scrub pines. Today, Gary is a vast, scientifically planned industrial metropolis of 160,000 persons and home of the world's largest producer of raw steel, United States Steel Corp.'s Gary steelworks. Besides the Gary steelworks, the United States Steel Corp. has the following subsidiaries within the city limits of Gary: Universal Atlas Cement Co., which is the world's largest cement producer; the Gary plant of the American Bridge Division of the United States Steel; the world's largest sheet and tin mill, the Gary Sheet and Tin Mill of the United States Steel; and the Gary plant of the National Tube Specialties Division.

Among the 20 industries which have contributed to the growth of Gary are the Budd Co., which manufactures automobile bodies; the Anderson Co.; Gary Screw and Bolt Division; Union Drawn Steel Division of the Republic Steel Corp.; Marbon Co., a division of Borg-Warner. Gary has a number of industries which vary from the manufacture of women's hosiery to paddle-wheeled riverboats.

It was Judge Elbert H. Gary, as the first chairman of the board of United States Steel, who envisoned a steel-producing city on the southern tip of Lake Michigan. On March 12, 1906, three engineers came out to what was then a wilderness of sand, trees, and swamps and staked out the site of the proposed city of Gary. The task went ahead rapidly and the harbor was constructed, foundations were laid for the erection of mills, and installations of machinery got underway with surprising speed. On April 18, 1906, civil engineers drove stakes platting the site of the city. Gary was incorporated in July of that year and the citizens of Gary elected their first mayor, Thomas C. Knotts.

The first big civic celebration occurred on July 23, 1908, when the steamer *Elbert H. Gary,* entered the Gary steel works harbor with the first cargo of ore from the Mesabi range in northern Minnesota. A few weeks later, the first of the 12 new blast furnaces was blown in, and the Gary works of the then Illinois Steel Co. produced the first pig iron. In February 1909 the open hearth furnaces turned out their first steel, and in the same month, the new rail mills turned out their first finished product.

Workers from all over the world flocked to this new steel city. For the most part they were young former soldiers of the Spanish-American War, English builders who heard of Gary while in South Africa. Realtors, architects, doctors, lawyers, engineers, and laborers were included in the first census taken in June 1906, and totaled 334 persons.

The steel corporation bought 6,000 additional acres of land adjacent to the mill site, and the newly former Gary Land Co. was commissioned to lay out an ideal city. With amazing rapidity the city was platted, conduits laid, parks laid out, and rich black loam brought in from the Indiana farms to the south.

In 1912 two large public buildings were completed and dedicated, the YMCA and public library donated by the late Judge Gary. Today the library has enlarged the original building and has, in addition, established 8 city branches and 9 township branches, as well as traveling trailer libraries. Since that time many public buildings have been erected—2 hospitals, 8 high schools, theaters, modern shopping centers, numerous churches, and apartment buildings.

Gary has a fine park system, recognized as a model in the State of Indiana, consisting of 17 parks, including 3 miles of Lake Michigan beach. These total 696 acres. In addition, there are 21 playgrounds operated by the schools which cover 380 acres.

CHOICE LOCATION

Gary is well situated in terms of markets and sources of materials. Within a 500-mile radius of Gary, Ind., there are located 36 percent of the Nation's population, 37 percent of the Nation's wholesale establishments, 38 percent of the Nation's retail stores, 39 percent of the Nation's manufacturing concerns, and 40 percent of the Nation's farm output in terms of dollar value of products.

Spiritually, Gary finds comfort in its 135 churches, representing virtually every denomination and providing the city with some of its most attractive and unusual architecture.

The total industrial payroll in Gary in 1955 was $212,225,879, and was paid to over 60,000 workers. This averaged $17,685,490 per month during 1955.

Among the Gary pioneers who were leaders in the planning and development of Gary were William P. Gleason, general manager of Gary works for 30 years; Capt. H. S. Norton, president of the Gary Land Corp.; Ralph E. Rowley, engineer of construction of the Gary Steel Plant; Dr. William A. Wirt, for many years superintendent of the Gary public schools and initiator of the work-study-play system which has been copied throughout the United States; Judge Ora Wildermuth, active in Gary's civic life and also Gary's first school teacher; Oscar Burch and Jim Farley were the pioneers of union labor in Gary when they organized the first carpenter's union; John Radigan was a pioneer merchant; H. B. and J. Ralph Snyder, the present editors of the Gary Post-Tribune, arrived in Gary in February 1910 and launched a newspaper which through expansion and growth has developed into one of the most outstanding daily newspapers in the Middle West.

Only recently the Gary Post-Tribune announced the construction of a new modern plant which will cost many millions and give to the citizens of Gary and surrounding areas a daily newspaper unrivaled in any metropolitan city in the Nation.

Gary is strategically located on the south shore of Lake Michigan. When Congress approved the St. Lawrence River project last session and also the Calumet-Sag development connecting Lake Michigan with the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico, ocean-going ships will be landing with regularity at the harbor in Gary, Ind., within a few years. Gary will then have all the facilities of being a world water port and truck and rail shipping center. Industrial expansion of the city of Chicago must come south along the southern shores of Indiana and Gary will be the hub of this growth and expansion.

Some day in the not too distant future, the south shores of Lake Michigan will be a solid procession of industry and beautiful homes from the Illinois State line to the Michigan State line. The city of Gary with its 160,000 population after only 50 years, is still in its infancy compared with other American cities. It is not overoptimistic to predict that Gary will attain a half million in population during the next quarter of a century.

Gary is an example of the power of American free enterprise, and is a symbol of democracy. People of all faiths, creeds, races, and nationalities have worked together for the past 50 years to produce from a barren land one of the great industrial and civic centers of the world, full of vitality and with an ever-continuing eagerness to grow and expand.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. UTT (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for the period May 28 through June 7, on account of official business.

Mr. KRUEGER, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

Mr. SAYLOR (at the request of Mr. DAGUE), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MCVEY, on Monday, May 28, for 20 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MADDEN, for 20 minutes today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HOLTZMAN.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. SHEEHAN.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. SISK and to include in the remarks he made in the Committee certain data and statistics furnished by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. WICKERSHAM (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey.

Mr. KEOGH.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2875. An act to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5862. An act to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation; and

H. J. Res. 261. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to donate surplus supplies and equipment for memorial purposes to The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 23, 1956, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1016. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ida Bifolchini Boschetti;

H. R. 1471. An act for the relief of William J. Robertson;

H. R. 1779. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Juniper division of the Wapinitia Federal reclamation project, Oregon;

H. R. 2284. An act for the relief of Maj. Robert D. Lauer;

H. R. 2904. An act for the relief of Maj. Orin A. Fayle;

H. R. 3054. An act for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs, or personal representatives;

H. R. 3268. An act for the relief of Comdr. George B. Greer;

H. R. 3366. An act for the relief of Mary J. McDougall;

H. R. 3964. An act for the relief of Kingan, Inc.;

H. R. 4026. An act for the relief of James C. Hayes;

H. R. 4162. An act for the relief of Kahzo L. Harris;

H. R. 4604. An act relating to the issuance of certain patents in fee to lands within the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 4640. An act for the relief of James N. Wilson;

H. R. 5047. An act to increase the compensation of trustees in bankruptcy;

H. R. 5478. An act to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 5652. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army and Air Force, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6084. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians to the Palm Springs Unified School District;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of Lt. P. B. Sampson;

H. R. 6374. An act to repeal legislation relating to the Gallup-Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navaho Indian Reservation;

H. R. 6623. An act to amend the act of July 1, 1952, so as to obtain the consent of Congress to interstate compacts relating to mutual military aid in an emergency;

H. R. 6990. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America;

H. R. 7540. An act to provide for the sale of a Government-owned housing project to the city of Hooks, Tex.;

H. R. 8309. An act for the relief of Col. Henry M. Zeller;

H. R. 8810. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, equip, maintain, and operate a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Miles City, Mont.;

H. R. 8904. An act to amend certain laws relating to the grade of certain personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps upon retirement;

H. R. 9207. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands;

H. R. 9257. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the punishment of persons who assist in the attempted escape of persons in Federal custody; and

H. R. 10875. An act to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 28, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1893. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report for the month of April relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1894. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to include, within the provisions of law providing punishment for killing or assaulting Federal officers on official duty, officers and employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare engaged in enforcing the food and drug or public health laws of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1895. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 13, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of the Atlantic coast of Long Island, Fire Island Inlet and shore westerly to Jones Inlet, N. Y., prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented. (H. Doc. No. 411); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be be printed, with five illustrations.

1896. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated February 27, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of reports on Mississippi River at Clinton, Iowa, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on March 16, 1954. (H. Doc. No. 412; to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1840. A bill to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination; without amendment (Rept. No. 2202). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6024. A bill to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain land at Kaakaukukui, Honolulu, Oahu, T. H.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRICE: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 8552. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the town of Chincoteague, Va., permanent easements on certain lands for the purpose of taking subterranean water; without amendment (Rept. No. 2204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 7641. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal and non-Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2210). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 11132. A bill to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2211). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 910. An act for the relief of Lino Perez Martinez; without amendment (Rept. No. 2205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee of the Judiciary. H. R. 5041. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Dows Thyberg; without amendment (Rept. No. 2206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 618. Joint resolution to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 2207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 620. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 2208). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 621. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 2209). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 11436. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a tax on certain processing of watch movements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 11437. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a tax on certain processing of watch movements; to the committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 11438. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing 14th Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 11439. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 11440. A bill to provide for the exchange of certain lands between the United States and the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DODD:

H. R. 11441. A bill to authorize the construction of flood-protection measures, with particular reference to areas where severe damages have recently occurred as a result of extreme rainfall accompanying hurricane storms; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 11442. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 11443. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 11444. A bill to allow credit or refund of gift tax erroneously paid by reason of treating nontaxable divisions of community property as gifts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 11445. A bill to promote the progress of medicine and to advance the national health and welfare by creating a National Library of Medicine to be located in Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 11446. A bill to establish the principle of a basic single salary wage scale in the Canal Zone for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 11447. A bill to provide that small-business concerns which are displaced by urban renewal projects shall be compensated for their losses arising out of their displacement, and shall be granted loans to meet expenses incident to their relocation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 11448. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Cape Cod Canal National Park, in the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 11449. A bill to amend section 69 of the Hawaiian Organic Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 11450. A bill to increase and make certain revisions in the general authorization for small flood-control projects in the Flood Control Act of 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 11451. A bill to provide for research and technical assistance relating to the control of salt-marsh and other pest mosquitoes of public health importance and mosquito vectors of human disease; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 11452. A bill to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 11453. A bill to amend the Trademark Act of 1946; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 11454. A bill to amend section 4 of the Sherman Act to prescribe a procedure with respect to consent judgments, decrees or orders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 11455. A bill to provide for payments in lieu of taxes to State and local authorities with respect to certain real property subject at the time of its acquisition by the United States to real property tax committed to the discharge of bonded indebtedness for any

improvement; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 11456. A bill to authorize the partition or sale of inherited interests in allotted lands in the Tulalip Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 11457. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to assist in the provision of housing for essential military and permanent civilian personnel approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Atomic Energy Commission; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 11458. A bill to amend the Meat Inspection Act to provide for the inspection of poultry to be shipped in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 11459. A bill to amend Public Law 68 in order more adequately to express the spirit of that law and to remove the inequities to which Postal Transportation Service substitutes are now being subjected under its provisions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 11460. A bill to change the name of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation to the Office of Rehabilitation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. J. Res. 629. Joint resolution providing for participation by the United States in the ceremonies celebrating the 300th anniversary of the signing of the Flushing Remonstrance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. Con. Res. 243. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the Constitution of the United States together with the Declaration of Independence, and providing for additional copies; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. Res. 512. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to investigate and study racketeering and related activities within labor unions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. Res. 513. Resolution to provide for sending the bill H. R. 4507 to the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts: Resolutions of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States against accepting or taking action upon the findings and recommendations of the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 11461. A bill for the relief of Lee Chong Taik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 11462. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Walker Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 11463. A bill for the relief of Francisco Ponce-Cruz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 11464. A bill to confirm title in fee simple in Vital Flores to certain lands in De Soto Parish, La.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 11465. A bill for the relief of Rebecca Erriete Mustacchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11466. A bill for the relief of George Kefalas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY (by request):

H. R. 11467. A bill for the relief of Luis Gustavo Garcia-Oliva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 11468. A bill for the relief of Harry Gold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H. R. 11469. A bill for the relief of Jose Mendoza Lujan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 11470. A bill for the relief of Sheila G. Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11471. A bill for the relief of George P. Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 11472. A bill for the relief of Thomas Q. Beesley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1077. By Mr. BOW: Petition of Henry W. Koontz and others of Canton, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1078. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of William W. Bieber and 33 other citizens of Lycoming County, Pa., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1079. By Mr. CRUMPACKER: Petition of Richard Ostrom, of Elkhart, Ind., and other residents of Elkhart, Marshall, St. Joseph, and La Porte Counties, Ind., urging enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1080. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Richard H. Hind, of Springfield, Mo., and other citizens of the Seventh Congressional District of Missouri, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1081. By Mr. WESTLAND: Resolution of the Pacific Northwest Apparel Manufacturers Association of Portland, Oreg., an association representing every major producer of sportswear and related apparel in the Pacific Northwest; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1082. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of Mrs. Elroy Henderson, Sandusky, Mich., and 29 other residents of Sandusky and Carsonville, Mich., to call upon Members of both Houses of Congress to seriously consider whether it is for the good of the Nation to permit the glamorous alcoholic beverage advertising appealing to young people and to children, especially over the radio and television and urging the passing of the Langer bill, S. 923, and the Siler bill, H. R. 4627; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Afghanistan Celebrates Its 37th Anniversary of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to felicitate the people of Afghanistan, His Majesty Zahir Shah, King of Afghanistan, and His Excellency Mohammad Kabir Ludin, Ambassador of Afghanistan, upon the occasion of the celebration of the 37th anniversary of independence of Afghanistan, May 27, 1956.

As soon as King Amanullah had established himself upon the throne of Afghanistan, he gave voice to the long-suppressed desire of his people for independence of their land. This demand resulted in the Afghan War of Independence, 1919. The termination of the war brought freedom and independence for the people of this long-oppressed nation. Having achieved the goal of independence, the nation then turned its attention to the necessary reforms in internal affairs and the required orientation to prepare themselves to play their part in international affairs. In 1933 His Majesty Zahir Shah, the present King of Afghanistan, assumed the leadership of his people and continued to work for the attainment of the objectives of sound development.

The government has vigorously attacked the basic problems of the country and is looking hopefully toward the future. Programs of economic and social development have been undertaken which bespeak the interest of the people in the vital needs of the nation.

Afghanistan has adhered to the principle of full participation in the international life of nations. She supports the cause of independence for all peoples, and is desirous of preserving world peace. To these ends Afghanistan has been anxious to take part in international activities. A faithful member of the League of Nations until its dissolution, Afghanistan today attaches great importance to the work of the United Nations. She is also a member of the United Nations Specialized Agencies: the International Labor Organization, the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, UNESCO, and the International Civil Aviation Organization.

Afghanistan remained neutral in the First and Second World Wars and the justice of this policy was recognized by the nations of the world when in 1946 Afghanistan was unanimously admitted to the membership of the United Nations.

I salute Afghanistan as she embarks upon her 37th year of independence and pray for her continued success and progress.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose a portion of an address made by me over KWKH radio station, Shreveport, La., on Sunday, May 27, 1956, on the subject of foreign aid. The remainder of this address dealt with local and domestic matters. The speech is as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, the perennial foreign-aid bill is now before the House of Representatives and a vote will occur within the next few weeks. After a lot of good work in reducing the amount of money included in this bill last year, we had confidently looked forward to a smaller recommendation to be made in the giveaway program during the coming year. We were, of course, rather disturbed when we learned that Secretary of State John Foster Dulles had set a goal to increase last year's gifts by 40 percent for the coming year. The pressure has been on and we who have steadfastly insisted on reductions in this program have been under fire from those who want to give away more money.

When Secretary Dulles appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, he asked for $4,965,275,000. The committee has cut his request by $1,109,000,000—a considerable figure but not yet a big enough cut. I believe the Congress will further reduce the amount; and unless it is cut to the bone, I may vote against the entire bill as a protest against the huge giveaway program.

While the committee has reported a bill carrying with it the sum of $3,563,475,000 for foreign aid, this does not give the entire picture. This amount is to be used for administration expenses of the far-flung organization; it is to be used for the point 4 program; the military aid program, and the economic aid program. And this new money, over $3.5 billion, is to be supplemented by the additional sum of $6,800,000,000, which is carryover money; that is, the money appropriated by Congress during past years which has not been spent, and, as they say, is in the pipeline, and is being carried over for use during the coming year. If you add the amount of money carried over as unexpended to the new money appropriated, you will have the total figure of money available for foreign aid of some $11 billion—yet they want more than this to give away. This sum is so huge that it will take years to finish giving it away even if the Congress stops appropriating money at once; and the foreign aid organization of the State Department will be in existence 10 years hence even without receiving another cent.

One of the projects to receive money under this program is the Aswan Dam and Reservoir to be built along the upper Nile River in Egypt. It is to be built, according to plans of our State Department, to cost $1.3 billion—a sum so large that even at the rate of $100 million per year, it will require 13 years to complete our promises. And this dam and reservoir is to be used for the purpose of impounding waters of the Nile River in Egypt to be used for irrigation and to reclaim the dry sands of the Sahara Desert. Some 3 million acres of land can be successfully irrigated with this water, and, of course, according to the Egyptian Government, this irrigated land is to be used to grow cotton, to send to a world market in competition with Louisiana-grown cotton, now in surplus supply on the world market.

Our Government is using this money in foreign lands today for the purpose of teaching these foreign people to grow cotton in competition with our own southern-grown staple. I have seen some of this cotton with my own eyes and held it with my own hands. I know what I am talking about. I have seen it in the fields where American-trained personnel showed the local people how to grow this staple.

To show you how ridiculous this situation is, I have to remind you that this week the House passed a new farm bill, creating a soil bank recommended by the administration, which will cost our taxpayers $1.2 billion per year to administer. This is necessary according to Secretary Benson, because of the tremendous surplus of American agriculture crops.

We added to the bill an item which I consider small but very important for our cotton people. This provision requires the State Department to sell 5 million bales of American cotton on the world market in competition with world prices. For some time, Congress has been urging that American surplus cotton be sold on the world market. Other countries have taken advantage of our price-support program, which has kept the domestic price of cotton at a reasonable level. They have increased their own production of foreign-grown cotton, and when it has been increased they have sold it on the world market at prices slightly lower than the support prices of American-grown cotton.

Of course, these countries are going to yell to high heaven when we sell 5 million bales of our surplus cotton. This fact alone will hurt their sales in foreign markets, and I expect the State Department to take its customary position against selling our local product so as to permit foreigners to get a price for their own staple. Nonetheless, the sale of 5 million bales of American cotton on the world market will reduce our surplus of cotton to the point that it will not be a serious threat. It will take the pressure off the domestic price and will have the effect of bringing us to a point where our further curtailment of planting cotton may not have to last long and we may not have to be so rigid in applying it.

Hon. James P. Richards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in private and undoubtedly much more will be said publicly concerning the retirement from the Congress of our very distinguished colleague, Representative JAMES P. RICHARDS, of South Carolina. It is generally conceded to be lamentable that the Congress and the country should lose the services of one who has earned for himself the universal admiration and respect of all his colleagues and who has served with credit and distinction as the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee during these difficult and dangerous times and who has in such service earned an enviable reputation for fairness and capacity. It was my intention to include in these remarks the article which appeared in the New York Times of Friday, May 18, 1956, on Mr. RICHARDS, but a Member of the other body has set forth that article in the RECORD. It is an interesting but by no means complete word picture of a great American and a distinguished legislator.

Statement in Support of Housing Bill Introduced by Hon. Victor Wickersham, of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to amend the National Housing Act to assist in the provision of off-base housing for occupancy by or rental to military or permanent civilian personnel and their dependents. At the present time, there is no housing law under which financing can be made available for the construction of 1 to 4 family dwellings for such personnel in areas or communities outside of military bases. Therefore, I believe this will provide a most worthy and needed addition to present military family-housing laws and one which will certainly prove useful to the armed services in the State of Oklahoma and I feel sure in many other States.

My bill would authorize the Federal Housing Administration to provide insurance on mortgages for 1 to 4 family off-base housing, under the same terms as provided in the basic FHA title II sales-housing program. Because I believe housing constructed under these provisions will prove most useful to military and other personnel if they are held for rent by builders, I have provided that the FHA Commissioner shall have power to require properties covered by mortgages insured by these provisions to be held for rent for such periods of time as he may prescribe.

This bill should provide our armed services with another housing program which will supplement those now in the laws and which should prove extremely useful in providing off-base housing for those enlisted and officer personnel for whom the Armed Forces cannot now provide on-base housing. Because I am also advised that the provision of housing for atomic-energy installations is a similar and closely parallel problem, I have included language so that the Atomic

Energy Commission may also take advantage of the financing provided by this bill.

Under the provisions of this bill, either the Secretary of Defense or the Atomic Energy Commission, as the case may be, is in a position to control the number of units which will be available under this program. As a further safeguard, the FHA is given veto power over their requests unless, in an exceptional case, the Secretary of Defense or the Atomic Energy Commission is willing to guarantee the FHA's Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund.

National Library of Medicine in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, all 13 Congressmen from the Chicago and Cook County area have introduced or signified their intention of introducing a bill similar to H. R. 11273, which I introduced last week to create a National Library of Medicine in Chicago.

Under date of May 22, I received a letter from the president of the Medical Center Commission in Chicago, which commission was created by an act of the Illinois State Legislature to foster development as a medical center of the district bounded by Ashland Boulevard, Congress Street, Oakley Boulevard, and Roosevelt Road. Dr. Walter H. Theobald, president of the Medical Center Commission, advised me that the commission will donate the land for the location of the proposed National Library of Medicine.

The members of the Medical Center Commission are as follows: Hon. William G. Stratton, Governor of Illinois; Hon. Daniel Ryan, president, Board of Cook County Commissioners; Hon. Richard J. Daley, mayor of Chicago; Hon. James H. Gately, president, Chicago Park District; Hon. Latham Castle, attorney general, State of Illinois.

The commissioners of the Medical Center Commission are Walter H. Theobald, M. D., president; Karl A. Meyer, M. D., vice president; Thomas J. Downs, treasurer; C. Hilding Anderson, secretary; Otto L. Bettag, M. D.; Charles J. Burg; Park Livingston; George W. McLester, executive directors.

The body of Dr. Walter H. Theobald's May 22, 1956, letter, on behalf of the Medical Center Commission, reads as follows:

This is to let you know that we of the Medical Center Commission deeply appreciate your introducing the bill to establish the National Library of Medicine in Chicago.

Since Chicago is the acknowledged distribution and communications center, as well as the medical center of the United States, the library, when located here, will be more useful to doctors, medical teachers, and research personnel throughout the country than it could be at any other site.

You, of course, are familiar with the unique composition of the Medical Center District on Chicago's West Side. The famous hospitals, professional schools, and related institutions concentrated here make this the world's foremost medical center. The important functions of medical research, medical teaching, and medical care, as featured here, emphasize the suitability of the Medical Center District as the location for the library—where it will be available to the thousands of doctors, teachers, and students who come to this mecca of the healing arts. Establishing the library in the Medical Center District will make it easily accessible also to the personnel of the many other professional institutions and medical organizations at various locations in Chicago.

In view of the immeasurable good that will come from having the library as an important facility of this center, we are pleased to tell you that the Medical Center Commission will donate the land for this purpose.

The offer of the Medical Center Commission is most commendable. With all of the advantages offered by a Chicago location and with no cost to the Federal Government for the land involved, the location of the National Library of Medicine in Chicago is a must.

Reduction of Premium Rates for FHA Insurance on Cooperative Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the 1st session of the 84th Congress I introduced H. R. 4443, which provides for the reduction of premium rates for FHA insurance on cooperative housing from one-half of 1 percent to one-fourth of 1 percent.

This morning I had an opportunity to testify before the House Committee on Banking and Currency, to urge that this particular legislation be enacted, and I would like to include herewith my testimony:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, first I would like to express my appreciation to you for granting me an opportunity to appear before you to testify in behalf of H. R. 4443, a bill I introduced during the last session, which would reduce the premium rates for FHA insurance on cooperative housing from one-half of 1 percent to one-fourth of 1 percent.

I realize that the Housing and Home Finance Agency has not reported favorably on this legislation, indicating that it is the Agency's view that the amount of mortgage insurance premium should be directly related to the risk involved and the adequacy of the various insurance funds set out in the National Housing Act. The Agency also states that from their experience they have found no evidence which would indicate that the risk involved in the case of cooperative housing is any less than the risk involved in the other insurance programs administered under the National Housing Act, or that the insurance fund for cooperative housing is of such a nature that a reduced premium is warranted.

However, I would like to point out a few facts. Since the end of the war there has been a very critical shortage of housing for the middle-income group, many of whom are veterans. Section 213 of the Housing Act was designed to fill the gap between public housing for the low-income groups and private homes and luxury apartments for the high-income groups. Unfortunately, as we have learned, some builders were able to use section 213 for their own private gain, far in excess of a reasonable profit, to the detriment of the very people for whom section 213 was intended. The net result has been that in every section 213 cooperative which has been built, increases in carrying charges have occurred ranging from 10 to 30 percent and more, forcing many of our citizens, most of them veterans, to vacate their apartments because they were unable to meet these increased charges.

The residents of the 213 cooperatives are deserving of relief. Practically all of them relied upon the representations of the builders that the various cooperatives were under the supervision and guidance of the FHA, which implied that the FHA had carefully scrutinized the proposed carrying charges and verified them. That, in fact, was not done, and it either should have been done, or the FHA should have forced the builders to represent the true picture of the co-op corporations before the tenant-stockholders purchased stock and signed occupancy agreements.

One feasible avenue of relief for the section 213 cooperatives is the reduction of the FHA mortgage insurance premium from one-half to one-fourth of 1 percent per annum of the amount of the principal application of the mortgage outstanding at any time.

Experience has shown that there have been practically no foreclosures of section 213 cooperatives, and thus the fund created by the mortgage insurance premiums has not been touched. It is reasonable and fair to assume that the continued prosperity of section 213 cooperatives and the nonexistence of foreclosures will continue. Moreover, the fund created by the mortgage insurance premiums is not an escrow or separate fund, but is part of the general funds of the FHA, not specifically designated to indemnify the Government in the event it becomes liable, pursuant to Government guaranteed mortgages issued pursuant to section 213.

Reduction of the mortgage insurance premiums as set forth in my proposed bill will enable all cooperatives built under section 213 to resist further carrying charge increases at no expense to the FHA, and without causing any detriment to that agency.

The section 213 cooperatives have proven to be excellent insurance risks in the past, and the reduction in the present mortgage insurance premiums will be a tremendous help to the tenant-stockholders. The cooperatives have shown that with strong and intelligent management they have been able to operate and maintain their properties at a minimum cost.

If the FHA had taken definite steps in the first place to protect the tenant-stockholders who bought into the cooperatives, the terrific increases in carrying charges would not have taken place.

These people are entitled to our consideration and support, and I urge you to study H. R. 4443 carefully with a view toward reporting it favorably to the House of Representatives.

In addition, I might suggest that you permit some of those most closely associated with the operation of these cooperatives to testify before your committee so that they can give you a true and factual picture of the problems faced by these projects under the present system.

Bad for the Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there is mounting evidence that all is not well with the Department of Defense as it is being administered by Secretary Charles Wilson. A genius for the management of big business, which Mr. Wilson undoubtedly demonstrated in his career before entering Government, does not seem to be adequate for the duties and responsibilities Mr. Wilson has assumed as a member of President Eisenhower's Cabinet. The Trenton Evening Times said editorially the other day that—

Secretary Wilson's weakness for inept utterances, while embarrassing, is on the lighter side. Much more serious is the apparent failure of the United States to keep pace with Soviet Russia in certain vital fields of military development, particularly the air, attended by the bitter dissension among the services.

Attributing the harmful discord to "eager beaver" service partisans, Mr. Wilson declares that the existing conflicts "are not good for the country." This is an extremely restrained estimate of their consequences. They are dangerous, and it is the responsibility of Secretary Wilson and President Eisenhower to see that they are ended.

If Secretary Wilson has not succeeded after nearly 4 years in building an organization that can work in harmony for the creation of a formidable military establishment, he has written a record of failure. The existing situation is far from creditable to him or to the Eisenhower administration.

On Memorial Day I was one of the speakers at the annual observance held at the Beverly National Cemetery by the William A. Cortright, Jr., Post of the American Legion. The size and success of the affair is a tribute to the post members who work for months on the plans. It is a great expression of gratitude to the 10,000 veterans who rest in the cemetery.

The principal speaker at the Beverly ceremonies was Lt. Gen. Thomas W. Herren, commanding general of the First Army. The general's excellent speech emphasized the need for a great Ready Army Reserve to back up the Regular Army which has been cut back considerably in recent years.

General Herren did not say so, but the Reserve Act passed in 1955 has been a resounding flop. This is tragic at a time when the Russians and their satellites have 8 million men under arms. When the Reserve Act was adopted, I reported that, in my opinion, it was poorly drafted and replete with inequities and loopholes. To a large extent it was designed to cover up earlier failures. There have been only 800 Reserve enlistments in New Jersey in the past year. Our present Reserve strength is not much more than one-third of that which is authorized. The boys cannot be blamed for not enlisting in a program which is based upon a law so confusing that hardly anyone can understand how it is supposed to work. The Department of Defense would do well to take off its rose-colored glasses. The services should stop alternately bragging and fighting with each other and straighten out the mess they have created for themselves. Do we have a good Reserve? Do we have the best Air Force? Do we have the best missile program? Are our concepts of the missions of the services correct? These and many other questions of the American people should be answered because the people are, in fact, the owners of the Nation's Defense Establishment.

I include here for the information of my colleagues two editorials from the Trenton Evening Times:

[From the Trenton (N. J.) Evening Times of May 22, 1956]

RESERVE LAW FAILS

Endorsement by President Eisenhower and Defense Secretary Wilson of Military Reserve Week was not expected to give essential vitality to a movement which has failed from the beginning to enlist public interest, much less the practical support necessary to its success.

President Eisenhower signed the Reserve Forces bill last August with the comment that while it fell short of what it should have been "it does contain provisions that will definitely strengthen the Reserve structure." In practical application, however, the measure has failed to accomplish even this modest purpose.

It was hoped that by July 1 at least 95,000 boys between the ages of 17 and 18½ would volunteer to serve 6 months in the Reserve and that by 1959 the Ready Reserve would be increased to 2,900,000. Most recent figures show, however, that only 22,175 boys have volunteered for the 6-month enlistment and that the Ready Reserve numbers only 890,000.

It is apparent that when Congress, fearful of an unfavorable political reaction to any compulsory features in a military service bill, made the Reserve law wholly voluntary, it enacted an impotent and ineffective measure.

The youth of the Nation is not interested in military service. Its attitude toward this obligation of citizenship is influenced by the fact that the draft is operating in extremely slow motion and that there is little to suggest that service is inevitable. The young men prefer to take their chances on not being called.

It is obvious, accordingly, that if the Reserves are to become "a bulwark of our Armed Forces," the role in which they have been envisioned, more formidable legislation will have to be devised and enacted. It is not too soon to appraise the current law as a failure.

[From the Trenton (N. J.) Evening Times of May 23, 1956]

BAD FOR THE COUNTRY

There is mounting evidence that all is not well with the Department of Defense as it is being administered by Secretary Charles Wilson. A genius for the management of big business, which Mr. Wilson undoubtedly demonstrated in his career before entering government, does not seem to be adequate for the duties and responsibilities Mr. Wilson has assumed as a member of President Eisenhower's Cabinet.

Secretary Wilson's weakness for inept utterances, while embarrassing, is on the lighter side. Much more serious is the apparent failure of the United States to keep pace with Soviet Russia in certain vital fields of military development, particularly the air, attended by the bitter dissension among the services.

Attributing the harmful discord to "eager beaver" service partisans, Mr. Wilson declares that the existing conflicts "are not good for the country." This is an extremely restrained estimate of their consequences. They are dangerous, and it is the responsibility of Secretary Wilson and President Eisenhower to see that they are ended.

If Secretary Wilson has not succeeded after nearly 4 years in building an organization that can work in harmony for the creation of a formidable Military Establishment, he has written a record of failure. The existing situation is far from creditable to him or to the Eisenhower administration.

Another and a different phase of the Defense Department record is revealed in the complaint by Joseph Campbell, Federal Comptroller General, that the Department is illegally holding $400 million in foreign-aid funds that should have been handed back to the Treasury. It may be, as Defense Department officials maintain, that this is only a technical violation of the law but it is indisputably bad business practice.

Jordan Celebrates 28th Anniversary of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend greetings to the people of Jordan, His Majesty Husayn al Hashimi, and His Excellency Abdul Monem Rifa'i, Ambassador of Jordan, upon the occasion of the celebration of the 28th anniversary of independence of Jordan, May 25, 1956.

On May 25, 1928, the people of Jordan threw off their shackles and proclaimed their freedom and independence. It was not until 1939, however, that the sovereignty of the country was recognized. Later, in 1946, Jordan started establishing their diplomatic relations with other countries and the nation was declared a monarchy under the kingship of his late majesty, King Abdullah, the founder of the state.

The Kingdom of Jordan is rightfully proud of its accomplishments during its period of national life. The nation has always stood in defense of the principles of democracy and freedom. It is well remembered that its gallant army fought side by side with the Western Allies in the last World War.

In the words of His Excellency Abdul Monem Rifa'i:

The Jordan Kingdom is the protector of the holy places in Jerusalem and Bethlehem, where the Dome of the Rock and the Mosque of Omar stand side by side to the Church of the Holy Sepulcher and the Church of the Nativity, a living symbol of brotherhood and fraternity.

Well aware of the tensions in the Middle East, the Kingdom of Jordan is contributing to the stability of the area by shouldering many of the burdens of the

Arab refugees. By offering shelter to more than half the number of the Palestine Arab refugees Jordan is to a great extent alleviating their suffering.

I salute Jordan as she embarks upon a new year of national life and pray for her continued success and progress.

The Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I delivered before the Propeller Club of New Orleans, La., on National Maritime Day, Tuesday, May 22, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHARLES E. POTTER BEFORE THE PROPELLER CLUB OF NEW ORLEANS, LA., ON NATIONAL MARITIME DAY, MAY 22, 1956

Mr. President, members of the Propeller Club of New Orleans and distinguished guests, I find it difficult to tell you in adequate terms what a very great pleasure it is for me to be your guest here in New Orleans today to celebrate National Maritime Day and to commemorate the 137th anniversary of the sailing of the first American steampship across the Atlantic.

Senate business brought me to your wonderful city of New Orleans—the Queen City of the South—in June 1953.

I shall never forget your warm reception, your friendly cooperation and your magnificent, unparalleled hospitality. I long to return, and in fact, as chairman of the newly constituted subcommittee on water transportation, I had scheduled another visit to your fascinating city for December 1953. What more perfect opportunity to renew my brief but enjoyable acquaintance with New Orleans hospitality and, at the same time, seriously to view this great port providing access between the vast agricultural and industrial heartland of America, the Mississippi Basin, the Gulf States, and the ports of all the free world. I thought nothing could prevent my visit at that time, but fate decreed otherwise.

I have had to wait until now to come back among you.

I was, therefore, not only honored, but greatly pleased to be invited to appear before you on this occasion. My only regret is that the press of business in these final months in the Senate will keep me from lingering long enough to savor the atmosphere and hospitality of New Orleans as much as I would like.

Today we are celebrating a major national anniversary, one of deep significance to this country whose origins and growth developed from commerce on the seas. This banquet here tonight is being repeated all over the country by the hundreds of thousands of informed Americans who know the part that our maritime commerce has played in making the United States, from pioneer beginnings, the greatest nation on earth. They believe, with firm conviction, that we must develop and maintain a strong merchant marine if we are to continue to enjoy the bounteous blessings of this great and productive country of ours, and remain secure against forces from without that would destroy our culture and our way of life.

When we celebrate birthdays or anniversaries we frequently think in terms of growth and the making of comparisons of one year with another.

Today, more people with higher incomes are creating an expanding market for homes, durable goods, and for many items which were once considered luxuries or nonessentials. Along with all this demand for new goods has come new demands for travel, brought on by paid vacations and a reduction in the workweek. At present the population of the United States is increasing at the rate of almost 3 million persons per year. I have heard estimates that by 1965 it will be one-fifth larger than it was in 1953, while production will be one-half again greater, disposable income per person will be one-third larger, and the hours of work one-tenth less.

This amazing growth is vividly reflected in the overall tonnage flowing through the port of New Orleans from 1950 through 1955. Considering domestic, foreign, Department of Defense, and in-transit cargoes, we have seen a steady rise from just over 35 million tons in 1950 to well over 41 million tons in 1955, an average annual increase in total volume of waterborne trade in excess of 1 million tons. The picture is similar when we examine the overall export and import foreign commerce through New Orleans, where over 8 million tons of cargoes were handled in 1950, as compared with the import and export foreign trade of approximately 11 million tons enjoyed in 1955.

Making still another comparison, at present levels our total export foreign trade is almost 3 times the monthly average of approximately 2 million tons exported in 1938. And our 1955 imports are double the 1.7 million tons imported monthly in 1938.

We are clearly, then, enjoying a growth and expansion of economy unprecedented in the history of the world.

MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Maritime Day this year seems to me to have more than usual significance. Almost exactly 1 month from today marks the 20th anniversary of the enactment of the Magna Carta of American shipping—the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

In 1935, after over 15 years of effort to establish a privately owned merchant marine—with almost every conceivable form of aid—the Government owned some 250 vessels, approximately 40 of which were being operated under agency agreements on four foreign service lines owned by the Government. There were around 300 vessels in private operation engaged in the mail contract services—only 29 of which had been built under the provisions of the 1928 act.

American ships were carrying less than 35 percent of our overseas foreign commerce.

Many of our ships were already obsolete, and most of them, ranging in age from 15 years up, had an economic life of 5 years or less to go.

The net working capital of the ocean mail contractors was a little more than $4 million, and the net worth of the companies operating those 300 vessels was only a little more than $76 million.

Two oil tankers, each of about 9,000 gross tons, were the only seagoing merchant vessels under construction in the shipyards of the Nation. The ship-repair segment of the industry was comparably impoverished.

The maritime situation in those early prewar years was depressing and steadily worsening. When the small, but threatening, dark cloud of Hitler's rise to power in Europe was recognized by only a few, the Congress was directed to bend its full efforts toward restoration of our merchant marine.

The committees of the House and Senate worked arduously and continuously for over 18 months. Seven or eight legislative proposals were introduced and exhaustively examined before the final resulting compromise, which became the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

In the long and sometimes bitter battle that produced the act the future of the American merchant marine frequently hung in the balance between the forces who favored Government ownership and operation and those who—while recognizing the necessity for Government aid—fought for the maximum degree of private ownership and operation. Above all, however, the sense of the majority of both Houses was for the need for a strong merchant marine.

In the final compromise—adopted in the House of Representatives on June 20, 1936, by a vote of 225 in favor and 21 against—the private-enterprise proponents won out overwhelmingly. This victory came only after yielding to the proviso that if private enterprise could not, or would not provide what was needed, the Government itself must take the initiative to establish or augment essential services until competent private ownership could take over.

The framers of the act insisted that its provisions be made applicable to the carrying out of a specific long-range program of additions and replacements to be developed immediately after its enactment to meet the needs of commerce and defense in the foreseeable future. Immediately after the new act became effective, the Maritime Commission, on consultation with the Navy Department, directed itself to the task of determining a realistic and tangible program to serve as the guide and goal for action during the coming years.

The record discloses that such a program might be made effective in a minimum of 7 years.

The Commission studied the flow of our overseas commerce, and established a system of some 30 essential trade routes. Account was taken of the flow of our trade existing at that time, and trade which might be developed to the long-range advantage of our national economy.

The Navy indicated that its minimum mobilization needs required the construction of about 500 modern ships in the ensuing 10 years.

Thus, it was that the Commission adopted its long-range building program calling for 50 ships a year over a 10-year period to rehabilitate the dry cargo portion of the merchant marine.

Happily, time was on our side, and the early steps to implement the long-range program previously adopted proved—as has been repeated time and again—the wisdom and foresight of those who conceived and molded this basic legislation.

It is now history that the start we made in the few years before war broke out in Europe in 1939, revitalized our shipbuilding industry and provided us with a nucleus of modern ships which may well have been the margin of victory in World War II.

TWENTY YEARS OF THE 1936 ACT

Implementation of the 1936 act had scarcely begun before World War II broke out in Europe. And the abnormal conditions prevailing throughout the world from September 1939, until the end of the war, denied us the opportunity of true perspective on the effectiveness of the act during its first 10 years. The second 10 years has also been characterized by violently changing conditions, not consciously anticipated in the prewar years.

In the first years after the war, before the rehabilitation of the foreign fleets—when we were carrying better than 50 percent of our foreign commerce—I have heard cynics say that the Merchant Marine Act was in no way responsible for the health of the American merchant marine. They pointed to the impending war—to the war itself—and to the

devastated condition of the rest of the world as being both cause and effect in the development of our maritime strength.

I cannot argue against the obvious fact that wartime construction and the wartime demands for transportation greatly accelerated the attainment of the original goal of the framers of the act. They strengthened the financial position of operators who were in serious financial straits in 1935. Wartime and postwar conditions, plus the Ship Sales Act, brought previously nonexistent operators into the American-flag fleet.

Yes, those things are true, but from the vantage point of a score of years, let us look at that part of the merchant marine today which has been operating under the provisions of the 1936 act, and decide whether it has been effective—whether it has proved its worth.

The original Maritime Commission went into action immediately upon its formation, and established a definite program for the immediate future. In this program was the development of the excellent, high-speed, modern, and safe C-type cargo and combination vessel, designed in collaboration with vessel owners, to meet the requirements of our commerce and defense. Many of these fine ships were actually in being long before we got into World War II. Their construction affected the revitalization of our shipbuilding capacity. The operators who acquired them, under the carefully developed requirements of the 1936 act, set about the improvement of their services on the previously determined essential trade routes.

The fast, regular, and frequent services required under the law are now paying dividends to American exporters and importers, and to the areas which they serve. As was stated by your own E. J. McGuirk, president of the New Orleans Steamship Association, and dean of the New Orleans steamship fraternity, "In spite of all the provisions of nature, the great port of New Orleans did not begin to grow until there was established regular and dependable services by the American merchant marine." The far-sighted terms and requirements of the 1936 act are responsible for the highest development of the conception of regularity and dependability of shipping services.

The wartime chairman and the other members of the Maritime Commission kept their eyes closely on the postwar needs of the merchant marine under the 1936 act. They firmly insisted that a good part of the emergency ship construction program be devoted to building of modern vessels suitable for peacetime commerce—those ships are the backbone of our present fleet.

Today, as we approach the 20th birthday of the act, we find that the original 12 operators have grown to 16. They are presently operating 300 large, fast vessels. Through the wise provision for the establishment of reserve funds and replacement obligations, they are now beginning to replace their present fleets on an orderly basis with ships of the latest design. Twelve of the sixteen subsidized lines, having existing replacement obligations, will build 180 new ships between 1955 and 1970, at an estimated total cost in excess of $1,500,000,000. We have seen the strengthening effect of the 1936 act dramatically reflected in comparison of the net worth position of the mail contract operators in 1935, and the subsidized operators today, as mentioned earlier, the net worth of the companies operating 300 vessels under the 1928 act was only a little more than $76 million. According to the latest available figures—as of September 1955—the subsidized lines had an aggregate net worth of approximately $550 million. The working capital of most of the individual subsidized lines today exceeds the $4 million which was available to all of the mail contract operators in 1935. And, by no means the least of the achievements made possible by the 1936 act, are the standards of safety, working and living conditions, and wages of the American seafarer, who can no longer be labeled a second-class citizen.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was conceived and developed as an integrated whole, each section and each chapter deliberately and carefully interlocked with one basic objective—the development and maintenance of an adequate American merchant marine.

Every precaution was taken to assure that that merchant marine should be owned, operated, and manned by American citizens, and that the Government's substantial interest and contribution be protected. But the objective was paramount in every provision.

THE MERCHANT MARINE TODAY

I have recited the phenomenal facts of growth and development of our national economy and our foreign commerce. I believe I have presented the facts that prove the foresight of the fathers of the 1936 act—facts which show that its principles have been sound and effective, where previous efforts had met miserable failure. Therefore, having painted such a rosy picture, you may wonder why I have entitled this address "Hope for the American Merchant Marine"—for hope implies the need for correction of an unsatisfactory situation.

I do not wish to belabor you too much with statistics—but a few figures can sometimes tell a story better than a thousand words.

Our national maritime policy has been construed as setting a goal of approximately 50 percent American-flag participation in the foreign commerce of the United States. Yet, since World War II, we have seen our participation drop from 70 percent in 1946 to 54.8 percent in 1948, to 35.8 percent in 1952, to 29.6 percent in 1953 at the conclusion of the Korean war. Then, in 1954, it dipped to 27.8 percent, and by the end of 1955, the American-flag was only carrying 22.7 percent of our foreign trade—far lower, even, than the proportion which was viewed with alarm in what were deemed to be the dark days of 1935. This depressing but baffling situation prevails despite the firm retention of the 50–50 principle in the carriage of our vast Government programs. It exists despite the fact that all, or nearly all, of our subsidized operators are in a substantial recapture bracket, signifying highly profitable operation in recent years.

Within the past 4 years, our privately owned oceangoing merchant fleet has dropped from the postwar peak of 1,300 vessels in 1952, to 1066 vessels as of the 1st of April 1956. These things have occurred while our export and import foreign trade has nearly doubled itself since 1946.

The shipbuilding picture is nearly as bleak as it was 20 years ago. And the projected replacement plans will not maintain a safe level of activity in the shipyards.

Three years ago, I was appointed chairman of the Water Transportation Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate, and directed to conduct merchant marine studies and try to find why our relative position on the seas was plummeting so drastically and so rapidly. Our subcommittee was directed to find the answers.

Our aims in the studies that were commenced at that time were somewhat similar to the aim of the fathers of the 1936 act. For the problem was relatively the same in many respects.

We took note of the violently changing times, the accelerating pace of our industrial economy, the shifting patterns through the world as the result of the hot war and the tensions of the cold war. We attempted to evaluate our maritime needs in the light of the completely new era which burst upon the world with the explosion of the first atomic bomb at Alamogordo, N. Mex.

We wanted to find out what our needs were for commerce and for defense—how close we were to satisfying those needs—and finally to take action accordingly. In the course of this program, we wanted to determine the adequacy of the 1936 act to serve its high purpose in a world vastly different from that in which it was conceived.

In hearings held throughout the spring, summer, and fall of that year we compiled a voluminous and valuable record on the first phase of our program—a study of the size, composition and quality of a modern American merchant marine. While the particular program which I had determined upon could not be carried to fulfillment, the subsequent years have seen continued dedicated efforts in the Congress to adjust our merchant marine legislation to the postwar world.

Thus, no one can say that we have been guilty of the complacency of indifference and ignorance which led to the disappearance of the American flag from the seas after the passing of the clipper ship era, prior to World War I. Each year since World War II has seen some new legislative approach designed to arrest our downward trend, by patchwork amendment to our basic shipping laws, and other measures. They are obviously not measuring up to their purpose, however, for despite these well-meant efforts, we are faced with the sobering fact that our participation in foreign trade is only 22 percent. Ships are annually disappearing from the American flag. We have built only three new passenger ships in the last 10 years, in the face of ever-accelerating waterborne passenger traffic. Our shipyards are depressed notwithstanding recent programs for tanker construction, modernization of Liberty ships, repair of reserve-fleet vessels, and conversions of mariner vessels sold to private operators.

This time we recognize the dangers of an inadequate American-flag merchant marine, and we are making motions in the hope that we can restore ourselves to our proper place among the fleets of the world. I firmly believe that this can be done. Before we do so, however, we must overcome another type of complacency which derives from a strong tendency in the shipping industry to preserve the status quo. There seems to me to be a failure to realize that we are in a completely new era of world development, notwithstanding some notable steps of a revolutionary nature being taken in some segments of the industry. Finally, the intervention of World War II and the special postwar problems that had to be met by new legislation have obscured the fundamental soundness of the clear concept of original 1936 act. Too much reliance has been placed on patchwork panaceas, and too little adherence to the carefully integrated principles which brought about the creation of the hard core of what is left of our merchant marine today.

With all humility, I would like to suggest the following steps which, if taken by the Government and supported by the industry, offer hope for a modern American merchant marine, adequate in all respects to serve our commerce and national security in this new era in world civilization.

First, I suggest that there be a redetermination made as to the size, composition, and quality of an American merchant marine adequate to meet our initial mobilization requirements in the immediately foreseeable future to carry our domestic waterborne commerce and at least 50 percent of our foreign waterborne commerce. The importance of such a goal cannot be underestimated. Only through the establishment of a previously determined program can we know for what we strive. There is not now any tangible target of this kind.

Secondly, I suggest the initiation and adoption of a long-range program similar

to that called for by section 210 of the original 1936 act. That program, excellent and adequate though it was for the times in which it was adopted, has been virtually completed, even though there still remain some few essential routes or services not served by American-flag vessels.

Thirdly, in developing such a program there should be no hesitancy in departing from traditional concepts if they offer adequate promise.

Fourthly, when the goal and the program have been determined—we should then proceed to take whatever action is necessary to assure the accomplishment of the program. If new blood and sound new ideas can be brought into our merchant marine, all necessary assistance should be provided by the Government.

We should not be inflexible. For example, in insistence upon private financing, which would prevent the birth of a new venture and the type of growth and expansion of the 16 existing subsidized operators. This is not an advocacy of getting the Government more deeply into the shipping business. On the contrary, some direct Government financial assistance to private enterprise embarking upon new ventures will, I am sure, make it less necessary for the Government to construct and operate ships that are needed to build up our mobilization potentials.

None of these recommendations are in any way revolutionary. They merely restate, in the context of 1956, what was contemplated in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. They urge that that act be carefully reexamined and viewed as a whole. They urge that the objectives and statement of policy of the act, which are as sound as ever, should override restrictive influences which are of only incidental importance in relation to the goal we are trying to achieve.

In closing, I firmly believe the basic principles of the 1936 act can produce the merchant marine we need just as they produced the merchant marine we have.

Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, as president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, it gives me much pleasure to present a very able address delivered at the 43d annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in Washington, D. C., on May 11, 1956, by Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Representative from Colorado. The address is as follows:

RECLAMATION

It is a happy and pleasing experience for me to be here at this time to meet with this congress dedicated to programs for flood control, river and harbor development, and navigation. I know that much of the success of the programs in these areas is due to the diligent effort of this rivers and harbors congress, and I wish to compliment not only the officers of this group but all of those on the working front.

I cannot in the few minutes of your time which I propose to take do justice to the subject of reclamation. I cannot in this time cite to you all its virtues, nor even trace its history. Federal assistance in the "reclaiming of land" in the West is nothing more or less than a continuation of the historic land policies of this Nation. It has been of great and demonstrable value to the whole Nation, and its value is becoming more evident every year, even though opposition to this wise development program has, if anything, increased of late years. It has never been my policy to lambaste the opposition in any field. There are many comments I could make about various narrow and sectional types of opposition that reclamation has faced in the past, faces today, and undoubtedly will face in the tomorrows, but I much prefer to make my case on the merits. I am convinced that merit is on the side of reclamation.

Reflect with me for a moment. This Nation was founded in no small part by those who wished to acquire their own land—a hope denied to them in their homeland by laws of primogeniture and entail and by the great estates of the nobility. Early attempts at communal agriculture here in this New World established the real worth of the individual unit of the family farm. The land policy in this Nation, over the years, represented a struggle between the speculator and land monopolist on the one side, and the individual enterpriser on the other. Hardy pioneers forced the Nation to accept the principle that he who first reclaimed the land from the forest or grass and, unfortunately, the native Indian, had first right to continued possession. Unfortunately, the issue has never been clearly resolved—nor will it ever be. In our own time, we are seeing an inexorable reversal of our pattern of land ownership. There is a steady decrease in the number of family-unit farms; a steady increase in the average size of farms, and, right, now, a most serious decline in family-farm income. It is my conviction, both from experience and from study, that this Nation owes much to the determined men who carved farms out of the wilderness and who then insisted upon their possession. You may take it as histrionics if you like, but I am convinced that the hardy enterpriser who fought for land and who carried the tide of settlement westward to the Pacific, has done more to advance the continuing democracy in this land than any other single force. This great force is recounted in many places, but none greater nor better known than Frederick Jackson Turner, the great historian, who traced the value of the frontier to this Nation. We should never forget, in an age when the pursuit of the Jones family or the romance of certain Hollywood stars seems to constitute the major interest of the Nation, that the individual who has a life interest in the soil will contribute far more to a good society than a host of modern-day serfs or factory farms.

By the turn of the century hardy pioneers had settled and developed the favorable lands of the West—the private development had reached its limits. Accordingly, President Theodore Roosevelt proposed to the Congress that the Federal Government should enter the field for, as he said, "The reclamation and settlement of the arid lands will enrich every portion of our country, just as the settlement of the Ohio and the Mississippi Valleys brought prosperity to the Atlantic States." The Reclamation Act of 1902 still stands, with some modifications, as a process by which construction costs advanced by the Government are to be repaid by water users, with public lands made available to family unit farms under homestead laws. True, the initial thought that interest-free money for 10 years would do the job has proved to be too optimistic, but the amendments to the act providing for a longer repayment period and incorporating the multiple-purpose concept of water development, have served to maximize the development of the West to the gain of the Nation.

Nothing less than a major program would have been adequate. Policies which had been adequate for land settlement in humid areas, that is, the 160-acre homestead under the act of 1862, proved to be of little value in the more arid West. Other programs were tried and had value, but they tended to be at variance with established land settlement policy. I am proud that this Nation, in 1902, saw fit to continue the policy of providing an area of operation for the family unit farm for enterprising individuals. I am happy presently to support programs which still aim to reward individual initiative by aiding in the establishment of family unit farms under reclamation—farms not to exceed 160 acres in size for each individual or 320 acres for a man and wife. Indeed, in many reclamation projects the average landholding is much less than this where the nature of the crop permits a family operation on smaller units. We should here, I think, examine some of the special problems faced in the West and the "why" of reclamation development.

First, although it is vastly different than your usual problem of too much water, especially at certain times, the major problem of the West is a persistent shortage of water. West of the 100th meridian, it is almost impossible to grow crops without irrigation, except for wheat on a rotating basis. The average moisture available, the great bulk of which comes in the winter, is just not adequate for row crops. In my home area where we raise some of the world's finest peaches, the average rainfall is on the order of 10 inches annually. All through the summer, the ground loses more moisture than comes from the heavens. Irrigation is essential to make the desert bloom. Without a sure supply of water, we have little but a dry and seared desert, hardly capable of supporting animal life, let alone great cities like Denver, Boise, Spokane, Phoenix and others. Without irrigation, the population of the West would be negligible indeed and it would not constitute its present great market for the goods of Detroit, Pittsburgh, and other great manufacturing centers.

This is not to indicate that it took the helping hand of the Government to provide all of the irrigation development. Something on the order of three-fourths of all irrigated land in the West was developed under private plans and programs, including some 10 million acres under the Desert Land Act of 1877. An additional 1 million acres were developed under State programs and the Carey Act of 1894. Reclamation projects now bring water to something over 7 million acres scattered in some 69 projects over the 17 Western States. This land is divided into about 125,000 family unit size farms. An additional 125,000 suburban units receive water from these projects and there are over 400 towns with a total population in excess of 1,600,000 within these projects. Taking it all together, that is, irrigation, power, municipal and industrial water, more than 5 million people in the service areas of reclamation projects obtain their living directly or indirectly by reason of the Federal project development program.

Many figures exist to show the buying power of these people—the market they form, the taxes they pay—and any, or each, of these are but additional testimony to the national value of reclamation projects. Taking tax returns alone, it is carefully estimated that the cumulative returns to the United States Treasury from net new income created by these projects total over $3 billion, an amount comfortably in excess of total expenditures to date for reclamation. I might also remind you, although I do not wish to labor the point, that these tax returns and market potentials are cited for demonstration only, as, under reclamation law, all reclamation projects are required to repay the great bulk of their costs to the Federal Treasury. When these loans, and the fact is that the Federal contribu-

tion should be considered a loan, are repaid, many revenues, especially power revenues, will continue to come back to the Treasury. These returns, of course, include all interest on moneys advanced for power and municipal water features.

I wish it were possible to report that each and every project was either on time or ahead of schedule in repayment, but the situation is not that rosy. Many of the early projects have not worked out as effectively and successfully as originally expected and hoped for. Most of these difficulties were due to the newness of the program and the lack of information that can come only with experience. However, the record has, over the years, improved and we are looking forward to an increasingly sound investment-return program. May I also make passing comment that we have what is known as the reclamation fund—the reclamation area's own "operation bootstrap." It is not too well recognized that a substantial proportion of the land in the States in the West is held as public domain by the Federal Government—in some Western States over half of all land. We collect no taxes as such from that land. Still, it is not without virtue, for much of this land is valuable for oil and gas and other minerals and metals. A portion of the royalties and fees obtained by the Government from these leases goes into the Federal reclamation fund, and each year we are able to supply an increasing percentage of all reclamation expenditures from this western generated fund and a decreasing percentage from the general treasury. This is a revolving fund and repayments now being made from big projects like the Central Valley in California and the Coulee project in Washington, will be most helpful.

It took the mighty Hoover Dam to break the back of the wild and dangerous lower Colorado River, making it a servant and not a menace to man. The vast storage provided sure supplies of water for irrigation and municipal use and also flood control for a river that had run rampant many times with great damage to cities and rich agricultural areas. The falling water activated turbines to provide power, vital power, for the development of the whole metropolitan area of southern California—one of the most important industrial complexes we have in this Nation.

Likewise, other great projects are as useful—the Central Valley in California, the Grand Coulee in Washington, and many more. In my own State—Colorado—projects range from small single-purpose projects to substantial transmountain diversion projects, and each is of great value to its own area and to the Nation. I have a little clipping, hardly deserving of the dramatic story it tells, stating that the Colorado-Big Thompson project contributed an estimated $126 million in direct and indirect benefits to its users—or to say, this represents $126 million of income and spending power obtained by water users of this project which otherwise would not have existed. This might be compared to another story from Colorado where, on lands not under irrigation, farmers suffered a loss of $290 million from drought, high winds, and other causes from 1952 to 1955. The benefits of reclamation are tangible, measurable, real. That $126 million of income cited above, like all income, was spent for many goods—tractors, cotton shirts, fertilizers, irons, furniture—goods produced all over this broad land.

There is much more that I could say, but it could not tell the story any better. Reclamation makes the desert bloom and become productive. The net new income which it generates contributes to the well-being of the whole Nation, as well as to its own area.

We who have lived on the edge of disaster, have a great sympathy and understanding for other water problems, including that of too much even though with us it is most often too little water. We of the West have an understanding of the benefit of low-cost transportation for we have long been a high rate area for transportation. Water is our life and we understand its importance in all its uses as well as its destructive force when not properly harnessed and controlled. We are great believers in multiple-purpose development—in controlling a whole river or river basin so that the water can be put to the use of man—so that it may become man's servant and not his ever-lurking enemy. We have accordingly been pleased over the years to lend our support to projects and programs distant to our area and different than our own needs—great flood-control projects, including dams and new channels and floodways. We have seen the benefit of water transportation and harbor improvement. We are conservationists by conviction. We are dedicated to the wise use of our resources, especially water, for we have seen productive land lay idle and bake in the sun, and sudden torrents of wild water that cut and scar the land, washing away its productivity.

Our interest in water extends from the raindrop or snowflake to the ever-increasing flow of water right down to the sea. Our interest is that water should not be wasted nor waste the land. Water, controlled and regulated, is the servant of man, providing irrigation and food, municipal and industrial water for our great productive machine, recreation for a busy people, transportation for our goods, and power for the wheels of progress. Uncontrolled and unregulated, it becomes a vicious enemy, eating away the soil, despoiling the city and factory, and carrying our vital topsoil to the sea.

Statement on H. R. 9424, Antimerger Bill Before Senate Judiciary Antitrust Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith my statement made before the Senate Judiciary Antitrust Subcommittee, in favor of H. R. 9424, on May 24, 1956:

The hearings being held by this distinguished committee on H. R. 9424 are most timely and important indeed. I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you to present my views and to urge prompt and favorable consideration of this bill which is essential to enable the Federal enforcement agencies to deal more effectively with the merger threat to the competitive economy.

To determine how serious this threat is, our House Judiciary Antitrust Subcommittee made an extensive study and report on the entire corporate and bank merger problem.[1] It found that the present rate of corporate and bank mergers is not only alarming but constitutes one of the most ominous clouds on the economic horizon, since it is drastically reducing competition in many areas and accelerating the trend toward greater and greater concentration of economic power.[2]

To cite a few statistics, in 1955 the number of corporate mergers set a 25-year record and proceeded at a rate 4 times that of 1949. What is more, since 1951 over 3,000 independent concerns in the manufacturing, mining, trade and service industries have disappeared in the process.[3]

Our subcommittee found the same merger trend exists in the banking field as well, which is concentrating control of the Nation's financing resources into fewer and fewer hands. In fact, the rapidly accelerating trend of mergers stands out as the major development in the field of banking during the past 5 years. From 1950 through 1955 about 850 of the commercial banks of the Nation have been lost by way of mergers and consolidations. In 1955 alone 250 mergers have occurred, a 22-year record.[4]

It is against this background that the House Judiciary Antitrust Subcommittee after extensive hearings,[5] the House Judiciary Committee, and the House of Representatives, each without dissent, approved the present bill. I would also point out that the bill is supported by the President, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Trade Commission.

Specifically, what does the bill do and why is its passage imperative? First, the bill plugs a loophole in section 7 of the Clayton Act resulting from the fact that the present section covers only bank mergers achieved by stock acquisitions, but fails to cover bank mergers accomplished by means of asset acquisitions. The bill plugs this loophole by providing the Attorney General and the Federal Reserve Board with the same authority to move against asset acquisitions by banks as they now have to move against stock acquisitions.

Second, it further amends section 7 to require prior notification of certain corporate mergers.

Finally, the bill amends section 15 of the Clayton Act to provide the Federal Trade Commission with authority to seek a preliminary court injunction restraining the completion of a merger until adjudication of its legality.

Each of these provisions I should now like to discuss with you.

BANK MERGERS

Bank mergers are circumscribed by the provisions of the Sherman Act of 1890 which prohibits combinations in restraint of trade, attempts to monopolize, or monopolization of trade or commerce. Illegality is established by proof that the merger has actually resulted in an unreasonable lessening of competition; it is immaterial whether the merger was accomplished by stock or asset acquisitions.

Section 7 of the Clayton Act adopted in 1914 on the other hand, deals specifically with corporate and bank mergers and bans those achieved by stock purchases where there is a reasonable probability of a substantial lessening of competition or a tendency to monopoly. Responsibility for enforcing the section insofar as banks are concerned was vested concurrently in the Attorney General and the Federal Reserve Board.

Section 7 was designed to stop mergers beyond the reach of the Sherman Act but its failure to include mergers accomplished by asset acquisitions resulted in a loophole which so far as nonbanking corporations are concerned was closed by passage of the Antimerger Act of 1950. However, because of revisions made in subsequent versions of

[1] Interim Report of Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary, Corporate and Bank Mergers (84th Cong., 1st sess., 1955).

[2] Id., pp. 1, 37.

[3] Id., pp. 1, 2.

[4] Id., pp. 26, 40.

[5] Hearings, Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary on H. R. 5948 (84th Cong., 1st sess., 1955); Hearings, Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary on H. R. 6758, 7229, and 8332 (84th Cong., 2d sess., 1956).

antimerger bills, it became impracticable to include within the scope of this act corporations other than those subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission. This left asset acquisitions by banks unaffected by the new law since authority to enforce the provisions of section 7 dealing with banks is vested in the Federal Reserve Board and not in the Federal Trade Commission. This gap in existing law which allows a bank merger accomplished by purchase of assets irrespective of its injurious effect on competition has no logical basis. What is more, many bank mergers in recent years have been accomplished by this device.

There is no doubt that this loophole in section 7 has seriously hampered the efforts of the enforcement agencies and that legislation is urgently needed which would provide the Federal Reserve Board and the Attorney General with the same authority to move against bank mergers accomplished by asset acquisitions as they now have to move against bank mergers achieved by stock acquisitions.

The purpose of the first paragraph of section 1 of the present bill is to provide such authority. That paragraph, it will be noted, is identical with H. R. 5948 which was approved by the House on February 6, 1955, without a dissenting voice. Since the present bill incorporates H. R. 5948 in toto, separate consideration of that bill is, of course, unnecessary.

It is important to note that the bank-merger provisions of the present bill do not extend antitrust jurisdiction to any area not previously covered by the antitrust laws. Authority of State banking supervisors to approve or disapprove mergers under local law would remain unaffected subject, of course, to the right of Federal enforcement agencies to proceed in the event of a possible violation of the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act as amended by the pending bill.

The right of Federal enforcement officials to intervene in such situations is one of long standing. For example, the Attorney General now can proceed under the Sherman Act against bank mergers, regardless of how accomplished, where they restrain competition unreasonably. Furthermore, either the Attorney General or the Federal Reserve Board can move under section 7 of the Clayton Act against bank mergers achieved by stock acquisitions where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create monopoly. Thus the bill, in providing the same right of action under the Clayton Act against bank mergers accomplished by asset acquisition, merely follows the existing Federal statutory pattern insofar as State-Federal division of responsibility is concerned.

Moreover, section 7 as proposed to be amended, would provide a far more effective weapon than the Sherman Act in dealing with bank mergers. This is because the Clayton Act requires proof only of a reasonable probability of a substantial lessening of competition whereas the Sherman Act requires proof that competition has actually been lessened unreasonably. Consequently, the bill would allow Federal enforcement agencies to deal with bank mergers well before they have attained such effects as would justify a Sherman Act proceeding. At the same time it is recognized that in some cases a bank merger would not be contrary to the policy of the antitrust laws or of the present bill even though it may lessen competition. For instance, an acquisition of a bank which otherwise would be faced with the possibility of failure would be permissible. Also permissible would be a situation where the acquisition is the most practicable means of dealing with a problem bank having inadequate capital or unsound assets or where the acquired bank has no adequate provision for management succession. Also, where several banks in a small town are compelled by an over-banked situation to resort to unsound competitive practices which may eventually have an adverse effect upon the condition of the banks, the merger of two or more of the banks may well be in the public interest. The same principle applies where there are not adequate banking facilities.[6]

I would stress that the bank merger provisions of the bill represent no departure whatsoever from the basic principles of section 7 of the Clayton Act. Nor do I believe that the characteristics of the banking industry are so unique as to justify such a departure. I am aware that the Office of Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation take the position that while they are in accord with the general purpose of the bank merger provision of the present bill, they believe that this purpose can best be accomplished by an amendment of the banking statutes rather than by an amendment of the antitrust laws. Their proposal would vest administrative responsibility in the bank supervisory agencies and most important of all, would deprive the Department of Justice of enforcement responsibility in the bank merger field.

The position taken by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency must be viewed in light of the fact that the Comptroller, Mr. Ray Gidney, has repeatedly assured our Antitrust Subcommittee that he would not in the exercise of his responsibility approve any bank merger which would be contrary to the policy of the Antimerger Act of 1950, which prohibits corporate mergers where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any section of the country. But, contrary to these assurances, Mr. Gidney in the some 3 years since he has occupied the office has approved over 300 mergers throughout the country, many of which have had extremely damaging competitive consequences. The amazing fact is that in no instance has Mr. Gidney disapproved a bank merger on the basis that it might substantially lessen competition. What this indicates more than anything else is Mr. Gidney's predilection for rubber stamping bank mergers.

Mr. Gidney has not issued anything specific to the examiners in regard to considering anticompetitive factors; he has never notified national bank examiners or given them any specific admonition that it is his policy as Comptroller to disapprove any bank merger violative of the policy of the Antimerger Act. Nor has he required examiners to make findings of fact with regard to competitive considerations in recommending approval or disapproval of proposed bank mergers.

In this context Mr. Gidney's statement that his office will disapprove any bank merger that might jeopardize competition must be taken with a grain of salt. Furthermore, it is doubtful that Comptroller Gidney is even aware of the purposes of antimerger legislation or of the dangers that mergers pose to the competitive banking structure. This conclusion is indicated by Mr. Gidney's testimony before our subcommittee that he "would not say any banks have been eliminated from competition" as a result of the mergers that have occurred in recent years. In his view, even if a merger takes place between the only two banks in a community, "there is still competition in the community." As was pointed out to him, under this theory "that there is still competition where you have mergers * * * that consolidations bring about competition * * * you can never have the application of the Antimerger Act."

It is significant that the position of these two agencies differs sharply from the position taken by the President, the Federal Reserve Board, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Trade Commission, all of whom conclude that legislation limiting bank mergers which have substantial anticompetitive consequences should come through revision of antitrust legislation. The President, for example, in his Economic Report transmitted to the Congress on January 24, 1956, had this to say:

"Mergers have become more numerous of late and an eye, at once vigilant and discriminating, must be kept on such developments. Many mergers have a solid economic justification and serve the general interest by increasing competition; others have neutral effects; while still others place obstacles in the path of effective competition. Over the years Americans have wisely viewed excessive business concentration, or any other undue concentration of economic power, with uneasiness. To serve the basic American desire for an economy in which business opportunities are increasing and in which economic control is widely diffused, it is desirable to strengthen our antitrust laws and provide larger appropriations for their enforcement.

"Toward this end, the following revisions of antitrust legislation are recommended. * * * Federal regulation should be extended to all mergers of banking institutions." [7]

The approach suggested by the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation fails to recognize that monopolistic tendencies in the banking field have since the passage of the Sherman Act in 1890 been dealt with under the antitrust laws and not under the banking statutes. It also fails to recognize that since passage of the Sherman Act bank mergers whether accomplished by stock or asset acquisitions were banned if they resulted in an unreasonable restraint of trade. The Clayton Antitrust Act passed in 1914 to supplement the Sherman Act by arresting monopolies in their incipiency dealt with mergers and prohibited any corporation (including banks, banking associations, and trust companies) from acquiring the stock of another where the effect might be to substantially lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly. Beyond that section 8 of the Clayton Act deals specifically with banks and prohibited interlocking directorates, thus presenting another instance where antitrust problems in the banking field have been covered under the antitrust laws.

On this question Assistant Attorney General Barnes, head of the Antitrust Division, testified before our subcommittee that—

"This committee should weigh carefully the wisdom of tailoring section 7's strictures to the assertedly unique needs of the banking industry. In the more than 60 years since the Sherman Act's passage no one has suggested its provisions did not apply to banks as well as to all other sectors of American business. Similarly, in the Transamerica case, never was it urged that unamended section 7 did not apply with equal force to both banks and nonbanking corporations. And finally, in its 1950 amendment to section 7, Congress reiterated prohibitions on stock acquisitions to fit banks the same as all other corporations. Against this background, * * * this committee should move slowly in creating or encouraging special antitrust treatment for banks." [8]

Furthermore, the proposal of the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to oust the Attorney General of enforcement responsibility in connection with bank mergers would alter the established statutory scheme in a manner which is most inappropriate. As Judge Barnes testified:

"This congressional decision to give the Department of Justice some say in enforce-

[6] House Committee on the Judiciary, Report No. 1417 on H. R. 5948 (84th Cong., 1st sess., 1955) pp. 5–6.

[7] Pp. 78–79.

[8] Hearings on H. R. 5948, p. 11.

ment of bank merger prohibitions is firmly rooted in enforcement realities. Without the Department's right to intervene, there might be as many different views of section 7's standards and scope as there were agencies charged with its enforcement. The result could well be disparities in view which in turn spell real enforcement inequities. Enforcement effectiveness as well requires some procedure for this Department's intervention. Otherwise, in its overall responsibility for section 7's enforcement the Department would be bound by bank merger precedents it had no voice in picking or shaping." [9]

In gaging the necessity for bank merger legislation of the kind here proposed, I am sure that this committee will be particularly mindful of the fact that competition is one of the strongest single factors which safeguard a sound banking system. In this context the rash of recent bank merger activity has had serious competitive implications to the extent where the merger trend is considered by the Federal Reserve Board "a matter of deep concern." [10]

In New York City alone, in the last 7 years, there have been 17 bank mergers. Since the first of this year the New York City area has experienced, in terms of total deposits, the three largest bank mergers in the history of the country. First in March 1955, the Chase National Bank with total assets of $5,669 million merged with the Bank of Manhattan Co. with assets of $1,629 million and the Bronx County Trust Co. with assets of $76 million. This merger provided the new entity, the Chase Manhattan Bank, with total assets of $7,374 million or 21.7 percent of total assets of all banks in New York City and jumped it to first place in New York City and second place in the Nation.

Also, in March 1955, the National City Bank of New York with total assets of $5,767 million merged with the First National Bank of New York with total assets of $713 million. Less than a month later the Bankers Trust Co. with assets of $2,207 million acquired the Public National Bank & Trust Co. of New York with assets of $562 million. This was only the last of a series of acquisitions by Bankers Trust Co. which had absorbed since 1940 the Title Guarantee & Trust Co., Lawyers Trust Co., Flushing National Bank, the Commercial National Bank & Trust Co., and the Bayside National Bank.

These mergers have resulted in a steadily increasing bank deposit concentration in New York City. In 1900 that city's four largest banks had 21 percent of the total deposits; now the 4 largest banks have about 61 percent of all deposits.

This wave of bank mergers is not peculiar to New York City. In Philadelphia, for example, the Pennsylvania Co. for Trusts and Banking, which is now the second largest bank in the area with total assets of approximately $805 million, proposes to merge with the First National Bank which is fifth in size with total assets of $218 million. The consolidated bank would have total assets of about $1,023 million which would make it the largest banking institution in the area with control of 25.3 percent of total banking assets.

This is just the most recent of a series of bank mergers that has occurred in Philadelphia. In 1953 the Tradesman's National Bank & Trust Co. with total assets of $139,801,596 merged with the Land Title Bank & Trust Co. which had assets of $96,378,000. Also in 1953 the Girard Trust Corn Exchange Bank with assets of $579,978,000 acquired the National Bank of Germantown with assets of $39,833,432. The Girard Trust Corn Exchange Bank itself resulted from a merger in 1951 between the Girard Trust Co., one of the hundred largest banks in the Nation, with the Corn Exchange National Bank & Trust Co., another leading bank.

In Pittsburgh the Mellon National Bank & Trust Co. now controls 61 percent of the total bank assets in that area. This has been accomplished by a long process of absorbing a number of smaller institutions.

In Providence, R. I., the Industrial Trust Co., with assets of $312 million, merged with the Providence Union National Bank with assets of $168 million. The resultant Industrial National Bank now owns 57.7 percent of all assets while the first two banks in that city own 93.3 percent of all assets.

In California during 1954 the First Western Bank & Trust Co. of San Francisco, itself a subsidiary of Transamerica Corp., acquired 14 other California banks and increased its assets in the process from $333,537,000 to $798,645,000.

These are only a few examples of the bank merger activity going on throughout the Nation which is wiping out competition of strong independent banks and strengthening the position of the giant banking institutions. In fact, considering national banks alone, some 494 banks have been absorbed between 1950 and May 1, 1955, involving in excess of $13,478 million.

The fact is that due in large part to merger activity the 100 largest banks today control approximately 46 percent of the total assets of all the commercial banks in the country and more than 48 percent of the Nation's bank deposits. In 10 of the Nation's 16 leading financial centers, 4 banks own more than 80 percent of all commercial-bank assets. In 9 of these financial centers, 2 banks own more than 60 percent of all commercial-bank assets. In each of the 16 leading financial centers the first 2 banks own more than 40 percent of all commercial-bank assets; the first 4 banks more than 60 percent.[11]

In light of these considerations additional legislative precautions of the nature that are contained in the present bill are vital to preserve that competition which still exists and to guard against the very real possibility that banking credit, which is the lifeblood of our entire economic system, be dominated to an ever-increasing degree by a small, tightly knit group.

PREMERGER NOTIFICATION

H. R. 9424 would amend section 7 of the Clayton Act in a second respect and require that where the combined capital structure of parties to a proposed merger exceeds $10 million, the acquiring corporation must notify the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission (or the appropriate commission or board vested with jurisdiction) 90 days in advance of the transaction. Together with the notice, the acquiring corporation must also supply the Attorney General and the appropriate agency with specifically enumerated information which would enable them to assess the merger's probable impact on competition. During this 90-day period the merger could not take place, although in appropriate cases this prohibition could be waived. It must be observed that the waiting period requirement would not operate to bar an agency from instituting proceedings at a later date and would not expressly or impliedly serve as a statute of limitations against the Government.

The merging corporations would also be required to furnish the appropriate agencies with such additional relevant information as may be requested, within 30 days. Willful failure to submit the notification or furnish the required information is subject to a civil penalty or from $5,000 to $50,000.

Premerger notification would not be necessary in all transactions. It would not be necessary (1) where stock is acquired solely for investment and does not exceed 5 percent of the outstanding share capital of the corporation in which the investment is made; (2) where the assets acquired do not exceed $5 million or 5 percent of the capital structure of either the acquiring or acquired corporation, whichever is less; and (3) where the assets acquired are stock in trade sold or held for sale by the corporation in its ordinary course of business.

Experience over a period of 5 years in administering the 1950 Antimerger Act has demonstrated the basic need for advance notification legislation. At the present time, the staff of the antitrust enforcement agencies must rely upon newspapers, financial periodicals, trade journals, and other publications for information regarding proposed mergers which the companies themselves could without difficulty supply. Present procedures are quite unsatisfactory, especially since many significant mergers are not even publicized in advance of consummation.

The enforcement agencies also are confronted with the problem of collecting elementary information about the companies involved in a proposed merger in order to determine the merger's impact upon competition and whether a full investigation should be made. This information includes the nature of the business of the merging companies, the products and services sold or distributed, the total sales, the total assets, net sales, and trading areas of both the acquiring and acquired corporations. While this type of information is ordinarily requested from the companies, they neither have a legal obligation to furnish such information let alone make it available expeditiously.

The bill therefore would obviate the considerable time, effort, and investigative expense required to determine whether mergers are about to occur and make unnecessary the haphazard methods of scanning newspapers and trade publications to ascertain where merger threats to competition are arising. It would also enable the antitrust agencies to be informed of mergers not publicly announced before consummation.

Particularly important, the advance notice requirement would afford the enforcement officials a reasonable period of time in which to study the competitive implications of a merger before deciding whether to seek a preliminary injunction restraining its consummation pending a determination of legality.

An additional consideration is that advance notification is necessary in the interest of even-handed enforcement. With that requirement incorporated in the statute, the company that tries to obey the law and seek advance clearance from the Department of Justice or the Federal Trade Commission will no longer stand by and watch its competitor who chooses to remain silent, complete a merger and thereafter rely on the natural indisposition of the enforcement agency to bring a suit to unscramble the commingled assets at some later time.

The force of these considerations was recognized by the President, who, in recommending enactment of a premerger notification requirement, stated:

"All firms of significant size that are engaging in interstate commerce and plan to merge should be required to give advance notice of the proposed merger to the antitrust agencies, and to supply the information needed to assess its probable impact on competition." [12]

The committee is undoubtedly aware that no burden is imposed upon small-business mergers by this bill, since premerger notification is required only where the combined capital, surplus, and undivided profits of the

[9] Id., p. 12.

[10] Testimony of William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, Hearings, Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on Judiciary on Current Antitrust Problems (84th Cong., 1st sess.), p. 2159.

[11] Testimony of George A. Mooney, superintendent of banks, State of New York, id. pp. 1995–1999.

[12] Economic Report of the President transmitted to the Congress January 24, 1956, pp. 78–79.

acquiring and acquired corporation are in excess of $10 million. This figure was recommended by the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission and would probably cover most mergers that have a significant economic effect. Of course, there may be mergers which have a substantial effect on competition, where the aggregate capital structure is less than $10 million. It is clear, however, that the possibility of such transactions having a substantial competitive effect does not justify burdening all corporations with notification and reporting requirements, especially since the antitrust authorities would not, in any event, be foreclosed against taking action against an indicated violation.

Further, minimizing the possibility of hardship, the bill authorizes the enforcement agencies to waive the 90-day period in appropriate cases. For example, if a corporation is in bankruptcy and a quick sale of the assets is proposed, no good purpose would be served by requiring a waiting period of 90 days, assuming the transaction will have no competitive significance. Undoubtedly, there will be a wide variety of other transactions where no possible antitrust implication is involved and where a waiver of the waiting period would be entirely appropriate.

FTC AUTHORITY TO SEEK PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

Equally as necessary as premerger notification is the provision giving the Federal Trade Commission authority to seek a preliminary court injunction to prevent consummation of mergers, or after consummation, to preserve the status quo until completion of administrative proceedings before the Commission.

The authority so provided is similar to that which the Federal Trade Commission now has in certain cases under section 13 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. It is also similar to the authority of the Department of Justice under section 15 of the Clayton Act, which authorizes the Attorney General to seek injunctive relief in the Federal courts to prevent and restrain violations of the Clayton Act, section 7 (the Antimerger Act).

Since the Federal Trade Commission has concurrent responsibility with the Attorney General to enforce that act, logic and policy dictate that the Commission have coextensive authority to invoke the injunctive powers of a district court upon an appropriate showing of necessity. The anomalous situation existing now is that the Commission lacks authority which even private parties have to petition a Federal district court to enjoin the consummation of a reasonably probable illegal merger in order to avert irreparable injury.[13]

Lack of such a provision enabling the Commission to prevent mergers prior to consummation or after consummation, to take action to preserve the status quo until completion of proceedings, has created a serious loophole indeed in the Antimerger Act. It has allowed companies to obtain the benefits of a completed merger even though the legality of the transaction has been challenged by the Federal Trade Commission and notwithstanding the fact that pending final disposition of the complaint, the merger may have caused the very damage to the competitive structure of the industry which the Antimerger Act was intended to safeguard. Furthermore, in many mergers the acquired competitor is completely swallowed up and disappears as an identifiable entity. This makes it practically impossible thereafter to restore completely the preexisting competitive situation.

Consequently while premerger notification is a necessary preliminary step, it is just as important to provide the corollary power to seek an injunction preventing the commingling of assets, management, and productive facilities to a point where they cannot be effectively unscrambled.

I would make it clear the preliminary injunction provision may well benefit the business community itself. Representatives of numerous merging companies believe, in fact, that disruption of business plans is lessened by agency action before merger consummation; some companies point out that if the agencies are to proceed at all they should sue before completion of the merger itself.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 25, 1956

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 24, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in the heat and burden of days that drain our strength and demand our best, we would find the springs by the wayside—that living water whose elixir alone can refresh and restore our bodies and spirits, saving us from physical exhaustion, from spiritual impoverishment, from the numbness of routine and from cynicism and bitterness of heart. Through the sincere expression of differing appraisals in this Chamber, may the final wisdom that charts the Nation's course in these perilous days be higher than our own.

"Set our feet on lofty places,
Gird our lives that they may be
Armored with all Christlike graces
In the fight to set men free;
Grant us wisdom, grant us courage
That we fail not man nor Thee."

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 24, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 8636. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1957, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10542. An act to liberalize certain criteria for determining eligibility of widows for benefits.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 8636. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1957, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10542. An act to liberalize certain criteria for determining eligibility of widows for benefits.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KNOWLAND was excused from further attendance on the session of the Senate today after 2:30 p. m.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations and the Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Committee on Armed Services were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

[13] See *Hamilton Watch Co.* v. *Benrus Watch Co.* (114 F. Supp. 307 (D., Conn. 1953) affirmed 206 F. (2d) 738 (2d Cir. 1953)).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and take up nominations on the Executive Calendar under the heading "New Reports."

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar under the heading "New Reports" will be stated.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the National Science Foundation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the National Science Foundation be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc, and, without objection, they are confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Public Health Service be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc, and, without objection, they are confirmed.

IN THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc, and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the nominations today confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business, with a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AUTHORITY TO DISPOSE OF CERTAIN VESSELS

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of certain vessels, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO LOAN CERTAIN NAVAL VESSELS TO GOVERNMENTS OF GREECE, GERMANY, PORTUGAL, AND SPAIN

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation to authorize the loan of certain naval vessels to the Governments of Greece and the Federal Republic of Germany; to authorize the loan of 2 destroyer escort vessels to Portugal, and to authorize the loan of 2 destroyers to the Government of Spain (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED CONCESSION PERMIT, CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession permit on the south side of Oregon Inlet, Cape Hatteras National Seashore (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Resolution 40

"Resolution relative to the centennial of the birth of Booker T. Washington

"Whereas on April 5, 1856, just 100 years ago, there was born to slave parents in a hut on a farm in the State of Virginia, a son then destined to life-long drudgery in slavery, with education denied to him by law; and

"Whereas when that boy, Booker T. Washington, was 9 years old he was emancipated by the triumph of Lincoln's armies and opportunity in life began to beckon the freed boy; and

"Whereas that Booker T. Washington grew to be a great educator, a gifted leader of his race, then started on the great highway to fullness of life and an inspiration to those who struggle to success despite tremendous handicaps, overcoming high racial barriers with great benefit to the Nation; and

"Whereas, well signalizing the 100th anniversary of that slave boy who came to lead a people and bless a nation, the United States Congress, by unanimous action in each House, has just sent to the President the bill creating the Booker T. Washington National Monument, comprised of the old plantation where he was born; and

"Whereas the State of Virginia by appropriation completed the purchase of the lands of the old home and birthplace, thus giving full recognition of worth, even though in a black skin: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives,* That this house commends the unanimous recognition by the Congress of this great educator and national leader a century after his slave birth in surroundings of ignorance, and cherishes the hope that the coming century may well obliterate the racial prejudices which tend to handicap the fullest development of our people and their fullest usefulness to the Nation; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be sent to each House of Congress, to the secretary of state of Virginia, to the President of the Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Ala., and to the Director of the National Park Service.

"Adopted by the house April 4, 1956.

"NORMAN C. PHILLES,

"Clerk of the house of representatives."

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States against accepting or taking action upon the findings and recommendations of the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions

"Whereas the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions established on January 14, 1955, under Executive Order 10588, submitted its final report, including findings and recommendations to the President of the United States on April 23, 1956; and

"Whereas the findings and recommendations of said Commission are detrimental to the best interests of all veterans; and

"Whereas any action taken favoring the recommendations as submitted by said Commission would be unfair, unjust, inequitable, and contrary to the concept of benefits to veterans: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the President of the United States to take no action upon the report of the Commission on Veterans' Pensions; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Congress of the United States reject any legislation submitted to it based upon the report of the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth."

A resolution adopted by the Citizens' Councils of the New Orleans, La., area, favoring the enactment of legislation to prescribe minimum qualifications for Justices of the United States Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the city of Quincy, Mass., relating to the restoration of the portraits of John Adams and John Quincy Adams upon 2- and 6-cent postage stamps; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RESOLUTIONS OF NORTH DAKOTA BANKERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the North Dakota Bankers Association relating to spring wheat acreage allotments, and so forth.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there never has been, and there is not now, a surplus of high quality hard spring wheat; and

Whereas it is uneconomical to grow wheat in small acreages; and

Whereas there is an unfair discrimination against the small spring wheat farmers of North Dakota in acreage allotments, as compared with the large winter wheat farmers in other States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the North Dakota Bankers Association, That Congress, the President, and Secretary of Agriculture of the United States are hereby urged and requested to take steps to provide a suitable premium on milling grades of hard spring wheat and to allocate a hundred acres as a minimum to any spring wheat farmer who has had a hundred-acre allotment in any year during the past 6 years and in no event should the allotment of any spring wheat farmer with less than a hundred-acre allotment ever be reduced; be it further

Resolved, That we continue to support the agricultural short course and the junior bankers course, and urge all member banks to cooperate to insure the continued success of these activities; be it further

Resolved, That we do everything possible to encourage the Federal Government to continue to exert every effort to eliminate waste and extravagance and reduce Federal expenditures to the point where the national budget will remain in balance and build a surplus for reasonable debt retirement; be it further

Resolved, That Congress be urged to liquidate the postal savings department, as it is no longer necessary or desirable, since we have Federal deposit insurance and savings bonds to fit the requirements of all types of investors and savers, and the elimination of postal savings would help cut down the deficit of the Post Office Department; be it further

Resolved, That the FHA title I terms presently in effect are adequate and should not be changed, and by all means should not be made permanent; be it further

Resolved, That we go on record as favoring the Hoover report recommending the merging of the Production Credit Association and the Federal intermediate credit banks, and

that the free capital be returned to the United States Treasury, together with the surplus earned by such capital as soon as practical; be it further

Resolved, That the North Dakota bankers continue their good effort of the past in promoting the sale of United States savings bonds, and thus continue to keep the public debt widely distributed among our citizens and promote the habit of thrift.

FRANKLIN PAGE,
Chairman, Resolution Committee.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

H. R. 6376. A bill to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2053).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, with additional amendments:

H. R. 10660. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuels, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2054).

By Mr. LEHMAN, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

H. R. 7679. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Muskogee, Okla. (Rept. No. 2056);

H. R. 8490. A bill authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Bonham, Tex. (Rept. No. 2057);

H. R. 8674. A bill to provide for the return of certain property to the city of Biloxi, Miss. (Rept. No. 2058);

H. R. 9358. A bill to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to issue a deed to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for certain land heretofore conveyed to such city, removing the conditions and reservations made a part of such prior conveyance (Rept. No. 2059); and

H. R. 10251. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to deed certain land to the city of Grand Junction, Colo. (Rept. No. 2060).

By Mr. LEHMAN, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

H. R. 8123. A bill authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg. (Rept. No. 2061).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

S. 3857. A bill to clarify section 1103 (d) of title XI (Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Rept. No. 2062).

REPORT ENTITLED "MOTION PICTURES AND JUVENILE DELINQUENCY" (S. REPT. NO. 2055)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 173, 84th Congress, 2d session, I submit a report entitled "Motion Pictures and Juvenile Delinquency," which contains an interim report of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency. I request that the report be printed.

This report culminates a year of intensive study during which time we have had the full cooperation of the movie industry, including the Motion Picture Association of America and its president, Mr. Eric Johnston. The development of this report was greatly aided by professional people from the fields of psychiatry, psychology, criminology, education, and the large field of the effects of the communication media on their audiences.

Once the movie industry realized that we were not concerned with the entire motion picture output, but only those pictures that dwelled on brutality, violence, sadism, and crime, they quickly joined with us in taking a critical look at this portion of their product. While the major part of the report deals with the harmful effects of these pictures on children, recognition is given to those who have made excellent contributions in the fields of education and children's entertainment.

The recommendations made in the report are sound ones. They are based upon the expert knowledge and opinions of recognized authorities in the fields of abnormal juvenile behavior and the effects of the mass media. They were made in an attempt to improve the social climate that our children are growing up in, to make them more knowledgeable, and to help them solve the many problems that are now facing them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed under the rule.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 3924. A bill for the relief of Erwin Widenhofer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 3925. A bill to provide for the modification of the existing project for Salem Harbor, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 3926. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to charge for special services to purchasers of timber from Indian lands; and

S. 3927. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to Indian tribes certain federally owned buildings, improvements, or facilities on tribal lands or on lands reserved for Indian administration; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 3928. A bill for the relief of Blanca G. Hidalgo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 3929. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3930. A bill to authorize certain enlisted personnel retired with less than 30 years service to credit for retirement pay purposes all service credited for longevity pay purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 3931. A bill to provide for loans to individuals for the purpose of enabling them to obtain a college or university education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3932. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons, and for other purposes; and

S. 3933. A bill to extend the authority of the National Science Foundation with respect to awarding scholarships and fellowships; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 3934. A bill for the relief of Han Hong Wang and An-Yin Chen Wang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 3935. A bill to amend the act of September 3, 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 3936. A bill for the relief of Jeannine Therriaud Grantham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STUDY OF FOREIGN SERVICE INSTITUTE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to speak very briefly in support of a resolution which I wish to submit, and which proposes the undertaking of a study into the advisability of either improving and implementing the program and facilities of the existing Foreign Service Institute or, as an alternative, establishing a new Foreign Service Academy.

I am submitting the resolution because I think the subject deserves study.

Last fall, Mr. President, I had the opportunity of taking a 2-month trip around the world in company with Mrs. Saltonstall. In the course of that trip, we visited a sizable number of this country's diplomatic and military installations in various parts of the world. I was impressed throughout the trip by the generally high level of caliber and competence of our people in the Foreign Service. I was equally concerned, however, by the clear indication, in too many instances, of the fact that there is room for marked improvement in our method of recruiting and training young men and women for the Foreign Service in order that we might, in the years ahead, assure our country of adequate numbers of diplomatic personnel who have been just as well trained and encouraged as we can possibly train them for their important posts.

On my return home from that tour, I had occasion, in Boston, to suggest the advisability of a study of this particular problem with an eye toward focusing attention upon it. The response I received from these remarks was such as to encourage me to submit this resolution.

By means of Public Law 724 of the 2d session of the 79th Congress, the Foreign Service Institute, as we know it today, was established to achieve just such a purpose as that to which I now refer. Unfortunately, by admission of those in authority as well as in the opinion of interested observers, that purpose has

not been achieved. Most recently the Secretary of State's Public Committee on Personnel, known as the Wriston Committee since its Chairman was Dr. Henry M. Wriston, then president of Brown University, conducted a broad survey of the Department of State with particular reference to its personnel problems. That Committee—in its report to the Secretary of State on May 18, 1954—criticized quite strongly the failure to realize and achieve the purposes of Congress as expressed in Public Law 724.

This has been but one of a number of critical observations made of the Foreign Service Institute and its efforts to achieve the objectives set forth in that legislation. Those now in authority in the Foreign Service Institute have been among the very first to admit freely and frankly that it has not yet by any means achieved the goals it seeks.

I submit this resolution because the training and encouragement of young people to enter the Foreign Service for their lifework and their ability to represent us properly in the different countries to which they may be assigned and at the level in the Service where they may be is increasingly important to us in the United States and to every free nation in the world. We depend on these people not only to serve our Government but to sell our ideals and our ideas. I do not pretend to make recommendations as to just what should be done. But I do feel that a constructive concentration upon the purposes, program, and objectives of the Foreign Service Institute is a most desirable approach to make to this problem. It may be that the recommendation of the Wriston Committee to improve and broaden the recruitment methods of the Foreign Service, utilizing, among other things, a nationwide system of competitive scholarships, deserves development or, conceivably, serious thought may be given to the establishment of a separate and distinct Foreign Service Academy comparable, though on a graduate school level, with the purposes of such institutions in the Military Establishment.

Since last November, Mr. President, when I came home and broached this subject, I have carried on a correspondence with the members of the Wriston Committee, with officials of private institutions who administer, among other things, curricula for Foreign Service training, with Foreign Service officers of various levels in both an active and retired status and with interested and informed private individuals, whom I have approached for their opinions or who have, on their own initiative, written me. I have also talked, as have members of my staff, with Mr. Hoskins, Director of the Foreign Service Institute, and with Dr. Franklin, dean of that institution, who have been most helpful and most objective in discussing this problem.

Let me repeat, Mr. President, that my single purpose in submitting this resolution is to highlight the need for more widespread and yet more concentrated thought upon this important question of the improved recruitment and more thorough training of young men and women of high caliber in preparation for their careers in the foreign service of our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks a memorandum which shows Foreign Service Institute appropriations from the year 1947 to the estimated appropriation for the year 1957.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Foreign Service Institute appropriations

Year:	*Amount*
1947	$501,404
1948	598,071
1949	782,512
1950	964,221
1951	1,181,400
1952	1,368,371
1953	1,245,834
1954	768,451
1955	907,143
1956	2,103,962
1957 (estimated)	3,759,717

Figures submitted to Senator SALTONSTALL by Harold Hoskins, Director, Foreign Service Institute, Department of State, verified by Harold Merrick, Senate Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to add that the Foreign Service Institute appropriations in the past 11 years indicate a need for further consideration of this important subject because of the varying amounts. They vary from $501,404 to $3,759,717. They vary from year to year, which shows the difficulty under which an institute of this kind is operated.

So, Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution providing for a study of the Foreign Service Institute, the study to be conducted by the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 272), submitted by Mr. SALTONSTALL, was received, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the recruiting and training of young men and women for the Foreign Service of the United States has become increasingly significant and important in view of the prevailing international tensions, and the varied problems which face this country today in its relations with other nations; and

Whereas there is clearly room for improvement in our Foreign Service recruiting methods and training program, despite the excellence of the work generally being done by our diplomatic forces abroad; and

Whereas the Foreign Service Institute, created by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, has not been able thus far to achieve the purposes intended by that act; and

Whereas the origin, activities, and potential of the Foreign Service Institute deserve careful reassessment; and

Whereas, after such careful reassessment in the light of present needs, the alternative of a separate and distinct Foreign Service Academy, of graduate-school level and having a more academic emphasis than that of the Foreign Service Institute, might be indicated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of ways and means by which personnel of the Foreign Service of the United States may be more effectively recruited and trained with particular reference to the desirability of improving and implementing the program and facilities of the existing Foreign Service Institute, or, as an alternative, the establishment of a new Foreign Service Academy. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954, AS AMENDED

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has just completed public hearings on legislative proposals for a governmental indemnity or insurance program to supplement private insurance covering reactor hazards to the public. Considerable information and recommendations were submitted, probably for the first time on an organized basis, on the various facets of the problem.

As a result of the hearings, I am today introducing a bill which I hope will prove satisfactory, as a basis for study and eventual action. This bill, which was prepared by the joint committee staff, incorporates the three features set forth in my open letter dated April 26, 1956, to the atomic power industry and insurance industry as well as certain suggestions made at the hearings.

In brief, the bill provides the following coverage:

First. A governmental indemnity over and above a reasonable amount of public—third party—liability insurance provided by the private insurance industry or other financial protection. The AEC would be delegated the responsibility for determining the amount of basic private insurance or other financial protection required of the licensee as a condition of its insurance of each facility license. The cost of private insurance would be one of the factors considered in fixing this level at which the Government indemnity begins to operate.

Second. The liability of reactor operators and equipment manufacturers would be limited to the amount of private insurance coverage or other financial protection required by the AEC, together with the sums made available by the Government for the third party claims under the indemnity arrangement.

Third. The Government would make a minimum charge per year per reactor for its indemnity coverage with the proceeds to be devoted to the AEC's research and development program on atomic safety.

Fourth. AEC is authorized to enter into the same type of indemnity agreement with its prime contractors and subcontractors, including lump sum as well as cost type contracts, and including arrangements where AEC finances only part of the project. This authority is in addition to AEC's existing authority to enter into indemnity agreements. Normally AEC has made its contractual indemnities subject to the availability of funds. It has used these indemnities sparingly in subcontracts and in jointly financed projects with other Federal agencies or private organizations. This bill would authorize AEC to treat its

contractors and licenses on a more consistent basis.

Fifth. Procedures and standards for the settlement of claims have been established to broaden the protection of the public, and at the same time protect the Government against excessive settlements.

This bill, like the principles outlined in my April 26 letter, should be regarded merely as a basis for careful review and suggestions, both from the standpoint of substance and of drafting. Any comments on the bill would therefore be welcomed.

The committee intends to hold brief hearings on the bill, as well as the AEC legislative proposal, which was introduced by Representative COLE as H. R. 11242, in the next few weeks. Thereafter I hope we can report a committee bill.

Therefore, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an introductory statement which was made by me when the committee began the hearings on Senate bill 2725, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and introductory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3929) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding a new subsection to read as follows:

"i. In order to encourage the development and operation of production or utilization facilities, the United States may assume liability for a portion of the damages suffered by the public in connection with the design, construction, or operation of such facilities, and may limit the liability of those persons responsible for such losses."

SEC. 2. Subsection 53 e. (8) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(8) except to the extent that the United States shall have granted indemnity as provided in section 170 of this act, the licensee will hold the United States and the Commission harmless from any damages resulting from the use or possession of special nuclear material by the licensee."

SEC. 3. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding thereto a new section, with the appropriate amendment to the table of contents:

"SEC. 170. Indemnification and limitation of liability.

"a. Each license for the operation, possession, or use of a production or utilization facility shall have as a condition of the license a requirement that the licensee have financial protection of such a type and in such amounts as the Commission shall determine to be reasonably adequate to cover public liability claims arising out of or resulting from the radioactive, toxic, explosive, or other hazardous properties of source, special nuclear, or byproduct materials used in or resulting from the construction or operation of the facility. Such financial protection may include private insurance, private contractual indemnities, self insurance, or a combination of such measures.

"b. In determining the amount of financial protection to be required, the Commission shall take into consideration the following: (1) the total amount of insurance available from private sources, (2) the cost of such insurance, (3) the type, size, and location of facility involved, and (4) the type of ownership of the facility, whether the ownership is (a) private, (b) public, (c) profitmaking, or (d) nonprofit.

"c. The Commission shall, until August 1, 1966, agree to indemnify and hold harmless the owner, operator, manufacturer, designer, or builder of a production or utilization facility and each supplier of equipment, material, or services for such facility, as their interests may appear, in the event of claims arising out of or resulting from the radioactive, toxic, explosive, or other hazardous properties of source, special nuclear, or byproduct materials used in or resulting from the construction or operation of the facility constructed or operated under license from the Commission, against that liability to members of the public for bodily injury or death or property damage, including loss of use, which is in excess of the amount of financial protection required, but not to exceed $500 million in the aggregate for each facility within the United States, and for each incident. The Commission shall execute such a contract of indemnification with the licensee, covering the liability of all indemnities arising out of, or resulting from, the radioactive, toxic, explosive, or other hazardous properties of source, special nuclear, or byproduct materials used in or resulting from the construction or operation of the facility because of activities of the indemnitee during the period of the license.

"d. In addition to any other authority the Commission may have, the Commission is authorized until August 1, 1966, to enter into agreements of indemnification with its contractors for the construction or operation of production or utilization facilities for the benefit of the United States, in which the Commission may require its contractor to provide financial protection of such a type and in such amounts as the Commission shall determine to be reasonably adequate to cover public liability claims arising out of or resulting from the radioactive, toxic, explosive, or other hazardous properties of source, special nuclear, or byproduct materials used in or resulting from the construction or operation of the facility because of activities of the indemnitee during the period of the contract and to indemnify the contractor against such claims for such sums above the amount of the financial protection required, but not in excess of $500 million. Such agreements shall be for activities performed within the terms of the contract and shall include the liability of subcontractors and suppliers and be applicable to lump sum as well as cost-type contracts and to contracts financed in whole or in part by the Commission.

"e. The owner, constructor, or operator of a production or utilization facility and all other parties set forth in subsections c. and d. above shall not be liable for damages arising out of or resulting from the radioactive, toxic, explosive, or other hazardous properties of source, special nuclear, or byproduct materials used in or resulting from the construction or operation of the facility in an aggregate amount of more than the amount of the financial protection required by the Commission to be obtained, together with the sums set forth in subsections c. and d. above, and any other sums which may be made available by the Congress for the payment of such damages. In the event that such damages exceed this aggregate sum, any indemnitee may apply to the appropriate district court of the United States having venue in bankruptcy matters over the location of the facility, for an order limiting the liability of all indemnitees, including all contractors and subcontractors in accordance with the provisions of this section, and for further orders, as appropriate, apportioning the payments to be made to such claimants upon appropriate proof of damage and permitting partial payments to be made before final determination of the total claims.

"f. The Commission is authorized to charge for the right of indemnification given by this section to licensees of production and utilization facilities. This charge shall be $10,000 per year for facilities licensed under section 103. For facilities licensed under section 104, the Commission is authorized to reduce the charge set forth above, taking into consideration: (1) The type and location of facility involved, (2) the amount and type of fuel, (3) the purpose for which the facility is built, and (4) the ownership of the facility, whether (a) private, (b) public, (c) profitmaking, or (d) nonprofit. All sums collected by the Commission pursuant to this subsection shall be made a part of and be merged with appropriations to be used by the Commission for research and development.

"g. In the administration of indemnity agreements entered into hereunder, the Commission shall use, to the maximum extent practicable, the facilities and services of private insurance companies and established insurance adjustment organizations and the Commission may contract to pay a reasonable compensation for such services. Any contract made under the provisions of this subsection may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, upon a showing by the Commission that advertising is not reasonably practicable.

"h. Where it appears that there may be damages arising out of any incident for which the United States shall be required to make an indemnification under this section, the Commission shall be authorized in the agreement of indemnification to approve the payment of any claim and to appear through the Attorney General on behalf of the indemnitee in any action and to settle or defend any such litigation or claim and to represent the indemnitee in or take charge of any such proceedings. The Commission shall have authority to settle or approve the settlement of claims without regard to the rules of legal liability in the State of the accident, and regardless of whether liability has been established by the judgment of any court.

"i. After any incident which may require payments by the United States under this section, the Commission shall make a survey of the causes and extent of damage which shall forthwith be reported to the joint committee. Such reports shall also be made available, to the extent that the provisions of chapter 12 or any other law or Executive order permit, to the public, to the parties involved, and to the courts. The Commission shall report to the joint committee every 3 years on the operations under this section.

"j. The Commission, in administering this section, may make contracts in advance of appropriations and incur obligations without regard to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, and any appropriations presently or hereafter made available to the Commission shall be available for the payment of obligations under indemnity agreements entered into under this section."

The statement presented by Mr. ANDERSON is as follows:

MAY 23, 1956.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ANDERSON

Today we begin hearings on proposals to accelerate the civilian reactor program, including consideration of S. 2725 introduced by Senator GORE and H. R. 10805 introduced by Representative HOLIFIELD.

As you know we have just concluded hearings on legislative proposals for Governmental indemnities or insurance to protect

the public and reactor operators against reactor hazards. In those hearings we identified some of the other possible roadblocks, primarily legislative or administrative, to private atomic development.

In a floor statement on May 9, I attempted to place the two sets of hearings in proper perspective and would like to insert this statement in the record at this point as a means of providing a partial framework for the hearings.

In my opinion there are three basic questions with which the hearings should be concerned:

1. What is the true nature of world leadership in the field of atomic power, and of America's role in it? Does it consist primarily in developing the technology to provide the basis for eventual construction of prototype and commercial plants, or does it consist in building such plants on an accelerated scale to obtain experience and achieve kilowatt production goals?

2. Is it important that we maintain our world leadership in civilian atomic development? Does America's role with the peacetime atom have a psychological significance in our competition with the Soviets and our friends in the United Kingdom and Europe far greater than merely to achieve economic atomic power at a normal industrial rate? Will the progress of our own domestic atomic energy industry depend to a considerable extent on the foreign market for American atomic powerplants and their components? I think the answer to these questions is "Yes."

3. If so, the third basic question is how do we maintain this leadership? Through an independent effort by private industry? Through a private demonstration program supported in part by the Government? Through construction of Government demonstration plants? Or do we do it by some combination of the three?

The nub of the problem we are concerned with today, it seems to me, is the pace of atomic development. Who is determining that pace, and who should be determining it? Whose task is it to keep the program moving?

As you know, it has been alleged that the pace of our development is lagging. Attention has been drawn to the fact that we will have only one prototype in operation in this country until at least 1960, and possibly later. No commercial types have been planned. England and Russia, on the other hand are going full steam ahead with the construction and operation of full-scale central-station atomic powerplants.

It seems to me that the real policy issue involved—the pace of our atomic development—was set forth clearly in the Commission's statement dated May 18, 1956, of its position on S. 2725, the Gore bill. On page 2, the AEC stated it succinctly as follows:

"The Commission takes the view that while it must take the lead and carry most of the burden of developing nuclear power reactor technology, industry should take the initiative and assume the major responsibility for full-scale prototype reactors."

Mind you, the Commission is talking about uneconomical demonstration power plants, still in the prototype stage. It raises a fundamental question of whether AEC has abdicated some of its responsibilities to private industry. Can we expect these uncoordinated groups still in a developmental stage to provide the direction and accomplishment necessary to maintain our world leadership?

In addition to these basic questions, there are a number of other questions which should be appropriately explored in these hearings. Among them are the following:

1. What are the technical roadblocks in the civilian atomic energy program?

2. Does it appear that the private atomic groups will achieve their schedules for prototype development set for 1960–62?

3. If the Congress authorized 6 or even 3 reactors for construction, which types should be built and where?

I believe we should be particularly interested in atomic power plants which would serve the emerging needs of the friendly countries of the West, as well as help in achieving economic atomic power in this country.

Undoubtedly many other relevant questions will be explored.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I submit two amendments, intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 10660) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes, which is shortly to be considered by the Senate. I request that the amendments be printed and lie on the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 10660, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I understand House bill 10666, the road bill, will probably be before the Senate on Monday. I have very important amendments which involve the question of logging roads and logging trucks, and the use of fuel and trucks by those vitally interested in the subject in the Pacific Northwest and throughout the country. Because there is such a wide interest in the amendments, I submit them now, so that they may be printed and lie on the desk, with other amendments. I ask unanimous consent that a statement regarding the purposes of the amendments be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON ON AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 10660

The amendments that I am proposing to H. R. 10660 provide in effect for a refund of the fuel tax increases of 1 cent a gallon on gasoline and diesel fuel, and for a similar refund of the 3 cents a pound increase in the tire tax and the 3 cents a pound tread rubber tax, to the extent that highway vehicles are used on any road, thoroughfare, or property in private ownership. There is also included a provision for refund of the use tax imposed by the new section 4481 of the code for that portion of the vehicles use which is on nonpublic highways.

The increaed taxes provided for by H. R. 10660 are imposed with the intent of making the expanded highway program self-financing, and on the theory that the highway users, as the major beneficiaries of the program, should pay the costs.

The added tax burden is inequitable, however, in the case of the logging industry to the extent that it uses the tremendous network of privately owned, privately built, and privately maintained roads. It has been conservatively estimated that logging trucks use as much as 250 million gallons of fuel a year, and that more than 800,000 new tires and recaps are mounted annually by the logging industry, not including those on the 30,000 new trucks which are purchased each year by such industry.

To the extent that highway vehicles used by the logging industry are operated on the public highways, the increases in the fuel, use, and rubber taxes would, of course, be applicable as in all other cases, together with the taxes which are now in force.

In many instances, however, the use of the public highways is a minor part of the overall logging operations, and my amendments recognize this fact and seek to remove a discriminatory and inequitable tax burden in the case of nonhighway use by an industry which is the economic mainstay of many regions of the country.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON FINANCE TO SUBMIT REPORTS DURING RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to submit reports following the recess or adjournment of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by him at the Electric Consumers Conference, Washington, D. C., on May 20, 1956.

Address delivered by him at the convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, Washington, D. C., on May 24, 1956.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

Article by Senator COTTON concerning the highway program and how it affects the State of New Hampshire.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FREDERICK O. MERCER, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on behalf of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, June 7, 1956, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Frederick O. Mercer, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Illinois, vice J. Leroy Adair, deceased.

Prior to the above-mentioned date all persons interested in the above nomination should file with the committee such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and myself, chairman.

FAIRER FARM PRICES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I received today, as did all of my colleagues, a letter from Mr. Clarence Poe, editor and board chairman of the Progressive Farmer, published at Birmingham, Raleigh, Memphis, and Dallas. Mr. Poe encloses an editorial from his June issue, entitled "The Fight for Fairer Farm Prices Must Go On."

Mr. Poe says in his letter to us:

We hope that Congress will not adjourn without more positive help for the man at the bottom.

Mr. Poe's letter and editorial deserve the personal attention of every one of us. Because so much of this type of mail comes to our offices, and cannot all be given personal attention, I am fearful this mailing may not receive the attention it deserves. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Poe's letter and his June editorial printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in the hope every Senator will read it.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROGRESSIVE FARMER,
Birmingham, Ala.

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

DEAR FRIEND: The farm problem is going to be with us all through the coming months of 1956—and into 1957 if conditions do not change.

In the enclosed article and illustration we have presented some aspects of the situation that have been too often overlooked.

1. Note how steadily prices received by farmers have declined while prices paid by farmers held almost steady at 279. This is still true in 1956.

2. Note that even with parity prices the average farm income is only half that of industrial workers.

3. Note that while industry can quickly adjust production to demand, the farmer can never be sure whether his yields will be 50, 100 or 150 percent.

4. Please note especially item VIII on the serious need for more help for small farmers and that when farm prices fall, it is not necessarily the efficient farmer who survives. Many small farmers whose operations are highly efficient are nevertheless being bankrupted by causes we set forth.

We hope Congress will not adjourn without more positive help for the man at the bottom.

Yours sincerely,

CLARENCE POE,
Editor and Board Chairman.

THE FIGHT FOR FAIRER PRICES MUST GO ON

(By Clarence Poe)

The farmers have lost one fight. But now they must make another. The farm bill the President vetoed clearly had some unsound features, but most of these could have been corrected now or later. We lost because neither the President himself nor enough farmers, townspeople, or Congressmen fully understood the farm situation. As we start a continuous battle to get fairer prices for farmers, let's first of all see what misconceptions brought loss in this recent fight and how to win the next one.

I

"It's just a bill to help farmers," was the feeling of the general public. Actually, of course, the manufacturers, merchants, laborers, and all classes of people with whom the farmer spends his money almost as soon as he gets it would have benefited almost as much as farmers. All, too, will suffer by reason of the bill's defeat.

II

"I just don't understand parity," many said, and all too few tried to understand it. As everyone should know, a parity price means a price which will enable a given quantity of cotton, tobacco, corn, pork, milk, eggs, or any other farm product to buy 100 percent as much goods as that quantity would have bought in some base period of years when farm prices were supposed to be fair. Originally, this was the 5 years 1909–14 for all crops. While this has been raised in recent years, the period is still one regarded as fair to farmers and the public.

III

Many voters have thought 90 percent parity would virtually mean riches for the farmer—"all this and heaven, too." No sooner had this Congress started than a distinguished magazine, usually very fair, spoke of farmers as riding around in Cadillacs while begging for more price supports. The facts are that in 1949 farmers had 99 percent of parity, and in 1951, 107 percent of parity—and yet the average 1951 net income of farm workers and industrial workers compared as follows:

For farm workers	$1,718
For industrial workers	3,416

Actually, 100 percent parity would give farmers only a fairly decent income. And the term "90 percent" on its very face indicates not an increase but a decrease in some desirable goal. It takes a parity price—which is itself only fair—and then makes a straight, full 10-percent cut before the farmer gets it as a guaranty. On products for which any "variable price-support formula" is set up, it should be at 85 to 95 percent of parity—not 75 to 90.

IV

The two-way character of our farm program of recent years was all too often overlooked or ignored. Chairman HAROLD COOLEY said that Secretary Benson never seemed to realize that (1) in return for a guaranty of reasonable prices; (2) the farmer was expected to cut his acreage or production to fit market demands. This two-way requirement has not been observed in all cases, but should be. Of course, the farmer can never be sure when he plants a crop whether he will get 50, 100, or 150 percent of a normal yield. Still, the price supports the farmer receives should be offset by programs which over the years might reasonably be expected to keep production in line with demand.

If farmers follow such programs as set forth by Government and burdensome surpluses nevertheless occur, should they not receive just and reasonable price supports until the surplus can be gotten rid of? Frequently, of course, this may not take just one year but several years. If this two-way feature of the program has been imperfectly carried out in the past, we should not end the program, but mend it. Last year's bumper cotton crop, for example, was in no way due to overplanting by the farmers. The farmers did what the Government asked, but the bumper crop came from record-breaking acre yields given by the Almighty.

V

The Department of Agriculture and some farm organizations seemed at times to be willing to see how little could be given the farmer and still keep him satisfied. To them the doctrine, "What is good for the country is good for the farmer," seemed sound, but didn't seem to work both ways. We never expect to see the Department of Labor trying to see how small a wage labor can be made to accept. Nor do we ever expect to see the National Association of Manufacturers trying to see how much tariff reduction manufacturers can possibly stand. Certainly now, at a time when labor's wages are the highest ever and the manufacturer's profits the biggest ever, the Secretary of Agriculture and our farm organization leaders should be the farmer's retained attorneys to fight for his full share of the country's prosperity.

VI

Whether or not he was badly advised and however good the intentions we give him credit for, we cannot escape the feeling that President Eisenhower himself should have consulted with plain, often hard-hit farmers. They would almost certainly have reminded him of his pledge as given in 1952 and in these exact words at Brookings, S. Dak., on October 4: "The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90-percent parity price support, and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100-percent parity, with the guaranty in the price supports of 90." Furthermore, without questioning the highly religious character of Secretary Benson, we cannot escape the feeling that he should have strictly supported the explicit pledge which the President gave.

VII

The lack of unity on the part of farm organizations hurt. Even though they could not have agreed on a general farm policy, we believe they should have made much greater efforts to find areas of agreement. We also think that there is too much demand on the part of some top farm organization leaders for uniformity of thought and action by the general membership. North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Texas Farm Bureau members for example, strongly favored 90-percent price supports for cotton, but the appeal for uniformity kept most of them silent to their own hurt. As we have said before, "We believe it is equally the duty of a farm organization member to support it when it is right and try to correct it when it is wrong." A healthy and outspoken, conscientiously questioning minority is a fine thing for a farm organization—as it is in State or National Government—and frequently in our churches.

VIII

Finally, the plight of the small farmer, the little man, should have more attention. We hope we did not misjudge him, but we heard a nationally known farm leader say, in substance, "If farm prices go down, I can stand it until they come back again. The efficient farmers will survive and be better off with less competition." Unfortunately, however, we cannot even be sure that it's always the efficient farmers who survive. Does the man who survives always do so because of his superior efficiency? Or may it not often be because he is more fortunate in his inheritances, marriage, investments, or friendliness of financial connections? Or that income tax opportunities enable him to charge off his farm losses? On the other hand, are not many young farmers who are producing as efficiently as larger farmers nevertheless being bankrupted by low crop and livestock prices, and especially by mortgages and debts they incurred when such purchases of land or equipment seemed justified? They have simply had the rug pulled out from under them. More such struggling young farmers and small farmers should be put in places of leadership in farm organizations. Also, more farm leaders and farm organizations should get religion and acquire more concern for the man at the bottom—for "the needy when he crieth, the poor also, and him that hath no helper."

THE EMERGENCY FARM LOAN SITUATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask that a statement which I send to the desk be read by the clerk, in view of the

physical disability to my eyes from which I am suffering temporarily.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the statement the Senator's personal statement?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from North Dakota does not feel that he can read the statement himself; is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. I regret to say that the doctors advise me that at this time I should not attempt to read very much.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the statement will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words relative to the present emergency farm loan situation.

There are under consideration at this time, by a subcommittee of the Senate Agriculture Committee, some 13 emergency farm credit bills. The earliest one was introduced on February 23, 1955, the latest on May 14, 1956.

I invite especial attention to Senate bill 3559, introduced on March 29, 1956, which would release funds for emergency loan purposes to farmers on July 1, 1956.

There has been a widespread rumor throughout the Middle West that $50 million, payable now when it is needed, would be included in the final version of the farm bill. It now appears that this was little more than wishful thinking on the part of many small farmers in desperate need of such assistance.

As I believe I have made clear on other occasions, I am more than a little sick of these unceasing efforts to crowd the small farmers of the Nation out of the picture.

What is the basis for this indifference to the problem? Is it because of a feeling that the trouble exists on a small and unimportant scale? The Department of Agriculture has just advised me that emergency loans of some type are presently authorized to 40 States.

North Dakota was declared a disaster area early in February of this year and our State director of the Farmers' Home Administration states he now has on hand approximately 300 approved loan applications that cannot be fulfilled due to this lack of funds. These applications are coming in at the rate of about 50 a week. They average about $700 each. A total of $200,000 is needed—not next July, but right now—in North Dakota.

The problem is by no means confined to the farmers, as this letter from one of North Dakota's leading seed dealers will indicate:

MAY 22, 1956.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Quite a number of farmers who were up against it for securing money to plant this year's crop back in February and early March made applications to the Farmers Home Administration's local office for disaster loans. These loans were approved and put on record. The farmers were told that the money would be forthcoming. On the strength of that we have furnished quite a number of farmers at Gardner, Grandin, and Hillsboro seed grain for planting this year's crop.

Now we are told by the local office that no funds are available to pay these loans, and the local office does not know whether additional funds will be made available to them or not. Some of these farmers still have flax and soybeans and corn to plant. We have already furnished them oats, barley, and wheat in amounts over and above what we could furnish them had we not been assured of the farmer getting his FHA money. We certainly cannot afford to supply these farmers with additional seed unless there is some assurance that this money will be furnished the local FHA office to take care of these approved loans.

It seems to us that this is very misleading to these farmers and also to the elevators that have been supplying seed grain. We trust that you will look into this situation and see if some assurance can be given that this money will be forthcoming promptly. Delay on the part of the farmer planting his flax and beans can be rather serious.

Yours very truly,
R. F. GUNKELMAN & SONS,
By R. F. GUNKELMAN, Sr.

When Mr. Gunkelman says that delay on the part of the farmer in planting his flax and beans can be rather serious, he is only saying that the farmer, forced into such a delay, could face failure. What good is a release of loan funds in July when about all they would do would be to pay up the bills left by these small farmers who found themselves bankrupt in June?

The majority of normal lending sources are apparently not too inclined to make loans on any farms consisting of less than a half section of land. With no funds in sight before July 1, I call upon every Senator to help get this bill out of committee and onto the floor so we can vote these distressed farmers some help now.

NEW APPROACH IN CANCER RESEARCH

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a most illuminating editorial from the New York Times of May 24, entitled "New Approach to Cancer." The editorial describes the experiments in cancer research to which certain courageous convicts in Ohio are willing to subject themselves. These men, whatever may be their earlier sins against society, deserve great credit for their valor.

Mr. President, I believe this further experimentation in the realm of cancer research serves to support the enlightened proposal of the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] that our Government invest far more funds and effort annually in the entire field of medical research, with special emphasis on investigation into this most sinister and dangerous of diseases.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW APPROACH TO CANCER

Ninety-six convicts in the Ohio State Penitentiary have volunteered to serve as guinea pigs in a daring experiment that is being carried out by the Sloan-Kettering Institute of Memorial Hospital and the department of medical research of the Ohio State University. Twenty-five are to receive injections of live material from malignant tumors. Newspaper readers must have been relieved to learn that the experiment is fraught with no great risk—that if cancer is incited it can be eradicated in its early stages at the site of injection.

There is more than idle curiosity behind this experiment. The purpose is to find out, if possible, why it is not only difficult but often impossible to start a cancer in a healthy organism. What is the mechanism of resistance? It may be that in the answer lies new hope for the successful treatment of cancer.

For many years research biologists have focused their attention on the cell, which is where cancer starts. Much research has been conducted in trying to find out why it is that normal cells organize themselves into organs and tissues of the right size and then put them in the right places. Thus considered, the problem of cancer is the problem of growth, normal and abnormal. Now the problem is to be approached from the standpoint of resistance. Financially suported by the American Cancer Society, scientists in half a dozen university medical schools have been working along these lines with experimental animals. But what holds good for rats and mice does not always hold good for man. Hence the daring study that is under way in Ohio.

This is not the first time that convicts have voluntarily contracted diseases in the interest of medicine. Nevertheless, there is nothing but admiration for men who are regarded as enemies of society yet are fully aware of the contribution that they can make to medicine by willingly subjecting themselves to tests from which most men and women would shrink even though assured that risk of death is negligible.

ANIMAL DISEASE LABORATORY AT BELTSVILLE, MD.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared relating to the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1957, with reference to a request by the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget for $18,915,000 to build an animal disease laboratory at Beltsville, Md.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my statement, a copy of the letter, written under date of May 25, 1956, to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, and a copy of another letter, dated May 25, 1956, addressed to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENNINGS

On Tuesday, May 22, during the debate in the Senate on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for the 1957 fiscal year, the Senate voted to provide no funds for a request by the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget for $18,915,000 to build an animal disease laboratory at Beltsville, Md. The House of Representatives had earlier provided $10 million for this item. The bill is now in conference between the two Houses. During the debate on Tuesday in the Senate, it became clear that most Senators are in favor of this appropriation item to establish an animal disease research laboratory, but that they are likewise opposed to the location of this research center at Beltsville for various logical reasons. In the first place, the laboratory as

located at Beltsville would be near the large metropolitan center of Washington, D. C., and would inevitably create a health hazard, particularly in the event of bombing during a war. The Department of Agriculture, having in mind the hazards in this location at Beltsville, even provided for nearly a million dollars, as I understand it, to erect special protective walls in case of bombing. Another reason for the opposition to locating the laboratory at Beltsville is that such a location is far removed from the center of livestock and dairy industries. I have an appointment at my office with the Under Secretary, the Honorable True D. Morse, on Tuesday to present this matter to him as fully as I can for his consideration.

Having in mind the considerations which moved the Senate to reject the appropriation request for the construction of this much-needed laboratory, I today sent a letter to Senator HAYDEN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, urging the members of the Appropriation Committee to consider providing the money to build a laboratory and to locate it at St. Joseph, Mo. I wrote a similar letter to Senator ELLENDER, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert a copy of each of these letters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the end of my remarks. The regular 1957 appropriation for the Department of Agriculture is now in conference. I hope the conferees will include at least $10 million for the construction of this laboratory so that work on it may proceed. Supplemental funds would be provided later, and I hope further that the conferees agree that the logical location of the laboratory is at St. Joseph, Mo. If the conference committee fails to provide for the construction of this laboratory, I shall urge the two committees concerned with this item to provide for it in the first deficiency appropriation bill which they consider later in this session.

The reasons why St. Joseph, Mo., is the logical location for this laboratory are quite fully set forth in the letters which I sent to Senator HAYDEN and Senator ELLENDER earlier today. For this reason I shall not elaborate on them at greater length now. If the 1957 regular appropriation bill does not include an item for the animal disease laboratory, I shall submit an appropriate amendment to any supplementary or deficiency appropriation bill to provide for the nearly $19 million needed for construction of the laboratory, with a direction that it be built at St. Joseph, Mo.

MAY 25, 1956.

The Honorable ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: In the budget request for the Department of Agriculture's 1957 appropriation, there is an item in the amount of $18,915,000 to build new facilities for an animal disease laboratory of the Agriculture Research Service to be located at Beltsville, in nearby Maryland. As you know, the 1957 agricultural appropriations bill is now in conference.

The House of Representatives reduced this item to $10 million and the Senate provided no funds. The debate in the Senate on Tuesday, May 22, on this subject made it very clear that Senators generally are in favor of providing the necessary funds for adequate research facilities to study animal diseases, but that they are also generally opposed to establishing the laboratory at Beltsville. While various suggestions have been made concerning the possible location of this laboratory, the general sentiment did not appear in favor of any particular locality as long as it was not Beltsville and was situated in a place more centrally located with respect to the livestock and dairy industries.

During the course of his remarks on the subject on Tuesday, Senator RUSSELL said that if the Department of Agriculture would indicate its willingness to locate the laboratory at a point more suitable than Beltsville, he was sure that the Appropriations Committee and the Senate would provide the funds necessary for this work in the first supplemental or deficiency appropriation which the committee and Senate hereafter handle, provided the Department of Agriculture gave the proper assurances concerning the location of the laboratory. Senator RUSSELL also indicated that the Appropriations Committee would follow the lead and suggestions of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry concerning a proper location for the laboratory. I am sure that Senator RUSSELL is correct in his estimate of the general sentiment of the Senate on the subject.

At this time, I wish to suggest that the laboratory be located in St. Joseph, Mo. I think this Missouri city would be most suitable for the site of the laboratory. St. Joseph is in the geographical center of the United States, and has the largest livestock yards in the State of Missouri licensed by the United States Government. It is situated approximately 120 miles from each of 3 veterinarian colleges located, respectively, at the University of Missouri, in Columbia, Mo.; Kansas State College, in Manhattan, Kans.; and at Iowa State College, in Ames, Iowa. In addition, the University of Nebraska, at Lincoln, is suitably near.

If the laboratory were located at St. Joseph, it would enable the Government scientists working at the laboratory to have easy access to land-grant colleges for the purposes of consultation with other scientists located in each of these great institutions. This central location would have an advantage over a location close to only one such land-grant college.

If the laboratory were located in St. Joseph, the acquiring of animals for the purpose of testing would be greatly facilitated. Also, if any large field trials of animals were necessary, they would be easily accessible to the laboratory at St. Joseph, which lies in the heart of the livestock area. St. Joseph can offer a plentiful supply of labor available for all types of jobs to be filled at the Government laboratory. All utilities are more than adequate and an abundant supply of water is available from the Missouri River. I am informed that a suitable 200-acre tract of land can be selected from several locations near the city of St. Joseph. Such a tract would be offered to the Federal Government free of cost if the laboratory would be located there.

With these facts in mind, I want to strongly urge the members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to give favorable consideration to locating the laboratory at St. Joseph and providing the necessary funds either in the 1957 appropriations bill or in the first supplementary appropriation which the committee considers hereafter in this session.

I shall be very glad to furnish any additional information which the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry might desire. I am also taking up this matter with Senator HAYDEN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
United States Senate.

MAY 25, 1956.

The Honorable CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: In the budget request for the Department of Agriculture's 1957 appropriation there is an item in the amount of $18,915,000 to build new facilities for an animal disease laboratory of the Agriculture Research Service to be located at Beltsville, in nearby Maryland. As you know, the 1957 agricultural appropriations bill is now in conference.

The House of Representatives reduced this item to $10 million and the Senate provided no funds. The debate in the Senate on Tuesday, May 22, on this subject made it very clear that Senators generally are in favor of providing the necessary funds for adequate research facilities to study animal diseases but that they are also generally opposed to establishing the laboratory at Beltsville. While various suggestions have been made concerning the possible location of this laboratory the general sentiment did not appear in favor of any particular locality as long as it was not Beltsville and was situated in a place more centrally located with respect to the livestock and dairy industries.

During the course of his remarks on the subject on Tuesday, Senator RUSSELL said that if the Department of Agriculture would indicate its willingness to locate the laboratory at a point more suitable than Beltsville, he was sure that the Appropriations Committee and the Senate would provide the funds necessary for this work in the first supplementary or deficiency appropriation which the committee and Senate hereafter handle, provided the Department of Agriculture gave the proper assurances concerning the location of the laboratory. I am sure that Senator RUSSELL is correct in his estimate of the general sentiment of the Senate on the subject.

At this time, I wish to suggest that the laboratory be located in St. Joseph, Mo. I think this Missouri city would be most suitable for the site of the laboratory. St. Joseph is in the geographical center of the United States and has the largest livestock yards in the State of Missouri licensed by the United States Government. It is situated approximately 120 miles from each of 3 veterinarian colleges located respectively at the University of Missouri in Columbia, Mo., Kansas State College in Manhattan, Kans., and at Iowa State College in Ames, Iowa. In addition the University of Nebraska at Lincoln is suitably near.

If the laboratory were located at St. Joseph it would enable the Government scientists working at the laboratory to have easy access to land grant colleges for the purposes of consultation with other scientists located in each of these great institutions. This central location would have an advantage over a location close to only one such land grant college.

If the laboratory were located in St. Joseph, the acquiring of animals for the purpose of testing would be greatly facilitated. Also if any large field trials of animals were necessary they would be easily accessible to the laboratory at St. Joseph which lies in the heart of the livestock area. St. Joseph can offer a plentiful supply of labor available for all types of jobs to be filled at the Government laboratory. All utilities are more than adequate and an abundant supply of water is available from the Missouri River. I am informed that a suitable 200-acre tract of land can be selected from several locations near the city of St. Joseph. Such a tract would be offered to the Federal Government free of cost if the laboratory would be located there.

With these facts in mind I want to strongly urge the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee to give favorable consideration to locating the laboratory at St. Joseph and providing the necessary funds either in the 1957 appropriations bill or in the first supplementary appropriation which the committee considers hereafter in this session.

I shall be glad to furnish any additional information which the full committee or the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations might desire. I am also taking up this matter with Senator ELLENDER,

chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
United States Senate.

PROBLEMS OF INDEPENDENT MEMBERS OF THE GASOLINE TRADE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Retailing, Distribution, and Fair Trade Practices of the Senate Small Business Committee, I have recently spent a good deal of time on the problems faced by the independent members of the gasoline trade in an attempt to avert the destruction facing many independent business establishments in the gasoline servicing industry. Mr. George Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, has recently written a letter to the editor of Service Station News, St. Louis, Mo., dealing with one aspect of this general problem.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Burger's letter be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 16, 1956.

EDITOR, SERVICE STATION NEWS,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR SIR: In reviewing the May issue of your publication I noted with considerable interest the front page story NCPR (National Congress of Petroleum Retailers) Files Application for Trade Practice Conference.

Not being unduly critical of the action planed, we are just wondering whether such planning will bring about the long overdue relief to the many thousands of independent filling station operators throughout the 48 States. It's a matter of public record as to the plight facing the efficient independent filling station operators due to what appears to be the control exercised over their independent operations to serve the public.

This statement is confirmed by the actions of the Small Business Committees of both the House and the Senate in due public hearings during the past year, and the entire proposition was exposed in the first instance by the Senate Small Business Committee early in 1941, so it is our honest opinion that if the independent filling station field is to get the long overdue and immediate relief, Trade Practice Conference through the Federal Trade Commission will not solve their basic problems.

The writer has had some experience with these Trade Practice Conferences as it applied to the rubber tire industry. Although those rules were instituted in October 1936, here some 20 years later we find no attempt upon the part of the Government agency to vigorously enforce those rules.

Wholly in the interest of independent business of all descriptions, which would certainly include a substantial membership of independent filling station operators in the federation, and merely as a help to them, it would strike us that all efforts should be used to bring about immediate relief so that the free enterprise system can actually operate in the independent filling station field through:

1. Similar action to be instituted individually by gasoline suppliers filing their prices under the Fair Trade Acts, as has recently taken place by certain leading companies in the State of New Jersey. Such action, we repeat, must not be by collusion, but by the individual action of the suppliers.

2. Due to the disclosures made through congressional committees beginning in 1941, and more recently through the splendid actions of the Small Business Committees of the Senate and the House on this problem, it would strike us that the only permanent correction for the protection of independent filling station operators is the complete divorcement of the gasoline supplier operating in the retail field through their own setups.

Bear in mind that the federation is committed by its nationwide membership of 100,000 or more for all out vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws. In fact that is the principal and main objective of the federation to protect independent business, and in view of this we make this suggestion as to the proper approach in correcting the cancer that is slowly but surely destroying independent establishments where certain large interests in the production field are operating in the retail field through their own setups.

These comments are made wholly for the best interests of the people your publication serves.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

MINNESOTA'S SINGULAR TRAFFIC SAFETY RECORD

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as the Memorial Day weekend approaches, with the grim prospect of another burst of slaughter on the highways, it behooves every citizen to give careful thought to what he or she can personally do to keep down the staggering toll of dead and injured. For 13 consecutive months, the national traffic death toll each month has exceeded the same month's toll for the preceding year. Unless we act now to do something about it, we are going to find ourselves with 40,000 dead and more than a hundred thousand persons totally disabled on our highways again this year.

This situation has reached the dimensions of a national disaster. I should like to call the attention of the Senate again to the highway traffic safety amendment to the highway bill which I introduced last week. It is absolutely vital that action be taken by the Federal Government to study the problem of traffic safety in all its ramifications. This amendment would direct the Secretary of Commerce to cause a comprehensive study to be made, to be followed by a report and recommendations no later than June 30, 1959.

In the meantime, Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a remarkable example of governmental leadership at the State level.

This morning the wire services carried an announcement from the National Safety Council that of all the 48 States in the Union, only Minnesota qualified during the past year for the council's award of merit by scoring 70 percent in all sections of the council's traffic safety award program.

Also this morning, I sent the following telegram to Gov. Orville L. Freeman, of Minnesota:

Warmest congratulations on the splendid quality of your leadership which has resulted in the announcement this morning by the National Safety Council that Minnesota is the only State in the Nation to qualify for the award of merit in the council's traffic safety-award program. Minnesota again leads the ways.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. President, I cannot deny that I am proud of Minnesota's singular safety record during the past year. And I am hopeful that Minnesota can continue its leadership during the coming year.

Yet there were many Minnesotans killed on our highways; there were too many Minnesotans maimed and disfigured for life in automobile accidents during the past year. Minnesota can do better, and intends to do better.

We all must do better. I was greatly impressed yesterday by the brilliant remarks of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], on the subject of traffic safety, and I wish to express my strong support for his resolution—Senate Resolution 270—to authorize and direct the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to make a full and complete investigation and study of the entire field of automobile accidents, automotive engineering and design, possible legislation to establish uniform safety standards, and other matters relating to the problem of automobile accidents and accident prevention.

Frankly, Mr. President, I do not know whether to be proud or sad when I contemplate the fact that Minnesota was the only State to qualify for the merit award of the National Safety Council. I think that I am a little of both. As a Minnesotan, I am proud. As an American, I am deeply and desperately distressed.

I hope when we come to discuss the highway bill, at some point in our deliberations attention will be paid to the importance of traffic safety, and not merely the importance of concrete highway construction itself. This is a problem which will require more and more attention on the part of the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, the morning hour is closed.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LAND TO SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 8, MOHAVE COUNTY, ARIZ.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask that the House amendment to the bill S. 2822, be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2822) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer approximately 9 acres of land in the Hualapai Indian Reservation, Ariz., to School District No. 8, Mohave County, Ariz., which was, on page 2, line 7, to strike out "Secretary may" and insert "Secretary shall immediately."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the bill, which originated in the Senate, was intended to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer approximately 9 acres of land in the Hualapai Indian Reservation of Arizona to a school district.

The House amended the bill by striking out the words in line 7, page 2, "Secretary may" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Secretary shall immediately."

The amendment is acceptable to the Senate committee.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

The motion was agreed to.

STATE, JUSTICE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H. R. 10721.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10721) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc; and that the bill as thus amended be considered for the purpose of amendment as original text, provided, however, that no point of order against any amendment shall be deemed to have been waived by the adoption of this agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Under the heading "Title I—Department of State—Administration of Foreign Affairs," on page 2, line 22, after "(22 U. S. C. 287o, 287q, 287r)", to insert "except that members and experts serving without compensation in activities of the National Commission may be paid a per diem in lieu of subsistence at not to exceed the rate provided in section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended;"; on page 3, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "six" and insert "seven"; on page 4, line 22, after the word "advance", to strike out "$90,000,000" and insert "$91,210,000"; and on page 5, line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$3,600" and insert "$5,000."

On page 6, line 2, after "(22 U. S. C. 1131)", to strike out "$700,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

On page 6, line 23, after "(31 U. S. C. 107)", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,150,000."

Under the subhead "International Organizations and Conferences", on page 7, line 12, after the word "Congress", to strike out "$33,830,875" and insert "$33,859,285, of which $28,410 shall be for contribution to the Inter-American Radio Office for the calendar years 1951–1955."

Under the subhead "International Commissions—International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico", on page 9, line 24, after the word "boundary", to strike out "fence or."

On page 10, line 17, after the word "stations", to strike out "$1,400,000" and insert "$1,463,000."

On page 12, after line 19, to insert:

"PASSAMAQUODDY TIDAL POWER SURVEY

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the act of January 31, 1956 (Public Law 401), including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purpose of this appropriation; $935,000, to remain available until expended."

Under the subhead "International Fisheries Commissions", on page 13, line 8, after the word "Congress", to strike out $542,862" and insert "$645,587."

Under the subhead "Educational Exchange", on page 14, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "$18,170,000" and insert "$20,000,000."

Under the heading "Title II—Department of Justice—Legal Activities and General Administration—Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities", on page 18, line 2, after "(31 U. S. C. 529)", to strike out "$10,020,000" and insert "$10,320,000."

Under the subhead "Salaries and Expenses, Antitrust Division", on page 18, line 6, after the word "laws", to strike out "$4,265,000" and insert "$3,526,910."

Under the subhead "Salaries and Expenses, United States Attorneys and Marshals," on page 18, line 20, after the word "ammunition", to strike out "$19,000,000" and insert "$19,225,000."

Under the subhead "Special Temporary Attorneys and Assistants," on page 19, line 10, after the word "law", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$300,000."

Under the subhead "Immigration and Naturalization Service—Salaries and Expenses," on page 22, line 18, after the word *"Provided"*, to strike out "That the compensation of the five assistant commissioners and one district director shall be at the rate of grade GS–16: *Provided further,"*.

Under the subhead "Federal Prison System—Buildings and Facilities," on page 24, after line 7, to insert:

"For preparation of plans, acquisition of sites, and commencing construction of a maximum-custody penitentiary and a western youth-guidance center, $3,500,000."

Under the heading "Title III—The Judiciary—Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services," on page 29, line 14, after the word "for", to strike out "$16,250,000" and insert "$16,701,000."

On page 31, line 2, after the word "case", to strike out "$2,650,000" and insert "$2,793,600."

On page 31, line 11, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "$700,000" and insert "$753,500."

On page 31, after line 11, to insert:

"Air conditioning courtrooms, offices, and other rooms assigned for the use of courts of appeals and district courts in federally owned buildings: For the purchase and installation of air-conditioning units in courtrooms, offices, and other rooms, assigned for the use of courts of appeals and district courts in federally owned buildings outside the District of Columbia, upon authorization of the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, pursuant to section 604 (a) (11) of title 28, United States Code, $1,150,000."

Under the heading "Title IV—United States Information Agency," on page 34, line 12, after the word "of", to strike out "caps for personnel employed abroad" and insert "uniforms, or allowances therefor as authorized by the act of September 1, 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 1114 and 69 Stat. 49)"; on page 35, line 22, after the word "organizations", to strike out "$110 million" and insert "$115 million"; in line 25, after the word "States", to insert "and of which sum not less than $350,000 shall be available by contracts with one or more private international broadcasting licensees for the purpose of developing and broadcasting under private auspices, but under the general supervision of the United States Information Agency, radio programs to Latin America, Western Europe, Africa, as well as other areas of the free world, which programs shall be designed to cultivate friendship with the peoples of the countries in those areas, and to build improved international understanding:", and, on page 36, line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$100,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to make only a brief statement on the bill, and to mention the major items.

The bill contains the appropriations for two of the most vital instruments of American foreign policy, the Department of State and the United States Information Agency. It also includes the appropriations for the two branches of the Government concerned with the enforcement of law, the Department of Justice and the Judiciary.

The total amount of funds for these activities, as reported to the Senate, is $556,271,517. This is $42,833,303 less the estimates for 1957. However, it is $57,998,282 over the appropriations for 1956. The Senate committee has increased the House version of the bill by $14,904,145.

The subcommittee worked very diligently on this measure; heard all the witnesses who desired to be heard; obtained complete, thorough, and accurate reports, we believe, from the departments concerned; and voted to report the bill in substantially its present form to the full committee. The full committee made one minor amendment to the subcommittee bill, by increasing by about $53,000 to provide $102,725, the full amount requested restored for the Fisheries Commission. The full committee reported the bill to the Senate unanimously.

The sum of $4,619,135 has been added for the State Department. Perhaps the item which will interest the Senate most is the increase of $1,830,000 for the International Educational Exchange Program—which, I may add, restores that item to the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget.

One billion two hundred and ten thousand dollars has been added for salaries and expenses of the Department and the Foreign Service.

The House made a $25 million reduction in the estimate for the United States Information Agency. The committee had recommended $5 million of this be restored, but that none of this particular increase is to be used for expanding activities in the European area or for the aircraft carrier Cinerama project, which would cost $3,800,000. On the basis of the feeling of the committee members, the testimony the committee heard, and the very sincere representations made by the United States Information Agency, we felt that we were justified in recommending the additional

$5 million. We hope the Members of the other body will agree to go along with us in regard to that amount, and we are prepared to urge most strenuously that they do so.

Your committee has added about $1,800,000 for the Judiciary, of which $1,200,000 is for air-conditioning of court rooms and chambers of Federal judges, so that those facilities may be used during the summer months.

The balance is to strengthen the probation system of the courts, with a small additional item for the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

Three million five hundred thousand dollars has been added to the Justice Department, primarily for planning and acquisition of sites for two new prison facilities. There has been an additional increase for marshals, temporary attorneys, and assistants.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to take this opportunity to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee and the distinguished majority leader and also the subcommittee and the full committee for recommending the $20 million requested by the State Department for the international educational exchange program.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement commenting upon the program and also commenting upon and explaining, I believe, the observations made by the committee relative to concentration of students in foreign countries, and other observations the committee made. I believe the statement will explain for the Senate and for the committee the facts regarding the program.

I certainly wish to compliment and to thank the majority leader for his assistance in restoring the full budget request for this item.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

I wish to compliment the Appropriations Committee for recommending the $20 million requested by the State Department for its international educational exchange program. I note that the committee says that there has been a lack of association by American grantees with the local people of the country in which they are residing. The committee also states that group concentration of grantees as practiced in some countries is not in keeping with the intents and the purposes of the program and should be stopped.

I do not know where the committee got these impressions; and, if they were true, I, too, would deplore such a situation. However, as you know, I have been very much interested in this program, have kept in touch with its operation, and I must say I think the picture painted by the committee in its report is decidedly exaggerated.

On the first point—of lack of association with the people of other countries—I have seen many reports and have read hundreds of letters from American grantees which point out how valuable they considered their contacts with the people of the countries they visited and the great numbers of people they met whom they felt to be real friends. Just the other day I read a report from Italy which said that "many an Italian individual and many an Italian family owes its reconstructed picture of America to a personal acquaintanceship with one or more of the 750 American students who have lived in Italy under the exchange program in the past 7 years."

I know that it is the policy of the Board of Foreign Scholarships and the State Department to select Americans who are interested in mixing with the people of their host country. In fact that is one reason they insist, wherever possible, on the candidate knowing the language of the country in which he plans to study or teach. It is also a matter of policy to encourage such contacts in the binational commissions overseas do everything they can to introduce American grantees to the people of the country. But we should also keep in mind that these people go abroad for a serious educational purpose—not a junket—and that if they are to represent us well among foreign scholars, they must devote their main energies to their studies or teaching assignments. Thus many of their most fruitful contacts are made with their professional colleagues. From my observation and experience, I think the record shows that most of the grantees are doing a fine job of balancing their professional and social contacts and making many friends for the United States in the process.

On the second point—of concentration of grantees as practiced in some countries—I think the record will show that this is not a serious problem. Again, the Board of Foreign Scholarships, the State Department, and binational commissions overseas have realized that this might become a problem and have bent every effort to place the grantees as widely as possible. But there are several factors that have to be kept in mind if the program is to be effective. The American grantee should be placed at an institution where he can carry out the specific work he wants to do and he must be placed at an institution that will accept him—just as in our own universities. What is more, educational resources in some countries are more concentrated than in our own country. While it is true that more American grantees go to Paris to study than to other parts of France, we should remember that half the population of French university students is also in Paris. And under the Fulbright program, we have some students in every French provincial university. In England, where more people find the best facilities in London, Oxford, and Cambridge, we also have students and scholars in 20 or more universities in England, Scotland, and Wales, and teachers in 80 or more towns throughout the United Kingdom. In Germany, where universities are much more decentralized, our grantees are spread quite equitably throughout the Federal Republic.

I am sure that the Board of Foreign Scholarships, the State Department, and the commissions will give careful attention to the committee's recommendations on these two points and will do everything they can to improve the situation, but I do not myself think it is a serious problem, although it should certainly be watched.

The committee also joins in the suggestion of the House that the State Department scrutinize more carefully the method of selecting foreign grantees. I believe this suggestion stemmed from the fact that in 1955, 8 grantees had to be returned home on account of mental illness. Since this represents eight-tenths of one percent of all the grantees (about 6,000) selected in that year, it would not seem such a bad record. Emotional stability, as we all know, is a pretty difficult thing to assess accurately. But from what I know of the selection procedures used in this program, a great deal of attention is paid to determining the good health of applicants. Each one has to submit a certificate signed by his doctor and questions are asked about mental health. The people who interview these candidates are also on the alert for any signs of emotional disturbances. I do not know how much more can be done and I think, as I said, that the record is as good as one could reasonably expect in a program of this size in a world of constant tensions.

It seems to me that none of the points raised by the committee are serious enough to detract from the excellent results that are being achieved through the exchange program. I am more convinced than ever that the friendship and understanding we are building through these personal relationships with people around the world are a vital part of our efforts to solve our international problems by peaceful means.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for his great interest in this program. He and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] were both very helpful to the subcommittee in its deliberations. We appreciated his statement very much, and I think it contributed very materially to the decision we finally reached.

As the Senate has been told previously, we felt that it would be extremely shortsighted on our part not to allow the full budget estimate. Some members of the committee, including the chairman, felt that perhaps the Budget Bureau had not recommended enough money; but, in view of the situation which confronted us, and in view of the action already taken by our colleagues in the other body, we felt that we should not go beyond the budget estimate. However, we restored all of the budget estimate. That action was due, in large part, to the very fine, persuasive statement made by my friend from Arkansas, who has done so much for the program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator. I wish to make the record clear that I was very much disappointed over the fact that the request of the Budget Bureau was decreased. This is the first time since the program has been under way that the Budget Bureau's request has been decreased. I and the others interested in the program are not satisfied with that action, but, of course, we do not hold the committee responsible for it. I shall certainly make an effort, through other means, to have restored the amount which I believe is necessary to keep the program operating efficiently. That, of course, is another matter.

I wish to compliment the committee on doing what it did. It did all it could do; and we shall have to find some other way to rectify the mistake of the Budget Bureau.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Arkansas. So far as the committee is concerned, it is as nonpartisan a group as any with which I have ever served. There was absolutely no politics in any of our deliberations.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to compliment the committee for recommending an appropriation for 2 additional penitentiaries, 1 for youths.

As every Senator knows, we have been trying for a great many years to abolish the penitentiary known as Alcatraz, off

the shore of San Francisco. That penitentiary was established by Spain 400 years ago. Its closing was recommended by a former Attorney General, Frank Murphy. The present Director of Prisons, Mr. James J. Bennett, who is a most efficient administrator, has also recommended its closing.

I am delighted to see the recommendation for an appropriation for a new penitentiary to deal with adults. I am particularly pleased to note that there is included in the bill an appropriation for an institution for the detention of youths who unfortunately must be confined. I am very proud, as I believe every other Senator is, of the very fine institution which is now maintained at Englewood, Colo., for young boys up to 17 or 18 years of age. It is most efficiently operated. Each of the boys learns a trade. I urge any Senator who is in that vicinity to visit the institution. I know that any Senator who does so will be proud of the rehabilitation of boys of 17 or 18 years of age. A visit to the Federal penitentiaries at Atlanta, Leavenworth, and other places, will disclose that there are comparatively few youths among the prison populations in those institutions—only those who have very bad records. The so-called graduates who have come from the institution at Englewood have made a very fine record. I am glad to see an appropriation recommended by the committee for another such institution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank my friend from North Dakota for his very deep interest in additional prisons. The committee heard excellent testimony on that subject. Mr. Bennett, of the Prison Bureau, testified substantially as the Senator has stated. He testified that the amount which we allowed will not delay the project in any way. The sites have not yet been selected.

The Senator from North Dakota has made reference to the Western Youth Guidance Center. It may be that the Senator can obtain a prison for North Dakota. Two new ones are to be constructed. Mr. Bennett testified that the sites have not been selected. For that reason, he testified that if we would allow $3,500,000, that amount would be sufficient to cover the plans and specifications, as well as the acquisition of the sites.

Mr. LANGER. I am certain that if I could obtain the aid of the distinguished Senator from Texas we could succeed in having one of the new prisons constructed in North Dakota.

The Federal prison farm at Seagoville, Tex., is one of the best operated institutions in the entire United States. I visited it about 3 weeks ago. It is a model prison farm. It is very well conducted. I know that if the Senator from Texas would help me, we might be able to have one of the new prisons located in North Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There will be an appropriation of $3,500,000 to start the project. The sites are being selected.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as the majority leader, chairman of the subcommittee, has stated, he conducted a meeting in which there was no partisanship involved. We tried to do the best we could for the State Department and the other services included in this budget. Several of us felt very strongly that the United States Information Service should have more money than was finally decided upon; but we unanimously agreed upon the amount recommended, and the subcommittee agreed to try to hold the $5 million increase in the conference. We felt that by acting unanimously we could do better than by having a division and a debate on the floor of the Senate.

With the permission of the majority leader, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a single sheet containing a table entitled "State, Justice, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies, 1957."

In a very concrete way, this sheet shows what the Budget Bureau's requests were, what the House action was, and the action of the Senate committee. This is the first time I have seen such information shown concisely on one sheet, in connection with any appropriation bill. I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the RECORD, with the permission of the majority leader, who is chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I agree that it should go in the RECORD. I am glad that the Senator made the request. I certainly concur in it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State, Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies, 1957

	Estimates	House bill	Senate subcommittee	Increases over House bill	Total under estimates
State	$182,142,285	$171,506,737	$176,125,872	$4,619,135	$6,016,413
Justice	235,880,000	215,965,000	219,451,910	3,486,910	16,428,090
Judiciary	37,582,535	35,395,635	37,193,735	1,798,100	388,800
United States Information	135,000,000	110,000,000	115,000,000	5,000,000	20,000,000
Refugee relief	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000		
Total	599,104,820	541,367,372	556,271,517	14,904,145	42,833,303

State (increases):	
Salaries and expenses	$1,210,000
Representation allowances	300,000
Emergencies	150,000
Contributions to international organizations	28,410
Boundary and Water Commission	63,000
Fisheries Commission	102,725
Educational exchange	1,830,000
Passamaquoddy project	935,000
Total, State	4,619,135
The Judiciary:	
Salaries of supporting personnel	451,000
Travel and miscellaneous	143,600
Administrative office	53,500
Air conditioning	1,150,000
Total, Judiciary	1,798,100
Justice (increases):	
General legal activities	300,000
Antitrust Division	−738,090
United States attorneys and marshals	225,000
Special temporary attorneys	200,000
Construction of 2 prison facilities	3,500,000
Total, Justice	3,486,910
U. S. Information Agency: Salaries and expenses	5,000,000

The bill is over the House bill in the amount of $14,904,145.

The bill is over the 1956 appropriations in the amount of $57,998,282.

The bill is under the 1957 budget estimates in the amount of $42,833,303.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, first of all, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues who have spoken on the subject. I concur in the verdict that the majority leader, wearing his new hat as chairman of our subcommittee, did an excellent job. However, I was disappointed that the United States Information Service, in respect to certain of its functions, did not receive additional funds. We did, however, increase by $5 million the amount approved by the House.

We also established a subcommittee, of which I believe the chairman of the subcommittee will serve as chairman, to undertake an analysis and study of the expenditures and programs of the United States Information Service. I think it will be a sort of senatorial seminar, and that, as a result, the majority leader will be enthusiastic about the potentialities of the program. I am sure he will have some suggestions to make, as will other members of the subcommittee, as to how the program can be made more effective. As we learn more about it as a group, I believe we can obtain additional funds to carry out this great program to preserve the peace and to acquaint the rest of the world with the highly constructive program sponsored by the Government of the United States. As one of the coauthors of the legislation establishing this program, I am confident it is one of our most important weapons in the achievement of a lasting peace.

Now I should like to speak on another subject. Yesterday, I sent each Member a note regarding the visit of a group of mayors from Brazil. These mayors, accompanied by Ambassador Muniz, of Brazil, will visit the Capitol on Monday, the 28th of May. I should like to read a portion of the letter I sent to each Senator:

The group will be in the District of Columbia committee room from 1 p. m. to 2:15 p. m., Monday afternoon. At that time the Voice of America will record a number of interviews with Senators who stop in to greet these guests. Photographers will be present to take special pictures which some of you may want to use in your State papers.

I urge you to make every effort to meet and greet these representatives from Brazil who are the special guests of our Government.

After leaving Washington, this group will visit New York; Cleveland; Detroit; Chicago; Brazil, Ind.; Kansas City; Nashville; Chattanooga; Atlanta, and Miami.

That visit will give them a good look at a segment of America.

I regret the fact that they will not find time to go into the heartland of America, to the Midwest or to the west coast; but they will at least have an opportunity to see a good bit of our country.

I hope that many Senators will find it convenient to be in the District of Columbia committee room on Monday next between 1 and 2 o'clock in the afternoon.

The visit is a part of the program under the Smith-Mundt Act, which is made possible by appropriations made by Congress, and it is one of the great constructive services which are rendered in the development of improved mutual understanding.

When this distinguished group of mayors comes to the Capitol from a great friendly country like Brazil, I am sure Senators will wish to extend the hand of welcome and to exchange ideas. I hope many Senators will be able to be present on Monday.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., May 24, 1956.

DEAR SENATOR: This note is to let you know that on Monday, May 28, a group of 50 mayors and other city officials from some 20 cities in the state of São Paulo, Brazil, is planning a visit to the Capital.

These people are here under the sponsorship of the Department of State in order to study municipal governments and the problems of municipal government in a number of cities in our country.

This group will be in the District of Columbia Committee room from 1 p. m. until 2:15 p. m. Monday afternoon. At that time the Voice of America will record a number of interviews with Senators who stop in to greet these guests. Photographers will be present to take special pictures which some of you may want to use in your State papers.

I urge you to make every effort to meet and greet these representatives from Brazil who are the special guests of our Government.

After leaving Washington, this group will visit New York; Cleveland; Detroit; Chicago; Brazil, Ind.; Kansas City; Nashville; Chattanooga; Atlanta; and Miami.

I hope that the Senators from the States where these people will visit will make a special effort to come to the District of Columbia Committee room next Monday afternoon.

With best wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

KARL E. MUNDT,
United States Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. First, I wish to join with the other Senators in commending the distinguished majority leader, who has recently taken on in the Committee on Appropriations the assignment and the responsibilities of chairman of the Subcommittee on State, Justice, and Judiciary Appropriations, for the very fine work he has done. He has brought to the floor a bill which has the unanimous approval of the subcommittee and of the full committee. It will certainly have my support on the floor.

I should like to commend the Senator for the action taken by the Appropriations Committee whereby the work of publishing the foreign relations volumes is to be continued. Several years ago Members on both sides of the aisle were greatly concerned to learn that the publication of these volumes had fallen considerably behind, and that it was taking more than 20 years to get the foreign relations volumes published.

As a result of cooperation and support on both sides of the aisle, when it was found that in part the delay was caused by lack of funds, additional funds were supplied, and the time lag has been cut down.

It has not been cut down to the extent to which I believe ultimately it should be cut. I hope that the staff of the committee will continue to keep in touch with the State Department, in order to expedite the publication of these volumes, so that ultimately they can be published within 4 or 5 years of the events with which they deal.

The testimony, at page 605, shows that the State Department was appreciative of the additional funds; that it had cut the time lag by about 3 years, and that a part of the difficulty was getting the necessary clearance from some of the other countries involved.

I believe there has been some unnecessary dragging of feet in this regard. I hope everything will be done by both the State Department and the committee to expedite the program, which was first brought to my attention by the departments of history of several American universities, which were greatly concerned by the time lag that has existed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the interest of my good friend from California, and his helpfulness in getting consideration of the bill. The witnesses who appeared before our subcommittee agreed that the publication of the volumes had been somewhat slowed down, but that they would try to expedite it. We have had some delay in that connection in the Defense Department, and some of the delay was also caused by the necessary clearance that had to be obtained from foreign countries. They promised to do everything they could to expedite the job. When we look at their appropriation requests next year, we hope to find that they have complied with our suggestion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am delighted to yield to my friend from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join other Senators in commending the distinguished majority leader for the fine work he has done in considering the appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and the judiciary. I also wish to join the distinguished minority leader in expressing the hope that the time lag in the publication of the important volumes to which he has referred will be reduced considerably and that before long we will be able to have access to these volumes within 4 or 5 years after the events, rather than 15 or 20 years, as is the case now.

I am sure that if that is done the atmosphere will be cleared on many matters and the American people and the Congress will have a better idea of what the situation is in the field of foreign policy.

I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question relative to the allowance of $150,000 over the amount provided by the House for emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service. That means, of course, that there will be an overall reduction of $1,750,000 under the budget estimate for the next fiscal year.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, in the event we establish embassies at places like Rabat, Morocco, and Tunis, Tunisia, and other capitals, what the procedure would be for the State Department to get the necessary funds to enable such embassies to operate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator from Montana will look at page 3 of the report, he will note that the amount is $150,000 over and above the House figure. Then we included in our report the statement:

> This amount is specifically denied by the committee since it is felt that should it be found that additional foreign posts must be opened during the year which were not contemplated in the regular estimates, additional sums can be requested from the Congress in the form of supplemental estimates.

If it is necessary to open additional legations or embassies, the State Department can come to us and tell us where they are to be opened, and then we can give thorough and deliberate consideration to such requests in a supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator very much. I merely wish to say, in conclusion, that I am delighted that Congress is giving recognition to the fact that our State Department, in time of peace—if we can call the present era a time of peace—is our first line of defense. I am very hopeful that morale is increasing in the State Department, and that the officers and employees of the Department know they have many friends in Congress who wish them well and who know that they will do the best they can, as they have always done, in behalf of the foreign policy of the United States.

Again, Mr. President, I want to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Texas for the judicious and vigorous manner in which he conducted the hearings and the officers of the State Department for their cooperation in this matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I regret that because of the urgent need for enactment of farm legislation to help bail our farmers out of the economic doldrums in which they are caught, I was

unable to attend many of the hearings of the subcommittee dealing with appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and the Judiciary, and other related agencies. I had hoped to have the opportunity to delve deeply into the operations of our Information Service installations.

As is well known by many Senators, I have made an etxensive study abroad of the operations of our embassies, legations, and other foreign programs, including the United States Information Service. I have stated on many occasions that I do not believe there is a single segment of our Federal personnel which makes greater sacrifices than do those loyal Americans who represent us abroad. I want to make it plain, the criticisms I make today are not directed toward individual representatives who serve us overseas but toward our overriding policies.

Mr. President, I notice that the budget estimates for the USIA for the coming year aggregate $135 million, in contrast to $87,336,630 appropriated for fiscal 1956.

I also notice that the House appropriated $110 million, which, while $25 million under the budget estimate, still represents a $22 million increase over the current year. The Senate committee has seen fit to increase the total to $115 million, or $27 million over and above fiscal year 1956. I wonder if my good friend from Texas can tell us for what purpose the additional sum over last year's appropriation is to be used.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator has correctly stated the fact that the budget estimate was $135 million, and the House appropriated $110 million. The Senate committee did not feel that it could go along with that action. It was extremely critical of certain aspects of the program in England, France, and some other countries. After considerable discussion, the Appropriations Committee felt that by making a lump-sum allowance of $5 million instead of the $25 million for which the Agency was asking, the Agency could distribute among its various activities, such as its motion pictures, its Voice of America, and its operations in Latin America, where it was felt by several Senators, particularly the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Maine, that there was considerable need of money. For its operations in the Near East and Middle East, it was felt that it was necessary to supplement the funds.

The chairman of the subcommittee did everything he could to keep the amount within reasonable limitations. The Senator from Louisiana will observe that we kept witnesses on the stand for a considerable length of time to probe every item requested. We thought it was the better part of wisdom to allow $5 million, to be generally distributed as the Agency thought best.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator tell us how much of the increase will be utilized to further expand Information Service activities in Western Europe?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is the opinion of the committee that none of the $5 million should be used there. It may be that some of the money now being used there is wasted.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the view which I entertain; I am in complete agreement with my distinguished colleague from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator gave the committee some very valuable information. We questioned him at length about it, and I may say, as the result of the Senator's explanation, made orally and in memoranda which I received from him, the committee was convinced that we should urge the agency to quit trying to teach the English culture and get on with their job in other parts of the world where there was a greater need.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad the distinguished Senator from Texas has taken that attitude. My only regret it that the committee did not see fit to reduce the level of expenditures, rather than increase the appropriation. I have been contending for quite a number of years that it is a waste of money for us to have an information service scurrying around and spending American tax dollars in England, in France, in Italy, and other friendly countries. I can see no reason why our Government should be investing in information programs designed to sell America to the people of those countries.

I made the same statement in the fall of 1954, after I had visited Australia and New Zealand. I do not know of any people in the world more pro-American than are the Australians and New Zealanders; yet, I found our Information Service spending substantial sums of money there in order to sell America to these fine people.

I wish to say that when I voted for the bill authorizing the establishment of an information service, I was under the impression it was to be a temporary activity for the purpose of selling America to the people behind the Iron Curtain. But, as in so many other programs, the Washington planners and empire builders want to make it worldwide in scope and permanent in nature.

Mr. President, last year the State Department asked for $6 million so that we could send some of our orchestras to Europe. This was done despite the fact the people of Europe can teach us much about music. I think it is a pure waste, and absolutely indefensible, for our money to be poured overseas to show the English, the French, the Italians, and others of our European allies, that we are not barbarians.

I understand from the report that the committee has requested that a study be made of the Information Service for next year. Am I correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I cannot speak for the other members of the committee, but if I correctly judge the sentiment, the other members generally feel as the Senator from Louisiana feels with reference to our program in western Europe and with reference to the waste of funds in that general area.

I should like to say to my friend from Louisiana that as a result of some of the facts he brought to the attention of the committee, and facts which were brought to the attention of the committee by some of the members of the staff, the committee unanimously adopted a motion by one of its members, which reads as follows:

> I move you that the chairman of the subcommittee, together with the chairman of the full committee and the ranking minority member of the full committee and another minority member from the subcommittee designated by the ranking member constitute a special subcommittee with the power to investigate and check all phases of the work of the United States Information Agency and to report to the full committee prior to the consideration of USIA appropriation for the next fiscal year; that such special subcommittee have sufficient personnel assigned to it and be granted authority to employ such temporary persons as necessary.

I think perhaps that motion, which was adopted by the subcommittee as a result of the testimony we had taken and the evidence which was presented to us, will do a great deal to save the taxpayers' dollars which are now being wasted. That is one of the most encouraging things that came to the consideration of the committee. Next year I hope we can have a thorough study made so that all members can have the facts which the Senator from Louisiana has.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I pointed out last year, there are members of the Information Service, on the Washington level, who have gone so far as to urge that, whenever a building is to be erected abroad to house one of our embassies or legations, quarters also be built to house the Information Service, in the hope that the Service will become a permanent fixture.

Now to be specific, Mr. President, I have no objection to our furnishing data, books, or other types of information to our friends abroad along the lines followed by the English. We could operate modest programs of this kind in conjunction with our embassy and consular activities, and at a reasonable cost. I have found, however, that an effort is being made to make the Information Service a perpetual organization, operating on a grandiose scale—something they hope will become an essential and indispensible part of our foreign relations. I disagree thoroughly with those plans, Mr. President.

It strikes me that most of the money which is being appropriated for the Information Service ought to be channeled in such ways that it will search out and reach the peoples behind the Iron Curtain. Why should the Government spend millions of dollars throughout the world, mostly in countries that are friendly to us, to establish libraries, as I have just pointed out? As I view it, that is an utter waste of money. Another thing, Mr. President: In some of the countries where USIA libraries are established, the rate of illiteracy is about 3 percent. It is obvious that these services are not being used by the people whom we should be trying to reach.

On the other hand, I find, from my studies, that the Information Service is spreading its operating funds around too thinly. In some countries efforts are being made to establish and operate libraries, carry on film services, and all the other programs that are allowed un-

der the law. I have noted that in some places as many as seven different programs were being conducted, and as a result the money allocated for expenditure in those countries had to be spread around so thinly there was no single effective program in the area. In other words, our information was not reaching the people whom it was sought to reach. I have been trying, vainly, it seems, to impress upon our officials in Washington that funds allocated to a country should be limited to one, two, or not more than three of the services—the most effective media being chosen—so that a majority of the people could benefit by their use. I should say that if that procedure were followed, the programs would be of greater value.

As an example of what I have in mind, I might cite our information activities in Japan. There we employ over 350 persons just to disseminate information. The idea seems to be: "You name a medium, we have it." We have in that country a full-scale motion-picture operation, and press services; we publish periodicals, operate cultural centers, finance exchange of persons programs, and in general, engage in all the various types of information activities that are authorized by law. It is my belief that rather than try to carry on an activity in each of the fields of endeavor, we should limit our operations to those activities which can best reach the masses of the Japanese people, in order to acquaint them with our way of life and our democratic principles.

To cite another example: In India much work could be done through moving pictures. Much effective work could be done in other underdeveloped areas also by concentrating our efforts on the use of moving pictures. But in India I found that we are using every form of informational activity, including those designed for use in countries like England, France, and others, where there are different kinds and temperaments of people, and different economic and cultural standards.

It strikes me that the Information Service could maintain itself and perform a commendable job with the same amount of money which was appropriated last year, if only the agency would eliminate many of its services which, in my opinion, are being wasted because they do not reach the people of the host country.

I shall not go into any details this afternoon, but I have before me much information to the effect that the Government spends thousands of dollars in foreign countries in order to pay the rent for libraries. We have operated these libraries long enough, it strikes me, to teach the people the value of libraries. I have been trying to get the Information Service to make a start in the direction of economy by telling the people of the countries where the United States maintains libraries that it is now up to them to assist in maintaining those libraries; that from now on we will confine our efforts to making the books available to them at no cost, but they must operate the libraries. But no; you would think that nobody can operate the libraries except an American. Our Information Service people want the libraries to remain under their supervision rather than be placed under the supervision of the people of the host countries, in spite of the fact that we could thereby save substantial sums each year, and the library program would have a better chance to become an established, integral part of the country's culture.

I do not want to labor the point, Mr. President, but in London, England, we spend $10,575 each year on rentals for library quarters, when that city already boasts 31 public libraries and 502 special libraries. We are spending $6,200 a year just for rental on library quarters in Brussels, Belgium. In Italy we spend $34,500 a year to rent facilities for USIA-operated libraries in 11 cities. We also furnish at least a portion of the staff in these libraries, the cost of utilities, and other items of maintenance. I cite these expenses as an example of the money that, as I evaluate the program, is being spent needlessly and to no good advantage, by our United States Information Agency in its ambitious policy to conduct information activities in every country of the world, regardless of the need for such activities.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The committee brought that matter as forcefully as it could to the attention of the representatives of the Information Service.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, but reductions rather than increases in the appropriations should have been made, and money should have been denied to carry on some of these operations. With respect to the library program in particular, it strikes me that we ought to go on record and let Mr. Streibert and the others in the Information Service know that we think it is about time they began to inform the people of foreign lands that if they desire a continuation of the libraries, they will have to assist not only in maintaining them but, also will be expected to make available the housing for the libraries.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The chairman of the subcommittee concurs wholeheartedly in what the Senator from Louisiana has said. The committee cut the amount $20 million below the budget estimate.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand; but what I am complaining of, I may say to my good friend from Texas, is that with an $87 million appropriation for the current fiscal year, the activities of which I am complaining were carried on. If the committee now intends to increase the Service's funds by some $27 million, my guess is that the Information Service will not only continue these wasteful programs, as it has in the past, but will probably expand them. My thought is that we had better notify them now to reevaluate these programs, streamline some, eliminate others, or face the fact that Congress will take a hand and reduce the appropriations in the future.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to ask the Senator a question or two regarding the report of the committee about the Antitrust Division, as it appears on page 7 of the report. It is apparent from a reading of the report that the reduction which has been made below the budget estimate has been largely designed to eliminate certain personnel positions requested by the Department of Justice to carry out a survey of the activities of the Interstate Compact Commission. I have no objection to that reduction. I wanted to make it clear upon the floor, however, before the bill was finally disposed of, that the Committee on the Judiciary, through one of its subcommittees, is presently conducting a study of the antitrust laws and the antitrust problems. It is already clear that the Department of Justice approves some suggesions which have been made for proposed legislation. At the moment, the Committee on the Judiciary is holding hearings on certain antimerger bills.

Only yesterday the head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice appeared before our subcommittee and endorsed certain proposed legislation which has already passed the House. Judge Barnes suggested certain amendments to the proposed legislation, so it is likely that before the end of the session we may have more antitrust measures to consider.

I wanted, if I could, to have it made clear by the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished and amiable majority leader, that the reduction does not reflect any intention upon the part of the committee which is hostile to the enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Not only is the Senator from Wyoming correct, but the chairman of the subcommittee—I can speak only for myself, as the distinguished Senator knows—suggested that the antitrust funds be increased, in view of the fact that 1,200 new complaints had been filed, in view of the fact that mergers were at an all-time high, and in view of the fact that it appeared to the chairman of the subcommittee that this would be a very fruitful field for any additional attorneys who were needed, and that the committee would give the Department all the money it asked for in order to do this type of work.

The chairman of the subcommittee, I think, violates no confidence when he says that he suggested that the committee add several hundred thousand dollars over and above the request.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know he did.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In view of the budget estimate, and in view of the fact that the Division was getting all it asked for, except for this compact, we felt we should call to the attention of the Senate and the country the facts as they appear in the second paragraph on page 7 of the report, namely, that the Antitrust Division received 1,200 new complaints charging violations of the antitrust laws; and yet that Division apparently feels its present personnel can carry such a burden, since no additional increase was requested.

We do not suggest that they come forward and ask for the increase. If they can handle those complaints with their present personnel, more power to them. If they cannot, we think any of the additional personnel which are being allowed

could well be assigned to this type of work.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will note the second from the last sentence in that paragraph, it reads:

> The committee is of the opinion that the present personnel in the Division is sufficient to absorb the duties which the Congress has placed on the Department in this respect but has approved $25,000 for this purpose.

I take that to mean that the committee has allowed $25,000 additional for the enforcement of present antitrust laws. So that is an indication that when and if Congress tightens up the antitrust law and gives the Department of Justice some of the additional power which has been requested, nothing done by the committee is to be interpreted as being at all adverse to such action.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The able Senator is eminently correct. The pending bill provides for about 500 employees in the Antitrust Division. If the Antitrust Division determines to go into the mergers which are taking place, or if it needs additional personnel to go into the 1,200 new complaints which have been received from small-business men who are being run out of business, the committee will look with sympathy upon any petition submitted by the Department. I cannot speak for anyone but myself, but as chairman I made that suggestion during the consideration of the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I want the RECORD to show that the antimerger bill as passed by the House requires prenotification of the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice by companies desiring to merge. If this bill is passed by the Senate, and enacted into law, it will mean that additional work will be placed upon the Department of Justice.

I desire to make it clear in the RECORD by this colloquy with the Senator from Texas that nothing contained in this appropriation for the Department of Justice creates an obstacle against the enforcement of such future antitrust laws.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is correct. We did not want to put the cart before the horse. As soon as the Judiciary Committee acts, I am sure the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee will be glad to follow in its footsteps.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume the subcommittee looked into the amounts our Government contributes to the various international organizations. For instance, I notice that the amount for the United Nations for 1957 has been increased by almost $3 million as compared to 1956. I presume that although the budget for the United Nations has been increased, the amount of our contribution percentagewise has remained the same.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Members of the committee were very much concerned about the percentage of contribution the United States was making compared with the number of American personnel employed. As I recall, we disallowed the $3,000 requested, for the Inter-American radio office, but allowed $2,800 because we thought that was a rather important activity.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I scan quickly through the portion of the report on page 4, I think it could be said that the amount of contribution for each organization of which we are members has not been increased materially percentagewise. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct, and the committee was rather critical of the situation which presently exists. That was one of the reasons for its refusal to allow the additional amount.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator well knows, the percentage of the United States contribution to the United Nations has been reduced from 40 percent, as it was when it first came into being, to 33⅓ percent. It is my hope that as these international organizations expand, we can continue to decrease our contributions percentagewise. I think we should pay a just share, but I believe that one-third is too much, and our participation should continue to be reduced until all the other members of the United Nations contribute their just proportion of operating expenses.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I share the Senator's general viewpoint. If he will permit me, I should like to read into the RECORD, for the benefit of all who may care to read it, the following from the committee report, on page 4:

> The committee strongly endorses the recommendation of the House committee regarding the disproportionate number of qualified American personnel on duty in the various organizations in comparison with this Government's contributions, and requests the Secretary of State to take the steps necessary to rectify this situation.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator realizes very well that when these organizations were first started, it was expected and perhaps could be justified that we would have to pay a little more money than our neighbors, because we originated the organizations; conditions are materially altered today, however, and the State Department should take notice that the attitude of Congress has also changed, and that we expect further steps to be taken to reduce the percentage of our contributions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If they read the reports of congressional committees, as I assume they do and hope they do, they certainly will be on notice of Congress' attitude.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana is a good Senator, and he is my friend, but I want the RECORD to show that I am one Senator who violently disagrees with the Senator's accusations respecting the United States Information Agency.

Last year my wife and I went to Europe. It was not an official trip; it was a vacation. I took the trip as a private citizen, not as a United States Senator. I visited a number of United States information centers. For example, I visited one in Vienna on a Sunday. I met the young men and women who work there for the Government of the United States. I saw the literally hundreds of people of Austria reading and studying in our America House there.

I think our USIA has done a magnificent job.

I do not pretend to hold myself out as an expert on foreign affairs, but I believe I sufficiently understand the hazards of human freedom in this nuclear age to say that if our American way of life is to succeed, as I pray it will and believe it will, its success will rest in great part on the ability of the people and the Government of the United States to pursuade human beings all around the globe that the kind of government and the kind of freedom we have is the best means by which peoples can live in happiness and honor and can sit in judgment on their own lives.

All of us are against waste. If waste can be ferreted out of the budget in Republican administrations or Democratic administrations, I think most of us—I suppose all of us in the Senate—will vote for measures to accomplish such a result.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California permit me to interject at that point?

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. What the Senator desires is exactly what the committee sought to do. None of the members of the subcommittee which included the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Washingto [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] were enemies of any particular program. All of them concluded finally, though they may have had some doubts, to go as far as we did go. If we go that far with any other agency of Government, we will not be able to let the party of the Senator from California keep its promise to balance the budget, because we increased the amount of this appropriation from $87 million to $115 million this year. That was a sizable increase. The House allowed $110 million. We allowed an additional $5 million.

Members of the committee were concerned about certain expenditures we were making in certain areas of the world. I do not know how we are going to be successful in our purposes by employing 100 or so personnel in England and by renting Lord Chesterfield's mansion in London so the British people can read books. It may be they can teach us,

as, indeed, they have taught us, much that we ought to follow.

I do not think anyone can create the impression that the committee has not been overgenerous with the Information Service, and I may say more generous than the chairman thought was justified.

Mr. KUCHEL. I will say to the able majority leader that as I sat here and listened to the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana, I thought it was his opinion, as he expressed himself, that the Senate should serve notice on the United States Information Agency to prepare for a period of decline, so far as the Senate was concerned. With that I disagree. I want the RECORD to show it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let me state what the Senate committee has done about that matter: The Senate committee unanimously agreed that the Senate should have more information regarding the operation of the United States Information Agency all over the world, and that before the Senate passes another appropriation bill affecting the Agency, a thorough study of all of its activities should be made.

Let me say that the Senator from Louisiana is one of the most diligent and one of the most thorough members of the subcommmittee; and before this work is completed, the Senator from Louisiana may have to assume some of the duties the Senator from Texas has been carrying, because he is carrying more than he should carry.

So I repeat that the full committee unanimously agreed that a thorough study of all the activities of this Agency should be made.

Mr. KUCHEL. I do not disagree with that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Certainly. I think the Senator from California favors it.

After a thorough study is made, if it is found that additional funds are needed, the Senator from Texas will be the first to say so. On the other hand, if the study shows that reductions should be made in the appropriations for the Agency, I know that the making of such reductions will, under those circumstances, meet with the approval of my friend. We do not favor waste. If libraries are needed, we do not propose that mansions be provided for them.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I do not propose to detain the Senate longer in regard to this matter. I merely did not wish the RECORD to indicate that there was unanimity of approval of what I considered to be the tenor of the remarks of the very able Senator from Louisiana. Obviously, everyone should be required to justify the expenditure of public moneys.

But I believe that the United States Information Agency, through its centers around the world, has been of assistance to the people of the United States in strengthening the respect of free peoples for the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We believed it $87 million worth last year, and we are giving the Agency $115 million for this purpose this year.

Mr. KUCHEL. I well remember that a year ago it was the Senate which restored the amounts which had been cut from the Agency's appropriations, after the House of Representatives had voted to make considerable reductions in the appropriations the Bureau of the Budget had recommended for the Agency.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY A MEMBER OF THE TURKISH PARLIAMENT

Mr. BRIDGES obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield briefly to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to call the attention of the Senate and the attention of our guests in the galleries, particularly those in the newspaper gallery, to the fact that at the present time we are very highly honored to have with us a member of the Turkish Parliament, Mr. Ahmet Tokus, who has been visiting with us today and has been observing our procedures.

I wish to ask my new-made friend from Turkey to stand, so that the Senate may greet him.

[Mr. Tokus rose from his place on the floor, and was greeted with applause, Senators rising.]

STATE, JUSTICE, THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10721) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to make a few comments on the bill.

In the first place, let me say that I think the subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] has done a good job on the bill. I happen to be the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, and, in turn, of the full committee.

There was a difference of opinion regarding the United States Information Agency. Some members of the committee felt its appropriation should be reduced from the amount voted by the House of Representatives. Some members felt the amount should be increased. We tried to arrive at a common ground—which is so necessary in connection with the legislation—so that we could have some meeting of minds.

The figure decided on had the approval of most of the members as the figure which we could generally agree upon.

As the distinguished Senator from Texas has said, and as the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has pointed out, the investigation in connection with this matter which is authorized by the subcommittee and the full committee is for protection of the Senate and the House of Representatives. If we were to proceed with such an investigation while this appropriation bill is pending, the investigation would have to be superficial at best.

But I hope that before the next appropriation for the Agency comes before us, we can do a good job in scrutinizing the work of the Agency and in determining whether waste can be eliminated and whether the work of the Agency is being properly channeled, so as to attain the end which we seek to attain.

If the Agency is satisfied with its work—and I believe it is—then it should welcome the making of such an investigation. It should have nothing to cover up; and the investigation should be made in a fair manner.

I should also like to comment on the historical division and on what the senior Senator from California has had to say in that connection. I am disturbed at the lag in the preparation by the State Department of the records regarding many of the great historical events of our times. The longer the period which elapses between the occurrence of such an event and the completion of the records on it, the harder it is for the proper records to be made.

I do not think the delay is altogether the fault of the State Department, although the State Department must assume its share of the blame for it. On the other hand, I think some of the delay has been occasioned by the situation existing in the various departments concerned. We hope these obstacles will be removed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to read into the RECORD an excerpt from the fifth report to Congress by the United States Information Agency. On page 1 of the report we find the following:

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE HALF-YEAR

Leading activities of the United States Information Agency during the last half of 1955 included:

Giving the world a clear look at United States policy on the major issues at the Summit Conference and the subsequent Foreign Ministers' Conference (see p. 20).

Launching a major program to dramatize President Eisenhower's proposal for exchange of military blueprints with the Soviet Union and for mutual aerial inspection.

Publicizing intensively the United Nations conference on peaceful uses of atomic energy at Geneva, and redoubling efforts to bring knowledge of the United States' leadership and achievement in atoms-for-peace.

The Senator from New Hampshire well knows that in capitals such as Paris and London, these programs are handled by the press to the same extent that they are handled by the press here. So why should we have a separate agency to gather the information and send it to these foreign press representatives for publication, when they get it through their regular news information channels, such as the INS, the UP, and similar agencies.

I say that money spent for that purpose is money wasted; that wherever there are publications such as the Manchester Guardian and the London Times, and other great newspapers, I believe it is purely a waste to maintain a staff of Americans there, spending considerable time and money in trying to disseminate such information, when it is obvious their work is just a duplication of what is being done by the press of those countries.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, in the case of the appriations for the Department of Justice, the one item which struck me in the face, so to speak, was that referred to in the colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Texas and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, namely, the appropriation item for the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. The amount requested for it was well toward three-quarters of a million dollars, for the purpose of investigating the interstate compact in oil, which is an interstate compact between various of the States of the Union. The total budget for the compact to spend is $92,000. It seemed to me, at least, to be absurd for the United States to proceed to expend either $681,000 or $762,000, or nearly three-quarters of a million dollars, to investigate the expenditure of $92,000.

I believe that on motion by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] the subcommittee provided $25,000 for this purpose. That seems to be a reasonable amount of money to investigate the expenditure of $92,000, rather than an appropriation of 7 or 8 times the total amount to be spent by the organization being investigated.

Generally speaking, I believe that the bill is a good bill. There may be differences of opinion with respect to certain items, but generally we have arrived at a reasonably satisfactory bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is a pretty good illustration of what often happens when amendments are taken to conference and then remain in a bill.

I brought to the floor of the Senate the so-called interstate oil compact bill, and this amendment was offered by my colleague [Mr. DOUGLAS]. Manifestly I was not too happy about it, but it did go to conference, and it remained in the bill.

The Attorney General then had the job of interpreting the language to see what his duties and responsibilities were. He estimated that $691,000 would be necessary to make a full field investigation and to carry out what he thought was the intent of Congress. I think the action taken by the committee is in accordance with the spirit of the law. The Attorney General is not charged with too much responsibility in this matter. At the same time, I think this appropriation will serve the requirements of the compact and meet the desires of Congress in this connection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate what my distinguished friend, the ranking minority member of the committee [Mr. BRIDGES] has had to say about the ridiculous request by the Attorney General for several hundred thousand dollars to investigate a compact among 21 or 22 States, involing an expenditure of only $92,000 a year.

This subject was brought to my attention vividly by a memorandum from my very able friend from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. Subsequently it was brought to the attention of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who was the author of the amendment which directed the Department of Justice to take a look at the oil compact. I am in receipt of a letter, dated May 18, 1956, from the Senator from Illinois. It is a rather lengthy letter. I shall not read all of it. Let me read a pertinent paragraph which I think will interest the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and my friend from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]:

> May I say that this request by the Justice Department is absurd. I can only think it was done in an attempt to reduce the real purpose of my amendment to absurdity and to kill any effort to carry out the reasonable intent of the amendment. I am convinced that a staff of 2 to 4 competent economists, 1 to 2 lawyers, and perhaps 1 to 2 investigators, at the most, would be adequate to carry out the legislative intent of my amendment. I am at a loss to find anything in the legislative record of my amendment from which the Department could possibly request the sum of money and the new staff it has asked for. As it was my amendment, and as my statement was the only statement of substance about the amendment in the Senate, I believe that I am in a position to state the legislative intent.

I should like to have the RECORD show that not only are all Members present in agreement, but also that the Senator from Illinois feels that the request is absurd.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was pleased to hear the quotation from the letter from the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], because I knew of his interest in the particular amendment which went into the bill a year ago, and of his concern over the budget request. Apparently the question is now settled in the bill.

I invite the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee to the educational exchange features of the appropriation for the Department of State. I note that the committee allowed the full budget request of $20 million for the educational exchange program. I shall not go into all the details of the budget request, because the subject was covered very thoroughly in the committee.

I invite the attention of Senators to the so-called teen-ager exchange program. I have discussed the subject privately with the majority leader, and have taken the liberty to mention it to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

In the $20 million budget request, as I have been given to understand, no funds were budgeted for what is known as the teen-ager program.

Let me set the record straight as to what I mean. There are many wonderful private organizations engaging in this program. Such organizations include the American Field Service, the Brethren Service Commission of the Church of the Brethren, the Michigan Council of Churches, the National Catholic Welfare Council, the National Grange, and others, including the great National 4-H Club Foundation, which has an international farm youth exchange program.

These private groups have been sponsoring the admission into the United States, for a limited period of time, of teen-agers, who live in the homes of American citizens. They attend our high schools and participate in our community events. They learn a great deal about the United States, and become ambassadors of good will when they return to their homes.

I am not asking that the State Department pay their living expenses. That part of the program is supported by private groups, by subscriptions from private organizations, community clubs, and so forth. However, I wish to see the Department, through its educational exchange program, cooperate with the private groups I have named, by providing some technical assistance, and international travel. The real problem is the travel cost involved in getting the teen-agers to the United States.

I was discussing this subject in the Foreign Relations Committee earlier in the day. It seems to me that some of the currencies obtained under Public Law 480 could be used for this purpose. Such a possibility was explained this morning before the committee. Furthermore, by earmarking a portion of the $20 million appropriation we could cooperate with the foreign private groups which are doing everything humanly possible to enlist support in the local communities for the project of bringing into the United States many young people who need to know more about American living and American democracy.

I conclude by saying that the program in which we engaged in connection with German students was a great success. We brought in hundreds of young German teen-agers. We brought many from Austria. When I say "we" I mean the sponsoring agencies. Students were brought in from Latin America. We ought to continue this program.

I looked into the subject because many people in my home State are deeply interested in the American field service. They were becoming very much disturbed because our Government was showing so little interest in terms of financial contributions.

The report from the Department of State concerning the program sponsored by the United States Government for foreign teen-agers contains the following:

> The Department's request for $20 million for educational exchange activities in fiscal year 1957 was not sufficient to permit inclusion of a program for bringing teen-age students to the United States.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am in sympathy with what the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has had to say on this subject. I believe that the bringing into the United States of teen-agers—not teen-agers of the lower ages, but those of higher ages—by private groups should be encouraged. I did not realize that such a program was not included in this appropriation. I assumed that it was.

Notwithstanding the document from which the Senator has read, I think there is sufficient money in the appropriation so that a small part of the funds included in this appropriation could be used for

that purpose. I point out also that in the bill it is proposed to use certain foreign currency for that purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I invite the Senators' attention to page 13 of the bill, under "Educational exchange." The bill provides:

International educational exchange activities: For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for—

And we will assume that this would be a necessary expense.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I continue to read from the bill:

not otherwise provided for, to enable the Department of State to carry out international educational exchange activities, as authorized by the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 * * * and to administer the programs authorized by * * * the act of August 24, 1949.

The committee gave the educational exchange activities all the money requested in the budget estimates. It was $1,830,000 more than the House had provided. The committee recommended for those activities every dime which had been requested. That is unusual, of course. We thought the program was so important that we should give them the amount indicated. If they are prudent and careful in the use of the money and wish to do a good job, I can see no reason why they cannot take $75,000 or $85,000, or any similar amount, out of the $20 million and provide for the service the Senator refers to. I believe our discussion can serve as notice to them that that is the intention of the committee in restoring $1,830,000, to permit them to carry out the work the Senator has mentioned.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. It is my feeling, from looking at the language in the bill, that there is no exclusion intended with respect to the teen-age program, because the teen-age program is provided for under such programs as the United States educational-exchange program. Rather than mention any one particular figure, as I understand, it is the feeling of the Senator from New Hampshire, who addressed himself to this subject, and of the Senator from Texas, that the teen-age program should be continued. I am not talking about paying for living expenses. I wish to make that clear. I am talking about the teen-age program of the cooperating voluntary agencies, and with respect to travel primarily, because that will enable what limited money is appropriated to be spread among many more people than would otherwise be the case.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas has not taken any evidence on this subject, and has not heard any testimony on it at all other than the statements made by his colleague from Minnesota, which he appreciates. The Senator from Texas takes the position that there will be available $20 million, any part of which can be used for the purposes enumerated by the Senator from Minnesota. In addition to that, we have a foreign-currency program under Public Law 480, from which an additional $1,150,000 is available. Any part of that could be used in the same field.

The Senator from Texas, as chairman of the subcommittee, does not wish to pass judgment on the amount which should be allowed for a phase of the program on which he has not heard testimony. However, he believes that the language of the bill is broad enough, and the language of Public Law 480 is wide enough, to permit the use of the money for that purpose, if the agencies are disposed so to use it. I know of no way by which we can make them do it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If they do not do it, I will be back on the floor of the Senate to find out why they did not do it, because this is a worthwhile program.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assume they will take notice of the Senator's admonition, and I hope they will take proper notice of the statements which have been made by the chairman of the subcommittee and by its distinguished ranking minority member. I hope my friend from Massachusetts agrees with what I have said.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do agree with what the Senator has stated. I believe the State Department has interpreted the program in a very broad way. I am wholeheartedly in favor of the teen-age program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a report which I received from the Department of State with respect to this program.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM FOR FOREIGN TEEN-AGERS SPONSORED BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

In 1949, the first United States Government-sponsored teen-ager program was carried out with Germany. The teen-agers come to the United States to live for 1 year with typical American families and attend high schools.

From the beginning this Government has relied on contractual arrangements with competent private organizations to handle the placement of the teen-agers in homes both on farms and in cities, and to supervise them in their year of study. Arrangements for the first group of teen-agers were made by the Brethren Service Commission, the service organization of the Church of the Brethren, which was very active in relief work in Germany after World War II. In subsequent years the following private organizations have provided similar assistance in the teen-age program: The American Field Service, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Georgia District of Kiwanis International, the Michigan Council of Churches, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and the National Grange.

From 1949 to the present (including the teen-agers now in this country), this Government has paid approximately $2,178,061 toward the expenses involved in bringing 2,432 teen-agers to the United States. This figure of 2,432 includes 2,259 German, 139 Austrian, and 34 Latin American teen-agers. For 1956–57, there will be 10 department-sponsored Austrian teen-agers for 24 from the other American Republics, or a grand total of 34. For 1956–57, $68,668 in Department funds is to be spent on the teen-ager program, part of this amount being the actual cost of the grants and the rest representing funds allotted to several private cooperating agencies in the form of grants-in-aid to enable them to begin private teen-ager programs or to enlarge already existing private programs of this type. Thus by July 1, 1956, the department will have spent approximately $2,246,729 to bring to this country 2,463 teen-agers and to help competent private agencies to start or to enlarge private teen-ager programs of their own.

In accordance with the agreement between Mr. Carl Marcy and Dr. Russell, of the Department, there follows a chart describing the teen-ager program for the 1952 fiscal year through 1956:

Fiscal year	Germany		Austria		Latin America		Total	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
1952	423	$436,472	27	$28,360	----------	----------	450	$464,832
1953	415	416,470	19	18,208	----------	----------	434	434,678
1954	200	168,110	----------	----------	----------	----------	200	168,110
1955	169	136,613	----------	----------	34	$30,589	203	167,202
1956	----------	----------	10	7,190	24	24,138	34	[1] 68,668
Total	1,207	1,157,665	56	53,758	58	54,727	1,321	1,303,490

[1] This figure includes $37,340 which will be transferred to 4 of the cooperating agencies for assisting the Department in the placement and supervision of the 34 teen-ager grantees shown above; for the purpose of assisting these organizations in developing and/or expanding private teen-ager exchanges.

HOW COSTS HAVE BEEN MET

The Department's contribution toward the cost of bringing a teen-ager to the United States for a year has consisted of the following items: round trip international travel plus amount to cover incidental expenses during travel; round trip travel from the port of entry in the United States to the home where the teen-ager is to live; and a small sum toward the student's incidental expenses in the United States. In addition a small program-operation fee is also paid to the cooperating agencies to cover the cost of placement and supervision. The major part of the cost of the student's stay in this country is met by the individual family which accepts the student and provides his room and board as though he were a member of the family. In some cases interested community groups take care of room and board costs. The great interest which private Americans have shown in the teen-ager program, and their large financial contribution to it, have been major factors in its success. For example, all States have thus far waived out-of-State tuition fees, and private schools have given free tuition.

BEGINNING OF TEEN-AGER PROGRAM WITH THE OTHER AMERICAN REPUBLICS

Prior to the 1955 fiscal year, the only Government-sponsored programs for teen-agers were with Germany and Austria. However, during the 1955 fiscal year the Congress earmarked specific funds for educational exchange activities in the other American Republics. This action provided sufficient funds to enable the Department to propose to the American diplomatic missions in those countries the possibility of utilizing a portion of these funds for teen-ager exchanges Nine countries, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Uruguay, requested and were allotted a total of 34 teen-ager grants. These

students came to the United States in the summer of 1955.

DECLINE IN TEEN-AGER PROGRAM WITH GERMANY

From the end of World War II through the fiscal year 1955, the exchange-of-persons program with Germany had been financed from a separate appropriation to the Department for "Government in Occupied Areas." This annual appropriation averaged more than twice the amount of funds available for any other country. Germany was, therefore, the only country in which an adequate and well-balanced program could be carried out. However, as Germany returned to normalcy and resumed her position as a partner in the Western European community, it appeared that the exchange program with that country should assume commensurate proportions.

This necessitated a relatively sharp cut in exchange activities in Germany. In view of this, the Embassy at Bonn decided that it would be preferable to use a greater share of the available dollar funds for grants to Germans already in prominent positions and to eliminate grants for teen-agers. Also, it was realized that those programs which attract substantial financial support from private sources, such as the teen-ager program, could bear a larger portion of this reduction without being completely eliminated, and that more governmental assistance should be given to programs which by their nature do not offer opportunities for large amounts of private financial assistance.

ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT IN TEEN-AGER EXCHANGE, FISCAL YEAR 1956

This decision resulted in only 34 Department-sponsored teen-agers for fiscal year 1956—24 from the other American Republics and 10 from Austria. This situation led the Department to search for ways in which it could encourage teen-ager exchanges under private auspices, since it was convinced of the positive value in such exchanges.

The United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange reviewed the question of the Department's future role in teen-ager exchanges at its meeting September 12, 1955. As a result it was decided that in order to promote private teen-ager exchanges the Department would consider small grants-in-aid to those agencies assisting in the 1956 fiscal year. (See enclosure 3, Fifteenth Semi-annual Report on Educational Exchange Activities.) These grants-in-aid will be used first of all to cover the program operation costs to the agencies of placing and supervising the 34 Department-sponsored teen-agers of the 1956 fiscal year; they will also be used by the agencies for developmental purposes—i. e., to explore possibilities of obtaining adequate support from nongovernmental sources to continue a teen-ager program under the agencies' auspices on at least a minimum level. Thus, the grants-in-aid will enable the agencies to maintain the staff necessary to bring the Government's program to an orderly conclusion and to devote time and effort to inaugurating programs of their own or to enlarge presently existing private programs which some of them are already conducting.

STATUS AS OF 1957 FISCAL YEAR

The Department's request for $20 million for educational exchange activities in fiscal year 1957 was not sufficient to permit inclusion of a program for bringing teen-age students to the United States. At best, the Department will be able to provide funds such as being provided in fiscal year 1956 for stimulating private programs.

If sufficient funds should become available, the Department proposes to provide grants-in-aid to private agencies to stimulate private teen-ager exchanges, and, in addition, we will be able to provide supplemental financial assistance for otherwise private-sponsored teen-agers. This procedure will enable qualified teen-agers, irrespective of financial status, to have the opportunity of participating in this worthwhile exchange program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two tables relating to the International Farm Youth Exchange—National 4–H Club Foundation.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL FARM YOUTH EXCHANGE—NATIONAL 4–H CLUB FOUNDATION, 8561 FENTON STREET, SILVER SPRING, MD.

Summary of State and Territorial participation in IFYE project, 1948–54 (preliminary incomplete summary based on records immediately available—further revision is anticipated)

	1948		1949		1950		1951		1952		1953		1954		1948–54 totals	
	United States [1]	Foreign [1]	United States [1]	Foreign [1]	United States [1]	Foreign [1]	United States [1]	Foreign [1]	United States [1]	Foreign [1]	United States [1]	Foreign [1]	United States [1]	Foreign [1]	United States [1]	Foreign [1]
Alabama							1			2					1	2
Arizona																
Arkansas	1		1	2	3	9	2	2	5	8	2	3	3	6	17	30
California				1			5	6	6	8	6	11	4	8	21	34
Colorado							2	3	2	4	2	6	2	4	8	17
Connecticut	1	1		1	1	2	2	2	2	3	1	8	2	4	9	21
Delaware				1			1	2	1			2			2	5
Florida																
Georgia					1	2	1	2	5	8	2	4	2	4	11	20
Idaho					1	2			1	2	2	4	3	3	7	11
Illinois			1	1	1	3	2	4	4	5	3	9	5	15	16	37
Indiana						1	2	3	4	5	4	5	3	5	13	19
Iowa	1	1	3	6	2	8	4	3	4	12	7	11	2	4	23	45
Kansas	1		2	2	3	5	8	7	9	12	12	14	12	32	47	72
Kentucky			3	1	5	3	5	12	4	5	4	6	6	8	27	35
Louisiana											1	2	1	2	2	4
Maine						1					2	4			2	5
Maryland	1	1	1	1				1	3	4	3	4	1	2	9	13
Massachusetts			1	2	2	4	2	2	4	5	3	3	1	2	13	18
Michigan	1		1	2	1	1	1	2	4	8	5	6	4	8	17	27
Minnesota	1	1	1	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	4	3	2	13	11	26
Mississippi							1	2	1	1	3	4	2	4	7	11
Missouri			1	1	1	1			3	4	2	8	6	11	13	25
Montana	1		1	2	2	4	4	2	3	7	2	4	4	12	17	31
Nebraska	1	1	1		1	2	1	2	1	2	1	3	2	4	8	14
Nevada																
New Hampshire				2	1	3	1	2	1	2	1	4	1	2	5	15
New Jersey				2									2	4	2	6
New Mexico							1	2	2	4	3	1	1	4	7	11
New York	1	1	2	2			2	2	3	5	4	8	4	8	16	26
North Carolina	1	1	2	1	1	2	3	2	2	3	3	1	4	8	16	18
North Dakota				2	2	2			2		1	5	2	4	7	13
Ohio				2	2	3	4	3	7	9	8	9	7	22	28	48
Oklahoma	1			1											1	1
Oregon							1	2	4	4	4	9	4	7	13	22
Pennsylvania	1		1	2	1	3	2	2	3	2	1	5	2	6	11	20
Rhode Island				2												2
South Carolina											2	4	1	2	3	6
South Dakota			1	2	1	2	2	2	3	5	1	4	1	2	9	17
Tennessee			2	1	2	2			2	4	1	3			7	10
Texas	1		2	1	1	2	2	4			1	2	1	3	8	12
Utah			1	1	1	2	1	3	2	4	2	2	2	6	9	18
Vermont				1	2	4	1	1	1	3	1	1			5	10
Virginia		1	1				2	1	3	3	2	6	5	7	13	18
Washington	1			1		1	1	2	3	4	1	2	4	6	10	16
West Virginia	1	1	1	2	1	3	1	2	1	1	1	3	1	2	7	14
Wisconsin							3	4	4	6	4	9	4	8	15	27
Wyoming	1		1		2	2	2	2	2	4	4	5	2	10	14	23
Alaska							1		1		1	1	1		4	1
Hawaii																
Puerto Rico																
Totals	17	9	31	51	42	81	75	95	113	170	117	208	116	262	511	[2] 876

[1] "United States" indicates United States delegates; "foreign" indicates foreign exchangees.

[2] Total number of placements.

Summary of participation in the international farm youth exchange project from 1948 through 1954

	1948–49		1950		1951		1952		1953		1954		1948–54 total	
	U.S.	For.	U.S.	For.	U.S.	For.	U.S.	For.	U.S.	For.	U.S.	For.	U.S.	For.
Algeria									(1)			2	(1)	2
Argentina							1		2	2	2		4	3
Australia					3		4	2	4	6	4	2	15	10
Austria			2	3	3		5		4		3	1	17	4
Belgium-Luxembourg	2	1	3	1	2	4	4	6	5	4	5	5	21	21
Bolivia							3	3				1	3	4
Brazil				2	2		2	1	3	4	4	4	11	11
Chile					2		3	2	4	3	3	4	12	9
Colombia					2	1		1	2	2			4	4
Costa Rica					1		2			2	2	3	5	5
Denmark	5	3	3		3		4	3	4		4		23	6
Ecuador									3	3	2	2	5	5
Egypt									1			1	1	1
Finland	2	4	3	3	2	3	4	5	4	8	5	6	20	29
France	5	4	3	3	4	2	5	1	4	4	5	6	26	20
Germany			3	2	4	4	5	5	7	7	5	5	24	23
Greece			2	2	2		3		3		3	3	13	5
India					1		2	1	10	31	10	25	23	57
Iran							2					2	2	2
Ireland-North Ireland	2		2	3	6	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	23	22
Israel					1		5	5	4		4	5	14	10
Italy	2				2		4				2		10	
Japan									2	3	2	2	4	5
Jordan												2		2
Lebanon-Syria					1		3		3	1		4	7	5
Mexico					4		4	4					8	4
Morocco									(1)			1	(1)	1
Netherlands	5		2	3	3	5	5	4	5	5	4	4	24	21
New Zealand					4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	16	16
Nigeria									2	1			2	1
Norway	5	3	3		2		4		4	3	4	2	22	8
Pakistan											5	9	5	9
Philippines									2	2	2		4	2
Portugal									1	1	1	2	2	3
Ryukyu Islands								5		4		6		15
South Africa								1						1
Sweden	7	4	3	4	2	2	4	6	4	6	5	5	25	27
Switzerland	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	28	30
Tunisia							2	1	2	1			4	2
Turkey					2		5	6	3	2	3	6	13	14
United Kingdom	8	12	9	12	10	10	15	12	10	13	12	14	64	73
Uruguay					2				2	2	2	3	6	5
Total	48	36	42	43	74	45	113	89	117	133	116	151	510	497

[1] Algeria and Morocco had 1 month visits by 1953 delegates to Tunisia.

NOTE.—"U. S." indicates United States delegates; "For." indicates foreign exchangees.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point recommendations submitted by the Department of State, as printed on pages 8 to 11 of the 15th Semiannual Report on Educational Exchange Activities.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

V. THE GOVERNMENT'S PARTICIPATION IN THE TEEN-AGE PROGRAM

RECOMMENDATION (SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, NOVEMBER 28, 1955)

The reduced appropriation voted by the Congress for fiscal year 1956 for the international educational exchange program has made it necessary for the Department to clarify its policy on the use of Government funds for exchange of person's activities in the teen-age program for the current fiscal year and in the future. In doing so, the Department requested the advice of the Commission on Educational Exchange.

The Department pointed out that since 1949 the international educational exchange program has included groups of German teen-age youths brought to the United States each summer to spend a calendar year living with American urban and rural families, attending high schools, and participating in community activities. This program was initiated near the termination of the United States military government in Germany and was taken over, along with other exchange program for Germans, by the Department of State on the occasion of the transition from military government to the High Commission in Germany.

Beginning in 1949, and including the group brought to the United States for the 1955–56 academic year, approximately 2,259 German teen-age youths have participated in this program. During roughly the same period about 139 Austrian youths have been brought to this country under the same type of program.

Until the 1955–56 academic year, Government sponsorship of the teen-ager program had been limited to students from Austria and Germany; however, with the passage in fiscal year 1955 of a supplementary budget for exchange activities with the other American Republics a number of embassies in these countries indicated an interest in sending to the United States a small number of high-school students. Accordingly under the 1955–56 academic year program 34 students from 9 of the other American Republics have been brought to the United States.

Initially, the program with Germany and, to a lesser extent, the program with Austria was one of reorientation and democratization. In other words, the German and Austrian programs originally sought to instill a knowledge of and respect for the democratic way of life in the youth of those countries who had been indoctrinated under the National Socialist regime and were isolated in their formative years from democratic practices and thought. With the changing status of Germany—and, earlier, of Austria—the program objectives here gradually shifted from reorientation and democratization to "increasing mutual understanding" as is the case with other participating countries. As the need for treating the former occupied areas as special cases has decreased, programs such as the teen-ager program have been cut back gradually. For example, the 1955–56 German program provided for only 169 German high-school students as contrasted with almost 500 youths in that category under the 1950–51 program.

It was also pointed out that in order to select qualified host families with which the students would live during their year in the United States, to assure proper placement and supervision of the youths, and to provide for competent administration of the program, the Department has contracted each year with private organizations interested in this type of endeavor and qualified to administer such a program. The six current contract agencies are: American Field Service, Brethren Service Commission, Georgia District of Kiwanis International, Michigan Council of Churches, National Catholic Welfare Conference, and National Grange. The American Field Service and Michigan Council of Churches have placed only urban youths, while the National Grange accepted farm youths exclusively; the other three organizations have placed both urban and rural teen-agers. Under the contracts the Department has provided these organizations with limited funds for the students' spending money and maintenance while in the United States and for their travel within this country. In addition, the contracts have provided funds for the administrative expenses, including certain staff salaries, of these organizations. The Department has given direct grants to the students for their international transportation. Supplementing this Government assistance, the host families and community groups have made substantial contributions to the teen-agers' maintenance. In fact, the major share of the costs of this program, once the student has arrived in the United States, is borne by the host family or by interested community groups or organizations.

One of the organizations, the American Field Service, has a well-established private program involving high-school students from many countries of the world, financed entirely by non-Government sources. That organization's private program includes more students than the number of Government-sponsored students it has placed each year in the recent past. The Michigan Council of Churches has also developed a small but ambitious private program based, however, on the assistance which the Department has provided that organization for its Government-sponsored German teen-agers.

The reduced appropriation for fiscal year 1956 necessitated a drastic reduction in funds earmarked for the German exchange of persons program. This resulted in the complete elimination of the German teen-ager program. Under the fiscal year 1956 budget, therefore, funds are available for only 20 teen-agers from Austria and 14 from the other American Republics.

The Department further advised the Commission that it had given careful thought to the situation described above and has considered ways in which it might assist, without directly participating as a sponsor, in effecting a transition from a program financed partially by the Government to one financed entirely by private sources. Several of the private organizations have indicated informally their interest either in developing further their private programs or, in the case of organizations that do not have private programs, in establishing such programs, provided some assistance to this end might be forthcoming from the Government.

Accordingly, in order that both an exchange program involving persons in this age group may continue and that the Government's direct participation may be gradually reduced and ultimately eliminated, the Department developed the following proposed policy respecting teen-age exchanges which includes the following elements:

1. The Department should provide temporary grants-in-aid for the purpose of developing programs supported and sponsored entirely by private sources

The Department would approach contract organizations with the suggestion that each agency interested in developing a private program could be given a small grant-in-aid to

be utilized during the 1956 fiscal year to develop the support necessary to initiate an entirely private program the following year.

Agencies receiving the 34 students from Austria and the other American Republics would administer the program for those grantees out of the grant-in-aid if they received one.

Although some hope might be held out for a diminishing grant-in-aid for the 1957 fiscal year, no commitments would be made for financial assistance beyond 1956. (While the grant-in-aid would not be restricted to developing a private program with Germany, the Department believes that the organizations would, at least initially, devote most of their efforts to that country since the program is already well known there. The private agencies have returnee alumni organizations in that country which would be helpful in establishing selection committees.)

2. The Department should offer maximum assistance in facilitating private teen-age programs

The Department would indicate a willingness to facilitate such private programs, where developed, by assisting in establishing screening committees abroad to help in the nomination of candidates, providing advice, and rendering such other assistance abroad and in Washington as might be found appropriate.

3. The Department should withdraw from direct participation in the teen-age programs

No additional teen-age grants would be given in 1956 beyond those already contemplated in Austria and the other American Republics, and in subsequent years such grants would be entirely eliminated from the program.

The Commission, because of the limited funds for fiscal year 1956, felt that the Department's approach to the solution of this problem was logical and reasonable and therefore endorsed the proposed policies as set forth above and recommended their adoption.

The Commission is of the opinion that the entrance of the Government into this new category of exchange activity, especially with respect to Germany and Austria, was motivated by objectives which we believe are now partially invalid. We also recognize that a program of this nature, under which the participants are placed in American families and supported to a large extent by private organizations and individuals, elicits from such sources private assistance not available to other categories of exchanges. Accordingly, while the cost of the teen-age program is comparatively low, it is felt that limited appropriated funds available would be most advantageously expended on programs which, by their nature, elicit less private aid.

However, the Commission has been convinced of the worthiness of the teen-age program and believes that its popularity leads to added support for the entire international educational exchange program. For instance, the teen-agers are usually placed on farms and in small to medium-sized towns, communities which otherwise might have little or no experience with or knowledge of other exchange programs. Their popularity is evidenced by the very great amount of publicity which they receive in the American press and in the press abroad.

The Commission, therefore, further recommended, in view of the recognized importance of the teen-age program, that the Department of State continue to give maximum encouragement to the private organizations and others privately supporting the program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank my colleagues for their cooperation.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I am very much disturbed by one paragraph in the report of the committee dealing with the United States Information Agency. It reads:

The committee emphasizes that this increased amount of $5 million be distributed among those items of services where they can be most advantageous.

That sentence does not disturb me. It is the next sentence that disturbs me.

The committee is insistent that none of these additional funds should be spent in Europe—

That is where my disturbance ends. I am not so keen about "Operation CV, the aircraft carrier, a floating Cinerama project, which was also denied by the House."

What I wish to say a word about is the assumption that money spent in Europe is spent where it cannot be most advantageously used. I have made some study of the United States Information Agency in at least three European countries, namely, Finland, England, and France. I would be particularly disturbed if our work of communications and our work of establishing understanding and friendship in Finland were to be diminished. That nation sits on the border of the Soviet area, and it is constantly subjected to the influences of Soviet propaganda. By nature it would prefer to follow along with the United States; but the fact that the strength, propagandawise and militarywise, of the Soviet Government, hangs over them, is something that will influence them if we pull out. So I would say, with regard particularly to Finland, let us not pull out.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. First of all, I do not want the Senator to be under any misapprehension. The committee this year allowed a $2 million increase for Europe over what was allowed last year. Compared with the problems we have in the Middle East, the Near East, and Far East, we felt that an increase in the amount for missions alone in the European area, from $17,615,000 to $19,627,000, was rather generous treatment for the European area, and perhaps much more so than we thought it should be when compared with the programs in other parts of the world. We have increased the appropriation for the European area by $2 million for the missions alone over the present fiscal year. That is the point I wish to make.

With respect to the additional $5 million, when we raised the amount from $110 million to $115 million, I do not believe there was a member of the committee who felt that the $5 million should be added to the $2 million increase we had already given.

Mr. FLANDERS. That explains what was not clear from the report as I read it. I am glad to know that that is the effect so far as the allocation of the appropriation is concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That $2 million for missions does not include the increase for press, movies, or TV in the European area.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is correct. I thank the Senator. I wish to say 2 or 3 words more with regard to a critical situation in France and Italy, as I saw it.

The main burden of Soviet propaganda will be directed toward breaking up NATO. The weak spots in NATO are France and Italy. For us to think of France and Italy as being countries which can be left to themselves, or that we can permit our support of freedom and democracy in those countries to be diminished, would be a very bad decision indeed. I am glad that is not the decision, as has been explained by the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks a memorandum received from USIA.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have been very much interested in the current tactics of the Communists, which are much more flexible and subtle and hence potentially more dangerous to the free world than were the brutal and relatively obvious tactics of Stalin. Fortunately, Communist Party boss Khrushchev has been kind enough to tip his hand and to spell out the new policy line in considerable detail.

In his opening speech to the 20th Congress of the Communist Party on February 14 of this year, Khrushchev declared that most free world governments are so enfeebled that the revolutionary movement can triumph without resort to violence. He was careful, of course, not to renounce the use of violence entirely, reserving the use of force for those countries where other tactics were not successful. However, the guts of his policy is to achieve world dominion by nonviolent methods—the capture of free governments by parlimentary methods, use of the popular front device, subversion, and by a greatly stepped-up propaganda, economic, cultural, and political offensive against the free world. To accomplish their objective all Communist organizations, agents and fronts have been ordered by Khrushchev to "* * * intensify our efforts in Communist education of the masses and in eliminating the survival of capitalism in the minds of men, make fuller and more active use, to this end, of all ideological mediums—propaganda, agitation, the press, radio, cultural, and educational organizations and institutions, science, literature and art."

I have been particularly interested in observing the application of these new tactics to our most important ally, Great Britain. All of us are familiar with the recent visit of Khrushchev and Bulganin to the United Kingdom, which underlines the importance the Soviet leaders attach to weakening or destroying the Anglo-American alliance. Unquestionably, the Soviet leaders dangled tempting trade offers before the British; proposed drastic increases in exchanges of British and Russian visitors, cultural attractions, athletes and the like; did all in their power to weaken British ties with this country. The small but well organized and financed British Communist Party is working day and night to picture the United States as an irresponsible, warlike, fascist, imperialist nation and to exploit anti-American feelings among the British.

In the light of these Soviet maneuvers, I am surprised when suggestions are made that since Great Britain and other Western European nations are basically friendly, we should cut back our information activities in these countries. This approach seems to me completely unsound and could only result in leaving the field open to our adversaries.

In my opinion, we have no alternative but to expand and make more dynamic our own information and cultural programs in these countries, and I strongly so urge.

The United States has a tremendous investment in the NATO alliance—the cornerstone of our foreign policy in Europe and essential to our national security. Soviet Russia is trying and will continue to try to break up this alliance. Through declarations of undying friendship, good will trips of its leaders and exports of Soviet culture, the Soviets are attemping to convince Western Europeans that the big bad bear is a figment of American imagination. The growth of neutralist sentiments among the European public in recent months is an indication of the success of such tactics.

Perhaps the most important single aspect of our policy in Europe is the durability of our alliance with the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom will follow the lead of the United States in world affairs only if persuaded and fully convinced that the United States knows the way. The British refuse to be taken for granted. They insist on being a full partner in the Anglo-American alliance, fully consulted and fully persuaded that our policy objectives are in their best interest, too. Their long period of past world leadership and prestige is an important factor in this assessment.

Our information programs in Italy and France are necessary to counteract the influence of the two largest Communist Parties outside the Soviet bloc. Germany, bisected by the Iron Curtain, is a key country where support of United States policies is essential to our position not only in Europe but throughout the world. In Spain and Portugal, it is essential to convince the people of these nations that the location of United States bases and the stationing of our troops within their territories is desirable from the viewpoint of their own interests. Norway, Denmark, and Iceland are important to us because of the vital role they play in the peripheral defense of Western Europe.

Each of the Western European countries is important in particular respects to the plans and policies of the United States. We cannot take the risk of assuming that they will remain friendly and cooperative without effort on our part. Friendship is not a static thing. Like a plant it has to grow or die. It needs constant nurture and preservation from influences hostile to it.

In my opinion, an intensified and skillful United States information program is vital to the continuance of friendly, cooperative attitudes toward the United States among the nations of Europe.

Mr. THYE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD just prior to the passage of the State, Justice, and judiciary appropriation bill, a brief statement which I send to the desk.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE

The United States Information Agency plays an important role in our Government's efforts to inform all of the peoples of the world of our Nation's policies and objectives, and generally speaking I am sorry to say that I do not believe citizens of our own country fully appreciate the valuable work of this Agency. All of us, of course, are aware of the tremendous propaganda efforts of the Communists. To counter their distortions of our Nation's basic objectives, we have established the United States Information Agency, and have charged it with the responsibility of campaigning, through truth and fact, against the hostile propaganda emanating from Moscow.

A vital activity of the United States Information Agency is the Voice of America which went on the air for the first time on February 24, 1942, at which time our Government was attempting to reach the German people who were then cut off from the world by Nazi censorship. Since that first broadcast, the Voice of America has grown in stature and in size until today when broadcasts are made from 14 modern studios around the clock and around the world in 41 languages.

One naturally wonders about the effectiveness of the Voice of America, and I have asked the United States Information Agency to furnish me with a report in this connection. It is an interesting report and an impressive one, in my opinion, and reads as follows:

"EFFECTIVENESS OF VOICE OF AMERICA

"How effective is the Voice of America? How is its effectiveness tested? The answers to these questions come from two sources: Technical monitoring of VOA broadcasts and what might be called audience reaction.

"In an effort to determine how well VOA transmissions can be heard behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, an intricate technical monitoring system is operated by the United States Information Agency. During 1955 close to 400,000 reports were received from this system, the evaluation of which enables a fairly reliable picture to be drawn concerning the reception of VOA broadcasts. In discussing the effectiveness of the VOA it also must be remembered that Voice broadcasts are not broadcast just once, but are repeated or rebroadcast at many intervals and on many different frequencies. This "saturation" is one of the means used to surmount jamming by the Soviet Orbit block and accounts in large measure for the effective reception of VOA broadcasts.

"From the evidence received it is apparent that jamming is especially heavy in and around some of the major Communist-area cities but languages other than that being broadcast to a particular country are normally not jammed. For example, in the U. S. S. R., the Russian who can understand a satellite language, English, or German, would have a good chance of frequently hearing VOA programs in these other languages. Also in the U. S. S. R. Russian language broadcasts penetrate on at least one frequency with a clear signal to urban areas about 30 percent of the time and in the rural areas technical reception is much better. A recent Associated Press dispatch from Moscow reported that in Georgia people were listening openly to VOA broadcasts. Elsewhere behind the Iron Curtain, programs to the Baltic countries (Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania) can be heard from one-half to three-fourths of the time, in Armenia and Georgia, at least half of the time. Reception of satellite languages in satellite countries is high as a general rule, although recently Polish broadcasts have been heavily jammed. Albanian broadcasts were not jammed at all. Reception of VOA programs in Mandarin, Cantonese, and Amoy is excellent in Hong Kong, Formosa, and southeast Asia, and it is believed that most of these programs can be heard on the mainland of China. VOA English programs, such as Music USA, are normally heard clearly in all parts of the world.

"'Audience reaction' is received in two ways: By information received from listeners who often write at considerable danger to themselves and by attacks and other actions of the Communist-dominated governments against VOA broadcasts. Among examples recently obtained were the following: Mail was received from Latvia addressed to the pseudonyms used by VOA broadcasters stating that the listeners could get VOA programs clearly. A recent Lithuanian escapee reported that he listened to VOA programs three times daily even though he was employed by the Lithuanian Government. Another source revealed that VOA Armenian programs are listened to in Soviet Armenia at both levels of officialdom and the rank and file of the people and are highly appreciated. Listeners from Hungary and Rumania have written to friends or relatives in the United States on the basis of their having recognized their voices when they appeared on VOA programs even though pseudonyms were used to protect their relatives behind the Iron Curtain. One such report came from Bucharest immediately after the writer had recognized his relative's voice; this despite frequent reports that the Bucharest area is heavily jammed all the time.

"Other defectors and escapees have also attested to VOA broadcast effectiveness. In January a Rumanian athlete reported that 'VOA was widely listened to in Rumania and very much liked; a Soviet Army officer who defected last December stated that listening to VOA broadcasts prompted his decision to go to the West; a Soviet escapee who jumped the Moscow circus train in January reported that listening to VOA broadcasts motivated his escape, and that he had listened to VOA broadcasts while serving as a communications officer on a Soviet plane in the Korean war.

"Concerning the other type of evidence of audience reaction, namely attacks by the Communist governments, a number of such attacks have been made in the last few months. A recent article in the Hong Kong Times reported on four Chinese Communist campaigns against VOA listening, each of which had failed. Last March a Peiping magazine launched a particularly bitter attack on VOA indicating it had hit where it had hurt, such as the Communist agricultural collectivization program. The article concluded that VOA audiences are not restricted to intellectuals, commercial and industrial circles, but includes youth as well. In the last few months, also, the Albanian National Radio frequently vilified VOA broadcasts for having, in effect, successfully counteracted the Albanian Communist redefection campaign; and the Czechoslovak Communist government in its official paper and through its Minister of Foreign Affairs attacked the VOA directly several times. An unusual effort to discredit VOA has been made through a play periodically presented to audiences in the Georgian Soviet Republic, the last occasion being only a few months ago. In this play every effort is made to discredit the Voice and to present it in a most unsavory light. A strong and bitter attack was recently launched by the former Prime Minister and present secretary of the Rumanian Communist Party before the Rumanian National Assembly. These items are just a few of many which have been received.

"The greater portion of the VOA broadcasts—over 75 percent—are directed behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. VOA broadcasts (supplemented by packaged programs for placement on local radio stations) to the free world have also demonstrated a high degree of effectiveness, as is attested to by thousands of letters received monthly, and by newspaper and other comment in the free world. In commenting on a recent VOA program played over the Austrian national network, for example, a leading Viennese newspaper stated 'for the majority of our own Austrian reporters listening to a broadcast like this should be made mandatory.' Another example is the VOA coverage to Italy of the recent visit of President Gronchi to the United States; President Gronchi himself highly complimented this coverage. The Italian national network has asked VOA to more than double its programs to southern Italy, where the Communists have shown strength, stating that VOA programs 'are being received with enthusiasm.'

"From all over the world evidence of the effectiveness of VOA broadcasting is continually received. Behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, despite the jamming and despite restrictions and controls, people not only continue to listen to VOA programs but even attempt to communicate their appreciation for being given the truth through VOA news and commentaries at peril to themselves, and from the free world evidence is continually received that VOA is doing its job of furthering friendly relations and understanding between our people and those of other nations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to read a motion which was unanimously adopted by the committee with reference to the Immigration Service:

I move that you, the chairman of the subcommittee, together with the chairman of the full committee and the ranking minority member of the full committee and another minority member from the subcommittee designated by the ranking member constitute a special subcommittee with the power to investigate and check all phases of the work of the Immigration Service and to report to the full committee prior to the consideration of Immigration Service appropriation for the next fiscal year; that such special subcommittee have sufficient personnel assigned to it and be granted authority to employ such temporary persons as necessary.

I should like to have that made a part of the RECORD. At the appropriate time the committee will carry out its responsibilities with reference to the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 10721) was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. MUNDT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to express my thanks to all the minority Members and to my colleagues on this side of the aisle for their kind and generous consideration of the chairman of the committee, and I am appreciative that the Senate has taken the action it has taken.

RETURN TO FORMER OWNERS OF MINERAL INTERESTS ACQUIRED IN CONNECTION WITH THE GARRISON DAM PROJECT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1975, Senate bill 746.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 746) to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands including Indian tribal lands, acquired in connection with the Garrison Dam project of mineral interests in such lands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 1, line 5, after the word "heirs", to insert "or devisees"; in line 6, after the word "whom", to strike out "lands or interests therein were" and insert "any mineral interest in lands or any estate in lands that included a mineral interest was"; on page 2, line 5, after the word "heirs", to insert "or devisees"; in line 7, after the word "interests", to strike out "in such lands as were" and insert "that were so"; in line 9, after the word "heirs", to insert "or devisees"; in line 11, after the word "interests", to insert "upon the date of approval of this act"; in line 12, after the word "Army", to strike out the comma and "but not in excess of 5 percent of the purchase price paid for the land by the Government" and insert a colon and "*Provided,* That where mineral interests in the same lands were acquired from more than one person or tribe, no conveyance shall be made unless it is established to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the proposed conveyance will operate in a manner which will be fair and just to each person (and the heirs or devisees of any such deceased person) or tribe from whom any mineral interest in such lands was acquired by the United States, and which will not prejudice the proper conservation and development of the mineral deposits affected by the conveyance. For the purposes of this act former mineral interests, whether or not in the same lands, may be combined or divided in such manner as may be requested by the applicant or applicants and approved by the Secretary"; and on page 3, after line 8, to insert:

SEC. 3. In the event all of the mineral interests of the United States in and to all of the mineral deposits that are subject to any one lease, permit, license, or contract issued under the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands, approved August 7, 1947 (61 Stat. 913; 30 U. S. C., 1952 edition, secs. 351–359), as amended, are otherwise eligible for conveyance under section 1 of this act to a single grantee, or to several grantees as tenants in common, then such conveyance shall contain an assignment of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to such lease, permit, license, or contract, including the right to all rentals, royalties, and other payments accruing under such lease, permit, license, or contract after the effective date of such conveyance. Except as provided in the preceding sentence, mineral deposits that are subject to any such lease, permit, license, or contract shall not be eligible during its continuance for conveyance under this act. Nothing contained in this act shall affect the continued validity of any such lease, permit, license, or contract or any rights arising thereunder.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon application filed within 3 years after the date of enactment of this act by or on behalf of any person (or the heirs or devisees of any such person who may be deceased), or any Indian tribe, from whom any mineral interest in lands or any estate in lands that included a mineral interest was acquired for the purposes of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River (excepting lands located within 1,000 feet of the main dam, spillway, outlets, powerhouse, and embankment section the bases of which are located below the maximum surcharge elevation), the Secretary of the Army shall convey to such person (or to the heirs or devisees of any such deceased person) or tribe all mineral interests that were so acquired from such person or tribe by the United States upon payment by such person, heirs, or devisees, or tribe of a purchase price therefor equal to the fair market value of such mineral interests upon the date of approval of this act as determined by the Secretary of the Army: *Provided,* That where mineral interests in the same lands were acquired from more than one person or tribe, no conveyance shall be made unless it is established to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the proposed conveyance will operate in a manner which will be fair and just to each person (and the heirs or devisees of any such deceased person) or tribe from whom any mineral interest in such lands was acquired by the United States, and which will not prejudice the proper conservation and development of the mineral deposits affected by the conveyance. For the purposes of this act former mineral interests, whether or not in the same lands, may be combined or divided in such manner as may be requested by the applicant or applicants and approved by the Secretary.

SEC. 2. Each conveyance of mineral interests under this act shall contain such reservations and restrictions as, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Army, are necessary in the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir and as otherwise may be in the public interest.

SEC. 3. In the event all of the mineral interests of the United States in and to all of the mineral deposits that are subject to any one lease, permit, license, or contract issued under the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands, approved August 7, 1947 (61 Stat. 913; 30 U. S. C., 1952 edition, secs. 351–359), as amended, are otherwise eligible for conveyance under section 1 of this act to a single grantee, or to several grantees as tenants in common, then such conveyance shall contain an assignment of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to such lease, permit, license, or contract, including the right to all rentals, royalties, and other payments accruing under such lease, permit, license, or contract after the effective date of such conveyance. Except as provided in the preceding sentence, mineral deposits that are subject to any such lease, permit, license, or contract shall not be eligible during its continuance for conveyance under this act. Nothing contained in this act shall affect the continued validity of any such lease, permit, license, or contract or any rights arising thereunder.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, Senate bill 746 was introduced in the Senate by the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] for himself and for the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

The bill came to the committee in January 1955 and in May 1956 it was reported to the Senate by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] with several amendments.

Briefly, the Government needed approximately 400,000 acres of land to impound water for the Garrison Dam and the surrounding areas. It acquired, by the program which was authorized by the Congress, approximately 150,000 acres of land, including the area for the dam site itself. A great deal of that land was acquired from Indians in the State of North Dakota.

There was a very active interest in exploration for oil and gas at that time, and the Corps of Engineers found they were having some difficulty acquiring land because of prospective oil and gas value. Therefore, after they had proceeded to acquire 150,000 or more acres of land, they reversed their policy, and, instead of acquiring oil rights, or complete, outright ownership of the land, they acquired flow-way rights, so they might cover the land with water; but the parties in interest were able to retain their oil rights to the land which was going to be submerged by water stored behind the dam. That raised the question of whether justice had been done in the case of the 150,000 acres previously acquired.

Perhaps at this point I should yield to the Senators from North Dakota, to permit them to explain the bill. However, let me say that the understanding that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs had of the bill was that it was for the purpose of attempting to restore these Indians to their former position, so as to give them some of their oil rights.

In its settlement with the Indians, the Government had paid a sum of money which the committee thought covered the speculative value of the oil rights. Had there not been quite the oil development which occurred in North Dakota, I am sure the settlement would have been regarded as an extremely advantageous arrangement for the Indians. But, in view of the subsequent development of oil, the settlement might not be regarded as so advantageous.

By means of the bill, the committee seeks to make it possible for the Indians again to acquire their oil rights in connection with the land.

I think the authors of the bill are prepared to speak on it better than I am. If there are questions, we can deal with them. But I am sure that the Senators from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER and Mr. YOUNG] are prepared to discuss the bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico has done extremely well in explaining the bill. As he has stated, in the acquisition of land for the Garrison Reservoir, the policy of the Corps of Engineers was to acquire both the surface rights and the mineral rights. Thereafter it reversed its policy and left the mineral rights to the individual landowners.

The Department of the Interior has handled this matter on behalf of the Indians.

Personally, I felt at the time this land was acquired from the Indians that all of us who were representing them made a mistake in not insisting that these mineral rights be reserved to them. Afterward the Indians desired to have the mineral rights returned to them. As a result, the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and I introduced a bill which would have returned the mineral rights to them, without any additional cost.

The pending bill represents a compromise. The Indians, and the whites as well who are covered by the bill, will be able to regain the mineral rights by paying an amount equal to the fair market value of such mineral interests, as determined by the Secretary of the Army. I think that will be a fair way to handle these rights and to return them to these persons, if they wish to take advantage of the provisions of the bill. I do not know how many of them will seek to do so, but I think there will be some whites and some Indians who will wish to take advantage of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does not the bill provide that their applications must be filed within 3 years after the date of enactment of this measure?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes.

I may say that I believe that both the Indians and the whites think this bill represents a fair compromise.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in this measure I have been very much interested. Shortly after the land was taken and the matter was brought to the attention of my colleague [Mr. YOUNG] and myself, I talked to the then Attorney General, Howard McGrath. It was his opinion that the Government did not want the mineral rights and did not intend to take them.

We were not satisfied with that. So we arranged for a radio and television program. The radio program was carried by one of the stations at Bismarck which at that time did not have television facilities. The people of the area listened to the program, and heard Mr. McGrath say that the Government would return all the mineral rights for nothing, except in the case of the 4,400 acres close to the dam. He said that, on the advice of experts, they could not return the mineral rights to those 4,400 acres.

The whole idea was to return the mineral rights to the Indians for nothing. My colleague agreed with me. However, at that time we were not able to have such a bill enacted into law; it was objected to. Finally, we have this bill.

The objection was not so much because the Indians would have the mineral rights returned to them but because some white men had speculated in some of the land. Therefore some amendments were made to the bill.

In my opinion, in the future, in any similar case, no matter what State may be involved, the mineral rights should be left to the Indians.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to say to the Senators from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER and Mr. YOUNG] that, as a result of the questions they posed to us and the points they raised, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs now has a firm policy that whenever, in the future, Indian land is taken, the oil rights will be reserved to the Indians.

I think the Indians of the United States should thank these two Senators for having brought this matter so forcibly to our attention.

I assure the Senators from North Dakota that, so long as I remain on the committee, I will never again vote for the taking of mineral rights from Indians when land is purchased from them for these purposes, except in the case of the narrow band of land needed for construction of the dam itself.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. He has aided greatly in the doing of a good job for both the Indians and the whites who lost their mineral rights in this case.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to thank the Senators from North Dakota for this fine solution of a difficult problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 746) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, our foreign policy should be based on human freedom. What advances it we should support and what retards or destroys it we should oppose.

Abraham Lincoln, the great emancipator, in his second inaugural, set the standard for free men everywhere, when he said:

> Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation. We, even we here, have the power and bear the responsibility * * * in giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free. We shall nobly save or we shall meanly lose this last best hope on earth.

Now, the voices of appeasement are arising abroad and are being augmented at home by certain columnists and commentators.

The suggestion has recently been made that invitations be extended to Khrushchev, Bulganin, and others to visit the United States.

Despite the downgrading of Stalin, the Soviet Union has not performed a single deed of good faith to carry out its broken treaty commitments. The present hierarchy in the Kremlin arose to power under Stalin. They were direct participants or accomplices for the crimes now charged to him, including the enslavement of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, the fastening of the Communist regime on Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Albania, the sending of millions of people to slave-labor camps, and the liquidation of untold numbers of people of both the Soviet Union and the satellites states.

I am opposed to any such an invitation to Khrushchev, Bulganin, Malenkov, Mikovah, Zhukov, or Kaganovich. Are the operators of the greatest slave-labor camps in all the history of the world to be given a cordial welcome as the honored guests of this Nation? Will it next be proposed that Khrushchev and Bulganin also be invited to the White House to sleep in the Lincoln bed? I do not believe that any American President would extend such an invitation or that the American people or the American Congress would approve it if extended.

I cannot help but wonder what the columnists and commentators advocating such an invitation or the Communist-front groups which are trying to create public opinion in favor of the same would have said if a proposal had been made to invite Hitler, Goering, and Himmler for a state visit while Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark, Norway, and Luxembourg were held in subjection. What a howl of indignation would have properly gone up at even the thought of such an invitation to visit our White House, to speak in the Halls of our free Congress and to receive the honor and the tributes of our American cities and American States.

I am greatly shocked that even some of our good citizens should be taken in by such a proposal. I call their attention to Second Corinthians, chapter 6, verse 14:

> Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion has light with darkness?

OPENING OF DELAWARE RIVER TURNPIKE BRIDGE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as the Senate approaches consideration of the vitally needed highway construction bill, I think it is appropriate that we should take notice of the opening today of Delaware River Turnpike Bridge. The opening of this final link between the New Jersey Turnpike and the Pennsylvania Turnpike is symbolic of the highway system contemplated under pending legislation.

With the final completion of the Delaware River Turnpike Bridge it is now possible for motorists to travel from New York City over the New Jersey Turnpike, the Pennsylvania Turnpike, and the Ohio Turnpike all the way to the Indiana border without encountering the hazards and delays of traffic lights, community congestion, or cross traffic. In addition, it is contemplated that the completion of the Indiana Turnpike will extend this modern artery of automobile travel to the outskirts of Chicago within approximately 6 months.

I think that the Members of the Senate could have no better example of the objectives and advantages which will be attained through the construction of the 40,000-mile interstate highway system. The States of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana will soon have completed a modern highway which will facilitate safe, rapid automobile travel from New York to Chicago. The Senate should rapidly proceed with the passage of highway legislation which will make such roads as this one the rule rather than the exception and will connect all the sections of the country with modern highways.

CONTROL OF NARCOTIC DRUGS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Texas desires to have the Senate consider Senate bill 3760, relating to control of narcotic drugs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2014, Senate bill 3760.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3760) to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other related purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the bill (S. 3760) now before the Senate, is the result of almost a year's work on the part of the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code of the Committee on the Judiciary.

As Senators know, this subcommittee held hearings throughout the United States. There was a total of 47 days of hearings, with 345 witnesses, and a total of more than 8,000 pages of testimony.

The subcommittee heard traffickers in narcotics, dope addicts, law enforcement officials, and anyone else who had evidence to present to the subcommittee which would be of help in determining what improvements in our present laws, and what new laws, were needed in order to try to eradicate this cancer in our society.

As has already been reported to the Senate, we found that the United States, with more than 60,000 addicts, has more dope addicts than any other nation in the Western World. The Bureau of Narcotics has a list of more than 30,000 addicts by name and address, and is receiving more than 1,000 new names of addicts a month.

We found that narcotics addicts and the dope traffic are responsible for 50 percent of all crime in metropolitan areas of the United States, and more than 25 percent of all crimes committed in the United States.

We found that the smuggling of heroin, marihuana, and other drugs is on the increase.

That same finding was made by the United Nations Commission on narcotics only week before last. The Commission found that there was an increase of one-third in the worldwide smuggling of heroin. We found in our last hearing that in our own country seizures of heroin had increased more than 165 percent in 1955, over 1954.

Early this session the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code of the Judiciary Committee, which conducted this investigation, made its unanimous report to the Senate. I should like to place in the RECORD at this time excerpts from the report, including certain of our findings and recommendations. I ask, therefore, unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks pertinent excerpts from the report entitled "The Illicit Narcotics Traffic." This includes a summary of the findings and recommendations by the subcommittee, which were later approved by the full Judiciary Committee.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report (No. 1440) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ILLICIT NARCOTICS TRAFFIC

By Senate Resolution 67, adopted March 18, 1955, the Senate authorized the first nationwide investigation of the illicit narcotics traffic, including foreign sources, narcotic-smuggling operations, drug addiction, treatment of drug addicts, and related matters.

The aim of the inquiry was to find ways and means of improving the Federal Criminal Code and other laws and enforcement procedures dealing with the possession, sale, and transportation of narcotics, marihuana, and similar drugs.

The task was assigned by the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee to the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code, of which the junior Senator from Texas, Mr. DANIEL, is chairman. Other members of the subcommittee are the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. O'MAHONEY; the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. EASTLAND; the Senator from Idaho, Mr. WELKER; and the Senator from Maryland, Mr. BUTLER.

SCOPE OF THE INVESTIGATION

Since its initial organization meeting on May 27, 1955, the subcommittee conducted 37 days of open hearings in Washington, Philadelphia, New York, Austin, Fort Worth, Dallas, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, Detroit, and Cleveland. Special hearings, lasting 3 full days, were held in New York devoted exclusively to the causes, treatment, and rehabilitation of drug addicts. In addition, the subcommittee examined the Mexican border situation in hearings held in San Antonio and Houston.

The subcommittee heard 345 witnesses, including Federal, State, and local officials and many addicts, smugglers, and other narcotic violators, for a total of 8,667 pages of testimony.

In addition, evidence and innumerable practical recommendations were obtained through a series of questionnaires mailed to 52 attorneys general of the States and possessions; 94 United States attorneys; 1,120 county sheriffs; and 1,336 chiefs of police in cities and towns over 10,000 population.

The subcommittee has completed its work and has filed its final report (S. Rept. No. 1440) and has introduced specific legislation, S. 3760.

The subcommittee was surprised and shocked at the extent and far-reaching effect

of the illicit drug traffic in the United States and concluded that narcotic addiction and the dope traffic constitutes one of the most serious problems facing the Nation.

NARCOTIC ADDICTION AND TRAFFIC IN ILLICIT DRUGS IS ONE OF THE MOST SERIOUS PBOBLEMS FACING THE UNITED STATES TODAY

1. The United States has more narcotic addicts, both in total numbers and populationwise, than any other country in the Western World.

While there are far less drug addicts in the Nation today than there were before the Harrison Narcotic Act was passed and before the Federal Bureau of Narcotics was created in 1930, the figure of at least 60,000 addicts today is far more than the number reported by any other western nation. In fact, if the reports of other nations to the United Nations Commission on Narcotics are correct, our country has more drug addicts than all of the other western nations combined.

Since January 1, 1953, the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, through voluntary reports sought from law-enforcement officials, has compiled the names and addresses of over 30,000 addicts, and new names are being reported at the rate of over 1,000 per month. Thirteen percent of the addicts are less than 21 years of age.

2. In spite of the fact that Federal officials have done all within their power under present handicaps and with limited personnel, the illicit drug traffic has trebled in the United States since World War II.

Addicts were in the ratio of 1 to 10,000 persons at the end of World War II. At the present time, the incidence is about 1 to every 3,000 persons, with an average of 2,000 persons arrested in the United States each month on narcotics charges. The traffic now costs over $500 million per year, to say nothing of the human lives shortened or destroyed and the many crimes which result from the traffic.

3. Drug addiction is responsible for approximately 50 percent of all crimes committed in the larger metropolitan areas and 25 percent of all reported crimes in the Nation.

Federal, State, and local enforcement officers testified that 50 percent or more of all crimes committed in the larger cities is attributable to narcotic addiction and the illicit drug traffic. Approximately 90 percent (actually 89.9 percent) of the illicit drug traffic is concentrated in 43 of the Nation's most populous cities, and these same cities account for 46 percent of the Nation's crime.

In addition to direct narcotic law violations, drug addicts are responsible for a large majority of the burglaries, thefts, prostitution, and other offenses committed to support their drug habits costing from $10 to $100 a day. Addicts also have been associated with crimes of violence, such as murder, armed robbery, safecracking, and rape.

The subcommittee is convinced that crime in the United States would be substantially reduced if drug addicts were taken off the streets and placed in appropriate institutions for treatment or detention.

4. Drug addiction is contagious. Addicts spread the habit with cancerous rapidity to their families and associates.

The Nation's foremost medical authorities on drug addiction agree that it is comparable to a contagious disease and that it should be dealt with as such. This view was confirmed by more than 90 percent of the addicts appearing before the subcommittee who began using drugs because of friends and associates.

Less than 20 percent of the known addicts are now confined. It is inevitable that this contagious problem will increase from year to year unless other known addicts are removed from society for treatment and, in the event that treatment fails, placed in a quarantine type of confinement or isolation.

THE UNITED STATES FACES PROBLEM OF THRIVING INTERNATIONAL TRAFFIC IN ILLICIT NARCOTIC DRUGS

5. Red China, Turkey, Lebanon, and Mexico are the primary sources of heroin reaching the United States, and international controls are inadequate.

While the total requirements of the entire world for opium for medicinal and scientific purposes is set at 500 tons annually, official sources estimate the total world production to be 12,000 tons a year. The 1953 protocol, prepared by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs of the United Nations for the purpose of "limiting and regulating the cultivation of the poppy plant, the production of, international and wholesale trade in, and the use of opium," was immediately ratified by the United States, yet only 14 other nations have ratified the protocol. This is 10 short of the 25 nations required to make it effective. Among those nations lagging in ratification are, significantly, the larger producers of opium; that is, Turkey, Iran, and Mexico. Together with Lebanon and Red China, these countries are the primary sources of heroin which reaches the United States.

6. Recent seizures of heroin and cocaine in record quantities point up the international smuggling operations with the United States as a target.

In May of 1955, cocaine valued on the illicit market at $2 million was seized by narcotic agents in New York. During October and November 1955, two seizures of heroin were made in New York by agents of the Bureau of Narcotics with a street value of more than $8,500,000. The cocaine seizure was the largest ever made in the history of the United States, and the most recent seizure of heroin, November 3, 1955, was the largest single seizure of heroin ever made in the United States. These seizures show the magnitude of the international traffic aimed at the country and the necessity for increased penalties for smugglers and other traffickers to combat this growing menace.

7. Subversion through drug addiction is an established aim of Communist China. Since World War II, Red China has pushed exportation of heroin to servicemen and civilians of the United States and other free nations of the world.

Sworn testimony before the subcommittee, and the Internal Security Subcommittee, setting forth names, dates, secret codes, methods of smuggling, and drug seizures chemically analyzed, proved beyond any doubt that Red China is producing and exporting opium and heroin as an established policy of its governing officials. This is further confirmed by reports of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

The United States is one of the principal targets of this vicious illicit traffic in drugs as the Peiping regime seeks (1) to obtain dollars to purchase strategic materials and to pay foreign operatives and (2) to demoralize susceptible individuals in our military services and in the general population.

SMUGGLING OF NARCOTICS ACROSS THE MEXICAN BORDER IS FACILITATED BY THE FAILURE OF THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO TO WAGE A MUTUAL ALL-OUT FIGHT AGAINST THE DRUG TRAFFIC

8. Ninety percent of the overland smuggling of heroin and marihuana is across the Mexican border into Texas, California, and Arizona.

Federal, State, and local officials reported that the majority of the illicit drug sales along the Mexican border is conducted by well-known Mexican operators in violation of Mexican laws. Their headquarters are just across the international boundary, principally at Nuevo Laredo and Juarez. Most of the actual smuggling is carried on by Mexican professionals, and American drug peddlers and addicts. The enforcement officers unanimously agree the smuggling operations are not conducted by Mexican laborers and braceros, commonly referred to as wetbacks.

The magnitude of the enforcement problem along the Mexican border is evidenced by the fact that not only are heroin, marihuana, and other illicit narcotics readily available just across the border in Mexico, but the international border which must be policed is 1,500 miles long. Almost 20 million pedestrians and over 15 million cars (averaging 3 passengers each) cross annually which precludes using search as the sole weapon to prevent smuggling.

9. Only one United States official, devoting part time to narcotics, is stationed in Mexico, and no Mexican official is stationed in the United States to cooperate in solving the mutual problem.

10. Known American drug addicts are permitted to cross the Mexican border in large numbers each day.

American drug addicts flock across the Mexican border in substantial numbers each day for injections of heroin at well-known "shooting galleries" and for smuggling operations. No law prohibits such crossings by addicts, even though they may admit their addiction to customs officers on duty. At best, customs officials can submit the known addicts to thorough searches on their return trips, but many of these addicts hide heroin in their natural body cavities and escape detection. Many of these addicts are also big-time peddlers, and their smuggling is not limited to a quantity for personal use.

This was emphasized in the sworn testimony of one female addict who told the subcommittee that she hid $1,000 worth of heroin in her vagina and smuggled it across the border at Nuevo Laredo each week for nearly a year. She and her husband were both addicts and dope peddlers in Houston, Tex.

In addition to civilian addicts, servicemen stationed at military installations along the border have also frequented Mexican cities and towns for marihuana and heroin. Juveniles also cross with ease.

11. Mexico will not extradite fugitives, including bond jumpers and others who are evading criminal indictments for narcotic violations.

CRIMINAL LAWS AND PROCEDURES ARE INSUFFICIENT TO INSURE THE APPREHENSION AND PUNISHMENT OF NARCOTIC OFFENDERS

12. Judicial interpretations of constitutional search and seizure safeguards have resulted in major narcotic traffickers escaping trial.

13. Although the telephone is the major instrument of contact between top narcotics traffickers, Federal narcotics agents are not permitted to intercept telephone communications, and such evidence is not admissible in trials of individuals accused of narcotics violations.

Because of the covert nature of the narcotic traffic wherein the big supplier avoids all possible direct contact with the ultimate buyer and with the petty pusher or peddler, distribution is usually effected through a conspiratorial network in which the telephone is the means of communication. Nevertheless, agents of the Bureau of Narcotics are not permitted to intercept, under any circumstances, telephone communications that might provide evidence which would lead to the arrest and conviction of major narcotic violators. Moreover, neither is evidence obtained by wiretapping by State and local enforcement officials admissible in Federal cases. As a consequence, the Government of the United States is unwittingly giving narcotics violators, especially the larger racketeers and wholesalers, a great advantage over Federal law-enforcement officers in their effort to stamp out the illicit narcotics traffic.

14. Granting of low bail bonds to narcotic traffickers and delay in trials result in intensified narcotic traffic.

15. Federal narcotics agents are hampered in their investigations in that they do not possess statutory authority to carry firearms, execute and serve search and arrest warrants, serve subpenas, and make arrests without warrants for narcotic law violators.

PENALTIES FOR NARCOTIC VIOLATIONS ARE NEITHER COMMENSURATE WITH THE SERIOUSNESS OF THE CRIME NOR SUFFICIENT TO REMOVE THE PROFIT

16. The maximum penalties under present laws of 5 years for the first offense, 10 years for the second, and 20 years for the third are too low.

The Nation's illicit narcotics traffic grosses more than a half billion dollars per year. Heroin purchased abroad today for $3,000 will bring $300,000 when finally cut, packaged, and sold in the United States. The subcommittee has evidence that, with the prospect of such enormous profits, Federal penalties are not sufficiently severe to deter unscrupulous persons from engaging in the traffic. Significantly, it has found that whenever and wherever the penalities are more severe and strictly enforced, the incidence of both addiction and narcotics offenses has decreased proportionately. Federal penalties for narcotics violations generally are lower than the penalties of the various States.

17. Penalties for narcotics smuggling are unrealistic in view of the loss of lives and high profits which result.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

With these findings in mind, the subcommittee drafted specific legislation, S. 3760, which embodies the following general recommendations:

Increased penalties

1. That minimum and maximum penalties b increased for all violations of the narcotics laws, with greatly increased penalties for sales to juveniles.

3. That heroin, the most deadly of all narcotic drugs, which is used by 80 percent of all drug addicts in the United States, should be completely outlawed. Federal laws should deal with heroin offenses not only as tax-law violations but as criminal acts injurious to the peace, health, and welfare of the Nation.

4. That smuggling of heroin into this country and sales should be punishable by penalties ranging from a minimum of 5 years in the penitentiary to a maximum of death (when the death penalty is recommended by a jury).

Heroin smugglers and peddlers are selling murder, robbery, and rape, and should be dealt with accordingly. Their offense is human destruction as surely as that of the murderer. In truth and in fact, it is murder on the installment plan, leading not only to the final loss of one life but to others who acquire this contagious infection through association with the original victim.

The death penalty recommendation in this case would be a maximum—not a mandatory sentence. It would be available for extreme cases, such as the man who started 40 high-school students on heroin in San Antonio, Tex. It would put greater fear in all persons who might otherwise think of smuggling this drug into our country or selling it to our children.

5. That offenses involving the smuggling of illicit narcotic drugs should be punishable under the narcotic laws rather than the general smuggling statutes, in order that the higher narcotic law penalties might apply, and in order that the cases might be counted among previous narcotic convictions.

Enforcement procedures

6. That a chapter be added to the Federal Criminal Code providing for—

(a) More liberal search and seizure provisions in narcotics cases. When Federal agents see the violation occur or have probable cause to believe that it is occurring, and in cases of consent searches, the agents should be permitted to make arrests without search warrants, and the Government should be granted right of appeal from Federal court decisions suppressing evidence thus obtained.

(b) Interception and admissibility of telephone communications in narcotics cases, with due safeguards, including the requirement of a sealed court order permitting such action.

The bigtime traffickers in illicit narcotics are seldom caught and convicted, because they avoid all direct contact with the peddlers and ultimate buyers. Their operations are almost wholly limited to the telephone. Federal agents are not permitted to intercept their communications or to use such evidence in court. As a consequence, the United States Government is unwittingly giving narcotics violators, especially the larger racketeers and wholesalers, a great advantage over Federal law-enforcement officers in their effort to stamp out the illicit narcotics traffic.

(c) Stricter provisions for granting bond in narcotic cases and speedier trials. All over the country the subcommittee heard evidence that narcotic violators intensify their sales after arrest and while out on bond. One witness became the biggest marihuana wholesaler in New York while out on bond during the 2 years between conviction and the disposal of his appeal.

(d) Statutory authority for Federal narcotics agents to carry firearms, execute and serve search and arrest warrants, serve subpenas, and make arrests without warrants for narcotics law violations occurring or observed in their presence.

(e) Mandatory reports from all Federal officers and agencies to the Bureau of Narcotics of all narcotic addicts and violators who come to their attention, with pictures and fingerprints, in order that the Bureau may increase and complete its present record system and serve as a clearinghouse for information concerning such persons; further providing that this information shall be available for law-enforcement purposes to State and local officials of all States which require their officers and agencies to report such addicts and violators to the Bureau of Narcotics.

It is vitally important that the names, addresses, pictures, fingerprints, and records of all known narcotic addicts and violators be assembled in one central agency. A splendid effort is being made in this direction through a voluntary system of reports set up by Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger in cooperation with State and local officials, but the Bureau has no authority to require these reports and has not been given the authority, funds, or personnel necessary to expand and complete this vital record system.

7. That narcotic addicts, illegal users of marihuana and narcotic drugs, and convicted narcotic violators (other than aliens) be prevented from leaving the continental limits of the United States except under special procedures approved by the Secretary of State and the Bureau of Narcotics.

CONCLUSION

In concluding this preliminary report, it should be stated that our Federal officials and agencies have done the best that they could to combat the narcotics traffic with the laws, procedures, personnel, and funds at their disposal. In spite of their efforts, they have been handicapped to such an extent that narcotic addiction and the illicit dope traffic continue to increase in many parts of the Nation and present a most shocking and serious problem.

It is to be hoped that the facts produced by the subcommittee, together with the evidence adduced by a House Ways and Means Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Congressman HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, will result in the enactment of legislation and provide the basis for appropriations necessary to remove the illicit narcotics cancer from our society. If the Congress fails to act, it must accept a great part of the responsibility for the continuation and possible increase of the problem in the future.

The conduct of this investigation has been a most tiring and trying experience. This was due in some degree to the wanton, criminal, and sometimes threatening attitudes of some of the racketeers, smugglers, and murderers who appeared before our subcommittee, but even more to the heartache caused by the dozens of drug addicts who confessed the crime and destruction which had blacked and destroyed their minds and bodies.

If the Congress acts, partially as a result of this investigation, it will have performed a great service to humanity. If the illicit drug traffic of our country can be cut to the irreducible minimum, we will have saved many of our citizens of today and tomorrow from the worst type of moral and human degradation.

Mr. DANIEL. We found that it was absolutely necessary for the Congress of the United States to strengthen the hands of our law enforcement officers and provide higher penalties if we are to stop the narcotics traffic in this country. Heroin, which is used by more than 80 percent of the drug addicts in the United States, would be completely outlawed by the bill now before the Senate. We have urged that other countries of the world completely outlaw heroin, because it is the most deadly of drugs, and serves no medical purpose which cannot be better served by other drugs. Although, in effect, heroin has been outlawed in our country—and that has been the testimony of law enforcement officers—we want to go a step further and outlaw it totally. This bill would do so.

The bill provides that all heroin heretofore legally possessed by hospitals and druggists—and of course not being used at the present time—would be surrendered to the Treasury Department.

The bill provides that the penalties be increased on the smuggling of heroin into the United States. We found in our investigation that the present penalties for smuggling and selling smuggled heroin in this country are not high enough to take the profit out of the business. We had traffickers in heroin actually appear before our committee. We asked them why they continued to get back into the racket after several convictions. They admitted, very candidly, that they could make enough money in 2 years out of the penitentiary by selling heroin to take care of themselves for the time they had spent in the penitentiary in the past and the time that they might spend in the penitentiary in the future. They could accumulate a great enough profit to take care of themselves and their families and to take the risk of being convicted again and going back to the penitentiary. Therefore they admitted that our present laws were not severe enough to take the profit out of smuggling and selling heroin in our country.

The committee bill would increase the penalties for smuggling heroin, for the first offense, from 5 to 10 years for the first offense; from 10 to 30 years for a second offense; and a fine up to $10,000 and life imprisonment for the third of-

fense, or the death penalty, if recommended by the jury.

Mr. President, in New York City we heard witnesses, including the smugglers themselves, who brought into this country $2 million worth of cocaine, and it was then we realized that we must do something to put fear into those who would smuggle illicit drugs across our borders. Two Cubans had flown into our country $2 million worth of smuggled cocaine for a fee of, I believe, $2,000. They had made numerous trips before.

If we had a death penalty—even for the third offense, because we find there are many repeaters—we believe it would deter smuggling.

Under section 1403 of the bill, the subcommittee would increase penalties which might be imposed on those who sell heroin to juveniles. One of the saddest things that came to the attention of our committee is that 13 percent of all narcotic addicts in our country are under 21 years of age.

In one city the committee found that 1 dope peddler had started 40 or 50 high-school boys on heroin. The sheriff of Bexar County, Owen Kilday, testified before the committee that the community of San Antonio would be suffering for 50 years from the destruction of life and the crime that followed because that drug peddler started those high-school boys on heroin.

Mr. President, our committee came to the conclusion that the only way to deal with the sale and smuggling of heroin to those under 18 years of age was to increase the penalties to such an extent that peddling would not be worth the risk.

We have a provision in the bill which would increase the penalty for selling heroin to those under 18 years of age from a minimum of 10 years to a maximum of a death penalty, if the jury so recommends.

Mr. President, the proposed maximum penalty for selling heroin to juveniles is not, of course, a mandatory penalty at all; it is simply a maximum penalty which could be applied in serious cases, such as the case of the peddler who made drug addicts of 40 or 50 high-school boys, which I have already mentioned. If the jury felt that the facts of the case justified the penalty, it could recommend the death penalty.

I am no particular advocate or defender of capital punishment, but so long as we have in this country provisions for the death sentence for armed mail robbery, for kidnaping, for murder, and for rape, I think it is nothing but right that we elevate to the same level the penalty for selling heroin to juveniles. Those who start a young boy or a young girl in the use of heroin are certainly beginning the destruction of human life. Truly, it is murder on the installment plan, because our committee found few cases in which those who had become addicted to heroin were cured by any type of treatment.

If something had to happen to one of my boys, I should prefer that he be shot with a bullet than to be shot with a heroin needle, because to become addicted to heroin is to experience a living death. Not only will heroin eventually destroy the life of a person, but in the process it will cause the addict to turn to crime—to the destruction and theft of property, and to other violations of the law.

Our committee believes that as a maximum penalty for sales of heroin to juveniles, we are fully justified in recommending the death penalty. We feel that such a penalty will deter those who have been engaged in the perpetration of a heinous crime, and that in some instances the penalty may actually be applied in cases such as the one which has already been described to the Senate.

The next provision in the bill provides that heroin shall be completely outlawed: that any heroin now on hand which formerly was held legally should be turned in to the Secretary of the Treasury, with just compensation to be made therefor. This would strengthen the presumptions in the present law to the effect that anyone who has in his possession heroin must have smuggled it into the country, because there would be no heroin legally held, as there is today.

The next provision is for stiffer penalties for the smuggling of marihuana. That is a drug which starts most addicts in the use of drugs. Marihuana, in itself a dangerous drug, can lead to some of the worst crimes committed by those who are addicted to the habit. Evidently, its use leads to the heroin habit, and then to the final destruction of the persons addicted.

The committee feels that the cases involving the smuggling of marihuana should not be tried under the general smuggling act, under which the sentences are very low, but that they should be tried under the provisions of the proposed law, which would make them narcotics offenses, and would count against the persons if they were tried for subsequent offenses. Such cases would amount to a conviction in a narcotics case. Provision is made for a penalty, not of from 1 to 5 years, as is the case in the general smuggling statute, but of from 5 to 10 years for the first offense.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield for a question.

Mr. PAYNE. Is it not true that at least a portion of the bill which has been reported by the committee follows, in a general way, the provisions of the joint resolution which the junior Senator from Maine introduced on January 14, 1955, known as Senate Joint Resolution 19, in which the distinguished junior Senator from Texas and 43 of our colleagues in the Senate joined as cosponsors?

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct. The joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Maine more than a year ago was one of the things that first interested me in this entire subject. The Senator's joint resolution was transferred from the Committee on Finance to the Committee on the Judiciary. The committee had it under consideration along with other measures. Many of the provisions contained in the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Maine are likewise contained in the bill now before the Senate.

(At this point Mr. DANIEL yielded to Mr. PAYNE, who made a statement relating to the bill. Mr. PAYNE's remarks appear in the RECORD following Mr. DANIEL's speech.)

Mr. DANIEL. The next section in the bill provides for a change in the present search and seizure requirements, so that search warrants could be obtained and served in the nighttime in the same way as they are served in the day.

Under the present law, there must be positive evidence of the possession or sale of narcotics in the place to be searched before a nighttime search warrant can be issued. The law enforcement authorities told the committee it was very difficult to cope with the narcotics problem because they could not get search warrants at night when 9 out of 10 narcotic violations occur and most of the dope peddlers are at work. So this provision would follow the recommendations made in that connection by most of the law enforcement officers throughout the country.

The next section of the bill provides for the interception of telephone communications by Federal law enforcement officers, on certain conditions, and with certain safeguards. I want it clearly understood, Mr. President, that this bill does not simply provide that Federal officers may wiretap telephones or make interceptions of communications. It provides that those interceptions may be made only in narcotic cases, and that information resulting from interceptions—which are already being made by various Federal officers—may be used in prosecutions in narcotics cases, provided the officers first go to the United States attorney and get his approval, and then go before the Federal judge in the proper jurisdiction and get a sealed order permitting the interceptions to be made.

The committee put every possible safeguard around this provision, because every Member of the Senate, of course, is opposed to the general idea of eavesdropping or wiretapping. However, it was conclusively shown to the committee that we shall never be able to get the top traffickers in narcotics, who are operating in this country and having narcotics smuggled in from other countries in the world, if law enforcement officers are not able to intercept telephone communications, by which the top traffickers carry on their business.

The provision was recommended to us by the Department of Justice. I may say the Department of Justice for over 22 years has been following the rule and policy, except for a period of a few months, of intercepting telephone communications in certain cases, such as in subversion and kidnaping.

United States attorneys have recommended time and time again that Federal officers be given this limited authority to make telephone interceptions in narcotics cases.

If this bill is passed without provision for telephone interception, the Senate will be saying, in effect, that we are going to hit the street peddlers and pushers of dope over the head with a sledge hammer, but the men at the top, who are making huge profits, will be allowed to continue operating in this country and obtain narcotics from Mexico, Lebanon, and Hong Kong, by use

of the telephone, and will be allowed to ship narcotics in interstate commerce over the entire Nation. The provision would allow the law enforcement officers to use interception of communications as evidence against the top men in the dope traffic.

If the Congress wants to hit the small pushers and the peddlers over the head, give them all a penitentiary sentence, and let the big traffickers, who are operating by telephone, under the present practices, continue to do what they have been doing, what is proposed is one way to do it. That certainly will be the result. Our committee found unanimously—the law enforcement officers all over the country say this—that it would be impossible for us to convict the top people in the drug traffic unless the law enforcement officers could use the same modern methods traffickers use. The top drug traffickers are protected in their use of the telephone. They have the modern conveniences and inventions by which they can spread their traffic and trade. It is our opinion that law enforcement officers should be equipped to meet them weapon for weapon. If a law enforcement officer can go before a Federal judge and show that judge that he has good reason to believe that a certain telephone is being used for the narcotics traffic, the judge, under this provision, could give the law enforcement officer a sealed order to intercept that telephone communication, for the sole purpose of using evidence obtained therefrom in the trial of narcotics cases.

Mr. President, we have put safeguards around that provision, because it is provided that if any officer intercepts and uses the telephone communication contrary to this provision, he shall be held to be guilty, and shall be penalized under our Federal Communications Act.

I have already pointed out that wiretapping is now being practiced. The Federal agencies have told our committees that wiretapping is being used in certain cases. The evidence obtained therefrom cannot be used as evidence in Federal courts, under the decisions of our Supreme Court. We feel this provision in the bill would help stamp out unwarranted wiretapping and interceptions which exist today, because there is set up the safeguard and the procedure that if the evidence is to be used, it must be done in accordance with the language of the bill. Anyone who would fail to follow the provisions of the bill would be guilty and punishable under the Federal Communications Act.

As I have already stated, it is provided that wiretapping shall be done only after a Federal court order has been issued. The bill provides how the evidence shall be preserved, and that the order lasts only 90 days, unless it is extended by another order for 90 days. The bill provides that only certain limited personnel of the Treasury Department may use or get the information by interception.

Let me state what is happening today, Mr. President. There are 30 States which permit wiretapping, or at least which allow evidence obtained from wiretapping to be used in court. Today we find that in many jurisdictions Federal law enforcement officers are simply going to the State officers and putting an extra burden on them. In some cases the only way law enforcement officers can obtain evidence for narcotics cases is by wiretapping. Some Federal officers go to State officers and tell them they have reason to believe that two particular persons are engaged in the narcotics traffic, and they suggest that the State officers tap the wire of the telephone being used, and make State cases against them. We have had that complaint from some State officials. They do not believe they should have that extra burden placed upon them when national and international traffickers are involved.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield for a question.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Has the junior Senator from Texas considered the danger of the precedent that might be established by the adoption of this provision of the bill?

Mr. DANIEL. We certainly have. We have studied the matter very carefully. We have adopted every safeguard that could possibly be thrown around this provision concerning interception of telephone communications. Today the safeguards are thrown around the illicit traffickers at the top, who are making millions of dollars off the poor addicts and the street peddlers of this country. Safeguards are now thrown around them, under our laws. I do not propose that we tear down those safeguards without putting up other safeguards which will protect innocent people, and which will prevent unjustifiable telephone interception.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator feel that there might be a danger that the success of wiretapping in narcotics cases might lead to a similar request in other areas of violation of the law?

Mr. DANIEL. Well, it might; for example, in cases of subversion. I believe every Attorney General for the last 22 years has asked for authority to use wiretap evidence in court in cases of subversion. Actually, law enforcement officers have been tapping wires in subversion cases, with the approval of President Roosevelt, President Truman, and President Eisenhower, for some 22 years, but they have not been able to use that information as evidence in court.

It may be that in cases of sedition, and kidnaping, wiretapping would be justified. The House of Representatives has passed a bill to that effect for sedition cases. So far as the Senator from Texas is concerned, he believes interception of telephone communications in sedition cases would be justified.

However, I wish to say to the Senator from Arizona that this provision applies to nothing except the narcotics traffic. There is no more subversive element that can be found than the narcotics traffic. Red China has been the main offender. It has been sending out more heroin than has any other nation in the world, for two purposes. Their officials are sponsoring such traffic, in the first place, to make money for Red China, and, in the second place, to demoralize the soldiers and other citizens of the free nations.

So in this case we are dealing with a conspiracy and a subversive agent—something that would destroy human life.

The situation is so serious that it appears to me we should put out of business not only the street traffickers and small pushers but also those at the top of the narcotics traffic in this country.

On pages 9 to 11 of the report, Senators will find quotations from Federal judges and law enforcement officers who say there is no way to get at the top traffickers if we cannot intercept the modern communications they are using to carry on the narcotics traffic.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the evidence before our committee from every Federal law-enforcement officer, from the office of the Attorney General on down, including the agents in the various bureaus and the United States district attorneys, was unanimous that they cannot cope with this problem, in the case of the top national and international traffickers in narcotics, if they are not permitted to use the same modern methods the traffickers are using, in trying to obtain evidence on them and their operations.

That evidence led the committee to reach the conclusion that—

> Wiretapping, therefore, is essential in the fight against the illicit drug traffic. Without it, law-enforcement agencies are severely handicapped in this age of modern electronic methods which are freely utilized by the traffickers. Unless law-enforcement agencies can match the criminals weapon for weapon, law-enforcement agencies cannot be fully effective. With careful and stringent judicial safeguards, including a sealed court order of permission, section 1407 of S. 3760 would remedy this situation by permitting interception of communications between narcotic traffickers.

The next provision of the bill provides for an appeal by the Government from court orders suppressing evidence on account of the search and seizure provisions of our present laws. This provision would simply give the Government of the United States the right to appeal, so that in the case of such decisions the law will be uniform.

The next provision of the bill gives additional authority to the Bureau of Narcotics and the Bureau of Customs for their agents and officers to carry firearms, execute and serve search and arrest warrants, serve subpenas, and in certain instances make arrests without warrants for narcotic-law violations—in other words, to proceed in the way that other law-enforcement officers are now required to do.

The next provision of the bill provides that narcotics addicts and those who have been convicted of violation of narcotics laws shall be required to obtain a certificate from the customs office before they cross one of the borders of the United States, to enter another country, and shall be required to surrender the certificate upon their return. Many persons bring narcotics with them, upon returning to the United States. We found that today there are literally hun-

dreds of well-known narcotic addicts and narcotics-law violators who are crossing the Mexican border. At some of the border points, the customs agents keep records—card index files—of those persons and the dates when they cross the border. Of course, such persons are searched when they return to the United States at those points. However, at other points that is not being done. The bill provides that it shall be done at all border-crossing points.

In title II of the bill, section 201 provides that the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be amended so as to read in part as follows:

(23) Any alien who has been convicted of a violation of, or a conspiracy to violate any law or regulation relating to the illicit possession of, or traffic in narcotic drugs, or who has been convicted of a violation of, or a conspiracy to violate any law or regulation governing or controlling the taxing, manufacture, production, compounding, transportation, sale, exchange, dispensing, giving away, importation, exportation, or the possession for the purpose of the manufacture, production, compounding, transportation, sale, exchange, dispensing, giving away, importation, or exportation of opium, coca leaves, heroin, marihuana, or any salt derivative or preparation of opium or coca leaves, or isonipecaine or any addiction-forming or addiction-sustaining opiate; or any alien who the consular officer or immigration officers know or have reason to believe is or has been an illicit trafficker in any of the aforementioned drugs.

They will constitute additional grounds for excluding any alien from the United States. Today all violations of our narcotics laws constitute grounds for excluding an alien from this country except in the case of possession of a narcotic drug or conspiracy to violate the narcotics laws. By means of this provision of the bill such cases would be included as Congress evidently intended. It seems evident that Congress thought that all such matters relative to narcotics law violations had been included under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Section 202 amends section 8 of the act entitled "An act to create in the Treasury Department the Bureau of Narcotics, and for other purposes," by authorizing the Bureau of Narcotics to conduct narcotic-training programs for State and local law-enforcement personnel. It creates in the Bureau a new Division of Statistics and Records which would accept, catalog, file, and use all types of narcotic information and statistics received from Federal, State, and local law-enforcement agencies. This information would be made available for Federal, State, and local law-enforcement purposes.

Under this section all Federal agencies, notwithstanding any law to the contrary, would be required to make available to the Bureau of Narcotics the names and identifications, and any other pertinent information relating to all persons who are known to them to be narcotic addicts or convicted narcotic law violators.

Section 203 relates to venue in marihuana cases. Today there is quite a question as to where marihuana cases may be made under the statute. This section of the bill would clarify that situation so that prosecutions could be instituted either where there has been a transfer of marihuana or where the marihuana is found.

Mr. President, that is a brief summary of the provisions of the bill.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the report submitted by the Interdepartmental Committee on Narcotics to the President of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS TO THE PRESIDENT

FEBRUARY 1, 1956.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On behalf of the Secretaries of State, Defense, Health, Education and Welfare, and the Attorney General, as well as myself, I am pleased to transmit to you the report of the Interdepartmental Committee on Narcotics, which has been completed pursuant to your letter of November 27, 1954. The departments of the Federal Government concerned with the narcotics problem stand ready to carry out the proposals of the report in their respective fields.

You will note that the report emphasizes greater integration of Federal, State and local activity both between the Federal Government and the States, within the States, and among contiguous States. In this respect, you may desire to call it to the attention of the governors of the States, through the Governors' Conference, for appropriate study and such cooperative action as is possible.

It is gratifying to report that the committee has had the benefit of complete cooperation of the various departments and bureaus of Government, the members and staff of congressional committees working on the problem, and representatives of State and local governments.

With your permission, I will transmit copies of this report to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the interested committees of the Congress, and the appropriate committee of the United Nations.

Faithfully yours,

G. M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

The survey which is the subject of this report has been conducted by a committee representing the Departments of State, Treasury, Defense, Justice, and Health, Education, and Welfare, during the past year. The objectives of the study were those outlined in a letter from the President to the four Secretaries and to the Attorney General on November 27, 1954, as follows:

"DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is gratifying to know that your representatives have been meeting with representatives of the other departments concerned with the problem and with my special counsel as an informal committee to review and coordinate the Federal Government's programs to combat narcotic addiction in this country.

"In order to define more clearly the scope of the problems which we face and to promote effective cooperation among Federal, State, and local agencies, a comprehensive up-to-date survey on the extent of narcotic addiction is urgently needed and should be made by the Committee. A determination of what the States and local agencies have accomplished and what they are equipped to do in the field of law enforcement and in the rehabilitation of the victims of the scourge should also be included in the survey. In this, I know, the Committee will have the enthusiastic cooperation of State and local authorities.

"Receipt of the Committee's report on both subjects as promptly as possible will expedite systematic review and improvement of our narcotics programs—local, national, and international. I know that devoted and strenuous attention is being given to the problem on a number of fronts; but we should omit no practical step to minimize and stamp out narcotic addiction.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

The method of the Committee has been that of pooling the information and the experience gained by the agencies of the Federal Government most directly concerned and by those other public and private authorities and investigators who have become familiar with the problem in its manifold phases. From its study and review of this material, it has endeavored to arrive at an evaluation of the situation now existing, and at recommendations looking toward a plan for integrated Federal, State, and community action most likely to result in its improvement, within both the near and the more distant future.

It is believed that no important, informed point of view with respect to the character and dimensions of the problem, or method proposed for its alleviation, has been overlooked. The subject is one to which many, in private and public life, have given earnest thought. Numerous differing opinions have been advanced and complete unanimity has been found on no single aspect of the problem except the chemical analyses of the drugs themselves.

A survey by the Bureau of Narcotics, covering calendar 1953 and 1954 on addicts reported by the various enforcement authorities and, to a limited extent, by the cooperating hospitals and medical services, listed a total of 24,043 addicts reported during that period. Approximately 13 percent were under the age of 21; of this group of 3,145, 87.6 percent were found to be 18 or over. This figure is significant as indicating that unofficial reports of a problem of serious dimensions among young people of school age have been exaggerations; the number in that age bracket, among the total of 24,043, was under 400. Additional names were reported during 1955, bringing the total number of addicts known to authorities to approximately 32,000. Preliminary analysis of these most recently reported cases indicates a still smaller proportion of those under the age of 21.

The Department of Defense has secured statistical data indicating a rate of addiction of less than three per 100,000 military personnel, or less than one-tenth the estimated rate for the civil population in the United States. A problem of some proportions was found to have existed in the Far East. A majority of addicts were found to have been involved with narcotics prior to their entry into service. The rate of addiction found among military personnel in the Far East is in general similar to that estimated for the civilian population, for comparable age groups in the United States.

A Bureau of Narcotics analysis of arrests for violations of the various narcotics laws during 1954 shows 1,430 by Federal, and 18,059 by local authorities. This indicates a drop of 17 percent from 1953, during which 1,774 Federal and 21,853 local arrests were made. A special tabulation of cases involving persons under the age of 21 shows 58 Federal and 2,078 local arrests in 1954, against 134 Federal and 2,598 local arrests in 1953. It is encouraging to note that the greater decline—21.8 percent—was among that younger group.

In addition to formal studies and reports, the Committee has had the benefit of numerous consultations with experts within the departments concerned, and with others

possessing substantial experience with the problems of addiction. This has been of great value in the interpretation of the extensive literature on the subject.

The Committee is aware of the extremely informative testimony developed by the committees of both the Senate and House of Representatives, which have been currently conducting hearings on matters pertaining to the narcotic drugs, has had the benefit of generous cooperation of their chairmen, members and staffs, and has had the opportunity of reviewing the valuable preliminary report of January 9, 1956, on this subject of the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Representatives have participated in a panel discussion on the subject conducted by the American Bar Association, and attended meetings of the Committee on Drug Addiction and Narcotics of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council.

The studies conducted by State and municipal authorities, and by numerous private and civic groups, have been reviewed. The Committee has been in correspondence with the State and city agencies concerned with problems of prevention and treatment of drug addiction, and enforcement of the narcotics laws. It has been aided in this by the officers and Washington representatives of the Council of State Governments and the conference of mayors of the United States. Among the special studies undertaken on behalf of the Committee is the Report on Drug Addiction prepared by a committee of the New York Academy of Medicine. Advantage was taken of the opportunity to visit the Riverside Hospital in New York City, and to observe the special program conducted there for the treatment and rehabilitation of juvenile addicts.

The Committee has been impressed by the consistent support given to the Federal controls of the narcotic drugs by physicians and pharmacists, and by the manufacturers, importers, and distributors in the drug field. Associations representing these groups have cooperated in assuring compliance with all regulatory measures, and have made notable contributions to the effectiveness of the program.

DRUG CONTROLS IN THE UNITED STATES

The general properties of the narcotic drugs have been known for many centuries, one of the early recorded references dating from 5,000 B. C. These drugs have two striking characteristics: the quality of alleviating pain, extending even to the power of reducing anxiety and in some cases causing positive euphoria; and the power of creating physical and psychological dependence, operating through increased physical tolerance associated with compulsive craving.

The beneficial qualities of the drugs are obvious and they occupy an important place in medical practice. Their effects of inducing dependence and craving when used imprudently have had deleterious effects upon the individual and upon society, which have been observed with increasing concern during the past century. There have resulted regulatory measures of some degree of stringency, in every nation, and these have been supported in recent years by international agreements in which about 90 countries have taken part. An important principle of all such efforts at control has been that of limiting the use of the narcotic drugs to established medical needs, and thus seeking to prevent or minimize the harmful consequences of their abuse.

The basic materials for the common drugs are the opium poppy and the leaves of the coca tree. Both substances possess recognizable characteristics of the processed drugs, in their crude states. These are greatly heightened by their reduction and concentration, resulting in numerous opium and coca leaf derivatives which possess valuable and also harmful qualities, though in differing degrees. Certain of these, notably heroin, have been found to possess unusually strong addictive qualities uncompensated by medical properties not already available in less dangerous drugs. In consequence, heroin has been determined to have no acceptable use in the medical practice of the United States and a majority of other countries.

Certain synthetic drugs, some of which are chemical compounds not derived from opium or coca leaves, have been rejected for medical use for like reasons. Others have been found to possess valuable special characteristics, and have come into more or less general use. Continuing research in this field has as one of its hopeful objectives the discovery of a natural or synthetic drug with beneficial qualities comparable to the familiar narcotics, and without the dangerous addictive quality. To date, no drug of this description has been produced. For this reason it is necessary to be constantly alert to the possibility of illegal manufacture and abuse of these synthetics.

Within the United States, the narcotic drugs were used with considerable freedom throughout the 19th and early years of the 20th centuries. Addiction was relatively common, though not frequently recognized until after the Civil War, when its prevalence among veterans whose first acquaintance with the narcotic drugs was in military service gave it for a time the name of "The Soldiers' Illness." Narcotics were important ingredients in a number of proprietary medicines widely sold to the public, as well as prescribed by physicians far more freely than in contemporary practice.

Owing to these circumstances an unknown though certainly large number of persons became unwitting addicts; they continued the use of the drugs in one or more of the many forms then available. Many of these people must have had only slight understanding of the real nature of their involvement with and dependence upon the drug.

There developed meanwhile a considerable number of addicts who resorted to the drugs for purely sensual gratification, which they were able to support through unregulated purchase, without need for prescriptions. The resulting medical and social problems led to efforts, as long as 80 years ago, to estimate the numbers of persons affected and the quantities of drugs consumed. These early estimates were based upon sampled reports from physicians and pharmacists, usually confined to relatively small areas or segments of the national population. The extrapolation of such locally established rates to the whole population produced widely differing total estimates, ranging upward to the millions. Careful scrutiny of such early estimates and the methods by which they were reached suggests that they are of value chiefly as indications that a problem of considerable importance was already recognized.

The first truly national estimate of any statistical validity was made by Dr. Lawrence Kolb, of the Public Health Service, in 1923, at which time he found indications supporting the figure of 100,000.

By that date, however, the narcotic drugs had already come under Federal controls, and their manufacture, importation, and distribution were subject to regulation. Certain of the States had already adopted restrictive and regulatory controls, and the problem had been modified to a considerable extent where effective local measures were enforced. The basic statute establishing Federal controls was the Harrison narcotic law, enacted in 1914 and incorporated with its amendments in the Internal Revenue Code. The Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act of May 26, 1922, further extended direct Federal interest in and control over these drugs.

Enforcement of these laws has been a responsibility of the Treasury Department. The Bureau of Narcotics, established in 1930, is charged with the duty of regulating, supervising, and controlling the trade in narcotic drugs, and serves as the special administration which the United States became obligated to create for this purpose under article 15 of the Narcotics Limitation Convention of 1931.

The duties of this Bureau include regulatory supervision over all stages of importation and manufacture of narcotics, and the registration of physicians, pharmacists, and others concerned with their use. It is responsible also for the apprehension of those found to be violators of the narcotics laws, including those involved in the illicit traffic. The prevention of smuggling, an important consideration, since the United States does not produce the materials for the natural narcotic drugs, is a responsibility of the Bureau of Customs. These two Treasury agencies work in close coordination, and each maintains a small number of agents abroad for the purpose of preventing illegal shipments to the United States and cooperating with the enforcement agencies of other governments.

The Public Health Service, which was also at that date a Treasury agency, pioneered systematic studies of the nature and extent of addiction in the early twenties. Dr. Kolb, mentioned above, and Dr. Walter L. Treadway undertook a series of special studies, widely recognized as important contributions toward the development of effective measures for the treatment and rehabilitation of addicted persons. In 1928 the Federal Government authorized the establishment of the special Public Health Service hospital at Lexington, Ky., and later a similar institution at Fort Worth, for the purpose of treating narcotic addicts. An important purpose was to provide special treatment for Federal prisoners known to be addicts, but provision was made also for patients admitted on a voluntary basis.

This Public Health Service activity continues within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Its hospitals, unique in their special programs and facilities for the care of narcotic addicts, are also centers of the first importance in the research studies into the properties of the drugs and their effects. The extremely productive projects which their staffs have undertaken are carried on in association with the National Research Council, and draw upon the resources of the World Health Organization and principal medical teaching institutions throughout the world.

DRUG ADDICTION—CHARACTER OF THE PROBLEM

At the request of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs, the World Health Organization Expert Committee on Drugs Liable to Produce Addiction drafted a definition of "drug addiction" as follows:

"Drug addiction is a state of periodic or chronic intoxication, detrimental to the individual and to society, produced by the repeated consumption of a drug (natural or synthetic). Its characteristics include:

"1. An overpowering desire or need (compulsion) to continue taking the drug and to obtain it by any means;

"2. A tendency to increase the dose;

"3. A psychic (psychological) and sometimes a physical dependence on the effects of the drug."

The World Health Organization committee reiterated in January 1952 its opinion that a distinction must be made between drug addiction and habituation, and between addiction-producing and habit-forming drugs, that the terms are not interchangeable, and that only the expressions "drug addiction" and "addiction-producing drugs" should be used in documentation with respect to substances brought under, or to be brought under, international control. The following clarifying statement was added at that time:

"The cycle of administration leading to addiction may begin in legitimate medical

use but becomes established as a serious problem through self-administration beyond medical need. In the development of addiction there is an interplay between pharmacological action and the psychological makeup of the individual."

The Interdepartmental Committee has found this broad definition useful for the purposes of its study. It is applicable not only to the problem as it exists within the United States but also to any discussion of the control measures adopted or considered by international groups.

In a recent statement summarizing the experience of the Public Health Service with the problem of addiction, over a period of 30 years, Surgeon General Leonard A. Scheele reported:

"There are two groups of addicts. First are those who, after receiving repeated doses of narcotic drugs during a long and painful illness, become physically dependent upon the drug, and, therefore, addicted. In a majority of instances, people who become physically dependent in this way will lose their dependence simply by gradual withdrawal. A few do go on to become true addicts in the sense that they continue to be psychologically as well as physically dependent after efforts at withdrawal.

"The second and by far the larger group represents those in whom drug addiction is a manifestation of some abnormality of character or attitude. These addicts often say that they became addicted after having been introduced to the drug by their companions. For these people, the drug fills an emotional need, giving them a feeling of security, of being able to meet the realities and frustrations of life with more equanimity than they could otherwise muster. They usually suffer from any one of the types of character or personality disorders and have mental and emotional inadequacies that we classify as psychoneurotic, psychopathic, or more rarely, psychotic. These characteristics are not limited to narcotic addicts, they are found also in the chronic alcoholic and the barbiturate addict. In all of these addictions, the underlying emotional problem is likely to be similar. In fact, some narcotic addicts are first alcoholics, and turn to narcotic drugs as a secondary addiction."

The Surgeon General has made the following qualifications of the above quotation: "It should be borne in mind that the mental illness from which addicts suffer is rarely of the kind that can be classified as insanity. Their illness is similar to that suffered by many delinquents in the population who do not use narcotic drugs."

Analysis of the data concerning addicts tends to support the following generalizations as applicable at the present time:

1. The addict may be a person of any social, economic, or intellectual status. The chances are 4 out of 5 that he is a male—almost exactly a complete reversal of the situation existing prior to the passage of the Harrison Act in 1914, when female addicts represented much the larger number. More than half are under the age of 30, 13 percent under the age of 21; of this latter group, however, nearly all are persons approaching their majorities.

2. Heroin is the drug of choice for the large majority of addicts. It is the drug most often encountered in the illicit traffic; it may be easily adulterated; addicts report that it produces a greater effect than other drugs. Since manufacture or importation of heroin is prohibited within the United States, it is available only through smuggling and subsequent illicit traffic within this country; it is apparent that heroin addiction requires some form of contact with underworld sources. It is to be noted that heroin is now outlawed by all governments except Albania, Bahrein, Belgium, France, Hungary, Italy, and Paraguay.

3. Since the costs of the illicit drugs have been maintained at high levels, it is estimated that the addict dependent upon the illicit traffic must carry an expense of from $50 to $75 per week. Regular procurement of such an amount, considerably beyond the legitimate means of the average individual, accounts in part for the striking record of revenue-producing criminal or other antisocial activity commonly associated with drug addiction. Available data indicates:

(a) Established patterns of delinquency prior to and following addiction to the drugs.

(b) The fact that a large majority of addicts, identified as such through other than law enforcement activities, are found to have become known to the police.

(c) A high degree of similarity between the settings and circumstances in which both addiction and delinquency are prevalent.

4. Despite the difficulty of arriving at anything like a complete understanding of the phenomenon of addiction, and the conservatism of those most competent to form opinions in advancing them, it seems clear that addicts of whatever description share a characteristic and abnormal concern over the need for relief from pain, discomfort, or anxiety, and that they are prone to look for aid in dulling their perceptions. In each case, the addict seems to feel the need for relief from some oppressive circumstance, whether this relates to physical pain, recognition of personal or social inadequacy, or more complex considerations. The effect of the drugs has been likened to the function of a crutch, which enables an addict to get along in his given situation. Many addicts describe the effects of the drugs in positive terms of euphoria, but this apparently does not commonly continue beyond the early stages of addiction except for those who become habituated to intravenous injections. For most, the drugs seem to offer an escape which is a line of retreat, not an advance. Studies made in New York and Chicago indicate that in many instances the first use of drugs results from examples set by addicts enjoying local prestige, as in juvenile gangs; from a desire on the part of the individual to gain acceptance by his peers; or occasional thrill seekers who use drugs only as a phase in their pattern of delinquency, without developing into confirmed addicts. The manner of its spread has been felt to justify use of the term "contagion," particularly in the cases of the younger addicts.

Many and varied estimates have been made as to the number of persons in the United States addicted to the narcotic drugs. The Committee regards the current estimate of the Bureau of Narcotics, based upon the analysis of the figures tabulated later in this report, as the most accurate available. This estimate, indicating a current addict census of 60,000, is based upon the records of its own agents, and cooperating State and municipal authorities. The validity of the method by which it was arrived at is supported in part by the Chicago and New York studies, which indicate that a majority of the younger addicts, however identified as such, are known to the police. Addiction may exist for a period of months before the individual attracts police or other official attention, but upwards of 90 percent of such cases come within police knowledge within a relatively short period. Such duplication was found in checking the names secured in an exceptionally thorough and confidential census of addicts in metropolitan neighborhoods.

It has been noted further that persons who have arrived at larger estimates base their conclusions chiefly on contact with or observation of various categories of addicts which are included in the overall addict census maintained by the Bureau of Narcotics.

The Committee feels that the existence of 1 addict is 1 addict too many. But, the estimate of 60,000 narcotic addicts, which the Committee regards as the most reasonably accurate figure, is not as high as had been expected. The Committee was heartened to find that the number of juvenile addicts is smaller than had been thought even though, once again, the Committee realizes that the addiction of any person, young or old, is clearly a matter of concern.

It is noteworthy that the rate of addiction found among military personnel was at the virtually negligible level of 3 per 100,000. The thoroughness with which that special survey was conducted by the Department of Defense, coupled with the obvious difficulty of concealing narcotic addiction within the circumstances of military life, makes such a finding especially encouraging. Only in the Far East, where drugs are relatively plentiful and cheap, and civil enforcement measures largely ineffective, was a significant level of addiction discovered, in such an environment, clearly favorable to experimentation with and use of the drugs, the rate was found only to be close to that among males of military age within the civil population at home. That addiction was not found to be more prevalent in this critical area reflects credit upon commanders and service personnel generally, for their adoption of and responsiveness to effective preventive measures.

THE ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM

With growing public interest in the narcotics problem has come an intensification of the enforcement efforts by local authorities. There are indications, meanwhile, that the volume of the illicit traffic is declining. During 1954 there were a total of 19,489 arrests under the narcotics laws as compared with 23,627 in 1953. The arrests of persons under 21 years of age dropped from 2,732 to 2,136. These figures suggest an encouraging reversal of the trend observed during the years immediately following World War II which, like the corresponding period after World War I, had shown increases in the numbers of reported offenses.

State and municipal authorities have improved their agencies for coping with the local problem, by increase of the numbers of enforcement personnel assigned to narcotics squads, and providing special training in this field. The Bureau of Narcotics has continued to receive a high measure of cooperation and support from the local agencies, facilitating concentration of the efforts of its own personnel on the major offenders, particularly in interstate traffic. The Bureau of Customs has continued its apprehension of smugglers of the drugs, and has recently strengthened its force of customs agents on the Mexican border, in order to meet the changing channels of traffic from abroad.

Notable success has followed the various international efforts at controlling the production of the raw materials from which the narcotic drugs are manufactured, and in restricting their conversion and distribution to the requirements for medical and scientific use. The Narcotics Commission of the United Nations and the World Health Organization have been fruitfully active in this field. The United States has a continuing interest in encouraging efforts toward worldwide, cooperative controls of the narcotic drugs, since illicit traffic is supplied through smuggling from abroad. While the synthetic drugs are not as yet a factor in international traffic they clearly offer a threat for the future of control measures.

About 90 nations are parties to one or more international narcotics treaties. The United States Government has usually assumed the initiative in the adoption of these treaties.

Four organs at present exert international narcotic control: The Commission on Narcotic Drugs, which is the general supervisory and policymaking body, reviews annually the situation in all countries, considers necessary improvements in the control system, prepares new measures therefor, and appeals to public opinion. The Permanent Central Opium Board and the

Drug Supervisory Body are specialized supervisory bodies which work closely together on statistical returns and estimates of governments and watch over international trade. The Expert Committee on Drugs Liable To Produce Addiction of the World Health Organization is concerned mainly with medical aspects of drug addiction, and decides which new drugs, particularly the synthetic drugs, should be brought under international control. The Division of Narcotic Drugs, part of the United Nations Secretariat, works on implementation of existing treaties and plans new measures, and conducts scientific research.

The proposed single convention, under consideration for approximately 5 years, will simplify and replace all existing narcotic treaties and extend control to poppy straw, coca leaves, and cannabis, as well as to synthetic narcotics.

The assignment of a small number of narcotics agents to duty in southern Europe and the Middle East has resulted in striking accomplishment in the way of assistance to the internal police activities of cooperating governments, and has aided materially in reducing the sources of supply of the raw opium and processed drugs intended for the illicit market.

Evidence from seizures of drugs in the illicit traffic indicates that the risks of the clandestine trade have kept costs at a high level. Coupled with this has been a progressively greater adulteration of the drugs (sugar of milk being the common adulterant for heroin) associated with the greater scarcity of the basic drugs. Quantities seized in average individual cases, or by totals over comparable periods of time, have declined markedly in recent years; although, as in two recent instances, substantial amounts are occasionally encountered. There are continuing indications that the illicit drug traffic, though still supposedly profitable, has been recognized by the underworld as increasingly hazardous.

However, officers enforcing the narcotic laws feel strongly that their activities have been severely curtailed by a series of adverse court decisions in the last 2 decades. Their views are summarized in the following paragraphs:

These decisions upset investigative processes which had had the sanction of the courts for many years. Some of the areas in which enforcement officers have been restricted are: evidential use of postarrest admissions and confessions; authority to arrest without warrant; authority to search for and seize contraband before and after a valid arrest. Officers are compelled to desist from close pursuit and to abstain from seizing plain evidence of crime before them in favor of obtaining arrest or seizure processes from a magistrate, where there is any indication that the circumstances will permit of that course. The right of defendants to claim a third party's interest against search and seizure on a third party's premises has been asserted. The decisions have practically abolished the conception of a consent to search by the accused. Great latitude has been given suspected persons in asserting their rights against self-incrimination.

While restrictions imposed by these court decisions apply equally to all Federal law enforcement efforts, there is belief on the part of many able law enforcement people that they penalize with particular force operations against the illicit narcotic traffic. This is a well organized, professionalized racket, with a high degree of recidivism among violators. These professionals are very well informed as to the limitations placed on the operation of law enforcement officers and can be expected to conduct their business so as to take full advantage of every new development. Futhermore, the contraband merchandise is small in volume and high in price; a fortune in narcotic drugs can be concealed under the clothing. It can be transported to a place of safety on a few moments' notice.

Even the shortest delay incident to obtaining a warrant from a magistrate under the most favorable circumstances would be fatal to many narcotic cases. Much of the business is in neighborhoods where alarms are quickly spread; much of the activity of narcotic criminals is in the nighttime and on weekends, or at other times when a magistrate cannot be reached without delay.

The deleterious results of this line of judicial action come to light occasionally in borderline cases which may be thrown out of court. What does not appear so clearly is the frustration and the lack of effectiveness and efficiency imposed on the law enforcement agencies, as the areas of immunity and sanctuary of the criminal are expanded.

That these disabilities are real there can be no question. When the multiplicity of areas is considered it is obvious that the cumulative result is the equivalent of a severe loss of manpower. In 1950, in an attempt to offset some of these handicaps, the Bureau of Narcotics shifted enforcement emphasis to the purchase of drugs from violators—a method which is slow, costly, and inefficient by previous standards, but designed to avoid judicially imposed disabilities.

In more recent years there has been a tendency to take what might more appropriately be Federal cases into the State courts, because of fear that technical considerations would prevent their full development in the Federal courts. It is believed that the problem noted here should be considered by the Congress and by the judiciary.

TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION

Patients can now be withdrawn from physical dependence on the drugs without difficulty, as is routinely done at the Public Health Service hospitals; but treatment must usually be carried out in a controlled and drug-free environment because of the patient's psychological or emotional dependence. Institutional care thus seems to be an essential for all except those patients possessing unusually high motivation.

Rehabilitation toward resuming a useful place in society is commenced at once, and constitutes an important part of the individual's reorientation, under psychiatric supervision. The patient is guided toward a better understanding of his own problem, and an effort is made to help him prepare for the give and take of normal life in a modern community. For many, supervised experience in good work habits, and the development of some basic skills, are important. Ideally, he should leave the institution with considerably heightened confidence in his own ability to solve many of the basic and recurring problems of ordinary life, without the aid of the drugs.

Inevitably, the transition from institutional to free community life is a difficult one. The released former addict is likely to find himself cut off from helpful guidance and opportunity at the moment when he feels the need for them most keenly. Communities, even families, show a marked skepticism, sometimes hostility, toward the former addict. Too often he can find quick acceptance only in his former haunts, and among those associated with his earlier addiction. His attitude may too surely and quickly become that of seeking what appears to be the only available and familiar line of retreat, a return to the drugs.

It seems apparent, therefore, that post-hospital followup is essential to hopeful and lasting treatment of the addict. The recently released narcotic patient can benefit from many community services where these are available to him. They are likely to prove more effective where he can be guided in the light of the information gained from the close and continued observation of his special problems during his hospitalization. Conversely, the progress already made in devising improved methods of institutional treatment would be further advanced if they could be planned in the knowledge that certain facilities within the individual patient's community would be available to him after release. The interchange and cooperation which could follow between centralized institutions and home communities would throw additional light on the least understood aspect of the addiction problem—those measures most likely to aid in its prevention.

FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Although the Federal Government has recognized its large responsibility with respect to the control of abuse of the narcotic drugs, it is believed that in the aggregate the major responsibility must inevitably rest with the States and the local communities. In recognition of this, commendable attempts have been made during recent years to adopt measures designed not only to bring the drugs under more effective controls at the local levels, but also to make greater provision for treatment and rehabilitation within the communities directly affected. The Federal Government must clearly retain responsibility for the control of importation, and should have the power to license manufacture of synthetic narcotic drugs, fix quotas within medical needs, and control distribution. It should also continue its vigorous enforcement activities with respect to the international and interstate traffic and the breaking up of the major distributive networks. Beyond this, it has provided and should continue the important work of research into the properties of the drugs and those courses of treatment found to be most effective in contributing to the rehabilitation of addicts through its hospital programs at Lexington and Fort Worth.

With increasing, though yet far from complete understanding of the problem of addiction, has come the realization of its importance to the local community, not only as the principal victim of the abuse of the drugs, but also as the environment in which corrective measures on behalf of the addict, his family, and society can be most hopefully undertaken. With recognition of the importance and broader implications of the subject, attention has been properly directed toward preventive as well as curative action.

It is apparent that, despite the highly important contribution to a solution of the problem made by the Federal neuropsychiatric hospitals, they will be limited by the virtually insurmountable problems of effective followup, and reintegration of the individual patient into the life of his community after hospitalization, without the essential elements of community organization.

The Committee believes therefore that it is of the utmost importance to encourage the States and at least the major municipalities to undertake an extension of their hospital and community welfare programs to include treatment and social guidance for the narcotic addict.

Equally necessary, and perhaps even more difficult to provide, is the coordination of activities designed to help the individual overcome the handicap of his addiction experience, in resuming his place as a self-reliant and productive member of society. Experience has shown that without such support, a large proportion of former addicts are likely to return to the use of the drugs. To the extent that alternatives are not open to him, he is apt to return to the same environment, associations, and personal dilemma—perhaps in even more aggravated form—which originally brought him to recourse to drugs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Federal Government should encourage continuing studies of the narcotics

problem within the States and municipalities. Such studies, related to the special circumstances found to exist within the communities concerned, should be productive of sound and practical planning for a reduction of the problem. The Federal agencies already active in this field can provide valuable guidance and information for the assistance of State and city authorities.

2. It is recommended that assistance to the States and municipalities by the Federal agencies include provision of courses of instruction for both public health and enforcement officers, to be conducted in Washington and also by visits of small teams of qualified experts to appropriate centers. Some Federal support for such activities would be required, but it is believed that their cost should be moderate.

3. In each State, and in each city where a narcotic drug problem is found to exist, at least one senior law-enforcement official should be specifically charged with duties pertaining to this problem. An important function of such a designated official would be to undertake coordination of enforcement activities in this field, including exchange of reports and information with the Bureau of Narcotics and enforcement agencies of other States and municipalities.

4. There should be available within each State, and the larger municipalities where justified by the number of known addicts, adequate provision for the withdrawal of addicts from the drugs, and appropriate programs for their effective treatment and rehabilitation. In many instances such projects could be undertaken as extensions of existing hospital programs. In the planning of such facilities, the Committee feels that the assured maintenance of drug-free environments is essential to hopeful therapy; and that maximum use should be made of associated community resources and services in the social and economic readjustments undertaken on behalf of former addicts, following releases from institutional care. The suggestion has been advanced that the hospital facilities and services which would be required might be established on a regional basis, by groups of two or more States acting in concert.

5. It is recommended that the States give consideration to the desirability of establishing or more frequent utilization of present procedures for the legal commitment of addicts to institutions where they may be treated and rehabilitated, either within or without the boundaries of the States concerned.

6. Should certain of the States wish to provide for commitment to the Federal hospitals, pending the availability of comparable facilities under State auspices, it is recommended that legislation authorizing this for a limited period, in the future, and on a reimbursable basis, be considered for enactment. In view of the differing circumstances in which such commitments might be made, it would be desirable to reserve to the Surgeon General, Public Health Service, determination as to the suitability of patients for admission, and their length of stay. In determining suitability of patients for admission the Surgeon General should be authorized to take into account the mechanisms and programs for followup and aftercare within the State after the patient is discharged from the hospital.

7. It is recommended that the Public Health Service Act, Public Law 410 of the 78th Congress, be amended to permit the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to disclose information on voluntary patients under the usual regulations governing disclosure of material in the medical records, where, in his opinion, physicians and recognized health and welfare agencies will be enabled to act in the interest of the patients in further treatment of their addiction.

8. The progress toward full and effective international controls over the production and distribution of the narcotic drugs is felt by the Committee to have been highly encouraging. It is recommended that our Government continue its policy of close cooperative effort through the agency of the United Nations, and with other international groups and individual nations concerned with the problem.

9. Frequent note has been made of proposals for including special information concerning narcotic drugs in texts and curricula for the schools. The Committee has formed the conclusion that, unless carried out with extreme care, such programs might have the undesirable effect of attracting attention to and arousing curiosity over experimentation with the drugs. It is felt that further study by educational authorities, in concert with those engaged in the regional inquiries recommended above, is likely to result in programs best suited to local problems and conditions. The same cautions are urged on those sponsoring motion picture, television, and radio treatment of the subject. The Committee proposes to seek further advice and counsel on this matter, in realization of its extreme importance in assuring a healthful understanding of and popular attitude towards the drugs.

10. The Committee has given extended consideration to the matter of fixing penalties of appropriate severity for violators of the narcotics laws. It has been impressed with the importance of assuring not only deterrents to this category of crimes, but also of facilitating social as well as medical rehabilitation of those offenders who are users of the drugs. It has considered the special problems of three groups of persons involved in the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs.

(a) Violators of the narcotics laws whose involvement is of an exclusively criminal character, and who are not themselves addicts or habitual users of the drugs. It has been noted that, of the three groups, this group includes the highest proportion of major criminals, with respect to other forms of crime as well as the narcotics offenses committed by them.

(b) Peddlers who are themselves addicted. This group is composed largely of persons with records of delinquency or criminality preceding as well as following their addiction. Criminal activity of persons in this category is usually, but not exclusively, restricted to relatively petty crime. Even their involvement in the drug traffic is commonly found in the lowest retail brackets. They are however much the more numerous, their aggregate contribution to the traffic is very large, and their control presents peculiarly difficult problems of enforcement and rehabilitation. This results from the fact that their use of drugs is associated with some degree of incapacity for normal emotional and social adjustments, resistance to corrective and rehabilitative efforts, and the impetus of a habit which can be supported only at an expense beyond the legitimate earning capacity of the average citizen.

(c) Addicted persons with either no records of criminal activity, or records of delinquency not involving violations of the narcotics laws other than obtaining and possessing the drugs for their own use. Antisocial activity among this group is commonly found to be of a petty character, but must, in combination with such legitimate activities as occupy the addict, be sufficiently productive to support the high costs of addiction. This is the least homogeneous of the three groups; its members range from unemployables with serious psychiatric problems to highly skilled professional people. It is the class from which a majority of peddlers are recruited, and it provides the essential market of consumers for the illicit traffic. It includes also the most hopeful subjects of the curative and rehabilitative programs, many of whom undergo voluntary treatment in the public and private hospitals.

The Committee has found itself in immediate agreement with respect to the first and third of these groups. For the commercial type of trafficker, motivated solely by hope of gain from his handling of the drugs, it was agreed that penalties of a severe type are indicated. With respect to the third group, not involved in importation, manufacture, or sale of drugs, it is felt that the problem is principally one of appropriate treatment and rehabilitation, with subsequent guidance by interested social agencies within the individual's community. However, note has been made of the fact that in certain instances tangible evidence involving known major traffickers may depend solely upon possession of drugs. It is felt therefore that any scale of penalties applicable to convictions based merely on proof of possession should be broad enough in range to cover both the relatively innocuous and the serious offenders.

With respect to the second group, those involved in both trafficking and personal use of the drugs, the question has been raised as to whether the levels of punishment most likely to serve as effective deterrents may not obstruct the reform and ultimate rehabilitation of the individuals concerned. While recognizing the probable validity of such arguments, the Committee believes that first consideration must be given to the protection of society from the trafficker.

It is to be hoped that the extension of treatment and rehabilitative services into communities importantly affected, as recommended elsewhere in this report, will not only aid in reducing the problem of addiction, but also compensate in some degree for the effects of long prison terms on convicted addict drug peddlers. The Committee has noted the fact that the addict-trafficker has in the past shown a high rate of recidivism, both as addict and as peddler. Where he retains or returns to psychological dependence on the drug, he is often less responsive to the deterrents of future punishment than the more hardened, ordinary criminal. It is to be hoped that, as States and local communities accumulate experience with enforcement and treatment programs, valuable and much-needed data on the peculiarly difficult problem of the addict in crime will be produced. Such information should receive close and continued study at all levels of government.

The committee has arrived at the conclusion that there is need for a continuation of the policy of punishment of a severe character as a deterrent to narcotic law violations. It therefore recommends an increase of maximum sentences for first as well as subsequent offenses. With respect to the mandatory minimum features of such penalties, and prohibition of suspended sentences or probation, the Committee fully recognizes objections in principle. It feels, however, that, in order to define the gravity of this class of crime and the assured penalty to follow, these features of the law must be regarded as essential elements of the desired deterrents, although some difference of opinion still exists regarding their application to first offenses of certain types.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, because of its long experience with and responsibility for the treatment of addicts, further recommends for consideration a legislative step designed to provide for greater opportunity for the rehabilitation of certain addict-violators, particularly in groups (b) and (c), whose criminal activity is secondary to their addiction. Under this proposal, wider latitude would be given to the courts by authorizing them, in the case of such addict-violators, to commit the convicted offender for a period of hospital treatment, followed by an extended period of conditional release under close supervision by specially trained personnel. This procedure would be limited to those with the best prospects for rehabilitation, and would be

applicable only under optimal conditions of posthospital supervision. A few cases could be selected immediately for this procedure, to be supervised in the few communities where adequate personnel and services for effective supervision and rehabilitation are available. The plan could be gradually extended to additional communities as effective local rehabilitation programs are developed.

11. The Committee has been impressed by the record of enforcement activities carried out by the Bureau of Narcotics, and especially by the results of its recent efforts at cutting off the foreign sources of supply of the illicit traffic. It recommends that consideration be given to an increase in the agent force of that Bureau, with appropriately increased administrative and operational support.

12. The development of synthetic drugs with properties similar to the narcotics, not dependent upon foreign sources of supply, has created a need for effective controls over their manufacture and distribution. It is recommended that consideration be given to legislation which would empower the Bureau of Narcotics to license the manufacturers of such drugs, fix quotas to keep total quantities produced within the medical needs, and regulate their distribution.

13. It is recommended that the problems noted by enforcement officers and prosecutors, arising from court decisions limiting the procurement and presentation of evidence in narcotics cases, be given thorough and careful consideration from the standpoint of the optimum in law enforcement, in balance with and giving complete effect to the rights of individuals. The Committee believes that the Judiciary and appropriate committees of the Congress and of the various State legislatures should be made aware of these problems, in order to determine to what extent legislative action is desirable.

14. The Committee has noted striking similarities between the individual and social problems raised by the abuse of the narcotic drugs, and such substances as marihuana, the barbiturates, amphetamines, and others which affect emotional behavior. It has been observed that the circumstances and attitudes underlying excessive habitual use of such depressants and stimulants frequently parallel or precede those associated with the narcotics. It is recommended that a similar study of the extent and effects of the improper use of such drugs be undertaken, with a view to determining the appropriate scope of Federal, State and local regulatory controls.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a series of editorials. I may say that our staff has several hundred editorials from newspapers throughout the Nation which are in support of the bill or the recommendations of our committee. Some of the editorials go into the very heart of the bill which now is before the Senate. We have selected from the editorials a representative group, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of May 4, 1956]

PUNISHING DOPE PEDDLERS

Dope peddlers are a particularly obnoxious and dangerous type of criminal. Their illicit operations spread misery and degradation and spawn crimes of the most violent sort. They deserve no mercy from the law—and they would get none in aggravated cases under drastic legislation proposed by a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee.

The omnibus narcotics control bill sponsored by Chairman DANIEL of the subcommittee and his fellow investigators of the dope racket would even permit the death penalty for third-offense heroin smuggling or peddling—in the discretion of the jury. Life imprisonment would be mandatory on a third conviction, unless the jury decided that the nature of the crime was sufficient to warrant capital punishment. Heavy prison sentences for first and second offenders would be written into the law. Moreover, the bill would permit use of wiretapping evidence against drug racketeers, would liberalize search-and-seizure procedures, would authorize Government appeals from lower court decisions suppressing evidence and in other ways would materially tighten up enforcement of the narcotics laws.

The extraordinary measures were proposed as a result of the subcommittee's country-wide investigation of drug racketeering. Senator DANIEL and his group were astounded by disclosures as to the ramifications and the viciousness of drug smuggling and peddling—especially with respect to heroin. "It is time," he told the Senate, "that the Congress and the country declared the type of open warfare on the illicit norcotics traffic that will stop the destruction of lives and the commission of crimes now attributable directly to this cancerous menace within our country." The legislative proposals of the Daniel subcommittee are designed to support such an all-out war. However drastic some of the recommendations may seem, the bill's objective is so commendable that Congress should give it careful study, keeping in mind the seriousness of America's dope problem.

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) State Tribune of May 14, 1956]

IT'S ABOUT TIME

At long last, a no-holds-barred bill has been put forward in the Senate to curb the frightening narcotic addiction that has spread across the country, particularly among young people.

Sponsored by a special subcommittee, the legislation was introduced by its chairman, Senator PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas. The bill's sharpest edge is a provision which calls for the death penalty, at the discretion of a jury, for those who sell heroin to persons under age 18.

DANIEL has indicated there will be similar legislation from the House of Representatives, and he expects action on the bill to be taken during this session.

That will hardly be soon enough. Every day that addicts and dope peddlers roam the streets the well-being of our communities is in danger. For all forms of crime have been proven to be tied in with narcotics. And often it's the kiss of death.

The Daniel proposal follows nearly a year of nationwide hearings which made it brutally clear that there was no time to waste in cracking down.

The bill would completely outlaw heroin in the United States on the grounds that it is the "worst and most prevalent drug sold on the illicit market, and it has no medical use which cannot be served by other drugs."

Other important provisions include:

Permission to wiretap telephone calls between narcotic traffickers when authorized by a Federal court.

Penalties for the smuggling and sale of heroin ranging from 5 to 10 years for first offenders up to life imprisonment or the death penalty for third offenders.

This is one piece of legislation to which Congress might well give immediate attention. The penalties may be stiff. But they're nowhere near as stiff as the life-wrecking jolt of a narcotic needle.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) News of May 1, 1956]

CONGRESS SHOULD QUICKLY PASS THE DANIEL NARCOTICS-CONTROL BILL

Senator PRICE DANIEL, of Texas, and his subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee have devised the most potent narcotics-control legislation since passage of the Harrison Act of 1914. When he introduced the sweeping, stern bill, Senator DANIEL advised his colleagues:

"It is time that the Congress and the country declared the type of open warfare on the illicit narcotics traffic that will stop the destruction of lives and commission of crimes now contributable directly to this cancerous menace within our country. These new proposals are designed to accomplish this result."

Undoubtedly public opinion favors a forceful, all-fronts attack on the dope menace. Certainly that is the general view in San Antonio and over Texas. The extent of the evil that was revealed by the Daniel subcommittee's investigation here stirred local reform efforts, such as the San Antonio Narcotics Education Committee, that are still going strong.

The Daniel bill would serve two main purposes: (1) To stiffen penalties for narcotics violations, and (2) plug loopholes in the law that now handicap enforcement efforts. The bill would outlaw heroin altogether in the United States. That provision is based on the committee finding that heroin "is the worst and most prevalent drug sold on the illicit market and that it has no medical use which cannot be served better by other drugs."

Under the proposed law, all heroin would be called in within 120 days. And penalties for smuggling or sale thereafter would be increased to 5 to 10 years for a first offense, 10 to 30 years for second offense, and life imprisonment to death for the third offense. A minimum of 10 years and a maximum of death would be the special penalties for sale of heroin to minors.

Penalty for smuggling of marihuana, a big item in the illicit drug trade across the Texas-Mexico border, would be increased from the present 1 day to 5 years to a minimum of 5 to 10 years for the first offense.

Some may argue that such stiff penalties might move juries to find an offender not guilty rather than impose such harsh punishment. We do not see how that could be true in the handling of peddlers who sell death on the installment plan.

The Daniel bill is the product of extensive committee hearings and recommendations from interested Federal departments and law-enforcement officials over the country. It is the Senator's purpose to try to get the legislation passed before this session adjourns, and that Congress should certainly do.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) News-Register of May 4, 1956]

THE DRUG TRAFFIC

The seriousness of the narcotics traffic in the United States is attested to by the fact that a special study group of the Senate Judiciary Committee has approved unanimously a bill which would permit imposition of the death penalty for narcotic peddlers.

The evidence presented to the committee of misery and degradation following in the wake of the drug habit must have been impressive, indeed, to move these men to approve so drastic a penalty.

In addition to making possible execution at the discretion of a trial jury, the proposed law provides prison sentences ranging upward from 5 to 10 years for a first offense, increases the penalty to 10 years for smuggling marijuana into the country, and pro-

hibits the use of heroin for any purpose, even medicinal.

The enactment of such a law, even if the ultimate penalty never is exacted, should serve to impress upon the public mind the gravity of the narcotics situation, strike fear into some criminal minds, and arm the authorities with more effective weapons.

[From the Superior (Wis.) Telegram of May 12, 1956]

CRACKING DOWN ON DOPE

At long last a no-holds-barred bill has been put forward in the Senate to curb the frightening narcotic addiction that has spread across the country, particularly among young people.

Sponsored by a special subcommittee, the legislation was introduced by its chairman, Senator PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas. The bill's sharpest edge, is a provision which calls for the death penalty, at the discretion of a jury, for those who sell heroin to persons under age 18.

DANIEL has indicated there will be similar legislation from the House of Representatives, and he expects action on the bill to be taken during this session.

That will hardly be soon enough. Every day that addicts and dope peddlers roam the streets the well-being of our communities is in danger. For all forms of crime have been proven to be tied in with narcotics. And often it's the kiss of death.

The Daniel proposal follows nearly a year of nationwide hearings which made it brutally clear that there was no time to waste in cracking down.

The bill would completely outlaw heroin in the United States on the grounds that it is the "worst and most prevalent drug sold on the illicit market, and it has no medical use which cannot be served by other drugs."

Other important provisions include:

Permission to wiretap telephone calls between narcotic traffickers when authorized by a Federal court.

Penalties for the smuggling and sale of heroin ranging from 5 to 10 years for first offenders up to life imprisonment or the death penalty for third offenders.

This is one piece of legislation to which Congress might well give immediate attention. The penalties may be stiff. But they're nowhere near as stiff as the life-wrecking jolt of a narcotic needle.

[From the Alexandria (La.) Town Talk of March 12, 1956]

CRACKDOWN ON DOPE

At long last a no-holds-barred bill has been put forward in the Senate to curb the frightening narcotic addiction that has spread across the country, particularly among young people.

Sponsored by a special subcommittee, the legislation was introduced by its chairman, Senator PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas. The bill's sharpest edge is a provision which calls for the death penalty, at the discretion of a jury, for those who sell heroin to persons under age 18.

DANIEL has indicated there will be similar legislation from the House of Representatives, and he expects action on the bill to be taken during this session.

That will hardly be soon enough. Every day that addicts and dope peddlers roam the streets the well-being of our communities is in danger. For all forms of crime have been proven to be tied in with narcotics. And often it's the kiss of death.

The Daniel proposal follows nearly a year of nationwide hearings which made it brutally clear that there was no time to waste in cracking down.

The bill would completely outlaw heroin in the United States on the grounds that it is the "worst and most prevalent drug sold on the illicit market, and it has no medical use which cannot be served by other drugs."

Other important provisions include:

Permission to wiretap telephone calls between narcotic traffickers when authorized by a Federal court.

Penalties for the smuggling and sale of heroin ranging from 5 to 10 years for first offenders up to life imprisonment or the death penalty for third offenders.

This is one piece of legislation to which Congress might well give immediate attention. The penalties may be stiff. But they're nowhere near as stiff as the life-wrecking jolt of a narcotic needle.

[From the Amarillo (Tex.) Globe-Times of May 9, 1956]

BILL WITH A BITE

Will the threat of a death sentence for the sale of narcotics to youthful Americans be sufficient threat to the "pushers," these far-from-the-top dogs in the dreadful scourge of our times?

Senator PRICE DANIEL thinks so. In his bill (S. 3760), introduced last week in the 84th Congress, to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, the Senator wrote in such a penalty. However, it is to be applied at the discretion of the jury; otherwise the seller can get off with a $10,000 fine and imprisonment for life.

In the bill, too, is an important control—each violation of the act carries with it an increasingly higher penalty. On third offense of sales of heroin, the "pusher" can get life imprisonment.

The Daniel bill comes at the end of a nationwide inquiry which the Texan directed under a Senate resolution adopted shortly after DANIEL went to Washington.

The inquiry showed that some of the earlier controls had worked—the Harrison Narcotic Act and the formation of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics in 1930—but the United States still has more narcotics addicts than the number reported by any other western nation.

Drug addiction and the illicit narcotics traffic account for 25 percent of all reported crimes in the Nation; in the metropolitan areas this figure rises to 50 percent.

To stop the illicit trade in heroin and marihuana, S. 3760 throws up formidable barriers. Powers of the Narcotics Bureau agents are increased. Teeth that can bite have been inserted in order that the United States of America can carry out its assumed responsibilities under the Hague Convention of 1912 in which international traffic in narcotic drugs is sought; smoothing out of hitherto conflicting laws controlling State versus Federal powers, and Federal interagency powers is achieved.

We can think of no legislation that demands higher priority in the 84th Congress than that of narcotics control.

[From the Cape Girardeau Southeast Missourian of January 17, 1956]

WAR ON DOPE

Senators were visibly shocked as Senator PRICE DANIEL, head of a countrywide panel investigating narcotics, summarized the findings of its inquiry. Addiction has tripled in the United States in the last 10 years, he said.

More young people are acquiring the dope habit, which is so expensive that they are driven to luring their friends into it or to committing felonies to pay their way. "Their offense is human destruction as surely as that of a murderer," DANIEL said. "It is murder on the installment plan."

Senator DANIEL urges the death penalty for dope smugglers and peddlers. But would such legislation accomplish the desired purpose? Many smugglers and peddlers are victims themselves, or hirelings of the big shots in the racket. In any case, penologists declare that the effectiveness of punishment as a deterrent depends more on the certainty of being caught than on severity of the penalties.

If drug racketeers faced certain apprehension and sentencing, present penalties would suffice. As long as most of them aren't even caught, fear of capital punishment will prove ineffective in curbing this racket.

Narcotics enforcement forces, Mr. DANIELS said, are inadequate. Even with the help of State and local officials, they are waging a losing fight. Men arrested on dope peddling charges are often released on low bonds which are forfeited.

It should be possible for Congress to make it easier for narcotics men to catch these vicious criminals. A near certainty of being caught and convicted would make the narcotics racket unsafe and unprofitable. It would have more deterrent effect than the most savage penalties accompanied by poor enforcement.

[From the Texarkana (Tex.) Gazette of February 6, 1956]

MOVING AGAINST THE DOPE TRAFFIC

It is to be hoped that Congress will not consider lightly the revelations turned up by Senator PRICE DANIEL and his committee investigating the illicit narcotics traffic.

The subcommittee's report said in part: "We were surprised and shocked at the extent and far-reaching effect of the illicit drug traffic in the United States and have concluded that narcotics addiction and the dope traffic constitutes one of the most serious problems facing the Nation."

Here are some of the findings of the committee:

1. The United States has more narcotic addicts, both in total numbers and populationwise, than any other country in the Western World. In fact, if the reports of other nations to the United Nations Commission on narcotics are correct, our country has more drug addicts than all of the western nations combined. A total of 13 percent of the addicts are less than 21 years of age.

2. In spite of the fact that Federal officials have done all within their power under present handicaps and with limited personnel, the illicit drug traffic has trebled in the United States since World War II.

3. Drug addiction is responsible for approximately 50 percent of all crimes committed in the larger metropolitan areas and 25 percent of all reported in the Nation.

4. Drug addiction is contagious. Addicts spread the habit with cancerous rapidity to their families and associates.

5. Red China, Turkey, Lebanon, and Mexico are the primary sources of heroin reaching the United States, and international controls are inadequate.

6. Recent seizures of heroin and cocaine in record quantities point up the international smuggling operations with the United States as a target.

7. Subversion through drug addiction is an established aim of Communist China. Since World War II, Red China has pushed exportation of heroin to servicemen and civilians of the United States and other free nations of the world.

8. Smuggling of narcotics across the Mexican border is facilitated by the failure of the United States and Mexico to wage a mutual all-out fight against the drug traffic.

9. Criminal laws and procedures are insufficient to insure the apprehension and punishment of narcotic offenders.

10. Penalties for narcotic violation are neither commensurate with the seriousness of the crime nor sufficient to remove the profits. The maximum penalties under present laws of 5 years for the first offense, 10 years for the second, and 20 years for the third are too low.

Senator DANIEL's report went on to say that the Nation's illicit narcotics traffic grosses more than a half billion dollars per year. Heroin purchased abroad today for $3,000 will bring $300,000 when finally cut, packaged, and sold in the United States. The committee got evidence that, with the prospect of such enormous profits, Federal penalties are not sufficiently severe to deter unscrupulous persons from engaging in the traffic. Significantly, the committee found that whenever and wherever the penalties are more severe and strictly enforced, the incidence of both addiction and narcotics offenses has decreased proportionately. Federal penalties for narcotics violations generally are lower than the penalties of the various States.

Senator DANIEL has presented a very vivid picture of his subcommittee's report. Congress should feel its great responsibility to follow through with the program designed to root out this great evil in our country.

[From the Boston Record of January 12, 1956]

No PIGEONHOLE

A committee of the United States Senate, chairmaned by Senator PRICE DANIEL, of Texas, has just completed a months-long investigation of the narcotics traffic that deserves and should get more than ordinary attention in Congress and the country.

The narcotics problem is something that the country is either going to have to do something about, or wish it had.

It is the filthiest business in the world, and we are up to our necks in it.

The American citizen who can be complacent about the shocking facts in the report to the Senate is lacking in the most basic understanding of the responsibilities of citizenship.

One of these facts is that there is more narcotics addiction in the United States than in any other western country.

Another is that the narcotics traffic in this country has trebled since the end of the Second World War.

The clincher is that narcotic addiction is a factor in the great majority of all crimes committed in America.

There would be fewer murders, robberies, and all crimes of violence in the exact proportion that the use of narcotics should be reduced.

But what we are doing about it, or rather failing to do, constitutes one of the great follies of our time.

As Senator DANIEL says, we do not have adequate laws for the control of narcotics, and we do not properly enforce the weak laws we do have.

If the recommendations of this alert committee get no further than a Senate pigeonhole, the penalty will be ruined lives on an ever-growing scale. The Congress has a job to do in this vital field, and public opinion should see that the job is done.

[From the Houston Chronicle of May 1, 1956]

DANIEL BILL STRIKES HARD AT ILLEGAL NARCOTICS TRAFFIC

A bill introduced in the United States Senate Monday by Senator PRICE DANIEL will be a blow to the narcotics traffic if it becomes law. DANIEL, who headed the Senate subcommittee which last year made an intensive study of the narcotics situation, said that passage of his bill "will be the greatest assault on traffickers in illicit drugs since the passage of the Harrison Antinarcotics Act in 1914."

DANIEL'S bill provides severe penalties. It has long been held by many experts that the best way to control the narcotics traffic is to inflict tough penalties. States which have tried stiffening of their narcotics laws have had great success in reducing sale and use of narcotics.

Highlight of the Daniel bill is the complete outlawing of heroin in the United States. He said the committee found that it is the worst and most prevalent drug sold on the illicit market. In years past heroin was used for medical purposes, but the committee found that this no longer is true. DANIEL said this usage now can be better served by other drugs.

The bill provides that any heroin previously legally possessed, for medical purposes, must be surrendered within 120 days after the new law goes into effect.

New penalties for smuggling or sale of heroin would be from 5 to 10 years in prison for first offenders, 10 to 30 years for second offenders, and either life imprisonment or death for the third offense. A special provision sets a penalty of from 10 years' imprisonment to death for sale of heroin to persons under 18 years of age.

This provision is a vital one, since it is the sale of heroin to teen-agers which starts many of our youngsters on a life of crime and self-destruction. If a dope peddler knows he may get the electric chair for selling narcotics to a minor, he undoubtedly will think a long time before doing it.

The penalty for smuggling marihuana into the United States would be doubled, making it 5 to 10 years in prison.

An important provision in the bill permits interception of telephone calls between narcotics traffickers if permission is first obtained from a Federal court. The subcommittee found that "the big-time traffickers in illicit narcotics are seldom caught and convicted because their operations are limited almost wholly to the telephone."

The Daniel bill is a comprehensive one, long needed to cope with one of the most serious problems in the Nation today. Representative HALE BOGGS (Democrat, Louisiana) is planning to submit a similar bill in the House. Because of the urgency of the narcotics problem, the bill should be speeded through both Houses of Congress before it adjourns for election year.

[From the Mexico (Mo.) Ledger of January 21, 1956]

TWO NEWS ITEMS AND YOUR LIFE

Here are two news items which have appeared in the daily press within the past few days. You may not think they can have any effect on your life or that of your family. In that you can be sorrowfully mistaken:

"SUPERIOR, WIS., January 12.—A marihuana smoking veteran of the Korean war killed his young blonde sweetheart near here today then fled half the length of the State until he was captured in a police trap after terrorizing a family and kidnaping a hostage en route.

"CHATSWORTH, CALIF., January 15.—In one of the largest narcotics raids on record in southern California, peace officers early today surprised 87 persons, including 16 teen-age girls, at an alleged marihuana smoking party. Six adults were arrested and 28 juveniles were cited and remanded to custody of their parents."

Half the crimes in the cities of this Nation and 25 percent of the crimes in the country are attributed to drug addiction. So states the recent report of the United States Senate on investigating the narcotics business in this country.

The narcotics trade in the United States has grown to be such a menace that drastic action is indicated. Senator DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas, reports that the illicit drug traffic has trebled in this country since the end of World War II. He asked for legislation under which the death penalty could be applied to smugglers and peddlers of heroin in extreme cases.

DANIEL headed a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee which investigated the narcotics traffic.

"Heroin smugglers and peddlers are selling murder, robbery, and rape," DANIEL said in a prepared Senate speech. "In truth and in fact, it is murder on the installment plan, leading not only to the final loss of one life but of others who acquire this contagious infection through association with the original victim."

The committee recommended: Legislation to permit narcotics agents to tap telephones under sealed court orders and to use such evidence in courts, so they can get at the big operators.

Negotiation of a treaty with Mexico. DANIEL said 90 percent of the overland smuggling of heroin and marihuana is across the Mexican border into Texas, California, and Arizona.

Complete outlawing of heroin, which he said is used by 80 percent of the addicts in this country.

The subcommittee recommended that the force of narcotics agents be increased immediately by 50, and subsequently by another 50, to a total of 350 officers.

DANIEL said the Federal Bureau of Narcotics "has compiled the names and addresses of over 300,000 addicts, and new names are being reported at the rate of over 1,000 per month." He said there are now at least 60,000 addicts in the United States, 13 percent of them under 21 years old.

This is a matter in which maudlin sentiment has no part. The drug peddler and panderer who seeks to interest young people in this terrible practice, need prompt and tough handling in the courts of law.

We trust that the Senate report and its recommendations will not be pigeonholed and forgotten.

Let's don't just talk about it—let's do something.—L. M. W.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Express of May 3, 1958]

BRINGING UP BIGGER GUNS TO BATTLE THE DOPE MENACE

Senator PRICE DANIEL'S committee that investigated the illegal drug traffic in the United States is seeing some helpful results. The latest is introduction of a bill to give courts and enforcement officers added weapons for the Nation's war against this cancerous racket.

Closer to home and already in full swing is another facet of the war. Thousands of school children and many of their parents are getting to know the dope menace for what it is—in a growing educational battle. This program grew out of a suggestion advanced by Bexar's District Attorney Hubert W. Green, Jr.

The Daniel-sponsored bill will bolster enforcement of existing laws and make penalties more severe, at the discretion of our courts. In extreme cases, the death penalty is authorized. Federal narcotics and customs agents would be given much-needed help in the form of laws designed to make their work more effective.

These two developments are products of an aroused public interest, the most potent of all weapons in the democratic arsenal.

[From the New York News of January 11, 1956]

DEATH FOR DOPE PUSHERS?

The dope problem in the United States has been under serious study for some time by Senator PRICE DANIEL'S, (Democrat, Texas), Senate Judiciary Subcommittee.

It's a sinister problem: at least 60,000 addicts in this country (more than in all other Western nations put together), and about 1,000 new victims reported per month. Some 13 percent of our addicts are under age 21.

Accordingly Senator DANIEL and his associates want Congress to make life a lot more dangerous for dope peddlers and smugglers

than it is now. They'd like to have the death penalty itself available for heroin dealers, on jury recommendation.

Of the heroin fraternity, DANIEL says: "Heroin smugglers, and peddlers are selling murder, robbery, and rape, and should be dealt with accordingly. Their offense * * * is murder on the installment plan."

Other measures proposed by the subcommittee are a boost in the number of Federal narcotics agents, a law forbidding convicted violators to travel abroad without permission, and conferences with Mexico on border dope traffic.

As a longtime battler against dope pushers and smugglers, the News naturally takes a deep interest in the Daniel subcommittee recommendations. We hope Congress will be equally interested.

[From the Amarillo (Tex.) Globe-Times of May 11, 1956]

POPPY FIELDS FEARED

We have told you of Senator PRICE DANIEL'S proposed bill for control of narcotics, which was written after an intensive study by a senatorial investigating committee of the burgeoning sales of narcotics in the United States.

Out of that scrutiny came another important document—a report on proposed treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts.

The committee spent a great deal of time looking into a plan for clinics which would be maintained throughout the Nation by the Federal Government at which narcotic addicts could obtain drugs free or at a very nominal charge. Provision would be made for registration, fingerprinting, and photographing to identify the addicts. Attempts would be made to withdraw drugs gradually. However, if the addict failed to respond to the psychiatric treatment and other rehabilitation efforts of the clinic, he would be given "stabilizing" or "maintenance" doses of the narcotic for the rest of his life.

The fact of the proposal gleams. If drug addicts could go to a Federal dispensary and obtain free or nominally priced drugs, the profit would be taken out of the narcotics industry. No need for smugglers from Red China—the United States Government would buy up the required drugs at stable market prices. No need for a pusher to interest youth in starting the narcotics habit, if he doesn't have a lifetime sucker at hand to pay any price he later requires.

But if one lifts the mask a little, the prospects are frightening in a clinic system. First, medical authorities agree that without complete control of patient and his complete isolation from clandestine sources of supply, there is no hope for cure. No matter how much the clinic dispenses, the addict will like a little more, and he'll find a pusher who, in turn, will find a source of illegal supply. And besides, the plan is based on an idle dream: That men will seek cures when the disease is not painful—yea, when the disease is actually lovely in its protection from the realities of mundane living.

But the senatorial committee recognized that prohibition of sales, without a consequent program for the treatment and rehabilitation of addicts, also would be an idle dream. If the present addicts can be cured, or confined, and youth no longer seduced by pushers (remember the death penalty can be imposed on such sellers of narcotic drugs), then eventually the profit will be taken out of narcotics sales.

The committee therefore recommends a realistic program of rehabilitation. Recognizing that present treatment programs fail because there is no followup work with the patient after he leaves the institution of cure, it proposes 3-year probation status for drug addicts released from such institutions.

It further recognizes that there is a hard core of addicts that will never be cured; these, then, should be in quarantine-type confinement after having been treated three times in a narcotics hospital without complete cure.

The committee thinks the voluntary plan of commitment in Federal hospitals should immediately be abandoned. Instead, civil courts of the Nation should immediately require mandatory treatment. The Federal hospitals should be open to the States on a quota basis, and in the case of such States which have a larger population of addicts than their quota allows at the Federal hospitals now in existence, the States should provide their own special hospital facilities for the treatment of drug addiction.

Just as we hope the 84th Congress passes quickly the Daniel bill for increased penalties and enforcement of narcotics legislation, we hope a workable plan for rehabilitation is drawn up, put into legislation, and immediately enforced.

We fear the poppy fields of Red China more than we do their armies.

[From the Dallas News of February 7, 1956]

NARCOTIC REPORT ASKS QUICK ACTION

President Eisenhower wants effective action immediately to stop the narcotics racket. A Cabinet Committee recommends stiffer penalties, more enforcement agents, better cooperation between State and Federal agencies.

The Cabinet report finds only 60,000 addicts. There are probably 10 times that many users. The addict is the immediate problem—he and the pusher—but the step between user and addict is not long.

So the actual problem—present and potential—is far graver numerically than the Cabinet study reveals.

As for stiffer penalties, surely they are in order. Senator PRICE DANIEL'S committee view that the death penalty should be exacted for smugglers and peddlers is justified.

This will cause a cry from those opposed to capital punishment, who say death for a crime has not stopped crime. It hasn't. But nobody can say how much worse the criminal picture would be without the severest penalty. Surely the importation and promotion of dope is an atrocious offense against society. It is the cause of human and moral degeneracy. Its cure is doubtful, once the habit takes hold. It causes the user to commit robbery, burglary, and even murder—so desperate is he to get the stuff.

The current Congress should take the Cabinet study and Senator DANIEL'S committee records and act wisely for the Nation's future.

[From the Houston Post of May 1, 1956]

DANIEL AIMS BODY BLOW AT DOPE RACKET

"For medicinal purposes" will no longer be a legal excuse for the possession of heroin in the United States, if Congress enacts legislation introduced by Senator PRICE DANIEL and his Judiciary Subcommittee.

The outlawing of heroin for any use is a prime and laudable feature of the far-reaching bill which the Daniel group has framed to meet evils of the illicit narcotics traffic, found in its nationwide investigation. The subcommittee was convinced that heroin "is the worst and most prevalent drug sold on the illicit market, and that it has no medical use which cannot be served better by other drugs."

Long prison terms, ranging from 5 years for first offenders up to life imprisonment or death for third offenses, should serve as strong deterrents to violations of the proposed new law, provided it is enforced. The same may be said of the minimum penalty of 5 to 10 years for smuggling marihuana into the country.

The House Ways and Means Subcommittee, working closely with the Senate panel, is expected to offer similar legislation. Senator DANIEL believes the measure will be passed at this session, and there is no reason why it should not be. The legislation is noncontroversial, and the sooner Congress passes it, the sooner will begin the "open warfare on the illicit narcotic traffic that will stop the destruction of lives and commission of crimes now attributable directly to this cancerous menace within our country."

To the extent that the sale of heroin and marihuana can be scotched, the two worst factors in drug addiction will be removed. Provisions in the Senate bill for tightening enforcement in various ways will facilitate the detection and prosecution of offenders. More enforcement agents are needed to police the far-flung Texas-Mexican border and other parts of the country. But enactment of this legislation will be a long step toward stamping out those horrible destroyers of lives and minds.

[From the Houston Post of January 11, 1956]

DANIEL URGES NATION AND WORLD FIGHT ON ILLICIT NARCOTICS TRAFFIC

The investigation of the illicit narcotics traffic in the United States, which recently was conducted by a Senate subcommittee headed by Senator PRICE DANIEL, of Texas has disclosed the shocking information that this country has more drug addicts than any other country of the Western World, and may, in fact, have more than all others combined.

In a preliminary report to the Senate, Senator DANIEL Monday said there are at least 60,000 addicts in the United States and that about 13 percent of the known addicts are under 21 years of age. The Texas Senator added that the traffic in illicit narcotics is a $500 million per year business and is responsible for 25 percent of all reported crimes in the Nation. In the 43 most populous cities where most of the dope traffic is concentrated, it is the underlying cause of approximately 50 percent of the crimes.

An addict may spend from $10 to $100 a day for the illicit narcotics he craves. As a result, an addict is almost automatically a thief.

Even though the dope traffic is a serious source of crime, its worst feature is that addicts themselves enlist others into addiction. Senator DANIEL in describing the illicit narcotics traffic to the Senate called it "murder on the installment plan."

Senator DANIEL said his investigation disclosed that present Federal laws, together with lack of sufficient personnel in the Federal Narcotics Bureau, make efforts to curb the traffic extremely difficult. Penalties for narcotic violations, he added, are neither commensurate with the seriousness of the crime, nor sufficient to remove the profits.

The subcommittee is drafting legislation which will increase penalties for dealing in illicit narcotics up to the death penalty where it is recommended by the jury in aggravated cases. As an example of such a case DANIEL cited a peddler in San Antonio who started 40 high school students on heroin.

Senator DANIEL also urged Senate approval of a joint resolution urging all nations to ratify as soon as possible the 1953 protocol which would limit the cultivation of the poppy plant, source of opium, to the medical and scientific need for the drug and approval of another joint resolutiton urging all nations which have not done so to outlaw heroin at the earliest possible moment. He also urged that United States and Mexican officials hold conferences to agree on a treaty of cooperation in fighting the drug traffic at the Mexican border.

In short, Senator DANIEL wants the dope traffic attacked vigorously on both a national and an international basis. The subcommittee's investigation has shown clearly that both are necessary. No heroin is manufactured in the United States. It has been outlawed here and in a number of other countries, but Red China still is a major source.

However, if all of the free world would cooperate toward suppressing illicit narcotics, a big dent would be made in the traffic.

Congress would do well to consider Senator DANIEL'S recommendations and act accordingly.

[From the Washington News of January 10, 1956]

THE DRUG TRAFFIC

The Senate subcommittee investigating illicit narcotics has come up with the startling finding that the United States has more drug addicts in proportion to population than any other country in the Western World.

Some other conclusions may be equally hard to believe—that drug addiction is responsible for half the crimes committed in our metropolitan areas, that the illicit drug traffic has trebled since World War II.

This committee, under the chairmanship of Senator PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, Texas, unquestionably did a comprehensive and conscientious job.

If the situation is only half as bad as this report paints it, the stringent measures the committee recommends are wholly justified. The effects of drug addiction are horrible—"death on the installment plan," Senator DANIEL accurately phrases it. So there is no excuse for mercy under the law for the ruthless criminals whose greed has led them to spread addiction wherever they could.

The addict deserves our pity. The degenerate who made him an addict has earned the condemnation of civilization, and the death penalty in extreme cases.

[From the Palestine (Tex.) Herald-Press of May 1, 1956]

DEATH FOR DOPE PEDDLERS

As present laws stand in most States of the country, a man who kills another in the heat of anger can be executed for his crime.

Yet, another who schemes to avoid capture, who turns scores of people into helpless addicts of a living death, and makes them potential mad dog killers of the innocent, when convicted gets off with a year or two in prison.

Perhaps it was with such a comparison in mind that a special Senate Judiciary Subcommittee headed by Texas Senator PRICE DANIEL has recommended the death penalty for narcotics peddlers.

Under a bill proposed by the committee, heroin, the most evil of all the drugs peddled in this country, would be outlawed entirely, including medical uses. DANIEL explained that heroin has no medical use that cannot be served better by other drugs.

And the bill would provide prison penalties ranging from years to life, or the death penalty, for peddlers of heroin.

Marihuana, the enemy of youth, would be attacked by a penalty on smugglers of from 5 to 10 years in prison.

If the death penalty is ever morally justified, this is the time. This country has been strangely easy on dope smugglers and salesmen, even though they have been found working on school campuses, have wrecked the lives of unknown thousands, and have filled penitentiaries with murderers, thieves, and prostitutes. Few cities of as many as a few thousand people have been untainted by the evil. And the pitiful thing is that addicts are created in early youth or, usually, not at all.

It is to be hoped that Congress will pass DANIEL'S bill without delay and without weakening its provisions.

With such a law, our narcotics agents will have a real weapon with which to fight our most heinous crime.

Without a law of equal force, we can expect the spreading sore of dope addiction to continue its cancerous growth, and to weaken the moral and physical fiber of our country.

[From the Greenville (S. C.) Piedmont of May 4, 1956]

NOT FAR ENOUGH

Death is not too severe a penalty for narcotics peddlers. That punishment has been recommended by a special Senate Judiciary Subcommittee for dope pushers who sentence their victims to what has been described as a living death.

But dope pushers cannot exist without a measure of protection. The Senate subcommittee should extend its recommendation to include just punishment for those who aid and abet members of narcotics rings or who assist them in escaping retribution for their crimes.

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press of May 4, 1956]

SENATE GROUP BACKS TOUGH NARCOTICS BILL

The special Senate Judiciary Subcommittee which has recommended the death penalty for narcotics peddlers has indeed gone back to the idea of "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." Whether Congress or public opinion will agree to such punishment there may be some question, though in dope peddling the lowest in degradation may appear to have been reached.

The bill introduced by the subcommittee would seem to give the dope seller plenty of time and opportunity to mend his ways and renounce his infamous calling, if reform is possible. It would provide prison terms of 5 to 10 years for the first offense on a sale to adults; 10 to 20 years for a second offense; and either a life sentence or the death penalty, at the jury's discretion, for a third conviction.

There are crimes other than murder for which the death penalty is provided in certain States. Kidnaping, rape and, of course, treason are instances. In China the death penalty has been invoked in the case not only of narcotics peddlers but of drug users as well, and the procedure was summary. The wretched prisoners were often dragged before a people's court, convicted, and shot within the space of an afternoon. But no hasty procedure is present or intended in the committee's bill. All due process of law is provided for.

Other provisions of the committee's bill make for better and swifter law enforcement against dope agents. The measure would legalize tapping the telephones of suspected dope sellers, subject to permission from a Federal court, and would allow narcotics and customs agents to carry arms. The bill, which drastically tightens up the restrictions and increases the punishments for dope sales, including those of marihuana, is a good one in most respects. Probably there never could be unanimous agreement in the matter of the death penalty. Congress must decide that.

[From the Santa Barbara (Calif.) News-Press of May 3, 1956]

THE DOPE SALE PROCESS IS SAME AS MURDER

Being prepared for presentation to Congress is a bill providing for the death penalty for persons convicted of selling narcotic drugs. If we are to have the death penalty on the statute books as punishment for the destruction of another human being, then certainly it should be applied to the illicit traffic in dope.

A special Senate Judiciary Subcommittee unanimously approved the new measure, after an investigation of the narcotics traffic. It decided to ask for penalties ranging from 10 years to death for persons selling heroin to victims under 18. The death penalty would be left to the discretion of a jury.

Prison terms of 5 to 10 years would be provided for a first offense sale of heroin to adults, 10 to 30 years for a second offense, and a life term or the death penalty for a third conviction. In addition, the bill would outlaw heroin even for medicinal purposes and set a limit of 120 days from the time of enactment in which all stocks of heroin must be surrendered to the Federal Government. The committee's position is that heroin has no medicinal use which cannot better be served by other drugs.

Stiffer penalties would also be imposed for the traffic in marihuana, by setting the term of imprisonment at 5 years to 10 instead of the up-to-5 term now provided. The bill also proposes legalization of telephone tapping to trap dope peddlers, subject to permission from a Federal court, and allow Narcotics and Customs Bureau agents to be armed. Such agents could make an arrest without warrant for offenses committed in their presence.

We hope no soft-hearted and soft-headed people will profess to see a sinister threat to our basic liberties in the proposed measure, and that it will be approved as recommended. Ruthless dealing with dope peddlers and suppliers must be undertaken if the lethal racket is to be stamped out.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer of May 7, 1956]

NO QUARTER

Every thoughful student of our deplorable crime record, so much of it the product of narcotic addiction, must approve the Senate bill providing drastic sentences for smugglers and pushers, large and small.

When the deeply antisocial nature of the narcotics trade is considered, the death penalty seems appropriate for aggravated offenders. "It is time," said Senator PRICE DANIEL, of Texas, introducing the bill, "that the Congress and the country declare the type of open warfare on the illicit narcotics traffic that will stop the destruction of lives and commission of crimes now attributable directly to this cancerous menace."

The bill represents a year-long study by a judiciary subcommittee, which exhaustively explored the problem with testimony from doctors, judges, social workers, and police officials.

It seems agreed that addicts who turn to crimes of violence for the means to satisfy their cravings constitute a rising factor in the crime rate. Moreover, a great deal of juvenile gang violence in our cities stems from use of the introductory drug, marihuana.

The drug habit is acquired, it is practiced in secrecy. It is not invested with a long, convivial tradition as is the use of alcoholic beverages. Addicts become slaves dangerous to society. The way to deal with addiction is to choke off the supply. This bill looks to that end. Ohio already has a suitably stern measure on its statute books.

[From the Decatur (Ill.) Herald of May 3, 1956]

OPEN WAR TO THE DEATH AGAINST NARCOTICS TRAFFIC

New narcotics legislation written by a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee that has been been investigating enforcement of the present narcotics laws, really declares war on the drug traffic in this country.

The bill would outlaw the sale of heroin, even for medicinal purposes. Penalties for the sale of heroin range all the way up to capital punishment for selling the drug to a minor, or for a third conviction on a charge of selling heroin to an adult.

The imposition of the death penalty would not be mandatory, but would be left to the discretion of the jury.

That new provision of the death penalty may reflect a change of heart on the part of lawmakers, if not of sociologists and penologists. Various States have abolished capital punishment as barbaric and unnecessary. But when vicious crimes multiply, the pos-

sibility that the death penalty could serve as a deterrent is worth sober thought.

Narcotics kill as surely as a pistol bullet or switch-blade knife. But before the dope addict dies he suffers misery and degradation unknown to the quick victim of a murderer's gun. The dope peddler who gives the first dose of drugs to a human being deserves whatever punishment is available under the law.

When the English Government forbade the sale of heroin under any circumstances there was protest, even from the medical profession, which argued there was no substitute for the drug for medical use.

Chairman DANIEL, of the Senate subcommittee which wrote the new legislation, states flatly that heroin "has no medical use which cannot be served better by other drugs."

Any loophole is dangerous and while the medical profession is on the whole ethical and devoted to the ancient ideals, there are individuals in the profession who take selfish advantage and cannot be trusted.

The new Senate bill tightens enforcement procedures all along the line. It would permit the tapping of telephones of suspected dope peddlers, and would allow Customs and Narcotic Bureau employees to carry firearms. Agents would be authorized to make arrests without warrants for law violations committed in their presence.

If those provisions seem unusual, it must be remembered that the drug traffickers are ruthless and stop at nothing.

Necessary to the success of the open war against narcotics is a campaign of education to acquaint the innocent and the sheltered with the real proportions of the public danger. Paperback novels and movies have not made the point plain enough.

[From the Pensacola (Fla.) Journal of May 4, 1956]

DRASTIC DRUG PENALTY DUE

Once again a recommendation has been made that the death penalty be invoked for narcotics peddlers. A special Senate Judiciary Subcommittee, meeting in Washington, called for the death penalty in introducing a bill to "declare war" on the illicit drug traffic.

Chairman DANIEL (Democrat, Texas) announced introduction of the measure with unanimous backing of his group, which has been investigating narcotics law enforcement. The bill would outlaw the use of heroin even for medicinal purposes and provide penalties ranging from 10 years in prison to death for the sale of the drug to persons under the age of 18. Extreme sentences would be left to the discretion of juries.

In view of the continuing traffic in narcotics, stern measures undoubtedly must be taken and certainly the punishment for destroying the mind and moral fiber of a human should be as great as for destroying physical life. In fact, the former is by far the greater crime.

[From the San Francisco Examiner of January 13, 1956]

PUSHER'S PENALTY

Declaring itself "shocked at the extent and far-reaching effects of the illicit-drug traffic," a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee has recommended the death penalty for "unregenerate" dope peddlers.

"Peddlers are selling murder, robbery, and rape, and should be dealt with accordingly. Their offense * * * in truth and in fact is murder on the installment plan," the subcommittee concluded.

The Hearst newspapers have been saying the same thing editorially for years.

Recent disclosures of a dope smuggler's "haven and heaven" at Los Angeles Harbor, of rising importation of narcotics across the Mexican border, of totally inadequate numbers of enforcement officers at all points, and of the comparative lenience of existing laws add weight to the subcommittee's statement.

Death for repeated dope peddling is opposed by some well-meaning humanitarians and penologists.

They contend that it would prove no deterrent at all.

Against that view we have cited the dramatic drop in kidnaping cases since that crime was made a capital offense.

The formality itself of making dope peddling a capital offense may not at once impress the vile and mercenary salesman of "murder on the installment plan."

The mere enactment of the Lindbergh law did not drive kidnapers immediately out of business.

But when the first convictions and executions followed, when death did become the last reckoning, kidnaping dropped to virtual rarity.

So would dope peddling after the first few persistent peddlers of the white death have been dealt the same treatment.

The Senate subcommittee is to be commended for a realistic and urgently needed recommendation.

It deserves strong support in both Congress and the State legislatures.

[From the Lawrence (Mass.) Tribune of May 3, 1956]

CURRENT COMMENT

For the dope peddlers, death. The peddler of dope, particularly the one who plies his trade among minors, is the most evil figure in the drug traffic and any effort to control the traffic must be directed primarily at him.

A special Senate Judiciary Subcommittee which has been investigating narcotics law enforcement has come up with a practical recommendation in the form of stiffened penalties for convicted drug sellers.

A bill introduced in the Senate with the unanimous support of the subcommittee members would provide penalties ranging from 10 years in prison to death for sale of heroin to persons under 18. Death sentences would be left to the discretion of juries. On sale to adults, penalties would range from 5 to 10 years in prison for a first offense; 10 to 30 years for a second offense; and either a life term or execution at the jury's discretion for a third conviction. Sale and use of heroin would be outlawed absolutely.

These are severe penalties, because it has been proved that only the most severe can be of any use in deterring dope peddlers from pushing their vicious but profitable trade.

The peddlers are not frightened by the possibility of fines or even a few years in jail. But the prospect of the electric chair is something else again. It should make them think twice before risking their lives by the sale of drugs, no matter what the profit. (Philadelphia Inquirer)

[From the Beaver Falls (Pa.) News-Tribune of May 10, 1956]

THE NARCOTIC CRACKDOWN

A Senate Judiciary Subcommittee recently recommended a crackdown on violators of Federal narcotics laws. Federal agents in cooperation with local police taking the cue immediately went to work and just last week staged one of the biggest narcotic raids staged in years. Pittsburgh district was a focal point in a nationwide drive.

A bill has been submitted to Congress after thorough study of dope peddling and addiction in the United States, in which stiffer penalties are now asked than the present law provides.

The measure would permit juries to mete out life prison terms or the death sentence for a third conviction of selling heroin or smuggling it into the country. It would make the death sentence possible for those convicted of selling dope to children. The subcommittee also wants to broaden the investigative powers of the Federal Customs Bureau and Narcotics Bureau to make apprehension of dope peddlers more certain.

The need for tougher laws and stricter enforcement against the devilish crime that leads to dope addiction has been apparent for a long time. The subcommittee recommendations, based on evidence gathered in extensive hearings, merit the most serious consideration.

Strong laws and vigorous enforcement are not the whole answer to the dope problem, however. There is a deadly chain—from the smuggler to the peddler to the often innocent victim who may in turn become a thief or peddler—that must be broken. Homes, schools and churches can do much to help break the chain. They can do their part by showing children and young people the terrible consequences of addiction.

There is no place in modern society for the dope peddler. Once apprehended and convicted he should be meted the limit the law allows. Our courts too often in some of these cases, are swayed by political pressure, for there are many in the narcotics game, that are active in political machines for the security they often provide. Any court that permits a dope peddler "to get off easy" is as guilty as the offender, in this nefarious business.

[From the Texarkana (Tex.) News of May 12, 1956]

CRACKING DOWN ON DOPE

At long last a no-holds-barred bill has been put forward in the Senate to curb the frightening narcotic addiction that has spread across the country, particularly among young people.

Sponsored by a special subcommittee, the legislation was introduced by its chairman, Senator PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas. The bill's sharpest edge is a provision which calls for the death penalty, at the discretion of a jury, for those who sell heroin to persons under age 18.

DANIEL has indicated there will be similar legislation from the House of Representatives, and he expects action on the bill to be taken during this session.

That will hardly be soon enough. Every day that addicts and dope peddlers roam the streets the well-being of our communities is in danger. For all forms of crime have been proven to be tied in with narcotics. And often it's the kiss of death.

The Daniel proposal follows nearly a year of nationwide hearings which made it brutally clear that there was no time to waste in cracking down.

The bill would completely outlaw heroin in the United States on the grounds that it is the "worst and most prevalent drug sold on the illicit market, and it has no medical use which cannot be served by other drugs."

Other important provisions include:

Permission to wiretap telephone calls between narcotic traffickers when authorized by a Federal court.

Penalties for the smuggling and sale of heroin ranging from 5 to 10 years for first offenders up to life imprisonment or the death penalty for third offenders.

This is one piece of legislation to which Congress might well give immediate attention. The penalties may be stiff. But they are nowhere near as stiff as the life-wrecking jolt of a narcotic needle.

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Union of May 8, 1956]

DEATH FOR DOPE

Congress has before it a measure setting penalties for dope peddling in this country which it ought to pass without delay. The bill has been authored by a Senate Judiciary

Subcommittee headed by PRICE DANIEL (Democrat, Texas), and it has been approved by the committee for submission to both Houses of Congress.

CONGRESS SHOULD PASS MEASURE

It completely outlaws heroin, for which there is no medical use; it authorizes penalties up to death for dope peddling; steps up narcotics penalties all along the line.

This is no doubt very drastic legislation. But peddling dope, particularly to school youngsters, is a very fiendish crime. The only way to deal with it effectively is to put the penalty at the limit.

[From the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item of May 7, 1956]

PENALTIES FOR DOPE PEDDLERS

Legislators have the opportunity to act effectively against narcotics peddlers at this session of the Congress.

A Senate committee has presented a bill which stiffens penalties for dope peddlers, with life imprisonment or death provided for third offenders.

Chairman DANIEL (Democrat, Texas), of the committee, accompanied filing of the bill with the declaration that open warfare should be waged against the narcotics traffic.

It has been the stand of this newspaper for years that nothing short of death for persons selling narcotics to youth will halt the illegal sale of deadly drugs to the young.

The record is long which tells about the destruction of our boys and girls who are turned into addicts through the operations of narcotics peddlers.

Many of these young people become vicious criminals, forced deeper and deeper into law violations by the need for money with which to buy dope to satisfy their cravings. They turn from minor thefts to holdups and murders.

The executed destroyers of young lives never return to their peddling.

[From the Kenosha (Wis.) News of May 7, 1956]

THE DEADLY CHAIN

In recent years there have been numerous instances where dope has injected a violent note into the Kenosha crime picture. The result has been a hardening of thought here that there should be stiffer penalties on violators of Federal narcotics laws.

Such a crackdown has now been recommended by a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee. In a bill, submitted after a thorough study of dope peddling and addiction, the subcommittee asks for much tougher penalties than the law now provides.

The measure would permit juries to mete out life prison terms or the death sentence for a third conviction of selling heroin or smuggling it into the country. It would make the death sentence possible for those convicted of selling dope to children. The subcommittee also wants to broaden the investigative powers of the Federal Customs Bureau and Narcotics Bureau to make apprehension of dope peddlers more certain.

The need for such legislation against the devilish crime that leads to dope addiction has been apparent for a long time. The subcommittee recommendations merit the most serious consideration.

Strong laws and vigorous enforcement are not the whole answer to the dope problem, however. There is a deadly chain—from the smuggler to the peddler to the often innocent victim who may in turn become a thief or a peddler—that must be broken. Homes, schools, and churches can do much to help break the chain. They can do their part by showing children and young people the terrible consequences of addiction.

Meanwhile, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee bill, or one much like it, should be quickly passed.

[From the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator of May 8, 1956]

HITTING THE NARCOTICS RACKET

The mass raids which jailed 135 narcotics peddlers in half a dozen cities, including Youngstown, were the most effective kind of law enforcement in this field.

The ordinary kind of activity, picking up a pusher here or there from time to time, is necessary to keep pressure on this repulsive racket. Yet it makes only small gaps in the dope-distributing machine and these are rapidly filled. Also it usually catches only the little fellows while the brains escape.

The weekend raids followed 6 months of dangerous undercover work by Pittsburgh policemen. They traced the dirty business to other cities, finally reached the source of supply. The multiple arrests wrecked the whole machine at one blow and caught some of the big fish.

A new attack on narcotics appears in drastic legislation approved by a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee under Chairman DANIEL, of Texas. It would provide the death penalty for a third offense in smuggling or peddling heroin, although the jury could extend mercy as in murder cases. If this were done, life imprisonment would be mandatory.

Heavy sentences would be provided for first and second offsenses. Also the bill would allow wiretapping to get evidence, liberalize search-and-seizure procedures, and in other ways give officers more effective weapons.

No penalty contained in civilized law would be undeserved in the case of narcotics racketeers. Their evil work not only condemns the victim to misery and degradation but also goads him to the most violent kind of crime. Yet there is a law of diminishing returns in respect to drastic punishments; they can be set so high that in practice they are virtually unenforceable.

The Senate will need to keep this principle in mind, and also take care that in making it easier to catch dope peddlers the law does not deprive innocent men of their rights. Constructive measures are needed, as in providing treatment for addicts. These qualifications are necessary to give the law maximum efficiency, but the Daniel bill provides a useful basis of discussion for which the country can be grateful.

[From the Lancaster (Pa.) New Era of May 3, 1956]

OUR IDEAS: DEATH FOR DOPE PEDDLERS

Stamping out the traffic in narcotics is not an easy matter because the rewards to the peddlers are great and the penalties, if and when they are caught, are not relatively severe.

A fine or even a couple of years in jail have not deterred the sellers.

Now the Senate has before it a bill which would drastically step up these penalties. It is the work of a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee which spent considerable time studying the narcotic racket in this country. It concluded stiff steps were necessary.

The bill provides penalties up to death (at the discretion of the jury) in the case of a peddler who sells heroin to persons under the age of 18. Other penalties range up to 30 years for second offenders and a jury could give life to third offenders no matter who they sell to.

These penalties are not a bit too severe. The dope traffic must be stamped out. Introducing a youngster to the dope habit is, in a very real sense, equivalent in many cases to condemning them to a slow, torturous death.

What the Senate committee learned convinced it that only the heaviest penalties can be expected to cope with the traffic.

[From the Dothan (Ala.) Eagle of May 3, 1956]

MAKING THE PENALTY MATCH THE CRIME

A Senate subcommittee directed by Senator PRICE DANIEL, of Texas, has completed a long and exhaustive study of the drug traffic in the United States. More than being appalled at what it has found, it has brought forth recommendations that it believes will go a long way in remedying a shocking situation.

Getting at the root of an evil that is wrecking lives and leading addicts into crime, it proposes drying up the source of supply for narcotics users. And it suggests the drying up be accomplished two ways, first, by placing an absolute ban on heroin—even for medical purposes—and second, imposing stiffer penalties on dope sellers.

For stiffer penalties, it proposes capital punishment for peddlers convicted of a third offense—either life imprisonment or death. Already there are cries that such a penalty is excessive. But, is it? No one is compelled to sell dope, and certainly not to continue in business until a third conviction.

The peddler who persists in the racket is in it for gain and such a criminal who wrecks lives deserves no more leniency than the murderer. For sheer viciousness there is scant distinction between the two.

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of May 2, 1956]

BILL AGAINST DOPE

After lengthy and exhaustive hearings, a special Judiciary Subcommittee of the United States Senate has introduced a bill that calls for stronger penalties against dope peddlers.

The measure accurately reflects a strong trend of public opinion.

Its principal provisions are:

Outlawing of heroin even for medicinal purposes; giving juries the option of decreeing the death penalty in aggravated cases of narcotics sales to persons under 18; increasing prison sentences to a maximum of life for third-time offenders.

Of special interest in view of the intense controversy over the Cahan decision in California, is a provision permitting police wiretapping in narcotics cases.

Altogether, the bill deserves close attention and strong support in the Senate.

Giving jurors the option of imposing the death penalty merely affirms a precedent set by the Lindbergh kidnaping law.

Before death penalties were permitted for kidnaping, the country suffered an epidemic of that crime.

But it decreased to the point of extinction after the first few convictions and executions for that offense.

Why should dope peddlers, who are merchants of gradual murder, remain immune from the same effective remedy?

Why should their sordid traffic, which poisons communities and ruins lives, be exempt from reckonings deemed just for killers and kidnapers?

The Senate subcommittee evidently thinks it should not.

So do folks who realize the squalid horror, degragation, and vice which are the inseparable companions of dope addiction.

Many victims of the narcotics traffic take the same view—the most eloquent testimony of all.

The issue is clear: Either we move sternly to crush the evil, or continue to let dope peddling remain profitable in spite of present laws against it.

That is the point for the Senate to ponder.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 1, 1956]

FOR DOPE PEDDLERS: DEATH

The peddler of dope, particularly the one who plies his trade among minors, is the

most evil figure in the drug traffic and any effort to control the traffic must be directed primarily at him.

A special Senate Judiciary Subcommittee which has been investigating narcotics law enforcement has come up with a practical recommendation in the form of stiffened penalties for convicted drug sellers.

A bill introduced in the Senate with the unanimous support of the subcommittee members would provide penalties ranging from 10 years in prison to death for sale of heroin to persons under age 18. Death sentences would be left to the discretion of juries. On sale to adults, penalties would range from 5 to 10 years in prison for a first offense; 10 to 30 years for a second offense; and either a life term or execution at the jury's discretion for a third conviction. Sale and use of heroin would be outlawed absolutely.

These are severe penalties, because it has been proved that only the most severe can be of any use in deterring dope peddlers from pushing their vicious but profitable trade.

The peddlers are not frightened by the possibility of fines or even a few years in jail. But the prospect of the electric chair is something else again. It should make them think twice before risking their lives by the sale of drugs, no matter what the profit.

[From the San Francisco News of May 1, 1956]

SHOW THEM NO MERCY

The narcotics situation seems to be better than it was a few years ago. But the amount of addiction and the extent of the illegal drug traffic still is serious, both in the toll of wrecked lives and in its relation to other crime. Moreover, while some States and cities have awakened to the menace and done much to eliminate it, others remain complacent.

The Senate subcommittee headed by Senator DANIEL (Democrat, Texas), has made an exhaustive study of the illicit drug traffic and has concluded that harsher penalties, combined with an absolute ban on heroin even for medical purposes, is the only answer.

It would be hard to disagree with its findings.

Life imprisonment or death for the third offense of drug peddling may seem rather severe. But the pusher who persists at his trade of corrupting and wrecking innocent lives is a criminal of the most vicious sort, and deserves no mercy. Nor would we oppose the optional death penalty the Senators recommend for even the first offense of selling heroin to children under 18.

It may not be possible to stamp out the illicit drug traffic entirely. But tougher prison terms and an occasional hanging should discourage it considerably.

[From the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item of February 9, 1956]

DEATH FOR DOPE PEDDLERS BADLY NEEDED

Two reports have been made recently regarding the stand the Congress should take toward narcotics users and peddlers.

A Senate Judiciary Subcommittee several weeks ago recommended that laws be passed providing the death penalty for smugglers and peddlers of heroin in extreme cases.

President Eisenhower 14 months ago named a committee of 5 of his Cabinet members to investigate the narcotics traffic and offer suggestions.

This committee agrees that stiffer penalties are needed. But it also points to the need for more Federal agents to run down the offenders and for greater coordination between State and Federal narcotics officers.

The question of narcotics has posed a problem for years. It has taken a long time for officials to come to the conclusion that penalties now prevailing are too weak to cope with the illegal business.

As the President's board reported, "The existence of one addict is one addict too many."

True as this is, the greatest concern is that the youths of our country are being offered narcotics.

They are encouraged to the point where they become slaves to the habit and lose their sense of decency and morality.

Once they are addicts they follow the beaten path which leads to crime to get money with which to keep themselves supplied with dope. Under the influence of narcotics they often become killers.

In any event an addict becomes a lost individual, of no value to himself or to others.

Nothing short of the death penalty should be provided for those who peddle narcotics. The peddlers are the ones who sow the seeds for lost lives, contribute to the destruction of society and create murderers to sacrifice the innocent.

If enough of these persons were taken into custody and executed the example should have a sobering effect even on the hardened merchants of dope.

The sordid business they promote is too horrible to be dealt with in a delicate way. Society should assert itself through its laws to protect its young men and women from the cruel course to which narcotics addiction leads.

[From the Shreveport (La.) Times of January 22, 1956]

DEATH PENALTY NEEDED FOR NARCOTICS SELLERS

Nine-tenths of the illegal narcotics traffic in this country is concentrated in 42 cities. A Senate subcommittee which conducted hearings in 13 cities estimated that each month sees a thousand new chronic narcotics addicts in the United States.

Senator PRICE DANIEL, of Texas, chairman of the subcommittee, said the group favors the death penalty for narcotics peddlers.

Why not? The all-too-familiar pretense that these sellers of "dope" which destroys character and health are just wayward persons in the same class as shoplifters and Peeping Toms ought to be blasted out of existence.

What the American public wants and needs is a deterrent which will stop the illicit sale of narcotics. Legislative bodies have, for the most part, merely dilly-dallied with the subject. They definitely have not curbed the rise of the "dope" evil.

Merciless punishment should receive a test. Let those who fall back in horror at the mention of the death penalty explain just how far short of death is the fate meted out to users by these narcotics sellers.

The subcommittee knows the facts and has recommended a penalty which fits the crime. Louisiana's Legislature, meeting in May, may wish to be the first to take a real step toward saving the young people of America from the rising tide of "dope" addiction.

[From the Austin (Tex.) Statesman of January 20, 1956]

CHAIR HELD JUSTIFIED

Senator PRICE DANIEL reports that the traffic in illicit drugs has trebled since the end of World War II. Conducting hearings in various areas that are doors to the smuggling of drugs from the Orient and even processors in Europe, he concludes that drug addiction is responsible for nearly 50 percent of all crime in the Nation's major cities, and for at least 25 percent of all crime reported in the entire country.

Senator DANIEL and his subcommittee strongly urge the negotiation of a treaty with Mexico for concerted action against the drug traffic flowing across the border. He says that 90 percent of the overland smuggling of heroin and marihuana comes from across the Mexican border into Texas, California, and Arizona.

The Senator will get a great deal of support from all over the country for advocating that the death penalty be applied in extreme cases to peddlers of heroin.

The narcotics conspiracy is without conscience. It is not concerned that these drugs destroy body and soul. It is only concerned with bleeding addicts of every dime they can get hold of for the profit of the overlords.

Society and the law have been too long indulgent of the top and lesser kingpins in this vicious traffic. Other means having failed, the death house can accomplish two purposes. It can remove the notorious brains of the conspiracy, and by that action serve as a lasting lesson to others not to get involved.

[From the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen-Patriot of January 16, 1956]

DEATH PENALTY NEEDED

Senator DANIEL'S suggestion that more severe penalties be provided under the law for persons convicted of dope peddling should have strong support in the Congress.

The Texas Democrat's proposal that the death sentence be provided in extreme cases of heroin smuggling does not appear to be out of line.

Senator DANIEL framed his recommendation after an invesigation by his subcommittee of the illegal drug traffic in 11 cities. What he saw and heard during the hearings undoubtedly convinced Senator DANIEL that the present antinarcotics laws are not stern enough.

Persons who are in the enforcement end of the never-ending war against dope reached that conclusion long ago. They have been saying that they need rigid laws and judges who will impose stiff sentences on smugglers and pushers in order to stamp out the traffic in "living death."

The public has only a vague notion of the extent of the drug traffic and the problems faced by enforcement officers. Public interest in the matter seldom reaches the point where there is irresistible pressure on Congress to revise and strengthen the laws.

Senator DANIEL and his subcommittee members have seen enough to prompt them to recommend drastic changes in the law. If they get the proper support from the people and from fellow Members of Congress, a bad situation may be remedied.

The subcommittee's findings that 50 percent of all crimes in major cities and 25 percent of all those reported in the Nation have their origin in the dope traffic appear to be the compelling argument for the use of drastic measures—even including the death penalty. They should convince the public and Congress.

[From the Beaumont (Tex.) Journal of January 17, 1956]

DEADLY DRUG ADDICTION

Drug addiction, says Senator PRICE DANIEL, who is chairman of the Senate subcommittee investigating narcotics, is "death on the installment plan."

This is strong language, but it suits the subject. Flowery terms would be out of place in reference to the insidious drug, the addiction to which the committee finds is responsible for half the crimes committed in our large cities. It is the kind of language needed to describe the chairman's feeling when his group discovered that the United States has more drug addicts in proportion to population than any other country in the Western World.

Although the addict in most cases deserves pity, no sympathy is due the peddler who is responsible for his addiction and who preys upon weaker members of our adult society and high-school students alike.

For the degenerate dope pusher, the shadowy character who solicits the down-payment on the installment plan for death, the committee has wisely asked for the extreme penalty in extreme cases. In the face of the group's startling findings and what they mean for the future, unless checked, the investigators are not asking too much.

Frequent overdoses of their own medicine is a sensible procedure in curing this country of the evil disease they are spreading.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Journal of January 11, 1956]

CRIMES WORSE THAN MURDER

Is the ruining of men's lives less evil than murder?

This is a question raised by the Senate Narcotic Subcommittee in its recommendation of stiffer penalties for all dope smugglers and peddlers, including the death penalty for extreme cases of heroin smuggling.

The subcommittee, headed by Senator PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas, makes this excellent statement:

"Heroin smugglers and peddlers are selling murder, robbery, and rape, and should be dealt with accordingly. Their offense is human destruction as surely as that of the murderer. In truth and in fact, it is murder on the installment plan."

The report calls for the death penalty in such extreme cases as that of "the man who started 40 high-school students on heroin in San Antonio, Tex."

While justice is not often swift and sure, in most States we say that the man who deliberately plans and carriers out the killing of another man ought to forfeit his own life.

Then what about the one who, for profit, deliberately lays the foundation for the ruination of many lives and the probably violent ending of others? In the whole realm of human behavior is there a more reprehensible crime?

We agree heartily with the subcommittee's recommendations for stiffer penalties in all narcotic cases—even so far as death for the vilest of these criminals.

[From the Boston American of January 12, 1956]

SENATE COMMITTEE'S VIEWS ON DRUGS

Declaring itself "shocked at the extent and reaching effects of the illicit drug traffic," a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee has recommended the death penalty for unregenerate dope peddlers.

"Peddlers are selling murder, robbery, and rape, and should be dealt with accordingly. Their offense * * * in truth and in fact is murder on the installment plan," the subcommittee concluded.

The Hearst newspapers have been saying the same thing editorially for years.

Recent disclosures of a dope smuggler's haven and heaven at Los Angeles Harbor; of rising importation of narcotics across the Mexican border; of totally inadequate numbers of enforcement officers at all points, and of the comparative lenience of existing laws, add weight to the subcommittee's statement.

Death for repeated dope peddling is opposed by some well-meaning humanitarians and penologists.

They contend that it would prove no deterrent at all.

Against that view we have cited the dramatic drop in kidnaping cases since that crime was made a capital offense.

The formality itself of making dope peddling a capital offense may not at once impress the vile and mercenary salesman of murder on the installment plan.

The mere enactment of the Lindbergh law did not drive kidnapers immediately out of business.

But when the first convictions and executions followed, when death did become the last reckoning, kidnaping dropped to virtual rarity.

So would dope peddling after the first few persistent peddlers of the white death have been dealt the same treatment.

The Senate subcommittee is to be commended for a realistic and urgently needed recommendation.

It deserves strong support in both Congress and the State legislatures.

[From the Mobile (Ala.) Press of January 11, 1956]

NEW NARCOTICS LAWS

We hope the judiciary subcommittee means business in its current call for the death penalty for unregenerate heroin peddlers.

Such a law has been long needed. If it had been in existence, perhaps this Nation would not now have more drug addicts than all the other western countries combined. Latest figures indicate the United States has 60,000 addicts, of which 13 percent are under 21 years of age.

The Senate subcommittee recommended stiffer penalties for all narcotics smugglers and peddlers, particularly those who sell to minors. It charged that heroin dealers are dealing in "murder on the installment plan."

"Heroin smugglers and peddlers," said the subcommittee, "are selling murder, robbery, and rape, and should be dealt with accordingly. Their offense is human destruction as surely as that of the murderer. In truth and in fact, it is 'murder on the installment plan'."

It is also gratifying to note that the committee favors increasing the Federal narcotics enforcement personnel and giving agents the right to tap telephone lines of "big-time" narcotics traffickers.

Not only will tighter laws on these objectionable rackets save many young people from addiction; they will also strengthen our defense against Red China's efforts to increase her subversive activity by making heroin available to American servicemen.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND ORDER FOR RECESS TO 10 A. M. ON MONDAY

During the delivery of Mr. DANIEL'S speech,

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is the intention of the leadership to call up the road bill on Monday. We already have an agreement to meet early on that day. We hope we can discuss the bill on Monday, beginning at 10 o'clock, and run through the day until a late hour in the evening, perhaps 7 or 8 or 9 o'clock; then meet again at 10 o'clock a. m. on Tuesday, with the thought that we may be able to vote on and dispose of the road bill late Tuesday evening, if necessary by having a night session on Tuesday. If we are able to get through with the road bill on Tuesday, we will have a holiday on Wednesday, Memorial Day; we will not meet on Wednesday, but go over until Thursday. On Thursday and Friday we hope to have 3 or 4 appropriation bills ready for action by the Senate.

The social-security bill has been ordered reported by the Committee on Finance, and we hope to take that bill up on the following Monday.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator from Delaware give me a reason for objecting to moving that the Senate meet early on Monday?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I believe we can adjourn a little later today; we have a few important bills which should be considered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator wishes to blackmail the leadership, he does not have to do it in that way. All he has to do is say he does not want a bill brought up. There is only one bill that would be called up, and that is the bill on which two Republican Senators argued the other day. If the Senator from Delaware does not wish to argue the merits of the bill today——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no objection to bringing it up. I think it should be brought up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then can we not have an agreement that the Senate will meet at a certain time on Monday?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The point is that when the bill is taken up there will be a vote had on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No vote will be taken. The Senator from Texas has more consideration for his colleagues, even on the minority side, than to try to blackmail them into returning to the Chamber late Friday evening, when they have already made other arrangements. The Senator from Texas is not going to take up any bill that will require any yea-and-nay votes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I still object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator still objects?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. He objects to setting a convenient time for meeting on Monday morning?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no objection to that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas will assure the Senator from Delaware that if he wants a quorum call or a yea-and-nay vote on the bill in which he is interested, it will be brought up at a later time, when it will suit the Senator's convenience.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want the bill brought up this afternoon, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas is not going to bring up the bill if the Senator from Delaware wants a yea-and-nay vote on it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I believe we have already notified Senators that we would have a yea-and-nay vote on the bill this afternoon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; we have not. The leadership will not bring up any bill that will require a yea-and-nay vote after the pending business is disposed of. The Senator from Texas can assure the Senator from Delaware that there will be no rollcalls. If the Senator from Delaware insists, the Senator from Texas will move to recess the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. For the moment I will object, and I shall discuss the matter further with the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Very well; but I hope that we will not have too much said about a do-nothing Congress. We spent a good deal of time yesterday waiting for speakers on the minority side. During the rest of the year it may be that we will hear a great deal said about a do-nothing Congress. If so, I want the RECORD to show who will be responsible for it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until Monday at 10 o'clock a. m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there are some differences between our colleagues on the minority side of the aisle. It may be that at some time we shall have differences on this side. I am glad that we do not have them today. But because of the differences, the leadership is not going to call upon the Members of the Senate to return to the Chamber late in the evening to settle differences between minority Members. So, Mr. President, when we conclude consideration of the bill which is now before the Senate, it is the intention of the leadership to make the public-roads bill the unfinished business and try to secure action on it by next Tuesday evening. Wednesday will be a holiday, if we conclude our business, and on Thursday and Friday we will consider appropriation bills. In the event we are able to sandwich in the Great Lakes bulk-cargo-vessels bill, which has caused so much difference of opinion, it may be taken up on Thursday or perhaps early on Friday. But there will be no vote on it today.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Texas. I know that as majority leader he has been trying to schedule this measure for the past 2 weeks. I wish to thank the Senator for his efforts to schedule the proposed legislation for Senate consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would be glad, if it were possible, to schedule it this afternoon, but the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] wants to have a quorum call and a yea and nay vote. That is a privilege which he has a right to exercise, if he can get 10 other Senators to agree with him. I have no doubt there would be 10 who would agree with him. But it is not the intention of the leadership to embarrass Senators who have made engagements for this afternoon. If we should have a rollcall this afternoon, it would embarrass some Members. If a rollcall is not desired, and I am informed that it is not, I shall not make a motion to bring up the bill until adequate notice has been served on all Members. Certainly, not late on a Friday afternoon.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to repeat what I said to the Senator from Texas. I am not trying to delay discussion of the bill. It has been on the calendar for about 3 weeks. I told the Senator I would consent to a unanimous-consent request at any time he wishes for a limitation of debate on the bill, not exceeding 2 hours——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator has just informed me of that. If he had so informed me earlier, I would have endeavored to get unanimous consent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am perfectly willing to do so this afternoon, but I wish to point out that the Members of the Senate who are interested in this proposed legislation could have remained here as I have.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand the Senator from Delaware is very zealous about his attendance on the sessions of the Senate. But the leadership has no intention of embarrassing Members by calling a quorum late on Friday evening.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the legislative program as outlined by the distinguished majority leader last night, in which he stated that all Senators should be on notice that it will be necessary "to come in early and stay in session late from now on, in order to get all our bills passed."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas did not put any Senator on notice that the Senator from Delaware was going to insist on a quorum call or a yea-and-nay vote, because had I had such notice, I would not have scheduled the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know about a yea-and-nay vote, but certainly bills are not passed by the Senate without a vote of some description, and a bill is not supposed to be passed with the votes of only 3 or 4 Members on the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No one is attempting to pass a bill with 3 or 4 Members on the floor; but the Senator from Texas does not propose to have a quorum call and a yea-and-nay vote late on Friday afternoon, because the Senator from Delaware did not give notice that he intended to ask for a quorum call and a yea-and-nay vote. If he had, the bill would not have been scheduled for action today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[May 24, 1956]

LEGISLATVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, after the Senate concludes consideration of the State, Justice, and Judiciary appropriation bill, we may consider Calendar No. 1896, Senate bill 3108, to encourage the construction of modern Great Lakes bulk cargo vessels; Calendar No. 1975, S. 746, to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands, including Indian tribal lands, acquired in connection with the Garrison Dam project of mineral interests in such lands; and Calendar No. 2014, S. 3760, to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other related purposes.

It is expected that tomorrow the road bill will be reported to the Senate by the Committee on Finance. I should like to have all Senators on notice that we will consider the road bill on Monday, and that we hope to conclude its consideration on Tuesday.

If that can be done, we will have a holiday on Memorial Day, Wednesday, next week. On Thursday and Friday of next week we expect to consider 3 or 4 appropriation bills, together with any other bills that may be ready for action by the Senate. The Senate will also consider the social security bill.

I want all Senators to be on notice that we will have to come in early and stay in session late from now on, in order to get all our bills passed.

CONTROL OF NARCOTIC DRUGS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3760) to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other related purposes.

During the delivery of Mr. DANIEL'S speech,

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas be willing to yield further, to enable me to make a brief statement, with the understanding that my remarks will follow the remarks of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. DANIEL. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for that purpose to the Senator from Maine without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that the Nation as a whole should be eternally grateful to the junior Senator from Texas, the members of his subcommittee, and the members of his staff for the outstanding work which has been done in connection with this menacing problem which confronts the people of the Nation. No person could ever have accomplished what the junior Senator from Texas has accomplished, were it not for the painstaking work, the long hours, and the arduous effort which was put forth, and the visits to the very centers of the Nation where this particular situation is indeed prevalent.

The people of America should realize that this is the first real, concerted effort in the direction of solving the narcotics problem which has been undertaken for many years. Certainly it will give Harry Anslinger, of the Bureau of Narcotics, and the devoted servants of the law throughout the country, particularly in the Federal Bureau, the first chance which they have really had to put the fear of God into the hearts of those who deal in this type of traffic, which has led to the downfall of so many persons throughout the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared in connection with the bill, and paying tribute to the junior Senator from Texas and the work of the committee and its staff, may be printed at this point in the RECORD, with the same understanding that it will follow the statement which is now being made by the junior Senator from Texas.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

I should like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Senator PRICE DANIEL, of Texas, for the outstanding work he has done as chairman of the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code of the Senate Committee on Judiciary in his study of the narcotics problem. The thorough and comprehensive investigation which the Daniel subcommittee has made of this pressing social problem has laid the groundwork for passage of legislation to strengthen Federal narcotic control laws. It is my privilege to be the only cosponsor of S. 3670 who is not a member of Senator DANIEL'S subcommittee.

My own interest in more effective Federal narcotics legislation dates from my service as a member of the Senate District of Columbia Committee which brought me in close contact with this problem for the first time. In my own State of Maine there are few, if any, dope addicts or peddlers. It is difficult for many people to realize the seriousness of this problem in cities like New York, Washington, and Los Angeles. All you have to do, however, is pick up one of the newspapers in those cities almost any day of the week to read some of the most sordid stories in America.

In checking into this matter, I learned that there has been an alarming increase of traffic in narcotic drugs since the end of World War II. The increased use of narcotics by teen-agers has been of greatest concern since it is closely related to the increase in juvenile delinquency. It has been no consolation to know either that Communist China is the leading source of supply of the illicit drugs being used to corrupt our young people.

The only deterrent to even greater increases in narcotic addiction has been the United States Bureau of Narcotics in the Treasury Department. The Bureau is headed by Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger who is doing an outstanding job, with the extremely limited means at his disposal, in combating this living death.

The Bureau of Narcotics is handicapped, however, by lack of funds, personnel, and authority to deal with the narcotic problem. For example, there are only about 250 narcotic agents on the Bureau's payroll to deal with this problem all over the United States. These agents have not even had statutory authority to carry firearms or make arrests without warrants.

Because importation of illicit narcotic drugs involves foreign commerce and because the sale of narcotics in the United States involves the Federal tax laws, the Federal Government has assumed a great deal of responsibility toward meeting this problem. The first regulatory Federal narcotic measure enacted in the United States was the act of February 9, 1909, which prohibited the importation and use of opium for other than medical purposes. This was followed December 17, 1914, by the Harrison narcotic law, which was a taxing measure designed to have the effect of regulating the domestic distribution of narcotic drugs. These laws have been amended and revised from time to time. In 1937 Congress passed the Marihuana Tax Act. These existing laws, however, have failed to meet the narcotic problem which has developed since World War II.

On May 6, 1954, during the 83d Congress, I introduced S. 3412, a bill to provide an increased penalty for the sale of narcotic drugs to persons under the age of 21. This bill, however, was limited to attacking only one phase of the narcotics problem. Since no action was taken on S. 3412, I gave further study to the narcotics problem during the fall of 1954 and concluded that the time had come for a comprehensive review of this subject by the Congress to determine exactly what should be done on this national social problem to strengthen the hands of the appropriate Federal and State officials with responsibility in this field. As a point of departure, I prepared an omnibus bill incorporating many of the provisions of narcotics legislation which had not been acted upon in the 83d Congress. This bill (S. J. Res. 19) was introduced in the Senate on January 14, 1955. Forty-four Senators, including Senator DANIEL joined in cosponsoring this bill. The other cosponsors were Senators BARRETT, BEALL, BIBLE, BRICKER, BRIDGES, BUSH, BUTLER, CAPEHART, CARLSON, CHAVEZ, COTTON, DIRKSEN, DOUGLAS, DUFF, EASTLAND, FLANDERS, HICKENLOOPER, IVES, JENNER, KEFAUVER, KNOWLAND, KUCHEL, LANGER, LEHMAN, MALONE, MANSFIELD, MARTIN, MCCARTHY, MCCLELLAN, MORSE, MURRAY, NEELY, PASTORE, POTTER, PURTELL, ROBERTSON, SALTONSTALL, SCOTT, SMITH (Maine), SPARKMAN, WELKER, WILLIAMS, and YOUNG.

On introducing Senate Joint Resolution 19, I stated: "It is intended that this omnibus bill serve as a starting point in reviewing the Federal narcotic laws and programs. It is recognized that the bill contains controversial features on which there can be honest disagreement. The appropriate committee will be in a position to evaluate these differences of opinion after hearings have been held on the bill."

Although I thought that it had been made absolutely clear that Senate Joint Resolution 19 was intended to serve only as a starting point to focus attention on the need for reviewing Federal narcotic legislation and programs, for a time it looked as if the whole idea of a comprehensive study might be lost because of opposition to one of the more controversial provisions of the bill—the proposed transfer of the Bureau of Narcotics from the Treasury to the Justice Department as had been recommended by the first Hoover Commission. In spite of repeated assurances from me that I had no intention of pressing for approval of this section of the bill unless there was completely overwhelming evidence developed by the appropriate committees that the transfer would clearly result in strengthening our Federal narcotics control activities, opponents of this transfer continued to oppose the entire bill because of this one provision. It is assumed that this opposition stemmed from a lack of knowledge of the legislative process rather than from opposition to strengthening our narcotics laws. In spite of this opposition, however, Senate Joint Resolution 19 did focus attention on the need for a comprehensive study of the narcotics problem, so that constructive legislation could be enacted. A series of rapid developments in the Senate kept interest alive in this subject.

Following introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 19, Senator DANIEL on February 11, 1955, introduced S. 1043, a bill containing only the penalty provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 19. Senators PASTORE, O'MAHONEY and I cosponsored S. 1043. Then on February 21, 1955, the late Senator Harley Kilgore, chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, introduced Senate Resolution 67 to authorize a full-scale study of the narcotics problem. The Senate passed Senate Resolution 67 on March 18, 1955. A subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary under the chairmanship of Senator PRICE DANIEL, of Texas, and including among its members Senators O'MAHONEY, EASTLAND, WELKER, and BUTLER was assigned the task of conducting this study. The rest is history—recorded in the hearings and reports of the Daniel subcommittee which has culminated in the legislation under consideration here in the Senate today.

The Nation owes a very real debt of gratitude to Senator DANIEL and the members and staff of his subcommittee for a job well done. I am particularly proud to have been associated in a very small way with this enterprise. Many of the provisions of S. 3760 were included in Senate Joint Resolution 19, which was one of the ancestors of S. 3760. Senate approval of S. 3760 this afternoon will go far to strengthen our narcotics control program. I am happy, indeed, to support its enactment.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Maine for his kind words concerning the work of our subcommittee, of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the members of our staff.

We appreciate the trailblazing which the Senator from Maine did on this problem, and also his continued cooperation with us. He is a coauthor of the bill which is now before the Senate.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I desire to commend the Senator from Texas for his leadership in bringing the narcotics control bill before the Senate. I think he has performed a great service in bringing before the Senate a bill which will make it possible to place this great menace under control.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, at the outset of my remarks on the proposed Narcotics Control Act of 1956, I wish to pay tribute to the distinguished junior Senator from Texas, and to the members of his subcommittee. They have performed an outstanding service in focusing public attention upon the very real and very grave dangers which we face from the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs. It must be quickly brought under control. It is my firm belief that the magnitude of the fight to control the illegal traffic in narcotic drugs cannot be emphasized too much. But neither can we afford to overlook the equally important task of rehabilitating drug addicts to useful and productive citizenship. For their effective efforts to bring the seriousness of the danger out into the light, Senator DANIEL and his colleagues are greatly to be commended.

But, Mr. President, I have misgivings with respect to some provisions of the measure now before us. I do not profess to be an expert in this subject. I am a layman in this field and can only speak as such. But as a public official my duties have brought to my attention much information from knowledgeable people, of whose work with drug addicts I know and respect. And it is on the basis of the facts brought to light by these experts that I question in part the approach which S. 3760 takes to the problem of the control of the dope problem.

As I said on the floor of the Senate on April 19, 1956, what is needed is a "measure which will effectively control the narcotic drug traffic and aid those unfortunate individuals who have become drug addicts." In my opinion, S. 3760, as reported, fails to meet at least part of these objectives.

S. 3760 is a police measure. That is not enough. Its sights are set primarily on the apprehension and sentencing of the men and women who are engaged in the illegal traffic in narcotic drugs. I realize of course that improved enforcement measures to prevent illicit drugs

from being smuggled into and sold in the United States must be devised. But this bill does not speak of or deal at all with the treatment of those unfortunate souls who have become so enslaved by this vicious habit that they will go to any lengths to obtain their daily supply. S. 3760 contains no provisions which would call for the establishment of new and greatly increased facilities and services for the rehabilitation of the drug addicts themselves.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator from New York realize that the committee divided its work, and placed in this bill, S. 3760, only the type of legislation which would be properly before the Judiciary Committee, and that the committee submitted a separate report on treatment and rehabilitation to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare? In other words, we have not undertaken to enter the jurisdiction of the committee which has to do with our Public Health Service. However, we have made separate recommendations which are in line with what the Senator has in mind in connection with treatment and rehabilitation.

We certainly agree that the enforcement provisions are only a part of the work. We hope the committee that handles public health problems will draw up legislation on that subject. However, that subject is not under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee. That is why it is not included in the pending bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. What the Senator from Texas has just stated indicates the appropriateness of the remarks I am about to make. I say that because, while I realize we must improve measures for the prevention of smuggling so far as narcotics are concerned, I believe that is only a part, and possibly only the least important part, of our problem. Our problem is to try to cure people of the terrible affliction from which they are suffering. Of course, there will always be a certain number of them, but today there are thousands upon thousands.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. The only reason why I would not agree with the Senator in his statement that treatment and rehabilitation is the more important part of the problem is that, even if successful treatment and rehabilitation could be provided, it would take care of only those who had already become addicted. It is essential to stop the peddlers and smugglers who are making addicts out of our boys and girls. I should say that the two subjects are equally important, but that they must be handled by separate bills.

Mr. LEHMAN. In my remarks I laid emphasis on the fact that police measures, in my opinion, are not sufficient. We must take steps, and as great steps as it is possible to take, to provide for the rehabilitation of the poor souls, largely young men and young women, who have been afflicted with this terrible curse.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for an observation?

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course I am glad to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I have been a member of the Narcotics Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary with the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL]. I do not know how many people appreciate the tragedies which were disclosed at many of our hearings which were held throughout the country. I know the Senator from Texas has spoken the truth to all of us, and I beg my colleagues to listen to him, and that we undertake to control this traffic, as he has advocated it be done, before it is too late. I could speak for hours on the tragic sights we saw as we sat in committee and interrogated the unfortunate people who came before us.

Mr. President, the Senator from Texas has done an outstanding job for his country, in his fight to prevent so far as possible the dreaded addiction to narcotics of which we have seen so much. I thank my friend from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I do not know whether the Senator from Idaho was on the floor when I praised the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and the suboommittee for what I think is an outstanding service. I am very glad to repeat my praise of the Senator and the subcommittee. However, I should like to say to the Senator from Idaho that I, too, although I am not an expert and do not claim to be an expert, and although I am not a member of the committees which have gone into this subject, have had a considerable amount of experience with respect to drug addicts and the problems which flow from drug addiction.

As governor of my State for 10 years there were brought to my attention many thousand—scores of thousands, possibly—applications for probation or clemency, and a great number of those cases of course related in some degree, greater or lesser, to drug addiction. Therefore I have become acquainted with the seriousness of the situation. I think there are few problems facing our country today which are of greater seriousness than the narcotic addiction problem.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from New York will yield to me for a moment so that I may thank the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] for the kind remarks he has made concerning the work of our subcommittee and its chairman. I wish to express my appreciation for the excellent part the Senator from Idaho played as a member of the subcommittee in helping us in the hearings which were held all over the United States.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, we have already tried the punitive and repressive approach. Experience has shown that that alone will not solve this tragic problem. One of the major features of the measure before the Senate today is a provision to increase the penalties for the illegal sale or purchase of heroin and marihuana. Almost 5 years ago Congress passed a similar measure. We were then told that heavy penalties would act as deterrents to those who would engage in this traffic. Now, almost 5 years later, we are told that the drug traffic is again on the increase. And what is the proposed solution with which we are presented? We are advised to raise the penalties to life imprisonment and even death for third offenses. Have we any assurance that the higher penalties will work any better than those in the present law?

I raise these questions, Mr. President, because it is my firm belief that if we are to make any progress in getting the narcotic addicts back into society we should, and we must, take a hard, realistic look at who and what the narcotic addict is and what can be done about him.

As I have stated, I am no expert on this matter; but I have read with great interest some of the materials published by the New York Academy of Medicine, and from their study of the subject they urge most strongly that what is needed is a frontal attack with a treatment approach.

In their excellent report of June 7, 1955, the New York Academy, a highly reputable organization, makes these thoughtful observations on this problem:

> "Addiction" has a large psychological as well as physical component. * * * Addicts do not constitute a homogeneous group. They vary in age, personality, constitution, environmental background, culture, their mode of becoming addicts, and the duration of their addiction, to name only a few points of difference. * * * But to speak of the aggregate of addicts as a group, it must be borne in mind that the only thing they have in common is their addiction. These variables are reflected in the record of rehabilitative measures. In addition, the present state of knowledge on effective rehabilitation must be taken into account. Under these circumstances, it is misleading to speak of cures and to set a standard of freedom of addiction for the rest of the patient's life following an adequate period of therapy.

I do not necessarily subscribe to all of the recommendations on this subject made by the New York Academy of Medicine, but I do support—and commend most strongly to the Senate's support—its recommendation that we adopt a treatment and not a punitive approach.

Mr. President, I note on page 3 of the report accompanying S. 3760 this statement:

> Less than 20 percent of the known addicts are confined, and less than 15 percent of the addicts treated at Federal hospitals remain free of drugs. It is inevitable, therefore, that this contagious problem will increase from year to year unless more effective treatment procedures and facilities are devised and unless improved and strengthened enforcement measures prevent illicit narcotic drugs from being smuggled into and sold in the United States.

The bill before the Senate, however, mentions not a word about treatment procedures and facilities. The bill deals, instead, primarily with higher sentences and police procedures. Instead of seeking ways in which addicts are to be given longer and longer prison sentences, we should be seeking ways of increasing the needed facilities and services dedicated to their rehabilitation. Instead of saying to ourselves that the addict given a prison sentence was not "rehabilitated" because the sentence was too short, maybe we should be saying to ourselves

that he became readdicted because we did not provide him with the help he needed, of a quality, and in a quantity sufficient to achieve and assure his continued rehabilitation.

The absence from this bill of any provision for increased facilities and services for the rehabilitation of drug addicts is the more remarkable in light of the statements contained in the same subcommittee's earlier report. At that time comment was made on existing treatment and rehabilitation programs conducted under the auspices of the Federal Government. The subcommittee noted that the two world-famed narcotics hospitals operated by the Public Health Service at Lexington, Ky., and Fort Worth, Tex., were inadequate and "required substantial improvements," and yet the pending bill makes no provision for their improvement.

That same subcommittee report noted that "community follow-up or rehabilitation facilities and services for the discharged addict-patient are virtually nonexistent." Once the addict is released from the hospital, he needs community follow-up. He needs help in adjusting back into the community, help in getting settled in remunerative employment in a healthy environment. The subcommittee's own report notes that lack of such community support can well nullify the efforts at the hospital to rehabilitate the addict. And yet, S. 3760 makes no mention of these needed community facilities and services.

Mr. President, I would make one further point with respect to the report accompanying S. 3760. There are reprinted in that report the reports on this bill made by the Department of Justice, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Treasury Department, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Narcotics, and the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia. But where is the report from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare? That Department includes the United States Public Health Service which, as I mentioned a moment ago, is charged with the operation of the two Federal facilities devoted to the rehabilitation of drug addicts.

Will the enactment of the bill before the Senate help or hinder the work of those hospitals? Will it increase or decrease their chances of success with narcotic patients?

I know that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare testified, but where is its report of comment on the pending bill?

There is another office in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which should also be concerned with the provisions of this bill. I refer, Mr. President, to the United States Children's Bureau. That Bureau has, for a number of years, been spearheading a national fight against juvenile delinquency. According to the subcommittee's own report, 13 percent of the addicts are less than 21 years of age. This surely must be a matter of concern to the Children's Bureau. What are their views on S. 3760? Are they in favor of its provisions? Will it aid in the fight against juvenile delinquency—or will it make more difficult the task that lies ahead?

I am certain that all Senators have noticed the recent figures released by the Children's Bureau, showing an increase of 9 percent in the number of juvenile delinquents coming before the court in the past year. This figure must be considered in the light of the fact that child population rose only 3 percent last year. It must also be considered in the light of the fact that this is the seventh consecutive year that the number of juvenile delinquents coming before the courts has risen. Will S. 3760 make the Nation's fight against this rising tide of juvenile delinquency any easier—or any harder? I believe the views of the Children's Bureau would be vital on this point.

Mr. President, we are dealing with more than a law enforcement problem. We are now dealing with how this Nation can best save these thousands of men and women who have fallen prey to these insidious drugs. The problem is largely one of treatment—not punishment. Many of those who have taken up this degrading vice are themselves innocent victims. If we can, through proper measures, secure their return to normal, healthy society, we should do so.

There is one further office in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare whose views on this proposed measure are likewise important, but are not contained in the report on the bill. I refer to the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. That agency grants funds to the various agencies of the States to provide follow-up to the men and women released from narcotic hospitals. They provide training, counseling, and follow-up. If, as the report so correctly states, "Community follow-up, or rehabilitative facilities and services for the discharged addict-patient are virtually nonexistent," why were not the views of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation sought on this measure? Will its enactment help or hinder rehabilitative efforts?

In this connection, Mr. President, I would mention one important fact. While we are here debating the question of the enactment of a bill which aims at putting addicts in jails for longer and longer terms, there is before the Congress a measure making appropriations for this same Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. Cut from the budget of that office in the House of Representatives was the sum of $1 million, which had been requested for special projects. I can think of no more useful project to which part of that appropriation could have been devote than an intensification of effort to make the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts work.

Mr. President, words of hope about needed facilities and services for the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts are not enough. Sufficient financial resources must be devoted to the task. We should avoid at any cost impeding those whose task it is to work with drug addicts and to try to get them back on the road to recovery. It is bad enough not to give these devoted men and women engaged in so humanitarian a task the tools with which to do their jobs. Let us adopt a positive approach to the problem of drug addiction. Let us try to provide for the addicts all the help they need to become once again decent, self-supporting men and women.

Mr. President, I referred a few moments ago to the fact that I was Governor of my State for a long period. I never was certain that unduly long prison sentences were the correct answer to crime, although I realized, of course, that crime should be dealt with and punished in an adequate manner. But, aside from that, I am now chairman of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, which has held many hearings. Before us have come great numbers of persons telling about the problems of drug addicts and the problems of many boys and girls who are exposed to temptation of various kinds. I am convinced from the hearings which we have held and from the great amount of testimony which has been brought before us that the problems of juvenile delinquency, including that of drug addiction, can be solved only through community effort. I do not believe they can be solved by police departments, by courts, by churches, by homes, by schools, alone. I think there must be real community effort—effort seeking to help the young people who need our help. Without that, Mr. President, I believe the poison which is sown each day—and it is horrible poison—will spread throughout our entire society and affect the young people who are subject to the temptation.

I hope, Mr. President, that before Congress adjourns, in view of the fact that there is nothing in this bill which deals with the problem of rehabilitation, steps will be taken by the Congress to pass measures which will make a reality of the efforts to bring about more humane treatment of drug addiction.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at the very outset of my speech, I should like to have the attention of my friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL]. I extend to him, as chairman of the subcommittee which has done such outstanding work in connection with the investigation of the narcotics traffic in the United States, my sincere compliments and commendation for the remarkable service which he has rendered the American people. It is a service long overdue. I do not know of anyone more qualified or more dedicated to the public interest than the junior Senator from Texas, who has done this magnificent work. His has been a great educational task. He has brought to the attention of the people of America through various media, such as the newspaper editorials, some of which he has already placed in the RECORD, an enlightenment and a warning of the seriousness of a great social and health menace which confronts us—the narcotics traffic.

Although the junior Senator from Texas, and I disagree on two very vital procedural matters in connection with this issue, we do not disagree upon the objective of stamping out the narcotic drug traffic in the United States. We differ in the modus operandi for accomplishing that very much to be desired purpose and objective.

Also, I assure the junior Senator from Texas that, as the debate progresses, any

difference of opinion which may develop between us will be a professional difference of opinion between lawyers, and not a personal difference of opinion.

The junior Senator from Texas has been my seat mate in the Senate for some time. Not only have I become very closely acquainted with him and come to know him, I think, quite intimately; but, as I told him some weeks ago, I have come to develop a very fond attachment for his friendship. When he first came to the Senate, he and I were much further apart in our points of view than we are today. I think perhaps that was because we did not know each other personally, and because the friendship which I cherish had not at that time developed.

So I assure him that although I am unalterably opposed to two sections of his bill, and shall do my best to defeat them, and shall make a legislative history in connection with them, I do not at all question the sincerity of purpose and the dedication of the junior Senator from Texas to a government by law in this country. I stand on my own record for the same type of dedication. But as lawyers sometimes differ as how best to accomplish a great purpose, so the junior Senator from Texas and the Senator from Oregon today find themselves in disagreement on two procedural sections of the bill.

I shall at the outset of my speech give a very brief synopsis of my major contention in regard to those two sections and shall then proceed at some length to discuss my reasons in detail.

I believe, not as an obstructionist, although I shall probably be so charged, that in conducting the business of the Senate sometimes an issue is of such vital importance to the American people that the American people are entitled to be fully apprised of what is happening in the Senate on an issue before a vote is taken. I think this issue is so basic to the protection of our liberties as free men and women that I would regret it very much if the Senate voted on the bill this afternoon. I think it is important that the two cases in chief be presented to the American people this afternoon, and presented to them as a jury, and then let the jury have a little time to ponder the arguments in the two cases in chief, and let the Senate vote on the matter some time next week.

No matter what may be said in the press about the speech which is to be made this afternoon by the senior Senator from Oregon, let me say here and now to the American people that the only reason I propose to talk at some length this afternoon is that I believe the American people need to be aroused as to the implications of the procedural objections which I propose to raise to the bill. I think a period of time—at least a few days—should pass before a final vote is taken on the measure. But it will never be my intention, I wish to make clear to the majority leader and the junior Senator from Texas, to prevent a vote from ever occurring on the bill. I stand ready and willing to have a vote on the bill next week, but I am not willing to have a vote on the bill this afternoon, if within my parliamentary rights I can prevent it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Oregon knows better than anyone else that he need not consider the question of preventing a vote this afternoon, because the majority leader has already announced that he did not propose to ask for a quorum call or to bring Senators to the Chamber at this late hour.

I wonder if the kind of arrangement I shall now suggest might be agreeable to the Senator from Oregon. The road bill has been scheduled for consideration at 10 o'clock on Monday morning. Many Senators have canceled other plans for Monday and Tuesday of next week, in the hope that the Senate may dispose of that very important piece of proposed legislation, which must go to conference and which will require some time for consideration in conference.

Wednesday will be Memorial Day.

I think I could obtain the consent of the minority to have the Senate convene at 10 o'clock next Thursday morning. I wonder if it would be agreeable to the senior Senator from Oregon to set aside at the conclusion of the morning business on next Thursday, 1 hour on each amendment and probably 2 hours on the bill. That would give us almost a week, lacking 1 day, from today.

The Senate will be kept in session so long as the Senate desires to continue in session this afternoon, and so long as any Senator wishes to discuss the pending measure. The majority leader will certainly cooperate to make certain that the Senator from Oregon has ample time in which to debate it.

If we could reach some understanding along that line, I would pursue it with the minority leader. While the Senator is making his speech, if I could get any suggestions from him, I would try to discuss them with the minority leader, to see if they would be agreeable to the minority side of the aisle.

Mr. MORSE. I assure the distinguished majority leader that I have every intention to cooperate with him.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I know that.

Mr. MORSE. I am not alone in my opposition to the bill. Some of my colleagues in the Senate are very much interested in having a full discussion of the bill.

Frankly, I am not in a position at this very moment to commit myself to a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on next Thursday; but I want the Senator from Texas to know that at the earliest possible moment I shall confer with some of my colleagues and ascertain their wishes in the matter. Then I shall be glad to consult with the majority leader and suggest to him a procedure for reaching a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate on the bill, because after there has been a full discussion of the subject, I would favor a limitation of debate on this issue. I shall let the majority leader know my views at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall appreciate it if the Senator from Oregon will pursue that suggestion.

According to the previous announcement we should like to take up the social security bill on the following Monday.

The Senator from Oregon has the same problem as has the Senator from Texas. Both of us need to be in the Senate Chamber, and both of us need to be home at various times. I am sympathetic to his problem. I hope the Senator from Oregon and his colleagues may work out an arrangement which will be satisfactory to everyone. In any event, I shall be here all the time.

Mr. MORSE. I want to assure the majority leader, the Senator from Texas, as I have expressed it so many times in the past, that I am still deeply appreciative of the many courtesies and help he has extended to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. MORSE. I yield, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Under those conditions, I wish to make this comment. I was very glad to hear the Senator from Oregon say he felt it was important that the people of the United States should know what the bill proposed to do. I am one of the joint sponsors of the bill. I was one of the members of the subcommittee which did the work in making an investigation of the extent of the narcotics traffic in the United States.

I want the people to know that, like other members of the committee, I am very jealous of the rights of the individual citizen and their protection from arbitrary action by the Government. I believe in the Bill of Rights. I believe in the prohibition of search and seizure without warrant. I believe it is a mistaken assumption, however, that the authority for wiretapping as set forth in the pending bill is, in any way whatsoever, violative of any individual rights preserved in the Bill of Rights or presumed by the general tenor of the common law.

The provisions written into the bill, under the leadership of the distinguished junior Senator from Texas, are such that the wiretapping authority in the bill can be exercised only upon practically the same conditions and in the same circumstances under which a writ of search and seizure may issue.

I turn to the junoir Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and ask him if that is not his understanding, and his purpose as the author of the bill.

Mr. DANIEL. That is the understanding and the purpose, and the provisions are even more stringent than in regular search and seizure procedures.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What I want the people of the United States to understand is that, according to my interpretation of the bill, nobody need fear that it creates a precedent for the expansion of wiretapping by Government agents or law-enforcement officers or the use of wiretapping to invade a citizen's home, because under the provisions of the bill it is necessary for the agent first to present his application to the United States Attorney, and then it is necessary for the United States Attorney to take it

into court and to show reasonable ground for obtaining the information which is necessary to make the hidden source of the narcotic traffic liable to the law.

What we are after in the bill is an effective procedure to bring into court for trial the heartless and conscienceless individuals who, like spiders in a distant web, seek to hide even from their own victims. They sit in a little corner, surrounded by their homes and their offices, and without any contact with the users of narcotics, they send forth their representatives to prey upon the children of this land.

The bill sets no precedent. It is intended to go to the heart of one of the most villainous types of traffic ever brought into existence. I am sure neither I, nor any other member of the committee, nor any of the sponsors of the bill, would hesitate to accept an amendment to this provision which would make it utterly clear that it was not to be regarded as a precedent for wire-tapping in any other field.

Mr. President, I have made this statement with the indulgence of the Senator from Oregon, because, with his own well-known ability, he is laying before the Senate this afternoon the nature of the discussion from his point of view. I wanted my point of view to be expressed at the same time, and I wish those who read the Senator's speech to know that the Senator from Wyoming, who was happy to be on the subcommittee with the Senator from Texas, would not knowingly or willingly set a precedent for invading the individual rights of citizens of the United States which are guaranteed by the Bill of Rights of the Federal Constitution.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for yielding.

Mr. MORSE. I am always delighted to yield to the great legal scholar, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. The Senator from Texas has already expressed views almost identical with those of the Senator from Wyoming.

I am well aware it is the view of the sponsors of the bill that the bill does not invade individual liberties, and that there is no intention on the part of the sponsors of the bill to invade individual liberties. I certainly want to testify in behalf of the Senator from Wyoming by saying he would not knowingly or intentionally ever propose anything that would invade individual liberties; but in this case I respectfully submit the opinion that, mistakenly, that is what he has done.

That is my reply to the Senator from Wyoming. No matter how he clothes his protest, in my judgment he and the other sponsors of the bill have set up a procedure which endangers individual liberty; and, in my judgment, without drastic amendment, the bill cannot be put into such form as to prevent it from serving as a precedent, because once the stamp of approval has been put on the bill as it is, the nest has been made to contain the egg of another precedent.

Earlier in the remarks of the Senator from Texas this afternoon, he was asked a question by the Senator from Arizona with regard to the matter of precedent. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] inquired, and I think I paraphrase him with accuracy, as to whether the bill might not lead to setting a precedent. The Senator from Texas said it might in the case of legislation on so-called subversion, and the Senator said that had been proposed. He went on, very fairly and honestly, to express the view that he himself would be in favor of such a provision, but that this particular proposal before the Senate was not intended to be a precedent. But I respectfully say that is going to be the result of the proposal; and one of the objections to it, which I shall develop at some length, is that I think it is impregnated with the danger of setting a precedent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, without losing my right to the floor, I yield to the Senator for a comment, without its being in the form of a question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator I know his great skill in the use of language. I know his great ability as a lawyer. I do not believe that either he nor any of the rest of us who have sponsored this bill should so readily confess, as the Senator from Oregon seems to be doing now, to an inability to state in simple language in the bill, if it is not already stated therein, that this is not a precedent for any of the other things which he fears, but is solely confined to the search and seizure of the hidden criminals in the detestable narcotic traffic, which preys upon the children of this country from coast to coast and from north to south. I think it is a situation in which we should be able to draft the ability of the Senator from Oregon to compose language which will clear away all the doubts he is now about to raise.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Wyoming thinks that is so easy to do, let him propose such a draft of the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall do so, if the Senator from Oregon points out any reason for believing that it has not been done sufficiently already.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to read such a draft.

But, Mr. President, let me say that the establishment of such a procedure of law would establish the basis for application by analogy. It would be said, "It was done in that case, so let us do it in this case." That would establish a precedent by analogy, which time and time again in the course of debate in the Senate could constitute a very persuasive argument.

Mr. President, the way to prevent such an encroachment upon liberty is by striking out this section of the bill. My amendment will call for striking out the section. In my argument, I shall point out that in my judgment this section of the bill is not needed in order to do the job.

The Senator has referred to the search and seizure situation. Let us not forget the long line of decisions on search and seizure in which it has been held that so-called blanket seizure cannot be had.

The trouble with this provision of the bill is that it is not possible to confine its application to specific instances. When wires are tapped, all conversations are heard—both of those between the guilty and those between the innocent. Such procedure is an invasion of the privacy of the citizen for which I shall never vote; and I shall advance in great detail my reasons for never voting for it.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. First, Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Oregon for his preliminary remarks concerning the authors of the bill and the subcommittee. I have enjoyed my work with the Senator from Oregon, and I especially appreciate the fine work he is doing as chairman of the subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee which has before it the bill, which we have introduced, applying to the narcotics traffic in the District of Columbia.

I also thank the Senator from Oregon for his kind remarks concerning the objectives of the authors of the bill and of our subcommittee which made the study.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that, as he well knows, I am not in favor of any type of law which would provide for invasion of the rights of our people or for any trespass upon their liberties. I have tried—and I believe the Senator from Oregon will agree that the Judiciary Committee has tried—to write around the bill's provisions for interception of communications between narcotics traffickers, safeguards which would permit that to be done only in narcotics cases and only under sealed court order, just as would be done in the case of a search warrant to search someone's home.

I wonder whether the Senator from Oregon realizes that he is in agreement with what we found, namely, that today the Government agencies are intercepting these phone calls and are listening to them. However, under the law they are not able to use, against the guilty, evidence which is obtained from such interceptions.

It is our feeling that by having the benefit of this restrictive procedure, we shall stop some of the misuse of telephone interceptions today, and shall make it possible to use them only for the purposes set forth in this measure.

I wonder whether the Senator from Oregon realizes that we have at least made an attempt to do that.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, that is an interpretation which the committee has made of what it is recommending.

But I wish to say that it is shameful that the Congress has not made unlawful the interceptions which are made today. Instead of attempting to expand what is now being done, we should be taking steps to make unlawful any wiretapping which now is occurring. I think we should prevent any Federal agency from doing any wiretapping, because of what that does to the rights of privacy in the United States for in my judgment we cannot chip away at the foundations of liberty without finally having the columns which support the whole temple collapse.

So long as I am a Member of the Senate, I shall not support any procedure

which in my judgment would jeopardize the rights of free men and free women. In my judgment, this proposal would do that. Therefore, out of deep conviction, I must necessarily speak and argue in opposition to this provision of the bill.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that we have begun our discussion of this wiretapping issue, I want to make a statement which in my judgment describes my major thesis in opposition to the wiretapping section of the bill. I think this section is the most deadly drug that can be injected into our body politic. I say that because in my opinion this provision will deaden our sensitivity to individual liberties. In my judgment, we cannot dull the sensitivity of the American people to their individual liberties without getting them into such a frame of mind that more and more fragments of their liberty can be chipped away from them.

One of the things which disturbs me in our time, Mr. President, is the growing apathy on the part of the American people, which I think is reflected in their representation in the Congress—and that is to be expected, because Members of Congress mirror from time to time the prevailing public opinion—in respect to the protection of the liberties of the people.

Consider, Mr. President, the general acceptance today—almost without protest—of the creeping tentacles of government by secrecy in the United States. The American people have almost come to accept it without protest; and for the most part their opinion on most great public issues is based upon propaganda and upon headlines—not upon the true information and the facts regarding what is going on within their Government, but upon handouts, only fragments of the facts which they should know about our domestic policy and our foreign policy.

Mr. President, consider the extent to which the American people have been drugged into accepting the apathetic position, "Well, our Government knows best. If our Government says it is not in the public interest that this information be made available to the public, we accept that."

To the American people I say today, "If you continue to accept government by secrecy, you will lose your freedom in the years not too far ahead." Ours is a government of the people, not a government of the administrators who perform governmental administrative duty. We must waken the people to the fact that history teaches that free people can never afford to take their freedom for granted.

Mr. President, in the history of mankind there have been other free societies, but they have fallen. One of the primary causes for their falling has been the fact that the people forgot the importance of protecting their freedom.

Today, I am talking about a great procedural freedom which is about to be taken from the American people if we do not rise up and protest this encroachment upon their privacy. I am talking about the right of free men and women to live in their homes as their castles of freedom, free from police state procedures.

One of my great ideological objections to the bill is that in my judgment its wiretapping provisions constitute police state procedure, and I do not believe that democracy requires the adoption of Communist or Fascist procedural devices. This is the kind of procedure which is prevalent in Communist and Fascist states, and should never be allowed in a free state. It is still true that it is better for a few guilty to escape than for free men to be subjected to police state procedures.

I shall discuss this section at some greater length later, but at this point in my remarks I wish to discuss the other section of the bill which I think is so dangerous, namely, the capital punishment section. On this issue each one of us must come to grips with his own subjective values of morality. I have no intention of seeking to persuade any Member of this body to accept my standards of moral values, because I respectfully submit that in my judgment this subject goes to the very essence of one's spiritual beliefs. It cannot be read out of this problem, Mr. President. In my judgment, how we vote on this section will be determined more by our religious convictions, our individual code of spiritual values, than by any other single factor.

However, I think we owe a duty to ourselves and to our constituencies, if we hold convictions as deep as mine on this point, to make for the RECORD a statement as to why we cannot accept the capital punishment section of the bill. In my professional work as a teacher of the law, with considerable specialization in the field of administration of criminal law, innumerable times I have discussed at length with students the whole problem of the moral right of the state to take life as a part of punitive justice.

I have never been able to accept the point of view that the State has the right to take life. I do not accept it because I think life belongs to God, not to the State.

Oh, yes; in those arguments the question is always raised, "How do you justify self-defense? How do you justify taking life in war?" Of course, I continue to pray that mankind will reach such a level of civilization that it itself will recognize it has no spiritual right to take life. But I am also aware of the fact that the instinct for survival, and the instinct for self-defense, are also controlling in human behavior. Outside the realm of self-defense, including national self-defense, I cannot hold any brief whatsoever for the voluntary taking of life. I certainly cannot support any criminal law or procedural bill which seeks to make the death penalty the punishment for the commission of a crime.

I think we have the duty, in protecting society, to see to it that the very type of criminal sought to be dealt with by this bill is confined for life, without parole or probation; but I think we have the moral and spiritual duty to let him live. It is for God, and God alone, to determine when a human being shall walk before the bar of judgment of God. I do not think any bar of judgment set up by man has the moral or spiritual right to substitute itself for the Almighty and extinguish the life of a criminal found guilty of the most heinous of crimes.

That is subjective. That goes to our personal spiritual beliefs. I also wish to say that, as a Christian, I cannot interpret my faith in Christianity as one which would justify my ever voting for capital punishment. I cannot apply the words of the Master in support of any proposal to take a human life. I have read a good many religious treaties which have tried to rationalize it, but they have not been able to erase the words of the Master himself. If there is any intent of the Master that is made crystal clear in the New Testament, it is the teaching that life is for God, and not for man, to extinguish.

So I wish to say in this very brief argument that I shall oppose the capital punishment section of the bill, out of the deep religious conviction that it cannot be reconciled with at least my belief in Christian principles.

I turn now to devote the remainder of my argument to the procedural provision of the bill which has to do with wiretapping. I shall repeat and expand upon the argument which I made on this subject on May 18, 1954, in the Senate, as well as the second argument, which I made on June 11, 1954, which contains the legal research I have done on this subject, a discussion of the cases, and an analysis of the other side of the coin of this argument from that presented by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

From the standpoint of sound legal procedure, this is a bad bill so far as its widetapping provisions are concerned.

Freedoms and rights which have been long enjoyed are too often taken for granted. The decades of sacrifice with which they were earned are too often forgotten.

Our heritage of liberty is as precious as any of the material riches and mechanical marvels past generations have willed. If we are not vigilant, this inheritage can be lost, not in one lawless sweep, but by the erosion of what appear to be minor exceptions.

Today the right of our citizens to privacy and security in their homes, won after centuries of struggle, stands in such peril. This bill is one of the latest manifestations of the threat to that privacy.

Attorney General Brownell has recommended to the Congress that it legalize wiretapping by authorizing the interception of private telephone messages by officials of the executive branch of the Government and the military department in the investigation of certain activities broadly defined as interfering with the national security and defense.

I stress that point because, as we discuss the proposal that goes to the narcotic drug traffic, we already have pending before the Senate and the House other proposals involving the legalizing of wiretapping in other fields. Yet we hear it said that this will not be a precedent. I repeat, Mr. President, if we approve the procedure we strengthen the

argument, by analogy, of every proponent who wants to apply the same procedure to some other field. I am afraid we can never escape the danger, if we approve of the pending measure, of its being a forerunner by way of precedent of a constantly expanding wiretapping procedure.

Mr. Brownell also recommends changes in the law which now prohibits the use of evidence obtained by wiretapping in the Federal courts.

In a series of speeches on the floor of the Senate, I intend to show that not only is the use of wiretapping by Government officials repugnant to historical and constitutional principles of American freedom and a threat to the personal security of loyal citizens, but also that, as an investigatory device, the unreliability, in efficiency, and the expense of wiretap operations outweigh their alleged utility.

Wiretapping, as I said earlier this afternoon, is a police state method. We will do a poor job of defending democracy from the aggression of Communists and other totalitarians if in the process we adopt as our own the methods of our enemies.

The wiretap, the rubber hose, and the third degree are standard equipment of the officer with the prosecution complex whose zeal for conviction exceeds his respect for rights. They should have no place in the activities of responsible public officials.

Adoption of the Brownell proposal would revive search-and-seizure practices of the type outlawed by the courts of England 188 years ago, and recognized as unlawful by the framers of the Bill of Rights amendments to the Federal Constitution.

The fourth amendment to the Constitution was designed to protect personal privacy and security and the sanctity of the homes of Americans from the assaults of impatient, overzealous, and opportunistic officials. The fourth amendment provides—and it is well to reread it:

> The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated, and no warrant shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.

Only that kind of search and seizure is allowed. That is a far cry from a wiretap. When in the case of a wiretap a court order is applied for—and it is necessary to get such a court order for search and seizure—it is not possible to describe what the applicant for the court order is to take off the wire, because he does not know until he hears it. So he invades the privacy of the men or women whose wires are tapped; he listens to their private, intimate conversations, and he takes all of them.

In that way their privacy of conversation is destroyed. In that way, in my judgment, their castle of freedom, their home, is torn down. That will never be done with my vote.

In the first place, it is not necessary, and, in the second place, no one can justify that kind of encroachment upon freedom.

There is no way, in my opinion, by any language that can possibly be drafted, to close the ears of the wiretapper to anything in a conversation which does not deal with narcotics. The wiretapper sits at his place in expectancy. He sits there and listens to all conversations. The danger is indeed great of giving over the rights of privacy to so-called law enforcement.

Let us not wrap the flag around law enforcement officials. They are human beings. There are good ones and there are bad ones. The public is entitled to protection from the bad ones.

The best way to protect the public in this matter is to deny to any law-enforcement officer the right to invade a person's privacy or to proceed to hear anything and everything a person says in a telephone conversation.

Oh, yes, it is said, "Well, if he is not guilty, what does he object to? If he is not guilty, what is he kicking about? If he is not engaged in the narcotic traffic, what difference does it make if the law officer hears what he says on other matters?"

The difference is the difference between freedom and no freedom. The difference is the difference between privacy and no privacy. The difference is the difference between having one's home as one's castle or not having one's home as one's castle. The difference is, in my opinion, whether we believe in protecting the freedom of the individual, or whether we believe in injecting this procedural drug into the veins of our body politic in an endeavor to make our people even more insensitive to their liberties than millions of people already are.

Oh, Mr. President, I wish I could be given the strength and the power to so present this issue so that not only my colleagues in the Senate but the people throughout the country would recognize its serious import before it is too late.

I shall always be proud to have my descendants read that at least I tried on this day in 1956 to forewarn the American people that the pending bill is the stuff out of which encroachments upon personal liberty are forged.

Mr. President, there is no sound argument by analogy to the search and seizure procedure, because the search and seizure procedure deals with specifics, and it is necessary to describe in a request for a warrant the place to be searched and the goods to be sought. Such warrants are limited to those specifics. The cases are legion, as we shall see before I get through with this argument.

Mr. President, our forefathers protest against general searches and seizures; indeed general searches and seizures as practiced by the British Crown were one of the reasons why our constitutional fathers fought for their freedom. I think they would revolve in their graves if they were aware of this encroachment upon the personal liberty of free men and women whom they fought so hard to liberate and protect.

Mr. President, wiretapping, secret listening to words spoken in the home, or surreptitious interception of a person's confidential communications to his family, friends, associates, lawyer, doctor, or priest, is an insidious kind of intrusion upon personal privacy.

I indulge in no exaggerated argument when I say that in this bill not even the confessional is safe. We cannot find in this bill, Mr. President, any protection of privacy in any telephone conversation of any citizen. The prosecuting officer decides that he has reason to believe a certain individual might talk to someone about the drug traffic, so he will get a court order authorizing a wiretap.

Let me say something about such court orders, Mr. President. Let us not make the false assumption that in the administration of the judicial process it is always true that much time, great care, and thorough attention are given to the request of a prosecutor. Every lawyer in this body knows that in the administration of justice there develops between the judge and the prosecutor a confidence, a respect, and a working arrangement whereby too frequently requests made by the prosecutor become matters of form and are dealt with almost as mere formalities.

Furthermore—and I say this with complete respect for the judiciary—do not forget, Mr. President, that a great many of the judges who issue these orders themselves have had prosecution experience, and have come to the bench with the frame of mind of a prosecutor. All we have to do is to read the report of statements of judges who have had distinguished records as prosecutors.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that in the administration of criminal justice the phrase "prosecutor complex" has great meaning. If we are going to protect the liberties of the American people we must constantly be on guard against the prosecution complex, because too many prosecutors too frequently are bent on prosecution. Justice is not always well served by a prosecutor complex. I shall not take the time today, but I shall be glad to do so later in the debate, to cite some of the court decisions in our country which have forewarned us in regard to overzealous prosecutors. It is our duty to see to it that we adopt procedures which protect the freedom of the American people from overzealous prosecutors.

There flashes through my mind now, as I mention that point, another argument which is frequently heard to the effect that only the guilty have any cause to be concerned about wiretapping. An interesting thing about our great system of jurisprudence and justice, Mr. President, is that we have always been proud of the fact that the guilty are entitled to the same procedural protections which are accorded the innocent. We cannot justify a procedure such as this on the basis that it makes it a little easier to catch the guilty. We can justify it only if it can be squared with the rights of all citizens of the country, both the innocent and the guilty.

Do not forget that the guilty also have their right to freedom. A wrongdoer is not without his rights of freedom, Mr. President. We take pride in the fact that guilt must be established in this country under very fundamental

procedural safeguards, and we boast to the world about our presumption of innocence as one of the basic foundation stones of our system of justice.

So I wish to say, Mr. President, that, in my opinion, we cannot justify this wiretapping section of the bill by the argument that it will make it easier to prosecute and to convict. We can justify it only if we know that it cannot invade individual freedom as such freedom was contemplated when the fourth amendment was written with respect to searches and seizures.

Mr. President, it would be impossible, in my judgment, to authorize the use of wiretapping and at the same time provide safeguards consistent with the spirit and purpose of the fourth amendment.

It has been said that law is not a manufacture, but a growth, and that it is, therefore, difficult thoroughly to comprehend the true scope and meaning of a law without at least some knowledge of its history and development.

In this speech, Mr. President, I propose to discuss the history of the fourth amendment and the history of the rights it protects and the evils it prohibits.

LIBERTY CANNOT BE TAKEN FOR GRANTED

A review of history may help us to understand more clearly the meaning of American freedom. It should help to banish any inclination we may have to take our liberties for granted.

The mistake of taking liberty for granted is not an uncommon one. Witness the fact that our Constitution, as ratified in 1788, and as it stood on the day of the opening of the first session of Congress in 1789, contained no Bill of Rights.

Among men who had gone through a great war for freedom, and then settled down to put a democratic government into operation, there were those who thought a declaration of rights not necessary in a democracy.

No declaration of rights was necessary, they felt, because it was assumed that all knew their rights.

No constitutional protection of rights was necessary, they contended, because in a democracy each would be respectful of the other's rights.

Far-sighted men knew, however, that threats to liberty might come not only from kings—that elected or appointed officials, unless checked, could be as arbitrary as the mightiest monarchs in their exercise of power.

NEED FOR THE BILL OF RIGHTS

The need for a Bill of Rights was a major point of discussion in the constitutional debates, when ratification of the proposed Federal Constitution was being considered in the various States.

In the State of Virginia, Patrick Henry fought ratification of the Constitution because it contained no insurance against infringement upon the rights of the people by the Government. Virginia, on the advice of Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, both Bill of Rights advocates, ratified the Constitution, but by a narrow margin of 10 votes in a convention of 168 members, and only on the condition that a Bill of Rights be added by amendment.

In fact, Mr. President, that great debate in the Virginia Constitutional Convention found Madison and Jefferson on the one side and Henry on the other, not in disagreement as to the desirability of a bill of rights, because both Madison and Jefferson recognized the importance of a bill of rights, but over the question as to whether the Constitution should be ratified at all until there was a bill of rights written into it. That staged one of the great historic debates of our entire history.

Patrick Henry was so effective and persuasive in that debate that for a time both Jefferson and Madison knew they were defeated, because the caucuses showed, as the historians point out to us, that a majority of the members of the Virginia Constitutional Convention agreed with Patrick Henry.

What did Jefferson and Madison have to resort to? They had to go around and, in effect, buttonhole their colleagues in the Constitutional Convention, and make the pledge that if the delegates would only ratify the Constitution as it was written, and therefore not make it necessary to reconvene the Constitutional Convention and thresh the question out anew, Jefferson and Madison would assume the responsibility of proceeding, after the ratification of the Constitution, to urge the adoption of a bill of rights as the first addition to the Constitution. Only on the basis of that personal promise by Jefferson and Madison did Henry lose a majority of the votes in the Viriginia conference—and then he lost by only 10 votes.

Patrick Henry, in the great series of speeches he made in the Virginia Constitutional Convention on the question of personal liberty, on the question of protection against search and seizure, which had been such an abuse on the part of the British Crown, carried the Convention with him for a long time during its discussion.

But, at I have said, Jefferson and Madison finally got a majority vote over Henry's protest only on the basis of their personal salesmanship. They promised that with the ratification of the Constitution, they would make it their first order of business to have the Bill of Rights added subsequently to the Constitution. They made the great argument, the old argument we hear so often on the floor of the Senate, if we will check the RECORD, that time is of the essence; that we have to do this now, and then in the future we will do something else.

In this particular instance, the argument was successful, in that the promises made by Jefferson and Madison were subsequently accomplished, and we now have the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, of which the 4th is one, and is, in my judgment, so vital to the debate now in progress in the Senate, because I cannot reconcile with the spirit and intent of the 4th amendment the section of the bill we are debating.

Virginia was not the only State in which this historic fight was made. An attempt to attach conditions to ratification in New York almost succeeded. Ratification was finally voted in July 1788, by a vote of 30 to 27, with a recommendation that a bill of rights be appended to the Constitution.

In the New York Constitutional Convention, as in the Virginia Constitutional Convention, the fight over protecting the personal liberties of free men and women was paramount. In the New York Convention, the Constitution almost failed of ratification because there was not written into the Constitution the protections of personal liberty, of which the fourth amendment is one of the examples.

But New York and Virginia were not the only States. The Massachusetts and New Hampshire ratifications contained bill-of-rights recommendations. In Massachusetts and New Hampshire, the delegates went even further. In those 2 States they ratified the Constitution, but they also adopted recommendations for a bill of rights.

Interestingly, if we will check those recommendations, we will find that a great many of their principles found their way into the great Bill of Rights in the form of the first 10 amendments. So when I talk about this matter today, I am talking about a principle which has been a great bulwark of procedural protection to free men and women in this country since the very day of the ratification of the Constitution itself.

It was in Massachusetts that Elbridge Gerry told his fellow citizens that he had refused to sign the Constitution because it then contained no protection in law of the rights of the people, and "that the greatest men may err, and their errors are sometimes of the greatest magnitude."

Two of the 13 Original States did not ratify the Constitution until after the bill of rights amendments were adopted in the Congress.

PURPOSE OF BILL OF RIGHTS

James Madison, bringing to the first session of the Congress Virginia's proposed constitutional amendments, 10 of which were to become our Bill of Rights, told the Members of Congress:

> It will be a desirable thing to extinguish from the bosom of every member of the community any apprehensions, that there are those among his countrymen who wish to deprive them of the liberty for which they valiantly fought and honorably bled.

The announced purpose of the amendments was "to raise barriers against power in all forms and departments of Government."

Madison in his famous speech to Congress said:

> So far as a declaration of rights can tend to prevent the exercise of undue power, it cannot be doubted but such declaration is power.

Congressional adoption of the Bill of Rights amendments in 1789, and their subsequent ratification by the States, established in law the principle that in a democracy, the rights of the people are always superior to the expediencies of Government officials.

English law has long recognized a right of man not to be disturbed in the occupancy of his home. But the principle "a man's house is his castle," enunciated in

the 17th century by Lord Coke in *Semayne's Case* (5 Coke 91), was not unique to English jurisprudence.

HOME PROTECTED BY BIBLICAL LAW

Even in ancient times there were evidences of that same concept in custom and law. Biblical literature reveals a number of instances illustrative of a strong respect for the dwelling as a place which was not subject to arbitrary visitation, even on the part of official authority.

In the story concerning Achan, Joshua did not send his messengers to search for and seize the prohibited articles in Achan's tent, even after his detection, until the latter had first confessed both his deed and the place where the articles were concealed.

By Biblical law a creditor was forbidden to enter his debtor's house for his debt but had to wait outside for the bringing forth of the pledge, and a bailiff of the court was forbidden to enter for the same purpose.

The high regard that the law had for the home is reflected in the protection afforded it in article 21 of the Code of Hammurabi:

> If a man makes a breach into a house, one shall kill him in front of the breach, and bury him in it.

The laws of ancient Rome held the home to be a place that was under the special protection of the household gods, who dwelt and were worshipped there. If even an enemy reached the fireplace of the house, he was sure of protection. Cicero said in one of his orations:

> What is more inviolable, what better defended by religion than the house of a citizen. This place of refuge is so sacred to all men, that to be dragged from thence is unlawful.

When Roman criminal law allowed the search of the house of a person suspected of theft, such search could be undertaken only after the victim of a theft described with particularity the goods he was seeking. When, accompanied by a bailiff, he entered the suspect's house, the law required that he be clad only in an apron, to prevent his concealing objects in his garments and "planting" them in the other's house to implement a false charge.

Roman occupation of England implanted in that country the principle that an individual had a privilege not to be disturbed in the peaceful occupancy of his home.

In Anglo-Saxon and Norman times the crime of hamfare, the forcible entry into a man's dwelling, was looked upon with great severity, justifying the killing of the perpetrator in the act.

Chapter 39 of the Magna Carta of 1215 has been recognized as a safeguard against official intrusion into the home. Lord Coke said in 4 Coke's Institutes 177:

> Breaking the houses of any subjects to search for felon or stolen goods is against the Magna Carta.

STAR CHAMBER PROCEEDINGS

During the Elizabethan and Stuart periods in England, in the enforcement of tyrannical laws concerning printing, religion, and seditious libel and treason, the Court of Star Chamber initiated practices of unlimited search and seizure by government officials.

A warrant issued by the Star Chamber in 1593 directed messengers of the Crown to search for and arrest every person suspected of libels "and for that purpose to enter into all houses and places where any such shall be remaining. And, upon their apprehension, to make like search in any of the chambers, studies, chests, or other like places for all manner of writings or papers that may give you light for the discovery of the libellers."

The Star Chamber was abolished in 1640, and a year later the House of Commons resolved that the search of studies and papers of opposition members of Parliament and the issuance of warrants for that purpose in 1629 had been a breach of privilege on the part of those who executed the warrants, for which they were to be punished.

At this period in English history there began to be recognized a principle that government searches and seizures, if allowed, must be reasonable. The full significance of the principle, however, was not yet recognized, and further experience on the part of the people and the courts was required before the right to be left undisturbed in the home was given constitutional protection.

New regimes found it expedient to lapse back into the old practices from time to time, and a few years later there was enacted the hearth-money statute, by which custom officials in their collections were given right of entry into all houses at any time during the day.

After the revolution of 1688, one of the first acts of the new government was to abolish hearth money. King William gave as his reason for the abolition not only that the practice was a great oppression of the poorer classes, "but a badge of slavery upon the whole people, exposing every man's house to be entered into, and searched by persons unknown to him."

GENERAL WARRANTS CONTROVERSY

So strong had become the popular feeling against government intrusion into the homes of citizens, that the practice of arbitrarily searching private homes for government purposes was all but abandoned in England until the accession to the throne of George III in 1760, at which time there began the great controversy about the general warrants.

In the American Colonies the general warrants took the form of so-called writs of assistance, authorizing revenue officers to enter, in their discretion, suspected places and search for smuggled goods.

James Otis, speaking in Boston in February 1761, pronounced these warrants "the worst instrument of arbitrary power, the most destructive of English liberty, and the fundamental principles of law, that ever was found in an English lawbook," since they placed "the liberty of every man in the hands of every petty officer."

I digress for a moment, Mr. President, to comment on this observation of the great Otis, because he is revered in American history as a great defender of personal liberty. In commenting upon his remarks, I speak as a lawyer with complete respect for law-enforcement officers, for prosecutors, and for judges. But I stress, Mr. President, that they are human beings, and I stress that it is dangerous to liberty to give arbitrary power to law-enforcement officers. Mr. President, if we are going to have a government by law, then we had better constantly look to our checks upon the administrators of government by law, because if we do not, we shall soon have a government by men and not by law.

I cannot stress this point too strongly, Mr. President. It must be stressed in this debate, because earlier this afternoon I talked about the lethargy of our times. To me it is a frightening lethargy. There is a growing tendency upon the part of too many in our citizenry to make the great mistake of thinking that Government officials can do no wrong. In my judgment, Government officials will do right only to the extent that the people and their Congress are constantly jealous and vigilant of the procedures under which they are required to perform their duties.

It happens to be the history of the enforcement of criminal laws, not only in our country, but throughout the world and throughout all history, that there cannot be given to human beings unchecked arbitrary power without great abuses ensuing. We cannot, Mr. President, turn our freedoms over to law-enforcement officers and prosecutors and judges, and then lean back with the pleasant attitude that they will take care of our liberties.

I say that, Mr. President, fully cognizant of the fact that the law-enforcement officers of America and the judiciary of America are entitled to the highest respect of the American people. But they are human beings, and it is important, in the consideration of the legislative process, that we protect the American people procedurally from arbitrary discretion.

Oh, we become aware of this, Mr. President, when from time to time we discover that a law-enforcement agency has become impregnated with corruption, when we discover that an officer has become a common bribetaker and, on occasion, we even find that a judge now and then has betrayed the solemn obligation of his robes. No; we do not protect personal liberty, as Otis pointed out in the early history of our country, when we relinquish to petty officers the freedoms of the American people.

I think that great sentence of Otis is worth repeating time and time again. He said:

> The worst instrument of arbitrary power, the most destructive of English liberty, and the fundamental principles of law, that ever was found in an English lawbook, since they placed the liberty of every man in the hands of every petty officer.

I do not propose, Mr. President, to place the liberties of the American people in the hands of Federal law-enforcement officers who will tell a judge that they think they ought to have the right to violate the privacy of the American home and listen in on the telephone to

all the conversations of the occupants of the home simply because the officers think they have reason to believe that the occupant of the home is engaged in the narcotics traffic.

The Senator from Texas, the Senator from Wyoming, and the other members of the Judiciary Committee are no more determined than I am, Mr. President—and they are no more opposed to the narcotics traffic than I am—to see to it, in the first place, that the narcotics traffic is stopped, and, in the second place, in agreeing to any reasonable procedure, within the framework of the privacy of the American people, for an improvement in the enforcement of the antinarcotics laws.

The Senator from Texas was kind enough to point out that, as chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee, I now have pending before me a bill, of which he is the author, which seeks to improve the control of drugs and narcotics in the District of Columbia. I have issued to the staff of the committee instructions to schedule hearings on that bill next week, because I want hearings on it to be held immediately. As the record will show, we received the bill from the Senator from Texas just a few days ago—in fact, I think it was the first part of this week. I want hearings on that bill to be held at the earliest possible date, and I want the bill to be brought up on the floor of the Senate in the very near future, with such amendments, if any, as the hearings may show should be added to the bill—although at the present time I know of none. I want that bill to be passed by the Senate, because in my judgment the objectives of that drug-control bill are in the public interest. But that bill does not raise the problems which are raised in connection with this bill.

In the case of the pending bill, we are dealing with the matter of the procedural rights of the American people to be protected completely in their privacy and in their homes, as in their castles.

In his great speech in 1761, James Otis had some other things to say; and I wish to emphasize them now. He denounced the dangerous character of the writs as an infringement of the Englishman's "right of house."

John Adams said later of the Otis speech:

> Then and there was the first scene of the first act of opposition to the arbitrary claims of Great Britain. Then and there the child Independence was born.

In England general warrants issued by the Secretary of State authorized government officials to secretly enter homes and search for and seize the private papers of persons suspected of seditious libel.

The court case of *Wilkes* v. *Wood* (98 Eng. Rep. 489 (1762)) involved a suit by a publisher of pamphlets critical of the government against an official who had issued a warrant by the authority of which Wilkes' house was ransacked in a search for the alleged treasonable papers. The warrant was general as to the persons to be arrested and places to be searched and papers to be seized, and before the agents of the King discovered that Wilkes was the person who had published the papers nearly 50 other persons were arrested and their homes searched.

Wilkes was awarded a verdict against the Under Secretary of State responsible for the warrant, and some of the other persons whose homes had been searched brought suit against the King's messengers.

In *Huckle* v. *Money* (95 Eng. Rep. 763) the court held the general warrants to be illegal and awarded judgments against the messengers. The court said in awarding the judgment:

> To enter a man's house by virtue of a nameless warrant in order to procure evidence is worse than the Spanish Inquisition—a law under which no Englishman would wish to live an hour.

Mr. President, over the decades this has been a great constitutional issue—namely, the constitutional prohibition against unreasonable searches and seizures.

Constitutional prohibition against unreasonable searches and seizures was established in England in 1765 in the case of *Entick* v. *Carrington and Three of the King's Messengers* (19 Howell's State Trials 1030). The United States Supreme Court in the case of *Boyd* v. *U. S.* (116 U. S. 616 (1885)) described the judgment in this case as "one of the landmarks of English liberty" and a "monument of English freedom."

This case grew out of a search of the home of one John Entick, a publisher of articles critical of the government, by messengers acting under a warrant to seize him, together with his books and papers.

The warrant was specific as to the person, but general as to the papers; and the messengers made the most of the discretion granted them.

The defendants attempted to justify their actions by an argument of "state necessity." They claimed that the power to search homes and seize evidence was "essential to government, and the only means of quieting clamors and sedition."

Mr. President, that sounds almost like 1956 and the arguments made in connection with the pending bill. It is the old prosecutor's argument, "Mr. Citizen, I tell you that this is necessary and essential. You should let me do it this way because I think I can do a better job of detection and a better job of prosecuting if you let me invade your privacy."

Mr. President, there is nothing new about that argument; it is bewhiskered; it is as old as the great contest over the protection of individual liberties.

Mr. President, there have been crimes, crimes, more crimes, heinous crimes; but I wish to say that I am proud that today in this country the principle for which I am fighting on the floor of the Senate this afternoon has prevailed for the most part, namely, that, after all, the personal liberties of free men and women are more vital than the convenience of law-enforcement officers and prosecutors. I think the issue is about that simple, Mr. President. I think that is a very important part of this fight. Are we going to legalize this invasion of the privacy of free men and women, on the basis of the argument that it will make it a little easier to catch some criminals in the narcotics drug traffic?

My reply is that efficient and effective police departments and prosecutors do not need weapons which infringe upon the personal liberties of free men and women. What was said by a court in 1885 in regard to this matter, I wish to repeat today; I shall repeat what was said by the court in the Entick case. In effect, the court said that the attempt to justify their actions by an argument of strict necessity was not acceptable to the court.

Pronouncing the judgment against them, Lord Camden said:

> With respect to the argument of state necessity, or a distinction which has been aimed at between state offenses and others, the common law does not understand that kind of reasoning, nor do our books take notice of any such distinctions.

The court condemned secret searches of the home:

> If this injury falls upon an innocent person, he is as destitute of remedy as the guilty * * * there is no man capable of proving either the taker or the thing taken. * * * the only witnesses are the trespassers, the party injured is left without proof.

Mr. President, that is completely applicable to the telephone conversations referred to in connection with the pending bill. It is the height of absurdity to assume that if this procedure is legalized, the only wires which will be tapped will be the wires of the guilty. I think that is bad enough, because—subject to the misunderstanding to which one is always subject when he makes this argument—I wish to point out that, under our system of jurisprudence, proper and fair procedure is as essential for the innocent as it is for the guilty, insofar as protecting their rights as citizens is concerned.

I believe in vigorous prosecution, but I believe in vigorous prosecution by procedures which do not violate the rights of privacy.

Mr. President, let us consider the innocent. In the United States, have we really reached the point where we have to depart from the glorious history of the protection of personal rights in respect to search and seizure? After all, wiretapping is a form of search and seizure. Are we going to walk out on that great history and subject innocent people to violation and invasion of their privacy by allowing a law enforcement officer—I care not who he may be—to have knowledge of the full conversations a man may have with his wife, for example, a son with his father, a lover with his sweetheart, or a business partner with his associate? Have we reached the point in America where, on the basis of the argument of necessity, which the King's messengers used back in the time of the Entick case, the privacy of the citizen is invaded? Is our liberty now less precious than the liberty of the individual citizen which was so nobly protected by Lord Camden in the Entick case? I do not believe it. I refuse to accept the argument. Lord Camden was right in

protecting British free men and women from intrusion by the King's messengers. I think it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to protect the American people from intrusion into their rights of privacy by wire tappers, no matter how much of an argument is made about the heinous nature of the violations of our drug laws, and the despicable character of the violators—and they are despicable people.

I should like to handle that part of the argument in these words: There is not a Member of the Senate who despises more than I do the individual who seeks to lead another into the drug or narcotics habit. That class represents about the lowest form of humanity. But when we deal with matters of procedural rights we must always keep our minds and eyes on the fact that, merely because there are some despicable characters within our citizenry who will stoop to almost anything for their unscrupulous purposes, we have no right to adopt a procedure which subjects the innocent to the kind of invasion of their personal freedom which this bill would involve.

It may be said, "Well, they are law enforcement officers. They are prosecutors. They are officials of the Government. It is not so bad for them to know all the intimate secrets of a fellow citizen, gained from listening in on a telephone conversation." I hold just the other point of view. It makes all the difference in the world. It makes the difference between living in a free state and living in a police state. It makes the difference between living in a democracy where one's home is truly his castle of freedom, and living in an autocracy. When one takes down the telephone receiver he does not know whether or not he is enjoying the right of freedom, or whether there is on the telephone a silent, unknown eavesdropper wearing a police badge.

Let me repeat what I said earlier this afternoon in regard to the precedential question. This is a procedural step which, unless we remain on guard, will lead to the "knock on the door."

We all know what has been told to us by people who lived in Germany during the Hitler regime. Since I became a Member of the Senate there appeared before one of our committees—I well recall the situation—a witness who testified that in Hitler's time in Germany an anti-Hitlerite would wrap his telephone in blankets when he was at home at night, because suspicion was so great that the people even feared that the telephone had been so installed that conversations could be heard over it even though the receiver had not been taken down.

That is what happens when the fear of a police state takes possession of the people. Of course, it is an exaggerated argument, but I offer it to point out that fear creates exaggerated attitudes on the part of the people.

The best way to guarantee the privacy of the American citizen is to refuse to adopt the kind of procedure which—and it cannot be denied—would make it possible for a police officer wearing a badge to listen in to the conversation of an innocent fellow citizen if he could succeed in convincing the court, by whatever formality he might find it necessary to go through, that he should be granted permission to tap a certain individual's telephone.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator from Oregon realize that the Justice Department is now tapping certain telephones? Representatives of the Department have testified before committees of Congress that, so far as subversion cases are concerned, the practice has been going on for 22 years, and that each succeeding Attorney General has followed the same procedure, with the approval of President Roosevelt, President Truman, and President Eisenhower?

Mr. MORSE. I think it is shocking.

Mr. DANIEL. I was surprised to learn it, too. The only difficulty is that evidence obtained in that manner cannot be used in the courthouse.

Mr. MORSE. Thank God for that. That much, at least, we have protected.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Texas is certainly in agreement with the Senator from Oregon, that there should not be unlimited, unrestricted, and unrestrained tapping of telephones by law-enforcement officers. I believe the Senator from Oregon will agree that the Judiciary Committee has at least written this provision in such a manner as to tighten the requirements, and make it unlawful for officers to listen in, or to divulge information which they might obtain after receiving a Federal court order and going through this procedure, except in a limited class of cases. The proposed legislation would place law-enforcement officers in a much different situation from that which they occupy today.

Mr. MORSE. But they would hear the conversations.

Mr. DANIEL. They would hear them; but they hear them today.

Mr. MORSE. We should not add another evil. I think it is a terrible thing.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator from Oregon realize that under the proposed procedure the telephone wires could not be tapped, or the information divulged, unless the enforcement officer could prove to a court that he had good reason to believe that the telephone was being used in the narcotics traffic?

Mr. MORSE. I do not accept that argument at all. I think we enhance the evils when we add the proposed procedure to the present procedure. It must involve adding something, or the Senator would not be asking for it. I do not want to legalize the procedure for which the Senator is asking.

Mr. DANIEL. All we would be doing would be legalizing in narcotics cases the procedure which is being followed at present in other cases.

Mr. MORSE The practice would be greatly speeded up, and it would become much more common than it is at the present time. I believe that the fact that evidence obtained in such a manner cannot be used in court at the present time has to a considerable extent slowed down the commission of the act.

Mr. DANIEL. Let me explain to the Senator from Oregon what we found. We found—and there was no contradiction—that today law-enforcement officers are unable to obtain convictions against the top racketeers in the national and international narcotics trade, because all of them know that the wiretap evidence cannot be used against them, and they therefore operate by telephone.

In their international orders and in their interstate orders concerning the narcotic traffic, they never touch the drug; they work strictly behind the telephone. Does the Senator from Oregon know any way we can get a conviction of the top narcotic racketeers of the Nation without being able to use weapon for weapon in intercepting these communications?

Mr. MORSE. I believe the very investigation the Senator and his subcommittee have made answers the Senator's question. He and his committee did a wonderful job. His committee did not even function as a prosecuting agency of the Government. It functioned as an investigating agency of the Government. In their capacity as investigators the Senator and the other members of the committee did a wonderful job in finding out where the problem is. If they can do that by an investigation, I will say to the Senator, I do not consider the next problems to be impossible of solution. Certainly it is not necessary to give the prosecutor a wiretap provision to catch the big fellows about whom the Senator already knows.

Mr. DANIEL. We found that where the big money is being made is behind the telephone by the big racketeer who does not have any other kind of communication with the pusher or the drug addict. That is where the problem is. I say to the Senator that the provision in the bill would never be before the Senate if we had not found that that is where the problem is with respect to the big million-dollar racketeers. Those racketeers are never convicted. It is a crying shame to see all the small pushers of narcotics, who do the bidding of the big fellows on the other end of the telephone, get convicted and sent to the penitentiary, while the big boys escape punishment altogether. That is the reason why the provision is in the bill.

If the Senator from Oregon, over the weekend, can find any other method by which we can get the top racketeers in the international and national narcotic rackets without a provision of this kind, I should like to have him suggest it. I would accept such a substitute.

Mr. MORSE. I do not need to wait for the weekend. I will say to the Senator now that a prosecutor could work on the basis of what the Senator found in his investigation. Does the Senator mean to tell me that our prosecutors are so inefficient, that when the Senator's investigation has brought out where some of the drugs come from the prosecutors cannot proceed with criminal prosecutions?

Mr. DANIEL. They cannot proceed.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest they bring that evidence before a jury in the trial

of some of the top operators and see what the jury will do.

Mr. DANIEL. The big narcotics operators have never been convicted. The prosecutors do not have to go before a jury, because the big operators carry on their business over the telephone.

Mr. MORSE. But they have the testimony of the people who have received the drugs. That is pretty good evidence.

Mr. DANIEL. No; they do not have that, because the big racketeers never touch the drugs. They place their orders in a foreign country by telephone, and they deal with certain henchmen who handle the drug; they never touch the drug. There is no way to tie them into the traffic except by telephone conversations.

The reason we know about those people and who they are and where they are is that some officers are tapping wires, under the present laws. The only point is that they can never get that evidence into court. They can never use that evidence to convict the big fellows.

Mr. MORSE. I may say to the Senator that in the penitentiaries of the country are many persons who have been convicted as violators of the narcotic drug laws. I believe they are very good sources of information for prosecuting some of the big fellows.

Mr. DANIEL. Two police officers here in Washington, D. C., were tried because they were in league with top drug handlers in this area. Those officers were members of the narcotic squad. They were tried in court, and the jury turned them loose. All the evidence against them was evidence on the part of the drug pushers and of those in the drug racket. In court the prosecutor had the wire tap which showed that these police officers were making arrangements with the drug peddlers, but that evidence could not be used in court. Therefore, those two officers were turned loose. I will say to the Senator from Oregon, that our committee could not find one top racketeer in the million-dollar bracket, in the international or national field, who had been convicted in the courts of this land since we have had on the books the Federal Communications Act as it now reads.

I will stand subject to correction, if counsel remembers any, but I know we went over the matter time and time again. It is not possible to hit the big men in the narcotics racket, and it is for one reason only, and that is that they safeguard themselves behind the telephone, and they cannot be charged in certain jurisdictions by State officials. There are 30 States in which they can be charged. Therefore, they do not operate in the States where they can be charged. They get out of those States and go into the States where they cannot be charged. Of course, they cannot be charged in any Federal court. Therefore, they have established themselves in a haven of refuge in which they can conduct their business.

I wish the Senator from Oregon would suggest a substitute for this provision, if he can find one. If we could have found it he may be sure that we would have tried to recommend something else. It does seem to us to be a shame to tighten up on the peddlers and the small pushers in this business and to let the big fellows behind the telephone continue to carry on this international traffic in human misery.

Mr. MORSE. It is a grave problem the Senator has presented, and I am perfectly willing to discuss it.

First, let me say that, if I recall the record of the Senator's committee correctly, some 30 States, as the Senator has pointed out, do permit wiretapping and do admit wiretap evidence.

If that were such an effective procedure, one would think that such States would have had some success in their prosecutions because that kind of evidence is admissible, and because those States have so-called drug-control laws.

Mr. DANIEL. They have had great success in those States.

Mr. MORSE. Have they convicted any of the top racketeers?

Mr. DANIEL. They have, in some instances in the State courts, yes, they have had some convictions. However, the big boys move out of those States. They operate in States where they have a haven of refuge and where they cannot be touched in the State courts. They move out of the States where they can be touched through interception of their telephone conversations.

Mr. MORSE. Was any evidence adduced by the committee that successful prosecutions in those States have been limited to those cases in which wiretap has been used?

Mr. DANIEL. Oh, no; not at all. As a matter of fact, wiretap evidence is mostly used as corroborating evidence in those States, because the men at the top of the racket whom we are trying to reach do not operate in States where that kind of law enforcement is practiced. They get out of those States. Therefore those racketeers are not being touched by the wiretap provisions in the laws of those States.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Texas has just said something that is very vital. He said that the wiretap evidence is used only as corroborating evidence.

Mr. DANIEL. Mostly, I said, in those States that have those laws.

Mr. MORSE. Mostly; yes.

Mr. DANIEL. I say that because the big-time racketeers get out of those States and go into States where there are no wiretap provisions in effect.

Mr. MORSE. But there was obtained evidence on the basis of which prosecutions could be brought without any corroborating evidence, and the corroborating evidence was used only to strengthen the cases which were brought.

Mr. DANIEL. Yes; they were mostly against small-time drug pushers and racketeers. Very seldom have any people at the top of the racket been convicted. It made our committee feel that we should go this far with a properly safeguarded provision for telephone interception. We felt we were being a little more stringent in writing the provision than would be necessary, for example, if there was involved a search of a person's home. It is possible to get a search warrant on reasonable cause during the daytime if probable cause is shown that some kind of crime is being committed in a home.

Mr. MORSE. But limited to the specifics to which I have referred.

Mr. DANIEL. In the case of narcotics court orders would be limited specifics of conversations having to do with the drug traffic.

Mr. MORSE. But they would not be limited to the specific of hearing only what was discussed about the drug traffic. That is the violation of privacy which I am protesting.

Mr. DANIEL. That gets back to what is permissible under the present law. Officers can listen in all they want to.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator thinks I am standing here justifying the existence of wiretapping, I have not made myself clear. I think we should make it unlawful even though the conversation cannot be used in evidence, as courts have consistently held. This is a movement which should be taken in the opposite direction from that in which the Senator from Texas is walking.

Mr. DANIEL. The committee was of the opinion that we were actually narrowing down and making the requirements more stringent than they are today.

Mr. MORSE. More stringent than in some of the State laws. I think this is an unwarranted use of wiretapping by some Federal officers.

Mr. DANIEL. We have no law today which prohibits the mere listening-in on telephone conversations.

Mr. MORSE. I shall cover that point later.

Mr. DANIEL. As the law is today, officers can listen, but are prohibited from divulging. They have to do both in order to prove a narcotics offender guilty, under the law. There are law enforcement officers in various departments of the Government listening in and doing exactly what the Senator is opposed to and what I am opposed to. Under our provision, we would say, "It is unlawful for you to do that any more. You must show a Federal court that you have reasonable cause to believe that those phones are being used for carrying on a traffic in dope. Then you must get a Federal court order to listen and use the evidence in court."

That is certainly more stringent, more confining, than what we have today.

Mr. MORSE. But, in my judgment, it does not make it right. Furthermore, with reference to the practice now existing, this third-degree pressure cannot be used in evidence. The law-enforcement officers listen to it, but cannot use it in evidence. There are too many cases in which the accused is told, "You might as well confess, because we have a tape on you of a telephone conversation you had. There are a lot of interesting things in the telephone conversation you had." They are using too frequently wiretapping procedures as a form of third degree or a form of law-enforcement blackmail. It is a dangerous thing.

I do not accept the Senator's premise that there cannot be successful prosecution without wiretap evidence. My reply is that we had better get some better law enforcement. In our history there have been many crimes as to which

we have tried to get evidence, and careful detection has finally ferreted out the guilty ones. It is better to do it in that way than to adopt a procedure which is incompatible with personal freedom.

Mr. DANIEL. If the Senator from Oregon had sat through the 37 days of hearings with the Senator from Texas and the other members of our committee I do not believe he would have made the statement he has just made, because there are a good many law-enforcement officers in the Federal Government who are trying to catch narcotics racketeers, but the big operators never come any closer to the drug addict or to the drug than the telephone, and they cannot be convicted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Texas that the remainder of my speech will deal with the development of my views on the history of the old search and seizure system. In my speech next week I shall discuss what I consider to be the controlling cases in American law on the subject. I shall devote the rest of my time this afternoon to a discussion of the broader subject, the relationship of the proposals of the Senator from Texas in the matter of protecting the rights of the American people, as I see those rights, and complete personal freedom, without any tampering with or tapping of telephone wires. I want the Senator to know the course of my argument today.

Mr. DANIEL. I am against, as is also the committee, the complete freedom of the top racketeers in narcotics in using telephone communication for the purpose of carrying on the narcotics business. Does the Senator from Oregon understand the reasoning behind our proposal?

Mr. MORSE. I understand the reasoning, but I think it is on a basic false assumption, and that is that we cannot count on law enforcement officers to exercise very wise discretion.

Mr. DANIEL. Even under an order of the court?

Mr. MORSE. Oh, yes; because I think court orders become very much a matter of routine formality. They do not result in any real thorough-going investigation. Under the procedure suggested by the Senator, innocent people will have their wires tapped. One innocent person having his wires tapped is one too many for me. I do not think there is any procedure that makes it right for even 1 man or 1 woman to have his or her wires tapped.

INDISCRIMINATE SEARCHES PROHIBITED

Indiscriminate search for evidence was held unreasonable by Lord Camden, who recalled the search in the case of Wilkes against Wood:

> All was taken and Mr. Wilkes' private pocketbook filled up the mouth of the sack. Such is the power, and therefore one should naturally expect the law to warrant it should be clear in proportion as the power is exorbitant.

Lord Camden stated a recognized principle of English law:

> The law obligeth no man to accuse himself; because the necessary means of compelling self-accusation, falling upon the innocent as well as the guilty, would be both cruel and unjust; and it should seem that search for evidence is disallowed upon the same principle. There, too, the innocent would be confounded with the guilty.
>
> Whether this proceedeth from the gentleness of the law toward criminals, or from a consideration that such a power would be more pernicious to the innocent than useful to the public, I will not say.

I say most respectfully that I think the procedure provided in the bill is one in which the guilty are asked to accuse themselves. I think it is the duty of the Government, under our system of criminal justice, to assume the full burden of proof and to proceed to do the accusing, and to base the accusations upon evidence which is not supplied to the Government by a defendant accusing himself. I think Lord Camden stated that principle succinctly and clearly back in his day; and I am for applying it to the bill.

These words may be recalled when later we consider an American wiretap case *Olmstead* v. *United States* (277 U. S. 438 (1927)). Justice Holmes said in his dissent in that case:

> For my part I think it a less evil that some criminals should escape than that the Government should play an ignoble part.

We know that that great statement of Holmes has become almost a maxim in a discussion of the essentials of American justice. It is a restatement of an earlier maxim that it is better for a few guilty to escape than that one innocent person rot in jail.

WHOSE HOUSE WOULD BE SAFE?

The basic objection to unreasonable search and seizure was stated by Lord Camden:

> Observe the wisdom as well as the mercy of the law. The strongest evidence before a trial, being only ex parte, is but suspicion; it is not proof. Weak evidence is a ground of suspicion, though in a lower degree; and if suspicion at large should be a ground of search * * * whose house would be safe?

In the course of argument in the Parliament, when the House of Commons in April 1766, declared general warrants to be illegal, William Pitt declared:

> The poorest man may, in his cottage, bid defiance to all the forces of the Crown. It may be frail; its roof may shake; the wind may blow through it; the storm may enter; the rain may enter; but the King of England may not enter. All his force dares not cross the threshold of the ruined tenement.

That great principle of English justice is very applicable to this situation. Of course, we will be allowing a so-called escape hatch for the very vicious drug peddlers, whom the Senator from Texas has described so ably this afternoon, to continue the great damage they are doing to American youth. But I am talking about a system of justice. I say that that system of justice can be no stronger than its procedures.

I have said over and over again, and I must say it once more, because it is so applicable to this debate, that the American people have no substantive rights separate from their procedural rights. I respectfully submit that the proposal to adopt a bad procedure is a good example of the loss of a substantive right. The substantive right which will be lost is the complete privacy on the part of innocent persons to carry on telephone conversations with absolutely no danger whatsoever that any other person will hear their conversations. That is the substantive right which will be lost by the bill. That is the freedom which will be lost by the bill. The American people must stand guard against this kind of encroachment upon individual liberty.

COLONIAL HISTORY

Freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures was one of the rights prominent in the thinking of Americans who on October 14, 1774, in the "Declarations and Resolves of the First Continental Congress" demanded "the rights, liberties, and immunities of free and natural-born subjects within the realm of England."

On June 12, 1776, less than a month before American independence was declared, the State of Virginia adopted in its bill of rights the provision:

> That general warrants, whereby an officer or messenger may be commanded to search suspected places without evidence of a fact committed, or to seize any person or persons not named, or whose offense is not particularly described and supported by evidence, are grievous and oppressive, and ought not to be granted.

In September 1776, the constitution of the State of Pennsylvania declared:

> That the people have a right to hold themselves, their houses, papers, and possessions free from search and seizure, and therefore warrants without oaths or affirmations first made, affording a sufficient foundation for them, and whereby any officer or messenger may be commanded or required to search suspected places, or to seize any person or persons, his or their property, not particularly described, are contrary to that right, and ought not to be granted.

By the time the fourth amendment to our Federal Constitution was adopted a similar search-and-seizure provision was included in the bill of rights of every State in which the rights of the people were specifically enumerated in the State constitution.

CONSTITUTIONAL DEBATES

In the debates of the Federal Constitution the question of search and seizure was the first illustration seized upon by Lee, of Virginia, and Gerry, of Massachusetts, as indicative of the necessity of a Bill of Rights.

In his arguments in the Virginia Convention, Patrick Henry dwelt on possible oppressions by public officials, and said:

> When these harpies are aided by excisemen, who may search, at any time, your houses and most secret recesses, will the people bear it? If you think so, you differ from me. Where I thought there was a possibility of such mischiefs, I would grant power with a niggardly hand; and here there is a strong possibility that these oppressions shall actually happen. I may be told that it is safe to err on that side, because such regulations may be made by Congress as shall restrain these officers, and because laws are made by our Representatives, and judged by righteous judges; but, sir, as these regulations may be made, so they may not; and many reasons there are to induce a belief that they will not.

I think it is very interesting that even in his time Patrick Henry warned the American people that they must main-

tain restraints and checks upon law-enforcement officers and on judges.

When James Madison spoke for a Bill of Rights in the First Congress general warrants were to him the most prominent illustration of the need for a Bill of Rights.

It is significant to note that the fourth amendment, when adopted, did not attempt to create a right: it stated an already existing right of the people to be secure in their persons, homes, and effects which should not be violated.

The first clause of the amendment stated the right and the prohibition against its violation. The second clause stated specifically the requirements of a search warrant, its purpose obviously being to insure against future intrusions of the particular kind that was then fresh in the minds of the framers of the amendment, but not to limit the effect of the amendment to that one type of intrusion.

MONUMENT, OF FREEDOM

It must be concluded that when our fourth amendment was adopted, its framers and those who approved it intended that the principles of the case of Entick against Carrington should be embodied in our law. The United States Supreme Court in the Boyd case said, referring to Entick against Carrington:

> As every American statesman, during our revolutionary and formative period as a Nation, was undoubtedly familiar with this monument of English freedom, and considered it as the true and ultimate expression of constitutional law, it may be confidently asserted that its provisions were in the mind of those who framed the fourth amendment to our Constitution, and where considered as sufficiently explanatory of what was meant by unreasonable searches and seizures.

Blackstone's Commentaries, 1 Tucker App. 301–304, stated in the year 1803:

> The case of general warrants, under which term all warrants not comprehended within the description of the preceding article may be included, was warmly contested in England about 30 or 35 years ago, and after much altercation they were finally pronounced to be illegal by the common law.
>
> The constitutional sanction here given to the same doctrine, and the test which it affords for trying the legality of any warrant by which a man may be deprived of his liberty, or disturbed in the enjoyment of his property, cannot be too highly valued by a free people.

PRINCIPLES OF FOURTH AMENDMENT

Summing up, then, the framers of the fourth amendment had three main principles in mind:

First. That privacy and the sanctity of the home ought to be constitutionally protected;

Second. That the protection of individual rights was paramount to governmental expediencies;

Third. That secret search of a man's property for evidence, by way of general warrants, was an unjustifiable infringement upon the rights of a free people.

I find it difficult to reconcile the decision of the Supreme Court in 1928, in the case of Olmstead against United States, which has been cited in support of the proposition that wiretapping is not a violation of the fourth amendment, with what history shows me to be the purpose and spirit of the amendment.

Legalized wiretapping, as proposed by the Attorney General or in the bill passed by the House of Representatives, could not meet the requirements laid down by the court in the decision in Entick against Carrington.

The proposals would legalize wiretapping for investigation purposes, without evidence of a fact committed. Suspicion alone would be the ground for search.

That is so true of this section of the bill, Mr. President. All the prosecutor or the law enforcement officer has to do is to state to the judge that he has reason to believe that X is a big-time dope peddler, and ask the judge to sign the order which he prepared authorizing the department to tap the wire. That is suspicion, and that is all it is. It is a serious infringement, in my opinion, of the rights of Mr. X, who does not stand convicted until proof has been presented before a body of his peers, and who, in my judgment, is entitled to the kind of protection for his personal freedom for which I am fighting this afternoon.

Wiretapping is nonselective. The privacies of innocent persons would be invaded, because its operations cannot be limited to the conversations of only those who are properly held suspect.

Innocent persons whose lines were tapped would be without protection. In the words of Lord Camden:

> The only witnesses are the trespassers.

Wiretapping is indiscriminate. Its attention cannot be confined to materials legitimately the subject of examination.

No wiretapping warrant—whether it be called a warrant, an official authorization, or a court order—could be other than a general warrant.

The reason I have discussed the fourth amendment is the long history of the fight in this country against general warrants. Certainly, I am applying it by way of an argument by analogy; but I am saying this section in effect would work out in practice to be nothing but a general warrant; and general warrants are a serious infringement upon the personal liberties of our people.

Listening to and recording a person's conversations is a taking of his property. Modern law recognizes as property, and protects, every kind of possession, intangibles as well as tangibles.

Interception of telephone conversations from or to the home is an intrusion into the home, whether or not the home itself is physically entered, because its purpose and effect is to snoop into what goes on in the home.

In the Boyd case, the leading case of interpretation of the fourth amendment, the Supreme Court said that the amendment prohibits not only proceedings containing the obvious incidents of search and seizure, but also those which contain their substance and essence, and effect their substantial purpose.

HISTORY MUST GUIDE US

If we are to be guided by our constitutional history; if we are to give more than lipservice to the Bill of Rights; if we are to maintain our democratic institutions—we cannot authorize the use of the police-state practice of wiretapping in America.

In a recent Supreme Court case, Justice Jackson said:

> Security is like liberty in that many are the crimes committed in its name.

In the name of security, the police state justifies its oppressions.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator from Oregon allow the Senator from Texas to give another quotation from one of Mr. Justice Jackson's cases, to go right along with the one he has just quoted?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator will remember that Mr. Justice Jackson also said, in a case before him:

> Criminals today have the free run of our communications systems, but the law-enforcement officers are denied even the carefully restricted power to confront the criminal with his telephonic and telegraphic footprints.

Mr. Justice Jackson, when he was Attorney General of the United States, did do away with wiretapping, but later he went back to it, with the specific approval of President Roosevelt in certain cases where he thought it was necessary. Later Mr. Justice Jackson, while on the bench, several times decried the fact that our law-enforcement officers are not allowed to use the evidence—against the criminals, not the innocent—which they receive by interception of telephone calls.

Mr. MORSE. Justice Jackson was a great prosecutor, and he brought to the bench the prosecutor's complex, and we see it manifested in the very comment the Senator has just read. That is why it is so important that we protect the American people from the prosecutor's complex, even though he may wear judicial robes. But the quotation I gave from Mr. Justice Jackson had nothing to do with the wiretapping issue. He was not talking about wiretapping when he was referring to the great American liberties. I speak respectfully in his memory, but I think it is one of the black marks on his record that he ever tolerated wiretapping when he was Attorney General.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator knows that President Roosevelt tolerated it, and that President Truman tolerated it. Does he not?

Mr. MORSE. That did not make it right.

Mr. DANIEL. For 22 years, except for a few months when Mr. Justice Jackson, as Attorney General, discarded it, wiretapping has been tolerated.

Mr. MORSE. That does not make it right. It only shows that they, too, were prone to adopt the "end justifies the means" theory in this particular field. It does not make it right. What is right is the great, emblazoned principle of individual liberty that we find running through all our history, and which is so firmly embedded in the fourth amendment.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator knows that the Court has held that the fourth amendment does not make wiretapping unconstitutional. Does he not?

Mr. MORSE. That was held in the Olmstead case, but, as I shall say in my

argument next week, I should like to see a case on all fours with the Olmstead case go before the Court. Prediction is always dangerous, but, in my judgment, a case on all fours with the Olmstead case, if it were properly reargued, would upset the Olmstead case.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator thinks the present Court would overrule the previous decision and write the law differently?

Mr. MORSE. I hope a new case will cause the Court to go back to the fourth amendment, so far as history goes, which the Court did not do in the Olmstead case. If the Senator wants my opinion about the Olmstead case, I think it is very bad law; but we have to live with it until it is reviewed by the Court under a new set of circumstances and the decision is changed. I am inclined to think that in due course of time the Olmstead case will cease to be the law.

In the name of security, we are asked to set aside our constitutional guarantees of liberty.

At any time in history, short-sighted leaders can use a national emergency as an excuse for precipitous actions.

The strength of our democratic processes is in their proven ability to withstand the tests put to them in times of emergency.

I do not for a moment underestimate the aggressive intent of foreign Communists and their agents within our country. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that the FBI and the intelligence agencies, working within the framework of our Constitution, are doing an excellent job of discovering and destroying enemy activity, a better job than could be done by aping the methods of the Communists.

NO NEED FOR WIRETAPPING SHOWN

Brownell and the other administration proponents of wiretapping have not shown that the agencies cannot continue to do an effective job without the use of wiretap. They have only claimed that without it the Government is handicapped in its work.

I have no doubt that some of the police have always considered constitutional limitations on the methods they may use in their work to be handicaps. But these limitations have been what has distinguished the free state from the police state.

It has been argued that because spies and criminals make use of modern scientific devices, the police should be allowed similar liberty in the case of the wiretap—a sort of a "fight fire with fire" argument.

The trouble with "fighting fire with fire" in a case such as this one is that in doing so, the Bill of Rights may be reduced to a heap of ashes.

History shows that bad police methods breed disrespect for law, shake the confidence of law-abiding citizens in the administration of justice, and weaken the national morale. Police tyranny is no substitute for police protection.

Our strongest weapon in the fight against communism is constant and undiminished observance of democratic processes and procedural safeguards.

Mr. President, in my next speech on this subject I shall discuss this bill and the proposals of the administration in the whole field of wiretapping. I shall review the court cases, and shall outline today's laws and practices, and shall make specific recommendations as to how I think this problem should be handled. Of course, I shall frequently refer to the words of Lord Camden in the case of Entick against Carrington, and the other historical landmarks I have reviewed here today.

Paraphrasing Lord Camden's question "If suspicion at large should be ground for search, whose house would be safe?" Let me conclude by asking: If the citizen's every word must be uttered in the fear that it is being monitored by the agents of an all-powerful government, whose mind will be free?

Mr. President, in my judgment, the wiretapping section of the pending bill is exactly what I said of it at the beginning of my speech, namely, in itself it is the most deadly drug which could be injected into our body politic because it will deaden our sensitivity to individual liberty. It will tend to cause the American people, without a full realization of what they are doing, to accept another police-state technique within our democracy. Inasmuch as government by secrecy is a police-state technique—and today there is too much of it—so it is, Mr. President, that wiretapping is also a police-state technique. As one Member of the Senate, I shall never vote my approval of it in any shape, form, or fashion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a release including a telegram by Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., national chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, on the wiretapping provisions of the narcotics bill, and also a release on the same subject which has come to my attention, including a telegram from Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers.

There being no objection, the releases were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADA URGES SENATE REJECT WIRETAP PROVISION OF NARCOTICS BILL

AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION,
Washington, D. C., May 25, 1956.

The following telegram was sent today to Senators LYNDON JOHNSON and WILLIAM KNOWLAND:

"Americans for Democratic Action respectfully urges that the Senate reject the wiretap provision included in the narcotics bill now pending before it. Wiretapping and wiretap evidence do not assure more efficient police work, are not reliable, are susceptible to abuse, and would invade the privacy of our citizens. In unscrupulous or irresponsible hands, they could be instruments of blackmail and campaigns of vilification and slander. Most States which permit wiretapping provide for court order as set forth in the provision pending before the Senate. However, it is notorious that the court-order provision does not assure selectivity and cannot assure the confidential handling of information obtained.

"We urge the Senate to reject this provision and to make it unmistakably clear to the Justice Department and other Federal agencies that the present prohibition against wiretapping is to be enforced against all, including agents of the Federal, State, and local governments who are now engaged in this dirty business.

"JOSEPH L. RAUH, Jr.,
"National Chairman."

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 25, 1956.*

UAW President Walter P. Reuther today sent the following wire to Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON and Minority Leader WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND urging the Senate to drop from the narcotic-control bill the provision that would legalize wiretapping:

"We understand that decision was made late yesterday for the Senate to take up today S. 3760, a bill for the control of narcotic drugs. United Automobile Workers strongly supports all necessary measures for control of narcotic drugs. Their illicit distribution damages hundreds of thousands of American lives and families. But proper control of narcotic traffic does not require legalization of wiretapping provided in pending bill. Wiretapping is still the dirty business described by Justice Holmes and the instrument of tyranny and oppression described by Justice Brandeis. Were Congress to breach the dike which restricts overzealous law-enforcement officials from invading the privacy of the telephone for this purpose soon there would be a revival of proposals to breach this dike for other purposes. Instead of pushing bill through without debate, United Automobile Workers urges that adequate opportunity be afforded for debate on this vital issue of civil liberties. We believe that such debate and thoughtful examination of this great issue by the American people will demonstrate the wisdom of dropping the wiretapping legalization provision from the pending bill.

"WALTER P. REUTHER,
"President, UAW."

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, in view of the statements made by the Senator from Oregon and the telegram from Mr. Walter Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers, in opposition to this particular section of the bill, and also the telegram from the Americans for Democratic Action, protesting this particular section of the bill—both telegrams having been placed in the RECORD by the Senator from Oregon—I wish to say that every law-enforcement officer who appeared before our committee and advocated this particular section of the bill, said it should be included in the bill with adequate safeguards to protect the liberties and rights of American citizens. All the witnesses who appeared before our committee and who recommended that the bill provide for the right to intercept telephone communications between narcotics drug traffickers, said that the provision should be made "with adequate safeguards."

We have included in the bill a provision stronger than any present provision of Federal law with respect to protection against wiretapping. The bill provides that the United States attorney must obtain from the Federal court a sealed court order, and must prove to the court that he has reason to believe that such telephones are being used for the narcotics drug traffic. But the members of our committee have found there is no way to get the top national and international traffickers in narcotics unless authorization is made to intercept their means of carrying on their business, which is by telephone.

Mr. President, on this subject I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the body of the RECORD a portion of our report on the District of Columbia narcotics problem, beginning with page 13 and concluding on page 16.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 2033) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL NARCOTICS AGENTS ARE NOT AUTHORIZED TO MAKE WIRETAPS, OR TO USE WIRETAP INFORMATION IN ORDER TO CORROBORATE TESTIMONY OR DETECT NEW EVIDENCE OF NARCOTICS LAW VIOLATIONS

While a great many States permit enforcement officers to make wiretaps, and permit the use of evidence obtained by wiretapping, such authority is not available to enforcement and prosecution agencies in the District of Columbia.

The subcommittee has found the telephone to be an essential medium for the conduct of the organized and tenacious narcotic racket. This is particularly true in operations conducted in large metropolitan areas like Washington and in intercity and interstate trafficking. Peddlers of dope could not organize or operate their vicious racket without the telephone. For this reason law enforcement officers and prosecutors throughout the United States have overwhelmingly urged this subcommittee to recommend carefully restricted wiretapping authority to be used in narcotics investigations. The value of wiretapping in the campaign against the illicit drug traffic, in corroborating testimony by addicts and informers, and in detecting new evidence is dramatically illustrated in the testimony of two able prosecutors, Mr. Samuel Dash, acting district attorney, Philadelphia, and Mr. Fred Smithson, assistant United States attorney, Washington, D. C. Their testimony, which follows, is truly "a tale of two cities"—one which succeeded and one which failed in apprehending and punishing vicious drug traffickers. Statement by Mr. Dash:

"One of the most important uses of wiretapping in Philadelphia today is in combating the drug traffic. As a result of two important raids in the last 3 months, the Philadelphia police and the district attorney's office have virtually driven the drug traffic out of Philadelphia.

"There has been no single drug peddler who has escaped conviction. The sentences have been severe. There has been a steady stream of drug addicts leaving Philadelphia. Through wiretapping, we have learned that large distributors in Chicago and New York have refused to come to Philadelphia because, in their words, 'It is too hot in Philadelphia for drug sellers.' In the latter stages of the program against the drug peddlers we were reaching the large distributors. These persons were too clever to sell to police officers. But through information learned from the drug sellers who had already been arrested, the district attorney's office and the Philadelphia police were able, through wiretapping, to secure enough evidence on some of the large distributors to make arrests and to try to convict these distributors. Today these distributors are behind bars serving long prison terms.

"In one case a distributor who thought himself so clever that he could never be detected was tapped and his entire operations were learned. The day before his arrest our wiretappers even learned that he had an inside tipoff man who warned him of the arrest. He didn't believe that he could be arrested. He was found sleeping peacefully in bed when the raiders came."

Compare the above testimony to the experience of prosecutors here in Washington when they tried to convict two police officers assigned to the narcotics squad who themselves were alleged to have become entangled in the drug traffic. Mr. Smithson, assistant United States attorney, testified:

"One case is very close to me, for I was trial assistant. It involved two high-ranking police officers who were assigned to the narcotics squad—Hjalmer Carper, who was acting lieutenant in charge of the narcotics squad of the Metropolitan Police Department, and Detective Sergeant William Taylor, who, I believe, was second-ranking man on the squad. Both of these officers were charged with conspiracy with a man by the name of Jim 'Yellow' Roberts, a notorious narcotics trafficker.

"Assigned to this case, there was an outstanding investigator with unusual ability to convey his thoughts and knowledge in the field, a man by the name of Howard Chappell, of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics. When he was developing the original case against Jim 'Yellow' Roberts and his wife, he worked under cover for the Federal Bureau of Narcotics without any information being known to anyone else in the city. And there came a time when Jim 'Yellow' Roberts told the agent—and the agent so testified—that he would have no trouble, he would take care of him, because he had his fix with the head of the local narcotics squad.

"There came a time further when Agent Chappell met for the first time these two police officers—it was in the office of the United States commissioner where testimony was taken—and they learned for the first time that an agent and undercover man had a purchase on James 'Yellow.' And James 'Yellow' testified that he was immediately notified by telephone by that police officer that two, a white and colored agent, had purchases on him, and to get out of town.

"Now, there is a prime example, because prior to that occasion the agent had information that Jim 'Yellow' was dealing with someone in the local narcotics squad. If they had been permitted to use a tap on those particular wires, there would have been the direct corroboration necessary to identify the person that made the telephone call from that police lieutenant to Jim 'Yellow' telling him what he had just discovered and telling him to get out of town.

"I would like to stress this, that wiretapping evidence would have supplied that degree of corroboration which that jury would have found, I believe, sufficient to have convicted those two police officers. While we had Chappell and one other witness testify, the great parade of witnesses were convicted narcotic peddlers or addicts whose testimony the jury is cautioned to view with scrutiny and care. However, evidence we could have obtained by wiretapping would have identified and corroborated the narcotics peddler, Jim Roberts' story, to Chappell when he did not know Chappell was a narcotics agent, that he had a connection, a payoff arrangement, with the head of the local narcotics squad, and that would have corroborated the call from Lieutenant Carper to Roberts' residence, and the admonition to Roberts to leave town because the 2 agents, 1 a white and 1 a colored informer, had purchased drugs from Jim 'Yellow,' and that they were applying for an arrest warrant and were going to arrest him.

"Without such corroboration, which wiretapping evidence would have made possible, the verdict was 'not guilty,' and these police officers escaped punishment."

Wiretapping, therefore, is essential in the fight against the illicit drug traffic. Such wiretapping evidence would be corroborative of the testimony of informer-witnesses whose testimony is otherwise critically affected by the standard instructions to juries that informer-testimony should be received with caution and scrutinized with care. By having such corroborative evidence, informer-witnesses will receive more nearly their deserved credence. Without it, law-enforcement agencies are severely handicapped in this age of modern, electronic methods which are freely utilized by the traffickers. Unless law-enforcement agencies can match the criminals weapon for weapon, law-enforcement agencies cannot be fully effective. Denying the use of supervised wiretapping authority in the District of Columbia in narcotics cases, recalls an observation made by the late Supreme Court Justice, Mr. Jackson, when he said:

"Criminals today have the free run of our communications systems, but the law-enforcement officers are denied even a carefully restricted power to confront the criminal with his telephonic and telegraphic footprints."

Recommending wiretapping authority for use in the District of Columbia, especially in narcotics cases, are Mr. Warren Olney III, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division; Mr. Harry J. Anslinger, Commissioner of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics; Chief Judge Leo A. Rover; Mr. Oliver Gasch, United States attorney; Chief of Police Robert V. Murray; and Capt. Todd O. Thoman, head of the narcotics squad of the Metropolitan Police Department, and many others.

The subcommittee proposes therefore, that specific authority to intercept telephone conversations between narcotics traffickers, as well as authority to introduce the information so gained into evidence, should be made available for use in the District of Columbia. To that end, the subcommittee has written specific authority to intercept and divulge telephone conversations into the bill amendatory of title 18 of the United States Code. The authority contained therein will apply to the District of Columbia and will thus serve to remedy a serious impediment to local law enforcement. We are not, however, recommending that such wiretapping authority be given directly to the Metropolitan Police Department, but we are proposing the authority for Federal narcotics agents with the specific direction that they afford District law-enforcement agencies their complete cooperation and assistance in specific cases involving violations of Federal narcotics laws. This decision to make wiretapping authority available and yet reserve its use to Federal officers, reflects the subcommittee's belief that the authority to make wiretaps should be restricted to a small and highly specialized group to be used under limited conditions and with judicial approval.

THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in 1936, Congress enacted the Robinson-Patman Act which is known as the Magna Carta of small business. The Robinson-Patman Act was designed to protect small firms from predatory and discriminatory pricing practices of their large competitors. Throughout the years, many of the 4 million small firms now in existence has survived only because of the protection afforded them by the Robinson-Patman Act. Although there have been many attacks against this legislation, both in the courts and in the Halls of Congress, its provisions remained unimpaired until the celebrated decision in the Standard Oil of Indiana case, which has made it virtually impossible for the Federal Trade Commission to provide adequate enforcement of the act's provisions.

On the very first day of the 84th Congress, I joined with 29 other Senators in sponsoring the bill (S. 11) to amend the Robinson-Patman Act with reference to equality of opportunity. We introduced this legislation to plug the loophole

created by the Supreme Court's decision and restore the Robinson-Patman Act to its full vigor.

On the same day, H. R. 11 was introduced by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN. Identical bills were also introduced by his colleagues in the House.

I was gratified to note that a majority of the Members of the House expressed their approval of the principles and purposes of H. R. 11 last week. Just yesterday, the House Rules Committee granted a rule on this legislation, and it appears certain that the House will pass its version within the next week or 10 days.

Another encouraging development of the past week on this front has been the shift in position of the Federal Trade Commission. Although the FTC spoke in opposition to H. R. 11 before the House Judiciary Committee, I have just received a letter from Commissioner Sigurd Anderson, advising me that he and Commissioner Robert T. Secrest now withdraw their objection to the legislation and urge its support. With that change of position, it now appears that a majority of the FTC supports both H. R. 11 and S. 11.

Mr. President, with this shift by the Federal Trade Commission, I would recommend to the Department of Justice and the Small Business Administration that these agencies might well reexamine their announced opposition to this legislation. In view of the widespread support received by H. R. 11 and S. 11 from every small-business association, and the small-business community generally, I am hopeful that the Senate Judiciary Committee will schedule hearings on Senate bill 11 at the earliest practicable date so that congressional enactment may be assured well before adjournment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a letter which I have received from Mr. Sigurd Anderson, Commissioner of the Federal Trade Commission, and also copies of letters which Mr. Anderson has written to Representative CELLER, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, and to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, with a note showing the concurrence of Commissioner Robert T. Secrest.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
May 23, 1956.

Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Please find enclosed herewith copy of letter to the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and copy of letter to the chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary with respect to my position in connection with S. 11 and H. R. 11, both of the 84th Congress, 1st session, respectively. Please note that Commissioner Robert T. Secrest concurs with me in these matters.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,

SIGURD ANDERSON,
Commissioner.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, May 21, 1956.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On March 1, 1956, the Honorable JOHN W. GWYNNE, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, advised you that the Commission by a vote of 4–1, Commissioner Kern dissenting, registered opposition to H. R. 11, 84th Congress, 1st session. The members of the Commission felt that in view of certain existing circumstances, that any recommendation for a change in the law would be premature at the time.

Recent developments have caused me to reverse my position with respect to H. R. 11. The decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the 7th Circuit in the Standard Oil of Indiana case and the denial of certiorari in the *Balian Ice Cream Co., Inc., et al.* v. *Arden Farms Co., et al.*, case in the Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit have changed the picture. Both of these cases, in my opinion, rather indicate that the matter of successful administration of section 2 of the Clayton Act, as amended, has been made more difficult.

Therefore, I withdraw my opposition to H. R. 11 and urge its support. I will appreciate your making this letter a part of your official record.

Sincerely yours,

SIGURD ANDERSON,
Commissioner.

I concur in the above views of the Commissioner Anderson.

ROBERT T. SECREST,
Commissioner.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, May 22, 1956.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On March 1, 1956, the Honorable John W. Gwynne, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, advised your committee that the Commission by a vote of 4–1, Commissioner Kern dissenting, registered opposition to S. 11, 84th Congress, 1st session. The members of the Commission felt that in view of certain existing circumstances, that any recommendation for a change in the law would be premature at the time.

Recent developments have caused me to reverse my position with respect to S. 11. The decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit in the *Standard Oil of Indiana* case the denial of certiorari in *The Balian Ice Cream Co., Inc., et al.* v. *Arden Farms Co., et al.*, case in the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, have changed the picture. Both of these cases, in my opinion, rather indicate that the matter of successful administration of section 2 of the Clayton Act, as amended, has been made more difficult.

Therefore, I withdraw my opposition to S. 11 and urge its support. I will appreciate your making this letter a part of your official record.

Sincerely yours,

SIGURD ANDERSON,
Commissioner.

I concur in the above views of Commissioner Anderson.

ROBERT T. SECREST,
Commissioner.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALTONSTALL in the chair). Let the present occupant of the chair ask the acting majority leader whether the understanding of the present occupant of the chair is correct, namely, that when the Senate concludes its business today, it will take a recess until 10 o'clock on Monday morning, at which time the pending business will be the highway construction bill.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, as acting majority leader, let me say that I understand that on Monday morning the measure now before the Senate—the Narcotics Control Act of 1956—will be laid aside, for consideration of the highway construction bill; and the highway construction bill will be the pending business on Monday and thereafter until it is concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is also understood, is it not, that at the conclusion of its business today, the Senate will take a recess until 10 o'clock on Monday morning?

Mr. DANIEL. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well.

FEDERAL REGULATION OF INSURANCE

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I now turn to another subject, namely, Federal regulation of insurance. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to another trespass by a Federal agency on what Congress had understood was within the power of the States, namely, regulation of the insurance business. I am referring to the recent case, before the Federal Trade Commission, styled in the matter of the American Hospital and Life Insurance Co., in which it was held that the Federal Trade Commission has jurisdiction to regulate advertising by insurance companies. This was held by a divided—3-to-2—vote of the Commission.

I do not know anything about the company named; neither have I heard from any officer or member of this company. In addition, I do not have any knowledge about the merits of this particular case. All I am concerned with is the question of jurisdiction and the fact that a majority of the Federal Trade Commission appear to assume federal jurisdiction over the insurance business, contrary to the clear intent of the McCarran-Ferguson Insurance Regulation Act, Public Law 15, of the 79th Congress.

Prior to the decision in *U. S.* v. *Southeastern Underwriters Association* (322 U. S. 533 (1944)), it was generally understood that the regulation of insurance was a problem for the respective States. This was in keeping with a long line of decisions, starting with *Paul* v. *Virginia* (8 Wall. 168 (1868)). The Southeastern Underwriters case reversed the holdings of 75 years, and held for the first time that the business of insurance was interstate commerce and therefore subject to regulation under the commerce clause of the United States Constitution.

The uncertainty and confusion which resulted from this reversal was recognized by Congress and prompt action was taken. In order to return the law to its previous state, Congress enacted Public Law 15, the McCarran Act, and again it was generally understood, both by Congress and the Nation, that insurance was not subject to regulation by the

Federal Government but was a matter for the control of the individual States wherein a particular company operated.

The Federal Trade Commission, in the American Hospital and Life Insurance case, has in effect overruled Congress by extending the jurisdiction of the Commission to the regulation of the business of insurance companies. It is my prediction that this serious and unwarranted conflict with the rights of the States will be heard about by all Members of Congress when the existence and implications of the majority opinion are fully known. The possible far-reaching effect of this Federal encroachment is emphasized by Commissioner Mason in his additional views which supplemented the minority opinion.

I ask unanimous consent that the additional views of Commissioner Mason be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE MATTER OF THE AMERICAN HOSPITAL AND LIFE INSURANCE CO., A CORPORATION, DOCKET NO. 6237

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF COMMISSIONER MASON

The issue here resolves itself basically into that ever fundamental question—States' rights versus centralized government.

Our problem is not the determination of which philosophy is right—that is a legislative function. Our sole duty is to determine which road Congress has directed us to follow in the instant matter.

In my opinion, if the rationale on which the majority bases its decision in this case stands, it must of necessity follow that the Federal Government has almost unlimited control over the management of the insurance business.

This would apply not only to false advertising of health and accident policies, the present center of our attention in 41 cases, but would include all other aspects of the business of insurance, such as the approval of policy forms, the establishment of rates, the maintenance of reserves, the regulation of agency commissions, and the countless other components of the internal management of any single company or companies.

To transfer in one fell swoop the control of every phase of the business of insurance, whether regulated or not by State law, to the Federal Government when crossing State lines is to flout the expressed intent of Congress.

APRIL 24, 1956.

Mr. DANIEL. The serious implications and dangers of this Federal-State conflict and the manner in which the intent of Congress has been misinterpreted or disregarded is apparent from the joint dissenting opinion of Chairman Gwynne and Commissioner Mason. I ask unanimous consent that the dissenting opinion be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the dissenting opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE MATTER OF THE AMERICAN HOSPITAL AND LIFE INSURANCE CO., A CORPORATION, DOCKET NO. 6237

JOINT DISSENTING OPINION OF CHAIRMAN GWYNNE AND COMMISSIONER MASON

We are unable to agree with the views expressed in the majority opinion. The reasons for our dissent are: first, the opinion completely ignores the intent of Congress in adopting Public Law 15 (McCarran Act); second, it would return the insurance business to the uncertainty and confusion which followed the decision in *U. S.* v. *South-Eastern Underwriters Association* ((1944) 322 U. S. 533). It was to remove this uncertainty and confusion that the McCarran Act was adopted.

Prior to the decision in the South-Eastern Underwriters case, regulation of insurance was recognized as a problem for the respective States. This was partly because the Supreme Court of the United States in a long line of decisions from *Paul* v. *Virginia* (8 Wall. 168), to *New York Life Insurace Company* v. *Deerlodge County* (231 U. S. 495), had held that the business of insurance was not commerce.

Although the business of insurance was not subject to regulation under the commerce clause, it was universally recognized as a business affected with a public interest. Consequently, the States found few obstacles to regulating it to the fullest extent and in the manner the respective legislatures thought to be for the public good in their particular States. These laws took the form of determining who should engage in the insurance business within the State boundaries, the terms under which the business might be conducted, regulation as to rates to be charged (even to the extent of fixing them, or permitting representatives of insurance companies to do so under State supervision). The right of the States to levy tax and license fees, even discriminating against foreign insurance corporations, was also recognized. (See 44 C. J. S. p. 518; *LaTourette* v. *McMaster, Insurance Commissioner* (244 U. S. 465).)

Had these regulations been directed at the usual industry engaging in interstate commerce, many would have run counter to paramount Federal authority. For example, the many discriminatory taxing programs were not in accord with decisions of the Supreme Court relating to interstate commerce generally. Certain State rate regulations were contrary to the philosophy of Federal antitrust laws. No conflict arose, however, because it had been settled that the business of insurance was not interstate commerce.

This does not mean that the insurance business and the States in regulating it were free from all Federal constitutional and statutory provisions. They were, of course, subject to such constitutional restraints as the due-process clause, the exclusive right of Congress to establish post offices and post roads (*U. S.* v. *Sylvanus* (1951) (192 F. 2 (d) 96)) and many others. In fact they were, and still are, subject to all restraints properly imposed by paramount power, except as that power elects to exempt them.

In regulating insurance, States act under that great reservoir of power known as the police power. There are, of course, jurisdictional limitations on the exercise of that power. It may be directed only at activities within the State. It has never been claimed that the States may operate directly in that phase of regulation known as the flow of commerce. Nor by no stretch of the imagination can it be said that the McCarran Act intended to give any such power.

In 1944 in the southeastern Underwriters case, the Court reversed its holdings of 75 years standing and concluded that the business of insurance was interstate commerce. It was also specifically held that it was subject to the Sherman Act.

The immediate effect of this decision was to bring the business of insurance and the laws of the various States regulating it under the paramount power of the Federal antitrust laws. Because of the inconsistency previously referred to, this created considerable uncertainty and confusion in the insurance field, of which Congress took immediate cognizance.

Confronted with this emergency, Congress had several alternatives:

(1) It might take no action and allow the antitrust statutes to be superimposed on the existing State systems of regulation and taxation. This would create great confusion as to the legal boundaries between Federal and State control, which confusion could only be lessened, bit by bit, as courts made decisions on specific problems.

(2) It might write a comprehensive law for Federal regulation of insurance—a law which would provide new methods for many matters theretofore handled by the States, and which might make such changes in the application of existing antitrust laws to the peculiar business of insurance as experience had indicated might be necessary.

(3) It might recognize and continue existing or future State regulation by removing the obstacles to that regulation which had been called into being by the decision that the business of insurance was interstate commerce.

Congress chose the latter course and expressed its choice by the adoption of the McCarran Act. The general purpose of this legislation was to meet the problems created by the South-Eastern Underwriters case. The plan for meeting this problem is clearly expressed in the law. It may be reduced to a simple statement as follows: The Congress declares that the continued regulation and taxation by the States of the business of insurance is in the public interest and shall remain, with two exceptions, namely, (1) this act shall not render the Sherman Act inapplicable to agreements to or acts of boycott, coercion or intimidation, and (2) that after June 30, 1948 (but not before), the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act shall be applicable to the business of insurance, but only to the extent that such business is not regulated by State law. Thus, in any case, the jurisdictional question may be quickly and certainly resolved by finding the answer to a simple question, namely, is there State regulation to meet the particular problem presented by the facts.

That this is the proper interpretation of the law is indicated by the following: (1) the wording of the statute itself, (2) the legislative history, (3) events which transpired immediately following passage of the law, (4) decisions of the courts interpreting the McCarran Act.

It is, of course, well settled that the power of Congress under the commerce clause is broad and is also paramount. It includes the right to regulate, or even prohibit, the flow of things across State lines, the right to regulate the instrumentalities by which commerce is carried on, and also the right to regulate activities, wholly within the State, which affect interstate commerce. The power to regulate the so-called flow of commerce covers every species of movement of persons and things, whether for profit or not; every species of communication; every species of transmission of intelligence, whether for commercial purposes or otherwise; every species of commercial negotiations, which, as shown by the established course of business, will involve sooner or later an act of transportation of persons or things, or the flow of services or power across State lines. (See the Analysis of the United States Constitution as prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, and cases cited.)

The great power of Congress to regulate matters wholly within the State but affecting interstate commerce is well settled in *U. S.* v. *Darby* ((1944), 312 U. S. 100), in which the court held that the payment of substandard wages wholly within a State affected commerce and could be prohibited.

Going with these great powers, and a necessary corollary to them, is the right of Congress to determine where and when these powers are to be used. Thus, it may decline

to exercise certain powers; and it may condition its refusal to exercise them on the fact of regulation by the States.

This is exactly what Congress was seeking to do in the McCarran Act. Much of the fallacy of the reasoning in the majority opinion springs from a refusal to recognize this obvious fact. The majority would decide the issues in this case by applying principles which admittedly were applicable following the decision in the South-Eastern Underwriters case. They conveniently ignore the fact that the purpose of the McCarran Act was to prevent the application of these principles.

For convenience, and before discussing the law in detail, the McCarran Act is set out here in full text:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Congress hereby declares that the continued regulation and taxation by the several States of the business of insurance is in the public interest, and that silence on the part of the Congress shall not be construed to impose any barrier to the regulation or taxation of such business by the several States.

"SEC. 2. (a) The business of insurance, and every person engaged therein, shall be subject to the laws of the several States which relate to the regulation or taxation of such business.

"(b) No act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance, or which imposes a fee or tax upon such business, unless such act specifically relates to the business of insurance: *Provided*, That after January 1, 1948, the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, and the act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, shall be applicable to the business of insurance to the extent that such business is not regulated by State law.

"SEC. 3. (a) Until January 1, 1948, the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, and the act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, and the act of June 19, 1936, known as the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act, shall not apply to the business of insurance or to acts in the conduct thereof.

"(b) Nothing contained in this act shall render the said Sherman Act inapplicable to any agreement to boycott, coerce, or intimidate, or act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

"SEC. 4. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to affect in any manner the application to the business of insurance of the act of July 5, 1935, as amended, known as the National Labor Relations Act, or the act of June 25, 1938, as amended, known as the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, or the act of June 5, 1920, known as the Merchant Marine Act, 1920.

"SEC. 5. As used in this act, the term 'State' includes the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 6. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person, or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected."

While the title to a statute is not, strictly speaking, a part of the law, nevertheless, it is interesting to note that the title is "To express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance."

Immediately after the enacting clause, occurs the following:

"That the Congress hereby declares that the continued regulation and taxation by the several States of the business of insurance is in the public interest, * * *."

This is a clear and positive declaration of congressional policy, which cannot be read out of the law. It expressly points out the character of State regulation and taxation which is in the public interest. It is the "continued regulation." In the past, the States have done all the regulating so far as the commerce clause was concerned. That was to carry on, with the exceptions expressly provided for, and which will be discussed hereafter. There is nothing in this statement or in the entire act which justifies the interpretation that the regulation contemplated was to continue only by the grace of the Federal Trade Commission.

Speaking on this subject in *Prudential Insurance Company* v. *Benjamin* (328 U. S. 408), the Supreme Court of the United States had this to say:

"Obviously Congress' purpose was broadly to give support to the existing and future State systems for regulating and taxing the business of insurance. This was done in two ways. One was by removing obstructions which might be thought to flow from its own power, whether dormant or exercised, except as otherwise expressly provided in the act itself or in future legislation. The other was by declaring expressly and affirmatively that continued State regulation and taxation of this business is in the public interest and that the business and all who engage in it 'shall be subject to' the laws of the several States in these respects.

"Moreover, in taking this action Congress must have had full knowledge of the nationwide existence of State systems of regulation and taxation; of the fact that they differ greatly in the scope and character of the regulations imposed and of the taxes exacted; and of the further fact that many, if not all, include features which, to some extent, have not been applied generally to other interstate business. Congress could not have been unacquainted with these facts and its purpose was evidently to throw the whole weight of its power behind the State systems, notwithstanding these variations.

* * * * *

"It clearly put the full weight of its power behind existing and future State legislation to sustain it from any attack under the commerce clause to whatever extent this may be done with the force of that power behind it, subject only to the exceptions expressly provided for."

That a declaration of policy by Congress will be given weight by the courts is well settled. (See *U. S.* v. *Darby* (312 U. S. 100.))

Continuing, the statute further provides:

"And that silence on the part of the Congress shall not be construed to impose any barrier to the regulation or taxation of such business by the several States."

Some of the powers granted to Congress by the Constitution are either expressly, or by necessary implication, exclusive and cannot be exercised by the States, even though Congress has taken no action thereon and has remained silent on the subject. The power to declare war is an example. Under the commerce clause, the line between Federal and State authority cannot be so precisely drawn. This is particularly true in the field of State activities which may or may not have a prohibited effect on interstate commerce. The supremacy of the Congress, when properly exercised in this field, is clearly recognized. A difficult problem arises where the powers of Congress are allowed to lie dormant; that is, when Congress is silent on a given subject. Should its silence be construed as a reservation of its power, which will bar any State regulation; or will it be considered as consent to State action until Congress has spoken? This question has arisen many times and has received a variety of answers, depending upon the circumstances of the particular case.

The question of silence of Congress is not involved in this case. The Congress evidently thought it might be raised, and intended to make its position clear. The inclusion of the above-quoted clause indicates how thoroughly Congress has considered this matter and how determined it was to remove all possible barriers to its declared policy of State regulation.

Section 2 (a) provides:

"The business of insurance, and every person engaged therein, shall be subject to the laws of the several States which relate to the regulation or taxation of such business."

When used in this connection, "subject to" means "subordinate to," "obedient to." (*Shay* v. *Roth* (Calif. (1923), 221 p. 967); *Davies* v. *City of Los Angeles* ((1890), 24 p. 771).)

In a long line of cases from *Paul* v. *Virginia* to *New York Life Insurance Co.* v. *Deerlodge County*, insurance companies have challenged their subjection to State regulatory or taxing laws. The Supreme Court, however, consistently rejected this defense on the theory that the business of insurance was not interstate commerce.

When the Supreme Court in Southeastern Underwriters reversed its decision, this defense became good, and the business of insurance was subject to State laws, only to the extent that such laws did not interfere with paramount Federal power under the commerce clause. In section 2 (a) Congress clearly showed its intention to remove the barrier of its own paramount power and thus make the business of insurance subject to State laws, notwithstanding the decision in Southeastern Underwriters.

Section 2 (b) provides:

"No act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance, or which imposes a fee or tax upon insurance: *Provided*, That after January 1, 1948, the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, and the act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, shall be applicable to the business of insurance to the extent that such business is not regulated by State law."

Stronger language to give State laws top billing could hardly be imagined. The clause beginning with "unless" is particularly significant. While Congress had not legislated directly concerning the insurance business, it had done so with reference generally to interstate commerce and with reference to persons and corporations engaged therein. The antitrust laws are examples. Congress in section 2 (b) said none of these laws (except as indicated in the proviso) shall apply to the business of insurance, unless such law specifically relates to insurance. It recognized: first, that insurance has some problems peculiar to that industry; second, that many States had adopted regulatory systems tailored to the insurance business in their boundaries; and third, that any attempt to superimpose the general laws regulating commerce on these systems would create great confusion.

The proviso applies only to the provision immediately preceding it. *Dahlberg* v. *Young* ((1950) Minn. 42 NW. 2d 570). It provides an exception to the general statement preceding it, which exception is that the three acts named therein shall, after January 1, 1948, apply to the business of insurance, but only to the extent that such busines is not regulated by State law. This proviso was adopted to answer criticism of the original House bills, which provided simply that certain laws shall not apply to the business of insurance or to acts in the conduct of that business. In other words, in the original bills, the House proposed to wash its hands of the whole matter, re-

gardless of whether any particular State had provided regulation. The final version, which was accepted by the House without objection, simply conditioned Federal withdrawal from the field on the fact that the particular State had provided regulatory laws. In view of the strong stand taken by the House in favor of continued State regulation, it does not seem reasonable that it would have accepted, without question, this final version, if (as claimed by the majority) such version set up concurrent jurisdiction, with the Federal power paramount to the State power.

What Congress had in mind is further illustrated by section 3 (a) which provides that until January 1, 1948, the antitrust laws should in no event apply to the business of insurance. The majority claim that the purpose of this moratorium was to give the states time "in which to design a reasonable area of State police power. Beyond that reasonable area, States could not go."

That view is based on a misconception of the State police power. That power was reserved to the States by the Constitution. It is not up to the Congress to determine whether it is exercised reasonably. Whether exercised reasonably or not, this power is subject, at all times, to the paramount power of the Federal Government under the commerce clause and other constitutional provisions not involved here; and in case of conflict, the question is resolved by the Federal Government and not by the States. The whole purpose of the McCarran Act was to express the congressional intent that the barrier of paramount power under the commerce clause was to be removed in the event that the States did adopt regulatory laws. The purpose of the moratorium was to give the States time to adopt such laws. Failing to do so in any particular area, the Federal power would still remain.

Section 3 (b) provides:

"Nothing contained in this act shall render the said Sherman Act inapplicable to any agreement to boycott, coerce, or intimidate, or act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation."

The South-Eastern Underwriters case involved a boycott by a number of insurance companies operating in several States. The Congress concluded that the paramount power of the Federal Government in such cases should remain.

The fact that section 3 (b) is in the law is a strong argument against the interpretation urged by the majority. If the McCarran Act left the Federal Government and the States with concurrent powers (in which the Federal power would necessarily be paramount), why was it necessary to include section 3 (b)?

The legislative history of the McCarran Act strongly supports our interpretation of the jurisdictional feature.

While the Southeastern Underwriters case was pending in the Supreme Court, bills were introduced in the House, providing for the unqualified exemption of insurance from the Sherman and Clayton Acts. Thereafter, and after considering suggestions by representatives of the National Association of State Insurance Commissioners, and also by representatives of the insurance industry, bills were introduced both in the House and Senate, which bills, with some minor modification, eventually became the McCarran Act. In some respects, these bills further limited the control of Congress, as, for example, in the inclusion of the Federal Trade Commission Act. In other respects, the Federal authority was broadened to retain control, in all cases where State regulation did not exist. The law, as finally passed, is clear on this point; regulation shall remain in the States with the exception of the boycott situation, and with the exception of those situations where a State either did not or could not adopt the necessary regulations.

There is literally no evidence to the contrary. Note the following excerpts from the Senate debate:

"Senator MURDOCK. And it is intended that on the expiration of the moratorium, the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the other acts mentioned will again become effective, except——

"Senator MCCARRAN. Except as the States themselves have provided regulation.

* * * * *

"Senator PEPPER. States may determine whether or not the Sherman and other acts become applicable to the business of insurance?

"Senator MCCARRAN. Yes."

What was done after the adoption of the McCarran Act indicates that the persons concerned had no doubt about the meaning of the act. The National Association of State Insurance Commissioners prepared a model code for the regulation of the insurance business in accordance with the directions of Congress. This code has been adopted by a majority of the State legislatures. Other States have adopted laws which in effect are equivalent.

It is difficult to understand why these actions should have been taken if the parties thereto thought that the net result would leave the law as it was just prior to the McCarran Act, which is the contention of the majority in this case.

The McCarran Act has been considered in four Federal court cases. In none of them, did the court experience any difficulty in determining what the McCarran Act meant. In the Sylvanus case, the court said:

"It is clear, we think, that by this legislation, the Congress established a public policy upon the part of the National Government to refrain from interference with the regulation and taxation of insurance companies by the several States."

In *Maryland Casualty Company* v. *Cushing* ((1953) 347 U. S. 409) the Supreme Court said:

"Even the most cursory reading of the legislative history of this enactment (McCarran Act) makes it clear that its exclusive purpose was to counteract any adverse effect that the court decision in the Southeastern Underwriters case might be found to leave on State regulation of insurance."

The Court then quotes from House Report No. 143, 79th Congress, 1st session, as follows:

"It is not the intention of Congress in the enactment of this legislation to clothe the States with any power to regulate or tax the business of insurance beyond that which they had been held to possess prior to the decision in the Southeastern Underwriters case."

A clearer and more concise statement of the extent of the McCarran Act, and also its limitations, could hardly be found.

In *North Little Rock Transportation Co.* v. *Casualty Reciprocal Exchange* ((1950) 181 F. 2d, 174) the Court said:

"The purpose of the McCarran Act was to permit the States to continue the regulation of the business of insurance unhampered to the extent provided by the act, by Federal legislation relating to interstate commerce. (See *Prudential Insurance Co.* v. *Benjamin*, supra, p. 429 of 328 U. S.)

"In view of what was said by the Supreme Court about the effect of the McCarran Act in the *Prudential Insurance Co.* case and the case of *Robertson* v. *People of State of Calif.* (328 U. S. 440, 449, 461), there is no need for discussing the validity or effectivenes of the McCarran Act. A ruling that it is invalid or ineffectual, we think, would be absurd."

The Prudential Insurance Co. case is directly in point. There, the Prudential Co. challenged a statute of South Carolina which imposed on foreign insurance companies as a condition of doing business within the State, an annual tax of 3 percent of premiums on business done in the State without reference to transactions, whether interstate or local. It should be noted that the case did not involve purely intrastate matters, which the majority claim is the limit of the McCarran Act's effectiveness. This State tax was clearly discriminatory, affected interstate commerce, and would ordinarily have been stricken down. However, it was not, and the reason given was that a State tax or regulation discriminating against interstate commerce which would be invalid under the commerce clause, in the absence of action by Congress, may be validated by the affirmative action of Congress consenting thereto. The only difference between the Prudential case and the one at bar is that the former deals with State taxation and the latter with State regulation. The McCarran Act covers both.

The majority view of jurisdiction under the McCarran Act is entirely different. They say the McCarran Act "was designed to permit the States to regulate, in the traditional manner, the business of insurance." They obviously do not mean they are permitted to regulate it as they did prior to the South-Eastern Underwriters case, because their decision in this case asserts the paramount power of Federal laws over those of the States.

No law of Congress was necessary to give the States a right to carry on activities within their own borders, designed to regulate insurance. That is covered under the police power, guaranteed to the States by the Constitution. Just as Congress with reference to powers under the commerce clause, State legislatures may exercise these powers or not as they choose, subject only to their own and the Federal Constitution. The real problems arise when the exercise of these powers come in conflict with the commerce clause. There, the Federal power is paramount. *Parker* v. *Brown* (317 U. S. 34). *Southern Railway Company* v. *Railroad Comm. of Indiana* (236 U. S. 439). But, as was pointed out in the latter case, Congress could have circumscribed its regulation so as to occupy a limited field. This intention to occupy a limited field is the very essence of the McCarran Act.

Just how far the majority would go in disregarding this intention is well illustrated in the case at bar. For example, suppose a State having the model code should decide that certain advertising disseminated therein did not violate the law. Nevertheless, the Federal Trade Commission asserting its paramount power to regulate the flow of commerce into the State comes to an opposite conclusion. Or suppose the State officials held the advertising was illegal, while the Federal Trade Commission held to the contrary. The majority decision does not recognize State regulation; it destroys it.

The cases cited do not support the majority position. Of course, the Federal Government, under the commerce clause, may regulate the flow of lottery devices into a State, regardless of State laws on the subject. The reason is that Congress has never enacted in the lottery field an equivalent of the McCarran Act. It requires a violent stretching of the imagination to find any support in the Sylvanus decision. There, the defendant was indicted under a statute prohibiting the use of the mails to defraud. The power of Congress in mail fraud matters does not depend on interstate commerce; it is based on the exclusive constitutional right to control the mails. Prior to the South-Eastern Underwriters case, immediately after and prior to the McCarran Act, and under the McCarran Act, the result would have been the same. As the court well expressed it, "This indictment does not have to do with the regulation of the insurance business in Illinois. Rather it has to do with the question of whether defendants have used the mails in pursuance of a scheme so to manipulte their authorized regulated business in Illinois as to result

in fraudulent deception of its prospective policyholders. The charge is not that the corporate charter should be ignored or that the administrative officers of Illinois may not perform their statutory duties and supervise and regulate the company's insurance business in Illinois, but goes to the use of the mails over which Congress has by the Constitution paramount power and authority."

The McCarran Act arrests the overriding power of the Federal Government under the commerce clause as it affects insurance, where the States have regulatory laws. Nowhere does the act express any intention of doing the same with the power to regulate the mails, the power to enforce due process, or the many other constitutional powers.

To us, the conclusion is inescapable that under the majority view, the McCarran Act accomplished nothing. Courts will not presume that a statute was meant to have no effect. On the contrary, it will be presumed that the legislative body intended to make some change in existing laws, particularly where the whole history shows they intended to remedy what they thought was an existing evil. This rule is usually applied in situations where the overall intent is not clearly expressed in clear language.

Here the majority would reverse these well-known rules of statutory construction in order to prove that Congress accomplished nothing. They, in effect, rewrite portions of the McCarran Act as follows:

"That the Congress hereby declares that paramount regulation and taxation by the Federal Government of the business of insurance, rather than the continued regulation and taxation thereof by the several States, is in the public interest.

"SEC. 2. (a) The business of insurance, and every person engaged therein shall be subject to the laws of the several States which relate to the regulation or taxation of such business, only to the extent that such laws do not conflict with the paramount Federal power under the commerce clause.

"SEC. 2. (b) Any act of Congress, whether it specially relate to the business of insurance or not, shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or suspend any law enacted by any State for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance, or which imposes a fee or tax upon such business, whenever the State law conflicts with such act of Congress. The act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, and the act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, shall be applicable to the business of insurance regardless of any State regulation on the subject."

II

Our second objection to the majority opinion is that it would return the insurance business to the confusion into which it was plunged by the Southeastern Underwriters decision. The nature and extent of that confusion was well expressed by the dissenting judges. The late Mr. Chief Justice Stone said:

"And in view of the broad powers of the Federal Government to regulate matters which, though not themselves commerce, nevertheless affect interstate commerce, *Wickard* v. *Filburn* (317 U. S. 111); *Polish Alliance* v. *Labor Board, supra,* there can be no doubt of the power of Congress if it so desires to regulate many aspects of the insurance business mentioned in this indictment.

"But the immediate and only practical effect of the decision now rendered is to withdraw from the States, in large measure, the regulation of insurance and to confer it on the National Government, which has adopted no legislative policy and evolved no scheme of regulation with respect to the business of insurance. Congress having taken no action, the present decision substitutes, for the varied and detailed State regulation developed over a period of years, the limited aim and indefinite command of the Sherman Act for the suppression of restraints on competition in the marketing of goods and services in or affecting interstate commerce, to be applied by the courts to the insurance business as best they may.

"In the years since this Court's pronouncement that insurance is not commerce came to be regarded as settled constitutional doctrine, vast efforts have gone into the development of schemes of State regulation and into the organization of the insurance business in conformity to such regulatory requirements. Vast amounts of capital have been invested in the business in reliance on the permanence of the existing system of State regulation. How far that system is now supplanted is not, and in the nature of things could not well be, explained in the court's opinion. The Government admits that statutes of at least 5 States will be invalidated by the decision as in conflict with the Sherman Act, and the argument in this Court reveals serious doubt whether many others may not also be inconsistent with that act. The extent to which still other State statutes will now be invalidated as in conflict with the commerce clause has not been explored in any detail in the briefs and argument or in the Court's opinion."

The late Mr. Justice Jackson said:

"The States began nearly a century ago to regulate insurance, and State regulation, while no doubt of uneven quality, today is a successful going concern. Several of the States, where the greatest volume of business is transacted, have rigorous and enlightened legislation, with enforcement and supervision in the hands of experienced and competent officials. Such State departments, through trial and error, have accumulated that body of institutional experience and wisdom so indispensable to good administration. The Court's decision at very least will require an extensive overhauling of State legislation relating to taxation and supervision. The whole legal basis will have to be reconsidered. What will be irretrievably lost and what may be salvaged no one now can say, and it will take a generation of litigation to determine. Certainly the States lose very important controls and very considerable revenues.

"The recklessness of such a course is emphasized when we consider that Congress has not one line of legislation deliberately designed to take over Federal responsibility for this important and complicated enterprise. * * *

"It is imposible to believe that Congress, if it ever intended to assume responsibility for general regulation of insurance, would have made the antitrust laws the sole manifestation of its purpose. Its only command is to refrain from restraints of trade. Intelligent insurance regulation goes much further. It requires careful supervision to ascertain and protect solvency, regulation which may be inconsistent with unbridled rate competition. It prescribes some provisions of policies of insurance and many other matters beyond the scope of the Sherman Act.

"Also it requires sanctions for obedience far more effective than the $5,000 maximum fine on corporations prescribed by the antitrust laws. Violation of State laws are commonly punishable by cancelation of permission to do business therein—a drastic sanction that really commands respect."

The accident and health insurance industry is a large and important one; yet, it is a small part of the business of insurance. This case, under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, involves only a matter of advertising. But section 5 is a comprehensive section which covers many things, such as combinations and restraints under the Sherman Act and at common law, price fixing, and many other things which the Federal Trade Commission might hold to to be unfair methods of competition.

As has been frequently said, insurance is a business effected with a public interest. Many years of regulation in 48 States have developed the fact that insurance has some problems peculiar to the business. One is the necessity of maintaining an industry whose financial ability to meet obligations accruing many years in the future will not be undermined by short term considerations. Consequently, the States have asserted their right to regulate the financial policies of the companies licensed to do business in their States, to demand the deposit of certain reserves, to regulate and even limit competition, to fix rates, etc. Some of the regulations permit, or even require, cooperative action among insurance companies which could easily be contrary to the philosophy of the Federal antitrust laws.

In this connection, the majority opinion says:

"However, as we have already said, our proceeding to abate deceptive practices by such companies does not impinge on those State functions, and we do not believe that the Federal Trade Commission Act can be properly interpreted to interfere with the taxing or rate-fixing powers."

We have already called attention to the breadth and extent of the Federal power to regulate the flow of commerce and also to the extensive power under the "affecting interstate commerce" theory to regulate matters entirely within the State which were once thought to be far removed from Federal authority. In South-Eastern Underwriters, the Supreme Court called attention to the many activities of a modern insurance company which involved or affected interstate commerce as we now know it. Such activities are necessarily centered in a home office. From there and to there flows a constant stream of advertising brochures, policies, applications, statements, rate schedules, directions, etc. These have to do with all the activities of the insurance business and are not restricted to advertising.

In this case jurisdiction is based on the admitted fact that the respondent sent bundles of advertising matter into States where it was licensed to do business. Actual dissemination of the advertising occurred entirely within the State. Except for the McCarran Act, it is clear this limited proof would sustain paramount Federal jurisdiction. Just how the majority arrive at the conclusion that similar proof would not sustain Federal jurisdiction in taxing and rate-making matters is not clear.

In fact, the decision in *North Little Rock Transportation Co.* v. *Casualty Reciprocal Exchage, supra,* is to the contrary. That case involved an appeal from a summary judgment of dismissal of a treble damage suit. The dismissal was based upon a determination that the fixing of rates by the National Bureau of Casualty Underwriters for casualty insurance written in the State of Arkansas by the members and subscribers of the Bureau is not violative of the Sherman Act, as amended. The Court adopted the findings of the district court, one of which was:

"3. In the absence of public regulation or congressional exemption, the price fixing activities of the Bureau involved in this case would constitute a violation of the Sherman Act" (85 F. Supp. 961, at p. 964).

The circuit court of appeals affirmed the holding of the district court that the Mc-

Carran Act permitted the State Arkansas to continue the regulation of insurance in the matter of rate fixing, which regulation, without the McCarran Act, would have violated the Sherman Act.

It is our conclusion that the majority opinion would bring tremendous confusion in the insurance industry and would open the door wide to complete Federal control. We are not discussing the relative merits of Federal versus State control. All we say is that the decision belongs to Congress and not to a Federal bureau.

The hearing examiner, after applying the jurisdictional tests to which we subscribe, concluded that in all States in which respondent was licensed to do business, except Mississippi, State regulation did exist. The hearing examiner then considered the alleged illegal advertising in Mississippi and concluded that it did not violate the Federal Trade Commission Act.

We have repeatedly pointed out that, under the McCarran Act, the Federal Trade Commission has some jurisdiction in the business of insurance. Within that jurisdiction, and in performance of duties imposed by Congress, 41 complaints have been issued. Where the Commission has jurisdiction, we would hold insurance companies to a high degree of responsibility in their dealings with the public. Consequently, we do not approve of some of the statements made by the hearing examiner in his consideration of the advertising in question.

However, that matter is not now before us. Since the filing of the initial decision, Mississipi has adopted the model code, effective as of February 29, 1956.

The law governing such a situation is clearly expressed in *United Corporation et al.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* ((1940), 110 F. 2d 473), as follows:

"And since the power of the Federal Trade Commission is purely regulatory and not punitive, it is clear that jurisdiction must exist at the time of the entry of its order. Jurisdiction at the time of the commission of acts objected to as unfair trade practices or at the time of the filing of the complaint with regard thereto is not sufficient; for the order to be entered does not relate to past practices or determine rights as of the time of the filing of the complaint, as in an action at law, but commands or forbids action in the future."

In *Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis et al.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* ((1926), 13 F. 2d 673), the Court said:

"As the orders of the Commission are purely remedial and preventative, the effect thereof is entirely in the future. Therefore, the jurisdiction of the Commission should, in this respect, be measured as of the time of the order rather than as of the filing of the complaint or as of the hearing thereon."

It thus appears that in every State involved in this case, State regulation now prevents further action by the Commission.

In accordance with the views expressed in this dissent, we would deny the appeal and dismiss the complaint.

APRIL 24, 1956.

RECESS TO 10 O'CLOCK A. M. ON MONDAY

Mr. DANIEL. In accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock a. m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until Monday, May 28, 1956, at 10 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 25 (legislative day of May 24), 1956:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The following-named persons to the National Science Board, National Science Foundation:

Laurence McKinley Gould, of Minnesota, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for a term of 6 years expiring May 10, 1962.

Paul M. Gross, of North Carolina, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for a term of 6 years expiring May 10, 1962.

George D. Humphrey, of Wyoming, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for a term of 6 years expiring May 10, 1962.

Frederick A. Middlebush, of Missouri, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for a term of 6 years expiring May 10, 1962.

Edward James McShane, of Virginia, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for a term of 6 years expiring May 10, 1962.

Samuel Milton Nabrit, of Texas, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for a term of 6 years expiring May 10, 1962.

Julius A. Stratton, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for a term of 6 years expiring May 10, 1962.

Edward Lawrie Tatum, of California, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for a term of 6 years expiring May 10, 1962.

Warren Weaver, of Connecticut, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for the remainder of the term expiring May 10, 1960.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

John E. Munzer — George F. Mallison
Richard Moore — John L. S. Hickey
Eugene J. Nesselson — Thad Patrick

To be assistant sanitary engineers

John E. McLean — Ernest D. Harward, Jr
Herbert A. Bevis — Charles A. Froman, Jr.
Richard V. Vaughan — Jack F. Neel

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers

Charles S. Oulman — Robert J. Kleffmann
Harry C. Vollrath III — Joseph L. Gerit
Joseph H. Norman, Jr. — Jack L. Witherow
Morton D. Sinkoff — John C. McMahon
Jules B. Cohen — Lynn D. Wilder
James G. Gardner

IN THE NAVY

The following-named persons to the grades indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be ensign in the Navy

Sidney F. Davis III

To be commanders in the Dental Corps of the Navy

Theodore R. Hunley
Alvin E. Riehl

To be lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy

Gary E. Rademacher

To be captain in the Medical Corps of the Navy

Stephen H. Tolins

To be commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy

Francies Marshall

The following-named Naval Reserve officers to the grade indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be lieutenant commanders

Scott G. Kramer
Carter B. Sigel

To be lieutenants

Eugene M. Joly
Carl W. Rogers

The following-named civilian college graduates to the grade indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

August Miale, Jr.
Russell Miller, Jr.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be chief warrant officers, W–4

Charles F. Pape
Samuel O. Grayson

To be chief warrant officer, W–3

Vincent Kozlowski, Jr.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Niagara River Power Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 25, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Sunday, May 20, it was my privilege to address the concluding session of the Electric Consumers Conference, the chairman of which was the Honorable Clyde Ellis.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I prepared for delivery on that occasion be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN AT ELECTRIC CONSUMERS CONFERENCE, HELD AT THE STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., ON SUNDAY, MAY 20, 1956

This is a most satisfying occasion. Last Wednesday we tasted together the fruits of victory. As deeply gratifying as that victory was to me, I am sure that it was no less gratifying to you.

But while we claim it as our victory, climaxing not only months, but years of effort—it was in a real sense a victory for the people of the United States.

This I deeply believe. With this, I think you wholly agree.

This organization, encompassing as it does many of the public-interest groups in our country which are interested not only in public power but in the public welfare, contributed much to the successful outcome of the Senate vote on the Niagara bill.

But that was not your sole contribution. You contributed much also to the formulation of the bill. Your representatives in Washington spent long hours in consultation with members of my staff and with me, in working over the provisions of the bill, not only this year and last year, but during all the years that the Niagara bill passed through its many forms and changes.

From the beginning I wanted a bill that served not only the immediate interests of New York State, but also the interests of the Nation. The formulation of legislative provisions that would serve the interests of the people of New York and simultaneously advance the interests of the country as a whole, was the result of these long studies, deliberations, and consultations.

That is one of the reasons, I said, a moment ago, that the passage of S. 1823 was not only our victory, but a victory for the people. It was, of course, a great victory for New York State, and a long step forward in a direction desired and needed by New York State. But it was more, very much more.

It was a resounding reaffirmation of principles which have been fought for by farsighted men, and men of good will generally, since the turn of this century—basically the principle that our water resources belong to all the people and should be developed in a manner to provide the maximum possible benefits to the maximum number of people.

One of the leading opponents of the Niagara bill said, in the course of the debate, that he did not see the difference between our water resources and our resources of coal, oil, and farmland. Senator KERR, I believe, in his own picturesque manner, effectively answered that argument.

But the most convincing answer was given by the Senate itself in voting, by a substantial majority, the approval of a bill which asserts the inalienable right of the people of New York State to develop the great waters of the Niagara River primarily for the benefit of the people, and not—I repeat, not—for the benefit of private, profit-seeking monopolistic utility corporations.

This victory was not an isolated one, although it has been some time since we have had such a satisfying and resounding one. This victory was built upon other victories of the distant and recent past—victories against the same kind of selfish and self-serving forces as those which sought, and still seek, to oppose our Niagara power development legislation.

In recent years, in the years during which I have been in the Senate, we well recall the strenuous efforts which were made to defend the public's right to another public resource—the offshore oil deposits; and more recently still, the public's interest in the peacetime uses of atomic power. All those efforts, those which succeeded and those which failed, contributed in good measure to the victory on the Niagara bill.

And, my friends, the victory on Niagara will contribute, I trust and believe, to victory sooner or later, and I hope sooner, in the fight for a Federal high dam at Hells Canyon.

I pledge my efforts to supplement yours toward this end.

Sometimes in our concentration on the battle, we foget that low-cost power is not the final object of our efforts. Electric power, high cost or low, means nothing in and of itself. It is with the use of electric power that we are ultimately concerned. We see the real consequences of low-cost hydroelectric power in terms of happier lives, relief from needless drudgery in the home and on the farm, and a vast expansion in industrial development. It is in this context that I see the benefits from public development of our publicly owned water resources.

It is for this reason that it is necessary for the Congress to be ever-vigilant to protect this precious public resource and prevent its alienation to private monopoly.

The victory in the Senate means we have won the initial battle in this Congress. Yet we know that final victory is not won until the bill is safely through the House and is signed into law by the President.

So even while we join in mutual congratulations over success in the Senate, we must waste no time in girding for the fight ahead.

Make no mistake about it, there is a real fight ahead—a tough and uphill fight all the way.

Remember that the private utilities' lobby has historically considered the House of Representatives its own particular hunting ground—and their hunting license seems to cover all sorts of weapons.

So we should be sure our own ammunition supply is adequate. I would like to review with you briefly the strategy and tactics involved in this grueling fight ahead.

In the House, there will be many more than in the Senate openly opposed to any form of public power development, and openly favoring a naked giveaway of Niagara to private monopoly interests.

But, of course, there will also be the bus-bar boys—those who pay lipservice to public development and then demand that the power produced be immediately turned over to private utility interests right at the project site.

We must, therefore, be sure that the Members of the House thoroughly understand the basic issues so familiar to all of us.

We will have to explain again and again why public development is necessary to preserve the public interest in resources belonging to all the people.

We will need to say over and over again that not one cent of Federal money is involved in paying for the Niagara development since the New York Power Authority is ready, willing, and able to finance the construction.

Then we will need to reeducate the House—and the general public, too—on the difficult but vital subject of preference and transmission lines.

Referring to the preference provision, we must make sure that we get over to Members of Congress, and the general public, exactly what "preference" means. In the course of the Senate debate, it was evident that there still lingers in the minds of some the mistaken impression that preference means discrimination in favor of a few selected customers.

You, of course, know that the preference clause is really an antimonopoly clause. Perhaps it should be called an equal-opportunity clause in that it insures a supply of low-cost publicly developed power to rural consumer cooperatives and to municipally owned utilities—in other words, to nonprofit and public groups—to the people themselves.

That is what the preference clause is: a device for marketing the people's power to the people, and at the same time establishing a rate yardstick for the benefit of those people who are served by private utilities—so that all the people benefit.

Nor is it enough to show that private utility companies tend to reduce their rates to their own customers when there are municipal utilities and rural electric cooperatives in the area. It should also be brought home that the private power companies are not only not driven out of business by the rate reductions resulting from the yardstick, but actually, to their own surprise, sell more power and reap greater profits.

We must anticipate that the private monopoly interests will step up their propaganda efforts. We must recognize and explode their phoney arguments about the taxes they pay—and want to pay. A person hearing these arguments might be led to believe that the highest aspiration and most urgent desire of the private utilities is to pay more taxes. A moment's sober reflection should convince anyone that this is not their goal. The fact is that the private utilities do everything they can to escape paying taxes. And as soon as they pay them, or even before, these taxes are passed directly on to the consumers. We know that. But do the Members of the House know it? Does the general public realize it? We must make sure that they do know it, and that they understand further that even greater revenues come to the Federal, State, and local governments when there is, in any area, an abundant supply of low-cost power.

Well, there is much more I can say. But it isn't necessary. I am sure we all realize what must be done in this fight and in others which we face on this whole issue of public power.

If we can get the Niagara bill through the House, it will help break trail for a Federal high dam in Hells Canyon. It is, in essence, all one fight. But let us not forget for a moment that the fight ahead will be rough and tough. The private utility lobby will see to that.

But let us take heart and look at the larger picture. Our efforts on behalf of a public-power policy are but a part of our larger concern for the cause of conservation and for the proper use of all of our natural resources for the benefit of all our people.

And this, in turn, is but an integral part of our struggle for the general welfare. Each success adds that much to the ultimate living for all of our people. Each success is one degree of fulfillment.

Our fight on this front—public power—is part of a great fight for the public good. Let us get on with it, and spare no efforts.

The Highway Program and How It Affects the State of New Hampshire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 25, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by the very able junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] on the highway program and how it affects the State of New Hampshire.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR SENATOR REPORTS

(By Hon. NORRIS COTTON, of New Hampshire)

The President's highway program, which has been batted back and forth for the last 2 years like a bird caught in a badminton game, went through another bout in our Committee on Public Works this week.

The committee rejected the new House bill and resurrected last year's Senate bill, expanding it to a complete 13-year program so that it conforms more nearly to the President's plan. The House bill was acceptable in the main to the administration, and had the blessing of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway commissioners. Yet I voted for the Senate version. Why?

Because the apportionment of Federal funds under the House bill is monstrously unfair and New Hampshire is about the worst victim.

A few facts and figures will demonstrate this clearly. Two years ago each State was invited to furnish the Bureau of Public Roads an estimate of the cost of completing its interstate highways. Apparently no standards were set, and each State was allowed to use its own judgment and imagination as to how much it would spend and how elaborately it would build. New Hampshire, with typical Yankee thrift and frugality, estimated about $300,000 a mile. Vermont's estimate was $500,000, Delaware a million and a half, and New Jersey nearly $4 million per mile. Result: Under the House bill, New Hampshire's share of Federal funds is second lowest in the Nation. Delaware, with only 42 miles to be built, gets only slightly less than New Hampshire, with 214 miles. Little District of Columbia, with 28 miles of road, gets twice as much as our State. Both our neighbors, Maine and Vermont, far outstrip us, and New Jersey, with only 354 miles, gets 19 times as much Federal money. Figuring it another way, we would get back only 83 percent of what we pay the Federal Government in gasoline taxes. Maine would get 111 percent; New Jersey, 173 percent; Vermont, 317 percent.

Now you are asking, "Why would the administration and the highway commissioners agree to such a bill?" The answer is that, on the face of it, the discrimination is corrected later in the bill. It provides that at the end of 2 years the Bureau of Public Roads shall review the requirements of each State, standardize them, and recommend a fair reapportionment for subsequent years, taking into consideration overpayments already made. The fly in this ointment is that the new schedule must be approved by the Public Works Committees of the Congress. I wouldn't worry about my own Senate committee. Eight out of the thirteen members come from the poorer States which have made modest estimates, and no State has more than one member. The House committee, however, is a horse of a different color. It has 34 members. Eight of the larger, richer States have two members or more, and these dominate the committee. New England has one lone member. The Bureau and the administration may press for a complete and fair reapportionment, but don't think that the more powerful States will give up the frosting on their cake without a fight. Everyone who has ever served in a legislature knows what would then happen—a compromise. That means that a portion, at least, of the discrimination would be frozen into the law permanently and the loss to the less fortunate States over the whole 13-year period would run into many millions.

The method of apportionment in the Senate bill is based on population, area, and highway mileage as reflected in mail routes. It is not perfect, but it is at least a definite formula, not a haphazard group of independent estimates. Under it, the same yardstick would be applied to every State. For the first 2-year period the Senate bill gives New Hampshire's interstate highways $17 million; under the House bill, we would get less than $8 million. The House bill dishes out $160 million to New Jersey in those 2 years; the Senate bill reduces it to $60 million.

Many other provisions of the highway bill are controversial and must be ironed out in the Senate and in committee of conference. On these I shall report to you later. Whichever of the highway bills is finally enacted into law, we shall fight to include in it a definite formula for a just division of Federal aid among the States.

Above all, our first and main objective must be to secure the passage of an adequate national highway program this year. Otherwise the 40,000 deaths and a million and a half injuries occurring annually on our highways will continue undiminished.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 25, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Thursday morning, May 24, I addressed one of the sessions of the convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, a fine organization with a very large representation among the people of my State.

I spoke, for the most part, on the subject of social security, a subject which will be before the Senate very soon.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I made at the Amalgamated Clothing Workers' convention be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN BEFORE THE 20TH BIENNIAL CONVENTION OF THE AMALGAMATED CLOTHING WORKERS OF AMERICA, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

It is good to be here with you today. It is always deeply satisfying for me to attend an Amalgamated convention. It is like old home week. I know that here I am not only with friends, but with tried and true, first-line friends.

The Amalgamated is like a familiar landmark to me. It has been part of the economic and political scene in which I have moved as long as I can remember. The great names in the history of this union were friends and associates of mine from the earliest days of my mature life. It was a privilege then, and a source of satisfaction still, to have had the friendship of the late great pioneer leader and president of this union, the late and deeply beloved Sidney Hillman.

I remember the early days of struggle of your union—when one of the main objects of struggle was mere existence and bare recognition. Those days are long gone now. But it is well to think of them once in a while, in order to realize how far we have come.

One of the highest tributes I can pay this union, however, is to say that you do not look backward into the past, but forward into the future. You continue to struggle toward the goals which lie ahead.

It is good to be with a group which sees and clearly realizes that great challenges confront us, and great efforts are needed to meet those challenges. Indeed, one of the greatest dangers our entire Nation faces today is the false, but widely spread impression that all is well with us, at home and abroad, and that those in charge of our Government have found the keys to lasting peace and permanent prosperity.

The hard facts indicate quite a different situation. In my judgment, the economic situation is far from sound. Great segments of our economy, including farmers and small-business men, are experiencing distress to a greater or lesser degree. There are many for whom this is a time of real hardship.

And over and above this, is the fact of the deepest internal crisis this country has experienced in many years—the crisis resulting from the Supreme Court decision and decree in the school segregation cases. Tensions rise steadily in some parts of the South. The Constitution is openly defied and flouted. Tides of hate and fear roll through the delta lands and canebreaks of the Deep South.

Abroad, the new masters of Soviet Russia move in triumphal procession from one country to another, not with armies, but with false words of peace. They speak in new terms which fall on willing ears, and the initiative of leadership has been taken from us.

What are the leaders of our Government doing or saying about all these things? Very little. They say as little as possible about the danger spots in our economy. They maintain what amounts almost to a conspiracy of silence about the segregation crisis. They move with slow and timid steps to counter the bold Russian moves on the world front.

In such troubled areas as the Middle East, where the existence of the democratic Republic of Israel is at stake, our Government exhibits a hesitant policy of part appeasement and part aloofness, trying to be all things to all men, and succeeding only in passing the buck—and the leadership—to others.

I do not wish to be harsh in my judgment, or criticize for the sake of criticism. But I am deeply disturbed and alarmed, at the present situation at home, and the trend of events abroad. Most of all, I am concerned over the lack of concern over the dangers and problems of the day exhibited by the leaders of our Government, and over the climate of complacency which has been so assiduously cultivated and so widely disseminated throughout our land.

These are the real dangers.

But I do not think I need to convince the leaders and delegates of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers that what I have said is so. Your union is one of the organizations which is trying, I know, to dispel the fog, to point out the dangers, and mobilize the American people for action on all the troubled fronts we face.

You see the dangers of Soviet initiative in the world abroad.

You understand the menace of the Middle East.

You favor and support, as I do, all necessary measures to bolster up the sagging sectors of our economy, and to restore to it an expanding and dynamic momentum, designed to bring an ever-higher standard of living to more and more people.

You favor and support, as I do, a comprehensive program of action to assure to all Americans the full enjoyment of all basic rights, including the right to vote, the right to be secure in one's person, and the right of equal opportunity, without segregation, in employment, in access to public and semi-public facilities, and in education.

But these are not the only challenges that face us. There are others, many others. One which I want to discuss briefly today is the need for vast improvement in our provision for the aged, the disabled, and the disadvantaged members of our society.

A great man once said, "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

The man who said this was a historic apostle of the creed of practical humanitarianism, a man who led our country out of darkness into light, and out of the shadow of defeat into victory, a hero to all of us, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

He spoke wise words, and we may well examine our present condition in the light of them.

We have a system of social security, an old-age and survivors insurance, enacted under the leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1935.

But there are still millions of employed persons who are not covered by that system.

And there is a growing number in our country who, for reason of age or disability, can no longer work, and who live today, in this land of plenty, on the barest level of subsistence, and dependent for even that on public or private charity or on relatives.

The question is one of revising our social-security laws. We must extend coverage to classes of workers and self-employed individuals who are not now covered. We must lower the age at which women, for instance, can become eligible—it is now 65—for social-security benefits. And we must provide for payment of social-security benefits to men and women whose working years are suddenly cut short by permanent and total physical disability.

As most of you know, there is legislation pending in the Senate—it has already been approved by the House—to make desirable changes in our social-security laws.

The changes approved by the House do not go far enough to suit me. But apparently they went too far to suit a majority of the members of the Finance Committee in the Senate. And so the bill reported out by the Senate Finance Committee eliminated the provision for payments to the permanently disabled, and struck out the provision reducing the retirement age of women from 65 to 62.

There will be a fight on the floor of the Senate on these two major provisions. It will be a sharp fight, pitting against each other two distinct philosophies of government—those who think of government in terms of promoting the general happiness and welfare of all, and especially of those least able to care for themselves, and those who think of government in terms of promoting the special interests of the few—and especially of the already strong and the already powerful.

The case for the lowering of the retirement age of women from 65 to 62 is obvious. I would prefer to see it lowered to 60, but I will support the House-approved provision for 62.

Not so obvious, but even more appealing, is the case for making benefits available to the permanently disabled.

Here are men and women who, in the prime of life, while engaged in gainful employment covered by social security, are suddenly rendered physically incapable of continuing work. Struck down by crippling disease or totally maimed by accident, they are thrown upon the mercy of society.

Will our society recognize them as part and parcel of present company, and entitle them to receive at least the minimum benefits of our social-security system, or will we continue to say, as we do today: Shift for yourself, live on charity, starve to death if you must, but you will not get social-security benefits until you are 65.

The House approved a provision making the physically disabled—those who were working in jobs covered by social security before they were disabled—eligible for social-security benefits when they reach the age of 50. The Senate committee eliminated even this improvement.

I strongly favor striking out the age limit entirely. But the majority of the Senate Finance Committee does not wish to make these unfortunate people eligible for social-security benefits until they reach the statutory age of 65—if they ever do. What happens to these people between the time of their disability and the time they reach the age of 65 is not a matter of Government concern, under the terms of the bill reported by the Finance Committee.

Two major arguments were made against the disability amendment by the powerful lobby which worked against this provision. And I regret to say that the Eisenhower administration joined in the opposition to this humane provision and worked with the lobby of the National Manufacturers Association, the American Medical Association, and other like-minded organizations.

First it was maintained that this provision was administratively impractical—which is just gobbledygook—and second, that it would lead to socialized medicine, which is even worse gobbledygook.

They said further that making these disabled people eligible for social security will discourage their rehabilitation and return to productive life.

This argument, too, is sham and humbug. The fact is that only a percentage of those who become totally disabled can be rehabilitated under any conditions. And it is a further fact that the facilities which are available in this country for rehabilitation of the physically handicapped is so pitifully inadequate that only a fraction of those who could be rehabilitated are actually rehabilitated.

There are already more than 2 million physically handicapped persons in this country. A total of 250,000 people are added to the list of totally disabled every year, by disease and accident. Of these, only 50,000 annually are being restored to productive life. I have fought for many years for an expansion of Government assistance for the training of experts and the increase of facilities for the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped. Some of the very same lobbyists who are now fighting the disability provision in the social security bill, using this argument, opposed me in my efforts to get more money for vocational rehabilitation.

No, the disability provision must be included in the social-security legislation we shall enact this year. The people must insist upon it. Organizations like yours must insist upon it. The Congress must know that the people want this provision.

In every session of Congress since 1950, I have introduced a social security bill which included a provision for benefit payments to the permanently disabled, at whatever age. I now have an amendment pending which proposes the same thing. So has Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, the ranking Democratic member of the Finance Committee. Once this was considered a visionary proposal. Now it is within reach.

We must join the battle on the ground of principle. Are these disabled people, growing in number year by year, and the aged women who can no longer work past 60 or 62, to be thrown on the scrap heap of our society, with no more consideration than is given to a broken or wornout machine?

Are these unfortunate people to continue to be one of the abandoned, forgotten, and neglected elements in our society? No social order imbued with a philosophy of human dignity can continue to tolerate the present situation.

But the issue is even deeper. The issue is whether the motive of fear is to continue to be used as the impelling force in our society—fear of want, fear of old age, and fear of physical disability. The reactionaries believe and profess that with these fears, people must be driven to work, to save and to provide for their own security.

I do not agree with this philosophy. I believe that the driving force of life is and should be fulfillment, contentment, and happiness for all individuals everywhere.

I believe that material comforts are a means, not an end, and if our social and economic order cannot provide for the weak, the aged, and the infirm—those who can no longer themselves carry their share of the load—there is something drastically wrong with the social and economic order.

Life expectancy is being extended. People are living longer. Our social and economic order must be so managed as to keep pace with this advance. This is one of the most arresting problems we face today. I have just touched on one aspect of it. There are many others of equal urgency, and even greater complexity.

My friends, there are horizons of challenge beyond even the horizons we see today. We must advance. We must have a leadership which calls constantly for advance. The explosion of the H-bomb out in the Pacific a few days ago was not only a warning to the Russians. In a sense, it was even more of a warning to us.

Can we master the arts of building and living as well, or even nearly as well, as we are mastering the arts of destruction and killing?

Will that blinding flash and shocking roar that came out of the far Pacific usher in a new day, or does it herald the coming of a total darkness?

We do not know the answers, but we must find the answers. We must hasten our advance in the area of the heart and the mind. The greatest achievements and victories in that area remain to be won.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 28, 1956

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 24, 1956)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Dr. Lawrence D. Folkemer, pastor, Church of the Reformation, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Lord God of power and giver of grace and wisdom, we commend to Thee all who are engaged in the government of our land; grant to them clean hands, pure hearts, and unfailing devotion to the cause of righteousness. To Thee, merciful Lord, we commend their work, praying that it may be such as will promote Thy work in our midst, to the aid of the poor, the relief of the oppressed, the putting down of all social evils, and the redress of all social wrongs. Let all they think or speak or do be for Thy glory and the good of Thy people. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 25, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 24, 1956, the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

S. 3254. An act to authorize the county of Custer, State of Montana, to convey certain lands to the United States; and

S. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution to designate the dam and reservoir to be constructed on the lower Cumberland River, Ky., as Barkley Dam and Lake Barkley, respectively.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SPARKMAN was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, for Senator NEELY, and by unanimous consent, the Judiciary Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the conference committee on the District of Columbia transit bill (S. 3073) were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE GRANAHAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, it is my sorrowful duty to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate the fact that Representative WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN died on Friday.

Mr. GRANAHAN underwent a minor operation 2 days previously, and died suddenly in the Fitzgerald Mercy Hospital, Darby, Pa., from a heart attack.

Mr. GRANAHAN, at the age of 60, had just previously won the nomination for a sixth term in Congress.

I had the honor and pleasure of being well acquainted with Representative GRANAHAN, who represented Pennsylvania's Second Congressional District in west Philadelphia. He was a splendid colleague, and one who could always be depended on to give his own personal consideration to problems or situations which were presented to him. He represented his district with honor and distinction, and served his State and Nation with devotion.

Mr. GRANAHAN was born in south Philadelphia, and was a graduate of Roman Catholic High School. Before coming to Congress, he was supervisor of inheritance taxes for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and chief disbursing officer for the State treasurer.

He was first elected to Congress in 1944. He was elected again in 1948, and was reelected in 1950, 1952, and 1954. He was a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House, and was especially devoted to the cause of the great Delaware Valley.

He was a veteran, and served in Europe for 18 months during the First World War. He was a leading member of the American Legion, Catholic War Veterans, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

We extend our deep sympathy to his wife, the former Kathryn O'Hay McNally, whom he married in 1943, and to all the other members of his family.

Later in the day, Mr. President, I shall submit a formal resolution.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business, with a limitation of 2 minutes on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF CERTAIN ANIMAL DISEASES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to facilitate the control and eradication of certain animal diseases, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the agricultural attaché program, to facilitate the operations of the Farmers' Home Administration, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation and the Forest Service, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PLANS FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT IN WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD CONTROL

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PROPOSED LOAN OF MODEL OF U. S. S. "SAN JACINTO" TO BATTLESHIP TEXAS MUSEUM

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material), reporting, pursuant to law, that the Department of the Navy proposes to loan to the Battleship Texas Museum, an exhibition model of the U. S. S. *San Jacinto*; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF RUBBER PRODUCING FACILITIES DISPOSAL COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman and Members of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, and recommending the disposal of the Government-owned alcohol-butadiene plant at Louisville, Ky. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO EMPLOY RETIRED OFFICERS WITHOUT AFFECTING THEIR RETIRED STATUS

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to appoint and employ retired officers without affecting their retired status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (with accompanying papers); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

AMENDMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES ACT OF 1946, RELATING TO PAYMENT OF CERTAIN TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION COSTS

A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the continental United States and Alaska and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Resolutions memorializing the Postmaster General of the United States protesting the discontinuance of postage stamps bearing the portraits of John Adams and John Quincy Adams and urging the restoration thereof

"Whereas the Post Office Department of the United States has discontinued the use on United States postage stamps of the portraits of John Adams and his son, John Quincy Adams, the second and sixth Presidents of the United States, and distinguished citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and

"Whereas it is unthinkable that this great Nation should banish from the face of its stamps the man who carried the fight for the Declaration of Independence through the Continental Congress, nominated Washington as Commander in Chief, and appointed John Marshall Chief Justice of the United States, and it is equally unthinkable that it should banish his brilliant son, who, beginning his diplomatic career at the age of 17, served his country with unequaled integrity as Secretary of State, President, and as Congressman, dying at his post defending the rights of the least of his fellow citizens to be heard: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives urges the Postmaster General of the United States to take immediate action to restore the portraits of John Adams and John Quincy Adams to their appropriate and rightful places upon the 2-cent and 6-cent postage stamps; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Postmaster General, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to each of the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Resolution No. 48

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to implement the tripartite declaration of the United States, Great Britain, and France guaranteeing the borders of Israel

"Whereas the State of Israel was created by resolution of the United Nations on No-

vember 29, 1947, and was recognized by the United States on May 14, 1948; and

"Whereas the State of Israel has secured her borders by force of arms from invading aggressor nations; and

"Whereas on May 25, 1950, the United States, Great Britain, and France gauranteed these borders by tripartite agreement; and

"Whereas certain Communist nations have sold munitions to Egypt, thus threatening the peace of the Middle East and the entire world; and

"Whereas the State of Israel has requested this Nation to sell certain arms for its own protection: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby petitioned and urged to take such action as may be necessary to make available to the State of Israel such arms as may be necessary and also to negotiate a mutual security pact with the State of Israel; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives in Congress, and to the Michigan Members of the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress."

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to conform with recommendations in the Report of Interdepartmental Committee on Narcotics to the President, dated February 1, 1956

"Whereas the Interdepartmental Committee on Narcotics to the President has filed a report under date of February 1, 1956; and

"Whereas said report contains inter alia the following recommendations:

" 'Recommendation No. 1 providing that the Federal Government shall encourage continuing studies of the narcotics problem within the States and municipalities by providing guidance and information for the assistance thereof;

" 'Recommendation No. 2 providing that assistance to the States and municipalities by the Federal agencies include provision of courses of instruction for both public health and enforcement officers, to be conducted in Washington and also by visits of small teams of qualified experts to appropriate centers;

" 'Recommendation No. 6 providing that should certain of the States wish to provide for commitment to the Federal hospitals, pending the availability of comparable facilities under State auspices, legislation authorizing this for a limited period, in the future, and on a reimbursable basis, be considered for enactment;

" 'Recommendation No. 7 providing that the Public Health Service Act, Public Law 410 of the 78th Congress, be amended to permit the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to disclose information on voluntary patients under the usual regulations governing disclosure of material in the medical records, where, in his opinion, physicians and recognized health and welfare agencies will be enabled to act in the interest of the patients in further treatment of their addiction'; and

"Whereas the State of New Jersey has specific interest in the carrying out of these recommendations: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey (the Senate concurring):

"1. The Legislature of the State of New Jersey does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation to carry out the provisions of Recommendations Nos. 1, 2, 6 and 7 of the report of the Interdepartmental Committee on Narcotics to the President, dated February 1, 1956, hereinbefore described, as an aid to the carring out of the State's program for the control of the use and traffic in narcotic drugs.

"2. Copies of this resolution, when adopted and signed by the speaker of the general assembly and attested by the clerk, shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of New Jersey, and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

"LEO J. MOSCH,
"Speaker of the General Assembly.

"Attest:

"WILLIAM J. KOLMAN,
"Clerk of the General Assembly."

A petition signed by 4 members of the senate and 4 members of the house of representatives of the Legislature of Hawaii, Hilo, Hawaii, relating to reapportionment of the Hawaiian Legislature; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A telegram from the annual congress of the North American and Canadian Diocese of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church, in New York, N. Y., signed by Archbishop Vitaly, chairman, extending greetings to the Congress of the United States; ordered to lie on the table.

AUDIT REPORT OF THE NAVY CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate an audit report of Navy Club of the United States of America, for the fiscal year ended April 30, 1956, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. LEHMAN, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

H. R. 9824. A bill to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability or disease incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean conflict (Rept. No. 2063).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Walter C. Dowling, of Georgia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Korea;

J. Graham Parsons, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Laos, vice Charles W. Yost;

Theodore C. Achilles, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Peru, vice Ellis O. Briggs; and

Ellis O. Briggs, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Brazil, vice James Clement Dunn.

NOMINATION OF CHARLES J. LOWEN, JR., TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS

Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, reported favorably the nomination of Charles J. Lowen, Jr., of Colorado, to be Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, and submitted a report (Ex. Rept. No. 6) thereon.

On request of Mr. MAGNUSON, and by unanimous consent, it was,

Ordered, That the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. WOFFORD] be given permission to file minority views on the nomination of Charles J. Lowen, Jr., to be Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and together with the minority views, will be printed, and the nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PAYNE:

S. 3937. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain property situated in the State of Maine to the town of Castine, Maine; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. PAYNE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 3938. A bill for the relief of Milka Krivec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 3939. A bill for the relief of certain Korean war orphans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. LANGER):

S. 3940. A bill to assure the accurate labeling and advertising of alimentary paste products with respect to their durum wheat flour or semolina content; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. BARRETT):

S. 3941. A bill relating to certain mining claims which were eligible for validation under the act of August 12, 1953 but which were not validated solely because of the failure of the owners to take certain action to protect their claims within the prescribed period; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (by request):

S. 3942. A bill to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma for the Cheyenne and Arapaho Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG:

S. 3943. A bill authorizing a comprehensive project for control and progressive eradication of salt-marsh and other injurious mosquitoes in the coastal area of southwest Louisiana; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. IVES:

S. 3944. A bill for the relief of Rebecca Erriete Mustacchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS (by request):

S. 3945. A bill for the relief of Walter C. Jordan and Elton W. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 3946. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain unfair methods of competition and certain unfair practices in the distribution of new motor vehicles in interstate commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONRONEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DANIEL (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas):

S. 3947. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the Sabine River Authority of Texas easements in certain lands of the United States within the Sabine National Forest, Tex.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 3948. A bill to amend the Texas City Disaster Claims Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE TOWN OF CASTINE, MAINE

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the transfer of certain federally owned real property to the town of Castine, Maine, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a copy of a memorandum I have prepared on the bill, may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3937) to provide for the transfer of certain property situated in the State of Maine to the town of Castine, Maine, introduced by Mr. PAYNE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the town of Castine, Maine, for public-park purposes, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that portion of the property known as the Dice Head Lighthouse Reservation, Maine, consisting of the light tower and the plot of land surrounding such tower 100 feet square (together with any right of ingress and egress thereto), which was excepted from the conveyance transferring a part of such reservation to the town of Castine, Maine, authorized by section 5 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to dispose of certain lighthouse reservations, and for other purposes," approved May 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 305), such property having been transferred to the Administrator of General Services for disposition as surplus property. The exact legal description of the property authorized to be conveyed under this act shall be determined by the said Administrator.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this act shall be subject to the conditions (1) that in the event the property conveyed pursuant to this act ceases to be used for public-park purposes all right, title, and interest so conveyed shall revert to the United States in accordance with the provisions of section 36 of the act referred to in the first section of this act, and (2) that the United States reserves the right to resume ownership, possession, and control, for Government purposes, of any of such property so conveyed, at any time and without the consent of the grantee.

The memorandum, presented by Mr. PAYNE, is as follows:

MEMORANDUM BY SENATOR PAYNE

The bill I am introducing today would convey to the town of Castine, Maine, a small area of land consisting of about 100 square feet. The property is a part of an area known as the Dice's Head Lighthouse Reservation. In 1935 Congress by an act approved May 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 305), authorized conveyance of the Dice's Head Lighthouse Reservation to the town of Castine but reserved the light tower and 100 square feet of land in the event that the light should be reestablished. This small reservation is entirely within the area transferred to Castine and is not accessible except over such area. The reservation was conveyed to the town on the condition that it be used as a public park.

In 1953 the small area in question was declared surplus to the needs of the Federal Government. Some representatives of the Coast Guard indicated that the property would be given to the town of Castine, and the town took all steps necessary to accept it as a gift. The town went so far as to undertake maintenance of the property including painting the light tower. Since the Coast Guard had no authority to give the property away the proposal was disapproved and the property turned over to the General Services Administration for disposal. GSA offered to sell the land to the town of Castin, but it is a small community and was not financially able to purchase. the property.

When the town of Castine was unable to purchase the land, GSA advertised it for sale and accepted a bid. When the prospective buyer inspected the land and found that it was located inside a public park he refused to complete the purchase. The matter was first brought to my attention during the pending sale, but at that time it would have been unfair to the buyer, who acted in good faith, to introduce legislation. Since the sale was not completed and there is now no sale pending, I am introducing this bill to give the land to the town of Castine for use as a public park.

The conveyance to the town would be subject to two conditions. First, if the area should cease to be used as a park, title would revert to the Federal Government. Second, if it should become necessary to reestablish the light the Government could take back the property.

It is my belief that the bill I am introducing today will serve to carry out the intent of Congress in the act of 1935 when it transferred some 80 percent of the Dice's Head Lighthouse Reservation to Castine. The only reason for reserving any part of the area was the possible future needs of the Government, and it is certainly reasonable to assume that Congress intended for the town to have the excepted area under the same terms as the original grant whenever it could be determined that the Government no longer had any need for the area. As I have indicated, the land in question is entirely within the boundaries of the original grant, and consequently is surrounded by a public park. It is difficult to see how such property could have any real value to a private owner, and this conclusion is borne out but the fact that a potential private owner refused to purchase the land after inspecting the situation.

It is hoped that Congress will act favorably on this bill during the present session.

CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF MOSQUITOES IN SOUTHWEST LOUISIANA

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing a comprehensive project for control and progressive eradication of salt-marsh and other injurious mosquitoes in the coastal area of southwest Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3943) authorizing a comprehensive project for control and progressive eradication of salt-marsh and other injurious mosquitoes in the coastal area of southwest Louisiana, introduced by Mr. LONG, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. LONG is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LONG

1. Anyone familiar with the Mississippi Delta and gulf coast of Louisiana has felt the sting of salt-marsh and flood-water mosquitoes blown inland from breeding marshes and knows about their power of flight and ability to be carried by wind for many miles as well as their viciousness and the effect of their attacks. The great swarms that arise from the marshes following storms and lesser ecological disturbances that create conditions favorable to mosquito breeding, forming clouds of destruction wafted inland to add to an already dense mosquito population, are intolerable for man and beast alike in an area of economic importance.

2. These conditions are not new but their occurrence is more frequent and is taking on greater importance with the economic development of the resources of the region, some of which contribute substantially to the conditions and call for exploration of remedial measures. The coastal marshes of Louisiana are built upon a foundation of vegetation which has been progressively sinking for many years bringing about higher water levels and intrusion of salt water in the marsh areas favorable to mosquito production. Salt-water brought to the surface by oil and mineral development has changed some fresh water areas to a saline condition. The deepening and widening of existing water channels and construction of new channels for navigation to the Gulf of Mexico and through the Intracoastal Waterway has admitted more salt water into the marsh area. Guard locks installed to prevent salt-water from entering the canals from which many farmers derive their fresh-water supply undoubtedly have caused a major increase in the extent to which salt-water overflows the marshes. The resulting inter-mixture of fresh- and salt-water and changes in water levels throughout the extensive marshes along the coast create an abundant breeding area for mosquitoes. Livestock production, recreational development, and human occupation in the vicinity are seriously affected to the point that full development of the resources of the region will require the necessary investigations to determine the factors that make up the potential of the marshes for mosquito production, the means whereby mosquito production may be controlled, and development of an operational program that will provide the necessary relief from mosquito infestation that now impedes full development and use of the resources of the coastal area.

3. It is recognized that the control of mosquitoes is primarily a responsibility of the State and local interests. However, now that the Federal Government has expended millions of dollars in development of the water resources of the coastal area of Louisiana for navigation, flood control, water supply,

salt-water regulation, and agricultural, industrial, and recreational uses, it is equitable that the Federal Government cooperate with the State of Louisiana in providing funds for survey of the situation that has developed concurrently with these improvements, research in development of control methods, and experimentation in control practices to realize the full benefits of the improvements that have been made.

4. The Corps of Engineers, as the Federal agency primarily concerned with the problem, is well prepared to conduct the necessary engineering and operational investigations and the experimental and demonstration activities and to direct the exploration of the technical problems associated with mosquito production in the areas affected by Federal water-control projects and to undertake development of adequate mosquito control measures in cooperation with the State of Louisiana and other interested Federal agencies. Millions of dollars of Federal funds have been expended in a similar manner through the Corps of Engineers for the same general purpose with outstanding success for development of mosquito control in connection with reservoirs in upland areas under jurisdiction of the Corps. Improvements brought about by these endeavors have resulted in establishing satisfactory controls and reduction in costs for management of reservoirs throughout the principal mosquito breeding areas of the United States. Extension of the same type activity to the coastal area of Louisiana in the vicinity of Federal water-control structures will serve an equally urgent need and results obtained will be equally applicable to many other coastal areas of the same type in other States. It is anticipated that joint endeavors may substantially improve and reduce the cost of the continuing program of the State of Louisiana for mosquito control in the coastal areas.

5. It is proposed that, subject to further planning by the Corps of Engineers and the State of Louisiana, a project area be selected in the coastal marshes of Louisiana between the Calcasieu and Mermentau Rivers, or some equally suitable area; for study, experimentation, and demonstration; for control of salt-marsh and other injurious mosquitoes, including comprehensive investigation of environmental factors and conditions favorable to mosquito production and all possible biological, chemical, mechanical, or other methods that may be economically practiced and demonstrated successful for control of mosquitoes.

6. In order to accomplish the above purposes, it is proposed that Federal funds in the amount of $250,000 per year be appropriated for a period of 3 years for the Corps of Engineers to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, subject to concurrence and cooperation of the State of Louisiana through its agency or agencies responsible for mosquito control activities.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT, RELATING TO PRACTICES IN DISTRIBUTION OF NEW MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain unfair methods of competition and certain unfair practices in the distribution of new motor vehicles in interstate commerce. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the table for 3 days, in order to permit additional sponsorship.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The bill (S. 3946) to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain unfair methods of competition and certain unfair practices in the distribution of new motor vehicles in interstate commerce, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LEHMAN submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 10660) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 10660, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. SMATHERS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 10660, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. KUCHEL submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 10660, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. BUSH submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 10660, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CAPEHART submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 10660, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. JENNER) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 10660, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. JENNER (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 10660, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. ALLOTT submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 10660, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. BARRETT (for himself, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. MAGNUSON) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 10660, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT OF SPECIAL REPORT ENTITLED "INTERNATIONAL GEOPHYSICAL YEAR" (S. DOC. NO. 124)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, at the meeting of the Committee on Appropriations on May 24, in connection with consideration of the independent offices appropriation bill, it was recommended that a committee print of a special report on the United States program of cooperation in the International Geophysical Year, as prepared by the National Academy of Sciences, and submitted by the National Science Foundation, be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

I present the committee print, and ask that it be so printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence relating to the report, together with a press release explaining its purpose, be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the correspondence and press release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D. C., March 28, 1956.

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations and Government Matters, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: I am transmitting herewith the special report on the United States program for the International Geophysical Year, as requested by you during our recent appropriation hearing.

The report presents the scientific programs now planned by the United States as well as a brief synopsis of activities to date in connection with the International Geophysical Year. It contains considerable information that has not as yet been published.

It is my understanding that you are considering publishing the material as a special report of your committee. The services of members of my staff or of the United States National Committee are available to assist you in any way in editing the material or in preparing it for the printer.

The report was prepared by the United States Committee for the International Geophysical Year of the National Academy of Sciences .

Dr. Kaplan, Chairman of the Committee, joins me in expressing our sincere appreciation for the interest displayed by your committee in this great scientific undertaking.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN T. WATERMAN,
Director.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1956.

Dr. ALAN T. WATERMAN,
Director, National Science Foundation, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. WATERMAN: I want to thank you for sending me the very comprehensive report covering participation by the United States in the worldwide program of the International Geophysical Year. At a time when we are inching along toward international political understanding, this cooperative effort in which 46 nations join together to observe and study geophysical phenomena comes as reassuring news.

In my capacity as chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate which approved

the appropriation of funds for the program, I have previously reviewed the plans for the International Geophysical Year and I am convinced that this cooperative effort will undoubtedly unlock secrets of nature of vast importance to the welfare of mankind.

It appears to me that the story of the International Geophysical Year—its programs and objectives—should be made known to the citizens of the United States, since the results of this venture, particularly as they relate to weather forecasting, communications, and transportation, may well affect the lives of all of us. Furthermore, at a time when the United States urgently requires more and better trained scientists and engineers, the exciting nature of the International Geophysical Year should serve as a stimulant to our youngsters toward careers in science.

The data you have sent me summarizes the International Geophysical Year programs and objectives completely, yet concisely, and could well serve as a mechanism for bringing the International Geophysical Year to the attention of all our citizens—particularly to our high-school students. Therefore I have today requested the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, to cause the data you sent me to be reproduced as an official print of the committee and to be issued as a Senate document.

Sincerely yours,

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Independent Offices and General Government Matters.

To more fully inform the public about the International Geophysical Year, the Senate Committee on Appropriations is publishing a report summarizing its programs and objectives, according to a joint announcement today by Senator CARL HAYDEN, chairman of both the congressional Joint Committee on Printing and the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations. Senator HAYDEN pointed out that it is unusual for the Senate committee to publish a scientific document of this length, and that it is doing so now because of the dramatic scope of the international geophysical year program and its importance to the people of the United States.

"This unparalleled scientific effort known as the International Geophysical Year is very much in the national interest," Senator MAGNUSON asserted. "It will, for example, give us vital information on natural events that exert a controlling influence on our daily lives, on commerce, industry, transportation, and on the range and reliability of radio, television, and navigation systems. From the scientific standpoint these studies will produce needed information, for example, about cosmic rays, the ionosphere, particles from the sun, the weather, the relationship between the sun and the earth, and other important aspects of the physics of the earth and its atmosphere."

Senator MAGNUSON described the scope of the United States program for the International Geophysical Year. "It will," he explained, "include scientific studies in the Antarctic, the Arctic, the continental Americas, the Atlantic and Pacific, and even high in the atmosphere above us." "To learn all these things," said Senator MAGNUSON, "the scientists will use the most up-to-date methods available, including elaborate expeditions to the Arctic and Antarctic, oceanographic vessels making long sea voyages, rockets, and earth-circling satellites."

Senator MAGNUSON explained that "observations in many cases will be taken on agreed-upon 'world days' when the geophysicists of the 46 participating nations, located at prearranged points about the globe, will simultaneously and on a completely coordinated basis make their observations of particular natural phenomena. The period 1957–58 has been chosen because it will be a time of exceptional solar activity. Never before has such a comprehensive worldwide scientific endeavor been undertaken."

Senator MAGNUSON indicated that each nation is planning and conducting its own program, but that all national programs are technically coordinated. He said that the program of the United States had been planned by the Nation's leading geophysicists, gathered together by the National Academy of Sciences.

Publication of the report will serve the important purpose of providing comprehensive and lucid information on this unprecedented international scientific effort to Members of Congress, Government agencies interested in the program, scientists, and the general public.

Compilation of this report resulted from a request by Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, to Alan T. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation.

Senator HAYDEN said: "It seems fitting that it should be the National Science Foundation which has been assigned the responsibility for securing and administering the Federal funds needed to carry out the United States program. The Foundation, in assuming this duty, is fulfilling its responsibility for supporting scientific research, as was originally envisaged by Senator MAGNUSON, who, with Senators H. ALEXANDER SMITH and LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, contributed so much to the creation of the Foundation 6 years ago."

The Senate recently voted to appropriate an additional $28 million for the purpose of balancing the total United States program with that planned internationally and to finance the satellite project. In addition, many scientific institutions and universities are contributing the use of their laboratories, observatories, and staff members to the program.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON H. R. 7049, CODIFICATION AND ENACTMENT INTO LAW OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "ARMED FORCES," AND TITLE 32, UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "NATIONAL GUARD"

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Revision and Codification of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, June 1, 1956, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on H. R. 7049, to revise, codify, and enact into law title 10 of the United States Code, entitled "Armed Forces," and title 32 of the United States Code, entitled "National Guard." At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and myself, the chairman.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT AT BAYLOR UNIVERSITY, WACO, TEX.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a speech made by President Eisenhower when he received an honorary degree at Baylor University, in Waco, Tex., last Friday. This talk emphasizes the importance of better education, more broadly spread among the free peoples of the world, to build a greater opportunity for peace. With education comes a greater knowledge of the meaning of freedom and understanding of the responsibility that goes with it. As one who has supported scholarships and worked toward greater opportunities for more education for all, and by that means toward better understanding among all people, I am heartily in accord with what the President said. I can only add that we have responsibility here at home, too, to stimulate the education of scientists and doctors and make it possible for the young people of today to get the most out of their talents. The more that can be done through private endeavor, with Government assistance only when proven necessary, the better it will be for us all.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT AT BAYLOR UNIVERSITY COMMENCEMENT CEREMONIES, WACO, TEX., MAY 25, 1956

Members of the graduating class and fellow Texans, the honor you have conferred on me joins me with a great school of great traditions, of great achievements, of great goals. Baylor's 10 schools and colleges are the fruition of seeds planted in 1845 at Old Independence. Baylor's graduates in positions of leadership testify to the wisdom and foresight of Baylor's founders. Your magnificent Armstrong Browning library exemplifies the growth of Baylor as a principal cultural center of the Southwest.

This university is dedicated to true education; it strives to develop wisdom. This implies, over and beyond mere knowledge, an understanding of men's relationship to their fellow men in a world created for their stewardship by a God in whose image they are all made.

You have been taught here to do justice and to love mercy and to walk humbly before your Maker even as you use every opportunity to better yourselves through the profession in which you have been here grounded.

Now you enter a new phase of your life experience—in a world where the principles by which you live are frequently flouted and ignored. What is your place in this world? What can you do to improve it? Pointedly, what can each one of you as an individual do to promote a world society that respects the values in which you, and this school, believe so deeply. The thoughts I bring to you this morning deal primarily—and that sketchily—with the international phases of a suggested answer.

I speak of international affairs for a very simple reason. In the fundamental struggle in which the world is now engaged, world issues create, or at least color, almost every domestic question and problem.

Clear comprehension on the basic factors involved is vitally important to leaders and officials and to every citizen of this country and of the free world. Such understanding, I submit, is especially important to you young people who perforce must look at these critical current problems against a horizon of 10, 20, 40 years hence.

Today a militant, aggressive communistic doctrine is dominant over much of the world's surface and over hundreds of millions of the world's people. In the postwar period we have seen it indulge in a particularly cynical type of colonialism, expressed in the Communist subjugation of once free and proud

nations in Europe and in Asia. Simultaneously, in the free areas of the world, 600 million people in more than a score of new countries have achieved independence.

Communism denies the spiritual premises on which your education has been based. According to that doctrine, there is no God; there is no soul in man; there is no reward beyond the satisfaction of daily needs. Consequently toward the human being communism is cruel, intolerant, atheistic. This doctrine, committed to conquest by lure, intimidation, and force, seeks to destroy the political concepts and institutions that we hold to be dearer than life itself. Thus communism poses a threat from which even this mighty Nation is not wholly immune.

Yet communism is, in deepest sense, a gigantic failure.

Even in the countries it dominates hundreds of millions who dwell there still cling to their religious faith; still are moved by aspirations for justice and freedom that cannot be answered merely by more steel and bigger bombers; still seek a reward that is beyond money or place or power; still dream of the day that they walk fearlessly in the fullness of human freedom.

The destiny of man is freedom and justice under his Creator. Any ideology that denies this universal faith will ultimately perish or be recast. This is the first great truth that must underlie all our thinking, all our striving in this struggling world.

A second truth is that the fundamental principles of human liberty and free government are powerful sources of human energy, loyalty, dedication, and guides to enduring success. They are mightier than armaments and armies.

Americans have recognized those two truths in the historical documents of the Republic. They are repeated in the preamble to the fundamental policy statement in our current series of national security directives. In part that preamble reads:

"The spiritual, moral, and material posture of the United States of America rests upon established principles which have been asserted and defended throughout the history of the Republic. The genius, strength, a: d promise of America are founded in the dedication of its people and government to the dignity, equality, and freedom of the human being under God.

"These concepts and our institutions which nourish and maintain them with justice are the bulwark of our free society and are the basis of the respect and leadership which have been accorded our Nation by the peoples of the world."

Much as we are dedicated to this expression of lofty sentiment, it will count for little unless every American—to the extent of his influence and capacity—daily breathes into it the life of his own practice. The test is the readiness of individuals to cleave to principle even at the cost of narrower, more immediate gains.

For you graduates, and for all citizens, opportunities to strengthen our assault on injustice and bigotry will be as numerous as the tasks you undertake and the people you meet each day. Nothing I might add could either quicken your recognition of such opportunities or strengthen your response to them. But certain it is that in this recognition and this response will be found the measure of America's future safety, progress, and greatness.

The third great truth that must underlie our thinking on international questions is this: People are what count. A sympathetic understanding of the aspirations, the hopes and fears, the traditions and prides of other peoples and nations, is essential to the promotion of mutual prosperity and peace. Such understanding is a compulsory requirement on each of us if, as a people, we are to discharge our inescapable national responsibility to lead the world in the growth of freedom and human dignity.

Communism seeks to dominate or to destroy; freedom seeks to cooperate and to help others to build. But these basic differences are not self-evident. Therefore, the people of the world are not necessarily thinking in terms of opposing concepts of communistic dictatorship and of human rights and freedom.

Rather, today, the most unyielding expression of peoples' aspirations seems to be an intense nationalism. There is nothing to be feared in this—of itself. The right of a people, capable of self-government, to their own political institutions is deeply imbedded in American thinking. Among peoples as among our own citizens we believe the rights of the weak are identical with those of the strong. And, in the past we have helped many small nations to independence. We will continue to hail with satisfaction the birth of each new nation whose people, achieving independence and freedom, become peaceful members of the world community.

In this day, however, one acute economic problem grows more acute as each new nation steps forward to an independent place in the international family. New nations, springing up, create new political boundaries. Far too often these political boundaries become serious barriers to the flow of trade.

Such barriers are daily of more importance as increasing industrialization and specialization critically increase the economic interdependence of peoples. Specialization in any area—which implies an unbalanced local economy—is not necessarily a weakness, provided always that there is free opportunity for exchanging a portion of the products of such specialization for the other things needed to satisfy the requirements of people.

This means that, where any nation does not possess, within its own boundaries, the major elements of a broadly balanced economy, it is normally handicapped in assuring maximum satisfaction of human wants and a stable prosperity for its own people. So we find that the emotional urge for a completely independent existence may conflict with an equal desire for higher living standards.

This conflict, so obvious, is often ignored. But even the productivity and prosperity of this great country would vanish if our States were 48 separate nations, with economic and political barriers at each boundary preventing or impeding the interflow of goods, people, and information.

We must put to ourselves this question: How can we help answer both the great desire of peoples for a separate, independent existence and the need for economic union or, at least, effective cooperation among them?

This question is of vital importance to every nation. Unhappiness, unrest, and disaffection caused by depressed living standards can be as acute as when caused by political injustice. Disaffection, long continued, in any portion of the earth, can bring about political convulsions and grave global crises. In Communist areas the answer is achieved by compulsion.

But effective cooperation is not easily accomplished among free nations. Permit me in one illustration to point up the difficulty, among free peoples, of progress toward this type of union.

The statesmen of Western Europe have long been aware that only in broad and effective cooperation among the nations of that region can true security for all be found. They know that real unification of the separate countries there would make their combined 250 million highly civilized people a mighty pillar of free strength in the modern world. A free United States of Europe would be strong in the skills of its people, adequately endowed with material resources, and rich in their common cultural and artistic heritage. It would be a highly prosperous community.

Without such unification the history of the past half century in Europe could go on in dreary repetition, possibly to the ultimate destruction of all the values those people hold most dear. With unification, a new sun of hope, security, and confidence would shine for Europe, and for the free world.

Why, then, has this great objective not been attained by intelligent peoples? The basic reasons are simply stated. First: It is the great pride of each nation in separate existence. Second, it is the intense fear of losing, in such a union, cherished local traditions and cultural and political institutions—and of suffering temporary economic dislocations. We, of course, appreciate the weight of such considerations—and are therefore patient—even though the history of this largest of our States refutes the fears that seem to loom so large in Europe.

Another stumbling block to European unity is the failure of populations as a whole to grasp the long-term political, economic, and security advantage of union. These are matters that do not make for a soul-stirring address on a national holiday. They can be approached only in thought, in wisdom—almost, we might say, in prayer.

Nevertheless—and happily—much progress has been made.

Years ago, our European partners began both to study and to act. Our country's help was given wherever possible because our own future security and prosperity are inescapably linked to those of our European friends. There was established the Brussels Compact, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the European Payments Union, the European Coal and Steel Community, and the Council of Europe. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization—NATO—although an organization comprehending much more than Western Europe, nevertheless provides the cooperative mechanism for greater security in the area. All these were set up to attack immediate problems in cooperation.

Despite setbacks and difficulties, these have been operating with increasing efficiency. So, European union, one of the greatest dreams of western man, seems nearer today than at any time in centuries, providing bright promise for the future of our European friends and for the growth and strength of liberty.

On a broader geographical scale, members of the Atlantic Community are working together in many different ways and through many different agencies. But such cooperation can usefully be further developed. At the NATO meeting several weeks ago it was decided that the members of the Atlantic Community should "examine actively further measures which might be taken at this time to advance more effectively their common interests." They designated a committee of three foreign ministers to advise on "ways and means to improve and extend cooperation in nonmilitary fields and to develop greater unity within the Atlantic Community."

This effort recognizes the truth that all peoples of the free world must learn to work together more effectively in the solution of our common problems or the battle for human liberty cannot be won. Among equals, attempting to perform a difficult task, there is no substitute for cooperation.

It is gratifying, to all of us, to know that Senator WALTER GEORGE has agreed to act as my personal representative and special ambassador in working for this new evolution of the Atlantic Community. Nothing could testify more forcefully to the critical importance of this project than the willingness of Senator GEORGE to undertake it.

Patiently but persistently we must work on. We must take into account man's hunger for freedom and for food; all men's

dignity as well as some men's power; the eventual triumph of right and justice over expediency and force.

The responsibility for carrying forward America's part in helping improve international cooperation cannot be met through paperwork in a governmental bureau. But it can be met through a combined effort by all of us, in and out of Government, all trying to develop the necessary understanding that every international problem is in reality a human one. You—the fortunate graduates of this great institution—are in a particularly advantageous position to lead in the development of this kind of thinking and understanding.

You owe it to yourselves and to your country to continue your study and critical analysis of the great international questions of our day. You can join with like-minded men and women in the many voluntary associations that promote people-to-people contact around the world. By means of them, the thorny problems of the time are scrutinized from many viewpoints. Solutions are approached by many avenues. Creative thinking is sparked. Mutual understanding is furthered.

Thus, every thinking person will come to understand that his country's future will be brighter as the lot of mankind improves; that no nation can in the long run prosper except as the world enjoys a growing prosperity.

We must indeed be partners for peace and freedom and prosperity, if those words are to record achievement as well as to express a dream.

The foreign policy of this Republic—if it serves the enduring purposes and good of the United States—must always be founded on these truths, thus expressing the enlightened interests of the whole American people.

Certainly the basic foreign-relations measures taken by the United States in this century have been so developed. They do not belong to any political party—they are American. These measures range from our support of the Organization of American States to our membership in the United Nations and our present programs of partnership and assistance.

The United Nations by its very comprehensiveness is a unique association within which nations of every political complexion and philosophy have their place. The smaller groupings, in which we hold membership, are bound together by a respect for common values and principles. They conform, of course, to the U. N. Charter. But in each organization the likeness in background or interest or purpose that characterizes the membership and the restricted geographical limits within which it operates—assures more effective discharge of their functions than is possible in a group as large as the U. N.

We shall continue in our loyalty to the United Nations. But we should, at the same time, further expand and strengthen our other international associations.

Some of them, although only a few years old, are already household words, recognized as immense contributions to the prosperity and the security of particular areas in the free world—and to our own prosperity and security. Yet none provides a complete answer to any of our international problems. Again, consider NATO.

A united Western Europe may still be on the far-off horizon. NATO is, nevertheless, a great alliance, rich in human and natural resources. But this great array is neither self-sustaining nor self-sufficient. Its freedom and prosperity and security are intertwined with the freedom and prosperity and security of many other nations—old and new and still to be born—that people an even greater portion of the earth. Within this community of freedom all are more sure of their independence and prosperity and security when all join so that:

Mutual trade is fostered.

Legitimate political and economic aspirations are advanced.

Cultural traditions are respected.

The difficulties and misfortunes of the weaker are met by help from the stronger. To be backward or penny-wise in our practice of this truth can lead only to greater risk and greater cost—far greater cost to ourselves.

The ways in which progress along these four roads can be achieved are legion in number. The first, of which I've spoken at some length, is the need for the growth and spread of understanding among our own people. The next is that the peoples of other nations must, through similar study and thought, recognize with us the need for this kind of cooperation. This, in itself, is not easy. Many nations, although their cultures are ancient and rich in human values, do not possess the resources to spread the needed education throughout their populations. But they can wisely use help that respects their traditions and ways.

For example, the whole free world would be stronger if there existed adequate institutions of modern techniques and sciences in areas of the world where the hunger for knowledge and the ability to use knowledge are unsatisfied because educational facilities are often not equal to the existing need.

Do we not find here a worthy challenge to America's universities and to their graduates? I firmly believe that if some or all of our great universities, strongly supported by private foundations that exist in number throughout our land, sparked by the zeal and fire of educated Americans, would devote themselves to this task the prospects for a peaceful and prosperous world would be mightily enhanced.

In no respect should the purpose of these institutions be to transplant into a new area the attitudes, the forms, the procedures of America. The staffing, the conduct, the curriculum of each school would be the responsibility of the people where the school might be built.

Each school would help each nation develop its human and natural resources and also provide a great two-way avenue of communication. We would gain new knowledge and wisdom out of the priceless values of another people's traditions and proud heritage. They would gain knowledge in the technical and scientific fields where we have had an earlier start.

Such a voluntary effort in people-to-people partnership would be a dynamic, a fruitful corollary to three elements already effectively at work in our governmental foreign policy.

To our atoms for peace program.

To our efforts to establish a climate in which universal disarmament can go forward.

To our long-sustained campaign for the exchange of knowledge and factual information between peoples.

Purposes and projects such as these—formulated by Republicans and Democrats—are parts of a comprehensive effort to meet present and future needs, to solve problems in the enlightened self-interest of the United States. It takes into account our global concerns on all the continents, on all the oceans.

It is not a haphazard, makeshift arrangement to meet day-to-day crises—big or little or imaginary.

Instead, it is a platform for the development of a stable, prosperous, peaceful world. Immediately concerned with this year and next year, our foreign policy is a realistic approach to a better world for all in 1966, 1976, and 1996.

The basic policy objectives I have described are in furtherance of the aspirations of those who founded the Republic. These objectives are plainly advanced if we foster and secure conditions at home and abroad with which this system of freedom can live and under which it can find fertile ground for acceptance and growth. Thus our security and our aspirations are linked with the security and aspirations of liberty loving people in many other lands. It is idle to talk of community of interest with them in measures for defense, without recognizing community of interest with them in that which is to be defended.

Security cannot be achieved by arms alone, no matter how destructive the weapons or how large their accumulation.

So today it is vitally important that we and others detect and pursue the ways in which cultural and economic assistance will mean more to free world strength, stability and solidarity than will purely military measures.

You of this class, like all Americans, must act in terms of today. At the same time, you in particular should think in terms of those years that now seem so distant.

Increasingly, from this day onward, the influence of men and women now of your age will mold our course at home and abroad. It is logical that you should start immediately thinking about the Republic and the world that stretches out ahead. Then you can start working now for the sort of country and world you want as a home for your children and grandchildren.

You have in your heritage the dynamic principles that arouse visions in mankind.

You have in your hearts and minds the means to lift the eyes of men and women above the drab and desolate horizon of hate and fear and hopelessness.

For, my friends of Baylor, as Texans, as Americans, believing as you do in the brotherhood of man, and in his right to freedom—joined with all the millions of dedicated men and women at home, linked in partnership with hundreds of millions of like-minded people around the globe—you constitute the mightiest temporal force on earth.

THE CIVIL-RIGHTS RECORD OF THE ADMINISTRATION MUST MATCH WORDS WITH DEEDS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the administration has submitted to Congress a civil-rights program. It is not a strong program, and it does not go very far. But I commend the administration for it, and I plan to vote for a forward-looking civil-rights program if and when it reaches the floor of the United States Senate.

Furthermore, administration spokesmen have been making many speeches and statements proclaiming great and profound interest in the protection of racial and religious minorities. I also commend these statements.

Mr. President, the desire of the administration to protect minorities is most laudatory, as I have said. However, Mr. President, it also is well that words should square with actions—that no administration ever should be allowed to substitute mere oratory for deeds. For that reason, I believe the Senate and the Nation will be interested in a most significant situation in my home State of Oregon.

On May 18, 1956, Elmo E. Smith was nominated by Oregon Republicans as their candidate for reelection as Governor of the State. Mr. Smith succeeded to the governorship in January of this year, following the tragic and untimely

death of Gov. Paul L. Patterson. Governor Patterson, incidentally, had a fine record in the general field of civil rights.

It is significant that Republican leaders brought heavy political pressure to bear in order to secure a clear field for the nomination for Governor Smith, even to the extent of forcing Representative WALTER NORBLAD, of the First District, to withdraw from the gubernatorial contest after he actually had filled out his nomination papers and paid the legal filing fee. But, what is the record of the Oregon Republican standard bearer?

Mr. President, on February 17, 1949, the Oregon State Senate passed a historic fair employment practices bill, to forbid discrimination in jobs because of race, creed, religion, or color of an applicant. The bill passed by the overwhelming vote of 27 to 2. I am familiar with that vote because I sponsored—with many helpful cosponsors—the first fair employment practices bill ever introduced in the Oregon Legislature. One of the two State senators voting "no" on fair employment practices was Elmo E. Smith, now Governor of the State of Oregon.

On April 18, 1951, Mr. President, the Oregon State Senate passed a bill forbidding discrimination against students in trade and professional schools because of race, color, religion, or national origin. An ugly situation had developed in which Negro students were being barred from schools which taught mechanical trades and work in beauty parlors. This denied them job opportunities. The bill passed 25 to 5. Among the five State senators voting "no" was Elmo E. Smith, now Governor of the State of Oregon.

ELMO SMITH OPPOSED BILLS SAFEGUARDING MINORITY RIGHTS

Again, on March 16, 1953, Mr. President, the Oregon State Senate enacted a bill forbidding discrimination in public places, such as hotels and restaurants and theaters because of race, religion, color, or national origin. My wife and I were cosponsors of this bill, I am pleased to report. The bill passed 21 to 9. Among the nine State senators voting "no" was Elmo E. Smith, now Governor of the State of Oregon.

In other words, Mr. President, the present Governor of Oregon voted against all three measures adopted by our State to prevent discrimination against members of minority races or religions. From our research, Mr. President, we can find no other member of the Oregon State senate who voted against all three of these bills to safeguard minority rights in the State of Oregon. Elmo E. Smith stands alone in this unenviable category.

Mr. President, this is where we come to making words square with deeds. On a great many occasions, Republican orators urge the Democratic Party to repudiate its high officials who allegedly oppose civil rights for our colored citizens. This oratory has become particularly frequent during recent months.

So I ask the Republican Party what it plans to do about Elmo E. Smith, Republican candidate for Governor of Oregon, and now the head of his party's 1956 ticket in that State? Mr. Smith, by his votes as a State senator, has demonstrated his opposition to the most simple and elemental legislation for safeguarding minority rights and privileges.

CAN A CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM BE SQUARED WITH AN ANTI-CIVIL-RIGHTS GOVERNOR?

Can the Republican Party lay claim to sincere sponsorship of civil rights, so long as it supports a candidate with the obvious views and attitudes in this field held by Oregon's Gov. Elmo E. Smith? His nomination provides a revealing study in contrasts, when compared to the administration's professed concern for the rights of racial and religious minorities.

A few years ago, the Republican national committeeman for Oregon, as well as my predecessor in the Senate, the Honorable Guy Cordon, recommended State Senator Warren Gill to be United States attorney in our State. After long delay, Attorney General Herbert Brownell rejected the recommendation backing Mr. Gill, because of what then was claimed to be Mr. Gill's unfortunate and adverse record in the State legislature on civil rights. Mr. President, note this incongruity: The record of State Senator Gill on civil rights and liberties in the Oregon Legislature, while not outstanding in any respect, has been far better than that of Gov. Elmo E. Smith, the man who heads the Republican ticket in 1956. Does this mean Republican leaders are actually less wedded to civil rights now than they were several years ago? Could this be possible? I hope not.

For example, Mr. Gill—as a member of the legislature—voted for both the fair employment practices bill and the bill banning discrimination in trade schools. Elmo Smith opposed both these bills. Yet, by administration standards, because of his record on minority rights, Mr. Gill was unfit to be United States attorney for Oregon, while Elmo Smith evidently is qualified to be Governor of Oregon and to head the entire Oregon Republican ticket.

It will be interesting and significant to learn what the administration has to say about the fact that the most determined legislative foe of minority rights and minority liberties in Oregon is now the head of the Republican ticket in our State for the 1956 elections, the elections in which national GOP leaders expect to play so prominent a part.

I rather imagine the whole Nation, especially our minority groups, will watch this performance with keen interest.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that I have no criticism to make of Governor Smith personally. I do not deal in personalities. But the people have a right to know his legislative record on so vital a question as human dignity and freedom. The founders of the State of Oregon wrote into the State constitution a provision for rollcall votes on the final passage of bills in the legislature for the very purpose of informing the electorate on such matters as the record of State senators and representatives on issues such as FEPC and civil rights.

RICHARD M. NELSON, MONTANA HIGH-SCHOOL SCIENCE INSTRUCTOR, NAMED "McCALL'S TEACHER OF THE YEAR"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes in addition to the customary allowance during the morning hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Montana is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Richard M. Nelson, a Kalispell, Mont., high-school science teacher, who "enjoys the prestige that a successful football coach would enjoy in another scholastic climate," is named "McCall's Teacher of the Year" in the magazine's June issue. Mr. Nelson, a science instructor at Flathead County High School, in Kalispell, will be presented to President Dwight D. Eisenhower at the White House at 11:15 a. m., Tuesday, May 29. He will be accompanied by two of his students—Gerald Miller, 16, a junior; and Everett O'Hare, 17, a senior—who were selected to represent their classmates. The boys are bringing gifts to the President. Everett O'Hara is bringing a solar-powered transistor radio—pocket-size—which he himself made; and Gerald Miller is bringing a "decision meter." Both boys are from Kalispell, Mont. O'Hara will enter Montana State College this fall. His interest in science dates from the age of 10, and he has won several science fair prizes. He is sports editor of his school newspaper, and was president of the student body. He is the only child of Gilbert and Agnes O'Hara. His father is an auto mechanic, and his mother works part time at Torbert's Stores. Young Miller also is interested in sports. He is president of the Luther League, and has the Chevalier degree in De Molay. His father, Manuel Miller, is a merchant in Kalispell, and his mother, Ethel, is a housewife. He has a brother, Keith, and a sister, Sandra.

Richard Nelson was selected by the magazine and the United States Office of Education, which cosponsors the "Teacher of the Year" project. He was lauded for "bringing the world of science to the attention of an agricultural and lumbering community—contributing to an eventual understanding of the atomic age by the layman." His selection as the fifth "McCall's Teacher of the Year," named in the magazine's annual project honoring the teaching profession, is particularly timely. It comes at a moment when distinguished American leaders in government and industry are calling for more qualified science teachers to insure our continued national safety and industrial strength.

In selecting Mr. Nelson, the editors of McCall's pay tribute to the entire science teaching profession and its contribution to our national welfare and growth. The magazine also named seven other instructors to the "McCall's Honor Roll of Teachers" for 1956.

"McCall's Teacher of the Year" and those named to the "McCall's Honor Roll

of Teachers" were selected after months of study and observation by representatives of the Office of Education and McCall's. All nominations were made by State departments of education at the invitation of Dr. Samuel M. Brownell, United States Commissioner of Education, and Dr. Edgar Fuller, executive secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers. Nominees were observed at work in their classrooms; and parents, civic leaders, and educators were interviewed on the effect of the teacher's work on their respective communities.

Richard Nelson was appraised by the 1956 teacher of the year judges as an inspiring teacher of science, concerned with the development of the whole child. As skiing instructor at the school, Mr. Nelson acquired the nickname "Knute," and Knute he has become to the Kalispell community. His students like him and have confidence in him. They find his classroom technique preserves discipline with humor, and invites informal but controlled discussion. He is characterized as a forthright teacher who tempers a bawling out with a word of encouragement after class.

Mr. Nelson, a bachelor of 30, believes that his responsibilities toward his students are governed by his responsibilities toward society as a whole. It is his conviction that to teach is to make a subject current experience, one that a teen-ager can become intensely interested in and develop an affection for. "The primary objective of a high-school physics course," asserts Mr. Nelson, "is to lay the foundation for the eventual understanding of the atomic era by the layman."

Mr. Nelson entered the University of Denver in 1945, intending to study drama, but was guided to science by his father, Dr. Alfred C. Nelson, then a professor of chemical engineering, and now dean of Community College, and director of the summer session at the university. No textbook theorist, Richard Nelson works in the summers for the Bureau of Reclamation, as an instrumentman for a civil engineer, and in construction work at an aluminum plant near Kalispell. His personal ambition is to continue teaching science on the high-school level. His ambition for his students is to see them enter scientific research and production work in industry and medicine, and to become teachers of science.

McCall's June issue also contains the honor roll of teachers who have earned special mention for their significant contributions to the improvement of national teaching standards. Named to the McCall's 1956 honor roll of teachers are:

Mr. Russell Bay, Corvallis School, Corvallis, Mont. His eighth-grade pupils learn the satisfactions of citizenship through community participation: Taking the village census and public-opinion polls, constructing a model house, writing editorials for their class newspaper, and working on a 160-acre conservation project.

Miss Anne Gibbs, Churchill County High School, Fallon, Nev. Her warm and sound relationships with the students in her English classes have encouraged a number of them to become teachers. School-community understanding has been fostered through her class news items.

Mrs. Maude A. Hudson, Greenwood High School, Greenwood, S. C. An energetic, resourceful teacher, mother, citizen, and church leader, her distributive-education classes aim toward adjusting the future of her students, most of whom will not attend college.

Miss Frances L. Johnson, Windom High School, Windom, Minn. Her enthusiasm enhances her students' respect for English as a living language. She works consistently for professional improvement and teacher welfare, and she sets high standards of scholarship for her pupils.

Mrs. Kathryn Stagge Marr, Goshen Elementary School, Goshen, Ohio. She brings to young elementary teachers a helpful variety of lively, challenging practices of good teaching. Her immediate rewards are the affection and respect of pupils, parents, and fellow teachers.

Miss Velora Reed, Mesilla School, Las Cruces, N. Mex. Her pre-first-grade boys and girls, who come from Spanish-speaking homes, sense her unusual sympathy, understanding, patience, and affection as they learn their first English words along with the three R's.

Mr. John P. Shaw, Concord Senior High School, Concord, N. H. His dedication to the total welfare of high-school youth has expanded his role of outstanding social-studies teacher and debate coach to that of guidance counselor. He promoted a statewide social-studies program.

Mr. President, on February 4 I received a letter from my old friend, Russell Bay, of Corvallis, Mont., who is one of those included in McCall's 1956 honor roll of teachers. In the letter, Mr. Bay called to my attention the outstanding work done by these eighth grade students. He also sent to me a copy of the Green Hornet's Buzz, the publication of the Corvallis Junior High School. That publication includes an editorial which is of particular interest. I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the editorial and also my letter in reply to that of Russell Bay.

Mr. President, Montana's distinguished senior Senator [Mr. MURRAY], the distinguished Congressman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and I have had the pleasure of meeting "Knute" Nelson, Gerald Miller, and Everett O'Hare at a luncheon. That we are proud of them, of Russell Bay, and of the Flathead County High School and the Corvallis Junior High School goes without saying. We of Montana appreciate the recognition they and their schools have received and we are indebted to McCall's for their selection. It was well deserved.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITORIAL

For many years our National Government has been spending billions of dollars on flood-control dams, dikes, and river improvements to protect the unfortunate valley dwellers from destructive floods. These costly improvements, however, are possibly hindering the solution of this national problem.

In the first place, what caused these floods? The original cause was started with the overgrazing and plowing of land that should never have been treated in this manner. Therefore, the land was robbed of its water-holding capacity.

The project of building dams on rivers to help control overflowing water is justified to a certain extent, but, if we would stop and think, we would find the trouble begins at the watersheds, not in someone's flooded home. Then, the question is asked, "If the watersheds are the beginning of the trouble, why are they not considered as a part of the problem?"

Let us consider a typical watershed at the head of a river system. The farmer who owns this land uses it to his own selfish advantage only, seldom thinking of his fellow men, particularly those thousands of miles below him being flooded every spring. What can be done about someone as selfish as he? There is only one apparent solution and that is to try to educate him, so that he will know the wrong he is doing.

The solution to this problem then, lies in educating the general public. To put this thought into use, the purpose of our Terra Verde project actually is to prevent floods, erosion, and damage to our national resources. We are practicing conservation and attempting to show the public what can be saved if we conserve our resources. If all of us would take into consideration our neighbors and the future of America, we would have to worry little about what happens tomorrow.

To summarize, we feel that more of the billions of dollars spent on flood control should be given to the improvement of our watersheds, and to conservation education.

FEBRUARY 9, 1956.

Mr. RUSSELL BAY,
Corvallis Public Schools,
District No. 1, Corvallis, Mont.

DEAR RUSSELL: This will acknowledge receipt of your good letter of February 4 and also the enclosed copy of the Green Hornet's Buzz.

I have looked over the enclosure with a great deal of interest, and I wish that you would congratulate the students who were responsible for the articles contained therein for doing an outstanding job. They are to be complimented highly. The editorial is not only interesting, but very sound and, I might say, literally excellent. I certainly shall make use of the ideas advanced by the students of the eighth grade in my consideration of matters affecting our water resources, because they have come to grips with the real heart of the problem. I am also impressed, Russell, with the fact that they are showing themselves to be good citizens and are taking an active interest in affairs which not only confront them in the Bitterroot Valley, but which could confront people in many other parts of the United States as well. It is my hope that my fellow Montanans in the eighth grade and their good teacher will put me on their mailing list for the Green Hornet's Buzz so that I may have the benefit of the views expressed therein and so that I can, wherever possible, put the recommendations made to good use back here.

In closing, Russell, I want to thank you for your courtesy in sending me a copy of the paper. I wish you would do me a favor and extend my personal congratulations and best wishes to all the members of the eighth grade. Will you assure them of my deep appreciation for the fine work they are doing and tell them that if at any time I can be

of assistance to them, they need only to call on me?

With best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senator.

BRIG. GEN. JAMES O. GUTHRIE HONORED ON ARMED FORCES DAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Armed Forces Day, May 19, the Chamber of Commerce of Great Falls, Mont., honored one of the outstanding men in the service of the United States Air Force, Brig. Gen. James O. Guthrie. General Guthrie is the commander of the 29th Air Division, with headquarters at Malmstrom Air Force Base, at Great Falls.

Malmstrom is one of the most vital of our Strategic Air Command bases on the continent, because of its proximity to our northern frontier. General Guthrie has done an outstanding job as commander of this SAC Division during his years at the base. A great deal of the credit for the capabilities of this SAC base is due to the untiring efforts of General Guthrie.

It is unfortunate, indeed, that General Guthrie soon will be leaving Malmstrom Air Base, to assume command of an air-defense division in Japan. Montana's loss will be Japan's gain.

At the luncheon in his honor, General Guthrie made a number of remarks relative to the defense of the Nation. I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Great Falls Tribune containing excerpts from his speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR FORCE MAJOR DETERRENT TO WAR, GENERAL GUTHRIE SAYS

"The United States Air Force is the major deterrent to war today," Brig. Gen. James O. Guthrie, commander of the 29th Air Division (Defense), said at an Armed Forces Day luncheon at Hotel Rainbow Saturday.

The luncheon was given by the Great Falls Chamber of Commerce as part of the Armed Forces Day observance. It also was a tribute to Guthrie himself, who will leave soon to assume command of an air defense division in Japan.

Guthrie said that while the Air Force is just one part of the Nation's defense team, which includes the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Air National Guard, National Guard ground forces, and the various reserves, he felt that because of Russia's ability to develop atomic and hydrogen weapons, the Strategic Air Command, of which his division is a part, is spearheading the defense job.

"Unless we keep the Strategic Air Command extremely alert, well trained, and up to the latest standards by research and development, we are really 'asking for it.'"

Guthrie said the United States today has the deterrent force to prevent war, and the strength to repel any attempted aerial invasion. He said airbases such as Malmstrom here, and the new bases under construction at Glasgow, Minot, and Grand Forks will provide the muscles to implement the radar warning systems stretched across Canada.

"Our biggest job today," Guthrie added, "is to make the Armed Forces attractive enough to keep trained men in the services. The present turnover in manpower is fantastically expensive. We feel that we can show Congress the desirability of increasing the pay of airmen and officers."

Guthrie said the great technological advances made since the end of World War II have completely changed the manpower requirements of the services. The new weapons, he said, will make it possible for fewer men in uniform, but men with a much higher degree of skill in their various specialties. For this reason, he said, it is desirable to retain the services of the trained men.

F. M. Ganey, chairman of the chamber's military affairs committee, was master of ceremonies. Forrest Hedger, chamber president, presented Guthrie a painting of a Montana wildlife scene done by Les Peters, Great Falls artist.

Top officers of the various Reserve units here, Malmstrom Air Force Base, and the Montana Air National Guard were introduced to those attending the luncheon.

FAILURE TO FILE INCOME TAX RETURNS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared concerning the failure on the part of self-employed members of certain occupations to file Federal income tax returns.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAMS

In June 1955 the Treasury Department announced the launching of a sample check throughout the country to determine to what extent the self-employed members of 84 different occupations had been failing to file their Federal income tax returns.

On August 7, 1955, this drive was accelerated when it was discovered that Mr. Lemuel B. Schofield, a prominent attorney in Philadelphia, had for the preceding 8 years failed to file his income tax returns and that during this same period his total gross income was $1,352,950.65, upon which the normal tax would have been $435,225.27. To make this situation more embarrasing to the Treasury Department, they had to admit that this case was only discovered after the man had died and during the attempt to settle his estate.

Then on January 5, 1956, a Federal grand jury in Philadelphia, Pa., which had been investigating charges of irregularities in the Philadelphia regional office, issued a scorching report, in which they said that while the statute of limitations prevented them from returning any indictments their investigation had disclosed that there was evidence of "criminal misconduct within the Internal Revenue Service."

A couple of weeks later this sensational charge by the grand jury was followed by an announcement by the Philadelphia office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue that another Philadelphia lawyer, Clarence J. Corcoran, had likewise failed to file his tax returns during the preceding years.

With this second disclosure the Treasury Department announced that they were stepping up their investigations in this direction to determine why these nontaxpayers had not been discovered more promptly.

For the preceding 4 years I had repeatedly been complaining of the laxity of conditions in the Philadelphia regional office and had requested the appropriate committee of Congress to investigate that area.

Upon the release of this grand jury report in January, which more than confirmed my previous suspicions, I again called upon the Treasury Department to identify the public officials referred to in the grand jury report as having been guilty of "criminal misconduct" in carrying out the duties of their office.

Nearly 5 months have elapsed, and still the Treasury Department maintains a wall of silence.

On January 20, 1956, Mr. Chamberlin, the new director of the Philadelphia office, shocked the whole area with the sensational charge that their agents had discovered that nine more lawyers in the Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington area had for several years been failing to file any tax returns.

Mr. Chamberlin said that 3 of these were in Philadelphia, 2 in Camden, N. J., and 4 in Wilmington, Del., with 3 of this latter number from Wilmington proper and 1 from the Wilmington area.

This spectacular and sensational charge, without identification of the individuals involved, had the inevitable effect of placing every attorney in that area under suspicion. This was a wholesale indictment by a top Government official of an entire profession without any evidence being submitted to support his charges, and it was properly resented as such by the membership of the bar associations and the other citizens in those States.

The Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. MARTIN, and my colleague, Senator FREAR, joined me in a letter to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue protesting against this blanket indictment, and we called upon him to take immediate steps either to identify the individuals by properly presenting the charges against them in the courts or, if they did not have sufficient evidence to back up Mr. Chamberlin's allegations, to retract publicly the charge. Our letter of February 16, 1956, follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., February 16, 1955.

Hon. RUSSELL C. HARRINGTON,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Department of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HARRINGTON: Your letter of February 13, 1956, outlining your reasons for your refusal to release the names of the nine lawyers in the Philadelphia-Wilmington area who on January 20, 1956, were charged by your Regional Commissioner with failure to file their tax returns or to pay their taxes, is acknowledged.

We commend you for your effort to make sure of your case before releasing the name of any taxpayer, but it is inconceivable that your Regional Commissioner did not think of this and take these precautions before issuing his statement of January 20.

Having proceeded to the point of definitely charging that there are 3 attorneys in Philadelphia, 4 in Wilmington, and 2 in Camden who have not filed their returns, you now have a responsibility to identify these individuals and thereby remove what presently constitutes a blanket indictment against all members of the legal profession or, otherwise, to withdraw the charge.

It is an intolerable situation as it now stands. Not only is this embarrassing to all members of the legal profession, but every citizen in that area utilizing the services of an attorney is in the position of having had his confidence shaken in his own attorney by wondering, "Is he one of them?"

It is most unfortunate that your Department released this statement in the first place without having been ready to support the charges, but we cannot accept your reasons for an indefinite delay in clearing up this situation after having proceeded this far.

Once again we are asking that the Treasury Department either identify these men by filing charges or publicly retract the statement of January 20, 1956.

Yours sincerely,

EDWARD MARTIN.
JOHN J. WILLIAMS.
J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.

On April 11, 1956, when Commissioner Harrington was visiting in Philadelphia, he made the statement to the press that criminal prosecution would be instituted against nine lawyers in the Philadelphia area for failure to file their income-tax returns.

But while he renewed these charges, he still failed to identify the individuals to whom he referred. The blanket indictment was reemphasized but left unsupported.

I am not in a position to confirm or deny Mr. Chamberlin's charge of January 20, 1956, that there were nine more lawyers in that area who had not been filing their tax returns, but I am in a position here today to name one of the attorneys referred to in Mr. Chamberlin's statement of January 20. Mr. Louis L. Redding, an attorney in Wilmington, Del., for several years has not been filing any Federal income-tax returns. Complete reports of his case were forwarded to the Washington office of the Treasury Department and the Department of Justice months ago.

The specific charge is that Mr. Redding did not file any tax returns for the years 1953 and 1954. After the Schofield case began making headlines, he did in November 1955 rush into the Bureau's office requesting an opportunity to file retroactively belated returns for the years missed.

Mr. Redding, as an attorney, claims to be an authority on the American Constitution, and as a student of the Constitution he certainly cannot claim ignorance of the 16th amendment, which provides that every American citizen shall be subject to filing and paying a Federal tax upon his income at rates approved by the Congress.

Before making this statement, I conferred with the Treasury Department in Washington, and, while they were not permitted to give any details as to the individual case, they did confirm the accuracy of the allegation that Mr. Redding had failed to file tax returns as outlined above, and that he was 1 of the 9 attorneys referred to by Mr. Chamberlin.

With the identification of Mr. Redding, the Treasury Department's number is reduced to 8; the Government now more than ever has a definite responsibility to identify these other 8 men by filing charges or explain how the erroneous charges were released.

The statement of January 20 never should have been made until the Treasury Department was ready to produce the proof, and I hope that this type of incident will never happen again.

THE PEOPLE—AMERICA'S STRENGTH

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD excerpts from the keynote address prepared by me for the annual meeting of the National Tuberculosis Association in New York City on May 21, 1956. Because I had to remain in Washington to handle the Crooked River irrigation project bill—S. 3101—on the floor of the Senate that day, the address was given in my absence by my wife, Mrs. Maurine B. Neuberger.

In the keynote address for the National Tuberculosis Association, which has performed so outstandingly in working to eradicate and minimize this dreaded scourge of mankind, both Mrs. Neuberger and I have tried to emphasize the supreme irony of the fact that, while this country can spend billions and billions of dollars in preparation for war, it invests only a token sum in research looking toward the elimination of such cruel diseases as cancer, muscular dystrophy, and so forth.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEOPLE—AMERICA'S STRENGTH

(Excerpts from address by keynote speaker, Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon, at annual meeting of the National Tuberculosis Association, at Hotel Statler in New York City, N. Y., May 21, 1956)

If one man is wedged in a cave, we will spend tens of thousands of dollars to get him out—as we should. But when it comes to medical research and study, which might save innumerable lives and make other lives both longer and happier, we often become frugal and parsimonious. I believe that a nation which can invest $300 million in a battleship, which then is anchored amidst a mothball fleet, should appropriate every possible cent needed to combat the diseases plaguing mankind.

How can we even remotely tolerate a dollar mentality when human life is at stake? In the end, all we have is the land and the people who inhabit the land. If we waste either human resources or natural resources, we are playing ducks and drakes with the future of this great country. On the North American Continent, we have wasted both, frequently in shocking degree.

Money represents material wealth; mortal disease means suffering, agony, death, and human tears. If, by spending money we can hasten the conquest of any grave malady or disease, I favor spending that sum of money which is necessary. Let us look at the budget of human life first and the financial budget second. You people have demonstrated how effort, energy, and investment can reduce so greatly the wreckage, tragedy, and mortality due to tuberculosis. Your brave example should be followed in such dark and grim realms as those of cancer, kidney diseases, multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, and many other agonizing diseases where we still are far from victory.

In America we still think too much of dollars and too little of suffering. The Man of the Year for 1955 was the head of the first corporation in American history ever to make a profit of $1 billion. Undoubtedly this was a singular achievement and one worthy of note. Yet, in my opinion, the Man of the Year should have been the physician in Pittsburgh who developed the first serum to immunize little children against the dread ravages of infantile paralysis. I dare say that, in history, the discovery of the Salk vaccine will seem more important than collecting a profit of $1 billion—nay, even of $2 billion.

Speaking of billions, that fine Member of the Senate, Mrs. MARGARET CHASE SMITH of Maine, has proposed a medical research and education program of $1 billion. I indorse her proposal. If $1 billion should prove insufficient, why not twice that sum? For example, as long as the cause and cure of cancer elude us, what possible argument can be made for thriftiness where cancer investigation is concerned?

One killer, tuberculosis, has been cornered. This does not mean the killer can be left unguarded. The obstacles to its former rampant attacks must be kept carefully tended. But the chaining of tuberculosis has shown us that other diseases, too, eventually can be shackled if sufficient energy, resourcefulness and funds are devoted to the goal. And I am against economy when it comes to protecting people.

When I speak of resources, I mean both human and natural resources. After all, only 150 years have passed since Lewis and Clark carried our flag across the continent. Yet, in that short period, as the history of nations is measured, we have destroyed much of our heritage in timber, soil, wildlife, and water. Nor have we learned the full lesson of this destruction. The bill to help end pollution of our rivers still lies in committee, awaiting passage by Congress. The administration is encouraging oil and gas leasing on our comparatively few wildlife refuges, despite the fact that the ducks and geese soaring along the flyways of the continent could ultimately be exterminated, as was the hapless passenger pigeon.

I often hear that our resources must pass from public protection to private exploitation because of our free-enterprise system. I refuse to believe that free enterprise is not consistent with national safeguarding of upland grandeur, mountain majesty, and the thrilling pageant of wildlife, birds, and fisheries. Theodore Roosevelt, who led the movement to set aside vast outdoor reserves where men and women might be stimulated and inspired—yes, and regain their health, too—was certainly dedicated to the fundamental tenets of economic freedom as well as personal liberty.

In the Senate, I have suggested a study of Canada's famous family allowances program for children, whereby each mother with a child under 16 receives a certain sum monthly to devote to the health and welfare of the child. I have been informed that this is socialistic. Yet, as I prepare these words, I read in the May 4 issue of U. S. News & World Report that American financiers are investing frantically in Canadian factories, forests, and mines. Our investors, for example, already own over 25 percent of all the industries of Canada. Evidently a program of assistance for Canadian mothers and their boys and girls—a program which has contributed to health, nutrition, and general living standards—does not seem socialistic to the leaders of capitalism in our own land.

Mr. Justice Brandeis once said: "If we would guide by the light of reason, we must let our minds be bold." This surely applies in the field of health—a field so closely related to our resources, both human and natural. We are a country which spends $10 billion annually for liquor and half that sum for tobacco. This must mean that we are far from destitute when it comes to financing TB sanatoria, cancer clinics, children's allowances and research into nearly all other perplexing diseases. Family allowances, for example, would cost about 40 percent as much as Americans dedicate each year to highballs, cocktails, and similar consumption.

The people are America's strength. They need adequate medical care, adequate education, good schools, an opportunity to develop their talents in college, an assurance of security in old age. When he was Governor of California, Earl Warren once replied to some critics of the migration threading constantly to the great State. He said that people were California's No. 1 resource. Who can challenge this statement?

The time to grapple with disease, poverty and ignorance in America is when we have only 165 million persons on this continent which is still rich and wealthy, despite our carelessness of the past. When we have the 400 million population of Europe, it will be too late, or, at best, the task will be infinitely harder. This challenge confronts our own generation, as directly and immediately as it has faced any era in our eventful history.

I believe there is a 5-point program which could contribute materially to the betterment of the human resources on which our Nation depends.

1. There should be at least $1 billion spent by the Government in the general field of health and medical research and education.

2. Private donations in the realm of health, such as those which make possible the program of tuberculosis control, should be accelerated to keep pace with our expanding economy and our increasing population.

3. Social-welfare measures such as family allowances, reduced retirement ages under

social security and new disability payments should be considered.

4. Federal aid to both lower and higher education must be increased, because the Federal Government has the financial resources for such undertakings.

5. Our natural resources must be protected from exploitation, so that the basic heritage of Americans will not be destroyed within 1 or 2 generations.

These proposals are not original but, I believe, they are positive and look ahead to the future. Perhaps they are not what one might call economical. Yet I remember from my readings of history that there were people who criticized the $2,500 expenditure for the Lewis and Clark Expedition. Some of these same people, after the return of Lewis and Clark from the vast and marvelous West, prophesied that nobody ever would travel through that region again. They said the whole project had been a waste and folly.

In the America of today there is no room or niche for such counsels of gloom and despair. "If we would guide by the light of reason, we must let our minds be bold."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not the morning business is closed, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3760) to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other related purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1956

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, by prior arrangement the Senate will today take up the road bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the Consideration of Calendar No. 2077, House bill 10660.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10660) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Finance with additional amendments.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the pending bill will be handled on the floor of the Senate by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. However, before the Senate begins consideration of the bill, I should like to submit on behalf of myself, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] an amendment to it. I ask to have the amendment read and made the pending question before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed on page 49, after line 24, to insert the following:

SEC. 117. Prevailing rate of wage: The Secretary of Commerce shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on the initial construction work performed on highway projects on the interstate system authorized under section 102 of this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the act of August 30, 1935, known as the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U. S. C., sec. 276-a).

Renumber following sections.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for title I of the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Do I understand correctly that the question now is on the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to the bill as reported by the Committee on Public Works?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] has offered an amendment to the committee amendment, which is in the nature of a substitute for title I of the bill. That is the question now before the Senate.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico to the committee amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. As I understand, the committee substituted for the House bill the bill the Senate passed last year, with an amendment relating to the Interstate Highway System. Is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] has offered an amendment to title I of the bill as reported to the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Is the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, then, to be considered at this time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is in order at this time.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to make sure that I understand the parliamentary situation. As I understand, the pending question is the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], to inject into the committee amendment the Davis-Bacon provision, as modified. Is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is to insert the language contained in the amendment, whatever the language is. That is the question now before the Senate.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question, to clarify the situation?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Is the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico identical with the provision of the House bill respecting wages?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would answer "Yes" to that question.

Mr. BUSH. Is it identical with the provision of the House bill in that respect?

Mr. CHAVEZ. In simple language, it provides for the Davis-Bacon provision.

Mr. BUSH. But modified, as I understand—and this is what I am trying to make clear—as in the House version. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. BUSH. As it applies to wage rates only. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. In order to have the matter clear in the mind of the Senator from Connecticut, the amendment applies only to the Interstate System.

Mr. BUSH. I understand that, but, Mr. President——

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor. Does he yield; and, if so, to whom does he yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk. It would do exactly what the able Senator from New Mexico has in mind. Would he object to having me join him in his amendment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I want every Senator who cares to do so to join me in the amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator ask that my name be placed on his amendment as a cosponsor?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly. Any Senator who wishes to join us is welcome to do so, and he is using good commonsense if he does join us.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have just sent to the desk an amendment which would do what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I send to the desk an amendment identical with the one proposed by the Senator from New Mexico. If agreeable to him, I should like to join him in sponsoring his amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am very happy to have the Senator from New York join us.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President——

Mr. CHAVEZ. And also the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it lie on the table and be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield for that purpose?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if we are to have a discussion on the pending amendment, I should like to ask that we have a live quorum present. This is a very important amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Virginia for that purpose?

Mr. BYRD. It is a matter of very great importance. I should like to ask for a live quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield for that purpose?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Cotton	Kuchel
Barrett	Daniel	Lehman
Beall	Dirksen	Mansfield
Bible	Douglas	Martin, Pa.
Bricker	Frear	Monroney
Bush	George	Neuberger
Butler	Gore	Payne
Byrd	Green	Saltonstall
Capehart	Hill	Smith, Me.
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Watkins
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Williams
Chavez	Knowland	

Mr. SMATHERS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Mississippi, [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is not present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LAIRD, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WOFFORD, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As I understand, before the Senate proceeds to a discussion of the road bill itself, the Senate committee amendment will have to be perfected by adopting the amendment, which I and other Senators have offered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am ready for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I think there should be a full discussion and explanation of the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is debatable.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator from New Mexico desire to explain the amendment? I understood the Senator to say he was going to explain the bill—that is, title I—and that after that he would discuss the amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Under the parliamentary situation, I believe the pending amendment will have to be adopted before we can proceed with the bill.

Mr. BYRD. That is something new. I make a parliamentary inquiry as to whether that is correct. Is it necessary that the pending amendment be adopted before the Senate can consider title I of the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Speeches can be made on any part of the bill or on the entire bill.

Mr. BYRD. I understand that; but the Senator from New Mexico said it would not be possible for him to explain the bill until the Senate adopted the amendment he has offered to title I. As a parliamentary inquiry, I ask whether that is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair state to the Senator from Virginia that that is hardly a parliamentary inquiry.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico. Any Senator who has the floor can speak on any part of the bill he wishes to discuss.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well, Mr. President.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield for a question.

Mr. KUCHEL. Let me say to my friend, the Senator from New Mexico, that I have some comments to make in favor of the amendment the Senator from New Mexico has offered; but I prefer to wait, and to take the floor in my own right.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I hope the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] will explain title I to the Senate.

Mr. GORE. We plan to do so.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. In that way I think we shall proceed much more intelligently, and shall save time in the long run, because this subject is probably the most important one, aside from war, that the Congress has considered in all our history, and it is a complicated one. Both the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and the distinguished Senator from Tennessee are very familiar with the entire bill. So if they will make an explanation of the bill, I think we shall save time in the long run.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, through the kindness of the people from New Mexico and under the rules of the Senate, I happen to be chairman of the Committee on Public Works. As in the case of other standing committees, the Committee on Public Works has subcommittees. In this instance it happens that our committee has a Subcommittee on Roads, headed by a very able chairman, namely, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], whom I asked to be the floor manager of this bill.

Previously the bill dealt only with roads. But when the bill went to the House, the House added title II, which has to do only with the financing of roads, whereas in our committee we discussed only how to build roads and how to authorize their construction.

I think the Senator from Tennessee and the other members of the subcommittee are bipartisan. I am proud of the subcommittee because it is a road construction subcommittee, not a political committee.

Rivers and harbors improvements, navigation facilities, roads, and public buildings constructed throughout the country have nothing to do with politics. A good road is essential in Louisiana, which is Democratic; and a good road is also essential in North Dakota, which is Republican. It makes no difference to a poor farmer who has to take his products to the market whether the road he uses is constructed by Democrats or Republicans. He still would like to be able to travel without breaking the springs of his old jalopy.

Mr. President, the Committee on Public Works has approved title I of the bill. Let us bear that in mind, because it is

what we must deal with in this instance. Title I is the road title. In approving that title of House bill 10660, the committee voted to delete the language of the House version of the bill, and to substitute therefor essentially the language of Senate bill 1048, passed by the Senate in the first session of the 84th Congress, approximately a year ago.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is that the Gore bill?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; it is the Gore bill.

Last year the committee held extensive hearings on Senate bill 1048. We then held numerous executive sessions, and reported to the Senate a committee bill which included the most desirable features of the several proposals before the committee.

On May 25, 1955, the Senate passed Senate bill 1048 substantially as reported by the committee, after defeating efforts materially to amend the bill. The Senate bill was designed to provide a balanced and a greatly accelerated program for the construction of all the Federal-aid highway systems which are so urgently needed by the country.

We thought the Senate bill of last year was a good bill. It would involve the Nation in one of the largest construction programs ever authorized by the Congress, except those for defense purposes. The bill did not provide a method of financing the highway program. That feature was considered by us to be within the function of other congressional committees. In other words, Mr. President, we did not feel that the Committee on Public Works, in reporting a bill authorizing the construction of roads, should deal with the financing of the roads. Roads of this kind have been financed by the Government since 1916, and not once has the congressional committee handling a road-authorization bill dealt with the question of its financing.

Title I of House bill 10660, which now is before the Senate and which authorizes a highway construction program, was considered and reported to the Senate by the Committee on Public Works.

Title II of the bill contains tax-revenue provisions for financing the program, and was considered by the Senate Committee on Finance, of which the able Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is chairman.

Only one material change has been made in the bill since it was passed last year by the Senate. The committee recommends that the program for the National System of Interstate Highways be extended from a period of 5 years to a period of 13 years, the same as is provided in the House bill. This proposed expansion of the Interstate System will, insofar as the estimated costs are concerned, permit the proposed financing to match the authorizations, and will keep the financing and construction programs in balance.

In reporting the bill to the Senate, the committee has considered that a balanced program for all the highway systems within the framework of the existing Federal-aid highway laws is a sound approach to the matter, and will contain adequate safeguards of the taxpayers' money.

Title I of the bill, as amended by the committee, places emphasis on the early completion of the Interstate System. It also includes increased authorization for the primary and secondary road systems for a period of 5 years, whereas the House voted to increase the authorization only for a period of 3 years.

These systems are vital to the general economy and welfare of the Nation, and cover large areas in all sections remote from the Interstate System—in other words, the country roads, the farm-to-market roads, which are just as essential as the Interstate System, or just as essential as a road which will permit a person to drive from Philadelphia to Los Angeles. Their development should continue at an expanded rate, in order to keep pace with the growth of the country, the increased highway needs, and the acceleration provided for the Interstate System.

Title I provides authorization for the construction of the 40,000 miles of Interstate System over a period of 13 years, to a standard of construction, and with controlled access, believed adequate to meet the traffic needs for the next 20 to 30 years.

All the mileage in this system has now been designated, and the Senate committee amendment provides an increase in mileage to 42,500. In other words, it adds 2,500 miles to cover needed extensions and connections.

The committee gave careful consideration to the question of apportionment to the various States of the funds for the Interstate System. It must be remembered that economically, populationwise, and in other respects, every State is different. New Jersey has a large population. New Mexico and North Dakota have large areas, the major portions of which belong to the Federal Government. So we must meet problems of different types.

In its deliberations the committee concluded that a definite formula governing such apportionment, based upon reasonable estimates, of course, should be written into the law.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the formula which has been devised a formula based upon consideration of the number of miles in each State and the number of lanes times the actual cost? Is the money apportioned on that basis?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall go into detail on that subject later. I will say to the Senator from Indiana that the formula adopted many years ago, at the beginning of the Federal-aid highway system, was based one-third on population, one-third on total area, and one-third on postal miles. The only authority under which we appropriate money for roads which have been authorized is a provision in the Constitution to the effect that Congress shall have power to establish post offices and post roads.

Mr. CAPEHART. The present system is based upon the Federal Government paying 50 percent and the States 50 percent.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. If the Senator will bear with me for a moment, I shall explain the formula.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have an amendment to change the formula. I can see only one proper basis upon which to arrive at a formula, and that is the number of miles and the number of lanes times the actual cost. That is the only reasonable basis on which to arrive at a formula. I do not see that population has anything at all to do with it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is one of the factors which is considered important in certain areas.

Mr. CAPEHART. It seems to me that the formula should be based on the number of miles times the actual cost. If Illinois wishes to build 1,500 miles of roads, the roads will cost 1,500 times the unit cost per mile. That is all there is to it.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me finish this sentence, and then I shall be glad to yield.

The committee concluded that a formula based upon responsible estimates should be written into the law. Such a formula must be equitable to all the States, and must provide for a coordinated program of highway development in accordance with the objectives of the bill. It must also provide that Congress shall retain exclusive control of the apportionment of the funds. It must provide for periodic reviews of the program, and for legislative modification found necessary from time to time.

The Federal-aid laws are creatures of Congress. There is a school of thought which maintains that Congress should enact the authorizations and provide the money, and allow the States to decide whether or not roads should be built. The committee felt that Congress should retain control of that particular subject.

FEDERAL FUNDS DISTRIBUTION: POPULATION, FEDERAL LANDS, POST ROADS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The question of population has been raised. Is it not a fact that population bears a definite relationship to the wealth of the State? Does not the proportion of public lands have a bearing? In our State the proportion of public lands is probably greater than any other State in the Union. It is 87½ percent. It means that on a greater proportion of such lands no Federal law was ever passed to allow such lands to pass into private ownership—lack of water for irrigation was the principal reason.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Indiana understands the problems which we must meet.

Mr. CAPEHART. The problem is not simple.

Mr. MALONE. I think it is simple. The wealth of a State is in almost direct proportion to the people in it—for the reason already stated.

Mr. CAPEHART. No; I do not wish to leave the impression that I think it is simple.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Federal Government owns 87½ percent of the area of the State of Nevada.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. What I am saying is that there probably never would have been interstate highways across Nevada if our State had had to meet 50 percent of the cost, so when the formula was arrived at in the beginning nearly 40 years ago balancing the population, area of public lands, and miles of post roads in the States share it worked out in an equitable manner. The proportion of public lands and the relative population of a State has a direct bearing on the wealth of the State, and its ability to contribute to the public road system.

The whole point is that the number of people in a State has a definite relationship to the percentage of public lands and the wealth of a State—and the ability to meet the Federal contribution for roads. The federally owned lands—87½ percent in my State—are benefited by the construction of highways.

Every State receives 50 percent—then it means that in the public-land States the Government simply pays its own way for the lands it owns in addition to the 50 percent.

The question raised by the distinguished Senator from Indiana has long been debated, and the answer arrived at seems equitable.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe that the factors which have been described were what the authors of the legislation had in mind in the early days, when population was considered.

Mr. MALONE. It is still a factor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. At the present time we are paying a tremendous price in the cost of accidents on our highways, not to mention the deaths, injuries, and disabilities, to which a monetary value cannot be assigned. Such accidents will continue and even increase as long as we have the present traffic volume and congestion on our out-moded, obsolete, and inadequate highways. Last year the vehicle registrations increased about 7 percent. In 1946 the registration was 34 million vehicles. Today it is over 62 million. By 1966 that registration will be about 85 million. We must build every known safety device into our present-day highways. We must also study the matter, enforce our traffic laws, and bring the realization of the conditions to the motoring public. The annual savings that will be realized will far exceed the annual expenditures on this vast new highway program.

The highway program recommended in H. R. 10660 would permit our economic growth and expansion to continue. It would retain the existing responsibility and authority vested in both Federal and State Governments. It would give this Nation an adequate system of modern and safe highways for continued economic expansion, national defense, and the general welfare of our citizens.

Numerous amendments have been proposed to H. R. 10660. These will be discussed at the proper time. There will also be considerable discussion and debate on various other features of the bill. The Committee on Public Works recommends its amendment to the Senate as that which it considers the most desirable program to meet the growing needs and urgency for improving the highways of our Nation.

Mr. President, I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point some tables showing the apportionments to the several States under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954, and the approximate apportionments of the additional funds under the authorizations included in H. R. 10660. It should be noted that the total apportionments indicated for the National System of Interstate Highways may later require adjustment as reliable estimates of cost are received and the program reviewed.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Approximate apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds for fiscal year 1957 authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954

[Millions]

State	1954 act					State	1954 act				
	Primary ($315)	Secondary ($210)	Urban ($175)	Interstate ($175)	Total ($875)		Primary ($315)	Secondary ($210)	Urban ($175)	Interstate ($175)	Total ($875)
Alabama	$6.7	$5.2	$2.3	$3.5	$17.7	New Hampshire	1.6	1.0	.5	1.1	4.2
Arizona	4.7	3.2	.7	2.0	10.6	New Jersey	4.1	1.4	7.6	3.8	16.9
Arkansas	5.3	4.2	1.0	2.5	13.0	New Mexico	5.1	3.5	.6	2.1	11.3
California	14.5	7.5	15.4	9.8	47.2	New York	14.9	6.0	23.2	12.2	56.3
Colorado	5.7	3.8	1.5	2.3	13.3	North Carolina	7.9	6.7	2.2	4.4	21.2
Connecticut	2.0	1.0	3.4	1.7	8.1	North Dakota	4.6	3.4	.3	1.9	10.2
Delaware	1.6	1.0	.4	1.1	4.1	Ohio	11.0	6.7	10.0	7.4	35.1
Florida	5.1	3.4	3.1	2.9	14.5	Oklahoma	6.8	4.9	1.9	3.1	16.7
Georgia	7.8	6.0	2.5	4.1	20.4	Oregon	5.4	3.8	1.4	2.3	12.9
Idaho	3.9	2.7	.3	1.7	8.6	Pennsylvania	12.4	7.4	13.1	9.2	42.1
Illinois	12.2	6.6	12.1	8.1	39.0	Rhode Island	1.6	1.0	1.2	1.1	4.9
Indiana	7.5	5.2	4.2	4.2	21.1	South Carolina	4.3	3.6	1.2	2.3	11.4
Iowa	7.6	5.6	2.1	3.5	18.8	South Dakota	5.0	3.6	.3	2.0	10.9
Kansas	7.6	5.4	1.6	3.2	17.8	Tennessee	6.9	5.3	2.5	3.7	18.4
Kentucky	5.9	4.9	1.8	3.2	15.8	Texas	20.6	13.8	8.3	9.9	52.6
Louisiana	4.9	3.6	2.5	2.8	13.8	Utah	3.6	2.4	.7	1.7	8.4
Maine	2.7	1.9	.7	1.4	6.7	Vermont	1.6	1.0	.3	1.1	4.0
Maryland	2.8	1.7	2.9	2.0	9.4	Virginia	6.0	4.7	2.7	3.5	10.9
Massachusetts	4.0	1.5	7.2	3.7	16.4	Washington	5.2	3.5	2.6	2.8	14.1
Michigan	9.9	6.0	8.1	6.2	30.2	West Virginia	3.5	3.0	1.1	2.1	9.7
Minnesota	8.3	5.9	2.8	4.0	21.0	Wisconsin	7.5	5.2	3.4	3.9	20.0
Mississippi	5.6	4.7	1.0	2.8	14.1	Wyoming	3.9	2.7	.2	1.7	8.5
Missouri	9.2	6.2	4.3	4.7	24.4	Hawaii	1.6	1.0	.6	----------	3.2
Montana	6.3	4.3	.4	2.4	13.4	District of Columbia	1.6	1.0	1.5	1.1	5.2
Nebraska	6.1	4.3	1.0	2.4	13.8	Puerto Rico	1.6	1.7	1.5	----------	4.8
Nevada	4.1	2.7	.2	1.8	8.8						

Approximate apportionments of Federal-aid funds and State matching funds pursuant to H. R. 10660 as reported out by Senate Public Works Committee, May 4, 1956

PRIMARY, SECONDARY, AND URBAN FUNDS

[Millions of dollars]

State	For fiscal year 1957			For each of fiscal years 1958-61 inclusive			5-year total		
	Federal (200.0)	State (186.1)	Total (386.1)	Federal (900.0)	State (835.8)	Total (1,735.8)	Federal (3,800.0)	State (3,528.5)	Total (7,328.5)
Alabama	4.1	4.1	8.2	18.6	18.6	37.2	78.4	78.4	156.8
Arizona	2.5	1.0	3.5	11.6	4.5	16.1	48.9	19.0	67.9
Arkansas	3.0	3.0	6.0	14.0	14.0	28.0	59.1	59.1	118.2
California	10.9	7.8	18.7	47.8	34.1	81.9	201.9	143.9	345.8
Colorado	3.2	2.5	5.7	14.9	11.5	26.4	62.8	48.4	111.2
Connecticut	1.9	1.9	3.8	8.0	8.0	16.0	34.1	34.1	68.2

Approximate apportionments of Federal-aid funds and State matching funds pursuant to H. R. 10660 as reported out by Senate Public Works Committee, May 4, 1956—Continued

PRIMARY, SECONDARY, AND URBAN FUNDS—continued

[Millions of dollars]

State	For fiscal year 1957			For each of fiscal years 1958–61 inclusive			5-year total		
	Federal (200.0)	State (186.1)	Total (386.1)	Federal (900.0)	State (835.8)	Total (1,735.8)	Federal (3,800.0)	State (3,528.5)	Total (7,328.5)
Delaware	.9	.9	1.8	3.9	3.9	7.8	16.5	16.5	33.0
Florida	3.4	3.4	6.8	15.1	15.1	30.2	63.6	63.6	127.2
Georgia	4.6	4.6	9.2	21.4	21.4	42.8	90.2	90.2	180.4
Idaho	2.0	1.3	3.3	9.5	6.0	15.5	39.8	25.0	64.8
Illinois	8.9	8.9	17.8	39.4	39.4	78.8	166.7	166.7	333.4
Indiana	4.8	4.8	9.6	21.7	21.7	43.4	91.7	91.7	183.4
Iowa	4.4	4.4	8.8	20.1	20.1	40.2	84.7	84.7	169.4
Kansas	4.2	4.2	8.4	19.2	19.2	38.4	81.0	81.0	162.0
Kentucky	3.6	3.6	7.2	16.7	16.7	33.4	70.4	70.4	140.8
Louisiana	3.2	3.2	6.4	14.6	14.6	29.2	61.6	61.6	123.2
Maine	1.6	1.6	3.2	7.0	7.0	14.0	29.5	29.5	59.0
Maryland	2.1	2.1	4.2	9.6	9.6	19.2	40.6	40.6	81.2
Massachusetts	3.7	3.7	7.4	15.9	15.9	31.8	67.1	67.1	134.2
Michigan	6.8	6.8	13.6	30.7	30.7	61.4	129.7	129.7	259.4
Minnesota	4.9	4.9	9.8	22.1	22.1	44.2	93.2	93.2	186.4
Mississippi	3.3	3.3	6.6	15.0	15.0	30.0	63.4	63.4	126.8
Missouri	5.6	5.6	11.2	25.5	25.5	51.0	107.6	107.6	215.2
Montana	3.3	2.5	5.8	15.4	11.8	27.2	65.0	49.8	114.8
Nebraska	3.4	3.4	6.8	15.7	15.7	31.4	66.3	66.3	132.6
Nevada	2.1	.4	2.5	9.5	1.9	11.4	40.0	7.9	47.9
New Hampshire	1.0	1.0	2.0	4.1	4.1	8.2	17.4	17.4	34.8
New Jersey	3.8	3.8	7.6	16.2	16.2	32.4	68.5	68.5	137.0
New Mexico	2.7	1.6	4.3	12.5	7.4	19.9	52.6	31.0	83.6
New York	12.8	12.8	25.6	55.0	55.0	110.0	232.7	232.7	465.4
North Carolina	4.8	4.8	9.6	22.4	22.4	44.8	94.6	94.6	189.2
North Dakota	2.4	2.4	4.8	10.9	10.9	21.8	46.1	46.1	92.2
Ohio	8.0	8.0	16.0	35.6	35.6	71.2	150.2	150.2	300.4
Oklahoma	3.9	3.9	7.8	17.8	17.8	35.6	75.2	75.2	150.4
Oregon	3.1	1.9	5.0	14.1	8.7	22.8	59.5	36.5	96.0
Pennsylvania	9.7	9.7	19.4	42.6	42.6	85.2	180.3	180.3	360.6
Rhode Island	1.2	1.2	2.4	4.9	4.9	9.8	21.0	21.0	42.0
South Carolina	2.5	2.5	5.0	11.9	11.9	23.8	49.9	49.9	99.8
South Dakota	2.5	2.0	4.5	11.6	9.1	20.7	49.0	38.5	87.5
Tennessee	4.2	4.2	8.4	19.4	19.4	38.8	81.8	81.8	163.6
Texas	12.3	12.3	24.6	56.0	56.0	112.0	236.3	236.3	472.6
Utah	2.0	.7	2.7	9.2	3.1	12.3	38.6	13.0	51.6
Vermont	.9	.9	1.8	3.8	3.8	7.6	16.1	16.1	32.2
Virginia	4.0	4.0	8.0	17.7	17.7	35.4	75.1	75.1	150.2
Washington	3.3	2.9	6.2	15.0	13.0	28.0	63.3	54.8	118.1
West Virginia	2.2	2.2	4.4	10.2	10.2	20.4	42.8	42.8	85.6
Wisconsin	4.6	4.6	9.2	21.0	21.0	42.0	88.4	88.4	176.8
Wyoming	2.1	1.2	3.3	9.5	5.3	14.8	40.2	22.3	62.5
Hawaii	1.0	1.0	2.0	4.2	4.2	8.4	17.7	17.7	35.4
District of Columbia	1.2	1.2	2.4	5.2	5.2	10.4	22.2	22.2	44.4
Puerto Rico	1.4	1.4	2.8	6.3	6.3	12.6	26.7	26.7	53.4

Approximate apportionments of Federal funds and State matching funds pursuant to H. R. 10660 as reported out by Senate Public Works Committee, May 4, 1956

INTERSTATE FUNDS

[Millions of dollars]

State	For fiscal year 1957			For fiscal year 1958			For each of fiscal years 1959–69, inclusive			13-year total		
	Federal (1,000.0)	State (106.0)	Total (1,106.0)	Federal (1,750.0)	State (185.9)	Total (1,935.9)	Federal (2,000.0)	State (212.2)	Total (2,212.2)	Federal (24,750.0)	State (2,624.3)	Total (27,374.3)
Alabama	20.3	2.3	22.6	35.6	4.0	39.6	40.6	4.5	45.1	502.8	55.9	558.7
Arizona	11.5	.7	12.2	20.1	1.2	21.3	22.9	1.4	24.3	283.6	16.9	300.5
Arkansas	14.5	1.6	16.1	25.4	2.8	28.2	29.1	3.2	32.3	359.6	40.0	399.6
California	57.0	5.2	62.2	99.8	9.1	108.9	114.1	10.4	124.5	1,411.4	128.1	1,539.5
Colorado	13.7	1.3	15.0	23.9	2.3	26.2	27.3	2.6	29.9	338.3	32.2	370.5
Connecticut	9.6	1.1	10.7	16.9	1.9	18.8	19.3	2.1	21.4	238.3	26.5	264.8
Delaware	6.3	.7	7.0	10.9	1.2	12.1	12.5	1.4	13.9	154.7	17.2	171.9
Florida	17.0	1.9	18.9	29.8	3.3	33.1	34.0	3.8	37.8	420.8	46.8	467.6
Georgia	23.3	2.6	25.9	40.8	4.5	45.3	46.6	5.2	51.8	576.8	64.1	640.9
Idaho	10.1	.8	10.9	17.7	1.5	19.2	20.2	1.7	21.9	250.5	20.9	271.4
Illinois	47.1	5.2	52.3	82.5	9.2	91.7	94.3	10.5	104.8	1,166.9	129.7	1,296.6
Indiana	24.3	2.7	27.0	42.6	4.7	47.3	48.6	5.4	54.0	602.1	66.9	669.0
Iowa	20.4	2.3	22.7	35.7	4.0	39.7	40.8	4.5	45.3	505.6	56.2	561.8
Kansas	18.1	2.0	20.1	31.8	3.5	35.3	36.3	4.0	40.3	449.2	49.9	499.1
Kentucky	18.8	2.1	20.9	32.8	3.6	36.4	37.5	4.2	41.7	464.2	51.6	515.8
Louisiana	16.5	1.8	18.3	28.9	3.2	32.1	35.0	3.7	36.7	408.5	45.4	453.9
Maine	8.0	.9	8.9	14.1	1.6	15.7	16.1	1.8	17.9	199.0	22.1	221.1
Maryland	12.0	1.3	13.3	21.0	2.3	23.3	24.0	2.7	26.7	296.9	33.0	329.9
Massachusetts	21.3	2.4	23.7	37.4	4.2	41.6	42.7	4.7	47.4	528.4	58.7	587.1
Michigan	36.0	4.0	40.0	62.9	7.0	69.9	71.9	8.0	79.9	889.8	98.9	988.7
Minnesota	22.5	2.5	25.0	39.4	4.4	43.8	45.1	5.0	50.1	557.6	62.0	619.6
Mississippi	15.9	1.8	17.7	27.8	3.1	30.9	31.7	3.5	35.2	392.5	43.6	436.1
Missouri	27.1	3.0	30.1	47.4	5.3	52.7	54.2	6.0	60.2	670.4	74.5	744.9
Montana	14.4	1.4	15.8	25.1	2.4	27.5	28.7	2.7	31.4	355.5	33.7	389.2
Nebraska	14.3	1.6	15.9	25.1	2.8	27.9	28.7	3.2	31.9	355.0	39.4	394.4
Nevada	10.4	.5	10.9	18.3	1.0	19.3	20.9	1.1	22.0	258.4	13.6	272.0
New Hampshire	6.3	.7	7.0	10.9	1.2	12.1	12.5	1.4	13.9	154.7	17.2	171.9

Approximate apportionments of Federal funds and State matching funds pursuant to H. R. 10660 as reported out by Senate Public Works Committee, May 4, 1956—Continued

INTERSTATE FUNDS

[Millions of dollars]

State	For fiscal year 1957			For fiscal year 1958			For each of fiscal years 1959–69, inclusive			13-year total		
	Federal (1,000.0)	State (106.0)	Total (1,106.0)	Federal (1,750.0)	State (185.9)	Total (1,935.9)	Federal (2,000.0)	State (212.2)	Total (2,212.2)	Federal (24,750.0)	State (2,624.3)	Total (27,374.3)
New Jersey	21.9	2.4	24.3	38.3	4.3	42.6	43.8	4.9	48.7	542.1	60.2	602.3
New Mexico	12.1	1.0	13.1	21.2	1.7	22.9	24.3	1.9	26.2	300.5	24.0	324.5
New York	70.9	7.9	78.8	124.1	13.8	137.9	141.8	15.8	157.6	1,754.6	195.0	1,949.6
North Carolina	25.5	2.8	28.3	44.6	5.0	49.6	51.0	5.7	56.7	631.0	70.1	701.1
North Dakota	11.1	1.2	12.3	19.4	2.2	21.6	22.2	2.5	24.7	274.4	30.5	304.9
Ohio	42.8	4.8	47.6	74.9	8.3	83.2	85.6	9.5	95.1	1,059.8	117.8	1,177.6
Oklahoma	17.9	2.0	19.9	31.3	3.5	34.8	35.8	4.0	39.8	442.8	49.2	492.0
Oregon	13.6	1.1	14.7	23.8	2.0	25.8	27.2	2.2	29.4	336.0	27.7	363.7
Pennsylvania	53.6	6.0	59.6	93.8	10.4	104.2	107.2	11.9	119.1	1,326.8	147.4	1,474.2
Rhode Island	6.3	.7	7.0	10.9	1.2	12.1	12.5	1.4	13.9	154.7	17.2	171.9
South Carolina	13.4	1.5	14.9	23.5	2.6	26.1	26.9	3.0	29.9	332.8	37.0	369.8
South Dakota	11.6	1.1	12.7	20.3	2.0	22.3	23.2	2.2	25.4	286.6	27.7	314.3
Tennessee	21.4	2.4	23.8	37.4	4.2	41.6	42.8	4.8	47.6	529.2	58.8	588.0
Texas	57.5	6.4	63.9	100.6	11.2	111.8	114.9	12.8	127.7	1,422.4	158.0	1,580.4
Utah	9.7	.5	10.2	17.1	.9	18.0	19.5	1.0	20.5	241.2	12.8	254.0
Vermont	6.3	.7	7.0	10.9	1.2	12.1	12.5	1.4	13.9	154.7	17.2	171.9
Virginia	20.2	2.2	22.4	35.4	3.9	39.3	40.5	4.5	45.0	501.0	55.7	556.7
Washington	16.1	1.6	17.7	28.1	2.9	31.0	32.1	3.3	35.4	397.5	40.7	438.2
West Virginia	11.9	1.3	13.2	20.8	2.3	23.1	23.8	2.6	26.4	294.8	32.8	327.6
Wisconsin	22.8	2.5	25.3	39.9	4.4	44.3	45.5	5.1	50.6	563.7	62.6	626.3
Wyoming	10.4	.8	11.2	18.2	1.4	19.6	20.8	1.6	22.4	257.2	19.7	276.9
Hawaii												
District of Columbia	6.3	.7	7.0	10.9	1.2	12.1	12.5	1.4	13.9	154.7	17.2	171.9
Puerto Rico												

Total funds, apportionment to States, H. R. 10660, as amended, (based on existing law)

[Millions of dollars]

State	Primary system			Secondary system			Urban system			Total regular systems	Interstate system			Total	Grand total in bill
	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958–61	Total	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958–61	Total	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958–61	Total		Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958	Fiscal year 1959–69		
Alabama	8.6	34.0	42.6	6.7	30.0	36.7	3.0	10.4	13.4	92.7	23.8	35.6	446.6	506.0	598.7
Arizona	6.1	24.4	30.5	4.1	18.8	22.9	.9	3.2	4.1	57.5	13.5	20.1	251.9	285.5	343.0
Arkansas	6.8	27.2	34.0	5.4	24.4	29.8	1.3	4.4	5.7	59.5	17.0	25.4	320.1	362.5	422.0
California	18.7	75.6	94.3	9.7	44.0	53.7	19.9	71.6	91.5	239.5	66.8	99.8	1,255.1	1,421.7	1,661.2
Colorado	7.4	30.0	37.4	4.9	22.8	27.7	1.9	6.8	8.7	73.8	16.0	23.9	300.3	340.7	414.5
Connecticut	2.6	10.4	13.0	1.3	6.0	7.3	4.4	15.6	20.0	40.3	11.3	16.9	212.3	240.5	280.8
Delaware	2.1	8.0	10.1	1.3	6.0	7.3	.5	1.6	2.1	19.5	7.4	10.9	137.5	155.8	175.3
Florida	6.6	26.4	33.0	4.4	19.6	24.0	4.0	14.4	18.8	75.8	19.9	29.8	374.0	423.7	499.5
Georgia	10.0	39.6	49.6	7.7	34.4	42.1	3.2	11.6	14.8	106.5	27.4	40.8	512.6	580.8	687.3
Idaho	5.0	20.4	25.4	3.5	16.0	19.5	.4	1.6	2.0	46.9	11.8	17.7	222.2	251.7	298.6
Illinois	15.7	62.8	78.5	8.5	38.4	46.9	15.6	56.4	72.0	197.4	55.2	82.5	1,037.3	1,175.0	1,372.4
Indiana	9.6	38.0	47.6	6.7	29.6	36.3	5.4	19.2	24.6	108.5	28.5	42.6	534.6	605.7	714.2
Iowa	9.8	38.8	48.6	7.2	32.0	39.2	2.7	9.6	12.3	100.1	23.9	35.7	448.8	508.4	608.5
Kansas	9.8	38.8	48.6	6.9	30.4	37.3	2.1	7.6	9.7	95.6	21.3	31.8	399.3	452.4	548.0
Kentucky	7.6	30.4	38.0	6.3	28.0	34.3	2.3	8.4	10.7	83.0	22.0	32.8	412.5	467.3	550.3
Louisiana	6.3	25.6	31.9	4.7	20.8	25.5	3.2	12.0	15.2	72.6	19.3	28.9	363.0	411.2	483.8
Maine	3.5	13.6	17.1	2.5	11.2	13.7	.9	3.2	4.1	34.9	9.4	14.1	177.1	200.6	235.5
Maryland	3.6	14.8	18.4	2.2	10.0	12.2	3.7	13.6	17.3	47.9	14.0	21.0	264.0	299.0	346.9
Massachusetts	5.2	21.2	26.4	1.9	8.8	10.7	9.3	33.6	42.9	80.0	25.0	37.4	469.7	532.1	612.1
Michigan	12.7	50.8	63.5	7.7	34.8	42.5	10.4	37.2	47.6	153.6	42.2	62.9	790.9	896.0	1,049.6
Minnesota	10.7	42.0	52.7	7.6	33.2	40.8	3.6	13.2	16.8	110.3	26.5	39.4	496.1	562.0	672.3
Mississippi	7.2	28.8	36.0	6.1	26.8	32.9	1.3	4.4	5.7	74.6	18.7	27.8	348.7	395.2	469.8
Missouri	11.8	46.8	58.6	8.0	35.6	43.6	5.5	19.6	25.1	127.3	31.8	47.4	596.2	675.4	802.7
Montana	8.2	33.6	41.8	5.6	26.0	31.6	.5	2.0	2.7	76.1	16.8	25.1	315.7	357.6	433.7
Nebraska	7.9	32.4	40.3	5.6	25.6	31.2	1.3	4.8	6.1	77.6	16.7	25.1	315.7	357.5	435.1
Nevada	5.3	21.2	26.5	3.5	16.0	19.5	1.3	4.8	1.1	47.1	12.2	18.3	229.9	260.4	307.4
New Hampshire	2.1	8.0	10.1	1.3	6.0	7.3	.7	2.4	3.1	20.5	7.4	10.9	137.5	155.8	176.3
New Jersey	5.3	21.2	26.5	1.8	8.4	10.2	9.8	35.2	45.0	81.7	25.7	38.3	481.8	545.8	627.5
New Mexico	6.6	26.8	33.4	4.5	20.4	24.9	.8	2.8	3.6	61.9	14.2	21.2	267.3	302.7	364.6
New York	19.2	77.2	96.4	7.8	35.2	43.0	29.9	107.6	137.5	276.9	83.1	124.1	1,559.8	1,767.0	2,043.9
North Carolina	10.2	40.4	50.6	8.6	38.8	47.4	2.8	10.4	13.2	111.2	29.9	44.6	561.0	635.5	746.7
North Dakota	5.9	23.2	29.1	4.4	19.2	23.6	.4	1.2	1.6	54.3	13.0	19.4	244.2	276.6	330.9
Ohio	14.2	56.8	71.0	8.6	38.8	47.4	12.9	46.8	59.7	178.1	50.2	74.9	941.6	1,066.7	1,244.8
Oklahoma	8.7	34.4	43.1	6.3	28.0	34.3	2.5	8.8	11.3	88.7	21.0	31.3	393.8	446.1	534.8
Oregon	7.0	28.0	35.0	4.9	22.0	26.9	1.8	6.4	8.2	70.1	15.9	23.8	299.2	338.9	409.0
Pennsylvania	16.1	65.6	81.7	9.6	44.0	53.6	16.9	60.8	77.7	213.0	62.8	93.8	1,179.2	1,335.8	1,548.8
Rhode Island	2.1	8.0	10.1	1.3	6.0	7.3	1.6	5.6	7.2	24.6	7.4	10.9	137.5	155.8	180.4
South Carolina	5.5	21.6	27.1	4.6	20.4	25.0	1.5	5.6	7.1	59.2	15.7	23.5	295.9	335.1	394.3
South Dakota	6.4	24.8	31.2	4.6	20.0	24.6	.4	1.6	2.0	57.8	13.6	20.3	255.2	289.1	346.9
Tennessee	8.9	35.2	44.1	6.8	30.8	37.6	3.2	11.6	14.8	96.5	25.1	37.4	470.8	533.3	629.8
Texas	26.5	105.6	132.1	17.8	79.6	97.4	10.7	38.8	49.5	279.0	67.4	100.6	1,263.9	1,431.9	1,710.9
Utah	4.7	19.2	23.9	3.1	14.0	17.1	.9	3.6	4.5	45.5	11.4	17.1	214.5	243.0	288.5
Vermont	2.1	8.0	10.1	1.3	6.0	7.3	.4	1.2	1.6	19.0	7.4	10.9	137.5	155.8	174.8
Virginia	7.8	31.2	39.0	6.1	27.2	33.3	3.5	12.4	15.9	88.2	23.7	35.4	445.5	504.6	592.8
Washington	6.7	27.2	33.9	4.5	20.4	24.9	3.4	12.4	15.8	74.6	18.9	28.1	353.1	400.1	474.7
West Virginia	4.5	18.0	22.5	3.9	18.0	21.9	1.4	5.2	6.6	51.0	14.0	20.8	261.8	296.6	347.6
Wisconsin	9.6	38.4	48.0	6.7	30.0	36.7	4.4	15.6	20.0	104.7	26.7	39.9	500.5	567.1	671.8
Wyoming	5.1	21.2	26.3	3.5	16.0	19.5	.3	.8	1.1	46.9	12.1	18.2	228.8	259.1	306.0
Hawaii	2.1	8.0	10.1	1.3	6.0	7.3	.8	2.8	3.6	21.0				0	21.0
District of Columbia	2.1	8.0	10.1	1.3	6.0	7.3	1.9	6.8	8.7	26.1	7.4	10.9	137.5	155.8	181.9
Puerto Rico	2.1	8.4	10.5	2.2	10.0	12.2	1.9	6.8	8.7	31.4				0	31.4

H. R. 10660, total authorizations, Senate amendment, fiscal years 1957–69 (apportionment based on existing law)

[Millions]

State	1957	1958	1959	1960–69	Total
Alabama	$42.1	$54.2	$59.2	$443.2	$598.7
Arizona	24.6	31.7	34.5	252.2	343.0
Arkansas	30.5	39.4	43.1	319.0	432.0
California	115.1	147.6	161.9	1,236.6	1,661.2
Colorado	30.2	38.8	42.2	302.8	414.0
Connecticut	19.6	24.9	27.3	209.0	280.8
Delaware	11.3	14.8	16.4	132.8	175.3
Florida	34.9	44.9	49.1	370.2	499.1
Georgia	48.3	62.4	68.0	508.8	687.5
Idaho	20.7	27.2	29.7	221.0	298.6
Illinois	95.0	121.9	133.7	1,021.8	1,372.4
Indiana	50.2	64.3	70.3	529.5	714.3
Iowa	43.2	55.8	60.9	448.2	608.1
Kansas	40.1	51.0	55.5	401.4	548.0
Kentucky	38.2	49.5	54.2	408.4	550.3
Louisiana	33.5	43.5	47.6	359.2	483.8
Maine	16.3	21.1	23.1	175.0	235.5
Maryland	23.5	30.6	33.6	259.2	346.9
Massachusetts	41.4	53.3	58.6	458.8	612.1
Michigan	73.0	93.6	102.6	780.2	1,049.4
Minnesota	48.4	61.5	67.2	495.2	672.3
Mississippi	33.3	42.8	46.7	347.0	469.8
Missouri	57.1	72.9	79.7	593.0	802.6
Montana	31.1	40.5	44.1	317.8	433.5
Nebraska	31.5	40.8	44.4	318.4	435.1
Nevada	21.3	27.8	30.4	228.0	307.5
New Hampshire	11.5	15.0	16.6	133.2	176.3
New Jersey	42.6	54.5	60.0	470.4	627.5
New Mexico	26.1	33.7	36.8	268.0	364.6
New York	140.0	179.1	196.8	1,528.0	2,043.9
North Carolina	51.5	67.0	72.4	554.8	745.7
North Dakota	23.7	30.3	33.1	243.8	330.9
Ohio	85.9	110.5	121.2	927.2	1,244.8
Oklahoma	38.5	49.1	53.6	393.6	534.8
Oregon	29.6	37.9	41.3	300.2	409.0
Pennsylvania	105.4	136.4	149.8	1,157.2	1,548.8
Rhode Island	12.4	15.8	17.4	134.8	180.4
South Carolina	27.3	35.4	38.8	292.8	394.3
South Dakota	25.0	31.9	34.8	255.2	346.9
Tennessee	44.0	56.8	62.2	466.8	629.8
Texas	122.4	156.6	170.9	1,261.0	1,710.9
Utah	20.1	26.3	28.7	213.4	288.5
Vermont	11.2	14.7	16.3	132.6	174.8
Virginia	41.1	53.1	58.2	440.4	592.8
Washington	33.5	43.1	47.1	351.0	474.7
West Virginia	23.8	31.0	34.0	258.4	347.2
Wisconsin	47.4	60.9	66.5	497.0	671.8
Wyoming	21.0	27.7	30.3	227.0	306.0
Hawaii	4.2	4.2	4.2	8.4	21.0
District of Columbia	12.7	16.1	17.7	135.4	181.9
Puerto Rico	6.2	6.3	6.3	12.6	31.4

Includes authorizations for fiscal year 1957.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works has made a very able statement, and I wish to congratulate him upon it. I also wish to take this opportunity of expressing my own appreciation to him for the guidance and inspiration he provided in the consideration in committee of this proposed legislation, as well as that provided by other members of the committee. It was at the suggestion of the distinguished chairman of the committee that, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, I introduced a highway bill last year. I wish to say that no senior Member of the Senate has, in my opinion, ever afforded a junior Member of the Senate greater opportunity, finer cooperation, and more helpful suggestions and leadership than the senior Senator from New Mexico has afforded the junior Senator from Tennessee, and I appreciate it very much.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his kind words. I am proud of the Committee on Public Works. When I say Committee on Public Works, I do not mean to be partisan at all. I am proud of the Democrats and I am proud of the Republicans on the committee. I have had wonderful cooperation. My nature—I will not call it patience—is such that when I appoint a Member to a subcommittee I trust him. That is the reason I told the Senator from Tennessee to go ahead. I trust the Senator from Tennessee. He happens to be the chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads. The hard working Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] handles proposed legislation on rivers and harbors and flood control, and I trust him, too. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] does not come from the West, but he has his problems, and I trust him also. I trust all members of the committee, and I thank all of them, including, of course, my good friend the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. All of us are very appreciative of the explanation which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has made of title I of the bill. In the Committee on Public Works we tried to be nonpartisan. We have endeavored to frame a bill which will redound to the benefit of the whole United States. We have tried to avoid being partial to our own communities. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works has done a very fine job, and I am proud of my association with him.

In order to clarify the subject further, I wonder whether the Senator from New Mexico will permit me to ask him a few questions.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall be glad to have the Senator do so. Before he proceeds, I wish it understood that I am not partial or partisan in any way. I wish to pay my respects also to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and all other members of the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. And the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

Mr. CHAVEZ. And the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], of course.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. If the Senator will yield for some questions, to clarify the subject, I should like to ask him this question first: As I understand, the bill which is now before the Senate provides an additional 2,500 miles for the interstate system. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. The legal limit now for the interstate highway system is 40,000 miles. All the 40,000 miles have been designated and allocated. No more are available, no matter how pressing the circumstance or requirement may be. So the Senate Committee on Public Works recommends the addition of 2,500 miles, or a total of 42,500 miles.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. As I understand, the Interstate System is not intended simply to connect certain cities, but rather, localities; and the purpose is to create a system of roads which can be used for defense purposes and also to meet the expansion of our economy.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is correct. For example, there are many small communities between Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, and we hope that this system will give service to those communities also.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. As I understand, the committee have substituted for the House bill what is known as the Gore bill, which was passed by the Senate without a record vote last year. Although we had some debate on the floor last year relative to financing, and matters of that kind, the Gore bill was practically unanimously passed by the Senate last year. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. If the Senator will recall, so far as the committee action was concerned, the bill was reported by a vote of 11 to 2.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. We amended the so-called Gore bill. In the Gore bill the interstate system would have been subject to a 5-year plan.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. We amended that provision to include the plan of the House, which is known as the Fallon bill, which extends the 5-year period to 13 years. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It extends it to 13 years; that is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina addressed the Chair.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to continue to yield further to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. The reason I am asking these questions is to afford our colleagues an opportunity to have full knowledge of the bill the Senate is now considering.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senate bill provided for a 5-year program.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That was last year.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Last year. We did that with the idea that we should look it over at the end of that period. However, the Senate committee has now adopted the House program, which is 13 years.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall ask the President pro tempore to rule on that point.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut will state it.

Mr. BUSH. I make this inquiry for the purpose of having the parliamentary situation clearly stated for the benefit of the Senate. I had intended this morning to offer an amendment to the pending bill, which would substitute the House bill for the committee bill. I ask the Chair to rule whether such an amendment would be in order. I may say, for the information of the Senate, that the purpose was to bring into sharp focus the House bill and to obtain a yea-and-nay vote on the House bill as against the committee bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Such a motion would not be in order, in the judgment of the Chair.

Mr. BUSH. It would not be in order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It would not be in order at this time.

Mr. BUSH. I wished the Senate to understand that situation, because there has been some question as to why we did not offer an amendment to substitute the House bill. It is because it would not be in order to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Even if it were in order, perfecting amendments to the House provision would be in order first, and would take precedence.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for one more question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. As I understand, the House bill makes the distribution to the various States on the basis of what are termed needs, while there is an exact formula in the Gore bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The reason why the Senate took that position is that, for instance, my good friend from Connecticut would know more about the needs of his State than would some clerk in the Department of Commerce.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not possible to work it out on the basis of what actually is the cost? We shall eventually have to do that. Someone must pay the actual cost.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes, I know; but the need the Senator from Pennsylvania was discussing is one thing. All States need roads. The question is, Who is going to determine the need?

Mr. CAPEHART. There are 40,000 miles of interstate highways. We want roads so badly that the Federal Government is willing to pay 90 percent and to ask the States to pay only 10 percent. Why can it not be worked out on the basis of taking the number of miles in each State times the actual cost of constructing the roads?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Using, as an example, the State of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, one would not think there would be such a difference in cost.

Mr. CAPEHART. There is a difference in cost because it costs much more to build a road in Wyoming or in New Mexico, through the mountains, than it costs to build one in Kansas, for example.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let us take New Jersey and Pennsylvania as an example. The needs are based on the information the State submits to the Bureau of Public Roads as to the cost. The cost in Pennsylvania is $500,000 a mile, and in New Jersey it is $6 million.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why can it not be worked out on the basis that the Federal Government, before the contracts are let, may approve the cost—give the Federal Government the right to approve or disapprove all costs—and the Federal Government will then pay 90 percent of that amount and the States will pay 10 percent?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree completely with the Senator from Indiana, and I hope the Federal Government will do just that.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The best answer to the question of the distinguished Senator from Indiana is to take the estimate of cost as written into the House bill with reference to the State of Indiana as compared with the State of Illinois. We find this situation. The House proposed the figures submitted to the Bureau of Public Roads under section 13 of the 1954 Highway Act. These were the figures used by the Clay Commission for determining the total cost involved, and these are the figures the House would write into the formula of distribution on the so-called basis of need.

Indiana submitted her estimate of what it would cost to build the Interstate System. So did Illinois. Let me show the Senator from Indiana the result on 4-lane construction for the urban section of the Interstate System. In Indiana the low 10 percent of cost figure was more than $2 million a mile. In Illinois it was only $610,000 a mile.

On rural roads Indiana estimated a low 10 percent cost of $335,000 a mile. Illinois estimated $225,000 a mile.

On structures for a mile of 2-lane rural interstate road in Indiana, the estimate was $185,000 per structure. In Illinois it was only $18,000.

Mr. CAPEHART. Those figures mean nothing to me, because they are only estimates. I say that whatever the cost may be, that is the amount we should appropriate for each of the States.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No. The amount which would be apportioned to the States under the House formula would be based upon the figures I have just read.

Mr. CAPEHART. We should write into the bill, then, that when the total contracts are ready to be let, the Federal Government will either approve or disapprove them. Indiana may have overestimated; I do not know. Illinois may have underestimated; I do not know. But, if we are going to be fair about the matter, it must be based on the actual cost. It cannot be anything else, because if that is not the case we shall get into a great deal of trouble.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota read the estimates of Pennsylvania and New Jersey?

Mr. CAPEHART. We are talking about estimates put in by the States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yielded to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from New Mexico asked me to read the figures affecting Pennsylvania and New Jersey. The average cost per mile gives these results: Pennsylvania has an average cost per mile of $577,000. New Jersey has an average cost of $6,652,000 a mile.

The able Senator from Indiana has pointed out that the actual cost will be the amount which is written into the contract, but the apportionment to the States for the first 2 years, under the House formula, is by law going to be—it would be by law if we should adopt the House provision—the figures I have just read. That is the so-called estimate of need.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from New Mexico has yielded to me, and I should like to finish my statement.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The difference is that for the first 2 years the States would be in the program upon an apportionment of dollars. During the first 2 years the States would receive their money, under the House formula, in the magnitude I have indicated, and they would begin buying their rights-of-way and letting contracts. They would have that much money with which to start the program, and there would be that kind of a disproportionate approach to the program. The right-of-way is one of the important factors. For example, in Maine it is estimated that the right-of-way for a mile of four-lane construction will cost $1 million, but in Maryland, represented by my distinguished friend at my right [Mr. BUTLER], it will cost $195,000 for a mile of right-of-way.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Obviously, it is going to make a great deal of difference if we give Maine a million dollars a mile to start her interstate system and give Maryland $195,000.

The Senate committee formula may not be perfect, but it has some precedent. It was worked out following a good deal of debate and discussion during the consideration of the 1954 bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. Presient, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to finish my thought.

The program in the Senate bill preserves the historic distribution formula of one-third on mileage, one-third on population, and one-third on area.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield so that I may ask the Senator from South Dakota a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota a specific question. The State of South Dakota estimated it would need $101 million. Was that an honest estimate? If it was, then, why, under the Senate bill is it increased by $184 million?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. We did not do any such thing.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator said Indiana was overestimated. Was South Dakota underestimated? If so, why does the Senator want to increase the amount for South Dakota by $184 million?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not want South Dakota to get any more money than will be needed to build the interstate system for South Dakota.

Mr. CAPEHART. South Dakota said it could build its system for $101 million. In the Senate committee bill it is proposed to grant South Dakota $286 million.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; it is not. It is not anticipated, I believe, by any member of the Committee on Public Works that any formula will be continued for 13 years after the initial period of determining costs.

In South Dakota, it was estimated that $15,900 would be required to acquire a mile of right-of-way. In Indiana it was estimated that it would cost $40,000 a mile for a rural road.

Mr. CAPEHART. South Dakota estimated and gave to the House a figure of $101 million as the cost of building its share of the interstate system. Because in the Senate bill the amount has been increased to $286 million, my question is, Did South Dakota underestimate the cost, or did not South Dakota know what it was doing?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from Indiana has not followed the complete story of the development of the formula.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have followed it. I have followed it to the extent of noticing that South Dakota's amount has been increased by $184 million. That is what is shown in the formula. In other words, the Senator from South Dakota is the one who injected Indiana into the picture and said that Indiana had overestimated. My question is, Did South Dakota underestimate its needs. Evidently it must have.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the final analysis, no State will receive more than the amount which it needs to discharge the contracts which will be let.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then why did the Senator criticize Indiana a moment ago?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What I am objecting to is the allocation to Indiana, or any other State, in the first 2 years of a disproportionate amount of money for launching the program.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from South Dakota and I are in 100-percent agreement on that point.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My desire is that each State shall receive exactly the amount it will need.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. In response to the question of the able Senator from Indiana, I point out that some States grossly underestimated the amounts they would require. The Senator has asked certain questions of the Senator from South Dakota. He might ask the same questions with respect to Tennessee. If he would, I think I could provide him with the answers.

Tennessee underestimated. Tennessee has only recently completed a new estimate, one which was made with a great deal of care, after surveys had been made. The first estimate was made very hurriedly. In the first estimate, which was submitted as a part of the report and the chart, Tennessee estimated a cost of about $380 million to complete its interstate system. The estimate now is more than $600 million.

When the bill was previously before the committee, a statement was made that under the formula in S. 1048, Tennessee would get more than it needed, just as it is now implied that South Dakota would get more than it needed.

Mr. CAPEHART. I did not say that South Dakota would get more than it needed.

Mr. GORE. Let me complete my statement. Now, however, after a careful survey has been made, the original estimate is revealed to have been exceedingly low.

Pennsylvania made the same mistake. Pennsylvania submitted an estimate of $550,000 a mile. Her adjoining sister State of New Jersey, as the Senator from South Dakota has pointed out, submitted an estimate of $6,650,000 a mile. There we find two adjoining States which have submitted estimates according to a formula in the House bill, one of which is being penalized for no other reason than that its highway department, in response to an invitation, submitted a hurried, unrealistic estimate. On the other hand, the adjoining State would be favored with an apportionment of about 12 times as much a mile, only for the reason that its State highway department, perhaps also hurriedly, submitted a very high estimate.

I say that Congress cannot and must not start the distribution of the vast sums involved in the bill in such a haphazard manner. The formula in the Senate committee bill is not a perfect formula. No perfect formula can be devised. But the formula has the merit of being a legal formula for the distribution of the taxpayers' money. Moreover, it has the merit of having been tested and tried with 2 years of experience. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, I have not heard one complaint about its operations during the 2 years.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from California, who is a member of the committee.

Mr. KUCHEL. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy.

I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee a question. When his State government, as I believe he just indicated, made an estimate of the cost of the Interstate System, did it make the estimate on the basis of its conception of its need, or did it make the estimate under the Federal 1954 formula?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield, so that I may answer the Senator from California?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I am glad the able Senator from California has asked his question. The answer to it points up one of the fallacies in the apportionment of funds on the basis of the table, because there was little uniformity in the standards which the various States used. Pennsylvania used one standard; Ohio may have used another.

Mr. KUCHEL. Will the Senator from Tennessee, however, state the basis on which his State, which he, in part, ably represents, made its estimate? Was it not on the basis of its belief of need?

Mr. GORE. I am not certain whether the Senator from California is referring to the first, hurried estimate, or to the later, more careful estimate. To which does he refer?

Mr. KUCHEL. To both. In each instance, what was the basis which was used by Tennessee to say, "We need this much money in order to complete the Interstate System within Tennessee"? On what basis did Tennessee make that estimate?

Mr. GORE. Tennessee made a very hurried estimate, in the first instance, of what it would cost to finish the interstate highways according to the standards which Tennessee had in mind at that time. The later estimate was more carefully made, according to the standards of the present day.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to add to the statement of the Senator from Tennessee. The Senator from California understands the operations of highway departments in the individual States. Every State in the Union is interested in getting some of the money which Congress will make available. So the first thing each State did was to have its State highway engineer estimate what the State would need for the next 2 years. Two years later, the State highway commissions have learned, after hearing from the people of the States, that their estimates were based upon a little guessing done by the State engineers. Then the highway engineers prepared real surveys of their respective States. That is what accounts for the difference. I think that is what happened in Pennsylvania, because it is certainly amazing that Pennsylvania should have estimated its needs as $550,000 a mile, while New Jersey was asking for more than $6 million a mile.

Mr. KUCHEL. My purpose in bringing out these facts is so that Senators may read in the RECORD tomorrow the reason for the difference between the House approach and the Senate committee approach. We shall then be in a better position to judge which method will be more effective in getting the work done.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I should like to read from the needs report:

> The term "needs" likewise requires explanation——

I hope I may have the attention of the junior Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. From what page is the Senator reading?

Mr. GORE. I am reading from the needs report, House Document No. 120, page 1:

> The term "needs" likewise requires explanation. It is a word widely used in recent years to denote construction backlog. Amounts cited as "needs" sometimes refer to the cost of complete modernization as of a given moment; sometimes they cover a

construction program stretching over a period of years.

Some estimates are based on the needs of current traffic; others take future traffic fully into account.

There are variations, too, in the specifications of design standards, and there are differences in their application—one study may permit no deviations, while another will accept large deviations or tolerances.

That illustrates total lack of uniformity. That illustrates the inequity of the Congress of the United States apportioning funds to the respective States in such a haphazard manner, without uniformity of standards. I say it would be a big mistake for the Congress to do it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is it not true that in the House-adopted bill the House has incorporated a provision that the Bureau of Roads shall have the responsibility of determining the standards of construction for the Interstate System across the entire country? Is that not a fact?

Mr. GORE. That has nothing to do with the question we are discussing because the language adopted by the House would provide for apportioning for the first 2 years on the basis stated and leave future apportionments to the future action of the Congress. I say the House bill provides for only 2 years' apportionment, and it is on the basis of that haphazard, inequitable treatment——

Mr. KUCHEL. It is true that the House bill does lodge responsibility in the Bureau of Roads to determine a standard; is it not?

Mr. GORE. I am not sure that is true at all.

Mr. KUCHEL. I submit to the Senator that it is true, and I wish to discuss that question. The crux of the particular section to which the Senator has been devoting his time is that the Congress of the United States ordered the Bureau of Roads to make an estimate of costs of all highways, streets, and roads in America to bring them up to a standard. That is what Congress did in 1954. What did the Bureau of Roads do? It asked the different States of the American Union to furnish it with estimates of costs. The estimates of costs, to begin with, are going to vary to some extent——

Mr. GORE. To the extent of 12 times as much for one State as compared to another.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am going to agree with the Senator from Tennessee that as to a part of the variance, I do not understand the basis for it. That is why I want to have the Senate recognize that if the Federal Government is to assume 90 percent of the cost of an Interstate System, it ought to determine whether it is going to do it on the basis of need all across the country. If so, perhaps we can improve upon the House bill and have something acceptable to the Senate rather than do what my able friend wants the Senate to do, namely, take a formula which is now in the law and try to provide for its use in determining the basis of apportionment of an Interstate System.

The proposal constitutes for the first time an objective of Federal construction—almost total Federal construction—of an Interstate System. We need to be realistic. We need to determine the basis on which the Federal Government can pay the cost of the construction. I argue that it is on the basis of need alone. I raise that question at this time, and I shall discuss it later. Let us determine what the basis will be, and determine whether that will be the basis on which the Federal Government will proceed.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has stated that the quicker the Congress can fix the standards, the quicker and better the job can be done. The bill proposes that Congress shall proceed to fix the standards. It is unrealistic for Congress to start so vast a program on the basis of apportioning to 1 State 12 times as much as it apportions to an adjoining State. I agree with the Senator that we ought to abandon any such idea.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico if it is not a fact that 90 percent of the cost of the Interstate System will be borne by the Federal Government, and only 10 percent by the States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. There is a reason for that. The Interstate System will be available to take care of national defense and other national requirements having to do with the security of the Nation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the allocations for the initial 2 years are based upon the estimates of cost by the States, will not that furnish an inducement for individual States to make their estimates of cost as high as possible, because the higher the estimate, the greater the share of the initial apportionment they will get?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the House method is followed, does it not mean that those who threw caution to the winds, and asked for the largest amounts, will get the most?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. That is why I think the Senate proposal is the sounder of the two.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do, too.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I cannot see the justice of allocating a much larger amount to one State as compared to a neighboring State.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Did the committee not try to draft an amendment whereby the Federal Government would pay 90 percent of the actual cost? Is it not possible, under the House version, to write such a provision into the bill? I think it is there now. Regardless of the estimates of the various States, whether too high or too low, when a project is completed, the Government will have to pay 90 percent of it. Is it not possible to write into the law a provision that, before the contracts are awarded, the Federal Government must approve them? Could we not try to write such a provision into the bill?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think the proposal is to carry out that purpose.

Mr. CAPEHART. If that is done, I do not think either formula will particularly be needed. Why is either formula needed?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Because I am just as much interested in getting good roads in Colorado as I am in getting them in New Jersey. I want each State to get its fair proportionate share, and not have someone in Washington determine whether or not Colorado needs a road.

Mr. CAPEHART. What I want to do is to take the number of miles in each State, regardless of which State it is, and multiply the cost per mile by the number of miles. That is the amount of money which ought to be authorized and spent, no more and no less. I do not see how it can be done on any other basis and still assure a good Interstate System.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to say to the Senator from Indiana that some complication does arise by reason of the fact that in some States sections of roads have already been completed which will fit into the Interstate System, some of which might be more expensive than would be indicated by taking a per mile cost and multiplying it by the number of miles. Some States have a need for four- or six-lane highways. Other States have a need for two-lane highways. Some States have portions of roads already constructed, and others do not.

Mr. CAPEHART. There is no provision in the bill to reimburse States for roads which they have already built, is there?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; but it makes a difference in the amount necessary to complete the system.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am speaking about the number of miles involved. If a State has half of its mileage completed, it does not enter into the picture.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But it makes a difference whether the roads to be built are low-cost or high-cost highways.

Mr. CAPEHART. No; because the States are not going to be reimbursed for any roads.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the Senator from Indiana will listen to me for a minute, I shall try to make this point perfectly clear.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am listening.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Very well.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor. Does he yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to yield to the member of the committee, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who was trying to conclude his statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is impossible to have orderly debate if several Senators attempt to speak at the same time. Of course, under the rule, a Senator who has the floor has no right to yield except for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield for a question; I think the Senator from South Dakota was propounding one.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This is my question: Is it not true that some States have completed more of their high-cost mileage on the Interstate System than others have completed? Consequently, is it not difficult to apply a straight per mile cost multiplied by the number of miles, to arrive at the need of any particular State?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; the conditions in all the States are different.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the Senator from New Mexico permit me to read from a letter written by the Commissioner of Bureau of Public Roads? In the letter he refers to the character of the estimates.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under date of May 18, 1956, I received a letter from Mr. C. D. Curtiss, Commissioner of Public Roads. I read from the letter:

> You will see that there is considerable variation, as would be expected, due to differences in specifications used in different States, as well as differences in terrain, soil types, local materials, wage rates, traffic loads, and many other factors. As you know, the Bureau did not edit or otherwise alter the individual State estimates submitted.

A similar statement was made by George T. McCoy, president of the American State Highway Officials, when he appeared before our committee on February 21, and testified with respect to the estimates submitted under section 13 of the 1954 act. He said, in that connection:

> Please bear in mind that this is an estimate, and not a proposed program.

The committee feels that that estimate and those unedited requests from the several States should not be frozen into law as the basis of the apportionment during the first 2 years.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that the very words the able Senator from South Dakota read—which were to the effect that every State is different, and every State has different terrain and different conditions—are the best reasons in the world for paying the actual per-mile cost in each State, multiplied by the number of miles?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think that will be done. I call the Senator's attention to page 4 of the report of the Senate committee, where, in referring to the fund, this language is found:

> The committee would also like to explain that funds authorized under the Senate amendment are not to be advanced to the States to construct the highways, but that such funds are to be used to reimburse the States for the work that has been performed.

Certainly a State will not build a very costly road, because the less the cost of construction the more miles of road will be built.

I read further:

> Such reimbursements are made on the basis of vouchers properly executed and certified by the State officials. In this connection, it can thus be seen that apportionment of funds authorized for the Interstate System, with subsequent reimbursement to the States for their expenditures, will be made only to the extent of completing the Interstate System in the States to established standards.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a further question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that we know definitely that there will be X number of miles of the Interstate System in each State, and that the cost of constructing the roads will vary in the different States, due to the terrain and other conditions existing in the States, because it will cost much more to build a road in a mountainous area where tunnels will have to be constructed than to build a road across flat country? Furthermore, is it not possible to work out a formula or language based strictly, 100 percent, upon the actual cost in each State, as certified by the Federal Government and approved by the Federal Government, before the contracts are let? Is that not possible?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is possible, but extremely improbable.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why?

Mr. CHAVEZ. For the reason that for years and years and years the Bureau of Public Roads has been investigating and making surveys and trying to arrive at a formula. After many reports to both the House committee and the Senate committee, the Senate Committee on Public Works has reached the conclusion that the formula which has been submitted to this body is the most equitable formula, if every State wishes to be treated like every other.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that this is the first time the Senate has had before it a bill designating and naming the exact number of miles in each State, and therefore the situation is entirely different, as compared with the situation in the past?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not think so. Heretofore we have had 40,000 miles in the Interstate System.

Mr. CAPEHART. But we never had an overall plan, as we have at the moment. The map displayed in the rear of the Chamber shows the 41,000 miles——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Forty thousand, as designated in 1947.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; 40,000 miles. The map shows the 40,000 miles, and shows the exact mileage in each State. We want to build those 40,000 miles at the earliest possible time, and we want to have the Federal Government pay 90 percent of exactly what the roads cost—no more and no less. We also want the Federal Government to approve the contracts before they are let.

Mr. GORE. That has been the practice since 1944.

Mr. CAPEHART. In connection with the estimates, we must realize that engineers do make errors. Sometimes the estimates are too high; sometimes they are too low. In the case of Indiana, possibly the estimate is too high. Evidently in the case of South Dakota the estimate is too low, because the estimate for South Dakota was $101 million, whereas under the Gore formula, South Dakota will get $286 million. So evidently the estimate for South Dakota was much too low—almost by three times. So it is that we know that sometimes the estimates are either too high or too low.

Why cannot we handle this matter on a scientific, businesslike basis, instead of on the basis of the Senate committee version, under which the authorizations for 31 States would be increased and the authorizations for 17 States would be decreased?

Mr. CHAVEZ. One thing I love about America is the right to disagree.

Mr. CAPEHART. Certainly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think the committee tried to approach this matter on a scientific basis.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not question that at all.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The red lines on the map to which the Senator from Indiana has pointed indicate roads which have been in existence since 1944.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. All we are trying to do is accelerate construction of the existing Interstate System.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; and we are trying to construct each and every mile shown by the red lines on the map.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to my good friend, the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I think there is considerable confusion about appropriations, in connection with this matter.

In the event the pending bill shall be passed, and if it shall then be followed through by appropriations to implement the authorizations provided by the bill, the able Senator from Indiana desires to know why it is that the Senate committee version would increase the amounts for 31 States, and would decrease the amounts for 17 States.

Mr. President, the Senate committee version of the bill is based on an allocation formula which, for the most part, has been in effect for 40 years. In 1954, when the Congress increased the authorizations and appropriations for the Interstate System from a flat amount of $25 million to $175 million, the argument was made—and evidently it was made with some merit, because it was accepted by the Senate—that the historic formula of allocations should be amended, in order to provide greater impetus to the building of the Interstate System on a general basis, and in a manner which would carry it forward in all the States more nearly in proportion to their needs.

So, whereas the historic formula had divided the Federal funds among the States one-third on the basis of population, one-third on the basis of area, and

one-third on the basis of rural mail route roads, the formula was changed so that, so far as the Interstate System is concerned, under the law in effect for the biennium ending June 30 this year, it is now two-thirds on the basis of population, one-sixth on the basis of area, and one-sixth on the basis of rural mail route roads.

The change about which the Senator from Indiana complains was not brought about by any new action of the Public Works Committee. The basis of allocation used by the committee is that provided under existing law, as enacted in 1954, for the Interstate System.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is an eminent member of the Senate Public Works Committee, whose interest in good highways is known all over the country, but more particularly in his State, because, as Governor of the great State of Oklahoma, he instituted a wise and vigorous highway improvement program.

I preface my question with that qualification of the Senator in that connection because I want to ask him if during the past 2 years he has heard a single complaint as to the operation of the apportionment formula for the Interstate System which he has just described?

Mr. KERR. I have heard none. If there were a basis for complaint, the complaint would not come from the heavily populated States, because the interstate money now is allocated two-thirds on the basis of population.

The formula in the bill now before the Senate is therefore not a new formula. It is the formula of existing law, which amended a formula which had been in effect for 35 or 40 years. The present formula was developed on the basis of that history. The Senate committee, in its version of the bill, bases the bill on that formula.

The new formula before the Congress is the one developed by the House. It was not developed on the basis of need. There has been before no committee evidence establishing the need for interstate systems as between the States, in such a way as to justify the formula in the House version of the bill.

The formula in the House bill was not developed on the basis of population. It is the result of "guesstimates."

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I shall be delighted to yield in a moment. I wish to complete my preliminary statement.

The formula in the House bill is based upon guesses, not made in response to questions by the Congress, not made in hearings before congressional committees, where cross-examination could have been had, but on the basis of private correspondence between the Clay committee and the highway commissions of the several States. That is the reason why a law basing allocations upon such a formula would be so unjust.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] have very ably and aptly pointed out that the Federal Bureau of Roads will not give a State any more money than is represented by contracts which have been made, approved, and completed. That is true; but if the House formula were adopted, a few of the States would receive disproportionate amounts of the vast highway building fund in the first 2 years of its availability. Against such allocations, those States could develop projects, make contracts, and have them approved by the Federal Bureau of Roads, and they could be paid for. On the other hand, 31 of the States would be proportionately slowed down in their highway building programs, in a manner which would result in the gravest injustice, upon the basis of an operation which at no time in the history of the Congress has been approved or permitted to prevail.

Mr. BUSH and Mr. CAPEHART addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. KERR. I yield first to the Senator from Connecticut. Then I shall yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BUSH. I ask the Senator from Oklahoma if it is not true that the House formula for apportionment, to which he has objected, has built into it a self-correcting device for adjustment.

Mr. KERR. No; it has not.

Mr. BUSH. I invite the Senator's attention to page 15 of House bill 10660, which is the bill before us. Under the heading "Studies and Estimates; Use of Revised Estimates for Apportionment Formulas," it is provided that the Secretary must make a reestimate and a reapportionment after the first 2 years. It is perfectly clear that probably no formula we might adopt will be absolutely satisfactory to everyone for the first 2 years. However, if we can get started——

Mr. KERR. If the Senator will read the last lines on page 15, he will see that the changes are not self-executing.

Mr. BUSH. That is true.

Mr. KERR. That was the question the Senator asked me.

Mr. BUSH. No; I said self-correcting. The provision on page 15 is for the correction of the formula. The Senator has made a good point about the formula not being self-executing.

Mr. KERR. How could it be self-correcting if it were not self-executing?

Mr. BUSH. The formula can be corrected.

Mr. KERR. How?

Mr. BUSH. By the reestimate provided for in this section.

Mr. KERR. No; by the reestimate upon approval by the Congress. Let me say to my able friend from Connecticut that 31 of the States would be in one position. If they are protected by the present formula, which cannot be changed except by action by both Houses of Congress, then they are in one position if they surrender that sanctuary, and in another if, in order to get justice, it is necessary to have action by both Houses of Congress.

If the Senator will read page 15 of the bill he will read the words:

> Upon approval by affirmative resolution of the committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives to which referred, the Secretary of Commerce shall use such estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1959, June 30, 1960, June 30, 1961, and June 30, 1962.

Does the Senator call that a self-correcting and self-executing provision?

Mr. BUSH. I did not call it self-executing.

Mr. KERR. I say to my able friend there is no doubt in my mind that the Committee on Public Works and the Senate itself would be raising an unprecedented hue and cry to correct the injustice which would prevail, but they would be impotent in the matter until and unless both Public Works Committees and both Houses of Congress, by appropriate legislation, changed the situation.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. Why leave a formula with a traditional history of operation of 40 years, with an amendment made 2 years ago to meet the very purpose discussed by the able Senator from Connecticut, to give more highly populated States relief, in that two-thirds of the allocation of the money is now made on the basis of population? Why leave that formula?

Why leave that stable foundation of operation for the precarious and insecure situation in which 31 States would find themselves if they abandoned it or permitted it to be taken away from them, and if then the only chance they could possibly have to recover a part of it would be upon affirmative legislative action by both Houses of Congress?

Mr. BUSH. If the question is addressed to me, I should like to answer it. It is because under the formula which the Senator proclaims the Interstate Highway System would never be built. The whole reason for the Government to guarantee 90 percent of the cost to the States is to effect the concept of a national system of interstate highways.

I wish to say one more thing to the Senator, who has been very indulgent with me on all occasions, and always very generous in yielding to me: So far as the question of corrections is concerned, I believe the Senator from Oklahoma has a good point when he talks about the finality of the situation. I should like to see him come up with a suggestion as to how it could be made final, but giving effect to a reappraisal of the costs after the first couple of years. I believe that almost anyone of a reasonable frame of mind will agree that, after the first couple of years, there will probably have to be some recorrecting of the estimates which have been made.

We have already seen in the House bill some apparent inaccuracies in the estimates. Therefore I do not believe there is much doubt in anyone's mind that we must come up with something after 2 years to correct the apportionments, so as to make the apportionments on the basis of need.

However, from listening to the Senator from Oklahoma, I am a little surprised that he would, in effect, eliminate

the Senate committee, because he has always cautioned me not to be too trustful with respect to the reports submitted by Government agencies downtown, including even the Bureau of Public Roads.

I do not understand why he objects to this particular feature, which gives the Senate Committee on Public Works an opportunity to review the matter.

Mr. KERR. My faith in the committees of the Senate is just as great as it has always been. I must say that their action in bringing the pending bill to the Senate on the basis of the historic traditional allocation is one reason why I feel that I am entitled to continue to have confidence in the committees.

Let me say to the Senator that the procedure set up in the bill is a net to catch the unwary and inexperienced and incautious. To begin with, it makes the allocation on the basis of estimates which have no established foundation before the Congress.

Mr. BUSH. Is the Senator referring to the Gore formula or to the House formula?

Mr. KERR. I am referring to the formula which implements estimates which are without recognized foundations.

In the second place, it makes it a continuing thing until Congress changes it. The Senator from Oklahoma knows that the present formula will need looking at. Congress will have a chance every 2 years to look at it. The Senator from Connecticut knows, on the basis not only of the record on this bill, but with reference to every piece of highway legislation passed in the past 20 years, that the House will always be ready to increase the proportion of allotments with reference to population. The House will always be ready to change the formula of distribution so as to give greater significance to the population phase in the allocation formula.

Therefore, we will not be lacking any opportunity to reappraise the matter on the basis of experience. However, in the meantime, we have the assurance that we are proceeding on the basis of allocating this money in accordance with a tried and proven formula, which has only recently been revised so as to give a tremendously increased amount of significance and amounts of money to the States on the basis of population.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator says it is a tried and proven formula. It is a tried and proven formula, I would suggest to the Senator, only to the extent that it divides up a certain amount of money so that no one can say he received more or less than he is entitled to under the formula.

Mr. KERR. What are we talking about except dividing money?

Mr. BUSH. If the Senator will permit me to finish this thought, the point is that the formula was devised to take care of the allocation of the Interstate System when we had $175 million a year to put into the Interstate System, in the 1954 bill.

Now what the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Tennessee seek to do is to make that formula, which was designed to divide up $175 million, apply to a national system of interstate highways which is going to cost the Federal Government in the neighborhood of $25 billion, the whole purpose being to complete the system of interstate highways and to give the States 90 percent of whatever it takes to complete that system. The formula was never designed to meet that kind of contingency. It could not possibly do it, because under the Senator's formula he will find that many States will have a great amount of money left over. It will stay in the Federal Treasury and will never be spent. In the meantime we will overtax our people to the extent of $4½ billion, and most of that money will stay in the Treasury unspent. That is not the purpose of raising the taxes under the tax provisions of the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to interrupt the Senator from Connecticut to say that the Senator from Oklahoma is certainly correct when he says it is a tried and proven formula. All the Senator from Connecticut has to do is to turn around and look at the red lines on the map. They illustrate what the formula has done. It is right before him.

Mr. BUSH. I hesitate to disagree with my distinguished chairman, for whom I have the utmost respect, but to complete the system we have to go farther than we have gone.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The roads have been built to the extent indicated. One can travel from Connecticut to San Francisco.

Mr. BUSH. I may have misunderstood. I understand that the projected system is shown in red. If I am mistaken in that——

Mr. CHAVEZ. Every red line on the map represents a road. What we are trying to do by this bill is to improve the roads.

Mr. BUSH. That may be. I do not wish to question the Senator, but my understanding is that there is going to be $25 billion worth of improvement.

Did the Senator from Oklahoma wish to address a question to me?

Mr. KERR. I wanted to reply to the Senator's remarks. I realize how treasured is the opportunity to reply, and I was trying to conform to his request.

Mr. BUSH. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy, and I will end my comments and my questions at this point and will listen with interest to the Senator's reply, as I always do.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. Let me address myself to what the Senator from Connecticut has said.

The Senator from Connecticut seeks to substitute a grab bag for a carefully worked-out formula. The Senator said the formula in the Senate committee bill would result in having $4½ billion in the Treasury that would never be spent.

He could not have been more mistaken, because he was here 2 years ago when the formula applying to the Interstate System was changed. He participated in changing it. Last year the Senator himself sought by legislation to provide authority whereby the States would not even have the protection they have under the House bill. The Senator sponsored a measure on this floor which would have turned all the money over to the Secretary of Commerce to be allocated as he saw fit, without any guaranty that any State would receive a single dollar. Now the Senator's posture is that we should allocate the money for the first 2 years on a basis, as it has been aptly set forth, which would give New Jersey $6½ million a mile and Pennsylvania $500,000 a mile, and to Connecticut an enormously disproportionate amount as compared with New Mexico or Oklahoma or Tennessee or South Dakota or North Dakota. What the bill which is before the Senate seeks to do is to see to it that all the States, under this great new formula, get off to as nearly an equal start as may be possible in the light of present knowledge and past experience.

We are aware that efforts will be made 2 years from now to change the formula, and we are aware that when experience demonstrates that changes are needed, Congress will make them. But, in the meantime, we shall not have discarded and thrown away the foundation upon which this formula has been built, namely, the allocation as now provided by the law.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma permit me to ask him one more question?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. BUSH. Does the Senator believe that in order to finance this system the Federal funds should be allocated on a basis of need, assuming we can agree on a specific way of finding out what the relative needs are? Will the Senator say with me that he believes that is the way to allocate these funds for the Interstate System, or does he not subscribe to that?

Mr. KERR. If the Senator from Connecticut will agree with me on what the words mean, the answer is "Yes."

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Indiana has given a pretty good definition of "need" this morning. It is the cost per mile multiplied by the number of miles.

Mr. KERR. But the point is that this bill makes it possible for Oklahoma to get an equal start with Connecticut in meeting her needs. On the basis of the House bill, her proportion would be cut down greatly, Pennsylvania's would be cut down greatly, Illinois' would be cut down greatly, and the proportions of some other States would be greatly stepped up.

Mr. BUSH. What really disturbs the Senator, then, is the allocation of the funds in the first 2 years. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. That is the question now before us.

Mr. BUSH. That is one of the questions.

Mr. KERR. And that is the thing we are moving into.

Mr. BUSH. If we can modify that system of allocation for the first 2 years so as to get what the Senator would con-

sider a more equitable, indeed, an equitable distribution of funds in the first 2 years, would the Senator then be satisfied that the general allocation provisions in the House bill should be adopted?

Mr. KERR. I do not think the allocations in the House bill can possibly be adopted by men conscious of their responsibility, for the reason that there is no evidence before the Congress to support the allocations provided in the House bill.

Mr. BUSH. Then, am I correct in assuming that we shall have to consider that the Senator discards the idea of needs?

Mr. KERR. Not at all. I stand firmly on the basis of allocation in accordance with the needs of 48 States instead of the needs of less than one-third of the States.

Mr. BUSH. But the Senator's formula certainly does not allocate funds on the basis of need.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator say that when we give two-thirds of the money on the basis of population, it is of no significance, and that when we limit the allocation on the basis of area to one-sixth, and the rural roads to one-sixth, there is any basis of need established in the allocation?

Mr. BUSH. Some of the estimates which are set forth in the House table appear to be obviously too high and some obviously too low. Nevertheless, it is the table which the House used in connection with the bill, and if we average it out it may not be too bad. But on basis of that table and those estimates, if we apply the Senator's formula, it will be found that there will be left over in some 30 States about $4,800,000,000, based on those estimates, and there will be approximately $4½ billion underallocated for a group of 18 or 19 States, including the District of Columbia.

Mr. KERR. I wish to say to the Senator that I could not say anything more effective against the allocation in the House bill than the Senator himself has said. He says that some are too high, some are too low, but it will average out pretty well.

Mr. BUSH. But the bill itself has a device in it for correcting estimates which may be wrong.

Mr. KERR. In that statement, the Senator is in error. Congress could pay the allocation without the language in the House bill. The language in the House bill is entirely futile and ineffective in the absence of action by the Congress.

Mr. BUSH. By the committee.

Mr. KERR. By the Congress. The Senator has not read the provision. The Senator has read only the first part of it.

The allocation for the first 2 years would be ad infinitum until the House itself agreed to change it. There is nothing in the bill or in the record to give any Member of the Senate any hope that that time will ever arrive.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma was a member of the committee when the present formula was adopted in 1954. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. That formula would give the Senator's own great State of Oklahoma less than the amount given under the previous formula; but we wanted to devise a formula which would push ahead the construction of the roads throughout the Nation in accordance with the needs. Was that not the idea?

Mr. KERR. That was the basis of the recommendation of the formula. I say to my good friend from Pennsylvania that that is the best change in the formula of 2 years ago, with nothing like, however, the vigor of the opposition, because then the change, when effected, would be the result of an act of Congress; but it would be valid until Congress itself again changed it.

The proposal of the House which is now before the Senate would entirely scrap every vestige of the 40-year formula, including that which was made 2 years ago.

I may say to the great Senator from Pennsylvania that on the basis of the interest of his State, he helped to lead the fight to amend on the floor. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] went along with the Senator from Pennsylvania, because they both thought it was a just proposal, even though it would cost their States something in allocation.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Was not the change made because we had in mind the densely populated areas and the fact that people from the sparsely populated areas would travel in States like California, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, New York, and Illinois, where the population is dense, and where the cost of highway construction is much greater than it is in the less populated States?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Pennsylvania is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Is it not true that the House bill really only makes an allocation for 2 years, and that its formula is based very much on guesswork?

Mr. KERR. If I read the allocation in the House bill correctly, it is permanent.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. It is permanent for 2 years.

Mr. KERR. And until a change shall be approved by the committees of both Houses.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Congress has it in its power to determine how the various allocations shall be made. Is it not much better to have an exact formula, such as is contained in the Gore bill? Then it can be changed from time to time, if Congress so desires. Is not that advisable, and is it not a more logical method of procedure?

Mr. KERR. I beg the Senator's pardon; will he repeat his question?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Is it not more logical to have an exact formula as the plan of procedure, a plan which Congress can change from time to time if it seems advisable to change it?

Mr. KERR. I see no other basis whereby a Senator from any State can afford to vote for a bill except on the basis that he knows what his State will get.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. No one knows how the money will be expended until the work has actually been done and has been approved according to the specification which may be set forth by the Bureau of Public Roads in the National Capital. Is not that correct?

Mr. KERR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. If we use this formula, and some State has its entire mileage of the Interstate System completed, then cannot the money be allocated to other States, even if the formula would be permanent?

If we keep this formula, and some States might have their entire system completed, then the money which is left in the almost $25 billion fund could be allocated to other States, where the need for roads existed?

Mr. KERR. There is not the slightest doubt that the Senator from Pennsylvania is correct about that. In my judgment, we will not wait until that time to change the formula. I believe we will change the formula 2 years from now, but we will not change the solid foundation upon which it now rests, whereby each Senator may know what his State will get. We will be going forward under a formula developed over a period of 40 years, after having made a substantial revision in 1954 for the benefit of the more densely populated States.

If the experience demonstrates, as has been indicated by the Senator from Connecticut, that some States have been getting more than they need in accordance with their road-building program and other portions of the interstate system, 2 years from now there will be a revision made to move in the direction of greater aid.

But what the House bill does is to surrender the authority for the next 2 years, and to provide that a few of the States will have an opportunity for an enormous surge forward in their interstate systems, while the other States of the Union will be proportionately curtailed, retarded, and held back. Among those would be the State of the great Senator from Pennsylvania, and also the State of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. If I may be permitted to make this comment, I wish all Senators would examine the tables which the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] placed in the RECORD on May 23. Consider, for example, the matter of two-lane surfacing, which should be almost uniform throughout the Nation. However, the cost runs from $25,000 a mile to $160,000 a mile. That shows that the estimates were not edited, as the Senator from South Dakota has already stated on the floor. This is a matter which requires our deep study. I think it is a

matter which should be reviewed probably every 2 years.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for yielding to me.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Connecticut to the provision of the bill on page 36, line 17, subsection (c):

Any amount apportioned to the States under the provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure under the terms of subsection (b) of this section shall lapse.

So in the event the program goes forward on the basis that the formula will give some States more than they need, but they do not use it, the allocation or apportionment to that State will lapse. It will revert to the fund, and that will be adequate evidence for an effort to be made by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut and others then to seek a revision in the allocation, which will prevent a recurrence of such an experience.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am sorry but I did not hear the first part of what the Senator has just said.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Connecticut had spoken a while ago about the unhappy situation that $4,500,000 might never be used.

Mr. BUSH. Yes.

Mr. KERR. I simply remind the Senator that subsection (c) on page 36 of the bill would prevent that.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. After hearing the colloquy among Senators regarding the difference between the two bills, it seems to me there is very little difference. I think both the Senate and the House recognized that it is hard or almost impossible to devise a definite formula, one which does not require a review from time to time. Both bills now contain provisions for a review. The language is a little different. The Senate committee bill provides for a review "from time to time." The House bill provides that it shall be at the end of a 2-year period. Beyond that, what substantial difference is there between the two bills?

Mr. KERR. Beyond that, so far as the authority of Congress is concerned, there is no difference.

The advantage sought to be gained by some and avoided by others would occur in the 2-year period. The position of those who advocate the provisions of the bill as prepared by the Senate committee is that on the basis of our experience and the give and take between the two Houses, this is the most equitable formula which Congress has yet been able to devise.

Rather than to have a formula for a 2-year period and then to make a new program on the basis of experience, our position is that we should stay with the formula we know about and have tried, the law we amended 2 years ago, to meet the very need which the Senator from Connecticut has been talking about, rather than to take one about which we know nothing.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. Is it not pretty well agreed that in the first 2-year period all the States will have all the money they can possibly use with which to start the program?

Mr. KERR. I do not think so.

Mr. McNAMARA. It seems to me the hearings before the committee well established that all the States would have enough money to get started on the program regardless of the formula. If the formula is as good as the Senator and I think it is, because of the years over which it has been developed, will it not be the department that will ultimately prevail? There is nothing in the House bill which says that the formula cannot be followed. I think the difference under discussion is the difference between the provision that at the end of 2 years there shall be a review and the provision that there shall be a review from time to time.

Mr. KERR. My concern is how the money will be allocated after the review.

Mr. McNAMARA. If the Senator should contend that there would not be sufficient money for all the States to use during the first 2 years, he would have a good point, but I am sure there will be enough money to enable all the States to get started.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma two questions. One concerns a matter which I think has already been very well brought out, but which should be emphasized, for I believe we cannot give it too much emphasis.

Under the House version of the bill, even though it is provided that after 2 years there shall be a review and a reapportionment, the fact remains, does it not, that there must be approval by the Public Works Committees of both Houses of Congress, and considering the fact that in the House of Representatives many States are represented on that committee, some with a stronger representation than others——

Mr. KERR. Numerically.

Mr. COTTON. Numerically—is it not a fact, from the Senator's experience in legislative bodies, that even though those concerned may have the best intentions in the world—there is bound to be some kind of compromise, which means that at least some of the inequities and inequalities will be frozen into the law for 13 long years?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma fears it so greatly, and he feels so keenly the injustice of the formula, that he thinks it would be a legislative tragedy if the Senate permitted the bill to become law in the language regarding allocation as provided by the House.

Mr. COTTON. I am glad to have the Senator's assurance. As I know the Senator will recall, we agreed on that point in committee. That is the reason why the Senator from New Hampshire previously supported, and supports now, the Gore proposal in preference to the House bill.

Now I should like to ask a second question, at which point we may come to a parting of the ways. Why does the Senator from Oklahoma feel it is essential that a formula be used in the Interstate System? Why could we not make a start, always retaining the control in the hands of the Congress, with a system of having estimates made and contracts let under the supervision of the Secretary of Commerce and the Bureau of Public Roads, subject to review by the Congress, thus avoiding the situation of being compelled to consider a formula? There is no formula which can be exactly fair and correct. In other words, whatever formula we may try to adopt, whether it be the formula in the Gore bill, some new formula suggested by the able Senator from South Dakota, some new formula which might be suggested by the Senator from Oklahoma, or some other formula. Senators from some States—and there would probably be a good many of them—would find the formula did not result to the advantage of their particular States. Why tie ourselves to a 2-year formula?

Mr. KERR. I should like to answer, in two parts, the question of the Senator from New Hampshire, whose affection and respect for the people of his State I know. No. 1, in the absence of a formula, the Senator from New Hampshire might go back home and tell the people of his State about the great highway bill we passed, and the many billions of dollars which are to be spent on the development of an Interstate System, and then have the unhappy experience of seeing 2 years go by and not a dollar spent either in New Hampshire or in Oklahoma—which would be a matter, I am sure, of as grave concern to the Senator from New Hampshire as it would be to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Another reason is that the highway assistance program is one of the few remaining definite recognitions by the Federal Government of the sovereignty of the States, and it is one of the most significant program wherein the sovereignty and the identity of the States are recognized and preserved.

Although the Federal Government, under the Interstate System as proposed by both Houses, will be putting up 90 percent of the money, the roads in the State of New Hampshire and in the State of Oklahoma will still be built under the control of the State highway departments of those States. The program entered into will have to be initiated with the agreement of the State government in Oklahoma, through its highway department, and the State government of New Hampshire, through its highway department. On the basis of the Senator's suggestion, as I understood it, that right of the State would be either completely forgotten or wiped out, and the program would be one wherein the Federal Bureau of Roads would be completing high-

ways in the State of New Hampshire, retaining title thereto, fixing access to and from those roads, and controlling the program in a way which would create revolt in that stronghold of independence and States rights known as New England, which I have admired for many years. I want to say to the Senator from New Hampshire I know that would be the situation in Oklahoma.

Those are the two reasons why I think a formula is necessary.

Mr. COTTON. I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma must have misunderstood my question, because my question did not contemplate for one single instant that the Bureau of Public Roads or any other Federal agency should construct highways in the States. I do have a strong feeling that the bill should provide that a proportionate part of the Interstate System in each State shall be built every year.

Mr. KERR. That is what the formula in the bill provides.

Mr. COTTON. That is correct, and I think it should be retained. After all, this applies only to the Interstate System. The formula for the other phases of the program is generally adequate, but in the Interstate System there may be wide differences in the cost of highways. In one State it may cost much more to buy the right-of-way because they go through a thickly populated section, where high real-estate values prevail. In another State, perhaps the land may be purchased at lower prices but the grading costs might be greater.

It seems almost impossible for the human mind to devise a formula which will work satisfactorily 2 years, 4 years, or 10 years from now, and under which the varying conditions in the States can be handled properly. But in having a proportionate share of the highways built in each State each year, why could not we require from the start that the States submit their costs and their contracts, so there could be approval by the executive department and by the Congress each year? Why must we select an artificial yardstick—and, as the Senator from Oklahoma knows, I favor the yardstick provided in the Senate version of the bill—when from the start we know that the yardstick at best is artificial.

Mr. KERR. I do not know that it is an artificial yardstick. I realize that no legislation has yet been devised—it may be because the Congress has not seen fit to let the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Oklahoma devise it——

Mr. COTTON. I meant to say an arbitrary yardstick, rather than an artificial yardstick.

Mr. KERR. Yes. But under the bill the contracts must be approved by the Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads. I believe that if we had no formula of allocation—which would mean that there would be no certainty of allocation to the States—we would authorize the greatest highway building program in history, and then would say to the Executive. "This money is yours; spend it where you wish." I think the Executive now has too much pressure on him, because of our having delegated too many powers, rather than too few, to the Executive. I cannot think of a more revolutionary delegation of authority, nor can I think of one which would be more disastrous for many, than for us to authorize this program and provide the necessary funds, and then say to the Executive, You build the roads where you wish."

Mr. COTTON. Will the Senator from Oklahoma permit a further observation?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. COTTON. In the State of Oklahoma there are a number of miles of the Interstate System, are there not?

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. COTTON. And in New Hampshire there are a certain number of miles of the Interstate System. Those miles of road are known. If the bill were to provide each year for the construction of one-thirteenth of the mileage in the State of Oklahoma and one-thirteenth of the mileage in the State of New Hampshire, at the lowest possible cost, with both State and Federal authorities checking the contracts, would we be delegating to the Executive any arbitrary or tyrannical power?

Mr. KERR. I say to my good friend, the Senator from New Hampshire, that now he has included a new provision in his proposed allocation formula. The one he suggested a moment ago did not contain the provision that the Executive build one-thirteenth of the roads within each State each year; the able Senator from New Hampshire did not give me the benefit of his thought in that connection until just this moment.

Mr. COTTON. I intended to make that clear. The Senator from Oklahoma said that the Gore bill already provides that a proportionate part shall be built each year.

Mr. KERR. The Gore bill provides that a proportionate part shall go to each State each year. But I remind the Senator from New Hampshire that although the present law authorizes 40,000 miles of the Interstate System, in the Senate version of the bill we make provision for an additional 2,500 miles, and we do not know where they will be constructed. In my judgment this program will not be underway for more than 2, 3, or 4 years before provision will be made for the addition of substantial numbers of miles to the Interstate System; and then the allocation formula the Senator from New Hampshire suggested just now would have to be revised.

Mr. COTTON. But each year there could be built in each State that year's proportion of what was then known to be the program; and if it were necessary for it to be extended, that could be done.

I think I agree with the Senator from Oklahoma; but I am trying to explore the possibilities of a more practical way to go about this matter, without the great drawback that at the outset of the program, certain States will receive much more of the "frosting," so to speak. Whereas, under the House version of the bill, certain States are to receive much of the "frosting," the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from New Hampshire find that their States will not receive much "frosting" and not much cake either.

The fixed formula of the Gore bill, which I stand ready to support, is far better than the haphazard estimates, based on nothing, which we find in the House version of the bill. Under the Gore bill, certain Senators will find, however, that the States of other Senators will get more of the "frosting." No doubt that situation will be taken care of later.

I appreciate the patience of the Senator from Oklahoma, but I should like to explore the possibility of setting up an arrangement not based on an arbitrary formula which we know will have to be revised, and which at the outset will put some Senators on the spot, and will hold out to the States of other Senators hopes which will not eventually mature.

Mr. KERR. I say to the Senator from New Hampshire that when he finally got around to suggesting an alternative formula, it was an arbitrary one, and presupposed that each State would be ready each year to match one-thirteenth, whereas we cannot predetermine for a certainty that that would be the case.

Furthermore, in connection with this formula, I remind the Senator from New Hampshire that it did not originate in the Gore bill. The bill approved by the Senate Committee on Public Works, to which the Senator from New Hampshire has referred as the Gore bill, merely provides for a greatly expanded program of Interstate System highway construction on the basis of the formula now in the law. That formula is not a new one. It does not originate in the Gore bill. The Gore bill provides authorizations of funds for allocation on the basis of the formula now in the law. As the Senator from New Hampshire knows, that formula is the result of legislative compromise extending over a period of nearly half a century. We may be certain that next year an effort will be made to change it, and the effort may succeed. But if it does, it still must result in a formula which, so long as it is in operation, will be arbitrary.

Mr. COTTON. But that formula was not devised for the program on the Interstate System that we now envision.

Mr. KERR. But it was devised 2 years ago by the Congress, when the Interstate System allocation was increased approximately 700 percent—namely, from an annual authorization of $25 million to an annual authorization of $175 million. If the Senator from New Hampshire will go back and read the RECORD, he will see that at that time able Senators, in discussing the new proposal, said the Interstate System must be built, and that the program under it would continue to expand by leaps and bounds, and that they wished to arrive at a formula which would be more nearly equitable than the formula previously used. The Congress did that. It seems to me that the thing to do is to try it. It is the law. Once we surrender it, the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from New Hampshire will find that it

will be a long, long time before they will get any of it back.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me, to permit me to make a brief statement?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall yield, but before yielding I wish to make a very brief statement at this point.

A little while ago I sent an amendment to the desk. I hope it will be possible to obtain a vote on that amendment this afternoon. The amendment relates to the so-called Davis-Bacon Act.

When the road bill was before the Senate in 1955, the report of the committee contained the following language relating to the Davis-Bacon Act:

> The committee recommends that the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act apply to all construction projects on the National System of Interstate Highways.

It was not to apply to local highways.

> This act now applies to contracts for school, hospital, and airport projects constructed with Federal aid funds.

There is very little difference between Federal aid funds for a hospital or school and Federal aid funds for highways.

> It is believed that the provisions should apply to projects on the Interstate System, but that some difficulty might be experienced should the provisions apply to the Federal-aid primary and secondary projects, many of which are located in rural and isolated areas, or constructed by State, county, or local governments under force account.

The same reasoning applies to the amendment which I have offered. It is my hope that the Senate may reach a vote this afternoon on my amendment.

I now yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in line with what the able Senator from New Mexico has said, it was my understanding that the majority leader intended to ask for a controlled-time situation tomorrow, pursuant to a unimous-consent agreement under which the various amendments would be considered and voted upon.

Let me say specifically that I join with my friend from New Mexico in sponsoring the amendment which he offered earlier today. I desire to speak briefly in favor of that amendment. However, I had intended to delay that comment until I was reasonably sure that there would be a vote on it; and I thought the vote probably would not come until tomorrow, in accordance with the suggestion which I have heard.

Is the acting majority leader able to tell me whether or not it is contemplated that a unanimous-consent agreement will be entered into?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, as I understand, a definite agreement has not yet been reached between the majority leader and the minority leader as to when the vote shall come. As the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico has suggested, it is hoped that at some time later in the day a proposed unanimous-consent agreement may be submitted, with the approval of both the majority leader and the minority leader. However, it is intended that general debate on the pending measure shall proceed, pending the consummation of such an agreement.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the question before the Senate is undoubtedly the most momentous domestic issue which the present Congress thus far has been called upon to consider. The issue is whether or not the Government of the United States should undertake, to the extent of 90 percent of the cost, the construction of a modern and efficient 40,000-mile Interstate Highway System in America.

As has been indicated earlier, over a long period of years the Government of the United States has been interested in the development of highways, streets, and roads in this great land of ours. From time to time the Congress of the United States has adopted formulas under which moneys were authorized to be appropriated, and under which the Federal Government would pay a portion of the construction on all types, or almost all types, of public roads.

However, the particular issue before the Senate today concerns the Interstate System. That issue was crystallized when, about 2 years ago, unanimously a Presidentially appointed study commission represented to the Congress and to the people that there was an urgent pressing need for Congress to undertake the construction of an Interstate Highway System in America.

That Presidentially appointed commission was headed by Gen. Lucius Clay. Its membership consisted of able American citizens from all segments of our economy, and in a very real sense it was a nonpartisan advisory body.

The commission demonstrated the urgent need of an Interstate Highway System, based upon four compelling reasons. It pointed out that the military needs of the people of the United States in this thermonuclear age demand an Interstate System upon which rapid transportation of the military can be made available from one corner of our land to the other. By the same token, the commission indicated that the needs for the civilian defense of the people of the United States require the construction of such a modern Interstate System within the next 10 years.

The commission went on to point out that in its judgment we need an Interstate System because of the manner in which our economy has grown. In this Nation today we operate our economic machine in very large part through constant use of the highways of America.

The commission gave a fourth reason which will appeal to most of the people of the Nation. It concerns itself with the social aspect of the problem. In 1955, almost 40,000 people were slaughtered on American highways. We did not lose that many American military personnel during the entire Korean conflict.

For those reasons, the commission made specific recommendations to Congress. In the meantime, and over the years, each Congress had adopted legislation to provide Federal participation, in growing degrees, with States in the construction of all types of highways in this land.

Finally, in 1954, Congress devised the formula which has been mentioned a number of times today. With respect to the Interstate System, Congress provided a formula by which each State should receive a moiety of the money appropriated, on the basis of a two-thirds weight for population, a one-sixth weight for mileage within the State, specifically star routes and postal routes, and a one-sixth weight for the area of the State.

In each of the opportionment formulas written into law by Congress, each State could come and get the money if it wanted to match it with State funds. If it did not wish to do so, it would not have to take it.

Under Federal law, a State can use the moneys which Congress has apportioned to the extent that it wants to use the money, utilizing it with the State's own money in building the various roads, streets, and highways. If a State does not wish to match the money which the Federal Government has made available to it, the State does not have to use it, and the roads and highways are not built.

The problem before Congress today is different from the one that has been before Congress in years gone by. The problem with respect to the construction of an Interstate System, which I believe all Senators agree is an urgent necessity, is a problem in which the people of the United States, through the Federal Treasury, will assume a burden of 90 percent minimum of the cost of construction of that system, and 95 percent in some instances.

Thus, I believe it can be said that each State in the Union will be required to contribute a very small amount of the money necessary to construct the Interstate System. Why is that? The answer is perfectly obvious. We should not be vying in this Chamber, one State with another, on a system that is of benefit to all the people. This Interstate System is intended to be a Federal undertaking. When the Federal Government assumes the responsibility of not less than 90 percent of the cost, it is clear that it represents almost exclusively an undertaking by the Government of the United States.

In 1954 Congress, in adopting road legislation, added a provision in which it said to the Bureau of Public Roads, "You make an estimate of the costs necessary in this country to bring all types of roads, streets, and highways in the Interstate System up to a standard." The Bureau did that. The Bureau did it in part by sending out to each State its conception of specifications on the amounts of money necessary.

For the purpose of the comments I am now making—and I hope they may be helpful tomorrow when the question of apportionment is before the Senate for a vote—it is only necessary for me to say that each State, rightly or wrongly, efficiently or inefficiently, arrived at a figure which it believed represented the amount necessary to build that part of

the Interstate System located within its borders. That is all that was involved. That is all that was intended.

It has been suggested—I hope jokingly—that some States had the idea of putting gold bricks on the Interstate System, and therefore were more liberal in their mileage estimates than States which were more frugal.

Whether the figures are completely accurate or completely inaccurate, there is only one basis upon which the Government of the United States can undertake to build a 40,000-mile Interstate System across the United States, and that is on the basis of how much it will cost. In order to determine how much it will cost, estimates are needed. The final, actual costs involved will not be completely known until the 13 years of construction have passed. No one should quarrel with this.

What is the administrative routine through which moneys have gone to States, and in accordance with which, under either bill, the Senate committee substitute or the House approved bill, the money would go to the States in the future?

The Federal Government does not write out a Federal warrant and send it to the State treasuries. The Bureau of Public Roads is the Federal agency which is required to determine whether a specific proposed contract a State desires to enter into is a correct one under the law. If it is, the contract is approved. The State contracts with the construction firms, and a particular piece of roadway is built. Then the State presents a claim to the Federal Government, that claim is audited, and a determination is made as to whether the claim is in accordance with the law and with the specifications and rules laid down by the Bureau of Public Roads.

To the extent that the Bureau of Public Roads determines that the claim is accurate, a Federal warrant by way of reimbursement is given to the State which files that claim. I mention that because earlier this morning it was suggested that if allocations or apportionments were written into law by the Senate on the basis of need, some States would get too much and some States would get too little. That is not so.

It seems to me that, upon reflection, my fellow Senators who have made that claim will recognize that that cannot be so. It cannot be so because the Bureau of Public Roads—and I now speak of the House provisions—is required to determine a standard for the Interstate System all across the country. It will be the same standard in the Pacific Coast States as in the South or any other section of the country. The standards will be uniform.

If a State decided to enter into a contract of construction with respect to the Interstate System within its boundaries, the Bureau of Public Roads would have the responsibility of determining whether the standards were met. The State would then proceed to enter into contracts for the construction. Subsequently, when the State made its claim to the Bureau of Public Roads, there would be a second opportunity for the Federal Government to determine whether the law had been complied with and whether the standards of construction were neither greater nor less than what the law and the regulations of the Bureau required. On that basis the Federal Government would reimburse the State to the extent of 90 percent of the cost.

Mr. President, there is only one sound way for the Federal Government to undertake the construction of an Interstate System within the next 13 years, and that is upon the basis of determining need, and, having determined need, to make apportionment by way of reimbursement to the States upon contracts of construction which have been approved to the extent of 90 percent of the cost.

That is the position which the American Association of State Highway Officials takes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the policy statement of the American Association of State Highway Officials, appearing on page 73 of the House hearings of February and March 1956, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AASHO POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION, 1956—41ST ANNUAL MEETING, NEW ORLEANS, LA., DECEMBER 1955

The American Association of State Highway Officials urges the Congress to enact an expanded and adequate highway program early during the 2d session of the 84th Congress and to make funds authorized thereunder available for apportionment to the several States by July of 1956.

Further delay in taking action will cause additional critical traffic congestion and accidents, as well as create indecision at all levels of government in highway planning and construction and thereby materially retard the economy of the United States.

Any Federal-aid program authorized by the Congress should be administered by the Bureau of Public Roads and constructed by the State highway departments—a working relationship that has proved so successful over the past years.

An enlarged adequate highway program should indicate the intent of the Congress to construct the 40,000-mile Interstate System in not more than 15 years and to provide a progressive increase in the Federal aid to the secondary, urban, and primary systems. The initial authorization should be for a period of not less than 5 years.

The matching of funds for the construction of the Interstate System should be on a 90-percent Federal and 10-percent State basis, with the matching on the other systems as now provided under existing legislation.

A 20-percent transfer provision should be allowed between secondary, urban, and primary allocations to make the highway program flexible enough to meet the most pressing needs of the individual States.

Funds for the construction of the Interstate System should be initially apportioned on a basis of need as indicated by the section 13 study as reported by the Bureau of Public Roads, and as indicated by future successive needs estimates; such successive estimates to be made first in 1957 and in 5-year intervals thereafter. The apportionment to the other systems should be on the present basis.

The subjects of reimbursing for the moving of utilities from public highway rights-of-way, of labor relations and requirements, and of vehicle sizes and weights should not be included in Federal statute but should be matters to be determined at the State level.

It is recommended that the Congress give consideration to the dedication of more of the general fund to road construction in view of the Federal responsibility in the national defense system of highways.

Such additional revenues as may be needed in the judgment of Congress for financing an enlarged highway program could be obtained by using one or more of the following, and it is suggested that the Congress explore these possibilities:

(a) A reasonable increase in the present Federal motor-fuel tax.

(b) A reasonable tax or an increase in tax on items not now taxed by the States but that will serve as a measure of highway use.

(c) The reasonable use of short-term credit financing with due consideration to its effect upon the national debt limitation.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, that is the postion which the city officials in the United States take.

I ask unanimous consent that the testimony of a representative of the American Municipal Association, appearing on pages 123, 124, 125, and 126, of the hearings, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. BEN WEST, MAYOR OF NASHVILLE, TENN.

Mayor WEST. Mr. Chairman, my name is Ben West, and I am mayor of Nashville, Tenn. I appear here today on behalf of the American Municipal Association which represents 12,000 cities throughout the Nation. I speak both as vice president of this association and as chairman of its committee on highways.

First, I would like to thank the chairman and the members of this committee for giving us an opportunity to appear before you in executive session and present the views of the cities and towns on perhaps the most vital single problem facing our cities today—the problem of providing adequate highways in and around our traffic-choked urban areas.

There is no way to build roads that will be more expensive than not building them.

We believe that the need for highways is so overwhelming that it justifies almost any compromise to get started. We in the cities just cannot wait any longer. The situation is beyond being critical and is now approaching a point where "desperate" would be a more adequate word to describe our needs. We must have an adequate expanded highway bill in this session of Congress. To accomplish this, we believe that Congress should postpone for future consideration those aspects of the program that do not need to be settled immediately. Thus, in limiting the area of controversy to those matters that are essential to getting the program underway, Congress will greatly enhance the chances of a road bill becoming law in 1956.

When Congress adjourned the last session without having passed a national highway program, the American Municipal Association, along with millions of others, felt a deep sense of disappointment and frustration. We queried all the cities of the Nation of over 50,000 population to determine the effects of the failure of Congress to enact an adequate highway bill. The results of this query have been tabulated, and, Mr. Chairman, I request that this tabulation be made a part of the record of this hearing.

We also have on file the letters that are the basis for this tabulation. They are available to this committee.

In summary, this tabulation shows that in 85 cities, representing 38 States and the District of Columbia, 129 projects totaling an estimated $5,500 million are adversely affected by the failure of the expanded highway program to pass.

City after city reports that the delay will increase the costs of rights-of-way, in some cases as much as 10 times for each year of delay because private developers are constructing on the proposed routes.

Municipal planning for city streets and other projects such as urban renewal is at a standstill or proceeding at a snail's pace because there is no assurance of the extent of participation of the Federal Government in the Interstate System or the rate of participation. Cities cannot plan for connecting streets to an interstate highway that hasn't been planned and that may not be constructed for a generation.

Cities are rapidly coming to the end of the line as far as improving the traffic capacity of present city streets and highways is concerned. Yet the traffic counts continue to mount. During the past year we have not been able to even keep pace with the increased traffic of a single year to say nothing of the accumulated backlog. There has been a net increase of 3 million vehicles in the year since we appeared before you on this question in 1955. We are worse off today than we were only 1 year ago.

City officials are worried about the civil defense implications of present inadequate highways. They are concerned about the possibility of enemy attack and the new evacuation policy in the light of their positive knowledge that if it is nearly impossible to properly evacuate the evening business migration to the suburbs in a reasonable length of time, how can they evacuate the entire population of the city under an emergency situation.

City officials are also concerned about the appalling loss of life on inadequate traffic-choked city streets and highways. They look with envy to those very few cities that have constructed modern highways which are proving that properly engineered highways will greatly reduce the loss of life.

Cities are particularly interested in the Interstate System. Of the $25 billion Federal share for this system, an estimated $14 billion will be allocated for construction in urban sections. By our calculations, at the present rate of Federal contributions of $175 million per year and taking the total estimated cost of $25 billion for the entire Interstate System, it would take 143 years to construct the highways that we should have had years ago. It should also be borne in mind that because the highway problem within cities is so enormous and complicated, and because the available funds have been so small, no real start has been made on interstate construction within cities. A survey we have just completed of 24 States indicates, for example, that while 12 States report that they have used interstate funds within the corporate limits of cities, in 9 States they have not so used these funds. To cite a single example, in the State of Kansas, during the past 3 years, $6,524,007 has been spent on Federal-aid programs within the corporate limits of cities. Of this total, only $8,743 was spent on interstate projects. There are 94 miles of the Interstate System within urban areas of that State, and the estimated cost of these 94 miles is $39 million.

Our national municipal policy on an expanded national highway program is, I think, well known to the members of this committee. We unanimously adopted at our last American Municipal Congress a policy which represents the thinking of our 12,000 member cities. We ask for immediate action on an expanded Federal-aid highway program that will provide for the completion in the next 10 years of the Interstate Highway System while simultaneously maintaining the highest possible level of construction on the Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban systems. We ask for 90 percent Federal sharing on the Interstate System including the urban feeders and that such funds be made available to the States in such amounts and at such times as to meet the Federal pro rata share of all rights-of-way costs, including the cost of relocating publicly owned utilities.

As you can see from this policy statement, Chairman FALLON's bill, H. R. 8836, does not meet the wishes of cities in every respect. It provides for a 13-year construction program on the Interstate System, for example, instead of the 10-year program that we support. We do believe, however, that the urgency of this legislation is such that there must be compromise. In general, the Fallon bill meets the needs of the cities and towns and we pledge the support of this organization for this or a similar bill that will accomplish the same objectives.

We favor the construction of the interstate highways as a single system with each State receiving an amount of money necessary to complete those portion of the system within its boundaries. We have opposed for this large program the interstate allocation formula established in the 1945 Highway Act on the grounds that it provides too much money to some States and to little to others. It would not provide for the uniform construction of a system of highways. This same formula is contained in the Senate-passed Gore highway bill. We have felt that allocations for this system should be made on the basis of the needs study made by the State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads at the direction of Congress.

I might add in connection with Senator ALBERT GORE that we in the cities and towns appreciate the tremendous job that he and the members of his committee have done in trying to get adequate highways. That also applies to you, Chairman FALLON, and to the Representatives of this committee. You have all worked long and hard on this legislation. I'm sure that I speak for all municipalities when I say that your effort, interest and enthusiasm are greatly appreciated.

There is some question, however, of the adequacy of this needs study. Everyone will agree that it is difficult to make long-range estimates of highway costs in a nation as dynamic as this one. This is particularly true since there has been so little highway construction of this magniture, especially in the cities and towns. The engineers have very little experience on which to base an estimate. I reviewing the needs for the first 2 years of the interstate program, we find that regardless of whether the present formula or the needs study are used, no State will receive more or less money than it can program. We suggest therefore that either method of allocation be employed the first 2 years. At the end of that time, the Congress can review the program and in the light of actual experience determine the method or methods of allocation that will best accomplish the completion of the interstate highways as a system.

The present bill provides for reimbursements to States for sections of the Interstate System. As we understand it, in order to qualify for such reimbursement, the sections must meet the standards as determined by the Secretary of Commerce. It is our further understanding that no study has been made to determine the extent to which these highways that have been constructed will meet these standards. There is no estimate of the cost of this reimbursement. It has been estimated that there are 2,900 miles of toll roads alone, most of which are on the Interstate System and which were built at an estimated cost in excess of $4 billion. Again, we believe that reimbursement is a matter that could well be delayed pending a complete study by the Bureau of Public Roads to determine the extent to which the roads meet the interstate standard, the depreciated value of the roads and in the case of toll roads, the structures and interest charges which would not be reimbursable under the provision of the Fallon bill. Without discussing the merits of this question of reimbursements, a postponement of a decision pending receipt of accurate factual data would have several advantages. In the first place, it would postpone for awhile the question of increased revenue to cover the cost of reimbursement until experience with the program could give a clearer picture of actual construction costs and revenues from new taxes. It would also have the advantage of channeling the first moneys into highway construction rather than into bookkeeping transactions that in themselves would construct no roads. Section 8 (d) of the Fallon bill provides that such credits may be applied at the option of the State to construction on the Federal-aid primary system. Most of the mileage of the primary system is in rural areas and would not help the cities where traffic is heaviest.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a few days ago the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page 8816 and following, a number of statistical charts forwarded to him by C. D. Curtiss, Commissioner of Public Roads. With those statistical charts came a letter of transmittal, and a part of that letter of transmittal reads as follows:

You will see that there is considerable variation as would be expected due to differences in specifications used in different States, as well as differences in terrain, soil types, local materials, wage rates, traffic loads, and many other factors.

Mr. President, the Commissioner was talking about the estimates which the States of the Union had made under House Document No. 120 which the Congress required the Bureau of Public Roads to obtain in the 1954 highway legislation.

The Senator from South Dakota then indicated, and I think it was a logical indication for him to make, that the Commissioner of Public Roads took the position that different specifications were used in the different States.

I have here a letter from the Commissioner which I wish to read. It is addressed to me, and dated May 28, 1956:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS,
Washington, May 28, 1956.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: Reference is made to our telephone conversation relative to the estimates in the so-called section 13 report covering costs of completing the Interstate System in each State.

In my letter of May 18 to Senator CASE which is printed on page 8817 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 23, reference is made to the variation in the estimates "* * * due to difference in specifications used in different States * * *." It is apparent to me now that this paragraph is open to different interpretations. Actually the specifications and design standards used were such as to be adequate in the States where used for the estimated traffic. There would necessarily be a difference in cost from one section of the country to another—even in different sections in the same State where there were widely differing climatic,

soil, and traffic conditions. Also, because of 2-lane, 4- and 6-lane sections of the Interstate System.

The section 13 report required an estimate of the cost of bringing to adequate conditions of improvement all the highways and streets in the United States, approximating 3,300,000 miles. Obviously it was not possible in the time available to make this estimate with the same care and attention to details as would be the case in connection with the estimates of the cost of completing the 40,000-mile Interstate System called for in the Fallon bill as it passed the House.

Knowing that there appeared to be variations in the accuracy of the estimates, and also because the 2,300 miles of circumferential and distributing routes in urban areas were not included in the section 13 report as part of the Interstate System since this mileage had not been designated at the time, we strongly urged in our appearance before the House Committee on Public Works that reappraisals be made of the cost from time to time. With each new appraisal being used as the basis for further apportionments, a formula based on needs is sound and the only basis on which a reasonably uniform rate among the States of completing the Interstate System can be accomplished.

Trusting this will give you the desired information, I am

Sincerely yours,

C. D. CURTISS,
Commissioner of Public Roads.

Mr. President, I should like to repeat that last statement, which is very important:

With each new appraisal being used as the basis for further apportionments, a formula based on needs is sound, and the only basis on which a reasonably uniform rate among the States of completing the Interstate System can be accomplished.

That is the statement of the Commissioner of Roads. We have heard from representatives of State governments in America, we have heard from representatives of city governments in America, and we have heard from representatives of the Government of the United States, and they all agree that the only sound and realistic manner of doing this job in a given period of time is to make Federal apportionments on a basis of cost—a basis of need.

Mr. President, it seems to me it is irrelevant to talk about applying the historic Federal apportionment formula to a job that is to be done in 13 years. There is a fundamental difference between historic Federal participation in highway construction and what we have before us at this time. I submit, Mr. President, that the Senate Public Works Committee was wrong in scrapping the House bill and in substituting an apportionment which never was intended to build an Interstate System in 13 years, 15 years, or 10 years, or any period of years.

Last year the Senate Public Works Committee considered the testimony of General Clay and the members of his commission. I very much regret that the Senate Public Works Committee refused to approve the recommendations of the Clay Commission when the bill was fashioned in our committee. It was fashioned by our able brethren who served on the committee, and the majority of them saw the problem differently from the view which I take, and which the Federal, State, and city governmental representatives take.

When the bill came to the Senate last year I think I describe it accurately when I say it was merely a more generous continuation of the old historic means of Federal road apportionment to the States, and in that form it passed the Senate.

The House of Representatives this year held, through its Public Works Committee, painstaking and careful hearings on the broad subject.

Representative FALLON and his brethren on the committee wanted to do a good piece of work. They wanted Congress to pass legislation which would provide for the new Interstate System within a given period of time. They faced up to the problem of paying for it realistically, and they provided for increased taxes in a number of Federal revenue laws.

The House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed the bill, as I have said, in two parts, one providing that the Federal Government have the work done on the basis of needs, regardless of where the interstate highways were located; the second part provided for an increase in revenue.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. In a few moments.

Now the Senate is asked to throw out what the House has done. There are parts of the House bill which I believe could be improved; but I do not believe the Senate could improve upon the manner in which the House bill apportions Federal funds for the Interstate System on the basis of need. The House bill realistically provides that at the end of 2 years a restudy of the needs shall be made by the Bureau of Public Roads, subject to the approval of the two Public Works Committees of Congress, and that this shall be the basis for reapportionment thereafter until, as the bill provides, a third, a fourth, and a fifth reestimate of needs shall be undertaken by the Bureau of Public Roads. That is a well-done piece of legislation.

I believe we shall be doing a tragic disservice to the people of America if we abandon the work which the House of Representatives has done, and seek to apply to a situation which has never occurred before in road construction a historic method of apportionment which does not face up, confessedly, to the Federal responsibility of Federal construction in a given 13-year period, so as to provide the people of America with a modern and efficient system of interstate highways across the country. I shall have more to say on this subject later, if I shall be permitted to speak on it, but I wish to make one more comment now.

Some objection has been made to the table of needs, which appears in House Document No. 120, and which represents the estimates of the 48 States of the Union. I throw out this idea for Senators to think about, if they will take a moment to do so. Would Senators favor an amendment to provide that the Bureau of Public Roads, during the first 2-year period, should determine the needs on the basis of costs as the Bureau would find them to be? If so, it might well be that there could be a meeting of the minds on that point. It might well be that a majority of Senators could agree upon that type of suggestion. To that extent, we would eliminate the argument advanced this morning, namely, that some States were unrealistic in arriving at their estimates of needs. I hope we shall be able to compose these differences, because it will be a sorry day for the people of the United States if the Senate junks the House-approved bill and then fails realistically to write a bill which will give us what all Senators know the people of the United States demand.

Mr. COTTON and Mr. JENNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield first to the Senator from New Hampshire, who previously asked me to yield; then I shall yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COTTON. I wish to ask the Senator from California one question. But, first, I compliment the Senator on the excellent speech he has just made. It is only a continuance of the masterly contribution he has made toward solving the problem throughout its consideration by the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. If I understood the Senator correctly a few moments ago, he said that the estimates in the House bill could not possibly, in the long run, operate to the disadvantage of any State, because the procedure would be that the State would consider its needs and its costs and would submit its estimates to the Bureau of Public Roads. The Bureau would approve the estimates, the highways would be built on the basis of cost, and the result would be the same regardless of the apparent inconsistencies or inequalities of the estimates in the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. COTTON. This is the point of my question. The Senator based his statement on the fact that, as he said, the bill provides standards. The standards will be established by the Bureau of Public Roads, and they will be uniform in every State.

Is it not true that the standards have to do with the surfacing and the quality of the highways? They do not necessarily specify in advance what the States shall have or what given sections shall have, or whether there shall be 2-lane, 4-lane, or 6-lane highways on a given stretch. Is not that correct?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is correct. In other words, the Fallon bill as I see it, expresses it to be the intent of Congress that the system shall be the same throughout the country so far as the standards are concerned. It is true that in some parts of the country a 6-lane highway will be necessary, while in some of the wide open spaces a 4-lane highway, or even a 2-lane highway, might be necessary. But the level of construction, the type of construction, and the standard of construction for

each of the given types of highway would be the same wherever highways were built, as I interpret the language.

Mr. COTTON. But the point which I want to raise—I think it is an important point, and it is one on which I find myself in disagreement with the Senator from California—is that those standards are minimum standards only. They have to do with the quality, rather than the type of highway or the number of lanes. Consequently, if the preliminary estimates taken from the various States and written, I claim, hastily and in a haphazard fashion into the House bill, continue for 2 years, and then, when they are threshed out, a compromise will result, and in some measure the hasty estimates will be frozen into the law. I cannot agree with the Senator's assertion that it is impossible that any State should suffer ultimately in the amount, or the number of lanes or the quality of its highways, because of inaccuracies of the estimates in the House bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. I will state why I said that. This system is contemplated to be built in 13 years, not in 2 years. So in the first 2 years, under the House bill, the various States would ask the Bureau of Public Roads for approval of specific contracts. The approval would be given, the contracts would be left, and construction would be undertaken. Claims for reimbursement would be lodged with the Bureau of Public Roads. The Bureau would audit what had been done and would then authorize reimbursement in whole or in part.

At the end of 2 years, the Bureau of Public Roads, under the House bill, would be required to submit a new estimate of needs to complete the system.

Its approval by the two committees would be in effect until a third estimate was required to be presented to the Congress, and then the fourth estimate, and then the fifth estimate, and so on.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator for his patience. I wish to bring out one more point, if he will permit. I agree with what I understood to be his last statement, that a cost arrangement is preferable to any formula, but I still want the RECORD to show that I must differ with the Senator to an extent in his analysis of the effects of the House bill. If a good, lush stretch, a 4- or 6-lane highway, were started, on the 2-year basis, in a State which perhaps did not require it, either because of the amount of traffic or the population, it would still have to be completed in subsequent years.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. With regard to the Senator's point about a 2-lane or 4-lane or 6-lane highway, that is an automatic proposition. That will be determined by an actual traffic count, and so forth. Is that correct?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JENNER. Therefore, no State can take advantage of that.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JENNER. So far as the House version and the Senate committee version of the bill are concerned, I think one thing should be pointed out, and I want to know whether or not this is correct. For example, some States may estimate that they need $100 million, but under the Gore formula, may get $270 million. If they do not spend the money, it does not go back to the general fund for the benefit of States which will need the money to make the system uniform and complete. But under the Gore proposal, it is provided that the States can take 20 percent of the money allocated to them and use it on secondary roads. So what would be happening? Instead of the money being spent on the Interstate Highway System, the taxpayers of the country would be paying for the construction of secondary roads in some States. In addition to that, under the Gore formula, some States might complete the Interstate Highway System in 5 years, but other States will hardly get started in 5 years. So the formula is not fair under any analysis.

Mr. KUCHEL. Will the Senator agree with me there may be those who may be in favor of the Gore proposal, not because they are interested in an Interstate System, but because they are interested in something else?

Mr. JENNER. Of course, and their argument cannot stand.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield? I should like to ask him a question.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Inasmuch as under the Gore proposal, many of the States will get far more than they can possibly use, does not the Senator think that they will be able, under the language of the proposal, to take 20 percent of the funds, provided they match the funds on a 50–50 basis, and build secondary and primary roads? Talk about a pork-barrel bill; we would have it in the so-called Gore amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. I will say to the Senator, and he may speak later for himself in the debate, one of the States of one of our brethren would, under the Senate Public Works Committee formula, receive three times as much money as the people of that State asked for, and to that brother's eternal credit, he will stand on the floor and vote in favor of the House-approved measure.

Mr. CAPEHART. Which provides that the State cannot possibly use that amount of money.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Other States will take 20 percent of the total amount allocated, match it with 50 percent of their own funds, and build secondary and primary roads. Is that the reason why so many are in favor of the so-called Gore amendment, or is it for another reason?

Mr. KUCHEL. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Indiana has made a very excellent point about the 20-percent proviso with regard to the reallocating of the money to roads other than in the interstate system. Some of it may be used, and some of it may not, because the money will have to be used on a 50–50 matching basis. For that reason, I think much of the money may not be used. But is it not true that the money which was not used would remain in the Federal Treasury; that it would be a part of the highway fund, and could be used only for that purpose? Therefore, under the proposal of the Senator from Tennessee we shall end up with approximately $4½ billion which must remain in the highway fund and cannot be used.

Mr. KUCHEL. My friend from Connecticut has added another telling argument to that which the Senator from Indiana has made. The proposal would take more money away from the American taxpayer, but, under the proposal of the Senator from Tennessee, the money would be sequestered in the Treasury and remain unavailable.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. What the Senator has stated is exactly true. This is exactly what is going to happen. Because the money will be in the fund, earmarked, and unavailable for any other purpose, there will be pressure on the Congress for an extension of the 40,000-mile Interstate Highway System. Some of the State systems will be completed, and the officials of those States will say, "We have the money, so we are going to build another new highway." There will be requests for extensions of the systems because the money will be available. In the meantime, in many States there will be gaps in the system, with the result that there will not be an Interstate Highway System.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I proposed to offer, and I ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from California will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the pending bill comes to the Senate as the result of long study, exhaustive hearings, and extensive consideration. The debate which has transpired thus far today has been very helpful, and in some respects obviates the necessity——

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senate yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. GORE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message anounced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 767. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 1111. An act to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 1883. An act for the relief of Pietro Rodolfo Walter Stulin and Renate Karolina Horky;

S. 1970. An act for the relief of Kim Boksoon and Anke Naber;

S. 2822. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer approximately 9 acres of land in the Hualapai Indian Reservation, Ariz., to School District No. 8, Mohave County, Ariz.;

H. R. 4656. An act relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina;

H. R. 7678. An act to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibitions at the Eleventh Annual Instrument-Automation (International) Conference and Exhibit, New York, N. Y., and the Americas' New Frontiers Exposition, to be held at Oklahoma City, Okla., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9429. An act to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF MAYORS AND OTHER CITY OFFICIALS FROM THE STATE OF SAO PAULO, BRAZIL

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that there are seated in the gallery 50 mayors and other city officials from some 20 cities in the state of Sao Paulo, Brazil, who are visiting the Capital of the United States. They are here under the sponsorship of the Department of State in order to study municipal governments and problems of municipal governments in a number of States in this country.

I ask the gentlemen to rise and receive a welcome from the Senate.

[The members of the delegation rose in their places and were greeted with applause, Senators rising.]

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10660) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to the amendment of the Committee on Public Works, on page 49, after line 24.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received a series of telegrams from my State in support of the Magnuson amendment, which seeks to exempt from the tax provisions of the highway bill, so far as the gas tax is concerned, operators who use equipment on private roads.

I think the Magnuson amendment is a sound amendment. It certainly is in keeping with my understanding as to the purpose of the tax features of the highway bill, namely, that taxes go to help to pay for public highways.

It seems to me that the owners of private equipment, such as logging trucks, for example, who use their equipment on their own roads, stand in a position analogous to that of a farmer using his tractor in his own fields. I think it is unfair and unjust to impose upon them an additional tax.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a series of telegrams which I have received on this subject. I serve notice that unless it can be shown to me that there is some unsoundness in the logic of these telegrams, I intend to vote in accordance with the position taken by these constituents.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUREKA, CALIF., *May 26, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Reference H. R. 10660, highway tax bill. Urgently request you lend favorable ear to Senator MAGNUSON'S amendment, upon which action is scheduled Monday or Tuesday, to eliminate discrimination against logging trucks and provide for tax refund for use of privately owned or maintained roads based on proportionate mileage formula. Your favorable consideration appreciated.

JACK FAIRHURST,
Vice president and general manager, Fairhurst Mill Co. and Fairhurst Lumber Company of California and California Eastern Timber Co., Trinity National Lumber Corp., Los Angeles Lumber, Inc., Athena Mill Co., and Oregon Western Timber Co.

JUNCTION CITY, OREG., *May 26, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I sincerely urge you to give Senator MAGNUSON your full support on his proposed amendment to highway user tax bill, H. R. 10660. It is imperative that the lumber industry be given equitable nondiscriminatory treatment in the application of this proposed bill as provided for under Senator MAGNUSON'S amendment. We approve the basic premise of H. R. 10660 in that the users of public highways should stand the major costs of their construction. However, it would seem to be extremely unjust to impose this additional burden upon the users of private logging roads which have been constructed with private capital and are used primarily by off-highway equipment.

Sincerely,

NILS B. HULT.
HULT LUMBER CO.

MEDFORD, OREG., *May 26, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you support Magnuson floor amendment on H. R. 10660 to eliminate discrimination against logging trucks and provide tax refunds for private road use and maintenance.

KOGAP LUMBER INDUSTRIES.
SOLAR LUMBER CORP.
OFFORD LOGGING CO.

SPRINGFIELD, OREG., *May 26, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: Urge favorable action on Senator MAGNUSON'S amendment to eliminate discrimination against logging trucks and provide for tax refunds for use of privately owned roads based on proportionate mileage formula in connection with highway use tax bill H. R. 10660.

Owners of off-highway type of equipment are already contributing to the solving of the highway problem and should not again be taxed for the same purpose.

Trusting you will support this logical and fair amendment,

Yours truly,

ELIOT H. JENKINS,
President, the Booth-Kelly Lumber Co.

SALEM, OREG., *May 26, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate your effort to change the distribution formula of the interstate highway legislation back to House version. Final vote expected Tuesday in Senate. Please wire me Monday if you can support this change.

R. H. BALDOCK.

LONGVIEW, WASH.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge your active support to Senator MAGNUSON'S floor amendment on highway user tax bill, H. R. 10660, eliminating discrimination against forest products industries using logging trucks on privately owned and maintained logging roads. Such operators should not be required to pay unfair highway taxes when trucking over their own road systems.

THE LONG BELL LUMBER CO.,
J. D. LELAND, *President.*

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unaniconsent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the minority leader and myself, I send to the desk a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The legislative clerk read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Tuesday, May 29, 1956, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 10660) the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 and the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator on any amendment, motion, or appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand, the Senator's program would be to have the Senate meet tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. And the Senate would stay in session this evening if Senators had more prolonged speeches to make on the bill than they could not make tomorrow under the proposed limitation of debate; is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct; and I previously assured the Senator from California that we would stay in session late this evening, if necessary.

Mr. KNOWLAND. And that the Senate would not reach the voting stage on the bill until tomorrow; is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate and also the bill which passed the House of Representatives, for which the pending bill is recommended as a substitute, maximizes the concept of a greatly improved Interstate Highway System. An interstate highway concept is not new; indeed, the Interstate Highway System was created in 1944. It was 2 years ago that Congress, upon the recommendation of the Committee on Public Works, then under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], recommended a large increase in the authorization of funds for the Interstate System. It was then that the Committee on Public Works recommended that the authorization of funds for interstate highways be increased from $25 million a year to $175 million a year. It was at the same time that the bill recommended to the Senate by the Committee on Public Works directed the Secretary of Commerce to make an extensive study of the Interstate Highway System and to report the result of its study to Congress.

Thereafter, President Eisenhower appointed a commission, under the chairmanship of Gen. Lucius Clay, which also made a study. The facts show that the study of the Clay Commission was in large part based upon the compilation of reports and statistics collected by the Department of Commerce in conformity with the directive contained in the act of 1954.

By reciting this legislative history I would not wish to be understood in any way as undertaking to diminish the credit to which I believe President Eisenhower and General Clay are rightfully entitled for the service rendered in this field.

Were it not for the public opinion which was generated as a result of the Clay report, and were it not for the overall study and report which that Commission made, I doubt that Congress would this year, as I said of the bill last year, be considering a bill of such magnitude as the one which is before the Senate today. There is room for credit for all. And there is a challenge sufficient for the talents of all.

Mr. President, this is the largest peacetime measure from the standpoint of fiscal outlay that Congress has ever considered. It involves the construction of a magnificent system of interstate highways, interconnecting all of America's principal cities. When completed, it will be the object of national pride and will afford greater safety in highway traffic, and more rapid and efficient movement of highway transportation, and thus add to the social, economic, and cultural attainments of the United States.

The Interstate Highway System, however, is not all that is included in the pending bill. From the beginning of the consideration of this subject last year, the Senate Committee on Public Works has repeatedly expressed the desire and the intent of providing a balanced highway program. A highway program cannot be balanced if we place all added emphasis on the Interstate System, There are other very important roads, such as the Federal-aid primary highways. In some States there are Federal-aid primary highways which carry more traffic than does the interstate highway. Therefore, Mr. President, we cannot ignore the primary Federal-aid highway system. Those roads are far greater in mileage than are the interstate highways, and they carry more traffic than do the interstate highways, measured alone.

Neither can we overlook the urban extensions of the primary or secondary roads. Therefore, the bill before the Senate, recommended by the Senate Public Works Committee, would increase the Federal aid for the three categories of highways, primary, secondary, and urban from $700 million a year to $900 million a year.

Mr. President, I now come to the first difference between the bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate committee bill.

The House bill would increase Federal aid for primary, secondary, and urban roads next year only from $700 million to $725 million. The House bill would provide further increases of $25 million for 1958 and 1959. In other words, for 3 years, the House bill provides for urban, primary, and secondary highways $725 million for the fiscal year 1957, $750 million for fiscal 1958, and $775 million for fiscal 1959.

Mr. President, those amounts may be adequate for some States. Indeed, a few States have indicated that the amounts for those particular highways will be adequate. But we find them inadequate for Federal aid to this category of highways in other States.

What does the Senate committee bill provide for primary, secondary, and urban highways? It provides not a 3-year program, but a 5-year program. Each year Federal aid would be provided to the extent of $900 million. The House bill would provide only for a 3-year program for this category of highways; the Senate committee bill provides for a 5-year program. The House bill contains an additional provision declaring it to be the legislative intent to increase the authorizations for this category of highways by $25 million a year for 10 years following this 3-year period.

Mr. President, a legislative intent declared by the present Congress has no meaning in law and will have no meaning in law unless a succeeding Congress enacts legislation giving effect to the intent. It is not known what a future Congress may do.

Therefore, Mr. President, we must measure the provisions of the House bill as they really are—a 3-year authorization provision for primary, secondary, and urban highways.

We must likewise measure the Senate committee bill for what it provides—a 5-year program for primary, secondary, and urban highways.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the portion of the bill to which the Senator is addressing his remarks has not received as much attention as it deserves. So much attention has been focused on the interstate highway provisions of the bill that there is a tendency to overlook the fact that the bill as reported by the Senate committee contemplates, as the Senator from Tennessee has said, keeping the other road programs in balance. I am particularly glad the Senator has called attention to the A–B–C roads, the primary, secondary and urban sections.

I wish to invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that, in spite of all that has been said about the inadequacies or inaccuracies and variations in estimating by several States, they know much more about estimating the cost of completing the primary, secondary, and urban system than the so-called interstate system. The reason for that is that they have more experience in building roads. Another reason is that they match on a 50–50 basis, generally speaking, for the primary, secondary, and urban roads. Consequently, they are much more concerned with accuracy in estimating for those roads than they are where they think Uncle Sam will pay 90 percent of the cost.

But, having said that there may be some inaccuracies in the estimates, it must be remembered that section 13 of the 1954 act called upon the Department of Commerce to get the same kind of reports on the completion of these three categories as on the interstate system, and, consequently, we do have the figures which they supplied for the completion of the primary, secondary, and urban roads.

Much has been said about the necessity for starting on a program whose completion will be assured. Having composed the language which became section 13 of the Highway Act of 1954, I know that the intent was to get the data which would make it possible to complete all the roads, and that is borne out by the language of section 13. Unless we augment the authorization for the primary, secondary, and urban systems, they will not be completed in any foreseeable period of years.

The amount proposed in the Senate committee bill is a figure which will make it possible to complete the primary, secondary, and urban system in 25 years, if the estimate is accurate. But I submit that the 25-year figure should be contrasted with the 13-year figure about which we are talking. I hope Senators will keep that in mind. Unless we increase the authorization for primary, secondary, and urban roads to the figures proposed in the Senate version of the bill, there will not be sufficient funds to complete those systems even in 25 years.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has called attention to the inadequacies of even the Senate committee bill with respect to the primary, secondary, and urban roads. I have deliberately chosen to discuss this particular phase of the bill at this point because the preceding debate has been entirely upon the Interstate System.

I should like to inquire of the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota if he is familiar with the estimates of the costs to complete primary, secondary, and urban highways, as contained in the Clay report, that is, to bring them to a condition of adequacy?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Reasonably so.

Mr. GORE. For the benefit of the Senate, the Clay report may be found on pages 6 and 7 of House Document No. 120. If the Senator from South Dakota will be so kind as to refer to that report, he will find that the Clay report estimates a need for $30 billion in order to bring the primary Federal-aid highways to a satisfactory condition.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. Yet enactment of the House bill would for the next 3 years increase the amount of Federal aid available to the 3 categories of highways by only $25 million annually.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct. Of course, it should be kept in mind, in interpreting the Clay figures, that those estimates are for the completion of the system; and the funds for those categories are matched on a 50–50 basis, so as to determine the Federal share necessary for meeting the estimate. Presumably the States would contribute 50 percent of the cost, and the Federal Government would contribute 50 percent. But, at that, it will take at least 25 years, under the augmented figures of the Senate committee bill, to accomplish the completion of these systems.

Mr. GORE. I should like to point out to the Senator one additional fact. When a request was made to the States to submit their estimates of cost for completion, they were asked to submit estimates on the Interstate System to handle the traffic of 1974. But for the primary, urban, and secondary systems—

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That was to bring them up to date.

Mr. GORE. It was 1964, I believe.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In any event, it was not the 30-year period.

Mr. GORE. In other words, it was the 10-year period from 1954 to 1964.

Therefore, I submit to the Senate that although the Senate committee bill makes a vigorous attempt to provide additional Federal aid to the primary, secondary, and urban highways, it is still inadequate, but is far better than the provisions of the House bill.

I point out once again, as I did a year ago repeatedly, that only one-seventh of the Nation's traffic travels on interstate highways. We cannot ignore the other Federal-aid highways, and we must not. We cannot ignore them if we expect to have a balanced highway program. Therefore, I point out that one of the first differences between the House bill and the Senate committee bill to which the Senate will want to give consideration in deciding which it will support is the difference in the level of Federal aid to primary, secondary, and urban highways.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In that connection, it seems to me the RECORD should contain a notation of the percentage of distribution which is proposed between the different categories of roads.

Historically, in Federal-aid highway legislation we have apportioned 45 percent of the total amount to ABC, 30 percent to secondary, and 25 percent to urban highways.

The Interstate System in reality is a part of the primary system. The House figures contemplate taking the money which would be available for the ABC roads, and apportioning it still under the old formula, notwithstanding the fact that there would be selected and set aside 40,000 miles of primary system roads, which would be called interstate, and given up to $2,200,000,000 a year.

That is, after having given the primary roads this great augmentation for the benefit of the section designated as the Interstate System, it is proposed in the House bill to come back and give the primary roads 45 percent of the amount apportioned to the ABC roads.

The Senate committee bill, on the other hand, recommends that the primary system get an extra largess through the interstate funds and apportions $400 million, $300 million, and $200 million, which is roughly 44 percent, 33 percent, and 22 percent, respectively, thus giving a little more emphasis to the secondary roads and the urban roads, although still giving 44 percent to the primary system which remains after taking out the Interstate System.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

I wish to point out one additional factor with respect to the urban extensions. The very fact that the Interstate System is to be constructed with its relocation circumferentially around large municipalities creates problems for the urban interconnections and creates a greater need for Federal aid to urban highways, which I do not think the provisions of the House bill at all recognize or could possibly meet. I have some doubt that the provisions of the Senate committee bill are adequate in that regard.

I do not wish to dwell at great length upon this matter, because there are a number of other differences between the two bills which in the course of my remarks I shall undertake to set forth, in order that Senators who may listen to the debate or who may read it in the RECORD tomorrow can have a clear, clean-cut decision to make as between the two bills.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Tennessee has just mentioned the need for the urban connections, as to which I think we are all in accord. I believe testimony was presented to the Committee on Finance that 55 percent of the funds which we are allocating in the trust fund for the Interstate System will be spent within cities or in what are called urban areas. Can the Senator give the Senate any information about that?

Mr. GORE. A large part of the Interstate System will be through and around the municipal centers. That, however, does not forestall the need for urban interconnections between the newly located highways and the existing primary and secondary routes coming into and going out from the municipalities, into which and around which the interstate system will be built.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I am in accord with what the Senator has just said about the need for connections on the Interstate System, which was laid out some years ago. The amendment written into the bill by the Committee on Finance, enlarging the system by 2,500 miles in order to take care of newly and urgently needed connections, is important because, as I understand, 39,990 miles of the Interstate System actually were laid out, leaving only about 100 miles which would be available for distribution to new defense locations which want to connect with the Interstate System.

Therefore, the Committee on Finance, in section 111, increased the mileage by 2,500, thus giving the Bureau of Public Roads, and the States something on which to work in trying to determine the amount of the increase needed to take care of situations where new defense industries or other industries want to be included in the system. Having served as the Governor of my State, I may say that the State highway commission of Kansas was given leeway to shift some of the mileage in the State. I do not think it can be tied down tightly. I am in accord with what the Senator has said so far as the urban roads are concerned, but I think the addition of 2,500 miles will not be sufficient to provide the needs of various States. For instance, in my own State there are communities which should be on the Interstate System. If we limit it to 40,000 miles, they never will be.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Kansas has pointed up another difference between the House bill and the Senate committee bill, to which I shall presently come. However, I wish to suggest to him that in doing so he has also pointed up the need—the imperative need—for providing additional funds for urban interconnections. As the Senator has pointed out, all of the 40,000 interstate mileage has been designated. That being true, when a circumferential route is built around a city and there is no mileage which can be designated as interstate, so as to build the urban interconnections and through routes, then on what do we rely? We can rely only on funds provided for the urban system. Yet the House bill provides only $25 million additional money, not only for urban, but also for secondary and primary roads; not only for interconnections, but for all purposes.

I say that the Senate will want to consider that fact. We must have a balanced highway program. I cannot say that the Senate committee bill is perfect. Of course not. But it represents the result of the longest hearings a committee of Congress ever held in regard to highway legislation. The bill came from the committee with bipartisan support. The amendment was recommended by the Senate Public Works Committee as a substitute for the House bill by a vote of 11 to 2.

I now come to the second difference between the two proposals, to which the Senator from Kansas has already referred.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I was thinking of the State of Montana, where there are cities such as Miles City, Missoula, and the largest city in the State, Great Falls. Does the Senator really believe that 2,500 miles are ample to take care of connections between such cities?

Mr. GORE. No; I do not. I believe the committee may have erred in failing to increase to a greater extent the interstate mileage. A very good case was made, and can be made, for increasing the interstate mileage to 48,000. The committee decided to recommend an increase of 2,500 miles, making the total 42,500 miles. I believe that is inadequate. It will, however, take care of some pressing needs, particularly in and around municipalities and for connections of some of the principal cities which are not now connected by interstate highways.

But I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the House bill provides for no increase whatsoever. So as between the Senate proposal and the House proposal, I would say 42,500 miles, though inadequate, is to be preferred to 40,000 miles.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The point which the able Senator from North Dakota has raised is of special interest to me. If the Senator will examine the map at the back of the Chamber, he will note that there is a designation for a route from the Canadian line to Fargo, where it joins the East-West Highway and there terminates. At the same time there is a north-south road which goes from Kansas City up to Sioux Falls and there terminates. Anyone who will look at the map will have to agree that it would be logical to continue the route from Sioux Falls, S. Dak., north to Fargo, N. Dak.

I know the State Highway Commission of North Dakota in requesting the Bureau of Public Roads to consider that as an additional designation. It is not logical to have a road go from Fargo to the Canadian border. This does not connect any States. It should go south from Fargo to Sioux Falls, S. Dak. I know that anyone looking at the map will notice that there is a great distance, between the Twin Cities and some point in western Montana or Idaho, where there is no north-south route. The logical conclusion would be to extend the road, which runs south from the Canadian border to Fargo, to Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and then from Sioux Falls to Kansas City.

Mr. LANGER. I agree with the Senator from South Dakota. There has been a need for years for a north-south road in that area.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. One of the purposes of the Interstate System supposedly was to connect State capitals. Even though North Dakota and South Dakota are sister States, and originally belonged to the same Territory, there is not any north or south connection between the two States. Neither is there any connection between the State capitals.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. With reference to a road from the Canadian border south, does not the U. S. Route 57 start on the Canadian border and go through the Dakotas, Colorado, and eventually to El Paso?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think Route No. 85 does.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Route No. 85.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Route No. 85 and Route No. 83 do, but those are on the primary systems. They are not on the Interstate System, and consequently do not have a very high standard of development or very high priority.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Is it not true that it will probably be necessary, every 2 or 4 years, to make a resurvey and add interstate mileage, because the population in the United States will shift? There will be a greater concentration of population in places that we do not think of at the present time. Does not the Senator believe it will be necessary to make a resurvey and probably add to the Interstate System every 2 or 4 years?

Mr. GORE. I agree with the Senator.

I should like to say to the Senate that it was in recognition of that point of view, which was advanced in the committee by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, that the committee decided to recommend an increase in Interstate System of 2,500 miles. The committee did not reach, as I recall, any determination that the 2,500 miles would be sufficient for any given period of time, but felt it was necessary for the immediate and foreseeable future. I agree thoroughly with the Senator that, even if the 2,500 additional miles is agreed to and written into the bill, within the next 2 or 4 years the Congress will be reconsidering and reexamining that particular phase of the law.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Is that not also a very good reason to review the allocation of interstate highway money and to review the whole road program probably every 2 or every 4 years?

Mr. GORE. It is one of the reasons, but there are many more.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. There are many more reasons.

Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I should like to say it is my recollection that there are six State capitals which are not on the Interstate System. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. I am not advised of the correctness of that statement at the moment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is approximately correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I know there are several State capitals that are not on the Interstate System.

There are also a great number of communities with a population of 50,000 and more that are not on the Interstate System.

Mr. GORE. Yes; there are several of those.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. We have been referring to various sections of the country. We feel there should be a road from some point in western Pennsylvania, south to Florida, because so many of the people of Pennsylvania take such a trip at the present time, and today there is no direct interstate road from western Pennsylvania to Florida. In the future I believe we shall have to give consideration to such matters.

But, Mr. President, it seems to me that at the present time we have a very good approach to the problem. However, all of us must agree that in the very near future, and probably very often in the future, it will be necessary to make resurveys, because our population and the number of motor vehicles using the roads probably will increase much more rapidly than we estimate at the present time.

Mr. GORE. In other words, if I may ask a question of the Senator from Pennsylvania, like the junior Senator from Tennessee, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania thinks that if the committee erred, it was in not going a little farther; is that correct?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Yes, I think that is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think the Senator from Tennessee will recall that last year, when the bill was under consideration and discussion in the Senate, it was the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] who led a considerable portion of the debate regarding the addition of 2,500 miles to the Interstate System.

Mr. GORE. Yes, and I recall that the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] also contributed ably.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy. We appreciate very much the part the junior Senator from Tennessee played in that connection.

A brief examination of the map will indicate quite adequately one of the great, fundamental defects of the present system; namely, that in Colorado, although we have one north-and-south route, and although Highways 6 and 24 end in Denver, yet between the great western portion of the State of Colorado and into Salt Lake City, the needed, vital connection has no designation whatever. The Senator from Pennsylvania is pointing to it on the map at this time. In addition, the designation of Highway 30 and Highway 60, to the south, has put the State in what actually is an unfair economic position, although we do not wish to say or to imply that either of those highways is unnecessary. They are necessary, and they should not be disturbed.

However, I merely wished to make the point here; and the Senator from Tennessee will recall that at the hearings on the bill during 1955, former United States Senator Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado, as well as the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and many others, appeared and, I believe, were the first among those who pointed out the need for additional highways to the Interstate Federal System.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. GORE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does not the Senator from Colorado know that the best way to reach Salt Lake City from Denver, particularly in the case of tourists traveling on the interstate highways, is to go by way of Cheyenne, over the Lincoln Highway? [Laughter.]

Mr. ALLOTT. If I were going to do it, I could not possibly avoid looking at the beautiful scenery in Colorado. Of course I admire very much the Senator's State of Wyoming, and I wish to say that we have no quarrel as to either Highway 30 or Highway 60. As we see it, both of them are necessary links in the Interstate System. But if the Interstate System is going to be complete, then the great paradise which is western Colorado should not be deprived of an interstate road.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is the Senator from Colorado speaking of the paradise in the form of the proposed tunnel through the Rocky Mountains?

Mr. ALLOTT. Of course I do not know whether that tunnel when completed, will be a paradise or not.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his courtesy in yielding.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Colorado for the contribution he has made.

Mr. President, I recall the debate of last year. There are many areas where additional mileage on the Interstate System is needed. I am sure that when the Senator from Colorado referred to the need in his State, he did not do so to the exclusion of the need in other States, or did not intend to do so. In the case of the Interstate System, there are many such needs; and as the Interstate System is constructed as envisioned under this bill, there will be more needs.

I say that because relocations of routes to the extent of as much as 70 percent in some cases are contemplated. As the Senator from Colorado knows, and as the former governor of the State of Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] knows, when a highway is relocated, there are created innumerable needs for the relocation of other highways, particularly in areas adjacent to municipal centers.

So the construction of this highway will bring about a need for the designation of many additional miles of highway; and I dare say that will be true in the case of every State in the Union. Of course I could with some pleasure and anticipation stake out a claim for some additional mileage on the Interstate System within the State which in part I have the honor and privilege of representing.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield further to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am sure the Senator from Tennessee would be justified in doing what he has suggested. He has correctly stated my position, which is that I do not feel that what I have proposed should be done to the exclusion of the needs of other areas. Certainly there are definite needs. That is why the Senate in its wise discretion—and I think the Senate acted wisely—made provision for the addition of 2,500 miles, last year. That was not to the exclusion of other mileage, because there is need for other circumferential highways, connecting links, and so forth. I merely wished to call attention to this fact.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I rise to commend the committee for providing the additional mileage, because, as has been demonstrated in the course of the colloquy on the floor of the Senate, not only is there a demand for increased mileage, but there is also definite need to increase it so as to make certain connections. When that is done, I think we must bear in mind that that will place an additional burden upon the funds.

For the RECORD, I should like to point out that when the increase was made from 40,000 to 42,500 miles—and now I read from pages 17 and 18 of the report of the Senate Committee on Finance:

> This additional 2,500 miles (as well as any other authorizations in the future) may at some time require the extension of the financing provisions of the highway revenue bill beyond June 30, 1972, or require the imposition of additional taxes. Approved projects on any part of the presently designated Interstate System, or any subsequent additions thereto, shall be eligible for financing under this act.

I think that is a very fine statement which shows foresight on the part of the committee, and I commend the committee for it.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield briefly to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. On the point of the effect of the addition of 2,500 miles in the case of the financing, let me say that as a practical matter it will merely mean that if we apportion the funds so as to complete the construction of 40,000 miles in 13 years, probably at the end of that time there will be 2,500 miles of the lowest priority which will be built after the end of the 13 years, unless in the meantime we increase the basis of the apportionment. But it is entirely possible that if some of the estimates of need are as fantastic as individual illustrations indicate, we might be able to build 1,000, 1,500, or 2,500 more miles within the authorizations here contemplated. No one can tell that now. In any event, that would not disrupt the program, but would merely mean that

the miles of roads which would be the last to be built—that is to say, those of the lowest priority—would be those for which the cost was in excess of the apportionments.

It must be remembered that each State submits its proposals or projects, so the projects of highest priority would be built first. That would be true whether 4,000 miles, 40,000, or 42,500 miles were designated. The priority rests with the State highway commission as to the projects which it submits to the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

In that connection I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that in the debate earlier today the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and also both Senators from Indiana seemed to think that if some State transferred up to 20 percent of its interstate apportionment to urban, primary, or secondary roads, that would be a terrible calamity for the country. There may be an urgent need for some transfers between the various categories of highways. I would not want it to go so far as to bring about an inequitable situation, but let us remember that when we undertake to assume the attitude that the spending of some Federal money on primary, secondary, or urban roads is a bad thing for the country, we should remember that the bulk of the money under this bill is for the interstate highways, on which travels only one-seventh of the traffic of the country.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator is not advocating, is he, that under the Interstate System a part of the money be put into secondary and primary roads? A moment ago the Senator said that it might be a good thing.

Mr. GORE. The bill provides for interchangeability. That does not mean that 90-percent money provided for the Interstate System can be spent on a secondary road, and require only 10-percent matching. It would require 50–50 matching.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is not the Senator seeking to do by indirection that which should be done directly? Are we not hiding in the bill a great deal of money which will go into secondary and primary roads, rather than interstate roads?

Mr. GORE. I do not think so.

Mr. CAPEHART. The able Senator almost said as much a moment ago.

Mr. GORE. There is no hiding of funds, and no intent to hide funds. I doubt if very many States will change 90-percent Federal matching money over to 50-percent Federal matching money, unless it is in answer to an urgent need within the particular State. As I recall, the Bureau of Public Roads requested this interchangeability feature. The mass system of roads, comprising millions of miles of highways in the country, cannot be foreseen in all its details—certainly not by the junior Senator from Tennessee, and not by the Bureau of Public Roads. It is a system which must be kept in balance by the various highway departments, the Bureau of Public Roads, and the various county and municipal highway and street departments.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would the Senator be willing to strike that portion of the bill which would permit any State, under the formula, to get more money than it could spend for the Interstate System? Would the Senator be willing to strike the provision which permits taking 20 percent of the total and, by matching it 50–50, spend the money on primary and secondary roads?

Mr. GORE. In the first place, I am not sure that any State would receive, under the Senate committee bill, more funds than it would need to build its interstate system. Earlier I cited the case of my State. The estimates, submitted hurriedly in order to be included with the Clay report, totaled approximately $380 million.

However, when a careful survey was made, when thorough estimates were prepared, the State found that it would need nearly twice that sum. As I understand, all States are now conducting a restudy of the estimates which they hurriedly submitted. We may find that other States will have an experience similar to that of the State of Tennessee.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. Let me answer the Senator's question further.

In the event that, perchance, some State is apportioned more funds than it needs, then there will come into operation the provision of the bill which was involved in the debate between the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. I refer to the subsection which provides that any apportionment which remains unexpended after 2 years shall lapse and be returned to the Treasury. If it is not spent within a certain State, the Federal taxpayers will not be hurt, and the money will be available for reapportionment to other States.

Mr. CAPEHART. By act of Congress only.

Mr. GORE. That is true. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and I have been discussing a possible amendment to that provision, to provide for automatic reapportionment. Would that please the Senator?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. GORE. Would that satisfy the Senator?

Mr. CAPEHART. That would be very helpful, of course. But what would happen to a State such as Indiana, whose estimate was $926 million? That figure has been reduced by $324 million. Suppose the estimate of $926 million was correct? How are we to get the additional $324 million to complete the interstate highway system in Indiana?

Mr. GORE. The Senator is asking me a hypothetical question. He is presuming that the estimates within the State are entirely too high.

Mr. CAPEHART. No. I am assuring that the estimates are exactly right.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is assuming, for the sake of the question——

Mr. CAPEHART. I am assuming that the estimates are exactly right. Under the Fallon bill Indiana would be given $926 million. That was the estimate of the Indiana highway officials. Under the Senate version that figure has been reduced by $324 million. My question is this: If the estimate of $926 million is correct how are we to get the other $324 million to finish the 1,100 miles we shall be required to build in Indiana?

Mr. GORE. In the first place, 1,100 miles, at an estimated cost of $900 million——

Mr. CAPEHART. The estimate is $926 million.

Mr. GORE. I must say that that is a rather healthy estimate.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know whether it is or not.

Mr. GORE. If someone will use a slide rule and determine how much a mile that represents, it may be found that Indiana has duplicated the experience of New Jersey.

Mr. CAPEHART. It will be found that Indiana is one of the States which will require 4, 6, and 8-lane highways, because all the traffic between the East and Chicago comes through Indiana. I should like to have the Senator answer my question, if he can. If the cost is $926 million, as estimated, where will we get the other $324 million to build what we should build in Indiana?

Mr. GORE. It is to be presumed that the Federal Government will provide 90 percent of whatever the cost may be within a State. Obviously the Congress would have to apportion more funds to complete the system within the Senator's State. It does not necessarily follow, however, that we must start a program which would give to the Senator's State or to any other State an undue share of the money.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. In a moment, if the Senator will permit me to proceed. The formula in the present law allocates to the States two-thirds of the money on the basis of population, one-sixth on the basis of area, and one-sixth on the basis of star and post road mileage within the State. The Senator's State is a populous State; it is a rich State; it is a State in which there is a considerable amount of interstate mileage. The formula should give to his State its fair and proportionate share of the money.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not believe it does, because I am sure Indiana is one State in which the roads will have to be at least 4 lanes wide, and possibly 6 lanes, and some perhaps 8 lanes. That is not true of Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. It is true of Pennsylvania. Every mile of interstate highway in Pennsylvania, as the survey shows, will have to be a minimum of four lanes. Would the Senator substitute for the present formula, imperfect as it is, an apportionment which would penalize Pennsylvania in order to be more generous to Indiana?

Mr. CAPEHART. I would not like to see any State penalized. All I desire is to see a formula worked out under which the Federal Government will pay 90 percent of whatever constructing the roads costs in a State; no more and no less. I do not want the Federal Government to pay more, and I do not want the Federal

Government to pay less. If we find that in a Rocky Mountain State, for example, where it is necessary to go through mountains or over mountains, it will cost a great deal more, I want the Federal Government to pay 90 percent of the cost, and the State to pay 10 percent; no more and no less. I do not want any of the money left over, as suggested by the Senator from Tennessee, as a result of which 20 percent can be allocated to some other road system. That ought to be taken care of in another measure, not in the pending bill. Perhaps we can work the matter out on the floor, although I doubt it.

Why was it not possible for the committee to write a formula whereby the Federal Government would pay 90 percent of whatever the cost might be, the State to pay 10 percent of whatever the cost might be, with the Federal Government approving the cost before the contract was let, and the Federal Government auditing and approving the cost after the job was finished, then giving the State a check for 90 percent of the cost and requiring the State to pay 10 percent of the cost? Why could not that be worked out?

Mr. GORE. The Senator's suggested formula undoubtedly has merit. If after consideration the committee had found that it was better than the provision contained in the bill, I dare say the committee would have adopted it. The Senator has suggested the formula on the floor of the Senate. I have not had an opportunity to study it; nor has the committee. If the Senator has tables prepared showing how it would affect the various States, I am sure the Senate would desire to consider his proposal.

Mr. CAPEHART. It never entered my mind that the bill did not do exactly what I have described, because I thought we were going to build 40,000 miles of interstate highways, that the Federal Government was going to pay 90 percent of the cost and that each State was going to bear 10 percent of the cost, based on 100 percent of what the actual cost was, after careful auditing and after careful contracting for the construction of the highways. It never entered my mind, until I saw the bill, that the Government would be asked to do anything else than pay 90 percent of the cost, so far as the Federal Government's share was concerned, because almost every mile of highway in the United States has a different cost. That is due to different terrain conditions, and the different number of lanes of highway which are required in the various States.

Mr. GORE. I hope the Senator will not completely overlook the fact that the taxpayers of all the United States will contribute to the interstate system. I hope he will not overlook the second point, namely, that what is proposed is a system of Federal aid to States.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. And that it is primarily, therefore, a State's responsibility to submit a plan for the construction of highways which meet given standards. The Bureau of Public Roads, under the present law, has sent to the States minimum standards of construction for the Interstate System.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. GORE. I emphasize minimum. Those standards refer to roadbed, the thickness of the pavement, the quality of the surfacing, the grade, visibility, degree of curvature, and drainage. Some States, as has been the experience of the past, may wish to exceed those minimum standards. That would greatly affect the cost of the road. Some States may want to construct 6 lanes on segments of the highway on which the Federal Bureau of Public Roads would approve 4 lanes. Therefore, we must have some formula to govern if we are to continue a system of Federal-aid highways.

If we wish to have a Federal highway program for the Federal Government, the Government to design the highways, to locate the highways, to finance the highways, and to construct them, then the formula which the Senator from Indiana has suggested might be a very good one.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I should like to go a little further before I yield. The formula which the Senator from Indiana has suggested undoubtedly has merit even when applied to the present Federal-aid system. I for one would be willing to give it consideration and ask the committee to consider it. I doubt, however, if the Senator would want to press for adoption on the floor of the Senate his formula to which the committee has given no consideration at all. I submit to the Senator that the Bureau of Roads has considered about 100 different formulas, I believe they told me. No formula works out perfectly for all 48 States. The committee formula has the advantage of having worked for 2 years without serious complaint. It has the advantage of being a legal formula for the handling of the vast amount of money involved.

Mr. BUSH and Mr. CAPEHART addressed the Chair.

Mr. GORE. I should like to proceed for just another moment, before I yield. Then I shall be happy to yield.

The bill also contains a provision, to which I have already alluded, requiring that when a State has completed its Interstate System with the exception of the 20 percent transferability—and if the Senator wishes to strike out that provision, I am sure the Senate will reach its decision and conclusion upon that question—every dollar lapses into the Treasury and will be available for reapportionment to Indiana and any other State which has not completed its system.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is just the point. Under that system some States will get more than they can use, and they can go into the 20 percent which will be returned to the general fund——

Mr. GORE. Not the general fund.

Mr. CAPEHART. It goes back into the Treasury.

Mr. GORE. Into the Treasury; yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. On the other hand, an adjoining State which does not have enough money will not be able to complete its construction. Therefore, as a person travels across the country from New York to California, he will pass through one State where the system has been completed; then through another State where two-thirds of it, perhaps, has been completed, because the State has not had enough money given to it; then another State in which three-fourths of it has been completed. Under the proposed system that it what will happen. I cannot understand why the easiest thing to do would not be simply to say, "The Federal Government will pay 90 percent of the actual cost." In other words, the Federal Government should approve the actual cost before construction starts, audit the books when construction has been completed, and then pay 90 percent of the cost. I do not know how in the world we can do otherwise.

Mr. GORE. It would appear to me that there is one basic question involved; namely, the constitutional responsibility of the Congress to make appropriations.

Mr. CAPEHART. Congress would be making appropriations.

Mr. GORE. Congress must discharge its constitutional responsibility in this regard. If the Senator would be happier if we struck out the transferability clause, I should be glad to ask the members of my subcommittee their attitude regarding it. I suggest, however, that the relocation of the Interstate System—and I point out to the Senator, again, that it involves up to 70 percent of relocation on some routes—will create many unforeseeable problems which will make desirable the provision for 20 percent transferability. It may be that we should make it 10 percent.

Mr. CAPEHART. That same situation may well exist in a State such as Indiana, which is not going to get enough money to complete its Interstate System. It, too, may have the same problem, and it will not only not get money for its primary, secondary, and urban roads, but will not get enough to complete its Interstate System.

All I am suggesting is that the Government contribute 90 percent of the actual cost and treat all States exactly alike. The Government would simply contribute 90 percent of whatever the cost might be in the several States.

Mr. GORE. I wish to point out to the Senator from Indiana that under the Senate committee bill, in the first year, $28 million would be apportioned to the State of Indiana. In the second year, in 1958, $42 million would be apportioned to the State of Indiana.

I wish to point out also that the House bill—I am not sure that the Senator is satisfied with the House bill, but he has cited it—there is only a 2-year apportionment. Beyond the 2-year apportionment, the senior Senator from Indiana would be buying a pig in a poke.

Mr. CAPEHART. All I am pleading for is that whatever it costs to build 1,100 miles of road in Indiana, according to specifications to be approved by the Federal Government, the Federal Government will give a check for 90 percent, and the State will give a check for 10 percent, no more and no less. I

wish to provide the same for all the other 47 States. If it is going to cost Pennsylvania twice as much money as was originally estimated, then I want Pennsylvania to get the money.

Why is not that the most simple, the most businesslike, the fairest, the quickest, best, and easiest way to handle the problem?

Mr. GORE. It is obvious now that neither the House bill nor the Senate committee bill will meet the requirements of the senior Senator from Indiana. I am not prepared to say that his suggestion is not very meritorious, but I must say that it has never before been suggested to the committee. I am not prepared either to reject it or accept it. I am prepared to suggest that the committee give it consideration.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why can we not take the figures in the House bill, some of which may well be too large and some may be too small, and use them as a basis, then write into the law that whatever may be the actual cost the Federal Government will pay 90 percent of it? If the figures are too large, they will automatically be reduced; and if they are too small, they will be automatically increased. That would be a very simple and easy way to handle it.

Mr. GORE. I am not sure that it would be either simple or easy. Nor am I sure it would be in conformance with the constitutional responsibility of the Congress. It is my view that we must have a government by law. I think contributions so vast as those encompassed in either the House bill or the Senate committee bill must be distributed according to legal requirements and according to a formula written into the law.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think my suggested formula is both legal and easy to apply. It is a formula which provides that whatever the cost may be the Federal Government will approve it in advance; and when the contract has been finished, it will audit the books and make certain that the specified amount, no more and no less, has been spent. Then the Government will give a check for 90 percent of that amount. That is controlling the purse strings more than is the formula which the Senate committee reported, because it is on the basis that some States need more than others. It was even anticipated, because there is a section saying that if a State gets more than it can use for the Interstate System 20 percent of it may be used for the primary and secondary roads. So the committee knew that some States would get more than they could use. Otherwise that section would not be in the bill.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator will reduce his amendment to writing, I am sure the committee will give it careful consideration.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would it not be much better to recommit the bill and let the committee work out the details, rather than try to do it on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. GORE. I would not be prepared to make that suggestion.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. I think probably the basic difference between the two Senators is that the Senator from Tennessee is talking about an allocation of money and the Senator from Indiana is talking about a completed highway system.

The State of Michigan is in the same position as is the State of Indiana. We will complete only 65 percent of our Interstate System. We know the mileage of our Interstate System. We wish to have all States carry on in a uniform manner. Under a 13-year program the States will contract for the building of one-thirteenth of the system each year. As the distinguished Senator from Indiana has stated, the contract has to be approved by the Bureau of the Budget, anyway, and upon approval of the contract, the allocation of funds can be made, one-thirteenth of it each year.

The estimates in the House bill as to the cost of construction may very well be padded in some States, but we would eliminate the fat from those estimates, because the Bureau of the Budget would have to approve the contracts, and if they were padded, the Bureau of the Budget could refuse the contracts and ask for rebidding. It seems to me that would facilitate the handling of the allocation of funds; much more so than the formula provided for in the Senate committee bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from Michigan has made a very interesting suggestion, but the practical difficulty is that the Treasury would never know accurately what would be required from it because of the varying mileage. Each State, the first year, would provide one-thirteenth of the most expensive mileage, the next year the next most expensive 13th, in terms of mileage, and the next year, the next most expensive 13th. The heavy demand for money would come during the early part of the 13 years. The projects of less cost would come at the end of that period.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt, we have no assurance that the respective States would be prepared to construct highways in given yearly segments.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In terms of miles, there is a great variation, of course, between rural miles and urban miles in the Interstate System.

Mr. POTTER. The allocations are based upon a 2-year period. We have no assurance that the States will be prepared or able to use all the funds allocated during the 2-year period. Some may and others may not.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The expenditures would not be so heavy the first year, under the Senate committee bill.

Mr. GORE. By what reasoning does the Senator from Michigan assume, if he does assume, that the provisions of the House bill would bring about the completion of the Interstate System within his State?

Mr. POTTER. The formula in the House bill is on a mileage basis, according to the number of miles of interstate highway within the State.

Mr. GORE. Can the Senator from Michigan show us that provision? I am afraid he is grossly in error. There is only a 2-year apportionment in the House bill.

Mr. POTTER. At the end of 2 years the estimate is reviewed.

Mr. GORE. That is correct. Beyond the 2 years there is no provision for apportionment to his State or to any other State.

Mr. POTTER. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], in a colloquy earlier today with the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], was eminently correct in the positions he took. The apportionment formula provisions of the House bill do not go beyond a 2-year period.

If the Senator from Michigan wants to assume that after 2 years Congress will act to the complete satisfaction of his State, he is privileged to make such an assumption. But it is not written into the House bill.

I say in all candor to the Senator from Michigan, and to other Senators who may have doubts about this point, that in my opinion, whatever apportionment formula may be written into the law will not only be subject to review repeatedly, as the junior Senator from New Hampshire has said, but very probably it will be changed to meet the needs as we can foresee them then better than we can foresee them now. I have felt all along that 5 years is about as far as we can safely foresee the Nation's traffic pattern; about as far as we can safely undertake to determine apportionments.

However, to meet the fiscal requirements of the program, we have extended the apportionment formula to the full 13-year period, but with the expressed intent within the committee report—and I say it now on the floor of the Senate—that that formula will be subject to review and amendment to meet the problems in the minds of the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from Michigan, and other Senators.

However, even if that be true, as I believe it to be, it is still basically sound, and I think a requirement of the democratic processes, that we have the program on the sound foundation of a legal formula for distribution and allocation of the funds.

Mr. POTTER. The Senator from Tennessee is correct. Congress at any time can, and probably will, review and amend any highway act or any other piece of legislation. But we are today asked to vote on a bill to provide an Interstate Highway System.

According to the Senate committee bill, the projected plan would build 65 percent of the interstate highway system in Michigan. The Senator can say, "Yes, but Congress can review it later, and perhaps take care of the other 35 percent."

The Fallon bill provides a 2-year period for allocation, but at least it is the purpose of that bill to construct an interstate highway system in 13 years—not 65 percent of an interstate system in

Michigan or 70 percent in Indiana, but a complete Interstate Highway System.

Mr. GORE. That is the purpose of the Senate committee bill, too.

Mr. POTTER. The Senate committee bill provides for a partial Interstate Highway System within certain States and a complete system in others. It will require additional effort on the part of Congress to provide additional funds for those highways.

Mr. GORE. I find it particularly abhorrent to start the apportionment of funds in this vast program on the basis of wild estimates.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. Not at the moment.

Perhaps I have used too strong a word in calling the estimates "wild"; perhaps I should have said they were made on the basis of estimates which the Bureau of Public Roads itself has said are totally lacking in uniformity. I shall state to the Senator exactly what the Bureau of Public Roads said about these estimates.

To start the distribution of vast sums of money on the basis of what some particular individual says he may need or wish or desire is a fallacious principle. I agree with much of what the Senator from Michigan has said to the effect that a review will be necessary, but I do not think such review necessarily requires the initiation of the program on a wholly unsound basis. This is what the Bureau of Public Roads itself says about the estimates to which the junior Senator from Michigan seems to attach some importance:

> The term "needs" likewise requires explanation. It is a word widely used in recent years to denote construction backlog. Amounts cited as needs sometimes refer to the cost of complete modernization as of a given moment; sometimes they cover a construction program stretching over a period of years.
>
> Some estimates are based on the needs of current traffic; others take future traffic fully into account.
>
> There are variations, too, in the specifications of design standards, and there are differences in their application—one study may permit no deviations, while another will accept large deviations or tolerances.

According to the best estimate within the State which I have the honor, in part, to represent, carrying out the formula of apportionment under the Senate committee bill would not complete the highways in Tennessee, either. But I say to the Senator from Michigan that this program, in my opinion, may not be completed in 13 years. It may take 15. But if we start on a sound basis with the determination to complete the Interstate Highway System, and provide in the law a legal basis for apportionment, and include language that when the State has completed its system, its funds will lapse, and will be reapportioned to other States, how much better can we do?

Mr. BUSH and Mr. CAPEHART addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. GORE. I must yield first to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, a member of the committee, who has asked me several times to yield.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator's formula, if I understand the situation correctly, is designed to apportion approximately $25 billion, which is arrived at in the House calculations or in the House table. The estimates are made by the different States coming together, so to speak, in the House table, and they total $25 billion. The House bill apportions the funds on the basis of the estimate of relative cost.

Mr. GORE. For 2 years.

Mr. BUSH. For 2 years. The formula of the Senator from Tennessee is based on the same amount of money, arrived at in exactly the same way. But the Senator's formula does not give any protection against erroneous estimates which might have been made and used in connection with the Fallon bill. Is not that so?

Mr. GORE. That is true; but it has the advantage of not apportioning the funds on the basis of fallacious estimates.

Mr. BUSH. I believe it apportions dollars on the basis I have indicated.

Mr. GORE. It authorizes a similar overall total, but it does not authorize the apportionment of funds on the basis of erroneous estimates.

Mr. BUSH. It uses the same estimate as a basis for apportionment. It takes the figures from the House bill—$25 billion—and then apportions those dollars on the basis of the Senator's formula. Is not that so?

Mr. GORE. The Senate version of the bill, as the Senator knows, preceded the House bill.

Mr. BUSH. That is right. Of course, the Senator's formula preceded the House bill, because he worked that out in 1954, as I recall, and he worked it out to apply to a $175 million program for interstate highways. Now the Senator is taking his formula and applying it to a 13-year National System of Interstate Highways which it is estimated will cost $25 billion, when the formula was never designed to deal with that kind of situation at all. It was designed to deal with a certain number of dollars, and not with a program to complete a system of interstate highways.

It seems to me this is the crux of the situation, and I wish to ask the Senator this question: Is not it true that the greatest difficulty we face in the debate, and which we shall face as we come to voting tomorrow, is to try to get this program off the ground for the first 2 years? As I have listened to the debate all day, I do not believe we shall have too much difficulty if we can get the program off the ground for the first 2 years.

I wish to say to the Senator from Tennessee that I intend to offer an amendment tomorrow. I shall give him a copy of it tonight, and I hope he will give it some study. The purpose of the amendment will be to take the Senator's formula, the so-called Gore or Senate committee bill formula, for the first 2 years, and base it, as he bases it, on apportioning the $25 billion contained in the House bill, but limiting it so that no State will get more than 15 percent of the estimated cost of building its interstate highways in the first 2 years, nor less than 10 percent.

I shall submit to the Senator a table which shows how such an amendment will bring the States pretty closely together, but will maintain the basic philosophy of the approach from the standpoint of need. While some States will get a little more and some will get a little less in the first 2 years, the amendment will treat the States altogether quite fairly, and will revert to the general philosophy of the Fallon bill. Then the Bureau of Public Roads will revise or reestimate or reaudit, and go ahead on the basis of experience, and not on the basis of guesswork.

Mr. GORE. This is the first time I had heard of this particular suggestion, and I appreciate the willingness of the Senator from Connecticut to let me have a copy of it overnight.

Mr. BUSH. I may say to the Senator, if he will permit me, I did not intend to take him by surprise. This is not something I have had worked out for some time. I have had it worked out only in the last day or two. This is the first opportunity I have had to bring it up. I sent it to the desk a while ago. I have some copies on my desk.

Mr. GORE. If I may hazard a quick reaction—and I hope it will be regarded only as a quick reaction—it seems to me the Senator's suggestion for the first 2 years has considerable merit, in that it not only preserves the principle which he desires to have preserved, but also preserves that which I think is imperative in the program—a legal formula for application. I doubt, however, that 2 years is a sufficient time to enable Congress to evaluate the program, because almost 2 years will necessarily elapse before any widespread construction is under way. As the Senator knows, it takes a long period to make surveys, to acquire rights of way, and to let all the contracts, with all the safeguards which will be necessary under so vast a program.

If the Senator would extend the period to 5 years instead of 2 years, he would, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Tennessee, be making a suggestion which would be of great value in the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GORE. That is only a quick reaction. I would appreciate it if the Senator would confer with me after I have an opportunity to study the amendment.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator for his comments.

Mr. GORE. As the Senator knows, in the Public Works Committee, I took the position that it was my view that an authorization for 5 years was perhaps as far as we should go at this particular time, but then there were the fiscal requirements, under title II of the bill, which had to be taken into consideration.

Mr. BUSH. Those provisions are contained in the bill. They are going to be with us. If we are to complete the system, we will have to go ahead with the tax program which is to provide the money, not only for 5 years, but for the duration of the program.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to discuss for a moment with the Senator from Tennessee the question of the transfer clause. I think all Senators should bear in mind that the transfer clause had its origin in the recommendation of the State highway officials a few years ago. We are asked to provide a 25-percent transfer as between funds for primary, secondary, and urban roads, and funds for interstate roads. That came at a time when the interstate system was a small part of the total apportionment of the fund. It also came at a time when matching was on a 50–50 percent basis with respect to all the funds. So the question of transferring from the 50–50 percent ratio to a 90–10 percent ratio was not possible.

It also came at a time when there was no distinction made in the purposes of the gasoline tax. The transfer clause was originated, with a 10-percent provision, in the act of 1954. That was the first time a transfer was permitted from one fund to another. Congress did not provide for a 25 percent transfer, but only 10 percent.

Last year, as reported by the committee, there was a proposal for a 20-percent transfer, and it was made applicable to all the funds; but at that time it was also proposed that if there were an increase in the gasoline tax the money accruing therefrom would be at least kept in mind as a possible source of funds for building the Interstate System.

We felt that if farmers were to be taxed on the gasoline they used in their tractors for building an Interstate System, it should be possible to transfer some of that interstate portion of the fund to secondary, or farm-to-market, roads.

Now the situation has changed. The Congress passed, and the President signed into law, a bill to exempt gasoline used in farming operations from the increased Federal tax. Consequently, there is not quite the same equity there would have been to preserve the right of transfer from the interstate fund to the secondary fund. In view of that, I think one of the main arguments for the 20-percent transfer applying to the interstate fund has vanished.

Furthermore, there is the point, which the Senator so ably made a short time ago, that few States will transfer amounts from a fund in connection with which they can get money for 10 cents on the dollar, under the 90–10 ratio, to a category of a fund for roads in respect to which they will have to put up 50 cents on the dollar.

Consequently, it seems to me there would be no great harm done if the bill were amended by deleting the transfer clause, so far as section 102 is concerned. Section 101 is the one which carries the authorization for the primary, secondary, and urban roads. Section 102 provides for the Interstate System.

Mr. GORE. I would react quite favorably to the Senator's suggestion—if he makes it as a suggestion—if we could be assured that the provisions of the Senate committee bill providing more Federal aid to urban, primary, and secondary roads is included in the final version of the bill. I think the Senator recognizes, as I have indicated earlier, that the relocation and rebuilding of the Interstate System will bring about innumerable needs for extensions and interconnections of other highways to the interstate highways. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There is no question about that, and I think all of us who participated in conferences on highway legislation which resulted in the previous act probably felt that some adjustment of this sort might be made in the conference, after we were assured of recognition of the larger allocations proposed in the Senate version for the secondary, urban, and primary road funds.

Mr. GORE. I agree.

Mr. President, I wish to refer briefly to another difference between the two bills. The Senate Public Works Committee's version of the bill does not contain a requirement that contractors for the Interstate System pay prevailing wages. In other words, the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act are not required to be observed, under the Senate Public Works Committee's version of the bill. Such a provision is contained in the House version of the bill. The chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] has, however, submitted an amendment—which is the pending question—to include in the Senate version of the bill a provision identical to that contained in the House version of the bill. I shall accept that amendment; and if a yea-and-nay vote is taken on the question of agreeing to the amendment, I shall vote for it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Another difference is in respect to the requirement for the observation of weight and dimensional limitations for vehicles traveling on the Interstate System. The Senate Public Works Committee's version of the bill, offered as a substitute for the House version of the bill, provides that—

(d) No funds authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year by this section shall be apportioned to any State within the boundaries of which the National System of Interstate Highways may lawfully be used by vehicles with any dimension or with weight in excess of the greater of (1) the maximum corresponding dimensions or maximum corresponding weight permitted for vehicles using the public highways of such State under laws in effect in such State on July 1, 1956, or (2) the maximum corresponding dimensions or maximum corresponding weight recommended for vehicles operated over the highways of the United States by the American Association of State Highway Officials in a document published by such association entitled "Policy Concerning Maximum Dimension, Weights, and Speeds of Motor Vehicles to Be Operated Over the Highways of the United States" and incorporating recommendations adopted by such association on April 1, 1946.

A similar provision of the House version of the bill relates only to weight per axle. In my view of the matter, Mr. President, that provision of the House version is good insofar as it goes; but the safety of highway traffic and the safeguarding of the vast investment of the people of the country in this magnificent system of interstate highways require some realistic limitations on overall weight, width, length, and height, as well as on weight per axle. In other words, I seriously doubt that a per-axle weight limitation alone will meet the need. There are also needs for width limitations, for length limitations, for limitations on the length between axles, for height limitations, and so forth.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. With reference to the weight and width limitations, this morning I called attention to the matter of accidents. When a poor man who is driving his family in a Chevrolet or a Ford, certainly their lives are jeopardized when, on the highway, he meets a truck which is wider than necessary. That situation involves not only their safety, but also the maintenance of the highway. After all, the cost of the highways is borne by all the people of the country. If vehicles of very great weight and size are permitted to use these highways, they will be destroyed in a year or 2 years, and then the American people will have to rebuild the roads.

So, in connection with weight and width limitation considerations, we must also consider the safety factor. The number of people killed on our highways, these days, is greater than the number of casualties in the World War. Both the weight and the width of vehicles play an important part in connection with the number of accidents on the highways. I am very glad that the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], as chairman of the subcommittee, has given consideration to these matters.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. I wish to point out that this particular provision was included in the bill last year by the unanimous vote of the committee. It is not a stringent provision. It embodies the recommendations of the Bureau of Public Roads and the recommendations of the highway officials of the 48 States. However, the provision would allow States having limitations above the standards recommended by the State highway officials and the Bureau of Public Roads still to participate in the program without reducing their limitations. In other words, this provision calls a halt where we are, and recognizes that the safety on our highways and the safeguarding of the people's investment in the pavements and roadbeds require some realistic limitations.

The committee felt that we should adopt a uniform standard of maximum limitations, and then should build the highways so as to carry vehicles of those weights and those dimensions, but should not permit those limitations to be increased, and thus render inadequate and

out of date, before we could complete the highways, the standards by which they are to be constructed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I should like to ask a question; but first I wish to say, as one who completely disagrees with the position taken by the able junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], that I do not want the RECORD to indicate that that disagreement on my part interferes at all with my high respect and my great personal friendship for a Member of the Senate who represents, as my colleague does, in my judgment, the finest type of membership in this body.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator very sincerely.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I believe that in colloquy earlier today with the Senator from Indiana, the Senator from Tennessee indicated that under the Senate Public Works Committee's version of the bill—the so-called Gore bill—he would favor some type of reexamination of the formula 2 years after the bill became a law. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. I would favor a reexamination at any time; but just now I said to the Senator from Connecticut that I wondered whether 2 years would be a sufficient length of time really to see this program actually in full operation. However, I would wish to see a review made as frequently as the Senate Committee on Public Works and the Congress could possibly have one made.

Mr. KUCHEL. My point is that for purposes of future argument it is true, is it not, that the bill for which the Senator from Tennessee is speaking—namely, the substitute proposed by the Senate Committee on Public Works, or the so-called Gore bill—provides for a 13-year annual apportionment to the States under the 1954 Federal formula. Is not that correct?

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to argue the point that in whatever action we take we need a provision requiring periodic reexamination by the appropriate executive agency, the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. GORE. Together with the proper committees of Congress.

Mr. KUCHEL. I would add that requirement.

Mr. GORE. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. KUCHEL. I might even be pleased to consider a requirement that Congress approve by resolution.

Pursuing my thought, some of us would be inclined to offer an amendment at the appropriate time to require such periodic examination of any formula by the Bureau of Roads, subject, as the Senator suggests, to control either by congressional committees or by the Congress itself.

Mr. GORE. I shall certainly be interested to see the Senator's amendment; and if the purpose of it is to guarantee a review by the Congress or the appropriate congressional committees, with the advice of the Bureau of Public Roads, I shall be very favorably inclined toward it.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I point out that on page 47 of the bill, in subsection (c) of section 112, it is provided as follows:

(c) It is hereby declared to be the sense of Congress that all segments of the Federal-aid highway systems should be improved to standards adequate to meet the needs of national defense and the national economy at the earliest practicable date. The Secretary is hereby directed to submit to the Congress not later than February 1, 1959, a report on the progress made in attaining the foregoing objective, together with recommendations for the extension of the program.

Thus the Senator will see that the bill recommended by the committee contemplates an objective not unlike that now advocated by the distinguished junior Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I appreciate the fact that, to the extent that it would represent an indication of congressional intent, it is along the lines my friend and I have been discussing. The important point is that in whatever language we begin apportioning moneys for the interstate system for 2 years, I want to see an ironclad guarantee in the bill that there will be such reexamination periodically during the 13-year period.

Mr. GORE. I shall be very sympathetic with that motive, and I hope the Senator will reduce his suggestion to writing.

Mr. President, I have discoursed upon the principal differences between the two bills. I should like very briefly to summarize by naming the principal differences.

First is the difference in the amount of Federal aid for secondary, primary, and urban roads.

Second, the Senate committee version provides 42,500 miles for the interstate system, whereas the House bill leaves the present 40,000 legal limit in effect.

Third, there is a difference in the apportionment formula for the Interstate System. I did not emphasize what I should like to mention now, that with respect to the primary, secondary, and urban highways, the apportionment formula is the same in both bills, and in both bills remains the same as the present law.

Fourth, the Senate committee version does not contain a requirement that prevailing wages be paid on interstate projects. The House bill does. However, the pending amendment, offered by the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. CHAVEZ], would make the Senate committee version conform.

Fifth, there are differences in the requirements with respect to weight and dimensional limitations for vehicles traveling the interstate highways.

Those are the principal differences between the two bills. I appreciate the patience of the Senate in hearing me out in this detailed discussion of the differences.

I appreciate very much the courtesy of my colleagues, both members of the committee and those not privileged to serve on the Public Works Committee.

This is a most important legislative proposal. It involves a program which will mean a great deal to the people of the United States. I trust that the Senate will approve the Senate committee recommendation. Then it is my hope that we can go to conference with the House and merge the 2 bills into a legislative proposal embodying the best of the 2 versions, so that a bill can be sent to the President of the United States for his approval before the end of the fiscal year. I hope such a bill will provide for a vigorous highway improvement program which will bring about a condition of adequacy of our Federal-aid highways, and particularly the construction of a magnificent system of interstate highways connecting all our principal cities.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I should like to compliment the Senator from Tennessee, particularly for the patience with which he has addressed the Senate today, and yielded so generously of his time for questions and observations by all of us. We are all very greatful to the Senator for his capable treatment of the subject and his fine performance this afternoon.

Mr. GORE. I thank my distinguished friend the senior Senator from Connecticut. He is particularly generous, not only in his official attitude, but in his personal attitude. I have very greatly enjoyed my association with him on the committee and in the Senate, and I am very grateful to him for his generous remarks.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President——

Mr. BUSH. Does the Senator wish to have me yield to him?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask a few more questions of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BUSH. I have the floor now. I have been waiting for 6 hours. I shall be glad to yield, with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I may be acting under a misapprehension, but I understood that, according to the list on the desk, my name was next.

Mr. BUSH. I do not think the Senator's name was ahead of mine on the list. However, I do have the floor.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I was trying to obtain the floor to ask the Senator from Tennessee some questions as to the allocation of funds for highways in my State. If the Senator desires to have me do so, I shall wait.

Mr. BUSH. No. The Senator misunderstood me. I said I would be very glad to yield for the purpose mentioned, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I had presumed that, in view of the fact that a great many Senators desired to speak, the order of recognition would be according to the list at the desk. I was in the Chamber at 10 o'clock this morning, and hoped to make a few remarks on the road bill. However, I thought it was best to wait until the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Tennessee

[Mr. GORE], the chairman of the subcommittee and the author of the bill.

Mr. BUSH. I had exactly the same idea. I have been on the floor continuously since 10 o'clock this morning. I do not believe the Senator from Oregon has been here during all of that time. I do not reprove him for that; but, having been recognized, I have the floor, and I should like to avail myself of it.

If the Senator would like to have me yield to him for a few minutes so that he may question the Senator from Tennessee, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to yield to the Senator from Oregon for 10 minutes in order that he may question the Senator from Tennessee, without my losing the right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I would prefer not to ask questions about the way the road bill would affect my State on the basis of any time limitation. I had been told that the order of recognition would be in accordance with the list at the desk. If the order is to be determined by whichever Senator succeeds in attracting the attention of the Chair and obtaining recognition first, that will create an entirely different situation in the Chamber. Merely for our guidance, I should like to ask the Chair what the situation is with respect to the list.

Mr. BUSH. Has not the Senator from Oregon spoken on the bill already?

Mr. NEUBERGER. No; I have not.

Mr. BUSH. I believe the Senator had the floor previously today.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I spoke for about 4 minutes on another subject. I have not spoken on the highway bill today.

Mr. BUSH. I believe I have been properly recognized by the Chair and that I have the floor. I have been on the floor since 10 o'clock this morning, with the exception of 15 minutes for lunch, and I do not believe any other Senator has spent as much time on the floor as I have today. I have been trying to get the floor all day. If the Senator from Oregon does not wish to avail himself of my offer, I am sorry.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President——

Mr. BUSH. I shall be glad now to yield to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] for an insertion or for a comment, provided I do not lose the floor. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield under those conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCNAMARA. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I am delighted to find that many of my colleagues are in agreement that the prevailing wage clause should be a firm part of highway legislation.

This is not something that is new, or radical. The Davis-Bacon Act has been on the Federal statute books since 1935—more than 20 years. Its implementation is not questioned when applied to all direct Federal construction programs, and the act has been so used for many years, particularly during World War II, without dispute.

The act also is implemented in highway construction programs where the Federal Government contributes 100 percent.

Why, then, should the act not be implemented in a highway program calling for 90 percent Federal contributions? In proposing the pending legislation, the Congress has recognized the fact that local community and State governments cannot possibly provide the total funds necessary to produce the kind of highways we need. It is thus congressional intent that the Federal Government carry the lion's share of the financial burden.

By taking this stand, the Congress also assumes the responsibility for the fair treatment of the hundreds of thousands of people who will actually be building these roads. We cannot permit local groups to determine what is a "fair wage." Too many such groups are either completely unsympathetic to the needs of the working man, or else they have no facilities through which to determine what is the prevailing wage.

I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am unalterably oposed to the fund distribution formula in the committee substitute—the so-called Gore bill—because it is deceptive and monstrously unfair.

For the first time in the history of the United States, the Congress is embarking on a program to build a national system of highways—a system urgently needed for reasons of traffic safety, national and civil defense, and for the growth of our economy.

The Gore bill is deceptive because it would never build this national system. It would deceive the American people by taxing them heavily for highways which never would be constructed.

It is deceptive and monstrously unfair because it purports to allocate to 30 States $4,777,000 more than they could possibly use in the construction of interstate highways. It is monstrously unfair because it proposes to deny to 18 other States and the District of Columbia $4,852,000 which they need in order to complete the portions of the National System of Interstate Highways which lie within their boundaries.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I am glad to yield, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. BUSH. I yield for that purpose, with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor by yielding to the Senator from Tennessee to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the Gore bill is monstrously unfair because it would waste at least $3,500,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money by freezing it in a highway trust fund where it could never be used. It is monstrously unfair to the American taxpayer because it could permit windfalls to certain States which could total approximately $1,325,000,000. This could result from provisions permitting transfer of up to 20 percent of interstate funds—for which the new taxes are being imposed—to other highway systems.

The Senate need not swallow this bitter dose of medicine for the American people which is contained in the Gore bill. The Senate has an alternative in the bill passed by an overwhelming vote—388 to 19—by the House of Representatives.

The House bill will build the National System of Interstate Highways in 13 years. It is fair to the American taxpayers and to every State by allocating the amounts—no more and no less—which will be needed to construct the National System. It treats each State fairly by basing payments on costs audited and approved by the Bureau of Public Roads. In no other way can this urgently needed national system be built within a reasonable period of time.

It is my hope that the Senate will reject the Gore bill and join the House of Representatives in fulfilling the desires of the American people by approving an allocation formula which will work—allocations based on cost, allocations which will build highways, treat every State fairly, avoid wastage of the taxpayers' money, and prevent unconscionable windfalls in a few States.

The American people want a completed National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. There can be no question of their desire for this. It is evident from the press; more evident from the support given H. R. 10660 by all of the organizations interested or expert in road problems; and most evident from the overwhelming vote of 388 to 19 by the House when it adopted H. R. 10660.

Why then, should the majority of the committee recommend a substitute which clearly does not give the American people what they desire; that is, a completed National Interstate Highway System? I heard no reasons advanced in the committee, and can think of none that would warrant the United States Senate in not complying with the popular will in this matter.

The substitute will not build the National Interstate System. The reason is simple and obvious. Nineteen States, including the District of Columbia, will not receive enough cash to cover the cost of construction of the National Interstate System in their particular States. The table which appears on page

25 of the committee report indicates the total funds apportioned under the substitute, and the total estimated cost in each State. One State would receive only 38 percent of this estimated cost. The total deficit in these States would be the staggering sum of $4,852 million. What are these States to do?

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table which appears on page 25 of the committee report.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of apportionments for Interstate System under H. R. 10660 as passed by House and as reported out by Senate Committee on Public Works

[Federal funds, millions of dollars]

State	13-year apportionment under H. R. 10660 as—		Comparison of Senate version with need		Percentage of Interstate System needs met by—	
	Passed by House [1] (based on estimated costs)	Reported by Senate committee [2]	Excess	Deficiency	House bill	Senate committee version
Alabama	390.1	502.8	112.7		100	129
Arizona	223.4	283.6	60.2		100	127
Arkansas	216.3	359.6	143.3		100	166
California	2,477.9	1,411.4		1,066.5	100	57
Colorado	166.1	338.3	172.2		100	202
Connecticut	593.4	238.3		355.1	100	40
Delaware	69.9	154.7	84.8		100	220
Florida	528.9	420.8		108.1	100	80
Georgia	747.2	576.8		170.4	100	77
Idaho	114.1	250.5	136.4		100	220
Illinois	1,137.2	1,166.9	29.7		100	103
Indiana	926.2	602.1		324.1	100	65
Iowa	295.5	505.6	210.1		100	173
Kansas	221.0	449.2	228.2		100	204
Kentucky	526.1	464.2		61.9	100	89
Louisiana	526.1	408.5		117.6	100	78
Maine	156.7	199.0	42.3		100	127
Maryland	464.1	296.9		167.2	100	64
Massachusetts	893.7	528.4		365.3	100	59
Michigan	1,382.5	889.8		492.7	100	65
Minnesota	516.5	557.6	41.1		100	108
Mississippi	263.1	372.5	129.4		100	150
Missouri	637.8	670.4	32.6		100	105
Montana	163.8	355.5	191.7		100	218
Nebraska	114.1	355.0	240.9		100	315
Nevada	79.1	258.4	179.3		100	333
New Hampshire	72.1	154.7	82.6		100	220
New Jersey	1,449.9	542.1		907.8	100	38
New Mexico	250.7	300.5	49.8		100	120
New York	1,427.3	1,754.6	327.3		100	123
North Carolina	263.1	631.0	367.9		100	240
North Dakota	114.1	274.4	160.3		100	241
Ohio	1,452.1	1,059.8		392.3	100	73
Oklahoma	402.0	442.8	40.8		100	110
Oregon	339.8	336.0		3.8	100	99
Pennsylvania	811.5	1,326.8	515.3		100	164
Rhode Island	131.7	154.7	23.0		100	118
South Carolina	196.3	332.8	136.5		100	171
South Dakota	101.7	286.6	184.9		100	283
Tennessee	404.9	529.2	124.3		100	131
Texas	930.8	1,422.4	491.6		100	153
Utah	252.8	241.2		11.6	100	95
Vermont	188.6	154.7		33.9	100	82
Virginia	608.2	501.0		107.2	100	83
Washington	499.0	397.5		101.5	100	80
West Virginia	275.5	294.8	19.3		100	107
Wisconsin	345.2	563.7	218.5		100	164
Wyoming	315.5	257.2		58.3	100	82
District of Columbia	161.4	154.7		6.7	100	96
Total	24,825.0	[3] 24,750.0	4,777.0	4,852.0	100	100

[1] Apportioned according to needs based on H. Doc. No. 120, 84th Cong.; apportionments subsequent to fiscal 1957 and 1958 subject to revisions based on periodic reestimate of needs.

[2] Apportioned ½ according to population and ½ according to formula for primary funds.

[3] For the purposes of this table the total deficiency of $75 million of the proposed substitute has been ignored.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, last year the argument was made that the estimate of costs might be inaccurate and, therefore, should not be used as a basis for the apportionment of Federal funds. That argument no longer has any merit whatsoever in view of the provisions contained in paragraph (f) of section 108 of H. R. 10660. These provisions call for periodic studies to be made of the estimated costs of completion of the Interstate System, and for reports showing the results of those studies to be furnished the Congress in 1958, 1962, 1966, 1967, and 1968. These studies must be made in accordance with rules and regulations adopted by the Secretary of Commerce and applied by him uniformly to all of the States. These provisions clearly will require correction of any inaccuracies in the present estimates. Accordingly, the argument over inaccuracies no longer has any merit.

What other possible reason can be advanced to justify the apportionment to a number of the States of insufficient funds to complete the National Interstate System? Can we say that merely because in past years a certain formula has been used that we should blindly follow that formula for the rest of time? Of course not. That formula was useful in distributing Federal dollars for aid in the construction of highways. It was not intended to provide for the completion of a national system of designated and limited mileage. The old concept of merely providing aid is no longer applicable to the National Interstate System. The American people desire that system to be completed within a given period of time, and the only possible way to accomplish this purpose is to provide the funds in each State necessary to cover the costs of construction.

But that is not the whole story. A further reference to the table indicates that 30 States would be allotted more funds than necessary to complete the Interstate System. What will become of these excess funds, totaling $4,777 million? At least $3,452,200,000 of these excess funds will be frozen in the trust fund in the United States Treasury. This huge sum will not be used for building roads. It will not be used for building anything. It will stay in the Treasury of the United States invested in Government bonds. How can the United States Senate agree to raising taxes for the purpose of building roads, and then let such a substantial sum as this lie useless in the Treasury? American taxpayers would properly resent such fiscal irresponsibility.

Not only would the American taxpayer be deceived by this apportionment formula in the committee substitute, but the Senators themselves would be misled. The majority report carries a table showing the apportionments for the Interstate System which shows a certain amount of dollars opposite the name of each State. Senators from those States, which you think would receive an excess of dollars over the estimated cost of the Interstate System, beware. Take care. All that glitters is not gold, nor are all of the dollars apparently apportioned to your State going to benefit the State. As indicated above, a total of $3,452,200,000 will never be used by any State.

However, it is true that some States may receive a windfall at the expense of other States. It will not be all of the excess dollars apportioned, but some of them. The windfall to these States could total $1,324,800,000, but it is unlikely to reach this maximum. Funds not used as a windfall will be added to the frozen funds.

It is not likely to reach that maximum, because the funds must be used on a 50–50 matching basis, and it is not likely that a large proportion of the money will be used on such a matching basis.

To the extent it is a windfall, it could result from a transfer of funds from the Interstate System to the primary or secondary systems under section 103 of the substitute, which permits 20 percent of the amounts apportioned to be so transferred. There is no reason in justice or fairness why one State should get a windfall at the expense of another. This only occurs because interstate funds are being apportioned on a completely unrealistic formula which creates a surplus in some States and a deficit in others.

What is the reason given for using such an unrealistic formula? The only apparent reason is the belief of the majority that the estimates of the cost of construction of the National Interstate

System made by the various State highway departments are inaccurate. In spite of this alleged inaccuracy, the majority use the total of these estimates as the basis of the amount which they authorize for the National Interstate System. Accordingly, while they question the accuracy of the estimates, they use approximately the same total used in H. R. 10660. I brought that out in the debate this afternoon. But after using the total estimate as a basis for their authorizations, they abandon the estimate entirely and use formulas designed for another purpose.

Contrast this apportionment with the carefully drawn provisions of H. R. 10660 which limit the State's participation in Federal funds to the amounts needed to complete the construction of the system.

When a State estimates that it needs no further funds to complete the system, it will receive no further apportionment of Federal funds for the system. The taxpayers' money is not frozen, nor used for windfalls, since the funds purported to be used for the completion of the National Interstate System are in fact used for that purpose and no other.

The American people have indicated their willingness to pay additional taxes, but it is crystal clear that they would be very unwilling to pay taxes to be distributed under an apportionment formula which freezes a substantial amount in the United States Treasury, which gives an inequitable windfall to some States, and insufficient funds to others with the net total result that the National Interstate System will not be completed with the increased taxes provided.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Would the Senator from Connecticut be willing to explain a little further the windfall possibilities to which he refers?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Tennessee was not in the Chamber when I did that. I have already explained it for the RECORD, but I shall be glad to review it if the Senator wishes me to do so.

I simply pointed out that under the 20-percent transferability clause as much as $1,300,000,000 could be transferred on a 50–50 matching basis if, indeed, the States were willing and able to match at the rate of 50 percent. That is the extent of the potential windfall.

Mr. GORE. I believe the Senator from Connecticut heard the suggestion of the junior Senator from South Dakota that the basis on which the 20-percent transferability was placed in the bill had now been changed, and that it might be desirable to reduce the 20 percent or possibly to eliminate it. Would that improve the Senate bill, in the opinion of the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BUSH. Anything which would decrease the likelihood of transferring those funds by any amount would improve it. But, frankly, I very much question the propriety of any transfer of funds designed for the national system of interstate highways. The Federal Government is putting up 90 percent of those funds only for the purpose of getting the national system built. So I question the fundamental principle of any transfer from that particular fund.

I would not have objected to a 20-percent transfer under the provision for $175 million, which was contained in the 1954 bill, but when we come to the phase of the bill in which the whole purpose is to build an Interstate System and complete it, I see no reason why any part of that money should be transferred at all. A State ought to be able to get enough money to build the interstate mileage, and that is all—no more, no less.

Mr. GORE. I am certain the Senator from Connecticut realizes that the interchangeability had its genesis, not in the Senate Committee on Public Works, but rather with highway officials.

Mr. BUSH. May I ask the Senator where and when it had its genesis? I myself do not recall that.

Mr. GORE. Perhaps the junior Senator from South Dakota could answer that better than I can.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The American Association of State Highway Officials in its annual conventions over a period of 3 or 4 years has proposed the transfer. They originally suggested a transfer clause allowing a 25-percent transfer.

Mr. BUSH. May I ask the Senator from South Dakota if that did not apply to the earlier figures we were talking about for interstate highways, as well as to the most recent figures up until now, namely, $175 million?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. We had $175 million only in the current year. That much was never available for the Interstate Highway System.

Mr. BUSH. That amount was contained in the 1954 act.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It was contained in the 1954 act; but the first year in which it was to apply was fiscal 1957.

Mr. BUSH. Yes; but my point about the origin of the 20-percent transferability is that it goes back a long time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I beg the Senator's pardon; it was to have been applied to fiscal 1956 and 1957.

Mr. BUSH. Yes. My point is that the transferability provision antedates the time of the Clay Committee report or the modern conception on the National System of Interstate Highways bill. It had crept into the bill and into the interstate road proposal. Frankly, I do not think it belongs there. I am saying this in answer to the question asked by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Frankly, I do not think it would mean too much if it were applied to the interstate system. We now have the interstate system on a matching basis of 90 percent Federal and 10 percent State, so I doubt very much that any State will transfer $1 of road money, of which it puts up only 10 cents, into a fund where it would have to put up 50 cents on the dollar. There is in the bill a limitation of 50 percent. So a State could not transfer from the interstate money to the primary or secondary fund and get money on a 90-to-10 ratio.

Mr. BUSH. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the provision might just as well go out, and I do not think the bill would be hurt at all if section 102 were stricken. I would preserve the transferability in section 101, so that the needs of a State could be tailored as between a primary system, a secondary system, and an urban system. I would retain that provision together with the provision in the law that the transfer could be made only upon the initiative and authority of a State highway department.

Mr. BUSH. If the Senator would offer an amendment to strike out that section, I would be glad to support it. If that section were eliminated, and if the program ran its course as estimated, there would be in the highway fund as authorized in the bill in excess of $4,500,000,000 in allotments which simply could not be used; they would remain in the fund.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If it were assumed that there would be no adjustment or reapportionment after several years of experience.

Mr. BUSH. So long as the bill does not provide for any such contingency, I do not know how we can assume that the contrary would be the case.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. If I did not misunderstand the Senator from Connecticut, he stated there might be a possibility that as much as $3,500,000,000 would be in the trust fund, to be used for interstate purposes, but which could not be used by some States.

Mr. BUSH. That is true. It might be as much as $4,500,000,000. If the Senator from South Dakota is correct in his estimate about the 20-percent transferability the amount would be about $4,800,000,000.

Mr. CARLSON. Let us consider a State which has already built a road according to modern specifications for the Interstate System. The road is on the Interstate System which will be taken over by the Federal Government as a part of the Interstate System. The highway department within the State has already built the road by tolls.

Is it fair to let a State build its own roads and tax the people to drive on them, and then require them to be taxed for the benefit of the people of all the other States of the Union? Is it fair to say to that State that that is all it is going to get, even though there is in the fund, unexpended, $3,500,000,000 or $4 billion? Is it proposed to let that one State build its own roads and tax its people who drive on them, in order to pay for them, in addition to taxing them to build roads for the people throughout the Nation?

Mr. BUSH. I shall come to that point in my remarks. But I think the Senator from Kansas is absolutely correct. The House bill contains a provision to take care of such farsighted States as have gone ahead and tried to solve their own problems. If the States have mileage which is suitable to meet the requirements of the Interstate System and can be taken into that system, then under the House bill such States will get credit for those funds, and they should get credit for them.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will a State be able to use that money on some other roads? I think if we could reach an agreement that States which have, out of their regular primary money, built roads to the interstate standard, and have done it on a 50–50 basis, should get credit for it, we would get somewhere.

One of the reasons, as the Senator has suggested, why, for instance, my State of South Dakota would get more money than it would use is that we have already gone ahead and built road mileage which will be used in the Interstate System, and we did it on a 50-50 matching basis. We built that road mileage because it is the most important highway in the State. Our State highway commission did not try to pad its request for the Interstate System either in miles or in cost.

Mr. BUSH. In answer to the question, I simply quote section 109 of the House bill, entitled "Declaration of Policy With Respect to Reimbursement for Certain Highways." The question which the Senator has raised is dealt with in the House bill, but it is not in the Senate committee bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does that deal with both the free roads and the toll roads?

Mr. BUSH. Yes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I think it is a most important provision, and that consideration should be given to it. I do not see why a State, which has already built highways, and is paying for them by the issuance of bonds, and so forth, should not be entitled to credit for what it has paid.

Mr. BUSH. I am wholeheartedly in agreement with the Senator from Kansas. I have an amendment at the desk, upon which the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] has joined me as a sponsor, which I intend to call up tomorrow, which will satisfy the Senator, I am sure.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I also have an amendment at the desk, to which I shall refer later in my remarks this afternoon, which covers the whole field.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, in conclusion on this point, I wish to emphasize that this is a national system designed to benefit the economy of the Nation as a whole, as well as the defense of the Nation as a whole. It is not designed for the benefit of one State or another, but for the United States of America. What other justification could there be for using 90 percent Federal funds? The people of this country want a National Interstate Highway System. The State highway officials and other road experts want it. An overwhelming majority of the House of Representatives want it. Why then should the Senate stop it? The reasons for stopping it, if any there are, should be sound, logical, and based on clear, indisputable, well-recorded facts—not on impressions, beliefs, isolated instances, and matters not testified to before the committee.

The substitute contains no provision whatsoever with respect to States which have constructed toll or free highways eligible for inclusion in the National Interstate System. The Clay committee recommended reimbursement in these States according to certain formulas contained in section 207 of S. 1160. Objections were raised to these provisions for reimbursement. The principal objection was the uncertainty involved because it is unknown to date as to the mileage of these roads that will be included on the Interstate System and eligible for reimbursement.

In order to meet this objection, but at the same time show clearly an intention on the part of Congress to be equitable in this matter, the House committee inserted section 109 in H. R. 10660. This section contains a declaration of policy with respect to reimbursement of certain highways in the following words:

It is hereby declared to be the intent and policy of the Congress to equitably reimburse those States for any portion of a highway which is on the Interstate System, whether toll or free, the construction of which has been completed subsequent to August 2, 1947, or which is either in actual use or under construction by contract, for completion, awarded not later than June 30, 1957, and such highway meets the standards required by this title for the Interstate System.

This section then requires the Secretary of Commerce to make a study in cooperation with the State highway departments to determine which highways measure up to the standards required for the Interstate System, and to give all relevant facts concerning the reimbursable costs of such highways. The approach to this problem contained in section 109 is a fair and reasonable one. It contains a declaration of policy to indicate that there is equity in reimbursing those States which have already constructed eligible toll and free roads. At the same time, it does not go into the matter blindly, but calls for a report of all of the factors involved. Two years from now Congress with the facts before it can enact fair and wise legislation to take care of this problem.

The original Federal highway legislation of 1916 contained a provision that all roads constructed under the provisions of that act should be free from tolls of all kinds. Certain toll roads have been constructed without the aid of Federal funds and are located on routes of the Interstate System. It would be unsound economically to construct roads paralleling these roads. Yet, if these roads were not part of the system, we would not have a fully integrated system.

Mr. President, I have sent to the desk an amendment dealing with section 109 and section 116 of the Fallon bill, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BUSH was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 49, between lines 24 and 25, insert the following new sections:

"SEC. 117. It is hereby declared to be the intent and policy of the Congress to equitably reimburse the States for any portion of a highway which is on the National System of Interstate Highways, whether toll or free, the construction of which has been completed subsequent to August 2, 1947, or which is either in actual use or under construction by contract, for completion, awarded not later than June 30, 1957, and such highway meets the standards required by this title for the National System of Interstate Highways. The time, method, and amounts of such reimbursement shall be determined by the Congress following a study which the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed to conduct, in cooperation with the State highway departments, and other agencies as may be required, to determine which highways in the National System of Interstate Highways measure up to the standards required by this title, including all related factors of cost, depreciation, participation of Federal funds, and any other items relevant thereto. A complete report of the results of such study shall be submitted to the Congress within 10 days subsequent to January 2, 1958. It is also declared to be the policy and intent of the Congress to provide funds necessary to make such reimbursements to the States as may be determined.

"SEC. 118. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to approve as part of the National System of Interstate Highways any toll road, bridge, or tunnel, now or hereafter constructed which meets the standards adopted for the improvement of projects located on such system, whenever such toll road, bridge, or tunnel forms a logical segment of such system: *Provided*, That no Federal-aid highway funds shall be expended for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of any such toll road except to the extent hereafter permitted by law: *Provided further*, That no Federal-aid highway funds shall be expended for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of any such toll bridge or tunnel except to the extent now or hereafter permitted by law.

"(b) The funds authorized under this title, or under prior acts, shall be available for expenditure on projects approaching any toll road, bridge, or tunnel to a point where such project will have some use irrespective of its use for such toll road, bridge, or tunnel.

"(c) The funds authorized under this title, or under prior acts, shall be available for expenditure on projects approaching any toll road on the National System of Interstate Highways, even though the project has no use other than as an approach to such toll road: *Provided*, That agreement has been reached with the State prior to approval of any such project (1) that the section of toll road will become free to the public upon retirement of any bonds outstanding at the time of the agreement, (2) that all toll collections are used for maintenance and operation and debt service of the section of road incorporated into the National System of Interstate Highways, and (3) that there is one or more reasonably satisfactory alternate free routes available to traffic by which the toll section of the system may be bypassed.

"(d) Nothing in this title shall be deemed to repeal the act approved March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1398), or subsection (g) of section 204 of the National Industrial Recovery Act (48 Stat. 200), and such acts are hereby amended to include tunnels as well as bridges."

Renumber the following sections in title I accordingly.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, in order to take account of this situation, the House committee inserted section 116 in H. R. 10660. This section permits the Secretary of Commerce to approve as part of the Interstate System any toll road, bridge, or tunnel which meets the Standards of the Interstate System whenever such toll road, bridge, or tunnel forms a logical segment of that system. Such inclusion would be for purposes of integration only. This same

section also makes provision for approaches to these toll facilities and permits the expenditure of Federal funds on such approaches subject to the conditions therein stated. This entire section 116 is one which clarified the intent of Congress and is considered essential for a proper administration of the act. It should be included in the substitute.

Mr. President, I also have at the desk an amendment which is a compromise amendment on the question of the distribution of funds. I hope that Senators will have an opportunity to study it before the Senate commences voting tomorrow. I would certainly prefer the House formula, but in the interest of getting a bill to conference and of getting something of a constructive nature through the Senate, I shall propose this compromise.

I ask unanimous consent that the proposed amendment and the table which accompanies it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BUSH and the table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 35, beginning with line 11, strike out all through line 20 on page 36, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy and intent of the Congress that the funds authorized in subsection (a) of this section shall be distributed among the several States in such manner that each State will receive the amount required to pay the Federal share of the approved actual cost of completing the system in each State at an orderly and uniform rate of progress and with geometric standards uniformly applied in the several States.

"(c) The additional sum herein authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and the sum authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, shall be apportioned immediately upon enactment of this act. The sums herein authorized for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958 shall be apportioned among the several States in the following manner: One-half in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census: *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the money so apportioned; and one-half in the manner now provided by law for the apportionment of funds for the Federal-aid primary system: *Provided further*, That no State shall receive out of the apportionments for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958 combined more than 15 percent nor less than 10 percent of its estimate of total needs for the National System of Interstate Highways as shown in table I on pages 6 and 7 of House Document No. 120, 84th Congress.

"(d) All sums authorized by this section to be appropriated for the fiscal years 1959 through 1969, inclusive, shall be apportioned among the several States in the ratio which the estimated cost of completing the National System of Interstate Highways in each State bears to the estimated total cost of completing the National System of Interstate Highways in all of the States. The estimated costs shall be those set forth in the reports required to be filed by subsection (f) of this section and shall be those contained in the latest report so filed. Each apportionment herein authorized for the fiscal years 1959 through 1969, inclusive, shall be made on a date as far in advance of the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized, as practicable, but in no case more than 18 months prior to the fiscal year for which authorized.

"(e) The geometric standards to be adopted for the National System of Interstate Highways shall be those approved by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with the State highway departments. Such standards shall be adequate to accommodate the types and volumes of traffic forecast for the year 1975. The right-of-way width of the National System of Interstate Highways shall be adequate to permit construction of projects on the National System of Interstate Highways up to such standards. The Secretary of Commerce shall apply such standards uniformly throughout the States. Such standards shall be adopted by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with the State highway departments as soon as practicable after the enactment of this act.

"(f) As soon as the standards provided for in subsection (e) have been adopted, the Secretary of Commerce shall request each State highway department to make and furnish to him before July 1, 1957, a further study of the National System of Interstate Highways within its boundaries and a detailed estimate of the cost of completing the same based upon such standards. Such study and estimate shall be made in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be adopted by the Secretary of Commerce and applied by him uniformly to all of the States. Upon approval of such estimate by the Secretary of Commerce, he shall, within 10 days subsequent to January 2, 1958, transmit to the Senate and the House of Representatives a report of such study and estimate. The Secretary of Commerce shall use such estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1959, June 30, 1960, June 30, 1961, and June 30, 1962. The Secretary of Commerce shall cause a revised estimate to be made in the same manner as stated above and shall transmit the same to the Senate and the House of Representatives within 10 days subsequent to January 2, 1962, and shall use such revised estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1963, June 30, 1964, June 30, 1965, and June 30, 1966. The Secretary of Commerce shall cause a revised estimate to be made in the same manner as stated above and shall transmit the same to the Senate and the House of Representatives within 10 days subsequent to January 2, 1966, and annually thereafter through and including January 2, 1968, and shall use such revised estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal year which begins next following the fiscal year in which such report is filed. Whenever the Secretary of Commerce, pursuant to this subsection, requests the State highway departments to furnish studies and estimates to him, such highway departments shall furnish copies of such studies and estimates at the same time to the Senate and the House of Representatives.

"(g) The Federal share payable on account of any project on the National System of Interstate Highways provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be increased to 90 percent of the total cost thereof, plus a percentage of the remaining 10 percent of such cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area: *Provided*, That such Federal share payable on any project in any State shall not exceed 95 percent of the total cost of such project.

"(h) Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to be expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State specifically for the National System of Interstate Highways for such fiscal year and previous fiscal years is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of specific projects under this section.

"(i) Any amount apportioned to the States under the provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure under the terms of subsection (h) of this section shall lapse: *Provided*, That any National System of Interstate Highways funds released by the payment of the final voucher or by the modification of the formal project agreement shall be credited to the National System of Interstate Highways funds previously apportioned to the State and be immediately available for expenditure."

On page 36, line 21, strike out "(d)" and insert in lieu thereof "(j)."

On page 37, line 22, strike out "(e)" and insert in lieu thereof "(k)."

Combined 1957 and 1958 interstate apportionments under Fallon bill formula, Senate committee substitute, and a suggested compromise

[Millions of dollars]

State	Fallon bill, H. R. 10660 [1]	Gore bill, committee substitute [2]	Suggested compromise [3]
Alabama	43.3	55.9	54.9
Arizona	24.8	31.5	31.5
Arkansas	24.0	39.9	30.4
California	274.5	156.8	232.1
Colorado	18.6	37.6	23.5
Connecticut	65.6	26.5	55.5
Delaware	7.8	17.2	9.9
Florida	58.7	46.7	49.6
Georgia	82.8	64.1	70.0
Idaho	12.7	27.8	16.0
Illinois	126.0	129.7	129.4
Indiana	102.5	66.9	86.7
Iowa	32.5	56.2	41.2
Kansas	24.5	49.9	31.0
Kentucky	58.2	51.6	51.5
Louisiana	58.3	45.4	49.3
Maine	17.4	22.1	22.1
Maryland	51.3	33.0	43.4
Massachusetts	99.1	58.7	83.8
Michigan	153.2	98.9	129.5
Minnesota	57.1	62.0	61.9
Mississippi	29.1	43.6	36.9
Missouri	70.8	74.5	74.3
Montana	18.1	39.5	22.9
Nebraska	12.5	39.4	15.9
Nevada	8.6	28.7	11.0
New Hampshire	7.8	17.2	9.9
New Jersey	160.5	60.2	135.7
New Mexico	27.8	33.4	33.3
New York	158.0	195.0	194.5
North Carolina	29.2	70.1	37.1
North Dakota	12.7	30.5	16.1
Ohio	161.0	117.7	136.1
Oklahoma	44.6	49.2	49.1
Oregon	37.7	37.3	37.2
Pennsylvania	89.9	147.4	114.0
Rhode Island	14.5	17.2	17.2
South Carolina	21.6	37.0	27.5
South Dakota	11.2	31.8	14.2
Tennessee	44.9	58.8	57.0
Texas	103.1	158.0	130.8
Utah	28.2	26.8	26.7
Vermont	21.1	17.2	17.8
Virginia	67.3	55.7	56.9
Washington	55.2	44.2	46.7
West Virginia	30.5	32.8	32.7
Wisconsin	38.2	62.6	48.5
Wyoming	35.0	28.6	29.6
Hawaii			
District of Columbia	18.0	17.2	17.2
Puerto Rico			
Total	2,750.0	2,750.0	2,750.0

[1] Apportionment based on estimated costs, subject to periodic revision, audit and review after fiscal 1958.

[2] Apportionment based on formula for entire 13-year period: ½ population; ½ primary aid formula; ½ population; ½ area; ¼ mileage rural free delivery and star routes.

[3] Formula of Gore bill with proviso that no State shall receive less than 10 percent nor more than 15 percent of the cost it estimated for construction of Interstate System within its boundaries; after fiscal 1958, apportionment based on estimates revised periodically, audited and reviewed as in Fallon bill.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, that concludes my remarks on this subject.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I wish to express my appreciation for the thoughtful and provocative statement which the Senator from Connecticut has just delivered. Though he has been vigorously opposed to some of the provisions in the Senate committee bill, the able Senator from Connecticut has expressed himself with tolerance, understanding, and almost sympathy for the views of his colleagues. I appreciate that. It is typical of the fine gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I should like the RECORD to show that there is no more able member of the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate than the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut. From the very first, Mr. President, I have served with him on that committee. I participated with him in the 83d Congress in an attempt to fashion a highway bill suitable to the needs of the American people. I saw him stand up for principle then. I see him stand up for principle now. I am very glad that my able friend, the Senator from Connecticut, has participated in a sincere attempt to draft the kind of highway legislation the people of the United States need. I congratulate him on his position and on his statement.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am very grateful to my very good friend, the Senator from California, for his most tolerant and generous remarks.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President——

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I also wish to commend most highly the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. Although I do not agree with everything he has presented, yet he has given an enormous amount of time to the bill, and I know the entire Senate is most appreciative of what he has done.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am very appreciative of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, whose approval I value highly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President——

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to associate myself with the statements which have been made in regard to the intelligence and industry with which the able Senator from Connecticut has approached the problem of building roads. All of us have the highest respect for his sincerity and integrity and his readiness to work in the most tireless way in endeavoring to arrive at a solution of any problem.

Of course it is inevitable that Members of the Senate will have different points of view regarding the proper solution of various problems. However, when we credit each other with sincerity in our efforts, we make it much more likely that we shall arrive at good results.

In this case I believe a good highway bill will be arrived at, very definitely as a result of the work done both on the floor and in the two committees which have dealt with the bill. In that connection, let me say that it is unquestionable that a considerable amount of the credit for that achievement will be due the able and distinguished Senator from Connecticut, as a result of the fine work he has done.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am very thankful to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for his statement, particularly in view of his long service on the committee. I thank him very much.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I wish to join in thanking the distinguished Senator from Connecticut for his splendid presentation of the subject. I am sure he has the matter well in hand. He has given a very lucid and clear explanation of the pending bill as it affects not only his own State, but also many of the other States. So I wish to associate myself with the statement he has made today.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator very much indeed, and I greatly appreciate his comments.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield again to me?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, for over half a century I have been working at one or another of the three different levels of government. I should like to state that never before have I seen any two legislative committees give to a problem the serious attention which has been given to the one now before us by the Senate Committee on Public Works and the Senate Finance Committee.

I have discussed this matter with the Parliamentarian, who informs me that this is the only instance of which he knows when a bill which originated in the House of Representatives has dealt with two separate and distinct provisions relating to the jurisdiction of different committees.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet, I wish to commend the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] for the excellent work he has done. He has devoted an enormous amount of time to the problem, as have the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]; the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]; the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the chairman of the Committee on Public Works; and the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. These Senators have done outstanding work in the study of the problem by the two committees. We are very fortunate to have the benefit of two committees of such outstanding character.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania and I desire to associate myself with the comments he has made about the Finance Committee and our own Committee on Public Works. I think we have worked together in a very conscientious way in the interest of the enactment this year of some very important highway legislation.

I hope my colleagues' very generous comments augur well for the adoption of some of the amendments which I expect to submit tomorrow.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to join the other Senators in complimenting the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] for the fine work he has done on the highway bill. I also wish to commend the other members of the Senate Committee on Public Works and the members of the Senate Finance Committee.

At this session we have been fortunate in having the benefit of the excellent work done by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], both of whom serve on both the Public Works Committee and the Committee on Finance. It has been my privilege to sit with the Finance Committee during its consideration of the section of the bill dealing with the financing of these roads. In this instance, that service has given me an opportunity to obtain an insight into some of the problems handled by the Committee on Public Works. Both the Senate and the country are, in my opinion, indebted to these Members, who have given so much of their time in studying these problems.

Mr. President, I am advised that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] feels that at this time he should be recognized. So I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to him whatever time he needs, provided that I may be recognized next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas for his courtesy.

Before I proceed with my brief remarks and ask some questions of the chairman of the subcommittee which considered the highway bill, I should like to state that the reason for the previous misunderstanding was that, I had understood we could rely on the lists which were placed at the desk. I was informed by the Senate staff and attachés that I would be the next Senator to be recognized, following the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. I relied upon that information; and inasmuch as I was told that my name was next on the list, I was glad to defer to the Senator from Connecticut.

I realize that such lists have no official standing whatsoever. Yet, Mr. President, if they are to be used, I believe Senators should be able to rely upon them. I had relied upon the list. So I

very much appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Kansas in permitting me to speak at this time.

I shall be very brief, because I realize that other Senators wish to speak on the bill.

First, I wish to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee some questions about objections which have been voiced in my State to the Senate Public Works Committee's version of the bill.

The Oregonian, which is published in Portland, Oreg., is one of the largest newspapers, if not the largest, in the Pacific Northwest. I wish to read an editorial which appeared on May 24, 1956, in the Oregonian. The editorial expresses the general viewpoint that the House version of the highway bill would be better for the State of Oregon than the Senate Public Works Committee's version.

The editorial reads as follows:

[From the Oregonian of May 24, 1956]

NEED AS ROAD YARDSTICK

So far as Oregon alone is concerned it would make little difference whether the billions Congress soon should be authorizing for the Interstate Highway System were distributed according to the formula set up in the Senate (Gore) bill or the one provided for in the House (Fallon) bill. Oregon would get almost the same amount of Federal money under either bill for expenditure on Highways 99 and 30.

But so far as the Nation as a whole and the West as a region are concerned there is a vast difference in the effectiveness of the two formulas. And, since the Interstate Highway System within Oregon is only a link in the nationwide network, it is to this State's advantage that the best one be adopted. An effort is being made by western Senators to have the Senate adopt the House plan in place of its own, and Oregon highway planners are behind them.

Briefly, the House measure treats the 40,000-mile Interstate System as a unit. To each State would be provided as much of the $25 billion Federal fund as it needs to bring that part of the system within its borders up to a standard adequate for the traffic carried.

The Senate plan would distribute the interstate highway money in the same way that Federal aid funds have been distributed in the past and are now distributed. Half of the money would be parceled out to the States on the basis of population and the other half would be divided one-third each on population, area, and mileage.

This plan would result in some States receiving much more than they need and others much less. Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of Washington, in calling a meeting of western Senators the other day, said the Senate version dangerously imperils western highway expansion. Washington would lose $8 million a year over the 13-year life of the highway program under the Senate formula. California would lose $82 million a year. But Nevada would gain $13 million a year.

It would not actually be a gain for Nevada. For that State would not be able to match the Federal money and much of it would be wasted. Nevadans are in the unusual position of demanding less rather than more Federal assistance. They would rather have the extra money go to California so that State can modernize those California highways which tie in with the feed traffic to the parts of the Interstate System within Nevada.

Oregon State Highway Engineer R. H. Baldock puts the situation this way: Under the Gore bill Nevada would get Federal money for 3⅓ times the interstate mileage it needs, whereas California would get only 57 percent of its needs. He strongly favors the House formula, under which need would be the yardstick. Need would be reviewed in 1958 and again in 1962 to bring the original estimates made in 1954 up to date.

The House bill as a whole is a reasonable compromise between administration and congessional proposals for modernizing the American highway system. The Senate would do well to adopt it in toto in place of its own inadequate measure.

Let me say to the chairman of the subcommittee that I think he knows that I have supported the Senate Committee version of the highway bill; and it is still my disposition to support the Senate version when the yea and nay votes begin tomorrow. However, I would appreciate it very much if he would explain for me and for other Senators his answers to the points raised in the editorial which I have just read.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, as I heard the editorial read I made three notes. The first was on the question of apportionment. Funds for the Interstate System are apportioned by a formula which apportions funds to States on a comparative basis, that basis being two-thirds on the basis of population, one-sixth on the basis of area—of which Oregon has a great deal—and one-sixth on the basis of star route and post road mileage within the State. Of course, Oregon has a great many post roads.

Second, the apportionment to the primary, secondary, and urban roads is on the basis of one-third for population, one-third for area, and one-third for star route and post road mileage within the State. I do not know to what the editorial refers when it states that any State is going to lose by the Senate committee version, as compared with the provisions of the House bill, because the House bill contains only a 2-year apportionment for interstate highways, and a 3-year apportionment for urban, secondary, and primary roads. On the other hand, the Senate committee version carries a 13-year apportionment for interstate roads, and a 5-year apportionment for the other 3 categories, namely, primary, secondary, and urban.

I made a third note, with respect to needs. The editorial refers to the needs of the various States to complete the Interstate System. I wonder if the able junior Senator from Oregon is aware of the statement of the Bureau of Public Roads with respect to the needs table.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am well aware of the statement of the Bureau of Roads. I think I was present at the hearing before the subcommittee, so ably presided over by the Senator from Tennesee, when various officials of the Bureau of Public Roads testified about the manner in which the figures representing needs were arrived at in the House distribution formula.

Mr. GORE. The Senator knows, then, that the needs were not determined by the Bureau of Public Roads, but that the Bureau of Public Roads merely served as a compiling agent. The Bureau of Public Roads merely listed the estimates of needs submitted by the States.

One of the clerks of the Senate has now handed me the editorial. I wish to read one sentence:

To each State would be provided as much of the $25 billion Federal fund as it needs to bring that part of the system within its borders up to a standard adequate for the traffic carried.

I suggest to the Senator that that presumes that whatever the needs are, the $25 billion will be sufficient to meet them. As a matter of fact, my own State, to which I have already referred today, submitted an estimate which the editorial presumes to be a correct estimate, and which was included in the Clay report. This report provides the basis for the 2-year apportionment in the House bill. With the assistance of the Automotive Foundation and an extensive survey by the Corps of Engineers, the State of Tennessee has now completed a reestimate, which is 77 percent greater than the original estimate.

The point I wish to make is that if other States are submitting similar estimates, the $25 billion pie cannot cut into so many large slices. So what we must do, it seems to me, is to begin with a policy of bringing all our Federal aid highways to a condition of adequacy. We must begin with a sound foundation for apportioning funds to the States in order that the States may depend on such apportionments and then proceed with a program, which will be reviewed from time to time, for bringing not only the Interstate System, but also urban, primary, and secondary highways, to a condition of adequacy.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield, so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee, to develop these facts a little further?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I shall be happy to yield. However, first, I wish to make a brief comment before I yield to the Senator from California, so that he may ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee.

I wish to say to the Senator from Tennessee, with whom I served on the subcommittee, that I share his opposition to any system of self-assessment, by which a State merely announces arbitrarily what it presumably needs, in the total absence of any fixed standards. I feel that we need fixed standards. What I hope the Senator from Tennessee will develop a little further, perhaps after he replies to the Senator from California, is the further point made in the editorial—and I do not have the editorial before me—that the State of Nevada will, so it is claimed, get far more money than it actually needs under the Senate version of the bill. I hope the Senator will discuss that point briefly.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I have not seen the result of the restudy and the new estimates with respect to the State of Nevada. Therefore, I do not know how the funds apportioned under the bill would apply

to the newer estimates. Be that as it may, the Senate bill provides that the apportionment unused by a State 2 years after the apportionment will lapse into the Treasury. I stress the word "apportionment." The funds will never go to the State unless they are actually programed and unless they are actually used.

Therefore I do not understand how any other States would be seriously penalized if the funds which go to Nevada should, perchance, be somewhat in excess of the cost of completing the system, so long as we have in the bill the provision that they cannot be actually expended in Nevada unless they are needed within Nevada. These funds can be reapportioned to other States.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator. I now yield to the Senator from California for the purpose of having him ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator. I have two questions. I am delighted to see the able Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] on the floor, because I believe we are getting down to some of the specific questions which must divide the Senate when we vote tomorrow.

First of all, I should like to ask the able Senator from Tennessee whether it is not true that in the House-approved bill provision is made for five reexaminations of the basis of need during the 13-year period of contemplated construction.

Mr. GORE. I am not sure that the provision provides exactly that, but there are provisions in the bill which provide for review. I repeat, however, that in the case of interstate roads the apportionment is only a 2-year basis, and on a 3-year basis for primary, urban, and secondary roads.

Mr. KUCHEL. I believe that that answer is not scrupulously accurate, as I read the House bill. Does the Senator mean that the House bill provides for a 2-year apportionment on the Interstate System subject (a) to a reexamination of estimates by the Bureau of Public Roads and (b) approval by two committees of Congress? Is that what the Senator means?

Mr. GORE. I will explain exactly what I mean. I will read the actual provision of the House bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. I believe it is at page 13.

Mr. GORE. On page 13, line 12, the Senator will find subsection (c). The bill reads: "Apportionments for 1957 and 1958." That section of the bill runs down through line 23 on page 13. As I read it, that is the only definite apportionment that is made.

Mr. KUCHEL. No; that is where the Senator is in error. If the Senator will read the next section, which begins at the bottom of the page, he will find this language:

> All sums authorized by this section to be appropriated—

And so forth.

Mr. GORE. That is correct. The subsection is headed: "Apportionments for Subsequent Years."

Mr. KUCHEL. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator from Oregon will yield further, it might be well to read that whole section into the RECORD.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. GORE. It reads:

> (d) Apportionments for subsequent years: All sums authorized by this section to be appropriated for the fiscal years 1950 through 1969, inclusive, shall be apportioned among the several States in the ratio which the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in each State bears to the estimated total cost of completing the Interstate System in all of the States. The estimated costs shall be those set forth in the reports required to be filed by subsection (f) of this section and shall be those contained in the latest report so filed. Each apportionment herein authorized for the fiscal years 1959 through 1969, inclusive, shall be made on a date as far in advance of the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized, as practicable, but in no case more than 18 months prior to the fiscal year for which authorized.

That is the end of subsection (d).

I now call the Senator's attention to the sentence beginning at line 5:

> The estimated costs shall be those set forth in the reports required to be filed by subsection (f).

Mr. KUCHEL. That is right.

Mr. GORE. Coming now to subsection (f), we read, at line 11 of page 15:

> Upon approval of such estimate by the Secretary of Commerce, he shall, within 10 days subsequent to January 2, 1958, transmit to the Senate and the House of Representatives a report of such study and estimate. Upon approval by affirmative resolution of the committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives to which referred, the Secretary of Commerce shall use such estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1959, June 30, 1960, June 30, 1961, and June 30, 1962.

I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the apportionment beyond fiscal 1957 and 1958 cannot be made, and that the Secretary of Commerce cannot use estimates for making the apportionment, as I read the bill, until such estimates have been approved by affirmative resolution of both the Senate and House Committees on Public Works.

Mr. KUCHEL. I completely agree with the Senator. In other words, that subsection lays down the means by which a realistic examination of the needs shall be undertaken by the Secretary of Commerce, and shall go into effect subject to the approval of the appropriate two committees of Congress.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I suggest to the Senator from California that, instead of being realistic, it appears to me to be entirely unrealistic. I can foresee the possibility that the Public Works Committee of one House of Congress might approve, whereas the committee of the other body might not approve. The bill does not provide that Congress shall legislate on the proposition. It provides for approval by affirmative resolution of the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House. The House Committee on Public Works might, as it has with respect to the legislation before the Senate today, have one point of view, while the Public Works Committee of the Senate might have a different point of view. Therefore, a stalemate would develop, and no apportionment could be made.

I come back to the original statement I made, that under the House bill no definite apportionment is made except for 1957 and 1958.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is obviously entitled to his opinion as to whether the provision of the House bill is workable. But I renew my question. Is it true that the bill as passed by the House of Representatives lays down its conception of the basis of need for apportionment for 2 years and, thereafter, a basis upon which further estimates of need will be found, subject to the approval of the two committees of the Congress? Is not that a factual statement?

Mr. GORE. It depends upon the definition we give to the word "need." If we accept the definition which the Bureau of Public Roads gave to it, the first part of the Senator's statement would be correct, and the latter part would be subject to doubt.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator can answer the question or not, as he sees fit; but is it not true that the language of the bill provides a basis upon which apportionments shall be carried out for the entire 13 years?

Mr. GORE. I do not think that is a definite basis at all.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Let me ask the Senator from Tennessee a question along the line of the questions asked of him by the Senator from California.

Is it not true that under section (f) of the House bill there still is no fixed standard by which the money will be distributed? Is not that perhaps a vital weakness, that we are still dealing with estimates?

Mr. KUCHEL. Is the Senator from Oregon asking the Senator from California that question?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am asking the Senator from Tennessee. I should be glad to have the Senator from California comment on it. But are we not still dealing with estimates rather than with any fixed standard?

Mr. GORE. In the first instance, we are dealing with estimates which have already been demonstrated to be unrealistic, already acknowledged to lack uniformity, already described by the Bureau of Public Roads as being without standardization.

In the second place, the House bill deals with estimates about which we are yet uninformed, but the provision contains a requirement that they be approved by affirmative resolutions by both the House and the Senate Committees on Public Works before they can be used as a basis of apportionment. It seems to me that is a long way from a definite method of approaching the problem.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, if I may make a comment on the same question—and we are getting down to the crux of the whole matter—my answer to the Senator from Oregon is that when we

attempt to apply the usual Federal apportionment rule to a job which is going to be completed in 13 years, there is no justifiable basis on which apportionments can be made.

To the contrary, the Senator from Oregon does not know, the Senator from California does not know, the Senator from Tennessee does not know, to the penny, how much money will be taken out of the Treasury of the United States to construct a 40,000-mile highway system. It has got to be done on estimates. It has got to be done in a manner which will give the Bureau of Public Roads in each instance the right to determine whether a State expends Federal money properly so that it can be properly reimbursed from the Federal Treasury.

It seems to me that our brethren in the House of Representatives have done an admirable job in saying that in the first 2 years the needs should be determined on the basis of a State's estimate. At the end of the 2 years the Bureau must make a new estimate of what the needs are in each State. Subject to the approval of the two committees mentioned, the apportionment shall then be carried on for 4 years, at which time a third, then a fourth, and then a fifth reexamination by the Bureau is provided.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Let me ask the Senator from California a question. He represents, in part, one of the most populous States of the Union and one of the largest in area. Are we not totally dealing with estimates? To the Senator's knowledge, have Federal funds ever before been distributed in this fashion?

Mr. KUCHEL. On the basis of need?

Mr. NEUBERGER. On the basis of self-assessment by the States.

Mr. KUCHEL. I deny that this is a self-assessment. This is in no sense a self-assessment.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator will admit that for the first 2 years it is a self-assessment?

Mr. KUCHEL. I deny that. Congress required the Bureau of Public Roads to obtain from the States estimates, to give to the Congress some opportunity to determine how much money is necessary and how much money the several States are going to utilize. Under the language of the House bill, we do not open the Treasury and say to the people of Oregon, "Here, come and take this much money."

We do not say to the people of California or of Tennessee, "Here is what the estimates are."

They are only estimates, and in each case the Bureau of Public Roads, on a given standard, will determine whether to approve a contract by a State for highway construction, and the construction having taken place the bureau will determine whether to approve reimbursement.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I still do not understand that there are any fixed standards governing the estimates whereby, under the House bill, the program starts off the first 2 years. When the officials of the Bureau of Public Roads testified before the subcommittee, they indicated that there were no fixed standards.

Mr. KUCHEL. I will say to my friend from Oregon that the RECORD tomorrow will include a letter which I received today from the Commissioner of Public Roads—I do not have it before me now, but it is printed in the RECORD—in which he says the only way to do this job is on the basis of need. All we have before us today is the best estimate that could be given at the time by the States.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is that not self-assessment?

Mr. KUCHEL. No; because the responsibility lies with the Bureau of Public Roads. If a State's estimate is too high, the State will not be given that much money by the Bureau of Roads.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Did the Bureau of Public Roads turn back to the States the estimates which were supplied to it?

Mr. KUCHEL. I can answer that question only in this fashion. If a given State has asked for too much money, the Bureau of Public Roads is not going to say, "Here, come and take all of it." The Bureau of Public Roads is going to approve in advance every contract within a State for road construction. On the other hand, if the people of Nevada ask for $8 million and they get $27 million under the Senate committee bill, the people of Nevada and their Senators, to their credit, will say, "We do not want this much money; we cannot spend it."

Mr. NEUBERGER. Let me ask the Senator another question.

If there is any accuracy in these estimates, how does the Senator account for the fact that on page 32 of the committee report containing various supplemental views, which is on the desks of all Senators, under the Fallon bill the distribution to the State of Pennsylvania, for example, is $62 million, whereas, to the State of New Jersey, which, according to my understanding, is far smaller than is Pennsylvania in area and has a smaller population than has Pennsylvania, the amount is $111 million, nearly twice that to the State of Pennsylvania. What accuracy is there in such a division as that?

Mr. KUCHEL. All the Senator is doing is referring to estimates. The Bureau of Public Roads is going to be required to apportion moneys on a reimbursement basis.

Prior to that reimbursement, the Bureau of Public Roads will determine in every single instance of a road construction contract anywhere in the Nation whether or not it is in keeping with standards, whether or not it is correct under the law; and having made such a determination, it will approve the State's claim to reimbursement, the reimbursement in no case, however, to exceed the amount of the estimates. At the end of 2 years, new estimates will be submitted to Congress.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is not the particular division in the House bill which I have mentioned certain for the next 2 years?

Mr. KUCHEL. As an estimate, yes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It is an actual distribution.

Mr. KUCHEL. Oh, no. That is incorrect. That is not the fact, Mr. President, and it should be iterated and reiterated in the RECORD.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield on that very point?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I have no quarrel with the point which has been made by the Senator from California, but I call his attention to line 16, page 13, of the House bill:

> The sums herein authorized for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958 shall be apportioned in the ratio which the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in each State bears to the estimated total cost of completing the Interstate System in all of the States as set forth in the computations compiled by the Bureau of Public Roads on pages 6 and 7 of House Document No. 120, 84th Congress.

Mr. KUCHEL. Does the Senator from Kansas quarrel with that language?

Mr. CARLSON. I do not quarrel with it in its entirety. I quarrel with it in this regard: That the apportionments for the first years are based on estimates which, I say, in certain instances are unfair and unrealistic. Following the experience with costs of construction, I shall have no objection; but the first estimates, I think, are wrong.

Mr. KUCHEL. Let us try to nail this proposition down, so that there will not be any misunderstanding. Will the Senator from Oregon further yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator from Kansas has referred to page 13 of the bill. I quote from the language of the House bill, page 13, line 16:

> The sums herein authorized for fiscal years 1957 and 1958 shall be apportioned in the ratio—

I underline the word "ratio"—

> which the estimated cost—

I underscore "estimated cost"—

> of completing the Interstate System in each State bears to the estimated total cost—

I underline that phrase—

> of completing the Interstate System in all of the States as set forth in the computations compiled by the Bureau of Public Roads on pages 6 and 7 of House Document No. 120, 84th Congress.

In other words, to get the program underway, the House of Representatives in its bill has said, in effect, "We will take these estimates, and for the first 2 years the contracts which the Bureau of Public Roads lets in each State of the Union shall be generally in accordance with the estimate of each State against the total estimated cost for constructing the system." That is all.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. On what basis does the formula allocation under the Senate committee bill operate? Is not the dollar allocation based upon the very same estimates to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. CARLSON. The allocations are to be based on the Fallon bill—the House bill—not on the Senate committee bill; not on the ratio as to total cost of the entire program. The first allocation will determine the amount of money which will go to each State in the fiscal years

1957 and 1958. I say those estimates are unrealistic and unfair.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator from Kansas will have the opportunity to listen in a moment to one of our able brethren who, in part, represents a State which, under the Senate committee bill, would get three times as much money as it has estimated it will need. That State does not want all the money, and it is to their credit that they say so. Some other States will get less money than they need.

The point is that all of these figures are estimates; and, good or bad, they will serve as guidelines, so to speak, for 2 years. They will provide a ceiling. If the money cannot be utilized under the ceiling within the estimate of each State, in 2 more years the committees of Congress, under the provisions of the bill, will have the right to correct the condition. It will be the duty of Congress to correct it. There will be three more opportunities after that to do exactly the same thing.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Since the Senator from California has referred to this matter, I call his attention to page 697 of the hearings which were held by the Subcommittee on Public Works. Commissioner Curtiss of the Bureau of Public Roads, testified as follows:

> We found—and by "we" I mean the Bureau—when we analyzed the estimates submitted by the States, and I would like to make that clear that these estimates are not estimates of the Bureau of Public Roads, they are the estimates of the State highway departments, and we have merely analyzed and summarized and brought them together in this report.

In other words, the Bureau of Public Roads made no changes. I asked earlier if the Senator knew whether any changes had been made. The Bureau of Public Roads merely collected the estimates. They took what each State sent to the Bureau and merely submitted the figures from the States.

Mr. KUCHEL. I do not think the Senator from Oregon is quite accurate. Again, I shall have to ask the Senator to wait until tomorrow, because earlier today I gave to the Official Reporters, for inclusion in the RECORD, a letter I received from the Commissioner. I think the Commissioner would disagree with the statement which the Senator from Oregon has just made.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I read it exactly.

Mr. GORE. If the Commissioner disagreed with it, he would have to disagree with his own testimony.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I read exactly what the Commissioner said. Is it the position of the able Senator from California that the Bureau of Public Roads scaled down or changed or amplified the estimates?

Mr. KUCHEL. I never said that. I do not need to say it in order to make my point. All I said was that the Commissioner of Public Roads wrote me a letter, which I placed in the RECORD this morning, and in which he stated that, in his judgment, the basis of need or cost is the only basis upon which Congress can get the work done in 13 years. That is all I said.

I say, also, that the estimates for the first 2 years may be out of line. Some of them may be too low; others may be too high. But I maintain that at the end of 2 years, when the Bureau is required to make further estimates, subject to the approval of the Committees on Public Works, we will begin to have sounder estimates coming to Congress.

At the end of 13 years, when Congress shall have had the benefit of five reestimates, we shall have a broad, sound basis upon which to know that the needs will be satisfied to the exact extent necessary. No more money will be spent in any one State than is necessary; and no less money will be spent in another State than will be necessary.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the able Senator from California. I shall not presume very much longer upon the time of the Senate, because I realize other Senators are waiting to speak.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD my individual views as briefly stated in the committee report, because they summarize my feeling about the so-called estimates.

It is my opinion—I may be mistaken, but it is certainly sincerely held—that when we go to the estimates, the States having a smaller population, and therefore having ultimately less political influence nationally, will lose. I have tried to express in my brief individual views my sentiment that if we discard a fixed formula, on which he have relied so long to distribute highway funds, and rely upon estimates, then it will be a political matter; and in a political matter the relatively smaller States, in terms of population, will not fare very well.

I ask unanimous consent that my individual views may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the individual views of Mr. NEUBERGER were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATOR RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

These points seem to me essential in considering differences between the highway bills passed by the House (H. R. 10660) and by the Senate (S. 1048):

1. The sums authorized annually for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, and for parkways are more adequate in the House bill than in the Senate amendment. As I stated in the Committee on Public Works, it is my intention to offer an amendment to substitute the House-approved sums for the sums presently in the Senate amendment thereto. Forest development roads in the Pacific Northwest more than pay for themselves in the additional sums made available to the Federal Treasury, through better access to federally owned timber and increased competitive bidding when it is offered for sale. Furthermore, additional access roads in both forests and parks are made necessary by fact that recreational use of these outdoor playgrounds has nearly tripled during recent years. The automobile is the means by which virtually all these additional campers, hikers, fishermen, and hunters reach wilderness realms on Government lands.

The following comparisons will demonstrate why I favor the funds for forest and park road projects, as contained in the House bill, as being more realistic in view of increasing pressures for transportation in these areas:

Roads on federally owned lands

[Millions]

Type	House bill, fiscal years, 1958–59	Senate amendment, fiscal years, 1958–61
Forest highways	$25	$22.5
Forest developments roads and trails	27	24
Park roads and trails	16	12.5
Parkways	16	11
Total, annual	84	70

While these more adequate roads are necessary on Federal public lands, both for economic purposes and to facilitate access to their recreational opportunities in the automobile age, it is at the same time of the utmost importance to avoid invasion of wilderness areas and other roadless areas.

Such areas have been set aside in our national forests to preserve a tiny fraction of our country's land area, less than 1 percent, as completely as possible in the original condition of natural beauty and grandeur as the first explorers found it. No permanent shelters and no machine-driven means of travel are permitted in these areas.

While it might be assumed in any case, I think the record should be clear that planning and construction of roads under the Federal-aid highway program now before us will recognize and respect these roadless areas and the long-standing national conservation objectives which they serve.

2. The Senate amendment should contain the same provisions to protect wage standards on federally financed road projects, modeled on the Davis-Bacon Act, as are contained in the House bill. If the Government can safeguard wage structures and standards of living of men engaged in erecting hospitals and airports with Federal-aid funds, it is not less important and equitable that these safeguards be used to protect the men who build the Nation's major trunk highways.

3. There was proposed in the House an amendment providing for a comprehensive study of highway traffic-safety problems. The amendment was narrowly defeated. Because more than 36,000 Americans perish each year in automobile accidents, to say nothing of many more cruelly injured, and the enormous economic losses from traffic additions, such a study should be authorized and an amendment to that effect should be added to the Senate amendment.

4. The Territory of Alaska is still excluded from this Federal-aid highway legislation, in spite of the fact that this is our nearest land to the Soviet Union, and an expanded Federal highway program is cited by the administration as being crucial to national defense. Why should Hawaii and Puerto Rico be included and Alaska eliminated? Such discrimination makes neither rhyme nor reason.

Furthermore, residents of Alaska will pay the road and vehicle taxes included in title II of H. R. 10660, without sharing in the benefits made available by title I. This is the epitome of taxation not only without representation, but also without reciprocity. I plan to sponsor an amendment to bring Alaska within the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act, but with some modification as to formula, so that Alaska's vast area will not make disproportionate the benefits thus conferred.

5. Although I believe that the House bill is more adequate and realistic as to the overall needs of the Nation, I have voted to substitute the language of the Senate bill for one basic and decisive reason. This is the difference in the formulas by which the authorized funds would be distributed under the two measures.

In the Senate amendment the Federal funds for the Interstate System are distributed according to a formula which is fair and which protects the interests and welfare of all States. Under this section of the Senate amendment, one-half of the funds are apportioned according to the existing formula, which has been in effect with general acceptance since the year 1921. That formula is predicated one-third on a State's population, and one-third on area, and one-third on rural-postal-route mileage in the State. The other 50 percent of funds for the Interstate System under the Senate amendment is based wholly on population.

Thus, in the Senate amendment, there is a fixed and definite formula. The standards are there for all to see. The yardstick is the same for every State. What the census has disclosed, what geography has accomplished, and what the Post Office Department has specified as rural and star mail routes—these factors decide the distribution of highway funds.

But in the House bill, the time-tested formula which has existed since 1921 has been junked. The whole distribution in the House bill is fixed according to what is described as needs. In other words, if one State highway department decides that it wants its interstate roads equipped with split-brick retaining walls and fog lights, then its needs are obviously far greater than those of States with less pretentious ambitions. In fairness to all States, can we permit self-assessment of different States' highways needs any more than we could dispense with Federal standards for aid to State public welfare, old-age assistance, hospital construction, or other matching fund programs?

As a Senator from a State with only 1 percent of the national population, I fear that abandonment of fixed statutory standards in favor of any nebulous apportionment of highway funds will inevitably work to the ultimate disadvantage of all the States with relatively small populations and accordingly with small congressional delegations and electoral strength. The protection of the smaller States is to be found in a definite formula. Such a formula cannot be violated and is beyond administrative caprice, while distribution of funds predicated on needs can mean anything the Secretary of Commerce desires it to mean.

I favor a statutory formula of apportionment of Federal highway construction funds among the States. For this single, compelling reason I have voted to substitute the terms of S. 1048 for title I of H. R. 10660. In other, less-fundamental features, I believe sections of H. R. 10660 are preferable and might be added to the Senate amendment. But I cannot vote for a bill under which Oregon, with a population of 1,670,000, would have to seek its share of funds for the Interstate System of Highways on the basis of needs, along with the most populous State, New York, with its population of 16 million. In that kind of competition, States like Oregon will not fare well in the long run. In addition, the administrative method of apportionment of H. R. 10660, even with its provision for review by the congressional Committees on Public Works, risks plunging the distribution of Federal-aid highway construction funds into repeated controversy and making it subject to attempts at introducing political considerations.

We have avoided such a calamity for many decades. Let us not risk it now. The fixed formula of the past, modified slightly to keep pace with changing population patterns, is a far more prudent method of allocating our highway funds from Federal sources than according to something as intangible and indefinite as needs.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his forebearance and patience, but he knows that this matter is vital to all of us.

I have before me a table which deals with my State alone. It is dated May 10, 1956, and was prepared by the Western Highway Institute. I believe other Senators from Western States, including the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], have similar tables dealing with their respective States. This table, from the general compilation of the Western Highway Institute, which refers particularly to the State of Oregon, indicates that under the Gore bill there is somewhat more revenue set aside for the Federal-aid primary system, for the Federal-aid secondary system, and for the urban highways and roads than under the Fallon bill.

Mr. GORE. Does not the Senator think that there will be a need, particularly since there will be so much relocation of the Interstate System, for interconnection of urban streets and highways with primary and secondary highways, and that more Federal aid will be needed than some persons now anticipate?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I agree completely, and I also think that some of us who are from agricultural States must not forget that the Interstate Road System, because of its very limited access, is not a farm-to-market system. We must not forget that other road systems, which are not so spectacular as the Interstate Road System, still need Federal aid.

I desired to ask the Senator from Tennessee a question. The criticism which has been made of the somewhat more generous allotments in the Gore bill is that some of the States may have difficulty in providing necessary matching funds. Has the Senator from Tennessee given thought to that criticism, and what is his comment about it?

Mr. GORE. In the first place, the record of the States in matching Federal-aid highway funds has been that of almost 100 percent matching performance. There have been some instances of Federal funds not having been matched, but they are very much the exception.

In the second place, I doubt if even the State highway commissioners, let alone the Senate, can accurately foresee the need which may occur within the next 4 or 5 years for additional secondary, primary, and urban highways. The West particularly is growing, and growing very rapidly.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In other words, it is the feeling of the able Senator from Tennessee that the States will be able to provide the necessary matching funds to meet the allocations provided in his bill for roads other than the Interstate System?

Mr. GORE. If performance in the past is a guide to the future, then I say the answer is in the affirmative.

There is a third point I want to make. A formula for apportionment—a legal formula for apportionment—may very well, even in the case of secondary roads, provide for a particular State more generously than for another. We have never been able to devise a perfect yardstick for the apportionment of Federal funds with respect to highways, old-age pensions, or many other activities of our Government. However, whereas one State may be dealt with somewhat more generously than another, I do not see that we ought to penalize the State which is dealt with less generously because some States may be dealt with over-generously. So long as there is within the law the provision that unused funds, after 2 years, will lapse and will then become available for further apportionment, I think in the end we shall arrive at as nearly an equitable situation as can be arrived at.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I want to thank the Senator from Tennessee for his courtesy, his knowledge, and his patience in answer to these questions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Western Highway Institute table, as it applies to the State of Oregon only, with respect to distribution of these funds, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimate of Federal-aid highway funds provided and State matching funds required by bills pending in Congress

OREGON

[In millions of dollars]

Year	Fund	Present act			Fallon bill			Gore bill		
		Federal funds	State funds	Total	Federal funds	State funds	Total	Federal funds	State funds	Total
1957	FAP, FAS, U	10.6	6.5	17.1	11.0	6.8	17.8	13.6	8.3	21.9
	Interstate	2.3	1.0	3.3	16.2	1.3	17.5	15.6	1.3	16.9
	Total	12.9	7.5	20.4	27.2	8.1	35.3	29.2	9.6	38.8
1958	FAP, FAS, U				11.3	6.9	18.2	13.9	8.5	22.4
	Interstate				23.0	1.9	24.9	23.3	1.9	25.2
	Total				34.3	8.8	43.1	37.2	10.4	47.6

Estimate of Federal-aid highway funds provided and State matching funds required by bills pending in Congress—Continued

OREGON—continued

[In millions of dollars]

Year	Fund	Present act			Fallon bill			Gore bill		
		Federal funds	State funds	Total	Federal funds	State funds	Total	Federal funds	State funds	Tota
1959	FAP, FAS, U				11.7	7.2	18.9	13.9	8.5	22.4
	Interstate				27.0	2.2	29.2	26.7	2.2	28.9
	Total				38.7	9.4	48.1	40.6	10.7	51.3
1960	FAP, FAS, U				12.1	7.4	19.5	13.9	8.5	22.4
	Interstate				29.7	2.4	32.1	26.7	2.2	28.9
	Total				41.8	9.8	51.6	40.6	10.7	51.3
1961	FAP, FAS, U				12.5	7.7	20.2	13.9	8.5	22.4
	Interstate				29.7	2.4	32.1	26.7	2.2	28.9
	Total				42.2	10.1	52.3	40.6	10.7	51.3
1962–68	FAP, FAS, U				97.9	60.1	158.0	97.0	59.5	156.5
	Interstate				198.6	16.4	215.0	186.6	15.4	202.0
	Total				296.5	76.5	373.0	283.6	74.9	358.5
1969	FAP, FAS, U				15.5	9.5	25.0	13.9	8.5	22.4
	Interstate				13.5	1.1	14.6	26.7	2.2	28.9
	Total				29.0	10.6	39.6	40.6	10.7	51.3
1957–69	FAP, FAS, U				172.0	105.6	277.6	180.1	110.3	290.4
	Interstate				337.7	27.7	365.4	332.3	27.4	359.7
	Total				509.7	133.3	643.0	512.4	137.7	650.1

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in general I agree with the Senator from Tennessee, who has taken the position consistently in this entire issue, extending well over the period of a year, that a fixed formula for distribution of these funds is better for most of the States than so-called estimates.

I want to say in conclusion, before I yield the floor, that on tomorrow I hope to comment very briefly in support of the Davis-Bacon provision, which I hope will be included in the Senate version of this bill. The Senator from Tennessee will remember that last year in committee, it was the junior Senator from Oregon, I think, who made the motion that the Davis-Bacon provision be included in the bill, and I voiced some protest on the floor when it was taken out of the highway bill at the time of the debate on it. I believe it was a mistake to delete the Davis-Bacon provision for the application of prevailing wages, because if that provision can be applied to the construction, with Federal funds, of hospitals, housing, airports, and other facilities, it certainly seems no less fair that the Davis-Bacon provision should apply to the construction of the Interstate Highway System.

I hope the Senator from Tennessee, with his great influence, will see fit to support the inclusion of the Davis-Bacon provision in the bill on tomorrow, Tuesday, when I understand it will be before the Senate for a vote.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I do expect to support the amendment. As the Senator knows, a year ago I supported in committee the move to have the amendment included in the committee bill at that time.

With respect to the desirability of apportioning and distributing funds on the basis of a legal formula, in contradistinction to estimates, I desire to emphasize what the Senator from Oregon referred to as self-estimates. One thing I have difficulty in understanding and comprehending is how so many Senators race to the conclusion that the $25 billion is going to be sufficient to give every State all the money it estimates it may need under the most volatile imagination. The $25 billion cannot be stretched that far.

As I have indicated to the Senate, my own State has made an estimate which is 77 percent larger than the first estimate on which the $25 billion figure was based.

I wish to conclude by expressing my appreciation for the privilege of working with the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon. He has been diligent in committee work. He has been steadfast in studying the problem, not only from a national standpoint, but also from the standpoint of the West and the standpoint of Oregon. For instance, he has been insistent that adequate consideration and treatment be given to forest and park highways. I believe he has an amendment now pending at the desk on that very point.

Mr. NEUBERGER. My amendment would make the sums for forest, park, and Indian reservation roads identical with the allocations contained in the House bill.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee. With regard to his kind compliments for the junior Senator from Oregon, I wish to say the latter has a great deal to learn, and he has learned a great deal today.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield, so that I may ask a question? I am very well aware of the fact that the Senator from Kansas wishes to have the floor, and was previously recognized.

Mr. NEUBERGER. With the forbearance of the Senator from Kansas, I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. It seems to me this would be a timely place to ask this question. I know the Senator from Tennessee is very well aware of the problem I have mentioned to him as concerns primary, secondary, and urban roads. The problem of the State of Nevada, through the allocation of $900 million for this 5-year program——

Mr. GORE. I am sure the Senator refers to Nevada's share of the $900 million.

Mr. BIBLE. Nevada's share of the $900 million. I thank the Senator for his correction. I refer to the problem of receiving more than the officials feel they can match or can provide an adequate engineering staff for. I intend, a little later, when I secure the floor in my own right, to introduce a table pointing out with respect to Nevada what the Senator from Oregon pointed out with respect to Oregon. I wonder if the Senator from Tennessee can tell me how the Public Works Subcommittee arrived at the figure of $900 million, as contradistinguished from the House figure of $700 million, stepped up in $25 million increments.

Mr. GORE. As the Senator from Nevada knows, legislation is not an exact science, any more than medicine is. We took all the estimates we had, all the testimony before the committee, the knowledge and experience of individual Senators, some of whom have been governors of their respective States, and we arrived at an estimate which represented the best judgment of the committee. That is as nearly as I can state to the Senator from Nevada how the committee proceeded to arrive at the recommended $900 million a year for the three systems of Federal-aid highways.

I wish to inform the Senator from Nevada that in my opinion the Senate committee gave more consideration to the early and rapid growth of the country than did the House committee or the House; and we particularly gave more

attention, in my opinion, to the need for additional extensions to tie in with the Interstate System, which is to be rebuilt and relocated in large measure under the provisions of the bill. Therefore we felt that more funds were needed.

It may be that in the case of Nevada, more funds are allocated for the primary, secondary, and urban roads than the officials of Nevada can foresee a need for. However, I wish to state to the Senator from Nevada that those officials will have from 4 to 5 years to make their final determination as to the period of time in which the actual expenditure of those funds may be made.

Mr. BIBLE. I shall be very happy to have the Senator from Tennessee outline that situation.

Mr. GORE. I shall be glad to do so. Of course the Senator from Nevada realizes that, after the apportionment, there is to be a 2-year period before the unused apportionment would lapse.

Mr. BIBLE. Yes, if the funds were not appropriated.

Mr. GORE. Very well. If at any time before the 2-year period expires, the officials of his State file a program with the Bureau of Public Roads, that will amount to a commitment of the apportionment. Then, in the normal course of events, there will be a period of from 2 to 2½ years for the acquisition of rights-of-way, for the surveys, for the engineering designs of the highways, and for the program to be actually placed under construction. Even with that extension, it might be that there would still be available for matching more funds than the State of Nevada would wish to avail itself of.

However, the committee did not feel that it should exclude Nevada from the benefit of the apportionment formula which has been in effect for many years. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Nevada would not wish his State excluded from the formula.

Mr. BIBLE. I certainly agree with the formula idea.

Mr. GORE. I am sure the Senator from Nevada would not wish his State to be excluded from the formula if it works out in such a way as to be overly generous to Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. As well as possibly to 10 other Western States, for about 10 other Western States are similarly situated.

Mr. GORE. But if the formula also meets the needs of other States, then I really cannot see how Nevada or any other State could seriously complain, because it would not be deprived of any benefit. Indeed, it would have available these funds for matching. If a State does not desire to match them, then they are simply not apportioned.

With respect to many of the other States, the needs are great. I dare say that under the $900 million apportionment, the amount apportioned to several States will not be sufficient to meet their needs. Then we shall face the difficulty of deciding whether we wish to exclude certain States from the operation of the formula or whether we wish to change the formula.

The committee decided to arrive at a figure representing its best judgment, and to leave the formula with respect to the primary, secondary, and urban roads in the way it has been for many years.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator from Tennessee, because I certainly recognize the great difficulties involved in attempting to work out a formula that will treat every State in accordance with its needs.

I wonder whether the Senator from Tennessee and the subcommittee have given thought to continuation of the $900 million beyond the 5-year period.

Mr. GORE. Only to the extent of writing into the bill a declaration of intent, namely, that it is the purpose of the committee to sponsor a program that will bring all our Federal-aid highways to a condition of adequacy. The committee realizes that an extension of the program will be necessary, but the committee has not undertaken to predetermine whether $900 million will be necessary or whether a lesser or a greater amount will be necessary.

Mr. BIBLE. So there is no way to say that $900 million, multiplied by 13—for the 13 years—will be necessary in order to reach approximately the same total as that arrived at in the House version of the bill, which provides for increasing the $700 million by $25 million a year.

Mr. GORE. Certainly there is no reasonable basis for assuming that the House version of the bill will arrive at a given amount beyond 3 years, because there is only a 3-year apportionment, insofar as the primary, secondary, and urban roads are concerned.

Mr. BIBLE. Yes; but I realize there is a clear declaration of intent to build up the fund in increments of $25 million.

Mr. GORE. Yes; but in the case of the urban, primary, and secondary roads it is unrealistic to extend either bill by calculation for a period of 13 years. One version of the bill contains provision for a 5-year apportionment. The other version of the bill contains provision for a 3-year apportionment.

Mr. BIBLE. I am trying to say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee—and in this connection I heard a statement not long ago by the Senator from California—that for the first time in my service in the Senate I am in the anomalous position of saying that my State will receive too much. Certainly that is true under both the tables for the Interstate System and the formula for the primary, secondary, and urban roads. I admit that that is a rather unique position for a Senator to take. However, our interest is very much akin to that of California, because Nevada is a "bridge" State, so to speak; Nevada serves two main transcontinental highways. So it is important to the people of my State not only to have the Interstate System built to adequate standards, but also not to be hemmed in by an inadequate system, in the case of highway transportation to the Pacific coast. Likewise, the people of San Francisco wish to go inland to Nevada. There should be no bottleneck because of inadequate State highways from San Francisco to Reno or from Los Angeles to Las Vegas.

So, although the Senate version would give the State of Nevada far more than it needs on its Interstate System, I know, from the very limitations of economics, that only so many matching dollars can be raised from the taxpayers in our State; and, of course, the State can take only sufficient to build the Interstate System into an adequate system. I think that is likewise true, judging from the colloquy engaged in with the Senator from Tennessee, so far as the primary, secondary, and urban system is concerned. So the real problem is not only a matching problem, but also an engineering problem, so far as we are concerned.

I thank the Senator very much, and pay him tribute, as other Senators have done, for the energetic and thorough work he is doing in connection with this legislation.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. He is bothered by a problem with which I have never been confronted. My State is usually on the short end of the deal. It usually receives too little rather than too much.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, we are considering today legislation to launch the biggest road-improvement program in the history of our country.

I am in accord with the intent of this program. Almost unbearable traffic congestion is steadily growing worse in many places on our highway system, and it must be relieved. A vital remedy to the mounting slaughter of our citizens in traffic accidents is that of improving our road system.

At the same time we must consider the huge amount of cost involved in such a tremendous undertaking. The cost ultimately goes back to the road user. The road-use taxpayer must foot the bill. Most of our citizens, I believe, are strongly in favor of highway improvements. Yet all of them want an equitable distribution of what they pay in the form of roads they can use. I am sure this is the feeling in my home State of Kansas.

The only practical method to achieve equity for the taxpayer under Federal legislation is to preserve his own State's rights, which should be protected in every possible way.

Let us remember that the States are charged with the responsibility of building roads. Therefore, proposed Federal legislation is a measure to assist and aid the States just as the term "Federal aid" implies. When the Federal Government legislates its aid to the States for highway improvement it taxes the same sources that the States must tax for the same purpose.

Our total road and city street highway system now approaches 3,350,000 miles—our secondary system is 483,000 miles—our Federal aid primary system is 235,000 miles—our Interstate System 40,000 miles.

Present Federal legislation now before us places its emphasis on the 40,000 miles of Interstate System. I am not in disagreement with the importance of the Interstate System from a national standpoint. However, I wish to call attention to the fact that there are many thou-

sands of miles of other highways important to both State and national economy, and the taxpayers who live in their proximity.

The Interstate System is highly important; but I think there are means by which the Interstate System could be built and at the same time improve many other important roads not on the System. Also, by utilizing such means the Interstate System's critical roads could be built much faster than present legislation envisions, while a great share of the tax funds could be used on these other highways.

My suggestions have to do with the use of private capital through toll revenues by State agencies, a course which is now proving itself all over the Nation.

It seems to me that here is a means by which the States and the taxpayers and everyone concerned can be benefited. It is an optional program, to be used by States only if they determine it is to their best interests. It will permit States to utilize private capital through toll revenues, as so many have already done, to substitute for increased State tax levies in support of road improvement on the Interstate System.

My own State of Kansas could use such a program to good advantage, and I am sure many other States could do likewise. At the same time no other State is injured or discriminated against in its own road program. In the overall program this is not a mandatory provision, but a voluntary matter to be determined on the basis of each State's best interests.

An amendment to this bill is suggested which would allow States, if they choose, to build their critical sections on their Interstate System by means of private capital raised from toll revenues in conjunction with their interstate Federal-aid apportionments. Such a course would relieve many States from raising additional State road-use taxes.

The presently proposed Federal highway legislation fails to take advantage of construction of roads by means of private capital through toll revenues. The effect will be to curtail toll-road construction almost to the vanishing point on the Interstate System.

The failure to accept the principle of toll roads means the abandonment of $10 billion or more of private capital on from 10,000 to 12,000 miles of interstate roads, which could be built by means of temporary tolls by the State in combination with a nominal amount of Federal aid from the State's interstate allocation.

The great bulk of Federal tax moneys, under the present form of legislation, will be dedicated to the 40,000 miles of the Interstate System for the next 13 years. If the cost of the Interstate System is to be borne by all road-use taxpayers there is bound to be inequity.

Less than 20 percent of traffic travels the Interstate System. Over 80 percent travels other roads. All new additional taxes and part of present taxes for Federal aid will go to the Interstate System. Therefore, over 80 percent of the taxpayers will be paying for a road system which they seldom, or never, travel.

Construction of the Interstate System is proposed on an annual basis proportionate to the annual allocation from tax receipts. This means that, in general, it will require the length of the proposed 15-year construction program to complete even the more critical roads. There will be some exceptions, but public demand and pressure in most States will result in spreading construction to all interstate roads in each State each year of the program. Each year's construction will be limited by the annual allocations.

The suggested amendment to the present highway bill would accomplish three major objectives:

First. Substitute private capital through temporary tolls in place of tax moneys as far as practicable, so that an equivalent amount of the tax funds could be utilized on other Federal-aid roads—thus giving all taxpayers more road improvement in their localities and spreading tax moneys into a vastly broadened road program.

Second. Make possible immediate construction of the most critical projects from the standpoint of traffic and safety, so that many thousands of miles could be completed in from 3 to 4 years instead of waiting the 15 years of the program.

Third. Preserve States' rights by allowing each State to choose its own method of financing and determine its own highway priorities; also to provide means by which States can furnish State funds without further increasing their road-use taxes.

Present legislation proposes that the Federal Government pay 90 percent and the States 10 percent of the cost of construction on the 40,000 miles of the Interstate System. The amendment suggested would allow States to select certain projects on their Interstate System where the State would pay no less than 50 percent of the cost, and as much more as possible and desirable, with the State's share coming from private capital based on toll revenues.

On such projects, instead of 90 percent of the cost the Federal share would be no more than 50 percent, and in many cases where traffic is heavy, much less than 50 percent.

In other words, wherever feasible the Interstate System could be built by the States and the Federal Government by using a combination of private capital through toll revenues and Federal aid. This method would result in huge savings by individual States in their annual apportionments of interstate Federal aid—and these amounts could be diverted for construction of other Federal-aid roads in such States.

In no case would Federal funds be subject to interest or financial charges. There would be no increase in cost or taxes. No State would benefit more than another so far as its Federal-aid apportionment is concerned. States which have highways with traffic heavy enough to justify toll revenues in conjunction with a limited amount of Federal aid would benefit through improvement of other roads and quick construction of their critical projects.

The point may be brought up that some roads would require tolls and others would not. That is true temporarily. However, use of toll roads is voluntary and other roads can be used as a matter of choice. Tolls are temporary until debt is retired. States using tolls would gain the equivalent of the toll contribution for improvement of other roads. It is not as discriminatory for less than 20 percent of the taxpayers to pay tolls temporarily and voluntarily on critical highways as for over 80 percent of the taxpayers to pay taxes for highways which they virtually never use.

Under the trust fund section of the proposed Federal highway bill, it is believed that an amendment would be workable if acceptable, which would include the following:

First. If a State desires to construct a section of the Interstate System immediately and agrees to advance no less than 50 percent of the cost thereof immediately, the Secretary of Commerce may contract with such State to apportion to it annually over the period to 1969 the remaining cost from the State's allocation of interstate Federal aid out of the highway trust fund.

Second. Any such contract shall be deemed to be an obligation of the United States.

Third. The State's contribution of no less than 50 percent may be provided from any resource of the State or an agency thereof, including proceeds of toll revenue bonds, provided that the road shall be toll free as soon as the State debt is retired.

Fourth. States or agencies thereof may borrow in anticipation of receipts of Federal contract payments, provided that no Federal funds shall be subject to payment of interest or financial charges.

Fifth. In any such contractual agreement between a State and the Federal Government an amount equivalent to the State's contribution of the project cost over and above the required 10 percent shall be apportioned to such State from the highway trust fund on an annual basis of appropriations, and the amount so apportioned to be taken from the State's annual allocation of interstate Federal aid, and to be used by the State for either (a) construction of other Federal-aid roads, or (b) debt retirement, or (c) both.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point an amendment which I believe would achieve these objectives.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, or any other provision of law, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized, as provided herein, to enter into agreements on behalf of the United States, with any State or any agency or instrumentality thereof for the payment to said State or an agency or instrumentality thereof over a period of years, not exceeding 13, of funds payable under this act on account of any project on the National System of Interstate Highways to assist such State or agency or instrumentality thereof in the financing of the

immediate construction of a project on the National System of Interstate Highways.

The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with any State or agency or instrumentality thereof only if—

(a) Such State or agency or instrumentality thereof is empowered to enter into an agreement with the Secretary under this section and otherwise comply with the provisions of this act;

(b) Such State or agency or instrumentality thereof shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary the desirability of immediate construction of the project on the National System of Interstate Highways to which the agreement relates; and

(c) In States where the agreement is to be entered into between the Secretary and an agency or instrumentality of such State, the Governor shall have approved such an agreement.

An agreement pursuant to this section shall provide that the State, or the agency or instrumentality thereof entering into the same, shall proceed immediately with the construction of the project on the National System of Interstate Highways to which the agreement relates, and such project may be a toll project or a free project, as shall be determined by the State or the agency or instrumentality thereof entering into such agreement.

In the event the project covered by such agreement shall be a toll project, such agreement shall obligate the State or the agency or instrumentality thereof constructing the same to cause such project to become free to the public upon retirement of any bonds or other obligations issued to finance the cost of such project.

Such agreement shall provide for the payment to the State or the agency or instrumentality thereof constructing the project of no more than one-half of the cost of construction of the project covered thereby, as approved by the Secretary, excluding interest on any obligations issued by the State or such agency or instrumentality to finance its portion of the cost thereof and any financing charges relating to any such obligations so issued. Such payment shall be made in equal annual installments over such period of years, not exceeding 13, as shall be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State or agency or instrumentality thereof entering into such an agreement. No agreement entered into pursuant to this section shall provide for the payment thereunder to the State or agency or instrumentality thereof, in any 1 year, of funds in excess of 50 percent of the funds which such State will be entitled to under the apportionment of the Federal share payable on account of projects on the National System of Interstate Highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957. Moneys paid to a State or agency or instrumentality thereof under such an agreement shall be applied to the payment of actual construction costs of the project or the payment of the principal of obligations issued in connection with the financing of the cost of such project.

Such agreement shall also provide that the difference between the 50 percent or less of the project cost payable to the State or agency or instrumentality thereof entering into the same and the amount otherwise provided in this act as the Federal share payable on account of such project on the National System of Interstate Highways shall remain available to the State as additional Federal aid for the purposes specified in this act and shall be used for such purposes as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State; provided, however, such Federal aid may be used by the States without State matching requirements.

Such agreement shall also provide that the expenditure of funds contracted to be paid under such agreement shall be subject to all of the conditions, restrictions, and limitations contained in this act with respect to the appropriation and apportionment of funds for the National System of Interstate Highways, except as otherwise in this section expressly provided.

The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of all moneys contracted to be paid by the Secretary pursuant to this section, and there is hereby appropriated in each fiscal year, out of any money in the Highway Trust Fund not otherwise appropriated, the amounts necessary to provide for such payments.

Mr. CARLSON. My own State of Kansas is among a score or more of States which have already undertaken on their own the improvement to modern standards of a part of their Interstate System in an effort to relieve the evergrowing traffic congestion and to promote safety and economy in travel.

Kansas and these many other States have built or are building divided highways, expressways, and turnpikes, some of them tax roads, most of them toll roads. My State is now building a toll road of some 236 miles in length, extending in the main along the route of part of our Interstate System. Other States have done or are doing the same thing.

These highways must become inevitably a part of the Interstate System. The States, however, are paying their cost. Under the legislation before us the remainder of the Interstate System will now be paid for with Federal Government assuming 90 percent of the cost.

I ask, Why should the States which took the initiative, pioneered in the field, led the way, so to speak, in the program of through-highway modernization penalized by having what they have built and paid for be financially ignored in this legislation?

In my own State of Kansas our nearly completed turnpike will modernize close to one-half the Interstate System in our State. Under present legislation Kansas will receive little more than half of the 90–10 allocation which the State would have received had Kansas sat back and done nothing about the interstate road problem. We are just one State. Many others are affected in the same manner, and many of them in greater degree.

I am heartily in favor of the study provided by the House bill, which calls for ways and means to be studied in an effort to reimburse the 20 or more States which have already contributed to the Interstate System with modern, up-to-date expressways. The amount of reimbursement received would be used to construct other Federal-aid highways.

Yet, it seems to me, we should in all fairness and equity go a step further, and instead of merely providing for a study, implement the study with a modest amount of funds to show good faith in the intent of Congress for reimbursement purposes. This amount need not be so large it will jeopardize the program, nor affect in any appreciable degree the overall allocations. But it will prove that we mean to do what is equitable, just and fair, during the 2-year period until the study is presented to the Congress in 1958.

During the delivery of Mr. CARLSON'S speech,

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me, to permit me to send an amendment to the desk?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes, provided that I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. President, I request that these remarks by me be printed in the RECORD following the remarks of the Senator from Kansas.

I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me, together with a table showing how the funds shall be distributed under the provisions of the amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD, for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. CASE of South Dakota is as follows:

On page 48 of the bill, line 15, strike out all of section 113 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 113. The Secretary of Commerce shall study the designation of routes heretofore made for the National System of Interstate Highways and determine whether those routes as designated best serve the purposes of the system under present conditions and those likely to prevail in 1974 and shall make a report to the Congress not later than January 15, 1958 with his recommendations for allocation or reallocation of the mileage of the authorized system or any portions of it not designated: *Provided*, That no presently designated portion of the system shall be modified without the concurrence of the highway authority of the State or States concerned."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table which will give Senators an opportunity to compare possible apportionments to the several States under various methods. I have had this table prepared by the Bureau of Public Roads on the basis of an even $1 billion, so that Senators may adjust it to any year or combination of years of authorized apportionments. In order to make the total comparable to the tables which deal with a combination of 1957 and 1958 in the total of $2,750,000,000, the amount in any column should be multiplied by 2.75.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Five interim formulas showing approximate distribution by States of the 1957 $1 billion Senate bill authorization for the Interstate System, for possible use pending completion of cost studies

[Millions of dollars]

State	House bill	Senate bill	½ population, ½ mileage	⅔ population, ⅓ mileage	⅚ population, ⅙ mileage
Alabama	15.7	20.3	22.0	21.4	20.9
Arizona	9.0	11.5	17.3	13.2	9.1
Arkansas	8.7	14.5	13.2	13.0	12.9
California	99.8	57.0	62.1	64.8	67.5
Colorado	6.7	13.7	12.8	11.5	10.2
Connecticut	23.9	9.6	10.2	11.2	12.3
Delaware	2.8	6.3	1.6	1.8	1.9
Florida	21.3	17.0	23.8	22.0	20.2
Georgia	30.1	23.3	26.1	25.0	24.0
Idaho	4.6	10.1	10.2	8.1	6.0
Illinois	45.8	47.1	49.7	52.4	55.1
Indiana	37.3	24.3	26.9	26.7	26.4
Iowa	11.9	20.4	17.9	17.7	17.6
Kansas	8.9	18.1	15.9	14.8	13.7
Kentucky	21.2	18.8	18.1	18.6	19.0
Louisiana	21.2	16.5	17.1	17.3	17.6
Maine	6.3	8.0	7.0	6.7	6.4
Maryland	18.7	12.0	12.2	13.4	14.5
Massachusetts	36.0	21.3	20.7	24.2	27.6
Michigan	55.7	36.0	34.8	37.3	39.8
Minnesota	20.8	22.5	21.6	21.0	20.4
Mississippi	10.6	15.9	15.9	15.4	15.0
Missouri	25.7	27.1	27.6	27.2	26.8
Montana	6.6	14.4	17.4	12.9	8.4
Nebraska	4.6	14.3	10.7	10.1	9.4
Nevada	3.2	10.4	7.3	5.2	3.2
New Hampshire	2.9	6.3	4.5	4.1	3.8
New Jersey	58.4	21.9	20.5	24.4	28.2
New Mexico	10.1	12.1	14.9	11.4	8.0
New York	57.5	70.9	64.6	75.9	87.1
North Carolina	10.6	25.5	22.4	23.9	25.5
North Dakota	4.6	11.1	8.5	7.0	5.6
Ohio	58.5	42.8	43.2	46.4	49.5
Oklahoma	16.2	17.9	17.8	16.8	15.8
Oregon	13.7	13.6	14.5	13.0	11.6
Pennsylvania	32.7	53.6	53.8	58.8	64.2
Rhode Island	5.3	6.3	3.5	4.1	4.7
South Carolina	7.9	13.4	16.6	15.8	14.9
South Dakota	4.1	11.6	8.8	7.3	5.8
Tennessee	16.3	21.4	24.5	23.7	22.7
Texas	37.5	57.5	62.0	58.4	54.8
Utah	10.2	9.7	11.2	9.0	6.8
Vermont	7.6	6.3	5.6	4.6	3.5
Virginia	24.5	20.2	23.6	23.1	22.5
Washington	20.1	16.1	15.8	15.8	15.8
West Virginia	11.1	11.9	9.5	10.8	12.0
Wisconsin	13.9	22.8	17.4	19.2	21.0
Wyoming	12.7	10.4	13.7	9.8	5.8
Hawaii					
District of Columbia	6.5	6.3	3.0	3.8	4.5
Puerto Rico					
Total	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,000.0

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, in considering the highway legislation which has been proposed this year, it is important for us to remember that we are dealing with roads through cities, as well as with the cross-country roads which wind through relatively open areas. Mayor Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., mayor of Baltimore, has issued a statement on this matter, and I asked unanimous consent that it be printed in today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR., MAYOR, BALTIMORE, MD., IN SUPPORT OF THE NATIONAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman, the fact that we desperately need a greatly expanded Federal highway construction program has been well established. Legislation, as proposed by the Fallon bill, H. R. 10660, must be enacted if we are to survive and thrive as a Nation. As mayor of a big city, I speak particularly for the National System of Interstate Highways, where this system passes through the urban areas. Also, I speak for the mayors of many other cities and towns throughout the Nation, where highway and traffic conditions are similar.

If we study the highway maps and trace the many routes used by the traveler, we can readily see that people are definitely going from one fixed place to another, and, in most instances, at least one of these places is the big city. How often have you traveled along a well-developed State highway, at an almost undisturbed and unrestricted pace, only to be suddenly retarded to a snail's-pace speed as you approach and enter the city? All these fast-moving, free-flowing vehicles must be threaded through the eye of the needle—the city street. These undeveloped and long-neglected systems of city streets are the major traffic bottlenecks of today.

But why is this true? For many years we have planned elaborate State highways, and seldom or never have we carried them through the cities. These State highways, almost without fail, stop at the city line, and the mass of vehicles must filter through the already overcrowded, traffic-jammed city streets. Therefore, I want to lay particular emphasis on the construction of a national system of interstate highways through the cities and towns—because the city or town is where the traveler wants to go. This system through the urban areas must be designed and constructed to the same high standards as in the rural areas.

Most cities are already burdened with taxes and expenses in carrying on the many necessary functions that make up a big city, the many services that are necessary and required where there is a great concentration of people. Therefore, if we expect to complete the Interstate System within a reasonable time, Federal financial assistance will have to be materially increased, particularly in the urban areas. With Federal participation on a 90-percent basis, we can both build these much needed highways and also carry out the many other local mandatory functions. Also, with Federal allocation of funds on a 90–10 basis, we can greatly accelerate the construction of the Interstate System through the cities and realize their use before it is too late and the big cities are strangled by traffic congestion. The urban sections of this system will be much more costly to construct than rural sections.

Therefore, gentlemen, when considering this Federal-aid highway legislation, I urge you to give special consideration to the urban sections, to the end that the cities receive an adequate share of the highway funds allotted. Only then will we have a well-integrated system of defense highways passing through State, city, town—all the way from origin to destination—and when completed, they will render an unpredictable contribution to the Nation's economy, defense, and security. But, most important of all, they will go a long way toward reducing unnecessary loss of life through highway accidents.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the specific question before the Senate is the amendment which, in a word, provides that the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act—the prevailing wage law—apply to the moneys expended by the Federal Government for the Interstate Highway System.

I wish to speak in favor of that amendment.

I had previously announced that I intended to offer the same amendment. Let me recall that in the 84th Congress, 1st session, the question of whether the Senate highway bill should have the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act apply came before our committee. I was one of the members of the committee who voted in favor of making it apply, as did the present occupant of the chair, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA].

When that issue was on the floor of the Senate last year, although the Senator from Michigan and I and some other Senators fought to retain the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act, nevertheless the Senate saw fit to delete it.

Let me read the text of the amendment which is now pending before us:

The Secretary of Commerce shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on the initial construction work performed on highway projects on the Interstate System authorized under section 102 of this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the act of August 30, 1935, known as the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U. S. C., sec. 276 (a)).

The Davis-Bacon Act has been on the Federal statute books for a long time. It derives its name from two late distinguished Members of Congress, Senator James Davis, of Pennsylvania, and Representative Robert Low Bacon, of New York.

When the legislation was originally sponsored by these late Members of Congress, Mr. Bacon made a statement, which I wish to read into the RECORD.

I believe it indicates why he asked Congress to pass legislation providing for the payment of prevailing wages on Federal construction. I quote what he said:

I want to cite the specific instance that brought this whole matter to my attention. The Government is engaged in building in my district a Veterans' Bureau hospital. Bids were asked for; several New York contractors bid, and in their bids, of course, they had to take into consideration the high labor standards prevailing in the State of New York. I think I can say that the labor standards in New York are very high. The wages were fair, and there has been no difficulty in the building trades between the employee and employer in New York for some time. And the situation existed therefore, and the New York contractors made their bids, having the labor conditions in mind. The bid, however, was let to a firm from the South, and some thousand nonunion laborers were brought to New York in my own congressional district. They were hired onto this job, they were housed, and they were paid a very low wage, and the work proceeded. Of course, that meant that labor conditions in this part of New York State where the hospital was being built were entirely upset. It meant that the neighboring community was very much upset.

Suffice to say, Mr. President, in 1931 the Davis-Bacon Act was adopted by Congress and signed into law by the President of the United States. It is a fairly short law. I shall not read it all, but I wish to read a brief summary of it which the Congressional Quarterly has prepared:

The Davis-Bacon Act (40 U. S. C. 276 (a)) requires that all contracts in excess of $2,000 for construction of Federal public works or buildings include the condition that wages must be paid laborers and mechanics at rates not less than those paid workers on similar projects in the cities, towns, village or other civil subdivision of the State where the work is performed. The Secretary of Labor determines what the prevailing wage is in the locality.

The determination is made by the Secretary before the bids for contracts are advertised. The boundaries of the area and the methods of determining prevailing rates are decided by him. There is no appeal from his decision. Currently, about 20,000 separate decisions predetermining the prevailing wage rates are issued by the Department of Labor each year.

If the contractor pays mechanics and laborers less than the minimum prevailing wage determined by the Secretary, payment may be withheld to make up the difference and the Government may cancel the contract. Contractors who do not fulfill the prevailing wage requirement are prohibited from receiving Government contracts for 3 years thereafter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that comments from a recent Congressional Quarterly, entitled "Background," "Davis-Bacon and Highways," "Pro and Con," and "Support, Opposition," be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON THE DAVIS-BACON ACT

The Davis-Bacon Act (40 U. S. C., 276 (a)) requires that all contracts in excess of $2,000 for construction of Federal public works or buildings include the condition that wages must be paid laborers and mechanics at rates not less than those paid workers on similar projects in the city, town, village, or other civil subdivision of the State where the work is performed. The Secretary of Labor determines what the prevailing wage is in the locality.

The determination is made by the Secretary before the bids for contracts are advertised. The boundaries of the area and the methods for determining prevailing rates are decided by him. There is no appeal from his decision. Currently, about 20,000 separate decisions predetermining the prevailing wage rates are issued by the Department of Labor each year.

If the contractor pays mechanics and laborers less than the minimum prevailing wage determined by the Secretary, payment may be withheld to make up the difference and the Government may cancel the contract. Contractors who do not fulfill the prevailing wage requirement are prohibited from receiving Government contracts for 3 years thereafter.

BACKGROUND

In the late 1920's some contractors obtained contracts for Federal construction projects by bidding low and then organizing construction crews in low-wage areas, transporting them to the site of the project, and housing them in camps. Competition for low-wage labor caused strikes and work stoppages, shut out contractors willing to pay local wage rates, damaged the wage structure of local craftsmen, and disrupted local economies. To protect communities from such practices, a Republican-controlled Congress in 1931 enacted the Davis-Bacon Act requiring the payment of prevailing local wages on Federal hospital construction projects. The law was written by Senator James J. Davis, Republican, of Pennsylvania (1930–45) and Representative Robert L. Bacon, Republican, of New York (1923–38), in whose district a veterans' hospital had been constructed by a contractor who imported cheap labor. No rollcall vote was taken on passage of the act, so party lineups are not recorded.

During the early depression years, Congress authorized greatly expanded Government public-works programs. In 1935 a Democratic-controlled Congress amended the Davis-Bacon Act to make it apply to all direct Federal construction, not only hospitals.

Following enactment of the basic law applying to Federal construction, Congress began including a Davis-Bacon provision in laws authorizing Federal aid to non-Federal construction programs for hospitals, housing, airports, and schools in federally affected areas.

Existing laws containing a Davis-Bacon provision include the Federal Airport Act of 1946, the School Survey and Construction Act of 1950, the Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946, low-rent public housing under the National Housing Acts of 1937 and 1949, as amended. Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, slum-clearance and urban-renewal program in the Housing Act of 1954, and the Lease Purchase Contracts Act of 1954.

DAVIS-BACON AND HIGHWAYS

The basic Davis-Bacon law applies to Federal construction of forest roads, trails and parkways on Federal land. It never has been applied to programs providing Federal aid for highways constructed by the States. In 1955 after President Eisenhower proposed a $101 billion Federal-aid-to-highways program, the Senate reported a bill (S. 1048) calling for a 5-year highway-aid program and requiring that laborers and mechanics on the Interstate Road System be paid in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act.

The Davis-Bacon provision was deleted from S. 1048 by the Senate, May 25, by adoption, on a standing vote, of an amendment offered by Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, Democrat, of New Mexico. The House then reported a bill (H. R. 7474) providing a 13-year highway-aid program and including a Davis-Bacon provision. Representative GEORGE A. DONDERO offered a substitute to H. R. 7474 without a Davis-Bacon provision. The House accepted by voice vote an amendment by Representative RUSSELL V. MACK, Republican, of Washington, to include a Davis-Bacon clause in the substitute. The DONDERO substitute was then rejected by the House and an amendment by Representative BRUCE ALGER, Republican, of Texas, to delete the Davis-Bacon provision from H. R. 7474 was rejected by voice vote. The House subsequently rejected H. R. 7474 and the question of an expanded highway program and the issue of Davis-Bacon were deferred until 1956. (1955 Almanac, p. 441.)

On April 21, 1956, the House Public Works Committee reported a bill (H. R. 10660—H. Rept. 2022) authorizing a 13-year highway program and providing $28.8 billion in Federal funds for construction of the Interstate Highway System by the 48 States. The bill included a provision requiring that all laborers and mechanics employed on the initial construction work be paid wages comparable to those on similar construction in the immediate locality, as determined in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act.

The House passed H. R. 10660, April 27, after rejecting on a division vote, 77 to 192, an amendment by DONDERO to permit States instead of the Secretary of Labor to determine the prevailing wages for highway workers (Weekly Report, p. 510).

The Senate Public Works Committee, May 10, reported H. R. 10660 (S. Rept. 1965), amended, and deleted the Davis-Bacon provision from the House-passed bill. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Republican, of California, May 11, said he would offer an amendment on the Senate floor to put the Davis-Bacon clause back in the bill (Weekly Report, p. 539).

If KUCHEL's amendment is defeated and the Senate passes H. R. 10660 without a Davis-Bacon provision, the sixth and final battle over the issue probably will be fought in a conference committee to compromise differences between the Senate and House bills.

After the dispute is settled over including Davis-Bacon in the highway construction bill, it is expected to arise again should legislation to authorize Federal aid for the construction of schools be brought before Congress.

PRO AND CON

The fight over including a Davis-Bacon clause in the proposed highway program involves these issues:

Opponents, who want the prevailing wage question left up to the States, say—

A Davis-Bacon clause in the highway program would invade States rights, and would be the first time in history that a Federal wage fixing provision had been imposed on highway contracts awarded by the States. The States are better able to know local conditions and make accurate determinations of the local prevailing wage scales.

A Davis-Bacon provision would increase the cost of the highway program by as much as 15 percent. In the past, Davis-Bacon has been misapplied by Secretaries of Labor who determined metropolitan wage rates on rural projects, increasing the cost of the project and disrupting the local wage structure. When the prevailing wage rate has not been clearly established in some areas, the tendency of the Labor Department is to import a higher wage rate from the nearest large community.

Federal wage fixing on the highway program would be a serious interference with the right of management to work out agreements with labor through collective bargaining. The highway bill would become a vehicle for promoting union warfare and union organizational drives on the unorgan-

ized areas of the country, particularly the South and West.

A Federal wage fixing clause would increase Federal regulation and red tape and would result in unnecessary costs and delay on the highway program.

Federal-wage fixing would not be necessary to protect highway workers because they are now being paid wages higher than those paid the average factory worker.

A Davis-Bacon provision applying to the Interstate Highway System would set a precedent for extending the law to cover all highway construction, and would indirectly result in increased wages for all types of road building by States and local communities.

Proponents who want the Secretary of Labor to determine the prevailing local wages say:

"Many States have neither the facilities, staff, budget nor experience to determine prevailing wages. A Davis-Bacon provision would protect States and responsible contractors from unscrupulous firms that might damage local economies by importing cheap labor into a high-wage area. An expanded highway program will accelerate highway construction and intensify competition, and the Federal Government, which is supplying 90 percent of funds, has the responsibility of seeing that workers, contractors, local communities and States are given the equal protection of the prevailing wage principle.

Davis-Bacon would not increase the cost of the highway program because the Secretary of Labor would be required by law to determine the prevailing wages being paid to local craftsmen on highway construction in the immediate locality of the project. Lower costs could be achieved only by importing workers at less than the prevailing rate. The machinery for determining wage rates in the Department of Labor is supported by 25 years of experience. Hundreds of thousands of determinations have been issued with only a handful of protests.

A Davis-Bacon clause would encourage collective bargaining and would prevent a breakdown of existing wage scales privately negotiated between contractors and construction craft unions. There have been no strikes in the 25-year history of veterans' hospitals constructed under Davis-Bacon provisions. The men who would get the primary benefits under Davis-Bacon are unorganized nonunion highway construction workers.

Centralized enforcement of the prevailing wage principle on highway construction will help stabilize the national economy. The gigantic size of the proposed roads program magnifies the need for the Federal Government to guarantee that communities affected be assured a fair division of employment, bidding opportunities and purchasing power.

SUPPORT, OPPOSITION

Party alinements in Congress have not been clearly established on the issue of including Davis-Bacon in the highway program. None of the four votes taken on the question during the 84th Congress have been rollcalls. If the Senate takes a rollcall vote on the Kuchel amendment to H. R. 10660, party and regional positions will be recorded officially for the first time. Statements made during past debate on the issue indicate that it cuts across party lines.

C. D. Curtis, head of the Commerce Department's Bureau of Public Roads, February 7, testified before the House Public Works Committee that the Bureau was opposed to inclusion of Davis-Bacon provisions in the proposed highway bill. "We feel that it is a matter that should be left up to the States." The Department of Labor has not taken a public position on the issue.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, there is a similar prevailing wage law in the State of California, which has been in effect for a very long time. As I indicated here, there has been a prevailing wage law on the Federal books for a long time, operating on all but small Federal contracts for construction, alterations, and/or repairs, including painting and decorating of public buildings or public works of the Government of the United States.

There is no reason, Mr. President, why the provisions of this statute should not apply to the huge public construction of highways contemplated in the measure which is now before us. Indeed, it is all the other way around. There is every reason for the Congress to adopt the provisions of the prevailing wage law in its consideration of this measure for interstate highway construction where the Federal Government will pay almost all the costs.

Earlier today I suggested that the Clay Commission urge this Congress to adopt a law providing for Federal construction of a 40,000-mile Interstate Highway System in America for four reasons: military defense, civil defense, economic needs, and the social aspects of the problem.

I wish to suggest that there may be a fifth reason. The possible expenditure over the next 13 years of $25 billion of Federal public money to do a job, or 90 percent of a job, all in the public interest, will have a tremendous impact upon the economy of America, in every section of the Nation, where contracts for interstate highway construction are negotiated and carried forward to completion.

To that extent I think it would be a shame, Mr. President, if we failed to provide that in each area of this Nation where a contract for an Interstate Highway is let, there should be the protection of the prevailing wage law. That means, in my State, Mr. President, that our local working people would be given the statutory assurance by the Congress that, in working on a public construction job, they would have the same level of income or salary which they would have if they were working in similar enterprises in that locality. It also means that the local contractor who had local people working for him would not be subject to the hazard that some contractor from another part of the country might underbid him on the basis that he could import cheap labor into that area and could underbid the local contractor, and depress the local economy.

So I think there is a good fifth reason for the adoption of this interstate measure to provide that with the expenditure of $25 billion of Federal money for highway construction across this country, jobs for Americans working on the project will receive the protection of the prevailing wage provisions of this Federal statute.

I make these comments, Mr. President, because this morning, when the proposed amendment was offered, there were some Senators who asked for a justification of the provision, and I have endeavored fairly to give it to them. I have given them the arguments which those who opposed it have made, as well as the arguments of those of use who support it. I have done it because, in my judgment, any reasonable man, as he reads the RECORD, which will be before the Senate tomorrow, will have very little difficulty—indeed, he will have no difficulty at all, in my judgment—in making up his mind that the amendment before us is one which should be adopted in the public interest.

One more comment, Mr. President, and I shall be through. While the Senate did fail to approve the Davis-Bacon provisions last year, I am glad to say, Mr. President, that the House included the provisions of that law in the bill which is before us. Tomorrow the Senate will have an opportunity to redeem itself from the error which it committed a year ago. I am sure that on tomorrow's rollcall, we shall be able to have a majority of the Members of the Senate rectify the error of last year and make the Davis-Bacon Act a part of the interstate highways legislation of 1956.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in the first place I wish to compliment the members of the committee, especially the chairman of the committee and the chairman of the subcommittee, together with the other members, both Democratic and Republican, on the splendid piece of work which they have completed in reporting the bill to the Senate. It shows a tremendous amount of industry and a devotion to duty. On the whole, I think it will make a very great contribution to the welfare of our country.

Mr. President, I have given careful consideration to the pending bill, the proposed Federal Highway Act of 1956. I have reviewed not only the provisions of the bill as reported by the Senate committees, but I have also given attention to the provisions of the bill as it passed the House of Representatives.

I must say, from the viewpoint of New York State, that the House version of this bill seems much preferable to the Senate version in a number of major respects. However, there is at least one provision of the Senate bill which seems to have greater merit than the equivalent provision in the House version. I refer to the formula under which apportionments of Federal funds are made to the States for highways. The Senate version, while far from perfect, seems definitely superior, and I hope it will be retained in the final bill as submitted to the President. It is considerably better for New York State and other large and populous States.

The Senate bill provides for retaining the present factors governing the apportioning of Federal funds for highway construction. Those methods are two-thirds according to relative populations, one-sixth according to relative areas, and one-sixth according to relative existing road mileage. These are the factors employed under existing law.

Of course, Mr. President, the existing formula can be improved upon. The objectives sought to be attained by the computation methods proposed in the House version of this bill are most laudatory. What disturbs me are the cost figures actually used for the first 2 years in the House bill. These figures, which would be the basis of the apportionment in the first 2 years, were gathered in an

adventitious manner. They are by no means an accurate reflection of actual cost data.

I quote the comment on this point contained in the supplemental views in the Senate committee's report:

> Although the formula for apportionment of funds to the States under the Gore bill is far from perfect, the method in the House bill is monstrously unfair and discriminatory. Furthermore, its inequalities are frozen for 2 years with the hope but by no means the certainly of subsequent correction.

These sentiments are echoed in a communication which I have received from the Department of Public Works of the State of New York. That department states:

> These estimates of cost in this table are not correct and some method of adjusting them is most necessary if the table is used.

It would be better, I believe, Mr. President, to continue the present formula for the initial period of the program, as the Senate bill does, and to institute immediately an objective study of costs and needs on which a more down-to-earth formula can be based.

With the exception of this one point relating to the apportionment of Federal funds, Mr. President, I prefer, as I have already said, many of the provisions of the House bill. My preference is based on the fact that the Senate version works a number of insupportable injustices on New York State. It is my feeling that if the Senate version is enacted into law without amendment great harm and ill feeling will result.

First, there is the absence of any provision with respect to reimbursement for certain highways completed subsequent to August 2, 1947, or in actual use or under contract for completion by June 30, 1957—the so-called highway credit provision.

The omission of any provision on this point is a severe penalty upon those States which had the foresight and the initiative to construct highways which will now become part of the Interstate Highway System. Why are these States now to be penalized? If we do not put a premium upon foresightedness, let us not, at least, place a penalty upon it.

This matter was very lengthily considered by the House Committee on Public Works and in its report it stated:

> Some States have already constructed, to the required standards, toll or free highways which have been or may be selected for the final location of the Interstate System, and other States are proceeding along similar lines. It is the committee's view that those States which have provided a toll or free highway which is selected for the final location of the Interstate System and which meets the standards required for such system should, as a matter of equity, be reimbursed for such construction after making appropriate deductions for depreciation and other items.

Mr. President, I stress the words used by this committee. It is a matter of equity to these States. The millions of dollars which they invested in good highways which will now become part of the Interstate System could have been saved had they been content to sit back and wait for this new and enlarged Federal highway program.

In a letter submitted to the House Committee on Public Works, the Honorable Averell Harriman, Governor of the State of New York, put the case for the inclusion in this bill of a highway credit when he stated:

> At this time, I should like to emphasize once more the need for a form of credit to go to those States which like New York have already constructed many miles of their interstate systems to exacting and costly Federal standards. New York State has, in the last few years, constructed 557½ miles out of a total interstate allowance of 1,216½ miles. This means that the number of miles eligible for this type of aid is reduced to only 659 miles. An increase in Federal participation from 60 to 90 percent would deprive our State of many millions of dollars in Federal aid. It would serve to penalize all of those States which have moved ahead in construction of their interstate systems.

What the Governor of New York says about my State is, of course, true with respect to many other States which have, in the past few years, forged ahead in the construction of highways which are a part of the Interstate System. And, Mr. President, the allowance of this credit to these States will not represent a windfall for them. For it must be remembered that these highways are up to standard, are part of the interstate allowance for highways, and were constructed with State funds, or borrowed funds.

It is for these reasons that I am in favor of a highway credit provision.

Section 109 of the House version of the bill contained a declaration of policy with respect to reimbursement for interstate highways already constructed. While I believe that such a provision is a step in the right direction, I do not believe that it goes far enough. In my opinion, there should be a provision in this bill which would establish a definite commitment to reimburse for these highways. Accordingly, I have offered an amendment which would, under certain circumstances and with certain safeguards, provide such a definite commitment on the part of the Federal Government to reimburse those States which have moved ahead in the construction of highways which fit into the Interstate System.

The second serious omission from the Senate version of this bill is a provision similar to section 116 of the House version which would permit the approval, as part of the Interstate System, of any toll road, bridge, or tunnel which meets standards and which forms a logical segment of the Interstate System. In the consideration of such a provision it is important to recognize that the House version would not permit the expenditure of any Federal funds on toll roads, bridges, or tunnels. The provision relates only to their approval as part of the Interstate System.

In a letter dated April 14, 1955, the Secretary of Commerce transmitted to the Speaker of the House a report prepared by the United States Commissioner of Public Roads dealing with the "progress and feasibility of toll roads and their relation to the Federal-aid program," House Document No. 139. The cogent reasons for the inclusion in this bill of a provision relating to toll roads, bridges, and tunnels such as was contained in the House version are stated in that report in the following language:

> The present law should be changed to permit the inclusion of toll roads as part of the National System of Interstate Highways when they meet the standards for that system, and when there are reasonably satisfactory alternate free roads on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems which permit traffic to bypass the toll road.
>
> This recommendation is made to meet present-day conditions. A number of toll roads which are in operation, under construction, or authorized, lie along the preferred location of interstate routes; duplication of these roads would generally be an economic waste. Accordingly, if there is to be a continuous integrated Interstate System, it is reasonable that these toll roads be included in it. The inclusion of a toll road in the Interstate System would not be contrary to recommendation 1 (no Federal participation in the cost of toll roads). It would merely make unnecessary to construct a free road to interstate standards closely paralleling the toll road.

It is not a question, Mr. President, of asking for Federal funds to pay for these toll roads, bridges, and tunnels. That is not an issue. The point is to include in the bill authority for the Secretary of Commerce to approve toll roads, bridges, and tunnels, built or to be built at State expense, as part of the Interstate System. Subsections (B) and (C) of section 116 of the House version of the bill, authorizing Federal funds to be used for approaches to toll roads, bridges, and tunnels is but logical. For it seems to me that Federal funds should be available for approaches to bridges, roads, and tunnels if they are declared part of the Interstate System, irrespective of whether the bridges, roads, and tunnels they serve are toll or are free.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I shall offer an amendment to the Senate version of the bill now before us to restore the provisions of section 116 of the House version of this bill.

The third serious omission from the Senate version is a provision requiring the payment of the prevailing wage on construction work performed on highway projects on the Interstate System authorized by the bill. This is the so-called Davis-Bacon Act proviso.

Before inserting section 112—the Davis-Bacon Act provision—in its version of the bill, the House Committee on Public Works heard at length from both the proponents and the opponents of such a provision. A majority of that committee came to the conclusion that the inclusion of such a requirement was wise, justified, and equitable in the interests of prevening workers employed on this program from being exploited. This is what the majority of the House committee said, in part:

> Since by far the greatest part of the Interstate System * * * will be financed by Federal funds, the committee feels that labor standards normally applicable to Federal construction should also apply to this great arterial system. Such action only has the effect of substantially preserving and affirming rather than extending the long-standing policies of the Congress in matters of Federal expenditure and procurement. * * * The Davis-Bacon Act now applies to all direct Federal construction as well as to contracts for school, hospital, housing, and airport

projects constructed with Federal-aid funds. Federal prevailing wage requirements apply presently to highway construction where the Government is the contracting party. A majority of the committee feels that where the Federal Government absorbs 90 percent of the cost, as it does under the provisions of this bill with regard to the Interstate System Federal prevailing wage requirements should also apply. A difference of 10 percent should not distinguish the situation. This is especially true in light of the fact that the Federal contribution is much less percentagewise on the other federally assisted programs where federally prevailing wage requirements apply.

Mr. President, it is proposed, under both versions of the highway bills, to spend in the course of the next several years many billions of dollars. The impact upon the highway construction industry of the expenditure of these huge sums of money will be tremendous. We must make certain that the impact upon the wages paid to the workers on these projects is not disastrous. And we can do it by incorporating in this bill the prevailing wage formula of the Davis-Bacon Act.

As the House report pointed out, we are not attempting or proposing anything new when we incorporate such a provision in a Federal-State grant-in-aid program.

Consider, for example, the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, the so-called Hill-Burton Act. That, too, is a Federal grant-in-aid program. The Hill-Burton Act, which operates much as the pending act does, contains a prevailing wage proviso tied to the Davis-Bacon Act.

No, Mr. President, we are not setting any precedent by including a Davis-Bacon provision in this bill. Indeed, if we do not adopt such a proviso we shall be going against precedent. And if we do not do so we shall be risking the welfare of thousands and thousands of construction workers who could be employed on this program at depressed wages, 90 percent of which represent Federal dollars.

Mr. President, a Davis-Bacon proviso is an absolute must in this bill.

My fourth point, Mr. President, relates to the provision in the Senate committee bill with respect to payments for utility relocation.

In the House version section 113 authorized the use of Federal funds to reimburse the States for the pro rata share of the cost of relocating utilities when the costs had been paid by the State. But the House version contained the safeguard that Federal funds could not be so used when "the payment to the utility violates the law of the State or violates a legal contract between the utility and the State."

The Senate version of this provision has an entirely different effect. The Senate version cuts across State laws and existing contracts between the State and the utility companies. The Senate version states that Federal funds can be used to pay up to 50 percent of the cost of utility relocations when "the entire relocation cost is required to be borne by the utility." Now under many existing State laws and contracts, including in my own State, utilities are permitted to utilize the public right-of-way without cost to them, but on the condition that they will bear the cost of relocation if such relocation became necessary in the future.

The Senate version of the utility relocation provision goes still further. It gives the utilities a right to payment out of the Federal Treasury of up to 50 percent of the cost of relocating their utility facilities. Here are the exact words of subsection (E) of section 110:

> Any utility required to relocate a facility within the terms of this section shall have a right to payment out of Federal funds.

No longer is the provision discretionary or limited by State law or existing contracts.

True, subsection (D) states that "no more than 2 percent of any sum appropriated to any States for any fiscal year may be expended" for these purposes, and subsection (A), as I have stated, limits the amount of reimbursement to 50 percent of the cost. But within these broad limits, section 110 represents practically a blank check given to the utility companies and drawn upon the Treasury of the United States, despite contract terms with the State which contemplated no such gratuity.

The Governor of my State, the Honorable W. Averell Harriman, very correctly points out that this mandatory provision "would work serious inequity in New York State where by established tradition utility companies are not charged for the use of State rights-of-way and correspondingly are not compensated for relocation costs when they occur."

Accordingly, Mr. President, I shall move to substitute for section 110 the utility relocation provisions contained in section 113 of the House bill, with the added limitation on the total amount available in 1 fiscal year, as contained in section 110 (D), of 2 percent of the amount apportioned.

Mr. President, there is a further omission from the Senate version of this bill that will have very serious repercussions on urban highway construction.

I refer, Mr. President, to the fact that in the Senate committee bill, the definition of the term "construction" does not include the cost of relocating tenants who are displaced by highway projects. This is a vital provision as far as New York City is concerned—and many other cities, too, I am sure.

Mr. President, we are about to launch an expanded program of modern interstate highways. The very purpose of the program is to provide safe, speedy means of transportation between our urban areas, benefiting, at the same time, rural areas through which these highways will pass. To facilitate the traffic movements through our cities, tenants must be moved and relocated to avoid circuitous, time-consuming alternate routes. This is properly a part of the cost of constructing the highway. And the Federal funds made available under the pending program should be made available for this part of the cost of highway construction.

Mr. President, at an appropriate time, I shall move to amend the Senate version of this bill to include in the definition of construction costs the costs of tenant relocation, as does the equivalent House provision.

Mr. President, I shall refer to one further provision in the pending bill, one that was inserted in the Senate version and which does not appear in the House version.

Subsection (D) of section 112 requires State highway departments submitting plans for highway projects involving the bypassing of any city, town, village, or any other community to certify that in the case of each such city, town, or village which is proposed to be bypassed, a public hearing has been held in each such instance to consider the economic effects of each such bypassing. The State Highway Department must submit to the Commissioner of Roads a transcript of each of such hearings.

It is my opinion, Mr. President, that this provision is not only unnecessary, but would unduly delay and hinder the total highway program. Basically, in many areas, the Interstate System is a bypass system, with limited access to achieve speed and safety. To require a public hearing for each instance of bypassing would be very time-consuming, indeed.

The governor of my State is opposed to this provision. In deference to the officially expressed views of New York State, I shall, at the appropriate time, move to delete that subsection.

Now, Mr. President, I do not wish my remarks criticizing various provisions of the pending bill to be misinterpreted as being indicative of a general opposition to the Federal highway proposal. Quite the opposite is the case.

I wish to make it perfectly clear that I am in favor of the general objectives of this bill. I think the country needs such a program, not alone from the standpoint of our defense, but also to facilitate trade, commerce, and communications between the various parts of the country.

My comments have been aimed at specific provisions of both versions of the bill, and my amendments are designed to assure that the bill passed by the Senate will be fair and equitable, and will assure the best possible interstate highway program.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, this evening I wish to address the Senate for a few moments concerning the pending bill.

In 1944, when the prospects of peace directed attention to the need for postwar planning, the highway engineers of the Nation advocated a road program commensurate with our needs. As a former member of my State's highway board, I am aware that in that year their spokesmen appeared before Congress and advocated an annual Federal-aid program totaling $1 billion. In extensive testimony, graphs and charts were presented to demonstrate that by 1960 we would have 60 million vehicles on our highways. Last year, 61 million motor vehicles were registered in this country. There may be 75 million by 1960.

Instead of the $1 billion program advocated by the highway engineers in

1944, Congress actually authorized $500 million. In 1952 the annual authorization was increased to $575 million, and again in 1954 to $875 million.

Faced with the unprecedented growth in motor vehicles, the obvious necessity for an adequate system of defense roads, and, at long last, the realization that the ability of the country to expand its economy is tied directly to its ability to consume transportation, Congress has had to come to grips with the highway program on a realistic basis. As a result, to overcome the gap in highway construction caused by at least 1 depression, 2 wars, and 10 years of procrastination, we are now about to embark on what has been called the greatest public-works program in history.

This year, under even the most modest of the plans under consideration, we propose to make available on July 1 nearly two billion dollars of Federal funds for highway construction. That is roughly equivalent to the total amount we have provided over the past 3 years. In other words, some 30 days from now we are going to ask our State highway departments to triple their output of the past 3 years, and to more than double last year's output.

Few manufacturers in this country could expand their plants and increase their personnel to accommodate such a production increase. Neither can many of our State highway departments. For some, it means the construction of additional buildings to house the engineering help needed. Mine is such a State. Every State must increase its engineering staff, and in most cases this means training the men directly. Engineers are in short supply in this country. Last year, a representative of the American Society of Civil Engineers testified before the Senate Public Works Committee that there was then a shortage of 4,000 highway engineers and no immediate prospect for improvement in the situation.

The converting of the new Federal authorizations into roads will present a tremendous challenge to our States and their highway departments. If we are to achieve the results desired—the construction of the most comprehensive system of superhighways ever conceived, plus the continued development of the other primary and rural roads needed to complement that system and to carry the traffic to and from it—then we must make sure that our planning is in line with the ability of the States to meet that challenge.

It is on this particular problem that I address the Senate now.

Let me say, first, that my concern over the new highway program does not stem from any misconceptions concerning the manner in which funds for the new Interstate System are to be made available. That system, when finished, will be a complete project; and when the last ribbon is cut, the job will be over, and we can then take a new look at the job ahead. So, no matter how the funds are provided to the States, either on the basis of needs or on the basis of some annual formula, each State will eventually get the funds to complete its particular sections—no more and no less. This being the case, each individual State can gear its activities on the Interstate System to its own capabilities without fear of losing its share of the funds its citizens are contributing. If any State cannot use its allocation of interstate funds this year, they will still be there the next, and the next after that, until the job is finished. The concern of Congress over this matter is thus confined to one point: We must be sure that each State can and will make reasonable progress on modernizing the Interstate System, to the end that the entire project is completed on schedule. To do otherwise would be to ignore our responsibilities toward the national welfare.

It is with respect to carrying on the regular Federal-aid program for other important intercity highways and rural roads that my concern arises. This concern also relates directly to my previous comments about the need for assuring that progress on the Interstate System goes forward.

Unless we provide for a balanced program for both the Interstate System and the regular Federal-aid program, we run two risks: First, States with limited manpower and financial resources will concentrate on utilizing their regular Federal-aid funds, for fear of having them lapse; and critical deficiencies in the vital Interstate System will not be eliminated. Second, the greatly increased need for administrative help, maintenance funds, and matching money, all of which must be borne by the States, could force, in some of them, large local tax increases on top of the substantial Federal increases this Congress will impose; or, failing to provide these new funds, such States will be forced to forego sharing in some of the benefits the new program seeks to achieve, and for which their citizens are being taxed.

To understand this second problem, it is essential to know that, unlike the Interstate System, wherein we have a fixed, one-time job, confined to a specific net of highways, with an assurance that the funds will be available to complete it, regular Federal-aid funds are made available to the States on a basis which permits rather broad latitude in the selection of the roads and the extent of the system to which they are applied. Furthermore, it has been the traditional policy of Congress—and both the present House version and the Senate committee version of the road bill contain the same provision—that unless these regular Federal-aid funds are programed by a State within 2 years of the end of the fiscal year in which they become available, they are lost to that State for all time.

As the highway bill (H. R. 10660) was passed by the House, it sought to recognize the limitations of the various States to undertake the tremendous job we are placing in their hands. Beginning with the present level of regular Federal highway aid, $700 million annually, the House provided an increase of $25 million for the coming year, and an additional $25 million for the next. Then the House declared the intent of Congress to continue these yearly increases at not less than $25 million a year, for the balance of the 13-year period during which the Interstate System would be under construction. Thus, on the 13th year, the annual authorization for regular Federal aid would be $1,025,000, reaching this peak as the expenditures for the Interstate System are tapering off.

There were several purposes which motivated the House approach: First, the gradual increase, plus the declaration of intent, permitted orderly long-range planning on the part of highway departments and contractors; second, the coordinating of the maximum effort on the regular Federal-aid program with the tapering off of the Interstate System, to avoid any sudden dislocations among highway and contracting personnel; and, third, and possibly most important, a realization of the practical limitations the States would face in getting the job underway.

The Senate Public Works Committee, on the other hand, has amended the House version of the bill in such a way as to make $900 million of regular Federal-aid funds available for each of the next 5 years, an immediate annual increase of $200 million, on top of which is the authorization of over $1 billion for the Interstate System.

It is my studied belief that many of the States will be unable to provide the necessary engineering potential to carry on the increased construction of regular Federal-aid roads necessary under the Senate committee's amendment to H. R. 10660, and at the same time accomplish any reasonable progress on the Interstate System. Lacking the potential to do both jobs simultaneously, such States must, of necessity, protect their local interests by concentrating their attention on utilizing the regular Federal aid. As a result, progress on the Interstate System will lag.

Just how well-equipped are the States to assimilate a 30-percent increase in regular Federal aid and still carry on the interstate program?

Under the terms of the 1954 Federal Aid Highway Act, Congress provided an increase in Federal aid of $300 million for the 1955–56 fiscal year, bringing the annual total to $875 million. These increased funds became available last July 1.

On July 14, 1955, the Bureau of Public Roads published a table showing that, as of June 30, 1955, the States had a total of $956 million of authorized funds that had not actually been placed under contract.

The latest report on the status of Federal highway aid shows the condition at the end of March 1956. As of then, the available Federal funds not under contract amounted to $1,228,861,000 an increase of $272,904,000 over the June 30, 1955, figure. In other words, during the 9-month period since the $300 million of increased Federal aid became available, only $27 million of it is reflected in increased construction projects underway.

What is going to happen next year if we add another $200 million of regular Federal aid, plus over a billion dollars of interstate funds?

With further reference to the tables mentioned above, they show that only 11

States were able to utilize fully their share of the $300 million increase. The other 37 showed increases in the balance not committed to actual construction.

A comparison of the tables mentioned above is as follows:

	June 30, 1955	Mar. 31, 1956
Unprogramed balances	$377,968,000	$567,137,000
Programed only	400,623,000	407,350,000
Plans approved, construction not started	177,366,000	254,374,000
Total	955,957,000	1,228,861,000

Let me now discuss the ability of the States to match the additional regular Federal-aid funds under the Fallon and Gore bills. Last year a questionnaire circulated by the American Association of State Highway officials revealed that 25 of the States could not match the funds which would have become available under the bill as it was then before the Senate Public Works Committee. Subsequent amendments to that measure, prior to passage by the Senate of the act in its present form, have probably reduced the number somewhat; but there is no doubt that many States will be faced with financial difficulties if we hold to the terms of the Senate bill. Let me read some typical excerpts from letters and telegrams sent last year to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Gov. Edmund S. Muskie, of Maine, in a letter dated March 28, 1955, said:

Maine has found it difficult to match Federal funds now available. In order to do so, the State gasoline tax was increased to 6 cents in 1947 and in 1951 a substantial bond issue was authorized. The proceeds of this bond issue will be used up on July 1, 1957, and thereafter we will again have a problem of matching Federal funds even if the Federal program is not increased above the present level. The legislature is now considering another increase in the gasoline tax and another bond issue for this purpose. In the light of these difficulties, if Federal matching funds are increased to the level recommended in your proposal, there is considerable doubt that we could find the necessary State funds.

Gov. J. Hugo Aronson, of Montana, had this to say in a telegram dated March 22, 1955:

Montana State Highway revenues derived substantially from 7 cent gasoline tax, 9 cent diesel-fuel tax and gross-vehicle-weight tax on trucks, after necessary deductions for administration and maintenance cost leave but $9,500,000 approximately for the matching of Federal aid. This is barely sufficient to match the allocations to this State under the provisions of the 1954 Federal Aid Highway Act. There is no prospect of any increase being favorably considered here which would provide additional State or other local revenues for Federal aid highway construction above the State revenues now being received. Consequently, Montana is definitely opposed to any change in the Federal Aid Highway Act which would call for an increase in State matching funds. We favor continuation of the 1954 Federal Highway Act appropriations and matching ratios for the primary highway system other than the Interstate System, and for the secondary and urban systems.

Mr. Newman E. Argraves, State highway commissioner of Connecticut, in a letter dated March 9, 1955, had this to say:

Connecticut favors an expanded program of federally financed interstate highway construction which makes available to the State the largest possible Federal grant obtainable within the ability of the State to furnish its share of matching funds without the necessity of reducing its program of other highway improvements or increasing current taxes. It is also desirable that the Federal Government continue the Federal-aid program, other than that for the Interstate System, substantially as constituted under the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1954.

Gov. Raymond Gary, of Oklahoma, in a telegram dated March 9, 1955, said this:

Oklahoma favors accelerated program within State's ability to participate. Doubt if State's funds available could be materially increased.

I think it is worth recording that, even on the Interstate System, where under the Senate approach Nevada would appear to get an overly generous share of the funds, my constituents have been solidly in favor of a program that would see every State get its share of the money needed to complete the job, but that and no more. As a consequence, they have favored the House approach to the allocation of funds for that system.

Our State highway engineer states Nevada's position as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS,
Carson City, Nev., May 8, 1956.

Hon. ALAN BIBLE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALAN: We appreciate your letter of May 2, 1956, acknowledging our telegram pertaining to the new Federal highway legislation.

We were certainly delighted over the nearly unanimous action of the Members of Congress in passing H. R. 10660. This action, we believe, indicated strong confidence in the highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads.

We very carefully reviewed the bill, and while there was some language not particularly advantageous to the State such as the Davis-Bacon labor provisions and reimbursement of public utilities, we strongly endorse approval of this bill by the Senate and hope that if any changes are made they will be very minor. The financial setup, together with the method of apportionment, will permit Nevada to progress with its highway program in a most efficient and economical manner. We are expressly opposed to the method of apportioning the interstate funds as provided in the Gore bill as it is our belief that under those provisions the Interstate System could not be completed in an orderly manner, permitting all States to complete these highways within each State at approximately the same date.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

H. D. MILLS,
State Highway Engineer.

Concerning the regular Federal-aid funds, however, they have appealed to me to endeavor to secure Senate approval of the gradual annual increases advocated by the House. In support of this position they point out, and I think with substantial justification, that the State of Nevada has so far managed to hold up its end of the Nation's highway-building program with commendable success. In taking this position, they acknowledge that this would not have been possible were it not for the Federal-aid grants, and a matching formula which takes into consideration the vast acreage of nontaxable public lands.

At the same time, however, the people of Nevada point out that ours is one of the few States in this country that has never diverted 1 cent of its motor-vehicle taxes and fees to uses other than highway construction. Nevada was one of the first States to pass a constitutional amendment earmarking road-user taxes solely for the construction of highways, a philosophy advocated by this Congress through the Hayden-Cartwright Act in 1934, but unfortunately never followed at the national level.

Nevada's citizens have never failed to provide the necessary local money to match their Federal aid and to carry on the administrative work, the policing, and the maintenance, all of which is the sole responsibility of the State. As a consequence, there are no gaps in the transcontinental routes one must travel across our State. As a matter of fact, I believe there are few places where one will find equally modern highways.

Last year, to match the additional Federal aid provided under the 1954 act, our taxpaying road users toured the State in support of a voluntary tax increase to raise the money. Passed at our last regular legislative session without a dissenting vote, those new taxes became effective last July.

Our road users have given their full support to the present move for an expanded national program, and they have supported the tax increases necessary at Federal level to get the job under way. What they ask now is that they be given an equal chance to share in the new program without a third round of tax increases. They believe that will be possible if we will follow the pattern set by the House for the authorization of regular Federal aid. Their arguments follow exactly those of Senator MAGNUSON in his letter of May 17, which some Senators have received. Let me summarize the problem by quoting from that letter as follows:

The House would assure continuation of the local road program for the same 13-year period established for the Interstate System. Beginning with the current authorization of $700 million for primary, secondary, and urban roads, they propose an additional annual increase of $25 million for each of the 13 years. Thus, next year the authorization would be $725 million. For the 13th year it would be $1,025,000,000.

The Senate would jump the annual authorization for primary, secondary, and urban roads from seven hundred to nine hundred million dollars next year and would continue this same annual grant over a 5-year period. The Senate makes no provision for continuing the local road program beyond the fifth year. Should the Senate extend the same $900 million authorization for another 8 years to complete the 13-year program to which the House financing plan is geared, the aggregate amounts by the House and Senate would not be significantly different, 11.375 billion as compared to 11.700 billion.

Neither bill contemplates any change in the traditional formula for allocating funds to the States nor in State matching requirements.

I quite agree with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] that some

States, such as Nevada, will not have sufficient local funds during the next few years to match the primary, secondary, and urban funds provided in the Senate bill due to the abrupt increase of nearly 30 percent. Such States can, however, match the funds provided in the House bill because the steady growth in traffic will each year provide greater local revenue.

If the House plan is adopted, Nevada and other States similarly situated can continue to share in the local road program without difficulty. If the Senate plan is adopted, such States would have to increase local tax rates on motor vehicle owners to raise additional matching money or forego sharing some of the local road improvements the new program is supposed to achieve.

The financing of the expanded highway program calls for substantial tax increases on all types of motor vehicles. Were it necessary to increase local taxes as well, the burden would be heavy. Furthermore, some States, including Nevada, have had to increase taxes during recent years to keep the road program going.

Inasmuch as both House and Senate plans for continuing the local road program will achieve almost identical results during the next 13 years, an approach permitting all States to participate has obvious benefits. Furthermore, considering the difficulties to be expected by some of our highway departments in developing the engineering manpower required to get the huge interstate program off the ground, a more gradual acceleration of the local road program seems practicable.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table pointing out the funds available to the State of Nevada under both the Fallon bill and the Gore bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimate of Federal-aid highway funds provided and State matching funds required by bills pending in Congress

NEVADA

[In millions of dollars]

Year	Fund	Present act			Fallon bill			Gore bill		
		Federal funds	State funds	Total	Federal funds	State funds	Total	Federal funds	State funds	Total
1957	FAP, FAS, U	6.9	1.3	8.2	7.1	1.4	8.5	8.9	1.8	10.7
	Interstate	1.8	.3	2.1	5.0	.3	5.3	9.2	.5	9.7
	Total	8.7	1.6	10.3	12.1	1.7	13.8	18.1	2.3	20.4
1958	FAP, FAS, U				7.4	1.5	8.9	9.2	1.8	11.0
	Interstate				5.3	.3	5.6	12.9	.7	13.6
	Total				12.7	1.8	14.5	22.1	2.5	24.6
1959	FAP, FAS, U				7.7	1.5	9.2	9.2	1.8	11.0
	Interstate				6.2	.3	6.5	14.8	.8	15.6
	Total				13.9	1.8	15.7	24.0	2.6	26.6
1960	FAP, FAS, U				7.9	1.6	9.5	9.2	1.8	11.0
	Interstate				6.8	.3	7.1	14.8	.8	15.6
	Total				14.7	1.9	16.6	24.0	2.6	26.6
1961	FAP, FAS, U				8.1	1.6	9.7	9.2	1.8	11.0
	Interstate				6.8	.3	7.1	14.8	.8	15.6
	Total				14.9	1.9	16.8	24.0	2.6	26.6
1962-68	FAP, FAS, U				64.0	13.7	77.7	64.4	12.8	77.2
	Interstate				45.4	2.4	47.8	103.4	5.4	108.8
	Total				109.4	16.1	125.5	167.8	18.2	186.0
1969	FAP, FAS, U				10.1	2.0	12.1	9.2	1.8	11.0
	Interstate				3.1	.2	3.3	14.8	.8	15.6
	Total				13.2	2.2	15.4	24.0	2.6	26.6
1957-69	FAP, FAS, U				112.3	23.3	135.6	119.3	23.6	142.9
	Interstate				78.6	4.1	82.7	184.7	9.8	194.5
	Total				190.9	27.4	218.3	304.0	33.4	337.4

Western Highway Institute, May 10, 1956.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 28, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 767. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 1111. An act to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 1883. An act for the relief of Pietro Rodolfo Walter Stulin and Renate Karolina Horky;

S. 1970. An act for the relief of Kim Boksoon and Anke Naber;

S. 2822. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer approximately 9 acres of land in the Hualapai Indian Reservation, Ariz., to School District No. 8, Mohave County, Ariz.; and

S. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming.

NOMINATION OF FORMER SENATOR FRED A. SEATON, OF NEBRASKA, TO BE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this afternoon President Eisenhower nominated Fred A. Seaton, of Hastings, Nebr., to be Secretary of the Interior.

Fred Seaton has the background and experience to fill this position with great credit to this administration and great service to the Nation.

While he is listed as coming from Nebraska, having served that State in the State legislature, and having served in the United States Senate as a Senator from Nebraska, he is truly a Kansan.

The Seaton family is an old and established family in the State of Kansas. For many years his father was secretary to a very distinguished Senator from Kansas, the late Senator Joseph L. Bristow.

He is an able administrator. He has a personal interest in the problems of conservation. He has great financial interests in the Middle West and in the Rocky Mountain area. He is a very warm personal friend of mine.

If I may be pardoned for a moment, I was elected Republican State chairman in Kansas in 1932. At that time I selected Fred Seaton as the young Republican chairman of that State. He and I campaigned together very effectively, with very satisfactory results within the State.

I have a very high regard for the ability, integrity, and sincerity of Fred Seaton, and personally I am most pleased at his appointment.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair) laid before the Senate the following resolution (H. Res. 514) from the House of Representatives, which was read:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
May 28, 1956.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of 19 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have read, and for which I ask present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 273) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Under the second resolving clause, the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania and Mr. DUFF as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, on behalf of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 10 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and at 7 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m. the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, and as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Representative GRANAHAN, until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 29, 1956, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 28 (legislative day of May 24), 1956:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Frederick A. Seaton, of Nebraska, to be Secretary of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Garrison Norton, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

Edwin R. Price, of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review for a term expiring July 15, 1959. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Roger G. Connor, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for the district of Alaska, division No. 1, for the term of 4 years, vice Theodore E. Munson, resigned.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, Robert W. Knox to be Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years, effective August 10, 1956.

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be commissioned lieutenant

Donald L. Campbell
Robert C. Munson
Gerard E. Haraden

To be commissioned lieutenant (junior grade)

James P. Randall

To be commissioned ensign

Vastine C. Ahlrich
Jordan S. Baker
Ronald D. Bernard
Mirlyn D. Christensen
Larry H. Clark
Arthur M. Cook
Robert D. Frost
Charles E. Fuller
Lawrence C. Haverkamp
Robert A. Hoyt
William A. Hughes
William M. Lee
Allen J. Lewis
Michael G. Lusk
Earl R. Scyoc
Lawrence L. Seal
Richard F. Shoolbred
G. Thomas Susi
Philip J. Taetz

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 28, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Canon Donald C. Means, rector, St. Luke's Episcopal Church, Altoona, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we commend to Thee, all who are engaged in the government of this Nation, and more especially, the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States assembled; grant to them integrity of purpose, wisdom of good judgment, and unfailing devotion to the ideals of good government. May all their deliberations and resultant legislation be such as will promote the welfare of all the people of this country; that upholding what is right and just, and following what is true, they may obey Thy holy will and fulfill Thy divine purpose.

We remember this day those who have given their lives in the service of this Nation, knowing that Thou hast received them unto Thyself. Grant that we may continue to dedicate ourselves to the unfinished work they so nobly advanced, and give increased devotion to the cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that our government of the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

Grant that this Nation may always be in the vanguard of nations that shall always strive to achieve and cherish a just, honorable, and lasting peace in our land and among the nations of the earth. And, we beseech Thee that Thou wilt never fail to bestow Thy blessing upon this good land which Thou hast promised to that people whose God is the Lord. In all humility of heart, but with strength of purpose, we ask Thee to grant our petitions which we offer in the name of Thy son Jesus Christ our Lord who with Thee and Thy holy spirit livest and reignest ever one God world without end.

Remember, O Lord, a Member of Congress and grant that increasing in love of Thee he may grow from strength to strength in the life of perfect service in Thy heavenly kingdom. Grant that those members of his family, casting every care upon Thee, may know the consolation of Thy love and grace. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 24, 1956, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 746. An act to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands, including Indian tribal lands, acquired in connection with the Garrison Dam project of mineral interests in such lands;

S. 3275. An act to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to fisheries; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; to establish within the Department of the Interior a Fisheries Division; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; and for other purposes; and

S. 3855. An act to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10721. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MUNDT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr.

HICKENLOOPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2822. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer approximately 9 acres of land in the Hualapai Indian Reservation, Ariz., to School District No. 8, Mohave County, Ariz.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) entitled "Joint resolution for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming."

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that District of Columbia business in order for today may be in order tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MILITARY PERSONNEL CLAIMS ACT, 1945—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FORRESTER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill H. R. 3996, an act to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957—CONFERENCE REPORT

Pursuant to permission granted on Thursday, May 24, 1956, Mr. WHITTEN, on Friday, May 25, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 11177) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration, for printing in the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CRAMER, for Monday, May 28, 1956, on account of official business.

Mr. HALE (at the request of Mr. MCINTIRE) for week of May 28 to June 1, inclusive, on account of personal business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 746. An act to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands, including Indian tribal lands, acquired in connection with the Garrison Dam project of mineral interests in such lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 3275. An act to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to fisheries; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; to establish within the Department of the Interior a Fisheries Division; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 25, 1956, present to the President, for his approval, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5862. An act to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation; and

H. J. Res. 261. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to donate surplus supplies and equipment for memorial purposes to The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore:

H. R. 4656. An act relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina;

H. R. 7678. An act to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibitions at the 11th Annual Instrument-Automation (International) Conference and Exhibit, New York, N. Y., and the Americas' New Frontiers Exposition, to be held at Oklahoma City, Okla., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9429. An act to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 767. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 1111. An act to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 1883. An act for the relief of Pietro Rodolfo Walter Stulin and Renate Karolina Horky;

S. 1970. An act for the relief of Kim Boksoon and Anke Naber;

S. 2822. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer approximately 9 acres of land in the Hualapai Indian Reservation, Ariz., to School District No. 8, Mohave County, Ariz.;

S. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming.

THE LATE MISS LUCINDA RAYBURN

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Texas delegation, I rise to formally announce to the House the death of Miss Lucinda Rayburn, sister of our beloved Speaker.

"Miss Lu," as she was affectionately known at home and in Washington, passed away Saturday, May 26 at her home and the home of the Speaker, in Bonham, Tex. As the House knows, Speaker RAYBURN left Washington just a week before to be with his sister in her final days.

Mr. Speaker, we can all well understand that Speaker RAYBURN is at this time carrying a great burden of sadness, and I know I speak for the entire membership of this House, from north to south and east to west, in saying that our thoughts are with our beloved Speaker in his deep sorrow, and that we hope divine power will sustain him and strengthen him in his bereavement.

All we mortals can do is to extend our sympathies to the Speaker and other members of the family, and to convey to him our feelings.

Miss Lu was very close to Speaker RAYBURN. She served for many years as his official hostess in Washington, and during her visits here, endeared herself to thousands who came to know her. She will be missed in Washington as a charming lady of the old school, who radiated graciousness and personality, and always warmed the hearts of those about her.

In this hour and in the days to come when the shock is so great to Speaker RAYBURN, I know you join me in asking that God's blessing be with him and that God may keep him.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I want to join with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], chairman of the Texas congressional delegation, in paying tribute to the memory of Miss Lu. Like many of the members of the delegation, I have visited the home of the Speaker and Miss Lu in Bonham, and we have known Miss Lu here in Washington as she has come from time to time as the hostess of the Speaker. We know how much she meant to the Speaker; and since the Speaker has meant so much through the years to the Nation and to the world, we must give a great share of the credit to Miss Lu. I join my colleagues and others in paying tribute to her memory. She will be remembered as one of the great women of the Southwest.

I lack adequate words to express my deep sympathy to the Speaker and the members of the family in this hour of great sadness and sorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in expressing my deep sympathy to our distinguished friend, Speaker RAYBURN, on the death of his beloved sister, Miss Lucinda Rayburn, lovingly called Miss Lu, I know I express the feeling of all my colleagues and of the countless friends Speaker RAYBURN has throughout the country.

The close attachment that existed between the Speaker and his beloved sister is well known. They lived for each other. For many years, as you know, his sister maintained the Speaker's home in Washington, serving as his official hostess during much of the Speaker's long and honorable career here.

Miss Lu was so proud of her distinguished brother. The life of Miss Rayburn was a beautiful one, an example and inspiration for all others to follow. In her passing the Speaker and his brothers and sisters can derive great consolation in the beauty of her life.

To the Speaker and his brothers and sisters, Mrs. McCormack and I extend our deep sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. DIES. I wish to join with my distinguished colleague and my other colleagues from Texas in expressing deep sympathy to the Speaker in his great loss and in paying tribute to Miss Lu for her many sterling qualities of mind and heart.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, all of us, from both sides of the political aisle, express to the distinguished Speaker of the House [Mr. RAYBURN] our deepfelt sympathy in this, his hour of bereavement. We do so because of our great affection and respect for our Speaker.

It was my privilege to become acquainted with his wonderful sister on some of her visits to Washington and to visit with this charming lady. I know the love and closeness between the Speaker and his sister. I know her passing is a great loss, not only to her distinguished brother but to all who were privileged to know her.

Words are lacking to express the deep feeling within our hearts, as we extend to the Speaker the sympathy of this Congress in the loss he has sustained.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, as has been stated here, those of us who were privileged to know Miss Lu find it difficult and really impossible to put into words our real feeling of sadness today and the deepness of our sorrow and regret.

I join with my colleagues in expressing to the Speaker my heartfelt sympathy and to say that the life of Miss Lu will be an eternal monument to one who lived for others.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I join with those who have spoken before me in expressing sympathy to the Speaker on the loss of one who was loved by all who knew her. It was my experience last year to bring my family by Mr. RAYBURN'S house on our way back to Washington. We stopped for a little while. I went in first to see if the Speaker was there and in position to see us. While I was talking to him Miss Lu went out to the car and brought Mrs. Rogers and the children into the house unbeknown to me. When I got back to the front part of the house she was entertaining them and all of the children had apparently fallen in love with her. We had such a wonderful visit with her and the Speaker.

Since that visit those children have continually referred to Miss Lu as the nice lady at Mr. RAYBURN'S house. I do not know of any higher compliment that could be paid anyone than for a child to call them a nice lady or a nice man, and for them to be so remembered after this life. I think we all felt that way about Miss Lu, and will all remember her as the nice lady at the Speaker's house.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and character of Miss Lu Rayburn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, our hearts are heavy today. Our beloved Speaker's sister and companion, Miss Lu, died on Saturday after an illness of more than 6 weeks.

Miss Lu, as she was affectionately known in official Washington for many years, was more than a sister to her brother. She was an associate on whom he leaned heavily in his great responsibilities. She served as his hostess at official functions and she was his constant counselor and adviser.

In addition to her activities in official Washington, Miss Lu found time to interest herself in numerous other activities. She took great interest in promoting girl's activities and in garden club work.

I know I express the views of all Members when I say our hearts in this hour are with the Speaker. Miss Lu is going to be missed by all of us.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, all of us share today the sadness that has come to our beloved Speaker over the loss of his sister, Miss Lu.

On her many visits to the Capital Miss Lou endeared herself to Members of the House by her graciousness and the genuineness of her friendship.

The family of Speaker RAYBURN is a closely knit relationship, and the passing away of Miss Lou is indeed a very great loss.

Our sincerest sympathy is extended to Speaker RAYBURN, and for him we pray for divine help in carrying his load of grief.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, my family and I join in extending our deepest sympathy to our Speaker and the other members of the Rayburn family on the loss of their much loved and respected sister, Miss Lu.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I join with my colleagues of the House in expressing to our beloved Speaker my heartfelt sympathy in the loss of his esteemed and devoted sister, Miss Lucinda Rayburn. While the measure of a life is not in the length but in the quality of it, Speaker RAYBURN and his brothers and sisters, as well as all whom her life touched, were abundantly blessed by more than fourscore years of beauty and usefulness in the life of Miss Lu. May the great good in her life this side of eternity and the promise of eternal life which is hers bring comfort to her survivors.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, we all share a part of our Speaker's grief in the passage of his sister who is being buried in Bonham, Tex., at this moment. All of the members of the Texas delegation and most of the Members of the House knew and loved Miss Lu Rayburn, probably because she loved the Members of this House. We all welcomed her cheerful and friendly greeting and looked forward to her visits to Washington. We will miss her and we know that our friend and our Speaker will find the loss even keener. I want to join with the other Members of this House in expressing my admiration for the life and character of Miss Lu Rayburn and my sympathy for the loved ones she left behind.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our sympathy for our beloved Speaker RAYBURN is very difficult to put in words. At the very moment when we are gathered here today to express our sorrow, the Speaker's beloved Miss Lu is being laid to rest and we can only trust that across the miles that separate us the sympathetic thoughts in our hearts will find their way into Mr. Sam's heart and comfort him.

When he returns to us he will know by the clasp of our hands and the look in our eyes that we are grieving with him and praying that God will give him the needed strength to carry on.

Mrs. Thompson and I join our colleagues in their expressions today.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to extend my condolences to our Speaker on the loss of his beloved sister, Miss Lucinda Rayburn.

Miss Rayburn was a fine woman, highly respected, loved, and revered by all who knew her. To our Speaker she was sister, companion, confidant, and hostess; a person dedicated to his welfare and happiness. Her loss will be keenly felt by her family, friends, and the many thousands who had the opportunity to benefit by her kindliness, graciousness, and sincerity.

Our Speaker and other members of his family have my deepest sympathy in this time of bereavement.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great sense of loss that I learned

of the untimely passing of Miss Lucinda Rayburn, sister of our beloved Speaker.

During a long and fruitful life, Miss Lu, as she was lovingly known, was a constant companion and helpmate to Speaker RAYBURN. For many years Miss Lu was the Speaker's official hostess and during her visits to Washington endeared herself to all who came to know her. Hers was a life of devotion and good works and she will always be remembered among the great women of the Southwest.

Mrs. Kilgore and I join with Mr. RAYBURN's many friends in the 15th District of Texas in expressing our heartfelt sympathy to our Speaker and to his family and pray that our Lord will sustain him in his hour of grief as He has guided him throughout his life.

THE LATE WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of deep sorrow and of great personal loss that I announce to the House the untimely passing of our colleague and my very dear friend, Congressman WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, of Philadelphia.

Bill, as he was affectionately known by so many people, was a conscientious, hard-working, sincere public servant, modest to a fault, but very methodical in the work he did on behalf of his people. His passing will leave a big gap in the important work that is now being done by some of our colleagues.

I know that I speak the sentiments of all Members of this body when I extend to his fine wife our deepest sympathy at her great loss.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked when I learned of the death of my good friend, BILL GRANAHAN. He was a conscientious, able, and valuable Member of this House. More than that, he was possessed of rare qualities of kindness, gentleness, and consideration for others that marked him as a gentleman in the highest sense of the word. He was a good man, a noble soul. During the past year I have learned to know him well; and to know him is to love him. He was my friend. I shall miss him indeed.

I am sure I speak for all Members of the House when I say that this Congress has lost an outstanding Member; this country has lost an outstanding American.

I join all Members in extending to his loved ones my deepest sympathy.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the best liked Members of the House was our late friend and colleague, BILL GRANAHAN. His unexpected death is a shock to all of us. His passing is a great loss to the House. During his period of service in this body BILL GRANAHAN served his people with ability and devotion. He was recognized by his colleagues as one of the most substantial Members of this body, a hard worker, and able Member, and one who contributed greatly in committee to the drafting of sound, constructive legislation. As we all know from our own experiences, it is in committee, unseen by the public, where the greatest contribution is made by a Member. Our late colleague was not only a great American, but he was a loyal Democrat. He was truly a man of the people. His fine character of service and his nobility of character, the strong respect in which he was held, I am sure will be a source of consolation to Mrs. Granahan.

Mrs. McCormack and I extend to Mrs. Granahan our deep sympathy in her great loss and sorrow.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed a great shock to hear of the death of our colleague Mr. GRANAHAN.

Congressman GRANAHAN was a fine gentlemen; beloved by those whom it was his privilege to represent.

The city of Philadelphia, the State of Pennsylvania, and our country have lost a fine representative. He will be greatly missed.

I extend to his widow and others of his family my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my very deep and sincere grief over the death of BILL GRANAHAN. I have been very closely associated with him during his and my tenure on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He was a kind man, a very gentle man, always considerate of the feelings and viewpoints of other Members. He was a tolerant man. He was devoted to the public interest, and he had, I think, to a rather marked degree, a comprehension of the needs of humanity, the needs of the people in this country and around the world. He gave, as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the very best he had in effort and in energy. He worked diligently on legislation in which he was interested, and that covered a very wide field.

Mr. Speaker, for myself and other members of the committee, I wish to convey our sympathy to Mrs. Granahan and other members of his family, and to say to them that the memory of BILL GRANAHAN will live with us on into the future.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHENCK].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, the unexpected and untimely death of our very good friend, Congressman GRANAHAN, came as a distinct shock and brought a feeling of great personal loss to me. It has been my privilege to serve with BILL GRANAHAN on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and also on the special Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance. He was always deeply interested in the work of our committee and very serious in his obligations as a Member of this great body.

It was a great privilege for Mrs. Schenck and me to meet the very fine and charming wife of BILL GRANAHAN some months ago. She is a wonderful person. We would like to express to her our most sincere sympathies for her great loss and our very great appreciation for the fine work of her distinguished husband. We hope and pray that the Father of all of us will grant her the courage, wisdom, strength, and understanding to meet this great loss and will sustain her in all the coming months.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow that I learned of the sudden passing of one of our outstanding Members from Philadelphia, BILL GRANAHAN. It was my happy pleasure to become acquainted with him more than 5 years ago. During that period a friendship grew up between him and me and from time to time we had breakfast together in the House cafeteria. It was then that I learned to know that he was an honest, sincere and conscientious legislator. He was at all times ready and willing to discuss with all Members the problems of government as he saw them.

We in Congress will miss BILL GRANAHAN because he had a smile, a good how-do-you-do for all of us. I know that in the future we will miss him in our Hall.

I should like to express my most sincere and deep sympathy to Mrs. Granahan, the members of his family, and his many friends.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER].

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing sympathy to the family of WILLIAM GRANAHAN and pay a tribute to a fine gentleman who will no longer be with us.

It was my privilege also to serve with BILL GRANAHAN on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I became acquainted with Bill when I first came to the Congress. I learned that he was one of these quiet and kindly people who always was sincerely working in the cause of good Government.

It was a pleasure to travel with BILL GRANAHAN on official committee trips. I found him on these trips to be equally serious and devoted to the cause that he so well represented in the House.

I know that these words that we express today will seem hollow in the great sorrow and bereavement of Mrs. Granahan and of BILL GRANAHAN's many friends. It is hoped, however, that the giver of all good and perfect gifts will to her and all of us the strength to bear our loss. All of our lives were enriched because Bill had been with us.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday morning last I was indeed shocked and saddened at the news of the sudden and untimely death of our colleague, Hon. WILLIAM THOMAS GRANAHAN, of Philadelphia, Pa.

It has been my privilege to enjoy BILL GRANAHAN's friendship since he first came

to the House of Representatives in January 1945. We all know of his geniality, his outstanding ability, and the great contributions made by him in behalf of the best interests of the people of the Second Congressional District, the State of Pennsylvania, and his beloved country. He was a most conscientious and able legislator and served with great distinction on the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. He was most faithful in his support of all legislation which he believed to be beneficial to the welfare of this Nation and the people he represented.

Men like BILL GRANAHAN are sadly missed. His life, his fine personality, his genial and charming character were an inspiration to me, and I shall ever remember him with fond memories.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his dear wife in her great loss and sorrow. I am sure he rests in peace.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed shocked and saddened when I learned of the passing of our colleague, BILL GRANAHAN. His passing is a great loss not alone to his district, the State of Pennsylvania and this Congress, but to the entire country.

I was very fond of BILL GRANAHAN. I never met him but what he had a friendly smile and a word of greeting. I had the great pleasure of serving with him on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I greatly enjoyed my association with him and his passing is a personal loss to me.

BILL GRANAHAN had a genial personality and made friends. I can understand why he was selected by the people of his district to represent them in Congress. I shall always treasure happy memories of our departed colleague. I was indeed proud to have him as a friend.

I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to BILL GRANAHAN and I extend my deepest sympathy to his widow.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply grieved when I learned of the passing of our beloved colleague and friend, BILL GRANAHAN. I was sitting in my office doing some work at the desk on Friday morning when I turned around to look out the window and as I did I saw the flag being lowered. I immediately called the telephone operator to find out about it and she, not having learned of it at that moment, called the information office and I was then advised that Bill had just passed away.

The Nation can ill afford to lose good men like BILL GRANAHAN. I have had the special privilege and great pleasure of knowing Bill for a good many years and serving with him on the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. For several years we have sat near each other during the course of legislative consideration.

When you have the privilege of being with a person as I did in committee with BILL GRANAHAN you learn to know him and know his fine qualities and the great ability he possessed. Not only have we lost a good friend but the district that he represents, the State of Pennsylvania, and the Nation have lost a very able, outstanding, hard working, and conscientious Member of this great body.

I shall miss him personally as I know our colleagues will. We extend to his fine wife and family, to his friends, and to the delegation from Pennsylvania our deep sympathy at the loss of such a fine man, husband, and friend.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak for all on this side of the aisle when I express our deepest regret at the passing of BILL GRANAHAN. Bill was a very modest and very conscientious legislator. Whenever he differed with another Member on a particular issue he always did it in a pleasant and never in a disagreeable way. No one in this body, to my knowledge, ever had anything but the most friendly feeling toward BILL GRANAHAN. It was always refreshing to run into him because he always had a pleasant smile and courteous greeting for everyone. I know that all of us will sorely miss him, and we extend to his wife our deepest sympathy.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the untimely passing of BILL GRANAHAN has enshrouded this House with a pall of gloom that will lift only as we place a proper estimate on his outstanding services to his constituents and the Nation and consider his unswerving devotion to the traditions undergirding this great lawmaking assembly.

This colleague, whose passing we all mourn so deeply, was truly a humble man who never traveled very far from the place of his birth, nor did he embark upon flights of legislative fancy that would take him beyond the ken of the people he came here to represent. Indeed, BILL GRANAHAN was the very embodiment of the philosophy that a good Congressman does not necessarily mean one who on all occasions must take the well of this House to regale his colleagues with his linguistic prowess. His conception of congressional responsibility, even as it is also mine, was to attend to those day-to-day requests that come from his people—great and small—and in the quality of that service he excelled to the highest degree.

We shall miss this humble, sincere and lovable colleague of ours who has been elevated to that celestrial chamber and has answered "here" to the Master's summons. We shall miss him, yes, but we shall not forget him and we know that we shall be better Congressmen for having known him and for having had the benefit of his example.

Our hearts go out to his sorrowing widow and we would not undertake to beguile her from the grief which now encompasses her, since only time can heal the anguish of these partings. We would, however, commend her to the ministrations of our gentle Saviour who will wipe all tears and who has promised for all of us a final glad reunion with those we have loved and lost a while.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in expressing my heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Granahan. I was privileged to serve with BILL GRANAHAN on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for nearly 5 years, and I learned to know and respect him. He was my personal friend, and I enjoyed the many hours we spent working together on this committee.

He was a conscientious, hard-working, and sincere representative of the people's interest. His votes were cast without regard for political expediency, in the committee, as well as on the floor of the House. He made a record here which clearly displays the dedicated spirit with which he served his people.

BILL GRANAHAN will be keenly missed by all of us who know and appreciate the work he has done for his constituents and the contribution he has made to his country.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, mine is the tribute to the memory of a beloved neighbor who brightened many of my days. In the last Congress, when his office was across from mine and when the problems of the workday were heavy, BILL GRANAHAN would look in with that smile of his and his greeting of radiating cheer. All in my office would feel the sweetness of a great personality enveloping us. We shall all miss him very, very much. I was in my district in Chicago when the word came that again the flag over the Capitol was at half mast and another colleague had fallen on the field of duty, a colleague who had been so very close to me as friend and neighbor. It was a shock eased only by the thought that a soul as sweet and gentle as was his must have ascended to realms where sweetness and gentleness abide forever. He was a statesman of integrity and vision, a servitor of mankind, in every sense a great American. My deepest sympathy goes to his fine wife, the other members of his family, and to the delegation from Pennsylvania that has sustained the loss of one of its outstanding and most beloved members.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and service of our deceased colleague.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned of the passing of my beloved friend and colleague, BILL GRANAHAN, on Friday.

It is with a heavy heart that I extend my sincere condolences to his devoted wife.

Bill and I were friends since childhood. We were born and raised in the same locality and for the past 35 years

enjoyed each other's company and counsel.

On most every occasion we sat side by side here on the floor of the House.

His accomplishments were many and his efforts in behalf of his friends and constituents were unequaled. His humility was exceeded only by his humbleness. He will be greatly missed by me and all who knew and loved him.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, it was with a feeling of great sadness that I learned of the death of our beloved colleague and a member of my State delegation, WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, of Pennsylvania.

It is in the nature of eulogies that words are inadequate to express the extent to which BILL GRANAHAN will be missed in this House by his many friends.

He was a true example of a fine public servant and his qualifications for the legislature were enhanced by his previous record of public service to the State of Pennsylvania before his election to Congress. His devotion to ideals and his sense of fair play have been an inspiration to all of us here and the impact of his personality will long be remembered.

My deepest sympathy goes out to his wife and the other loved ones he has left behind.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the loss of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, of Philadelphia, was indeed a great shock to all of us, and particularly to those of us from Pennsylvania who are privileged to serve in this House.

We knew Mr. GRANAHAN for his devoted and tireless service to his congressional district, to his State, and to the Nation. His work as a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is a record for all present and future members of that great committee to emulate. His widespread interests, including veterans' affairs, and the construction industry, as well as his long and varied service in positions of public trust, attest to his qualities as a leader and as a citizen.

Our hearts go out to Mrs. Granahan in her hour of bereavement. Her loss is shared by all of us.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the untimely and sudden death of our dear colleague, WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, came as a great shock to me. I had come to know him well through serving with him on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I shall miss him very much and am saddened by his death.

BILL GRANAHAN was conscientious, devoted to duty, and rendered outstanding service to his constituents and his State and Nation. He was a great American, a fine gentleman, and true friend. He was noted for his kindliness, his courtesy, and other splendid qualities which endeared him to all who knew him.

The people of the Second Congressional District of Pennsylvania have lost an able legislator who labored diligently in their behalf. His loss will be keenly felt by Members of this House, for he had the respect and devotion of his colleagues.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his fine wife and the other members of his family.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I join in expressing my grief and shock at the passing of my good friend and colleague, BILL GRANAHAN.

Bill was a man of ability, modesty, and integrity, who was admired and respected by all who knew and served with him. His devotion to the needs and desires of the people of his district, State, and Nation has always been in the highest tradition of service in the House of Representatives. BILL GRANAHAN has left behind him a distinguished record of accomplishment in the cause of liberalism. His sincerity of purpose and his faithful service in behalf of the average American were an inspiration to his fellow Pennsylvanians.

We have lost a true servant of the people and a great American who will be long remembered for his outstanding record in the House. To his widow I express my heartfelt sympathy in her bereavement.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the death of BILL GRANAHAN this House has lost a Member, who for 10 years has distinguished himself as an able, conscientious legislator, who discharged his duties scrupulously and who worked tirelessly for the best interests of his country and the constituency that sent him to us.

It was my privilege to have known BILL GRANAHAN for more than 20 years. For more than 10 years I served with him here in the Congress. I knew him socially. I met him in the furore of political campaigns. I worked with him on this floor, in committees and in conferences and at all times and in all places he impressed me, as he did all the Members of this body to whom I have spoken, as a man of character, determination and ability. He will, indeed, be missed by all of us.

BILL GRANAHAN was a pleasant, affable man and a very wise and discerning student of his fellowman. In the many, many years that I have known him I doubt that he ever made an enemy. His gentle manner will linger with his friends always and yet he could fight for the right with the best of them. BILL GRANAHAN just got along with everybody and stirred up no animosities. He was friendliness personified, a quiet, engaging gentleman. I deeply regret the loss of so fine a friend. The Nation, the Members on both sides of the aisle and particularly the West Philadelphia area are poorer for his passing. To his devoted wife, Katherine, and to the other members of his family, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker. It was with a deep sense of personal loss and shock that I learned of the passing of my friend and colleague, BILL GRANAHAN. Bill's tolerance and understanding, his sincerity and his conscientiousness will long be remembered. I learned to know him, not only as we sat side by side during committee hearings, but during our travels to South America with the committee and it was during these days that I grew to admire his ability and his devotion to his fellow man, characteristics which he hid beneath a cloak of great modesty.

The respect in which he was held by his colleagues was unsurpassed; his friendship was genuine; his smile ever ready and cordial. He will be sorely missed by all of us.

My deepest sympathy goes out to Mrs. Granahan and the other members of his family.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, may I join in the tribute paid a great American and a great Congressman. I had the pleasure of meeting Representative BILL GRANAHAN in the last session and I found him to be a delightful personality, a good friend, a devoted husband and a great citizen. His constant thought was for the well-being of his district. Both my wife and myself are indebted to him for his help and hospitality. May our tears of bereavement crystallize as they flow and be worn as a rosary of remembrance for his beloved memory.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the death of Representative WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN I, as a new Member of Congress, lost a good friend and wise counselor.

It was not my privilege to know BILL GRANAHAN well until I came to this body on January 3, 1955. His warm friendship and wise advice was very helpful to me in my efforts to understand the workings of the House of Representatives.

I had known him well by reputation as a political fighter of the highest ideals, a man constantly devoted to the welfare of the people he represented.

I deeply regret the loss of a fine colleague. His voice will be missed in his State and in this body.

To his wife and family I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep feeling of loss and a great sorrow that I join with my colleagues in saying a word as a last farewell in memory of our departed good friend, WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN.

"Bill," as he was affectionately known to many of us, will never walk this way again—yet once he walked among us a smiling and kindly man who radiated by his mere presence a warmth of affection and friendliness.

"Bill" was a good man—for he was dedicated to all the things that are good. And, he was a fine man because he did those things which are fine.

Though he was small of physical stature, Bill was possessed of a greatness because of his dedication to his fellowman. As a servant of the people he knew well the meaning of service and he gave of himself unselfishly and devotedly to his country's good. He shall always be remembered for these things and those whom he has left behind shall be grateful to his name.

I know that as a friend and colleague, I shall miss him and his kind face in these cherished Halls. His friends and those whom he served will also miss him. But, there is consolation in the thought that his good works will carry on.

To his family and to those dearly beloved to Bill, I extend my sincerest and deepest sympathy in this hour of their great loss.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and grieved to learn of the sudden and untimely death

of my dear friend and colleague, BILL GRANAHAN, with whom I have been associated for many years. His contributions to the welfare of his district and the State of Pennsylvania are numerous and he will be greatly missed by his host of friends. We shall miss his friendly smile, his geniality, and his general statesmanship, for he was a fine example of kindness, integrity, and American citizenship. His passing is our loss, but he has gone to his great reward.

My deepest sympathy goes out to Mrs. Granahan in her great sorrow, and I am sure she will be consoled by the knowledge that Bill is so kindly remembered by such a throng of good friends and the memory of a husband of such fineness of character and noteworthiness.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and saddened at the death of my esteemed colleague and good friend, WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN. His loss will be keenly felt.

Bill earned the respect of his colleagues and the people of his district for his outstanding ability and devotion to duty, and their deep affection for his sterling personal qualities. He was a truly effective Member of Congress because of his ability, sincerity of purpose, trustworthiness, and dependability. It was a privilege to know BILL GRANAHAN, and his passing is a personal loss to me. My deepest sympathy goes out to Mrs. Granahan and the other members of the family.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on my return to Washington I was shocked to learn of the death of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, my friend and colleague, William T. Granahan.

Words are inadequate on such occasions. The Nation has lost an able legislator and a fine American. I had a deep feeling of friendship and respect for BILL GRANAHAN. He will always be remembered by those who served with him because of his kindly disposition. He will be missed by all of us here in the Congress and his passing is a distinct loss to the people of his congressional district.

To his loved ones left behind and to the people of his district, I extend my deepest sympathy in their great loss.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened and shocked by the untimely passing of our colleague and my dear friend BILL GRANAHAN.

Bill and I were both elected to the 79th Congress in 1944, and we became close, personal friends. He was a fine gentleman and a true friend. His death is a personal loss, and I shall miss him very much.

Bill was a man of integrity and ability. He served his constituents conscientiously, and I know his unselfish and devoted service to them will be greatly missed. Our State of Pennsylvania, as well as the Nation, has lost a very able, capable and outstanding legislator.

I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to his beloved wife, Kathryn, in her great loss and sorrow.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, it was with a feeling of great sorrow that I learned of the death of my very dear friend and colleague, BILL GRANAHAN, on Friday morning, May 25.

Not only have I lost a good friend but the people of the district that he represented, the State of Pennsylvania, and the United States Congress have lost a very able, sincere, hard-working, and conscientious Member. It was a pleasure to have him as a friend, and I will always treasure happy memories of him.

I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to BILL GRANAHAN and extend deepest sympathy to Mrs. Granahan.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the people of the Second District of Pennsylvania have sustained a great loss in the passing of our beloved colleague, my good friend, BILL GRANAHAN.

Back in the 79th Congress, after taking his oath for the first time as a Member of this House, he was assigned to the Committee on the Revision of the Laws. It was in that way that a warm friendship commenced and developed between us—a friendship that I valued because of the many attributes of fine character that Bill possessed. He was distinguished by his gentle friendliness and sincerity—marks of a true gentleman. These traits alone, however, did not make BILL GRANAHAN the outstanding legislator that he was. His industry, wisdom, and conscientious devotion to duty that became immediately apparent in his work on the committee were what also contributed so much to his success both in committee work and in the representation of his constituents.

BILL GRANAHAN is going to be missed by his family, his colleagues, and his constituents. To his widow who, I know, in Bill's eyes was the person most responsible for his own success, I particularly want to extend sincere condolences.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 514) for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of 19 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. WALTER, Mr. EBERHARTER, Mr. FENTON, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. DAGUE, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. CHUDOFF, Mr. JAMES, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MACK of Illinois, Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania, Mr. KING of Pennsylvania, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. CLARK, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. HOLLAND.

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, May 29, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1897. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1898. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, relative to three legislative proposals which would authorize the President, under certain conditions, to loan naval vessels to certain foreign countries, with explanations of each proposal; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1899. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of certain vessels, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1900. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report stating that the Department of the Navy proposes to loan an exhibition model of the U. S. S. *San Jacinto* (CVL–30) to the Battleship Texas Museum, pursuant to section 6 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 898; 34 U. S. C. 546 (k)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1901. A letter from the Chairman, Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, transmitting a report recommending disposal of the Government-owned alcohol-butadiene plant at Louisville, Ky., pursuant to public Law 433, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1902. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with Messrs. James S. Turner and Bateman P. Miller, which, when executed by the superintendent, Cape Hatteras National Seashore, N. C., will authorize them to operate the Pea Island campground store on the south side of Oregon Inlet, Cape Hatteras National Seashore, for a term of approximately 4½ years from June 15, 1956 to December 31, 1960, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1903. A letter from the Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation which would amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, entitled "(u) The term 'United States' when used in a geographical sense includes all Territories and possessions of the United States, the Canal Zone and Puerto Rico"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

1904. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 650 of title 14, United States Code, entitled 'Coast Guard', relating to the Coast Guard supply fund"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1905. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 3, 1956, submitting an interim

report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on the Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, Ala. and Miss., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted May 2, 1939. This report is also submitted in final response to resolutions of the House of Representatives adopted March 10, 1937, by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and March 26, 1952, by the Committee on Public Works, requesting reviews of reports of the Warrior and Tombigbee rivers and their tributaries, Alabama and Mississippi, with reference to navigation, hydroelectric power, flood control, and other purposes. This report covers only the headwater reservoirs of the Warrior River, Ala. (H. Doc. No. 414); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with three illustrations.

1906. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 23, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a letter report on waterway to connect Basin Bayou and Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved May 17, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

1907. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting certain plans for works of improvement which have been prepared, pursuant to the authority vested in the President by section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 667) and delegated to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget by Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1908. A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the continental United States and Alaska, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 23, 1956, the following bill was reported on May 25, 1956:

Mr. NORRELL: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 11473. A bill making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2212). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 24, 1956, the following bill was reported on May 25, 1956:

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 11356. A bill to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2213). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 24, 1956, the following conference report was filed on May 25, 1956:

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee of conference, H. R. 11177. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2214). Ordered to be printed.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 24, 1956, the following bill was reported on May 25, 1956:

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 3515. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to assist in the provision of housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces; with amendment (Rept. No. 2215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted May 28, 1956*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee of conference. H. R. 3996. A bill to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 (Rept. No. 2216). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 10630. A bill relating to the District Court of Guam; without amendment (Rept. No. 2218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 8452. A bill to authorize and direct the conveyance of certain tracts of land in the State of Mississippi to Richard C. French, Lewis M. French, and Ruth French Hershey; with amendment (Rept. No. 2217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 626. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 2219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 627. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; with amednemnt (Rept. No. 2220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 23, 1956 the following bill was introduced on May 25, 1956:

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. 8. 11473. A bill making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

[*Introduced and referred May 28, 1956*]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 11474. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Fort Towson, Okla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 11475. A bill to amend section 312 (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit certain additional elderly persons to be naturalized without meeting the literacy requirements of such section; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AVERY:

H. R. 11476. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 11477. A bill to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 11478. A bill to provide for a program to encourage the utilization of domestic cotton fiber; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 11479. A bill to promote the fishing industry in the United States and its Territories by providing for the training of needed personnel for such industry; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska:

H. R. 11480. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 11481. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Potomac Electric Power Co. for the construction of a dam on the Potomac River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 11482. A bill to allow credit or refund of gift tax erroneously paid by reason of treating nontaxable divisions of community property as gifts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 11483. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 11484. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the disposal of certain surplus property to State defense forces; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 11485. A bill to assure the accurate labeling and advertising of alimentary paste products with respect to their durum wheat flour or semolina content; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 11486. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 11487. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 11488. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 11489. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Institute of Architects in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 11490. A bill to amend part III of subchapter O of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 11491. A bill to provide that small business concerns which are displaced by urban renewal projects shall be compensated for their losses arising out of their displacement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 11492. A bill to provide that small-business concerns which are displaced by

urban renewal projects shall be granted loans to meet expenses incident to their relocation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 11493. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, so as to direct the Federal Communications Commission to provide for the licensing of television reflector facilities and VHF translator facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 11494. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act to provide for a system of appeal from adverse actions taken by any Federal department, agency or the Civil Service Commission; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 11495. A bill to establish the principle of a basic single salary wage scale in the Canal Zone for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 11496. A bill to provide that small-business concerns which are displaced by urban renewal projects shall be compensated for their losses arising out of their displacement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 11497. A bill to provide that small-business concerns which are displaced by urban renewal projects shall be granted loans to meet expenses incident to their relocation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 11498. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 11499. A bill to amend the Texas City Disaster Claims Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 11500. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, with respect to certain unfair methods of competition and certain unfair practices in the distribution of new motor vehicles in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 11501. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands and rights-of-way in the State of Wyoming to the town of Jackson, Wyo.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 11502. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to fisheries; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; to establish within the Department of the Interior a Fisheries Service; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. Con. Res. 244. Concurrent resolution to provide for a joint committee of the Congress to represent the Congress at the unveiling of the Commodore John Barry Memorial at Wexford, Ireland, on September 16, 1956; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States protesting the discontinuance of postage stamps bearing the portraits of John Adams and John Quincy Adams and urging the restoration thereof by the Postmaster General; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States against accepting or taking action upon the findings and recommendations of the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to implement the Tripartite Declaration of the United States, Great Britain and France guaranteeing the borders of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to conform with the recommendations in the report of Indepartmental Committee on Narcotics to the President, dated February 1, 1956; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 11503. A bill for the relief of Miss Etsuko Yamada Hartwig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 11504. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Theodore (Nicole Xantho) Rousseau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 11505. A bill for the relief of Col. Fred E. Dueker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. R. 11506. A bill for the relief of Mary Felicia Ling Vong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 11507. A bill for the relief of Khanbaba Fatoullah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 11508. A bill for the relief of Dr. James R. P. Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 11509. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margarete Holdy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1083. By Mr. BOW: Petition of William Schwartz and others of Stark County, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1084. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Post No. 8730, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Blossburg, Pa., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1085. By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Petition of Henry H. Reeves, North Little Rock, Ark., and others urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1086. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Leslie C. Moore, of Joplin, Mo., and other citizens of Jasper County, Mo., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1087. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the acting clerk of City Council, Quincy, Mass., requesting the Postmaster General to take action to restore the portraits of John Adams and John Quincy Adams, both Quincy, Mass., men, who served as Presidents, to their "appropriate and rightful places" upon the 2- and 6-cent postage stamps; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1088. Also, petition of the executive secretary, Niagara Falls Chamber of Commerce, Niagara Falls, N. Y., requesting that Congress withhold its approval of H. R. 5550, a bill to authorize United States membership in the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1089. Also, petition of William J. Nobriga, senator, first district, and others, Territorial Legislature, Honolulu, T. H., recommending certain amendments to the bill H. R. 8337, and being opposed to the bill in its present form; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Small Business Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, May 21, the 218th name was signed to the petition to discharge H. R. 11, the equality of opportunity bill. On that day the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], gave out a press release thanking and congratulating the 218 Members who signed this petition. I failed to see anything in the local press on this release, and it occurs to me therefore that the Members would be interested in knowing about the press release of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

On Tuesday, the day following the completion of the petition to discharge H. R. 11, the House Committee on the Judiciary met and reported another bill on this subject. This is bill H. R. 1840. I am not at this time prepared to comment on the relative merits of the two bills; I simply call attention to the fact that our chairman [Mr. PATMAN] has offered his congratulations to the Members who signed the discharge petition on his bill; and I likewise congratulate those Members.

STATEMENT OF WRIGHT PATMAN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS—SMALL BUSINESS VICTORY: 218 MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE SIGN PETITION TO CALL UP H. R. 11

Two hundred and eighteen Members of the House of Representatives have now signed the discharge petition to call up H. R. 11, which

means that this bill will definitely be acted upon by the House.

The 218 Members who signed this petition are to be warmly congratulated, both for the interest they have shown in preserving independent businesses in the United States, and for taking this affirmative action to pass this needed legislation.

H. R. 11 will strengthen the antitrust laws and plug the loophole created by the Supreme Court in the one antitrust law which affects the everyday practical operations of every small business in the United States. The bill will restrain abuses of power by which big businesses destroy equally efficient and even more efficient small businesses. This is the abuse of power which is exercised through price discrimination.

The House Rules require that after completion of the discharge petition, 7 days must pass before the bill can be taken up and voted on, and furthermore, that it be taken up only on any 2d or 4th Monday after expiration of the 7 days. This means that the bill will be taken up and acted on by the House on Monday, June 11.

My belief is that a great majority of the House is overwhelmingly in sympathy with preserving the free-enterprise system, which means restoring equality of opportunity for small business. The bill will simply make it illegal for any seller to engage in any discriminatory pricing practice which substantialy lessens competition or tends to create a monopoly.

I predict the bill will pass. Small-business people all over the United States will hail this as a great victory.

Congressman McGregor's Schedule of Meetings in the 17th Ohio District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, having been assured by the leadership that the Congress will not be in session during the latter part of August and September, I will again this year follow the procedure of holding meetings in the courthouses of the seven counties in my district.

While a Congressman is expected to have a broad grasp of national and international matters, I have always deemed it most advisable to keep in touch with the people of my district so that I might have their views and endeavor to be of service to them in their personal problems. I will be at the courthouses in the various counties as per the following schedule:

Monday and Tuesday, August 27 and 28, Ashland.

Wednesday and Thursday, August 29 and 30, Mansfield.

Friday and Saturday, August 31 and September 1, Coshocton.

Tuesday and Wednesday, September 4 and 5, Delaware.

Thursday and Friday, September 6 and 7, Newark.

Monday and Tuesday, September 10 and 11, Millersburg.

Wednesday and Thursday, September 12 and 13, Mount Vernon.

Weekdays, 9 a. m. to 4 p. m. Saturday conferences will last only until noon, when the courthouse closes.

In the past these meetings have been most successful, and it is surprising how much can be accomplished when a citizen and his Congressman can sit down and talk over national and personal problems.

No appointments are necessary for these conferences, and I urge any or all of my constituents to meet with me on the date most convenient to them.

With the knowledge thus obtained, I know I will be better able to truly represent them in the Congress of the United States.

Danger in Domestic Textiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD H. POFF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, by reason of our low tariff rates on uncontrolled importation of foreign textile finished products produced by cheap foreign labor, our domestic textile industry, including synthetics, apparel and other finished textile mill products, is fast becoming the sick man of the American industrial economy. This industry, which employs about 14 percent of our manufacturing wage earners, has in recent years been compelled by unfair competition from abroad to curtail production, shorten the workweek and discharge temporarily or permanently over 260,000 employees. Since 1947, domestic cotton manufacturers' exports have dropped from $748.8 million to $242 million. During the same period, foreign imports have increased from $24 million to $123 million. These imports now supply 30 percent of the domestic gingham market, 30 percent of the cotton blouse market and 70 percent of the velveteen market.

What accounts for this tremendous increase in imports and this alarming threat to our American textile manufacturers? Approximately 27 percent of the production cost of cotton cloth is wages. The average Japanese textile worker's wage is 13 cents an hour, as compared to our $1.35 an hour in the United States. It is unthinkable to expect the American worker to compete at this wage level with Japanese workers, and the manufacturer himself, faced with this fixed production cost, has no flexibility with which to meet foreign prices on the finished product. As a matter of fact, the cotton manufacturer is faced with still another inflexible factor which does not face his foreign competitor. About 53 percent of the production cost of the cotton cloth is raw cotton whose price to the American manufacturer is sustained at an artificially high level by the domestic cotton price-support program. Cheap foreign cotton is not available to him as it is to his foreign competitor, because America has placed an import quota on raw cotton of 29,000 bales. Compared with the 9 million bales required by the American manufacturer, this quota is not a drop in the bucket.

Those of us interested in the welfare of the American cotton manufacturer and his employees cannot understand why America will impose a quota on a cheap foreign raw-product import to protect domestic growers, but refuses to consider a quota on importations of the cheap foreign-finished product to protect the American manufacturer and his employees.

For similar reasons, we fail to understand why there continues to be such an unfair balance in tariff rates between the United States and foreign competitor nations. According to the 1953 figures, which are the latest presently available to me, the United States tariff rate on imported finished cotton product was 21.55 percent. On the other hand, Britain's tariff rate on cottons was 30 percent, Italy's up to 25 percent, Germany's up to 30 percent, and Canada's up to 27.5 percent. With respect to synthetic textile products, America's tariff rate on foreign imports was only 19.7 percent, whereas Norway's was 22 percent, France's 20 to 25 percent, Italy's 25 to 27 percent, and India's 50 percent.

I do not profess to know whether the proper solution is an import quota or an increased tariff or a compromise combination of both. However, I do know—and every domestic manufacturer and worker will bear me out—that unless some firm and positive action is taken soon this Nation faces the bleak borders of bankruptcy of the domestic textile industry—an industry which is not only vital to our economic health in peacetime but essential to our very national security in wartime, when foreign imports might be suddenly and completely cut off.

Mr. Speaker, all of us are concerned about the economic well-being of the Japanese. We are encouraged to hope that in the unhappy event of war Japan would be an ally. Indeed, we have been so concerned about Japan's welfare that we have used American taxpayer dollars to rebuild her shattered industries. The irony of the fact is that we have furnished the capital to install the very machinery which, with subsubsistence wage levels, produces textile products which are undermining our domestic industry. It is one thing to say that we should help the Japanese, but it is entirely a different thing to say that we should do so by hurting our own American citizens.

Congressman Miller's Record on Public Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the following remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and a copy of a letter

I am sending to the Honorable MICHAEL KIRWAN, of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, on May 22 the gentleman from Ohio made a serious charge against me in stating, "Nebraska has voted against every State that wanted public power." The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] was referring to seven votes which occurred on May 2, 1951. He was using this as his excuse for voting against public power and not supporting the administration's request which had budget approval for the 230-kilovolt line from Fort Randall, S. Dak., to Grand Island, Nebr. His motion to strike this item from the bill denies the REA's of Nebraska a right to get public power. According to press reports he said, "This public power project would go in over my dead body." He also made the statement on the floor of the House that he doubted "if I would vote for the second coming of Christ." This was in bad taste and offensive and, to his credit, he did delete it from the permanent RECORD. It is a rare occasion when a Member's motive or votes or religion is attacked on the floor of the House.

The letter I have written to Mr. KIRWAN and which appears as a part of these remarks, shows that there are a total of 371 reclamation, hydroelectric plants, and flood-control projects which have been presented to the House in the last 14 years since I have been a Member. I have challenged Mr. KIRWAN to show where I have failed to support legislation or the appropriations for all but 4 or 5 of these projects. In fact, the criticism I get is that I have been a bit too liberal. I have always felt that reclamation, public power, and flood-control projects were an investment in the future of America. They return dividends, they are needed for an expanding population.

Close examination of my voting record will refute the charge that I have voted against "every State who wanted public power."

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 25, 1956.

Hon. MICHAEL KIRWAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: I have just reviewed the debate we had in the House on May 22, 1956, in which you made some serious charges that the Nebraska delegation, and A. L. MILLER in particular, on May 2, 1951, failed to support seven rollcalls which you claimed was a vote against public power. You have stated, "Nebraska has voted against every State that wanted public power." The records, of course, deny this statement. The vote you refer to occurred on May 2, 1951. This was in the midst of the Korean war, which was not going well for this country. The budget was out of balance $14 billion. The votes I made to cut Southeastern Power Administration and the Southwest Power Administration was in support of an amendment made by Democrats. It was a small cut. One in the direction of economy. Both votes prevailed. The House voted with the Nebraska delegation and it was a Democrat-controlled House. I also voted for Mr. TABER's motion to cut all appropriations including reclamation and power projects by 5 percent. Again it was an economy move and could not possibly be considered having voted against public power.

Now I want to cite to you my record of voting for reclamation projects and for public power. In the last 2 years I have voted for the Chief Joseph in Washington; Washita in Oklahoma; the great upper Colorado project with its numerous reservoirs and powerplants. The Trinity River project in California which is a great public power and irrigation project; the Ventura project in California, and others.

You will find in the May 22 issue of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of hydroelectric plants either constructed and operated or to be constructed and operated by the Bureau of Reclamation. This list was put in by our colleague, JOE L. EVINS, of Tennessee. There are a total of 72 projects in all—59, while I have been a Member of the House, have been considered. I have been in support of every one of the 59 Bureau of Reclamation projects. I challenge you to show where I have failed to support legislation or appropriations for these projects. I list them as follows:

Hydroelectric powerplants

CONSTRUCTED AND OPERATED BY THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

State	Project	Name of plant
Alaska	Eklutna	Eklutna.
Do	do	Little Eklutna.
Arizona-Nevada	Boulder Canyon	Hoover.
Do	Parker-Davis	Davis.
California	Central Valley	Folsom.
Do	do	Keswick.
Do	do	Nimbus.
Do	do	Shasta.
Colorado	Colorado-Big Thompson	Estes.
Do	do	Flatiron.
Do	do	Green Mountain.
Do	do	Marys Lake.
Do	do	Polehill.
Do	Grand Valley	Grand Valley.
Idaho	Boise	Anderson Ranch.
Montana	Missouri River Basin	Canyon Ferry.
Do	Hungry Horse	Hungry Horse.
New Mexico	Rio Grande	Elephant Butte.
South Dakota	Missouri River Basin	Angostura.
Wyoming	Kendrick	Alcova.
Do	Missouri River Basin	Boysen.
Do	do	Kortes.
Do	Shoshone	Heart Mountain.

CONSTRUCTED AND OPERATED BY OTHERS

Montana	Fort Peck (USCE)	Fort Peck.
South Dakota	Missouri River Basin	Fort Randall.
Texas	Falcon Dam (IBWC)	Falcon.

UNDER CONSTRUCTION BY BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Idaho	Palisades	Palisades.
Montana	Missouri River Basin	Yellowtail.
Utah	Provo River Basin	Deer Creek.
Washington	Yakima-Kennewick	Chandler.
Do	Yakima-Roza	Roza.
Wyoming	Missouri River Basin	Glendo.

UNDER CONSTRUCTION BY OTHERS—POWER TO BE MARKED BY USBR

North Dakota	Missouri River Basin	Garrison.
South Dakota	do	Gavins Point.
Do	do	Oahe.

AUTHORIZED TO BE CONSTRUCTED BY BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

California	Central Valley	Lewiston.
Do	do	Matheson.
Do	do	Tower House.
Do	do	Trinity.
Colorado	Collbran	Upper Molina.
Do	do	Lower Molina.
Do	Colorado-Big Thompson	Big Thompson.
Idaho	Minidoka	American Falls.
Montana	Missouri River Basin	Absaroka.
Do	do	Kenil.
Do	do	Little Porcupine.
Do	do	Lyon.
Do	do	Moorhead.
Do	do	Portage.
Do	do	Tiber.
Nebraska	do	Lillian.
Oregon	Talent	Green Springs.
South Dakota	Missouri River Basin	Pony Hills.
Utah	Weber Basin	Gateway.
Do	do	Wanship.
Wyoming	Missouri River Basin	Bald Ridge.
Do	do	Fremont Canyon.
Do	do	Hunter Mountain.
Do	do	Sheridan.
Do	do	Sunlight.
Do	do	Thief Creek.

AUTHORIZED TO BE CONSTRUCTED BY OTHERS

California	Central Valley (USCE)	Iron Canyon.
South Dakota	Missouri River Basin (USCE)	Big Bend.

If you will refer to your own report on pages 5 and 6, you list all of the appropriations for reclamation. There are 44 individual projects for irrigation and power. I challenge you to show where I failed to support legislation or appropriations for any one of these reclamation and hydroelectric plants. On pages 10 to 17 inclusive, are listed 299 projects for the Corps of Engineers. They are flood control and hydroelectric plants. The record will show that I have supported legislation and appropriations for all but 4 or 5 of these projects. Again I challenge you to show that I voted against power in these projects.

It was my amendment to the appropriations bill last year that placed 8 new irrigation and power projects in the Public Works legislation. I believe this was much to your discomfort.

The record will show that I have voted for steam plants for TVA; I have voted for all of the money to increase the appropriations for REAs. I have said repeatedly that these appropriations were an investment in the resources of this country. I complained bitterly, and you will find in the RECORD, volume 98, part 3, page 3066, where I said, in part: "It comes to my attention that no new starts have been the rule of Congress and the administration for some time and if this program continues, the present irrigation projects will have been finished and we will be without a new start for irrigation projects—I earnestly hope that the policy of the Government and the Committee on Appropriations might be changed so that we can proceed with the orderly development of feasible irrigation districts—electric power makes irrigation feasible—when the Congress spends money for the development of power projects that money and the fruits of this thing ought to be for the benefit of the people of the United States—the policy has been that there should be no new starts, this must be changed. I repeat, these new projects plus electricity, adds new wealth, brings new business, taxes, and security to our Nation. The resources must be developed to meet the needs of an expanding population." I believe, sir, that each year the record will indicate that has been my attitude on public power.

As a ranking member of the Interior Committee and chairman in the 83d Congress, we were diligent in protecting the rights of the preference customers getting public power.

I am a little surprised, sir, that you would attempt to mislead my colleagues and the country by stating that I have failed to support public power projects. The record denies such an allegation. I am wondering, also, that if I was wrong, as you say I was, in not supporting public power projects, that if you now consider your vote, which is against public power and the REA's of Nebraska, is right?

I think it is most unfortunate that you have used your position as the Democratic chairman of the subcommittee, to make the motion to strike the 230-kilovolt line from the appropriations bill when it was approved by the Bureau of the Budget and the Republican administration. I think it was unfortunate that you stated, and I quote the press, "They will get it only over my dead body." You are in a powerful position to defeat the appropriation, but, sir, it is a vote against public power.

I note that you deleted the statement you made in the debate when you said, "I doubt if the gentleman from Nebraska would vote for the second coming of Christ." That, sir, was not in good taste and to some, quite offensive.

I can only conclude from your action on the floor that you have attempted to mislead the Congress and the country with the hope that you might gain some political advantages in Nebraska. I know your hopes will be in vain. I can only say that if I had voted as you have been voting, my people would not be returning me to Congress with such a handsome vote.

I expect, sir, to place this letter and report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I would again urge that you examine my record in the project list in this letter. If you will do that and examine my voting record you will find that it is as good as most Members in the House on public power. Your citation of the seven votes on May 2, 1951 was not against public power, they were for economy in our country when we were losing a war and had a $14 billion deficit facing the American people.

The hearings on the 230-kilovolt line will be held in the committee of the other body on May 31 or the early part of June. I believe it will again be presented to the House as a conference matter. I trust you will use your influence and support public power as I have done in the past.

Sincerely yours,

A. L. MILLER,
Member of Congress,
Fourth District, Nebraska.

Armenian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on the 28th of May the Armenians celebrate the 38th anniversary of the short-lived independence of the Republic of Armenia. This event which marks their brief independence between the years 1918 to 1920 causes one to reminisce on the principles of a great President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, who actually believed in the freedom of all nations. He was not one to pay lip service to gain votes but acted with sincere effort to produce harmony and individualism in people throughout the world. What a different picture there is today.

Soviet Russia has consistently attempted to annex properties of foreign nationals as a guise of progress to its peoples, to plunder for the purpose of supplementing its treasuries, and to raid to obtain additional recruits for its slave labor camps.

Following World War I in 1920, the Soviets took over the Republic of Armenia. The same year they also attempted to take over Poland but were defeated. Both these nations were looted, devastated, and unprepared to withstand these menacing hordes. Fortunately, Poland had assistance from America and France which helped defeat these ravaging savages.

The freedom of the nations I have mentioned and others was established by people with foresight and vision to the future. President Wilson recognized the practicality of independence of various nations. His foresight is woefully lacking today among administration circles for in the interests of peaceful coexistence, no real effort is being put forth to bring about any stability in the world.

The great ado about the Geneva Conference only brought about more confusion among Americans and throughout the rest of the world. What was accomplished; certainly no attempt was made to reestablish the right of self rule to the rightful people.

The Geneva Conference was actually brought about through Communist subterfuge, although a venerable gentleman from the other body is credited with having initiated the proposal. And, of course, the present administration fell for it hook, line, and sinker.

The Russians by their indirect interjection have gained beyond their expectations. They gained not only knowledge of our advancements in medicine, nuclear physics and other fields, but also gained in the implementation of exchange programs of visitors in various nations. The seven Russians who visited America last year were typical examples. They were not just journalists but were professionals in various fields. From their trips they gleaned valuable information for the U. S. S. R. They are so far behind in Russia that they have had to buy innumerable items from us, such as a complete window assembly to be reproduced in Russia. Their constant boasting about their progress is I believe deflated by just this one item.

What did the present administration gain? Only a stroke of propaganda for peaceful coexistence. That makes many of us who are thoroughly familiar with Russia's actions not only in recent years but also in centuries past firmly convinced that the Russians are working only for their own benefits. Any agreements or treaties are simply scraps of paper for us to adhere to but for them to benefit by and forget at the opportune moment.

The purpose behind the present moves of Russia for peaceful coexistence is to neutralize Western Europe and Asia, to destroy NATO and SEATO and to isolate America.

Today, in spite of the attempt to follow many of the Roosevelt and Truman policies, the present administration is allowing itself to become more and more entrenched in an isolationist position. For this trend, we certainly have no cause to rejoice in America.

For instance, the so-called relaxation of terror in the satellite nations might have some truth to it, but it really is of no consequence. Russia has not and will not relax her complete military and police domination and policy control over any of the nations behind the Iron Curtain. She has willfully destroyed leaders of these countries and to a degree the spirit of active participation but never the desire for self rule.

Presidents Wilson, Roosevelt, and Truman were controversial figures. Anyone who has the qualities of leadership and the ability to act when necessity arises will always be a controversial figure. This, of course, is not true today. So we may justly assume that we have a figure at the helm of our Government who will never be controversial.

To those of us who pray and hope for the reestablishment of a free and inde-

pendent Armenia and of the other nations, the present looks hopeless unless this conglomerate giant falls of its own weight. From all indications, this is not immediately possible.

The Atomic-Hydrogen Age—A Challenge to Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 27, 1956, it was my privilege to deliver the commencement address at the 91st annual commencement exercises of Rider College, Trenton, N. J., at which time I was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Mr. address follows:

COMMENCEMENT DAY ADDRESS DELIVERED BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE 91ST ANNUAL COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, RIDER COLLEGE, TRENTON, N. J., MAY 27, 1956

Dr. Gill, Dr. Moore, Reverend Wismer, members of the board of trustees, members of the faculty, the alumni association, distinguished guests, class of 1956, ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor to be selected by Rider College as the recipient of an honorary degree and to be invited to deliver the commencement address at the 91st annual commencement exercises.

It is gratifying to me that honorary degrees are being awarded Dr. Frederick M. Adams and Mr. George R. Hill.

I congratulate them for the honor conferred upon them. And may I add that I find myself in select company in being honored with such distinguished Americans.

Every commencement speaker feels some emotion as he stands before a graduating class in its hour of triumph.

He knows something of the mixed feelings the students, the faculty, and the families are experiencing.

Parents are pardonably proud and beaming with joy because their sons and daughters, by their scholastic attainments, have justified the confidence they placed in them.

Commencement day is a reminder that an institution is made of people, not of buildings.

Here at Rider College there will be a new freshman class in the fall, and the life of Rider will go on.

It will have a continuity, but not exactly as it was, with the class which is leaving.

To you members of the class of 1956 these have been years of experience, both pleasant and trying, which have belonged to you.

Suddenly in your hearts you feel that Rider College, which you are about to leave, is more precious than it ever was before.

Now there are jobs to think of, whether already waiting or still to be fund.

Because this is a technical age, to some of you this commencement day is another step in your plans to acquire further education in graduate schools.

As your commencement speaker it is not easy to find words that will long be remembered, because there is so much competition for attention in your thoughts.

But my subject, nevertheless, is an important one.

It is a subject which will shape your lives in the years ahead.

This is true whether you take an active role in business, industry, government, politics, or the professions, or whether you think you can escape to a smaller though also important world of homemaking.

The subject of my discourse—the atomic-hydrogen age, a challenge to youth—relates to the importance of my duties as a member of the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

This committee is aware that the development of atomic energy carries with it some of the gravest responsibilities in the world today.

It is the manner in which we employ this great source of energy now loose in the world that the fate of mankind will be determined.

The picture which I am about to present is neither wholly dismal nor wholly one of good cheer.

It is, however, exciting in its implications and significant to our lives.

Everyone living in modern-day America has some notion of the effects of atomic weapons and at least an awareness that there are peacetime uses of the atom which will be important to all of us.

In discussing the subject of atomic energy there is a definite feeling of adventure in exploring the nuclear field.

On the one hand we are exploring the unknown in sciences, physics, chemistry, metallurgy, biology, etc., as well as unknown fields in engineering and construction and in the business and industrial life of the Nation.

On the other hand there must be applied sound scientific engineering and business principles to solve unprecedented problems arising from unique and sometimes impossible situations.

The result has been that today as a Nation we are faced with a vast new science that affects the lives of all of us and which has had a marked influence on the business and industrial life of America.

Therefore, every one of us sooner or later will come to realize that in our midst there are quietly working revolutions in almost every phase of the art of living.

Over a period of years the emphasis in exploring atomic energy has been in the weapon field.

The result has been a mad race for superiority.

Ten years ago the United States alone controlled a supply of fissionable material.

It was, however only enough for a token number of weapons of moderate yield.

Since then the supply of uranium 235 and of plutonium has increased tremendously.

According to the Manchester Guardian, a leading newspaper in Great Britain, it was recently estimated that the United States may have the makings of 35,000 weapons.

It was also estimated that the Soviet Union strength in such material might be the equivalent of 10,000 nuclear weapons.

In addition Great Britain was said to have the capability of producing over a thousand weapons.

Then, too, we know that a large number of other countries are building atomic reactors which will produce the necessary material used in weapons.

According to a recent newspaper article we know that President Eisenhower has offered for peacetime power development a supply of uranium 235, equivalent to more than 4,000 atomic bombs.

This generous action on the part of the American people in furthering the desire for world peace certainly reveals the adequacy of supply of fissionable material in our stockpile.

In recent years the American monopoly of such materials has been broken with profound significance for our position in the world.

Meanwhile the supplies of nuclear explosives have grown tremendously.

Then, too, the efficiency of weapons has increased, the variety of weapons has multiplied, and the means for delivery are in a period of revolutionary change.

It is not difficult to recall that less than 11 years ago the United States took out to the Pacific the bulk primitive weapons which were dropped on Japan.

These "model T" weapons could hardly be lifted by a B–29 bomber, and though we view them as crude today, they represented the culmination of the most complex scientific effort the world had undertaken up to that time.

In their single plane drops they wiped out Hiroshima and much of Nagasaki, which served as the excuse for the Japanese to end the war.

Today through improved design nuclear weapons have been shrunk small enough to be carried by fighter planes.

To fit inside an artillery shell.

To be used for antiaircraft purposes and indeed, perhaps, even a suitcase bomb which a saboteur can plant in a locker in a metropolitan railway station.

There is no reason why, in the near future, one cannot envisage even smaller weapons.

The increase in efficiency toward higher yields of energy has multiplied the destructive effects of the A- and the H-bomb to the extent that today they yield many more millions of tons in destruction.

Let me illustrate what this increased yield could mean.

A high-yield weapon centered on Trenton could wipe out virtually everything from here to Princeton in one direction and to the edge of Philadelphia in the other.

The radioactive rain of debris could drop its lethal fallout depending on the weather and wind in a swath across Greater New York City, Connecticut, and eastern Massachusetts without favor on rich and poor alike.

A Bison jet bomber or Bear turboprop bomber of the Soviet Air Force could fly a one-way mission above the altitude of our typical defending fighters.

It is quite possible these Soviet bombers, without detection of our radar, could drop such a weapon from a vertical distance beyond the range of our Nike batteries.

Or the weapon might arrive without warning as the warhead of a guided missile shot from a submarine suddenly surfaced off the Jersey coast.

Or an agent working from simple blueprints might assemble the components of a suitcase bomb in any basement workshop with only the fissionable core brought across our border by clandestine means.

This is the present-day horror with which we live.

If we become indifferent about it it is only because the world has feared the threat of retaliatory effects which up to now have discouraged Soviet aggression.

The picture is so fluid that it would be extremely dangerous to assume that because we have escaped so far we will continue to do so.

I hope and pray that we will not commit such an error.

Our survival demands that until an effective system of control and inspection has been created for the entire world we must constantly be alert and push our own weapons development to serve as a deterrent.

I wish that good will and peaceful example were enough to make us safe but they are not.

In this atomic-hydrogen age we must be realistic.

If we were to test the theory that we could disarm first or without fool-proof guaranties, the price of any error in the theory would be the destruction of the Nation.

But this does not mean that we must give up living, give up trying to find a solution to the ideological struggle which causes our danger.

It is not the fault of the impersonal fissionable atom that we are in danger—it is the inadequacy of man's social adjustments.

This maladjustment provides a constant challenge for the years ahead.

The solution is not to surrender to those who would enslave us; but, to the contrary, to possess the ability to take fresh looks at old concepts.

The problem is to preserve the freedom and integrity of the United States.

At the same time we should strive to modify international relationships to fit realistically the changing nature of the world.

As a small example, new questions of sovereignty over the space above a country will be raised by the launching of artificial satellites.

How far up can a nation control the air against invasion by observation satellites?

There is no adequate precedent for settling such a problem.

Therefore we must have faith that a solution will be found.

Meanwhile all our problems will not be solved by simply ignoring them.

Just as the passengers on a transoceanic plane have faith that their flight will be successful, so must we have faith that we can solve the problems of human relations before we destroy human life and civilization on this globe.

But even the safest transoceanic airline carries liferafts, gives ditching instructions, and insists on constant safety inspections of all mechanical equipment and pilots.

In like manner we Americans must take precautions in the dangerous world in which we live.

As a Nation we must have military, political, social, and technical information about all the world to a degree never required by this country in the past.

We must maintain an adequate national defense and cheerfully carry a heavy burden of taxation for the indefinite future.

We must have a maturity and grasp of foreign policy that no earlier generation needed to worry about.

We must have a strong industrial base, widely dispersed and decentralized, so that we never find ourselves being caught with "all our eggs in one basket."

We must support education and research by whatever means are necessary to insure our superior strength in an age of rapid scientific change.

Personally, we must be willing to take that inconvenience and trouble when survival requires.

This includes our share of military duty, of service with the civil defense program, or other activities of good citizenship, which can help us survive when the chips are down.

Facing such a grim state of affairs, we must maintain faith in our future and the sense of humor and individuality which have made us a great Nation.

These dangers are very real, but we have managed to live with them ever since the explosion of the first atomic bomb on the desert at Alamogordo, N. Mex., in 1945, which made such danger inevitable.

Yes, we have lived with these dangers ever since the first Soviet atomic bomb explosion in 1949, making the danger immediate.

But let me turn to the other revolution in our life which a clear understanding of nuclear processes will bring to our everyday living.

Very few people carry the illusion that the new age will be one which will immediately transform automobiles into plastic streamline shapes powered with tap water and atomic pills.

Most people understand now that even if atomic fuels become cheap in a powerplant, electricity will have a price.

This is true of hydroelectric power which burns no fuel at all.

The technical problems to be solved before the full benefits of the atomic age can be realized are staggering.

They are appreciated only as each becomes acute in blocking further progress.

It will be many years before present-day predictions will become a full reality.

Despite our accomplishments in the field of atomic energy and the fact that we have spent $15 billion to date—we have scarcely scratched the surface in producing the ultimate benefits to be derived by mankind through the peacetime uses of the atom.

It is possible within the next decade, barring atomic or hydrogen warfare, atomic powerplants will produce electric energy that will join the flow of electricity now generated by coal, gas, oil, and hydropower plants.

It is freely predicted that within 10 or 15 years uranium, which is the source of atomic energy, will be as common as present-day fuels.

Within that period of time it is anticipated that atomic-powered planes, rocket ships, automobiles, locomotives, and farm tractors will be in everyday use and an accustomed sight on the world scene.

Homes will be lighted, heated, and cooled by the atom.

Food, clothing, medicine, and crops will be improved, and in general, our way of living will be completely revolutionized.

There is one important area of application of atomic power which I have not discussed, namely, atomic propulsion.

In this particular field the success of the U. S. S. *Nautilus*, an atomic-powered submarine, has removed any lingering doubts about the effectiveness of an atomic reactor to propel ships.

As a long-time naval Reserve officer I can assure you that this particular revolution in seapower is wrought with the greatest significance.

Our growing fleet of nuclear-powered submarines may in the years ahead sweep other naval vessels from the seas.

In the interim the same propulsion applied to the next *Forrestal*-type carrier and to a guided-missile cruiser in the program for this year will add tremendously to the fighting effectiveness, the speed, and the radius of action of our Navy's future nuclear-powered task force.

Within 5 years there should be an oil tanker with nuclear power flying the American flag.

In 15 years such power could be commonplace for merchant ships and possibly for new passenger ships.

Within a decade the same results will probably be achieved from the current projects in the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, Norway, Japan, and West Germany.

Already an atomic reactor has been carried aloft in a B–36 and large sums of money have been, and are to be spent, in the development of an atomic-powered intercontinental bomber.

While the mad race for superiority in exploring the field of atomic energy continues, we cannot ignore the threat to our world leadership because of the lack of trained scientific minds.

In the beginning of our effort to explore the atomic field, not more than 500 scientists were at work.

Today, that number has grown to over 5,000.

In 20 years we will need in the field of atomic power alone 23,000 scientists and engineers, or nearly five times our present number.

When you add to this number the needs of the military program our requirements for the future will be in excess of 30,000 scientific minds.

At the present time we are training fewer than 500 a year, as compared with the 1,500 needed annually.

If the United States is to meet the competition of Soviet Russia and maintain its leadership in the field of atomic energy we must increase the reservoir of scientists and engineers.

Over a 10-year period Russia will graduate 1,200,000 engineers alone, against 900,000 to be graduated in the United States, or a deficit of 300,000.

This deficit is a serious menace to our problem of retaining our supremacy in the field of atomic energy.

It brings us face to face with the terrifying question: Can the world afford to permit Russia to gain supremacy in the atomic energy field, and employ it as a decisive force in her efforts to conquer the world for communism?

It is not sufficient to answer this question in a negative manner.

We must reinforce our answer by a positive program of action.

In this connection, as a member of the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I can assure you that the subject is receiving serious consideration by our committee.

From what I have told you it is evident that these are exciting years which lie ahead of us.

As I suggested earlier in my presentation it is not the atom which is evil.

We can make it do useful things for us, or we can allow it to destroy the world.

What will happen not alone depends upon us as Americans, but upon our neighbors in other countries of the world.

The development of the necessary long-range policies will demand the highest efforts of every segment of our population.

It is your responsibility, to understand at least, the basic facts of this new technology if you are to influence public opinion and Government in the right direction.

Not only the lives of you and your loved ones are involved, but the very survival of mankind and the present-day civilization which has taken centuries to develop.

More than this, it is hard to prescribe for the individual.

The new atomic-hydrogen age will be a challenge to our ingenuity and, likewise, our resourcefulness.

Endless frontiers are being opened to human intellect which gives new emphasis to the age-old expression, "knowledge is power."

Some of us, of the older generation, may find it difficult to accept some of the changes that will demand that we alter our manner of thinking.

These changes, as they come, will give real meaning to the graduation day exhortation that atomic energy poses a challenge to you graduates as you embark upon your careers in life.

I wish you all the success in the world.

It will be a world with many uncertainties, truly an exciting one, yet one well worth living and fashioning.

It is my fervent prayer that God may grant you the courage and strength to meet life's responsibilities and may He continue to shower you with his choicest blessings.

Good luck and Godspeed.

Mother of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. BELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House of Representatives, I have the pleasure to announce that a constituent

of mine, Mrs. Maria Reyes, of Beeville, Tex., has received the distinct honor of being designated mother of the year by the cadet corps of our great Texas A. & M. College on Mother's Day.

Mrs. Reyes, one of our fine Latin-American Texans, does not speak English too well, but in spite of this fact, she has managed to grow enough cotton to put 5 of her 8 sons through Texas A. & M. College. Another son, Marcarito, is an Aggie senior this year. Two younger sons, now in high school, plan to enroll at A. & M., also.

Mrs. Reyes has reared six daughters, and through her inspiration and efforts, has given them the help and encouragement to receive college educations.

Three of her sons served their country in the Armed Forces during World War II. Two returned as majors and one as a lieutenant colonel.

It is apparent that the cadet corps of A. & M. College chose wisely and well in selecting this great woman for mother of the year. It is on homes like these that our great American tradition is founded. I know all Texas is proud to claim Mrs. Reyes and recognize her contribution to her State and her Nation. It is with pride and humility that I commend her to you, the Members of the House of Representatives, as a wonderful mother, a fine Texan, and a splendid American.

Eliminate Secret Agreements Under Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I introduced a bill, House Resolution 11454, to amend section 4 of the Sherman Act to prescribe a procedure with respect to consent judgments, decrees or orders and for other purposes.

The House Small Business Committee has had under study and investigation the effect of consent decree procedures upon small business. There is no question that small-business men can be benefited by the negotiation of consent decrees in antitrust actions brought by the Department of Justice. Small-business men need speedy and prompt relief from monopoly practices and often a consent decree may avoid long protracted litigation lasting 15 years or longer.

The Department of Justice may also benefit from the settlement of an antitrust case by consent of the parties. As pointed out by Judge Barnes in testifying before the House Small Business Committee in March of this year:

> The division is caught in a vise between increasing complaints of violation and decreasing appropriations * * *. Since savings in time generally spell like savings of men and resources, consent settlements mean lower cost per judgment entered. And, more important, it means quicker relief to the parties adversely affected by the acts charged in the complaint.

While these objectives are laudable there remains serious defects in the procedure by which consent decrees are negotiated and accepted by the courts. The purpose of my bill is to remove such defects without detracting from the advantages that can be obtained through the use of consent decrees.

A consent decree, under the procedures now in use by the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission, is in effect a private settlement between the Government and an antitrust defendant, resulting from secret negotiations and compromises.

The court in accepting such consent decrees has no record or objections before it, upon which it can make a determination whether in fact the compromise between the Government and the antitrust defendant is in the public interest. As stated by Judge Barnes in his testimony on March 29, 1956, before the House Small Business Committee:

> Though consent judgments bind both parties and estop future de novo proceedings involving matters covered, their provisions ofttimes receive only cursory judicial scrutiny. * * * These facts, it seems clear, support one commentator's conclusion that consent "procedure permits no conclusion of independent court determination."

How then is the public interest, and in particular the interest of small business, to be protected?

I submit that the only way to adequately protect these interests is to provide that any consent judgment, decree, or order in any civil proceeding brought by the Department of Justice or the Federal Trade Commission under the antitrust laws or the Federal Trade Commission Act should not become final for a period of 30 days, during which time any person who may be aggrieved by the proposed judgment, decree, or order may formally make to the court his objections and have the same considered by the court.

Such a proposed procedure is not a reflection upon the integrity and the ability of the Department of Justice, whether it be under a Democratic or a Republican administration.

However, as stated by Judge Barnes, in consent decree negotiations—

> Shirt-sleeve conferences replace formal court trials; the give and take of bargaining supplants the atmosphere of an adversary proceeding.

An adversary proceeding is, of course, the basis of our system of jurisprudence; and certainly the history of Anglo-American jurisprudence has proved that the adversary proceeding best protects the rights of interested parties and is the best and surest means of ascertaining the truth in disputed matters. Consent decree negotiations, however, take away the safeguards inherent in adversary proceedings.

While the informality of shirt-sleeve negotiations may upon occasions, in the words of Judge Barnes, "resolve issues of fact, proof of which would be difficult if not impossible in a contested suit," upon other and probably the majority of occasions this same informality will result in the Government relying upon or being influenced by statements on the part of the defendant, which will never need to stand the tests and safeguards of either trial or public scrutiny. There are other factors inherent in the present consent decree procedure which further put the Government and the public interest at a disadvantage. One is the fact that the Antitrust Division is admittedly understaffed. In discussing the consent decree negotiations between the Department and the United Fruit Co., Judge Barnes stated that—

> Underscoring the complexity of our task is the fact that four law firms in Washington, New York, Boston, and New Orleans, in addition to United's own law department, now represent United Fruit * * * The Antitrust Division, in sharp contrast, during 1954 had only one man—albeit a capable and experienced one. * * * Beginning with 1955, I was fortunate enough to bring into the case * * * a man versed in trial work, who, in addition, had some 20 years of antitrust experience. Even now, however, our staff consists of too few lawyers, in comparison to the galaxy on the other side.

Such disparity in attorneys does not, of course, mean that it is impossible for a few representatives of the Department of Justice adequately to protect the public interest against a host of corporate attorneys. It does mean, however, that the job is extremely difficult and that the Government negotiates under a definite handicap.

Further, according to Judge Barnes, it is not only announced policy of the Department of Justice, but also an economic necessity, that Government antitrust cases be compromised and not brought to trial. The Government then indeed is in a poor bargaining position in negotiating the decree; and the Government's lawyer would appear to be subject to heavy pressure to take whatever he can get in a form of a compromise, even though this falls far short of the real belief which is needed adequately to protect the public interest.

There are also other pressures upon the Government representative to accept less from the defendant than what the public interest requires. Present consent decree procedures may be long drawn out affairs. The Government lawyer negotiating such a decree, as a practical matter, does not want to see all of his work go for nothing. He may—and in the utmost good faith—rationalize away some of the dangers of a proposed consent decree in order to reach a compromise which the defendant is willing to sign. Or the Government lawyer may face a more practical problem—the fact that agreeing to a consent decree is a lot easier than preparing for a long and difficult trial. And finally, even though the Government were prepared for trial, there must inevitably lurk in the minds of the Attorney General down to the lowest employee in the Department of Justice the question—why take a chance on losing the trial when a consent judgment can be entered into which will look well for the "record?"

These criticisms of the consent decree procedure should not be taken as impugning the motives and good faith of the hard working and overworked officials of the Department of Justice and

the Federal Trade Commission. Bad decisions, however, can be made with the utmost of good faith. That, of course, is the reason why both our judicial and administrative system always carries with it the right of review. My bill, in some measure, will make possible a review by the court of what has heretofore been a private and secret compromise between antitrust defendants and lawyers in the Department of Justice. At the same time the basic values of the consent decree will be fully retained. The only loser will be he who has at first achieved an unfair and harmful advantage. The gainers will be all who have a right to ask that the Government consider their rights also.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly recommend this bill to the members of the Judiciary Committee and ask my colleagues to give it careful consideration.

Our Mutual Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, we shall soon have before us for consideration the Mutual Security Agency appropriation bill which, in more understandable terms to the public, means our foreign aid spending program. The amount of aid extended to foreign countries since the inception of this program has reached staggering proportions. It seems appropriate that we reexamine our commitments thus far and attempt to arrive at the correct position in regard to a continuance of these expenditures.

The aid which this Government has extended to all countries and international organizations for the period covering World War II and the postwar period ending June 30, 1955, amounts to $108,847,779,000. This total does not include United States capital investments in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, $635 million, and the International Monetary Fund, $2,750 million.

Summary of aid

Lend-lease, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1955	$48,767,777,000
Grants in aid, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1955	43,459,158,000
Net loans, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1955	16,620,844,000
Summary total	108,847,779,000

The foreign aid program began with the lend-lease shipments on July 1, 1940. In the postwar years, one appropriation after another has followed in rapid succession.

The extension of these huge sums during World War II in foreign aid is understandable. We were engaged in an all-out war, and we felt the need of winning it at any cost. But let us look at the aid extended since the close of the war.

Between July 1, 1945, and June 30, 1955, the United States disbursed gross foreign aid in the amount of $60,719,482,000. It is difficult for the average individual to understand the impact upon our economy of such huge sums. If we were to spread this postwar cost over the householders of the Nation, it would be found this program will cost every householder of the Nation $1,277.

There is a general impression that the corporations and the rich pay the bulk of these expenditures. This, however, is not the case. The President in his budget for 1957 gives the following estimate of receipts:

[In billions]

Individual income taxes	$35.1
Corporation income taxes	20.3
Excise taxes	9.9
Other taxes	2.1
Miscellaneous receipts	2.8
Refund of receipts	—3.9

Does not the average family play an important part in the support of our financial structure? The answer is "Yes." The working men and women, as well as the corporations, carry this burdensome load. In the budget estimates listed above, it is seen that the individual income taxes account for more than half of our total tax collections. There are 50 million Federal taxpayers whose net yearly incomes are below $5,000. This large group pays about 60 percent of the total income taxes collected by the Federal Treasury. There are only 2 million Federal taxpayers whose net incomes are above $5,000.

Our income-tax rates run from 22 percent in the lowest bracket to 92 percent in the highest bracket. If we should confiscate all incomes over $10,000 by levying a 100-percent tax, it would not raise enough money to run the Government for more than 2 months. So, in spite of the fact that we are "soaking the rich" for about all we can get, the brunt of support for this spending spree is falling upon the individual with a salary under $5,000.

It should be remembered, too, that a considerable sum is collected in hidden taxes. Taxes upon about every purchase made: Theater tickets, transportation, purses, jewelry, alarm clocks, hand lotions, and many other articles. Telephone companies have calculated that taxes on each telephone installed in the home amount to more than $3 per telephone. Yes, we meet these taxes at every turn, and it is time the working men and women become conscious of the inroads of taxes upon their economy.

The belief held by some that our foreign-aid spending program is solely for the purpose of rebuilding the free nations of Europe, and assisting them to rearm with modern weapons is erroneous. The fact of the matter is our foreign-aid program has encompassed most of the nations of the world. It is believed that the taxpayers have a right to know where their money has gone, and, with this in mind, the following information has been gathered from authoritative sources.

Lend-lease, July 1, 1945–June 30, 1955

Brazil	$3,616,000
Colombia	11,000
Dominican Republic	3,000
Guatemala	1,347,000
Mexico	553,000
Paraguay	2,000
Peru	237,000
Belgium	59,480,000
United Kingdom	341,462,000
Australia	12,300,000
India	3,000,000
New Zealand	2,300,000
China (Formosa)	729,418,000
Czechoslovakia	2,000
France	372,441,000
Greece	5,956,000
Iran	750,000
Italy (civilian supplies)	134,444,000
Netherlands	64,344,000
Poland	92,000
Saudi Arabia	1,591,000
U. S. S. R.	277,254,000
Yugoslavia	76,000
Unspecified	29,364,000
Total	2,039,490,000

Grants in aid, July 1, 1945–June 30, 1955

Argentina	$198,000
Bolivia	30,833,000
Brazil	17,432,000
Chile	9,499,000
Colombia	6,105,000
Costa Rica	5,953,000
Cuba	1,249,000
Dominican Republic	1,675,000
Ecuador	7,547,000
El Salvador	3,708,000
Guatemala	7,364,000
Haiti	9,367,000
Honduras	4,569,000
Mexico	104,105,000
Nicaragua	2,896,000
Panama	5,216,000
Paraguay	7,243,000
Peru	13,157,000
Uruguay	1,892,000
Venezuela	2,069,000
Unspecified Latin America	288,792,000
Afghanistan	2,909,000
Albania	20,444,000
Austria	1,054,315,000
Belgium	521,863,000
United Kingdom	3,396,096,000
Australia	239,000
North Borneo	43,000
British Guiana	75,000
British Honduras	80,000
Leeward and Windward Islands	101,000
Canada	3,964,000
Ceylon	107,000
Federation of Malaya	354,000
Federation of Rhodesia	1,000
Gold Coast	10,000
Hong Kong	1,808,000
India	128,459,000
Jamaica	3,000
Malta	331,000
Nigeria	$8,000
Pakistan	121,639,000
Sierra Leone	1,000
Singapore	9,000
Burma	20,505,000
China	1,209,077,000
Czechoslovakia	185,825,000
Denmark	247,524,000
Egypt	21,451,000
Ethiopia	6,932,000
Finland	2,544,000
France	3,746,883,000
Algeria	107,000
French Morocco	552,000
Tunisia	274,000
Germany, East	17,351,000
Germany, Federal Republic	3,753,147,000
Greece	1,627,954,000
Hungary	5,856,000
Iceland	29,571,000
Indochina	305,246,000

Grants in aid, July 1, 1945–June 30, 1955— Continued

Indonesia	$109,218,000
Iran	157,134,000
Iraq	5,945,000
Ireland	18,346,000
Israel	231,363,000
Italy-Trieste	2,421,889,000
Japan and Ryukyu	2,537,675,000
Jordan	21,038,000
Korea	1,166,632,000
Lebanon	11,926,000
Liberia	5,609,000
Libya	15,370,000
Nepal	2,216,000
Netherlands and Surinam	846,020,000
Norway	234,541,000
Palestine	175,000
Philippines	745,462,000
Poland	364,886,000
Portugal	15,833,000
Saudi Arabia	2,792,000
Spain	37,548,000
Sweden	87,143,000
Switzerland	1,803,000
Syria	949,000
Tangier	17,000
Thailand	26,103,000
Turkey	421,748,000
U. S. S. R	188,180,000
Yugoslavia	688,288,000
Trust Territories in Pacific	4,444,000
International organizations	1,072,154,000
Unspecified areas:	
Asia and Pacific	2,467,417,000
Europe	9,495,196,000
Near East and Africa	1,356,547,000
South Asia	15,094,000
Other	317,165,000
Total	42,059,148,000

In addition to the above, authorized loans and credits have been granted in a substantial amount. These loans and credits granted to nations all over the globe amounted to $16,620,844,000 during the period beginning July 1, 1940, and ending June 30, 1955.

No one would challenge for one moment the motives behind this giveaway program. The nations of Europe had been devastated by the ravages of war. Their industrial potential had been largely destroyed. In the rebuilding process, our aid was badly needed. However, this program began in 1948, supposedly, for a 5-year period, but it has continued in force until the present day—notwithstanding the fact that many of the original recipients of aid have been balancing their budgets and reducing taxes. This situation has occurred in recent years when our own budget was running a deficit.

During these years, we have piled upon our people a taxload about equal to that of the free nations of the world combined, and a Federal debt almost twice as great as the other nations of the free world put together. For many years, we have indulged in an unsound fiscal policy. During that time, we have piled up a Federal debt of approximately $275 billion—the greatest debt load that any nation has been called upon to bear since the dawn of history. We have seen the purchasing power of our dollar decline to a little more than 50 percent of its prewar value.

This decline of the American dollar has had a great impact upon the lives and fortunes of the American people. The value of life-insurance policies, time deposits, E, F, and G savings bonds has just about been cut in half. The misery caused the old-age pensioner and those, who with thrift, had saved something for their declining years is sad to relate. The question today is, Will the United States adopt a policy consistent with its resources and taxing power, or will it continue to distribute its largess to the entire world?

In the light of facts here presented, it seems that, in addition to our efforts to make our Nation secure, we must make certain that we keep our economy strong and our currency sound. Would it not be better to think more of the homefront for awhile and take a vacation from foreign-aid grants? We may be surprised how well other nations can get along without us.

The chances of a third world war are very remote. With the nuclear weapons now available, no nation could expect to win in a world struggle. There would be devastation unending. Russia understands this situation and has no intention of starting a world conflagration.

When one is trying to reach a decision relative to his vote on the mutual-security-aid legislation, he is faced with many crosscurrents of opinion. Just about everyone feels there are nations in the world which deserve our assistance. This program, however, is just about all-inclusive. We have extended help to many nations which are in better fiscal position than we are. Not only that, we have extended help to nations which have never aided us in a military conflict and which have profited from our own involvement. Examples in this category are Brazil, which has received $381,686,000, and Sweden, $116,220,000.

An analysis of our foreign aid spending program reveals that through our lend-lease program from July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1945, 62 nations and territories were assisted by this program. In the years that followed, July 1, 1945, to July 30, 1955, 24 nations participated in our lend-lease program. The grants-in-aid during this postwar period reached a total of 88 nations and territories.

It should be noted that not all of these nations are friendly. The following countries which are certainly not allies have benefited by our mutual security program:

China	$2,861,376,000
Czechoslovakia	1,211,837,000
Yugoslavia	750,730,000
Russia	11,241,614,000

Most of the aid received by Yugoslavia has been extended during recent years while that country has been under a Communist dictatorship. The aid extended to Yugoslavia amounts to more than $44 for every man, woman, and child in that country.

The mutual security bill is an omnibus measure. When it reaches the House, the Congress will be asked to pass upon an additional appropriation of approximately $3½ billion. No one knows where all of this money will eventually be spent. One cannot support a program of this nature—although there are certain countries of the world he would like to assist. It is believed that the foreign aid spending program is wasteful and most unfair to the taxpayers who have to shoulder this burden.

Patents and Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an address delivered by me on May 24, 1956, in New York City, before the New York Patent Law Association entitled "Patents and Monopoly":

I was particularly pleased to receive and accept the kind invitation to appear before you at this annual dinner meeting for at least two reasons. To begin with, my official duties serve as a constant reminder of the vital relationship between the patent laws which have their fountainhead in the Constitution itself and the antitrust laws which are likewise fundamental to the American way of industrial and business life.

The House Committee on the Judiciary has a subcommittee with special jurisdiction over patents, trademarks, and copyrights, as well as appropriate revision of the law in this area. As you know, this subcommittee has had occasion in the past to consider important patent measures including the comparatively recent codification of the patent law, in connection with which able witnesses have appeared on behalf of your association. Legislation that is referred to our patent subcommittee must next, of course, go to the full Judiciary Committee where it receives further careful consideration before action is taken which helps determine whether or not it will finally appear on the statute books.

To deal with monopoly problems, the House Judiciary Committee established a special committee concerned exclusively with antitrust matters and the concentration of economic power. The Antitrust Subcommittee during this Congress has conducted extensive hearings into current antitrust problems facing the country and is presently engaged in an inquiry involving key industries which fall within the jurisdiction of Federal regulatory agencies.

This brings me to the other reason why I particularly welcome the opportunity to address you tonight. I have in mind a brand of dire and alarmist statements concerning patent-antitrust problems that have currently come to the fore. For example, one distinguished lawyer and friend, for whose ability I have great admiration, said this to you at your annual dinner last year:

"The judicial assaults on the patent system in the late thirties and forties are reminiscent of the hurricanes that pounded the eastern seaboard early last fall. * * * By injecting into the general patent law antitrust principles in the guise of unclean hands, by expanding the concept of patent misuse, by eliminating the estoppel between patentee and licensee where the license agreement contains a price-fixing stipulation, by invalidating customary license restrictions, and by obliterating the remedy of contributory infringement, the courts effected radical changes in doctrine, leaving this branch of the law in a state of turmoil."[1]

Another distinguished patent practitioner makes these even more sweeping allegations—and I quote:

"During the last 30 years an antipatent movement has developed in the United States. It is clearly depicted in events that have occurred in all three branches of the Government, and never more noticeably than

[1] Antitrust Bulletin, vol. 1, No. 3, June 1955, p. 157.

in several legal decisions and legislative proposals that have been made in recent months. Principally by means of the antitrust laws, which were not originally intended for this purpose, our patent system is being deliberately emasculated. Large corporations have, in effect, been put on notice that their research laboratories can be raided." [2]

On the basis of this diagnosis, what remedy do these critics advance? Some would stop at nothing short of making patents wholly exempt from the antitrust laws, and restricting defenses in patent suits solely to traditional questions of validity and infringement.[3]

As one who sincerely believes in and appreciates the vital role that a healthy patent system must play in our economy, I challenge the interpretation of these gentlemen. If there has been such a nefarious scheme afoot—a plot to destroy the patent system by means of the antitrust laws—it has certainly escaped my attention during my 33 years of legislative service in Washington.

Could it be that these distinguished gentlemen simply long for a return to the good old days of the 1920's when the inhibitions on patent antitrust abuses were few?

What is the true meaning of the proposal to completely exempt patents from the application of the antitrust laws? As you well know, patents when legitimately used raise no question of antitrust infringement. Trouble begins only when they are subverted to accomplish purposes which our lawmakers never intended to sanction.

I take it that what the proposal really contemplates is antitrust immunity for the patentee no matter what his course of conduct in utilizing his patents. Frankly, I find the suggestion shocking. It would seriously confuse and impair antitrust enforcement; it would open a veritable Pandora's box for the revival of a great many evils that we have fought hard over the years to wipe out, even the participation of American concerns in international cartels. Large industrial organizations would be free to use the patent grant as a means for engaging in activities that would otherwise be illegal. In short, it would permit patents to be used as a device to restrain competition and perpetuate monopoly.[4]

Even apart from the costly lessons that the great depression and the last war have taught us, the vastly changed world in which we now live makes it not only undesirable but impossible to turn back the pages of time. Instead, the patent system must be adapted and accommodated to our altered industrial structure in an age that has now harnessed the atom and the H-bomb.

I know that as patent practitioners you have had frequent occasion to appraise the relationship between the patent laws and the antitrust laws. Let me make clear my own philosophy on this score. I share the view of those who believe that there is no basic conflict or incompatibility between the patent and the antitrust laws. I think it is a fair generalization to say, as one analyst does, that "so long as a patent owner stays within his patent grant he has no antitrust problems and when he goes outside the terms of his grant, he has no patent protection. The many so-called patent antitrust cases do not resolve or decide conflicts between the patent laws and the antitrust laws but rather define the line at which one steps outside the protection of the patent laws into the prohibitions of the antitrust laws." [5]

I think you will agree that many of the so-called patent-antitrust cases illustrate attempts to use a patent to accomplish a result for which the patent is not adapted. Familiar examples come to mind, such as patents on salt-dispensing machines being used to monopolize salt [6] or a patent on a domestic heating system used to monopolize switches.[7] Condemnation by the courts of such practices does not by the same token restrict the patent right and raises no conflict between patent law and antitrust law. Rather, the so-called patent-antitrust decisions serve to delineate the two laws and keep each in its proper sphere.

I would hazard the opinion that the majority of patent owners throughout the United States find it both possible and profitable to handle their affairs in a way that is completely consistent with the objectives of both the patent laws and the antitrust laws. These law-abiding citizens and corporations have every right to expect that their associates and rivals in the industrial world will likewise abide by the rules of the game.

As good lawyers, watchful over your clients' interests, you know that no matter how valuable the patent may be, its value may be jeopardized if it is abused or made the basis for an antitrust violation. You will, therefore, wish to guide your clients in such a way that they may enjoy the full benefit of their patent assets and exploit them in a manner consistent with the antitrust and other laws enacted in the public interest.

This makes good legal sense and it makes good business sense. As the law now stands—and there have been some notable decisions over the past two decades that have contributed to this development—it is well for the patent-owning corporation to heed the practical admonition that its patents are less likely to be tested for validity or to be infringed by others if it abides by the antitrust laws. It is the violator that runs a greater risk of having its patents either tested and declared invalid or infringed with impunity. The net result is that patents lose their legal effectiveness when used in violation of antitrust laws.[8]

Beyond these practical considerations, I believe that as good citizens we should oppose the use of patents in ways that Congress never intended that they be used, where the effect is to imperil the competitive and free enterprise system to which this country is dedicated. Indeed, it might be well to take a moment at this point to epitomize the basic objective of our antitrust laws. The goal is the preservation of a system in which economic activity is controlled so far as possible by the market and not by men. Those who enacted our antitrust laws strove to safeguard and preserve the freedom to compete effectively so that prices, output, wages, and other rewards depend not on the decisions of a few but result from the day-to-day actions of rival business firms, independently motivated. This decentralized kind of decision-making insures a maximum not only of individual opportunity, but of political liberty. Familiar hallmarks of monopoly are the power to control prices and the power to determine who enters into or remains in an industry.

Turning to the nature of the patent grant, it secures to the patent owner the right to exclude others from making, using, or selling the patented invention for the limited 17-year period.[9] There was nothing in the common law to prevent the appropriation of another's designs or inventions. The creator of a better mousetrap might see his competitor copy it, detail for detail, and have no remedy. Thus the patent grant from the Congress constitutes a special instrument of public purpose to promote the progress of science and useful arts in furtherance of the constitutional authorization (contained in art. 1, sec. 8). Important public policy is at stake: to provide incentive to inventors, reward them for their contributions, and stimulate further effort. The inventive genius of Americans has responded well.

In a sense, a patent may be considered as the translation of a specific, physical invention into a precise legal document. Exactness, particularity, and distinctness are essential characteristics of a patent so that the patentee, licensees, competitors, and the public may know with certainty the extent of the patentee's right to exclude.[10] While these characteristics are limitations on a patent, they are also among its greatest virtues. So long as a patent is confined to its proper sphere, the integrity of the patent system is maintained and antitrust involvements are avoided.

Why do many of us differ with the critics who view with alarm legal developments in the patent-antitrust field over the past 25 or 30 years. I am persuaded that the evolution of the case law demonstrates a natural and normal response to the problems posed by a changing industrial environment. Here again we find a reassuring evidence of the dynamic capacity of our legal system to respond to the demands of the modern age. A very brief historical sketch provides a useful frame of reference for this point of view. In looking back, it is well to bear in mind the fact that the vast majority of antitrust problems have arisen when the patent owner sought to exploit his patent by licensing others.

For about a half century after passage of the Sherman Act in 1890, relatively few cases involving patent-antitrust questions reached the Supreme Court. Since many of these cases were infringement or contract suits between private litigants, decided on specific and limited facts, the economic ef-

---

[2] Harvard Business Review, vol, 34, No. 3, May–June 1956, p. 21.

[3] Ibid, p. 32.

[4] Advocates of this school of thought would apparently not only wipe out such defenses as patent misuse, but would even go so far as to legalize deliberate, planned monopolization of patents in its most naked form. As the law now stands, patents like any other form of property, may be monopolized; and a monopolization of patents is as illegal as any other form.

Most patent antitrust cases have arisen under sec. 1 of the Sherman Act, which forbids contracts in restraint of trade; however, a patent monopolization action would invoke sec. 2 of the act which prohibits monopoly. In *United States* v. *Vehicular Parking, Ltd.* (No. 61 USPQ 102), deliberate planned acts in acquiring by purchase and otherwise, substantially all of the parking meter patents, were held to result in an illegal monopoly of patents. In *Kobe, Inc.* v. *Dempsey Pump Co.* (97 F Supp. 342), the court found that the acquisition of substantially all of the patents on deep-well pumps had been with the purpose and intent of illegal monopolization.

[5] Bartholomew Diggins, The Patent-Antitrust Problem, Michigan Law Review, June 1955, vol. 53, No. 8, p. 1093.

[6] *International Salt Co.* v. *United States* (332 U. S. 392, 68 S. Ct. 12 (1947)); *Morton Salt Co.* v. *G. S. Suppiger Co.* (314 U. S. 495, 62 S. Ct. 402 (1942)).

[7] *Mercoid Corp.* v. *Mid-Continent Investment Co.* (320 U. S. 661, 64 S. Ct. 268 (1944)).

[8] Floyd L. Vaughan, The United States Patent System (Norman, 1956) See: *Leitch Mfg. Co.* v. *Barber Co.* (302 U. S. 458 (1938)), holding that where patents were used in violation of the Sherman Act relief against infringement may be denied until the effects of this misuse are removed; *United States* v. *Gypsum Co.* (333 U. S. 364 (1948)), holding that the Department of Justice may attack the validity of a patent in an antitrust proceeding; and *Sola Electric Co.* v. *Jefferson Electric Co.* (317 U. S. 173 (1942)), holding that the validity of a patent may be challenged by a licensee if his contract, unsupported by valid patents, would be illegal.

[9] 35 U. S. C. 154.

[10] 35 U. S. C. 112, 121; *Morton Salt Co.* v. *C. S. Suppiger* (314 U. S. 488 (1942)); *General Electric Co.* v. *Wabash Appliance Corp.* (304 U. S. 364 (1938)).

fects of various patent practices went largely unnoticed. In the first Supreme Court decision forbidding the tying of unpatented supplies to the use of a patented machine, the Court found the practice illegal because "the patent laws furnish no warrant for such a practice." While reference was made to "the cost, inconvenience and annoyance to the public" of the practice and the decision contains general references to the public interest, there is no indication that the Court had more than a vague appreciation of the economic consequences of the practice on competition.[11]

In this bygone era of comparative simplicity, inventions usually consisted of self-contained complete articles, which were ordinarily exploited by the inventor himself with the result that a new industry might be developed. This happened when someone thought of putting an eraser on a pencil.[12]

When a specific situation was considered apart from its economic consequences, the courts were prone to uphold restrictions based upon patents on the theory that if the patentee could prevent infringement entirely, he could impose any condition he wished in a license. For almost 30 years, after passage of the Sherman Act, even tying contracts were legal and patentees were permitted to control unpatented articles. Thus there was little appreciation of the relative functions of the patent system and the antitrust laws in the national economy.

In this favorable climate, restrictive patent practices multiplied and by the 1930's whole industries were regimented under patent license agreements. This regimentation was not only national in scope, it was perhaps even more widespread and more complete in international trade. As business competition expanded geographically, patents were sometimes used by industrial giants to divide world markets into exclusive trade areas.[13]

It was not enough that patent restrictions increased in number and scope, ingenious counsel sought ways to overcome the effects of the few decisions which limited the patentee's right to restrict. For example, while the law clearly prohibited fixing the resale price of patented products, prices were fixed by the manufacturer at the retail level by securing patent coverage at the retail as well as the manufacturing level; restrictive practices were continued after the patents supporting the restriction had expired; or licensors and licensees met to impose license restrictions for the benefit of all.[14]

When the Temporary National Economic Committee was set up in 1937 to investigate factors bearing on the great depression of the early thirties, the patent system and patent practices formed one of its major fields of inquiry. This was the first time that there had been a thorough and comprehensive investigation of the nature and extent of restrictive patent practices and their effect on the national economy. The facts developed in the TNEC studies[15] led to the investigations which resulted in numerous antitrust suits brought by the Department of Justice in the late thirties and in the forties.

By this time, of course, the industrial pattern had undergone radical change in contrast to its appearance at the turn of the century. Inventions now consisted of narrow improvements on existing devices, or a single element in a complicated machine not usable except in connection with an existing device. Usually, too, the vast number of patents on these inventions found their way into the corporate portfolio, since they were the product of technicians working in well staffed research laboratories. As someone has said, patents were removed by assignment from the inventors' world to the executives' world. They become a part of the corporate assets to be exploited in the manner that best suited the corporations' interest. As you know, this might or might not involve use of the invention or the licensing of the invention to others for use.

It is, of course, impossible to explore this evening all of the various avenues of improper patent use which have resulted in unwarranted elimination of competition. I am sure that you are familiar with these practices and how the pendulum has swung in the course of the Court decisions, which now generally condemn them as illegal. Consider, for example, the judicial narrowing of the scope of restraint which may be imposed upon the licensee. For many years the courts interpreted license agreements primarily from the standpoint of the historic right of the patentee to grant a license with restrictions on the making, using and selling of his inventions. Licenses that limited the "method of sales and the price" of former competitors were approved in 1926 in the General Electric decision.[16] In that case the Supreme Court held that provisions in the license agreement whereby the licensor controlled prices at which the licensee sold light bulbs manufactured under the license, did not violate the Sherman Act. This authorization gave rise to patent licensing arrangements which served as a device for achieving uniformity and avoiding price competition in entire industries. Since licensing could thus be used as an instrument of coercive control, efforts were made to prevail upon Congress to amend the antitrust laws so that manufacturing licensees could no longer be legally required to observe certain price restrictions.

But it was not until 1948 that the Supreme Court in the Line Material case[17] cast doubt upon the General Electric doctrine, and seriously undermined its authority. The Court, after dividing 4 to 4 on the question of whether to flatly overrule the General Electric Co. doctrine, held, in any event, that the owners of separate patents may not by cross-licensing fix the price to be charged by themselves and their licensees.[18]

I have had frequent occasion to differ with the views expressed by the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws and I fear that in some respects the patent-antitrust section of the report is no exception. The committee recommends a reaffirmance of the General Electric doctrine and would give the patentee the green light to fix his licensee's selling price.[19] The recommendation apparently contemplates situations where multiple as well as single licenses are involved. It is my view that price fixing clauses in patent licenses should be forbidden by the antitrust laws under any circumstances.

I am persuaded by the logic of the dissenting member who said that it "has never been shown that this dangerous power must be added to the other benefits of a patent in order to provide adequate incentives for invention, disclosure or licensing. A patentee obtains the exact value of his lawful monopoly on the invention when he exacts all the traffic will bear in the way of royalties, or by exercising his privilege to be the sole maker or seller. * * * there is no justification for depriving the public of the benefits of competition in * * * other aspects of production and distribution merely because the patentee is entitled to a protected price for his inventive contribution." [20]

In another area, the law today is clear-cut in prohibiting the use of tying clauses to give the owner of the patent a competitive advantage in the sale of unpatented products. The rule of thumb is that any attempt by agreement or course of conduct to use a patent to restrain or monopolize parts, materials, or supplies not covered by the patent is illegal per se and subjects the patentee to civil and criminal liability.[21] Here again it was not until 1944 that the Supreme Court made it unmistakably clear in the Mercoid case that a patent cannot be used to extend monopoly control over products not covered by the patent as such. This case involved an attempt to use a combination patent to control the sale of switches. It is significant that it would have made no difference in the outcome of the case if the switch itself had been patented. Whatever might have been done to monopolize the sale of switches under a switch patent could not be done under a patent to a combination including the switch.[22]

Contrast this state of affairs with the doctrine of the Leeds and Catlin case, decided in 1909, where the Supreme Court held that the owner of a patent on a phonograph, of which the record was an element of the combination, could require licensees to use only records furnished by the patentee.[23] While this decision was circumscribed by the Court itself in a 1931 case,[24] the law on the subject was not finally reversed until the High Court handed down the Mercoid decision some 13 years later.

The majority of the Attorney General's committee does not approve the trend of Supreme Court opinions in the so-called tying cases. The committee recommends instead that "where the tying product is patented, the patentee should be permitted to show that in the entire factual setting, including the scope of the patent in relation to other patented or unpatented products, the patent

---

[11] *Motion Picture Patents Co.* v. *Universal Film Mfg. Co.* (243 U. S. 502 (1917)).

[12] *Rubber Tip Pencil Co.* v. *Howards* (87 U. S. 498 (1874)).

[13] E. g., *United States* v. *National Lead Co.* (63 F. Supp. 513, 332 U. S. 319).

[14] *United States* v. *Univis Lens Co.* (316 U. S. 241 (1942)); *Ethyl Gasoline Corp.* v. *United States* (309 U. S. 346 (1940)); *United States* v. *General Electric Co.* (272 U. S. 476 (1926)); *United States* v. *U. S. Gypsum Co.* (353 U. S. 364 (1948)).

[15] Investigation of Concentration of Economic Power, hearings before Temporary National Economic Committee on Public Resolution 113, parts 2 and 3 (patents) and part 25 (cartels), 75th Cong.

[16] *United States* v. *General Electric Co.* (272 U. S. 476).

[17] *United States* v. *Line Material Co.* (333 U. S. 287).

[18] The Court indicated also that licensees, as distinguished from patent owners, may infringe the antitrust laws if they have knowledge of the overall agreement and are aware that price competition between themselves will be eliminated.

[19] Report of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws, p. 233. Various members of the committee testified at length last year before the Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary. See hearings on current antitrust problems, Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary (84th Cong., 1st sess.)

[20] Report of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws, pp. 235–236.

[21] *Mercoid Corp.* v. *Mid Continent Investment Co.* (320 U. S. 661 (1944)); *Mercoid Corp* v. *Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co.* (320 U. S. 680 (1944)); *United States* v. *International Salt Co.* (332 U. S. 392 (1947)).

[22] The doctrine of the tie-in cases applies whether the tying-in is accomplished by express contracts or by implication from the sale by the patentee of a material or part used in the patented combination or process. *Leitch Mfg. Co.* v. *Barber Co.* (302 U. S. 458 (1938)).

[23] *Leeds and Catlin Co.* v. *Victor Talking Machine Co.* (213 U. S. 325 (1909)). This decision was inconsistent with *Morgan Envelope Co.* v. *Albany Paper Co.* (152 U. S. 425 (1894)).

[24] *Carbice Co. of America* v. *American Patent Development Co.* (283 U. S. 27 (1931)).

does not create the market power requisite to illegality of the tying clause." [25]

Again I must take sharp issue with the report. The recommendation on this score is based on the premise advanced by the committee that "a tying clause in a patent contract is like a tying clause in any other contract." As one critic has pointed out, this overlooks economic and business realities.[26] Disregard of a tying restriction would also involve the issue of infringement. The mere threat of a costly infringement suit by the patentee may be enough to prevent the purchaser from questioning the tying arrangement. This form of coercive control would not be available to the patentee if any other type of contract were involved.

Before concluding, I want to return to the charge that is being made in some quarters that antitrust enforcement imperils our patent system with the result that large and powerful corporations have become fearful. They are threatened, we are told, with raids on their research laboratories and disruption of their entire patent pattern. We are warned that if this trend continues, it will "dam up the steady stream of progress" [27] and that the rate of technological advance in this country will be slowed down.[28] These are serious assertions indeed when the role of the United States in world politics demands that we preserve our industrial vitality and military defense posture.

Exponents of this position are particularly concerned about the developments like the recent consent decree settling the Government's antitrust action in the case against the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and its subsidiary, the Western Electric Co. The A. T. & T. has allegedly been stripped of its patent rights with all of its existing and future patents thrown open.[29] A closer examination of the patent effects of the decree will show, I believe, that the lament on behalf of this dominant firm in the communications field consists of crocodile tears.

The story of how American Telephone & Telegraph Co. has utilized patents to maintain its dominance and leadership in key areas of the communications field has been well documented.[30] This organization with the aid of its subsidiaries controls the manufacture of equipment and research. It has always maintained a controlling patent position in long distance telephone service. By reason of its patent position, it has a virtual monopoly in furnishing transmission service for national radio programs. Not only this, but A. T. & T. has acquired important patents in other fields of communication. For example, its ownership of important patents on the teletypewriter gives it substantial control over Western Union, its chief rival. In addition it furnishes the wire facilities to which this machine is attached; and a subsidiary of A. T. & T. is the principal manufacturer of this device. In short, by amassing thousands of patents cutting across the whole field of communication, A. T. & T. not only dominates the telephone but also controls the exploitation of potentially competitive and emerging forms of communication.[31] Would-be rivals may enter and remain as licensees only under restrictive conditions.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding about my position, let me make it clear that aside from patents, I regard the consent decree as falling dismally short of what the Government sought in filing its original action. And by immunizing American Telephone from further antitrust action, the decree serves to perpetuate rather than destroy its monopoly. However, these antitrust aspects are the subject of another evening's discussion.

With respect to the patent relief contained in the decree, A. T. & T. and Western Electric Co. are required to license some 8,600 patents on a royalty-free basis. It is well known that a requirement to license seldom, if ever, places the licensee on an equal footing with the licensor in the sale of the patented product. By having been the first in the field, the licensor generally has such a head start on the licensees that he retains a commercial advantage despite any judgment provision requiring him to license others.

Aside from this, corporation officials have admitted that any loss of royalties will not have a significant effect on the company's future revenues. Moreover, under the decree, licensees may still be charged for know-how and technical information, costs that could be equivalent to royalty charges.

Finally, with respect to that part of the consent decree that calls for compulsory licensing of future patents on a reasonable royalty basis, some large concerns have deliberately adopted licensing systems which contemplate both the exploitation of patents by the manufacture of the patented product and the collection of royalties from licensees who are making the same products.[32]

I am sure that counsel for American Telephone had many of these considerations in mind [33] when they agreed to accept the patent relief provisions of the consent decree instead of standing trial, and that the business world is neither genuinely alarmed nor disturbed by the consequences.

Our present framework of law provides adequate means for correcting patent abuses and renewing competitive opportunity in industry. To the extent that it is successful in so doing, both the patent system and our free economy benefit.

[25] Report of the Attorney General's National Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws, p. 238.

[26] Michigan Law Review, ibid., p. 1103.

[27] Editorial, The Wall Street Journal, April 26, 1956.

[28] Harvard Business Review, ibid., p. 21.

[29] The Wall Street Journal, April 10, 1956.

[30] Investigation of the Telephone Industry in the United States, 76th Cong., 1st sess., H. Res. No. 340.

[31] Id.

[32] It has been the policy of the Bell System Co. since 1949 to license anyone for any purpose.

[33] It should be pointed out, too, that Radio Corporation of America has the unrestricted right to sublicense, retain royalties, and sue for infringement on a substantial number of these patents. These are rights that remain unaffected by the consent decree. Also, an RCA package license would be required before a licensee could manufacture and sell FM and TV commercial broadcast transmitters or receivers, manufactured under patents affected by the decree.

Fiscal Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in 5 years and for the fourth time since the depression the Federal budget will be in balance when the Government's fiscal year ends this coming June 30, 1956.

Tax rates since the Eisenhower administration came into power have been cut substantially, but due to higher individual incomes and business prosperity generally the Federal revenue has been larger.

There is reason to believe the Federal surplus will amount to $1.8 billion or perhaps even $2 billion, and if there is continued prosperity and no great changes in the international situation the 1957 surplus ought to exceed the 1956 figure.

I have wondered, Mr. Speaker, if this situation justified a tax cut this year or perhaps if rather than risk a preelection tax reduction bill it might not be wiser to delay consideration until next January.

As the Representative of the congressional district which has the highest ratio of organized union labor in the United States, I submitted a questionnaire to union leaders on this subject. Some of the replies mentioned the opinion expressed was of the individual officer of the union. A few responses indicated the question had been submitted to the membership before answering.

A tabulation of viewpoint showed a divided opinion:

Sixteen labor leaders favored immediate tax reduction, and eight of them took special pains to write in that it should be for low-income groups.

Nine labor leaders favored waiting until the President's recommendation after the next election. Two of these nine wrote in a specification that any relief at that time should be for low-income individuals.

Seventeen labor leaders answered in support of reducing the national debt.

The questionnaires returned are from the officials of unions representing, I would estimate, about 20 percent of the population of my district, and I rather imagine the thinking of these replies reflects pretty closely the views of the union membership.

Incidentally, to clarify the previous statistical statement, this is the way I phrased the inquiry in a personal letter to each union official:

DEAR ———: I would greatly appreciate your views on an important Federal policy affecting the members of your organization.

As you know, there is every indication that the United States Treasury for the fiscal year ending this coming June 30 will show a $2 billion budget surplus, and also a cash surplus for the first time in several years.

Mr. David Lawrence, writing in U. S. News & World Report, advises:

"Politicians will be seeking to give away that surplus to those in low-income brackets on the mistaken theory that this will be of real benefit to them. Yet this would be the very group hit by inflation.

"What would be of more benefit to more people would be to reduce the national debt by $2 billion."

My questions have to do with your views on tax reduction. Would you mark them in the proper spaces below, and return this to me in the enclosed self-addressed envelope?

Thanking you for your favor, I am

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. PELLY,
Representative in Congress.

------ I favor tax reduction now.
------ I favor delay until President's recommendations in 1957.
------ I favor reduction of national debt.
Comments: ----------

In a few instances I wrote officers of international unions with headquarters either here in the Nation's Capital or outside of my district. Of the 9 responses from this group, 6 favored immediate tax reduction, of which 4 wrote in that it should be for low-income groups. One favored a delay and two supported reduction of national debt.

To me, Mr. Speaker, the greatest contribution of the Eisenhower administration and in which I share some pride, is the halting of inflation which had been destroying the buying power of the working man's wages. In one 6-month period in 1950, according to a statement of the present majority leader made to the House on February 26, 1953, the consumers of this country suffered a loss of more than $16 billion. Food prices alone rose 11½ percent. And that comes from a Member of the party in control of Congress at the time.

As a member of the Eisenhower team during 1953 and 1954 when the Republicans controlled the Congress, I sat and listened to various Democratic Members attacking our program. The then minority Members fought our attempts to hold the line to a moderate spending program. I remember one instance when a supplementary appropriation was before the House; the statement was made that certain requested funds were included in the bill although it was believed more money could not be spent before June 30 and there would be an unexpended balance at the end of the fiscal year. Nevertheless, the minority party insisted on increasing the amount of that appropriation. Every means was used to embarrass and thwart the endeavors of the Republicans to control expenditures.

Meanwhile we were continually charged with failing to keep our preelection promises to work toward a balanced budget. We were called fiscally irresponsible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we hear no more of such charges. We do not hear, either, about the depression which the Democrats tried to talk the country into just prior to the 1954 election.

The present 1956 Federal budget surplus has quieted a great deal of partisan shouting and demagoguery.

For myself, Mr. Speaker, I frankly get much satisfaction from being associated with a sound program and with, for example, a man like the Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Humphrey knows what the problem is and what policies are needed to protect the finances of the country. He believes in fiscal responsibility and practices it.

We Republicans, I admit, are not inclined to be politically expedient. For example, right now certain Democrats from the Pacific Northwest are trying to label the Republicans as a giveaway party. In that connection, when President Eisenhower and his administration recommended against a tax cut in an election year in the face of a budget surplus, it certainly does not reflect a policy of political expediency or fiscal irresponsibility.

A prime example of "giveaway" was on May 24 in a House vote on the conference report on Senate Joint Resolution 135, providing payment to the Crow Indian Tribe for transfer of right-of-way for the Yellowtail Dam unit in the Missouri River Basin project. It was typical of political expediency.

As the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] said in explaining why the Republican conferees did not sign the conference report:

> It was a political vote, pure and simple. I understand the Indians vote in Montana. They carry some political weight and many groups back them.

Under this legislation, it was proposed to buy, except for the mineral and recreational rights which the Indians would retain, less than 6,000 acres. The Department of Interior estimated the value of this land at $36,000. The Democratic House committee agreed to $1,500,000, which the House in turn voted. The Democratic-controlled Senate changed this to $5 million.

The Democratic members of the conference committee did not offer any resistance to the Senate figure of $5 million. There was no effort to compromise the difference between the $1.5 million and $5 million.

One excuse given the House was that the funds came from existing appropriations for the project and are reimbursable from the sale of power.

I do not think there is any difference whether this Democratic giveaway of $5 million eventually comes from future power revenues or from the general government revenues; it is the peoples' money.

Only one Democrat voted with 125 Republicans against this giveaway. In campaign years the Democratic Party may lack funds, but it does not lack resourcefulness in using Federal appropriations for campaign purposes.

This is only one example of the free-spending political party that has tried to falsely lable its opposition with its own crime. I mention this giveaway in the interest of accuracy in order that the record may be clear as to which political party is fiscally responsible with the taxpayers' money.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I say President Eisenhower's slogan is the one to follow. He says, "Doing the right thing is good politics."

Personally I believe with the President that the right thing today is to refrain from the temptation of trying to write a tax reduction just before the election. If Democratic political enthusiasm runs away, like its inflation and giveaway programs in the past have run away, it would be unfortunate for the citizens of this country. There will be ample opportunity to reduce rates next January. And then, Mr. Speaker, let us not forget, as union leadership obviously has not forgotten, that low-income groups need relief from present high taxes. I suggest low-income family groups in particular.

Meanwhile, all due credit and praise to the Republican leadership for this fiscal program which has produced a Federal surplus.

Washington, D. C., Has Unique Opportunity To Obtain an Art Gallery and Preserve Historic Lafayette Park Unchanged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of the Nation's Capital have a unique opportunity at this very moment to obtain a great art gallery intimately associated with the early life of their city, and, at the same time, to preserve the character of historic Lafayette Park unchanged.

Washington, unless its citizens move decisively now, will lose a venerable landmark if Congress dooms the old Court of Claims Building at 17th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., and the present character of Lafayette Park may be lost forever.

The old red brick Renaissance-style building with brownstone facings and ornaments adjacent to the Blair House and Lafayette Park, and across from the White House and the Old State Department Building, was built by William W. Corcoran as an art gallery and he deeded it to the city of Washington in 1869. Architect of the original Corcoran Gallery was James Renwick, one of the country's foremost architects of that time, who also designed the Smithsonian Institution Building.

Washington architects say the building is well worth preserving for its intrinsic value as an example of early building and that it represents a phase of development of American architecture.

Extremely interesting is the fact that the building was constructed "for the perpetual establishment and encouragement of painting, sculpture, and the fine arts generally." Mr. Corcoran desired his trustees always to show special interest in the productions of American artists. Down through the years, the best examples of the work of native painters and sculptors were displayed in the old gallery.

Under legislation pending before the Senate and House Public Works Committees the Architect of the Capitol would be empowered to construct a modern building on the present site of the Court of Claims Building. Tentative plans call for a five-story building with the exterior of limestone. Many people feel that if the Old Court of Claims Building is razed and a modern building put in its place it will be only a matter of time until the present character of Lafayette Park is changed beyond recognition.

New York City, rich beyond all other American cities in cultural facilities, obtained its great civic center almost free because of tax delinquency on the part of its previous owners. The citizens of the Nation's Capital have a similar,

unique, once-in-a-lifetime, opportunity to obtain a great art center almost without cost. I hope they will have the courage and the vision to seize this opportunity in the same way that any other community would.

I include here an address I gave to the Federal City Council on May 24, 1956, in which I discussed this and related matters:

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE FRANK THOMPSON, JR., OPENING THE SPRING MEETING OF THE FEDERAL CITY COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, D. C., THURSDAY, MAY 24, 5 P. M., SOUTH AMERICAN ROOM, STATLER HOTEL

Ambassador Garrett, Chairman Addison, and distinguished members and guests of the Federal City Council, I'm delighted to have an opportunity to talk with you this afternoon and to think out loud with you about the future of Washington as the cultural center of our Nation and of the world. It's a subject which, in my opinion, has received far too little attention in our Capital City although it is just as important from a community development standpoint as the economic and civic problems with which all of us here work so closely.

I am especially glad to be able to discuss this subject at this time and before this group. As the name of your organization indicates, you are particularly concerned with Washington as the Federal City—a concept which, as I shall presently show, our Founding Fathers intended to be synonymous with that of a cultural capital. And the indispensable role played by your group and your president, George Garrett, in such projects as the Southwest redevelopment plan for beautifying our Nation's Capital demonstrates that you are well qualified to play a leading role in molding Washington's cultural future. It is my deep conviction that Washington can attain its place in the sun as a leading cultural center of the world only through the active and close cooperation of the Congress, local government officials, and of civic organizations such as the Federal City Council and the Washington Board of Trade.

WHAT IS HONORED IN A COUNTRY IS CULTIVATED THERE

This is why I shall take as my text for this afternoon Plato's well-known statement in the Republic that "What is honored in a country is cultivated there." Cultivation of anything, be it a corn or wheatfield, or a cultural center, involves active participation and hard work.

THE FEDERAL CITY AS A CULTURAL CENTER

But first, let's consider for a moment the artistic heritage of our Nation's Capital. It is one which goes back to our Founding Fathers, who intended the Capital City to be a focal point for learning and the cultivation of the fine arts.

Washington and Jefferson and others knew the purpose of the liberal and fine arts is to mold capable and cultivated human beings and, therefore, to help build better citizens and better communities. The desire to make the Nation's Capital a great center of art and learning was evidenced by our first President, George Washington, in many ways and he worked hard to translate this vision into reality. He provided funds in his will for a national university in the District of Columbia "to which the youth might be sent for the completion of their education in all the branches of polite literature, in arts and sciences, in acquiring knowledge in the principles of politics and good government." Such an education, he maintained, "would have the tendency to spread systematic ideas through all parts of this rising empire, thereby to do away local attachments and State prejudices, as far as the nature of things would, or indeed ought to admit, from our national councils."

JEFFERSON'S BILL FOR A DEPARTMENT OF FINE ARTS

Jefferson, a renaissance man as Albert Schweitzer is today, was a brilliant statesman, author, architect, and musician. As third President, Jefferson became, by virtue of his office, a manager and chief superintendent charged with the construction and completion of the United States Capitol Building. He brought to this task a well-equipped mind, architecture having formed a portion of his education. Like Washington, Jefferson considered the fine arts to be as necessary as the other disciplines to a knowledge of the State. Consequently, his bill for a system of public education provided for a public art gallery and a Department of Fine Arts.

WASHINGTON'S CULTURE IMPORTED AND "PASTED ON," SAYS KIPLINGER

All this was, you'll agree, a good beginning for the National Capital which, in the course of time, as the Washington Star predicted in 1852, was "destined to be the most powerful and brilliant capital in the world." Despite the best intentions in the world, however, we still have a long way to go—after 157 years—before these dreams are realized. Powerful our Capital City certainly is, but how far we have yet to go before it may be held to be brilliant may be clear from a statement by one of your own council members, W. M. Kiplinger, who said in his book, Washington Is Like That, published in 1942, that "despite the wealth of national tradition attached to Washington there is very little native culture. The city has never been a notable breeding place for art, or music, or literature. Unlike other great capitals of world thought, such as prewar London and Vienna and Paris, where the native-born leaders of the cities shaped the intellectual patterns which influenced the nation, Washington as a city has no homegrown culture. Its influence in cultural matters is not by Washington but rather via Washington. Whatever culture there is here was started elsewhere and brought in and pasted on."

OUR COUNTRY HOLDS CREATIVE ARTISTS IN LOW ESTEEM, SAYS KENNAN

If this is a correct analysis, we must ask ourselves the question, Why has Washington failed to develop into the breeding place for the arts that our Founding Fathers obviously intended it to be? A second question might be, Why is it that after 157 years a shrewd world traveler like my constituent, Former Russian Ambassador George F. Kennan, can say with truth that "I can think of few countries in the world where the artist, the writer, the composer, or the thinker is held in such general low esteem as he is here in our country."

CULTURAL LEADERS LACK THE AGGRESSIVENESS OF BUSINESSMEN

I am convinced that the answer does not lie in any lack of interest or ability among the citizens at large. Rather, it is simply that we lack on the art front of American life the aggressiveness and the habit of attack and success we have so brilliantly cultivated in our commercial, industrial, and financial levels of action. Certainly mere civic pride in imported cultural events—which Washington has plenty of—is not enough. What counts in cultural matters, as in all other kinds of progress, is civic action at the grass roots—the kind of well-coordinated, hard-hitting action which can break through lethargy on a dozen fronts and make and keep Washington a truly dynamic city. In particular, it is the work done by organizations such as the Federal City Council, the American Institute of Architects, the National Symphony Orchestra, and, surprisingly, the District of Columbia Recreation Department, which is developing music and fine arts programs that are attracting national attention, which keeps the fires of community progress burning brightly here.

RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS FOR WASHINGTON'S CULTURAL BACKWARDNESS

As I indicated earlier, the responsibility for improving Washington as a cultural city is three-pronged. It must be shouldered by Congress, by the District government, and by civic groups such as your own. I need hardly elaborate for the members of this council, who know the facts of political life here better than most, the critical role played by Congress in our Capital City. The citizens of Washington are deprived of virtually all voice or representation in local or national government, and the District Commissioners are appointed by the President. Washington can't build a sewer, collect garbage, or put a dog in the pound without a prior O. K. by the Congress.

A BALANCED RECREATION PROGRAM INCLUDES ARTS AND SPORTS

This is why it is up to Congress, in its role as the City Council of Washington—which is what the District Committees of the House and Senate are—to sympathetically consider the needs of the residents of the Federal city for creative art programs in which they can participate. It is extremely encouraging that the Recreation Department of the District of Columbia has begun to move in this direction. Their National Music Week observance, with Sherman Adams and Robert E. McLaughlin as honorary chairman and vice chairman, respectively, which included the distinguished production of an opera in the classic tradition is to be highly commended. Music and the arts cost money, however, just like playgrounds and sports, and must be included in any balanced recreation program. Your support and encouragement is absolutely vital to Milo Christiansen and his fine staff at District of Columbia Recreation.

THE 1935 ACT OF CONGRESS TO PRESERVE HISTORIC BUILDINGS

The revived interest of Congress in Washington's cultural status is taking a variety of forms, of course. There is recognition, for example, that progress can be made sometimes by holding tightly to our cultural heritage. I made a determined effort to keep the Civil Service Building here from being destroyed and, as a result, am happy to be able to say that the General Services Administration and the National Park Service have just this week established review procedures pursuant to a 1935 act of the Congress which will prevent the thoughtless razing of any structure of national significance.

The rate of destruction of notable buildings in this country is so dangerously high that many are concerned lest we be largely despoiled of the structures which identify the historic achievements of our people. In establishing the review procedures we are at long last joining the ranks of the great nations of Europe which have maintained national lists of sites, buildings, and objects which are declared a part of the national treasure and are designated for careful preservation.

But if Washington is to become the cultural center of light and learning envisioned by Washington and Jefferson we must not only jealously guard and preserve our cultural heritage, we have a most solemn obligation to add to it and to blaze new trails. Bold ideas are required, and legislative action to carry some of them out is essential.

BIPARTISAN POLICY ESSENTIAL IN THE ARTS AS WELL AS FOREIGN POLICY

There is a growing realization at the highest levels of government, just in time it turns out, of the importance of the arts both at home and in our foreign policy.

Upon the recommendation of President Eisenhower the Congress in 1954 and again in 1955 appropriated $5 million to send our leading orchestras, plays, performing artists, and athletes abroad. This fund, known as the President's Emergency Fund for Participation in International Affairs, also covers trade fairs, and in both these fields the Communist bloc is spending enormous sums and devoting much effort—$38 million for trade fairs alone last year.

The bipartisan interest of Congress in the fine arts does not arise because the Communist leaders charge us before the world with being cultureless materialists. The interest is broader and deeper than that, and members of both parties are sponsors of legislative proposals of great importance to the arts and our cultural status as a nation.

THE PRESIDENT URGED CONGRESS TO ENACT ART LEGISLATION

You will recall that the President in his 1955 message on the state of the Union told the Congress that "in the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities. I shall recommend the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation."

This statement has had a terrific impact throughout our country in cultural circles. It is a great statement on the arts regardless of the fact that the President as an amateur artist is about on a par with former President Truman as a musician.

With this foreword, I would like to talk briefly about a very ambitious project which is underway in the Nation's Capital, one for which I solicit the active and enthusiastic support of every member of your council.

SMITHSONIAN GALLERY OF ART LONG OVERDUE

This project, authorized by Public Law 128, 84th Congress, calls for the formulation of plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents, and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center. As I testified at the hearings on this legislation last year, the fine arts section of my H. R. 21, which some 15 of my colleagues from both parties joined me in sponsoring, referred to the Smithsonian Gallery of Art authorized by the Congress in 1938 to house the $10 million National Collection of Fine Arts.

TEN MILLION DOLLAR NATIONAL COLLECTION BADLY HOUSED

In its 1953 report to President Eisenhower on art and Government the Commission of Fine Arts headed by David E. Finley strongly recommended the early establishment of this gallery. And Dr. Carmichael, brilliant secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, advises me that this great gallery has the very highest priority, ranking besides the air museum and the Museum of History and Technology.

With some help from an administration which clearly is aware of the value of the fine arts, and with hard-hitting support of community-action groups such as yours, the music and fine arts center could soon become a reality.

COURT OF CLAIMS BUILDING URGED AS MUNICIPAL ART GALLERY

In this connection I would like to suggest that the Court of Claims Building at 17th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., near the White House, Lafayette Park, the old State Department Building, and adjacent to the Blair House, be used either as a temporary home for the national collection or as a municipal gallery. The Court of Claims Building was the original Corcoran Gallery of Art—as the Washington Star told us recently in a moving article entitled "Few Can Spare a Tear for Venerable Landmark." This old gallery, its contents, the ground, and the endowment were valued at $1,600,000 in 1869 when William W. Corcoran gave them all to Washington. New York City got its great civic center almost free because of tax delinquency. The residents of the Nation's Capital have a similar unique once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to obtain a great art center—and one intimately connected with the early life of Washington—almost without cost. I hope they will have the courage and the vision to seize this opportunity in the same way that any other community would.

FEDERAL CITY COUNCIL COMPARABLE TO ALLEGHENY CONFERENCE

I would like to urge you to make the establishment of the proposed civic and cultural center a council project along with those other important civic undertakings in which you are engaged.

Individually, many of your distinguished members are already making great contributions to Washington's cultural renascence. You now have the opportunity to support such important cultural projects as the proposed stadium and the civic and cultural center, and to take the same vital part in the reawakening of Washington as the Allegheny Conference is taking in the growth of Pittsburgh.

Remembering Plato's classic dictum that "what is honored in a country is cultivated there," you can and you must, I think, demonstrate to freemen everywhere that nowhere else in the world are learning and the fine arts more highly honored than in the Capital of the free world. Let us work together, then, to complete the task so ably begun by our Founding Fathers.

This spring meeting, with its distinguished representation from the legislative, administrative, and civic elements of our city is ample proof that you are ready to accept this basic challenge. Working together we can bring the unique heritage of the Federal city as a center of art and learning to triumphant realization.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 29, 1956

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 24, 1956)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Holland Hale, pastor, Calvary-Victory Methodist Churches, Fayetteville, N. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everlasting God, who dost govern all things in both heaven and earth, we invoke Thy blessing upon these who are our leaders. May we all be duly impressed with the dignity and necessity of the work of our Government. We pray Thy protection upon those whose service demands devotion. Let Thy mercy be ever upon them. Give us understanding of our fellow men. Give patience to walk with unity with each other. Bind us together with cords of sympathy and friendliness, and give us the vision of our common duty, making us glad and strong in doing it. By the memories of our Nation's glorious past, make us alert to the call of the present, that, inspired by the spirit of wisdom, courage, and patience, we may respond with signal devotion to its just claim upon us.

In the name of our Lord and Saviour we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 28, 1956, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations and the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and take up nominations on the Executive Calendar under the heading "New Reports."

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar under "New Reports."

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ellis O. Briggs to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Brazil.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of J. Graham Parsons to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Laos.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Theodore C. Achilles to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Peru.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Walter C. Dowling to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Korea.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles J. Lowen, Jr., to be Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that that nomination go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be passed over.

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD—NOMINATION OF CLARENCE G. MORSE, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder if the distinguished Senator could give some indication as to when the nomination of Clarence G. Morse to the Federal Maritime Board may be called up. We had some colloquy some time ago about the nomination. I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. I understood that the situation in which he was interested had been clarified. I wish the Senator from Texas would look into the matter, so we may know when the nomination will be considered. It has been pending on the calendar since April 25.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas asked one of the attachés this morning about the nomination. He was notified, although his informant may be in error, that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] had written Mr. Morse asking certain specific questions, and was awaiting a reply to them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understood he had been in touch with him and had received a reply.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall get in touch with the Senator from Washington. The Senator from Texas has no interest in holding the nomination up. I had assumed that if the Senator from Washington were ready, he would be willing to have the nomination taken up.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I had understood one of those interested was out of town, but that is no longer the situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be glad to look into the matter and report to the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, subject to a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED CONCESSION PERMIT, EVERGLADES NATIONAL PARK, FLA.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession permit in Everglades National Park, Fla. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest; and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A telegram, in the nature of a petition, signed by J. H. Goding, mayor of the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, relating to the inclusion of Alaska in the national highway bill; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Resolution memorializing the Postmaster General of the United States protesting the discontinuance of postage stamps bearing the portraits of John Adams and John Quincy Adams and urging the restoration thereof

"Whereas the Post Office Department of the United States has discontinued the use on United States postage stamps of the portraits of John Adams and his son, John Quincy Adams, the second and sixth Presidents of the United States, and distinguished citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and

"Whereas it is unthinkable that this great Nation should banish from the face of its stamps the man who carried the fight for the Declaration of Independence through the Continental Congress, nominated Washington as Commander in Chief, and appointed John Marshall Chief Justice of the United States, and it is equally unthinkable that it should banish his brilliant son, who, beginning his diplomatic career at the age of 17, served his country with unequaled integrity as Secretary of State, President and as Congressman dying at his post defending the rights of the least of his fellow citizens to be heard: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives urges the Postmaster General of the United States to take immediate action to restore the portraits of John Adams and John Quincy Adams to their appropriate and rightful places upon the 2-cent and 6-cent postage stamps; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Postmaster General, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to each of the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

THE HEIFER SLAUGHTER INCENTIVE PROGRAM—RESOLUTION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President: I have received a resolution from the Vale Grange of Vale, Oreg., which is entitled, "The Heifer Slaughter Incentive Program." I have had letters from many Oregon cattlemen expressing interest in such a program. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HEIFER SLAUGHTER INCENTIVE PROGRAM

1. OBJECTIVES

1. An orderly reduction in beef cattle numbers and production.

2. Stabilization and possible improvement in beef and cattle prices.

Whereas the beef cattle industry is being endangered by increasing supplies of beef in spite of record per capita beef consumption; and

Whereas diverted acres from supported crops has become an important factor in increasing the already surplus of beef on the market; and

Whereas the proposed soil bank has implication of further increasing the supply of beef; and

Whereas beef supplies are directly related to the number of producing females; and

Whereas it is important to the livestock industry that high quality beef be supplied to the consuming public; and

Whereas cattle numbers on farms in the United States on January 1, 1956, reached an all time peak of 97.5 million head; and

Whereas this increase in cattle numbers is a continuation of a long term upward trend: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Vale Grange No. 696, assembled in regular session at Vale, Oreg., on May 18, 1956, proposes that the United States Department of Agriculture put into effect the following program:

2. THE PLAN

1. The plan would go into operation whenever cattle prices average less than 80 percent of parity based on the modern parity formula. The incentive payments should be discontinued whenever prices reach 90 percent of parity. (Prices averaged 68 percent of parity March 15, 1956.)

2. Incentive payments should be paid on a graduated basis with a relatively large payment for lightweight heifer calves and a smaller payment on heavier calves; $30 per head on 200-pound calves and graduated down to $15 on 500-pound calves is suggested, with no payment below 200 or over 500 pounds.

3. Only producers who voluntarily complied with the program by selling for slaughter 50 to 100 percent of their entire heifer calf crop would be eligible for the incentive payment. This provision is intended to discourage the marketing of only cull calves just to get the incentive payment.

As prices for beef cattle are currently at 68 percent of parity ($14.40 per hundredweight) the plan would go into operation immediately and would be discontinued when prices reached 90 percent of parity: ($19.20 per hundredweight under present farm cost conditions.)

A 200-pound calf at market price of $17 per hundred would receive an additional $15 per hundred for a total price of $64 per head to the producer, which would be 88.2 percent increase over market price. A 500-pound calf would bring 17.6 percent increase over market price.

ALLAN F. WESTCOTT,
FANNEO YRAGUEN,
J. B. WOODCOCK,
Resolution Committee.

SIZE AND WEIGHT OF PARCEL POST MAIL MATTER—RESOLUTION

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by 350 members of the Songo Shoe Manufacturing Corp., of Portland, Maine, favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 3635) to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class—parcel post—mail.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF S. 3635

Whereas the existence of an efficient, economical parcel post system is essential to the pattern of life of our citizens and businesses in both rural and urban areas; and

Whereas the present discriminatory parcel post size and weight limitations seriously disrupt the service once enjoyed by all at great and unnecessary cost and inconvenience; and

Whereas there is no nationwide substitute for parcel post that can and will serve all citizens regardless of address; and

Whereas the present size and weight limitations have been both a financial and an administrative burden to the Post Office Department: Be it hereby

Resolved, That the Songo Shoe Manufacturing Corp., comprised of 350 members in Portland, Maine, favors immediate enactment of S. 3635 and restoration thereby of uniform parcel post size and weight limits.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF FEDERAL FOOD AND DRUG ACTS—PROCLAMATION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, June 30 marks the 50th anniversary of the signing by President Theodore Roosevelt of the first Federal Food and Drug Acts passed by an American Congress.

In commemoration of this important event, our secretary of agriculture in South Dakota, the distinguished and able Charles Bruett, has sent me an official proclamation issued by South Dakota's great Governor, Joe Foss, urging the people of my State to engage in appropriate commemorative activities fostering public recognition of this milestone in the protection of all Americans against practices prevailing before the passage of the Food and Drug Acts. I trust other Governors will associate themselves with this constructive program.

I ask unanimous consent that the proclamation may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas June 30, 1956, will mark the 50th anniversary of the signing by President Theodore Roosevelt of the first Federal Food and Drug Acts, amended and reenacted in 1938 as the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, and the Federal Meat Inspection Act; and

Whereas 1956 will also mark the 60th annual convention of the organization today known as the Association of Food and Drug Officials of the United States; and

Whereas the purity, integrity, and abundance of our food, drug and cosmetic supplies are unexcelled in the world today and stand as a tribute to the industries producing them; and

Whereas the maintenance and protection of the purity and integrity of our food, drug and cosmetic supplies are essential elements of our national strength, safety and economic welfare; and

Whereas for this protection we are indebted to Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, who as crusader for the first Federal legislation, became known as the father of the pure food and drug law; to the distinguished and dedicated public servants at all levels of Government who have supported the enactment and improvement of these laws and have cooperated in their enforcement.

Now, therefore, I, Joe Foss, Governor of the State of South Dakota, do hereby proclaim the week of June 24–July 1, 1956, to be Food and Drug Law Golden Anniversary Week, and I request the appropriate officials of the State of South Dakota and all citizens of South Dakota to cooperate in the observance of that week.

I also urge all industrial, business, professional, labor, and agricultural, education and civic groups, and the people of South Dakota generally, to observe 1956, as an anniversary year with gatherings, discussions, exhibits, and other appropriate commemorative activities to foster public recognition of the benefits derived from Federal, State, and local food, drug and cosmetic laws.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of South Dakota to be affixed this 1st day of May 1956.

JOE FOSS, *Governor.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. 1614. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids," title 21, United States Code, section 321c (Rept. No. 2064).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. 1873. A bill to increase the minimum postal savings deposit, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2065); and

H. R. 4569. A bill to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes (Rept. No. 2066).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. 3620. A bill to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies (Rept. No. 2069);

S. 3907. A bill to amend section 345 of the Public Health Service Act (Rept. No. 2068);

S. 3958. A bill to improve the health of the people by assisting in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and practical nurses and professional public health personnel, assisting in the development of improved methods of care and treatment in the field of mental health, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2070); and

H. R. 2840. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas (Rept. No. 2067).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

S. 3430. A bill to promote the progress of medicine and to advance the national health and welfare by creating a National Library of Medicine (Rept. No. 2071).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3949. A bill to promote the progress of medicine and to advance the national health and welfare by creating a National Library of Medicine to be located in Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 3950. A bill for the relief of Josephine Suydam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 3951. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program; and

S. 3952. A bill to regulate the movement from foreign countries into or through the United States, and the interstate movement, of plant pests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (by request):

S. 3953. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 relative to import duties on wool; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 3954. A bill for the relief of Bhan Singh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 3955. A bill to authorize research by the Fish and Wildlife Service to determine methods of, and to provide for grants to the States to assist approved research or other projects for, control or extermination of sea nettles and jellyfish in marine waters of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 3956. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 3957. A bill to amend the act authorizing the exchange and amendment of certain farm units in order to limit the time during which applications may be made under such act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. IVES, Mr. NEELY, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BENDER, Mr. MCNAMARA, and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. 3958. A bill to improve the health of the people by assisting in increasing the number

of adequately trained professional and practical nurses and professional public health personnel, assisting in the development of improved methods of care and treatment in the field of mental health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 3959. A bill for the relief of Catalino Properties, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3960. A bill to amend section 4232 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain places where no instrumental music is provided shall not be treated as cabarets; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3961. A bill to provide for the establishment of additional animal disease laboratory facilities at or near the University of Minnesota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 3962. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the use of broadcasting stations by presidential, vice presidential, and congressional candidates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ANIMAL DISEASE LABORATORY FACILITIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the establishment of additional animal disease laboratory facilities.

At the time the agricultural appropriation bill was before the Senate, I announced my intention to introduce this bill to conform to the expressed wishes of the Appropriation Committee.

In disallowing requested funds in the budget for this facility, the committee reported to the Senate that it preferred to have the project reviewed by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and a specific authorization provided designating the site of the facility at some location other than Beltsville, Md.

In my opinion, no better location could be found than in Minnesota, out in the heartland of the upper Midwest which contributes so much of our livestock. The bill I have introduced calls for the location of the laboratory in Minnesota.

I hope speedy action can be provided by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, so that funds for this building can be included in the next budget, or possibly even in a supplemental appropriation yet this year.

In support of this facility, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks, a copy of the budget justification for this project originally presented by the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture to our Appropriations Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the justification will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3961) to provide for the establishment of additional animal disease laboratory facilities at or near the University of Minnesota, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The justification presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

JUSTIFICATION

New facilities are urgently needed for the animal disease research and control programs.

In June 1955 three widely known research workers from outside the Department were asked to inspect animal disease research and control facilities located at Washington, D. C., Beltsville, Md., Auburn, Ala., and Denver, Colo., to determine whether (1) the facilities and procedures were adequate for proper safeguarding of working personnel from the hazards of infection; (2) safeguards were sufficient to protect workers in other parts of the building and the public utilizing the corridors; and (3) facilities were adequate to protect experiments from cross-contamination. Many of the diseases under study at these points were transmissible to man, including tuberculosis, brucellosis, anthrax, erysipelas, rabies, equine encephalomyelitis, Newcastle disease, and others.

The committee reported that facilities in use were not adequate to safeguard workers and other persons in the buildings from exposure to disease or the experimental work from cross-contamination. Moreover, the committee reported that in most cases basic building structures were not adaptable to the modifications which would be necessary to provide modern safety measures, and also that they were inadequate for the fundamental disease research program underway. Following this report it was necessary to discontinue all research in Washington, D. C., and all that portion at Auburn, Ala., and Denver, Colo., on animal diseases infectious for man. This has resulted in curtailment of much important work and the suspension of other lines of research because of a lack of suitable space. Overcrowded quarters at Beltsville have been temporarily made available for certain of the work discontinued at other points. Provision for adequate laboratory facilities is essential not only to the conduct of a comprehensive animal disease research program but also to animal disease control programs.

The new facilities would provide space for comprehensive research on animal diseases and for diagnostic and testing work for control and regulatory activities. These facilities have been designed for experimental work with safety to the livestock industry and the health of workers.

Investigations would cover methods for diagnosis, cause, mode of transmission, and methods of prevention, treatment, and control of infectious diseases of all classes of livestock, including poultry, which exist in this country. Bacteriological, serological, pathological, immunological, and animal inoculation studies would be made. Research would cover diseases caused by bacteria, fungi, viruses, rickettsia, and pathological conditions.

Diagnosis of diseases would be made as they are encountered in animal disease control and eradication work in the field and in meatpacking plants. Tests would be made of animal biologics produced commercially to determine their purity and potency as required under the Virus-Serum-Toxin Act. The laboratory would contain facilities for pilot plant development of production methods for biologics and diagnostic agents based on research findings. Chemical analyses and bacteriological examinations would be made of dips and disinfectants to determine their efficacy and reliability for use in control and eradication programs, and of germicides to determine conformity with the Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CURTIS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 10660) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. SMATHERS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 10660, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me to House bill 10660, the pending Federal-Aid Highway Act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. MAGNUSON. On Friday, May 25, I submitted an amendment to H. R. 10660, to provide in effect for a refund of the fuel tax increases of 1 cent a gallon on gasoline and diesel fuel, and for a similar refund of the 3 cents a pound increase in the tire tax and the 3 cents a pound tread rubber tax, to the extent that highway vehicles are used on any road, thoroughfare, or property in private ownership.

When I submitted the amendment on Friday, it was designed to amend the House-passed version of H. R. 10660. At that time the bill was still before the Senate Finance Committee and had not been reported.

EXPANSION OF TEACHING AND RESEARCH IN EDUCATION OF MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

On request of Mr. GORE, and by unanimous consent, the names of Mr. WILEY and Mr. ALLOTT were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3620) to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies, introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] (for himself and other Senators) on April 12, 1956, and which was reported today.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by him on receiving Philip Murray award of the NAACP at Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, N. Y., May 17, 1956.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Statement by him on importance of work of United States Information Agency.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FREDERICK VAN PELT BRYAN TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, June 5, 1956, at 10: 30 a. m., in room 424, Senate office building, on the nomination of Frederick Van Pelt Bryan, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, vice William Bondy, retired.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and myself, chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON H. R. 2383 AND S. 2157, INVENTORS AWARDS BILLS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, June 7, 1956, at 10: 30 a. m., in room 424 Senate office building, on H. R. 2383, to authorize the National Inventors Council to make awards for inventive contribution relating to the national defense, and S. 2157, to authorize the establishment of an inventive contributions awards board within the Department of Defense, and for other purposes. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]; the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and myself, chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 3897, TO IMPROVE GOVERNMENTAL BUDGETING AND ACCOUNTING METHODS AND PROCEDURES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommitte on Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations, of which I have the privilege of serving as chairman, I desire to announce that a public hearing has been scheduled to begin next Monday, June 4, 1956, at 10 a. m., in room 457, Senate Office Building, on S. 3897, relating to the Government's accounting, budgeting and appropriations processes, and which is sponsored by 32 Members of this body. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Comptroller General of the United States, the Comptroller of the Department of Defense, and representatives of other major Government departments, will present testimony to the subcommittee upon this important legislation which provides that budget requests shall be made on a cost basis, that accounts of the executive agencies shall be maintained on an accrual basis, and that appropriations shall be determined on an annual accrued expenditures basis. All Members of the Senate are cordially invited to join with members of the subcommittee in the hearings upon this bill, which directly implements the recommendations of the second Hoover Commission relating to budgeting and accounting, and which are expected to continue for several days, or to present testimony to the subcommittee if they desire to do so.

NOMINATION OF FORMER SENATOR FRED A. SEATON, OF NEBRASKA, TO BE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to take a moment to compliment the President of the United States for the very excellent appointment he made in naming Fred A. Seaton, of Nebraska, to be Secretary of the Interior. I consider Mr. Seaton to be one of the outstanding citizens of the United States, and a man exceptionally well qualified to be Secretary of the Interior. I think it is a recognition of the Middle West to have a man of the character, the ability, and the outstanding qualifications of Mr. Seaton made Secretary of the Interior. I compliment the President of the United States for making the appointment.

I wish Mr. Seaton well, and I hope his nomination will be speedily confirmed. In these remarks, I believe, I speak not only for the citizens of North Dakota, but of the entire Northwest, who know of the outstanding ability of Mr. Seaton.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I desire to express my heartiest commendations to President Eisenhower for his nomination of the Honorable Fred Seaton as Secretary of the Interior. The people of the United States are to be congratulated on the appointment, for it is their good fortune.

I first met Fred Seaton when he came to the Senate to fill out the term of the late Ken Wherry, of Nebraska. Our seats were close together. We often talked about the bills and other public matters that came before the Senate. I came to have the very highest regard for his ideals, his principles, and his personality.

Fred Seaton is a westerner of the mountains as well as of the broad prairies. He has perhaps been most frequently identified as a newspaper publisher of Kansas and Nebraska. He is also the publisher of the Lead Daily Call and the Deadwood Pioneer-Times, published in Lead, known as the mile-high city of the Black Hills in South Dakota, having acquired these newspapers in recent years.

Speaking as one whose State contains public lands, reclamation projects, national parks, Indian reservations, mines and mining, both metallic and nonmetallic, public power and transmission lines, vast interests in fish and wildlife and every other activity for which the Department of the Interior has responsibilities, I say wholeheartedly and enthusiastically that the President could not have made a better appointment.

Fred Seaton will conserve the national interests in our great national resources conscientiously, and foster their development with imagination, courage, and integrity.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the nomination of Fred A. Seaton to be Secretary of the Interior brings great honor to the State of Nebraska. It is fitting that this selection be made from a State which has long been identified with the development and appreciation of the basic problems of the Department of the Interior.

It is fitting, also, that the appointment be of one who has so long and faithfully served as a member of Ike's team.

It was gratifying to note Mr. Seaton's immediate declaration expressing agreement with the Eisenhower-McKay basic power and water program.

Congress, particularly the Senate, of which Mr. Seaton was formerly a Member, can look forward with pleasure to working with Mr. Seaton.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the President has made his selection of a new Secretary of the Interior. While I worked for the appointment of Mr. Clarence A. Davis, because I believed him to be eminently qualified and because his appointment would have been in recognition of the outstanding service he had rendered to the President, nevertheless, Mr. Seaton has my congratulations. I am glad that a Nebraskan has been so honored, and I shall work with the new Secretary on all matters important to the Western States. Mr. Seaton is a long-time friend and associate of the President, and he is a man of ability.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS RELATING TO THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last Friday the Senate passed the Justice Department appropriation bill. One item in the bill had to do with the amendment I offered last year to the interstate oil compact. I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement which I have prepared about that amendment and the Senate action on last Friday may be printed at this point in the RECORD, in order that the record may be clear.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

Last year I offered an amendment in the Senate to the Interstate Oil Compact when it was before the Senate. Article V of the compact states:

"It is not the purpose of this compact to authorize the States joining herein to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof, or create or perpetuate monopoly, or to promote regimentation, but is limited to the purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the avoidable waste thereof within reasonable limitations."

My amendment to the Interstate Oil Compact merely asked that the Justice Department make a study and annual report to the Congress as to whether or not the clear purpose of the compact, as stated by the compact

States themselves in article V was being carried out.

The reason for my amendment was simple. The Constitution of the United States says:

"No State shall, without the consent of Congress * * * enter into any agreement or compact with another State."

Therefore, Mr. President, the Interstate Oil Compact, could only come about and exist by the express permission of the Congress of the United States. The right for States to organize in a compact is that of Congress to grant or withhold, and there is no issue of States rights involved.

The interstate oil compact allows the States to get together to set production levels and prices, etc., for the express purpose of conserving gas and oil. This is an unusual grant of power and one which neither States nor businesses enjoy except where specifically sanctioned by Congress. Article V of the compact itself states that the setting of prices and the limiting of production, etc., shall be done for no other purpose than for conservation. All my amendment did was to ask the Justice Department to make a yearly report as to whether or not the clear language of article V, agreed to by the States themselves, was being carried out. Without my amendment, Congress has no check or any yearly report on the activities of the compact in this respect.

When the Justice Department submitted its request this year, it asked for $763,090 and for 147 additional positions to carry out the purposes of my amendment. The House committee passed this amount. The Senate committee, however, recognized that this was an absurd request and that the Justice Department had no real grounds, either in the legislative intent or the job to be done, to justify such a request. As it was my amendment to the oil compact, and as my remarks in the Senate make up the only substantive legislative record, I want to say that I concur with the committee's feeling. I believe the Justice Department's request was an attempt to reduce the real purpose of my amendment to absurdity and to kill any effort to carry out the reasonable intent of the amendment.

I wrote to Senator JOHNSON to this effect on May 18, but I believe that the bill had been marked up before he or his committee had an opportunity to consider my letter.

The committee cut the amount from $763,090 to $25,000. I believe that if the Department really carries out the intent of Congress and goes about this task in a reasonable way, that the $25,000 granted by the committee is quite adequate for the job. This amount is enough to insure that the Justice Department can have no excuse whatsoever to get on with their clear duty and responsibility under the law and under the clear language and intent of my amendment to the oil compact.

The original Justice Department request was ridiculous. When pressed before the Senate committee to support the amount, they fell back on the legislative intent of Congress. I believe I know as much about that as anyone else, and I can say that there certainly is nothing in the history of the amendment in the Senate to justify $763,090.

It is a clear principle of Government, that the Congress and the legislative branch should be able to secure, as a matter of right, that the spirit of the acts of the executive are suffused with the clear purposes and intents of the Congress. In this case the Justice Department is trying to kill the amendment to the oil compact by asking for an absurd amount. I want them to have no excuse for failing to carry out the clear intent of the Congress and I believe that as the author of the original amendment I can say that the amount the committee has given them is enough to do a workmanlike job and to carry out the legislative intent of the Congress.

I ask that a letter which I sent to the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Justice Department Appropriations, and addressed to its chairman, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, be inserted in the RECORD at this point. I wish to say that this letter probably arrived too late for the committee to consider it before this bill was marked up, and that I ask that it be included in the RECORD because it could not be included in the hearings, and because it is self-explanatory.

I attach hereto the complete contents of the letter from the Department of Justice to the Honorable PERCY PRIEST commenting on my amendment when it was before the House committee last year and which I quote in my letter to Senator JOHNSON be included in the RECORD at this point.

This latter insertion especially shows very clearly that from the beginning the Justice Department has been less than reasonable in their attitude toward this amendment.

I am happy that the Senate committee saw through their request and has acted as it has. Further, I want to say that I expect, and I believe the Congress has a right to expect, that the Justice Department get on with its job and stop trying to kill or make ridiculous the amendment to the oil compact. The first report, if the Justice Department has done its job, should be ready very soon.

MAY 18, 1956.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Justice Department Appropriations, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: My attention has been called to the request of the Department of Justice for $700,000 to carry out the legislative intent of the amendment to the Interstate Oil Compact which I introduced and which was carried in the Senate during the last session. I understand that the Justice Department contemplates hiring something like 110 investigators, opening 3 new offices, and increasing the Antitrust Division by something like 25 percent in order to carry out the legislative intent of my amendment.

May I say that this request by the Justice Department is absurd. I can only think it was done in an attempt to reduce the real purpose of my amendment to absurdity and to kill any effort to carry out the reasonable intent of the amendment. I am convinced that a staff of 2 to 4 competent economists, 1 to 2 lawyers, and perhaps 1 to 2 investigators, at most, would be adequate to carry out the legislative intent of my amendment. I am at a loss to find anything in the legislative record of my amendment from which the Department could possibly request the sum of money and the new staff it has asked for. As it was my amendment, and as my statement was the only statement of substance about the amendment in the Senate, I believe that I am in a position to state the legislative intent.

The purpose of my amendment was simple. The Constitution of the United States says:

"No State shall, without the consent of Congress * * * enter into any agreement or compact with another State."

Therefore, the Interstate Oil Compact, like other compacts, can only come about and exist by the express permission of the Congress of the United States. There is no issue of States' rights involved, for the right is that of Congress to grant or withhold.

Article V of the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas is worded as follows:

"It is not the purpose of this compact to authorize the States joining herein to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof, or create or perpetuate monopoly, or to promote regimentation, but is limited to the purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the avoidable waste thereof within reasonable limitations."

My purpose in offering the amendment was to make certain that the clear intent of the States entering the compact under article V was being carried out. The Congress makes the grant of power to the States involved in the compact but until my amendment, there was no agency of the Congress or Federal Government which reported to the Congress whether or not the clear language of the compact was adhered to.

The Interstate Oil Compact meets only occasionally. I am reasonably certain that the records of the Compact are kept where they are accessible. Further, the Compact invited a representative of the Antitrust Division to attend one of its recent meetings. For some reason, the Justice Department did not even send a representative. I must say that the Department of Justice has acted in a most curious way in this as in other situations affecting my amendment.

After the Compact was agreed to by the Senate, it went to the House committee. The House asked the Department of Justice for its opinion on my amendment. The reply received by the Justice Department was an amazing one—it was signed by Deputy Attorney General Rogers. I shall quote the relevant part:

"The general purpose of this provision seems unobjectionable. However, the investigation into the operation of the Compact contemplated under the provision would apparently involve, among other matters, questions in the field of economics. Such functions do not properly come within the activities of the Department of Justice which is the chief litigating arm of the Government. It is believed, therefore, that it would be inappropriate for the Attorney General and the Department of Justice to be designated to perform such functions."

This quotation is the entire substance of any reference in the Justice Department's letter concerning my amendment.

At a later date, I questioned the head of the Antitrust Division, Judge Barnes, concerning this letter. He admitted before the Banking and Currency Committee that the Antitrust Division did hire numerous economists, that it did have an economics division or section, that this was a legitimate function of the Antitrust Division, and that the subjects of limiting production, stabilizing or fixing prices, creating or perpetuating a monopoly, etc., were ones they dealt with regularly in the normal course of events. Thus, the statement that questions in the field of economics are not functions which properly come within the activities of the Department of Justice is one which does not bear examination. When the Assistant Attorney General, by any clear meaning of his own words, admitted that the Justice Department's contention was ridiculous, I think it is clear that the provision was unobjectionable to them.

We all know that for conservation purposes, the Compact is allowed to set prices, limit production, etc. As this is an unusual grant to any group, private or public, Congress should have a regular report on such activities. The Compact itself, I understand, has given the Justice Department every cooperation. Thus, I am convinced that the Attorney General, in making his request, is attempting to reduce what is a simple and straightforward amendment, requiring the use of a small group of competent people and the writing of a yearly report, to absurdity.

I sincerely hope that the Appropriations Committee will appropriate funds in the amount necessary to carry out the simple provisions of the amendment. It is difficult to make an exact estimate of the amount needed but it would probably be in the neighborhood of $100,000, which would be enough to pay the salaries of a half dozen competent lawyers and economists and the secretarial help and printing costs, etc., which such a

staff would need. Certainly, no new offices or 100 investigators are needed.

I wish to state again that I can find no evidence whatsoever in the legislative history of my amendment to support the Justice Department's request, and I believe that as it was my amendment, I am as competent to interpret the legislative intent as anyone.

I hope that this letter will be useful to the committee and if the committee so desires, I see no reason why it should not be made a part of the RECORD.

With best wishes.

Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., June 14, 1955.

Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your requests for the views of the Department of Justice concerning House Joint Resolution 143 and Senate Joint Resolution 38, consenting to an Interstate Compact to conserve oil and gas.

The Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas was originally executed at Dallas, Tex., on February 16, 1935, by representatives of the oil-producing States (Oklahoma, Texas, California, and New Mexico), with recommendations to other States for ratification. The States of Kansas, Illinois and Colorado subsequently ratified the original Compact. House Joint Resolution 407 was introduced in the 74th Congress for the purpose of giving consent to the Compact under the provisions of article I, section 10 of the Constitution. It was passed on August 27, 1935 (Public Res. 64, 74th Cong., 49 Stat. 939). The approval was for a period of two years, expiring September 1, 1937. The Compact has continued in effect since that time through periodic enactments by the Congress similar to House Joint Resolution 407 of the 74th Congress. The last enactment (Public Law 128, 82d Cong., Aug. 28, 1951) continued Congressional consent to the Compact until September 1, 1955. The joint resolutions would give Congressional consent to a further extension and renewal of the Compact until September 1, 1959.

Whether the proposd extension and renewal of the Compact should be approved involves a question of policy concerning which this Department prefers to make no recommendation. However, there is one provision of Senate Joint Resolution 38, as passed by the Senate, which this Department deems objectionable. Section 2 of that joint resolution reads:

SEC. 2. The Attorney General of the United States shall, within one year from September 1, 1955, and annually thereafter for the duration of the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas, make a report to the Congress as to whether or not in his opinion the activities of the States under the provisions of such Compact (1) have remained within the purpose of such Compact as set out in article V thereof, and (2) have resulted in the stabilizing or fixing of prices of oil or gas, the creation or perpetuation of any monopoly, or the promotion of any regimentation in the production or sale of oil or gas, with the understanding that conservation and the protection of the small producer are the paramount purposes of any rules and regulations issued under the Compact."

The general purpose of this provision seems unobjectionable. However, the investigation into the operation of the Compact contemplated under the provision would apparently involve, among other matters, questions in the field of economics. Such functions do not properly come within the activities of the Department of Justice which is the chief litigating arm of the Government. It is believed, therefore, that it would be inappropriate for the Attorney General and the Department of Justice to be designated to perform such functions.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Deputy Attorney General.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allott	Douglas	Lehman
Barrett	Duff	Mansfield
Bender	Dworshak	Millikin
Bennett	George	Neuberger
Byrd	Goldwater	Payne
Case, S. Dak.	Hayden	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Cotton	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Curtis	Knowland	Watkins
Dirksen	Langer	

Mr. SMATHERS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is not present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GORE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JENNER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERR, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LAIRD, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THYE, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WOFFORD, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Is there further morning business?

CONDITION OF OHIO'S HIGHWAYS

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, today is important in the life of all the people of Ohio. At last we are about to have a highway bill which will provide relief for the great State of Ohio.

Of course, I believe the President in his message last year provided the formula that was the answer for a national highway system, properly financed and expeditiously provided to give relief to the Nation bereft of adequate highways.

As a Senator from the great State of Ohio, with a population, according to the Census Bureau, approaching the nine-million mark, you can appreciate what pleasure I have in voting for the measure now pending, providing for an adequate road system. Every Member of the United States Senate will appreciate how deeply I feel about this legislation. Ohio has been talking about good roads for a long time, but it has all been conversation.

On March 19, 1956, one of the leading newspapers of Ohio entitled its lead editorial, Our Highway Shame. Every family in this State can verify this description.

Several years ago, the voters of Ohio approved a $500 million bond issue for the express purpose of constructing new, modern, multiple-lane highways. This bond issue has been nullified by engineering and planning bottlenecks in the State highway department at Columbus. In these times, when provisions for civilian, commercial and military traffic are matters of vital concern to the entire Nation, negligence and procrastination in this area are utterly inexcusable.

There is only one place where the blame for this sorry record can be placed—at the door of the State's chief executive. Our Governor must be held responsible for the failure of his highway director to anticipate our needs, and to submit the necessary plans to meet them.

Ohio's narrow, inadequate roads are hazardous at best, downright dangerous at worst. Highway statistics for 1955 reveal more than one million deaths and personal injuries in the space of 12 months. Ohio contributed far more than its share to this tragic toll.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would remind the Senator that the Senate is still in the morning hour. General debate is not permissible.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I am merely making a statement during the morning hour. It is not debate; it is a statement describing the road conditions in my own State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Any statement is limited to 2 minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed for 2 minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I do not believe that the people of our State are exercised over the controversy with respect to toll roads or freeways. They are concerned over the prospect of getting the job done.

In my judgment, the point of diminishing returns in the operation of toll roads must be carefully considered in the ultimate decision on a north-south Ohio Turnpike. If private financing for a toll road is not found available, the duty to build a modern highway from Lake Erie to Cincinnati will in no way be diminished. The daily risk of our people's lives along Routes 3 and 42 cannot be justified on any basis.

The chairman of the Ohio Turnpike Commission issued a most significant public statement on this subject during the past week. Addressing himself to the north-south turnpike delays, he wrote:

The Ohio Turnpike Commission maintained an at-alert position for all the months it awaited the engineering reports from the director of highways and on the very day, May 11, 1956, they were delivered to the commission after having been held by the director of highways for 10 days after he had received them from the engineers, they were sent by the commission to the members of the syndicate of investment bankers formed to undertake the financing.

Those of us who have occasion to use the roads of other States as well as our own know how rapidly and how completely we are being outstripped by our neighbors, Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey. We have only one thoroughly modern highway despite vast expenditures. Only four States in the Union collect more funds from motor fuel taxes than Ohio, but we are far from having the fifth best highways in the United States.

I believe that highway planning experts alone can determine whether or not the north-south highway can be built most efficiently as a turnpike project or a freeway. It does not take an expert to determine that it ought to be built before the automobile becomes obsolete.

The facts are evident. A large part of the Ohio roadway system, both primary and secondary, is dangerous and inadequate.

Our people have been prompt and generous in approving every request for the funds necessary to build a modern highway system.

The long delays which have occurred have been in the executive branch of our Government. Our Governor has applied neither the initiative nor the administrative efficiency which are necessary to get such major activities on to the drafting boards of his highway department and into actual construction.

The Federal Government is interested in helping Ohio to build more roads, and to build better roads. All of us talk a great deal about local responsibility. We want our State governments to assume those burdens which traditionally belong right here at home. If the State's chief executive refuses to accept the responsibility vested in him by his office, the people should know exactly where the fault lies. In Ohio, the blame for poor highways lies squarely at the door of the Governor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dead End in Ohio" which was published in the Cleveland Press of November 25, 1955. The Cleveland Press has been Governor Lausche's principal supporter.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAD END IN OHIO

If the State highway department has anything to do with the proposed north-south turnpike, chances are it never will be built.

In fact, the only reason that Ohio has turned to turnpikes at all is because of the failure of the State highway department.

The important through roads, the vital main highways, simply weren't being built.

There was a patchwork of fine back-country roads—but nothing where the traffic was.

The present excellent Ohio Turnpike is a toll road because that was the one way it would get built.

The State highway department has been, and continues to be, a tragic joke.

The suggestion that the floundering State highway department now be brought back into the picture is made by Turnpike Chairman Shocknessy as a desperate financial move.

Shocknessy finds that the north-south turnpike as proposed would lose money in certain stretches. To avoid those losses, he suggests the State highway department build freeways to link together the probably profitable toll sections of the road.

All this does, of course, is dump the responsibility on a department that already has failed in the task of providing decent roads.

It puts the task up to a group of foot-dragging bureaucrats who haven't even plans for spending the cash the legislature has voted them for other top-priority jobs.

And, just as important as a matter of principle, it would mean traffic in a congested area like Cleveland would have to pay tolls, while downstate the riding would be free.

Perhaps this is a time for reexamination of the whole north-south turnpike situation, as Shocknessy suggests.

But that study will mean nothing if the State highway department is brought into the act.

Its almost complete incompetence is a matter of unpleasant record.

Anyone who has ever had the good fortune to ride on the highways of any other State knows the too-little and too-late mess in Ohio.

There is only one legitimate way to include the State highway department in future planning:

And that is after a thorough housecleaning of the department from top to bottom.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, on January 1, 1957, this matter will be corrected, because Ohio will have a new governor, a governor who will conscientiously endeavor to have new highways built for Ohio.

Today, we in the Senate are helping to provide some of the machinery and tools with which the new governor can work.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may ask the Senator from Ohio a question.

Mr. BENDER. I shall certainly be glad to answer the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Governor of Ohio running for the United States Senate?

Mr. BENDER. The Governor of Ohio is running for President, for Vice President, and for United States Senator. I do not know what more he could run for.

DALE LONG, PITTSBURGH PIRATES FIRST BASEMAN

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, extraordinary achievements in many fields of endeavor have frequently been publicly acknowledged on the floor of the Senate. I rise to suggest an unprecedented performance in the field of sports.

At Pittsburgh yesterday, in the National League baseball game between Pittsburgh and Brooklyn, Dale Long, the Pittsburgh first baseman, hit a home run which was his eighth home run in eight consecutive games, a performance never before equaled in the history of organized baseball.

At a time when we are inclined to look fondly on the performances of the past, it is reassuring to know that we still have in our day those capable of reaching the supreme heights of performance in our athletics.

Dale Long did not come to this supreme distinction suddenly. The fact is that when he came up to the big leagues, he was not found equal to its performance and was sent back to the minors. Most men would have been discouraged and would have resigned themselves to a situation of mediocrity. But Long had the courage not to submit or yield to inferiority. He had the courage and the will to fight to realize what he thought was his potential.

As a result of extraordinary determination, coupled with confidence in himself, despite setbacks and discouragement, he has achieved a distinction never equaled by any player in the whole history of our greatest national pastime.

Long's extraordinary performance is an encouragement to youth everywhere. He is therefore entitled to public acknowledgment, not only for spectacular accomplishment, but also for the determination by which it was achieved.

All Pittsburgh, all Pennsylvania, as well as all America, proclaim this extraordinary young American.

HELLS CANYON POWER PROJECT

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, much has been said, and much will be said, about the Hells Canyon power project. This public project has been before several Congresses without success, and all the while the wrangling has gone on in Washington over it, the people of that section of the country have been denied a source of increased power.

At this moment, Mr. President, the Idaho Power Co. is building that project with private money, so that the people who need more power may have it. As a result of their building these dams the taxpayers of the United States are saved approximately $465,500,000;

and with the completion of the project, the Federal and State governments will begin to benefit by taxes paid to them—a benefit that never occurs when the Government builds power projects.

I ask unanimous consent that an approximation of the savings to each State be made a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MUCH IS HE SAVING YOU IN TAXES?

Here's about how much the people of each State save in taxes because the local independent electric company, instead of the Government, is building the Hells Canyon power project:

Alabama	$4,300,000
Arizona	1,900,000
Arkansas	2,200,000
California	42,900,000
Colorado	4,700,000
Connecticut	8,800,000
Delaware	2,300,000
Florida	6,900,000
Georgia	6,100,000
Idaho	1,200,000
Illinois	35,600,000
Indiana	11,900,000
Iowa	5,600,000
Kansas	4,500,000
Kentucky	4,700,000
Louisiana	5,100,000
Maine	1,800,000
Maryland	9,100,000
Massachusetts	15,000,000
Michigan	26,900,000
Minnesota	7,800,000
Mississippi	2,200,000
Missouri	11,600,000
Montana	1,500,000
Nebraska	3,400,000
Nevada	700,000
New Hampshire	1,300,000
New Jersey	16,900,000
New Mexico	1,400,000
New York	68,700,000
North Carolina	6,400,000
North Dakota	1,000,000
Ohio	29,700,000
Oklahoma	4,600,000
Oregon	4,400,000
Pennsylvania	35,000,000
Rhode Island	2,400,000
South Carolina	3,000,000
South Dakota	1,100,000
Tennessee	5,400,000
Texas	18,900,000
Utah	1,600,000
Vermont	700,000
Virginia	6,900,000
Washington	7,300,000
West Virginia	3,300,000
Wisconsin	9,500,000
Wyoming	700,000
District of Columbia and possessions	6,600,000
Total	465,500,000

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not care to labor the point, but I believe the advertisement to which the Senator has referred was the most misleading one I have ever read in all the time I have been in Washington. The list shows how much each State would have to pay for the construction of the dam. The truth is that the cost of such dams is paid back, with interest.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is speaking about the dams in his own State. I am not arguing about that. The Senator is entitled to his own opinion, as is the Senator from Arizona, who believes that this is a justifiable presentation of the facts.

Mr. NEUBERGER subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks made a few moments ago by the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] about the insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] concerning the proposed Hells Canyon Dam. The Hells Canyon high dam would be part of the Bonneville power system, in the Pacific Northwest. That system has collected more than $300 million in power revenues, which have been put into the Federal Treasury. Furthermore, it is approximately $68 million ahead of schedule in repaying to the Treasury the money invested in it.

The claim that giving the Hells Canyon power site to a private power company, like the Idaho Power Co., will save the Treasury $460 million, is a complete misrepresentation. It totally overlooks and avoids the fact that public dams sell power, collect revenues, and pay for themselves.

At some time in the future I shall place in the RECORD a complete answer to the statement about Hells Canyon inserted in the RECORD by the Senator from Arizona. With his permission, I shall insert it on behalf of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and myself.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT AT BAYLOR UNIVERSITY, WACO, TEX.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Friday, last, in Waco, Tex., at the commencement exercises of Baylor University, President Eisenhower made a major foreign policy address. It was inserted in the RECORD yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. The report of this address in the papers has stressed quite properly the President's emphasis on the growth and spirit of understanding, not only among our own people, but among the peoples of the world.

He emphasized:

The whole free world would be stronger if there existed adequate institutions of modern techniques and sciences in areas of the world where the hunger for knowledge and the ability to use knowledge are unsatisfied because educational facilities are often not equal to the need.

However, this was only one part of an address which really covered the vision and spirit of our foreign policy today. At the very beginning of the President's address he pointed out how world issues color practically every domestic question, as well as our foreign relations. He pointed out clearly the clash between communism and the ideology of the free world. At one point he said:

Communism denies the spiritual premises on which your education has been based. According to that doctrine, there is no God; there is no soul in man; there is no reward beyond the satisfaction of daily needs. Consequently, toward the human being, communism is cruel, intolerant, materialistic.

Later in his address he said:

The destiny of man is freedom and justice under his Creator. Any ideology that denies this universal faith will ultimately perish or be recast. This is the first great truth that must underlie all our thinking, all our striving in this struggling world.

A second truth is that the fundamental principles of human liberty and free government are powerful sources of human energy, loyalty, and dedication. They are guides to enduring success. They are mightier than armaments and armies.

Mr. President, this speech in my judgment is the finest presentation I have seen of the underlying arguments supporting the nonmilitary aspects of our foreign-aid program.

Our Senate Foreign Relations Committee will presently write up the foreign-aid bill. It is my sincere hope that we shall all so inform ourselves on the merits of this proposed legislation that we shall be able to cure the unfortunate mistake made by the House committee in slashing the bill recommended by the administration by over $1 billion.

REMARKS BY HOWARD PYLE RELATING TO UNEMPLOYMENT IN DETROIT

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, on Wednesday, May 23, I called the attention of the Senate to the remarks made in Detroit by Howard Pyle, an assistant to President Eisenhower.

Speaking to reporters in my State, where unemployment has now climbed to 220,000 persons, Mr. Pyle made the "offhand" remark that "the right to suffer is one of the joys of a free economy."

Displaying more speed than it usually does, the White House got Mr. Pyle to "apologize" for his callous remark. In so doing, Mr. Pyle compounded his error by describing the Michigan unemployment as "seasonal," which I am sure is news to the auto manufacturers. Mr. Pyle might be interested in conservative predictions that unemployment in Michigan will "level off" at about 200,000 for the rest of the year.

I might point out, also, that the cost of living has gone up again, resulting in a penny an hour wage increase for those auto workers still on the job. This hardly is a windfall for those still working, but the cost-of-living rise makes things just that much tougher for the many thousands who are unemployed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a number of editorials and articles concerning the "right to suffer" remarks and Michigan unemployment be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Labor's Daily of May 25, 1956]

"RIGHT TO SUFFER" NO JOY TO KENNEL DOGS

WASHINGTON.—The Labor Department's action in declaring Detroit and Flint depressed areas apparently doesn't agree with the Republican attitude toward the plight of laid-off workers, declared Senator PATRICK V. MCNAMARA, Michigan, Democrat. MCNAMARA'S statement was provoked by Howard Pyle, special administrative assistant to President Eisenhower, who asserted this week:

"The right to suffer is one of the joys of a free economy, just as the right to prosper is. But Michigan will come out of it, just as the farmers are doing now."

Predicting that Senators from the farm States would be quick to challenge Pyle's comments that the farmers are "coming out" of their difficulties, MCNAMARA likened the remark to one made just 2 years ago by Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense and former president of General Motors, when he said that he liked "bird dogs" who went out and scrounged for their food rather than those who sat in the kennel and waited to be fed.

Pyle later issued an apology.

"Now it will be up to Mr. Wilson to see to it that our idle Michigan plants receive Government contracts," said MCNAMARA. He didn't think the 190,000 unemployed in Michigan are finding their situation joyful.

In Detroit, UAW President Walter Reuther said naming Detroit as a surplus labor area must be followed by determined efforts to have Government let contracts here. Having a city reclassified is of no practical importance unless it is followed up with a vigorous and determined effort to channel defense work into such areas, Reuther said.

"What we need in the current situation is fewer generalities from Washington and more specific and tangible action that will produce immediate results and provide job opportunities for the tens of thousands of people who have been laid off," he declared.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 25, 1956]

MR. PYLE'S FOOT

Howard Pyle, an administrative assistant to President Eisenhower, was twice elected Governor of Arizona after extensive campaign tours. Before that he was a radio broadcaster, specializing in news commentary and verse readings. So he is used to talking. He talked too much last Tuesday in Detroit, a city with an unemployment problem. He said that "the right to suffer is one of the joys of a free economy, just as the right to prosper is." Walter Reuther of the AFL–CIO didn't think the quip was very funny. Neither do we. The best that can be said for Mr. Pyle is that he was prompt to apologize for what he called an "offhand" and "informal" remark.

Needless to say, Mr. Pyle's statement doesn't reflect the beliefs of the administration. For all we know, it may not reflect his own, for even older than the right to suffer is the right to put your foot in your mouth. It might be pertinent to recall, however, that in 1950 Mr. Pyle told an interviewer that he could talk forever about the beautiful deserts and mountains of Arizona. For him, it might not be a bad idea.

[From the Baltimore Sun of May 25, 1956]

UNGRACEFUL MR. PYLE

People are connecting what Mr. Howard Pyle said about Detroit unemployment this week with what Secretary of Defense Wilson said 2 years ago. And there is a connection. Mr. Pyle, a White House assistant, said that the right to suffer was one of the joys of a free economy. Secretary Wilson said that he preferred bird dogs to kennel dogs, meaning he liked people who looked for new jobs more than he liked people who just sat home and complained. Mr. Pyle was just as ungraceful in his terminology as Mr. Wilson. But both had in mind a quite legitimate comment on the general subject of unemployment.

This was the point that in a dynamic and progressive society like ours it is good to have people looking for new jobs. Full employment is accepted by all as a goal, but the full-employment economists themselves never wanted absolutely 100-percent employment. Always they assumed there would be a steady, if narrow, margin of people shifting from job to job, either because they had lost their old job or were discontented with it. The general impression was that only with this steady search of new employment could working people get into the niches where they fitted best and so produced maximum economic efficiency.

This idea was worked into the very core of the original Federal-State unemployment-insurance programs. They eased unemployment, but also encouraged the unemployed to seek new jobs. Now a newer concept has come along, symbolized by the so-called guaranteed annual-wage plans. In these plans unemployment insurance is not a device encouraging the worker to find a new job, but a way of financing him in idleness until he can go back to the old job. People who support GAW, as it is called, like Mr. Walter Reuther, will be against references to the older idea that a jobless man ought to be encouraged to look for new work. Indeed, it was Mr. Reuther who led the protest against Mr. Wilson 2 years ago and who leads it against Mr. Pyle now.

[From the Washington Post of May 25, 1956]

CALL ON THE DOGS

A court of law might not find Presidential Assistant Howard Pyle guilty of treason for his unwitting remark in Detroit, but the Republican National Committee may. Mr. Pyle committed the unpardonable political error of sounding callous to the misfortune of his fellow citizens. It is easy to understand in context what Mr. Pyle meant when he said that "the right to suffer is one of the joys of a free society," and not even the Democrats can think that Mr. Pyle really endorses suffering as a joy. But the exchange of political brickbats in an election year takes place out of context, and Mr. Pyle has handed his opponents a handy slogan. His prompt and forthright apology hardly excuses his indiscretion, for as the former Republican Governor of Arizona and a leader of his party he should have known better. No doubt the Democrats will be happy to help banish Mr. Pyle to the doghouse—Secretary Wilson's bird-dog house, that is.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of May 25, 1956]

THE RIGHT TO SUFFER

For the second time, a high official of the Eisenhower administration has had to explain away and apologize for an unfortunate remark involving unemployed automobile workers in the Detroit area.

First it was Defense Secretary Wilson who, in October 1954, told a Detroit news conference that he preferred the bird dog to the kennel dog or, as he put it, "one who'll get out and hunt for food rather than sit on his fanny and yell."

That unhappy analogy has now been topped by Howard Pyle, an administrative assistant to President Eisenhower and former Governor of Arizona. With an ineptness bordering on genius, he told reporters in Detroit this week that "the right to suffer is one of the joys of a free economy, just as the right to prosper is."

Now Mr. Pyle is sorry. He has apologized to anyone who may have been offended by an offhand remark. We hope the unemployed automobile workers will accept this attempt to explain away an offhand remark.

It will be much harder, however, to explain away unemployment in the automobile industry. And that is what Mr. Pyle's remark points up. This situation cannot be dismissed as a slip of the tongue. Nor can it long be camouflaged by such high-flown economic phrases as "technical adjustment." The problem at issue is not a right either to suffer or to prosper but a condition with which responsible men should deal responsibly and humanely.

[From the New York Post]

FAMOUS LOST WORDS

Gather around, children, the journalism class is meeting. Once again our subject is the tenderness accorded the blunders and self-revelations of this Republican administration by a big section of the United States press.

The story began on Tuesday in Detroit when Presidential Aid Howard Pyle delivered his historic comment on the unemployment crisis in the auto industry: "The right to suffer is one of the joys of a free economy, just as the right to prosper is."

His words received moderate mention in the Detroit Times (a Hearst paper). Yet for nearly 24 hours his statement remained unreported out of Detroit. Then UAW President Walter Reuther dispatched a hot telegram to Ike, and in midafternoon Wednesday the press associations finally recognized something had happened.

By late afternoon it became apparent that the news might get around; and by the time Pyle got back to Washington Wednesday night, he was prepared to swallow his words. He did so in a formal communique, apologizing to "anyone who may have been offended." The hardships of unemployment, he had decided on second thought, "are not pleasant for any of us."

Now, by any rule in any book, it seemed like news to us when a deputy to the President proclaimed "the right to suffer" as one of the glories of our way of life. It seemed even bigger news when the GOP strategists so frantically persuaded him to change his mind.

But on the basis of the performance of most of the New York press, it looks as though there was no cause for administration concern. As of last night, 48 hours after Pyle first spoke and 24 hours after the news got out of Detroit, this was the coverage the episode had received in the local gazettes:

New York Daily News: Zero.

New York Daily Mirror: Zero.

New York Journal-American: Zero.

World-Telegram and Sun: A one-paragraph final-edition bulletin on page 1 Wednesday, suggesting great initial excitement that faded into a six-paragraph story on page 3 in Thursday's first edition, and less as the day wore on.

The Times and Herald Tribune: Dispatches of modestly respectable length, quietly interred on page 20 and page 11, respectively.

And that, kids, is another saga of a story that was almost suppressed before it was born and died in most places before it was 1 day old.

[From the New York Post]

PROTESTS MOUNT OVER WHITE HOUSE ASSISTANT'S RIGHT-TO-SUFFER CRACK

(By Robert G. Spivack)

WASHINGTON, May 25.—Adlai Stevenson today joined the mounting protest over Deputy Presidential Assistant Howard Pyle's observation that "the right to suffer is one of the joys of a free economy."

Stevenson, commenting on Pyle's discussion of the Detroit unemployment problem, said:

"Such an attitude, I suggest, denies completely the basic proposition upon which the future of this society and economy of ours depends.

"The proposition is that in growth, in full use of our resources, in the expansion of our economy is the full answer to the problems we face."

Representative TUMULTY, Democrat, of New Jersey, said of Pyle:

"He should be given the opportunity of enjoying his own philosophy. There is no greater suffering that I can think of than being separated from that conduit of joy, the public payroll."

Louis Hollander, president of the New York State CIO, said that "it's inadvertent, unprepared, off-the-cuff remarks like these that show what is in the hearts of the men who are running this administration."

Representative ROONEY, Democrat, of Brooklyn, called Pyle's comments "just another example of the facetious disregard of the administration for people who work by the sweat of their brow."

TUMULTY waxed eloquent on the subject of Pyle. "His speech was about as logical as my saying that starving is good for you as I wipe my mouth of whipped cream.

"The American people have once had the pleasure that Mr. Pyle suggests. They 'enjoyed' suffering under the last Republican administration. Somehow the average man has a twisted view when he goes through this 'joy' of suffering. Sometimes he changes doctors.

"Mr. Pyle ought to give a graphic illustration of the willingness of the 'team' to suffer and practice what he preaches. As for his 'apology,' I suppose he'll now send autographed pictures of Herbert Hoover to every man on relief. I'd have had more admiration for him if he had said, 'Well, I said it and I'm glad.'"

Pyle apologized Wednesday to anyone who may have been offended by what he called an offhand remark to a group of Detroit newspapermen.

[From the New York Post]

DETROIT, May 25.—Michigan's unemployment probably will average 200,000—one-twelfth of its labor force—for the remainder of the year, the Michigan Employment Security Commission said today.

Current jobless rolls stand at 220,000, with 128,000 of the total in the metropolitan Detroit area, which the Federal Government has declared a region of critical unemployment, along with Flint and Monroe.

Henry Ford II, president, told stockholders of the Ford Motor Co. at their first meeting yesterday that the automobile business is likely to get worse before it gets better this year.

Leonard Woodcock, vice president of the United Auto Workers in charge of the General Motors Division, estimated 90,000 GM workers now are idle and predicted the figure would go past 100,000 by the end of June.

TWO BRIGHT SPOTS

There were two bright economic spots, however.

All auto, aviation, and farm equipment workers, except those at Chrysler Corp., will get a 7-cent hourly wage increase June 1. Chrysler workers got a 6-cent boost April 1.

One cent of the increase is to compensate workers for the increased cost of living. A 6-cent hourly increase is provided annually to compensate workers for technological advancements that provide less costly and more efficient production.

The new 7 cents will raise to approximately $2.19 hourly the average pay of auto workers still on the job.

ARMY CONTRACTS

The Army's Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command said it planned to award more than $65 million in defense contracts in the Detroit area in the next month.

Ford told his stockholders that retail sales of automobiles will be down and profits substantially lower than last year, but he termed prospects for the future as particularly bright.

The State employment commission predicted Michigan's peak employment will come in late July or early August, periods in which auto makers are expected to begin recalling workers for 1957 model production.

[From the Detroit Free Press of May 24, 1956]

UNITED STATES PLANS DETROIT-FLINT JOB AID

(By Tom Nicholson)

Detroit and Flint were classified Wednesday by the United States Department of Labor as areas of serious unemployment.

The ruling means industries in the two areas will get preferential treatment in the placing of defense contracts.

Indications were, however, that the action would have no immediate effect on reducing unemployment—which totals 125,000 in Detroit and 190,000 in Michigan.

Observers said that it would take several months, at least, to arrange the placing of contracts and get into production.

The Labor Department estimated auto-industry unemployment at 159,000.

Additional layoffs this week at Pontiac, Fisher Body, and Chevrolet plants are expected to increase this total to 164,000.

OTHER DEVELOPMENTS

1. Mayor Cobo said he would discuss with Detroit industrialists ways to implement the Labor Department ruling.

2. Governor Williams said he would ask Walker L. Cisler, chairman of the State emergency industrial production commission, to devise a program for getting new contracts.

The Governor's full-employment committee will meet here Thursday.

3. UAW President Walter P. Reuther said the reclassification order "is of no practical importance unless it is followed up with a vigorous and determined effort to channel defense work into such areas."

"What we need in the current situation is less of generalities from Washington and more specific and tangible action," Reuther said.

4. White House Assistant Howard Pyle apologized for saying, in connection with Detroit unemployment, that "the right to suffer is one of the joys of a free economy."

He apologized after Reuther had severely criticized his remark. Reuther's criticism was wired to President Eisenhower.

Senator MCNAMARA, Democrat, of Michigan, also assailed Pyle's remark and likened it to Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson's "bird dog" story.

"I don't think our 190,000 unemployed workers are very happy about this 'right to suffer'," said MCNAMARA.

Pyle said of his remark:

"As for my offhand comment on the Detroit situation, which I made informally in the company of several press representatives, I apologize to anyone who may have been offended by it."

Pyle had said of the unemployment situation:

"The right to suffer is one of the joys of a free economy, just as the right to prosper is. But Michigan will come out of it, just as the farmers are doing now."

Pyle also reportedly termed Michigan's current unemployment as "seasonal and diminishing."

Said Reuther: "UAW members, who are laid off, find it difficult to smile at remarks terming the 'right to suffer' as a 'joy' regardless of how facetiously such a statement might have been meant."

He said that unemployment—far from being "seasonal and diminishing"—had increased from 60,000 in January to 125,000 now in the Detroit area.

"Laid-off workers in Michigan and elsewhere would be far more impressed by concrete action on the part of your administration to get them back to work than the sending of court jesters to tell them that suffering is really a joy," Reuther said.

The Labor Department also classified South Bend, Ind., and Kenosha, Wis., two other automobile towns, as serious unemployment areas.

Monroe, Marquette, Iron Mountain, and Escanaba have the same classifications.

Under the Government program, military buyers may set aside portions of large purchases if bidders in unemployment areas can meet requirements.

THE PRESIDENT'S ACTION IN SIGNING THE FARM BILL

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon, after I learned that the President had signed the farm bill, I wrote Secretary Benson as follows:

MAY 28, 1956.

Hon. EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Now that the President has signed the recently approved farm bill, I would urge that every effort be made to make the provisions of the soil bank applicable for 1956.

There are many areas in the Nation where crops have not been planted and there are also areas where, although the crops have been planted, they have not been harvested.

Many individual farmers and county Farm Bureau organizations have wired me urging that this action be taken in order that the farmers who can avail themselves of the soil bank for 1956 be privileged to do so.

The financial situation of some farmers in the great agricultural Midwest is such that I feel this action will not only be of benefit to the individual farmer, but will lay the groundwork for a greatly expanded soil-bank program next year.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK CARLSON.

Mr. President, this morning I have discussed this matter with the Secretary of Agriculture. I am pleased to note that the matter is being given every consideration at the present time.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1956

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed, and the Chair lays before the Senate the pending business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10660) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], inserting on page 49 of the committee amendment, after line 24, a provision relating to the prevailing wage.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to the amendment of the Committee on Public Works, on page 49, after line 24.

The time is now under the control of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the minority leader or acting minority leader.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, with respect to the pending bill the Senate Finance Committee has approved title II, to finance the highway program, without making provision for the increased cost occasioned by the Davis-Bacon amendment, if it should be adopted. If this amendment is adopted, it will be necessary to give further consideration to the question of obtaining increased revenue to pay the additional cost. By a conservative estimate adoption of the Davis-Bacon amendment will cost between $4 billion and $5 billion additional. Last year the Davis-Bacon amendment was deleted by the Senate from the highway bill then pending.

From a practical standpoint, it is an absurdity to say that a scale of wages can be applicable to the Interstate System and not apply to other road construction. The practical effect will be that the same scale of wages will have to be paid in all programs—Federal, State, and county—as many of these roads are side by side.

The amendment, if adopted, would bring about one of the greatest concentrations of power in Washington yet authorized, as the impact of this authority on the Federal Government would be felt in practically every line of business.

This is a field in which the States could act if they so desired, but it is not a function of the Federal Government. As a matter of fact, 30 States have prevailing wages law.

The widely publicized purpose of this highway bill is to build the greatest Interstate System of roads on the fastest schedule for safety, economic expansion, and defense.

The effect of this amendment would be to build less mileage at a slower rate, and at a higher cost.

It would upset wage rates and local economies from coast to coast.

It would increase the cost of all other road construction programs and reduce mileage.

It would disorganize practically every state highway department in the country as I shall show in a few moments by communications from State highway departments. State highway departments are generally conceded to be among the most efficient of all public agencies.

This amendment would concentrate in Washington bureaucracy without appeal the power to veto collective bargaining agreements and State prevailing wage laws. Let us understand that no appeal could be taken from the prevailing wages fixed by the Secretary of Labor. No matter how wrong they were, nothing could be done about it. The determination would not be reviewed by the courts.

Under the so-called Davis-Bacon amendment employees would be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on the same kind of work on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Federal Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act. However, the determination would be left exclusively and entirely to the Secretary of Labor.

The policy of this bill is to pay for the Interstate System by increased highway user taxes. Title I of the bill does not contemplate universal payment of Davis-Bacon rates, and title II does not raise revenue sufficient to build the system at Davis-Bacon rates.

The Bureau of Public Roads has reaffirmed this statement as late as yesterday.

If Davis-Bacon rates are fixed, they will mean either less roads or increased taxes.

The cost of the Interstate System as contemplated in the bill is based on labor rates being paid currently by the several States. On this basis it is officially estimated that labor costs will run to approximately 40 percent of the total cost. I am advised by Federal highway experts that universal application of Davis-Bacon rates would increase the cost of labor on this system alone by approximately 30 percent. This would mean an increase in the overall cost of the Interstate System of between 10 and 20 percent. The new taxes in title II would have to be raised to cover this deficit.

The rates fixed on the Interstate System necessarily have an impact on other road construction.

An example of how this Davis-Bacon Act works recently came under my personal observation. Employees hired for construction of a hospital in my relatively small city of Winchester had to be paid at rates prevailing in the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C., 75 miles away, although the prevailing rates in Winchester were much less than the prevailing rates in Washington. The rate was fixed arbitrarily by the Federal Secretary of Labor here in the midst of Federal bureaucracy at Washington in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act. Although protests were made the Secretary of Labor insisted upon these exorbitant rates, using the Washington scale of wages and not the scale of wages prevailing in the city of Winchester.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The point which the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia is making, as to how the proposed amendment would increase the cost of all roadwork in Virginia, was well illustrated to me last Monday, when I visited the site of the new Air Force Academy near Colorado Springs. The Congress authorized a total expenditure of $125 million for the Air Force Academy. The Government fixed prevailing wage for bricklayers, stone masons, plumbers, and electricians at $3.50 an hour, but there was such a shortage of labor in that area that the unions demanded and got $3.75 an hour, which means $30 a day for the normal 40-hour week; $45 a day for Saturdays; and $60 a day for Sundays. The Government requires all contractors who are falling behind in fulfilling their contracts to work both Saturdays and Sundays.

Mr. BYRD. I thank my colleague.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief comment?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is true that wages are high throughout the country. However, who would have them otherwise? I will ask the junior Senator from Virginia: How much would a man who makes $15 a week be able to spend at a country store in Virginia in comparison with a man who makes $45 a week?

Mr. ROBERTSON. With all due deference to the Senator, he is speaking about what a man makes a week, and I am speaking about what a man makes a day. How can anyone in private industry build a home or a business building with a labor cost of $45 a day or $60 a day?

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator from Virginia will look at the Federal Housing Administration operations, he will find that a great many homes are being built in Denver and in Colorado Springs, and even in my own State. If people cannot afford homes, how can they build them? It is necessary to have the money to pay for them. The purpose of the Davis-Bacon Act is to protect human beings and to help them maintain an American standard of living.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In the area referred to by the Senator I have seen hundreds of trailers being used as homes, because people cannot afford to build homes in view of the extremely high wages which must be paid. There is an acute shortage of homes in the Colorado Springs area, in the Denver area, and in the Pueblo area, and in all the industrial areas of Colorado where there has been a remarkable increase in population, indeed, probably the largest percentage increase in the whole country. There is an acute shortage of homes, and we are going to make it even more acute by setting a wage standard on Government projects which the home builder cannot meet.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief comment?

Mr. BYRD. For a brief comment; yes. I do not have very much time remaining. Perhaps I will be able to get some additional time.

Mr. McNAMARA. It has been indicated in this debate that the situation referred to is somehow connected with the Davis-Bacon Act. Contractors are paying the high wages referred to because of economic conditions, not because of the Davis-Bacon Act. They have their men work Saturdays and Sundays in order to attract people to the job. If the Davis-Bacon Act called for a wage of $1.50, the contractors in the area mentioned would still have to pay the high wages cited. I do not see how all that has any bearing on the question before the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have recently received communications from the highway commissions of 29 States. I believe the State highway commissions are the best judges of what the effect of the Davis-Bacon Act provisions would be.

From Alabama, H. L. Nelson, highway director:

> Policy followed by United States Labor Department in establishing labor rates for highway work under Davis-Bacon Act results in urban union rates being applied to large rural areas. * * * Will result in substantial increase in cost.

From Arkansas, Herbert Eldridge, director highway department:

If Federal Government usurps States rights and includes Bacon-Davis provisions in highway bill it is estimated that highway costs in Arkansas will be increased by 38 percent.

From Colorado, Mark U. Watrous, chief engineer, department of highways:

Full protection given labor under State statute and only possible effect Davis-Bacon Act would be delay and increased cost by application of arbitrary rules which would prevent local employment on projects outside of large urban areas.

From Delaware, R. A. Haber, chief engineer, highway department:

The Delaware State Highway Department has gone on record as opposing * * * the Davis-Bacon wage rate legislation.

From Florida, Wilbur E. Jones, chairman, State road board:

Estimates are that highway construction costs in Florida would be increased from 15 to 30 percent by Davis-Bacon provision. There would be additional administrative expense at Federal and State levels for enforcement. Such a provision would seriously disrupt local labor markets. It would cause a ridiculous situation with two wage scales being paid on road construction in the same community, etc.

From Georgia, W. A. Blasingame, chairman, State highway board:

Inclusion of Davis-Bacon provisions in the Federal Highway Act could increase cost of work to State of Georgia approximately 12 percent from calculated estimates. This could result in a program loss of approximately $44 million during the next 3 fiscal years and a further increasing loss thereafter. It would create an atmosphere of uncertain labor costs on all projects, regular Federal-aid, State aid, as well as interstate.

From Iowa, Russell F. Lundy, chairman, State highway commission:

Indications are that as far as we can determine Davis-Bacon will increase our construction costs approximately 20 percent.

From Kansas, F. E. Harwi, Jr., director of highways:

Estimate the probable effect of Davis-Bacon * * * in this State would be at least 10 percent increase in total costs of projects.

From Louisiana, Grady Carlisle, assistant to director, department of highways:

It appears labor costs would be increased from 15 to 25 percent if the Davis-Bacon requirements are met. * * * If we are required to meet the Davis-Bacon requirements it will be but a short time before this increase will spread to all highway construction in the State, as our larger contractors frequently are working on several projects simultaneously in order to efficiently utilize their equipment and men.

That confirms the opinion I have expressed, that application of the Davis-Bacon rates to the Interstate System would undoubtedly be followed by the application of those rates to other road work in the same areas.

From Maine, David H. Stevens, chairman, State highway commission:

There would appear to be a possibility that inclusion of the Davis-Bacon provision in the highway bill would increase highway costs in this State from 15 percent to 20 percent.

From Maryland, Russell H. McCain, chairman, State roads commission:

Maryland State Roads Commission feels wage scales should be left to the States rather than having same written into Federal act.

From Massachusetts, John A. Volpe, commissioner, Massachusetts Department of Public Works:

Our opposition to Davis-Bacon Act being included in any Federal highway bill is not concerned with costs, but we believe the labor matters should be left with the States. We have good labor laws, good means of administering them, and our relationship with labor has always been excellent. We feel that these conditions can be continued better under State administration rather than Federal.

From Missouri, Rex M. Whitton, chief engineer, Missouri State Highway Department:

Anticipate an increase in highway costs in Missouri under Davis-Bacon provision. Factual estimate of probable increase impossible; could be negligible or considerable, depending on administrative procedure. A realistic wage determination at the State level is highly desirable.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator from Virginia need additional time?

Mr. BYRD. I believe the Senator from New Mexico will yield to me some of his time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall be glad to yield 10 minutes of my time to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. From Montana, Scott P. Hart, State highway engineer:

We believe existing State laws give labor equal wage scale protection to that which Davis-Bacon would afford. Construction costs would therefore not be affected one way or the other. We prefer State sovereignty. However, in matters of this nature, would prefer to see enforcement handled by State rather than by Federal authorities with the bureaucratic confusion and attendant and unnecessary expense which the latter plan would involve.

From Nebraska, L. N. Ress, State engineer, department of roads and irrigation:

Construction costs on the Interstate System in Nebraska will be increased an estimated 10 to 15 percent by the application of the Davis-Bacon provisions. Wage rates will be increased from 15 percent in the common labor class to 60 percent in the skilled labor class. A delay in implementation of the interstate program is anticipated due to the necessity of wage rate determinations by the Secretary of Labor.

From New Mexico, Ira B. Miller, operations engineer, State highway department:

Davis-Bacon provision would increase highway costs in New Mexico 5 percent or more. Minimum-pay schedules would be raised in some areas. A varying minimum-pay schedule for each highway project would seriously hamper the cost-accounting system now in use by New Mexico contractors and would increase costs. Preparation of necessary documents to comply with Davis-Bacon provisions would result in unnecessary expenditure of funds by the highway department and would cause a time lag in contract letting.

From North Carolina, A. H. Graham, chairman, State highway commission:

Strongly oppose inclusion of Davis-Bacon section. Will cause increase in wages and materials. If added would make cost of road construction entirely out of line with our present economic wage scale and would prevent completion of contemplated job with funds appropriated.

From North Dakota, S. W. Thompson, State highway commissioner:

Cost of Federal construction in North Dakota under Davis-Bacon provision is 15 to 25 percent over labor costs on State construction. No labor trouble experienced under existing State laws. We urge elimination of Davis-Bacon provision in highway bill.

From New Hampshire, John O. Morton, commissioner, department of public works and highways:

Incorporation of Davis-Bacon provision in highway bill will seriously affect costs of all types of public construction in this State. Our local laws have proved to be fair and satisfactory. Federal funds will constitute about 20 percent of this State's highway program. Davis-Bacon provision would permit Federal wage rates to spread to the remaining 80 percent of the highway program plus all types of other public improvements.

From Ohio, S. O. Linzell, director, department of highways:

Federal supervision of prevailing-wage laws on highway contracts probably would result in additional delays in putting work under contract and superimpose additional administrative control, duplicating work that is already done by State administrative agencies.

From Oklahoma, C. A. Stoldt, director, department of highways:

A recent check indicates that labor costs on highway construction would be increased a minimum of 25 percent if this section is included in the bill. Predetermining wages by the Department of Labor could not be applied solely to contracts on the Interstate System, but if required there, would have to be applied to all other highway contracts let.

From South Carolina, C. R. McMillan, chief highway commissioner:

Passage of Davis-Bacon Act would be detrimental to highway progress in South Carolina. Because of encroachment of States' traditional rights and of increase in construction and administrative costs, strongly urge wage determination by responsibility of each State.

From South Dakota, Charles J. Dalthorp, director, department of highways:

Officials of South Dakota estimate that the Bacon-Davis provision in highway contracts will increase cost by 30 percent.

From Texas, D. C. Greer, State highway engineer:

Application of Davis-Bacon law in setting the wage rates for use on highway construction will no doubt result in higher labor costs. It is not possible to give a very close estimate of the amount of increases; however, we believe the initial increase would be about 15 percent and would continue to increase to approximately 30 percent. * * * Based on annual construction expenditure in Texas * * * it appears that application of the Davis-Bacon law would cause an increase in cost of at least $14.4 million per year, and within a short time the additional cost would probably climb to $28 million per year.

From Utah, E. G. Johnson, chief engineer, State road commission:

Davis-Bacon Act in highway bill would increase the highway cost in the State of Utah.

From Vermont, William Poeter, commissioner of highways:

Davis-Bacon provision will double our present road-construction costs. Total construction costs would increase 22 percent, meaning Vermont will be able to build 18 percent less roads per dollar of expenditures on construction.

From Virginia, J. A. Anderson, commissioner, department of highways:

Davis-Bacon amendment may increase labor cost from 20 to 25 percent resulting in overall increase in construction cost of approximately 10 percent or $9 million if expanded highway program is passed.

From West Virginia, Burl A. Sawyers, State road commissioner:

There is no way to determine the effect of Davis-Bacon on highway costs in West Virginia as we cannot assume action of Secretary of Labor. However, we believe it would increase cost of highway construction in this State between 10 and 20 percent.

From Wyoming, J. R. Bromley, superintendent, Wyoming Highway Department:

Davis-Bacon Act will increase cost and provide less miles of highway. It will provide the probability of delays in contracting, and tend to restrict small contractors and use of local labor. Administration of labor regulations should be left to the State.

Mr. President, these communications have come from 29 States. Officials in 12 States said the Davis-Bacon Act would have no effect in their States.

The estimates of cost submitted in connection with the program proposed in this bill do not contemplate wages at Davis-Bacon rates. Those who are to carry out the program estimate application of Davis-Bacon will increase costs in this program all the way up to 38 percent in one State. It is generally indicated costs will be increased from 10 to 20 percent in most States. If this amendment is adopted, the revenue provided in title II will be far from sufficient to finance the program.

The State highway officials have indicated further that its application to this program will increase the cost in other programs. Under these circumstances, there are two alternatives:

First. Curtail all highway programs; and

Second. Increase both Federal and State highway-user taxes up and down the line again.

I submit that any benefits which may be achieved do not justify either alternative. Therefore, the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia if he has a statement with reference to Kansas.

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. CARLSON. Would the Senator mind reading it?

Mr. BYRD. It is from F. E. Harwi, Jr., director of highways, reading as follows:

Estimate the probable effect of Davis-Bacon * * * in this State would be at least 10 percent increase in total cost of projects.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Virginia will yield further, I wish to say that we have in Kansas a very fine, outstanding highway department, and I was interested to have their views on this particular amendment and the cost to the State.

Personally, I would oppose any legislation which would in any way reduce labor standards and wages in my State. On the other hand, I would definitely object to legislation which would permit some regional labor office setting the wage standards. I shall do everything in my power to protect the prevailing wages in my State. We have good wages and good labor conditions.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Virginia 1 additional minute on the bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, while I am very much opposed to Federal control of local wage scales, I would agree to legislation under which the States would establish wage scales on road construction.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator intend to offer an amendment, if the pending amendment is defeated?

Mr. BYRD. I understand such an amendment will be offered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. WOFFORD].

Mr. WOFFORD. Mr. President, I shall like to make a few observations regarding the Davis-Bacon provision and its sought-for application to the Federal highways bill.

First of all, I feel that we should redefine the term which has been commonly used with reference to the Davis-Bacon Act. Under this act the Secretary of Labor is charged with the duty of determining the prevailing wage in a community for the purpose of a Federal project or a federally assisted project. The Secretary has wide discretion in making such a determination. He is not limited to any definite area around the community in arriving at his decision. He may survey far and wide if he so desires.

The result of this latitude of discretion has been that the Secretary has, in too many instances, arrived at determinations of unprevailing wage scales instead of prevailing rates. My impression is that the Secretary has been remarkably unsuccessful in learning the actual prevailing scales of wages paid in the communities of this Nation.

In many cases the unions representing workmen have complained that the scales have been set lower for the community in which the work was being done than rates for other projects. On the other hand, there have been numerous cases in which contractors charged the Secretary with fixing unrealistically high scales of wages for certain communities.

The passage of the highway bill with the Davis-Bacon provision certainly would greatly increase the load of work of the Department of Labor. The Secretary would have to make many thousands more wage-scale determinations each year than he now has to make. The number of complaints now being heard about Davis-Bacon determinations would increase with the number of projects considered.

No bureaucrat in Washington can be expected to be able to determine accurately what the prevailing scale of wages is at some distant point in the country. Despite all the statistics he might assemble, he could not be familiar with the details of what to him might be small problems in small communities.

But what might be small problems to the Secretary of Labor might well be of sufficient importance in a small community to disrupt the entire economic balance of the community.

No one man should have the power to fix what he says is a fair wage—a power from which there is no appeal.

In this country we believe in the right of the individual and the right of a union representing individuals to negotiate agreements with employers without unnecessary governmental influence. I cannot believe that many workmen would accept employment on a highway-construction project unless they were paid the actual prevailing wage for the type work being performed.

Because of the many complex problems in connection with wage-scale surveys throughout the country, I cannot believe that a bureaucrat in Washington can find out more about the wages prevailing in South Carolina, or any other State, than the workmen, the contractors, and the State highway department officials.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Carolina 5 minutes on the bill.

Mr. WOFFORD. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WOFFORD. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I take this opportunity to express my pleasure in serving with the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina, and to say that in the comparatively brief period in which he has served in the Senate he has impressed his colleagues with his diligence, his ability, and his sincerity.

Mr. WOFFORD. I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WOFFORD. Recently I received a copy of a letter from a contractor engaged on a Federal project in South Carolina. This contractor was writing to the Solicitor of the Labor Department. The contractor refused to sign a statement saying that the wages set by the Labor Department for his project represented the prevailing wages in the community.

He suggested to the Labor Department that it "determine the prevailing wages by confirmations from local businesses from whom such rates should be secured and not from the false rates as set by your Department."

Back in 1951, when the H-bomb plant was constructed in South Carolina, I recall the furor which ensued over the determination of wage scales by the Secretary of Labor. Senators can visualize the confusion which grew out of the original determinations of wages at rates being paid in Atlanta, a metropolis 300 miles away, instead of at rates being paid in the several large cities much nearer the project.

More recently, I am informed that wage scales established for Federal projects in my State vary from the actual prevailing rates by as much as from 5 to 37 percent.

Not only would additional chaos be created in the United States Department of Labor by applying the Davis-Bacon provision to the highways bill; the provision would also disrupt non-Federal highway construction in the States. It is not difficult to realize the problems which State highway administrators would face if they were forced to apply one wage scale to Federal projects and another scale to State projects nearby.

A loss of from two to four billion dollars' worth of highways by virtue of increased costs is estimated if the Davis-Bacon provision is applied to the bill. I do not believe the taxpayers of this country want Congress to enact a provision which would deprive them of badly needed miles of highways. Neither do I believe the American taxpayers want Congress to approve the expenditure of more funds than are necessary to secure the best highways possible, whatever the reason.

If we approve the Davis-Bacon amendment to the highways bill, then we ought to rename the act. We ought to call it a guide on how to gouge the taxpayers.

Almost a half century has passed since the first Federal aid bill for highways was passed by Congress. In that period the State highway administrators have done outstanding work on carrying forward the Federal highways program within the limits of their funds. No reason has been given why Congress should take away from them the authority to conduct the construction program when they will have more money to build more roads.

The application of the Davis-Bacon Act to the highway construction program would mean that every dollar collected in taxes for this purpose would immediately be worth less than its already shrunken value. We would be applying the principle of soak the taxpayers so that more could be spent to build fewer roads per dollar. I am opposed to any such principle.

What we ought to be trying to do is to build as many good highways as possible for every dollar collected from the taxpayers.

The American taxpayers are tired of being robbed. They want to have some of the water squeezed out of Federal programs. If we use common sense, sound economy, and good government, we will apply democracy instead of bureaucracy to the proposed legislation. We will throw out the Davis-Bacon provision instead of throwing up our hands and yielding to pressure for its enactment.

The attempts of the proponents of the Davis-Bacon provision to impose such Federal controls on the highway program is another illustration of the fact that control goes with the purse strings. It is further proof that we who are wary of Federal-aid-to-education bills, and other similar schemes, have good reason for our fears.

Congress should have no concern with special interests.

I hope the Senate will consider the public interest and reject the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. WOFFORD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield me 2 additional minutes?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Carolina 2 additional minutes on the bill.

Mr. WOFFORD. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

We have no obligation to the unions and none to the contractors. Our obligation is to the public—to make certain that every mile of road possible is built for every dollar spent under the program. The millions of highway users have a greater stake in the use of their tax dollars than either the workmen or the contractors who construct the highways. Both of the latter are already protected by laws passed by Congress and tested in the courts.

The only protection the taxpaying public has regarding the construction of this vast network of highways is the protection which will be provided by the passage of a sound bill—a bill free of costly plums.

Let me recapitulate briefly some of the reasons why the Davis-Bacon Act should not be applied to the bill:

First. The economy of local communities, particularly rural communities, should not be disrupted.

Second. Federal redtape should not be allowed to delay and confuse the construction program.

Third. Free bargaining should be permitted between labor and management under the laws already regulating such activities.

Fourth. Each State's right to carry out the best program possible should not be interfered with by Federal purse-string control.

Fifth. Highway construction costs should be kept as reasonable as possible instead of being inflated by artificial wage-scale fixing.

Sixth. The public interest is a greater interest than any other.

I cannot disregard the factors I have cited here. I shall vote against the amendment, and I hope the Senate will reject it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Public Works, I support the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], to include the Davis-Bacon prevailing-wage provision to the highway bill now under consideration.

I think we should consider the amendment temporarily and in view of the fact that, after all, the Davis-Bacon Act now applies to all contracts for direct Federal construction, as well as to contracts for schools, hospitals, housing, airports, and other facilities constructed with Federal-aid funds. Certainly it would not be logical for the Senate to fail to include the Davis-Bacon provision in a bill providing for the construction of an interstate road system for which the Federal Government will pay a full 90 percent.

Let me call to the attention of the Senate the fact that under the Federal Airport Act, the normal Federal contribution varies only from 50 to 62 percent. Yet the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage provisions apply to the Airport Construction Act.

Under the Hill-Burton Federal Act, providing funds for hospitals, an act which aided them so generously and which was of such value in the construction of hospitals throughout the Nation, the Federal share usually runs between 33 and 66 percent. Yet I do not think there has been a great deal of controversy over applying the prevailing wage standards to the Hospital Act.

So far as the School Construction Act is concerned, under which compliance with the Davis-Bacon provision is required, the Federal contribution varies, but hardly ever reaches 90 percent, and often is below 50 percent.

To those particular Federal acts, in connection with which the amount contributed by the Federal Government is far less than 90 percent—and 90 percent is the amount the Federal Government will contribute to the interstate road system—the Davis-Bacon Act applies. Therefore, it seems to me logical that it also should apply to the interstate road system.

I have heard with interest some very able speeches, in which it has been asserted that if the Davis-Bacon provision were added to the road bill, it would result in adding to the cost of the roads. Conversely, it might just as logically be argued that if the men working on the roads were paid only 10 cents an hour, it would result in a lower cost and that more roads could be built.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think some of us who oppose the application of the Davis-Bacon Act to the road program do not oppose it because of the principle of the prevailing wage, but because we believe the Secretary of Labor is not an impartial agent for determining what is the prevailing wage. If a system could be adopted whereby the Federal Government and the State could participate in the decision as to what is the prevailing wage, it would satisfy some of those who have no opposition to the principle of the prevailing wage, but who believe that the Secretary of Labor is partisan and

has no real interest in knowing what the prevailing wage is in any particular community.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I may say to the Senator from Arkansas that perhaps the experience in his State has been different from that in my State; but in my State there has been no major controversy over the rulings of the Secretary of Labor with respect to prevailing wages on facilities constructed with Federal aid. Furthermore, the States are going to pay very little toward the cost of the interstate road system. The Federal Government will pay 90 percent of the cost of the Interstate System, under the bill now before the Senate—even as much as 95 percent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is a very superficial distinction, because the States ultimately will pay all the costs of both programs. But in answer to the first part of the Senator's statement, I should like to point out exactly what happened in the construction of the Bull Shoals Dam. The Secretary used, as the basis for determining the prevailing wage, the rate paid in a city 100 miles away, which was very unrealistic, because the dam was built in an undeveloped area, and the conditions there were very different from those which prevailed in the city which he used as the basic area for determining what was the prevailing wage.

The point I wish to make is that I have no objection to the principle of prevailing wage. I think it is a proper one. I am for it. But I do object to using an agent who is really and admittedly partisan in this matter. The Secretary of labor no longer intends to take an impartial view of labor matters. He represents labor, which is all right; but I do not wish to give him the judicial function of determining a fact which it is beyond his personal knowledge and interest to know. The prevailing wage would be fixed under a system which would result in an erroneous finding.

I should like to suggest that in that decision someone representing the State could participate along with the Secretary in determining the facts. I would be agreeable to such a program.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In answer to the Senator from Arkansas, I wish to say that the Committee on Public Works considered all the factors which he has mentioned. We have a little faith in the Secretary of Labor in the Eisenhower administration. We think he will be able to make a fair decision. If he cannot make such a decision, he should not be there.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes on the bill to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I want to make it clear that I am not applying my remarks to the present Secretary of Labor's position. There is nothing personal in what I am saying. Former Secretary Tobin was a fine man, but I had many conferences with him. I think he really made no great pretense of taking an impartial view. He was for labor. He not only was for labor, but he was for Boston labor. He did everything he could to protect Boston labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. To me, it was not a question of defending the present Secretary of Labor. I was trying to say that, whether the Secretary of Labor be Tobin, Perkins, or anyone else, there should be a certain amount of faith by the American people that the Secretary of Labor will take into consideration the rights of labor. That is all the Davis-Bacon Act, in my opinion, does.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to call this to the attention of the Senator from Arkansas. Although I do not have the exact dates before me, it is my understanding that the Davis-Bacon principle has been a part of the law of the land since about 1931, just before President Hoover left office. The principle has been applied to airports, schools, housing, hospitals, and other facilities constructed with the aid of Federal funds. If the Davis-Bacon provision has not worked out well, or if it should be changed, why have not its opponents brought in proposals to amend it so as to have another so-called impartial authority make wage determinations? It seems to me it is a very poor time to bring that question up when we merely wish to extend to the construction of roads the same principle which presently applies to the construction of hospitals, schools, airports——

Mr. CHAVEZ. And libraries.

Mr. NEUBERGER. And other facilities constructed with Federal funds. Furthermore, the Federal Government, as now provided in the bill, will pay a far greater percentage of Federal funds for the construction of roads than it contributes toward construction of other installations over which the Davis-Bacon rule prevails. If the Davis-Bacon rule has failed to work out right, why have not its critics brought in suggestions for changing its operation over the last 25 years?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is not the first instance in which principles have been ignored or in which no one has bothered to pay particular attention until a measure which is very large or which has a great impact on a particular community is brought up for consideration. As the Senator knows, this is an enormous program. It is far greater than was the library program or any other he has mentioned. For instance, the library program had no impact on my own State, or any other State, and no one really became excited about it. The program before the Senate is so large that it will mean a great deal. I am referring to the administration of it, and it strikes me as a matter of great importance. This being a joint program, I see no reason why we should seek to exclude State participation in a matter peculiarly within the knowledge of the local people. That is the prevailing wage in that locality, not the prevailing wage in Boston or New York or the District of Columbia. The prevailing wage in other places is not the question. The question is what is the prevailing wage in the locality.

I do not see why the Senator from Oregon objects to the participation of State authorities in that connection.

Mr. NEUBERGER. If the Senator from Arkansas believes the State should participate in the determination of the wages paid under the Davis-Bacon Act, then the thing for the Senator from Arkansas to do is to bring in, following this discussion, a general amendment to the Davis-Bacon Act, and let it be considered by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare or some other appropriate committee.

But inasmuch as the Davis-Bacon Act applies to other Federal facilities or other facilities which are constructed with the aid of Federal funds, I believe it should apply to the road system. It seems to me this a very inopportune time to suggest a general change in the Davis-Bacon Act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not suggesting it; the Senator from Oregon suggested it. I am suggesting it only in the case of this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield 2 additional minutes to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Oregon 2 additional minutes on the bill.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 additional minutes on the bill.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in conclusion, I repeat that the arguments made earlier today on the floor, namely, that the application of the Davis-Bacon Act may require further funds in connection with the construction of these highways, could be used against the payment of prevailing wages in connection with the construction of any Federal facility. It even could be used in reverse to suggest that we return to the coolie wages paid to humble immigrants brought from abroad to construct our transcontinental railroads—workers who were paid virtually nothing, and who hardly got enough to eat. On the basis of that argument, we could virtually pave the entire country with roads, if we starve the laborers building them.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the recommendations of the Senate Committee on Public Works should be supported.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt, under the heading "Labor Standards," from the House committee's report on the pending bill, and also an excerpt from my own individual views which accompany the report of the Senate Committee on Public Works on the pending bill, suggesting inclusion of these provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From H. Rept. No. 2022 of April 21, 1956]

LABOR STANDARDS

A provision has been inserted in H. R. 10660 to require the Secretary of Commerce, with respect to the initial construction work performed on highway projects on the Interstate System authorized under section 108, to take such action as may be necessary to insure payment of wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act.

Since by far the greatest part of the Interstate System, provided for in section 108, will be financed by Federal funds, the committee feels that labor standards normally applicable to Federal construction should also apply to this great arterial system. Such action only has the effect of substantially preserving and affirming rather than extending the long-standing policies of the Congress in matters of Federal expenditure and procurement. Accordingly section 112 of the bill provides for the adoption and acceptance of the prevailing wage principle under the terms and provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act as one of the conditions governing financing and construction of the Interstate System.

The Davis-Bacon Act now applies to all direct Federal construction as well as to contracts for school, hospital, housing, and airport projects constructed with Federal-aid funds. Federal prevailing wage requirements apply presently to highway construction where the Government is the contracting party. A majority of the committee feels that where the Federal Government absorbs 90 percent of the cost, as it does under the provisions of this bill with regard to the Interstate System, Federal prevailing wage requirements should also apply. A difference of 10 percent should not distinguish the situation. This is especially true in light of the fact that the Federal contribution is much less percentagewise on the other federally assisted programs where Federal prevailing wage requirements apply. In extending the application of this act to highway construction work on the Interstate System, the committee did so with the understanding that all determinations made by the Secretary of Labor will be based on the prevailing wage rates on the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality, it being recognized that the prevailing rate of wages in rural areas will generally be less than those in large metropolitan areas. The provisions of section 112 do not apply to projects authorized to be constructed under section 102 of this act. Other Federal standards, such as regulation of the hours of work (relating to working more than 8 hours a day and the payment of overtime for such daily overtime when the total hours worked in any week do not exceed 40) are not specifically made applicable to this construction and no such standards are specified concerning other construction under the bill. A majority of the committee recognizes the applicability of existing regulations because the construction contemplated by the bill is so directly and vitally related to the functioning of an instrumentality or facility of interstate commerce as to be, in practical effect, a part of it, rather than isolated local activity.

In discharging his responsibilities, the Secretary of Labor will have, with respect to the labor standard specified in the bill, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan No. 14 of 1950, section 2 of the act of June 13, 1934, as amended, section 625, Public Law 725, 79th Congress, 2d session, and section 205, Public Law 815, 81st Congress, 2d session.

[From S. Rept. No. 1965 of May 10, 1956]

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATOR RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

The Senate amendment should contain the same provisions to protect wage standards on federally financed road projects, modeled on the Davis-Bacon Act, as are contained in the House bill. If the Government can safeguard wage structures and standards of living of men engaged in erecting hospitals and airports with Federal-aid funds, it is no less important and equitable that these safeguards be used to protect the men who build the Nation's major trunk highways.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Mexico to the committee amendment.

The amendment of the Senator from New Mexico provides for the inclusion of a requirement that the prevailing wage be paid in connection with construction work performed on highway projects in the Interstate System, as authorized by the pending bill. In other words, the amendment provides for inclusion of the so-called Davis-Bacon Act provision.

Of course the Davis-Bacon Act provision appears in the House version of the bill.

Before inserting section 112—the Davis-Bacon Act provision—in its version of the bill, the House Committee on Public Works heard at length from both the proponents and the opponents of such a provision. A majority of that committee came to the conclusion that the inclusion of such a requirement was wise, justified, and equitable in the interests of preventing workers employed on this program from being exploited. This is what the majority of the House committee said, in part:

Since by far the greatest part of the Interstate System * * * will be financed by Federal funds, the committee feels that labor standards normally applicable to Federal construction should also apply to this great arterial system. Such action only has the effect of substantially reserving and affirming rather than extending the long-standing policies of the Congress in matters of Federal expenditure and procurement. * * * The Davis-Bacon Act now applies to all direct Federal construction as well as to contracts for school, hospital, housing, and airport projects constructed with Federal-aid funds. Federal prevailing-wage requirements apply presently to highway construction where the Government is the contracting party. A majority of the committee feels that where the Federal Government absorbs 90 percent of the cost, as it does under the provisions of this bill with regard to the Interstate System, Federal prevailing wage requirements should also apply. A difference of 10 percent should not distinguish the situation. This is especially true in light of the fact that the Federal contribution is much less percentagewise on the other federally assisted programs where federally prevailing wage requirements apply.

Mr. President, under both versions of this highway bill, it is proposed to spend in the course of the next several years many billions of dollars. The impact upon the highway construction industry of the expenditure of these huge sums of money will be tremendous. We must make certain that the impact upon the wages paid to the workers on these projects is not disastrous. We can do that by incorporating in this bill the prevailing wage formula of the Davis-Bacon Act.

As the House report pointed out, we are not attempting or proposing anything new when we incorporate such a provision in a Federal-State grant-in-aid program.

Consider, for example, the hospital survey and construction act, the so-called Hill-Burton Act. That, too, is a Federal grant-in-aid program. The Hill-Burton Act, which operates much as the pending act does, contains a prevailing wage proviso tied to the Davis-Bacon Act.

Mr. President, for the RECORD I wish to read the list of Federal-assistance programs for which the enabling act includes the Davis-Bacon Act provision:

First. The Federal Airport Act.

Second. The School Survey and Construction Act of 1950.

Third. The Hospital Survey and Construction Act.

Fourth. The slum clearance and urban renewal program in the Housing Act of 1954.

Fifth. The National Housing Act.

Sixth. Multi-family rental housing under the FHA.

Seventh. Defense housing.

Eighth. The Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951.

Ninth. The Lease-Purchase Contracts Act of 1954.

Mr. President, we shall not be setting any precedent by including a Davis-Bacon provision in this bill. Indeed, if we do not adopt such a proviso, we shall be going against precedent, inasmuch as the Davis-Bacon Act was enacted in 1931, 25 years ago, and applies to all the programs to which I have referred, in connection with which the Federal Government assists the States in carrying on the work. If we do not include the Davis-Bacon Act provision in the pending bill, we shall be risking the welfare of thousands and thousands of construction workers, who could be employed on this program at depressed wages, 90 percent of which represents Federal dollars.

Mr. President, a Davis-Bacon proviso is an absolute "must" in this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield additional time to me?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes on the bill to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, for upwards of half a century I have followed wage, labor, and social projects. From my experience not only in the Senate, but also as Governor

of my State, I can testify that every time we have tried to put into the law a provision costing some money to help or to protect the workers we have been met with the argument that the provision would ruin the country and would ruin those who would be affected.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a brief observation?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. For the moment let us forget the effect of this provision on human beings—which is the important point—and consider the effect of the provision from a business standpoint. In terms of the purchase of groceries and the purchase of other commodities, what can a man earning $15 a week buy, as compared with the purchases which can be made by a man who earns $45 a week? Is not that a valid point in connection with this matter?

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly the Senator from New Mexico is entirely right. He will recall that when the first minimum-wage law was proposed in the Congress, there was an outcry on the part of employers all over the country; it was said that the enactment of such a measure would ruin the merchants and manufacturers and dealers. But, far from doing that, the enactment of that measure has helped them and has helped the economy of the country tremendously, because it has increased the purchasing power of the workers, in addition to sustaining their standard of living.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time yielded to the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], a member of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, for the life of me I do not see why any Member of the Senate should oppose the pending amendment. The theory of the prevailing wage is not new in America. This is no new-fangled idea which has been dreamed up in the past day, week, month, or year.

More than 25 years ago the Congress of the United States and the President agreed that, so far as Federal construction of buildings was concerned, the wages paid on such construction should be the prevailing wages in the area where the public construction was undertaken.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. My time is limited.

Mr. LANGER. That was during the administration of President Hoover.

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes.

That area was defined in the Davis-Bacon law of 1931 as the village, town, city, or other political subdivision of the State where the Federal construction was to be undertaken.

This law does not require more wages to be paid than the prevailing wages in the area. It merely provides that, as a minimum, the prevailing wages in the area shall be paid to those working on a public project.

There was a very good reason why this law was placed on the statute books in 1931. I alluded to it yesterday. The late Representative Bacon, of New York, made a speech in which he said that in his congressional district the Federal Government was intent upon building a veterans' hospital, and a contractor from another part of the United States, who was able to pay wages far less than those paid in the area of New York represented by Representative Bacon, underbid the local contractor, imported labor into New York. Thus there was a deleterious effect upon the economy of that particular area, and upon the people of the congressional district represented by Mr. Bacon. The Davis-Bacon Act prevents a reoccurrence of this in Federal construction.

We are dealing with a $25 billion Federal construction program for an Interstate Highway System. The House of Representatives, in passing a bill to provide for Federal construction of that system, inserted the provision that the wages paid in the construction of such system should be the prevailing wages in each area where the Interstate System was to be constructed.

I do not believe anyone can quarrel with that kind of theory. Indeed, if we should fail to approve the pending amendment today in the Senate, the Senate would be saying to the Nation, "We are going to permit the expenditure of $25 billion of Federal money in the construction of an Interstate Highway System, and we do not care what effect the expenditure of that money may have on the economy of people who work for a living in the construction business." I do not believe that Members of the Senate wish to go on record in favor of such a policy. At any rate, I hope they do not.

The criticism has been made that in certain specific instances the Secretary of Labor has misapplied or misinterpreted the Davis-Bacon Act. That may or may not be true.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, may I have 1 minute more?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am sure the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] will allow 1 minute additional on the bill.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute additional to the Senator from California on the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

The fact is that this is the legislative branch. We do not administer the law. We write the law. No word of protest has yet been uttered against the theory of laying down the rule that prevailing wages should be paid to those who are employed in construction underwritten by the Government of the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was not raising that question. The determination of what is the prevailing wage has been very troublesome under the Walsh-Healey Act. Congress adopted an amendment granting the right of appeal from the decision of the Secretary. The reason it did so was the question which I have raised. The Secretary has not always shown an impartial attitude. I doubt if he ever will. That is the only point I raise. There is no objection to the principle of the prevailing wage. Does the Senator object to the participation by State officials in the determination of what is, in fact, the prevailing wage?

Mr. KUCHEL. If the Secretary of Labor wished to receive the assistance of State officials in making his own Federal determination as to what constitutes the prevailing wage in a given area, I should not object; but I do want the law to provide that a Federal official, the Secretary of Labor, shall have that responsibility with respect to the $25 billion expenditure for the Interstate System. To that extent, he would have the same responsibility he has under the law today with respect to the Federal construction of buildings.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from California have gone to the heart of the issue. This highway program is to be at least 90 percent federally financed. To all intents and purposes, it is therefore virtually entirely financed by the Federal Government. To say that the States, which are to pay only 10 percent of the cost, are to determine what the wages shall be is, I think, letting the tail wag the dog.

There are a few misconceptions which should be cleared up. One of our colleagues says that the Secretary of Labor would fix the wage. The Secretary of Labor merely finds what the prevailing wage is. He cannot arbitrarily fix wages. He merely determines what the prevailing wages are. Furthermore, under the terms of the Chavez amendment, the wage must be "the prevailing wage for the same type of work, on similar construction in the immediate locality." This is not like the provision in the Walsh-Healey Act, under which it is possible to impose a regional or national minimum. The wage under the pending amendment must therefore be the wage in the immediate locality. According to the Davis-Bacon Act, as revised in 1935, a copy of which I have before me, it must be the wage "in the city, town, village, or other political subdivision of the State." So it is the local prevailing wage, and not a regional or national wage scale.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would there be any appeal from the decision of the Secretary of Labor if he were to make an arbitrary decision? Would the State or any individual have the right to appeal from his decision?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The original finding would be made by an examiner, and an

appeal might be taken from the decision of the examiner to the Secretary of Labor, who would make the final determination.

As I understand, the Bureau of Public Roads has made the complaint that 14 erroneous rulings were made. I am informed that in the 7 years covered by this complaint, the Department of Labor made findings in approximately 100,000 cases, and therefore made only 1 error out of approximately every 7,000 cases, or in approximately one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the cases. Those cases were appealed, and in 7 of the cases the original finding was reversed.

So there is an administrative procedure by which initial errors may be corrected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has not answered my question. Is there any appeal from the determination of the Secretary of Labor as to what is the prevailing wage?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think there should not be a final appeal outside of the administrative agency.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then the answer is that there is no appeal.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is a provision for an appeal within the Department of Labor. However, there is not a divided responsibility between the Department and other agencies. In my judgment, there should not be.

This provision does not impose the prevailing wage in the building trades on construction work. The Chavez amendment provides it shall be the prevailing wage on similar construction. Therefore, the building scales will not be transferred to the construction of highways. It will mean that only the highway scales will be applied to the construction of highways. That is extremely important.

I do not believe we will have any great trouble so far as the rates of skilled labor are concerned. Such labor is in scarce supply. The men who operate the bulldozers and the scraping machines and the road-laying machines will be in such scarce supply that they will be able to get a decent wage. The trouble will come with the unskilled labor or the semiskilled labor. In that category there is a great danger that the large contractors will hire men from across the border in Mexico or hire labor from low-wage areas and take them into regions which pay a higher wage scale for common labor, and thus undermine the wage scale and the standard of living of workers in those communities. That is why the people of the country need the protection of the Chavez amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. GORE. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

This proposed highway program provides for the expenditure of billions of dollars of Federal money. It seems to me that no hardship would be worked on any locality or on any State by providing that the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act shall apply to the road construction work under the bill.

Although it is possible that the application of the act might make the construction of roads more expensive, yet, I do not believe that the Federal Government should be in the position of forcing wages in an area down below the wages prevailing in that area on similar projects.

Therefore, in view of the expenditure of such a huge amount of public money, which will affect business and labor in all parts of the country, I believe that it is definitely in the public interest that the Federal Government establish the policy in this bill, as it has in so many other bills since the passage of the Davis-Bacon Act, that those who work on these projects shall be paid the wages which are prevailing in the respective areas.

It seems to me that it is in the interest of every community and of every State and definitely in the public interest. Therefore, I hope the Senate will accept the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have a number of friends in the road-contracting business who do not agree with me on this subject. I certainly respect their position, and I know they respect mine. My analysis of the subject is made purely from a practical standpoint. We are talking about building roads, which require a contractor to bid in advance or to calculate his cost in advance, and to submit his bid under sealed conditions. In that situation someone must predetermine the wage rate. Someone must predetermine the labor cost of a project. The contractor has to do it. If every contractor uses different figures, a bad situation results.

The amendment calls for the prevailing wage rates. As a practical matter, that is exactly what each contractor will use in filing his bids. He will file his bid based upon the prevailing wage rates, and he must ascertain those rates. It is the same as the condition which prevails under the Walsh-Healey Act with respect to manufacturing something for the Federal Government. The Federal Government does have manufactured for it billions and billions of dollars worth of goods. A contractor must comply with the Walsh-Healey Act.

We are talking about spending $24 billion of Federal money, and the amendment would require contractors to comply with Davis-Bacon Act provisions by making them pay the prevailing wage rate in a community.

I do not understand how that provision will hurt any contractors or increase the cost of the roads. I do not understand how that will happen if the Secretary of Labor uses the prevailing wage in a community.

How else can a contractor bid on a job except by using the prevailing wage rates in a community? He is not going to be foolish enough to bid on the job by using a lower rate than the prevailing wage rate. He will not be foolish enough to bid on a job by figuring on paying higher wages than the prevailing wage rates. If he does, he will lose the contract to one of his competitors. If he pays less than the prevailing wage, he may not be able to complete his contract, and may possibly lose money. I do not understand how anyone can be hurt by applying the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act to this road program. I do not believe it will increase the cost of building the roads.

As a matter of principle, perhaps something could be said. That is something else, Mr. President. A question may be raised as to whether the Federal Government should be doing this sort of thing. However, unfortunately, that decision was made, not by this Congress, but by the Congress in 1932. That is when the Davis-Bacon Act was passed. That is when the decision was made. We are already confronted with the situation so far as the Walsh-Healey Act is concerned in the construction of buildings.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator for yielding. Suppose we forget all about the Davis-Bacon Act and suppose we forget all about the Walsh-Healey Act. Suppose we consider only the building of roads. The only authority we have for giving any money to Arizona or to Indiana or to New Mexico or to any other State is contained in a very short provision in the Constitution of the United States to the effect that Congress shall have power to build post roads. That is our only authority for spending the billions of dollars we are asked to spend.

Whether it is good policy to pay the prevailing wage, as I think it is, is one thing; but whether we will build the roads is another thing completely. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe we ought to provide the means whereby anyone can take an appeal from a decision of the Secretary of Labor, in the event the Secretary sets other than the prevailing wage rate in a community. I certainly agree that that ought to be done.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the point I was going to ask the Senator about. I believe an appeal process should be provided so that an appeal may be had from an arbitrary ruling of the Secretary of Labor. If that were done, it would go a long way toward making the amendment acceptable in this kind of legislation.

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe an appeal ought to be provided.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That kind of provision was added to the Walsh-Healey Act.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I hope the sponsors of the amendment will accept an

amendment to provide for a judicial appeal from the determination by the Secretary of Labor of the prevailing wage.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree with the able Senator, because I believe a citizen ought to have the right of appeal to the Government on any matter, including this one.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Under the Fulbright amendment to the Walsh-Healey Act, as a result of a decision in 1952, the question was in the courts for more than 3 years, with various decisions, all the way up to the Supreme Court being rendered. Matters were more or less in escrow during that time. Whether such a situation would be bad or not, I doubt that it could operate successfully in the case of a contractor doing some work on a highway and then moving on.

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe the right of appeal should apply to both labor and to a contractor. If labor believes it is not getting the prevailing wage, it should have the right to appeal.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is chairman of the Finance Committee, has quoted many of the State highway commissioners in order to show that the inclusion of the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act would merely mean an increase in the cost of labor to the extent of 25 or 30 percent or possibly even more. Is not that a clear indication that those communities are not paying the prevailing rate of wages?

Mr. CAPEHART. If the Senator is asking me that question, my answer is that 99.9 percent of the contractors are paying the prevailing wages.

Mr. LEHMAN. Then, how can the Senator account for the tremendously high figures which the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee has quoted?

Mr. CAPEHART. I did not hear those figures, so I do not care to make any comment at all on that question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from "Boston" called attention to the number of appeals under the Walsh-Healey Act. I think there was a misapplication of the law. The arbitrary rulings of the Secretary of Labor did bring forth considerable complaint and attack upon the reasonableness of his rulings. There is no question that if the Davis-Bacon provision is applied to the bill it will affect the highway department in every State, and, under this bill, which involves such a large program, a contractor cannot pay 1 rate on 1 job and a different rate on another job. There should be some provision for appeal to the judicial authorities in order to avoid arbitrary rulings. Under the existing law, if the Secretary of Labor determines that the wage should be $5, there is no way to challenge his ruling.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think there should be provision for an appeal for both labor and the contractor. If the wages are too low, labor should have a right to appeal, and if the wages are too high, the contractor should have a right to appeal.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I object to an arbitrary determination of what is the prevailing wage.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree with the distinguished Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Arkansas inadvertently referred to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] as the Senator from Boston. I am sure he did not intend to do so. We are representatives of States and not of the localities in which we live. I should be very proud to live in the city of Boston, but I am even more proud to come from the city of Chicago. I think the Senator from Arkansas graces not only his own State but the country as a whole, and I think the Senator from Massachusetts does the same. I shall not refer to the Senator from Arkansas as the Senator from Fayetteville, and I hope that hereafter the Senator from Arkansas will also refer to his colleagues in the correct manner. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico a couple of questions.

I notice in his amendment that it is left to the Secretary of Commerce to "take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on the initial construction work performed on highway projects on the Interstate System authorized under section 102 of this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the act of August 30, 1935, known as the Davis-Bacon Act."

This amendment does not mean that labor will receive the same wages throughout the United States, does it?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It leaves the determination to the individual locality in the individual State.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator has tied it down to a little more than cities. The amendment refers to "similar construction." That means roadbuilding, does it not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In other words, the contractor will pay the prevailing wages paid in any particular State in the locality where the road is being constructed?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The determination of wages would be in the locality where the road is to be built. It would be a local matter, purely and simply. With reference to a road 30 miles in length, constructed from one city to another, the prevailing wages in the area will prevail.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is being left to the Secretary of Commerce to take the action, under the amendment. Would it not be possible for the Secretary of Commerce, in cases where there was a disagreement as to wages paid in a particular locality, to sit down with the Secretary of Labor and iron out the differences?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the reason for the provision is that there had to be some responsibility in the Federal Government. The committee felt that the responsibility should be with the Secretary of Labor, who handles labor standards, minimum wages, and everything pertaining to labor. We have to place the responsibility somewhere.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Under the Senator's amendment, with reference to "similar construction," which is highway construction, is it not true that the Secretary of Labor will take up with the highway commission and also with the county commissioners the question involved in a particular locality, and ascertain what are the prevailing wages?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The same procedure is followed as in the case of the allotment of a highway in any State. It is taken up with the State highway commission. As to urban roads, it is taken up with municipalities, in my State or in any other State, and in connection with counties it will be taken up with the county commissioners.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. To ascertain what wages are being paid at the present time?

Mr. CHAVEZ. How can the Secretary of Labor say what is the prevailing wage in a country town in Montana, for instance?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, would the Senator from New Mexico accept an amendment providing for appeals?

Mr. CHAVEZ. We are engaged in building roads. I do not want to tie up a road bill with an appeal by some lawyer in any State in the Union. I do not think I would accept such an amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the Senator from Arkansas was successful in getting a similar amendment incorporated into the Walsh-Healey Act, and the result was that his amendment tied up action for 3 or 4 years, and that the present proposal would also result in delaying the road program?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Please believe me, America is road conscious. Americans want roads. Every little country town, every motel owner, every hotel owner, every traveler—and the American people are tourists at heart—is asking for roads.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would the Senator accept an amendment providing for a board of arbitration, one side represented by the Secretary of Labor and the other by the State highway department, in a State where a grievance might arise?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to have Congress represented. I would not want to leave it all to the States, or to the administration in Washington, but I should like to have Congress included.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have been listening to the debate with great interest. I should be dishonest if I did not say that there are many serious questions in my mind as to the advisability of acting favorably upon this amendment. I feel that we are treading on very dangerous ground.

The argument has been advanced that because Federal funds are involved in the bill, therefore there should be Federal control. We speak glibly about Federal funds and the highways being paid for 90 percent by Federal funds, but who provides those funds? They come from the States and the citizens of the States; they do not come from any other source.

When the suggestion is made that the Davis-Bacon Act be adopted for the roadbuilding program, that is saying, in effect, that we are going back to the taxpayers for more than $25 billion.

I want to advance the argument a little further. While I realize that it has not been an argument advanced chiefly by the proponents, nevertheless it follows that if the Federal Government becomes involved in the control of wages in the construction of the Interstate Highway System, it will not be long before the Federal Government will be in control of wages at all levels. That is the first question which enters my mind, and it poses a most serious danger to me. How long will it be until the philosophy prevails in the Federal Government that the Federal Government under one man—not a tribunal, not a quasi-judicial body, but one man—can dictate to the country the wages which shall prevail.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is my friend acquainted with the fact that it was Herbert Hoover who signed the Davis-Bacon Act 25 years ago?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I may say to the junior Senator from California that I do not care who signed it. I think it would be a dangerous precedent to include it in the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Does my friend object to the payment of prevailing wages in the field of construction in areas where Federal construction is contemplated?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Oh, Mr. President, my friend from California knows me well enough to understand that I am not against prevailing wages; I am against having the Federal Government come into the picture and decide what the wages shall be at any location. The Senator knows that.

Mr. KUCHEL. If the Senator from Arizona favors prevailing wages, then he ought to be in favor of the amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator from California had read more closely the hearings in the House——

Mr. KUCHEL. I participated in those hearings.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is the Senator from California a Member of the House?

Mr. KUCHEL. I participated in the Senate hearings.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I know the Senator from California is a remarkable man, but to be a Senator and a Representative at the same time is a very difficult task, even for a Californian.

Mr. KUCHEL. The highways of Arizona unquestionably are paid for in part from tax moneys which the people of California contribute, and I am glad they do. But, to answer the Senator's question, I did read the entire hearings in the House of Representatives.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Then the Senator will recognize that the prevaling wages already apply in 30 States. In 25 States there are union contracts. The problem of applying the prevailing wages will not be so difficult, if we would only leave the matter in the hands of the State highway commissions.

Mr. KUCHEL. If 30 States apply the prevailing-wage standard, what is the objection to writing the provision into the Federal law?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from California knows me well, so undoubtedly he knows that I believe in an old southern concept that has apparently been abandoned by the Democratic Party. That concept is States' rights.

I hope the Senator from California will now let me continue, because I have only 5 minutes, and I want to go into some other questions.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania and Mr. LEHMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have never been so popular. I do not know to whom to yield first. I yield first to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Does not the Senator from Arizona feel that if the Davis-Bacon provision were included in the bill it would probably be only 2 years until it would be necessary for Congress to raise taxes in order to construct the highways under the Federal program?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I definitely believe that. I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I might also mention one fact which I neglected to mention to my good friend from California, namely, that this is the first attempt which has been made to apply the Davis-Bacon Act to State agencies. That is the root of my objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have only a few minutes. I shall be happy to yield further if the distinguished minority leader will yield me additional time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield the Senator from Arizona 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Is it not entirely impractical to say that the prevailing wage shall be applied to an interstate highway contract, but to have some other wage rate applied to another road contract in an adjacent community?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think the Senator from Pennsylvania is correct in that approach.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I will yield for a short question.

Mr. LEHMAN. If the Senator from Arizona is accurate in his statement that the Government is already applying the prevailing wage provision, how does he account for the figures given by the chairman of the Committee on Finance, which indicate that the application of the Davis-Bacon provision would increase the cost of labor in the various States by 25, 30, or 40 percent, and in some cases even more than that?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I shall be glad to read in the RECORD tomorrow the statement of the Senator from Virginia; and after I have come to some conclusion from a reading of the statement, I shall be glad to talk to the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, some other questions have come to my mind in connection with the debate. Is it fair for a contractor to be forced, without recourse, to change the wage rates after he has bid to get a job? This road program will not be accomplished in 12, 24, or 36 months. Suppose a contract were let to a contractor whose bid, made in good faith, included the existing wage rates. Then suppose the Secretary of Labor, under pressure—because the pressure will be there—says that the prevailing wage rates, which are higher, shall apply. What will then happen? More money will be appropriated for the road program, without its having been contemplated in the original instance.

Another question: Should Congress delegate to an administrative agency great authority over the people without the usual protection of the courts? That subject was argued on the floor this

morning, and it has been argued before. I maintain that ours is not a government of men; it is a government of law. The dangerous tendency in this country since 1932 has been toward a government of men, not a government of law. So I look on the proposal with great fear in my heart, because if such authority can be delegated to an administrative agency, it will not be long before other authority will be delegated, authority which the American people cherish. The American people look to the law and not to men for redress.

The question has come to my mind, since this is a labor matter, Why did not the amendment come before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare? Why was a labor matter considered by the Committee on Public Works?

Then there is an important question with which my good friend from California [Mr. KUCHEL] might be concerned, namely, Why has Congress in the past 40 years of highway programs not had wage fixing?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may answer his question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KUCHEL. Let the RECORD be perfectly clear. Never before in history has Congress had before it a bill to provide that the Federal Government would undertake the construction of a given part of the highway system of America. Up to this time the Federal Government has apportioned moneys to the States for that purpose. Now Congress is asked to provide for a 90 percent minimum and a 95 percent maximum of the cost of constructing the Interstate Highway System in America. That is the reason why, for the first time, Senators on the floor, not in committee, are urging that the prevailing wage standards be included in the bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am sorry to learn that my good friend from California has been lulled by the prospect of Federal money. The Federal Government is not going to build the road system. The individual State highway commissions are going to build it; 90 percent of the money which the Senator talks about will come from the pockets of the taxpayers who live in the States; they do not live in the District of Columbia.

Mr. KUCHEL. If a State expects to use 90 or 95 percent of Federal money, it should comply with the standards set by the Federal Government.

Mr. GOLDWATER. There is the word "comply" again.

Mr. KUCHEL. A State will do it with my vote. I want the State to comply with the prevailing wage law.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I understand that the junior Senator from California believes explicitly in the amendment. I know there is nothing I can say which will argue him out of his position. So possibly I am wasting my time.

Mr. KUCHEL. No, because it is always a pleasure to listen to the junior Senator from Arizona, although sometimes he too has a capacity for confusion.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I believe the junior Senator from California has my capacity for confusion mixed up with my muleheadedness when it comes to a question of individual and States' rights, higher taxes, and loss of individual control in this country.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am going to yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I do not think anyone is advocating that the bill or any provision proposed to it is a wage-cutting proposal. I do not think the issue is whether or not this amendment, if adopted, is really going to raise wages. Certainly we do not want to cut wages. But there are two questions which ought to be settled.

First, if wages are going to be determined, are they going to be determined with some certainty, so that a contractor will know what he is bidding on when he bids?

The second question is whether or not the determination will be made by a person who is best equipped or by an agency which is best equipped to determine the prevailing wage for highway work in a given locality.

I was hoping the distinguished chairman of the committee, who is the author of the amendment, would be on the floor, because I wanted to ask him if he would agree to adding to his amendment the following sentence:

> Such prevailing wages shall be predetermined and shall be set out in each project advertisement for bids and each proposal form and shall also be made a part of the contract covering such project.

The reason why I think that kind of a provision ought to be in whatever language is adopted is that, unless there is a predetermination of the wages, and the contractor knows in advance, when he gets ready to bid he either bids too high, in order to protect himself against a wage rate that he does not know about, or he bids too low, and then gets into trouble if he gets the contract.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I shall yield in a moment.

I recently had occasion to see two illustrations of the working of the Davis-Bacon wage determination. In one instance a contractor on a reclamation project bid on a dam, and he underbid the other bidders by more than 25 percent. Now the contractor is in trouble, is about to go broke, and faces severe penalties because he is not able to complete the job on time, because he did not allow enough for the wage which the Secretary of Labor determined should be paid on the job.

In another case the contractor got the job, and he is now refusing to pay the wage demanded because of a difference of opinion as to the classification of a certain type of work, that of truck driver. The labor people in that area are up in arms because he is refusing to pay. He is standing on some sort of determination or definition made somewhere else.

I say a contractor is entitled to know in advance what wage rate he is going to pay.

My second point is that I think the determination should be made by the agency which is best fitted to determine the going wage on highway work in a given locality.

Mr. President, I am hopeful we shall not have to choose between no determination of wages and a determination of wages. I think if there could be before the Senate an opportunity to have a predetermined wage rate settled by the agency best fitted to determine the going wage rate in a given locality, we could get somewhere.

I had understood that an amendment would be offered whereby the determination would be made by the proper State agency, and in advance. The State agency is the one which lets contracts for secondary, primary, and urban roads. It is the agency which is best fitted to know what the going wage rate is in a given locality. The amendment which I would vote for would be one which would provide that the State highway agency should make the determination, and make it in advance, and announce it when the bids were advertised. Then a contractor would know what rates he would have to pay, and all contractors would bid on an equal basis.

Mr. President, I understand the chairman of the committee is engaged in a telephone conversation. When he returns to the Chamber, I shall ask him whether he will consider adding to his amendment the language which I have suggested.

I wonder if I might now have the attention of the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I have 1 more minute?

Mr. GORE. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wonder what the Senator from New Mexico would think about adding the following language to his amendment:

> Such prevailing wages shall be predetermined and shall be set out in each project advertisement for bids and each proposal form and shall also be made a part of the contract covering such project.

I am told determinations at the present time are made for 90 days at a time. Any contractor working on a road project which will run for a long time cannot know what he will be up against if a new wage determination is made after 3 months.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to agree with the Senator from South Dakota, but, from my own personal experience in my home State, not only with contractors, but with the highway commission—and we build a lot of roads in my home State——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would say the language suggested would be surplusage, so far as the amendment is concerned. I reluctantly disagree with my good friend. I cannot take his suggestion.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator certainly feels that a contractor should know what the wage rates are going to be, does he not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. He knows what they are. That is why he bids.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But he does not know what determination will be made in Washington 3 months after the contract starts. I was talking this morning with officials in downtown Washington, and I was told that wage determinations are good for 90 days. How can a contractor bid if a wage rate is changed after 90 days?

Mr. CHAVEZ. He certainly does.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. He takes a chance.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator from South Dakota will examine the record and the history of contractors in road bidding in South Dakota, he will learn that there is never a shortage of bidders.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I may say that sometimes we are short of bidders. A short time ago in my State a contract was turned down because only two bidders tried to get a contract, and it was felt it was not a representative bid.

There are two contractors I know of operating under the Davis-Bacon Act, one of whom is going broke and facing penalties because he did not allow enough for labor costs. Another is in trouble with the labor unions because he is not paying what they think should be paid.

It seems to me there should be advance determination by the agency which best knows what the going wage rate is in contract work.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If a contractor does not realize that he must take into consideration the wages he will pay his men, how much cement is going to cost him; how much gravel is going to cost him; how much tractors are going to cost him; how much bulldozers are going to cost him, he does not deserve the bid.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in conclusion, I should like to say that, of course, the contractor tries to find out, but he cannot know because he does not know what the officials in Washington are going to determine what is the prevailing wage 90 days or 120 days or 180 days later.

I hope Senators will have an opportunity to vote for some specific language which provides for predetermination of the wage rates and for determination by the agency which best knows what the prevailing or going rate is on road work in the locality where the job is to be prosecuted.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, with the general idea of having the locality make the determination, I agree with the Senator; but I think that in a Federal project there should be some Federal responsibility finally to conclude the determination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes on the bill. I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico which proposes to apply the Davis-Bacon Act to this highway bill. There are a number of facts which I think the Senate should keep in mind.

First. The contracts will be awarded by the States and the States will have primary responsibility with respect to proper performance of the work.

Second. Further Federal encroachment upon State functions is undesirable. The constitutional authority of the State to deal with matters within its own borders should be respected.

Third. The States are fully capable of making accurate wage determinations. State agencies are more familiar with wage and employment conditions within the State than a Federal agency in Washington, far removed from the scene.

Fourth. It cannot be argued that the State agencies would determine wage rates lower than those actually prevailing. Insistence upon Federal wage determinations implies a lack of confidence in the integrity of the responsible State agencies.

Fifth. A frequent source of complaint in the past has been that wage determinations by the Federal Government tend to follow the wage structures in the metropolitan areas and to extend these metropolitan wage rates into nonurban and rural areas.

Sixth. In many instances work will be simultaneously performed in the same locality on construction of interstate highways and also upon State primary, secondary, and urban highways and streets. Federal wage deteriminations for the interstate construction would necessarily affect labor costs on the other types of road construction.

Seventh. If the Davis-Bacon Act is made applicable to the Interstate System now, it will ultimately be made applicable to the entire Federal-aid highway system.

Eighth. Wage determination decisions under the Davis-Bacon Act are not subject to any review, as has been ably pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]; thus, there is no check upon the authority of the administrative agency making the determinations. In direct contrast, State agencies making wage determinations would be responsible to the highest State officials and, in most instances, to the State courts.

Ninth. Inclusion of the Davis-Bacon Act in the highway bill would also result in placing enforcement functions in the Federal Government as provided under Reorganization Plan No. 14, 1950 (5 U. S. C., sec. 133z–15). This would mean that the Federal Department of Labor would have authority to conduct compliance inspections on work under State contracts, make nonreviewable findings, and issue orders requiring State agencies to cancel contracts, withhold contractor's payments, and apply other types of sanctions.

Tenth. Federal wage determinations involve delays, redtape, and complications which would impede the progress of the interstate highway program.

Eleventh. When the interstate highway construction program reaches full stride, upward of 10,000 contracts will be awarded each year. The making of Davis-Bacon wage determinations for all these contracts would involve a very substantial expense to the Federal Government, since a large administrative staff would be necessary to make these determinations and to maintain inspections for compliance with the determined rates.

Twelfth. The Hoover Commission, after an exhaustive and impartial study, recommended that the Federal wage determination provision in a comparable statute, the Federal Airport Act, should be changed to allow State governors or their designees to make the prevailing wage determination in order "to improve the operation of the Federal-aid program and to eliminate certain sources of discord in intergovernmental relationships."

Thirteenth. In planning the Interstate Highway System each State had submitted its estimate of the cost of constructing its portion of the system. These estimates were based upon labor costs prevailing within the State. The inclusion of a provision for Federal wage determination could throw these estimates out of line and require substantial upward revision.

Fourteenth. Virtually all State highway officials—as outlined earlier today by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]—are opposed to inclusion of a Federal-wage-determination provision in this bill.

Mr. President, I have sent to the desk an amendment which I ask to have read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 49, in line 25, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 117. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors on the initial construction work performed on highway projects on the Interstate System authorized under section 102 of this act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on the same type of work in the immediate locality. Such prevailing wages shall be predetermined by the State highway department or other proper State agency, and shall be set out in each project advertisement for bids and each bid proposal form, and shall also be made a part of the contract covering each project.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I desire to call this amendment to the attention of both the acting majority

leader and the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California is recognized for 5 more minutes on the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has his own amendment pending, and at the desk, as an amendment to the committee amendment, my amendment would be an amendment in the third degree. So the only parliamentary opening I have for submitting my amendment would be to obtain unanimous consent to have my amendment included as a part of the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico—with the result that the prevailing wage in the locality would be required by the authorities, as I have outlined.

Mr. President, I hope what I have proposed can be done.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Senator from California knows that no Member of the Senate respects him more that I do. However, it appears that we have more faith in the Secretary of Labor and in the administration than does the Senator from California.

So, Mr. President, I shall have to object.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it is not a question of my having faith in any one individual. I believe in a government of laws, not a government of men. I believe that the principle of States' rights is important. I believe that if we once open the door in this way, the Senate and the country will live to regret having taken such action.

There is room for an honest difference of opinion. I greatly respect the Senator from New Mexico.

Since I have been denied unanimous consent to have my amendment included as a part of the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, I will say to him that the only parliamentary alternative which ultimately will be available to me, under the rules of the Senate, will be to move that his amendment be tabled, so that I may offer an amendment putting in the hands of the State authorities, rather than concentrating in Washington, the power to determine the prevailing rates. I do not intend to make that motion now, because it would foreclose debate. I understand that the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] wishes to speak on the bill.

However, I felt that in fairness—as I have tried to deal with not only the Senator from New Mexico, but also all other Members of the Senate—I wished to point out in advance that my amendment is subject to a point or order, in that it would be an amendment in the third degree.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from California has been read. Even before I object to having his amendment taken up, I would have no objection whatsoever to having the Senator from California discuss the amendment, if he wishes to do so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have discussed it briefly before, and at the proper time I shall discuss it again.

If the Senator from Florida would like to have 5 minutes, I can yield to him 5 minutes on the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the distinguished minority leader, but I prefer to have a little more time.

Therefore, I now move that the bill be recommitted, in order that I may have somewhat more time to discuss the bill as I see it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in the first place, let us remember that the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] does not follow out the wishes of the Senate Committee on Public Works, but, instead it constitutes a change in the bill from the form in which it was reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works.

I think my friend, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, may have overlooked that fact, in the statement he made, a few minutes ago, to the effect that the members of the Senate Committee on Public Works had greater confidence in the Secretary of Labor than other Senators seemed to have. The fact is that last year the committee so ably headed by the senior Senator from New Mexico included this amendment as a part of the bill it reported; but last year the distinguished Senator from New Mexico himself, along with other Senators, moved to strike out that provision of the bill. I think the committee showed greater wisdom this year, in that it eliminated this provision, or at least reported the bill without including this provision.

The pending amendment of the Senator from New Mexico seeks to include in the bill reported by the committee a provision which the committee itself did not see fit to include in it. So we are being asked to override an able committee of the Senate, by means of adoption of the pending amendment. We are also being asked to override the philosophy relative to the Federal-aid road program which has prevailed ever since the time when that program was created, so usefully, so many years ago.

At that time the control with respect to important questions of policy under the Federal-aid road program was left in the States, and in the State highway departments. At the time of the enactment of the Davis-Bacon Act that fact was recognized by the noninclusion in that act of any provision which would have made it applicable to any part of the Federal-aid road system.

Senators who have insisted—and I have heard several do so mistakenly on the floor today—that we are trying to change the Davis-Bacon Act are exactly wrong in that statement, because the Davis-Bacon Act, from its beginning, has been addressed solely to projects which are completely constructed by the Federal Government, and projects of certain kinds. The Federal-aid road program has always been unaffected by it, and it is now unaffected by it. The pending amendment seeks not only to depart from the judgment and considered expression of the Committee on Public Works, but also seeks to engraft a very important change upon the Davis-Bacon Act and a very important change upon the Federal-aid road program, both of which, since their respective beginnings, have failed to apply any such philosophy to the construction of projects under the Federal-aid system as would give an officer sitting in Washington, sometimes thousands of miles away, the control and regimentation which would result if this amendment were adopted.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield only for a question. My time is limited.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder if the Senator from Florida would include in the category which he has mentioned, of purely Federal functions, operations under the Hill-Burton Act.

Mr. HOLLAND. The point I am making is that, with reference to the Federal aid road program, which I think is the finest example of Federal-State cooperation we have, consistently, from the very beginning, those who supported the Davis-Bacon Act in its inception, and all the way through, have, by their inaction in this field—and sometimes by their action, as was illustrated last year on the floor of the Senate—declined to apply the philosophy of Federal regimentation and control to any part of the Federal aid road program.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield. First, however, let me say that the Senator from New York interjected the question of hospitals, which represents an entirely different kind of project. They fall in an entirely different category. The act under which that function is carried out has to do with the construction of relatively small projects in various communities. It does not deal with States as a whole, in connection with important State programs. It is an entirely different field. The Senator from Florida has supported the Davis-Bacon Act as applied to the construction of courthouses, customs houses, and other projects of the type to which it applies. But here it is sought to depart from the time-honored policy of cooperation between the Federal Government and the States in the important Federal-aid road program, and to engraft a change upon the Davis-Bacon Act which was not contemplated in the beginning and has never been made since. Such changes would mark very great departures from the acts concerned. So those who are insisting that we follow the Davis-Bacon Act are failing to see the facts. The Davis-Bacon Act was never extended to this field. It was purposely kept away from this field. As recently as last year the Senate, by a considerable majority, kept the Davis-Bacon Act from applying to this field.

The Federal-aid road program has been a program of cooperation between the Federal Government and the States, in which State responsibility and power

of decision have been recognized from the beginning. It is now proposed, instead of even giving the Federal agency which handles the program the right to make important decisions, to bring in a still different Federal agency, the Department of Labor, whose functioning in the field of wage determinations has been anything but acceptable to many communities and industries throughout the Nation. It is proposed for the first time to make the Davis-Bacon Act applicable to the Federal-aid road program.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not know whether the Senator was present in the Chamber when I gave a list of some of the federally assisted programs to which the Davis-Bacon Act applies. There were nine programs in the list which I gave. There may be others. At least there were nine in the list I gave, including various activities with respect to which the Federal Government has less financial interest, and pays less of the cost, while the States pay more.

Mr. HOLLAND. Undoubtedly the Senator from New York listed those programs correctly; but he cannot escape the conclusion—because it is true—that the Davis-Bacon Act, from its original enactment, and at every moment since that time, by the actions of its friends and supporters, has been kept away from any application to the Federal-aid road program. Now it is proposed to do violence both to the philosophy of the Davis-Bacon Act and to the Federal-aid road program. It is proposed, at one fell swoop, to undo two fine programs by the method suggested in the amendment.

So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, his position on this point is the same as it was last year. He notes with some concern that some of his distinguished associates seem to have changed their minds.

One of the troubles in connection with proposals of this kind—and this observation applied also to the farm bill—is that frequently consideration of them is postponed until the eve of an election when Senators are subjected to pressure. Sometimes expressions on the eve of a presidential election differ from the deliberate, considered judgment of other years. Pressure has been exerted upon every Senator in this case. Pressure is still being exerted upon every Senator, but I sincerely hope it will not result in any change in the philosophy of the Senate of the United States as expressed in these two fields during all the time of the existence of the Davis-Bacon Act and of the Federal-aid Highway Act.

Last year in the Senate Public Works Committee report there was a very fine statement by the minority in their views on the then pending bill. That statement so clearly covers the entire question that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. I shall not read it into the RECORD, because I have already commented on some of its contents.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Davis-Bacon Act was enacted by Congress during the early stages of the depression of the 1930's. At that time very few, if any, of the States had minimum-wage laws on their statute books, nor had the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act been passed. Today, two-thirds of the States have minimum-wage laws or are operating under general labor-management areawide wage rate agreements covering highway construction. Indications are that about one-half of the States have minimum-wage laws based on prevailing rates being paid in the locality of the work. Labor classifications in those States follow in most cases the general pattern set in union-employer agreements, and in some areas are parallel to those used in the administration of the Davis-Bacon Act.

The Davis-Bacon Act is now applicable to highway work performed under direct Federal contract. It requires, prior to the advertising for bids, that minimum-wage rates be determined for all laborers and mechanics employed on the project. These minimum rates are based on prevailing rates in the area. The boundaries of the area and the methods for determining prevailing rates are determined by the Secretary of Labor. There is no appeal from his decision.

The regulations further require that copies of all payrolls be received and checked by the Bureau of Public Roads for compliance with labor standards, including rates of wages paid, overtime, and classification or reclassification of employees of the contractor or subcontractor, conformable to the labor classes set forth in the Labor Secretary's decision of minimum wage rates to be paid on the project. It has been estimated that some 4,000 contracts would be involved annually under section 17. This would require the checking of upward of 10 million payroll items for compliance with labor standards provisions. In addition, there would be involved investigations and hearings on wages or other labor disputes growing out of the performance of the contract, and surveys of wage levels.

One only has to glance at the above procedures and figures to understand the vastly increased burden of Federal administrative work involved. Whenever this amount of paperwork becomes involved, delays are bound to occur. Accordingly, the enactment of this section would result in serious delays to the completion of the Interstate System. The procedure indicates the centralized control and vast power which this section would place in the Secretary of Labor.

Those who use the analogy of other Federal legislation, such as the building of a housing project, or an airport, or a hospital, do not take into account the magnitude of the construction work contemplated. Nor do they take into account the fact that roads stretch throughout all parts of the land and affect all communities small and large. It is so vast that other precedents are not appropriate.

The employment of labor is generally recognized as a local matter, affected many times by conditions that do not apply universally. Rates in rural areas frequently are less than those in cities because of living costs and reduced hazards involved in the performance of the work. For example, a laborer on a rural project would be subject to less hazard than one in a downtown locality. A contractor having a large building or housing contract would pay his laborers the same rates whether working on the building itself or on a street or alley to serve a new development. When such a rate is extended to all highway work in the area, both rural and urban, then the highway rate would be entirely unrealistic and the fixing of such an arbitrary level might have a serious disruptive effect on highway construction.

Such conditions are intensified where it becomes necessary to fix prevailing levels of wage rates based on scattered information received in Washington, often thousands of miles away from the area in question. Such information may not only represent the highest rates in the area but may actually be paid under competitive economic or other conditions of special application only.

It should be noted, finally, that the fact that S. 1048 purports to limit this Federal control to the Interstate System is illusory. It will gradually spread vast Federal controls to all Federal-aid highways, including farm-to-market roads. Its effect will also spread to purely local road construction and maintenance in every city, town, village, and hamlet throughout the Nation.

Since these highways will be designed and contracted for by the States, will be built by the States, will belong to the States, and will be maintained and policed by the States, we believe that very careful thought should be given before the Federal Government takes on the heavy burdens of expense involved in checking millions of payroll items for compliance, holding hearings, making investigations, and otherwise extending its activity into areas heretofore universally recognized as responsibilities of the States.

Mr. HOLLAND. The facts stated then are still true. The position of the minority last year has now become the position of the majority of the Senate Public Works Committee. In the report last year the minority called attention to and commented upon the fact that if this provision were written into the act it would mean the checking of about 4,000 contracts a year, covering all the pay items, all the classification items, and all the promotion or demotion items, for one factor or another. It was pointed out by the minority last year that the amount of administrative work and the extra expense attendant upon it would be of such great magnitude that no one should for a moment overlook it.

I hope Senators will remember that, but I hope they will remember, above everything else, that it is now proposed definitely to change the philosophy of the the Federal-aid highway program. Senators say that that is justified because, as to the Interstate System, it is proposed that the Federal Government pay more than it has customarily paid heretofore on any part of the system. It is very true that the Federal Government, under the pending bill, will pay a larger portion of construction costs of the Interstate System. Yet it is equally true that much of the mileage in the primary system, much of the mileage in the secondary system, and much of the mileage in the urban system has been paid for 100 percent by the States, when they could not await the time when particular mileage which was important to them could be reached under the regular Federal-aid program.

There was no thought at that time, and there has never been any thought, of saying that such mileage was not a part of the Federal-aid system, because the entire program is built upon the concept that the Interstate System is the most important mileage, not in a new Federal system of highways, but in the Federal-aid road system.

Every mile of it falls in the primary system or the urban system, with the

possibility that a little of the mileage falls into the category of the secondary system.

Mr. President, there is no doubt in the world that we have before us now, with reference to an important and critical part of the Federal-aid system, an attempt to break away from and do violence to an established structure, which we have respected in the past, and which has brought such good results, and to do 2 things which do violence to 2 fine bits of Federal philosophy which have prevailed to the advantage of the people of the Nation ever since these 2 acts were enacted. I refer, of course, to the Davis-Bacon Act and the first Federal Aid Highway Act.

Mr. President, I do not think it is justifiable to do that. I call attention to the fact that if we do it we will make the Secretary of Labor, who otherwise has nothing to do with this program, the referee and the final decider, subject to no appeal whatever, of an important factor of cost, which he will be asked to determine.

I remember, only a few years ago, when the Senate, by a huge vote, enacted into law the Reorganization Plan submitted by the then President, by which the Bureau of Roads was placed not in the Department of Labor—and was not even allowed to continue as a separate agency—but was placed in the Department of Commerce for good reasons, which were argued on the floor at that time.

Having gone up the hill a good way and having placed responsibility on the Secretary of Commerce and on the Department of Commerce, the proponents of the Chavez amendment would mutilate the picture of responsibility by giving a large part of it to the Secretary of Labor.

There is no question about what the Secretary of Labor has done heretofore. For instance, I have a letter from a very good friend of mine, a small contractor, who lives in Chipley, Fla. He has quoted for my information some facts about the activities of the Department of Labor in the fixing of prices for labor at Eglin Field and at Tyndall Field in west Florida. They are islands of activity surrounded by many miles of rural country and semirural country, many miles away from cities, but with county seat towns and other towns.

I should like to recite merely a few contrasts between prices set by the Secretary of Labor applicable to contracts at Eglin Field and at Tyndall Field, as compared with prices paid in the whole surrounding area under contracts made under State law, with prices fixed by the industrial commission of my State, which is given authority to do this job for the State of Florida and for both contractors and workers in certain types of public construction the entire cost of which is paid by the State.

For instance, in the case of a crane operator, $3.07 was the rate fixed per hour at Eglin Field and at Tyndall Field by the Secretary of Labor, sitting here in Washington; whereas $1.50, or less than half as much—but that amounts to $12 a day in an 8-hour day—was fixed by the Industrial Commission of the State of Florida.

As to carpenters, $2.25 an hour, or $18 a day, was fixed by the Secretary of Labor; whereas $2 was fixed by the Industrial Commission of Florida for the same class of labor. That rate came right up to the boundary lines of the two military reservations.

There are other contrasts. For instance, with reference to cement finishers, the Secretary of Labor said $2.50 was the hourly wage that should prevail—I understood he brought that wage rate up from Mobile, which is a good long way from western Florida—whereas $1.75 was the rate fixed by the State agency as applicable in the great area around those two airbases.

We must not fool ourselves by thinking that the decisions of the Secretary of Labor are in accord with the actual conditions prevailing in those areas. It has not been too long since I have had personally to take up a matter with the Secretary of Labor relative to prices set for construction projects on Lake Okeechobee. In that case, he fixed the wage scale at rates prevailing in the city of Miami, which is nearly 100 miles away. That rate was completely out of harmony with the rates prevailing in many of the smaller towns closer to that spot than the city of Miami.

That is the history of the matter.

We know that we are not being asked for this provision—at least I am not in my own State—by the people who work for those who build the roads. I understand that of the 75 firms who are in the road-contracting business in my State, and who do nothing but that kind of work, not a single one has had his labor unionized. His employees stick to him just like blood brothers.

Whether he is doing work in west Florida or 900 miles away, down on the keys, they go with him, because they are a part of the family. They are well pleased with the wages they are paid. They stick with him loyally. They have an esprit de corps. When it rains, or when it is necessary to continue to pour cement into the night—of course, they are under the Wage-Hour Act, and they get paid for the extra time—they do not think of stopping or quitting. They are content to stay with their employer, and they show it by refusing to be unionized, and they show it by refusing to take up this matter with the Senator from Florida or to show any interest in this bill.

I have had five communications asking for approval of the Davis-Bacon Act as a part of this bill. They all come from the business agents of unions in cities—Miami, Fort Lauderdale, Tampa, and Jacksonville. They are unions which are not represented in the working staff of the contractors of Florida.

I have had a visit from a very representative and fine group of union people of my State, representing the carpenters, plumbers, electricians, and other laboring folk, speaking in behalf of the Davis-Bacon provision. However, I have yet to hear from one person who works for the contractors of my State. They have a sense of very great loyalty and appreciation, and they are being paid more than they can make in other activities, and they stick to the man who they think is treating them fair.

That is one aspect of the matter. Another is this: I have had this morning a call from the Florida State Road Department, which apparently is in great perturbation. It wanted me to state to the Senate that our road program in Florida, whether the pending bill is passed or not, amounts to more than $100 million a year.

We are constructing with State funds and under the regular Federal-aid program, more than $100 million worth of roads each year. In addition to that, we are building a great toll road up and down the east coast. We are building a great limited-access system in the city of Jacksonville. Furthermore, we will be building more roads of that kind. The road department believes it is completely unfair to import chaos and disorganization and confusion into the situation, which will be occasioned by the bringing of the Bacon-Davis factor into the program, particularly when it is not asked for by the very people who would be affected by it.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator from Florida was discussing the Eglin Field of the United States Air Force. Was the Senator talking about the firm of Maultsby & Sutton?

Mr. HOLLAND. No; I was talking about the firm of Mr. A. Deermont, at Chipley, Fla. At the time he wrote me, he had 1 contract at Eglin Field and he had 8 small contracts in other parts of west Florida, some of which were covered by State law and some not, but the same rates applied to them. He gave me a summary of the facts based on the very great contrast between the rates prevailing at Eglin Field—one of his contracts was at Eglin Field—and other contracts in the surrounding areas very close to Eglin Field.

Mr. KENNEDY. There was a hearing before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in which the firm of Maultsby & Sutton was mentioned. That firm was a prime contractor at Eglin Field, and it was held in violation of the Davis-Bacon Act on 7 or 8 counts. I did not know whether the Senator was making any reference to that firm.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have not heard of any complaint of any violation by Mr. Deermont. He is a very estimable man. He is what I call a small contractor. However, he has felt the bite of regimentation and interference from a level where he cannot be heard with any degree of satisfaction. He cannot lay down his job away off in west Florida and come to Washington and argue out every matter. He knows that when the Secretary of Labor here in Washington speaks up, he is through, because he has no right of appeal.

I believe he has the right to express very great opposition to the extension of the Davis-Bacon principle—as he believes it will be extended—to all our

roadbuilding projects. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that it was stated by the minority of the Public Works Committee last year—and apparently that position is now taken by the majority—that this is merely an entering wedge, and that when it once comes into one part of the Federal aid system—which differs in no respect from the others, except that the Federal contribution is larger—it will get into other parts of the system just as surely as we are standing here today.

My constituent, Mr. Deermont, does not want to have to do business by remote control, with uncertainties such as those which would exist in connection with everything he does and when his whole payroll situation would be subject to dictation from Washington.

Mr. KENNEDY. The only point I wished to make was that in the hearing at Pensacola, Fla., the report of which came out in 1952, there are cited numerous breaches of the Davis-Bacon Act. The way these breaches occurred indicates, in my opinion, the desirability of the Davis-Bacon Act.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Davis-Bacon Act applied to that contract. The work was done for Uncle Sam at Eglin Field, if I correctly understand. Certainly, I am not disposed to change that provision. But when a contractor, who is one of our finest citizens, tells me of the kind of regimentation to which he had been subjected from Washington on contracts in that broad area of west Florida concerning two airbases, I know he is telling me the truth.

The Senator's statement as to some other Florida contractor whom I do not recognize as being a road contractor is no answer to the point I am making, because it is a fact that these things have been causing trouble. The Department of Labor made so much trouble under the original Wagner Act that it became necessary to set up a separate agency to handle it. One of the principal reasons for that—and I bring this particularly to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts—was that it was proven to the satisfaction of the Congress, the majority of whom, on both sides of the aisle, passed that act, that the Secretary of Labor was not an impartial mediator to handle the kind of a question as to which labor on one side and industry on the other side had differences of opinion.

So, Mr. President, we have recognized the principle involved. Yet here it is proposed to make the Secretary of Labor the arbiter of the important point of how much money a contractor has to pay to get his work done.

I yield to my friend, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA].

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, mention has been made of the fact that generally the Secretary of Labor establishes wage scales which are usually found in the larger cities. Generally speaking, it is necessary to do that for the practical purpose of getting people to go into more or less isolated areas such as the Senator describes, on islands, for instance.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator understand that it is 400 miles from Jacksonville, on one side of the State of Florida, to Pensacola on the other?

Mr. McNAMARA. It is generally accepted that in many areas workers have to travel 400 miles.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall conclude as quickly as I can——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield before he concludes?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is a record of some violations of the Davis-Bacon Act. Could not that indicate that where there is no appeal it is intolerable to operate under it? It is not conclusive that the contractor was in the wrong at all, because it is a very unusual procedure that an official of the Government is given so important a responsibility as this without any appeal provided.

Mr. HOLLAND. That may be one of the reasons for that situation. But I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I have never heard of the matter to which he has referred, and I do not know the firm involved.

There may be many reasons for what happened. Certainly I would not say that all contractors everywhere are lily-white, and that they have always treated their labor correctly. I supported the Davis-Bacon Act, but I am unwilling to see the philosophy of that act so changed as to apply to the field we are now considering, and I am unwilling to see this Federal-aid program mutilated by having it become a puppet of the Department of Labor when it is a shining example of Federal-State cooperation, and has been such throughout many years.

Mr. President, in conclusion, let me say that this is a pressure matter. It is a matter in which a group of very good leaders are trying on behalf of individuals who apparently are not much interested to force something on our Government which will involve very important policy changes if we adopt it. I, for one, do not propose to favor its adoption, because I do not think it is sound.

Mr. President, if the material men and contractors were meeting together and trying to force higher prices for the doing of the work or the furnishing of the materials as we are entering into this program, we all know what would happen to them. The Department of Justice would be on them almost overnight. Presumably, they would have to go to jail. I understand that my distinguished friend from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has often said they do not go to jail as often as they should, and I agree with him in that statement, but the fact is that it is unthinkable that either the material men or the equipment men or the contractors would form such a combine or come here with such an axe. If we yield to the axe coming from any other direction we shall be just as guilty as we would be if we had yielded to such demands as I have mentioned.

Mr. President, this road program is very much needed. It has been thought out very carefully by the distinguished committee which handled the bill, which was of one opinion last year and included this provision, and left it out this year. I congratulate them on having come to that conclusion after a year's deliberation and consideration. I do not think we should override them on the floor of the Senate. I am perfectly willing to bring the State regulatory bodies into the picture. We already have in my State an industrial commission consisting of appointees from the public, labor groups, and industry groups, as a wage-fixing agency on many jobs in connection with State business. I would have no objection to following that course on this program. But to have the long arm of the Federal Government reach into a great area, which we are now proposing to make greater, and which would soon control the whole Federal-aid program, when every feeling in my breast is that we have gone too far already, is something which I do not favor. What we need to do is to impose greater power upon persons who are close to the job, where they can see that it is well done. To do the opposite of that I think would be little less than a crime. It is for that reason that I have occupied this much of the Senate's time.

Mr. President, I withdraw my motion to recommit.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I should like to have read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from California will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 49, line 25, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 117. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors on the initial construction work performed on highway projects on the Interstate System authorized under section 102 of this act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on the same type of work in the immediate locality. Such prevailing wages shall be predetermined by the State highway department or other proper State agency, and shall be set out in each project advertisement for bids and each bid proposal form, and shall also be made a part of the contract covering each project.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In view of the fact that the amendment has now been modified to be an amendment to the House bill rather than to the committee amendment, will my amendment take precedence over the so-called Chavez amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee desires to speak.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I shall defer my remarks for the moment.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KNOWLAND. With the understanding that the time for the quorum call will not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to a quorum call, with the understanding that the time for the quorum

call will not be charged to either side? Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McNamara
Allott	George	Millikin
Anderson	Goldwater	Monroney
Barrett	Gore	Morse
Beall	Green	Mundt
Bender	Hayden	Murray
Bennett	Hennings	Neuberger
Bible	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pastore
Bridges	Hruska	Payne
Bush	Humphrey	Potter
Butler	Jackson	Purtell
Byrd	Jenner	Robertson
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Kennedy	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Smathers
Chavez	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Laird	Stennis
Daniel	Langer	Symington
Dirksen	Lehman	Thye
Douglas	Magnuson	Watkins
Duff	Malone	Welker
Dworshak	Mansfield	Williams
Eastland	Martin, Iowa	Wofford
Ellender	Martin, Pa.	Young
Ervin	McCarthy	
Frear	McClellan	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6268) to facilitate the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and like projects.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9390) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. NORRELL, Mr. SIEMINSKI, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. FENTON, Mr. SCRIVNER, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10721) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ROONEY, Mr. PRESTON, Mr. SIKES, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. COUDERT, Mr. BOW, Mr. CLEVENGER, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11177) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 5 to the bill, and concurred therein, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 6268) to facilitate the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and like projects, and it was signed by the Vice President.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10660) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the pending amendment is the amendment I have offered to the original text of the bill. Mimeographed copies were made, and the only change in them is the reference to where the amendment will be inserted in the bill. The new language is as follows:

> On page 25, line 17, it is proposed to strike out down to and including line 3 on page 26, and to insert in lieu thereof.

Then the text of section 117 is exactly as is shown in the mimeographed copies.

I shall not delay the Senate, but I wish to go over some 14 points which I believe are important to an understanding of the implications of the Chavez amendment, which was previously under discussion, and of the importance of an amendment which leaves rights in the hands of the several States, because the roads, in the final analysis, will be built by the State highway departments, and not by the Federal Government.

First. The contracts will be awarded by the States, and the States will have primary responsibility with respect to proper performance of the work.

Second. Further Federal encroachment upon State functions is undesirable. The constitutional authority of the State to deal with matters within its own borders should be respected.

Third. The States are fully capable of making accurate wage determinations. State agencies are more familiar with wage and employment conditions within the State than a Federal agency in Washington, far removed from the scene.

Fourth. It cannot be argued that the State agencies would determine wage rates lower than those actually prevailing. Insistence upon Federal wage determinations implies a lack of confidence in the integrity of the responsible State agencies.

Fifth. A frequent source of complaint in the past has been that wage determinations by the Federal Government tend to follow the wage structures in the metropolitan areas and to extend these metropolitan wage rates into nonurban and rural areas.

Sixth. In many instances work will be simultaneously performed in the same locality on construction of interstate highways and also upon State primary, secondary, and urban highways and streets. Federal wage determinations for the interstate construction would necessarily affect labor costs on the other types of road construction.

Seventh. If the Davis-Bacon Act is made applicable to the Interstate System now, it will ultimately—and I believe inevitably—be made applicable to the entire Federal-aid highway system.

Eighth. Wage determination decisions under the Davis-Bacon Act are not subject to any review. This was ably brought out by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. Thus, there is no check upon the authority of the administrative agency making the determinations. In direct contrast, State agencies making wage determinations would be responsible to the highest State officials and, in most instances, to the State courts.

Ninth. Inclusion of the Davis-Bacon Act in the highway bill would also result in placing enforcement functions in the Federal Government as provided under Reorganization Plan No. 14, 1950 (5 U. S. C., sec. 133z–15). This would mean that the Federal Department of Labor would have authority to conduct compliance inspections on work under State contracts, make nonreviewable findings, and issue orders requiring State agencies to cancel contracts, withhold contractors' payments, and apply other types of sanctions.

Tenth. Federal wage determinations involve delays, redtape, and complications which would impede the progress of the interstate highway program.

Eleventh. When the interstate highway construction program reaches full stride, uyward of 10,000 contracts will be awarded each year. The making of Davis-Bacon wage determinations for all these contracts would involve a very substantial expense to the Federal Government since a large administrative staff would be necessary to make these determinations and to maintain inspections for compliance with the determined rates.

Twelfth. The Hoover Commission, after an exhaustive and impartial study, recommended that the Federal wage determination provision in a comparable statute, the Federal Airport Act, should be changed to allow State governors or their designees to make the prevailing wage determination in order "to improve the operation of the Federal-aid program and to eliminate certain sources of discord in intergovernmental relationships."

Thirteenth. In planning the Interstate Highway System each State had sub-

mitted its estimate of the cost of constructing its portion of the system. These estimates were based upon labor costs prevailing within the State. The inclusion of a provision for Federal wage determination could throw these estimates out of line and require substantial upward revision.

Fourteenth. As was so ably pointed out earlier in the debate by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], virtually all State highway officials are opposed to inclusion of a Federal wage-determination provision in this bill.

I might say in conclusion, Mr. President, that as we know, there is a provision for the Davis-Bacon Act in the House bill. There is no such provision in the original Gore bill, as passed by the Senate. The bill will go to conference. If there is included the Davis-Bacon provision, there will be no opportunity in conference to reach some kind of adjustment, either for the review of any finding, as has been suggested by the Senator from Arkansas, or some other suitable compromise.

I suggest that, if my amendment is adopted and if it stays in the bill through the subsequent parliamentary procedures, we shall then have the Senate continue its historic position in favor of keeping the authority over wage scales in the hands of the States. Certainly, the Senate of the United States should be interested in the matter of States' rights, if anybody is to be interested in it. The House will have expressed its position in favor of the Davis-Bacon Act provision, and the matter will then have to be worked out suitably in conference.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the purpose of the Senator's amendment is not to affect wage rates adversely, but to make it clear that each State is responsible for fixing the wage rates within the State.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is absolutely correct. I, for one, happen to have confidence in the integrity of our State officials, and I believe States like Massachusetts, California, Ohio, and States in the North, South, East, and West are alive to the needs of their citizens. Many States have prevailing wage laws. The Senator from Kansas mentioned that his State has a very good prevailing wage law. Without imposing on such States the decision of the Department of Labor, standards will be established which have been set up by the States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Under the Senator's amendment, no contractor could conceal the wages he would pay. They would be set forth in the bid advertisements, as I read the amendment. So that every other contractor and the department of public works in the State would know what wage the contractor would pay. Is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct. I read once again from the language:

> All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors on the initial construction work performed on highway projects on the Interstate System authorized under section 102 of this act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on the same type of work in the immediate locality. Such prevailing wages shall be predetermined by the State highway department or other proper State agency, and shall be set out in each project advertisement for bids and each bid proposal form, and shall also be made a part of the contract covering each project.

So it will be a matter of public notice and public information.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the other amendment, the one offered by the Senator from New Mexico, should prevail, it would mean that the Federal Government would sit on top of every highway commission in every State of the Union and say, "Do it this way, or else." Is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct, as I understand the situation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It seems to me that what the Senator from California has offered is exactly what ought to be adopted. It provides first for paying the prevailing wage. Secondly, it provides for a predetermination, so that a contractor will know in advance, when he bids, what he is bidding on. It provides for a predetermination by the State agency, which is the agency best fitted to know what the prevailing wage is on highway contracts in a given locality.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for his remarks. I know he has given some thought to a possible amendment along this line, and I want to give him credit for that.

The distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. WOFFORD] had also been considering an amendment along this line. I wish to pay tribute to him for it. It was because of the parliamentary situation that I offered the amendment. I believe in keeping within the constitutional doctrine to protect the rights of the States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield once again?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have received from the commissioner of public works of Massachusetts, Mr. John A. Volpe, a telegram which I wish to read in order to supplement what the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has said:

> Our opposition to Davis-Bacon Act being included in any Federal highway bill is not concerned with costs but we believe the labor matters should be left with the States. We have good labor laws, good means of administering them, and our relationship with labor has always been excellent. We feel that these conditions can be continued better under State administration rather than Federal.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before I yield the floor, I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from California.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the pending amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] would establish, not an authority to deal with this matter, but at least 48 authorities, which in effect would be no authority at all.

Furthermore, the authority to be established under the amendment is not defined. As the amendment reads, the authority might be the State highway department, which certainly is not very readily identifiable, or it might be any other State agency. Obviously, this is a move to establish so many authorities that there will be no authority.

In view of the record the Department of Labor has had in the field of labor-management relations, I am astonished at the lack of confidence expressed on the other side of the aisle in the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield for a question?

Mr. McNAMARA. Not at this time, thank you.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Very well.

Mr. McNAMARA. It has been said over and over again that the Secretary of Labor has really acted as a tyrant in that field. But the record simply does not support such a contention.

The Department of Labor has done a magnificent job. It has taken into consideration practical and real problems involved in establishing wages.

When an airport is built, the labor to build it must, logically, be drawn, not from the small towns, but from the larger communities. Hundreds of mechanics are required for the construction of an airport. In a small town there probably would be not more than 10 mechanics. In order to obtain sufficient labor for the construction of an airport, it probably would be necessary to go to the larger communities, perhaps hundreds of miles away.

In the construction industry it is a standard practice or pattern to obtain the necessary labor in the communities where such labor, including mechanics, is available. In the work described a moment ago by the Senator from Florida, mechanics at $1.50 an hour cannot be used to work alongside of other mechanics who are paid much higher wages.

I think this amendment is not one to establish any authority at all. I repeat that the amendment would result in no authority. I again say that in its long period of working in this area the Department of Labor has done an excellent job.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the position of the Senator from Michigan

regarding the Secretary of Labor. Personally, I liked the previous Secretary of Labor, Mr. Tobin, a friend of mine from Massachusetts.

As I understand the pending amendment, it relates to the situation which will exist when the bill becomes law. In the administration of the law, there may be throughout the entire Nation 10,000 contracts or more. The Secretary of Labor is an excellent man; but we must consider the problem of administration.

The Senator from Michigan comes from Detroit. He knows the State of Michigan, and he is popular there. In the administration of such contracts, would not the Senator from Michigan prefer to go to a State of Michigan agency, where he is well known, and where he would receive friendly consideration, rather than to have to hurry to Washington in connection with perhaps 5, 6, or 7 contracts in Michigan alone?

Mr. McNAMARA. In answer to the question, Mr. President, let me say that the Davis-Bacon Act is not needed in Michigan; it is not needed in Detroit. Neither is it needed in Boston. But it is needed in most of the areas where the 40,000 miles of road will be built. Minimum wages will be paid in Massachusetts and in Michigan, because in those States the conditions are such that over the years the contractors have paid minimum wages for work of this kind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield a few more minutes to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 2 more minutes.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, the existing practices in Michigan and Massachusetts will not prevent the payment of less than minimum wages to itinerant workers, who may not even be citizens, and who, after helping harvest crops—perhaps the apple crop—will work in some of the other States on road projects. That situation will break down proper working conditions for the local people.

Mr. President, I repeat that that situation will not hurt Michigan or Massachusetts, it will not hurt Detroit or Boston, where the Davis-Bacon Act is not needed, in view of the wages already being paid there.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask this question: If the pending amendment is adopted, it will mean that a contractor will have to advertise publicly what he will pay his help, before he begins the work. Will not that help in respect to the situation to which the Senator from Michigan has just referred to?

Mr. McNAMARA. No; it will not.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope it will.

Mr. McNAMARA. No, it will not help a bit, because when an agency such as the Department of Labor is involved, its functioning in this situation will be deliberately broken down by having so many agencies participate. To have 48 authorities is to have no authority.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the richer States will pay higher wages than will the poorer States?

Mr. McNAMARA. I think they will, under ordinary circumstances.

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, aside from my 3 years of service in the Senate, the only experience I have had in government has been in State government, in a department of the State government of California. For 7 years I had the responsibility of conducting the business of one of the executive agencies of that government. That was one of the happiest experiences of my life.

I think most of the Members of the Senate will recognize that the constitution of each State of the United States provides for the legislative branch to sit in judgment with respect to the power and authority of the executive branch of the State government and the various agencies of the State government, whether created by legislative statute or under authority of the State constitution.

Mr. President, I raise this question most sincerely: In the second sentence of the pending amendment, we find the following:

> Such prevailing wages shall be predetermined by the State highway department or other proper State agency, and shall be set out in each project advertisement for bids and each bid proposal form, and shall also be made a part of the contract covering each project.

Mr. President, in attempting to legislate here in the Congress as to what a department of a State government must do, I fear that we run into serious constitutional questions and, beyond them, serious questions of governmental management.

Let us assume that in the State from which I come, the State's highway department would have the so-called responsibility, under a Federal statute, of determining for the various areas of California what the prevailing wages in each of those areas would be. I can conceive that that responsibility would require manpower and would require the appropriation of funds by the legislative branch of my State government, in order to do the job which should be done in order to obtain the answer. Suppose the legislature of my State should refuse to appropriate those moneys. Suppose the legislature of any State should say, "We are not going to have the Government of the United States dictating to us." What would that do to a Federal interstate highway program?

I raise this question sincerely. It seems to me that we are on tenuous ground when we say to a State agency under this bill, "We are going to make you do certain things." No provision is made in the bill for the expenditure of money with respect to the responsibility with which we attempt to clothe the States, and the authority with which we attempt to clothe them.

One of my most pleasant experiences has been my 3 years in the Senate as a member of the Committee on Public Works. I well remember the first occasion upon which an individual came before our committee asking that the Davis-Bacon Act be written into the then pending highway legislation, which was being discussed. Not a single word of protest was uttered by anyone who came before the committee a year ago with respect to writing into the highway bill then under discussion the provisions of the prevailing-wage statute.

It seems to me that Members of the Senate ought to face up clearly to the fundamental issue before us in this entire debate. The issue is, Do we want to provide for prevailing wages in connection with a Federal expenditure of $25 billion? Or do we want to permit undercutting and underbidding by those who are wont to undercut and underbid in order to get work? In my judgment, that is the issue which faces the United States Senate today.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. THYE. The question I should like to have answered is this: Assume that a contractor has been the successful bidder with respect to certain mileage of highway in Ohio. Assume that that stretch of highway extends into Indiana. He is bidding, and the commissioner of highways of the State of Ohio says, "These are the regulations you must follow, and this is the wage you must pay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, may I have some more time?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from California.

Mr. THYE. Assume that the commissioner of highways in the State of Ohio says, "These are the regulations, and this is the wage you must pay." The contractor is likewise under contract or is bidding in the State of Indiana, and the Indiana commissioner of highways says, "This is the hourly wage you must pay for the various classes of workers, and these are the regulations which you must abide by under any contract you enter into." What type of problem do we subject the contractor to? Can he be a bidder under such circumstances, or must he bid separately for the mileage which lies within each State?

Mr. KUCHEL. I think the Senator has placed his finger on a most important problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute. I should like to answer the question of the Senator from Minnesota.

Is not the answer to the problem that in the final analysis the building of the highways will still be under the State

highway departments? That part of the highway being built in the State of Ohio is built under the supervision and direction of the Highway Department of the State of Ohio. That which is being built in Indiana, Minnesota, or any other State will be built under the supervision of the highway department of the particular State. So there would have to be separate contracts in any event.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield sufficient time so that I may ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield for that purpose?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Is it not true that this is a national system of highways, extending from East to West and from North to South? We want uniformity; and if we are to have uniformity, and if we are to have a continuity of successful bidding across the Nation, it will have to be under some system of bidding across the Nation. We cannot have a contractor bidding on 5 or 6 miles of highway in Ohio, 5 or 6 miles in Indiana, 7 or 8 miles in Wisconsin, and 10 miles in Minnesota, and have any uniformity or continuity of successful bidding.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is exactly what would happen in any event. To follow the argument of the Senator from Minnesota to its conclusion, I say most respectfully that the theory should have been to turn over to the head of the Federal Bureau of Roads the entire $25 billion, or so much of it as was to be used in the Interstate System, and say to him, "You contract for a Federal system of roads." But that is not the theory of the bill. The theory of the bill is that we shall use the State highway departments, which have had great experience with this character of work. We all want the Interstate System completed, but it is to be completed by the States. If we want to impose upon them the decision of a single official in Washington as to the prevailing wage, which has not been the situation in the past, that is one question, as a matter of policy. As the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] pointed out earlier in the day, the overwhelming majority of State highway departments are very much opposed to any such provision.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we now have before us the Knowland amendment instead of the Chavez amendment. The Knowland amendment would give to the State highway departments, rather than the United States Department of Labor, the responsibility for determining the prevailing wages. In my judgment, in certain States where union labor is very weak, the result would be that the highway departments would fix the nonunion scales as the wage for common labor, which would be set at a very low level. I am pained to find the distinguished minority leader taking this position after the protestations which the Secretary of Labor has made that the Eisenhower administration is favorable to the cause of labor.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I think the proposed amendment of the minority leader would inevitably delay work on this program for a very considerable period of time.

A great many of the States have no prevailing wage laws. It is claimed that 25 of the States have prevailing wage laws. Assuming that to be true, that would leave 23 States which do not have such laws. Legislative action would be required in each of those States in order even to commence the work which is to be undertaken.

Furthermore, a number of States have assigned to different agencies the duty of determining rates of pay. In some States, the determination is made by the highway commissioner. In other States it is made by the industrial commissioner; and in other States it is made by still other officials or agencies.

The most important thing, from which we cannot possibly escape, is that this interstate road system is a Federal project. Even the law is called the Federal-Aid Road Act.

Ninety percent of the cost of the program is to be defrayed by the Federal Government. Where does the Federal Government get the money from which the appropriations and grants are made to the States?

The States of Arizona, New Mexico, California, New York, and Pennsylvania do not necessarily raise all the money which will be coming to them under this program. It is a Federal program. The people of the States of New York, Pennsylvania, California, New Mexico, Arizone, Montana, and Minnesota all contribute. So all the States have a very definite stake in this program. I do not think we can escape that fact.

We would be foolish, and unwise, and our action would be unjustified, if we turned over the conduct of this great Federal program exclusively to the States. If we approve this amendment, I believe that, inevitably, certain States, the States which have higher standards of living, will pay high wages, while other States will pay low wages. There will be no uniformity and no general policy. Forty-eight States can adopt schedules of wages which will have no relation to each other.

Obviously, too, there will be no uniformity whatever in the conduct of the work. The Davis-Bacon Act was sponsored by Representative Bacon, of New York, a very distinguished Republican Congressman. He stated his reasons for sponsoring it more than 25 years ago when he wrote:

> I want to cite the specific instance that brought this whole matter to my attention. The Government is engaged in building in my district a Veterans' Bureau hospital. Bids were asked for; several New York contractors bid, and in their bids, of course, they had to take into consideration the high labor standards prevailing in the State of New York. I think I can say that the labor standards in New York are very high. The wages were fair, and there has been no difficulty in the building trades between the employee and employer in New York for some time. And the situation existed therefore, and the New York contractors made their bids, having the labor conditions in mind. The bid, however, was let to a firm from the South, and some thousand nonunion laborers were brought to New York in my own congressional district. They were hired onto this job, they were housed, and they were paid a very low wage, and the work proceeded. Of course, that meant that labor conditions in this part of New York State where the hospital was being built were entirely upset. It meant that the neighboring community was very much upset.

If we adopt the amendment of the minority leader and thus do away with all uniform labor standards, on a Federal program toward which all the taxpayers of the country contribute to the extent of 90 percent of the cost, then we are sanctioning a complete diversity in the computing of rates of pay and in working conditions.

It is an unfortunate and a bad amendment. It would inevitably delay the prosecution of the work. It would also, in my opinion, lower labor standards in many parts of the country. The Federal Government has a right to supervise standards. Supervision should not be left wholly to the discretion of the commissioners of 48 separate States.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I join the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works in opposition to the amendment. It is all very well to speak about States rights, but we should not at the same time overlook States' responsibilities. Any Member of the Senate who is concerned about the result of the adoption of the Davis-Bacon provision can very easily move to amend the proposed legislation to have the States pay 50 percent of the funds, for example.

However, all that is heard is the argument that the States should set the wage standards on the project, but that the Federal Government shall continue to pay 90 or 95 percent of the cost.

It seems to me that if the Federal Government, under the Bureau of Public Roads, can set the specifications of how the highways should be built, there is nothing sinful or immoral or inimical about having the Federal Government set the wage standards. If the States are to set the wage standards, as proposed under the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from California, why should it not also be proposed, collaterally, that the States shall set specifications as to road curvature and width and other standards? I oppose the amendment, and I join the distinguished chairman of the Senate committee in opposition to it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe it is well known in the Senate that when the Federal Government builds a highway entirely with Federal funds, such as a highway on a Federal reservation or in a forest area, or on any other Federal property, the Davis-Bacon

provisions apply. In other words, where 100 percent of the cost is paid by the Federal Government, there is no doubt that Congress has stated that the wage standards shall be established by the Department of Labor.

With respect to the Interstate Highway System, about 95 percent-plus of the total cost of the system is to be paid out of the Federal Treasury. Are we to understand, because a contribution of approximately 10 percent is to be paid by the States, that we are to sacrifice and throw out the window the principle of federally established wage standards on the whole Interstate Highway System?

It seems to me that that argument falls for lack of merit. It seems to me it is rather foolish to argue that a very small contribution of 10 percent on the part of a State is sufficient reason to destroy an established policy by the Federal Government, which has been in effect for many years.

It should also be noted that in the building of airports, the Davis-Bacon Act applies, as it does in the building of all defense facilities and flood-control projects and rivers and harbors projects. Even when small local contributions are made in such a case, the Davis-Bacon provisions apply.

I should like to cite other instances where the Davis-Bacon provisions apply, in the event that the RECORD is not complete. They are the Federal Airport Act, the School Survey and Construction Act of 1950. Incidentally, I should like to point out that the late Senator Taft was a cosponsor of that act, and went along with that provision. I am rather surprised to see the minority leader take a position which is a retreat from the position once held by his distinguished predecessor in the Senate. The Hospital Survey and Construction Act, in connection with which there is a considerable Federal contribution. Work done under that act must be done in accordance with the principles of the Bacon-Davis Act. The slum clearance and urban renewal program. The National Housing Act. The Multi-Family Rental Housing Act. The Defense Housing Act. The Community Facilities Act. The Lease-Purchase Contract Act of 1954. Under that act, the Davis-Bacon provisions apply when a private contractor builds property to be leased by the Government, even though the Federal Government's relationship is only that of a tenant. Nevertheless Congress insisted that the principle established in the Davis-Bacon Act with respect to prevailing wages be incorporated into that legislation establishing the Lease-Purchase Contract Act.

I say most respectfully that the argument to limit the Davis-Bacon Act, to weaken it, to adulterate it, as the Knowland amendment would do, falls for lack of merit.

The adoption of the Knowland amendment would mean the sacrificing on this interstate highway system all the wage provisions that Congress has written into law throughout the past years for the sole purpose of paying lipservice to what some people call local or States rights. We already insist on a much more stringent system with respect to private construction in the Lease-Purchase Act than we would apply to the highway system, which is entirely public in use and purpose.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I am persuaded that the Knowland amendment has not been offered for the purpose of bringing about the implementation of the prevailing wage principle. In the first place, so far as I know, a program or a method of fixing the prevailing wage is not now in effect as a matter of law in the 48 States on a State basis. I take it that if a State had one method of fixing the prevailing rate, under this amendment, if adopted and made a part of the law, such State could not participate in this proram until the legislature had met and provided a means of determining the prevailing wage within the State. But even if it were effective, Mr. President, it would fix the minimum of 48 prevailing wage rates.

Mr. President, everything that goes into a highway is the product of labor, and the workers who did the work in connection with the product being used received the prevailing wage with reference to the production of that product.

All the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico would do would be to give to the workers in each State who do the construction labor the same right they have now with reference to the development of every product that goes into the construction of the highway.

So, as I interpret it, the rejection of the Chavez amendment would mean a denial to the road construction workers in our States of the privilege which is now enjoyed by every other worker whose labor goes into the manufacture of any product used in building the highways. Whether it be a truck or an automobile or gravel or a rock product or cement or asphalt or steel, the various laborers who produced those commodities received the prevailing wage. If we defeat the amendment, we are saying that we will not permit construction workers to enjoy the same privilege which the workers in connection with every other product used in the highway construction have already received.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In the construction of our highways, what are the essential things? One is cement. Does that require labor? Another is asphalt. Does that require labor?

Mr. KERR. And steel.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yielded for a question.

Mr. GORE. I yield an additional minute to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does not the man who helped to construct a bulldozer in Ohio contribute to the highway construction?

Mr. KERR. Yes; and if he helped to construct it in Ohio, and it is used in Oklahoma, he is paid the prevailing wage. And I believe the worker in Oklahoma who puts together the products of the labor of so many groups, which go into the finished product of the highway, is just as much entitled to the prevailing wage as are the workers who made all the products which go into highway construction.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the reason for the amendment.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. That is why I say the amendment offered by the Senator from California should be defeated, and the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico should be adopted.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has 1 minute on the amendment.

Mr. GORE. I yield myself that minute and 2 minutes on the bill.

I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the amendment offered by the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], is an amendment to the House text. No matter what disposition the Senate may make of the amendment offered by the senior Senator from California, the pending question will then be the amendment to the Senate bill offered by the Senator from New Mexico on which all time has expired. So, apparently, we will have two successive rollcalls.

Briefly, Mr. President, I should like to make my position clear on this matter. It seems that the two amendments are diametrically opposed to each other. The amendment offered by the senior Senator from New Mexico proposes to attach the condition, upon the grant of 90 percent of the funds, that the prevailing wage as determined by Federal officials shall be paid.

The idea of the Federal Government attaching conditions to a Federal grant is not new. It has been done in the case of funds for hospital construction. Under the present law the Bureau of Public Roads has already sent to the various States standards of construction which must be met in order to obtain funds. The grade must meet certain conditions, there must be certain curvatures, certain vision requirements. They attach to the granting of the 90-percent fund for interstate highways.

The senior Senator from New Mexico would attach, in addition, the condition that the prevailing wages be paid.

The Senator from California has proposed to amend the House bill, which would not settle this issue at all, to provide that the 48 State highway departments fix the wages.

There are some real questions involved. Some States do not have methods of fixing prevailing wages. Some do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Chavez amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute in order that the senior Senator from Oregon may ask

a question of the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, can the Senator from California advise me whether Secretary of Labor Mitchell approves of his amendment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator that I have not discussed the amendment with Secretary Mitchell.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee withhold his suggestion for a moment?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield so much time as he may need to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I had not intended to take 1 minute in this debate, but as a member of the Committee on Public Works who last year took part in the debate on this question, I cannot refrain from taking a moment at this time.

Mr. President, yesterday on the floor of the Senate, when we were discussing the question of the allocation of funds to various States, some of us were trying to point out that either under the so-called Gore bill, which prescribed an arbitrary formula, or under the House bill, which is predicated on a set of unrealistic estimates, the result might be unsatisfactory. When we suggested what we thought was a common sense approach, namely, that the highway departments of the States should award contracts to build their proper share of the roads, and then the Secretary of Commerce, through the Bureau of Public Roads, should study the contracts and approve them, I recall that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma and other members of the committee said, "No. There is one thing which, throughout the hearings and throughout the deliberations of the Committee on Public Works, we have maintained, namely, that these are not going to be national highways, they are going to be built by the States, and we are not going to put into the hands of a Cabinet official in Washington—in this case, the Secretary of Commerce—the arbitrary and far-reaching power of passing on the division or allocation of the funds in the building of highways in the various States."

Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma. I do not wish to quote him incorrectly, but only yesterday, in answering my question, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma said—and I am quoting from the RECORD of yesterday's debate:

> The highway assistance program is one of the few remaining definite recognitions by the Federal Government of the sovereignty of the States, and it is one of the most significant programs wherein the sovereignty and the identity of the States are recognized and preserved.

Mr. President, what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. If we cannot delegate to the Secretary of Commerce the power simply to examine, to coordinate, and to approve the contracts which are entered into by the highway departments of the several States, how can we approve of giving arbitrary power to the Secretary of Labor, without any right of appeal, to fix the standards of wages throughout the country, to fix the scale of wages which will seep down into every town and city in the land? If one Cabinet officer should not have such power, another certainly should not.

I suggest that we shall be doing what we have never done before. The building of a hospital in a community or the improving of a harbor facility does not leave its imprint on the wage scale of a community for years to come. But the fixing of wages for highway construction is something which will remain, and will make the highways cost more, thus increasing the problem through the years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, if we are able to write into the bill an arbitrary power which will enable the Secretary of Labor, without the right of appeal, to override, if he desires, even the agreements entered into between labor unions and employing contractors in the fixing of wages, then I hope that later, when we consider the matter of allocations, we can forget all the statements which have been made about a formula in one bill and a set of estimates in the other. If the highways are intended to be Federal highways, then let them be Federal highways.

One more point. Who will pay for the highways? Again and again I have heard distinguished Senators say that the Federal Government will pay 90 percent. Where will the Federal Government get the money? It does not grow in the Treasury. It comes from the citizens, the businessmen, the taxpayers of the 48 States.

If the Davis-Bacon provision shall be adopted, let us not hear any more about a system of Federal aid. It will have become a nationalized highway system, with more power centralized in the Federal Government than has been the case in any similar program.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I think it might be well to include at this point in the RECORD a list of States having minimum- or prevailing-wage requirements on highway construction. The list appears on page 291 of the hearings on the bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATES HAVING MINIMUM- OR PREVAILING-WAGE REQUIREMENTS ON HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION [1]

Twenty-five States having prevailing wage-rate laws: Arizona, California, Connecticut, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Five States having administratively predetermined wage rates: Delaware, Maine, Minnesota (by administrative ruling), Nebraska, and Vermont.

Five States having statutory minimum-wage rates: Colorado, Nevada (also has prevailing law), New Hampshire (also has prevailing law), Texas (also has prevailing law), and Wyoming.

States having prevailing wage-rate laws	25
States having administratively determined minimum wage-rate requirements	5
States having statutory minimum rates, 3 of which also have prevailing wage laws	5
States not having any of the above [2]	16
Total	51
That overlap	−3
Total	48

[1] Florida has prevailing-wage law on certain highway bridges not counted in this list.

[2] Alabama, Arkansas, Florida (except bridges), Georgia, Iowa, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Virginia.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time on the Knowland amendment.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan will state it.

Mr. McNAMARA. Am I correct in assuming that the proposed amendment of the Senator from California is an amendment to the House text of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is correct.

Mr. McNAMARA. I wonder if Senators have properly taken into consideration the fact that a similar amendment was rejected in the House by a vote of 162 to 77.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest that this is the Senate of the United States. We have not acted on the proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair correctly understand that the Senator from California has yielded back the remainder of his time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time. I do not know whether a point of order has been made on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A point of order has not been made.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield back the remainder of my time on the amendment, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time of the Senator from Tennessee on the amendment has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time to be taken for the quorum call not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the time for the quorum call will not be charged to either side. All time having been yielded back, and the absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Frear	McNamara
Allott	Fulbright	Millikin
Anderson	George	Monroney
Barrett	Goldwater	Morse
Beall	Gore	Mundt
Bender	Green	Murray
Bennett	Hayden	Neuberger
Bible	Hennings	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hill	Pastore
Bridges	Holland	Payne
Bush	Hruska	Potter
Butler	Humphrey	Purtell
Byrd	Jackson	Robertson
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Carlson	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Kerr	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Knowland	Smathers
Chavez	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Laird	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Langer	Stennis
Daniel	Lehman	Symington
Dirksen	Magnuson	Thye
Douglas	Malone	Watkins
Duff	Mansfield	Welker
Dworshak	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Eastland	Martin, Pa.	Wofford
Ellender	McCarthy	Young
Ervin	McClellan	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLOTT (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were premitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. CAPEHART (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. ELLENDER. On this vote I have a pair with my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. FULBRIGHT (when his name was called.) On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. SMATHERS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG, and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 39, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—39

Barrett	Ervin	Mundt
Bennett	Frear	Robertson
Bricker	George	Russell
Bridges	Goldwater	Saltonstall
Byrd	Holland	Smathers
Carlson	Hruska	Smith, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Cotton	Knowland	Thye
Curtis	Malone	Watkins
Daniel	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Dirksen	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Dworshak	McClellan	Wofford
Eastland	Millikin	Young

NAYS—39

Aiken	Hayden	McNamara
Anderson	Hennings	Monroney
Beall	Hill	Morse
Bender	Humphrey	Murray
Bible	Jackson	Neuberger
Bush	Kennedy	O'Mahoney
Butler	Kerr	Pastore
Case, N. J.	Kuchel	Payne
Chavez	Laird	Potter
Douglas	Langer	Purtell
Duff	Lehman	Scott
Gore	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
Green	Mansfield	Symington

NOT VOTING—17

Allott	Hickenlooper	McCarthy
Capehart	Ives	Neely
Clements	Jenner	Schoeppel
Ellender	Johnson, Tex.	Sparkman
Flanders	Kefauver	Wiley
Fulbright	Long	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote the yeas are 39 and the nays are 39. Under the Constitution, the Vice President, having the right to vote in case of a tie, casts his vote in the affirmative, and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

Mr. HUMPHREY and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CAPEHART (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS]. If the Senator from Kentucky were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. FULBRIGHT (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If the Senator from West Virginia were present, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. ELLENDER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Louisiana, my colleague [Mr. LONG]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. SMATHERS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—41

Allott	Ervin	Mundt
Barrett	Frear	Robertson
Bennett	George	Russell
Bricker	Goldwater	Saltonstall
Bridges	Holland	Smathers
Byrd	Hruska	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Case, S. Dak.	Knowland	Thye
Cotton	Malone	Watkins
Curtis	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Daniel	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Dirksen	McCarthy	Wofford
Dworshak	McClellan	Young
Eastland	Millikin	

NAYS—39

Aiken	Hayden	McNamara
Anderson	Hennings	Monroney
Beall	Hill	Morse
Bender	Humphrey	Murray
Bible	Jackson	Neuberger
Bush	Kennedy	O'Mahoney
Butler	Kerr	Pastore
Case, N. J.	Kuchel	Payne
Chavez	Laird	Potter
Douglas	Langer	Purtell
Duff	Lehman	Scott
Gore	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
Green	Mansfield	Symington

NOT VOTING—15

Capehart	Hickenlooper	Long
Clements	Ives	Neely
Ellender	Jenner	Schoeppel
Flanders	Johnson, Tex.	Sparkman
Fulbright	Kefauver	Wiley

So the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. All time has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes on the bill.

Because of the parliamentary situation, the amendment which has just been agreed to was first offered in order that there might be an opportunity for an expression by the Senate. First I proposed a unanimous-consent request that it be voted upon ahead of the Chavez amendment. Inasmuch as it would have been an amendment in the third degree, that could not be done except by unanimous consent. I made the unanimous-consent request that the amendment might be offered at that point to the Chavez amendment, without the rule applying.

The distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico, as he had a perfect right to do under the rule, refused to grant unanimous consent for that purpose.

I then stated that from the parliamentary point of view, in order to offer my amendment to the committee amendment, it would be necessary for me then to move to lay on the table the Chavez amendment, with the understanding that if that motion prevailed, I would then offer the amendment which the Senate has just acted upon favorably.

I do not wish to foreclose any debate, but we have debated this amendment for most of the day. I do not wish to foreclose any Senator who wishes further to discuss the subject, but in order that the action of the Senate in agreeing to an amendment to the House language may not be an empty gesture, inasmuch as that language will be substituted by the committee amendment, I feel that in fairness to the Senate I must at the proper time, without foreclosing any debate, move to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, with the understanding that if that motion shall prevail I will again offer the amendment which has just been agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes on the bill.

In view of the expressed sentiment of the Senate, the senior Senator from New Mexico has authorized me to say that he is willing to modify his amendment by striking out the period at the end of line 4 on page 2, inserting a comma, and the words "after having solicited the advice of proper State officials."

Does the Senator from New Mexcio so modify his amendment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It appears that the Senate wishes to have the advice of State highway officials before a determination is made. For that reason I agree with the Senator from Tennessee, and will modify my amendment to that effect.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall personally not object to the Senator modifying his amendment, although unanimous consent is required for him to do so—I point out that the amendment would still leave the power in the hands of the Secretary of Labor, and there would be no appeal from his decision. Solicitation of the advice of State highway officials would be purely discretionary, and there is no indication that the Secretary would follow such advice. So I do not believe that the modified amendment would meet the point raised by the Senator from Arkansas; nor would it meet the very fundamental problem which we have discussed all afternoon, namely, the fact that these highways are to be built by the State highway departments, and that the amendment would be an abridgement of the rights of the States.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from New Mexico may be permitted to modify his amendment in the manner he has indicated.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has a perfect right to offer his amendment, as we all know. However, it would be an empty gesture. It would provide for the solicitation of an opinion, with no way of providing the Secretary with anything more than an opinion. I shall not object, but the amendment would be an empty gesture.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is a matter of opinion. I believe in the right of disagreement. I do not think it would be an empty gesture. When a Federal official inquiries of a State government, or a State highway department, with respect to matters pertaining to the highway program, that is not an empty gesture.

I have more faith in our State officials, possibly, than do some others. But I believe that when the Federal Government is paying 90 percent of the cost of the highways, the Federal Government should at least have the right of determination. I am willing to modify the extent of such authority by providing for the solicitation of the opinion of the State highway department.

That is why I seek to modify my amendment. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for asking unanimous consent that my amendment may be modified to that extent.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object, because I think the Senator from New Mexico should have permission to modify his amendment—I should like to bring to his attention the other point involved in the Knowland amendment, which has not been discussed, namely, the question of predetermination. Even with the language as proposed to be modified, it seems to me that the difficulty is that there is no predetermination. I think an essential part of the Knowland amendment was the provision for predetermination, so that wages would be set forth in the project advertisement, and so that the bidder would know what he was bidding upon.

I wonder if the distinguished Senator from New Mexico would include in his proposed modification of his amendment the addition of these words:

Such prevailing wages shall be predetermined, and shall be set out in each project advertisement for bids and each bid proposal form, and shall also be made a part of the contract covering each project.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I feel that the Senator's suggestion is very good. The only difficulty I see is that there are 48 different highway departments and 48 different highway commissioners. Every State is different. As the Senator knows, usually the members of the highway commissions in the several States are appointed by the governors of the States.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What I have suggested would not go to that point. It would merely require that the Secretary of Labor shall make his determination before the contract is let, instead of afterward, so that the contractor would know it when he made his bid.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would have no objection to it.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Regular order!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order has been requested.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have the request restated?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee has requested that the Senator from New Mexico be permitted to modify his amendment to the extent suggested by him.

Mr. KNOWLAND. May we have the language read?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the suggested modification.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 4, it is proposed to strike out the period, substitute a comma therefor, and insert the following language: "after having solicited the advice of proper State officials."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I understood the distinguished chairman of the committee to say that he would have no objection to adding the requirement of predetermination.

Mr. CHAVEZ. By the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes. I would add at the end of the amendment, as modified, the following sentence:

Such prevailing wages shall be determined and shall be set out in each project advertisement for bids, and in each bid proposal form, and shall also be made a part of the contract covering each project.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would the Senator be willing, in view of the judgment of the Senate just recently expressed on his amendment, to modify it, after the words "Secretary of Commerce," by adding the words "based on findings made by the appropriate State agency, which shall be binding on the Secretary"?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am afraid not. I should like to have the Federal Government have some finality in the determination.

Mr. KNOWLAND. There we have the fundamental issue, I believe, between the two situations. It is a question whether the wage rates of the States shall be imposed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am acting more and more like a Republican, and the Senator from California is acting more and more like a Democrat.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am proud to act like a Jeffersonian Democrat, if that is still popular in this Chamber.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from California relative to the issue before the Senate now. I ask unanimous consent that I may do so at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the event the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico remains as it is now, and is voted down on a motion to lay on the table, as the Senator from California has suggested he will make such a motion, is it or is it not the purpose of the Senator from California to offer again in the same words the amendment which the Senate has adopted, addressed this time to the committee amendment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the motion which I intend to make, to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, shall prevail, I intend to offer an amendment to this section and in exactly the same words as the amendment just recently approved, and in precisely the same form.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I object to the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I shall now use 2 minutes on the bill, which I yield to myself.

Mr. President, the issue is now sharply drawn. The Senate now has a clear-cut choice. Does the Senate wish to apply to a 90-percent Federal grant of funds to construct interstate highways the Federal prevailing wage provisions of law?

It needs no argument, and I shall make no further argument. If we cannot apply Federal wage standards to projects to which the Federal Government contributes 90 percent of the funds, then for what reason do we have Federal wage standards?

Unless the Davis-Bacon provision of law, written into law by a Republican Congress under the leadership of a Republican administration, cannot be applied to projects to which the Federal Government contributes 90 percent, then we may as well repeal the Davis-Bacon Act.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes. I do not believe that the arguments made by the Senator from Tennessee are valid. It seems to me that the fundamental constitutional principle at issue today is whether we are to apply for the first time in this type of program Federal regulations upon the 48 sovereign States. If it be said that we are going to do it with reference to a project calling for a 90-percent Federal contribution, what are we going to do in the case of a project that calls for an 80-percent or 70-percent or 60-percent Federal contribution? Where are we going to draw the line? If we are to do it on the principle that the Federal Government will build the roads, then we are proceeding on the wrong premise. In that case, what we should do is turn over to the Federal highway officials the entire sum of money to be spent and tell them to build the Federal highway system. If we wish to impose the discretion of Federal officials upon State authorities, without any appeal, then we should vote for the Chavez amendment.

However, let us not in the future hear the plea for States' rights or for sovereignty of States, if today we override those rights and the sovereignty of the States, by giving to any Federal official, I care not what his party political affiliation may be, the right to override State authority and override State-established customs and laws, and to do so without any right of appeal. That is the fundamental issue before the Senate today. I am proud, as one Republican in the Senate, to appeal to my Democratic friends on the other side of the aisle: "If you want to uphold the rights of the States in this Chamber, now is the time, this is the place, and this is the issue."

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator heard the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], that of the 48 States of the Union, only 25 have thus far established a means of regulating prevailing wages. If that be the case, will the Senator from California agree with me that it will take a long, long time for the States to set up the necessary procedure. This will particularly be true in view of the fact that some legislatures do not meet more than once every 2 years, and therefore there will be great delay caused among the States which have not provided this kind of machinery?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not agree that there will be any delay on the highway program. I have served as a member of the legislature of my State, and the distinguished Senator from New York has served as Governor of his State. I have never taken the position that all the wisdom is concentrated in the Federal Government in Washington. We have a great Nation of 165 million people. The founders of this Republic wisely created a Federal system. The 48 States now build their highways. We are making a contribution toward an Interstate System which will be built by the States. Why should we say that we have no confidence in the States, and why should we try to impose the discretion and administration of one Federal official on the States without any right of appeal? I have more confidence in the States than to do that to them.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. If it is a fact that only 25 of the 48 States have provided the necessary procedure by which prevailing rates of wages can be regulated, I again ask is not delay inevitable, in view of the fact that no legislatures are in session now, and that in many States biennial sessions are held?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That may be; but the opposite argument to the argument of the Senator from New York is that, if the States fail to keep up to what may be considered proper standards, we will impose the Federal will upon them. I do not think that should be done. I believe that the 48 States are 48 experimental laboratories. I believe that the States in many activities are actually ahead of the Federal Government, and I do not believe we should try to impose a pattern on the 48 States of the Union based on what some officials in Washington may determine it should be. The people elect the legislatures and the legislatures can pass new laws. I will not sit here, so long as I have a voice and a vote, and impose the will of the Federal Government upon States in connection with a matter which is properly the function of the States.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senator any longer, but I would appreciate it if he would yield to me once more.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. If what the Senator has said is correct—and I know that anything he says is correct—how does he justify the fact that in at least nine of the Federal-aid programs the Davis-Bacon Act is in effect and provides the procedure which is followed?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Because I think as to most of the instances to which the Senator refers, for example, construction in connection with flood control, the work is done by a Federal agency, the Army engineers. But this is not such a case. These roads are not to be built by Army engineers. They are not to be built by the Federal Highway Division; they are to be built by the highway departments of the 48 States of the Union.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have in mind for instance the building of hospitals, under the Hill-Burton Act, Lease Purchase Contracts Act, Slum Clearance Act, and the FHA housing program. In all of these and others, the Federal Government makes relatively small contributions. In the Federal interstate road program the Government pays 90 percent of the cost.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield me a little time?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from California that he has made an eloquent plea for States rights. If he would amend his plea and make it for the people's rights, I would be more impressed. The right of a State to do what? To depress wages? The right of the States to have inferior standards? No one would complain if a State wants to go above the prevailing wages. We have tried to raise the standard of living in this country. I think, as I have said on other occasions, that we should distinguish between States rights and the people's rights.

The Senator from California says the States are going to build these highways. I ask, with whose money? The Federal Government is to contribute 90 percent of the money. That money does not come in equal proportions from every State. Some States have high wage standards. The State of Illinois will help pay for highway construction, or the people of the State of Illinois will pay. The State is a legal structure. It has no spirit or soul. What is important is the people of the State—the people who live and work in the respective States.

The people of the State of Illinois and the State of Minnesota will be paying taxes, and I think they have a right to expect that those taxes will not depress wages.

I am in somewhat of a quandary with respect to the Senator's position——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Frankly, I am in a quandary about the position of the Senator from California. Is he saying to the Senate that we should repeal the part of the Federal Airport Act which relates to prevailing wages? Airports are a part of the transportation system of this country, as are Federal highways. Is the Senator saying that every one of the bills we have passed, such as the bill for hospital construction, the bill for slum clearance, and so forth, to which the Davis-Bacon Act applies, ought to be repealed? Those are laws under which private groups share in the cost of the projects.

I think the Senator's argument is more or less a legal one which would make a fine treatise in a law journal, but it does not make much economic sense.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself two minutes.

I should like to say to the Senator from Minnesota that it is because I believe in human rights and the people's rights that I am here advocating States rights. The men who drafted our Constitution were very wise. They knew that when a people had lost their freedom they had lost it primarily because of concentration of power in the Nation's Capital, and usually because power was in the hands of a single individual. In drafting the Constitution, out of the wisdom of the ages, they created a division of power. They not only jealously guarded against power being concentrated in the executive, but provided for three coequal and coordinated branches of the Government, and to protect our freedom under those circumstances they made the Federal Government one of limited and specified powers, and reserved to the States and to the people thereof all other powers.

They did so fundamentally and primarily because they wanted to protect the people's rights, human rights. It was for that reason that they created this great constitutional system of ours.

I have no apologies to make for rising on the floor of the Senate and defending the rights of the States, because I think I am defending the rights of the people when I do so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield further?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have no additional time to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

The question now recurs on agreeing to the so-called Chavez amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay the Chavez amendment on the table, and on that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the Chavez amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the negative when his name was called.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand, the vote is on my motion to lay on the table the Chavez amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. A vote of "yea" is a vote to lay the amendment on the table; a vote of "nay" is a vote not to lay the amendment on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will resume the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. ALLOTT (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. EASTLAND (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. POTTER (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMATHERS (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. ELLENDER. On this vote I have a pair with my colleague, the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMATHERS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—37

Barrett	Frear	Robertson
Bennett	Fulbright	Russell
Bricker	George	Saltonstall
Bridges	Goldwater	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Holland	Stennis
Carlson	Hruska	Thye
Case, S. Dak.	Knowland	Watkins
Cotton	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Curtis	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Daniel	McCarthy	Wofford
Dirksen	McClellan	Young
Dworshak	Millikin	
Ervin	Mundt	

NAYS—41

Aiken	Hayden	Mansfield
Anderson	Hennings	McNamara
Beall	Hill	Monroney
Bender	Humphrey	Morse
Bible	Jackson	Murray
Bush	Johnston, S. C.	Neuberger
Butler	Kennedy	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Kerr	Pastore
Case, N. J.	Kuchel	Payne
Chavez	Laird	Purtell
Douglas	Langer	Scott
Duff	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Gore	Magnuson	Symington
Green	Malone	

NOT VOTING—17

Allott	Ives	Potter
Clements	Jenner	Schoeppel
Eastland	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Ellender	Kefauver	Sparkman
Flanders	Long	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Neely	

So Mr. KNOWLAND's motion to lay on the table the amendment of Mr. CHAVEZ was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays having been previously ordered, and all time on the amendment having expired, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the affirmative when his name was called.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Are we voting on the Chavez amendment as it was printed and as it was on the desks of Senators; or was the Chavez amendment modified in accordance with the request of the Senator from New Mexico?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment was not modified. The vote is on the Chavez amendment as it is printed and as it appears on the desks of Senators.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say to the Senator from South Dakota that I asked to have it modified, but objection was made from this side of the aisle.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will resume the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. ALLOTT (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr

FLANDERS]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. EASTLAND (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. ELLENDER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with my colleague, the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMATHERS (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS]. Were he present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. SMATHERS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—42

Aiken	Hayden	Mansfield
Anderson	Hennings	McNamara
Beall	Hill	Monroney
Bender	Humphrey	Morse
Bible	Jackson	Murray
Bush	Johnston, S. C.	Neuberger
Butler	Kennedy	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Kerr	Pastore
Case, N. J.	Kuchel	Payne
Chavez	Laird	Potter
Douglas	Langer	Purtell
Duff	Lehman	Scott
Gore	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
Green	Malone	Symington

NAYS—37

Barrett	Curtis	Goldwater
Bennett	Daniel	Holland
Bricker	Dirksen	Hruska
Bridges	Dworshak	Knowland
Byrd	Ervin	Martin, Iowa
Carlson	Frear	Martin, Pa.
Case, S. Dak.	Fulbright	McCarthy
Cotton	George	McClellan
Millikin	Smith, N. J.	Williams
Mundt	Stennis	Wofford
Robertson	Thye	Young
Russell	Watkins	
Saltonstall	Welker	

NOT VOTING—16

Allott	Ives	Schoeppel
Clements	Jenner	Smathers
Eastland	Johnson, Tex.	Sparkman
Ellender	Kefauver	Wiley
Flanders	Long	
Hickenlooper	Neely	

So the amendment of Mr. CHAVEZ was agreed to.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I send to the desk my amendment, 5–21–56—A, and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point, and that I be permitted to proceed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendment of Mrs. SMITH of Maine, to the committee amendment was, on page 50, between lines 8 and 9, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 118. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation and study for the purpose of determining what action can be taken by the Federal Government to promote the public welfare by increasing highway safety in the United States. In making such investigation and study the Secretary of Commerce shall give consideration to—

(1) the need for Federal assistance to State and local governments in the enforcement of necessary highway safety and speed requirements and the forms such assistance should take;

(2) the advisability and practicability of uniform State and local highway safety and speed laws and what steps should be taken by the Federal Government to promote the adoption of such uniform laws;

(3) possible means of promoting highway safety in the manufacture of the various types of vehicles used on the highways;

(4) educational programs to promote highway safety;

(5) the design and physical characteristics of highways; and

(6) such other matters as it may deem advisable and appropriate.

The Secretary of Commerce shall report his findings, together with such recommendations as he may deem advisable, to the Congress not later than June 30, 1957.

On page 50, line 9, strike out "SEC. 118" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 119."

On page 50, line 12, strike out "SEC. 119" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 120."

The VICE PRESIDENT. How much time does the Senator from Maine allot to herself?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I yield myself 12 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 12 minutes.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the genesis of this amendment began 6 months ago, in November 1955, when I assured President Eisenhower of my full support of his leadership for highway safety, and announced that I would submit in the Senate a resolution calling for the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee to conduct an inquiry and study of highway safety to determine what action could be taken by the Federal Government to stop the annual slaughter on the highways.

I stated that it was my hope that such a study would include statements and observations from, first, highway officials of the several States as to their possible needs with respect to paying for adequate enforcement forces; second, automobile manufacturers with respect to emphasis on safety features on automobiles such as seat belts, crash cushioning, polaroid lights, and other safety features, rather than current emphasis on increasing the speed and horsepower of automobiles; and third, highway safety experts with respect to the advisability and practicability of uniform safety and speed laws.

On January 5, 1956, I submitted Senate Resolution 156, which incorporated these objectives. I regret to say that as of this time the committee to which the resolution was referred has not given it any consideration.

However, I am grateful that within the last 2 weeks individual Members of the Senate have evidenced similar interest. On May 24, 1956, my good friend and former resident of Maine, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], submitted a Senate resolution similar to mine of 5 months before, calling for an investigation by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of means of effecting greater highway safety.

Since he was until recently a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I sincerely hope that he will receive greater response from that committee to his resolution than I have.

On May 16, 1956, another of my good friends and colleagues in the Senate, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] announced his enlistment in the cause for an investigation and study for greater highway safety, with the notice that he intended to offer an amendment to the highway bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to make such a study.

The amendment I offer now to the highway bill lifts the language of my Senate Resolution 156, which I submitted 5 months ago, and applies it to the Secretary of Commerce, instead of to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. By no means does this amendment mean that I have abandoned all hope that the Senate will make such a study. To the contrary, I am more hopeful that it will, now that the senior Senator from Illinois has also submitted a resolution calling for the same thing.

Instead, I hope that this grave and awesome problem may receive twofold consideration, and may be tackled by both the legislative branch and the executive branch.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I prefer to finish my statement, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. Certainly.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I am sure that the Senate needs no extended discussion of details in support of my amendment, the need is so clear and commanding.

We Americans have immediate concern over war casualties, but we have

failed to show an equal concern about highway casualties. Yet, Mr. President, recklessly driven vehicles can, and do, kill Americans just as completely as bombs do.

On Wednesday we shall make many Memorial Day speeches honoring those killed in war, and vowing that every effort must be made to prevent future war killings. Yet, we scarcely give attention to stopping the highway killings—which, ironically enough, will be high on Memorial Day.

In fact, the annual automotive killing is approaching 40,000 lives, in addition to the million Americans injured and the economic loss of billions of dollars each year from automotive accidents.

I do not propose Federal intervention in State matters; but I do believe that 40,000 deaths, a million injuries, and a multi-billion-dollar economic loss caused by automotive accidents so greatly affect the welfare of Americans nationally that our Federal Government, both Congress and the executive branch, has a grave responsibility to study the matter and determine how it can effectively and appropriately assist in lowering this awesome annual loss.

All of us agree that something should be done. But our lack of response to the urgency of the matter is almost unbelievable. It is like the weather—we just talk about it, instead of doing something. While we cannot do much about the weather, we certainly can do much about stopping the high rate of mass murder and maiming on our highways.

One might ask what relevance a safety-welfare measure has to a highway construction bill. The answer is very simple and very direct; it is just this: We are putting jet cars on horse-and-buggy roads. That is one of the reasons why 40,000 Americans are being killed every year.

I want to commend the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for his action on his amendment, which has substantially the same objective as that of my amendment. However, in all seriousness and sincerity—and without any pride of authorship, for—after all—it was essentially drafted by the Senate legislative counsel—I submit that my amendment is preferable. It is preferable for the following reasons:

In the first place, my amendment would require the Secretary of Commerce to report 2 years sooner than the amendment of the junior Senator from Minnesota would. My amendment would require a report to be made within 1 year, but not later than June 30, 1957, whereas the amendment of the junior Senator from Minnesota would allow a period of 3 years and would permit the report to be made by June 30, 1959.

My amendment differs on the time aspect, because while I acknowledged that studies sometimes take a great deal of time, all of us realize that a study or survey can sometimes be the means of brushing something aside and letting the mere operation of time kill it. I do not want that to happen in this case, because I consider this matter to be extremely urgent, inasmuch as nearly 40,000 people are killed on the highways each year. At that rate, we cannot afford to wait for 3 years.

Time is of the essence. This cannot be a leisurely, take-your-time approach; and to allow longer than 1 year for the making of the first report would be just tragically too long.

Certainly if more time is needed—as I would expect, because I think this study should be a continuing one—the authorization for the study can be extended.

My point is that the sooner a report is required, the sooner we shall get corrective action; and the sooner we get corrective action, the sooner we shall save lives and stop wholesale slaughter on the highways.

My amendment differs further from the amendment of the junior Senator from Minnesota in that my amendment would specifically bring into participation in the making of such a study and investigation with Federal officials, the representatives of automobile manufacturers, as well as State and local officials.

My amendment proposes a study of the advisability of having uniform State and local highway safety and speed laws, and proposes a study of vehicles, educational programs, and other facets. Although these might be covered by the amendment of the junior Senator from Minnesota, they are not specifically covered by it, and we have no specific assurance that they would be covered by it.

One final and very personal word on this important subject: In all the years I have served in the House and the Senate there is nothing that I have wanted to be adopted by Congress more than the amendment I am now offering. I feel that way because I know of nothing worthier for Congress to do than to save lives. There could be no greater gratification to me than to have the Senate adopt what might be known as the Smith Life Saving Amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I rise to support the amendment of the Senator from Maine and to commend her for the leadership she is giving the Senate in connection with the safety drive she is making by means of the Smith amendment.

I wish to say that in the course of her remarks the Senator from Maine gave the American people, I believe, the clear call of duty in connection with this matter. It seems probable that this year approximately 40,000 persons will be slaughtered on our highways. In my opinion, that makes this issue one of the major domestic issues confronting us, insofar as moral problems are concerned—and this is a problem of good morals. In my judgment, good morals are vitally connected with good government.

I am particularly glad that the Senator from Maine has indicated by her amendment that State agencies, traffic safety groups, and State councils are to be called on to be of assistance in connection with the survey which is to be made. I am particularly pleased that her amendment calls for a 1-year time limit, because—and now I speak as a former member of the Committee on Public Works—we have a great wealth of material which needs to be correlated and coordinated into findings and conclusions which can be presented to both Federal and State officials.

Last of all, I wish to point out that when I was a member of the Committee on Public Works the experts who testified before it were unanimously in agreement about the problems and dangers arising from the high-powered automobiles now in use. The distinguished Senator from Maine has used a very apt phrase in that connection; she has referred to such high-powered automobiles as jet automobiles, which is exactly what they are. We should face the fact that the horsepower placed under the hoods of modern automobiles is far in excess of what is reasonably needed for transportation and turns such automobiles into dangerous weapons. We can provide all the safety programs we may wish to provide, but until we construct highways which can safely accommodate automobiles of this type we shall not make much of a dent on the casualty lists.

That is why this provision belongs in a road-building bill. I think it is important to emphasize the fact that our road builders, the Federal agents who are to make use of Federal funds in the States, have a clear moral obligation to see to it that the results of such a study and survey as the Senator from Maine proposes are put to work in building safer highways.

I congratulate the Senator from Maine for the great leadership she is giving to us on this subject.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I thank my distinguished colleague from Oregon. As always, he is constructive and cooperative, and I appreciate his kind words.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have conferred with other members of the Public Works Committee with reference to the amendment which the Senator from Maine has suggested. We accept it, and we assure her that we will try to save it in conference.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, chairman of the Public Works Committee. As always, he is most cooperative and helpful, and I greatly appreciate his statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am more than happy to support the amendment of the Senator from Maine, which has been accepted by the committee chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). Who is yielding time to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think this is one of the most important amendments that could be adopted to the bill. As the Senator from Maine has noted, I had

submitted an amendment of similar import. I think her amendment has some points in it which mine did not cover.

The Senator from Maine has been active in the fight for traffic safety for years. Let me say, as a colleague and friend of the Senator from Maine, that I submitted my amendment after receiving a letter from the American Automobile Association. I read a proposal by one of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, of the Eighth Congressional District of Minnesota. He talked with me about his proposal in the House, and hoped that we might be able to do something of a similar nature in the Senate. With that as a background, I submitted my amendment.

As a part of the legislative history I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks a letter dated May 18, 1956, which I have received from the American Automobile Association. The letter is signed by Mr. Burton W. Marsh, director of the traffic engineering and safety department.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1956.

Re proposed amendment to Federal-aid highway bill for traffic safety studies.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Attached are two copies of a suggested amendment to H. R. 10660, as now being considered in the Senate for the purpose of securing greatly needed traffic safety studies. Purposely, the proposed amendment has been reduced to what is considered to be the minimum practical number of words. It will be noted that it relates to section 10 (a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954, which section reads as follows:

"The Secretary of Commerce is authorized in his discretion to engage in research on all phases of highway construction, reconstruction, modernization, development, design, maintenance, safety, financing, and traffic conditions, including the effect thereon of State laws, and is authorized to test, develop, or assist in the testing and developing of any material, invention, patented article, or process. The Secretary may carry out the authority granted hereby, either independently, or in cooperation with any other branch of the Government, State agency, authority, association, institution, corporation (profit or nonprofit), or any other organization or person. The funds required to carry out the provisions of this subsection shall be taken out of the administrative and research funds authorized by section 21 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 212), as amended. The provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C., sec. 5) shall not be applicable to contracts or agreements made under the authority of this subsection."

The proposed amendment does three things over and beyond what is in section 10 (a): (1) It not only authorizes but directs that a comprehensive study of all phases of highway traffic safety be made. (2) It makes it clear that such study would include physical highway characteristics, but would not be limited thereto. It would also cover the human element, etc. (3) A report with recommendations is called for by a specific date.

The traffic fatality total for 13 consecutive months has been higher than that for the same month of a year earlier. Unless the situation is reversed, we are on our way this year to the highest number of persons ever killed by traffic accidents on our streets and highways.

A number of Members of Congress have expressed an interest in greater Federal activity in the field of traffic safety.

This amendment is also in line with a resolution adopted by the Committee on Research of the Advisory Council to the President's Committee for Traffic Safety. That Committee consists of 28 representatives of virtually all of the major national organizations in this country interested in traffic safety. In a meeting attended by 21 of these persons, there was a unanimous vote in favor of a study being made under the auspices of the Bureau of Public Roads and that this be provided for through congressional legislation.

For years, it has been recognized that there is great need for further study of basic causes of accidents and various national groups have called for such studies. Unfortunately, the resources have never been available and the studies have not been made. The need is especially urgent in light of the rapid growth of traffic involving an estimated 3 cars on the road 10 years from now compared to each 2 now.

Unless such a Federal study is provided for through congressional action, there is very little chance that these greatly needed researches will be conducted any time in the near future.

Such researches would benefit all classes of road users—the truckers, the motor bus group and passenger car owners. It would benefit rural areas, where three-fourths of the traffic fatalities occur, as well as urban areas.

It is our hope that some such amendment will be introduced and acted upon on a bipartisan basis for the great benefit of all the people of our country.

We trust that this will provide information which will be useful to you in connection with this matter, and we stand ready to help you in any way that we can.

Sincerely,

BURTON W. MARSH,
Director, Traffic Engineering and Safety Department.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table which I developed relating to the rate of automobile accidents, and showing the number of deaths taking place on our highways, as compared with the death rate and accident rate in other areas of American life.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In 1954, 560,077 people died of diseases of the heart, 234,669 died of cancers, and 90,000 died of all accidental causes.

Of these 90,000 deaths, 36,000 (23.3 per 100,000) resulted from motor vehicle accidents.

Accidents are the leading cause of death in the age groups from 1 through 36 years.

Among accidents, motor vehicle accidents are the leading cause of accidental death in the age groups 1 through 65 years, falls being a more frequent cause of death for persons 65 years or older.

About 70 percent of all accidental deaths and about 75 percent of motor-vehicle accident deaths happen to men.

Combining some of the above facts, one might note the loss in family income earners and in younger men indicated by these facts.

Costs of accidents:

Estimated costs resulting from accidents in 1954

[Amounts in billions of dollars]

	Non-motor vehicle	Motor vehicle	All accidents
Losses of wages and probable future earning power	1.95	1.25	3.20
Property damage, including losses from fire	2.37	1.60	3.97
Medical expenses	.60	.10	.70
Administrative and claim settlement costs of insurance	.45	1.45	1.90
Total	5.37	4.40	9.77

Source: Accident Facts, 1955 edition: Chicago, National Safety Council, pp. 4 and 13.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In concluding my commendation of the Senator from Maine, let me say that I hope this project will get underway. Authority for this survey has been in the law. It is contained in the Highway Act of 1954, but there is no directive to the Secretary to perform. The amendment of the Senator from Maine would require the Secretary of Commerce to make a complete report as expeditiously as possible. I think it is a wonderful proposal.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I, too, wish to join my colleagues in wholehearted support of the amendment which the chairman of the Public Works Committee has indicated his willingness to accept.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a very excellent editorial entitled "Congress and Highway Deaths," published in the Boston Herald of May 25, 1956, paying high and well-deserved tribute to my senior colleague, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS AND HIGHWAY DEATHS

Maine's energetic lady Senator, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, is fighting for a two-part study of our highway death problem.

Senator SMITH feels the matter is so urgent that she is urging the Senate Public Welfare and Labor Committee to undertake one study, and the Secretary of Commerce to do a second.

The response she has been getting from her fellow Members of Congress has not been exactly overwhelming so far. Indeed it has been downright apathetic.

But by all rights there should be strong response to the Smith proposals. We hope Massachusetts' congressional delegation will line up solidly behind them.

For 40,000 useless deaths and 300,000 equally useless injuries—and there will undoubtedly be more when the next year's statistics roll in—mean something beside the numerous personal tragedies for the country as a whole.

These 340,000 casualties represent a frightful waste of our precious manpower resources. And there is an almost equally fantastic waste of the millions of tons of expensive steel, copper, chromium, glass, lead, rubber, paint, plastic, fabric and all the rest that goes into the manufacture of the automobile.

Consider also the thousands of hours spent by doctors and nurses patching up and attempting to save the victims—doctors and nurses who are needed elsewhere—and the tedious hours mechanics devote to repairing smashed vehicles—hours which could be better utilized to turn out new machinery.

Certainly a highway safety study is as important to the country as most of those which have been undertaken in recent years. Highway safety is as important as juvenile delinquency, crime, the stock market, narcotics, pornographic literature, coffee, lobbying and influence peddling, and the Voice of America. There have been investigations made of all these. It is time the spotlight was focused on the highway.

Highway safety concerns everybody—the urban dweller, the farmer, the suburbanite, rich man, poor man. It is a bipartisan issue—can you by any stretch of the imagination blame the Republicans or the Democrats (or even the Communists) for our bloody road record?

The fact is we can't blame anybody or anything at this point because we don't know who or what to blame. We desperately need to find out. Congress ought to get to work on it.

Mr. PAYNE. I urge the committee not only to take the amendment to conference, but to do everything possible to hold it in conference, so that the study may be undertaken.

I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I thank my Maine colleague for his kind and generous remarks. I now yield to the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to join in commendation of the distinguished Senator from Maine. I remember reading about her work in behalf of highway safety before I ever came to the Senate.

I should like to ask a question, if I may, for the purpose of the legislative history with respect to her amendment. We all recognize her leadership in this field.

Many of us are interested in highway beautification, and in protecting the scenery along our highways. Is it possible that roadside distractions, which catch the eye of the driver and take it off the road ahead of him, might possibly come within the scope of the study proposed to be authorized by the amendment of the Senator from Maine? I refer to such things as unsightly signs, and so forth.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I am sure my amendment would cover anything that constituted a driving hazard and a threat to safe driving. Whether such a provision should be included in this amendment or in a separate amendment would be for the Senate to decide. I want to express my appreciation to the junior Senator from Oregon who shares my concern about saving lives and who repeatedly is so generous in his statements about me.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do both sides yield back the unused time?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I am very glad to yield back my unused time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the opposition yield back the unused time?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield back the time on our side, and accept the amendment of the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been exhausted or yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] to the amendment of the Committee on Public Works.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, it is the purpose of the acting majority leader—and he wishes to advise Members of the Senate accordingly—to proceed past the dinner hour in the hope of concluding consideration of the pending bill tonight. Apparently there remains only one more controversial amendment. It does not seem likely that we shall reach that controversial amendment, which relates to apportionment, for at least an hour or an hour and a half. When that amendment is reached, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum and have a complete call, in order that Senators may have an opportunity to return to the Chamber.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11177) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of May 29, 1956, p. 9258, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on a certain amendment of the Senate to the bill H. R. 11177 entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes," which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
May 29, 1956.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to the bill (H. R. 11177) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes," and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$4,465,000" named in said amendment, insert: $4,400,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 5.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I submit for the record a comparative statement of appropriations and authorizations for 1956, and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1957, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparative statement of appropriations and authorizations for 1956, and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1957

REGULAR ACTIVITIES

(TITLE I)

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1956 [1]	Budget estimates, 1957	House bill, 1957	Senate bill, 1957	Conference allowance, 1957
Agricultural Research Service:					
Salaries and expenses:					
Research	$39,655,155	[2] $50,011,400	$49,972,000	[2] $49,736,400	$49,972,000
Plant and animal disease and pest control	20,652,920	[3] 26,200,000	22,594,000	[3] 26,665,000	[3] 26,294,000
Meat inspection	15,369,000	15,745,000	15,500,000	15,745,000	15,650,000
Total, salaries and expenses	75,677,075	91,956,400	88,066,000	92,146,400	91,916,000
Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico	24,753,708	[3] 29,503,708	29,503,708	30,753,708	29,503,708
Diseases of animals and poultry—Research	1,945,000	3,993,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Animal disease laboratory facilities	250,000	[4] 18,915,000	10,000,000	----------	----------
Total, Agricultural Research Service	102,625,783	144,368,108	131,069,708	126,400,108	124,919,708

[1] Includes funds contained in the "Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1956."
[2] Includes additional funds contained in H. Doc. 326, and $39,400 for the Squaw Butte Experiment Station carried in budget estimate for Department of the Interior.
[3] Includes $2,500,000 contained in H. Doc. 383, and $1,000,000 in H. Doc. 403, and $1,500,000 in H. Doc. 407, of which $1,250,000 to be immediately available.
[4] Contained in H. Doc. 383.

Comparative statement of appropriations and authorizations for 1956, and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1957—Continued

REGULAR ACTIVITIES—continued

(TITLE I)

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1956	Budget estimates, 1957	House bill, 1957	Senate bill, 1957	Conference allowance, 1957
Extension Service:					
Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico	$44,490,000	[5] $50,115,000	$49,615,000	$50,115,000	$49,865,000
Federal Extension Service:					
Administration and coordination	1,980,000	2,065,000	2,000,000	2,035,000	2,000,000
Penalty mail	1,650,000	1,650,000	1,650,000	1,650,000	1,650,000
Total, Extension Service	48,120,000	53,830,000	53,265,000	53,800,000	53,515,000
Farmer Cooperative Service	427,000	[6] 577,000	550,000	550,000	550,000
Soil Conservation Service:					
Conservation operations	62,942,745	65,215,000	67,500,000	67,500,000	67,500,000
Watershed protection	11,994,065	16,000,000	17,500,000	17,500,000	17,500,000
Flood prevention	10,000,000	10,700,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
Water conservation and utilization projects		232,000	232,000	232,000	232,000
Total, Soil Conservation Service	84,936,810	92,147,000	97,232,000	97,232,000	97,232,000
Agricultural Conservation Program Service	214,500,000	225,000,000	217,500,000	250,000,000	227,500,000
Agricultural Marketing Service:					
Marketing research and service:					
Marketing research and agricultural estimates	11,652,630	[6] 13,565,000	13,000,000	13,265,000	13,200,000
Marketing services	12,674,510	13,016,000	13,000,000	13,020,000	13,020,000
Total, marketing research and service	24,327,140	26,581,000	26,000,000	26,285,000	26,220,000
Payments to States, Territories and possessions	1,000,000	[5] 1,200,000	1,100,000	1,200,000	1,160,000
School lunch program	83,235,212	83,236,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	108,562,352	111,017,000	127,100,000	127,485,000	127,380,000
Foreign Agricultural Service	3,443,000	[5] 3,890,000	3,600,000	3,750,000	3,750,000
Commodity Exchange Authority	775,000	787,400	780,000	787,400	787,400
Commodity Stabilization Service:					
Agricultural adjustment programs	39,150,000	41,463,000	41,000,000	41,200,000	41,200,000
Sugar Act program	59,600,000	67,600,000	62,600,000	67,600,000	67,600,000
Total, Commodity Stabilization Service	98,750,000	109,063,000	103,600,000	108,800,000	108,800,000
Federal crop insurance, administrative expenses	6,209,985	6,210,000	6,210,000	6,210,000	6,210,000
Rural Electrification Administration, salaries and expenses	8,135,785	8,700,000	8,500,000	8,700,000	8,600,000
Farmers' Home Administration, salaries and expenses	26,339,480	26,405,000	26,405,000	26,805,000	26,750,000
Office of General Counsel	[6] 2,657,000	2,762,700	2,700,000	2,762,700	2,740,000
Office of Secretary	[7] 2,489,805	2,510,500	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Office of Information	[8] 1,298,600	1,348,100	1,325,000	1,325,000	1,325,000
Library	699,950	773,000	725,000	773,000	735,000
Total, regular activities	709,970,550	787,888,808	783,061,708	817,880,208	793,294,108
Title II, corporate expenses, restoration of capital impairment	1,634,659	929,287,178	929,287,178	929,287,178	929,287,178
Title III, special activities	184,513,109	271,165,682	271,163,682	271,163,682	271,163,682
Total	896,118,318	1,989,841,668	1,983,512,568	2,018,331,068	1,993,744,968

[5] Includes additional funds contained in H. Doc. 326.
[6] Includes $401,000 transferred from other appropriations.
[7] Includes $113,345 transferred from other appropriations.
[8] Includes $17,100 transferred from other appropriations.

Permanent authorizations

Agency and item	Authorizations, 1956	Budget estimates, 1957	House bill, 1957	Senate bill, 1957	Conference allowance, 1957
Agricultural Marketing Service:					
Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act fund	$460,000	$460,000	$460,000	$460,000	$460,000
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	166,761,959	199,525,000	199,525,000	199,525,000	199,525,000
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	167,221,959	199,985,000	199,985,000	199,985,000	199,985,000
Commodity Stabilization Service: National Wool Act	187,684	25,390,728	25,390,728	25,390,728	25,390,728
Total, permanent appropriations	167,409,643	225,375,728	225,375,728	225,375,728	225,375,728

Loan authorizations

(TITLE I)

Agency and item	Authorizations, 1956	Estimates, 1957	Recommended in House bill for 1957	Recommended in Senate bill 1957	Conference allowance 1957
Rural Electrification Administration:					
Electrification	$160,000,000	$145,300,000	$145,300,000	$214,000,000	[3] $214,000,000
Telephone	75,000,000	49,500,000	49,500,000	100,000,000	[4] 100,000,000
Total, Rural Electrification Administration	235,000,000	194,800,000	194,800,000	314,000,000	314,000,000
Farmers Home Administration:					
Farm ownership and housing	[1] 24,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	24,000,000	24,000,000
Production and subsistence	137,500,000	140,000,000	140,000,000	180,000,000	[4] 165,000,000
Soil and water conservation	11,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	10,500,000	5,500,000
Total, Farmers Home Administration	173,000,000	164,500,000	164,500,000	214,500,000	194,500,000
Total, loan authorizations	408,000,000	359,300,000	359,300,000	528,500,000	508,500,000

[1] Includes $5,000,000 contained in the "Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1956," under authority of title I, Housing Act of 1949, as amended.
[2] Of which not to exceed $25,000,000 shall be placed in reserve.
[3] Of which not to exceed $20,000,000 shall be placed in reserve.
[4] Includes authorization for an additional $15,000,000.

Corporate expenses

(TITLE II)

Agency and item	Authorizations, 1956	Estimates, 1957	House bill, 1957	Senate bill, 1957	Conference allowance, 1957
Federal crop insurance:					
Transfer from premium income	($1,500,000)	($2,000,000)	($2,000,000)	($2,000,000)	($2,000,000)
Commodity Credit Corporation:					
Restoration of capital impairment	1,634,659	929,287,178	929,287,178	929,287,178	929,287,178
Administrative expense limitation	(30,750,000)	(31,000,000)	(31,000,000)	(31,000,000)	(31,000,000)
Total, corporate expenses	1,634,659	929,287,178	929,287,178	929,287,178	929,287,178

Special activities

(TITLE III)

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1956 [1]	Budget estimates, 1957	House bill, 1957	Senate bill, 1957	Conference allowance, 1957
Research on strategic and critical agricultural materials	$314,000	$316,000	$314,000	$314,000	$314,000
Reimbursements to Commodity Credit Corporation for non-price-support activities:					
Animal disease eradication	5,788,897	13,060,954	13,060,954	13,060,954	13,060,954
Grading and classing		367,740	367,740	367,740	367,740
Special commodity disposal programs	178,410,212	257,420,988	257,420,988	257,420,988	257,420,988
Total, reimbursements to Commodity Credit Corporation	184,199,109	270,849,682	270,849,682	270,849,682	270,849,682
Total, special activities	184,513,109	271,165,682	271,163,682	271,163,682	271,163,682

Farm Credit Administration

(ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE LIMITATIONS)

(TITLE IV)

Agency and item	Authorizations, 1956	Budget estimates, 1957	House bill, 1957	Senate bill, 1957	Conference allowance, 1957
Farm Credit Administration	$2,320,000	$2,230,000	$2,230,000	$2,230,000	$2,230,000
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	550,000	(1)	550,000	550,000	550,000
Federal intermediate credit banks	1,825,000	1,932,000	1,932,000	1,932,000	1,932,000
Production credit corporations	1,595,000	1,644,000	1,644,000	1,644,000	1,644,000
Total, Farm Credit Administration	6,290,000	5,806,000	6,356,000	6,356,000	6,356,000

[1] Indefinite authorization.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10660) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 44, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$12,500,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, both the House bill and the committee amendment provide for an authorization of $10 million for the construction, improvement, and maintenance of roads on Indian reservations. I desire to stress the point that these funds are to provide for both construction and maintenance. This is not true with respect to the funds authorized for the road and parkway program of the National Park Service, amounting to $23,500,000. A separate appropriation is made annually for the maintenance of the road and parkways system of the Park Service. For the fiscal year 1957 this amounts to over $4,500,000. On the other hand, of the $10 million authorized for Indian roads for fiscal year 1957, $2,200,000 will have to be used for maintenance of the existing road system.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am offering an amendment to increase this authorization from $10 million to $12,500,000. This increase is fully warranted to accelerate road construction on all reservations to meet the growing need for a system of improved roads adequate to the social and economic needs of the residents on these Indian lands.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs maintains a road program and is responsible for Indian roads on 132 reservations serving 337,966 Indian people and with a total area of 51,488,258 acres, or 80,450 square miles, an area larger than that of all of the 6 New England States.

The need for more and better roads is illustrated by the Navaho-Hopi Reservation, which is an area almost as large as the State of West Virginia, and is served only by Bureau roads except for State highways along the outer edges. Due to the discovery of uranium and oil, the area is involved in an industrial development and requires more and better roads to serve the greatly increased traffic. Congress recognized the need of the Navaho-Hopi people in the Navaho-Hopi Rehabilitation Act of April 19, 1950, by including $20 million for a 10-year road-construction program. Even with increased appropriations the Indians will be fortunate if that congressional promise is made good in 20 years.

There are over 75,000 Navaho Indians residing on their reservation in Arizona, Utah, and New Mexico, over half of whom have not learned to speak the English language primarily because lack of roads has isolated them from contact with English speaking people. Lack of roads has prevented the operation of reservation schools, with the result that there are now more than 5,000 Navaho children of school age who have never been in school. Inadequate transportation is one of the main reasons why within the past 3 years more than 5,000 Indian children have been taken from the reservation to attend public school in the adjacent cities and towns where they have been provided with board and lodging.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I have examined the amendment which the distinguished Senator from Arizona has offered, and I have also conferred with other members of the committee. The amendment is agreeable to them and it is agreeable to me. I accept the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. GORE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "5–28–56–Q."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 42, line 20, it is proposed to strike out "$22,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$33,750,000."

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

At long last it looks as though we are going to get a highway bill. As everyone knows, our highways deteriorated terribly during the last world war. I doubt, however, if it is fair to lay all the blame for the outrageous condition of our Federal-aid highway system to the delay occasioned by the war. The fighting ended 10 years ago; yet the big end of the job of modernizing our outmoded and antiquated national road system remains to be done.

While present-day cars are designed for the atomic age, comparatively speaking, the roads they must travel are of the horse and buggy days. That is precisely why we have 100 people killed and 3,000 injured every day of the year on these obsolete highways. However, as I said before, it appears now that before many years roll by we can look forward to a highway system worthy of the name of our great country. That will be true, Mr. President, of all but one segment of our complex network of highways.

There is an old saying that a chain is no stronger than its weakest link. I wish to say something about that weak link in our national highway system. I refer now, Mr. President, to our forest highways. The system has been the orphan of the highway program for years on end. It still is. Compared with the rest of the system, the condition of the forest highways on the whole have been simply terrible for many years. Under this new program as now proposed they may even be worse. These particular highways in many cases have been not only inadequate and outmoded but dangerous and deplorable as well. Sad to relate there is no hope for improvement of these particular highways in this bill.

All our highways except forest highways are handsomely taken care of in this bill. We can look forward to tremendous progress on the primary, the secondary, the urban, and the Interstate System, but at present the case of the forest highways looks hopeless.

Under the 1948 act, $202 million was authorized annually for the primary, $135 million for the secondary, and $112.5 million for the urban system. Under the present Senate bill it is exactly twice that amount for each—$404 million for the primary, $270 million for the secondary, and $225 million for the urban system. I have no objection whatever to a 100-percent increase in these funds. I certainly agree with the statement in the Senate committee's report on page 5:

> By increasing the funds for the primary, secondary, and urban systems above the level now in effect, the committee desired to avoid an unbalanced program that would permit further deterioration of the primary, secondary, and urban systems, so vital to our economy. As great as the need for completing the Interstate System may be, it should not be undertaken at the expense of the secondary and farm-to-market roads.

The Interstate System is set up in a grand way. In both the House and the Senate bills, about $25 billion of Federal funds are made available for interstate roads over the next 13 years. But what about the forest highway system? The Senate bill provides $22,500,000 for the forest highways. That represents a 12½ percent increase over the 1948 act. It is true that the House provided $25 million for forest highways, but I can establish the point that even that figure is only about half as much as should be authorized. Forest highways are of tremendous importance to the people of the country, particularly to the people of the Western States. About 86 percent of our national forest area is located in the 12 Western States and our national forests comprise about one-tenth of the land area of this country. That the whole country is interested in our national forests and in the highways leading into them is self-evident by reason of the fact that more than 100 million people visited the forests last year. It might be pointed out, also, that a great portion of the transcontinental traffic moves through our national forests and, in fact, it is almost impossible to travel to the west coast by car without using a forest highway. While our forest highways are, therefore, of tremendous importance to the motoring public, yet for defense purposes alone it must be borne in mind that our forest highways are vital connecting links in our vast highway system.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wish to commend the Senator from Wyoming for his diligence and his interest in bringing up the matter of forest highways. I shall support his amendment. I wish the RECORD to show, however, that the figure of $22,500,000 for forest highways and trails represents an increase over the amount provided for forest roads and trails prior to 1955. In 1954 we increased the authorization from $17½ million to $22½ million. In addition to that, we wrote into the law the language which appears in the pending bill as section 109, and which is also contained in the Highway Act of 1954. It provides:

> Any funds authorized herein for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, parkways, Indian roads, and public lands highways shall be available for contract for 1 year in advance of year for which authorized.

We did that—and I know the Senator from Wyoming is familiar with this fact—because for many years the appropriations were not coming up to the level of the authorizations. They ranged from $9,892,000 in 1949 to $13 million, $14 million, and $16 million a year. In other words, there was a gap between the authorizations and the appropriations. By inserting this contract authority, we made it possible to provide for forest highways and trails the money which the committees have felt should be provided.

Mr. BARRETT. I may say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that I am aware of that fact. I also wish to say that the contract authority was added to the bill by the distinguished Senator, Mr. CASE, and I commend him for it. I certainly agree that it was the greatest single factor in forest highway improvement in a long time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate what the Senator has said. If he will yield to me further, I should like to read into the RECORD what the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. True D. Morse, said in a letter to the committee in 1954:

> In fiscal year 1953 the national forest timber cut was about 1.5 billion feet below the allowable cutting capacity. In that year the loss to the Federal Government through inability to market mature timber was about $20 million in potential gross revenue. Losses of this character will continue from year to year until a major part of the access-roads system has been installed.

I bring that to the attention of the Senate because I do not believe it is generally realized that money spent for building access roads actually brings money back into the Treasury. The Assistant Secretary of Agriculture tells us that $20 million was lost in 1953 alone because of the lack of access roads. That is why it will pay us to adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, because we will get the money back in increased timber sales.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for his splendid contribution.

Mr. President, the forest highway system comprises the main and secondary roads within and adjacent to the national forests, which are located in 38 of the 48 States, and have a total length of 24,275 miles. The forest highway system was set up under the Federal-Aid Road Act of 1916 and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1921. There are three classes of forest roads. Class I consists of 9,290 miles of forest highways which are on the Federal-aid primary system, class II consists of 8,858 miles of forest highways on the Federal-aid secondary system, and class III consists of 6,127 miles of forest highways on State and local but not on the Federal-aid system. About 12,000 miles or roughly one-half of the forest highway system in the United States are located within the area of South Dakota and the 11 public-land States of the West. The following table shows the miles in each of these States by classes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table setting forth the number of miles of forest highways in the 12 Western States, including the State of South Dakota.

There being no question, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mileage of the National Forest Highway System, by forest road class and by State, as of June 30, 1954

State or Territory	Total miles	Class 1 miles	Class 2 miles	Class 3 miles
Western States:				
Arizona	1,059.2	406.1	384.0	269.1
California	2,460.6	675.3	305.0	1,480.3
Colorado	1,507.0	583.0	466.0	458.0
Idaho	1,122.0	660.4	132.9	328.7
Montana	1,190.5	699.9	168.3	322.3
Nevada	318.8	157.2	130.8	30.8
New Mexico	652.0	204.0	293.0	155.0
Oregon	1,423.2	716.8	397.3	309.1
South Dakota	302.0	189.0	101.0	12.0
Utah	716.0	187.0	245.0	284.0
Washington	755.8	387.7	114.0	254.1
Wyoming	492.0	353.0	109.0	30.0
Alaska	365.9	----------	----------	365.9
Total	12,365.0	5,219.4	2,846.3	4,299.3

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, this system is not thoroughly connected, but by all manner of means the first two classes of that system consisting of 8,064 miles are an integral part of the Federal aid system. More than two-thirds of each class of forest highway roads in the western area are badly in need of improvements. I raise no point here, Mr. President, that such a vast part of our public domain was set aside as a national forest reserve and locked up for all time in Federal ownership. I do say, however, that such being the case, the responsibility for these lands and for the highways crossing them belongs wholly and completely to the Federal Government. The House committee, on page 7 of its report on the highway bill of this year, recognized this responsibility in these words:

> The committee feels that the authorizations in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1954 for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, and parkways, which are the prime responsibility—

I emphasize the words "prime responsibility"—

> of the Federal Government, should be increased to provide for accelerated improvement programs in these Federal domain roads.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. President, the fact of the matter is that instead of accelerating the construction of additional forest highways this bill will in fact retard the development program. While we are increasing the development of our primary system by 100 percent over 1948, our secondary system by 100 percent over 1948, and our urban system by 100 percent over 1948, the fact remains that we are increasing forest highways in this bill by only 12½ percent. The increased demands on the States for funds to match the accelerated program of the Federal-aid system and the Interstate System will make it impossible for the States to spend any State funds on forest highways. As the House committee report so well pointed out, the responsibility is primarily that of the Federal Government. For that reason it seems to me that we should by all manner of means increase the funds for forest highways.

Mr. President, I have placed in the rear of this Chamber a map showing the forest highways in the 12 Western States. A look at it will disclose beyond question that these highways are an integral part of our Federal aid primary system.

A few years back the Congress asked the Bureau of Public Roads to submit an estimate of forest highway needs. As a result of the survey, it was apparent that more than two-thirds of the forest highways were badly in need of reconstruction or improvement, in fact, 97 percent of the 16,500 miles in that classification were considered critically in need of immediate improvement. To meet these critical needs it was estimated that for the 10-year period commencing in 1955 $1,292,904,000 would be needed. At the rate of $22,500,000 a year it would take well over 50 years to complete that program, and that, Mr. President, is precisely why I rise to speak on this subject matter here today.

Of course, it is ridiculous to talk about taking a half a century to complete a road system. In 1948 the Bureau of Public Roads estimated the 10-year needs for the forest highways in the Western States would cost $679 million. Between that time and 1954 $204 million was spent on the forest highways of the West and, by the way, half of it was State funds; and yet in 1954 when the new estimate was made it was reported that $736 million would be needed in the next 10 years on the western forest highways, which meant an increase of $56 million in needs notwithstanding the expenditure of $100 million of Federal funds and $100 million of State funds.

Now, assuming, Mr. President, that the appropriations for forest highways total $22½ million each year for the next 10 years, then it would be safe to figure that a total of about $165 million of Federal funds will be available for expenditure on these roads over a 10-year period. That represents about one-fifth of the estimated 10-year needs for forest highways in the Mountain States. I venture the statement, Mr. President, that will be just about all that will be spent on forest highways during that period of time, notwithstanding the fact that the construction of these roads is a prime responsibility of the Federal Government as was so well pointed out in the House committee's report. The States of the West in years gone by have expended about $202 million on forest highways.

Nearly every Western State has experienced great difficulty in matching Federal aid funds in recent years. In order to match the Federal funds on the new and expanded program, it will take about $4 billion of new State matching funds during the next 13 years. In other words, it will take $2½ billion to match the interstate funds and a billion and a half to match the expanded Federal aid program. I know that my State will experience great difficulty in raising the necessary State funds in order to match the expanded program. I am sure that is true of the other Western States.

If the States are short of matching funds when the new program gets underway, it is an absolute certainty that State funds will be used, first, to match the interstate program; secondly, to match the Federal aid primary, secondary and urban program; and no State funds will be available for forest highways except Federal funds. That is why I say, Mr. President, that while forest highways have been the forgotten man of the highway system up to now, the prospects are that it will be much worse under the new program.

The importance of our forest highways in relation to the vast Federal-aid system in the Western States can best be demonstrated by a map which has been prepared by the Bureau of Public Roads. A glance at this map will show that these relatively short stretches of forest highways are important links in our Federal-aid system and assume a vital role in the overall use of the principal roads in the West. It is most difficult, as can be seen, to travel to any part of any of our Western States without traveling over a forest highway. The forest highways shown on this map are only class I forest highways, since they connect with the Federal-aid primary system. Not shown on this map are the many hundreds of additional miles of forest highways which connect with Federal-aid secondary and county roads.

As can readily be seen from the map, it is virtually impossible for anyone to travel from any of the Great Plains States to the west coast without using a forest highway. Thus these highways can be seen in their true light as an integral part of the great transportation system which enables goods and people to move to and from the great industrial areas on the west coast.

A survey has shown that the forest highways represented on this map are more deficient than the adjoining sections of Federal-aid primary routes and, therefore, are the weakest links in this system. Our forest highways remain far from adequate to meet present-day requirements and are becoming even more inadequate as the traffic problem increases and needed improvements are postponed. Bureau of Public Roads engineers report that in general, during each decade since 1920, it has been necessary to raise the standards of such design features as alinement, roadway width, steepness of grades, surface thickness, and drainage, in order to accommodate the constant increase in traffic volumes and loads being carried. An age analysis shows that 55 percent of the system in the Western States was constructed prior to 1940 with the result that most of the surface has reached the end of its economical life.

Highway usefulness is closely associated with the age of the road. In this regard rather comprehensive studies have been made on primary highways in a group of Western States, including 5 States with national forests. The results of this study have revealed that pavements of surface-treated types have

an average life of about 11 years and the heavier road-mix type have a life expectancy of 17 years.

In addition to the surface inadequacies, there is a great need of reconstruction to ease sharp curves and steep grades to accommodate the increased volume of fast-moving and heavier-laden vehicles. Such improvements contribute much to the safety of the traveling public.

It is also important that 26 percent of the class I forest highway mileage has widths of less than 19 feet. Engineering studies show that roads with less than 19 feet of width present extremely dangerous conditions for present day traffic. Two vehicles cannot comfortably meet and pass without one or both moving partially off the surfaced area. The result of this additional wear on the surface edges is that maintenance costs are increased due to the rapid breakdown of the surfaced roadway area.

In recent years the use of forest highways has increased in proportion to the increased use of Federal-aid primary roads. It is quite evident that this use will continue to increase along with the economic development of the Western States. All observations, statistics, and studies definitely indicate the need for a greatly accelerated program if our forest highways are to be developed to a reasonable standard along with other segments of our highway system.

To illustrate more graphically the forest highway situation in the 12 Western States, I have prepared a chart which shows the comparison of forest highway mileage which needs improvement as compared to the total mileage. The chart shows the situation with regard to class I forest highways, and reveals that more than 66.7 percent are in need of improvement. These highways are connecting links on the Federal-aid primary system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this chart printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Forest highway system (12 Western States)

[Class I]

State	Mileage			
	Good	Poor	Total	Percent poor
Arizona	152	254	406	62.6
California	277	398	675	58.9
Colorado	425	158	583	27.1
Idaho	157	503	660	76.2
Montana	178	521	699	74.5
Nevada	56	101	157	64.3
New Mexico	61	143	204	29.9
Oregon	141	576	717	80.3
South Dakota	38	151	189	79.8
Utah	92	95	187	50.8
Washington	46	342	388	88.1
Wyoming	112	241	353	68.3
Total	1,735	3,483	5,218	66.7

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, the survey conducted by the Bureau of Public Roads in 1954 shows that $31,519,353 was expended on forest highways in the 12 Western States in 1954. This amount takes into account forest highway funds of $15,602,788, Federal-aid funds of $6,166,138, and State funds of $9,750,427. Even if it were possible to spend $32.5 million on forest highways during the next 10 years, it would mean a total expenditure of $325 million which would be less than half the amount required to meet the estimated 10-year needs for these States. However, Mr. President, I fear that only $165 million of forest highway funds will be available during that period of time for the roads in the Western States. As I have pointed out, the States simply will not have the funds to spend on these Federal forest highways.

Insofar as the West is concerned forest highways are located, for the most part, in mountainous areas where construction is expensive and difficult. Rugged winters in the high altitudes break up road surfaces and cause rapid deterioration of highways and State highway departments must exert constant effort to keep these roads in a "passable condition." However, these highways are important segments of the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems and should come up to the same standards as the main transportation routes.

The highway legislation now before Congress provides a 13-year program for enlarging and improving the Federal highway system. It seems to me that it is good, sound planning to provide adequately for every part of our complex Federal-aid system. The House has approved of only a slight increase for forest highways. The Senate Public Works Committee has recommended no increase at all.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a copy of the resolution of the Western Association of Highway Officials, adopted at their convention on April 12 last.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 8

Whereas the forest highway system is deficient for present-day needs; and

Whereas the present annual authorization rate of $22,500,000 for forest highways will not allow completion of this system to adequate standards for over 30 years; and

Whereas the construction of many important sections of the forest highway system is lagging behind the other portions of the Federal aid system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Highway Officials, in convention assembled at Phoenix, Ariz., on April 12, 1956, urgently requests the Congress of the United States to take the necessary action to speed up the construction of the forest highway system to keep pace with the other Federal aid systems, and that copies of this resolution be sent to Members of Congress of the Western States and to members of the appropriate committees.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I have not mentioned the matter of forest development roads, park roads, and parkways, although I am just as vitally interested in these other roads on the public lands. I believe that they too are important links in our overall highway system. I shall support the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] in his efforts to increase funds for these roads.

Mr. President, if we are to develop a well coordinated plan for an integrated highway system, it seems to me that it is absolutely essential that at least connecting links of the Federal aid primary system, known as class I forest highways, should be stepped up in the expanded program in the same fashion as are the other important highways. In order to correct this situation, Mr. President, I am submitting an amendment which will increase by one-half the authorization for forest highways in the Senate committee bill. To my way of thinking, such an increase is manifestly fair and proper. I trust the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I promised to yield first to the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I should like to address a question or two to my colleague from Wyoming.

As my colleague knows, there are on the desk three amendments, one of which relates to other forest highways, and the others to national park roadways and parkways. One of the amendments was offered by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and the other two have been offered by myself. It seems to me that the other amendments are really a part of the program which the Senator from Wyoming has been discussing. I wonder if he would consider modifying his amendment so as to take in the figures of these other amendments, covering forest trails, and raising the amount from $24 million to $27 million, raising the figures covering park roads from $12,500,000 to $16 million, and the figures covering parkways from $11 million to $16 million. These were the figures authorized by the House. If the Senator would consider modifying his amendment to include these figures, then the time of the Senate could be saved and we would not be under the necessity of offering additional amendments.

Mr. BARRETT. I should be delighted to do that. As I said before I am very interested in increasing the funds for forest trails, for park roads, and for parkways. The reason why I did not add those items to my own amendment was because I knew the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] had an amendment to increase funds for those highways and I proposed to support his amendment and I may say that sometime back I joined with my colleague [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in the introduction of a 10-year national park bill to implement Mission 66.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which will incorporate the suggestions made by the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. I wish to express my personal gratitude to my colleague from Wyoming for his action, and to say to him that I had the privilege of discussing this proposed action with my colleague from Oregon, who joins me in the request. He is on the floor and may wish to express his point of view, but I am grateful for this opportunity.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 42, line 20, it is proposed to strike out "$22,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$33,750,000," (2) to strike out "$24,000,000"; and insert in lieu thereof "$27,000,000"; at the proper place in section 107 (a) to strike out "$12,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$16,000,000," and in section 107 (b) to strike out "$11,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$16,000,000."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As I understand, the Senate has already agreed to an amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], so the amount provided for Indian roads has already been changed. We have now provided for all the roads for which contract authority is established in section 109, namely, forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, parkways, Indian roads—in fact, all except the public lands highways.

Mr. BARRETT. I think the Senator from South Dakota is correct.

Mr. President, it seems to me that it is only fair, right, just, and proper that Congress should accept the responsibility which the House committee so clearly pointed out in its report, and should provide adequate funds for the construction of the forest highways, park roads and trails, and forest trials in the public domain States of the West.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Has any provision been made for access roads to mines supplying strategic materials?

Mr. BARRETT. Yes; I am certain provision has been made for such roads.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Formerly provision was made for a separate category of access roads under the allocations made to the Atomic Energy Commission and other agencies. More recently, however, appropriations have been made directly to the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense for access roads.

I may say that I think the Senator from Wyoming has put his finger on an important point, namely, that the Federal Government should take as good care of its own lands as it does of lands belonging to others. I hope Congress will accept the responsibility, so that proper provision can be made for the public lands.

Mr. LANGER. Should not the bill contain a provision for access roads to mines?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Access roads to uranium deposits can be made available through funds provided for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. LANGER. I was not speaking principally about uranium; I was speaking also about antimony, tungsten, and other ores.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Two million dollars has been provided in the bill for public lands roads.

Mr. LANGER. I do not come from a mining State, but I think such a provision should be included in the bill.

ACCESS ROADS TO MINES ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I discussed the Senator's proposed amendment with him before he offered it. I think he has offered an excellent addition to the bill.

Would the Senator accept an addition to his amendment providing for access roads to mineral deposits?

We understand that the Atomic Energy Commission has provided for access roads to uranium deposits. Uranium has captured the headlines and the imagination of the public. However, there are several other minerals, including tungsten, manganese, columbium, tantalum, beryl, and asbestos, without which a jet engine cannot be built. The Atomic Energy Commission has nothing to do with those minerals whatsoever, and provision for access roads to mines producing these minerals on public lands.

Mr. BARRETT. I have not had an opportunity to discuss the matter of allocations, but an increase in the amount will make it possible, of course, for more access roads to be developed.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator from Wyoming accept an amendment at the proper place in the bill?

Mr. BARRETT. If the Senator from Nevada will prepare an amendment, I will ask the acting majority leader if we may use some of his time, so that the Senator from Nevada and I may have an opportunity to discuss the text of the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I believe my time has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There is not a mile of forest trails and roads built with Federal funds in the Black Hills of South Dakota which does not afford an opening to some mining property. I think the increase to $27,500,000 which has already been made for the forest trails is itself a means of providing access to a great many mining prospects. At least, that is the case in the Black Hills.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. GORE. How much time does the Senator think he will require in order to prepare his amendment in the form in which he wishes to offer it?

Mr. BARRETT. Only a matter of a few minutes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I support the amendment which has been offered to increase the amounts for forest roads, and I shall support a further amendment which will bring those other public-land area sums up to the figures which are contained in the House bill.

The amounts in the House bill, as well as the additional amounts proposed for forest roads in the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], are fully justified by the increased demands on the forest and park roads system. The sound management of national forests for lumbering, recreation, and other uses requires construction of roads to improve accessibility.

I point out that these roads are not financed from gas tax or other highway-user levies, but from funds derived from the sale of timber harvested from the national forests. Forest development roads in the Pacific northwest more than pay for themselves in the additional sums made available to the Federal Treasury, through better access to federally owned timber and increased competitive bidding when it is offered for sale. Furthermore, these roads offer smaller firms an opportunity to bid on this timber. They thus help to prevent monopoly in the lumber industry.

It is estimated that the forest road-building programs of the past have provided $2 in revenue for every $1 invested by the Federal Government.

The large benefits from improved forest access roads also accrue to millions of anglers, hikers, hunters, campers, recreationists, and others who vacation in our national forest areas. During recent years, recreational use of these outdoor playgrounds has almost tripled. Additional roads will open new areas to large numbers of vacationists who seek relaxation in the forested areas of our public domain.

Similar conditions prevail with respect to our national parks and national monuments, which are visited each year by increased numbers of vacationists. While we are improving our Federal-aid highway systems for the benefit of the motoring public, we should also provide roads and connections from these highways into the vast Federal recreational areas. Improvement of the roads and parkways in national forests and parks is urgently needed in order that millions of pleasure-seeking American motorists will have a place to go off the improved Federal-aid highway system.

Mr. President, I believe that the increased authorizations proposed by these amendments constitute a realistic approach to the attainment of a beneficial objective, and I urge their adoption.

I hope that the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who is Chairman of the Committee on Public Works, will consent to take to conference the proposals for increased funds.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] for his amendment in regard to forest access roads. It is, in my judgment, very similar to the amendment of my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], since he has accepted modifications of his amendment along the line of the amendment of the junior Senator from Oregon.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of the proposal to increase the authorization for forest access roads and for roads and trails in our national parks.

FOREST HIGHWAYS; FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

Forest highways are arterial highways which constitute a segment of the Federal-aid road system. Forest development roads and trails are tributary roads in the forests which link remote forest areas with our main highways.

My colleague and I went before the House Committee on Public Works and explained the importance of increasing the authorizations on these items. We were supported by communications from the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] and Senators MAGNUSON, JACKSON, LEHMAN, DOUGLAS, SCOTT, HUMPHREY, SPARKMAN, KEFAUVER, and MURRAY, all of whom expressed approval of our proposals. We demonstrated to the satisfaction of the subcommittee and the full committee that it is good business to increase the authorization for forest access roads. Consequently, the House of Representatives increased the authorization for forest highways from $22.5 million to $25 million for each of the fiscal years 1958 and 1959. It also authorized an increase of from $24 million to $27 million per annum for forest development roads and trails.

Following that testimony, Mr. President, I received letters from Mr. BLATNIK and Mr. BUCKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the two letters be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 25, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Without your excellent and detailed testimony before our Public Works Committee, the forest highway and timber access authorizations in the pending Federal highway bill would not have been increased. Many of us on both sides of the aisle knew that these programs were beneficial to sound development of our national forests. We were faced with unwillingness by the administration to present a realistic program.

You came over and testified for yourself and 11 other Senators, including the distinguished majority leader LYNDON JOHNSON, Senator SYMINGTON, and Senator KEFAUVER. The testimony you gave caused the committee to review the whole program and to make increases.

I know that the increases are not as large as they should be, but I also know that this example of congressional interest should be a strong indication of the feelings of the committee for the guidance of the executive branch.

The confidence that your colleagues, the Oregon House Members and the recreationists and lumbermen of the West, placed in you to be the major spokesman before our committee is well deserved.

Your testimony provided the impetus for increases in the basic programs necessary for wise development of our natural resources. As a man with a deep interest in conservation, I want to express my appreciation for the service you have rendered. It is another in a long list of your accomplishments in the public interest.

My kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. BLATNIK,
Member of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., April 24, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wanted to express my personal thanks for the excellent service you have performed for conservation and full development of our natural resources in connection with the Federal highway bill.

When the bill reached the full committee, I looked it over carefully. The administration had not requested that either the forest highway or forest development road and trail item for the Forest Service be increased.

I had studied your testimony in behalf of increased roads into our public timber, and was deeply impressed by the compelling reasons you set forth. It was my conviction we would err unless we provided an increase. However, in the absence of Administration support for the type of increase you suggested, and the time element involved in conducting further hearings. I felt only one sound course was open to us. We could increase the program to show the executive branch that we recognized the merit of the program, and thus encourage them to get their facts together later to present a realistic long-term program.

I felt, however, that increases should be made on both access roads and forest highways, which also serve timber and recreational use. Two and one-half million dollars was added for forest highways and $3 million for forest development roads and trails.

The Oregon congressional delegation, which apparently let you, supported by Senator NEUBERGER, speak for the needs of Oregon, is indebted to you.

I am sure the people of your State will also fully appreciate your accomplishments in their behalf.

H. R. 10066 by Mrs. GREEN, of Oregon, a companion to your S. 3420, is before our committee. These bills formally propose a complete long-term access road program. I think your efforts in the current highway bill and the results, can give you every reason to believe that the committee is strongly interested in seeing a realistic long-term program developed.

We have worked hard to bring forth as nearly as perfect a program as we could achieve in the time available. It is a genuine source of pleasure to me to have had the type of constructive assistance you gave our committee.

Sincerely,

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the wisdom of the increased authorization becomes quite evident when we consider the handsome return to the Government that will accrue from an expanded program of developing our forest access roads. For example, in Oregon, the National Forests have vast stands of timber, some of which have reached maturity or have become overripe. Large areas of this fully matured timber are not being cut for the simple reason that we do not have access roads to remove the logs.

Before the access-road program was started, inaccessible Federal timber was developed by putting up a large block in one sale. The successful bidder—and there was generally only one—would push a railroad or truck road into the timber, cutting as he went. The result was a minimum price to the Government and usually a very high cost for the construction of the access road, deducted from the proceeds of the sale of the timber.

Changes in logging techniques and the development of the modest access-road program presently being carried on by the Forest Service made it possible to make smaller sales in areas where access roads had been constructed. The net result has been that the Forest Service has made many smaller sales, has received better prices for its timber on competitive bids, and has been able to to a better job of forest management. Benefits to the Treasury have increased. To illustrate the wisdom of the access-road investment, let me cite the example of the Mount Hood National Forest. In 1942, a timber-access road was put into this forest with appropriated funds, and has been extended since that date. Six million dollars has been invested in the road to date, and the Government has received back $9 million in cash from the sale of timber. From now on, this area alone will bring over a million dollars annually because of its development. In addition, the construction of a high-grade access road has increased recreationists from 3,000 to 112,000 a year.

I cite the foregoing example to show how important it is that we invest a relatively small amount in our Federal forests, so they may be operated on a business-like basis which brings heavy dividends to the American people who own the forests.

As presently set up, the appropriations for forest-access roads equal only 30 cents per acre of commercial timber lands in our national forests. By comparison, we are spending 60 cents per acre per year for access roads in our national parks; and at the current request level for the O. & C. lands of Oregon, we shall be spending $2.25 per acre.

The amendment would bring the forest highways authorization back to $25 million per year, and would restore the $27 million authorization for forest development roads and trails. I urge its adoption because it constitutes a wise business practice and sound forest management.

NATIONAL PARK ROADS

The amendment also proposes to restore the $16 million per year item for park roads and trails, which was recommended by the House of Representatives. The Senate Committee reduced this amount to $12.5 million for each fiscal year from 1958 to 1961, inclusive. I also urge that the House action approving an authorization of $16 million per annum for parkways be restored. The Senate committee had reduced this figure to $11 million for the fiscal years 1958 to 1961, inclusive. The benefits of these roads, trails, and parkways to our national park system are many and varied. The House action promises sound management of our national park system.

CONCLUSION

These roads do not cost the taxpayer 1 cent, and they make money for the Treasury. The question before the Senate is whether we shall increase revenue by building more roads, using experienced road contractors, and thereby enabling the Forest Service to sell its timber at better prices; or whether we shall continue to build access roads under timber sales contracts at higher costs, bringing less money for the timber when it is sold.

This program has merit. It does not increase the authority of the Government with respect to things that private industry can do.

For those of us who have a deep interest in the development and wise use of our natural resources, the amendment is of primary importance.

Mr. President, in my opinion, the people are greatly indebted to my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER] for the excellent leadership he is extending to the conservation forces of the Nation in the fight he is making in the Senate to see to it that wise use is made of our timber resources on the basis of a sound conservation program. Mr. President, an access-road program is a sound conservation program.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, does the Senator from Wyoming wish to have time yielded to him?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to have about 2 minutes yielded to me.

Mr. GORE. I yield 2 minutes to the junior Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish formally to associate myself with the remarks of the Senators who are sponsoring the amendment. I am one of the sponsors of the amendment.

I am personally acquainted with conditions in the national forests. I feel that there can be no question about the need for this additional fund to improve the highways in and through the forests of the United States. These national forests were set aside for a great public purpose; and from the time when they were set aside during the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt, and until this hour, they have been productive of very good results, not only for the States in which the forests are located, but also for all the people of the United States.

The forests are great in extent. The terrain is mountainous. The difficulty of building roads there is such that the expense of their construction is too great for the States involved to bear. Frequently the areas of the forests are greater than several counties put together.

So it is important that the Federal Government, which manages the forests, also carry on the building of the roads within the forests.

Mr. President, I hope there will be no objection whatever to this amendment to the committee amendment.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee for yielding to me.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President——

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to join the able senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] in endorsing the amendment he has submitted. I am very happy to be a cosponsor of the amendment.

For many years I have had a great deal of interest in our national forests and our national parks for the use of all the people. It seems to me that the Senator from Wyoming has very ably pointed out the squeeze that the roads in the national forests are receiving as a result of the economy we now have and as a result of the expanded highway program.

I wish to join him in urging adoption of the amendment, which I believe will greatly expand the road program in the forests, for the benefit of the people of the Nation.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Colorado for his very effective help in the drafting and preparation of the amendment and for his fine help on the floor of the Senate.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BUILD ROADS TO DEVELOP OWN LAND ACCESS ROADS TO MINERAL DEPOSITS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have long believed—and I am sure the distinguished Senator from Wyoming will join me in this—that the Federal Government should at least contribute as much to the improvement of its own lands as it does to the improvement of others.

Access roads to mineral deposits on Government lands are very important to national defense as well as to the development of such lands.

I inquire whether the Senator from Wyoming would accept, as a modification of his amendment, the following:

On page 43 of the committee amendment, in line 23, after the word "amended" and the comma, to insert "and for access roads to mines on public lands."

And on the same page, in line 24, to strike out the figure "$12,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof, instead of "$16,000,000", $18,000,000."

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I am glad to modify my amendment accordingly.

Mr. MALONE. Then, Mr. President, I should like to join the distinguished Senator from Wyoming in sponsoring the amendment.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I ask that the RECORD show that the Senator from Nevada is a cosponsor with me of the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that will be done.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I modify my amendment accordingly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment as modified will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 42, in line 20, it is proposed to strike out "$22,500,000" and to insert "$33,750,000."

On the same page, in line 23, it is proposed to strike out "$24,000,000" and to insert "$27,000,000."

On page 43, in line 23, after the word "amended" and the comma, it is proposed to insert "and for access roads to mines on public lands."

In line 24, it is proposed to strike out "$12,500,000" and to insert "$18,000,000."

On page 44, in line 6, it is proposed to strike out "$11,000,000" and to insert "$16,000,000."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have followed the modified amendment as best I could, and I have read the text. I wish to be sure that it does not change the contract authorizations.

Do I correctly understand that the amendment as modified applies only to the amounts for the purposes stated in the bill, with the exception of the modification with respect to mines only, which the Senator from Wyoming accepted from the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]?

Mr. BARRETT. The Senator from Tennessee is correct.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I accept the amendment as modified.

Mr. BARRETT. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I am very happy to be a cosponsor with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] of this amendment, and I am pleased to hear the acting majority leader say that he will accept the amendment.

The public lands States in the West have thousands of square miles of public domain. For example, in Idaho 65 percent of our total area is public domain, and it has been extremely difficult for the Western States to provide funds to match Federal funds with which to construct forest highways, especially.

I commend the Senator from Wyoming for sponsoring this amendment. I am sure it will be accepted by the conferees, because it merely accelerates the construction of highways over the public domain to a degree which is to some extent, at least, comparable with the greatly expanded highway construction programs throughout the entire country.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] for his splendid contribution. I also thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for his kindness in accepting this amendment. I hope the conference will agree to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield back all of my remaining time, and ask for a vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time has been exhausted or yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] for

himself and other Senators to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KERR subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished acting majority leader, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], may be permitted to yield 1 minute on the bill to me, so that I may clear up one point in my mind with reference to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], which amendment the Senate has adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee a question with reference to section 108, appearing at page 44 of the bill, beginning in line 22. That section authorizes the sum of $2 million a year for each of 5 years for "the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations."

Is it the understanding of the Senator from Tennessee that with reference to that authorization, contract authority is included in section 109, the section immediately following?

Mr. GORE. I have understood and now understand that sections 108 and 109 relate to the same subject. The contract authorization contained in section 109 does specifically relate to the contents of section 108.

Mr. KERR. In other words, section 108 is but one of the authorizations to which section 109 relates; is that correct?

Mr. GORE. Section 109 certainly relates to section 108.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is correct. Section 109 also relates to other sections preceding it, which have to do with authorizations for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, and park roads and trails.

Mr. GORE. On page 43.

Mr. KERR. On page 42, 43, and 44.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. What I wished to clear up was that it also relates to the authorization in section 108.

Mr. GORE. I believe that is true.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I merely wish to add that that is my understanding of the intent.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. FRED A. SEATON TO BE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the senior Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. The President of the United States yesterday announced he was nominating the Honorable Fred A. Seaton to be Secretary of the Interior. In view of the fact that this highly important post has remained vacant for some 6 weeks, since the resignation of Douglas McKay on April 15, I believe the Senate should act with all possible speed in considering the nomination.

Therefore, I am calling a meeting of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for next Monday, June 4, at 10 o'clock, in the committee room, No. 224 in the Senate Office Building, to act on the nomination, and have invited Mr. Seaton to attend the meeting.

This committee meeting will be public, and all interested Members of the Senate are invited to be present.

THE MEDITERRANEAN FRUITFLY—RELAXATION OF REQUIREMENTS FOR PERSONS ENTERING THIS COUNTRY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, during recent days much has been said and a lot has been done about two problems that concern, to one degree or another, virtually every family circle in the land.

One of these problems is the recent outbreak of the Mediterranean fruitfly. The second has to do with the illicit traffic in narcotics.

The first, if allowed to run its course, would destroy every fruit tree in the Nation. It would leave barren the rich citrus groves in my own great State of Florida, and those in Texas and California. It would strip naked the luscious peach orchards of Georgia, of Oregon, of Virginia, and the bountiful cherry trees of Michigan. No, the Mediterranean fruitfly is not a respecter of State boundaries. Neither is it a disciple of one political party, nor the tormentor of another. It is a common enemy of all the people.

I commend the members of the Appropriations Committee for their wisdom in providing additional funds to the Department of Agriculture with which to cope with the invasion of this dreaded enemy of every fruit producer in the Nation.

I commend the Members of the Senate for upholding the Appropriations Committee. I was confident the Senate conferees would not have difficulty in obtaining the concurrence of the House conferees. This confidence was upheld, for the House conferees did concur in this action, and the House and Senate adopted the conferees' report today. Funds will now soon be available to continue the campaign against this pest that so recently invaded our shores.

The illicit traffic in narcotics poses every bit as grave a problem to the youth of our Nation as does the Mediterranean fruitfly to the orchards of our land.

I have been greatly impressed by the tremendous job done by the Judiciary Committee in connection with the problem. I am confident their work will result in an awareness of the problem that will lead to appropriate legislation, both on a national and on a local level. I am sure there will follow stricter enforcement of the laws and more stringent punishment of offenders.

However, it occurs to me that in both instances all too little attention has been and is now being given to our first line of defense against such attacks. I refer to the work of our customs inspectors and others who guard our borders against improper entry of any nature—including, but not limited to, such things as narcotics and plants bearing pests such as the Mediterranean fruitfly.

I cannot say that the present administration is responsible for either the illegal entry of narcotics or for the recent outbreak of the Mediterranean fruitfly. However, I do say that the procedures adopted by the present administration are such as to permit either situation to occur.

Shortly after this administration took office it abandoned the time-honored practice of conducting complete baggage inspection at our ports of entry. This was done ostensibly to effect a savings—a few minutes in the time of arriving passengers, and a few cents in the salary of the assigned inspector.

Even at this hour studies are underway looking to a further curtailment in the traditionally splendid and effective work of our customs department.

The plan under consideration involves abandonment of the traditional practice of requiring each person entering the country to submit a written declaration of articles being brought in. Instead, all that would be required is an "oral declaration" that nothing of a dutiable or restricted nature is being brought in.

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee has been concerned for many months with the steady curtailment of the work of the customs department. The chairman of that committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the ranking minority member, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], appeared before the Appropriations Committee to invite the officials of the customs department to request sufficient funds to adequately perform their duties.

Nonetheless, the position of the Customs Department was stated as follows:

> Prior to April 1953, it was the practice of this Bureau to inspect substantially every piece of passenger's baggage arriving by vessel and air into the United States. This inspection was made primarily for the purpose of determining dutiable importations and for the purpose of detecting and excluding prohibited importations, including those of plant and meat products subject to the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. This type of examination frequently required from 4 to 5 hours or even longer for large passenger vessels and delayed the release of many passengers for extensive periods of time. Also about this time we were advised that we could anticipate a sharp rise in the number of passengers, particularly on aircraft, that would have to be processed. This increase has occurred.
>
> In order to reduce these delays and also in order to permit the customs service to function effectively within the limited funds available, a much more limited inspection, generally of not more than one piece of baggage for each passenger, was instituted. In

1949 the personal exemption from duty for persons returning from abroad was increased from $200 per person to $500 per person. Now, only approximately 3 percent of all baggage declarations are found to be dutiable. The Commissioner of Customs and the Secretary of the Treasury were and are satisfied that the requirements of customs laws and regulations are being adequately enforced by this limited inspection program.

Mr. President, I hope those responsible for our customs service will not be more interested in their contribution to a balanced budget than in their contribution to the welfare of the Nation. I hope they will quickly abandon thought of further curtailments such as is proposed in the plan to operate under a system of oral declaration upon entry.

I suggest that if their present course is followed they will find themselves in the position of the homeowner who went broke buying fuel oil in a vain attempt to keep his family warm because he felt he could not afford to spend the money necessary to replace a couple of broken windowpanes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an article which appeared in the Tampa Tribune of May 20, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT EASES ENTRY REQUIREMENTS FOR YACHTS

The United States Government has made it easier for American pleasure yachtsmen going to and coming from foreign countries these days.

Merrill D. White, collector of customs for Florida, has announced that yachts of United States registry are now exempt from clearing for a foreign port and making formal entrance at the customhouse.

However, White stressed, the master of each vessel arriving from a foreign port must report his arrival within 24 hours. He may do this by simply making a telephone call if he can't make it to the customhouse.

The new regulation also makes it possible for either a custom officer or an immigration officer to examine the vessels, not both as in the past.

There is an exception, however, if both dutiable articles and aliens are aboard.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10660) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. JENNER] and myself I offer the amendments to the committee amendment which I send to the desk. I do not ask that they be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD at this point; and, without objection the amendments will be considered en bloc.

The amendments proposed by Mr. CAPEHART, for himself and Mr. JENNER, to the committee amendment are as follows:

On page 35, beginning with line 1, strike out all through line 20 on page 36, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) The additional sum herein authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and the sum authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, shall be apportioned immediately upon enactment of this act. The sums herein authorized for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958 shall be apportioned in the ratio which the estimated cost of completing the National System of Interstate Highways in each State bears to the estimated total cost of completing the National System of Interstate Highways in all of the States as set forth in the computations compiled by the Bureau of Public Roads on pages 6 and 7 of House Document No. 120, 84th Congress.

"(c) All sums authorized by this section to be appropriated for the fiscal years 1959 through 1969, inclusive, shall be apportioned among the several States in the ratio which the estimated cost of completing the National System of Interstate Highways in each State bears to the estimated total cost of completing the National System of Interstate Highways in all of the States. The estimated costs shall be those set forth in the reports required to be filed by subsection (e) of this section and shall be those contained in the latest report so filed. Each apportionment herein authorized for the fiscal years 1959 through 1969, inclusive, shall be made on a date as far in advance of the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized, as practicable, but in no case more than 18 months prior to the fiscal year for which authorized.

"(d) The geometric standards to be adopted for the National System of Interstate Highways shall be those approved by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with the State highway departments. Such standards shall be adequate to accommodate the types and volumes of traffic forecast for the year 1975. The right-of-way width of the National System of Interstate Highways shall be adequate to permit construction of projects on the National System of Interstate Highways up to such standards. The Secretary of Commerce shall apply such standards uniformly throughout the States. Such standards shall be adopted by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with the State highway departments as soon as practicable after the enactment of this act.

"(e) As soon as the standards provided for in subsection (d) have been adopted, the Secretary of Commerce shall request each State highway department to make and furnish to him before July 1, 1957, a further study of the National System of Interstate Highways within its boundaries and a detailed estimate of the cost of completing the same based upon such standards. Such study and estimate shall be made in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be adopted by the Secretary of Commerce and applied by him uniformly to all of the States. Upon approval of such estimate by the Secretary of Commerce, he shall, within 10 days subsequent to January 2, 1958, transmit to the Senate and the House of Representatives a report of such study and estimate. Upon approval by affirmative resolution of the committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives to which referred, the Secretary of Commerce shall use such estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1959, June 30, 1960, June 30, 1961, and June 30, 1962. The Secretary of Commerce shall cause a revised estimate to be made in the same manner as stated above and shall transmit the same to the Senate and the House of Representatives within 10 days subsequent to January 2, 1962, and upon approval by affirmative resolution of the committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives to which referred, the Secretary of Commerce shall use such revised estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1963, June 30, 1964, June 30, 1965, and June 30, 1966. The Secretary of Commerce shall cause a revised estimate to be made in the same manner as stated above and shall transmit the same to the Senate and the House of Representatives within 10 days subsequent to January 2, 1966, and annually thereafter through and including January 2, 1968, and upon approval by affirmative resolution of the committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives to which referred, the Secretary of Commerce shall use such revised estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal year which begins next following the fiscal year in which such report is filed. Whenever the Secretary of Commerce, pursuant to this subsection, requests the State highway departments to furnish studies and estimates to him, such highway departments shall furnish copies of such studies and estimates at the same time to the Senate and the House of Representatives.

"(f) The Federal share payable on account of any project on the National System of Interstate Highways provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be increased by 90 percent of the total cost thereof, plus a percentage of the remaining 10 percent of such cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area: *Provided*, That such Federal share payable on any project in any State shall not exceed 95 percent of the total cost of such project.

"(g) Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to be expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State specifically for the National System of Interstate Highways for such fiscal year and previous fiscal years is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of specific projects under this section.

"(h) Any amount apportioned to the States under the provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure under the terms of subsection (g) of this section shall lapse: *Provided*, That any National System of Interstate Highways funds released by the payment of the final voucher or by the modification of the formal project agreement shall be credited to the National System of Interstate Highways funds previously apportioned to the State and be immediately available for expenditure."

On page 36, line 21, strike out "(d)" and insert in lieu thereof "(i)".

One page 37, line 22, strike out "(e)" and insert in lieu thereof "(j)".

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] for himself and his colleague [Mr. JENNER] to the Public Works Committee amendment. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a

quorum without the time being charged to either side.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield for that purpose provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be ordered on my amendment.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I request the distinguished Senator to refrain from submitting a unanimous-consent request. If he will wait a little while, we shall all try to have the yeas and nays ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. I withdraw the request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. How much time does the Senator from Indiana yield to himself?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to substitute for the Senate committee version the House of Representatives language with respect to apportionment of the funds to the 48 States.

The House version carries one specific formula, and the Senate committee bill carries another formula.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to construct approximately 40,000 miles of interstate highways as shown by the red lines on the map in the rear of the Chamber.

The Senate committee bill apportions or allocates funds to the respective States on the basis of a formula which is calculated on a population basis, an area basis, and a mileage basis.

The way the matter ought to be handled is in a very simple way. It ought to be handled on the basis of whatever the cost to the respective State is; no more and no less. In other words, if it costs the State of Florida $100 million, the Federal Government ought to pay $90 million to the State, and the State ought to pay $10 million. The State of Florida ought not to pay any more than 10 percent, and the Federal Government more than 90 percent.

However, with the Senate version of the bill based on population, number of miles, and area, there will be allocated to a number of States more money than they can possibly spend. The committee evidently intended it that way, because the committee has written into the bill a provision that any money beyond that necessary to construct the given miles in a specific State shall be allocated on the basis of 20 percent of the total to secondary and primary roads.

I was amazed when I discovered that the bill would do anything other than simply to allocate whatever funds were necessary for the Federal Government to pay 90 percent of the cost. I was utterly amazed to find that such a formula was not provided in the bill, because that is the simple way to do it, that is the honorable way to do it, and that is the fair way to do it; indeed, I may say it is the only way to do it.

We are not concerned with population, because we are not building roads on the basis of population. We are building X number of miles of roads. Some of the roads will be 2 lanes wide and some 4 lanes wide and some 6 lanes wide and some 8 lanes wide. Some roads will go through mountains, some will go over the top of mountains, some will be built on flat surfaces, and some will be constructed through swamps.

Every mile of the 40,000 miles of road will cost a different amount. No 2 miles will cost exactly the same amount of money.

To try to make the allocations on any basis other than that the Federal Government shall pay 90 percent of whatever the cost is and the States shall pay 10 percent of whatever the cost is, is something I do not quite understand. As a result of the Senate committee's formula, 19 States will get a reduced amount of money apportioned to them, whereas 29 States will get an increased amount.

Why do they want an increase? All we in Indiana want to do is to build approximately 1,100 miles. We want to build 2-lane, 4-lane, 6-lane, or 8-lane highways, or whatever is necessary to carry the traffic. We want the Federal Government to pay 90 percent of the cost, and we want the State of Indiana to pay 10 percent of the cost. We do not want 1 cent more than 90 percent or 1 cent less than 90 percent.

Why is that not what every State should want? Why do some States want more? What is so hard about working out a plan whereby the Federal Government will approve in advance the amount needed and then, when the project or the road has been completed, and the books have been audited, the Federal Government will pay 90 percent? Is that too simple for us in the United States Senate to do?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wonder whether the Senator from Indiana would help me with a problem I have. As I read the Senator's amendment, it provides:

> The additional sum herein authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and the sum authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, shall be apportioned immediately upon enactment of this act. The sums herein authorized for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958 shall be apportioned in the ratio which the estimated cost of completing the National System of Interstate Highways in each State bears to the estimated total cost of completing the National System of Interstate Highways in all of the States as set forth in the computations compiled by the Bureau of Public Roads.

I call particular attention to the word "completing."

I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana this question. Let us take, for example, the State of Kansas, which has already completed, by means of a toll road, one-half of the Interstate System. Am I to understand the Senator from Indiana to state that the State of Kansas is to get one-half of the money required to complete the rest of the system in Kansas?

Mr. CAPEHART. I want the State of Kansas to get exactly 90 percent of what it costs the State to complete the interstate highways the construction of which the system calls for in the State of Kansas; no more and no less.

Mr. CARLSON. In other words, half of our State highway system in the Interstate System will be paid for, and the rest of it will be a toll system. Travelers will not only pay for the toll road which is already constructed, but will be paying for roads all over the Nation.

Mr. CAPEHART. There is nothing in the House bill or the Senate bill that covers the point the Senator is making. The language of the amendment is the exact language contained in the House bill.

Mr. CARLSON. Of course, I have not yet said that I approve of it.

Mr. CAPEHART. I did not say the Senator had said he approved of it; but all we are doing is taking the exact language of the House bill. We have not added anything and have not taken anything away from it. We have the same situation in Indiana. We shall have, when it is completed, a 131-mile toll road. I do not know what is going to happen to all the toll roads in the future.

Mr. CARLSON. Half of the particular road to which I have referred is in the Interstate System. I think we are entitled to have some consideration on that account.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is not that an entirely different problem?

Mr. CARLSON. I do not think so, because the allocation of funds will be based on the ratio of the amount of money that is needed to complete the Interstate System.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield myself another 5 minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. I appreciate the opportunity the Senator from Indiana gives me to make a comment to the Senator from Kansas.

The amendment he offers deals solely and exclusively with what formula the Senate wishes to use to apportion money. The Senator from Kansas asked what the situation would be with respect to a State which previously had on its own responsibility created an expressway or a superhighway, toll road or not. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the language of the House bill on page 19, section 109, entitled "Declaration of Policy with Respect to Reimbursement for Certain Highways," which indicates the manner in which the House would attempt equitably to make reimbursement for the section of a State-constructed freeway which might subsequently become a part of the system.

But the Senator from Indiana was completely accurate in his answer to the Senator from Kansas. The Senator from Indiana has one single amendment to present. The question is, Do we want the historic apportionment formula to be used in the Interstate System to be constructed in 13 years, or do we want to make it on the basis of need?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 more minute.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nevada.

FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC-LAND STATES

Mr. MALONE. I would suggest to the distinguished Senator from Indiana that his amendment, whether it is on a basis of straight 10 percent or on the formula basis, will not amount to very much money; but whatever the Senate and the House, in their wisdom, decide shall be the proportion of Federal money in the thickly populated States where there are no government lands, should apply on the same established basis, on the public lands, so that the Government pays for roads in proportion to the lands, it owns.

Such roads increase the value of the public lands.

In Nevada we still have 87½ percent public lands. We still have a very small population, though Nevada is a much larger State than Indiana.

We think we have a population of about 300,000; however that does not compare with the population of Indiana.

The people of my State own only about 13 percent of the land.

Mr. CAPEHART. I want Nevada to be paid 90 percent by the Federal Government for every mile of Interstate Highway constructed within the State.

Mr. MALONE. I understand that, but I also understand that there are only 300,000 to 350,000 people in Nevada, and they would have to put up a much greater percentage of the 10 percent than the people of the more heavily populated States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table entitled "Federal Aid Formula."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL-AID FORMULA

Primary: One-third area, one-third population, one-third miles of rural post roads.

Secondary: One-third area, one-third rural population, one-third miles of rural post roads.

Urban: Percentage of population in cities over 5,000.

Above funds matched 50–50, except public land States are allowed credit for one-half of public lands.

Thus, in Nevada, we get 50 percent plus one-half of 68 percent, or 84 percent Federal and 16 percent State.

Interstate: Two-thirds population, one-sixth area, one-sixth miles of rural post roads, matched on 60–40 basis with same allowance for public lands.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the controversy as to whether the formula contained in the Senate bill, otherwise known as the Gore bill, or the formula contained in the House bill, otherwise known as the Fallon bill, shall be made the basis of allocation and apportionment of funds during at least the first 2 years of the proposed program has been fought out in committees, and was discussed in the general debate yesterday. The factors and elements are well known, and I have no desire to delay the deliberations of the Senate. But because of the solemn and serious obligation and responsibility which a Member of this body, particularly a member of the Public Works Committee, owes to his own State, and to all the States, in trying to secure a fair and just method of apportionment, I wish to bring out certain facts on this vital question which is fully as important as is any other question incident to this bill.

The House bill, which is the version the distinguished Senator from Indiana is asking the Senate to substitute for the Senate formula, bases the allocations on estimates made by the States. After passage of the 1954 highway Act, the Bureau of Public Roads requested the States to submit estimates of their needs.

We should not be in any way deluded by this so-called need formula or by the use of the word "needs," which has been used again and again in connection with the House bill. No word was ever more distorted. It does not represent in anyway, shape, or manner the actual needs, the boiled-down and considered needs of the States. The "needs" estimates were developed by the States without any knowledge of how they would be used. My statement is borne out by the Bureau of Public Roads which states that most of the State highway departments were not even told and did not understand why they were making the estimates or how they would be used.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let us consider the Senator's own State. Under the House bill it would receive $72 million. Under the Senate version it would receive $154 million. Which one is the more realistic?

Mr. COTTON. I shall meet that question fully and fairly.

Mr. CAPEHART. All I am trying to do is to make certain that New Hampshire gets 90 percent of whatever the roads cost, whether it be $72 million or $154 million.

Mr. COTTON. Let me say in reply to the Senator from Indiana that if his heart is bleeding for my State of New Hampshire, I should like to tell him that under the apportionment in the House bill New Hampshire will suffer more than will any other State of the 48 States and the District of Columbia. I shall indicate to the Senator in a moment how, if this is taken as the basis, New Hampshire and certain other States may never receive fair treatment.

Mr. CAPEHART. The $72 million was estimated by the New Hampshire highway department.

Mr. COTTON. That is correct. They made an estimate—and I will come to that in a moment—and they made it as frugally as possible and as economically as possible on the basis of bare minimum requirements.

They had no way of knowing what part the Federal Government would pay, and they estimated about $300,000 a mile. On the other hand, California, for instance, estimated more than $1 million a mile, and New Jersey estimated more than $4 million a mile.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I cannot yield any further. I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. I will yield the Senator a minute.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. CAPEHART. What we are trying to do is to establish a formula whereby New Hampshire and the other 47 States will get 90 percent of whatever the cost will be. How can any Senator be opposed to that? Is it because he thinks his State will get something beyond that amount?

Mr. COTTON. If the Senator will let me proceed for 5 minutes, I will tell him what I think of his method of obtaining a fair apportionment and why I object to it.

In the first place, the estimates were made without any knowledge of what the purpose was. Some States assumed that when they made estimates, they were on a 50–50 matching basis. Some States tried to project themselves into the future on the basis that the ratio would be 60–40. Some thought it would be on the basis of 90–10. Some thought it would be on the basis of a 100 percent Federal contribution. In other words, various motives animated the State highway departments to make their estimates.

In the second place—this point is important and I have not seen it brought out in the debate yet—the estimates were developed on an entirely hypothetical mileage. The last 2,300 miles of the Interstate System were not designated until after the needs estimates were compiled and completed. Some States estimated their needs on their actual mileage at the time. I am referring, of course, to the interstate system.

Some States estimated their needs on the basis of their actual miles plus the additional mileage they had requested.

None of the States could estimate their needs on the basis of actual total miles, because at that time they did not know what their actual mileage would be when the entire 40,000 miles were designated and assigned.

In the third place, the estimates represented the first time in history that an effort was even made to estimate the total highway needs of the Nation.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly for a question?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. If the Senator will permit me to do so, I shall read from page 5 one paragraph from the letter of the Secretary of Commerce transmitting the report. It bears directly on the

Senator's comment. The statement relates directly to the subject of preparing estimates:

In preparing the cost estimates of needs improvements for this study the highest design standards were, of course, used for the Interstate System. Progressively lower standards were used for each road system of lesser importance. In general, the design standards used in making the cost estimates are in accord with those adopted by the States.

I thought that statement should be a part of the RECORD. I do not quarrel with the Senator's right to interpret the estimates in any fashion he wishes, but I think the responsible authority who accumulated the estimates, after he was required to do so by act of Congress, should have his opinion in the RECORD, too.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The origin of the estimates was section 13 of the Highway Act of 1954. The origin of that section was a joint resolution which I introduced, proposing a study to determine the cost of building the several road systems of the country. I think the Senate passed the resolution, but the House committee did not want to join in the study. So later I submitted a separate resolution to provide for a study by the Senate committee. That study became the basis of section 13 of the Highway Act of 1954.

To carry out the purpose of that section, the Bureau of Public Roads was directed to cooperate with the State highway departments. I have here a statement by Mr. George T. McCoy, president of the American Association of State Highway Officials, before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Public Works, on February 21, 1955. Mr. McCoy said:

Section 13 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 requested the Secretary of Commerce to prepare an estimate of need for the Nation's 3,350,000 miles of roads, streets, and highways. The State highway departments cooperated with the Bureau of Public Roads in this undertaking.

The next sentence is the one to which I invite particular attention:

Please bear in mind that this is an estimate and not a proposed program, and it is the first time that an attempt has been made to place a dollar value upon the total highway needs of the Nation.

I have been told that 1 State, in 3 days, compiled figures for an estimate of the cost of completing its secondary, urban, and primary roads on the Interstate System.

The other day on the floor of the Senate I said that Maine had used $1 million a mile as the basis for determining the right-of-way cost of the roads. I took that figure from a table prepared by the Bureau of Public Roads in response to the study requirement in the Highway Act of 1954. The Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] came to my desk and told me he questioned the figure. He wanted to know my authority for it, because I had contrasted $1 million a mile for rights-of-way in Maine with $195,000 a mile for rights-of-way as proposed by Maryland.

The Senator from Maine later told me that he went to the telephone, called the State highway engineer in Maine, whom he knew personally, and asked him if the figure was correct. He said the engineer replied that they had to use some figure; that he did not know what the rights-of-way would cost; so he used $1 million as the figure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is how the estimates were prepared. Round figures were used. To call them a sound basis for determining the actual needs certainly is improper.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly for a question?

Mr. COTTON. The question must be brief. I do not want to delay the Senate; but I desire to complete my statement.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator for yielding. I again refer to the letter of the Secretary of Commerce with reference to section 13. He said, on page 3—and I want the RECORD to show it——

Mr. COTTON. If the Senator wants the RECORD to show it, he should use his own time. I yielded for a question.

Mr. KUCHEL. I shall read only four lines.

Mr. COTTON. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. KUCHEL. The paragraph reads:

Relatively minor differences occurred among the States in the interpretation of and adherence to the concepts and guides established for this study. These account for a certain lack of uniformity in the reported information. Nevertheless, the totals are deemed wholly adequate as a representation of nationwide needs, forming a basis for setting the initial course of remedial action.

Mr. COTTON. I call the attention of the Senator from California to page 1 of the document from which he has been reading, under the heading "Basis of Needs." This is the statement made by the Secretary of Commerce and the Bureau of Public Roads:

The term "needs" likewise requires explanation. It is a word widely used in recent years to denote construction backlog. Amounts cited as "needs" sometimes refer to the cost of complete modernization as of a given moment; sometimes they cover a construction program stretching over a period of years.

Some estimates are based on the needs of current traffic; others take future traffic fully into account.

There are variations, too, in the specifications of design standards, and there are differences in their application—one study may permit no deviations, while another will accept large deviations or tolerances.

I do not wish to linger on this point. Anyone who simply takes that tables and sees the variations among the estimates of the proposed costs of the interstate highways in the different States need not read any reports, and he certainly need not pay any heed to anything said by any Senator or anyone else. If he will simply look at the figures, he will know instantly that they have no uniformity. They are simply a collection of haphazard estimates. Some States make them lavishly; some States make them frugally and conservatively. If these estimates are made a basis for any kind of future allocation, whether the program lasts 2 years, 4 years, 10 years, or 13 years, we shall be building on sand, and shall be inflicting an unfair system on the States of the Union.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. COTTON. May I have 3 additional minutes?

Mr. GORE. I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. The answer which has been given to our committee is that these figures do not mean anything; that, after all, they will be used only for the first 2 years, and then everything will be made right and lovely, and every State ultimately will get its proper mileage, and the roads will be standardized and will be built to specifications. So, it is said, even though a particular State may suffer greatly because of the preliminary figures which have been submitted, the differences will be adjusted.

In the first place, Mr. President, remember that the standards prescribed for the highways are minimum standards, and if one State chooses to build, in the beginning, on a lavish basis, and builds a lush highway, then that State will receive more than its just share, because another State will be building on a frugal basis.

In the second place, after 2 years' use of this admittedly—I stress the word "admittedly"—unfair and unbalanced aggregation of figures and estimates, the approval of the Public Works Committees of the House and the Senate must be received.

As a matter of fact, if an examination of the roster of the members of the House Pubilc Works Committee—I do not think I am violating any rule against criticizing the other body—will disclose that several States have two members each, and that many States have no members at all, on that committee. If any Senators think those States are going to give up their frosting voluntarily, I am sure such Senators are mistaken, because the result will be a compromise, as is always the result in the legislative process. Somewhere along the line some part of this inequality will be frozen into the allocation of funds, if we start with these unfair allocations.

The Senate bill is far from perfect, but it does contain a formula based on population, based on roads to be built, and it is a formula, a yardstick, which will be applied the same way to every State. If it is used for 2 years or 5 years, we can still have a second look. By adopting it, we shall not be starting out, on the most expensive program for highways or any other needs ever conducted in this country, by authorizing the use of a series of estimates made up of a collection of haphazard figures which are entirely unfair to many States.

Mr. President, I am perfectly frank in saying that I am not undertaking to

represent any other State than my own. I assume the Senator from Indiana is looking after his own State, but perhaps my State is the worst sufferer of all the States under the proposal, chiefly because my own State made a frugal and conservative estimate. I shall do everything in my power to prevent the House proposal from being accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

I thought I had made myself perfectly clear, and had stated that what we are trying to do is to establish a system whereby the State of the Senator from New Hampshire will get 90 percent of exactly what it will cost to build the interstate highway, whether the cost be $75 million or $100 million. I do not understand the argument at all. The figures will be the basis on which the start will be made, but the Government will pay 90 percent of what the roads will cost.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator will yield, I point out that the amendment the Senator has offered does not do what he has said.

Mr. CAPEHART. It will do that, after 2 years, just as the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee will do. That is what I am trying to argue for. That is why I think the bill ought to be recommitted. I cannot imagine that the President of the United States will sign a bill of this kind. He may well do it. I cannot speak for the President. I am only pleading that the Federal Government pay 90 percent for whatever it will cost to construct the roads in the State of New Hampshire.

Mr. President, I now yield 3 minutes to the junior Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I think it is perhaps appropriate for me to make a few comments so shortly after the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], because if his State fares the worst under the House bill, certainly the State of New Jersey is the greatest sufferer under the Senate committee bill.

It should not be, as the Senator from Indiana has said, a very difficult problem for us to provide for the building of an Interstate System of highways on a sensible basis, whereby actual needs are determined, actual costs are fixed, roads are built, and the Federal Government pays 90 percent of the actual cost of the Interstate Highway System. It should not be too difficult, if we have the will to do it. I do not suggest any individual chicanery, but it seems to me the difficulty we have been having in trying to arrive at a sensible method of the application of the program indicates that there is something more than a simple effort to arrive at that result, because, certainly, reasonable men of good will ought to be able to agree on the need for the system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. May I have 3 additional minutes?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana has 13 minutes remaining to him.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wanted to yield 4 minutes to the able Senator from California. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Indiana promised to yield me some time.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall do so.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, although I am not a member of the Senate Committee on Public Works, it is quite apparent from a reading of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the report of the committee that New Jersey has become a whipping boy in one of the most important issues involved in the highway bill now before us. The record, in my judgment, should not go unchallenged.

The issue into which our State has been projected is, as I said, basic to our efforts to build an Interstate System. After all, why are we here today? Had it not been for the leadership of President Eisenhower and the Clay committee, we would likely be considering how best to extend the traditional, 2-year authorization for Federal-aid highways—that is, the normal development of our primary, secondary, urban, and Interstate Systems.

Instead, because of this leadership and the enlightened action taken by the House, we have a rich opportunity to concentrate on our greatest unfulfilled highway need, an adequate interstate network of roads. This challenge has been answered in the House bill. Because of the stoginess of the traditional system of apportionment of Federal funds which lies at the heart of the Senate amendment, we shall not be able to fulfill our goal for a completed Interstate System. Certainly, we shall not be able to do the job in New Jersey, under the Senate formula.

Now, proponents of the Senate amendment have pointed at New Jersey's estimated needs—which would be met under the House version—with a great deal of scorn. The needs, in the view of these opponents, are inflated. So, it is implied, are the costs of road construction in New Jersey. Then these opponents point to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Here, the estimated needs are considerably lower.

Thus, it is stated, let us throw out the whole program under the House bill. Our opponents say let us turn instead to the good old method of allocating Federal funds—a method which is old, all right, but is particularly good only for Arkansas, Kansas, Nevada, and other States without the problems of population, traffic density, and other complex factors which make us in New Jersey victims of rank discrimination under the Senate version of this proposed legislation.

Now, Mr. President, because I had my doubts about these alleged errors in the statement of costs and needs in New Jersey, I decided to take up the matter with our State highway commissioner, Mr. Dwight Palmer. After all, his department prepared the figures. I should add that Mr. Palmer is of the opposite political faith from me, to say nothing of his chief executive, Governor Meyner.

What I am about to relate is Mr. Palmer's explanation of why New Jersey figured as it figured; why the statistics supplied are accurate, in his estimation; and why the Senate apportionment formula would doom our State's efforts to build an effective Interstate System right from the start.

Here are the facts, according to Mr. Palmer. New Jersey's traffic is 7 times the national average. It is 5½ times that of Pennsylvania, for example. It is 2½ times the traffic density of New York. The density of traffic on the New Jersey State highway system is 11,000 cars per average day per mile of State highway.

New Jersey averages 1,000 registrations per mile of State highways. Two hundred million vehicles cross New Jersey's borders in 1 year.

By comparison, we must remember that New Jersey is 2d in population density, 6th in industry, 8th in population, 8th in motor-vehicle registration, and, significantly, 45th in size.

Route U. S. 1 carries upward of 90,000 vehicles per day through Newark. Routes 4 and 46 through Bergen County carry 46,000 vehicles a day, with peak volumes of 75,000 vehicles in a 24-hour period. In the Camden area, the Admiral Wilson Boulevard carries some 75,000 vehicles daily, while the Crescent Boulevard daily carries some 50,000 cars.

Our friends in the West cannot visualize the transportation problem of New Jersey because they are simply not in the same position trafficwise. We are a corridor State. Through us, traffic to and from New England must pass. We are between the two cities of New York and Philadelphia. Our transportation problems are perhaps unsurpassed in the Nation for their magnitude.

Mr. Palmer tells me that when the United States Bureau of Public Roads requested the States to prepare an estimate of their individual needs, New Jersey set about the task with the idea that accuracy was necessary. Mr. Palmer frankly questions the estimates of the responsible officials in Pennsylvania. Does this mean that New Jersey's figures are any less accurate?

New Jersey, with 60 percent of its roads being urban in character, compared, for example, with Pennsylvania's 15 percent, is faced with high costs of construction. There is one stretch from the George Washington Bridge to Wayne Township, 17½ miles in length, which will cost more than $120 million. In Essex County, one 4½-mile stretch will cost $70 million.

In New Jersey's most rural areas, Mr. Palmer reports, a 4-lane divided highway costs $1 million per mile. So that we recognize that when Pennsylvania presents an average cost per mile of $557,000, either proper consideration was not given to the needs of the State or the anticipated design of their highways failed to recognize the growth of traffic and provide necessary capacity for that traffic.

The average cost per mile of New Jersey's Interstate System was $6,652,000 in 1954, according to statistics placed in the RECORD. This figure has been used to twist the significance of New Jersey's basic needs. From the foregoing, it is apparent it costs New Jersey a lot of money to plow a road through our tremendously built-up urban areas. Actually, the figure itself is a distortion. It is expensive for us to build roads, but not that expensive.

The Bureau of Public Roads advises me the average cost per mile figure for New Jersey was obtained by dividing 204 extant miles on the Interstate System in 1954 into the total cost of $1,357,000,000. Included in that total cost, however, were some $425 million, submitted in good faith as part of the Interstate System, which came from the building of a second deck of the George Washington Bridge, and similar expenses. Can that tremendous expense be compared with the normal cost of road building, even in New Jersey? The actual average cost per mile, therefore, is really in the neighborhood of $4,440,000. Thus, the statistics have been distorted, even though the error may have been honest.

In New Jersey, we do not believe we can improve our Interstate System by constructing any two-lane highways. Pennsylvania estimates that 292 miles of two-lane highways would be adequate. On the other hand, New Jersey needs 200 miles of 6-lane roads or wider to bring the Interstate System up to par. Pennsylvania says it needs only 21 miles at that width. Yet, 6-lane highways cost $2,600,000 for each mile in New Jersey.

Is it not obvious, Mr. President, why our costs are higher; why we have to build more roads? And, I emphasize again, the State highway department stands by its figures.

I hope that this discussion will help demolish the ridiculous arguments that high estimates from one State are false, per se, and that because another State has different problems, or pays less attention to its survey, it must be right.

I believe that the needs estimates of the States are accurate, on the whole. Besides, if we adopt the spirit of the House bill, there is ample protection against misstatement or error. Anything short of this principle will fail to build an interstate network.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the senior Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to commend my able colleague for his fine presentation of some of the facts concerning the much maligned estimates submitted by my State of New Jersey. But beyond the question of whether the estimates are accurate or inaccurate, lies the fundamental question of whether the interstate highway system shall be built and whether the funds shall be apportioned to the States upon the basis of their costs of construction or some approximate fixed formula. That is what is troubling those of us who reside in New Jersey, as we consider the matter on the basis of the committee report.

As my colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], has pointed out, no State can be hurt through the adoption of the House method of apportionment of the funds. If, as seems probable, Pennsylvania erred through underestimating its needs for the construction of the interstate system in that State, then such errors will be readily apparent and can easily be rectified at the end of the first 2 years of the program when the Secretary of Commerce prepares his estimates for apportionment, based upon actual cost experience during the first 2 years of operation under the program. In the so-called Gore version of the highway bill, the same fixed formula will apply for the total life of the program. States which do not receive sufficient funds under the Senate committee or so-called Gore formula of apportionment will have no opportunity to have their shortages taken into account and alleviated. Instead, their allocations will be left as they are. Such States will have no means available to obtain sufficient funds to build their share of the interstate system. The converse is just as true; States which, under the Gore formula, receive more money than is necessary to build their share of the interstate highway system will have that money apportioned to their account in the Highway Trust Fund. They may transfer up to 20 percent, on a 50–50 matching basis, for their primary, secondary and urban roads; but such transfers by States with their share of the interstate highway system already built, will not in any way lead to the completion of the integrated Interstate Highway System. The States which will not receive sufficient funds to cover their costs of construction will have no subsequent revision of the apportionment upon which to rely for the allocation of the necessary funds.

I can not see any possible justification for the apportionment of the funds for this interstate highway system upon any basis other than one which will take into account the actual costs of construction undertaken by the various States, and which will provide for periodic revision of apportionment upon the accumulation of cost data from actual operations. That is the important point.

Therefore, Mr. President, I join with my junior colleague from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] in support of the amendment proposed by the able Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], which would substitute the apportionment formula of the House version of the bill, with the provision for periodic revision based upon the actual construction costs of the various States, in place of the Senate committee or Gore provision.

Mr. President, for the benefit of my colleagues, let me add that in my State of New Jersey, in very large part our highways constitute channels for travel coming from other States. For instance, the travel from New England comes through New Jersey. Included in that travel is that coming from the State of New Hampshire. We are compelled to enlarge our highways from 2-lane to 4-lane to 6-lane and possibly to 8-lane roads, in order to take care of the needs of the interstate highway system.

Mr. President, I believe the amendment of the Senator from Indiana should be adopted, in connection with the needs of the traffic situation.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to support the amendment of the Senator from Indiana. As I pointed out yesterday, the trouble with the Gore formula is that it simply will not result in construction of the Interstate System of Highways. In fact, it will absolutely prevent completion of the construction of that system, which is the whole point of this entire bill. The apportionment is based on the same amount of money and the same calculations as those of the Fallon bill, namely, $25 billion.

What will the Gore formula do with that money? It will over-allocate approximately $4,800,000,000, and it will underallocate $4,800,000,000; and thus it will miss the mark by $9,600,000,000, which is almost 40 percent of the $25 billion.

I submit that we never can complete the construction of this system of interstate highways under that formula. I submit that the only way by means of which we shall ever complete construction of the Interstate System of highways will be to allocate the funds on the basis of need.

In the table appearing on page 9101 of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, we observe that a large number of the States would be allocated more than 200 percent of their estimated needs. In one case, as we observe by studying the table, one State would be allocated 202 percent of its estimated needs; another State would be allocated 220 percent; another State would be allocated 315 percent; another would be allocated 333 percent, another would be allocated 220 percent, another would be allocated 240 percent, and another would be allocated 241 percent of the estimated needs. Such an arrangement would not result in the construction of the needed roads, Mr. President, for the States would not receive that money. Instead, the money would go into the highway fund established under the bill, and would remain there, and such a procedure would simply defeat the entire purpose of the administration and the entire purpose of the mayors' conference and the Clay Commission and the Governors' conference, all of whom have said that this system of interstate highways is a national necessity.

So, Mr. President, I strongly support the Fallon bill, which is the only guarantee that we shall ever have a national system of highways.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, is the Senator from Tennessee ready to yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. GORE. There is one more speaker on our side.

Mr. CAPEHART. How much time remains to the side of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. GORE. Five minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. We have 4 minutes remaining, I believe.

Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the able junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Senate is perplexed and confused. Some of our colleagues are worried about what will happen to their States. I do not quarrel with that point of view. I am sure the present Presiding Officer does not, either. We also have the duty of worrying about the United States as a whole.

I suggest that the Senate committee version of the highway bill does a disservice to the whole Nation, as well as a disservice to many of the States.

Under the Senate committee formula, we would be adopting a 40-year-old allocation formula which is unrealistic. It would rivet into the law for 13 years a means of giving to some States more money and giving to other States less money than is necessary in order to build within that period of time an Interstate Highway System of 40,000 miles.

Representatives of the Federal Government, of the State governments, of the city governments, and of the county governments came before the Senate Committee on Public Works and the House Committee on Public Works; and all of them asked for the House formula—a formula on the basis of need to build a nationwide highway system within a specified period of time. No representative of any of those public agencies urged that the Senate committee's version be adopted.

The House version of the bill will provide—as the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] has suggested in his amendment—an apportionment on the basis of needs. Of course, there are estimates made and to be made; but they are only estimates, nothing more and nothing less. They merely serve as a general indication to the Bureau of Public Roads as to what the necessities in the case of each of the 48 States may be.

Under the House version of the bill, insofar as this item is concerned, and in this respect the House version is the same as the amendment of the Senator from Indiana—the Bureau of Public Roads will apportion only the amount of money necessary to give 90 percent of the cost of construction of the interstate highway in each State, to that State—no more and no less.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time on the amendment to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I think the Members of the Senate wish to have clearly in mind the issue which is presented by the amendment of the Senator from Indiana. The distinguished Senator from Connecticut has referred to the provisions of the Senate committee's version of the bill as the Gore formula. Therein is the basic error of the proponents of the amendment. The Senate committee's version of the allocation now before us is not the Gore formula. The bill as reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works allocates this money on the basis of existing law, on the basis of the law governing the allocation of Federal funds which has been in effect for nearly 40 years, as amended by Congress in 1954, at which time the authorization for the Interstate System was raised from $25 million a year to $175 million a year. At that time Senators from the States with larger populations took the position that because so much of the Interstate Highway System designated would be serving their States, the allocation previously provided by the law was not entirely equitable, and that a greater amount of the funds should be allocated on the basis of population. Theretofore, funds had been allocated one-third on the basis of population, one-third on the basis of area, and one-third on rural mail route mileages. However, in 1954, following the efforts of Senators and Representatives from the States with greater populations, the formula was amended so that half of the interstate funds were allocated on the basis of population, and the other half on the basis of the traditional formula.

Thus we find that under the bill as reported by the Senate Public Works Committee—not with the Gore formula, but on the basis of existing law—two-thirds of the interstate money would be allocated to the States on the basis of their population, only one-sixth on the basis of area, and one-sixth on the basis of rural mail route mileage.

The discussion about the establishment of a basis for the new formula, as proposed by the House, is not realistic. When the Secretary of Commerce submitted to the Congress the so-called table of needs in House Document No. 120, he had this to say, as appears from page 1 of that document:

BASIS OF NEEDS

The term "needs" likewise requires explanation. It is a word widely used in recent years to denote construction backlog. Amounts cited as "needs" sometimes refer to the cost of complete modernization as of a given moment; sometimes they cover a construction program stretching over a period of years.

Some estimates are based on the needs of current traffic; others take future traffic fully into account.

There are variations, too, in the specifications of design standards, and there are differences in their application—one study may permit no deviations, while another will accept large deviations or tolerances.

Thus we see that there is a multiplicity of bases for the estimates of needs as provided by the States. The so-called allocation by the House is merely a compilation of such estimates. That is found in the testimony of Mr. McCoy, who is president of the Association of State Highway Officials, in the hearings. I read from page 161 of the hearings:

Section 13 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 requested the Secretary of Commerce to prepare an estimate of need for the Nation's 3,350,000 miles of roads, streets, and highways. The State highway departments cooperated with the Bureau of Public Roads in this undertaking. Please bear in mind that this is an estimate and not a proposed program.

Yet, Senators tell us that it should be the basis of a program, and that there should be a revolutionary change in the allocations now fixed by law.

The Director of the Bureau of Roads, Mr. Curtiss, had this to say, concerning the estimate, as appears from page 697 of the hearings:

We found—and by "we" I mean in the Bureau—when we analyzed the estimates submitted by the States, and I would like to make that clear that these estimates are not estimates of the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. President, this tabulation has neither pride of ancestry nor hope of posterity. It does not have the approval of the Bureau of Public Roads. It does does not have the sanction of the Department of Commerce. It is printed as a compilation of estimates, many of which are on different bases. The compilation was made by the American Association of Highway Officials. In his testimony, Director Curtiss, of the Bureau of Public Roads, specifically denied any responsibility for it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have before me a letter dated May 18, 1956, from Commissioner C. D. Curtiss, of the Bureau of Public Roads, in which he says very specifically:

You will see that there is considerable variation as would be expected due to differences in specifications used in different States, as well as differences in terrain, soil types, local materials, wage rates, traffic loads, and many other factors.

He continued:

As you know, the Bureau did not edit or otherwise alter the individual State estimates submitted.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently correct. I have never seen a greater or more specific effort by a public bureau than that by the Bureau of Public Roads to disclaim any responsibility for a document, a formula, or a compilation. The Bureau denies that it is in any way a program or a recommended program.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Yet despite that fact, we are now asked to legislate on the basis of it.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently correct.

The Senate version of the bill now before us is based upon existing law. The allocation is based on existing law, which has grown out of 40 years' experience. It was hammered out on the anvil of hearings, debates, and legislation.

There is no place in the record before either committee where the formula

proposed by the Senator from Indiana was substantiated on the basis of uniform needs, as a presentation of the needs for the Interstate System in the various States. We are asked to make a guess as a basis for a definite allocation.

No Senator could go home to his people and tell them with certainty what his State would receive out of this program on any basis now before us except the formula in the bill as reported by the Public Works Committee. Therefore, while we all realize that there may be changes in the allocation formula as the years go by, and while I am certain that experience will prove that some States are getting more than they can use, and others are getting less than they need, we shall have time, on the basis of experience, to change the formula. But certainly we should not do so on the basis of whim, caprice, or estimate, or without the basis of experience or established fact behind the traditional formula in our law, which has been there, with only legislative changes, for nearly 40 years.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, first, I think the able Senator from Oklahoma is mistaken about the formula in the Senate version being the same as the formula of the present law. The old formula was based one-third upon population, one-third upon area, and one-third upon post roads mileage. The new formula is based one-half upon population, another one-sixth upon population, one-sixth upon area, and one-sixth upon miles of post roads.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall be glad to yield later. My time is limited.

Mr. KERR. I know the Senator does not want the RECORD to show that he has made an error.

Mr. CAPEHART. What we are doing is trying to build 40,000 miles of roads. We are not dealing in population. We are building roads. We have asked each State for X number of interstate miles of roads within its State borders. Why is it not just as realistic to start in Pennsylvania, for example, on the basis of its estimate that it could build the roads for $811 million rather than under the Gore formula, which would increase the amount by $515 million?

Who is right and who is wrong? Who knows whether it is $811 million or $1,326,000,000? All I am trying to have the Senate to do is to take the House formula and to start from that point and then to pay every State 90 percent of what it actually costs; no more and no less.

If Senators wish me to tell them what I think about the bill, I will tell them. I will tell the Senator from Oklahoma. He talks about its being something—I do not know what he said, because I get lost in trying to follow him when he uses those big words. I will tell the Senator from Oklahoma what I think about the bill. I think it is a lot of pork barrel. I think many of the States under the formula will get a great deal more money than it will cost them to build the Interstate System. They will take 20 percent, as the bill permits, and put that money into their primary and secondary roads. I believe the real purpose behind the formula in the bill is to provide some pork barrel money. That is what I say, if anyone wants my opinion of it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the senior Senator from Oklahoma. Following that, I will suggest the absence of a quorum and ask that the Senate proceed to a vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). The Senator has 1 minute remaining on the amendment.

Mr. GORE. Then I yield the 1 additional minute on the amendment to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana is right when he says he gets lost. However, he does not get lost when he is trying to follow the Senator from Oklahoma. He gets lost when he refuses to follow the Senator from Oklahoma.

He said I was talking about an allocation on the basis of population, and he said I was in error. He said I said that one-third of the money was allocated on the basis of population, and he said that is wrong. He said one-half of it is on the basis of population, plus one-sixth on the basis of population. I submit, Mr. President, that one-half and one-sixth is equal to two-thirds. Therefore, the Senator from Indiana has verified rather than disputed what I have said. Under the law, not under the Gore formula, the money is allocated two-thirds on the basis of population, one-sixth on the basis of area, and one-sixth on rural post road mileage. I thank the Senator from Indiana for verifying what I have said. I am regretful he did not know he was doing it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum and that the time be not charged——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired. The request is not necessary.

Mr. GORE. I ask unanimous consent that the time be not charged to the time allowed for debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has been consumed. It is not necessary to make the request.

Mr. GORE. Then I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator yield on that point? Could we have a unanimous-consent agreement that when a quorum is determined or the quorum call called off we immediately proceed to vote without further debate?

Mr. GORE. I was about to make that unanimous consent request and to explain to Members of the Senate that Senators will be called from their dinner for the rollcall, and I believe it would be an accommodation to everyone if we have a unanimous-consent agreement that immediately after a quorum has been determined a vote be had on the amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Without further debate.

Mr. GORE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired. The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Frear	McNamara
Allott	Fulbright	Millikin
Anderson	George	Monroney
Barrett	Goldwater	Morse
Beall	Gore	Mundt
Bender	Green	Murray
Bennett	Hayden	Neuberger
Bible	Hennings	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hill	Pastore
Bridges	Holland	Payne
Bush	Hruska	Potter
Butler	Humphrey	Purtell
Byrd	Jackson	Robertson
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Carlson	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Kerr	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Knowland	Smathers
Chavez	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Laird	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Langer	Stennis
Daniel	Lehman	Symington
Dirksen	Magnuson	Thye
Douglas	Malone	Watkins
Duff	Mansfield	Welker
Dworshak	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Eastland	Martin, Pa.	Wofford
Ellender	McCarthy	Young
Ervin	McClellan	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] which are being considered en bloc. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. GEORGE. On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMATHERS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is paired with the Senator

from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—27

Aiken	Capehart	Magnuson
Barrett	Case, N. J.	McNamara
Beall	Dirksen	Potter
Bender	Ellender	Purtell
Bible	Holland	Robertson
Bricker	Jackson	Russell
Bush	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Butler	Knowland	Smathers
Byrd	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.

NAYS—55

Allott	Green	Morse
Anderson	Hayden	Mundt
Bennett	Hennings	Murray
Bridges	Hill	Neuberger
Carlson	Hruska	O'Mahoney
Case, S. Dak.	Humphrey	Pastore
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Payne
Cotton	Kerr	Scott
Curtis	Laird	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Langer	Stennis
Douglas	Lehman	Symington
Duff	Malone	Thye
Dworshak	Mansfield	Watkins
Eastland	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Frear	McCarthy	Wofford
Fulbright	McClellan	Young
Goldwater	Millikin	
Gore	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—13

Clements	Jenner	Schoeppel
Flanders	Johnson, Tex.	Sparkman
George	Kefauver	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Long	
Ives	Neely	

So the amendments offered by Mr. CAPEHART, for himself and Mr. JENNER, were rejected.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "5–17–56–D."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon desire that his amendment be read in full?

Mr. NEUBERGER. No; merely by title; and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment offered by Mr. NEUBERGER was on page 11 after line 25, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 108. (a) The Territory of Alaska shall be entitled to share in funds herein or hereafter authorized for expenditure for projects on the Federal-aid primary and secondary highway systems, and extensions thereof within urban areas, under the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, upon the same terms and conditions as the several States and Hawaii and Puerto Rico, and the Territory shall be included in the calculations to determine the basis of apportionment of such funds, except that one-half only of the area of Alaska shall be used in the calculations to determine the area factor in the apportionment of such funds: *Provided*, That the Territory of Alaska shall contribute funds each fiscal year in an amount that shall be not less than 10 percent of the Federal funds apportioned to it for such fiscal year, such contribution to be deposited in a special account in the Federal Treasury for use in conjunction with the Federal funds apportioned to the Territory. The system or systems of roads on which Federal-aid apportionments to the Territory of Alaska are to be expended shall be determined and agreed upon by the Governor of Alaska, the Territorial Highway Engineer of Alaska, and the Secretary of Commerce, without regard to the limitations contained in section 6 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 212), as amended and supplemented. The Federal funds apportioned to the Territory of Alaska and the funds contributed by said Territory in accordance herewith may be expended by the Secretary of Commerce either directly or in cooperation with the Territorial Board of Road Commissioners of Alaska and may be so expended separately or in combination and without regard to the matching provisions of the Federal Highway Act; and both such funds may be expended for the maintenance of roads within the system or systems of roads agreed upon under the same terms and conditions as for the construction of such roads.

(b) Effective 60 days after the approval of this act, the functions, duties, and authority pertaining to the construction, repair, and maintenance of roads, tramways, ferries, bridges, trails, and other works in Alaska, conferred upon the Department of the Interior and heretofore administered by the Secretary of the Interior under the Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 446; 48 U. S. C., sec. 321a and the following), are hereby transferred to the Department of Commerce, and thereafter shall be administered by the Secretary of Commerce, or under his direction, by such officer, or officers, as may be designated by him.

(c) There are hereby transferred to the Department of Commerce, to be employed and expended in connection with the functions, duties, and authority transferred to said Department by paragraph (a) hereof, all personnel employed in connection with any such functions, duties, or authority, and the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds now available, or that hereafter may be made available, for use in connection with such functions, duties, or authority; and the Department of the Interior is directed to turn over to the Secretary of Commerce all equipment, materials, supplies, papers, maps, and documents, or other property (real or personal, and including office equipment and records) used or held in connection with such functions, duties, and authority.

(d) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce shall take such steps as may be necessary or appropriate to effect the transfer from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Commerce of the functions, duties, and authority, and the funds and property as herein provided for.

(e) The Secretary of Commerce shall have power, by order or regulations, to distribute the duties and authority hereby transferred, and appropriations pertaining thereto, as he may deem proper to accomplish the economical and effective organization and administration thereof.

Renumber the succeeding sections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Oregon yield himself?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield myself 5 minutes.

The amendment would authorize the extension of Federal-aid highways to the Territory of Alaska on the same terms and conditions as for the Territories of Hawaii and Puerto Rico, insofar as the expenditure per project on the Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban systems is concerned.

The people of the Territory of Alaska have for many years sought the inclusion of Alaska in the Federal-aid highway program, in order that a comprehensive highway program might be developed and carried out there. The lack of highway construction over the years has substantially contributed to the slow development of Alaska and has impaired its ability to raise revenue to finance to highway construction.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the Senator's amendment use the entire area of the Territory of Alaska as the basis for determining apportionment?

Mr. NEUBERGER. My amendment uses one-half of the total area of Alaska rather than the entire area of the Territory.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not wish to take the Senator's time to debate that point at length, but I may say that if the entire area of Alaska, or even as much as one-half of it, is used, it is my personal opinion that we will undoubtedly weight the apportionment of highway funds for the Federal, urban, and secondary systems on the one-third population, one-third area, and one-third mileage basis.

I think the proposal would be much sounder if the Senator limited the area to one-third of the Territory, since a large part of the area of Alaska is not inhabited at present, and much of it is not susceptible to the building of roads.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I hope the Senator from South Dakota realizes, so far as the formula is concerned, that Alaska has so few roads that the road part of the formula is reduced very substantially.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I realize that. I am sympathetic to the idea of getting a road-building program in Alaska on a standard basis, so to speak. The general idea of putting it under the Department of Commerce or Bureau of Public Roads has much to commend it, rather than be dependent upon chance appropriations from year to year through the Department of the Interior.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to say this to the Senator: After we had talked on the floor yesterday—and we have talked several times in the Committee on Public Works—about the problem of Alaska, I did some figuring and had some statistics obtained from the Bureau of Public Roads. I find that if we were to reduce the area from 50 percent, as it is in my amendment, to 40 percent, that would reduce very substantially the amount of Federal funds which would be received by Alaska. It would make a difference of about $42 million over the 10-year period.

Let me ask the Senator from South Dakota how he would feel about reducing the percentage to 40. I can show him a table which indicates how much this would diminish the Federal aid funds which Alaska would receive over the 10-year period, if the area factor were reduced from 50 to 40 percent.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I recall that when we were discussing statehood for Alaska one of the suggestions made had to do with the division of the Territory, because the area north of the Yukon is only very sparsely inhabited, aside from the city of Nome. That area, since

there is no road construction proposed, should hardly be counted for the purposes of road building. I do not know, specifically, enough about the actual territorial area of the portions of Alaska where it would be desired to build roads to enable me to weigh or evaluate it. I think, however, that if we were to start out on the basis of considering one-third of the area of Alaska, that would not be a bad start, considering that at the present time Alaska is entirely on a hand-out basis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes of the Senator from Oregon have expired.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Let me say to the Senator from South Dakota, because I know he shares my interest in this question that if we used the 40-percent factor, so far as area is concerned, for the inclusion of Alaska——

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Let me complete this comment first. It would mean that in the fiscal year 1958 Alaska would receive, in Federal aid funds, $13,390,000. That would gradually increase to the sum of $18,300,000 in 1969.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is a certain population growth rate being projected, when that is done?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Yes. That is estimating a certain population growth rate. With the roads available and with the 40-percent factor, the figure goes from $13 million in 1958 to $18 million in 1969. That does not seem to me to be a very great Federal contribution to a Territory which is so vast as Alaska, where road building is very expensive, where there exist high mountain ranges, steep terrain, terrific ice conditions, and permafrost, which require expensive roadbed construction.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I recognize that, but I have in my hand figures which some of the States will receive for primary, secondary, urban, and even interstate highways, added all together. Under the law, for example, the State of Alabama will get $17.7 million; Arizona will receive $10.6 million; Arkansas, $13 million; California, $47 million; Colorado, $13 million; Connecticut, $8 million; Delaware, $4 million; Florida, $14 million; Georgia, $20 million; Idaho, $8.6 million; Iowa, $18 million; Kansas, $17 million; Kentucky, $15 million; Louisiana, $13 million.

I could go down the list.

I am fearful that if there were provided for Alaska more Federal aid money for highway construction than for such well-established States as those I have mentioned, we would run into trouble.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I point out to the Senator that not only is Alaska probably the most expensive area under the American flag in which to construct roads, but that also it is one-fifth the size of the entire United States.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I recognize that is true.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Alaska will never have a road program unless it obtains some funds. Today there are only 3,700 miles of highway in Alaska. Only 800 miles of those highways are paved. That compares with 3,842 miles of road in the State of Delaware, and Delaware is an infinitesimal spot compared to the vast area of Alaska. It seems to me that expenditures of from $13 million in 1958 to $18 million in 1969 for road building are not exorbitant annual sums for an area for which we have responsibility, which has great national defense needs, and which is only 50 or 60 miles from the domain of the Soviet Union.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I recognize the fact that the very able Senator from Oregon ordinarily does not care to make a comparison in relationship to his own State, but for the purposes of illustration, Oregon, under the present law, receives $12.9 million. Tennessee receives $18.4. I think that, as a practical matter, to get started in Alaska, it would be the better part of discretion to start on a more modest basis.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I may say to the Senator from South Dakota that my main interest today in this debate is to secure inclusion in the bill of the recognition that Alaska should qualify for Federal aid, just as does Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the 48 States. I have suggested 50 percent. The Senator from South Dakota has suggested 33⅓ percent. Would the Senator from South Dakota consider 40 percent to be a reasonable compromise?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think one-third would be better. The Senator has mentioned the Territory of Hawaii. That Territory gets $3.2 million Federal aid. I think if we attempted to start road construction in Alaska by providing a sum of from $13 million on up to $18 million, the Senator would be inviting much trouble.

Mr. NEUBERGER. My main interest is to establish the principle that Alaska should not be further discriminated against. My own personal opinion is that the 50-percent or the 40-percent factor is not unreasonable. However, I believe it is so important and so essential for us to recognize that Alaska does merit inclusion, that I shall ask that the area factor in my amendment be modified to one-third, or 33⅓ percent.

Mr. President, I wish to modify the amendment which I have submitted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I believe the Senator desires to change the language on page 2, lines 5 and 6, so that the word "one-half" will be changed to "one-third."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on page 2, lines 5 and 6 of my amendment, I wish to modify my amendment so that the phrase will read "except that one-third only of the area of Alaska shall be used in the calculations."

Does the clerk have that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield himself additional time?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I think that is a good modification. I think, at the same time, the Senator is to be commended for proposing that Alaska be put on a regular basis for highway development. My own feeling is that over the course of years our investment in Alaska will repay the Nation manyfold.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his interest. I feel certain that in the case of Alaska we have established today a principle which will help that great area to develop economically and to improve our national defense situation.

Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] desires to speak briefly at this time. I yield 2 minutes to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The Senator from Washington is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, during the debate I suppose a considerable amount of material has been submitted for the RECORD by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and other Senators, in connection with their presentations as to the real need for the amendment. However, in case all the figures have not been placed in the RECORD, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD a statement or memorandum regarding the amendment.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON ALASKA ROADS

HISTORY

Uniquely among the States and other Territories, Alaska is not and never has been included in the Federal-aid highway systems.

There are three principal road agencies in Alaska. The most important is the Alaska Road Commission, an operating agency of the Department of the Interior. It constructs and maintains roads on the public domain through direct congressional appropriations made to the Department of the Interior; these appropriations are segregated as to construction and maintenance. There was no segregation as to the two functions until 1951. The Bureau of Public Roads is responsible for forest highways in the two national forests of Alaska, comprising about 5 percent of the total land area. Then there is the Territorial highway department. As a matter of operating expediency, the Alaska Road Commission or the Bureau of Public Roads provides construction or maintenance services for the Territorial highway department on a reimbursable basis. The Territory of Alaska is not required to provide matching funds either for construction or maintenance by any fixed formula. It makes voluntary contributions. The Alaska Road Commission came into existence 51 years ago. Until about 1930 it was under the jurisdiction of the War Department.

Direct congressional appropriations to the Alaska Road Commission totaled in the years from 1913 through 1941 only $18,197,389. In addition during that period the Alaska Road Commission performed work for the National Park Service in the amount of $1,517,583.07. Additionally the Alaska Road Commission expended something over $4 million in appropriated funds derived by imposition of license taxes on Alaska businesses collected by United States clerks of the court and deposited in the United States Treasury. Now Alaskans are permitted through their own legislature to collect their own taxes and to appropriate highway funds more directly.

For many years there was a congressional limitation on forest highway allocations to Alaska. The Territory was denied its rightful share of such appropriations. That prohibition since has been removed.

During World War II years, appropriations remained at what might be termed a subsistence level. Indeed, in the fiscal years 1942, 1943, and 1944 they sank even beneath that point. In the 1944 fiscal year the total appropriation to the Alaska Road Commission for construction and maintenance amounted to only $500,000.

In the postwar period increasing attention was paid to Alaska's transportation system both in respect to highways and to the Alaska Railroad, which is owned by the Federal Government. There is substantial proof that this was not done to put the railroad in better shape and to improve and extend the highway system in recognition of expanding civilian development and increased civilian population. The really big program which was launched was undertaken at the insistence of the Department of Defense that Alaska's transportation system would have to be improved to meet military requirements.

In recognition of this need the Congress appropriated in the neighborhood of $80 million for reconstruction of the Alaska Railroad.

Likewise, the highway work which was undertaken brought about black-topping for the first time of many principal highways (this work is continuing) but included comparatively little new road building.

This program was launched in the fiscal year 1948. In the previous year the Alaska Road Commission appropriation had been just under $4 million. In the following year the figure was over $1 million and went up to over $27½ million in 1951. Construction appropriations for the fiscal years from 1949 through 1954 for the Alaska Road Commission totaled over $116 million.

Thereafter with military necessities largely satisfied, the appropriations plummeted. In the fiscal year 1955 the construction item amounted to only $8 million; in the following year it went down to $6,300,000; and for the 1957 fiscal year only $7,800,000 has been requested.

SIGNIFICANCE

Highway widening, black-topping, and other improvements have naturally been of great assistance to the development of the civilian economy, including tourism, in the regions traversed by the highways. It is important to note, however, that actually even with this comparatively huge expenditure there have been few additions to the total road mileage. And only the public domain has benefitted. With the exception of one special-purpose appropriation, southeastern Alaska, the geographical boundaries of which are almost synonymous with Tongass National Forest, has continued on a starvation diet with respect to road money.

This hit and miss policy has had evil consequences not only for the Territory of Alaska but for the Nation. The valley and peak appropriation history for public domain roads, with the peak being visible for only a few years and then only to satisfy national defense needs, leaves Alaska in 1956 with only 3,700 miles of public domain highway of which 800 are paved. This is an area one-fifth as big as the United States. Alaska's area covers 586,000 square miles. Nevada, 110,540 square miles in extent, has 25,545 miles of rural roads. Delaware's 2,057 square miles have 3,842 miles of rural roads.

Had the Federal-aid laws been extended to Alaska at the time of their inception, it follows that the Territory now would have a comparable road system, that there would not have been the need for such heavy expenditures in the postwar years, and that the development of Alaska with a functioning highway system would long since have brought about a larger population.

In the national forests, over 35,000 square miles in area, there are only about 300 miles of roads.

Aside from the larger sums which would be available for roadbuilding were Alaska under the national system, there would be another great advantage. Roadbuilding could proceed under a planned program. No such planning is possible now because of the ups and downs, chiefly downs, of the annual Interior Department appropriations. For example, the budgetary request for the 1957 fiscal year calls for only $500,000 for new road construction. This is the second year for which no appropriation request has been made for a highway already started to connect Cordova with the Richardson Highway.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The time has come to place Alaska under the Federal-aid highway system.

We recognize the fact that despite our just entitlements there may be some concern over admission of Alaska to the system immediately on a basis of full equality because of the very considerable sums which Alaska would receive on account of its public-domain area. Likewise, we recognize the fact that because the Federal Government has failed to give Alaska autonomy in ever so many fields a fiscal problem would confront the Territorial legislature if it were required to appropriate the considerably increased funds which would be necessary for carrying on maintenance and providing matching construction funds.

The amendment proposed by Senator Neuberger would allow intermingling of Federal funds for construction or maintenance, and in return for this concession Alaska would receive only half the amount which otherwise would come to it by reason of its public-domain area. This formula provides that the Territorial government would contribute to the highway fund 10 percent of the amount apportioned each year from the Federal Government. It would permit a real roadbuilding program to be launched in Alaska and perhaps, just as important, would permit roadbuilding for the first time to be carried on by means of a planned program.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, of course I desire to associate myself with everything the Senator from Oregon has said about the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield 2 minutes to the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my able colleague. I think the amendment is a very sound one. Certainly we have an increasing obligation to the Territory of Alaska.

It is very important, not only for the economy of Alaska, but also for the economic interests of the mainland, that this amendment be adopted. It is a most equitable amendment, and I strongly urge its adoption.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee desire to speak in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I should like to ask the sponsors of the amendment to amend it or modify it so that the allocation for Alaska, in reference to its area, will not exceed that of any State of the Union.

In the modified amendment the Senator from Oregon has provided that—

The Territory of Alaska shall be included in the calculations to determine the basis of apportionment of such funds, except that one-third only of the area of Alaska shall be used in the calculations to determine the area factor in the apportionment of such funds.

I have just read the modified portion of the Senator's amendment.

I wish to ask the Senator from Oregon what the area of Alaska is.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I think it is approximately 586,000 square miles. It is about twice the area of Texas, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. KERR. I should like to have the RECORD show the accurate figure. I believe the area of Alaska is twice the area of Texas.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I believe the area of Alaska is approximately 586,000 square miles. Let me say that I do not have a World Almanac before me.

Yes, Mr. President; I find that my memory is correct, and that the area of Alaska is 586,000 square miles.

Mr. KERR. What is the area of Texas?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am not as much of an expert on Texas as I am on Alaska; but I think the area of Texas is approximately 250,000 square miles, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. KERR. I think the area of Texas is approximately two hundred and sixty-odd thousand square miles. So the area of Alaska is more than twice that of the largest State in the Union.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Under my amendment, as now modified, only one-third of the area of Alaska will be used in the calculations.

Mr. KERR. But that would still leave Alaska with an area factor larger than that of any State of the Union, other than Texas. I do not believe that Alaska needs that much.

I am much in favor of the spirit of the Senator's amendment. However, in view of the extraordinary size of Alaska, I should think, unless the Senator from Oregon would accept a modification or amendment of his amendment, so that the allocation to Alaska on the basis of area would not exceed that to the average State of the Union, that his amendment would be subject to serious doubt.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that already one part of the formula is very small with respect to Alaska, and that is in the case of its miles of rural post roads. Furthermore, the population of Alaska is not large.

Mr. KERR. Would the Senator from Oregon accept the figure of 100,000 square miles for the area factor for Alaska?

Mr. NEUBERGER. We now have the figure at approximately 180,000 square miles. We must remember that Alaska has been receiving certain direct appropriations from the Interior Department, under the Interior Department bill with respect to road building. Occasionally such funds for Alaska are as large as $20

million, when the military needs in that area are urgent. At other times, such funds for Alaska virtually disappear, decreasing to less than $1 million. In other words, the funds for Alaska are made available on a hit-or-miss basis; and Alaska cannot count on any particular amount of funds. However, in view of the tremendous area of Alaska and the mountainous terrain and the permafrost conditions in the ground, I do not believe an area factor of 100,000 square miles would be sufficient for Alaska, for purposes of road building.

Mr. KERR. But does not the Senator from Oregon realize that nine-tenths of Alaska cannot have roads built on it?

Mr. NEUBERGER. But in Alaska there are widely separated areas of development which must be linked if Alaska is to amount to anything.

Mr. KERR. But all those areas are along the coast, are they not?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Of course, there are also communities in the interior—such as Fairbanks—and also communities on the more remote portions of the coast—such as Nome. They are much farther to the north. In such areas, road building is extremely expensive and difficult.

Let me state what the Federal contribution to Alaska would be if we used for calculation purposes one-third of the area of Alaska, the Federal contribution in 1958 would be $11,456,000.

Mr. KERR. For what?

Mr. NEUBERGER. For the Federal funds for Alaska for primary, secondary, and urban roads. That would be the total contribution in the fiscal year 1958. That amount would increase in 1969 to $15,657,000.

When we consider the immense area of Alaska and the difficulty and expense of road construction there, I cannot believe that a Federal contribution, beginning with $11,456,000 in 1958, and increasing to $15,657,000 in 1969, would be exorbitant.

Mr. KERR. Would those funds not be in addition to the funds Alaska now receives through the Interior Department?

Mr. NEUBERGER. No; it is my presumption that with the inclusion of Alaska in the Federal-aid program, Alaska's direct appropriations for road building, under the Interior Department budget, would cease.

Mr. KERR. But the Senator from Oregon does not have in the amendment any provision to bring that about, nor has any such provision been sought. Alaska would still receive its allocation for forest roads, forest trails, and so forth.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I would be perfectly willing to include in the amendment an additional sentence, if the Senator from Oklahoma desired it, namely, that these Federal-aid funds——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield further to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I would not wish to have any of the funds now going to Alaska transferred from Alaska—for the reason that the funds now going to Alaska are in connection with public lands, the public domain, and forests. There are vast forests in Alaska; and in the future, as well as in the past, Alaska will have need for such funds.

Mr. NEUBERGER. But these funds will supplant those. Furthermore, we wish to have the funds for Alaska placed on a regular basis.

Mr. KERR. Even if Alaska receives less money?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I think it would be better to have Alaska receive less money, rather than be subjected to a fluctuating program, under which in 1 year there would be a large amount of funds for roadbuilding, because of a military emergency, and in a subsequent year, after the emergency subsided, such funds for Alaska would virtually vanish.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I withdraw my proposed amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am anxious that Alaska shall have more generous support in connection with roadbuilding funds than she has had heretofore.

Does the Senator from Oregon know what part the public land factor will play in the road allotment for Alaska if the amendment of the Senator from Oregon is adopted? He knows, of course, that when there are large acreages of public lands in any of the States, they receive special consideration by reason of that fact.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The amendment which I have proposed provides that, because of the special situation in Alaska, the Territory—or the State, as the case may be—would put up only 10 percent matching funds. It has been my presumption in offering this amendment that this would be the total amount Alaska would receive for roadbuilding in any 1 year. The allocation would be governed by Alaska's population, and by its rural post road mileage, under the formula outlined by the able Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] when he was discussing the Capehart amendment. Yet only one-third of Alaska's area would be involved, under the terms of my amendment as modified.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The point I am trying to bring out is this: There are two special considerations given to States with large acreages of public lands. One is a special figuring down of the State's proportion of the payment by reason of the fact that the Federal Government owns a large part of its area.

The second is a special provision which was discussed a few minute ago, relative to the granting of $2 million a year to public land States for the construction of public highways which extend across the public lands. As I understand, the States with large acreages of public lands have two special considerations which have been traditionally accorded to them for years.

How does that factor relate to the added recognition which the Senator—very properly, as I see it—is trying to give to the Territory of Alaska for additional highway construction?

Mr. NEUBERGER. It has been my presumption, in offering this amendment, that Alaska would continue to get its forest highway funds, for roads in the national forests, but that the direct Department of the Interior Appropriations which have been made in the past for road construction in Alaska, with great fluctuations, would cease. The same situation, with respect to forest road funds, obtains in our Western States. For example, the States of Washington and Oregon receive forest roads funds in addition to Federal aid for their primary, secondary, and urban systems.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the Senator is correct with reference to the national forest acreage. However, the public lands acreage which is in the custody of the Interior Department results in giving to certain States special consideration under two different classifications, as I recall.

I wonder if the distinguished Senator is giving to Alaska the consideration which should arise from the fact that a very large part of its total acreage is neither privately owned nor in national forests, but consists of public lands which are under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It is obvious that Alaska presents a very special situation. I think 99 percent, or a little more, of the area of Alaska is held by the Federal Government.

Mr. HOLLAND. Ninety-seven percent.

Mr. NEUBERGER. We will not quarrel over the difference. A very large percentage of Alaska is held by the Federal Government.

It has been my understanding, in discussions with the staff of the Public Works Committee and the Delegate from Alaska, who is in the Chamber at this moment, that this amendment, to put Alaska under the Federal aid program for highway building, would supersede any direct appropriations which have been made in the Interior Department budget or any other budget, for road building in Alaska, with the exception of the forest road program, for roads in the national forests. This is a separate program, as the distinguished Senator from Florida knows.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator speak of forest highways, or of forest roads for the purpose of developing and getting out the products of the forests? There are two separate classifications.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I realize that there are two separate classifications. I refer to both of them. I think both would be outside the Federal-aid program, just as both of them are outside the Federal-aid program in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and other Western States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 more minutes, and I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am most sympathetic toward the proposal of the Senator from Oregon. I think I know Alaska. But we cannot approach the solution of the problem in Alaska as we would approach the problem in the Senator's State, or any other State.

In the first place, there are geographical difficulties. We can build a little road around Ketchikan, but we cannot go from Ketchikan to Juneau. We can build a road around Juneau, for 14, 20, or 30 miles, but we cannot continue that road over to Anchorage. The only place where we actually have a real system of highways is from Anchorage to Fairbanks, and then on the Alcan Road over to Missolula, Mont. That is the difficulty involved in approaching the problem of roads in Alaska. In the first place, 99 percent of the area is public domain.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is what I stated earlier, in the discussion with the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Notwithstanding the fact that 99 percent of the area is public domain, there is not an available mile in the 99 percent. There is nothing there to which to build a road. So the roads must be isolated and sectionalized.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The distinguished Senator is familiar with Alaska, as I am.

It is my understanding that a vast road system has been built in the Soviet Union, in Siberia, across the Bering Strait, and in the same latitude as Alaska, in the same geographical situation as Alaska, with the same difficulties Alaska faces. Many roads have been built in the Scandinavian countries, which are in the same latitude as Alaska, and have the same type of coastline, and similar difficulties. But we are not going to have a road system in Alaska so long as Alaska does not share in the Federal-aid system.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I want it to share in the Federal-aid system, but I want to approach the problem from the standpoint of the situation in Alaska, and not from the standpoint of the situation with respect to general roadbuilding in the United States. The situation is entirely different. The geography is different. The profile is different. The territory is different. So we must approach the problem from the standpoint of the needs of Alaska. Alaska does need roads. We ought to be concerned about the need for roads.

However, I do not believe that the proposed transfer would solve the problem. I wish we could treat Alaska in a separate manner, as a separate problem, instead of in a general road bill.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It seems to me that, if we can include Hawaii and Puerto Rico and if we can levy new taxes on the people of Alaska under title II of the bill——

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will go further than does the Senator. I am for statehood for Alaska.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is not further than I go. I favor statehood for Alaska, too.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would include not only Hawaii and Puerto Rico but also Alaska.

I am sympathetic toward the problem. If the chairman of the subcommittee is willing to take the modified amendment to conference, I shall be glad to accept it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee, and I wish to compliment him on his vast knowledge of Alaska, where I was stationed during the war.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator. I am willing to accept the amendment as modified.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to myself.

The committee considered the question of Alaska. The committee was convinced that Alaska needed and deserved more road development than she has. It was the very difficulty about which the distinguished chairman of the committee has been speaking, namely, the impracticability of applying to Alaska a formula which suits the 48 States, that got us into trouble. However, inasmuch as the Senator from Oregon has modified his amendment, and with the understanding that the committee members are not committed to the exact terms of the amendment in conference, I am willing to accept the amendment, as modified, and take it to conference in the hope that we can arrive at something beneficial to the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 3 minutes to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. The printed record of the hearings, on page 841, shows the application of the special rule to States which have large acreages of public lands. Taking the States alphabetically, the first State in the list is Arizona. In Arizona the percentage of the cost contributed by the Federal Government to primary-aid and secondary-aid projects, instead of being 50 percent, as in the normal State, would be 71.95 percent. The reason for that is that 43.9 percent of the lands in Arizona belong to the Federal Government. Half of that 43.9 percent, or 21.95 percent, is added to the 50 percent to make 71.95 percent.

In addition to that, as the distinguished Senator from Tennessee well knows, and as the distinguished Senator from Oregon also well knows, additional special consideration is given to States which have large blocks of public acreage, by the provisions discussed a few minutes ago, under which $2 million a year is permitted for the construction of trunk routes through those public lands.

My understanding is—and if I am not correct in my understanding, I should like to be corrected—that the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon in effect replaces both of those provisions by the amendment which is suggested, under which the territory of Alaska would make up about 10 percent of the total cost of Federal-aid projects, notwithstanding the fact that about 95 percent of the area in Alaska is federally owned land.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is absolutely correct. That is the way we have tried to meet this special and unique situation in Alaska.

Mr. HOLLAND. That proposal is a substitute, although it is a less generous one than the two provisions which I have quoted as applicable to States. Is that correct?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct. That is the way we have attempted to solve the long injustice with respect to Alaska.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. GORE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I do. I first wish to thank the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from New Mexico for their cooperation in this vital question confronting the great Territory of Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "5–28–56–J."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 49, after the period in line 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

Such agreements shall also contain a clause providing that the State will not permit automotive service stations or other commercial establishments for serving motor vehicle users to be constructed or located on the rights-of-way of the Interstate System.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes.

In the House bill, at page 27 of the bill, a provision was inserted by the House, which reads as follows:

Such agreements shall also contain provisions to insure that the user of the Interstate System will receive the benefits of free competition in purchasing supplies and services at or adjacent to highways in such System, and such agreements shall also contain a clause providing that the State will not permit automotive service stations or other commercial establishments for serving motor vehicle users to be constructed or located on the right-of-way of the Interstate System.

The purpose of the provision was to prevent the granting of monopolies along the highways, particularly with respect to oil companies and restaurants, to the exclusion of everyone else.

Such a provision is not contained in the Senate bill. I am offering only half of what is contained in the House bill in that regard. I am offering that part of it which provides that no agreements

shall contain a clause permitting commercial establishments within the limits of the highway. There are two reasons for that, and I can recite each reason within 10 seconds.

The first one is that if they are not on the highway, they will be built on private property, and it is rather obvious that even though the State will control the ingress and egress, it will not be possible to grant monopolies.

The other reason is that it is highly imperative, in the opinion of many members of the committee, that in the Senate bill the wording should be different from the House bill, so as to enable the committee on conference—there being a difference—to review the whole matter and to try to effectuate the intent in the best possible way.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to join the Senator in his amendment. Many people in the West—and I suppose the same is true of people in other parts of the country, particularly motel owners—do not want to be deprived of opportunities by a bill which would allow some kind of monopoly on a Federal highway system or on Federal land. It is a very good amendment, and I wish to join the Senator in support of it.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator. It is my understanding that the Senator from Tennessee is agreeable to accepting the amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I have listened to the argument of the able Senator from New Hampshire, and I have also talked with him about it. I have also discussed the matter with the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and with other Senators. I am not authorized by the committee to act in the matter, but I am convinced that the amendment should be adopted. It serves a good purpose and it is well drawn. I will take the responsibility of accepting it.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator. If the Senate will adopt the amendment, I shall have nothing further to say about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the Senators yield back the remainder of the time?

Mr. GORE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. COTTON. I do, also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on page 45, line 4, the figure "1956" be changed to "1957"; and that on page 45, line 5, the figure "1961" be changed to "1962".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENDER obtained the floor.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have two amendments at the desk, but I shall not press them because the subject of the amendments has been practically resolved and voted on. However, I wish to take 5 minutes to ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee a few questions for the benefit of the RECORD. It is a matter which is of extreme importance to us on the Pacific coast. It is important also to the State of Nevada and to the State of California.

As I understand, the Federal Government has never participated in aiding the construction of so-called toll bridges and toll roads and toll tunnels. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. I believe that is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Therefore, the construction of a specific piece of road which would require a toll tunnel through the mountains, such as the Cascade or Sierra Nevada Mountains, which run precipitously down to the coast, or a piece of road which would call for the construction of toll bridges, would not be included in the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. On the Interstate System a tunnel would have to be free.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Free.

Mr. GORE. If such a tunnel or bridge is constructed on an interstate route and the project receives the approval of the Bureau of Roads, the Federal Government would contribute up to 90 percent of the cost, the State would have to provide 10 percent of the cost, and the facility would have to be free.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to ask this question. I believe the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] will be interested in it also. Two of the major interstate routes run to the west coast. One stretches from Spokane to a point where it runs into the mountains close to Puget Sound. Then there is a great rise over 2 or 3 passes into the Puget Sound area. Similarly, an interstate route runs from Reno through the Sacramento Valley, and that route will have to be improved considerably if we are to have a free highway system along that route. Those two routes will require tunnels through the Cascade and the Sierra Nevada Mountains, and they would cost a great deal more per mile than would any other sections of the Interstate Highway System of the United States.

As I understand, the Senator from Tennessee states that even though the added cost—as in the case of a Cascade tunnel in my section of the country, or the improvement of the highway into the Sacramento Valley—might seem to be very high for those sections, it is still possible if the Bureau of Public Roads approved, under the provisions of this bill, to have a free highway system and an accessible one, even though the highway had to surmount the almost insurmountable barricade of the Sierra Nevada and Cascade Mountains.

Mr. GORE. That is correct. It is very similar to the construction of a through route through one of our great municipal centers. There the right-of-way may cost 10 times as much as the actual construction of the road, but so long as it is on an interstate route and so designated, so long as the plan and program submitted by the State highway department meet the approval of the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads, it is eligible for construction on a 90-percent contribution basis. The same would be true of a causeway in Louisiana, for example.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let us use the figure $100 million for a Cascade tunnel. Suppose the State should appropriate twenty-five or thirty million dollars. Could it submit that figure as the cost, rather than the full cost, and receive the 90-percent contribution? In some cases the States may be so desirous of having a Cascade tunnel that they would reduce the cost down to an amount which might be more reasonable. Could that be done?

Mr. GORE. I am not sure that I correctly understand the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Supposing the cost of the tunnel is $100 million. If we submit that figure for a short route it might be too high to receive the approval of the Bureau of Public Roads. Supposing the State itself, over and above the 10 percent, cuts the cost and appropriates some money. Could it still apply for the remainder, if it is on an interstate route?

Mr. GORE. I wish to make it plain that the bill does not prescribe the standards which must be met. Those standards, under existing law, are determined by the Bureau of Public Roads. So long as the project sponsored by the Senator's State meets the minimum standard and is also on an interstate route and receives the approval of the Bureau of Public Roads, it would be eligible for a 90 percent Federal contribution.

The Senator's State is subject to an apportionment, and if a single tunnel costs $100 million, then the State would have to choose between using a large portion of its apportionment on that particular tunnel, or using it otherwise. But that would be within the choice of the State, subject to the approval of the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And the State could make a local contribution to a given project, because of its peculiar situation.

Mr. GORE. There is certainly no prohibition against that, except that it must be a free facility.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I have one further question. I know the Senator can answer it only generally, but I have noticed that in the bill the word "tunnel" does not appear.

Mr. GORE. No. I do not recall that it does, nor do I think the word "causeway" is contained in the bill. But they are both parts of a public roads system.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And the Senator thinks that the word "tunnel" would not be obnoxious in a particular case?

Mr. GORE. I cannot commit the Bureau of Public Roads as to what they might accept.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Tennessee, and I also wish to thank the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] for yielding to me.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 45, at the end of line 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

Such agreements may, however, authorize a State or political subdivision thereof to use the air space above and below the established grade line of the highway pavement for the parking of motor vehicles, provided such use does not interfere in any way with the free flow of traffic on the interstate system.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I would say to my colleague, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], that if the Cotton amendment had been adopted, this amendment would not be necessary. The House passed this amendment unanimously. It deals with a problem which Cincinnati and several other cities have in connection with their parking problems. Some of the cities have narrow streets. Unless there is some question about it, I would appreciate it if we may consider the amendment immediately. I would spare the time of the Members by asking for a vote on my amendment at this time.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may the clerk state the amendment again? I apologize to the able Senator from Ohio. I was in conference with another Senator and I did not hear the amendment read. I am sorry.

Mr. President, the able Senator from Ohio has now identified his amendment. I am acquainted with it, and I accept it.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield back his time?

Mr. GORE. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "5-25-56-D."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 49, between lines 24 and 25, it is proposed to insert the following new sections:

SEC. 117. It is hereby declared to be the intent and policy of the Congress to equitably reimburse the States for any portion of a highway which is on the National System of Interstate Highways, whether toll or free, the construction of which has been completed subsequent to August 2, 1947, or which is either in actual use or under construction by contract, for completion, awarded not later than June 30, 1957, and such highway meets the standards required by this title for the National System of Interstate Highways. The time, method, and amounts of such reimbursement shall be determined by the Congress following a study which the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed to conduct, in cooperation with the State highway departments, and other agencies as may be required, to determine which highways in the National System of Interstate Highways measure up to the standards required by this title, including all related factors of cost, depreciation, participation of Federal funds, and any other items relevant thereto. A complete report of the results of such study shall be submitted to the Congress within 10 days subsequent to January 2, 1958. It is also declared to be the policy and intent of the Congress to provide funds necessary to make such reimbursements to the States as may be determined.

SEC. 118. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to approve as part of the National System of Interstate Highways any toll road, bridge, or tunnel, now or hereafter constructed which meets the standards adopted for the improvement of projects located on such system, whenever such toll road, bridge, or tunnel forms a logical segment of such system: *Provided*, That no Federal-aid highway funds shall be expended for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of any such toll road except to the extent hereafter permitted by law: *Provided further*, That no Federal-aid highway funds shall be expended for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of any such toll bridge or tunnel except to the extent now or hereafter permitted by law.

(b) The funds authorized under this tile, or under prior acts, shall be available for expenditure on projects approaching any toll road, bridge, or tunnel to a point where such project will have some use irrespective of its use for such toll road, bridge, or tunnel.

(c) The funds authorized under this title, or under prior acts, shall be available for expenditure on projects approaching any toll road on the National System of Interstate Highways, even though the project has no use other than as an approach to such toll road: *Provided*, That agreement has been reached with the State prior to approval of any such project (1) that the section of toll road will become free to the public upon retirement of any bonds outstanding at the time of the agreement, (2) that all toll collections are used for maintenance and operation and debt service of the section of road incorporated into the National System of Interstate Highways, and (3) that there is one or more reasonably satisfactory alternate free routes available to traffic by which the toll section of the system may be bypassed.

(d) Nothing in this title shall be deemed to repeal the act approved March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1398), or subsection (g) of section 204 of the National Industrial Recovery Act (48 Stat. 200), and such acts are hereby amended to include tunnels as well as bridges.

Renumber the following sections in title I accordingly.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to declare it to be the intent and the policy of the Congress equitably to reimburse the States for any portion of a highway which is on the National System of Interstate Highways, whether toll or free, the construction of which has been completed subsequent to August 2, 1947, or which is either in actual use or under construction by contract, for completion, awarded not later than June 30, 1957, and such highway meets the standards required by this title for the National System of Interstate Highways.

The time, method, and amounts of such reimbursement shall be determined by the Congress following a study which the Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to conduct, in cooperation with the State highway departments and other agencies as may be required, to determine which highways in the National System of Interstate Highways measure up to the standards required by this title, including all related factors of cost, depreciation, participation of Federal funds, and any other items relevant thereto. A complete report of the results of such study shall be submitted to the Congress within 10 days subsequent to January 2, 1958.

It is also declared to be the policy and intent of the Congress to provide funds necessary to make such reimbursements to the States as may be determined.

So this is a declaration of policy, Mr. President, designed to reimburse the States for that portion, or any portion, of a highway which is on the national system, whether it be toll or free, the construction of which has been completed subsequent to August 2, 1947, or which is either in actual use or under construction by contract, for completion, awarded not later than June 30, 1957.

I should say, before I proceed further, that the amendment was offered for myself and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. I neglected to mention that at the outset of my remarks.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield for a question.

Mr. CARLSON. I sincerely appreciate the offering of the amendment, which is cosponsored by the junior Senator from New York. I think the amendment has merit and should be given consideration by the Senate. I earnestly hope that it will be approved.

I should like to suggest, however, that some language on lines 6 and 7, on page 1, including the date, June 30, 1957, be stricken. The language which I propose to strike out reads:

For which is either in actual use or under construction by contract, for completion, awarded not later than June 30, 1957.

It occurs to me that that language should be stricken because this is to be a long-range highway program, extending from 13 to 16 years. There may be States or areas where a road could be completed within 4 or 5 years, and it might be necessary that it be completed within that time. It could be completed as a toll road, as a part of the Interstate System, and would take care of the increasing traffic.

I hope that the date, June 30, 1957, will be eliminated, because I do not think it adds anything to the bill. I think it would be very helpful to leave the date open on that basis.

Mr. BUSH. I should be glad to accept the modification suggested by the Senator from Kansas. However, I should like to ascertain the view of the distinguished acting majority leader on that point.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. Undoubtedly there are equities which deserve to be considered with respect to the States which have built toll thoroughfares which conform to the standards of the Interstate System.

Mr. BUSH. And also, I may add, free roads.

Mr. GORE. And free roads.

I am not in a position to accept the amendment as declaring the intent and

policy of Congress, because as chairman of the subcommittee on roads I am the agent of a committee in which the sentiment was rather strongly against this proposal. If the committee had the benefit of a careful study and report, it would be in a position to give consideration to the equities which we all acknowledge exist.

Because of the lateness of the hour, I wonder if the Senator from Connecticut would be willing to modify his amendment so as to begin, on page 2, line 4, with the word "the." The amendment then would read:

The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed to conduct, in cooperation with the State highway departments, and other agencies as may be required, to determine which highways, whether toll or free, measure up to the standards required for inclusion in the National System of Interstate Highways, including all related factors of cost, depreciation, participation of Federal funds, and any other items relevant thereto. A complete report of the results of such study shall be submitted to the Congress within 10 days subsequent to January 2, 1958.

Mr. BUSH. On that point, I should be glad to have the comments of my colleague, the junior Senator from New York, who is a joint sponsor of the amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, when I agreed to become a cosponsor of the amendment offered by the able Senator from Connecticut, I was under the impression, and very naturally and appropriately so, that not only was section 117 to be offered, but also section 118.

Mr. BUSH. I may say to the Senator from New York that I had not finished my discussion of the amendment when I was asked by the Senator from Kansas to yield. I intended to offer the whole amendment. The reason why I did not discuss the next section was that the Senator from Kansas asked me to yield at that point. Then we turned to the Senator from Tennessee for his advice.

The Senator from Tennessee has asked us to change section 117 substantially. The effect of what the Senator from Tennessee has said is that he wants to eliminate entirely the declaration of intent and policy of Congress to reimburse equitably such States. I hope I am correctly interpreting his suggestion.

He wants to eliminate the intent and policy entirely, and simply to reduce section 117 to a requirement that the Secretary of Commerce shall make a study of the possibilities involved in the reimbursement for such facilities. Is that not correct?

Mr. GORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to ask my cosponsor, the Senator from New York, for his views. I am very much disinclined to accept the modification suggested by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. LEHMAN. I, too, am very much disinclined to accept it. In fact, I could not possibly accept it. I still have great hope that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee will accept the amendment as it now reads.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. A chairman of a committee in charge of a bill, as the able Senator knows, has certain latitude in accepting amendments, and I think properly so. That latitude, however, is circumscribed severely when an amendment is offered which is a part of a bill identical in terms with a bill which already has passed the House.

Should I accept the amendment as the Senator has proposed it here, it would then not be the subject of a conference at all. I would be acting in violation of what I know to be the sentiment of the committee of which I am the agent.

So, much as I would like to yield to the entreaty of my distinguished friends and colleagues, for whom I have not only a very high regard, but also the warmest of personal affection, I am simply not in a position to do so.

I could accept the amendment with the modification I have suggested, and I should feel justified in doing so. But as the Senator has presented the amendment in toto, I should have to ask for a yea and nay vote; I could not do otherwise.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief statement?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I realize the obligation of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee; but I hope he also realizes that I have a responsibility and obligation to my own State.

Mr. GORE. I do, indeed.

Mr. LEHMAN. The amendment which was proposed by my colleague from Connecticut, and which I was very glad to join in cosponsoring, is requested by the administration of the State of New York, representing the 16 million people of that State.

As a matter of fact, I believe I may say parenthetically, the amendment is in the interest of a great many other States, as well. Not only is it in the interest of New York and Connecticut, but it is also in the interest of States such as Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Kansas, and others.

Mr. BUSH. And California.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BUSH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. As I have said, this provision is in the House bill. If the two distinguished Senators would accept the modification I have suggested, and would eliminate from the amendment the declaration of intent and policy, which at least is a moral commitment upon a future Congress, I would not only be prepared to accept the amendment but as a conferee I would be prepared to give it most sympathetic consideration.

Mr. BUSH. I had not finished my explanation of the amendment, including section 118.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he discusses that section?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wonder if I could ask the able Senator from Tennessee to take the sentence beginning on line 14, and ending in line 16 on page 2 as a part of this section? Then the first part of the section would be eliminated, and the amendment still could go to conference.

As I understand, the Senator from Tennessee wants to have something to take to conference. I think that is not more than right, but I do not think the Senate ought to pass a bill without putting in it some language based upon intent. As a matter of fact, I had considered offering an amendment, and I now read three lines from it:

As proof of the good faith of this declaration of intent and purpose of the Congress, during the period from June 30, 1956, until the time when the Congress takes action upon the results of the study hereafter provided, the sum of—

I had intended to put in a certain number of dollars at that point. I think we ought to be very definite, because certain States have built toll roads. They are going to be paid for by the people who travel on them. At the same time, people traveling on the highways will be paying, through taxes on tires and gasoline, for the free roads.

I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Tennessee that he wants to have something in conference. If a portion of the amendment is left out and the Senator takes the quotation I have read, he will still have something in conference.

Mr. GORE. I may still have something in conference, but it will be a very slim need, because the sentence on lines 14, 15, and 16 of page 2 is really a repetition of the declaration of intent and policy on lines 1 and 2 on page 1. I would be prepared to accept the part I read to the able Senator, ending with the figure "1958" on line 14, page 2, with the modifications I read as I proceeded and then beginning with section 118, down through line 5 on page 3.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I should like to read that language from section 118:

(a) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to approve as part of the National System of Interstate Highways any toll road, bridge, or tunnel, now or hereafter constructed which meets the standards adopted for the improvement of projects located on such system, whenever such toll road, bridge, or tunnel forms a logical segment of such system: *Provided*, That no Federal-aid highway funds shall be expended for the construction, reconstruction, or after permitted by law: *Provided further*, That no Federal-aid highway funds shall be expended for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of any such toll bridge or tunnel except to the extent now or hereafter permitted by law.

The Senator wants to end the amendment at that point, I take it, but we rather insist that the ensuing provisions of the amendment are very, very important, and particularly paragraph (b), on line 6, which reads as follows:

The funds authorized under this title, or under prior acts, shall be available for expenditure on projects approaching any toll road, bridge, or tunnel to a point where such project will have some use irrespective of its use for such toll road, bridge, or tunnel.

In other words, if it is an approach to the toll road, bridge, or tunnel, and has some other use—for example, if it turns off to the north or to the south—

then these funds should be available for such approaches, that is to say, other connections.

Subsection (c) I think is very important, too. It reads:

The funds authorized under this title, or under prior acts, shall be available for expenditure on projects approaching any toll road on the National System of Interstate Highways, even though the project has no use other than as an approach to such toll road: *Provided*, That agreement has been reached with the State prior to approval of any such project (1) that the section of toll road will become free to the public upon retirement of any bonds—

And so forth. I shall not read the rest of the language.

Mr. President, those are very important provisions for many of the States which have gone ahead, farsightedly and boldly, to meet the terrible traffic problem.

I think it would be difficult for me, as it is for my colleague from New York, to accept the modification which the Senator from Tennessee has suggested.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What is the provision of the language which the Senator seeks to have adopted with respect to the status of a toll project after its recognition as a part of the National System of Interstate Highways? Would tolls continue to be charged?

Mr. BUSH. Yes, until the debt had been retired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the language which the Senator is offering carry any provision for reimbursement to the toll authority or to the State for the portion of the toll road incorporated into the Interstate System?

Mr. BUSH. I do not think so.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What the Senator is seeking to do, then, is have designed, as a part of the Interstate System, a road which would operate as a feeder to the segment of the road or bridge where the toll might be collected. Is that correct?

Mr. BUSH. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It would feed traffic into the toll operation.

Mr. BUSH. Yes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. On the very point the Senator from South Dakota has raised about the funds being paid back to the States for the use of toll roads, I had submitted an amendment in which I covered that phase of the question. I had it at the desk. I did not call it up, but I should like to offer it for printing in the RECORD. I think it has much merit, because States have gone ahead and have invested in roads which will be a part of the Interstate System. We were advised in committee that the Federal Government would take the roads. No provision has been made for doing so. I asked officials of the Bureau of Public Roads if they intended to use toll roads as part of the Interstate System. I think some of the States are being treated unfairly. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will give us some consideration.

Mr. President, I should like to present the amendment as a part of the debate, for the purpose of legislative history, and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, Mr. CARLSON's amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, or any other provision of law, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized, as provided herein, to enter into agreements on behalf of the United States, with any State or agency or instrumentality thereof for the payment to said State or an agency or instrumentality thereof over a period of years, not exceeding 13, of funds payable under this act on account of any project on the National System of Interstate Highways to assist such State or agency or instrumentality thereof in the financing of the immediate construction of a project on the National System of Interstate Highways.

The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with any State or agency or instrumentality thereof only if—

(a) such State or agency or instrumentality thereof is empowered to enter into an agreement with the Secretary under this section and otherwise comply with the provisions of this act;

(b) such State or agency or instrumentality thereof shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary the desirability of immediate construction of the project on the National System of Interstate Highways to which the agreement relates; and

(c) in States where the agreement is to be entered into between the Secretary and an agency or instrumentality of such State, the governor shall have approved such an agreement.

An agreement pursuant to this section shall provide that the State, or the agency or instrumentality thereof entering into the same, shall proceed immediately with the construction of the project on the National System of Interstate Highways to which the agreement relates, and such project may be a toll project or a free project, as shall be determined by the State or the agency or instrumentality thereof entering into such agreement.

In the event the project covered by such agreement shall be a toll project, such agreement shall obligate the State or the agency or instrumentality thereof constructing the same to cause such project to become free to the public upon retirement of any bonds or other obligations issued to finance the cost of such project.

Such agreement shall provide for the payment to the State or the agency or instrumentality thereof constructing the project of no more than one-half of the cost of construction of the project covered thereby, as approved by the Secretary, excluding interest on any obligations issued by the State or such agency or instrumentality to finance its portion of the cost thereof and any financing charges relating to any such obligations so issued. Such payment shall be made in equal annual installments over such period of years, not exceeding 13, as shall be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State or agency or instrumentality thereof entering into such an agreement. No agreement entered into pursuant to this section shall provide for the payment thereunder to the State or agency or instrumentality thereof, if any one year, of funds in excess of 50 percent of the funds which such State will be entitled to under the apportionment of the Federal share payable on account of projects on the National System of Interstate Highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957. Moneys paid to a State or agency or instrumentality thereof under such an agreement shall be applied to the payment of actual construction costs of the project or the payment of the principal of obligations issued in connection with the financing of the cost of such project.

Such agreement shall also provide that the difference between the 50 percent or less of the project cost payable to the State or agency or instrumentality thereof entering into the same and the amount otherwise provided in this act as the Federal share payable on account of such project on the National System of Interstate Highways shall remain available to the State as additional Federal aid for the purposes specified in this act and shall be used for such purposes as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State; provided, however, such Federal aid may be used by the States without State matching requirements.

Such agreement shall also provide that the expenditure of funds contracted to be paid under such agreement shall be subject to all of the conditions, restrictions and limitations contained in this act with respect to the appropriation and apportionment of funds for the National System of Interstate Highways, except as otherwise in this section expressly provided.

The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of all moneys contracted to be paid by the Secretary pursuant to this section, and there is hereby appropriated in each fiscal year, out of any money in the Highway Trust Fund not otherwise appropriated, the amounts necessary to provide for such payments.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I was going to ask the question whether or not the provision included bridges, but from a reading of it, I think it does. There are bridges between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey which are toll bridges.

I should like to make this statement in conjunction with what the distinguished Senator from Connecticut has said. It is already being worked out that Route No. 40, for example, from Baltimore, will go to Hancock. Then there will be a new interstate road built to the Pennsylvania Turnpike. Then the Pennsylvania Turnpike will be used to the Ohio line. I presume the route will continue on the Ohio Turnpike. Then the Indiana Turnpike will be used. Then the Illinois Turnpike will be used to Chicago. That is a part of the plan, as I understand.

The Senator from Maryland and I have been a little concerned about it. We felt that the interstate road probably should be Route 40 west, but we were informed by the Bureau of Roads and the highway departments of Maryland and Pennsylvania that an agreement of that kind has been entered into.

I merely wish to say to the Senator from Connecticut that is the plan.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think there is a great deal of misunderstanding about this matter. We are not asking for reimbursement, even though the State of

New York has built 557 miles of throughways and other thoroughfares. Of course, we feel that construction should be subject to reimbursement to the State.

Certainly it does not seem proper that we in New York State and those in other States which also build these throughways should be penalized as we are being penalized now. I have an amendment which would ask for reimbursement on that score. But as a compromise, I join the distinguished Senator from Connecticut in sponsoring this amendment, by which we are not requesting any reimbursement for the cost of the toll bridges or tunnels, although we believe we are entitled to that and to much more.

All we are requesting is that these tunnels and bridges be recognized as parts of the Interstate Highway System and, further, that expenditures on projects approaching any toll road, bridge, or tunnel be reimbursed. We shall not get any benefit from this amendment. We simply ask that when we build one of the circuitous approaches to a bridge—such as the approaches to the George Washington Bridge—at least we be reimbursed for that cost. But beyond that, we are not asking to be reimbursed for the cost of the George Washington Bridge or the cost of the tunnels under the Hudson River or the cost of the other projects which are for the benefit of the entire country and for the benefit of the Interstate Highway System which is to be authorized under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from New York understands, does he not, that 50–50 matching funds would now be available to his State, to build approaches to the Interstate Highway System facilities within his State? Is he now requesting that the Federal Government pay 90 percent of the cost of approaches to toll roads and bridges, or will he be content with the 50–50 matching?

Mr. LEHMAN. I think what the distinguished Senator is saying about the 50–50 matching is accurate, but I would not be satisfied with that. If we were requesting any reimbursement in the case of the cost of these tunnels, crossings, or bridges, that would be entirely different; and then, of course, I would be very willing to compromise on the basis of 50–50 matching. But in this case we are only asking that recognition be given to these bridges, tunnels, and crossings as parts of the Interstate Highway System—as they undoubtedly are—and that because they are parts of it, the cost of constructing the approaches leading to them be reimbursed to the States on the basis of the formula followed in connection with all other construction work in connection with the Interstate System of Highways.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from New York for that very clear statement. He says so wisely that he only wishes the expenditures for the construction of approaches which are to serve the Interstate System to be reimbursable. We want these sections to be eligible for reimbursement for the cost of construction of the approaches which feed traffic into the Interstate Highway System. That should be done, because such approaches must be constructed.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator knows that under the present system and under the provisions of the pending bill, his State or the State of New York or any other State can propose a program for the construction of State roads—primary, secondary, or urban. They can be interconnections; they can be new roads; they can be approaches. The State would be eligible to receive 50–50 matching on that basis. It may be that I am in error, but it seems that that is sufficient, unless these segments are on the Interstate System itself.

But when we go outside the Interstate System, and begin reimbursing on a 90-percent basis, then we are in trouble.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator states correctly that reimbursement for the cost of construction of the primary, secondary, and urban roads can be had on a 50–50 basis. But we are talking about the Interstate System, in which there is a 90-percent Federal interest.

Mr. GORE. No; the Senator from Connecticut is talking about approaches to it.

Mr. BUSH. That is right.

Mr. GORE. And not about the Interstate System.

Mr. BUSH. That is right.

Mr. GORE. That is why I say there must be a distinction.

Mr. BUSH. I remind the Senator from Tennessee that the House of Representatives approved this proposal by a vote of 388 to 19. That is a very important point. In this connection there will have to be a conference; and I think this amendment only requests fair treatment for the States which have been forehanded and have led the way in connection with the construction of toll roads, toll bridges, tunnels, and so forth, for the convenience of all the rest of the Nation. Almost all the people of the United States seem to use our highways.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to have the author of the amendment explain certain of the language of the amendment.

Mr. BUSH. To what part of the amendment does the Senator from South Dakota refer?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. To page 2, in line 17, reading as follows:

SEC. 118. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to approve as part of the National System of Interstate Highways any toll road, bridge, or tunnel, now or hereafter constructed which meets the standards adopted for the improvement of projects located on such system, whenever such toll road, bridge, or tunnel forms a logical segment of such system—

What do the words "forms a logical segment of such system" mean?

Mr. BUSH. I take it that they mean exactly what they say, namely, if it fits logically into the Interstate System.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does that mean a part of the designated system?

Mr. BUSH. Yes, if the Secretary of Commerce so designates it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But 39,990 miles of the 40,000 miles authorized by the present law are already designated. Are the parts the Senator from Connecticut has in mind parts of the designated Interstate System; or is the Senator from Connecticut seeking to take advantage of the provision of the Senate committee's version of the bill which would authorize 2,500 additional miles, and to have a portion of the 2,500 miles applied to the tunnels, bridges, or approaches to them?

Mr. BUSH. No. The whole purpose of the amendment is to give the Secretary authority to approve——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My point is that if it is a part of the designated system, I do not think any language is needed. If it is not a part of the designated system, and if it requires some new designation, then some additional miles are needed.

Mr. BUSH. The amendment refers to toll roads, bridges, or tunnels now or hereafter constructed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the amendment give the Secretary carte blanche authority to select a toll road not now a part of the system?

Mr. BUSH. "Whenever such toll road, bridge, or tunnel forms a logical segment of such system."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then can the Secretary extend the system whenever he wishes?

Mr. BUSH. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BUSH. My time has been exhausted, partly as a result of yielding to other Senators. Perhaps the Senator from Tennessee will give us a little time.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, does the Senator from Connecticut understand my point? If it is now a part of the designated system, I do not think any additional language is needed. If it is not now a part of the designated system, then some mileage is needed.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from South Dakota will find sections of road which are on the interstate route and are so designated, and either may not be up to the standards or may be up to the standards, in which event they can be designated by the Secretary——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As I understand, the designation is between control points. Specific highways which are numbered are not necessarily the

designated system, but the designation runs between certain control points.

Mr. BUSH. I do not see how the language could be any clearer, because it provides specifically what the Secretary is authorized to do.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I was wondering if, instead of the words "forms a logical segment of such system," the Senator would be satisfied to make it read: "whenever such toll road, bridge, or tunnel is a part of the designated Interstate System."

Mr. BUSH. I think that could be done. I would accept such a modification. Will the Senator repeat it?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Instead of the words "whenever such toll road, bridge, or tunnel forms a logical segment of such system," make it read: "whenever such toll road, bridge, or tunnel is a part of the designated Interstate System."

Mr. BUSH. I do not see very much difference, but if the Senator would feel happier, I would be glad to accept the modification in order to get the amendment to conference.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If it is designated, there is no reason why it should not be approved. If it must be designated, some additional mileage is needed.

Mr. BUSH. Without objection, I will accept the modification suggested by the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from South Dakota send to the desk the modification accepted by the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the Senator from New York wishes some time on his own account. I should like to yield the floor if the Senator from Tennessee will yield a little more time to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall offer an amendment merely for the sake of gaining more time. After I have concluded speaking, I shall withdraw the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York from the time on the bill.

Mr. BUSH. I am sure the Senator from Tennessee realizes that we have been yielding time back and forth.

Mr. GORE. I fully intended to yield additional time to the distinguished Senator from New York, and will yield some additional time after he uses the 5 minutes so generously assigned to him by the senior Senator from California.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator. I think that is very fair.

Mr. GORE. After the Senator from New York concludes, I should like to have about 2 minutes, if I may.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have no objection to accepting the slight modification suggested by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, but that would not cure the situation, unless the chairman of the subcommittee were willing to accept section 118.

In order to sharpen the issue, I should like to make a very brief statement with regard to this amendment.

Mr. President, the purpose of the pending amendment to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to designate toll roads, bridges, and tunnels as part of the Interstate System—is not to secure Federal aid for these toll structures but rather to make possible Federal aid for the construction of expressways, bypasses and feeder roads made necessary by the fact that these toll roads, bridges, and tunnels are, in fact, part of the Interstate System.

The problem arises from the fact that many States have constructed toll roads, bridges and tunnels on the Interstate System. They had to do this without waiting for Federal aid because the traffic problems had grown so great.

The pending amendment does not seek to have Federal aid extended for the construction of these toll structures—bridges, tunnels, and roads. That is another question which is quite beyond the purview of this amendment.

This amendment seeks only to make it possible for Federal aid to be extended for expressways through a city, for bypasses around a city, and for connecting links to other parts of the Interstate System where such bypasses, expressways, and connecting links originate or terminate in the toll bridge, toll tunnel, or toll road.

Such roads are necessary, Mr. President, because these toll structures are, in fact, part of the Interstate System. Most of the traffic going over or through these structures is not proceeding to the urban center, which is at the end of these toll roads, bridges, or tunnels. Most of this traffic is through traffic. It is brought to and over these structures because they are, in fact, on the Interstate System. In order to avoid adding intolerably to the congestion of the city in question it is necessary to build expressways or bypasses, or to provide a link from these toll structures to another part of the Interstate Highway System. It is for these links, bypasses, and expressways that Federal aid is justified and desired and that is why this amendment is necessary, in order to make it perfectly clear that these nontoll highways and expressways and bypasses which lead into or away from the toll bridges, tunnels, or highways may be eligible for Federal aid as parts of the primary Federal system.

There is a possibility that even without this amendment such an interpretation might be given to the law. But it is far from clear. Hence, this amendment is offered.

This problem arises in every urban center. Take New York City. Long before the Interstate System was ever thought of, New York City had built and was operating the Lincoln Tunnel, the Holland Tunnel, and the George Washington Bridge. New York City is an anchor point and nexus of the Interstate System as a glance at the map will show. Certainly, much of the traffic moving on the Interstate System will have to pass through these tunnels and bridges. Statistical studies show that the preponderance of traffic passing through these two tunnels and this bridge is not traffic bound for New York. It is traffic passing through the city.

To speed this traffic on its way on the Interstate System, New York State and the New York Port Authority will have to construct urban bypasses and urban expressways. Needless to say, this will be one of the most expensive aspects of the total highway construction plan.

The same can be said for every other urban center in the country.

What the pending amendment would do, Mr. President, is make sure that this vital and expensive network of bypasses and expressways will be eligible for Federal aid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. GORE. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. These roadways will not be primarily for the use of the city dwellers. They will not be toll roads. They will be free to anyone. But if it is not made clear that they are part of the Interstate System—as in logic they are—then Federal aid may be denied to one of the most important parts of this entire program.

It should be obvious why these bypasses and expressways are so important. The Interstate System—a system designed to create a nationwide grid of high-speed superhighways for defense and other national purposes would be a mockery indeed if it contained a bottleneck at every urban center.

The way to do this is to approve the pending amendment which will authorize the Secretary of Commerce to designate the toll structures, themselves, as parts of the Interstate System where such designation is justified by the facts.

At the present time, under old law, there is some question of whether these structures can be so designated, regardless of the justification.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I should like to report what I believe to be the language to which the Senator from Connecticut has agreed.

Mr. GORE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. On page 2, line 22, it is proposed to strike out the words "forms a logical segment of" and insert in lieu thereof the words "fits into the designated route of."

Let me say, by way of interpretation of that language, that the purpose is to make sure that the language does not of itself create or authorize an extension of the system, but does authorize recognition as a part of the system, where the toll road, bridge, or tunnel is on a presently designated route.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have no objection.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I join the Senator from New York in offering no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from South Dakota send the modification to the desk?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The pending amendment raises two enormous problems. One is the question of reimbursement. We have had no study made of how much of the interstate fund the amendment might require. We have had no study reported to the committee and to Congress on which we could act.

There is contemplated not only reimbursement for toll roads and toll approaches, but also for free roads. The purpose of the bill before the Senate is to build roads. The bill before the Senate does not contemplate reimbursement.

Let us think for a moment where the amendment might lead. What is the difference between reimbursing a State which has built a road up to standards because we have initiated a greatly expanded interstate highway program, and, on the other hand, reimbursing a county which has built a hospital up to standards before the Hill-Burton hospital assistance program went into effect?

Soon, I hope, we will consider Federal aid for the construction of schools. While the committee had the pending bill under consideration, I received a letter from the superintendent of a county school in Tennessee. It read something like this:

DEAR ALBERT: I read in the newspaper that Congress is soon going to enact a Federal school construction program. My county last year issued bonds, and we constructed a large number of new school buildings in the county. If Congress is going to pass the bill, I want you to get an amendment attached to it to reimburse Sullivan County for the part to which it would be entitled if it had waited to build the school building until after Congress had passed that bill.

I ask, therefore, what is the difference? If we make reimbursements, we will set a precedent, and in time it will lead to great expense. In fact, the amendment offered by the two distinguished Senators might take away a large slice of the $25 billion anticipated for the Interstate Highway System.

I say that Congress should not do that without a study first being made. We should not leap in the dark. We should have a study made and a report made before we act. I would agree to accept that part of the Senators' amendment, and I believe that is as far as I can go. I may be going farther than I should.

The second problem is this. If we agree to the amendment as it is offered, we permit certain States to increase the interstate mileage within their borders. What does that mean? It means that they will receive a 90 percent contribution on the construction of the approaches, as well as other features.

What is an approach? Can anyone tell me what is meant by an approach as that word is used in the amendment? How many miles constitutes an approach? Is it 30 miles of an interconnection which approaches from one side of a city and runs to the interstate highway on the other side?

I say that Congress should not act on so important a matter as this without first having more knowledge on the subject than we have available to us.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I merely wish to point out to the Senator from Tennessee that when he mentions reimbursement for a hospital which has already been built or for a schoolhouse which has already been built in Sullivan County, for example, that is not analogous to the situation we have before us now, although I believe very definitely that the State of New York and other States should be reimbursed for the work already done and the construction already carried forward on highways which are now a part of the Interstate System.

We are not pressing that in this amendment. There is nothing mentioned at all about paying for those roads, although I again wish to emphasize the fact that I believe reimbursement would be fair to the States. We are not asking for any reimbursement for the Holland Tunnel or for the Lincoln Tunnel. We are not asking 1 cent for that, although I believe it would be fair to do so, because those tunnels have been designated as a part of the Interstate Highway System. All we are asking for is reimbursement for the approaches and the connecting links.

Mr. GORE. Let me read from the amendment:

It is hereby declared to be the intent and policy of the Congress to equitably reimburse States for any portion of a highway which is on the National System of Interstate Highways, whether toll or free.

Mr. BUSH. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. GORE. If the Senator from New York has completed his interrogation.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have, temporarily.

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. If we were to accept the Senator's modification——

Mr. GORE. I am not asking the Senator to accept it.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator has made a proposal.

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. BUSH. If we were to accept it——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GORE. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BUSH. If we were to accept the Senator's modification of section 117, would he be disposed to accept section 18, as modified by the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. GORE. Would the Senator define the word "approaches"?

Mr. BUSH. I can give the Senator a definition of the word, but I do not know whether the Senator from Tennessee would accept it. Anything I might say in that respect might be subject to challenge. I do not know exactly how long an approach is. It might vary.

Mr. GORE. That is what I am afraid of. I am afraid that it might vary from 30 yards to 30 miles.

Mr. BUSH. I should not think it would go as high as 30 miles. It might vary from several yards to several hundred yards, or something of that nature. It would vary.

Mr. GORE. I do not wish to press the matter. I have yielded as much as I believe I should yield. I do not wish to be disagreeable, but if the Senators wish to vote on the amendment, I am ready to vote.

Mr. BUSH. If the Senator would be agreeable to taking the amendment to conference, I would be willing to limit the approaches to not over a half mile.

Mr. LEHMAN. I believe that would be a mistake. I do not know how long they would be.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to propound a question. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Assuming that the National Highway System proposed in the bill crossed a State which uses an existing highway that has already been improved by the State but which consists of the normal width, with a center area for passing, but which does not meet the National Highway System requirement of two lanes, would a State get credit for that type of road which would be used in the National System? In other words, it would be possible to use the existing highway as one lane, and it would be necessary only to put down a second lane alongside of it to be used for either the righthand lane or the lefthand lane. Under such circumstances, would a State be reimbursed for that one section of the highway?

Mr. GORE. There are no provisions in the Senate bill for reimbursement. The committee considered the matter, and overwhelmingly decided to omit it from the bill.

Mr. THYE. Then may I make this further inquiry? Does the Senator interpret the amendment which is being offered as giving a State the kind of credit I have described and reimbursing the State for the expense involved in the construction of that highway, such as it is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has again expired.

Mr. GORE. I yield myself 1 additional minute. I have been trying to get an interpretation as to the length of an approach from the distinguished Senator from New York and the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. THYE. The National Highway System proposes to use Highway 16 across Minnesota. It is a good highway. If the Senators in their amendment propose to reimburse us for the one lane I have described, I would support their amendment. Unless I have that assurance, I cannot support it.

Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. BUSH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I should like to have a little time.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the reason why I was unwilling to make the stipulation of half a mile is because of a fairly long experience in road building. When I first went to Albany the only roads we were building were 2-lane roads, with an occasional 3-lane road. We thought we were making great progress when we built a 3-lane road. Since that time, of course, the situation has changed rapidly and continuously, so that the old-fashioned roads which we considered a great achievement in my younger days in public life are now almost discarded. We are now building 8-lane roads, divided; we are building

them of a character which was previously completely unknown.

The curlicues which are seen around bridges and tunnels—there are a great many in New York, and I am sure there are many in other cities—were entirely unknown 15 or 20 years ago. We are making progress in road building continuously.

So, Mr. President, I am not able in good faith and in good conscience to say that an approach should be limited to half a mile. That might be enough; 200 yards might be enough. But as time passes and as the needs grow and as the science of road building develops, we may find it is an entirely inadequate description of what is meant by an approach.

We are not asking in this amendment for reimbursement. Although I believe we would logically be entitled to it, we are not asking for it. All we are asking is that the approaches and tunnels which are now or will be a part of the Interstate System, or will be designated on the interstate map, may have the chance of having connecting roads and approaches built without expense to the people of the States.

Take, for example, the Holland Tube and the Lincoln Tube. They are on the interstate map. People come from the South, from the North, and from the West, and use those tunnels and go right through New York. They go to Pennsylvania or Ohio or much farther west. They do not remain in New York. Most of them travel on and use New York City and its tunnels as a thoroughfare, as an artery. Certainly, we cannot expect the State of New York or other States to pay——

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The users of those tunnels pay a toll. Does the amendment provide that when the tunnels are paid for, the tolls cease?

Mr. LEHMAN. The tolls would cease as soon as the bonds are paid off.

Mr. PASTORE. In other words, passage through those tunnels would become free?

Mr. LEHMAN. When the bonds which have been issued against the tunnels have been paid off, so that there is no charge against the city of New York whatsoever, the tolls will cease entirely.

Mr. PASTORE. Will not the fee come to an end when the bonds are paid off, anyway, whether or not we pass this bill?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not know.

Mr. PASTORE. I understand that the reason for paying a toll is to pay back the loan on the bonds. Once the bonds have been paid off, whether or not we pass this bill, the fee will come to an end. If an interstate toll road becomes a part of the Interstate Highway System some people will be paying for a part of the interstate highway, and will be paying taxes to the Federal Government to pay 90 percent of the cost of roads built in another part of the country which will be free.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator is entirely incorrect in his assumption.

Mr. PASTORE. I am not being critical; I am agreeing with the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. But I am not asking for a cent of reimbursement.

Mr. PASTORE. I feel that there is a tremendous inequity in this bill. It means that people who use toll roads will also be paying taxes to the Government to build roads which will be free. The Merritt Highway is a toll highway. It costs 50 cents to go from Providence to New York City.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield further?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Unless the Merritt Highway becomes a part of the Interstate System, the people who are using that road will be paying 50 cents toll, and yet they will be paying taxes to support the building of another road in another State. I submit it is unfair. I think the whole problem should be restudied. There are too many problems to solve in deciding the question on the floor this evening, especially at this late hour. But whose money is going to be used to support this tremendous appropriation if people are still going to be compelled to continue to pay tolls and yet contribute 90 percent to building roads in another part of the country? I think it is unfair unless the tolls come to an end.

Mr. GORE. Does not the Senator from Rhode Island think a problem so complex as this should be acted on after the Congress and the committees of Congress have had the benefit of surveys, studies, and recommendations?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; and I hope we will not simply sweep it under the rug.

Mr. GORE. But here the question would be preempted. The amendment provides that—

It is hereby declared to be the intent and policy of the Congress—

And so forth.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, we are perfectly willing to accept the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee and strike out the language in section 117 from line 1 on page 1 to the end of line 2 on page 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have had my say for the moment. I may wish to say a little more later on.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. My understanding of the agreement is that the Senator from Tennessee would accept section 118?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is understood.

Mr. BUSH. As suggested by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I have assumed that if tolls are to be collected, when they have produced revenue to retire the bonds and liquidate the cost of the toll section, no further tolls will be charged. If that is not clear, then I think section 118 should carry additional language which would read:

Provided further, That when the tolls collected are sufficient to retire the bonds or liquidate the costs of an interstate toll road, charges for its use shall cease.

Mr. BUSH. I do not think the Senator from New York would accept that suggestion. They are not going to forego tolls because the bonds are paid off.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am willing to accept the language of section 118. I am perfectly willing to stand on that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield myself one-half minute; then I shall yield the remainder of the time to the Senator from South Dakota.

We have now spent 57½ minutes on the amendment. It is apparent to all, it would appear to me, that it is very complicated. Even though we should completely reject the amendment here, it will still be in conference, because the amendment is in the House bill verbatim. I suggest that with the benefit of the discussions in the Senate tonight and the benefit of further consultation, the conferees can go to the conference better prepared than we have been heretofore.

I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, it may be that the language from line 17 and following, on page 3, to which the Senator from New York has alluded, may answer the question I have raised. But it seemed to me that the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island raised the possibility that what might be money-making institutions could be created out of a toll road or a toll facility, whether a bridge or a tunnel, which would continue to yield profits for the toll authority, the State, the city, or whoever built the facility, profits which could be used for other purposes. It may be that the language at the bottom of page 3 will prevent that. I think that, if the bill goes to conference, the matter should be carefully considered, to make certain of it.

However, it certainly would be unfortunate if the country should be taxed, as the Senator from Rhode Island has pointed out, to create a sort of gate or funnel or attraction to feed traffic into the moneymaking facility, so to speak, in order to produce revenue for the particular unit of government which built the facility in the first place.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. There is a greater inequity than even that. As I understand, the purpose of the bill is to promote, more or less at public expense, a freer

movement of interstate traffic. For that reason, we are proposing to build interstate roads. There are certain parts of the system which have already been built which are toll roads. Anyone who traverses those sections has to pay toll.

I think it would be grossly unfair to continue to demand the payment of toll by people who are actually paying taxes to build the roads which are located in other parts of the country. I myself think that presents a very serious inequity which ought to be given consideration. I do not say that it can be corrected tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Dakota 1 minute on the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is said today that one of the most popular customs in merchandising is to offer a free coupon or gift or stamp in order to attract business. I simply hope that we do not make the Interstate System into a sort of gift stamp to be handed to travelers in orders to bring them into the "store" of the tunnel or bridge which charges a toll in order to make money for the operator of the toll gate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I desire to emphasize what the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] has just expressed so forcefully this evening. For 2 days I have been trying to advise the Senate of a situation which I regard as most inequitable, and the Senator from Rhode Island certainly has placed his fingers on it.

In the Committee on Finance, under the able leadership of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], we were told that 2,200 miles of toll road have been built as a part of the Interstate System. That means there will be 37,800 miles to build with the $25 billion.

We were also advised that the agencies which built the toll roads expect to keep them as toll roads. In fact, it was suggested by someone before the committee that it was the purpose to funnel the traffic into the toll roads to make them very profitable roads.

I think that is an inequity. It is unjust, as the Senator from Rhode Island has said.

Let us take a specific case. A road has been completed as a toll road from Kansas City to Topeka to Wichita. One-half of the road in Kansas will be a part of the Interstate System. It has already been stated that it will be.

Persons who travel from Topeka, Kans., to Kansas City will pay a toll. They will be able to travel from Kansas City to St. Louis on a free road. They will not pay a toll to pay for the road from Kansas City to Topeka. They will pay taxes on gasoline and tires to travel on the road from Kansas City to St. Louis. I think that is unfair.

I understand the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is willing to take the amendment to conference. He made that statement. We cannot settle the question here tonight, but we ought to say it is the intent of the Senate to correct such a situation as I have described. I think we ought to make that a matter of record.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does not the Senator think it would be extremely dangerous to tamper with the whole toll road situation as it has been set forth in section 118?

Mr. CARLSON. I am not for toll roads on the Interstate System. I think I have described the situation accurately. I sincerely hope the Senate will be willing to express at least the intent to remedy a situation which I maintain is most unfair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] for himself and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "5–28–56–O" and ask that it be read by title, and that the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be read by title, and will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. BUSH'S amendment was, on page 35, beginning with line 11, to strike out all through line 20, on page 36, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy and intent of the Congress that the funds authorized in subsection (a) of this section shall be distributed among the several States in such manner that each State will receive the amount required to pay the Federal share of the approved actual cost of completing the system in each State at an orderly and uniform rate of progress and with geometric standards uniformly applied in the several States.

(c) The additional sum herein authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and the sum authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, shall be apportioned immediately upon enactment of this act. The sums herein authorized for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958 shall be apportioned among the several States in the following manner: One-half in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census: *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the money so apportioned; and one-half in the manner now provided by law for the apportionment of funds for the Federal-aid primary system: *Provided further*, That no State shall receive out of the apportionments for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958 combined more than 15 percent nor less than 10 percent of its estimate of total needs for the National System of Interstate Highways as shown in table I on pages 6 and 7 of House Document No. 120, 84th Congress.

(d) All sums authorized by this section to be appropriated for the fiscal years 1959 through 1969, inclusive, shall be apportioned among the several States in the ratio which the estimated cost of completing the National System of Interstate Highways in each State bears to the estimated total cost of completing the National System of Interstate Highways in all of the States. The estimated costs shall be those set forth in the reports required to be filed by subsection (f) of this section and shall be those contained in the latest report so filed. Each apportionment herein authorized for the fiscal years 1959 through 1969, inclusive, shall be made on a date as far in advance of the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized, as practicable, but in no case more than 18 months prior to the fiscal year for which authorized.

(e) The geometric standards to be adopted for the National System of Interstate Highways shall be those approved by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with the State highway departments. Such standards shall be adequate to accommodate the types of volumes of traffic forecast for the year 1975. The right-of-way width of the National System of Interstate Highways shall be adequate to permit construction of projects on the National System of Interstate Highways up to such standards. The Secretary of Commerce shall apply such standards uniformly throughout the States. Such standards shall be adopted by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with the State highway departments as soon as practicable after the enactment of this act.

(f) As soon as the standards provided for in subsection (e) have been adopted, the Secretary of Commerce shall request each State highway department to make and furnish to him before July 1, 1957, a further study of the National System of Interstate Highways within its boundaries and a detailed estimate of the cost of completing the same based upon such standards. Such study and estimate shall be made in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be adopted by the Secretary of Commerce and applied by him uniformly to all of the States. Upon approval of such estimate by the Secretary of Commerce, he shall, within 10 days subsequent to January 2, 1958, transmit to the Senate and the House of Representatives a report of such study and estimate. The Secretary of Commerce shall use such estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1959, June 30, 1960, June 30, 1961, and June 30, 1962. The Secretary of Commerce shall cause a revised estimate to be made in the same manner as stated above and shall transmit the same to the Senate and the House of Representatives within 10 days subsequent to January 2, 1962, and shall use such revised estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1963, June 30, 1964, June 30, 1965, and June 30, 1966. The Secretary of Commerce shall cause a revised estimate to be made in the same manner as stated above and shall transmit the same to the Senate and the House of Representatives within 10 days subsequent to January 2, 1966, and annually thereafter through and including January 2, 1968, and shall use such revised estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal year which begins next following the fiscal year in which such report is filed. Whenever the Secretary of Commerce, pursuant to this subsection, requests the State highway departments to furnish studies and estimates to him, such highway departments shall furnish copies of such studies and estimates at the same time to the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(g) The Federal share payable on account of any project on the National System of Interstate Highways provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be increased to 90 percent of the total cost thereof, plus a percentage of the remaining 10 percent of such cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area: *Provided*, That such Federal share payable on

any project in any State shall not exceed 95 percent of the total cost of such project.

(h) Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized: *Provided,* That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to be expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State specifically for the National System of Interstate Highways for such fiscal year and previous fiscal years is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of specific projects under this section.

(i) Any amount apportioned to the States under the provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure under the terms of subsection (h) of this section shall lapse: *Provided,* That any National System of Interstate Highways funds released by the payment of the final voucher or by the modification of the formal project agreement shall be credited to the National System of Interstate Highways funds previously apportioned to the State and be immediately available for expenditure.

On page 36, line 21, strike out "(d)" and insert in lieu thereof "(j)."

On page 37, line 22, strike out "(e)" and insert in lieu thereof "(k)."

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from South Dakota desires to leave soon in order to catch an airplane. He has two minor amendments which he thinks may be accepted by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

I ask unanimous consent that, without losing my right to the floor, I may yield to him for the purpose of enabling him to call up his amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "5-28-56-S" and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 48, line 15, it is proposed to strike out all of section 113 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 113. The Secretary of Commerce shall study the designation of routes heretofore made for the National System of Interstate Highways and determine whether those routes as designated best serve the purposes of the system under present conditions and those likely to prevail in 1974 and shall make a report to the Congress not later than January 15, 1958, with his recommendations for allocation or reallocation of the mileage of the authorized system or any portions of it not designated: *Provided,* That no presently designated portion of the system shall be modified without the concurrence of the highway authority of the State or States concerned.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

Section 113 of the bill at the present time is outdated. The reason is that at the time the so-called Gore bill passed the Senate last year, there were 2,800 undesignated miles in the Interstate System. Since that time the mileage has been designated for the purpose of eliminating bottlenecks in evacuation routes. The mileage is to be used for the construction of urban roads. So the directive in section 113 at the present time has already been complied with. It ought to be stricken from the bill.

I thought it would be appropriate to have a report from the Secretary as to the use of any odds and ends of mileage which may remain undesignated.

Mr. GORE. I have conferred with the Senator from South Dakota on the amendment. I agree completely with what he has said. The provision in the bill related to the bill last year. It is now outdated. The provision which the Senator from South Dakota suggests is an improvement and will bring the bill up to date.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. GORE. I also yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which is at the desk. The amendment would insert a new section 118 following the so-called Chavez amendment. I ask that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 49, after section 117 (the Chavez amendment), it is proposed to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 118. In carrying out the duties of the foregoing section, the Secretary of Labor shall consult with the highway authority of the State in which a project on the Interstate System is to be performed. He shall make a predetermination of the minimum wages to be paid laborers and mechanics in accordance with the provisions of the foregoing section which shall be set out in each project advertisement for bids and each bid proposal form and shall be made a part of the contract covering the project.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, this is the language which the Senator from New Mexico earlier sought to add to his amendment, by unanimous consent. It provides primarily for consultation between the Secretary of the Interior and the State highway departments where an interstate project is located; and, secondarily, that the determination of wages shall be made before the project is advertised for bids, so contractors will have definite information as to what they are bidding on.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from New Mexico thinks it is surplusage language, but we are willing to take it to conference. I am willing to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do.

Mr. GORE. I yield back the time remaining to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Connecticut for his courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair now recognizes the Senator from Connecticut on his amendment, on page 35, beginning with line 11, to strike out all through line 20 on page 36, and insert in lieu thereof certain language.

Mr. BUSH. I hope the Senator from South Dakota will have a happy landing in South Dakota.

Mr. President, I shall try to contain my remarks within 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut yields himself 10 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on the subject of this amendment, we had a long discussion yesterday, and again today, on the question of the allocation of funds. The Senate finally voted this afternoon on the Capehart amendment, which was to adopt the allocation or apportionment formula of the Fallon bill. That was defeated by the Senate.

I remind Senators that the House passed the bill, with the Fallon apportionment formula, by the enormous vote of 388 to 19.

I have talked with members of the House committee. I feel it only fair to say they are going to stand very firmly on the question of apportionment on the basis of need, as outlined in the Fallon bill.

We have before us the Gore bill formula, which is not based at all on the question of need, but on the old-fashioned formula, somewhat modified and streamlined for 1954, so to speak, based on population and mileage; but a formula which can never build a National System of Interstate Highways.

As has been pointed out repeatedly, that formula results in overallocating approximately $4,800 million worth of funds, and underallocating approximately $4,700 million worth of funds, or it misses the mark altogether by a total of those 2, which amounts to approximately $9,600 million.

The result is that it fails to dispose of about 40 percent of the money which is involved in the estimates for the cost of the interstate highway system, namely, $25 billion.

Of course, it is perfectly clear that we shall never have an Interstate System if the formula in the Senate bill prevails. I know it will not prevail, because the House will never take it, since the vote in the House was so overwhelming that it cannot prevail.

The purpose of my amendment is to present a compromise which will use the Gore formula for the period of the first two years, providing that no more than 15 percent, nor less than 10 percent of its estimated share, according to the

estimates in the table in the House bill, be allocated to any one State.

With regard to estimates, Mr. President, almost everything Congress does is based on estimates. Every appropriation bill which is passed is based on estimates. We cannot get away from the fact that we must have estimates on which to base such a program as is now proposed. The Gore formula itself purports to apportion $25 billion on the basis of estimates, the same estimates which are used in the Fallon bill.

What will be the effect of my amendment? The effect of the amendment, so far as the Senate committee bill is concerned, will be that 13 States will gain by it and 20 States will lose some of the overage, which they will never be able to spend, anyway, and 15 States will not be affected, or will be affected only nominally by the change in the formula.

The net result will be that some 28 States will be as well or better off, and 20 States will lose somewhat, but will still have a guaranty that 100 percent of their part of the interstate highway system will be built in their States.

Respecting the comparison with the Fallon bill, which, of course, the House has approved by an overwhelming vote, the compromise would improve the status of 30 States vis-à-vis the House formula, as compared with 17 States losing vis-à-vis the House formula. Incidentally, my own State of Connecticut would be one of the losing States; it would lose some $10 million in the 2-year period, vis-à-vis the House formula, if my own compromise should be approved. One State, the State of Oregon, would not be affected noticeably by the amendment.

So if Senators who continue to look at this proposition on the basis of how much money is to be allocated to the States, are willing to concede that the States will not be able to spend the overage, because it will go into the Treasury and stay there, I think they will agree this is a very fair basis for compromise. I have had conversation with members of the committee in the House. They might be willing to accept the compromise, but they never will accept the formula proposed by the Senate committee bill, because they are determined to have an Interstate System of highways started, and they know that under the Senate version, the roads will never be built.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say on my amendment. I strongly recommend to the Senate, the amendment and its formula for allocation, and I hope it will be favorably acted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee desire to speak in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, as acting majority leader, I desire to yield back all time remaining to the opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut desire to yield back the time remaining to him?

Mr. BUSH. If no Senator desires to speak on the amendment, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] to the committee amendment on page 35, beginning with line 11.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the amendment been printed?

Mr. CURTIS. No; it has not been printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Nebraska to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 49, between lines 24 and 25, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 119. Funds authorized by this title to be appropriated, to the extent approved as necessary by the highway authority of any State, may be used for archeological and paleontological salvage in that State in compliance with the act entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities," approved June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225), and State laws where applicable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized. How much time does he yield to himself?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, when excavations are made in connection with construction of our Interstate Highway System, it is very important that the scientific and historical value of the fossils and other materials unearthed be preserved, and that the colleges, universities, museums, and scientists of the land have an opportunity to preserve these materials for all time to come.

This amendment will make that possible. It will not require any new funds, but will require only a very small portion of the money which will be spent anyway.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute on this amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, as I understand the amendment, it is not identical with the similar amendment adopted by the House, but differs in sufficient detail to require a conference. I further understand that the amendment does not provide for the expenditure of any additional money.

Mr. CURTIS. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I accept the amendment, and I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time remaining on the amendment to the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I call up my statement identified as "5–15–56—A."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 90——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that amendments to title II are not now in order, inasmuch as the Senate is still considering title I.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in that case I call up an amendment to title I which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 50, between lines 8 and 9, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 118. (a) All wage determinations made by the Secretary of Labor under the act of March 3, 1931, as amended, known as the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U. S. C., sec. 276a et seq.), which are applicable to highway construction contracts entered into under this title, shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act, be subject to such act, and made on the record after opportunity for hearing. Review of any such wage determination, or the applicability of any such wage determination, may be had within 90 days after such determination is made in the manner provided in section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act by any person adversely affected or aggrieved thereby, who shall be deemed to include any contractor or subcontractor engaged in the same type of construction operating in the locality to which such wage determination is applicable.

(b) Notwithstanding the inclusion of any stipulation required by any provision of said act of March 3, 1931, in any highway construction contract made subject to such act by this section, any interested person shall have the right of judicial review of any issue which might otherwise be raised.

(c) No appeal taken as herein provided shall in any way delay the advertising for bids or the awarding of contracts.

On page 50, line 9, strike out "118" and insert in lieu thereof "119."

On page 50, line 12, strike out "119" and insert in lieu thereof "120."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized on his amendment to the amendment. How much time does he yield to himself?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this amendment is very similar to one adopted by the Senate in regard to the Walsh-Healey Act. I had not intended to offer the amendment unless, of course——

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For what purpose does the Senator from Ohio request me to yield?

Mr. BENDER. I understand there is no objection on this side of the aisle to the amendment. I have three Memorial Day speeches to make tomorrow, and I am running against a part-time Democrat. I would appreciate it if the Sen-

ator from Arkansas would give us an opportunity to vote. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has been recognized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the statement the Senator from Ohio has made means that he approves of a full-time Democrat, but that at the present time he is contesting with only a half-time Democrat? [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate very long.

Adoption of the Chavez amendment of course makes it appropriate that this amendment be submitted. The amendment merely provides for an appeal from decisions had under the Chavez amendment.

Mr. President, I shall not take further time on this amendment. Of course, I wish to be recognized on my amendment to title II, which I thought would be appropriate for consideration at this time.

I yield back the remainder of the time available to me on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator in charge of the time in opposition to the amendment yield back the time available to him?

Mr. GORE. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been either used or yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.]

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "5–28–56–G." Instead of having the amendment read, inasmuch as it has been printed and lies on the desks of Senators, I ask that the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD, without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The amendment submitted by Mr. LEHMAN to the committee amendment is as follows:

On page 45, beginning with line 20, strike out down through line 4 on page 47 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 110. (a) Subject to the conditions contained in this section, whenever a State shall pay for the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of a project on the Federal aid primary or secondary systems or on the National System of Interstate Highways, including extensions thereof within urban areas, Federal funds may be used to reimburse the State for such cost in the same proportion as Federal funds are expended on the project: *Provided*, That Federal funds shall not be apportioned to the States under this section when the payment to the utility violates the law of the State or violates a legal contract between the utility and the State.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, the term 'utility' shall include publicly, privately, and cooperatively owned utilities.

"(c) For the purposes of this section, the term 'cost of relocation' shall include the entire amount paid by such utility properly attributable to such relocation after deducting therefrom any increase in the value of the new facility and any salvage value derived from the old facility.

"(d) No more than 2 percent of any sum apportioned to any State for any fiscal year may be expended under the provisions of this section, and expenditures under this section from any such sum shall be made only with respect to utility relocations in connection with projects prosecuted by the use of such sum."

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I favor adoption of this amendment, which restores the House language on this point, because the House language simply codifies existing practice.

This is a so-called utility relocation amendment.

This amendment substitutes permissive terms for mandatory terms. Its effect is to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to reimburse States which make a practice of compensating their public utilities when they ask their public utilities to move equipment so that highway alterations and improvements may be made.

The House provision says, Mr. President, that Federal funds may be used to reimburse the States in the same proportion as that which applies to the project involved. In other words, if the payment made to the utilities by a State relates to the Interstate System, then the State may be reimbursed for 90 percent of that payment. If the payment relates to construction on other parts of the Federal-aid system, the State may be reimbursed for 50 percent.

But, Mr. President, the main point of this amendment is that it will make the law permissive. It will say to the States, "Continue your existing practice with regard to public utility locations, and we will count this as a cost of construction, and reimburse you in the proper proportions."

The Senate provision does just the opposite. Instead of continuing the present practice it would substitute a new feature. Its effect would be to say that if a State does not compensate the utility the Federal Government will. The Senate provision makes compensation of the utility mandatory. Such mandatory compensation is unfair and unjustified in many States.

In New York State, by long-standing custom, public utilities place their telephone poles, pipelines, and wires on the public highway without any charge whatsoever. They get this right for nothing, with the distinct understanding that if it becomes necessary to move such facilities they will do so.

That agreement has existed for many years. The Senate committee provision would turn it into a bonanza for many utilities. They would get their gratuitous easements on New York State roads, and in addition receive compensation from the Federal Government.

The language of the Senate committee provision states flatly that this compensation shall be regarded as a right of the private utilities. They have no such right, and we should not give it to them now. In some States and under certain circumstances private utilities must pay for their rights-of-way. In some cases it may be fair to offer fair compensation. The effect of the language for which I am arguing, which is merely permissive language, would be to make it possible to take care of such cases without creating unwarranted windfalls in other States, such as New York.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I commend the Senator in unmeasured terms for offering this amendment. The Senate version as it is now worded requires that, even though the State law prohibits reimbursement, and even though the original understanding was that the utility was on the right-of-way by sufferance and that the expense of moving was to be its own, nevertheless, the Federal Government, out of its generosity, is going to force a 50-percent payment of costs, and take that much away from the States which would otherwise have the money with which to build roads.

I support the distinguished Senator in the position he takes. I think it is sound States rights, and it is good business for our Government. I hope the Senate will adopt his amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Florida. He is absolutely correct in his analysis of the amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I received a letter from the North Dakota Highway Commission. During all the years they have had an agreement with the public utilities whereby the utilities get the right-of-way along the highway for nothing. The agreement provides that at any time the facilities must be moved, they will be moved at the expense of the utilities. I strongly object to the requirement in the Senate version of the bill that the Government pay one-half the cost of moving the facilities. I hope the Senator will permit me to join him as a cosponsor of his amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further observation?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Under the present situation, if any property right is involved, the utility has the right to be paid in full, and such property right cannot be taken away from it, either by the Federal Government, the State, or any other public body without compensation. The provision in the bill as it now stands is a proposed gratuity out of Federal funds, nothwithstanding the opposition of State laws; and eventually the gratuity would come out of the State's pocket, because it would cut down the contribution to the State for the building of highways.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Florida is eminently correct. In New York State, as far back as I can recall, we have given the public utilities the right to place their poles, wires, and other facilities on the State-owned right-of-way. Under the terms of the bill, as it now stands, the utilities would have to be reimbursed if they were asked to move. This provision represents a

raid on the Treasury of the United States, without doing any of the States any good, save in those instances in which the public utilities have paid for rights-of-way. Of course, the Senator from Florida is correct when he says that if any taking of property from the public utilities in involved, they will have to be reimbursed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I join the Senator from Florida and the Senator from North Dakota is commending the Senator from New York for offering this amendment.

As I understand, in virtually every State no charge is made to the utilities for locating telephone poles, electric poles, and so forth, on rights-of-way owned by the States or by the local governments. I think that is the situation in virtually all the States. Therefore, the utilities are already being given a very important privilege for which no charge is made.

If there are States or localities where, under State law, compensation is given to the utilities for relocation of the facilities, then under the provision passed by the House and proposed by the Senator from New York, compensation would still be paid; but the Senator from New York is closing the provision in the Senate version of the bill which requires the Federal Government to meet 50 percent of the cost, even though State law expressly forbids any payment whatsoever for relocation.

The Senator from Illinois had intended to offer an amendment to this effect. He is delighted that the Senator from New York has taken up the cause. The Senator from Illinois would esteem it a great privilege if he were permitted to join as a cosponsor of the amendment. I hope it may be adopted.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Illinois very much, indeed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from North Dakota and the senior Senator from Illinois be joined with me as cosponsors of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The committee found this to be one of the most troublesome problems in connection with the bill. I acknowledge that at first I opposed providing any relief for the utilities. I suppose that in taking that position I was thinking of reimbursing a utility company, a telephone company, or an electrical utility company which had utility poles on the right-of-way under an agreement that it would move them when requested to do so.

What caused me to modify my own position, and I believe what led the committee to recommend the provision which is now before the Senate, was the plight of utilities such as water systems and sewer systems in small communities. When we begin a vast road-building program such as is envisioned in the pending bill, many local communities will face insurmountable problems. I have in mind a small community within my own State with which I am familiar. A six-lane drive went through the center of this little community. It destroyed a water system for which the little community had just bonded itself. It was unable to sell bonds to construct another water system. Similar situations were found time after time, in State after State.

In addition, it was found that some States reimburse the utilities for the cost of relocation, and some do not. The committee felt that there should be some reasonable uniformity—at least that some equity was involved. So what we have recommended and what is before the Senate is a provision that the utilities shall be entitled to 50 percent of the cost of moving after they deduct the value of the replacement, whether the State has a policy of paying by law or by custom or otherwise.

That is the feeling of the committee. That is my feeling. There is a limitation. The compensation may not exceed 2 percent of the cost of the project. So far as I am concerned, I do not feel too strongly about it. It may be that the committee erred in reaching that decision, but we reached it in good conscience, thinking we would respond to the equities and the needs of the situation, particularly in small communities. Whatever the Senate wishes to do with it, it is a subject for Senate action.

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that I believe he overlooks the fact that we are not preventing reimbursement in the bill. The House bill makes it permissive where it is necessary, but the Senate bill makes it mandatory. It looks to me like a raid on the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. GORE. I respectfully say to the Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GORE. I yield myself 1 additional minute. The committee did not regard it as a raid. The committee did not intend to approve a raid on the Treasury. It is not reimbursement for money the utility has spent in locating on the highway. It is reimbursement for the expense of relocating after there is deducted therefrom the value of the improvements to the system as the result of the relocation. The committee may have erred, but at least if the Senate will approve the committee bill, there will be a difference, and the matter will be in conference as between the two bills, and we will do all we can to arrive at an equitable provision.

Mr. LEHMAN. I want to vote on the amendment, because I think it is an absolutely fair amendment. I do not want to deprive anyone of his rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GORE. I yield myself an additional minute.

Mr. LEHMAN. However, where a public utility company in New York, for example, or in any other State, has had to pay for the right-of-way, and is compelled to move out of the right-of-way, it will be compensated. Where they have been permitted to place their facilities on State property with the understanding that they will remove the facilities without compensation, to compel payment under those circumstances, does not seem to me to be the right thing to do.

Mr. GORE. Were there involved only that which the Senator has referred to, I would find myself in agreement with him. The matter he suggests will be in conference, because it is largely a duplication of the provision of the House bill. It will be in conference anyway. If I should accept the amendment, it would more or less tie the hands of the committee, and we would not have any leeway to work out the equitable provision I hope we will be able to work out.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wonder whether it would not be a good thing to tie the hands of the committee on this matter. It might be a good idea to tie their hands.

Mr. LEHMAN. It is such a clear-cut proposal——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. I ask for a vote.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. LEHMAN. Because of the lateness of the hour, I shall not ask for a yea and nay vote, but I do ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. GORE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does any Senator yield time for that purpose? No time is yielded.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] to the Committee amendment. The amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have two other amendments at the desk. If any Senator wishes to offer an amendment, I will not preempt his time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has the Chair announced the result of the vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from New York?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announced that the amendment offered by the Senator from New York was agreed to.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I send to the desk my amendment "5–18–56–C," as I have modified it, and I ask the clerk to read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 36, beginning with line 21, it is proposed to

strike out all through line 21 on page 37 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(d) No funds authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year by this section shall be apportioned to any State within the boundaries of which the Interstate System may lawfully be used by vehicles with weight in excess of 18,000 pounds carried on any 1 axle, or with a tandem axle weight in excess of 32,000 pounds, with an overall gross weight in excess of 73,280 pounds, or with a width in exces of 96 inches, or the corresponding maximum weights or minimum width permitted for vehicles using the public highways of such State under laws or regulations established by appropriate State authority in effect on July 1, 1956, whichever is the greater. Any amount which is withheld from apportionment to any State pursuant to the foregoing provisions shall lapse: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein shall be construed to deny apportionment to any State allowing the operation within such State of any vehicles or combinations thereof that could lawfully be operated within such State on July 1, 1956.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes. I submitted the amendment to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] in the form I had originally submitted it to the Senate. In a series of discussions with him, certain limiting factors have been added to it, in accordance with the copy which has been read by the clerk. The Senator from Tennessee has advised me that with these modifications he is willing to accept the amendment. If there are any questions, I shall be glad to answer them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not have a copy of the modified amendment before me. I do not have the text of the amendment as it has been worked out by the Senator from Oklahoma with the Senator from Tennessee, who is handling the bill. As I understand, it is amendment "5–18–56–C," with additional language which has been agreed to between the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Tennessee. The modification is on page 1, line 6, to strike out the words "or the maximum corresponding axle weight permitted for vehicles," and to insert in lieu thereof the words "with an overall gross weight in excess of 73,280 pounds, or with a width in excess of 96 inches, or the corresponding maximum weights or minimum width permitted for vehicles."

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator whether there would be any objection to taking to conference a modification providing for a limitation on height and length of vehicles. Some of the vehicles are becoming longer than boxcars and so high that they cannot go under the normal clearances in the highway system. I do not know whether that would be finally advisable, but it seems to me that if a height and length were added to the width and weight, the committee on conference would have the whole subject matter before it.

Mr. KERR. The language now in the amendment conforms in general to the recommendations of the American Association of State Highway Officials. It conforms generally to the requirements of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads. In fact, the Bureau of Public Roads had approved the language of the amendment before the additional limitations were inserted in it.

On the basis of the table shown in the recommendations of the American Association of State Highway Officials, it is indicated that a truck with a gross weight of 73,280 pounds is approximately 57 feet long. The limitation with reference to axle and tandem just about fixes the specification of the length.

However, the reason why I did not include a specification for length and the reason why I do not believe the distinguished Senator from California would wish to insist upon it is that in some of the Western States licenses are issued for the addition of another trailer to a truck, where there are long stretches of open road and little congestion of traffic. The language of the amendment before the Senator from California would not prevent that being allowed by the regulatory bodies or authorities of the State, and at the same time the specifications which the Senator holds in his hand generally conform to the recommendations of the American Association of State Highway Officials.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator for his explanation.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. In order that Senators may be better informed, will the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma explain the difference between what is provided in his amendment and what is in the House bill?

Mr. KERR. The House bill is identical with the amendment which I have offered, with the exception that alternative limitations have been added. No. 1, a gross total weight of 73,280 pounds. No. 2, a gross width of 96 inches. Otherwise, the limitation in the amendment as offered by me is identical with the language of the House bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. May I ask what is the maximum weight provided in the House bill?

Mr. KERR. The House bill as written has as the limitation on the gross weight 18,000 pounds carried on any one axle, or with a tandem axle weight in excess of 32,000 pounds, or the maximum corresponding axle weight permitted for vehicles using the public highways of the State under laws or regulations established by appropriate State authority in effect on July 1, 1956, whichever is the greater.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I read the amendment, the State laws in existence on July 1 or to be in existence on July 1 shall prevail.

Mr. KERR. Whichever is the greater. If under a State law or regulation established by the appropriate State authority, in effect on July 1, 1956, a vehicle with specifications in excess of those prescribed in the amendment is operated, then the specifications of the State law or of the State regulatory authority will prevail.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. How does the weight of 73,280 pounds compare with that provided in the laws of the State of Massachusetts or of the State of Oklahoma?

Mr. KERR. In Oklahoma I believe the present gross weight is 64,000 pounds. I do not know from memory what it is in the State of Massachusetts, but if the State of Massachusetts at this time by law or by appropriate regulation permits a gross weight in excess of the amount stated in the amendment, the limitation of the State would be controlling.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And the same wouud be true if it were less?

Mr. KERR. If the provision of the State is less, then the limiting factor is written in the law.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask if this amendment is adopted how long and how high could a truck be?

Mr. KERR. As long or as high as is permitted by the laws or regulations of the State, provided it did not weigh in excess of 73,280 pounds. If the Senator will look at the amendment he will see that the tandem axle weight is limited to 32,000 pounds. With two tandem axles under the vehicle the weight would be 64,000 pounds. Then the weight of the truck itself or the part of the vehicle that furnishes the motive power under ordinary circumstances would bring the weight of the vehicle up to 73,280 pounds. So that for all practical purposes, under this amendment, the length would be limited either to 4 single axles or to 2 tandem axles, and if that of itself did not limit its length, then there would be only that limitation which is fixed by the Senator's State.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Would the State law prevail even though the pending bill should be enacted into law?

Mr. KERR. The amendment specifically provides that the gross weight and width shall not exceed the specifications in the amendment, unless maximum corresponding axle weight or length is permitted for vehicles using the public highways of the State under laws or regulations established by appropriate State authority in effect on July 1, 1956. The amendment is not exclusive in its application. It is one of the two alternate limitations which will be in effect.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Why does the Senator limit it in two details and not go into the other?

Mr. KERR. As explained to the Senator from California, to all intents and purposes, the length is limited, but in certain Western States, where there are long stretches of road and little interference with traffic of this kind, the State authorities now have in effect provisions which permit trucks to operate

which have an extra trailer on behind the regular transportation part of the vehicle.

It is not the purpose of the amendment to interfere with that. It is the thought in my mind and in the minds of those who agree that the limitations in this amendment will be adequate, because in those States where circumstances do not permit the longer vehicle, the State regulatory bodies have already established limits on the length of vehicles. This amendment does not interfere with that.

NO STATE LIMITS—THEN ANY FUTURE ACT MUST CONFORM TO FEDERAL LAW

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I have listened carefully to the Senator's explanation. If there are no laws on the subject such as weight, length, or height, if a State has no such limitation, and this amendment becomes part of the law, if the State should pass any law on the subject later, it would have to conform to the Federal law? There is no limitation on weight, length, or height in my State of Nevada.

Mr. KERR. In my judgment, there is either a limitation or there is a regulatory authority that could establish one.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator means it could be done by Executive order before the date fixed?

Mr. KERR. Under law or regulation established by appropriate State authority.

Mr. MALONE. I do not believe that any agency in our State can exercise such authority, and our State legislature does not meet until 1957. I am not sure we have that authority.

Mr. KERR. In effect on July 1, 1956.

Mr. MALONE. But if there is to be no limitation until the date fixed in the Senator's amendment, then any limitation fixed by the State of Nevada or any other State after that date would have to conform to the Federal law.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is correct. But, in my judgment, the highway department in the Senator's State now has the regulations in effect.

Mr. MALONE. No; I am informed that it does not.

Mr. KERR. I feel certain in my own mind that it does, but I defer to the Senator's knowledge.

Mr. MALONE. I am informed that there are no limitations now in effect on weight, length or height.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator of the opinion that the highway department of his State could not fix limitations?

Mr. MALONE. It is not usual for our State legislature to allow the highway department to make law. The highway department generally proposes the laws to the legislature which it desires and then conforms to the action of the lawmaking body.

Mr. KERR. In Oklahoma the highway department fixes the regulations controlling, either to carry out State law or under permissive provisions of State law.

Mr. MALONE. Nevada has no State law covering the weight, length or height specifications. It is my opinion that the highway department could adopt regulations carrying out the State law, but could not make the law.

Mr. KERR. Under the language of the bill as passed by the House, the limitations would be, in effect, similar to those proposed in the amendment. Under the language of the bill as reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works, more stringent limitations would be in effect than those proposed in the amendment or than those in the provisions of the bill as passed by the House.

Mr. MALONE. Could not the Senator from Oklahoma amend his amendment to provide that a State which has no applicable legislation, and would not have a meeting of the legislature before the date fixed in the amendment, and in which a State agency is not allowed to make law, could pass such legislation at the next meeting of the legislature?

Mr. KERR. I am of the opinion that the highway department of the Senator's State could make such regulations tomorrow if it wanted to do so.

Mr. MALONE. I am not so informed.

Mr. KERR. If they could, then their regulations would be controlling.

Mr. MALONE. But I am not so informed. I think it could cause a very bad situation.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has handed me a table of information prepared by the Bureau of Public Roads under date of February 1956.

The table contains the State legal maximum limits of motor vehicle sizes and weights as compared with AASHO standards. AASHO is an abbreviation for American Association of State Highway Officials.

In the table I find that Nevada has at this time a maximum width of 96 inches, the same as is provided in the amendment.

The table shows no regulation for height in feet and inches, and there is none in the amendment.

Single unit: No regulation.

Axleload, pounds: 18,000, statutory limit, including a statutory enforcement tolerance of 18,900.

Tandem limitation: 32,000 pounds, which is identical with the amendment. That includes a statutory enforcement tolerance of 33,600 pounds.

Type of restriction: Applicable to any group of axles under 18 feet.

So there seem to be quite a few limitations on vehicles in the Senator's State. I do not think the amendment would conflict with any of them.

Mr. MALONE. Is there a limitation on weight or length?

Mr. KERR. There is no limitation on length in the bill.

Mr. MALONE. Is there a limitation on weight?

Mr. KERR. The table indicates that the limitation for a 5-axle vehicle would be 74,000 pounds; in other combinations, 76,800 pounds. The axle and tandem limitations are identical with those in the bill.

Apparently, by whatever authority in the Senator's State, the 5-axle vehicle could weigh 720 pounds more than the gross weight provided in the bill, and any other vehicle could weigh 3,520 pounds more.

Mr. MALONE. Is there a limitation on the number of axles?

Mr. KERR. The limitations now in effect in the Senator's State, as disclosed by the table, are the same as would prevail under the amendment.

Mr. MALONE. Is there a limitation upon the number of axles? The Senator from Oklahoma has stated there is a limitation on weight for five axles. But is there any other limitation on the number of axles?

Mr. KERR. As I read the table, there is an overall limitation of 76,800 pounds.

Mr. MALONE. For five axles?

Mr. KERR. No. If the Senator will look at the table with me, he will see that it discloses that for five axles the limitation is 74,000 pounds, and that the limitation for other combinations is 76,800 pounds.

Mr. MALONE. I am informed that there is no limitation on the length, weight, or height. What is the real intent of the amendment, in the first place?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator speak louder, so that we may participate in the debate?

Mr. KERR. I am sure that the Senator from Minnesota is addressing himself to the Senator from Nevada, and the Senator from Nevada must answer for himself.

Mr. THYE. The colloquy may cover the question I have in mind.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Nevada now sees, I believe, that his State does have limitations in every respect in which the amendment would place limitations; and having them, and once they are in effect in his State, the law or the regulation of the regulatory authority would prevail.

The Senator from Nevada has asked the Senator from Oklahoma why the limitations are in the bill. I shall try to answer that question.

The Bureau of Public Roads and the American Association of State Highway Officials have published findings and reports indicating that roads of certain specifications are capable of standing up under operations by vehicles of certain specifications.

At this time there are 48 sets of regulations and limitations in effect throughout the Nation. All of them apply to any part of the Interstate System within those States. Under the bill it is contemplated that the Federal Government will spend, I believe, $25 billion in the next 13 years, and that the States will spend $2,500,000,000, or a little more—or approximately that—in completing 40,000 miles of interstate highways.

It is the conviction of the committee and of the Senator from Oklahoma, and certainly it must have been the conviction of the membership of the House, that these highways will be built to bear certain loads, carry certain weights, and render certain services. They will not, however, be built to endure under conditions not now in contemplation.

In preparing the amendment, I recognized that where a State already has its regulations, its laws, and its limitations, it is not the purpose of Congress

to change them or to violate them. However, on the basis of the best information available to us, and on the basis of consultation with the representatives of the American Trucking Association, and also on the basis of the best estimate we can make, the limitations in the amendment will protect those roads.

That is my answer to the Senator's question.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. Let me finish answering the question of the Senator from Nevada, then I will yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has about 5 minutes remaining. The Chair suggests that the time be divided.

Mr. KERR. Very well.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator from Oklahoma has been very fair in the committee, as he has been in his explanations. I notice from the table that neither height, weight, nor length is restricted in Nevada.

Mr. KERR. And it is not restricted in the bill.

Mr. MALONE. I notice that a single truck or bus is not restricted in length. I notice that the other combinations and the number of towed units are not restricted. The number of trailer units is not restricted. Semitrailers and full trailers are not restricted. My point in the first place was that if it became necessary to pass legislation covering areas not now included in regulations, then such law must conform to the Federal law—and it would be more restrictive than the surrounding States.

Mr. KERR. But I call the Senator's attention to the fact that every such unit is subject to the regulations and limitations of the State, which are either identical with those in the amendment or which will still be in effect after the passage of the provisions of the amendment, if it is agreed to.

Mr. MALONE. But I do not see the reason for the amendment, when the provision is already in the House bill, and covered generally by the Gore provision. The bill will go to conference. Then the conference committee will have complete information as to the States which have no rules or regulations or no law affecting certain areas, which will not have an opportunity to pass a law between now and July 1, or whatever date the amendment would go into effect. Therefore, I do not see the reason for the amendment.

Mr. KERR. I regret that the Senator takes that view, but again I say I do not believe his State will be injured by the amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Does the amendment impose any restrictions on width over those which may exist in State laws?

Mr. KERR. If the present State law or regulation of an appropriate authority permits a greater width than 8 feet, then the width fixed by the State will prevail. Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. THYE. That does not clarify the matter.

Mr. KERR. Let me say it again. The Senator from Minnesota asked the Senator from Oklahoma whether, if the State permitted a greater width, the amendment would limit the operation of the State regulation.

I say to the Senator from Minnesota if the law or regulation in his State in effect on July 1 gives permission for a greater width, then the width permitted by the State will prevail. Does that answer the question?

Mr. THYE. My question was in the reverse, but the Senator has answered it in two ways, so my interpretation of the Senator's reply is that his amendment does not impose any restriction on a trucker operating in a State if the State permits his operation.

Mr. KERR. If the State permits a trucker to operate with greater specifications than are provided in the amendment, those in effect in the State will prevail.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I was about to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wished to make clear the Senator's statement. In reverse English, what would happen if a State provides for a lesser width?

Mr. KERR. If a State law provides for a lesser width, naturally, the State law would have to be abided by. The amendment does not violate the integrity of a State which has limitations more exacting than those provided in the bill. It only provides, insofar as the bill and its effect are concerned, that the greater latitude of the two will be permitted by the provisions of the bill.

Mr. THYE. Greater, but not to exceed State laws in existence. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. I call to the Senator's attention that if his own State passed a law with a stricter limitation than that provided in the amendment, the State law would prevail.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask one further question. The intent of the amendment of the Senator is primarily that, in the absence of State regulation, a longer truck unit will be permitted to be in operation on the Federal highways. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. I do not know how the Senator from Minnesota can say that, in the absence of a State regulation, my amendment would permit a longer truck unit to operate. In the absence of a State regulation, the bill would permit truck units of certain specifications. I would not say that it could be said it would be longer than something which did not exist.

Mr. THYE. But the Senator did state that in the Midwest, where there are wide-open highways, it would be permissible——

Mr KERR. I said in many States there are specifications not so exacting as the specifications in the amendment, and therefore these specifications would not interfere with them.

Mr. THYE. What I am endeavoring to ascertain is what is intended by the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. The amendment speaks for itself, I say to my good friend from Minnesota, and in my humble, stumbling, bumbling way, I have tried to explain it.

Mr. THYE. I am in favor of the amendment, but I do not want to have a solicitor put an interpretation on it which may be contrary to what I think is in the amendment now, and what I think the Senator from Oklahoma is endeavoring to do by his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the Senator has stated that in the West there are longer trucks than there are in some other sections of the United States, and that was one of the reasons for the amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. When the national highways become interstate highways, is it not true that, if longer trucks are permitted in certain States, there will be a movement in adjoining States to have longer trucks operate in those States, and if the amendment is adopted, it will mean that we shall have longer trucks on the highways?

Mr. KERR. I do not think so, because that situation exists now. Trucks operate in the States now, and neighboring States have different regulations, but they live side by side in peace, without conflict. I may say the differences of opinion in this regard are less in conflict than are any other ones I know of.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

For the first time the Congress of the United States is asked to attach as a condition to Federal highway funds a requirement that certain limitations with respect to motor vehicles be observed.

I wish to speak for a moment about the history of the proposal and the language in the Senate bill. I offered the amendment in the Senate Public Works Committee. The amendment in the Senate bill now would require States to comply with provision for greater widths in the State laws as of July 1, 1956, or the maximums prescribed in what is called the AASHO code. The AASHO code is a compilation of the recommendations of the American Association of State Highway Officials, which was concurred in by the Bureau of Roads. I hold the pamphlet in my hand. It can be found in the House document. I do not have the number of it now, but I hold in my hand the pamphlet. It is quite an extensive set of statistics. The Senate committee bill refers to this Government pamphlet. This would be the maximum permitted in interstate traffic unless—to come to the question of the distinguished Senator

from Minnesota—any State had a maximum in excess of this.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Or less.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has said "or less." If the State limitations were less, the provision would have no effect within that State. The State law would remain in effect.

I may point out to the Senate that this will not be a law with respect to requirements. It is an attachment to Federal funds; a condition to Federal funds.

If the State of Massachusetts had an axle weight limitation of 16,000 pounds, it could raise that axle weight limitation to 18,000 pounds, under either the Senate committee bill or the amendment of the senior Senator from Oklahoma.

If the State of Massachusetts had an axle weight limitation of 22,000 pounds, which I think is actually the case, then it would not be required to reduce it to 18,000 pounds.

The committee felt that with the vast investment the people are to make in this magnificent Interstate System of highways, somewhere, somehow, we should call a halt to the ever-increasing weights, to the ever-increasing widths, to the ever-increasing lengths of vehicles traveling the highways.

Therefore, the Senate committee approved by unanimous vote inclusion of the AASHO code for maximums, provided the States themselves do not have maximums in excess, in which event they would be permitted to participate in the 90 percent funds without reducing to these maximums.

Now let us come to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] to the committee amendment. The Senator from Oklahoma pointed out that there was no uniformity in width, and the record shows that that is so. But I did not think the provisions voted by the House were sufficient. The Senator from Oklahoma originally submitted his amendment to have it comply exactly with the provision voted by the House, which applies only to axle weights—18,000 pounds in the case of a single axle and 32,000 pounds in the case of tandem axles.

According to the testimony before the Senate committee, the most important factor, and the one causing the greatest damage to the highways, is the axle weight. The width causes great hazards in traffic. I insisted that we provide a limitation on width. It happens that there is more uniformity as regards width than as regards any other dimension or specification. At the present time, 46 States have a maximum width of 8 feet, and 2 States have a maximum width in excess of that. The amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma to this committee amendment provides a maximum width of 8 feet for 46 States, and allows the maximum of the 2 States in excess of that to remain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield at this point for a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Does the Senator from Tennessee know, or from any of the records of the committee has he learned, that there will be a hazard if those two States are allowed to continue to permit a width in excess of that permitted by the other States of the Union?

Mr. GORE. The committee very carefully considered whether the States which now have limits in excess of those provided in the AASHO code should be allowed to continue their limits, or whether we would recommended that those States be required to roll back their limits, so as to conform with those required by the other States and required by the AASHO code. We may have erred, but the committee decided by unanimous vote not to force a State to roll back its limits, but to permit a State's present limits to stand.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Tennessee recognized, did he, the sovereign right of a State to make decisions relative to its own regulations?

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. And the committee did not vote to disturb those regulations?

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Also, in the case of States with limits below those of the AASHO code, we did not attempt to say that they could not bring their limits up to the maximums recommended in the AASHO code.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator from Tennessee inform the Senate how in his judgment he interprets the Kerr amendment?

Mr. GORE. I shall be glad to do so.

(At this point Mr. GORE yielded to Mr. MAGNUSON, who discussed an amendment of his applying to title II of the bill. By unanimous consent, the debate which ensued was ordered to be printed in the RECORD in connection with the debate on title II.)

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I shall be glad to yield. Before yielding to the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire, let me make a brief statement with respect to the contents of the House bill, the Senate committee amendment, and the Kerr amendment.

The House bill contains a limitation only on per-axle weights. The Senate committee version contains limitations on weights, height, length, and width. The Kerr amendment provides for limitations on axle weights, overall loads, and widths.

Mr. BRIDGES. Various questions have been asked of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. The Senator from Tennessee is the author of the so-called Gore amendment. How does he think the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma, if it were adopted, would affect the bill from a practical standpoint?

Mr. GORE. I shall be glad to reply. As I see it, the most important thing to protect the investment of the people in the roads, that is, to keep the roadbeds and surfaces from being crushed by excess weight, is the control of the axle weights. The most important thing in preserving bridge structures is control of overall weights. The most important thing in preserving safety of traffic is control of the width of the vehicles.

The Kerr amendment applies to all three. What it does not involve is the overall length, except indirectly. But when there is a limitation on both the per-axle weight and overall weight, practically speaking, there is a limitation on the vehicle, unless there is an additional unit drawn behind. I hope my State will never permit it. I hope no other State which does not now permit it will in the future permit additional units to be drawn behind a tractor.

Coming back to my reply to the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, the committee has not recommended that we undertake to force any State to roll back its laws or abolish any of its present regulations.

The Kerr amendment does not apply to height. I do not think that is so important. If an additional foot is added to the top of a moving van, it may be dragged off when it goes under a railroad underpass somewhere. But additional height does not seem to add additional weight, so it is not important if there is a limitation on weight.

One part of our highway transportation industry which needs additional height is the automobile trailer. It needs 13½ feet. The limit in most States is now 12½ feet. Several of the States are in the process of moving up to 13½ feet. That subject is not covered in the Kerr amendment. I think the most important things are dealt with in the Kerr amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the practical effect of the Kerr amendment to allow larger trucks?

Mr. GORE. No. If the Kerr amendment were written into law, it would for the first time attach a condition upon Federal highway funds that States could not exceed certain limits and still participate in such funds. In no way would it allow larger trucks. It would not allow larger trucks than the recommendations of the State highway officials and the Bureau of Public Roads. It would permit States whose limits now are below that level to come up to it and still participate. Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. Let me ask one further question, if I may. In the Senate committee language reference is made to a specific document published by the American Association of State Highway Officials. As I understand, that is not true of the Kerr amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. The difference between the two is that the Senate committee provision refers to the AASHO code, and says, "These are the limits beyond which the States cannot go—unless they have already gone beyond that point—and receive interstate highway funds. If they have gone beyond that point, they can-

not go any further and still receive the 90-percent funds."

The Kerr amendment, instead of referring to this particular document, to which people would have to refer to ascertain what the law was, actually spells out a limit of 18,000 pounds for a single axle, 32,000 pounds for tandem axle, a 73,000-pound overall load, and a width of 8 feet. It is just that simple. Those are the same figures, incidentally, as are found in the AASHO Code. What is omitted is a limitation on length, which is indirectly dealt with, but only indirectly. What is not dealt with at all in the Kerr amendment is height.

Mr. BRIDGES. In other words, the Senator is telling the Senate that the language referring to this subject in the bill as reported, and the subject matter of the Kerr amendment, are one and the same.

Mr. GORE. Not one and the same. They are one and the same to the extent to which the Kerr amendment goes; but the provision in the Senate committee version, as reported, goes further and includes height, and certain length limitations.

Mr. BRIDGES. Assume that the Kerr amendment is approved. What will be the latitude in conference? Does the Senator think the conferees could agree upon a satisfactory provision? Would they have sufficient latitude?

Mr. GORE. The House language contains only one thing, and that is per-axle limitations. The Kerr amendment would add to it total weight and width limitations. I think that would be the latitude of the conference.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from New Hampshire has asked a question about which I wish to inquire.

If we were to accept the Senate committee provision, or the so-called Gore amendment on this subject, would not that put us into conference on every possible suggestion or modification of the subject matter which the conferees might wish to consider? Because of the difference between the Gore amendment and the House language, the entire question of width, height, weight, and length would be in conference, anyway, would it not?

Mr. GORE. That is true.

Mr. MORSE. Later I shall ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD communications which I have received from representative organizations in my State urging that I support the Gore amendment, with regard to which I have responded favorably. I do not wish to place myself in the position tonight of having responded favorably to the Gore amendment and then voting for another amendment, when by adopting the Gore amendment we can go to conference on every phase of the subject, anyway.

In view of the Senator's answer to the questions of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], it seems to me that the adoption of the Senator's amendment will accomplish any desire anyone might have for a full discussion of all facets of the subject in conference. Therefore, I am inclined to stand with the Gore amendment and put the whole matter in conference. I certainly believe that the conference committee can consider the entire question.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the communications to which I have referred.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I have a ruling on my unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 21, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate:

Very vital you maintain militant stand on Gore original provisions and sizes and weights of trucks in the Federal highway bill. This is of utmost importance to the Railroad Brotherhood.

REMI E. ZERTANNA,
Chairman, State Legislative Committee of Oregon Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express, and Station Employees.

BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS, UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD,
OREGON DIVISION,
March 23, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In trying to fit together all of the available information in connection with the Federal road program and the two bills which appear to bear directly on that subject (H. R. 8836 and H. R. 9075), two items stand out above all the biased statements issued by the supporters and opponents.

It would seem that H. R. 9075 stands to be voted upon in a form that will stick the private motorist with the same straight increase in fuel and rubber tax per gallon and per pound that commercial haulers will pay. Understand the only difference in the figures as between the two classes of transportation is a proposed Federal registration fee of $1.50 per 1,000 pounds on the commercial vehicles above 26,000 pounds.

Understand there is a section in 8836 which has for its purpose limiting truck size and weight to that fixed by the individual States as of March 1, 1956 in all cases where Federal financial aid is to be made available.

At this time of year one is inclined to be painfully conscious of tax matters and, as a private motorist as well as a railroad employee, it is not pleasant to contemplate financing a program which would contribute so much to commercial highway haulers without some definite assurance in the bill that limits are enforced which will guarantee that the roads are going to last until they are paid for. I am inclined to doubt that the trucking industry would be throttled or put out of business by the present weight-length restrictions and feel that they have gotten a terrific bargain to date.

Sincerely,

A. F. ZIMMERMAN,
General Chairman.

RAILROAD BROTHERHOODS
LEGISLATIVE LEAGUE OF OREGON,
Salem, Oreg., May 1, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: On February 13, 1956, we expressed our views on the matter of financing a Federal highway construction program. That view was in accordance with the views of a vast majority of the people of the State of Oregon. Time has shown that the imposition of user charges based on the amount of use obtained is a fair and equitable means of financing highways.

Equally as important as enacting legislation which will provide for a fair means of paying for highways is the matter of insuring their preservation after construction. The provisions of the Gore bill concerning size and weight limitations would appear to offer this assurance. Weight limitation is, of course, essential. Size limitations would appear to be almost mandatory as an aid to those officials required to police the highways.

We believe that conscientious thought on this matter will give us the kind of highways we urgently need, as well as adequate assurance of their continued preservation upon completion.

With best wishes and kindest personal regards,

Respectfully,

W. C. HEFNER,
Chairman.

RAILROAD BROTHERHOODS
LEGISLATIVE LEAGUE OF OREGON,
Salem, Oreg., May 17, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Referring to our previous correspondence with regard to the Federal highway legislation, we are now informed that the truck people intend to concentrate upon the Senate and the House to throw out the size and weights protection as was incorporated in the Gore bill.

It seems to us that this is the most important feature of the legislation. It no doubt has come to your attention that the State of Oregon is trying to protect the present size and weights limitations and that not long ago some State officials came across a truck somewhere in eastern Oregon with a 33,000-pound overload. The truck had mired down in the center of the pavement. This occurrence has received wide publicity. Then, again, one loaded truck damaged the highways between Portland and eastern Oregon by carrying an excessive overload. A few years ago another big truck and trailer apparently had slipped across the Longview Bridge and stopped on Highway 99 West in Yamhill County after it, too, had damaged the highways.

If this Nation is to spend the private automobile owners' tax money to build super freeway highways, then we are entitled to protection. The large truck companies use the highways for a profit and should pay their share for their construction and should not operate vehicles with such heavy loads that they destroy the highways. The big truck concerns with their lobbies defeated the highway bill a year ago and we understand that it is their intention to have the bill amended from the floor to lessen the size and weights protection and to reduce the truckers' taxes, all of which would be unfair and unsound. We urge your militant opposition to such a move.

With best wishes and kindest personal regards,

Respectfully,

W. C. HEFNER,
Chairman.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *May 22, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Important to retain in Highway Bill H. R. 10660 text of Gore bill as originally passed and as reported by Senate Public Works Committee providing reasonable limitations

on size and weight of motor vehicles. Respectfully suggest growing toll of traffic accidents warrants your action to prevent trucks from getting any bigger or heavier. Such limits should be held until pending studies of highway safety and pavement capacity are completed. House version would only limit axle loads while Senate report properly controls gross weight as well as width, length, and height. Senate should hold firm on conference, if any. Will greatly appreciate your favorable consideration.

W. P. KENNEDY,
Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

ASTORIA, OREG., *April 30, 1956*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Now that highway bill is in the Senate may I suggest support for Gore weight and height limitations.

Thanking you,

GUY BOYINGTON,
County Judge.

NEWPORT, OREG., *April 30, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

This association representing seven Oregon coast counties, sincerely hopes that you will be able to retain provisions of Gore bill as to maximum weight and size features as also recommended by the American Association of Highway Officials in your committee's consideration of highway bill.

VERNE AYERS,
Manager, Oregon Coast Association.

ONTARIO, OREG., *May 14, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In regards to the Federal highway bill now being or to be considered by the United States Senate soon.

I feel that adequate highway user charges should be based on the amount of use obtained by the individual user, this is only way to finance this new highway, as cannot see more taxes placed on the small user to provide a super right-of-way for the large truckers.

I also feel that the size and weight limitations in the original Gore bill are necessary to preserve our investment in highways, otherwise we will be rebuilding them again in a few years for bigger and heavier trucks.

Respectfully,

C. A. KEIM.

BAKER OREG., *May 22, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please protect Oregon highways in the Federal highway bill by enacting the Gore sizes and weight amendments. The small amount of taxes that the big truck operators will pay is no insurance to the private car owner.

PAT DAVIS.

ONTARIO, OREG., *May 14, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In regards to the Federal highway bill now being considered or soon to be considered by the United States Senate.

I feel that adequate highway user charges should be based on the amount of use obtained by the individual user, this is only way to finance this new highway, as cannot see more taxes placed on the small user to provide a superhighway for the large operators.

I also feel that the size and weight limitations in the original Gore bill are necessary to preserve our investment in this highway otherwise we will be rebuilding this highway in a few years for longer and heavier carriers.

Respectfully yours,

JOE WILSON.

ASTORIA, OREG., *March 20, 1956.*

Re H. R. 8836 (Fallon bill).

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please pardon me for again calling to your attention highway legislation now before the Congress. I am sure we all agree that the importance of preserving the investment we have already made in Federal and State highways, county roads, and city streets cannot be overemphasized. There is a definite need in any highway legislation to establish size and weight limitations on the heavy vehicles using our roads and highways.

It appears to me that the provisions of section 7 (e) of H. R. 8836 (Fallon bill) adequately limit sizes and weights without imposing any additional restrictions other than now imposed by existing State laws. I feel sure this provision merits your wholehearted support.

Thanking you again for your kind consideration, I am

Yours truly,

GUY BOYINGTON,
Clatsop County Judge.

ASHLAND, OREG., *March 17, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Oregon U. S. 99 Highway Association is vitally interested in the passage of national highway legislation, as indicated in our former telegram.

We feel that if this tremendous investment in highways is made, that reasonable rules for the protection of the highways should be adopted. Section 7 (e) of H. R. 8836 provides this protection and, we feel, is not unduly restrictive on the truck operators.

The report of the American Association of State Highway Officials is based on the Washo road test and is the best indicator we have of maximum load limits when the economics of road construction is considered.

We respectfully request your support of this important legislation.

Sincerely yours,

OREGON U. S. 99 HIGHWAY ASSOCIATION,
R. E. KOOZER, *President.*

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The reason I wished to comment on that specific point is that I have had communications during the past 10 days which indicate that the writers are very anxious that the provisions of the Kerr amendment be embodied in the bill and be taken to conference. That is the only reason why it has been a little difficult for me to determine the provisions of the Kerr amendment in relation to the Gore amendment, because they are almost identical. Am I correct?

Mr. GORE. I believe they are identical as to axle weight and as to tandem axle weight and as to width. I have tried to make it plain that the Senate bill deals with height, which the Kerr amendment does not deal with.

Mr. THYE. And the Senator says that is immaterial. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. It is immaterial, but I became convinced, after studying the matter, that the most unjustifiable restriction, if there be any in the Senate bill, was in the imposition of a height limitation, from which there seems to be no particular damage to the road, and which the States are in the act of raising.

There is less uniformity in the height limitation and in the length limitation than in any other. The Kerr amendment deals with the three important points on which there is reasonable uniformity among the 48 States. I could not agree to the amendment as the Senator from Oklahoma had first submitted it, but in negotiating with him we finally agreed on the amendment which he has presented.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it seems to me to be important that the conferees have jurisdiction to negotiate. The Gore amendment gives such jurisdiction. In view of the fact that a great many people are familiar with the Gore amendment, and not with the Kerr amendment, so far as I am concerned, I shall stand with the Gore amendment. If in conference a compromise is necessary to be reached, the committee will have jurisdiction to negotiate such a compromise.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The communications I have received have come from people who have made a very careful study of the proposed legislation, and they were interested because they are members of the American Trucking Association and they are truckers themselves. They stated there was merit in the Kerr amendment and that it made the bill a better bill than it would otherwise be. That is why I have stated that I was hopeful I might be able to support the Kerr amendment.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask a few brief questions. As the Senator knows, I supported him in committee when he submitted the original Gore amendment. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Tennessee that the original Kerr amendment strengthens or weakens that section of the bill which applies to limitations on the size, weight, and dimension of trucks operating over the Interstate System?

Mr. GORE. I will say in all candor that the Kerr amendment is less restrictive than the Senate committee amendment. I should like to add, if I may, that I have become convinced that the committee bill is a little too restrictive on height.

Mr. NEUBERGER. What is the Senator's opinion as to length? Under the Senate bill there is a limitation on the length of a truck operating on the Interstate System. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Under the Kerr amendment, the restriction on length is eliminated. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. It is directly, but when we take into consideration—as the Senator can see from the AASHO code—the

single axle weight, the tandem axle weight, and the weight limit, we come up to 60 feet, which is the AASHO code limit.

Mr. NEUBERGER. With respect to great big trucks, the length of the trucks becomes a very important factor in highway safety from the standpoint of motorists getting around them and on sharp curves.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The Senator's time has expired. All time for debate on the amendment has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I promised to yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nevada. I yield myself 1 additional minute on the bill. Then I shall yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. May I ask just one further question?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does the Senator believe it is advisable to delete the restriction on length from the original provision in the bill?

Mr. GORE. The Senator has catechized me very thoroughly on this subject, and in all candor I will say to him that I compromised on that point. I thought I should yield on the height. I saw no necessity for yielding on the length. However, in order to reach a compromise with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], realizing that axle placement and limitation would indirectly limit the length, and also believing that there was a total lack of uniformity as among the States, I agreed to that.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. First, I should like to ask the Senator to yield to me for a question.

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Under the Gore amendment or under the Kerr amendment, a State which has no limit on certain features that are limited in the Gore amendment or in the Kerr amendment, would not be limited by the Federal law. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. In my opinion, whatever is legal now in Nevada, will remain so until doomsday.

Mr. MALONE. There would be no limit?

Mr. GORE. That is my understanding.

Mr. MALONE. Now I shall ask the Senator to yield me 2 minutes.

Mr. GORE. I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator yield to me first for a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator from Tennessee intend to hold the Senate in session all night; or how long does he intend to have the Senate remain in session tonight?

Mr. GORE. So far as I know, there are no more major controversial amendments. I shall yield to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]; then there is a minor amendment pending. It is the plan of both the acting majority leader and the minority leader to finish consideration of the bill this evening, and I hope we will be able to do so before very long.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Even if it means staying in session all night?

Mr. GORE. Not all night.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is not important whether we run all night or two nights. The important thing is that we need a road bill, and we need it now. The American people are calling for it. We must have a road bill, because the State legislatures will meet in January. They want to know what Uncle Sam is going to do about it before they provide for the contribution of State funds.

FEDERAL ENCROACHMENT ON STATE LAWS WHERE NO LIMITATIONS NOW OBTAIN

Mr. MALONE. I understand from the answer of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that any State without a law limiting certain features including length, height, and weight, would not be limited by the Federal law. I take it that through exempting any State regulations exceeding the Federal law—or no limitation is in the nature of a "grandfather" clause.

The House freeze on size and weight applies only to axles. The Senate amendment involves axle groups, total gross load and height, width, and length.

Both bills provide that State limits in effect on July 1, or the standards of the American Association of State Highway Officials, whichever are greater, will apply after that date.

Nevada has no limits on height, length, or weight. The standards of the American Association of State Highway Officials for height, weight, and length are less than those in surrounding States. Nevada must either continue without State limitations, or, if increased local traffic makes it necessary to set limits as a safety factor, must impose limits below those of the surrounding States to conform to Federal limitations. This would throw a roadblock across interstate traffic between many of the Western States and would result in serious handicaps to western economy.

Mr. President, I wish to include in the RECORD figures of height, width, and length in the States of California, Utah, and Arizona.

In California the height limit is 13 feet 6 inches; the width is 96 inches; the length is 60 feet.

In Utah the height is 14 feet; width, 96 inches; length, 60 feet.

In Arizona the height limit is 13 feet 6 inches; the width is 96 inches; the length is 65 feet.

So, if we were forced by traffic congestion to any limitation of these factors we would have to adopt height and length limits below those of the surrounding States.

I think it is unnecessary to adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, because it has been stated before that this matter will be in conference, and I think the conference can take care of it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee.

Is there any limitation on length in the Kerr amendment? Could a truck be 100 feet long under the Kerr amendment?

Mr. GORE. There is no limitation in the Kerr amendment.

Mr. KERR. There is in the House bill.

Mr. GORE. And there is in the Senate committee bill.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "5–28–56–H," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 50, after line 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 118. The definition of the term "construction" in section 1 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 is hereby amended to read as follows: "The term 'construction' means the supervising, inspecting, actual building, and all expenses incidental to the construction or reconstruction of a highway, including locating, surveying, and mapping, cost of rights-of-way, cost of relocation of building tenants, cost of demolition of structures or removal of usable buildings to new sites, including the cost of such sites, and the elimination of hazards of railway grade crossings."

On page 50, line 9, strike out "SEC. 118" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 119."

On page 50, line 12, strike out "SEC. 119," and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 120."

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I shall speak very briefly on this amendment.

I urge this amendment, Mr. President, because it deals with a very important part of the cost of highway construction in New York State and other States.

Governor Harriman has wired me about it and so have other officials of my State.

The effect of this amendment would be to include in the definition of the cost of highway construction the cost of relocating tenants on property which has to be condemned in order to put a new road through.

For any State which assumes the responsibility for relocating people on property it must condemn for other purposes, this relocation is a large item in the expense of the cost of the project. Many States assume this responsibility and, although it is, of course, a matter for individual States to determine whether they will do so, I for one certainly think it is a responsibility they ought to assume.

This amendment, therefore, would have the effect of allowing a State which undertakes this responsibility to use their Federal-aid funds for this purpose, just as the State uses Federal-aid funds to purchase the right-of-way and to build the highway, and other authorized expenditures.

This amendment does not increase the apportionment of any State. It does not

affect that apportionment whatever. All it does is allow the State to count this cost in with its other costs of highway construction.

This provision was included in the language of the House bill and I think it certainly should be added here.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

A few moments ago the Senate voted to limit the amount of reimbursement for the moving of utility poles of local utilities. The junior Senator from New York now proposes that we consider as a part of highway construction the relocation of tenants who are disturbed in their domiciles and businesses as a result of highway construction.

The committee has not considered the amendment. I am not in a position to accept it, and I ask that it be rejected.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that there is no analogy between my amendment and the one to which he refers. My amendment does not increase the apportionment of any States, not a red cent; it does not affect the apportionment in any way whatsoever. All it does is to allow the State to include this cost with other costs of highway construction.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the so-called Fulbright amendment was adopted be reconsidered, and I ask that the Fulbright amendment be again read, because I think very few Members of this body know what it is.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move to lay the motion of the Senator from Illinois on the table. I do not object to the amendment being read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the reading of the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas which was adopted? The Chair hears none, and the amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 50, between lines 8 and 9, insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 118. (a) All wage determinations made by the Secretary of Labor under the act of March 3, 1931, as amended, known as the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U. S. C., sec. 276a et seq.), which are applicable to highway construction contracts entered into under this title, shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act, be subject to such act, and made on the record after opportunity for hearing. Review of any such wage determination, or the applicability of any such wage determination, may be had within 90 days after such determination is made in the manner provided in section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act by any person adversely affected or aggrieved thereby, who shall be deemed to include any contractor or subcontractor engaged in the same type of construction operating in the locality to which such wage determination is applicable.

(b) Notwithstanding the inclusion of any stipulation required by any provision of said act of March 3, 1931, in any highway construction contract made subject to such act by this section, any interested person shall have the right of judicial review of any issue which might otherwise be raised.

(c) No appeal taken as herein provided shall in any way delay the advertising for bids or the awarding of contracts.

On page 50, line 9, strike out "118" and insert in lieu thereof "119."

On page 50, line 12, strike out "119" and insert in lieu thereof "120."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, when the amendment was originally proposed, there was a good deal of disorder on the floor, and some Senators did not hear the contents of the amendment. I am informed by the clerks at the desk that the amendment was read. Although at first there was some uncertainty as to whether it was read, the clerks now inform me that the amendment was read. I can say that there were many Senators who certainly did not hear it. The vote to approve the amendment went through with supersonic speed. So I think the issue should be debated and understood.

In effect, the amendment would negative and shoot to pieces the Chavez amendment, which was agreed to this morning, because not merely would the procedures of the Administrative Procedures Act be carried out, but there would be a judicial review.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], for whom I have great esteem, and whom I regard as one of the finest Members of the Senate, inserted a similar clause in the Walsh-Healey Act, a clause which has virtually prevented the Walsh-Healey Act from functioning. What will happen if this clause is retained is that after a finding has been made, the interested parties can go into court and, with all the delays of court procedure, tie things up for years, and make the Chavez amendment and the Davis-Bacon Act completely ineffective.

I cannot believe it was the opinion of the majority, after the vote in the Senate this morning, that we should reverse ourselves by a voice vote early this evening. I am confident that a very large proportion of the Members of the Senate did not realize what was being approved. So I hope very much that the amendment can be reconsidered, and then that it may be rejected.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not want to cut off the debate, but I intend to make a motion to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

I wish to say in full fairness to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] that I thought, at the time his amendment was called up, that he made a very full explanation of what the amendment provided. I think it is a constructive amendment. I think it is in keeping with the discussion which went on, and with one vote, at least, the Senate took, that arbitrary power should not be left in the hands of any Secretary of Labor. I think the amendment was understood. If we are to complete the bill, I do not see how we can continue to reconsider actions which we have already taken on this and many other amendments.

I do not wish to prevent the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] or the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] from speaking, if they desire to do so; but I wish to be recognized in order to move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I may say, first, to the Senator from Illinois that the subject matter was under discussion for, I suppose, a good hour this morning; and several Senators who were in favor of the Chavez amendment expressed themselves in the course of the debate as being in favor also of judicial review. Certainly there was no element of surprise about the substance of the amendment. I stated very clearly, I think the Senator will recall, in answer to questions in the course of the debate this morning, the purpose of the judicial review, and I called attention to the insertion of the provision in the Walsh-Healey Act.

I recall distinctly that the Senator from Indiana was one who, I believe, voted for the Chavez amendment, but said he was also in favor of judicial review.

First of all, the provision relates to the application of the Davis-Bacon Act only in matters arising under the bill. It does not relate generally to the application of the Davis-Bacon provision now in force in other fields of Federal construction.

So I think there was no element of surprise. The amendment was debated at considerable length.

I also call attention to the fact that the Senate approved, after a very strenuous battle, the insertion of the same type of provision in the Walsh-Healey Act. So there is no evidence that the Senate does not approve of this provision generally as a proper procedure in matters in which heretofore the Secretary of Labor has had the final authority without any appeal.

I think I made it very clear this morning that I am not opposed to the application of the principle of prevailing wages in this or any other type of construction program conducted by the Federal Government. What I am opposed to are arbitrary rulings by the Secretary as to what is the prevailing wage. That is where all the complaint has been under the Walsh-Healey Act and the Davis-Bacon Act in the past, so far as I am concerned. No one is trying to say that we are attempting to pay or wish to pay persons in any of these fields at a rate below the prevailing wage, or that we are trying to operate sweatshops with Government funds. But we do object to the quite arbitrary rulings by the Secretary of Labor as to what is the prevailing wage in a particular locality.

All the amendment does is to provide an appeal from such a decision on the part of the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas a question—and it will be a question. The Senator from Arkansas seems to be very enthusiastic or emphatic about judicial decisions. The Supreme Court of the United States made a decision sometime ago with reference to integration. I wish to ask the Senator from Arkansas now whether or not he approves of that judicial decision.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator from New Mexico well knows that I and many other Senators publicly and clearly stated our disagreement with that decision. But because I disagree with a particular decision or the quality of the Court at any particular time does not mean that I am ready to abandon judicial process as a part of orderly government. I do not approve of all the decisions of this body, either, but I am not ready to abolish the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am not ready to abolish the Senate. That is why I am willing to have the Senate be counted on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was counted a little earlier. I did not hear the Senator from New Mexico raise his voice in opposition.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I want the Senator from Arkansas to realize that this is 1956. This is an election year. So let us be counted—every Senator from every State—as to how we will vote on this proposal.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. This question, in my judgment, should not be handled by judicial finding. It involves a simple question of fact. Administrative agencies are best suited to ascertain the prevailing wage in any area, with the assistance of the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor.

I think it is very unwise to clutter up the judicial process with this kind of determination. It will result in delay, and it is bound, in my judgment, to scuttle the objective of the Chavez amendment.

Assume that a highway is about to be built, and the contractor needs to have a determination as to what wage he will have to pay. The administrative law process has been developed to meet exactly that kind of situation which confronts us in running the economy. To involve this kind of a question in the delays incident to a judicial review can have only one purpose, namely, to prevent a determination of the prevailing wage until long after the highway has been built. If what is wanted is dilatory tactics, then Senators should vote for the Fulbright amendment.

I think the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] should be commended for asking for a review of the matter tonight, because a good many Senators were at dinner when the amendment was called up. We did not even have the benefit of a quorum call. We were not aware that this was a proposal, really, to modify an amendment which had already been agreed to earlier by a yea-and-nay vote.

I think fair procedure required our being summoned to the floor of the Senate by a quorum call and being put on due notice as to what subject was under consideration.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the junior Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, for one who does not find himself in complete intellectual mesh with my brother from the State of Oregon, I am delighted to join with him in the comments he has just made. I was absent from the Chamber when the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas came before the Senate, and I must say I am just a little bit confused that, after 40 years of living with a piece of legislation which clearly and simply provides for the payment of prevailing wages on Federal construction contracts, we suddenly find, in a debate on highway legislation, that someone desires to have a judicial review of what prevailing wages may be.

Mr. President, I am a lawyer, perhaps not very much of a lawyer, but I must say there is a need to have finality of decision with respect to administrative fiat in the Federal Government.

For a long, long time the Congress and the President of the United States have approved a law by which the Secretary of Labor makes certain decisions. I think it ill behooves the Senate to provide now, in 1956, an opportunity for judicial review of what has been sanctioned and approved for a long, long time.

I hope we may now have an opportunity to reverse what the Senate approved a little earlier, when some of us were at dinner and did not have knowledge of or a chance to vote on the Fulbright amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I want to acknowledge to the Senate an error. I was acquainted with the fact that the junior Senator from Arkansas had an amendment to title II. When he rose to offer the amendment, I turned to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and I said to him, "You look after this one." I am not suggesting that he did. [Laughter.] But, upon making that remark, I turned and conferred with three Senators about amendments on which we were trying to reach some recommendation and compromise.

I did not hear the speech of the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas. Someone said, "Do you yield back your time?" I looked around. No one was seeking time to speak. I yielded my time back.

I have been here since 10 o'clock this morning. I acknowledge I made an error.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I inquire whether there was a quorum call prior to the vote on the so-called Fulbright amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised there was not a quorum call.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MORSE, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with my colleague, the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. SMATHERS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If present and voting the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay," and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

Also, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the

Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—36

Allott	Eastland	McClellan
Barrett	Ervin	Millikin
Bible	Frear	Mundt
Bricker	Fulbright	Robertson
Bridges	George	Smathers
Byrd	Goldwater	Stennis
Carlson	Holland	Thye
Cotton	Johnston, S. C.	Watkins
Curtis	Knowland	Welker
Daniel	Malone	Williams
Dirksen	Martin, Iowa	Wofford
Dworshak	Martin, Pa.	Young

NAYS—33

Aiken	Hennings	Monroney
Anderson	Hill	Morse
Beall	Humphrey	Neuberger
Bush	Jackson	O'Mahoney
Case, N. J.	Kerr	Pastore
Chavez	Kuchel	Payne
Douglas	Laird	Potter
Duff	Langer	Scott
Gore	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Green	Mansfield	Sparkman
Hayden	McNamara	Symington

NOT VOTING—26

Bender	Hruska	Murray
Bennett	Ives	Neely
Butler	Jenner	Purtell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Clements	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Ellender	Long	Smith, N. J.
Flanders	Magnuson	Wiley
Hickenlooper	McCarthy	

So the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "5–25–56–C." I ask that the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD, but not read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment submitted by Mr. BUSH to the committee amendment is as follows:

On page 49, between lines 24 and 25, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any provision of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, where any State desires to levy tolls on any section of a highway on which Federal-aid highway funds have been expended, the Secretary of Commerce, upon the request of the State highway department, may authorize the State to repay the amount of the Federal-aid funds theretofore expended on such section of highway to the Federal Government either by cash or by credit deduction against vouchers submitted for reimbursement of the Federal share of the cost of Federal-aid work currently under construction. Cash repayments shall be made to the Treasurer of the United States to the account of the highway trust fund and be deposited to the credit of the appropriation for Federal-aid highways. The Secretary of Commerce shall credit the amount of any repayment, together with the unpaid balance of any amount programed for expenditure on such section of highway, to the unprogramed balance of Federal-aid road funds of the same class last apportioned to such State, and the amount so credited shall be in addition to all other funds then apportioned to such State and shall be available for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented. Upon such repayment, the project agreement with respect to the project from which the funds are repaid shall be canceled and such section or sections of highway shall become and be free from any toll limitations or other restrictions contained in said act."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Is this the amendment about which we have conferred?

Mr. BUSH. It is.

Mr. GORE. I accept the amendment, and will take it to conference.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Tennessee yield back all the remaining time on the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut to the committee amendment?

Mr. BUSH. I do, Mr. President.

Mr. GORE. I do, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time on the amendment to the committee amendment has been yielded back.

The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for purposes of discussion, I call up the amendment intended to be submitted by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and identified as "5–28–56–A." I ask that only the first clause of the amendment be read at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 60, beginning with line 17, it is proposed to restore all the matter stricken out through line 2 on page 61.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is the original Smathers amendment. I have brought it up now for the purpose of brief discussion.

I may withdraw the amendment on the advice of my friend, the Senator from Florida.

The amendment relates to a very serious problem existing in many parts of the country, in the case of transit companies.

At this point I wish to read a telegram I have received from the president of the transit company in Portland, Oreg. I assure the Senate that a similar situation exists in the case of most of the transit companies in the country. The telegram reads as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 24, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

New highway legislation in H. R. 10660 excepted most transit companies from payment of additional fuel tax and any weight tax where 60 percent of the total passenger fare revenue came from fares presently exempt from Federal transportation tax. Senate committee has removed these exemptions. Each 1 cent in fuel tax rate costs the Rose City Transit Co. $25,000 per year. A 3 cent fuel tax would cost the company an additional $75,000 per year and would necessitate an immediate increase in fares to enable the company to meet the additional costs. City transit cannot, based upon present revenues, absorb any additional tax load. Present annual net income of the company is slightly less than $10,000. Earnestly request your effort to have the options restored in this legislation.

ROSE CITY TRANSIT CO.,
GORDON G. STEELE, *President.*

Mr. President, the Portland transit company, which is known as the Rose City Transit Co., does not differ very much from transit companies in many other parts of the country. By and large, this industry is a declining one and a losing one. We have only to consider the situation existing among transit companies across the country, to recognize that we cannot justify the imposition of this additional tax burden on transit companies, because by and large these companies serve the poorer economic groups in our society; by and large they serve those who cannot own automobiles and drive to work. These companies do not serve the Cadillac riders.

I have talked to members of the committee, and I am advised that the situation is about as follows: The Senate committee was a little concerned because some other organizations or economic groups thought that if this exemption were allowed the transit companies, it should be allowed to other companies, such as dairy companies, which deliver milk in cities, but are not monopolies or public utilities, or businesses serving a public interest, such as a public utility is, and are not businesses whose profits in the first instance are limited and whose operations are strictly regulated in the way that those of public utilities and monopolies are regulated.

Mr. President, it seems to me to be an undue hardship to impose this additional tax on transit companies. I think we ought to try to reach some understanding on the floor of the Senate, or else adopt the Smathers amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that this condition was called to my attention by the transit company in my home community. The city of Albuquerque has been compelled to make some adjustments in franchise taxes, and in various other respects, in order to keep the bus company in operation. This tax would mean an annual charge on the transit company of approximately $5,000 a year, which is not very much, but when the city must make concession after concession to keep the transit company in operation, it seems so strange to impose this further tax. If the Senator from Oregon offers the amendment to which he has referred, I intend to support it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I find the situation in my own State to be much the same as that which the Senator from Oregon has described.

As members of the Committee on the District of Columbia we have both been through the transit situation. We know the situation in which transit companies find themselves.

Our Pueblo Transit Co. finds that the additional tax would cost about $3,000. The Denver Tramway Corp. finds that it

would cost it about $128,000 additional during the year.

I ask unanimous consent that letters which I have received on this subject be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DENVER TRAMWAY CORP.,
Denver, Colo., May 25, 1956.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: Reference is made to your telephone conversation with Mr. Allan Phipps Thursday evening, May 24, in which the matter of House bill H. R. 10660, new highway legislation, was discussed.

Mr. Phipps asked us to forward to your attention such facts as would demonstrate the effect of this bill on the Denver Tramway Co. The diesel fuel tax restored by removing the exemption will cost us approximately $120,000 per year, and the new vehicle weight tax will cost us $8,842, or a total of $128,842 in additional taxes resulting from the elimination of the exemptions. In addition to this, of course, there was already contained in the bill $36,687 annual increased cost by reason of increased taxes on tires and tubes, or a total annual increased cost to the Denver Tramway of $165,794.

We are greatly concerned over the added $128,842 in taxes resulting from the removal of the exemption, as we cannot emphasize too strongly that Tramway is in no position to absorb the increased cost resulting from these increased taxes.

This company and transit generally does not use the Federal System of Interstate and Defense Highways covered by H. R. 10660.

We, at Tramway, have during the past year completely modernized our entire operation for one purpose only, to reduce operating expenses and avoid, if possible, substantial fare increases, thus permitting us to continue operating as a privately owned mass transportation system. As a result of these steps, expenses were reduced in 1955 over $700,000, yet this was all absorbed by the continued patronage decline. Income for the first 4 months of 1956 is far below 1955 for the same reason. Therefore, it is obvious that this tax will increase operating expenses to the extent that we will be forced to immediately file for a substantial fare increase.

Tramway, together with the transit industry generally, is fighting for its very existence as a result of increased operating expenses and declining revenues. In this respect we are completely unlike any other form of for-hire passenger transportation. State and local regulatory bodies have recognized the seriousness of the problem facing our industry as demonstrated by steps taken to eliminate or reduce taxes in numerous cities and States. The taxes imposed on our industry, like those contained in H. R. 10660, without exemptions, can only result in the ultimate elimination of the mass transit industry under private ownership. The net result will, of course, be Government ownership in one form or another, with corresponding subsidies which I am sure we can all agree would be most undesirable.

The ironical effect of this tax is that it must be passed on to our fare-paying passengers, who are the very people who don't use the highways by reason of their utilization of local public transportation. We also feel that these same passengers are, because of their general economic level, those who can least afford the increased cost. It is an accepted fact that fare increases, which could only result from this bill, further reduce transit patronage, which, in turn, accelerates the need for further fare increases. All of this only multiplies our already serious problems in Denver and throughout the country, and hastens the day when we shall no longer be a private industry.

We are sincerely hopeful that transit exemptions will be restored to H. R. 10660, and because of the urgency of this matter, we will greatly appreciate anything you can do to assist us.

Respectfully yours,
W. A. ALEXANDER,
President.

PUEBLO, COLO., *December 5, 1955.*

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
United States Senator,
Denver, Colo.

DEAR GORDON: We are attorneys for the Pueblo Transit Co., of Pueblo, Colo., which concern owns and operates the Pueblo local street bus system. Its operations are confined to the city limits of said city.

It is our understanding that highways, and more particularly, taxes to pay for them, will receive top consideration when Congress reconvenes in January. Proposals will probably be made for increasing taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel, and large tires.

As you are no doubt already aware, the revenue derived from the operation of local bus companies has been continually diminishing, due to automobile competition and decentralization, to such an extent that there is a serious question whether many of the now existing local bus companies throughout the country will be able to continue. In most cases the fares now being charged by the local bus companies are already so high that it is questionable whether any additional revenues would be realized by increased fares, because of the reduction in riders which would necessarily result therefrom.

This is a condition that is not peculiar to our local company. It is a situation which confronts practically every local bus company in the country.

We sincerely hope therefore that before the passage of any legislation increasing the operating costs of local transit companies, that hearings will be arranged in order that all parties affected will have an opportunity to present their views, and how any proposed increase in taxes will affect their particular operations.

Very truly yours,
PETERSEN & EVENSEN,
By HARRY PETERSEN.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. President, I wish to make a prediction. There is not a Member of this body from a single State in the Union who would not find that the problem which I am deploring in connection with this subject exists in his or her State. This is a uniform problem across the country. When we have a problem so uniform as this, when we have a problem dealing directly with the low income groups, who necessarily ride on public transportation systems, I think we should take this amendment to conference.

I recognize the problem of the committee with other requests before it, but I think we are relieving the committee on the floor of the Senate when we say most respectfully to the committee that there is a common problem in each one of the States, and we believe that our committee should do us the favor of taking the Smathers amendment to conference.

Before I make the final decision as to whether or not to press for this amendment, I should like to know, first, what my friend from Florida thinks about the situation. I am in a position in which, in effect, I have accepted his amendment, although he knew from previous conversations that I intended to raise this question. Technically I am offering the amendment as my amendment, but let the RECORD be clear that the amendment was first submitted by the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senate that the amendment would not be in order at this time, because the Senate is dealing with technical amendments to title I, and not title II.

Mr. MORSE. We are completing the discussion on this subject.

Mr. President, do I still have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the reason I had not offered the amendment previously was that we had not approached the particular part of the bill with respect to which this amendment would have been appropriate. However, I had some previous discussion with the Senator from Oregon on the subject. He had evidenced his interest in the amendment, as had the Senator from Colorado, the Senator from Minnesota, and many other Senators who find in their States transit companies which operate under franchises and in precarious financial straits. Many of them are operating on a borderline basis, so to speak. If additional taxes are to be imposed under the Senate version of the bill, many of them will be forced out of business.

The result is that what we are doing in the Senate is punishing people who have no other means of transportation—such as housewives, clerks, stenographers, elevator operators, and others who must use the transit systems in order to perform necessary household tasks and get from their homes to their jobs.

If we do not change the Senate committee provision, and adopt the provision as passed by the House we shall punish the people to whom I referred by depriving them of the only type of transportation available to them.

The Senator from Oregon has already shown—and it seems to me very persuasively—why this particular amendment should be adopted. The city transit companies do not participate to any great extent in the highway program. Only 15 percent of the mileage of the highway program will be used in any fashion by them. So we are actually taxing them for something which they cannot afford and do not substantially use.

I hope the Senate conferees will be willing to accept the House provision in the conference. I understand from the ruling of the Chair, that it would not be in order to offer the amendment now. I should like to confer further with the Senator from Oregon to determine what is the best course of action to follow in offering the amendment later.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was advised, apparently erroneously, that the Senate was almost at the point of

the third reading of the bill, and that it was almost ready for final passage. I had my notes on the desk. I knew that the question had not been covered. That was the reason why I raised it.

In view of the comments of the Senator from Florida, I withdrew the amendment at this time, to await the decision of the Senator from Florida as to whether or not he will offer the amendment. Unless good cause is shown to me in private conversation between now and the time of final action, I serve notice that if the amendment is not offered by the Senator from Florida I shall offer it again. I believe that this is such a universal problem across the country that we ought to ask that the amendment be taken to conference, because I believe that the transit industry is entitled to that consideration from the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that we have also the complication of municipally owned transit systems as well as privately owned transit systems?

Mr. MORSE. That is true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is involved the question of the payment of taxes. No taxes are paid by municipally owned corporations, while on the other hand private systems must pay.

Mr. MORSE. If we do not charge the municipally owned systems we discriminate against the private systems.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is true. The record indicates that most privately owned transit systems have a tough time making ends meet.

Mr. MORSE. There is no question about it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. More and more of them are going into the hands of munipalities.

Mr. MORSE. That is true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I concur in the arguments made by the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Oregon. I have received a number of communications with respect to this particular proposal. I was not sure what the final judgment should be, but I think a difficult problem is posed, and one which could be reconciled by giving some special consideration to this kind of transportation.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Municipal traction companies are not taxed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is my understanding.

Mr. BYRD. I understood the Senator to say that they were taxed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; I am sorry.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Minnesota was pointing out the discrimination against private transit companies in favor of publicly owned transit companies. I do not think such discrimination is fair or equitable.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Under present law municipally owned transit companies do not pay a gasoline tax.

Under the proposal of the Senate Finance Committee privately owned transit companies in addition to the new use tax would have an additional 1-cent gasoline tax. In effect, we would be telling every privately owned local transit company, "You might as well go out of business and sell to some Government agency. We are in fact discriminating against the private enterprise system by giving the municipally owned transit company an advantage which a privately owned company may not enjoy.

Mr. MORSE. Such a provision would discriminate unfairly against the private company so far as the principle is concerned; and it would discriminate against privately owned companies in relation to publicly owned companies, which are operating on the basis of municipal bonds which have been sold to private investors. Such bondholders have an advantage over the bondholders of private companies.

I withdraw the amendment for the time being, with notice that I may offer it later.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, has consideration of title I of the bill been completed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator from Virginia that it has not been completed.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we complete consideration of title I?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Committee on Public Works to title I is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed to the committee amendment, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The committee amendment to title I, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To title I of the bill; that is correct.

The committee amendment to title I, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have a brief statement to make with respect to title II of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the first amendment of the Committee on Finance in title II.

The first amendment of the Committee on Finance was under the heading "Title II—Highway Revenue Act of 1956," on page 51, line 6, after the word "gallon", to insert a comma and the following:

And by adding after paragraph (2) the following "In the case of a liquid taxable under this subsection sold for use or used as a fuel in a diesel-powered highway vehicle which (at the time of such sale or use) is not registered, and not required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country (or, in the case of a diesel-powered highway vehicle owned by the United States, which is not used on the highway), the tax imposed by paragraph (1) or by paragraph (2) shall be 2 cents a gallon in lieu of 3 cents a gallon. If a liquid on which tax was imposed by paragraph (1) at the rate of 2 cents a gallon by reason of the preceding sentence is used as a fuel in a diesel-powered highway vehicle which (at the time of such use) is registered, or required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country (or, in the case of a diesel-powered highway vehicle owned by the United States, which is used on the highway), a tax of 1 cent a gallon shall be imposed under paragraph (2)."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to ask permission to insert in the RECORD at this point a statement I have prepared explaining title II, the financing provisions of the highway bill. I shall, however, summarize orally the financing features of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

I wish to call up for consideration of the Senate title II of H. R. 10660. This title provides the revenue to meet the expenditures of the Interstate Federal Highway System and also the expenditures for the primary, secondary, and urban roads provided under title I of the bill.

To provide the revenue for carrying out title I it is necessary to increase the rates of certain fuel taxes and levy new taxes. Our committee bill has adopted the increases and new taxes provided by the House bill with the exception of a change made in the annual use tax applied to trucks and buses. These taxes are as follows:

INCREASES UNDER TITLE II

1. A 1 cent a gallon increase in the gasoline, diesel, and fuel taxes is provided, raising these taxes from 2 cents a gallon to 3 cents a gallon.

2. The tax on tires is increased from 5 cents a pound to 8 cents a pound, and a new tax of 8 cents a pound is imposed on camelback.

3. An increase of 2 percentage points is provided in the manufacturer's tax on trucks, buses, and truck trailers. The rate of tax on these articles under the present law would have reverted to 5 percent on April 1, 1957. Both the House bill and your committee bill provide an overall rate of 10 percent and continue such rate in effect until July 1, 1972, when the 5-percent rate becomes applicable again.

4. A new use tax on trucks and buses of $2.50 per 1,000 pounds of taxable weight is imposed. The House bill applied a tax of $1.50 per 1,000 pounds of taxable weight to all trucks weighing over 26,000 pounds. Thus, if a truck weighed slightly over 26,000, it was subject to the full tax of $1.50 on entire taxable gross weight. In the opinion of your committee, this created a discrimination against those trucks which were just over 26,000 pounds. To meet this problem the Senate Finance Committee raised the rate from $1.50 to $2.50, but applied it only to the excess taxable weight over 26,000 pounds. The following table shows the tax effect under the two bills in the case of trucks of different weights:

TABLE I

Truck weight	Tax under—	
	House bill	Senate amendment
28,000 pounds	$42.00	$5.00
30,000 pounds	45.00	10.00
35,000 pounds	52.50	22.50
40,000 pounds	60.00	35.00
55,000 pounds	82.50	72.50
65,000 pounds	97.50	97.50
70,000 pounds	105.00	110.00

Under the House bill, the increases in the gasoline and diesel fuel taxes are limited to such fuel used in highway vehicles. In general, a highway vehicle is a vehicle which if new would be subject to the manufacturers' excise tax on the sale of trucks, buses, passenger cars, etc., or which is a motorcycle. In the case of diesel fuels, the existing 2 cents a gallon tax applies only in the case of liquids used as a fuel in a diesel-powered highway vehicle. The increases will, therefore, under the House bill apply to gasoline

or diesel fuel sold for use in a highway vehicle, including a diesel-powered highway vehicle, whether or not the vehicle is actually used on the highway.

In the case of special motor fuels, the tax under the present law applies only with respect to the special motor fuels sold for use in a motorboat, airplane, or motor vehicle. Under the House bill, the increased tax is limited to the special fuel used in motor vehicles. However, it was pointed out in the hearings before our committee that under the House bill, the increase of 1 cent a gallon tax on special motor fuels will apply, whether or not the motor vehicle is of the highway type. Therefore, in the case of a motor vehicle not of the highway type a different rule will be applied to the purchase of special fuels than is applied to the use of gasoline and diesel fuels. Your committee has amended the law to apply the special increased fuel taxes to a highway vehicle as distinguished from a motor vehicle.

The attention of your committee was called to the fact that there are many vehicles of the highway type which never use the highway. Your committee bill therefore has amended the House bill to provide that the 1 cent increase in gasoline, diesel fuel, and special motor fuel will apply only to vehicles registered (or required to be registered) for use on the public highways. Thus, the same rule which was applied in the House bill to the use tax on trucks and buses is extended to the fuel taxes by your committee's bill.

The increase in the tax on tires under both bills applies only to those used on highway vehicles. In this respect, your committee found it impracticable to apply the tax on tires of the type used on highway vehicles to only tires used on registered vehicles. This is because a tire of the type used on a highway-type vehicle may be used either on a registered or an unregistered vehicle.

Under the Senate bill, as well as under the House bill, the revenues provided will cover a period of 16 years, that is, until July 1, 1972. The road program under title I is established on a 13-year period.

The total receipts to be used for carrying out title I of the bill amount to $38,202,000,000, of which $14,518,000,000 represents new or increased taxes and $23,684,000,000 represents existing taxes. This is shown by the receipts of the trust fund for the 16-year period. At this point, I insert the following table showing the details as to these receipts:

TABLE II.—*Receipts over 16-year period from new or increased taxes*

	Million
Gasoline	$9,359
Diesel fuel	267
Tires	1,909
Tread rubber	180
Trucks, buses, and trailers	2,313
Truck use tax	490
Total	14,518

TABLE III.—*Receipts over 16-year period from present law taxes*

	Million
Gasoline	$19,561
Diesel fuel	535
Tires	3,435
Tubes	153
Total	23,684

TABLE IV.—*Total tax receipts allocated to highway trust fund over 16-year period*

	Million
Total	$38,202
New or increased taxes	14,518
Present law taxes	23,684

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

Both the House and your committee's bill provide for the highway program to be handled through a Highway Trust Fund.

All of the new and increased taxes provided by the bill are to be paid from this fund. As I previously indicated these are expected to amount to $14.5 billion over the 16-year period up to 1972. In addition the present taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel and tires and tubes go into this fund. Revenue from these sources is expected to amount to $23.7 billion over the period making a grand total for trust fund revenues of $38.2 billion.

Expenditures from the fund will include the authorizations made for the regular highway Federal aid program as well as those for the Interstate System. The new authorizations under title I are as follows:

	Million
Regular aid program	$3,800
Interstate System	24,750
Total	28,550

In addition existing authorizations, which also will be paid from the fund, amount to about $2 billion, bringing the total authorized expenditures from the fund up to $30.5 billion.

The trust fund will operate in the same manner as the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund under existing law. Fund balances will be invested in Government bonds bearing an average interest rate and any amounts borrowed by the trust fund will also bear this same rate of interest.

LIMITATIONS ON APPORTIONMENTS OUT OF THE TRUST FUND

In section 209 (b) of the bill, it is declared to be the intention of Congress that if it hereafter appears—

"(1) that the total receipts of the trust fund (exclusive of advances under subsection (d)) will be less than the total expenditures from such fund (exclusive of repayments of such advances); or

"(2) that the distribution of the tax burden among the various classes of persons using the Federal-aid highways, or otherwise deriving benefits from such highways, is not equitable,

the Congress shall enact legislation in order to bring about a balance of total receipts and total expenditures, or such equitable distribution, as the case may be."

While over the entire 16-year period it is estimated that receipts will exceed expenditures, there will be years in which expenditures will exceed receipts after the program gets fully underway. This is shown by the following table:

TABLE V.—*Years in which the expenditures of the trust fund exceed the tax receipts of the fund*

[In millions]

	Tax receipts minus highway expenditures	Interest credit (+) or charge (−)	Net annual credit (+) or charges (−)
1959	−$2	+$18	+$16
1960	−509	+13	−496
1961	−630		−630
1962	−296	−10	−306
1963	−26	−14	−40

To give assurance that no deficit will develop in the highway trust the committee has added a section placing a limitation on disbursements from the highway trust fund for apportionment to the States when the Secretary of the Treasury determines there is a deficiency in the fund. This will apply only in the case of apportionments to the Interstate System. Under this section, the Secretary of the Treasury is to advise the Secretary of Commerce, who is then to reduce the funds available for apportionment to the States with respect to the Interstate System. This reduction in the apportionments for the Interstate System is to be made among the States on a pro rata basis. Subsequently, as the Secretary of the Treasury estimates that interstate highway trust fund balances will become available to meet these apportionments to the States for the Interstate Highway System, the amounts previously withheld are to be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce to the various States.

REFUND PROCEDURES

Your committee amended the House bill in the case of the gasoline tax to provide direct refunds of the 1-cent additional tax to purchasers of gasoline for use in other than registered highway vehicles. The procedure followed is similar to that already provided for farmers. Under the House bill exemptions were provided for this 1-cent tax where purchases were made direct from the producer. Where the gasoline was purchased from wholesale or retail dealers under the House bill refunds were provided but these required processing up through the refiner of the gasoline. The direct refund provided by your committee's bill short-cuts much of this paperwork.

Your committee's bill continues the exemption and refund procedure provided in the House bill, however, in the case of special motor fuels and also applies it in the case of diesel fuel, where these fuels are used in other than registered highway vehicles. These taxes are retail taxes instead of manufacturers' taxes and, therefore, the exemption and refund procedure followed in the House bill does not involve the same amount of paperwork which would be involved in the case of the manufacturers' tax on gasoline.

LOCAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

One of the problems confronting the committee was the exemption granted in the House bill for local transportation systems. This exemption applies not only to the fuel taxes but also to the special tax on trucks and buses in excess of 26,000 pounds.

Enactment of this bill will lead to the construction, on the Interstate System, of about 36,900 miles of highway. Of this, 31,200 miles will be rural roads at an average cost of a little over $400,000 per mile; and about 5,700 miles will be urban highways at an average cost of about $2,625,000 per mile. This should virtually complete the Interstate System program.

On the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems the program authorized by the bill will construct about 248,000 miles of rural roads at an average cost of $67,000 per mile; and about 8,750 miles of urban highways and streets at an average cost of $814,000 per mile.

The Interstate System will, after its completion, accommodate about 20 percent of all urban level. Of the travel on this system, about 21 percent will be interstate travel and 79 percent will be intrastate, mainly local.

On other Federal-aid roads in urban areas only about 6 percent of the traffic is interstate, and 94 percent is intrastate, mostly between points within the urban area.

Travel by commercial buses constitutes 0.6 percent of the total travel on city streets. Presumably, this would be diverted to the Interstate System in about the same proportion as other traffic (20 percent). In any case, buses would benefit from relief of congestion on other main routes brought about by diversion of traffic to the Interstate System.

Furthermore, I believe that to exempt local transportation systems from the increased taxes and apply them to taxicabs will cause a real discrimination against taxicabs. Since each will receive substantial benefit from this increased tax, each should be willing to contribute to the increased burden caused thereby.

FLOOR-STOCK TAXES AND REFUNDS

Both the House and your committee's bill provide for floor-stock taxes on the inventories in the hands of dealers on July 1, 1956, the date when the various increases or new taxes become effective under this bill. These

floor-stock taxes are necessary to prevent dealers, in order to avoid the new taxes, from stocking up on goods just before the new tax rates become effective. Also, these taxes will place all dealers in the same position on the date of the tax increase—that is, in all cases they will make their sales from tax-paid inventory. The floor-stock taxes are provided with respect to:

(1) The 2-percentage-point increase in the tax on trucks and buses, from 8 percent to 10 percent.

(2) The 3-cents-a-pound increase in the tax on highway-vehicle-type tires.

(3) The new 3-cents-a-pound tax on camelback.

(4) The 1 cent additional tax on gasoline, although in this case the tax does not apply to gasoline stocks of retail dealers.

Your committee has added a provision to make it clear, however, that these floor stock taxes need not be paid until 3 months after the date they are imposed. The House bill contained no date for paying these taxes and as a result taxpayers were concerned as to what time for payment the regulations might provide.

The bill, both as it passed the House and as approved by your committee, also provides for floor stock refunds for dealers in 1972 when the tax increases provided by this bill are scheduled for reduction. These refunds are to be available with respect to the same items as in the case of the floor stock taxes. These refunds will remove the discrimination against dealers who happen to have large stocks of items on hand on the rate reduction date on which tax has been paid at the higher rates.

CLOSING STATEMENT

The benefits to be derived from this bill are immeasurable.

Our highway systems operated by all levels of government from county and township to Federal constitute the largest single public facility in America. They are essentially an extension of our vast private enterprise production and distribution system on which the American economy rests. As such they are as important to this free-enterprise system as the factories and mines and farms and stores themselves, because they form one of the important mediums which link these units of the system together and permit it to function as a single unit. It is not the movement of raw materials and finished products alone which must be transported that is to be considered but of equal importance we must consider the movement of people between homes and places of employment and to and from the market places and other places which constitute our accepted economic and social pattern of living. It is in this transport of people—individual people—or small groups of 2, 3, 4, or a couple of dozen that highways are the only feasible and economical form of transport.

I say it is important because studies show that at least 4 out of every 5 of our 65 million workers get to work over the highways—the small remainder either walk, work in their homes, or use rail facilities. Most of this is through personalized transportation, that is, the family automobile, rather than mass forms of transport such as buses or trains. In our larger cities this personalized transport rather than so-called mass forms has become almost a necessity because of the wide spreadout of our people into the suburbs where the concentration of persons is so much smaller than is the case in heavily built up areas of apartments and flats and row houses. This thin spreadout of population to the suburbs (which has characterized our city growth of recent years, and which undoubtedly will continue, and is a good thing for many reasons) makes the private automobile essential as a part of our modern economy.

While it solves some of the problems, it also creates others. I mean traffic congestion, of course, and I don't have to explain what this is to any of you for all of us to have been and are experiencing it every day—morning, noon, and night. As an example, traffic in the rush hours of our big cities moves no faster than a man can walk. On the Shirley Highway during rush hours adjacent to Washington, the average actual speed is only about 15 miles per hour instead of the 45 to 55 for which it is designed. The reason it is so slow is because there is only one such highway available in this area and it is just not enough to meet the demand.

This bill proposes to take the largest step forward in remedying the Shirley Highway congestions in Washington and all the other similar places over the country. It will not correct all of them to be sure, but it is big enough to furnish the major portion of the relief that is needed. The problem is big and the cost of course seems also big. The amount of money we are talking about is the largest single sum ever proposed by this Congress except for war. But the large figures referred to in the press and in this bill should be brought down to the size which we as individuals can understand more readily. For each of us as average passenger-car owners, the annual price tag is only $8.80 or about 18 cents a week. And that 18 cents from the tens of millions of passenger cars pays the big share of the large and spectacular figures you are hearing about in connection with this program. But actually the 18 cents is not a cost at all but rather an investment which returns at least that much dividend—even more. We are told—and the figures look reasonable—that the savings in automobile liability insurance premiums alone resulting from fewer accidents—will equal this small charge. This does not even take into account the savings in gasoline, tire and brake wear and engine repair resulting from fewer stops and starts of the average car. You can make your own calculation from a figure of about a penny as the average cost of one start and stop at a traffic light or in a long congested waiting line of traffic. I say we are already paying the bill for the highway program proposed in this bill but we don't have the roads. This bill proposes to convert these losses into a usable highway system for our people's general benefit and enjoyment.

The traffic relief that the program will bring will extend to all our people, particularly to our metropolitan areas. Fifty-five percent of all the funds provided for the Interstate System are expected to go into metropolitan area relief and 25 percent of the funds for the Federal aid primary and secondary systems and their extensions into urban areas. In all, about 45 percent of all the Federal funds to be expended in this program will go in urban areas—but this is in about the same ratio as payments would be made by the users themselves—and about the same ratio in which vehicles use our public streets and highways. The bill provides substantial programs in all classes of highways, from the farm-to-market roads to the big city expressways—and I think in a reasonable relation to the benefits received by the different users.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the bill, over the 16-year period from July 1, 1956, to June 30, 1972, will raise $14,518,000,000 in new revenue.

This revenue will be raised from:

First. A 1-cent increase in the present 2-cent tax on gasoline and other motor fuels;

Second. A 3-cent increase in the present 5-cent tax on tires and a new 3-cent tax on camelback;

Third. An increase to 10 percent of the 8-percent manufacturers' tax on trucks and buses; and

Fourth. A new annual use tax of $2.50 on trucks and buses for each 1,000 pounds over 26,000.

The new gasoline and other fuel taxes are limited to fuel for use in registered highway vehicles. Limiting this tax to registered highway vehicles is an amendment made by the Finance Committee designed to limit the new tax to the extent administratively feasible to highway use.

The Finance Committee also adopted an amendment in the case of gasoline used in other than registered highway vehicles to provide direct refunds of the 1-cent additional tax along the lines Congress has already provided in the case of gasoline used on farms. This was a substitute for the House provision which would have provided exemptions or refunds which would have to be processed up through the producers and would involve a lot of paperwork.

The Finance Committee also adopted an amendment removing the exemptions from the new gasoline, and truck, and bus use taxes provided by the House bill for the local transit systems. These systems use the urban highways extensively and I have been informed that according to present estimates 55 percent of the interstate funds will be spent in urban areas. If we were to exempt these systems because they are in bad financial shape, every other hard-pressed business using the highways could make a similar claim for exemption.

The Finance Committee, to eliminate discrimination against trucks or buses weighing just over 26,000 pounds, modified somewhat the new tax provided by the House bill on the use of trucks and buses. The House bill provided a tax of $1.50 for each 1,000 pounds of weight in the case of loaded vehicles weighing over 26,000 pounds. The Finance Committee amended the bill to limit the tax to the weight over 26,000 pounds, but to regain part of the revenue this would lose, raised the tax rate from $1.50 to $2.50 per 1,000 pounds.

The $14.5 billion in new revenue raised by this bill, together with the present taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel, and tires and tubes are to go into a highway trust fund created by this bill. The present law revenues going into this fund amount to $23.7 billion over the period up to 1972. This means that total trust fund tax revenues will amount to $38.2 billion in the 16-year period.

Expenditures from the fund as authorized by title I of this bill and by present law which will come out of this fund amount to $30.5 billion, $5.5 billion under the regular road program and $25 billion under the Interstate System. Thus, authorized expenditures under the bill will be $7.7 billion below expected revenues. However, this only takes into account authorizations for the regular road program for 5 of the 13 years.

The Finance Committee has adopted an amendment to give assurance that no deficit will develop in this trust fund. The Secretary of the Treasury is to estimate the revenues of the fund from time to time and if they are less than the apportionments for any year or years, these apportionments are to be reduced on a pro rata basis so no deficiency will de-

velop. This reduction in apportionments, however, is to be limited to those for the Interstate System. Moreover, as more funds become available, the apportionments previously withheld will be restored.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments of the Committee on Finance to title II be agreed to en bloc and that title II as thus amended be treated as original text for purpose of further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The committee amendments to title II, agreed to en bloc, are as follows:

Under the heading "Title II—Highway Revenue Act of 1956," on page 51, line 6, after the word "gallon," it is proposed to insert a comma and "and by adding after paragraph (2) the following: 'In the case of a liquid taxable under this subsection sold for use or used as a fuel in a diesel-powered highway vehicle which (at the time of such sale or use) is not registered, and not required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country (or, in the case of a diesel-powered highway vehicle owned by the United States, which is not used on the highway), the tax imposed by paragraph (1) or by paragraph (2) shall be 2 cents a gallon in lieu of 3 cents a gallon. If a liquid on which tax was imposed by paragraph (1) at the rate of 2 cents a gallon by reason of the preceding sentence is used as a fuel in a diesel-powered highway vehicle which (at the time of such use) is registered, or required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country (or, in the case of a diesel-powered highway vehicle owned by the United States, which is used on the highway), a tax of 1 cent a gallon shall be imposed under paragraph (2).'"

On page 52, after line 3, to strike out:

"In the case of a liquid sold for use or used as a fuel for the propulsion of a motorboat or airplane, the tax imposed by paragraph (1) or by paragraph (2) shall be 2 cents a gallon in lieu of 3 cents a gallon. If a liquid on which tax was imposed by paragraph (1) at the rate of 2 cents a gallon by reason of the preceding sentence is used as a fuel for the propulsion of a motor vehicle, a tax of 1 cent a gallon shall be imposed under paragraph (2)."

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

"In the case of a liquid taxable under this subsection sold for use or used otherwise than as a fuel for the propulsion of a highway vehicle which (at the time of such sale or use) is registered, or required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country (or, in the case of a highway vehicle owned by the United States, which is used on the highway), the tax imposed by paragraph (1) or by paragraph (2) shall be 2 cents a gallon in lieu of 3 cents a gallon. If a liquid on which tax was imposed by paragraph (1) at the rate of 2 cents a gallon by reason of the preceding sentence is used as a fuel for the propulsion of a highway vehicle which (at the time of such use) is registered, or required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country (or, in the case of a highway vehicle owned by the United States, which is used on the highway), a tax of 1 cent a gallon shall be imposed under paragraph (2)."

On page 53, line 8, after the word "of", to strike out "subsection" and insert "subsections (a) and (b)."

On page 56, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "(a) Increase in rate: Section", and insert "Section"; after line 8, to strike out:

"(b) Reduced rate in certain cases: Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, in the case of gasoline sold by the producer or importer thereof, or by any producer of gasoline, to any person for use by such person otherwise than as a fuel in a highway vehicle, the tax imposed by subsection (a) shall be 2 cents a gallon in lieu of 3 cents a gallon. This subsection shall not apply to gasoline which (within the meaning of pars. (1), (2), and (3) of sec. 6420 (c)) is sold for use on a farm for farming purposes.

"(c) Rate reduction: On and after July 1, 1972—

"(1) the tax imposed by this section shall be 1½ cents a gallon; and

"(2) subsection (b) shall not apply."

And insert:

"(b) Rate reduction: On and after July 1, 1972, the tax imposed by this section shall be 1½ cents a gallon."

At the top of page 57, to strike out:

"(b) Technical amendment: Section 6420 (a) (relating to gasoline used on farms) is amend by striking out '4081' in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof '4081 (a).'"

On page 57, after line 10, to strike out:

"(a) Imposition of tax: A tax is hereby imposed on the use of any highway motor vehicle which (together with the semitrailers and trailers customarily used in connection with highway motor vehicles of the same type as such highway motor vehicle) has a taxable gross weight of more than 26,000 pounds, at the rate of $1.50 a year for each 1,000 pounds of taxable gross weight or fraction thereof."

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

"(a) Imposition of tax: There is hereby imposed on the use of any highway motor vehicle a tax at the rate of $2.50 a year for each 1,000 pounds of taxable gross weight or fraction thereof in excess of 26,000 pounds of taxable gross weight."

On page 58, line 4, after the word "registered", to insert a comma and "or, in case the highway motor vehicle is owned by the United States, by the Department or agency of the United States operating such vehicle."

On page 60, after line 16, to strike out:

"(c) Certain transit type buses: Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, no tax shall be imposed by section 4481 on the use of any bus which is of the transit type (rather than of the intercity type) by a person who, for the last 3 months of the preceding year (or for such other period as the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe for purposes of this subsection), met the 60-percent passenger fare revenue test set forth in section 6416 (b) (2) (L) (i) as applied to the period prescribed for purposes of this subsection."

On page 63, line 13, after the word "vehicles", to insert "(as defined in section 4072 (c))."

On page 64, line 7, after "(a)", to strike out "(3)."" and insert "(3).", after line 7, to insert:

"(d) Due date of taxes: The taxes imposed by subsection (a) shall be paid at such time after September 30, 1956, as may be prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate."

On page 68, after line 2, to strike out:

"(J) In the case of a liquid in respect of which tax was paid under section 4041 (b) (1) at the rate of 3 cents a gallon, used or resold for use as a fuel for the propulsion of a motorboat or airplane; except that the amount of such overpayment shall not exceed an amount computed at the rate of 1 cent a gallon."

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

"(J) In the case of a liquid in respect of which tax was paid under section 4041 (a) (1) at the rate of 3 cents a gallon, used or resold for use as fuel in a diesel-powered highway vehicle which (at the time of such use or resale) is not registered, and not required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country (or, in the case of a diesel-powered highway vehicle owned by the United States, which is not used on the highway); and, in the case of a liquid in respect of which tax was paid under section 4041 (b) (1) at the rate of 3 cents a gallon, used or resold for use otherwise than as a fuel for the propulsion of a highway vehicle which (at the time of such use or resale) is registered, or required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country (or, in the case of a highway vehicle owned by the United States, which is used on the highway); except that the amount of any overpayment by reason of this subparagraph shall not exceed an amount computed at the rate of 1 cent a gallon."

On page 69, after line 5, to strike out:

"(K) In the case of gasoline in respect of which tax was paid under section 4081 at the rate of 3 cents a gallon, used or resold for use otherwise than as a fuel in a highway vehicle; except that (i) the amount of such overpayment shall not exceed an amount computed at the rate of 1 cent a gallon, and (ii) this subparagraph shall not apply in respect of gasoline which was (within the meaning of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 6420 (c)) used or resold for use on a farm for farming purposes;

"(L) In the case of a liquid in respect of which tax was paid under section 4041 or 4081 at the rate of 3 cents a gallon, used in vehicles while engaged in furnishing scheduled common carrier public passenger land transportation service along regular routes; except that (i) this subparagraph shall apply, in respect of any liquid used during any calendar quarter or such other period as the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe, only if at least 60 percent of the total passenger fare revenue (not including the tax imposed by section 4261, relating to the tax on transportation of persons) derived by such person during such period from scheduled service along such regular routes was attributable to fares which were exempt from the tax imposed by section 4261 by reason of section 4262 (b) (relating to the exemption for commutation travel, etc.), and (ii) the amount of such overpayment for such period shall not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount computed at the rate of 1 cent a gallon as the passenger fare revenue derived during such period from such fares exempt from tax for such scheduled service bears to the total passenger fare revenue (not including the tax imposed by section 4261) derived during such period for such scheduled service."

On page 70, at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "(M)" and insert "(K)"; in line 23, after the word "vehicles," to insert "(as defined in section 4072 (c)), unless credit or refund of such tax is allowable under subsection (b) (3)."

Beginning at the top of page 71, to insert:

"(c) Payments to ultimate purchasers: Subchapter B of chapter 65 (relating to rules of special applicatiohn for abatements, credits, and refunds) is amended by renumbering section 6421 as 6422 and by inserting after section 6420 the following new section:

"'SEC. 6421. Gasoline used for certain nonhighway purposes

"'(a) Nonhighway uses: If gasoline is used otherwise than as a fuel in a highway vehicle which (at the time of such use) is registered, or required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country (or, in the case of a highway vehicle owned by the United States, which is used on the highway), the Secretary or his delegate shall pay (without interest) to the ultimate purchaser of such gasoline an amount equal to 1 cent for each gallon of gasoline so used.

"'(b) Filing of claims:

"'(1) Period covered; general rule: Except as provided in paragraph (2), not more than 1 claim may be filed under subsection (a)

by any person with respect to the gasoline used during the 1-year period ending on June 30 of any year.

"'(2) Exception: A claim may be filed under subsection (a) by any person with respect to the gasoline (for which he is entitled to payment under subsection (a)) used during the period ending with any calendar quarter, if the claim is filed with respect to the use of at least 100,000 gallons of gasoline. A claim may be filed under subsection (a) pursuant to this paragraph with respect to the use of less than 100,000 gallons of gasoline, if filed—

"'(A) for a period of less than 1 year,

"'(B) for a period ending on June 30 of any year, and

"'(C) by a person who has filed one or more claims under the first sentence of this paragraph with respect to gasoline used during the portion of such year preceding the period for which claim is filed under this sentence.

"'(3) Time for filing: No claim shall be allowed under subsection (a) with respect to gasoline used during the 1-year period ending on June 30 of any year, or during any period ending with any calendar quarter ending with or within such 1-year period, unless filed on or before September 30 of the year in which such 1-year period ends.

"'(c) Meaning of gasoline: For purposes of this section, the term "gasoline" has the meaning given to such term by section 4082 (b).

"'(d) Exempt sales; other payments or refunds available:

"'(1) Exempt sales: No amount shall be paid under this section with respect to any gasoline which the Secretary or his delegate determines was exempt from the tax imposed by section 4081. The amount which (but for this sentence) would be payable under this section with respect to any gasoline shall be reduced by any other amount which the Secretary or his delegate determines is payable under this section, or is refundable under any provisions of this title, to any person with respect to such gasoline.

"'(2) Gasoline used on farms.—This section shall not apply in respect of gasoline which was (within the meaning of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 6420 (c)) used on a farm for farming purposes.

"'(e) Applicable laws:

"'(1) In general: All provisions of law, including penalties, applicable in respect of the tax imposed by section 4081 shall, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with this section, apply in respect of the payments provided for in this section to the same extent as if such payments constituted refunds of overpayments of the tax so imposed.

"'(2) Examination of books and witnesses: For the purpose of ascertaining the correctness of any claim made under this section, or the correctness of any payment made in respect of any such claim, the Secretary or his delegate shall have the authority granted by paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 7602 (relating to examination of books and witnesses) as if the claimant were the person liable for tax.

"'(f) Regulations: The Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe the conditions, not inconsistent with the provisions of this section, under which payments may be made under this section.

"'(g) Effective date: This section shall apply only with respect to gasoline purchased after June 30, 1956, and before July 1, 1972.

"'(h) Cross references:

"'(1) For reduced rate of tax in case of diesel fuel and special motor fuels used for certain nonhighway purposes, see subsections (a) and (b) of section 4041.

"'(2) For civil penalty for excessive claims under this section, see section 6675.

"'(3) For fraud penalties, etc., see chapter 75 (section 7201 and following, relating to crimes, other offenses, and forfeitures).'

"(d) Technical amendments:

"(1) Section 6206 (relating to special rules applicable to excessive claims) is amended—

"(A) by striking out 'section 6420' in the heading and inserting in lieu thereof 'sections 6420 and 6421';

"(B) by inserting after '6420' in the first sentence thereof 'or 6421'; and

"(C) by inserting after '6420' in the second sentence thereof 'or 6421, as the case may be."

"(2) Section 6675 (relating to excessive claims for gasoline used on farms) is amended—

"(A) by striking out 'For Gasoline Used on Farms' in the heading and inserting in lieu thereof 'With Respect to the Use of Certain Gasoline';

"(B) by inserting after '6420 (relating to gasoline used on farms)' in subsection (a) thereof 'or 6421 (relating to gasoline used for certain nonhighway purposes)'; and

"(C) by inserting after '6420' in subsection (b) thereof 'or 6421, as the case may be.'

"(3) Section 7210 (relating to failure to obey summons) is amended by inserting after 'sections 6420 (e) (2),' the following: '6421 (e) (2).'

"(4) Section 7603 (relating to service of summons) and 7604 (relating to enforcement of summons) and the first sentence of section 7605 (relating to time and place of examination) are each amended by inserting after 'section 6420 (e) (2)' wherever it appears a comma and the following: '6421 (e) (2).' The second sentence of section 7605 is amended by inserting after 'section 6420 (e) (2)' the following: 'or 6421 (e) (2).'

"(e) Clerical amendments:

"(1) Section 4084 is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 4084. Cross references.

"'(1) For provisions to relieve farmers from excise tax in the case of gasoline used on the farm for farming purposes, see section 6420.

"'(2) For provisions to relieve purchasers of gasoline from excise tax in the case of gasoline used for certain nonhighway purposes, see section 6421."

"(2) The table of sections for subpart A of part III of subchapter A of chapter 32 is amended by striking out

"'SEC. 4084. Relief of farmers from tax in case of gasoline used on the farm.'

and inserting in lieu thereof

"'SEC. 4084. Cross references.'

"(3) The table of sections for subchapter A of chapter 63 is amended by striking out

"'SEC. 6206. Special rules applicable to excessive claims under section 6420.'

and inserting in lieu thereof

"'SEC. 6206. Special rules applicable to excessive claims under sections 6420 and 6421.'

"(4) The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 65 is amended by striking out

"'SEC. 6421. Cross references.'

and inserting in lieu thereof

"'SEC. 6421. Gasoline used for certain nonhighway purposes.'

"'SEC. 6422. Cross references.'

"(5) Section 6504 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(14) Assessments to recover excessive amounts paid under section 6421 (relating to gasoline used for certain nonhighway purposes) and assessments of civil penalties under section 6675 for excessive claims under section 6421, see section 6206.'

"(6) Section 6511 (f) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(6) For limitations in case of payments under section 6421 (relating to gasoline used for certain nonhighway purposes), see section 6421 (b).'

"(7) Section 6612 (c) is amended by striking out 'and' before '6420' and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ', and 6421 (relating to payments in the case of gasoline used for certain nonhighway purposes).'

"(8) The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 68 is amended by striking out

"'SEC. 6675. Excessive claims for gasoline used on farms.'

and inserting in lieu thereof

"'SEC. 6675. Excessive claims with respect to the use of certain gasoline.'"

On page 84, line 18, after the word "farms", to insert "and for certain nonhighway purposes"; in line 22, after the word "under", to strike out "section 6420 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to amounts paid in respect of gasoline used on farms)" and insert "sections 6420 (relating to amounts paid in respect of gasoline used on farms) and 6421 (relating to amounts paid in respect of gasoline used for certain nonhighway purposes) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954."

On page 85, after line 21, to strike out:

"(g) Apportionments not affected. Nothing in this section shall limit the amount of the apportionments made under any authorization in title I of this act or in any act heretofore or hereafter enacted which amends or supplements the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916."

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

"(g) Adjustments of apportionments—

"The Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time, after consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, estimate the amounts which will be available in the Highway Trust Fund (excluding repayable advances) to defray the expenditures which will be required to be made from such fund. In any case in which the Secretary of the Treasury determines that, after all other expenditures required to be made from the Highway Trust Fund have been defrayed, the amounts which will be available in such fund (excluding repayable advances) will be insufficient to defray the expenditures which will be required as a result of the apportionment to the States of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of the National System of Interstate Highways, he shall so advise the Secretary of Commerce and shall further advise the Secretary of Commerce as to the amount which, after all other expenditures required to be made from such fund have been defrayed, will be available in such fund (excluding repayable advances) to defray the expenditures required as a result of apportionment to the States of Federal-aid highway funds for the National System of Interstate Highways for such fiscal year. The Secretary of Commerce shall determine the percentage which such amount is of the amount authorized to be appropriated for such fiscal year for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of the National System of Interstate Highways and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, shall thereafter apportion to the States for such fiscal year for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of the National System of Interstate Highways, in lieu of the amount which but for the provisions of this subsection would be so apportioned, the amount obtained by multiplying the amount authorized to be appropriated for such fiscal year by such percentage. Whenever the Secretary of the Treasury determines that there will be available in the Highway Trust Fund (excluding repayable advances) amounts which, after all other expenditures required to be made from such fund have been defrayed, will be available to defray the expenditures required as a result of the apportionment of any Federal-aid highway funds for the National System of Interstate

Highways previously withheld from apportionment for any fiscal year, he shall so advise the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Commerce shall apportion to the States such portion of the funds so withheld from apportionment as the Secretary of the Treasury has advised him may be so apportioned without causing expenditures from the Highway Trust Fund for the National System of Interstate Highways to exceed amounts available in such fund (excluding repayable advances) to defray such expenditures. Any funds apportioned pursuant to the provisions of the preceding sentence shall remain available for expenditure until the close of the third fiscal year following that in which apportioned."

On page 89, line 17, after the word "section", to strike out "108 (k)" and insert "102 (e)."

On page 90, line 13, after the numerals "205", to strike out "(a)"; and in the same line, after the numerals "1956", to strike out the comma and "and the amendment made by section 205 (b) shall apply on with respect to gasoline purchased after June 30, 1956."

During the debate on title I,

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for 2 or 3 minutes to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I make this request inasmuch as the Senator from Tennessee has already been interrupted. The remarks I am about to make are in regard to title II, not title I, which now is under consideration. I am sure that my colleagues understand that I must catch a plane, in order to reach my home State.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the last plane tonight which I can take, in order to reach my State in time, will leave at 10:50 p. m. I have an amendment relating to title II, section 2, of the bill.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] has a substitute for that amendment.

My amendment relates to those who operate vehicles on their own private roads—for instance, a logging road, which is the prime example in my State. My amendment provides that those who build their own roads and operate vehicles on them are not to be taxed for the Federal-aid highway system when they use their own private roads. That is now the case in Washington, Oregon, California, Colorado, and other States.

My amendment provides that the tax shall not apply to tires and to gasoline and diesel fuel when the vehicles are operated on private roads. However, as a practical matter I think such a provision would be difficult to apply.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who is concerned with a similar problem which exists in his section of the country, has a substitute amendment, which would allow exemption from the tax in the case of gasoline and diesel fuels used in vehicles operating on private roads.

When we reach title II, I hope the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] will request that my amendment be read, and then will ask that his amendment be substituted for it.

I understand that the amendment probably will be acceptable to the Senators in charge of title II of the bill, which deals with the taxation features. The amendment will simply permit such operators to continue in their present status or situation. Obviously we should not levy such a tax on one who uses his own private road.

So the amendment is a very simple one to administer, because it is easy to ascertain definitely the amount of mileage used on a private road and the amount of mileage used on an interstate primary or secondary road.

I wished to make this statement for the RECORD. I am sure the Senator from Colorado will see that my amendment is called up and then will offer his substitute for it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. At the proper time I shall be very happy to see that the amendment of the Senator from Washington to the committee amendment is called up, and then to offer my amendment as a substitute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Washington knows that I have been supporting the so-called Magnuson amendment to the committee amendment. The explanation of the Senator from Washington of his amendment and of the substitute to be offered by the Senator from Colorado is perfectly satisfactory to me.

I ask unanimous consent to have certain communications in support of these amendments to the committee amendment inserted at this point in the RECORD, in connection with the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], which is to be called up by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who will offer a substitute for the Magnuson amendment.

Mr. THYE. Are the communications in support of the Magnuson amendment?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; they are in support of the original Magnuson amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDMOND, OREG., *May 29, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Senate action scheduled Monday or Tuesday on highway user tax bill H. R. 10660. Senator MAGNUSON will offer floor amendment to eliminate discrimination against logging trucks and provide for tax refunds for use of privately owned or maintained roads based on proportionate mileage formula. We feel you should support equitable recognition of our industries' nonhighway use.

TITE KNOT PINE MOULDING.
H. D. BARCLAY, *Logging.*
DAHL PINE, INC.,
GEO. WAKEFIELD,
Contract Trucking.

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 28, 1956.*

Re H. R. 10660.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge your support Magnuson amendment which provides for tax refunds for use of privately owned or maintained logging and forest protection roads on proportionate mileage formula. Logging and forest products manufacture is principal industry in Douglas Fir region and discriminatory taxation on private road users to build public highways is not equitable.

W. D. HAGENSTEIN,
Executive Vice President, Industrial Forestry Association.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG., *May 28, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The basic theory of H. R. 10660 is that highway users will pay in proportion to their use. Certain aspects of the bill are inconsistent with this theory and would cause to be levied heavy and unjust taxes on the operation using heavy equipment on private roads. In the interests of fairness to all we respectfully urge you to support Senator MAGNUSON's amendment to provide a reduced rate for use on private roads.

WEYERHAEUSER TIMBER CO.,
KLAMATH FALLS BRANCH,
J. B. BISHOP, *Branch Manager.*

BEND, OREG., *May 28, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE, *Washington, D. C.:*

Imperative to future of Oregon timber industry that you support Magnuson floor amendment to highway user tax bill, H. R. 10660. Amendment will eliminate discrimination against logging trucks and provide tax refunds for use of privately owned or maintained roads based on proportionate mileage formula.

CHAS. M. KREIDER,
Assistant Manager, Broks Scanlon, Inc.

SPRINGFIELD, OREG., *May 28, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate:

Senator MAGNUSON's proposed amendment to H. R. 10660 is consistent with the intent of legislation to pay for highway construction by the user in proportion to his use of the public road system. This appears to be a sound method of financing new road construction. I urge you to work with the Senator from Washington to assist him in getting his amendment written in as part of this legislation.

J. O. JULSON,
Pulp Division, Weyerhaeuser Timber Co., Springfield, Oreg.

SPRINGFIELD, OREG., *May 28, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Senator MAGNUSON offering amendment to H. R. 10660 providing reduced rate for us on private roads. Hope you will give this amendment your full support, inasmuch as it vitally affects production of timber, both public and private, throughout State of Oregon. The imposition of pay-as-you-go tax plan on highway users is reasonable but could hardly be extended fairly to nonhighway users. This inequity should be corrected prior to passage of H. R. 10660.

GEORGE H. WEYERHAEUSER,
Manager, Weyerhaeuser Timber Co.

WEYERHAEUSER TIMBER CO.,
Tacoma, Wash., May 17, 1956.

Re H. R. 10660.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Earlier this year we exchanged correspondence about H. R. 9075, the Highway Revenue Act. This has become title II of H. R. 10660.

As you know, a substantial part of every log truck round trip is on either private roads or on United States Forest Service roads which the operator builds and maintains. We see no equitable basis for imposing highway user taxes upon such operations.

We understand that Senator MAGNUSON is introducing an amendment to H. R. 10660 which would limit the impact of the additional taxes to travel on public highways. We urge your support of this amendment.

Very truly yours,

J. E. NOLAN,
Vice President and General Counsel.

KOGAP LUMBER INDUSTRIES,
Medford, Oreg., May 16, 1956.

The Honorable WAYNE F. MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Our attention has been drawn to the highway bill, H. R. 10660, now being considered by the Senate Finance Committee. We understand that as it is now constituted this bill will be highly discriminatory against the log trucking industry in that no allowances are made in the gasoline, tires, and new truck taxes for the considerable off-highway, private-road use that log truckers encounter.

We are sure that you are familiar with the situation in Oregon wherein the lumber industry builds, operates, maintains, and uses many, many miles of private roads each year. It should not be the intention of this particular bill to cause inequities such as this and certainly some provisions should be incorporated to give proper credit for off-highway, private-road use.

We hope you will be successful in bringing this to the attention of the Finance Committee with favorable results.

Sincerely,

KOGAP LUMBER INDUSTRIES.
S. V. MCQUEEN.

WILLAMETTE VALLEY LUMBER CO.,
Dallas, Oreg., April 25, 1956.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Attached is a blind copy of my letter to Senator BYRD explaining how the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (H. R. 9075) as it is presently written will treat the logging industry unfairly.

I will appreciate anything you can do toward obtaining wording in this bill that will protect our industry.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM SWINDELLS,
President.

APRIL 25, 1956.

The Honorable HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I am advised that the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (H. R. 9075) will be considered by your committee in the near future. It is my understanding that the purpose of this bill is to require the users of public highways to finance the new road system to the degree that each uses it. This is to be accomplished by means of additional taxes on fuel and tires.

As the bill is presently written these taxes would also apply to those who are not users of public highways such as a large segment of the logging industry and certain other industries. Our company, for example, has built and maintains many miles of private road on which we operate log trucks and other vehicles. Many of these vehicles are suitable for highway operation and would be taxed accordingly, but in fact, they do not operate on public highways at all. Certainly it is not within the purpose of the act to tax these vehicles along with those which are used on the public highways.

It has been said that the reason for not excluding these off-highway vehicles from these taxes is the difficulty in administering collection. Oregon's present fuel-tax law is administered equitably by refunding the tax on these vehicles and this method could easily be applied on a Federal level. I urge you to give strong consideration to clarifying present language in the act so that those who do not operate vehicles on public highways are not put in the position of having to help pay for them.

Another type of operation which will be affected in a similar manner is those loggers who operate trucks partly on private or Forest Service roads and partly on public highways. These trucks should not have to pay taxes on that part of the road which is not a public highway. This particular matter is also now equitably handled by Oregon's State fuel-tax system in which each truck is required to keep a daily log showing the origin and destination of each load together with the miles it has traveled on public highways and off them. A refund is then granted for those miles not operated on a public highway.

Since both of these problems are now being taken care of at the State level, I feel that they can also be taken care of at the Federal level and your efforts to obtain this will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

WILLAMETTE VALLEY LUMBER CO.,
WILLIAM SWINDELLS, *President.*

KOGAP LUMBER INDUSTRIES,
Medford, Oreg., May 22, 1956.

Senator WAYNE F. MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Our attention has been drawn to the highway bill H. R. 10660 now being considered by the Senate Finance Committee. We understand that as it is now constituted, this bill will be highly discriminatory against the log trucking industry in that no allowances are made in the gasoline, tire, and new truck taxes for the considerable off-highway, private road use that log trucks encounter.

We are sure that you are familiar with the situation in Oregon wherein the lumber industry builds, operates, maintains, and uses many, many miles of private roads each year. It should not be the intention of this particular bill to cause inequities such as this and certainly some provisions should be incorporated to give proper credit for off-highway, private road use.

We hope you will be successful in bringing this to the attention of the Finance Committee with favorable results.

Sincerely yours,

KOGAP VENEER CO.
LEROY WHITE,
Superintendent.

SOLAR LUMBER CORP.,
Medford, Oreg., May 21, 1956.

Senator WAYNE F. MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Our attention has been drawn to the highway bill, H. R. 10660, now being considered by the Senate Finance Committee. We understand that as it is now constituted, this bill will be highly discriminatory against the log trucking industry in that no allowances are made in the gasoline, tire, and new truck taxes for the considerable off-highway, private road use that log trucks encounter.

We are sure that you are familiar with the situation in Oregon wherein the lumber industry builds, operates, maintains, and uses many, many miles of private roads each year. It should not be the intention of this particular bill to cause inequities such as this and certainly some provisions should be incorporated to give proper credit for off-highway, private road use.

We hope you will be successful in bringing this to the attention of the Finance Committee with favorable results.

Sincerely yours,

SOLAR LUMBER CORP.,
JERRY S. LAUSMANN,
President.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Senator from Washington whether the amendment can be effectively administered in the forest areas of the Nation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. THYE. Is there a way to determine when such operations will be on either private roads or public roads?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is done now in most of the States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Washington has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is done now in all the States involved in this matter; it is done in connection with the State gasoline tax.

It is a very simple matter. No one "cheats" on it, because there is no way to do so. A logging operation which uses 20 miles of a public road and 10 miles of private road simply pays two-thirds of the tax which normally would be paid for the use of 30 miles of public road.

Mr. THYE. Is that the practice in Washington?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, and in all the other States in which logging operations are conducted.

Mr. THYE. I understand that the Senator from Washington proposes that in connection with this Federal law, that situation shall be recognized in the same manner it is recognized in the case of the State of Washington and other States which similarly provide for such tax exemption.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, that is all that will be done by my amendment and by the substitute amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield briefly to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to say, for the benefit of the Senator from Minnesota, that the State of Oregon has more forest area and more lumber operations than does any other State. As a former member of the legislature of Oregon, I am familiar with the exemptions which the logging companies have had when their operations have been conducted on their own roads, roads which they have constructed.

It was the opinion of the Public Utilities Commission, which enforces the collection of highway taxes, that there was

very little, if any, serious evasion under the State law.

I think the amendment of the Senator from Washington and the substitute amendment of the Senator from Colorado would be carried out by the same methods of enforcement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have been reminded that I stated that the loggers did not cheat because they could not. They do not want to. Even though someone might want to cheat, there would be no way to do so.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Would this amendment qualify the miner who is operating trucks in the area of the iron ore pits, and over his own system of roads?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. The substitute of the Senator from Colorado, which also involves a great many mining roads, accepts the definition of a highway which is now in the bill, and which defines highways very carefully. The other roads are private roads, operated by mining operators, logging operators, and others. They are the two prime examples. What is now being done in all the States could be done with respect to such operators.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks a statement on this subject by the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, together with a statement by Mr. Loran L. Stewart, of Cottage Grove, Oreg., who sets forth the problem very clearly.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL LUMBER MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION WITH RESPECT TO THE REVENUE FEATURES OF H. R. 10660, THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY ACT OF 1956, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, MAY 17, 1956

The lumber industry is greatly concerned over the revenue provisions of this highway bill. The history of the bill shows an intent to make a greatly expanded program of highway construction self-financing through use of so-called highway user taxes on the theory that beneficiaries of an improved highway system should bear the tax burden. To raise the needed revenue, the bill would increase existing Federal excises on gasoline, diesel and special motor fuels, tires and trucks. A new tax would be imposed on retread rubber and an annual fee imposed on use of the highway by heavy trucks. In general, the bill makes a nearly complete assumption—yet an erroneous one—that use of trucks is synonymous with public highway use. It almost completely ignores the fact that trucks may be tools used by people who are not primarily engaged in the business of transportation on the highways. The tax theory of this bill fails to consider that the lumber industry in its logging operations, extending over several hundred million acres of commercial forest land in private and public ownership, uses a vast network of roads built and maintained by the industry itself. Where the industry uses and benefits from the expanded highway program contemplated by this bill, it stands in the same position as all highway users and should bear its share of the tax load. But if tax increases or new taxes are imposed for construction and use of public highways, it is grossly inequitable to extend such taxes to the use of logging trucks and to the enormous quantities of fuel and rubber consumed by them in operating over private roads.

STATISTICS ON USE OF TRUCKS, FUEL, AND TIRES IN THE LOGGING INDUSTRY

Motortrucks are the backbone of the logging industry. During the past 20 years there has been an almost complete transition of logging methods from use of railroads to use of trucks. A survey made by the Forest Service shows that as of January 1, 1951, the commercial logging industry had on hand 123,618 motortrucks; of these more than 10 percent or 13,194 were over 26,000 pounds GVW. In addition there were in use 32,139 heavy trailers of which more than 10,000 were of the double-axle type. Most of the truck-trailer combinations in use would have weights over 26,000 pounds. Each year the logging industry purchases in the neighborhood of 30,000 new trucks, about 1,500 of which are rated 26,000 pounds GVW and over.

Consumption of gasoline, diesel fuel and special fuels in logging amounts to some 400 million gallons a year. Some of the fuel is consumed in other than highway-type equipment, but it may be conservatively estimated that logging trucks use as much as a quarter of a billion gallons of fuel a year.

More than 800,000 new tires and recaps are mounted annually by the logging industry (not including those on new trucks). At least 75 percent of these are 8.25 in diameter and larger, which means 100 pounds or more weight per tire. In addition, there are vast quantities of mobile logging equipment which, while not operated on the highways, use tires of the type used on highway equipment.

FUEL AND TIRE COSTS ARE A MAJOR ITEM IN LOGGING COSTS

A few basic facts about logging and logging roads clearly reveal that these proposed taxes for use of the highways, in addition to being highly discriminatory, place an undue hardship upon the industry. As pointed out in the forestry handbook of the Society of American Foresters, logging is the key to good forestry and sustained-yield management. Logging costs are usually the major item in the end cost of forest products. They have risen steeply in recent years, much more so than our other costs. Efficient and economical logging is essential to forest management.

A study presented before the Sierra-Cascade logging conference last year by Prof. Henry J. Vaux of the University of California, School of Forestry, revealed that logging and log transport costs were by far the greatest single item of cost in manufacturing lumber in a respresentative mill—amounting to a third of the total. His study showed that in the past 20 years log transportation costs were up 62 percent as compared to only a 22-percent increase in mill overhead and a 24-percent increase in cost of planing, shipping, and selling. A wartime study of the War Production Board, concerned with the enormous quantities of fuel and rubber consumed in logging, found that forest road hauling cost from 3 to 6 times as much per round-trip mile as hauling over public highways and that cost of fuel and rubber alone may exceed costs of labor, equipment, repair, and depreciation.

A comprehensive study of logging costs by the Forest Service in 1947, made from operators' records, placed the cost of a complete set of tires for 8 different classes of logging truck-trailer combinations in common use in the West at $1,650 for the lightest class and $9,400 for the highest. The tire cost per mile of operation averaged 12 cents on gravel roads and 16 cents on dirt roads for the lightest class, and 43 cents and 57 cents per mile, respectively, for the heaviest class. Since this study was made there have been very sharp price increases.

The fact that fuel and rubber costs are so high has led to use of rather elaborate record-keeping systems, replete with tables and performance charts and graphs showing the logger how to wring the best possible performance from his equipment in operating over varying road and load conditions. Some companies maintain detailed records for each and every tire, showing serial numer, date mounted, date changed, wheel position, mileage, cause of removal, etc., and classes of road surfaces operated over. It has been appropriately pointed out that tire cost "spells the difference between marginal and profitable logging." This is important because the availability of records justifies our petition for seeking a refund of highway-user taxes to the extent we operate over our own roads. The fact that detailed tire records are kept goes far in refuting statements that a refund provision will present administrative difficulties.

ROAD SYSTEMS BUILT OR MAINTAINED BY THE LUMBER INDUSTRY

The fact that fuel and rubber is a major portion of total logging costs has a direct bearing upon our high expenditures for road construction. The cost of hauling is a rather complex function of the type of road surface, the degree of curves, the grades, and the loads carried. It follows then that roads are the key to good forest management and protection—a corollary of the statement above that logging is the key to good forestry and sustained-yield management. Not only does the lumber industry build and maintain annually thousands of miles of roads over privately owned forest lands, but it builds and maintains at its own expense thousands of miles of access roads across public lands. In a representative situation in the West a mile of improved road is needed for each million board-feet of timber harvested. That figure may be conservative applied to the South and East where the timber volume per acre is not as heavy as in the West. Based on a 40 billion board-foot log production, the lumber industry builds thousands of miles of roads annually—ranging from graded dirt roads to those that compare favorably with public roads in cost and quality.

A recent study of 24 lumber operations in the Douglas fir region revealed that the average cost of privately built mainline timber access roads was $26,500 per mile; secondary roads averaged $18,900 per mile. One Oregon lumber company completed a $1 million timber access road system in an isolated and rugged mountain drainage, involving 30 miles of mainline and 15 miles of spur. At one point, where solid rock was encountered, the cost soared to $100,000 per mile rate.

This road will be used by some 20 small-business men—independent log-hauling contractors who will pay, directly or indirectly, nominal fees for the use of this road and its maintenance. In time the road will become available to public use as do most timber-access roads. Since this road was built and will be maintained by private funds, it would be most unfair to impose highway-user taxes on the fuel and rubber consumed, or on use of trucks, operating over them.

It is estimated that 14,200 miles of timber-access roads are needed in the national forests to bring them up to their full allowable cut under sustained-yield management; about 9,000 of these miles will be built by timber purchasers, at an estimated cost of $100 million.

NONHIGHWAY USE REFUND PROVISIONS ARE FEASIBLE

The House Ways and Means Committee in its report (H. Rept. 1899) on the tax provisions included in the highway bill (H. R. 10660) states (p. 4):

"The bill imposes the additional tax with respect to motor fuels used in a highway vehicle (motor vehicle for special motor fuels) whether or not the fuel is consumed

while the vehicle is on a public highway because of the administrative problem in determining the extent of the use of these vehicles off the highways."

Again, with respect to the additional tire tax and the new tax on retread rubber, it is stated on page 5 of the report:

"It is necessary to base the additional taxes on tires used on highway vehicles because of the difficult administrative problems which would be involved in attempting to base the taxes on the actual use to which the tires are placed."

Regardless of these statements, the growth of motor fuel and other similar user taxes by the States to finance their highway programs has led to general recognition of off-highway uses. The States have developed well-defined procedures for allowing either exemptions or refunds in the case of taxes imposed upon use of a motor vehicle or upon fuel where the operation is entirely or partially over privately owned or privately maintained roads. In almost all instances, the refund method is used in preference to an original exemption in the case of fuel used off the highway.

Studies by the Federation of Tax Administrators show that all but three States have refund provisions in the case of gasoline taxes and the cost of administering such refund provisions is negligible in comparison to revenue collections. For example, the maximum cost reported by any one State for administering its refund provision was about one-half of 1 percent of its gross gasoline collections and the cost of administering the refund provision for a third of the States making refunds, was about one-tenth of 1 percent of gross collections. Numerous provisions are resorted to by the States to render these provisions administratively feasible from the tax-collecting viewpoint, such as: licensing of dealer; licensing of users or refund applicants; record keeping, reporting, and invoicing requirements; limitations on frequency and timing of refund claims; minimum claims both as to volume and dollars involved.

Illustrative of State provisions that meet the peculiar requirements of the logging and lumber industries, which build or maintain tens of thousands of miles of their roads over which their vehicles are operated are the fuel refund and public highway use taxes of the States of Idaho and Oregon, both of which make allowance for refunds in the case of fuel consumed or motor vehicles operated on privately owned or maintained roads.

Operating records maintained on logging truck mileage and tire use make administration of a refund provision administratively feasible. Another factor further simplifies calculation of off-highway use of logging trucks: most log hauling is done between two well-defined points—from the "landing" area, where the logs are assembled in the woods, to the mill. It is very easy to keep a record of mileage between these points and the proportion of private road use and public highway use involved. And when the logging operation pushes deeper into the woods, the mileage over the public highway remains constant. In fact, the typical timber-sales contract in the West usually has a map attached showing very clearly the log transport route followed. Objections that it will be hard to determine off-highway use cannot stand up. Records maintained by operators on their fuel consumption, tire use, and miles traveled afford an easy way of administering a tax drawback provision under the Treasury's regulations. Certainly in many States, the tax administrators rely upon operator's records for diesel-fuel taxes imposed solely on public highway use and for the ton-mile tax imposed on mileage over public highways. There is no reason the Federal Government cannot do likewise.

Shall relief from taxes for off-highway use be denied to the overwhelming majority of small operators who, though operating almost entirely on privately owned or maintained roads, have to travel a short distance over the public highway as an incident of getting logs to a mill? Will the small operator be denied a refund for his off-highway use because he has to move 1, 2, or 3 miles on a public highway? This feature is worthy of the committee's careful consideration. Each year the proportion of use of privately built roads is growing and logging areas are pushed deeper into the woods.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is noted that the committee report of the House Ways and Means Committee on this bill states it "to be the policy of Congress that if the distribution of the tax burden among the various classes of persons using the highways or deriving benefits from them is not equitable, Congress is to enact legislation to bring about an equitable distribution." This is significant. It is implicit recognition that highway-user taxes might prove inequitable when applied to certain classes of highway users. The point is then these taxes are clearly inequitable when applied to nonhighway use. There seems no reason to await further studies. The bill should be immediately amended to recognize nonhighway use to a far greater degree than it does.

In concluding it is emphasized that the lumber industry is not seeking special privilege. It is not asking for exemption from either the existing rates of taxes or the proposed rates. What is recommended is that this Senate Committee on Finance amend the House-passed bill to recognize nonhighway use of fuel, rubber, and trucks by setting up a refund provision to the extent that highway vehicles operate over privately owned, built, or maintained roads. Such refunds should be limited to the amount of the tax increases proposed by the bill and the new taxes imposed. Contrary to the implications of the House committee's report, such drawback provisions are feasible and simple to administer. There is wide precedent and experience among the States in administering such refund procedures. We recommend that the Treasury Department's problems be simplified by giving it broad power to prescribe regulations and to place the burden of proof upon the nonhighway user applying for refund of taxes paid.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ACT OF 1956, H. R. 10660

(Statement of Loran L. Stewart, in behalf of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, before the Senate Committee on Finance, May 17, 1956)

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the committee, I am Loran L. Stewart, of Cottage Grove, Oreg. I am president of the Bohemia Lumber Co., located east of Cottage Grove, Oreg. We are a small company; we do not own any timber of our own and are entirely dependent upon the United States Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management for our supply.

I am director of the Industrial Forestry Association and a member of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association of Portland, Oreg., both of which are organizations of loggers, forest owners and lumber manufacturers in the Douglas fir region. I am here representing my own area and also the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, a nationwide organization of the lumber industry. With your permission, I would like to file for the record a statement prepared by the national association on the revenue features of H. R. 10660, the highway bill, as it affects logging and off-highway use of logging trucks.

I have had the good fortune of being a member of the Oregon State Legislature for the last 3 sessions. In 2 of them I was a member of the House Highways Committee as well as the Highway Interim Committee. At the present time I am chairman of the House Taxation Committee so I am somewhat familiar with both highway and tax problems in the State of Oregon.

Highways are one of our important assets and we in Oregon have bonded ourselves to the limit of our capacity for construction of important highways, and we are still short of the necessary transportation facilities. We in Oregon, and I am certain the lumber and logging industry of the Pacific Northwest and the United States are wholeheartedly in accord with an improved highway system. We also recognize that an expanded highway construction program is going to cost a great deal of money and someone must pay the bill. We should bear our fair share of the cost because we will benefit proportionately in marketing our products.

But there is a feature of this highway bill that gives wholly inadequate consideration to the problems of our industry and which on its face is highly discriminatory and inequitable. As I understand the intent of this bill from reading the House committee's report, the highway user will pay the cost of building the proposed highways through higher taxes on motor fuels, tires, and trucks. This idea seems to be brought out clearly by the fact that gasoline used in boats and airplanes is exempted from the tax increase and, as indicated in the committee report, the tax will not apply to operation of mammoth trucks used exclusively off the highways. It would be consistent with this approach that all equipment used off the public highways should be exempt from the tax increases, or allowed refunds to the extent that taxes are imposed and paid; also equitable allowance should be made for the fact that trucks operate both on and off the highways.

I estimate that over three-fourths of the logging trucks in the Pacific Northwest are off-highway users during some portion of their trip from the loading point in the woods where logs are assembled to the point where they are dumped in the millpond or mill yard. The tax increases and the new taxes proposed in this bill will fall heavily upon our industry and particularly upon the small independent contractor engaged in logging. The bill in its present form is highly discriminatory because:

1. It taxes us for use of our own trucks over our own roads which we have already built and paid for.

2. Notwithstanding that loggers will pay highway use taxes under this bill, they will have to continue to build and maintain thousands of miles of roads annually at their own expense.

Since the Federal Government seems to be embarking for the first time on the highway use theory of taxation recognized in many States, what our industry is seeking before this committee is recognition from the start that nonhighway use—that is, operation of motor vehicles over privately owned, privately built, or privately maintained roads—should not be subject to highway use taxes. My own State of Oregon recognizes this principle.

May I diverge here to explain the workings of the pertinent part of the Oregon law? It is based fundamentally on two principles: First, the privilege tax which is, in effect, the license fee. Any truck or car that travels a mile or 100,000 miles on our highways is subject to this tax. A completely off-the-highway vehicle does not pay this tax because it is not privileged to use the highways. Second, the "use" tax which takes two forms: One, the gasoline tax which in effect says the more miles you use the highways, the more tax you pay. Two, the weight-mile tax which applies to heavier ve-

hicles. The scale of this tax is graduated from the lowest weight to the highest weight vehicles, so in effect the more weight they carry, the more money they pay to use the highways. I believe, gentlemen, that this is exactly what this bill is attempting to do—the more gasoline or rubber used, that is, the more miles traveled, the higher the taxes.

Now let me explain a little of the mechanics of the operation of our use tax. Gasoline used in vehicles not operating on public highways is not subject to the gasoline use tax. If a logging truck operates over 10 miles of private roads and over 10 miles of public roads, the operator can apply for a refund on the gasoline consumed over the private roads, based on proportionate mileage, and on records that the Secretary of State requires him to keep.

The weight-mile tax I spoke of, which is also a use tax, is based on the same principle. If a logging truck operates over 10 miles of private road and over 10 miles of public road, it pays the weight-mile tax only on the mileage traveled over the public road. The mileage and trip records are kept on forms prescribed by the Public Utilities Commissioner, who makes periodic audits to see that proper payment is made.

Now, gentlemen, this has proved to be a relatively easy system to administer. Let me give the history of a test that was performed to determine the accuracy of collections and the extent of evasion, if any. In 1954, the Oregon State Highway Interim Committee, of which I was then a member, wanted to determine the operation of the weight-mile tax in Oregon. The committee hired an independent out-of-State organization, the Stanford Research Institute, to examine the records and results. They spent about 4 months in Oregon making various checks in cooperation with State police, highway officials and other agencies. After a very detailed analysis, they found that Oregon was losing on the first direct return 3.4 percent of the taxes due. This was phenomenally low and did not reflect a true picture of the satisfactory operation of the system because this deficiency was picked up in the course of regular audits by the Public Utilities Commission. I am sure the Stanford report is available if this committee would like to examine it.

The experience of my State amply refutes the implications found in the report of the House Ways and Means Committee on this bill that allowances for nonhighway use, as urged by our and other industries before the committee, would be difficult to administer. Further, I think the principle of our proportionate mileage tax based on allowances for mileage operated over privately owned or maintained roads could be extended to use of tires. The statement of the national association that I have filed covers adequately the fact that rubber is a very substantial item of cost in logging operations due to the classes of roads over which we operate. For this reason, logging operators keep detailed cost records on tire use, sometimes by individual tires upon which refund allowances could be based to the extent these tires are used off the highways. Such allowances might also be based on records kept for nonhighway use of fuel or the weight-mile tax, using the proportionate mileage principle. I might say that all the breaks would be in favor of the Government as our consumption of fuel and rubber may be 2 to 6 times as high operating over logging roads as over public highways.

In conclusion, I would like to say that highway-use taxes are so clearly discriminatory when applied to off-highway use, Congress should immediately and completely recognize the fact in this bill. There is no reason to defer this until studies are made as to whether highway-use taxes are equitable as applied to all classes of highway users. Broad powers may be given to the Treasury Department to prescribe regulations governing refund provisions and to place the burden of proof upon the nonhighway user applying for refund of taxes paid. Such refunds should be limited to the tax increases proposed in this bill or to the amount of the new taxes proposed. It is my understanding that Senator MAGNUSON of Washington will offer an amendmet to this effect.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senators for their indulgence. I ask unanimous consent that this colloquy be placed in the RECORD after the remarks pertaining to title I, and at the appropriate place in connection with the debate on title II.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Title II is open to amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in conformity with my agreement with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] I call up the amendment which he has submitted, and as a substitute therefor I offer my amendments, designated 5–28–56–P, and ask that the amendments be not stated, but printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments offered by Mr. ALLOTT, as a substitute for the amendment of Mr. MAGNUSON, are as follows:

On page 51, line 13, after "highway)", insert "or as a fuel in a diesel-powered highway vehicle while such vehicle is not being used on a highway."

On page 51, line 22, after "highway)", insert "or as a fuel in a diesel-powered highway vehicle on a highway, as the case may be."

On page 52, line 17, after "highway)", insert "or sold or used as a fuel for the propulsion of a highway vehicle while such vehicle is not being used on a highway."

On page 53, line 1, after "highway)", insert "or is used as a fuel for the propulsion of a highway vehicle on a highway, as the case may be."

On page 68, line 19, after "way)", insert ", or as a fuel in a diesel-powered highway vehicle while such vehicle is not being used on a highway."

On page 69, line 3, after "highway)", insert ", or used or resold for use as a fuel for the propulsion of a highway vehicle while such vehicle is not being used on a highway."

On page 71, strike out lines 8 through 16, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"(a) Nonhighway uses: If gasoline—

"(1) is used otherwise than as a fuel in a highway vehicle which (at the time of such use) is registered, or required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country (or, in the case of a highway vehicle owned by the United States, which is used on the highway), or

"(2) is used as a fuel in any such highway vehicle while such highway vehicle is not being used on a highway.

the Secretary or his delegate shall pay (without interest) to the ultimate purchaser of such gasoline an amount equal to 1 cent for each gallon of gasoline so used."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc. The question is on agreeing, en bloc, to the amendments offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as I understand, the amendments apply only to gasoline and diesel fuel.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I accept the amendments.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two letters written in support of the amendments be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

J. STANLEY WEIDMAN, INC.,
Durango, Colo., May 16, 1956.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
United States Senator,
Senate Chambers, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GORDON: Your attention is directed to highway bill H. R. 10660, which we favor with exceptions.

As you know, as loggers, we are required in our operations to use both the highway, and many miles of road off the highway in the woods. For the last calendar year we spent $52,381.41 in constructing roads and the maintenance was $34,904.82. A conservative figure on our gasoline expense is 60 percent off highway and 40 percent on the highway. I think these figures may proportionately apply to other loggers, and of course we are approaching you in behalf of the industry as well as for our personal preservation. It would be unfair for us to be required to pay special highway tax on gasoline used off the highway.

A letter from you indicating how you view this matter will be appreciated, and meanwhile we hope that should the bill come up for vote you will give the matter close scrutiny and not penalize loggers with the additional tax.

Regards,

STAN,
President.

DENVER, COLO., *May 18, 1956.*

Subject: Inequitable tax on loggers in new highway bill.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
United States Senator,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: The new highway bill, H. R. 10660, passed by the House last month and now before the Senate Finance Committee proposes a multi-billion-dollar long-range Federal highway program to be financed through tax provisions which, in some respects, are seriously discriminatory against the pole and sawlog industry.

The purpose of the above bill is to require the highway users, as the beneficiaries of the program, to pay the cost of building the highways. An effort is made in the bill to limit the increased rates and new taxes to vehicles used on, or suitable for use on the highways. However, a vehicle used partly on and partly off the highway would be subject to all of the taxes, even though the highway use is an insignificant part of the total use. This feature, as applied to logging, is most inequitable and should be corrected.

If an exemption for off-highway use of fuel, tires, and mobile equipment is administratively impractical, as claimed by the Treasury Department, a refund can and should be provided where the operator can affirmatively show from his records the extent to which fuel, tires, and mobile equipment subject to tax were actually used off the highway.

Much of the estimated quarter-billion gallons of taxable fuel and million tires used each year by the industry is unrelated to public highways. Between our two treating plants here in Denver, Colo., this company

operates 18 pieces of mobile equipment that never leaves company property and in no way can be related to public highways. In our woods operations in the Tabernash, Granby, Walden, Fort Collins and Breckenridge, Colo., logging areas, this company operates approximately 20 pieces of mobile equipment on logging roads built and maintained by the company. At the present time this company maintains approximately 144 miles of logging roads in order to harvest our timber products. The inequity of taxing loggers on use of the roads they built themselves should be obvious.

Providing a refund for nonhighway use of fuel, tires, and mobile equipment is the simple and logical answer. That it is also a practical answer is evidenced by the fact that most States have some provision for refund of gasoline and similar taxes. Congress recently enacted a provision for refunding gasoline taxes paid by farmers and the pending highway bill already extends the refund provisions of the tax laws and in the case of gasoline used otherwise than as a fuel in a highway vehicle, for gasoline and other fuels used in local transportation systems and for retread rubber not used in recapping highway-type tires.

The bill would require the Secretary of Commerce to make studies to enable Congress to determine "an equitable distribution of the tax burden among the different classes of persons using the Federal-aid highways or deriving benefits from these highways." In the case of off-highway use of motor vehicles in logging, there should be no need to await studies and reports. Since it is off-highway use, there is no reason why equitable distribution cannot be achieved by provision for refund of such taxes in the case of nonhighway use not covered by specific exemption.

The wood-preserving industry and lumber industry are most important in your State of Colorado as well as in a number of other Rocky Mountain States, and are engaged in a highly competitive business essential to the economy of our country. These industries should not be burdened with inequitable taxes. These western industries will appreciate your full effort to relieve an anticipated difficult and apparently complicated situation.

Yours very truly,

BRODERICK WOOD PRODUCTS CO.,
S. A. TAIT, *General Manager.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing, en bloc, to the amendments offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I call up my amendments designated "5–15–56–A."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendments.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be not stated, but printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments offered by Mr. FULBRIGHT are as follows:

On page 78, after line 7, insert the following:

"SEC. 211. Adjustment of corporate normal tax and surtax rates.

(a) Corporate normal tax rate: Section 11 (b) (relating to rate of corporate normal tax) is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Normal tax: The normal tax is equal to 22 percent of the taxable income.'

"(b) Corporate surtax rate: Section 11 (c) (relating to rate of corporate surtax) is amended by striking out '22 percent' and inserting in lieu thereof '31 percent.'

"(c) Certain mutual insurance companies:

"(1) Normal tax rate: Section 821 (a) (1) (A) (relating to rate of normal tax on certain mutual insurance companies) is amended to read as follows:

"'(A) Normal tax: A normal tax of 22 percent of the mutual insurance company taxable income, or 44 percent of the amount by which such taxable income exceeds $3,000, whichever is the lesser; plus.'

"(2) Surtax rate: Section 821 (a) (1) (B) (relating to rate of surtax on certain mutual insurance companies) is amended by striking out '22 percent' and inserting in lieu thereof '31 percent.'

"(d) Interinsurers and reciprocal underwriters:

"(1) Normal tax rate: Section 821 (b) (1) (relating to rate of normal tax on certain interinsurers and reciprocal underwriters) is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) Normal tax: A normal tax of 22 percent of the mutual insurance company taxable income, or 44 percent of the amount by which such taxable income exceeds $50,000, whichever is the lesser; plus.'

"(2) Surtax rate: Section 821 (b) (2) of such Code (relating to rate of surtax on certain interinsurers and reciprocal underwriters) is amended to read as follows:

"'(2) Surtax: A surtax of 31 percent of the mutual insurance company taxable income (computed as provided in subsection (a) (1)) in excess of $25,000, or 46.5 percent of the amount by which such taxable income exceeds $50,000, whichever is the lesser.'"

On page 78, line 8, strike out "SEC. 211" and in lieu thereof insert "SEC. 212."

On page 78, line 11, strike out "and the" and in lieu thereof insert "the"; and in line 13, after "1956" insert the following: ", and the amendments made by section 211 shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after June 30, 1956."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate be in order. We cannot hear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a statement explaining the provisions of the amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

II. NEED TO RETAIN EARNINGS

OBTAINING EQUITY CAPITAL

Small businesses have three principal sources for funds with which to maintain and expand production: First, new capital investment; second, borrowing; and third, business earnings.

Small business has difficulty in obtaining equity capital because it does not have the large financial resources which will guarantee stockholders against severe loss on their investment. A small-business man who needs equity capital usually is told that the expense of raising up to $300,000 in the securities market averages almost 20 percent and may reach 25 percent or 30 percent. He may ask, "Why," and point to the recent Ford or General Motors issues where the expense was a small fraction of 1 percent. But he must face the uncomfortable fact that it will cost him 40 or 50 times as much to tap the capital markets as it costs the larger corporations.

HIGH INTEREST ON BORROWED MONEY

Because of the difficulty in obtaining equity financing, the small-business man usually must borrow money for a short term from a bank or other lender to realize his capital needs. Long-term borrowings in the securities markets would be subject to the same difficulties as equity financing. Interest rates are commonly established at 6 percent or even higher for the small-business man. The large corporations may either float a debt issue of securities or borrow money at interest rates of 3½ percent or 4 percent for long terms. This gives larger corporations a competitive advantage which reduces their costs and, therefore, could result in lower prices to customers or higher returns on their stockholders' investments.

In this connection, however, it is interesting to note that the lower costs made possible by these competitive advantages are not necessarily passed on to consumers. The FTC–SEC Quarterly Financial Report for the 2d quarter of 1955 shows that corporate profits as a percentage of sales rise in proportion to the asset size of the corporation. For example, the smallest corporations (assets under $250,000) earned only 1.1 cents per dollar of sales, while the largest corporations ($100 million and over) were earning 7.4 cents per dollar of sales. This disparity in profits occurs while the largest manufacturing corporations increased their sales volume by 19 percent between the 3d quarter of 1954 and the 3d quarter of 1955, in contrast to a mere 3 percent increase in sales volume of the smallest manufacturing corporation. Thus, the small manufacturer is losing out in both volume of sales and percent of profit per dollar of sales.

NEED TO RETAIN EARNINGS

Since equity capital is generally not available and since interest rates on borrowings are so high, the only solution for most small businesses is to plow earnings back into the businesses. Tax relief is a positive answer to this problem. Without tax relief the number of small-business failures will continue upward.

III. BUSINESS CONDITIONS

BUSINESS FAILURES

These are the statistics on business failures for the last 6 years—the President's Economic Report of January 24, 1956, page 231:

1949	9,246
1950	9,162
1951	8,058
1952	7,611
1953	8,862
1954	11,086
1955	10,969

The number of business failures was dropping steadily from 1949 through 1952—the number in 1952 being almost 18 percent lower than in 1949. Beginning in 1953 the number of failures began to rise, and by 1955 failures were over 44 percent higher than in 1952. In no year since 1941 have there been more business failures than there were in 1954 and 1955—and it is common knowledge that these statistics relate almost exclusively to failures of small businesses.

Furthermore, 1956 promises to be the worst year since 1940. Failures in January were 1,048, in February they were 1,024, and in March were 1,170. At this rate total failures for 1956 will be almost 13,000—the highest since 1940.

MERGERS

The following table on mergers was supplied by the Federal Trade Commission:

Number of mergers and acquisitions in manufacturing and mining

Year	Number of mergers	Year	Number of mergers
1919	438	1938	110
1920	760	1939	87
1921	487	1940	140
1922	309	1941	111
1923	311	1942	118
1924	368	1943	213
1925	554	1944	324
1926	856	1945	333
1927	870	1946	419
1928	1,058	1947	404
1929	1,245	1948	223
1930	799	1949	126
1931	464	1950	219
1932	203	1951	235
1933	120	1952	288
1934	101	1953	295
1935	130	1954	387
1936	126	1955	525
1937	124		

This table shows that after the peak merger years of 1928 and 1929, mergers declined rather steadily until 1942. There was a significant rise during the war years and a tapering off in 1948 and 1949. From 1950 through 1953 there were less than 300 mergers per year. In 1954, however, the number rose to 387 and in 1955 to 525. The number of mergers for 1955 is the highest for any year since 1930. I think that this is a significant indication of business conditions and that high corporate tax rates on small businesses are a contributing factor to the increase.

INCREASE OF OPERATING BUSINESSES

Another set of statistics which should be of grave concern to the Senate is the reduction in the rate of increase of operating businesses. Page 231 of the President's economic report of January 24, 1956, contains the following data:

Year	Net increase of operating businesses
1949	52,000
1950	50,000
1951	58,000
1952	59,000
1953	26,000
1954	−4,000
1955	(1)

[1] Not available.

Although final figures for 1955 are not available, it appears that the increase in business firms for 1955 will be no higher than the increase in 1953. These statistics show that the average increase in the number of operating businesses for the 4-year period for 1949 through 1952 was approximately 55,000. In 1953 this steady increase declined over 50 percent, and in 1954 there was an actual net reduction in the number of operating businesses of 4,000. In fact, 1954 is the only year since 1943 in which there has been a reduction in the number of operating businesses in this country.

EARNINGS AFTER TAXES

Another indicator of the need for small-business tax relief is shown by the following statistics on the earnings, after taxes, of manufacturing corporations:

United States manufacturing corporation earnings (after taxes) by asset size

[Index: 1947–49=100]

Year [1]	Index of earnings: Assets under $1 million	Index of earnings: Assets over $1 million	Disparity in favor of large concerns	Average disparity
1947	98	143	45	
1948	103	112	19	
1949	55	90	35	
1950	122	130	8	22
1951	96	106	10	
4th quarter 1952	86	103	17	
4th quarter 1953	49	103	54	
4th quarter 1954	59	119	60	58
1st quarter 1955	68	127	59	

[1] Annually 1947–51.

Source: 5th Semiannual Report, Small Business Administration.

The computation of disparity in favor of large concerns is made for the purpose of comparison. Using 1947–49 as an index of 100, the earnings index of large concerns averaged 22 points higher than the index for small firms throughout the period of 1947–52. In the years 1953, 1954, and 1955, however, this average disparity has risen to 58 index points. In other words, the relative disadvantage in earnings of small manufacturing corporations has almost tripled in the last 3 years.

EARNINGS ON EQUITY (AFTER TAXES)

Also pertinent to the consideration of tax relief for small business is the following table of earnings, after taxes, on stockholders' equity:

United States manufacturing corporations' earnings (after taxes) on stockholders' equity by asset size

[Expressed in percentage]

Annual rate for year	Index of earnings on equity: Assets under $1 million	Index of earnings on equity: Assets over $1 million	Disparity in favor of large concerns	Average disparity
1947	16.3	15.5	−0.8	
1948	12.6	16.3	3.7	
1949	7.0	10.6	3.6	
1950	12.5	15.7	3.2	2.8
1951	9.0	12.6	3.6	
1952	7.9	10.6	2.7	
1953	7.1	10.8	3.7	
1954	5.4	10.3	4.9	4.7
1955	6.9	12.3	5.4	

Source: 5th Semiannual Report, Small Business Administration.

This table shows that the percentage of earnings on stockholders' equity has declined 1 percent for small businesses from 1952 to 1955, but that the percentage for large businesses has increased 1.7 percent during the same period. Furthermore, throughout the period 1947 to 1952 large firms returned to stockholders an average of only 2.8 percent more than did small firms. But in the last 3 years, 1952–55, earnings on equity for large corporations have averaged 4.7 percent higher than the earnings on equity of smaller corporations. The position of the owners of small businesses has declined steadily since 1952.

For the further information of the Senate, I submit recent statistics on the net income after taxes of manufacturing corporations. These statistics show that in the third quarter of 1955 manufacturing corporations with assets of $100 million or more made 63.2 percent more income after taxes than in the same quarter of 1952. In fact, for the first 9 months of 1955 they averaged 63.8 percent more income after taxes than in the first 9 months of 1952.

In contrast with this phenomenal increase for big businesses, corporations with assets of less than $1 million made 15.6 percent less in the first 9 months of 1955 than they made in the first 9 months of 1952.

Net income after taxes of manufacturing corporations

[Listed by quarters and in millions of dollars]

Grouped by size of assets	1952 1st	1952 2d	1952 3d	1952 4th	1953 1st	1953 2d	1953 3d	1953 4th	1954 1st	1954 2d	1954 3d	1954 4th	1955 1st	1955 2d	1955 3d
All assets (total)	2,562	2,597	2,590	2,965	2,847	3,031	2,871	2,591	2,595	2,922	2,658	3,057	3,335	3,878	3,735
Under $250,000	71	104	110	23	54	102	84	−30	1	58	58	−25	24	36	72
$250,000 to $999,999	116	143	142	78	125	162	126	33	71	125	126	73	120	147	180
$1,000,000 to $4,999,999	228	231	237	227	247	245	207	140	147	170	159	152	224	275	272
$5,000,000 to $9,999,999	122	125	120	146	168	160	136	107	101	126	109	108	119	156	147
$10,000,000 to $49,999,999	379	392	386	443	423	459	414	359	362	391	364	403	400	495	497
$50,000,000 to $99,999,999	182	175	177	220	188	197	189	162	165	176	170	194	216	255	254
$100,000,000 and over	1,464	1,426	1,417	1,829	1,641	1,706	1,714	1,822	1,748	1,876	1,672	2,152	2,232	2,513	2,312

	1st 9 months of— 1952	1953	1954	1955	Percent change, 1955 over 1952
All assets (total)	7,749	8,749	8,175	10,948	+41.3
Under $250,000	285	240	117	132	−53.7
$250,000 to $999,999	401	413	322	447	+11.4
$1,000,000 to $4,999,999	696	699	476	771	+10.8
$5,000,000 to $9,999,999	367	464	336	422	+15.0
$10,000,000 to $49,999,999	1,157	1,296	1,117	1,392	+20.3
$50,000,000 to $99,999,999	534	574	511	725	+35.8
$100,000,000 and over	4,307	5,061	5,296	7,057	+63.8
Under $1,000,000	686	653	439	579	−15.6
$1,000,000 to $99,999,999	2,754	3,033	2,440	3,310	+19.4
$100,000,000 and over	4,307	5,061	5,296	7,057	+63.8

Comparison of net income after taxes of manufacturing corporations

[In millions of dollars]

Grouped by size of assets	1st quarter comparisons					2d quarter comparisons					3d quarter comparisons				
	1952	1953	1954	1955	Percent change, 1955–52	1952	1953	1954	1955	Percent change, 1955–52	1952	1953	1954	1955	Percent change, 1955–52
Under $1,000,000	187	179	72	144	−23.0	247	264	183	183	−25.9	252	210	184	252	0
$1,000,000 to $99,999,999	911	1,026	775	959	5.3	923	1,061	863	1,181	28.1	920	946	802	1,170	27.2
$100,000,000 and over	1,464	1,641	1,748	2,232	52.5	1,426	1,706	1,876	2,513	76.1	1,417	1,714	1,672	2,312	63.2
All assets (total)	2,562	2,847	2,595	3,335	30.2	2,597	3,031	2,922	3,878	49.3	2,590	2,871	2,658	3,735	44.2

Source: FTC–SEC Quarterly Financial Report.

NET SALES

A further indication of the deteriorating position of small business in recent years is in the record of net sales of manufacturing corporations. This record is shown by the following table:

United States manufacturing corporations' net sales by asset size

[Index—1947–59=100]

Year [1]	Index of net sales		Disparity in favor of large concerns	Average disparity
	Assets under $1 million	Assets over $1 million		
1947	94	100	6	
1948	105	107	2	
1949	97	100	3	
1950	104	120	16	15
1951	115	140	25	
4th quarter 1952	115	150	35	
4th quarter 1953	97	146	49	
4th quarter 1954	103	150	47	49
3d quarter 1955	108	158	50	

[1] Annually 1947–51.

Source: 5th Semiannual Report, Small Business Administration.

The increase in net sales for small firms has lagged far behind the net sales of larger corporations. Using 1947–49 as an index of 100, the net sales index of large manufacturing corporations averaged only 15 points higher than the index for smaller corporations throughout the period 1947–52. This disparity in favor of large businesses rose rapidly in 1953 and for the last 3 years the net sales index for big corporations has averaged 49 points higher than the index for smaller firms. This trend to sales dominance by big businesses is consistent with increases in earnings and return on investment which have also characterized business activity since 1953.

IV. MITIGATING FEATURES OF PRESENT TAX LAW

DEPRECIATION OF NEW MACHINERY

One example of existing big business bias in our corporate tax laws involves the accelerated depreciation of new machinery, while similar treatment is not available for used machinery. It is well known that small businesses are the principal purchasers of used machinery. Thus, the very significant benefit of the accelerated depreciation tax provisions are not available to many smaller corporations.

Now, some people advocate including secondhand machinery under the accelerated depreciation provisions, but I think that this action alone would merely accentuate the problem. For example, under present law a large corporation can, in a relatively short time, depreciate new machinery to a figure below its market value. The large corporation can then sell this machinery for more than its depreciated value and treat the income as a capital gain. If secondhand machinery had the benefit of accelerated depreciation, small businesses would be more eager to buy secondhand equipment. Then the giant corporations would realize even greater profits from the sales and greater capital gain windfalls.

The way to treat small businesses fairly would be to permit accelerated depreciation of both old and new machinery, and to tax income derived from the sale of depreciated machinery at the regular rates for corporate income. But until such changes are made, this is one more factor contributing to the financial dilemma of small businesses.

RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION AND DEFENSE PROCUREMENT

Some very wise provisions in the tax law, designed to encourage research and experimental programs by industry, operate to the primary benefit of big business. These provisions offer favorable tax treatment of expenditures made for research. While these provisions have considerable merit, I think we should frankly admit that the benefits inure almost exclusively to big businesses.

Furthermore, the defense needs of the Nation require direct Federal expenditures for research for weapons and other items of military necessity. The size of these Federal expenditures amounts to over a billion dollars every year, and the contracts go primarily to our huge industrial corporations. It would seem that the law has compounded the advantage of big business in the field of research.

And while on the subject of Federal expenditures for the output of industrial concerns, we should remember that a very substantial part of the total business in this country is associated with the national defense. Defense contracts awarded in 1955 totaled over $15 billion. And in spite of congressional efforts to divert some of this spending to small firms, the major portion has gone to a few giant corporations.

The Senate Armed Services Committee recently reported that from June 1950 through June 1953 over 63 percent of the value of all defense contracts went to the 100 largest defense contractors. During the period of July 1953 through December 1954 this percentage rose to over 69 percent. It is no answer to pretend that such conditions are inevitable. The ability to accumulate capital and grow through more equitable corporate tax rates would be a very important factor in reversing this trend of defense buying from the largest corporations.

STOCK OPTIONS

Another advantage for large corporations is their ability to attract and hold highly skilled management and technical personnel by deferred-compensation plans. These plans reduce the impact of individual income-tax rates and give a higher real income to such employees. For instance, a special bonus is given large corporations by those provisions of the tax laws which deal with stock options. All salaried employees must pay taxes upon their incomes at the regular income-tax rates. The fortunate recipient of a stock option, however, pays no tax, in most instances, when he receives the option, pays no tax when he exercises the option, and pays only a capital-gains tax upon any profit he makes when he sells the stock.

To qualify for this preferred treatment, the corporation must be able to value its stock by some acceptable reference to market value at the time the option is granted. The small corporation, which is closely held, has great difficulty in meeting this requirement. As a result, it is the large publicly held corporations which benefit. Almost half the corporations listed on the New York Stock Exchange have such plans. The revenue loss to the Government cannot be estimated, but it is very substantial.

By this and similar devices, big business is able to attract and to hold the most able technical and executive talent. A small corporation must pay much higher salaries, if its employees who do not have stock options are to be able to keep, after taxes, as much as the employees of the large corporation which does have a stock-option plan in force. Naturally, in a competitive labor market the most valuable employees will tend to enter the employ of the corporations paying them the highest net salaries after taxes.

Even the owner of the small corporation may believe that he himself can find refuge against business risk, attain relative security, and provide a fund for his retirement by giving up his small business and going to work for a large corporation. The tax laws foster this trend by such provisions as restricted stock options.

LOSS CARRYOVERS

In addition to failures, statistics of the Federal Trade Commission show the following trend in the number of manufacturing and mining concerns acquired or merged during the last 30 years. Beginning in 1922, the number of mergers rose steadily from 297 to a peak of 1,216 in 1929. Thereafter, the number of mergers leveled off at less than 200 in 1932 and varied within a range from 87 to 419 throughout the 1940's. The number of mergers were under 300 per year in the early 1950's, but rose to 387 in 1954 and to 525 in 1955.

While I don't pretend to be an expert on tax matters, it is very obvious to me that the ability to carry over business losses from one year, to offset profits in another year, is a strong factor in this merger movement. It is very difficult for the small corporation, suffering losses caused in many instances by its smallness alone, to resist the eager embrace of the profitable giant seeking a dowry of tax advantages to be derived from the prior losses of the unfortunate bride-to-be.

I do not have a solution to this problem. But until some solution is found, we must do whatever we can to strengthen small companies and thus make them less attractive to the rich suitor with a loss carryover gleam in his eye. My amendment will reduce the taxes on small companies, and the income retained thereby will contribute directly to this strength.

SHIFTING TAXES

Still another advantage of the large corporations is their ability to adjust to tax rates with little effect upon their rates of earnings after taxes. This is possible because large corporations can, to a considerable extent, shift a large portion of their taxes to con-

sumers in the form of higher prices. This is especially the case in industries which are dominated by one or a few corporate giants, and where competition does not operate to hold prices down.

Small corporations can rarely set prices to absorb taxes. There are too many of them and generally no single one is in a position to exert substantial control over prices in its industry.

Actually, the small corporation gets hit from both sides under the present corporate tax structure. His raw materials tend to be produced by giant concerns which can pass on a large share of their taxes to him. Thus, corporate taxes, for the small corporation, will generally result in higher costs. At the same time, he does not have the economic power to set prices to absorb his own taxes.

STATEMENT OF MR. DEXTER M. KEEZER

Mr. President, there are many others in this country who believe that the corporate tax structure favors the growth of large businesses as against small businesses. For instance, last December when testifying before the Subcommittee on Tax Policy of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, Mr. Dexter M. Keezer, vice president and director of the economics department of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., made the following statement:

"I think we have at the present time a high and satisfactory level of business investment. * * * But simply in terms of maintaining an adequate level of investment, I would not say that the present is an occasion to reduce the corporate tax rate. Except, may I give this qualification? Maintaining this rate means that you are going to have larger and larger corporate units at the expense of smaller units. This seems to be a matter of great social, political, and economic significance. Over a period with which we are concerned, the smaller corporations, as you well know, have not had the same rate of growth and capital acquisition."

Mr. President, that is exactly my position. Unless some action is taken to reverse the present trend, the growth of small businesses will continue to lag and their relative position in our economy will continue to worsen.

V. SUMMATION

Mr. President, I have tried to show that small businesses are in a bad way in this country. This is shown by business failures, by business mergers, and by profit ratios and sales volume of different size classes of corporations. I believe that conditions exist in our general economy as well as in the tax law itself which contribute to and aggravate this situation. In considering this amendment, we have an opportunity to offset in a real way some of the disadvantages faced by the small-business man.

The present rate structure seems to have contributed to the decline in the relative importance of small business in recent years. To the extent that our tax laws foster larger and larger business units, our political democracy is weakened. I am sure that we all recognize the relationship between the survival of many thriving business units and the survival of our political democracy.

This amendment will assist those companies in the formative or development stage to overcome initial capital difficulties, and will assure a continuing supply of capital when it is needed to maintain the competitive position of the small-business enterprise. I can think of no action more vital to the maintenance of our system of free enterprise than the encouragement and development of small businesses. They are the very foundation of our national economy.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], I offer these amendments. My statement is patterned after the bill S. 3129, and proposes tax relief for small businesses.

Under present law, corporations generally are subject to a normal tax rate on net earnings of 30 percent, plus a surtax rate of 22 percent on net earnings in excess of $25,000. My amendment provides a normal tax rate of 22 percent and a surtax rate of 31 percent. According to the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, this would result in an estimated increase in revenue of approximately $20 million.

The distribution of the benefits, or increased liabilities, under this proposal are shown in a table which appears at this point in my remarks:

Effect of a normal tax rate of 22 percent and a surtax rate of 31 percent (proposal in S. 3129)

Income subject to normal tax and surtax	Present tax liability [1]	Proposed tax liability [2]	Change	
			Amount	Percent
$5,000	$1,500	$1,100	−$400	−26.7
$10,000	3,000	2,200	−800	−26.7
$15,000	4,500	3,300	−1,200	−26.7
$20,000	6,000	4,400	−1,600	−26.7
$25,000	7,500	5,500	−2,000	−26.7
$50,000	20,500	18,750	−1,750	−8.5
$100,000	46,500	45,250	−1,250	−2.7
$225,000	111,500	111,500	[3]	[3]
$500,000	254,500	257,250	+2,750	+1.1
$1,000,000	514,500	522,250	+7,750	+1.5
$10,000,000	5,194,500	5,292,250	+97,750	+1.9
$100,000,000	51,994,500	52,992,250	+997,750	+1.9

[1] Normal rate, 30 percent; surtax rate, 22 percent.
[2] Normal rate, 22 percent; surtax rate, 31 percent.
[3] No change.

The effects can be illustrated by these examples taken from the table. Corporations with incomes of $25,000 and less would have their tax burden reduced by 26.7 percent. A corporation with income of $100,000 would be given tax relief of 2.7 percent. Corporations with incomes of $500,000 and over would have increased tax liabilities of from 1.1 percent, in the case of a corporation with that income, to 1.9 percent for a corporation with income of $100 million.

The "break even" point under this amendment occurs at the $225,000 income level—all firms earning less than $225,000 would receive a tax reduction and all firms earning more than $225,000 would receive a tax increase. Obviously this redistribution of the impact of corporate taxes would benefit the low-income corporations. While the tax relief afforded would be modest, I believe it would have a significant beneficial effect on the smaller businesses of the Nation.

Mr. President, this amendment is patterned after the bill, S. 3129, which I introduced on February 3, 1956. On March 15, 1956, I offered it as an amendment to H. R. 9166, the bill which extended existing corporate tax rates. Subsequently, on March 21, 1956, I testified before the Senate Finance Committee in behalf of this amendment.

In view of the urgency for extension of certain excise taxes contained in H. R. 9166, I was advised by the chairman of the Finance Committee that the committee would be unable to hear witnesses for or against my amendment, and that such hearings could be held at a later date if the amendment were offered to another revenue measure.

In personal conversations with the chairman of the Committee on Finance, he advised me of the necessity for immediate action on the bill to extend the present rates of corporate and excise taxes. He told me in these personal conversations that he would hold hearings on my amendment in order to give any possible opponents an opportunity to testify. At that time and also in the record of the hearings at which I testified he suggested that I offer my amendment to another revenue measure originating in the House. I quote from page 53 of the transcript of the hearings held before the Committee on Finance on H. R. 9166, March 21, 1956:

The CHAIRMAN. I assure the Senator this, if he offers it (the amendment) to another bill, there will be hearings and full hearings.

From page 54:

The CHAIRMAN. The Senator will offer it to some other bill. We have very many important bills before this committee. We have very many. When we can work it in, we will be glad to.

Senator FULBRIGHT. I would welcome a suggestion from the committee or the chairman. If you have any (bill) you think is especially appropriate to, I would be glad to have a suggestion about that. I certainly will endeavor to find one myself.

The CHAIRMAN. I guess the staff can refer it for the Senator.

Later, when the bill H. R. 9166 was being considered on the floor, I again stated my understanding of the agreement between myself and the chairman. This statement appears at page 5523 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 26, 1956. I stated at that time that I would not press my amendment on the understanding that I would have an opportunity to do so at a later date.

On April 11 and May 4, 1956, I wrote the chairman of the Finance Committee urging him to schedule hearings on my amendment. On May 8 the chairman wrote me that he would present my request to the committee, but to date the hearings have not been scheduled. On May 11, 1956, I replied to the chairman of the Finance Committee and stated my intention to offer S. 3129 as an amendment to H. R. 10660. On May 15, 1956, I offered this amendment.

Mr. President, I am advised that the Finance Committee did not accept this amendment on grounds that it is not germane to the pending bill. Such a decision leaves me somewhat perplexed and frustrated. I did not press the issue during the consideration of H. R. 9166, which extended the present biased corporate tax rates, in a spirit of cooperation with the Finance Committee. I deferred to the suggestion of the chairman that the amendment be offered on

another revenue measure, and in the expectation that the issue would be fully explored in public hearings. I feel that my actions have been orderly and that this amendment should be considered on its merits. The vote on this amendment will be construed as a vote on its substance, and should not be opposed on grounds that it is not germane to H. R. 10660.

Mr. President, I gave notice to the Senate that I would offer the amendment to this present bill.

Subsequent to the time I declared on the floor that I intended to offer this amendment, a unanimous-consent agreement was obtained. I went on to explain that it was obtained during my absence from Washington. I was on a mission to the great State of Alabama to make a speech at the State university, and I did not return in time, but I feel that to hold this amendment not germane under the unanimous-consent agreement is a very unfair procedure, because, obviously, if I had been present, I would have objected. The Senate had notice that I intended to offer it to the bill. I recognize that it is not as germane to this bill as it would be to the bill extending the corporate-tax rate. That was the bill to which this amendment especially pertains. That was a bill dealing with exactly the same subject matter. I regret that it was not then considered, but I deferred it only at the urgent request of the chairman of the Finance Committee because of the necessity of passing the excise portion of the bill. Otherwise, there would have been a lapse and a substantial loss.

So I called the Senator's attention to the quality of the sponsorship, some 10 Senators from important States, all of whom are interested in the substance of the proposed legislation.

I hope the Senator will not raise a point of order against the amendment under the unanimous-consent agreement.

It certainly is germane in a general way to legislation of this character.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas has made a very accurate statement. He did ask that hearings be held so that those in opposition might be heard. It so happened that he first offered the amendment to a bill dealing with excise taxes which expired on April 1. That bill came before the Senate only 3 or 4 days before the expiration date. It would have been very unwise to risk having a conference with the House, because if the excise taxes had expired they could not be collected retroactively.

Then the Senator, as he has said, wrote to the chairman of the committee—I happened to be in the hospital at the time—and I presented his letter to the Finance Committee. The Finance Committee did not raise the point that it was not germane. The members of the committee thought this proposed legislation was of such importance that it should deal solely with the question of roads, and if we had hearings and heard the opposition to the Senator's amendment—and there are many corporations, as the Senator knows, which are opposed to it—there would have been delay, and the majority leader was pressing the committee to have this bill reported promptly to the Senate.

When an appropriate bill comes before the committee we will be glad to have hearings for those who are opposed and those who are in favor of the proposal. It was the unanimous opinion of the members of the Finance Committee that it could not be considered in connection with this particular bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator feel that his committee can hold hearings giving the opponents of the measure an opportunity to testify before his committee?

Mr. BYRD. The Finance Committee had carried over from last session five very important bills. It had before it the sugar bill, the social-security bill, on which we have spent 3 months because no hearings were held on that bill by the House; we had the old-age and survivors' bill; also the simplification-of-customs bill. As soon as those bills are reported, if an excise bill should come over from the House, the chairman of the Finance Committee will be very glad to see that hearings are given to both sides. But I think the bills passed by the House last year are of very considerable importance and should have priority in the consideration of the Senate Finance Committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Am I correctly informed that in the discussion of the measure before the committee reference was made to a bill which I believe was intended to improve the administration of excise taxes, and it is expected that it will come to the Finance Committee, and that is the one which the committee felt would be most appropriate?

Mr. BYRD. I read to the committee the letter from the Senator from Arkansas, and it was very fully discussed. The committee expressed the desire to give full hearings to the Senator from Arkansas, but it was not deemed wise to hold hearings on this bill. If the road bill is not enacted into law by June 30, the road program will stop. We shall have to have a continuing resolution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What I wanted to make clear was whether I could have an understanding with the Senator in order to make our own plans for a hearing. I plan to offer the amendment to the excise bill which is coming over to the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. I give the Senator the assurance that he will have an opportunity to be heard, and those in opposition will have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have already been heard. I want the opposition to be heard in order that there may be a record on which the Senate can vote.

Mr. BYRD. Would the Senator not care to be heard again?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the statement of the chairman of the committee. I think it clarifies the present status of the amendment. It is an important amendment. I recognize the fact that it is not pertinent to the road bill; but under the constitutional requirement that it must be attached to some tax bill, we are under the necessity of offering it to a bill which has originated in the House. Therefore, I wanted to have an opportunity, at least, to discuss it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment is not in order. I refer to the unanimous consent agreement, which provides:

> That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Furthermore the title of the bill we are considering reads:

> An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes.

The amendment of the Senator from Arkansas deals with the adjustment of corporate normal and surtax rates, and therefore is not germane under the unanimous consent agreement.

Mr. President, I ask for a ruling on the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The amendment of the Senator from Arkansas provides for the adjustment of the normal tax and surtax rates on corporations.

If the Chair correctly understands the situation, there is no provision in the bill relating to normal and surtaxes on corporation incomes, but the taxes imposed therein are excise taxes on motor fuels, trucks, buses, tires, rubber, certain highway motor vehicles, and floor stocks.

For this reason the Chair is of the opinion that the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas does not relate to any provision in the pending bill, is not germane, and therefore is not in order under the unanimous-consent agreement. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield 2 minutes to me so that I may clear up a question with respect to taxes on aviation gasoline?

Mr. BYRD. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. As I read the report and the law, the tax on aviation gasoline will be 2 cents a gallon instead of 3 cents, as provided in the highway-user tax. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. That is correct. There will be a reduction of 1 cent.

Mr. MONRONEY. But there will be an effective tax of 2 cents a gallon on aircraft gasoline.

Mr. BYRD. That is what the tax is now.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; but it will decline on April 1, 1957, to 1½ cents under present law. So in effect the aircraft operators will be required to pay 25 percent more tax on gasoline than

the present law requires, after the expiration date of April 1, 1957.

While practically all these funds appear to be earmarked for highway construction, since aircraft operators are required to pay 2 cents a gallon on their fuel, is it the intent of the sponsors of the bill to recognize that in the subsequent construction of necessary airports aircraft operators, by paying the gasoline tax, will be entitled to some of the benefits derived from the 25 percent increase in the gasoline tax, as provided in the bill?

Mr. BYRD. That will go into a trust fund. A considerable amount of the funds is spent on the airways and on subsidies granted the airlines.

Mr. MONRONEY. From an effective standpoint, considering the large amount of gasoline now being used and which will continue to be used, the need for more and more airports is becoming apparent. Congress has been rather niggardly in providing adequate funds for airport construction.

With the bill increasing taxes 25 percent, to 2 cents, when ordinarily they would go to only a cent and a half after 1957, will consideration be given by the committee chairman to helping to set aside a part of the money, at least, to meet the ever-expanding needs for modernizing the ground facilities for aviation?

Mr. BYRD. The Senate merely continued the House action on taxes. When 1957 comes around, I hope consideration will be given to whether an adjustment should be made.

Mr. MONRONEY. So long as aircraft operators are paying considerable amounts in taxes, it is hoped that consideration will be given to the needs of modernizing the ground facilities for aviation.

Mr. BYRD. The committee will give full consideration to the problem.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Title II is open to further amendment.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill. I am certain Senators are familiar with the text of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment of the Senator from Michigan for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert in lieu thereof the text of title I of the Federal Aid Highway bill as passed by the House.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee will state it.

Mr. GORE. Has not action on title I been completed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment strikes out title I and title II.

Mr. GORE. Title I and title II?

Mr. McNAMARA. No; title I only.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, it appears that at long last we are to have a major, new Federal highway program. I feel certain there is no doubt in the mind of any Senator as to the need for building up our sadly neglected road system. This must be done—and soon—for the primary purposes of improving present highways and building new ones to take care of motorists and industry, and also in the interests of the national-defense program.

We might have considered ourselves fortunate that we had not 1, but 2, highway bills before Congress for consideration. This was not a fortunate fact, however, when we consider the matter in the light that we had one more highway bill than was needed.

H. R. 10660, as passed by the House, was to my mind a good road bill, and the one which should have been considered by the Senate at this time. I think it was unfortunate that in committee the Senate version of a highway program was substituted for the original H. R. 10660.

Naturally, there were differences of opinion as to which of the two bills was best suited to our highway needs. I can only give my opinion, which I am sure is shared by many of my colleagues, that the original House bill is the best overall road program that has been presented in either session of the 84th Congress.

My main concern was that should these two different versions be sent to conference, the net result would be a mare's nest of road legislation, as a number of amendments have been adopted by the Senate though many of the amendments merely substituted sections of the House bill.

There may, to be sure, certain parts of the House bill open to question. But viewed in the light of the best program for all of the public, I think these are mainly small matters.

In my individual views contained in the report of the Senate Committee on Public Works, Report No. 1965, I said the original House bill presented a clear declaration of congressional intent as to long-range highway development. I stated further:

> The national scope of the Interstate System must be emphasized. The House bill presents a sounder approach in that it looks toward the completion of the Interstate Highway System and apportions funds according to the needs of the States. I recognize that there may be inequities in the "need table" of the House bill, but it should be pointed out that such inequities could be eliminated when, as provided in the House bill, new reviews and estimates of need are made in 1958 and subsequent years.

There has been considerable talk about the fact that the Senate bill adds 2,500 miles to the 40,000-mile program envisioned by the House bill.

I do not think anyone is going to argue that the 2,500 miles is not needed. But the point is that at this time it does not make much difference whether the stipulated goal is 40,000 miles, 42,500 miles, or even 100,000 miles. For the next few years, the States will have their hands full building the mileage allotted to them. Then, in 3 years or so, all Congress will have to do will be to review the situation, in light of revenues, and add 2,500 miles, or more, I hope.

It strikes me, further, that the original House bill made fair compromises on a number of important matters that could very well be made unnecessarily complicated and unfair under the Senate version of the bill.

I might point, in this respect, to the House section on public utility relocation costs, which I think is a fair approach; the House stipulated tax on heavy trucks, the Senate amendment of which is drawing heavy fire from the trucking industry; the tax exemptions for city transit systems contained in the House bill; and the prevailing wage section of the House bill.

Mr. President, a good many States are holding up their highway programs, awaiting action by the Congress. This is the season to build roads. Further delay on this bill—holding it up another month or two, as could very well happen—would have a serious effect in postponing the State programs. By adopting the original House bill, this threat would be eliminated, and we could begin immediately to build the highways we so desperately need.

I might add further, Mr. President, that heavy unemployment in some sections of our country points up the urgency of getting started with road building just as quickly as possible to help put people to work. This particular argument would be unnecessary if the great prosperity we hear so much about were as widespread as the administration would like us to believe.

Back in my State of Michigan, more than 220,000 persons are out of work right now, and a highway-construction program would be one way to cut into this great surplus of manpower and build up the economy. Most of the amendments offered yesterday and today are already in the House bill.

Therefore I urge that the Senate adopt my amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The pending amendment would erase all the work the Senate committee has done, and all the work the Senate has done in 2 days and nights. Technically, however, the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Michigan would wipe out titles I and II, but would substitute only another title I.

Under the circumstances, I ask that the Senate vote down the amendment.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield for a question.

Mr. BEALL. Does the Senator not think that the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, adopting the House bill, would be more equitable than the Senate amendment?

Mr. GORE. I have said "No" to that question several times in the past 2 days.

Mr. BEALL. It seems to me that the Senator from Michigan has made a proposal which is more equitable for all the country.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate having the Senator's opinion.

Mr. BEALL. I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield back the time remaining to him?

Mr. GORE. I yield back the time remaining to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield back the time remaining to him?

Mr. McNAMARA. If no other Senator cares to speak on the amendment, I yield back the time remaining to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to have the Chair clear up a point on which the Senator from Illinois is in doubt. As I understand, this morning the Senate adopted the Knowland amendment to the text of the House bill, which provided that the determination of the prevailing wage should be made by the State authorities. Then, shortly afterward, the Senate adopted the Chavez amendment providing that the determination of wages should be made by the United States Department of Labor, and ultimately by the Secretary of Labor.

The Chavez amendment has been pretty well mauled by the Fulbright amendment, and I am not certain it is worth anything at the present moment; but I am curious as to which of the amendments, the Knowland amendment or the Chavez amendment, is in the bill before the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GORE. Is it not a fact that the Senate committee bill, including the Chavez amendment, has now been substituted for title I of the House bill, which included the Knowland amendment? Therefore, the bill before the Senate embodies the Chavez amendment and the Fulbright amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the whole House text will be in conference.

Mr. GORE. The bill before the Senate is the House bill as amended, with the substitution of the Senate committee bill for the provisions of the House bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like a ruling from the Chair on my inquiry, and I should also like to know whether, in the measure which is before the Senate, we have the Chavez amendment, or the Knowland amendment, or the Chavez amendment as amended by the Fulbright amendment.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may we have a ruling by the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Illinois restate his parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, let me try to make a confused situation as clear as possible. Is it not true that this morning the Senate adopted the Knowland amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was not the Knowland amendment attached to the House bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Later did not the Senate adopt the Chavez amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate did.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was not the Chavez amendment attached to the Senate committee bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is a correct statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Which of them is now before us?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All four of them are before the Senate. [Laughter.]

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SMATHERS. For the sake of the RECORD, I should like to announce that in the case of the amendment which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] submitted for me, which amendment was withdrawn, it has been the decision of the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Colorado, and myself that we shall not press for adoption of the amendment. Instead, we shall rely on the good judgment of the conferees on the part of the House and the conferees on the part of the Senate, and we hope they will accept the House provision on this point.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to add that the Senator from Florida and I have discussed the problem with the Senators who will be the conferees on the part of the Senate. They fully understand the position presented, and they are cognizant that this problem is a common one in various parts of the country. We are perfectly willing to place our confidence in the conferees to handle this matter in conference.

I recognize that at 12:10 a. m. it is not opportune to raise additional tax problems in connection with the bill. However, the tax problems are exceedingly serious ones. I am sure that most of my colleagues have received a number of communications in regard to this tax problem.

In view of the fact that the bill will go to conference, I shall rest again on my confidence in our conferees to discuss this matter in the conference to the extent they can within their jurisdiction as conferees, rather than at this late hour attempt to engage in debate on a series of amendments dealing with tax problems, because, after all, the best that could be accomplished in connection with the amendments would be to have them agreed to and taken to conference; and I think the subject matter can be discussed in conference.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, certain telegrams I have received in connection with this tax problem.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 29, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Senate Finance Committee version of Federal highway bill, H. R. 10660, also calls for a tax against commercial vehicles exceeding 26,000 pounds gross weight. This is unfair to an industry which hauls a substantial volume of the Nation's freight and which performs a vital service for every farmer and manufacturer, businessman, and consumer. If enacted such a tax would put a tremendous financial penalty on both common and private carriers everywhere. Studies show that heavier vehicle operators are already paying more than their share of highway construction and maintenance costs, this additional discriminatory tax would be enough to put many trucking companies out of business. I respectfully urge you to do everything in your power to bring about a Federal highway bill which is fair to all highway users and which contains no special taxes directed against commercial vehicles.

W. J. JARVIS.

OREGON, CITY, OREG.

EUGENE, OREG., *May 24, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly protest House and Senate version H. R. 10660. The registration fee is highly discriminatory. Feel increases in diesel gasoline, tire, and excise taxes comprises equal share for trucking industry. My company paid 10 percent of gross earnings for highway use in 1955.

C. F. ERWERT.

EUGENE, OREG., *May 24, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly protest House and Senate version H. R. 10660. The registration fee is highly discriminatory. Feel increases in diesel gasoline, tire, and excise taxes comprises equal share for trucking industry. My company paid 10 percent of gross earnings for highway use in 1955.

GEORGE W. CLARK.

Mr. SMATHERS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at the conclusion of the debate regarding the tax on transit companies, certain telegrams.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIAMI, FLA., *May 24, 1956.*

Hon. GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge your assistance in restoring exemption of local transit companies from extra gas and weight taxes in Federal highway bill now pending before Senate Finance Committee, H. R. 10660, we represent Coast Cities Coaches, Inc., local bus company that does not use intercity Federal highways and extra taxes would be discriminatory and unduly burdensome.

SHUTTS, BOWEN, SIMMONS, PREVATT, & JULIAN.
WILLIAM P. SIMMONS, Jr.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA., *May 24, 1956.*

Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
Senate Finance Committee,
Washington, D. C.:

Would appreciate anything you can do to reinstate transit exemptions.

FORT LAUDERDALE TRANSIT LINES.
ORVILLE R. BLUDAU.

MIAMI, FLA., *May 24, 1956.*

Hon. GEORGE SMATHERS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

City transit systems do not use Federal System of Interstate Highways as covered

by H. R. 10660. This additional and unjustifiable taxation on motor fuels will adversely affect the economy of this industry, already precarious. Therefore, solicit your every effort reinstating the exemption for city transit industry.

MIAMI TRANSIT CO.,
R. D. FREEMAN.

MIAMI, FLA., *May 24, 1956.*

Hon. GEORGE SMATHERS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

City transit systems do not use Federal System of Interstate Highways as covered by H. R. 10660. This additional and unjustifiable taxation on motor fuels will adversely affect the economy of this industry, already precarious. Therefore, solicit your every effort reinstating the exemption for city transit industry.

MIAMI BEACH RAILWAY CO.,
WILLIAM D. PAWLEY.

PENSACOLA, FLA., *May 24, 1956.*

Hon. GEORGE SMATHERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We consider transit exemptions from new fuel and weight taxes are fair because most of the miles would not be on Federal highways. Any additional burden on transit increases hardship on lower income bracket people and would tend to lower downtown real estate values.

G. G. PICKETT,
Pensacola Transit.

LAKELAND, FLA., *May 24, 1956.*

Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully urge your support in keeping additional fuel tax and weight tax exemptions in H. R. 10660. Local transit systems are generally nonusers of Federal highways. Additional tax on local transit systems at this time would cause many to have to curtail operations or close down, depriving many people of transportation. Please consider the urgency of this request.

C. L. CARTER,
General Manager, Cities Transit, Inc.

LAKELAND, FLA., *May 25, 1956.*

Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Omitted from yesterday's message the fact that this company employs 100 persons. We figure approximately 500 persons are dependent on our staying in business. None of the city governments where we are serving want to run a bus operation. Additional taxes would be detrimental to us. An additional penny on fuel alone would double our loss of last year. We are struggling to exist and hope we will not be taxed out of business. We are providing service to cities with populations of 175,000. Urge retaining exemptions in H. R. 10660.

C. L. CARTER,
General Manager, Cities Transit, Inc.

MIAMI, FLA., *May 24, 1956.*

Hon. GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

I understand Senate Finance Committee has removed transit exemption from fuel and weight taxes in H. R. 10660, new highway legislation. For several years transit companies all over the country have found themselves slowly dying due to loss of passengers, higher costs, and higher taxes. We simply cannot stand another round of tax increases. City and suburban transit operators are basically nonusers of Federal highways and should be specifically exempted from these taxes. I sincerely urge you to reinstate the exemption previously given transit companies in this bill.

L. WILLIAMS COAST CITIES COACHES, INC.
HIALEAH, FLA.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has proposed an amendment to direct the Secretary of Commerce to make a study of the designation of routes included in the National System of Interstate Highways and determine whether those routes as designated best serve the purposes of the system under present conditions and those likely to prevail in 1974. The Secretary would make a report to the Congress not later than January 15, 1958, with his recommendation for allocation or reallocation of the mileage of the authorized system. There is one proviso, namely, that no presently designated portion of the system shall be modified without the concurrence of the highway authority of the State or States concerned.

In my opinion, Mr. President, an overall study is highly desirable. Personally, I should like to have such a study completed before 1958. In fact, I hope the next Congress will make a thorough review of the system. This will enable such States as West Virginia to present facts relating to the advisability of constructing additional links to perfect the system. One such link, highly needed, in my opinion, is a direct route from the Great Lakes to Florida.

Taking all essential factors into consideration, West Virginia is placed in a strategic location in any proposed highway plan which would include a direct route from the Great Lakes area to Florida.

The voluminous traffic potential arising in the large cities of Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Akron, Canton, and even Buffalo, N. Y., which would have access to this route would lend credence to its feasibility.

It is interesting to note that north-south routes are provided on the present Interstate System, east and west of the Appalachian Mountains. However, there remains a wide corridor through these mountains which is currently void of any interstate north-south route. This necessitates the heavy Great Lakes traffic to bypass this natural southeast traffic movement which leads direct to the Carolinas, Georgia, and Florida.

In West Virginia our general feeling about the present Federal Interstate System is that the mileage assigned to West Virginia is woefully inadequate when comparison is made with the mileage provided other States. West Virginia's current interstate allotment is 225.03 miles. This situation no doubt is caused by the fact that no other State in the Union is faced with such a continual succession of difficult and costly location problems.

In West Virginia steep grades, sharp curves, and narrow roadways have become common as a result of trying to avoid high cut and fill costs on roads in this precipitous, rocky terrain. Cities and towns have been cramped into valleys with all too little space allotted for streets. West Virginia, in my opinion, should not be penalized in its highway needs which are clearly indicated by the above facts. Because of our peculiar location, resulting in high construction and right-of-way costs is no sound reason for reducing our interstate mileage.

In conclusion I wish to reemphasize the importance of an early study of the Interstate System. I am convinced that such a study will strongly support the importance of a route from the Great Lakes to Florida. Officials of my State of West Virginia stand ready to come to Washington at any time to present to the Congress the data they have compiled regarding the urgent need for such a route.

I realize there is not time during this session of Congress to make this study and it would not be possible or practical to try and rewrite the route system on the floor of the Senate. But the importance of this matter is so great that I urge an early study so that the next Congress may take appropriate action to include the route from the Great Lakes to Florida as well as any other routes that may be needed to provide the best possible Interstate System.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that we are about to proceed to the third reading of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; if there are no further amendments to be proposed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Which bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. House bill 10660, as amended by the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I did not understand that it was stated that all the different versions of the Davis-Bacon amendments were before us simultaneously. Will the Chair please explain on which particular version of the Davis-Bacon amendment we are to vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question will be on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill. Every amendment adopted by the Senate and the House version of the bill will be in the conference.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Are we about to vote on every version of the Davis-Bacon amendment?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has not completed his answer to the inquiry of the Senator from Oregon. Does the Senator from Oregon wish to restate his inquiry?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to know on which particular version of the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage amendment we shall be passing upon either favorably or unfavorably when the vote is taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question will be on the engrossment of the amendments—including the Chavez amendment—and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. When the vote is taken, it will be taken on the engrossment of the Chavez amendment, as well as the other amendments adopted by the Senate; and, of course, so far as the Bacon-Davis provisions are concerned, the vote will be on the Chavez amendment with the modification of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] in regard to an appeal to the administrative and judicial agencies. Is not that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The statement of the Senator from California is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. And, Mr. President, with the further modification suggested by the Senator from South Dakota and accepted by the Senator from New Mexico; is not that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the vote will be taken on the engrossment of every amendment which has been adopted by the Senate.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 10660) was passed.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint from both the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate Public Works Committee the conferees on the part of the Senate to confer with the conferees from the corresponding two committees of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. KERR, Mr. GORE, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, and Mr. BUSH conferees on the part of the Senate on title I; and Mr. BYRD, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. KERR, Mr. MILIKIN, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania conferees on the part of the Senate on title II.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill as amended be printed with the Senate amendments numbered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. SPARKMAN (by request), by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 3963) for the relief of Jacqueline Raymonde Gosse, which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON VARIOUS CIVIL RIGHTS PROPOSALS BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the Committee will resume hearings on the various civil-rights proposals beginning at 2:30 p. m., Friday, June 1, 1956, in the committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I should like to announce for the information of the Senate that when the Senate takes a recess tonight, it will be until Thursday, at noon, at which time the Senate will resume the consideration of the narcotics bill, Senate bill 3760, the unfinished business. Thereafter, the Senate will consider the Department of Commerce appropriation bill, which I understand is ready.

I also announce that there will be considered certain private bills which already have been cleared in a group by the respective majority and minority calendar committees. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the list of the private bills which will be considered on Thursday.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Calendar No. 1833, H. R. 1866, a bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Compton.

Calendar No. 1848, H. R. 1671, a bill for the relief of Clement Sprouse.

Calendar No. 1916, H. R. 1913, a bill for the relief of Anna Doherty.

Calendar No. 1931, S. 2048, for the relief of certain former employees of the Inland Waterways Corporation.

Calendar No. 2066, H. R. 22160, authorizing the retention in service of certain disabled commissioned officers.

Calendar No. 2067, H. R. 4229, providing running mates for certain staff corps officers in the Navy.

Calendar No. 2068, H. R. 4437, dealing with the withholding for State employee retirement systems from compensation of certain civilian employees of the National Guard.

Calendar No. 2069, H. R. 4704, providing for examinations preliminary to promotion to officer of the Naval Service.

Calendar No. 2070, H. R. 5268, authorizing the payment of mileage allowances to certain military personnel.

Calendar Nos. 2071 and 2072, S. 2771 and 2772, to authorize lending of certain military equipment to the Boy Scouts of America.

Calendar No. 2073, H. R. 2106, providing that enlistment contracts of members of the Armed Forces shall not terminate by reason of appointment to the service academies.

Calendar No. 2074, H. R. 4363, authorizing the conveyance of certain property to the State of New Mexico.

Calendar No. 2075, H. R. 8477, amending the laws governing the distribution of women officers grades in the Armed Forces.

Calendar No. 2078, H. R. 7679, conveying certain land to the city of Muskogee, Okla.

Calendar No. 2079, H. R. 8490, conveying certain land to the city of Bonham, Tex.

Calendar No. 2080, H. R. 8674, conveying certain property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.

Calendar No. 2081, H. R. 9358, directing the issuance of a deed for certain land to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.

Calendar No. 2082, H. R. 10251, conveying certain land to the city of Grand Junction, Colo.

Calendar No. 2083, H. R. 8123, conveying certain property to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.

NATIONAL RECREATION ASSOCIATION AWARD TO ALLEN E. MORRELL, OF BRUNSWICK, MAINE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, a special honor has been awarded to one of Maine's outstanding citizens—Allen E. Morrell, of Brunswick, Maine—for his leadership in the establishment of a fully municipal year-round program of recreation under trained leadership in Brunswick. As chairman of many recreation committees, he has spearheaded practically every organized step toward the ultimate creation of a municipal recreation program.

For his outstanding leadership, he has been awarded a special certificate of appreciation and letter of citation by the National Recreation Association.

I salute this distinguished graduate of Bowdoin for this well-deserved honor, as I am sure all other Maine citizens do. He carries on the great record he made at Bowdoin as a star in football, baseball, and hockey.

AWARD OF AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE ACHIEVEMENT TROPHY TO SENATOR BUTLER, OF MARYLAND

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, unfortunately I was not in Washington on last Thursday, when it was announced that my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Maryland, JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, had been named recipient of the American Legion's merchant marine achievement trophy.

Through close association with JOHN BUTLER, I believe I can attest to his great leadership and foresight in behalf of the American merchant marine. Though belatedly, I should like to join with the other Senators who have paid tribute to JOHN BUTLER on this outstanding achievement, and to ask, Mr. President, that an editorial entitled "Due Reward," from the May 25, 1956, issue of the Baltimore News-Post, be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DUE REWARD

Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER has been named recipient of the American merchant marine achievement trophy, an award given by the Robert L. Hague Merchant Marine Industries Post of the American Legion. The honor is not misplaced.

In his promotion of our merchant marine, a cause which was sorely in need of support, Senator BUTLER has been zealous. He realized and emphasized the need of keeping up our ships and of maintaining at least a nucleus of organization in our shipyards, Baltimore's among them.

He recognized that we need ships of our own in time of peace, and that, should a third world war ensue, we shall need them urgently and in multitude; and that hence our shipyards should not be permitted to

languish, starved by lack of orders, to less than a skeleton force.

He saw our American merchant marine as our fourth arm of national defense.

Senator BUTLER deserves recognition. He received what is his due.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, RELATING TO USE OF BROADCASTING STATIONS—HOLDING OF BILL AT DESK FOR COSPONSORS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier today I introduced a bill (S. 3962) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the use of broadcasting stations by presidential, vice presidential, and congressional candidates. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk, to enable other Senators to join in sponsoring it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For how long a period of time does the Senator from Minnesota request that that be done?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Until Tuesday of next week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTROL OF NARCOTIC DRUGS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3760) to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other related purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the acting majority leader. Do I correctly understand that the narcotics bill will be the order of business on Thursday? Also, is it the intention to dispose of that bill on Thursday afternoon?

Mr. SMATHERS. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that that bill is the unfinished business, and its consideration will be resumed on Thursday. However, inasmuch as I understand that the Department of Commerce appropriation bill is ready for consideration, when that bill is considered, of course the narcotics bill will again be laid aside.

Mr. MORSE. In order that no one may say that the Senator from Oregon did not give due notice of the concern many of us feel in regard to the narcotics bill, a considerable number of us think it is one of the most major pieces of legislation which could possibly confront the Senate at this session. We believe that the wiretapping feature of it goes to the very roots of personal liberty in America. We believe that it raises a great historic issue. We are satisfied that it calls for the most careful and deliberate consideration by this great deliberative body. We trust that the Senate leadership will plan ample time for its careful consideration, because we think it is a matter of which the country should be fully aware. We do not believe that such legislation should be enacted until our people as a whole are made aware of the precedential features of the wiretapping section of the bill. We think that every man and women in America ought to know that under that section of the bill, if it should ever become law, their telephones could be tapped, and all the conversation which might take place over those wires could come into the possession of law-enforcement officials.

I wish to make it very clear that I think the narcotics traffic needs to be brought under strict regulation. I say this to the acting majority leader because since my speech of last Friday certain commentators who obviously, from their writings, show gross ignorance of what I said on the floor of the Senate, and clearly never took the time to read what I said on the floor of the Senate before they wrote their articles, sought to leave the impression that in some way, somehow, the senior Senator from Oregon seems to favor the illicit drug traffic. I certainly do not.

However, I will tell the Senate what I do favor. I favor the protection of the privacy of free men and women in America. I do not propose on Thursday to have the narcotics bill passed in any short period of time. I want it understood that I am not alone in my viewpoint that when we resume consideration of the narcotics bill and reach the section on wiretapping, we shall be dealing with a subject which goes to the freedom of free people. I do not propose to have that bill pass without a thorough discussion of the entire question of wiretapping, no matter how many days may be required fully to inform the American people of what I consider to be a serious threat to their liberties.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished Senator from Oregon that a bill of this nature should have adequate discussion. I certainly hope it will have. However, I think the conscience of the Nation and the conscience of the Senate are not unmindful that there is no greater crime than the sale of narcotics to any person, for that matter, but particularly to youngsters and juveniles; and there is no crime on the statute books—not even excluding murder or kidnapping—which to my mind is a greater crime than inducing the narcotics habit in youngsters of school age. I think the Government should take every action necessary to make sure that this crime of crimes is adequately curtailed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say that the Senator from California has not uttered a syllable in his last remarks with which I am not in complete agreement. However, I call attention to the fact that at the very foundation of our great Republic Patrick Henry was careful to point out to the Founding Fathers that not even the crime of treason justifies our jeopardizing and destroying the individual liberty of free men and women by the adoption of a procedure which would violate their personal freedom.

I happen to believe that we can check the illicit traffic in drugs, and must check it, without adopting a procedure which would endanger the freedom and privacy of free men and women.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I feel certain that the Senator from Oregon will have ample time to go into a full and thorough discussion of his views on this particular proposal. I am sure there will be no effort on the part of anyone to curtail that discussion in any way.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. SMATHERS. If there are no further remarks or requests, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and at 12 o'clock and 26 minutes a. m., Wednesday, May 30, 1956, the Senate took a recess until Thursday, May 31, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 29 (legislative day of May 24), 1956:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ellis O. Briggs, of Maine, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Brazil.

Theoder C. Achilles, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Peru.

Walter C. Dowling, of Georgia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Korea.

J. Graham Parsons, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Laos.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 29, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whom we live and move and have our being, we praise Thee for the gift of life, its wonder and mystery, its beauty and glory, its joys and pleasures, its fellowships and friendships, and its opportunities for service.

We beseech Thee to inspire and sustain us with a sense of Thy divine presence and power as we again assemble in this Chamber to discharge the duties and responsibilities of our high vocation.

May we perform every task faithfully and diligently and whenever we fail or falter, through ignorance or weakness, may Thy fatherly wisdom correct us and Thine infinite mercy forgive us.

Grant that our beloved Speaker and the members of his bereaved family may continue to be blessed with the consolation and certainty of Thy grace as they seek to carry on courageously.

We thank Thee for their humble and confident spirit which is not murmuring or complaining but yielding itself with due resignation and patience unto all Thy righteous dealings and the wise dispensations of Thy divine providence.

To Thy name we ascribe all the glory. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 273):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate take a recess until 10 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9390) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. NORRELL, Mr. SIEMINSKI, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. FENTON, Mr. SCRIVNER, and Mr. TABER.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1957

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 10721, an act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. PRESTON, Mr. SIKES, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. COUDERT, Mr. BOW, Mr. CLEVENGER, and Mr. TABER.

THE INTEGRATION ISSUE

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is seldom that I come into the well of the House to speak on any subject unless it has to do with an appropriation bill which is handled by my committee, or with agriculture, flood control, or pertains to the conservation of our natural resources. However, because of the unrest, heartaches, and even turmoil in my State that has been brought about by the nonjudicial, political school integration decision of the United States Supreme Court, I am moved to speak again at this time.

Without a doubt, the situation which has developed, and now exists, in the South as a result of the Supreme Court's public-school integration decision has brought more tension and disruption and disturbance into the hearts and minds and lives of the people of the South than they have experienced since the fratricidal War Between the States and the destructive carpetbagger period that followed. The now commonly referred to "Black Monday" decision of the Court has, in fact, caused more damage to the colored race in the South than any other single act of the past 50 years.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this Nation, and particularly the Members of the Congress, urgently need to come to a more positive understanding of the necessity for safeguarding the States rights concept in our Government. The people of the Nation as a whole, and especially our officials of Government, must more fully comprehend the need for cessation of acts which are literally fanning fires of unrest and suspicion and hatred.

The recently issued Southern Manifesto—of which I was proud to be a signer, while regretting with my whole being the existence of the situation requiring its issuance—was, and is, much broader than the question of racial segregation to which it was, of course, specifically directed. It is a document which actually embodies in its thoughts and principles the traditions which the South has cherished for generations. It makes clear the continued adherence of the people of the South to the most basic principle of our constitutional form of government—the principle which holds that all rights not granted to the Federal Government are reserved to the States and to the people.

The final power in a free nation resides in the people. The people generally are reasonable, Mr. Speaker; but they know that when any one branch of government oversteps its bounds, then the people must take action to remedy the situation.

It would, therefore, indeed be fuzzy thinking on the part of anyone to doubt that the southern people will use all lawful means to reverse the Supreme Court's school integration decision. To say that our people should not object to a decision so unfair as this one, with its disregard for all judicial precedent and reason, with its attempt at usurpation of the powers of Congress and the several States, would be in violation of all sense of reason and decency.

Mr. Speaker, what we need now is a return to reason. It is very much to be hoped—for the welfare of the whole country and for the best interests of all races—that the reasoned judgment of reasonable men, as set forth in the Southern Manifesto, will serve to bring the Nation to its senses.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama to call up a bill.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3515) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to assist in the provision of housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 809. (a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title and in addition to mortgages insured under section 803, the Commissioner may insure any mortgage under this section which meets the eligibility requirements set forth in section 203 (b) of this act: *Provided*, That a mortgage insured under this section shall have been executed by a mortgagor who at the time of insurance is the owner of the property and either occupies the property or certifies that his failure to do so is the result of a change in his employment by the Armed Forces or a contractor thereof and to whom the Secretary or his designee has issued a certificate indicating that such person requires housing and is at the date of the certificate a civilian employee at a research and development installation of one of the Armed Forces of the United States or a contractor thereof and is considered by the Armed Forces to be an essential, nontemporary employee at such date. Such certificate shall be conclusive evidence to the Commissioner of the employment status of the mortgagor and of the mortgagor's need for housing.

"(b) No mortgage shall be insured under this section unless the Secretary or his designee shall have certified to the Commissioner that the housing is necessary to provide adequate housing for such civilians employed in connection with such a research and development installation and that there is no present intention to substantially curtail the number of such civilian personnel assigned or to be assigned to such installation. Such certification shall be conclusive evidence to the Commissioner of the need for such housing but if the Commissioner determines that insurance of mortgages on such housing is not an acceptable risk, he may require the Secretary to guarantee the Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund from loss with respect to mortgages insured pursuant to this section. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to provide for payment to meet losses arising from such guaranty.

"(c) The Commissioner may accept any mortgage for insurance under this section without regard to any requirement in any other section of this act, that the project or property be economically sound or an acceptable risk.

"(d) Any mortgagee under a mortgage insured under this section is entitled to the benefits of insurance as provided in section 204 (a) with respect to mortgages insured under section 203.

"(e) The provisions of subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), and (j) of section 204 shall apply to mortgages insured under this section except that as applicable to those mortgages: (1) all references to the 'Fund' or 'Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund' shall refer to the 'Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund' and (2) all references to section 203 shall refer to this section.

"(f) The provisions of sections 801, 802, 803 (c), 803 (i), 803 (j), 804 (a), 804 (b), and 807 and the provisions of section 803 (a) relating to the aggregate amount of all mortgages insured and the expiration date of the Commissioner's authority to insure under this title, shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this section."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 8, strike out "research and development" and insert "research or development."

Page 2, line 9, strike out "Armed Forces of the United States or a contractor thereof and is considered by the Armed Forces" and insert "military departments of the United States or a contractor thereof and is considered by such military department."

Page 2, line 21, strike out "research and development" and insert "research or development."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend at this point in the RECORD a letter from the Defense Department concerning this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

(The letter referred to follows:)

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., May 29, 1956.

Hon. ALBERT RAINS,
Chairman, Housing Subcommittee,
Committee on Banking and Currency,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to a request by a member of your staff for a further statement on S. 3515, with regard to which it is intended to make use of the provisions of this legislation.

It is planned to build housing under the S. 3515 program for civilian employees of the military departments at installations where the primary mission is research or development in the Department of Defense research and development program, or for civilian employees of firms holding research and development contracts.

It is proposed to build such housing in the vicinity of Redstone Arsenal, Ala.; Patrick Air Force Base, Fla.; Holloman Air Force Base, N. Mex.; Naval Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern, Calif., and possibly a few other installations. It is not expected at this time that the number of units to be built under this program will exceed 10,000.

Sincerely yours,

FLOYD S. BRYANT.

THE LATE HONORABLE FINIS J. GARRETT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed to announce the death of a former Member of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it is with very deep regret and personal sorrow that I announce the death of my predecessor as a Member of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Finis J. Garrett, who passed away at his home here in Washington last Friday, May 25.

Judge Garrett served 24 years of continuous service as a Member of this House, and voluntarily retired. He was the Democratic nominee for Speaker of the House at the time of his retirement, and for several terms prior thereto had been the minority leader of the House. On his retirement from Congress he was appointed a judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals by President Coolidge. Later he was appointed presiding judge of that court by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. He also served with great credit and distinction as a member of the Battle Monuments Commission from the beginning of that Commission until he resigned a few years ago.

During his service in the House of Representatives he was recognized as one of the greatest parliamentarians and orators of his time. He was a great statesman and a most distinguished and outstanding judge. He rendered public service for more than half a century.

I am sure I express the true sentiment of each and every Member of this body, especially those remaining here who served with him, when I extend to his son and his daughter and their families our deepest regret and most heartfelt sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD and that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of Judge Garrett.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Finis J. Garrett was elected to the 59th Congress and served during the 11 succeeding Congresses.

It was my privilege to serve with him during the time that he was Democratic floor leader.

He was a courtly gentleman, a powerful debater and a great parliamentarian. I would class Finis Garrett as a great American and one of our Nation's capable and outstanding statesmen.

He and I were friends not only during the period that we served together in the House of Representatives but after he became judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals. Hon. Finis J. Garrett was appointed judge by President Coolidge and he took office on March 5, 1929, and became presiding judge of that court on December 9, 1937.

The people of the great State of Tennessee can be proud of the legislative and judicial record of the Honorable Finis J. Garrett. He was a great man.

I extend my sympathy to those members of his family who mourn his loss.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with my colleagues in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of Judge Finis J. Garrett, of Tennessee.

Judge Garrett enjoyed a wide and honorable reputation and was held in great esteem as a legislator, jurist, and able public servant.

After coming to Congress, I learned to know Judge Garrett personally and although he was then a member of the United States Court of Claims, he continued his interest in the House of Representatives where he served for a number of years with great distinction. Judge Garrett frequently visited the House and it was my privilege to come to know this distinguished jurist intimately. I was always impressed by his outstanding ability, the brilliance of his mind, and his penetrating interest in public affairs.

Judge Garrett was a great Tennessean—an esteemed son of the Volunteer State. He served his State and Nation long and well and with great distinction.

The news of his passing brings sadness to his many friends in Tennessee and elsewhere. I wish to extend my sympathy to his fine son and daughter-in-law, Burns and Hilda Garrett, and their lovely children—the grandchildren of Judge Garrett—as well as to other members of his fine family. His memory will live on. His name is high on the honor roll of the great men of Tennessee.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, I was distressed to learn of the death of Judge Finis Garrett. He was a most distinguished Member of the House of Representatives for many years prior to his appointment on the bench. He served his State and the Nation with fidelity and courage. Our State and Nation have lost another distinguished statesman and judge. His service to this country was outstanding and will long be remembered, and his passing is mourned by all who knew him.

REFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations be discharged from further consideration of the bill H. R. 11125 and that the bill be rereferred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House may have until midnight tonight to file reports on H. R. 11456, 5382, and 9280.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

AMENDING FURTHER THE MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1954, AS AMENDED

Mr. BOLLING (on behalf of Mr. MADDEN), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 515, Rept. No. 2221), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 day, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

ADVANCING THE SCIENTIFIC AND PROFESSIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS OF THE DEPARTMENTS OF DEFENSE, THE INTERIOR, AND COMMERCE

Mr. BOLLING (on behalf of Mr. TRIMBLE), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 516, Rept. No. 2222), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11040) to advance the scientific and professional research and development programs of the Departments of Defense, the Interior, and Commerce, to improve the management and administration of certain departmental activities, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PROVIDING A LUMP-SUM READJUSTMENT PAYMENT FOR MEMBERS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS WHO ARE INVOLUNTARILY RELEASED FROM ACTIVE DUTY

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 517, Rept. No. 2223), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9952) to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

FLUORIDATION OF WATER

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include the contents of a pamphlet entitled "Facts in Refutation of Claims by Opponents of Fluoridation."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I have noticed in the RECORD the insertion of letters from time to time from individuals who are opposed to the fluoridation of the water supplies of the country. In relation thereto I think it quite appropriate that the opinion of the American Dental Association and other authorities should also be made a part of the RECORD, as this organization, with many other scientific bodies, have studied this problem from every angle and reached the conclusion that this is a great public health project which will be of inestimable value to present and future generations of the American people. I, therefore, include as a part of my remarks the contents of the pamphlet entitled "Facts in Refutation of Claims by Opponents of Fluoridation," by A. P. Black, Ph. D., Gainesville, Fla., a reprint from the Journal of the American Dental Association, June 1955, and approved by that organization, as follows:

[From the Journal of the American Dental Association of June 1955]

FACTS IN REFUTATION OF CLAIMS BY OPPONENTS OF FLUORIDATION

(By A. P. Black, Ph. D., Gainesville, Fla., presented before section on public health dentistry, 95th annual session, American Dental Association, Miami, Fla., November 8, 1954)

When the story of fluoridation is examined in retrospect, it becomes clear that its development as a recognized public health measure may be divided into three distinct periods. The first and longest was a period of study and observation which could be called the period of discovery, for during that period the idea of fluoridation was born. It began in 1906 with the now classical studies of G. V. Black of the enamel lesions which were found on the teeth of most of the native population of Colorado Springs, Colo., and which in 1909 he called mottled enamel. It witnessed the publication in 1916 of a series of five papers by G. V. Black and Frederick S. McKay[1] describing for the first time these lesions and indicating that some constituent of the water supply might be the causative agent. It witnessed the important studies carried out at Britton, S. Dak.;[1] Oakley, Idaho,[2] and Bauxite, Ark.[3] The latter study led directly to the discovery by Churchill in 1931[4] that the fluoride ion present in the water supply was the cause of the mottling. In the period 1933 to 1937, Dean and Elvove[5] reported that fluoride in concentration of 1 part per million or less had no public health significance. The period was brought to a close by the well-planned field surveys of Dean, Elvove and Arnold, culminating in the announcement by Dean in 1942[6] that caries incidence was about 60 percent less in areas where the fluoride content of the water was 1 part per million or more.

Since it was now evident that concentrations of the fluoride ion substantially in excess of 1 part per million resulted in dental fluorosis and that concentrations less than 1 part per million were associated with a significant increase in the amount of dental caries, it was inevitable that the suggestion should be made that the concentration of fluoride ion in public water supplies should be adjusted so as to provide this optimum concentration.

The second period in the development of fluoridation should perhaps be called the period of controlled experimentation, because it was during this period that the procedure was on trial by professional scientists. Ast,[7] in 1943, presented a detailed program for testing what was then called artificial fluoridation, and the following year baseline studies were begun on large groups of children at Newburgh and Kingston, N. Y., and at Grand Rapids and Muskegon, Mich. Fluoridation was begun at Grand Rapids in January 1945 and at Newburgh in May of the same year. Because of the publicity given to these experiments, a few communities, unwilling to await the results, began to fluoridate their water supplies. Five communities initiated fluoridation in 1946, 4 in 1947, 8 in 1948, 19 in 1949, and 39 in 1950. Thus, the close of the first 5 years of the experimental period found 78 cities and towns employing fluoridation. Early in 1950[8]

[1] Black, G. V., and McKay, F. S. Mottled teeth: An endemic developmental imperfection in the enamel of teeth heretofore unknown in the literature of dentistry. D. Cosmos 58: 129 February; 477 May; 627 June; 781 July; 894 August 1916.

[2] McKay, F. S. Mottled enamel: The prevention of its further production through a change of the water supply at Oakley, Idaho. JADA 20: 1137 July 1933.

[3] Kempf, G. A., and McKay, F. S. Mottled enamel in segregated population. Public Health Report 45: 2923 November 28, 1930.

[4] Churchill, H. V. Occurrence of fluorides in some waters of the United States. Journal of Industrial and Engineering Chemistry 23: 996 September 1931.

[5] Dean, H. T., and Elvove, E. Studies on the minimal threshold of the dental sign of chronic endemic fluorosis (mottled enamel). Public Health Report 50: 1719 December 6, 1935.

[6] Dean, H. T., Arnold, F. A., and Elvove, E. Domestic water and dental caries. V. Additional studies of the relation of fluoride in domestic water to dental caries experience in 4,425 white children, age 12 to 14 years, of 13 cities in 4 States. Public Health Report 57: 1155 August 7, 1942.

[7] Ast, D. B. Caries-fluorine hypothesis and a suggested study to test its application. Pub. Health Report 58: 857, June 4, 1943.

[8] Dean, H. T., and others. Epidemiological studies of fluoride waters and dental caries. Compilation of basic studies conducted by the National Institutes of Health on domestic water and dental caries. Washington, D. C., National Institute of Health, Federal Security Agency, Public Health Service, 1950.

the United States Public Health Service released information that the Grand Rapids experiment was showing striking reductions in dental decay in the 5-, 6-, and 7-year-old children. Since it had been assumed that 10 to 12 years would be required to establish possible benefits, this information convinced many other communities of its success, and the number of cities and towns has increased rapidly from that date until the present, reaching a peak for the 10-year period in 1952.[9]

On August 12, 1954, Osawatomie, Kans., became the 1,000th community to fluoridate its water supply, and at present more than 18 million people are consuming fluoridated water. An additional 3,500,000 people are consuming, and have consumed for years, water naturally containing concentrations of the fluoride ion needed for maximum protection. In July 1954 Chicago joined the rapidly growing list of major American cities to adopt fluoridation. These facts make it evident that fluoridation has now reached full stature as a recognized public health procedure, and that another great landmark in man's long fight against disease has been passed. The year 1954 may therefore be looked upon as the beginning of the third period which may be characterized as the Period of Development. There is every reason to expect that its rapid adoption as a public health procedure, both in this country and abroad, will continue, and that before another decade has passed fluoridation will be as routinely practiced for public water supplies as chlorination is today.

ANSWERS TO OBJECTIONS

The great progress that has been made has not been made without difficulties. Through December 31, 1953, 115 towns had held referendums on fluoridation. Sixty-three communities with a population of 2,159,438 had approved it, while 52 communities with a population of 1,789,404 had rejected it. Fourteen communities in 9 States discontinued fluoridation after it had been put into practice. By 1951 opposition had developed throughout the country manifested by printed material, letters to the editor, newspaper articles, mimeographed reproductions of adverse statements on the subject, and articles in national magazines. Many of the statements which recur in this material are so fantastic that they do not merit serious consideration. A careful study of a typical cross section of this material reveals that most of the arguments fall into a common pattern, and it is the purpose of this paper to present the facts which may be used to refute them.

Does fluoridation actually reduce tooth decay?

There are still numerous opponents of fluoridation who maintain that fluoridation is not effective in reducing tooth decay, and there are others who maintain that it is only good for children up to 8 years of age. Table 1 [10] presents the most recent data. Findings at Grand Rapids and Newburgh may be summarized as follows:

1. After 8 years of fluoridation at Grand Rapids, dental caries among 6-year-old children who have had only fluoridated water during their entire life has been reduced 70.8 percent.

2. A totally unexpected result has been a 25 percent reduction in caries in the 16-year-old group who were 8 years of age when the experiment began.

3. At Muskegon, Mich., the control city where fluoride-free water is used, the incidence of dental caries is unchanged and approximates the national norm.

4. The Grand Rapids caries rate in 6-year-old children is identical with the caries rate of the same age group at Aurora, Ill., where the water supply contains 1.2 parts per million of naturally occurring fluorides, indicating that added fluoride is identical in nature and effect to fluoride naturally present in the water supply.

TABLE 1.—*Fluoridation study projects*

Community	Date started	Report period	Age group	Reduction in decay [1]
		Years	*Years*	*Percent*
Grand Rapids, Mich.	1945	8	6	70.8
			7	52.5
			8	49.2
			9	48.1
			13	39.7
Brantford, Ontario, Canada	1945	7	6	59.4
			7	69.5
			8	51.5
			9	46.2
			13	32.9
Newburgh, N. Y.	1945	7	6	69.4
			7	67.8
			8	40.4
			9	51.4
Evanston, Ill.	1947	4	6	73.6
			7	56.4
			8	35.4
Sheboygan, Wis.	1946	6	[2] 9–10	35.3
			[3] 12–14	29.7

[1] Decayed, missing, filled (DMF) permanent teeth.
[2] 4th grade.
[3] 8th grade.
Source: Committee on Dental Health of the Food and Nutrition Board, National Research Council—National Academy of Sciences.

In the Newburgh-Kingstn studies, the results are as follows:

1. Children in the 6 and 7 year age groups at Newburgh, where flouride is added, have 60 percent less caries than children in the same age groups at Kingston, where fluoride-free water is used.

2. The percentage of children in the 5, 6, and 7 year age groups at Newburgh with no decayed deciduous teeth is twice as high as at Kingston.

3. The general decay rate for deciduous teeth at Newburgh is 59 percent lower for 5-year-olds and 48 percent lower for 6-year-olds than for the same age groups at Kingston. The DMF rate in the 6 to 12 year age group at Newburgh is 47 percent lower than the same age group at Kingston.

4. The most careful and extensive pediatric examinations of the hundreds of children in each city have disclosed no harmful effects of any sort which could be attributed to the consumption of water containing flouoride.

Data are now becoming available from all parts of the Nation that indicate that the rate of reduction in various age groups is essentially the same in spite of varying climatic conditions.

Is fluoridation mass medication?

The statement is often made that fluoridation constitutes mass medication and that it constitutes, in fact, the practice of socialized medicine. The following facts serve to refute the idea completely.

1. The purpose of medication is the cure of disease in some form. Fluorides are not added to water for therapeutic purposes, namely, to treat or to cure a disease. They constitute the only preventive tool which has ever been available to dental science throughout its long history. Fluorides do not cure a diseased condition of the teeth, namely caries. They perform a much more important service in that they help nature to build more resistant teeth.

2. Fluorides occur very widely both in this country and abroad as a normal constituent of natural water, although their presence in so many natural waters was not realized or even suspected until its importance became evident. Table 2 documents this statement.[11]

In table 2, it will be noted that 1,401 public water supplies in this country serving 4,188,000 consumers contain more than 0.7 parts per million of fluoride. Of these, 877 supplies serving 2,156,000 people contain more than 1 part per million and 283 waterworks systems, serving 703,550 people, contain more than 2 parts per million of fluoride.

From this data, therefore, it will be understood that fluoridation consists of merely a process of supplementation—adjusting a normal constituent of most natural waters to its optimum content from the standpoint of public health. Obviously, since fluoridation is not medication, it cannot be considered the practice of socialized medicine.

TABLE 2.—*Natural fluoride content of water supplies in United States*

Floride content p. p. m.	Number States reporting	Number waterworks systems	People served 1950
Unknown	24+	2,768	6,508,930
Less than 0.69	44	10,506	87,736,609
0.70 to 0.99	38	524	2,031,900
1.00 to 1.49	35	424	1,025,578
1.50 to 1.99	24	170	427,119
2.00 to 2.99	28	171	405,125
3.00 to more	23	112	298,425

Fluoridation violates the personal rights or religious freedom of the individual

The statement that fluoridation violates personal rights or religious freedom is employed, probably more than any other, by the opponents of fluoridation. The first five court decisions on fluoridation were rendered in 1952. They were in Northampton, Mass.; San Diego, Calif.; Chehalis, Wash.; Baltimore, Md.; and Fargo, N. Dak. In all cases fluoridation was upheld by the court, and in all except the Northampton case the main issue presented was the contention that fluoridation violates the 14th amendment to the Constitution, which indirectly protects persons from an invasion of their religious freedom by action of State and local governments. A discussion of all 5 of these cases by 2 outstanding New York attorneys may be found in the April 1953 number of the Journal of the American Water Works Association.[12] The court's decision in the San Diego case is typical of all of them and presents the philosophy of the law so clearly that it is quoted herewith:

"Religious freedom embraces two concepts—freedom of belief and freedom to act. The first is absolute, but in the nature of things the second cannot be, in that all acts or conduct of our citizens must conform to all reasonable regulations adopted by the respective governmental agencies acting within the scope of their authority. (*Rescue Army* v. *Municipal Court* (28 Cal. (2d) 460, 470).)

"In this connection our [California] State supreme court has said: 'There can be no question, therefore, that a person is free to hold whatever belief his conscience dictates; but when he translates his belief into action, he may be required to conform to reasonable regulations which are applicable to all persons and are designed to accomplish a permissible objective.' (*Rescue Army* v. *Municipal Court, supra* (citing U. S. Supreme Court cases); to the same effect, *Hamilton* v. *Regents* (293 U. S. 245 (Calif.)), *Garielli* v. *Knickerbocker* (12 Cal. (2d) 85).)

[9] Task group E 5–10. A decade of fluoridation, Journal of the American Water Works Association 46: 987, October 1954.

[10] American Dental Association, Bureau of Public Information. Information bulletin, May 1954.

[11] Task group E 5–10. Natural and applied fluoridation census. Journal of the American Water Works Association, 44: 559 June 1952.

[12] Land, W. W., and Mosenthal, E. K. Court decisions on municipal water fluoridation. Journal of the American Water Works Association, 45: 387, April 1953.

"Therefore, no constitutional rights of any of the citizens of San Diego to freedom of religious belief would be invaded or violated by the adoption of the proposed program."

The ruling in the Baltimore case was phrased in similar terms:

"The term 'religion' has reference to one's views of his relations to his Creator, and to the obligations they impose of reverence for His being and character, and of obedience to His will. It is often confounded with the cultus or form of worship of a particular sect, but is distinguishable from the latter. The first amendment to the Constitution, in declaring that Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or forbidding the free exercise thereof, was intended to allow everyone under the jurisdiction of the United States to entertain such notions respecting his relations to his Maker and the duties they impose as may be approved by his judgment and conscience, and to exhibit his sentiments in such form of worship as he may think proper, not injurious to the equal rights of others, and to prohibit legislation for the support of any religious tenets, or the modes of worship of any sect * * *. There have been sects which denied as a part of their religious tenets that there should be any marriage tie, and advocated promiscuous intercourse of the sexes as prompted by the passions of its members. And history discloses the fact that the necessity of human sacrifices, on special occasions, has been a tenet of many sects. Should a sect of either of these kinds ever find its way into this country, swift punishment would follow the carrying into effect of its doctrines, and no heed would be given to the pretense that, as religious beliefs, their supporters could be protected in their exercise by the Constitution of the United States.

"There is no question that under the Constitution of both the United States and the State of Maryland a person has a right to believe in any particular religion or faith that he cares to, but he does not have the absolute freedom to act in accordance with the tenets of any of those religions, but in his action he is bound to follow the laws duly enacted for the preservation of the health of citizens generally. He cannot object on religious grounds to laws enacted either by National, State, or city authorities. I find in this case that from the evidence none of the constitutional rights of the plaintiff to freedom of religious belief would be invaded or violated by the adoption of the proposed program."

It is also important to note that in the San Diego case the court rejected the argument that it was necessary for the defendant city to show that an emergency, epidemic, or danger of contagion or infection existed. The court found, on the other hand, based on numerous precedents, that the city need only to show that particular measure was reasonably necessary to promote health, which it had done.

Counsel for the American Water Works Association admirably summarized the five 1952 court decisions in the following words:

"Based on the foregoing court decisions and the other available legal authorities, the only possible conclusion is that, upon compliance with local law, there is no legal obstacle to adopting and carrying out a fluoridation program. For this reason, it would appear that the decision of a legislative body on the matter is controlling and that the desirability of initiating or continuing fluoridation of a public water supply can properly and usefully be argued only before the local governing body."

There have been a number of other cases since 1952 culminating in June 1954 in the refusal by the United States Supreme Court to interfere with previous California court decisions upholding San Diego's legal right to fluoridate its water supply. The record of all court actions to date may be summarized by the statement that the power of a municipality to fluoridate its water supply has been upheld by the courts in every instance where that power has been challenged.

Fluoridation means adding a poison to the water supply

The statement that fluoridation means adding a poison to the water supply, which has sometimes been facetiously termed "operation rat poison," recurs very frequently and is the type of statement calculated to inspire fear in the minds of the great body of consumers who are not able to check the facts themselves. Again and again, in the anti-fluoridation literature, the properties of the fluoride salts are confused with those of gaseous fluorine. It is true that all of the compounds presently used for the fluoridation of water have long been known as poisons, when ingested in massive doses. However, the same statement is true of a great many of the materials with which everyone comes in contact in their daily lives. The chlorine used for water sterilization, the alum used for water coagulation and the quick-lime and soda ash used for water softening are all corrosive poisons when ingested in massive doses. Both the spirits of ammonia and tincture of iodine, found in almost every home medicine chest, are corrosive poisons. Many of the medicines routinely used for the cure of diseases are deadly poisons when taken in sufficient doses. The truth of the matter is, of course, that when characterizes a substance as "poison," one must specify the conditions under which it is used. In the concentration of 1 part per million employed for fluoridation, none of the fluoride compounds will produce toxic effects, with the possible exception of unobjectionable dental fluorosis of the enamel in a small percentage of cases. It should again be emphasized that fluoridation does not add anything new to most water supplies since, as has been shown in table 2, the fluoride ion is a normal constituent of most water supplies and fluoridation merely adjusts its concentration to the optimum needed for protection of the teeth of children. Millions of people have been consuming fluoride-bearing waters all their lives without the slightest indication of any toxic effects.

Fluorides are stored in the body and produce a variety of diseases in older people

Of all the objections which have been raised by the opponents of fluoridation, the statement that fluorides are stored in the body and produce a variety of diseases in older people is possibly the one which has caused most concern and aroused most fear in the minds of people everywhere. It has been stated, for example, that fluorides will make bones brittle; that it will increase deaths due to cancer, nephritis, heart disease, cirrhosis of the liver, and intracranial lesions. It has been stated that fluorides will produce brain damage and feeble-mindedness and, most fantastic of all, that it will break down the "wills" of people and make them susceptible to Communist propaganda. The truth of the matter is that the evidence attesting to the safety of the addition of fluoride ions to water in a dosage of approximately 1 part per million is overwhelming. The Kettering Laboratory at the University of Cincinnati has recently listed more than 5,500 separate references in its classified bibliography of publications concerning fluorine and its compounds in relation to man, animals, and their environment, including effects on plants.

From the large number of competent statements covering this point, two will be quoted. The report of the water fluoridation committee of the St. Louis Medical Society [13] contains an admirable summarizing statement with respect to the storage of fluorides in the body:

"At the levels of intake supplied in fluoridation programs, there is practically no storage of fluorine except in the teeth. The ideal daily amount is about one milligram in temperate or predominantly cool climates and would be obtained by drinking one quart of water containing 1 part per million of fluoride ion. Storage elsewhere in the body has not been demonstrated with daily intakes of as much as 3 or 4 times that amount. Storage in bone apparently occurs with daily intakes substantially above 4 milligrams, though without demonstrable ill effect on persons who have lived all their lives with a water supply containing 8 parts per million of fluoride. A wide margin of safety is thus provided, inasmuch as intakes of fluorine about 50 percent above the ideal dose produce very mild evidences in the appearance of the teeth of such excess. These dental warnings are detectable only by expert examination and are in no way harmful to the teeth. There is no published record of any injury to the health of any person drinking natural fluoridated water with a concentration as high as 8 parts per million, nor of harmful effects at such lesser concentrations as occur naturally or are provided in fluoridation programs. No injurious effects can be found in the study of vital statistics of all the common major diseases, including cancer, or in the statistics of maternal and newborn death rates. Experimental studies on man (the most sensitive species) and lower animals confirm these evidences of the safety of a fluoridation program."

The report of the United Kingdom Mission [14] presents a somewhat similar statement that was arrived at after the Commission had spent 3 months in this country studying all phases of the problem:

"Research into the toxicology of fluorine compounds has been continuous, and the possibility that continued low-level consumption of flouride might eventually cause undesirable effects has been recognized for many years. This research and awareness has been stimulated by keen scientific and public interest and by not a little controversy. Yet, no definite evidence has been forthcoming that the continued consumption of fluorides at a level of about 1 p. p. m. is in any way harmful to health. This is an impressive fact and one which, in our opinion, makes it quite certain that if any untoward effect is revealed by future research it will be of a relatively trivial order. However, the opinion held by a minority of American scientists that fluoridation policies should not be actively pursued until further research into possible hazards has been undertaken, may be noted. It has been said that fluoridation involves a degree of "calculated risk." The authorities and communities concerned must decide for themselves what degree of risk is worth accepting. We do not wish to take sides in this matter of opinion, but merely to assert the fact that no risk is at present known to exist. If a risk exists at all, it is so inconspicuous that it has not been revealed by many years of investigation. Millions of people are living in ordinary good health on water containing fluoride in the amounts recommended for caries control (or more), so that the fluoridation of other waters involves no new experience in human welfare."

It seems well to conclude the arguments on this point with two other brief but highly significant statements.

---

[13] Water fluoridation, report of the committee of the St. Louis Medical Society summary. Missouri Med. 51: 124, February 1954.

[14] Report of the United Kingdom Mission. Fluoridation of domestic water supplies in North America as a means of controlling dental caries, London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1953.

Regarding the cancer charge, the president of the American Cancer Society, Dr. Charles S. Cameron, recently declared:

"The American Cancer Society does not consider fluorine or the common fluorine salts to be carcinogenic. Its position, therefore, with respect to water fluoridation for the purpose of dental caries prophylaxis, is that such treatment of public water supplies is without danger as far as cancer causation is concerned."

In December of 1953 the El Paso County (Colorado Springs, Colo.) Medical Society unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas, there is substantial evidence that the water supply of Colorado Springs has contained a surplus amount (2.6 parts per million) of fluoride for a period of about 75 years: Be it

"*Resolved*, That during the long practice of medicine in Colorado Springs, it is the considered opinion of the members of the El Paso County Medical Society that we have not experienced any clinical symptoms which can be attributed to the use of such water."

Natural fluorides versus artificial fluorides

The terms "natural fluorides" and "artificial fluorides" should never be used since there are no physical or chemical differences of any kind between fluorides naturally present in the water and fluorides being added in any of the forms presently being used in this country. The evidence for that statement is as follows:

1. Most salts, including the salts of fluorine which occur in water or which are added to water for the reduction of caries, dissociate into positively and negatively charged ions. The salts themselves are, therefore, not present in the water but only the ions resulting from their dissociation. In the case of fluorides naturally present in water and in the case of fluorides added to water, these ions are identical, and it is not logical to suppose that the same ions in water would produce different effects depending on whether they were naturally present or have been added.

2. The chemical methods for determining fluorides in water work equally well in the case of fluorides already present or in the case of fluorides added to the water. As a matter of fact, there is no known method of differentiating, physically or chemically, between fluorides naturally present and fluorides added.

3. The effects of natural fluorides and added fluorides in reducing dental caries are identical for the same concentration. This has been conclusively shown by comparison of the Grand Rapids and Newburgh data with data from the same age groups at Aurora, Ill., where fluorides are naturally present. The same conclusions have been reached in numerous other studies conducted throughout the country.

Fluoridation is wasteful since it benefits few people

It is true that people drink only about a half gallon of water per day of an average of 140 gallons produced per person per day. It should be remembered, however, that the water consumed for drinking, cooking, laundry, dishwashing, and bathing for each member of the average family is less than 10 gallons per day. In spite of this low percentage of water consumption required to meet all domestic requirements, hundreds of municipal water supplies are softened or treated for the removal of color, taste, odor, and are sterilized with chlorine at treatment costs many times greater than the cost of fluoridation. Yet these treatment processes are likewise required for only that small percentage of water used for direct human needs. Furthermore, in the last 50 years these improvements in the quality of public water supplies have saved the lives of at least 5 million persons who would have died of water-borne diseases if the water supply industry had not kept in step with the advances in scientific knowledge. In 1900 more than 50 persons per 100,000 living died each year from typhoid fever alone in the United States. Today in this country less than 1 person per 200,000 living dies of typhoid.

Lastly, the cost of fluoridation is extremely small. At present prices, it ranges from $1.40 to $3.20 per million gallons. To the local consumer it is much more meaningful to say that the total amortized cost of fluoridation, which includes the cost of the chemicals, of the feeding equipment, and additional labor required, varies between 5 cents and 20 cents per person per year. The saving which will result for every American family in lowered dental bills will amount to hundreds of times that family's proportionate cost of fluoridation. The waterworks industry has, therefore, expressed its willingness that water be used as the vehicle for providing children with the optimum daily requirement of fluoride and its willingness to implement the program when it comes as the result of public demand and has the approval of the local medical and dental societies and the local and State health authorities responsible for the communal health.

Overdosage of fluorides would be possible, with dangerous consequences

There are a number of chemical feeders on the market capable of meeting all requirements for feeding the chemicals used in fluoridation. As a matter of fact, waterworks operators have for many years been feeding other water-treatment chemicals with the uniformity of feeding and accuracy which will be required of fluoridation. The danger of significant overdosage simply does not exist. Eighteen and eight-tenths pounds of 98-percent sodium fluoride is added to each million gallons of water to provide a dosage of 1 pound per minute of the fluoride ion. In order to produce among water consumers the first mild symptoms of toxic fluorosis, there would need to be added to each million gallons of water 4,600 pounds, or 2.3 tons, of sodium fluoride or its equivalent. For each consumer to receive a lethal dose of sodium fluoride, there would need to be added to each million gallons of water 80,000 pounds, or 40 tons, of the chemical.

Fluorides produce tastes in water and render it corrosive

In the concentration of 1 p. p. m. employed in fluoridation, none of the chemicals has any effect on the taste of the water, nor do they render it corrosive.

The Delaney Committee Report [15]

The Delaney committee was a House Select Committee To Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Foods and Cosmetics of the 82d Congress. It held hearings in New York City and Washington in January, February, and March of 1952. Toward the end of its hearings it received testimony for and against fluoridation. The committee made no attempt to check the professional competence of witnesses to testify in a scientific inquiry and, as a result, a great deal of irrelevant and incompetent material was introduced. At the conclusion of its hearings, the committee described fluoridation as a calculated risk. It is important to remember that this observation represents only the personal opinion of a majority of a small congressional committee and has no official standing or meaning, and remember also that it has been completely refuted by the great mass of contrary evidence. It is significant to note that the city of Washington, D. C., adopted and began the practice of fluoridation after the Delaney committee hearings had been concluded.

COMMENT

Space does not permit consideration of all of the arguments which have been advanced against fluoridation. It has been characterized, for example, as a plan to make profits for the Aluminum Company of America and other large chemical companies. It has been claimed that it will produce sterility in human beings. It has been said that individual variations are such that it is not possible to state that any amount of fluoride is safe. It has been claimed that it is an unnecessary procedure since caries can be controlled by reducing the amount of sugar and carbohydrates in the diet of children. The answers to all of these questions, and many others, may be found in the references which have been cited, to the list of which must be added the excellent fluoridation kit of the American Dental Association. Finally, it should be said again that "this reduction in the incidence of dental caries gives promise of being one of the landmarks in the history of public health, not only in this generation but in this century."

[15] Fluoridation of water. Hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. House of Representatives, 83d Congress, 2d session, on H. R. 2341. A bill to protect the public health from the dangers of fluoridation of water, May 25–27, 1954. Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1954.

CONSTITUTION WEEK

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution to designate the 7-day period beginning September 17 each year as Constitution Week. Last year we passed this resolution for 1955. Considering the importance to us of "the greatest document ever written," as Gladstone called it, I think it entirely fitting and proper that this be an annual celebration. If we now so declare it, proper celebration plans can be made far enough in advance to make it an annual nationwide and highly celebrated event.

Back in 1832 Daniel Webster, in his matchless eulogy on General Washington, declared:

We must defend our heritage against enemies, foreign and domestic.

Now, 114 years later, we quote him to the House:

Other misfortunes may be borne, or their effects overcome. If disastrous wars should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation, they will grow green again, and ripen to future harvests.

It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these may be rebuilt.

But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government?

Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty?

Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity?

No, if these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Coliseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a

mournful and a melancholy immortality. Bitter tears, however, will flow over them than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the monuments of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR AND SUSPENSION OF THE RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar on Monday, June 4, be dispensed with; and that it may be in order on Tuesday, June 5, to call the Consent Calendar; and that it may be in order on June 5 for the Speaker to recognize Members for motions to suspend the rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

STATUS-OF-FORCES TREATY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a United Press news report from Tokyo brings word that an American Air Force captain, who fired four Japanese civilians from their jobs on an Air Force base in Japan, is being held liable for their wages. He has been ordered by a Japanese civil court not only to reinstate these four workers, who he had every reason to believe are Communists, but he has also been ordered by the same Japanese civil court to pay each of them 4 months' back wages out of his own pocket.

I submit that this is another good reason why the Status of Forces Treaties, agreements, and secret agreements with foreign countries providing for trial of Americans in foreign courts ought to be thrown into the discard without further loss of time.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 11177) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2214)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11177) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 7, 8, 12, 19, 20, and 22.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 14, 15, 17, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, and 36, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$26,294,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,650,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$48,370,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$49,865,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$227,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,160,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "$214,000,000, of which not to exceed $25,000,000 shall be placed in reserve to be borrowed under the same terms and conditions to the extent that such amount is required during the fiscal year 1957 under the then existing conditions for the expeditious and orderly development of the rural electrification program; and rural telephone program, $100,000,000, of which not to exceed $20,000,000 shall be placed in reserve to be borrowed under the same terms and conditions to the extent that such amount is required during the fiscal year 1957 under the then existing conditions for the expeditious and orderly development of the rural telephone program"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$165,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "$5,500,000; and an additional amount not to exceed $15,000,000 may be borrowed under the same terms and conditions to the extent that such additional amount is required during fiscal year 1957 under the then existing conditions for the expeditious and orderly conduct of the loan program under Title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$26,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,740,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$735,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 5.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
FRED MARSHALL,
WM. H. NATCHER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
C. W. VURSELL,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
LISTER HILL,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
JOE MCCARTHY,
KARL E. MUNDT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11177) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Research Service

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2—Research: Appropriate $49,972,000 as proposed by the House instead of $49,736,400 as proposed by the Senate, including $1,850,000 for construction of buildings instead of $1,300,000 as proposed by the House and $1,900,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed to by the conferees includes an additional $550,000 above the House allowance for the various construction programs, together with an additional $50,000 for flax research, an additional $39,400 for the Squaw-Butte Experiment Station, and an additional $15,000 for research on mechanization of prune harvesting.

Amendments Nos. 3 and 4—Plant and animal disease and pest control: Appropriate $26,294,000 instead of $22,594,000 as proposed by the House and $26,665,000 as proposed by the Senate, and provide $4,400,000 for the contingency fund instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the House and $4,465,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase above the House figures includes the following: $500,000 for gypsy moth control; $300,000 for baggage inspection by the Customs Bureau; $400,000 for expansion of Khapra beetle eradication work; $2,175,000 for eradication work on Mediterranean fruitfly; and $325,000 for survey and identification work on the burrowing nematode in Florida.

The conferees wish to fully endorse the statement in the House committee's report concerning the desirability and necessity of preventing travelers from leaving foreign ports with contaminated articles in their possession. Preembarkation inspection, together with adequate advance notice as to prohibited articles, should be undertaken to the fullest extent possible in carrying out the baggage-inspection program.

The amounts provided for the Mediterranean fruitfly, the gypsy moth, and the burrowing nematode are made available with the expectation that the States will provide funds in an amount at least equal to that provided by the Federal Government.

Amendment No. 5: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 6—Meat Inspection: Appropriates $15,650,000 instead of $15,500,000 as proposed by the House and $15,745,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8—Payments to States, etc.: Appropriate $29,503,708 as proposed by the House instead of $30,753,708 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement with the long-range objective of a "two-to-one ratio" between the Department of Agriculture and the State experiment station research funds, subject to annual review by Congress.

Amendment No. 9—Animal disease laboratory facilities: Eliminates House proposal to appropriate $10,000,000. The conferees agree that this item will again be considered when a final decision has been made as to the location of this facility. They are of the opinion that it should not be located at Beltsville, Md.

Extension Service

Amendments Nos. 10 and 11—Payments to States, etc.: Appropriate $49,865,000 instead of $49,615,000 as proposed by the House and $50,115,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees believe that the increased amount should be used to strengthen existing activities of the Extension Service rather than to create a separate organization for work in low income areas.

Amendment No. 12—Administration and coordination: Appropriates $2,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $2,035,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Agricultural Conservation Program Service

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $227,500,000 instead of $217,500,000 as proposed by the House and $250,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have agreed on a program for 1956 of $250,000,000, comprised of $227,500,000 in the accompanying bill and the use of balances from the 1954 program.

The Department is urged to review and modify its requirements on conservation practices to encourage farmer participation, and to institute changes in practices to liberalize the program.

The balance from the 1954 program clearly indicates the need for the Department to revise its procedures in making and revising program fund allocations to counties to meet changes in local conditions, as well as to compensate farmers in counties where conservation practices have exceeded the amounts heretofore allowed.

The Department should correct such problems and use such carryover funds as may be necessary to carry out in 1956 the full program of $250,000,000 announced by the Congress.

Amendments Nos. 14 and 15: Authorize $24,698,000 for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $24,500,000 as proposed by the House; and provides $4,773,800 for Washington office and State administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Agricultural Marketing Service

Amendment No. 16—Marketing research and agricultural estimates: Appropriates $13,200,000 instead of $13,000,000 as proposed by the House and $13,265,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17—Marketing services: Appropriates $13,020,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $13,000,000 as proposed by the House. The amount agreed to includes the two additional market news offices added by the Senate, as well as the locations set forth in the House report. The items added by the House are included in view of the strong local support as evidenced by the availability of matching funds from local sources.

Amendment No. 18—Payments to States, etc.: Appropriates $1,160,000 instead of $1,100,000 as proposed by the House and $1,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Foreign Agricultural Service

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $20,000 for representation allowances as proposed by the House instead of $25,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20: Deletes the Senate proposal to extend the use of representation allowances.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $3,750,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22: Restores House language earmarking funds for special studies of foreign agricultural production.

Commodity Exchange Authority

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $787,400 as proposed by the Senate instead of $780,000 as proposed by the House.

Commodity Stabilization Service

Amendments Nos. 24 and 25—Agricultural adjustment programs: Appropriate $41,200,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $41,000,000 as proposed by the House, and provide $6,343,100 for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $6,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 26 and 27—Sugar Act program: Appropriate $67,600,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $62,600,000 as proposed by the House, and authorize $1,873,000 for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,700,000 as proposed by the House.

Rural Electrification Administration

Amendment No. 28—Loan authorizations: Authorizes $214,000,000 for the rural electrification program, of which $25,000,000 is placed in reserve to meet unforeseen requirements, and provides $100,000,000 for the rural telephone program of which $20,000,000 is placed in a similar reserve.

Amendment No. 29—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $8,600,000 instead of $8,500,000 as proposed by the House and $8,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Farmers' Home Administration

Amendment No. 30—Loan authorizations: Authorizes $24,000,000 for farm tenancy loans as proposed by the Senate instead of $19,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 31—Loan authorizations: Authorizes $165,000,000 for production and subsistence loans instead of $140,000,000 as proposed by the House and $180,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32—Loan authorizations: Authorizes $5,500,000,000 for soil and water conservation loans as proposed by the House instead of $10,500,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and provides an additional $15,000,000 for production and subsistence loans to meet unforeseen requirements.

Amendment No. 33—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $26,750,000 instead of $26,405,000 as proposed by the House and $26,805,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the General Counsel

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates $2,740,000 instead of $2,700,000 as proposed by the House and $2,762,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Library

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates $735,000 instead of $725,000 as proposed by the House and $773,000 as proposed by the Senate.

General provisions

Amendment No. 36—Section 501: Provides that 622 of the 645 new motor vehicles to be purchased shall be for replacement, as proposed by the Senate.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
FRED MARSHALL,
WM. H. NATCHER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
C. W. VURSELL,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, in my discussion with the Department of Agriculture I have determined that the Department is agreeable to locating the new animal disease facility away from the Washington-Beltsville area. There has been no question in Congress about the need for this facility. The whole question has been as to the site.

There are a number of outstanding land-grant colleges having strong veterinary medical schools and which are presently engaged in extensive research and teaching on livestock problems in the central part of the United States. Selection of one of these locations would,

first, facilitate the exchange of research information between the schools and the laboratory; second, assist in the training of new research personnel; third, provide for better coordination and cooperation of research on livestock problems; fourth, provide the use of reference material from additional library facilities; and, fifth, be situated in the center of the livestock industry.

Before arriving at a final decision on the specific location, in my opinion, the Department should seek recommendations from the beef, dairy, swine, and poultry producers, the veterinary medical profession, land-grant colleges, State departments of agriculture and livestock sanitary commissions having livestock regulatory responsibilities, and other segments of the livestock industry.

If the Department will use this means in arriving at the selection of a site, I think the money required for the new facility should be provided. I hope the Department will make a new request as soon as possible on this basis. We can include this item in the final supplemental appropriation bill of the session, once the site selection has been made.

We cannot afford further delay in this matter. Over 55 percent of the gross farm income is derived from the sale of livestock and livestock products. Livestock disease losses are estimated at over $2 billion a year. These losses do not include large sums which are being spent by producers for pharmaceuticals, disinfectants, and so forth, used as treatments or preventatives. A highly effective research program can cut these tremendous livestock losses significantly as it has done so many times in the past. The new laboratory would provide space for comprehensive research on animal diseases and for diagnostic and testing work for control and regulatory activities. It would be designed to permit the study of 25 animal diseases simultaneously in completely isolated units under conditions providing for safety to the livestock industry and to the workers.

In Minnesota alone, for example, cash receipts to farmers from sales of dairy products in 1955 amounted to $234.7 million, cattle and calves $206.1 million, hogs $234.7 million, and poultry and eggs $165.4 million. Total cash receipts from sales of livestock and livestock products in Minnesota were $838.9 million. Livestock production in Minnesota is almost a billion-dollar industry, and in the United States as a whole returned cash receipts of almost $16 billion in 1955.

Now, might I ask my chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], whether he is not in agreement with my statement in substance.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would say to the gentleman we are all in agreement in thinking that attention should be given to putting this laboratory in such section of the United States as would remove the dangers which we pointed out would exist if it were put at Beltsville. I think it is highly important that the Department seek the advice of the organizations and of the people the gentleman has mentioned in his statement. Taking into consideration the time element, we do face something of an emergency, or so it is insisted by the Department. In view of that, they would probably have to limit themselves to some degree as to how thoroughly they could go into all of these various aspects with all the organizations, if we were to have the money in the supplemental bill in the present session.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Would the gentleman from Mississippi agree with me that, if the Department announces it will make the selection after following the procedure I have outlined, we could, without knowing the exact site, allocate the money in the final supplemental bill?

Mr. WHITTEN. I would personally not wish to reserve all right to determine exactly where the location is to be. I am not trying to get into the locating business.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am not either, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. On the other hand, I do think the conference report which was agreed on did say that they should reach some conclusion as to where they were going to put it, and, if they could do that, we would put it in the supplemental bill. I do not want to take issue with our own report, but certainly there is merit in the gentleman's contention and I think they can work it out.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I feel certain that the gentleman from Mississippi feels as I do and that there is no inclination from either side of our subcommittee to hold up this laboratory.

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly not.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We do not, however, want it in the Beltsville-Washington area because of the possible danger in locating such an animal-disease laboratory there.

Mr. WHITTEN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during the debate in the House on the Agriculture appropriation bill, I opposed the location of the Animal Disease Laboratory at Beltsville, Md. I did this because I was convinced that the Beltsville site was not an appropriate place to locate this type of permanent research facility. When this matter was being considered in the other body, the $10 million item of appropriation for this laboratory was deleted. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear that I am not opposed to this type of facility as this research is seriously needed. It is my understanding that an appropriation will be requested for this purpose when an agreement can be reached between the Department of Agriculture and the committees of Congress as to where such facilities should be located.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge that the Department of Agriculture consider locating this Animal Disease Laboratory in the Midwest. It would seem to me that the logical location would be in an area where the livestock is being produced, where the animals are available, and not too far removed from the livestock and packinghouse centers. I do not believe that such a facility need necessarily be located adjacent to any of the present research facilities but I do believe it should be located in an area where it is accessible.

It is my understanding that the Department of Agriculture is considering several sites in Illinois. It would appear that such a facility could logically be located in this area near the center of population, perhaps near Springfield, Ill., and the Animal Disease Eradication Branch of the Agricultural Research Service. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that the Department of Agriculture consider the appropriateness of sites available in Illinois, especially the suggested sites between Springfield, Ill., and St. Louis, Mo. I feel that this area would fully meet the requirements of the Department of Agriculture and would have facilities of the Department of Agriculture available as well as facilities such as the Research Center at the University of Illinois. Four agencies of the Department of Agriculture are located in Springfield, Ill., including the Animal Disease Eradication Branch of the Agricultural Research Service.

I would like to emphatically state that my opposition was predicated on the inadequacy of the proposed site at Beltsville, and I am in no way opposed to the development of an Animal Research Laboratory per se. I believe the action taken in re-evaluating proposed sites is most constructive. I strongly support this facility with the hope that it will be located in the Middle West.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: On page 3, line 25, insert "*Provided further*, That $1,250,000 of such $4,465,000 shall be immediately available for expenditure for control and eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of $4,465,000" named in said amendment, insert "$4,400,000."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FACILITATING CONSTRUCTION OF DRAINAGE WORKS AND OTHER MINOR ITEMS ON FEDERAL RECLAMATION AND LIKE PROJECTS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.

R. 6268) to facilitate the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and like projects, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2199)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6268) to facilitate the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and like projects, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "*Provided*, That in the event construction work to be accomplished by any one repayment organization, pursuant to contract with the United States, exceeds a total cost of $200,000, such contract shall not be executed by the Secretary prior to the expiration of 60 calendar days (which sixty days, however, shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain) from the date on which it has been submitted to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate for reference to the appropriate committees, except that such contract may be executed prior to expiration of such sixty days in any case in which both such committees approve said contract and notify the Secretary in writing of such approval."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
LEE METCALF,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
E. Y. BERRY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JAMES E. MURRAY,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6268) facilitating the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and like projects, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed on and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

This legislation is designed to facilitate the completion of drainage systems and other minor work on authorized reclamation projects by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to contract with water users' organizations for the accomplishment of such work, or to accomplish such work by force account with Government employees. The action by the conference committee does not alter this basic purpose.

The House-passed bill contained no limitation, moneywise, as to the extent of the work which might be accomplished on a single project or by a single repayment organization under the provisions of the bill—the limitation being dependent upon the interpretation of what is considered "minor items of construction." The Senate amended the bill to provide that the cost of work to be performed under the bill not exceed $200,000 on any one project, division, or unit of a project. If limited to works costing no more than $200,000 the legislation would not meet the need for the larger projects such as the Central Valley, Missouri Valley, and Colorado River storage. On the other hand, the conference committee felt that there should be a limitation on the extent of the work which could be performed under this legislation by a single organization without review by the Congress. Therefore, the conference committee agreed on and adopted a substitute for the Senate amendment which provides that in the event construction work to be accomplished by any one repayment organization exceeds $200,000, the contract for such work shall be submitted to the Congress and not be executed by the Secretary prior to the expiration of 60 days while Congress is in session, unless the appropriate House and Senate committees approve the contract prior to the expiration of such 60 days.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
LEE METCALF,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
E. Y. BERRY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11473) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be divided and controlled equally between the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] and myself.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11473, with Mr. METCALF in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, before proceeding to summarize the bill before the Committee today, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my thanks to the members of the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations for the support and assistance they have given in writing and handling this bill. Messrs. KIRWAN and ROONEY, on the majority side, and Messrs. HORAN and BOW on the minority side, have been extremely cooperative and helpful. It is a pleasure to work with such a fine group of men.

I would also like to thank our efficient and very able clerk, Paul Wilson, for the splendid assistance rendered to the committee.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bill that we have all agreed to. The majority and the minority side are both in complete agreement. Our chairman [Mr. CANNON] was there at the time, and Mr. TABER was there.

There is no disagreement on this bill whatsoever, and due to the fact that the House will probably have other matters before it today I shall extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and yield the balance of my time to others.

Mr. Chairman, the legislative branch appropriation bill as reported carries a total of $88,976,450 for 1957. Following the custom of some years standing, the bill omits any appropriation for the other body. Those items will be added when the bill reaches the Senate. The bill is $4,288,453 below the estimates of $93,264,903. It is, however, $16,707,692 above comparable appropriations to date for 1956. The bill includes $35,499,240 for the House of Representatives; $2,575,295 for such joint activities as the Police Force, Office of the Legislative Counsel, education of pages, and the like; $27,843,000 for items under the Architect of the Capitol; $253,000 for the Botanic Garden; $10,614,915 for the Library; and $12,190,400 for congressional printing and binding and for the Office of the Superintendent of Documents.

The committee has tried to make reasonable provision for the various offices and services covered by the bill. I believe we have a pretty good bill. The large increase over 1956 is practically all in two items, one for continuing the work of extending the east front of the Capitol Building and the other for further work on the additional House Office Building. Other than those two items, there is really only very minor items involved. We do recommend a few additional clerical positions in the Library of Congress and Office of the Superintendent of Documents, and I think just one additional position under the Architect of the Capitol.

The details of the bill are set out rather fully in the committee report and hearings so I shall not dwell at length on them. But I would like briefly to outline the highlights under each segment of the bill. As I indicated a moment ago, the sum of $35,499,240 is provided for the House of Representatives. This is $110,415 below the estimates and only $48,040 above the appropriations for 1956. We have recommended a small item of $7,500 for temporary clerical assistance in the Office of the Sergeant at Arms for use in case of emergencies, such as illness in the small staff they now have in the bank. We thought the Sergeant

at Arms ought to have a small fund limited, as I say, to emergencies, so that the important work of the Office can be assured of moving forward in an orderly and efficient manner. It may be that not much of it will be used.

The committee was, as usual, approached on the matter of adjustments in compensation for certain employees, but has adhered to its policy of not getting into that sort of thing, which is, of course, not a matter within jurisdiction of the committee. We have, of course, provided the funds to implement various and sundry position and salary adjustments authorized in the past several months by a number of specific resolutions adopted by the House.

For the various joint offices, a total of $2,575,295, the budget estimate, is recommended. This compares with appropriations in 1956 of $2,466,080. Practically all of the increase above the current year is for penalty mail costs which are paid over to the Post Office Department.

For all the items coming under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol, $27,843,000 is recommended, a reduction of $4,015,700 below the estimates, but, as I indicated, it is $16,137,300 above 1956. The bill includes $10 million for the additional House Office Building project and $12 million for the extension of the east front. We have suggested a fairly modest reduction of $4 million in the request for the east front project, based on the testimony of the Architect that the $12 million plus $5 million that was appropriated in 1956 will be quite ample to cover everything that can possibly be accomplished under the most favorable time schedule in the fiscal year 1957. Aside from these two items, we have provided for a number of maintenance and repair projects which come along just about every year, and will probably continue to do so if we are to keep our physical plant here on Capitol Hill in reasonably good condition. All of that is covered in detail in the printed hearings.

At the request of the Architect and with the approval of the House Office Building Commission, it was also necessary to include in the bill 1 or 2 language changes. They are necessary and they are explained in the report.

For the Library of Congress, the bill includes $10,614,915, which is $62,338 below the estimates but $354,407 above 1956. We have gone along with practically all of the requests of the Library which were quite modest. We have allowed a few additional employees, mostly in the lower clerical grades to enable the Library to catch up on some of its backlog processing, and also to improve some of its reference services. For the Legislative Reference Service, the committee has approved an amount sufficient to continue the persent staff. We have also allowed a few additional positions in the Copyright Office and in the catalog card program, both of which are substantially self-supporting. And for the program of books for the blind, we have approved the full amount requested.

For items under the Government Printing Office, we have allowed $9,200,000 for congressional printing and binding and also provided a supplemental amount of $400,000 for that purpose for 1956. The other item is the Office of the Superintendent of Documents, which is a service organization, and there we decided to approve the requests for 11 additional clerical jobs to handle an expected increase in volume of publication sales. That also is self-sustaining.

There is one particular provision of the bill in which I am sure Members of the House generally will be very much interested. You will note by looking at the bill that the committee has included, as section 105 beginning on page 22, a provision which would abolish, insofar as the House of Representatives is concerned, the present joint recording facility and establish in lieu thereof a separate House recording studio. This is of course a matter which is not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations and is a matter which therefore would not normally appear in this bill. However, the committee was requested to include it and has done so. The language is based primarily on a draft presented to the committee amended, however, to comport with what the committee is advised is the desired plan as regards the manner of operation and supervision of the proposed House recording studio. The committee also struck from the draft presented to it all references to establishing a similar separate facility for the other body, in harmony with the general practice of omitting any provision for appropriations or other matters pertaining to the Senate.

As indicated in the report, the sum of $90,000 is recommended for personnel to operate the separate House Studio. This is only slightly below the amount suggested by the Clerk of the House.

Information available indicates that a rather large number of Members of the House apparently feel that better service would be available to Members under an arrangement as is provided in the bill. The plan would be for the studio to be operated by the Clerk of the House under the direction and supervision of a 3-member committee to be appointed by the Speaker, 2 members of which would be from the majority side and 1 member from the minority side. Administrative matters, such as employment of personnel, rates charged for services rendered, disbursements, and the like would be subject to such regulations and rules as the 3-member committee would prescribe. It will be necessary in order to provide for a self-contained facility, to add a few additional employees to the House rolls inasmuch as several of those presently employed are carried under Senate items. I do not, of course, know what the Senate may do as regards a facility for its Members, but there is some indication that they may set up a separate facility on that side.

As I say, we would normally not have anything in the bill like this, but we were requested to do so, and I believe I am correct in saying that it was agreed by all concerned, including the leadership of the legislative committee concerned, that the appropriation bill should be used as the vehicle to bring about the desired rearrangement of the recording facility.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to take this time to say that we are completely unanimous in this report and in this bill. I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. HORAN. Yes, surely.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have read these hearings with a great deal of interest, and there are a few questions I should like to ask.

I note that there are two elevators to be provided for the benefit of the other body. I have had the experience of taking visitors around the Capitol, as all of you have. I have gone over in that wing of the Capitol and I have waited, and waited, and waited for a public elevator to take my constituents and guests to another floor. I am sure that has been the experience of many others. I should like to ask some member of the committee if these two new elevators in the Senate wing of the Capitol are to be private or public elevators?

Mr. ROONEY. I might say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that as far as I know they are to be public elevators, although I do not recall that specific question being asked at the hearings. Therefore, I am not sure.

There unquestionably is great need for the installation of two more elevators. $285,000 was appropriated and allocated for this purpose in the current fiscal year and the committee in this bill provides that $60,000 of this allocation be carried over into the coming fiscal year for completion of the work. Everybody was in agreement that there was and is a necessity for these two additional elevators in the Senate wing of the Capitol.

Mr. GROSS. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman that there is necessity for them, but had the gentleman said that these two elevators were to be private elevators I would have been inclined to offer an amendment to strike out the appropriation for the purpose of providing them because it seems to me that there are already enough private elevators in operation on that side and that the public is entitled to at least a little consideration in the matter of transportation from one floor to another of this, their Capitol Building.

Mr. ROONEY. Surely the distinguished gentleman from Iowa does not have any trouble using the elevators marked "Private" or "For Senators only" in the other body even if he has some constituents or guests with him, does he?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Iowa has never been informed of any private right to use such elevators.

Mr. ROONEY. By comity between the two bodies the gentleman from Iowa is just as much entitled to use them as a Member of the other body. He is likewise entitled to enter upon the Senate floor, use the facilities of the restaurant of the other body and other facilities; in effect, he is a Member of the other body when it comes to the use of such facilities.

Mr. GROSS. Let me say to the gentleman from New York that even had the gentleman from Iowa known of his right to use private elevators in the Senate wing he would still have pursued the same course, for he feels that visitors, who may not be accompanied by a Member of Congress, are entitled to every consideration in the matter of elevators whether on this side or the other side of the Capitol. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement that they are to be public elevators.

I understand there is an item of $64 million in this bill for a new House Office Building. That is a lot of money. As far as I am concerned personally I can see no need for a new House Office Building at this time when this Nation is $280 billion in debt and paying $7 billion a year in interest and various carrying charges on that debt. At the proper time I propose to offer an amendment to cut the $10 million to $3 million which I believe will take care of the construction of a cafeteria which is needed in the court of the New House Office Building, and a garage in the court of the New House Office Building. I believe those two items total more than $2 million. I propose to offer an amendment to cut the $10 million, which is a foot in the door for the New House Office Building, to that extent.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the distinguished gentleman from Iowa understand that not only is the foot in the door but the whole body is already in the door? The gentleman may possibly recall that last year there was appropriated in a supplemental appropriation bill for the legislative branch $5 million toward the erection of this badly needed additional House Office Building.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I am well aware of that fact, but I know of no reason why if we have previously made a mistake we should not attempt to correct it at this time. In my opinion, we made a mistake. I may say for the information of the gentleman from New York that I opposed even the first toe in the door so far as the construction of a new House Office Building is concerned as well as a new building on the other side of the Capitol. I was very much alone in that effort, but I still oppose it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inquire about the wording in one portion of the bill referring to the radio facility. I note that we are going to divide the joint Senate and House recording facility. In one section of this bill it is stated:

> No person shall be an officer or employee of the studio while he is engaged in any other business, profession, occupation, or employment which involves the performance of duties which are similar to those which would be performed by him as such an officer or employee of such studio.

I think I understand the purpose of putting that wording in there, yet I want to call attention to a situation you will probably run into. If you staff this recording facility to take care of the peak load you are going to find yourself carrying a lot of employees which would involve a lot of expense that is not necessary during the time Congress is in recess and during seasons when there is not much demand on those facilities. If you carry a normal load, under the wording of this paragraph here, you are going to find yourself prevented from reaching out and hiring a temporary or emergency employee. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York if he thinks we will probably run into that situation?

Mr. ROONEY. Under the terms of the instant bill wherein there is set up a management under the auspices of the Clerk of the House and a committee of 3 Members of the House, 2 from the majority side, 1 from the minority side, appointed by the Speaker, that situation should not arise.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am calling the attention of the gentleman to the fact that not only in this instance but in many other instances when we have a situation where we set up a facility and we attempt to staff it to take care of the peak demands, we find any number of employees who have nothing to do during the time when the Congress is in recess. I think that would apply in this case. I do not think you need the full staff during the time when the Congress is in recess and I think you could save a lot of money.

Mr. ROONEY. I agree with the gentleman. Some satisfactory arrangement should be made. But I am sure that under the committee composed of both the minority and majority, and under the Clerk of the House, who is a highly distinguished and capable gentleman, we should not have any trouble in this regard.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am wondering if the language in your bill would not prevent the hiring of any temporary emergency employees who might be experienced in this work and who may be on even a part-time basis employed elsewhere.

Mr. ROONEY. I should think so.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I think we might as well get to the root of this thing and the reason for the incorporation of this language in the pending bill. We had a situation where one of the employees of the joint Senate and House recording facility some months ago was found to be engaged in business which conflicted with the business of the joint reporting facility, and some action had to be taken about it. It is the thinking of the committee that we do not want such a situation to again arise.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I should like to ask this question of the gentleman from New York in reference to the question that has been raised, whether or not in that paragraph 2 on line 17 it might clear the situation by adding the words "unless approved by the committee."

Mr. ROONEY. Speaking for myself I would be inclined to accept such an amendment, I will say to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I would be in agreement with that as long as we put this committee firmly in the saddle on this facility and at least advise with the Clerk of the House.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] today under the 1-minute rule raised the question again of the status-of-forces treaties and the gentleman's position is sound. I take this time today to advise the House that when the mutual security bill is before the House next week I will again offer an amendment which relates to the status of forces treaties. I call the attention of the membership to the report on mutual security filed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs in which for the first time they discuss the question of status of forces. I should also like to call to the attention of the House that I have taken the time for a special order on Thursday next at which time I shall discuss, together with other Members of the House, the question of the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I hope we may have the support and study of the amendment before it is offered on June 6. I have taken the time on Thursday, because I rather question whether time would be granted for a full discussion on the status of forces during debate on the bill. There will be an amendment offered, and I may say to the House that the amendment that will be offered on status of forces next week when the bill is before the House will be one which is a sense resolution rather than a mandatory amendment which would force the President to take some action. The amendment that will be offered this time will be one that it is the sense of the Congress that some effort should be made by the Chief Executive under the terms of the provisions of the treaty itself, that the status of forces be changed, and that we no longer permit American servicemen to be tried in foreign courts under foreign laws and be deprived of their constitutional rights and of the Bill of Rights of the Constitution. I call this matter to the attention of the House now and to serve notice on the Committee on Foreign Affairs that we will discuss it Thursday and that such an amendment will be offered during the consideration of the bill next week.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, not only as individuals, but as the people of a nation, all who think realize that we have enjoyed exceptional

prosperity, and that, for the first time since 1917, without the harmful, disastrous, false prosperity brought about by war.

While we all hope that peace and prosperity will continue indefinitely, the natural and ever-present desire which each of us has to better a material situation makes it difficult to adopt and follow nationwide policies which will be deterrents to either inflation or deflation.

Recently, the National Association of Manufacturers, through its research department, has conducted and made public a survey of the elements of inflation, together with its conclusions. That study, which was released last Thursday, reads as follows:

A NEW FORCE FOR INFLATION

Throughout the free world, economists and economic bodies have been expressing growing concern in recent months over an inflationary force, more insidious than any they have faced before.

By definition, inflation is an increase in the money supply of an economy out of proportion to the amount of goods and services available for purchase. When more monetary units than normal are available to buy the goods and services being produced, prices rise.

In the past, inflation has stemmed from two sources:

1. The creation of artificial money through the payment of Government obligations by means of the printing press or through the sale of Government debt to banks.

2. Unsound credit policies by central banks—in the case of the United States, the Federal Reserve—which lead to excessive credit extension by the private banking system.

In recent years, a new force for inflation has appeared in nearly all the industrialized nations of Western Europe and also in the United States. It stems from a characteristic of a free modern industrial society—the tendency for wage rates to grow without any definite or normal relationship to market conditions.

The problem is most acute in those countries in which trade unions are most powerful and unified.

Rising wage rates in excess of productivity increases, forced on an economy by union economic or political power, cause prices to rise generally; to sustain activity and employment, an increased supply of money is required to handle this larger monetary volume of business transactions; and Government or the banking system must either supply this inflationary volume of money or face the harsh alternative of curtailed activity and increased unemployment.

The latter course not only is socially and economically undesirable, but politically unrealistic in free nations today. On the other hand, the former course—endless inflation—will lead ultimately to disaster and economic collapse. Inflation is an evil from which few escape, whether they are employers or wage earners. Values which have been built up over a lifetime or over generations are reduced or wiped out. Savings accounts shrink in value; life insurance policies, pension funds and other forms of savings to which people have contributed lose purchasing power; bonds, mortgages, and other evidences of value become little more than pieces of paper; the wage earner is caught in a treadmill of spiraling costs; those on fixed incomes or whose incomes are slow to rise suffer sharply decreased living standards.

The problem which today confronts free industrial nations, therefore, is how to maintain economic growth and full employment and at the same time avoid forced additions to the money supply beyond the normal requirements of economic expansion. This is the problem which is causing concern in Western Europe, Great Britain and the United States.

Late in March of this year, the British Government issued a white paper which discussed the basic problem of keeping prices stable while maintaining full employment.

The Government noted that the experience of the past 10 years has shown that the more nearly the goal of full employment is approached, the more likely prices are to rise. The only way out, the white paper advised, was self-restraint on the part of unions in making wage demands and on the part of employers in fixing profit margins and prices, so that total money income would not rise faster than output.

"In the absence of such self-restraint," the white paper said, "it may seem that the country can make a choice—albeit a painful one—between full employment and continually rising prices, or price stability secured with some danger to the level of employment that might otherwise have been achieved."

The white paper then proceeded to demolish the first alternative as a possibility. It pointed out that continually rising prices would have an adverse effect on exports and that with declining exports Britain soon would have to cut the imports which are essential to maintain full employment and the present standard of living.

The Government recommended that management of British industry make every effort to increase individual productivity by utilizing the most modern plants and most efficient techniques and that it eliminate all practices which curtail output. It said labor also will have to cooperate in adopting new methods and by dropping its own limitations on work performed and other restrictive practices.

The white paper said that British production costs per unit for the average article increased when wages, salaries, and profits rose faster than output. From 1946 to 1955, it pointed out, income from these three sources rose 90 percent while the country's output rose only 30 percent. As a result, prices are now about 50 percent higher than they were in 1946. About one-seventh of this price rise is attributable to changes in taxes and subsidies, and about one-fifth to rising import costs, leaving about two-thirds due to changes in home costs. What this means is that British prices have risen about 33⅓ percent in 10 years because of increases in the cost of production alone.

On the continent of Europe, the situation is reported in the New York Times of Monday, March 26, 1956, by Michael L. Hoffman, the economic correspondent of that paper in Geneva. Mr. Hoffman writes as follows:

"The Economic Commission for Europe has made an attempt to prod Western Europe governments into frank consideration of their most vexing and politically touchy problem of economic policy: wages.

"The present form of the problem is characteristic of the 1950's. It arises from the attempt of governments to regulate their national economies so that three things can be accomplished simultaneously: the maintenance of full employment, the avoidance of inflation, and a satisfactory rate of economic growth.

"Economists of the United Nations group have produced, in this year's survey of the European economy and in previous studies, ample evidence that the only country that can be said to have succeeded in all three is Switzerland. Elsewhere there has been either inflation or too slow a rate of growth in investment, or both, when full employment of labor has been achieved.

"It would be unavailing to advise other governments to study the Swiss example. Few Western European countries are in a position to meet the inflation problem by admitting foreign workers when the demand for labor expands and expelling them when it contracts. Were it not for this factor, it is probable that a serious upward pressure on wages would have given Switzerland inflationary problems like those of her neighbors.

"This year's survey concentrates attention on the rate of growth of productive capacity and fixed capital generally in Europe. It finds that the older industrial countries have a perilously low rate of investment compared with the newer industrial countries of Scandinavia and, even more so, compared with the Soviet Union.

"The reason is that not enough of the national product is left over for investment when the claims of current consumption have been met. As these claims are being constantly expanded by the granting of increases in money wages, the countries of Western Europe are eating up their substance and making wholly inadequate provision for their industrial future.

"The countries with the strongest and most unified trade unions are those in which the problem appears in its most acute form. In those countries wage rates largely cease to be related in any traceable fashion to market forces and become increasingly determined by what are essentially political decisions."

American economic observers recognize a close parallel in many particulars between the situation abroad, as described above, and that prevailing here. Unwarranted wage increases, exceeding labor's reasonable share in the gains of productivity, are forced on industry year after year by union power. Such wage increases are possible without slowing down the economy only in a strongly inflationary situation where the money supply exceeds that normally required by economic growth.

The situation was described as follows by the United States Steel Corp. in its annual report for 1955:

"Of great importance to industry and hence to United States Steel is the development of what appears to be a permanent and alarming peacetime trend of cost and price inflation. During the war period, 1940–45, United States Steel's employment costs per employee-hour increased at a rapid rate. But in the 10 years since 1945 there has been an uninterrupted and even greater rate of inflation in this cost. Over the whole period, 1940–55, the average annual increase is 8 percent compounded.

"A paralleling employment cost inflation has been general throughout industry and government. This has been reflected in greater taxes and mounting prices of things purchased by United States Steel. Thus, United States Steel's costs other than employment costs have risen in step with its employment cost inflation. During the 15 years since 1940, United States Steel's total of all costs per employee-hour has increased an average of 8.7 percent per annum compounded.

"Since it is impossible for output per employee-hour to be increased at anything like these rates, it has been necessary from time to time—as competition permitted—to raise steel prices and thereby pass on to buyers of steel part of the underlying cost inflation. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the prices of steel mill products increased from 1940 to 1955 by 119 percent. None of that increase has resulted in widening the percentage spread between costs and sales prices since United States Steel's income as a percent of sales was less in 1955 than in 1940, despite 1955's higher operating rate."

In describing how prices receded sharply from their wartime peaks immediately following the War of 1812, the Civil War, and World War I, while they continued to rise even more sharply after World War II ended,

United States Steel says "something new has appeared in the American economy."

In describing this something new, the report states as follows:

"Two basic roots of the inflationary tendency are discernible. The first one is the institution of industrywide labor unions, headed by leaders who, with power to bring about industrywide strikes, seek always to outdo each other in elevating employment costs in their respective industries. The legislative and social framework within which they function compels them to compete in elevating this basic cost.

"The other root is the Government's full-employment policy under which the money supply must be inflated fast enough to accommodate the inflating employment cost, lest that mounting cost bring about its natural result of pricing some people out of their jobs, even though only temporarily. It takes even more dollars to cover ever-rising costs and prices if industry's full output is to be purchased. The money supply—people's bank deposits subject to check plus their pocket money—was in 1955, on a per capita basis, 2.7 times what it was in 1940. This is equivalent to 6.8 percent per annum compounded.

"The abuse of labor-monopoly privilege and the monetary policy that transfers to the public in higher prices the penalty of that abuse appear to be the main elements of institutionalized inflation. It would be most helpful in this regard if those responsible for determining wage costs and fiscal policies were constantly aware of the inflationary potentials of their decisions."

In recent years this Nation has experienced an inflation of the traditional type resulting from Government deficits. From 1931 to 1955, Federal Government expenditures exceeded receipts by $250.5 billion. The effect of this vast deficit financing was mitigated to a great extent by the fact that many of the billions needed to pay the Government's obligations during these years came from the sale of bonds directly to individuals and nonbanking institutions, and to the various United States Government agencies and trust funds.

Nevertheless, much of the Government's debt entered the commercial banking system, where it became the basis for an increase in the money supply. In the period 1939–1955, the actual expansion in the money supply amounted to a 280 percent increase.

Thus a vast reservoir of money was available which permitted a growing volume of business transactions to be handled at higher prices. In this inflationary situation the unions representing the employees of industry were able to demand increases in money wages, far exceeding increases in productivity, without causing an economic downturn.

In a similar period (1939–53, the latest period covered by the figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics), physical output per man-hour in manufacturing increased by 28 percent. However, during the same interval, the pay received by employees in manufacturing plants for each man-hour of their work increased by 180 percent. This does not include the cost of the numerous and steadily mounting fringe benefits which have been granted to industrial workers. Thus, the indicated percentage gain in labor costs in industry greatly exceeded the percentage gain in labor productivity.

As a result prices rose generally, but unevenly, all along the line. The index of industrial prices increased by 100 percent during the 1939–55 period. The Consumers Price Index advanced by 93 percent, thus cutting labor's gain in real wages to 60 percent. The balance of labor's wage gains in excess of the increase in productivity was absorbed by decreases in the shares of the gross proceeds of private business going to other segments of the economy. The percentage share of the gross proceeds of private business going to rent, interest, and dividend receivers showed a sharp decrease. The shares going to unincorporated business, professional people and farmers also decreased.

The reservoir of excess money supply which permitted these gains by labor and the resultant price increases now has been absorbed. At the present time, the administration has succeeded, after diligent effort, in balancing expenditures with receipts. Furthermore, the banking system of the Nation is benefiting from sound, conservative leadership. However, unwarranted wage increases, exceeding labor's reasonable share in the gains of productivity, will necessarily destroy this stability, and through forcing a further increase in the money supply beyond that required by normal economic growth, will start us again on the road of inflation.

If this danger is to be avoided wage increases, at the maximum, must be restricted, company by company, to increases in productivity, and, in the general public interest, the wage increase should be held to an even smaller figure. This is because gains in productivity should not all go to labor but rather should be divided three ways—to labor for its increased efficiency, to investors for the more effective tools and machines their savings provide, and to consumers through price reductions of the products which are being produced with these improved tools.

When an industrywide union, exercising monopoly control over the labor supply of an industry, demands wage increases which discount productivity gains far in advance, possible price reductions of mass-produced products are prevented and buying power is shifted unfairly from the public as a whole to the favored few who happen to work in the industry in question.

Furthermore, competition cannot act to restore the proper balance. Any new concern, attracted to the industry by growing demand, would have to submit to dictation by the same union and would not be permitted to establish labor costs which would reflect the true value of the services rendered in the economic situation then prevailing.

Thus, union monopoly power distorts economic rewards in favor of those who are under the umbrella of the monopoly, to the detriment of all other economic interests. In the situation which prevails today, where monopoly power over the labor supply is a reality in most of the Nation's basic raw materials, manufacturing, transportation, and communications industries, persistent inflation is a constant threat.

Even though the effect of union-wage demands may not show up immediately in significant or important changes in overall prices at the consumer level, concealed within this apparent stability is a shift in buying power from other economic interests to those employees of business and industry who are getting the unwarranted wage increase. Also, the consuming public is not benefiting as it should from scientific and technological advances, which should have the effect of increasing everyone's buying power.

Under present conditions, monopolistic power is wielded by small groups at the head of international unions in mass production industries. The practice is to set adamant terms and, with little or no regard to local conditions or the competitive situation of an individual employer, impose these terms on an industrywide basis. Employers must submit or face long and bitter strikes which are costly to the Nation, to communities, to employees and stockholders.

The obvious remedy in the situation is to curtail the power of industrywide unions to engage in monopolistic practices and restore bargaining to the local level. There is nothing harsh or disconcerting about this suggested solution. With the rapid strides of science and engineering, and with the adoption of automation in those mass production industries in which it is feasible, the American workingman can look forward to a steadily advancing standard of living and a steady increase in personal security and well-being.

The great danger to the future of the American people, including particularly those who work in industry, is that by grabbing for too much now, we will jeopardize what is sure to come and perhaps lose our liberties and free way of life in the process.

America's road is the road of orderly economic growth, which avoids the perils of inflation on the one hand and the evil of unemployment on the other. The only way to stay on this road is to share the benefits of economic growth fairly by means of lower prices to consumers, better wages to labor, and increased returns to investors. As long as unions are permitted by law to exercise monopoly powers, this sane course is unavailable.

[Chart omitted.]

1. During the period 1939–55, the hourly earnings of factory workers, exclusive of the cost of fringe benefits, almost tripled.

[Chart omitted.]

2. In a similar period 1939–53 (the latest year covered by the figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics), output per man-hour in manufacturing rose by 28 percent.

[Chart omitted.]

3. The net result was that the prices of the products turned out by industrial workers doubled.

[Chart omitted.]

4. A quadrupling of the money supply made it possible to handle the increased output of industry at these higher prices. Without the monetary inflation, the growing cost of production would have priced one line of goods after another out of the market.

[Chart omitted.]

5. While gross national product figured in constant dollars doubled over the 1939–55 period, it quadrupled in inflated dollars.

[Chart omitted.]

6. The economy now has built up to the inflated money supply as a result of increased volume at higher prices. There is no further room for higher labor costs per unit of production to be absorbed. If labor costs are increased beyond productivity, goods will not be able to find a market unless the Nation again embarks on the road of monetary inflation.

[Chart omitted.]

7. Inflation already has cut the purchasing power of the consumer's dollar in half during the 1939–55 period. This means that savings accounts, Government bonds, building and loan shares, life insurance proceeds, and all other forms of savings redeemable in dollars have lost nearly half their value.

[Chart omitted.]

8. If inflation of the money supply is resumed for any reason, the value of the consumer's dollar and his savings will continue to decline. Future inflation at the same rate as in the period under discussion would make it necessary for the income earner—whether he works in a factory, an office, in public employment, or teaches school—to advance his earnings an average of 4.8 percent each year in order to stay even.

Mr. Chairman, from the foregoing, it is evident that neither labor nor management, while apparently seeking the same objectives, is able to disregard the personal factor.

And while we are on the subject, it would be remiss not to call the attention of the taxpayers to the fact that Congress itself, in an election year, apparently is willing to take the chance of promoting inflation by huge appropriations. Should

not the appropriations for billions of dollars be mentioned? The thirty-odd billion national defense bill; the highway bill, which calls for the expenditure of some $50 billion in the next 13 years, with its Bacon-Davis amendment which permits the Secretary of Labor to fix an artificial wage scale which applies to the expenditure of these billions. Then there is the farm bill, which in the not too distant future means the collection and payment by the Federal Government of some additional $1.5 billion a year.

Is it illogical to suggest that the activities just referred to mean increased inflation? Just how many billions of additional currency can be pumped into the national economy without completely destroying present investments? What has become of the dollar the conservative individual invested in Government or other bonds?

Will we ever, as individuals and as a people, do the things which our judgment and commonsense tell us must be done if a depression is to be avoided?

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Folding documents: For folding speeches and pamphlets, at a gross rate not exceeding $2.15 per thousand or for the employment of personnel at a gross rate not exceeding $1.61 per hour per person, $165,000: *Provided,* That paragraph (2) of subsection (g) of section 4 of Public Law 94, 84th Congress, relating to "Folding documents," is repealed effective July 1, 1956.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do so for the purpose of asking someone of the committee what is repealed with respect to folding documents effective July 1, 1956, under the language beginning on page 6 and continuing on to page 7.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me, may I say that this language will not cost any money. It has the thorough endorsement of all the members of the committee.

The hourly and piece rates currently being paid in the Folding Room are continued in the coming fiscal year by the customary provision in the language of the bill. In order to avoid a conflict which would otherwise obtain it is necessary to repeal a transitory provision of the 7.5 percent general pay law of the last session, dealing with Folding Room rates, which will have served its purpose by June 30, 1956. Necessary language has therefore been included which has been coordinated with those concerned.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Acquisition of property, construction, and equipment, Additional House Office Building: To enable the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the House Office Building Commission, to continue to provide for the acquisition of property, construction and equipment of an additional fireproof office building for the use of the House of Representatives, and other changes and improvements, authorized by the Additional House Office Building Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 41, 42), $10,000,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 14, line 5, strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$3,000,000."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of taking 5 minutes. I have already expressed my sentiments on this provision of the bill.

I am opposed to the construction of a new House Office Building at this time of debt and high taxes at a cost of $64 million. I am informed that the cafeteria which is proposed to be constructed in the court of the New House Office Building will cost approximately $1,200,000, and the garage to be constructed in the court of the Old House Office Building will cost approximately $900,000.

My amendment would cut the $10 million appropriation to $3 million, which would leave ample funds for carrying out these two improvements.

Right now is the time to put these plans in mothballs, for another $20 million spent in remodeling the present office buildings to provide 3-room suites will inevitably call for more employees to fill the rooms. But the bare construction plans indicate an ultimate expenditure of nearly $100 million. I repeat, I am opposed to leaping off the deep end, and I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this request submitted by the Architect of the Capitol, the Honorable J. George Stewart, is in effect the request of the House Office Building Commission, which is comprised of the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS].

This $10 million, which is quite a firm estimate, as firm as can be gotten under all the circumstances, is connected not only with the erection of the additional New House Office Building but the erection of the cafeteria in the courtyard of the present New House Office Building, the alteration of the Old House Office Building to provide for larger and better offices and committee space and larger and better offices and committee rooms in the present New House Office Building.

I call the attention of the Committee of the Whole to the following formal expression by the House Office Building Commission of approval of the preliminary plans and estimates of cost in connection with the additional House Office Building project:

PRELIMINARY PLANS AND ESTIMATES OF COST, ADDITIONAL HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING PROJECT, MAY 17, 1956

Yesterday it was necessary for the Architect of the Capitol to justify before the House Appropriations Committee an appropriation request of $10,000,000 for continuation of the Additional House Office Building project in the fiscal year 1957.

With respect to the status of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for the project, it was stated as follows:

STATUS OF PRELIMINARY PLANS AND ESTIMATES OF COST

Preliminary plans and estimates of cost have been developed by the associate architects and engineers, in close collaboration with the Architect of the Capitol and the House Office Building Commission, for all parts of the Additional House Office Building project, with the exception of security vaults, subways, and underground transportation systems.

The preliminary plans and estimates of cost completed to date are now before the House Office Building Commission for final review and approval, as follows:

Additional House Office Building:

Preliminary plans call for an office building, 4 stories above ground and a multiple-level structure underground, ranging from 3 levels underground at the west end to 5 levels underground at the east end. The plans provide adequate accommodations in the additional office building for 8 major standing committees, 15 subcommittees, 170 three-room office suites, storage facilities for Members, and other appurtenant and necessary facilities. The additional office building will also provide parking accommodations in the underground levels for between 1,800 and 2,000 automobiles.

The estimated cost to carry out these plans is $64 million.

Changes, alterations, and remodeling of the Old House Office Building:

Preliminary plans and estimates of cost have been completed for changes, alterations, and remodeling of the Old House Office Building. The preliminary plans provide for remodeling the building in such a manner as to provide 135 three-room office suites, 3 major standing committee rooms, 5 subcommittee rooms, and other miscellaneous appurtenant and necessary facilities. The plans also call for construction of an underground garage in the courtyard of the old building, providing parking accommodations for approximately 250 automobiles. This garage is to consist of two levels, with a roof no higher than the first floor of the building.

The estimated cost to carry out these plans is $9 million.

Changes, alterations, and remodeling of the New House Office Building:

Preliminary plans and estimates of cost have been completed for changes, alterations, and remodeling of the New House Office Building. The preliminary plans provide for remodeling the building in such a manner as to provide 142 three-room office suites, 6 major standing committee rooms, 4 subcommittee rooms, 14 two-room suites, and 16 odd rooms, and other miscellaneous appurtenant and necessary facilities. The plans also call for construction of a cafeteria building in the courtyard of the new building, with a total seating capacity of 618. The cafeteria is to consist of two floors—a main floor and a mezzanine floor.

The estimated cost to carry out these plans is $9,500,000.

In response to inquiry made by the committee, the Architect of the Capitol agreed to endeavor to obtain a formal expression of approval of the preliminary plans and estimates of cost before the legislative appropriation bill is reported out this week.

Preliminary plans and estimates of cost hereby approved.

SAM RAYBURN,
Chairman, House Office Building Commission.

CARL VINSON,
Member, House Office Building Commission.

JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
Member, House Office Building Commission.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that this proposed amendment should be rejected by the Committee of the Whole. It is absolutely necessary that the Architect of the Capitol have this $10 million in order to carry out the projects previously authorized and approved by this House of Representatives and the Congress.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. May I say to the Committee of the Whole that we are already committed to the extent of $5 million, and we are merely carrying out the will of the Congress by placing this amount in this bill. I, too, hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I suspect that a good deal of that $5 million has already been spent in the acquisition of property, which is not going to be blown away overnight.

Mr. ROONEY. A good deal of it has been spent up to now in the acquisition of property, over $3½ million of it, but there are preliminary plans and cost estimates on which that money has been spent.

Mr. GROSS. Those could be held in abeyance until we work down some of our $280 billions of debt.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not think that it is the will of this House to have these plans held in abeyance. These offices are badly needed. We badly need additional committee rooms. We need these new facilities to properly function.

Mr. GROSS. May I say to the gentleman as of now or in the foreseeable future—if I had three rooms in one of the present House Office Buildings I would need them just about as badly as I need a hole in my head—if I may put it that way.

Mr. ROONEY. Of course, this might be discussed without reference to a hole in anyone's head, but my staff could use extra room. I have a sizable committee room here in the Capitol, but I could use extra space in my office and I know a great many other Members of the House who could use extra space.

Mr. GROSS. At a cost of $9 million to remodel the Old House Office Building and $9½ million to remodel the New House Office Building, and in addition $64 million for a brand-new House Office Building, we are really getting super duper in the matter of spending the taxpayers' money.

Mr. ROONEY. As an answer, I might say to my distinguished friend, by repeating something I have heard him say many times: When the Congress is spending all the money it does around the world for foreign aid and the building of the Aswan Dam in Egypt and other such things, I think we can afford an additional House Office Building and I think we can afford to fix up the two present House Office Buildings.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 103. Whenever any office or position not specifically established by the Legislative Pay Act of 1929 is appropriated for herein or whenever the rate of compensation or designation of any position appropriated for herein is different from that specifically established for such position by such act, the rate of compensation and the designation of the position, or either, appropriated for or provided herein, shall be the permanent law with respect thereto: *Provided*, That the provisions herein for the various items of official expenses of Members, officers, and committees of the House, and Clerk hire for Members shall be the permanent law with respect thereto: *Provided further*, That the provisions relating to positions and salaries thereof carried in House Resolutions 297, 336, 339, 342, 374, 424, 446, 443, 468, 486, and 494 of the 84th Congress shall be the permanent law with respect thereto: *Provided further*, That the provisions of House Resolution 465 of the 84th Congress shall be the permanent law with respect thereto.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say at this point that I am opposed ordinarily to legislation in an appropriation bill. In the last 2 or 3 pages, this bill is certainly loaded with legislation, but I have no intention of making a point of order against the legislation in this particular bill because I think the proper legislative committee ought to have acted some time ago to take care of the situation as is provided in the last few pages of the bill.

Mr. ROONEY. I hope the gentleman from Iowa understands that the chairman of the legislative committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], stated in writing addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that he had no objection to the insertion of this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; your hearings or report so state.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 105. (a) There is hereby established a House Recording Studio (hereinafter referred to as the Studio) under the House of Representatives.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am well aware of the reason for the existence of section 105 in this bill. I want to compliment the committee for an attempt to eliminate an unsavory situation which has existed in this Congress for some while. I have before me two special reports of the General Accounting Office, both dealing with abuse of the facility by Mr. Robert J. Coar and other employees. The first one submitted on June 18, 1954, is entitled "Relating to Outside Private Operations of Officials and Employees."

This report states that in the recording facility, as it existed at that time, there was an unlisted private telephone which was maintained on the premises of the facility used in connection with private operations, conducted in that Government facility. Considerable private mail was received by the facility. Employees have been given strict instructions not to open any mail unless it can be definitely identified by return address, or otherwise, as being for the facility, otherwise mail is to be delivered unopened to the director, Mr. Coar.

Other evidence of private operation within the facility was mentioned, including a suit filed by one John Convery against Robert J. Coar, the coordinator, alleging that he had entered into an agreement for certain private enterprise.

There was an unexplained absence of Government equipment which was not located in the facility at the time of the inventory, mentioned in the special report dated June 18, 1954. There was a substantial amount of work for others outside of Congress.

The report says:

FAILURE TO ACCOUNT FOR CERTAIN WORK AS FACILITY BUSINESS

The files contain a copy of a billing by the facility for work performed on a Sunday by the coordinator and another employee at the request of a Member of the House of Representatives. This billing contains the following notation: "Check to be made payable to Robert J. Coar, Roberts Road, Fairfax, Va." Neither the work performed nor any payment received therefor is recorded in the accounting records of the facility.

In connection with work performed by a local film processing company under a contract with the facility, the coordinator, in a memorandum dated April 6, 1953, relative to a claim under such contract, states in part that some of the contract work was performed by another person and himself "on my own time." For this work he received $100 from the contractor, which amount was paid over to the other person. No record of the performance of this work and the receipt and repayment of this $100 is recorded in the accounting records of the facility.

It should be noted that under the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 the regular salaries of certain employees of the legislative branch includes additional compensation of 10 percent of the basic rate in lieu of overtime. Salaries received by facility employees are apparently intended to cover payment for all facility work performed whether during regular working hours or not.

There was unauthorized use of the facilities; some 1,200 feet scotch sound record tape was missing from inventory. Some 135,431 feet of unaccounted-for film was reported missing. This is in the first report of the General Accounting Office on this recording facility, a public document compiled from reports to the former Clerk of the House and from records of the facility itself.

Then it was followed by another report in June 1955. The audit reports went even further this time. They went into a number of special outside projects which were undertaken by the coordinator for other than Members of Congress.

WORK FOR PERSONS OTHER THAN MEMBERS

We observed that work or services were performed by the facility for persons other than Members in contravention of existing regulations. Examples of such work are as follows:

1. A number of tape recordings were made of a Christmas program for offices of the Small Business Administration. Payment for such services was made from private contributions and not from funds of the Small Business Administration.

2. A number of motion-picture recordings were furnished or made at the request of one Edward Ingle, who, we understand, is

associated with the coordinator in one of his private enterprises. The prices billed for such services were at rates generally charged to Members, which are considerably less than commercial rates and also less than actual cost. Present rates for motion-picture recordings are slightly above the approximate cost of the materials used but do not cover the cost of labor, use of equipment, and overhead. The work performed at the request of Mr. Ingle during the year 1954 was charged to the following accounts:

Edward Ingle	$328.98
Joseph Borkin	43.35
TV research	359.34

As of December 31, 1954, there was due and outstanding in the TV research account a balance of $200 for services rendered in April and June 1954.

The report goes into a very interesting subject, which I think ought to be brought to the attention of all Members of this House, and that is the compensation received by facility employees from outside sources. The report shows that $12,500 was paid to facility employees for work similar to or relating to that done by the facility. This is from reports filed with the Clerk pursuant to the Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

Mr. Coar has been heard to say that his work for outside agencies was done on his own time, and he only used the Government facility for that purpose. I call the attention of the membership to the fact that we have an overtime act which provides 10 percent extra pay for Mr. Coar in lieu of overtime. His actions in using this facility could conceivably be not only a violation of good ethics but also a violation of the laws of the United States and should be scrutinized in that light.

It is also interesting to note that on page 4 of that report there is considerable mention of work done for persons other than Members of Congress, as I already mentioned. I refer to the three names mentioned in the report of the General Accounting Office. Mr. Edward Ingle paid $328.98, Mr. Joseph Borkin paid $43.35, and Television Research paid $359.34 for services done by the facility which is supposed to be reserved for Members of this Congress. What business did these people have using this facility in violation of the rules?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DINGELL was granted 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. DINGELL. I am going to include in my remarks mention of the schedule of compensation received by facility employees from outside sources during the year 1954:

Schedule of compensation received by facility employees from outside sources during the year 1954

Audio and Video (a partnership consisting of Robert J. Coar and Helen B. Coar):	
Television service	$1,771.52
Slide films	5,666.82
Transcription and recordings	881.15
Reimbursement of postage on shipments	150.00
Total	8,469.49

Schedule of compensation received by facility employees from outside sources during the year 1954—Continued

Robert J. Coar:	
Professional services	2,762.50
Slide film	175.00
Total	2,937.50
William D. Koster:	
Professional services	150.00
Slide film	294.00
Total	444.00
Joseph F. Johenning: Slide film	70.00
George E. Potter: Professional services	73.50
Paul Clark: Professional services	217.00
C. G. Bouchard: Professional services	129.00
Leonard Parker: Professional services	21.00
Joseph Pettis: Professional services	114.00
Fred Lopez: Professional services	55.50
Total	12,530.99

Source: Reports filed pursuant to the Federal Corrupt Practices Act (2 U. S. C. 244) by the following committees: Democratic National Congressional Committee,[1] Democratic National Committee,[1] National Republican Congressional Committee, Republican National Committee.

[1] No such payments were found to have been made by the Democratic National Congressional Committee nor the Democratic National Committee.

Since that time we have found that Coar has received a substantial amount more. Take, for instance, 1955, on January 18, he received $95; November 29, 1955, $204; on the 20th of December 1955, $204. Koster received $175 in 1955; Esper received $60 in 1955; Johenning received $40; and Helen Coar and Robert J. Coar operating as a partnership received $544, $136, and $173 on different dates in 1955.

This is a shameful situation; I think that the membership of this Congress are being put upon and I think the trust of the people of the country is being abused by these people. I have here in my hand a copy of the court record of partnership which the Coars used to set up this partnership under the laws of the State of Virginia.

The records show that—

A paid invoice dated May 27, 1953, from E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., for 27,600 feet of film sold to Audio and Video Productions, and check dated April 30, 1953, in favor of said company, in the amount of $397, signed by R. J. Coar for Audio and Video Productions. The coordinator explained that Audio and Video Productions is a partnership formed by Mr. Coar and Mrs. Coar about 4 or 5 years ago.

Quote from report of the General Accounting Office.

However, the court records show the partnership was formed April 17, 1953, only 13 days before the date of the check.

I think it is high time that we in this Congress did something to stop these people. I notice we have finally gotten around to discharging Mrs. Coar. I hope that we will soon be to the point where we can get rid of Mr. Coar.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. BROWNSON. I know the gentleman from Michigan has spent a long time studying this and collecting facts. Is it the gentleman's position that no employee of the legislative branch anywhere along the line is entitled to do anything for extra compensation outside of his duty?

Mr. DINGELL. I can answer the gentleman in this way: That no employee should be permitted to use the facilities which this Congress sets up with public money for the purpose of making personal gain from the use of those facilities is indicated in these reports of the GAO.

Mr. BROWNSON. How does the gentleman separate the use of this radio and broadcasting facility for campaign purposes and the use of the same facilities for normal congressional reporting purposes?

Mr. DINGELL. I have the report from the General Accounting Office and have examined it very thoroughly. I refer the gentleman to that report. I am sure that after reading it he will be as shocked as I was; and I hope he will join me in attempting to do something about this situation.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude my remarks by mentioning to the membership Title 5 of the United States Code, section 66, and also Title 18 of the United States Code, section 1914, which outline the duty of employees of the Government. I hope that Mr. Coar, while he continues in the employment of this Congress, will read those sections so that he will come to understand his responsibility not only to the people of the United States but also to himself. I hope he will stop doing some of the things which he has been doing in the past and that he will thereby stay out of jail.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had not expected to speak upon this bill or this situation, but the question has been raised about the use and the operation of the recording facilities. The gentleman has brought out some of the facts that have been shown by the General Accounting Office, but I am one of those who since being a Member of the House for 6 years now has used the facilities of the joint recording studios, and I have always found the services rendered by the joint facilities to be very good. I have appreciated the courtesy shown to me by the people who operate them. The quality of the operation has been excellent. People in the radio business throughout the country have commented many times on the fine quality of the broadcasts that come from the joint facilities, and I believe that we should pay tribute at least to the service we have received as Members of Congress from those who operate the facilities.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I realize that the technical quality of service of these facilities has been of a very high order,

but I ask the gentleman if he approves of what has been going on in the facility?

Mr. BOW. I will say that in the period of time I have been here, being rather busy on some of these appropriation committees, perhaps I have not taken the time that the gentleman from Michigan has taken in the last few months in checking into this matter or had it called to my attention by somebody. I believe the facility has been well operated.

Let me raise this question. The gentleman is now complaining about some outside income. I do not know what it has been. If it has been from the use of facilities owned by the taxpayers, that is wrong. I do not believe anyone should use facilities owned by the taxpayers to make a profit on the outside. When you talk about income on the outside, may I say to the gentleman that there are many people on the legislative payroll who do that very thing. I do not believe we should confuse this situation. There are many Members of this House, I think, who would not want to see any rule laid down that anyone on the legislative payroll should not have any outside income.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I want to associate myself with the gentleman from Ohio in expressing my appreciation for the way that the facility has been operated. I have used it and I have been treated very well. I do want to point out right now that we have taken steps in this bill to correct anything that might need correction.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am one who has used the facility and I thought it a very fine service and I thought it would be a very fine situation to have this convenience in the House Office Building. It is my recollection, in looking back, that to start with the Coars owned this equipment. They were using their own equipment and brought it in while the matter was being worked out in the House. Since the origin of the service I think probably we bought additional equipment, perhaps we bought the Coar equipment, I do not know, but let me point out that at the start there was not a separation between something owned outright by the Government and that owned by the Coars. They owned a great deal of the equipment at least. Certainly the know-how and the knowledge they possessed was a matter of great value to us.

I have another question. A very serious question is raised as to who is going to make the distinction between what is going out as a radio broadcast and what is nonpolitical for the benefit of the constituents, and what goes out that might be used during a campaign, and therefore the claim is made it is political. I think the radio stations at home have worked that out pretty well. I have received no complaint prior to the gentleman's statement on the floor of the House here. I have heard no complaint. Actually, I have not used the service for several years, but that was purely personal. I think it is a very good service.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to say to the gentleman that what I have said today about outside income I want limited to such outside income as is derived by the Coars and by other employees of the facility using those facilities for their own personal gain. They have, in my opinion, acted in a shameful, unjustifiable manner. They have used these facilities for their own purposes and thereby abused their trust.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further. I did not get time so that the gentleman may receive additional time. It is my understanding that the Coars did not use the joint facilities for their own use, but facilities that they own. I hope further that the gentleman from Michigan does not feel that he has the right to censor the programs of Members of both bodies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say in conclusion that we now have a separation. I understand a committee amendment will be offered which will clarify the whole situation regarding employment on the outside. I sincerely hope, and I believe it is the desire of the Speaker of the House and the minority leader, certainly it is of this committee, that the facility be properly operated and I hope no attempt will be made to bring partisanship into the operation of the facility.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in the last statement made by the gentleman from Ohio he brought out the crux of the whole situation. I am wondering how many Members of Congress will feel that to make this simply a patronage job from now on will give us a better service than putting it in the hands of a long-time experienced radio and television operator, who has been able by his know-how, his contacts, his ability, and at the start his own equipment, to give the service we have been accustomed to getting out of the facility from which we benefit.

The Clerk read as follows:

(2) No person shall be an officer or employee of the Studio while he is engaged in any other business, profession, occupation, or employment which involves the performance of duties which are similar to those which would be performed by him as such an officer or employee of such Studio.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 24, line 17, before the period insert "unless approved in writing by the committee."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, this committee amendment is self-explanatory and alludes to the colloquy a while ago between the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], and myself. This would clarify the situation mentioned with regard to the House Recording Studio.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. We on this side accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MCCORMACK] having assumed the chair, Mr. METCALF, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11473) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year 1957, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE LORING M. BLACK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the recent death of Loring M. Black saddened me greatly but brought back memories of our service together in this

body. His service in this body started in 1923, several years before my election to the House, and continued until 1935. We served in this body with each other about 7 years before the termination of his service herein. During that period we became very close friends.

I also saw Loring Black a number of times since, and in fact, the last time was less than a month ago.

Loring Black was one of the ablest Members of the national House of Representatives. In debate, he had no superior. His keen, penetrating mind drove home telling points and also exposed the weakness of the opposition. There were few who would dare cross swords with him in debate.

Loring Black was loyal and devoted to the Democratic Party. He believed strongly in the principles and the policies for which our great party stands. He believed in the principles of Thomas Jefferson and could always be relied upon to fight for those principles.

During his period of service, he was greatly respected by the Republicans in the House, and highly respected by his Democratic colleagues.

Loring Black was a people's Congressman.

He represented in this body his people with ability, loyalty, and courage. I can see him now in the well of the House during the dark days of the depression, speaking and fighting for millions of unemployed and their dependents, for the home owner and the farmer whose homes and farms were being foreclosed by the thousands, and for the small and independent businessmen of America who were also at that time being forced into bankruptcy in large numbers.

The public service of Loring Black is a matter of record. In their loss, it is a record in which his family can take great comfort.

To his loved ones left behind, I extend my deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

RESEARCH AND EXTENSION SERVICE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee of Agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations, I have been so impressed with the work that is being done in all phases of agriculture that I would like to illustrate the contribution that is being made through the Research and Extension Service by referring to the improvement made in the field of poultry, dairying, and swine production.

You will recall, not many years back, poultry—both chicken and turkey—was a luxury generally reserved for the Sunday dinner, special holidays like Thanksgiving and Christmas, and other festive occasions. How times have changed. Today chicken and turkey are served daily in hundreds of thousands of restaurants, and have become one of the leading meat diets of the Nation.

The scientists in the United States Department of Agriculture's research, in cooperation with the State Experiment Stations and Extension Service, many years ago began to cross-breed and to develop better meat-type fowl and to develop fowl with greater egg productivity.

Since 1935 the research they started has brought about the broad-breasted turkey, a better meat-type chicken, and greater production in the number of eggs per hen.

In addition to years of cross-breeding to get the right physical type, and their research in feed nutrition, a heavier chicken is now produced on less feed, in a shorter time than heretofore—all a big saving to the farmer and the consumer. The application of research findings to poultry has brought striking changes at every step along the line—from the henhouse to the dining table.

The most tremendous of these is in the great growth of the broiler industry, which formerly was a farm-fringe operation, with a total output of about 43 million birds in 1935. Since that time, in just 20 years, poultry has become a full-time commercial enterprise, with an increase in production of broilers from 43 million in 1935 to over 1 billion broilers today.

As I have suggested, this has been made possible through breeding research to develop hardy fast-growing birds that make efficient use of feeds, and by nutrition studies which have developed improved feeds that include vitamins, minerals and antibiotics.

Research to control a number of poultry diseases that made broiler production an uncertain business has played a large part in increasing broiler production.

There has been research in marketing to move high-quality birds rapidly from the farm to the consumer. The attractive display of dressed chickens in the foodstores of the Nation increases sales, and is the result of marketing research.

Let us also consider what research has done to increase egg production. Since 1935 the average egg production for hens has increased from 122 to 184 per hen in 1954. That is an egg increase per hen of 51 percent. These gains can be traced back to research, identifying bloodlines capable of high egg production, and to research resulting in better rations, with more minerals and higher quality protein for laying hens; research that has reduced poultry diseases and parasites has also been important. The 200-eggs-a-year hen is becoming more common on farms, and the research scientists have set a goal in the future for a 240-eggs-a-year hen.

They have reduced the feed necessary to produce 100 pounds of poultry meat from 420 pounds of feed in 1935 to 296 pounds of feed—to produce 100 pounds of broilers—in 1955; in other words, saving 124 pounds of feed in producing 100 pounds of poultry meat. This is a big saving to the poultry farmer, allows him to put his product on the market at a more attractive price, which increases the demand for his product to the consumer—who also gets a bargain.

Now, let us consider the turkey business. Thanks to research, we now have the beautiful shortlegged broadbreasted turkey, a beauty to behold, and a real delicacy when properly prepared and cooked—a great improvement over the longlegged narrowbreasted range turkey of a few years past. Research scientists have been years in developing this beautiful and delectable fowl. There is also such a market for turkey, which you will find on the menus of hundreds of thousands of restaurants every day in the United States, that it has become a big commercial business which returned to the farmers and turkey raisers a total sum of $314 million last year compared with about $62 million 20 years ago.

The consumer demand for turkey rose from 300 million pounds in 1935 to more than 1 billion pounds last year. This increased demand was accomplished by an increase in output per breeder hen—from less than 60 pounds live weight she produced in 1935 to more than 200 pounds live weight turkey production in 1954. This has been accomplished by increasing turkey egg production, and lengthening the breeding season so that turkeys are now hatched every month of the year rather than only in the spring—as they were 20 years ago.

Finally, research in nutrition has produced better feeds. In 1935 on the average it required 519 pounds of feed to produce 100 pounds of live turkey. In 1954 it required only 421 pounds of feed to produce 100 pounds of live turkey—a saving of 88 pounds of feed.

When Dr. Byron Shaw, who has been with the Department of Agriculture 20 years and heads its Research Department, came before our appropriations subcommittee to explain the success his scientists, in cooperation with the State experiment stations, have had with research in poultry, he was asked about the importance of feed ration. To this question, he gave this answer:

As an experiment, we took two chickens with identical breeding and fed one of them the ration that was being used in 1935. We took the other one and fed it the ration we currently use. We found that in 9 weeks the chicken fed the 1935 ration weighed 2.3 pounds, and it took 3.1 pounds of feed to produce a pound of gain. The other identical type chicken we fed the 1954 ration for 9 weeks weighed 2.8 pounds as compared with the other one that in the same length of time weighed 2.3 pounds. We also found that it took only 2.6 pounds of feed to produce 1 pound of meat, rather than 3.1 pounds of the feed used 20 years ago. In other words, the present rations put on an extra half pound of meat, and it took one-half pound less feed to produce a pound of meat with the 1954 ration.

You will get some idea of the importance of this industry when I tell you that the total gross income in 1955 for poultry products alone amounted to $3,450,000,000, which is over 10 percent of the total national income for all agricultural products, which amounted to $32,200,000,000.

Let us see what research has been able to do for the hog farmer. Testimony be-

fore our committee, as well as statistics from the United States Department of Agriculture, show that while we were getting 1,756 pounds of pork per sow on the average 20 years ago, that output has been increased to 2,118 pounds per sow in 1954, or 362 extra pounds of pork per sow increase.

Turning to dairying, we find the records show that in 1935 the dairy cow averaged in our country a production of 4,184 pounds of milk. She now produces on an average 5,512 pounds of milk per cow. I shall not discuss the steps that the research scientists in cooperation with the experiment stations in the different States have taken over the past 20 years in building up better milk strains throughout the dairy business, as time will not permit; however, may I say that it did not just come about. It was brought about by the best agricultural research brains in the Nation with the cooperation of the best agricultural research scientists in the land-grant colleges, State experiment stations, by the leading breeders of dairy herds throughout the Nation, and with the cooperation of county agents, and millions of the most progressive farmers in our country.

GI LOAN GUARANTY PROGRAM

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining with Congressman ED EDMONDSON and several other Members of the House of Representatives in sponsoring legislation for a 6-year extension of the GI loan guaranty program.

The bill which I have introduced is designed to avoid the untimely death of a program which probably has done more to improve the housing conditions of a large segment of our American population than any other measure. I am speaking, of course, of the GI loan program for World War II veterans. Unless action is taken by the Congress, this program will reach its end on July 25, 1957.

Let us take a look at what this program has accomplished. Through March 1956, nearly 4,700,000 veterans had shared in its benefits. About 4,400,000 had obtained guaranteed loans for the acquisition of homes and the balance for farm and business purposes. Aside from the benefit to the veterans we also should consider the tremendous influence which the program has had on the residential construction and home financing industries. The original principal amount of all guaranteed loans totals $35.4 billion of which more than $34½ billion represents home loans. The enormity and importance of the program is attested to by the fact that in 1955 nearly one-third of all new homes were purchased by veterans with the assistance of GI loans.

Now let us take a look at the record that the veterans have made in meeting their GI loan obligations. More than 1 million of these loans have been paid in full, and of this number 837,000 represent home loans. The Veterans' Administration has been called upon to pay a total of 41,000 claims of which about 25,000 were on home loan cases. Thus, in the case of home loans, the claims have run slightly in excess of one-half of 1 percent of the total number of loans made. This is indeed a laudable and remarkable record which the veterans have established.

There are still in the neighborhood of 10 million World War II veterans who have not made use of their loan guaranty benefit. If the program is not extended, a great many of these veterans will lose their opportunity of obtaining GI financing and the chance of acquiring, thereby, a home for their families. This fact alone affords justification for continuing the program in effect. But there is another and equally important reason for continuing the GI loan program. I do not believe that we should subject our national economy to the blow which it naturally would sustain if this financing aid is abruptly removed from the picture. I urge the Members of Congress to give this bill the wholehearted support which it so richly deserves.

UNJUSTIFIED DEMOCRATIC CRITICISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MADDEN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Paul Butler, some weeks past, came out with the statement that the Democratic National Committee was bankrupt financially, and bemoaned the fact that they would have trouble raising sufficient funds to carry on an effective campaign.

While he was doubtless making a play for sympathy, if he had said the Democratic Party is bankrupt for sound issues and policies in the coming campaign that will appeal to the intelligent American voters, he would have hit the nail on the head.

Mr. Butler should not be surprised if he finds it hard to raise funds for his party, with its record of years of wasteful spending, corruption in Government, and the Korean war. Why should anybody want to contribute money to put his party back in power? Naturally, they are not interested in contributing to Mr. Butler's candidates.

The people like the change to a Government of efficiency and economy under President Eisenhower. They know he is sincere, and is interested in the welfare of all of them. They are pleased that he and his Republican Congress in the first 2 years of his administration reduced their taxes about $7½ billion, and they greatly appreciate that he stopped the Korean war and that we now have peace and prosperity throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, yet in the face of this record, 4 or 5 potential Democratic candidates—including dark-horse hopefuls—who want to be President, and who find their party bankrupt for sound issues, have gone to the dangerous length of recklessly criticizing the adequacy of our military defense.

There are those who are constantly giving the American people, and the free nations of the world, the impression that the military strength of the United States is being neglected, and is not a match for the military strength of Russia. This constant repetition by men high in Government could dangerously shake the confidence of free nations of the world—especially the NATO countries in Europe, of which organization we are a member, and influence their decisions not only to their own detriment but to the detriment of the security of the people of the United States.

We have spent over $50 billion since the close of World War II in helping to rehabilitate the free nations of western and southern Europe, and in helping to arm and equip them, in building a strong wall of defense against the further expansion of Russia.

We have told them, and the free nations of the world, that the strength and might of the United States would be used to protect them in the event they are attacked by Russia.

Since the American people and the Members of both bodies of the Congress know that the United States militarily and industrially is the strongest nation of the world, it would seem that this matter of national defense and the ultimate containment of communism is so important that no person in Government should play down our military strength to the point of shaking the confidence of the free nations of the world.

The facts are that never in the history of this Nation has the military and the Defense Department of our Government been in more capable hands. Never in its history in peacetime has the efficiency and military power for defense and offense of this country been developed as rapidly and effectively as it has in the past 3 years under the executive leadership of our President, his able Joint Chiefs of Staff, and his Secretary of Defense, Charles E. Wilson.

They have adapted all branches of the service to the best and most effective use of modern instruments of warfare, and they have built up the Air Force from 70 wings to 137, which will be reached in fiscal year 1957, just as has been planned. They have stopped billions of dollars of waste, increased efficiency by good business management, and at the same time pushed ahead of schedule.

Mr. Speaker, these amateur political critics should be telling the world the facts, and the facts are that, since President Eisenhower, the Joint Chiefs of Staff appointed by him, and Secretary of Defense Wilson have been directing the rebuilding of our military defense, that we have built the best, if not the biggest Army in the world, that we now have the biggest and best Navy in the world, and that we have the best Air Force, and the greatest airpower in the world.

Mr. Speaker, if I may indulge in a little sarcasm, I should like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that we apparently here in Washington have a self-designated new corps of military

"experts." This small group is made up of various members of the Democratic Party, and some ex-officials and spokesmen for that party who are striving mightily for the presidential nomination.

And it is a group which presumes to know everything the Russians are doing, and everything the United States is not doing. It boldly challenges the wisdom and intelligence of the man whom they once extolled as the greatest military genius of our time. It is a group that apparently equates military know-how with political affiliation.

Prominent among this group of military "experts par excellence" are former President Harry Truman, and a few ambitious Democrat Members of the other body. Scarcely a day goes by that one or more of these experts do not inform the American people of the great advances being made by the Soviet Union in the field of military prowess, against the lagging ineptitude of the Republican Eisenhower administration in the same sphere of cold-war activity.

Listening to this election year coterie of experts, one cannot help but wonder who in this country has access to the most up-to-date intelligence reports on Russian military progress. One wonders if the Central Intelligence Agency and other such agencies turn over their latest information to these spokesmen instead of to the Defense Department, and the Chief Executive.

This situation, I submit, is little short of ludicrous. Here we have a bunch of military amateurs, who have proven, in time of grave peril to their country, their complete inadequacy to cope with defense problems, pitting themselves against the man whose brilliant successes during World War II included the North African campaign and the Normandy invasion.

Mr. Speaker, to illustrate what I mean, let us go back a few years to the time when these same men who now set themselves up as the greatest military strategists of our day had a hand in arranging the defense of our proud Nation.

At the end of World War II, the United States was the most powerful military force in the world's history. We had the best Army, the greatest Navy, and the mightiest Air Force. Our fighting men on land, sea, and in the air were the best trained, and their leaders had no equal in ability and enthusiasm.

After our soldiers had won every battle on land and sea from the Southwest Pacific, Japan, and all the battles in Western Europe and went into Berlin, at a cost of over 300,000 killed and 1 million men wounded, and the expense of $300 billion of the taxpayers' money to win the war, and with the greatest military might in the world, we had the power then to force world peace. What happened?

The President of the party in power at that time with his associates lost the peace of the world at the conference table at Yalta; gave concessions to Communist Russia in Europe and China—that put Russia virtually in the driver's seat, and as a consequence built up her power in China that brought on the Korean war, which dragged on until it was brought to an end by President Eisenhower.

The Truman administration after the close of World War II wrecked our grand military force. The Army was disbanded, the Navy scuttled, the Marine Corps whittled down to almost nothing, and our Air Force slashed to token size. It seemed to make no difference that the cold war was developing with great speed and deadliness.

Defense material was disposed of in the most shameful fashion. Tanks and fighting planes were abandoned in all quarters of the globe, left to rust and rot away. Accessory defense material, valued at billions of dollars, was scrapped and junked.

When the fighting ended in 1945, the Army had 89 combat divisions, with manpower totaling about 7,500,000. The Navy was bigger than all other navies of the world combined, with 1,132 combat vessels, 28,583 fighting planes, and 3,300,000 officers and men. The Marines totaled 472,506 and the Air Force had 273 groups.

But, when President Truman sent American troops into war in Korea on June 27, 1950, the Army had only 10 regular divisions and about 600,000 men. The Navy had only 243 combat vessels and 1,200 fighting planes. Its manpower had been cut to 370,000. The Marine Corps had but 74,000 men, all of them in the United States. The Air Force consisted of only 48 groups with 8,600 planes.

Mr. Speaker, that was what the Truman administration did to our great defense machine in the postwar days. While the United States was being whittled down to a third-rate military power, the Communists worked day and night to build up their military strength.

So it was that the men who now claim to know everything about military problems, and what should be done, were responsible for sending inadequately equipped and unprepared American troops into Korea in the summer of 1950. All of you, I am sure, remember how the Reds almost pushed them off the peninsula in the first months of fighting.

From June of 1950 through 1952, Congress, at the urging of the Truman administration, appropriated $151 billions for defense purposes. Earlier, from 1946 to 1950, Congress had voted $95 billions for the same purpose. Thus, a total of $246 billions had been voted for defense and rearmament in the postwar period. And in 1952, the Nation still was unprepared.

But for this, let me quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks of one of the really important Democrat leaders before this body on May 23, 1952:

> The margin of our atomic superiority over the enemy is daily disappearing. We have lost air superiority to him. We have already permitted our Air Force to fall below the minimum necessary for security. And even 2 years hence—according to present plans—it will still be below that minimum. Indeed, we shall not reach it until 1956.

Just 5 days later, Bernard M. Baruch told the Senate Preparedness Committee:

> Since the outbreak of war in Korea, more than $100 billion have been appropriated for defense—an enormous sum. Why has it produced proportionately so little in the way of actual weapons?
>
> Our highest military authorities have stated unequivocally that from now until 1954 will be the period of maximum peril for this Nation. Yet, we deliberately are doing less than we can to achieve readiness by that date.

Mr. Speaker, when the Republicans came into power in 1947, with full appreciation of the dangers facing the Nation, from the growing arrogance of the Soviet Union, they passed legislation calling for a 70-group Air Force, and appropriated $882 million of additional Air Force funds for that purpose.

But, the Republicans reckoned without consideration, for President Harry S Truman, the then President, violently opposed the 70-group Air Force, saying that there was no need to build up our airpower. He directed his Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, to impound and not spend $978 million which the Republican Congress had appropriated.

In June of 1952, J. H. Kindleberger, chairman of the board of North American Aviation, Inc., one of our great plane-building companies, stated:

> We're not getting airplanes because no one ordered them when they should have been ordered. Our trouble started when President Truman locked up the money Congress gave us for a 70-group Air Force.

The chairman of the Senate watchdog committee, and a member of President Truman's own political party, declared on April 11, 1952:

> In the field of aircraft production, I think it is fair to say we have lost almost 3 years as a result of the 1948 decision (of the President) to impound funds Congress appropriated to keep the plants tooled up and productive.
>
> This could well be one of the tragic decisions of our time. We will never get back the 3 years we lost in developing adequate airpower. * * *
>
> We have been too slow in building up since Korea. That slow buildup has handicapped our fighting men. But even before Korea, we encouraged the would-be conqueror to start trouble. There would have been no such encouragement if we had followed through on congressional policy to tool up our defense machine.

Mr. Speaker, this then is the record of those who today criticise the Eisenhower administration, and who would like to make us believe that they are the ones to entrust with the intricate, many-sided problem of American defense in an atomic age. And they have the audacity to place themselves in technical judgment of a military man, a proven genius in his field, respected by allies and enemies alike.

President Eisenhower has pointed out time and again that changes in weapons and technology throughout the world have placed the United States in "a new kind of world with respect to all military formation, policy, organization and equipment."

I repeat again and again and again—

He said recently—

> that the strength of America is not to be found in a guided missile or a bomb, no matter how big, or in airplanes. * * * It is in everything.

Russia is discovering this new fact of life, the President added, and that is why

the Communists are planning to reduce the manpower in their armed forces. He said he believes the Soviet Union is beginning to carry out the same New Look in defense that the United States armed forces have been undergoing for the past 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that it was President Eisenhower who decided to make use of our atomic weapons as an integral, rather than theoretical part, of our defense system. The Democrats previously had been reluctant on this score.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, when the President began streamlining our defense system and cutting down on the manpower requirements of the Armed Forces, the Democrats did not seem to understand the purpose. They even tried to force the administration, through legislation, to add two full, new divisions to our military strength. Today we are witnessing Russian enlightenment to the new era in military defense. As you know, they recently announced sizable cuts in their tables of organization for manpower—cuts designed to carry out the same strategy that the United States had begun years previously.

As the President has said, our defense today is made up of everything—not just a guided missile or a particular type of plane. He knows, perhaps better than anyone else in the Nation, the importance of weapons. But he also knows that weapons today are only one part of our security requirements. Other factors, equally important, are such things as, first, treaties and military alliances with other nations; second, intelligence as to the purposes, ambitions, and plans of other nations; third, a flexible base for national mobilization on a wartime or emergency footing.

Mr. Speaker, let me say in closing that if we must have critics of President Eisenhower's farsighted, pace-setting defense system, let us at least have critics who know what they are talking about. In short, critics who have no past record of dismal failure in the military and defense fields, and who have a present capacity for understanding the interlocking nature of world problems and their bearing on the Nation's defense.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HILLINGS (at the request of Mr. NORBLAD), through June 7, 1956, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. Bow, for 45 minutes, on Thursday next.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ROGERS of Florida and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FASCELL (at the request of Mr. SIKES) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROBERTS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANHAM (at the request of Mr. ROBERTS) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida and to include extraneous matter.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan and to include an address by Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT.

Mr. MCGREGOR.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. MAGNUSON.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. ROOSEVELT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore:

H. R. 6268. An act to facilitate the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and like projects.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 28, 1956, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4656. An act relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina;

H. R. 7678. An act to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the 11th Annual Instrument-Automation (International) Conference and Exhibit, New York, N. Y., and the Americas' New Frontiers Exposition, to be held at Oklahoma City, Okla., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9429. An act to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, May 31, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1909. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1957 involving an increase of $62,500,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission (H. Doc. No. 415); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1910. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to facilitate the control and eradication of certain animal diseases, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the agricultural attaché program, to facilitate the operations of the Farmers' Home Administration, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation and the Forest Service, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1911. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to appoint and employ retired officers without affecting their retired status"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1912. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380) as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

1913. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of each of its newly issued publications entitled, "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1954, Privately Owned", and "Typical Electric Bills, Cities of 50,000 Population and More, January 1, 1956"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1914. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with Lewis C. Watson, which, when executed by the Superintendent, Everglades National Park, Fla., will authorize him to provide charter-boat service for sport fishing in Everglades National Park for a period of 6 months from July 1, 1956, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1915. A letter from the National Shipswriter, Navy Club of the United States of America, transmitting the Annual Report of the Navy Club of the United States of America as of April 30, 1956; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 515. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 11356, a bill to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2221). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 516. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 11040, a bill to advance the scientific and professional research and development programs of the Departments of Defense, the Interior, and Commerce, to improve the management and administration of certain departmental activities, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2222). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 517. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 9952, a bill to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty; without amendment (Rept. No. 2223). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5731. A bill to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and their dependents, to occupy inadequate quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic

allowance for quarters; with amendment (Rept. No. 2234). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6218. A bill to authorize payment by the Federal Government of the cost of making certain studies necessary to assist the Menominee Tribe of Indians to prepare for the termination of Federal supervision with amendment (Rept. No. 2235). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of California: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9970. A bill to provide for the disposition of a portion of Sharpe General Depot, Stockton Annex, Calif.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 11380. A bill to readjust postal rates and to establish a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2237). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1053. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands in the State of Montana to the Phillips County Post of the American Legion; without amendment (Rept. No. 2238). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee of Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2498. An act to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Clatsop, Oreg., as a national monument; without amendment (Rept. No. 2239). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. Report on the Communist Conspiracy. Part I, section A: Marxist Classics; without amendment (Rept. No. 2240). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. Report on the Communist Conspiracy. Part I, section B: The U. S. S. R.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2241). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. Report on the Communist Conspiracy. Part I, section C: The World Congress of the Communist International; without amendment (Rept. No. 2242). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. Report on the Communist Conspiracy. Part I, section D: Communist Activities Around the World; without amendment (Rept. No. 2243). Referred to the Committee of the whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. Report on the Communist Conspiracy. Part I, section E: The Comintern and the CPUSA; without amendment (Rept. No. 2244). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5838. A bill to provide that payments be made to certain members of the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians as reimbursement for damages suffered as the result of the establishment of the Pine Ridge aerial gunnery range, and to provide a rehabilitation program for the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians; with amendments (Rept. No. 2245). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 9280. A bill to provide for the formulation of a plan for control of the property of the Menominee Indian Tribe, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2246). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 11456. A bill to authorize the partition or sale of inherited interest in allotted lands in the Tulalip Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2247). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5868. A bill for the relief of the estate of Gertrude I. Keep; without amendment (Rept. No. 2224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7400. A bill for the relief of Ernest C. St. Onge; with amendment (Rept. No. 2225). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7515. A bill for the relief of James E. Driscoll; with amendment (Rept. No. 2226). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10010. A bill for the relief of Roy Click; with amendment (Rept. No. 2227). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10011. A bill for the relief of Jess Gary; with amendment (Rept. No. 2228). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10199. A bill for the relief of A. O. Nissen and Don Nissen; with amendment (Rept. No. 2229). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 872. An act for the relief of Sam Bergesen; without amendment (Rept. No. 2230). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1067. An act for the relief of Tibor Horvath; without amendment (Rept. No. 2231). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1221. An act for the relief of the estate of Joseph Kelsch; without amendment (Rept. No. 2232). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2984. An act for the relief of Col. John A. O'Keefe; with amendment (Rept. No. 2233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 11510. A bill to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 11511. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 11512. A bill to authorize grants of not more than $500 to certain persons who are injured or whose property is damaged by aircraft of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11513. A bill to include, within the provisions of law providing punishment for killing or assaulting Federal officers on official duty, officers and employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare engaged in enforcing the food and drug or public health laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois (by request):

H. R. 11514. A bill to provide for the relief of certain female members of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 11515. A bill to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the continental United States and Alaska and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 11516. A bill to extend for an additional 6 years the authority to make, guarantee, and insure loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 11517. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alligator grass or water chestnut or water hyacinth plants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 11518. A bill to provide for the establishment of a commission to study the shortage of doctors of medicine in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 11519. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, with respect to certain unfair methods of competition and certain unfair practices in the distribution of new motor vehicles in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 11520. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain property situated in the State of Maine to the town of Castine, Maine; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MURRAY of Illinois:

H. R. 11521. A bill to establish a Council on National Fitness; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 11522. A bill to implement section 25 (b) of the Organic Act of Guam by carrying out the recommendations of the Commission on the Application of Federal Laws to Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 11523. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 11524. A bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 11525. A bill to provide more stringent penalties for violations of laws concerning pornography and related matters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 11526. A bill to improve governmental budgeting and accounting methods and procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 11527. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the Good News Camp, Port Hope, Mich.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. J. Res. 630. Joint resolution to designate the 7-day period beginning on September 17 in each year as Constitution Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 245. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 2189, 84th Congress, 2d session; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the house of representatives, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the Postmaster General of the United States protesting the discontinuance of postage stamps bearing the portraits of John Adams and John Quincy Adams and urging the restoration thereof; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 11528. A bill for the relief of Misuzu Yamada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 11529. A bill for the relief of Mariette Forehand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H. R. 11530. A bill for the relief of M. Sgt. Harold LeRoy Allen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 11531. A bill for the relief of George H. Meyer Sons, Brauer & Co., Joseph McSweeney & Sons, Inc., C. L. Tomlinson, Jr., and Richmond Livestock Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 11532. A bill for the relief of Philip Lee, also known as Lee Yat Hua, and Joan Lee, also known as Faung-jean Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 11533. A bill for the relief of Kobayashi Takayashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 11534. A bill for the relief of Jose Maria Chan-Caballero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 11535. A bill for the relief of Eleanor French Caldwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 11536. A bill for the relief of Eglin Manor, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. J. Res. 631. Joint resolution for the relief of Joseph L. Barrow; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1090. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of C. A. Potter and other residents of Williamsport, Pa., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1091. By Mr. VORYS: Petition of 45 persons, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1092. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the vice president, National Association of Credit Men, New York, N. Y., requesting that the Hoover Commission recommendations be made effective so as to eliminate waste in Government, etc.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1093. Also, petition of the president, Texas Motor Transportation Association, Austin, Tex., requesting that they be placed on record as being opposed to Senate bill 898 so long as it contains the provisions exempting from regulation the transportation of processed and manufactured perishable commodities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1094. Also, petition of the chairman, Citizens' Council of New Orleans, New Orleans, La., relative to a resolution adopted by the Citizens' Council of New Orleans pertaining to the United States Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Work of the United States Information Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement I have prepared indicating the importance of the work of the United States Information Agency in carrying on the fight for freedom in the world today.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

One of the most important items in the appropriations bill now before us is the appropriation for the United States Information Agency. It is important because the work of the USIA has a vital bearing on the question of war or peace. That Agency is charged with the responsibility of interpreting the policies of our Government and the great aspirations of the American people for peace to all the people of the world. It is also charged with the duty of exposing Communist lies about American objectives and intentions in world affairs and with presenting the facts about communism, its shabby record of aggression, occupation, and colonialism, as well as the tyranny it exercises over the lives of all people compelled to live under it.

The degree to which the USIA succeeds in this mission in large degree measures our progress in the prevention of war and the establishment of a just and lasting peace. This is necessarily so because the present conflict between the cause of human freedom and that of Communist totalitarianism is being fought out in the arena of ideals and ideas.

The Communists claim to want peace, but their record shows they quickly resort to aggression and conquest whenever such action serves their timetable of world empire. The Communists claim they stand for equality of nations and people, yet their record shows that every one of the once independent nations held within the present-day Communist empire is subservient to and exploited by the Russians. Worse still, the Communists have set up an elite class of people who enjoy every luxury while the lot of the common man under communism is one of deprivation, uncertainty, needless sacrifice, and even human slavery.

The Communists also claim that under their system man is made more free, creative, and independent than under all other systems of Government. But here again the record shows that communism requires a vast slave-labor system, a huge secret police organization and the terrors of their Iron Curtain to preserve the empire and keep down revolt. These, then, are the basic facts about communism as against their sugar-coated claims which must be made known to all the people of the world.

It is even more important that we make known to the people of the world the truth about our American social and political philosophy. The great human values which caused the Revolutionary War and gave birth to our Nation are still the goals that inspire men in every land. The story of the development and growth of our free institutions is one that will surely benefit those newly independent nations who are seeking a better life for their people while preserving those great human values which give real meaning to life. I speak of individual liberty and the basic freedoms.

We are not understood by vast numbers of people in many critical areas of the world. There is still a great deal of misunderstanding by foreign people about the American heritage and way of life. Communist propaganda has deliberately spread the big lie about our free institutions, political system, and aspirations for all the people of the world.

One of the most effective methods of getting across the truth about the United States is through books which express our basic social and political philosophy. Such books must be within the reach of the common man and in a language he can read and understand.

Last year a group of people at the University of Chicago, after making a careful survey of what the United States had been doing around the world by way of a book program and after studying what the Russians have been accomplishing for years in this field, proposed a program called The Classics of American Democracy. That program called for the printing of a select number of books in volume and in inexpensive editions for distribution in those areas of the world

where the cold war is the hottest. The books to be printed were those that best represented our basic social and political philosophy.

The Chicago Daily News took up the cause and queried its correspondents in foreign posts as to the need for such a program. Soon thereafter the Chicago Daily News was engaged in a real crusade to put the facts before the American people and to gain support for a large-scale book program to be developed by the USIA.

My good friend Congressman BARRATT O'HARA, of Chicago, championed the proposal here in Congress. Hundreds of Americans in key positions in labor, industry, education, religion, veterans groups, women's organizations, civic groups and others were asked to give their opinions on the type of books that best expressed our basic social and political philosophy. The response was both enthusiactic and practical.

Congressman O'HARA then took the proposal to the officials in the United States Information Agency. The Committee on Books Abroad made up of prominent educators and publishers were equally enthusiastic about the proposal for putting out the classics of democracy in inexpensive editions and in as many major languages as feasible.

In February of this year the United States Information Agency launched a pilot project to determine the extent to which such a program would be welcomed in various parts of the world. Twenty-six titles were selected and 10 major languages were agreed upon for translations. The price of the paperback editions was set at between 10 and 15 cents to the purchaser. Each book was to be put out in from 10,000 to 25,000 copies. Of the 26 titles chosen for this project, 10 were those that meet the requirements of Classics of American Democracy. These titles are:

John Adams: The Political Writings of.

John C. Calhoun: A Disquisition on Government and Selections From the Discourse.

Selections from Emerson: Lindeman.

Benjamin Franklin: The Autobiography and Selections From His Other Writings.

Lincoln: Charnwood.

Hamilton, Madison, and Jay: On the Constitution. Selection from the Federalist Papers.

Thomas Jefferson: The Political Writings of.

Thomas Paine: Common Sense and Other Political Writings.

Henry D. Thoreau: Selected Writings on Nature and Liberty.

From the Declaration of Independence to the Constitution. The Roots of American Constitutionalism.

Advance shipments of these books arrived in a key country of Asia and were completely sold out in a few days. Five thousand copies were sold with no advance publicity whatever given to the books. This month the distributors in Asia will have their full quota of the selected books and plan a local publicity campaign on them.

This year the USIA expects to engage in an expansion of the type of book program demonstrated by the pilot project and to spread the Classics of American Democracy to those areas of the world where Communist propaganda and activity are greatest. By this means the common man can secure books in his own language at a price he can afford which tell him the truth about our institutions and way of life.

Moreover, this program is geared to break the virtual monopoly the Russians have held on the inexpensive book market in many countries of the world. Scholars in many foreign colleges and universities will for the first time have access to books on our political philosophy and system in their native language. The great ideals and values which stirred such men as Jefferson, Franklin, Madison, Lincoln, Calhoun, and John Adams will be made known to the people in those newly independent countries of the world and those people who still seek self-government. This should be a real contribution to freedom's cause and a practical means of demonstrating to other people of the world that the human ideals which move the American people are the same as those which give other peoples hope for a better tomorrow.

I have long supported the need for an international information program as necessary to the winning of a just and lasting peace. Programs such as the Classics of American Democracy can make a real contribution to the winning of peace. I hope this good work will be continued and expanded.

Remarks of Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, on Receiving Philip Murray Award of the NAACP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the remarks I made on receiving the Philip Murray award of the NAACP at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel on Thursday, May 17, 1956.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN ON RECEIVING PHILIP MURRAY AWARD OF THE NAACP AT THE STARLIGHT ROOF OF THE WALDORF IN NEW YORK CITY ON MAY 17, 1956

I accept your award which I shall always treasure among the most cherished honors I have received. I am deeply grateful for the distinction which you have conferred on me. I ask that the proceeds of the check which you were good enough to hand to me be given to the North Side Center for Child Development whose fine work has, I know, made a great contribution to the community.

I accept the award with pride in the name of all who work and strive this day, as in the past, for that goal which has beckoned mankind since the first glint of consciousness began to light up the mind of man—the goal of brotherhood and equality of all, under law.

It makes me very proud to receive an award in the name of the late, great, beloved Philip Murray, a man whose deep human compassion was united with an unshakable resolve to achieve justice for all, and especially for those to whom social and economic justice was denied in whole or in part.

The life of Philip Murray was an illuminating life. He was a man gifted above all with the power for leadership, for inspiring confidence in his fellows, for instilling courage, for finding hope, and for holding faith.

The story of Philip Murray, the immigrant who arrived in this country at the age of 16 and who became one of the most influential figures in the United States, cannot be told too often. He was 25 years old before he became a naturalized American citizen, but he embraced the country of his adoption with such zeal and dedicated himself to the cause of labor with such fervor that he became one of the first citizens of America and a power for good to be reckoned with throughout the length and breadth of this land.

But the success story that was Philip Murray's is not the one on which I shall dwell tonight. There is a deeper and richer aspect of Philip Murray's life which is more pertinent to this occasion. I speak, of course, of Philip Murray's devotion to the cause of human rights.

In a true sense, Philip Murray's mature life was dedicated primarily to the struggle for human rights. In this struggle his battlefield expanded with his horizon, beginning with his local union and spreading out in ever-widening sweeps until it embraced all America and even the world.

The stamp of his ideology is clearly marked today on the great united labor organization—the AFL-CIO. And that organization is today one of the principal forces in the continuing battle for justice and equality, under law, for all Americans.

That organization, too, has its problem with its southern membership and with those whom it seeks to organize in the South. Within the councils of that organization, too, are heard the voices of those who plead for delay in grappling with the problem of equal rights for all citizens alike, regardless of race or color or creed.

And as within the councils of the Democratic Party, for instance, and in the inner councils of the Senate and the Congress itself, reasons are cited in justification of the plea for postponement of the issue, on the plea of concentration on other problems and in the name of so-called unity.

As far as organized labor is concerned, I am sure that the ideological heritage of Philip Murray has served to strengthen the resolve of the present leadership of the AFL-CIO in setting a course of determined advance toward the goal of equality, and of determined resistance to the forces of discrimination and nullification.

So must we do, in the Democratic Party, in the Republican Party, and in the Nation.

For this is no partisan matter, although it necessarily is and should be a political issue. It is an issue above party, but it is an issue on which candidates for public office should be tested, and it is an issue on which the people should be asked for their mandate.

I believe that in this year of 1956, whether some like it or not, or whether some wish it or not, the question of equal rights and of the abolition of legally-sanctioned second-class citizenship based on race or color, is the great issue which dominates all others.

It is not only the issue of this day and hour. It is the issue of this generation, which has come into critical focus in 1956.

Even if we would, we could not escape it. It is foolish to try to do so.

Let us rather grapple with it, admitting its difficulties, its vast complexities, and its obviously great delicacy. Let us move upon it with deliberate restraint but with unqualified determination and unflagging zeal.

Our tempo must be that defined by the Supreme Court as deliberate speed. An understanding of the complexity of the problem does not require that we postpone for even a moment any single thing that can and must be done to speed its solution.

There has been on the part of some, including, I regret to say, the top leadership of our Government, a regrettable tendency to identify themselves as a kind of third force in the area of struggle. They seem to consider themselves as neutralists in the cold war over civil rights.

Speaking certainly only for myself, but hopefully also for the majority of the American people, I cannot either be or pretend to be a neutral in this struggle.

This is not a battle between two equal and opposite forces in our country. This is a struggle against oppression. It is a struggle to uphold not only the letter of the Constitution, but its spirit, and the spirit of the Declaration of Independence as well. And what is even more, the spirit of America.

How can I be a neutral in this situation? How can any who hold a role of public leadership be neutral in the face of oppression of some of our citizens and nullification of the law?

I identify myself with the victims of oppression and with the upholders of the law. Is that an extremist position? I do not think so.

The NAACP has come to be unfairly considered in some quarters—and I am thinking of responsible quarters which should know better—as the spokesman of an extremist viewpoint. In my judgment, this is a false depiction and I am glad to brand it so. In my judgment, the NAACP is the spokesman for a truly moderate viewpoint. And it is, above all, a responsible champion of the law, an amicus curiae in the truest sense of that classic Latin phrase.

The NAACP does not speak only for Negroes. It speaks also for that vast number of white people in our country, both north and south of the so-called Mason and Dixon's line, who advocate no more and no less than equal justice under law for all Americans.

It is important that this be understood. It is important that the victims of oppression know that they are not being left to their own devices of struggle, that they are not isolated and alone.

It is important, vitally important, that the struggle for justice be carried on, not primarily by the victims of injustice, but on their behalf.

Let us each and all remember the classic dictum that when we struggle for the rights of others, we struggle to maintain our own rights as well.

I have been talking about struggle, and about the necessity of championing the rights of the victims of discrimination and segregation. In carrying on this struggle—and again, I speak only for myself, but hopefully for the majority of the American people as well—I believe that we must bear constantly and considerately in mind the problems of the oppressors as well as the oppressed.

Many, if not most of them, are, in my judgment, unwilling oppressors. Consciously or unconsciously, most of them will, I believe, rejoice when freed from their end of the chains.

Identifying myself with the victims of segregation does not preclude me, and should not preclude the rest of us, from sympathizing with and trying to understand the problems and points of view of those on the other side of the wall.

They carry a heavy burden, too. They must be helped to free themselves of it, and as Dr. King, that young and inspiring spiritual leader of Montgomery, has so movingly said on so many occasions, they must be loved.

Hate will not accomplish our ends. Love and the spirit of brotherhood—even for erring brothers—will.

There are many in the South—I do not know how many, but I believe very, very many—who are men of truly good will. They do not know how to extricate themselves from their present dilemma. Let us help show them the way.

Firmness in our resolve, enlightenment in our approach, certainty in our cause, and dedication to our purposes, will help us through the difficult months ahead and will enable us to meet the present crisis.

It is unnecessary to magnify the crisis. Nor is it wise, or possible, to minimize it.

We move in what we hope and believe to be God's way, to solve one of the fundamental problems of human existence—the problem of achieving brotherhood in the midst of conflict.

If we have faith, we will have strength and courage. With strength and courage, born of faith, we will not fail.

This Nation Under God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUTH THOMPSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT, M. C., before the Washington Pilgrimage Group on April 29, 1956:

Dr. Dudley, Father Steiner, and distinguished guests, it is indeed a pleasure to be here today with your splendid group, which represents many faiths and geographic areas and dedicated to the program caption "This Nation Under God."

It is most appropriate that the Pilgrimage meets here in the Nation's Capital, so that recognition of an almighty god guiding the destiny of our country might be brought to bear in a forceful and lasting manner.

Far too many people today are guilty of what, for want of a better name, we will label "intellectual arrogance." They have ceased to depend on prayer, charity, or good works in accomplishing their desired ends. They rely strictly on knowledge gleaned from the printed work. Man has succeeded in constructing machinery that will do his bidding to a degree that staggers the imagination. He has planes that fly higher and farther and faster than ever before. Many automobiles now have 300 horsepower. Diseases are being eradicated with new miracle drugs. According to insurance statistics, improved diets are increasing the life span. Man has come a long way from the stone age. Unfortunately, he too often forgets he did not travel his long path alone.

A divine hand has led man, step by step, year by year, up the hill of human achievement—until he stands today with the capabilities of blowing himself from the face of the earth. The intellectual progress has been steady; unfortunately, the spiritual and moral progress has not kept pace. Where does mankind go from here?

Nations, like men, also quite often feel everything they are is a direct result of clever diplomacy, capable generals, or possibly a strategic geographic location. Any thinking person knows better. How many times have nations been saved from destruction by an absolute miracle? How many times have nations or cities been under siege, only to have the enemy depart just when those within the walls could no longer defend their positions? How many times in the history of our own country have we had circumstances similar to those just described? A question vexing military leaders for the past 15 years is "Why did not the Japanese move into Hawaii as they did the Philippines?" It could have been theirs for the taking, and World War II might easily have been prolonged by 5 years—with possible destruction of our west coast. Why didn't the Japanese move in? Was it because we were strongly entrenched? The islands were quite defenseless and the majority of the world knew it. God only knows. It's just that fundamental. You may search the records and review the tactics and intelligence reports of all nations concerned and you cannot find a logical military excuse for sparing Hawaii. Maybe that's because there are no records of the prayers offered in those hectic days by a terribly frightened people.

Probably every one of us here can think of a situation similar to that of Hawaii. "Why did not Hitler invade Britain at the time of Dunkirk? Why did not the Japanese take Australia?" We have seen many incidents such as these in our short life span that bear out my point.

Certainly, we have seen countless manifestations that this Nation is particularly blessed and watched over. "This Nation under God." The United States is unique; its citizens for almost two centuries have enjoyed freedoms that even today are still strangers to the majority of the world. We have stores of natural resources that appear inexhaustible. We have been able to draw on the cultures of the whole world to create what is known as the American scene.

Even from its very inception, this Nation has obviously been under the protecting hand of God. Just imagine—in a population originally only 4 million on the frontier of the world—the very cream of liberal thinking was assembled to construct the foundation of the finest government the world has ever known. It never fails to amaze me, as I sit in Congress, how many daily extenuating circumstances of government were anticipated by the Founding Fathers. These men were intelligent and educated, but one cannot help feeling that the safeguards placed in the Constitution of the United States go beyond the limits of human foresight. I like to feel that God had seen enough of brutality and despotism, and decided to let the world see how one nation could live and prosper under the auspices of Christian principles and teachings.

A most singular feature of the bountiful American way of life is the fact that despite the admission of almost everyone that our Government is based on religion and Christian teachings, there are many who do not want religion even mentioned insofar as government is concerned.

How many otherwise sensible people object to the morning reading of the Bible in public school classrooms? How many people do you know that object to a prayer opening a legislative day in the State legislatures or Congress? These people will tell you that religion does not belong in the proceedings of a democratic government.

Such a statement is ridiculous. Almost every step of governmental progress in history has been brought about through the gentling effect of religion. Did not the Christian missionaries tame the savage tribes that roamed the world for centuries? Was not the code of chivalry a direct result of the teachings of the church? Courtesy to ladies, treating others as you would have them treat you, Thou Shalt Not Kill—from these church teachings eventually came organized government. True government is but a gathering of people who desire to live and work together peacably for their common good. Is religion antagonistic to this purpose?

In this connection—prompted by a desire to make our citizens and the world conscious of the value of prayer—I introduced a bill to authorize the Postmaster General to use the words "Pray For Peace" on mail cancellation dies. Certainly, we have tried every other method to avert a war which no one can win. Why not turn to prayer? Imagine the good that can be done as thousands of people here and abroad are reminded daily of the only way to achieve a just and lasting peace. This bill passed without objection in the House of Representatives; however, it has been held up in the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The Post Office Department has filed an objection to this measure, claiming the expenditure of $250,000 is not justified for an endeavor of this sort. This is a mighty small amount when compared with what we are spending against the possibility of a war. For a change, this spending would be in the interest of peace. A cancellation die of this type would go far to show the rest of the world that we are not completely engrossed in the material things of life and yearn as earnestly as they for a cessation of

war—hot or cold. This would be an appeal from the first of the sister nations of the world.

In closing, I would again like to congratulate your dedicated group, many of whom have traveled a great distance to be here today. You are a symbol of the moral strength of which our great Nation is capable. In addition, you are a working application of tolerance that should stand as an inspiration and challenge to all those who feel their way is the only way. The symbols of various faiths on display here is ample proof that uniformity is not demanded; rather, the intention is to show appreciation and respect for the religious faith of everyone. Let us hope that the trust and good will evidenced here today will spread to the far corners of our country and remove the needless mistrust that sometimes exists among the various denominations.

Thank you and God bless you.

Reduced Production of Certain Agricultural Surpluses Put Into Effect by Executive Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on January 17, 1956, I introduced H. R. 8549, a bill to prohibit the use of real property owned by the United States for the production of agricultural commodities which are to be disposed of by sale. It seemed ridiculous to me that we have had a policy of renting farmland that is owned by our Federal Government to people, who in turn, produce the very crops that are in surplus.

The Federal Government had been following a policy of buying this property, constructing the needed projects, and then leasing thousands of acres, in many instances, back to the previous owner who puts the land into production of crops we now consider surplus and for which we are now paying the farmers for not growing. To me this is a silly procedure. After many conferences with the Defense Department, a decision was reached whereby this program could be put on a sound and logical basis simply by a Presidential directive. I am happy to advise, the President made a public release, and I quote from that release:

> The President today by memorandum requested the heads of all executive departments and agencies to place in effect specified policies designed to limit the leasing of federally owned farmlands for the production of price-supported crops in surplus supply. The President's action was taken to make the leasing of farmlands owned by the Federal Government consistent with the administration's program to reduce price-depressing surpluses and to bring agricultural production into line with markets.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from the President's executive memorandum to all executive departments and agencies:

> 1. Except as provided in paragraphs 2 and 4 hereof, leases of farmlands made by the Federal Government on or after the effective date of this memorandum shall prohibit the cultivation of price-supported crops in surplus supply.
>
> 2. In the case of acquisitions of farmlands by the Federal Government on or after the effective date of this memorandum, if price-supported crops in surplus supply are growing on such lands at the time of acquisition, the harvesting of such crops may be permitted.

This directive, Mr. Speaker, by the President establishes a policy that is in accord with the administration's program to reduce depressing surpluses and would bring agricultural production into line with market demands. I am highly pleased that this policy, that has been adopted, will accomplish the objective of the bill I introduced, H. R. 8549, and will assure fair and equitable treatment to the farmers that are leasing Government-owned real property for agricultural purposes.

Congress and the OTC Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, the failure of H. R. 5550, the OTC bill, to move beyond the Ways and Means Committee is a tribute to the integrity of Congress. The bill represents no more than a concealed stratgem to confirm the State Department in its ambition to raise its field of acitivity, i. e., international relations, to an overriding level of priority wherever it comes into conflict with domestic interests.

In the pursuit of such ambitions the Constitution is an obsolete document or at best meaningless; any expedient obeisance to it is reduced to twisting it, humoring it where otherwise offense might be given, and in its essence stultifying it by playing fast and loose with its principles.

We have the instance of the Department's support of the submission of OTC to Congress on the grounds, as expressed by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles before the Senate Finance Committee, that submission of the "organizational features" of GATT—the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—in the form of the OTC legislation, is a matter of "propriety" rather than an obligation under the Constitution. In other words, the submission of the OTC to Congress was above and beyond the call of duty. Presumably the Congress should vote the Congressional Medal of Honor to the Secretary for such an act of selflessness. In the meantime the substance of the issue, namely GATT, is carefully withheld from Congress. The State Department is willing to entrust Congress with the shell—OTC—but not the core—GATT.

When we reflect upon what is really at stake, namely the regulation of the foreign commerce of this country, the authority over which lies exclusively with Congress under the Constitution, it becomes clear that behind all the words, the shifts of position and the bravado of the State Department, what we really behold is a desperate struggle to dislodge Congress and, the Constitution notwithstanding, replacing the elected representatives of the people by the State Department.

Admission of this is stoutly denied by the State Department, for admission of it would point to the need of a constitutional amendment to accomplish the purpose. The State Department well knows that an amendment transferring the power to regulate foreign commerce from Congress to the executive would have no chance. That explains all the inverted logic, the topsy-turvy allegations, the denials of the obvious and the proclamation of the improbable to which the State Department has been reduced in its sorry stratagem.

The end that it cannot gain by an open and aboveboard approach it seeks one way or another by hook or crook to obtain in any event. It is to the great credit of Congress that it has shown itself not only wary and skeptical but firmly set against such unworthy strategy.

There are those who deplore what they call the "jealousy" of Congress over its authority. The word "jealousy" itself is an epithet designed to water down the integrity of Congress. I want to emphasize that unless Congress looks after its authority, a duty to which each Member is sworn as he takes an oath to uphold the Constitution—unless Congress is true to its responsibility to the voters who elect it and who rightly look to it to reflect the will of the electorate, there is little that will stand against the encroachment from the executive power. If "jealousy" is the right word for a proper concern over the division of powers then I say we should be jealous of our responsibility.

In this connection, I include, under leave to extend my remarks, a letter in the New York Journal of Commerce of May 23 that expresses the concern of numerous industries, producers and labor groups in this country over the threat of the OTC to the powers of Congress. The substance of the letter is in point with what I have said and develops some aspects that are worth keeping in mind:

> STRACKBEIN CITES DULLES' STATEMENT
>
> To the EDITOR:
>
> Your editorial entitled "Furor Over OTC" in the May 9 issue was a masterpiece in its reflection of the differences between the pros and cons of the question. You aline yourself frankly with those in support of the OTC (i. e., for United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation). Your views as expressed in the editorial fully confirm this frank alinement.
>
> The OTC you say is merely "an administrative arm" of GATT. "It is to be endowed with no supranational powers whatever," you continue.
>
> DULLES' STATEMENT CHANGED
>
> May I point out (with malice toward none) that Mr. Dulles, Secretary of State, in oral testimony before the Ways and Means Committee on March 1, 1956, changed his prepared text from a statement that

OTC "is entirely administrative" to one saying that "it is essentially administrative" and that this marks an important difference; in fact it confirms the fear expressed by the opponents.

They fear the loss by Congress of its authority to regulate foreign commerce and its transfer to OTC–GATT if H. R. 5550 were passed. The safeguarding amendments adopted by the Ways and Means Committee would not apply to GATT itself but only to the OTC.

Therefore, GATT would remain free to amend itself, with our own acceptance of such amendments left to the State Department rather than the Congress. This is at the bottom of the fear.

To you this fear is something strange and you refer to it at once as tragic and ridicule it as something highly exaggerated. Moreover it is sinister since this fear is used by the protectionists as an appeal "to the worst nature of Congress—that is, to its jealousy of the powers of the executive branch."

CAUTION HELD JUSTIFIED

As one who has consistently called attention to this very aspect of the OTC I will say that not only is the caution justified—it is entirely commendable that Congress should be jealous of its constitutional authority, just as the press should be jealous of its freedom.

I do not believe that the point needs arguing. Hitler not only suppressed the freedom of the newspaper but he closed the legislature. Both stood in his way, one as formidable an obstacle as the other. Perhaps you are yourself jealous of the freedom of the press.

Let us hope so. If so, you should not berate those who for equally sound reasons are jealous of the functions of Congress. It would be just as easy to laugh at your concern for freedom of the press as the other way around. Neither is a laughing matter.

You say that this congressional jealousy of the Executive ignores the ominous changes that have swept the world since 1945. This raises the question whether there can be a dateline on the preservation of the integrity of the legislative branch. Both the freedom of the press and the preservation of the powers of Congress are as important since 1945 as before.

OPPOSES CURBING CONGRESS

If Congress is to be brushed aside every time a so-called emergency arises or is to be put to sleep for the duration of the cold war it cannot be worth much. Why not curb the press on the same pretext? Or is the press worth something to the preservation of freedom? If so, I do not believe that you can set Congress on a lower rung without courting consequences as disastrous as would follow suppression of the press.

If you will credit those of us who oppose the OTC with at least average sincerity you will better understand that there is much more at issue in the OTC legislation than meets the eye at first blush. That you are not sensitive to this imminent threat is no more surprising than the relative indifference of mere readers of newspapers to a particular threat to freedom of the press that to newspaper editors and publishers may be very real and vital.

The Constitution, like rules of a game, is invoked in nearly all instances by those whose interests would be injured by a breach. Those whose interests are not directly affected or who might even gain from such an infraction usually remain remarkably cool to an imminent threat or may even abet it.

The executive department, because of the vast powers at its disposal, is under constant temptation to enlarge its sway on the grounds that execution of laws requires wide discretion. On this theory the legislative branch would soon be out of business. The OTC is a perfect example.

O. R. STRACKBEIN,
Chairman, Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy.

The A. T. & T. Antitrust Consent Decree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith an address I made before the Private Communications Association at the Hotel McAlpin in New York City, on May 28, 1956:

THE A. T. & T. ANTITRUST CONSENT DECREE

This evening I should like to discuss with you a matter which is of great concern to your industry and your organization. I am referring specifically to the Government's disposition of its antitrust suit against American Telephone & Telegraph and its subsidiary the Western Electric Co.

As you know, on January 24 of this year the Government's much-touted antitrust suit against American Telephone & Telegraph Co. came to a halt. After years of preparation and after exhaustive examination of thousands of documents, the Government's prosecution terminated in an innocuous, albeit much publicized, decree.

This decree, agreed to by both sides to avoid trial, represents one of the worst antitrust dispositions I have ever seen. In fact, it is worse than nothing at all. It not only fails to accomplish what the Government set out to do when it filed suit 7 years ago, but it goes further by prejudicing future administrations in any subsequent efforts to mitigate the effects of A. T. & T.'s monopoly.

The only conclusion I am able to draw from the facts is that the Attorney General has given A. T. & T. singularly preferential treatment.

Let us compare the chief provisions of the complaint filed by the Department of Justice in 1949 with the consent decree that the Department agreed to in 1956.

This complaint, carefully prepared following years of investigation, charged that the Western Electric Co., a wholly owned subsidiary of A. T. & T., manufactures and sells more than 90 percent of all telephones and telephone equipment sold in the United States and that a substantial part of the remaining 10 percent is produced under the control of Western Electric. It also alleged that A. T. & T. controls about 85 percent of local telephone service in the United States.

The complaint further charged that Western Electric and A. T. & T. combined with each other to monopolize the United States telephone manufacturing and telephone service industries. To correct this monopoly, the complaint requested the court to force A. T. & T. to sell all of its interest in Western Electric so that the business of manufacturing telephones would be divorced from the business of operating telephone service.

This was the heart of the suit—to break up the combination of A. T. & T. and Western Electric. Yet the consent decree does nothing to carry out this most important objective. The corporate structure of this combination not only remains unchanged but is fused even closer together. The manufacturing and telephone service monopoly is still concentrated in the same hands.

The complaint also asked that Western Electric be split into three separate companies to diversify the manufacturing of telephone equipment and to create competition where none existed before. The consent decree makes no effort to divide up Western Electric.

The complaint asked that Western Electric be required to sell to A. T. & T. its 50-percent ownership of Bell Laboratories so that research and experimentation by other manufacturers would be encouraged. The decree requires no transfer of ownership in Bell Laboratories.

When the complaint was filed, the Department of Justice had evidence that A. T. & T. required its many operating companies throughout the country to buy equipment and supplies only from Western Electric. The Government, therefore, requested that these contracts be declared void and that A. T. & T. be forbidden from entering into similar contracts in the future. The consent decree ignores this problem.

The complaint prayed that A. T. & T. and the Bell System companies be required to purchase their equipment by competitive bidding so as to inject competition in the manufacturing industry and to protect telephone users by insuring that the telephone companies paid no more than a fair price. The decree does nothing about this.

The complaint refers to existing agreements between Western Electric and other manufacturers of communications equipment, including, for example, Radio Corporation of America, General Electric, and Westinghouse. It charged that these agreements restrain competition and requests that they be adjudged illegal and void. The decree fails so to do.

Why is there such great disparity between the relief sought originally and the relief finally obtained? Representatives of the Department of Justice could say only that the terms of the consent decree were the best the Government could get and that in their opinion there was insufficient evidence to justify the court's dissolution of the A. T. & T.–Western Electric combine.

The fact is, however, that the head of the Antitrust Division admits that A. T. & T. owns and controls 85 percent of all local telephone service in the United States.

He admits that A. T. & T. has practically a 100-percent monopoly on long distance service.

He admits that Western Electric manufactures and sells between 80 and 90 percent of all telephones and telephone equipment sold in the United States.

He admits that A. T. & T. requires its operating companies and its own Long Lines Department to buy virtually all of their telephone equipment from Western Electric.

He admits that A. T. & T. and Western Electric bought up or otherwise eliminated competing manufacturers of telephone equipment.

If these facts do not establish such a violation of the antitrust laws as warrant a court decision on the necessity for dissolution, then no facts would.

In the Government's antitrust case against the Pullman Co. the Court ordered a separation of Pullman's unregulated monopoly of the manufacture and sale of sleeping cars from its regulated monopoly of sleeping-car service. Since the Court did break up the Pullman monopoly why did the Department of Justice believe that the Court could not similarly break up the A. T. & T. monopoly?

The head of the Antitrust Division has asserted that although the decree did not accomplish what the Government had originally asked the Court to do, it did protect the public interest in alternative ways. Let us look more closely at the decree and see if it does. There are four main things that the decree purports to do.

First, instead of preventing A. T. & T. from requiring that its many operating companies

buy only from Western Electric, it prohibits A. T. & T. from requiring independent companies to buy from Western Electric. From a practical standpoint this provision affects none of the long-distance telephone service in the United States and no more than 15 percent of the local telephone service in the country.

Second, instead of forcing Bell companies to buy all equipment by competitive bidding to protect competing manufacturers, the decree provides only that Western Electric must set up a generally acceptable accounting system subject to inspection by the Department of Justice. According to the Department, this will better enable appropriate governmental regulatory bodies to determine whether A. T. & T. is being charged fair and reasonable prices for equipment it buys from Western Electric. Presumably the appropriate regulatory body would be better able by this accounting provision to determine whether equipment costs incurred by A. T. & T. for Western Electric equipment are unreasonable and should be disallowed in the establishment of Bell company rates. Not only is this provision so vague and general as to be practically unenforceable the Department is even unaware whether the decree will require any changes in Western Electric's present accounting methods.

Third, the decree requires A. T. & T. to license, royalty free, any or all of its existing 8,600 patents to anyone who asks for a license with certain minor exceptions and also requires that future patents be licensed for reasonable royalties. This the Department regards as the heart of the decree. The Attorney General stated that the decree makes available to any citizen all inventions and know-how of the Bell System. It sounds good but what does it mean? In the light of the following facts, I think you will agree that it means very little:

(1) Although royalty free licensing is required for existing patents, the decree permits A. T. & T. to charge for the know-how necessary to use the patents. It is common knowledge that in most cases patents are useless without know-how. I understand that the charges for know-how and technical information connected with these patents could be as much as the royalty would have been before the decree.

(2) It is of little or no value for an independent manufacturer of telephone equipment to get a license from A. T. & T. to make, use, and sell such equipment if he has no market for his equipment. And under the decree there is little possibility that the independent's market will be broadened.

(3) A large number of the patents involved are valueless unless the licensee can obtain additional patents owned solely by RCA. At the present time RCA issues a package license which includes its own and many of A. T. & T.'s patents. Consequently a prospective licensee might well prefer an RCA package license which includes A. T. & T.'s patents rather than get an A. T. & T. license and then still have to get the RCA package license.

(4) A substantial number of the 8,600 patents involved in this decree have expired.

(5) Although the decree requires A. T. & T. to license any or all of its patents, existing or future, the company has had a standing policy since 1949 to license anyone for any purpose. Therefore, the decree makes little change in A. T. & T.'s licensing policy.

In the light of these circumstances, the fact is that the benefits of the patent provisions of the decree are largely illusory.

Finally, we come to the part of the decree that purportedly was designed to help small business, the part that supposedly limits the Bell System companies to common-carrier operations and supposedly requires Bell companies to get out of the private nonregulated communications field. If this in fact were the result of the decree, one of the effects of A. T. & T.'s monopoly on your industry would have been mitigated to some extent at least.

Unfortunately, the decree in practical operation has not required A. T. & T. to get out of the private communications field. It is true that under the decree, A. T. & T., Western Electric, and their subsidiaries are forbidden to engage in any business other than the furnishing of common carrier communications services, but the decree defines that term so loosely that the small-business man in the private communications field will be given little comfort.

Under the decree common carrier communications services include any communications service and facility (other than message telegram service), the charges for which are or become subject to regulation under existing or future laws of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia. It also includes services and facilities, the charges for which are subject to regulation under the Federal Communications Act or would be subject to such regulation if they were furnished in interstate commerce. Thus, despite the decree, A. T. & T. and Western Electric can still engage in manufacturing, selling, and leasing of any and all private communications equipment and services, provided only that the charges made are subject to regulation under State law.

Just 1 week after the entry of this decree a bulletin of the Bell Laboratories announced that the telephone companies whose private communications services were not then subject to regulation were going to file tariffs with the appropriate regulatory authorities to bring them within regulation and so exempt these operations from the prohibitions of the decree. Accordingly, 2 months later, the Bell Co. in California filed tariffs for its private communications services. At about the same time the President of the Illinois Bell Telephone Co. announced to the stockholders that the company expected to look into the possibility of doing the same thing.

I have no doubt that this strategy will be followed throughout the United States. If it is, the Attorney General's consent decree will afford the private communications industry of America little protection indeed.

These are not the only loopholes in this decree. There are many more, but time does not permit listing them now.

The loopholes I have discussed, however, show that despite the Attorney General's claims that the A. T. & T. monopoly has been dissipated by the consent decree, the converse is true. Moreover, its monopoly position has been given the seal of Government approval. The facts with regard to this decree must be brought to the attention of the American people. Perhaps in the future there can be undone some of the harm that this decree has caused to competitive conditions in the communications industry.

Miss Carrie L. Allen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the Department of the Air Force held its fourth annual honor awards ceremony honoring certain civilian employees of the Air Force for their distinguished service.

I am very pleased and proud that a constituent of mine, Miss Carrie L. Allen, from Ashland, Clay County, employed in the Office of Legislative Liaison for the Air Force, was granted an award for outstanding performance for her work. I know that many Members of this House and their offices, like myself and my office, have received very competent, prompt, and courteous assistance from Miss Allen on many occasions. In this day, when so much happens so quickly, it is very gratifying to know that time is being taken to give recognition to an individual for outstanding work.

I extend my congratulations and appreciation to Miss Allen for her very fine work for the Air Force and in behalf of Congress.

Revision of Government Appropriation, Budgeting, and Accounting Processes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today legislation which I believe is a necessary step and long overdue to place our governmental accounting and budgeting processes on a more realistic and orderly basis. As I am sure most Members realize, we have a backlog of unexpended authorizations in the amount of almost $80 billion and I think all of us realize the lack of control that this situation brings about. I had been working on provisions to incorporate in legislation to present to the House for consideration when a bill was introduced in the Senate, being S. 3897, which incorporates proposals to bring about some necessary reforms as suggested by the Second Hoover Commission and which has strong bipartisan support in the Senate. I have introduced a companion bill to the Senate bill today.

It is estimated by the Second Hoover Commission that the reforms suggested and as set forth in this legislation could effect savings in the amount of almost $4 billion. This figure is perhaps hard to fully substantiate but at least it gives a very dramatic evidence of the great savings that can be effected in our Government by the enactment of this legislation.

It is my strong feeling that the House should consider this legislation at the earliest possible time and I am respectfully asking for a hearing before the House Government Operations Committee on the provisions of this measure which I believe are sound and should be enacted by the Congress.

This measure proposes changes in executive branch accounting and formulation of budget requests for appropriations, and it proposes changes in congressional authorization of the expenditure of money on Federal programs. It would place the entire governmental financial structure on an annual accrued expenditures basis, as opposed to the obligations system now in operation. It would permit a much closer supervision by Congress over the expenditures of the executive branch of the Government

and would provide for the top management of the executive branch a more complete and more meaningful understanding of the financial operations of the Government. Almost all major private corporations have adopted this system of budgetary control, and the Hoover Commission's report indicates that this system can profitably and effectively be adopted by the Federal Government.

The changes which are proposed are generally stated in "where and as practicable" terms. They are not of as much consequence to agencies which spend money primarily for administrative and operating purposes such as employee services, travel, rents, utilities bills; and which now are granted appropriations that remain available for incurring obligations only during a specified fiscal year. The changes are more substantial for agencies that are engaged in construction or purchase of equipment in large volume, and which require appropriations to be available for obligation over a period that is longer than 1 fiscal year.

For the latter sort of department or agency, the bill would introduce practices that are essentially different from those now followed. Money would be provided by Congress only for 1 year's accrued expenditures; contracts for work in excess of 1 year would be authorized, but the money would not be provided for more than 1 year at a time. At the present, the contract authorization is little used, and money is appropriated for incurring obligations not only in 1 year but over a greater period the duration of which may be either definite—multiple-year—or indefinite—no-year.

Two differences are to be noted: a proposed one-year-at-a-time appropriation, contrasted with multiple or indefinite years; and appropriation for accrued expenditures rather than obligations. As implied in the remarks of an earlier paragraph, accrued expenditures and obligations incurred do not differ for some important objects, such as employees' services, travel, and communication, utilities bills, rents, interest, pensions, claims, investments. But accrued expenditures do differ from obligations incurred for lands and structures, equipment, supplies and materials, grants, subsidies and contributions. Expenditures accrue when goods and services are received or, generally, when title passes to the Government. Accrual includes the occasions when performance on a contract is accepted for the purpose of progress payments that are made before the completion of the entire job. Obligations are incurred, on the other hand, when orders are placed and contracts are awarded. The accrual of expenditures differs from the incurral of obligations, when it differs at all, in coming at a later point in the process of the Government's procurement.

The significance of the difference between expenditures and obligations is this: If appropriations are limited to the year's accrued expenditures rather than to authority to obligate—whether or not obligations are incurred—then the Congress keeps much shorter the time that elapses between its authorization of the expenditure of funds and the actual expenditure of the funds. The process of review of accomplishments is made more immediate.

The bill requires that appropriation requests be in terms of accrued expenditures. It requires also that requests be built up from accounts of costs, and that measurements of performance be shown. These requirements are consistent with making appropriations in terms of accrued expenditures, but costs may diverge from expenditures. If the costs incurred in the year, rather than the obligations incurred, are summarized in building up appropriation requests, accounts of such assets as inventories and of fixed properties will be needed. These assets may be used and so become costs in years additional to, or other than, that in which they are purchased. The actual cost of getting the benefits of the Government's programs can be ascertained only if cost accounts which reflect changes in inventories, depreciation, and so on are developed.

Let's Extend and Logically Terminate GI Home Loan Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on April 12, 1956, I introduced H. R. 10469, a bill to provide for a 3-year extension of the GI home loan program. This measure provides for a gradual termination allowing a 1-month extension for every 2 months of active service for World War II veterans. It further provides that all veterans disabled during World War II shall receive a full 3-year extension from the July 25, 1957, termination date.

Action in the United States Senate Thursday, May 24, recognizes the need for an extension of the GI home loan program. The Senate has not, however, given consideration to the need for a gradual termination nor has it recognized the adverse effects that an abrupt termination will have upon our overall economy. Their action reminds me of the doctor who, after examining his patient—who was sorely in need of glasses—prescribed merely an aspirin.

The entire American public, particularly the veteran and American businessman who are affected by this program, are entitled to fair consideration. This consideration can be and should be extended now in the form of positive and final action in this session of the Congress.

The Washington Post and Times Herald of Friday, May 25, 1956, quoted Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks as terming the economy "very spotty today." He and Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey pointed to existing soft spots in our economy. It behooves us as Members of this Congress to enact an extension of the GI home loan program and uphold the all-important home building and related industries. An extension with a gradual termination will prevent further softening in these fields.

Since April 12, 1956, the date I introduced this measure, 32 bills calling for an extension of this program have been introduced by my colleagues in the House. Positive recognition of the need was further evidenced as I previously noted by the United States Senate in their affirmative action in calling for an extension last Thursday.

During the 6½ weeks since I introduced this legislation, endorsements have been received from DAV, AMVETS, home builders, Mortgage Bankers Association, savings and loan associations, realtors, electrical appliance dealers, and labor organizations. In addition to this, the American Legion, VFW, and other veteran organizations have urged Congress to enact an extension of this program during this session. I have yet to receive or hear of any well-founded opposition to an extension of this worthy program.

At this time I would like to call my colleagues' attention to several more of the numerous letters of endorsement which I have received:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FASCELL: The United States Savings and Loan League, the nationwide trade association representing the savings and loan institutions of America, and its 4,300 member savings and loan associations and cooperative banks have gone on record in favor of a reasonable extension of the GI home-loan program.

In this connection the United States Savings and Loan League is pleased to endorse your bill, H. R. 10469, which extends the program and calls for an orderly and gradual termination between now and 1960. The philosophy of your measure promises a logical and equitable solution to the problem of orderly terminating a program which has been of invaluable assistance to the veterans of our country and the Nation as a whole.

In a recent survey conducted by the Department of Commerce, it was noted that the percentage of American families who own their own homes has now reached 59 percent. Undoubtedly, the GI home loan program contributed significantly toward making us a nation of which the majority of families own their own homes. The savings and loan industry of America takes pride in this record of home ownership and is doing everything within its power to encourage home ownership and thrift.

This bill, H. R. 10469, is definitely in keeping with our philosophy and we heartily congratulate you on your efforts in this regard. I feel certain that the savings and loan business will wholeheartedly support you in this important endeavor.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN SLIPHER,
Staff Vice President,
United States Savings and Loan League.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FASCELL: The Dade County Central Labor Union wants you to know how much it appreciates your work in our Nation's Capital in behalf of good government and the welfare of all the people. We are especially grateful for your efforts in behalf of low-cost housing. So many of our people still do not have decent places to live and this is the only way that they ever will get them.

We have gone on record in approval and commendation of your work and accomplishments.

Very truly yours,

EDGAR CHAMBERS,
Secretary, Dade County Central Labor Union.

DEAR MR. FASCELL: We very much appreciate the reprint enclosed with your letter under date of April 27 showing the very able manner in which you presented this bill to extend the GI home-loan program to the House.

We believe that you have a practical solution to a serious problem, and hope that the Congress will agree with you to the extent that they will pass your measure without any unnecessary delay.

If there is anything we can do to assist, please advise. Again thanking you for your very fine cooperation, we are,

Sincerely,

FLORIDA BUILDING INDUSTRY COUNCIL,
H. SIMPSON, *Secretary.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FASCELL: The board of governors of this association has read with interest and approval your speech of April 21, 1956. It is in entire agreement with your suggestion and has asked me to send to you the enclosed copy of the resolution adopted today.

With kindest regards.

Very cordially yours,

MORTGAGE BANKERS' ASSOCIATION OF GREATER MIAMI,
CHARLES CONTOPOULO,
Secretary-Treasurer.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Honorable DANTE B. FASCELL, a Member of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States from the Fourth Congressional District of Florida, made a noteworthy speech in the House of Representatives on April 12, 1956, in which he strongly recommended the extension of the GI home-loan program, a copy of which speech is contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and which speech has been studied by the undersigned organization; and

Whereas this organization likewise strongly recommends the extension of the said GI home-loan program, believing such extension to be in the public interest, as well as in the interest of all mortgage lenders: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Mortgage Bankers' Association of Greater Miami, That Hon. DANTE B. FASCELL be commended for his forthright position with reference to the proposed extension of the GI home-loan program; and be it further

Resolved, That this association strongly favors, and urges the adoption of, appropriate legislation and action to extend the GI home-loan program; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Hon. DANTE B. FASCELL and a copy thereof spread upon the records of this association.

Adopted at Miami, Fla., this 21st day of May 1956.

MORTGAGE BANKERS' ASSOCIATION OF GREATER MIAMI.

DEAR MR. FASCELL: Received your copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which you presented your speech for the extension of the GI home loan program. We all feel that this is a wonderful thing. I do not know whether you sent a copy to other brokers in this area or not. In the event you haven't, I will be glad to do that for you.

Yours truly,

WALTER A. STADNIK,
Realtor, Miami Springs Realty.

DEAR DANTE: We are writing in reference to the speech you made on the extension of the GI home loan program, Thursday, April 12, 1956.

We would like to go on record and state that we agree with everything you have brought forth to the 84th Congress, second session.

We, who deal in the building and financing of GI houses can greatly see the need for the extension of this program. We know this need will not only affect the mortgage men, the builders and the GI's but will also affect the prosperity and the economy of this country if such termination is allowed to come to an abrupt ending on July 25, 1957, which is the termination of said legislation now of record.

Yours very truly,

REID BUILDERS, INC.,
WARREN G. REID,
Secretary-Treasurer.

DEAR DANTE: Just a line to tell you that I think your bill providing for gradual termination of the VA program in an orderly manner is an exceptionally sound and well conceived piece of legislation.

I certainly hope it will be enacted and believe that it would work to the best interests of the veterans, the public and the Nation as a whole.

With warmest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

R. V. WALKER,
Executive Vice President, First Federal Savings and Loan Association of Miami.

DEAR SIR: As an active builder, realtor, and mortgage loan correspondent in the northern Virginia area, I have recently reviewed the type of client that has been purchasing our homes and brokerage properties, and for your information, they fall in the following categories: 8 percent conventional, 4 percent FHA, 88 percent GI.

As you readily evaluate, the curtailing of the GI program would hit this area with a terrific impact. Therefore, we request that you eagerly pursue the approval of Representative FASCELL's bill to extend the Virginia home guaranty program for an additional 3 years, in order that an abrupt termination of this program does not create an unhealthy and inflationary effect on the entire Nation's economy.

If we can be of any further assistance in developing other necessary statistics for you, please call on this firm.

ARTHUR POMPONIO,
M. Pomponio & Sons, Inc., Builders,

DEAR DANTE: You are to be commended for your bill, H. R. 10469, as the veterans sure need some aid.

If I can do anything to help at any time, let me know.

Your friend,

W. C. JOHNSON,
Business Manager, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FASCELL: The members of local union No. 359, IBEW, who number 1,150, wish for me to convey to you their feelings in regard to the extension of the GI home loan program.

At the last regular business meeting of local 359, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in regard to the extension of the GI home loan program was fully discussed and it is the wishes of the members of this local to inform you that we are in full support of extension of the GI home loan program.

Very truly yours,

LEONARD W. SPRING,
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

It is obvious from the endorsements from organizations representing millions of Americans that definite steps and final action to extend this program must be taken. It is extremely important that the veteran home buyers, the home builders and the thousands of others that produce materials for this industry be given advance notice as to what to expect in the way of legislation in this field.

Any action calling for an abrupt termination will have adverse economic effects on our economy. The only logical way to terminate the program is through a gradual process based on length of service. A committee study of this proposal could effect the proper solution to a gradual termination.

Let us extend the GI home loan program and provide for a gradual termination.

Disabled Are Valuable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, "I'm wearing two hats, one as Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, and the other as national commander of the Disabled American Veterans," said Gen. Melvin J. Maas during the opening meeting, Thursday, May 17, 1956, of the annual meeting of the representatives of some 300 organizations affiliated with the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. Then he was speaking in the departmental auditorium, in Washington, D. C., and continued:

I'm going to step aside, while Maj. Omer W. Clark, national legislative director of the DAV, turns over to DICK NIXON, our country's Vice President, the prize winning checks, from the national headquarters of the DAV, which the Vice President will then present to the five national essay contest winners, whose traveling expenses to Washington, D. C., and back home were also paid for by the DAV.

The 5 DAV checks having been presented to Vice President NIXON, he in turn presented them to the 5 national essay contest winners: Alaire Dickson, Gooding, Idaho; Kaye Ray, Tucson, Ariz.; Theresa Drzal, Johnstown, Pa.; Sharon Berg, Salt Lake City, Utah; and Rodney Nicholson, El Dorado, Ark.

The Vice President casually remarked that he was glad that there was at least one young man among the essay contest winners.

The Vice President also presented a beautiful plaque—the President's trophy—made by handicapped persons being trained by the National Institute for the Crippled and Disabled in New York City, to the Outstanding Handicapped Person of the Year, Dr. Arthur S. Abramson, of New York City, himself a wheelchair veteran of World War II, in appreciation of him, notwithstanding

a paralysis of the lower portion of his body by reason of gunshot wounds, making very outstanding contributions toward the physical rehabilitation of disabled veterans and other handicapped persons during the last several years.

The theme of the 2-day session, and of the panel discussions, was that "Disabled Are Valuable"—dependable, appreciative, valuable. The session included discussions as to how to surmount the various road blocks toward facilitating the employment of the physically handicapped, both civilians and veterans.

Changing from one hat to the other, as chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped and as national commander of the DAV, "Mel" Maas—as he is known to his friends—has, in both capacities, taken advantage of every opportunity to point out the advantages to employers of employing handicapped employables in suitable useful jobs, matching the man to the job by utilizing his remaining abilities. Surveys, he asserts, indicate that, generally speaking, handicapped employees lose less time because of accidents, absenteeism, or indisposition, and are generally more productive than able-bodied employees.

No better investment can be made by the Nation, resulting in greater financial and humanitarian dividends, than the relatively small cost involved in effectuating the physical and vocational rehabilitation of handicapped persons—thus enabling them to be converted from tax-consuming to tax-paying citizens.

Though now totally blind, General Maas sees in many ways better than those who have eyesight. A veteran of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, rising from the rank of private and then corporal in the Marine Corps during World War I, General Maas has made many contributions to society; but he considers his present two positions as of paramount importance, in this country, and in effect throughout the world, because he says human dignity, independence for human beings, can be obtained only by enabling them to become useful and self-sustaining.

"Independence Through Employment—Hire Disabled Veterans" is the printed message on an attractive Independence Hall 1956 calendar card which, several months ago, was distributed to some 300,000 employers, under the sponsorship of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, designed to focus their attention upon the advantages of employing America's disabled defenders. This special calendar card indicates "printing costs paid by the Irving J. Phillipson rehabilitation fund of the Disabled American Veterans' Service Foundation."

These facts I know, by what I have read in our newspapers, and because a long-time friend of mine, Miles H. Draper of Tampa, Fla., is president and chairman of the board of trustees of the DAV Service Foundation. Serving with him are Gen. Melvin J. Maas, Daniel W. Bell, and Maple T. Harl, of Washington, D. C.; Gen. George C. Kenney, Lewis L. Clarke, Francis Buono, and Arthur W. Procter, of New York City; John L. Golob and James L. Monahan, of Minnesota; Laurence Curtis, of Boston, Mass.; Boniface R. Maile, of Detroit, Mich.; and Floyd L. Ming, of Bakersfield, Calif.

A past national commander of the DAV and former national service director, Millard W. Rice is the foundation's executive secretary and full-time executive director, with offices at 631 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, D. C.

I am told that the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation was created by the DAV in 1931, as an incorporated trustee under the laws of the State of Ohio, to give assurance to donors of a continuity of policy as to funds raised; and that it has been responsible, during the 1948–55 period for appropriating the aggregate sum of $2,490,000 to the congressionally chartered 36-year-old service-giving Disabled American Veterans—DAV—in addition to smaller amounts to DAV departments and units by reason of localized fund-raising projects.

Its continuity of policy is assured by its method of electing its trustees, 10 of whom each serve for a 5-year period, with 2 expiring each succeeding year, whereas the remaining 3 consist of the incumbent national commander and chairman of the National Finance Committee of the DAV and 1 other elected for a 1-year term.

Most of its net funds have been raised by the DAV Service Foundation by conducting annual puzzle contests, but almost immediately after proving the success of such formula, many other organizations decided to do likewise, which has thus been responsible for diminishing returns in successive contests.

Other effective methods for raising substantial funds therefore need to be developed. Several recent bequests in wills have given encouragement to the distribution of a lawyers advisory committee folder among lawyers who specialize in probate work. I am advised that up to 20 percent of an individual's taxable income, and somewhat less of a corporation's taxable income, may be deducted for Federal income tax purposes, when donated to this foundation; and thus the Federal Government shares in the cost of making donations to such Treasury-recognized organizations as the DAV Service Foundation and the service-giving Disabled American Veterans.

The welfare of America's disabled defenders is inevitably linked with our country's future welfare and security, because our country's potential future war veterans will naturally be impressed by the fact that our Nation enables its disabled war veterans to become useful civilians.

Unfortunately, too many of my fellow-Americans erroneously assume that governmental benefits to disabled veterans are automatically awarded. They fail to realize that more claims are denied by the United States Veterans' Administration than are allowed. Ordinarily, it is much more difficult for a disabled veteran to prove his case factually and technically than it is for an able-bodied veteran to prove his entitlement to benefits under the so-called GI bill of rights.

The burden of proof to establish his claim for service-connection of his disability rests upon the disabled veteran himself, if official records fail to substantiate his claim. Thus proving service connection may necessitate detailed specific fact-giving, affidavit evidence, which because of the death or disappearance of buddies and others who know the pertinent facts, may be exceedingly difficult to obtain.

Because of such technical difficulties, the DAV has long maintained the largest veteran staff of full-time, paid, expert national service officers located in all of the regional offices of the United States Veterans' Administration—where they have access to the claimant's official records—to advise and assist distressed, disabled veterans, and their dependents, how to establish service-connection and entitlement to disability compensation for their handicapping disabilities, plus needed physical and vocational rehabilitation, and finally placement into useful self-sustaining employment.

Thousands of discouraged disabled veterans are each year thus converted from community liabilities into community assets. Each claim is different from every other one, just as the problem of every handicapped person is different from every other one. In extending much needed service to disheartened, disabled veterans, the DAV not only benefits scores of thousands of disabled veterans, and their dependents, each year, but also benefits their respective communities, and, in the final analysis, our country. The extensiveness and effectiveness of their personalized, helping-hand services to America's disabled war veterans is only in part indicated by the statistical résumé of their activities for the last fiscal year, as follows:

Service connections established	7,231
Attendant's allowances procured	188
Death compensation awards	4,281
Burial allowances processed	1,571
Public Law 346 benefits obtained	2,601
VA claim files reviewed	299,096
Increased compensation obtained	18,193
Nonservice pensions proven	6,860
Insurance benefit adjustments	1,208
Public Law 16 benefits obtained	2,596
Retirement benefits secured	63
Appearances before rating agencies	134,915

The nationwide service setup of the DAV is under the jurisdiction of Capt. Cicero F. Hogan. As national director of claims, he has his offices at the Disabled American Veterans national service headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW, Washington, D. C.

Also located at such national service headquarters is the DAV national legislative director, Maj. Omer W. Clark, former Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and his assistant legislative director, Elmer M. Freudenberger, former Chief of Claims of the United States Veterans' Administration. Major Clark is also chairman of the Disabled Veterans Committee of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

A very important part of the services extended by the DAV comes under its national director of employment, John W. Burris, who is also its national civil service officer—also at the same address.

The administrative activities of its national service headquarters are coordinated by the DAV's able assistant national adjutant, Roland A. Jensen.

The overall administrative activities of the DAV come under the jurisdiction of its long-time National Adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly—a wounded Marine of World War I—located at the DAV National Headquarters at 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio. Under his jurisdiction also comes the DAV's chief fundraising project—sending out miniature automobile license tags to automobile owners, by reason of which about 125,000 sets of lost keys are each year returned to their owners, without regard to whether they had previously made any donation therefor.

Unfortunately, only about 20 percent of the recipients of such key-insurance Idento Tags do send back donations to the DAV, but those who do so, fortunately, have enabled the DAV to maintain its some 200 full-time National Service officers, and about 600 employees at its Idento Tag plant in Cincinnati—mostly disabled veterans, their dependents, and other handicapped persons—owned and operated entirely by the DAV itself.

Every automobile owner who receives an Idento Tag ought to attach same to his key-ring. He is assured that his keys will probably be returned to him if lost, if the finder deposits them in some post office box. Prior to the DAV's adoption of this Idento Tag project in 1941, it had been conducted commercially, and, on an ordered basis, a charge of at least $1.00 was made therefor. If all the recipients of the DAV's Idento Tags were to make a $1.00 contribution, then, together with those who are more generous, the DAV would show a profit on such project of several hundred percent, which would enable it to accomplish its long time objective of establishing full-time national contact officers in all of the some 174 hospitals that are maintained by the United States Veterans' Administration throughout the country. Bed patients in these hospitals are greatly in need of such personalized contacts from trained service officers, to advise, counsel, and assist them as to their rights and how to prove entitlement to same, under the some one thousand laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

No charitable donation brings greater dividend returns, from a financial and humanitarian standpoint, than those donations which make it possible for the DAV to extend its helping-hand services to scores of thousands of distressed disabled defenders, and their dependents, which they so sorely need.

Direct donations to the DAV are greatly needed if it is to be enabled to continue to maintain its invaluable, personalized services. Many Americans may wish to make more substantial donations by designation of the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation as a beneficiary in trust agreements, wills, insurance policies, assignment of stocks and bonds, and other properties.

Incidentally, I am myself a member of the DAV, and sincerely believe its service activities, locally through its some 2,000 local chapters, and nationally through its some 200 full-time national service officers, to be of paramount importance to America's disabled veterans, and to their local communities and for the future security of America itself.

Mr. Speaker, Americans who are grateful to America's disabled defenders for their sacrifices of parts of their bodies or of their health will generously support the vitally important rehabilitation service program so effectively maintained by the 36-year-old congressionally chartered Disabled American Veterans—DAV—as sponsored and supported by its incorporated trustee, the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation.

Address by Hon. Pat McNamara, of Michigan, to the United Automobile Workers at Detroit, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on Sunday, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] made a very important address in Detroit. In his address he emphasized some of the real problems regarding unemployment in the automobile industry. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY PAT MCNAMARA, OF MICHIGAN, AT DODGE LOCAL NO. 3 HALL, UAW, SUNDAY, MAY 27, 1956, DETROIT, MICH.

I want to thank Pat Quinn for inviting me here. I always like to speak to my friends, but it makes me very unhappy when my friends are out of work.

If there was some way I could stand here and tell you not to worry—that everything is going to be all right—I would do it in an instant. But I'll make no false promises to you. You people have been through this before—too often before—and you realize there is no quick answer.

You auto workers apparently are becoming the forgotten men in this period of great prosperity you hear so much about.

There's something about this prosperity picture that strikes me as a bit odd. According to some sources you get a picture of people singing and dancing in the streets and lighting their cigarettes with $10 bills. But when you look a little closer, it reminds you of a movie set. All the buildings are beautiful, but when you get around behind them, you find they are only attractive fronts held up by some shaky props.

That's why I think what we have now is something like a false-front prosperity. The surface looks good, the high-sounding figures are impressive—but some of the props are giving way—and these are important props such as the auto industry, the farmers, and independent business.

I get the feeling that some of the prosperity boosters wish you people would sort of disappear. They'd like to sweep you under the rug and out of sight—but I can tell you that that rug is getting pretty lumpy and it's going to be uncomfortable walking for the prosperity boosters.

Why are you down here this morning—instead of at home enjoying a comfortable Sunday, assured that your regular paycheck is coming in every week? There are a number of reasons.

One big one perhaps is that the auto industry may have gotten a bit greedy last year and gobbled up too much of its market. Sales races between the giants were more important than maintaining an orderly market. And you boys build such good cars that it's hard to convince someone that his 1955 model really isn't any good and that he should buy a 1956.

Another reason is the tight-money policy of the Eisenhower administration. You know what tight money is. That means it's hard to come by—and harder to hold onto when you get some.

No less an expert than Mr. Harlow Curtice, who operates a small business hereabouts, has been complaining about that. He says the credit policies of the Federal Reserve Board are very restrictive. When Mr. Curtice said that, I welcomed his comments, and I said I hoped his conversion would have some weight with his friends in the White House.

At the same time Mr. Curtice made his remarks, he lowered his estimate of the year's auto production. He said the industry would produce not more than 5,800,000 cars, compared with his original estimate of 6½ million. I don't think that's news to any of you.

It may have taken some courage for Mr. Curtice to take issue with the Government's economic policy. It was almost like biting the hand that feeds him. After all, the present administration has done a lot for his General Motors, dedicated as it is not only to preserving giantism, but to making it even bigger.

(I don't mean to concentrate on General Motors here, but a lot of the GM people aren't getting regular paychecks, either.)

This giantism is having severe effects on independent business—or small business—as it is frequently called. Something like 10,000 firms went out of business last year, while corporation profits went up nearly $10 billion. The farmers, meanwhile, were losing a billion dollars in income.

Now the reason I have been talking about the farmers and the independent business troubles in conjunction with your own current difficulties is that all this goes together.

When you auto workers aren't getting paid, you sure as the devil aren't going to buy any of these stockpiled cars, or a lot of things that other manufacturers make, either. Neither are the farmers, and this kind of situation hits the independent businessman long before it hits the big boys. But it will hit them eventually.

In other words, when you take away some of the props of this so-called prosperity, it puts a big strain on the others—and you face the threat of the whole thing tumbling down.

It doesn't need to tumble down. We can have solid prosperity built on solid foundations of good judgment and forward-looking planning.

I don't get any joy out of hard times just because it might make a good campaign issue. What we need is a realistic economic policy by the Government—one that spends less effort making the big outfits bigger—and spends more time creating the greatest good for the greatest number.

In your own case, a realistic production policy is needed—one that doesn't try to slug the public into buying more cars than it can absorb solely to back up advertising slogans.

As I said, it seems the present administration wishes you people wouldn't cloud up

the prosperity picture they're bragging so much about.

On top of that, we continue to get that callous big-business attitude toward the plight of the unemployed workers. You all remember when Charlie Wilson made his crack about bird dogs and kennel dogs in reference to the laidoff autoworkers in 1954.

Just the other day, we had another example when Howard Pyle, assistant to President Eisenhower, described—right here in Detroit—the right to suffer as one of the joys of a free economy. Well, I don't think any of us will agree that the right to suffer is part of our Bill of Rights—as I said in the Senate at the time.

Even when he apologized—which he did in an awful hurry—Mr. Pyle put his other foot in his mouth when he said your current trouble was seasonable. Apparently he hasn't been conferring with Mr. Curtice.

Unfortunately, we in Congress can't just pass a law and make everything rosy. But one of the things I have done is to personally request of Defense Secretary Wilson that more defense work be channeled into our idle plants here to help keep you people working. This isn't a permanent answer, I know, but it could mean the difference between pay lines and breadlines.

Dr. Aaron Kottler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a new honor has come to my congressional district. Dr. Aaron Kottler, who has long resided in my district and practices his profession of medicine throughout the Borough of Brooklyn and the city of New York, has just been elected president of the Kings County Medical Society and the Brooklyn Academy of Medicine.

He is attached to the medical staff of the Coney Island Hospital and has served for many years as chairman of the legislative committees of the Kings County Medical Society and of the Coordinating Council of the Five County Medical Societies of Greater New York.

He has served as a member of the board of censors of the Kings County society, and, more latterly, as its senior censor. He has been a delegate to the State Medical Society since 1948 and is a member of the Board of Directors of the State Academy of General Practice and of the Group Health Insurance, Inc.

Dr. Kottler graduated from the Fordham University School of Medicine and served as an interne at the Williamsburg, Cumberland and Kingston Avenue Hospitals. He is former president of the Physicians Guild and of the Kings County Chapter of the American Academy of General Practice.

It is indeed a pleasure to join his many friends in wishing him well in his new office and many more years of happy service to his community.

John F. Stevens: Basic Architect of the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, truly notable events in history and the great leaders primarily responsible for their outcome have often been temporarily obscured by occurrences of more spectacular but less basic nature. Nevertheless, with the passage of time, when it is possible to view with better perspective, they tend to assume their due stature.

One such episode in American history was the 1906 decision of the Congress and the President for the high-level-lake and lock-type canal at Panama—a major decision brought about mainly under the vision and leadership of chief engineer, John F. Stevens, of the Isthmian Canal Commission. The year 1956 marks the 50th anniversary of that momentous choice.

It was my privilege, on May 12, 1956, to have been the principal speaker for the 21st annual meeting of the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D. C., held at the Sheraton-Carlton Hotel in this city, when the great work of John F. Stevens for the Panama Canal was commemorated.

In the preparation of my address, I have had access to a wealth of information on Panama Canal history, published in recent years. Not only that; I had the additional advantage of having my manuscript checked by John F. Stevens, Jr.

As a principal collector of his father's papers and student of Isthmian history, the young Stevens was exceptionally well-informed on the canal chapter and other portions of his father's career. He made a number of valuable suggestions as to facts of which he had direct personal knowledge which I used.

The officers of the society, 1955–56, were Col. George S. Brady, president; Alexander E. McClure, vice president; and Col. David R. Wolverton, secretary-treasurer. The committee on arrangements consisted of Roger S. Erdman, chairman; and Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher and Joseph A. Cheeseman, members. The arrangements included a delightful musical program.

The toastmaster was the Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher, of Kentucky, former Member of Congress, Civil Governor of the Canal Zone, and the sole surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, serving more than 3 years during peak construction, 1910 to 1913. He is also past president and honorary life president of the society.

All the officers of the society were reelected for the ensuing year, except that Gustav C. Hertz was elected secretary-treasurer.

In the course of the program Toastmaster Thatcher described the society as follows:

The Panama Canal Society of Washington, D. C., is made up chiefly of those who as officials and employees of the Isthmian Canal Commission rendered service in and about the building of the canal. The ranks of surviving members of that splendid band of Americans are fast diminishing. Our society was founded 21 years ago, under the suggestion and aid of Ben Jenkins, whose absence today because of another engagement we regret. He served on the Isthmus as Chief Clerk of the Atlantic Division, the head of which was Gen. Wm. L. Sibert, in construction days, Colonel Sibert. In our annual society meetings we have especially honored various leaders in the great Isthmian undertaking; and now we strive to pay a just measure of appreciation to another—an always earnest friend of old-timers—who is all deserving—John F. Stevens, Chief Engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission, 1905–07.

In addition to former officials and employees of the construction era, the society also includes those who have served the Panama Canal organization since the canal was opened to traffic in 1914, and members of the Armed Forces who have served on the Isthmus. Thus, its membership is representative of various professions, businesses, and skilled trades in these connections. Other Panama Canal societies are located in Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, and Seattle; Arkansas, Florida, North Carolina, and Virginia.

The event was outstanding, and, indeed, of historic character. Hence, I believe that an account of the principal features of the proceedings merits a place in the annals of the Congress. This should constitute an enduring record of the high honors and recognition paid to John F. Stevens by those whose labors were joined with his own in building the canal and those who remained to maintain and operate it.

To make this stirring chapter of American history available to scholars and historians of the future, as well as members of the legislative and executive departments of the Federal Government, especially cognizant committees of the Congress and their staffs, under leave granted by the House, I include the principal features of the program, including my address.

Called to order by President Brady, the 21st annual meeting of the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D. C., opened with the following invocation by Rev. John J. Heenan, S. J., of Georgetown University:

INVOCATION

Almighty God who, in the beginning didst gather together into one place the waters that are under the firmament—and didst make the dry land to emerge therefrom—who didst bestow upon man the genius to conceive and the courage to effect the junction of the eastern and western oceans—by a wondrous water stairway upraised between two continents—and didst give to him the indomitable will to level the mountains, to fill up the valleys—and to overcome the malevolence of pest and plague—we praise and thank Thee for this signal triumph of human enterprise for the benefit of mankind—and we beg Thee to bless those who have gathered here to celebrate in grateful memory the

accomplishments of one of Thy chosen instruments in this design. May this blessing descend upon all of us through Christ our Lord. Amen.

After the pledge of allegiance to the flag led by Andrew W. Dewling, past president of the society, an enumeration of deceased members of the society during the past year by Roger S. Erdman, honorary life member, and brief opening remarks, President Brady turned over the program to the toastmaster, Governor Thatcher.

Among his first comments, the toastmaster expressed appreciation of the beautifully worded invocatory prayer offered by Father John J. Heenan at the opening of the program, and introduced me as the principal speaker with appropriate remarks outlining my career.

At the conclusion of my remarks, Toastmaster Thatcher said:

Congressman FLOOD, we are deeply appreciative for your brilliant historical address and fine tribute to one who performed such outstanding service in the construction of the Panama Canal. You are a busy man, indeed, and you have greatly honored us in coming before us and speaking of matters that occurred 50 years ago, and bringing them into striking historical focus.

REMARKS OF HON. MAURICE H. THATCHER, INTRODUCING MR. EARL HARDING

Some time back, when this program was being planned, the society most appropriately invited John Frank Stevens, Jr., of Brooklyn, N. Y., to respond to our principal speaker on this occasion. He accepted and had arranged to arrive here this morning.

Last week, on Tuesday, May 1, 1956, we were shocked to learn of his sudden death at his church in Brooklyn—an irreparable loss to his family, a multitude of friends, his community, and to his country.

I have known him as a sturdy, outstanding, American citizen, possessed of the highest attributes of patriotic zeal and character. His death tends to cast a shadow over our proceedings today, but I know that he would wish us to carry on in the cheerful mood so characteristic of him.

Fortunately, in arranging for this event, Mr. Stevens wrote a brief response to Congressman FLOOD's address, which had been furnished him. His widow, Harriette Scofield Stevens, has requested that it be read to this gathering by Mr. Earl Harding, of New York.

A retired business executive with the background of a distinguished career in journalism, Mr. Harding, early in life, was thrust into the Panama Canal situation and other problems affecting Latin American nations. He has made detailed studies of the diplomatic history of the Panama Revolution of 1903; in Panama, in Colombia, and in Europe, as well as in the United States. He has written extensively, on this subject and on Panama Canal problems.

In the course of his Isthmain studies, he long ago developed a great admiration of the vastly important work of Chief Engineer John F. Stevens for the Panama Canal. As a consequence, he became a close friend of his son, John F. Stevens, Jr., with whom he enjoyed a common interest in canal history.

It is signally appropriate that Mrs. Stevens chose Mr. Harding to deliver the last address, and I may add, the last public utterance of her husband. May I present Mr. Earl Harding.

RESPONSE OF JOHN F. STEVENS, JR., READ BY EARL HARDING

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *May 5, 1956.*

Mr. EARL HARDING,
New York.

DEAR MR. HARDING: It is my sad duty to transmit a brief response to Congressman FLOOD's address, which my late husband had planned to make on May 12 before the Panama Canal Society of Washington.

As I understand that you will attend that meeting I shall be grateful if you will read it.

Please assure the society and those participating in its program of my deep gratitude for the honor they are paying to my husband's father.

Sincerely,

HARRIETTE S. STEVENS.
(Mrs. John F. Stevens, Jr.)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, today's program honoring my father, soon after his birthday, is a great occasion for our family on this 50th anniversary of the momentous decision as to the type of canal to be built at Panama.

In June 1906 father was in Washington at our home, and I was home from school. He learned from the press that a decision had been reached on the recommendations of the International Board of Engineers appointed by President Theodore Roosevelt, and that it was decided to build a sea-level canal.

When father read this news he telephoned the White House and asked for an appointment with the President for that very evening, which was given him for 8 o'clock.

When he returned home and came through the hall, he tossed his hat over on the table and said: "Well, that's settled. There will be no sea-level canal built at Panama."

A few days later, President Roosevelt insisted in the Congress on a lock canal, which was then designed, built, and has been operating for 40 years.

Speaking for our family, please accept our heartfelt thanks for this occasion and especially for Governor Thatcher's tribute in verse, which follows the splendid address of Congressman FLOOD. Thank you sincerely.

Called upon by the toastmaster, the Honorable George H. Roderick, Assistant Secretary of the Army and Chairman of the Board of Directors of Panama Canal Company, spoke briefly. He expressed appreciation for Mrs. Roderick and himself for the society's invitation to be present and of the pleasure which was theirs. He brought greetings from the Panama Canal organization to the gathering and expressed his deep interest in the history of the Panama Canal, as revealed in the course of the program.

Secretary Roderick also spoke of his own official tasks in dealing with current problems of the Panama Canal, and of his trips to the Isthmus in this connection. He referred particularly to the flight of Mrs. Roderick and himself to and from the Canal Zone in late March 1954 with Senator and Mrs. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, as well as Governor and Mrs. Thatcher—all making the trip to attend the dedication of the memorial at Balboa to Gen. George W. Goethals on March 31, 1954.

At the luncheon the toastmaster introduced those at the speaker's table in addition to Secretary and Mrs. Roderick, Mr. Earl Harding, and myself, as follows:

Mrs. Maurice H. Thatcher and Mrs. Aileen Gorgas Wrightson, past presidents of the ladies auxiliary of the society.

Mrs. George S. Brady.

Rev. John J. Heenan, S. J., of Georgetown University.

Mrs. Lyle Prather, whose husband was a former manager of the Panama Railroad.

Andrew W. Dewling, former president of the society.

Mrs. Charles G. Holle, whose husband is Deputy Chief of Engineers, United States Army and a former engineer of maintenance, Panama Canal.

Roger S. Erdman.

Col. Pierre Gaillard, son of Col. David D. Gaillard of the Isthmian Canal Commission.

Distinguished personages in the audience, noted by the toastmaster, were:

Capt. Charles Bittinger, well-known artist and naval camouflage expert.

Dr. Robert W. Bruere, editor and writer.

Chalkey DuVal, chief engineer of the city of Richmond, Va.

Col. Eugene D. Hegarty, United States Marine Corps Reserve.

Carroll Kenworthy, foreign editor, United Press.

Capt. E. John Long, writer and editor.

Comdr. E. S. Moale, secretary of the United States Naval Historical Foundation.

Mrs. Ruth Shipley, longtime Chief of the Passport Division, Department of State, and a resident on the Isthmus during construction.

Col. Joseph F. Siler, president of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine.

Prof. Ben. Williams, for many years superintendent of schools of the Canal Zone.

The toastmaster also introduced other past presidents of the society as follows:

Wm. R. McCann, of Hopewell, Va., distinguished engineer, who started his career on canal construction;

Walter G. Ross, business executive, who was a quartermaster during the construction era; and

Col. David R. Wolverton, lawyer, formerly with the sanitary department during construction.

In closing the formal program Governor Thatcher made some remarks of general character, from which highly pertinent quotations are given, as follows:

The future of the Panama Canal must be determined by the Congress of the United States. Let us hope that when it comes to act it may be fully informed, and do that which is best for the public interest.

* * * * *

There are those who wish to see the Panama Canal internationalized; taken from the hands of the United States and turned over to an international or world organization, which would very likely team up with the world at large, and use it in such a way as to greatly harm this Nation. Our people taxed themselves to build this, the greatest industrial enterprise of history; and our Government has maintained and operated it with great success ever since its completion. American lives, American leadership and skill, and American treasure went into the successful American effort. The work was effected under American treaty rights and arrangements which the world recognizes as valid. Speaking for myself, and voicing, I believe, the overwhelming sentiment of the American people, I would oppose the indicated suggestion or movement as one of monumental stupidity and evil.

Our Nation has used the canal for the good of mankind; and in times of war for the cause of freedom. It will be a sad day, indeed, that on which this great ocean link is taken from the jurisdiction, control, and operation of the United States and turned over to any other organization or power. Not only would our own land greatly suffer thereby but at some time of crisis perhaps with fatal effect, and the cause of free nations and

free peoples would everywhere be imperiled. There is no other country in all the earth today which, if it had built the canal as we have built it, would surrender its right to own, control, and operate it.

Yet there are those in our midst at this hour, at this time of grave danger to the freedom to the entire human race, who, through impractical idealism or sinister design, would yield up all of these precious and dearly earned rights which are ours. With these rights responsibilities have come, and we have discharged them well.

Our country's conduct and attitude in the past constitute assurance of what may come. Our action has served every worthy cause and end. The canal has enabled us to make the critical contribution to defeat in war the tyrannies of despotism; and in peace to serve the free shipping and commerce of the world. We have thus benefited not only ourselves but all mankind. Our abandonment of the control of this great waterway—beneficent and strategic—would be, indeed, an act of stupendous criminal folly.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN FLOOD

Fifty years ago, the Government of the United States was faced with the grave responsibility of deciding the type of canal to be constructed at Panama. In a memorable struggle in the Congress in 1906 between advocates of a canal formed by elevated lakes and those for one at sea level, later described as the "Battle of the Levels," victory went to the high-level-lake and lock type. That was the key decision in building the Panama Canal.

How were these results accomplished? The full answer is a long and complicated story. However, when reduced to its essentials, the explanation is relatively brief and simple. It revolves about one sturdy man—Chief Engineer John F. Stevens of the Canal Commission. Who was he and what was the path that led him to become associated with the famous project? The answers form an important section of American history.

A native of Maine, after a try at teaching, he decided, despite his lack of formal technical training, to become an engineer. In 1874, at the age of 21, he moved to Minneapolis where his uncle, Jesse Stevens, was an engineer, and began as an assistant engineer for the city—a rodman.

At that time railway building in North America was booming. Finding municipal engineering too limited, Stevens, in 1876, shifted to railroading with a position as section hand in Texas. Serving as axman, rodman, instrument man, surveyor, location engineer and construction superintendent, he rose rapidly step by step to executive positions. Eventually attracting the attention of the great railroad-empire builder, James J. Hill, he made an enduring friendship based upon their great common interest in transportation.

Sent by Hill to locate a route for the Great Northern Railway across the Rockies, Stevens, in 1889 made the dramatic discovery of Marais Pass in Montana, through which the road was constructed. For this extraordinary feat, the engineer-explorer was honored during his lifetime by the erection of a heroic bronze statue near the tracks at Summit, Mont., showing him as he appeared at the time of the discovery. Replicas of this statue are in the State Library of Maine and at the New York headquarters of the American Society of Civil Engineers.

In 1890, Stevens was assigned the task of locating the best line for a railroad from western Montana to Puget Sound. This involved the choice of a crossing of the Columbia River, which in turn depended upon location of a pass in the Cascade Range.

Again Stevens found a suitable pass near the Wenatchee River, which is now called the Stevens Pass. Today, this important region of the Northwest is served by the railroad through this pass and the Stevens Pass Highway.

Ever alert to great undertakings in other parts of the world, he naturally became interested in the even more challenging problem of building a canal at Panama.

Meanwhile, events that would profoundly affect his career and Isthmian history were occurring. These included the dramatic voyage of the U. S. S. *Oregon* in 1898 around Cape Horn, which focused public attention on the necessity for the Isthmian Canal; the vast interoceanic canal explorations by the Isthmian Canal Commission under Adm. John G. Walker, 1899–1902, which finally recommended Panama; the choice by the Congress and President Theodore Roosevelt in 1902 of the Panama route in preference to Nicaragua, after a scorching debate known as the battle of the routes; the Panama Revolution of 1903, which sealed the choice of the Panama location; acquisition in 1904 of the French Panama Canal Co.'s holdings and the Canal Zone; and finally, assumption by the United States also in 1904 of the vast task of completing the canal under the direction of an Isthmian Canal Commission for construction, of which Admiral Walker was the first chairman. He was succeeded April 1, 1905, by Theodore F. Shonts, president of the Clover Leaf Railroad.

Though not then expecting ever to be actively connected with the great enterprise, Stevens had followed the unfolding of Isthmian events with increasing understanding. The grave problems likely to be encountered in constructing a navigation channel across a mountainous undeveloped region of heavy tropical rainfall appealed to him as offering an extraordinary challenge.

However, he had accepted an appointment with the Philippine Commission to head its railroad building program and, in June 1905, was in Chicago preparing to accompany Secretary Taft's Commission to the Islands. It looked as if he had been definitely diverted from any association with the Panama Canal.

But ominous events on the Isthmus of many months duration had culminated in a yellow fever epidemic followed by the unexpected resignation on June 26, 1905, of the first chief engineer, John F. Wallace. The Canal Zone promptly became a scene of chaos and hysteria, for a time threatening the security of the canal program, which was then still in the experimental and development stage.

President Roosevelt, who had watched the crisis growing over those trying months, became deeply concerned and sought a solution. Turning to leaders in the railroad world for assistance, he consulted James J. Hill, who told the President of Stevens' ability and record of achievements. The President became interested in appointing him as chief engineer of the Commission.

Stevens, when advised of this opening at Panama, because of his involvement in the Philippine situation, appears to have been rather hesitant and wished time to consider. He mentioned the matter to his wife who, since their marriage in Texas in 1877, had accompanied him during many travels on the frontiers and shared the hardships of his upward climb as well as its compensations. Mrs. Stevens knew her husband's capacity and never hesitated to encourage him to greater tasks. She promptly replied: "Ever since you left Maine in 1874 you have been training yourself for this, the greatest engineering project in the world, and now it is offered to you. Please telephone at once and tell the President you will accept."

This ended his hesitancy and the President, on June 30, appointed Stevens as Chief Engineer of the Canal Commission, effective July 1, 1905.

Before departing for Panama, the new Chief Engineer visited Oyster Bay to see the President, who described affairs on the Isthmus as being in a "devil of a mess." Stevens understood the difficulties likely to be encountered, but felt thoroughly competent to handle them. However, to avoid any possibility of later misunderstanding, he outlined to Roosevelt the conditions of his acceptance; that he was to have a "free hand in all matters;" that he was not to be hampered by any authority, high or low, and that he would remain with the project until, in his own judgment, its "success or failure" was determined.

The President approved these terms and directed Stevens to communicate about the project directly with him rather than through routine channels. When Stevens pointed out that this procedure might result in conflict with the War Department, the President waved his point aside, stating that everyone there knew his views.

Then, to impress his desire for action, President Roosevelt told the story of the man of sudden wealth speaking to his newly employed butler: "I don't know in the least what you are to do—but one thing I do know, you get busy and buttle like hell."

Arriving with Chairman Shonts at Colon on July 25, 1905, Chief Engineer Stevens found a dangerous psychological situation, with employees "scared out of their boots, afraid of yellow fever and afraid of everything." The only thing that had kept many on the Isthmus was lack of transportation to go home. In fact, more employees returned on the steamer that carried Stevens to the Isthmus than had been brought down by it.

At a conference of high officials the same evening on the spacious veranda of Gov. Charles R. Magoon's home in Ancon at the Pacific end of the canal, attended by Col. Wm. C. Gorgas and the Governor, Chairman Shonts and Chief Engineer Stevens correctly estimated the urgent needs of situation: housing and feeding of employees, sanitation and health, recreation and morale, and an adequate and revitalized organization.

Within the short period of 1 week Stevens decided what to do: double track the Panama Railroad, which he then described as a "phantom railroad;" establish commissaries for all employees; build a hotel, the Tivoli, as a temporary measure; place all available labor on houses and sanitary work; design proper track levels in Culebra Cut and a rail transportation system for mass excavation; and organize the forces for construction. His extensive observations in comparable situations enabled Stevens to form sound and discerning judgments quickly.

Stopping all unnecessary canal construction activities, he sent excess men to the United States with instructions that they would be notified when to return. Others were placed on immediate necessities. Having previously accepted the mosquito theory of disease propagation, he became an ardent supporter of Colonel Gorgas in health and sanitation matters.

A man of imposing stature and commanding personality, Chief Engineer Stevens tramped the entire length of the canal viewing the various works. Walking with energy, he radiated the confidence of a natural leader. Often speaking to employees, he told them that there were only three diseases on the Isthmus: "Yellow fever, malaria, and cold feet; and the greatest of these was cold feet."

Prior to the appointment of Stevens, President Roosevelt had designated an International Board of Consulting Engineers to consider the type of canal. Until that question was resolved, Stevens was seriously handicapped. Nevertheless, he went ahead with excavation of Culebra Cut, which work would be useful no matter what the decision; and on alternate canal plans, which would be ready in anticipation of whatever verdict the Government might reach.

Reporting to the President on January 10, 1906, this Board split. Eight members, including five Europeans, voting for the "sea-level" type; and the five remaining members—all Americans—for the high-level-lake and lock type. The minority report, which

reflected the views of Chief Engineer Stevens, was prepared by Alfred Noble, an American member of the Board.

Meanwhile, in the Canal Zone, Stevens thoughtfully examined all significant angles of the problem. Though initially inclined toward the popular idea of a "sea-level" canal, when coming to the Isthmus, he approached the solution of the problem objectively. Interpreting the topography in the light of operational and navigational needs as well as engineering and construction, he decided on the high-level-lake plan with the Atlantic terminal dams and locks at Gatun and the Pacific dams and locks in one group at Aguadulce—a hill south of Miraflores. This was essentially the plan originally presented in 1879 by the French engineer, Godin de Lepinay, the originating genius of the basic plan for the Panama Canal as actually constructed.

Forwarding the engineering board's report to the Congress on February 19, 1906, President Roosevelt summarized its main points but strongly supported the high-level-lake plan. He invited especial attention to the fact "that the chief engineer, who will be mainly responsible for the success of this mighty engineering feat, and who has therefore a peculiar personal interest in judging aright, is emphatically and earnestly in favor of the lock-canal project and against the sea-level project."

When testifying in Washington in January 1906, Stevens had advocated the high-level plan with a conviction that no one could shake and voiced his determined opposition to the "sea-level" idea. But one appearance of the engineering leader was not enough.

In June he was again in Washington leading in the historic debate. Testifying before committees of Congress, preparing refutations of "sea-level" advocates, and drafting addresses for Senator Philander C. Knox, Chief Engineer Stevens faced the great crisis of his canal career.

He went to the President for assistance but discovered that he had become "lukewarm" in his stand. As one who believed in vigorous handling of superiors as well as subordinates, Stevens talked to him "like a Dutch uncle." Roosevelt was again convinced and stood behind him "like a brick."

In the end, with the strong support of the President, Secretary of War Taft, and the Isthmian Canal Commission, the plans of Chief Engineer Stevens prevailed. In an act approved June 29, 1906, the Congress adopted the high-level-lake and lock plan as proposed by the minority of the International Board of Consulting Engineers. That was the great decision in building the Panama Canal.

Whatever may have been urged at the time of the decision as to the merits of the so-called sea-level design, it is a matter of history that the existing canal was constructed substantially according to the plan strongly recommended by Chief Engineer Stevens, approved and accepted by the Congress and the President. Moreover, it has proved an eminent success, with the transit since 1914 of more than 250,000 vessels of various classes of all nations, commercial and military, with toll rates measurably reflecting the costs of construction, maintenance, and operation.

The day after approving the act of Congress, June 30, 1906, President Roosevelt showed his confidence in Stevens by appointing him as a member of the Canal Commission in addition to his position as Chief Engineer. His star was in the ascendant.

Unfortunately, the minority report provided for constructing the Pacific locks in two groups, separated by a small intermediate-level lake. Instinctively recognizing this division of locks as a serious error in functional design, Stevens, early in 1906, had recommended to Chairman Shonts in Washington the combination of all Pacific locks at one location as a desirable change in the approved plans. But he did not present this well-founded proposal with the detailed operational justification required to secure the attention it merited. Nor had there been any ship-transit experience in the canal upon which to base such justification, and no action was taken.

Promptly returning to the Isthmus on July 4, 1906, Stevens resumed studies of the Pacific lock situation. Eventually, on August 3, 1906, he approved a plan for placing all Pacific locks in 1 group of 3 lifts south of Miraflores with the terminal dam and locks between two hills, Cerro Aguadulce, on the west side of the sea-level section of the canal, and Cerro de Puente, on the east. This location would have provided the same lock arrangement at both ends of the canal, avoided creating a traffic choke at Pedro Miguel, enabled uninterrupted summit-lake navigation from the Atlantic locks to the Pacific, and supplied a lake-level traffic mobilization anchorage at the Pacific end to match that at the Atlantic—a plan identical with the original conception of De Lepinay.

At this time, however, Stevens was under great pressure to start construction. Opponents of any canal at all were seeking some means to delay the enterprise. Advocates of the sea-level idea, stung to the quick by their defeat in the Congress, were set, ready to strike at any change in the approved program as indicating weakness in the high-level plan of Stevens. These two forces together represented a political and economic power that he could not safely ignore.

It is indeed regrettable that Stevens' foundation studies for the Pacific locks, which were necessarily made in great haste, proved unsatisfactory. He did not dare to jeopardize the project by further delay. Still confident, however, that this important question would come up again, 20 days later, on August 23, 1906, he voided his plan, marking it, "not to be destroyed but kept in this office," and proceeded with the plan for separating the Pacific locks as approved by the minority of the International Board of Consulting Engineers.

Many years later, in 1943, as a result of critical traffic problems in World War II, Capt. Miles P. DuVal, then captain of the port, Balboa, in charge of marine operations in the Pacific sector of the canal, developed what proved to be the first comprehensive plan for the canal's operational improvement, known as the Terminal Lake Plan.

Submitted by him to higher canal authority, it received immediate attention. Later, in 1945, it was approved in principle by the Governor of the Panama Canal when testifying before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the event of completion of the Third Locks project, which, by the way, had been suspended in 1942. Published as a technical thesis in leading engineering journals, the Terminal Lake-Third Locks proposal, because of its inherent logic and "comparatively low cost," has had a wide appeal as the proper form of modernization for the Panama Canal. Moreover, it is being strongly supported in the Congress.

Let us return to events of 1906. President Roosevelt, after the decision as to type had been made, was free to visit the Isthmus as he had long wished to do. Under an itinerary prepared by Chief Engineer Stevens, Roosevelt's visitation to the Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama, November 14–17, 1906, marks a highlight in Isthmian history—the first time any President of the United States had set foot on foreign soil.

In January 1907, in the midst of a crisis over contracts, Chairman Shonts, after receiving an offer to head a large transportation merger in New York, resigned effective March 4, 1907. News of this produced a sensation on the Isthmus. All eyes promptly turned to Stevens as their man of destiny. But even he had been hard pressed for many months protecting the interests of the canal.

Accustomed to doing great things in an unhampered way, he had grown tired of Government redtape and frustrations and, on January 30, 1907, wrote his own resignation directly to the President, expressing his desire to return to the railroads. To his close associates, however, he revealed his disgust and irritation at Washington officialdom.

The President promptly acquiesced. He had had two civilian chief engineers. The first had left after 1 year and now the second was planning to leave after 2 years. The canal could not be satisfactorily built with such frequent changes in engineering leadership.

By 1907 the major decisions had been made, success had become a certainty, and problems less acute. Roosevelt determined to secure continuity in management of construction: "I propose now to put it in charge of men who will stay on the job till I get tired of having them there, or till I say they may abandon it."

He selected Maj. George W. Goethals, an outstanding engineer officer of the Army as Stevens' successor and again reorganized the commission. The other engineering members were Majs. William L. Sibert and David D. Gaillard, and Rear Adm. Harry H. Rousseau, a former chief of the Navy Bureau of Yards and Docks. Col. William C. Gorgas, the great sanitarian, who had come to the Isthmus in 1904, and had been appointed a member of the commission on recommendation of Stevens, was also named. The two civilian members were Jackson Smith, succeeded by Col. H. F. Hodges; and Hon. J. C. S. Blackburn, who was succeeded by Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher, afterward a Member of Congress. It is noteworthy that neither this commission nor its predecessor included members experienced in navigational operations.

Stevens did not leave the Isthmus until April 7, when employees arranged a farewell reception at Colon attended by many throughout the Canal Zone and from the Republic of Panama. In addressing the throng, he gave generous credit to his predecessor, John F. Wallace, for the organization he had inherited and had modified. He revealed that 2 years previously, on taking charge, he was almost as overwhelmed by the vastness of the preparatory work to be done as was the President. He added that "until Colonel Gorgas had lifted the dark cloud which the unsanitary conditions placed over the work," he was doubtful of success.

Appealing to the men, as a friend, to take their "little differences and complaints" to Chief Engineer Goethals and not to Washington, Stevens predicted that the canal would be open to traffic by January 1, 1915.

As evidence of the esteem in which he was held, canal employees presented him with two bound volumes of 10,000 signatures of a petition in which they had requested him to reconsider his resignation and remain, a gold watch, diamond ring, and a silver table set. The last included a tray with an engraving showing the completed canal.

Stevens was visibly moved by the exceptional demonstration. He knew that it marked the end of an outstanding chapter in his career. With its passing went forever his hope of becoming the builder of the Panama Canal.

The next day was Sunday. Many had remained in Colon overnight. Long before departure of the S. S. *Panama*, the largest crowd since United States occupation of the Canal Zone, gathered on the pier. At noon the Isthmian Canal Commission Band, which he had established in 1905, played Auld Lang Syne. The *Panama* slowly left her dock and headed toward the sea, amid cheers of the spectators and whistles on ships in the bay. Stevens, standing at the rail with his young son, John F., Jr., looked on, pale and sad.

After returning to the United States, Mr. Stevens continued his upward climb in the railroad industry, becoming one of the best

known railroad officials in the country. In 1917, after declaration of war against Germany, he went to President Wilson in search of an active assignment in the war. As Russia was then an ally and in urgent need of a competent railroad man in connection with its war transport problems, the availability of Stevens was timely. Appointed as Minister Plenipotentiary and Head of the United States Railway Mission to Russia, he undertook the difficult tasks involved in operating and improving its rail systems. Later, from 1919 to 1923, he was president of the Inter-Allied Technical Board supervising the Siberian railways.

In these positions, he observed the start and early years of the Communist revolution. Accurately assessing the tremendous scope of that world conspiracy, he was among the first observers to alert responsible leaders in the United States as to its dangers.

Returning home in 1923, he later became president of the American Society of Civil Engineers, and received many other honors, including the John Fritz medal for great achievements. He died at Southern Pines, N. C., in 1943, at the age of 90 years, keen in mind to the end.

The significance of Stevens' canal contributions, though substantially obscured for a time, has gained stature with the years. He rescued the project from possible disaster; assembled a major part of the plant and organized the forces for construction; planned the main features of the waterway and brought about the great decision for the high-level lake and lock plan; launched the enterprise into the era of construction and guided the work until its success was a certainty. Not only that, Stevens clearly foresaw the necessity for major changes in the Pacific lock arrangement, for which he developed a plan but was unable to secure its adoption. Subsequent studies of canal operations have established that this plan would have supplied the best operational canal practicable of economic attainment—striking evidence of the high quality of his insight.

A man of eminent vision whose great gifts were harnessed to practicality, Stevens made no major mistakes, either of engineering or policy. His great constructive contributions for the Panama Canal have now emerged into historical perspective. The facts increasingly demonstrate that he was the basic architect of the Panama Canal.

I deem it appropriate to close my remarks by reading the fine tribute in verse paid by Governor Thatcher to the distinguished man whom we now honor. It epitomizes in compact and enduring form the splendid character and achievements of John F. Stevens.

"JOHN F. STEVENS: A TRIBUTE

"Amongst all those whose labors cleft the land
To blend, as one, the seas at Panama—
There was none greater than John Stevens; and
The passing years bear witness. He foresaw—
More clearly than the others had foreseen—
The value of the plan for lock and lake,
And led Authority—in doubt between
Diverse designs—the wiser choice to make.
Possessed of genius rare, with skills supreme
And ripened knowledge gained from ventures vast—
He shaped the molds to vitalize the Dream
Which had so long persisted in the past.
His all he gave to serve the Isthmian task:
What more could men demand, or duty ask?"

—*Maurice H. Thatcher.*

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 31, 1956

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 24, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Robert H. Prentice, Second Presbyterian Church, Long Beach, Calif., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, sovereign of all lives and nations, in whose hand the rise and fall of nations are but as shifting sand, yet who carest for each one, we humbly stand before Thee, penitent and waiting Thy blessing.

Let Thy blessing of love and holy understanding descend upon each Member of the Senate, that their duties and united undertakings may be truly a part of Thy providence.

Give courage to the fearful, conviction and steadfastness to those with committee responsibilities. Relate the deliberations of this body to the welfare of our Nation and the continued effort to understand our brothers the world around.

In this solemn day of global decisions let the voice of this body speak only the things of love, peace, and understanding. This we ask together in the name of Christ Jesus, our Redeemer. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., May 31, 1956.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint ALAN BIBLE, a Senator from the State of Nevada, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BIBLE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. SMATHERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 29, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3515) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to assist in the provision of housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3996) to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 11473) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 11177) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 11473) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be absent from the sessions of the Senate on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of next week.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. SMATHERS, and by unanimous consent, the Air Force Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, and that statements in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligations of certain appropriations, for the quarter ended December 31, 1955; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MEMBERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION IN AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR PROTECTION OF CHILDHOOD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by

the United States in the American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood and authorizing an appropriation therefor (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

NEWLY ISSUED PUBLICATIONS OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, copies of its newly issued publications entitled "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1954, Privately Owned," and "Typical Electric Bills, Cities of 50,000 Population and More, January 1, 1956" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 3920. A bill to authorize the partition or sale of inherited interests in allotted lands in the Tulalip Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2072).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1324. A bill for the relief of Salvatore di Morello (Rept. No. 2074);

S. 1627. A bill for the relief of Alexander Orlov and his wife, Maria Orlov (Rept. No. 2075);

S. 2342. A bill for the relief of Yvonne Rohran (Tung) Feng (Rept. No. 2078);

S. 2586. A bill for the relief of Annie Fieg Hildebrand (Rept. No. 2079);

S. 3024. A bill for the relief of Donald Shang-Peh Kao (Rept. No. 2081);

H. R. 1484. A bill for the relief of Garrett Norman Soulen and Michael Harvey Soulen (Rept. No. 2082); and

H. R. 7702. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Shenekji (Rept. No. 2083).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 2229. A bill for the relief of Nina Greenberg (Rept. No. 2077).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1921. A bill for the relief of Ileana Issarescu and her children, Stefan Habsburg-Lothringen, Maria Ileana Habsburg-Lothringen, Alexandra Habsburg-Lothringen, Dominic Habsburg-Lothringen, Maria Magdalena Habsburg-Lothringen, and Elizabeth Habsburg-Lothringen (Rept. No. 2076);

S. 2999. A bill for the relief of Modesto Padilla-Ceja and his wife, Maria Padilla-Toscano (Rept. No. 2080);

H. J. Res. 534. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens (Rept. No. 2084);

H. J. Res. 553. Joint resolution waiving certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens (Rept No. 2085); and

H. J. Res. 554. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens (Rept. No. 2086)

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H. R. 5516. A bill to amend title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide that service as an Army field clerk, or as a field clerk, Quartermaster Corps, shall be counted for purposes of retirement under title III of that act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2089); and

H. R. 6274. A bill to provide that no fee shall be charged a veteran discharged under honorable conditions for furnishing him or his next of kin or legal representative a copy of a certificate showing his service in the Armed Forces (Rept. No. 2088).

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

S. 3307. A bill to amend section 9 (d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to authorize jurisdiction in the Federal courts in certain reemployment cases (Rept. No. 2087).

By Mr. DUFF, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H. R. 8102. A bill to provide for the disposition of moneys arising from deductions made from carriers on account of the loss of or damage to military or naval material in transit, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2090);

H. R. 8693. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, in relation to the refund of reenlistment bonuses (Rept. No. 2091); and

H. R. 8922. A bill to provide for the relief of certain members of the uniformed services (Rept. No. 2092).

A BILL TO GIVE AUTOMOBILE DEALERS THEIR DAY IN COURT (S. REPT. NO. 2073)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, from the Judiciary Committee, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 3879) to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States, in order to balance the power now heavily weighted in favor of automobile manufacturers, by enabling franchise automobile dealers to bring suit in the district courts of the United States to recover twofold damages sustained by reason of the failure of automobile manufacturers to act in good faith in complying with the terms of franchises or in terminating or not renewing franchises with their dealers.

The bill was unanimously approved by the Judiciary Committee at a special session today. I report the bill, and request unanimous consent that the written report on the bill may be filed on Monday. I make this request because of my desire to have the bill on the calendar, since it is understood that the Senate will take an adjournment following today's session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the request of the Senator from Wyoming regarding time for filing the report is granted.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 3964. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 3965. A bill for the relief of Earl E. Brown; to the Committee on the Judicary.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 3966. A bill for the relief of Herta Kubelle Shields; and

S. 3967. A bill for the relief of Edith Elisabeth Wagner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (by request):

S. 3968. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Peoria Tribe of Indians in the State of Oklahoma and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 3969. A bill for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Ottawa Tribe of Indians in the State of Oklahoma and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; and

S. 3970. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 3971. A bill for the relief of Bernardo Paternostro and Wawara Dibert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. J. Res. 175. Joint resolution to provide for continuation of public mass transportation in the District of Columbia subsequent to August 14, 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ACT OF 1933, AS AMENDED

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide authority for the Tennessee Valley Authority to issue revenue bonds to finance expansion of its power system. This bill would accomplish the objective of the President's 1956 budget message of financing further expansion of its power system by means other than Federal appropriations. Inasmuch as neither the agency nor the Congress has had experience in the issuance of revenue bonds, the bill has been drafted with a specific dollar limitation as to the amount of bonds which may be authorized at any one time. In drafting this bill I have also attempted to hold to a minimum the changes required in existing law.

The major features of the bill would—

First. Authorize the issuance of revenue bonds to be secured by the power revenues of TVA in an aggregate amount not to exceed $200 million outstanding at any one time. These bonds would not be guaranteed by the Federal Government as to interest or principal. It is estimated that the limitation of $200 million should be adequate to provide for the agency's requirements for about 2 years. At the end of this period the Congress can consider the advisability of an increase in this limitation in the light of actual experience.

Second. Provide that none of the power revenues of the TVA shall be used for the construction of new power producing units, installations or projects—except for replacement purposes—except as may be made available by the Congress after consideration of budget programs transmitted by the President pursuant to the Government Corporations Control Act. The recent discussions before the Senate on the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act for 1956 have clearly indicated the need for clarifying the 1948 act with respect to the Authority's use of power revenues. I think it is important to point out that the corporate funds of

the TVA are just as much the property of the general taxpayer as the general funds appropriated from the Treasury. The Congress should exercise the same type of control over the use of corporate funds for expanding an existing powerplant as it does in approving their use for the building of a new plant.

Third. Continue the provisions of the Government Corporations Control Act with respect to budgeting, auditing, and financial control by the Treasury Department. The Government Corporations Control Act was passed by Congress after extended hearings and was intended to provide both the President and the Congress with a means of exercising financial control over wholly owned Government corporations. The TVA is a wholly owned Government corporation in which the net investment of the Federal Government on June 30, 1955, amounted to $1,533,000,000, of which $1,231,000,000 represented the unpaid Treasury investment—chiefly appropriated funds.

Fourth. Preserve the repayment provision of the 1948 act which requires the TVA over a period of 40 years from completion of plant to return the power investment provided from appropriated funds. The corporation would, therefore, continue to repay the principal on the same basis as it has since enactment of this act.

Fifth. Require the Authority to pay into the Treasury beginning with the fiscal year 1956 as a return on the appropriation investment in the Corporation power facilities a payment which shall be equal to the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury upon his outstanding marketable public obligations as of the beginning of said fiscal year. In the past, the TVA has averaged a return of slightly more than 4 percent of its power investment but has not been required to make any interest payment. The effect of this provision would be to require that a part of this return be paid to the Treasury as an interest cost each year. This provision is in line with the President's recommendation that the financial statement of the TVA reflect the cost of the funds which have been provided by the general taxpayer in the form of appropriations.

Sixth. Maintain the power service area of the Corporation existing on May 1, 1956, unless changed by act of Congress. This provision should meet the objections of many Members of Congress that under existing law there is no effective limitation on the area which can be served by the TVA.

In closing, I believe this bill provides a sound basis for initiating a revenue bond financing program by the TVA to finance its normal growth, which all of us agree must be provided, and at the same time will preserve congressional control in the interests of the general public. I hope that it will be possible to give it early consideration in the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3964) to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

CONTROL, APPROPRIATION, USE, AND DISTRIBUTION OF WATER—EDITORIAL—ADDITIONAL CO-SPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, on February 1, 1955, on behalf of myself and Senators ALLOTT, BIBLE, CURTIS, DWORSHAK, GOLDWATER, MALONE, and WELKER, I introduced the bill (S. 863) to govern the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of water.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published by the Portland Oregonian in support of my bill, S. 863, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WARM SEAT FOR SEATON

The nomination of Fred A. Seaton, of Nebraska, is meeting such widespread approval and minimum of criticism that the Senate's Interior Committee, headed by Democratic Senator MURRAY, of Montana, may not even hold a hearing on confirmation of the new Secretary of the Interior. This would be a disappointment to some Senators hankering for a last chance to knife resigned Secretary Douglas McKay before his election battle with WAYNE MORSE. But it speaks a good deal for Mr. Seaton's personality, background, and capability.

The Nebraska newspaperman, ex-United States Senator, and White House troubleshooter will step into one of the administration's hottest political jobs. This is right down his alley. Mr. Seaton, now 46, has been active in politics since 1932 when he was chairman of the Riley County Young Republicans in Kansas. He served as Alf Landon's secretary, and was Harold E. Stassen's Nebraska campaign manager and preconvention executive in 1948. He has served in the Nebraska Legislature. He joined the Eisenhower campaign in 1952, became Assistant Secretary of Defense in 1953, and moved to the White House as special assistant to the President a year later.

His service in the Senate, by appointment to succeed Senator Wherry who died in office, gave him a friendly standing with Members of Congress in his effective work for Ike on farm, defense, and natural resources legislation—the latter including the upper Colorado multiple-use program.

President Eisenhower showed political acumen as well as a desire to reduce criticism of the Department of the Interior—the wearying giveaway campaign leveled at Mr. McKay for 3 years by Democrats, public power and labor spokesmen, and some conservationists—when he rejected the petition of 14 western Republican Senators to elevate Under Secretary Clarence Davis to the top spot. The selection of a new man, with an independent background in western irrigation, power, flood control, and land problems, is assurance of a reappraisal of interior policies.

The United States Supreme Court's decision in Oregon's Pelton Dam case, which nullified State control of inland waters on Federal lands, has roused the West. Bills by Senator BARRETT, of Wyoming, and others are before Congress and should be dealt with in this session.

The Departments of the Interior and Agriculture favored such legislation, restoring the State powers long recognized under the Desert Land Act and other legislation, in committee hearings. But the Department of Justice and the Federal Power Commission opposed amendments and supported the Supreme Court's view. The western Senators believed Mr. Davis would go down the line for States rights on water. Mr. Seaton has not expressed a position on this vital issue.

But Mr. Seaton's record on western resources, his active membership in the National Reclamation Association, and his grassroots knowledge of State problems are reasonable assurance that he will make a sound decision on water rights. It could not have been expected that he would plunge into this brawl, which is basically a matter of resisting Federal domination of State resources, without making a thorough investigation.

The West has a tremendous stake in the Department of the Interior and in the policies and attitudes of the man who heads that Department. It will watch with interest the role played by the next Secretary in resolving western problems of water, lands, forests, minerals, and fish and wildlife. We wish Mr. Seaton well.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, let me say that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, of which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is chairman, unanimously reported my bill to the full committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the names of the following Senators be added as consponsors of my bill (S. 863): Senators O'MAHONEY, ANDERSON, BENNETT, CHAVEZ, HRUSKA, KNOWLAND, LANGER, MILLIKIN, MUNDT, and WATKINS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I ask, further, that this request be held open until next Monday, so that other Senators may have an opportunity to add their names as cosponsors of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, the following Senators joined with me as cosponsors at the time I introduced the bill:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

I am very hopeful that the full committee will report the bill to the Senate, and that it may be considered before the end of next month.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE RELATING TO NARCOTIC VIOLATIONS—ADDITIONAL CO-AUTHOR OF BILL

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name may be added as coauthor of the bill (S. 2307) to provide for the establishment of a chapter dealing with narcotic violations in title 18 of the United States Code, introduced by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] on June 24, 1955.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT, RELATING TO PRACTICES IN DISTRIBUTION OF NEW MOTOR VEHICLES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of May 28, 1956—

The names of Mr. ERVIN, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. PASTORE were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3946) to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain unfair methods of competition and certain unfair practices in the distribution of new motor vehicles in interstate commerce, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and other Senators) on May 28, 1956.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION, RELATING TO EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be listed as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 39) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women, the next time that joint resolution is printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

Editorial entitled "As We See It," written by Senator FREAR and published in the June 1956 issue of the National Guardsman.

CHARLES J. HARES

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a pioneer of the Rocky Mountain area was justly honored Friday. The efforts of this man have contributed much to the prosperity of the Rocky Mountain region, and the State of Colorado and its people.

Charles J. Hares, Boulder, Colo., was honored Friday by the Colorado School of Mines. This college of mineral engineering, located in Golden, Colo., has gained a worldwide reputation. Today, Mr. Hares will receive the honorary degree of doctor of engineering at the commencement exercises at this famous school. He is being honored for his extensive work, his writing, and his contribution to the general fund of man's knowledge.

He has diligently studied and has contributed to the development of theories pertaining to the accumulation of petroleum. He has applied his broad knowledge, and has been responsible for the discovery and development of important oil reserves which make available to mankind increased amounts of that vital source of energy.

Mr. Hares has not been selfiish with his knowledge. For many years he has taken great interest in young geologists and engineers, has assisted them, guided them, and provided them with inspiration to succeed in their scientific endeavors, as well as contributing to the welfare and security of this country.

Mr. President, it is an honor to call to the attention of the Members of the Congress this worthy citizen of the Rocky Mountains who is being justly honored. I ask that the resolution of the board of trustees, Colorado School of Mines, conferring the degree, be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Charles J. Hares has for many years been a leader in the field of petroleum geology and has achieved for himself a worldwide reputation in this field; and

Whereas through his extensive work he has added and through his writings he has given much to the general fund of man's knowledge in this area; and

Whereas through diligent study he has contributed to the development theories of accumulation of petroleum and through application of his broad knowledge, he has been responsible for the discovery and development of important oil reserves, making available for mankind increased amounts of natural liquid fuel resources; and

Whereas through his personal and kindly interest and assistance he has helped innumerable young geologists along the way to professional success and has provided for them guidance and inspiration; and

Whereas the board of trustees feels that granting an honorary degree to Mr. Hares would be accepted by all his professional associates who know him and his achievements as a commendable recognition: Now be it

Resolved by the Board of Trustees of the Colorado School of Mines, That Mr. Charles J. Hares be granted the honorary degree of doctor of engineering at commencement exercises held on May 25, 1956.

RECENT DECISIONS OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in this country today there is a rising tide of question over the Supreme Court's most recent decisions. This concern has been caused by the seeming continuity of the Court's thinking that appears to be directed against the 10th amendment and its important bearing on States rights.

This amendment is the cornerstone of our Constitution, in spite of what some people in this country hold. The people of the United States do not want a government centralized in Washington. They want their governmental activities to be close to home, where they can be watched. They are fearful now of the extent to which the Federal Government has grown. They want this trend stopped. To reflect the feelings of our citizens, two Americans have devoted their time to preparing their thoughts on the recent activities of the Supreme Court, and I ask unanimous consent that these articles, one by David Lawrence and one by Frank Chodorov, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the U. S. News & World Report of June 1, 1956]

ERODING THE 48 STATES

(By David Lawrence)

The present Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States by their unanimous decision last week moved a step nearer to complete erosion of the rights of State sovereignties in America.

The Court revealed a brazen indifference to the Bill of Rights—and particularly to the 10th amendment of the Constitution—by declaring for the second time this year that whenever the Federal Government preempts any field of lawmaking, the State governments must stay out.

This is creeping usurpation. It is a denial of the rights which have long protected the States against the tyranny of intolerant majorities in Congress.

Specifically, the Supreme Court last week wiped out—so far as railroad employment is concerned—this provision of the constitution of the State of Nebraska:

"No person shall be denied employment because of membership in or affiliation with, or resignation or expulsion from, a labor organization or because of refusal to join or affiliate with a labor organization; nor shall any individual or corporation or association of any kind enter into any contract, written or oral, to exclude persons from employment because of membership in or nonmembership in a labor organization."

Seventeen States have similar laws or constitutional provisions guaranteeing the right to work. But the Supreme Court of the United States now proclaims that when Congress passes a prohibitory or permissive law in a particular field—such as the conditions of private employment on the railroads or airlines—the provisions of State constitutions on the subject are automatically repealed.

The Federal law in question, passed by Congress in 1951, says that notwithstanding the law of any State, a railroad or airline may make an agreement with a labor organization requiring all employees within 60 days to become members of that labor organization.

Compulsion occurs through enforced payments of dues which the employer deducts from the pay envelope. Unless the worker is willing to pay tribute, he loses his job. He cannot get further employment on the railroads or airlines unless he is willing to sacrifice his principles and involuntarily join an organization—political and economic—to whose tenets he may have conscientiously refused to conform.

Justice Douglas, who wrote the latest opinion for the Court, makes no secret of his enthusiasm for trade unionism which he claims has strengthened "the right to work." He insists, however, that this is now a "policy" of Congress. He adds that "Congress, acting within its constitutional powers, has the final say on policy issues." He argues that if Congress "acts unwisely, the electorate can make a change."

But how can the electorate change the Justices of the Supreme Court? Must we revive the platform of the Progressive Party of 1912, which, led by Theodore Roosevelt, advocated the "recall of judicial decisions" by vote of the electorate?

The principle of compulsory unionism can, of course, be extended by Congress to all fields of employment. A worker's earnings, moreover, can now be taxed by two private economic groups—the employer and the union operating together.

It has been generally assumed as a result of a decision of the Supreme Court in 1935, that any private system of government is unconstitutional. For in that year the

Court unanimously declared that Congress could not delegate to private economic groups the right to make NRA Code agreements of their own between employers and unions and thereby set up their own system of private government.

Yet, Justice Douglas boldly writes today in behalf of a unanimous Court:

"If private rights are being invaded, it is by force of an agreement made pursuant to Federal law which expressly declares that State law is superseded. In other words, the Federal statute is the source of the power and authority by which any private rights are lost or sacrificed.

"The enactment of the Federal statute authorizing union-shop agreements is the governmental action on which the Constitution operates, though it takes a private agreement to invoke the Federal sanction."

So now the Supreme Court sanctions a private system of government after all—a system of confiscation of the workers' earnings, moreover, by which his money—his property—is taken from him under duress.

The tenth amendment of the Constitution states that "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

The Supreme Court of the United States has deliberately ignored that stipulation. In case after case in recent months, the Court has deprived the States of their basic and original rights. To paraphrase the late Justice Cardozo—this is "usurpation run riot."

[From the Human Events of May 26, 1956]

SUPREME COURT AGAINST BILL OF RIGHTS

(By Frank Chodorov)

The real conflict today between the Supreme Court and Congress arises from what amounts to an effort by the Court to repeal one of the fundamental principles of the Constitution:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

This is article 10 of the Bill of Rights. The meaning seems clear enough. It says that the business of the Federal Government is limited to those matters which the Constitution has specifically put within its province; everything else is out of bounds. Putting it another way, the residuary legatees of all powers not definitely assigned to the Central Government are the States.

That's how a layman would understand the article. But, it has come to pass that article 10 has acquired, by juridical interpretation, a meaning quite the opposite. It now means that when "Congress has occupied a field to the exclusion of parallel State legislation * * * the dominant interest of the Federal Government precludes State intervention." That is to say, if Congress legislates in any field, that field is out of bounds for a State. Furthermore, even if Congress legislates on the fringe of any field, "the conclusion is inescapable that Congress intended to occupy the field." Thus, the Supreme Court supplements the legislation by divining the intent of Congress.

The quotations are from a recent decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of *Pennsylvania* v. *Steve Nelson*. This man had been convicted of sedition in a Federal court. Pennsylvania, along with other States, has its own sedition law, and under it had convicted Nelson and sentenced him to imprisonment for a longer term than the Federal court had given him. He appealed to the Supreme Court on the ground that the Federal Government had preempted the field of sedition and that Pennsylvania had no jurisdiction in the matter. The Supreme Court, by a 6 to 3 vote, upheld the contention.

Of course, the quotations are taken "out of context." But, that is exactly what will be done when lawyers offer this decision as a precedent in other cases that will come up. Even in this case, the majority decision quotes (out of context) from another decision (*Rice* v. *Santa Fe Elevator Corp.*, (331 U. S.)), as follows: "the Federal statutes 'touch a field in which the Federal interest is so dominant that the Federal system [must] be assumed to preclude enforcement of State laws on this same subject.'"

This line of reasoning suggests some interesting speculations. If Congress should pass the pending aid-to-education bill, could not the Supreme Court decide (if the matter were brought to its attention) that in so doing, Congress had intended to preempt the entire field of education, even to the extent of deciding on textbooks, and that the States were transgressors if they presumed to legislate in that field? Or, suppose somebody should refuse to pay a State income tax on the ground that the 16th amendment gave the Federal Government a monopoly of income taxation. How would the Supreme Court rule?

The point is that the "occupation of the field" argument reverses the intent and meaning of article 10. The Court has decided that the States have no power to act in any area in which Congress has once legislated; furthermore, if Congress has legislated on any specific matter within this area, it must be assumed that Congress intended to cover all of it. There appears to be no field of State authority which the Congress may not invade and therefore preempt. Thus, the vaunted autonomy of the States is wiped out and thoroughgoing centralism has replaced the great American principle of imperium in imperio. Article 10 has been repealed by the United States Supreme Court.

An effort to restore to the States some measure of independence, and to prevent their complete reduction to parish status, is now before the House of Representataives. It is a bill called H. R. 3, introduced by Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, the gist of which is in this first sentence: "That no act of Congress shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which such act operates, to the exclusion of all State laws on the subject matter, unless such Act contains express provision to that effect."

It will be observed that H. R. 3 makes no reference to article 10, or to any constitutional limitations on the power of Congress vis-a-vis State powers. Even if this bill should become law, Congress could invade fields which are constitutionally and historically reserved to the States; it merely states that (for instance) Congress does not prevent the States from legislating in the field of education just because it has passed one law in that field—"unless such act contains express provision to that effect." The right of Congress to invade and preempt any particular field is not affected. That is, Congress, not the Constitution, may decide on the prerogatives of the States—even as Parliament makes laws for all subdivisions of England, or as the Kremlin decides how its "Socialist republics" shall be run.

Nevertheless, even this limited restoration of some State authority is meeting with strenuous opposition. A vigorous attempt is being made to replace H. R. 3 with a bill giving the States authority to legislate in the field of sedition only.

The character of the opposition to H. R. 3 is significant. It is being led by organized labor, with an able assist from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The significance lies in the fact that it indicates how far we have gone in the development of our democratic form of Government, in which the interests of powerful pressure groups take precedence over the Constitution.

The laborites' interest in the Nelson decision stems from their dislike of the right to work laws that have been enacted by 18 States, under the aegis of the Taft-Hartley law. If an amenable Congress were to vitiate or repeal this law, could not the Supreme Court decide that under existing laws, Congress has preempted the field of labor legislation and thus throw out the right to work laws? In any event, the more power the Central Government has, the easier it is for labor leaders to impose their will on the whole country; local laws, customs and prejudices could be overridden in one fell swoop. Centralism is the ideal arrangement for pressure groups.

As for the NAACP, their reason for supporting the Nelson decision and opposing H. R. 3 is obvious. They are all for civil rights, which they interpret to be the uncivil procedure of imposing a politically determined pattern of behavior on people. They are impatient with suasion. They rest their case on power, and who has more power than the Central Government? If Congress preempts the field of social relations, the State laws will have no effect. True, but what they overlook is that laws result from customs, not the other way around, and that discrimination against Negroes can be exacerbated by attempts from outsiders to eradicate it. No people have ever been made good by law; they are frequently made mad by it.

Support of H. R. 3 comes from a flock of legal lights from various States, who have the Constitution and reason on their side, but not the votes of the pressure groups.

Coupled with the desegregation decision, the Nelson decision has aroused an intense interest in the doctrine of States rights. The arguments of the attorneys general, before the House Subcommittee on the Judiciary in favor of H. R. 3, are reminiscent of Calhoun, and so are a number of editorials on the Nelson decision which have appeared in the public press. Whether anything will come of this enthusiasm depends on the extent to which it is rooted in a disillusionment with centralism; that is, are Americans ready to return to that concept of freedom which found expression in article 10, or are we so deeply devoted to the Washington golden calf that the idea of freedom strikes us as heresy?

States rights sprang from fear and distrust of centralized government. It was not just a political theory worked out in an ivory tower. The 1776 Americans rose in revolt against an impersonal, self-sufficient, and arbitrary government and were in no mood to countenance an American Government built along the same lines. As every schoolboy should know, there were delegates to the Constitutional Convention who favored a government of practically unlimited powers, and they dropped the idea because they knew the American people would make short shrift of a constitution that embodied it. The genius of the Americans was against centralism.

But, why? Why did they favor State governments as against the newly proposed Government? Simply because they knew from experience, and some from history, that their freedom was less likely to be impinged upon by a government of "neighbors" than by one that was beyond their reach. One could keep one's eyes on the governor and the State legislature and, if need to, lay one's hands on them. The States cannot print money and there is a sharp limit to the deficit spending in which they can engage. Taxes could be held within reason, enforcement officers could not be arbitrary, the legislators would be more amenable to local customs.

Those early Americans knew what we have forgotten, that inherent in government, any government, is an insatiable appetite for power; that it could be contained only by the

vigilance and opposition of the governed. But, how can you watch over and resist a government that is beyond your reach, physically and fiscally? After all, one has enough to do to make a living.

To this understanding of political institutions, the Founding Fathers had to make concessions if they hoped for ratification. James Madison, the intellectual genius of the Convention, went out of his way to assure the people that the Government proposed in the new Constitution could not under its terms invade the rights and powers of the State governments. In one of his Federalist Papers, he made it clear that the proposed Government would in fact be nothing more than the foreign department for the State governments, which in domestic affairs would be supreme. Nevertheless, ratification came hard, and only the inclusion of the Bill of Rights, with its famous article 10, made it possible.

But, neither the Constitution nor the promises of its authors could contain the craving for power that is built into all government, and the new establishment had hardly been set up before centralism showed its ugly head. It is common knowledge that the instrument of transformation was the Supreme Court which, under the leadership of Chief Justice Marshall, was elevated to supremacy in the supposedly coequal triumvirate of the branches of Government. However, it must be said that while the decisions of John Marshall violated the spirit of the Constitution, they always held within the letter; he was a stickler for the word. It is hardly conceivable that he would have countenanced the decision of Chief Justice Warren, in the Nelson case, which in effect wiped out an important clause of the Constitution.

The importance of article 10, in terms of freedom, became evident long after it was written, and in a way the Founding Fathers apparently did not realize. It set up something new in political science, a competitive system of government. The monopoly of political power was broken by its provision, so that if a citizen found the government of his State distasteful, he could escape its clutches by moving to another State. It was this choice that kept the respective State governments from getting out of line with the will of its citizens.

Thus, before the 16th amendment was enacted, a number of States instituted the income tax. Other States were quick to take advantage of this by advertising their lack of income taxation, thus attracting industry; and men of means transferred their citizenship from States that levied on inheritances to those that did not. The effect was to cause a number of the income-taxing States either to drop the levies or to keep them so low that the incentive to move was inconsequential. The citizen had a choice, and choice is the essence of freedom. There was no choice after income taxation became federalized.

The recurring interest in States rights in this country is but a version of the recurring struggle of the individual throughout history to attain a measure of freedom. There is only one kind of freedom—freedom from government. Every acquisition of power by government, under any pretext, is at the expense of individual freedom. As in the balance scale of the figure of Justice, when the power of government goes up the power of the people goes down.

Article 10 was put into the Constitution for the specific purpose of preventing this imbalance. Now that the Supreme Court has taken it out of the Constitution completely, the struggle of those who hold freedom to be the highest human value should be to restore it in all its pristine beauty. Unfortunately, whenever the issue of States rights has come up in the past the detonator has not been the love of freedom, but some sectional and pecuniary interest.

When, in the War of 1812, the British blockade brought ruin to New England industrialists, their governments invoked States rights even to the extent of threatening secession; the issue was dropped as soon as the war was over. Again the South raised the issue when protective tariffs played havoc with the planters' profits. In neither case did the question of freedom play a dominant role.

States rights has nothing to do with sectional interests. It has nothing to do with the racial question or with the sedition laws of Pennsylvania. It has everything to do with freedom. It is a device invented by our forefathers to prevent the centralization of power, to the detriment of the individual. If the present enthusiasm for this doctrine is to be galvanized into a political movement, a movement to restore article 10 to the Bill of Rights, it will be only because the spirit of freedom is not dead in this country.

VETERANS' BENEFITS—BRADLEY COMMISSION PROPOSALS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, last week I discussed an analysis of the Bradley Commission on Veterans' Benefits. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article published in the Disabled American Veterans' Semimonthly, May 15, 1956, written by Mr. Hogan, who is the public-relations man for the Disabled American Veterans. I recommend that it be read by every Senator.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMISSION PROPOSALS BY DIRECTOR CLARK—DAV REBUTTAL ACCLAIMED BY TEAGUE AND ENTIRE COMMITTEE

WASHINGTON, D. C.—In a blistering attack on proposals of the President's Commission on Veterans' Benefits, Maj. Omer W. Clark, DAV national legislative director, has informed the House Veterans' Affairs Committee that it would be unfortunate and bordering on the catastrophic for Congress to adopt the recommendations of the Bradley report.

Flanked by Capt. Cicero F. Hogan, DAV national claims director, and assistant legislative director E. M. Freudenberger, Major Clark offered a point-by-point rebuttal to the report which won the acclaim of Chairman OLIN E. TEAGUE, Texas Democrat, and the entire membership of the House group.

Major Clark made it clear that in attacking the report of the Commission he was not questioning the motives behind the proposals, nor the integrity of the Commission's membership, and that he had only the highest personal regard for the author of the report, Gen. Omar N. Bradley, with whom he had been in close association for 2 years or more.

"There can be no question," Major Clark said, "as to the importance of the Bradley Commission report, whatever one may think of its contents."

He told the House committee that DAV is primarily interested in the war disabled, their widows, children, and dependents, and that some of the Commission's proposals, if adopted, would be extremely destructive as to certain important facets of the compensation structure and that for this reason they are strongly opposed by our organization.

The DAV spokesman also made it clear that while certain of the Commission's recommendations were not accorded the formal comment treatment by him it should not be taken "as necessarily implying acceptance" by the organization.

As a matter of fact, he said, some of them are deemed inequitable, impractical, or otherwise undesirable from an administrative standpoint, but he preferred to concentrate DAV's fire upon "proposals of major and particularly objectionable nature."

Major Clark then took bead on the report's very first recommendation which took the position that military service is in the discharge of a citizenship obligation and is not in itself a basis for future Government benefits.

"The Disabled American Veteran realizes," Major Clark observed, "that the obligation of citizenship carries with it the duty and privilege of defending the Nation in time of war, stress, or national emergency." However, he added, "it has been the long established and historic policy of the United States to consider veterans as a group apart in awarding legislative benefits, the propriety of which has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Congress."

As to the Commission's recommendation that the Nation should not obligate future generations to bear burdens "that we ourselves are unwilling to shoulder," Major Clark pointed out (1) that no one generation, nor several generations, can pay for a war, and (2) that the future generations, "so solicitously referred to by the Bradley Commission, should indeed pay their full share for the wars that saved the Nation, increased their security, and that enabled them to "benefit immeasurably by the heavy personal and financial sacrifices made by the veterans and their families during wartime."

The DAV spokesman waxed sarcastic in commenting on the Bradley group's recommendation that the VA rating schedule be revised "based on thorough factual studies by a broadly representative group of experts."

"In the opinion of the DAV," he said, "the primary responsibility should be left in the hands of technicians who understand it, who work with it every day," and who have made extensive industrial research to guide them in adjudication of compensation and pension claims.

"It is an appalling thought," the witness said, "to try and imagine what sort of a schedule would issue from the efforts of an outside group with such diverse backgrounds and ignorance of all that goes into the production of a necessarily complex rating schedule as evidently contemplated by this recommendation."

Pointing out that construction of a satisfactory rating schedule is a most difficult task even for highly trained technicians, Major Clark let go this verbal broadside:

"If anyone should desire to create a chaotic condition in the VA, and thereby in all veterandom, we know of no better way than to bring in an outside group, such as the one proposed, no matter how highly educated, trained, and skilled in their own fields, and put them to work on preparing a VA rating schedule."

Regarding the Commission's recommendation to abolish statutory awards and to pay veterans equally for equal disability, Major Clark was equally forceful when he commented:

"They forget, or never know of the legislative processes leading to adoption of the various statutory awards after hearings and the introduction of medical and lay evidence in support thereof."

He then raised the question of how, if statutory awards were eliminated, could the Government possibly compensate certain maimed or badly disabled veterans with any degree of justice.

"The statutory awards," he reminded the committee, "which were made a part of the laws, proved to be a practical solution to the problem that has faced the VA and the Congress since during World War I. Certainly it could not be done through any one regular rating schedule. And if more than one schedule is employed then it would be simpler and better to retain the statutory awards and the present machinery to pay them."

The DAV spokesman next trained his fire on the Commission's suggestions that the veteran with lower compensation rating is overpaid and that a still further proportional disparity be authorized between the lower and the upper rates.

Calling the committee's attention to his testimony before the group in March of this year, Major Clark said the DAV "favors increases for all the compensation evaluations and desires to see that percent ratios are brought in line and with the veterans rated less than 50 percent allowed to draw additional compensation for wife, children, and dependent parents in proportional amounts, as is now the case where ratings are 50 percent or higher."

As to the proposal that there be several gradations, "depending upon the extent of helplessness," the witness said that would cause administrative difficulties in its application and might open the door to charges of discrimination in adjudication of claims in cases involving applications for nurse and attendant allowance.

The DAV legislative director said his organization is opposed to paying off even low-rated so-called static cases through a lump sum or short-term settlement. He said that such a proposal would not be to the best interest of the Government.

"The DAV," he said, "does not subscribe to the impression created within the Commission that little disability is credited as being present in cases rated 10 or 20 percent."

He pointed out that his organization has observed through long experience many instances where the disabilities were not truly minor in their effect upon the mental and physical well-being of the individual "although rated only 10 or 20 percent in accordance with the terms of the rating schedule."

Major Clark added that there were even some instances where veterans should have been granted higher ratings, and that adjustments were being made to correct this situation.

In expressing DAV's opposition "with all possible energy" to the Commission's recommendation for withdrawal of the presumptive provisions of service connection for chronic diseases, tropical diseases, psychoses, T. B. and multiple sclerosis, Major Clark took a sideswipe at the American Medical Association as well as at the recommendation itself.

In modulated tones, but at times bitingly derisive, he said that the Commission's view that "accepted medical principles can reasonably and accurately establish the onset of a disease and a disability process" was not only "humorously contrary" to DAV's experience in handling many thousands of compensation cases but contrary, he was certain, "to the experience of members of this committee."

He asked: "What are the 'accepted medical principles' as to the origin of multiple sclerosis, leprosy, and a host of other diseases, where medical science has not progressed to the point where it can determine the cause, let alone the date of inception."

It was at this point that he brought in the AMA, whose past president, Major Clark reminded the committee, went on record before them as opposing any presumptions.

Despite the fact, he said, that the committee "must be aware, either through long personal experience as Members of Congress, or through study of the old records, physicians of eminence and ability have appeared and given favorable testimony regarding authorization of presumptions for certain classes of diseases, there are many physicians, it must be conceded, who are in opposition." Once again, Major Clark said, this would seem to be the case where doctors cannot agree among themselves, and he added:

"It is obvious that many of them are merely following the AMA line." He quoted from an AMA Washington letter (84–70, April 27, 1956) which stated on page 1 that the Commission's findings on non-service-connected VA care in many respects are just what the AMA has been saying for a long time."

The committee members up to this point had listened attentively to Major Clark without interruption. But the mention of the AMA line caused Representative BERNARD W. ("PAT") KEARNEY, Republican, of New York, to break in with the observation:

"I would like to remind Mr. Clark that it has been my experience that the AMA has been before this committee many times saying a lot of things which have never been proven."

The New Yorker, a veteran of World War I, reminded his colleagues that when he was chairman of a subcommittee of the Veterans Affairs Committee, he had presided at meetings where the AMA came in here with a lot of charges which were simply untrue."

Major Clark then referred to page 2 of the AMA letter where specific reference was made to the Commission recommendation for withdrawal of the presumptions.

Reminding his listeners that the term "accepted medical principles" was found to be so controversial, even among doctors, that the VA Claims Service forbade use of the term in writing veterans about disallowances of compensation cases, the witness said:

"Further argument on this recommendation is unnecessary as it is inconceivable that your committee would approve such an unfair and improper proposal."

At this point, Major Clark's assistant, Mr. Freudenberger, took up the reading of the DAV presentation.

He directed the committee's attention to the Bradley group's recommendation that would gear the rates for disability compensation to the prevailing average of national earnings by some representative group of workers. He said:

"What group of workers, may we ask? And how would the proposal be carried out to bring about a review of the actual rates paid every 2 years and adjustment made to conform with such standards?" He continued:

"This, to us, is an impractical visionary scheme that would break down of its own weight and the insuperable and administrative difficulties, if attempted."

Mr. Freudenberger next referred to the proposal that the rate of compensation payable to veterans who are actually disabled be two-thirds of the average earnings in the group selected as standard. He said the DAV's view is that it is not only impractical "but would probably result in reductions in cases where the veterans are now receiving compensation on 100 percent rating plus statutory awards."

The DAV spokesman then placed the organization on record as against Commission proposals which urged that establishment of dependency should be required in the case of wives (widows) and minor children as well as the proposal that, whenever legally possible, premium rates for government life insurance include a charge to cover administrative costs.

DAV also is definitely opposed, the speaker said, "to any weakening of the Veterans' Preference Act" and, accordingly, "does not subscribe to the Commission's views as presented in its recommendation on this point."

As long as men are being taken into the Armed Forces via the draft, Mr. Freudenberger said, the DAV has no objection to the Commission's proposal that the compensation rates in peacetime cases should be the same as the disability and death compensation rates as to those who served in wartime.

After reminding the committee that DAV, though primarily devoted to problems of the war disabled, their wives (widows), children, and dependents, is unwilling "to stand idly by while the pension structure erected through the years is dismantled," the witness repeated to his listeners the organization's position on the pension program as outlined to the committee last February by DAV National Commander Melvin J. Maas.

The congressional group was reminded that, on the occasion, General Maas said, in part:

"I am sure this committee recognizes the fact that the Disabled American Veterans is unique among the veterans organizations in that from the beginning our purpose, and our sole objective has been devoted to the cause of improving and advancing the conditions, health, and interest of all wounded, gassed, injured, and disabled veterans, and to aid and assist worthy wartime disabled veterans, their widows, their orphans, and their dependents.

"* * * The DAV has never registered any protest to existing part III benefits—the payment of a pension where the veteran became permanently and totally disabled."

"* * * We have not supported such legislation because of our desire and efforts to secure increased awards or amounts for the service-connected veteran and his dependents."

The DAV statement then recalled the early days of 1933 when Public Law 2, 73d Congress, was passed under the misnomer "An act to Maintain the Credit of the United States Government."

Some $200 million were to be pared from the Government's budget, the statement said, all at the expense of veterans and Federal employees.

"You all know," the committee was told, "what happened subsequently as numerous benefits then denied, eliminated, or reduced, were restored, some in part. In the meantime, there were some suicides among veterans and widespread misery and hardship."

The DAV spokesman then said:

"The Bradley Commission recommendations, if adopted, could well have the most unfortunate results and in some instances they would border on the catastrophic."

The Congressmen were warned that if the retrogressive movement away from existing national policy as advocated by the Bradley Commission goes unchecked, it might well prove to be the opening wedge that would place the compensation legislative structure in jeopardy."

It might also, the statement said, "spearhead a subsequent attempt to tie in the compensation program to 'needs,' the word that runs like a thread through the tapestry of the 'new look' advocated so strongly by the Commission."

DAV was next put on record as opposing any change in the present regulations whereby VA determines, under its controlling criteria and precedents, whether a veteran with an undesirable or bad conduct discharge was released from service under conditions and for acts, constituting discharge under dishonorable conditions.

"The statement said VA staff activities are now overrun with specialists to such an extent that the Agency is losing or has lost sight of the more important functions "such as rendering the best possible service to veterans and their dependents."

Regarding the Commission's proposal to make the Administrator of VA a Cabinet member, the statement said that while it has appealing aspects it could very well turn out to be a mirage.

As a member of the Cabinet, the Administrator could be faced with some unhappy situations, the DAV statement pointed out, and he might become involved in political controversy to such an extent that his time would be taken up with matters of little, if any, importance to veterans and veterans affairs. Also, it was pointed out, that with a change of administration the VA representative in the Cabinet would resign along

with his colleagues, and thus we might have a new VA-Cabinet member every 4 or 8 years.

The statement added: "If the idea means what we think it might mean then the DAV can be recorded as opposed."

As to the suggestion by the Bradley Commission that a high-salaried reviewing group be set up "thereby constituting an intermediate step between rating boards decisions and appellate determinations of Veterans Appeals Board" the DAV statement "wondered if the Commission had any real comprehension of the number of additional trained personnel and the extra costs involved in such a proposal."

"The DAV is concerned," the statement concluded "with the many surveys that have been made of the VA, the too frequent internal reorganizations that have been imposed, the stress and strain upon the personnel, much of it resulting from changes, experiments, and generally considered moves of one kind or another, and the greatly impaired morale that must inevitably accompany such basic insecurity and feelings of frustration.

"Nothing was very much wrong with the operation of the VA," the statement went on, "but it certainly is now or will be unless there is a cessation or letup in the investigatorial and critical activities that have seemingly started on the false premise that something is radically wrong with the VA that can only be remedied by drastic surgery and a prolonged and stormy convalescence."

When Major Clark, who had resumed the DAV presentation, came to the end of his prepared statement, he thanked the committee for the courteous hearing accorded him and expressed the hope that DAV's views might be helpful.

He said the Bradley Commission's findings failed to provide "any good reason for changing our position as theretofore announced."

Chairman TEAGUE and each member of the committee then expressed their warm approval of Major Clark's presentation. There was not a single exception to any of his remarks in the 17-page presentation.

Capitol Hill observers said they could not recall when such a controversial topic had been discussed without provoking some question or challenge of a presentation.

Representative B. F. SISK, California Republican, caused a laugh when he said he had read the Bradley report through from cover to cover three times and that the only reason he didn't start a fourth reading was that he was more confused when he finished than before he had begun.

VISIT TO SENATE BY MISS RUTH MARIE PETERSON, OF AUSTIN, MINN.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the month of June is Dairy Month, which has not only nationwide observance, but is especially significant in Minnesota, because of the prominence of the dairy industry in that State.

The dairy producers throughout the United States have assessed themselves a certain amount of money from their annual dairy production, in order to create a fund for use in promoting the consumption of dairy products. They have also selected what they have designated and termed as "Princess Kay of the Milky Way."

A young lady from Minnesota was selected, first as Minnesota queen, and then later as National Princess of the Milky Way. This young lady is Ruth Marie Peterson, of Austin, Minn.

Miss Peterson not only visited Bogotá in connection with the International Trade Fair there, in order to promote the sale of dairy products, but she did far more than promote the sale of dairy products. She actually was an ambassador of good will, representing the United States, and she made a wonderful impression upon the people of Colombia.

Later Miss Peterson visited Japan, and the reports from Japan commended the young lady for her contribution to public relations, and for the good will she created in Japan for the American people and the American farmer.

She did far more than merely promote good will. She was instrumental in the introduction of the use of dairy products into both the countries she visited, showing how powdered milk could be reconstituted into fluid milk so that it would be desirable for consumption.

Mr. President, Princess Kay is in the gallery of the Senate. I will ask her to stand.

[Miss Peterson rose in her place in the gallery, and was greeted by the Senate with applause.]

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the young lady to whom I have referred, and whom the Senate has greeted, deserves commendation for the growth of good public relations between the United States and other countries of the world.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. BIBLE). The Chair desires to thank the Senator from Minnesota, and wishes to state that he is very happy to welcome on behalf of the Senate the charming young lady who has visited us. The Chair simply would add that he himself selected a Minnesota product as his wife. The Senate is delighted to have this young lady visit it.

Mr. THYE. I have always known that the Presiding Officer was a wise gentleman.

THE REAL FACTS ABOUT SO-CALLED TABLES CONCERNING FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF HELLS CANYON DAM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for not to exceed 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on May 29, 1956, the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a table purporting to show that, in his words, "the taxpayers of the United States are saved approximately $465,500,000" through construction of 3 low dams at Hells Canyon by the Idaho Power Co.

At that time, Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and I were present on the Senate floor, and we both commented on the misleading and unsound premise underlying the claims of the Senator from Arizona. In comments then made, Senator MAGNUSON and I agreed that I should include in the RECORD of today our reply to the statements of the Senator from Arizona concerning the Hells Canyon situation.

This material and information are presented to the Senate on behalf of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and myself.

To begin with, Mr. President, the table presented by Senator GOLDWATER is identical with a table presently appearing in advertisements in many national magazines, paid for by the private utility corporations of this country. It does seem to us that the Senator from Arizona might have identified the source of his table—a table claiming what the taxpayers of each State have been "saved" through surrendering the Hells Canyon hydroelectric site to private utility companies.

In this connection, I should like to point out that, last week, when I inserted in the RECORD some information about rural electrification rates in Idaho I frankly and candidly told the Senate that the data came from the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

If the table of the Senator from Arizona did indeed originate in a private utility advertisement—and the tables are identical, as I observe them—I believe the Senate might have been told that fact. At least, Senators could then have decided for themselves the accuracy of the information.

Is the information accurate?

In the first place, the proposed Hells Canyon high dam, as recommended in the famous 308 Report of the Corps of Engineers, would be operated as part of the Bonneville Power Administration network. As of June 1955 this Federal agency had collected $401,813,269 in power revenues from industries, rural electric cooperatives, private power companies, public utility districts, and Government agencies in the Pacific Northwest. In fact, these revenues to the Treasury have been so extensive and so continuous that the Bonneville Administration is $68 million ahead of the repayment schedule established by Congress and the Federal Power Commission, at the time when its various component dams came into operation. Federal dams in the Columbia River system are producing power which puts revenue into the Treasury at the rate of $140,000 per day.

Yet the table presumably prepared by the propagandists for the power companies, and included in the RECORD by the Senator from Arizona, totally and blithely ignores this remarkably successful record of repayments to the Government for energy marketed by the Bonneville Administration. The table relies upon public ignorance of the real facts, because the table could be accurate only if the kilowatts from the Bonneville system were given away, rather than sold at what eventually will be a substantial profit to the United States Treasury.

Total Bonneville revenues of $401,813,269 are given no credence by this table, which indicates, for example, that the taxpayers of Illinois are saved $35,600,000 because the Government is not erecting Hells Canyon high dam. This is about like claiming that the taxpayers of Illinois might be saved a vast quantity of money if only our entire United States Post Office system were turned over to some mail-order corporation, and if the so-called saving ignored every cent in revenue which the Post Office realizes from the sale of postage

stamps, postcards, envelope, mailing permits, and so forth. Would this be an honest claim? Would it tell the whole story?

Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona, who tells us in the RECORD that the Hells Canyon project would cost the taxpayers of the 48 States a sum of $465,500,000, was one of the ardent advocates of the $780 million upper Colorado project—a project with considerably less likelihood of paying for itself in the form of power revenues than is Hells Canyon Dam. I support the upper Colorado project, because I believe it is essential to the development of the intermountain region. But how can a promoter of a $780 million project, like the Senator from Arizona, advance the welfare of that project when he inserts in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tables contending that the taxpayers of all the 48 States are being made the goats of a $465 million project?

In addition, the table about Hells Canyon which was inserted in the RECORD did not disclose these essential facts:

First. An able engineer of the United States Bureau of Reclamation, the chief of its estimates and analysis branch, testified on May 2, 1955, before the Senate Interior Committee, that Hells Canyon Dam would cost $308,500,000 to construct, and not $465,500,000, as claimed in the misleading private-utility table. This capable man was Cecil I. Hoisington.

Second. While the Soviet Union taps its great rivers to the utmost, we evidently settle for less than full development. The 3 low dams at Hells Canyon will make possible a total of only 505,000 kilowatts of prime power, as contrasted with 924,000 kilowatts as a result of the high dam.

Third. The 3 low dams of the Idaho Power Co. will impound 1 million acre-feet of storage for flood control, as compared with 3,800,000 acre-feet by the high dam. Is it worth while to risk grave floods to enrich the Idaho Power Co.?

Fourth. Despite the fact that the table included in the RECORD made much of mythical savings to taxpayers, the Idaho Power Co. has applied for an accelerated tax writeoff of about $70 million to aid in the construction of its low dams. This would represent an interest-free loan from the Treasury of great value to Idaho Power Co.

Mr. President, in conclusion, the loss of nearly 3 million acre-feet of storage at Hells Canyon is forcing certain advocates of power, flood control, and navigation to advocate dams such as Bruces Eddy and Penny Cliffs, which could choke off the magnificent fisheries, scenery, elk, forage, and recreational vistas of the Clearwater River watershed.

In view of the great public importance of the issues and policies which depend upon these facts, Mr. President, it is the hope of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and myself that in the future, when tables on these matters are inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, they will be checked very carefully for factual truth and accuracy, particularly when they appear in the RECORD without being attributed to any source.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Inasmuch as the distinguished Senator from Oregon has attempted to take the Senator from Arizona to task about a table placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the Senator from Arizona, it seems appropriate for the Senator from Arizona to reply briefly.

Mr. President, at this time I do not care to answer all the allegations the Senator from Oregon has made. I shall do so in due course.

But what the Senator from Oregon is overlooking is that private funds are available for the building of this dam. If private funds were not available for the building of the dam, it would be perfectly proper for the Federal Government to consider constructing it.

The Senator from Oregon ignores the fact that Congress after Congress has turned down this proposal, because private money is available.

I did not think it was necessary to identify the table I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because the table has appeared in perhaps half a dozen or a dozen national publications, and the source of the table is common knowledge.

As I have previously stated, and as the Senator from Oregon correctly recalls, $465,500,000 is the amount, plus the interest, which would have to be paid if the Federal Government built the dam, but which otherwise could be saved. That money would come out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the United States.

On the other hand, if the dam were constructed by a private company, not only would that money be saved, but after the dam was constructed, the private company would pay taxes on it to the Federal Government.

I am not arguing about Bonneville Dam or the rate of repayment at all. The Senator from Oregon and I are pretty much in agreement on the statistics regarding those projects.

But I think the Senator from Oregon is in error when he advocates construction by the Federal Government of a project, for one particular area, which can be built with private funds, at no cost to the general taxpayers of the United States.

In the case of the upper Colorado project, it could not be constructed with private funds; not that much private money is available for it. It is a reclamation, flood-control, and navigation-control project; and the Senator from Oregon knows that, historically, the Federal Government has developed such projects, when private money cannot do so.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in brief reply to the distinguished Senator from Arizona, I will say that his program adds up to reserving the skim milk of power sites for development at public expense, out of the Federal Treasury, while the cream of sites, like Hells Canyon, are surrendered to private-power companies.

I am pleased that the able Senator from Arizona agrees with me that Grand Coulee is a fine project. Yet, in the late 1920's, a private power company sought to preempt the Grand Coulee reach of the Columbia River, much as the Idaho Power Company now is preempting the Hells Canyon stretch of the Snake River.

Fortunately, there were then in public life men like Senator Clarence Dill, of Washington, Senator Charles L. McNary, of Oregon, and Rufus Woods, editor of the Wenatchee, Wash., Daily World, who helped prevent the relinquishment of the Grand Coulee reach of the Columbia River for piecemeal and less-than-full development.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF FOOD AND DRUG LAW—STATEMENT BY GOVERNOR HODGES OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in today's RECORD a statement on the observance of the week of June 24–July 1, 1956, as Food and Drug Law Golden Anniversary Week. The statement has been issued by the Governor of North Carolina, the Honorable Luther H. Hodges.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY GOV. LUTHER H. HODGES

The Nation will observe the week of June 24-July 1, 1956, as Food and Drug Law Golden Anniversary Week.

June 30, 1956, will mark the 50th anniversary of the signing by President Theodore Roosevelt of the first Federal Food and Drugs Act, amended and reenacted in 1938 as the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and the Federal Meat Inspection Act.

The purity, integrity, and abundance of our food, drug, and cosmetic supplies are unexcelled in the world today and stand as a tribute to the industries producing them. The maintenance and protection of the purity and integrity of our food, drug, and cosmetic supplies are essential elements of our national strength, safety and economic welfare.

For this protection we are indebted to Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, who, as crusader for the first Federal legislation, became known as the father of the pure food and drug law; to the distinguished and dedicated public servants at all levels of government who have administered these laws over the years; and to the leaders in industry who have supported the enactment and improvement of these laws and have cooperated in their enforcement.

I am glad, therefore, to designate the week of June 24-July 1 as Food and Drug Law Golden Anniversary Week in North Carolina and request that the appropriate officials of the State and all the citizens cooperate in the observance of this week.

LUTHER H. HODGES.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the enactment of the Federal food and drug law, under which so much has been done to protect and preserve the health of our people. This law is a daily reminder of the dedicated efforts of Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, who worked so tirelessly for its enactment. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks, the proclamation issued by the Honorable Averell W. Harriman, Governor of the State of New York, commemorating these events and

proclaiming the week of June 24–30 as Food and Drug Week.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION

This year the men and women of the Association of Food and Drug Officials of the United States are holding their 60th annual convention.

This year also marks the 50th anniversary of the enactment of the Federal Food and Drug Act and the Federal Meat Inspection Act, the first nationwide legislation in the field of maintaining the purity of the food and drugs we use. Signed in 1906, the Food and Drug Act has since been amended and reenacted as the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

We are all grateful to Dr. Harvey W. Wiley whose inspiration and untiring efforts contributed so much to Federal adoption of the pure food and drug program.

The Association of Food and Drug Officials is composed of those charged with the duty with maintaining the purity standards for food and drugs. Their work has been so well done that our people enjoy a safer supply than any in the world.

Because of their vigilant watch over standards, we all buy food and drugs with complete confidence. In New York State, our public servants closely cooperate with those of other States and the Federal Government in carrying forward this program.

It is fitting that we pay tribute to Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, the pioneer of the program, and to all those men and women of the association who work to keep us healthy and contented by making certain that the food and drugs we consume are pure.

Now, therefore, I, Averell Harriman, Governor of the State of New York, do proclaim the week of June 24–30, 1956, as Food and Drug Law Week in the State of New York, and call upon all our people to recognize the benefits we derive from these laws and their conscientious enforcement.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 16th day of April in the year of our Lord 1956.

By the Governor:

AVERELL HARRIMAN.
JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
Secretary to the Governor.

HOW LOW POSTAL RATES HELP BUSINESSMEN AND FARMERS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, by request, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial, reprinted from the Progressive Farmer, entitled "How Low Postal Rates Help Businessmen and Farmers."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW LOW POSTAL RATES HELP BUSINESSMEN AND FARMERS

At this time a proposal is pending in Congress to increase postage rates on all publications—so-called second-class matter. We believe this is bad, not merely for publishers, but for the general welfare.

Publications serving farmers would be especially hard hit. This is because of the great distances between farm homes as compared with city homes, and the higher postage rates we must pay because of the greater distance each copy must travel to reach its destination. A tiptop New York magazine may easily develop 1 million circulation in a 100- or 200-mile area. Our 1½ million subscribers are scattered over an area 2,300 miles wide.

I

Moreover, there are two good reasons why both our Government and the people would benefit by continuing the present low rates to insure maximum circulation of both reading matter and advertising by all our people. These two reasons are as follows:

1. Unquestionably a well informed adult citizenship is one of the surest guaranties of good government and of sound action on national and international problems. This is not only true in ordinary times, but especially so in times like these—times of almost unprecedented international danger. For an educated citizenship, the State must first educate its children and young people in public schools and colleges. But then by some method there should follow a lifelong continuation of education—adult education. And for this purpose one of the main dependencies are the publications of America—magazines, daily papers, weekly papers, etc. Many millions of tax funds are spent every year to provide public schools and colleges to educate our young people. But for all its invaluable part in educating older people the American press receives and desires only a relatively meager contribution in the form of somewhat lower postal rates.

2. Magazines and newspapers help maintain maximum consumption of manufactured products and therefore maximum employment in American industry and on American farms. No more important statement on 20th century economics has ever been made than that made by Edward A. Filene, the great Boston merchant and philanthropist. Said he: "In an age of mass production one of the major concerns of government must always be this—to make every citizen an adequate consumer."

II

Not only is this true, but the No. 1 agency for insuring mass consumption is the American press. This is true because no other agency can so cheaply bring together manufacturers of goods and the consumers or buyers of goods. To send a post card to every one of the 1,300,000 subscribers of the Progressive Farmer would cost $26,000 for postage alone. Partly by reason of present postal rates, we are enabled to give the American businessman the benefit and so let him put a full-page advertisement into every one of our 1,300,000 homes at a mere fraction of what post cards alone would cost. And this is but one illustration of the service rendered to American business by American publications.

Thus publication advertising becomes the lifeblood of American business, the most practicable and cheapest way of helping make every citizen an adequate consumer. Present relatively low postage rates are passed on by us in two ways: (1) to subscribers in the form of lower subscription rates and (2) to businessmen in the form of lower advertising rates. Both these keep the wheels of industry turning, keep employment high, and insure better markets for farmers.

III

Meanwhile, competition among publishers is so keen that, while a few big publishing corporations make large profits—the publishing industry as a whole is far below average in profitableness. Higher postage rates would bankrupt some excellent publications and seriously cripple many others. Especially would it hurt farm papers because of the large percent of their circulation in high-postage zones and because most farm publications refuse to take any of the millions spent for liquor, beer, and other objectionable advertising.

To sum up, American publications constantly carry on a vast campaign of adult education which helps give our Nation the indispensable values of a well informed citizenship in times like these. Furthermore, while our schools require untold millions for the education of children and adolescents, the American press is content with a meager fraction of that amount in the form of a slightly reduced postage rate. This reduction helps make every citizen an adequate consumer, thereby maintaining a full volume of business, full employment, and good markets for farmers.

HUNGRY HORSE DAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, several weeks ago I read with considerable interest an editorial credited to the Flathead Courier, a weekly newspaper in Polson, Mont., stating that there was not enough water in the South Fork of the Flathead River to run the four generators at Hungry Horse Dam, and that the Bureau of Reclamation was going to build a dam on the Middle Fork to put the water in the South Fork in order to rectify the supposed miscalculations in the construction of Hungry Horse Dam.

The editorial continued in part to say:

Didn't the Engineers know there would not be enough water to turn the Hungry Horse generators when they lavishly spent the taxpayers' money on these costly installations? Now they plan on ruining some more country in the Flathead to cover the first mistake.

In light of these statements I immediately contacted the Bureau of Reclamation, inquiring as to the reliability of the facts as stated in the editorial. I have received a reply from Commissioner Dexheimer, dated May 24, in which he stated in part:

The Bureau of Reclamation is investigating a possible diversion from the Middle Fork to the South Fork of the Flathead River but not for the alleged reason mentioned in the editorial.

The present water supply at the Hungry Horse Reservoir is good and the outlook for this year is considered normal.

The potential project under investigation, which is mentioned in the editorial, is the Flathead River project.

Not only has the Bureau of Reclamation answered the unwarranted charges expressed by the Flathead Courier, but an article in the Hungry Horse News, Columbia Falls, Mont., dated May 25, 1956, enumerates some of the great benefits derived from Hungry Horse as a multipurpose project. The Hungry Horse News states that while neighbors to the west know the might of the uncontrolled Kootenai, the Flathead was spared a May flood by the Hungry Horse Dam. Without the dam, the river would have neared 18 feet or 4 feet above flood stage at Columbia Falls.

The article states that the reservoir is now 44 feet below the full mark, a rise from the low of 83 feet below. The reservoir is expected to be full about July 1, compared to last year's June 29.

In order that the Senate be fully informed on this matter, I ask unanimous consent that the following items be printed at this point in the record: An editorial from the Flathead Courier, reprinted in the May 13 issue of the Miles City Star, Miles City, Mont.; my letter of May 17, 1956, to Wilbur A. Dexheimer, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation; Mr. Dexheimer's reply, dated May 24, 1956; and an article entitled

"Hungry Horse Dam Holds Back Flood" from the May 25, 1956, issue of the Hungry Horse News.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Miles City (Mont.) Star of May 13, 1956]

HUNGRY HORSE THIRSTY

A study will start in July to see if a dam, storage reservoir, and diversion tunnel should be built through the mountains to the Hungry Horse Reservoir. The project of the Reclamation Bureau calls for a 307-to-380-foot-high dam and a 7-to-8-mile tunnel through the rock to Hungry Horse. Now that $101 million plus has been spent on Hungry Horse Dam, and there is not enough water in the South Fork to run the four generators, the United States Bureau of Reclamation thinks the solution to their miscalculations will be a dam on the Middle Fork, to put the water into the South Fork.

Didn't the Engineers know there would not be enough water to turn the Hungry Horse generators, when they lavishly spent the taxpayers' money on these costly installations? Now they plan on ruining some more country in the Flathead to cover the first mistake. It would have been better to install just enough generators at Hungry Horse to operate with the water supply, with additional space available for other generators. But no, the United States Bureau of Reclamation had to go whole hog, install the biggest dam the canyon would hold, and then sit back and figure out how to fill the reservoir with enough water to generate power with the otherwise useless generators. It seems the Government can do anything with the taxpayers' money, even to the point of building a second project.—Flathead Courier.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1956.

HON. WILBUR A. DEXHEIMER,
Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DEXHEIMER: The attached clipping of an editorial reprinted in the Miles City Star, Miles City, Mont., on May 13, 1956, was brought to my attention and I am sending it on to you for your comment.

The facts as set forth in this editorial are very disturbing. I wish to be advised if at the present time there is not enough water in the South Fork to run the four generators at Hungry Horse Dam. Is the Bureau of Reclamation contemplating construction of a dam on the Middle Fork, diverting water into the South Fork?

If such action is planned, would appreciate being informed as to the progress of such planning. Please return the clipping with your reply.

With best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

P. S.—Isn't it true also that, because of Hungry Horse, the Montana Power Co. is able to run another 62,500(?)-kilowatt generator at Kerr Dam?—M. M.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., May 24, 1956.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: This is in reply to your letter of May 17, 1956, with which you forwarded for our consideration a clipping of an editorial from the May 13, 1956, issue of the Miles City Star, Miles City, Mont.

The Bureau of Reclamation is investigating a possible diversion from the Middle Fork to the South Fork of the Flathead River but not for the alleged reason mentioned in the editorial.

The present water supply at the Hungry Horse Reservoir is good and the outlook for this year is considered normal.

The potential project under investigation, which is mentioned in the editorial, is the Flathead River project, discussed in our letter to you dated January 5, 1956, in response to your letter of December 28, 1955.

Our regional director is proceeding with a basin survey of the Clark Fork Basin, including the drainage area of the Flathead River which is a tributary of the Clark Fork. However, these investigations have not yet proceeded far enough to evolve the general plans for the development of the Flathead River and its tributaries.

The first step in a basin survey is to make an inventory of the many potential projects that might be developed in the basin. This inventory has been made which shows that there is an attractive reservoir site, called the Spruce Park site, on the Middle Fork of the Flathead River, 5 miles above Bear Creek. This site lies entirely within the Flathead National Forest and in no way would affect the Glacier National Park, the railroad or the national highway. A dam about 350 feet high would provide about 360,000 acre-feet of storage capacity.

This site offers several possibilities of development: (1) Storage only (for downstream benefits); (2) storage with a powerplant at the dam; (3) storage and a pressure tunnel from the reservoir to the Hungry Horse Reservoir on the South Fork of the Flathead River, with a powerplant at the end of the tunnel; or (4) storage with a gravity tunnel to Hungry Horse Reservoir.

The most desirable plan of development cannot be determined until more detailed investigations are made. The feasibility investigations of the Flathead River project are scheduled to proceed in fiscal year 1957.

In regard to the postscript on your letter, the storage regulation at Hungry Horse Reservoir does benefit the Kerr plant of the Montana Power Co. and other privately owned plants downstream. Reimbursement for this river regulation should be made under the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act. Such payments would be fixed by the Federal Power Commission under this act. However, the amount which would be paid by downstream privately owned plants for river regulation cannot be determined without a detailed analysis of each situation. The Commission is making studies of the Hungry Horse project.

It is not anticipated that the Bureau of Reclamation would collect any payments from the power company for river regulation. Presumably such collections would be made by the Bonneville Power Administration, which is the marketing agent for the power generated at Hungry Horse.

The newspaper clipping is being returned as requested.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. DEXHEIMER,
Commissioner.

[From the Hungry Horse News, Columbia Falls, Mont., of May 25, 1956]

HUNGRY HORSE DAM HOLDS BACK FLOOD

While neighbors to the west know the might of the uncontrolled Kootenai, the Flathead was spared a May flood in 1956 by Hungry Horse Dam.

Without the dam, the river would have neared 18 feet, or 4 feet above flood stage, at Columbia Falls.

As it was, Tuesday afternoon the river at Columbia Falls reached 15.1 (14 feet is flood stage) and water was lapping at the top of county roads in the Red Bridge vicinity. No local damage resulted.

Flow of the Flathead River was 65,800 cubic feet per second past Columbia Falls. Without Hungry Horse it would have been 95,000.

May 20, 1954, saw the Flathead River at Columbia Falls practically duplicate what happened May 22, 1956. The river in 1954 reached 15 feet. On May 22, 1948, before Hungry Horse blocked the South Fork, the main river at Columbia Falls went to 20 feet, 6 feet over flood stage, flowed 110,000 cubic feet per second and caused damage locally. This was the year of the disastrous Vanport flood downstream on the Columbia.

The South Fork flow actually peaked Monday with 34,382 second-feet inflow into Hungry Horse Reservoir. Tuesday's flow was 33,486 second-feet, and Wednesday it was down to 29,549.

Meanwhile the river at Columbia Falls dropped from its Tuesday 3 p. m. high of 15.1 feet to 13.9 Wednesday and 13.5 feet Thursday noon. July temperatures in May stimulated the river flow. It was raining Thursday and cooler with the river flow diminishing.

Hungry Horse powerhouse this week was keyed to the flood picture with discharge averaging about 3,000 second-feet, compared to the inflow topping 30,000. Backwater of the main river resulted in the South Fork under United States Highway 2 bridge being full.

Floodwaters held back are filling Hungry Horse Reservoir. Storage was 2,532,000 acre-feet Thursday compared to 1,965,800 acre-feet April 18—low for the year. Elevation of the reservoir is now 3,516 feet above sea level up from a low of 3,477 or 83 feet below the full mark. Now it is 44 feet below.

The reservoir is expected to be full about July 1 compared to last year's June 29.

PROVISION OF HOUSING FOR CERTAIN CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE ARMED FORCES

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3515) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to assist in the provision of housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces, which were, on page 2, line 8, strike out "and" and insert "or"; on page 2, lines 9 and 10, strike out "Armed Forces of the United States or a contractor thereof and is considered by the Armed Forces" and insert "military departments of the United States or a contractor thereof and is considered by such military department", and on page 2, line 19, strike out "and" where it appears the first time and insert "or."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

David T. Lewis, of Utah, to be United States circuit judge, 10th circuit, vice Orie L. Phillips, retired.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Charles E. Whittaker, of Missouri, to be United States circuit judge, eighth circuit, vice John Caskie Collet, deceased.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

One hundred and forty postmasters.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Clarence G. Morse to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board, which nomination had theretofore been passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS — NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles J. Lowen, Jr., to be Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask that the nomination be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

CONTROL OF NARCOTIC DRUGS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3760) to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other related purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and myself, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, lines 13 and 14, it is proposed to strike out "except that the offender shall suffer death if the jury in its discretion shall so direct"; and on page 4, lines 3 and 4, it is proposed to strike out "except that the offender shall suffer death if the jury in its discretion shall so direct."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be very brief in my comments in support of this amendment.

This is an amendment which, in effect, would strike the provisions of the bill imposing capital punishment as one of the penalties for violation of the provisions of the bill.

As I said last Friday, this is a matter of religious faith with me. I do not propose to impose my religious faith on others, but I do wish to reiterate for the RECORD what I said on Friday. This deep spiritual conviction of mine is based upon the premise that human life is not for the Government to dispose of. Human life does not belong to the Government. Human life belongs to God. I shall never, as a United States Senator, sit in this body and vote to take human life as a penalty for the transgression of temporal law. I hold to the view that it is before the bar of God's judgment, and only before that bar, that human life should be taken.

As a Christian I cannot reconcile capital punishment with my faith and Christian principles. This is no new position for the Senator from Oregon. In my professional work as a lawyer and a teacher of the law I have always opposed the principle of capital punishment, because I cannot reconcile it with spiritual values. There is nothing more that one can say. It is for each Member of the Senate to judge, on the basis of his own convictions of conscience, the question of whether or not he can support capital punishment.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement on capital punishment which has been issued by the Friends Society. In my judgment, this statement sets forth very clearly the spiritual conviction which the Senator from Oregon has expressed in this connection.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STATEMENT ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT—WHY WE SHOULD ABOLISH THE DEATH PENALTY

We speak to Friends and our fellow citizens everywhere, under a deep sense of religious and social responsibility, in opposition to the use of capital punishment either by a State or by the National Government.

We believe there is no crime for which the death penalty should be imposed, and that it is as much forbidden to society organized as government to deprive a human creature of life, as it is forbidden the individual to do so.

We hold life, given us by our Father, to be sacred and hence not to be taken from any of us by the judgment of man.

We hold it to be our duty to find methods other than intimidation, cruelty, retribution, or revenge, in coping with wrongdoing and crime.

We aim to prevent crime by removal of its causes. We seek to further also the use of modern methods for rehabilitation of the evildoer in order to bring about his regeneration.

We speak at this time because we are in the midst of unrest and upheaval when the outlook of religion and the influence of the spirit are profoundly needed by mankind.

THE STATUS OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN OUR COUNTRY

We are gravely concerned by the increase in our country today of authorization of capital punishment, which now is applied not only when murder has been committed, but also for robbery, burglary, rape, treason, arson, train-wrecking, kidnaping.

Recent Government reports show that there have been, during the past 25 years, 3,363 persons executed under civil authority. Of these 1,806 were Negro, 1,518 white, and 39 of other races. For murder 2,926 were put to death, for rape 382, for armed robbery 19, for kidnaping 15, for burglary 10, for espionage 8 (6 in 1944 and 2 in 1953), for aggravated assault 3. In 1954 alone, 82 were sent to death, 72 for murder, 9 for rape, and 1 for armed robbery. In 1951 a man and wife were condemned to die as spies, in time of peace.

THE FALLIBILITY OF MAN'S JUDGMENT

As Friends, who hold there is that of God in every man, we believe that even the most degraded can be salvaged by love and faith, wisdom, and compassion. Because execution is irrevocable and human judgment not infallible, innocent men have been put to death. Then, too, so long as we have capital punishment, those among the guilty who are redeemable are destroyed without opportunity accorded them for atonement of their deeds and regeneration of their lives. Many are very young. In 1950, for example, 6 out of every 10 hanged, electrocuted, or gassed to death, were under 35 years of age; in 1949 there were 7 out of every 10 executed who were below that age, 9 being youths less than 20 years old, 1 indeed being only 17, and another 16 years old.

HAVE EXECUTIONS DECREASED CRIME?

Those favoring capital punishment cannot point to any decrease in civil crime under the death penalty throughout the centuries of its use in Great Britain and the United States, the two countries which still remain strongholds of society's extreme penalty for civil offenses.

DOES THE ABOLISHMENT OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT INCREASE CRIME?

In the six States of our country and in the nations of continental Europe, and of South and Central America, most of which have abolished the sentence of death for civil offenses, there is no evidence of increase in such offenses as a result.

MORAL RESPONSIBILITY AND HUMAN MOTIVATION

It is believed by most that murder and other crimes for which death is now exacted are planned, deliberate, inimical acts, for which retribution should be demanded. However, numerous thorough unbiased studies, including the survey a few years ago by the Royal Commission on Capital Punishment in England, reveal that murder is most commonly due to crises arising between men and women and between friends, and that although the professional killer exists, he is exceptional.

As Friends, we stress the moral factor, but we are also concerned with the human situation, since it is the basis of behavior. We know that conduct has roots in personality, and that it is conditioned by psychic elements and environment. These in turn are molding influences upon the individual. New light shed by psychology, psychiatry, and the social sciences, upon motivation and the springs of conduct, provides abundant evidence that intimidation and menace of death have small effect on people who are feebleminded, psychotic, or suffering mentality and personality deviations and difficulties. Such people, however, constitute a large proportion of the men and women committing the most serious offenses, and they are very frequently among the criminals put to death.

WHAT IS OUR SUBSTITUTE FOR CAPITAL PUNISHMENT?

In six States of our country—Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, Wisconsin, Rhode Island and Maine—life imprisonment long has replaced executions. The decision as to life imprisonment or death has been placed, by 41 of our States, in the hands of trial juries. Although we gravely doubt that a decision so momentous should be entrusted

to the judgment of any group of untrained laymen, we may be grateful that in most of our country's courts there has already been made provision which does away with a mandatory death penalty. In Vermont and in the District of Columbia alone is there still no alternative to the death sentence permitted.

A recent official study shows that the total nationwide prison population of our country is nearly 100,000 inmates. Of these, approximately 7,000, or 1 in every 14, are "lifers." These men are cared for with the rest of the prisoners in institutions.

If capital punishment were to be abolished completely tomorrow, the country's prisons could easily take care of all who would be committed for what now are capital offenses.

NEW CONCEPTS OF PRISON TREATMENT

Our whole conception of prison and imprisonment is undergoing a profound and sweeping change. Emphasis today is on rehabilitation of the individual, and the protection of society.

As has been made clear, by riots in Michigan, New Jersey, and elsewhere, we still have prisons so huge that administrators must rely on mass treatment. Some of the buildings indeed are so ancient that they are unfit for human habitation. There are too many political and untrained employees. But, throughout the land, there exist institutions under charge of the States or of the Federal Government, which possess facilities to provide humane and scientific care for both short-term and long-term inmates, through employment of such media as education, work in prison, special training, exercise, recreation, medical equipment, psychiatric and psychological services, as well as the most modern forms of group therapy and social casework.

The aim is readjustment of a prisoner to life and rebuilding of character, whether it means spending his years to the end in prison without release, or freedom to go forth and begin anew in the community.

OUR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR PUNISHMENT AND FOR THE OFFENDER

Capital punishment and a program rooted in revenge debases each one of us. We are all involved personally. Though we would flinch in horror from ourselves performing the task of an executioner, he is hired to act for us who as citizens comprise the state, which employs him.

Sensational publicity concerning executions enters our homes, by way of press and radio and other media. It is brought thereby to our very children.

We believe we must accept responsibility for the offender whose crimes we punish. We all help to create the kind of civilization in which an individual can and has become a criminal.

The whole system of criminal justice must therefore be changed from its foundations, so that revenge and destruction of the wrongdoer no longer will be the goal and symbol.

WHAT DO WE ASK FRIENDS AND OUR FELLOW CITIZENS TO DO?

1. Support abolition of the death penalty in our own community and State.

2. Provide for an adequate prison system suitable for care of offenders of all types and for their reeducation and rehabilitation.

3. Support a parole system utterly free of politics, protective of society, with concern for the remaking of the individual.

4. Develop crime-prevention services in the community in which we live.

5. Provide training schools for erring youth, with programs of education and character building.

6. Support scientific study and treatment of those whose personalities may lead them into wrongdoing.

7. Encourage institutions of progressive kind, where mass treatment is not given, where the worth of the individual is regarded, and the light within every man is recognized.

8. Support probation whenever possible as a substitute for imprisonment.

9. Give ourselves personally, by visiting the prisons and befriending individual men and women in them.

10. Support State and local efforts concerned with removal of the causes of crime through improved housing, education, employment, for all conditions and manner of men.

Social Service Committee, Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, Religious Society of Friends, Committee on Friends and Penology, Philadelphia, Pa.: Leon Thomas Stern, Chairman; Mabel H. Ambler; Ray Arvio; G. Richard Bacon; Doris K. Baker; Winifred Chambers; Mona E. Darnell; Wendell East; Ruth Edwards; Anna Cope Evans; Edith M. Harper; Thomas B. Harvey; Sara Houghton; Dorothy B. James; Ernest Kurkjian; Richmond P. Miller; Elmer Pickett; Marian Rannels; Dorothy W. Scheer; Elton R. Smith; Mary R. Taylor; Charles Walker; Kale Williams; Roselynd A. Wood.

Mr. MORSE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a number of letters and telegrams which I have received in support of my opposition to capital punishment.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *May 29, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Grateful for your opposition to S. 3760. Death penalty has not proved deterrent to other crimes. Bill offers false solution to complex problem which demands our best thinking.

FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATION OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA,
TREVOR THOMAS.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *May 30, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I strongly oppose wiretap evidence and death-penalty portions of S. 3760. Much as I approve of antinarcotic legislation, this would just be an entering wedge for all sorts of wiretap laws. Death penalty just closes cases conveniently; that may not really be closed correctly.

Mrs. GEORGE A. SLATER.

BALTIMORE, MD., *May 28, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It was with deep sympathy and real admiration that I read in the RECORD the speech you made last Friday on the Senate floor relevant to S. 3760.

The protest against the capital-punishment section in the bill was one that needed saying. I hope that you will use all your eloquence and strength in the days ahead to fight this most un-Christian procedure.

Certainly the remarks regarding our dwindling liberties in connection with the wiretapping provisions in the narcotics-control bill were well taken.

Georges Bernanos, in his book Tradition of Freedom says, "The horrors which we have seen, the still greater horrors we shall presently see, are not signs that rebels, insubordinate, untamable men, are increasing in number throughout the world, but rather that there is a constant increase, a stupendously rapid increase, in the number of obedient, docile men." It is good to know that there are some Senators who are not obedient and docile.

I sincerely hope that the people of Oregon will act in their interest as well as ours as a country and return you to the Senate this fall.

With best wishes,
DOROTHY G. ATKINS
Mrs. JOSEPH K. ATKINS.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *May 31, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Support your opposition to bill 3760 permitting wiretap death penalty in narcotic control.

MARGARET VONSELLE.

NEWTON, MASS., *May 30, 1956.*

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Massachusetts branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom is always concerned to halt traffic in narcotics but continues to oppose the wiretap death provisions of S. 3760. We appreciate your stand of May 25 and hope for an effective measure without these provisions which you can support.

MARIE J. LYONS,
President.

BROOKLINE, MASS., *May 31, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate your effort to defeat S. 3760 permitting death penalty for illegal dealing in heroin. All reliable evidence proves that providing death as a penalty accomplishes nothing and may make conviction more difficult. Deplore congressional act in extending application of death penalty when the trend is to abolish capital punishment in the civilized world.

Mrs. HERBERT B. EHRMANN,
Director, American League To Abolish Capital Punishment, Massachusetts Council for the Abolition of the Death Penalty.

RELIGIOUS SOCIETY OF FRIENDS,
COMMITTEE ON FRIENDS AND PENOLOGY,
Philadelphia, Pa., May 29, 1956.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

I was much heartened to hear that you are opposing the death penalty for narcotic offenders. It is a step in the right direction to oppose the trend toward more executions for serious crimes. I hope sincerely that the Congress will not take this unfortunate step. Most dope peddlers and pushers are themselves addicts. Addiction is on the whole a mental illness, while the narcotics business is a matter of trade and supply at the source in Asia and Eastern Europe.

You will recall that you and I met at a Quaker forum meeting which you addressed in Philadelphia, and at that time we discussed the possibility of having the Federal Congress take up the question of the abolition of the death penalty on the national level. I hope this might be an opportune moment for you to launch that idea. The proposed extension of the death penalty to mental cases is a penological extravaganza and shows how wide of the mark we are in our penal laws.

I still look back with pleasure to our temporary association 20 years ago on the Federal Survey of Probation and Parole under the United States Attorney General.

Sincerely yours,
LEON F. STEEM.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly in support of the

amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], of which I am very proud indeed to be a cosponsor.

I speak largely upon the basis of the experience which I have had with regard to capital punishment. The laws of the State of New York, of which I had the honor of being Governor for 10 years, provide for capital punishment following conviction of murder in the first degree.

Since we have no pardon board in New York the final responsibility of decision regarding the carrying out of the sentence rests wholly upon the Governor. In the case of every person sentenced to death the Governor must hold a hearing. During the 10 years I was Governor of New York there were in the State 300 convictions for murder in the first degree, calling for the death penalty. I went over the records very carefully. I personally heard every case. The duty of decision which was placed upon me was one of the most difficult, one of the most moving, and one of the most trying of all the duties which devolve upon the chief executive of the State.

Under the regulations in force in the State of New York a man condemned to suffer capital punishment goes to his death at 11 o'clock on a Thursday night. I can assure my colleagues that even though I might have been convinced beyond any question of the guilt of a particular individual, when the hour approached I realized very painfully that a man's life depended upon whether I would or would not sign my name to a commutation of sentence. It was a tremendously moving circumstance and it involved a great emotional strain.

I granted commutations whenever I felt there was the slightest doubt of guilt or compelling mitigating circumstances. In many cases, however, under the law I felt it my duty to let the man go to the death chamber. As a result of the 300 cases which came before me, I reached the conclusion that there was no proof whatsoever that the death penalty served as a deterrent to crime.

I think that is the experience in all the other States of the Union, both in States where the death penalty has been done away with and in States where it still obtains. In New York I found absolutely no proof that the death penalty was a deterrent. Under those circumstances, I believe it is wrong to place in the hands of one man, or even of a board, the responsibility and the power to decide as between life or death. As I have said, my experience was not haphazard or trifling but covered 300 cases.

I am very glad indeed to support the amendment, and I hope it will be agreed to.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject this amendment. The bill does not provide a mandatory death penalty. It simply provides the death penalty as the maximum, if the jury should see fit to apply it, following conviction of a third offense of smuggling or selling heroin; and also for the sale of heroin by anyone to a person under 18 years of age.

Our committee knows that juries will not recommend the death penalty except in very aggravated cases. We think it would be a deterrent, as it has been found to be in the case of the kidnaping law. We believe that it would dry up sales to minors if, as a maximum penalty, juries were allowed to impose the death penalty, in their discretion.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the legislature of the people of North Dakota some years ago abolished the death penalty. I feel I would not be representing my State if I voted for the death penalty.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that we are dealing with one of the most evil traffics in the whole world. We are dealing with the purveyors of the means of destruction of the souls and bodies of little children, as well as adults. We are dealing with the activities of men who, though not themselves addicts, are willing to hide behind the curtains of anonymity and promote the sale of death-dealing narcotic drugs among defenseless victims.

The circumstances described by the Senator from Texas under which the death penalty would be authorized by the bill are such that in my judgment they would not raise the slightest emotion of pity in the heart of any executive in connection with an application for commutation. When, after three convictions by jury trial, it has been revealed in court that a defendant has been the source of the sale of narcotics and of distributing narcotics among the people there is no doubt in my mind that the death penalty ought to be invoked, and, certainly, the death penalty will serve as a deterrent.

By voting for the committee's recommendations, we are voting for the rising generation in America. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make one comment on the remarks of my good friend from Wyoming. Those of us who are opposing the capital punishment feature of the bill deplore the drug traffic and are as much opposed to it as any other Senator can be. We are for the imposition of tough penalties. As I said last Friday, I am in favor of a provision which will put those guilty of traffic in drugs in prison subject to no parole, and for the rest of their lives.

I do not believe, however, that the Government of the United States should set itself up as a judge to decide whether a human being shall live or die. With regard to that matter I raise again the moral issue to which I have previously given voice. I am in favor of a law which will make clear that those found guilty shall never be paroled; that a sentence of life imprisonment will mean life imprisonment; that the guilty parties shall be put away in prison for the rest of their lives.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for himself and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] I offer an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out from line 18, page 7, down to and including line 13, page 10, constituting section 1407 and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 1407. Use of communications facilities—penalties:

(a) Each use of any telephone, mail or any other public or private communication facility in the commission or in causing or facilitating the commission, or in attempting to commit any act or acts constituting a violation of or a conspiracy to violate sections 1402 or 1403 hereof, or section 2 of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, or any provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the penalty for which is provided in section 7237 (a) of such code, as amended, shall be considered a separate offense punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 and imprisonment for not less than 2 nor more than 5 years.

(b) As used in this section, the term "Communication facility" means any and all instrumentalities used or useful in the transmission of writings, signs, signals, pictures, and sounds of all kinds by wire or radio or other like communication between points of origin and reception of such transmission.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall discuss the amendment very briefly, because it speaks for itself. I wish to say that the Senator from Texas and I have conferred at some length regarding this matter. We have reached an agreement on the amendment I have offered. It is a substitute for the wiretapping provision of section 1407 in the bill. I have already spoken at some length on this subject.

In essence, my position is that the Congress should not establish the precedent of Federal authorization of wiretapping, or the use of evidence obtained thereby, in any Federal court, for the reason that, in my judgment, it is a threat to the very roots of personal freedom in America; that it goes to the question of whether we will protect the privacy of the individual and the privacy of the home; and that, as has been brought out many times in the past, wiretapping cannot be a selective process. The tapping of a telephone wire is not a search-and-seizure warrant, in which specifics are involved. A person who taps a telephone wire, taps everything. He hears all. There can be no selection. He invades the intimacy and the privacy of the individual.

The argument advanced against my position is the same as that which was advanced in the Virginia convention at the time the Constitution was before it for ratification. It is the argument of necessity. Even in that convention it was contended that it was necessary to have such a provision in the Constitution. It was argued that general search and seizure was necessary in connection with treason. Let us not forget, Mr. President, that at that time there was great concern in this country about treason and subversion, and that many people who had fought in the Revolution were charged with being guilty of treason or subversion.

At that time an argument was made which in my humble opinion has not been answered to this day. In that great convention Patrick Henry pointed out what I consider to be the unanswerable argument in this fight. He pointed out the fallacy of the argument of necessity. He pointed out that in a free nation, it is better to have a few guilty men escape punishment than to cause even one innocent citizen to lose his liberty and freedom of a citizen by enacting a provision which destroys or strikes at privacy, as would be done under a so-called general search and seizure provision.

What was true then of general search and seizure is equally true in 1956 with respect to tapping the telephone wires of free men and women.

Because I am so unalterably opposed to any further encroachment upon personal liberty, I stand again on the floor of the Senate and make this fight on behalf of the personal freedom of men and women. I do not accept the argument that adequate checks have been provided in the bill. There can be no adequate check. There can be no adequate check so long as anyone in or out of the Government is given the authority to tap wires and thus intrude on the privacy of free men and women. That is exactly what would be done by the wiretap provision in the bill.

Nor do I accept the argument that it is perfectly safe to rely upon judges to provide the necessary check. We lawyers know that in the administration of criminal law, as should be the case and as it is intended to be the case, there is teamwork between a judge and a prosecutor. For example, a prosecutor will go to a judge and say, "Your Honor, we are hot on a trail, and we would like to have an order signed by you permitting us to tap the telephone wire of a certain person who is involved in this hot trail."

If anyone believes that in the administration of criminal law a judge will conduct any thorough investigation into the subject before he grants such an order, he is not aware of how our criminal law is administered.

What will happen, Mr. President, under such circumstances? The procedure will become pro forma. It will become routine. Therefore the requirement that a judge must sign such an order constitutes no check. The fact remains that the police officers will become aware of what takes place in the private homes and in business establishments of America, and they will learn all the intimacies which go on over the telephone between free men and women.

Wiretapping is a great evil and abuse. It is a much greater evil than many of us are willing to admit. It is a fact that in the administration of criminal law, we have what is known as a police complex, a prosecutor complex, a desire to ring up a great record of prosecutions and convictions and a tendency, Mr. President, by the use of wiretapping evidence, to call an individual on the carpet and say, "You may as well come clean, because we have tapes on you that involve conversations with Mrs. So and So or Miss So and So." Thus, wiretapping becomes a form of legal blackmail, by means of which what I consider to be illicit confessions may be obtained from many persons.

It all serves to indicate plainly that what we need to do is to stand firmly in opposition to any attempt to lessen or weaken the individual liberties of the American people because of any desire on the part of anyone, in the interest of prosecution of a few guilty persons, to tap their telephone wires.

I submit, Mr. President, that my amendment is what I consider to be a reasonable compromise with the provision in the bill, but in the interest of legislative history let it be understood that I am submitting my amendment with the understanding, the intent, and the purpose that the amendment will not countenance in any way the tapping of wires to get evidence for prosecution, but when in the prosecution of a case evidence is brought forward which shows that someone used the facilities of communication, radio, writing, or any other facility, in order to violate the law dealing with the drug traffic, the evidence so arrived at, and not through any wiretapping means, can be the basis of prosecution and for finding a man guilty of a crime committed. That is the effect of my substitute amendment. It is a tough one, providing, as it does, a heavy fine and imprisonment of from 2 to 5 years.

It negates any intimation that I am soft on the drug traffic. I am tough on it, and I am also tough with reference to efforts to endanger the liberties of the people.

Mr. LEHMAN subsequently said: Mr. President, I had prepared a statement in opposition to the provision of S. 3760 which authorized wiretapping. I am a cosponsor with the senior Senator from Oregon of an amendment deleting the wiretapping provision from the bill. I understand that the amendment will be agreed to. Under these circumstances I ask unanimous consent that the text of that statement be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

I am deeply concerned with the growing evil of the narcotics traffic. The peddling of drugs is one of the most evil things within our knowledge. I abhor the crime and detest with all my heart those evil characters who seek to benefit from the peddling or selling drugs. I yield to no one in my desire to suppress crime and lawlessness. I believe that I can claim to have done as much as anyone, through administration and legislation in my capacities as chief executive of a State and as a Senator, to maintain law and order and to strengthen the hands of law enforcement officials. The question of wiretapping, however, goes far beyond that of the arrest and conviction of criminals. Criminals can be arrested and convicted by means now employed by the Federal jurisdiction and by the States.

I am strongly opposed to section 1407 of S. 3760, which would authorize Federal law enforcement officials to eavesdrop on telephone conversations. I have in the past opposed all attempts to place in the hands of law enforcement officials a weapon so potentially dangerous as this one. The sanctity of an individual's home and private conversations are not lightly to be tossed aside because it might be a substitute for good police work in the apprehension of lawbreakers.

What justification is given for this provision? Why is it necessary? According to the subcommittee's report, "The telephone is the major means of contact between top narcotic traffickers" and because Federal law enforcement officers are not permitted to tap telephone wires "big time traffickers are seldom caught and convicted, because they otherwise avoid all direct contact with the peddlers and ultimate buyers."

That is an argument which can be made with respect to most Federal crimes. I should imagine that robbers quite frequently make some of their preliminary arrangements for pursuing their nefarious activities by using the telephone.

I should likewise imagine that embezzlers, counterfeiters, and those engaged in commercialized vice also make frequent use of the telephone to further their illegal pursuits. If we now sanction wiretapping as provided for in this bill, where will this end? Today we are being asked to legalize wiretapping to apprehend violators of our narcotics laws. The same arguments, with the same lack of substantive reasoning, will be used tomorrow to ask for the legalization of wiretapping to apprehend embezzlers or counterfeiters.

Thus, little by little, slowly but surely, crime by crime, we will be asked to legalize wiretapping until ultimately it will extend to all Federal crimes.

And it is not possible to confine the applications of the provisions of this bill to specific instances. When wires are tapped, all conversations are heard—both of those between the guilty and those between the innocent. Such procedure is an invasion of individual privacy of the citizen, for which I cannot vote.

I consider wiretapping, in general, to be what a Supreme Court Justice once called nasty business. It may be that there are some conditions under which wiretapping can be justified. I also suppose that it must be used under certain conditions in police work. But I certainly do not favor legalizing or sanctioning its use unless there is clearly shown to be a pressing, all-pervading necessity for such an invasion of individual privacy. And even then I would insist that its use be strictly circumscribed by the most carefully controlled and regulated conditions.

And with respect to the measure which we are today being asked to approve in S. 3760, I find that none of these conditions appears to have been met.

What must a law-enforcement officer show, under the terms of this bill, before he is granted permission to tap your telephone, or my telephone, for 90 days? Only "reasonable belief that the telephonic interception is necessary to obtain evidence relating to the violation." Note, that the only safeguard is a "reasonable belief" that the wiretap is "necessary." And the applicant for permission to tap a telephone wire needs only to satisfy the court that "reasonable grounds" exist.

Let us compare these provisions with the safeguards erected around applications for warrants to conduct searches and seizures. The application for such warrant must show either cause or probable cause. There we have not been satisfied merely with a "reasonable belief" that a search and seizure is "necessary."

The provisions in section 1407 circumscribing the issuance of permission to tap an individual's telephone are not, in my opinion, sufficient to safeguard the rights of decent, honest private citizens to conduct their day-to-day affairs without the constant fear that some law-enforcement officer may be listening to matters that are of no concern to anyone except the individuals themselves.

One of the most vicious weapons that dictatorship invokes against individual rights

of its citizens is that of espionage, wire tapping and search and seizure. It has been the vehicle of great oppression and persecution. It has caused people to be afraid of discussing even their most intimate personal problems.

I hope the day will never come when a citizen of this country, with nothing to hide, will pick up his telephone with fear and trepidation because a police officer had the right to tap his telephone merely because that public officer had a reasonable belief that such action might possibly uncover evidence of a crime.

The threat to our liberties lies, in my opinion, not so much on sudden or revolutionary change. Its greatest danger comes through ignorance, through lethargy and through the failure of the people to defend their fundamental rights against gradual and oftentimes cleverly disguised encroachment.

In all despotic states the first steps toward the abridgement of liberties have come through the curtailment or the denial of rights of some of their citizens under the alleged sanction of the majority. A denial of the rights of any of our citizens would lead us inevitably to the plight of despotic countries abroad.

If we are to maintain our liberties we must uncompromisingly oppose any principle either of majority or minority inspiration which would in the slightest degree weaken the principles of liberty upon which this Nation has been founded.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself fully and completely with everything the Senator from Oregon has said.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator from North Dakota care to be a cosponsor of my amendment?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] may be permitted to be a cosponsor of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER. There has been a long, and continuous fight with reference to trying to make wire tapping legal, and I am very glad that we have the Senator from Oregon to stand and fight against it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Oregon for his consistent position regarding wire tapping and for his successs in getting the wiretapping provision eliminated from the pending bill.

I also wish to congratulate the Senator from Texas, who has done such good work in connection with the general problem of narcotics, for being willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. President, along with many other Americans I have been greatly disturbed by the fact that wiretapping is being widely practiced. Occurrences in New York City last year indicated that wiretapping was quite common and that there was an obvious effort to cover up and conceal the disclosure of the wide extent of this wiretapping. There were good grounds for belief that wire tapping was widely practiced in that city, not only by public authority, but by private citizens.

When the Senator from Oregon was discussing the question about 2 years ago I mentioned the fact that acquaintances of mine, lawyers, who upon occasion defend persons accused of criminal offenses in connection with tax matters in the Illinois Federal courts, told me they were confident that prior to trial their wires were being tapped by the Department of Justice, so that the Department would know the details of the cases they were presenting. I checked with a responsible judge in the Federal court in Chicago. While the whole matter is confidential, and I shall not disclose any names, because that would be improper, nevertheless I can vouch for what has been told me. The judge stated that he had found that some questions of the prosecution would throw the defense into utter consternation. The prosecution was asking questions which presumably had been touched upon only by the defense attorney and his client. I think there is a great deal of evidence to that effect. The privacy of communication between lawyer and client was therefore being violated and the prosecution given an unfair advantage.

I could not testify in a court of law that I know this of my direct knowledge, but I am confident that wiretapping is carried on in many cities of our country, that there are central agencies which tap the wires of persons not yet accused of crime, and I wish to point out that while this evidence cannot be legally produced in court, nevertheless it is used as an instrument to extract or extort confessions.

I may also point out it gives police officers the power of blackmail, because the information which they obtain, taped or recorded, becomes known to them, and sometimes they leave the Government service and establish private detective or shadowing agencies, and, therefore, of necessity they have knowledge of intimate and private affairs which they have accumulated during their service in the Government, and a wide opportunity for blackmail is thus opened up.

I quite agree with the Senator from Oregon that if we permit this practice to continue we may have something which will develop into a police state.

I wish to congratulate the Senator from Oregon for the position he has taken. He has rendered a great public service.

I also wish to congratulate the Senator from Texas, not only for his good general work on the bill, but also for being willing to accept this amendment. I hope we have rolled back this tendency to undermine the historic liberties of our citizens.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Illinois, and I also wish to join in his comments regarding the Senator from Texas. He has been a wonderful associate to work with in trying to reach an understanding on the provisions of the bill.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, in accepting this substitute I wish to make it clear that the members of the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee who are the authors of the bill do not intend to give up our fight for the right to wiretap in limited instances in which a United States attorney can go before a Federal judge and show reasonable cause for believing that narcotic sellers are using the telephone in order to carry on their business.

I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Illinois. I have discussed the subject with the Senator from Illinois and with several other Senators, and they are willing to handle the wiretapping provision in this way in order not to endanger the passage of some 20 other salutary provisions in the bill or to delay its passage.

I am willing to accept the substitute, which provides a very heavy penalty to be imposed on anyone who uses the telephone, mail, or any other private communication facility in the commission or in the attempt to commit one of the crimes described in the bill.

I agree with the Senator from Oregon that he has offered a substitute which is very stringent. It provides heavy penalties. It is the only alternative I can think of which would be helpful in attacking the dope traffic, if the bill does not contain a wiretapping provision. It may be possible, under this substitute, for narcotic agents and other Federal officials to reach some of the dope traffickers who are using telephones to conduct their illicit operations.

As I have said, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee will introduce promptly a separate bill concerning the wiretapping feature, but with all the safeguards anyone can think of to keep officers from wiretapping except to get information for the purpose of showing that the drug traffic is being carried on over the wires or by the use of any other communication facilities.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am very desirous of seeing the penalty provisions of my substitute amendment tried, because I have studied very carefully the wonderful record which the subcommittee made in conducting the hearings on the drug traffic.

As I said last Friday, and as I repeat today, the junior Senator from Texas is deserving of the thanks of every American for the excellent work which his subcommittee did. In my judgment the subcommittee brought out evidence which shows that if my substitute amendment should be adopted, the Government could reach the very persons who are using the communication facilities for the illicit traffic. So I should like to see some prosecutions tried under my amendment, rather than to resort to the wiretapping approach.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I hope he is correct as to what will be possible under the provisions of his amendment. To say the least, it is a good, new provision for us to write into the laws of our country in an attempt to attack the narcotic menace.

I want the Senate to understand the circumstances under which I have accepted the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon. I wish to make it amply clear that in the future the sub-

committee will continue to press, in other legislation, or by separate bills, for a wire interception provision under order of a Federal court, such wire interception methods to be used only in narcotic cases.

I wish to make a few comments before the bill comes to a final vote. Even with the adoption of the Morse amendment, the Senate will have passed today the strongest bill against the narcotics traffic which has ever been passed by a legislative body in our country. The death penalty provisions approved a moment ago should be a great deterrent, especially in the sale of narcotics to juveniles.

There are also some 20 other provisions which will strengthen the hands of law-enforcement officers in their effort to eradicate a cancer in our society which has afflicted 60,000 addicts, 13 percent of whom are under 21 years of age.

I hope the Senate will pass the bill promptly. I understand that in the House, action is proceeding upon a bill introduced by Representative HALE BOGGS, which contains many of the provisions of the Senate bill. I hope we will have the final passage of the bill today, because I believe it will do much to reduce the narcotics traffic and the terrible human destruction which that traffic is causing in our country.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I feel that with the passage of the bill today the Senate will have accomplished something for which many of us have been fighting over a long period of time. During the 15 years I have been a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, we have been confronted with the terrible problem of the traffic in narcotics. We have tried to get certain bills passed, but the House did not agree with them. So about a year ago I myself introduced a bill, S. 2307, which dealt with this very problem. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2307) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That part 1 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after chapter 67 the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 68—NARCOTICS

"Sec.
"1401. Criminal penalties.
"1402. Narcotic tax violations.

"SEC. 1401. Criminal penalties

"(a) Whoever fraudulently or knowingly imports or brings any narcotic drug (as defined in section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) into the United States or any territory under its control or jurisdiction, contrary to law, or receives, conceals, buys, sells, or in any manner facilitates the transportation, concealment, or sale of any such narcotic drug after being imported or brought in, knowing the same to have been imported contrary to law, or conspires to commit any of such acts in violation of the law of the United States, shall be fined not more than $10,000 and imprisoned not less than 5 or more than 10 years. For a second offense, the offender shall be fined not more than $20,000 and imprisoned not less than 10 or more than 20 years. For a third or subsequent offense, the offender shall be imprisoned for life.

"(b) Whoever sells, transfers, orders, exchanges, or gives away, or facilitates the sale, transfer, barter, exchange, or giving away, (1) of any narcotic drug as defined in section 1 of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 21, sec. 171), in violation of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 21, secs. 171–185), or of sections 4701–4776, 6001, 6065, or 7237 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, or (2) of marihuana as defined in section 4761 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in violation of sections 4741–4776 of such Code, to any person who has not attained the age of 21 years, shall, notwithstanding any other penalties provided by law, be fined not more than $10,000 and imprisoned for 20 years. For a second offense, notwithstanding any other penalties provided by law, the offender shall be fined not more than $20,000 and imprisoned for 40 years and for a third or subsequent offense, the offender shall be imprisoned for life.

"(c) Upon conviction for a second or subsequent offense pursuant to the provisions of this section, the imposition or execution of sentence shall not be suspended and probation shall not be granted. For the purpose of this section, an offender shall be considered a second or subsequent offender, as the case may be, if he previously has been convicted of any offense the penalty for which is provided in this section, in section 7237 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, or in section 2 (c) of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, or if he previously has been convicted of any offense the penalty for which was provided in section 9, chapter 1, of the Act of December 17, 1914 (38 Stat. 789), as amended; section 1, chapter 202, of the Act of May 26, 1922 (42 Stat. 596), as amended; section 12, chapter 553, of the Act of August 2, 1937 (50 Stat. 556), as amended; or section 2557 (b) (1) or 2596 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939. After conviction, but prior to pronouncement of sentence, the court shall be advised by the United States attorney whether the conviction is the offender's first or a subsequent offense. If it is not a first offense, the United States attorney shall file an information setting forth the prior convictions. The offender shall have the opportunity in open court to affirm or deny that he is identical with the person previously convicted. If he denies the identity, sentence shall be postponed for such time as to permit a trial before a jury on the sole issue of the offender's identity with the person previously convicted. If the offener is found by the jury to be the person previously convicted, or if he acknowledges that he is such person, he shall be sentenced as prescribed in this section.

"(d) Whenever on trial for a violation of subsection (a) of this section the defendant is shown to have or to have had possession of the narcotic drug, such possession shall be deemed sufficient evidence to authorize conviction unless the defendant explains the possession to the satisfaction of the jury.

"SEC. 1402. Narcotic tax violations

"Whoever commits an offense or conspires to commit an offense described in subchapter A of chapter 39, entitled 'Narcotic Drugs and Marihuana' of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, for which no specific penalty is otherwise provided, shall be fined not more than $3,000 and imprisoned not less than 5 nor more than 10 years. For a second offense, the offender shall be fined not more than $5,000 and imprisoned not less than 10 or more than 20 years. For a third or subsequent offense, the offender shall be imprisoned for life. Upon conviction for a second or subsequent offense, the imposition or execution of sentence shall not be suspended and probation shall not be granted. For the purpose of this section, an offender shall be considered a second or subsequent offender, as the case may be, if he previously has been convicted of any offense the penalty for which is provided in this section, or in section 7237 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, or in section 2 (c) of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 21, sec. 174), or if he previously has been convicted of any offense the penalty for which was provided in section 9, chapter 1, of the Act of December 17, 1914 (38 Stat. 789), as amended; section 1, chapter 202, of the Act of May 26, 1922 (42 Stat. 596), as amended; section 12, chapter 553, of the Act of August 2, 1937 (50 Stat. 556), as amended; or section 2557 (b) (1) or 2596 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, as amended. After conviction, but prior to pronouncement of sentence, the court shall be advised by the United States attorney whether the conviction is the offender's first or a subsequent offense. If it is not a first offense, the United States attorney shall file an information setting forth the prior convictions. The offender shall have the opportunity in open court to affirm or deny that he is identical with the person previously convicted. If he denies the identity, sentence shall be postponed for such time as to permit a trial before a jury on the sole issue of the offender's identity with the person previously convicted. If the offender is found by the jury to be the person previously convicted, or if he acknowledges that he is such person, he shall be sentenced as prescribed in this paragraph."

SEC. 2. The analysis of part 1 of title 18 of the United States Code, immediately preceding chapter 1 of such title, is amended by adding

"68. Narcotics."

after

"67. Military and Navy.".

SEC. 3. Section 2 (c) of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 21, sec. 174), and section 7237 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, are hereby repealed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, during the time I was chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the committee repeatedly tried to have passed the type of legislation which the junior Senator from Texas has presented to the Senate. When my term as chairman expired, the junior Senator from Texas may remember that I made a motion that there be a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary be appointed to deal with the terrible problem of narcotics which has confronted the country throughout the years. Later the late distinguished Senator from West Virginia, Mr. Kilgore, then chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, appointed the junior Senator from Texas as chairman of the subcommittee.

Early this year the question of funds to finance the investigation arose. At that time the Senator from Texas, as he may remember, asked for only $35,000. In the committee I offered a substitute motion to make the amount $50,000, because I felt the subcommittee should have at least that much. However, the Senator from Texas said he could get along with $35,000.

I say to the Senate that the junior Senator from Texas has done magnificent work. He has performed outstanding service. Every citizen of the country owes him a deep debt of gratitude. I cannot resist telling him again how much I appreciate the important work he has done for the people of the United States.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. I have served only as chairman of the subcommittee. But the subcommittee has other diligent members, including the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who is now on the floor; the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

The subcommittee has a very capable staff, headed by Mr. C. Aubrey Gasque, chief counsel, and Mr. Lee Spear, the investigator, who was loaned to us by the Bureau of Narcotics. So the credit should go, of course, to them and to the members of the full Committee on the Judiciary, who have been so helpful to the subcommittee.

The senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who was previously chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, has always been most helpful in the preparation of bills and the conducting of investigations concerning the narcotics traffic. It is true that he suggested in the committee that a nationwide investigation of the narcotics traffic be conducted. The senior Senator from North Dakota also sought constantly to have the subcommittee ask for more money, because he felt there should not be any limitation on the funds to conduct the investigation into the narcotics traffic and to bring before the Senate the evidence necessary on which to base and pass adequate legislation. Certainly the Senator from North Dakota has been one of the most earnest and conscientious supporters of the investigation and of the bill, and I thank him publicly for all the assistance he has given to us.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas. I may add that I was a sponsor of the Payne bill. I wonder if the Senator from Texas would permit me to be a sponsor of the bill now before the Senate.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] be added as a sponsor of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am very happy indeed to be a sponsor of the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. But I also wish to say I feel the Senate owes a debt of gratitude to the junior Senator from Texas and his committee for having supported a bill designed to control the traffic in narcotics, and for having accepted the amendment which is now pending.

I still have some reservations, as the Senator knows, with regard to the death-penalty provision. But with that exception, when the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon shall have been adopted, I believe the bill will be a good one, because it embodies very many valuable provisions. I will be glad to support the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas is very gracious in extending compliments to the members of the subcommittee. But I feel certain that all Senators know a subcommittee cannot rise above the level of the chairman of the subcommittee. If the chairman of the subcommittee is not diligent, able, and understanding, the work of the subcommittee is bound to be bogged down.

The subcommittee which has conducted the investigation into the traffic in narcotics has been most fortunate in having as its chairman a man who possesses the qualities of understanding, diligence, and leadership, which have made it possible to report the bill which I think is about to pass.

I think we should not fail to note, also, that the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] was himself the author of a bill directed at this nefarious traffic, and that he cooperated most effectively with the subcommittee in bringing about the proposed legislation which the committee has now recommended to the Senate.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Wyoming. Again I express my appreciation to him and to the other members of the subcommittee for their diligent efforts in the work confronting us.

I also join with him in an expression of appreciation to the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] for the assistance which he has given all the way through our work, and for joining as a coauthor of the bill.

Mr. President, I cannot emphasize too strongly how important I think the action of the Senate a moment ago was in not striking from the bill the death penalty provision.

I desire to say a word or two more before yielding the floor. Reports from all over the country are to the effect that traffickers in narcotics are being overheard, not by wiretap, but by other means, through undercover agencies, as saying that if the United States Senate passes the death penalty provision of the bill, they are going to have to get out of the heroin business.

Mr. President, that is a good sign. The passage of the pending bill will do more than has ever been done by a legislative body to dry up the narcotics traffic, especially traffic in heroin, the most miserable and dangerous of all narcotic drugs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point some 40 additional editorials and news articles from newspapers all over the country, in support of the proposed legislation.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Austin American of May 29, 1956]

TOUGH NARCOTIC BILLS ADVANCE IN CONGRESS

Congress is being urged to adopt anti-narcotics measures even more stringent than laws against subversion and espionage.

Senator PRICE DANIEL'S bill unanimously approved by the Senate judiciary committee would provide death sentences for some narcotics offenders and outlaw all use of heroin. It would permit injuries to impose the death penalty on persons convicted of selling heroin to juveniles and on three-times offenders in heroin smuggling and peddling. It would require sale of all heroin legally held by doctors to the Government.

Legislation equally drastic is coming up in the House. A Ways and Means Subcommittee unanimously agreed to recommend:

Increasing both minimum mandatory sentences and maximum permissible sentences for traffickers in narcotics and marihuana;

More severe penalties for adult traffickers selling to minors;

An increase in maximum permissible sentences in all cases;

Removal of suspension of sentence and probation for traffickers;

Granting of immunity from prosecution to witnesses; permitting the use of wiretapping information in narcotics and marihuana cases; and

Increasing Federal control of barbiturates amphetamines.

Bills to implement this agreement have been pouring into the hopper. Some apply directly to narcotics and marihuana; the others to barbiturates and amphetamines.

For contrast, only the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 applies the death penalty to peacetime espionage. However, Congress in 1953 extended the drastic wartime espionage-sabotage penalties, including the death penalty, for the duration of the Korean emergency and 6 months thereafter.

An immunity law adopted by Congress in 1954 limits such grants to witnesses whose testimony may be needed in cases affecting the national security. Even so, congressional committees or United States attorneys must petition Federal courts for the right to grant immunity from prosecution.

The House in 1954 voted to authorize wiretapping in national security cases, as requested by Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr. But it tacked on an amendment prohibiting wiretapping unless authorized by a Federal court, and that provision made the legislation unacceptable to the Justice Department.

The Senate Crime Investigating Committee headed by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER in 1951 urged immunity grants to key witnesses in Federal cases, also penalties of 20 years to life, without probation, for adults peddling narcotics to youths under 17.

No action was taken on these recommendations, but at the same session Congress did put through the Boggs Act tightening penalties for violations of the Harrison Narcotic Act of 1914. The measure made prison sentences of from 2 to 5 years mandatory for second offenders; sentences of 10 to 20 years on third or subsequent convictions.

Some opposition to stiffer penalties for drug peddlers is based on the theory that the stiffer the penalties the less likely juries will be to convict. The Federal Bureau of Narcotics, however, reports that experience under the Boggs Act has not supported that theory.

Federal Narcotics Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger continues to maintain that the drug trade can best be curbed by putting the convicted trafficker out of business for longer periods of time. That is what the bill, based on Senator DANIEL'S committee hearings and report, would do.

[From the Salt Lake City Deseret News and Telegram of May 18, 1956]

THE CRIME THAT BREEDS CRIME

The Senate Judiciary Committee has unanimously approved a bill that would drastically tighten restrictions on the drug heroin and make punishment for illicit dope peddling much more severe, even including the death penalty for repeat offenders. Public interest will be served if the full Senate and then the House follow suit.

If this seems drastic at a time when there is considerable hue and cry to abolish the death penalty altogether, it should be remembered that the dope peddler is in many ways worse than an outright murderer. The man who snuffs out a human life commits a frightful crime indeed, but he who kills the

soul in a living body may be piling mortal tragedy upon mortal tragedy.

Starting a person on a life of addiction to narcotics is like casting a pebble in a pond—the effect grows and spreads, and no one knows how far the farthermost waves may reach. The Reader's Digest, in an article to appear on the newsstands shortly, calls the narcotics traffic the crime that breeds crime, and presents some shocking statistics to back up the assertion.

In New York City it was found that 30 percent of all robbers, burglars, and other dangerous offenders are drug addicts. Men frequently turn to these crimes, and many girls and women to prostitution, in order to get the money to purchase the narcotics they so desperately crave.

The case of one woman is cited where the craving for heroin grew to the point where satisfying it cost $30 a day. Desperate, the addict finally solved her problem by turning dope peddler herself, and she was making $60 a day from the drug traffic when she was arrested. The imagination staggers at the thought of how many young people she, and others like her, introduced to the horrors of drug addiction. And all to satisfy a craving that the victim himself would give anything to be rid of.

A Senate committee headed by Senator PRICE DANIEL, of Texas, made an extensive study of the narcotics situation in the United States, and found present laws pitifully inadequate to meet the situation. As a result, Senator DANIEL is sponsoring the current bill, which, in addition to increasing the penalties for dope peddling, would completely outlaw the use of heroin. Heroin is one of the most-used drugs by addicts, but reportedly does nothing medically that cannot be done as well or better by some other drug that is less used in the criminal trade. Doctors and other legitimate holders of heroin would sell their entire stocks to the Government, and it should be much easier to control illicit heroin when there is no legitimate supply of the drug to confuse the issue.

A second bill pending in the House is considerably less severe than Senator DANIEL'S measure. But anyone who has seen the full horror of the drug traffic is not likely to think it too much to give a first offender narcotics peddler 5 to 10 years, provide up to life imprisonment for a second offender, and make third offenders and persons caught selling narcotics to youths under 18 subject to the death penalty.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) News of May 11, 1956]

CONGRESS MUST SPEED DOPE LAW REFORMS

Senator PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas, was a Cleveland visitor some months ago with a Senate committee investigating the narcotics traffic. He was eloquently enthusiastic about the program for revision of Ohio's outmoded narcotics laws, which was projected by Attorney General C. William O'Neill and passed by our legislature.

Now the United States Senate Judiciary Subcommittee, headed by DANIEL, has approved a long-needed antinarcotics bill, which completely outlaws heroin (it has no medical use); authorizes punishment up to death for dope peddling; and stiffens sentences for narcotics trafficking and use all down the line.

We like to think that Attorney General O'Neill's legislative achievement is persuading Federal authorities toward this tremendous revamping of Federal statutes. The harder the laws hit the sooner will this savage commerce be curtailed. We can't encourage Congress enough for swift passage.

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune of May 18, 1956]

DEATH FOR DOPE PEDDLERS

A bill in Congress would apply the death penalty to something other than murder—although in many ways it is the next thing to it.

This no-holds-barred bill aimed at the appalling dope traffic in the Nation. It is sponsored by a special Senate subcommittee. It provides the death penalty for those convicted of selling heroin to persons under 18. The penalty would be applicable in the discretion of juries.

No prevalent crime is more heinous, more terrible in its consequences, more immoral, and more cruel than that of peddling narcotics to youngsters.

The traffic in illegal drugs in this country is expanding. It is affecting more teenagers than ever.

It is a big business. The law enforcement agencies combating it are hard-pressed. They and the courts need stiffer laws and sterner penalities.

Heroin, which would be completely outlawed by the new legislation, has no distinctive medical value.

Senator PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of the subcommittee, says that a similar measure will be introduced in the House. Both Houses of Congress will have a chance to act in this session.

Legislators who seem reluctant might be taken on a tour of institutions in which drug addicts, especially youngsters, are treated. There they might see for themselves the awful consequences of the narcotics trade.

The supreme penalty is usually reserved for murder. It is fitting in this case, too, for the heroin traffic often results in murder, in slow, tortured, nightmare death. Congress should act without serious delay.

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Journal of May 12, 1956]

DEATH FOR DOPE

A Senate Judiciary Subcommittee headed by PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas, has okayed a long-needed antinarcotics bill. It completely outlaws heroin, for which there is no medical use; authorizes penalties up to death for dope peddling; steps up narcotics raps all along the line.

This is drastic medicine, but dope-peddling is a fiendish crime. We hope Congress will pass this one, fast.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) Post-Herald of May 2, 1956]

SHOW THEM NO MERCY

The narcotics situation seems to be better than it was a few years ago. But the amount of addiction and the extent of the illegal drug traffic still is serious, both in the toll of wrecked lives and in its relation to other crime. Moreover, while some States and cities have awakened to the menace and done much to eliminate it, others remain complacent.

The Senate subcommittee headed by Senator DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas, has made an exhaustive study of the illicit drug traffic and has concluded that harsher penalties, combined with an absolute ban on heroin even for medical purposes, is the only answer.

It would be hard to disagree with its findings.

Life imprisonment or death for the third offense of drug peddling may seem rather severe, but the pusher who persists at his trade of corrupting and wrecking innocent lives is a criminal of the most vicious sort. He deserves no mercy. Nor would we oppose the optional death penalty the Senators recommend for even the first offense of selling heroin to children under 18.

It may not be possible to stamp out the illicit drug traffic entirely, but tougher prison terms and an occasional hanging should discourage it considerably.

[From the Jamestown (N. Y.) Post-Journal of May 4, 1956]

STIFF PENALTIES NEEDED

Members of a special subcomittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee have joined in recommending substantially stiffer penalties for persons convicted of illegally selling narcotics.

The bill introduced on behalf of the Democratic and Republican members of the group by their chairman, Senator PRICE DANIEL, of Texas, provides for a penalty of from 10 years to life imprisonment, or the death penalty at the discretion of the jury in cases involving the sale of narcotics to minors under the age of 18. In cases of sales to adults, prison terms of from 5 to 10 years would be the penalty for a first offense, 10 to 30 years for second offenders, and either a life term or death at the jury's discretion for third offenders.

These proposed penalties would be severe. Nevertheless, the alarming increase in the illegal narcotics traffic certainly calls for drastic legislation, particularly in cases involving sales to youths. Fiends who prey upon the youth of the land deserve no consideration or sympathy.

A similar proposal was submitted in Congress last year but no action was taken. It can be hoped that the Daniel bill will reach a roll call before the present session is adjourned. That there will be wide public support of the proposal of the committee for long overdue stiffer penalties for convicted dope vendors there is every reason to believe.

[From the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of January 15, 1956]

PUSHERS' PENALTY

Declaring itself shocked at the extent and far-reaching effects of the illicit drug traffic, a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee has recommended the death penalty for unregenerate dope peddlers.

"Peddlers are selling murder, robbery, and rape and should be dealt with accordingly. Their offense * * * in truth and in fact is murder on the installment plan," the subcommittee concluded.

The Hearst newspapers have been saying the same thing editorially for years.

Recent disclosures of a dope smuggler's haven and heaven at Los Angeles Harbor, of rising importation of narcotics across the Mexican border, of totally inadequate numbers of enforcement officers at all points and of the comparative lenience of existing laws add weight to the subcommittee's statement.

Death for repeated dope peddling is opposed by some well-meaning humanitarians and penologists.

They contend that it would prove no deterrent at all.

Against that view we have cited the dramatic drop in kidnaping cases since that crime was made a capital offense.

The formality itself of making dope peddling a capital offense may not at once impress the vile and mercenary salesman of "murder on the installment plan."

The mere enactment of the Lindbergh law did not drive kidnapers immediately out of business.

But when the first convictions and executions followed, when death did become the last reckoning, kidnaping dropped to virtual rarity.

So would dope peddling after the first few persistent peddlers of the white death have been dealt the same treatment.

It deserves strong support in both Congress and the State legislatures.

The Senate subcommittee is to be commended for a realistic and urgently needed recommendation.

[From the Port Huron (Mich.) Times Herald of January 16, 1956]

PAUL HARVEY: DEATH FOR DOPE PUSHERS

(By Paul Harvey)

You and I have talked about this before. I think neither of us expected Congress to be talking about it so soon. But Texas' Senator PRICE DANIEL dug deeply enough into the open, bleeding sore to see that it was cancerous.

We'll cut it out or die.

In our cities, approximately 50 percent of all crimes can be traced to drugs.

They kill and attack because they're on it or rob because they are desperate for money to buy it.

Senator DANIEL says probably 25 percent of all crimes of all kinds committed in the entire United States start with the needle.

And more * * *

That 80 percent of the addicts are on heroin * * * and that 90 percent of the heroin is coming into the United States across the Mexican border * * * from Communist China.

What a perfect device for financing themselves and undermining United States at the same time.

So Senator DANIEL has asked our Congress for the death sentence for dope pushers.

"Heroin smugglers and peddlers are selling murder, robbery, and rape and should be dealt with accordingly. Their offense is human destruction," says the Senator.

They destroy with the needle as surely as with the gun.

Only more slowly, more agonizingly, more painfully.

"Mr. Harvey, what makes you and the Senator believe that stiffer penalties will stop this traffic?"

It won't stop it.

But it will erase the judicial absurdity wherein most of our States cannot under law mete out more than a 1-year jail sentence.

One year the pusher gets and he's back in the same alley behind the schoolhouse.

But these men, very rarely addicts themselves, will not usually risk the gas chamber.

And the States wherein second offenders are properly punished don't find many second offenders.

When the hired help is scared off, the big syndicate bosses will wither on the vine.

Senator DANIEL also asks for more narcotics agents.

Let the critics witness that depraved parade of helpless victims pleading for release * * * 13 percent of them under 21 years old * * *

Let the critic come up with some better weapon against an enemy which has captured 30,000 of us and is capturing another 1,000 a month * * *

But until he does, I urge acceptance of Senator DANIEL'S recommendations without delay.

And permission for them to tap telephones under sealed court orders in order to trap the big operators.

Otherwise we allow our enemies the use of weapons which we deny our defenders, an absurdity which the Communists have found most convenient.

[From the Indianapolis Times of January 22, 1956]

THE DRUG TRAFFIC

The Senate subcommittee investigating illicit narcotics has come up with the startling finding that the United States has more drug addicts in proportion to population than any other country in the Western World.

Some other conclusions may be equally hard to believe—that drug addiction is responsible for half the crimes committeed in our metropolitan areas, that the illicit drug traffic has trebled since World War II.

This committee, under the chairmanship of Senator PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas, unquestionably did a comprehensive and conscientious job.

If the situation is only half as bad as the report paints it, the stringent measures the committee recommends are wholly justified. The effects of drug addiction are horrible—"Death on the installment plan," Senator DANIEL accurately phrases it. So there is no excuse for mercy under the law for the ruthless criminals whose greed has led them to spread addiction wherever they could.

The addict deserves our pity. The degenerate who made him an addict has earned the condemnation of civilization, and the death penalty in extreme cases.

[From the Cleveland Press of January 24, 1956]

FACTS ON DRUG TRAFFIC ALMOST SURPASS BELIEF

The Senate subcommittee investigating illicit narcotics has come up with the startling finding that the United States has more drug addicts in proportion to population than any other country in the Western World.

Some other conclusions may be equally hard to believe—that drug addiction is responsible for half the crimes committed in our metropolitan areas, that the illicit drug traffic has trebled since World War II.

This committee, under the chairmansnip of Senator PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas, unquestionably did a comprehensive and conscientious job.

If the situation is only half as bad as the report paints it, the stringent measures the committee recommends are wholly justified. The effects of drug addiction are horrible—"death on the installment plan," DANIEL accurately phrases it. So there is no excuse for mercy under the law for the ruthless criminals whose greed has led them to spread addiction wherever they could.

The addict deserves our pity. The degenerate who made him an addict has earned the condemnation of civilization, and the death penalty in extreme cases.

[From the New York News of February 7, 1956]

A HOTTER WAR ON DOPE

A hotter war on dope is urged in a report just released by a Cabinet committee which the President appointed 14 months ago, with Treasury Secretary George M. Humphrey as chairman.

The committee finds that there are about 60,000 dope addicts in the United States—a small figure percentagewise; but, as the report says ,"one addict is one too many."

To hot up the war on the illegal dope traffic, Humphrey and his colleagues (with the President's endorsement) recommend stiffer penalties, more Federal narcotic agents, and closer cooperation among Federal, State, and city government agencies.

All this sounds desirable, and we hope the report will be carefully studied by all law-enforcement groups that can profit from it. We hope, too, that Congress won't forget Senator PRICE DANIEL'S suggestion that juries be empowered to order the death penalty in extra-rotten cases of dope pushing. That idea still looks pretty promising to us.

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of February 7, 1956]

CRACKDOWN ON DOPE

A long-felt need for judicial severity in dealing with dope peddlers has been met by four Los Angeles Superior Court judges: Clement D. Nye, Aubrey N. Irwin, Herbert Walker and Leroy Dawson.

Passing sentence on 7 separate cases of narcotics violations, the magistrates imposed one 10-year-to-life term, two 5-year-to-life, and four 1-to-10-year terms for possession.

We hope this is the beginning of an unrelenting crackdown by all State courts on this nefarious and loathsome traffic.

Federal courts in California have recently handed down two 30-year terms for selling heroin, "the white death."

How drastically the crackdown has been needed in recent years, is illustrated by one Los Angeles defendant. His appearance in court to receive Judge Nye's 5-year-to-life sentence, was his 20th in 10 years on narcotics convictions.

He had already served eight jail sentences on the same charges.

Until Judge Nye caught up with him he had obviously enjoyed vacations in jail between selling excursions.

This is the kind of unregenerate criminal for whom the death penalty was recommended by a Senate judiciary subcommittee January 14 last.

At that time the examiner urged—with the backing of medico-legal authorities—that the recommendation be adopted.

We feel that although some humanitarians consider this harsh and ineffective as a deterrent, the death penalty for repeated dope peddling would have the same healthy effect as it proved to be in the crime of kidnaping.

Pending enactment of laws providing extreme punishment for an extreme offense, the four Los Angeles judges are to be commended for invoking the utmost severity present laws provide.

But the courts should be fortified with the power to decree, in aggravated cases, the death penalty.

When the first executions followed convictions for kidnaping, that crime soon became a comparative rarity.

So would dope peddling, after the first few persistent salesmen of "murder on the instalment plan" have been dealt with in the same way.

[From the Houston Press of May 2, 1956]

SHOW THEM NO MERCY

The narcotics situation seems to be better than it was a few years ago. But the amount of addiction and the extent of the illegal drug traffic still is serious, both in the toll of wrecked lives and its relation to other crimes.

The Senate subcommittee headed by Senator PRICE DANIEL has made an exhaustive study of the illicit drug traffic and has concluded that harsher penalties, combined with an absolute ban on heroin even for medical purposes, is the only answer.

Life imprisonment or death for the third offense of drug peddling may seem rather severe. But the pusher who persists at his trade of corrupting and wrecking innocent lives is a criminal of the most vicious sort, and deserves no mercy. Nor would we oppose the optional death penalty the Senators recommend for even the first offense of selling heroin to children under 18.

It may not be possible to stamp out the illicit drug traffic entirely. But tougher prison terms and an occasional hanging should discourage it considerably.

[From the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise of May 2, 1956]

PENALTIES FOR DRUG PEDDLING

Senator DANIEL, of Texas, chairman of a special Senate Judiciary subcommittee, introduced with unanimous consent of the committee a bill designed to make the illicit traffic in drugs subject to drastic punishment. If this bill becomes a law, even drug peddlers who have been engaged in their horrible business for years may decide it would be safer to earn an honest living or merely become some other kinds of criminals.

The penalties under the bill introduced by Senator DANIEL, ranging from 10 years in prison to death for peddlers caught selling narcotics to persons under the age of 18, and for a third conviction, may be pronounced too severe by those Americans who, while not criminals themselves, act as if they hate to see anybody sent to prison or executed for a capital offense.

Who is a greater enemy to society, who commits a worse, more despicable crime, than a drug peddler who sells narcotics to schoolchildren? Such vermin may give narcotics to children in order to make them addicts and steady customers. Also, the peddler hopes they will cause other youngsters to use drugs, thus adding more filthy dollars to his income.

The murderer, who may kill in a fit of passion, takes only one life. Drug peddlers destroy the minds, bodies, and souls of many victims, perhaps of hundreds of unfortunate wretches who acquire the drug habit and are never cured permanently.

It has been said profits in the illicit drug traffic are so enormous it is impossible to prevent criminals from smuggling narcotics into the United States and supplying the trade at prices addicts will pay, no matter how high or exorbitant they may be.

But execution of a few drug peddlers would make some at least of these criminals decide their lives, however worthless, are worth more to them than the money they might make as members of a narcotics ring.

[From the El Dorado (Ark.) News of February 7, 1956]

MOVING AGAINST THE DOPE TRAFFIC

It is hoped that Congress will not consider lightly the revelations turned up by Senator PRICE DANIEL and his committee investigating the illicit narcotics traffic.

The subcommittee's report said in part: "We were surprised and shocked at the extent and far-reaching effect of the illicit drug traffic in the United States and have concluded that narcotics addiction and the dope traffic constitutes one of the most serious problems facing the Nation."

Here are some of the findings of the committee:

1. The United States has more narcotic addicts, both in total numbers and populationwise, than any other country of the Western World. In fact, if the reports of other nations to the United Nations Commission on Narcotics are correct, our country has more drug addicts than all of the other Western Nations combined. A total of 13 percent of the addicts are less than 21 years of age.

2. In spite of the fact that Federal officials have done all within their power under present handicaps and with limited personnel, the illicit drug traffic has trebled in the United States since World War II.

3. Drug addiction is responsible for approximately 50 percent of all crimes committed in the larger metropolitan areas and 25 percent of all reported in the Nation.

4. Drug addiction is contagious. Addicts spread the habit with cancerous rapidity to their families and associates.

5. Red China, Turkey, Lebanon, and Mexico are the primary sources of heroin in reaching the United States, and international controls are inadequate.

6. Recent seizures of heroin and cocaine in record quantities point up the international smuggling operations with the United States as a target.

7. Subversion through drug addiction is an established aim of Communist China. Since World War II, Red China has pushed exportation of heroin to servicemen and civilians of the United States and other free nations of the world.

8. Smuggling of narcotics across the Mexican border is facilitated by the failure of the United States and Mexico to wage a mutual all-out fight against the drug traffic.

9. Criminal laws and procedures are insufficient to insure the apprehension and punishment of narcotic offenders.

10. Penalties for narcotic violations are neither commensurate with the seriousness of the crime nor sufficient to remove the profits. The maximum penalties under present laws of 5 years for the first offense, 10 years for the second, 20 years for the third are too low.

Senator DANIEL's report went on to say that the Nation's illicit narcotics traffic grosses more than a half billion dollars per year. Heroin purchased abroad today for $3,000 will bring $300,000 when finally cut, packaged, and sold in the United States. The committee got evidence that, with the prospect of such enormous profits, Federal penalties are not sufficiently severe to deter unscrupulous persons from engaging in the traffic. Significantly, the committee found that whenever and wherever the penalties are more severe and strictly enforced, the incidence of both addiction and narcotics offenses has decreased proportionately. Federal penalties for narcotics violations generally are lower than the penalties of the various States.

Senator DANIEL has presented a very vivid picture in his subcommittee's report. Congress should feel its great responsibility to follow through with the program designed to rule out this great evil in our country.

[From the Lancaster (Pa.) New Era of May 14, 1956]

CRACKDOWN ON DOPE

The bill before the Senate to curb the frightening narcotic addiction that has spread across the country, particularly among young people, is really a no-holds-barred measure.

Sponsored by a special subcommittee, the legislation was introduced by its chairman, Senator PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas. The bill's sharpest edge is a provision which calls for the death penalty, at the discretion of a jury, for those who sell heroin to persons under age 18.

DANIEL has indicated there will be similar legislation from the House of Representatives, and he expects action on the bill to be taken during this session.

* * * * *

That will hardly be soon enough. Every day that addicts and dope peddlers roam the streets the well-being of our communities is in danger. For all forms of crime have been proven to be tied in with narcotics. And often it's the kiss of death.

The Daniel proposal follows nearly a year of nationwide hearings which made it brutally clear that there was no time to waste in cracking down.

The bill would completely outlaw heroin in the United States on the grounds that it is the "worst and most prevalent drug sold on the illicit market, and it has no medical use which cannot be served by other drugs."

* * * * *

Other important provisions include:

Permission to wiretap telephone calls between narcotic traffickers when authorized by a Federal court.

Penalties for the smuggling and sale of heroin ranging from 5 to 10 years for first offenders up to life imprsonment or the death penalty for third offenders.

This is one piece of legislation to which Congress might well give immediate attention. The penalties may be stiff. But they're nowhere near as stiff as the life-wrecking jolt of a narcotic needle.

[From the Pensacola (Fla.) Journal of May 18, 1956]

ANTIDOPE LAWS TIGHTENED

Unanimous approval by the Senate Judiciary Committee of a bill to crack down on the narcotics racket by providing the death penalty for some offenders and outlawing all use of heroin comes not before time. It is safe to say that the infamous trade will be drastically curbed.

As stated by Senator PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas, the legislation declares open warfare on the cancerous illicit traffic in narcotics, and this is exactly as it should be. Jail sentences are to be increased and, among other things, the measure would allow Federal courts to authorize wiretapping and custom agents and agents of the Treasury Department's Narcotics Bureau would be given broader police powers, including the right to carry firearms.

While there may be some reservations regarding wiretapping, the remainder of the legislation may be said to fit the bill. Traffic in narcotics is traffic in moral subversion and those found guilty deserve no mercy of any civilized court. They drag the filth of the gutter into the Nation's living room.

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press of May 11, 1956]

TO CURB DRUG TRAFFIC

We have heard a great deal in the last year about the dope traffic in the United States and have had at least one really powerful movie, The Man With the Golden Arm, depicting the evils and horrors of drug addiction. All this has been good and very much to the point. But now positive action is called for—and, thankfully, Congress appears to be ready to take it.

A bill already has been introduced in the Senate and a similar bill is pending in the House which would make drug peddling a capital offense. This bill is the outgrowth of year-long hearings throughout the country on the drug traffic. The prevalence of dope addiction and the tragically degrading effect it has on human beings have impelled a special subcommittee to draft the toughest bill anyone yet has written to bring the drug situation under control.

One of the bill's provisions would permit juries to inflict the death sentence on any person found guilty of providing heroin for persons under 18 years old. Another would outlaw heroin entirely in the United States, on the ground that it is the worst and most plentiful drug on the market and that it no longer is necessary from the medical standpoint because there are other, less dangerous drugs to take its place.

Still a third provision would establish stiff penalties for smuggling or peddling heroin—5 to 10 years for first-time offender, life imprisonment or death for third-time offenders.

In no sense can these penalties be considered unduly severe or harsh. The use of heroin often leads to premature death—and if it doesn't to untold and prolonged agony and probably a shattered life for the addict. Any person who induces another to use drugs, or in any way contributes to the formation of the dope habit in another, is a potential murderer and should be treated as such.

Anything less than the present bill would be a cowardly and weak approach to the menace. It should have the approval of every decent citizen.

[From the Austin (Tex.) American of May 17, 1956]

AT THE SOURCE

A repeat offender at Austin has been given the maximum jail sentence for possession for sale of pornographic printed material and lewd pictures, which police said had been fed to junior high-school boys. The inadequate penalty is 6 months. Habitual criminals in this field ought to be kept out of circulation permanently.

Actually, what ought to be done is to impose felony prison sentences on the makers

of this sort of filthy, degrading pornograph. It ought to be stopped at the source.

A similar condition exists in the degraded sex and crime comics, which the State has attempted to outlaw, but which, in various degrees of fringing or passing the border line of illegality, seep into the public magazine counters. It is easy for charges to be filed against some small newsstand operator because he wasn't able to exclude all the crime and sex books condemned by the law. There, again, the penalty ought to be against the maker; or, if possible, penalties ought to be so severe that such illegal and illicit production and distribution would be prevented.

Texas has not had the crackdown that should have been expected on the distribution and sale of the types of debasing and vicious comic books and lewd magazines proscribed by the law of 1955.

The makers of this sort of vicious products do not risk putting it in the mail, of course. But it is distributed necessarily through some sort of commercial channels.

Texas Senator PRICE DANIEL is just now getting consideration of bills to outlaw certain lethal narcotics, and to prescribe death penalties for sales of narcotics to children. That is certainly a legitimate and proper field for Federal legislation and prosecutions. It might be a worthy supplement if the traffic in vicious pornography, obscenity, and lewdness were tied right onto that Federal law. Its disease-breeding capacity in the minds of young people is just about as great as the bodily disease brought on by heroin and marihuana.

Whatever law-enforcement is necessary should be armed with adequate power to prevent the production of this type of cancerous filth, and to clamp drastic penalties on those who try to evade the law.

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of May 19, 1956]

ANTINARCOTICS BILL

United States Senator DANIEL'S antinarcotics bill comes close to being a model piece of legislation. Perhaps that is the reason it has won approval of the Senate Judiciary Committee without a dissenting vote.

The purpose of the bill is to curb the growing traffic in illicit drugs, including both the smuggling and selling of dope. It does so by providing for stronger enforcement and for sterner penalties on those who persist in engaging in this sinister traffic. One of its striking provisions is to ban entirely in this country the sale or use of heroin, one of the drugs most frequently used by addicts. Hearings held throughout the country by a subcommittee headed by Senator DANIEL revealed that heroin no longer is necessary to the medical profession, having been replaced by other and better preparations.

If there is any provision of the bill that may meet opposition, it is the one which would permit a jury to impose the death penalty upon persons who sell heroin to youngsters under 18 or who persist in selling it to adults. There are many who oppose the death penalty for any crime, although it must be pointed out in connection with this measure that a death sentence is not mandatory in cases in which it would be permitted. It could be that in particularly aggravated cases a jury might find that no other punishment would fit the crime.

A notable thing about the Daniel bill is that it in nowise seeks to bar the States from enforcement of their own laws against narcotics. Instead, it seeks to make Federal and State laws supplement each other, as they are supposed to do, and for local enforcement officers to act in areas where Federal officers cannot act. The result should be better enforcement and more positive control of the illegal drug traffic through effective teamwork between Federal and State officers. That is in accord not only with good sense but with the basic theory of Federal-State relationships.

[From the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune of May 17, 1956]

STRIKING AT THE DOPE TRAFFIC

A strong new measure has been put forward in the United States Senate to curb the frightening narcotic addiction that has spread across the country.

Sponsored by a special subcommittee, the legislation was introduced by its chairman, Senator PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas. The bill's sharpest edge is a provision which calls for the death penalty, at the discretion of a jury, for those who sell heroin to persons under the age of 18.

A similar bill is expected in the House, and DANIEL believes there will be action in this session although time is drawing short.

The Daniel proposal follows nearly a year of nationwide hearings which make it brutally clear that there is no time to waste in cracking down.

The Senate bill would completely outlaw heroin in the United States on the grounds that it is the "worst and most prevalent drug sold on the illicit market, and that it has no medical use which cannot be served by other drugs."

Other important provisions of the measure include: Permission to wiretap telephone calls between narcotic traffickers when authorized by a Federal court, and penalties for the smuggling and sale of heroin ranging from 5 to 10 years for first offenders up to life imprisonment or the death penalty for third offenders.

Indiana's law was strengthened last year, through a measure introduced by Senator Eugene Bainbridge, of Munster. It now provides penalties ranging up to life in prison. There is already discussion of making it tougher in the 1957 general assembly, and the matter of a death sentence for sale to minors probably will be considered.

Generally, Americans have regarded the death sentence as justified only in extreme cases of murder or for traitorous acts. In some parts of the world it is being done away with entirely; that is the move in England now.

There is strong sentiment in the United States, however, for going the limit on punishment for traffic in narcotics, especially when it involves youngsters. The penalties proposed in the Daniel bill may be stiff, but they are nowhere near as stiff as the life-wrecking jolt of a narcotic needle.

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal of May 16, 1956]

NARCOTICS RACKET CRACKDOWN

Unanimous approval by the Senate Judiciary Committee of a bill designed to institute a drastic crackdown on the narcotics racket is fully justified and in the public interest. There may be occasions when penalties can be made too severe, but it is difficult to think that any punishment inflicted on narcotics racketeers could cause any sympathy for them.

There is hardly anything else as flagrantly vicious and reprehensible as the traffic in illicit narcotics in general, and certainly the sale of habit-forming drugs to young people is the worst part of it. It is contemplated in the bill that juries could recommend the death sentence for anyone convicted of peddling heroin to youths under 18, and the nature of the offense makes that appropriate.

The bill would stiffen all penalties applicable to the smuggling and sale of heroin. Punishment would range from 5- to 10-year sentences for first offenders to life imprisonment or even a death sentence for third convictions. Further, the bill proposes to outlaw heroin entirely, with the Government purchasing all supplies legally held at the time the bill gained the effect of law. The committee held that other drugs can serve better than heroin for medical purposes.

There is ample reason to believe that stronger penalties systematically applied against proved participants in the narcotics racket would get the desired result. When the enemy is as mean and conscienceless as are those who peddle narcotics, only the most extreme measures are apt to avail.

[From the Gastonia (N. C.) Gazette of May 16, 1956]

CRACKING DOWN ON DOPE

So far as we know, Gastonia has no serious problem with dope peddlers.

There are undoubtedly numbers of Gastonia people who go for the needle or the pellett * * * and there have been a few instances in which small amounts of heroin have been found in the possession of local peddlers.

But in the Nation at large—particularly in the big towns—the illegal sale and use of dope has become a problem that makes the age-old infamy of alcoholism, as bad as it is, look like a Sunday school picnic.

China, the world's greatest nation of dopers, long ago decreed the death penalty for dope peddlers and users alike.

Now, at long last, a no-holds-barred bill has been put forward in the United States Senate to curb the frightening narcotic addiction that has spread across the country, particularly among young people.

Sponsored by a special subcommittee, the legislation was introduced by its chairman, Senator PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas. The bill's sharpest edge is a provision which calls for the death penalty, at the discretion of a jury, for those who sell heroin to persons under age 18.

DANIEL has indicated there will be similar legislation from the House of Representatives, and he expects action on the bill to be taken during this session.

That will hardly be soon enough. Every day that addicts and dope peddlers roam the streets the well-being of our communities is in danger. For all forms of crime have been proven to be tied in with narcotics. And often it's the kiss of death.

The Daniel proposal follows nearly a year of nationwide hearings which made it brutally clear that there was no time to waste in cracking down.

The bill would completely outlaw heroin in the United States on the grounds that it is the worst and most prevalent drug sold on the illicit market, and it has no medical use which cannot be served by other drugs.

Other important provisions include:

Permission to wiretap telephone calls between narcotic traffickers when authorized by a Federal court.

Penalties for the smuggling and sale of heroin ranging from 5 to 10 years for first offenders up to life imprisonment or the death penalty for third offenders.

This is one piece of legislation to which Congress might well give immediate attention. The penalties may be stiff. But they're nowhere near as stiff as the life-wrecking jolt of a narcotic needle.

[From the Tampa Times of May 15, 1956]

DOPE PEDDLERS MAY FACE SENTENCE OF DEATH

The Senate Judiciary Committee has taken stern action by approving a bill which would authorize Federal courts to impose the death penalty in certain instances of violations of antinarcotics laws.

The measure, if adopted by Congress, would permit the death penalty for the sale of heroin to minors, or for a third conviction involving a sale to adults.

The punishment for dope peddling has been relatively light. Narcotics salesmen risk the comparatively light prison sentences for a chance at the rich profits to be derived from the dope trade. And they constantly attempt to "hook" new victims for their despicable business.

Once the habit is formed, a person will go to great extremes to secure funds to purchase narcotics. A large amount of United States crime is attributed to narcotics. The pattern followed by the peddlers is familiar. The first amounts of heroin are sold to young people at very low prices, but once the habit is formed the price goes up. The "hooked" youths resort to robbery or even murder to secure funds to buy dope to meet their insatiable craving.

The Federal Narcotics Commission has repeatedly stated that drugs are made available to the criminal dope peddlers in an effort to weaken the will of young people in the democracies. The crime syndicates willingly cooperate because of the vast profits involved.

Backers of the death penalty legislation think imposition of the death penalty on dope "pushers" would do much to discourage this trade and give narcotics agents a powerful bargaining weapon to use against apprehended peddlers to locate the source of the dope traffic. It is thought that the hope of getting a sentence lighter than the death penalty might loosen many tongues which otherwise would remain quiet.

The death penalty for a narcotics conviction would be severe, but dope peddlers in a sense automatically pass a death sentence on their victims when they supply them with heroin and other narcotics.

The Senate committee has taken a controversial step; now it remains to be seen how Congress will react.

[From the Uniontown (Pa.) Standard of May 14, 1956]

CRACKING DOWN

At long last a no-holds-barred bill has been put forward in the Senate to curb the frightening narcotic addiction that has spread across the country, particularly among young people.

Sponsored by a special subcommittee, the legislation was introduced by its chairman, Senator PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas. The bill's sharpest edge is a provision which calls for the death penalty, at the discretion of a jury, for those who sell heroin to persons under age 18.

DANIEL has indicated there will be similar legislation from the House of Representatives, and he expects action on the bill to be taken during this session.

That will hardly be soon enough. Every day that addicts and hope peddlers roam the streets the well-being of our communities is in danger. For all forms of crime have been proven to be tied in with narcotics. And often it's the kiss of death.

The Daniel proposal follows nearly a year of nationwide hearings which made it brutally clear that there was no time to waste in cracking down.

The bill would completely outlaw heroin in the United States on the grounds that it is the "worst and most prevalent drug sold on the illicit market, and it has no medical use which cannot be served by other drugs."

Other important provisions include:

Permission to wiretap telephone calls between narcotic traffickers when authorized by a Federal court.

Penalties for the smuggling and sale of heroin ranging from 5 to 10 years for first offenders, up to life imprisonment or the death penalty for third offenders.

This is one piece of legislation to which Congress might well give immediate attention. The penalties may be stiff. But they're nowhere near as stiff as the life-wrecking jolt of a narcotic needle.

[From the Norfolk (Va.) Ledger-Dispatch and Portsmouth Star of May 15, 1956]

PUNISHMENT THAT FITS THE CRIME

The Government's narcotics enforcement people have been pleading for years for heavier penalties for dope peddlers. There has been some improvement as the public, and Congress, have grown more aware of the menace of the dope trade. But a special subcommittee of the Senate, headed by Senator DANIEL, has proposed a law which will go further than any antinarcotics measure has gone before. It would provide the death penalty for selling heroin to any person under 18 years of age.

In all the world of vice and crime there is no more vicious enemy of society than the dope peddler. And the most vicious of the dope peddlers are those who sell to young people. The law which the Daniel subcommittee proposes is aimed at all dealers in illicit narcotics. And it lifts the penalties on most of the categories. But it is directed with special force at the heroin peddler who sells the stuff to minors.

Federal investigations in the last few years have brought into the open many of the evil practices of the narcotics trade. It is being beamed particularly at young people. And heroin and marihuana, which have a peculiarly exhilarating effect upon those who use them, are the chief stock in trade of this most shameless of the underworld. The Daniel subcommittee has held hearings on the subject throughout the country for a year, and its proposed legislation is based upon startling disclosures as to the prevalence of the narcotics trade.

Under the proposed bill, heroin would be completely outlawed in the United States because, the subcommittee says, it is the "worst and most prevalent drug sold on the illicit market and it has no medical use which cannot be served by other drugs." The penalty for sale of heroin to those under 18 years would be a minimum of 10 years imprisonment, and a maximum penalty of death.

The penalties for smuggling heroin and marihuana into the country would be from 5 to 10 years in prison for the first offense. The heroin smuggler would receive life imprisonment on conviction of this third offense. In nearly every aspect of the illicit narcotic trade, the penalties would be increased.

The country has been temporizing with the problem of dealing with the illicit narcotics trade. Penalties have been trifling, when compared to the enormity of the offense. The proposal by the Daniel subcommittee takes a realistic view of a criminal practice which contributes more to human degradation, perhaps, than any other form of criminality. The penalties proposed by the Senate subcommittee would come far nearer than present law to making the punishment fit the crime.

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post of May 15, 1956]

CRACKDOWN ON NARCOTICS

The recent narcotics raids and arrests in this community and others throughout the State indicate that the sale and use of deadly drugs is on the increase. Bridgeporters must have been shocked by the news, especially when they read in the police reports the ages of those unfortunates, from teen-agers to men close to 40.

The problem is so serious throughout the Nation that new laws are being sought in the hope that the horrible evil can be checked. State laws and the present national laws seem to have teeth in them, but apparently not enough to make more than a dent in the suppression of the frightening traffic and addiction.

One bill has been introduced in Congress with no holds barred, designed particularly for the protection of young people. The legislation was sponsored by a special subcommittee and introduced by the chairman Senator PRICE DANIEL, Texas, Democrat.

The sharpest edge of the bill is a provision which calls for the death penalty, at the discretion of a jury, for anyone convicted of selling heroin to anyone under 18 years of age. Similar legislation will be offered in the House, and Senator DANIEL expects the present session to act on it.

Such legislation cannot come too soon, because of the fact that depraved characters have been supplying the poisonous narcotics to the young, girls and well as boys. Every day that drug peddlers and addicts roam around our streets, especially at night, the well-being of this and every other community where they operate is in peril.

The police are alert to this menace, and they know from long experience that drug traffic and addiction are linked to the worst crimes that come to police attention. It is very often the kiss of death, as we read almost daily of crimes committed across the Nation.

The legislative proposals of the Texas Senator come after a year of nationwide hearings, during which it was made clear to Congressmen that action had to be taken speedily in order to make the crackdown effective. The new bill would completely outlaw heroin in the United States on the ground that it is the worst, as well as the most prevalent, drug sold in the illicit market. It has no medical use which cannot be served by other drugs, according to the proposed legislation.

In addition the bill includes permission to tap telephone calls between narcotic traffickers when authorized by a United States court; penalties for smuggling and selling narcotics from 5 to 10 years for first offenders to life, or the death penalty, for third offenders.

These are the stiffest penalties ever sought for correction of this evil, but they are not as severe as the life-wrecking jolts that come from addiction to drugs.

[From the Greensboro (N. C.) Record of May 14, 1956]

VICIOUS BUSINESS

A special subcommittee of the Senate has come out with a no-holds-barred bill designed to curb the awesome spread of drug addiction over the country.

The most drastic feature of the proposed legislation is a provision calling for the death penalty, in the discretion of the jury, in cases involving sale of heroin to individuals under 18 years of age. Another important provision of the bill would permit telephone calls between narcotics traffickers to be wiretapped, when authorized by a Federal court. Punishment for the smuggling and sale of heroin would range from 5 to 10 years' imprisonment for first offenders to life imprisonment or the death penalty for third offenders.

The particular piece of legislation was drafted after nearly a year of nationwide hearings that left no doubt of a sickening situation calling for immediate crackdowns on the dope trade. The bill would outlaw heroin in the United States on the ground that it is the worst and most prevalent drug sold on the illicit market, and—it has no medical use which cannot be served by other drugs.

Legislation similar to the Senate antinarcotics bill is expected to come to the floor of the House. Senator PRICE DANIEL, chairman of the subcommittee sponsoring the Senate bill, has said he expects enactment during the current congressional session.

Dope peddling is a vicious and scurrilous business. Those engaged in it are a contemptible lot that traffic in human degradation for paltry profits. They deserve no mercy at the hands of the law and courts.

Congress should lose no time enacting drastic legislation matching the narcotics peddler's despicable crimes with harsh punishment.

[From the Dallas News of May 16, 1956]

TIGHTER LAW ON DOPE

Further strengthening of the Federal laws against illicit narcotics now seems likely. Unanimously the Senate Judiciary Committee has approved Senator PRICE DANIEL'S bill to give more authority to narcotics agents and to increase penalties for smuggling and selling dope. No opposition to this measure has appeared in either House.

The Texan's bill steps up penalties for smuggling or illicit dealing in marihuana. It bans entirely the stronger drug, heroin, a derivative of opium. This can be done without harm to the medical profession, since doctors now have other drugs that serve better the purpose for which they formerly used heroin.

One controversial provision in the bill is that which would allow a jury to impose a death penalty as a maximum punishment for selling heroin to a person under 18. If Congress leaves this dubious provision in the bill, the death penalty is not likely to be imposed by a jury. The bill might be more workable without it. The other provisions promise stronger enforcement, especially if matched by sterner State laws. The bill specifically avoids stepping on State narcotics laws. The latter should be the avenue for local enforcement, thus allowing the Federal agents to concentrate on smuggling and interstate shipments.

[From the Griffin (Ga.) News of May 15, 1956]

LET'S STOP THE HUMAN SCUM

Is it worse to kill a person outright than to ruin his and his family's lives, turn a human being into a shell of an individual, pervert every sense of decency and every shred of goodness into lust and undeniable craving for dope?

The answer is not for us to give. But we know that at long last a bill has been introduced in the Senate to curb the frightening drug addiction that has spread across the Nation, particularly among young people.

It was presented by Senator PRICE DANIEL, of Texas, and calls for the death penalty at the discretion of a jury for anyone who sells heroin to young people under 18.

Senator DANIEL'S bill singled out heroin on the grounds that it is the worst and most prevalent drug sold on the illicit market, and it has no medical use which cannot be served by other drugs. The bill would completely outlaw heroin in the United States.

The death penalty may seem stiff. But we suggest that it be extended to include anyone who illegally sells any narcotic to youngsters, be it heroin, morphine, opium, marijuana, or what have you. If the death penalty is the only way to stop the human scum from peddling dope to youngsters, then let's have it.

QUIMBY MELTON, Jr.

[From the Hutchinson (Kans.) News-Herald of May 16, 1956]

HISTORY KEEPS REPEATING ITS OLD MISTAKES

For many centuries our ancestors, the British, operated on the misconception that extreme punishment was the most effective discouragement to crime. Their fixation finally carried them to the place where death penalties were exacted for more than 200 different offenses.

But some 150 years ago in Great Britain the trend changed. Through the years since, one crime after another was removed from the capital punishment list. This year the transformation has been made complete by the elimination of the death penalty.

These facts seem to have escaped the attention of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, which has voted unanimously to provide death sentences, in certain circumstances, for narcotics sellers.

Should this measure become law, it will not stamp out the dope traffic. It will only induce the trade to demand higher profits because of its added risk. This greater tribute demanded from the addicts will drive them to more antisocial acts.

Experience allegedly is the best teacher, but history keeps rotating its same old mistakes.

[From the Hartford Courant of May 17, 1956]

CONGRESS WOULD LIKE TO BAN ALL HEROIN

The Senate Judiciary Committee has unanimously approved a bill to crack down on the narcotics racket. Under its terms the death penalty will be imposed on certain hardened pushers. Another completely new approach is the plan to withdraw all heroin from circulation. This is the opium derivative most commonly used by drug addicts. Medical opinion says that there is nothing this drug does medically that cannot be done as well by other drugs that are not adapted to use by addicts.

Consequently, if the bill becomes law, all heroin now held legally by doctors and others will be sold to the Government. In addition to withdrawing all heroin the bill would stiffen penalties for smuggling heroin into the United States, and for selling it. The penalties would range from 5- to 10-year sentences for first offenders, to life imprisonment and a possible death sentence for the third offense. Juries also would be permitted to recommend the death sentence for sale of heroin to youths under 18.

As a somewhat less severe bill was recommended last week by the House Ways and Means Committee, a compromise bill will doubtless be worked out. Even as Congress tightens the narcotics law, the local community should also be increasing rather than decreasing the pressure. This is a problem that can be licked. But to do it means that local prosecutors must be willing to assume the responsibility of full pressure to get and keep both peddlers and users out of circulation for as long as possible. Sometimes it has seemed that fines and sentences imposed on narcotics offenders have been mere gestures.

[From the Camden (N. J.) Courier-Post of May 17, 1956]

CRACKING DOWN ON DOPE TIMELY ON THREE FRONTS

Encouraging is the action on several fronts in the war to curb the frightening narcotic addiction that has spread across the country.

In New Jersey, the assembly on Monday passed three bills providing heavy fines and longer jail sentences for narcotics peddlers. Senate approval is expected soon.

In Washington, a no-holds-barred bill has been put forward in the Senate, aimed at those who sell narcotics, particularly those who deal with young people.

In Camden and Philadelphia, fourscore persons were arrested in surprise raids staged by 300 officials, assisted by Federal and State narcotics agents.

The New Jersey bills, drafted by the State narcotics-control commission, provide that peddlers who sell, give, administer, or dispense any narcotic drug to persons under 18 would be subject to a fine of not less than $2,000 or more than $10,000 and by imprisonment at hard labor for not less than 20 years. Other provisions subject first offenders to a maximum $2,000 fine and a prison term of 10 to 20 years; second offenders to a fine up to $5,000, with a prison term from 20 to 30 years; and third offenders to a fine up to $5,000 and a jail term of 30 years to life. Mandatory sentence of 20 years to life imprisonment is provided for peddlers who hire children under 18 to transport or sell narcotic drugs illegally.

The bill now in the United States Senate carries even sharper teeth than the New Jersey legislation.

Sponsored by a special subcommittee, the legislation was introduced by its chairman, Senator PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, Texas. Its sharpest edge is a provision which calls for the death penalty, at the discretion of a jury, for those who sell heroin to persons under 18.

DANIEL has indicated there will be similar legislation from the House of Representatives, and he expects action on the bill to be taken during this session.

That will hardly be soon enough. Every day that addicts and dope peddlers roam the streets the well-being of our communities is in danger. For all forms of crime have been proven to be tied in with narcotics. And often it's the kiss of death.

The Daniel proposal follows nearly a year of nationwide hearings which made it brutally clear that there was no time to waste in cracking down.

The bill would completely outlaw heroin in the United States on the grounds that it is the worst and most prevalent drug sold on the illicit market, and it has no medical use which cannot be served by other drugs.

Other important provisions include:

Permission to wiretap telephone calls between narcotics traffickers when authorized by a Federal court.

Penalties for the smuggling and sale of heroin ranging from 5 to 10 years for first offenders up to life imprisonment or the death penalty for third offenders.

This is one piece of legislation to which Congress might well give immediate attention.

The penalties may be stiff.

But they're nowhere near as stiff as the life-wrecking jolt of a narcotic needle.

We wholeheartedly approve all of these bills and hope nothing will occur to prevent speedy passage. Laws with teeth—and all of this legislation is razor-sharp edged—will help considerably in curbing this terrible scourge.

[From the Durham (N. C.) Sun of May 18, 1956]

CRACKING DOWN

An insidious menace because those who are not drawn into the web hear little about it and are not often too concerned, is the narcotics curse. Narcotics form one of the weapons being used by the Communist world against the free world.

Aghast at the growing problem of addiction, especially in the larger cities and particularly among young people, Congress is taking action. At least, it seems on the verge of action—positive action.

Unanimous approval has been given by the Senate Judiciary Committee to a bill which would authorize the death penalty:

1. For those who sell heroin to minors.
2. For those convicted three times of selling to adults.

Heavier prison sentences would be provided for other narcotics offenses.

Death sentences would be imposed in the discretion of the juries. Penalties for the smuggling and sale of heroin would range from 5- to 10-year terms for first offenders to life imprisonment or death for the three-timers.

Heroin is singled out in the bill because "it is the worst and most prevalent drug sold on the illicit market and it has no medical use which cannot be served by other drugs." It is the purpose of the bill's sponsors to drive heroin out of the United States and keep it out.

There is no assurance that the bill as approved in the Senate committee will pass both houses but it, or something similar in spirit and effect, should be enacted. Its

penalties are not more harsh than the tragic condition of those, young people and old, who are victims of the brutal trade. The heroin traffic is bad enough in itself but it leads as well to profligate abandonment, to a long list of crimes including murder and to despair and suicide.

[From the Savannah Press of May 16, 1956]

CRACKDOWN ON DOPE

The Congress of the United States is moving toward a relentless crackdown on the illicit traffic in narcotics and what has been described as a no-holds-barred bill has been put forward in the Senate to curb the frightening narcotic addiction that has spread across the country, particularly among young people.

Sponsored by a special subcommittee, the legislation was introduced by its chairman, Senator PRICE DANIEL of Texas. The bill's sharpest edge is a provision which calls for the death penalty, at the discretion of a jury, for those who sell heroin to persons under age 18.

Senator DANIEL has indicated there will be similar legislation from the House of Representatives, and he expects action on the bill to be taken during this session.

Action can't come too soon. Every day that addicts and dope peddlers roam the streets the well-being of our communities is in danger. For all forms of crime have been proven to be tied in with narcotics and often it's the kiss of death.

The Daniel proposal follows nearly a year of nationwide hearings which made it brutally clear that there was no time to waste in cracking down.

The bill would completely outlaw heroin in the United States on the grounds that it is the worst and most prevalent drug sold on the illicit market, and it has no medical use which cannot be served by other drugs.

Other important provisions include:

Permission to wiretap telephone calls between narcotic traffickers when authorized by a Federal court.

Penalties for the smuggling and sale of heroin ranging from 5 to 10 years for first offenders, up to life imprisonment or the death penalty for third offenders.

This is one piece of legislation to which Congress might well give immediate attention. The penalties may be stiff. But they're nowhere near as stiff as the life-wrecking jolt of an illicit narcotic needle.

[From the Casper (Wyo.) Tribune-Herald of May 16, 1956]

DEATH FOR DOPE PEDDLERS

Death for narcotics peddlers may at first blush seem to reflect an unduly severe attitude; and yet narcotics peddlers deal in a commodity worse than death, and the traffic is not only constantly expanding but is reaching down into the teen-age population.

It was findings along this line arrived at in a lengthy Senate investigation that prompted Senator PRICE DANIEL, of Texas, to urge extreme measures.

In a committee-approved bill he not only proposes "open warfare" against dope peddlers, but the outlawing for any purpose of heroin, one of the drugs most widely used by addicts, as a means of simplifying police procedures.

The bill would stiffen penalties for smuggling and selling heroin by providing sentences ranging from 5 to 10 years for first offenders to life imprisonment and even death for a third offense.

The minimum penalty for sale to juveniles would be 10 years with a death sentence authorized.

By this means it is hoped to find an effective way of dealing with dope peddlers. A parallel problem exists with respect to their victims, most of whom are in need of rehabilitation. Some voluntarily seek institutional treatment. It seems reasonable that such procedure should be required for such time as might be indicated to effect a cure.

There is no assurance that lasting cures can always be had but any effective measures to curb the narcotics traffic must take account of the people who support it.

[From the El Paso (Tex.) Herald-Post of January 10, 1956]

THE DRUG TRAFFIC

Texas Senator PRICE DANIEL'S Senate subcommittee investigating illicit narcotics has come up with the startling finding that the United States has more addicts in proportion to population than any other country in the Western World.

Other findings are that drug addiction is responsible for half the crimes committed in our metropolitan areas, that the illicit drug traffic has trebled since World War II.

Senator DANIEL'S committee unquestionably did a comprehensive and conscientious job. If the situation is only half as bad as the report paints it, the stringent measures the committee recommends are wholly justified. The effects of drug addiction are horrible—"death on the installment plan," Senator DANIEL accurately phrases it. So there is no excuse for mercy under the law for the ruthless criminals whose greed has led them to spread addiction wherever they could. There should be no suspended sentence for them.

The addict deserves our pity. The degenerate who made him an addict has earned the condemnation of civilization, and the death penalty in extreme cases, such as that of the brutes who start juveniles on the habit.

[From the Huntsville (Ala.) Times of January 10, 1956]

PUNISHMENT OF DOPE PEDDLERS

We find it rather difficult to believe that drug addiction is responsible for nearly 50 percent of all crimes in major cities and for 25 percent of all those reported in the Nation.

Nevertheless, that was the statement of Texas' Senator PRICE DANIEL yesterday in a report prepared by a Senate judiciary subcommittee. This group, which investigated illegal narcotics traffic across the Nation during 37 days of hearings in 11 cities, certainly must have a foundation for such a statement.

One of the subcommittee's recommendations in the report was for more severe penalties for dope peddlers, including the death penalty for heroin pushers in extreme cases.

That might seem too severe to some our citizens, but the case Senator DANIEL used to illustrate the extreme—the San Antonio, Tex., man who started 40 high-school students toward addiction—seems to justify such drastic action.

Of course, the students themselves are not without blame, but youngsters cannot always be expected to use the judgment of mature adults. Any person who takes advantage of youth in any way is rotten in the beginning, and he who would sell narcotics—especially heroin, the worst of the lot—to a boy or girl, or even adults is guilty of the lowest crime. He is selling not only chances on the tortures of addiction, but, as the subcommittee report put it:

"Heroin smugglers and peddlers are selling murder, robbery and rape. * * * Their offense is human destruction as surely as that of the murderer. In truth and in fact, it is 'murder on the installment plan.'"

Certainly Congress will give serious consideration to this subcommittee report, alarming as it is.

It is our guess that if more severe punishment is enabled by Congress and awarded by the courts at every opportunity, illegal sales will decrease, and the Nation's crime rate—if Senator DANIEL is correct—will take a corresponding drop.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, since the Senate convened this afternoon a question has been raised by officials of the Public Health Service with regard to the language in the bill starting on line 16, page 16. The language to which I refer is as follows:

> Any law to the contrary notwithstanding, Federal agencies of the United States shall make available to the Bureau of Narcotics the names, identification, and any other pertinent information which may be specified by the Secretary of the Treasury, or his designated representative, of all persons who are known by them to be drug addicts or convicted violators of any of the narcotic laws of the United States, or any State thereof.

I may say to the Senator from Texas that some of the doctors of the Public Health Service who work in connection with the Lexington, Ky., farm—and I think there are some other institutions, but principally the Kentucky farm—are concerned about violating the doctor-patient relationship in the type of case of a drug addict who voluntarily goes to the public health officials and asks for medical help, and who asks, for example, for confinement at the Lexington farm.

That raises a question as to whether or not we can handle the situation, either by legislative history on the floor or possibly by some change in the language on page 16, so it will not cover volunteers who go to a public health doctor or a member of the medical staff at the Lexington Institute and ask for assistance, so that their names will not be turned over to the Bureau of Narcotics.

Do I make myself clear?

Mr. DANIEL. Yes. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that witnesses from the Public Health Service and the Lexington institution appeared before the subcommittee. Our counsel went to Lexington. The chairman himself went to the Fort Worth hospital. We had as witnesses all those who wished to appear before the committee. They all seemed to be perfectly in agreement with the language contained in the bill providing that the names of addicts shall be sent to the Narcotic Bureau, in order that there may be maintained an overall file concerning narcotic addicts in our country.

New York State, for example, has a law providing that every private physician must report to the Department of Health of New York the names of his patients who are narcotic addicts. That department in turn reports the names to the Bureau of Narcotics. There would be no way in the world by which we could have any knowledge of the number of addicts, what kind of treatment facilities should be provided, or anything else of that nature, if we did not have a central agency compiling the information.

The State of New York has done better in reporting addicts than has any other State, because of the law which exists in that State. The problem was recognized, and it was thought the law should cover the situation. The bill provides that the officials at the Lexington Hospital and the State officials in New York and other States shall report the names of addicts to the Bureau of Narcotics, so a record can be kept by a Federal agency, which is not presently doing it, and which is forbidden from doing it under the law.

We went into that question very thoroughly. For the purpose of keeping a central record of all the narcotic addicts in the country, I think it is very essential that the provision be retained in the bill.

Mr. MORSE. I wanted that information in the RECORD. I wish the Senate to know that I talked to the Senator from Texas before the Senate convened, but my legislative assistant received a call and talked to one of the officials, who raised the question.

What has been said on the floor of the Senate is good legislative history. The purpose of the language is only that the names shall be reported to the Bureau of Narcotics, to be kept only as a matter of information. The report shall have nothing at all to do with any police process, and it will not be a police record in any way, but simply a file for keeping the names of all known drug addicts in the country.

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct. The only way I know whereby the police could profit by the information would be in the case of someone who had violated the law and the information were obtained from the Bureau, in the same way the FBI gives out information. It could get to the police authorities in that way.

It is a shame that the information has not been getting to State officials, because some of the so-called volunteer patients who go to the hospitals at Lexington and Fort Worth, leave before they are cured, they will not remain—there is no law requiring them to remain—and they go back home and spread their disease and crime, and the hospital officials are not able to tell the State officials that the addicts are loose.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. In studying the pending legislation, I had need to refer to some of the records relating to the provision which the Senator from Texas has mentioned. The requirement for the reporting of the cases in New York State goes back to 1933. It has been in effect ever since. The provision has worked extremely well, and I am glad the provision is contained in the pending bill.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Texas and the Senator from New York for helping to make this legislative history.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask that on page 2, at the top of the page, after the numeral "1407.", the words "Telephonic interception, evidence," which item is the index provision, be stricken out, and that there be inserted in lieu thereof, in accordance with the amendment adopted on the floor of the Senate, the words "Use of communications facilities—penalties."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3760) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Narcotic Control Act of 1956."

TITLE I

SEC. 101. Part I of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after chapter 67 the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 68—NARCOTICS

"Sec.
"1401. Definitions.
"1402. Heroin—penalties.
"1403. Sale of heroin to juveniles—penalties.
"1404. Smuggling of marihuana—penalties.
"1405. Second or subsequent offenses—procedure.
"1406. Surrender of heroin—procedure.
"1407. Use of communications facilities—penalties.
"1408. Additional authority for the Bureau of Narcotics and Bureau of Customs.
"1409. Motion to suppress—appeal by the United States.
"1410. Issuance of search warrants—procedure.
"1411. Border crossings—narcotic addicts and violators.

"§ 1401. Definitions

"As used in this chapter—

"The term 'heroin' shall mean any substance identified chemically as diacetylmorphine or any salt thereof.

"The term 'marihuana' shall have the meaning given such term in section 4761 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"The term 'United States' shall include the District of Columbia, the Territory of Alaska, the Territory of Hawaii, the insular possessions of the United States, the Trust Territory of the Pacific, and the Canal Zone.

"The term 'person' shall include any partnership, association, company, corporation, or one or more individuals.

"§ 1402. Heroin—penalties

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, whoever knowingly imports or otherwise brings any heroin into the United States, or causes any such heroin to be imported or otherwise brought into the United States, or receives, conceals, buys, sells, or in any manner facilitates the transportation, concealment, or sale of any such heroin after being imported or brought in, knowing the same to have been imported or brought in contrary to law, or conspires to commit any such act or acts shall, except as provided in section 1403 of this chapter, be fined not more than $3,000 and imprisoned not less than 5 nor more than 10 years. For a second offense, the offender shall be fined not more than $5,000 and imprisoned not less than 10 nor more than 30 years. For a third or subsequent offense the offender shall be fined not more than $10,000 and imprisoned for life, except that the offender shall suffer death if the jury in its discretion shall so direct.

"Whenever on trial for a violation of this section, the defendant is shown to have or to have had the heroin in his possession, such possession shall be deemed sufficient evidence to authorize conviction unless the defendant explains his possession to the satisfaction of the jury.

"§ 1403. Sale of heroin to juveniles—penalties

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, whoever knowlingly sells, gives away, furnishes, or dispenses, facilitates the sale, giving, furnishing, or dispensing, or conspires to sell, give away, furnish, or dispense any heroin unlawfully imported or otherwise brought into the United States, to any person who has not attained the age of 18 years, shall be fined not more than $10,000 and imprisoned for life, or for not less than 10 years, except that the offender shall suffer death if the jury in its discretion shall so direct.

"Whenever on trial for a violation of this section, the defendant is shown to have had heroin in his possession, such possession shall be sufficient proof that the heroin was unlawfully imported or otherwise brought into the United States unless the defendant explains his possession to the satisfaction of the jury.

"§ 1404. Smuggling of marihuana—penalties

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, whoever, knowingly, with intent to defraud the United States, imports or brings into the United States any marihuana contrary to law, or smuggles or clandestinely introduces into the United States any marihuana which should have been invoiced, or receives, conceals, buys, sells, or in any manner facilitates the transportation, concealment, or sale of such marihuana after importation, knowing the same to have been imported or brought into the United States contrary to law, or whoever conspires to do any of the foregoing acts, shall be fined not more than $3,000 and imprisoned not less than 5 nor more than 10 years. For a second offense, the offender shall be fined not more than $5,000 and imprisoned not less than 10 nor more than 20 years. For a third or subsequent offense the offender shall be fined not more than $10,000 and imprisoned for life.

"Whenever on trial for a violation of this section, the defendant is shown to have or to have had the marihuana in his possession, such possession shall be deemed sufficient evidence to authorize conviction unless the defendant explains his possession to the satisfaction of the jury.

"§ 1405. Second or subsequent offenders—procedure

"(a) Upon conviction of any of the offenses defined in section 1402 or 1403 hereof, or upon a second or subsequent conviction of the offense defined in section 1404 hereof, execution of sentence shall not be suspended, and the provisions of section 4202 of title 18 of the United States Code shall not apply, and in the District of Columbia the provisions of the act of July 15, 1932 (47 Stat. 697, D. C. Code 24–201 and the following), as amended, shall not apply.

"(b) For the purpose of this chapter, an offense shall be considered a second or subsequent offense, as the case may be, if the offender previously has been convicted of any of the offenses defined in section 1402, 1403, or 1404 hereof, or if he has been convicted of any other Federal offense involving the unlawful importation, transportation,

purchase, dispensing, distributing, sale, or concealment of heroin or marihuana or of conspiracy to commit any such act or acts. After conviction, but prior to pronouncement of sentence, the court shall be advised by the United States attorney whether the offense is a first or a subsequent offense. If it is not a first offense, the United States attorney shall file an information setting forth any prior convictions. The offender shall have the opportunity in open court to affirm or deny that he is identical with the person previously convicted. If he denies such identity, sentence shall be postponed for such time as to permit a trial before a jury on the sole issue of the offender's identity with the person previously convicted. If the offender is found by the jury to be the person previously convicted, or if he acknowledges that he is such person, he shall be sentenced as prescribed in this chapter.

"§ 1406. Surrender of heroin—procedure

"(a) Any heroin lawfully possessed prior to the effective date of this act shall be surrendered to the Secretary of the Treasury, or his designated representative, within 120 days after the effective date of the act, and each person making such surrender shall be fairly and justly compensated therefor. The Secretary of the Treasury, or his designated representative, shall formulate regulations for such procedure. All quantities of heroin not surrendered in accordance with this section and the regulations promulgated thereunder by the Secretary of the Treasury, or his designated representative, shall by him be declared contraband, seized, and forfeited to the United States without compensation. All quantities of heroin received pursuant to the provisions of this section, or otherwise, shall be disposed of in the manner provided in section 4733 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, except that no heroin shall be distributed or used for other than scientific research purposes approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, or his designated representative.

"(b) Any heroin or marihuana introduced into the United States in violation of section 1402, 1403, or 1404 hereof shall be summarily forfeited to the United States without the necessity of instituting forfeiture proceedings of any character. All quantities of heroin so forefeited shall be disposed of in the same manner as provided in subsection (a) hereof, and all quantities of marihuana so forfeited shall be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of section 4745 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"§ 1407. Use of communications facilities—penalties

"(a) Each use of any telephone, mail, or any other public or private communication facility in the commission or in causing or facilitating the commission, or in attempting to commit any act or acts constituting a violation of or a conspiracy to violate section 1402 or 1403 hereof, or section 2 of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, or any provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the penalty for which is provided in section 7237 (a) of such code, as amended, shall be considered a separate offense punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 and imprisonment for not less than 2 nor more than 5 years.

"(b) As used in this section, the term 'communication facility' means any and all instrumentalities used or useful in the transmission of writings, signs, signals, pictures, and sounds of all kinds by wire or radio or other like communication between points of origin and reception of such transmission.

"§ 1408. Additional authority for the Bureau of Narcotics and Bureau of Customs

"The Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, Assistant to the Commissioner, and agents of the Bureau of Narcotics and Bureau of Customs may carry firearms, execute and serve search warrants and arrest warrants at any time of the day or night, serve subpenas and summonses issued under the authority of the United States, and make arrests without warrant for violations of any law of the United States relating to narcotic drugs (as defined in the first section of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act (21 U. S. C. 171)) or marihuana (as defined in section 4761 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) where the violation is committed in the presence of the person making the arrest or where such person has reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested has committed or is committing such violation.

"§ 1409. Motion to suppress—appeal by the United States

"In addition to any other right to appeal, the United States shall have the right to appeal from an order granting a motion to suppress evidence or return seized property made prior to the trial of a person charged with a violation of sections 1402, 1403, or 1404 hereof or section 2 of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, or of any of the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the penalty for which is provided in section 7237 (a) of such Code, as amended: *Provided*, That the United States attorney shall certify to the judge granting such motion, that the appeal is not taken for purposes of delay and that the prosecution is unable to go forward without the evidence suppressed. Any such appeal shall be taken within 30 days after the decision or order has been entered and shall be diligently prosecuted.

"§ 1410. Issuance of search warrants, procedure

"Notwithstanding the provisions of rule 41 (c) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, in any case involving a violation of sections 1402, 1403, or 1404 hereof, or section 2 of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, or any of the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the penalty for which is provided in section 7237 (a) of such code, as amended, (1) a search warrant may be served at any time of the day or night if the judge or the commissioner issuing the warrant is satisfied that there is probable cause to believe that the grounds for the application exist; and (2) a search warrant may be directed to any officer of the Metropolitan Police of the District of Columbia authorized to enforce or assist in enforcing a violation of any of such sections.

"§ 1411. Border crossings—narcotic addicts and violators

"(a) In order further to give effect to the obligations of the United States pursuant to the Hague Convention of 1912, proclaimed as a treaty on March 3, 1915 (38 Stat. 1912), and the limitation convention of 1931, proclaimed as a treaty on July 10, 1933 (48 Stat. 1571), and in order to facilitate more effective control of the international traffic in narcotic drugs, and to prevent the spread of drug addiction, no citizen of the United States who is addicted to or uses narcotic drugs, as defined in section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended (except a person using such narcotic drugs as a result of sickness or accident or injury and to whom such narcotic drugs is being furnished, prescribed, or administered in good faith by a duly licensed physician in attendance upon such person, in the course of his professional practice) or who has been convicted of a violation of any of the narcotic or marihuana laws of the United States, or of any State thereof, the penalty for which is imprisonment for more than 1 year, shall depart from or enter into or attempt to depart from or enter into the United States, unless such person registers, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, with a customs official, agent, or employee at a point of entry or a border customs station. Unless otherwise prohibited by law or Federal regulation such customs official, agent, or employee shall issue a certificate to any such person departing from the United States; and such person shall, upon returning to the United States, surrender such certificate to the customs official, agent, or employee present at the port of entry or border customs station.

"(b) Whoever violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished for each such violation by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not less than 1 nor more than 3 years, or both."

SEC. 102. The analysis of part 1 of title 18 of the United States Code, immediately preceding chapter 1 of such title, is amended by adding

"68. Narcotics"

after

"67. Military and Navy."

TITLE II

SEC. 201. (a) Section 212 (a) (23) of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended to read as follows:

"(23) Any alien who has been convicted of a violation of, or a conspiracy to violate any law or regulation relating to the illicit possession of, or traffic in narcotic drugs, or who has been convicted of a violation of, or a conspiracy to violate any law or regulation governing or controlling the taxing, manufacture, production, compounding, transportation, sale, exchange, dispensing, giving away, importation, exportation, or the possession for the purpose of the manufacture, production, compounding, transportation, sale, exchange, dispensing, giving away, importation, or exportation of opium, coca leaves, heroin, marihuana, or any salt derivative or preparation of opium or coca leaves, or isonipecaine or any addiction-forming or addiction-sustaining opiate; or any alien who the consular officer or immigration officers know or have reason to believe is or has been an illicit trafficker in any of the aforementioned drugs."

(b) Section 241 (a) (11) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(11) is, or hereafter at any time after entry has been, a narcotic drug addict, or who at any time has been convicted of a violation of, or a conspiracy to violate any law or regulation relating to the illicit possession of or traffic in narcotic drugs, or who has been convicted of a violation of, or a conspiracy to violate any law or regulation governing or controlling the taxing, manufacture, production, compounding, transportation, sale, exchange, dispensing, giving away, importation, exportation, or the possession for the purpose of the manufacture, production, compounding, transportation, sale, exchange, dispensing, giving away, importation, or exportation of opium, coca leaves, heroin, marihuana, any salt derivative or preparation of opium or coca leaves or isonipecaine or any addiction-forming or addiction-sustaining opiate."

(c) Section 241 (b) of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following additional new sentence: "The provisions of this subsection shall not apply in the case of any alien who is charged with being deportable from the United States under section 241 (a) (11) of this act."

SEC. 202. Section 8 of the act entitled "An act to create in the Treasury Department the Bureau of Narcotics, and for other purposes", approved June 14, 1930 (46 Stat. 587), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury shall cooperate with the several States in the suppression of the abuse of narcotic drugs in their respective jurisdictions, and to that end he is authorized (1) to cooperate in the drafting of such legislation as may be needed, if any, to effect the end named, (2) to arrange for the exchange of information concerning the use and abuse of narcotic drugs in said States and for cooperation in the institution and prosecution of cases in the courts of the United States and before the licensing boards and courts of the several States, (3) to conduct narcotic training programs, as an integral part of narcotic law enforcement for the training of such local and State narcotic enforcement personnel as may be arranged with the respective local and State agencies, and (4) to maintain in the Bureau of Narcotics a 'Division of Statistics and Records' to accept, catalog, file, and otherwise utilize narcotic information and statistics, including complete records on drug addicts and other narcotic law offenders which may be received from Federal, State, and local agencies, and make such information available for Federal, State, and local law-enforcement purposes. Any law to the contrary notwithstanding, Federal agencies of the United States shall make available to the Bureau of Narcotics the names, identification, and any other pertinent information which may be specified by the Secretary of the Treasury, or his designated representative, of all persons who are known by them to be drug addicts or convicted violators of any of the narcotic laws of the United States, or any State thereof. The Commissioner of Narcotics shall request and encourage all heads of State and local agencies to make such information available to the Bureau of Narcotics.

"(b) As used in this section, the term 'Federal agencies' shall include (1) the executive departments, (2) the Departments of the Army, Navy, and the Air Force, (3) the independent establishments and agencies in the executive branch, including corporations wholly owned by the United States, and (4) the munipical government of the District of Columbia.

"The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to make such regulations as may be necessary to carry this section into effect."

SEC. 203. Section 4744 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Persons in general: It shall be unlawful for any person who is a transferee required to pay the transfer tax imposed by section 4741 (a) to acquire or otherwise obtain any marihuana without having paid such tax, or to receive, conceal, buy, sell, or in any manner facilitate the transportation, concealment, or sale of any such marihuana, knowing the same to have been acquired contrary to law, or to conspire to commit any of such acts in violation of the laws of the United States; and proof that any person shall have had in his possession any marihuana and shall have failed, after reasonable notice and demand by the Secretary or his delegate, to produce the order form required by section 4742 to be retained by him shall be presumptive evidence of guilt under this section and of liability for the tax imposed by section 4741 (a)."

SEC. 204. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remaining provisions of this act, or the application of such provisions to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2062, House bill 10899, the Department of Commerce appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10899) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 10899), which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

WITHHOLDING BY PRIVATE EMPLOYERS OF FEDERAL INCOME TAX OR SOCIAL-SECURITY TAX DEDUCTIONS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, as of December 31, 1955, $284,803,237 which had been withheld as deductions for income tax or social-security tax from the pay envelopes of workers throughout the country had not been turned into the Federal Treasury.

This amount does not represent the current accounts which are due quarterly from the employers but represents only those which were overdue to the extent that second notices of delinquency had been mailed to the employers and the delinquent accounts had been formally transferred to the field collection force for collection action.

The employers who have failed to send in these withheld taxes continued to use the funds to finance their own businesses, perhaps to pay their own salaries or to help them underbid their taxpaying competitors.

I shall cite one glaring example of how this works. I refer to the Reliable Plastering Corp., Philadelphia, Pa., of which Martin Levin is president; Alexander Levin, secretary and vice president; and Samuel Levin, treasurer.

Since 1951, the Reliable Plastering Corp., of Philadelphia, has withheld over $400,000 from its employees, representing both income-tax and social-security tax deductions. This amount, instead of being forwarded to the United States Treasury, has been kept by the company for its own use.

These additional funds have enabled the firm to underbid successfully several of its competitors on various contracts, since by not sending in these taxes, which are being withheld from its employees, that meant that, in effect, this firm's labor costs were 20 percent less than any competitor's.

A few months ago this firm, having advantage of the use of this $400,000 of Government money—for which it did not have to give a note—underbid all competitors for the plastering job on the new Senate Office Building, now being constructed across the street from the Capitol.

Furthermore, not only has this company kept its employees' tax money, but since 1951 it has not been paying its own income taxes. The following is a list of the recorded tax liens against this company as of May 18, 1956, broken down as to amounts, dates, and type of taxes:

Class of tax	Year or taxable period	Amount shown on notice
Withholding and Federal Insurance Contributions Act taxes.	June 30, 1951	$26,334.29
	June 30, 1952	35,413.30
	Sept. 30, 1952	26,383.96
	Dec. 31, 1952	32,651.60
	Mar. 31, 1953	32,302.29
	June 30, 1953	33,418.50
	Dec. 31, 1953	52,764.59
	June 30, 1954	54,450.16
	Sept. 30, 1954	66,154.65
	Dec. 31, 1954	72,890.63
Income tax	Fiscal year, June 30, 1951	13,892.73
	do	210.45
	Fiscal year, June 30, 1953	1,511.51
	Fiscal year, June 30, 1954	7,898.04
		456,276.70

It should be pointed out that in awarding the contract for the new Senate Office Building, the bids were first awarded to a prime contractor, who placed a bond guaranteeing performance. This prime contractor then sublet certain contracts to smaller operators; and it was as one of these subcontractors that Reliable was the successful bidder, apparently using these Government funds to underbid its competitors and finance its operations.

There is no reasonable explanation as to why the United States Government would allow any employer in Philadelphia or in any other area to keep for the personal use of his company the funds which are deducted as income and social security tax from the pay envelopes of his employees.

These are trust funds, and are never to be considered under any circumstances as cash belonging to the employer. It is inexcusable that any employer should have been allowed to work this racket for 5 years without proper action being taken; and when we consider that, as of last December, employers in this country were over $284 million delinquent in turning these taxes in to the Federal Treasury, it is time that something be done.

When we speak of the amount of delinquent income tax or delinquent corporation tax as of a given date, we recognize that the figures are always subject to readjustment, since an assessed tax deficiency by the Government is never recognized as conclusive until either the taxpayer agrees upon the amount or the court rules upon its determination.

However, as to this $284 million item there can be no dispute. It represents income tax and social security tax deductions made by the employer from the pay envelopes of the employees, and it belongs to the United States Government. The employer has no right ever to keep these funds for his own personal use.

I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated at this point in the RECORD a letter from the Treasury Department, dated May 18, 1956, confirming the deficiencies of the Reliable Plastering Corp., of Philadelphia, as referred to above.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 18, 1956.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your letter of March 22, 1956, in which you requested a report as to the outstanding delinquent taxes (by class of tax and years involved) of the Reliable Plastering Corp., of Philadelphia, Pa.

The district director of Internal Revenue at Philadelphia has advised that liens, which are of public record, have been filed with the prothonotary for Philadelphia county court, as follows:

Class of tax	Year or taxable period	Amount shown on notice
Withholding and Federal Insurance Contributions Act taxes.	June 30, 1951	$26,334.29
	June 30, 1952	35,413.30
	Sept. 30, 1952	26,383.96
	Dec. 31, 1952	32,651.60
	Mar. 31, 1953	32,302.29
	June 30, 1953	33,418.50
	Dec. 31, 1953	52,764.59
	June 30, 1954	54,450.16
	Sept. 30, 1954	66,154.65
	Dec. 31, 1954	72,890.63
Income tax	Fiscal year, June 30, 1951	13,892.73
	do	210.45
	Fiscal year, June 30, 1953	1,511.51
	Fiscal year, June 30, 1954	7,898.04
		456,276.70

The taxpayer has been making periodic payments under an arrangement which if continued would result in full liquidation of the delinquent taxes.

Very truly yours,
RUSSELL C. HARRINGTON,
Commissioner.

Mr. WILLIAMS subsequently said:

Mr. President, earlier this afternoon I referred to the fact that the Reliable Plastering Corp. had a subcontract on the new Senate Office Building.

Since that time the prime contractor, the George Hyman Co., has indicated lack of knowledge of the Reliable Plastering Corp.'s having any subcontract. To refresh their memory I remind them that on October 7, 1955, they submitted to the Architect of the Capitol a report stating that they had subcontracted certain plastering work with the Penn-Jersey Plastering Corp. and that affiliated with that company in the work would be two other companies; namely, the Miller Mason Studios, Atlantic City, N. J., and the Reliable Plastering Corp., of Philadelphia, Pa.

MR. AND MRS. THOMAS V. COMPTON

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1833, House bill 1866, for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas V. Compton.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WOFFORD in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1866) which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, line 6, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement explaining the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Authorizes payment of $6,000 to the Comptons as compensation for loss of business and decline in market value of their commercial establishment on Highway 15 at Clarksville, Va., caused by the relocation of that highway.

2. The relocation occurred after flooding of the area by the Corps of Engineers, and one other commercial owner, damaged by direct flooding, has recovered.

3. The Army objects on the ground of "normal risk attached to ownership"; this relief is solely equitable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO ST. JOHNS COUNTY, FLA.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1972, House bill 7471, to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Board of Commissioners of St. Johns County, Fla.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "the", to strike out "Board of Commissioners of St. Johns County, Fla.", and insert "city of St. Augustine, Fla., a municipal corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Florida", and on page 4, line 6, after the numerals "330", to strike out "degrees" and insert "feet."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at this time I wish to call up an amendment which I understand my good friend, the Senator from Florida, is willing to accept.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I am very willing to accept the very fair and fine amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for helping protect and defend the Morse formula, which, since first followed in 1946, has saved the taxpayers a little more than $500 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, it is proposed to strike out lines 9 through 12 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by the first section of this act shall be subject to the condition that the city of St. Augustine, Fla., pay to the Secretary of the Treasury, as consideration for the land conveyed, an amount equal to 50 percent of its fair market value as determined by independent appraisal, and the deed of conveyance shall reserve to the United States all mineral rights, including oil and gas, in the land so conveyed, and shall be subject to such other reservations, limitations, or conditions as may be determined to be necessary by the Secretary to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 3. The deed shall contain a covenant that no structure shall be erected on the land which will in any way adversely affect the operation of the Coast Guard facilities, and a covenant that the.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the city of St. Augustine, Fla., a municipal corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Florida."

CLEMENT E. SPROUSE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1848, House bill 1671, for the relief of Clement E. Sprouse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1671) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ANNA ELIZABETH DOHERTY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1916, House bill 1913, for the relief of Mrs. Anna Elizabeth Doherty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1913) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CERTAIN FORMER EMPLOYEES OF THE INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1931, Senate bill 2048, for the relief of certain former employees of the Inland Waterways Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2048), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, line 7, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to E. J. Fogarty the sum of $890.45, (2) to W. F. McGrade the sum of $443, (3) to T. E. Kelly the sum of $429.71, (4) to J. J. Gestring the sum of $216.31, (5) to T. C. Stiffler the sum of $188.05, and (6) to G. H. Bohler the sum of $268.06, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for annual leave payments, retroactive wage increases, and other salary and wages, earned or accrued by the above-named employees of the Inland Waterways Corporation, a Government-owned corporation, prior to their discharge from the employ of such Corporation, such amounts having been withheld pursuant to provisions of section 305 of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act of 1947: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RETENTION IN SERVICE OF DISABLED COMMISSIONED OFFICERS AND WARRANT OFFICERS OF THE ARMY AND NAVY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, we now come to the consideration of some general bills. I wish to say for the RECORD that these bills have been cleared with the calendar committees and the leadership on both sides.

First, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2066, H. R. 2216, to amend the act of June 19, 1948, relating to the retention in the service of disabled commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army and Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wish to make the following statement in regard to the bill:

It permits officers with temporary commissions to be transferred from military to veterans' hospitals for prolonged treatment. Presently only Regular and Reserve officers can be so transferred.

In 1948, legislation was enacted to permit the retention in the service of temporary officers whose appointments might expire while they were undergoing treatment; they were permitted to remain in military hospitals. No authorization has ever been granted, however, for transferring these officers to veterans' hospitals.

About 4,100 temporary commissions are outstanding. This authorization will apply only to those who may hereafter become disabled and require prolonged treatment.

Also the bill permits the retention on active duty of certain Reserve officers whose 5-year terms would otherwise expire while they were undergoing treatment. The retention is for the purpose of determining eligibility for disability benefits, which must be done prior to separation if the officer is to qualify.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RUNNING MATES FOR CERTAIN STAFF CORPS OFFICERS IN THE NAVAL SERVICE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 2067, House bill 4229.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4229) to provide running mates for certain staff corps officers in the naval service, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, this bill has been approved by the Armed Services Committee. It provides a new method of assigning line officer "running mates" to lieutenant junior grade staff officers.

Presently, staff officers suffer a "fanning" process when they are placed on the promotion lists for full lieutenant. Navy custom is, theoretically, to assign each staff officer—supply, medical, engineer, et cetera—a line officer as his "running mate"—that is, a line officer who has an approximately similar length of service in that grade; then both come up for promotion simultaneously.

But the "fanning" process embodies a favoritism for line officers by which staff officers are spaced throughout the entire list of line officers. Hence with 200 officers, of which 10 are staff, up for promotion to lieutenant, staff officers would rank 20, 40, 60, et cetera, by a mechanical formula.

The bill would eliminate this fanning process, and allow staff officers to rank where they should, among lieutenants junior grade.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WITHHOLDING OF COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 2068, House bill 4437.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4437) relating to withholding for State employee retirement system purposes, on the compensation of certain civilian employees of the National Guard and the Air National Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the bill has been unanimously reported by the Armed Services Committee. It would permit Federal disbursing officers to deduct, from the payrolls of civilian National Guard and Air National Guard employees, contributions to the State or Territorial retirement systems.

These people, while considered State employees, are paid by Federal funds. This results in State authorities being unable to deduct contributions from payrolls, and consequently prevents complete employee participation in State retirement systems. Deductions are to be made only on request by the States. Presently eight States permit this type of employee to participate in their retirement systems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXAMINATION PRELIMINARY TO PROMOTION OF OFFICERS OF THE NAVAL SERVICE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 2069, House bill 4704.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4704) to provide for the examination preliminary to promotion of officers of the naval service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, this bill provides a new and clearer test for the promotion of naval officers.

Under the proposed test, Marine second lieutenants and Navy ensigns would go before an examining board for a determination of their mental, moral, and professional qualifications for promotion.

Officers of higher grade, but not including flag or general officers, must "demonstrate to a selection board such qualifications as the Secretary may prescribe for promotion to the next higher grade."

Thus an examining board will review ensigns and second lieutenants, in regard to their mental and moral qualifications for promotions, and officers of higher grades would be examined as to their professional qualifications by selection boards.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN MILEAGE ALLOWANCES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 2070, House bill 5268.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the payment of mileage allowances for overland travel by private conveyance outside the continental limits of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the bill would amend the compensation statutes for travel performed by servicemen overseas.

Under present law, compensation for travel by private conveyance overseas is made on a 5-cents-per-mile, plus per diem rate basis. The per diem rate requires a computation which delays payments and places an undue administrative burden on paymasters.

The proposed amendment would pay a flat mileage, presently 6 cents per mile, and eliminate per diem. No substantial increase in cost is anticipated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill if open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LENDING OF CERTAIN EQUIPMENT TO THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA FOR FOURTH NATIONAL JAMBOREE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 2071, Senate bill 2771.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2771) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the Fourth National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, on page 2, line 6, after the word "useful", to insert "to the extent that items are in stock and available and their issue will not jeopardize the national-defense program", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to lend to the Boy Scouts of America, a corporation created under the act of June 15, 1916, for the use and accommodation of the approximately 50,000 Scouts and officials who are to attend the Fourth National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America to be held as a part of the national program Onward for God and My Country during the period beginning in June 1957, and ending in July 1957, at Valley Forge, Pa., such tents, cots, blankets, commissary equipment, flags, refrigerators, and other equipment and services as may be necessary or useful to the extent that items are in stock and available and their issue will not jeopardize the national-defense program.

(b) Such equipment is authorized to be delivered at such time prior to the holding of such jamboree, and to be returned at such time after the close of such jamboree, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of Defense and the National Council, Boy Scouts of America. No expense shall be incurred by the United States Government for the delivery, return, rehabilitation, or replacement of such equipment.

(c) The Secretary of Defense, before delivering such property, shall take from the Boy Scouts of America a good and sufficient bond for the safe return of such property in good order and condition, and the whole without expense to the United States.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, this bill would authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend ceratin equipment—refrigerators, mess kits, medical items, and so forth—to the Boy Scouts of America for their fourth national jamboree at Valley Forge, Pa., in June and July 1957.

Similar bills have permitted loans to prior jamborees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LENDING OF CERTAIN EQUIPMENT TO THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA FOR WORLD JAMBOREE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 2072, Senate bill 2772.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2772) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in England in 1957; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, on page 2, line 3, after the word "useful", to insert "to the extent that items are in stock and available and their issue will not jeopardize the national defense program"; on page 3, line 6, after the word "act", to insert "to the extent that such transportation will not interfere with the requirements of military operations"; and on page 3, line 17, after the word "be", to strike out "deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the" and insert "credited to the current applicable", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to lend to the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, for the use and accommodation of the approximately 1,500 Scouts and officials who are to attend the World Jamboree, Boy Scouts, to be held in England in July and August 1957, such tents, cots, blankets, commissary equipment, flags, refrigerators, and other equipment and services as may be necessary or useful to the extent that items are in stock and available and their issue will not jeopardize the national defense program.

(b) Such equipment is authorized to be delivered at such time prior to the holding of such jamboree and to be returned at such time after the close of such jamboree, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of Defense and the National Council, Boy Scouts of America. No expense shall be incurred by the United States Government for the delivery, return, rehabilitation, or replacement of such equipment.

(c) The Secretary of Defense, before delivering such property, shall take from the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, good and sufficient bond for the safe return of such property in good order and condition, and the whole without expense to the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to provide, without expense to the United States Government, transportation from the United States and return on a vessel of the Military Sea Transportation Service for (1) those Boy Scouts and Scouters certified by the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, as representing the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, at the jamboree referred to in the first section of this act, and (2) the equipment and property of such Boy Scouts and Scouters and the property loaned to the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to this act to the extent that such transportation will not interfere with the requirements of military operations.

(b) Before furnishing any transportation under this section, the Secretary of Defense shall take from the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, a good and sufficient bond for the reimbursement to the United States

by the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, of the actual costs of transportation furnished under this section.

SEC. 3. Amounts paid to the United States to reimburse it for expenses incurred under the first section and for the actual costs of transportation furnished under section 2 shall be credited to the current applicable appropriations or funds to which such expenses and costs were charged and shall be available for the same purposes as such appropriations or funds.

SEC. 4. Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State, no fee shall be collected for the application for a passport by or the issuance of a passport to, any Boy Scout or Scouter who is certified by the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, as representing the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, at the jamboree referred to in the first section of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION SAFETY PROGRAM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, on March 23, 1956, the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] expressed in this Chamber his deep concern for the apathy he said existed in the numerous veterans' hospitals scattered throughout the United States from Maine to California. He was referring to an alleged lack of safety precautions in hospital operational aspects by the Veterans' Administration.

The Senator stated that some of our bedridden veterans are housed in nonfire-resistant buildings and that at the time of his speech approximately 25 percent of the veterans' hospitals were inadequately protected. He asked the VA Administrator why he had only six safety and fire prevention engineers in the field and recommended to the Administrator that the field safety and fire prevention force be at least tripled in number. He said work injuries sustained during calendar year 1954 in the Veterans' Administration totaled 5,992 workers injuries, 2,993 disabilities, and 6 fatalities. He added that the total direct and indirect cost exclusive of fire losses or tort claims was in excess of $11 million.

The Senator concluded that consideration also must be given to the fact that many of the patients in veterans' hospitals are bedridden and disabled. Some are mental patients, he said, and in case of an unexpected catastrophe, unnecessary tragedy could result. He said:

> Therefore, I sincerely hope that the VA Administrator will pay heed to my recommendations for it is better to be safe than sorry.

Mr. President, I was appalled at the information cited by my colleague from Minnesota. Every Member of this body will agree with me that if the information cited were based on fact the Veterans' Administration would indeed be exceedingly derelict in its duty. I was so shocked at the implications that I also investigated the matter. I am pleased to state, Mr. President—and I am sure the Senator from Minnesota will share my pleasure in view of his recent stated concern—that the administration has not shirked its solemn responsibility to our hospitalized veterans.

Quite to the contrary, the Veterans' Administration has made great progress during the past 3 years toward correcting antiquated and dangerous facilities which then existed. I might add that this information comes as no surprise to me, since the present administration always has taken a position of great responsibility in all of its undertakings.

In view of the serious charges made on this floor on March 23, I asked Mr. Harvey V. Higley, the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, to inform me of the safety policies and practices now employed in the operation of that agency and for a report on the progress made to date. I am happy to state that Mr. Higley made a full and prompt reply which certainly refutes the charges made against his administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter Mr. Higley transmitted to me under date of May 3, 1956, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1956.

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: This is in reply to your letter of April 20, 1956, which requested information as to steps the Veterans' Administration is taking to protect against fire hazards in VA hospitals.

Right at the start, permit me to emphasize that the safety of patients in our hospitals has been of paramount personal concern to me in the nearly 3 years I have been Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. I can think of no other activity that has had the priority of attention and action VA has accorded this problem.

The most permanent-type protection, of course, is provided through the replacement of older and temporary hospital buildings with modern, fire-resistive structures, and the VA has engaged in such a replacement program as rapidly as possible within governing financial limitations.

Since the end of World War II the VA has placed in operation 61 new fire-resistive hospitals, with a capacity of about 31,000 beds. In addition to increasing the bed capacity in the VA hospital system, the erection of these new hospitals enabled the VA to abandon 14 older, non-fire-resistive hospitals.

Nearly 14,000 additional beds were provided in fire-resistive buildings through extensive construction additions at 38 other stations, and many of these additions replaced older units.

As you know, construction now is underway on a 1,000-bed replacement hospital at Topeka, Kans., and the VA has definite plans for the replacement of fire-resistive modernization of a number of other hospitals. These plans, of course, are subject to the approval of annual budget programs for specific fiscal years.

In addition to these replacements and additions we have been engaged in an intensive patient protection program involving more than 600 buildings in our older hospitals. The installation of automatic sprinkler systems and the provision of stairwell enclosures, fire escapes, fire doors, smoke barriers, and fire alarm systems are included in this program.

Indicative of the stress placed on this program is the fact that expenditures for just the last 3 fiscal years are in excess of the total amounts expended for this type of patient protection in all the preceding years of VA history.

Patient-protection installations, which are already completed, or are now underway, have involved an expenditure of more than $5 million during fiscal years 1944, 1955, and 1956, and we plan to spend another $1 million for this purpose in the next 2 fiscal years.

The installation of automatic sprinkler systems in VA hospitals during the past 3 years is acknowledged to be one of the largest programs of its kind in the history of the sprinkler industry.

Those of our hospitals which are within corporate limits have the benefit of firefighting and rescue services provided by regular city fire departments. Through trial runs or visits to our hospitals these departments become acquainted with the areas and also assist us in detecting any fire-protection deficiencies.

In our other hospitals not covered by municipal departments VA his its own firefighting equipment manned by full-time, trained firefighters under competent fire chiefs. These full-time staffs are ably supplemented by volunteer brigades of VA employees who are trained and drilled in a part-time basis. In many instances VA-manned fire departments have mutual-aid agreements with nearby municipal departments, which assure added protection for both parties to the agreement.

VA hospitals have guard forces which are on duty around the clock. Through periodic rounds of the hospital areas these guards provide added protection in the matter of fire detection and prevention, and also help to man the volunteer brigades.

Our hospitals have evacuation drills, which often include the actual movement of ambulatory patients, at regular and frequent intervals. These drills serve to insure knowledge of disaster assignments, and assist in inculcating an orderly procedure to be followed in event of an actual fire or other emergency.

Safety and fire protection in the VA is regarded as an integral part of operations at all levels, and is held to be the personal responsibility of each station manager. Through our emphasis of this concept, the manager of each station is made vitally aware of the need for protective measures, and of his first-line responsibility for insuring that proper measures are taken.

A regular staff engineer at each of our hospitals and domiciliaries is designated as the station safety and fire protection officer, and other key personnel are so designated in our regional and district offices.

To assist managers and other supervisory personnel in carrying out these important responsibilities the VA has 15 fully qualified safety and fire protection engineers. It is the responsibility of all these engineers to give expert technical assistance and guidance to VA personnel and installations throughout the nation.

Although your letter made inquiry about only fire protection measures, you may be interested in knowing that we also are making a concerted effort to reduce accidents and injuries among our employees.

We have just finished our annual evaluation of the VA Safety and Fire Protection Program for calendar year 1955, and I was pleased to learn that the number of disabling injuries per unit of employee exposure had dropped 8.6 percent from the 1954 rate, and that the severity of injury was down 28.8 percent.

This same evaluation report shows VA had 8 percent fewer fires in 1955 than in 1954, and that the monetary loss attributable to fire had dropped from $458,015 to only $40,516.

I very much appreciate your interest in our patient protection program, and I can assure you there never will be any laxity or

complacency in such a vital matter as long as I am administrator.

Sincerely,

HARVEY V. HIGLEY,
Administrator.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this letter shows without question that the matter of providing protection for patients is an integral part of the Veterans' Administration program. The VA is engaging in the most concerted "patient protection" program in the history of the agency. By the end of the current fiscal year, June 30, 1956, the VA will have completed construction on 35 or more major protection projects. Construction is under way on another 53 projects. I am sure these facts should dispel any misconceptions about irresponsibility in our present Veterans' Administration program.

CERTAIN ENLISTMENT CONTRACTS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 2106.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2106) to provide that the enlistment contracts of members of the Armed Forces shall not terminate by reason of appointment as cadets or midshipmen of the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Forces with an amendment on page 2, line 6, after the word "and", to strike out "allowances" and insert "allowances, compensation, pensions, or benefits."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the bill provides a contingent enlisted status for enlisted men who are appointed to one of the service academies. At the present time inductees in the service who are appointed to the academies may, when they quit the academies prior to graduation, resign from the service and terminate their military obligation.

The proposed bill would impose a contingent enlisted status, to be carried throughout the man's academy career, and to which he will revert if he resigns from the academy. If he does resign he must finish out his original service obligation. Time spent as a cadet or midshipman will be counted as time under the original obligation.

No additional pay advantages are to be conferred by the contingent status.

The proposed legislation is designed to close an obvious loophole in the service requirement statutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2074, H. R. 4363.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4363) authorizing the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the State of New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, on page 2, line 10, after the word "emergency", to insert "declared by the President or the Congress."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Florida make a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. SMATHERS. The bill conveys about 51 acres of the former Buras Hospital site, New Mexico, to the State of New Mexico for use by its State National Guard in training.

The land is conveyed without consideration, but with a proviso that the land shall revert to United States ownership if it is used for other than Guard training purposes.

The State has been leasing the land for this purpose since 1947.

Mineral rights are reserved to the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Unless another Senator desires to relieve the present occupant of the chair of the duty of presiding over the Senate, the Chair, without objection, will make a brief statement on the pending bill.

As the Chair reads the bill, it in no way violates the Morse formula. It is one of a series of similar National Guard bills, in which the consideration for the Federal Government is really the security services which will be rendered by the National Guard with respect to the State it represents. The bill is along the line of a series of similar bills which comply with the Morse formula. Therefore the present occupant of the chair has no objection to the bill.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

DISTRIBUTION OF WOMEN OFFICERS IN THE NAVY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2075, H. R. 8477.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8477) to amend title II of Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 by providing flexibility in the distribution of women officers in the grades of commander and lieutenant commander, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the bill alleviates promotion obstacles in the grade of lieutenant in the WAVES.

Because of wartime recruiting policies and existing restrictions on the promotion of WAVE junior officers, there is at present a considerable number of WAVE lieutenants whose time in grade without promotion will compel their separation from the service in the coming year.

The bill makes two changes in the promotion situation—it provides that any excess in the number of full commanders authorized by law over the number determined to be necessary by the Secretary of Navy, will be shifted to the authorized number of lieutenant commanders; and it permits lieutenants to remain in service until they have served 15 years of active commissioned service, rather than 13 years.

This shift would result in no additional cost to the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE CITY OF MUSKOGEE, OKLA.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2078, H. R. 7679.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7679), to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Muskogee, Okla.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the bill reconveys to the city of Muskogee, Okla., a 9-acre tract in Muskogee County. The tract was part of a 14-acre grant made by the county to the United States in 1945 for improvements to the Veterans' Hospital located to the south. By the act of July 28, 1954, 5.4 acres were reconveyed to the county. This bill reconveys the remainder.

Mineral interest is retained in the United States.

The VA does not object to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair will make a

brief statement on the bill. The bill is in line with a series of similar bills heretofore passed by Congress whereby property was transferred to the Federal Government for a specific Federal use, with the implied understanding, although not actually stated, that in case the Federal Government did not have use for the property for the specific purpose stated, it was to revert to the State or to the original conveyor. The bill not being in violation of the Morse formula, there is no objection to it on that ground.

The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE CITY OF BONHAM, TEX.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2079, H. R. 8490.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8490) to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Bonham, Tex.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. The bill conveys 21.9 acres, which are a part of a Veterans' Administration center reservation, to the city of Bonham, Tex.

The land is to be used for recreational purposes. Reversionary clauses provide for its return to the United States if it is not so used. It has been declared excess to Veterans' Administration needs by the General Services Administration.

Mineral rights are reserved to the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in understanding that this bill involves the transfer of property which in the first instance was conveyed to the Government for a specific Federal purpose, namely, the development of the particular Federal institution involved, that the property to the extent stated in the bill is no longer needed for that purpose, and that under the implied understanding at the time of the conveyance, if the property should no longer be required for the stated purpose, it would be returned to the original donor?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Therefore the bill does not violate the Morse formula. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RETURN OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE CITY OF BILOXI, MISS.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2080, H. R. 8674.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8674) to provide for the return of certain property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the bill conveys 144 acres, which are a part of a VA hospital reservation, to Biloxi, Miss., for park purposes.

One hundred and thirty-nine acres of this tract were donated to the VA by the city of Biloxi. The entire 144 acres is determined to be surplus by the Veterans' Administration.

A clause is included which will permit the VA Administrator to make certain requirements for the use of the land, subject to reversion to the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is is correct to say that two factors are involved in the bill? The first factor is that the Federal Government continues to maintain some user interest, in that the Veterans' Administration is allowed to impose certain restrictions. The second factor is that we are dealing with a case in which the original purpose of the transfer by the city of Biloxi was to make the land available for Veterans' Administration purposes in case it was needed for a certain purpose. The implied understanding, of course, was that if the land was no longer needed for that purpose, it was to be returned to the city of Biloxi, the original donor. It is no longer needed. Is that correct?

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. The bill does not violate the Morse formula. I have no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO THE CITY OF CHEYENNE, WYO.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2081, House Resolution 9358.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9358) to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to issue a deed to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for certain land heretofore conveyed to such city, removing the conditions and reservations made a part of such prior conveyance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the bill provides for the conveyance of 431 acres which were formerly a part of a VA center reservation, to Cheyenne, Wyo., and for the reconveyance of this land to the city by the VA.

The land was first conveyed to Cheyenne by act of the 80th Congress, subjcet to its use as a park and golf course. The city has not complied with this requirement, but has used it for airport and school purposes, and as a gravel pit. Upon learning that the land might revert to the United States because of its noncompliance, the city recently abandoned these uses.

This bill would permit the land to be used for other than park and golf course purposes, but subject to conditions which would not, in the judgment of the VA Administrator, interfere with the operation of the VA hospital.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is another one of the transfers which is identical with the bill we have been discussing, where the land involved is now surplus to the Veterans' Administration and was originally made available to the Veterans' Administration for Veterans' Administration purposes, and, therefore, the bill proposes to give the land back to the original donor. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ISSUANCE OF DEED FOR CERTAIN LAND TO THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLO.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 2082, House bill 10251.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10251) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to deed certain land to the city of Grand Junction, Colo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, this bill directs the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to quitclaim 16.72 acres,

which are a part of a Veterans' Administration hospital reservation, to the city of Grand Junction, Colo.

The land is to be used as a park, and will revert if not so used. Mineral rights will be retained by the United States, but will vest in the city after 50 years, or upon the cessation of operations by the Veterans' Administration hospital.

The identical land was donated by the city to the Veterans' Administration in 1946, and the city has made considerable utility improvements thereon. Presently the Veterans' Administration leases the property to the municipal golf course.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to make a brief statement concerning the bill. As the distinguished Senator from Florida has stated, the bill would enable the city of Grand Junction to use the land for recreational purposes. The deed will contain a reversionary clause, and also a reservation of minerals, so that the Government will be adequately protected throughout. In the event the land is not used for recreational purposes, it will immediately revert to the Government.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the bill is in line with those we have been discussing. The land is surplus to the Veterans' Administration so far as the original purpose for which it was donated to the Federal Government is concerned, and therefore it will go back to the original donor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE CITY OF ROSEBURG, OREG.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar 2083, House bill 8123.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8123) authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments on page 1, line 3, after the word "to", to strike out "section 2 of this act" and insert "such reservations and restrictions as may be necessary to protect the interests of the United States", and on page 2, after line 3, to strike out:

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this act (1) shall provide that the tract of land so conveyed shall be used for park purposes, and shall be available for recreational use by the patients of the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Roseburg, Oreg., under the same conditions as it may be made available to the public, so long as the property is used for the purpose conveyed, and if it shall ever cease to be used for such park purposes the title to such property shall revert to the United States, which shall have immediate right to reentry thereon, (2) shall reserve to the United States all mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the land so conveyed, and (3) may contain such additional terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as may be determined by the Administrator of General Services to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, this bill directs the General Services Administrator to quitclaim 163 acres, which are a part of the Veterans' Administration hospital reservation, to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.

The land is declared to be excess to Veterans Administration needs. It was originally donated to the United States by the city of Roseburg.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the committee report, because it contains a letter which I sent to the committee in explanation of the bill. It shows that the bill falls within the same category as the series of the bills which the Senate has just been considering.

There being no objection, the report (No. 2061) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8123) authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., having considered same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

On page 1, line 3, strike out "section 2 of this act" and insert in lieu thereof "such reservations and restrictions as may be necessary to protect the interests of the United States."

On page 2, beginning with line 1, strike out through the end of the bill.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The bill authorizes and directs the Administrator of General Services, subject to such reservations and restrictions as may be necessary to protect the interests of the United States, to quitclaim to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., all right, title, and interest of the United States to 163 acres of land situated within the Veterans' Administration hospital reservation at Roseburg, Oreg., the exact legal description of which shall be determined by the Administrator of General Services.

In 1932 the city of Roseburg donated to the United States a tract of 413.7 acres of land and the State of Oregon donated a tract of 40 acres on which the Veterans' Administration constructed a hospital which is presently operating as a 670-bed neuropsychiatric hospital. Following a study of land requirements, several tracts of this land were declared excess to the needs of the Veterans' Administration to the General Services Administration. This bill relates to 163 acres of the tract, 123.43 acres of which were declared excess on April 15, 1955, and 38 acres of which were declared excess on October 28, 1955. Included in the report of excess for the 123.43-acre tract were 2 buildings constructed in 1943 at a cost of $790 which were used by the hospital as a farrowing house and a feed granary.

In a letter regarding this bill written to the chairman of your committee, Hon. WAYNE MORSE, United States Senator from Oregon, stated that the bill as passed by the House was more restrictive than necessary under the circumstances, and proposed that it be amended to provide for conveyance of the 163-acre tract by quitclaim deed rather than by the limited type of conveyance authorized in the House bill. He wrote as follows:

"In the instant case, section 2 of H. R. 8123 provides that the land to be reconveyed shall be used for park purposes with a reversion in case such use should cease, and there is also a reservation of mineral rights. Such a conveyance, if authorized and carried out, would involve something less than a fee title. It is my personal opinion that, since the United States has declared the 163 acres as excess to the needs of the Veterans' Administration and since there is no objection on the part of any Government agency to a reconveyance of the 163 acres to the city for park purposes, the Government should be willing to do as it has done in other cases without violating the Morse formula, namely, quitclaim the 163 acres to the city of Roseburg without condition or restriction.

"For the foregoing reasons I respectfully suggest to the committee that H. R. 8123 be amended so as to provide for the conveyance of the desired tract to the city of Roseburg by quitclaim deed rather than under the limited and restrictive type of conveyance that would be authorized in the House bill. An amendment along the lines I have suggested would appear to me to be consonant with fair play and more in line with the intention of the parties when the original conveyance was made to the United States in 1932."

With respect to the two buildings that have been erected on the tract in 1943 at a cost of $790, Senator MORSE wrote:

"I am informed that these buildings have little or no salvage value at the present time and that, in fact, it would cost the Government money to attempt to dispose of these buildings as separate pieces of property. In such cases the Morse formula has no application."

AMENDMENTS

In view of the explanation given your committee by the senior Senator from Oregon, in this letter quoted above, H. R. 8123 has been amended by the unanimous action of the committee so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to make the conveyance subject only to "such reservations and restrictions as may be necessary to protect the interests of the United States."

The letter from Senator Morse to the chairman of your committee follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
May 21, 1956.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HILL: I appreciated very much the courtesy of your letter of May 14 relative to the bill H. R. 8123, an act of authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.

At the outset I want you to know that in my opinion your interest in ascertaining whether the Morse formula is applicable to this bill constitutes another example of your devotion to the general public interest. Your desire to make certain that the United States receives any compensation to which it is rightfully entitled in these land-transfer cases is to be highly commended.

As you know, the Morse formula is not incorporated in a specific provision of Federal law, but is a rule of compensation that I have applied in the Senate for many years in order to assure that the people of the United States receive what is rightfully due them in cases wherein legislative proposals call for gratuitous transfer of federally owned property that has been declared surplus to the needs of the Government.

The Morse formula came into being shortly after World War II as the result of a study

made by a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee consisting of Senators BYRD, SALTONSTALL, and myself. The subcommittee had been given the job of analyzing problems relative to the disposal of surplus military property and during the course of its studies the members became concerned about the number of bills which were introduced in both the Senate and the House to bring about free transfers of large quantities of valuable military property. We discovered that millions of dollars of Government property was being given away under what was really a grab-bag program and it was our conclusion that the Government was entitled to fair and reasonable compensation for these property transfers. We also agreed that such compensation should be based on a formula to be applied uniformly in all cases.

We did not claim that our formula was scientific and precise, but we were satisfied that it was reasonable and based on commonsense. So far as compensation for military property was concerned, the formula required States and their governmental subdivisions to pay the United States the appraised fair market value—100 cents on the dollar—for property designed for nonpublic use, and one-half of that amount for property acquired for public uses such as parks and recreational areas. The formula was soon extended to all other surplus property of the Federal Government covered by any private disposal bill.

I am satisfied that you are correct in your conclusion that the application of the formula has saved millions of dollars for the taxpayers of the United States. Furthermore, these savings continue to accrue, because most committees of the Senate now check carefully to make sure that proposed land transfer bills reported to the Senate comply strictly with the formula.

As suggested in your letter, I have analyzed the bill H. R. 8123 and House Report No. 1968 thereon. In my opinion the element that is of primary importance is found in the following language appearing at page 2 of House Report No. 1968:

"In 1932 the city of Roseburg donated to the United States a tract of 413.7 acres of land and the State of Oregon donated a tract of 40 acres on which the Veterans' Administration subsequently constructed a hospital * * *."

The foregoing quotation as well as information supplied by the General Services Administration demonstrate clearly that the 453.7 acres of land comprising of the Roseburg Veterans' Hospital Reserve were originally donated to the United States by the city of Roseburg (413.7 acres) and the State of Oregon (40 acres).

If the Federal Government had purchased the land in the first instance, the Morse formula would have been applicable and the payment of 50 percent of the fair appraised market value by the city would have been a proper requirement in a bill proposing a transfer of any portion of such land to the city for public purposes.

However, in cases such as this, where the land was acquired by the Government through donation, and its original donor seeks a reconveyance of a portion of the donated land, in unimproved condition, the Morse formula is inapplicable. The reason for this conclusion becomes apparent when we analyze the obvious intentions of the parties to the original transfer. When the city of Roseburg donated 413.7 acres of land to the United States in 1932, the understanding of the city and Government officials, either express or implied, was that the land would be dedicated to the United States as the site of a veterans hospital. It is true that the original conveyance was made to the United States without condition or provision for reversion, but if the appropriate agency of the United States decides that it would be fair and proper to return any portion of the land to an original donor, the Morse formula would not prevent the United States from making a land transfer that in its essence represents fair play and equity. This same principle was applied upon almost identical facts in connection with the bill, S. 1585, of the 84th Congress.

In S. 1585 the proposed legislation sought to authorize a return of certain Veterans' Administration lands to the city of Hartford, Vt. As in the Roseburg case, Hartford had donated a large tract of land to the United States to be used as the site of a veterans' hospital. Fifty-three acres of the Hartford veterans' hospital land, comprising part of the original tract, were declared in excess of the needs of the Veterans' Administration and were turned over to the General Services Administration for disposal as surplus.

On the floor of the Senate I pointed out that there could be no objection, from the standpoint of the Morse formula, to the bill S. 1585 authorizing the United States to quitclaim to Hartford all the right, title and interest of the United States to the portion of the land originally donated to the United States by the town. At the time the bill passed the Senate I stated:

"There is no doubt about the fact that the town of Hartford, Vt., dedicated this property to the United States Government as a site for a veterans' hospital.

"There is no question about the fact that it was their intention that only so much of the land as would be needed by the United States Government for hospital purposes was to be given to the United States Government * * *.

"I am satisfied, Mr. President, that this bill conforms to the spirit and intent of the Morse formula and I shall not raise an objection to it."

In a number of other cases involving proposed reconveyances of land donated to the United States I have applied the same principle.

In the instant case, section 2 of H. R. 8123 provides that the land to be reconveyed shall be used for park purposes with a reversion in case such use should cease and there is also a reservation of mineral rights. Such a conveyance, if authorized and carried out, would involve something less than a fee title. It is my personal opinion that since the United States has declared the 163 acres as excess to the needs of the Veterans' Administration and since there is no objection on the part of any Government agency to a recoveyance of the 163 acres to the city for park purposes, the Government should be willing to do as it has done in other cases without violating the Morse formula, namely, quitclaim the 163 acres to the city of Roseburg without condition or reservation.

For the foregoing reasons I respectfully suggest to the committee that H. R. 8123, be amended so as to provide for the reconveyance of the desired tract to the city of Roseburg by quitclaim deed rather than under the limited and restrictive type of conveyance that would be authorized in the House bill. An amendment along the lines I have suggested would appear to me to be consonant with fair play and more in line with the intention of the parties when the original conveyance was made to the United States in 1932.

House Report No. 1968 refers to the fact that 2 buildings located on the tract described in H. R. 8123 were erected in 1943 at a cost of $790 and were utilized by the veterans' hospital as a farrowing house and feed granary. I am informed that these buildings have little or no salvage value at the present time and that in fact, it would cost the Government money to attempt to dispose of these buildings as separate pieces of property. In such cases the Morse formula has no application.

If you or other members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare have additional questions, I shall be pleased to discuss them at your convenience.

With warm personal regards,

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

The reports of the Veterans' Administration, the General Services Administration, and the Bureau of the Budget follow:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1956.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: Further reference is made to your letter of April 19, 1956, requesting a report by the Veterans' Administration relative to H. R. 8123, 84th Congress, an act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., which bill passed the House of Representatives on April 16, 1956.

The bill proposes to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to convey to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a tract of approximately 163 acres of land situated in the reservation of the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Roseburg, Oreg. The bill provides that the exact legal description of the land to be conveyed shall be determined by the Administrator. Section 2 states that the deed of conveyance (1) shall provide that the land shall be used for park purposes and shall be available for recreational use by the patients of the mentioned hospital under the same conditions as it may be made available to the public, and if it ceases to be used for park purposes, title thereto shall revert to the United States which shall have immediate right of reentry thereon; (2) shall reserve to the United States all mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the land; and (3) may contain such additional terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as may be determined by the Administrator to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

In 1932, the city of Roseburg, Oreg., donated to the United States a tract of approximately 413.7 acres of land lying north of the South Umpqua River, near Roseburg, Oreg., and the State of Oregon donated a tract of 40 acres of land lying immediately south of that river. The Veterans' Administration subsequently constructed a hospital on the land, which it is presently operating as a 670-bed hospital with a preponderance of neuropsychiatric patients.

Following studies of the land requirements at the Roseburg hospital, it was determined that several tracts of land of the hospital reservation were in excess of the present and foreseeable future requirements of the hospital. As a result, those tracts were declared to the General Services Administration, under dates of April 15, 1955, and October 28, 1955, as excess to the needs of the Veterans' Administration. H. R. 8123 is concerned with a 124.43-acre tract of land which was declared as excess to our needs on April 15, 1955, and a contiguous tract of approximately 38 acres which was declared as excess on October 28, 1955. Included in the report of excess for the 124-acre tract were 2 buildings located thereon. These buildings were erected in 1943 at a cost of $790 and were utilized by the hospital as a farrowing house and feed granary.

By letter dated January 3, 1955, the mayor and the city manager of Roseburg, Oreg., advised this agency that in the event the 124-acre tract was found to be excess to the needs of the Veterans' Administration, the city intended to make application to the General Services Administration to acquire it, for park and recreational purposes, pursuant to a provision of law under which the city would pay 50 percent of the fair

value of the property based on its highest and best use at the time it is offered for disposal. Accompanying the letter of the mentioned officials was a letter from the Douglas County Realty Board indicating that in the opinion of 3 named reality appraisers a reasonable value of the land, for recreational purposes, is $100 per acre, or a total of $12,500. The mayor and city manager indicated the willingness of the city to pay 50 percent of that price. It is understood that following the declaration of this property as excess, the city filed an application with the General Services Administration to acquire the property for use for public park and recreational purposes.

The Veterans' Administration has been advised by the General Services Administration that both the 124- and 38-acre tracts in question have been screened against the needs of Federal agencies and determined to be surplus to the needs of the Government. We have informally learned that the General Services Administration appraised the 124-acre tract at approximately $40,000, and that following this appraisal the request by the city of Roseburg to acquire this property was withdrawn. We are not informed whether the General Services Administration has appraised the 38-acre tract.

In view of the fact that the land in question is presently under the jurisdiction and control of the Administrator of General Services and since the bill provides for the conveyance of the land by him, it is assumed that your committee will secure his comments relative to the proposal.

The reports of excess to the General Services Administration covering both the 125- and 38-acre tracts contained a condition requiring the transferee to relocate the existing boundary fences along the new boundary of the hospital reservation. As a matter of information, if the bill is enacted, the Veterans' Administration will attempt to have such a requirement incorporated in the deed, pursuant to subsection 2 (3) of the bill.

It is believed that the transfer of the acreage in question to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., under the terms and conditions set forth in the bill, and its use for park purposes, would not interfere with the present or prospective operation of the nearby Veterans' Administration hospital. Accordingly, the Veterans' Administration would interpose no objection to the favorable consideration of H. R. 8123 by your committee.

Advice was received from the Bureau of the Budget with respect to a similar report on this bill to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs that there would be no objection by that Office to the submission of the report to the committee.

Sincerely yours,

H. V. HIGLEY,
Administrator.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1956.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This will acknowledge your letter of April 19, 1956, requesting the views of this Office on H. R. 8123, an act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.

The purpose of H. R. 8123 is to convey to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a tract of land containing approximately 163 acres, which is now a part of the Veterans' Administration hospital reservation, Roseburg, Oreg. The bill stipulates that the deed of conveyance shall provide that the land be used for park purposes and be available for recreational use by patients of the hospital with reversion of title to the United States if it ceases to be used for park purposes. The bill also reserves to the United States mineral rights, including gas and oil, and provides that the deed of conveyance may contain such additional conditions, terms, reservations, and restrictions as may be necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

The lands which comprise the Veterans' Administration hospital reservation at Roseburg, Oreg., were donated in 1932 to the United States by the city of Roseburg and the State of Oregon. The portion now proposed for conveyance to the city has been determined to be surplus to the needs of the Federal Government.

Under the circumstances, the Bureau of the Budget would have no objection to the enactment of H. R. 8123.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. MERRIAM,
Assistant to the Director.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 28, 1956.

Re H. R. 8123

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Further reference is made to your letter of February 21 requesting the views of this agency regarding H. R. 8123 providing for the conveyance of certain lands to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.

The bill directs the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Roseburg (without consideration) 125 acres, more or less, situated in the Veterans' Administration hospital reservation in that city. Further, the bill requires that the deed (1) shall provide that the land shall be used for park purposes and shall be available for recreational use by the patients of the hospital under the same conditions as it may be made available to the public, and if it ceases to be used for park purposes title should revert to the United States which shall have immediate right of reentry; (2) shall reserve to the United States all mineral rights, including gas and oil; and (3) may contain such additional terms, conditions, reservations, and restirctions as may be determined by the Administrator to oe necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

The Veterans' Administration has reported that the property described in the bill was acquired by donation from the city of Roseburg, Oreg., in 1932.

The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and regulations issued pursuant thereto, in conjunction with section 13 (h) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, which was continued in effect by the former act, prescribe detailed and permanent procedures for the conveyance of surplus Federal realty to State and local governments for public park and public recreational use. These laws require (1) payment by the grantee of 50 percent of the fair value of the property conveyed, based on the highest and best use of the property at the time it is offered for disposal; (2) use and maintenance of the property for the purpose for which it was conveyed for not less than 20 years; (3) reverter of the property to the United States upon cessation of use for such purpose during such period. Determination and enforcement of compliance with the terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions of such conveyances is made the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior.

The city of Roseburg in June 1955, acting pursuant to procedures established by this agency under said laws, applied for the property referred to in the bill for park and recreational use. An appraisal of the property, made by this agency after determination by the Department of the Interior that the land, was suitable and desirable for park and recreational purposes, established the value of the land in the amount of $38,750. The city of Roseburg was informed that transfer of the property would be made to it in consideration of the payment of the sum of $19,375.

It is understood that funds in that amount were not available to the city of Roseburg, and, since the land was originally donated by it to the United States, H. R. 8123 was introduced to provide for a transfer without consideration.

It is a matter of policy for the Congress, of course, to determine whether on this record the general laws on the subject should be superseded by special legislation.

Since the land concerned has been reported as excess to and is held by this agency for disposal, it is suggested, if the bill receives favorable consideration, that it be amended to delete the references to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in the title and body thereof and to substitute therefore "Administrator of General Services."

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN G. FLOETE,
Administrator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ADJUSTMENT OF COMPENSATION UNDER CONTRACTS FOR CARRYING MAIL ON WATER ROUTES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2088, H. R. 4569.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4569) to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall certainly not object—because it is a bill which I believe should be passed, I wonder whether the chairman of the committee would be willing first to call up Calendar No. 2087, S. 1873. It also has the unanimous approval of both leaderships.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It was felt by the leadership that that bill should be considered on Monday. We will be glad to bring it up at that time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, after conferring with the Senator from South Carolina, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The bill has been discussed with the leadership, and has received the clearance. There is no opposition to it on either side. The bill would strike out the word "inland" in the present act relating to the carrying of mail.

The Postmaster General has advised us that he is running into a technical limitation in this regard, and he wishes the word "inland" stricken from the law.

Enactment of the bill will not cost anything. In all probability it will save a little money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10899) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for th fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the work on the bill this year has been a pleasant task. The committee has had no partisan differences of any kind with which to deal. I do not believe the Senate will find in this year's bill items which will tie us up for as many hours or in as long sessions as occurred last year. I hope that will prove to be the case.

The ranking minority member of the subcommittee which handled the bill, the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], is on the floor. She and all other members of the subcommittee have been most loyal and most attentive to the business of the committee.

I think the report reflects the united judgment of the subcommittee and of the full Appropriations Committee. I do not recall any difference of opinion arising in reporting the final draft of the bill, either from the subcommittee or from the full committee.

The total amount of funds for the Department of Commerce and related agencies covered by the bill, H. R. 10899, as reported to the Senate, is $1,445,566,000, or almost one and one-half billion dollars. This is $77,107,000 under the estimates for 1957, and $33,432,500 under the appropriation for 1956. The Senate committee, however, has increased the amount in the House version of the bill by $63,563,000.

Notwithstanding that substantial increase, however, the bill now is, as I have already stated $77,107,000 under the 1957 estimates as they came to Congress from the President and the Bureau of the Budget.

The substantially greater part of the increase over the amount in the House bill is to be found in the ship-construction item, under "Maritime activities, Department of Commerce." The Senate committee has recommended a ship replacement and a replaced-ship acquisition program with an increase of $54,080,000 over the $54,800,000 provided in the House bill, making a total of $108,880,000.

Of the total recommended by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, approximately $1,250,000,000, or 86 percent, relates to 3 programs as follows:

Two hundred and two million, two hundred and twenty-six thousand dollars relates to the Civil Aeronautics Administration program. Two hundred and fifty-one million, two hundred and forty thousand dollars relates to maritime activities under the Department of Commerce. Seven hundred and ninety-nine million dollars relates to the highway program under the Department of Commerce. The total of those 3 items, as already stated, is more than $1¼ billion.

I do not believe it will be necessary, unless a request is made by some Senator, to discuss all the amendments, some of which are of quite minor importance. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be considered, for the purpose of amendment, as original text; provided, however, that no point of order against any amendment shall be deemed to have been waived by the adoption of the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of Commerce—general administration," on page 2, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "$2,425,000" and insert "$2,465,000," and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That the certificate of the Secretary shall be sufficient voucher for the expenditure of $3,600 of this appropriation for such purposes as he may deem necessary."

Under the subhead "Bureau of the Census," on page 2, line 16, after the word "only", to strike out "$7,413,000" and insert "$7-475,000."

On page 3, line 1, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "$1,750,000" and insert "$2,100,000."

On page 3, after line 2, to strike out:

"National housing inventory: For expenses necessary for conducting a survey of housing, including personal services by contract or otherwise at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of Commerce without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; and compensation of Federal employees temporarily detailed for field work under this appropriation; $1 million."

Under the subhead "Civil Aeronautics Administration," on page 4, at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "90" and insert "one hundred and ten"; and in line 19, after the word "snowshoes", to strike out "$125,000,000" and insert "$128,608,000."

On page 5, line 12, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "$37,500,000" and insert "$40 million."

Under the subhead "Civil Aeronautics Board," on page 7, line 2, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "$4,550,000" and insert "$4,700,000."

On page 7, line 8, after the numerals "1953", to strike out "$15,000,000" and insert "$17,400,000."

Under the subhead "Coast and Geodetic Survey," on page 8, line 6, after the word "law", to strike out "$10,800,000" and insert "$11,020,000."

On page 8, at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "$3,400,000" and insert "$3,700,000."

Under the subhead "Business and Defense Services Administration," on page 8, line 23, to strike out "$7,200,000" and insert "$6,900,000."

Under the subhead "Office of Business Economics," on page 9, line 7, after the word "Economics", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$900,000."

Under the subhead "Maritime Activities," on page 9, line 18, after "(46 U. S. C. 1154)," to strike out "for reconditioning and betterment of one ship in the national defense reserve fleet"; on page 10, line 2, after the word "equipment", to strike out "$54,800,000" and insert "$108,880,000"; and in line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,232,000."

On page 11, line 22, after the words "two thousand", to insert "and seventy-five."

On page 12, line 3, after the word "Administration", to strike out "$15,187,000" and insert "$15,500,000."

On page 12, line 9, after the word "only", to strike out "$6,482,000" and insert "$6,600,000."

On page 12, line 11, after the word "warehouses", to strike out "$1,455,000" and insert "$1,650,000."

On page 17, after line 2, to insert:

"Inland Waterways Corporation (administered under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Commerce): Not to exceed $14,000 shall be available for administrative expenses to be determined in the manner set forth under the title "General expenses" in the Uniform System of Accounts for Carriers by Water of the Interstate Commerce Commission (effective January 1, 1947)."

Under the subhead "National Bureau of Standards," on page 22, after line 14, to insert:

"Construction of facilities: For acquisition of necessary land and to initiate the design of the facilities to be constructed thereon for the National Bureau of Standards outside of the District of Columbia to remain available until expended, $930,000, to be transferred to the General Services Administration."

Under the heading "Title II—The Panama Canal—Panama Canal Company," on page 25, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$3,562,100" and insert "$3,679,000"; on page 26, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "eighteen" and insert "thirty-one", nd in the same line, after the word "vehicles", to insert "of which eighteen are."

Under the heading "Title III—Independent Agencies—St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation," on page 29, line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$315,000" and insert "$325,000"; in line 15, after the word "basis", to insert "including not to exceed $1,500 for official entertainment expenses, to be expended upon the approval or authority of the Administrator"; and in line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "three" and insert "four."

Under the subhead "Small Business Administration," on page 30, line 6, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$1,890,000" and insert "$1,900,000"; and at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "$4,610,000" and insert "$4,634,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the committee has prepared and is having circulated for the convenience of Senators who are present a clearer and easier-to-follow copy of the tables which are to be found in the back of the committee report, covering the various items in the bill and showing the differences between the amounts contained in the fiscal year 1956 appropriations, the budget requests for fiscal year 1957, the House bill, and the Senate bill.

There is one amendment which the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and I have agreed upon, and in which we are joined by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. The amendment has to do with the appropriation for a national intercensal survey of housing. I offer the amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, between lines 9 and 10, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

National Intercensal Survey of Housing: For expenses necessary for conducting a national intercensal survey of housing, including personal services by contract or otherwise at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of Commerce without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and compensation of Federal employees temporarily detailed for field work under this appropriation, $650,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in explanation of the item, I may say, first, that the last housing survey was made at the time of the decennial census of 1950. Since that time, as every Senator knows, there has been an immense amount of housing construction in the Nation. The Senate has been advised, and the budget reflects this thought, that it would be highly advantageous to have down-to-the-minute information as to the progress of housing and as to the principal problems confronting the housing construction industry.

The Senate committee deleted the whole item from the bill. Because of this action by the full committee, I think this explanation should be made. The original amount contained in the budget was $1,800,000 for this purpose. The House granted $1 million, striking $800,000. The justifications for the request for restoration and the appearance of the witnesses from the Bureau of the Census before our subcommittee did not clearly reflect the fact that while this item was to take care of some special intercensal housing surveys in various cities, it also was intended to cover, by a sampling of about 2 percent, the national picture. When that information became clear to the members of the subcommittee, after the action of the full committee, we felt it was thoroughly logical for us to suggest the proposed amendment, remembering that last year our committee had recommended $500,000 for the same purpose, and it had been approved by the Senate, although it was lost in conference.

The proposed amendment allocates $650,000 for a national intercensal housing survey, which will be predicated on a 2 percent sampling of housing throughout the Nation—in every city, town, and in the rural areas as well. When we found that the $650,000 covered such an item, although the hearings did not clearly bring that out, and when we found that a truly national service could be rendered, we felt it should be rendered; and we have therefore offered the amendment.

Under the presentation made, we had understood it was simply for the building up of information in a relatively few cities, and we felt it was not justified to build up a partial picture of that kind.

I am sure I speak for the four Senators who are sponsors of the amendment, but if there are any questions, I shall be glad to try to answer them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There was a request for a more limited housing survey, embracing, I believe, $175,000 before another subcommittee. The subcommittee was trying to take care of a housing inventory, but it deferred to the Commerce subcommittee for whatever action it might take in that field, in the belief that there should be a survey. I am glad an agreement was reached, for, as we spend more money in the housing field and enlarge the number of Federal units, certainly the more worthwhile a housing inventory becomes, and I think it will be profitable for all concerned. That statement applies to those dealing with materials, those making contracts, and everybody else who may be interested.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I fully agree with his comments, particularly since I know he will recall that when the full committee passed on the item, it was understood clearly, upon the facts then available, that the survey did not propose collection of data at this time on a truly national scale. The committee was regretful that it did not cover such an item, as we understood it, and so the item was acted upon unfavorably under a misapprehension as to what it covered. Actually, it covered this particular survey along with other items which the committee did not pass, but I believe the item of $650,000 will fill a truly national need.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask to have it stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, line 23, it is proposed to strike out "$6,900,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$7,500,000."

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment proposing an increase of $600,000 is to provide funds to the Business and Defense Services Administration, so that it can undertake the construction-statistics program as originally proposed in the budget.

Some of the greatest needs today for information about the economy have to do with the largest sectors. The construction industry, for example, is today about a $60 billion industry, or about 15 percent of our total economy. It is essential that we know what is happening in this big industry, or else decisions taken by the administration and by the Congress will not be on a firm foundation.

The construction industry, the Department of Commerce, and the Joint Committee on the Economic Report have all, at various times, attested to the vital need for a substantially expanded construction-statistics program. The $600,000 requested for this program of construction statistics would, I am assured, overcome most of the major deficiencies that everyone seems to agree are present. The proposed program would overcome the deficiencies in new construction estimates, which I understand are about 50 percent guesswork. It would measure, for the first time by reliable methods, the volume of expenditures for alteration, maintenance, and repair work. Finally, it would provide information on the kinds and volume of materials used in construction. All of this information is urgently needed by the Government in its current policy decisions and in its defense and mobilization programs. It is needed equally by industry for its market research planning and in its investment decisions.

The need for having this kind of information has been attested to on many occasions by leaders in industry and officials in the Government. Decisions that we in the Congress must make depend in many ways on the accuracy of the facts we have about the construction industry.

The Department of Commerce has tried to secure funds for this work on several occasions. Last year the Senate approved $600,000 for this program. The House of Representatives disallowed the request in total, and no funds were approved by the conference committee.

This year the House approved $350,000 of the $600,000 requested by the Department. The bill before the Senate provides no funds for this program. I am sure that the decision made by the Senate last year to appropriate $600,000 for this activity was the right decision then, and is still the right decision now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter under date of May 9, 1956, submitted to the chairman of the subcommittee, by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], which appears on page 535 of the hearings.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE
ECONOMIC REPORT,
May 9, 1956.

Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Department of Commerce and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLAND: I am writing to express my interest and the interest of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report in certain statistical programs included in the budget request for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1957.

Statistical data are essential in appraising the welfare of the economy and in determining economic policy. Because of this, the Joint Committee has been increasingly concerned with the adequacy and accuracy of the data upon which it must rely. Through hearings, studies, and reports it has attempted to determine how adequate our present statistics are for the important purposes for which they are used, and many of the increases included for statistical programs in 1957 have resulted from the committee's studies and recommendations during the past 2 years.

In its report on the 1956 Economic Report of the President (S. Rept. No. 1606, p. 6) the Joint Economic Committee stated:

"We urge the Congress to give strong support to the proposals in the current budget for additional funds for improving our sources of economic intelligence. In the long run, such expenditures to enable early and correct diagnosis of imbalances will make a greater contribution to our economic stability and growth per dollar spent than the much larger sums needed to correct difficulties discovered only after they have become large and menacing."

We are pleased that many of the basic improvements needed have been passed by the House for the 1957 appropriations. I am concerned, however, that there are still a few places in the bill which the House passed that need strengthening if we are not to impair the statistical program proposed for 1957. Most of these instances are in programs to be conducted by the Department of Commerce, as follows:

(1) In the Office of Business Economics, the 1957 appropriation request was $1,200,000—an increase of $240,000 over the amount available in 1956. This increase was to provide for four projects of direct concern to the Joint Economic Committee—improving and remedying present inadequacies in (a) estimates of consumer expenditures in the national income and product accounts; (b) estimates of manufacturers' inventories; (c) estimates of expenditures for plant and equipment; and (d) estimates of changes in the business population. The House allowed only $40,000 of this $240,000 increase, which would be insufficient to bring about the immediate improvements which we have recommended in these areas.

(2) In the business and Defense Services Administration, the 1957 request included an increase of $600,000 for construction statistics; and the House reduced this amount to $350,000. This is a great improvement over any previous bill but since the present data for measuring changes in this significant economic activity are particularly weak, I hope it will be possible to provide the full amount necessary to remedy the major existing inadequacies. The Joint Economic Committee was unanimous in its support of this last year when we stated in Senate Report No. 1309 (p. 2):

"* * * One of the most important forces in our current prosperity has been the continued high level of construction. In any appraisal of the economic outlook it is essential to know as much as possible about the health of this industry. * * *"

(3) Of particular interest to the Joint Economic Committee, too, is the request in the item for the Bureau of the Census for $82,800 for monthly estimates of retail inventories, as recommended by the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics. The reduction of the request of the Census Bureau from $1,800,000 to $1 million for the National Housing Inventory would drastically curtail the amount of local area data which could be obtained from the survey, seriously limiting the usefulness of the information. The national data which could be obtained with the $1 million are greatly needed, but so also are indications of the variations in the housing supply in different areas, which would require additional funds.

On behalf of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and of its Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, on which I have served since its founding 2 years ago, I sincerely hope that the Senate Committee on Appropriations may restore funds for as many of these programs as possible.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN SPARKMAN,
Subcommittee on Economic Statistics.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I asked to have the letter printed in the RECORD because the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who is the chairman of the subcommittee on housing of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and who is also active in the Select Committee on Small Business and the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, was very much interested in this particular proposal, and strongly supported it.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an outline of what this particular program would accomplish; an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 23, 1955, pertaining to the same subject matter; and, finally, an editorial appearing in Engineering News-Record of March 22, 1956, which further elaborates on this particular problem.

There being no objection, the outline and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The Construction Statistics Program ($600,000) will answer:

How much money is spent in new nonresidential building? By State and local governments for schools, hospitals, sewer, and water projects, other public buildings. By public utilities for railroads and shops, powerplants, telephone exchanges, oil and gas pipelines. By private business and institutions for industrial plants, office buildings, stores, churches, schools, hospitals.

How much money is spent for alterations and repairs? By business, Government, and individuals on houses, stores, schools, public utilities, institutions.

How much material is used in industrial building? Lumber, cement, steel, bricks, copper, aluminum, glass.

ECONOMIC FACT FINDERS

Congress this year wisely reversed a trend and voted an increase in appropriations for improving the Government's economic statistics, the essential tools of all persons concerned with private or public economic programs and planning. President Eisenhower asked for an increase of $4,722,000 for a "Government-wide effort to improve statistics in those areas where our work has been handicapped by incomplete information." Congress did not go all the way but did vote an increase of $2,616,000 for current economic statistical programs. In view of the record of recent years, when severe reductions in the programs were voted, this year's record is encouraging. Two years ago, for example, Congress held up the appropriations for the census of manufactures, the census of business, the census of transportation and the census of mineral industries.

There was one major deficiency this year which Congress next year should correct. It is most unfortunate that funds were not provided for improving statistics on construction. As Representative BOLLING, chairman of the Economic Statistics Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, said, "One of the most important forces in our current prosperity has been the continued high level of construction. In any appraisal of the economic outlook it is essential to know as much as possible about the health of this industry." Construction statistics lag too far behind the event to be of real value and reflect only substantial changes in construction activity.

This country has the most extensive and complete economic statistics of any country in the world. Their value to economists is enormous. Businessmen as well as Government officials rely on them in nearly all of their planning. Fortunately, under the leadership of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report there has been a much wider understanding in Congress of the necessity of improving them and keeping them constantly up to date. As John Maynard Keynes said in 1938, "I appeal to the Government in fervor of heart to lose no opportunity of adding to our knowledge of the essential facts and figures which alone can make the workings of the economic system intelligible."

WRITE YOUR CONGRESSMAN

A $600,000 budget request by the Department of Commerce to improve its statistical service to construction will soon come up for Congressional decision via hearings before the House Appropriations Subcommittee. From every possible viewpoint it should be approved. Construction is the Nation's largest, busiest industry. Its efficient functioning is essential to the health of the Nation's economy. Its statistical guides are far from adequate. And, finally, the funds requested are modest in amount.

Last year, when the same request was made, the Senate approved it but the House turned it down. Now, in this year of seriously increasing materials shortages, these improvements are even more vitally needed—and one of the purposes planned for the increased funds is to learn what quantities of materials are required by various types of construction. The other main need for the increased funds is to improve accuracy in sampling and estimating the total volume of construction on the one hand, and the total volume of repair, maintenance, alteration and improvement of existing structures on the other.

With widespread shortages of materials and equipment existing at the very beginning of this year's construction season, thoughtful construction men must entertain grave doubts that our national capacity to produce construction materials is adequate to supply even today's volume of new construction and repair. If this is so, what of tomorrow's even greater needs? Will construction volume bump into a ceiling set by materials shortages?

Certainly better facts than our present industry statistics give us are needed to solve this basic problem.

The present monthly and annual estimates of total construction work "put-in-place" were designed to measure construction's contribution to gross national product. They were a depression baby, and now

the formula used to convert contract dollars into "work-put-in-place" is out of date and does not reflect the much faster tempo of today's construction operations. This alone could cause the construction-volume-increase statistics to lag behind materials use or delivery needs. Some of the money requested of this Congress would be used to make field studies to update this work put-in-place formula.

Present estimated construction totals are obtained by projecting huge samplings by private agencies of contracts awarded or work started. This is done without benefit of a good measure of how much volume comes from big projects, how much from small ones. So some of the new money would be used to get construction cross-section samples in selected areas to obtain better knowledge of the mix of big, medium and small jobs.

Some of this money would also be used to get a good measure of repair-maintenance volume and its demands on basic materials and equipment supplies. This is now the weakest segment of the construction statistics service provided by the Government.

Construction has outgrown guesswork in measuring the adequacy of its basic supplies. And since construction contributes so much to our national economic health, it is decidedly risky to continue taking its pulse on inadequate stethoscopes or reading its temperature on a leaky thermometer.

But if you want good instruments for checking the health of your industry you will have to ask for them. Write your Congressman and ask him to support this $600,000 appropriation request for the Department of Commerce, Business and Defense Services Administration.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I shall not take further time, but simply urge that the appropriation for this item be restored by the adoption of the amendment I have just proposed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I dislike very much to oppose the distinguished Senator's request, but this particular item was carefully considered by the subcommittee and the full committee. I think the action of the subcommittee and the full committee in granting a $300,000 increase for this particular activity, Business and Defense Services Administration, and then in earmarking it for two necessitous activities, one of them $50,000 for the National Inventors' Council, the other $250,000 for area development, indicates that we did not act hastily and without deliberation on this item.

We felt that a $300,000 increase in a budget of this size was very substantial. After having heard the testimony, we felt that the two most necessitous needs proposed by the very large increase of $900,000 which the agency requested, were the two we provided for in our action.

The $50,000 for the National Inventors' Council is important from the standpoint of the advancement of inventions and the use and further development of inventions for all purposes in the Nation, but especially for the national defense. Up to this time, the part of the budget for this use has been advanced by the Department of Defense, but it has asked that this year the budget of the agency which actually handles the work take over the expense. Frankly, we feel that Congress prefers to have activities financed in the appropriation bill for the particular agency which is to use the funds.

The $250,000 for area development meets a need which last year was debated at some length on this floor, particularly by Senators from areas where development equal to that which has been had in other parts of the Nation in the postwar years had not been attained. The $250,000 meets the need which the Senate itself recognized last year, after rather extensive debate on that subject.

So far as building statistics are concerned, we did not feel that additional provision for that work was necessary. I think it is even less necessary now, in view of the adoption by the Senate a few minutes ago of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine, the Senator from Alabama, the Senator from Illinois, and myself, which amendment provides $650,000 for a national intercensal housing survey. Of course, housing is a very large part of the construction industry.

So I hope my distinguished friend from Maine will not insist upon this item. If he feels that some recognition of this need should be made in this bill, I remind him that we shall have $350,000 for this item in the conference between the Senate and the House of Representatives, and that that might well result in some funds for this purpose. If the conference does not make available any of the $350,000, the supplemental appropriation bill now in the making should permit us to go into this field.

The present allocation of the funds added to the appropriation is the result of thinking and planning by the committee, and is the committee's view of the most necessitous needs covered by the very large increase requested by this particular agency.

So I hope the distinguished Senator from Maine will not insist upon his amendment at this time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. PAYNE. My distinguished colleague has certainly touched upon about every facet of an analysis which could be undertaken, with one exception. The exception is the analysis and survey mentioned in this particular amendment, and having to do with construction-statistics programs.

I should like to set forth what some of these items are. Before doing so, let me say that subsequent to the action of the committee and the testimony which was placed before the committee in this regard, on Tuesday evening, as all of us well remember, this body sat in session until a late hour, in connection with its consideration of the highway construction bill. Further to emphasize the fact that there is great need for compiling up-to-the-minute statistics in the case of the construction industry, let me point out that the Senate on Tuesday evening passed the largest highway construction bill ever passed by this body. Undoubtedly that bill will be reported from conference in relatively the same shape in which it was when it was passed by the Senate. That measure will bring about a further problem in connection with knowledge about the use of these materials.

Let me set forth some of the things a program of this type would make available. For instance, in the construction activity that is undertaken by State and local governments, the current statistics are entirely educated guesses at this time.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENTS OF CERTAIN NATO COUNTRIES

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield to me? Some distinguished visitors are waiting to enter the Senate Chamber.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not have the floor. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has the floor, and has yielded to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I gladly yield for that purpose to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I regret to interrupt the debate by my distinguished colleagues on the amendment which is now pending; but I rise to a question of personal privilege, and to state that there are at the entrance to this Chamber, a group of distinguished visitors whom I wish to introduce to the Senate.

Let me say that the Department of State of our Government is sponsoring a project to bring to the United States, for a period of 30 days, a group of distinguished members of the parliaments of several North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries, so as to enable them to obtain accurate impressions and information, at first hand, about current economic, political, and military affairs in this country. In addition, in broader terms, it is hoped that their experiences will further develop the understanding of these visitors of the basic cultural and social values in present-day America.

Mr. President, these gentlemen are now entering the Senate Chamber, following their visit to the House of Representatives. I am happy to introduce them. All of them are members of the parliaments of their respective countries. I wish them to have the courtesy of the floor of the Senate for a few minutes, in order that they may see how the operations of the Senate are conducted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a memorandum giving the names of these representatives and information concerning their present positions and professional background.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FOR PARTICIPANT IN NATO LEADERS PROJECT: GROUP II (1956) (MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT)

Mr. Henri Fayat: Brussels, Belgium.

Present position: Member of the Foreign Affairs, Foreign Commerce and Colonial Committees of the Chamber. Mr. Fayat is a lawyer and has served in the Cabinets of several Ministers, beginning in 1939. He is Secretary of the Belgian Section of the NATO

Parliamentary Association and a member of the Study Commission for European Problems, which is sponsored by the Belgian Government to study European integration.

Professional background: At the outbreak of World War II, Mr. Fayat was Secretary to the Minister of Public Works and later a legal attaché in the Cabinet of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Belgian Government in exile in London, becoming Chief of Cabinet in 1943. In 1944, he was Chief of Cabinet of the Minister of Agriculture with the same Government. Mr. Fayat was elected Socialist member of the Belgian Chamber of Representatives from Brussels in 1946. In 1947 he was political counselor of the Belgian delegation at the International Trade Organization conference at Habana, Cuba.

Mr. Fayat was a delegate to the sixth session of UNESCO in 1951 and was Belgian delegate to the Seventh United Nations General Assembly in New York in 1952.

Mr. Frank Enfield: York-Scarborough, Canada.

Present position: Mr. Enfield has been a Liberal Member of Parliament for York-Scarborough in the Toronto area since 1953.

Professional background: Mr. Enfield studied at the University of Toronto and Osgoode Hall (law college), receiving a law degree. He has since been a practicing lawyer.

In his parliamentary work, Mr. Enfield has specialized in economic problems of Canada and the interrelationship with the economy of the United States. He is also interested in atomic energy, defense research, the DEW line, and continental defense.

Mr. Erhard William Jakobsen: 61 Amagerbrogade, Copenhagen S., Denmark.

Present position: In 1953, Mr. Jakobsen was elected as a Member of Parliament on the Social-Democratic ticket. From 1946 to the present, he has been a civil servant in the Assessment Department of the Ministry of Finance.

Professional background: Mr. Jakobsen was president of the Social-Democratic students movement, Frit Forum, from 1943 to 1951; and, before that, he was a member of local leading bodies in the labor movement.

Mr. Jakobsen has published numerous articles for trade-union periodicals on taxation, the main problems of democracy, State and trade unions, the Atlantic Pact, and various economic problems. In addition, he has lectured extensively to members of his party, as well as trade-union members, on these topics and has given several talks over the Danish State radio.

Other: In 1954, Mr. Jakobsen visited SHAPE and has made several trips to England, Switzerland, and Germany.

Mr. Percy Daines: 49 Finchley Road, Eastcliffe, Hampshire, England.

Present position: Labor Member of the British Parliament for East Ham North.

Professional background: Mr. Daines joined the Labor Party 35 years ago and has been active politically during the whole of this time. He was elected to Parliament in 1945. He has done much constructive work on social insurance schemes and monopolies and has spoken often on these subjects in the House.

Mr. Daines speaks often in Parliament on foreign affairs. His main theme is Russian communism and he stresses the need for awareness of this problem and unity of purpose with the United States. For 1 year Mr. Daines was the Government whip in Parliament.

An active cooperator, Mr. Daines served for many years as director of a large distributive cooperative society. He was a local counselor for 6 years and chairman of many important committees. Mr. Daines also was an insurance worker and inspector for some time and has been a trade unionist from the age of 16.

Dr. André Colin: 15, Avenue de Breteuil, Paris 7°, and Ploudalmezeau, Finistère.

Present position: Député, Département du Finistère and member of the Finance Committee of the Assembly.

Professional background: M. Colin served as secretary general and later president of the Association of Catholic French Youth; simultaneously, he was a professor of law at Lille. He was active in the resistance organizing youth groups and the Republican Liberation Movement, later known as the MRP. M. Colin served as secretary general of the MRP. As a member of the Consultative Assembly after the liberation of Paris, he headed the Youth Committee of the Assembly.

In 1946 he was elected to the National Assembly and reelected in 1951 and 1956. M. Colin also served as Secretary of State in the Bidault Cabinet in 1946, as Minister of Merchant Marine in the Queuille Cabinet in 1948, Secretary of State for Interior in the cabinets of Queuille, 1951, Faure, 1952, and Mayer in 1953.

Dr. Stefan Dittrich: Auf der Rast 7, Koetzting, Germany.

Present position: Dr. Dittrich is a practicing lawyer and a Bundestag deputy. He is a member of the CDU/CSU Bundestag faction.

Professional background: From 1932 to 1945, Dr. Dittrich studied jurisprudence and international law at Munich and Wuerzburg universities, graduating with a doctor of laws degree.

Dr. Dittrich has served as assistant judge of lower court at Regensburg and judge of county court at Deggendorf, Bavaria.

Dr. Roland Seffrin: Memellandallee 18, Hamburg-Altona, Germany.

Present position: Dr. Seffrin is a Bundestag deputy and a member of the CDU/CSU Bundestag faction. He is also a high school teacher.

Professional background: From 1925 to 1929 Dr. Seffrin studied German philology, law, and folklore at Munich University. He studied sociology and geography at Hamburg University, graduating in 1938 with a doctor of philosophy degree. Dr. Seffrin has taught in various high schools in Germany and was a lecturer at the German Academy in Neusohl (Slovakia) from 1941 to 1945.

Other: Dr. Seffrin has published various works on literature, among them studies of Storm and Moliere. In 1938 he published The Catholic Population in the State of Hamburg. He has also published some geographical-historical pamphlets.

Dr. Seffrin has traveled in France, Denmark, Sweden, Yugoslavia, and Slovakia.

Dr. George Katsafados: 89 Patission Street, Athens, Greece.

Present position: Dr. Katsafados was elected Deputy to Parliament from Piraeus this year, as a member of the ERE (National Radical Union).

Professional background: In 1955–56, Dr. Katsafados was Under Secretary for Social Welfare. Since 1951, he has been the Greek Rally deputy from Piraeus and in 1950 was MEA (Kanellopoulos) party deputy. He has been a member of Parliament since 1930.

Dr. Katsafados received his doctor of medicine from the Medical School of the University of Athens and took courses in medicine at Paris under eminent professors.

Other: Dr. Katsafados is a member of several Greek and French medical societies and served twice in the Greek Army as a military surgeon. He is an officer of the French Legion of Honor and has been awarded several medals for his service during World War II. Dr. Katsafados has published several treatises on urology.

Mr. Paul Ingolf Ingebretsen: Stavanger, Norway.

Present position: Member of the Norwegian Storting (Parliament) as Liberal representative from Rogaland Province. Mr. Ingebretsen is vice chairman of the Storting's Finance and Customs Committee.

Professional background: In 1927 Mr. Ingebretsen received his bachelor of laws. He was a civil servant, higher police official, and assistant judge in Ryfylke County from 1928 to 1930. Since 1947, he has been a tax official in Stavanger, a position from which he is on leave. He is a member of the Stavanger City Council and has been very active in communal affairs and on a number of civic and other committees. Mr. Ingebretsen was chairman of the Stavanger Young Liberals from 1934 to 1936 and chairman of the Stavanger Liberal Party from 1947 to 1949. He was first elected to the Storting in 1949 and reelected in the subsequent elections in 1953.

Dr. Alberto Pacheco Jorge: Avenida Dr. Rodrigo Rodrizues, 25, Macau, Portugal.

Present position: Deputy from Macau to the National Assembly (Congress); lawyer; acting public notary; president of Macau branch, Portuguese Red Cross.

Professional background: Acting attorney general from Macau, most recently in 1954; vice president of Macau municipal council, 1941–49.

Other: Dr. Jorge is a graduate of the School of Law of the University of Lisbon, a member of the Rotary International and the National Union. He has traveled extensively, including England, France, Italy, Switzerland, Spain, and the Philippines.

Dr. Celestino Bernardo Marques Pereira: Avenida Almirante Reis, 227–5° D., Lisbon, Portugal.

Present position: Procurator of the Camara Corporativa (corresponding to the House of Representatives). Dr. Pereira is first teacher of the National Physical Education Institute, general inspector of physical education, general inspector of gymnastics in the Federacao Nacional da Alegria polo Trabalho, and director of the physical education services of Portuguese youth. He is a voting member of the National Education Organization and a voting member of the Technic Council of Physical Education of the General Director Education of Sports and School Health.

Professional background: Dr. Pereira was Director of the National Physical Education Institute of Portugal and has taught in army training schools. He was general director of the international stage of military physical training of the Military Council of Physical Training. He is a member of many organizations in Portugal having to do with physical education and athletic activities.

Other: Dr. Pereira has published many articles and books and has traveled widely, making official studies, in Spain, France, Belgium, Holland, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, Austria, and Italy. He has made official trips to Africa on service with the National Education Ministry.

Dr. Kasim Kufrevi: Agri, Turkey.

Present position: Member of Land National Assembly. At present Dr. Kufrevi is a member of the executive committees of the American-Turkish and the Anglo-Turkish parliamentary groups and is also a member of the executive committee of the Turkish group of the Interparliamentary Union.

Professional background: Dr. Kufrevi was elected deputy from the Province of Agri in 1950 as a member of the Democratic Party and was reelected from the same Province in 1954. He recently resigned from the Democratic Party, however, and his status is now that of an independent member of the National Assembly.

In 1943 Dr. Kufrevi was appointed assistant to the chair of Turkish literature, faculty of letters, Istanbul University, and lectured on Islamic mysticism until 1950. From 1942 to 1950 he served as a member of the redaction and editorial committee of the Turkish Encyclopedia of Islam and contributed to that publication a considerable number of articles on theology, mysticism, and literature. He is a member of the Turkish His-

torical Society and the Islamic Research Society of India.

Dr. Kufrevi participated in the Vienna and Helsinki Conferences of the Interparliamentary Union which took place in the summers of 1954 and 1955, respectively.

RECESS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time the Senate take a brief recess, subject to the call of the Chair, in order that the Members of the Senate now present may greet these distinguished visitors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Acting President pro tempore wishes to join the distinguished Senator from New Jersey in welcoming these gentlemen, members of the parliaments of various nations, to the Senate of the United States.

The Senate will now stand in recess for 10 minutes, subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, at 2 o'clock and 16 minutes, the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 2 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m., when called to order by the Acting President pro tempore [Mr. BIBLE].

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10899) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, at the time of the recess the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] had the floor, and he had kindly yielded to me. I shall now proceed to conclude the statement I was making.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I continue to yield to the Senator. As I recall, he was impressing us with the importance of the road building program. I think we are all pretty well impressed with the importance of that program. However, the Senator from Maine is presenting it in such a colorful, imaginative, and attractive way that I am glad to listen to him.

Mr. PAYNE. I thank the Senator from Florida.

In addition to the new construction activities undertaken by State and local governments, which I mentioned earlier, new public utility construction would also be considered. At the present time final figures are not available until 2 years after the construction has taken place.

With respect to residential alteration and repair expenditures on existing structures, current statistics are not available until 9 months after the construction, and are of questionable accuracy.

With regard to industrial and commercial alteration and repair expenditures on existing structures, current annual statistics are merely educated guesses.

The proposed program, under the suggested increase of $600,000, would yield completely new statistics—not statistics available at the present time, but new statistics—in the following areas, for which no current figures are available at all:

First. The quantities of material consumed in the construction of selected types of structures and facilities—that is, how much cement, steel, copper, lumber, plumbing fixtures, and other materials and products are used in construction.

This program is proposed as a 4-year cycle of statistics. The work this year would be largely on industrial and commercial building projects.

Second. The average pattern of progress experienced with respect to each category of construction from the date of the contract award to the date of final completion.

Moderate improvements are planned in the following areas:

First. Industrial, commercial, and institutional building. The improvements will be limited to large projects, which make up about 75 percent of the total. Improvements in the small project sector await the results of the methods research part of the proposed program.

Second. Seasonal patterns of construction activity, and the underlying causes thereof.

The reasons I have set forth, plus the fact that we shall be confronted with the need for up-to-the-minute information in connection with the massive highway construction program, which we hope will be set in motion by the beginning of next year, are compelling reasons why it should be possible for this amount of money to be made available in order that a survey of these statistics may be up to the minute, may be factual, and may be of value to the Congress and to the administration in evaluating each of the programs before the Congress.

I thank my colleague from Florida very much for his courtesy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. With reference to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], I should like to say I am glad to support it wholeheartedly. I agree with what the Senator from Maine has said. I do not know the extent to which the matter was presented to the committee, or what facts or information seeking to back it up were given to the committee. However, I certainly believe this is the time when we need this type of information. From time to time we read in the press about certain conditions which may not be bad, but which, at the same time, should give us warning and suggest that we be very careful. In many such instances we do not have the information we ought to have.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Maine would be very helpful if the information were provided at the time when it was usable, and not, as the Senator from Maine has pointed out, 2 or 3 years later, after its worthwhileness had passed.

I should like to call attention to the fact that last year the Bureau of the Budget submitted a request for this type of information, and the Senate voted funds. The House did not do so. In conference, the funds were eliminated. Therefore nothing was allowed last year.

This year we have the reverse situation. The House has allowed $350,000 of a budget request of $600,000. This year the Senate knocked out the funds it had allowed last year.

The Joint Economic Committee, in its report issued January 5, 1956, has this to say about the matter:

> We find it most unfortunate that no funds were provided for improvement in construction statistics. One of the most important forces in our current prosperity has been the continued high level of construction. In any appraisal of the economic outlook it is essential to know as much as possible about the health of this industry. Failure to provide any of the requested improvements leaves us with inadequate and scattered data, which reflect only long term trend or the largest changes in construction activity.

That is the conclusion which has been arrived at by the joint committee under the able chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] after a very careful study of the whole field. As a matter of fact, the joint committee is charged by Congress with the responsibility of making a continued study of the economic conditions of the country. One of the difficulties we encounter is not being able to get usable information at the time when it is worthwhile. That is what the amendment of the Senator from Maine would correct. I express the hope to the able chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] that he will be willing to accept the amendment of the Senator from Maine.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I agree with the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Alabama. One of the difficulties we have with current statistics on construction gathered from private sources is that, very frequently, they give contrary information.

In the recession of 1954—and it has been established now that it was a recession by the admission of the President's Economic Adviser, Mr. Burns—one private index moved in one direction, and other private index moved in the opposite direction. Therefore, there was no clear consensus as to what was happening.

I hope the chairman of the subcommittee, if he does not accept the amendment—which I hope he will—will have some feeling of compassion in dealing with the matter in conference with the House.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the eloquence of the three Senators. However, I suspect that if they had made their eloquence heard in committee, when the committee was conducting its hearings, there might well have been a different result.

The fact is that the committee conducted long and extensive hearings in

trying to balance off the needs of the agencies. We gave very generous treatment to the agencies. My original statement showed that we have stepped up the appropriations as they came to us from the House by $63,563,000.

We came into the Senate this morning somewhat with bowed heads, fearful that we would be castigated for having been more generous with the agencies than were our friends at the other end of the Capitol.

Now we hear great advocates of economy finding some fault—not serious fault, but some little fault, at least—because we have not been generous enough.

I may say, in trying to reply in a general way to my three eminent colleagues, that, in the first place, this matter has nothing to do with the road building program, except indirectly. At most, it would show what the needs were for cement and structural steel and the like in the part of the construction industry not represented in the housing survey, which itself accounts for a great number of these activities in connection with apartment and hotel building, and the like.

The fact is that very intensive research is going on in the appropriate Federal agency and in the appropriate State agencies throughout the Nation, in the field of road construction.

With further reference to the points so ably made by the distinguished Senators, I recall that by action of the Senate, within the last hour, on the amendment jointly sponsored by two of my eminent friends, the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Alabama, the Senate has generously added $650,000 for the accumulation of housing statistics, all with knowledge of the fact that there was a very elaborately built program costing approximately $18 million for a housing survey in 1950 at the time of the decennial census, and we are now supplementing it with the intercensal survey. Our distinguished friends are now asking for more money in this field, which, important as it is, has been found by the committee, after careful investigation to be not quite so demanding and important as the other objectives of which we have taken care.

There is $350,000 additional in the bill as passed by the House for this item, which, by the way, is an extension because there is already an agency doing this work. That amount will be in conference. If my distinguished friends will reduce to writing their eloquent appeals, supplemented by the persuasive arguments we have heard today, there will be some hope of retaining some of those funds in the bill as finally passed. But I hope they will not expect us to put in a $600,000 item for the expansion of the agency.

I see some gleams of sympathy and understanding in the eyes and upon the faces of my friends, which I hope indicate that they will be willing to do two things: First, to present this matter in writing so that we may have it in a complete form for the conference, and, second, if the conference agreement is not satisfactory to them, that they come forward with additional requests in connection with the supplemental bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, there are two things I wish to mention. First, let me say that I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Florida, the chairman of the subcommittee.

I should like to say that all the money which is included in the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine would not represent an increase over what the House appropriated. The Senator from Florida brings out the point that the bill represents an increase of, I think he said, $63 million over what the House appropriated, but in this particular item there is a cut from what the House appropriated.

Mr. HOLLAND. May I say that approximately $63.6 million is a net figure.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But this item took a cut. It is true that the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine would exceed that cut, but, nevertheless, as it stands in the bill before us, there is a cut.

I wish to invite the attention of the Senator from Florida to the fact that I wrote a letter to the committee, speaking in behalf of the Joint Economic Committee, which will be found on page 535 of the hearings. I tried in that letter to present the matter as clearly as I could. I am sorry that another engagement on that day made it impossible for me to be present before the committee, but I believe my position was understood by the committee and my letter was accepted and placed in the record.

I hope that this proposal may receive not only careful consideration but most sympathetic consideration by the chairman.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend, and I wish I were in position to accept the amendment, but, as I stated in the beginning, the committee was unanimous in all its actions. There were a dozen or more requests for the extension of present activities of various agencies of the Department of Commerce. We granted such extensions in a good many cases. We are not wiping out an activity. We merely are declining another requested increase. We have given the requested increases to two kindred items which we thought were more important. We may have erred. But, at least, they were smaller items, and they were stated to be very important. I felt very keenly about financing at the place where the work is being done rather than to have the Defense Department transferring the money.

I am not in a position to accept the amendment. I should be very happy to study the position of the Senators prior to the conference. I am sure I speak for my fellow conferees in that statement, because none of us wants to do violence to a worthwhile objective; but, after all, if we had granted all the requests made, I am sure the Senate would not have been glad to see us come before it with our report today.

So I hope the Senator from Maine will withdraw his amendment, follow the two courses I have suggested, and be assured of the sympathy of the subcommittee.

By the way, Mr. President, his distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, and I am sure she is sympathetic to the request I have just made.

We shall do the best we can in conference, while at the same time doing justice to the other members of the committee. As Senators know, there are 23 Members of the Senate on the Appropriations Committee. There action was unanimous. Very few of those Senators are present today. To accept the amendment would be going back on the unanimous expressions of the members of the committee.

We shall be sympathetic with the request. I think there is merit in it, and we should like to work it out in conjunction with other problems which we shall have before us.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. PAYNE. I personally am sympathetic with the problems which the committee faces and which it has faced in connection with many matters before it. I have great respect for the chairman of the subcommittee. I know the committee has put an enormous amount of work into the entire bill and into every request which has been made for funds. I understand full well that the chairman does not feel, in view of the action taken, that he can accept the amendment which was offered.

If the amendment is rejected by the Senate, it is my sincere hope, as I believe the chairman assured us earlier, that this question can be taken up in connection with the supplemental appropriation bill which will pertain to an activity of this type and will be given the consideration which it seems rightfully to deserve.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be very happy to do the latter, that is, to consider it sympathetically in connection with the supplemental appropriation bill, and also in the conference. But I hope the Senator from Maine will withdraw his amendment, because there are but a handful of Senators here today, and we would have difficulty in obtaining a quorum. I hope the Senator from Maine will not by his insistence bring us back to the consideration of the same item next week.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. PAYNE. On the basis of the statement which the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has made, and out of respect for members of the committee who are on the floor and who have worked on the problem, I shall not press the amendment at this time, but shall withdraw it, hoping that in connection with a supplemental appropriation bill the matter may either be taken up or may be taken to conference to see what can be arranged.

Mr. HOLLAND. The item is in conference to the amount of $350,000.

Mr. PAYNE. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Maine.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the junior Senator from Maine is withdrawn.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say to the Senator from Maine that, as one speaking from experience, I feel that the advocates of his amendment are now in a very excellent position. I had somewhat the same contention to make a year ago with respect to the Bureau of the Census. The Senator from Florida, in a kind and good-humored way, denied my specific request, but assured me that, if the eventualities proved the additional work to be necessary, he would support my request.

As it happened, the work for which I was contending at that time was an expansion of the activities of the census of manufacturers. It has developed that with the cooperation of the committee and of the Bureau of the Census the work on the statistics showing the concentration of manufacturers has been handled in a most excellent manner by the Bureau of the Census.

In the report which the Senator from Florida has just filed, I find that, again, the Senator from Florida has, with his usual good sense, recognized the importance of gathering statistics in the proper way, so that the activities of the Government and the knowledge of the people may be sustained. I refer particularly to the paragraph on page 3 of the report, under the heading "Censuses of business, manufactures, and mineral industries."

The Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, of which I have the honor to be chairman, has requested the Bureau of the Census to carry on certain statistical research. That work is in progress. It has had the support of the Senator from Florida.

In the report, again, we find evidence of the sound sense of the Senator from Florida, as chairman of the subcommittee, in relating, so that all may know, the purpose of the work and how it will be carried on. There are nine separate units of investigation functioning.

I appeared before the subcommittee and expressed the belief that the report should be filed with the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation before being released for general consumption, so that the subcommittee might have the opportunity of coordinating all the figures and of expressing its opinion on the meaning of this concentration.

The committee has gone on record as sustaining that point of view. It has quite properly added that these figures should be presented to the Committee on Appropriations and to the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation of the Committee on the Judiciary, as well.

It is an example to the junior Senator from Maine and to those of us who are members of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report that we have as chairman of the Subcommittee on Department of Commerce Appropriations a comprehending man, a man of good humor, one who will help us to get the basic facts which are needed in determining economic matters for the good of the country.

I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank warmly the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. I never heard a more generous or gracious advocate. I express my gratitude to him.

Mr. President, I feel certain that my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, and who worked most capably in the subcommittee—I think, in fact, she carried more than her share of the responsibility and work—has some comment to make, so I am glad to yield to her. I yield the floor.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, it has been my pleasure and privilege to work side by side on the bill with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Department of Commerce Appropriations, the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. He spent many hours and days in the preparation of the bill. Because of his knowledge of matters pertaining to commerce, and his clear and real understanding of State and Federal needs, the bill comes to the Senate with the unanimous approval of the subcommittee and the full committee.

The best way I can express my admiration for the work done by the senior Senator from Florida is to say that in the event the Republicans regain control of the Senate next year, and as ranking Republican on the subcommittee I should become chairman of the subcommittee, I hope that I can do nearly as well as he has done.

I also express my appreciation to the very capable members of the staff of the Committee on Appropriations, who have done so much to help the committee bring this very important bill to the Senate. I refer to Mr. John Witeck and Mr. William Kennedy.

There is one area of the bill on which I wish to make some extended remarks, the area having to do with appropriations for commercial aviation.

Most of us can remember a few years ago when there were predictions of gigantic expansion of air travel. We have seen a great expansion develop. But we have not seen a gigantic expansion develop—not what most of us thought would have happened by this time.

I think that the principal reason for this can be laid to the airlines themselves. There are not enough airlines with enough equipment and operating over enough routes to meet the demands of Americans for air travel.

Something will have to be done about this matter, whether it be the granting of certificates to more airlines to operate competitively over the same routes or in the acquisition by the existing route holders of more equipment with which to accommodate the air traveling public and the demand for air travel space.

I am inclined to think that the answer lies in having more competition over the existing routes by more airlines instead of the present system of granting a quasimonopoly to a few favored airlines, with the concurrent discriminatory treatment against other airlines which have asked to provide service over existing routes.

We of Maine and northern New England are quite aware of this. We are aware of it because we are getting poor service on transportation south of Boston and New York. Those of us who travel by air to and from Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont have found Boston and New York actually to be dead end streets or passenger dumping stations.

This is not the fault of the airline which serves these three States. Rather it is the fault of a system which fails to provide through flights between Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont to Washington, D. C., Florida, and other points south.

It is the old story of the fight on reservations between the short-haul and the long-haul connections. The airline that gets the short haul is understandably, though by no means approvingly, not interested in taking care of connectees from the long haul. The answer to the question of which is the short-haul airline and which is the long-haul airline depends upon whether the connection is made in New York or Boston.

We, of northern New England, are not advocates of any particular airline. But we do feel that we are entitled to through flight service out of Boston and New York. We are tired of being stranded in those cities in the never-ending frustration and fight over getting connections on other lines out of Boston and New York.

Nor do we appreciate a regulatory body taking an attitude of regarding the one relatively small airline that serves northern New England as a poor cousin merely to be tolerated by the big airlines which have no interest whatsoever in extending their flights into northern New England and giving better service to that part of the country.

In general, I am shocked at the callousness of the attitude of airlines, particularly the big airlines operating on the east coast—callousness to their passengers on such matters as reservations, overselling, flight connections, and withholding of flight information.

As I stated at the hearings, the airlines keep the traveling public in the dark. They maintain an iron curtain on weather information for their own convenience, and to prevent passengers from switching to railroad transportation when air travel becomes questionable because of weather and air traffic congestion. They maintain an iron curtain so that the traveler does not have a free choice of how to travel.

That is why, as I stated at the hearings, I believe the only hope for tearing down this iron curtain on weather information is by having the Civil Aeronautics Administration have a weather

and traffic reporting desk in the passenger area of every major airport—where the passengers can go for information, instead of being frustrated as they now are by the airlines.

I do not believe that either the Civil Aeronautics Board or the Civil Aeronautics Administration should be permitted to escape the responsibility of lifting the iron curtain on weather and traffic information imposed by the airlines.

Even the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board at the hearings admitted that he himself had had this experience and had complained bitterly about it.

I have been assured that this will be given the fullest consideration by the authorities.

Another point that I stressed at the hearings, and which I bring to the attention of the Senate, is the reprehensible practice of airlines overselling and taking through-flight passengers off without advance notice, because of passenger stack-up resulting from overselling. The airlines even go to the extent of threatening to physically eject from a plane passengers who hold through-flight reservations—to eject merely to take care of the trouble caused by overselling at some point along the route by the airlines.

I regret to say that a national magazine which holds itself out as an accurate reporting and responsible publication—Newsweek—went out of its way to rewrite and distort a story filed by one of its capable and conscientious Washington correspondents on my expressions and efforts on calling for an elimination of this reprehensible practice of overselling by the airlines.

The New York office of Newsweek not only wrote an erroneous story, which, to the embarrassment, chagrin, and anger of its Washington correspondent, was a rewrite of his report, but it went out of its way to characterize my motivations in the matter as stemming from pettiness it attributed exclusively to women.

I am glad to say that I have received several letters from men commending my efforts to eliminate the reprehensible practice of overselling. A Colorado man, who until recently was an airline employee, wrote me:

It is very gratifying that someone of national significance has made an attempt to have the airlines stop their practice of overselling.

On April 1 I quit an airline position after having been with the company more than 10 years, and one of the chief points in my decision was the uncontrolled overbooking of passengers which has developed in the last 3 or 4 years. Since all airlines practice it, I do not wish to condemn any single one, so will not reveal the one I worked for. Nevertheless, to me, it is as much a crime to sell a seat that doesn't exist as to sell any real property that isn't there, or selling mortgaged goods.

May I commend you for your effort, and hope you are successful in finding a solution for this problem.

A Massachusetts clergyman wrote me:

Good for you on the airlines deal. I think it is a crime that they get away with murder on the ticket business.

Our daughter left Houlton last year to go to her home in Buffalo with her young son. When the plane reached Portland, Maine, she was told that her seat had been sold, and that she would have to get off. She made a real fuss about it, and succeeded in staying on. My daughter Marjorie going to Buffalo from Boston was told at Albany that she would have to get off as her seat was taken. It was all paid for by her, why should she get off. She said to the official "What will I do? I don't know anybody here." She did not get off. Someone else had to.

I think the whole thing is unfair. I hope you can do something about it. It is a great nuisance to buy your ticket, and to read on the ticket that it is not a ticket.

I hope you will fight it through.

A businessman from Chicago, Ill., wrote me:

It was with a great deal of personal interest and pleasure that I read the item on page 21 of the May 28 issue of Newsweek regarding your experience with an airline reservation. My interest lies in the fact that I had a similar experience a few months ago when time was of particular importance. My pleasure stems from the fact that you are supporting a bill to penalize airlines that oversell passenger space.

That your experience is by no means an isolated case is borne out by the mishandling (the kindest word I can think of) I received at Christmastime. I am attaching copies of my letters of December 27, 1955, to the Chicago manager of passenger service and the president of Delta Air Lines, Inc., which present all the facts in the case. These letters are self-explanatory.

You might be interested in the explanation which I received from Delta. About 3 weeks after my unfortunate experience the local representative of Delta telephoned me (after I had again written the airline) to explain that they had oversold space and that I was selected for removal because I was "only going to Atlanta and was traveling alone." By implication I suppose that means that bachelors should not fly unless they wish to run the risk of being removed even though they have good reservations (which in my case was a month old and had been confirmed by the airline 3 times, the last time being only 4 hours before departure time).

I sincerely hope that you will be successful in your efforts to force the airlines to assume some responsibility to their passengers. To this end you have my permission to make whatever use you see fit of the attached letters.

I ask that unanimous consent copies of the letters to which he refers be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *December 27, 1955.*

Mr. C. E. WOOLMAN,
President, Delta Air Lines, Inc.
Atlanta, Ga.

DEAR SIR: You may or may not be interested in the attached copy of my letter to your passenger service manager in Chicago. However, I rather think you should be.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS J. TUCKER,

CHICAGO, ILL., *December 27, 1955.*

MANAGER OF PASSENGER SERVICE,
Delta Air Lines, Inc., Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: I believe that some sort of explanation from you is in order in connection with the treatment I received last Wednesday night when I went home for the holidays. In all my experience, both as a passenger and as an airline employee (I was manager of systems and procedures for United Air Lines in Chicago for 4 years before being appointed assistant controller of Stewart-Warner Corp.), I have never, except in wartime, seen anything to equal it.

Here are the facts, which you can easily check and verify if you are so inclined:

On November 22 (please note date) I telephoned your Chicago office for a round trip reservation to Atlanta as follows:

Flight 65—Chicago to Atlanta (nonstop) for December 21.

Flight 116—Atlanta to Chicago for December 26 (originally flight 748).

The tickets were picked up on November 26. Attached is the passenger coupon, and I have my canceled check, also.

On December 14 your Chicago office telephoned me at work (La 5–600) to make certain that I would use my reservation, and I assured him that I would.

On December 21 at 6 p. m. (please note date and time), 4 hours before flight time, your Chicago office telephoned me at home (Su 4–1036) informing me that the flight was on time and requested that I be at the airport 45 minutes or so before scheduled departure time.

I arrived at Midway at 8:30 p. m. and immediately checked in. The clerk checking me in verified my reservation by telephone in accordance with your procedures.

Departure was called just before scheduled flight time, and as I walked to board the plane I was called back to the ticket counter and told that there was "some mixup in reservations" (and that is all I was told) and that I was being removed from that particular flight. I was also informed that I could be accommodated on flight 65B leaving at 11:30 p. m. with a stop at Cincinnati.

Your agent was kind enough to allow me to telephone Atlanta to relay this surprising bit of information to a relative who was planning to meet me at 1:30 a. m.

To make matters worse, although I asked my relative not to meet me, he inquired of your Atlanta office when flight 65B was scheduled to arrive and was told 3:15 a. m. Shortly before that time he went to the Atlanta airport and upon inquiry there was told that no such flight was coming from Chicago.

However, after some further checking he was told that it probably would be an hour or so late. With such indefinite information he had little alternative but to return home. As a result I took a cab (at 4:35 a. m.—3 hours from my scheduled arrival time on the plane for which I had held reservations) which, incidentally, cost $4.65.

I anticipate your using the rush of the Christmas season as your explanation—that is, if you feel it necessary to reply to this letter at all. But that is no excuse for such mismanagement, mishandling, and inefficiency. Perhaps it would be well for you to study other airlines' systems.

If you were oversold, why did you wait until exact departure time to find it out and to remove me from the plane?

Why did your agent call me at 6 p. m., 4 hours before flight time on December 21, to tell me everything was in order?

Why, when I made reservations on a 4-engine, nonstop flight, was I transferred to a later (2 hours and 15 minutes, to be exact) 2-engine, Cincinnati-stop flight?

Could it be that some VIP displaced me? If so, why bother with reservations at all?

Could it be that your coach reservations are less sacred than first class?

I could well understand it if the weather or some such event caused cancellation of the flight. But it is a fact that the plane did leave, that I had reservations for almost a month, and that those reservations were verified and confirmed at least three times.

I make frequent visits to my parents' home in Rome, Ga., and have nearly always flown Delta. However, to borrow a phrase from Westinghouse: You can be sure . . . that from now on I will fly Eastern, and if I have any influence in business or socially, so will my associates.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS J. TUCKER.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Mr. C. E. Woolman who, I am sure, is deeply interested in the operation of your airline.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. That condemnation of the practice of overselling is not a mere petty, vindictive attitude reserved exclusively for women, as Newsweek would seem to conclude, but, rather, that it is a serious matter, as I have characterized it, is attested to by a letter which I received this morning from the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. I want to read that letter to the Members of the Senate:

Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. SMITH: In view of the instances of poor airline service which you mentioned at the Appropriations Committee hearing on May 11, we want you to know that the Board's Office of Compliance is investigating airline policies and procedures pertaining to overbooking of flights and the dissemination of flight information to the public.

The sale of more seats than available on flights has been a cause of concern to us for some time. Our staff has opposed and condemned any such practice in discussions and correspondence with airlines against whom complaints have been received. Such situations continue to recur, however. Although it may not be a serious industrywide problem, an investigation was deemed necessary, and therefore was begun several weeks ago.

Our Office of Compliance also has repeatedly emphasized to various airlines the importance of giving the public reliable and timely advice regarding weather conditions or equipment difficulties which may necessitate flight delay or other deviations from schedules. Some carriers have recognized that this is a pressing problem and are working to improve this phase of their service.

We shall be glad to advise you of our findings and any action taken as a result of these investigations.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES R. DURFEE,
Chairman.

Thus in conclusion I want to say to the Members of the Senate and to the air traveling public that these matters of overselling and dissemination of flight information to the public are being investigated, with the objective of removing as much as possible the objectionable conditions that do presently exist.

If the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce has contributed anything to this development, it surely will have performed a valuable service to the American public concurrent with its appropriating duties.

Mr. POTTER obtained the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield so that I may follow up the able statement made by the Senator from Maine?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, like the Senator from Maine, I was deeply disturbed by the facts which came to our attention from various sources relative to the overselling of space on the airlines and the giving of preferential treatment to passengers, particularly if traveling in groups, and particularly if traveling relatively long distances. I joined the Senator from Maine in the request for an investigation along the lines she has so ably indicated.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a copy of a letter, dated May 29, which I received from the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. The letter is in the same vein as the one received by the distinguished Senator from Maine and already placed by her in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, D. C., May 29, 1956.

Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLAND: At the Appropriations Committee on May 11, you expressed an interest in protection of the public from oversale of space by airlines. We, therefore, want you to know that the Board's Office of Compliance is investigating airline policies and procedures pertaining to this problem.

The Board is aware that the airlines do, from time to time, sell more seats than are available and has been concerned about this fact for some time. Our staff has opposed and condemned any such practice in discussions and correspondence with airlines against whom complaints have been received. Such situations continue to recur, however. Although it may not be a serious industrywide problem, an investigation was deemed necessary and was begun several weeks ago.

We shall be glad to advise you of our findings and any action taken as a result of our investigation.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES R. DURFEE,
Chairman.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to say that our committee, in taking note of the failure of both the airlines and the Civil Aeronautics Administration to furnish appropriate weather information to travelers or potential travelers, inserted in our report the following, and now I quote from page 4 of the committee's report:

The committee has been advised of an indifference relative to providing weather information to plane passengers during their waiting periods at airports. The Civil Aeronautics Administration is requested to give attention to this matter and take the necessary steps to effect an improvement in this service to the public.

I call attention to the fact that the committee has taken this action, and to the further fact that in this field there are duties which relate to functions of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and also of the Civil Aeronautics Board. The Civil Aeronautics Board may very properly request further cooperation with the traveling public on the part of the airlines themselves, as a part of their service.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration—heeding, as I hope it will, the request and direction given in the Senate committee's report—will itself make weather information available, particularly at the principal airports throughout the country.

In closing on this point, Mr. President, I wish to say that while of course our country is extremely proud of the progress we have made in civil aviation, and is anxious that the carriers operate successfully and continue in increasing measure to serve the needs of the public, we must never forget, and neither must they ever forget that, unlike other carriers in other fields, they are getting from the Public Treasury a great deal of assistance without which they could not operate. I refer now, not so much to subsidies, because I know that no commercial line which is now receiving subsidies wishes to remain in that position, and that practically all the trunk lines are not now receiving any direct subsidy—but to the fact that in this particular bill we are appropriating $202,226,000, through the Civil Aeronautics Administration, for the supplying of aid in the construction of airports and better air-navigation facilities and the operation of those facilities and the regulation of air traffic, all of which are necessary adjuncts to the commercial air business. So it may be truthfully said that that great agency in the use of that tremendous amount of money is, in a measure, making possible the successful operation of the civil airlines.

I also call attention to the fact that in this very bill we recommend the appropriation of funds in excess of $22 million, through the Civil Aeronautics Board, the largest part of which is for paying of direct subsidies to air carriers, and a substantial part of which is for salaries and expenses in carrying out the administrative duties of that body, which has jurisdiction over commercial air travel.

So I hope that both the carriers and the public will equally recognize that the Congress, while anxious to cooperate with, and to aid in, the continued progress of civil aviation, is also expecting civil aviation, commercial aviation, to adhere to the highest standards of public service, and that in its quick growth, we hope it will not be unmindful of the fact that sometimes it has not been sufficiently careful in observing the highest standards of service for the convenience of the traveling public.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, to the committee amendment on page 2, in line 17, I submit the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 2, in line 17, it is proposed to strike out "$7,475,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$7,575,000."

Mr. POTTER. First, Mr. President, I should like to pay tribute to my distinguished colleagues, both the chairman of our subcommittee, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the ranking minority member, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], for their leadership, their knowledge of the items which came before the subcommittee, and also for their genuine interest in bringing as good a bill as possible to the Senate. The work with respect to which they assumed leadership resulted in a bill which was accepted by the full committee without change.

At the time the bill was under consideration, when the subcommittee of which I am a member marked up the appropriation bill, we increased the item for the Bureau of the Census by $62,000 for salaries and expenses. Since that time it has come to my attention that

even though an increase of $62,000 was made, a very vital item has been excluded. I refer to the item for the publication known as County Business Patterns. That is the purpose of the amendment which I have offered. I have discussed the amendment with the subcommittee chairman and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee [Mrs. SMITH of Maine], and they have agreed to take the item to conference.

County Business Patterns is a publication which is particularly valuable to small business people throughout the country. It is used extensively by the small business people who do not have the personnel necessary to provide for themselves the statistical data which they need. Many large business organizations have the necessary personnel. County Business Patterns provides the only comprehensive coverage and information available from any source with respect to agricultural services, forestry, fisheries, mining, contract construction, manufacturing, public utilities, wholesale trade, retail trade, finance, insurance and real estate, services, and many other items. These data are used widely throughout the country in setting sales quotas, sales manpower, distribution, estimating potential markets by industry classifications, and measuring regional industrial growth for all major industries. I am delighted that the chairman and the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee have agreed to accept this amendment. It will prove of great benefit to small business.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished ranking minority member, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and I have agreed to take this item to conference, for one reason only, and that is that it is not clear—at least to me—as to how far the $90,000 allowed would go in carrying out the necessary functioning of the agency in the field to which the Senator has referred. The additional $100,000, which would bring the total to $190,000, would give us sufficient latitude to make certain in the conference that the necessitous part of this function, which has to do with the compilation of old-age and survivors insurance benefit information, may be provided, in order that information compiled on that subject may be made available.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the Senator for accepting the amendment. It is my understanding that it would cost an additional $100,000, but I am sure the Senator from Florida, in conference, will be able to determine the exact cost of the publication, a copy of which I hold in my hand, and which is so valuable. The main interest is to make sure that the publication County Business Patterns shall continue.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] has the floor.

Mr. BARRETT. I desire to address a question to the Senator from Florida. I have received complaints from my State with reference to the public-relations activities of some few employees of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The complaint seems to be that some of the employees at our stations do not feel that they can give information to the general public with reference to weather conditions. It seems as though pilots on occasion have been unable to get such information from such employees.

The point with respect to which I wish to inquire specifically is this: Is there any intention on the part of the committee to prevent the employees of the Civil Aeronautics Administration from giving information to the public, even though it might not be strictly within the scope of their duties, provided it does not interfere with their work?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, that particular phase of the activities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration did not, so far as I can recall, come before our committee. However, we did hear complaints of indifference in connection with furnishing weather information to travelers and potential travelers. Before the Senator entered the Chamber, I stated for the RECORD that we had inserted in our report a paragraph requesting the Civil Aeronautics Administration "to give attention to this matter and take the necessary steps to effect an improvement in this service to the public."

As to the propriety of giving information directly to the public, it seems to me that a great deal would depend upon the legislation covering the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The legislative committee which has jurisdiction of that field would be better able to determine that point. The Senator from Florida regrets to say to his friend that he does not recall with sufficient accuracy the details of the authorizing legislation to be able to state whether it is the proper function of the Civil Aeronautics Administration to give out directly to every inquirer information which it has collected from its stations.

We shall be glad to address an inquiry on that subject to the Civil Aeronautics Administration. I hope the distinguished Senator will likewise lodge a request with the appropriate legislative committee. Perhaps in one place or another he can obtain an early and clear answer to his very pertinent question.

Certainly private pilots should come within the classification of persons to whom all information developed at the Civil Aeronautics Administration observation stations should be made available. In the opinion of the Senator from Florida, that would seem to be reasonable. Of course, the limits of the responsibility of the Civil Aeronautics Administration are fixed by the legislation under which it was created. As to the details of that legislation, I am unable at this time to advise the distinguished Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER.]

The Chair thought that if there were no objection to the amendment it might be disposed of at this time.

Mr. BARRETT. I have no objection, if it is desired to dispose of the amendment at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that I appreciate his remarks. However, I am certain there is nothing in the act itself which would authorize the Civil Aeronautics Administration to give this information to the general public. By the same token, it seems to me that the Appropriations Committee, as well as the appropriate legislative committee, would be justified in asking the Civil Aeronautics Administration to extend this information to pilots and to the general public, provided, of course, it does not interfere with their activities in the management of a station.

I will say to my colleague that my information is that in some few cases they have refused to do that very thing. I believe it is not in the public interest to refuse to do it. I do not believe they are justified in taking that position, although, as a strict matter of law perhaps they could very well say, "We will not do it because it is something we are not required to do."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on this point I should be very happy to act for the committee in requesting immediate information and immediate response to any questions which the Senator will reduce to writing in this field, so that we can find out what the official attitude of the Civil Aeronautics Administration is.

I can easily see with reference to private pilots, if they should be taking off from a field where there is a station and where there are control facilities, of course they would be furnished information and would be subject to instructions that were given. However, I realize there are many fields where there do not exist right on the field itself the facilities for the control system, and I am not sure to what class of cases the Senator is referring. If he will give us a clear statement on the matter we will be very glad to assist him in any way we can.

Mr. BARRETT. I will do so. I appreciate the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to call up my amendment to the pending bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "$900,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,200,000."

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I am a member of the Joint Economic Committee. That committee is perhaps one of the largest users of the kind of information which is called for by the appropriation on page 9, line 7. The joint committee is by no means the only user of such information. It is pertinent to the operations of many of the committees of the Senate. We do, however, stand in the unique position of being responsible for using all of the elements of economic statistics with reference to production and labor and monetary considerations, and for working them together into a report on the entire

problem of maintaining production and employment.

I regret that the reduction in the item seemed wise to the appropriation committee, not merely from the standpoint of the budget request, but from the amount used last year.

Very briefly, I should like to refer to the uses to which the added amount of $240,000 proposed by my amendment would be put. Fifty-five thousand dollars of it would be used for information on the rate at which consumers are spending their income for food, shelter, and other items in the family budget.

A second item calls for an additional $95,000 for information as to the rate at which manufacturers or other businessmen are investing in factories and machinery with which to produce the larger national output we shall have in the coming years.

Our population is growing very rapidly indeed, and the reason for expanding production is twofold: One because of the increase in population, and the other because of the increase in the standard of living.

While there are reports privately obtained as to the intentions of business, it is important that we have a report also as to the actual expenditures, to determine whether the rate of investment is sufficient, or low, or exaggerated, or too optimistic.

The next item is $70,000 for information on the rate at which unsold inventories are piling up in factories and warehouses. Such experience as I have had in the matter of business cycles and the ups and downs of business leads me to believe that this is an exceedingly important item—one about which we cannot afford to have any wrong ideas or insufficient information. The question of inventories, and their disposal, is a primary basis of judgment as to whether business is going to decline or increase.

Then there is also $20,000 which would be applied to information on the rate at which businesses are failing and new businesses are being established.

It seems to me that the full amount asked for in the budget is justified. In view of the uncertainties which many people are pointing to with reference to the next year or two, I feel very strongly that the committee should be willing to accept some addition to what it has voted and reported to the Senate. Therefore I ask for the $240,000 additional, to bring it up to the amount requested by the Budget Bureau.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true that the increase of $240,000, requested by the Bureau of the Budget, as I recall, was strongly backed by every agency that appeared before the Joint Economic Committee; and, in fact, did not many of them point out to us that, because of the lack of these very statistics, it was very difficult, with any degree of accuracy, to reach a decision as to what the economic position was?

Mr. FLANDERS. I will say to the Senator from Alabama that it is my recollection—and he can correct me if I am wrong in my recollection—that the United States Chamber of Commerce is particularly anxious to have the larger appropriation made.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Vermont is exactly right. The United States Chamber of Commerce pointed out this lack, and strongly urged that Congress make up this deficiency.

I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont another question. Of course, he is familiar, as I suppose every other Member of the Senate is, with the monthly publication called Economic Indicators, which is published under the sponsorship of the joint committee. It contains each month a wealth of material. Is it not true that this material is based on just such studies as we are trying to provide, but with respect to which we are not able to get accurate estimates and accurate forecasts because of a deficiency in this respect?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I feel that it is exceedingly important that that publication, which goes to all Senators and which I know some Senators use, should be accurate. I am not at all sure that the available amounts cover anything more than what a previous speaker referred to in another connection as "educated guesses." We want something better than that if we are concerned with the maintenance of production and employment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I gladly yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think I should warn the Senator from Vermont that he is in danger of being accused of being a prophet of gloom because he made the statement that there was some uncertainty about the business outlook. I wish to warn him that if he keeps on that course, the chairman of the Republican National Committee, Mr. Leonard Hall, will shortly accuse him of being a prophet of doom and gloom, and that the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, of Massachusetts, may well go to Philadelphia and accuse him of being 1 of the 4 horsemen of the Apocalypse.

So I wish to warn my friend of the grave danger he is running, because very shortly the orators will take to the stump and say that everything is booming except the guns, and that we dwell in a land of milk and honey. So my good friend, in pursuing his scientific inquiries, may find himself up against the hard pressure of political conformity. I have great respect for the character of the Senator from Vermont, and I do not wish to have him speak unwittingly in view of the terrific barrage of gas and machine-gun fire which may shortly open up upon him.

Mr. FLANDERS. I may say to my friend from Illinois that I shall read with great interest the report of what I said, because it is my strong impression that I said "There are those who question."

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator has an escape hatch.

The Senator has preserved his standing in the church and probably will not be accused by Mr. Hall and the others. I am glad he has sufficient foresight to protect himself against the defamation which otherwise would fall upon his head.

Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Florida on his excellent work for the committee, but I wish to invite attention to certain items.

We often hear from business sources in complaints that the subsidies to small farmers and welfare organizations are excessive and are bankrupting the country. I am sure these complaints are made in good faith, but I think it is important to realize the subsidies which are contained in this appropriation bill.

There is a direct subsidy to the airlines of $17,400,000, about which I shall speak in more detail in a moment.

There are direct subsidies to ship construction firms of $108,880,000, which the committee increased by $54 million over the appropriation by the House.

There is another subsidy of $124,000,000 for the operation of ships. So, if we take these direct subsidies into account, there is a total of $250.2 million in this bill.

In addition to that, there are indirect subsidies for the CAA, as the Senator from Florida pointed out, for operation and regulation and for the establishment of air navigation facilities, which total $168,608,000, and a further appropriation of $30 million in grants-in-aid to airports.

So there is a total of $448.8 million which I think could quite correctly be called subsidies to business.

When we remember, Mr. President, that the Post Office bill also contained huge subsidies, there is a very large total. Virtually the entire deficit of the Post Office Department is on second-, third-, and fourth-class mail. It used to be true that first-class mail more than paid its way. I am not quite certain of the definite figures, but certainly it almost pays its own way now. But the big deficit comes from carrying newspapers, magazines, and second-class matter at very much less than the cost which they occasion the Government.

There is also a large deficit on third-class mail, the unsealed advertising matter which we receive in such profusion in our mail, most of which is discarded, thrown into the wastebasket.

There, is, furthermore, a subsidy on fourth-class mail or parcel post, although that subsidy is diminishing.

From figures which I have seen I have strongly believed that the allowances for the transportation of mail on railroads are in excess of what they should be, and that, therefore, there is a hidden subsidy contained in these items as well.

We find the totals running into the hundreds of millions of dollars. If all these items were tabulated, the total would probably not be far from a billion dollars a year in subsidies to business. In addition to this there are a great many other subsidies which receive little opposition from those who object to those for the small farmers or for human welfare. In particular I should mention the just tax writeoff for businesses, the direct subsidy to United States Steel for deepening the Delaware River, the interest-free money for reclamation projects, the tariffs which subsidize business, the 107 percent of parity payments on wool, and the subsidies received by the big sugar and sugar beet growers. I

always find it amazing that some of those complain most vehemently about subsidies to the little fellow seldom complain about those which they receive themselves.

For the moment I am not going to object to these but I do not think it unfair to point out these business subsidies exist.

If I may turn to the subject of subsidies for airlines, the figures this year are a great improvement over those of last year. Last year the committee, as I remember it, recommended appropriations of approximately $60 million. At that time the Senator from Delaware and I both said those subsidies were, in our judgment, excessive and that they should be reduced.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I happen to recall the exact amounts which I know the Senator wishes to have in the RECORD.

The budget request for CAB subsidies was $63 million. The amount recommended by the Senate committee and approved by the Senate was $55 million. The amount coming out of the conference was $52½ million.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Florida. In my opinion, these sums were excessive. I think no one would object if I pointed out that in practice these funds were not spent and that a very considerable carryover of some $22 million is available for the coming year.

I wish to have the RECORD show that the criticism which I advanced last year has largely been borne out by developments.

I think the CAB has made an honest effort during the past year to reduce the amount of the subsidies and to bring them into manageable proportions. I am very glad that Northwest Airlines, for example, is now off subsidies, as I understand it, and is supporting itself. I think they deserve much credit for what they have done.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not only is Northwest Airlines off the subsidy list; but later today I shall comment concerning the manner in which the Northwest Airlines application for a transpacific route has been handled. The one transpacific line which is off subsidy is being denied an opportunity for a decent route; while the Pan-Am Line is apparently meeting with much more favorable treatment.

I have merely interrupted the Senator's comments to note this, because I was just examining some material I have prepared on this particular case.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. In times past, I have been very critical of the management of Northwest Airlines, but I pay tribute to them for getting off the subsidy list and for trying to reduce their costs and to make of themselves an enterprise which can stand on its own feet. Northwest Airlines deserves much credit.

When I have been critical of the airlines in the past, I think I should place them on a roll of honor in the future. I only wish that some of the other airlines, which seem to enjoy great favors from the CAB, could show a similar record.

I think possibly the discussion on the floor last year about the subsidies has had an effect upon the CAB. I know the chairman of the subcommittee has been working in this direction, too. It indicates, I believe, that discussions on items in the appropriation bills, instead of being acts of heresy, frequently have a salutary effect.

I think we have galvanized the General Accounting Office into a more detailed audit of the expenditures of the airlines. I hope we can continue in that direction. I think we have galvanized the CAB into taking more decisive action. I hope they will continue with their good work and will do still more. I wish to assure them that the eyes of the Senate and of the country are still upon them.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, I express my very great appreciation for the kind, cordial, and constructive remarks made by my friend, the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I would be the first to admit that I think good has resulted from the facts which he presented the last year. I think he has been very generous, likewise, in giving credit, where credit is due, to the former chairman of the CAB.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And to the subcommittee and to its chairman.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. Particularly do I thank him for that reference. But I was thinking, in the first instance, of other than legislative agencies.

The CAB has done outstanding work in the past year, in my opinion. The General Accounting Office has completed an audit which was in the course of preparation last year during the debate, and has published it and furnished it to the Senate. It throws a very great light upon many of the practices, some of which are completely approved, and some of which are diverted into different channels.

I think that good has resulted from the debate of last year and from the consequently greater effort which has been noted on the part of the regulatory agencies.

The commerce subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, charged with this particular duty, has also been particularly anxious to bring out all the facts on matters which were called in question last year. For instance, last year not only was the General Accounting Office requested to supply information relative to the hotel operating activities, which information, I believe, was made available at that time, but also the same request was made again this year for such information, and Senators will find it printed in the record, in the report of the General Accounting Office, which, after all, is the arm of Congress in this field with reference to that particular operation.

We also requested specific light on the question of the progress made in the application of the offset decision. Senators may remember that it was stated in the debate last year that the then new chairman of the CAB, Chairman Rizley, now, I believe, a Federal judge, was appointed with particular reference to the fact that he had been one of counsel for the Government in the successful effort of the Government to have the offset principle allowed by the courts—and it had been allowed. Chairman Rizley was charged with the specific duty, among others, of making certain that the offset principle was placed in action with reference to the accounts of the carriers which were affected thereby. That has been done.

Senators will discover that the only items still remaining for discussion, for liquidation, and perhaps for litigation, total, as I recall, approximately only $8,600,000. I am speaking, now, of old, hangover items.

The affairs of the CAB have been placed on a much more current basis. Of course, I think Congress is entitled to some credit for that, aside from the bringing out of the discussions on the floor, because the CAB last year was given a substantial personnel increase to aid them in the tremendous volume of accounting and clerical work which had accumulated over the years. The affairs of the CAB are now in much better shape. The affairs of the carriers generally, I think—and I know of no exception—seem to be well understood by the CAB. I believe they are being well handled by the CAB.

The General Accounting Office was also asked to give the committee its opinion upon the treatment of certain capital gains items which appeared in the accounts of one or more of the large carriers. Senators will find in the RECORD the information furnished by the General Accounting Office in that field, which indicated that the operations today by the carriers and CAB in that field have been approved by the General Accounting Office, and, furthermore, have been approved by the Federal courts. So the operation is following the course as laid down and approved by the courts in a particular case.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In order that the RECORD may be clear, is it not true that instead of the $63,000,000, which the CAB asked for last year, this year they asked for only $20 million, and the committee has now reduced that amount to $17,400,000?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Illinois is correct. I am glad that that kind of cut has been made possible. I think, though, that the Senate and the public in general should know that we cannot expect a reduction to that level in subsequent years, because the heavy carryover which has resulted from the accentuated operation in the cleaning up of old troubles in this year will not take place next year; and the member of the staff who is most conversant with the operations estimates that the CAB next year will probably be back on a level of operations of $35 million, or $40 million.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope they can do still better than that.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope so; but I think, in fairness to the CAB and the carriers, we should realize that it is not at all certain—in fact, I think it is almost certainly not true—that the present level shown in the appropriation bill can be maintained, because nothing but the carryover of a very large unexpended balance makes possible the reduction to the amount shown this year.

I shall make one more observation in this field, other than to express my very great gratitude to the Senator from Illinois. I am very much pleased that the CAB, the Maritime Administration, and the CAA all show a disposition to comply with the request of the Senate Appropriations Committee; that they play their full hand when they make their annual request; and that we know what their business is estimated to be for the year, so that they will not continue to come back to Congress with requests for deficiency and supplemental appropriations, which make it very difficult to follow their operations. Not only have they acceded to that request this year—and it may be remembered that two of the agencies did not have any requests in the supplemental bill which was considered by the Senate the other day—but also—and this pleases me more—the thinking of the able committee at the other end of the Capitol, which handles the same work as our committee, is much more nearly identical with ours. Senators will find, for instance, that the appropriation allowed by the able committee handling this appropriation at the other end of the Capitol on the item for public roads covers almost the entire asking for the year, without requiring a large supplemental amount to be appropriated next spring.

Likewise, in the case of the Maritime Administration appropriations, whereas last year we had to be in the invidious position of stepping up a greatly reduced appropriation coming to us, we did not have to be quite that kind in the operating differential field.

So, too, in the field of improved installations for the Civil Aeronautics Administration, it pleased me greatly to know that the two committees of both Houses were viewing the matter apparently alike—that we should speed the program, which I believe is a 5-year program, now under way for the installation of modern facilities. It was felt that we should keep up with the program, and both Houses are apparently moving in that direction without any difference of opinion.

I am glad to report that to the Senate, because I think that is as notable an improvement as is the change in performance on the part of the administrative agencies.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I find out from the Senator whether the appropriations in the bill for the Civil Aeronautics Administration will be adequate to maintain and sustain the existing control towers at our civilian airports?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, it will. The Senator will recall that last year a suggestion was made for cutting out quite a number of those installations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. About 17.

Mr. HOLLAND. Or 19; whatever it was. There is no such effort this year.

There were several small intermediate landing fields which were proposed to be discontinued. I believe that item involved $108,000. The CAA said they were no longer needed, but the Senate committee was ultraconservative in that field. The judgment of the full committee, which is always better than the judgment of any one Senator, was that there should be some delay in this field, and we declined to permit that one step of retrenchment suggested by the Civil Aeronautics Administrator. I think we all agree that if even one life is saved thereby, the $108,000 will be well spent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My reason for asking the question in reference to the control towers is that the Senator from Florida may recall that about 2 years ago there was a definite intention to close down the control tower at Duluth, Minn., where there is also a military installation. Needless to say, the mayor and the city council, the governing body of that community, were greatly disturbed, because there had already been 2 or 3 accidents because of bad weather conditions. I wanted to make sure that we would not be faced with that threat again this year.

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say to my distinguished friend that there is no threat in that field. To the contrary, there is no recommendation from the Bureau of the Budget or the CAA itself for discontinuance of installations of that kind.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator, and commend him for the hard work he has done on the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should now like to address myself to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I was about to ask if the Senator would do that. I hope the Senator's remarks will be friendly, and that he will accept the amendment I have offered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Certainly the Senator is 50 percent right. My comments will be extremely friendly. The Senator from Florida is unable to grant the request of the Senator from Vermont. He has had to refuse similar requests from the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Alabama, the Senator from Maine, and I believe another Senator, whose amendment was not called up.

The Senator from Florida will simply have to say to his friend from Vermont that the committee took the invidious position of restoring $63,563,000 net. The actual restoration was in excess of the $64 million cut made by the House. However, the committee did that in a selective way, and restored those items which seemed to be highly necessitous.

The objectives so ably advanced by the Senator from Vermont were not in that necessitous category, or at least they were not necessitous in the opinion of the 23 members of the committee, who unanimously approved the report.

As I have had to say to other distinguished friends, two things might be done. It has been mentioned that there is a difference of $100,000 in amount which will be in conference between the Senate and the House. I shall be a conferee, and other Members of the Senate will be conferees. I am sure if the Senator will address to us letters, setting forth the complete nature of the activities which are embraced in his amendment, we shall be glad to give the fullest and most sympathetic consideration to anything he may suggest to us in that field.

Aside from that, the Senator from Vermont probably knows that a supplemental appropriation bill is in the making, and if he has any requests which are necessitous, he will at least be given a chance to be heard again on a request which he may make without insisting upon having the selection made on the floor.

Since the Senator from Vermont was not on the floor at the time, I think the Senator from Florida should advise the Senator from Vermont that he did accept one amendment, with the concurrence of the Senator from Maine, the ranking minority member. But the reason for that was that we were not sure whether the amount allowed for the objective was fully cared for, and we agreed to take to conference an item involving $100,000, so we would be sure to be able to work it out, without leading the offerer of the amendment to any belief that it would be retained in conference.

No such question presented itself—at least I know of no such question—in the proposals of my distinguished friends from Alabama, Illinois, and Maine, in connection with the same type of work which the Senator from Vermont seeks to advance by his amendment. The matter may be pursued either by taking it to conference or as a supplementary budget item. I hope the Senator from Vermont will not insist on the item. Otherwise the Senate may have to wait until next Monday before it can pass on it.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator from Florida, who has made 50 percent of my request effective. The Senator referred to an item of $100,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. The $100,000 item will go to conference.

Mr. FLANDERS. So at least an item of $100,000 will be in conference. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. It will.

Mr. FLANDERS. I bespeak the continuance of the friendliness of the Senator, which I know will continue, and perhaps some recognition of the point of view I have tried to express, when the Senator becomes a member of the conference committee on the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator for withdrawing his amendment, if that is what he has done.

Mr. FLANDERS. I have.

Mr. HOLLAND. If he had carried his persuasion before the committee, I have no doubt the committee would have been more generous in passing on the item than it was, because it is exceedingly difficult for me, even under the conditions I have related, to refrain from granting the request of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. May I add that I have a very keen appreciation, not merely of the work which the Senator from Florida is doing, which I have reason always to appreciate, but also of this whole process of going through appropriation bills, which I think is one of the cruelest tasks which any Senator faces.

Why any Member of the Senate should wish to serve on the Appropriations Committee is beyond my understanding. However, I am glad that the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] are members of it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his kindness.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Vermont is withdrawn.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. On yesterday and today I have received a number of telegrams about the pending appropriation bill. In that connection, I should like to request certain information from the Senator from Florida.

One of the telegrams reads as follows:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *May 29, 1956.*

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Administration has requested appropriation of $1.8 million to conduct national housing inventory. One million dollars was approved by House committee, but has been denied by Senate committee. This study is designed to update 1950 housing census and will be conducted in 35 metropolitan areas, including New York. Continuing heavy housing production since 1950 creates necessity of determining whether this production truly meets the needs of broadest possible segment of our population. On Thursday a resolution approving the administration request will be offered from floor of Senate. I strongly urge your support of it when presented.

GEORGE C. JOHNSON,
President, the Dime Savings Bank of Brooklyn.

I am advised by the staff that this question was raised on the floor of the Senate, and that the committee agreed to restore to the bill a certain amount. I am not sure what the amount was.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the concern of the distinguished Senator from New York. The ranking minority member of the appropriations subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the chairman of the subcommittee, with the concurrence of other members who could be contacted, agreed to restore to the bill $650,000, which is the portion of the $1,800,000 which was proposed to be spent in a national effort on a 2 percent sampling basis, to check upon the homes and dwellings throughout the Nation, in order to bring up to date to that extent the information already contained in so voluminous a way in the 1950 Census.

We did not agree to restore to the bill other parts of the item; but I think the Senator from New York will realize why that was our view. The full committee had declined to include any of the $1,800,000, because at that time we understood all of it was to be spent only in selected cities; and a study of that sort would not extend widely enough to cover some of the fastest growing and most widely developed cities in the Nation. For instance, Buffalo, N. Y., was not included in the action taken by the House, although apparently Buffalo is a very rapidly growing city located in a very rapidly growing area, because we received many requests for its inclusion. Similarly, Miami, Fla., was not included; Dallas and Houston, Tex., were not included; San Diego, Calif., was not included; various other rapidly growing cities were not included. The best which could be said of the program was that it offered relief in a few places. But we felt that was not the national approach which should be made.

When we found that $650,000 could be used to bring up to date the national statistics, on a national basis, we approved that. So, with the approval of the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and myself, that amendment was accepted; and I am sure it will remain in the bill, because it is within the action taken by the House of Representatives.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Florida very much indeed.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield further to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the several other telegrams I have received on the subject just under discussion be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 28, 1956.*

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The section of Bureau of Census appropriation for national housing inventory has been deleted by Senate Appropriations Committee. This housing information is vital to planning and housing activities in the city and metropolitan region. Strongly urge your support of reinstatement of this section on floor of Senate.

JAMES FELT,
Chairman, City Planning Commission.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 28, 1956.*

Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you to vote for restoration of funds for national housing inventory in appropriation bill for Census Bureau.

J. CLARENCE DAVIS, Jr.,
President, Citizens Housing and Planning Council.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 25, 1956.*

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

An inventory of housing in metropolitan areas urgently needed for proper planning to meet housing needs. On behalf of Welfare and Health Council of New York City respectfully urge restoration of funds for national housing inventory in Census Bureau appropriation for current fiscal year. Also recommend that original request for $1.8 million be appropriated.

J. DONALD KINGSLEY,
Executive Director.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 25, 1956.*

Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge that you vote to restore $1,800,000 to Census Bureau appropriation, for vitally needed national housing inventory.

FRANCES LEVENSON,
Director, National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 29, 1956.*

The Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The following telegram sent today all members Senate Appropriations Committee:

"The National Association of Home Builders and its 260 affiliated local and State associations urgently ask restoration by the Senate of the President's request for an appropriation for a national housing inventory by the Census Bureau (H. R. 10899, title I, Bureau of the Census). Following a period of unprecedented national expansion and growth, the Government and the industry itself are severely handicapped in having to rely on the now inadequate and outmoded statistics of the 1950 census. There is a pressing need for current data to insure sound decision making in housing matters. The Federal Government alone is in a position to make this survey and inventory.

"We respectfully urge your support for restoration."

JOHN M. DICKERMAN,
Executive Director, National Association of Home Builders.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 10899) was passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the President pro tempore appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. STENNIS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. KNOWLAND conferees on the part of the Senate.

INCREASE OF MINIMUM POSTAL SAVINGS DEPOSIT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2087, Senate bill 1873.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1873) to increase the minimum postal savings deposit, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1873) to increase the minimum postal savings deposit, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I announce that it is the intention of the acting majority leader not to have the Senate proceed further with this bill today, but, instead, to have the bill considered further on Monday.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until Monday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT PERIOD

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Appropriations Committee be permitted to file reports during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON MONDAY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, the call of the calendar under rule VIII be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President pro tempore be authorized to sign enrolled bills during the adjournment of the Senate following the completion of its business today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING CONSIDERATION OF BILL AMENDING THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I should like to announce that a number of Senators have been requesting information as to when the bill amending the Social Security Act will be considered by the Senate. The best information we can give at this time is that there will be no opportunity to consider that measure before Wednesday or Thursday of next week. There has been some delay in the printing of the report on the bill. However, the bill will be brought up for consideration on the floor of the Senate as soon as the printing has been taken care of.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT OF REPORT ON RENEGOTIATION BY JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION (S. DOC. NO. 126)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the report of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, relating to renegotiation. Without objection, the report will be printed as a Senate document.

PROGRAM FOR MONDAY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I announce for the information of Senators that it is possible that on Monday the Senate will consider Calendar No. 2060, House bill 8225, a bill to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Pipestone National Monument in the State of Minnesota; Calendar No. 2061, House bill 9822, a bill to provide for the establishment of a trout hatchery on the Davidson River in the Pisgah National Forest in North Carolina; Calendar No. 2076, House bill 6376, a bill to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes; Senate bill 3920, a bill to authorize the partition or sale of inherited interests in allotted lands in the Tulalip Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes, reported today without amendment; and Calendar No. 2058, House bill 3255, a bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to preserve the rates of compensation of certain officers and employees.

USE OF RADIO AND TELEVISION BROADCASTING STATIONS BY CANDIDATES FOR OFFICE IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week, very late in the evening, during Senate consideration of the highway bill, I introduced, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], a bill (S. 3962) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the use of radio and television broadcasting stations by candidates for office in Federal elections. Because of the extreme importance and intense interest in this matter, I have requested that the bill be kept at the desk until the end of Senate business on next Tuesday, June 5, in order to enable other Senators to join in sponsoring it.

I am privileged to announce at this time that both the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] also join in sponsoring the bill.

I request unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U. S. C. 315) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 315. (a) If any licensee shall permit any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office to use a broadcasting station, he shall (except as provided by subsections (b) and (c)) afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting station.

"(b) Subsection (a) shall apply to the use of a broadcasting station by any legally qualified candidate for the office of President or Vice President of the United States only if such candidate—

"(1) is (A) the nominee of a political party whose candidate for such office in the preceding presidential election was supported by not fewer than 4 percent of the total votes cast, or (2) supported by petitions filed under the laws of the several States which in the aggregate bear a number of signatures, valid under the laws of the States in which they are filed, equal to at least 1 percent of the total popular votes cast in the preceding presidential election; or

"(2) is a candidate for presidential or vice presidential nomination by a political party whose candidate for such office in the preceding presidential election was supported by not fewer than 4 percent of the total popular votes cast and—

"(A) is the incumbent of any elective Federal or statewide elective office of any State; or

"(B) has been nominated for President or Vice President at any prior convention of his party; or

"(C) is supported by petitions filed under the laws of the several States which in the aggregate bear at least 200,000 signatures which are valid under the laws of the States in which they are filed.

"(c) Subsection (a) shall apply to the use of a broadcasting station by any legally qualified congressional candidate only if such candidate is—

"(1) the nominee of a political party whose candidate for the congressional office sought by the legally qualified candidate received in the preceding general congressional election not less than 4 percent of the total votes cast for all candidates for that office in such election; or

"(2) supported by one or more petitions filed under applicable State law which in the aggregate bear a number of signatures, valid under the laws of the State, equal to at least 1 percent of the total votes cast for all candidates for that office in the preceding general congressional election.

For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'congressional candidate' means a candidate for election as a Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States.

"(d) No license shall have any power of censorship over the material broadcast under the provisions of this section. No obligation is hereby imposed upon any licensee to allow the use of its station by any such candidate.

"(e) The charges made for the use of any broadcasting station for any of the purposes heretofore set forth in this section shall not exceed the charges made for comparable use of such station for other purposes.

"(f) It shall be the obligation of each television network and each television station to make available without charge to each candidate for the office of President of the United States eligible to receive equal opportunity under subsection (b) one-half hour of time per week during September and

1 hour of time per week during October and 1 hour in November preceding election of any year in which a presidential election is being held. Time made available under this subsection may be utilized only by the candidate for President or the candidate for Vice President and shall be in such time segments (not less than 15-minute segments) and at such times as the candidate for President shall request not less than 15 days in advance, but no network or station shall be under any obligation to provide time in less than half-hour segments at any time when there is a regularly scheduled half-hour program on such network or station or to provide time in less than 1-hour segments at any time when there is a regularly scheduled 1-hour program on such network or station. Where a request for time is made to a network under this subsection, it shall be the obligation of each station affiliated with that network to clear the time requested: *Provided, however,* That if a station is affiliated with more than 1 network and the total time requested for clearance in any 1 week shall exceed the amount of time the station is obligated to make available under this subsection, the candidate for President shall determine the network to which the time is to be made available by the station. The candidate for President may request time under this subsection directly from a station or stations rather than through a network or networks, but in no event shall any network or station be required to carry programs without charge for more time than specified in the first sentence of this subsection. No network or station shall be held responsible for the nonfulfillment of any contract heretofore or hereafter made because of its inability to carry out said contract by reason of the obligations imposed upon such network or station under this subsection.

"(g) The Commission shall—

"(1) prescribe appropriate rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this section; and

"(2) determine, and upon request of any licensee notify such licensee concerning, the eligibility of any candidate to receive equal opportunity under subsection (b) or (c) in the use of any broadcasting station."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, today I should like to address myself briefly to the provisions of the bill and the justification for it.

Let me begin by saying that it is a companion measure to H. R. 11150, a bill introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative PRIEST on May 10, 1956. It is apparent that there is considerable interest in this measure in the House of Representatives, and I am earnestly hopeful that committee consideration on that side may occur momentarily.

In an election year, Mr. President, it is obvious to everyone that the wisdom reflected in a citizen's vote largely depends upon the information which comes to him during the course of the campaign. Campaigning techniques themselves have now been revolutionized by the medium of television. It has added many new dimensions to a candidate's public image. In projecting appearance, as well as words and voice, the television medium is rapidly becoming the single most important vehicle for the conduct of political campaigns.

I think we should also recognize quite frankly that television is a mechanism in which the American people have not only an interest but a property right. The television frequency which is granted exclusively and for private profit to a television licensee under the Federal Communications Act is the property of the Government and the people of the United States. Just as a rental accrues to the United States Government from the leases of federally owned offshore oil-producing property, a modification in the terms of a current television license would be a kind of rental upon such property. In a sense, the bill I have offered would provide for such a public rental by requiring in certain limited cases applicable only to presidential and vice-presidential candidates the granting of free time for governmental purposes. Expert legal advisers have drafted and evaluated S. 3962. They have assured me that there is no legal obstacle to a modification of current licenses, requiring a rental in kind on what is now a completely unrestrained license, since there is no "contracts clause" limiting the Federal Government like that which limits the capacity of the States to change a contract.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

Mr. President, there are two major provisions in my proposed bill. The first would attempt to rescue radio and television stations from the predicament in which the present so-called equal-opportunity provision in the Communications Act places them. The present provision requires that any station which permits any candidate for public office to use its facilities must afford to any other candidates equal facilities. In numerous instances in the past the stations have been loath to grant the use of their facilities to bona fide major party candidates because of the possibility that they may have to grant equal time to any other applicant, no matter how insignificant or spurious his so-called candidacy might be. I can appreciate that we must always safeguard the right of minority party candidates to obtain appropriate public attention. Nevertheless, it is obvious that a change in the present provision of the Communications Act is called for.

Hence S. 3962 would require a station which permits one legally qualified candidate for public office to use a broadcasting station "to afford equal opportunities to all other candidates for that office." This provision is made applicable, however, only to the following candidates:

(a) Presidential and vice presidential nominees of any political party whose national votes in the preceding presidential election amounted to at least 4 percent of the total votes, or presidential and vice presidential candidates supported by petitions in each State containing signatures equal to at least 1 percent of the total popular vote cast there in the preceding presidential election;

(b) Candidates for presidential and vice presidential nomination by a political party whose candidate in the preceding presidential election obtained at least 4 percent of the total popular vote cast, provided that, first, such candidate for nomination is an incumbent of an elective Federal or elective statewide office; or, second, such candidate for nomination has been previously nominated for President or Vice President by his party; or, third, such candidate for nomination is supported by petitions bearing an aggregate of 200,000 signatures.

(c) Congressional candidates, that is candidates for election as Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, who have either been, first, nominated by a political party whose previous candidate for the congressional office in the preceding general congressional election won at least 4 percent of the total votes cast for that office; or, second, supported by petitions containing signatures equaling at least 1 percent of the total votes cast for all candidates for the appropriate office in the preceding general congressional election.

Mr. President, in connection with the first part of my bill concerning equal opportunity, there are also appropriate provisions preventing any television or broadcasting station from censoring material broadcast. There are also provisions requiring that the charges made for campaign broadcasts shall not exceed the charges made for a comparable use of the station for other purposes.

FREE TIME

Mr. President, the second major section of my bill would make available without charge to each candidate for the office of President of the United States who is eligible to receive equal opportunity under the above provisions, the following campaign time:

One-half hour of time per week during September, 1 hour of time per week during October, and 1 hour of time during November, each year in which a presidential election is held. The qualified candidates for President under this bill could request time either of the entire network or of specific stations. The detailed provisions are included in the bill governing such requests.

There are several specific limitations written into the bill which would safeguard the station from the interruption of hour or half-hour programs for smaller amounts of political time, and the time made available under this section may be used only by the candidate for President or the candidate for Vice President.

The free-time provision in my proposed bill would not prevent a station or network from selling additional time for use to the presidential or vice presidential candidates, or, of course, to other candidates for Federal office, who are not included in the free-time provision. The equal opportunity requirement would, however, apply throughout.

We cannot overestimate the importance of allowing the American people to hear the leading presidential candidates without being subject to the financial limitations burdening any particular candidate or party. All of us know that television is rapidly assuming the bulk of the expense in campaigning for public office. In some cases it is threatening to force public servants to rely more and more heavily upon the financial contributions of special interests.

I think there is a clear difference between the radio and television situation and the situation of newspapers and other publicity media. In the radio-

television case, the American people have made a gift of the exclusive use of certain channels to the licensees involved. This gift is for a temporary period of time only, and I think it is upon this that the American people may, if they wish, attach to such a lucrative gift certain conditions important to the public welfare. The condition of free time for the discussion of public issues is a reasonable one. Indeed, it has now become more than that, I think it has become essential.

I differentiate radio and television free time from anything relating to a newspaper because a newspaper is a private enterprise, in which no Federal license is involved. No particular gift from the Federal Government, such as an air channel or any other particular benefit, is involved.

Mr. President, I ask other Senators to consider this bill very carefully because it deals with the problem that will be of increasing importance to the future of American democracy. I shall welcome the support of those Senators who wish to join me, Senator MANSFIELD and Senator SPARKMAN, with whom I am sponsoring this measure.

Mr. President, I now wish to address myself to another subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

PAN AMERICAN AND NORTHWEST AIRLINE ROUTES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier today, in colloquy with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I said I wished to make comment with reference to the Trans-Pacific case which had been handled by the Civil Aeronautics Board and subsequently dealt with at the White House at Cabinet level.

The unusual and mysterious handling of some international air route cases in the White House, particularly the Trans-Pacific case, is a matter of growing concern to me, as I know it is to others on both sides of the aisle here today.

I should like to call the attention of the Senate to an article by Drew Pearson which appeared in the Washington Post on May 24, 1956. This article refers to the so-called Trans-Pacific case now pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board, and discusses the unusual role which the White House has played in the case.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the section of Drew Pearson's article which refers to the White House and the Trans-Pacific case.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAN AM JOB GOES TO IKE'S NEPHEW

(By Drew Pearson)

Pan American Airways, which knows how to use people with influence almost as well as it knows how to fly airplanes, has recently hired three interesting people. They are:

1. The nephew of President Eisenhower, Milton Eisenhower, Jr.

2. Robert Murray, former Under Secretary of Commerce and the man who helped get the White House to reverse, temporarily, a Civil Aeronautics Board ruling for Northwest Airlines and against Pan American.

3. Roger Lewis, former Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, who held a key position in the Eisenhower administration when important contracts were given to Pan American on guided missiles and overhauling Air Force motors.

The interesting thing to watch is whether these new and influential persons will cause the White House and the CAB now to side with Pan American when it comes to awarding the Great Circle route via Alaska to Japan.

Northwest Airlines originally was given this route at a time when Pan American could have got it but didn't apply. Instead it took what looked like the more lucrative route across the Pacific via Honolulu.

WHITE HOUSE REVERSES

But as transocean planes improved, the Great Circle route has become the most efficient to Japan; so Pan American has had astute, charming Vice President Sam Pryor camping out in Washington trying to get Pan American the right to fly this route.

Just a year ago, the CAB awarded the route to Northwest Airlines for 7 years. Whereupon, Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks who, like Pryor, has served on the finance committee of the Republican National Committee, persuaded the White House to reverse the CAB decision. He also got reversed a CAB decision to let Northwest continue its route from Seattle to Honolulu. Under Secretary of Commerce Murray helped Weeks in persuading the White House.

However, this caused such a furor that President Eisenhower stepped in personally and reversed his own White House advisers.

Since last year's failure, Pan Am has hired Ike's own nephew, plus the former Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, plus former Under Secretary of Commerce Murray, the man who intervened at the White House so effectively in favor of Pan American a year ago.

Pan Am has now applied to the CAB for the right to fly the Great Circle route over the back of Northwest. The hearings are in progress and it will be interesting to see what happens.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there is too much at stake for any of us to permit mishandling of international air route cases through errors in judgment, improper influence, or just plain meddling, as the strange manner in which the Trans-Pacific case has been handled would seem to indicate.

Not only is the economic welfare of airlines involved, but the outcome of this case will have a direct bearing on our national defense. It will have a far-reaching effect on the future of aviation, both in this country and the foreign field.

From the very beginning of the present case, the CAB's attempts to follow the mandates of the Civil Aeronautics Act and maintain a balanced competitive air pattern in the Pacific have met with White House interference and reversals.

What is behind such maneuvering? What has prompted the White House to ignore the Board's considered findings and to ask for revised directives instead? Are sources outside the Government attempting to influence final CAB decisions by making an end run around the CAB? If so, this body is entitled to know.

In the light of CAB recommendations and financial reports on file with the CAB, a few of these White House decisions demand a full explanation.

As Senators know, the accepted air policy in the Pacific is the maintenance of two strong but separate and competing air routes from the United States to the Far East. Northwest Airlines was an original applicant for a certificate over the great circle route, and Pan American World Airways was an applicant for both routes—the great circle course and the central Pacific route.

In 1946, the Board recommended Northwest over the great circle route and Pan American over the central Pacific, but ruled against Pan American monopolizing both routes.

When the certificates were up for renewal in 1953, Northwest again was an applicant for the Great Circle route and Pan American an applicant for both. Pan American's certificate over the central Pacific route was renewed, but again its application to duplicate Northwest's route was turned down by the Board.

At the same time the Board recommended a permanent certificate for Northwest on the great circle course.

In January of 1955, the President refused to approve a permanent certificate for Northwest, and based his decision on an assumption that subsidy was for Northwest operations.

The Senate will recall and it was brought out today during the consideration of the appropriations for the Department of Commerce that Northwest no longer has any subsidy for its overseas operations.

Other international carriers, by the way, were granted permanent operating rights while still on subsidy.

However, Northwest was not receiving subsidy at the time its permanent certificate was denied, and it still is today the only United States subsidy-free carrier without permanent rights to its international points.

In regard to Pan American's application to duplicate Northwest's service, the Board had recommended that it be denied. The President, however, again did not follow the Board's recommendation. Instead, he held his decision in abeyance until February of this year.

In asking the Board earlier this year to reconsider Pan American's application, the President indicated that he had been advised that new circumstances and new developments have arisen that may make at least some of the considerations previously raised by the Board no longer applicable.

Mr. President, I believe we should know who advised the President in this respect; I am sure it was not the Civil Aeronautics Board. Was it members of his staff? And if so, who advised the members of his staff, and what kind of information exchanged hands?

I am aware that Pan American claims discrimination or unfair competition by being restricted to the Central Pacific route, and that it cannot remain off subsidy unless it is granted authority to operate over the shorter route. But are Senators aware that Pan American already has the authority to operate a

route from San Francisco to Tokyo, via Midway, that is only slightly longer than the one it seeks?

Are Senators aware that revenues derived from Pan American's Pacific operations for 1955 amounted to $58,551,000 with a net operating income, without subsidy, of $5,076,000?

Northwest's revenues for the same period amounted to $21,357,267 with a net loss of $244,000 before taxes.

It is evident that Pan American does not need to gain access to Northwest's small market in order to stay off subsidy. Why, then, has the Board been asked to reconsider this issue? Is there a move underway to give Pan American, which is still a heavily subsidized carrier, complete control of all Pacific traffic and thereby create a monopoly at the expense of a completely subsidy-free carrier?

I wish the record to be absolutely clear that I am not selecting Pan American for any kind of abusive treatment. It is a great carrier. It has done marvelous work. It has been worthy of all possible consideration, but it is not worthy of special treatment, particularly when the facts do not permit that kind of treatment.

When the White House most recently returned this issue to the CAB, the Board expanded the case so as to also consider possible relief for Northwest in the event that Pan American's application was granted. Northwest does not want relief. It wants a certificate. But this was quickly stopped by the White House in a letter to the Board and signed by Gerald Morgan, special counsel to the President, who directed the Board to consider only the issues relevant to Pan American's application.

So far as I know, this is the first time the White House has directly intervened in any case before the CAB—and to come from a staff member at that. I am sure there is nothing in the Civil Aeronautics Act that provides for such a procedure.

In view of this unusual sequence of events, the Nation deserves nothing less than a complete report from the White House, explaining not only what appears to be strongly discriminatory action against an independent, self-supporting airline, but also in making a farce out of the lengthy and deliberate hearings and decisions of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. President, I should like to note that, according to the column to which I alluded previously, several developments have taken place in connection with Pan American in recent days which may be very interesting. For example, Robert Murray, former Under Secretary of Commerce, who helped to get the White House to reverse temporarily the CAB ruling for Northwest Air Lines and against Pan American has been hired by Pan American.

Mr. Roger Lewis, former Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, who held a key position in the Eisenhower administration when important contracts were given to Pan American on guided missiles and overhaul of Air Force motors is now with Pan American. Furthermore, a nephew of President Eisenhower, Milton Eisenhower, Jr., is now with Pan American.

These may be totally unrelated matters, and I am making no particular accusation. I merely say that, coming from a State where the main base of Northwest Air Lines is located, with thousands of people interested in what is done in connection with the CAB certificate matter, because the Northwest base means jobs for our people, and this air line means jobs for our people, and, furthermore, because the air line has done a good job for the government and for the country, I believe justice should be done.

All I ask is that justice be done, and that an explanation be given. If the explanation can be validated as worthy and honorable, and if the explanation justifies reconsideration of CAB rulings, then, indeed, we shall withhold any further comment. However until that explanation is forthcoming, we intend to comment and we intend to ask what I consider it to be very important questions, because the Civil Aeronautics Administration Act does not provide for the procedure which is now being used in this particular case.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate now adjourn until Monday, June 4, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, June 4, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 31 (legislative day of May 24), 1956:

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

Clarence G. Morse, of California, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board, for a term of 4 years expiring June 30, 1960.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 31, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, who art daily bestowing upon us the manifold blessings of Thy grace and goodness, help us to feel that it is our highest wisdom to enthrone Thy will and our noblest responsibility to establish the kingdom of justice and righteousness upon the earth.

Show us how to promote the spirit of understanding and unity in the heart of humanity and may all the members of the human family be bound to one another in mutual concern, seeking together those blessings which none can ever find or enjoy alone.

Grant that we may never yield ourselves to the enervating and debasing attitudes of the cynic and the defeatist, who would have us believe that our search for peace and good will is a forlorn quest and hope.

Make us more acutely sensitive and more eagerly responsive to Thy voice, calling us to give ourselves with courage and devotion to the task of safeguarding the heritage of freedom which we are privileged to enjoy.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 29, 1956, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10660. An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints on title I, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. KERR, Mr. GORE, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCNAMARA, and Mr. BUSH; and on title II, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. BYRD, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. KERR, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11177) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 5 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 56–14.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 9390) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, have until 12 o'clock to-

morrow night in which to file a conference report on that bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tomorrow in which to file a report on the bill (H. R. 10766) to authorize the payment of compensation for certain losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces during World War II.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

TRAFFIC DEATHS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we are all horrified at the number of deaths on the highways. There is no doubt that death stalks the highways today, and it seems to me we do very little about it except talk. I am wondering if life has become cheap as it is in Russia. I have introduced a resolution which creates a select committee to report back to the Congress on methods and means that can be used to prevent such deaths. Other resolutions have been introduced, but little comes of them. A woman was killed outside of my house, and for over a year signs were put up authorizing 25 miles an hour as the speed limit, but they have paid no attention to it. It is just as bad as it was before. We celebrated Memorial Day and dedicated our lives to the protection of our soldiers and our country. It seems that the least we can do is to see that in peaceful pursuits and in business pursuits more people are protected and our children are safe.

The resolution referred to is as follows:

House Resolution 519

Whereas the Nation is witnessing a terrible increase in the number of traffic accidents occurring on its highways which must be abated: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of 7 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, 1 of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study to determine means which are feasible and necessary to promote maximum safety on the highways of the Nation.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. Speaker, the clergymen in Massachusetts are making constant statements of caution to prevent accidents on the highways, and also the press, but accidents and deaths continue.

The following are the statistics on highway deaths and injuries furnished by Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads:

Deaths in 1955:

January	2,820
February	2,300
March	2,640
April	2,740
May	3,050
June	2,980
July	3,400
August	3,530
September	3,400
October	3,880
November	3,600
December	3,960
Total	38,300

Source of above figures: Public Safety, magazine published by the National Safety Council, June 1956 issue, page 32.

Injuries in 1955: Total on record for year 1955, 1,039,126.

(These figures include 32 States and the District of Columbia. Not broken down into months as some States do not report monthly figures, and only 32 States reporting.)

Source of above figures: Public Safety, May 1956 issue, page 36.

MILITARY PERSONNEL CLAIMS ACT OF 1945

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3996) to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2216)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3996) to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

Page 1, strike out lines 3, 4, and 5 and insert "That section 1 (a) of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 225), as amended, is further amended by striking out '$2,500' and inserting in lieu thereof '$6,500.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

E. L. FORRESTER,
HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
WILLIAM E. MILLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PRICE DANIEL,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
HERMAN WELKER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3996) to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment, namely:

The bill as passed the House would remove the $2,500 limitation upon the amount which may be recovered under the act. It also proposed to permit the recovery of the full amount of any claim in excess of $2,500 in the case of an individual whose claim may have been settled in the interim period after July 3, 1952, and prior to the date that this proposed legislation would be enacted and become effective.

The Senate amendment would limit the settlement to $4,000, and at the conference the amount of $6,500 was agreed upon.

E. L. FORRESTER,
HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
WILLIAM E. MILLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print certain charts and tables in the remarks that were printed in the RECORD on last Tuesday. I neglected to ask permission at that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RIVALRY IN THE MILITARY SERVICES

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I do not share in the concern which has been expressed in many quarters about rivalry between the military services. I do not base this statement on conjecture or hearsay. The Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations, of which I am a member, has held hearings on this matter following disclosures of conflicting views in and out of the services. Those hearings

have shown a healthy rivalry in new and important fields. America is developing new weapons and new techniques. Of these, none is more important than the field of guided missiles. There is serious doubt that America is ahead in this field. Yet, it is one race that we cannot afford to lose. The most dangerous thing to the peace of the world would be Soviet supremacy in the field of guided missiles. It is because of this fact that I am not disturbed by rivalry within the services for progress and prestige in the development of guided missiles and other new weapons and techniques. While I am convinced there is not serious overlapping, I could even condone a certain overlapping and duplication if it would help to insure that America will stay abreast and eventually surpass all other powers in these fields. We do not under any circumstances want military services whose leaders simply "go along" instead of fighting vigorously for their viewpoints and for the most rapid development of the weapons which may mean the difference between success or failure in future conflicts.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 505) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9852) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up this resolution which makes in order consideration of the bill H. R. 9852, which is an extension of the Defense Production Act of 1950.

The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate on the bill.

H. R. 9852 as reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendment, extends the Defense Production Act of 1950 for 2 additional years until June 30, 1958, and would make the same 2-year extension in the authority to purchase strategic materials under section 303 of the act.

The bill would continue the priorities and allocation authority which is important to the procurement programs of the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission. This is accomplished by requiring producers of steel, copper, and aluminum to set aside certain percentages of their production for the filling of defense orders which are given preference in delivery.

Authority for lending and loan guaranties to provide incentives to expand productive capacity are also continued by the extension of the act, as well as the procurement authority. Through these means the threat of wartime shortages of strategic and critical materials is reduced.

The committee amendment to the bill pertains to persons who are trained under the executive reserve program of the agencies having mobilization responsibilities, as set up in the Defense Production Act of 1955. It provides that these trainees will be required to file the same statement of financial interests as persons who serve in the Government without compensation.

The committee report complies with the Ramseyer rule and I urge the adoption of House Resolution 505 so the House may proceed to the consideration of H. R. 9852.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, there are no requests for time on this side. There is no objection to this bill. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, some 2 weeks ago I invited the attention of this House to the grave hardships being worked on our rural citizens by the closing of rural post offices and the curtailment of mail service. You may recall that I cited figures to demonstrate that the post-office closings in the name of economy save less than two-tenths of 1 percent of the Post Office budget. This minute saving is made at the expense of tremendous hardship on millions of American farm families.

Since my statement of 2 weeks ago, I have obtained certain official facts and figures that show this curtailment of rural mail service to be even more shocking than was apparent at that time.

Mr. Speaker, official figures reveal that in many instances the closing of rural post offices did not result in any saving whatever, but instead caused sizable increases in the cost to the Department for the mail service that was substituted.

In my own State of Georgia the official figures reveal that in no less than 11 instances, the closing of small post offices resulted in increased expenses to the Post Office Department.

Let me illustrate by two specific examples in the First District of Georgia, which I have the honor to represent in this body.

Let me cite the case of Ogeechee, Ga., in Screven County. With loud protestations of economy, the Post Office Department closed this small post office last year. In so doing the Department ignored my emphatic protests of this action, and the Post Office Department callously disregarded the pleas and petitions of the post office patrons of this fine community.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you what the result of this so-called economy move has been.

Official Post Office Department figures show that the cost of providing mail service to the patrons of the Ogeechee Post Office is $4,000 a year more since the post office was closed.

Is not this incredible? The Post Office Department deprives the community of Ogeechee of its post office in the name of economy. Then the inadequate rural route service with which they replace the post office costs $4,000 more than the cost of maintaining the post office.

Mr. Speaker, I just wonder if the many highly press-agented economies that the Eisenhower administration claims are as costly to the taxpayers as closing the post office at Ogeechee, Ga.

As briefly as possible, let me invite attention to another so-called economy move in my district.

After my repeated protests the Department closed the post office at Woodcliff, Ga., again in Screven County.

Here, official figures reveal, the rural mail route service substituted for the post office at Woodcliff which had served these patrons so many years, cost the taxpayers $6,000 more than did the operation of the post office which they closed.

Let me remind you that there were nine other instances in the State of Georgia alone in which the cost of the service substituted for the discontinued post office amounted to more than the cost of operation of the post office that was closed.

Mr. Speaker, these figures conclusively demonstrate that in many instances the claims of savings in closing rural post offices are nothing less than direct misrepresentation of the facts.

You may recall that in my earlier remarks I cited figures from the official hearings and a statement by Mr. Norman R. Abrams, the Assistant Postmaster General, to demonstrate that the so-called savings effected by depriving millions of our rural citizens of adequate postal service amounted to less than two-tenths of 1 percent of the annual budget of the Post Office Department.

I quoted Mr. Abrams to show that the closing of more than 3,000 post offices resulted in a saving of only $4,267,000. We all know that the 1957 Post Office Department budget is $3 billion.

Let me reemphasize that the hardships worked on our rural citizens by this curtailment of mail service far outweighs the alleged savings by the Post Office Department. It is my conviction that the needs of the people should be the paramount consideration in providing mail service.

The Post Office Department was not established as a profit-making agency.

Certainly, I agree that the Post Office Department and all Government departments should be operated on a basis of strict economy. But when the Congress

establishes a needed service agency and provides the funds for its operation, it should be operated for the benefit of the American public.

We Members of the House are much more aware of the needs of our constituents than are Republican appointees out to make a record of economy regardless of the disaster worked on the rank and file Americans.

It is deplorable the way in which this administration has ignored the sincere recommendations of Democratic Members regarding postal service. No less than 40 times have I written strong protests against the closing of rural post offices. But my protests, except for minor exceptions have gone unheeded.

My 40 written protests were supplemented by personal appeals to the Post Office officials time after time. Again, my efforts in behalf of my rural constituents were in vain.

Sure, some type of rural mail service was substituted in most instances. But rural routes were lengthened beyond all reason. Mail was delayed. In all too many instances, rural subscribers to daily papers received their newspapers a full day after publication.

Are not our rural residents as much entitled to current news as their city cousins? It is my conviction that they are.

You know that excessively long routes inevitably result in delayed mail service. This is not mere inconvenience. This results in direct hardships on millions of Americans.

Picture the plight of a rural housewife who has ordered some necessary article from a store or mail-order house in the city. It is likely that the package is delivered c. o. d. What must she do? She must walk to the mail box, and there wait until the rural carrier arrives so that she may make payment for her purchase.

When that carrier is delayed beyond his usual time, which is all too often the case on lengthy routes, she must wait for lengthy periods. Frequently she must keep her vigil in bad weather.

Mr. Speaker, should this hardship be worked upon the citizens of the richest country in the world? Should our rural citizens be deprived of the prompt mail service that is the symbol of every civilized country in the world?

I think not. It is my conviction that our rural citizens are as much entitled to prompt mail service as are the residents of our cities.

It is not just the protests of a single Democratic Congressman that go unheeded. This arrogant Republican Post Office Department treats the highest ranking officials of this House in a most cavalier fashion.

Last September the esteemed chairman of our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service directed the Postmaster General to desist closing these rural post offices until the committee could complete an inquiry into the effect of this practice on rural Americans.

These instructions from our committee chairman were blithely ignored.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat my protest of several days ago. We have seen the callousness with which this administration regards our farmers as concerns the billions of dollars they have lost because of falling farm prices.

Must we Members of the House submit to the conscienceless policy of the Post Office Department in depriving our rural citizens of adequate mail service?

I say "No." Let us take measures to restore adequate rural postal service without further delay.

I pledge to the proper committees of this House my warmest and most vigorous support for measures that will once again provide adequate mail service to the forgotten Americans of the Eisenhower administration, the farm families of our great country.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9852) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9852, with Mr. PRESTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill would extend from June 30, 1956, to June 30, 1958, the Defense Production Act of 1950.

The Defense Production Act was passed to coordinate our economic power in the interest of our national security. It has served, I think, a very good purpose, and while it may be criticized on the ground that some of its functions have not been exercised as they should have been, certainly there is no Member of Congress who would consider not extending this act. By its power of allocations and priorities it has directed the economic power and the productive activities of the United States in the direction of national defense.

Its purpose was to stimulate all of the productive activities and direct them in the lines that are essential for our security. Its purpose was also to stimulate and expand the smaller plants whose production amounts to a great deal with reference to the national production and whose stimulation means much to the strengthening of the economy of our Nation.

This is the fifth time this act has been extended. There was some effort in the committee to extend it for 1 year in order that it might be reexamined every year. We have the Joint Committee on Defense Production, the watchdog committee, whose duty it is to investigate and keep in touch with the activities of this agency and report to the Congress.

I do not think the argument that we should extend it for only 1 year because it should be investigated annually is sound. Through this committee we are in constant touch with the agency's activities. I think that a 1-year extension might also be considered by the enemies of free government as an indication that we are weakening our efforts to preserve our liberties and our way of life.

This bill comes to you with only one amendment. There is in the agency an organization that works without pay—the WOC's. They are businessmen drawn from various industries and are usually men of wealth who have large holdings in various enterprises. They are required to divulge their interests and business associations. The good man actuated solely by patriotic motives, I am sure, would be willing to make these disclosures. For where a man's treasure is there his heart is also. No man can serve two masters. I do not sympathize with those who say that we should not subject these gentlemen who come here to help their country to any inquisitorial investigation as to their holdings. I think they ought to be glad to tell what their holdings are in order that we might know whether or not they have any interest in conflict with the interests of the Government. Certainly that does not demean them at all. It is often spoken of as though it might be a reflection on them. It is not a reflection on an honest man to put him under bond for the faithful discharge of his duties in connection with the handling of money. I never heard of anybody making that argument. It is essential that they should divulge their interests. There is another group known as Executive Reserves. They are trainees for contemplated future service in the agency. These are the men who might in the future be called upon for advice. In this bill there is also an amendment requiring the Executive Reserves as well as the WOC's to divulge their interests and holdings. I am informed that there will be an amendment offered to this amendment which will require the Executive Reserves to make but one disclosure and would relieve them from making periodic disclosures as required in this bill as reported. I hope that the amendment exempting the Executive Reserves from periodic disclosures will be agreed to, and that this bill as so amended will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I have no requests for time at this time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that this law must be extended. There is doubt, however, as to whether or not it should be extended for 1 year or for 2 years.

In that connection, our distinguished chairman has already indicated to you that we do have a Joint Committee on Defense Production that is supposed to

pay attention to the matters that are covered by this bill all the year around. I am certain they are doing the best they can and will call to the attention of our committee and the Congress any changes requiring our attention that may occur, whether the law is extended for 1 year or for 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take a minute or two to call the attention of the committee to the fact that although we do have a good law here and a law that must be extended, and that we do have a Joint Committee on Defense Production that is inquiring about its operation, in the administrative part of our Government, this law and the problems presented by its operation and its administration are not getting the kind of serious attention that they deserve and require.

In asking for the extension of the law, the executive department necessarily takes the position that we are still in a state of emergency; that we still require constant attention to the matters that may bring about a much worse situation internationally than exists today. Yet, when we ask the heads of the departments that come before us as to what they are doing, they tell you that they are studying and worrying and studying. When you seek details, you find that they are almost completely ignoring the matter.

Not the least of these problems presented under this Defense Production Act is the matter of scarce materials, and one of those materials is steel scrap, another is nickel. Despite the fact that we have had an alarming increase in price, and an alarming increase in the amount of exports, we still are unable to get from the executive department any factual report as to what the situation is or what they intend to do about it or what they should do about it.

We have a similar situation as to standby controls. Everybody in the executive department that comes before our committee admits that in the event the current emergency should develop into hostilities or in the event of an attack, or in the event of war, we would have to have control legislation. Despite that, no one in the executive department has given any serious consideration to what such a law should provide, what regulations will be needed for implementation, how the law should be executed and administered. They will tell you we do not need any standby controls on the books now. Mind you, standby controls are not something that you put on the books and make effective immediately, but a standby control law is one which would be enacted by the Congress, but made effective by the President if the Congress was not in session or by the Congress simultaneously with a declaration of war if that should come, and we all hope it will not come.

Nevertheless, nobody in the executive department is prepared to say to any Member of the Congress, "In the event of an emergency happening tomorrow, we are prepared to submit to you a proposed bill which will cover the situation adequately." They tell you that they are aware of the situation, but, as was said by Secretary Weeks, when he appeared before our committee, the best he could tell us was, and I quote:

> Like all matters relating to preparedness and defense establishment, these things—
>
> Meaning standby control legislation—
>
> come up from time to time, but I never recall having seriously considered standby controls.

I think that is a very sad reflection upon the executive department of our Government when things of this kind have not had serious consideration by the men who are charged with the duty of giving their time and attention to these very important matters.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman say whether he is going to offer an amendment to limit the extension to 1 year?

Mr. MULTER. I did not mention that fact. I was told that someone would offer such an amendment. I do not intend to offer the amendment to limit it to 1 year because of the representation to us by the distinguished chairman of our committee and by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] who is chairman of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, that they will continue to give close attention to this matter. Therefore, I personally do not intend to offer an amendment limiting the extension to 1 year instead of 2 years. I would support such an amendment if it were offered.

Mr. GROSS. An amendment to limit it to 1 year?

Mr. MULTER. Yes. That would automatically bring the matter before the next Congress, in the first session of that Congress.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON].

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time merely to ask a question of the gentleman who just spoke, Mr. MULTER. I believe I heard the gentleman quote Secretary Weeks; where was that testimony?

Mr. MULTER. I quoted from page 180 of the hearings before our committee on this extension.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Actually, standby controls would come under the jurisdiction of Mr. Flemming, would they not?

Mr. MULTER. No; I do not think so. I would say that Mr. Flemming also has jurisdiction over the matter, that Mr. Flemming as the Director of Defense Mobilization should certainly give attention to this. I can give similar quotations from Dr. Flemming's testimony, at another page of the record.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I would be interested in that quotation because it is my memory during the testimony of Dr. Flemming before our committee, that we questioned him at some length concerning this matter and the impression which I gathered was that the matter had received very serious consideration and was still under study.

Mr. MULTER. I will agree that the gentleman did tell us that the matter is still under study.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, it is with certain misgivings that I support H. R. 9852, the extension of the Defense Production Act for 2 years.

A reappraisal of the Defense Production Act is long overdue. The wide-scale economic effect of the activities of this important function should be carefully scrutinized. The administration of this law has gone far beyond its originally stated concepts. Defense mobilizing is used in our economy to prop up sagging conditions in various businesses and industries.

In the stockpiling of strategic metals, the emphasis seems to be on the establishment of a program of price supports for certain mining industries. The need for a price-support program for the development of a domestic metals industry may be justified, but the kind of activity should bear a proper label and should not be classified as "production for defense."

It is high time to calculate the cost of the accelerated amortization program and to determine whether there is a more efficient way to create productive facilities in the interests of national defense. Defense Mobilizer Flemming testified that tax certificates have already been granted to the extent of $18 billion or 60 percent of the cost of expanded facilities. In view of the fact that these certificates have been granted at a high-income period, it may be assumed that a good portion of the cost of this expansion would have otherwise flowed to Government as taxable income. Dr. Flemming stated he did not know whether it would have cost less for the Government to have collected the taxes due and paid for the expanded facilities on a direct contract basis.

The recent wide-scale grant of quick depreciation certificates for expansion of power facilities is certainly questionable. Most public utilities already operate on a cost-plus basis. The tax amortization certificates were granted in many cases where expansion would have been undertaken without them. The granting of these certificates constitutes a needless bonus to this large and powerful industry.

The use of mineral price supports and "quickie" tax amortizaton to prop up segments of our industrial life over and beyond the requirements of national defense are in the nature of wonder drugs applied to an economy supposedly in good health. The repeated use of these wonder drugs on a healthy patient serves to establish a resistance which will make them ineffectual in a period of grave emergency.

Productions for defense should not be charged with the added cost of economic

stabilization. I am not opposed to the cost of economic stabilization or props for certain industries, but these items should carry a proper label.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 9852 would extend the Defense Production Act for 2 years, and has been favorably reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency. I favor an extension of the Defense Production Act for the period favorably reported by the committee.

The Defense Production Act was first approved on September 8, 1950. For more than 5 years this act has been one of the main tools in the development of our defense mobilization program. This program has constituted an effort by the Government to meet the needs of military security with the minimum interference with our free-enterprise civilian economy. This has required considerable expansion, since there have been increased military requirements and increased production for consumers.

In providing for our defense through expansion programs, the Defense Production Act has provided incentives such as loans, loan guaranties, contractual commitments, and exploration. To accomplish these purposes, a borrowing authority fund of $2.1 billion was provided under section 304 of the act. This fund has enabled the Government to consummate transactions estimated at more than $7½ billion as of December 31, 1955.

It has been estimated that during the past fiscal year approximately two-thirds of the materials purchased for the stockpile to meet minimum stockpile objectives came from Defense Production Act inventories.

The priorities and allocations authority of title I of the act is of great importance to the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission. Under authority of the Defense Production Act, the defense materials system, as operated by the Department of Commerce, accomplishes the important purpose of requiring producers of certain basic items to set aside certain percentages of their production for the filling of identified defense orders. The loan-guaranty provisions of section 301 of title III of the act are used extensively by the Department of Defense. Through December 31, 1955, guaranties aggregating $2 billion had been authorized by the Department of Defense under this section.

The committee report sets forth that as of the close of 1955, purchases aggregating $4 billion had been completed under section 303 of title III of the act, with another $2.8 billion remaining in process.

H. R. 9852 does not change the voluntary-agreements program under which 23 agreements are now in force, and would continue the Executive Reserve program. H. R. 9852 also extends for 2 years the period of time over which expansion contracts under section 303 of the act may extend.

The 1955 amendments to the Defense Production Act recognized the need for preparedness programs designed to reduce the time required to mobilize in the event of an attack.

The maintenance of a strong and flexible defense program requires that current military and atomic energy programs proceed without interruption and that a broad and diversified mobilization base be established which will reflect new requirements resulting from changes in technology and strategy. The authorities provided in the Defense Production Act are essential to meet these objectives.

The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Secretary of Commerce appeared before the committee in support of the 2-year extension of the act.

On the basis of the unquestioned defense need of an extension of the Defense Production Act, I urge that H. R. 9852 be passed, thereby extending the Defense Production Act for a period of 2 years.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask a question of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]. Did I correctly understand him to say that he would offer an amendment that would make the bill more palatable to the manufacturers? I understood him to say there were certain provisions in the bill that would require the manufacturers to give information that they might not wish to give.

Mr. SPENCE. I understand such an amendment will be offered. I am not going to offer it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think it will be very dangerous. The manufacturers may have to give out a good deal of information publicly, and this means their competitors will have an advantage. The gentleman does not know whether such an amendment will be offered?

Mr. SPENCE. This would not require any privileged information, it would not require any trade secrets, it would only require information as to what he actually owned. It would be in conflict with the best interests of the country if he was acting in accordance with his own interests and not in a public spirit.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. People do not have very much privacy nowadays, it seems to me, in anything. I hope there will be an amendment to safeguard it. But, I would also like to ask the gentleman if there is anything to provide a stockpiling for the civil defense. I am appalled by the fact that they do not have any stockpile in the case on an emergency.

Mr. SPENCE. There is nothing in the bill with reference to that.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the gentlewoman and the chairman of the committee are talking about two entirely different things. The gentleman is talking about this program in which the administration encourages people with peculiar knowledge of production of articles which are considered to be strategic and so on, and people who have the know-how with reference to such matters to come into the Government. The gentlewoman, as I understand it, is talking about compelling someone to give information. There is nothing in the bill to compel anybody to give any information. As a matter of fact, there are safeguards in the bill in respect to those who work without compensation. If a certain material is declared to be critical and information concerning it is classified, there is a fine, I believe, of $10,000 for giving out such information.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Then, they do not have to give out any information about their product unless they wish to do so.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Not under any provision of the bill that I know of.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 717 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "June 30, 1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1958."

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "June 30, 1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1965."

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 3. Subsection (e) of section 710 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'No such person shall become a member of the executive reserve unless he has complied, to the extent applicable, with the same requirements as apply with respect to persons appointed under subsection (b) of this section'."

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON to the committee amendment: Page 2, before the period in line 7, insert a semicolon and the following: "this sentence shall not be construed as requiring any member of the executive reserve to file a statement of changes in interests in conformity with the last sentence of paragraph (6) of subsection (b)."

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, in explanation of this amendment, may I say the committee amendment to the bill merely makes the disclosure provisions, which are applicable under present law to those serving without compensation, also applicable to those who come into the Executive Reserve. The amendment which I have offered, and which I believe has been agreed to, would withdraw the provision which would require members of the Executive Reserve to report every 6 months. The feeling, at least on my part, and the reason I went along with the committee amendment, is that it is our job to preserve the integrity of the reputation of those who

are in Government, and if there is a challenge of their integrity which can be met easily, I see no reason against it. Therefore, since the disclosure of one's holdings is such an easy step, I thought this could be gone along with and would not keep men out of the Executive Reserve. However, after the amendment was adopted, we noticed that under the language, members of the Reserve would be required to file changes in their holdings every 6 months regardless of whether they were in Washington and regardless of whether they had any connection with Government business at that time except for a membership in the Executive Reserve. This amendment would withdraw that requirement and not make it necessary for members of the Reserve to report unless they were serving as men without compensation in Government.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I gladly yield, sir.

Mr. SPENCE. The Executive Reserve have no employment. They are those who it is anticipated might be employed.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. They merely agree that in time of emergency they will serve in a certain job.

Mr. SPENCE. I do not think they ought to have to disclose what they have every time they visit the agency, and I am for the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman. Therefore, I gather the gentleman would support this amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. I said I was in favor of it and I will support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield ?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Well, is this is a training program or a visiting program, or what is it?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. The Executive Reserve is a training program similar to that of Reserve officers, for those who are willing ahead of time to accept responsibility within Government should an emergency develop which would require their services. They come to Washington, or some other point designated, for approximately 2 weeks, although the time is not specifically designated, for orientation and reorientation in the department in the service that they would give to the Government.

Mr. GROSS. The chairman of the committee refers to it as a sort of a casual thing, a meeting at which they do little more than visit.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. That is certainly not my understanding. I think I can compare it to the mobilization tables of a National Guard Division. If one takes it down to the company level, in times of peace you have certain officer allotments, but the men are chosen to fill other officer jobs in case of mobilization, and the troop strength is increased.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me how many there are in this reserve training program?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I regret I do not have those figures, but the Executive Reserve is at present under formation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Am I to infer that in this particular status they have nothing to do with policy?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. It is my understanding that they do not have anything to do with policy.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. There is a table in the hearings on this bill indicating the number of WOC's who have actually served up to the present time in various capacities.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. If I might interrupt, this is no indication of their status in the Reserves.

Mr. MULTER. No, but I was about to say, if you look at that table you can get a fair idea of the number of men who must be trained for the full mobilization, because we will certainly need more men than they have already serving in these various capacities. It is fair to assume we are training as many as we are now using. I might suggest that Dr. Fleming testified that the Department recognized we should not put these trainees under the same or similar restrictions as those of the WOC, and the President had issued an Executive order under which he issued regulations which had to apply——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. MULTER) Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON was recognized for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. MULTER. Dr. Fleming indicated he had already issued a regulation or directive covering the trainees, and when asked a question, at page 61 of the hearings, he said he would have no objection to the Executive order being written into law. That is what we tried to do by the committee amendment, but, as the gentleman indicated, the committee amendment goes a little too far. The gentleman's amendment to the committee amendment will take care of that situation, and with the committee amendment as amended by the gentleman's amendment, I think then we will have the protection we need as against WOC and trainees so that nobody can complain.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. TALLE. I want to say in support of what the gentleman from Ohio said in reply to the question of the majority leader that it was stated repeatedly at the hearings that the trainees, that is, the Executive Reserve, have nothing to do with policy.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Gladly.

Mr. BEAMER. I take it the gentleman's amendment and the committee's amendment were offered in an effort to protect the so-called WOC. Is that correct?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Actually it has no reference to the WOC, sir; it refers purely to men who will agree to serve within the Executive Reserve.

The committee amendment extends to the men who agree to serve in the Executive Reserve the same requirements of reporting the companies in which they own holdings as do WOC's.

This amendment which I am discussing, however, would remove from the members of the Executive Reserve the requirement that they bring the status of their holdings up to date every 6 months. In other words, if you agree to serve in the Executive Reserve and you are living in Indiana and do not go on active duty, you do not go for training within that 6-month period, there would be no need for you to make a new report.

Mr. BEAMER. The reason I asked the question was that these are men who serve without compensation. I know some of them who served the Government at great sacrifice to their respective companies. Unfortunately the press and even Members of Congress on the floor of the House have taken occasion to criticize these people.

If this continues we are going to find it increasingly difficult to find people of merit who will give of their time to the Government; and I wonder if we should not attempt to think a little bit in terms of praise of these people. I hope the gentleman's amendment will indirectly, if not directly, encourage these men to come to the Government and give of their efforts and abilities.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. As far as the WOC's are concerned there can be no thought of impugning the honesty of their motives. There are some of us, however, who feel that dollar-a-year men should be confined to service in actual wartime. However, I have no criticism to offer of that.

The criticism I offer is where any man puts himself in the position of undertaking to serve two masters. I am not saying anyone did, but there is some evidence that some have. That is a thing that we have got to watch. I know I cannot serve two masters. Whenever I find myself in that position, which is very rarely, I absolve myself. I think there is an ethical consideration that I should absolve myself from making any decision where I am in any position of serving two masters.

So that is the situation that has got to be watched in the case of men coming here passing upon policy or taking any action where the Government is involved and where a company with which they are connected is directly or indirectly involved. That is the important question and that is the key question.

I do not recognize the right, the power, or the ability of any other human being to serve two masters. I know I cannot, and I do not recognize the ability of any other human being to do so. That to me is the kernel of the question.

But there is another consideration, whether outside of actual wartime, such people should be used. I recognize that I have never made any statement about the present situation, about the employment of WOC's because I realize it is a debatable question and that is where a man puts himself in the position of serving or giving others the color of right to think they are serving two masters. That is where criticism justifiably arises, as I see it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK: At the end of the bill insert the following:

"SEC. 4. Section 712 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(f) The Secretary of Commerce shall make a special investigation and study of the production, allocation, distribution, use of nickel, of its resale as scrap, and of other aspects of the current situation with respect to supply and marketing of nickel, with particular attention to, among other things, the adequacy of the present system of nickel allocation between defense and civilian users. The Secretary of Commerce shall consult with the Joint Committee on Defense Production during the course of such investigation and study with respect to the progress achieved and the results of the investigation and study, and shall make an interim report on the results of the investigation and study on or before July 15, 1956, and shall, on or before December 31, 1956, make a final report on the results of such investigation and study, together with such recommendations as the Secretary of Commerce deems advisable. Such reports shall be made to the Senate (or to the Secretary of the Senate if the Senate is not in session) and to the House of Representatives (or to the Clerk of the House of Representatives if the House is not in session)'."

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TALLE. May I say to the majority leader that my understanding of the effect of his amendment is this: The proposed study would be made by the Department of Commerce under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Defense Production; is that correct?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct.

Mr. TALLE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman states it correctly in a few words. It will have a very salutary effect, and I think out of it will come many beneficial results.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Although we have provided that the joint committee set up under section 7–11 of the act may do this and seek the advice and counsel of the experts of the Department of Commerce at their disposal, the only difference between what the joint committee must do or is expected to do under 7–12 of the act and the gentleman's amendment is that the Department of Commerce would initiate the study instead of the joint committee; is that right? They would work together in the same manner as they would under 7–12?

Mr. McCORMACK. This amendment does not in any way take away any of the authority that now exists in the joint committee under existing law. It is a direction to the Secretary of the Department of Commerce to make an investigation, but at all times the joint committee has its power to act under existing law or under the organic act. It in no way diminishes the power of the joint committee under existing law. As the gentleman says, it does require the Department of Commerce to make the investigation. All the time the joint committee is in position to act under existing law, as the gentleman from Iowa has well said. The joint committee can go further, if it desires; but this is under the supervision of the joint committee. I think the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan reconciles itself with the statement made by the gentleman from Iowa. Certainly both statements are consistent with the views I entertain.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. The gentleman's amendment is a very good one and I trust it will bring about salutary effects in the overall program. I hope, however, that despite the discussion that has taken place here today the Department of Commerce in deciding to make this survey is not going to use the very people who are using the nickel and who are creating the shortage in supply and diverting it. I hope they will not have a survey by the very people in the industry who bring about at least some of the demand for the nickel.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would assume that Sinclair Weeks, whom I know, has enough judgment not to do that.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. I am sure there is no objection to the gentleman's amendment. I shall support it.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I see no objection to it.

Mr. Chairman, there is a great shortage of nickel in this country. It is estimated that the free-world production of nickel for this year will be 440.5 million pounds. Last year it was 400 million pounds. And the United States secures nearly 70 percent of this amount.

The following figures, compiled by the Department of Commerce, reveal that for the 8 years beginning in 1948 and ending in 1955 the United States has received from 59.8 percent to 86.2 percent of the free-world supply of nickel. In 1948 it received 81.9 percent, in 1949 86.2 percent, and so on, the lowest being 66.5 percent in 1953.

Mr. Chairman, for many months it has been fully recognized by the responsible Government agencies that the available supply of nickel has fallen far short of meeting the combined requirements of the defense and civilian demand. For more than a year the demands of industry have increased each quarter until it is now estimated that a 30-percent deficiency exists between the requirements and the supply available for nondefense uses. This situation has been the outgrowth of the high level of our economic activity in practically all segments of the economy, and to even a greater extent by the constantly higher defense take each quarter since early 1955.

Since defense requirements have first priority on the market-price nickel, the available supply of market-price nickel has become less and less as the military "take" has increased. To meet this situation the Office of Defense Mobilization has made available to industry substantial quantities of premium-price nickel, starting late in 1955, by authorizing the producers to make diversions of such nickel scheduled for stockpile delivery under long-term Government contracts.

The major consuming industries for nickel include stainless steels, low alloy steels, nonferrous uses, high-temperature and electrical-resistance alloys, and electroplating.

Because of the hardship problems which the nickel shortage has created throughout the civilian nickel industries, it is understood that hundreds of letters have been received by the Business and Defense Services Administration in the Department of Commerce expressing concern over the apparent cutbacks in their normal nickel deliveries and the financial losses this has entailed. Many of you have received similar letters, particularly from the nickel plating industry, which appears to have suffered severely in view of the expanded demands during the period of short supply.

A review of the correspondence in the files of the Department of Commerce by the staff of the Joint Committee on Defense Production indicates that the electroplaters feel that they are being unduly penalized while other businesses not dependent on nickel have been in a position to expand production.

Unfortunately, the majority of the electroplating demands are primarily for nondefense uses, and, therefore, the platers have been forced to turn to premium price nickel as the defense needs have required a greater proportion of the market price nickel. There are, however, two classes of premium price nickel: First, that which is being diverted to industry by the Government which ranges in price at around $1.35 per pound for nickel anodes; and, second, the so-called gray market nickel which is reported to range in price as high as $3.50 per pound. This gray market nickel, according to the Department of Commerce, consists primarily of secondary nickel produced from nickel scrap and imports from French, Japanese and West German sources.

The letters from the electroplating industry requesting Government aid in alleviating the shortage problem fall into five general groups, as follows:

First. Firms claiming severe cutbacks from past delivery schedules—market price nickel;

Second. Firms claiming that total allocations, including Government diverted premium price nickel, are less than previous periods;

Third. Firms requiring increased quantities of nickel to meet increased consumer demands;

Fourth. Firms requiring additional nickel to operate expanded facilities; and

Fifth. New firms entering the plating business for the first time.

The following excerpts are from correspondence picked at random by the staff of the Joint Committee on Defense Production from the files of the Department of Commerce, and typical of the concern expressed by the plating industries regarding the problems created by the current shortage. In replying to letters, the Department of Commerce has recognized that it will be some months in the future before the foreseeable supply of nickel is expected to meet the demands of the defense, civilian, and stockpile requirements.

One plating company wrote the Department of Commerce in part on January 26, 1956, as follows:

We are appealing to this Department for help in the nickel situation.

Before allocations were removed, we were allotted 480 pounds of nickel per month. At that time, 1953, 480 pounds of nickel per month was sufficient, but since that time our business has increased until now our monthly requirements are around 1,100 pounds per month and our allotment has been cut to 30 percent of the original 480 pounds.

We used to supplement our usage by getting the small users amount (100 pounds) of nickel from two other sources but these have cut us off now. As a result of this, we have to go into the gray or black market whichever you wish to call it and pay $3 per pound plus freight as against $0.926 per pound freight prepaid when received from legitimate sources. The problem is getting serious because we cannot afford to continue in business buying upwards of a thousand pounds of nickel per month at $3 per pound.

With a $30,000 a month business and a 10 percent profit, $3 nickel can put you out of business.

The silliest argument is that there is a shortage of nickel, therefore the black market. If there is a shortage, how come there is so much available if you want to pay through the nose.

What can you do for us?

The Department of Commerce replied on February 2, 1956, as follows:

This is in reply to your letter of January 26, regarding your nickel problems.

Because of the large number of inquiries received on the subject of your communication, this agency has prepared a mimeographed statement discussing the current nickel situation. A copy of this statement is enclosed which I believe covers the points raised in your letter with the exception of the basis entitlement which you refer to as being 480 pounds. Review of the National Production Authority records dated March 18, 1953, established your entitlement at that time to 242 pounds.

Our investigation of February 1 showed that you received * * * 450 pounds of nickel contained in anodes and chemicals for December, 1955; 350 pounds for January, 1956; and 284 pounds for February. The December allotment included 100 pounds of premium priced nickel scheduled for stockpile delivery during that month. Such nickel was not available in January but should be available in February which will increase your allotment for that period.

We wish to assure you that this Agency is continuing to make every effort to find means of relieving industry from the current nickel shortage. However, we regret that we cannot be of more direct assistance to you at this time.

The plating company wrote further on April 6, 1956, as follows:

I have your letter of February 2, 1956, in answer to ours of January 26, 1956, and since we are having more trouble than ever meeting our requirements I have been reviewing some of your statements.

You state we received 450 pounds of nickel in December 1955. We did but the shipment December 9th should have been received in November 1955. The figures you use do not coincide with our receivals but that is beside the point. What I want to know is, are we entitled to the entire amount allotted in metal or is it the choice of the supplier to decide whether we get it in metal or salts. Further, you refer to the mimeographed copy on the nickel situation. With all due respect to the statements made, does it occur to those who set up the controls that the nickel used in nondecorative plating for corrosion resistance is just as important to the washing machine industry as it is when allotted to the makers of stainless steel which to a large extent is used for decorative purposes.

Further, if the nickel we receive is based on our usage back in 1951, how does the auto industry get the nickel for their increased production, also where does Oldsmobile and Ford get the nickel for their new installations which did not exist in the years when allocations were in effect?

We want 1,000 pounds of nickel per month and I don't see why we should be forced to purchase it through the black market any more so than the big industries. What is the explanation?

The Department of Commerce replied on April 25, 1956, as follows:

This will supplement our response of February 2 to your letter of January 26, in answering your further inquiry of April 6 on the subject of nickel.

The plating supplier in making his allotments of nickel makes his own determination of the ratio of metal to salts since he must ascertain the most economical balances in operating his business. Thus, if the supplier manufactures chemicals and all of his customers took only metal, it is conceivable that the supplier could thus be forced out of the chemical business. The Government's interest in the distribution of nickel for nondefense uses is that it be made on an equitable basis and for this purpose nickel contained in salts is considered together with that in the form of metal.

With respect to the nickel available to the automobile industry, we can assure you that the Government post-audits made of the plating suppliers' accounts, which incidentally are voluntarily permitted by the suppliers, have shown that the automobile companies have received only their equitable share of new nickel for plating determined on the same basis as for all other platers. The nickel available for nondefense uses which is equitably distributed consists of that offered at the normal market price and the premium price material scheduled for stockpile delivery which is diverted to industry. Aside from this nickel we do not have any authentic information on other sources.

It is rumored that at least some of the automobile companies receive appreciable quantities of anodes derived from domestic scrap and from nickel imported from Japan, France, and West Germany. However, you would have to consult with the respective automobile companies for specific details and information regarding their sources of additional nickel.

As you doubtless know, Government is without authority to direct or request a supplier to provide any particular quantity of nickel for nondefense uses. The supplier, as previously stated, does, of course, have a moral obligation to equitably distribute his nondefense share of nickel. Our periodic post audits of their accounts which are voluntarily permitted by the suppliers, show that they are doing a very creditable job in maintaining an equitable pattern of distribution. Unfortunately the suppliers, because of short supply, do not have sufficient nickel to provide the general needs of all of their customers and any effort to take care of one who pleads hardship must be done at the expense of their other customers who also are having difficulty in meeting their needs. Government of course is seeking a solution to this problem of nickel shortage by obtaining diversions to industry of nickel scheduled for stockpile delivery. Due to the current rate of increase in defense orders the civilian economy has not been receiving the added benefit anticipated from these increased diversions.

Under the circumstances set forth, I regret that we are unable to assist you in securing any additional nickel required to take care of your needs and we can only suggest that you seek to obtain the defense rated orders to supplement your allotment of nondefense nickel.

The long-term solution to the problems which exist as a result of inadequate supplies of nickel to meet defense and civilian requirements is through the expansion of nickel supplies. Large sums of money have been expended under the Defense Production Act to increase nickel supplies. The Joint Committee on Defense Production has held meetings in recent weeks with the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Secretary of Commerce on this subject, and announcements have since been made of an expansion of nickel supplies. The Joint Committee on Defense Production previously considered the Nicaro, Cuba, expansion, which is now underway.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. PRESTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9352) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 505, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous quesion is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on Armed Services have permission to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Walter subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary have permission to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

FARM CREDIT ACT OF 1956

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 508 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10285) to merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for supervision of production credit associations; and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and at this time I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order H. R. 10285, a bill out of the Committee on Agriculture, to consolidate the lending agencies. It is a third step in a program initiated by the committee. So far as I know, there is no opposition to the rule. I therefore reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Arkansas has explained to the House, this rule, which calls for 2 hours of general debate, would make in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10285) dealing with production credit corporations, Federal intermediate credit banks, and production credit associations.

There is no objection to the rule on this side and I have no requests for time.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I have read the bill and the report which accompanies it. I believe that on the whole, the committee has done a creditable job with a most complicated subject and I hesitate to place my judgment in opposition to the committee's decision. Nevertheless, I am disturbed by certain aspects of the bill and I have asked for this time in order to ask some questions. May I ask the chairman of the committee to inform the House of the surplus funds which are now owned by Federal agencies; are they owned by the production credit corporations or by the intermediate credit banks?

Mr. POAGE. There are some surpluses owned by the intermediate credit banks and some by the production credit corporations.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman tell the House the amount of surplus funds owned by the intermediate credit banks and the amount owned by the production credit corporations?

Mr. POAGE. My recollection is that $49 million is for the intermediate credit banks and about $12 million for the production credit corporations. I may have that reversed.

Mr. YATES. So that $61 million in surplus funds which are now the property of the United States Government will be used for the benefit of the merged corporation; is that correct?

Mr. POAGE. That is approximately correct, yes.

Mr. YATES. Under the proposal set forth in the bill, class A stock will be issued to the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration. Class B stock will be issued to production credit associations. The surplus funds now belonging to the Government would be made available to the new corporation and production credit associations will be allowed to share in the surplus, will they not?

Mr. POAGE. Only in the case of liquidation could there be any question about the ownership of those surpluses, because they go into the capital structure and do not come out except in case of liquidation.

Mr. YATES. Cannot dividends be paid out of surplus?

Mr. POAGE. No.

Mr. YATES. Only out of earnings?

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. YATES I saw no such provision in the bill. May I next ask the gentleman, in the event of liquidation do not the financial institutions as well as the cooperatives share in the surpluses?

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. YATES. Why should funds which belong to the Federal Government be handed over to private financial institutions for their private use and profit?

Mr. POAGE. For this reason: There are at present 94 of what they call the other financial institutions. Those are privately owned institutions that are rediscounting with the intermediate credit bank. Over a period of years there have been something over 1,200 such institutions.

Remember that the first 10 years or more of the life of this institution there were no production credit associations, and they did business only with these private institutions because there was nobody else to do business with. These institutions, the 94 that are still in business, have of course over the years built up a part of these surpluses. The bill provides that in case of liquidation, and only in case of liquidation, the surpluses, the then existing capital, should be divided in proportion to the business the institutions have done with the bank, and that would include the business that these 94 institutions have done even prior to this time.

Mr. YATES. The fact remains that $61 million in surplus funds which belong to the taxpayers are being made available for the use of private financial institutions. It is possible, too, that private financial institutions may be able to withdraw such funds under certain conditions. Certainly they can do so in event of dissolution or liquidation. Would it not be better for these surplus funds to be transferred now to the Treasury of the United States for the benefit of the taxpayers or earmarked for payment at some later time? Why should not the new corporation develop its own surplus?

Mr. POAGE. We do not think so because these surpluses were built up by the businesses and by these institutions.

Mr. YATES. The surplus funds represent payments made to the Government for the use of its money or credit. The gentleman's argument would place the Federal lending processes in the same category as Christmas savings account. Under this proposal, interest paid for the use of Government funds or credit would be deposited with Government lending institutions only until Christmas or another such holiday and then be repaid to those who use the money or credit. Are Government lending institutions to be in a separate class than private lenders in not being entitled to a return? Apparently this is

the purport of the gentleman's contention. Certainly the surpluses belong to the Government.

Mr. POAGE. The banks belong to the Government. The Government is going to get every dollar of its stock back. We are going to repay to the Government every dollar that the Goverment put into the business. The Government did not build these surpluses. These institutions built the surpluses and the people who did business with them are the people who built the surpluses.

Mr. YATES. Who owns the surplus now?

Mr. POAGE. The United States has title to them, of course. This is exactly what we had in the case of the land banks. It is just exactly what we had with the banks for cooperatives and whether, rightly or wrongly, this House has embarked on a policy of making these surpluses pass with the stock, when the Government is repaid the money that the Government put into them. Now the Government has been repaid all the money that it put into the land banks and all of the surpluses went to the owners of the land bank.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, may I have 1 more minute?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. YATES. It seems to me that the gentleman's arguments are quite unsound. Can it be argued that surpluses accumulated by private banking institutions belong to the depositors and borrowers because the banks did business with them? Of course, not. Under the same reasoning, would not the gentleman say that the Home Owners Loan Corporation, which was liquidated with a profit of over $14 million to the Government, should return this money to the homeowners? Would the gentleman say, under the same line of reasoning, that the small firms which pay interest to the Small Business Administration upon loans made to them should also share in accumulations derived from interest paid that they own such funds? Should the Government lending agencies loan money directly and without interest? If interest is paid, are the borrowers entitled to a return of such interest later? Apparently that is what the gentleman is arguing for.

These funds are properly the property of the Treasury of the United States. They should not be used for the benefit of private financial institutions or given to them without arrangements being made for their repayment.

Mr. POAGE. Of course, they are not being paid back. They are actually being kept.

Mr. YATES. They are being used for their benefit, are they not? In the event of liquidation, the funds will go to these institutions.

Mr. POAGE. And the Government is getting back every dollar that it has put in.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10285) to merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for supervision of production credit associations, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10285, with Mr. MULTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] will be recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] is absent on official business, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] will control the time on his side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to yield 1 minute at this time?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, it is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time in order to inquire of the gentleman from Louisiana if he can inform the House regarding the program for next week.

Mr. BOGGS. For the benefit of the Members, the program for next week is as follows:

On Monday, there is no legislative business due to the fact that there is a primary in Iowa. On Tuesday, the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar will be called and there will be one bill taken up under suspension of the rules. That bill is H. R. 10766 to compensate the Vatican for damages done during World War II.

There will be no vote on that day because of primaries in several States—California, Montana, New York, South Dakota.

Beginning on Wednesday, general debate on the Mutual Security Act of 1956. That will probably continue through Thursday and Friday. If we have finished it, H. R. 9952, the Armed Forces Reserves readjustment pay, will be considered.

Conference reports may be considered at any time.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, the bill as we bring it to you today is but the third and last of a series of 3 bills, all taken together, which will ultimately transfer the Government ownership of all of the Farm Credit institutions into the hands of those who are borrowing from those institutions. The Farm Credit Administration is composed of the land banks, of the Bank for Cooperatives, and the production credit agencies, which in turn are composed of the intermediate credit banks and production credit corporations. The production credit portion of the Farm Credit relates to those agencies that provide short-term credit for the making of crops. Of course, the land banks involve real estate loans on land; the banks for cooperatives involve those banks which finance such institutions as dairy cooperatives, livestock cooperatives, and some fruit and vegetable cooperatives.

It has long been the hope that all of those institutions might become farmer owned. It is the feeling of the Committee on Agriculture that it is well that they should become farmer owned. The land banks are now all farmer owned. There is no Government capital in your 12 land banks. The banks for cooperatives are on their way to becoming farmer owned as the result of legislation passed by this Congress last year. They are paying out the Government stock.

There were certain complications and certain unresolved questions last year which made it impracticable for the committee at that time to report out legislation that would accomplish farmer ownership of the production credit corporations and the intermediate credit banks. This year those questions have been resolved. The Governor of the Farm Credit Administration and his assistants have carried on a series of meetings all over the United States, in every one of the 12 credit regions, in which the local people have been invited to come in and express their views on this matter of transferring the stock. Over the past year I think those meetings have been very successful, and there has been a very fine understanding on the part of people in all parts of the United States, and certainly a great portion of the differences of opinion that existed last year have been eliminated.

I do not mean that everybody everywhere in the United States is entirely satisfied with this legislation. Obviously, when you reach a problem of this magnitude, some people will find fault with some of the details. There are many details that need working out. Most of them were worked out in these meetings of which I spoke. It is true the Bureau of the Budget took exactly the same position that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] took, and felt that we should provide that in case of liquidation the surplus funds should go to the public treasury. Our committee felt that this would be an unfair thing particularly at this late date. Whether the question was decided properly or not in the case of the land banks—whether it was properly decided in the case of the banks for co-

operatives—it is now a closed matter. We just do not feel it would be fair to say to those people, the borrowers from the intermediate credit bank, that we are going to apply to you a more harsh rule than has been applied to those who have paid out their credit institutions in the past.

Whether or not this Congress, this very House, was correct in voting this very principle last year for cooperatives is a closed issue. Last year we said to the people who were borrowing from the banks for cooperatives that they should simply pay back the money they borrowed from the Government. Why should we now say that "you who have been depending on this source of credit for your day-to-day operations should now be required to pay back not only what you borrowed from the Government but pay the Government all of the earnings that have been made on your money during the last few years"? We feel that that would be an unfair situation.

Frankly, I feel that in the very beginning we were right when we said to land banks that "you pay back what you get from the Government and the Government will be glad if you do that."

We set this up as a program whereby the farmers of America could have an available credit system, and the quicker we get back the Government money the quicker we can make the money available to others. It has been paid back by the land banks and it will be paid back by the intermediate credit banks if you allow this bill to be passed as written.

This bill consolidates the existing intermediate credit banks and the production credit corporations; it sets up one facility instead of two because we now have two institutions in each of the farm credit areas rather than simply one as we do for the land banks; we have an intermediate credit bank which was established not to deal with the production credit associations but to deal with private institutions.

Why? Because we had only private institutions rediscounting here for some 10 or 12 years after the creation of the production credit system. It was not until about 1933 that we created the farmer-owned production credit associations in the various localities and created a Government supervisory institution known as the Production Credit Corporation, not a banking institution, but a supervisory institution.

We have under this bill consolidated the intermediate credit banks and the production credit corporations into one new institution, believing that by so doing we will be able to reduce the cost of operation, that we will have a more efficient operation with only one rather than with two institutoins in each of the districts.

I think that is a sound proposition; I think it is going to save us some money. There are those who have raised objections to this bill on the ground that when we consolidate the two institutions we will not need as many people as we did formerly, and some would be thrown out of employment. To me that is a rather poor objection. We want to save all we can. We should not employ more people than we need. If we are going to effect economies, and we believe we should effect economies, then some of these people who are unnecessary under the new and more efficient operation certainly do not need to stay on the bank's payroll and they will have plenty of time to make a readjustment and get other employment. There is no better time for them to make such an adjustment than now when we have an opportunity for them to get employment elsewhere. The bill provides that it will not become effective until the first of January. These people will have 6 months within which to seek other employment and have an opportunity to readjust their living. There will not be a great many of them, but whatever the number they can make the readjustment. I think it is estimated it will save $40,000 to $60,000 a year to the banks.

These banks are going to be owned by the farmers of America, not by the taxpayers of America. It does not seem to me that I as a representative of the taxpayers ought to be determining who the farmers, who are going to own these banks, are going to have to employ. We are saying now: "You will employ whom you please." I think that is the only fair thing to say. Control of the banks should go with the ownership into the hands of new owners. The board of directors that is charged with the responsibility of running these institutions should have the authority to employ those they feel will most efficiently operate the institutions.

Then there has been the question of the name of the new consolidated institution. Very frankly, more than a year ago I suggested that we use the name "Production Credit Bank" because I think that the name "Production Credit" carries a little more meaning than "intermediate credit." There are a good many of the local associations now that say we ought to use that name. I would like to see that name used. But we came to the board of directors and the governor of the Farm Credit Administration and they pointed out if we changed the name of this institution we might have difficulty getting money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, you will bear in mind that these institutions get the money that they lend not from the Federal Treasury but from the sale of debentures which are the obligations of the intermediate credit banks. There is an established market for the debentures of the intermediate credit banks. There is none for the debentures of the production credit banks. I have never had occasion to deal with that kind of big financing, but those who know have suggested that the bond market and the debenture market are extremely sensitive to any kind of change and a change of name might result in an increase in the interest rate, a half or a quarter of a percent. I do not believe any farmers were so anxious for a particular name that they would want to pay the extra interest rate. I do not know of any farmer who could afford to do that simply for the benefit of a name he liked better. So the committee did not change the name even though many of us felt we would like to change it. I hope we may look forward to the day when the farmers have paid out these banks and have made them entirely farmer owned. At that time we might well consider the advisability of changing the name because then we will in all probability be in a much stronger position to make this move.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. What happens to the Federal Land Banks?

Mr. POAGE. Not a thing in the world under this bill because this bill does not touch the Federal Land Banks. The Federal Land Banks have already been taken care of and are already entirely farmer owned.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman spoke of the merger.

Mr. POAGE. The merger is between the intermediate credit banks and the production credit corporations.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That will hereafter carry on the functions of the two?

Mr. POAGE. The new corporation will carry on. That is right.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. They have operated separately or independently, you may say, of each other?

Mr. POAGE. Yes. In the past the intermediate credit banks have been the banks of discount, the production credit corporations have been the supervisory agency to supervise the production credit associations which are the local institutions that make the direct loans. The intermediate credit banks have not been banks of original lending. They have discounted the paper that originated at the level of the production credit associations.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman because I was not clear as to what happened to the Federal Land Banks.

Mr. POAGE. Nothing. This bill does not touch the Federal Land Banks and does not touch the Bank for Cooperatives.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE].

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], has already given an outline of the purposes of this legislation. I want to take just a moment to say that in my short experience on the Committee on Agriculture this legislation has been given as thorough analysis on the part of the committee as most any legislation we have had before us.

Mr. Chairman, somewhat this same objective was incorporated in legislation which was before the committee a year ago, which legislation resulted in the Farm Credit Act of 1955. However, in portions of the bill before the committee at that time dealing with the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank and the Production Credit Corporation there were certain areas which the committee felt

needed further study and further consideration on the part of the folks out in the country and others deeply interested in this system. Consequently, the provisions of the legislation before us a year ago dealing with this area were stricken from the bill, and the Farm Credit Administration officials were asked to review this matter in further detail and study, which they have done. The legislation before us today is the result of that very careful review and study not only on the part of those who, you might say, were in higher levels of the system, but these propositions, these thoughts and ideas which are developed in this legislation today, were taken out into the various communities which these production credit associations serve. Representatives from the production credit associations, delegates from the districts within the farm credit districts were all brought together, not once but at least twice, to thoroughly consider every provision of this proposition.

Mr. Chairman, this bill comes before you today not with the unanimous approval of all of the participating production credit associations but certainly, in my humble opinion, it is with the substantial approval of the various groups. True, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], has stated, some individual associations would prefer decisions otherwise than the provisions in this bill, but I think that the objectives are attained, and the basic objective is that in this step we are completing the job of providing the legislative framework by which all units of the farm credit system can become farmer owned and by which the capital subscribed by the Federal Government into this system can be retired to the Treasury.

I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], and members of the subcommittee in the thorough consideration of this legislation. We have spent many hours considering the details. We have not proceeded hurriedly with this bill. We heard all of those who were interested in being heard. We considered their propositions, and have taken their recommendations and incorporated them, insofar as the committee felt they could be incorporated, and keep the legislative objective intact.

So this bill comes before the House today, having had very careful preparation, very careful consideration in the country by the farm people, very careful consideration by the Farm Credit Board, and very careful consideration by the subcommittee and the full committee.

As has been stated, its objective is to merge the Production Credit Corporation and the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank, and it does this on a progressive basis. I should say that it does it immediately by the suspension or the closing out technically of the separate corporations and bringing them together in the new corporation which will be designated the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank.

It provides for the liquidation of the Government capital by gradual means, initial payment being made by the Production Credit Associations to start off this step toward complete ownership, and then the remaining liquidation of the Government's interest will be on the basis of the system's ability to retire this capital without losing the capability of the system to serve the farmers for which it is established.

I do not think it is necessary that I go into any further detail. I believe this legislation has been very soundly considered. It has been very carefully analyzed and comes before this committee and this House after due consideration on the part of the farm people, the Farm Credit Board, and your legislative committee dealing with this problem.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTYRE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman was on the subcommittee considering this proposed legislation. I just want to make it clear again, as the gentleman has so well stated, that there was no objection to the bill. As a matter of fact, the proposals made in this bill were agreed to after a long period of study by the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. McINTIRE. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There was no objection filed in the committee by any member of the committee to the provisions of this bill.

Mr. McINTIRE. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. So we can say that the bill was agreed to unanimously by the committee and comes here with a unanimous report of the committee.

Mr. McINTIRE. That is certainly my understanding.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Is it not a fact that the Bureau of the Budget did file with the committee a letter making recommendations for changes in the bill, or some other bill? I want to ask the gentleman whether that is a fact and whether the committee did consider the views of the Bureau of the Budget in their deliberations.

Mr. McINTIRE. Let me say in reply to the gentleman from New York that I am not familiar with any communication, although there may have been such, between the Bureau of the Budget and the committee on this point. I am familiar with the fact that the Bureau of the Budget had some points in which they were interested also. I believe those were presented in an executive communication sent to the Speaker of the House. Two bills were sent up through this executive communication. Both bills were introduced. One bill is the one we have before us today, H. R. 10285, introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and a bill which I introduced, H. R. 10392, which represent the position or the thoughts, you might say, of the Farm Credit Administration in regard to this proposed legislation. A bill, H. R. 10623, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING], carries the provisions of the Bureau of the Budget relative to this legislation.

I may say to my colleague that the views of the Bureau of the Budget were considered by the committee and each item was discussed. They were discussed in hearings with representatives from the Farm Credit Administration in order that we have full comprehension of just what those provisions incorporated and the intention. It was the conclusion of the committee in reporting the bill which is before us today that in their opinion the provisions in this bill were more applicable to the objectives which we have in this legislation.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman for that frank statement and explanation. I think it is important, as I know the gentleman does, that the views of the Bureau of the Budget be considered in connection with any legislation, although the primary responsibility rests with us to legislate. I hope that when the bill goes to the other body an opportunity will be given there for further consideration of the views of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. McINTIRE. May I reemphasize that the views of the Bureau of the Budget were carefully and objectively considered by this committee in developing this legislation.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 10285, a bill to merge production credit corporations and Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for supervision of production credit associations; and for other purposes.

The Federal Farm Credit Board in December 1954, pursuant to Public Law 202, 83d Congress, made recommendations relating primarily to the banks for cooperatives and production credit corporations. The recommendations of the Board, with respect to the production credit corporations, were not enacted into law because there were so many objections voiced at the hearings last year by the Committee on Agriculture that the matter needed further study.

I was one of those who thought that this matter required further study and had been requested by the Production Credit Association in the Eighth District of Florida to petition for further study of this matter on a grass roots level. I was especially anxious to see that the production credit associations were protected in any reorganization plan because I feel that these associations are what we might call the "grass roots" of the Farm Credit Administration. I was very much concerned last year, too, with the proposed changes at that time because I was fearful that these changes might cause a high interest rate to be charged to our farmers. I felt that the proposed changes in the Farm Credit System recommended last year, as they would apply to our production credit associations, would not give these associations their proper share of the control over credit policies.

I wish to congratulate the Federal Farm Credit Board for making a restudy of this matter, and for recommending

to us legislation which is substantially that recommended in H. R. 10285. I believe this proposed legislation has an overwhelming grass roots approval on the part of our 498 production credit associations. In this connection, I would like to point out that I have been informed by the Florida Federation of Production Credit Associations, representing the 10 associations in Florida, that they approve this legislation. I have also had special letters of approval from the Gainesville Production Credit Association, with headquarters in Gainesville, Fla.; the Northeast Production Credit Association, with headquarters in Palatka, Fla.; the Florida Citrus Production Credit Association, with headquarters in Orlando, Fla.; and the North Florida Production Credit Association, with headquarters in Live Oak, Fla. I feel, therefore, that I can speak for the many hundreds of farmers in all of Florida when I say that they are in favor of this legislation.

This bill that we are now considering will help those engaged in agriculture, I think, obtain a sound dependable source of credit. The legislation will combine the Federal intermediate credit banks and the production credit corporations in order to increase the efficiency of operation and facilitates the retirement of Government capital. I believe that this legislation would encourage and promote the continued growth and development of the production credit associations as self-supporting cooperative lending institutions operating on a sound credit basis, with maximum local authority to determine credit needs and loan policies consistent with the maintenance of a national production credit system.

Finally, this legislation will continue to provide other financing institutions making loans to farmers and ranches with the right to borrow from and rediscount with the combined entity on a basis comparable with the production credit associations.

One of the great needs of the American farmer today is as we all know dependable credit. Anything that we can do to help him obtain that credit on a good business basis is, I think, an action that should be taken immediately. I strongly support the passage of H. R. 10285, and I hope the House will give it enthusiastic approval.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, apropos of the comment just made by my colleague from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE] in reply to a question by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] concerning the views of the Bureau of the Budget, while I am not on this immediate subcommittee, it does seem to me that a matter of policy has already been established in this instance. For that reason, if none other, I am inclined to think that the opposition as expressed by the Bureau of the Budget is more of a pro forma registered objection than any actual attempt to change the status of this particular legislation.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. It is a fact, I understand, that the United States Department of Agriculture is supporting the measure. It has also been supported by the Federal Farm Credit Board. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman's remarks regarding the opposition of the Bureau of the Budget that it is more or less pro forma.

Mr. HARVEY. Yes, I think that is a correct statement. I was going to elaborate on that briefly. But, the earnings of the other two branches of the Farm Credit Administration were not treated as being necessarily returned to the Treasury. Certainly, if we are going to follow that policy, as we have followed it in the past in the instance of the two other branches of the Farm Credit Administration—whatever opinions any of us might have with regard to the policy—equity would certainly demand that we treat production credit in this instance on the same basis. I am very happy to see this final draft of the three part treatment of farm credit legislation come about. It has been, particularly to me since I have participated in the past in various branches of the farm credit activities as a borrower, very gratifying to see how successfully these branches have operated. It is gratifying to see the great contribution they have made to the well-being of agriculture throughout the Nation. It has been operated successfully, proving beyond question of doubt that farmers can operate their own cooperative credit organizations. The fact that the farmers are now returning the original capital to the Government, and are prepared to operate as an independent credit agency constitutes the attainment of a fine objective.

I would like to comment briefly on the fact that there was brought to my attention from some production credit agencies in Indiana a request for an amendment to be added to this bill. It was given consideration by the committee. It had to do with changing the method of selecting members for the various regional farm credit boards. By way of clarifying the record, I would direct my question to my colleague from Texas [Mr. POAGE] with whom I previously discussed this proposal.

Mr. POAGE. I presume the gentleman is referring to the amendment of our colleague, the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. HARVEY. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. That amendment is the same proposal that was first offered to the land bank bill and then to the co-op credit bill, and which has been turned down in the past. We do not feel it ought to go on this bill. We feel it is unsound all the way around because under that amendment an employee of one of these institutions would be able to sit on the board of directors that determined what his duties might be and what his policies should be. In fact, he would be sitting there instructing himself how to operate. We did not think that was a sound provision. We felt that these institutions should be farmer managed as well as farmer owned.

Mr. HARVEY. In other words, it had to do with what we deemed to be a proper separation of powers as between policy-making and the administration of the credit organizations.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the gentleman very kindly.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] for the splendid manner in which he has handled the pending measure through the subcommittee. This is a well-considered bill and should be enacted.

This bill is the culmination of several years of study and work on the part of the Committee on Agriculture, the farm organizations, officials of the Department of Agriculture, and of the Farm Credit Administration, and many other persons and groups interested in a sound and effective farm-credit program.

One of our major objectives has been to make it possible for farmers themselves to have the greatest possible opportunity for ownership and control of farm-credit agencies.

The Farm Credit Act of 1953 was the first big step in this direction. It established the Farm Credit Administration and the Farm Credit Board as agencies virtually independent of the Department of Agriculture. It established in specific terms the policy of Congress that farmers should have greater responsibility in the ownership, control, and operation of the credit system and that Government capital in the system should be retired as rapidly as possible.

In the Farm Credit Act of 1955, this policy was put into effect with respect to the banks for cooperatives. That act provides for the retirement of Government capital in those banks and for the assumption of ownership and greater control by those who use the banks—largely farmers themselves.

This bill completes the picture. It provides for the consolidation of the production credit corporations and the intermediate credit banks, for the retirement of Government capital from the merged institution, and for gradual assumption of ownership by the farmer-borrowers.

The production credit corporations were established under the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to organize, capitalize, and supervise the production credit associations in order to provide agriculture with a permanent and dependable source of short-term credit on a cooperative basis.

The function of the corporations to organize and capitalize the production credit associations has been largely achieved. Four hundred and forty out of the 498 PCA's are now entirely member-owners.

The most important remaining function of the corporations is that of assisting in supervising the production credit associations. Supervision and training in credit and operating matters have been important factors in the growth and development of the local associations, both as to their financial strength and

in extending sound credit service to agriculture. The production credit corporations prescribe general loan policies for the associations and guide them in the application of sound credit principles. The corporations make credit examinations of outstanding loans on behalf of the Government and review lending and collection policies of the associations. The corporations also assist in the training of employees, prescribe and approve loan interest rates, approve the compensation of personnel, and generally guide the associations in the conduct of their business and service to agriculture. We believe that important supervisory functions must be continued and the legislation makes adequate provision therefor.

The bill has the support of the Farm Credit Board, the Department of Agriculture, most of the farm organizations, and many others. Some of its features were objected to by the Bureau of the Budget, but the position of that agency has been carefully and thoroughly considered by the committee and rejected in favor of the existing provisions of the bill. It is a bill which I bring before the House with considerable pride and with the hope that it will be promptly enacted.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect and the highest esteem for the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], who have brought this bill to the floor. In my opinion, they know as much about agriculture and agricultural matters as any other Member of the House and I dislike very much to disagree with them on matters within their specialty. Nevertheless, I must do so in this case, because this bill deprives the taxpayers of this country of some $61 million in surplus funds which have been accumulated as a result of financial dealings benefiting the production credit associations, the intermediate credit banks, and the farmers of this Nation. These are taxpayers' funds. They should be earmarked for the benefit of the taxpayers and paid to them now or later.

I recognize the desirability of the plan of merger and private ownership contained in this bill. I am aware, too, that the success of the proposal may well depend upon the ability of the merged banks to command large accumulations of funds or sources of credit and that these, in all probability, must come from the Government. The fact remains that the $61 million in surpluses that have been accumulated are taxpayers' funds. The plan of merger in the bill should either provide for payment of the funds at once to the Treasury of the United States in the event they are not required to carry out the merger, or should provide for their being earmarked for payment in the future, if they are presently needed. The bill fails to do this. It gives away the taxpayers' funds. It assumes that the taxpayers have no interest in this bill at all. In the words of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] the bill presupposes that these surpluses were built up by and for the benefit of the production credit associations and by other financial institutions, one would think, without the help of the Government at all. The gentleman says these associations and institutions are entitled to the use of the funds during the life of the merged banks, and ultimately to receive them upon dissolution or liquidation. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that these funds do not belong to the members of the production credit associations or to the other financial institutions. These are taxpayers' funds, accumulated through the use of taxpayers' money or taxpayers' credit.

Under this bill it is intended that two grades of capital stock shall be issued. The Government will receive class A stock. Members of the production credit associations will receive class B stock. Under the plan the class A stock owned by the Government will be redeemed in time and under certain conditions. When this occurs, the millions of dollars in surplus funds will inure to the holders of the class B stock.

The gentlemen of the committee have stated that this bill provides for the ownership by farmers of their credit facilities. How can they reconcile this assertion with the provision which appears on page 13 giving the right to other financial institutions to share in the assets of the bank upon liquidation or dissolution? It is true that the term "other financial institutions" may be farmer organizations. It is equally true that they may not be farmer controlled. They may be the normal private banking institutions making money by loaning money.

Furthermore, what happens if the newly merged banks are liquidated voluntarily? Remote as this possibility may be, it is nevertheless present. The purpose of this bill is to keep open channels of credit for farmers through private ownership of credit facilities. Yet there is nothing in this bill that would prevent voluntary liquidation and access thereby to the Government surplus funds. If there is a voluntary dissolution at some future time, the $61 million received from the Federal Government would go to the stockholders and to other qualified financial institutions. The taxpayers would receive nothing.

In the colloquy I had with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], I asked him whether or not the surplus could be used for the payment of dividends. He indicated to me that in his opinion the surpluses could not be used for this purpose. He referred me to page 11, lines 6, and 7, reading:

> No part of such surplus of any bank shall be distributed as patronage refunds.

I do not believe this provision restricts the payment of dividends from surplus funds. Dividend payments are not necessarily the same as patronage refunds. It is true that borrowers from this bank may also be stockholders. Insofar as they receive their proportionate share of any rebates that might come through the mutualization of the institution, they receive patronage refunds, not dividends. As stockholders, however, they could only receive dividends, not patronage refunds. Dividends could very well be paid from surplus funds.

Moreover, on page 23 I notice that class C stock may be sold to investors. Investors are not necessarily borrowers from the bank. Dividends can be paid to investors who own class C stock. The prohibition against the use of the surplus for patronage refunds does not cover this situation.

In my view, the taxpayers of this country are entitled to the $61 million in surplus funds that have been accumulated by the Federal intermediate credit banks and the production credit corporations. If the merged banks want to use these funds, they should agree to repay them in the future. But this bill treats these surplus funds as gifts, from the taxpayers to the new banks, rather than as loans. I cannot agree with this concept and I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I take the time of the committee on this occasion to inquire about 2 or 3 provisions of this particular bill. I understood earlier in the discussion that there had been little or no opposition to the measure. I might say there has been quite a lot of interest in my district concerning this measure, that there was some rather vigorous opposition voiced by certain groups in the district and in the State of California. That opposition primarily came from livestock associations and range associations with reference to what they felt to be certain unfair provisions of the bill. Since that time I understand that the bill has been amended to cover that particular situation, and I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas to explain if he will the provision which I believe is discussed here in the report in section 103 on page 7, and whether or not he knows if it has allayed the opposition of certain range groups.

Mr. POAGE. I think it is fair to say that the amendment placed in the bill in the committee did at least materially reduce the opposition that has been suggested. I would not want to say that it has satisfied everyone, because obviously it did not; but it went a good deal further than some people thought we should go. The gentleman from Illinois has just expressed the contrary view that we should not have gone as far as we did. We did however provide that in case of liquidation, which is the only way in which these surpluses can pass out of the capital structure of the institutions, because you cannot pass these surpluses out in the way of dividends without some authority under the law, and the authority as I see it just is not here.

It is true that there probably is not a direct prohibition against it, but these institutions have no authority except such as we give them, and we did not give them any authority to pass these surpluses on except in case of liquidation. In that event we make it clear as to how the surplus and all of the assets shall be divided.

We did provide that in the event of liquidation these other financial institu-

tions—and they are the ones the gentleman speaks of—shall share in the division of these assets in proportion as the business they have done with the particular intermediate credit bank bears to the total amount of business that has been done over a period of years. It happens that the gentleman lives in a district that has the largest volume of business with the other financial institutions; I believe it runs about 23 percent in the Berkeley banks. It happens that the banks in my area run next, which is somewhere around 20 percent. Some of the banks in the United States are not doing 6 percent of their business with other financial institutions. As a result in those areas a very small amount would go to these other financial institutions. In the gentleman's area nearly one-quarter of the surplus would of course go to the other financial institutions in case of liquidation only.

I think the committee has done everything that could reasonably be asked in setting up that formula.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman for that explanation because, as he has suggested, it was of considerable concern to certain people in my district. I have, of course, a great number of people out there who are thoroughly in favor of the bill. On the other hand, there were these groups which did feel some concern about its effect upon them and upon their people. I appreciate very much the explanation of the gentleman. It is my hope it will work in that way. Certainly, as I understand it, this would apply only in case of liquidation which is not actually probable, is that a correct statement?

Mr. POAGE. That is a correct statement.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The bill follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this Act may be cited as the "Farm Credit Act of 1956."

Declaration of policy

SEC. 2. It is declared to be the policy of the Congress to continue to provide agriculture with a sound, dependable, and effective source of credit; to promote the efficiency of the farm credit system by merging production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks and to facilitate farmer ownership of the merged banks and retirement of Government capital therein; to encourage and promote the continued growth and development of the production credit associations as self-supporting cooperative lending institutions operating on a sound credit basis with maximum local authority to determine credit needs and loan policies consistent with the maintenance of a national production credit system; and to continue to provide other financing institutions making loans to farmers and ranchers with the right to borrow from and rediscount with such merged banks on a basis comparable with the production credit associations regardless of the ownership of such banks. The provisions of this act shall be construed in keeping with this declaration of policy.

TITLE I—PRODUCTION CREDIT SYSTEM

SEC. 101. Merger of production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks—(a) Transfer of assets: The production credit corporation in each farm credit district is hereby merged in the Federal intermediate credit bank of the district and all assets, funds, contracts, property, and records belonging to such corporation, except stock in production credit associations, are hereby transferred to and vested in such bank. All obligations and liabilities of the production credit corporation shall be assumed by the Federal intermediate credit bank of the district. Stock held by each production credit corporation in production credit associations is transferred to the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration to be held by him on behalf of the United States, and the Governor shall cancel an equal par amount of stock of the corporation.

(b) Services to and supervision of production credit associations: In order to carry out the declared policy of this act with respect to the production credit associations, the Farm Credit Administration shall, by appropriate provisions in the charter and bylaws, or otherwise, provide for such organization and assignment of functions within the Federal intermediate credit banks as will assure proper supervision of and assistance to the production credit associations in a manner which will enable them to make sound credit available to farmers and ranchers. The income derived from the surplus transferred from the production credit corporation to the Federal intermediate credit bank of the district shall be used to pay expenses of the bank in providing such supervision and assistance, and expenses in excess of such income may be paid out of other resources of the bank.

(c) Officers and employees: Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the employment of the officers and employees of each Federal intermediate credit bank and each production credit corporation is terminated on the effective date of this act and the board of directors of the Federal intermediate credit bank shall, not later than 60 days prior to the effective date of this act, take all necessary action to reemploy as of such effective date such of the officers and employees so terminated in such capacities as the board determines they are qualified and needed to carry out the functions, powers, and duties of the Federal intermediate credit bank. Such reemployment shall be subject to the approval of the Farm Credit Administration.

SEC. 102. Section 205 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Capital stock

"SEC. 205. (a) Classes of stock; ownership; dividends; and retirement of stock: Each Federal intermediate credit bank is authorized to issue class A and class B stock as follows:

"(1) Class A stock shall have a par value of $100 per share and shall be issued to and held by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration on behalf of the United States. Stock of all Federal intermediate credit banks held by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be transferred to the Governor and may be reallocated by him in such manner as he determines necessary to meet the needs of the respective banks. The Governor shall then exchange such stock of each bank for an equal par amount of class A stock of the bank. Stock of each production credit corporation held by the Governor (less the amount canceled pursuant to section 101 of the Farm Credit Act of 1956) shall be exchanged for an equal par amount of class A stock of the Federal intermediate credit bank in which such corporation is merged pursuant to section 101 of such act. No dividends shall be paid on class A stock. Annually at the end of its fiscal year each such bank shall determine the amount of its class A stock which shall be retired. Whenever the total of the capital stock, participation certificates, surplus, and reserves of the bank is more than one-sixth of the highest month-end balance of debentures and other obligations issued by or for the bank, outstanding during the immediately preceding five years, the minimum amount of class A stock to be retired shall be the total amount of class B stock and participation certificates issued for that year. All class A stock shall be retired at par. The proceeds of such class A stock retirements of each bank shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts until there is so paid a sum equal to the amount of class A stock of the bank issued in exchange for stock of the production credit corporation. The proceeds of any further such stock retirements shall be paid into the revolving fund established by section 5 (e) of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended. The Governor of the Farm Credit Administration is authorized to purchase from time to time class A stock in any bank in such amount as he determines is needed to meet the credit needs of the bank and such revolving fund shall continue to be available for such purchases as provided in said section 5 (e). The Governor may at any time require the bank to retire such class A stock if, in his judgment, the bank has resources available therefor, and the proceeds of such retirements shall be returned to such revolving fund.

"(2) Class B stock shall have a par value of $5 per share and may be issued only to production credit associations in series and amounts approved by the Farm Credit Administration. Such stock shall be issued only at par and may be transferred to another production credit association with the approval of the issuing bank. Whenever a bank has no class A stock outstanding it may pay like dividends on class B stock and participation certificates in an amount not to exceed 5 per centum in any year if declared by the board of directors. Dividends on class B stock and participation certificates shall not be cumulative. Within 60 days after the effective date of the Farm Credit Act of 1956, the production credit associations shall subscribe to class B stock in the banks in an aggregate amount equal to 15 percent of the total amount of class A stock in all banks. Such required amount of subscriptions shall be allotted among the several districts in the proportion that the average amount of the bank's loans to and discounts for the production credit associations of the district, outstanding during the immediately preceding five fiscal years, is of the average of such loans and discounts of all banks outstanding during such 5-year period. The amount so allotted to each district shall be further allotted to each production credit association on the basis of the proportion that its average indebtedness (loans and discounts) to the bank during the immediately preceding five fiscal years is of the average of such indebtedness of all production credit associations to the bank during such 5-year period. Each production credit association shall subscribe to class B stock in the bank of the district in the amount so allotted to it. One-third of the purchase price of such stock subscription shall be paid at the time of such subscription, one-third shall be paid within one year after the effective date of said act, and the balance shall be paid within two years after such effective date. Such class B stock shall be issued as payments therefor are made. Any production credit association chartered after the effective date of the Farm Credit Act of 1956 shall thereupon purchase class B stock in the bank in the amount of $5,000, and such amount shall be adjusted at the end of 5 years thereafter to an amount determined

by applying to its average indebtedness to the bank during such 5-year period the same percentage as the percentage which the initial subscriptions of other production credit associations was of their indebtedness, as provided in this subsection: *Provided,* That this provision shall not apply to any association owning stock in the bank in such required amount as a result of merger, consolidation, or reorganization of one or more associations. After all class A stock has been retired, the bank may retire class B stock at par and participation certificates at a face amount under policies established by the Farm Credit Administration. Class B stock and participation certificates shall be retired without preference and in such manner that the oldest outstanding stock or certificates at any given time will be retired first. In case of liquidation or dissolution of any production credit association or other financing institution, the stock or participation certificates of the bank owned by such association or institution may be retired by the bank at the fair book value thereof, not exceeding par or face amount, as the case may be.

"(b) Lien on stock and participation certificates: Each Federal intermediate credit bank shall have a first lien on all stock in the bank owned by each production credit association and on all participation certificates owned by other financing institutions as additional collateral for any indebtedness of the holders thereof to the bank: *Provided,* That the bank shall make no loan or advance on the security of its own stock or participation certificates. In any case where the debt of a production credit association or other financing institution is in default, the bank may retire and cancel all or a part of the stock of the bank held by the association or of the participation certificates held by the other financing institution at the fair book value thereof, not exceeding par or face amount, as the case may be, in total or partial liquidation of the debt."

SEC. 103. Section 206 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Application of earnings

"SEC. 206. (a) Annual application: At the end of its fiscal year, each Federal intermediate credit bank shall determine the amount of its net earnings after paying or providing for all operating expenses (including reasonable valuation reserves and losses in excess of any such applicable reserves) and shall apply such net earnings as follows: (1) To the restoration of the amount of the impairment, if any, of capital stock and participation certificates, as determined by its board of directors; (2) to the restoration of the amount of the impairment, if any, of the surplus account established by this subsection, as determined by its board of directors; (3) 25 percent of any remaining earnings shall be used to create and maintain a reserve account equal to 25 percent of the outstanding capital stock and participation certificates of the bank; (4) if said bank shall have outstanding capital stock held by the United States during the whole or any part of its fiscal year, it shall next pay to the United States as a franchise tax, a sum equal to 25 percent of its earnings then remaining, not exceeding, however, a rate of return on such Government capital calculated at a rate equal to the computed average annual rate of interest on all public issues of public debt obligations of the United States issued during the fiscal year of the United States Treasury ending next before such tax is due, as certified to the Farm Credit Administration by the Secretary of the Treasury; (5) dividends on class B stock and participation certificates may be declared as provided in section 205 (a) of this act; and (6) any remaining net earnings shall be distributed as patronage refunds as provided in subsection (b) of this section. Notwithstanding the provisions of item (3) of this subsection, if at the end of any fiscal year the sum of the surplus and the reserve account of any bank is less than its outstanding capital stock and participation certificates, the bank shall continue to apply such 25 percent of its net earnings to the reserve account until the sum of the surplus and the reserve account is equal to its outstanding capital stock and participation certificates. Each bank shall, on the effective date of the Farm Credit Act of 1956, establish a surplus account consisting of its earned surplus account, its reserve for contingencies, and the surplus of the production credit corporation transferred to the bank. No part of such surplus of any bank shall be distributed as patronage refunds. In the event of a net loss in any fiscal year after providing for all operating expenses (including reasonable valuation reserves and losses in excess of any such applicable reserves), such loss shall be absorbed by: first, charges to the reserve account; second, charges to surplus other than that transferred from the production credit corporation of the district; third, charges to surplus transferred from the production credit corporation of the district; fourth, the impairment of class B stock and participation certificates; and fifth, the impairment of class A stock.

"(b) Patronage refunds: Whenever at the end of its fiscal year a Federal intermediate credit bank has class A stock outstanding, patronage refunds declared for that year shall be paid in class B stock to production credit associations and in participation certificates to other financing institutions borrowing from or rediscounting with the bank during the fiscal year for which such funds are declared. The recipients of such patronage refunds shall not be subject to Federal income taxes thereon. Whenever at the end of its fiscal year a Federal intermediate credit bank has no class A stock outstanding, patronage refunds declared for that year may be paid in such class B stock and participation certificates or in cash as determined by the bank. All patronage refunds shall be paid in the proportion that the amount of interest earned by the bank on its loans to and discounts for each production credit association or other financing institution bears to the total interest earned by the bank on all such loans and discounts outstanding during the fiscal year. Each participation certificate issued in payment of patronage refunds shall be in multiples of $5 and shall state on its face the rights, privileges, and conditions applicable thereto. Patronage refunds shall not be paid to any other Federal intermediate credit bank, or to any Federal land bank or bank for cooperatives.

"(c) Distribution of assets on liquidation or dissolution: In the case of liquidation or dissolution of any Federal intermediate credit bank, after the payment or retirement, as the case may be, first, of all liabilities; second, of all class A stock at par; third, of all class B stock at par and all participation certificates at face amount; any surplus established pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be paid to the holders of class A and class B stock pro rata, and any remaining assets shall be distributed to the holders of class B stock and the holders of participation certificates pro rata."

SEC. 104. (a) Section 201 (b) of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "The directors shall have power, subject to the approval of the Farm Credit Administration, to adopt such bylaws as may be necessary for the conduct of the business of the banks."

(b) Section 202 (a) of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 202. (a) The Federal intermediate credit banks, when chartered and established, shall have power, subject solely to the restrictions, limitations, and conditions contained in this act or as may be prescribed by the Farm Credit Administration not inconsistent with the provisions of this act—

"(1) to discount for, or purchase from, any production credit association organized under the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, with its endorsement, any note, draft, or other such obligation presented by such association; and to make loans and advances to any such association secured by such collateral as may be approved by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration;

"(2) to discount for, or purchase from, any national bank, State bank, trust company, agricultural credit corporation, incorporated livestock loan company, savings institution, credit union, and any association of agricultural producers engaged in the making of loans to farmers and ranchers, with its endorsement, any note, draft, or other such obligation the proceeds of which have been advanced or used in the first instance for any agricultural purpose, including the breeding, raising, fattening, or marketing of livestock; and to make loans and advances to any such financing institution secured by such collateral as may be approved by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration: *Provided,* That no such loan or advance shall be made upon the security of collateral other than notes or other such obligations of farmers and ranchers eligible for discount or purchase under the provisions of this section, unless such loan or advance is made to enable the financing institution to make or carry loans for any agricultural purpose; and

"(3) to make loans to and discount paper for any other Federal intermediate credit bank, any Federal land bank, or any bank for cooperatives organized under the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, all upon terms and at rates of interest or discount approved by the Farm Credit Administration."

(c) Section 202 (c) of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, is amended by changing the word "three" to the word "seven."

(d) Section 204 (a) of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. (a) Loans and discounts by any Federal intermediate credit bank shall bear such rates of interest or discount as the board of directors of the bank shall from time to time determine with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration, but the rates charged financing institutions other than production credit associations shall be the same as those charged production credit associations."

(e) Section 204 (b) of the Federal Farm Loan Act is hereby repealed.

(f) Section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting in paragraph "Seventeenth", after the words "Federal land banks", a comma and the words "to Federal intermediate credit banks, or to banks for cooperatives organized under the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended."

SEC. 105. (a) Section 2 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, hereinafter in this act referred to as the 'Governor,' is authorized and directed to organize and charter 12 banks to be known as 'banks for cooperatives'. One such bank shall be established in each city in which there is located a Federal land bank. The members of the several farm credit boards of the farm credit districts provided for in section 5 of the Farm Credit Act of 1937, as amended, shall be ex officio the directors of the respective banks for cooperatives. Such directors shall have power, subject to the approval of the Governor, to employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees of such banks as may be necessary to carry out the powers and duties conferred upon such banks under this act."

(b) Section 3 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 is amended by striking from the first sentence the words "the production credit corporations and" and by striking from the second sentence the words "corporations and".

(c) Section 4 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 is hereby repealed.

(d) Section 5 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, is amended (1) by changing "$120,000,000" in subsection (a) thereof to "$60,000,000"; (2) by striking from subsection (b) thereof the words "the production credit corporations and"; (3) by changing "$40,000,000" in subsection (e) thereof to "$100,000,000"; and (4) by striking from subsection (e) thereof the words "and/or paid-in surplus".

(e) Section 6 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Investment by Governor in stock of production credit associations

"SEC. 6. The Governor may purchase class A stock of any production credit association in such amounts as he determines are required to meet the credit needs of farmers in the area served by such association. Payments for such stock purchased by the Governor shall be made out of the revolving fund authorized by section 5 (a) of this act and such stock shall be held by him on behalf of the United States. The Governor may at any time require any production credit association to retire and cancel any class A stock held by him in such association if, in his judgment, the association has resources available therefor, and the proceeds of such stock retirements shall be paid into such revolving fund."

(f) Section 20 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 is amended by changing the fourth sentence to read as follows: "Such articles shall be signed by the individuals uniting to form the association and a copy thereof shall be furnished to the Governor."

(g) Section 21 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, is amended (1) by striking from the first sentence the words "production credit corporations" and substituting in lieu thereof the words "the Governor"; and (2) by deleting the last sentence thereof.

(h) Section 22 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, is amended by striking out the words "production credit corporation", wherever they appear therein, and substituting in lieu thereof "Federal intermediate credit bank".

(i) Section 23 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, is amended (1) by changing the first sentence to read as follows: "Each production credit association shall, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the farm credit board of the district with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration, invest its funds and make loans to farmers for general agricultural purposes and other requirements of the borrowers."; (2) by deleting the second sentence; (3) by striking from the third sentence the word "corporation" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Federal intermediate credit bank"; and (4) by changing the period at the end of next to the last sentence to a colon and adding the following: *"Provided,* That an association may, under rules and regulations issued by the Farm Credit Administration, make loans to any class B stockholder secured by warehouse receipts covering agricultural commodities stored in bonded warehouses without the purchase of additional class B stock."

(j) Section 34 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, is hereby amended by adding before the semicolon at the end of "(b)" the words "or to Federal land banks or Federal intermediate credit banks".

(k) Section 41 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, is hereby amended by adding before the semicolon at the end of "(b)" the words "or to Federal land banks or Federal intermediate credit banks".

(l) Section 60 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, is amended (1) by striking from the first sentence the words "the production credit corporations,"; (2) by striking from the second sentence the words "association, or corporation" and substituting in lieu thereof the words "or association"; and (3) by striking from the third sentence the words "production credit corporation or", "or corporation," and "corporation or", wherever they appear therein.

(m) Section 61 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 is amended (1) by striking from the first sentence the words "production credit corporation,"; and (2) by striking from the second and third sentences the words "association, or corporation", wherever they appear therein, and substituting in lieu thereof the words "or association."

(n) Section 62 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, is amended by striking out the words "production credit corporations,".

(o) Section 63 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, is amended (1) by striking from the first sentence the words "the production credit corporations,"; (2) by striking from the first and second sentences the words "associations, or corporations" and "associations, and corporations," and substituting in lieu thereof, the words "or associations" and "and associations,", respectively; and (3) by changing the last sentence to read as follows: "The exemption provided herein shall not apply with respect to any production credit association or its property or income after the class A stock held in it by the Governor has been retired, or with respect to any bank for cooperatives or its property or income after the stock held in it by the United States has been retired."

(p) Section 65 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out the words "production credit corporation,"; and (2) by striking out the words "association or corporation", wherever they appear therein, and substituting in lieu thereof the words "or association".

(q) Section 86a of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 is hereby repealed.

SEC. 106. (a) Section 5 of the Farm Credit Act of 1937, as amended, is amended (1) by striking from subsection (d) (2) (B) the words "production credit corporation of the district" and substituting in lieu thereof the words "Governor of the Farm Credit Administration"; and (2) by striking from subsection (h) the words "production credit corporation.".

(b) Section 6 of the Farm Credit Act of 1937 is amended (1) by striking from the first sentence of subsection (a) the words "production credit corporation,"; (2) by striking from the third sentence of subsection (a) the word "three"; (3) by striking from the first sentence of subsection (b) the words "the bank for cooperatives, and the production credit corporation" and substituting in lieu thereof the words "and the bank for cooperatives"; and (4) by striking from the last sentence of subsection (b) the words "production credit corporation,".

SEC. 107. (a) Section 8 of the Farm Credit Act of 1953 is amended by striking out the words "production credit corporation", wherever they appear therein, and substituting in lieu thereof the words "Federal intermediate credit bank."

(b) Subsection (a) of section 16 of the Farm Credit Act of 1953 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Any other provisions of law to the contrary notwithstanding, after the effective date of this act any production credit association may, with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration, issue nonvoting preferred stock, to be known as class C stock, which may be purchased and held by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration and by investors: *Provided,* That the issuance of such stock shall be authorized by vote of not less than two-thirds of the outstanding shares of class A stock of the association (other than shares held by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration) by the holders thereof in person or by proxy and by vote of not less than two-thirds of the outstanding shares of class B stock of the association by the holders thereof in person or by proxy; and for this purpose holders of class A stock (other than the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration) and holders of class B stock shall be entitled to one vote for each share of stock held by them. Payments for such stock purchased by the Governor shall be made out of the revolving fund created by section 5 (a) of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, and the proceeds from the retirement of any such stock shall be paid into such revolving fund."

SEC. 108. Section 601 of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby amended (1) by striking from subsection (a) the words "production credit corporations,", wherever they appear therein, and the word "corporations,"; (2) by striking from subsection (b) the words "the Federal intermediate credit banks, and the production credit corporations" and substituting in lieu thereof the words "and the Federal intermediate credit banks"; and (3) by striking from subsections (b) and (c) the words "and corporation", "and corporations", and "corporation,", wherever they appear therein.

SEC. 109. Sections 658 and 1014 of title 8, United States Code, are hereby amended by striking from each such section the words "or in which a production credit corporation holds stock."

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. (a) The Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, is amended (1) by striking from section 101 the words "Federal Intermediate Credit Banks; Production Credit Corporations;"; (2) by inserting in section 201 immediately following "(3)" the words "Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, (4)"; (3) by changing "(4)" in section 201 to "(5)"; and (4) by striking from sections 302 and 303 the words "production credit corporations,".

(b) After the effective date of this act, the Federal intermediate credit banks may utilize their funds for administrative expenses without regard to the limitations contained in any other act of Congress governing the expenditure of appropriated funds.

(c) Paragraph Seventh of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, is amended (1) by inserting in next to the last sentence, immediately before the words "Federal Home Loan Banks", the words "thirteen banks for cooperatives or any of them or the"; and (2) by changing the last sentence to read as follows: "The limitations and restrictions herein contained as to dealing in and underwriting investment securities shall not apply to obligations issued by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development which are at the time eligible for purchase by a national bank for its own account: *Provided,* That no association shall hold obligations issued by said bank as a result of underwriting, dealing, or purchasing for its own account (and for this purpose obligations as to which it is under commitment shall be deemed to be held by it) in a total amount exceeding at any one time 10 per centum of its capital stock actually paid in and unimpaired and 10 per centum of its unimpaired surplus fund."

SEC. 202. (a) This act shall become effective on January 1 next following its enactment.

(b) For purposes of applying the amendment in section 103 of this act, that part of the fiscal year 1957 preceding the effective

date of this act shall be deemed to be a separate fiscal year.

SEC. 203. (a) If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provisions to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

(b) The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "farmer ownership" and insert in lieu thereof "increased farmer participation in the management, control, and ownership."

Page 3, line 5, strike out "to be held by him on behalf of the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 12, strike out lines 16 to 25, inclusive and the word "rata';" and on page 13, insert the following: "In the case of liquidation or dissolution of any Federal intermediate credit bank, after payment or retirement, as the case may be, first, of all liabilities; second, of all class A stock at par; third, of all class B stock at par and all participation certificates at face amount; any remaining assets of the bank shall be distributed as provided in this subsection. Any of the surplus established pursuant to subsection (a) of this section (excluding that transferred from the production credit corporation of the district) which the Farm Credit Administration determines was contributed by financing institutions, other than the production credit associations, rediscounting with or borrowing from the bank on the effective date of the Farm Credit Act of 1956 shall be paid to such institutions, or their successors in interest as determined by the Farm Credit Administration, and the remaining portion of such surplus (including that transferred from the production credit corporation of the district) shall be paid to the holders of class A and class B stock pro rata. The contribution of each such financing institution under the preceding sentence shall be computed on the basis of the ratio of its patronage to the total patronage of the bank from the date of organization of the bank of the effective date of the Farm Credit Act of 1956. Any assets of the bank then remaining shall be distributed to the holders of class B stock and the holders of participation certificates pro rata."

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment makes available the assets of the merged banks in the event of liquidation or upon dissolution not only to the production credit associations and the Government—if it has not yet been repaid on its stock—but also to the other financial institution. For the most part "other financial institutions" are the usual private banks which have loaned money to the farmers and which have made profits as a result of such loans. Why should they be given an additional profit? Certainly they never expected the added generous portion which this amendment grants to them. It will permit them to share in the distribution of the Government surplus funds in the event of the closing of the bank.

Mr. Chairman, it is more important that the taxpayers should be considered. The surplus funds belong to them and there should be an appropriate revision of this section in order to protect their interests, rather than those of other financial institutions. The committee amendment should be defeated.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is the identical question that was raised by the gentleman from California and this is the amendment which was referred to. The difference of opinion here actually refers to the question of whether or not you feel that the Government of the United States should go into this business as a profitmaking proposition or whether the Government went into this farm-credit business in order to render a service without expense or without profit to the Government. The committee took the view that the Government went into this, not to make a profit, but, rather, for the purpose of providing a service, if possible, without loss to the Government. This bill provides it shall be without loss to the Government, and so does the amendment. The very first thing in the amendment says "in the case of liquidation or dissolution" the assets shall go to the class A stockholders. The class A stockholders consist of the United States Government. If the Government investment has not been paid off at liquidation, the first money must go to the United States Government. It cannot go elsewhere. Until the Government is paid in full there cannot be a dollar go even to the borrowers of the institution. Only after the Government is paid in full can there be any distribution of any assets. Then they shall go, according to this amendment, to the holders not only of the class B stock but to the holders of certificates, and those holders of certificates are these other financial institutions, and the certificates will be merely a right in case of liquidation to share in the distribution of assets on the basis of the business that they have done with the institution.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Does not the original committee draft provide for the funds to go to the United States Government and to the farmer cooperatives alone on a pro rata basis rather than to the other financial institutions as well?

Mr. POAGE. No; I do not so understand. I understand the original draft provides that the class A stock is to be paid in full.

Mr. YATES. Which is held by the Government?

Mr. POAGE. Yes. And shall be paid in full, and once it is paid off, the original draft of the bill would have paid all the rest of the assets to the class B stock.

Mr. YATES. The farm cooperatives then would get the balance?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. YATES. But the amendment offered by the committee would permit private banking institutions to share in the funds on liquidation, would it not?

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly right. That is the difference. The Government's position is not changed by the amendment one iota. The question is simply whether these institutions, which in some of the districts are doing nearly a quarter of the business, and which in some districts are only doing a small part, should share in the earnings built up as the result of their business in case of liquidation or whether they should be completely ignored.

Mr. YATES. But are they not making money on the business they are doing?

Mr. POAGE. I presume some of them have and some have not. There have been over 1,200 and apparently there are only 94 left. So presumably some of those 1,100 did not make money, or they would have stayed in business. But, be that as it may, they are all trying to make money.

Mr. YATES. But the fact is that 94 are still in business, and they are the ones who will share in this distribution.

Mr. POAGE. I think that is right, but I do not think that it is necessarily a profitable business regardless of who is running it. The committee feels, regardless of the original merits of this matter, that it would be grossly unfair at this late date to come in and to say to those farmers who have borrowed money and to these institutions that have rediscounted their paper with the Intermediate Credit Bank, that we are going to change the rule and make it different from that which we prescribed back when the Government sold the land banks. I understand the gentleman from Illinois feels that we should follow a different policy, although I grant you that this amendment only relates to the difference between the surpluses of the various borrowers. We are not trying to penalize anyone, whether or not they may have made a profit. All of these institutions have rendered a service to farmers who needed credit.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to the fact that in the matter of these so-called profits that these other institutions have made, we are not dealing normally with a group of large private banking institutions; that actually, I would like to say to my friend from Illinois, we are dealing primarily with agricultural credit groups and livestock companies, and so on, which generally are farmers or agriculturalists who have organized financial institutions which have been cooperative in this field. Actually very few of them are so-called commercial banking institutions. And, they have contributed down through the years to the surplus which we are talking about now, and certainly to me I think they are entitled to share in case of liquidation, in case of distribution of this surplus, and I hope the amendment will be accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 16, line 2, strike out "seven" and insert "five."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 16, line 12, strike out all of lines 12 and 13.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 16, line 14, strike out "(f)" and insert "(e)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 16, line 20, insert:

"(f) Section 203 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, is amended (i) by inserting in subsection (a) thereof, after the words 'outstanding consolidated debentures', the words 'or other similar obligations'; and (ii) by inserting in subsections (d) and (e) thereof, after the word 'debentures' wherever used therein, except in the last sentence of subsection (d), the words 'or other similar obligations.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 18, line 18: after "act," strike out the remainder of the line down to and including "States" on line 20.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 19, line 22, insert a period after "borrowers."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 19, line 23, after the semicolon insert "and."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 19, line 25, strike out the semicolon, insert a period and strike out the remainder of the sentence.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE: On page 4 transpose lines 24 and 25.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, this is merely a corrective amendment. The printer printed the lines in the wrong place.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 11, line 7, after the word "refunds", strike out the period and insert "or as dividends."

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] and I have discussed this matter. It was his opinion that the bill prohibited the payment of dividends. I find no such provision in the bill. Therefore, in order to make sure that his understanding is correct, I offer an amendment to insert the words "or as dividends." Previously the gentleman indicated to me that he had no objection to this provision.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. I have not any objection. I am sure none of the committee has any objection. It does exactly what we intend to do.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for accepting my amendment. I believe it adds a necessary safeguard to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming: On page 5, line 1, after the word "banks", strike out the period, insert a semicolon and *"Provided, however,* That no such reallocation shall be made by the Governor until this act has been in effect for a period of 5 years."

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that the bill before the House for consideration deals with a highly technical and complicated subject. I further appreciate that legislation of such a nature cannot be well written on the floor of the House. I am further appreciative of the fact that the committee has given the subject of this bill very careful consideration and that such technical matters can best be considered in committee.

I take this means of bringing up the subject of this amendment for discussion at this time because of certain dangers that I believe may be encountered if this amendment is not incorporated in legislation as it is finally passed. At this time, due to economic conditions that exist in certain segments of our farm economy, if there is anything that we would not want to be responsible for, that would be to increase the cost of credit to people in farming and ranching activities. It is the thinking of my constituents who are identified with this very important program that such would be the effect of this legislation unless this amendment is incorporated. The section to which the amendment applies grants authority to the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration to reallocate the stock of all Federal Intermediate Credit Banks. The amendment would defer the exercise of the authority for a period of 5 years from the effective date of the legislation.

From what I have heard from my constituents directly associated with the Production Credit Association, I believe that they subscribe to the theory of ultimate complete ownership of the system by the production credit associations and their members. They however question the advisability of forcing the purchase of these agencies on the associations at this time, because of the belief that it will increase the cost of their operations which will necessarily be reflected in an increased interest rate to their members and borrowers.

Wyoming is in district No. 8. It is estimated that if the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration is given authority to immediately transfer capital, then, under this reallocation authority, this district No. 8 would lose about $3,500,000 in capital which would result in a loss of approximately $87,500 in income annually. The effect would then be double-barreled in that operating costs would go up as a result of the legislation and income would go down. This they believe would necessarily result in an increase in interest costs to the borrowers. The effect of this could be to enhance the capital in some districts to their advantage at the expense of other districts.

The effect of this amendment would be to defer the reallocation of capital for a period of 5 years. The 5-year period would allow time to develop expense-saving techniques. During this period the income from this additional capital would be available to offset the expenses usually incurred during any initial period of operation. Those district banks requiring additional capital structure now would not and should not be neglected. They could obtain paid-in surplus funds from the revolving fund to satisfy their needs.

This amendment was presented to the committee. I appreciate the consideration which was given to it. I do, though, believe that it should be given additional consideration as I am sure that no Member of Congress would want to increase interest rates to any section of our farm economy.

Because of the technical nature of the subject, I do not believe that it would be fair to expect the Members of this House to vote upon the amendment at this time and with the information that can be supplied here on the floor in the short presentation allowed under the rules. I offer the amendment to call it to the attention of the House at this time and to the attention of the appropriate committee of the other body. I sincerely hope that the committee of the other body will give it full consideration when the legislation is considered before that committee. Because of the fact that it is a technical subject, it is not my intention to bring the amendment to a vote at this time and if granted leave by the House, I expect to withdraw the amendment without bringing it to a vote.

Again I want to express my appreciation for the careful consideration that has been given to this legislation by the House committee and the attention given by the committee to this amendment.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. McINTIRE. I certainly assure the gentleman from Wyoming that the matter to which he refers was given consideration in the committee. It involves the matter of reallocation of capital as between the respective Federal Intermediate Credit Banks.

I think I could make this observation from some opportunity to observe the operations of this system, that the reallocation of this money, which will be within the discretion of the Governor and those associated with him, it will be done very carefully to protect the soundness of the operations of the Federal intermediate credit bank in the gentleman's district. I can appreciate that this is a point about which the people in the gentleman's district in Wyoming are concerned, but I do think the legislation as set forth in this bill provides for the effective use of this capital and that

his district will not be hurt in this process.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I especially thank the gentleman from Maine for his observation and his consideration of this problem as a member of the committee. As I said previously, our people, I believe, favor the farmers' taking over the ownership of these banks. They are merely questioning when and how it should be done. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I commend the gentleman on his alertness in bringing this to our attention and the very effective way in which he has done. I hope that if the gentleman does withdraw his amendment the views he has expressed will receive consideration when the other body takes up this matter.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. PRICE] having assumed the chair, Mr. MULTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10285) to merge Production Credit Corporations in Federal Intermediate Credit Banks; to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal Intermediate Credit Banks; to provide for supervision of production credit associations; and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 508, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 247, nays 4, answered "present" 1, not voting 180, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

YEAS—247

Abbitt	Fjare	Minshall
Abernethy	Flynt	Morrison
Adair	Fogarty	Multer
Alger	Forand	Mumma
Allen, Calif.	Ford	Murray, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl	Forrester	Murray, Tenn.
Andresen, August H.	Frazier	Natcher
Andrews	Frelinghuysen	Nelson
Ashley	Friedel	Nicholson
Aspinall	Gamble	Norblad
Auchincloss	Gary	O'Brien, Ill.
Avery	Gathings	O'Hara, Ill.
Ayres	George	O'Konski
Bailey	Gordon	Ostertag
Baker	Grant	Passman
Baldwin	Green, Oreg.	Perkins
Barrett	Gross	Pfost
Bass, N. H.	Haley	Poage
Beamer	Hand	Poff
Bennett, Fla.	Hardy	Polk
Bennett, Mich.	Harris	Preston
Blatnik	Harrison, Nebr.	Price
Blitch	Harrison, Va.	Priest
Boggs	Harvey	Quigley
Bolling	Hays, Ark.	Ray
Bolton, Frances P.	Hayworth	Rees, Kans.
Bonner	Hébert	Reuss
Bow	Henderson	Rhodes, Pa.
Boykin	Hiestand	Riehlman
Boyle	Hill	Riley
Bray	Holmes	Robeson, Va.
Brooks, La.	Horan	Robsion, Ky.
Brooks, Tex.	Huddleston	Rodino
Brown, Ga.	Hull	Rogers, Colo.
Brown, Ohio	Hyde	Rogers, Fla.
Brownson	Ikard	Rogers, Mass.
Broyhill	Jackson	Rogers, Tex.
Budge	James	Rooney
Burdick	Jensen	Schenck
Burnside	Johnson, Calif.	Scherer
Bush	Johnson, Wis.	Schwengel
Byrne, Pa.	Jonas	Scott
Byrnes, Wis.	Jones, Ala.	Selden
Cannon	Jones, Mo.	Short
Carrigg	Judd	Shuford
Cederberg	Kean	Siler
Celler	Kearney	Simpson, Ill.
Chase	Keating	Sisk
Chatham	Kee	Smith, Kans.
Chelf	Keogh	Smith, Miss.
Chenoweth	Kilday	Smith, Va.
Chudoff	Kilgore	Spence
Church	Kluczynski	Springer
Clark	Knox	Staggers
Clevenger	Knutson	Steed
Colmer	Laird	Sullivan
Cooley	Landrum	Talle
Coon	Lankford	Teague, Calif.
Cooper	LeCompte	Thompson, Mich.
Coudert	Long	Thompson, N. J.
Cramer	Lovre	Thompson, Tex.
Cretella	McCarthy	Tollefson
Cunningham	McConnell	Trimble
Dague	McCormack	Tuck
Davis, Ga.	McDonough	Udall
Davis, Tenn.	McDowell	Van Pelt
Davis, Wis.	McGregor	Van Zandt
Dawson, Utah	McIntire	Vorys
Devereux	McMillan	Vursell
Dies	McVey	Walter
Dingell	Machrowicz	Weaver
Dondero	Mack, Ill.	Westland
Dorn, N. Y.	Mack, Wash.	Wickersham
Dorn, S. C.	Madden	Wier
Ellsworth	Magnuson	Wigglesworth
Engle	Mahon	Williams, Miss.
Fallon	Mailliard	Williams, N. J.
Fenton	Marshall	Winstead
Fernandez	Matthews	Withrow
Fino	Meader	Wolcott
Fisher	Merrow	Wright
	Miller, Md.	Young
	Miller, Nebr.	
	Mills	

NAYS—4

Bosch	Thomson, Wyo.
Christopher	Yates

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Pelly

NOT VOTING—180

Addonizio	Anfuso	Bass, Tenn.
Albert	Arends	Bates
Alexander	Ashmore	Baumhart
Allen, Ill.	Barden	Becker
Belcher	Hale	Patterson
Bell	Halleck	Philbin
Bentley	Harden	Phillips
Berry	Hays, Ohio	Pilcher
Betts	Healey	Pillion
Boland	Herlong	Powell
Bolton, Oliver P.	Heselton	Prouty
Bowler	Hess	Rabaut
Buckley	Hillings	Radwan
Burleson	Hinshaw	Rains
Byrd	Hoeven	Reece, Tenn.
Canfield	Hoffman, Ill.	Reed, N. Y.
Carlyle	Hoffman, Mich.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Carnahan	Holifield	Richards
Chiperfield	Holland	Rivers
Cole	Holt	Roberts
Corbett	Holtzman	Roosevelt
Crumpacker	Hope	Rutherford
Curtis, Mass.	Hosmer	Sadlak
Curtis, Mo.	Jarman	St. George
Davidson	Jenkins	Saylor
Dawson, Ill.	Jennings	Scrivner
Deane	Johansen	Scudder
Delaney	Jones, N. C.	Seely-Brown
Dempsey	Karsten	Sheehan
Denton	Kearns	Shelley
Derounian	Kelley, Pa.	Sheppard
Diggs	Kelly, N. Y.	Sieminski
Dixon	Kilburn	Sikes
Dodd	King, Calif.	Simpson, Pa.
Dollinger	King, Pa.	Smith, Wis.
Dolliver	Kirwan	Taber
Donohue	Klein	Taylor
Donovan	Krueger	Teague, Tex.
Dowdy	Lane	Thomas
Doyle	Lanham	Thompson, La.
Durham	Latham	Thornberry
Eberharter	Lesinski	Tumulty
Edmondson	Lipscomb	Utt
Elliott	McCulloch	Vanik
Evins	Macdonald	Velde
Fascell	Martin	Vinson
Feighan	Mason	Wainwright
Flood	Metcalf	Watts
Fountain	Miller, Calif.	Wharton
Fulton	Miller, N. Y.	Whitten
Garmatz	Mollohan	Widnall
Gavin	Morano	Williams, N. Y.
Gentry	Morgan	Willis
Gray	Moss	Wilson, Calif.
Green, Pa.	Moulder	Wilson, Ind.
Gregory	Norrell	Wolverton
Griffiths	O'Brien, N. Y.	Younger
Gubser	O'Hara, Minn.	Zablocki
Gwinn	O'Neill	Zelenko
Hagen	Osmers	
	Patman	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Heselton for, with Mr. Pelly against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Fountain with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Durham with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Deane with Mr. Wolverton.

Mr. Carlyle with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Alexander with Mr. Becker.

Mr. Denton with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Krueger.

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Lanham with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Dolliver.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Hess.

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Bentley.

Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Betts.

Mr. Flood with Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. Fascell with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Hoeven.

Mr. King of California with Mr. Hillings.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Sheehan.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Reed of New York.

Mr. Roberts with Mr. Derounian.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. Gregory with Mrs. Harden.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Berry.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Baumhart.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Kearns.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Williams of New York.
Mr. Karsten with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Albert with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Dodd with Mr. Patterson.
Mr. Miller of California with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Dixon.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Tumulty with Mr. Morano.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Hagen with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Scrivner.
Mr. O'Neil with Mr. Seely-Brown.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Holt.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Hale.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Wilson of California.
Mr. Bowler with Mr. Younger.
Mr. Byrd with Mr. Pillion.
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Prouty.
Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Buckley with Gubser.
Mr. Donovan with Mr. Bates.
Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Johansen.
Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Scudder.
Mr. Healey with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Cole.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.
Mr. Davidson with Mr. Wainwright.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Radwan.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Sieminski with Mr. Crumpacker.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. McDonough.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. HESELTON. If he were present, he would have voted "aye." I voted "no." Therefore, I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO SECURE A VOTE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that this session of the Congress has only a few weeks remaining. Yet, one of the most important matters before this House has not yet been brought to the floor. H. R. 627, a bill to strengthen and protect the civil rights of all Americans, has now been reported from the Judiciary Committee. This bill is supported by the administration. It has the support of Members on both sides of this House. It is not and should not be a partisan issue. It should be brought promptly to the floor for debate and passage.

I want to include in my remarks the statement below, signed by Congressmen of both parties, stating our intention to file a discharge petition on H. R. 627 and our reasons for our action.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States are watching us and depending on us to act promptly and vigorously on this bill. They, too, know that time is short and that this bill is of the greatest importance. They rely on us to be sure that we act in good time. In order to keep faith with the people of this country we are taking this action to demonstrate, without partisan consideration, our determination that no precaution will be neglected to make sure that we meet our obligation and that this Congress consider and pass this needed legislation to assure to every American that, in the exercise of his personal rights, his Government offers support and protection.

MAY 29, 1956.

TO SECURE A VOTE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

On behalf of those Members interested in civil-rights legislation who attended a meeting held on Tuesday, May 29, the following statement is authorized:

It is the earnest hope of all Members that the Rules Committee will shortly grant a rule and that the leadership will schedule a vote on H. R. 627, the civil-rights bill. We particularly emphasize this because all Members prefer to follow the established and normal legislative procedure. It is for this reason that, in spite of tremendous pressure from our constituents, we have waited until the very last moment before initiating a procedure authorized by the House rules for the specific purpose of satisfying unusual situations.

We have, therefore, agreed in order that there may be a certainty of bringing H. R. 627 before the House for a decisive vote, that a petition to discharge the Rules Committee from further consideration of H. R. 627 will be placed on the Clerk's desk Tuesday, June 5. This is the very latest date possible in order to insure consideration of this petition as authorized by the Rules of the House on the fourth Monday in June—June 25. This will give barely 1 week to secure the necessary 218 signatures to qualify for consideration by June 25. Again, we would emphasize that this procedure is not intended as showing a lack of confidence in the Rules Committee, and we emphasize that the petition becomes inoperative if the Rules Committee acts at any time prior to 7 legislative days before June 25. It does, however, make sure that any difficulties encountered in the Rules Committee can be overcome by a majority of the House membership sufficiently prior to the closing rush of the session. We feel that the real sincerity of Members of both parties in their devotion to civil rights will be indicated by their willingness to sign this standby petition.

There will also be formed within a few days a parliamentary and steering committee charged with the responsibility of informing all Members on the parliamentary situation and with the responsibility for guiding the legislation on the floor of the House. Congressman MELVIN PRICE, Democrat, of Illinois, and Congressman THOMAS M. PELLY, Republican, of Washington, will act as cochairmen of the parliamentary and steering committee. On behalf of themselves and other Members who indicated the desire to be present and to assist the program, the following have affixed their signatures:

JAMES ROOSEVELT; MELVIN PRICE; THOMAS M. PELLY; Mrs. JOHN B. (LEONOR K.) SULLIVAN; RAY MADDEN; LAURENCE CURTIS; SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL; CHARLES B. BROWNSON; JOHN F. BALDWIN, Jr.; CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr.; BARRATT O'HARA; ROY W. WIER; Mrs. EDITH GREEN; HARRISON A. WILLIAMS; ELMER J. HOLLAND; FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.; STEWART L. UDALL; B. F. SISK; HENRY S. REUSS; CHARLES A. BOYLE; CHARLES A. VANIK; DON HAYWORTH; JOHN D. DINGELL; RICHARD BOLLING.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week and the following week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight Friday night, June 1, 1956, to file a conference report on the bills H. R. 6143 and H. R. 7247.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

ITALIAN REPUBLIC

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday marks the 10th anniversary of the Italian Republic. This is an occasion for great rejoicing in the free world, as we contemplate the gigantic steps taken by our friends in Italy along the road to stability and security.

One of the primary objectives of postwar United States foreign policy has been to strengthen the free world against the spread of communism in order to attain for all the world a measure of peace and protection. Italy has been a strategic area in this struggle to prevent the expansion of Communist influence, and the rebuilding of her shattered economy has thus been a task of the highest priority. The achievements of the Italians in this work have been

truly remarkable and though our aid has helped them, the accomplishment and the credit should be largely theirs.

Economic recovery was certainly not easily obtained. Not only had the democratic processes in this noble land been frozen for 22 years under Facist domination, but of course, the war disrupted the Italian economy completely. 4 million homes were destroyed, inflation was rampant and unemployment widespread in 1946, when the new Italian Republic came into being. Although the situation seemed hopeless, Italian determination and energy, coupled with outside aid, succeeded in making the nation's economy active and dynamic once again.

Italy's comeback in the short span of 10 years has been amazing. I have visited the country four times in the postwar years and have always seen on all sides signs of progress. Industrial production has been doubled, agricultural development is up 20 percent and deposits and savings have increased 71 times. Economic progress continues today, with emphasis on reclamation and irrigation undertakings in agriculture, development of public utility services and extension of public works.

Tangible evidence of Italian economic recovery is shown in statistics recently released by OEEC which include Italy among the countries which have made the greatest progress in the postwar period.

All of us are familiar with the ways in which the economic instability which existed in Italy after the war was exploited by the Communists. They fomented a series of strikes, riots and violence designed to obstruct economic recovery and destroy confidence in the new democratic government. Fortunately, Premier Alcide De Gasperi's Christian Democrat Party held the line against the Communists and the Italian people united and worked hard to put their country back on its feet.

Communism, of course, is still a threat to the Republic, though less so than before. The brightening of the economic picture and the strong stand of the country's leaders have greatly decreased the menace. A number of protective measures have been adopted. These include placing East-West trade under government control, to deny that important source of revenue to the Communist underground; strengthening the Italian police so that the Reds dare not challenge it; screening personnel holding positions of responsibility in the government; and decreasing the hold of Communist dominated unions over organized labor.

Despite these problems of economic recovery and communism which have been with the Republic since its birth, Italy has been an active leader in programs for European integration and cooperation. She has been a vigorous member of the Council of Europe, OEEC and the Coal and Steel Community. She was one of the first to ratify membership in the Western European Union.

By signing the Atlantic Pact in 1949, Italy pledged her powers to the common cause of the Western democracies. Although her struggles to gain economic and political stability imposed great limitations, Italy has made substantial contributions to NATO. Assistance from the United States has aided greatly in enabling the Italians to rebuild their military strength and meet their NATO commitments. Today, Italy's army is reequipped and reorganized. All branches of her armed forces have high morale, and have become efficient and well trained. They are an effective and integral part of the defense structure of Western Europe.

Today, as the anniversary of the establishment of the Republic approaches, the Italian economy is stable, communism has been held in check and Italy is an important member of the Western alliance. These accomplishments, achieved in but 10 years, are gratifying to all people of the free world.

Giovanni Gronchi, Italy's straight-talking President, who made such a fine impression when he addressed us not long ago, said on that occasion:

> Italy can be trusted, because of the capacity and willingness to work of their managers, technicians, and labor, and also because of her faithfulness to democratic ideals and her firm determination to defend and expand their accomplishments.

With these qualities—proven so ably in 10 dynamic years of progress since 1946—Italy shall not fail in her quest for peace, serenity and security. In that quest, the United States will always be at her side, aiding whenever possible, so that Italy shall remain with us, a stalwart champion of freedom and a vigorous defender of the democratic ideal.

On this Saturday, the 10th anniversary of the proclaiming of the Italian Republic, we wish her Godspeed, good luck, and continued success as she forges ahead to the bright future which must surely lie ahead.

UNFAIR PRACTICES IN RETAIL AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced in the House of Representatives a bill which is intended to relieve the retail automobile industry of many of its unfair practices. It amends the Federal Trade Commission Act to proscribe automobile bootlegging and certain other automobile marketing practices. From personal knowledge I am well aware of the specific problems facing the industry and I earnestly believe that the subject bill will go a long way toward correcting many of the unfortunate situations.

In order that automobile dealers may be advised of the various features of the bill, Mr. Speaker, I am including an analysis of the measure which explains its provisions section by section.

A. ANALYSIS OF BILL

First. In general, the bill is a new section to be added to the Federal Trade Commission Act. It provides that certain practices by automobile manufacturers and automobile dealers are unfair methods of competition and unfair acts or practices in commerce. It provides for the policing of these practices by two methods: recourse to the Federal Trade Commission and recourse to the courts.

The unfair trade practices specified are: the forcing of unwanted products on automobile dealers; the sale by automobile dealers of cars in bootleg channels without affording the manufacturer an opportunity to repurchase; the refusal of the manufacturer to so repurchase if financially able to do so; the requiring of dealers to maintain service and warranty facilities without an equitable system of compensation from manufacturers; the cancellation of dealers' franchises for reasons not specified therein and where there has been reasonable performance of those conditions; and the termination of a dealer's contract without effectuating a fair liquidation of the assets of the dealership.

B. ANALYSIS OF SPECIFIC PROVISIONS

Section 1: One of the results of our study and analysis of automobile marketing practices disclosed that a principal complaint of dealers was that they were required to accept merchandise which they did not wish. This was particularly true as related to the practice of bootlegging.

Paragraph (1) is designed to prohibit manufacturers from coercing, intimidating or discriminating against any of its dealers in order to force such dealers to accept merchandise which the factory wishes them to take and which they do not desire.

The techniques employed by the factories to accomplish the distribution of unwanted merchandise are many, diverse and often devious. The most direct and blunt technique used is to state, "you will accept what we assign to you or else lose your franchise." All gradations from that extreme to mere persuasions are used by the manufacturers to force the dealers to accept unwanted merchandise.

Another technique employed is the so-called tie-in method. To illustrate: if there is a fast-moving model and the dealer desires four of those vehicles, and the manufacturer has a slow-moving model, or trucks, then the manufacturer states, "in order to receive the 4 fast-moving models, you will have to take 2 trucks or 2 of the slow-moving models." Paragraph (1) is designed to prohibit the practice of tie-in sales.

It is to be noted that the phrase "any product of any kind" is used rather than the phrase "motor vehicles." This was purposely so worded because the practice of forcing is not confined to motor vehicles. It also is engaged in by manufacturers with respect to automotive parts and accessories and advertising media.

The factories have demanded that various advertising programs be participated in by its dealers in quantities and amounts satisfactory to the manufacturer.

The wording of paragraph (1) is simple, direct, and inclusive enough to

place in a position of complete independence and freedom of action a dealer with respect to his factory regarding commodities which he orders and accepts. The effect of this paragraph will be to also confer an independence of business judgment upon the dealer not currently enjoyed. In doing this it must be recognized that along with this independence of business judgment goes the responsibility of being held accountable for the exercise of this judgment. The dealer can no longer shift the blame upon the factory because of the quantity of any product that he finds himself with.

The effect of the enforcement of this paragraph also tends to remove one of the principal explanations offered by bootleg dealers as to why they bootleg—namely, they were forced to take more automobiles than they wanted and could sell by normal means and through normal channels.

When coupled with the second paragraph, paragraph (1) will bring about the abolition of the practice of bootlegging. As we know, bootlegging has been acclaimed to be the number one ill of the automobile industry for the past 3 years.

It must be clearly recognized that the language used in paragraph (1) does not in any way preclude or encroach upon the right of the manufacturer to engage in proper selling techniques in order to persuade its dealers to purchase its products. The language selected "to induce by means of coercion, intimidation, or discrimination" is designed to embrace all forms of improper persuasion to purchase and accept for delivery products of any kind.

Section 2: This section prohibits a dealer from bootlegging new automobiles. It requires that two steps be employed before a dealer may sell, other than to another dealer of his same make, a new car to be resold as a new car. First, the dealer must afford his factory an opportunity to repurchase the car at the price paid therefor and second, the factory, if able to do so, must repurchase. If the factory is unable to repurchase then the dealer is at liberty to sell.

This provision places the major responsibility for the amount of production upon the manufacturer. It would take a long stride forward in the area which has perennially been the most demoralizing problem of the automobile industry, that is, the conflict of interest between the manufacturer and the dealer with regard to the number of cars to be produced and sold each year.

In actual practice under this provision, a dealer could lose $50 to $100 on each car he resells to the manufacturer because of freight, storage, interest, and insurance charges. This, coupled with the fact that a dealer must sell cars to the public to make any money, is adequate to insure reasonable selling effort on the part of the dealer.

Mr. Harlow H. Curtice, president of General Motors, in his testimony before the subcommittee urged legislation along these lines. He described it as "a proposed new clause which, in effect, required the dealer to offer cars back to us at dealer's cost before disposing of them in bootleg channels." He also said "such a clause would have the effect of minimizing possible overproduction and maldistribution. The dealer would be careful to order only cars that he could expect to sell at retail. The manufacturer's representatives in the field responsible for distribution would avoid maldistribution in order not to be in the position of repurchasing or refusing to repurchase cars. The factory would schedule production carefully to avoid overproduction."

Furthermore, General Motors more than a year ago agreed, on its part, to accept new cars back at dealer's cost. This included freight costs to dealership concerned, and to the subsequent outlet. Therefore, as a matter of practice, this bill requires the manufacturer to do even less than what General Motors presently offers to relieve its dealers of excess stocks.

Smaller manufacturers have little difficulty with bootleg sales, and a good deal less difficulty in scheduling production than do the big three. Also, under the application of this section, they would not have to compete with the bootleg market of big three cars.

Section 3: Requires the manufacturer to establish a reasonable system of compensating all of its dealers for maintaining personnel and facilities required to discharge warranty obligations.

This section is designed to eliminate loss incurred by a nonselling dealer in discharging the warranty responsibility for an automobile sold by another dealer. At the same time it ensures to the using public that facilities, parts and accessories and trained personnel will be readily available to maintain and service automobiles throughout their useful life.

Section 4, subsection A: In effect, this section will force automobile manufacturers to spell out in specific terms the provisions in the franchise, the breach of which is grounds for canceling the franchise. The dealer is entitled to know specifically what his rights and duties are when he invests his money and time in a dealership. Also, because the contract will be specific, and not "to the manufacturer's satisfaction," the dealer will have the right to sue for breach of contract in a State court in whose jurisdiction he resides if the manufacturer breaches the contract. Also, he would of course have redress to the Federal Trade Commission as well.

Section 4, subsection B: This subsection exacts of the dealer a standard of reasonable performance of the myriad obligations contained in the franchise. Consequently, if a dealer fell one car short of any sales quota imposed on him by the franchise in a given month, but in other months exceeded his quota, or generally kept up with it, he would not be subject to cancellation. This would at least be a question of fact for the court to determine in the event the dealer elected to bring action under this bill.

Section 5: This section recognizes the economic interdependence between manufacturer and dealer after termination. This has been long recognized in the trade. For example, the General Motors contract of 1954 devotes more than 4 of its 20 pages to the rights and duties of the parties after termination. Furthermore, the committee has had much testimony regarding the economic veto which the manufacturer has and uses over prospective purchasers—thus taking the disposition of the dealership off of the free market, both as to purchasers and as to amount to be paid by purchasers. General Motors has recently taken forward steps along these very lines, especially regarding termination because of death.

The words "fail to renew" are contained in this section. It should be noted that there is no prohibition against the failure to renew. It merely imposes upon the manufacturer a recognition of his duties to help effect an equitable liquidation of the dealer's assets that go along with his rights in the disposition of the business. It is therefore not felt that any constitutional gamut is run by this section.

RACKETEERING IN LABOR UNIONS

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, last week I discussed the case of Victor Riesel and introduced a resolution authorizing an investigation by the Committee on Education and Labor of racketeering in labor unions. Members will recall that Mr. Riesel, a New York labor columnist, was permanently blinded on April 5 when sulfuric acid was thrown in his face. The incident followed a radio broadcast in which Riesel attacked racketeering in the International Union of Operating Engineers. He said later he was convinced that his denunciations of extortionists in the union had provoked the assault.

I wish to call the attention of the Members to an editorial entitled "The Falcon Is Hooded." This editorial appeared in the May 25 edition of the Washington Report, which is published weekly by the United States Chamber of Commerce. I should like to include that editorial at this point in my remarks:

THE FALCON IS HOODED

Last April 5, someone pitched the contents of a vial of sulphuric acid in the eyes of a newspaper reporter.

The reporter was Victor Riesel, of the New York Daily Mirror, whose labor column has been widely syndicated among newspapers of various political persuasions.

The incident occurred on the heels of a radio broadcast by Mr. Riesel in which he referred to certain labor leaders who had been convicted of extortion. Mr. Riesel recently has been told that he has lost his sight for life.

While one man's eyes have been burned out, the fact of the Riesel case is this:

The vision of the entire American public has been diminished and obscured.

Some say that Mr. Riesel's column has sometimes been prolabor. Others say it has sometimes been antilabor. That would appear to balance. That he was an expert in his reporting field has not been questioned.

No question of prolabor or antilabor is involved in the Riesel case. He was a reporter.

No more. No less. In pursuit of his profession, he was, as all legitimate reporters are, the eyes and ears of a sizable share of the American people—who cannot be in two places at one and the same time.

A falcon has been hooded with a mask that can never be untied.

What happens now?

Rewards for the apprehension of the acid-thrower have been piling up. Sympathetic comment has been widely printed.

Is that enough?

It would appear that the very institution of the free press—on which our basic liberties are founded—has been assailed.

This is an outrage to organized labor—and to organized business.

If the "someone" who threw the acid in Victor Riesel's eyes was indeed a henchman for a labor union, that union is in the same class as an enterprise condemned by a better business bureau for including poisonous ingredients in a supposedly edible product.

In particular, it would appear that this violence against a reporter is the responsibility of the American newspaper profession.

What happened to Mr. Riesel could happen to any reporter—now.

Is the newspaper profession going to deliver to the courts and the court of public opinion the "someone" and "the someones behind the someone" who tossed the acid? Or will the story fade away into the limbo of yesterday's sensations, forgotten in the excitement of today's events?

In its great respect for the newspaper profession, Washington Report believes that the newspaper profession, and only the newspaper profession is equipped, to trade down the source of this violence to the first amendment.

In its faith in the newspaper profession, Washington Report believes that the newspaper profession will maintain an unceasing hunt for the rude hands and vicious minds that dared to trespass on the rights of an institution devoted to the enlightenment of us all.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial raises a very important question: Is freedom of the press being attacked or jeopardized when a newspaperman has acid thrown in his face, apparently in retaliation for what he says in newspaper articles or radio broadcasts? What has been the psychological effect, on other newspapermen, of the attack on Victor Riesel? Has their freedom to print certain facts been restricted as a result of fear of such attacks?

These are extremely significant questions. I agree with the editorial in Washington Report that this matter should be studied by the Nation's newspapers. A few years ago the Freedom of Information Committee of the American Society of Newspaper Editors considered the question of whether freedom of the press was violated when a newspaper editor was called before a congressional committee and was questioned about things he had written. This was an important question and deserved the attention it received. However, the Riesel case seems to raise equally important questions. Offhand, I should think that fear of being blinded by sulphuric acid would be at least as restrictive to the freedom of the press as being called before a congressional committee. It is my intention to write Mr. J. Russell Wiggins, a member of the Freedom of Information Committee, and suggest that his committee look into this matter.

Mr. Speaker, the blinding of Mr. Riesel, and the possible intimidation of our Nation's press because of such acts of violence, also raises questions regarding the responsibility of Congress. I have today introduced a resolution suggesting that freedom of the press may have been jeopardized by the Riesel case. The resolution authorizes and directs the House Judiciary Committee to investigate the attack on Mr. Riesel, and to make recommendations as to whether any special steps should be taken to protect newspapermen from intimidation and assault.

The Nation's press performs a vital role under our system of government. It must be protected. The Nation itself would suffer if intimidation of our newspapermen were to be permitted. The House Judiciary Committee might well examine the advisability of extending certain protections to our newspapermen. It could consider, for example, making it a Federal crime to assault a newspaperman because of activities carried out in the line of duty.

If the resolution which I have introduced is adopted, the Judiciary Committee might also seek answers to the following questions:

First. Was freedom of the press actually jeopardized by the assault on Riesel?

Second. What has been the general psychological effect of the Riesel case on other reporters?

Third. How effective are State and local law enforcement officers, generally, in protecting newspapermen?

Fourth. What can and should Congress do in protecting newspapermen from intimidation? Should they be afforded certain Federal protections?

Fifth. Should it be made a Federal crime to assault or attempt to intimidate a newspaperman in connection with activities performed in the line of duty?

SOVIET SPY NETWORK IN AMERICA

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the old saying that complaints depend sometimes on "whose ox is gored," is called to mind by testimony taken before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate, recently made public.

Some of us remember the howling and the yowling of the leftwingers and the anti-anti-Communists when Senator JOE MCCARTHY was calling attention to the activities of some of the Communists at Fort Monmouth.

What a furore was created by the leftwing press. Remember how JOE was condemned, misused, abused, and lied about? Well, now apparently a similar job is being done by a highly respected and competent Member of the other body who is heading this committee and by some of his equally patriotic and vigilant associates.

On May 21, Constantine Brown, an astute observer and accurate narrator, commented on the situation as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of May 21, 1956]

SOVIET SPY NETWORK IN AMERICA—TESTIMONY OF FORMER RED AGENTS SEEN AS VINDICATION OF MCCARTHY

(By Constantine Brown)

A sensational story of 2 years ago, widely publicized in the press and on television, was the Army-McCarthy hearing which eventually ended in condemnation of the Wisconsin Senator by the Senate.

The basis for that spectacular row between an investigating committee and the Army Department, headed by Secretary Stevens, was the accusation by Senator MCCARTHY and his staff that the Army was coddling Communists who had imbedded themselves at Fort Monmouth.

The Army said it started the investigation because MCCARTHY had used "undue influence" to get a commission for one of his staffers, David Schine. At the same time, it insisted that there had been no espionage at Fort Monmouth and that only a routine error had been made in the promotion of Maj. Peress.

Last Thursday the testimony under oath of a former Soviet employee of the Soviet Signal Corps Research Institute in Moscow was read into the record of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate, and then made public. For security reasons the witness did not appear in public hearing and his evidence was given under the assumed name of "Andriyeve." When he fled from the U. S. S. R. and how he reached this country are also kept secret.

The testimony bore out entirely the accusation of Senator MCCARTHY that there had been large-scale espionage at Fort Monmouth since 1944 when Mr. Andriyeve first joined his outfit. One of his functions was to examine a series of documents in foreign language "90 percent of which were of American origin and 10 percent of British and French origin."

When asked by Committee Counsel Robert Morris whether they had originated at Fort Monmouth or the Signal Corps, the reply was: "One batch emanated from Fort Monmouth and the other from RCA. I could not tell you exactly which RCA laboratories because I don't remember."

When Mr. Morris asked for an approximation of the quantities of documents examined and translated by the witness over a period of years the reply was "thousands."

The Army Department was queried by reporters soon after the end of Thursday's hearings. Its spokesman pointed out that during the war we exchanged military information with the U. S. S. R.; hence it would have been natural that the Soviet Signal Corps Research Institute should have in its possession data about our then novel radar and other such things.

But in his sworn testimony Andriyeve stated: "The documents came from the Sepetsotdel (secret police section) and had to do with high power, supersonic frequency, and ultra-high frequency tubes that are used for radar. Some of them would be photocopies or photostats that evidently came in originally from the United States; others were enlargements, blowups from microfilms which got into the Soviet Union from America and were developed and enlarged at some local Soviet level. The vast majority of them had classification marks such as 'secret,' 'top secret,' or only 'confidential.'"

When asked how he thought they came into possession of his agency the answer was: "The only thing I can tell you is that when we would tell the secret police officer in what you may call a facetious way 'where

did you steal them' he would say 'shut up; it is none of your business. Your business is to try to find out how to use them. It is our business how to get them.'"

Insofar as Andriyeve could tell the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee the flow of documents continued through 1945 after he had been transferred from the Signal Corps Research Institute to the manufacture of radar parts.

It is, of course, accurate that we did give the U. S. S. R. some technical information of minor importance. The Pentagon's official policy was to keep away from the Russians our major technical inventions and know-how. This was, however, a policy which the Soviet agents in this country knew how to counteract. What they could not obtain officially they got through ideological stooges who had sensitive positions in the Government.

The revelations of the former Soviet official will change nothing, of course, in McCARTHY'S status as a "censored Senator." The Republicans in the Senate feel that they cannot afford to raise the question that he was censured too hastily and that there was some real foundation for the accusation of Communist infiltration at Fort Monmouth because they would go counter to the wishes of the executive branch of the party. The Democrats have no reason to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for an opponent whose activities cost them some seats in the 1952 election.

Yes, sometimes it makes a difference who is doing the prodding. Let us all be thankful that the job JOE undertook is being carried on.

STATUS OF FORCES AGREEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has now reported to the House the Mutual Security Act of 1956. I am amazed to find in the report this statement. I quote:

> The committee urges that the status-of-forces problem be faced directly and considered on its merits. It should not be used as a device for attacking the mutual security program.

Considering the facts, this statement borders on hypocrisy.

Before commenting further on this report however I want to remind this body that the NATO Status of Forces Agreement, signed in London in 1951, was a complete abandonment by our country of the rule of international law that the armed forces of a friendly nation, stationed in the territory of another with the latter's permission, are subject only to the laws of their own country. This rule had been recognized and ably restated by our great Chief Justice Marshall in the case of *The Schooner Exchange* v. *McFaddon* (11 U. C. 116). In our jurisprudence it has never been questioned. It has been cited with approval by many authorities in other countries.

I will read you a paragraph from a brief on this subject which was once prepared by our State Department. I quote:

> To summarize, it will have been seen from what has been said above that by the almost unanimous opinion of writers on international law, and jurists that have dealt with the subject, members of the armed forces of a state on foreign territory with the consent of the territorial sovereign are immune from the local jurisdiction in criminal matters. These views are based on and supported by international practice as well as reason.

Our Defense Department too has stated this rule in the United States Manual for Courts-Martial, 1951. The manual has never been changed, in spite of the Status of Forces Agreements and reads in paragraph 12 as follows:

> Under international law, jurisdiction over members of the Armed Forces of the United States or other sovereign who commit offenses in the territory of a friendly foreign state in which the visiting armed force is by consent quartered or in passage, remains in the visiting sovereign.

If this right had not been given away by our representatives there would now be no status of forces problem.

The committee has had every opportunity during the past year to face the status-of-forces problem directly—and to give the House an opportunity to express the sentiments of all. Last year, on May 18, 1955, I introduced House Joint Resolution 309 which would have directed the President to seek a modification of the Status of Forces Agreement, and similar agreements, which surrender our servicemen abroad to the criminal jurisdiction of foreign courts. The purpose of this resolution was to reclaim such jurisdiction and thereby restore to our servicemen the constitutional rights of which they had been deprived. If such modification could not be secured, then the President would have been authorized to denounce the treaty. All this procedure, mind you, being strictly in accordance with the provisions of the Status of Forces Agreement. Identical resolutions were subsequently offered by 14 of my colleagues.

Extensive hearings were held by the Foreign Affairs Committee but no report was made to the House. If you did not see the news release at the time, you may not know that the committee on March 8, 1956, voted against reporting my resolution to the House. Nineteen members of the committee thereby deprived 416 other Members of the House of the opportunity of voting on the resolution and thereby meeting the issue squarely.

These 19 committee members ignored the preponderance of the testimony developed during the hearings. They ignored the wishes of the majority of this body which had been plainly expressed last year in adopting by a vote of 174 to 56 the amendment which I offered to the first Reserve bill, to restrict the sending of troops abroad to countries which exercised criminal jurisdiction over our men.

I regret that the Members of the House may not have the time to study the testimony developed at the hearings on House Joint Resolution 309. In my opinion the hearings established these facts:

That prior to the negotiation of the Status of Forces Agreement the United States had always exercised exclusive jurisdiction over members of its Armed Forces everywhere abroad.

That surrendering jurisdiction to foreign governments was forced on the Defense Department by internationalists in the State Department who were currying favor abroad by deprecating our resources and capabilities and cutting us down to the level of our dependent allies.

That there is no evidence that we were forced to surrender our rights or that any nation demanded it, although that is suggested by defenders of the treaty.

That the various agreements were negotiated without investigation of foreign laws or prison conditions and without consideration of the cost to our servicemen in losing their constitutional protections.

That the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was not properly advised by advocates of the treaty when it considered ratification.

That our troops abroad are protecting foreign nations where they are stationed and boosting foreign economies by the spending that results from their duty there; and resulting benefit to us as a defense line is secondary and even highly questionable if it should be needed.

That there is no question that a serviceman loses even the minimal rights granted by our Constitution when he is tried in a foreign court. Studies of the Judge Advocate General's Department confirm this.

That prisoners actually serving sentences in England, France, and Japan have said they would have preferred to have been tried by our own court-martial. They were not concerned that if found guilty they might possibly have received more severe sentences. They felt they would not have been found guilty except after a fair trial, and would have been tried by their compatriots. Most of them believed they had been deprived of a proper defense.

That there is no evidence that a request for a modification in the agreements as to jurisdiction over our troops would result in a demand for their withdrawal or other consequences with which defenders of the agreements try to frighten us.

That there is a growing demand from the citizens of our country for a change in these agreements, as more people become aware of the situation.

That House Joint Resolution 309 was the appropriate way in which to advise the President that it is the will of the Nation that these treaties and agreements be changed or terminated, and to empower him to take action.

Those are the facts which the hearings brought out most forcibly, and the reasons why the fight to modify these status agreements must be continued, by whatever means may be left to us, since the committee has closed the door on a vote on my resolution, House Joint Resolution 309.

Having made it impossible for you to vote independently on the issue, the committee now says it should not be used as a device for attacking the mutual security program. Yet the committee is now using this present report on the Mutual Security Act as a vehicle for attacking House Joint Resolution 309 on which it

failed to make a report. Presumptuously, the committee says: "You dare not mention the Status of Forces Agreements or the plight of our servicemen abroad, but we will use the Mutual Security Act as a shield to protect the Status of Forces Agreement."

This belated mention by the committee of the hearings which were held on House Joint Resolution 309 contains such misleading and untrue statements that I feel obiged to disobey their admonition and to comment thereon. I hope to straighten out what appears to be very confused thinking.

Either to stifle an attack of conscience for refusing to report House Joint Resolution 309 to the House, or in a clever move to stifle further efforts to secure a change in these Status of Forces Agreements, the committee on April 13, 1956, appointed a subcommittee whose responsibility seems somewhat limited. According to the present report this subcommittee is charged with "keeping informed of decisions by our courts"—including the Supreme Court—"on certain pending cases which are relevant to this issue."

I call your attention to the cases which are listed in the report as receiving the continued attention of the subcommittee. The first three, referred to as the Toth, Krueger and Covert cases, involve only the question of the right to try civilians in military courts under present laws. Any connection with the Status of Forces Agreement is very remote. The right of foreign governments to prosecute our servicemen or their dependents, or the civilian components of our Armed Forces, in foreign courts is not considered.

I fail to understand why the subcommittee should continue to observe the Keefe case. It reached a conclusion in 1954. Keefe has now finished serving his term of imprisonment in a French jail, has been returned home, and has been discharged as an undesirable—just a shade less than a dishonorable discharge. This case did arise because of the Status of Forces Agreement, however. It was probably the first action to open the eyes of the American people to the fact that our servicemen abroad had been made second-class citizens. Once turned over to a foreign court for trial an accused became an involuntary expatriate. Even the President could not have pardoned Keefe—or any other serviceman surrendered to foreign jurisdiction.

The fifth case listed, known as the May case, involving four servicemen tried in a Japanese court, should certainly be watched. It raises the very interesting question as to the validity of the present agreement with Japan. However, a decision on the validity of the Japanese agreement will have no bearing on the validity of the NATO Status of Forces Agreement or other similar Executive agreements.

The present report contains the Defense Department statistics showing that up to November 30, 1955, there were 10,249 of our servicemen subjected to foreign jurisdiction. You are supposed to be impressed by the fact that 266 of these were tried and sentenced to confinement, because that is only 2.59 per cent of the total. If only 266 were imprisoned after trials which denied them the privileges of our Constitution does that make the treaty less onerous? And what of the 2,595 who were tried and punished by fine? Does the fact that they paid only in money make the loss of their constitutional rights more bearable?

The report does not tell you that in the same period only three servicemen of foreign countries met with any criminal prosecution in this country. This shows up as ridiculous the reciprocal features of the agreement which its proponents love to prate about.

Neither does the report tell you that in some foreign countries it is common practice to try a civil claim for damages along with the prosecution for crime. That is one of the reasons for so many arrests and charges—a form of blackmail. An accused can pay and sometimes secure a waiver of the charges, hoping his own court-martial authorities will ignore the charges. That happens you know. Or the accused can stand trial and have his guilt determined on testimony of witnesses who have a financial stake in securing his guilt.

The Army commander in France has stated that the French procedure of combining trial of criminal and civil actions is a persistent source of irriation and dissatisfaction, that civil issues are permitted to influence criminal issues, and vice versa, contrary to basic concepts of American jurisprudence.

We all know that a greater degree of proof is required in our country to convict a man of crime than to take his dollars for a civil claim. Yet Monroe Leigh, carrying the title of Assistant General Counsel for International Affairs, Department of Defense, is not concerned by the practice abroad. He told a Senate committee, and I quote him:

> I have not been able to see why the joining of these two actions is inherently unjust.

That is an example of the callous type of thinking of some of our internationally minded officials. Mr. Leigh's sympathies certainly do not lie with our servicemen. He was indoctrinated by the State Department quite early, during his employment in that Department, where the idea of surrendering the rights of our servicemen abroad was first spawned. There are other graduates of the State Department school of thought serving now in legal capacities with the Defense Department, who continue to combat the natural wish of service commanders to exercise complete jurisdiction over their forces.

The report says that the hearings did not bring to light a single instance where it is claimed that an American serviceman believed to be innocent had been imprisoned by a foreign court. That is following the executive department's line which claimed at the hearings that there was not one single instance of any accused receiving an unfair trial. The reports of the observers in some of the trials abroad quickly squelched that claim. Various violations of the agreement were reported and other irregularities disclosed by these observers. If the committee is trying to ignore these reports I will tell them again, as I had to do at the hearings, of one case in Japan where the accused were convicted on testimony which the observers of the trial described as, and these are their words, "not only preposterous and fantastic, but in some respects patently impossible." The observers further said that the conviction was "manifestly unwarranted and unfair, not matter under what rules of law the court is operating." One of the accused, sentenced to 8 years imprisonment, carried an appeal to the court of highest jurisdiction in Japan, which affirmed the findings and sentence of the lower court. The Defense Department has admitted that the original defects in the trial amounting to a denial of justice were not cured.

The use of the expression "believed to be innocent" in this paragraph is also illuminating. The proponents of the Status of Forces Agreement are all too prone to assume the guilt of every serviceman who is arrested by foreign police officers. Is a man's guilt proven by a conviction in a foreign court, in a hostile atmosphere, with faulty interpretation, where the accused is not always confronted by the witnesses against him, cross-examination is a joke, there is no presumption as to the innocence of the accused, no burden of proof on the prosecution, and other constitutional rights are lost?

The committee does recognize that every American feels a natural resentment against the fact that American boys are being tried in foreign courts and imprisoned in foreign jails. The committee further says that if the practical problem of maintaining our present defense posture could be disregarded, the decision on the status of forces issue would involve only the application of logical analysis to legal precedents and moral principles. That is a shameful statement. The committee would not consider legal precedents or moral obligations to our servicemen unless it is expedient to do so. I repeat that this is a shameful thing. For the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this body to base its decisions or reports on expediency.

Now what precedents are they ignoring. There was never any precedent for such a sellout as the Status of Forces Agreement in the history of our country. I believe the precedents which the committee has ignored are the statement by Chief Justice Marshall of the rule of international law which is applicable to this issue—the other decisions in the courts of our land—the position taken by our Government in the Supreme Court of Canada which was approved by a majority of that court—the principle of international law that appears in the United States Manual of Courts-Martial. Stated most simply, that principle of law is that the armed forces of a friendly nation, stationed in the territory of another with the latter's permission, are subject only to the laws of their own country.

There are moral principles involved, of course. One of these may be the matter of drafting or enlisting a man in the service of his country, sending him abroad through no choice of his, then denying him the protection of our Con-

stitution and laws. Another is the creation of two classes of servicemen, subjecting those at home and those abroad to different systems of justice. But I say there are more than moral principles involved. There is your oath to support the Constitution—your obligation to make the rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces. But the committee votes on principles of expediency.

The committee asks in its report what will be the consequences of reopening the issue without following the procedures for modification set forth in the treaty. There is another misleading assumption. I want to remind the committee now that House Joint Resolution 309, which the committee has prevented you from considering, was based entirely on the procedure for modification provided for in the treaty. It scrupulously followed the language of the sections providing for modification and denunciation of the agreement. If the issue is raised now in any other fashion, which the committee does not approve, it is solely the committee's responsibility for refusing to permit you to vote on my resolution.

There are some revealing admissions in this report—that the bargaining power of the United States has diminished in important respects during recent years; that nations are less willing to sacrifice their sovereign rights than they once were, that in nearly all of the countries where our troops are stationed a speaker receives hearty applause if he speaks against subservience to the United States and advocates an independent course. These are all very good reasons why we should promptly demand a change in the Status of Forces Agreements of all kinds so that we can reclaim the right to exercise complete jurisdiction over our own.

Why should we be the ones to sacrifice our sovereign rights to appease those who are unwilling to relinquish their rights. If our bargaining power is steadily declining it is high time that we bargain for the return of our rights before the bargaining power expires entirely. If some nations fear that our air bases are likely to draw attack in time of war how do we know that they have not made secret agreements with certain nations not to permit us to use the bases when we need them most. If other nations where our troops are stationed—and I say it is for the benefit of such nations, aiding in their defense, bolstering their economy with their spending—if such nations are now so unfriendly as to refuse to grant our request for a change in criminal jurisdiction over our troops—then we had better get out of those countries now. They will kick us out anyway whenever they deem expedient—probably when the chips are down and we might need to be there for our own protection as well as theirs.

I am not going to speak at this time on the merits of continuing the foreign aid program. You all know that giving away billions of dollars has not produced any noticeable good will for America or loyalty to our principles, and that there is no guarantee that our military aid will not in the end be used against us, rather than for us. It is therefor all the more tragic that the giveaway program should have included human rights, the constitutional privileges of our servicemen. They have been needlessly and uselessly sacrificed.

We should have learned by this time that a foreign policy which is founded on appeasement and charitable handouts will never succeed. Firmness, strength and good hard business principles are called for now.

Since the committee has brought the status of forces issue into this report but has stifled the consideration of the issue by any other means, I intend to offer an amendment to the Mutual Security Act which will give this body an opportunity to express its opinion on the subject. What does it profit the United States to maintain in the freedom of the peoples of other nations if we sacrifice the rights of our own citizens, guaranteed by the Constitution, when they serve in our Armed Forces, assigned to duty in those nations abroad.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. BUDGE. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Ohio on the struggle which he has been making to protect the constitutional rights of the servicemen of this Nation, and I join with him in the hope that during this session of the Congress the corrective measures which he has outlined can be adopted.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from Idaho not only for his remarks at this point but for the valiant fight he has been making with me to try to regain for American servicemen their rights.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I, too, wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Ohio not only for the statement he is now making, but for his unrelenting fight to secure justice for American servicemen overseas. The gentleman spoke of criminal jurisdiction a moment ago. I am sure he knows that there is now pending in Japan a case wherein the Japanese courts have confiscated the pay of an American Army officer for having fired four alleged Japanese Communists from their jobs at an American air base in Japan. Now, that is going beyond the question of criminal jurisdiction and becomes a question of civil jurisdiction as well. I am sure the gentleman is acquainted with that case.

Mr. BOW. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I am familiar with the case. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] called it to my attention and I immediatetly called the Defense Department to get the facts to to why an American soldier, an American captain, who tried to fire four alleged Japanese Communists employed in the construction of one of our airfields, should have his pay held up by a Japanese court. I was advised by the Department of Defense that they knew nothing about it so I will say to the gentleman that we have asked them to alert themselves and find out why an American serviceman's pay can be attached when he attempts to protect our Nation.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAIR. Should it not be pointed out that many of these men who were tried were men who were drafted and sent to those countries without their own voluntary consent? They were sent there as men who were put into the uniform of our country and then under military orders were dispatched here and there throughout the world as their commanding officers saw fit?

Mr. BOW. The gentleman from Indiana is quite right, and the point he makes is very pertinent to the subject we are discussing. Here we have the case of a man who, against his will, is drafted and put into the uniform of the United States, and then, under direction and against his will, is sent to a foreign country where he is unfamiliar with the language and the law, and if he gets into difficulties he is tried in a court where he does not understand the language, does not understand what the judge is saying; he does not have the protection of the Bills of Rights or the Constitution. In many cases he is judged to be guilty until he has proven his innocence. He is not presented with an indictment. He does not have the right of a trial by jury. In many cases a confession taken from him under duress may be used against him. Many other God-given rights we have in the Constitution of the United States are taken away from him.

I quite agree with the gentleman from Indiana that those are important questions to be raised.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. In the only report that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has rendered on this subject, which is to be found as a part of the report on the pending Mutual Security Act of 1956, there is set forth this language:

> International tension has lessened and none of our allies anticipates military aggression by the Soviet Union in the near future. As a consequence, the nations are less willing to sacrifice their sovereign rights than they once were.

Mr. BOW. That is right. May I say further, taking this language in the report of the committee that we are going to consider next week:

> In nearly all the countries where our troops are stationed a speaker receives hearty applause if he speaks against subservience to the United States.

In other words, we are to be told that if someone gets up and says, "Let us not go back to the international law as it has been recognized," they receive great applause, because they have the right to deprive American citizens of their constitutional rights.

Mr. GROSS. Is it any less important that we in this Congress and American citizens look upon the sovereign rights of our people as do foreign nations? Let me repeat in connection with this the language in the report:

> As a consequence, the nations are less willing to sacrifice their sovereign rights than they once were.

Why should we be any less willing to sacrifice our sovereign rights?

Mr. BOW. I agree with the gentleman. It simply means that as time goes on there will be less chance of regaining our rights for the men we have overseas.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr BUDGE. There has been considerable conversation both on the floor and in other places, and it is very strongly intimated in the majority report coming from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that the renegotiation of all of these various treaties would be required in order to correct this situation. I should like the gentleman's comment on this query: Would it not be possible to limit the expenditure of foreign-aid funds to those nations only who do not seek to avail themselves of this provision which is contained in the Status of Forces Treaty?

Mr. BOW. I think the gentleman is quite right. Under the provisions of the treaty there is that provision which says that those countries may waive their right to this jurisdiction. Under that if we should say we will withdraw this aid to those countries who do not waive, then the point the gentleman has now established, and has made in the past, is quite correct and they could waive jurisdiction and we could regain our rights in those countries over our American servicemen.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. BUDGE. In other words, it would be the conclusion of the gentleman from Ohio that no renegotiation of any treaty would be necessary to accomplish what the gentleman seeks to accomplish under the foreign aid bill.

Mr. BOW. That is correct, and under the suggestion made by the gentleman now, this report we have been discussing also says that their hearings did not bring to light a single instance where it was claimed that an American serviceman believing in his innocence had been imprisoned in a foreign court. They claimed that there was not one single instance of their receiving an unfair trial. But the reports of observers, as I have already mentioned, show otherwise.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. BOW. Certainly.

Mr. BUDGE. If the statement contained in the majority report of the Foreign Relations Committee as to the attitude toward the United States and toward its servicemen is true, then certainly there should be some safeguard to protect the servicemen from any such attitude as is expressed in that report. In other words, if a speaker is applauded in these foreign nations when he says his country should not in any way vacillate toward the United States, then I submit it might be pretty difficult for an American serviceman to gain any sort of impartial trial in the tribunals of that nation.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman is quite right, and I appreciate his further contribution.

So I say again, Mr. Speaker, we have a situation here where the committee itself has had this testimony. The gentleman from Indiana, Mr. ADAIR, visited these prison camps and talked to some of these men who have been tried in foreign courts. I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana for comment.

Mr. ADAIR. If the gentleman would yield on that question, what the gentleman has just said is completely true. I had occasion to visit a Japanese prison last December in which prison there were on that date more than 50 American boys incarcerated. I had occasion to talk to a number of them, and almost without exception, as the gentleman from Ohio has so well pointed out, they felt that they had not had a fair trial in keeping with American standards of trial and justice. It was not so much the fact that they were imprisoned as it was the matter of the principle of the thing. I think we should stress that, Mr. Speaker, the fact that here is a principle involved, also a principle of whether or not we are going to permit our men to be tried under a system of law that is foreign to the one under which they grew up; and, as the gentleman has said, one which we have assured them would be theirs in the event that they were to be tried.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman. And is it not true—and I think my colleagues will agree with me—that by the Status of Forces Agreement we set up two classes of citizens in our military? We have the boy who is inducted and serves in this country who has the protection of the Constitution. The Bill of Rights extends to him. If he is sent overseas, he loses those rights. So we have two classes of citizens among our military.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Why would the Congress be confronted, may I ask the gentleman, with a bill to provide legal counsel for these men if they have been given a fair trial, these servicemen and their dependents, in foreign courts?

Mr. BOW. The Defense Department said it was to protect United States personnel against possible disadvantages. The gentleman very properly held that bill up for a while, then went along with it so we could give them some semblance of protection. But that does not satisfy us. The fact he can have legal counsel appointed for him by the military does not carry with it the constitutional rights of which he has been deprived under the Status of Forces Agreement.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is correct. I maintain it does demonstrate that they have not had fair trials, else there would be no need for a bill to provide counsel for them.

Mr. BOW. The bill itself is an admission that something had to be done. Yet we are told that this question should be faced directly. Why does not the Foreign Affairs Committee give us the opportunity to let this House face it directly? Why, since May of 1955, after this House prior to that time had by an overwhelming majority voted against the Status of Forces Agreement, does that committee still resist this bill and not give the House a chance to face it directly? I say to my colleague that this language that we should face it directly is certainly against the will of this House. We want to face it. Let them bring it on to the floor of the House so that the Representatives of the people of the United States can say whether they believe these constitutional rights should be lost to American soldiers or not.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. I want to commend and certainly congratulate the gentleman from Ohio for the splendid job he is doing and has done on this matter. He is not only a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee on which he has done great work but he is also a distinguished Member of this House who has tried in every possible way to serve this Nation with the kind of statesmanship that is needed. So I want to commend him not only for the fine representation he gives to his district but also for the fine work he does as a Member of this body.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I, too, certainly want to add my commendation to the gentleman for the work he has done in trying to bring this matter to a successful and honorable American conclusion.

Just one thing more. The gentleman has made reference to the activities and the findings and the hearings held by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House. I do not need to call to the gentleman's attention the fact there are some of us upon that committee who do not agree with the majority views. There are some of us who feel that this matter of turning our servicemen over to foreign governments for trial under the Status of Forces Agreement, or under other administrative agreements, is wrong and ought to be corrected.

Mr. BOW. I agree with the gentleman. I think I should make the RECORD straight. I do know, although it is not a matter of record, that we had support in the committee for House Joint Resolution 309. Members of the committee have expressed themselves on the floor and in the committee and in the RECORD favoring regaining for our American servicemen their rights. I think those members of the committee should be complimented for what they have done. When I speak of the Foreign Affairs Committee denying the House the right to work its will, it is the majority who have refused to permit the bill to come out so we could meet it directly.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say, since the Foreign Affairs Committee has made the statement and urges that the status of forces problem be faced directly and considered on its merits, that I attempted that last year, and I was assured they would have hearings. Therefore I did not offer the amendment to a bill, having had that assurance. They had hearings. We have had them a long time ago. They have been completed.

But, as I say, no bill has been reported to the House, so I cannot meet it directly. But, I am going to go against the advice offered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I am not going to offer an amendment for the purpose of attacking the mutual-security program. I may say very frankly I have never voted for it, but I am not going to attack the program as the program itself. However, I am going to offer an amendment, and that no one can say that they have been taken by surprise and did not have a chance to study the amendment, and realizing that perhaps in general debate there will not be much time given for this discussion, I want to call the attention of the House to the amendment I am going to offer so that no one can say that this is an attack upon the mutual-security program. This is the amendment I will offer:

It is further the sense of the Congress that the rights of our own citizens guaranteed by our Constitution should not be sacrificed while the rights of freedom and self-government are secured to the peoples of other nations and that in order to insure justice, maintain the constitutional rights and privileges for our citizens who are serving with our Armed Forces in other countries and promote the general welfare that the President should forthwith, as provided for by article XVII of the Status of Forces Agreement, signed at London June 19, 1951, address to the North Atlantic Council a request for revision of article VII of such agreement for the purpose of eliminating or modifying article VII so that the United States may exercise exclusive criminal jurisdiction over American military personnel stationed within the boundaries of parties to the treaty; (2) that the President should take similar action with regard to all other treaties or international agreements to which the United States is a party and which give criminal jurisdiction over our Armed Forces to foreign governments which are parties thereto; (3) that failure of such negotiations to obtain exclusive jurisdiction for the United States should be grounds for the denunciation of or withdrawal from such treaties and international agreements as provided for by article XIX of the Status of Forces Agreement and similar provisions in other agreements.

My colleagues, that is the amendment which I will offer at the proper time to the bill as being the policy of this Government and that I shall ask my colleagues to support. It is not an attack on mutual security, but it is an attempt to regain for our American servicemen their constitutional rights which have been bartered away and to return again to sound international law which has been established by the Supreme Court.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Ohio for the fight he has made on the status of forces treaty matters since the time when he first posed an amendment to an appropriation bill in the last session. I also wish to associate myself with the remarks he has made and hope that we can make satisfactory arrangements to straighten out the situation concerning the American serviceman who has been inducted against his will. I again congratulate the gentleman from Ohio for the efforts he has made to take care of these servicemen.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McVEY. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio on his very able statement regarding a most important subject. I should like to ask him this question: Has the Senate of the United States ever passed upon these Status of Forces Agreement that the gentleman has mentioned?

Mr. BOW. The Senate of the United States in the NATO agreement has passed upon it and approved it. I would say, however, and I think it is rather evident, that the information that they had before them was not completely accurate. I think the remarks of Senator BRICKER on May 7, 1953, in the Senate, are very pertinent. He said:

I do not criticize any member of the Foreign Relations Committee for not exercising due care and diligence in reporting this treaty favorably to the Senate. In the light of statements made by Government witnesses at the hearings, the committee's action was sound and logical. Unfortunately—and this is very important—the committee's action was based on false and misleading representations. As to whether the misrepresentations were deliberate, or grounded in stupidity, I express no opinion.

They might have been prompted by those who were in the State Department—and who are still there—when these agreements were worked out, as a way of vindication. They might have been suggested, Mr. President, in an effort to cover up the executive agreements already illegally made.

But the Senate did pass upon it with some dissent. I have forgotten what the vote was. But since the gentleman raises the question, may I point out one thing that I think is very important here: The Senate has ratified the Status of Forces Agreement in NATO, but in the case of Japan, although a treaty was settled with Japan, the status of forces arrangement with Japan has never been submitted to the Senate of the United States. It was not entered into by the President; it was not entered into by the Secretary of State, but is an arrangement signed by an ambassador.

That is the kind of an arrangement we have with Japan. So this House and the Senate have never passed upon that. It came after the NATO agreements were signed.

Mr. McVEY. I thank the gentleman and say to him that I shall be very pleased to support his amendment.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

TAKING CARE OF THE VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was Memorial Day and in the different cities and towns that I visited and the parades that I saw, I never saw a more dedicated spirit among those who participated in the laying of wreaths in the cemeteries, those who participated in the parades and among the people along the line of march who watched; a spirit that indicated that for the future they wanted to see our veterans cared for in every way. Many men and many women came up and with tears in their eyes thanked the Congress for the legislation that had already been passed. Others expressed a great fear that as a result of the Bradley Report legislation might be passed that would take away what they have already, such as compensation to those seriously disabled, compensation to widows, and perhaps entirely wiping out compensation in non-service-connected cases, and presumptive cases, and many other parts of the very cruel Bradley Report which, if carried into effect, would work a tremendous hardship.

The same spirit was evidenced on Armed Services Day and thousands of people, without exception, felt that something should be done for the veteran such as the so-called Legion pension bill. That is a bill with many limitations, but it would serve a great need and do a measure of justice.

I shall include another day under permission to extend my remarks, a letter that I had from a GI thanking the Congress for his chance to get an education. Mr. Speaker, I hope that my bill or some other bill providing for a 5-year extension of that program will be passed in order that many may avail themselves of the benefits of education in order to be able to compete with others who did not lose their chance for education because of the war.

The letter referred to is as follows:

CONCORD, MASS., *May 28, 1956.*

Hon. Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives, United States Congress Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: On June 3, 1956, through the generosity of my great country, I will graduate from Boston University. My entire formal education was provided for by the American people through the legislation organized and passed by Congress for veterans of the Second World War.

The purpose of this letter is to express my deep gratitude to the Members of the Congress of the United States for giving so many of us this opportunity. A copy is being sent to the other Members of Congress from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

It is with the greatest sense of loyalty and pride that I thank God for the right to be an American citizen.

Sincerely yours,

PETER BENTON.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DIGGS (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), from Thursday to Monday, on account of official business.

Mr. SCHERER, for June 4, 5, and 6, on account of hearings of Un-American Activities Committee in St. Louis, Mo., on said dates.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legis-

lative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. VORYS, for 30 minutes, on Monday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WRIGHT.

Mr. RAY and to include an editorial.

Mr. BOGGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONAS on the subject of Youth Appreciation Day.

Mr. PELLY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZELENKO.

Mr. HOLTZMAN (at the request of Mr. MULTER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. MULTER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include resolutions passed by the Conference of New England Women, and a speech.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore:

H. R. 11177. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 4, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1916. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a report of two instances of overobligations of allotments by operational units within the Post Office Department during the quarter ended December 31, 1955, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1917. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood and authorizing an appropriation therefor"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10949. A bill to amend section 633 of title 28, United States Code, prescribing fees of United States commissioners; with amendment (Rept. No. 2248). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9137. A bill to waive section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina holding court at Bryson City, N. C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2249). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KIRWAN: Committee of conference. H. R. 9390. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2250). ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 11537. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 11538. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of certain employees (and former employees) of the Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, Calif., for unpaid compensation for overtime services performed by them between June 1, 1945, and March 16, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 11539. A bill to transfer certain mahogany from the dutiable list to the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 11540. A bill to amend section 650 of title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard", relating to the Coast Guard supply fund; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROOKS of Texas:

H. R. 11541. A bill to amend section 124 (c) of title 28 of the United States Code so as to transfer Shelby County from the Beaumont to the Tyler division of the eastern district of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD (by request):

H. R. 11542. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 11543. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to authorize courts of bankruptcy to determine the dischargeability or nondischargeability of provable debts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 11544. A bill to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H. R. 11545. A bill to provide an income-tax deduction for amounts paid as tuition or fees to educational institutions above high-school level and for amounts paid for books required by such institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 11546. A bill to provide a deduction for income-tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income-tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 11547. A bill to amend section 1481 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to mitigation of the effect of renegotiation of Government contracts) and section 3806 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 11548. A bill to provide for the establishment of a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Paint Bank, Va.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 11549. A bill to improve the health of the people by assisting in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and practical nurses and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 11550. A bill to exempt certain purchases by public museums and galleries from the excise tax on jewelry and related items; to the Committee on Ways anad Means.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 11551. A bill to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the county of Fresno, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 11552. A bill to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the county of Fresno, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 11553. A bill to provide for transportation of certain members of The National Flying Farmers' Association, and their aircraft, from the United States to Europe and return; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BONNER (by request):

H. R. 11554. A bill to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of passenger vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 11555. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, with respect to certain unfair methods of competition and certain unfair practices in the distribution of new motor vehicles in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. Res. 518. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate and study the facts and circumstances of the attack on Victor Riesel on April 5, 1956, and the effect of such acts of violence on freedom of the press in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 519. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of highway safety; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 11556. A bill for the relief of Alessandro Maraessa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOWLER:

H. R. 11557. A bill for the relief of Maizie Au-Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 11558. A bill to relinquish any right, title, and interest which the United States

may have in and to certain land located in Forrest County, Miss., in order to clear the title to such land; to the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 11559. A bill for the relief of Giuliano Romanacci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 11560. A bill for the relief of Salvatore D'Angelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 11561. A bill for the relief of Damaso P. Perez and Mercedes Ruth Cobb Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 11562. A bill for the relief of Nedelko Knezevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 11563. A bill for the relief of Cecelia Vaccaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 11564. A bill for the relief of Brenda Theresa Monaghan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 11565. A bill for the relief of Stylianos Panagis Antippas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 11566. A bill for the relief of Elvira A. Belford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 11567. A bill for the relief of Maria Carmela DiMascio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 11568. A bill for the relief of Mary Derzay and Anton Derzay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. Res. 520. Resolution to refer H. R. 4507 to the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1095. By Mr. BOW: Petition of G. W. Baker and others of Tuscarawas County, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1096. By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia: Petition of 63 veterans submitted by Augusta-Staunton (Va.) Post No. 2216, Veterans of Foreign Wars, urging enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1097. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Donald G. Taylor, Springfield, Mo., and other citizens of Greene County, Mo., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

As We See It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the National Guardsman, in its June 1956 issue, has as its guest editor the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR]. His subject is "As We See It." This editorial deserves the attention of all Americans. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS WE SEE IT—I AM THE GUARD

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Guest editorialist for this issue of the National Guardsman is Delaware's United States Senator J. ALLEN FREAR, JR. He writes a weekly commentary for his constituents, and has granted permission to reprint one which, while intended primarily for Military Reserve Week, has applicability every week.)

As many of you know, the 7-day period from April 22 to 28 has been designated as "Military Reserve Week." The purpose of this activity is to stimulate increased interest and participation in the Reserve components of our Armed Forces and thus help strengthen the national security. I am happy to devote this statement to Military Reserve Week because it provides an opportunity for me to express publicly and proudly a few words of support and encouragement for the National Guard of Delaware and of the Nation as a whole.

The guard is easily one of America's most famous military institutions. From the earliest beginnings of our Nation, the guard has functioned in an important and vital role as a partner with other units of our national defense. Known as civilians in peace and soldiers in war, the National Guard has established itself both as a State organization and as a federalized adjunct of the country's overall military system.

From time to time as our military planners review and revise the organization of our Armed Forces, mention is made of the future role which the National Guard may take in the overall defense picture. One hears rumors from time to time that the necessity for the existence of the National Guard is not as great as heretofore and that in fact the guard, as a separate organization, can be replaced.

However, those who advocate either replacing or integrating the guard with the Regular Reserve Forces of the Nation fail to take into account its importance as a unit of the State as much as it is an arm of the National Government. It should be remembered that the National Guard has provided the bulk of our fighting troops at the beginning of almost every national emergency, that is, war. In addition, in times of disaster or internal upheaval of a civilian nature, troops of the National Guard are available and ready for service to their respective States and communities. In Delaware our National Guard organization stands as one of the finest anywhere in the United States. Units of our National Guard, particularly its ground forces, have a long history of prideful accomplishments.

During the current observances of Military Reserve Week, the Army National Guard will undertake a drive for volunteers for the Army 6 months' training program and for the enlistment of men who have had previous military service in any of the Armed Forces.

The Air National Guard is seeking enlistment of prior servicemen and young men between 17 and 18½ years without prior service. Members of the National Guard have emphasized to me that young men of Delaware can fulfill their military training and service obligation through membership in the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard. Interested young men in the State may find it of value to discuss the question of new or added military service with members of our National Guard during the present week.

While I am happy to note the recruitment possibilities for the National Guard which are currently being highlighted, I want most of all in this brief message to emphasize the importance of having the National Guard's identity retained by our defense planners. Delawareans who are familiar with my general views on the relationship of the Federal Government to the several States, will know of my inherent belief that the power of our democracy lies in the authority of the States themselves as 48 separate entities working for the common welfare. As I see it, the National Guard through its long history has been developed to meet the varying requirements which arise from time to time in the States themselves. Secondly, it functions under the Federal Government in time of national crisis.

A significant description of this famous American institution has been prepared against a pictorial background of its many functions over years past. In our office here in Washington we have a framed copy of this declaration which is entitled, "I Am the Guard." In concluding these remarks I want to quote directly from its closing lines:

"Wherever a strong arm and valiant spirit must defend the Nation, in peace or war, wherever a child cries or a woman weeps in times of disaster, there I stand * * * I am the Guard. For three centuries a soldier in war, a civilian in peace—of security and honor, I am the custodian, now and forever * * * I am the Guard."

June 2, 1956, 10th Anniversary of Italian Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most remarkable comeback stories of the postwar years has been the restitution of Italy into good standing as one of the democratic nations of the Western community. Its record of internal reconstruction and rehabilitation and international cooperation, since the birth of the new Republic on June 2, 1946, has been outstanding. There is no doubt that the world has gained a new and stable democracy.

This Italian comeback was no easy task. The war had shattered Italy's economy; inflation was rampant, and the rate of unemployment was unusually high. Furthermore, this economic disorder bred political instability, hunger, and despair, providing fertile ground for the expansion of communism on the peninsula. Eagerly and industriously, however, the Italian people under the

astute political guidance of Alcide de Gasperi—the first Premier of the Italian Republic—set to work to rescue the suffering country from the brink of chaos.

We can, incidentally, take pride that our aid program helped the Italians in their struggle to get back on their feet.

In addition to achieving internal economic stability the infant Italian Republic has gained prestige internationally. Italy became a partner in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and eagerly supported a policy directed toward military and economic integration with Western Europe. Again with United States assistance, under the Mutual Defense Act, Italy has equipped her army, navy, and air force with modern military equipment and material and has become an effective unit of the Western defense system.

Today is the 10th anniversary of the birth of the Italian Republic. When one considers that Italy has achieved internal economic stability and international recognition in these few years, it makes the story of her comeback even more astonishing.

It is with intense pleasure that I join with all America in applauding Italy's tremendous progress on this anniversary day.

Nineteenth Anniversary of I Am An American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, May 20, 1956, marked the 19th anniversary of I Am An American Day.

As national cochairman of the Helois Foundation and I Am An American Day Committee, I should like to pay tribute to Mrs. Paul d'Otrenge Seghers, founder of I Am An American Day for her untiring work in awakening true Americanism among the citizens of our great country.

The celebration this year drew over 500 distinguished guests to the estate of Mr. and Mrs. Seghers at Sunnyhill Farm, Huntington, Long Island, where they assembled to renew their faith in the ideals upon which our country has been built and to become still more devout disciples of the American way of life.

The theme of this 19th annual celebration was "Peace with Freedom for All" and was dedicated to the Latin American Republics and the Dominion of Canada, whom we joined in paying homage and tribute to the people of the capitive European Nations.

I quote below a few of the many testimonials received from distinguished citizens of our country:

Hon. EARLE C. CLEMENTS, United States Senator from Kentucky:

" 'Peace with freedom for all' is a completely appropriate theme for the annual I Am an American Day program.

"A peace that would mean enslavement of the bodies and souls of freedom-loving peoples of the world would be a living death. As we work toward peace in the world, we must ever be on the alert to guarantee that the rights of all people to life, liberty, and the pursuit of their own happiness shall be safeguarded."

Hon. IRVING M. IVES, United States Senator from New York:

"On this significant day, when each of us expresses his gratitude for the Divine fortune which has made him an American and has blessed America, our thoughts turn with compassion to others less fortunate. We think particularly of the millions of silenced and oppressed human beings behind the Iron Curtain.

"I am most pleased that the sponsors of the 'I Am An American Day' celebration for 1956 chose as their theme 'Peace with freedom for all.' On this day, when Americans give thanks that they have peace and freedom, we pray that the people behind the Iron Curtain may likewise soon enjoy those blessings.

"In addition to our prayers, we send those people our sympathy for their plight and our encouragement for their efforts to shake off their bondage."

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON, United States Senator from Washington:

"It is only fitting on this 19th 'I Am an American Day' that our theme should be 'Peace with freedom for all.'

"We need to remind ourselves today and every day that there are vast areas of the world where people are not free.

"This is especially true at a moment when the new turn in Soviet foreign policy is in danger of obscuring the fact that 100 million freedom-loving peoples are still captive behind the Iron Curtain.

"We say to the world: If the Soviet Union really wants to show good faith, it can return to these peoples the freedom that once was theirs. This is an important message to tell the world. But this alone is not enough.

"Equally important, we must continue to protect and strengthen our freedoms at home as a symbol of hope for captive peoples everywhere. And we must pledge our untiring efforts to help free them from their bondage."

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL, United States Senator from California:

"The whole world recognizes the courage and tribulations of the oppressed peoples behind the Iron Curtain. The free world joins with them in prayer that once again soon they will see the light of liberty and freedom from fear.

"Our generation continues making progress in determining and overcoming those modern dangers to the cause of our freedom. The basic hazards of Communist aggression and intrigue is not one for the people of the United States alone. They are the concern of all free peoples, and it will be in concert with them that we shall continue to oppose the Communist ideology. Each succeeding American generation has preserved American freedom, and has resolutely clung to the same self-evident truths which the patriots laid down 170 years ago. Ours has been a history of progress and we mean, under the providence of God, to continue that progress in the years and generations which lie ahead."

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON, United States Senator from Washington:

"More people than many of us realize in today's world cherish the words, 'I am an American'—perhaps even more than some of us who obtain that right at birth.

"In this respect, it is significant that many who utter the words, 'I am an American' at the 1956 observance will be members of naturalization classes to whom the words 'liberty' and 'freedom' have a vastly deeper feeling because of actual background experiences on foreign soil.

"This individual can also add the word 'tolerance' and really means it because in his mind it is synonymous with the phrase, 'I am an American.'

"America looks to the persecuted and the oppressed for its very founding. Since that time, much of its greatest achievements have come from men and women—the Dr. Einsteins—who teach us the true meaning 'I am an American' by living the words in addition to speaking them."

Hon. GEORGE SMATHERS, United States Senator from Florida:

"On this 19th I Am An American Day, it is fitting that we in the United States extend our prayers to those behind the Iron Curtain who live in bondage and who have lost, or never known, the rights of free men accorded in our own country.

"While we enjoy—and sometimes take for granted—our individual sanctity under the Constitution, we must not forget that the flame of liberty has been extinguished in many parts of the world. No nation is an island unto itself, and when the bell tolls for a free people abroad, it tolls for us in America too.

" 'Peace with freedom for all'—this theme of the 19th I Am An American Day sums up the ideal for which we stand firm. I know that the observance will achieve success equal to last year's drive by the Helios Foundation for unity in the Western Hemisphere."

Hon. H. ALEXANDER SMITH, United States Senator from New Jersey:

"I am happy to send these words of greeting to the Helios Foundation on the occasion of the 19th I Am An American Day.

"It is with special gratification that I note this year's theme, Peace With Freedom For All, and the tribute your group is paying to the millions of captive people behind the Iron Curtain.

"We must never cease our peaceful efforts to restore to those people the freedom, independence and self-determination they once enjoyed before their subjection to Communist totalitarianism."

Hon. Thomas B. Stanley, Governor of Virginia:

"The annual observance of I Am An American Day affords the opportunity of rededicating ourselves to the underlying principles of free citizenship and of bringing to the attention of our neighbors of the Americas, as well as people throughout the world, the great contribution we can make with them to safeguard individual liberty and national integrity.

"I am glad to join with the sponsors of this celebration in reemphasizing the imperishable values we enjoy as Americans and I invite the people of Virginia to take the occasion to reaffirm their adherence to the basic tenets of government and freedom which are responsible for our status as a bastion of liberty today."

Hon. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT, Member of Congress from New York:

"As usual it is a pleasure to send the message to you and the wonderful people doing the work of the Helios Foundation.

"I can think of no greater message than to report to you the sentiments of a young 11-year-old lad who won Suffolk County's Americanism contest.

"He said:

" 'Of all the many things for which America stands, that which means most to me is liberty.

" 'At the age of 11 I am not too familiar with the deeper meanings of personal liberty. But I do know from a study of my history books that men have been fighting and dying for it since the beginning of history.

" 'Now that I am reading current events and newspapers reporting from all over the world, I have been surprised and saddened to

learn that peoples in the other countries do not enjoy the same personal freedom that I take so much for granted. To think that there are lands where men may not travel without police cards, may not worship God as they choose and may not be governed by officials of their own election is enough to prove to me that personal property is America's greatest blessing.

"'I am proud to pledge allegiance and ask God's guidance on the great system of government that promises each of us so much.'

"Doesn't this accurately report our mutual feelings in this great matter of Americanism?"

Congregation Shaare Hatikvah and Its Rabbi Emeritus, Dr. Siegmund Hanover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives the great contribution toward humanity, religion, and Americanism made by the Congregation Shaare Hatikvah and its rabbi emeritus, Dr. Siegmund Hanover.

Dr. Siegmund Hanover, rabbi emeritus of the Congregation Shaare Hatikvah, 4290 Broadway, New York City, is celebrating his golden jubilee as a rabbi. He was born in Wandsbeck, a suburb of Hamburg, Germany, where his father was the officiating rabbi. The deep religious spirit of his environment followed him throughout his whole life. He studied at the Rabbiner Seminar of the University of Berlin, an institution of world renown at that time. An outstanding student, he was chosen to become the assistant to the officiating rabbi, Dr. Rosenthal, of the Jewish congregation of Cologne, Germany. More than any other city on the Continent, Cologne was the center of the spiritual Jewish youth movements in this era. His office was interrupted when World War I broke out and he was serving as a chaplain in the German Army.

Soon after the war and his return to Cologne, he was installed as rabbi of the county and city of Wuerzburg, a well-know city in northern Bavaria. Unfortunately, the Nazi put an abrupt end to his career in Germany and after a short stay in England, he came to the United States where he became a citizen in due time.

Shortly after his arrival in New York City, he was called upon by the Congregation Shaare Hatikvah—Gates of Hope—which was founded by a small group of refugees, to be its spiritual leader. Under his guidance, the congregation developed into one of the largest and leading traditional immigrant congregations. Its members held a testimonial dinner in the honor of their very esteemed rabbi on May 27, 1956, at the Hotel New Yorker, New York City. At the specific request of Dr. Hanover, the proceeds of the dinner will go toward the building fund of the congregation. The construction of a new Jewish center and synagogue is already underway at West 179th Street near the George Washington Bridge. The new building will be dedicated as a monument to those who have perished during the persecutions of our time.

This Midweek Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted me, I urge that all Members and all others who read the RECORD give careful attention to the following editorial which appeared in the New York Daily News on May 30:

THIS MIDWEEK HOLIDAY

The main purpose of today's legal holiday, of course, is the honoring of our Nation's dead. The growing United States custom, however, is to regard Memorial or Decoration Day also as the year's first chance for a real look at the out-of-doors. And, when May 30 happens to fall on a Friday or Monday millions of Americans are able to enjoy a 3-day break.

This year, though, those extended joys are out. Our erratic Gregorian calendar has granted just a 1-day holiday for 1956. For 99 percent of us, it'll be back to work tomorrow.

And if you'll flip your calendar leaves a bit, you'll discover that other possible 1956 triple-decker holidays have been washed out. This Fourth of July will fall on a Wednesday. Christmas arrives on Tuesday. Only Labor Day, because it's always scheduled for a Monday rather than a date of the month, will provide one of those refreshing 72-hour vacations.

The proposed world calendar

FIRST QUARTER

January						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

February						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		

March						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30

SECOND QUARTER

April						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

May						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		

June						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
						**W

THIRD QUARTER

July						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

August						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		

September						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30

FOURTH QUARTER

October						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

November						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		

December						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
						*W

*The year-end world holiday, W or Dec. 31 (365th day), follows Dec. 30 every year.

**The leap-year world holiday, W or June 31 (an extra day), follows June 30 in leap years.

Dozens of proposals for calendar reform have reached Congress and other countries' legislative bodies, and have been approved tentatively by some United Nations members. One is the World Calendar, reproduced above.

DATES HAVE SHIFTED

It would cure most of the exasperations of the ancient job the Western world is struggling along with now. The calendar you have on your wall or desk was first whipped together some 2,000 years ago for Roman Emperor Julius Caesar by a Greek mathematician, one Sosigenes. It was reworked by Pope Gregory XIII in 1582, and was imposed on the American colonies by Great Britain in 1752. The British at that time decreed that the day following September 2, 1752, should be called September 14—a loss of 11 days.

That messed up George Washington's birthday (originally February 11, 1732) among others, and also casts a different light on the feelings of some religious and historical organizations that our present days of the week have always been set that way.

On the other hand, some of today's orthodox religious groups do point out that time switches such as those proposed by the World Calendar with its "Worldsday" would seriously disrupt their present 7-day sabbatical cycle.

Calendar reform advocates and representatives of the faiths affected have, so far, failed to reach agreement on the Sabbath question. The best minds on both sides, however, are still working on the problem.

In the meantime, our own United States Congress could be doing us a real and more immediate favor by decreeing that all legal holidays except those of religious significance shall hereafter fall on Mondays, like Labor Day.

CONGRESS CAN ACT

In most cases, there would be little problem. Even now, for instance, our Independence Day is celebrated on a Monday whenever our inconsiderate calendar happens to spot July 4 on a Sunday. A regular Monday observance of this holiday would give us all a 3-day break at the steaming stretch of year when we need that respite most.

It's too late to do anything about Memorial Day this year. But, should you feel sufficiently resentful as you slog back to the job tomorrow, why not inquire of your Congressman what, if anything, he is doing to eliminate such calendar annoyances in years to come?

H. R. 6588, which I introduced on June 1, 1955, would provide that all legal holidays except those of religious significance shall fall on Mondays. That bill has aroused a good deal of interest over the country. Similar legislation is now pending before several State legislatures. There has been some, but not much, opinion adverse to the plan but it has not assumed serious proportions. Personally, I should like to see the calendar reform adopted, but I am quite sure that would take a long time. In the meanwhile, I hope sufficient interest will be stirred up in H. R. 6588 and similar bills to induce their passage.

Dr. John Milburn Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, this month Dr. John Milburn Price completed

41 years of service to the School of Religious Education which he founded at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth.

He has been, in truth, a pioneer in this portion of the Lord's vineyard. In 1915, under his direction, Southwestern became the first school among Baptists to offer vocational training in religious education.

In 1917 it became the first school in America to offer a religious education diploma.

In 1919 it became the first Baptist seminary to offer a doctors degree with a major in religious education.

In 1921 it conducted the first vocational conference on religious education and the first demonstration kindergarten in a Baptist seminary.

In 1922 it developed the first vacation Bible school among Baptists, and this is the oldest of such institutions.

In the following year, it began reaching out to those not blessed with the academic prerequisites and became the first school to offer special seminary courses for noncollege graduates.

In 1950 Southwestern erected on its campus the first building in America designed exclusively for teaching religious education, and in the following year it became the first school of religious education among Southern Baptists to become accredited.

All of this is a tribute to the magnificent leadership of John Milburn Price.

While a Marston scholar in Brown University, Providence, R. I., J. M. Price was inspired by the thought that he should train lay men and women to become Sunday school teachers. And in less than 3 years, while completing his theological training at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky., the door of opportunity was opened through which he might enter and realize the achievement of his life's dream.

Dr. L. R. Scarborough, president of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Tex., wrote Price a letter, which said in part, "It is now our purpose to establish a school of Christian Pedagogy. I think we have hold of the small end of a big proposition. We will have to do pioneer work and break new ground." Then he asked J. M. Price to organize the School of Religious Education in Fort Worth.

The offer was challenging and divinely inspired but somewhat disconcerting. Others were requesting his services, too, and a decision had to be reached immediately. He had been elected as Sunday school secretary for Kentucky (his home State) and he longed to stay there. Friends in Canton, China, urged him to join their faculty at the seminary there.

J. M. Price was a praying man and he turned to God often in those heavy hours in order that he might find his Lord's will. When the answer came there was no doubt in his mind that he was to go to Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. For, then, he could be in Texas, Kentucky, China, at the same time, through the students he would train and sent out.

In August 1915 he arrived in Fort Worth, Tex., to pioneer and break new ground in religious education for the Kingdom of God. The first year only 5 courses were taught and today 129 courses for vocational training in religious education are available to a student, as he desires to select.

Since 1915 there have been 6,000 students to enroll in Southwestern's School of Religious Education with 2,250 of them graduating. There are 880 students enrolled in the school today. These trainees have revolutionized Sunday school and training union work in the Southern Baptist Convention, at home and abroad.

Since 1920 the Southern Baptist denomination has increased from 3 million to 8 million members. Total gifts to all causes have increased from $35 million per year in 1920 to $332 million in 1955. The phenomenal growth is due, in part, to the teaching ministry of the church as provided by the teachers receiving vocational training in religious education, mainly in Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary.

There are five Southern Baptist seminaries in America. Southwestern Seminary sends out 47 percent of the Baptist missionaries around the world. Of those going from Fort Worth, Tex., 50 percent, totaling 300 in foreign fields alone, have been trained in religious education.

Southwestern's School of Religious Education is first in the South—largest in the world among schools of religious education. It stands as a permanent memorial, vibrantly alive, to the man who dared to establish his life "by way of the throne of God," John Milburn Price.

Address of Hon. Edith Nourse Rogers, of Massachusetts, at Dedication of Billerica, Mass., High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by myself at the dedication of the new high school at Billerica, Mass., on May 30, 1956:

Mr. Hines, Commander Walker, Mr. O'Brien, veterans and other distinguished guests, students of the Billerica High School, and other schools, ladies and gentlemen:

It is always a very great pleasure for me to come to Billerica and visit with all of you who have been such wonderfully fine and loyal friends over so many years. This is indeed a great occasion both for this community and for me. It is extremely thrilling for me to contemplate the full meaning, if that is possible, of the event we are celebrating here this afternoon. To be invited to address you on this significant and unusual occasion is for me a great honor—an honor which I shall always remember.

In the complex social and economic structure of our country there is no unit of that structure more important and more basic than the family unit. Upon the development and strength of the family unit depends the strength and future of America. As fathers and mothers you are concerned and anxious to have your children receive the very best preparation, the best possible education for the responsibilities they must eventually assume and the leadership they must provide. Your children are concerned too and are anxious to obtain the very best preparation for that future time when they must be the leaders and shoulder the responsibilities of not only this community but also those controlling our Nation's destiny.

Just as it has been in the past, it is more a fact today that superior leadership is very scarce. As our country continues to grow and develop, as life and conditions continue to change, the need becomes greater and greater for persons well trained in their respective professions and possessing excellent judgment, able to make the right decisions and able to initiate and originate new methods and new solutions, for the complex problems of our civilization. Basic and fundamental education is now, more than ever before, a necessity. It is a requirement if our country is to maintain its top position in world affairs.

Education may be divided into three necessary parts. There must be the ability and the will to learn among the youth and our Nation's young men and women. There must be adequate numbers of excellently trained teachers in a profession made attractive in principle as well as a way of life. There must be adequate physical facilities, such as buildings, libraries, and laboratories, such as this fine new high-school building we are here to dedicate this afternoon. America possesses all of these, but not in the right proportions or in adequate numbers.

There are increasing numbers of students with the ability and will to learn. There are not enough teachers, largely because the present income of teachers is not sufficient to guarantee a comfortable way of life in comparison with other professions. This fault must be corrected. There is still much to be done in the construction of adequate physical facilities. This new Billerica High School is an example of the improvement that is taking place all over the country. As time goes on the education of the children of America will continue to improve, and as a result our country will be a greater and finer nation.

Only a few days ago with mixed emotions we read of the successful explosion of a hydrogen bomb dropped from an airplane with a devastating force of 20 megatons. We were astounded, shocked, proud, and, without question, sad. These were our mixed emotions. Exemplified by this explosion and many other great achievements is the tremendous march of the knowledge of science in our country today. In his perseverance, constantly raising the curtain of the unknown, man has reached the frightening crossroads where if he makes the wrong decision he will destroy himself, for within his hands there is this power.

In the vast area of physical and scientific knowledge there are many secrets. As mankind discovers these secrets and unlocks the forces they hold, man can either use these forces for benefit or destruction. To unlock the doors to fission and fusion, the intelligence of man has given to civilization a very great power. If this power is used to make for mankind a greater and more beneficial type of civilization, then these discoveries are indeed fine and good. If, on the other hand, these forces which are now completely in the control of the intelligence of mankind are used for destruction, then indeed they are wrong and bad.

If in his knowledge and wisdom and perseverance mankind has discovered forces which, uncontrolled, will force those of you here and in every community throughout America to carve out caves of safety in the sides of the great rocks or construct shelters deep in the ground, just as mankind lived in the days of his dawn on this earth, can

it then be said that with all his knowledge man has indeed progressed? At the crossroads which I mentioned stand all of us, you and I. As we choose our path we must be right. The path we choose for our Nation to take must be right. The decisions we must make now which concern all of us must be right. The alternative to right is now completely beyond all comprehension.

If we concentrate upon these tremendously important decisions which face us an individuals and as a nation, now and in the future, we can so easily comprehend the significance of this unusual event we are celebrating this afternoon. On this Memorial Day afternoon, we are engaged in the dedication of a magnificent new building devoted entirely to education, one of the great essentials in our American way of life. But this education so important to mankind, must be channeled into benefits and not be the cause or the way of the annihilation of civilization.

Many of you here this afternoon are parents of young men and women who will experience all there is in this great new education institution. Many of you here are parents of children who will be absorbing much of the knowledge that is to be offered here in the years to come. And here today also are present, students who will experience the next 4 years in this magnificent new structure devoted to basic knowledge. Also here are children, tomorrow's young men and women, who will also have the wonderful privilege and honor of attending this wonderful new high school. All of you parents and students, both present and those of the future, have cause to be proud and cause to be happy that this great institution is actually in reality and waiting for you in this fine community of Billerica. You are proud and glad that this new institution is going to touch very basically all of your lives and that you are going to be a part of it forever.

In an inspection of this new high school here in Billerica, it is only natural for many of us to look back over the years, at a comparison of this great modern institution with all its conveniences and physical equipment, to the high school of our day and its facilities. Compare, if you will, the buildings and equipment you used in your respective communities in your high-school days, as well as those which were available to your parents and grandparents, with this new modern high school. In any such comparison we know progress has in fact taken place, as it has taken place in every field of human endeavor. It would be, indeed, thrilling for me, and I know it would be thrilling for all of you parents here this afternoon, if we could somehow turn back the years and go back to high school in this wonderful new modern high-school building. Just as this would make our hearts skip a little faster, I am sure this wonderful new high school is a source of pride and an anticipated, exciting experience for you children, those students who will in fact have the great advantages in this modern new Billerica High School in the years to come.

This is an age of science. It is often referred to as the atomic age. It is an age when man's competition against man, requires knowledge and judgment to survive. Important as science is, important as is the whole field of knowledge, there are other values which are just as important, and are a significant part of our successful living and the future of our country. These values relate to a strong and well developed body, to a strong and well trained mind, to a great spirit that fears only God. These values relate to such qualities of life as fine character, the intellectual honesty and the courage to know the right and to stand and die for the right. These values relate to conscience, to understanding, to kindness, to thoughtfulness, to unselfishness and to moral integrity. These values all are involved in the necessity of community cooperation, in the work of the Nation, and in the peace of the world. Without these values man will use the great power he now possesses to destroy his own civilization. It is upon these values that man must depend, if his world and his civilization are to be saved through the control of these gigantic forces he holds within his power.

Here in this beautiful new Billerica High School all of these values which I have mentioned will be developed in the young men and women who have the honor and the glory of attending this new modern institution. Science, literature, languages, history, and all of the arts represent fields of basic knowledge. All are necessary and all have their use in the educational process. Important as learning is, however, it is more important to know how to use one's knowledge properly for the benefit of improving life and living during one's time and privilege upon this earth. Here in this new Billerica High School all of you parents will see your children enter as children and graduate 4 years later as well trained, well balanced young men and women. In addition to basic knowledge gained, they will possess strong bodies, strong minds, a strong faith and a God-fearing spirit. They will be prepared and ready to take their next step, whatever it may be, in the direction of future leadership.

Just as we compare this new Billerica High School with the physical facilities of years gone by, it is also possible to compare the quality and methods of instruction and teaching, for in this noble profession there also have been great strides of progress. In the days years ago, one teacher gave instruction in all of the subjects in the curriculum, and in some cases instructed all of the classes. There was one teacher for the entire high school. Today our teachers are specialized and only teach the subjects in which they are specialists. They are fine scholars in their respective subjects and are expert in their knowledge and presentation of all the elements involved in their particular subjects of instruction. As a result of this specialization, teachers in our high schools today, as well as in our colleges and universities, only instruct in 1 or 2 subjects but in doing so teach hundreds of students.

A teacher in the modern high school is a part of a very important and a very great profession. Just as our Government has done much, and is doing more and more to improve the physical facilities of high schools, through the erection of fine new modern buildings, such as this new Billerica High School, so also must the Government aid in every way possible, in the improvement and the making more attractive, the noble profession of high school teaching. This is progress which cannot be overlooked. It is progress that must be accomplished in the near future. I am confident it will be done.

As we look across the valleys to the far off horizon and focus our attention on the possibilities of the future we know in fact that, knowledge is power. Among the young men and women who will have the privilege and opportunity of attending this fine new Billerica High School, and among the young men and women in communities like Billerica all over the Nation, America must depend upon its leadership of the future. Among the students of future years, who will graduate from here, there may be a great scientist, there may be a great teacher, there may be an inspired leader of the church, there may be a great actor, there may be a great doctor or lawyer, or a great musician. Among these students there might be a future Member of Congress, a future United States Senator, yes, there might be a future President of the United States. It is from among these students our leaders in all walks of life must come. The teaching they receive here, the inspiration and values they develop here, the fundamentals they acquire here, all will have a bearing upon the type and quality of the leadership they bring to our country in the life of tomorrow.

Ladies and gentlemen, like you I love my country, the great principles of its foundation, the great accomplishments it has achieved over the years for the benefit of mankind everywhere, its enormous sacrifices and contributions to maintain and establish freedom, its freedom of religion and the right of everyone to worship God in their own way and all of the rights and privileges we enjoy as Americans.

I am proud of our power and strength as a Nation. I am proud we possess the power of the hydrogen bomb. But over and above this pride, I am proud that our America will never use this power aggressively, to injure or cripple mankind anywhere. I am proud of the fact our leadership today possesses the balance and judgment necessary to make the right decisions at the crossroads.

Many despair of the future. Many are fearful man is on the threshold of his own destruction. I do not possess this fear. On the contrary, I possess the confidence the march of scientific discovery and knowledge in America will always be shaped and molded into benefits for mankind. This confidence I possess is inspired by the countless numbers of the young men and women of America I have talked with, observed, and appraised, like those here in Billerica, who will have the privilege and honor of attending this magnificent new high school. I have this confidence because I know that within their ranks is endless material for greater, wiser, and more unselfish leadership than any we have experienced and known thus far.

The young men and women who are attending our high schools today, know full well the great responsibilities they must shoulder in the near future. They are preparing themselves. They are getting ready and when their time comes, I know they will be ready. It is because of this confidence that I have in them, the young men and women of today and tomorrow, that I know our great country is safe. I know they will find the solution to ultimtae peace throughout the world. I know that in the life to come, they will meet their tests and challenges successfully, and the march of knowledge and science will be channelled into peaceful processes, for the benefit of mankind throughout the world.

Youth Appreciation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, May 27, 1956, was observed in Charlotte, N. C., as Youth Appreciation Day. Similar recognition was given youth in a number of other North Carolina cities, in five other States, and in a Province of Canada.

The idea of designating a special day for adults to pay tribute to youth was originated by T. Earl Yarborough, a fine public-spirited citizen of Charlotte. Mr. Yarborough thought up this idea last year when he served as director of Optimist Club boys work in North Carolina. He thought it would be appropriate to use a date for Youth Appreciation Day between the dates designated as Mother's

Day and Father's Day in order to focus attention upon the importance of home and family relationships.

The Yarborough proposal was endorsed by the Charlotte Association of Civic Clubs. Harold Smoak, another outstanding civic leader of Charlotte and president of the Charlotte Optimist Club, was designated as chairman of a committee to inaugurate the program in Mecklenburg County. Mr. Yarborough served as State chairman and devoted his attention to selling the idea to other communities in our State.

The observance of Youth Appreciation Day in Charlotte in 1955 was so successful that it attracted the attention of Optimist International. The officers of that fine civic organization were so impressed by the possibilities for good in such a movement that they decided to throw the great weight and influence of Optimist International behind it. The Optimists do not plan to claim this program as an exclusive promotion but are inviting support from all other interested groups in their efforts to expand the observance of Youth Appreciation Day throughout the country and abroad.

Governor Hodges of North Carolina has endorsed the idea and issued a proclamation calling upon all parents to "rededicate themselves to the responsibilities of parenthood and urging all citizens to join in the celebration, to become aware of youth as earnest, helpful citizens, to recognize their accomplishments, and to credit them with friendly confidence."

Earl Yarborough explains the idea behind Youth Appreciation Day as an effort to encourage adults to express their faith in youth. He points out that 95 percent of our youths are not delinquent and that it is not fair for this great majority to be denied the recognition due them because of the dramatization of the problems created by the other 5 percent. "There is a need to dramatize decency instead of delinquency," Mr. Yarborough says, and then proceeds to take positive action to inaugurate a movement to do just that—a movement I predict will spread across the entire country."

This movement will spread because we have long needed a Youth Appreciation Day—a day on which we can take time out of our busy lives to tell our boys and girls how much they mean to us and to our country's future.

Many adults think that stern discipline is the only answer to the problem of juvenile delinquency. I do not discount the importance of discipline but am inclined to believe that it should be mixed with a generous portion of understanding and confidence. A little praise occasionally for a job well done might also pay dividends.

"As the twig is bent so is the tree inclined." As the youth of this great country of ours develop into wholesome and disciplined strength, so will our national safety be assured and thus will our country prosper.

A salute to T. Earl Yarborough and his associates who had the imagination to think up this idea in the first place and the initiative to put it into effect.

Recognition of Organizations of Postal and Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing in the House of Representatives a bill which would amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees.

This is a companion bill to the one introduced by Congressman GEORGE M. RHODES, of Pennsylvania, and would extend to any national employee organization representing postal or other Federal employees, the right to present in behalf of such members any grievances to the department or agency concerned.

In my opinion, passage of the union recognition bill would do much to boost the morale of our Government workers, and, in addition, would permit them to discuss, through their representatives, the policies affecting their working conditions, safety, in-service training, labor-management cooperation, methods of adjusting grievances, transfers, appeals, granting of leave, promotions, demotions, rates of pay, and reduction in force.

Employees of the Federal Government as well as those in private industry are entitled to job protection, and I believe that this will be a step in the right direction.

I urge the members of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to which the legislation has been referred, to give it prompt and serious consideration at this time, with a view toward reporting it out in the near future.

The bill is as follows:

A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 5, sec. 652), as amended, is hereby amended by adding a new subsection to read as follows:

"(e) (1) The right of officers or representatives of national employee organizations or local officers of such national organizations representing employees of a department or agency or subdivision of such department or agency, to present grievances in behalf of their members without restraint, coercion, interference, intimidation, or reprisal is recognized.

"(2) (A) Within 6 months after the effective date of this act, the head of each department and agency shall, after giving officers or representatives of employee organizations having members in such department or agency an opportunity to present their views, promulgate regulations specifying that administrative officers shall at the request of officers or representatives of the employees' organizations confer, either in person or through duly designated representatives, with such officers or representatives on matters of policy affecting working conditions, safety, in-service training, labor-management cooperation, methods of adjusting grievances, transfers, appeals, granting of leave, promotions, demotions, rates of pay, and reduction in force. Such regulations shall recognize the right of such officers or representatives to carry on any lawful activity, without intimidation, coercion, interference, or reprisal.

"(B) Disputes resulting from disagreement between employee organizations and departments or agencies on the policies enumerated in subsection (e) (2) (A) shall be referred to an impartial board of arbitration to be composed of one representative of the department or agency, one representative of the employee organization, and one representative appointed by the Secretary of Labor who shall serve as chairman. The findings of the board of arbitration shall be final and conclusive.

"(3) Charges involving a violation of this subsection shall be referred to an impartial board of arbitration to be composed of three members, one to be selected by the organization making the charge, one to be selected by the head of the department or agency involved, and the third, who shall act as chairman, to be designated by the Civil Service Commission. The findings of this board of arbitration shall be final and conclusive as to the fact of violation and the head of the department or agency involved shall take such action as may be necessary to cause the suspension, demotion, or removal of any administrative official found by the board of arbitration to have violated this subsection.

"(4) This subsection shall not apply to the Central Intelligence Agency or the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

H. R. 12078 Will Stop Profiteering of Foreign-Flag Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, non-United States flag privately owned commercial ocean vessels, with low-wage foreign crews, are charging rates for transporting United States Government-owned or financed cargoes substantially the same as the rates charged by American-flag privately owned commercial ocean vessels.

If, as I understand to be the case, the owners and operators of American flag ships are finding ample cargo available and are able to charge rates which return them substantial profits, then certainly the owners of foreign registered ships must be reaping a harvest from United States Government cargoes at the expense of the American taxpayer, because the rates of a crew on a non-United States flag vessel aggregate approximately $20,000 a month less than the wages of a crew of one of our United States flag vessels.

In effect, an American owner can register his ship under a foreign flag and then by replacing American seamen with a foreign crew he can reduce his cost of operation and increase his profits to the tune of nearly a quarter of a million dollars a year. That situation is deplorable because that profit is at the expense of American seamen and, likewise, is at the expense of our Federal Treasury—and

to add insult to injury, it is United States Government cargoes which are making possible such profiteering by foreign-flag ship operators.

I have sought, Mr. Speaker, to correct the situation. Earlier this year I introduced a bill to force our foreign competition, if it accepted our United States Government cargoes, to pay our scale of wages. Unfortunately, there has not been widespread support to date for that type of solution which is patterned after the Davis-Bacon area labor standard provision used in Federal construction and other legislation.

Meanwhile, the problem of foreign steamship profiteering has become more aggravated and, accordingly, I have developed a new legislative approach which offers, I think, a more practical remedy. This new idea is incorporated in H. R. 12078, a bill which I introduced yesterday and to which I call all Members' attention.

As the membership knows, Mr. Speaker, under the United States Cargo Preference Act, or, as it is generally referred to, the 50–50 cargo law, American ships to qualify for any preference must be available and agree to transport the cargo at reasonable rates. My bill provides, in effect, that foreign-flag vessels to qualify must have rates that are in line with the rates charged by American-flag ships so that the margin of profit of the former is not greater proportionately than the margin of profit of our privately owned commercial oceangoing ships for comparable service in comparable geographic areas, such margins of profit being based on determinations of the Secretary of Commerce, taking into account wage differentials.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation is fair and would accomplish three desirable objectives: First, American shipowners would be discouraged under such a provision of law from transferring their vessels to foreign registry by reducing their profit incentive; second, the bill would relieve the United States Treasury and the poor long-suffering taxpayers of this country of paying exorbitant transportation and profits to operators of foreign ships; and, third, the measure would expand our active American merchant marine and increase job opportunities for American seamen.

My purpose in introducing H. R. 12078 at this late date in the session is to allow time for study and Department reports, so the House Committee on Merchant Marine could give the bill early attention next year. At the moment there is considerable demand for cargo and passenger space, so that our seafaring personnel may not be too concerned or fully conscious of future unemployment possibilities. But if the American people come to a realization that in a measure they are subsidizing not only our merchant marine but the ships of other nations and ships flying foreign flags and manned by foreign crews, then there is a danger of a popular move to cut off Government assistance of every nature and to all. In effect, our United States ships are being driven off the seas right now and indirectly and in a large measure it is our own Government cargoes transported on foreign ships which are causing this situation.

Let us stop this profiteering before it boomerangs. H. R. 12078 may well hold the answer to the problem.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 4, 1956

Rev. Rafe C. Martin, pastor, St. John's Presbyterian Church, Reno, Nev., offered the following prayer:

Not with ponderous words nor phrases of piety, Almighty God, but with simplicity of mind and humility of heart we seek Thy blessing, for the people of this Nation in general, and especially for the Senate here assembled; that Thou wouldst be pleased to direct and prosper all their consultations, to the advancement of Thy glory, the safety, honor, and welfare of the people; that all things may be so ordered by their endeavors, upon the best and surest foundations, that peace and happiness, truth and justice, virtue and piety may be established among us.

These and all other necessities for them and for us, we humbly ask in the name of Jesus Christ, the Ruler of all. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 31, 1956, was dispensed with.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 31, 1956,

The following reports of the Committee on Appropriations were submitted on June 1, 1956:

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 9720. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2093).

By Mr. STENNIS:

H. R. 10003. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2094).

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On May 28, 1956:

S. 2286. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 so as to provide for the utilization of privately owned shipping services in connection with the transportation of privately owned vehicles;

S. 2327. An act for the relief of Takako Iba; and

S. 3237. An act to provide for continuance of life insurance coverage under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, in the case of employees receiving benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

On May 29, 1956:

S. 1883. An act for the relief of Pietro Rodolfo Walter Stulin and Renate Karolina Horky.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 9852. An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10285. An act to merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks, to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks, to provide for supervision of production credit associations, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 9852. An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 10285. An act to merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks, to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks, to provide for supervision of production credit associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for action on nominations on the Executive Calendar under the heading "New Reports."

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar under the heading "New Reports" will be stated.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGES

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles E. Whittaker to be United States circuit judge, eighth circuit.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of David T. Lewis to be United States circuit judge, 10th circuit.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for postmasters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations for postmaster be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations for postmasters will be considered en bloc, and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of all nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a limitation of 2 minutes on statements made during the morning hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NIHAT CENGIZ AND OTHERS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1026) for the relief of Nihat Cengiz, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bonds, which may have issued in the cases of Nihat Cingez and Rudolf Fritz Liermann. From and after the date of the enactment of this act, the said Nihat Cengiz and Rudolf Fritz Liermann shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, John Soudas, Catherine Callimanopoulos, Mary Callimanopoulos, Guiseppi Castrogiovanni, Anna Castrogiovanni, Stefano Castrogiovanni, Pil Nyi Kwak, Albino Braiuca, Lilu Yuen Chuang, Lin Tsai, Kimiko Yamada Clark, Leopold Riedl, Bozena Riedl, Hisakazu Hozaki, and Georgina Feher shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this section of this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, David Hayes, Nenita Santos, Elizabeth Santos, George Henry MacDonald (formerly Frederick William Arthur), and Catherine Toews shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mary Parlich Goldstein shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of certain aliens."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on February 3, 1956, the Senate passed S. 1026, to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to the beneficiary. On May 21, 1956, the House of Representatives passed S. 1026, with amendments, to include the beneficiaries of 17 similar individual Senate bills. Two cases, which have been included in S. 1026, passed the Senate to grant permanent residence to the beneficiaries, but have been amended to provide only for cancellation of outstanding deportation proceedings in behalf of the beneficiaries.

The amendments are acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 1026.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

EVA GERSHBEIN RUBINSTEIN AND OTHERS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1244) for the relief of Eva Gershbein Rubinstein, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eva Gershbein Rubinstein and Lydia G. Dickerson may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That suitable and proper bonds or undertakings, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

SEC. 2. Nothwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maximilien Beauvois may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lina Dias (formerly Lena Reeg) may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Katina R. Landrum and Renza Marsale Bartlett may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (17) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio Rubi Mendiola may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 6. The exemptions provided for in this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on March 29, 1956, the Senate passed Senate bill 1244, to waive a ground of inadmissibility in behalf of the beneficiary. On May 21, 1956, the House of Representatives passed Senate bill 1244 with amendments to include the beneficiaries of six similar individual Senate bills.

The amendments are acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate bill 1244.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am pleased to inform the Senate that we are well ahead of schedule this year on appropriation bills for the next fiscal year. Three bills have become public law, 3 bills are in conference, and 4 are currently on the Senate Calendar.

Two of the bills on the Senate Calendar, H. R. 9720, for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare; and H. R. 10003, for the District of Columbia, will be taken up tomorrow.

H. R. 9739, for the independent offices, and H. R. 9536, for general Government activities, are ready for floor consideration as soon as the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] returns to the city this week.

The appropriation bills for the Department of Defense and for Public Works are expected to be reported next

week. After that there will only be the legislative, mutual security, and supplemental bills for 1957 remaining to be reported by committee and acted upon by Congress.

I am confident that all of our money bills will be completely finished by the end of the current fiscal year, and I wish to commend the Committees on Appropriations in both the House and the Senate, particularly the eminently capable chairmen, Representative CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, and Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, as well as their able staffs, for the fine work they have done this year. I am also always pleased to extend my deepest appreciation for the splendid cooperation that I have received from every Member of the Senate in the scheduling and handling of appropriation legislation on the floor.

It is the hope of the leadership that the report on the social-security bill from the Finance Committee will be filed with the Senate not later than tomorrow, in which event it is the intention of the leadership to proceed to the consideration of the social-security bill, with the understanding that from time to time unanimous consent of the Senate will be asked to lay that bill aside and take up appropriation bills or other bills which require immediate attention.

I want to give Senators as much notice as possible, because I feel deeply in their debt for the very excellent cooperation I have received from the leadership on the other side of the aisle, and from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator anticipate that the social-security bill will be voted on this week?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should not like to make any definite commitment. If I should, the Senator knows I would try to keep it. Probably some 50 or 60 amendments will be offered to that bill. If it is reported on Tuesday and taken up for consideration on Wednesday, we shall probably have general discussion of it on Thursday and Friday, and perhaps more discussion on Monday, and it may be Monday before there will be any votes on the bill. I should think it would take part of next week to finish action on it, but the Senator from Vermont has had more experience in the Senate than I have had, and he can judge for himself.

The clerk tells me fifty-odd amendments have been submitted to the social-security bill. How many of them will be pursued, I do not know. I think it is a good guess to say there will be no votes on the bill this week.

Mr. AIKEN. I asked the question because of a selfish interest. I have to be out of town the latter part of the week, and I hoped there would be no votes taken on the bill this week.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Vermont is never selfish. I do not think he will miss any votes on the social-security bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I believe the acting majority leader last Friday mentioned the fact that the Alaska mental health bill will be brought up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. So far as the majority leader's information goes, he thinks it is one of the bills which have been cleared for consideration. Does the Senator have any wishes in the matter?

Mr. LANGER. I have a wish. I should like to have it lie over a day or two, pending an investigation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator's wishes will be complied with, and we shall put it over right now.

Mr. LANGER. For a day or two?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. Let us say for 2 days.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We shall be delighted to do so. We shall delay it today and tomorrow, for sure.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENTS TO THE WAR HAZARDS COMPENSATION ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of December 2, 1942, and the act of August 16, 1941, relating to injury, disability, and death resulting from war-risk hazards and from employment, suffered by employees of contractors of the United States, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 650 OF TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "COAST GUARD"

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 650 of title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," relating to the Coast Guard Supply Fund (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

FEES OF WITNESSES IN UNITED STATES COURTS AND BEFORE UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States courts and before United States commissioners, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO APPOINTMENT OF SECRETARIES AND LAW CLERKS BY DISTRICT JUDGES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 752 of title 28, United States Code (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, Buffalo, N. Y., favoring an amendment to the Social Security Act relating to a reduction of the age of those who are to receive benefits under that act; to the Committee on Finance.

COMMEMORATIVE STAMP IN HONOR OF DR. SAMUEL J. CRUMBINE—RESOLUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, one of the outstanding pioneer leaders in public health education was the late Dr. Samuel J. Crumbine, of Kansas.

He was the first full-time health officer in our State and was recognized nationally and internationally for his outstanding work in this field.

I have submitted a resolution directing the Postmaster General to issue a special postal stamp to commemorate Dr. Crumbine in recognition of his invaluable service in this field.

I have received a resolution adopted by the Ohio Public Health Association urging that we get early action on this commemorative stamp and I ask that it be referred to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Dr. Samuel J. Crumbine, now deceased, was the first full-time health officer in Kansas and a pioneer and outstanding leader in public health education; and

Whereas United States Senator FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas, introduced a bill designated as S. 2936, in which authority was requested to direct the Postmaster General to issue a special postal stamp to commemorate Dr. Samuel J. Crumbine in recognition of his invaluable service in directing and developing public health programs; and

Whereas S. 2936 has passed and is now in the hands of the Postmaster General: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Middle States Public Health Association and the Ohio Public Health Association transmit to the Postmaster General their endorsement to this bill and request that the postal stamp commemorating Dr. Samuel J. Crumbine be issued as soon as arrangements can be made; and be it further

Resolved, That the original copy of this resolution be directed to the Postmaster General of the United States, a copy to Senator FRANK CARLSON, of the United States Senate, and a copy to Marion Folsom, Secretary of the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS,
C. S. PALMER, M. D.,
Chairman, Member, Ohio Public Health Association,
JANET JENNINGS,
Member, Middle States Public Health Association,
EARL O. WRIGHT,
Member, Ohio Public Health Association and Middle States Public Health Association.

RESOLUTION OF KANSAS CHAPTER 13, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTMASTERS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, recently I have received much mail from citizens who live in Kansas, and, because of a ruling of the Post Office Department, carry their mailing address as Kansas City, Mo. There are several communities in Wyandotte and Johnson Counties where this situation prevails.

I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a resolution which has just been

adopted by the executive committee of Kansas Chapter, No. 13, of the National Association of Postmasters at the annual meeting of the committee on May 8, 1956, at Topeka, Kans.

I ask that the resolution be referred to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF KANSAS CHAPTER, NO. 13, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTMASTERS, AT ANNUAL MEETING OF SAID COMMITTEE MAY 8, 1956, AT TOPEKA, KANS.

Whereas an inquiry has been received from Senator FRANK CARLSON regarding the position of the Kansas Chapter of the National Association of Postmasters with respect to Kansas residents receiving their mail from an out-of-State post office and being thereby required to have an out-of-State post office address although such persons are legal residents of Kansas and reside within the boundaries of this State; and

Whereas we have received numerous complaints from such patrons and are convinced that they can receive postal delivery service equally as well or better from Kansas post offices; and

Whereas we believe that such practices of transferring the post office addresses of Kansans to out-of-State is misleading, is contrary to the wishes of the majority of such patrons and generally is unsound, unfair, and confusing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we reaffirm our position as being strenuously opposed to the assigning of Kansas patrons to post office addresses out of State and particularly in Kansas City, Mo., and we respectfully urge that such transfers cease and that correction be made to restore post office addresses of this State to such residents.

(The foregoing resolution adopted unanimously and the secretary instructed to transmit a copy thereof to Senator CARLSON.)

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—PETITIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received several petitions signed by sundry citizens of the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce. I ask unanimous consent that one of the petitions may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, one of the petitions was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWARK VALLEY, N. Y., *May 22, 1956.*

We the undersigned respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the States, under the 21st amendment, to control the sale of such beverages.

At a time when 1 out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic there should be no encouragement to increasing the use of such beverages.

Children and youth are continually being misled to consider them harmless, especially by the powerful audio and visual suggestions of radio and television.

THE CEMENT SHORTAGE—LETTER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Salzer Lumber Co., of Minneapolis, Minn., signed by John I. Salzer, relating to the cement shortage.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SALZER LUMBER CO.,
Minneapolis, Minn., May 29, 1956.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: You are undoubtedly aware of the very serious cement shortage which is developing in parts of Minnesota and the greater part of North Dakota.

We are in the building material business in the State of North Dakota with our headquarters in Minneapolis, and of course are extremely concerned over this situation. We depend entirely upon the suppliers in the Duluth area for our cement requirements and both the Cutler Magner and Universal Atlas people advise us at this time that they are at least 90 days behind in making shipment to their dealer customers. They explain the situation as being completely beyond their control.

The building of air bases at Minot, Grand Forks and Fargo, together with the completion of Garrison Dam, is taking such a tremendous drain from these two suppliers on dealer contractor orders that they are unable to supply their normal trade.

We know that these air bases and Garrison Dam are all very essential and of a priority nature. However, we do not feel that it is wise to jeopardize the economy of one particular section by completely depleting or depriving one particular section of such an essential building material as cement. We feel that the cement to be furnished to these projects could be supplied by not only Duluth but Mason City, Des Moines, Rapid City, or Montana. This would certainly more equitably distribute the burden of these projects named above, which are of a nationwie nature and concern rather than of local or area interest.

The differential in freight rates from the outlying areas mentioned above, and those of Duluth, would not amount to a great deal in dollars and cents when compared to the overall cost of these projects and when compared to the hardships which the cement shortage will create in Minnesota and North Dakota. Building activities already are way off in Minnesota and North Dakota areas and will be even further off unless something is done immediately to alleviate the cement shortage.

Yours very truly,

JOHN I. SALZER.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. 40. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William A. Curran (Rept. No. 2096); and

H. R. 692. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for peace" (Rept. No. 2095).

CITATION OF JOSEPH BRUNO FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. DANIEL), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 274) to cite Joseph Bruno for contempt of the United States Senate, and submitted a report (No. 2097) thereon; which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Joseph Bruno to answer questions before the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code of the Committee on the Judiciary, said refusal to answer being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois, to the end that the said Joseph Bruno may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF WILLIAM FRAZIER EVANS FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. DANIEL), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 275) to cite William Frazier Evans for contempt of the United States Senate, and submitted a report (No. 2098) thereon; which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of William Frazier Evans, alias Butch, to answer questions before the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code of the Committee on the Judiciary, said refusal to answer being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the eastern district of Michigan, to the end that the said William Frazier Evans, alias Butch, may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF ROBERT T. HOSOI FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. DANIEL), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 276) to cite Robert T. Hosoi for contempt of the United States Senate, and submitted a report (No. 2099) thereon; which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Robert T. Hosoi to appear before the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code of the Committee on the Judiciary, said refusal to appear being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the southern district of California, to the end that the said Robert T. Hosoi may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF SALVATORE SANTORO FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. DANIEL), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 277) to cite Salvatore Santoro

for contempt of the United States Senate, and submitted a report (No. 2100) thereon; which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Salvatore Santoro to answer questions before the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code of the Committee on the Judiciary, said refusal to answer being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the southern district of New York, to the end that the said Salvatore Santoro may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF JESSE ALEXANDER FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. DANIEL), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 278) to cite Jesse Alexander for contempt of the United States Senate, and submitted a report (No. 2101) thereon; which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Jesse Alexander to answer questions before the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code of the Committee on the Judiciary, said refusal to answer being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois, to the end that the said Jesse Alexander may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF JOSEPH BENDINELLI FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. DANIEL), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 279) to cite Joseph Bendinelli for contempt of the United States Senate, and submitted a report (No. 2102) thereon; which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Joseph Bendinelli to answer questions before the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code of the Committee on the Judiciary, said refusal to answer being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the southern district of New York, to the end that the said Joseph Bendinelli may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 3972. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Mrs. Walter E. von Kalinowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 3973. A bill for the relief of Eero Juno Valkonen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 3974. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to grant nonprofit educational institutions exemptions from the excise taxes which are now applicable to public educational institutions; and

S. 3975. A bill to amend paragraphs 1773 and 1774 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit free importation of certain religious articles by additional organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3976. A bill for the relief of Carmella Spinelli Porcelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3977. A bill to extend for an additional 6 years the authority to make, guarantee, and insure loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3978. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, render judgment upon the claim of Col. Walter E. Cole for retirement from the Army of the United States due to a service-connected disability; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 3979. A bill to provide for transportation of certain members of the National Flying Farmers' Association, and their aircraft, from the United States to Europe and return; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 3980. A bill to establish public use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. KERR):

S. 3981. A bill to provide a more equitable method for computing the self-employment income of farmers under the Social Security Act for taxable years ending during the period commencing January 1, 1955 and ending December 31, 1958; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 3982. A bill to provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. MCNAMARA, and Mr. BENDER):

S. 3983. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection of poultry and poultry products so as to prohibit the movement in interstate or foreign commerce of unsound, unhealthful, diseased, unwholesome, or adulterated poultry or poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3984. A bill to authorize the Chief of Engineers to reimburse owners and tenants of land acquired for Tuttle Creek Reservoir, Missouri River Basin, for certain business losses; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3985. A bill to validate certain payments made to members and former members of the naval service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 3986. A bill for the relief of Frosso Spiliotou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 3987. A bill to provide for the establishment of additional animal disease laboratory facilities at or near the Utah State Agriculture College; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3988. A bill for the relief of Ursula H. Mueller; and

S. 3989. A bill for the relief of Johann Leber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 3990. A bill to encourage the barter of surplus agricultural commodities for supplies, materials, and equipment financed under the Mutual Security Act of 1954; and

S. 3991. A bill to facilitate the control and eradication of certain animal diseases, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the agricultural attaché program, to facilitate the operations of the Farmers' Home Administration, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation and the Forest Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

S. 3992. A bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the cutting of timber, the manufacture and sale of lumber, and the preservation of the forests on the Menominee Indian Reservation in the State of Wisconsin," approved March 28, 1908, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. MALONE, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WELKER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. BEALL):

S. 3993. A bill to exempt certain shipments of farm produce from the tax on the transportation of property; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. J. Res. 176. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of additional animal disease laboratory facilities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. POTTER:

S. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built tankers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. POTTER when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

FREE ELECTIONS IN THE SLOVAK NATION

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 81), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas national self-determination is a universal aspiration inherent in all peoples and nations; and

Whereas the Slovak people and nation were among the first to suffer Communist aggression; and

Whereas the Slovak people and nation have been denied the right of self-determination: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the Slovak people and nation are entitled to and should no longer be denied the right of self-determination; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee proposed to the American delegation in the United Nations that the request for free elections or a plebiscite under United Nations supervision, by the Slovak people in order to choose their own form of government and to reestablish their own Slovak nation, be placed on the agenda of the United Nations Assembly for consideration and such action as may be appropriate.

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. DANIEL), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported the following original resolutions, which were placed on the calendar:

S. Res. 274. Resolution to cite Joseph Bruno for contempt of the United States Senate;

S. Res. 275. Resolution to cite William Frazier Evans for contempt of the United States Senate;

S. Res. 276. Resolution to cite Robert T. Hosoi for contempt of the United States Senate;

S. Res. 277. Resolution to cite Salvatore Santoro for contempt of the United States Senate;

S. Res. 278. Resolution to cite Jesse Alexander for contempt of the United States Senate; and

S. Res. 279. Resolution to cite Joseph Bendinello for contempt of the United States Senate.

(See resolutions printed in full, which appear under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

PUBLIC USE OF NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish public use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, and for other purposes.

This bill provides for the setting aside of 10 percent of the national forest receipts each year for development, maintenance, and operation of facilities and areas for recreation use, improvement and maintenance of wildlife habitat, and to provide for adequate safety, sanitation and health in connection with uses of the national forests. The amount so set aside shall not exceed $7,500,000 in any one year.

I would like to make it clear that this bill does not give the Agriculture Department further authority to charge fees for the recreational use of national forests. In fact, it limits the Agriculture Department's existing authority.

This bill, introduced by myself and Senator MANSFIELD, is similar to H. R. 1823, introduced by Representative METCALF. At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, an editorial supporting the Metcalf bill entitled "Why Not Let Our National Forests Use Some of the Profits?" which appeared recently in the Saturday Evening Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY NOT LET OUR NATIONAL FORESTS USE SOME OF THE PROFIT?

With the increasing rush for outdoor recreation the number of visitors to the national forests has doubled in the past 7 years. They reached a total of 45 million last year.

But many of the visitors had reason to complain. That is because the recreational facilities of the national forests have not kept up with this fastest growing of their multiple uses. A lot of the facilities date back to CCC days in the 1930's. Virtually all of the 4,700 improved camping ground and picnic areas are crowded far beyond their capacity. Other visitors are compelled to camp out in undeveloped areas, without fire protection, sanitation, or other accommodations. Some of the recreation areas have been closed because there was not money enough to keep them in proper condition.

The situation has so deteriorated that the Forest Service estimates that at least double the present appropriation is needed for cleanup and maintenance alone. Funds are even less adequate for the needs of the many annual visitors to the unimproved wilderness areas as campers, hikers, hunters, fishermen, or trail-riders. The national forests, with their 81,000 miles of streams and 2,750,000 acres of lakes, comprise the choicest public hunting and fishing areas in the Nation. But funds to maintain favorable game and fish habitat conditions have lagged behind with the others.

The national forests are a profitable investment. The receipts they turned in last year, principally from timber sales and grazing fees, exceeded operating and other costs by $18 million. It seems logical that some of this profit should be reinvested for the benefit of the public.

This is the practical proposal in a bill introduced in Congress by Representative LEE METCALF, of Montana. It would establish public recreation use of the national forests as a policy of Congress. No such policy now exists. The bill provides that 10 percent of the national forest receipts be set aside each year for the development, maintenance, and operation of facilities and areas for recreation use. The amount to be set aside is limited to $5,500,000 in any one year, and none of it can be used for further land acquisition.

There is nothing revolutionary in this policy. As far back as 1908 Congress adopted a similar policy, allotting 25 percent of all money received from the forests to the States for roads and schools in the counties that contain national-forest lands. The Metcalf proposal would not disturb such funds.

The national forests are a good place to begin catching up with the need for greater recreational facilities for the people, and the Metcalf bill provides a logical method by which it can be done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3980) to establish public use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

COMPUTATION OF CERTAIN SELF-EMPLOYMENT INCOME OF FARMERS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Montana may proceed.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to give our older farmers relief from a very unjust situation. In 1954 Congress passed an act bringing self-employed farmers under the old-age and survivors insurance program. In accordance with provisions of the basic act, farmers already 65 years old, or upon attainment of age 65, become eligible to retire on social-security benefits after having paid social-security tax on at least 6 quarters of earnings. Since farmers were started on the program in 1955, and pay their social-security tax with their annual income-tax reports, the bulk of elder farmers will first become eligible to apply for retirement in January 1957, when their 1955 and 1956 incomes have been established and taxes paid on them.

Census data indicates that there are approximately 900,000 farmers who are already 65, or will attain that age by January 1957. It is estimated that at least half of this total number normally have the necessary $400 per year minimum net earnings to make them eligible for old-age and survivors insurance.

In including these farmer citizens under the act in 1954, it was Congress' intention that they should have social-security benefits through their later years based upon their average level of earnings and economic station in life during their productive years.

Unfortunately, the base period on which benefits will be determined for the nearly half million farmers who will become eligible for benefits next year will not reflect normal earnings, or anything close to normal earnings, for the most of them. Those who retire next year will receive benefits based on their net farm earnings in 1955 and 1956; two of the worst farm income years in this generation. As we all know, net farm income in these 2 years is averaging around $11 billion, compared to a peak of $17 billion in 1949.

Because of this serious farm-income situation, the yardstick on which benefits for the elder farmers who desire to retire next year has been shortened, on the average, from 36 to about 23 inches.

As we know, extensive floods and droughts as well as low prices seriously impaired the incomes of tens of thousands of farmers last year, and they will depress large numbers this year.

I have had considerable correspondence with and about farmers who have had better than $4,200 net earnings for many years—the maximum on which

social security can be based—but fell far below in 1955 due to drought, flood, the low price of hogs or low price of some other commodity. Others, below the $4,200 figure, have had their earnings drastically reduced, some of them unfortunately even below the minimum to become eligible for old-age and survivors insurance.

The $4,200-year-year farmer whose earnings dropped to $1,600 faces a loss of benefits of from $162.80 per month for himself and wife to $102.80. The $1,800-per-year farmer whose income dropped to $540 will receive only $45 per month for himself and wife instead of $102.80.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a table of old-age and survivors insurance benefits for farmers, farmer and wife, and survivors at various income levels. This table indicates how the unusual drops in net earnings of farmers in 1955 and 1956 can reduce their social-security benefits for the rest of their lives.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Examples of OASI monthly benefits

Average monthly earnings after 1950	Monthly retirement payments		Monthly survivors payments		
	Farmer	Farmer and wife	Widow, child, or parent	Widow and 1 child	Widow and 2 children
$45	$30.00	$45.00	$30.00	$45.00	$50.20
$100	55.00	82.50	41.30	82.60	82.60
$110	60.50	90.80	45.40	90.80	90.90
$130	64.50	96.80	48.40	96.80	104.00
$150	68.50	102.80	51.40	102.80	120.00
$170	72.50	108.80	54.40	108.80	136.00
$190	76.50	114.80	57.40	114.80	152.00
$210	80.50	120.80	60.40	120.80	161.20
$230	84.50	126.80	63.40	126.80	169.20
$250	88.50	132.80	66.40	132.80	177.20
$270	92.50	138.80	69.40	138.80	185.20
$290	96.50	144.80	72.40	144.80	193.20
$310	100.50	150.80	75.40	150.80	200.00
$330	104.50	156.80	78.40	156.80	200.00
$350	108.50	162.80	81.40	162.80	200.00

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in perfecting the social security program we have recognized that economic misfortunes, illness and other causes sometimes unduly depress the income of our citizens for a year, or several years. We have provided that 4 or 5 years may be dropped out of calculations determining the base of the fresh start allowed in establishing base periods beginning with 1950, applicants are able to obtain benefits on their 2 best years.

Because agricultural income is subject to tremendous fluctuations due to both natural and economic forces, farmers are especially entitled to a drop-out provision—to a provision which will ameliorate the effect of disaster years on their old-age benefits.

But the older farmers, who have only 1955 and 1956 on which to base their claims, are unable to take advantage of any drop-out years. Under the law as it is now written, they must accept the disastrous incomes of 1955 and 1956 as their base even though they may be the worst income years in their whole farming experience.

The bill I have introduced is intended to achieve the original purpose and intention of the Congress to give farmers benefits based on normal earnings by making it possible for farmers, during the beginning years of their OASI coverage, to substitute one or more of the years between 1950 and 1955, for subnormal incomes which might occur in 1955 to 1958. Under the proposed amendment, a farmer may report—or file an amended report as to 1955 income—that his net earnings for any of the years 1955 to 1958 were:

First. Actual net earnings; or

Second. The presumed net earnings under the provision of the Social Security Act now in force—presumed net earnings of $900 are allowed if the farmer's gross sales were $1,800; or

Third. Actual net earnings for any one of the years 1951 through 1954, if the earnings can be substantiated by income tax returns regularly filed with the Internal Revenue Bureau; or

Fourth. Assumed net earnings for one of the years 1951 through 1954 computed by multiplying the farmers' production units, or facilities, by the average net earnings from such units in the same general farming area for any of the years 1951 to 1954.

In preparing this amendment, I have consulted with experts in the old-age and survivors insurance agency.

They are reluctant to use statements or affidavits of income from claimants as the basis of benefit payments. Consequently, the third and fourth alternatives I have just stated were included as the basis for establishing income in the 1951–54 period—substantiation by income-tax returns, or assumption that the farmer's net earnings were average in his area for his size and type of operation.

Experts at the Agricultural Marketing Service advise me that farmers' average earnings per acre, or per head of livestock, can be established as required from available statistics.

Mr. President, I hope there can be speedy consideration and enactment of this measure.

The Congress certainly does not want the agricultural hard times of 1955 and 1956 to condemn a half million elder farm families to lowered living standards for the remainder of their lives, yet that is what will have been done if they are forced to accept old-age and survivors insurance benefits based on the disastrous farm income levels of these years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3981) to provide a more equitable method for computing the self-employment income of farmers under the Social Security Act for taxable years ending during the period commencing January 1, 1955, and ending December 31, 1958, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. KERR), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

DOMESTIC TUNGSTEN, ASBESTOS, FLUORSPAR, AND COLUMBIUM-TANTALUM PRODUCTION AND PURCHASE ACT OF 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], my colleague, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would extend the Government purchase programs covering tungsten, asbestos, acid-grade fluorspar, and columbite-tantalite.

This legislation has been carefully drawn after extensive hearings before the Minerals, Materials and Fuels Subcommittee, and executive department witnesses have testified it will meet no objection or opposition on the part of the administration.

I would like to also point out that the committee has been advised by the Office of Defense Mobilization that it is now in the process of extending, by Executive directive, the purchase program covering six other strategic minerals which can be absorbed immediately into the national stockpile. Legislation, the committee has been advised, is needed only in the case of tungsten, asbestos, acid-grade fluorspar, and columbite-tantalite.

I and my associates on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs would welcome other Senators who may wish to join us in sponsorship of this vital legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3982) to provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REIMBURSEMENT OF OWNERS AND TENANTS OF LAND ACQUIRED FOR TUTTLE CREEK RESERVOIR, FOR CERTAIN BUSINESS LOSSES

Mr CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the chief of engineers to reimburse owners and tenants of land acquired for the Tuttle Creek Reservoir

in the Missouri Basin for certain business losses.

This is a companion bill to H. R. 11400 introduced by Representative AVERY on May 23.

These property owners and tenants are being forced to sell their property or business and everyone agrees that they will suffer a business loss, even though the Federal Government can and will pay them for the actual value of the real property or merchandise.

It is unfortunate that under present statutes, we cannot pay for goodwill that has been established over years of service to this community and area.

These people who are forced to liquidate their real property and business, are entitled to this consideration and I think everyone agrees they should be compensated not only for their actual property values, but for intangible values that can be accumulated only after years of service in a community.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3984) to authorize the chief of engineers to reimburse owners and tenants of land acquired for Tuttle Creek Reservoir, Missouri River Basin, for certain business losses, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

ADDITIONAL ANIMAL DISEASE LABORATORY FACILITIES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to provide for the establishment of additional animal disease laboratory facilities. The Appropriations Committee deleted an item of $10 million for an animal disease laboratory from the agricultural appropriation bill for 1957. There was no opposition to the establishment of such a laboratory, but the committee was of the opinion that it should not be located at the agricultural center in Beltsville, Md.

The joint resolution which I am introducing today would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to locate such a laboratory, and would provide that, in so doing, he should confer with a representative group or committee from the livestock industry, the land-grant colleges, and other agencies and organizations, in order that the laboratory might be properly located elsewhere than at Beltsville.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 176) to provide for the establishment of additional animal disease laboratory facilities, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SALE OF CERTAIN WAR-BUILT TANKERS

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built tankers. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be held in the Secretary's office until the close of business on Friday, June 8, 1956, for the purpose of adding additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be held in the Secretary's office, as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 177) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built tankers, introduced by Mr. POTTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, explaining the purpose of the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR POTTER

The purpose of this joint resolution is to permit the institution of common-carrier steamship service with United States-flag vessels between Atlantic coast ports of the United States and Cuba and Mexico on essential trade routes 3 and 4. These are the only steamship services which have been declared to be essential to the foreign commerce of the United States by the Maritime Administrator and Secretary of Commerce under section 211 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, on which there is no United States-flag operation.

Until 1953 United States-flag service was provided on these routes by the New York and Cuba Mail Line, which was one of the oldest steamship services under the American flag. The United States Government had invested many millions of dollars in the routes in the form of operating subsidy and construction subsidy to New York and Cuba Mail Line. That operator was subsidized from the outset of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and before that time it received financial aid from the Government under ocean mail contracts under previous maritime legislation.

In 1948 new financial interests succeeded to the control of New York and Cuba mail and in 1953 the company cancelled its operating differential subsidy contract with the Federal Maritime Board, and it subsequently sold its vessels. That operator now offers only a foreign-flag service with chartered vessels. Despite the efforts of the Federal Maritime Board in 1953, and thereafter, to interest existing subsidized lines to take over the former New York and Cuba mail service under the American flag, there has been little or no interest shown by such operators in taking over the service and protecting the substantial investment of the Government on the routes.

The reluctance of American-flag operators to institute service in the Cuba or Mexican trades can be attributed to the substantial cargo loading and discharging problems which are attendant to these services. These loading and discharging problems include not only the high costs of handling general cargo, but also the inordinate delays which are occasioned by the time spent in port by the standard type berth operation.

Browning Steamship Lines propose to institute United States-flag service on these essential routes. As the solution to the substantial loading and discharging problems, Browning Steamship Lines intend to operate a complete container-ship operation, such containers being capable of handling all general cargo moving on the routes, including refrigerated cargo. The containers are made of steel and would have a cubic capacity of approximately 900 cubic feet.

This container operation offers the tremendous advantage of consolidating cargo in one convenient handling unit and would eliminate export packaging requirements for outbound movements. The company estimates that this operation will eliminate more than 75 percent, of all handling, which will result in a commensurate reduction in handling costs and port delays.

The company has canvassed the private market for ships capable of being used for this service. There are none available with the necessary cubic capacity and speed. Although the company is willing to construct new vessels for the service, the necessary time interval would not permit the institution of American-flag service for a period of 2 or 3 years.

After conducting a detailed and lengthy study, Browning Steamship Lines has concluded that the most appropriate vessels for instituting immediate service are T2–SE–A2 tankers, which would be reconverted so as to provide three 'tween decks for the carriage of containers. The company proposes to purchase two tankers from the Government and reconvert them as container ships at a cost of approximately $3 million per vessel. Browning has had these plans worked out by its naval architects.

The company has arranged for a substantial investment of private capital into these routes. The cost of the containers alone would amount to approximately $8 million.

In addition to the investment in the purchase and reconversion of the vessels and in the containers, Browning intends to construct two specially designed container ships in domestic shipyards, as soon as operating experience makes such a step feasible. The reconverted T2–SE–A2 tankers themselves should have an economic life as dry cargo vessels of at least 15 years and would be a substantial addition to the American merchant marine and an aid to the national defense.

The sale of the two T2–SE–A2 tankers contemplated by this bill will allow for the immediate institution of long-range and permanent United States-flag services on routes where at the present time there is a serious void in the operation of our merchant marine.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO PAYMENT OF ANNUITIES TO DEPENDENTS OF JUDGES—AMENDMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3410) to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CONTROL, APPROPRIATION, USE, AND DISTRIBUTION OF WATER—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] be added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 863) to govern the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of water, the next time the bill is printed. The bill was introduced by me, on behalf of myself and other Senators, on February 1, 1955.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, and so forth, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MUNDT:

Address delivered by him to the State convention of the South Carolina State Bankers' Association, in Greenville, S. C., May 5, 1956.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by him on June 3, 1956, at the annual meeting of the Urban League of Greater New York.

By Mr. DUFF:

Excerpts from address delivered by him at the fourth national convention of the Polish-American Congress, in Philadelphia, Pa., on May 30, 1956.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Excerpt from introductory remarks by Assistant Secretary of the Army George H. Roderick, and address delivered by Senator WILEY at dedication of the Eisenhower Lock on the St. Lawrence Seaway, at Massena, N. Y., on June 3, 1956.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Address delivered by Senator ROBERTSON at commencement exercises, Staunton Military Academy, on June 3, 1956.

By Mr. MCCLELLAN:

A report to the people of Wisconsin by Senator MCCARTHY concerning East-West trade.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a Senator, and as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Chair desires to announce that the Senate received today a list of 120 nominations in the diplomatic service of the United States. The list is printed elsewhere in the Senate proceedings of today. Notice is given that these nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

ADDRESS BY FIRST PARTY SECRETARY N. S. KHRUSHCHEV AT 20TH PARTY CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, because of its importance, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a State Department release dated today, together with the purported version of the speech of First Party Secretary N. S. Khrushchev, at a session of the 20th party congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, on February 25 of this year. This was the speech of the so-called down-grading of Stalin and the party hierarchy.

Mr. President, I think one significant thing about the speech, which will be of interest to the Members of Congress and also to the American people—to whom the full text might not otherwise be available, except as they can obtain copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the various public libraries—is that while there is considerable criticism of the methods of Stalin in liquidating certain of the Communists, I find in the speech no expressions of regret on the part of Mr. Khrushchev for the liquidation during the same period of time of the vast number of liberals, democrats, and non-Marxist Socialists, and other believers in human freedom, nor do I find in the speech the slightest indication of repentence on the part of Khrushchev for the destruction of the freedom of the people of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, who lost their freedom and their sovereignty as nations despite the solemn pledges to the contrary by the Soviet Union.

In the speech, I find not the slightest indication of a single deed, such as suggested some time ago by President Eisenhower, which might constitute a demonstration that a basic change had occurred in the Soviet long-term strategic concept. Neither do I find in the speech any indication in favor of a free and united Germany; nor any indication that the heavy hand of control will be lifted from satellite governments of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, and Albania; nor any indication that the hundreds of thousands of persons in the slave-labor camps in Siberia will be given their freedom; nor any indication of any kind of compensation—not restitution, because the dead cannot be returned to life—for the loss of the lives of those who have been liquidated under the Soviet regime; nor the slightest indication that the Soviets are prepared to accept the kind of aerial inspection of arms as proposed by President Eisenhower, or other adequate arms inspection, which would avoid the type of farce which has existed in Korea, where the inspection teams have not been able to do their work, under the terms of the Korean armistice.

No, Mr. President; the speech does not contain the slightest indication that any deed of that sort has been performed, aside from the downgrading of the former leader, Stalin; there is no indication of an offer by those who were his accomplices in crime to return any of the loot.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, following the printing of the speech in the body of the RECORD, there be printed a brief article by Roscoe Drummond on the Khrushchev speech.

There being no objection, the speech and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(NOTE.—The Department of State has recently obtained from a confidential source a copy of a document which purports to be a version of the speech of First Party Secretary N. S. Khrushchev at a session of the 20th Party Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on February 25, 1956. This session was limited in attendance to the delegates from the U. S. S. R. The document is being released in response to many inquiries. This version is understood to have been prepared for the guidance of the party leadership of a Communist party outside of the U. S. S. R. The Department of State does not vouch for the authenticity of the document, and in releasing it, intends that the document speak for itself.)

Comrades, in the report of the Central Committee of the party at the 20th Congress, in a number of speeches by delegates to the Congress, as also formerly during the plenary CC/CPSU sessions, quite a lot has been said about the cult of the individual and about its harmful consequences.

After Stalin's death the Central Committee of the party began to implement a policy of explaining concisely and consistently that it is impermissible and foreign to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism to elevate one person, to transform him into superman possessing supernatural characteristics akin to those of a god. Such a man supposedly knows everything, sees everything, thinks for everyone, can do anything, is infallible in his behavior.

Such a belief about a man, and specifically about Stalin, was cultivated among us for many years.

The objective of the present report is not a thorough evaluation of Stalin's life and activity. Concerning Stalin's merits, an entirely sufficient number of books, pamphlets and studies had already been written in his lifetime. The role of Stalin in the preparation and execution of the Socialist revolution, in the civil-war, and in the fight for the construction of socialism in our country is universally known. Everyone knows this well. At the present we are concerned with a question which has immense importance for the Party now and for the future—(we are concerned) with how the cult of the person of Stalin has been gradually growing, the cult which became at a certain specific stage the source of a whole series of exceedingly serious and grave perversions of party principles, of party democracy, of revolutionary legality.

Because of the fact that not all as yet realize fully the practical consequences resulting from the cult of the individual, the great harm caused by the violation of the principle of collective direction of the party and because of the accumulation of immense and limitless power in the hands of one person—the Central Committee of the party considers it absolutely necessary to make the material pertaining to this matter available to the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Allow me first of all to remind you how severely the classics of Marxism-Leninism denounced every manifestation of the cult of the individual. In a letter to the German political worker, Wilhelm Bloss, Marx stated: "From my antipathy to any cult of the individual, I never made public during the existence of the International the numerous addresses from various countries which recognized my merits and which annoyed me. I did not even reply to them, except sometimes to rebuke their authors. Engels and I first joined the secret society of Communists on the condition that everything making for superstitious worship of authority would be deleted from its statute. Lassalle subsequently did quite the opposite."

Sometime later Engels wrote: "Both Marx and I have always been against any public manifestation with regard to individuals, with the exception of cases when it had an important purpose; and we most strongly opposed such manifestations which during our lifetime concerned us personally."

The great modesty of the genius of the revolution, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, is known. Lenin had always stressed the role of the people as the creator of history, the directing and organizational role of the party as a living and creative organism, and also the role of the central committee.

Marxism does not negate the role of the leaders of the workers' class in directing the revolutionary liberation movement.

While ascribing great importance to the role of the leaders and organizers of the masses, Lenin at the same time mercilessly stigmatized every manifestation of the cult of the individual, inexorably combated the foreign-to-Marxism views about a "hero" and a "crowd" and countered all efforts to oppose a "hero" to the masses and to the people.

Lenin taught that the party's strength depends on its indissoluble unity with the masses, on the fact that behind the party follow the people—workers, peasants and

intelligentsia. "Only he will win and retain the power," said Lenin, "who believes in the people, who submerges himself in the fountain of the living creativeness of the people."

Lenin spoke with pride about the Bolshevik Communist Party as the leader and teacher of the people; he called for the presentation of all the most important questions before the opinion of knowledgeable workers, before the opinion of their party; he said: "We believe in it, we see in it the wisdom, the honor, and the conscience of our epoch."

Lenin resolutely stood against every attempt aimed at belittling or weakening the directing role of the party in the structure of the Soviet state. He worked out Bolshevik principles of party direction and norms of party life, stressing that the guilding principle of party leadership is its collegiality. Already during the prerevolutionary years Lenin called the central committee of the party a collective of leaders and the guardian and interpreter of party principles. "During the period between congresses," pointed out Lenin, "the central committee guards and interprets the principles of the party."

Underlining the role of the central committee of the party and its authority, Vladimir Ilyich pointed out: "Our central committee constituted itself as a closely centralized and highly authoritative group."

During Lenin's life the central committee of the party was a real expression of collective leadership of the party and of the Nation. Being a militant Marxist-revolutionist, always unyielding in matters of principle, Lenin never imposed by force his views upon his coworkers. He tried to convince; he patiently explained his opinions to others. Lenin always diligently observed that the norms of party life were realized, that the party statute was enforced, that the party congresses and the plenary sessions of the central committee took place at the proper intervals.

In addition to the great accomplishments of V. I. Lenin for the victory of the working class and of the working peasants, for the victory of our party and for the application of the ideas of scientific communism to life, his acute mind expressed itself also in this that he detected in Stalin in time those negative characteristics which resulted later in grave consequences. Fearing the future fate of the party and of the Soviet nation, V. I. Lenin made a completely correct characterization of Stalin, pointing out that it was necessary to consider the question of transferring Stalin from the position of Secretary General because of the fact that Stalin is excessively rude, that he does not have a proper attitude toward his comrades, that he is capricious, and abuses his power.

In December 1922, in a letter to the party congress, Vladimir Ilyich wrote: "After taking over the position of Secretary General, Comrade Stalin accumulated in his hands immeasurable power and I am not certain whether he will be always able to use this power with the required care."

This letter—a political document of tremendous importance, known in the party history as Lenin's testament—was distributed among the delegates to the 20th Party Congress. You have read it, and will undoubtedly read it again more than once. You might reflect on Lenin's plain words, in which expression is given to Vladimir Ilyich's anxiety concerning the party, the people, the state, and the future direction of party policy.

Vladimir Ilyich said: "Stalin is excessively rude, and this defect, which can be freely tolerated in our midst and in contacts among us Communists, becomes a defect which cannot be tolerated in one holding the position of the Secretary General. Because of this, I propose that the comrades consider the method by which Stalin would be removed from this position and by which another man would be selected for it, a man, who above all, would differ from Stalin in only one quality, namely, greater tolerance, greater loyalty, greater kindness, and more considerate attitude toward the comrades, a less capricious temper, etc."

This document of Lenin's was made known to the delegates at the 13th Party Congress, who discussed the question of transferring Stalin from the position of Secretary General. The delegates declared themselves in favor of retaining Stalin in this post, hoping that he would heed the critical remarks of Vladimir Ilyich and would be able to overcome the defects which caused Lenin serious anxiety.

Comrades, the party congress should become acquainted with two new documents, which confirm Stalin's character as already outlined by Vladimir Ilyich Lenin in his testament. These documents are a letter from Nadezhda Konstantinovna Krupskaya to Kamenev, who was at that time head of the Political Bureau, and a personal letter from Vladimir Ilyich Lenin to Stalin.

1. I will now read these documents:

"LEV BORISOVICH:

"Because of a short letter which I had written in words dictated to me by Vladimir Ilyich by permission of the doctors, Stalin allowed himself yesterday an unusually rude outburst directed at me. This is not my first day in the party. During all these 30 years I have never heard from any comrade one word of rudeness. The business of the party and of Ilyich are not less dear to me than to Stalin. I need at present the maximum of self-control. What one can and what one cannot discuss with Ilyich—I know better than any doctor, because I know what makes him nervous and what does not, in any case I know better than Stalin. I am turning to you and to Grigory as to much closer comrades of V. I. and I beg you to protect me from rude interference with my private life and from vile invectives and threats. I have no doubt as to what will be the unanimous decision of the Control Commission, with which Stalin sees fit to threaten me; however, I have neither the strength nor the time to waste on this foolish quarrel. And I am a living person and my nerves are strained to the utmost.

N. KRUPSKAYA."

Nadeznda Konstantinovna wrote this letter on December 23, 1922. After 2½ months, in March 1923, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin sent Stalin the following letter:

2. The Letter of V. I. Lenin

To Comrade Stalin:

(Copies for: Kamenev and Zinoviev.)

DEAR COMRADE STALIN: You permitted yourself a rude summons of my wife to the telephone and a rude reprimand of her. Despite the fact that she told you that she agreed to forget what was said, nevertheless Zinoviev and Kamenev heard about it from her. I have no intention to forget so easily that which is being done against me, and I need not stress here that I consider as directed against me that which is being done against my wife. I ask you, therefore, that you weigh carefully whether you are agreeable to retracting your words and apologizing or whether you prefer the severance of relations between us. [Commotion in the hall.]

Sincerely,

LENIN.

MARCH, 5, 1923.

Comrades, I will not comment on these documents. They speak eloquently for themselves. Since Stalin could behave in this manner during Lenin's life, could thus behave toward Nadezhda Konstantinovna Krupskaya, whom the party knows well and values highly as a loyal friend of Lenin and as an active fighter for the cause of the party since its creation—we can easily imagine how Stalin treated other people. These negative characteristics of his developed steadily and during the last years acquired an absolutely insufferable character.

As later events have proven, Lenin's anxiety was justified; in the first period after Lenin's death Stalin still paid attention to his (i. e., Lenin's) advice, but, later he began to disregard the serious admonitions of Vladimir Ilyich.

When we analyze the practice of Stalin in regard to the direction of the party and of the country, when we pause to consider everything which Stalin perpetrated, we must be convinced that Lenin's fears were justified. The negative characteristics of Stalin, which, in Lenin's time, were only incipient, transformed themselves during the last years into a grave abuse of power by Stalin, which caused untold harm to our party.

We have to consider seriously and analyze correctly this matter in order that we may preclude any possibility of a repetition in any form whatever of what took place during the life of Stalin, who absolutely did not tolerate collegiality in leadership and in work, and who practiced brutal violence, not only toward everything which opposed him, but also toward that which seemed to his capricious and despotic character, contrary to his concepts.

Stalin acted not through persuasion, explanation, and patient cooperation with people, but by imposing his concepts and demanding absolute submission to his opinion. Whoever opposed this concept or tried to prove his viewpoint, and the correctness of his position—was doomed to removal from the leading collective and to subsequent moral and physical annihilation. This was especially true during the period following the 17th party congress, when many prominent party leaders and rank-and-file party workers, honest and dedicated to the cause of communism, fell victim to Stalin's despotism.

We must affirm that the party had fought a serious fight against the Trotskyites, rightists and bourgeois nationalists, and that it disarmed ideologically all the enemies of Leninism. This ideological fight was carried on successfully as a result of which the party became strengthened and tempered. Here Stalin played a positive role.

The party led a great political ideological struggle against those in its own ranks who proposed anti-Leninist theses, who represented a political line hostile to the party and to the cause of socialism. This was a stubborn and a difficult fight but a necessary one, because the political line of both the Trotskyite-Zinovievite bloc and of the Bukharinites led actually toward the restoration of capitalism and capitulation to the world bourgeoisie. Let us consider for a moment what would have happened if in 1928–29 the political line of right deviation had prevailed among us, or orientation toward "cotton-dress industrialization," or toward the kulak, etc. We would not now have a powerful heavy industry, we would not have the Kolkhozes, we would find ourselves disarmed and weak in a capitalist encirclement.

It was for this reason that the party led an inexorable ideological fight and explained to all party members and to the nonparty masses the harm and the danger of the anti-Leninist proposals of the Trotskyite opposition and the rightist opportunists. And this great work of explaining the party line bore fruit; both Trotskyites and the rightist opportunists were politically isolated; the overwhelming party majority supported the Leninist line and the party was able to awaken and organize the working masses to apply the Leninist party line and to build socialism.

Worth noting is the fact that even during the progress of the furious ideological fight against the Trotskyites, the Zinovievites, the Bukharinites and others, extreme repressive measures were not used against them. The fight was on ideological grounds. But some years later when socialism in our country

was fundamentally constructed, when the exploiting classes were generally liquidated, when the Soviet social structure had radically changed, when the social basis for political movements and groups hostile to the party had violently contracted, when the ideological opponents of the party were long since defeated politically—then the repression directed against them began.

It was precisely during this period (1935, 1937, and 1938) that the practice of mass repression through the government apparatus was born, first against the enemies of Leninism—Trotskyites, Zinovievites, Bukharinites, long since politically defeated by the party, and subsequently also against many honest Communists, against those party cadres who had borne the heavy load of the civil war and the first and most difficult years of industrialization and collectivization, who actively fought against the Trotskyites and the rightists for the Leninist party line.

Stalin originated the concept enemy of the people. This term automatically rendered it unnecessary that the ideological errors of a man or men engaged in a controversy be proven; this term made possible the usage of the most cruel repression, violating all norms of revolutionary legality, against anyone who in any way disagreed with Stalin, against those who were only suspected of hostile intent, against those who had bad reputations. This concept, enemy of the people, actually eliminated the possibility of any kind of ideological fight or the making of one's views known on this or that issue, even those of a practical character. In the main, and in actuality, the only proof of guilt used, against all norms of current legal science, was the confession of the accused himself, and, as subsequent probing proved, confessions were acquired through physical pressures against the accused.

This led to glaring violations of revolutionary legality, and to the fact that many entirely innocent persons, who in the past had defended the party line, became victims.

We must assert that in regard to those persons who in their time had opposed the party line, there were often no sufficiently serious reasons for their physical annihilation. The formula "enemy of the people" was specifically introduced for the purpose of physically annihilating such individuals.

It is a fact that many persons who were later annihilated as enemies of the party and people had worked with Lenin during his life. Some of these persons had made errors during Lenin's life, but, despite this, Lenin benefited by their work, he corrected them, and he did everything possible to retain them in the ranks of the party; he induced them to follow him.

In this connection the delegates to the party congress should familiarize themselves with an unpublished note by V. I. Lenin directed to the central committee's political bureau in October 1920. Outlining the duties of the control commission, Lenin wrote that the commission should be transformed into a real organ of party and proletarian conscience.

"As a special duty of the control commission there is recommended a deep, individualized relationship with, and sometimes even a type of therapy for, the representatives of the so-called opposition—those who have experienced a psychological crisis because of failure in their soviet or party career. An effort should be made to quiet them, to explain the matter to them in a way used among comrades, to find for them (avoiding the method of issuing orders) a task for which they are psychologically fitted. Advice and rules relating to this matter are to be formulated by the central committee's organizational bureau, etc."

Everyone knows how irreconcilable Lenin was with the ideological enemies of Marxism, with those who deviated from the correct party line. At the same time, however, Lenin, as is evident from the given document, in his practice of directing the party demanded the most intimate party contact with people who had shown indecision or temporary nonconformity with the party line, but whom it was possible to return to the party path. Lenin advised that such people should be patiently educated without the application of extreme methods.

Lenin's wisdom in dealing with people was evident in his work with cadres.

An entirely different relationship with people characterized Stalin. Lenin's traits—patient work with people; stubborn and painstaking education of them; the ability to induce people to follow him without using compulsion, but rather through the ideological influence on them of the whole collective—were entirely foreign to Stalin. He (Stalin) discarded the Leninist method of convincing and educating; he abandoned the method of ideological struggle for that of administrative violence, mass repressions, and terror. He acted on an increasingly larger scale and more stubbornly through punitive organs, at the same time often violating all existing norms of morality and of Soviet laws.

Arbitrary behavior by one person encouraged and permitted arbitrariness in others. Mass arrests and deportations of many thousands of people, execution without trial and without normal investigation created conditions of insecurity, fear, and even desperation.

This, of course, did not contribute toward unity of the party ranks and of all strata of working people, but on the contrary brought about annihilation and the expulsion from the party of workers who were loyal but inconvenient to Stalin.

Our party fought for the implementation of Lenin's plans for the construction of socialism. This was an ideological fight. Had Leninist principles been observed during the course of this fight, had the party's devotion to principles been skillfully combined with a keen and solicitous concern for people, had they not been repelled and wasted but rather drawn to our side—we certainly would not have had such a brutal violation of revolutionary legality and many thousands of people would not have fallen victim of the method of terror. Extraordinary methods would then have been resorted to only against those people who had in fact committed criminal acts against the Soviet system.

Let us recall some historical facts.

In the days before the October revolution two members of the central committee of the Bolshevik Party—Kamenev and Zinoviev—declared themselves against Lenin's plan for an armed uprising. In addition, on October 18 they published in the Menshevik newspaper, Novaya Zhizn, a statement declaring that the Bolsheviks were making preparations for an uprising and that they considered it adventuristic. Kamenev and Zinoviev thus disclosed to the enemy the decision of the central committee to stage the uprising, and that the uprising had been organized to take place within the very near future.

This was treason against the party and against the revolution. In this connection, V. I. Lenin wrote: "Kamenev and Zinoviev revealed the decision of the central committee of their party on the armed uprising to Rodzyanko and Kerensky * * *." He put before the central committee the question of Zinoviev's and Kamenev's expulsion from the party.

However, after the great Socialist October revolution, as is known, Zinoviev and Kamenev were given leading positions. Lenin put them in positions in which they carried out most responsible party tasks and participated actively in the work of the leading party and Soviet organs. It is known that Zinoviev and Kamenev committed a number of other serious errors during Lenin's life. In his testament Lenin warned that "Zinoviev's and Kamenev's October episode was of course not an accident." But Lenin did not pose the question of their arrest and certainly not their shooting.

Or let us take the example of the Trotskyites. At present, after a sufficiently long historical period, we can speak about the fight with the Trotskyites with complete calm and can analyze this matter with sufficient objectivity. After all, around Trotsky were people whose origin cannot by any means be traced to bourgeois society. Part of them belonged to the party intelligentsia and a certain part were recruited from among the workers. We can name many individuals who in their time joined the Trotskyites; however, these same individuals took an active part in the workers' movement before the revolution, during the Socialist October revolution itself, and also in the consolidation of the victory of this greatest of revolutions. Many of them broke with Trotskyism and returned to Leninist positions. Was it necessary to annihilate such people? We are deeply convinced that had Lenin lived such an extreme method would not have been used against many of them.

Such are only a few historical facts. But can it be said that Lenin did not decide to use even the most severe means against enemies of the revolution when this was actually necessary? No, no one can say this. Vladimir Ilyich demanded uncompromising dealings with the enemies of the revolution and of the working class and when necessary resorted ruthlessly to such methods. You will recall only V. I. Lenin's fight with the Socialist revolutionary organizers of the anti-Soviet uprising, with the counter-revolutionary kulaks in 1918 and with others, when Lenin without hesitation used the most extreme methods against the enemies. Lenin used such methods, however, only against actual class enemies and not against those who blunder, who err, and whom it was possible to lead through ideological influence, and even retain in the leadership.

Lenin used severe methods only in the most necessary cases, when the exploiting classes were still in existence and were vigorously opposing the revolution, when the struggle for survival was decidedly assuming the sharpest forms, even including a civil war.

Stalin, on the other hand, used extreme methods and mass repressions at a time when the revolution was already victorious, when the Soviet state was strengthened, when the exploiting classes were already liquidated, and Socialist relations were rooted solidly in all phases of national economy, when our party was politically consolidated and had strengthened itself both numerically and ideologically. It is clear that here Stalin showed in a whole series of cases his intolerance, his brutality, and his abuse of power. Instead of proving his political correctness and mobilizing the masses, he often chose the path of repression and physical annihilation, not only against actual enemies, but also against individuals who had not committed any crimes against the party and the Soviet Government. Here we see no wisdom but only a demonstration of the brutal force which had once so alarmed V. I. Lenin.

Lately, especially after the unmasking of the Beriya gang, the Central Committee looked into a series of matters fabricated by this gang. This revealed a very ugly picture of brutal wilifulness connected with the incorrect behavior of Stalin. As facts prove, Stalin, using his unlimited power, allowed himself many abuses, acting in the name of the Central Committee, not asking for the opinion of the committee members nor even of the members of the Central Committee's political bureau; often he did not inform them about his personal decisions concerning very important party and government matters.

Considering the question of the cult of an individual we must first of all show everyone what harm this caused to the interests of our party.

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin had always stressed the party's role and significance in the direction of the Socialist government of workers and peasants; he saw in this the chief precondition for a successful building of socialism in our country. Pointing to the great responsibility of the Bolshevik Party, as a ruling party in the Soviet state, Lenin called for the most meticulous observance of all norms of party life; he called for the realization of the principles of collegiality in the direction of the party and the state.

Collegiality of leadership flows from the very nature of our party, a party built on the principles of democratic centralism. "This means," said Lenin, "that all party matters are accomplished by all party members—directly or through representatives—who without any exceptions are subject to the same rules; in addition, all administrative members, all directing collegia, all holders of party positions are elective, they must account for their activities and are recallable."

It is known that Lenin himself offered an example of the most careful observance of these principles. There was no matter so important that Lenin himself decided it without asking for advice and approval of the majority of the Central Committee members or of the members of the Central Committee's political bureau.

In the most difficult period for our party and our country, Lenin considered it necessary regularly to convoke congresses, party conferences, and plenary sessions of the Central Committee at which all the most important questions were discussed and where resolutions, carefully worked out by the collective of leaders, were approved.

We can recall, for an example, the year 1918 when the country was threatened by the attack of the imperialistic interventionists. In this situation the seventh party congress was convened in order to discuss a vitally important matter which could not be postponed—the matter of peace. In 1919, while the civil war was raging, the eighth party congress convened, which adopted a new party program, decided such important matters as the relationship with the peasant masses, the organization of the Red Army, the leading role of the party in the work of the Soviets, the correction of the social composition of the party, and other matters. In 1920 the ninth party congress was convened which laid down guiding principles pertaining to the party's work in the sphere of economic construction. In 1921 the 10th party congress accepted Lenin's new economic policy and the historical resolution called about party unity.

During Lenin's life party congresses were convened regularly; always when a radical turn in the development of the party and the country took place Lenin considered it absolutely necessary that the party discuss at length all the basic matters pertaining to internal and foreign policy and to questions bearing on the development of party and government.

It is very characteristic that Lenin addressed to the party congress as the highest party organ his last articles, letters, and remarks. During the period between congresses the central committee of the party, acting as the most authoritative leading collective, meticulously observed the principles of the party and carried out its policy.

So it was during Lenin's life.

Were our party's holy Leninist principles observed after the death of Vladimir Ilyich?

Whereas during the first few years after Lenin's death party congresses and central committee plenums took place more or less regularly; later, when Stalin began increasingly to abuse his power, these principles were brutally violated. This was especially evident during the last 15 years of his life. Was it a normal situation when 13 years elapsed between the 18th and 19th party congresses, years during which our party and our country had experienced so many important events? These events demanded categorically that the party should have passed resolutions pertaining to the country's defense during the patriotic war and to peacetime construction after the war. Even after the end of the war a congress was not convened for over 7 years.

Central committee plenums were hardly ever called. It should be sufficient to mention that during all the years of the patriotic war not a single central committee plenum took place. It is true that there was an attempt to call a central committee plenum in October 1941, when central committee members from the whole country were called to Moscow. They waited 2 days for the opening of the plenum, but in vain. Stalin did not even want to meet and to talk to the central committee members. This fact shows how demoralized Stalin was in the first months of the war and how haughtily and disdainfully he treated the central committee members.

In practice Stalin ignored the norms of party life and trampled on the Leninist principle of collective party leadership.

Stalin's willfulness vis-a-vis the party and its central committee became fully evident after the 17th party congress, which took place in 1934.

Having at its disposal numerous data showing brutal willfulness toward party cadres, the central committee had created a party commission under the control of the central committee presidium; it was charged with investigating what made possible the mass repressions against the majority of the central committee members and candidates elected at the 17th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks).

The commission has become acquainted with a large quantity of materials in the NKVD archives and with other documents and has established many facts pertaining to the fabrication of cases against Communists, to false accusations, to glaring abuses of Socialist legality, which resulted in the death of innocent people. It became apparent that many party, Soviet, and economic activists, who were branded in 1937-38 as enemies, were actually never enemies, spies, wreckers, etc., but were always honest Communists; they were only so stigmatized, and often no longer able to bear barbaric tortures, they charged themselves (at the order of the investigative judges—falsifiers) with all kinds of grave and unlikely crimes. The commission has presented to the central committee presidium lengthy and documented materials pertaining to mass repressions against the delegates to the 17th party congress and against members of the central committee elected at that congress. These materials have been studied by the presidium of the central committee.

It was determined that of the 139 members and candidates of the party's Central Committee who were elected at the 17th congress, 98 persons, that is, 70 percent, were arrested and shot (mostly in 1937-38). [Indignation in the hall.]

What was the composition of the delegates to the 17th congress? It is known that 80 percent of the voting participants of the 17th congress joined the party during the years of conspiracy before the revolution and during the civil war; this means before 1921. By social origin the basic mass of the delegates to the congress were workers (60 percent of the voting members).

For this reason, it was inconceivable that a congress so composed would have elected a central committee a majority of whom would prove to be enemies of the party. The only reason why 70 percent of central committee members and candidates elected at the 17th congress were branded as enemies of the party and of the people was because honest Communists were slandered, accusations against them were fabricated, and revolutionary legality was gravely undetermined.

The same fate met not only the central committee members but also the majority of the delegates to the 17th party congress. Of 1,966 delegates with either voting or advisory rights, 1,108 persons were arrested on charges of antirevolutionary crimes, i. e., decidedly more than a majority. This very fact shows how absurd, wild, and contrary to commonsense were the charges of counter-revolutionary crimes made out, as we now see, against a majority of participants at the 17th party congress. [Indignation in the hall.]

We should recall that the 17th party congress is historically known as the Congress of Victors. Delegates to the congress were active participants in the building of our Socialist state; many of them suffered and fought for party interests during the prerevolutionary years in the conspiracy and at the civil war fronts; they fought their enemies valiantly and often nervelessly looked into the face of death. How then can we believe that such people could prove to be two-faced and had joined the camps of the enemies of socialism during the era after the political liquidation of Zinovievites, Trotskyites, and rightists and after the great accomplishments of Socialist construction?

This was the result of the abuse of power by Stalin, who began to use mass terror against the party cadres.

What is the reason that mass repressions against activists increased more and more after the 17th party congress? It was because at that time Stalin had so elevated himself above the party and above the nation that he ceased to consider either the central committee or the party. While he still reckoned with the opinion of the collective before the 17th congress, after the complete political liquidation of the Trotskyites, Zinovievites and Bukharinites, when as a result of that fight and Socialist victories the party achieved unity, Stalin ceased to an ever greater degree to consider the members of the party's central committee and even the members of the Political Bureau. Stalin thought that now he could decide all things alone and all he needed were statisticians; he treated all others in such a way that they could only listen to and praise him.

After the criminal murder of S. M. Kirov, mass repressions and brutal acts of violation of Socialist legality began. On the evening of December 1, 1934, on Stalin's initiative (without the approval of the Political Bureau—which was passed 2 days later, casually) the Secretary of the Presidium of the Central Executive Committee, Yenukidze, signed the following directive:

"I. Investigative agencies are directed to speed up the cases of those accused of the preparation or execution of acts of terror.

"II. Judicial organs are directed not to hold up the execution of death sentences pertaining to crimes of this category in order to consider the possibility of pardon, because the Presidium of the Central Executive Committee, U. S. S. R., does not consider as possible the receiving of petitions of this sort.

"III. The organs of the Commissariat of Internal Affairs are directed to execute the death sentences against criminals of the above-mentioned category immediately after the passage of sentences."

This directive became the basis for mass acts of abuse against Socialist legality. During many of the fabricated court cases the accused were charged with "the preparation"

of terroristic acts; this deprived them of any possibility that their cases might be reexamined, even when they stated before the court that their confessions were secured by force, and when, in a convincing manner, they disproved the accusations against them.

It must be asserted that to this day the circumstances surrounding Kirov's murder hide many things which are inexplicable and mysterious and demand a most careful examination. There are reasons for the suspicion that the killer of Kirov, Nikolayev, was assisted by someone from among the people whose duty it was to protect the person of Kirov. A month and a half before the killing Nikolayev was arrested on the grounds of suspicious behavior, but he was released and not even searched. It is an unusually suspicious circumstance that when the Chekist assigned to protect Kirov was being brought for an interrogation, on December 2, 1934, he was killed in a car accident in which no other occupants of the car were harmed. After the murder of Kirov, top functionaries of the Leningrad NKVD were given very light sentences, but in 1937 they were shot. We can assume that they were shot in order to cover the traces of the organizers of Kirov's killing. [Movement in the hall.]

Mass repressions grew tremendously from the end of 1936 after a telegram from Stalin and Zhdanov, dated from Sochi on September 25, 1936, was addressed to Kaganovich, Molotov, and other members of the Political Bureau. The content of the telegram was as follows:

"We deem it absolutely necessary and urgent that Comrade Yezhov be nominated to the post of People's Commissar for Internal Affairs. Yagoda has definitely proved himself to be incapable of unmasking the Trotskyite-Zinovievite bloc. The OGPU is 4 years behind in this matter. This is noted by all party workers and by the majority of the representatives of the NKVD." Strictly speaking we should stress that Stalin did not meet with and therefore could not know the opinion of party workers.

This Stalinist formulation that the "NKVD (term used interchangeably with 'OGPU')[1] is 4 years behind" in applying mass repression and that there is a necessity for catching up with the neglected work directly pushed the NKVD workers on the path of mass arrests and executions.

We should state that this formulation was also forced on the February–March plenary session of the central committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) in 1937. The plenary resolution approved it on the basis of Yezhov's report, "Lessons flowing from the harmful activity, diversion, and espionage of the Japanese-German-Trotskyite agents," stating: "The plenum of the central committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) considers that all facts revealed during the investigation into the matter of an anti-Soviet Trotskyite center and of its followers in the provinces show that the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs has fallen behind at least 4 years in the attempt to unmask these most inexorable enemies of the people."

The mass repressions at this time were made under the slogan of a fight against the Trotskyites. Did the Trotskyites at this time actually constitute such a danger to our party and to the Soviet state? We should recall that in 1927, on the eve of the 15th party congress, only some 4,000 votes were cast for the Trotskyite-Zinovievite opposition, while there were 724,000 for the party line. During the 10 years which passed between the 15th party congress and the February–March central committee plenum, Trotskyism was completely disarmed; many former Trotskyites had changed their former views and worked in the various sectors building socialism. It is clear that in the situation of Socialist victory there was no basis for mass terror in the country.

Stalin's report at the February–March central committee plenum in 1937, "Deficiencies of party work and methods for the liquidation of the Trotskyites and of other two-facers," contained an attempt at theoretical justification of the mass terror policy under the pretext that as we march forward toward socialism class war must allegedly sharpen. Stalin asserted that both history and Lenin taught him this.

Actually Lenin taught that the application of revolutionary violence is necessitated by the resistance of the exploiting classes, and this referred to the era when the exploiting classes existed and were powerful. As soon as the nation's political situation had improved, when in January 1920 the Red Army took Rostov and thus won a most important victory over Denikin, Lenin instructed Dzherzhinsky to stop mass terror and to abolish the death penalty. Lenin justified this important political move of the Soviet state in the following manner in his report at the session of the All-Union central executive committee on February 2, 1920:

"We were forced to use terror because of the terror practiced by the Entente, when strong world powers threw their hordes against us, not avoiding any type of conduct. We would not have lasted 2 days had we not answered these attempts of officers and White Guardists in a merciless fashion; this meant the use of terror, but this was forced upon us by the terrorist methods of the Entente.

"But as soon as we attained a decisive victory, even before the end of the war, immediately after taking Rostov, we gave up the use of the death penalty and thus proved that we intend to execute our own program in the manner that we promised. We say that the application of violence flows out of the decision to smother the exploiters, the big landowners, and the capitalists; as soon as this was accomplished we gave up the use of all extraordinary methods. We have proved this in practice."

Stalin deviated from these clear and plain precepts of Lenin. Stalin put the party and the NKVD up to the use of mass terror when the exploiting classes had been liquidated in our country and when there were no serious reasons for the use of extraordinary mass terror.

This terror was actually directed not at the remnants of the defeated exploiting classes but against the honest workers of the party and of the Soviet state; against them were made lying, slanderous, and absurd accusations concerning two-facedness, espionage, sabotage, preparation of fictitious plots, and so forth.

At the February–March central committee plenum in 1937, many members actually questioned the rightness of the established course regarding mass repressions under the pretext of combating two-facedness.

Comrade Postyshev most ably expressed these doubts. He said:

"I have philosophized that the severe years have passed, party members who have lost their backbones have broken down or have joined the camp of the enemy; healthy elements have fought for the party. These were the years of industrialization and collectivization. I never thought it possible that after this severe era had passed Karpov and people like him would find themselves in the camp of the enemy. (Karpov was a worker in the Ukrainian Central Committee whom Postyshev knew well.) And now, according to the testimony, it appears that Karpov was recruited in 1934 by the Trotskyites. I personally do not believe that in 1934 an honest party member who had trod the long road of unrelenting fight against enemies for the party and for socialism, would now be in the camp of the enemies. I do not believe it * * *. I cannot imagine how it would be possible to travel with the party during the difficult years and then, in 1934, join the Trotskyites. It is an odd thing * * *." [Movement in the hall.]

Using Stalin's formulation, namely, that the closer we are to socialism the more enemies we will have, and using the resolution of the February–March Central Committee plenum passed on the basis of Yezhov's report—the provocateurs who had infiltrated the state security organs together with conscienceless careerists began to protect with the party name the mass terror against party cadres, cadres of the Soviet state and the ordinary Soviet citizens. It should suffice to say that the number of arrests based on charges of counterrevolutionary crimes had grown 10 times between 1936 and 1937.

It is known that brutal willfulness was practiced against leading party workers. The party statute, approved at the 17th party congress, was based on Leninist principles expressed at the 10th party congress. It stated that in order to apply an extreme method such as exclusion from the party against a central committee member, against a central committee candidate, and against a member of the party control commission, "it is necessary to call a central committee plenum and to invite to the plenum all Central Committee candidate members and all members of the party control commission"; only if two-thirds of the members of such a general assembly of responsible party leaders find it necessary, only then can a central committee member or candidate be expelled.

The majority of the Central Committee members and candidates elected at the 17th congress and arrested in 1937–38 were expelled from the party illegally through the brutal abuse of the party statute, because the question of their expulsion was never studied at the Central Committee plenum.

Now when the cases of some of these so-called spies and saboteurs were examined it was found that all their cases were fabricated. Confessions of guilt of many arrested and charged with enemy activity were gained with the help of cruel and inhuman tortures.

At the same time Stalin, as we have been informed by members of the Political Bureau of that time, did not show them the statements of many accused political activists when they retracted their confessions before the military tribunal and asked for an objective examination of their cases. There were many such declarations, and Stalin doubtlessly knew of them.

The central committee considers it absolutely necessary to inform the congress of many such fabricated cases against the members of the party's central committee elected at the 17th party congress.

An example of vile provocation of odious falsification and of criminal violation of revolutionary legality is the case of the former candidate for the central committee political bureau, one of the most eminent workers of the party and of the Soviet Government, Comrade Eikhe, who was a party member since 1905. [Commotion in the hall.]

Comrade Eikhe was arrested on April 29, 1938, on the basis of slanderous materials, without the sanction of the prosecutor of the U. S. S. R., which was finally received 15 months after the arrest.

Investigation of Eikhe's case was made in a manner which most brutally violated Soviet legality and was accompanied by willfulness and falsification.

Eikhe was forced under torture to sign ahead of time a protocol of his confession prepared by the investigative judges, in which he and several other eminent party workers were accused of anti-Soviet activity.

On October 1, 1939, Eikhe sent his declaration to Stalin in which he categorically

[1] The content of this parenthesis is an editorial note of the translator.

denied his guilt and asked for an examination of his case. In the declaration he wrote:

"There is no more bitter misery than to sit in the jail of a government for which I have always fought."

A second declaration of Eikhe has been preserved which he sent to Stalin on October 27, 1939; in it he cited facts very convincingly and countered the slanderous accusations made against him, arguing that this provocatory accusation was on the one hand the work of real Trotskyites whose arrests he had sanctioned as First Secretary of the West Siberian Krai Party Committee and who conspired in order to take revenge on him, and, on the other hand, the result of the base falsification of materials by the investigative judges.

Eikhe wrote in his declaration: "* * * On October 25 of this year I was informed that the investigation in my case has been concluded and I was given access to the materials of this investigation. Had I been guilty of only one-hundredth of the crimes with which I am charged, I would not have dared to send you this preexecution declaration; however, I have not been guilty of even one of the things with which I am charged and my heart is clean of even the shadow of baseness. I have never in my life told you a word of falsehood and now, finding my two feet in the grave, I am also not lying. My whole case is a typical example of provocation, slander and violation of the elementary basis of revolutionary legality * * *.

"* * * The confessions which were made part of my file are not only absurd but contain some slander toward the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) and toward the Council of People's Commissars because correct resolutions of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) and of the Council of People's Commissars which were not made on my initiative and without my participation are presented as hostile acts of counterrevolutionary organizations made at my suggestion * * *.

"I am now alluding to the most disgraceful part of my life and to my really grave guilt against the party and against you. This is my confession of counterrevolutionary activity * * *. The case is as follows: not being able to suffer the tortures to which I was submitted by Ushakov and Nikolayev—and especially by the first one—who utilized the knowledge that my broken ribs have not properly mended and have caused me great pain—I have been forced to accuse myself and others.

"The majority of my confession has been suggested or dictated by Ushakov, and the remainder is my reconstruction of NKVD materials from western Siberia for which I assumed all responsibility. If some part of the story which Ushakov fabricated and which I signed did not properly hang together, I was forced to sign another variation. The same thing was done to Rukhimovich, who was at first designated as a member of the reserve net and whose name later was removed without telling me anything about it; the same was also done with the leader of the reserve net, supposedly created by Bukharin in 1935. At first I wrote my name in, and then I was instructed to insert Mezhlauk. There were other similar incidents.

"I am asking and begging you that you again examine my case and this not for the purpose of sparing me but in order to unmask the vile provocation which like a snake wound itself around many persons in a great degree due to my meanness and criminal slander. I have never betrayed you or the party. I know that I perish because of vile and mean work of the enemies of the party and of the people, who fabricated the provocation against me."

It would appear that such an important declaration was worth an examination by the Central Committee. This, however, was not done and the declaration was transmitted to Beriya while the terrible maltreatment of the Political Bureau candidate, Comrade Eikhe, continued.

On February 2, 1940, Eikhe was brought before the court. Here he did not confess any guilt and said as follows:

"In all the so-called confessions of mine there is not one letter written by me with the exception of my signatures under the protocols which were forced from me. I have made my confession under pressure from the investigative judge who from the time of my arrest tormented me. After that I began to write all this nonsense. The most important thing for me is to tell the court, the party and Stalin that I am not guilty. I have never been guilty of any conspiracy. I will die believing in the truth of party policy as I have believed in it during my whole life."

On February 4 Eikhe was shot. [Indignation in the hall.] It has been definitely established now that Eikhe's case was fabricated; he has been posthumously rehabilitated.

Comrade Rudzutak, candidate member of the Political Bureau, member of the party since 1905, who spent 10 years in a Czarist hard labor camp, completely retracted in court the confession which was forced from him. The protocol of the session of the Collegium of the Supreme Military Court contains the following statement by Rudzutak:

"The only plea which he places before the court is that the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) be informed that there is in the NKVD an as yet not liquidated center which is craftily manufacturing cases, which forces innocent persons to confess; there is no opportunity to prove one's nonparticipation in crimes to which the confessions of various persons testify. The investigative methods are such that they force people to lie and to slander entirely innocent persons in addition to those who already stand accused. He asks the court that he be allowed to inform the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) about all this in writing. He assures the court that he personally never had any evil designs in regard to the policy of our party because he had always agreed with the party policy pertaining to all spheres of economic and cultural activity."

This declaration of Rudzutak was ignored, despite the fact that Rudzutak was in his time the chief of the Central Control Commission which was called into being in accordance with Lenin's concept for the purpose of fighting for party union. In this manner fell the chief of this highly authoritative party organ, a victim of brutal willfulness; he was not even called before the Central Committee's Political Bureau because Stalin did not want to talk to him. Sentence was pronounced on him in 20 minutes and he was shot. [Indignation in the hall.]

After careful examination of the case in 1955 it was established that the accusation against Rudzutak was false and that it was based on slanderous materials. Rudzutak has been rehabilitated posthumously.

The way in which the former NKVD workers manufactured various fictitious "anti-Soviet centers" and "blocs" with the help of provocatory methods is seen from the confession of Comrade Rozenblum, party member since 1906, who was arrested in 1937 by the Leningrad NKVD.

During the examination in 1955 of the Komarov case Rozenblum revealed the following fact: when Rozenblum was arrested in 1937 he was subjected to terrible torture during which he was ordered to confess false information concerning himself and other persons. He was then brought to the office of Zakovsky, who offered him freedom on condition that he make before the court a false confession fabricated in 1937 by the NKVD concerning "sabotage, espionage and diversion in a terroristic center in Leningrad." [Movement in the hall.] With unbelievable cynicism Zakovsky told about the vile "mechanism" for the crafty creation of fabricated "anti-Soviet plots."

"In order to illustrate it to me," stated Rozenblum, "Zakovsky gave me several possible variants of the organization of this center and of its branches. After he detailed the organization to me, Zakovsky told me that the NKVD would prepare the case of this center, remarking that the trial would be public.

"Before the court were to be brought 4 or 5 members of this center: Chudov, Ugarov, Smorodin, Pozern, Shaposhnikova (Chudov's wife) and others together with 2 or 3 members from the branches of this center. * * *

"* * * The case of the Leningrad center has to be built solidly and for this reason witnesses are needed. Social origin (of course, in the past) and the party standing of the witness will play more than a small role.

"You, yourself," said Zakovsky, "will not need to invent anything. The NKVD will prepare for you a ready outline for every branch of the center; you will have to study it carefully and to remember well all questions and answers which the court might ask. This case will be ready in 4–5 months, or perhaps a half year. During all this time you will be preparing yourself so that you will not compromise the investigation and yourself. Your future will depend on how the trial goes and on its results. If you begin to lie and to testify falsely, blame yourself. If you manage to endure it, you will save your head and we will feed and clothe you at the government's cost until your death."

This is the kind of vile things which were then practiced. [Movement in the hall.]

Even more widely was the falsification of cases practiced in the provinces. The NKVD headquarters of the Sverdlov oblast discovered the so-called Ural uprising staff—an organ of the bloc of rightists, Trotskyites, Socialist Revolutionaries, church leaders—whose chief supposedly was the secretary of the Sverdlov Oblast Party Committee and member of the Central Committee, All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), Kabakov, who had been a party member since 1914. The investigative materials of that time show that in almost all krais, oblasts, and republics there supposedly existed rightist Trotskyites, espionage-terror and diversionary-sabotage organizations and centers and that the heads of such organizations as a rule—for no known reason—were first secretaries of oblast or republic Communist Party committees or central committees. [Movement in the hall.]

Many thousands of honest and innocent Communists have died as a result of this monstrous falsification of such cases, as a result of the fact that all kinds of slanderous confessions were accepted, and as a result of the practice of forcing accusations against oneself and others. In the same manner were fabricated the cases against eminent party and state workers—Kossior, Chubar, Postyshev, Kosaryev, and others.

In those years repressions on a mass scale were applied which were based on nothing tangible and which resulted in heavy cadre losses to the party.

The vicious practice was condoned of having the NKVD prepare lists of persons whose cases were under the jurisdiction of the military collegium and whose sentences were prepared in advance. Yezhov would send these lists to Stalin personally for his approval of the proposed punishment. In 1937–38, 383 such lists containing the names of many thousands of party, Soviet, Komsomol, army, and economic workers were sent to Stalin. He approved these lists.

A large part of these cases are being reviewed now and a great part of them are

being voided because they were baseless and falsified. Suffice it to say that from 1954 to the present time the military collegium of the supreme court has rehabilitated 7,679 persons, many of whom were rehabilitated posthumously.

Mass arrests of party, Soviet, economic, and military workers caused tremendous harm to our country and to the cause of Socialist advancement.

Mass repressions had a negative influence on the moral-political condition of the party, created a situation of uncertainty, contributed to the spreading of unhealthy suspicion, and sowed distrust among Communists. All sorts of slanderers and careerists were active.

Resolutions of the January plenum of the central committee, All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), in 1938 had brought some measure of improvement to the party organizations. However, widespread repression also existed in 1938.

Only because our party has at its disposal such great moral-political strength was it possible for it to survive the difficult events in 1937–38 and to educate new cadres. There is, however, no doubt that our march forward toward Socialism and toward the preparation of the country's defense would have been much more successful were it not for the tremendous loss in the cadres suffered as a result of the baseless and false mass repressions in 1937–38.

We are justly accusing Yezhov for the degenerate practices of 1937. But we have to answer these questions: Could Yezhov have arrested Kossior, for instance, without the knowledge of Stalin? Was there an exchange of opinions or a Political Bureau decision concerning this? No, there was not, as there was none regarding other cases of this type. Could Yezhov have decided such important matters as the fate of such eminent party figures? No, it would be a display of naivete to consider this the work of Yezhov alone. It is clear that these matters were decided by Stalin, and that without his orders and his sanction Yezhov could not have done this.

We have examined the cases and have rehabilitated Kossior, Rudzutak, Postyshev, Kosaryev, and others. For what causes were they arrested and sentenced? The review of evidence shows that there was no reason for this. They, like many others, were arrested without the prosecutor's knowledge. In such a situation there is no need for any sanction, for what sort of a sanction could there be when Stalin decided everything. He was the chief prosecutor in these cases. Stalin not only agreed to, but on his own initiative issued arrest orders. We must say this so that the delegates to the congress can clearly undertake and themselves assess this and draw the proper conclusions.

Facts prove that many abuses were made on Stalin's orders without reckoning with any norms of party and Soviet legality. Stalin was a very distrustful man, sickly suspicious; we knew this from our work with him. He could look at a man and say: "Why are your eyes so shifty today," or "Why are you turning so much today and avoiding to look me directly in the eyes?" The sickly suspicion created in him a general distrust even toward eminent party workers whom he had known for years. Everywhere and in everything he saw enemies, "two-facers" and spies.

Possessing unlimited power he indulged in great willfulness and choked a person morally and physically. A situation was created where one could not express one's own will.

When Stalin said that one or another should be arrested, it was necessary to accept on faith that he was an "enemy of the people." Meanwhile, Beriya's gang, which ran the organs of state security, outdid itself in proving the guilt of the arrested and the truth of materials which it falsified. And what proofs were offered? The confessions of the arrested, and the investigative judges accepted these confessions. And how is it possible that a person confesses to crimes which he has not committed? Only in one way, because of application of physical methods of pressuring him, tortures, bringing him to a state of unconsciousness, deprivation of his judgment, taking away of his human dignity. In this manner were confessions acquired.

When the wave of mass arrests began to recede in 1939, and the leaders of territorial party organizations began to accuse the NKVD workers of using methods of physical pressure on the arrested, Stalin dispatched a coded telegram on January 20, 1939, to the committee secretaries of oblasts and krais, to the central committees of republic Communist Parties, to the Peoples Commissars of Internal Affairs and to the heads of NKVD organizations. This telegram stated:

"The Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) explains that the application of methods of physical pressure in NKVD practice is permissible from 1937 on in accordance with permission of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks). * * * It is known that all bourgeois intelligence services use methods of physical influence against the representatives of the Socialist proletariat and that they use them in their most scandalous forms. The question arises as to why the Socialist intelligence service should be more humanitarian against the mad agents of the bourgeoisie, against the deadly enemies of the working class and of the Kolkhoz workers. The Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) considers that physical pressure should still be used obligatorily, as an exception applicable to known and obstinate enemies of the people, as a method both justifiable and appropriate."

Thus, Stalin had sanctioned in the name of the central committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) the most brutal violations of Socialist legality, torture, and oppression, which led as we have seen to the slandering and self-accusation of innocent people.

Not long ago—only several days before the present congress—we called to the Central Committee Presidium session and interrogated the investigative judge, Rodos, who in his time investigated and interrogated Kossior, Chubar, and Kosaryev. He is a vile person, with the brain of a bird, and morally completely degenerate. And it was this man who was deciding the fate of prominent party workers; he was making judgments also concerning the politics in these matters, because having established their "crime," he provided therewith materials from which important political implications could be drawn.

The question arises whether a man with such an intellect could alone make the investigation in a manner to prove the guilt of people such as Kossior and others. No; he could not have done it without proper directives. At the Central Committee Presidium session he told us: "I was told that Kossior and Chubar were people's enemies and for this reason, I, as an investigative judge, had to make them confess that they are enemies." [Indignation in the hall.]

He could do this only through long tortures, which he did, receiving detailed instructions from Beriya. We must say that at the Central Committee Presidium session he cynically declared: "I thought that I was executing the orders of the party." In this manner Stalin's orders concerning the use of methods of physical pressure against the arrested were in practice executed.

These and many other facts show that all norms of correct party solution of problems were invalidated and everything was dependent upon the willfulness of one man.

The power accumulated in the hands of one person, Stalin, led to serious consequences during the great patriotic war.

When we look at many of our novels, films, and historical scientific studies, the role of Stalin in the patriotic war appears to be entirely improbable. Stalin had foreseen everything. The Soviet Army, on the basis of a strategic plan prepared by Stalin long before, used the tactics of so-called active defense, i. e., tactics which, as we know, allowed the Germans to come up to Moscow and Stalingrad. Using such tactics, the Soviet Army, supposedly, thanks only to Stalin's genius, turned to the offensive and subdued the enemy. The epic victory gained through the armed might of the land of the Soviets, through our heroic people, is ascribed in this type of novel, film, and scientific study as being completely due to the strategic genius of Stalin.

We have to analyze this matter carefully because it has a tremendous significance, not only from the historical but especially from the political, educational, and practical point of view.

What are the facts of this matter?

Before the war our press and all our political-educational work was characterized by its bragging tone: When an enemy violates the holy Soviet soil, then for every blow of the enemy we will answer with three blows, and we will battle the enemy on his soil and we will win without much harm to ourselves. But these positive statements were not based in all areas on concrete facts which would actually guarantee the immunity of our borders.

During the war and after the war, Stalin put forward the thesis that the tragedy which our nation experienced in the first part of the war was the result of the unexpected attack of the Germans against the Soviet Union. But, comrades, this is completely untrue. As soon as Hitler came to power in Germany he assigned to himself the task of liquidating communism. The Fascists were saying this openly; they did not hide their plans. In order to attain this aggressive end, all sorts of pacts and blocs were created, such as the famous Berlin-Rome-Tokyo Axis. Many facts from the prewar period clearly showed that Hitler was going all out to begin a war against the Soviet state and that he had concentrated large armed units, together with armored units, near the Soviet borders.

Documents which have now been published show that by April 3, 1941, Churchill, through his Ambassador to the U. S. S. R., Cripps, personally warned Stalin that the Germans had begun regrouping their armed units with the intent of attacking the Soviet Union. It is self-evident that Churchill did not do this at all because of his friendly feeling toward the Soviet nation. He had in this his own imperialistic goals—to bring Germany and the U. S. S. R. into a bloody war and thereby to strengthen the position of the British Empire. Just the same, Churchill affirmed in his writings that he sought to warn Stalin and call his attention to the danger which threatened him. Churchill stressed this repeatedly in his dispatches of April 18 and in the following days. However, Stalin took no heed of these warnings. What is more, Stalin ordered that no credence be given to information of this sort, in order not to provoke the initiation of military operations.

We must assert that information of this sort concerning the threat of German armed invasion of Soviet territory was coming in also from our own military and diplomatic sources; however, because the leadership was conditioned against such information, such data was dispatched with fear and assessed with reservation.

Thus, for instance, information sent from Berlin on May 6, 1941, by the Soviet military attaché, Captain Vorontsov, stated: "Soviet citizen Bozer * * * communicated to the deputy naval attaché that according to a statement of a certain German officer from Hitler's headquarters, Germany is preparing

to invade the U. S. S. R. on May 14 through Finland, the Baltic countries, and Latvia. At the same time Moscow and Leningrad will be heavily raided and paratroopers landed in border cities. * * *"

In his report of May 22, 1941, the deputy military attaché in Berlin, Khlopov, communicated that "* * * the attack of the German Army is reportedly scheduled for June 15, but it is possible that it may begin in the first days of June. * * *"

A cable from our London Embassy dated 18 June 1941 stated: "As of now Cripps is deeply convinced of the inevitability of armed conflict between Germany and the U. S. S. R., which will begin not later than the middle of June. According to Cripps, the Germans have presently concentrated 147 divisions (including air force and service units) along the Soviet borders."

Despite these particularly grave warnings, the necessary steps were not taken to prepare the country properly for defense and to prevent it from being caught unaware.

Did we have time and the capabilities for such preparations? Yes; we had the time and capabilities. Our industry was already so developed that it was capable of supplying fully the Soviet Army with everything that it needed. This is proven by the fact that although during the war we lost almost half of our industry and important industrial and food-production areas as the result of enemy occupation of the Ukraine, Northern Caucasus, and other western parts of the country, the Soviet Nation was still able to organize the production of military equipment in the eastern parts of the country, install there equipment taken from the western industrial areas, and to supply our armed forces with everything which was necessary to destroy the enemy.

Had our industry been mobilized properly and in time to supply the army with the necessary materiel, our wartime losses would have been decidedly smaller. Such mobilization had not been, however, started in time. And already in the first days of the war it became evident that our Army was badly armed, that we did not have enough artillery, tanks, and planes to throw the enemy back.

Soviet science and technology produced excellent models of tanks and artillery pieces before the war. But mass production of all this was not organized, and as a matter of fact we started to modernize our military equipment only on the eve of the war. As a result, at the time of the enemy's invasion of the Soviet land we did not have sufficient quantities either of old machinery which was no longer used for armament production or of new machinery which we had planned to introduce into armament production. The situation with antiaircraft artillery was especially bad; we did not organize the production of antitank ammunition. Many fortified regions had proven to be indefensible as soon as they were attacked, because the old arms had been withdrawn and new ones were not yet available there.

This pertained, alas, not only to tanks, artillery and planes. At the outbreak of the war we did not even have sufficient numbers of rifles to arm the mobilized manpower. I recall that in those days I telephoned Comrade Malenkov from Kiev and told him, "People have volunteered for the new army and demand arms. You must send us arms."

Malenkov answered me, "We cannot send you arms. We are sending all our rifles to Leningrad and you have to arm yourselves." [Movement in the hall.]

Such was the armament situation.

In this connection we cannot forget, for instance, the following fact. Shortly before the invasion of the Soviet Union by the Hitlerite army, Korponos, who was chief of the Kiev special military district (he was later killed at the front) wrote to Stalin that the German armies were at the Bug River, were preparing for an attack and in the very near future would probably start their offensive. In this connection Korponos proposed that a strong defense be organized, that 300,000 people be evacuated from the border areas and that several strong points be organized there: Antitank ditches, trenches for the soldiers, etc.

Moscow answered this proposition with the assertion that this would be a provocation, that no preparatory defensive work should be undertaken at the borders, that the Germans were not to be given any pretext for the initiation of military action against us. Thus, our borders were insufficiently prepared to repel the enemy.

When the Fascist armies had actually invaded Soviet territory and military operations began, Moscow issued the order that the German fire was not to be returned. Why? It was because Stalin, despite evident facts, thought that the war had not yet started, that this was only a provocative action on the part of several undisciplined sections of the German army, and that our reaction might serve as a reason for the Germans to begin the war.

The following fact is also known. On the eve of the invasion of the territory of the Soviet Union by the Hitlerite army a certain German citizen crossed our border and stated that the German armies had received orders to start the offensive against the Soviet Union on the night of June 22 at 3 o'clock. Stalin was informed about this immediately, but even this warning was ignored.

As you see, everything was ignored; warnings of certain army commanders, declarations of deserters from the enemy army, and even the open hostility of the enemy. Is this an example of the alertness of the chief of the party and of the state at this particularly significant historical moment?

And what were the results of this carefree attitude, this disregard of clear facts? The result was that already in the first hours and days the enemy had destroyed in our border regions a large part of our air force, artillery, and other military equipment; he annihilated large numbers of our military cadres and disorganized our military leadership; consequently we could not prevent the enemy from marching deep into the country.

Very grievous consequences, especially in reference to the beginning of the war, followed Stalin's annihilation of many military commanders and political workers during 1937–41 because of his suspiciousness and through slanderous accusations. During these years repressions were instituted against certain parts of military cadres beginning literally at the company and battalion commander level and extending to the higher military centers; during this time the cadre of leaders who had gained military experience in Spain and in the Far East was almost completely liquidated.

The policy of large-scale repression against the military cadres led also to undermined military discipline, because for several years officers of all ranks and even soldiers in the party and Komsomol cells were taught to unmask their superiors as hidden enemies. [Movement in the hall.] It is natural that this caused a negative influence on the state of military discipline in the first war period.

And, as you know, we had before the war excellent military cadres which were unquestionably loyal to the party and to the fatherland. Suffice it to say that those of them who managed to survive despite severe tortures to which they were subjected in the prisons, have from the first war days shown themselves real patriots and heroically fought for the glory of the fatherland; I have here in mind such comrades as Rokossovsky (who, as you know, had been jailed), Gorbatov, Maretskov (who is a delegate at the present Congress), Podlas (he was an excellent commander who perished at the front), and many, many others. However, many such commanders perished in camps and jails and the army saw them no more.

All this brought about the situation which existed at the beginning of the war and which was the great threat to our fatherland.

It would be incorrect to forget that after the first severe disaster and defeats at the front Stalin thought that this was the end. In one of his speeches in those days he said: "All that which Lenin created we have lost forever."

After this Stalin for a long time actually did not direct the military operations and ceased to do anything whatever. He returned to active leadership only when some members of the Political Bureau visited him and told him that it was necessary to take certain steps immediately in order to improve the situation at the front.

Therefore, the threatening danger which hung over our fatherland in the first period of the war was largely due to the faulty methods of directing the nation and the party by Stalin himself.

However, we speak not only about the moment when the war began, which led to serious disorganization of our army and brought us severe losses. Even after the war began, the nervousness and hysteria which Stalin demonstrated, interfering with actual military operations, caused our army serious damage.

Stalin was very far from an understanding of the real situation which was developing at the front. This was natural because during the whole patriotic war he never visited any section of the front or any liberated city except for one short ride on the Mozhaisk Highway during a stabilized situation at the front. To this incident were dedicated many literary works full of fantasies of all sorts and so many paintings. Simultaneously, Stalin was interfering with operations and issuing orders which did not take into consideration the real situation at a given section of the front and which could not help but result in huge personnel losses.

I will allow myself in this connection to bring out one characteristic fact which illustrates how Stalin directed operations at the fronts. There is present at this Congress Marshal Bagramyan, who was once the chief of operations in the headquarters of the southwestern front and who can corroborate what I will tell you.

When there developed an exceptionally serious situation for our army in 1942 in the Kharkov region, we had correctly decided to drop an operation whose objective was to encircle Kharkov, because the real situation at that time would have threatened our army with fatal consequences if this operation were continued.

We communicated this to Stalin, stating that the situation demanded changes in operational plans so that the enemy would be prevented from liquidating a sizable concentration of our army.

Contrary to common sense, Stalin rejected our suggestion and issued the order to continue the operation aimed at the encirclement of Kharkov, despite the fact that at this time many army concentrations were themselves actually threatened with encirclement and liquidation.

I telephoned to Vasilevsky and begged him—

"Alexander Mikhailovich, take a map (Vasilevsky is present here) and show Comrade Stalin the situation which has developed." We should note that Stalin planned operations on a globe. [Animation in the hall.] Yes, comrades, he used to take the globe and trace the front line on it. I said to Comrade Vasilevsky: "Show him the situation on a map; in the present situation we cannot continue the operation which was planned. The old decision must be changed for the good of the cause."

Vasilevsky replied saying that Stalin had already studied this problem and that he, Vasilevsky, would not see Stalin further concerning this matter, because the latter didn't want to hear any arguments on the subject of this operation.

After my talk with Vasilevsky I telephoned to Stalin at his villa. But Stalin did not answer the telephone and Malenkov was at the receiver. I told Comrade Malenkov that I was calling from the front and that I wanted to speak personally to Stalin. Stalin informed me through Malenkov that I should speak with Malenkov. I stated for the second time that I wished to inform Stalin personally about the grave situation which had arisen for us at the front. But Stalin did not consider it convenient to raise the phone and again stated that I should speak to him through Malenkov, although he was only a few steps from the telephone.

After listening in this manner to our plea Stalin said, "Let everything remain as it is."

And what was the result of this? The worst that we had expected. The Germans surrounded our army concentrations and consequently we lost hundreds of thousands of our soldiers. This is Stalin's military genius; this is what it cost us. [Movement in the hall.]

On one occasion after the war, during a meeting of Stalin with members of the political bureau, Anastas Ivanovich Mikoyan mentioned that Khrushchev must have been right when he telephoned concerning the Kharkov operation and that it was unfortunate that his suggestion had not been accepted.

You should have seen Stalin's fury. How could it be admitted that he, Stalin, had not been right. He is after all a genius, and a genius cannot help but be right? Everyone can err, but Stalin considered that he never erred, that he was always right. He never acknowledged to anyone that he made any mistake, large or small, despite the fact that he made not a few mistakes in the matter of theory and in his practical activity. After the party congress we shall probably have to reevaluate many wartime military operations and to present them in their true light.

The tactics on which Stalin insisted without knowing the essence of the conduct of battle operations cost us much blood until we succeeded in stopping the opponent and going over to the offensive.

The military know that already by the end of 1941 instead of great operational maneuvers flanking the opponent and penetrating behind his back, Stalin demanded incessant frontal attacks and the capture of one village after another. Because of this we paid with great losses until our generals, on whose shoulders rested the whole weight of conducting the war, succeeded in changing the situation and shifting to flexible maneuver operations, which immediately brought serious changes at the front favorable to us.

All the more shameful was the fact that after our great victory over the enemy which cost us so much, Stalin began to downgrade many of the commanders who contributed so much to the victory over the enemy, because Stalin excluded every possibility that services rendered at the front should be credited to anyone but himself.

Stalin was very much interested in the assessment of Comrade Zhukov as a military leader. He asked me often for my opinion of Zhukov. I told him then, "I have known Zhukov for a long time; he is a good general and a good military leader."

After the war Stalin began to tell all kinds of nonsense about Zhukov, among others the following, "You praised Zhukov, but he does not deserve it. It is said that before each operation at the front Zhukov used to behave as follows: He used to take a handful of earth, smell it, and say. 'We can begin the attack,' or the opposite, 'the planned operation cannot be carried out.'" I stated at that time, "Comrade Stalin, I do not know who invented this, but it is not true."

It is possible that Stalin himself invented these things for the purpose of minimizing the role and military talents of Marshal Zhukov.

In this connection Stalin very energetically popularized himself as a great leader; in various ways he tried to inculcate in the people the version that all victories gained by the Soviet nation during the great patriotic war were due to the courage, daring, and genius of Stalin and of no one else. Exactly like Kuzma Kryuchkov (a famous Cossack who performed heroic feats against the Germans),[2] he put one dress on seven people at the same time. [Animation in the hall.]

In the same vein, let us take, for instance, our historical and military films and some literary creations; they make us feel sick. Their true objective is the propagation of the theme of praising Stalin as a military genius. Let us recall the film, The Fall of Berlin. Here only Stalin acts; he issues orders in the hall in which there are many empty chairs and only one man approached him and reports something to him—that is Poskrebyshev, his loyal shield bearer. [Laughter in the hall.]

And where is the military command? Where is the political bureau? Where is the government? What are they doing and with what are they engaged? There is nothing about them in the film. Stalin acts for everybody; he does not reckon with anyone; he asks no one for advice. Everything is shown to the nation in this false light. Why? In order to surround Stalin with glory, contrary to the facts and contrary to historical truth.

The question arises: And where are the military on whose shoulders rested the burden of the war? They are not in the film; with Stalin in, no room was left for them.

But Stalin, but the party as a whole, the Soviet Government, our heroic army, its talented leaders and brave soldiers, the whole Soviet nation—these are the ones who assured the victory in the great patriotic war. [Tempestuous and prolonged applause.]

The Central Committee members, ministers, our economic leaders, leaders of Soviet culture, directors of territorial party and Soviet organizations, engineers, and technicians—everyone of them in his own place of work generously gave of his strength and knowledge toward ensuring victory over the enemy.

Exceptional heroism was shown by our hard core—surrounded by glory is our whole working class, our Kolkhoz peasantry, the Soviet intelligentsia, who under the leadership of party organizations overcame untold hardships and, bearing the hardships of war, devoted all their strength to the cause of the defense of the fatherland.

Great and brave deeds during the war were accomplished by our Soviet women who bore on their backs the heavy load of production work in the factories, on the kolkhozes, and in various economic and cultural sectors; many women participated directly in the great patriotic war at the fronts; our brave youth contributed immeasurably at the front and at home to the defense of the Soviet fatherland and to the annihilation of the enemy.

Immortal are the services of the Soviet soldiers, of our commanders and political workers of all ranks; after the loss of a considerable part of the army in the first war months they did not lose their heads and were able to reorganize during the progress of combat; they created and toughened during the progress of the war a strong and heroic army and not only stood off pressure of the strong and cunning enemy but also smashed him.

The magnificent and heroic deeds of hundreds of millions of people of the East and of the West during the fight against the threat of Fascist subjugation which loomed before us will live centuries and millenia in the memory of thankful humanity. [Thunderous applause.]

The main role and the main credit for the victorious ending the war belongs to our Communist Party, to the armed forces of the Soviet Union, and to the tens of millions of Soviet people raised by the party. [Thunderous and prolonged applause.]

Comrades, let us reach for some other facts. The Soviet Union is justly considered as a model of a multinational state because we have in practice assured the equality and friendship of all nations which live in our great fatherland.

All the more monstrous are the acts whose initiator was Stalin and which are rude violations of the basic Leninst principles of the nationality policy of the Soviet state. We refer to the mass deportations from their native places of whole nations, together with all Communists and Komsomols without any exception; this deportation action was not dictated by any military considerations.

Thus, already at the end of 1943, when there occurred a permanent breakthrough at the fronts of the Great Patriotic War benefiting the Soviet Union, a decision was taken and executed concerning the deportation of all the Karachai from the lands on which they lived. In the same period, at the end of December 1943, the same lot befell the whole population of the Autonomous Kalmyk Republic. In March 1944 all the Chechen and Ingush peoples were deported and the Checken-Ingush Autonomous Republic was liquidated. In April 1944, all Balkars were deported to faraway places from the territory of the Kabardyno-Balkar Autonomous Republic and the Republic itself was renamed the Automomous Kabardnian Republic. The Ukrainians avoided meeting this fate only because there were too many of them and there was no place to which to deport them. Otherwise, he would have deported them also. [Laughter and animation in the hall.]

Not only a Marxist-Leninist but also no man of commonsense can grasp how it is possible to make whole nations responsible for inimical activity, including women, children, old people, Communists, and Komsomols, to use mass repression against them, and to expose them to misery and suffering for the hostile acts of individual persons or groups of persons.

After the conclusion of the patriotic war the Soviet nation stressed with pride the magnificent victories gained through great sacrifices and tremendous efforts. The country experienced a period of political enthusiasm. The party came out of the war even more united; in the fire of the war party cadres were tempered and hardened. Under such conditions nobody could have even thought of the possibility of some plot in the party.

And it was precisely at this time that the so-called Leningrad affair was born. As we have now proven, this case was fabricated. Those who innocently lost their lives included Comrades Voznesensky, Kuznetsov, Rodionov, Popkov, and others.

As is known, Voznesensky and Kuznetsov were talented and eminent leaders. Once they stood very close to Stalin. It is sufficient to mention that Stalin made Voznesensky first deputy to the chairman of the council of ministers, and Kuznetsov was elected secretary of the Central Committee. The very fact that Stalin entrusted Kuznetsov with the supervision of the state security organs shows the trust which he enjoyed.

How did it happen that these persons were branded as enemies of the people and liquidated?

[2] The content of this parenthesis is an editorial comment of the translator.

Facts prove that the Leningrad affair is also the result of willfulness which Stalin exercised against party cadres.

Had a normal situation existed in the party's Central Committee and in the central committee political bureau, affairs of this nature would have been examined there in accordance with party practice, and all pertinent facts assessed; as a result such an affair as well as others would not have happened.

We must state that after the war the situation became even more complicated. Stalin became even more capricious, irritable, and brutal; in particular his suspicion grew. His persecution mania reached unbelievable dimensions. Many workers were becoming enemies before his very eyes. After the war Stalin separated himself from the collective even more. Everything was decided by him alone without any consideration for anyone or anything.

This unbelievable suspicion was cleverly taken advantage of by the abject provocateur and vile enemy, Beriya, who had murdered thousands of Communists and loyal Soviet people. The elevation of Voznesensky and Kuznetsov alarmed Beriya. As we have now proven, it had been precisely Beriya who had suggested to Stalin the fabrication by him and by his confidants of materials in the form of declarations and anonymous letters, and in the form of various rumors and talks.

The party's central committee has examined this so-called Leningrad affair; persons who innocently suffered are now rehabilitated and honor has been restored to the glorious Leningrad party organization. Abakumov and others who had fabricated this affair were brought before a court; their trial took place in Leningrad and they received what they deserved.

The question arises: Why is it that we see the truth of this affair only now, and why did we not do something earlier, during Stalin's life, in order to prevent the loss of innocent lives? It was because Stalin personally supervised the Leningrad affair, and the majority of the Political Bureau members did not, at that time, know all of the circumstances in these matters, and could not therefore intervene.

When Stalin received certain materials from Beriya and Abakumov, without examining these slanderous materials, he ordered an investigation of the affair of Voznesensky and Kuznetsov. With this their fate was sealed. Instructive in the same way is the case of the Mingrelian nationalist organization which supposedly existed in Georgia. As is known, resolutions by the central committee, Communist Party of the Soviet Union, were made concerning this case in November 1951 and in March 1952. These resolutions were made without prior discussion with the Political Bureau. Stalin had personally dictated them. They made serious accusations against many loyal Communists. On the basis of falsified documents it was proven that there existed in Georgia a supposedly nationalistic organization whose objective was the liquidation of the Soviet power in that republic with the help of imperialist powers.

In this connection, a number of responsible party and Soviet workers were arrested in Georgia. As was later proven, this was a slander directed against the Georgian party organization.

We know that there have been at times manifestations of local bourgeois nationalism in Georgia as in several other republics. The question arises: Could it be possible that in the period during which the resolutions referred to above were made, nationalist tendencies grew so much that there was a danger of Georgia's leaving the Soviet Union and joining Turkey? [Animation in the hall, laughter.]

This is, of course, nonsense. It is impossible to imagine how such assumptions could enter anyone's mind. Everyone knows how Georgia has developed economically and culturally under Soviet rule.

Industrial production of the Georgian Republic is 27 times greater than it was before the revolution. Many new industries have arisen in Georgia which did not exist there before the revolution: from smelting, an oil industry, a machine construction industry, etc. Illiteracy has long since been liquidated, which, in prerevolutionary Georgia, included 78 percent of the population.

Could the Georgians, comparing the situation in their republic with the hard situation of the working masses in Turkey, be aspiring to join Turkey? In 1955 Georgia produced 18 times as much steel per person as Turkey. Georgia produces 9 times as much electrical energy per person as Turkey. According to the available 1950 census, 65 percent of Turkey's total population are illiterate, and of the women, 80 percent are illiterate. Georgia has 19 institutions of higher learning which have about 39,000 students; this is 8 times more than in Turkey (for each 1,000 inhabitants). The prosperity of the working people has grown tremendously in Georgia under Soviet rule.

It is clear that as the economy and culture develop, and as the Socialist consciousness of the working masses in Georgia grows, the source from which bourgeois nationalism draws its strength evaporates.

As it developed, there was no nationalistic organization in Georgia. Thousands of innocent people fell victim of willfulness and lawlessness. All of this happened under the "genial" leadership of Stalin, "the great son of the Georgian nation," as Georgians liked to refer to Stalin. [Animation in the hall.]

The willfulness of Stalin showed itself not only in decisions concerning the internal life of the country but also in the international relations of the Soviet Union.

The July plenum of the Central Committee studied in detail the reasons for the development of conflict with Yugoslavia. It was a shameful role which Stalin played here. The "Yugoslav affair" contained no problems which could not have been solved through party discussions among comrades. There was no significant basis for the development of this "affair"; it was completely possible to have prevented the rupture of relations with that country. This does not mean, however, that the Yugoslav leaders did not make mistakes or did not have shortcomings. But these mistakes and shortcomings were magnified in a monstrous manner by Stalin, which resulted in a break of relations with a friendly country.

I recall the first days when the conflict between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia began artificially to be blown up. Once, when I came from Kiev to Moscow, I was invited to visit Stalin who, pointing to the copy of a letter lately sent to Tito, asked me, "Have you read this?"

Not waiting for my reply he answered, "I will shake my little finger and there will be no more Tito. He will fall."

We have dearly paid for this "shaking of the little finger." This statement reflected Stalin's mania for greatness, but he acted just that way: "I shall shake my little finger and there will be no Kossior"; "I will shake my little finger once more and Postyshev and Chubar will be no more"; I will shake my little finger again and Voznesensky, Kuznetsov and many others will disappear."

But this did not happen to Tito. No matter how much or how little Stalin shook, not only his little finger but everything else that he could shake, Tito did not fall. Why? The reason was that, in this case of disagreement with the Yugoslav comrades, Tito had behind him a state and a people who had gone through a severe school of fighting for liberty and independence, a people which gave support to its leaders.

You see to what Stalin's mania for greatness led. He had completely lost consciousness of reality; he demonstrated his suspicion and haughtiness not only in relation to individuals in the U. S. S. R., but in relation to whole parties and nations.

We have carefully examined the case of Yugoslavia and have found a proper solution which is approved by the peoples of the Soviet Union and of Yugoslavia as well as by the working masses of all the people's democracies and by all progressive humanity. The liquidation of the abnormal relationship with Yugoslavia was done in the interest of the whole camp of socialism, in the interest of strengthening peace in the whole world.

Let us also recall the affair of the doctor plotters. [Animation in the hall.] Actually there was no affair outside of the declaration of the woman doctor Timashuk, who was probably influenced or ordered by someone (after all, she was an unofficial collaborator of the organs of state security) to write Stalin a letter in which she declared that doctors were applying supposedly improper methods of medical treatment.

Such a letter was sufficient for Stalin to reach an immediate conclusion that there are doctor plotters in the Soviet Union. He issued orders to arrest a group of eminent Soviet medical specialists. He personally issued advice on the conduct of the investigation and the method of interrogation of the arrested persons. He said that the academician Vinogradov should be put in chains, another one should be beaten. Present at this Congress as a delegate is the former Minister of State Security Comrade Ignatiev. Stalin told him curtly, "If you do not obtain confessions from the doctors we will shorten you by a head." [Tumult in the hall.]

Stalin personally called the investigative judge, gave him instructions, advised him on which investigative methods should be used; these methods were simple—beat, beat and, once again, beat.

Shortly after the doctors were arrested we members of the Political Bureau received protocols with the doctors; confessions of guilt. After distributing these protocols Stalin told us, "You are blind like young kittens; what will happen without me? The country will perish because you do not know how to recognize enemies."

The case was so presented that no one could verify the facts on which the investigation was based. There was no possibility of trying to verify facts by contacting those who had made the confessions of guilt.

We felt, however, that the case of the arrested doctors was questionable. We knew some of these people personally because they had once treated us. When we examined this case after Stalin's death, we found it to be fabricated from beginning to end.

This ignominious case was set up by Stalin; he did not, however, have the time in which to bring it to an end (as he conceived that end), and for this reason the doctors are still alive. Now all have been rehabilitated; they are working in the same places they were working before; they treat top individuals, not excluding members of the Government; they have our full confidence; and they execute their duties honestly, as they did before.

In organizing the various dirty and shameful cases, a very base role was played by the rabid enemy of our party, an agent of a foreign intelligence service—Beriya, who had stolen into Stalin's confidence. In what way could this provocateur gain such a position in the party and in the State, so as to become the First Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union and a member of the Central Committee Political Bureau? It has now been established that this villain had climbed up the government ladder over an untold number of corpses.

Were there any signs that Beriya was an enemy of the party? Yes; there were.

Already in 1937, at a Central Committee plenum, former People's Commissar of Health Protection Kaminsky said that Beriya worked for the Mussavat intelligence service. But the Central Committee plenum had barely concluded when Kaminsky was arrested and then shot. Had Stalin examined Kaminsky's statement? No; because Stalin believed in Beriya, and that was enough for him. And when Stalin believed in anyone or anything, then no one could say anything which was contrary to his opinion; anyone who would dare to express opposition would have met the same fate as Kaminsky.

There were other signs also. The declaration which Comrade Snegov made at the party's Central Committee is interesting. (Parenthetically speaking, he was also rehabilitated not long ago, after 17 years in prison camps.) In this declaration Snegov writes:

"In connection with the proposed rehabilitation of the former Central Committee member, Kartvelishvili-Lavryentiev, I have entrusted to the hands of the representative of the committee of state security a detailed deposition concerning Beriya's role in the disposition of the Kartvelishvili case and concerning the criminal motives by which Beriya was guided."

In my opinion, it is indispensable to recall an important fact pertaining to this case and to communicate it to the Central Committee, because I did not consider it as proper to include in the investigation documents.

On October 30, 1931, at the session of the organizational bureau of the Central Committee, All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), Kartvelishvili, secretary of the trans-Caucasian Krai committee, made a report. All members of the executive of the Krai committee were present; of them I alone am alive. During this session J. V. Stalin made a motion at the end of his speech concerning the organization of the secretariat of the trans-Caucasian Krai committee, composed of the following: First secretary, Kartvelishvili; second secretary, Beriya (it was then for the first time in the party's history that Beriya's name was mentioned as a candidate for a party position). Kartvelishvili answered that he knew Beriya well and for that reason refused categorically to work together with him. Stalin proposed then that this matter be left open and that it be solved in the process of the work itself. Two days later a decision was arrived at that Beriya would receive the party post and that Kartvelishvili would be deported from the trans-Caucasus.

This fact can be confirmed by Comrades Mikoyan and Kaganovich who were present at that session.

The long unfriendly relations between Kartvelishvili and Beriya were widely known; they date back to the time when Comrade Sergo[3] was active in the Trans-Caucasus; Kartvelishvili was the closest assistant of Sergo. The unfriendly relationship impelled Beriya to fabricate a case against Kartvelishvili.

It is a characteristic thing that in this case Kartvelishvili was charged with a terroristic act against Beriya.

The indictment in the Beriya case contains a discussion of his crimes. Some things should, however, be recalled, especially since it is possible that not all delegates to the Congress have read this document. I wish to recall Beriya's bestial disposition of the cases of Kedrov, Golubiev, and Golubiev's adopted mother, Baturina—persons who wished to inform the Central Committee concerning Beriya's treacherous activity. They were shot without any trial and the sentence was passed ex post facto, after the execution.

Here is what the old Communist, Comrade Kedrov, wrote to the Central Committee through Comrade Andreyev (Comrade Andreyev was then a Central Committee secretary):

"I am calling to you for help from a gloomy cell of the Lefortorsky prison. Let my cry of horror reach your ears; do not remain deaf; take me under your protection; please, help remove the nightmare of interrogations and show that this is all a mistake.

"I suffer innocently. Please believe me. Time will testify to the truth. I am not an agent-provocateur of the Tsarish Okhrana; I am not a spy; I am not a member of an anti-Soviet organization of which I am being accused on the basis of denunciations. I am also not guilty of any other crimes against the party and the Government. I am an old Bolshevik, free of any stain; I have honestly fought for almost 40 years in the ranks of the party for the good and the prosperity of the nation. * * *

"Today I, a 62-year-old man, am being threatened by the investigative judges with more severe, cruel, and degrading methods of physical pressure. They (the judges) are no longer capable of becoming aware of their error and of recognizing that their handling of my case is illegal and impermissible. They try to justify their actions by picturing me as a hardened and raving enemy and are demanding increased repressions. But let the party know that I am innocent and that there is nothing which can turn a loyal son of the party into an enemy, even right up to his last dying breath.

"But I have no way out. I cannot divert from myself the hastily approaching new and powerful blows.

"Everything, however, has its limits. My torture has reached the extreme. My health is broken, my strength and my energy are waning, the end is drawing near. To die in a Soviet prison, branded as a vile traitor to the fatherland—what can be more monstrous for an honest man. And how monstrous all this is. Unsurpassed bitterness and pain grips my heart. No. No. This will not happen; this cannot be, I cry. Neither the party, nor the Soviet government, nor the people's commissar, L. P. Beriya, will permit this cruel irreparable injustice. I am firmly certain that given a quiet, objective examination, without any foul rantings, without any anger and without the fearful tortures, it would be easy to prove the baselessness of the charges. I believe deeply that truth and justice will triumph. I believe. I believe."

The old Bolshevik, Comrade Kedrov, was found innocent by the military collegium. But despite this, he was shot at Beriya's order. [Indignation in the hall.]

Beriya also handled cruelly the family of Comrade Ordzhonikidze. Why? Because Ordzhonikidze had tried to prevent Beriya from realizing his shameful plans. Beriya had cleared from his way all persons who could possibly interfere with him. Ordzhonikidze was always an opponent of Beriya, which he told to Stalin. Instead of examining this affair and taking appropriate steps, Stalin allowed the liquidation of Ordzhonikidze's brother and brought Ordzhonikidze himself to such a state that he was forced to shoot himself. [Indignation in the hall.] Such was Beriya.

Beriya was unmasked by the party's central committee shortly after Stalin's death. As a result of the particularly detailed legal proceedings it was established that Beriya had committeed monstrous crimes and Beriya was shot.

The question arises why Beriya, who had liquidated tens of thousands of party and Soviet workers, was not unmasked during Stalin's life. He was not unmasked earlier because he had utilized very skillfully Stalin's weaknesses; feeding him with suspicions, he assisted Stalin in everything and acted with his support.

Comrades, the cult of the individual acquired such monstrous size chiefly because Stalin himself, using all conceivable methods, supported the glorification of his own person. This is supported by numerous facts. One of the most characteristic examples of Stalin's self-glorification and of his lack of even elementary modestry is the edition of his Short Biography, which was published in 1948.

This book is an expression of the most dissolute flattery, an example of making a man into a godhead, of transforming him into an infallible sage, "the greatest leader," "sublime strategist of all times and nations." Finally no other words could be found with which to lift Stalin up to the heavens.

We need not give here examples of the loathsome adulation filling this book. All we need to add is that they all were approved and edited by Stalin personally and some of them were added in his own handwriting to the draft text of the book.

What did Stalin consider essential to write into this book? Did he want to cool the ardor of his flatterers who were composing his Short Biography? No. He marked the very places where he thought that the praise of his services was insufficient.

Here are some examples characterizing Stalin's activity, added in Stalin's own hand:

"In this fight against the skeptics and capitulators, the Trotskyites, Zinovievites, Bukharinites, and Kamenevites, there was definitely welded together, after Lenin's death, that leading core of the party[4] that upheld the great banner of Lenin, rallied the party behind Lenin's behests, and brought the Soviet people into the broad road of industrializing the country and collectivising the rural economy. The leader of this core and the guiding force of the party and the state was Comrade Stalin."

Thus writes Stalin himself. Then he adds:

"Although he performed his task of leader of the party and the people with consummate skill and enjoyed the unreserved support of the entire Soviet people, Stalin never allowed his work to be marred by the slightest hint of vanity, conceit, or self-adulation."

Where and when could a leader so praise himself? Is this worthy of a leader of the Marxist-Leninist type? No. Precisely against this did Marx and Engels take such a strong position. This also was always sharply condemned by Vladimir Ilyich Lenin.

In the draft text of his book appeared the following sentence: "Stalin is the Lenin of today." This sentence appeared to Stalin to be too weak, so in his own handwriting he changed it to read: "Stalin is the worthy continuer of Lenin's work, or, as it is said in our party, Stalin is the Lenin of today." You see how well it is said, not by the nation but by Stalin himself.

It is possible to give many such self-praising appraisals written into the draft text of that book in Stalin's hand. Especially generously does he endow himself with praises pertaining to his military genius, to his talent for strategy.

I will cite one more insertion made by Stalin concerning the theme of the Stalinist military genius.

"The advanced Soviet science of war received further development," he writes, "at Comrade Stalin's hands. Comrade Stalin elaborated the theory of the permanently operating factors that decide the issue of wars, of active defense, and the laws of counter-offensive and offensive, of the cooperation of all services and arms in modern warfare, of

[3] Translator's note: "Sergo" was the popular nickname for Ordzhonikidze.

[4] Omitted portion of list as found in A Short Biography, by Joseph Stalin, Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1949, p. 89, is as follows: "* * * consisting of Stalin, Molotov, Kalinin, Voroshilov, Kuibyshev, Frunze, Dzerchinsky, Kaganovich, Orjonikidze, Kirov, Yaroslavsky, Mikoyan, Andreyev, Shvernik, Zhdanov, Shkiryatov, and others."

the role of big tank masses and air forces in modern war, and of the artillery as the most formidable of the armed services. At the various stages of the war Stalin's genius found the correct solutions that took account of all the circumstances of the situation." [Movement in the hall.]

And further, writes Stalin:

"Stalin's military mastership was displayed both in defense and offense. Comrade Stalin's genius enabled him to divine the enemy's plans and defeat them. The battles in which Comrade Stalin directed the Soviet armies are brilliant examples of operational military skill."

In this manner was Stalin praised as a strategist. Who did this? Stalin himself, not in his role as a strategist but in the role of an author-editor, one of the main creators of his self-adulatory biography.

Such, comrades, are the facts. We should rather say shameful facts.

And one additional fact from the same short biography of Stalin. As is known, the Short Course of the History of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), was written by a commission of the party central committee.

This book, parenthetically, was also permeated with the cult of the individual and was written by a designated group of authors. This fact was reflected in the following formulation on the proof copy of the Short Biography of Stalin:

"A commission of the central committee, All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), under the direction of Comrade Stalin and with his most active personal participation, has prepared a Short Course of the History of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)."

But even this phrase did not satisfy Stalin: The following sentence replaced it in the final version of the "Short Biography":

"In 1938 appeared the book, History of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), Short Course, written by Comrade Stalin and approved by a commission of the central committee, All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)." Can one add anything more? [Animation in the hall.]

As you see, a surprising metamorphosis changed the work created by a group into a book written by Stalin. It is not necessary to state how and why this metamorphosis took place.

A pertinent question comes to our mind: If Stalin is the author of this book, why did he need to praise the person of Stalin so much and to transform the whole post-October historical period of our glorious Communist Party solely into an action of "the Stalin genius"?

Did this book properly reflect the efforts of the party in the Socialist transformation of the country, in the construction of Socialist society, in the industrialization and collectivization of the country, and also other steps taken by the party which undeviatingly traveled the path outlined by Lenin? This book speaks principally about Stalin, about his speeches, about his reports. Everything without the smallest exception is tied to his name.

And when Stalin himself asserts that he himself wrote the Short Course of the History of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), this calls at least for amazement. Can a Marxist-Leninist thus write about himself, praising his own person to the heavens?

Or let us take the matter of the Stalin prizes. [Movement in the hall.] Not even the Tsars created prizes which they named after themselves.

Stalin recognized as the best a text of the national anthem of the Soviet Union which contains not a word about the Communist Party; it contains, however, the following unprecedented praise of Stalin:

"Stalin brought us up in loyalty to the people. He inspired us to great toil and acts."

In these lines of the anthem is the whole educational, directional, and inspirational activity of the great Leninist Party ascribed to Stalin. This is, of course, a clear deviation from Marxism-Leninism, a clear debasing and belittling of the role of the party. We should add for your information that the Presidium of the Central Committee has already passed a resolution concerning the composition of a new text of the anthem, which will reflect the role of the people, and the role of the party. [Loud, prolonged applause.]

And was it without Stalin's knowledge that many of the largest enterprises and towns were named after him? Was it without his knowledge that Stalin monuments were erected in the whole country—these memorials to the living? It is a fact that Stalin himself had signed on July 2, 1951, a resolution of the U. S. S. R. Council of Ministers concerning the erection on the Volga-Don Canal of an impressive monument to Stalin; on September 4 of the same year he issued an order making 33 tons of copper available for the construction of this impressive monument. Anyone who has visited the Stalingrad area must have seen the huge statue which is being built there, and that on a site which hardly any people frequent. Huge sums were spent to build it at a time when people of this area had lived since the war in huts. Consider yourself, was Stalin right when he wrote in his biography that "* * * he did not allow in himself * * * even a shadow of conceit, pride, or self-adoration?"

At the same time Stalin gave proofs of his lack of respect for Lenin's memory. It is not a coincidence that, despite the decision taken over 30 years ago to build a palace of Soviets as a monument to Vladimir Ilyich, this palace was not built, its construction was always postponed, and the project allowed to lapse.

We cannot forget to recall the Soviet Government resolution of August 14, 1925, concerning the founding of Lenin prizes for educational work. This resolution was published in the press, but until this day there are no Lenin prizes. This, too, should be corrected. [Tumultuous, prolonged applause.]

During Stalin's life, thanks to known methods which I have mentioned, and quoting facts, for instance, from the Short Biography of Stalin—all events were explained as if Lenin played only a secondary role, even during the October Socialist Revolution. In many films and in many literary works, the figure of Lenin was incorrectly presented and inadmissibly depreciated.

Stalin loved to see the file, The Unforgettable Year of 1919, in which he was shown on the steps of an armored train and where he was practically vanquishing the foe with his own sabre. Let Kliment Yefremovich, our dear friend, find the necessary courage and write the truth about Stalin; after all, he knows how Stalin had fought. It will be difficult for Comrade Voroshilov to undertake this, but it would be good if he did it. Everyone will approve of it, both the people and the party. Even his grandsons will thank him. [Prolonged applause.]

In speaking about the events of the October Revolution and about the civil war, the impression was created that Stalin always played the main role, as if everywhere and always Stalin had suggested to Lenin what to do and how to do it. However, this is slander of Lenin. [Prolonged applause.]

I will probably not sin against the truth when I say that 99 percent of the persons present here heard and knew very little about Stalin before the year 1924, while Lenin was known to all he was known to the whole party, to the whole nation, from the children up to the graybeards. [Tumultuous, prolonged applause.]

All this has to be thoroughly revised, so that history, literature, and the fine arts properly reflect V. I. Lenin's role and the great deeds of our Communist Party and of the Soviet people—the creative people. [Applause.]

Comrades, the cult of the individual has caused the employment of faulty principles in party work and in economic activity; it brought about rule violation of internal party and Soviet democracy, sterile administration, deviations of all sorts, covering up of shortcomings and varnishing of reality. Our nation gave birth to many flatterers and specialists in false optimism and deceit.

We should also not forget that due to the numerous arrests of party, Soviet and economic leaders, many workers began to work uncertainly, showed overcautiousness, feared all which was new, feared their own shadows and began to show less initiative in their work.

Take, for instance, party and Soviet resolutions. They were prepared in a routine manner often without considering the concrete situation. This went so far that party workers, even during the smallest sessions, read their speeches. All this produced the danger of formalizing the party and Soviet work and of bureaucratizing the whole apparatus.

Stalin's reluctance to consider life's realities and the fact that he was not aware of the real state of affairs in the provinces can be illustrated by his direction of agriculture.

All those who interested themselves even a little in the national situation saw the difficult situation in agriculture, but Stalin never even noted it. Did we tell Stalin about this? Yes, we told him, but he did not support us. Why? Because Stalin never traveled anywhere, did not meet city and Kolkhoz workers; he did not know the actual situation in the provinces.

He knew the country and agriculture only from films. And these films had dressed up and beautified the existing situation in agriculture.

Many films so pictured Kolkhoz life that the tables were bending from the weight of turkeys and geese. Evidently Stalin thought that it was actually so.

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin looked at life differently; he was always close to the people; he used to receive peasant delegates, and often spoke at factory gatherings; he used to visit villages and talk with the peasants.

Stalin separated himself from the people and never went anywhere. This lasted tens of years. The last time he visited a village was in January 1928 when he visited Siberia in connection with grain deliveries. How then could he have known the situation in the provinces?

And when he was once told during a discussion that our situation on the land was a difficult one and that the situation of cattle breeding and meat production was especially bad, a commission was formed which was charged with the preparation of a resolution called, "Means toward further development of animal breeding in Kolkhozes and Sovkhozes." We worked out this project.

Of course, our propositions of that time did not contain all possibilities, but we did charter ways in which animal breeding on the Kolkhozes and Sovkhozes would be raised. We had proposed then to raise the prices of such products in order to create material incentives for the Kolkhoz, MTS, and Sovkhoz workers in the development of cattle breeding. But our project was not accepted and in February 1953 was laid aside entirely.

What is more, while reviewing this project Stalin proposed that the taxes paid by the Kolkhozes and by the Kolkhoz workers should be raised by 40 billion rubles; according to

him the peasants are well-off and the Kolkhoz worker would need to sell only one more chicken to pay his tax in full.

Imagine what this meant. Certainly 40 billion rubles is a sum which the Kolkhoz workers did not realize for all the products which they sold to the Government. In 1952 for instance, the Kolkhozes and the Kolkhoz workers received 26,280,000,000 rubles for all their products delivered and sold to the Government.

Did Stalin's position then rest on data of any sort whatever? Of course not.

In such cases facts and figures did not interest him. If Stalin said anything, it meant it was so—after all, he was a genius and a genius does not need to count, he only needs to look and can immediately tell how it should be. When he expresses his opinion, everyone has to repeat it and to admire his wisdom.

But how much wisdom was contained in the proposal to raise the agricultural tax by 40 billion rubles. None, absolutely none, because the proposal was not based on an actual assessment of the situation but on the fantastic ideas of a person divorced from reality. We are currently beginning slowly to work our way out of a difficult agricultural situation. The speeches of the delegates to the 20th congress please us all; we are glad that many delegates deliver speeches, that there are conditions for the fulfillment of the sixth 5-year plan for animal husbandry, not during the period of 5 years, but within 2 to 3 years. We are certain that the commitments of the new 5-year plan will be accomplished successfully. [Prolonged applause.]

Comrades, if we sharply criticize today the cult of the individual which was so widespread during Stalin's life and if we speak about the many negative phenomena generated by this cult which is so alien to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism, various persons may ask: How could it be? Stalin headed the party and the country for 30 years and many victories were gained during his lifetime. Can we deny this? In my opinion, the question can be asked in this manner only by those who are blinded and hopelessly hypnotized by the cult of the individual, only by those who do not understand the essence of the revolution and of the Soviet State, only by those who do not understand, in a Leninist manner, the role of the party and of the nation in the development of the Soviet society.

The Socialist revolution was attained by the working class and by the poor peasantry with the partial support of middle-class peasants. It was attained by the people under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party. Lenin's great service consisted of the fact that he created a militant party of the working class, but he was armed with Marxist understanding of the laws of social development and with the science of proletarian victory in the fight with capitalism, and he steeled this party in the crucible of revolutionary struggle of the masses of the people. During this fight the party consistently defended the interests of the people, became its experienced leader, and led the working masses to power, to the creation of the first Socialist state.

You remember well the wise words of Lenin that the Soviet State is strong because of the awareness of the masses that history is created by the millions and tens of millions of people.

Our historical victories were attained thanks to the organizational work of the party, to the many provincial organizations, and to the self-sacrificing work of our great nation. These victories are the result of the great drive and activity of the nation and of the party as a whole; they are not at all the fruit of the leadership of Stalin, as the situation was pictured during the period of the cult of the individual.

If we are to consider this matter of Marxists and as Leninists, then we have to state unequivocably that the leadership practice which came into being during the last years of Stalin's life became a serious obstacle in the path of Soviet social development.

Stalin often failed for months to take up some unusually important problems concerning the life of the party and of the state whose solution could not be postponed. During Stalin's leadership our peaceful relations with other nations were often threatened, because one-man decisions could cause and often did cause great complications.

In the last years, when we managed to free ourselves of the harmful practice of the cult of the individual and took several proper steps in the sphere of internal and external policies, everyone saw how activity grew before their very eyes, how the creative activity of the broad working masses developed, how favorably all this acted upon the development of economy and of culture. [Applause.]

Some comrades may ask us: Where were the members of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee? Why did they not assert themselves against the cult of the individual in time? And why is this being done only now?

First of all we have to consider the fact that the members of the Political Bureau viewed these matters in a different way at different times. Initially, many of them backed Stalin actively because Stalin was one of the strongest Marxists and his logic, his strength, and his will greatly influenced the cadres and party work.

It is known that Stalin, after Lenin's death, especially during the first years, actively fought for Leninism against the enemies of Leninist theory and against those who deviated. Beginning with Leninist theory, the party, with its Central Committee at the head, started on a great scale the work of Socialist industrialization of the country, agricultural collectivization, and the cultural revolution. At that time Stalin gained great popularity, sympathy, and support. The party had to fight those who attempted to lead the country away from the correct Leninist path; it had to fight Trotskyites, Zinovievites, and rightists, and the bourgeois nationalists. This fight was indispensable. Later, however, abusing his power more and more, began to fight eminent party and government leaders and to use terroristic methods against honest Soviet people. As we have already shown, Stalin thus handled such eminent party and government leaders as Kossior, Rudzutak, Eikhe, Postyshev, and many others.

Attempts to oppose groundless suspicions and charges resulted in the opponent falling victim of the repression. This characterized the fall of Comrade Postyshev.

In one of his speeches Stalin expressed his dissatisfaction with Postyshev and asked him, What are you actually?"

Postyshev answer clearly, "I am a Bolshevik, Comrade Stalin, a Bolshevik."

This assertion was at first considered to show a lack of respect for Stalin; later it was considered a harmful act and consequently resulted in Postyshev's annihilation and branding without any reason as a people's enemy.

In the situation which then prevailed I have talked often with Nikolai Aleksandrovich Bulganin; once, when we two were traveling in a car, he said, "It has happened sometimes that a man goes to Stalin on his invitation as a friend. And when he sits with Stalin he does not know where he will be sent next—home or to jail."

It is clear that such conditions put every member of the Political Bureau in a very difficult situation. And when we also consider the fact that in the last years the Central Committee plenary sessions were not convened, and that the sessions of the Political Bureau occurred only occasionally, from time to time, then we will understand how difficult it was for any member of the Political Bureau to take a stand against one or another injust or improper procedure, against serious errors and shortcomings in the practices of leadership.

As we have already shown, many decisions were taken either by one person or in a roundabout way, without collective discussions. The sad fate of Political Bureau member, Comrade Voznesensky, who fell victim to Stalin's repressions, is known to all. It is a characteristic thing that the decision to remove him from the Political Bureau was never discussed but was reached in a devious fashion. In the same way came the decision concerning the removal of Kuznetsov and Rodionov from their posts.

The importance of the Central Committee's Political Bureau was reduced and its work was disorganized by the creation within the Political Bureau of various commissions—the so-called quintets, sextets, septets, and novenaries. Here is, for instance, a resolution of the Political Bureau of October 3, 1946:

"Stalin's proposal:

"1. The Political Bureau Commission for Foreign Affairs (sextet) is to concern itself in the future, in addition to foreign affairs, also with matters of internal construction and domestic policy.

"2. The Sextet is to add to its roster the chairman of the State Commission of Economic Planning of the U. S. S. R., Comrade Voznesensky, and is to be known as a Septet."

"Signed: Secretary of the Central Committee, J. Stalin."

What a terminology of a card player. [Laughter in the hall.] It is clear that the creation within the Political Bureau of this type of commissions—quintets, sextets, septets, and novenaries—was against the principle of collective leadership. The result of this was that some members of the Political Bureau were in this way kept away from participation in reaching the most important State matters.

One of the oldest members of our party, Kliment Yefremovich Voroshilov, found himself in an almost impossible situation. For several years he was actually deprived of the right of participation in Political Bureau sessions. Stalin forbade him to attend the Political Bureau sessions and to receive documents. When the Political Bureau was in session and Comrade Vorishilov heard about it, he telephoned each time and asked whether he would be allowed to attend. Sometimes Stalin permitted it, but always showed his dissatisfaction. Because of his extreme suspicion, Stalin toyed also with the absurd and ridiculous suspicion that Voroshilov was an English agent. [Laughter in the hall.] It's true—an English agent. A special tapping device was installed in his home to listen to what was said there. [Indignation in the hall.]

By unilateral decision Stalin had also separated one other man from the work of the political bureau—Andrey Andreyevich Andreyev. This was one of the most unbridled acts of willfulness.

Let us consider the first Central Committee plenum after the 19th party congress when Stalin, in his talk at the plenum, characterized Vyacheslav Mikhailovich Molotov and Anastas Ivanovich Mikoyan and suggested that these old workers of our party were guilty of some baseless charges. It is not excluded that had Stalin remained at the helm for another several months, Comrades Molotov and Mikoyan would probably have not delivered any speeches at this congress.

Stalin evidently had plans to finish off the old members of the political bureau. He often stated that political bureau members should be replaced by new ones.

His proposal, after the 19th congress concerning the selection of 25 persons to the Central Committee presidium, was aimed at

the removal of the old political bureau members and the bringing in of less experienced persons so that these would extol him in all sorts of ways.

We can assume that this was also a design for the future annihilation of the old political bureau members and in this way a cover for all shameful acts of Stalin, acts which we are now considering.

Comrades, in order not to repeat errors of the past, the central committee has declared itself resolutely against the cult of the individual. We consider that Stalin was excessively extolled. However, in the past Stalin doubtlessly performed great services to the party, to the working class, and to the international workers' movement.

This question is complicated by the fact that all this which we have just discussed was done during Stalin's life under his leadership and with his concurrence; here Stalin was convinced that this was necessary for the defense of the interests of the working classes against the plotting of the enemies and against the attack of the imperialist camp. He saw this from the position of the interest of the working class, of the interest of the laboring people, of the interest of the victory of socialism and communism. We cannot say that these were the deeds of a giddy despot. He considered that this should be done in the interest of the party; of the working masses, in the name of the defense of the revolution's gains. In this lies the whole tragedy.

Comrades, Lenin had often stressed that modesty is an absolutely integral part of a real Bolshevik. Lenin himself was the living personification of the greatest modesty. We cannot say that we have been following this Leninist example in all respects. It is enough to point out that many towns, factories, and industrial enterprises, Kolkhozes and Sovkhozes, Soviet institutions and cultural institutions have been referred to by us with a title—if I may express it so—of private property of the names of these or those government or party leaders who were still active and in good health. Many of us participated in the action of assigning our names to various towns, rayons, undertakings, and Kolkhozes. We must correct this. [Applause.]

But this should be done calmly and slowly. The central committee will discuss this matter and consider it carefully in order to prevent errors and excesses. I can remember how the Ukraine learned about Kossior's arrest. The Kiev radio used to start its programs thus: "This is radio (in the name of) Kossior." When one day the programs began without naming Kossior, everyone was quite certain that something had happened to Kossior, that he probably had been arrested.

Thus, if today we begin to remove the signs everywhere and to change names, people will think that these comrades in whose honor the given enterprises, Kolkhozes or cities are named, also met some bad fate and that they have also been arrested. [Animation in the hall.]

How is the authority and the importance of this or that leader judged? On the basis of how many towns, industrial enterprises, and factories, Kolkhozes and Sovkhozes carry his name. Is it not about time that we eliminate this private property and nationalize the factories, the industrial enterprises, the Kolkhozes, and the Sovkhozes? [Laughter, applause, voices: "That is right."] This will benefit our cause. After all, the cult of the individual is manifested, also, in this way.

We should in all seriousness consider the question of the cult of the individual. We cannot let this matter get out of the party, especially not to the press. It is for this reason that we are considering it here at a closed congress session. We should know the limits; we should not give ammunition to the enemy; we should not wash our dirty linen before their eyes. I think that the delegates to the congress will understand and assess properly all these proposals. [Tumultuous applause.]

Comrades, we must abolish the cult of the individual decisively, once and for all; we must draw the proper conclusions concerning both ideological-theoretical and practical work.

It is necessary for this purpose:

First, in a Bolshevik manner to condemn and to eradicate the cult of the individual as alien to Marxism-Leninism and not consonant with the principles of party leadership and the norms of party life, and to fight inexorably all attempts at bringing back this practice in one form or another.

To return to and actually practice in all our ideological work, the most important theses of Marxist-Leninist science about the people as the creator of history and as the creator of all material and spiritual good of humanity, about the decisive role of the Marxist party in the revolutionary fight for the transformation of society, about the victory of communism.

In this connection we will be forced to do much work in order to examine critically from the Marxist-Leninist viewpoint and to correct the widely spread erroneous views connected with the cult of the individual in the sphere of history, philosophy, economy, and of other sciences, as well as in the literature and the fine arts. It is especially necessary that in the immediate future we compile a serious textbook of the history of our party which will be edited in accordance with scientific Marxist objectivism, a textbook of the history of Soviet society, a book pertaining to the events of the civil war and the great patriotic war.

Secondly, to continue systematically and consistently the work done by the party's central committee during the last years, a work characterized by minute observation in all party organizations, from the bottom to the top, of the Leninist principles of party leadership, characterized, above all, by the main principle of collective leadership, characterized by the observation of the norms of party life described in the statutes of our party, and, finally, characterized by the wide practice of criticism and self-criticism.

Thirdly, to restore completely the Leninist principles of Soviet Socialist democracy, expressed in the constitution of the Soviet Union, to fight willfulness of individuals abusing their power. The evil caused by acts violating revolutionary Socialist legality which have accumulated during a long time as a result of the negative influence of the cult of the individual has to be completely corrected.

Comrades, the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has manifested with a new strength the unshakable unity of our party, its cohesiveness around the central committee, its resolute will to accomplish the great task of building communism. [Tumultuous applause.] And the fact that we present in all their ramifications the basic problems of overcoming the cult of the individual which is alien to Marxism-Leninism, as well as the problem of liquidating its burdensome consequences, is an evidence of the great moral and political strength of our party. [Prolonged applause.]

We are absolutely certain that our party, armed with the historical resolutions of the 20th Congress, will lead the Soviet people along the Leninist path to new successes, to new victories. [Tumultuous, prolonged applause.]

Long live the victorious banner of our party—Leninism. [Tumultuous, prolonged applause ending in ovation. All rise.]

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 4, 1956]

KHRUSHCHEV'S SPEECH

(By Roscoe Drummond)

UNREPORTED PARTS ARE ENLIGHTENING

More information concerning Nikita Khrushchev's famous 6-hour indictment of Stalin and the "cult of the individual" before the 20th Congress of the Communist Party is significantly coming to light.

This information, which will certainly be in the public domain before long, makes it clear that there were aspects of the anti-Stalin speech which were intended only for loyal Communist ears and which were not reported in the lengthy digests which the Soviet leaders carefully circulated via Pravda.

Already some heretofore unreported parts of Khrushchev's address have appeared in Paris and I would expect that one western government or another would momentarily lay its hands on the full unexpurgated version and make it known.

It would be a public service to bring out all the facts so that we can know more about what is going on inside Russia without the no-trespassing limits of the Soviet censorship.

Embassy diplomatic sources here are already aware in considerable detail of the unpublished sections of the Khrushchev speech and those who have access to this information agree that the full text makes several things more badly evident than what came out 3 months ago.

What emerges with new clarity is:

That, however much Khrushchev berated the "excesses" of Stalin's repressions he did not at any point in his speech berate repression.

That while the "collective" leaders of the Soviet regime spoke harshly of the "cult of individual" dictatorship, they did not speak harshly at all of dictatorship.

That Khrushchev specifically emphasized—and brought it home several times—that Lenin himself used the most severe measures against "enemies" of the revolution.

That Stalin's greatest offense was not that he used methods of brutality but that he used them when it wasn't really necessary and against the wrong people.

When the text of this historic speech becomes available, whether through a satellite or elsewhere, there is no doubt that it will show that Khrushchev actually praised Lenin for using repression when, as he would put it, it was actually necessary.

Thus the Khrushchev indictment of Stalin centers on the criticism that Stalin purged Communists who disagreed with him as well as all others who disagreed with him.

There now seems no doubt that the Khrushchev speech has given greater significance than it appeared to have in its first sensational disclosure. Despite the exhaustive official accounts which have been allowed to appear in Moscow, Belgrade and elsewhere, it is clear that the Kremlin has acted to keep much of it secret from the outside world and has deleted important parts of it from what the Russian people themselves have been allowed to know.

Apparently it is in line with this formula—that is, muting the excesses of repression but retaining the capacity to impose more repression at any time—that recent reforms in the Soviet system have been carried out. "Forced labor" camps are supposed to be abolished in the next 18 months. Mass purges are described as ended. Persecution and prosecution without evidence and without trial—or trial based on pressured confessions have been officially condemned.

But the totalitarian Soviet state still keeps at its disposal innumerable means of enforcement and punishment, including liquidation. The Khrushchev speech shows that the Kremlin has no intention of abandoning severe means or hesitating to resort to them.

Perhaps the most revealing aspects of the recently proclaimed reforms is that these new restraints against repression were decreed from above without any participation of the Russian people—exactly as were excessive repressions themselves.

What the full Khrushchev text will make clear is that while the "rude" Stalin has been laid to rest, all the organs of rude coercion are retained in the hands of the Kremlin for use whenever necessary.

CONGRESSIONAL INTENT IN EXTENDING BENEFITS OF SPECIAL SCHOOL-MILK PROGRAM TO CERTAIN CHILD-CARE INSTITUTIONS AND SUMMER CAMPS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement relative to the extension of the benefits of the special school-milk program to certain child-care institutions and summer camps. I submit this statement in the hope that it will clear up the purpose of that particular piece of legislation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There appears to be some misunderstanding concerning the intent of the action taken by Congress in extending the benefits of the special school-milk program to certain child-care institutions and summer camps. This extension was authorized in Public Law 465, approved April 2, 1956, which provided for the continuation of the school-milk program through June 30, 1958.

The action to include certain child-care centers in this overall program originated with the Senate Agriculture Committee in an amendment to the bill which had originated in the House. The members of the committee gave full consideration to the intended scope of this expansion of the program. It was the prevailing desire of the committee to direct this extension of the milk program to summer camps and to settlement houses, orphanages, and other similar institutions which were serving economically underprivileged children. The aim was to reach the school-age children who are least likely to be getting adequate amounts of milk during the summer months when schools are closed. In addition, by including nursery schools, child-care centers and orphanages, assistance could be provided in increasing milk consumption among underprivileged children of preschool age.

It was with this objective in mind that language was added to the bill which became Public Law 465 to provide that the eligible summer camps and child-care institutions must be "devoted to the care and training of underprivileged children on a public welfare or charitable basis." This was done in the belief that such camps and institutions for economically underprivileged children offered the best opportunity for increasing the consumption of surplus milk. It was recognized that the language used would exclude many fine organizations and summer camps, such as Boy Scout and 4–H camps, which are doing splendid work in providing recreational and other activities for all of our boys and girls. However, in view of the basic purpose of the special school-milk program, it was felt that Federal subsidies to such organizations should not be provided under a program which is essentially a price-support activity.

RETIREMENT OF GEN. ANTHONY C. McAULIFFE

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, last Thursday afternoon, May 31, 1956, at historic old Fort Myer, the United States Army honored the retirement of Gen. Anthony C. McAuliffe, retiring commander in chief, United States Army in Europe. The occasion brought to a brilliant conclusion the distinguished military career of a great American soldier, following 38 years of service.

Cohosts for the occasion were the distinguished Secretary of the Army, Wilber M. Brucker, and the superior soldier, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Army Chief of Staff.

Occupying the reviewing stand during the ceremony were Mr. Brucker, General Taylor, Maj. Gen. John G. Van Houten, commanding general of the Military District of Washington, and General McAuliffe.

In honor of the retirement of this outstanding American and brilliant soldier, a 17-gun salute was fired, and the 3d "Old Guard" Infantry Regiment passed in review. That historic outfit never appeared to better advantage. With flying colors, glistening bayonets, and perfect marching, it was an inspiration to view this representation of our glorious ground troops who have so greatly distinguished themselves in combat in all parts of the world.

America is extremely proud of General McAuliffe and his unwavering loyalty to his country. His unsurpassed leadership should inspire every American to stand up for the ideals of our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as part of my remarks a brief biography of General McAuliffe, and also two citations issued in connection with his retirement.

There being no objection, the biography and citations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHY

Gen. Anthony C. McAuliffe was born in Washington, D. C., in 1898 and was graduated from the United States Military Academy in 1918, when he was commissioned as second lieutenant of field artillery.

After an inspection of European battlefields, in 1919 General McAuliffe's career followed the normal peacetime pattern of a field artillery officer. During the 1920's and 1930's he held routine staff and line assignments in the United States and Hawaii.

From 1939 to 1942, General McAuliffe held important War Department general staff assignments with the Services of Supply. In August 1942 he was promoted to brigadier general and assigned to the 101st (Screaming Eagles) Airborne Division as artillery commander.

On the night of June 5–6, 1944, General McAuliffe parachuted into France with the 101st. Later, succeeding General Pratt (who was killed on D-Day) as deputy commander of that famous division, General McAuliffe led a task force which captured the junction city of Carentan.

During the desperate Battle of the Bulge, in December 1944, General McAuliffe was acting commander of the 101st when the Screaming Eagles made their epic stand at Bastogne.

In January 1945, General McAuliffe was promoted to major general and assumed command of the 103d Infantry Division which broke through the Siegfried line, raced through Germany and Austria, captured Insbruck and the Brenner Pass and linked up with the American Fifth Army troops from Italy.

Subsequent to World War II, General McAuliffe has held some of the Army's most important staff assignments, having served as Assistant Chief of Staff for Personnel, Chief of the Army Chemical Corps, and Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Administration.

Since World War II, the general has commanded the Airborne Center at Camp Mackall, N. C., the 24th Infantry Division in Japan, and the Seventh Army in Germany. General McAuliffe's final assignment was as commander-in-chief of the United States Army in Europe.

Among his American decorations, General McAuliffe earned the Distinguished Service Cross; the Distinguished Service Medal; the Silver Star; the Legion of Merit; the Bronze Star Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, and two Presidential citations. His foreign decorations include the British Distinguished Order with Bar, the French Legion of Honor, the Croix de Guerre; the Belgian Order of Leopold, Croix de Guerre, and Fourragere; and the Dutch Orders of William and of the Golden Lion.

ANTHONY CLEMENT McAULIFFE, GENERAL, UNITED STATES ARMY, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, UNITED STATES ARMY, EUROPE, MAY 31, 1956

Mindful of your long and distinguished service to the Army and to our country, we take great pleasure in subscribing this testimonial attesting to the high regard in which you are held by your associates.

Your illustrious career, embracing two world wars and the Korean conflict, has been characterized by your unswerving devotion to duty and high principled integrity. During World War II, the aggressive leadership you displayed as artillery commander and then as deputy commander of the 101st Airborne Division, contributed to the development of airborne warfare. When that division was besieged at Bastogne, your courageous leadership in the conduct of the defense electrified the entire Allied world. Later, the vigor and resourcefulness with which you led the 103d Infantry Division in the attack upon the Siegfried Line, and on into Germany and Austria added to the victory of American arms.

After the war the administrative ability you demonstrated as Chief of the Chemical Corps was instrumental in revitalizing that branch to enable it better to meet the demands of modern war. As Assistant Chief of Staff, G–1, of the Army during the Korean conflict, you played an important part in maintaining the morale and efficiency of our forces and thereby assisted greatly in coping with the emergency. Finally, as Commander in Chief of the United States Army in Europe, your efforts further developed the deterrent strength of American arms.

The entire Army joins in wishing for you, in your retirement, continued success and richly deserved happiness.

The President of the United States of America, authorized by act of Congress, July 9, 1918, has awarded the Distinguished Service Medal, First Oak Leaf Cluster, to Gen. Anthony C. McAuliffe, United States Army, for exceptionally meritorious service in a duty of great responsibility.

As commanding general, Seventh Army, and later as commander in chief, United States Army, Europe, from October 20, 1953, to April 30, 1956, General McAuliffe distinguished himself by exceptionally meritorious service in a position of great trust and responsibility. Under his brilliant and aggressive direction, his diversified forces achieved and maintained a peak level of fighting readiness. General McAuliffe effectively developed new combat techniques to meet the demands of the constantly changing international situation. His wide experience and understanding of diplomatic and political implications were of paramount importance in planning and directing the activities of this vital command. His superb leadership and outstanding professional skill were a source of inspiration to all with whom he

associated. General McAuliffe's unwavering loyalty and integrity and unsurpassed standing among soldiers reflect the utmost credit upon himself and the military service.

ISRAEL AND THE NEAR EAST

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, just about a year ago, on June 1, 1955, I took the floor of the Senate to express my misgivings about our Near East policy. At that time the Mutual Security Act was pending before the Senate, and I questioned the wisdom of arms shipment to Iraq, in view of the continued refusal of Iraq and her sister Arab states to make peace with Israel.

I said at that time:

I am afraid that this program endangers Israel. It may lead to a costly arms race. It may make it far more difficult to secure peace there. It may play into the hands of the Kremlin.

I said in the same speech:

The Israelis must be bewildered by our policy. They are a democratic people. They are ready to stand with the West. Here we are arming their enemies but refusing arms to them. More than that, we are actively promoting a system of alliance in the area, and Israel is excluded from membership.

I called attention to the fact that Israel is barred from joining the Turkish-Iraq Pact because Iraq does not recognize Israel.

I said:

Moreover, while we have an arms agreement with Iraq, the British are supplying arms to Jordan, Israel's eastern neighbor. The Egyptians have the means to buy large amounts of military equipment. To the Israelis the situation is fraught with peril, for Israel is isolated and alone; and if it were attacked tomorrow, no one would be obligated to come to its assistance.

This is a most unhealthy situation, and it does not make for a peaceful settlement because the vulnerability of the Israelis must be a source of tempting encouragement to the Arabs.

In the months that have passed, the situation in the Near East has gravely deteriorated and the misgivings which I expressed a year ago are deepened by events.

The Kremlin is now in the Near East. Egypt has acquired large amounts of military equipment from Communist Czechoslovakia, and now has air superiority over Israel. Egypt has organized a coalition of antiwestern states which resist our efforts to strengthen the region against the threat of Communist subversion and aggression.

I am convinced that we continue to blunder in the Near East. I object strenuously to the military shipments we have been making to the area, just as I fear the military shipments the Communists have been making. I intend to do everything in my power to change this policy.

Recently, despite the fact that our Government refused to sell arms to Israel, it was disclosed that we plan to continue to give arms to Iraq under the new mutual security program which calls for an increase of $367 million military aid to the Near East. I believe that it is morally wrong and inconsistent with the best interests of the United States for us to continue this kind of one-sided policy. In my judgment, our policies are playing directly into the hands of Russia and the Middle East.

The Arab States are determined to destroy Israel. Under the armistice of February 24, 1949, signed by Egypt and Israel, each side pledged that no aggressive action shall be undertaken, planned or threatened against the people of the other. They agreed that the right of each party to its security and freedom from fear of attacks by the armed forces of the other shall be fully respected. They promised that the armistice would be considered as an instrument to facilitate the transition from the present truce to permanent peace in Palestine.

During the same year, 1949, similar agreements were reached by Israel with Jordan, Lebanon and Syria. All of these formal armistice agreements were arranged under the auspices of the United Nations. I recall that the Jordan settlement provided for a special committee to expedite the reopening of the cultural and humanitarian institutions on Mt. Scopus, meaning the Hebrew University and the Hadassah Hospital. They were still closed.

Instead of carrying out the terms of this armistice, the Arab States have consistently threatened the absolute destruction of Israel. It has become a common-place of Egyptian politics for its leaders to launch tirades against Israel at the drop of a fez.

Some folks may play down the killings which have taken place as border incidents. I regard them as acts of war. From July 1949 to October 1955, 1,039 Israeli men, women, and children were killed along the frontier. In addition, a total of 2,231 armed attacks by Arabs upon Israelis took place. These things could not be ignored by any self-respecting nation. If our American borders were violated in any such way, we would have sent a full-size army to meet such a challenge.

I have said that our present policy plays into the hands of world communism. The Russians have everything to gain and nothing to lose by dealing with the Arab states. They would like to make Egypt a Russian Mediterranean base. Wars between nations are the Communists' meat. Whatever happens, no matter who wins or loses, communism is always waiting to claim the spoils. A war between Egypt and Israel would be the greatest calamity in the history of the Near East. We cannot permit it. I am certain that we will not permit it.

American foreign policy in the Near East, as everywhere else, is based upon our national interests. Admittedly, the oil reserves of Iraq and Iran are important. They are useless to us if war breaks out. From the purely selfish viewpoint of American self-interest, therefore, we must prevent war.

But I refuse to believe that oil must be the predominant factor in the development of an American foreign policy. Humanity is more important than oil. In this difficult period of world history, mankind is in need of spiritual regeneration. We have gone through an era of the most shocking barbarism in the records of humanity. One of the few decent reactions to the cruelty of World War II has been the establishment of the Republic of Israel. Nazi hostility will never be forgotten by civilized men. We cannot permit a new outbreak of savagery to follow in its wake. If American foreign policy permits such an event—or if it contributes to such a catastrophe—that foreign policy is wrong.

I do not know the answers to many of the issues raised in this most difficult field of international tension. But I do know this—that we cannot sit by while it goes from bad to worse.

Some positive steps are essential at once.

First, we must see to it that the balance of military power is not disturbed in the Near East by any one. I do not believe in an arms race, but I do not believe that we can allow Egypt to arm for aggression while Israel sits in the waiting room. We must make arms available to Israel.

Secondly, we must guarantee the borders of Israel, and see to it that they are not violated. If they are violated, we must call the violators before the bar of world justice.

Raiders, thieves, saboteurs and murderers must pay for their crimes, whether they be individuals or nations.

Thirdly, we must use our good offices to achieve a settlement of the Arab refugee problem.

This is by no means a simple matter. I know that the Arab States are large enough to absorb the estimated 800,000 Arab refugees. I know, too, that most of these refugees left their homes because they were urged to do so by Arab leaders. They were told in 1948 that the Arab forces would wipe out the Jewish armies in a few days, and they would return quickly. These are facts, but their recognition does not solve the problem.

The United Nations has set up a fund of $200 million to resettle the Arab refugees, but the Arab States have refused to act. They would rather use the difficulties of the Arab refugees as a political weapon than treat the problem on a humanitarian level. I am certain that the Arab States with almost 3 million square miles of land can absorb 800,000 people. If little Israel, with 8,000 square miles all told can build a homeland for one and a half million people, there can be no economic justification for the Arab position.

I believe that a firm stand must be taken to resolve this refugee problem. If we insist upon action, I believe that we can get it.

My fourth proposal is this: International supervision and patrol of the Gaza strip by the United Nations should be substituted for the present friction producing system. This area has been the most sensitive and difficult spot on the Israeli map. It can be eliminated.

There is a fifth important item on my list. Our country is a party to pacts with 44 European and Asiatic nations. Each of these agreements is part of the program of collective security. We are parties also to the Tripartite Declaration of 1950. In this agreement, our Nation, Great Britain, and France jointly pledged their efforts to prevent aggression and to preserve the military balance in the Near East.

This balance is clearly in danger of being destroyed. I believe that our Government should negotiate a security treaty with Israel and with all those Arab States which are prepared to take steps for the establishment of lasting peace in the Near East.

These are affirmative steps. I believe that they represent not only an effective approach to the problems of Israel and the Near East, but also to the basic interests of the United States. All of us, no matter what may be our political affiliations, realize today that the great threat to world peace comes from Communist aggression and Communist subversion. The Soviet Union courts friends for one purpose only, to weaken them through propaganda, and, subsequently, to engulf them. Today they are playing the field. The sale of armaments by Communist Czechoslozakia to Egypt is the first step in the invasion of Egypt by Soviet technicians, agents, and propagandists.

A similar proposal to sell arms to Afghanistan is already under way. We cannot sit idly by while the Soviet Union outflanks the Western World in the whole Mediterranean and Near East theater.

Israel is an important key to the unfolding drama of Asia Minor. For centuries in the ancient past, the land of the Bible linked Asia and Africa. In the critical world situation of the present day, the same importance may be attached to Israel once more.

It is only 8 years since Israel came into being. There is no doubt that wonders have been accomplished in this period. In this brief moment of history, three-quarters of a million people have swarmed into Israel. They have doubled the population. This is the most amazing refutation of modern immigration theories ever recorded. Only a few years ago, the British were saying that the "economic absorptivity" of a much larger Palestine could not handle any more immigrants. I know the situation which has resulted. The people of Israel are poor in material wealth. They do not enjoy the comforts of America. But they are living in freedom and glorying in their self-reliance.

All of us in this Chamber believe in God. We feel instinctively that God will protect this new nation in the future as He has protected its people in the past. There is a famous Lincoln story concerning a delegation of clergymen who visited President Lincoln during the Civil War. They discussed the moral problems involved in the fighting, and as they turned to leave, one minister said to the President: "Mr. Lincoln, I pray that the Lord will be on our side in this struggle." Abraham Lincoln looked at him and replied: "I pray that we may be on the Lord's side."

The issue, as I see it, is more than a diplomatic struggle. In Israel, our country has helped to create a new outpost of the Free World. It is threatened by hostile forces.

One group wishes to destroy its entire physical being, wipe out its people, and level this new nation to the ground. A second equally sinister group wishes to use Israel as a pawn in the Communist game. Neither of these attacks will succeed.

We as Americans have a great stake in this area. As human beings, we have no less a stake in the issues involved in the Near East. The Jewish community and the Arabs, too, sometimes forget the deep sentiments associated by the western Christian tradition with the land of the Bible. All of us abhor the thought of war and bloodshed on the soil we call the Holy Land.

These are, perhaps, unrealistic considerations. I regard them as important in determining the development of world opinion. From every viewpoint, practical, religious, sentimental, the American people must establish and preserve lasting peace in the Middle East.

In the past few days, the Foreign Minister of Israel has taken strong exception to the recent testimony of our Secretary of State before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Mr. Dulles said that "a nation's security does not rest on arms alone." This is true. Israel's fight for freedom in 1948 proved that more than weapons are required to win a battle. But you must certainly have the weapons, too. I shall do everything that I can to persuade our country to provide the necessary weapons.

I applaud David Ben Gurion's pledge to refrain from launching a preventive war. I hope that Israel will not apply to the Soviet Union for military aid.

We can understand the determination of Israel to preserve its existence by every possible means. If we do not help her, she must seek help elsewhere. But it seems to me we must help her. We are the leaders of the free world. We are dedicated to the defense of freedom and democracy wherever it may be menaced or endangered. Israel is a young and vibrant democracy and her survival is menaced by Communist weapons. She has a right to appeal to us for aid, and surely we have an obligation to respond to that appeal.

I want our Government to announce that the preservation of the State of Israel is a basic element of our policy in the Middle East. But I want more than words. I want decisive action, for when the Arab world realizes that we mean business, we may look for some kind of peaceful settlement.

I have heard it said within recent weeks that our Government now recognizes that Israel is in danger, that Egypt does have superiority in the air, and that therefore Israel really does have a legitimate need for planes and weapons to protect her cities and villages and to deter aggression. But it is reported that while we recognize that need, the Department of State would prefer to have other nations such as France and Canada supply Israel with the planes she must have. I cannot understand this indirect method of responding to the appeal of a sister democracy in peril. I cannot see any moral justification for urging other governments to do what we ourselves are not ready to do. This is not leadership.

Perhaps there are some who believe that we must remain aloof lest we might incur Arab displeasure or lose Arab oil or forfeit our potential role as the final peacemaker. I submit that this is not the road to peace.

Peace will never be secured by appeasing aggression. The way to bring the Arab States to the peace table once and for all is to make it clear that we will not permit them to dictate our Near East policy. I hope that Mr. Dulles will not persist in the course of indirection. It is not a proud or courageous policy. It does not reflect credit on the integrity or leadership of America.

These are difficult and uncertain days for all the world. In times of tension and tragedy, it is good to remember that God rules this world, not by might, not by force, but by His word. The still, small voice of man's conscience often goes unheard in the tempest, but when the wind subsides it is still speaking.

I pray, with my colleagues, for peace everywhere; but come what may, America must be on the side of decency and justice and humanity everywhere. In the Middle East, there is no doubt where these claims rest.

Decency, justice, and humanity place America squarely at the side of Israel. We must remain there.

THE TRUTH ABOUT PALESTINE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Saturday, June 2, the New York Times carried a very interesting and illuminating editorial entitled "The Truth About Palestine." This editorial pointed out the intransigent attitude that has been assumed by the Arab countries regarding the efforts of the United Nations to bring peace into the sorely troubled areas of the Middle East. As a result, consideration of the British resolution that expressed hope for lasting peace in the Middle East has been delayed. I quote only one sentence of the editorial from the Times:

> The delay that kept the Council working overtime was due mainly to the reluctance of the Arab States—Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and Egypt—to admit that the State of Israel legally exists and to give up, for good and all, their ambition to drive the Israelis into the Mediterranean.

With that kind of cruel and unrealistic attitude on the part of the Arab countries, how can we hope that lasting peace will be achieved in the Middle East? Peace will not come as long as there is on one side blind hate and a will to kill and to destroy. Peace must be based upon security and respect for the legitimate hopes and ideals of a noble little democratic nation.

This editorial is so important that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks. I hope that it will be carefully read and studied by Members of the Congress and by the American people, generally.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRUTH ABOUT PALESTINE

The United Nations Security Council has been spending some tedious hours this week wrestling with the wording of a British resolution that expressed hope for a lasting peace in Palestine. The delay that kept the

council working overtime was due mainly to the reluctance of the Arab states—Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and Egypt—to admit that the State of Israel legally exists and to give up, for good and all, their ambition to drive the Israelis into the Mediterranean. For this reason the discussion yesterday, still incomplete, was postponed until Monday afternoon.

Not one Arab speaker said one word to indicate that he felt the awful responsibility of restoring or maintaining peace in the Near East; not one showed the slightest understanding, or desire to understand, the urge that drove so many abused and harassed individuals into the ancient land of Palestine, to set up a new commonwealth and labor for a new hope; not one welcomed the kind of peace that might result from accepting Israel as a neighbor; each, without exception, seemed to be waiting for the ultimate catastrophe that by wrecking the Mediterranean world, and perhaps all the Western World might destroy the tiny State of Israel.

These assertions are not rhetorical. The fault the Arabs founds with the original British resolution was that it used words suggesting, however vaguely, that a peaceful and permanent settlement of the trouble between Israel and her Arab neighbors might be reached. The Arab spokesmen wouldn't have this. They regarded it as an offense for the United Nations to endorse, or the Secretary General to attempt, any solution that might put an end to the suffering and suspense in the Near East and open the way to peace and prosperity for all. They stuck to medieval notions that are now as out of date as chain armor, spears, and battleaxes.

Listen to the Syrian spokesman, Ambassador Ahmed Shukairy, speaking Thursday afternoon. He referred to Palestine, that is, the State of Israel, recognized by our own and most other Governments, received in 1949 as a member of the United Nations, as "part and parcel of the Arab homeland." He went on to say:

"To advocate the idea of a mutually acceptable solution must inevitably lead to a reversal of all the resolutions of the United Nations. * * * We must begin from the beginning. We must start de novo on a clean sheet. Everything written by the United Nations should be written off, ever since November 29, 1947. (This was the date of the U. N. partition resolution.) The establishment of Israel, its membership in the United Nations and all other resolutions will have to be revoked. Then, and then only, the United Nations can look forward to a solution 'on a mutually acceptable basis.'"

We have to put this remarkable utterance into the context of a debate over Mr. Hammarskjold's patient and impartial efforts to stop the killing in the Near East. Mr. Hammarskjold reported, as in duty bound. He had kept—so it seemed to most observers—within the limits of the April 4 resolution, under which he had gone to Palestine. He had received assurances from all the parties, the four Arab States necessarily included, that they would try to reduce border squabbles and accept an increased and improved measure of U. N. supervision. There is every indication that the Arab States and Israel gave the assurances in good faith. But if we judge by the Arab arguments in the Security Council this week this good faith was in the Arab case of a temporary nature. Given an opportunity, one had to conclude, the Arabs would pounce on Israel.

Neither side in the Near Eastern troubles has been without blame. Each side has unnecessarily taken innocent lives. But the Israeli are now willing to settle and end the bloodshed. The Arabs, if their spokesmen truly represented them this week, are not ready to do this finally and for all time.

PARTICIPATION BY ALASKA IN FEDERAL ROAD-BUILDING PROGRAM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the simple justice of Senate action last week to include the Territory of Alaska in the Federal Highway Act of 1956 has brought a favorable response from a number of major newspapers. This editorial support for our Senate amendment, bringing Alaska into the Federal road-building program, indicates a degree of public interest in improving the economic development of the Territory.

If the Senate amendment is retained in the Highway Act, Alaskans will share with residents of other Territories and the 48 States these benefits of long-range highway planning. The bill would bring an end to the on-again-off-again system which has made the Alaska road-building program an unknown quantity.

It is my hope that the House and Senate conferees will agree with the wisdom of providing Alaska with equality in Federal highway matters. I also hope that the editorial comments regarding the Alaska highway amendment come to the attention of the conference committee, so that its members may be apprised of the endorsements for this proposal. Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD excellent editorials from the Washington Evening Star of June 1, 1956; the Washington News of June 2, 1956; and the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 2, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 1, 1956]

COMPROMISE ON ALASKA

The Senate has sent into conference on the highway bill a proposal for ending a questionable discrimination against Alaska. Sponsored by Senator NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, it would entitle Alaska to receive a share of the new Federal road building aid. The highway bill as passed in the House excludes Alaska from this benefit—as has been the case since the first Federal aid highway bill was enacted in 1916. At the same time, the current legislation makes the new highway-user taxes—by which the program is to be financed—applicable in Alaska. Acknowledging that Alaska's great area and the large amount of public domain in the Territory made it a special problem, the Oregon Senator won approval for his amendment by proposing that only one-third of the area should be figured in the apportionment formula. The effect of this modification would be to keep the Alaskan grant within reasonable limitation. The compromise is worthy of serious consideration by the conferees on the bill.

[From the Washington News of June 2, 1956]

ROADS FOR ALASKA

The Senate's action dealing Alaska in on the new highway measure was a commendable recognition of that Territory's special road problems. The Senators who voted the amendment also seemed impressed with the argument that without it Alaskans would have to pay extra taxes to build new roads in the States, yet have no assurance of benefits for their own area.

Alaska has been getting Federal aid for highways, but only in the budget of the Interior Department. That agency's policy on roads for Alaska has been whimsical, to put it charitably, and if Alaskans had to depend on it in the future they still would have no idea from one year to the next what to expect.

Highways are especially important to a developing region, and Alaska's rapid economic development is in turn of special concern to the Nation.

The method approved by the Senate is the best means of assuring Alaska of the road aid it needs and should have during the next few years. We hope it will meet the approval of the conferees representing the House as well.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 2, 1956]

HIGHWAYS FOR ALASKA

The Senate remedied a long-time injustice by including Alaska in the new Federal highway aid bill. An amendment sponsored by Senator NEUBERGER was accepted after the basis for allocation of funds, initially figured on one-half of Alaska's area, was changed to one-third. This will bring Alaska approximately $11,500,000 in Federal road funds in fiscal 1958 in a program looking toward the expenditure of some $15,500,000 in 1959. Alaskans will also pay a greater share of their road costs; the Federal formula calls for a larger territorial expenditure than the previous voluntary contributions made to the Alaska Road Commission of the Department of the Interior.

A principal advantage of the new basis, if it is approved by the House, will be continuity. It is shocking to realize that because of the on-again-off-again nature of roadbuilding efforts through Interior, this vast northern Territory today has only 3,700 miles of highways, only 800 of them paved. The State of Delaware, with only one-two hundred and eighty-fifth the area, has more miles of road; and Nevada, which has a population comparable to that of Alaska, has nearly eight times as many miles of highways. Neglect, rather than the difficult of building roads in this ward of the Federal Government, has held back Alaska's development.

The compromise will not get Alaska substantially more funds immediately, for the 1957 Department of the Interior construction and maintenance figure is $11,425,000. Thus it is essential not to reduce the area formula below one-third lest it turn out to be a blow instead of a boon; 40 percent would be fairer. But the most important thing is the principle of including Alaska along with Hawaii and Puerto Rico. If House conferees will accept the amendment Alaska can feel that it has joined the Union in one respect, even though it is still denied statehood.

PANAMA CANAL IMPROVEMENTS: VIEWS OF EXPERIENCED ENGINEERS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, over a period of years I have devoted much time and effort to interoceanic canal problems and have made many statements thereon. Most of these are listed in the comprehensive documentation about Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States prepared by Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas, and published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 23, 1955.

In the course of my studies, I have received numerous illuminating commmunications from eminent engineers and others with Panama Canal experience. Some of these expressions, because of the grave importance of the canal subject and high stature of their authors, should be of great interest not only to the Congress and officials of the Executive Department, but also to the Nation,

especially agencies that use the canal or are otherwise affected by transit tolls.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD A Memorandum to the Members of the Congress on the Panama Canal Problem, and pertinent excerpts from a number of letters from experienced engineers.

There being no objection, the indicated memorandum and excerpts were ordered to be printed as follows:

THE PANAMA CANAL PROBLEM—A MEMORANDUM TO THE MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS

Honorable Members of the Congress of the United States:

The undersigned, who in various capacities participated in the construction of the Panama Canal, venture to bring to your attention the matters hereinafter discussed:

1. The necessity for increased capacity and operational improvement of the Panama Canal—a much-neglected waterway, now approaching obsolesence—has long been recognized. The traffic volume is the highest since 1914. With the saturation point approaching, it is essential to provide, without further delay, the additional transit capacity and operational improvements required to meet future needs.

2. The two major proposals for increased facilities are:

(a) Improvement of the existing canal by completing the authorized Third Locks Project, adapted to include the features of the well-conceived Terminal Lake Plan (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 21, 1948, p. A2449—approved in principle by the Governor of the Panama Canal in hearings on H. R. 4480, 79th Cong. Nov. 15, 1945, p. 9). A total of $75 million was expended on this project, mainly on lock-site excavations at Gatun and Miraflores, before work on it was suspended. The Terminal Lake Plan provides for removing all lock structures from Pedro Miguel and for regrouping of all Pacific locks at or near Miraflores, thus enabling uninterrupted navigation at the Gatun Lake level between the Atlantic and Pacific locks, with a greatly needed terminal lake anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal. As thus improved, the modified Third Locks Project can be completed at relatively low cost—estimated under $600 million. The soundness of this proposal has been established by 40 years of satisfactory operation of a similar arrangment at Gatun.

(b) Construction of a practically new Panama Canal known as the Sea-Level Project, initially estimated in 1947 to cost $2,500,000,000, and which would be of less operational value than the existing canal it was designed to replace, but which, under present conditions, would likely cost several times that amount. The Governor of the Panama Canal (a member of the Corps of Engineers) at that time definitely went on record as advocating none but the so-called Sea-Level Project for the major increase of canal facilities, which action served to exclude what may be the best solution when evaluated from all angles. This report, under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, was transmitted to the Congress by the President, December 1, 1947, and, significantly, without comment or recommendation. The Congress took no action, and the report was not published.

3. The Terminal Lake-Third Locks Project has been strongly urged as the proper form of modernization by experienced civilian engineers who took part in the construction of the present canal. They have spoken from personal knowledge of the original construction. Their views are shared by many independent engineers and navigators who have studied the subject. All these insist that the present lake-lock type should be preserved as supplying the best canal for the transit of vessels which it is economically feasible to construct. They, together with many of the leading atomic warfare authorities, stress the points that the defense of the canal is an all-inclusive Federal responsibility which must be met by active military and naval measures and by industrial planning in the United States, that passive protective features embodied in construction design are inadequate, and that the proper bases for planning canal improvements are capacity and navigational efficiency. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that the effective destructive power of the atomic bomb has been tremendously increased since the formal recommendation for a sea-level canal. Any canal, whatsoever the type, can be destroyed by atomic bombing, if permitted to strike.

4. The recent authorization to expend funds for repairs and alterations of present lock structures at an estimated cost of $26,500,000 is, as we believe, makeshift in character, and is without real merit. Consummation thereof, in lieu of fundamental improvements, will inevitably delay the basic and long-overdue solution of the problems involved.

5. In addition to the Panama projects, there are urgent proposals for canals at other locations, some of which have strong support, particularly Nicaragua. In developing a long-range Isthmian Canal Policy to meet future interoceanic transit needs, these should certainly receive full and unbiased consideration.

6. Transcending personal considerations, but nevertheless to state the matter candidly, we submit that the Third Locks Project, as originally planned in 1939 by the Governor of the Panama Canal, has proven most disappointing. We have every reason to believe that the insistently advocated Sea-Level Project (which, as a matter of fact, would require tidal locks as well as vulnerable flood-control reservoirs and dikes) would prove to be a monumental boondoggle, costing the American taxpayer billions of dollars. Both of these efforts were directed by routine administrative agencies, and at heavy public expense.

7. We wish to stress the fact that, aside from the A-bomb, the recurrent discussions as to the relative advantages and disadvantages of the lake-lock and sea-level types of canal were exhaustively investigated, debated, and considered in 1905–6 when the Congress and the President decided in favor of the lake-lock plan—under which the canal was constructed, and (with the exception of certain operational defects in the Pacific sector) has been successfully operated. The operational defects, we believe, can be adequately corrected.

8. It must be always borne in mind that the greater the cost of increased facilities at Panama the heavier will be the load on the already overwhelmingly burdened American taxpayer; and that also such cost must be reflected in ship-transit tolls, with all that increased tolls imply.

9. We respectfully urge the early enactment of H. R. 1048, 83d Congress, introduced by Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN, of Iowa and supported by Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas, who introduced a like measure in the 82d Congress [S. 766 and H. R. 3335, 84th Cong.] Both of these experienced and highly competent legislators have been thorough students of interoceanic canal problems, which have grave diplomatic implications affecting all maritime nations and the relations of the United States with all Latin American countries—especially Panama. As to Panama, we would most strongly emphasize that among the features overlooked in the report under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, is the fact that the Sea-Level Project recommended in that report is not covered by existing canal treaties and would necessitate the negotiation of a new treaty with a tremendous indemnity and greatly increased annuity payments involved. As evidence of this it may be noted that upon demand of the Panamanian Government, and the appointment by it of a commission for the purpose, the United States Government has named a like commission, to negotiate various questions, including that of the present annuity of $430,000 (originally $250,000), which Panama insists should be substantially increased. These negotiations began in September 1953, when the President of Panama and members of the Panamanian Commission visited Washington in behalf of the indicated demands. [Treaty signed January 25, 1955, and ratified July 29, 1955.]

10. References to the Governor of the Panama Canal herein apply to the incumbent Governor at the time of the stated action.

CONCLUSION

Because of these considerations, it would seem to be clear that the indicated commission should be created without delay, and put to work, so as to develop a timely, definite, and wisely reasoned Isthmian Canal Policy. Such a body should be made up of unbiased, broad-gaged, and independent men of the widest engineering, operational, governmental, and business experience, and not of persons from routine agencies, all too often involved in justifying their own groups.

Respectfully submitted.

James T. B. Bowles, Baltimore, Md.; Ralph Budd, Chicago, Ill.; Howard T. Critchlow, Trenton, N. J.; Roy W. Hebard, New York, N. Y.; Herbert D. Hinman, Newport News, Va; William R. McCann, Hopewell, Va.; E. Sydney Randolph, Baton Rouge, La.; Hartley Rowe, Boston, Mass.; William E. Russell, New York, N. Y.; Caleb Mills Saville, Hartford, Conn.; John Frank Stevens, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Ellis D. Stillwell, Monrovia, Calif.; William G. B. Thompson, New Haven, Conn.; Robert E. Wood, Lake Forest, Ill.; Daniel E. Wright, St. Petersburg, Fla.

THE PETITIONERS

James T. B. Bowles: Chemical engineer; in charge water supplies, superintendent filtration plants, Canal Zone, 1910–14; lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers, AEF; director, secretary, and technologist of Crown Petroleum Corp.

Ralph Budd: Civil engineer; chief engineer, Panama Railroad, 1909–13; president, Great Northern Railway; transportation commissioner, the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense; president, Burlington Railroad; now chairman of Chicago Transit Authority.

Howard T. Critchlow: Civil and hydraulic engineer; district and chief hydrographer, Panama Canal, 1910–14; New Jersey Department of Conservation and Economic Development on water supply, construction of dams, and flood control; past president, American Water Works Association; now director and chief engineer, Division Water Policy and Supply (N. J.).

Roy W. Hebard: Assistant engineer, resident engineer, and contractor, Panama Canal, 1905–11; major, Corps of Engineers, AEF; president, R. W. Hebard & Co., Inc., builders of highways, railroads, waterworks, and divers structures throughout Central and South America.

Herbert D. Hinman: Construction engineer whose first job for the Pacific Division in 1907 was boring to find rock for the locks; assistant engineer in charge of construction of the Pedro Miguel locks, and later in the building of the fortifications on the Pacific side; president of Virginia Engineering Corp., engaged in divers heavy construction in Virginia and the Southeastern States.

William R. McCann: Assistant engineer and supervisor of construction, First Division, Panama Canal, 1907–14; engineer,

Stone & Webster, Inc.; engineer, Allied Chemical & Dye Corp.; project manager, Buckeye Ordnance Works; now consulting engineer.

E. Sydney Randolph: Civil engineer; Panama Canal service, 1910–46; office engineer, designing engineer, construction engineer, principal engineer, and consulting engineer, handling various projects such as technical supervision of maintenance and lock improvement, Madden dam and power project, exploration and investigations for additional locks, defense structures, emergency gates, increased spillway capacity, and augmented power facilities; now consulting engineer.

Hartley Rowe: Electrical and construction engineer, various divisions, Panama Canal, 1905–15; engineering and construction, Lockwood, Greene & Co.; member of General Advisory Committee, Atomic Energy Commission; chief engineer, United Fruit Co.; now vice president thereof.

William E. Russell: Panama Canal service, 1905–09, under all three chief engineers, attached to office of superintending architect, and engaged in building construction; attorney, New York City; chairman of the board of several magazines in which he has controlling interests; headed committee for reevaluation of housing in New York State; has been lifelong student of Panama Canal affairs, and of the treaties pertaining thereto.

Caleb M. Saville: Hydraulic engineer; in charge Third Division, Panama Canal, 1907–11, investigating foundations for Gatun Dam, flow through spillway, and Chagres River hydrology; manager and chief engineer, Hartford Metropolitan District; now consulting engineer thereto.

John Frank Stevens: Life student of Panama Canal problems; son of first chairman and chief engineer, Isthmian Canal Commission, who planned the construction organization and plant, and was largely responsible for the adoption of the lock-lake type of waterway.

Ellis D. Stillwell: Electrical engineer; served on Panama Canal, 1912–49, assistant superintendent Gatun locks, superintedent Gatun locks, and superintendent Locks Division in charge of lock operations and transits, and responsible for lock maintenance and biennial overhauling.

William G. B. Thompson: Civil engineer; Panama Canal service, 1909–16, supervising, among other assignments, construction of Balboa terminal; State highway engineer of New Jersey; vice president and chief engineer, Gandy Bridge Co., St. Petersburg, Fla.; with Allied Chemical & Dye Corp., as superintendent of construction and as project manager Kentucky Ordnance Works; now consulting engineer.

Robert E. Wood: Assistant quartermaster, chief quartermaster, and director, Panama Railroad, 1907–14; brigadier general, United States Army (retired), and later acting Quarmaster General; president, Sears, Roebuck & Co.; now chairman of the board thereof.

Daniel E. Wright: Civil engineer; Panama Canal service, 1904–18, as municipal and sanitary engineer, Central Division, extended subsequently to all divisions and to Panama City and Colon; contracting and consulting in Central and South America; with Rockefeller Foundation and United States Public Health Service as sanitary expert on various commissions to Middle East, Greece, France, Burma, China, India, Egypt, and elsewhere; captain, United States Army, World War I; colonel, United States Army, World War II.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: I feel a great deal of comfort because of your recent contribution [1]—which is so important that I wish to comment at some length.

I am now a most interested spectator of developments concerning the Panama Canal, as are also a number of other civilian engineers who collaborated in the work of the original construction and subsequent maintenance of the Canal.

The Governor's Report of 1947, under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, should not stand as the unchallenged rule for Congress in deciding upon the future development of our transisthmian canal. It would be better if it were considered to be a mere tentative proposition representing the views of a relatively small group of engineers—a challenge to American engineers.

However, because it is still officially unchallenged in its present position as a report to Congress, made by its direction and appropriation and backed up by a great deal of technical data, it may be difficult to persuade the people that it is not the ultimate solution, without an authorized independent investigation and another report to Congress. The readiness of writers to accept the findings of the report shows that the above is true.

The Governor of the Panama Canal, in organizing for the work culminating in his report of 1947, may have intended to attack the problems in an openminded manner, free from what might be called preconceived ideas. Perhaps, for that reason, he failed to employ some of those engineers of great ability who had helped to build and maintain the Canal and who undoubtedly could have contributed extensively from their store of well-digested knowledge, particularly of the treacherous terrain of the Isthmus, as to the best means for the economical development of the Canal as a channel for navigation of vessels.

As you have pointed out, there is urgent need of a supplemental investigation, leading to a separate report to Congress, and it should include a program of development, general plans, and estimates of cost for construction, maintenance and operation. This should be made with the advantages of specific Congressional authorization by a broad-gage group including some of those associated with the building of the Canal and its auxiliary facilities, organized and acting independently of the influence bearing on the former group, free to examine any and all data available to that group, and to consult with experts in other Government departments. Only then would Congress be fully informed and in a position to decide what is the best solution for the future development of the Panama Canal.

Such a supplemental investigation could be made for a relatively small sum of money as there would not be required much, if any, work of surveys, borings, or other costly field operations. Furthermore, it should be possible to get out such a report in less than 2 years.

We who question the 1947 report are acting only as individuals interested in the public welfare and are actuated by no other motive. We live in widely separated areas and do not possess, of course, all the latest technical data involved; but we speak from a wealth of practical experience and observation of Panama Canal construction, maintenance and operation and are familiar with many of the basic facts underlying the entire question.

The following are some questions that require decisions by the best informed persons, engineers and others:

1. Why should the Terminal Lake Plan (improved lock-lake canal) cost about $2½ billion. The discarded bypass plan (1939 Third Locks Project) was estimated at $277 million. Estimates in 1943 for the Terminal Lake Plan ran to $283 million. The late Mr. H. O. Cole, in 1947, estimated $500 million to $700 million for the Third Locks Project modified to embody the Terminal Lake Plan ideas.

2. Why should locks as wide as 200 feet, as recommended in the 1947 report, be mandatory? Would not some smaller width be sufficient, and preferable from many viewpoints, until an added flight of wider locks were known to be needed?

3. Why is it essential to widen Gaillard cut in the lock canal plans from 300 to 500 feet at the outset? Would not some smaller increase in width serve for many years?

4. With respect to atomic missiles striking the Canal, did the planners of the sea-level canal obtain opinions from the best available sources? What is the opinion of the leading atomic warfare authorities?

5. Is not the defense of shipping in the sealanes each side of the canal possibly a greater problem than the defense of the canal itself? If so, can the vast expenditures required for a Sea-Level Project be justified on the basis of national defense?

6. If defense is the controlling design factor, would not a passage at Tehuantepec, where the canal and Gulf of Mexico could be better and more economically defended, be a better or alternate solution? What would the Tehuantepec Canal cost as a lock-lake canal and as a sea-level canal through a tunnel? What would benefits be if there were the present commercial canal at Panama and another canal, principally for military use, at Tehuantepec, or some other point?

7. If an enemy were so powerful that he could destroy a canal, wouldn't he also have immobilized our shipping in the major ports of the United States and also our industrial potential? Would not a sea-level canal at Panama with tidal locks and many miles of dikes, be vulnerable to atomic attack as well as the present canal?

These questions are disturbing but cannot be overlooked in any complete evaluation of the problem. The civil engineering work involved in such a study would be considerable but would be simple in comparison with the problems of general location, type, size, and defense of the canal. These general features require the highest order of judgment from the broadest and most competent independent sources.

I was employed, in various technical capacities, from 1910 to 1946 by the Isthmian Canal Commission, the Panama Canal and Railroad, attaining the ratings of designing engineer, construction engineer, and consulting engineer at different times. My varied assignments included engineering supervision on locks, the Madden Dam project, drydocks, and other facilities for ships; hence am familiar with the basic engineering situation on the Canal Zone. Under the direction of the Governor, I supervised the explorations, plans and cost estimates leading to the 1939 Third Locks Report (the bypass plan). One feature of this plan was the separation of new and old locks wherein bends in channels were necessarily large.

After further investigation, I opposed the location selected for the Pedro Miguel locks on the grounds that the foundations as originally planned were poor. Subsequently, my work was taken over by others and the construction was commenced and later, May 1942, was discontinued.

Capt. Miles Du Val, United States Navy, while Captain of the Port, in charge of marine operations in the Pacific Division of the Panama Canal, developed and submitted the Terminal Lake Plan which I then supported strongly. I remain unconvinced that there is a better plan. It eliminated the Pedro Miguel locks and has other major advantages. Eventually, it was adopted in the 1947 report if a lock canal is retained; but, to the best of my knowledge, it has not yet had full engineering examination such as would be required before presentation to Congress.

Summing up: The Panama Canal is so remotely situated that the general public takes little interest in it; hence, your interest exhibited in your several extensions to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are of nationwide service of the highest order. In the interests of international relations, navigation, and

---

[1] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 13, 1950, Panama Canal Propaganda for Sea Level Project, p. A5087.

our national economy, the Isthmian Canal situation should be examined by an entirely unrestricted Interoceanic Canals Commission to fully explore all of the major angles of the subject and report to Congress. These views derive from my long career as a civilian employee on construction, maintenance, and operation of the canal and its auxiliaries, during which period I absorbed information from many sources and on a great variety of subjects.

Yours respectfully,

E. SYDNEY RANDOLPH,
Licensed Civil Engineer (Louisiana).

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *April 7, 1956.*

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: Your letter of the 2d instant requests my views, to include suggestions, as to what should be done to increase trans-Isthmian transit facilities. I am honored to present to you the observations following.

Under date of November 21, 1947, in response to Public Law 280, 79th Congress, 1st session, there was signed what is now generally known as the Mehaffey report. The report duly reached Congress shortly thereafter, but without any recommendation of the Executive. So far as I know, it has rested in the files ever since.

It is my belief this report should be made the basis of an early and thorough review of the whole problem. At the time it was submitted, I was inclined in favor of plan III. But since then, atomic science has so far advanced that the protective features of this and other plans are subject to serious review and reestimate, so that at present I am open to conviction without bias on any plan. I need to have more up-to-date facts to form a valid opinion.

I had been hoping your S. 766, 84th Congress, 1st session, and its companion, H. R. 3335—would have brought about the desired restudy before this. We now have aircraft carriers of too wide a beam to pass the existing Panama Canal locks. The increase of international commerce also approaches canal capacity unless there are to be costly transit delays. And as long as ships sail the seas, the canal is our strategic and logistic lifeline in time of war. I therefore hope that the provisions of your bill, or something parallel thereto, may be put in motion soon and bring action.

* * * * *

Respectfully yours,

GEO. R. GOETHALS,
Colonel, United States Army, Retired.

LACONIA, N. H., *April 9, 1956.*

Dr. Richard H. Whitehead, the first superintendent of the Pacific locks, author of Hydraulics of the Locking Operations of the Panama Canal and Our Faith Moved Mountains, and now president of Scott & Williams, Inc., described the Sea-Level Project as a "dangerous, unnecessary, and costly venture."

He recommended that consideration of the Isthmian problem should be undertaken by a civilian controlled commission.

HOOSICK FALLS, N. Y., *April 26, 1956.*

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN:

* * * * *

I have been much interested in the discussions of operating difficulties on the Panama Canal and in the schemes proposed for correcting them and for increasing its transit capacity.

Most of the operating troubles appear to be due to groundings or to ships striking the banks, in Culebra Cut. This is caused by currents, set up by the operation of the lock at Pedro Miguel, which occasionally make control of ships difficult.

The Pacific locks (1 at Pedro Miguel and 2 at Miraflores) were constructed separately, rather than in 1 flight of 3 as at Gatun, because it was then believed that suitable ground conditions for a triple lock at Miraflores was not available. It is now reported that it has been determined that a triple lock can be built there and that doing so would permit elimination of the fight at Pedro Miguel and set up a water storage which would eliminate the rush of water through the cut during lock operations.

Frankly I have never seen any detailed study of these proposals nor of the additional locks at Gatun which were started during the last World War, but I believe the solution lies in the continuance of a lock canal with corrective construction somewhat as outlined above.

I can't see how anyone who saw the construction of the present canal and the tremendous difficulties with slides and bank settlement could possibly favor a sea-level canal, which would multiply these troubles many times both in construction and in maintenance. It would undoubtedly require tidal locks on the Pacific end and on the whole would be as vulnerable to attack as the present installation.

* * * * *

Yours very truly,

ANDREW L. BELL.

HAVANA, CUBA.

DEAR SENATOR: Your letter of April 2 duly received. I entered the canal service in 1900 and was there as superintendent of dredging for 18 years, the first 7 years as an employee of the Panama Railroad at Balboa in charge of docks and keeping a channel open from Bay of Panama to the docks at Balboa.

* * * * *

I do not believe any of the men who advocate a sea level canal have any idea of the difficulties they would encounter at Culebra Cut. It was bad enough at the 85-foot level until the banks reached a state of repose. To go 85 feet (actually 100–110 feet) deeper would be a tremendous undertaking and I certainly would not consider such a proposal.

I believe it was a mistake to build the Pedro Miguel locks as three stage locks as Miraflores would have answered the purpose and saved untold millions.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES MACFARLANE.

QUARRYVILLE, PA., *April 7, 1956.*

SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of the 2d regarding the Panama Canal. I understand that the present Governor of the Zone is in favor of a sea-level canal in place of the present lock type. I cannot agree with him as both types can easily be destroyed by bombing.

I spent 10 years on the Canal Zone in the engineering department. Governor Goethals was especially interested in the slides, so we kept a record of all slides that occurred. In 1916 he wrote an article on Slides of the Panama Canal and Donald F. MacDonald wrote Some Engineering Problems of the Panama Canal in their Relations to Geology and Topography, both by the Government Printing Office. If anyone thinks the slides at Panama are ordinary, let him read, at least, page 144 of History of the Panama Canal, by Ira E. Bennett.

One of the most consistent of the slides was Cucaracha. The old French company had trouble with it and as I had a former employee of the French I asked Mr. Raggi to see what he could find among the records. They had tunneled under Cucaracha and put in a timbered drain which did not last long and was a failure. As the French planned to use 12 locks in their canal, the difficulty of finding good foundations was paramount.

In their original plan the Americans expected to use a berm along the canal, with a 2-on-1 slope back of the canal. The last time that I checked Cucaracha the slope was 1 on 13.

The elevation of the water in the canal is 85 feet above sea level, with a depth of 45 feet. For a sea-level canal, they would have to remove 90 feet of earth and rock, working up to 135 feet below the present water level. The earth and rock would have to be moved several miles back into the interior in order not to aggravate the slides.

While the sea-level canal was being constructed, would they close the canal to traffic? How will they dispose of the water coming down the Chagres River? At the present time we use 7 of the spillway gates at Gatun to carry off the excess water, each gate is 59 feet across and 19 feet high. More gates are available, but to use more would wash out the railroad bridge and possibly the hydro plant, below the spillway.

The sea-level canal would require locks, as the tidal range on the Pacific side is 20 feet, while that on the Atlantic side is 2 feet.

How many years would it take to construct a sea-level canal, my guess would be that your great grandchildren would not live to see the work completed, and it would require billions of dollars, and not just millions.

I hope that a commission will be appointed to investigate the addition of lock facilities at Panama and also include an investigation of the Nicaraguan canal project, rather than undertake the construction of a sea-level canal at Panama.

* * * * *

Yours very truly,

C. J. EMBREE.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.

DEAR SENATOR: There is no better way of tackling the great problem than your proposal embodied in S. 766 to establish a well qualified commission. The proposed makeup of personnel for this commission is excellent and should prove worthy of this great undertaking.

This is a big problem, requiring much study, careful consideration of many interrelated factors, and sound, mature judgment as to final decisions and recommendations.

The many factors involved cannot possibly be disposed of properly in the congressional committees. However, these committees do have a vital part, and should accomplish their part toward getting the big investigation and study started and underway without longer delay by recommending to the Congress the establishment of the proposed Interoceanic Canals Commission.

* * * * *

Sincerely,

W. L. HERSH.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 15, 1956.*

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN:

* * * * *

The subject of your letter is one that has been of great interest to me over the many years from the time that the Panama Canal was built. During this time I have read and weighed the material which was available to me. Due to the great changes written and which was considered authoring, international affairs and many other factors which entered this monumental problem since some of the material was written and which was considered authoritative, of course must be reappraised.

For this reason, I feel that any single opinion that might be made as to the correct solution of the interoceanic canal problem might fall very short of the optimum solution. There is certainly no place for the cut-and-dried answer. Again an opinion based on a too close-up view might overlook some of the broader aspects of the problem.

It is my view that a matter as great as that of an interoceanic canal should be given to a commission, to collect all pertinent information, at home and afield, to study and weigh this information and to consider all the possible solutions, to select the most promising of these considering their cost and advantages and to make recommendations.

As the writer believes that this is the intent and purpose of S. 766, I wish you godspeed in your efforts,

Sincerely yours,

SYLVESTER H. GRAUTEN.

TYRONE, PA., *April 5, 1956.*

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: While I appreciate your opinion, expressed in your kind letter of the 2d instance, that my work on the Panama Canal and my long engineering experience qualify me to comment on the present interoceanic canal problems, the limitations imposed on me by advanced age make it difficult for me to put all my ideas on the subject into a letter. May I then inform you of them by reference to 3 articles on the subject with which I am in full accord. It is probable that all 3 are in your files.

The first is entitled "Isthmian Canal Policy—An Evaluation," by Capt. Miles P. DuVal, United States Navy (retired), which appeared in the Proceedings of the United States Naval Institute for March 1955.

The second, which you may not have at hand, is entitled "The Panama Canal: A Challenging Problem for the United States" and was prepared for the Military Engineer late in 1954 but, so far as I know, has not yet been published. This paper, by four engineers who had been connected with the canal during construction or subsequently, and in the preparation of which I had a very minor part, recommends further study of the current canal problems by an impartial and qualified commission. The authors, all familiar with topographic and geologic conditions, with construction conditions and some operating problems, agree that a sea-level canal at Panama cannot be built at any reasonable cost and is perhaps entirely impossible at any cost. They are, therefore, of opinion that the proposed Terminal Lake-Third Locks Plan is probably the most feasible so far suggested.

The third article, just published in the current issue of the United States Naval Institute Proceedings, for April 1956, is by Mr. E. S. Randolph, one of the coauthors of the second, and is entitled "An Engineer's Evaluation of Isthmian Canal Policy."

As the second article listed above has not been published it may not be in your files. If not, because of its importance, I recommend asking for a manuscript copy from the author, Mr. William R. McCann, Hopewell, Va. I feel sure he will be glad to supply it.

Yours very sincerely,

EDWARD C. SHERMAN.

BRADENTON, FLA.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I wish to advise that after 5½ years' continuous service in the Panama Canal, including both construction and operating activities, I am convinced that of the two plans for the enlargement of the canal which have been under discussion for the last 10 years, the plan calling for the retention of the present lock-type canal, with the addition of new and larger locks, as favored by the United States Navy, is greatly to be preferred to the proposed change to a sea-level canal.

Sincerely yours,

W. H. ROSE,
Brigadier General, Hon. Ret. List, United States Army.

KNOXVILLE, TENN., *February 28, 1956.*

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN:

* * * * *

Since I feel that increased capacity should be obtained as economically as possible—consistent with efficient operation—I favor the third-locks plan, in which a considerable investment has already been made. The Terminal Lake Plan has advantages in the speeding up of transits, and could well be used in connection with the third locks. Some added measure of security would also be provided by this combination of plans, and maintenance repairs would be facilitated. By increasing toll rates moderately, it should be possible to continue operation of the canal on a near-business basis, especially as transits continue to increase.

* * * * *

Sincerely,

HERBERT D. VOGEL,
Brigadier General, United States Army, Retired, and former Lieutenant Governor, Canal Zone, 1950–52.

TULLAHOMA, TENN., *April 5, 1956.*

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN:

* * * * *

My active connection with the Panama Canal dates far back—1913 to 1916. I visited the canal early in World War II and discussed its problems with responsible officials directing construction and operation. I have kept generally familiar with the more recent public discussions and debates and have talked from time to time with experienced people who had knowledge and opinions on the interoceanic-canals problem. I worked on the development and use of atomic weapons, both during the war, with the Manhattan project, and more recently with the Atomic Energy Commission.

For what they may be worth, I give you here some of my general views:

1. An improved high-level lock canal is preferable to a sea-level canal.

2. Atomic and thermonuclear weapons—if delivered on the target—will put a sea-level canal out of service as effectively as they will a lock canal.

3. Navigation through the wide lake of a lock canal should be much better than through the narrower channels of a sea-level canal.

4. The cost of building a sea-level canal would be enormously greater than the cost of needed improvements to the lock canal.

5. The probability of blocking the canal by slides would be greatly increased in a sea-level canal.

6. The present locks should be replaced or supplemented by larger locks—large enough to take present and planned shipping.

7. The Pedro Miguel locks should be removed and the entire lift at the Pacific end should be accomplished by new locks near Miraflores.

8. Additional water for the summit level should be provided.

9. The narrow channels should be widened as required for good navigation.

10. When, and if, a new canal becomes necessary to carry our commerce, plans should be ready so that it could be built without undue delay.

11. The United States should provide for an agency to carry on a continuing review of all the problems connected with interoceanic canals.

Sincerely yours,

T. F. FARRELL,
Major General, Army of the United States, Retired.

*

LABOR OFFICIAL OBJECTS TO COMPULSORY UNION POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senate may soon be considering the so-called clean-politics bill, I believe a recent statement by a former CIO official merits the close study of all Senators and Representatives.

For that reason, I call attention to the statement by George F. Hinkle as it has been reprinted in the current issue of Human Events, the sprightly and provocative weekly news commentary published in Washington, D. C., which has the habit of printing news and releases which frequently fail to find prominent mention in other American journals.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR FRONT

A man who was a former CIO official and still is a dues-paying member of the United Auto Workers-CIO union, Mr. George F. Hinkle, strikes out sharply against labor's compulsory collection of dues for political purposes. "Millions of union members in this country," says Hinkle, "are being forced to contribute to campaign funds of political candidates these very same union members oppose at the polls. This is being done through the use of union dues money by labor leaders. Individual union members are being forced to make political contributions to candidates and parties as a condition of employment."

Hinkle went on to point out that, "All labor leaders are not in favor of this compulsory political activity by all union members. It is only those who have the desire to promote and foster their absolute control over all the citizens of our country and those who wish to promote their own socialistic ideals and are using the labor movement as a vehicle to be used toward attaining these ideals."

Hinkle, who is presently State commissioner of labor in Indiana, proposes passage of legislation to prohibit the use of dues money by union leaders in political campaigns. "I say," remarked Hinkle, "that the penalty for violation of this legislation and principle should be the denial of the right of that particular union or local union to have a union shop. I say that this proposal is not a so-called right-to-wreck proposal and it is not an antilabor proposal. It is an antipolitical labor boss proposal."

PUBLIC DEVELOPMENT OF NIAGARA FALLS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the Denver Post of May 24, 1956. This editorial, published in the leading daily newspaper of the entire Rocky Mountain region, asks a very cogent question as to why some Senators from that area seem to favor public developments in their own region—such as the Colorado River storage project—but have opposed the public development of Niagara Falls by the State power authority of New York.

There is an old saying that "to have a friend you must first be a friend," and I think that the editorial in the Denver Post very clearly illuminates this undying bit of truth.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW NEARSIGHTED CAN OUR SENATORS BE?

On May 16 the Senate of the United States voted 48 to 39 in favor of granting the New York State Power Authority the right to develop a large hydroelectric project near Niagara Falls.

The vote came at the conclusion of a vigorous debate on public versus private power. Seven Republicans voted with the Democrats to carry the legislation. Four Democrats voted with the Republican minority against it. A bill to authorize private development by a combine of five companies was passed 262 to 121 in the House of Representatives during the previous Congress.

It is most unlikely that the prevailing views of either the House or the Senate can be reconciled in the present session. So the evident need for providing more than 1 million kilowatts of low-cost energy for the farms, homes, and industries of western New York State will go unremedied for another year. Why?

Well, under a provision of a 1950 treaty between the United States and Canada, Congress must decide who shall develop this international boundary river. The decision cannot be made, as in other cases, by the Federal Power Commission. And the development cannot be undertaken either by New York State or by private utilities without Congress' approval.

The treaty requirements thus brought about an opportunity for a clear and specific test of views on public power in the ideological sense. The issue did not involve a demand on the Federal Treasury. For the State power authority of New York would, under the proposal, finance the project with revenue bonds to be made available for purchase by the general public.

The power features of the plan were not, as with other public power projects submitted to Congress' decision, part of a multiple-purpose package, including irrigation, navigation, and flood control.

The issue was simply whether the Niagara River at this site should be harnessed by private individuals for profit, or by a public agency for service alone. And the Senate decided in behalf of the latter. Furthermore, by a majority of nine votes, the Senate directed that preference in the purchase of power produced at that project shall go first to municipalities, cooperatives, and other public bodies.

It is clear from the record of debate on the legislation, both in this and previous sessions of Congress, that prevailing opinion in New York favored public rather than private development. It is not clear whether the State's power authority act of 1931, or amendments to it sponsored by then Governor Dewey in 1951, carried any demand for the application of the same preference that is extended by Federal law to projects authorized and financed by the Federal Government.

There has been no massive public power development in New York State comparable to that of the Tennessee or Columbia River Valleys. Ninety-five percent of the electricity consumers of that State are served by private utilities. And the idea of restraining the monopoly practices and rates of private companies, by imposing the yardstick of public power through compulsory preference on the sale and distribution of publicly generated energy, is apparently not as widely accepted in the Northeast as it is in the Southeast or the Northwest sections of the country.

Many of those urging public development of the Niagara most strongly, including Mr. Dewey and Robert Moses, chairman of the New York State Power Authority, disassociated themselves with equal vigor from those sections of the bill extending mandatory preference. And this was true, notwithstanding that the experience elsewhere in the United States and the prospects in New York State as well suggest a very substantial participation in the power benefits of such projects by private utilities, regardless of preference.

Now, this controversy and its outcome contain elements of real political significance to the Nation generally, to the West and to the Rocky Mountain empire in particular. We commend these points to the reflection of Senators ALLOTT and MILLIKIN of Colorado, Senators BENNETT and WATKINS of Utah, and Senator BARRETT of Wyoming, all of whom voted against the legislation permitting public development by the State of New York:

1. The contention of the private utility industry, that publicly financed power generation is adverse to the public interest as an article of capitalistic faith, is a false and self-defeating doctrine. It is a dangerous generalization which, in this case, collided with the views of the people of New York as expressed, (a) in actions of the New York Legislature, (b) as articulated by every governor of the State (except one) since 1900, and (c) as set forth in every New York Democratic Party platform since 1918 and every New York Republican Party platform since 1936.

Such a contention is, too, in conflict with the economic aspirations of the upper Colorado River Basin States. For the whole future of those States is tied to the conservation of their share of the Colorado River by a project, the feasibility of which is completely and irrevocably dependent upon the revenues from the sale of public power in the upper Colorado River storage project.

2. To have embraced the spurious generalizations of the utility industry in the case of Niagara ignored (a) the obvious local preference of the State of New York, (b) revealed as confused if not insincere the concept of partnership between Federal and local interests in the development of natural resources, and (c) drove a wedge between like-minded political allies in the whole matter of applying public power selectively, as the need and justification for it arises here and elsewhere in the Nation.

We do not propose that our Representatives and Senators permit themselves to be dragooned into every public power venture under the threat of political retaliation against our own programs. Nor would we criticize dissent from and opposition to legislation proposing public power for which there is (1) no local need or demand, (2) no economic justification, or (3) honestly comparable alternatives to be supplied by investor-owned utilities.

But is is blind folly for our people in Congress to be suckered into untenable obstruction of public power, just as it is nonsense to rush headlong into every public power panacea that arises. This is an issue which cries out for discriminating thought and courageous action, neither of which was apparent in the vote of this region's five Senators on the Niagara issue.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCREASE OF MINIMUM POSTAL-SAVINGS DEPOSITS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further morning business to be transacted, without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 1873.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1873) to increase the minimum postal-savings deposit, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the pending bill was requested by the Post Office Department as means of reducing paperwork and cost in the handling of postal-savings accounts.

The Post Office Department does not believe the bill will work any hardship on persons who have made small deposits in the past or in any way discourage thrift, inasmuch as United States savings stamps are readily available at any depository post office for accumulating $5 in smaller amounts. At the present time the limit is fixed at $1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act of June 25, 1910, as amended (39 U. S. C. 756), is hereby further amended by striking out "$1" wherever it appears therein, and by inserting in lieu thereof "$5."

SALE OF INHERITED INTERESTS IN ALLOTED LANDS IN THE TULALIP RESERVATION, WASH.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2094, Senate bill 3920.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3920) to authorize the partition or sale of inherited interests in allotted lands in the Tulalip Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

POLITICAL SITUATION IN WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I recall an old saying, "We have had a skirmish. We are going to have a battle."

In Wisconsin we have had a skirmish. Certain "king makers" have arranged the endorsement of candidates in a convention which has no legal authority, no basis in law.

I refer particularly to the actions of the Republican State convention in Milwaukee on Saturday, May 26, and more especially to the actions of a handful of self-appointed "king makers" who have

attempted to dictate the choice of a senatorial nominee in Wisconsin. What took place on the 26th of May is one of the reasons why the primary law in Wisconsin was passed. I wish to discuss for a few moments what occurred and how the "king makers," so-called, finally, according to the Milwaukee Journal, arranged to guarantee a $150,000 jackpot. That has not been denied.

The basic facts are well known, but it is important that they be understood in proper perspective.

PEOPLE WILL CHOOSE, NOT "KING MAKERS"

Mr. President, in the first place, the decision of the Republican Party as to who its nominee shall be in the general election in November will be made in the State primary on September 11. It is the people who choose a senatorial nominee, and not a handful of unscrupulous individuals inside a party convention nor even a misguided majority of the convention itself.

I have complete confidence—more confidence than ever before—that the people of my State will utterly repudiate the backward moving actions of May 26.

WISCONSIN'S RECORD OF INDEPENDENCE

Of course, I fully respect differences of opinion. I have always said America was built on differences of opinion. The old saying, Mr. President, that "I do not believe what you say, but I will fight to the death for your right to say it," applies to this situation.

The convention had a perfect right to do as it pleased—to make its own mistakes. But the record of the past in my State—an independent-minded State, which does not like bossism—shows that where a Republican State convention has, unfortunately, strayed from the beam, when a few self-appointed "king makers" have professionally manipulated and stampeded a convention, then their conspiring has boomeranged. The record shows that invariably the convention endorsement has become, not the path to victory in September, but the path to resounding defeat for the endorsed candidate and victory for the unendorsed candidate. And that is what is going to happen in my State.

A few self-appointed "king makers" several times tried to purge a great governor of my State—Walter S. Goodland—and, without campaigning, he defeated them hands down.

The same self-appointed "king makers" tried to purge Wisconsin's most famous secretary of State, Fred Zimmerman—and he consistently defeated them hands down.

I have faith that once more the handful of political manipulators will find that they cannot boss the Republican Party of Wisconsin or the people of Wisconsin as a whole. They cannot blind the eyes of the alert people of Wisconsin to the realities of today's world.

Mr. President, Milwaukee is ringed about with Nike sites, 5 hours away from Siberia by fast plane. There are bombers in Siberia. Some of the self-constituted isolation-minded "king makers" think that the people of my State are isolationists. But the people have marched ahead with the facts of life. They have seen the march of events and they understand them. I am confident that the people will support me.

But every realist knows that in any political race, there is a chance that the people might not.

If that proves to be the case—and I firmly believe it will definitely not be the case—then I will, of course, accept the people's verdict. I shall accept the verdict with grace, without any feeling of hate in my heart. No one could go through what I have gone through in the past 2 months in my State, with the great amount of hate and venom and misrepresentation involved, without realizing that this is a planned attack. And yet, Mr. President, I hold no hate in my heart. I have long since learned that for me to hate is to stab my own physical being. But my eyes are open, Mr. President, and I sense the situation. Later on I shall tell a story which goes back 3 years, but not today.

A man must live with his own conscience, and his own principles. There is something dearer than a seat in the United States Senate, and that is the ability of a man to be true to his beliefs and to be honest with himself and with his Maker.

I WILL CAMPAIGN ON OVERALL RECORD, NOT RETREAT ONE INCH

Second. The second basic point I should like to make is this: I have served in the United States Senate for 17½ years.

My record here—my literally thousands of recorded votes—can be seen and noted by everyone.

It is a record which includes securing the enactment of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway law; fighting for liberalized social security; for the small-business man, for the veteran, for the dairy farmers; and fighting in the cause of world peace.

I will campaign on that record. I will not retreat from it one iota. I do not propose to compromise my principle now, or ever, for the sake of so-called political expediency.

If anyone expects me to retreat from my policies—if anyone expects me to do a flip-flop, and to turn my back, for example, on the cause of world peace, through enlightened mutual security—then that person has another guess coming.

IKE'S RECORD OF FRIENDSHIP IS CLEAR

The question is repeatedly asked as to what the position of President Eisenhower might be on this matter.

I, for one, do not propose to comment in detail on this subject, because I do not believe it would be proper to do so.

I should like to point out, however, that time and again in the past, President Eisenhower voluntarily, on his own initiative, and despite all sorts of other burdens on his time, has most graciously commented upon my efforts on behalf of our country.

So have members of his able staff, on many occasions. I am profoundly grateful for his and their comments.

The record of the President's relationship with me is there, for all to see. And, as an indication of that record—a record of which I am humbly proud—I shall ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of my remarks, several public letters which the President had kindly sent to me be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of talk from my opponent as regards the issue of "our respective percentages of support for President Eisenhower."

Some people who take great pleasure in trying to sabotage the President falsely proclaim that they allegedly support him on domestic policies, even though they fight him tooth and nail on foreign policy.

They were for the Bricker amendment, thus opposing the President in every respect. What these persons do is to engage in phony arithmetic in relation to votes. They count up every conceivable domestic issue which is almost completely noncontroversial, and then they say, "See—look how I have supported the President."

But when the chips are down on a real issue—a major issue, an issue on which the President has staked his entire record, an issue which will matter more in the eyes of history than any other issue, say, the matter of world peace—then these persons eagerly sabotage the President.

World peace is not just another issue; it is a decisive issue.

The Civil Defense Administrator, Mr. Val Peterson, has estimated that if war should come it would cost the United States upward of 25 million casualties. Does that, therefore, sound like just one trivial issue? Does the issue of preventing mass slaughter on continent after continent, sound like just "one more issue"?

Yet, the saboteurs contend that they are allegedly "for the President."

The saboteurs of his foreign policy conspire with every conceivable Eisenhower-hater to defeat the President's international efforts. And then these saboteurs have the nerve to pretend that they are really whole-hearted supporters of Ike.

It is not the quantity of their votes, it is the quality of their decisive votes on the big issues that really counts. I refer to issues like protecting the Constitution from an unsound amendment which would paralyze the President's treatymaking power.

Any man can differ with the President on some issues. He does not expect complete conformity. He respects wholesome, honest differences.

But is it one thing to vote against a few of his suggestions; it is another thing to conspire with Eisenhower-haters to defeat the President on the most important of all issues.

Does my opponent repudiate the Eisenhower-haters in his ranks? Does he repudiate the vicious attacks, which have been made against the President's foreign policies, and against the members of his Cabinet and sub-Cabinet who have been loyally carrying out those policies?

Does he repudiate the boos at the convention, the cat-calls, the smearing of President Eisenhower's endeavors on the world scene?

Does he repudiate the two-faced quality of those who pulled the strings at the convention in praising the President with one breath and then passing resolutions denouncing key policies of the President in the next breath?

A SMELLY AROMA OVER $150,000

My next point is this:

The State of Wisconsin is a clean State which, by and large, has kept itself free from shady influences which have tended to taint the record of some other States.

Unfortunately, an aroma has now been arising, a not very pleasant aroma, over financial phases of the intrigue against me which preceded the May 26 decision.

Why? Because Saturday a week ago, we saw how an individual who had completely withdrawn from the race several weeks previously, suddenly, in a matter of a few hours flip-flopped and decided to become a candidate.

The people of my State are asking "Why?"

This individual—my opponent—had announced, away back last year, that he intended to make a decision one way or the other about entering the race or declining to do so. He kept postponing his decision month after month, until January 1, 1956, and then for additional months.

Finally, he withdrew in April, after apparently taking soundings, and after noting the results of a private poll—a poll which was taken under the auspices of a Gallup-type group, a poll which was paid for by the Republican hierarchy, to show how the present speaker stood. The poll showed that my opponent would be overwhelmingly defeated in the primary; so, he withdrew from the race and announced to the people of his commonwealth that he would not be a candidate.

But then on May 25, in the final few hours, when he had not even been mentioned or nominated, he came back. Why? Perhaps the answer was given in a news story that day. The Milwaukee Journal reported that 3 or 4 individuals had apparently pledged the sum of $150,000 personally to that candidate.

Mr. President, there was a little scare on the floor of the Senate a few weeks ago about a $2,500 deal. It created quite a mess.

The disclosure by the Milwaukee Journal has never been denied. Yet those persons are the "king makers," and their names appear in the press. They pledged personally to the candidate $150,000. They pledged it not to the party, but to him.

Where is this money supposed to have come from? The people are asking that question. I shall annex to my speech as exhibits excerpts from hundreds of letters which have already come to me—and more are coming in every day. They are saying, in effect, "Senator, this is no longer your fight; it is the people's fight."

Where is the money coming from? Inside Wisconsin or outside Wisconsin, how could that large sum have been procured for a candidate who was not then even in the race, a candidate who had voluntarily retired from it completely several weeks previously?

The people are asking if once more the oil or gas crowd is at work, the crowd I opposed in my vote against the natural-gas bill. Wisconsin does not like the aroma which has arisen.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. No; I prefer to carry on with my speech.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the Senator has made some very serious charges against one of our colleagues in the House.

Mr. WILEY. I have asked some questions. I refuse to yield until I have concluded my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Wisconsin declines to yield.

Mr. WILEY. I expected something of this kind to occur, but I intend to get into the RECORD a speech that can be published without interference.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then, Mr. President, I call the Senator to order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rules, the senior Senator from Wisconsin cannot proceed but must take his seat.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I move that the senior Senator from Wisconsin be allowed to proceed in order.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I want a ruling on the junior Senator from Wisconsin's calling me to order. He has no business calling me to order on anything I have said. This is just another indication of who is in the fight.

Mr. McCARTHY. Because the senior Senator from Wisconsin impugned the integrity of a Member of the House, I called him to order. However, I move that he be allowed to proceed if he will proceed in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is requested. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, people are asking, once more, if the oil and gas crowd is at work, the crowd which I opposed in my fight against the natural gas bill.

Wisconsin does not like the aroma which has arisen. Wisconsin is determined to keep itself a clean State—clean politically, clean in every other way.

With regard to the convention itself, let me say——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator not yield, so that I may ask him a question?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have asked that I be permitted to continue to the end of my remarks, so that they may be printed consecutively without interruption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Wisconsin declines to yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, following the proceedings of the convention, a great many men who attended it, including those who have at times strongly disagreed with me—and I have letters to prove it—told me that they were absolutely disgusted over the results of the convention. This reaction was shared by many of the leaders of the Republican Party, by Republican county chairmen, and others.

At the conclusion of my remarks today, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some of the comments, as they poured into my office immediately following the convention.

The issue is not, of course, between ALEX WILEY and the Republican Party, because actually I am convinced that the mass of the thinking Republican Party supports me.

The issue is not even between ALEX WILEY and leaders of the Republican Party, because a great many leaders support me.

The issue is between ALEX WILEY and a handful of backward-looking, would-be king makers. They do not mind giving Wisconsin a black eye, the Republican Party a black eye, or the Midwest a black eye, in their ruthless desire to purge an independent-minded Senator, a Senator who believes in a modern approach, not a 19th century approach, to world problems.

CONCLUSION

The issue, then, is joined. It is for the people of Wisconsin to decide on September 11. If the successful 17½-year fight for the St. Lawrence Seaway were to mean nothing to them—and I should like to include the connecting-channels-into-the-lakes fight—if my fight for the dairyman, the farmer, the veteran, the small-business men, the old folks were to mean nothing to our people, then they might vote for my opponent. But most of all, if they were not interested in saving world peace, then they might well vote for him.

If they were not to care whether America has friends and allies in the world, they might vote for him.

I do not believe this will prove to be the case. I have faith in the people of Wisconsin—in their judgment, in their independence, in their wisdom, in their sense of decency and fair play and right dealing.

They will not turn the clock back. They will not retreat into 19th century thinking.

Mr. President, in the course of these remarks I have referred to various materials which I am going to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point. I should like to list them now:

PAST MESSAGES FROM PRESIDENT

First. The first consists of three letters which President Eisenhower had sent to me, supplementing his many warm comments in person, regarding my efforts in 1953, in 1954, and 1955, in the administration's behalf. The letters relate to foreign policy, generally, the fight for protection of the Constitution, and the fight for the St. Lawrence Seaway.

I reprint these past letters only as an indication of the spontaneous reaction of our Chief Executive.

THE $150,000 PLEDGE

Second. The second item consists of a Milwaukee Journal news clipping in the issue of May 26, referring to the fact that the campaign manager of my opponent confessed that my opponent's endorsement had first been cleared with three industrialists of Wisconsin, who had pledged to him $150,000.

The question is, what kind of a country is this when endorsement of the nomination of a United States Senator has to be cleared with individuals?

And the second question is: "Where does the $150,000 come from?"

That sum may seem like small money in some States, but it is a very, very big sum to be announced at the very outset of a primary in Wisconsin.

I have reported that numerous letters from my State suggest that oil industry money is included in that $150,000 figure.

I am not personally making any charges at this moment. I am simply reporting the fact that the people of my State are deeply disturbed over this $150,000 fund, and they want to know where it comes from.

The people of Wisconsin are not naive. They can put 2 and 2 together. They know, for example, that, according to a great many observers, in the past one of the principal sources of huge so-called liquid campaign funds, that is, funds readily available in huge amounts, has been the petroleum industry. I repeat, I am definitely not making any charges. I am simply reporting the reactions of a great many Wisconsinites.

SUPPORT FROM WISCONSIN

Third. Next, I am reprinting the messages which poured into my office from all over Wisconsin, protesting the convention's decision.

If, I wanted to, I could have doubled or even tripled the number of these messages which will be reprinted.

My purpose, however, is not to fill up a lot of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If you will look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. President, you will find I have not been in the habit of doing a lot of talking; I believe in action. I have been, until the past month or so, very busy in my committees. My purpose is not to take up more space now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these items be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I may say that I think the senior Senator who has been making completely unfounded insinuations against his opponent in the primary election—a man who is also an honored Member of the House of Representatives——

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I may raise a point of order to that remark, because I have not made any unfounded remarks.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President I think the senior Senator should answer my questions. I have some questions to ask him. He has made the statement that $150,000 was pledged to Mr. DAVIS. I know that is untrue, completely untrue. He has also suggested that money came from gas or oil interests. Now, if he has any evidence to that effect, he should take it before the lobbying committee. I know he has no such evidence to that effect.

Mr. WILEY. Do not be too cocksure, Brother. [Laughter].

Mr. McCARTHY. Let the Senator tell us, if he has it. Does he have any evidence to support his accusation?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is not running a committee. If he has a question, let him ask it.

Mr. President, I ask him to ask the question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Very well. I shall repeat the question.

Mr. WILEY. Go ahead.

Mr. McCARTHY. What evidence does the Senator have as to where the funds for DAVIS originated?

Mr. WILEY. I have answered that in my speech, but I shall answer it again. First I shall answer a part of the earlier statement. This appears in the Milwaukee Journal of May 27:

> Robert Dalton, Brookfield, who helped in the drive, said that the Davis boom had been cleared with William J. Grede, a Milwaukee industrialist and GOP finance chairman; Walter Harnischfeger, another Milwaukee industrialist, and Thomas E. Coleman, Madison, former State party chairman and fund raiser.
>
> "DAVIS is a protege of Coleman. This group has guaranteed to raise a $150,000 campaign chest for DAVIS if he were endorsed," Dalton said.

That is verbatim from the Milwaukee Journal.

Where does the $150,000 come from? Go and ask the kingmakers; do not ask me.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator knows better than that. The Senator knows the reputation of the Milwaukee Journal for accuracy. He knows it has an outstanding reputation for inaccuracy. Surely, that newspaper is not a competent authority for the charge he is making. Moreover, even the newspaper article to which the Senator refers makes no reference at all to oil and gas interests. Where is the Senator's evidence for that? Surely the Senator does not want to let a charge of that sort against a Member of the House stand if he has nothing with which to back it up. The Senator has also listed the names of persons who believed he was not a competent Senator. They have a right and duty in the circumstances to oppose the Senator, do they not? I repeat that the charge about a pledge of $150,000 is completely untrue.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, let me tell you something. The night my colleague entertained Mr. Kersten, then a candidate, Kersten made the statement that he was going to have the support of my colleague. The following day the $2,500 gas business broke, and the next day my colleague came over to me on this floor and said that he was not interfering in the primary. I accepted that as 100 percent correct, because when he ran 4 years ago I told him I would take no action in the primary. I expected that when he told me voluntarily he would take no action in the primary that was 100 percent correct. I have accepted it as 100 percent correct until today.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a point of personal privilege. That is incorrect. I told the Senator I would make no public speeches in the primary. I have never told him that I would take no part in the primary. Now, I say I did take a pretty active part in the convention. I am very proud of the part I had in it. But when the Senator talks about "kingmakers," I wish to say the one-thousand-seven-hundred-odd delegates who voted against him were the "kingmakers." They are the rank and file of the Republican Party—my party of the State—and they voted as they did because they were unhappy with the record of the senior Senator.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I came to the floor to lay some facts before the Senate. I am glad at long last that, out of the hole, certain other facts are coming. Now I know, which I did not know until right now, that the junior Senator was particeps criminis in this kind of thing. I will say the people of Wisconsin will decide. If I have any sense of direction at all, the people are going clearly to say to these "kingmakers" and everybody who participated with them, "We are through with this kind of tactics. We want things aboveboard."

Even at the convention, I led on the first ballot, and enough votes were pledged the night before. The thing was nicely arranged, but I did not know who arranged it. But now I am beginning to obtain knowledge in large chunks.

Mr. President, in the beginning I said I have no personal conflict with my opponent. I have known him for a long time. But I ask these questions.

Two weeks before, Mr. DAVIS announced to the people that he would not be a candidate. At that time there was no pledge of $150,000 forthcoming. The Milwaukee Journal reported that during the convention, according to Mr. Dalton, of Brookfield, who helped in the drive for Mr. DAVIS, $150,000 was guaranteed to Mr. DAVIS, and the guarantors were named.

I wish to say that I have known these gentlemen. I have nothing against them personally. If they act within the Corrupt Practices Act, they have a perfect right to give all the money they legally can. But, of course, we differ on an ideological basis.

I recognize that the world has been shrunk by men's ingenuity, and I recognize that closed minds will not protect America. They are still isolationists. When they talk about our spending our money in Korea, they should realize that every dollar we spent in Korea saved many times what we would have had to spend if we had to send our own troops there in place of the Koreans and other allies. From General MacArthur down, every general in charge has said that we must not abandon our farflung defense line, that is where the defense line is—beginning at Alaska, through the Aleutian Islands, through Korea and Japan and Formosa and down to the Philippines. We are also spending some of our money in Formosa. These critics speak of the giving away of our money, by

means of military aid. But, I say we are saving many, many dollars by having the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa stand on the front line. So, Mr. President, that is where I differ with these folk. They do not see eye to eye with me. They have the right to disagree.

Again I ask, Where is the money coming from? Why was there, at the convention, a change from a man not being a candidate to becoming one? The people want the answer. Was the change caused by the $150,000? What other pressures were put on? Who else put their fingers in the pie? Who promised them what? We shall see, Mr. President. In the days ahead, we shall see where the other promisers came in. Three months from now the people will make the decision.

Mr. President, as I have said, I have here the letters from President Eisenhower and excerpts from numerous letters showing the attitude of Republicans in Wisconsin as to the action which was taken.

Mr. President, no personalities are involved. The people resent this new idea in Wisconsin of certain men seeking to dictate the nominee. They will find they cannot.

Mr. President, in a few days I shall have something else to say about what developed. I shall also show what the newspapers of the State have said almost unanimously—and completely contrary to what has been said by the Chicago Tribune. I shall also show how the independents think, and then I shall trace the fight back to a certain period 3 years ago, when then and there was hatched the revolt because this Senator would not toe the mark, would not take orders, would not accept dictation to be ruled by the thinking of others.

EXHIBIT 1

LETTERS FROM PRESIDENT EISENHOWER TO SENATOR WILEY

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 28, 1953.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALEC: Today Foster Dulles, who was in my office on some business matters, took occasion to praise in extravagant terms your service as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee over the past 6 months. I just wanted to tell you how very greatly pleased I am that you and Foster have been able to see eye to eye and work together as such an effective team in carrying on these delicate and important activities.

Of course, I have personally been following the record that is made on the floor of the Senate, but it was encouraging to have evidence from Foster that you are fully as effective in committee as you are in the more public places.

You have been a great champion of the principles that the entire administration believes outline the best interests of the United States in the foreign field.

With warm personal regards,
Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 2, 1954.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALEC: In the turmoil of the past few days, I have neglected to send you a little note to tell you how greatly I appreciated your fine help in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1. For your stalwart assistance in defeating the proposed amendment, I am not only personally grateful; I think I express the thanks of the millions of Americans who realized to what extent such an amendment could have damaged our relationships with other nations of the world.

With warm personal regard,
Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 14, 1954.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Now that the St. Lawrence Seaway struggle is over, I want to thank you for your informed and aggressive leadership in this historic effort. This kind of legislative-executive teamwork in areas vital to all our citizens is, in my opinion, essential to a sound government and to the welfare of the Nation.

I am very pleased that you were able to move so effectively in helping to make the seaway at last a reality.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

EXCERPT FROM PAGE 1 OF MILWAUKEE JOURNAL, MAY 27, 1956

Robert Dalton, Brookfield, who helped in the drive, said that the Davis boom had been cleared with William J. Grede, a Milwaukee industrialist and GOP finance chairman; Walter Harnischfeger, another Milwaukee industrialist, and Thomas E. Coleman, Madison, former State party chairman and fund raiser.

CORNERED IN CORRIDOR

DAVIS is a protege of Coleman.

"This group had guaranteed to raise a $150,000 campaign chest for DAVIS if he were endorsed," Dalton said.

EXCERPTS FROM WISCONSINITES' LETTERS OF SUPPORT OF SENATOR WILEY

From Waukesha:

"Well, Senator, the battle is over as far as Milwaukee is concerned and you are the winner even if the moneybags turned you down. I attended a veterans' meeting last night and did not find a veteran who was for Glenn. One of our county officials attended a meeting at the Avalon Hotel last night and she tells me that all they talked about was the bundle that was going to be raised. I look for you to win by a bigger vote than you ever did and I am going to do all I can for you.

"In my estimation you are doing a fine job; you are working earnestly and honestly for the best welfare of the country and the State; and you should be continued in office as long as this continues to be the case and you wish to run. In addition, you have grown with your job and are doing an immeasurably better job now than you were even a few years back.

"The Republican Party of this State has somehow fallen into the hands of some narrow-minded individuals. Many of us honor you for your worldwide view of our economic problems. Personally I feel that it would be a loss to the State and to the Nation not to have you a Member of the United States Senate."

From Clintonville:

"Our assemblyman brought down some nomination papers of yours today, which were circulated in the shop. I am told that many people said, 'Here is one I want to sign.' Unless I am completely devoid of political acumen, I feel your chances of success are greater now than ever. Best of luck to you."

From Cross Plains:

"Well the boys at Milwaukee did it, or think they did; and I hope they will get a good trimming. I just wish you were able to get to many of the towns where there are picnics, and could give a talk or at least be introduced. I know you can beat your opponent and I will do all I can to help you."

From Milwaukee:

"Unhappy with endorsement of DAVIS by State Republican Party in Milwaukee Saturday. Want to work to help assure your nomination in September. Please advise who to contact."

From a clergyman:

"Ours is not a political church, nor am I a political preacher. The events of Saturday's convention of the Republican Party, State of Wisconsin, prompt me, however, to write this letter.

"Putting it briefly, I am shocked at the action of the convention. You have served our State with dignity and distinction. Your service in Congress, particularly in the Foreign Affairs Committee, has been of so high a quality, and the experience which you have acquired there is of such value both to our State and our Nation, that I consider it the height of folly to squander this by replacing you with a man whose chief qualification would be his youth, with all the lack of experience which that implies.

"It is certainly my opinion that if you will decide to enter your name in the primaries, nevertheless, your following will be sufficiently strong to win you the nomination in spite of the lack of the convention's endorsement. Whatever I can do as a private citizen will be done gladly in support of your renomination."

From Juneau:

"I want to express my admiration for you and the courageous fight you are waging against the political racketeers and 'kingmakers' who call themselves the Republican Party in Wisconsin.

"Your phrases 'kingmakers' and 'let the people decide' has a great appeal and don't you worry, Senator, if you go directly to the people with your record you can win again. There are very few men who have gone up to Washington with an enviable record such as you have made. You refused to be led around by the collar like the man who was chosen will surely be. Your record on the waterway, the gas bill, the tidelands oil, and your battle for the farmer of Wisconsin, made a record that is hard to beat.

"I want you to know that I am a strong union man and I know how labor thinks and acts and you would be surprised if you knew how the workers are turning to you. I'm working for you, ALEX, as I have always done. Keep up the battle and we will see you in, come September and November."

From Kenosha:

"The Milwaukee episode was utterly disgusting, but I have known some of the insurgents in other Wisconsin political situations, and they merely got you votes by their action. Good fortune."

From Hancock:

"I was very happy indeed, reading the Sunday morning edition of Milwaukee Journal, your statement that you were going to battle it out in the primaries this fall for your seat in the Senate. I was a delegate at the convention at Milwaukee, and stayed with you until final poll, there were also several others in our county delegation for you, but our delegation has a ruling that on third poll a majority made it unanimous, believe some of them wanted to go home, I also believe that if poll for United States Senator had been made prior to Wisconsin attorney general poll, that you would have made it in second poll. This political control of party by a few self-appointed individuals is a very vicious element and a practice in our State I am not in favor of or never will be. I tried to get to

you after the second poll but was unable to do so."

From West Bend:

"What has transpired the past few days has made us here at the company more united than ever and to show you we mean it, are enclosing herewith a few checks to back up our convictions that the Honorable Senator WILEY will be reelected this fall."

From Eau Claire:

"Incidentally, I was glad to read that you intend to enter the primary in the fall and believe you can win the nomination and the election. As a retired pastor, I can appreciate your position, for the person who does something for his constituency is bound to displease some for it is impossible to please everyone. God bless you."

From Kaukauna:

"I want you to know how badly we feel about the sad turn of events. However, I want you to know that we do not agree with the action taken by the Outagamie County Republican committee. We wish you lots of success in the coming election, and are confident things will work out well for you."

From Milwaukee:

"Believe me, Senator, when I say that I felt very sorry, and the same time my blood pressure was going up more and more, the more I thought of the raw deal that you received at the convention. To think that they would abuse a man like you, after all you did for the welfare of the State. I am just one man of no special importance, but I shall do everything—even go house to house, in order to show them that there are still people that they cannot dictate to. You, Senator, have proven your worth in the Senate. Other men will have to prove themselves in order to come up to your standard, Senator WILEY. Please provide me with any advertising that may be forthcoming during the coming campaign. God bless you, and the best of everything."

From Madison:

"I believe the endorsement of your opponent was most ill-advised. I am certain that the delegates permitted a stampede without reflection as to the real contingency in the accomplishment of their purpose or as to the secondary effects. The convention delegates did not realize that there would be 3 more congressional elections before the expiration of another 6-year term and that if the Republican Party would again gain control of the Senate or the House that it would be nice to have our senior Senator again head the Foreign Affairs Committee."

From Thetford Center, Vt.:

"A native of Wisconsin, but not having lived there for a number of years, I nevertheless have continued my interest in Wisconsin's public affairs. I regret noting in the press the action of the Republican convention at Milwaukee regarding your candidacy to succeed yourself as Senator for another term. I have taken a considerable pride in your leadership in the Senate on matters of high importance in our foreign relations and would like to see you return for another term to help in these crucial years ahead. I should regret to see someone take your place, who has not yet sensed the kind of world we are now living in. Your leadership is needed and I hope the forward-looking people of Wisconsin will wake up by election day."

From St. Paul:

"It was with a great deal of disappointment that I read of the failure of the Wisconsin Republican Party to grant you their endorsement for the 1956 senatorial campaign. Although I am a student at the University of Minnesota, I am a resident of Wisconsin. In my humble opinion, Senator WILEY, you have discharged your duties faithfully and well. My admiration for you comes only from your record of loyalty to our State and Nation and that your efforts should be met with such lack of gratitude by the Wisconsin Republican Party is both shocking and shameful. I am confident that the voters of Wisconsin, myself included, will repudiate this move by returning you to the office you have held so well, and so richly deserve. Pledging every support to you during the campaign and with best wishes for success."

From Milwaukee:

"Here are two votes from a family of independent voters—two votes for WILEY."

From Madison:

"Although I am not a member of the Republican Party, I am thoroughly disgusted with the banal platform they concocted at their State convention in Milwaukee. Further, I feel that they have seriously erred in failing to nominate you as their candidate for reelection. You have my support for 1956—and to prove it, I am enclosing a small contribution to assist you in your campaign."

From Milwaukee:

"The events prove that we must pitch in that much harder and while I seldom participate in a political campaign except to vote, you may depend on me for a moderate contribution to your campaign. I do not like double dealing in politics or even attorneys who take money in washrooms, even as a fee. Keep your chin up. And be thankful for such a gracious and supporting wife."

From Crandon, Wis.:

"Was indeed sorry to hear that the convention did not endorse you, but if it were I—some of those people there—I would not want their endorsement. So get in there and start pitching and we will win yet."

From Shawano, Wis.:

"It is difficult to understand the thinking of the party leaders. You are the first Wisconsin Senator since Senator La Follette to acquire a high committee standing in the Senate, and you have done more for Wisconsin than all our other representatives combined. In my opinion, the action in Milwaukee was disgraceful, but such is politics.

"I am sure the people will see the light and reelect you by a large majority."

From Wausaukee, Wis.:

"In 1951 I went with Taft. Subsequently the Eisenhower power in our county asked me as a Republican to go along with Eisenhower. I did. After that I was on the executive board of our county.

"Now the Republican Party of our county went against Taft and now they are going against Eisenhower, because of their vote against you.

"There is no leadership in Milwaukee to carry out the principles of Eisenhower. They hurt you at Milwaukee even with the split vote. If they had leadership they should, on past record, have given you the total.

"In conclusion, I was a Taft man. I am for you. What can I do to help?"

From Kenosha, Wis.:

"The result of the Republican State convention is an unmasking, therefore a great help for your victory in September and November. Now the people of Wisconsin know who its enemies and yours are; the isolationists in these modern times. Thanks to God, they are only few in comparison.

"Congratulations for what you said (quoted in the Milwaukee Journal)."

From Waukesha, Wis.:

"The politicians who refused to endorse you at Milwaukee this past weekend are not the fellows who put you in office. Most of us don't follow that crowd even in the second district.

"The primaries will tell the real story. I'm sure the real Republicans of the State of Wisconsin will repudiate the endorsement of the Republican convention at Milwaukee.

"So take heart, Senator. You have many real friends in your stable who will back you in your fight for reelection; for it's also our fight to keep the right man in the job."

From Beaver Dam, Wis.:

"May I join the ranks of those who wish you well in the senatorial nomination race? As a Democrat and constituent of Congressman DAVIS, the action of the Republican convention was incomprehensible to me.

"I believe that you have served the people of Wisconsin well, and party affiliations will not prevent me from working for your reelection and supporting you on the major issues for which you have fought so well."

From Milwaukee, Wis.:

"I want to thank you for all you have done for us in the State of Wisconsin. You can rest assured that you have done all in your power to further the cause of peace for our Nation and the world.

"I attended the caucus and convention held in Milwaukee and enjoyed talking with you and Mrs. Wiley. I tried very hard to have people vote for Senator WILEY. Your unit did give you its full unit rule of 43 votes on the first ballot, but as things went along, the pendulum swung the other way.

"Since then, quite a few of us have talked to people, or else the people have come to us, saying that since the demonstration at the convention, they felt you should remain in your office for another term.

"I think that the publicity, even though not too favorable, will aid you in your reelection. As you yourself said, let the people speak, and I am sure they will do so very loudly.

"May God bless you and your good wife who is really a wonderful person. My prayers go with you."

From Milwaukee, Wis.:

"I will do everything I can to campaign for you. As you have served the State and Nation, so every well so much better than our other Senator. You have been instrumental in furthering the St. Lawrence Waterway which surely is to the advantage of our State. You truly have served the State well and I feel confident that the voters of the State will not let you down.

"To me the State convention did not express the thought of the voters. Yours for victory."

From South Wayne, Wis.:

"I am gratified that you had the courage to declare you would enter the State primary even though the State Republican convention did not endorse you. This should show folks who appreciate deeds more than words that the people in control of the party machinery have some selfish ideas. How can they pretend to support President Eisenhower and yet repudiate their representative in the Senate who has supported the President's policies—especially the foreign policy?

"You are in a position to understand its problems more than anyone else, especially one with no experience."

From Cedarburg, Wis.:

"We were shocked the other evening when we learned what the so-called leaders of the Republican Party in Wisconsin had done at the convention.

"May we say that we class ourselves as independent voters and we have regularly supported you. The reason for our support was because you seemed to stand for the things we believed in. We have admired your work in the Senate.

"The leadership as it manifested itself at the convention was perfectly willing and anxious to turn down a man who has integrity, standing, and seniority so that his influence could be felt. A man who has consistently supported the Republican President (who incidentally is the only man who could win a national election for the Republican Party). Such a man was turned down for a nonentity.

"I cannot help but say rather frankly and quite emphatically that such leadership smells."

From Clintonville, Wis.:

"I was very sorry to hear what happened at Milwaukee last week, and while I always leaned toward the Republican Party in the past, I am thoroughly disgusted with their recent action in not endorsing you for reelection.

"Certainly, your past record as our senior Senator is one of which we are justly proud, and I know that I am voicing the sentiments of many of my friends in this vicinity. We simply cannot comprehend the action of the State's Republican Party.

"Anyhow, I want you to know that you have very many loyal friends who are for you all the way and have not forgotten how you have supported our great President wholeheartedly and always worked for the best interests of Wisconsin and our country, and I cannot help feel that time will prove what a loyal and efficient servant you have been to the voters of Wisconsin, and I, for one, hope in all sincerity that you will be our Senator from Wisconsin for many years to come."

From Sullivan, Wis.:

"Rest assured that we fully appreciate the good work you have done during your past 18 years in the Senate, and no doubt will continue to do in the future.

"The Republican State convention chose to take the lowest, most intolerant course of action attesting to their moral bankruptcy, hypocrisy, brutality, ingratitude, and disrespect for their own senior Senator of their own State.

"Such ruthless, incompetent, and ungrateful individuals are not fit to govern themselves much less to select those to represent the good and honest citizens of this grand State of Wisconsin.

"From what I hear in this community most of our people are fully behind you and are getting sick and tired of the chicanery at these political conventions.

"In full appreciation of your good work and with best wishes for your continued success, I remain."

From Madison, Wis.:

"It has been a frustrating experience to sit here in Madison watching the shenanigans of the GOPers in Milwaukee today. When will they ever learn? I asked my son to express my regrets at my inability to be present because of illness, but he tells me that after 10 minutes of looking in he discovered all decisions had been made, and he is too busy a person to wait for the puppeteer to pull the string, so he came home. I am sure there must be many others who feel the same way.

"May I offer my congratulations that you did not get the endorsement? You will go further without it."

From Oconomowoc, Wis.:

"We were extremely sorry you didn't get Republican backing at the convention and are writing now to urge you to fight for your position.

"We are on your mailing list, so we have been following your work for a long time and feel you have our interests and our welfare always in mind."

From Clintonville, Wis.:

"I can assure you that you will win both in the primary in September and in the election in November better now than if the convention had given you their endorsement. You have served Wisconsin faithfully, and I am sure the people will back you to the limit. There are, of course, times when I have not agreed 100 percent with you, that is the way for a Republic to be. The people have the right to think as free people should. This is the good old United States of America, and conditions cannot become like in Russia, where people cannot even dare to think for themselves. Be assured we will support you at the polls. Best of wishes to you, and you will win."

From Milwaukee, Wis.:

"Just a note to tell you that I am on your side on this failure of endorsement convention just concluded here in Milwaukee. I agree with all the Milwaukee Journal said in its editorial last night about shabby treatment given you by the delegates to this convention. I have been a Republican all my life, but sometimes get pretty ashamed of our party. I have been ashamed of the treatment accorded our great President and ashamed of the treatment accorded you. You will be vindicated on September 11 and later on this fall."

From Racine, Wis.:

"Just a note to say we have followed your recent experience at Milwaukee very closely. We believe the attitude taken is entirely out of line and entirely uncalled for. And, incidentally, we are not the only ones in this vicinity who have the same opinion.

"We are glad to note that you are going into the fight with the determination that some people sometimes go the wrong way, as at the Milwaukee convention. We believe you will put it over. We are with you all the way, 100 percent.

"Rest assured I will continue to talk you up on every occasion possible to the end, and that I will do my part in making your every effort successful."

From Benton, Wis.:

"I want you to know how sorry I am that the Republican convention did not see fit to endorse you at the Milwaukee meeting Saturday, and I want to urge you to keep up the fight for the nomination. I was very happy that the delegation from Lafayette County stuck solid for your endorsement. At no time during the balloting was there any thought of changing our support. It is amazing to me how few people in an organization as big as the Republican Party of Wisconsin can start a steamroller in reverse and have them carried away by hysteria, mob rule, or whatever it was that struck them.

"Keep up the fight. The rank and file of people will support you if you continue to give them the facts as you have in the past."

From Northena, Wis.:

"This is to let you know that, despite the recent action of the State Republican Party I personally shall continue to support you. Last Thursday night I wrote an editorial for this week's issue indicating this support; the official GOP action has in no way altered my decision to print that editorial.

"While I have not always agreed with you, it would be unnatural for 2 individuals to be in 100 percent agreement, I am personally satisfied that you deserve reelection. Best of success in your campaign."

From Milwaukee, Wis.:

"Just a few more words of encouragement in your coming campaign to retain your Senate seat. I'm sure many, many Wisconsinites have viewed the recent Republican convention in Milwaukee with as much disappointment as I have. Your representation of Wisconsin in Washington has always been consistent with both our national and international needs and demands, and I am sure that our citizens will reject the present attempt by the few to force another reactionary candidate down our throats.

"There are many of us working for your victory and the defeat of the big-money dictators this coming fall. Be sure this is one vote they will never buy. (And they'll find $150,000 won't be near enough to bribe the Wisconsin citizenry)."

From South Milwaukee:

"I'm sorry to hear that the Republican convention did not pick you as their candidate—but the people will.

"You have a fine record in the Senate and I am sure in the primary your vote will be at least double your opponent's. If there is any way that you wish me to help you in your campaign please call on me."

From Monroe:

"I was a small part of the initial movement in 1951 and 1952 for the citizens of Eisenhower. It was during this period that the Republican leaders of Wisconsin would not accept the known will of the people and remained with their isolationist ideals until almost the bitter end. During this period I tried to fulfill my position in the first Congressional District until I was recalled into the United States Navy.

"You may rest with confidence that another revolt to common welfare and logic will supplant the dictative patterns of a biased group who have remained with an old, betrodden and outdated ideal."

From Clintonville:

"I am sure that the people of Wisconsin have not forgotten the services which you have rendered this State.

"I can assure you of my continued loyal support and that I will actively work for your nomination."

From Augusta:

"I will be forwarding your nomination papers in a day or two and if there is anything else I can do for you in my community or in the State, I will surely be glad to do it for you. I am going out and battle for ALEX WILEY for Senator and will be very glad to sit in with your committee, if necessary, to form a nucleus to put you over in Wisconsin."

From Whitefish Bay:

"It is with great regret that we find the Republican leaders of the State of Wisconsin to be so shortsighted and apparently selfishly guided by vested interests to the degree that people are sacrificed regardless of their excellent record in the interests of the good of all. Plainly we mean that we think the Wisconsin Republican Convention just finished is an outright expression of the old saying, 'That the people be damned.' They have decided in their selection of another candidate to be endorsed by the party rather than recognizing your splendid record of action in the interest of American welfare. We want to tell you that it is our hope that all of the people will study their behavior and not miss the implications in their decision in the coming election. We assure you that we, because of our interest in public life as public school people, do recognize and appreciate your services and beliefs that you have practiced as United States Senator from Wisconsin. We want you to go ahead with faith and determination in the belief that you will be continued as Senator in the next election."

From Hudson:

"I was very much perturbed over the action taken at the State Republican Convention last week. I consider myself a party man, but I cannot and will not abide by the convention dictate in your case. It would seem that some of our people, a very few, I hope, gave no thought whatever as to what happened in the farmer labor Democrat presidential election this spring in our neighboring State of Minnesota. The two cases are very similar, and I predict that the thinking voters will give you a good majority. I was very happy to have already had the privilege of signing my name to your nomination papers and will hold to my conviction that you have given Wisconsin and the whole Nation the best representation that is possible. Your good works will not be forgotten come election time."

From Madison:

"May I disclose to you my personal feeling of resentment at the action taken by the Republican Convention in Milwaukee? In the refreshing colloquialism, I hope you go on to lick the socks off of their candidate in the primary."

From Watertown:

"I have always been an admirer of your work in the Senate. True, I have often disagreed with you on specific legislation, but you have acted with integrity and have attempted to serve the interests of your State

and the country at large. I am a young mother of four children, and my time and energies are necessarily limited. However, if there is anything I can do to help further your campaign, any way in which my small voice may be added to protest the action of the State convention, please feel free to call on me."

From Sparta:

"Though the whole State blushes, you may be comforted in the knowledge that the whole State is behind you. Your fine service to the Nation won you the respect and admiration of all."

From Milwaukee:

"It was with a feeling of tremendous regret that I read this morning of the shameful handling you received at the State GOP convention. However, it came not as a complete surprise, for I feel that action lacking good judgment can and must be expected from the State organization because of the extremely low level of the personally ambitious know-nothings who have apparently taken the reins of the State GOP. My very firm conviction is that all thinking Republicans whose vision extends beyond their personal aggrandizement, and likewise those who have the real national welfare at heart, will certainly be heard in a strong and effective voice in September when we return you to the Chambers in which you have worked tirelessly as a man of sound judgment and admirable integrity."

From Milwaukee:

"For the last several years it has been quite apparent to me that the Republican Party of Wisconsin is controlled by a collection of political crackpots. My wife and I would like to take this opportunity to inform you that despite the decision of the State convention, we back your candidacy 100 percent."

From Milwaukee:

"I feel that the recent disgraceful actions of the local Republican organization in denying you the chance for nomination certainly does not meet with the approval of all good Republicans. To say the least, your excellent record should entitle you to the opportunity to continue in your high office with the approval of those who have benefited by your long service at Washington."

From Fond du Lac:

"I am sure that I am expressing the sentiments of many Wisconsin citizens when I say that we are not in agreement with the action taken at the State convention. It is with great satisfaction to hear that you will let the people decide as to whom they wish to have represent them in the United States Senate. We appreciate very much the great efforts put forth by you during the time while you have so ably represented our cause in Washington. Do not hesitate to let us know if and when we can be of service in connection with the coming election, or any other matter where our help would be needed."

From Milwaukee:

"As a Wisconsin Republican, I was more than a little disgusted with the results of the recent State convention. You are assured of my vote in the fall primary, Senator."

From Milwaukee:

"Just a note to say I think the treatment given you at the State convention was shameful. I will have a chance to show how I feel in the primary, as will thousands of other Wisconsin voters. There seems to be no organization more stupid than the Republican State organization."

From Milwaukee:

"What has happened this weekend in Wisconsin was a disgrace to our State's politics, a few Wisconsin men railroaded their plans through the State Republican convention.

"I am writing as a Milwaukee independent who usually votes Democratic and who has followed your leadership in international defense for the last several years. You have been the only Wisconsin Senator who has understood what we face in our danger from Russian imperialism; and you have furthered our State's interests through your defense of the St. Lawrence seaway bill. * * * Your setback this weekend will further your interests more than any indorsement by the isolationist holdovers and pseudo-kingmakers of our State, who don't realize that the times have changed. * * * Please excuse the typing, but I have been upset all day about this."

From Watertown:

"We were much disappointed by the action taken by the convention in Milwaukee yesterday. I assume that a phase of isolationism is responsible for the action taken. I think your stand on foreign aid is fundamentally sound. It is Christian. I think if you hammer home that truth you can get the necessary support. The sentiment for foreign aid is not as vocal as that opposed to it."

From Madison:

"I was extremely disappointed at the action of the convention last Saturday. I will give you my unqualified support. If you will send me some of your nomination papers I will take care of them."

From Milwaukee:

"I wish at this time to offer my services to you in furtherance of your candidacy in the coming senatorial campaign. I am in fundamental agreement with your position and wish to help further the same. * * * My experience in the conduct of political campaigns is extremely limited; however, my background is such that I feel I may be of some benefit and assistance."

From Mosinee:

"There is every evidence that certain people within the Republican Party are now looking for trouble. I say this advisedly. A house divided against itself cannot exist. I had the privilege to cast my first ballot in the year 1915. Never before have I witnessed such intraparty chicanery."

From Waunakee:

"As an independent voter I have much admired your stand on many of the basic issues before the Nation and I have been equally disgusted with the shabby treatment given you by the regular Republican organization of Wisconsin. Dozens of my friends, Republican, Democrat, and Independent in view feel the same way. You will receive warm support in your campaign."

From Marinette:

"In view of the fact that you will have to combat $150,000 worth of reactionary propaganda, we are enclosing a small check to help neutralize it."

From Waukesha:

"I would like to assure you at this time that a great many of us heartily disapprove of tactics of this nature, and I wanted to offer my assistance in any way which might be helpful in the coming primary. * * * I sincerely appreciate all that you did for me in 1953 when I requested your assistance and will be only too happy to take this opportunity if you see fit to be of any service to you that might be helpful or beneficial to you in your coming campaign."

From a Wisconsin citizen in Bloomington, Ill.:

"Needless to say I am not at all in sympathy with the manner in which this convention paid its respects to its senior Senator from Wisconsin. I am also certain that the Wisconsin voters will indicate their dislike of this entire matter when next they come to the polls for the primary election. * * * When one has devoted so much of his life as a public servant and has done the very best in a Christian and honest manner as you have done for the people of Wisconsin, one must indeed have the patience of the Good Lord Himself to sum up enough courage and turn the other cheek."

From Madison:

"After what the Republicans did at their convention though I actually believe I have become convinced that I will become a Democrat. I say this in all seriousness because I know I could never get along with a bunch of hypocrites who pay lip service to the President and then proceed to pull their support from a man who has backed the President over 90 percent of the time."

From Platteville:

"The manipulations of certain of the alleged leaders of the Republican Party in Wisconsin, plus the underwriting of huge subscriptions to the party, are examples of incidents which lead to the charges of bossism."

From Clintonville:

"It was not only you but Eisenhower and what we believe to be the best leaders of the Republican Party. That the blow fell on you brings the question out into the open to the people of Wisconsin and the Nation because your record as a Christian, a citizen and a statesman is inviolable. This really puts you in place to use your viking courage, your fearless but your fair leadership. You are fighting for the very sacred principles of our way of life, and I pray and hope that your health will enable you to face the problem for the good of your State, your party, and your Nation. * * * I have never in any political experience seen such a reaction against the party and in your favor as is going around me everywhere."

From Fond du Lac:

"I was very much perturbed about the manner in which you were treated at Milwaukee, but if it has made other people in Wisconsin as mad as it made me, you will have gained plenty. I am glad our group from Fond du Lac stuck with you."

From Port Washington:

"It was again my pleasure to circulate your nomination blank which is enclosed herewith.

"You record at Washington speaks for itself, and I am sure, come election day, the results will be most favorable for you.

"Keep up the good work."

From Hurley:

"I am herewith enclosing your nomination paper properly filled out, and wish you all the luck in the world.

"It was a dirty trick to pass you up at the convention and feel confident you will come through on top, and whatever I can do for you I surely will."

From Sheboygan:

"My husband and I have been Republicans all our lives. To say we were utterly disgusted with the treatment you received in Milwaukee yesterday is putting it mildly.

"We and most of our relatives and friends in Sheboygan are for you and your policies wholeheartedly. Hence we are proud of your determination to let the people decide this fall."

From Milwaukee:

"Sorry about the insult you experienced in Milwaukee. We have a lot of stupid, ill-mannered, unappreciative, dumb louts. However, it has reacted to your benefit. Of 100 people I have talked to over 90 percent said they were for WILEY and some stated it riled them to read of your experience and darned if they wouldn't work for you and snow under the numbskulls. Many said WILEY will get back 4 to 1 or better. * * * Keep up the good work."

From Madison:

"Please send me about a dozen nomination sheets, for distribution among independents who are anxious to circulate them. I will see that they get back."

From Milwaukee:

"As you yourself have stated, the people will judge and make the final decision. I was very glad to know that you are going to run for nomination on your own without support of the organization. This great

country of ours has been founded and its progress has been sponsored by men like yourself who down through the years have opposed machine and boss politics.

"I shall request and urgently ask my friends to support you in the coming primary election."

From South Wayne:

"I am gratified that you had the courage to declare you would enter the State primary even though the State Republican convention did not endorse you. This should show folks who appreciate deeds more than words that the people in control of the party machinery have some selfish ideas. How can they pretend to support President Eisenhower and yet repudiate their representative in the Senate who has supported the President's policies—especially the foreign policy?

"You are in a position to understand its problems more than anyone else, especially one with no experience."

From Winneconne:

"You are doing a good job for us folks from Wisconsin, and for the Nation in general, and feel sure that you will weather the storm and receive a good vote in the primary."

From Kenosha:

"We are very disturbed about the result of the convention at Milwaukee last week. However, we did note that the Kenosha delegation did vote for your renomination.

"May we wish you good luck on your endeavors for gaining the nomination in the primary."

From Fort Atkinson:

"It almost makes me cry when I think of how you must feel—knowing you have done a hard job so well and realizing the little that matters to 'them'—all they care about is obtaining anyone who is more inclined to their ways. It's absolutely disgraceful and more.

"Perhaps you might like to know that there are citizens of Wisconsin—and the Nation, I would venture, who are outraged by all this—and intend to show our opinions in September—by voting for you, sir—a proven man and worker for what you feel is right and best."

From Milwaukee:

"The weakness of the Wisconsin Republican Party organization is evidenced in the treatment they accorded you and the things you have worked for at their recent gathering.

"With many other people in this area, I look forward to your name on the ballot in September."

From West De Pere:

"I feel compelled, nevertheless, as one of your constituents, to express my personal appreciation for your 18 years of loyal and honorable public service. Because of our divergent political philosophies, I have not often been in accord with your voting record. I believe, however, that you respect my right to that difference of opinion in the same way that I respect yours.

"On the other hand, all thinking Americans must recognize integrity and sincerity of purpose in our public officers, regardless of party. Your recent rebuff by your own political party was, in my humble opinion, unwarranted, undignified, and a discredit to our State. Your record of conscientious fulfillment of duty for 14 years in the party of opposition and your tenacious support of the President during the past 4 years of Republican administration, certainly merit for you now the right to carry the Republican banner in the senatorial election this year."

From Racine:

"Your display of independence will be attractive to Wisconsin voters who on past occasions have shown disrespect for labels—political convention recommendations—the kingmakers and their sycophants. The turmoil into which the Milwaukee convention descended will be a factor in your favor and success."

From Waukesha:

"It was a shame the way they treated you at Milwaukee last Saturday, however, it may yet work out satisfactorily. There are a number of us who do not like it and I feel sure that you will get considerable support."

From Hudson:

"We wish to again assure you that we are behind you 100 percent and will do everything possible to get you reelected to the job that you deserve. My phone has been ringing and people have been stopping by to find out what happened."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, let me say to the senior Senator from Wisconsin that I think in all fairness he should apologize to the man whose integrity he has just impugned. The Senator's opponent is a very distinguished Member of the House of Representatives. I think the senior Senator from Wisconsin should not, by innuendo, create the impression that there is something wrong with the fact that his opponent obtained some campaign funds. Every man who runs for office must have campaign funds. There is no evidence whatsoever—absolutely none—that a fund of $150,000 was pledged. The senior Senator from Wisconsin knows that to be so. Moreover, there is not the slightest evidence to support the charge about oil and gas interests. Under the circumstances, these charges must be put down as irresponsible.

In all fairness to a Member of the House of Representatives, even though he happens to be the opponent of the senior Senator from Wisconsin, I think the senior Senator should apologize to him. I think the senior Senator from Wisconsin should tell the Senate that he has no evidence of any kind, shape, or form as to where his opponent's campaign funds will come from. The senior Senator from Wisconsin could tell us where his own campaign funds will come from; he knows that. But the senior Senator from Wisconsin does not know where GLENN DAVIS' campaign funds come from.

GLENN DAVIS is one of the most honorable gentlemen I know. In the past I have seen the reports regarding his campaign contributions. They compare more than favorably with those of my senior colleague; and I think it is shoddy and unusual for him to use the floor of the Senate to attack his opponent without any proof whatsoever. I think he should apologize to Mr. DAVIS now, on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am sorry the junior Senator from Wisconsin has exposed his hand so clearly.

Mr. McCARTHY. My hand has always been exposed; there is nothing secret about where I stand.

Mr. WILEY. When the junior Senator from Wisconsin starts to talk about apologies, I think there is one who should apologize, and it is he.

Mr. President, what did I say? For one thing, I said what is common knowledge, and is not denied—namely, that these three kingmakers guaranteed a fund; and it was stated by Mr. Dalton, who is the agent of my opponent. I said I did not know where the money would come from. But I think it would be well to find out.

I have asked what changed the attitude of the man who previously told the people of the State he would not become a candidate. Was it the pledge of $150,000? Was it? Let us find out. He alone can tell us. If the money is clean, if it does not create any obligation to follow what others think, it is not for me to complain.

I am only saying that if a contribution of $2,500 can create the stir which it did on the floor of the Senate, I think we ought to give a little heed when tactics are such that a person proceeds along a certain line, indicating that he will not be a candidate, and then changes his course when a pledge of $150,000 decides the question. Let us get the answer. When it is forthcoming, I shall be glad to see it.

I do not like the attitude of the junior Senator from Wisconsin in trying to tell me what I should do. In all the years when the opportunities were multitudinous, I never tried to tell him what he should do. Until now he has gone about his business and I have gone about mine. But now he is meddling in my business.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, let me say to my colleague that it was not four "kingmakers" who repudiated him. It was the rank and file of the Republican Party. I forget the number. The Senator probably remembers it better than I do. It was some 1,700 representatives of the rank and file of the Republican Party who repudiated him. There are no "kingmakers" in Wisconsin. The charge of my colleague that $150,000 was raised is completely false. He knows that. He should not make such a charge. We should not have that type of campaign in Wisconsin.

My senior colleague has a very honorable opponent. The voters of Wisconsin may select my senior colleague. They may select Mr. DAVIS. As I told my senior colleague, I intend to make no public speeches in the primary campaign. If he gets the nomination, and if he wants my support, I will support the Republican candidate. I say "if he wants my support." But let us not throw around wild and completely irresponsible charges about $150,000 and about oil and gas interests. Let us not try to create the impression that it was the "kingmakers" who repudiated my senior colleague. It was the rank and file of the Republican Party of Wisconsin who decided that he had not been a good Senator, and that they did not want him to serve them in the future. They so voted.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the primary the people will decide whether or not the junior Senator from Wisconsin knows what he is talking about. There is every indication that he is as biased in this case as he is in many other cases. When he talks about knowing what the future will hold, he goes into a class where he does not belong.

The night before the convention there were pledged to the senior Senator from Wisconsin enough votes to nominate him on the first ballot. The rules were rigged. On Friday I was to be voted upon first. The rules were rigged, so

that I was not voted upon until late Saturday. According to the program, I was to be voted upon first. The manipulators sat up until 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning to do the job. The result was that the man who would not be a candidate was chosen. Why would he not become a candidate? Ask some of his associates. The $150,000 had not yet been pledged, when he stated he would not be a candidate. But it was pledged Saturday morning. It did the job. The Journal got the story and published it. The Journal is one of the great newspapers of America, in spite of what the junior Senator from Wisconsin says. A large percentage of it is owned by the employees. The Senator's abuse cannot hurt it.

I never took the opportunity on the floor of the Senate to talk about my associate as he has talked about me. Something seems to have gotten under his skin. The facts will show in the future what got under his skin.

Mr. McCARTHY subsequently said:

Mr. President, although I have not been able to verify it, I have just been informed that Representative DAVIS, who was accused of receiving oil and gas money, voted against the natural gas bill. I personally voted for it. I thought it was a good bill. But I think—since the charge has been made, by innuendo, that Representative DAVIS received oil and gas funds—that the RECORD should be clear that Mr. DAVIS voted against the gas bill. As I have said, I have not been able to verify this information. I have just received a call from the House to that effect.

SALE OF INHERITED INTERESTS IN ALLOTTED LANDS IN THE TULALIP RESERVATION, WASH.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3920) to authorize the partition or sale of inherited interests in allotted lands in the Tulalip Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words with respect to the legislation now pending before the Senate, S. 3920. I introduced this bill at the request of the Tulalip Tribes of Indians in the State of Washington.

The Indians on this reservation have recently been approached by a major oil company which desires to build a large refinery on the reservation lands. It is an excellent opportunity for the Indians in the community to derive tremendous economic benefits, and there is unanimity on the part of the membership of the tribes in attempting to make it possible for this refinery to be built.

There is one great difficulty which must first be overcome before the reservations lands can be utilized properly. As in the case of most reservations, the Tulalip Tribes have a very complex heirship land problem; that is, the lands on the reservation were allotted years ago and have since passed into multiple ownership. More than 15,000 acres out of a total of almost 18,000 acres on the reservation are in this fractionated status. If the lands are to be utilized at all, a legislative solution for this heirship problem must be found, and it is the opinion of the Indians, the Department of the Interior, and myself, that the language of S. 3920 will clarify the situation.

Briefly, Mr. President, this bill has two purposes. First, to permit any owner of an undivided interest in any trust or restricted lands on the Tulalip Reservation to go into the courts of the State of Washington and request that the land be partitioned, or if this is impractical, have it sold in accordance with State law. Second, it authorizes the tribal board of directors to sell tribal lands with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior.

The objective of the tribe under this legislation is to consolidate the lands of the reservation by buying up the individual tracts as they are sold under the laws of the State. In this way the tribe will be able to offer the oil company a suitable site for its refinery with the necessary access to deep water.

Mr. President, I want the record to show that the Indians on the Tulalip Reservation are a well-integrated group of citizens, and are recognized as being competent to administer their own affairs. They have adopted a resolution which is contained in the Senate report on S. 3920 requesting that I introduce this bill for them. They are desirous that the legislation be passed so that the proper steps may be taken to bring this important economic asset into their community. The fact that these people are trying to help themselves individually and collectively is highly commendable, and the passage of this bill would be of great assistance to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3920) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any owner of an interest in any tract of land in the Tulalip Reservation, Wash., in which any undivided interest is now or hereafter held in trust by the United States for an Indian, or is now or hereafter owned by an Indian subject to restrictions against alienation or taxation imposed by the United States, may commence in a State court of competent jurisdiction an action for the partition in kind or for the sale of such land in accordance with the laws of the State. For the purpose of any such action the Indian owners shall be regarded as vested with an unrestricted fee simple title to the land, the United States shall not be a necessary party to the proceeding, and any partition or conveyance of the land pursuant to the proceeding shall divest the United States of title to the land, terminate the Federal trust, and terminate all restrictions against alienation or taxation of the land imposed by the United States.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of the constitution and charter of the Tulalip Tribes of the Tulalip Reservation, any lands that are held by the United States in trust for the Tulalip Tribes, or that are subject to a restriction against alienation or taxation imposed by the United States, or that are hereafter acquired by the Tulalip Tribes, may be sold by the Tulalip Board of Directors, with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior, on such terms and conditions as the Tulalip Board of Directors may prescribe, and such sale shall terminate the Federal trust or restrictions against alienation of taxation of the land: *Provided*, That the proceeds from the sale of any tribal lands acquired otherwise than by purchase shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Tulalip Tribes and shall not be expended until otherwise specifically provided by Congress.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9390) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 10, 16, 27, 28, and 35 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18 to the bill, and agreed to the same with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10899) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PRESTON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. YATES, Mr. SHELLEY, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CLEVENGER, Mr. BOW, Mr. HORAN, Mr. MILLER of Maryland, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 1671. An act for the relief of Clement E. Sprouse;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Elizabeth Doherty;

H. R. 2216. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1948 (ch. 511, 62 Stat. 489), relating to the retention in the service of disabled commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army and Air Force;

H. R. 3996. An act to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945;

H. R. 4229. An act to provide running mates for certain staff corps officers in the naval service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4437. An act relating to withholding for State employee retirement system purposes, on the compensation of certain civilian employees of the National Guard and the Air National Guard;

H. R. 4569. An act to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes;

H. R. 4704. An act to provide for the examination preliminary to promotion of officers of the naval service;

H. R. 5268. An act to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the payment of mileage allowances for overland travel by private conveyance

outside the continental limits of the United States;

H. R. 7679. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Muskogee, Okla.;

H. R. 8477. An act to amend title II of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, by providing flexibility in the distribution of women officers in the grades of commander and lieutenant commander, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8490. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Bonham, Tex.;

H. R. 8674. An act to provide for the return of certain property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.;

H. R. 9358. An act to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to issue a deed to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for certain land heretofore conveyed to such city, removing the conditions and reservations made a part of such prior conveyance; and

H. R. 10251. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to deed certain land to the city of Grand Junction, Colo.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE PIPESTONE NATIONAL MONUMENT, MINN.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2060, House bill 8225.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8225) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Pipestone National Monument in the State of Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, H. R. 8225, if enacted, would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to add to the Pipestone National Monument, Minn., not more than 250 acres of adjacent Federal land, as the Secretary deems necessary to protect archeological remains, and to acquire not more than 10 acres of non-Federal land as he considers necessary to improve the boundary of the monument.

No appropriation of Federal funds is authorized by this legislation.

The Pipestone National Monument, created by the act of August 25, 1937 (50 Stat. 804), covers an area of 115.86 acres. The Federal land which would be added by H. R. 8225 contains important remains of the red pipestone quarry which served as a source of stone of unique properties from which many tribes of North American Indians fashioned their pipes. This land is part of the Pipestone school reserve, consisting of a tract of 532 acres of land, which has been abandoned and is surplus to the needs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The committee notes that the city of Pipestone, Minn., is interested in acquiring that portion of the tract that is not added to the monument. Therefore, it is the intent of the Federal agencies to dispose of such lands in accordance with surplus-property procedures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TROUT HATCHERY ON THE DAVIDSON RIVER, N. C.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2061, H. R. 9822.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9822) to provide for the establishment of a trout hatchery on the Davidson River in Pisgah National Forest in North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to offer an amendment to the bill. I am very glad, indeed, that the people of North Carolina are about to have a new fish hatchery established in Pisgah National Forest. In my State the fish hatchery which serves the Green Mountain National Forest is in need of reconstruction, equipment, and so forth, over a period of years. The appropriation for this year was $32,000.

It seems to me that equal consideration should be given to the needs of the Green Mountain National Forest as compared with the Pisgah National Forest. Therefore, I offer an amendment to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The secretary will state the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May I inquire whether the Senator from Vermont has submitted his amendment to the committee?

Mr. FLANDERS. No; I heard of this matter for the first time today. Year after year hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent on brandnew fish hatcheries, while at the same time a paltry $25,000 or $30,000 a year is appropriated for the fish hatchery in the Green Mountain National Forest, which is a program that has already been adopted by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not wish to disagree with the Senator from Vermont that Vermont has not been equitably treated, because I am not informed on that point. However, I believe that the amendment the Senator has in mind should follow the orderly procedure by being submitted first to the committee. If the Senator from Vermont insists on offering his amendment at this time, the majority leader is not in a position to accept it, because the author of the pending bill, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], is not on the floor, and the chairman of the committee has not held hearings on the Senator's amendment. If the Senator insists on his amendment, the majority leader will request that the Senate proceed to the consideration of some other bill.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to say to the Senator from Texas that I had assumed right along that the regular appropriation bill carried appropriations for the building and improvement of Federal fish hatcheries in the national forests and in other places. Nevertheless, from time to time bills providing special appropriations are introduced and considered. I feel it to be my duty to my constituents that I try to get the same treatment for Vermont.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I believe the Senator should try to do so; but he should follow the course pursued by the Senator from North Carolina, in having his bill referred to the appropriate committee and asking that the committee give it consideration and then having the committee report the bill to the Senate. If the Senator from Vermont were to follow that procedure, the Senator from Texas would be very glad to join him in urging the committee to give consideration to his bill.

The Senator from Texas does not wish to defeat the bill of the Senator from North Carolina by injecting into its consideration a matter which has not had consideration by the committee. If the Senator from Vermont insists on offering his amendment, the majority leader will ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of another measure.

The Senator from Texas would like to see the Senator from Vermont introduce his bill in the regular order; and the Senator from Texas will join him in asking the committee to give him a hearing on the bill. The Senator from Texas has no doubt that the committee will consider the needs of the State of Vermont as presented to it by the Senator from Vermont, who so ably represents it, in part.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, there are two comments which I should like to make on what the Senator from Texas has said. The first is that I have not the slightest animus toward the people of North Carolina; in fact, I have feelings of deep friendliness toward them and toward its representatives in the Senate. I do not wish to do anything which would in any way jeopardize what they have in mind and what they are asking for. That is one-half of the problem.

The second half of the problem is the question—and this is parliamentary—whether such a bill can be introduced in the Senate. Must not such a bill be introduced in the House?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Oh no; the Senator may introduce such a bill in the Senate. It is purely an authorization bill.

Mr. FLANDERS. It is purely an authorization bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct. The distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is a member of the committee that would consider such a bill. If the Senator from Vermont introduces such a bill, the Senator from Texas will ask the committee to give it consideration and to make a report on it to the Senate during this session of Congress.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, in view of my friendship toward the people of North Carolina and the Senators who represent that State in the Senate, and because of the very wise observations of the Senator from Texas, instead of trying to amend the pending bill, I shall submit my amendment to the Senate in the form of a separate bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the Senator's cooperation, and I assure him of mine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 9822) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2058, H. R. 3255.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3255) to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to preserve the rates of compensation of certain officers and employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to preserve the basic compensation of certain officers and employees whose rates of pay are fixed under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, whose positions have been or may be reduced to a lower grade by virtue of a reclassification action.

The Classification Act of 1949, as amended, authorizes the departments and agencies to allocate positions to appropriate grades in accordance with standards published by the Civil Service Commission. Such initial allocations are subject to review and confirmation by the Civil Service Commission. When the Commission dissents with the allocation of one or more positions it has the authority to order the allocation changed.

There have been instances where agency allocations have stood as initially established for several years and upon the second or third audit by the Commission were ordered reduced to a lower grade. In other instances, initial agency allocations were not audited for a period of several years. In still other instances, the agencies on their own volition reclassified positions to a lower grade. In any event, the downgrading of a position and resultant loss of pay to an employee who is but the victim of circumstances over which he has no control and for which he is in nowise responsible is highly demoralizing and most inequitable.

The Civil Service Commission in its report of June 13, 1955, on H. R. 3255, as introduced, raised a number of questions regarding the wording of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina subsequently said:

Mr. President, I have a statement in connection with Calendar No. 2058, House bill 3255, to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to preserve the rates of compensation of certain officers and employees, which explains the bill, and I should like to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

H. R. 3255 amends title V of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, by adding at the end thereof subsection 507 which is designed to preserve the basic compensation of employees whose positions have been downgraded since July 1, 1954, or may be downgraded in the future by virtue of a reclassification action.

The fixing of pay rates for positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is done by the agencies on the basis of standards promulgated by the Civil Service Commission. The Civil Service Commission has the responsibility for making post audits of the rates established by the agencies which frequently results in a downgrading of the positions. It is not uncommon for the downgrading to occur 4 or 5 or more years after the rate of pay was established by the agency. The result is that the individuals filling the downgraded positions become the unfortunate victims of factors beyond their control. The resultant loss of pay to employees who may have made long-range financial commitments based on a rate of pay they had every reason to believe would continue in effect is of serious consequence.

Extensive hearings were held on the bill in the House July 11 and 26, 1955, during which there was general agreement by the Civil Service Commission and employee organizations as to the need for corrective action. As a matter of fact, the Commission attempted to fulfill the objectives of H. R. 3255 by administrative regulation but the Comptroller General ruled on October 31, 1955, that it was without legal authority to do so. Accordingly, there is need for legislation as embodied in H. R. 3255.

It is to be noted:

First, that the bill does not apply to the supergrade positions.

Second, that the bill applies only to career employees.

Third, that an employee must have held the position being downgraded for a period of at least 2 years and performed the duties of the position in a satisfactory manner.

Fourth, that the bill will give no employee retroactive pay.

Fifth, that employee whose rate of pay is preserved will receive no further increases until protection of his salary is no longer required.

These are all good provisions and will serve to make the bill workable and equitable for both the Government and its employees.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR; HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE; AND RELATED AGENCIES, 1957

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2116, House bill 9720, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor; Health, Education, and Welfare; and related agencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9720) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor; Health, Education, and Welfare; and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is not planned that the Senate shall discuss the bill today, because it has not been before the Senate the necessary 3 days under the rule. We plan to have the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] call it up tomorrow.

GLORIA LOCKERMAN

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, during the past few months a little 12-year-old girl from Baltimore, Md., named Gloria Lockerman, has captured the respect and admiration of millions of Americans. Frankly, I consider her one of the best goodwill ambassadors Maryland has produced in years.

Gloria has been able to do all of this by the way in which she has conducted herself during her numerous appearances on two nationally televised shows entitled "The $64,000 Question" and "The $64,000 Challenge."

Some months ago, in the $64,000 question show, she won her championship in spelling, and incidentally, as I recall, some $8,000. More recently, on the $64,000 Challenge show, she has been pitted against another 12-year-old spelling wizard from Greenwich, Conn., named Andrew Douglass.

These two young experts in the fine, old, and, I am sorry to say, disappearing art of spelling week after week have spelled correctly every multisyllable word tossed at them. In fact they deadlocked by reason of each having spelled correctly the words which were given to them at the $64,000 plateau.

And so, last night Gloria and Andy were each given checks for $32,000 and the contest was declared a draw. However, it was obvious to those of us who watched the performance that, in a sense, Gloria was disappointed that the sponsors did not permit the match to go on. In fact when asked whether or not she was pleased with the decision to declare the match a draw, and to give each contestant $32,000, she said, "I do not know, I have been studying so hard."

Accordingly, I should like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to this young lady, not only for her spelling proficiency but, equally important, for the well-demeanored way in which she conducted herself at all times; and last but not least for her courage and humble, but firm, confidence in herself. In particular, to my distinguished colleagues from the fine State of Connecticut, I should like to say that while it is very clear that Connecticut turns out excellent spellers, too, thanks to Miss Lockerman, the Nation recognizes that the championship still resides in Baltimore, Md.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of an editorial which appeared in the May 5 issue of the Afro-American concerning Miss Lockerman entitled "And Still Champion."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AND STILL CHAMPION

Gloria Lockerman's appearance on the $64,000 Challenge television program last Sunday served to further endear her to millions of fans over the country.

Perhaps because of her challenger's extremely confident (is "cocky" the word?) attitude, the spelling queen of the airwaves seemed quite nervous.

We hope Gloria bears in mind that she doesn't have to deal with the challenger to win—all she has to do is spell the words—and her past performances have proven her ability to do this.

Win, lose or draw, Gloria will in reality still be the champ.

Why? Because she's a healthy, well-rounded girl with excellent spelling ability—not a professional prodigy who reads books on history and political science rather than comic books.

ANTITRUST RECORD OF EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the antitrust record of the Eisenhower administration.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER PERTAINING TO THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION'S ANTITRUST RECORD

Antitrust aims to promote free competition in open markets. This policy is a prime tenet of free enterprise. Thus, opportunity for market access and fostering of market rivalry are crucial to our faith in competition as a form of economic organization.

So it is that most Americans have a vital stake in effective antitrust enforcement. For antitrust has become a distinctly American means for assuring that competitive economy on which our political and social freedom in part depend. These laws have helped release energies essential to our world leadership, industrial productivity, and technological growth. They reinforce our ideal of careers open to superior skills and talent, a crucial norm of a free society. As a result, the essentials of antitrust stand proclaimed by both political parties.

General agreement on antitrust goals, let me caution, must not obscure important differences in means. Here this administration parts company with its immediate predecessors on at least three scores. First, cases brought have aimed not at mere doctrinal perambulations but at making real strides either toward cracking restraints on entry or controls over price. Thus, this administration's goal has been a vigorous cracking down, without fear or favor, on hard-core antitrust violations. Second, because businessmen know this difference in policy will spell greater court success, pretrial settlements have jumped sharply. Thus, this administration secures more results for each enforcement dollar. Finally, in these foggy unsettled reaches of law and policy, we have not sought a hasty certainty at the cost of careful deliberation. A study group, representing a fair cross section of all antitrust views, has surveyed major decisions under the Sherman and Clayton Acts and thus helped our Nation mold a coherent antitrust policy.

Recent Antitrust Division activities highlight these three differences. For the year ending December 31, 1955, for example, 54 new cases were filed—33 civil and 21 criminal. These 54 new cases represent a sharp increase over the recent past. Thus, in fiscal year 1952, the last year of the previous administration, 30 new cases were filed; in fiscal year 1953, 33 new proceedings were brought; and in fiscal 1954, some 32 new antitrust causes were launched. The bulk of these 54 new cases, I point out, involved traditional hard-core Sherman Act violations such as price fixing and allocation of territories.

Beyond these 54 new cases, during the same period, January 1, 1955, through December 31, 1955, some 52 antitrust cases were brought to a close. Of these 52, 14 of the cases closed were cases filed during that very year. Thus, this administration makes real strides toward keeping calendars up to date.

Ability to close these 14 cases in the same year they were brought stems in some measure from this administration's new program for prefiling negotiation. In essence, our approach involves negotiation of consent judgments prior to the filing of the civil complaint. By holding up formal proceedings, we aim to avoid freezing either Government or defendants' attitudes into publicly expressed positions. Thus, we hope to promote flexibility and ease compromise in the process of decree negotiation.

Prefiling negotiation itself is no stranger to the Department of Justice. In the second half of the 1920's about a quarter of all cases utilized this procedure. In the 1930's, however, such negotiation fell into disuse. And when it was revived, from 1939 through 1942, it was pressed after companion criminal cases had been brought. Thus, prefiling civil negotiations were then only a step in the settlement of the criminal proceedings. And this pressure of the pending criminal suit on civil settlement negotiation (whether actual or inferred) was generally criticized.

From this pressure policy, this administration's current prefiling negotiation practice differs sharply. Today, the Department of Justice enters prefiling negotiations only where civil proceedings are contemplated. Thus, in no instance is the criminal sanction used to coerce civil settlement. The purpose is to adjust civil controversies before they come to court, not to force their disposal by threat of criminal prosecution.

In addition to concentration on hard-core violations and increased emphasis on calendar cleanups, cases brought have aimed at practical enforcement results, at vigorous enforcement without fear or favor. Such enforcement results, I point out, this administration has pressed for against all groups alike. For example, Congress has exempted many activities of organized labor from antitrust. Nonetheless, this administration has moved vigorously to strike down those union restraints on commercial competition which Congress has not specifically shielded. From January 1953 to date the division has brought 10 cases in which a union was a defendant and 1 in which a union was a coconspirator. This 3-year record of 11 cases stands in sharp contrast with the 6-year record from 1946 to 1953 of only 16 cases naming unions as defendants. Thus, in a little over 2 years this administration has brought virtually 75 percent as many cases against unions as were brought in the 6 years before 1952.

Not only are all violators, no matter what their political power, brought to bar, but once judgments are rendered, this administration sees to it that they are lived up to. In the 62 years since the Sherman Act's passage, some 24 contempt proceedings have been brought for violation of outstanding decrees. Of this 24, one-third, or 8, have been brought in the past 3 years since the Republican administration took over in Washington.

In sum, then, this administration has made real strides toward effective antitrust enforcement. At the heart of our antitrust laws are the highest intellectual and moral principles. These concepts, based on a firm and definite national policy, a bipartisan article of faith, have endured with variations only in emphasis for more than a century. This national policy, this national belief, is not stationary nor static. That policy today remains vital and vigorous. It underscores Americans' fundamental belief that a dynamic republic can rest only upon the foundation of a free economy, and that economic freedom, like political liberty, belongs only to those who are vigilant to preserve it.

CONSTRUCTION OF MODERN GREAT LAKES BULK CARGO VESSELS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce the possibility of getting a unanimous-consent agreement in connection with Calendar No. 1896, Senate bill 3108, to encourage the construction of modern Great Lakes bulk cargo vessels. If an agreement could be reached to vote on that bill with an hour's limitation of time, 30 minutes to each side, it would be the disposition of the leadership to sandwich it in sometime tomorrow.

The distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has agreed to contact the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and if they can work out an agreement, I should like the Senate to be on notice that there is a possibility of the bill being considered tomorrow. If it is considered, I am informed that it will be necessary to have a quorum and yea-and-nay vote on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there are no other Senators who desire recognition, I move that, pursuant to the order previously entered, the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 5, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 4, 1956:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Edward Page, Jr., of the District of Columbia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Henry H. Ford, of Florida.
Frederick C. Oechsner, of Louisiana.

Robert P. Chalker, of Florida, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Ralph J. Burton, of Illinois.
Basil Capella, of Maryland.
Loren Carroll, of Illinois.
Arch K. Jean, of Pennsylvania.
Arthur G. Jones, of Virginia.
Robert N. Magill, of Maryland.
George H. Owen, of New York.
David H. Popper, of New York.
Walter A. Radius, of Virginia.
Donovan Q. Zook, of Ohio.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Kenneth W. Calloway, of Illinois.
Mary Mulloy Carmichael, of Montana.
Daniel H. Clare, Jr., of Virginia.
Robert A. Conrads, of the District of Columbia.
William E. Fee, Jr., of New York.
Bernard J. Humes, of Virginia.
Albert E. Irving, of Maryland.
Robert H. Kranich, of Maryland.
Richard S. Leach, of Connecticut.
Albert P. Mayio, of Michigan.
George T. Moody, of Maryland.
George S. Newman, of New York.
George A. Pope, of Idaho.
Ralph Scarritt, of Illinois.
Leslie C. Tihany, of Illinois.
Harold N. Waddell, of Georgia.
Findley Weaver, of Oklahoma.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Edward S. Benet, of Texas.
Waldemar B. Campbell, of Washington.
John Warner Foley, Jr., of New Hampshire.
Alvaro F. Galvan, of New York.
Lawrence E. Gruza, of Connecticut.
Paul M. Kattenburg, of Virginia.
Stanley R. Kidder, of Oregon.
Oris F. Kolb, of Virginia.
Glenwood B. Matthews, of California.
Saul Moskowitz, of New York.
John P. Reddington, of New York.
Everett W. Schoening, of Illinois.
Miss Eulalia L. Wall, of Texas.
Robert L. Ware, Jr., of New Jersey.
Samuel H. Young, of Florida.

George R. Phelan, Jr., of Missouri, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Charles W. Brown, of California.
Edward H. Brown, of Pennsylvania.
Joseph F. Christiano, of New York.
Thomas W. Fina, of Florida.
Wayne R. Gilchrist, of Missouri.
Walter T. Kamprad, of California.
George R. Kaplan, of Massachusetts.
Earl A. Kessler II, of Oregon.
Mrs. Elvira L. Lawyer, of the District of Columbia.
Miss Margaret McDonald, of South Dakota.
Miss Alice C. Mahoney, of Arizona.
Miss Colette Meyer, of California.
Miss Helen J. Mullen, of New York.
John G. Panos, of Illinois.
Miss Wilma C. Patterson, of Indiana.
Edward M. Peach, of Virginia.
Miss M. Adelaide Roberts, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Margaret A. Stanturf, of Missouri.
Robert G. Sturgill, of Utah.
Abraham Vigil, of Colorado.
Daroslav S. Vlahovich, of New Jersey.
Henry C. Wechsler, of Ohio.
Miss Hertha C. Wegener, of New York.
Mrs. Margaret P. A. Welsh, of Louisiana.
Miss Helen B. Wilson, of California.
Miss Jane B. Young, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Thomas A. Bartlett, of Oregon.
Carlton C. Brower, of California.
Davis S. Chamberlain, of New Jersey.
Edward M. Cohen, of New York.
John G. Dean, of New York.
Miss Sharon E. Erdkamp, of Nebraska.
Donald C. Ferguson, of California.
Lewis P. Fickett, Jr., of Maine.
Miss Catherine M. Frank, of Connecticut.
Roderick N. Grant, of California.
Charles W. Grover, of New York.
Mrs. Winifred T. Hall, of New Jersey.
Robert M. Immerman, of New York.
Donald A. Johnston, of New York.
Ernest B. Johnston, Jr., of Alabama.
Gordon A. Klett, of California.
Gerald Lamberty, of Wisconsin.
Jay H. Long, of California.
David R. McClurg, of Illinois.
Edward R. O'Connor, of New York.
Robert K. Olson, of Minnesota.
Miss Mary Hoxton Pierce, of Florida.
William B. Pounds, Jr., of Ohio.
Ernest G. Reeves, of North Carolina.
J. Harden Rose, of Illinois.
Edward M. Rowell, of California.
Miss Edith M. Scott, of the District of Columbia.
Peter Semler, of New York.
William Slany, of the District of Columbia.
John D. Tinny, of Florida.
Julius W. Walker, Jr., of Texas.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Robert W. Ades, of Oregon.
Jay Castillo, of Nevada.
Gordon P. Hagberg, of California.
James Moceri, of Washington.
Miss Barbara M. White, of Illinois.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Douglas S. Blaufarb, of Maryland.
George F. Wilson, of California.

Louis C. Bosetti, of Connecticut, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Paul Garbler, of North Carolina.
Lloyd A. Harnage, of Florida.
Robinson McIlvaine, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

William P. Boteler, of the District of Columbia.
James P. Hurley, of New York.
Theodore L. Lewis, of New York.
Jean M. Nater, of Virginia.
Richard H. Snowdon, of the District of Columbia.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

James Cunningham Sargent, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1961, vice Clarence H. Adams, term expired.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Willard Frank Libby, of Illinois, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for a term of 5 years expiring June 30, 1961. (Reappointment.)

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Albert E. McCollam, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission, under the provisions of section 1 of an act of Congress, approved March 1, 1893 (27 Stat. 507; 33 U. S. C. 661), vice Col. William J. Ely.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law and regulation:

I. FOR APPOINTMENT

To be surgeon

Richard L. Haines

To be senior assistant surgeon

Norman Tarr

To be senior assistant dental surgeon

Dale E. Smith

To be senior sanitary engineer

Eugene L. Lehr

To be senior nurse officer

Louise C. Anderson

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters.

ALABAMA

Jesse E. Fain, Piedmont, Ala., in place of H. C. Sharpe, deceased.

ALASKA

Everett J. Wilde, College, Alaska, in place of C. S. Hollingsworth, resigned.
Margaret P. Bohrer, Nome, Alaska, in place of J. M. McLean, resigned.
June E. Hutchinson, Whittier, Alaska, in place of M. M. Hayes, resigned.

ARIZONA

Ethel M. Green, Gila Bend, Ariz., in place of O. A. Carter, removed.

ARKANSAS

Kermit C. Sparks, Lamar, Ark., in place of M. E. Nation, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Clarence E. Farrin, Azusa, Calif., in place of T. B. Thomson, retired.
William H. O'Neill, Rosamond, Calif., in place of H. P. Vial, resigned.
Ilah M. Odem, Silverado, Calif., in place of I. B. Donovan, resigned.

COLORADO

Minta E. Gerry, Rangely, Colo., in place of M. C. White, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Camillo Altieri, Jr., Bantam, Conn., in place of E. M. Doyle, retired.
Frederick D. Parker, Clinton, Conn., in place of E. B. Knopf, retired.

DELAWARE

Herbert C. Whitney, Magnolia, Del., in place of R. W. Anderson, retired.

GEORGIA

James M. Cox, Whigham, Ga., in place of J. R. Kennemur, transferred.

IDAHO

Jesse O. Hiatt, Marsing, Idaho, in place of W. W. Volkmer, retired.

Martha W. Cook, Tetonia, Idaho, in place of D. J. Meikle, removed.

ILLINOIS

Otis Lutz, Waterloo, Ill., in place of H. F. Schneider, retired.

INDIANA

Billy L. Kruse, Elberfeld, Ind., in place of Minnie Richardson, retired.

John T. Stevenson, Kirklin, Ind., in place of J. G. Harding, retired.

Maurice C. Griffith, Pleasant Lake, Ind., in place of Clyde Brooks, resigned.

IOWA

Donald G. Burt, Polk City, Iowa, in place of John Blake, retired.

KANSAS

Bernice F. Harvey, Lenexa, Kans., in place of Harry Meyer, removed.

Glen L. Jenkins, Reserve, Kans., in place of Elizabeth Gillispie, retired.

Clarence M. McClelland, Studley, Kans., in place of J. R. Pratt, retired.

KENTUCKY

Kermit B. Cromwell, Clinton, Ky., in place of G. F. Hilliard, retired.

Rufus D. Higgins, Gray, Ky., in place of R. A. Brafford, removed.

Wilmer L. Boggs, London, Ky., in place of H. O. House, transferred.

MAINE

Everett A. Beal, Ellsworth Falls, Maine, in place of F. F. Quinn, resigned.

MARYLAND

Alfred C. Huffer, Jr., Boonsboro, Md., in place of John Hershberger, deceased.

Arthur F. Hightman, Brunswick, Md., in place of E. L. Gross, retired.

Edmund W. Rogers, Glen Burnie, Md., in place of H. C. Estep, deceased.

Edward C. Kaighn, Greenbelt, Md., in place of T. R. Freeman, resigned.

Stanley S. Sentman, Port Deposit, Md., in place of G. A. Hohn, retired.

Elwood J. Greenhalgh, Royal Oak, Md., in place of P. M. Pastorfield, Jr., retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Alfred E. Pineau, Westport Point, Mass., in place of A. E. Columbia, retired.

MICHIGAN

Alfreda E. Swanson, Freeland, Mich., in place of V. F. Beadle, retired.

Walter B. Steele, Muskegon, Mich., in place of S. J. Risk, retired.

Cole L. Neumann, Rochester, Mich., in place of C. F. Bushman, removed.

MINNESOTA

Carl G. Bergstrom, Cokato, Minn., in place of E. J. Larson, retired.

Wesley P. Rathvon, Deerwood, Minn., in place of G. A. Oberg, retired.

Henry Walter Malchow, Marietta, Minn., in place of O. E. Nelson, retired.

Frank W. Gurno, Redlake, Minn., in place of R. E. Lee, transferred.

Sigurd A. Bertelsen, Saint Paul, Minn., in place of A. A. Van Dyke, retired.

Albert L. Dyrdahl, Williams, Minn., in place of W. E. Charlton, deceased.

MISSISSIPPI

Alva G. Edmondson, Edwards, Miss., in place of J. M. Kendrick, resigned.

S. T. Gray, Jr., New Augusta, Miss., in place of C. A. McCoy, retired.

MISSOURI

Emmett J. Snyder, Taylor, Mo., in place of M. E. McLaughlin, resigned.

MONTANA

Charles P. Rapos, Fallon, Mont., in place of Carl Anderson, retired.

NEBRASKA

Enoch D. Long, Chappell, Nebr., in place of O. F. Stegeman, transferred.

Robert B. Shaw, Guide Rock, Nebr., in place of D. W. Crews, transferred.

Joel A. Schleiger, Overton, Nebr., in place of B. G. Worthing, retired.

Elmer R. Henkel, Ralston, Nebr., in place of E. E. Adams, retired.

NEVADA

Bernice K. Morse, Tungsten, Nev., in place of L. C. Sanford, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mary W. Britton, Westmoreland, N. H., in place of A. B. Britton, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Anita Grace King, Allenhurst, N. J., in place of G. J. Imlay, resigned.

Francis J. Kierman, Glen Ridge, N. J., in place of C. S. Tobin, retired.

Raymond F. Woolf, Kingston, N. J., in place of E. B. Brooks, retired.

Ralph F. Barra, Lake Hiawatha, N. J., in place of Sam Epstein, transferred.

Daniel M. McArdle, Passaic, N. J., in place of A. V. Gross, deceased.

NEW YORK

Mildred H. Merrell, Afton, N. Y., in place of Daniel Grant, retired.

Herman R. Sievert, Fort Hunter, N. Y., in place of M. B. Albers, retired.

Albert A. Clark, Hall, N. Y., in place of Winfield Eberhart, retired.

Ruth P. Benedict, Lewis, N. Y., in place of E. S. Marshall, retired.

William A. Maillet, Lockport, N. Y., in place of E. J. Murtaugh, retired.

John S. Volpe, Manchester, N. Y., in place of A. E. Ryan, retired.

Richard G. Gavette, Margaretville, N. Y., in place of W. R. Marks, resigned.

Celia B. Ferguson, Schuyler Lake, N. Y., in place of L. E. Weaver, resigned.

John A. Fiero, Shortsville, N. Y., in place of J. M. Sweeney, resigned.

William H. Olcott, Wurtsboro, N. Y., in place of Harry Northrup, removed.

NORTH CAROLINA

Vernon P. Fullbright, Brevard, N. C., in place of T. C. Galloway, retired.

Charles A. Brown, Efland, N. C., in place of M. E. Harris, retired.

James H. Parks, Swannanoa, N. C., in place of W. B. Stone, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Harold N. Gauthier, Williston, N. Dak., in place of G. G. Harvey, retired.

OHIO

Carlton W. Strosnider, Ansonia, Ohio, in place of P. E. Smith, deceased.

Raymond C. Harris, Eaton, Ohio, in place of C. F. Hildebolt, retired.

Harold E. Mills, Franklin, Ohio, in place of P. E. Ruppert, resigned.

Ralph G. Bostwick, North Benton, Ohio, in place of O. R. Iden, resigned.

John William Evans, Orrville, Ohio, in place of C. L. Weiser, retired.

Edgar W. Stevanus, Sugarcreek, Ohio, in place of S. A. Smith, retired.

OKLAHOMA

R. C. Chastain, Clayton, Okla., in place of R. H. Maxey, transferred.

PENNSYLVANIA

Verna Mae Murphy, Drumore, Pa., in place of G. W. Smith, deceased.

Thomas R. Lostrick, Ernest, Pa., in place of L. S. Helmick, deceased.

Rachel S. Rodgers, Hokendauqua, Pa., in place of E. M. Murphy, resigned.

Irvin R. MacMullen, King of Prussia, Pa., in place of L. E. Armstrong, removed.

William H. Hunsinger, Lattimer Mines, Pa., in place of F. W. Patterson, retired.

Dolores P. Mattichak, Lopez, Pa., in place of M. E. Walsh, retired.

Steve Olen, Lyndora, Pa., in place of M. S. Karlitsky, removed.

Violet F. Nelson, Minisink Hills, Pa., in place of Charles Frailey, deceased.

Catherine M. Viola, Morgan, Pa., in place of M. T. Morganti, resigned.

Leo J. English, Oil City, Pa., in place of G. W. McElhatten, removed.

Waldo L. Dyson, Sr., Pocono Pines, Pa., in place of J. P. Johnson, retired.

Kenneth E. West, Spring House, Pa., in place of F. S. Margargal, retired.

Paul E. Ness, Yoe, Pa., in place of Wilmer Stover, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

John B. Blanton, Nichols, S. C., in place of C. V. Daniel, transferred.

TENNESSEE

Charles Frank Heaton, Roan Mountain, Tenn., in place of W. T. Christian, retired.

Johnnie V. Braswell, Smyrna, Tenn., in place of N. E. Coleman, retired.

TEXAS

Ethel T. Bledsoe, Archer City, Tex., in place of Z. T. Burkett, retired.

Hugh Spinks, Menard, Tex., in place of H. P. Armstrong, removed.

UTAH

Howard D. Knight, Parowan, Utah, in place of Ivan Decker, removed.

VERMONT

Florence H. Tute, Newport Center, Vt., in place of H. J. Tute, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Burton R. Floyd, Buena Vista, Va., in place of W. H. Long, resigned.

Virgie C. Rawls, Burkeville, Va., in place of W. S. Overton, transferred.

Robert J. Bradshaw, Rice, Va., in place of R. M. Bradshaw, retired.

Ruth G. Walden, Saluda, Va., in place of L. M. Hedrick, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Wesley Wayne Gibbs, Woodinville, Wash., in place of Fred Kelly, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Helen J. Mayne, Browntown, Wis., in place of L. E. Maxfield, deceased.

Lyle A. Gallenbeck, Burnett, Wis., in place of H. H. Hilgendorf, deceased.

Ralph A. Nelson, Superior, Wis., in place of B. W. Robinson, retired.

WYOMING

Alma F. Bissell, Evansville, Wyo., in place of E. M. Sullivan, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 4, 1956:

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGES

Charles E. Whittaker, of Missouri, to be United States circuit judge, eighth circuit.

David T. Lewis, of Utah, to be United States circuit judge, 10th circuit.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Herbert G. Curtis, Glenwood.

Marie W. Nuss, Pine Hill.

ALASKA

Glenda A. Cobb, Annette.

John F. Connery, Barrow.

Frank W. Donalson, Galena.

Frances L. Nally, King Salmon.

Edna Peratrovich, Klawock.

Evelyn L. Conwell, Kotzebue.

Jenabe E. Caldwell, Unalaska.

Alice R. Brusich, Ward Cove.

ARIZONA

Cathryn A. Pulsifer, Camp Verde.
Donald L. Remm, Casa Grande.
Alice L. Maxwell, Chinle.
Nancy R. Caldwell, San Simon.

ARKANSAS

Nettie E. O'Roark, South Fort Smith.

CALIFORNIA

Elizabeth Waldron, Blue Jay.
Ethel M. Stott, Diablo.
Eugene M. Freitas, Herlong.
George P. Ashmun, Hughson.
Eugene A. Guerrettaz, Orick.
Harry L. Smith, Perkins.
Donald P. Morrison, San Bruno.

COLORADO

George R. Newmyer, Center.
Charles Herman Klipfel, Pueblo.
Ralph A. Nielson, Sanford.

GEORGIA

Homer E. Cook, Alto.
Adrian Dwight Massey, Canon.
Benjamin M. Woodruff, Sandy Springs.

HAWAII

Satoshi Ishimoto, Lihue.

IDAHO

James M. Lyke, Caldwell.
Leo G. Huguenin, Mullan.

ILLINOIS

Leroy Davis, Harvel.
William C. Regan, Stronghurst.
Clifford E. Vaughn, Tiskilwa.
Clarence E. Harden, Tolono.

INDIANA

Edward A. Costomiris, Cicero.
Mary A. Stites, Deputy.
Ernest D. Littler, Dunkirk.
Vernice Dick Seward, Jr., Royal Center.
Wilfred E. Shoemaker, Yorktown.

LOUISIANA

Otis G. Darbonne, Grand Coteau.

MAINE

John E. Sargent, Fryeburg.
Kellen R. Melanson, St. Francis.

MASSACHUSETTS

Edwin L. Naylor, Dunstable.

MINNESOTA

Preston H. Anderson, Blackduck.
Carl O. Palmer, Buffalo.
Edmonde K. Evanson, Canby.
Ralph W. Breitenbach, Darwin.
Neil S. Rasmusson, Emmons.
Maurice J. Wenker, Freeport.
Harold J. Harris, Hanley Falls.
Kent S. Bigbee, Jeffers.
Irvin L. Yeiter, La Crescent.
Erwin D. Beutel, Lake Elmo.
Paul R. Norby, Mabel.
Alvord J. Ellingboe, Paynesville.
Rodger A. McRae, Swanville.
Duane J. Davis, Verndale.
John D. Mellinger, Warba.
Sidney M. Anderson, Winger.

MISSISSIPPI

Hade W. Sessums, Lena.

MISSOURI

Alfred C. Kennedy, Avondale.
Hobart C. Nicolay, Butler.
John R. Smith, Jameson.
Charles F. Hern, Jasper.
Vance A. Meares, Reeds.
Jesse O. Weaver, Steele.

MONTANA

Cecil J. Ranney, Alberton.
Ivan W. Small, Alder.
Donald W. Bell, Browning.

NEBRASKA

Edward A. Rodenburg, Deshler.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Theodore R. Butler, Portsmouth.
George W. Carr, Winnisquam.

NEW JERSEY

Joseph S. Bird, Annandale.
Jacob Fetzer, Grenloch.
William T. Reedy, Iselin.
Laura A. Bradley, Monmouth Beach.
Erma B. Moncrief, Newport.
Ray W. Lingelbach, Port Republic.
William C. Conner, South Bound Brook.

NEW MEXICO

John R. Goddard, El Rito.

NORTH DAKOTA

Carl Raymond Culver, Dickinson.
LeRoy B. Wentz, Elgin.
Lawrence D. Larsen, Kindred.
Lillian R. Van Doren, Medora.
Ruby E. Omvig, Mylo.
Orris K. Rowe, New Leipzig.

OHIO

George B. Lewis, Blue Creek.
Ruben E. Spurrier, Buffalo.
William Edward Dornan, Canton.
Charles H. Walters, Circleville.
James W. Broad, Clyde.
Dale R. Wyker, Grove City.
Carrie Elizabeth Copley, Helena.
Gene F. Richards, Hollansburg.
James F. Church, Loudonville.
Carey W. Hodson, Mowrystown.
Edwin L. Seitz, Sebring.
James P. Emmitt, Tallmadge.

OKLAHOMA

Nell E. Neville, Altus.

OREGON

Lester W. Heise, Adams.
Neil L. Morfitt, Astoria.
John Gordon Watts, Beavercreek.
Francis L. Norton, Blachly.

PENNSYLVANIA

Gladys V. Lacey, Buena Vista.
James E. Sutton, Evans City.
Richard M. Bitner, Lansdale.
Richard S. Chesonis, Lucernemines.
Henry R. Heintz, Perkiomenville.
Grace G. Hendricks, Trexlertown.
Richard J. Griffith, Trucksville.
Leslie E. Carlysle, Sr., Verona.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Manly D. Padgett, Edgefield.
Rodney A. Russell, Troy.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Clayton L. Gibbs, Groton.
Philip S. Aldrich, Milbank.
Merton C. Matter, Orient.
Eva K. Gayken, Worthing.

TENNESSEE

Charles Ray Winton, Coalmont.
Raymond B. Cox, Cottagegrove.
Betty L. Milton, Duff.
Charles W. Meals, Gibson.

TEXAS

Edward H. Wester, Floydada.
James P. Fortenberry, Friona.

VERMONT

Harvey A. Dix, Brattleboro.

VIRGINIA

George Guy Farrar, Afton.
Carl C. Mason, Bridgewater.
Jane D. Nottingham, Carrollton.
Clinton Lewis Epperson, Lawrenceville.
Robert L. Via, Roanoke.
Harry L. Buston, Jr., Tazewell.

WEST VIRGINIA

Kenneth B. Rouzee, Kingwood.

WISCONSIN

Raymond E. Feller, Antigo.
Michael J. Stieber, Colby.
Benjamin F. Goehring, Random Lake.
Percy E. Braatz, Shiocton.
Francis Mattis, Stone Lake.

WYOMING

Bruce L. Bartholomew, Dayton.
LeRoy Williams, Grass Creek.
Noreen C. Hopkins, Story.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 4, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art always willing and able to bless us according to our needs, may we begin this new week with gladness and gratitude and continue it with calmness and courage.

Grant that in all our plans and purposes to serve our generation we may be inspired by the loftiest motives and employ the noblest means.

Show us how we may minister more effectively and efficiently to the welfare of all humanity, giving wise counsel to the baffled and perplexed, consolation to the sorrowing, companionship to the lonely, and strength to the burdened.

May we daily have within our hearts the joy of knowing that we are living useful and helpful lives and making a worthy contribution to a real and right solution of mankind's many difficult problems.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 31, 1956, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1671. An act for the relief of Clement E. Sprouse;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Elizabeth Doherty;

H. R. 2216. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1948 (ch. 511, 62 Stat. 489), relating to the retention in the service of disabled commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army and Air Force;

H. R. 4229. An act to provide running mates for certain staff corps officers in the naval service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4437. An act relating to withholding for State employee retirement system purposes, on the compensation of certain civilian employees of the National Guard and the Air National Guard;

H. R. 4569. An act to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes;

H. R. 4704. An act to provide for the examination preliminary to promotion of officers of the naval service;

H. R. 5268. An act to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the payment of mileage allowances for overland travel by private conveyance outside the continental limits of the United States;

H. R. 7679. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Muskogee, Okla.;

H. R. 8477. An act to amend title II of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, by providing flexibility in the distribution of women officers in the grades of commander and lieutenant commander, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8490. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Bonham, Tex.;

H. R. 8674. An act to provide for the return of certain property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.;

H. R. 9358. An act to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to issue a deed to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for certain land heretofore conveyed to such city, removing the conditions and reservations made a part of such prior conveyance; and

H. R. 10251. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to deed certain land to the city of Grand Junction, Colo.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2048. An act for the relief of certain former employees of the Inland Waterways Corporation;

S. 2771. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the Fourth National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes;

S. 2772. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in England in 1957; and for other purposes; and

S. 3760. An act to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other related purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1866. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas V. Compton;

H. R. 2106. An act to provide that the enlistment contracts or periods of obligated service of members of the Armed Forces shall not terminate by reason of appointment as cadets or midshipmen at the Military, Naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard Academies, or as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4363. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the State of New Mexico;

H. R. 7471. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Board of Commissioners of St. Johns County, Fla.; and

H. R. 8123. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10899. An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. STENNIS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. KNOWLAND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3515. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to assist in the provision of housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill just messaged from the Senate, H. R. 10899, making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

[After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PRESTON, THOMAS, ROONEY, YATES, SHELLEY, FLOOD, CANNON, CLEVENGER, BOW, HORAN, MILLER of Maryland, and TABER.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9390) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2250)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9390) "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 14, 17, 31, 32, 33, and 34.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 36 and 37, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$18,369,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,240,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,862,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$44,300,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,190,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"WOODROW WILSON CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMISSION

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of August 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 964, 965), as amended, $48,500."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 8, 10, 16, 18, 27, 28, and 35.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
WM. F. NORRELL,
ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
DON MAGNUSON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9390) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Research in the utilization of saline water

The conferees concur in the statement of the House report to the effect that the $50,000 reduction in the budget estimate is to apply to the item of administration and coordination.

Office of the Solicitor

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $2,835,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,800,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of Minerals Mobilization

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $300,000 as proposed by the House instead of $225,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Land Management

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $18,369,300 for management of lands and resources instead of $18,000,000 as proposed by the House and $18,738,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Permits the purchase of 31 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate, instead of 25 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $50,720,000 for education and welfare services as proposed by the Senate, instead of $50,700,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $16,200,000 for resources management as proposed by the Senate, instead of $16,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $5,240,000 for construction, instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House, and $7,740,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have approved the construction program as set forth in the justifications and recognize the need of future appropriations to cover the total costs.

Amendment No. 8: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 9: Permits the purchase of 290 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate, instead of 270 as proposed by the House.

Geological Survey

Amendment No. 10: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 11: Permits the purchase of 126 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of 100 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Mines

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $15,862,750 for conservation and development of mineral resources, instead of $15,363,000 as proposed by the House, and $17,363,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funds for mining research at the oil shale plant, Rifle, Colorado, have been disallowed. Of the increase above the House figure, $100,000 is for laboratory research on oil shale and shale oil at Laramie, Wyoming.

National Park Service

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $11,562,000 for management and protection as proposed by the Senate, instead of $11,480,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 14: Strikes out language proposed by the Senate which would have made the construction appropriation immediately available.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $15,250,000 for construction as proposed by the Senate, instead of $15,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 17: Strikes out language proposed by the Senate which would have made the construction (liquidation of contract authorization) appropriation immediately available.

Amendment No. 18: Reported in disagreement.

Fish and Wildlife Service

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $10,373,600 for management of resources as proposed by the Senate instead of $9,696,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $5,105,000 for investigations of resources as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,065,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $2,471,000 for construction as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22: Permits the purchase of 131 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of 97 as proposed by the House.

General provisions, Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 23: Strikes out House language limiting funds for informational services.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

Department of Agriculture

Forest Service

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $44,300,750 for national forest protection and management instead of $41,668,000 as proposed by the House and $46,063,500 as proposed by the Senate. Of the increase above the House figure, $250,000 is for soil and water management, and $620,000 is for reforestation.

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $10,000,000 for forest research instead of $9,350,000 as proposed by the House and $10,650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Inserts a heading, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 27 and 28: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $12,190,000 for state and private forestry cooperation instead of $11,385,000 as proposed by the House and $15,165,000 as proposed by the Senate. An increase of $495,000 above the House figure has been provided for cooperation in forest tree planting and $310,000 for cooperation in forest management and processing.

National Capital Planning Commission

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates $200,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $185,000 as proposed by the House and $210,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 31–34: Appropriate $1,250,000 for land acquisition as proposed by the House, instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate and provide for allocations as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35: Reported in disagreement.

Smithsonian Institution

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates $4,425,000 for salaries and expenses, Smithsonian Institution, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates $1,505,000 for salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,495,000 as proposed by the House.

Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates $48,500 as proposed by the Senate.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
DON MAGNUSON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider en bloc those amendments on which the House managers will offer a motion to recede and concur, as follows: Nos. 8, 10, 16, 27, 28, and 35.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 7, line 7, insert ", of which not to exceed $240,000 may be paid to the Municipal School District No. 1, Sandoval County, N. Mex., to supplement an allocation of funds from the Office of Education for the construction of elementary public school facilities which shall be available to Pueblo Indian children."

Senate amendment No. 10: Page 11, line 7, strike out "and the preparation of plans and specifications for a building or buildings to meet the special needs of the Geological Survey in the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C." and insert "and for the Geological Survey or the General Services Administration to acquire a site and to prepare plans and specifications for a building or buildings to meet the special needs of the Geological Survey in the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C., without regard to Revised Statutes, page 3709, as amended (41 U. S. C. 5), and section 302 (c) of the act of June 30, 1949, as amended (41 U. S. C. 252 (c))."

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 16, line 4, insert ", of which not to exceed $250,000 shall be available for the construction of additional school facilities at Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz."

Senate amendment No. 27: Page 34, line 23, insert:

"WEEKS ACT

"For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), $100,000, to be available only for payment of the purchase price of any lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in connection with such acquisition: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for acquisition of any land which is not within the boundaries of a national forest: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of any land without the approval of the local government concerned."

Senate amendment No. 28: Page 35, line 9, insert:

"SPECIAL ACTS

"For the acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior boundaries of the following national forest, in accordance with the provisions of the following act authorizing annual appropriations of forest receipts for such purposes, and in not to exceed the following amount from such receipts: Cache National Forest, Utah, act of May 11, 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, $10,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for acquisition of any land which is not within the boundaries of a national forest: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of any land without the approval of the local government concerned."

Senate amendment No. 35: Page 40, line 7, insert ": *Provided further*, That the employment of not more than one person by contract or otherwise, pursuant to the third sentence of section 2 (c) of the act of June 6, 1924, as amended by the act of July 19, 1952 (66 Stat. 783), may be extended for an additional year."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 8, 10, 16, 27, 28, and 35 and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: Page 17, line 2, insert ": *Provided*, That all receipts from the operation of the McKinley Park Hotel in Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska, may be applied to, or offset against, costs of managing, operating, and maintaining the hotel and related facilities, and any receipts or other revenues in excess of such costs shall be deposited at least annually into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided*, That all receipts for the fiscal year 1957 from the operation of the McKinley Park Hotel in Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska, may be applied to, or offset against, costs of managing, operating, and maintaining the hotel and related facilities, and any receipts or other revenues in excess of such costs shall be deposited at least annually into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

SEGREGATION

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues, I have recently been faced with a primary campaign in my district, which is the Eighth District of Florida. I am humbly grateful to the wonderful citizens of our district because they gave me an overwhelming majority over my opponent. I have always tried to the best of my ability to keep every campaign promise, and I emphasized to our people in my recent campaign my determination to present their viewpoints in Congress concerning the problems of segregation in our public schools, which the Supreme Court declared unconstitutional 2 years ago. I pledged to my people that I would do everything within the law to maintain segregation in our public schools. I repeat a statement concerning the Supreme Court's decision on segregation that I made in Congress over 2 years ago:

Let me tell you the attitude of the majority of the people of both races in the Eighth Congressional District of Florida, which I represent. They view this decision as fraught with dangers comparable to the tragedies of World Wars I and II, and the emergence of the Communist terror.

I did not exaggerate the situation then, and I find in the light of my recent campaign that, if anything, I understated the attitude of the majority of the citizens of the Eighth District of Florida.

I believe that those of us who live in the Deep South should make every effort calmly, but honestly, to present to the Nation the great tragedy of a Supreme Court decision that discounts the Jeffersonian conception of States rights, and takes away from our separate States those rights that were delegated to them specifically in the Constitution. I do not believe this problem of segregation in our public schools will ever be solved satisfactorily unless we revert to the theory of States rights. I believe Florida should be given the privilege of handling this problem as Florida sees best to handle it. I ask for the same privilege on the part of the other 47 States in the Union.

I know just about everything has already been said on this subject that could be said, but I want to present one thought that perhaps is a little different. Some of the critics of the Supreme Court's decision on segregation have suggested that the members of the Court based their ruling on sociology rather than on law. If the decision were based on sociology, may I say that I do not believe it was based on sound sociological principles. One of the basic facts a sociologist learns is that you cannot legislate the mores and traditions of a people. Yet by a Supreme Court decision which has the effect of legislation, we are trying to legislate the mores and traditions of many millions of our citizens.

One thing that many of the fine people I represent in the Eighth District of Florida resent is the fact that in so many of our northern newspapers we never have presented the factual problems that have been provoked by the integration of races. In this connection, I would like to include an article from one of the great newspapers of Florida, the Florida Times-Union in its issue of Thursday, May 31, 1956. This article concerns rioting by Negro teen-agers on a vessel plying between Buffalo and Crystal Beach amusement park in Ontario. The article points out that the Negro teen-agers turned the vessel into a nightmare of flashing knives and sobbing, frightened passengers. The article further points out that of the approximately 1,000 persons who made the trip, about 80 percent were Negroes and that most of the trouble was caused by gangs of Negro girls who walked the deck, attacking and molesting young white girls. The complete article follows:

NEGROES ATTACK WHITES ON SHIP

BUFFALO, N. Y., May 30.—Rioting by Negro teen-agers on a vessel plying between here and Crystal Beach amusement park in Ontario tonight turned the vessel into a nightmare of flashing knives and sobbing, frightened passengers.

The riots brook out on the *Canadiana* after a day of disorders at the amusement park.

Fourteen persons were injured at the park, and nine Buffalo youths were arrested by Ontario provincial police. Five of those arrested were Negroes and four were white.

Three teen-aged youths were taken into custody by Buffalo police when the ship docked, but no charges were placed against them immediately.

Courier-Express reporters Margaret Wynn and Dick Hirsch described the boat trip as a nightmare of flashing knives and sobbing, frightened teen-agers.

HIDE IN DINING ROOM

They said the youngsters, several beaten or cut, cowered below decks in the ship's dining room for most of the trip after being attacked or threatened by the many Negro teen-agers who made up the majority of the passengers.

"Above deck," the reporters wrote, "all hell had broken loose as roving groups of Negroes calmly attacked the outnumbered whites.

"Girls were beaten mercilessly and youths who attempted to defend them were slugged and kicked without feeling."

UNABLE TO KEEP ORDER

"Members of the ship's crew and private police vainly attempted to keep order, but when one fight was broken up, another flared in a different portion of the weather-beaten boat.

"Of the approximately 1,000 persons who made the trip, about 80 percent were Negroes.

"Most of the trouble was caused by gangs of Negro girls who walked the deck, attacking and molesting young white girls."

Members of the Canadian crew told the newsmen that the demonstration was the worst on record.

You see, Mr. Speaker, in certain areas of the South the white race is in the minority. Now when you get a national minority who are in the majority in certain areas of our great country anyone who understands anything at all about the problems of this great Republic of ours can realize the dangers of such a situation.

The only answer is a return to the Constitution—a return to the Jeffersonian conception of States rights. There are many of us who have found that the Supreme Court's encroachment has manifested itself into other areas properly reserved to the States by the Constitution, and I am hoping with all my heart that we can agree on legislation that will be effective in returning to the States their sovereign rights. I shall certainly support such legislation at every opportunity. America is a republic. We are a sovereign nation composed of sovereign States. Rights not specifically granted to the Federal Government are reserved for the States. That is the Constitution of our beloved country. We must return to the Constitution in this grave crisis.

INTEGRATION IN THE SOUTH

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States pronounced an edict which already has had a profound impact, and promises to have an even greater one, on the basic way of life in many of our States, and in the Deep South in particular. I refer to the amazingly broad interpretation placed by the Supreme Court on the 14th amendment to our Constitution, an amendment which became effective July 28, 1868. This far-reaching interpretation holds that the various States may not segregate white

and Negro children in their public schools solely on the basis of race.

The 14th amendment states that—

No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States.

I believe that this broad interpretation would actually work both ways: integration could be as much an abridgment of the rights of white children as segregation supposedly is an abridgment of the rights of Negro children.

From the date the 14th amendment became effective, July 28, 1868, until May 17, 1954, a period of 68 years, the executive branch of our Government, both State and Federal, the National Congress, the State legislatures, and the Federal and State courts made clear that under the Constitution of the United States power to control public schools in the States was reserved for each State, that a State could establish and operate schools for white and Negro children, and that by so doing there would be no conflict with the letter and intent of the 14th amendment. Just why the nine men who made up the Supreme Court in 1954 chose to go so far afield in their interpretation after these many years is something that I cannot answer. I do know that this decision has resulted in near chaos throughout the South, and is giving a fine outlet to those forces in our midst who are ever seeking some occasion to raise a hue and cry for the so-called oppressed and impoverished underdog, in whom they are interested not one whit, except as a means to further their own cause.

Let us say this, however, to those who would rush in precipitously to force an unacceptable social and educational system upon the South. The Supreme Court decree has awakened the South—and there are signs that enlightened elements in the North are stirring. We realize that the rights that have historically been preserved to the States must be preserved inviolate if we are to keep our Federal system of government. I am not speaking merely of the right to maintain separate schools, for this is only one of the many rights that have long belonged to the individual States. If the Constitution of our land can be so freely and so arbitrarily interpreted, what is there to prevent the same thing happening in the Bill of Rights, or any one of the other amendments? There is nothing but the people—and I say this to you today—if there is a need for a change in our basic law, then it can only be done by lawful process, not by judicial decree. The good people of the South, white and colored, have always been in the thick of the battle, when the cause was just. This battle, though it will be fought by every legal means, and not with weapons of war, is perhaps one of the most important the people of the country as a whole have ever been called upon to wage. The challenge has been thrown down. It is our way of life versus anarchy.

It will be interesting to note the qualifications and experience of the nine members of the Supreme Court in 1954. Justice Hugo Black had prior qualifying judicial experience only as police judge for 18 months. Justices Harlan and Minton were the only other members of the Supreme Court with prior judicial experience and, interestingly enough, their prior judgeships were appointive in nature. The other members of the Supreme Court did not have prior judicial experience. While these nine men who are political appointees are charged with great powers and responsibility in their positions on the Supreme Court of the United States, I cannot help but feel that these men—like all human beings—are subject to human frailties. They can make mistakes. They can be subjected to pressure and influences. Must the customs and the traditions and the way of life of millions of American citizens be completely revamped because the Supreme Court suddenly saw fit to reverse prior rulings?

I have never in the past, nor will I ever in the future, suppressed or stood in the way of the progress of any segment of the masses which make up our fine American citizenry. On the contrary, I have personally done what I could to help my fellow man, regardless of race, creed, or color. I have only to point to one of the basic principles which has been fostered by the Long family in Louisiana, and which was inaugurated and given a great start by my brother, the late Huey P. Long, former Governor of Louisiana and United States Senator. Louisiana was one of the first States to abolish the poll tax. When free schoolbooks were given by Huey P. Long, they were given to all schoolchildren, regardless of race, color, or creed. The free lunch program likewise was initiated by my brother, Earl Long, now Governor, for the third time, of the State of Louisiana.

For several years before I was grown, a family of colored people, including about 6 boys and 2 girls, lived on my father's farm some 200 yards from my home. My older brother and I played and went fishing with these colored boys. We often went to their house before breakfast, because their mother was a wonderful cook. My father found out that we were eating breakfast at this home, and threatened to whip us if we imposed on this family any longer. One morning, however, when my father was away, my brother Julius and I once again slipped over for breakfast. Our father returned and called us. We rushed home, and, my older brother, knowing what was coming, let me take the lead. When father reached me he began to whip me, not so much for visiting the colored family, but for taking food out of their mouths and for disobedience. I howled as if I were experiencing great pain, when suddenly an old Catahoula hog dog rushed to my rescue, and began to pinch father in the seat of the pants. That ended the beating, for father took off after the dog, I learned two lessons that day. One was that I should obey my father in the future. I also learned that right-thinking white people are, and always have been, considerate of the colored people. I merely recite this to show that I was not brought up to hate people because of their color, and what I am saying here today is as much in the interest of the good colored people as it is the white. I have discussed this matter with many fine people of the colored race, including preachers, lawyers, doctors, and farmers, and, with the exception of a few who belong to the NAACP, I have found that they would sincerely regret to see the segregation barriers broken down. They want their schools and their teachers. They want their churches and their preachers. They want their families. That is exactly what we all want, and is what we are trying to preserve.

The great tragedy of the present situation is that the people who are most closely involved with the nine-man decision, the people, Negro and white, who know the situation, are strongly against it. Intelligent, informed people in the North are against it. Who, then, are the ones that are fanning the flames most violently? Communist-inspired organizations are in the forefront of a nefarious plot to dupe the innocent Negro and cause the white man to become an object of hatred. Does anyone here think that these actions are taken because of any real sympathetic feeling for the colored race? The Communists have vowed not to rest until the United States becomes subject to their power, and they are at present concentrating their power against the South. By turning brother against brother, by turning race against race, they hope to succeed in demoralizing one great segment of our country. With the South as a base for their insidious fomenting of dissention, the enslavement of the whole Union will be much simpler. For if you can turn two races of people against each other, people who have lived and worked side by side in peace and harmony for over 200 years, by a program of slander and hypocrisy, then think of the tremendous possibilities; first, white against black; then Catholic against Protestant; labor against capital; city dweller against farmer. Friends, it is the old, old slogan of Divide and conquer. They are trying to divide us now. If they succeed, they will not stop until the whole Nation is conquered. We would be judged guilty of cowardice by future generations if we in the South did not take the stand set forth in the southern manifesto, a noble and courageous document.

I am impressed by an article concerning the question of integration written by a prominent northern Negro editor. His comments, with which I agree, reflect the opinion of serious minded and informed persons throughout our Nation, and are in opposition to the so-called bleeding-hearts, radicals, rabblerousers, agitators, and the just plain uninformed in our midst. What do those people really want; equal educational opportunity for the Negro or just plain integration? Most people who have studied the situation agree that the southern Negro is better off educationally than the northern Negro, because an honest effort is being made to give the southern Negro an equal opportunity to get an education, new job opportunities are becoming daily more available, and the Negro is able to take a position of leadership in all fields on a fairly segregated basis. For example, there are Negro doctors, lawyers, dentists, storekeepers, businessmen,

farmers, and workmen who, in a semi-segregated area, are able to maintain and live in an atmosphere of harmony with all and in a position of full leadership. In a completely integrated society, what intelligent person thinks that the Negro can operate in a position of full leadership and withstand the pressures of competition in a single economic unit? He does very well under the present arrangement of a dual-economic system.

If the southern Negro is seeking a greater educational opportunities, we have only to look about us to see that he is getting them. He plays the major role in an educational system which he directs. I firmly believe that racial problems cannot be solved by mixing the races. The Negro welcomes the opportunity to run his own schools, hospitals, churches, civic and social organizations. I do not think the Negro should be placed in the position of asking others to accept him into their society. He could attain a like objective by conducting himself in such a manner that all men would respect him for what he is as a person. Friendship between white and Negro would then have a concrete and natural basis. The Negro would do better to put forward qualified leaders in his race, to show his fellow Negroes how to make the most of the opportunities they already have. In my opinion, the southern Negro is being made the dupe of the biased, the radicals, and the uninformed.

To understand the great problem confronting the South brought about by the question of integration, we must first understand why the South differs from other sections of the country on this question. The Negro makes up approximately 10 percent of the overall population of the United States. In the 11 States of the Deep South are to be found 60 percent of all the Negroes in the United States. Since these 11 Southern States contain only 24 percent of the overall national total of all races in the United States, the ratio of Negro to whites is 1 to 4. Nationwide the ratio of Negro to whites is 1 to 10. California has only 4 percent Negro population; Pennsylvania, 5 percent; Indiana, 4 percent; Illinois, 7 percent; New York, 6 percent; and it is logical that these and other States with such a low percentage of Negro population can neither understand nor share the problems of integration which are visited upon our Southern States. For example, Alabama has 32 percent Negro population; Mississippi, 45 percent; South Carolina, 39 percent; Louisiana, 33 percent, and Georgia, 31 percent Negro population. With such a vast difference in the basic problems involved, it is only natural that a wide divergence in opinion concerning the whole issue should exist. The average Negro family in most areas being larger than the average white family, integration would necessarily result in many classrooms containing up to 50 percent or more Negro children. Obviously, there is a tremendous difference then in those classrooms being affected in this manner by integration and in those classrooms outside the South which would contain, for example, only 3, 4, or 5 percent Negro children.

It is extremely important that the high percentage of Negro population in the South be kept in mind in viewing the problems confronting integration. It is easy for the uninformed to shout for integration immediately, to insist that the southern Negro is oppressed and downtrodden, and that the only solution is through immediate integration; to insist that the South overcome decades and decades of tradition and custom and habits to accommodate the edict of nine Supreme Court Judges; that eyes be closed to mental, moral, and social barriers. No thinking person can fail to see the fallacy of immediate integration.

Segregation is nothing new in this world. In fact, it governs all forms of life in the world of nature—be it animal, vegetable, or mineral. Such rules are influenced by many factors which develop a basis for segregation, and the same is true of human beings. Some races and groups are held together by common bonds of temperament or culture and of physical characteristics which do not lend themselves to intermingling with other races and groups. Various species of fish segregate themselves. The birds of the air are clannish and are not inclined to intermingle. Even similar forest growths and plants and shrubs are inclined to stick together. It is certainly logical that this plan of life would carry over into human beings. Any attempt to go contrary to nature and to force integration will only result in discontentment, confusion, and a complete disruption of the orderly process of life.

ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 521, Rept. No. 2254), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1840) to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill, H. R. 1840, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit. After the passage of the bill, H. R. 1840, it shall be in order to move to strike out the number H. R. 1840 and title and provisions thereof and to substitute in lieu thereof the number H. R. 11 and the title and provisions thereof; provided, however, that such motion shall not be debatable.

CABINET COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, on May 31, 1956, President Dwight D. Eisenhower in a letter to Arthur F. Burns, Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers, notified him as follows:

I am establishing a Cabinet Committee on Small Business of which I would like you to serve as Chairman.

I should like to compliment the President and this administration on the recognition of the importance of small concerns and the many men and women serving their community in this capacity.

In establishing this Committee the President has designated as members the Secretaries of Defense, Commerce, Labor, the Director of Office of Defense Mobilization, the Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Administrator of Small Business Administration.

In his communication the President definitely expects this Committee to make specific recommendations, not only for administrative action, but also for additional legislation that will strengthen the economic position of small business as well as promote and develop the opportunities of all small-business concerns throughout the Nation so they may continue to benefit in the excellent economic progress we are now experiencing. I enclose the letter:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 31, 1956.

The Honorable ARTHUR F. BURNS,
Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The important contributions made by small-business concerns to the progressive spirit and vitality of the American economy have repeatedly been stressed in my economic reports to the Congress and on various other occasions. Such enterprises, of which there are some 4 million currently in operation, serve continuously as a dynamic influence in our enterprise system. It is often through them that new products and new processes are first brought into use. Equally important, it is in small concerns that many men and women find an opportunity to demonstrate their ability to serve constructively in the business world. For these and related reasons, Government policies that make it easier for new businesses to be established and that foster the growth of small concerns enhance the welfare of the whole economy.

The Federal Government has a number of programs now in operation that are significantly helpful to small businesses.

The Department of Commerce helps constantly in the solution of management problems for small businesses through its Office of Technical Services, Office of Area Development, Business and Defense Services Administration, and Office of Business Economics.

Financial assistance is available to small concerns through the Small Business Administration.

Jointly with the Department of Defense and with other Federal departments and agencies, the Small Business Administration assists small concerns in obtaining Government procurement contracts.

Many small construction companies and related businesses benefit from the home financing programs administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The Office of Defense Mobilization seeks to strengthen the production potential of small firms in our defense programs.

Through its enforcement of the antitrust laws, the Department of Justice helps maintain the competitive environment that is essential to the Nation's ecomonic welfare.

These and other programs and policies of the Federal Government facilitate the establishment of new concerns and foster the growth of small businesses. Yet the conditions of our modern economy are such that many small concerns confront substantial hindrances to their growth. It is my wish that the Federal Government keep fully abreast of developments that affect small businesses. Its programs and policies aimed at assisting small businesses should be carefully reviewed at this time with the object of strengthening them where necessary, and of making recommendations for steps that will provide such enterprises with additional constructive assistance.

To this end I am establishing a Cabinet Committee on Small Business of which I would like you to serve as Chairman. By copies of this letter I am designating the Secretaries of Defense, Commerce, Labor, the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration and the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency as members. Other department and agency heads will participate on an ad hoc basis as may be deemed desirable. The Committee is to have the continuing assignment of making specific recommendations to me for administrative actions, and where necessary for additional legislation, to strengthen the economic position of small businesses and to foster their sound development.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and at the conclusion of my remarks to extend my remarks by the addition of a speech made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] addressed the Georgia Bar Association convention at Savannah on May 25, 1956. Every Member of this body knows that the Georgia bar could not have selected one more competent, courageous, and ethical. His address was most scholarly, factual, and illuminating. His address reflects tireless work over many years and a complete devotion to constitutional government. Our colleague pointed out facts concerning our Supreme Court and its personnel that few others have tried to discover. Everyone knows that when this colleague speaks, he has the facts and logic to sustain him. This House and our Nation should have the privilege of reading that address, which follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, my fellow members of the Georgia Bar Association, ladies, and gentlemen, I am conscious of the high privilege which it is to address this association. I appreciate deeply the invitation to participate in your program today.

It is a particular pleasure to talk to the association while Henry Bowden is our president. I have for many years regarded him as one of Georgia's outstanding lawyers, and during my entire acquaintance with him, I have held him in affectionate regard.

I take this opportunity to compliment him and the association upon the year of splendid progress we have experienced under his wise, able, and energetic leadership.

May I express also the pleasure which is mine to be presented by my good friend, JACK FLYNT, our immediate past president of the association. I knew him well and appreciated his talents when he was in the active practice of law, and while serving as solicitor general of the Griffin judicial circuit. I have observed him closely in Washington where he has diligently applied himself to the task of representing Georgia's Fourth Congressional District. He is making the same reputation in Washington which he has already made in Georgia as a man who has the courage of his convictions, who is capable and efficient, who is a tireless worker for his constituents, and an effective fighter for the principles in which he believes.

We are facing today, I believe, the most critical period which America has faced since 1776, when a small group of men met in Philadelphia to choose between security and peace on the one hand, which could be purchased at the price of continued submission to tyrannical oppression, or revolution and war with the world's greatest power on the other hand. With the certain knowledge that years of misery and suffering lay ahead, that they would fight against heavy odds, and that defeat and death might be the portion of everyone who participated, they believed in their hearts that free government was worth the price they had to pay. They threw their all into the balance as they fought for it. Our Government of liberty, freedom, and opportunity today is the result of that choice and of the fight which they made.

Freedom was not just a topic of idle conversation with them. Integrity was more than a word in the dictionary.

In setting up a constitution to guarantee free government, they were aware that their liberty was hard won. They knew that ambitious human beings are selfish and ruthless, and they knew that human rights can be whittled away little by little by ambitious schemers.

They, therefore, set up this Government of ours to function as three coequal departments, each of the three separate from and independent of the others. The foundation of this free Government was a written Constitution. It was put in writing so that its lasting principles would not be subject to passing whims or fancies. They provided a specific way to amend the document if changing times and conditions ever required it. All of us are familiar with that method of amendment. Nothing less than a vote of two-thirds of the Congress ratified by three-fourths of the States will serve to change it. Without this concurrent action not a sentence or word of the Constitution can be changed.

Among his other great qualities, President George Washington was a wise statesman. He knew the need for reciprocal checks and balances in maintaining free government. Looking ahead to the future of this new Government, he feared that these reciprocal checks and balances might be upset by one of the three departments usurping the functions of another. Warning against this danger, he said in his Farewell Address on September 17, 1796:

"If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be, in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment, in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

Today our free Government faces the danger which George Washington feared, and against which he warned us in the words I have just repeated. This danger comes from attempts by the Supreme Court of the United States to usurp functions which it does not possess, functions which belong exclusively to the Congress and to the States.

For nearly a century and a half the Supreme Court deserved the respect which it received. It justified the confidence of the people that it would uphold the Constitution. It proclaimed the Constitution as written, regardless of consequences, knowing that the people had the power to amend it, if and whenever amendment became necessary. During the period I refer to, the personnel of the Court were selected primarily because of demonstrated legal ability. They possessed the necessary integrity and fidelity to the Constitution to function within their own prescribed jurisdiction. The Supreme Court as then constituted, was a roadblock in the pathway of any person or group who sought to destroy or weaken our Government and its systems of checks and balances. The Court refused to trifle with the Constitution.

Then came the era of Court-packing. A President of the United States contemptuously referred to the Supreme Court as "nine old men." He asked the Congress to vote him legal authority to pack the Court by increasing its membership. When Congress refused to grant this authority, he asked the people to purge the Congress of those courageous Members who refused to pack the Court with rubberstamp reformers. The people refused to request to purge. They endorsed the Court for its fidelity to constitutional functions. They endorsed the Congress for its refusal to pack the Court.

But the passage of time and the occurrence of vacancies gave the opportunity to pack the Court which Congress and the people had denied. Court-packing became the vogue. It is still the vogue in our Government.

We saw an era then in which the Supreme Court entered upon an orgy of usurping legislative functions, and rewriting the Constitution. It was obvious to anyone who would take the trouble to look that the Court was following a pattern of overruling long-settled previous decisions and of usurping the functions of Congress and the States in changing the meaning of our Constitution through so-called interpretation. I began to point this out on the floor of the House of Representatives in 1949. I warned of the Court's attempt to legislate judicially, and I said then:

"It is time for the bar of the Nation to take note of this practice. It is time for Congress to take note of it, and time for the people to take note of it.

"One of the evils of such a system is that is destroys respect for both the courts and the law.

"The decisions of such a court have no permanent value as precedents."

Just recently I obtained from the Library of Congress a table showing that in the 14-year period from 1937 to 1951 the Supreme Court rendered 39 so-called judicial decisions arbitrarily overruling previous decisions of the Court. In some of these decisions the Court overruled only one case. In some they arbitrarily overruled two previously decided cases. In some they overruled as many as 3 decisions in 1 case. In 1 case, they overruled 5 previous decisions.

The trend of the Supreme Court as presently constituted has been to flout the law and the Constitution; to regard the whole body of the law as an uncharted sea; to arrogate unto themselves complete authority to make law as they think it should be made, to arbitrarily overrule with 1 stroke of the pen 1 decision, 3 decisions, 5 decisions, or any number of decisions which do not conform to their pattern of Government changing, and finally to read into the United States Constitution language and meaning which is not there, and which the Court, the Congress, and the people concurrently agreed for 164 years so far as the Constitution itself is concerned, and for 86 years, so far as the 14th amendment is concerned, was never intended to be a part of the Constitution.

Probably the hardest blow struck at our Constitution by this present Supreme Court was the school segregation decision of May 17, 1954.

In that case all pretense at following the law was dropped by the Court. Its decision in substance and effect was that changing times and conditions require a changed interpretation of the 14th amendment, and we hereby change it.

This judicial fiat was not supported by legal authority. It overruled as an arbitrary edict all the previously established and settled law on the subject. Instead of citing legal authority, it cited only sociological works and treatises. Many of the authors of the authorities cited are well known to have numerous Communist front connections.

In addition to its departure from law and precedent, this Court which sets itself up as the arbiter of our destiny has demonstrated an inconsistency which is equaled only by its contempt for the Constitution and law. The Court affirmed the case of *Jones* v. *Opelika* (316 U. S. 584) at the October term, 1941. One year later, at the October 1942 term of the Court in the same case of *Jones* v. *Opelika*, on the same petition for certiorari, the Court reversed its decision set out in 316 United States 584. The language in the first decision of the case (316 U. S. 584) is just as firm, positive, and certain in support of the principle therein announced, as was the language holding exactly the opposite in the second decision of the case (319 U. S. 103).

On November 21, 1955, in case No. 436, *Cahill* v. *The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company*, the Court granted a writ of certiorari and reversed a judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, thus taking the final step in affirming a verdict for $90,000 damages in favor of Cahill. The railroad paid the money to the injured employee, who used a considerable portion of it in paying debts, buying a home, et cetera.

On May 14, 1956, the Court reversed itself, and solemnly held that its decision of November 21, 1955, was wrong, and that Cahill was not entitled to the money.

This wishy-washy dealing with the law, as the Court did in these cases, and the wholesale action of overruling previous decisions in 39 cases in 14 years, brings the Court into disrepute.

It raises doubts and questions in the minds of the public regarding not only this Court, but all courts and all law.

The man in the street can only wonder, "Is the law as uncertain as that? Is the meaning of the Constitution as uncertain as that?"

When the highest court in our land decides at one term of court that the law is one thing, and in the same case at the next term of court solemnly proclaims that the law is exactly the opposite of its previous decision, and then repeats the exact process 2 years later in another case, we have a feeling of sympathy with Mr. Bumble, Charles Dickens' character in Oliver Twist, who said, "If the law supposes that, the law is an ass, an idiot."

This custom of reckless dealing with the law has created apprehension and fears for our judicial system all over this country. Eminent lawyers and able writers have warned against the consequences of the Supreme Court's disregard of law and usurpation of powers not possessed by it. Even members of the Supreme Court, itself, in dissenting opinions, have voiced strong criticism of the Court's irresponsible actions. In the case of *Smith* v. *Allwright* (321 U. S. 649), Justice Roberts of the Supreme Court said:

"The reason for my concern is that the instant decision overruling one announced about 9 years ago tends to bring adjudications of this tribunal into the same class as a restricted railroad ticket, 'good for this day and train only'."

James F. Byrnes, a distinguished American who served as Secretary of State, United States Senator, Governor, and Justice of the United States Supreme Court, and who filled many other high Federal and State offices, has sharply criticized the Court in which he formerly served. In an article in the May 18 issue of U. S. News & World Report, former Justice Byrnes said, "The Supreme Court must be curbed." He makes this flat statement regarding the Court's public-school decision of May 17, 1954:

"The Court did not interpret the Constitution—the Court amended it."

In that article, he made a statement which the whole Nation would do well to note carefully. He said:

"Today, this usurpation by the Court of the power of the States hurts the South. Tomorrow it may hurt the North, East, and West."

The Court in its dictatorial attitude and evident determination to centralize power in Washington by striking down the powers of State government, has already struck at other States far from Georgia and the South.

In the case of *Slochower* v. *City of New York*, just decided, the Court struck down a law of the city of New York which required the discharge of a teacher who invoked the fifth amendment and refused to answer when questioned as to membership in the Communist Party.

From the State of Pennsylvania, in the Steve Nelson case, the Court held that a Pennsylvania statute making subversive activities a criminal offense was unconstitutional on the ground that the Federal Government had enacted legislation on the same subject, and had thus preempted the right of the States to enact laws punishing subversive activities. This ties the hands of law-enforcement officers in every one of the 48 States so far as Communists and subversives are concerned.

While we are talking of the Supreme Court and communism, it is worthwhile to point out that for years Federal and State officials have been trying to rid this country of Harry Bridges and his pernicious influence. Bridges has been ordered deported by the Attorney General on the ground that he had affiliated with organizations advocating the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, and that he had been a member of the Communist Party. Bridges has been convicted of fraud against the United States in obtaining naturalization by perjury in denying membership in the Communist Party. And each time these cases have traveled the long route to the Supreme Court in Washington, that Court has found a way to reverse the findings against Bridges and permit him to continue his nefarious career in this country.

In the case of *Communist Party of the United States of America* v. *Subversive Activities Control Board*, decided less than a month ago, on April 30, this year, the Supreme Court rendered one of its most amazing decisions. In that case the Subversive Activities Control Board, after a lengthy and exhaustive hearing, found that there is a world Communist movement, organized and directed by a foreign government and that the Communist Party of the United States was a Communist-action organization. This action was begun on November 22, 1950. The Communist Party squirmed and resisted all the way through the court of appeals to the Supreme Court, where after 5½ years of litigation, the Supreme Court held that it could not pass upon a record in which the credibility of the witnesses, Paul Crouch, Harvey Matusow and Manning Johnson, had been attacked; this notwithstanding the fact that the court of appeals passed upon this very question, and held that the conclusion of the Board was supported by the basic findings which it had affirmed, and further held that the testimony of the witnesses whose credibility was attacked was consistent with and supported by masses of other evidence.

When this astounding decision was announced the lawyers in the Justice Department in Washington were stunned. Some of them declared in public statements that this decision may prove to be the most important Communist victory in the courts within the past 10 years.

So shocking was the action of the Court that Justice Clark uttered one of the most stinging criticisms ever directed at the Court. In a dissenting opinion he said:

"The Court now says the court of appeals erred in its denial of the motion and remands the case directly to the Board for it to determine again the credibility of these three witnesses. It refuses to pass on the important questions relating to the constitutionality of the Internal Security Act of 1950, a bulwark of the congressional program to combat the menace of world communism. Believing that the Court here disregards its plain responsibility and duty to decide these important constitutional questions, I cannot join in its action.

"I have not found any case in the history of the Court where important constitutional issues have been avoided on such a pretext. * * * The action today is taken merely for delay and can result only in the Board reaffirming the action. In fact, it so advised the court of appeals and that court found all of the testimony of the questionable witnesses were supported by masses of other evidences. * * *

"This proceeding has dragged out for many years now, and the function of the Board remains suspended and the congressional purpose frustrated at a most critical time in world history."

Recently I asked the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress in Washington to furnish to me a list of cases in which the defendant was a Communist, or suspected of Communist activities, or charged with subversive activities, whose cases have been carried to the Supreme Court and the Communists received favorable decisions. There are 28 of such cases. They were decided in the 17-year period beginning with the year 1939. Included among them are such defendants as Harry Bridges, 3 cases; Judith Coplon, 2 cases; William Remmington and Steve Nelson. Included among the list also is the Slochower case, striking down the New York City law which I have already referred to, and the case of *Communist Party* v. *Subversive Activities Control Board*, so strongly denounced by Justice Clark, whose dissenting opinion was concurred in by two other Justices.

The strange antics of this Court within the past 20 years have caused much wonderment as to why this Court which had functioned for so many years within its rightful jurisdiction, should change so radically as to transform itself from a dependable, responsible, and respected Court into an agency, which, masquerading under the guise of a court, began to devote itself to the task of nullifying existing law, legislating judicially to make new law where none existed before, and usurping power not possessed to amend the Constitution, while at the same time lending comfort and encouragement to radical movements and organizations which have grown bold and powerful during that period.

One cannot help but ask the question: Is this something that just happened unintentionally, or is it being done according to plan and program?

If there is a plan and program for the Supreme Court to change our form of government by usurping functions it does not possess, what possible explanation is there that the Court would lend itself to any such scheme?

I think there is no doubt that the Court is following such a pattern, and the explanation for it is that the Court is a packed Court, and the personnel of the Court are reformers whose primary goal is to change this Government of ours from a Republic of sovereign States into a bureaucratic Central Government, which shall be devoted not to the preservation of States rights, local self-government, and individual liberty, but shall be devoted to the promotion of socialistic doctrines, one-world government, and the radical philosophies of such groups as the Americans for Democratic Action, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and similar leftwing organizations. Its actions and its decisions in the past 20 years point directly to this conclusion.

To better understand the amazing actions and philosophy of some of the leaders of the Court, it is well to have a look at some of their activities before they went upon the Supreme Court bench.

Between 1937 and 1939 four appointments were made to the Supreme Court. Within 2 years Justices Black, Reed, Frankfurter, and Douglas were nominated and confirmed.

The name of Felix Frankfurter had been intimately associated with radical organizations for many years prior to his appointment to the position of Associate Justice.

From 1919 to at least 1937 Frankfurter was associated with the left-wing American Civil Liberties Union. He was on its national board. The American Civil Liberties Union received large sums of money, according to the House Committee on Un-American Activities, from the notorious Garland fund which was noted for its support of Communists. From the same source comes the information that the American Civil Liberties Union provided bail for the trial of Communists at Gastonia, N. C., convicted of a conspiracy to kill the chief of police. A committee of the New York State legislature said of the American Civil Liberties Union that in the last analysis it was a supporter of all subversive movements. That organization had as its director for many years Roger N. Baldwin. The records of the House Committee on Un-American Activities show that Baldwin was formerly a member of the IWW, served a term in prison as a draft-dodger during the war, and testified to the committee that his organization upheld the right of an American citizen or an alien to advocate force and violence for the overthrow of the Government. The United States House of Representatives special committee to investigate Communist activities in the United States said of the American Civil Liberties Union:

"The American Civil Liberties Union is closely affiliated with the Communist movement in the United States, and fully 90 percent of its efforts are on behalf of Communists who have come into conflict with the law."

Willam Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party in the United States was one of Frankfurter's fellow members in the Civil Liberties Union.

In 1927 Frankfurter was found speaking at public meetings in behalf of two convicted murderers and anarchists, Nicolo Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti, to secure a pardon for them. In that effort, he was in league with Robert M. Hutchins, the present head of one of the most infamous leftwing organizations in the United States, the Fund for the Republic, whose energies and assets are being devoted to financing radical movements and organizations, and the philosophies of the NAACP.

In 1928 Frankfurter became a member of the legal committee of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the organization principally responsible for the existing hostility and strife between white and colored people. He remained on the legal committee of that radical organization until his appointment to the Supreme Court.

Frankfurter's affinity for radicals and radicalism was illustrated early in his career in his attitude toward the so-called Tom Mooney trials in San Francisco. Mooney, a labor agitator, with strong leanings toward the Bolsheviks of his day, had been convicted of first-degree murder, resulting from a brutal bombing in San Francisco which killed 10 people and wounded many others. Because of his Bolshevik connections, his conviction became an international incident.

In the Mooney proceedings, Frankfurter had a cloak to hide under. He had been appointed a mediations commissioner by President Wilson, and he operated from that base in the Mooney matter. He was unable to pull the wool over the eyes of former President Theodore Roosevelt, however. Roosevelt wrote him a letter, a part of which follows:

"MY DEAR MR. FRANKFURTER: I thank you for your frank letter. I answer it at length because you have taken, and are taking, on behalf of the administration an attitude which seems to me to be fundamentally that of Trotsky and other Bolshevik leaders in Russia; an attitude which may be fraught with mischief in this country."

While Frankfurter was professor of law at Harvard, and consorting with such characters as William Z. Foster, Robert M. Hutchins, and others of various shades of pink and red, he was also engaged in placing such men as Alger Hiss in positions in Washington. Hiss, first recommended to Washington by Frankfurter, had a meteoric rise which terminated in the penitentiary through a conviction of perjury which branded him as a Communist.

It is of some significance that Alger Hiss worked for Justice Reed when Reed was in the Justice Department. It is significant also that Reed and Frankfurter (then both Justices on the Supreme Court) went to New York to testify in behalf of Hiss as witnesses to his good character. It is significant also that the jury did not believe that testimony and convicted Hiss.

Justice Reed went on the Supreme Court bench in 1938. In a publication entitled "Current Biography," he is quoted as having this philosophy regarding the Supreme Court:

"If by interpretation based on moderation, social and economic experiments, we can advance steadily toward our objective, we can avoid dangerous experiments of fundamental constitutional change."

This philosophy indicates an intention to change our Constitution not by constitutional amendment as prescribed by the Constitution itself, but by interpretation based on modern social and economic experiments.

These men are representative of the moral fiber which makes up our present-day Supreme Court.

Another irresponsible radical on the Court who brazenly asserts the claim that instead of being bound by the language of the Constitution, the Supreme Court may change its meaning to conform to the Court's ideas of modern needs is William O. Douglas. These quotations from a book he recently wrote are typical of his contempt for the Constitution upon which our free government is based:

"In nations like America and India that have written Constitutions, the judiciary must do more than dispense justice in cases and controversies. It must also keep the charter of government current with the times and not allow it to become archaic or out of tune with the needs of today.

"Today's new decision becomes a coveted anchorage for new vested interests. * * * It then takes an oncoming group from a new generation to catch the broader vision which may require the undoing of the work of their predecessors."

Under such befuddled and fuzzy thinking as this, the Constitution would cease to have any meaning whatever. If that conception were correct, then actually we have no Constitution at all. Its written words lose their meaning. The people would lose their power to control the Constitution by amendment, because that power of amendment would have been usurped completely by the nine men who sit in the Supreme Court.

The following activities further illustrate the philosophy of Douglas: He said in a speech at the University of Teheran that Iran needed to make sweeping reforms, and should adopt a program embracing perhaps 10-percent Communism, 15-percent capitalism, and 75-percent something else.

In 1952, he accepted a $1,000 award given by the CIO, an organization having a constant interest in much of the litigation which reaches the Supreme Court.

He urged in Tokyo that the Western Powers recognize Red China in the United Nations and unseat Nationalist China from the Security Council.

He wrote a dissenting opinion when the 11 top Communists were convicted and carried their case to the Supreme Court. In his dissent, he wrote that the freedom of speech of these Communists who were convicted under the Smith Act, was violated.

Yet, he supported the Smith Act in the Steve Nelson case which tied the hands of the 48 States so far as communism is concerned. When the issue was whether 11 convicted Communists should be punished, Douglas dissented. When the issue centered around encroaching on State's rights, plus freeing another convicted Communist, Douglas affirmed.

June 17, 1953, the day before the atomic spies, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, were scheduled for execution, he entered a stay of execution and left town. His order was invalidated by the Court, and the Rosenbergs were executed, but it did provide time and oportunity for Communists the world over to work up demonstrations elevating the Rosenbergs to martyrdom, something the Communists always seek.

Time does not permit a complete discussion of the radical affiliations and activities of the Supreme Court personnel.

Of the entire Supreme Court as it exists today, only two members had judicial experience before appointment to the Court, unless service as a city recorder could be counted judicial experience. In that event, three of the present Supreme Court members had judicial experience before going upon the bench of the highest Court of our land. Obviously, in this present era politics and radicalism outweigh legal ability and judicial experience.

When our Supreme Court has upon its bench men who have not only been associates and well-wishers, but active participants in the programs of such organizations as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, American Civil Liberties Union, Americans for Democratic Action, what can we expect when the radical philosophies of these organizations come before the Court for approval or disapproval? The wonder is that our Constitution has survived as well as it has.

If our free, constitutional Republic is to survive, protection must be afforded from these who are destroying it, whether they be zealous fanatics or merely well-meaning judges, determined to force radical doctrines upon an unwilling, but helpless, citizenry. The danger is greater now than it was in the thirties when the Executive undertook to pack the Supreme Court with a personnel willing to upset established precedents and to change the meaning of our Constitution.

A storm of protest went up then. But that protest was against a proposal to pack the Court.

The Court has now been packed. Our task now is to see to it that this packed Court does not destroy our Constitution and our Republic.

The wisdom of the ages is contained in the body of the law. If the statute law is to be changed, these changes should be made by the legislative branch. If the Constitution is to be changed, such changes should be made only by amendment.

It cannot be repeated too often—the Supreme Court has no right or authority to change the law or amend the Constitution. One of the principal reasons that liberty has survived in America, while perishing in nearly every other section of the world, is that our Government has been a government of laws and not a government of men.

Our Constitution has been manhandled by political appointees, screened and approved by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and Americans for Democratic Action. Their practice has been, during their incumbency on the bench, to say the law is one thing today and something else tomororw. They are destroying our Constitution and the rights of States and individuals, and we are being told that we must accept these outrageous and fraudulent violations of our constitutional rights—that we are helpless to resist them. I say that such is not the case.

Members of the bar are usually the first to take notice of any encroachment upon the rights of its citizens. The bar has been the first to resist improper use of authority or illegal exercise of powers. An aroused bar can do much toward requiring the Supreme Court to stay within its proper sphere, even though it may chafe with impatience at the somewhat slower approach of the millennium through constitutional channels.

Let me urge you, as members of our great profession, to take your place in this critical era, in this vital controversy, on the side of legal procedure and constitutional government.

TRAGIC FARCE CORRECTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include pertinent matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the action taken by the United Nations in disbanding the so-called Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission in Korea is an action which should be commended by all freedom loving people because it strikes a hard blow at the international Communist conspiracy. Those of us who have had an opportunity to visit Korea and to review first-hand the activities that have taken place there since the so-called truce, know full well now this Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission was used by the Communists to further their nefarious ends.

Last November during the course of an inspection trip to the Far East I spent 5 days in Korea and during that time had the opportunity to see firsthand the evidence which demonstrated beyond any question of doubt that the representatives of Communist-occupied Poland and Communist-occupied Czechoslovakia were, in fact, espionage and propaganda agents for the Kremlin. Much of this evidence was made available to me by the late Maj. Gen. Kim Chang Young, Chief of the Counterintelligence Corps of the Republic of Korea Army.

Last February General Kim was struck down by the bullets of assassins on the streets of Seoul, Korea, during the early morning hours. In a statement I made before the House on February 1, drawing attention to the death of General Kim, I had the following to say apropos the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission:

While in Korea, I heard a great deal of talk about the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission which was provided for in the so-called armistice arranged during the Communist war of aggression in Korea. As you know, that Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission is supposed to inspect and report on the armed truce which now hangs so heavily over the people of Korea. This Commission is in no sense, a neutral nations commission because it includes in its membership representation of Communist-occupied Poland and Communist-occupied Czechoslovakia. It will be recalled that India agreed to accept the Chair of this Commission when it was set up. But soon after when the deal proved to be phony, the Indian general acting as Chairman could no longer stomach the tragic farce which involved his nation and he accordingly resigned the chairmanship and took the Indian troops back to India. Consequently, there remain four member nations on this so-called Supervisory Commission; in addition to the Communist Czechs and Poles, there are the Swedes and the Swiss. Because of all the talk I heard about this so-called Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission, I asked General Kim for his opinion on the matter. He hesitated to answer me, and he told me that he did not want to embarrass any of the governments of the free world by expressing his opinion on this matter. I assured him that truth could never be a matter of embarrassment to the American people.

It was at this point that General Kim took me to a set of files and exhibits relating to the activities of the so-called Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission. In those files was an abundance of evidence of a documentary character together with pictures showing that the Communist Poles and Communist Czechs serving as members of this mission engaged in both espionage and propaganda activities. From the evidence collected by General Kim and his staff, I have no doubt whatever but that the Communist world conspiracy regards the so-called Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission in Korea as nothing more than an instrument through which they can carry out espionage and propaganda. I need not add that our own military security officers were not in disagreement with the evaluation given to me by General Kim on this all-important question. It is to be regretted that the representatives of Switzerland and Sweden have continued to lend themselves to this tragic farce which only makes more difficult the task of enforcing the peace and bringing about eventual unity of Korea under one government, representative of the will of the people.

It is indeed encouraging to hear that the United Nations has discharged the so-called Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission and in doing so, announced to the world that it was not only a tragic farce, but that the Communist conspirators have been using it as a cover to the preparation of a wide range of activities which can lead only to a reopening of the war of Communist aggression in Korea. It is also noteworthy that the United Nations rejected the proposal of Red China for the opening of discussions on a final settlement in Korea. The United Nations has rightfully found that the Chinese Communists are guilty of aggression in connection with the Korean war. It naturally follows that the United Nations would refuse to lift this condemnation by engaging in fruitless discussions with the Red Chinese on a settlement in Korea. The United Nations are to be congratulated for taking positive action to prevent any further damage to the cause of the free world by the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission in Korea.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 11544) to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

FAILURE OF CONGRESS TO INVESTIGATE ACTIVITIES OF RACKETEERS AND EXTORTIONISTS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, yesterday on the television program Meet the Press, Victor Riesel took occasion to criticize the Congress because it had failed to investigate the activities of racketeers and extortionists who were bringing so much trouble and disgrace to legitimate labor organizations.

In his opinion the acid assault upon him was the result of his exposure of the racketeers and extortionists who have forced their way into unions which they now dominate.

In my judgment, his opinion and his criticism of the Congress was justified because heretofore on both sides of the aisle there has been opposition which seems to be dictated by fear of political retaliation from labor organizations, to any suggestion that the Congress make any investigation such as Mr. Riesel indicated should be made.

Well do I recall that in the Eightieth Congress, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor and also as a member of the Committee on Government Operations, then known as the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, we undertook to expose some of these racketeers who were doing so much to injure the cause of organized labor. But we were shut off by individuals who were rather prominent in the political organization of the Republican Party, and there were some in the Democratic Party, not so many but some.

Of course, they, the Democrats, were more effective because in political organizations and in political maneuvering they have more ability than we have or else more courage or something, perhaps less regard for the methods they use than do we. They really go to town when they have charge of the organization. You have to hand it to them. That is why we got licked politically so often—that and their willingness to promise anything and everything regardless of their ability or willingness to deliver.

In the 83d Congress, an effort was made by me to iron out some difficulties on the question of jurisdiction that might arise between those two committees if an investigation such as suggested by Mr. Riesel was undertaken. It was my privilege to be a member of both.

At my request, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor did appoint a 3-man committee headed by our colleague from Kansas, WINT SMITH, and of which I was a member. It was my privilege to appoint a similar committee from the Committee on Government Operations. We held joint hearings in Detroit. We were well on the way toward exposing some of these racketeers, but at that time some Republicans stopped us again.

Later on, when the investigation got around to where it might reflect some discredit on the Governor of Indiana, who happened to be a Republican—I just happened to think of that just as this moment as a Republican from Indiana passed by—they stopped us once more. I recall that on that particular occasion our colleague from Kansas, Mr. SMITH, who was chairman of the joint committee, went out of the hearing room to answer a call from Washington. He came back and he said it was all off; we could not go ahead with anything that might involve the Governor of Indiana. One of the newspaper boys asked him who had called him out and he said, "Somebody away up there," and he pointed to the sky. Which ended that proposed investigation.

Later on the Committee on Government Operations, getting a little sore at me because of my crudeness and lack of finesse—I was so dumb I thought we should actually economize as well as talk economy, I do not know just what it is—took away my authority to go ahead with that investigation of racketeering. I had been advised when I went to Detroit that it might involve Jimmy Haffa, of the teamsters. You have all heard about him. If you have not, consult your labor directory and you will find him listed as the boss. Do not misunderstand me. I am not charging that Jimmy is taking any graft. He does not need to. His legitimate income from the union of which he is president is tremendous. He has on occasion hidden behind his wife's skirts and by forcing some of his union boys out of business aided her to a few thousand dollars' profit without much, if any, effort on her part. One of the unions of which he is president authorized him to spend as much of $4 million for political campaign purposes as he might desire.

May I say to my colleague from Illinois, Mr. O'HARA, that he shculd thank the good Lord Jimmy does not live in your district. With your views, if you would not take his orders—I know you would not—he would be after you come election day. Anyway, some of those who engineered that job of putting us off, or at least had something to do with it, did not win, even on a Republican ticket at that time. And so it has been all along. Political fear of a union boss who had no real political control of union votes has been effective.

I hope that the House will take cognizance of the present situation, because Victor Riesel has certainly paid a price for his opposition to those gangsters and their activities which no individual should be called upon to pay, which others will pay if the House does not have the courage to act. Perhaps now, because, being a member of the press or associated with the press, Victor is in a position to call for action and to make it so imperative, so necessary that we do something, maybe we will get a real investigation, something long overdue.

I hope we will, and I hope the Republicans will have a hand in it, and instead of cutting off this investigation as they did in the 80th and the 83d Congress and then giving the other group over there, with a Democrat at the head, an opportunity to go on, and they have, get the credit for an investigation which will clean up the present troubled situation.

I do not know why, as long as our position has always been known, we do not get a little of the credit which would come out of a fair, decent, effective investigation of those lawless oppressive activities.

The assault upon Riesel is an assault upon the right of a free press and free speech. As a matter of fact, neither party has anything to fear from the opposition of the labor leaders. That is true because the vast overwhelming majority of the members of the unions are just as honest and decent as the members of any other group. And they are just as independent, and I know in my own district they do not take the word of the boss as to how their vote should be cast. Actually the labor leaders so-called have little political power except as they use union funds to influence elections.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I heard the broadcast yesterday on Meet the Press, as the gentleman did. It was my understanding from what Mr. Riesel said that George Meany and Walter Reuther had spoken out against these racketeers in labor, and as I understood it they were willing for such an investigation to be conducted. Now, I do not know whether that was to be a congressional investigation or not, but it was my understanding that he stated on two occasions in that interview that both Meany and Reuther were against this kind of a policy. Now, was that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, that was my understanding of what he said, but I do not go along with his views on Walter Reuther on that. As to Meany, I have not the slightest doubt in my mind, from what I have known of his record, that he wants to get rid of the gangsters in the union organization. From what I know of Walter Reuther's record, he does not, and I will tell you why.

In the recent Kohler strike over in Sheboygan, Wis., not so long ago, what position did Walter take? He sent his righthand man, Emil Mazey, over there to engineer the strikers' activities. They, the pickets, disregarded all law, violated or decried the civil rights of all who opposed them. Mazey is the boy who stands back, and I know this from previous investigations at Dowagiac, Mich., at St. Joe, Mich., and at Clinton, Mich. This man Mazey, who is Reuther's righthand man, is the general on the spot; he is just as yellow as a man can be, and just as lawless. We had him on the witness stand. We know of his activities. Here is what he usually did—at least, he did in this case: He stands back and he tells the pickets, sometimes professional pickets, goons many times, wearing those iron hats, sometimes with a dumbbell, an iron one, in the hand this way, backing up to the plate-glass windows, as they did in Detroit when the strike was on against the automobile dealers, smashing the windows in back of them; he tells the pickets to go ahead, encourages them to do the actual fighting. Mazey stands back and encourages them to go on. Then, when some of the fellows who follow his advice get caught by the police, that is, one of the pickets, big, brave Mazey is in the clear. And he testified at St. Joe—he had to admit it—he testified at St. Joe he had been arrested many times; but he boasted proudly of the fact that he had never been convicted, which he had not up to that time. He is always the bird that is back behind, a yellow individual who has no regard for the law, who incites violence, but hides back in the crowd. He lacks the courage to do his own dirty work. Unfortunately for him, over at Sheboygan he went a little too far afield, and they nailed him and they convicted him, and that, as I understand, was the first time.

While we are on the subject, and so that my Democratic friends will not get too much credit for the Senate investigation to which Riesel referred, I want to call their attention to the fact that when a man named Flynn was convicted at St. Joe, Mich., and in spite of the fact that many automobiles have been damaged during strikes, and when the jury found that the damage was enough to make the offense a felony and the judge sent him to State's prison, one of the great candidates—you better strike the "great"—one of the candidates for the Democratic presidential nomination, our governor, Mr. Williams, pardoned him shortly thereafter, and within 2 weeks the pardoned violator of the law was down on the picket line at Sturgis, Mich. In this Sheboygan strike one of Reuther's and Mazey's boys went over there and beat up one of the workers. I do not recall whether the man died or not, but, in any event, there was a fugitive warrant sent out for him after he es-

caped to Michigan. Governor Williams was protecting the crook—I withdraw "crook"—the alleged crook and refused to send him back to Wisconsin for trial. As I understand it, the Federal court has ordered him to appear before the National Labor Relations Board and testify on a matter pending before the Board. Whether Wisconsin will get him for trial on the criminal charge I do not know. Williams says the man would not get a fair trial in Wisconsin if returned there. Of course, that is all nonsense. If Williams tried him—he would not try him; he would issue him a pardon in advance. What Williams is doing is making Michigan a State of refuge for those charged with crime committed in another State. So when you say Reuther wants to clean up, I say no; he does not want to clean up; he never has wanted to clean up. He has been a party all the time, since December of 1937, to encouraging violence in Michigan. He was in the sit-down strikes in 1937. He was one of the boys on the overpass in the Ford Detroit strike, where he and Frankenstein took a licking because they underestimated the physical ability of the workers. Just read what I put in the RECORD about Walter Reuther. He is the bird who went to Russia to get part of his education—he and his brother Victor. He is the bird who wrote back that letter from Russia to some of the workers in Detroit in which he said, "Fight for a Soviet America." Do not put any credence in Walter Reuther or Emil Mazey or any of the leaders of their goon squads.

Meany? Yes; if given the authority, I think he will clean house. But Reuther? No; and he will prevent Meany doing a job if he can. Hundreds of thousands of loyal workers, members of unions, want to go along with law enforcement. That is what my mail indicates and has indicated over the years. It has been that way all the time. There are only a few, just a sprinkling here and there, who are doing the dirty work and who are bringing discredit upon the unions.

PRESSURE ON CERTAIN IMMIGRANTS TO RETURN TO THE COUNTRY OF THEIR ORIGIN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, during the last several weeks there have paraded before a committee of the United States Senate a number of aliens who have been telling a most unusual and harrowing story concerning the attempts being made by the Iron Curtain countries to persuade these people to return home. Many of them are afraid because they say that they made misrepresentations when they came into the United States and are fearful lest they be deported.

At the time the basic Immigration and Nationality Code was drafted, in 1952, the conferees of the House and Senate knew all about those people who had made misrepresentations as to the place of their birth at the time they left the continent of Europe. Many of these people swore that they were born in countries other than Russia because we at that moment were parties to the forcible repatriation program, a terrible blot on our history. These people knew that if they were sent back to Communist Russia they would suffer in many respects.

As a matter of fact, I was at a camp in Germany when a Russian repatriation team was interrogating people there endeavoring to prevail upon them to go home. I asked the Russian colonel in charge of the team what success he was having. He smiled and said, "Two have been prevailed upon to leave this camp." I then said to him, "They are afraid to go to Russia." And he said, "Well, they know that they have much to answer to."

These are the people who later swore that they came from places other then Russia when they made their application for admission to the United States. But with that knowledge before the conference committee we wrote in our report and in section 243 (h) of the Code broad enough language under which the Attorney General of the United States can withhold deportation so that these people may come forward and tell the truth as to the places of their birth instead of continuing the lie under which they came to the United States. We have broadened this authority recently in the bill H. R. 6888, which has already passed the House.

I do not know what you have to do to call to the attention of the Attorney General of the United States this section 243 (h) of the law, but there it is. In the conference report, part of which I wrote myself, we spelled out this situation. I sincerely trust that the Attorney General of the United States in his wisdom will send to the immigration districts the necessary information so that these people who are in the United States unlawfully because of this technicality may remain in this country as they so fervently desire to do.

WALTER REUTHER AND BROTHERHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have a very deep personal affection for the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, who represents the district in which I was born. Ours is a friendship that transcends differences in political convictions and in philosophies. I regret that my good friend on this primary day, when we have little legislative business and plenty of time on our hands, felt moved to spread a feast of joyance in the laps of those on his side of the aisle who easily are tickled into hilarity by verbal brickbats hurled at the champions of labor and the upholders of the rights and dignity of men and women who toil in the trades and crafts. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan, who never is dull, surpassed himself in this feast of joyance, in honor I take it, and lacking any better reason, of primary day in Iowa.

Seated in the Chamber listening was the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], and when she heard Mr. Reuther mentioned in manner disrespectful of Mr. Reuther's great and overshadowing contribution to the better world in which we live, and mentioned also of one of the great governors that my native State of Michigan has ever had, the present governor of Michigan, the gentlewoman from Oregon wished and prepared to reply; but duty was calling her to her committee and she had to leave, so I ask unanimous consent that her remarks may be extended immediately following my remarks here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was on another matter that I asked time, not a matter of personalities, but to bring to this House a message of good cheer from the great Second Congressional District of Illinois. It does have, however, a relationship to the subject of the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan, since one of the causes to which Mr. Reuther and the great governor of Michigan have devoted themselves is that of brotherhood.

Yesterday, in Woodlawn, in the heart of the district that I represent, a new minister came to the 59-year-old Sixth United Presbyterian Church, a church that in these 59 years had had no worshiper not of the white race. The new minister that came yesterday to preside over that flock is a Negro, the Reverend Abraham Lincoln Reynolds, Jr., called by the vote of a white congregation.

Integration in the great Second District of Illinois is an accomplished fact. By reaching for brotherhood we have attained it.

I am sure my colleagues will be interested in and heartened by the account of the coming of the Reverend Mr. Reynolds to the Woodlawn Church, as told in the following news article from the Chicago Sun-Times of June 4, 1956:

NEGRO CLERIC FILLS WOODLAWN PULPIT

(By Dolores McCahill)

"You know without a question the Sixth (Woodlawn) United Presbytrian Church is integrated," the new pastor said in presenting his family.

The introduction was made Sunday by Dr. A. L. Reynolds, Jr., new Negro pastor of the church at 62d and Woodlawn, on behalf of his wife Louise and their two sons, Leroy and Abraham Lincoln Reynolds III.

After preaching his first sermon to his new congregation, Dr. Reynolds received into its membership the first two members of his race other than his own family.

FIFTY-NINE-YEAR-OLD CHURCH

The congregation, which previously numbered 159 whites and a girl with Japanese ancestry, decided to call a Negro minister to show that Negroes would be welcome in the 59-year-old church. It stands on a street which has a number of Negro residents.

The church met overflow success in its attempt to attract Negroes to the service. For the first time since Easter of 1952, sliding panels were raised so that worshipers unable

to find places in the pews could participate in the service from the Sunday school assembly room at the side.

Attendance had been from 50 to 65 on Sundays for the past 4 months, while 263 persons came to Dr. Reynolds' first sermon. The chief usher, Alexander Stevenson, estimated the congregation to be about 60 percent Negro and 40 percent white. Dr. Reynolds from his pulpit thought he saw more Negroes than whites though he hadn't been thinking in those terms.

Extending the invitation to membership, the minister said "We are a group of people here who only see people. I can't help but believe the Saviour of us all smiles this morning as we work together in His name and for His cause."

Those who joined yesterday were David G. Hayes of 6431 South University, a real estate agent, and Mrs. George W. Prince of 6136 South Greenwood, substitute high school teacher.

BELIEVED PRECEDENCE

Officers of the Sixth United Presbyterian Church believe it was the first white congregation in Chicago to bring a Negro to its pastorate. It is thought to be the second United Presbyterian congregation in the country to adopt a program of interracial membership. One in St. Louis already had done so, they said.

Asked whether he regarded the new interracial character of his congregation as permanent or transitional, Dr. Reynolds said: "My aim is to serve the community. If the entire community becomes of one race, quite naturally the church would. But our doors are open to any nationality."

The minister previously served Mount Olive Methodist Church in Topeka, Kan., a Negro congregation. He chose Horizons Unlimited as the theme of his initial sermon here, telling the church members they shared "a challenge to lift our hearts by prayer, love, faith, and understanding."

The Chicago Tribune of June 4, 1956, gives the following account:

NEGRO PASTOR IN PULPIT OF WHITE CHURCH

The Sixth United Presbyterian church, 6161 Woodlawn avenue, the first white congregation in Chicago to appoint a Negro as its pastor May 11, became an integrated congregation yesterday.

The Reverend Dr. Abraham Lincoln Reynolds, Jr., 49, formerly of Topeka, Kans., assumed his pastorate at the 11 a. m. service. More than 300 persons, half of them Negroes, worshiped together in reciting psalms and singing hymns. An all white choir of 14 sang in the chancel, but whites and Negroes shared ushering assignments.

RECALLS CHRIST'S ORDER

Dr. Reynolds said in the invocation that "all men are created in the image of God," and recalled in the Scripture reading from the 16th chapter of St. Mark that Christ ordered his disciples to "preach the gospel to every living creature."

"There are some men who say all men and women cannot live and worship together," the pastor said. "But a Man who lived on this earth 1,900 years ago said it can be done."

During the service, Dr. Reynolds introduced his wife, Louise, and two children, Theon Le Roy, 11, and A. L. III, 8, to the congregation. A reception for the Reynolds family will be held in the church Friday night.

MANY LEAVE NEIGHBORHOOD

After the service, parishioners introduced themselves to each other. Monroe McMackin, sessions clerk of the church, explained that because of displacement of white families by Negro families, members living in the neighborhood had shrunk from 250 to 7 families although dozens who had moved away continued to attend services.

After the congregation voted to keep the church in its present location the missions board of the United Presbyterian church assisted in the search for a pastor. Meanwhile parishioners began a canvass of the neighborhood in invite Negroes to attend the 59-year-old church.

First of the new parishioners to sign membership cards yesterday was David G. Hayes, 33, of 6431 University Avenue, a real estate salesman.

ECONOMIC AID IN THE MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, the Mutual Security Act of 1956 will come to the floor next Wednesday. I thought it might be helpful to explain in advance some of the provisions in the bill which have not received much attention. There has been a great deal of discussion about the military part of this bill. Perhaps we forget that most of the money authorized in the bill is for economic aid of various kinds.

Of the $3,563,475,000 total, $1,550,700,000 is for furnishing military weapons, equipment and training; $2,012,775,000 is for other purposes. This year, economic aid for direct forces support in the amount of $374,300,000 was carried in the general military assistance request of $2,925,000,000. Even though this request has been cut to $1,925,000,000 in section 2 of the bill, I understand that the Executive is not planning to cut the spending for direct forces support, which is economic aid—food, clothing, gasoline, and so forth, for the support of troops.

Thus the authorizations for economic aid in the bill are as follows:

[In millions]

Direct forces support	$374.3
Defense support	1,147.7
Development assistance	243.0
Technical cooperation	157.5
Other programs	90.3
Total (rounded)	2,012.8

The first two items are for support of military effort. Every item is designed to promote our own security. Most of the money authorized, however, is for economic aid, not weapons and training. The amount for guaranties is increased $400 million in the bill, but is a contingent item and therefore is not shown as an increased authorization in the totals. If we add this amount to the authorizations available for economic aid under this bill, the total would be $2,412,800,000 for economic aid compared to $1,550,700,000 for strictly military aid.

LONG-TERM AID

This bill involves a considerable reappraisal of the Executive requests for economic aid, especially as to long-term aid to underdeveloped countries.

Recently, as part of their "new look," the Soviets have been offering technical assistance and economic aid to undeveloped countries.

We have been doing this for a number of years. A number of such programs are contained in existing law. The President's Fund for Asian Development was created last year, for $200 million to remain available until June 30, 1958. Development assistance was authorized in title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, with separate amounts for the Near East and Africa, Asia, and the Western Hemisphere.

This year's requests included a special authorization for the Middle East and Africa of $100 million, and specific longer-term commitments for economic development up to 10 years of not to exceed $100 million in any 1 year from any new funds made available.

The committee reappraised this program. There is no termination date in the mutual security law and therefore any amendment expressed in terms of years would be shorter in duration technically speaking than the law it amended. We also realize that no Congress can pass a law its successor cannot amend or repeal.

Therefore the committee adopted a carefully worded statement of policy—see section 7 of the bill—of continuing aid to free nations as long as this danger to the peace of the world and our own security persists, and then rearranged and combined the various programs of development assistance by an amendment I offered.

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

Assistance for economic development of their resources has been furnished to many countries in the past, including countries carrying on military programs as part of their defense support—see title I. This can be done under the present bill. In recent years, however, the words "development assistance" have come to have a special meaning; substantial economic aid in addition to technical assistance in countries which do not have military programs in the common defense. This applies especially to underdeveloped countries.

This year a number of separate programs of this character were requested. The requests were for $370 million, as follows:

President's Asian fund	$100,000,000
Title II—Development assistance:	
Near East and Africa	63,000,000
Asia	80,000,000
Latin America	27,000,000
Total title II	170,000,000
Middle East	100,000,000
Development assistance request	370,000,000

We put the request for Latin America in title I—defense support, as being more appropriate for neighbors who are joined together in treaties for defense against communism, even though they may not be carrying on joint military programs. We increased this amount by $5 million. This left $370 million in the development assistance category, as follows:

Development assistance request	$370,000,000
Deduct Latin America (transferred)	27,000,000
Development assistance request	343,000,000

We reduced this total request by $100 million and, in section 4 of the bill, authorized $243 million, to remain available until June 30, 1960, for economic development in free Asia, the Middle East and Africa. We did not divide the amount among these regions, but not more than 25 percent is to go any one nation. All of it is to be in loans or surplus agricultural commodities, except for regional projects involving 2 or more nations. We wish to encourage regional projects, but although the present law requires preference for such programs in the Asian fund, we learned—hearings, page 453—that only one-third of the $66.6 million programed is for regional projects.

LOANS

The present law provides in 3 places that the program "shall emphasize loans rather than grants, wherever possible." The efforts this year have been "disappointing," to quote Mr. Hollister, Director of ICA—hearings, page 49—probably about the same as last year's $209 million.

The requirements of the development assistance section should improve this record.

The Soviets furnish all of their economic aid, except for technical assistance, in the form of loans or barter deals. There is little or nothing in the record to show that we need to make outright grants to compete with them in neutral underdeveloped countries.

There is a popular misconception, stimulated by banking minds and by giveaway enthusiasts, that aid loans amount to grants, are never paid, and create hard feelings.

The record is otherwise. For instance, we received last year $502 million in principal and $273 million in interest on foreign-aid loans made since World War II according to the Department of Commerce. About one-fifth of our post-war aid of $5 billion has been in credits. Under the mutual-security program and its predecessors 50 loans to 23 countries, totaling about $1,868,000,000 have been made. This year $15,126,672 is being paid on principal and $37,651,945 in interest on these loans.

We are becoming a have-not country in essential raw materials. Any long-term development plans for other countries should include long-term repayments which can be made in raw materials we will need increasingly. This bill stresses this policy.

GUARANTIES

This bill—section 6 (k)—provides authority to guarantee $400 million in private investments by an amendment I offered, in addition to the estimated $100 million which will be issued by June 30. A fractional reserve is set up, in line with insurance practice instead of a 100 percent reserve. In addition to insuring convertibility of currencies, and against expropriation or confiscation, coverage may include losses caused by war, revolution, and insurrection.

Up to date we have had no losses on investment guaranties, and the reserve is maintained by issuance of notes which do not require appropriations. Over $293 million in applications are now pending. We charge a fee for guaranties. Our whole foreign-aid program is to assure that we will not have a war, and that we will end up with a peaceful free world where people respect private property and pay their debts. If we can secure private investment in underdeveloped countries by charging a fee to protect the investor against the risks we have spent billions to prevent, we can cut the amount of Government-aid programs.

Up to date, Government officials and bureaucrats here and abroad, and also businessmen here and abroad, when given the choice of grants, loans, or guaranties in foreign-aid programs, have usually chosen grants. In this case, flexibility has been expensive. When the choice has been loans or nothing, they choose loans. As grant money has been reduced, interest in guaranties has increased. By tightening up on grants, but opening up on loans and guaranties, for economic development, we hope to encourage a long-term policy that will involve private investment costing our Government nothing, or loans, where we are repaid. That is the capitalistic system that developed our country and most of the free world. We believe it is better than the Communist system, and will prove itself in competition.

AMENDMENTS TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODES OF 1939 AND 1954

Mr. COOPER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7247) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and for other purposes.

CERTAIN RAILROAD REORGANIZATIONS AND INSOLVENCY PROCEEDINGS

Mr. COOPER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6143) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and for other purposse.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, for 10 minutes, on today.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. WILLIS), on Thursday, for 30 minutes.

Mr. IKARD, on tomorrow, for 30 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY, on tomorrow, for 20 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois and to include an outstanding address by Mr. FEIGHAN.

Mr. WALTER and include an address he delivered at the national convention, notwithstanding the estimated cost will amount to $287.

Mr. KEARNS on the bill H. R. 10424.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOEVEN.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan and include an editorial.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2048. An act for the relief of certain former employees of the Inland Waterways Corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2771. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the Fourth National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2772. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in England in 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore:

H. R. 1671. An act for the relief of Clement E. Sprouse;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Elizabeth Doherty;

H. R. 2216. An act to amend the Act of June 19, 1948 (ch. 511, 62 Stat. 489), relating to the retention in the service of disabled commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army and Air Force;

H. R. 3996. An act to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945;

H. R. 4229. An act to provide running mates for certain staff corps officers in the naval service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4437. An act relating to withholding for State employee retirement system purposes, on the compensation of certain civilian employees of the National Guard and the Air National Guard;

H. R. 4569. An act to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes;

H. R. 4704. An act to provide for the examination preliminary to promotion of officers of the naval service;

H. R. 5268. An act to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the payment of mileage allowance for overland travel by private conveyance outside the continental limits of the United States;

H. R. 7679. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Muskogee, Okla.;

H. R. 8477. An act to amend title II of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, by providing flexibility in the distribution of women officers in the grades of commander and lieutenant commander, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8490. An act authorizing the administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Bonham, Tex.;

H. R. 8674. An act to provide for the return of certain property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.;

H. R. 9358. An act to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to issue a deed to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for certain land heretofore conveyed to such city, removing the conditions and reservations made a part of such prior conveyance; and

H. R. 10251. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to deed certain land to the city of Grand Junction, Colo.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 5, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1918. A letter from the president, the bar association of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to prescribe administrative procedure for the government of the District of Columbia, to require the maintenance of an official publication for said government, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1919. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of December 2, 1942, and the act of August 16, 1941, relating to injury, disability, and death resulting from war-risk hazards and from employment, suffered by employees of contractors of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1920. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States courts and before United States commissioners, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1921. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 752 of title 28 of the United States Code"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 31, 1956, the following bills were reported June 1, 1956:

Mr. GORDON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 10766. A bill to authorize the payment of compensation for certain losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces during World War II, with amendment (Rept. No. 2251). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOPER: Committee of Conference. H. R. 7247. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of gain in certain railroad reorganizations (Rept. No. 2252). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COOPER: Committee of Conference. H. R. 6143. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that for taxable years beginning after May 31, 1950, certain amounts received in consideration of the transfer of patent rights shall be considered capital gain regardless of the basis upon which such amounts are paid (Rept. No. 2253). Ordered to be printed.

[*Submitted June 4, 1956*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 521. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 1840, a bill to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination; without amendment (Rept. No. 2254). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 11544. A bill to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2512. An act to amend the Act of August 27, 1954, so as to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died or were killed while serving in such forces; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 9828. A bill to transfer 600 acres of public domain to the Kanosh Band of Indians, Utah; without amendment (Rept. No. 2258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 11522. A bill to implement section 25 (b) of the Organic Act of Guam by carrying out the recommendations of the Commission on the Application of Federal Laws to Guam, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7888. A bill to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands located at Weliweli, Island of Kauai, to certain claimants; without amendment (Rept. No. 2255). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 8005. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the Mathew American Horse American Legion Post No. 259, Cannon Ball, N. Dak., of certain lands upon the Standing Rock Reservation, N. Dak., for use as a site for the erection of a memorial monument in honor of soldiers killed in battle; with amendment (Rept. No. 2256). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 11569. A bill to provide for effecting the disposition of the Illinois and Mississippi Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 11570. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to fisheries and wildlife; to strengthen the fisheries and wildlife segments of the national economy; to create and establish within the Department of the Interior the office of Under Secretary of Fisheries and Wildlife, a Fisheries Service and a Wildlife Service; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 11571. A bill to incorporate the Boys' Clubs of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 11572. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place marine sextants on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois:

H. R. 11573. A bill to promote the progress of medicine and to advance the national health and welfare by creating a National Library of Medicine to be located in Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 11574. A bill to amend paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368), as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 11575. A bill to provide for an Assistant Secretary for Research and Development for each of the three military departments within the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 11576. A bill to amend part III of subchapter O of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 11577. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PRIEST (by request):

H. R. 11578. A bill to amend section 610 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the imposition of civil penalties in certain additional cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 11579. A bill to establish a Federal Recreation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 11580. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 11581. A bill to provide for registration, reporting, and disclosure of employee welfare and pension benefit plans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 11582. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act and the Communist Control Act of 1954 so as to provide for a passport review procedure and to prohibit the issuance of passports to persons going or staying abroad to support the Communist movement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY (by request):

H. J. Res. 632. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the T2-SE-A2 tankers, *Mission San Antonio* and *Mission De Pala*; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H. Res. 522. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Ways and Means to inves-

tigate and study tariff and trade laws, regulations, practices, and policies, with reference to their effect on industry, labor, and agriculture in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. Res. 523. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of labor racketeering in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 11583. A bill for the relief of Denise Curkan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 11584. A bill for the relief of Estelle Carlson as guardian of Hulda Ahlberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 11585. A bill for the relief of Plutarco Pecina Sierra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 11586. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Cornelia W. Heiss, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 11587. A bill for the relief of Shakeeb Dakour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 11588. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Norberta Cueto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 11589. A bill for the relief of O. J. Glenn & Son, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 11590. A bill for the relief of Harry N. Duff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 11591. A bill for the relief of Antonio Murgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Con. Res. 246. Concurrent resolution approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1098. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of John Q. Timbrell and 90 residents of Bloomsburg and Columbia County, Pa., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1099. By Mr. SILER: Petition of Dr. David A. Cavin, president, Baptist Bible Fellowship, Springfield, Mo., and Jesse M. Seaver, director, Carolina Christian Union, Roanoke Rapids, N. C., on behalf of some 1,800 delegates and members of the Baptist Bible Fellowship at their annual national meeting at Springfield, Mo., urging enactment of the Siler bill, H. R. 4627, and the Langer bill, S. 923, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1100. Also, petition of Dr. David A. Cavin, president, Baptist Bible Fellowship, Springfield, Mo., and Jesse M. Seaver director, Carolina Christian Union, Roanoke Rapids, N. C., on behalf of some 1,800 delegates and members of the Baptist Bible Fellowship at their annual national meeting at Springfield, Mo., urging the Congress to approve House Joint Resolution 312, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and which is known as the Christian amendment resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Water and Land Conservation and Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to present a brilliant address delivered to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at its 43d annual convention at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on May 11, 1956. Senator STUART SYMINGTON, former Secretary of the Air Force, presents in a most able and constructive manner the problems of water utilization throughout the United States and gives, as far as I know, for the first time his views on what may be the No. 1 internal problem within our country.

The speech is as follows:

I welcome this opportunity to discuss one of the Nation's most urgent problems—the conservation and use of our water and land resources.

History shows that every civilization which has risen to world prominence has done so only in areas where the soil was fertile; and where pure water was abundant.

It was not by coincidence that man's first cities were built along the fertile banks of the Tigris-Euphrates River in Mesopotamia; and along the Nile River in Egypt.

These areas were the "cradles" of early civilization.

It is a historical fact that no nation has long maintained a leading world position after either its soil or water supply became depleted.

As illustration, Rome was perhaps the proudest of all ancient empires.

But by the second century A. D. that Empire had become so impotent agriculturally the historian, Simkovitch, was moved to write:

"Province after province was conquered by Rome to feed the growing proletariat * * * Latium, Compania, Sardinia, Sicily, Spain, Northern Africa, as Roman granaries were successively reduced to exhaustion. Abandoned land in Latium and Campania turned into swamps; Northern Africa into a desert. The forest-clad hills were denuded."

In other words, when the Roman Empire became an agricultural parasite, like all other parasites, it perished when its sources of food became exhausted.

History's greatest lesson may be the fact adequate water and land are prerequisites not only to improved living standards but also to national survival.

When the United States was first settled some 350 years ago timber, water, and rich soil existed in great abundance.

But the population grew steadily and the consumption of soil products and water steadily increased; and therefore shortly after the year 1900 we realized that shortages were possible even in America.

As a result President Theodore Roosevelt initiated the Nation's first conservation program.

Then came World War I with its tremendous drain on our productive capacity; and later the gigantic growth in our industrial complex during the 1920's.

By the early 1930's the complete exhaustion of our natural land and water resources could be foreseen; and so, under the leadership of another Roosevelt, our Government undertook to carry out the greatest reclamation, conservation, and resources development program ever conceived in all history.

Vast tracts of arid desert became areas of fertile productivity. Denuded hills were reforested. Deplenished agricultural plains were first fertilized and then sown in grass and grain. Multiple-purpose reservoirs were constructed.

This was a program to preserve our greatest heritage—the soil and water of America.

With the exception of the air we breathe, water is the material most vital to human life. It is the largest single controlling factor in the growth of population, in the growth of industry, and in the growth of agriculture.

Because we of America were particularly blessed with an initial abundance of fresh water, we can only blame ourselves for that lack of foresight which in turn now forces us to face up to this impending water shortage.

As our population increases we must devote ever more attention to the elimination of water waste through uncontrolled floods, lack of conservtaion practices, and stream pollution.

In all probability within 20 years water will be the most critical scarcity of all our national resources.

According to the Hoover Commission, in 1975 water consumption will be 1½ times greater than it was in 1950, but in 1950 we were already suffering serious water shortages in many areas, a trend that is increasing each year.

Last fall the chief of the fish and game division of the Missouri Conservation Commission warned about this problem, as follows:

"Approximately three-fourths of the earth's surface is water, one-fourth land. I contend that the Lord made the earth that way because that is the relative importance of the two. Regardless of what anyone may believe, however, the fact remains that life on this earth, in all its forms and facets, has developed and must live accordingly.

"Water is our most important resource. The available supply of fresh, pure water is an absolute deadline beyond which no community, state, or nation can ever go. When humanity runs out of clean water everything stops—that is the end of the road for man and all his activities."

The growing domestic, industrial, irrigation, and power needs for water make imperative the adoption of a national water policy which will insure the development of our new water supplies.

To that end the following six steps, some now being taken haltingly, some not at all, should be followed resolutely:

There should be a coordinated program of flood control, water storage, and power development through the construction of multiple-purpose reservoirs, wherever feasible, on the water arteries of the Nation.

There should be a cooperative national and State program for organization and development of local watershed districts to control water runoff at its source. This would conserve and preserve a supply of fresh water on the land where it falls.

There should be a strong program of stream pollution control. That control should embody, first, provisions for interstate cooperation in the control and prevention of stream pollution; and, second, Federal grants-in-aid to towns and cities for the construction of sewage treatment plants, along with other water purification facilities.

There should be a cooperative national and State program for the reclamation of used water by the removal of waste and the use of purification processes.

There should be a cooperative national and State program for the development of new ground water reservoirs. This would tap the presently unavailable underground lakes and streams.

There should be a national research program designed to investigate the possibility of inducing rainfall through artificial means, the development of a practical method of removing salt from sea water, and the development of methods to use fresh water substitutes in industrial and agricultural production.

Unless we follow through on a positive program of this type, in the not too distant future we will find ourselves as a Nation in the position of the throat-parched ancient mariner who cried, "Water, water, everywhere—but not a drop to drink."

Now is also the time to give serious consideration to the problem of how to conserve our native soil, and make it more productive.

Each year millions of tons of our best soil are eroded by rivers and streams.

Add to this the tons of topsoil eroded by the wind of our western plains, and we begin to calculate how many acres of agricultural productivity are sacrificed each year through natural causes alone.

For many decades, farmers in this country, schooled in the tradition of their fathers and grandfathers persisted in the raising of the same crops on the same soil. As a result, the once fertile topsoil has been depleted of its regenerative powers; and in many cases each year the crop yield becomes less and less.

Despite this continuing loss and depletion of soil, our present agriculture production is high—so high that many persons, including the Secretary of Agriculture, term it a "crushing abundance."

Therefore, some people believe this is not a popular time to talk about practices that will increase rather than decrease our present farm production.

I am not one of those people.

I believe our present so-called agricultural abundance is a temporary economic condition.

By 1975 the population of this country will have increased to approximately 193 million people.

For this reason alone we will then consume 41 percent more food than we did in 1950, a record agricultural year.

To be specific: By 1975 according to the report in 1952 of the President's Materials Policy Commission, we will consume 41 percent more corn, 42 percent more beef, 23 percent more wheat, and a total of 25 percent of such nonfood agricultural products as wool and cotton.

As can readily be seen, our present so-called crushing abundance will not meet those increased needs of the future.

We do have the potential of a substantial increase in agricultural production during the next 20 years. It is estimated that through irrigation, reclamation, and other conservation practices, we may be able to add some 80 million or 90 million acres to our present agricultural land.

But as stated in the materials policy report:

"In years gone by, an increase in farm production normally meant an increase in acres planted. But new lands for the extension of farm frontiers no longer exist. Relatively few new acres remain for the plow * * *. The bulk of future farm production—for the next 25 years or the next 100—must come from land already under cultivation."

Present indications are that by 1975, through straining our production potential to the utmost, this country will nevertheless want to consume 3 percent more wheat than we can produce, 23 percent more fresh vegetables, 11 percent more eggs, 7 percent more wool, 27 percent more beef, and 30 percent more pork.

This is why I say that unless we adopt now a program of nationwide soil conservation, improved farming practices, and agricultural research we will be faced with the necessity of having to go abroad for more and more of our food supply.

In this connection, the material policy report, a great piece of work, predicts that by 1975 our agricultural imports will increase 46 percent, while our agricultural exports will decline by about 36 percent.

In my judgment, therefore, it is imperative we now begin to explore all ways to reclaim land, control erosion, develop better seeds and fertilizers, improve and encourage crop rotation practices; and also launch a long-range program of research on how to conserve and preserve the soil on which every one of us depends for physical livelihood.

During the last war, after our rubber supply was almost completely cut off, the scientists went to work and came up with synthetic rubber.

But the big difference in this analogy and our impending food shortage is the fact there is no substitute for food. No one wants energy pills as a substitute for steak.

In the long run, civilization, as we know it could be as seriously threatened by the possible future shortage of these resources as by the possibility of a hydrogen war.

In the fields, mines, mountains, and waters of the United States and its possessions lies much of the opportunity to preserve our national security as well as our future prosperity.

Therefore, let us now take stock of our present conservation programs, and adapt them to meet the needs of the future.

It was Daniel Webster who said:

"Let us never forget that the cultivation of the earth is the most important labor of man. When tillage begins, other arts follow. The farmers, therefore, are the founders of civilization."

From South Dakota to South Carolina—An Invitation and a Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on May 5, I had the opportunity to address for the second time the State convention of the South Carolina State Bankers Association. The meeting was held in Greenville, S. C.

My central theme was that it is fully as important that American businessmen understand the mechanics of politics and the science of political engineering as it is that they understand their machines of business and production or the science of economics.

My address was transcribed from the radio tape provided by the radio station broadcasting my off-the-cuff address to the convention, and I ask that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Thank you, very much, indeed, Mr. Chairman, for that altogether too generous introduction.

Distinguished officers of the South Carolina State Bankers Association, ladies and gentlemen of the convention, it really is worth the long trip from Washington to Greenville just alone to hear such a wonderful introduction as was presented to you by the distinguished chairman, a fellow politician of parts who accorded me all of the customary courtesies which extend between the members of our profession. However, I must make one slight correction in what we had to say because I recognize that it is dangerous enough for a Yankee Republican from South Dakota to come down into the sacred portals of South Carolina without having added to the uniqueness of the situation, a designation of having come from North Dakota. I come from far enough north as it is, and as long as there is an affinity between us which we have as South Dakotans and South Carolinians, I feel like I can speak with greater candor than if I came from that altogether strange land known as North Dakota.

They sometimes do confuse us, frequently confuse us, and I can understand why, but I like to point out the fact that there is at least one great distinction between North Dakota and South Dakota. It was brought out by the Associated Press statistics a couple of years ago which pointed out that the two States which have the greatest record of longevity from the standpoint of the people living within the boundaries of those States were North Dakota and South Dakota. For some strange reason, the climate or water or weather or something, the people there have a little slower rate of mortality than they have in any of the other 46 sister States. For some time it was a matter of chagrin to us, however, to realize that the people of North Dakota were a little bit better in their statistical averages than the people of South Dakota. Some way or another they cling to life a little more tenaciously, their mortality statistics were a little bit more optimistic than South Dakota. We thought, pondered, and worried about that for several months and tried to figure out what we could do to improve the living conditions of our State, and finally came to the inevitable conclusion that the reason why our good neighbors to the north hung on to life a little bit more persistently, were a little more reluctant to pass on, was because they cherished in their hearts the hope that before they died, they might live long enough to move down into South Dakota and become citizens of our State, and for that reason we are content to be only second high from the standpoint of those statistics.

Seeing you all here this morning brings to my mind a great many happy memories of my previous visit before this great association when you were in convention assembled over at Charleston. It brings to my mind many of the happy continuations and resumptions of those friendships which I have had during the intervening years as I have seen some of you here in South Carolina and have met some of you in other areas and as some of you have dropped into my Washington office to visit me.

I cherish greatly the friendships I have made in my visits into the South, and I rate none higher than those made in talking to

this distinguished company of business people and their wives here from this great State of South Carolina. It is indeed a privilege to be back. I have tried to figure out since I received the invitation from Mr. Alexander just why I was invited back. You know there are two kinds of speakers that come back for a second time before the same audience; there is the kind they invite to come back, and there is the kind they dare to come back, and I imagine, perhaps, that I come under the second category, because I recall that I spoke to you with complete candor when I was here before, as I intend to do this morning, because in these busy lives which all of us lead, there isn't much use of our just sitting around listening to pleasant mouthings of unimportant things.

It is interesting, when, on occasion, people with different points of view can get together, however, and discuss the things which they have in common and discuss the things as well on which they differ, and to try and find out how we can harness together each other's ideals and energies and abilities and talents in the public interest. That shall be the purport of my message here this morning.

I suspect that during the past quarter of a century of world history there have been more important changes made than in any other like period of human history, and, in my opinion, none of these changes insofar as they affect the American scene are concerned, none of the changes on the American scene is more important than this simple but incontrovertible fact, and that is that 25 years ago, economics—the profession in which you gentlemen have specialized—25 years ago economics was the controlling factor of our political life, and today politics has become the controlling factor in our economic life. It seems to me that that tremendous change very well typifies many of the problems which confront us, and pretty well challenges our ability whether we are economists, businessmen, or politicians to try and find a way to correct any difficulties which may have eventuated from that strange reversal of the coin.

In the early 1930's and in previous eras of American history, the economic tone of the Nation in large part determined the voting behavior of our citizens, and decided the fate of our various national administrations. We had slogans about the full dinner pail; campaign platforms, and campaign promises, and campaign pronouncements were made dealing with the unemployment statistics, dealing with the earning power of citizens, dealing primarily with the economic situation.

Today, I think, few if any among us, will deny the fact that the Government has grown so strong and Federal spending has become so important that the political bias of our national administrations determine the economic tone of our Nation and the financial status of millions of Americans whether they be workers or farmers or businessmen. Not all change in my opinion is progress, and, in my opinion, we have gone too far in the direction of gearing our prosperity curves and our individual financial success to the political philosophies which dominate the White House and the Congress. To return to an era in which the operation of economic principles and policies once again have a dominant part in determining our national destiny, however, is going to require a substantial shrinkage in the power, in the spending, and in the regulations of the Federal Government.

America today is enjoying unprecedented prosperity. We hear of that as we study every financial report of virtually every successful corporation in the country. Optimism for the future prevails on every side. These rose-tinted conditions have developed from the fact that we now have a national administration which commands public confidence and a bipartisan Congress which respects private ownership and individual freedom. However, in any era, when the stock market stampedes up or down depending upon the readings of an electric cardiograph and when a public address by a member of the President's Cabinet can stimulate or retard vast industrial expenditures, there can be no denial of the fact that we are living in an era where political behavior has become the throttle which determines the speed or the success of economic expansion.

This being true, and I believe it to be true, businessmen, including bankers, including, may I say, especially bankers because so much of the rest of the economic community rightfully depends on bankers for counsel and advice, businessmen then, especially bankers, must reexamine their political prejudices and preferences and performances. I think the same is true in labor whose success is tied in so closely with the success of business but I am speaking here primarily to businessmen who, in my opinion, must become as well versed as to what is good for them politically as they are trained in what is good for their institutions economically.

To do less than that is to turn over the ultimate success of their enterprises to power-seeking professional politicians who consider politics solely as a device for achieving office and who use public power as a mucilaginous device for holding them in their positions of prestige and importance as long as possible. Those tactics have destroyed the economic strength and the political authority of many of our western democracies who less than 20 years ago were comparatively strong and stable. Those tactics, in my opinion, can deviatlize America as well, and unless we pay as much attention to the polilt cal machines as we do the machines of commerce that we use in our offices and in our factories, it can very easily happen in this great country that we call America.

Increasingly the strong arm of Government is moving into your shops, into your offices, into your every economic determination, and that my good friends, brings me to the theme which I desire to talk about. With that historic backdrop I think that I should discuss with you the machinery and the mechanics of politics as I have come to understand them after some 20 years devoted to a study and analysis of them from the inside following, as the chairman has said, 10 years of study of them from the outside when I was engaged in teaching college youngsters about the basic tenants of America. Because of that, I appreciate this invitation even more to come down into the Deep South to think out loud with you for a while about some of these conclusions or conjuctures which I have because I know that here I have always received respectful and responsible attention to the analysis.

AS DIXIE GOES, SO GOES THE WORLD

I come here not necessarily with any desire whatever to seek approval or acceptance of the suggestions that I make, but I always have the right to hope, and sometimes my hope is encouraged by some of the performances of recent history. I come here, however, primarily to discuss with you as honestly and as frankly and as faithfully as I can what I think is happening to America and what I think primarily can be changed in America only by the behavior politically of the people of the South.

I think of that when I get criticized by the people of my section of the country, when I turn down invitations as I had to do for today to talk about some pleasant subject before a noncontroversial audience, such as addressing a Republican convention about republicanism or talking to a woman's club about foreign policy or to a veteran's organization about patriotism or to farmers about farming in order to come down into this perilous atmosphere to discuss with you subjects which, in my opinion, are so important to be discussed here and before you.

But I have a prevailing feeling which has continued to evolve to greater and greater clarity and greater and greater emphasis, in my opinion. I have a prevailing conviction that what happens in Dixie in the next 10 years is going to determine definitely what happens to America in the next 100. And this I also believe—that what happens in America in the next few years is going to pretty clearly determine what happens around the globe, because so many little people in smaller countries or less-developed areas are watching this great clash of the ideologies hoping that our system will prevail, but fearful that it won't, so I think that our capacity to make America work well is going to go a long way to determine what happens in other countries of this great world of ours.

I, therefore, welcome this opportunity to talk to important people in the most important area of the world, because what you do or fail to do, I believe, is going to determine the fate of humanity in the century just ahead. No other great area of the country or of the world by its own free choice has such an opportunity and with it, in my opinion, such a tremendous responsibility.

THE CURSE OF MODERN GOVERNMENT

I think the curse of modern government around the world is the fact that steadily and continuously and perniciously it has been constantly expanding the power of its functionaries in the capital cities of each country of the world. Without exception, in the countries of importance the power of people in political jobs like mine and in the executive department, and in the judiciary, and in the central cities of the land has been expanding steadily over the functions of people in private jobs like yours. It has brought disaster and war and unhappiness to large segments of the world. It has brought to Britain almost a collapse of its economic solvency. We in the United States have resisted this global trend more successfully than others, but few among us will argue that we have resisted it completely or enough.

We have gone downward on the same train, down the same hill; our brakes have held us back a little, but not enough to protect our economic and political safety. I believe, and I may have said this when I was here before, that future historians writing about the America of the thirties and the forties and the fifties, and future histories written about the pages of America which are yet unknown, looking for a point of departure, looking for a place in which to put a thumbtack marking the time and the date and the hour and the place where America changed from a complete and faithful following of certain economic, social, and political concepts to something strangely and dangerously different, are going to find that place and mark that hour as the occasion of the great national convention of the strong and great Democratic Party, to which you belong, which was held in convention assembled in the year 1936, in the city of Philadelphia.

I think they will mark that development in 1936 as they study what has been happening in America to such universally accepted American institutions and practices, for example, as private ownership, as our reward of merit system, as the great American concept of giving individual initiative unlimited opportunity to expand, or the great American and uniquely American concept of States rights and the feeling that in this Commonwealth of States which makes up the Republic known as the United States of America, States have functions and States have privileges and States have rights, along with maintaining a meaningful significant effective two-party system with adequate political machinery to make it operate.

As they inquire as to why America, blessed with all of those things preceding the thirties, has suddenly begun a concentrated attack upon them all trying to devitalize and

trying to stultify them, trying at times to destroy them, they will also have to analyze what developments followed your actions in that convention. Why did it happen to us? No other foreign country has adopted a formula of economic or political behavior even remotely approximating the successes we had achieved. We had lived well and had gone forward with great rapidity regardless of whether your party or mine was in power in the White House. Under Republicans and Democrats alike in Congress or in the White House, America had gone ahead. We had become the envy of the world, the only country compelled to erect immigration barriers to be safe from being flooded out by all the rest of humanity that wanted to locate here so that they could enjoy private ownership, to locate here so they could enjoy the reward of merit system, to locate here so that they could give their individual initiative a chance to expand, to locate here where they could uniquely become a citizen of a state which had some rights and a governor and a supreme court and some mores and some customs and some laws of its own. From every other land they wanted to locate here because we had a two-party system. We had a political machine and political mechanics which made every man a king, gave every individual a right to help determine his own destiny. Why are we changing? Why have we changed? When did it happen and where?

A TURNING POINT IN AMERICAN POLITICAL BEHAVIOR

Historians will have to answer that. I think as I said that they are going to pick the place that I have mentioned, and the Democratic convention of 1936 as the hour, and the change of your convention rules as the cause—when the South was compelled to abandon your two-thirds rule reluctantly it was with far less a degree of reluctance, I am sure, than you would have shown had you known as clearly then what was going to happen as we all know now. In all of this when the South was compelled to abandon their two-thirds rule in Democratic conventions, and at the same time retain the unit rule which was a siamese twin companion of the two-thirds rule, we set in operation political machinery which has influenced completely our ensuing developments. The spirit of America has not changed; our basic goals have not changed; our objectives have not changed; but something has happened to the politics and the machinery of self-government in this beloved Republic of ours.

This whole thing we call politics—or the mechanics of self-government. Thus, it is political engineering and the machinery of politics which has changed your lives and mine, and which has altered tremendously all predictions for our future. By projecting forward the trends of the past 20 years we can rather accurately predict what lies ahead for all of us unless some sharp and permanent political changes are made by you good folks of the old South. We can now envision how political developments determine all human behavior and what you do or fail to do down here different from what has been your prevailing political behavior will call the tune for all Americans.

It isn't only upon your traditional Democratic Party that the break with the past which took place at the Democratic National Convention of 1936 had a propretic and determining impact. Actually that change in your convention rules had indirectly but definitely almost as important and lasting an effect upon our Republican Party. In a great 2-party country like ours, the behavior and bias of one of our parties always tends to influence the behavior and bias of the other. Anything which succeeds steadily for the one is certain to be emulated by the other. Anything that brings defeat to the one is likewise avoided by the other. Thus, our two parties learn from each other just as they tend to imitate and approximate each other at regular intervals.

When for a long time—a sorrowful and mighty expensive long time, I might say—campaign and convention tactics which were designed to appeal to mass voters in big blocs (especially in our metropolitan cities of the North) brought you stupendous and steady majorities to the Democratic or the New Deal Party, it was understandable and inevitable that my Republican Party started emulating some of those tactics. We started directing our appeals to those same bloc voters. Since, in the main, the interests and ideals of the South do not coincide with those of the CIO-PAC, or those of Americans for Democratic Action, or those of the "banana-bunch" type of voters who group themselves in ethnic, vocational, left-wing, or other pressure groups, it appeared for a time that the fine folks of the old South were to be left out of the picture altogether when it came to determining the political policies of either major party. You were on the way to becoming the world's largest group of enfranchised citizens whose voices were ignored in the making of party policy and in the selection of party candidates and whose votes were considered so safely in the bag that neither party paid you any heed.

Then came 1948, when four courageous States of Dixie signaled to the rest of the country that they had had enough. No longer were they willing to be tied tight in the back seat of a political automobile which they were never permitted to steer.

And then came 1952. I sometimes feel that the Divine Architect of the Universe, realizing that America is His last chance to make decency prevail, to make freedom function, and to give law-obeying citizens a civilization which they themselves can regulate and control decides to step in to help us all set America right. Recognizing, for example, that if peace and self-government collapse here, they will have failed all over, perhaps He moves in just 15 minutes before it is altogether too late in order to give Americans and America another chance.

In all events, came 1952, and an unanticipated, and unexpected development took place. Americans, pretty much without any party designation whatsoever, turned to a great American leader in a military sense who himself had no political designations whatsoever, and both parties sought to secure Dwight Eisenhower as their candidate for President. My party happened to succeed. I don't suppose he would have been any different individual had your party succeeded. In all events, pretty much by acclamation, joined in, I am proud to say, by five great southern Democratic States and encouraged by the rest of them, the country turned to someone outside of political life, and said, "Mr. Eisenhower, you take over and be President of the country."

AMERICA NOW HAS A SECOND CHANCE—PROVIDED DIXIE LEADS THE WAY

That has given us a breathing spell; that has given us a chance for a second look. It has not, nor could it be expected to have, solved completely any of the problems and challenges that we are confronted with. It has not altered what, in my opinion, is positively going to eventuate as a result of what happened in that Democratic convention, or even what happened to my party as a result of that convention; it has not altered what is going to lie ahead once the Eisenhower era is over. I very frankly was one of those who thought for a long time after the President's unfortunate heart attack that he would not be able to become a candidate for office. I worried about that, because this I believe: Once Ike is no longer a candidate, America is going to face a showdown decision on basic principles the verdict of which is going to dominate the lives of all of us for the rest of our existence. I expected that to come in 1956.

I consequently worried about that 1956 decision because I knew America wasn't ready from the standpoint of political engineering to make that verdict honestly and effectively and on basic principles devoid of partisan prejudices. We are not yet ready to avoid old political affinities or to eliminate a lot of cloudy fuzziness in our elective machinery which makes it pretty well impossible today for right-thinking people in America to unite on a basic issue, regardless of where they happen to live geographically or how they happen to be registered politically. Unless we can develop the necessary political machinery to do that, I am going to tell you before this address is over who is going to write the ticket for Uncle Sam, and you aren't going to like the ticket, and neither am I. You aren't going to have anything to do about writing the ticket, and neither am I, unless down here you people rise up to one of the greatest challenges our civilization ever had and utilize the essential techniques of sound political engineering to write the right kind of ticket for the country and the world.

I know you are not ready for that in 1956, and that's one reason, I suspect, if I were to be completely frank, that is the greatest reason, I am so glad that Ike's heart has restored itself to the point where he can run again and thus give America until 1960 to develop the necessary political changes to preserve our cherished freedoms.

Some of you will like what I am going to say now, and some of you will dislike it, but I tell it to you as an observation I believe to be a fact: I think that if that heart holds up, as I believe it will, our present President is going to be reelected for a second term. I think our breathing spell, which looked like it was going to be cut short by 4 years, which wouldn't have given us much time for political engineering, is going to get a second breath, and that we will now have until 1960 to get ready for the showdown issues.

I think this breathing spell, this era of moderation, this middle-of-the-road consolidation of our position, this resistance to further movements in the direction of socialism, will carry on under Eisenhower's leadership until 1960. If it does, the question is, "Will we be ready then to answer the five prodigious questions you and I are going to have to answer then and could conceivably be called upon to answer even as soon as next November?"

FIVE BASIC ISSUES FACING US NOW—OR IN 1960

The first question is, "How big would you like to have the Federal Government become?" We have two opinions in this country. I don't discredit or disparage the patriotism of those who hold as many do that the Federal Government should grow on continuously. That 20 years from now State governors should not have any importance whatsoever except to perform ceremonial functions like a British king. State legislatures even less. People are entitled to that opinion. The British have had a unitary system of government without a breakdown into states' rights, and states' capitals, and states' functions for a long while. The British are a remarkable people. I have visited there many times. I respect their indefatigability and their courage and what they are able to do in their Island Kingdom. So few of them have affected the lives of so many. But that is something you have got to decide—how big do you want our Federal Government to grow? I'll make a guess with you. I know the people of South Dakota better than I know the people of South Carolina, but I can tell you this, that the people of South Dakota say, "Our Federal Government has already gotten too big, we want it smaller." I think you also believe that; I don't know; but if you believe that, I submit to you that we don't

have the political machinery today with which you can effectively and easily join up with South Dakotans who believe like you. We've got to cut down the size and the interference and the power of the Federal Government. But still we lack effective political machinery for deciding the question in conformity with our convictions. If we decide that we want the Government bigger than it is, that's a permanent decision because once you socialize an industry, it can be power or it could be banking, and it's likely to be banking's big sister, the insurance industry before it actually is banking—once you nationalize a big industry, it is very difficult to denationalize it, to get it back to private owners. So remember we are playing for keeps. We are making a verdict for which there is not going to be a mistrial and a second chance, and in my opinion we are not ready to make that verdict properly with our existing political allotments. That is why I prayerfully give thanks for Eisenhower, who is going to give us time, in my opinion, to get ready for this big important decision in 1960.

Second question: "How much should the Federal Government cost?" There are good people in this country, patriotic people, who say they can settle this question: "Spend as much as you can. We only owe the money to ourselves. Why worry about balancing the budgets? Spend for everything, spend everywhere, spend all the time, you can always get it from the people in taxes." I don't question their patriotism. I question their economics. I deplore their judgment. I know they are preaching something which is anathema to the economic concepts which I studied in college; repugnant to the economic concepts which my people believe. I know my people don't like these spending sprees out in South Dakota. They think we are spending too much now. I think so too. I think you think so too, but if you do, there isn't any generally acceptable political machinery in this greatest country in the world today which will easily and effectively permit the people in South Carolina and the people in South Dakota in a national election to join forces to strike a blow for economy or to team up in voiting for a party or a President pledged to perform economically and who will be faithful to that pledge.

Third big decision: "How much should the Government own and operate?" I don't know what you believe. I know there is a big segment of the South that believes that the power business should be turned over to the Federal Government. Maybe so. I certainly believe the Federal Government should own some things. Most of us surely agree it should run the Army, and the Air Force, and our post offices, but I think and I believe you think, and I know the people of South Dakota think that the Federal Government should cease expanding out as a giant competitor to private enterprises all over. I believe that you and I believe and I know the people of South Dakota too, believe the Federal Government shouldn't get into the automobile business, or the insurance business, or the banking business, that we shouldn't have socialized medicine, that we shouldn't have Government radio, we shouldn't have Government railroads, we shouldn't have Government newspapers. Now there are good Americans who believe otherwise. Some of them are in Congress now. We are going to have to decide this basic issue pretty soon. I thought, perhaps, we were going to have to decide that in 1956. With Ike a candidate, we'll have additional time, but in 1960 when we go back to bidding for the bunches of votes where they are and have to promise the bloc voters the things they want, it will be an issue. In fact, it could unhappily become a fact without ever having become an issue in the campaign, because if both parties start promising what your one party was promising in the forties, these things can become an actuality without your ever having a chance to vote upon them in the good American way.

How much should the Government own and operate?

I introduced a year ago in the Senate of the United States an amendment which was a simple amendment, I thought. I thought it would go through almost unanimously. I never had been as discouraged in 18 years in Washington as the day my amendment was defeated on a roll call vote. The President of the United States had sent up a request to Congress. It was a simple request. He said that we have discovered that there are over 2,500 different private enterprises in which the Federal Government is unnecessarily engaged. That your Government and mine was operating 50 coffee-roasting plants, a bunch of pop-bottling works, 2 or 3 barbed wire factories, some paint factories, some clothing factories, some furniture factories, all under the guise of supplying things for the armed services or of making them more economical for our give-away programs of foreign aid, whatever they were. I was aghast when I saw the President's report. He asked for permission to sell them back to you, the private citizens of America. I was a member of the Appropriations Committee so I introduced an amendment to the Appropriation's Act implementing the President's request. Let's give the President the power to divest himself, and the Federal Government of all the socialistic enterprises not essential to our national defense or our national economy, I stated in support of my amendment. In a roll call vote, the United States Senate in the year of our Lord 1955 defeated that amendment. Why did they defeat it?

Some good, sturdy, strong private enterprise Senators voted "No" because it happened that one or more of those particular industries were located in their communities or in their States and the realities of practical politics induced them to vote that way. I am happy to say that we finally got an amended version of my proposal through which said that unless the Appropriations Committee itself resisted by resolution any divestments of economic enterprises by the President, he could go forward with the program. So through that hurdle and through that screen he has been able to get rid of some 500 of the 2,500. Two thousand of them still are run by you and me as collective entrepreneurs under a system as completely socialistic as anything the "B and K boys" of modern Russia could possibly conceive, because there isn't anything more totalitarian than the complete government ownership of an industry, whether you do it under the stars and stripes or whether you do it under the hammer and the sickle. If the politicians run it, they run it and it is in competition with the rest of the economy if competition is at all permitted. Anyhow a decision on how much further America should move toward national socialism is one which we shall have to make in 1960.

The fourth decision: "How much authority should government exercise as a device for influencing our individual lives? How much authority do you want to give to us in Washington, to determine how you live, what you can and cannot do, into what businesses you can or cannot go, what hours your laborers can work and what you might pay them, what you can raise on your farms and plantations and what you cannot raise, the social mores of your community, who can and cannot attend church with you or go to school with you or work with you—these are the questions to be decided by voters in national elections—I don't know.

Some very fine friends of mine in Congress believe that people like you and people like me cannot be trusted to be ethical or decent or chivalrous or Christian or honest in our behavior, so that you have to give to politicians down in Washington custody over the collective goodness of the country and let them project it out from their angelic countenances by the political power of unimpeded centralized government. I do not believe that. I don't denounce them for their beliefs. I simply say that I, myself, dissent from their conclusions. I think the people who elect the politicians are certainly as good as the politicians they elect, and that the collective judgment of our people is always better than the individual judgment of anybody they elect. Consequently, if we retain for ourselves some of the rights of decision, we vest those determinations in a better spot than if we turn them all over to politicians and the Federal Government.

This is an issue to be decided, if not in 1956, most certainly in 1960. You know what is going to happen in 1960 as well as I. You don't have to have spent 30 years studying political behavior of the great parties of this country to know that in 1960 the great bid is going to be to the groups of voters in the big towns who want to do certain things in America, and who say if you agree to do them, our millions of people will vote your way. So if one party promises it, as your Democratic or New Deal Party is most likely to promise it on the basis of the historic record, the other party is going to be compelled to promise it or be defeated.

Either eventuality would be almost equally calamitous insofar as resisting the expansion of political and economic power in Washington is concerned. Our political machinery isn't in order today so that those who resist these trends in the South can join your forces to those in the North resisting them. Divided as we are by antiquated and meaningless political labels and legends, we cannot win. This is another reason I am happy that things are happening as they are in 1956. We need at least until 1960 to develop some new political machinery.

The fifth big decision that we have got to make: "How far should the Government go to take us into the functions of the welfare state?" We all recognize our joint responsibility to people who are injured, disabled, too old, improvident, blind, diseased. How far do we want to go? How far is it necessary to turn over to Federal politicians in the Capital City the operation of our hospitals and our health-insurance programs; our clinics and our local relief activities? How far must the old cash and charity that used to permeate the heart of most Americans be collectivized in the office of a member of the Cabinet down in Washington? We are not going to go back. We are not going to abandon what has been started. I said earlier that it is difficult to desocialize. It's mighty hard to take away from somebody something he has been getting. Each Congress, though, each national convention, each presidential candidate is beleaguered by those who constantly say "We want more." We are going to have to decide where we draw the line, or do we draw the line; do we follow the example of Great Britain? I like it like they put it down on paper that hot sticky summer down in Philadelphia's Independence Hall so long ago when our wise, far-sighted constitutional forefathers knew what was likely to happen if they brought forward on this continent a new Nation dedicated to the proposition that the men and women living there could rule themselves, so they wrote it in the preamble.

At Philadelphia they said the function of this new Government is going to be in part to provide the national defense. To be free, we must be secure. To be secure, we must have a common national defense. The function of the Federal Government is to provide it. To tax the people for the arms that they need, to conscript the soldiers if you need

them for a war, to win a war if we get in, to protect ourselves, to maintain peace if we can do it. We must be strong. The function of the Federal Government is to provide that defense. Our constitutional forefathers made that clear.

People were thinking about general welfare in those days also. The next clause in the preamble of our Constitution is an interesting one. Interesting because of the language that they used. They talked about general welfare. They had said that the purpose of the Federal Government is to provide the national defense. What about the general welfare? Note well the word that they used. To provide the national defense and to promote—and to promote—the general welfare. What a difference. That's the difference, isn't it, between the U. S. S. R. and the U. S. A.? It's the difference between Hitler's Germany and us. It's the difference between the welfare state and welfare assistance in this country. It could be the difference between two political parties. It could be an issue that we are going to decide in 1956 or 1960. Do you want to keep it that way? Does that make sense? Did it work out all right to have a great big Republic like this which provided the national defense and promoted the general welfare, made jobs available, made it easier for people to secure general welfare, did what we could to promote it without adopting a paternalistic Government so that everybody was fastened to the Federal pact? We are going to make that decision in this country not later than 1960. In my opinion, we are not ready to do it today because of our political machinery. And, in my opinion also, our American experiment not only worked out all right but it has provided living standards for all elements which are the goal and envy of the entire world.

I have said all this on an assumption that may be false or wrong or right and proper; namely, that South Carolinians, along with South Dakotans, will be on the side of limited powers of Government on these five major decisions. If I'm wrong, you have nothing to worry about, except that you have had to listen to a speech of no particular interest to you; but if I'm right, and you want what we want, you have some mighty serious thinking to do on a plane so much higher than partisan politics that it isn't even in the same range of atmospherical statistics. We have got some political engineering to do if you agree with my assumption. Let me suggest five things that might be done now, or that we can start to do now, to save us from the great big controlling bloc of votes and the socialistic trends that I am going to mention soon.

FIVE SUGGESTED REMEDIES

In the first place, we might develop the kind of political realinement that I was talking about when I spoke to you in Charleston some years ago. Getting the right thinking people of the country—let's not say that—let's be completely fair—getting the people who think alike in this country and who think conservatively and in terms of a modification and limitation of the powers of the Central Government; getting them into some kind of political party or political apparatus or political association or political instrumentalities so that they can vote alike for the same candidate on the same ticket regardless of what the party label is or where they live geographically.

We have made some headway in that direction. We haven't made it very fast. That's why I shuddered when I thought we were going to make these five great lasting determinations for the rest of my life in 1956, and why I hoped we could defer them for another 4 years to get ready to write the verdict. Then I'm content to live by it if most of my fellow Americans under a voting system which gives them a fair chance to vote in a national referendum desire the towering size of the omnipotent state, I'm willing to accept it. I suppose I will be a candidate again from the State of South Dakota, although I'm not going to be happy with all of that power because I know that it isn't going to be good for you. I think that under that kind of system I could talk up a speech that would be persuasive enough to be elected for the rest of my natural life out in South Dakota. I would have authority and I would have power and where I couldn't talk them into voting my way, I could seduce them to come over with a dam, or a bounty, or a pension, or a new post office or something else that I could bring by nature of loot from the Federal Government which by that time would be dominating all their lives. But I wouldn't like it. I would rather take a chance on trying to discuss with them the basic principles in which we jointly believe and win or lose on that basis.

I believe firmly in free choice by free voters. To get such free choice, however, and for freemen to reach sound political decisions, it is essential that we realine our partisan groupings in America. Southern Democrats and rural Republicans in this country have much in common. Their points of agreement on basic economic and political issues far outstrip their areas of disagreement. But we need to do some political engineering so we can work and vote together. So long as we cancel out each other's votes for President, we help the trend toward the total American state and defeat our ideals and our own best interests.

A second device we tried, and may I say here that we tried this with the support of your two good South Carolina Senators in this session of Congress: OLIN JOHNSTON, whom I have known for a long time and with whom I have served on the Senate Committee on Agriculture, and Strom Thurmond, that new gladiator from down South that you sent up there, who has cut probably the widest swath in the United States Senate ever cut by so young a Senator in so short a time. We proposed to do some political engineering, to get ready for 1960. We offered a constitutional amendment that wouldn't do any good under any circumstances for 1956, but would take off from the neck of the Democratic Party of America and the Republican Party of America, the big foot of the big cities of America who now dominate in the main the thinking, the activities, and the trends of both political parties.

We proposed by our amendment to break up the bloc-system of electoral voting. We proposed to give both those who vote for the winning candidate and those voting against the winning candidate a chance to have their votes counted at the electoral college level. This proposed constitutional amendment would have driven a death nail into the domineering controls of the city machines and some of their associated pressure groups. It takes a two-thirds vote to get it through the Senate. We debated it for a week. We received a majority vote but we lacked six votes from getting the essential two-thirds majority required to pass a constitutional amendment, so it's back in the Senate Committee on the Judiciary again. It's called the Mundt-Daniel-Thurmond amendment. I'm presently corresponding with Strom Thurmond, who's down in South Carolina enjoying a short vacation before resuming his activities in Washington, and we are soon going to come up with a new version of this amendment which we hope the Senate will approve early next year.

I think it is tremendously important, for example, that we break up a system which means, as I put it during a Senate debate, that one sodden drunk can fall off of a park bench in Battery Park of New York City, and hitting the ground wake up and stagger and stumble into a voting booth on election day, not knowing where he is, and, in the heat of the election booth to keep from falling on his face in his drunken stupor, reach for an election lever as a support and accidentally pull the election lever down, thereby determining the entire outcome of a national Presidential election. Do you all fully realize this can actually happen? That one vote cast by Mr. Stumble Bum in New York City can put in action 45 electoral votes which mean more than all of the votes cast by intelligent people voting unanimously in 12 or 13 separate States of the United States. Break up that system of unit voting in the electoral college so that no one group, no one city, no one State, and no one collection of 12 metropolitan cities in this country can run the rest of us, and you are moving in the direction of modernizing and improving our political machinery. We would then begin giving like-minded people a chance to vote alike regardless of where they live politically or where they are registered geographically. We would be taking our elections out of the hands of pressure groups and big-city political machines and putting them back in the hands of the people where they belong.

The third available remedy is revising your State election laws. We can do something in all of our States to make it easier for people to cross party lines and make it easier for a second party to get into operation, to make it easier for people who happen to be registered with one party and want to vote for another party for a certain cause to do so. That's a local responsibility which, in my opinion, can and should be locally met and which was locally met courageously under the leadership of Governor Allan Shivers over in Texas prior to the last election. I hope it can be met with equal success in a great many other States of the Union.

Of course, other States may follow the example of South Carolina in the last election under the leadership of an old friend of mine and a great American, who, except for the political mechanics of our country during his prime might well have been a candidate and President of the United States. I'm talking about Jimmy Byrnes of South Carolina. Jimmy Byrnes in 1952 demonstrated a courageous and patriotic leadership which other States, I hope, and other Governors will follow. His example in the last election, when, ignoring parties and concentrating on principles and confidence in personalities, he supported a candidate not of his own political party for the highest office in the land, deserves emulation by other courageous Democrats who are neither Fair Dealers or New Dealers. It is the medicine in the bottle that counts—not the label on the outside of the container. Governor Byrnes came pretty close to running up the score for South Carolina in support of Dwight D. Eisenhower. He came close enough to help write some new American history. He came close enough to cause even the city machines to wonder if somebody might be trying to get out of the bag in which they have been held so long and on which the party bosses in the big towns thought they had tied the knot.

Senator HARRY BYRD, a great American in anybody's book, did the same thing in Virginia. Virginia voted for the man HARRY BYRD supported. Allen Shivers and PRICE DANIEL did the same thing in Texas. Texas voted for the man that they supported. I simply point out that there are times when principles prevail, when the perils of following the line of least resistance are so great, that men have courage like Jimmy Byrnes, whose golden wedding anniversary I was happy to note this week has been observed by Mrs. Byrnes and Jimmy. Men take leadership to get results. They are history-makers. As long as southern political traditions continue, that is one way to break out of the trap.

I have discussed this for many years in every State of the South as your chairman said, and I did it because of no partisan motive. I do it only because there isn't any

other place that America can be saved from the consequences of the new controls which have been operating in this country as a result of what we all lost in the Democratic National Convention of 1936, and I use the word "we" advisedly. In the evolution and the development of the competent forces which now control the country, there is no way to escape those consequences except by some of the devices that I am mentioning. Changing the two-thirds rule in 1956 is a fourth method by which conservatives at the Democratic Convention could do the job. I think it may be hard to do but it could be done. Even breaking up the unit rule, which was a part of the two-thirds rule would help tremendously. It would once again have its same impact on my party as it has on yours, because parties emulate each other.

A FLORIDA LEGISLATOR SPEAKS OUT

It would move political controls in both our parties back to the hands of the people and out of the hands of political bosses and pressure groups. I was talking on this subject 2 months ago in Florida, and at a friend's home afterward, a man came up to me by the name of O'Neil Rogells, and may I say now that I use his name with his permission, came up to see me and introduced himself and said: "I have been a member of the legislature down in Tallahassee; I'm a Democrat. No northerner has ever come down and talked to us like this before. I'm more interested in America than I am in my political party or my political career." Mr. Rogells further said: "If you could promise me, Senator MUNDT, that your party at the next convention would write a strong States right platform, as strong as you did in your last convention in 1952, and nominate candidates who will support it and believe in it (Eisenhower will do if he is available), if you can promise me that you will get that kind of platform and perform on it in Congress, I'll register Republican in Florida despite I'm a member of the legislature of the Democratic Party in Florida."

I said, "Mr. Rogells, that is a very interesting suggestion, and a very encouraging one, because what does a political party mean in a war? Did you ever hear anybody come back from the war in Korea, and that was a war, did you ever hear anybody say 'We lost a skirmish down there because I told the boys in the troops that half of them belonged to the other political party and I wouldn't work with them'? You never heard that, did you? You forget all about political registrations when you get into the uniform of Uncle Sam. When you have a common cause, who cares if your Commanding Officer is a Republican or a Democrat or a North Dakota progressive or an Independent? You are concerned only about result."

So I said, "Mr. Rogells, your suggestion is challenging and interesting. As the issues confront us now, we are having a tough fight to hold our Party to an unfailing support of State's rights. I happen to belong to what we call the 'Thin White Line' of the Republican Party that's trying to keep our State's rights position alive; that talks about it openly and votes for it consistently; and tries to pursue it; and encourages the White House and the executive agencies and even the courts when we can, to remember and to sustain our State's rights. But we lose almost as many battles as we win. We are going to have a hard time at our convention. Those opposing the rights of States have been fighting us consistently since 1932 and driving us further and further into a corner. We could lose our fight in 1956 or 1960. Why don't you join us now? We need your help."

Mr. Rogells said, "I can't be sure that you are going to win it. I want to be sure." I said, "Look, my friend," I noticed he had a service button in his lapel, "You remind me of a situation where in a battle on a mountain slope, your side of the battle is up on the ridge with a thin and faltering line that is facing stupendous odds, and you send a runner back to a commanding officer who has a large platoon of troops about a half mile down the hill and tell him you need reinforcements quick or we'll lose the battle and the officer sends back the runner and says 'Keep on fighting boys and if you can get the enemy on the retreat, we'll come on up and join you with the cheers.' Mr. Rogells, we need you now, or we're apt to lose."

The conversation ended on that and then two weeks later I got a clipping from a newspaper down in Sarasota saying "Rogells Breaks With Demos." I read the article and Mr. Rogells tells how he is joining the Republican Party in Florida for the sole purpose of trying to be sure that they send to the convention Republican delegates who'll stand up and fight for a States rights platform in the Republican Party. He says I know we can't get it in the Democratic Party because we have tried it there and failed completely.

I wrote him a letter and told him I certainly appreciate that and that I was going to make a talk in South Carolina to the State Bankers' Association and I would like to mention his courageous action as another possible device if I may, but I wouldn't think of discussing our conversation or his name unless he gave me his permission. Here is his wire: "Senator MUNDT, appreciate your kind remarks. You have my permission to use statement in any way you see fit, O'Neil Rogells."

I mention this action as another way to solve our political problems. I'm not necessarily advocating; I don't think perhaps that it is the most effective way in a completely one party State like South Carolina. I simply mention it as another remedy. If 500 of the most prominent Democratic families in South Carolina, for instance, were to register Republican within any given month and publicize it widely you could go far toward rewriting the future pattern for America. There are ways that free men can escape from the trap you're in. The formula followed by Mr. Rogells is a fifth such possibility.

I have mentioned five possible remedies. Suppose we don't take any of them. May I make one final prediction, then before we close? Unless some way or another this great section of the country becomes unpredictable, unchained, unless you can take the lead, the five biggest blocs of votes in this country are going to continue to dominate your party and perhaps mine. I'm perfectly frank to say that they have already influenced mine to a considerable degree. And to the greater degree to which they influence yours and the greater degree to which that brings victory to your Democratic standard, I'm frank to confess, to that greater degree we are going to go in the direction of total centralization of authority in Washington. Unless some of these things that I have talked about are done, and they can be done only in Dixie, and only by southerners in Dixie, and only by Democrats in Dixie, because most of the best people of the South are Democrats, then I know unless you do something different, socialism will soon again become a realistic menace in America.

FIVE VOTE BLOCS WHO KNOW WHAT THEY WANT

The biggest voter bloc in this country today that influences more political behavior in Washington than any other bloc, I suppose, including the Republican and Democrat National Committees combined, is this new organization known as the CIO–AFL–PAC. Two great labor unions have merged and they have told the world "We are going to whip our enemies and elect our friends." They have told the candidates in both parties, "If you will move in the direction that we want you to move far enough, we will support you, or we'll support the one that yields to our demands the most, even though he is your opponent and of a different political party."

Add them up my good friends; there are tens of millions of them, these voters incorporated in the CIO–AFL merger. They are going to control a great many public decisions unless we find a political mechanism so those holding a different point of view can work together. I say that without criticism of the CIO–PAC. Why shouldn't they do that? They are Americans. They are loyal. They have a right to organize. They have their points of view, and while it happens they belong to a certain class and they unhappily seem to be trying to develop a class consciousness in this country, which in my opinion is unconscionable in America, still their patriotism is unquestioned and they have a right to function in the political system if they are smart enough to do it, and if those opposing their excesses are stupid enough not to react effectively, who can complain? If they should bring socialism to America under Mr. Reuther as President some day, that would be their right is it is done by the ballot, and if we permit our political machinery to be controlled by their zealous leaders.

The second biggest bloc is your city machines led by politicians who play politics for pelt not for public service. These are bossed by men who discovered in the last quarter of a century that "There is gold in them thar Potomac hills" and they are no longer going to fool around merely with electing sheriffs and police judges in big cities like Chicago and New York. They have learned they can drive people to the polls by multitudes, many of whom can neither read nor write in the English language, who haven't studied American history, who don't know American traditions, and who come from countries which had paternalistic governments before they moved here. Yet, they can outvote all of the rest of us. You can forget about Dixie as you can forget about the Dakotas and Nebraska and Kansas, so long as you continue to give the bosses of the city political machines in the 12 major cities and the 8 big States of this country votes enough to bring about a determination in a national election because of our failure to change some of our political machinery, especially the method of unit voting in our electoral college. I don't complain about that. I simply point out that we should exceed them and excel them in their wisdom and in their determination. They have a right to do what they can to boss America. But we have a duty to make the reforms needed to prevent their successful domination.

The third big group, and I say this completely without any suggestion of criticism of the colored voters of this country, is the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The have a right to their opinion. In my opinion they have a right to vote. They have a right to organize, and they have become a great organized voting bloc in this country seeking successes from their standpoint. There is nothing un-American about that, but it's a tremendous appeal to politicians on every side in every party to say, "If that many votes are involved, from the third biggest voting bloc in America, why not get them? Why not solicit them?" They have become more important through their association than the collective vote of all of Dixie, and more important than the collective vote of the States of the Missouri and Mississippi Valley, and we think that we are important people. We would like to get back into the Union, and we would like to find a way to join you in adopting basic fundamental principles which are not swayed by emotional suasion and are not based on prejudicial points of view. We want you in Dixie to get back into the Union, too, insofar as your voting importance is concerned.

The fourth biggest bloc of votes in this country is what they call the ethnic groups,

the hyphenated American organizations: People who come here and organize associations with the land of their ancestry and are attached to it. They read newspapers in the native language of their homeland, make frequent trips, write many letters back and forth, and maintain for many years greater attachments over there than over here. But, above everything else, they form voting blocs. This reminds me that a Democratic Congressman told me the other day in Chicago that all he needs to do to get elected is to see one Polish leader in Chicago and he's in. All of the Polish people, said he, in Chicago follow his suggestion. There is nothing wrong about that. It isn't illegal. I don't criticize it. I simply point out that we are living in a political era when blocs like that, which join at least in desiring more power for the central Government are going to control unless intelligent folks like you and me start living in the present and forget about the past and make at least as much of a study of political engineering as we have of mechanical and electrical and atomic engineering, in which fields we all have had to become educated.

The fifth largest pressure group is Americans for Democratic Action, a little association of self-protesting liberals who actually preach a doctrine carrying you back to feudalism when the king could do no wrong and the state was supreme. Americans for Democratic Action offer up their votes to the highest bidder. I'm happy to say that I belong to a political party which up to now has consistently refused to bid for the votes of that outfit and I hope that we Republicans continue to resist them even though we lose, because they are trying to push us as far toward socialism as is possible, as far as is favored by any sizable group in the United States of America today. They'll pack in a lot of people at their meeting a week from today in the city of Washington to write the ticket they are going to insist you Democrats adopt at your convention in Chicago this summer. I note a report in the papers of yesterday that they are inviting speakers including Elmer Davis, Kefauver, Stevenson, Walter Reuther of the CIO–AFL, Governor Williams of Michigan, Eleanor Roosevelt, Senator Lehman, Senator Humphrey, Senator Morse, and other like-minded and bewildered "liberals." I'm happy we Republicans have been excluded from the speakers' rostrum. I must point out that these people in the ADA are smart Americans and what they are doing is legal. I don't question their patriotism. They are just outsmarting the rest of the country. They point out that their main job in that convention in Washington next week is to further devitalize the influence of the South in the Democratic Party. That's why they are there.

I emphasize that you have a bigger bloc of votes in Dixie than any of the five great groups that I have mentioned provided you can develop a voting mechanism that will attach you some way or another to other right-thinking people in the North for specific purposes in specific campaigns. By doing that you can exercise the political influence which alone can save America.

I have nothing against any of these organizations: the CIO–PAC, the city machines, the organized colored voters, the ethnic voting blocks, or the ADA. I accept them all into our fraternity of Americans as good citizens, but I simply point out that, in my opinion, I wouldn't want any of those blocs, or all of them combined, to write the final political and economic ticket for America. I'd rather have it written by the people of the rural areas of this country, and by voters in our cities and on our farms who belong to no self-interested pressure groups. I'd rather have it written by the Republicans I know back home and the Democrats I know down here.

Yes, my good Democratic friends of the South, all I suggest is that we develop our abilities in the science of political engineering so that no longer will an imaginary line created by the War Between the States continue to divide into rival political camps people who have an identity of convictions and such close similarities of concept. It would be tragic indeed if a generation that has split the atom and harnessed its great power would let a problem in Semantics—an attachment to labels, tradition, and prejudice—cause us to continue to split people dedicated to identical high principles into rival camps under the comparatively meaningless names "Republican" and "Democrat," so that we are impotent and powerless to harness our great vote power into a single effective voting machine.

OUR 10TH AMENDMENT

I feel that next to our great written Constitution itself, the greatest invention of Americans in the field of self-government was the concept of States rights as set forth in our Bill of Rights by the 10th amendment. Other civilizations and other lands have contributed much toward the evolution and maintenance of human freedom. But it was left to freemen on this continent and in the early formative days of our system of government to establish by the 10th amendment formal recognition of certain inalienable rights of both States and individual citizens which could be transferred to the Central Government only by the voluntary and specific delegation of those powers by those entrusted with them by our Constitution. This, then, is America's greatest contribution to the science of self-government and the endless contest of free citizens versus the Central Government. This, to a great degree, is the great genius of what we call the American system. This, then, we must preserve if our future is to be as resplendent as our past. And, finally, it is this great key to our success that we must support by proper changes in our elective machinery and our political procedures lest those who lack faith in this concept, or who find it a barrier to their ceaseless drives for power succeed in developing too many powers for too strong a Central Government in Washington. It is this challenge which Dixie—and perhaps Dixie alone—can successfully meet by recognizing its dangers soon enough and by taking the indicated steps required to meet and defeat it.

Good friends, I have suggested five possible remedial steps. Others may occur to you. I believe the challenge to all of us is crystal clear. I appreciate your close attention. You have been very kind. I have been very frank. These are days which call for blunt talk and unpleasant truths. I came here neither to try to please you nor to lure you away from your traditional political behavior. I came only to describe what I believe I know and to predict that which I know I fear.

I came especially, however, because I am positive that the people of Dixie can determine America's destiny for the next half century. By so doing you will chart a course for all the world. No other group in America has the homogeneity, the good judgment, the high patriotism, combined with the tremendous vote power of our Southern States. You can have it as you want it. You will get it as you merit it. You can call the tune for Uncle Sam or you can become the victims of inertia and remain docile and impotent while living through a future the nature of which you will have failed to help in fashioning.

In conclusion, let me suggest to you as bankers that you always keep in mind that it is more important to you to help determine what takes place in the polling places of America than what takes place in the teller's cages of your banks. I beg of you to divert some of your great genius and your many talents to the problems I have discussed with you to the end that we can solve them in the best interests of all America and all Americans. In our country, we must all remember always that there is never anything wrong with America that a single good election will not cure. Likewise, there is no immortality for our freedoms and no security for our property that a single bad election cannot jeopardize and perhaps even terminate.

I salute you as the custodians of our country's future and I wish you well.

Excerpts From Address by Hon. James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania, at Fourth National Convention of the Polish-American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES H. DUFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, excerpts from remarks I made at the Fourth National Convention of the Polish-American Congress, in Philadelphia, on May 30, 1956.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY SENATOR DUFF AT THE FOURTH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS, AT PHILADELPHIA, MAY 30, 1956

In a period when there is the greatest known prosperity in the free world, the horrible and haunting tragedy of our time is that many once free people are now ground under the ruthless heel of a foreign communistic oppressor.

It matters not what the economic well-being of enslaved people behind the Iron Curtain may be. Several thousand years ago Pericles stated the eternal truth when he said: "There can be no happiness without freedom." And no people who have ever known freedom can ever be happy until they regain it again.

It is the devout wish of every American irrespective of national origin, that the wonderfully brave and heroic Polish people may be made happy again by recovering their freedom.

Despite all protests to the contrary, and despite the substitution of a forced smile by Khrushchev and Bulganin for the snarl and hate of Stalin, communism still remains what it has been from the very beginning, a fanatical and godless movement determined to conquer and destroy the government of free people everywhere.

Stalin today stands accused even by the present Communist leaders as a vicious and cruel murderer. Five thousand of his own officers were executed under his orders without trial merely because he was suspicious of their intentions. If any proof were needed, and it is not needed, this admission by present Communist leaders proves beyond any peradventure that 10,000 Polish officers who were captured under a promise of amnesty were ruthlessly and cruelly murdered by the Communist regime under Stalin in World War II.

The present Communist leaders were the disciples and agents for Stalin. They cannot escape the infamy of one of the most horrible violations of the rights of prisoners in all military history. Certainly no confidence and trust can be placed in the word

or promises of men who now defame and downgrade Stalin, who when they were his agents and subordinates did not raise their voice against some of the most infamous acts ever recorded.

If Khrushchev and Bulganin really want world peace, as they repeatedly say they do, the first gesture of sincerity would be to liberate the countries which the Communists have so ruthlessly deprived of their liberties. That would indeed open wide the doors of the whole world to peace.

The only peace the Russians want is peace on the basis of their retention of the conquered countries. Even a thief would be willing to settle with the law if he were permitted to keep untouched all the loot that he had acquired by reason of his violation of the law.

I am aware that one of the main purposes of the Polish Congress is to reestablish Poland as a free and independent nation through the legislative and executive branches of our Government. No purpose could be more commendable and no effort more worthy of the support of all people who believe in freedom and who hate tyranny and oppression.

No group in America understands better than those of Polish descent the horrible menace of Soviet imperialist communism. The ancestral lands of the Poles have been overrun; the government of the people destroyed, all civil and religious rights of the inhabitants violated, and the iron heel of the oppressor felt throughout the length and breadth of the land. All this without cause or provocation or any assertion of the right by the Communists except their greedy desire for power and domination.

What happened in Poland is the pattern of what will happen everywhere unless the continuous advance of communism is brought to a halt.

I salute you in your determination that Poland shall again be free, and I join with you in your prayers that in due time under divine guidance these prayers may be answered.

A Tribute to James T. Hixson, Educator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 2, 1956, the former students of James T. Hixson, for over 50 years a teacher, principal, and leader in the field of secondary education, presented to the Webster Groves, Mo., School District a portrait of Mr. Hixson which is to be hung in the new James T. Hixson Junior High School. On the occasion of the unveiling of this portrait I had the following remarks to make:

Many people talk about the need of more people with talent and the spirit of self-dedication in the field of primary and secondary education. I am satisfied that one way of assisting in bringing about that end is to honor those people who have spent their lives furthering good primary and secondary education.

From time to time the busy society of today pauses to evaluate the lives of its component parts, the men and women who go to make it up. We pay tribute with our lips and our passing thoughts to those who have entered the service professions; but this has not been sufficient to bring enough persons into the pursuit of such dedicated living.

Fortunately, our society has adjusted itself so that many of the service professions bring with them monetary returns as well as, occasionally, fame. We do not need to pause to discuss these more fortunate of the service professions, they have their obvious rewards.

We do need to start paying more deliberate attention to those service professions which remain largely unheralded, if we are to continue to attract to them the number of men and women our society needs. Not the least of these unheralded professions is that of education; and in the field of education an area that most lacks proper public acclaim is primary and secondary education.

Today the higher institutions of learning, through their spokesmen, are proclaiming an easily perceived truth that by and large our secondary school systems throughout the Nation are not turning out the caliber graduate that the higher institutions of learning must count upon. This indicates the need for more persons to dedicate their talents and lives to the problems of secondary education.

We in Webster Groves are blessed by having the highest caliber primary and secondary school products. This has not come about by chance. It comes from the dedicated work of men and women like the man we are honoring today.

All assembled know personally the great, fine, and silent work performed by James T. Hixson in behalf of education in our community, because he was our teacher and our principal. Not all of us may be aware of the influence that this work has had upon education throughout our land and yet this, too, is so.

In a sense we honor ourselves here today by following our natural inclinations to honor this distinguished educator. This fine building dedicated to public education appropriately bears the name of a great educator, James T. Hixon. We his former students now give to the Webster Groves Board of Education a portrait of this man to be placed in this building so that all may know and come to recognize the face of the man who personally gave to us so much. The qualities of a great educator are not limited to the fields of scholastic abilities; they also must encompass those that go toward making daily living among people a pleasant experience. James T. Hixson's scholarship is matched by his humanity, his friendliness, his good Christian character. His is a life to be emulated. It will be an inspiration to the thousands of students who will go through the corridors of this beautiful new junior high school to see the portrait of a man who gave so much to the education of the children of this country. It is fitting that honor should come to him while he is still with us.

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, at Dedication of Eisenhower Lock on the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, yesterday a great milestone of construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway was reached when the Eisenhower Lock was dedicated at Massena, N. Y., at a tremendously impressive ceremony. Several significant addresses were delivered on this memorable occasion.

One such address was offered by our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the man who is generally regarded, and rightly so, as the father of the St. Lawrence Seaway law. He was introduced by the Assistant Secretary of the Army, George H. Roderick, who gave a well-deserved tribute to our colleague.

I send to the desk a brief excerpt from Assistant Secretary Roderick's introductory comments, together with the text of Senator WILEY's address. I ask unanimous consent that the text be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and excerpt from the introductory remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM COMMENTS OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY RODERICK

America's part of the St. Lawrence Seaway is running ahead of schedule. That it has advanced this far is in great measure due to the men I will have the honor of presenting to you now.

The first of these is Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin. Senator WILEY, one of the most able and distinguished legislators in the Government, has served continuously in the Senate for almost 20 years. Among his many high posts have been those of the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and delegate to the United Nations General Assembly.

More important on this occasion, however, is the fact that he was one of the two sponsors of the St. Lawrence Seaway bill, which President Eisenhower signed into law in 1954.

He has been called the father of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Senator WILEY had his teeth in the St. Lawrence project for over 17 years. And like a bulldog he held on and on until the Senate passed the bill which makes all this possible.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER LOCK: ENGINEERING FOR ATOMIC PEACE

(Address by Senator WILEY at dedication of Eisenhower Lock, Massena, N. Y.)

This is a great day in the history of Massena.

It is a great day in the lives of the tens of millions of people in the valley of the Great Lakes. It is an historic day in Canadian-American relations; and it is an inspiring day for peoples elsewhere throughout the world.

In the comments which have preceded mine, we have all heard with pleasure of the enormous significance of this lock, and of the other seaway installations to ourselves and to our good neighbor to the north.

Naturally, for those of us Americans who come from areas in the upper lake region, we are particularly looking forward to the completion of work—further up the lakes—on the deepening and improving of the connecting channels. We hope for all possible speed in approval of United States funds for this vital upper lake purpose.

In the meantime, however, we rejoice in the splendid progress, evidenced in every single step in this mighty waterway and power project—every step everywhere along the lakes.

To myself, as one who has been proud to fight for this cause since the time I came to the Senate in 1939, this is indeed a day of real gratification.

And it is, of course, particularly appropriate that this lock be named in honor of our great President, an American and world statesman, who has contributed so much

to the coming into being of this bi-national seaway itself.

In the few moments that I have available, I would like to comment on the significance of the man from Abilene, the distinguished leader in the White House, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

I hope that the cable dispatches to overseas will fully describe our meeting today, for this dedication in his name to the free world. May this news come as further inspiration of what free men can do under Eisenhower-like leadership, and what they will achieve, with cooperation and teamwork.

This is the type of project into which we of North America gladly put our strength and our resources.

This is the only type of engineering we Americans really enjoy—engineering works that advance the well-being of mankind. There is no American, no Canadian—there is no thinking person anywhere in the world—who likes to see the genius of engineering, the genius of construction, devoted to weapons of destruction.

And so may the cables which will be read in Moscow tonight remind the leaders of the Kremlin that it is Dwight D. Eisenhower's and our most fervent hope, it is his and our prayer, that in the months and years up ahead, the people of this world may increasingly devote their energy to the building of other great works of peace.

This lock—this project symbolizes greater good for man—greater prosperity, greater harnessing of the forces of nature, for man's betterment.

It is but a symbol of what we can do and will do on an ever larger scale, in many other fields, particularly if the cloud of nuclear conflict is forever banished from our horizon, as it should and must be.

As one who is privileged to serve as a senior minority member of the United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I hope that the worldwide significance of the event today will be fully noted by all peoples.

Let them note that we proudly apply the illustrious name "Eisenhower" to a mighty engineering lock of peace—not to a tank, not to a missile, not to a bomb.

Why? Because Dwight D. Eisenhower, although he has devoted a life of honored service in the uniform of his country, is a man truly of peace.

He knows that there is no goal in all this world dearer than the twin goal of peace and freedom.

Dwight Eisenhower knows and has said that "There is no alternative to peace." Modern nuclear war could be mutual mass suicide—mass inhuman slaughter—mass destruction of edifices such as this.

That is why it is my earnest hope that we here today who dedicate Dwight D. Eisenhower Lock will simultaneously rededicate ourselves to President Eisenhower's goals—world peace and freedom. But how to achieve those objectives? By continuation and strengthening of our policies of partnership with the free world, by mutual security with all likeminded nations.

These are policies to which our Canadian good neighbor is contributing with outstanding effectiveness.

Perhaps a somewhat brighter day in East-West relations may be ahead. Perhaps, for example, Molotov's resignation may be taken as a further possibility for a bit more—I emphasize—just a bit more of easing of East-West tensions.

But I warn: the whole ominous Soviet record of the past, the record of treachery and doubledealing, the record of e. g. zagging Red policies and waves of purges—this dark record bids us to remain cautious and vigilant.

Meanwhile, however, thanks to the seaway, we are growing stronger with each passing day.

So, congratulations, my friends to all who have contributed to the arrival of this splendid hour. Congratulations to Administrator Lewis Castle, and to my able colleague, GEORGE DONDERO, and to all those, named and unnamed today, who dreamed great dreams, who worked and toiled and sacrificed that this proud event might come to pass.

Commencement Address Delivered by Hon. A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia, at Staunton Military Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, four of the most memorable years of my life were spent in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia where I attended the Staunton Military Academy. The beauty of the surrounding countryside, the historic significance of the area, and most of all, the delightful sincerity and friendship of the people, have remained with me all the intervening years since my graduation. I feel as close to that part of Virginia as I do to my own home, and it is pleasing to me to have my two sons in attendance at that same school, where they, too, will add to their education and to their appreciation of the fineness of Virginia.

Yesterday, the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] delivered the graduation address at my old school, and it carries such a message of importance to the youth of our Nation that I wish to make it available to my colleagues. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRADUATION ADDRESS OF SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON AT THE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, STAUNTON MILITARY ACADEMY, STAUNTON, VA., JUNE 3, 1956

It is a coveted privilege to address the Cadet Corps of one of the best military academies in the Nation, founded by a distinguished Confederate veteran and located in the second oldest city in the Valley of Virginia. While Staunton was not established as a town until 14 years before the Revolutionary War, it has been the county seat of Augusta County since 1745. At the present time, Augusta is just the second largest county in Virginia but when it was first created it was larger than the present State of Virginia because it extended to the Mississippi River, including all of what is now the State of Kentucky and the State of West Virginia, and even a small part of what is now the State of Pennsylvania.

I once heard a distinguished Staunton lawyer, Col. Rudolph Bumgardner, deliver an address which recounted a trip that George Washington made on horseback from Mount Vernon to Staunton after he had finished his second term as President. He first examined his land titles which were recorded in the clerk's office of Staunton and then proceeded through what is now West Virginia where he owned large tracts and into Pennsylvania where he also had holdings in what is now called Washington County, named by the grateful citizens of that Pennsylvania area for George Washington because when a boundary dispute arose between Virginia and Pennsylvania over who owned the land Washington urged the Virginia Legislature to cede it to Pennsylvania saying that Virginia would still have plenty left. And I am sure in your course on American history you learned that the first Declaration of Independence was adopted at a mass meeting in Augusta County and you also will recall that Washington said during the Revolutionary War, when many of his followers had gotten faint hearted: "Leave me but a banner to place upon the mountains of Augusta, and I will rally around me the men who will lift our bleeding country from the dust and set her free."

Augusta County furnished many brave soldiers for Washington's army and many brave soldiers to Stonewall Jackson's army of northern Virginia. It was, therefore, highly fitting and proper that William H. Kable, who later served as a captain in the Confederate army, selected Staunton as the site for a military academy, the primary aim of which was the development of character, of personal integrity and unselfish service. And needless to say, during my 23 years of service in the Congress, first as the Representative of this valley district, and since 1946, as the junior Senator from Virginia, I always have taken pride in saying that the Valley of Virginia is as fertile as the Valley of the Nile but more centrally located and that Staunton is a wonderfully fine place to send either a boy to get an education combined with military training or a girl to get an education and instruction in the art of gracious living. Incidentally, my mother graduated from Staunton Female Institute, now named for the greatest of all southern cavalry leaders, "Jeb" Stuart.

The goal Captain Kable set for character training at Staunton Military Academy has been kept constantly in sight by those who succeeded him in the leadership of this school, as is evidenced by the fact that its catalog says the aim of the academy is to send its students out into the larger world of adult life "with trained minds and bodies, adequate cultural resources, high personal ideals, and a sense of responsibility to society."

In looking over this catalog recently I was pleased to notice the personal word to parents, in effect warning them not to send boys here if they are looking for no more than military discipline which would harden bodies and mental discipline which would prepare minds for meeting college entrance requirements.

Those goals also could be achieved in a Communist school and, as a matter of fact, we have reason to believe that the educational system of the Soviet Union compares most favorably with the general run of schools in the United States in the fields of physical and scientific training.

Former Senator William Benton, who is publisher of the Encyclopedia Britannica, recently made a startling report on his personal observations of education in Russia. He said education has become a main theater of the cold war and that Russia's classrooms, libraries, laboratories, and teaching methods may threaten us more than her hydrogen bombs and guided missiles.

Benton said all children in Russia are required to attend school between the ages of 7 and 17 and that the standards of academic accomplishment set for them are higher than the best American high schools and would be comparable to the level of a junior college in the United States.

The Russian boys and girls go to school 6 days a week and 10 months a year. In addition to studying the three R's and algebra, geometry, and trigonometry, they are required to take 4 or 5 years of physics, 4 years of chemistry, 2 of biology, 1 of astron-

omy, 1 of psychology, and 6 years of a foreign language, preferably English.

After completing this general schooling graduates may go to 1 of 2,000 vocational colleges which train specialists for industry and technicians in the fields of medicine, education, and the arts or they may go to 1 of 800 institutions of higher learning which train engineers, doctors, dentists, lawyers, advanced scientists, and teachers.

But the objective of this system of education is not to train individuals for a life of happiness or to fulfill their potential in a free society. It is to discipline them for maximum service to the state. Teachers are given no academic freedom, nor are they allowed to criticize the political regime of the country or any official dogma. Students not only are required to follow prescribed courses in school but, once they have picked a particular profession and started training, they cannot change their minds about entering it and after graduation they must work 3 years at any assigned job. That last requirement, incidentally, might well be brought to the attention of any young man in America who considers it a hardship to be called for a limited period of service to prepare himself to help defend his country against any future attack.

Now, if our goals were the same as those of the Russians and the graduates of Staunton Military Academy were called upon to compete directly with the graduates of their schools, I believe the boys trained here would acquit themselves with honor. I know that this academy was the first school in the South to be rated by the War Department as an honor school on the basis of the military aptitude, training, and efficiency of its ROTC unit. I know also that in one of the recent yearly examinations given in all the honor schools in the United States to select 10 boys to enter the Naval Academy at Annapolis, with each school permitted to name 3 candidates, all 3 of the Staunton nominees won appointments—a record equaled by no other school. And I know, also, the school's record for winning football championships.

I am thankful, however, that the goal of Staunton Military Academy is not the same as that of the Russian schools and that parents considering sending their boys here are specifically told in advance: "We cannot be satisfied with the fostering of only mental and physical accomplishments. Our higher trust is to instill in the boy a sense of responsibility, encourage in him a respect for the soundest virtues and, through a discipline which is firm, kind, and just, to teach him the art of self-discipline." Self-discipline, as Henderson said of Stonewall Jackson, is the root of all manliness.

It is primarily to commend that attitude toward education that I have come here today.

We live in an age in which man's ingenuity in the physical sciences has enabled him to produce weapons capable of wiping out civilization and there are some who believe that destructive result cannot be avoided. They have seen a generation which triumphed over one form of totalitarianism at the cost of unleashing the atom bomb now confronted by a more dangerous form of totalitarianism which has been held in check only by the threat of the hydrogen bomb. But, since the totalitarians also have that weapon now, and do not have our scruples to deter its use, there is ample ground for pessimism about the ultimate result.

I am not personally willing to concede, however, that men are now powerless to control their own inventions or that it already is too late to choose any road other than the one which leads to destruction of civilization. The start which this Nation had in development of weapons of total destruction and the means of delivering them anywhere in the world has bought us time. In the words of Sir Winston Churchill, they were sanctions which have preserved an uneasy peace. All the free nations of the world fervently hope for a program of international disarmament and a lessening of the heavy burden of defense spending, and even the nations behind the Iron Curtain pay lip service to such proposals. Until they evidence their good intentions with respect to peaceful coexistence by deeds, such, for instance, as the release of East Germany and withdrawal from Korea, we cannot afford to let down our guard. But while maintaining a defensive power well calculated to stay the hand of a possible aggressor every effort must be made to bring into line the spiritual forces on which ultimate victory will depend.

Commenting on why the United States entered the First World War one of our distinguished Federal jurists, Judge Learned Hand, said we were not so much afraid of a physical German invasion, if they won, as we were that the example of totalitarian success would convert mankind, including Americans, to a discipline after the German pattern. "Not the violence of enemies would undo us," he said, "but our own spiritual weakness, the shallowness of our convictions."

That statement, I believe, reflects the thinking of that great native of Staunton, Woodrow Wilson, who in 1917 sincerely sought an honorable alternative to war and was unable to find it; and when the war was over tried unsuccessfully to show us the road to a lasting peace based on spiritual strength.

Another Federal judge, Harold R. Medina, who studied under Wilson at Princeton, recalled recently some of the things he learned there which had made the most lasting impression on him.

He said Woodrow Wilson had taught three things:

"(1) That American democracy could not function properly without a constant renewal of its leadership from the rank and file, the men and women who today are boys and girls trying to get some sort of an education.

"(2) Colleges do not exist for the purpose of sharpening our wits for our own use, but rather to quicken our social understanding, instruct our consciences, and develop in us what he called a 'taste of unselfishness and self-sacrifice.'

"(3) Ideals and moral principles are 'of the very spirit of all action,' and we are put in this world not to twiddle our thumbs but to act."

Again in World War II our greatest danger was not a German invasion but worldwide acceptance of the principles for which Hitler and Mussolini stood. Under that system, of course, there could be no such constitutional democracy as we now have, based on recognition of individual worth.

And today, as I indicated when I told of Senator Benton's observation of Russian education, our greatest danger is not that our cities will be wiped out by hydrogen bombs but that we shall be pressed by economic and psychological weapons to the point where a minimum security guaranteed by government seems preferable to the risks and gains of private initiative—where we yield our civic and social responsibilities to a centralized bureaucratic authority and where the despotic figure of a paternalistic state blocks our vision of the dignity of man.

One of our chief bulwarks against that threat must be schools and colleges which, like Staunton Military Academy, pledge themselves "to promote the ideals of personal integrity and unselfish service." And I know of no city and no institution better equipped by heritage and tradition to carry on that program than Staunton and its military academy.

In 1864, just 4 years after this school was founded, the streets of Staunton echoed with the unusual sound of a nursery song played by a military band and sung by hardened soldiers.

In that dark hour for the Confederate cause the VMI cadets had been summoned from nearby Lexington to help defend Staunton. Although they were of college grade, records show that those boys were little older than the present students of SMA. The average age was 18, and 4 of them were just past 15. Their youthful appearance amused the older soldiers quartered in Staunton, and when one veteran detachment's band started playing Rock-a-Bye Baby the men took up the air, singing and rocking their guns as if putting a baby to sleep.

Two days later, however, those boys made their famed charge at New Market, and as they marched to the front, past the weary veterans they were relieving, there was no derision but rather an admiring shout of "Look at the seed corn battalion, look, look."

At New Market and elsewhere during that sad, fratricidal war much of the seed corn of southern youth was lost, and after nearly a century we have barely recovered from that sacrifice of young manhood. As a compensating factor, however, we have profited by examples of irrefragable courage and self-sacrifice that will never die.

The spirit which led the boys of VMI to New Market as volunteers in defense of their native State not only has been perpetuated at VMI, but it has been stimulated wherever their story was known. Robert E. Lee, at Washington and Lee University, and William H. Kable, at Staunton Military Academy, set the pattern for training the kind of leadership a Republic demands. Woodrow Wilson carried that concept from Staunton to Princeton, and in his writings and speeches urged it upon our Nation and the free world.

I congratulate you, who are graduating today, on the privilege of sharing a great tradition, and I charge you to apply the ideals of personal integrity and unselfish service to every duty that may be required of you, remembering:

So nigh is grandeur to our dust,
So near is God to man,
When duty whispers low, thou must,
The youth replies, I can.

Memorandum on Kearns Bill, H. R. 10424

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I submit the following memorandum on my bill, H. R. 10424, which would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the excise tax on television receivers capable of receiving 50 or more ultra-high frequency television channels:

COMMITTEE FOR COMPETITIVE TELEVISION,
Washington, D. C.

MEMORANDUM ON KEARNS BILL, H. R. 10424

In order to achieve an all-channel television system it is essential that receiving sets at manufacturer's level be built as all-channel sets. Because of the inept manner in which allocations were made at the outset by the Government, it is now essential that the Government help to correct the error by creating an excise tax differential between all-channel sets and VHF-only sets at the manufacturer's level.

This is the purpose of H. R. 10424, and the following facts relate to the tax effect of that bill which provides a 5 percent reduction

in the excise tax on television sets capable of receiving 50 or more UHF television channels:

The average cost at manufacturer's level before taxes of all-channel sets is currently $134 per unit.

The average cost at manufacturer's level of VHF-only sets is currently $120 per unit.

It is estimated that all sets costing at manufacturer's level $129 or more would be manufactured as all-channel sets if there were a tax differential of 5 percent.

It is estimated that this would cause the manufacture of 50 percent of present VHF-only sets as all-channel sets. It would affect 3,300,000 sets.

In addition, in 1955 there were manufactured 1,181,000 all-channel sets.

The reduction of revenues from the 5 percent differential would be as following, presuming 1956 and later production would be approximately on the 1955 basis:

Value of 1,181,000 UHF sets	$160,000,000
Present excise tax, 10 percent	16,000,000
Kearns bill, loss, 5 percent	8,000,000
Value of 3,300,000 UHF sets	425,000,000
Present excise tax, 10 percent	42,500,000
Kearns bill, loss, 5 percent	21,250,000
Total loss	29,250,000

However, this loss would be offset by at least a 10 percent increase in set market as a result of increased stations. This will amount to approximately $6 million. In addition, the present UHF stations will have increased revenues. If this were to be an average taxable revenue of only $100,000 per station, there would be a gain to the Government of $5 million. The advent of new stations to the extent of only 400 stations with taxable income per station of only $50,000 would increase tax revenues by $20,000 per station or $10 million. All of these taxes would create a recoupment of $21 million per annum.

Additional employment of taxable employees, additional revenue to networks, and additional orders to manufacturers for transmitting equipment and receivers will all generate more taxable income than could be lost by the Government.

Therefore, the Government would under the Kearns bill gain revenue rather than lose it.

The foregoing is based on facts and figures supplied by the Statistical Division of Radio-Electronics-Television Manufacturers Association.

The Fault in the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the fault in the armed services is not that the top brass in the Army, Air Force, and Navy—at the moment primarily the Army and the Air Force—disagree and are arguing publicly as to which is the more important in preserving our national security; as to which should receive a major portion of available funds for the development of the weapons or equipment which it considers to be advisable or necessary; as to which service should be entrusted with the performance of a particular function.

The reason for and the purpose of the armed services is to maintain a front which will deter any potential enemy from attacking us and, in the event it fails in that, then to defeat that enemy quickly and with the least possible loss of life.

From the very beginning, individuals in the Army and the Navy disagreed as to the roles and missions which each was best qualified to perform in defense of our country. Naturally, when the Air Force came of age, the controversy was intensified.

Beyond doubt, the Navy needed carrier-based fighting air equipment to protect and make successful its operations. This was demonstrated in the last war. Experience also demonstrated that the ground forces needed air coverage if they were to fight successfully.

One has but to read the history put out by the armed services to realize that in World War II and in the Korean war each service was dependent upon the others for successful operation. Unified action by all three is necessary if we are to survive.

It is only natural that patriotic, ambitious, aggressive individuals in each service should, as do experts or specialists in any other human activity, become obsessed with the idea that their branch of the service is the most important, the best qualified to give us effective national defense. That is a healthy and desirable situation, for it keeps everyone on his toes. It leads to progress and the acquisition of the best.

Nor does any harm result unless one branch becomes unfairly, unduly, critical of the other. Even then the remedy is at hand. We have not only Joint Chiefs of Staff, but we have a Commander in Chief who can, figuratively speaking, knock the heads of even the generals together and tell them just how far to go.

In addition, back of it all, sits the Congress which, while its individual Members may know very little about what each service should do, is supposed to possess commonsense and, sitting as a jury, decide upon the testimony of the experts, not what each branch should do in peacetime or in war, but how far the country can go in spending money for national defense without destroying our security through bankruptcy.

As I see it, the fault in the armed services is that because of the technical training of its officers—they get into the academies when they are 20 or 21—they have never learned, they do not realize the efforts which the taxpayers must put forth to earn and contribute the dollars which the services spend. Hence, millions are wasted because of duplication in purchasing common items, because of the lack of unified effort to keep down the cost of overall national defense.

With 52 percent of the national income being spent for national defense—and this year we are giving the armed services something like $34½ billion, in addition to a holdover of some $20 billion—the top brass should have impressed upon it the realization that we can spend ourselves into insecurity as well as becoming insecure through lack of preparation.

Report to the People of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report to the people of Wisconsin by the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] concerning East-West trade.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR McCARTHY'S REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF WISCONSIN

Our committee (the Senate Subcommittee on Investigations) has just completed an investigation of current, United States-authorized strategic trade with the Communist nations. Since most newspapers have printed few, if any, of the hair-raising details of the committee's findings, I thought I should bring the principal facts to your attention.

The long and short of the matter is that you, the American taxpayer, are subsidizing the construction of the Communist war machine. This conclusion is inescapable since you are footing the bill for billions of dollars of American aid to so-called friendly nations, that, in turn, are supplying highly strategic war materials to the Soviet war economy.

The committee's investigation of this matter began in 1954 under my chairmanship and has continued up to the present in the face of strenuous efforts by the executive branch to keep the story from Congress and the American people. The committee discovered that in August 1954 our Government made secret concessions to our allies as regards what they could ship to the Communist bloc without losing American aid. As a result of these concessions, over 200 highly strategic items—such as machine tools, metals, and electronics, transportation and electrical equipment—were removed from the anti-Communist embargo.

I list below a few examples of the materials we agreed to let countries receiving United States aid ship to Soviet Russia, together with an indication of their strategic value.

Electric power generators up to 60,000 kilowatts, turbines up to 85,000 horsepower, and motors up to 12,500 horsepower: This electrical equipment is used in making fissionable material for atom and hydrogen bombs.

Horizontal boring mills: These machine tools, which cost between $200,000 and $500,000 each, are used in making tanks, artillery weapons, aircraft, and atomic reactors such as those used on the submarine *Nautilus*.

Vertical-boring mills: Essential in making jet engines.

Dynamic balancing machines: Used in making jet engines and guided missiles.

External cylindrical grinding machines: Used in making guided missiles and radar equipment.

Surface griding machines: Used in making jet engine parts, guided missiles, radar equipment, and diesel engines.

High precision boring mills: Used in making jet engine and guided missile parts.

Copper wire: Next to fissionable materials, copper is the single most strategic metal. Thousands of miles of copper wire, for example, go into the engine of every bomber.

Aluminum: Indispensable in making aircraft.

Nickel alloys up to 30 percent: Used in making aircraft parts and tanks.

Molybdenum alloys up to 20 percent: Used in making jet aircraft parts.

Magnesium: Used in aircraft construction and in foot-soldier equipment.

In return for these highly strategic war materials, the Communists are shipping to the free world butter, cotton, and woodpulp.

The American people were not informed of these secret concessions to our allies; indeed, deliberate and (until our committee got on the track) successful attempts were made to conceal them. Here is how the strategic trade agreements were reported to the Nation by Harold Stassen, who was the central figure in the negotiations. The agreements, Stassen announced in the summer of 1954, "will result in a net advantage to the free world of expanded peaceful trade and more effective control of the war potential items."

Not content with misleading statements of a general nature, Mr. Stassen resorted to specific falsification when, as Battle Act Administrator, he made his annual report to Congress in November 1954. The following is a paragraph from Mr. Stassen's report: "Minerals and metals of basic importance to the Soviet military power such as aluminum, copper, nickel, molybdenum, cobalt, magnesium, tungsten, and titanium remain on the * * * embargo list."

Mr. Stassen's statement, with respect to aluminum, copper wire, magnesium, and alloys of nickel and molybdenum was, simply, untrue.

The seriousness of our concessions can be appreciated by taking a closer look at just one of the items being shipped to the Communists—copper. Mr. Stassen said that copper was still embargoed. He was right about unprocessed copper, but he failed to mention that the finished product, in the form of highly strategic copper wire, was taken off the embargo. The committee then learned the following additional facts: (a) Since August 1954, when the embargo was relaxed, over 200 million pounds of copper wire have been shipped to the Soviet bloc by countries receiving United States aid; (b) the principal shipper is Britain; (c) the United States is providing a direct subsidy to British copper mines in Rhodesia; moreover (d) copper is on the United States critical stockpile list, and because it is in short supply in this country, we found it necessary during 1954 and 1955 to divert 150 million pounds of copper from our strategic stockpile for industrial use. In other words, although copper is badly needed in this country for our own war potential, we are giving the British money to mine copper, which they then turn around and sell to the Communists.

Congress provided in the Battle Act of 1951 that the President must immediately terminate United States aid to nations that ship materials of "primary strategic significance" to the Communists—or that he must immediately explain to Congress why he is not doing so. In this case, aid was not cut off, nor were the facts of the 1954 embargo revision transmitted to Congress. The way Mr. Stassen, as Battle Act Administrator, got around the Battle Act was to determine that certain obviously strategic items were not of "primary strategic importance"—despite the fact they had been so regarded in the past. The executive branch thus brazenly defied the clear intent of Congress.

Later on in this session, Congress will be asked to appropriate some $5 billion for aid to nations that are now shipping the Communists strategic war materials. I intend to oppose that appropriation unless it is accompanied by an airtight guaranty that American money will not be used in the future to build the Communist war machine.

I should add that the executive branch is now studying British demands to relax the embargo against Red China. These demands must be resisted. I trust you agree with me that trading with any of our enemies, in any goods whatsoever, is contrary to American interests.

Conference on Occupational Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, there was recently concluded here in Washington a nationwide conference on industrial safety. This conference was called by President Eisenhower, who addressed the opening session in a speech which I should like to include at this point:

Mr. Secretary, ladies, and gentlemen, the concentration of 3,000 people here in the city of Washington to conduct a conference on this problem of occupational safety is the most heartwarming experience I have yet had in my months of examination into this problem.

I want personally to thank each of you for the interest you are taking in it. I want to congratulate you for the simple reason that I know that out of this conference will spring the greatest advance we have yet made in this field.

Now, on the highways we know we lose a tremendous number of our people each year—I believe 38,000 were killed last year. The number we lose through occupational accidents is not so large, but in a way it is more tragic.

In the one case we have many millions of fast-moving units on the road with no possibility of coordinated control among them, except as they may choose to obey the laws in the areas in which they are driving.

In this occupational field we have much of our trouble arising in organized bodies and groups, in our factories and other places. Through proper spread of information, proper adoption of methods and procedures, we know that much of this could be eliminated. In other words, the 14,000 that we lose through occupational accidents seems to be more easily controllable within limits, at least, than does the other.

I don't know how many of the individuals in this audience have ever had the task—almost the daily task—of writing letters of condolence to families that have lost a dear one. For my part, I assure you, it is one of the most heartbreaking things I have ever had to do. And when you stop to think of 14,000 bereaved families in this country every year, occasioned by preventable accidents, it is indeed, to such a person as myself, a tragic fact.

So I believe that such people as yourselves have the solution largely in your hands. The Federal Government can do little. The President can call a conference to bring you together so that you may exchange ideas; so that each of you may gain some inspiration from the fact that so many people do come to look into this thing and show their determination to do something about it.

But the Federal Government's part here is limited very definitely to that of a general leadership. Federal law and Federal Government should not extend into the factory, into the farm, into the other places where these accidents occur. The community and the State, therefore, must pick up the burden of teaching, of devising, of planning, so that this tragedy is certainly lessened in extent and comes as close to the point of elimination as human ingenuity can bring it.

This is a short description of the feelings I had when, with Secretary Mitchell, we determined to invite you to this particular conference.

I again say, I thank you from the bottom of my heart for coming.

I have every confidence that from today forward, from the moment you return home, we will begin to show improvement, and we will improve all the time, each year, until practical elimination has been achieved.

Each of you will share in the great satisfaction that will come from that development. I for my part, expect that I will look back on this day for a long time as one of the finest things that has happened for America in this line.

It is a serious problem, but as they used to say in the war when people would complain about how tough this particular job was: "Well, if it wasn't tough, they wouldn't have brought such good men to do it."

I say that to you.

Goodbye and good luck.

Mr. Speaker, that same day the Secretary of Labor, James P. Mitchell, also addressed the Conference. In both these speeches the need was stressed for our people to give greater attention to the increasingly serious problem of occupational safety. Although the role of the Federal Government in this field may not be crucial, certain legislation is desirable. On April 25 of last year, I introduced H. R. 5740, which would provide certain assistance to States in their efforts to promote industrial safety. Although no action has yet been taken on this bill, it is my hope that Congress, through the appropriate committees, will consider this whole question in the near future.

Mr. Mitchell's address follows:

I am happy to welcome this vast audience to the fifth and largest President's Conference on Occupational Safety. I particularly want to greet the several new groups who are here for the first time this year. When we started this Conference, we concentrated by general agreement on certain segments of our economy—manufacturing, construction, utilities, trade and service, finance and government. This year we invited the Department of Agriculture and the farming community to join us. Increasing mechanization and greater use of chemicals have drawn farm safety problems close to those of industry. They have responded generously and we are very happy to welcome them. I hope this year's addition will stimulate future Conferences to invite the 1 or 2 remaining groups which are still not included.

This year for the first time we have invited leaders of the major religious organizations and women's groups to attend. We believe their knowledge of, and influence over, human motivation will help us discover what it is that makes a man take care of his own safety and that of others. In industry, labor, and government, we have developed many techniques and made much progress but workers continue to be killed and maimed. Something more is needed. The experts suspect we must find that something in the elusive wellsprings of human motivation. If anyone can help us with that quest, we believe it should be these groups whom we have asked to join us this year.

I ask all to consider with me for a few minutes what is the Nation's stake in occupational safety. Concern for human dignity is a tenet upon which our Republic was founded. The worth and well-being of the individual should determine all of our activities. Our first stake is to protect that well-being against needless suffering and pain. Our second concern is to maintain a high production and avoid economic waste.

Our third is directly related to our survival in competitive coexistence with our enemies in the world. Despite record employment levels today, we face dangerous shortages of skilled workers, not only scientists, but maintenance men, repairmen, mechanics, electronics experts, and many others.

When a jet aviator is killed, we know what we have lost in human and economic terms—not only a fine American boy who is lost to his family and his country, but whose intelligence and imagination, nurtured in freedom, gives us our qualitative superiority in the air. We are less aware of the loss sustained by death or injury to the man whose skill in maintaining the magic instrument box that keeps the pilot's B–47 jet effective in the air. In addition to his life and skill, and in addition to the untold suffering and anguish caused by injury, the loss of one repairman of these instrument boxes through occupational death or injury costs the Government an investment of 4 years and $22,500 in training, pay and allowances. We cannot afford this waste.

This is a dramatic instance of the importance of safety to world peace and survival. Every work injury is worse than one by enemy action because it is preventable.

Four decades of experience by industry, labor, and Government have taught us how to prevent over 90 percent of all work accidents. Despite that progress, last year 14,200 workers were killed and nearly 2 million injured on the job. These are not statistics—but the casualty list of our American economy in the peacetime year of 1955. We are shocked by newspaper headlines of a great disaster. Yet three times as many workers died on the job last year as in the Chicago fire, the Boston Coconut Grove night club fire, the Hartford circus fire, the sinking of the *Titanic*, the Johnstown flood, and the San Francisco earthquake combined.

Thet tremendous suffering of these workers and their families is immeasurable, and naturally transcends any economic losses involved. But the economic loss can be estimated, and is a factor with which businessmen must reckon. A rough estimate by one of our large insurance companies sets the employer's cost of a work injury at four times the cost of compensation. When a man is killed or permanently disabled, his production is lost not only at the time of the accident but for years to come. The 1955 work injuries cost our Nation a total of 193 million man-days of output—enough to produce 100 million refrigerators or cut and make 200 million men's suits, or make 1½ billion pairs of men's shoes, or fabricate more than 26,000 jet bombers, or build a million 6-room houses, or mine 2 billion tons of coal.

We can estimate, too, what a work injury will cost a worker in wages. For example, the average factory worker earned $76.52 a week in 1955. Suppose he were single and suffered a work injury in the State of Oregon. He would have lost $216.59 a month in wages. If he were married, he would have lost $191.99 a month. Suppose he were an average building craftsman earning $96.39 a week. If injured in Oregon and single, he would have lost $302.69 in wages each month; if married, $277.69. Maximum weekly benefits under the Oregon law—an unusually liberal one—would allow these injured men to live on only 30 to 40 percent of their previous monthly income. What would you and I do, if ill, in pain, and uncertain of our future earning capacity, we had to reduce our monthly living expenses by 60 to 70 percent?

This suffering and these costs need not happen. The Labor Department knows of 12 machinery plants which suffered less than one disabling injury per million man-hours worked in 1954. One such plant recorded 2.3 million hours without a disabling injury. On the other hand we know of 11 large plants with more than 1,000 employees each which suffered over 25 disabling injuries per million hours. If 12 plants can produce such a fine record, there is no reason why all the others can't also.

A frequency rate of 5 injuries per million man-hours is considered by most safety experts as very good. It is thoroughly practical. It has been achieved by many plants. Do you realize that if we could achieve that rate wherever people work in the United States, we would have had 1¼ million fewer injuries last year? With that completely achievable rate, we would have prevented two-thirds of our reported injuries. We would have had 238,000 fewer injuries in manufacturing, 225,000 fewer in trade, 228,000 fewer in agriculture.

How can we go about achieving such a rate? That's what this conference is for. Our problem is to convince those firms, who do not think safety is important or who think they cannot afford it, that safety is good business. A sound safety program pays the best dividends in the world.

How can we reach these firms? One way is through State labor departments who know the nonagricultural firms in their States. These departments are recognizing more and more that they cannot depend upon law alone to prevent accidents. Most work injuries today do not violate law but arise from a variety of other causes. The modern concept of a State labor department's service to industry is no longer that of a policeman but of a friendly and highly trained consultant.

If a State labor department is to realize this modern concept, if it is to build a competent, technical service, it needs the support of all of us. Governor Langlie will, I am sure, have a good deal to say about this today. What he has been able to achieve in Washington State can point the way for us all.

Another way to reach the unawakened firm is through community action. This, too, will be discussed tomorrow afternoon. That community safety programs can be effective is shown by one heavily industrialized county in Ohio whose 92 reporting firms—mostly engaged in fabricating iron and steel products—came up with a combined frequency rate of 5.5 last year. The Trumbull County Industrial Safety Committee has been at this game for a quarter century and had reduced their injury rate 75 percent in that time. They have the support of top management, the Ohio Industrial Commission, and their County Foremen's Club. Were they satisfied with their 5.5 frequency last year? No. Their goal had been "under 5 in 1955." So this year their goal is "4.6 in 1956." In 1955 they had an exposure of over 6¼ million man-hours and 29 of their 92 firms had perfect records—a frequency rate of 0.

How did they accomplish this? You can read their story in your complimentary conference issue of Safety Standards. Nor are they unique in Ohio. There are a number of similar community industrial safety programs throughout the State. I'm sure we can learn much from them that we can take back home and, I hope, put into practice.

Another way to reach the unawakened is by developing public understanding and support. At the 1954 conference you suggested we should utilize all the media of communication and that we have tried this year to do. President Eisenhower designated this week as Job Safety Week and called upon all citizens to join him in making it a success. This conference is the climax of the week. A number of Governors have issued similar proclamations and we are most grateful for the generous way in which they have helped bring before the people the importance of saving human life and limb in the workplaces of America. As the Federal Government's contribution to this observance the Federal Safety Council is sponsoring No Accident Week and using it as an occasion to stimulate safety meetings, training, and other safety activities.

In many other ways, we are trying to follow your suggestions of 2 years ago. They are all designed to reach men and women in every walk of life and arouse them to the horror of needless work injury and the necessity to preventing it. In a word, we go back to the community, to the neighborhood where people live and work. America's economic and social progress starts in the community, in the grassroots. The home is vitally important in motivating a safe community.

Fortunately the home was the one major area which last year reduced accidents, according to the National Safety Council. Safety in the home can influence safety at work, at school, on the highway, in the community. In other words, a safe home atmosphere reaches out into every activity of human life. Let us discover and utilize every motivation there is Let us incorporate safety into our daily life. Let us apply the skills that made this Nation an industrial giant to the problem of making it safe.

Spiritual Strength in the Cold War Struggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 27, our distinguished colleague from Ohio, the Honorable MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, addressed the second annual communion and breakfast of the United States Information Agency here in Washington at the Washington Hotel.

In his address Mr. FEIGHAN made a scholarly and practical analysis of the cold war and the relation of our great spiritual ideals to a winning program of the United States Information Agency.

Under leave granted, I include Mr. FEIGHAN's address on this occasion:

It is a pleasure for me to join with you in this, the second annual communion and breakfast of the United States Information Agency.

As many of you know, I have maintained over the years a keen interest in the program carried out by the information agency.

It has been my good fortune to have an early understanding of the real meaning of the cold war because of my equal good fortune of having knowledge of the real nature of communism at a very early age in my life.

I am one with Father Edmund Walsh, S. J., in the belief that the hotter we make the logistics of the cold war, the colder becomes the possibilities of a hot war.

The work in which you are engaged has a vital bearing upon the question of war or peace.

In your daily work, you do your best to contribute to the United States Worldwide Campaign of Truth.

Such a campaign of truth can do much to dispel the ignorance on which evil seeds of hatred and vengeance thrive.

Hatred and vengeance in turn are the architects of war. Truth is the architect of a just and lasting peace.

It is most fitting, therefore, that you, the Catholic employees of the USIA should have an annual corporate communion and breakfast.

Such an occasion as this provides a singular opportunity for a rededication to those great spiritual truths upon which civilization is based.

It also provides a splendid opportunity to gain added spiritual strength for the difficult tasks that are certain to confront your work in the immediate months ahead.

There can be no doubt that the world of our day is besieged by a force far more evil than any other in all of recorded history.

The struggle for the world is one in which the forces of human freedom and the forces of atheistic communism are locked in a death struggle.

This is fundamentally a conflict of ideas and ideals.

We believe that man is a creature of God, and as such possesses a special dignity, an immortal soul, and that in the hereafter every man must account for his stewardship on earth.

On the other hand, communism teaches that man is an animal, very little different from a horse or a pig.

Communism also teaches that all life ends with mortal death, that there is no hereafter, and consequently no accounting for a stewardship on earth.

It follows that material values are all that count with those who subscribe to the doctrine of communism.

This accounts in very large measure for the unequaled record of inhumanity to man established in the name of communism.

It is this irreconcilable difference in ideals and ideas which lies at the basis of the international conflict between communism and free people. Those who take part in the conflict in defense of our cause of human diginity and freedom must themselves be worthy representatives of our highest ideals.

There is no room for the materialists in the camp of human dignity and freedom.

They can only weaken our cause and dissipate the prospects for a just and lasting peace.

But there is unlimited room in the camp of human dignity and freedom for all those who believe that man lives not by bread alone and that things of the spirit are, in the end, what make life worth living.

And while we keep open the way for all men of good will to participate in the fight for universal justice and decency, it would do us well to ever bear in mind what the persecutors of the early Christians said about them—"See how they love one another."

The work in which you are engaged is in many respects novel—at least it is new to the American scene.

Consequently you must expect a great deal of criticism and very little appreciation for your efforts. It may be many years from now before due accord its given to much of the good work you are now doing. This, it seems, has been the lot of many great and necessary causes down through history.

I underscore great and necessary because those are the only causes that draw strong fire and criticism. Bearing this in mind, you must not become discouraged no matter how difficult the task ahead may seem or how strong the criticism leveled against your efforts to pursue and expand a worldwide campaign of truth.

In somewhat recent years your work has become more difficult because of the burdens and obstacles created by indifference, expediency, and the growing attitude of laissez faire.

The do-nothing attitude which we see on many sides today springs from the false notion that if we do nothing, we will make no mistakes, and if we make no mistakes, we will avoid public criticism.

This is an attitude which must be completely rejected from the important work in which you are engaged.

Leadership demands a try at the unusual or unique and consequently expects honest mistakes will be made. Real leadership sees its mistakes and corrects them.

That is the kind of leadership which must always be given to the cause of human freedom or else individual liberty as we know it, will perish from the world.

I am reminded of an experience I had last November during the course of an inspection trip in Korea. I attended mass at an Army chapel and as I entered the church, I was handed a small leaflet which announced the masses for the week, the feast days of the week, and other items of interest to the military post. But down at the bottom of this little leaflet, prepared by a chaplain assigned to work close to the front lines of freedom, was this timely admonition to all those who attended mass that morning: "The greatest sin of all is doing nothing."

More and more we are hearing the idea advanced that the only workable formula for easing international tension is to approach the Communists in the spirit of live and let live.

The spirit of live and let live is so fundamental to all established religions that it naturally has great appeal to everyone.

This formula if followed would create a situation in which those who believe in moral principles make great concessions to those who are in fact amoral, and whose basic doctrine holds that if needs be three-fourths of the people of the world must perish in order that communism will triumph.

This presents a very serious dilemma for us as we seek to preserve our great moral principles and at the same time prevent the destruction of civilization by the forces of atheistic communism.

We are also being urged to adopt a policy of forgive and forget in our dealings with the Russian Communists.

Here again all established religions teach the necessity of forgiving our transgressors and forgetting misdeeds of the past in the hope that good works will result in the future. But unfortunately the Communists seek to use these moral principles to cause us to forget the many nations and people enslaved by them and who today suffer the trials of the martyr.

In conscience we can never forget the victims of communism any more than we can forget the moral principles which, if adhered to, will prevent the continuance of the many crimes against humanity committed in the name of communism.

In my judgment, we should be quick to forgive and prepared to forget only when the Communists have corrected their evil practices upon humanity and have removed their apparatus of fear and terror from those vast areas of the world which they now hold by force alone.

Another notion being advanced as a solution to the crisis which now grips the world is that we who are free can safely cohabitate with those who seek to enslave us and that if we will be patient and agree to a mixture of what we believe in with that of what the Communists teach, there will evolve over a period of years a new civilization.

This is called the new political evolution. It presupposes that by some accident of nature, evil can be mixed with decency and that the future civilization it heralds can be at the same time both good and evil.

The misguided advocates of this unworkable concept of political evolution have not learned that it is impossible to mix fire and water.

These are only some of the signs of our times.

In your work you must run across many others that stand as obstacles to the performance of the high task that is yours.

But these obstacles, as many and as diversified as they might be, should only serve as added encouragement to push you forward with renewed energy.

I have long thought that those engaged in work such as yours could well adopt the classic saying of St. Augustine which concludes his writings on the subject of Christian combat.

He said, "The crown of victory shall go only to those who engage in the struggle."

In every sense of the word, you are engaged in the struggle to preserve the dignity of man and the decencies which make life worth living.

It is my hope and prayer that you will win that blessed crown, if not in this world, in the hereafter when all of us must give an accounting for our stewardship here on earth.

Twenty Years of Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose a speech made by me on the agricultural situation over the past 20 years. The speech is as follows:

This is the 20th anniversary of a project that has been of tremendous value to the American people. It had its beginning in the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana—the district I have the honor to represent.

Twenty years ago a demonstration project was established on the Brushey and Cooley Creeks watersheds near Minden, in Webster Parish, La. With alternating enthusiasm and doubt, a group of men set out to test the visions and dreams of a man who had for a long time been "crying in the wilderness" in a vain attempt to warn the people of America against the devastating effects of soil erosion.

The Soil Erosion Service was created by Executive order in the Department of the Interior in 1933 to demonstrate on a farm-wide, watershed basis that by application of all known practical conservation measures something could be done to stop this enemy of our national economy.

That demonstration was a tremendous success. It proved that erosion can be controlled through practices that are of immediate benefit to the landowners. It also proved that most erosion control practices can be applied by landowners using the equipment, power, and labor available on the farms being treated.

It is with great pride that I mention the fact that my native State passed the first Soil Conservation District Act which made it possible for farmers to organize soil conservation districts to conserve and improve land resources. Since that date most of the States have passed similar laws and today the soil conservation district movement is national in scope.

It is well to remember that early settlers in this country had no problems of erosion for the reason that under virgin conditions the surface soil was protected and held in place by grasses, trees, and other vegetation. This topsoil was filled with spongy organic matter, holding rainwater until it could soak into the ground to replenish subterranean aquifers, thereby maintaining high underground water level and rendering no damage to the land surface by rushing down the slopes to overflow the streams.

It has been charged that farmers invited soil erosion by their unsound land use. I have heard this denied by men and women who closely observed conditions during the latter part of the last century. They vehemently claim that soil erosion was unheard of until after commercial sawmills denuded the forests and destroyed the source of the spongy material that once covered the surface of the earth and held the rainfall.

Whoever may be guilty of the crime, unmistakably the corpus delicti lies before us. Unfortunately we cannot bury it; we are forced to live with it.

It is estimated that the annual cost of erosion in the United States, in wasted soil and reduction of crop yields, amounts to approximately $4 billion.

Surveys made in Louisiana by the Soil Conservation Service show that erosion has removed all of the topsoil from more than 170,000 acres; that 200,000 acres have lost 80 percent of the topsoil; and that 60 percent of the topsoil is gone from 1,400,000 acres.

It is scarcely necessary to remind you that we depend on topsoil for our production of food, clothing, and much of our shelter. Most of the soluble nutrients available to growing plants are found in the topsoil. The loss of any portion of it reduces the ability of fields to produce, for the reason that it contains a high percentage of organic matter.

Referring specifically to my native State, we suffer additional damage from unchecked soil erosion in States north of us. Floodwaters which rush down upon us come from watersheds that are mostly barren of forests or cover of any sort. Unchecked on eroded uplands, water builds up in Louisiana's stream channels, clogging them with sediment and debris to result in destruction of food and cover for wildlife. For many years commercial fishing played an important part in our State's economy. But soil erosion in Louisiana and in northward neighboring States has produced silt-laden waters which are detrimental to the propagation of fish.

However, I am happy to report that great progress is being made in Louisiana toward protection of soil and restoration of its fertility. Conservation surveys there have determined the proper land-use capabilities. They show that we have four kinds of land from the standpoint of proper use, namely, lands suitable for continuous cultivation, lands suitable for limited or occasional cultivation, lands suitable only for the growing of grass or trees, and lands suitable only for fish, wildlife, or recreation.

Four years ago the western gulf region of the Soil Conservation Service sounded this warning:

"Soil erosion is one of the biggest tasks Louisiana ever had. Planning the necessary conservation practices and fitting them to the land according to its capabilities and needs were an enormous undertaking. It required millions of man-days of skilled and unskilled labor, technical assistance, and work with heavy and light equipment to accomplish the task. If Louisiana had been afraid to tackle a big job and see it through to completion, the situation would have been hopeless."

It is pleasing to be assured that while the task has not, as yet, been completed, the situation is far from hopeless.

For several years I have been gravely concerned about our water-use, or more specifically stated, I have been apprehensive of our lack of serious planning for future water-use. If, in the future, we are as indifferent toward water-use as the two preceding generations were of forestry-use and land-use, the next immediate generation is going to find itself in a precarious situation. Our streams are polluted and our ground-water level is becoming distressingly low. A friend of mine relates that he sat at his desk and from memory listed 50 bubbling springs of pure and potent water that were bold and inviting to him as a young man 40 years ago, not 1 of which is visible today. I am told in my district that many shallow wells which were once generous in their production of pure water, are today either bone-dry or polluted beyond safe usage.

What has caused this distressing change?

It all goes back to improper use of our once bounteous timbered areas. When we denuded the forests we invited soil erosion which is the proximate cause of our present diminution of surface and underground water supply. We left nothing on the land to hold the rainwater or sponge it long enough for it to seep into the soil and into the fresh-water aquifers that were once so bountiful and dependable. In regard to our water supply, the future is rather dismal.

However, it is gratifying to learn that the Soil Conservation Service is including proper water use in its plans for the future, realizing that if we are to conserve our soil and protect our sources of water supply, we have got to grow trees or vegetation of some sort on every acre of land that we do not need for intensive cultivation.

I do not agree with the statement of the disgruntled old gentleman who acquired from his neighbors the nickname "Pessimistic Pete." When the overflow came and destroyed his cotton crop, Pessimistic Pete whined mournfully, "All nature is against man." And the following year when drought and heat burned his corn crop he gave tongue to the same plaint, "All nature is against man."

It seems to me the reverse of that statement is more nearly the truth. Hasn't man been against all nature? At any rate, the fact remains that whether the farmers or the commercial sawmillers invited soil erosion and coincidental water troubles, it behooves man of this generation to rectify those mistakes.

In that portion of Louisiana which I have the privilege of representing in Congress, the two oldest subdivisions of service are known as the Saline Soil Conservation District and the Dorcheat Soil Conservation District. The recent annual reports from these two districts reflect considerable progress. The Dorcheat reports disclose that, "During the past year, 2,891 acres were given improved woodland management practices and 1,686 acres were selectively cut. Pine seedlings were planted on more than 1,100 unproductive acres." These reports enumerate the progress that is being made in soil conservation practices, under such headings as, "Planning and Application of Conservation Practices," but the general subject is too broad for discussion at this time.

We ordinarily think of soil conservation as a means of restoring fertility to land in order that we may grow more crops. But I am more definitely concerned with what conservation practices will do for future generations in order that those who follow this generation will not condemn us too bitterly for spoiling that which we only had a right to use with care and skill.

The recent report from the Saline district shows:

"Plans are made to apply woodland management to 11,096 acres of woodland on lands of our new cooperators. The district as a whole actually applied woodland management to 7,833 acres."

In order to give you a picture of what the Soil Conservation Service is doing, please consider for a moment the results of that agency's mismanagement of two tracts of land in my district that were acquired by the Federal Government during the depression. This land was classified as submarginal, that is to say, it was considered worthless for row crops. There are 12,624 acres in the project near Minden and 18,533 acres near Homer.

Last year those 2 projects, under management of the Louisiana Division of the Soil Conservation Service, brought in a revenue of $153,678 from forest products, grazing permits and concession fees. In lieu of taxes which would be paid to the parish if the land were privately owned, the project pays each year a percentage of its earnings. Last year Claiborne Parish received $1.36 per acre and Webster Parish got $1.03 per acre, whereas comparable nearby land, privately owned, paid a tax of 21 cents per acre in Webster and 16 cents per acre in Claiborne.

One other figure concerning these two projects and I will leave with you conclusive proof that we can afford to cover every slope and hillside in the entire South with growing pines and at the same time be helping nature recover her balance and again to function in a manner that will assure us of productive soil and a bountiful water supply.

Under 5 years of management by the Louisiana Soil Conservation Service, those 2 tracts of submarginal land have produced, chiefly from trees, a total revenue of $616,571. And that timber is increasing in production as the years pass on and the land on which it grows is regaining its fertility. The cost of this management has been nominal. Mother Nature has been the boss and the conservation boys have listened attentively to her.

To January 1, 1953, 6 soil conservation districts have been organized within the area that I represent, consisting of a total of 6,626,900 acres and representing 31,461 farms. There is much of which I could boast concerning the achievements of the soil conservation as applied in the fourth Louisiana congressional district. I would like to point out to you the democratic manner in which districts are formed and operated and how the farmers themselves take the initiative and assume the obligations. There is much to say about the practices as applied to contour farming, strip cropping, terraces, cover cropping, et cetera, but I am restricting my discussion to those practices of soil erosion which more directly concern the future water use and resources.

Our land and water resources are the very foundation of our fabulous industrial and agricultural strength. They are the principal source of our wealth. Our great cities, with all their complex activities, are dependent directly on these resources. Ours is the highest standard of living on earth and it has been built largely on the abundance and fruitfulness of our land and water.

You may think it strange that I am apprehensive of our general neglect of water resources, particularly since Louisiana has an annual rainfall of upwards of 50 inches. Millions of acre-inches of water pass daily down our bayous and rivers, and yet I rejoice to find in the last annual report of activities in the fourth congressional district such items as:

	Acres
Pasture improvement	393,035
Seeding of pastures	245,961
Woodland management	255,421
Tree planting	41,030

Such items reassure me that some day in the future we will have trees growing on every acre of land that is not needed for intensive cultivation of crops. Trees covering our slopes and hillsides mean better soil and more abundance of pure water.

Time does not permit me to pay deserved tribute to the Agricultural Extension Department and the Louisiana Forestry Commission in their efforts to augment the general plan of growing forests for the protection of soil and the prevention of a future water famine.

Such a project does not entail the expenditure of a large sum of money. Protection

from fire is the most expensive item in the program, which means that someone must be assigned the task of protecting nature against the carelessness and indifference of man.

Let's give nature a chance to restore the balance which we have so ruthlessly disturbed.

However, in fairness to "Pessimistic Pete" let me admit that the schedule a farmer must follow is not fixed by himself. It is largely determined by the weather and other conditions that are beyond his control. When the farmer plows, seeds his acres, or harvests his crops, he is forced to operate in accordance with the whims and vagaries of nature.

Farmers are no longer independent of other phases of economy. There was a time when young men chose to be farmers because that life assured them of almost perfect aloofness from all other activities. They could act independently of the towns and cities. But this is no longer true. Farming has become a part of the fabric of our total economy. Tractors, motor trucks, combines, hay balers, and other mechanical equipment are necessary and make farmers dependent upon the factories who have built for them 4 million tractors, 4 million automobiles, and 2 million trucks, all of which use fuel and lubricating oil that help force farmers into the lifeline of trade and make them dependent upon many industrial enterprises.

Mechanizing the farm has not only brought the farmer into closer contact with industry, but it has changed his manner and standard of living. And it has also reduced his ranks, that is numerically.

Total agricultural production of the United States was harvested in 1952 with a half-million fewer workers than were used in 1950. Yet the harvest was approximately equal to the high records reached in 1948 and 1949. In other words, a half million fewer workers were needed in 1952 to harvest bigger production than was had 2 years previously.

The use of mechanical devices and the utilization of gasoline and electric power have combined to change the economic status of the farm family. The availability of electric power has done more to raise the living standard of rural people than any other innovation within my memory. Of the approximately 5 million farms in the United States, nearly half of them now depend upon electric power.

Who made this power available to rural people?

The Rural Electrification Administration was established by Executive order on May 11, 1935. The following year an act of Congress was passed which gave REA permanent status and authorized a 10-year lending program. In 1944 this authority was extended indefinitely, leaving to Congress the authority to determine each year the amount of funds REA may lend.

The basic policy of REA is to render "certain technical advice and assistance to its borrowers * * * and to assist rural people in doing things which they cannot do for themselves." The plan of the REA is democracy at its best. It provides credit for rural families who want to help themselves and furnishes technical guidance when needed. "Each borrower is an entirely independent corporate body, locally owned and controlled, and existing pursuant to applicable State laws, and each such borrower is itself responsible for the management of its own affairs, proper and successful construction and operation of its own system, and the repayment of the REA loan."

REA itself operates no rural-electric facilities, and its program involves no grants or subsidies. Its loans are paid out of the operating revenues of the locally owned and locally managed co-op organization.

The rural people of Louisiana have availed themselves of the opportunities offered by the REA. As of June 8, 1953, there are in that comparatively small land-area State 12,812 subscribers represented by 10 co-op organizations that have borrowed a total of $4,610,000 with which to construct many miles of powerlines.

These powerlines are a network of security. They relieve the mind and the body of many vexing and fatiguing problems and tasks. They pump water and keep it flowing through the home; they cook food, wash clothes and dishes; they milk cows and supply lights to the home and the barn; they provide communications with the doctor, with neighbors, and markets. Those lines are there because rural people put them there through their own initiative and labor, with assistance from an enlightened Government.

In October of 1949 the REA was authorized to make loans to local telephone co-ops for the purpose of constructing and operating telephone facilities. At an interest rate of 2 percent, loans totaling $106 million have been approved for borrowers from the different States of the Union.

It is important to note that commercial utilities companies supplied, last year, about 54 percent of the power used by rural consumers. However, in addition to the power purchased during the fiscal year 1952, REA borrowers used 649 million kilowatt-hours generated in their own plants.

Science has spread to the farms and the intelligent use of it has brought about many changes during the past century. Perhaps the rural family is again taking a prominent place in the social, political, and economic life of the Nation.

When this country was young, the farmer—particularly the planter of the South—enjoyed the highest standards of living American society had experienced. The Civil War, followed by discriminating legislation, such as differential freight rates and high tariff on manufactured imports, completely reversed the situation and the rural agricultural South became, in the words of the late President Roosevelt, "the Nations No. 1 economic problem."

Through such subsidies a vast discrepancy developed between prices the farmer had to pay for what he bought and the prices obtained for what he produced, and out of this unbalanced economy there emerged legislation that sought to remedy the situation. Agriculture had at last become a basic industry, closely meshed into our complex system of economy. Industry, labor, and agriculture became dependent one upon the other. Farmers demanded and deserved full-parity prices for farm products and parity income for farm people. It is true that this objective cannot be obtained by Government programs alone, nevertheless, the farmer needs some protection against changing international relationships which quickly affect prices of farm products, over which he has no control.

Earlier in this talk I called attention to the fact that the schedule a farmer must follow is not fixed by himself. It is largely determined by the weather and other conditions that are beyond his control. When the farmer plows, seeds his acres, or harvests his crops, he is forced to operate in accordance with the whims and vagaries of nature.

Everyone who is interested in agriculture or who speaks or writes about farm families and rural people should make some effort to comprehend the word "parity." I particularly commend to certain city newspaper columnists the following definition of the very much misunderstood word:

"The parity of an agricultural commodity, generally speaking, is the price which will give the commodity the same purchasing power as it had during a given base period in terms of (1) prices of commodities farmers buy, (2) interest on mortgage indebtedness, (3) taxes on farm real estate, and (4) for most commodities, wage rates for hired farm labor.

"The parity price of an individual farm commodity, in other words, is a standard for measuring the purchasing power of that commodity in relation to prices of goods and services during a definite base period."

Through the influence and direction of the USDA the southern farmer has been getting away from the so-called one-crop system and turning much of his acreage into pastures. As a consequence, the dairying and beef cattle industries have expanded while cotton production has decreased. During this same period of time cotton production has increased in some of the far-Western States. Sufficient time has not elapsed to determine that the South should sacrifice her traditional superiority in cotton culture in favor of animal husbandry, nor have those Western States had ample time to assure them that they should plow up their pastures and plant them in cotton. For better or for worse, the South has been for more than a century and a half the throne of Old King Cotton. And the prevailing economy of 150 years cannot be shifted abruptly without deplorable consequences.

There are many phases of agriculture which I would like to discuss, such as reciprocal trade agreements, trade expansion with foreign countries, foreign agricultural service and technical assistance, all of which are important factors in our national economy and of particular interest to rural people. However, I must acknowledge that no one could completely cover, in less than a book-length treatise, all the "Problems and Progress in Agriculture."

Even so, I consider it a duty, as well as a privilege, to express my high regard for work done by the Animal Husbandry Division of the Bureau of Animal Industry. I am amazed at the network service provided farmers by these divisions of the USDA, reaching down through their affiliates to the State livestock sanitary boards. May I cite only one example of accomplishment?

Five years ago that dreaded animal plague known as foot-and-mouth disease had spread over an area of nearly 260,000 square miles. Farmers in my section were alarmed. In fact, there was danger to the cattle of the entire Nation. To wipe out this scourge, it was necessary to kill almost a million cattle, sheep, hogs, and goats. Vaccination was administered to more than 60 million animals. These agricultural agencies of the United States were forced to spend about $123 million to carry out our part of the program in conjunction with Mexico, but that money was spent wisely and effectively.

We hear some growling about the tremendous sums that the National and State Governments spend on agriculture. But we haven't seen that man, woman, or child who wants to stop eating, wearing clothes, living in houses, and covering their feet with shoes. We haven't talked to a single historian who refused to admit that we won two world wars largely because we outproduced the enemy, nor have we talked to one who refuses to admit that our ability to grow food and clothing and to produce materials of war is our greatest deterrent against attack by the Communists. We haven't seen that person who isn't grateful to farmers for what they did during the last World War. Remember, farmers were called upon to do the impossible. And they did. They actually produced four times the amount of commodities called upon to produce.

But with our rapidly increasing population, how far away is that fatal day when our soil can no longer produce enough food, clothing, shelter, and water to sustain the people? How long before we reach the saturation point? Will it be a century from now, or will it be 80 years, or only 50 years from now?

Shouldn't we of this generation open our eyes and watch the jaws of the stupendous pincers steadily closing? Those jaws are someday going to squeeze the very life out of us if we don't begin right now making plans to avoid that catastrophe.

Shouldn't we open our eyes and see the terrible threat to our economic safety that is so evident in the rapid increase of population and so obvious in our diminution of water and land resources?

What countries are always the source of unrest? The pages of history unmistakably answer that question. Wars are started by and in those nations where populations have grown beyond the ability of land and water resources adequately to sustain them.

Where is communism flourishing today? In what lands has that evil doctrine taken root? The answer is:

In those parts of Asia and Europe where 1 acre of land is required to support 80 people. That's the answer, fellow Americans.

With our natural increase in population, plus our far too liberal laws that haphazardly govern immigration, how many years before every acre of our soil will be called upon to furnish 80 people with food, water, clothing, and shelter?

And yet there is demand from some quarters that we increase the immigration quotas during the next 2 years by admitting an additional thousands of Europeans. This demand is supported largely by tear-jerking stories.

The people of my district are sick and tired of tax burdens for the purpose of supplying peoples of foreign countries who thank us by a kick in the teeth. The people of my district don't want those huge quotas of aliens here to hasten the fatal day when our soil may no longer be able to sustain the population. Why should we be continually called upon to give, give, give and keep on giving to sustain some of them at home and at the same time called upon to bring great numbers of them to the United States to hasten the day when our land can no longer sustain the people?

In my opinion, immigration agreements with each country should be on an exchange basis, reciprocal in number. Example: We accept a thousand people from Shang-ri-la if there are a thousand Americans who want to go to Shang-ri-la.

I shed no tears with those who misinterpret Cain's question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" Abel had disappeared under suspicious circumstances and when Cain was asked, "Where is Abel thy brother?" the killer replied, "I know not: Am I my brother's keeper?"

And the murderer's sentence was pronounced in these words, "When thou tillest the ground, it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength; a fugitive and vagabond shalt thou be in the earth."

I don't find in this Biblical story any suggestion that we Americans should be classed as murderers among nations. I see no suggestion that we should run the risk of destroying our economy in order that we sustain peoples of the world in their own kitchens until they decide they'd fare better by coming to ours. It is shameful to distort the meaning of Biblical phrases in order to play upon human emotions.

These grave problems, which I have stated very simply, are being seriously pondered by the cotton farmers along the fertile Red River Delta and by the dairymen and cattlemen of the same area, as well as by the hill farmers who are wisely turning most of their land into the growing of grass and trees.

The fathers and grandfathers of these hill farmers were accused of the crime of depleting the soil by unsound farming. They were charged with inviting erosion. I seriously doubt their guilt. I think their only offense against the general economy was the selling of their timber for a mere pittance of what it was worth. It may not be unjust to accuse them of being accessories to the fact, because they permitted their slopes and hillsides to become denuded and made barren of trees.

This being the 20th anniversary of the soil-saving demonstration that was begun in the 4th Congressional District of Louisiana, I ask for the privilege of congratulating those people and saying to them that if it is true that each generation merely has the right of trusteeship over our natural resources, then they, the farmers, have demonstrated beyond peradventure that the precious treasures of this country are in trustworthy hands.

Address of Senator Wallace F. Bennett of Utah, at Memorial Day Services, Jefferson Barracks National Cemetery, St. Louis, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the excellent and most appropriate remarks made by Senator Wallace F. Bennett, of Utah, at the Memorial Day services held at Jefferson Barracks National Cemetery, in St. Louis, Mo.:

We are met here today—in this place of peace and beauty—to spend a brief hour in contemplation of the meaning and purpose of our great country and the parts these men have played and we must play in its destiny.

As I sought to prepare myself to participate on this occasion, my mind went back to the Saviour's profoundly beautiful parable of the talents; and there I found a focus for my thoughts.

To us Americans—as to the servants in the parable—has been given a great treasure: all that can be embraced in the word "America."

Our country is more than the geographic area which we inhabit or the material possessions we enjoy. From the beginning, it has been to its patriotic citizens the symbol of their greatest spiritual resources—the promise of their dreams for happiness—the reward for their devotion.

Our country has never been just another piece of land to those who came to its shores out of an older world. To some it was a refuge, to others a challenge. To all, it has ever been a promise of freedom. And this concept of freedom—spiritual before it became manifest in the form and function of government—is the greatest treasure that we have, and makes us the richest nation in the world. In the symbolism of the parable, we are the servants to whom the five talents were given.

Up to date, on the whole, we have used this treasure well. In the beginning it was little more than a dream, but in 300 years we have given it great substance. In the parable, the worthy servant doubled his talents. Ours have been multiplied almost to infinity. Inspired by it, each generation has made its own sacrifices for the future, so that our blessings have grown faster than our population, and there is more for each of us among the millions than there was to be divided among the first few. Certainly, because our fathers were faithful over a few things, we have been made rulers over many.

But the parable is never a completed story. It is a new challenge to every new American in every new generation; and before we can earn the plaudit of "Well done, thou good and faithful servant," we must, in turn, make our own contribution to the growth of this great treasure.

To do so effectively, we must first learn for ourselves its true significance. If we lose sight of its spiritual foundation, if we fail to comprehend the irreplaceable part that freedom has played in its accumulation, we cannot use it wisely. Unless we realize that our material abundance is the product of our spiritual strength, we are in danger of losing it all—like the slothful servant. If we measure America only in terms of the number of gadgets per capita—and preen and boast of these—our current contest with the Soviets becomes no more than materialistic marauding.

For, because it is a great treasure, it attracts and inflames the evil motives of evil men. Being without understanding of its spiritual significance, they seek to seize its material values which, in their hands, would turn to dust and despair—as it will in ours, if we lose our understanding.

So, how do we best make use of this great treasure that has been entrusted to our care?

The first and obvious truth we draw from the lesson of the parable is that in a world that so desperately needs help to build a similar treasure, we cannot save it only for ourselves by burying it in isolation. We must protect it, of course, against all enemies of peace and freedom; but to keep it vital, we must share its blessings and expand its power, both in our own country and in all the world. As a nation, this need should ever guide our fundamental policies at home and abroad. At home, we work to keep the light of liberty alive—abroad, to share its blessings and thus justify our stewardship as good and faithful servants.

In the spirit of this concept, President Eisenhower is completely right when he reiterates as our continuing objective the ultimate freedom of the enslaved nations.

He is profoundly wise when he works patiently for peace, because only in an atmosphere of peace can the blessings of liberty expand to full flower.

But he must also be prudent and alert to the danger of attack and the need for adequate defense. Peace and war are always literally hanging in the balance; and the skillful blending of plans for peace—with postures for defense—without letting either overturn the other is a task requiring almost superhuman judgment and infinite patience and devotion.

He has demonstrated his broad grasp of the scope of the problem and his ability to adjust to meet the changing challenge of the evil enemy by his proposals to broaden the effectiveness of NATO beyond its present limited military emphasis and breathe into the alliance the spirit of community in the spiritual values of liberty. This is a classic example of one means by which we can put our American talent to use and thus expand its value to the world.

Another great demonstration of adaptability has been our more effective use of the U. N. Since Eisenhower became President, we have ceased our previous passive policy by which we expected U. N., by itself, to solve all international problems and have used it affirmatively as an instrument to expand our influence for peace—a forum to explain and sell our basic concepts to the world—a channel through which our contributions could be made.

And in his recent appointment of Senator GEORGE to serve America abroad, he provides a living reminder to the world that Americans of both political parties stand and serve together in its great mission to build this great treasure by sharing it with all men everywhere.

Perhaps by this time you are asking yourselves, "Why talk about this problem here, in this place that has been hallowed by the presences of these men who gave their lives in war and on this day on which we honor them?" I know of no place more fitting and of no day more appropriate. It was in the furtherance of this great responsibility that these men gave their lives.

The concept of freedom is always in peril. Since the beginning of recorded history, most men have lived in virtual slavery, under the shadow of tyranny, and few men have been free. Our own American experience has been the longest and strongest flowering of freedom. But its perpetuation will never be assumed. The lust for power will never disappear. And we must always be prepared to defend and preserve it, by war if necessary.

And yet in a way, this is a wise part of God's purpose, because without opposition there can be no growth—without challenge, no inspiration to overcome. If there were no new areas in need of liberty, we might be tempted to "bury" liberty like slothful servants, and thus lose it.

As long as the evil challenges the good, it will seek to resort to its obvious weapon, force; and men will be called to use force in liberty's defense. Of these, some will die as these have done, making their life's contribution in one sacrifice. Their task has been to preserve for the rest of us the opportunity to build. They died to keep the door open and the hope alive. Theirs is a necessary and honored part in the process of peace.

Their sacrifice deepens our obligation to use the opportunity they preserved with greater effectiveness and more devoted zeal—to keep the light of liberty bright and make its blessings more abundant here in America so that all men can draw inspiration from this source and, working together, we can spread both light and blessings ever farther in a groping, starving world.

Spiritual Values in a World of Crises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 28, 1956, it was my privilege to deliver the commencement address at the 56th annual commencement excercises of Westmar College, Le Mars, Iowa, at which time I was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of laws. My address follows:

We live in a time of desperate challenge. Great problems confront us.

Your generation will be called upon to assume responsibilities of vast magnitude. You will be called upon to assume the burden of a world torn by two conflicting ideologies.

One preaches the Word of God, sustained and strengthened by faith in the divine teachings of the Holy Bible.

The other plots in darkness to enslave mankind under a cruel tyranny that denies God and would tear down all that we hold sacred.

One believes in freedom under God as the source of all human progress. That philosophy, to which we adhere, upholds the dignity and sanctity of the individual. The other would destroy all freedom and all religion except worship of the state. In the Communist philosophy the individual exists only to serve the purposes of the government.

Within the lifetime of all of us here today revolutionary changes have taken place.

The swift pace of modern scientific development has touched upon every aspect of human activity. The old concepts of time and space have been swept away. Research into the secrets of nature has made possible the destruction of civilization should the world become involved in total war.

I bring these grim facts to your attention only to emphasize my firm belief that the future of mankind depends upon a clear understanding of the eternal and unchanging truths that govern the destinies of men and nations.

I wonder if you will agree with me then that the human race is living today close to the edge of eternity and that this unprecedented fact in history calls for a reappraisal, so to speak, of the future of the world.

I wonder if you will agree with me that had we been living in a more normal period of history—before the nuclear age—we would, as the result of the natural forces of international attrition, be deeply involved at this hour in World War III.

Now what I want to be concerned with here today in my meditations with you is a determination—just among ourselves—on just what it is in civilization that endures. Our problem is to decide where to put the major accent on life and how to shape our world in the immediate hours ahead so that we shall not blow ourselves and all of life on this planet into a mass of nuclear gases.

This we know: There is no comparable period in human history during which so much has happened to so many people in so fractional a space of historic time.

We want to know first how we can go on living as the human race. And then we want to know how we can go on living without being enslaved.

I begin with a premise.

My premise is this:

My premise is that the United States of America is up to this hour the greatest triumph of Christianity.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower in an address in 1955 made this statement: "As we build a richer material world, we must always remember that there are spiritual truths which endure forever. They are the universal inspiration of all mankind." George Washington in his farewell address more than 150 years ago uttered these words: "Religion and morality lead to political prosperity." These great men, though living many decades apart, shared the belief that a sound prosperity cannot be accomplished without a foundation of high standards of spiritual and moral principles and values.

My premise is that the moral values are the enduring values.

My premise is that victory in the struggle we are now in is so deeply involved in moral values that we cannot hope to survive without them. We shall need and maintain our strength-in-being, our Gideon's sword, but, I insist, we shall get nowhere without the Ark of the Covenant.

Now when I say that the United States is the greatest moral and practical triumph of Christianity I am not to be misconstrued into believing that I think we Americans are (a) the chosen people, or (b) the master race.

I am not putting out that kind of boast.

On the contrary, I hold it the most vital long-term duty—a duty of the greatest magnitude—that the whole world, under whatever religion, feel at the heart of its peoples and the seat of its governments, the power of the moral principles that make for survival of mankind and amity among the nations of the earth. It is up to the United States to be among the nations what Paul of Tarsus was among men.

Now when I say we here represent the greatest triumph of Christianity, I mean by triumph of moral principle over that which is bad. Our Constitution says that "all men are created equal." It is a cornerstone in our sense of moral values. The question is: So you believe all men are created equal? So what? Here is the difference: The Americans spelled that phrase out into statutory law. They spelled it out in their Constitution. They amended their Constitution to spell it out even more. And they are rendering decisions in their highest courts not only to keep the Constitution, under which they established Christianity in Government alike, but to expand and enrich it.

When you do these things you then give yourself the right, by virtue of your conduct, to preach; you give yourself the obligation to teach, perhaps to boast.

The Bible came out of the steaming ferments of the Middle East in antiquity. But in 2,000 years I do not know where its credo has been applied more practically than in the Congress of the United States, the White House, and the Supreme Court. For that matter we did not invent the internal combustion engine. But when we got hold of it we made the automobile the greatest industry of all time. It is this business of plucking a great ideal out of the dreams of the visionaries, and the schemes out of the half-realized hopes of the great inventors—foreign and native—and putting them to work for the good of all men that explains so much of America's success.

The moral ethics we live by came from Christ, they came from Moses, they came from Aristotle, and others. But before we got through we had: trial by jury, habeas corpus, due process, no unusual punishments, equal justice under law, and a sublimely organized system of courts for the protection—precisely for the protection—of the dignity of man.

By triumph of Christianity, I mean we took the blueprints of Christianity and law and created working tools.

That has built us up to the present hour but it does not protect us for the future.

We began this Nation with 3 million agrarian citizens and a sort of gross national income in 1799 of $667 million—substantially less than $1 billion. Our gross national product is now approaching—as President Eisenhower pointed out in his state of the Union message recently—$400 billion.

From less than one billion, in rough economic language, to upward of $400 billion in something over 150 years. What made possible this fabulous progress?

There have been other great land masses with enormous resources.

Why did they not blossom with a parallel prosperity?

I venture a few broad-gaged guesses:

They gave priority and privilege to some one church instead of giving the fullest opportunity to all, as on this soil—and priority to none.

They failed to separate church from state and they totalitarianized the one and persecuted the other.

They preferred aristocracy and privilege to democracy and equal opportunity.

They perpetuated corruption and accelerated decay because they lacked the purgative powers and the self-criticism of a free press.

Their system of popular education was so debased by despotism or semi-despotism that teaching a nation to read and write made the people only more vulnerable to a form of totalitarian propaganda and yellow journalism, and the victims of deliberately designed falsifications.

They failed because they ignored the moral and spiritual values that alone give strength to a nation's roots, its foundations, its reason for being.

The system that grew up here was imbedded in the public school, the town meeting, and the free press. We implemented democracy and justice in government by providing a government by consent of the

governed. When we talked about "all men * * * created equal" we worried, as Lincoln did at Gettysburg, about giving it meaning in everyday life. When we Americans say, "love thy neighbor as thyself," we are not just reading Leviticus in the Old Testament and Mark in the New and letting it go at that. If someone invents a steam engine, we Americans expect it to run a locomotive. We expect it to replace sails on the sea, to carry freight, to move passengers, to build an economy. When we thunder at the greatest power of the time that all men "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," we Americans are not kidding because we expect to get those rights, fight for them and, if necessary, die in the process. All of which is precisely and exactly and extravagantly just what we do.

And we do it again and again and again.

"Love thy neighbor as thyself" did not mean for us sharing cookies with the family across the street on some one day during the Christmas season. It meant that Cuba was to be free. It meant that the Philippines were to have their independence, just as we had our independence. It meant that any little people anywhere on this earth could lift its melancholy face towards Washington, D. C., and hear ringing out to the oppressed peoples the electric language of the "self-determination of nations" in the ennobling words of Woodrow Wilson and his successors.

It meant relations with our neighbors, Mexico and Canada, founded on persuasion and consent. It meant a climax of thinking across the frontiers that rendered senseless and unthinkable any policy of violence, of infiltration, or conquest. It meant a relationship founded on mutual respect, not mutual fear, and it produced hemisphere understanding and vast regional solidarity and strength on the side of the free world.

That's what it meant.

And it meant that for the free world—after the United States had spoken and practiced its words—the existence of satellite nations would stand out as a symbol of shame, of national peonage, and that it would be an affront to the whole world's sense of freedom and right in the era that is our era.

Yet we are but seven percent of the population of the world.

After 157 years, this tiny confederation of 13 States emerges as the greatest power of all time. It is the unexampled phenomenon of 166 million people governed by 166 million people. It is so much the very heartbeat of world liberty that monarchs and statesmen, kings and queens, those in power and those in exile—but all seeking liberty or strength for liberty—come to the podium in the House of Representatives in the Capitol of the United States of America to plead their cause. The satellites that come to Moscow look glumly for their orders. The nations that appeal to us for whatever influence we have to give to enable them to continue free and independent.

As clearly as black is black and white is white, Washington means freedom and Moscow means enslavement.

We have then to ask ourselves: Now what?

If you agree with me that we have the moral might—in the interests not alone of our own preservation but in the interests of the preservation of the free world and life itself on this planet to right a wrong, then our problem is: What processes shall we employ? What methods shall we use, what tools, what means? And, can we do this at all without going to the brink and without precipitating the very World War III we are so bent upon preventing?

The answer is that, in one form or another, it all happened before—and in our time. The answer is that of course no people grimly determined to maintain its integrity against enslavement or destruction can hope to survive against a resolute and a dangerous enemy without some element of risk. But I insist that the risk can be buttressed by character, courage, and strength. And with these I feel—as history I am about to relate proves—that communism has been and can be stopped dead in its tracks. I believe we are doing this under our administration today and I believe, moreover, that in this contest between freedom and communism there are no party lines.

Of course, given the brute strength of a limitless army, given conditions of desperate poverty, given widespread chaos, and the Soviet Union, or its fatal export, communism, can and does expand. But unless everything we know about conquest by force as against conquest by moral principle is wrong, it will be impossible to convince me that communism has even begun to take root among the third of the earth's population and the fourth of the world's surface where it now rules.

It is only just now giving itself its own blow to its own solar plexus.

We now have the proof in the Kremlin's own words that communism in general and the Soviet Union's oligarchy do not respect each other or themselves.

It is because they are vulnerable on moral grounds that they are vulnerable on every other ground—economic, political, diplomatic, ideological.

We all remember Austria, France, and Italy in 1947. They were becoming Communist-ridden. Their governments were tottering under the vast despair of postwar chaos. Exercising our high moral standards we stopped, on the home soil of the other man's country—the tragic overwhelming of free government by Communist infiltration. We stopped subversion and the misuse of a people's poverty to destroy their liberty.

In our overall program, Western Germany was brought into the anti-Communist fold. It happened that total success was not to be our lot. For while we succeeded brilliantly for the most part in Europe, we underwent dismal failure for the most part in the Far East. We have to accept the conditions of combat—for wars are like that.

I could go on and relate the story of Iran, which but for us might have been swallowed by the Soviet Union.

I could go on and tell the story of Greece and Turkey with the Kremlin breathing on their necks.

I could go on and report the heroic tale of the Berlin airlift.

What I say in sum is that the Communist ideology is not an irresistible force. The Soviet Union, with its Kremlin, is anything but an immovable body.

But moral force is both.

No one with an open mind and a clear view will belittle the compelling impact of President Eisenhower's challenge to the Soviet Union on disarmament and aerial inspection at the Geneva "meeting at the summit." Who can miss the sheer power of the confidence President Eisenhower enjoys from the people of his own country and the world in relation to this contest with communism?

What I urge today is that we seek with all the diligence we have, with all the wisdom we can get to lead us, with all the sincerity of our own people, some formula tailored—in each case—to the prevailing situation, for the defeat of the Communist enemy.

One part of this formula must be our own strength in the area of education in our own country.

We may even turn the Soviet tragedy to some benefit if under pressure of its crisis we exert ourselves on the educational plane to meet it head-on. We must defeat the peril of drastic shortages in skilled occupations. We must determine why students drop out of school and how gifted students may develop their abilities. I go all the way with the proposal that opportunities for higher education should be available to all Americans to the extent of their capabilities.

What I have sought to emphasize in this address is the suddenly extended, suddenly accentuated meaning of our moral and spiritual values in the light of atheism's physical and ideological threat from Moscow. We cannot miss the importance in a technological age of the need for higher education and the development of our national talents to their noblest flowering. It is this that will contribute mightily to a strong and progressive America. Above all, this growth, morally and spiritually, this strengthening of our native talents by training and education, is without meaning if it is not based on the bulwarking, equally, of our faith in our constitutional rights. Given these moral and spiritual forces, given this all encompassing education for all our people, given this faith in the American heritage, victory for the free world will be the inevitable reward for mankind.

Nothing you graduates can possibly do will enrich yourselves more or hasten the triumph of faith or make a better contribution to your country than to proclaim and demonstrate the faith and learning you have gathered here at Westmar. May each of you bring something to a world in need of light and understanding.

The Civil Rights Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a speech which I delivered yesterday, Sunday, June 3, at the annual meeting of the Urban League of Greater New York, held at the Williams Institutional CME Church, 131st Street and 7th Avenue, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN AT 45TH ANNUAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING OF THE URBAN LEAGUE OF GREATER NEW YORK, WILLIAMS INSTITUTIONAL CME CHURCH, 131ST STREET AND 7TH AVENUE, JUNE 3, 1956

I take this opportunity to pay my heartfelt tribute to the Urban League which has been working on the problem of intergroup and interracial relations for almost half a century.

Over the years the Urban League has made historic contributions to the solution of many aspects of the civil-rights problem. One of the league's main achievements has been to help expose and define its roots and manifestations, in terms of housing, schools, recreation facilities, and other phases of segregation and integration.

The Urban League has furnished a framework within which men of good will of all races could work together to achieve steady advances toward the goal of adjustment, focusing their efforts on the neighborhood and the community.

This organization has helped to show how vast are the ramifications of intergroup and interracial adjustment, what concrete and specific evils flow from discrimination and segregation, and what must and can be done about it.

Some people, including some of the leaders of our Government, act as though civil rights were a brandnew problem, which has just arisen and needs nothing so much as to be studied. And they indicate that as soon

as they finish studying it, they will probably do something about it. And, of course, that may take a long time.

Others talk as if the civil-rights problem were like a sudden attack of virus and that all that should or can be done is to give the patient plenty of rest, and maybe a dose or two of some patent medicine, like a conference.

You and I know how unrelated to the facts of life these views of the problem are. We know that the problem called civil rights is one of vast complexity, some of whose manifestations will take time to work out, but all of whose aspects need to be worked on, without a moment's needless delay, urgently, deliberately, and zealously.

You and I know, and some of you better than I, how galling and intolerable are the many aspects of injustice, discrimination, and segregation based on race, and how they involve almost every phase of neighborhood, community, and national life.

In basic respects, the civil-rights problem is as much a northern problem as it is southern. Harlem here is a glaring manifestation of the civil-rights problem in the North, and I shall speak more about that in a moment.

But, above all, the civil-rights problem is one which involves each of us and millions like us, in our personal everyday lives, either as victims of discrimination and segregation, or as those who, willing or not, or consciously or not, are the victimizers, the discriminators, or the segregators.

The civil-rights problem is reflected in the house or apartment we live in, in the street or neighborhood we call our own, in the job or profession we work at, in the shops we patronize, in the movie we attend, in the vacation we plan, and in the schools to which we send our children or to which we ourselves go. In short, the civil-rights problem touches us all in the most personal and intimate details of our lives, in one way or another, depending upon the racial, social, and economic group to which we belong.

These aspects constitute the real core of the civil-rights problem. Around this core are gathered the more dramatic manifestations—the legal and political manifestations which furnish the major approaches to the core and substance aspects of it.

In our concentration on these approaches, which are the obvious instruments of our efforts, we must never lose sight of the core and substance, which are the end objects of these efforts.

In recent months the civil-rights problem has sharpened into a national crisis. This crisis dominates our thinking today; it dominates our political life, too, unwilling as some are to recognize that fact.

Just as the possibility of atomic warfare overshadows our foreign policy today, so the possibility of a racial conflict overshadows our domestic policy.

The civil-rights problem is like a volcano, smoking and bubbling, in the full view of the Nation. All eyes are upon it. Endless words are now being spoken and written about it.

But that volcano has been there for a long time. Only a relatively few have paid much concentrated attention to it in the past, or tried to understand the teeming forces within it. Yet we must understand those forces or we will be unable to cope with them, or control their disastrous consequences.

Today, as I have already indicated, too many Americans, including, I fear, many at the highest levels of our political life, do not understand those forces at all, either as to their nature or their magnitude. And in this lack of understanding lies our greatest danger. Without such an understanding we will not be able to meet the crisis or mobilize the efforts needed to solve the deep-laid problems which underlie the crisis.

In my work in the United States Senate on the civil-rights problem, my efforts are necessarily limited to the tools with which I work. Those tools consist of national legislation and such influence as I can bring to bear, as a Senator, upon the executive branch of the Federal Government. I must further limit my efforts to those undertakings which have either some practical prospect of success, or indicate some possibility of having a constructive effect. None of us can operate on all fronts or move simultaneously in all directions.

At the moment in Washington I am devoting my efforts to the following fronts:

1. Legislation to guarantee to all our citizens the right to participate fully in political activity, in all parts of the country—the right to vote.

2. Legislation to guarantee to all our inhabitants physical security of person, and the equal protection of the law in the enjoyment of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—the right of equal justice under law.

3. Legislation to provide a greater degree of equality of opportunity—in jobs, in education and in access to the major avenues of personal fulfillment and realization—in other words, FEPC, school integration and nondiscrimination in all publicly supported facilities.

4. Legislation to provide a greater measure of social welfare for all underprivileged groups, including minority groups—such as housing and medical care.

5. And, executive action to complete integration in all branches of the Government service, especially in the so-called elite services, such as the Foreign Service.

This is a big order. How much, if any, of this legislation will be enacted at this session of Congress I cannot predict. The prospects are not too bright.

But speaking for myself, alone, I am going to continue to fight for legislation designed to achieve these objectives, and will continue to press the executive branch for action and for leadership, to the full extent of my energies and abilities.

And if we are frustrated in Congress, I am prepared to carry the fight to the Democratic Convention in Chicago in August, and to the people, in the elections in the fall, regardless of whether I am a candidate for reelection or not.

I pledge that I will not spare my own efforts, or withhold any influence which I can exert toward these ends.

A few moments ago I said that the civil-rights problem is a northern as well as a southern one, and that here in Harlem we have both illustration and proof that the acute manifestations of this problem are not confined to the South.

Harlem is a community rich in tradition and culture. Its contributions to the mainstream of national life, politically, socially, economically and culturally have been many and varied. But Harlem is also a rebuke to us of the North, and a challenge to clean up our own backyard, even as we press forward with our efforts to bring justice and equality to the Negroes and other oppressed minorities.

Harlem is a ghetto. Harlem is an area of poverty, congestion, substandard housing and substandard schooling. These conditions rather than the race or national origin of the people who reside in Harlem, are primarily responsible for the high incidence of crime and juvenile delinquency in the area.

We need residential integration in New York City. Housing segregation is responsible for the high incidence of school segregation in our metropolis, the empire city of the Nation. I am afraid that the policies of our New York City planners have not helped the situation.

We have built too many housing projects, not on vacant land, but on congested land. We have cleared some slums only to create new and worse ones. We have constructed housing projects which were, by their location, forced into a pattern of segregation.

There are substantial elements, including the Urban League, which are working patiently, persistently and strenuously toward the solution of these aspects of the problem, which are as much a part of civil rights as the right to vote and FEPC. Residential segregation is the other side of the coin of school segregation.

One public official who, long before he became a public official, had analyzed this problem, focused on it and agitated consistently for its solution over a period of many years, is my old friend, Charles Abrams, whom Governor Harriman was wise enough to name last year as chairman of the State commission against discrimination.

I want to pay my public tribute to Charles Abrams for his long-time efforts in this field.

I was amazed and, may I say, deeply shocked when Charles Abrams was recently made the object of a political attack by a leading political figure in New York State. Mr. Abrams was accused of being a zealot in the cause of nondiscrimination. Well, if ever there was a cause which called for ceaseless dedication and agitation, this is it.

In this whole struggle I range myself on the side of the Charles Abramses in this, and there are quite a few of them in this country.

I cannot be a neutralist. I cannot stand above the battle.

I identify myself with the victims of oppression and discrimination, wherever and whoever they may be. If that is being a zealot, if dedicated efforts to uphold the law, the Constitution and the laws of New York make one a zealot, well, call me a zealot, too.

We need more and not less of this kind of zealot in the fight for civil rights. Of course, I do not mean that we need more intransigent extremists. I mean men of practical understanding and of patient energy, but also of unlimited dedication and devotion.

Yes, we need more men like Charles Abrams, in New York and in the Nation, and we need less who spend their time trying to understand the viewpoint of those who defy the law or the spirit of the law but who have little concern for the victims of illegal oppression and discrimination.

We need fewer public leaders who utter empty platitudes instead of proposing concrete plans for action.

There are too many in Washington and elsewhere in the North who, when they say "we must sympathize with the problems of the South," really mean—the problems of the southern whites, and particularly the problems of those southern whites who have a stake, political or economic, in the maintenance of segregation and the doctrine of white supremacy.

I think I understand the problems of the South, or at least I try to, but I have little sympathy for those elements of the South that are determined to defy the supreme law of the land and to maintain the practice of segregation for their own comfort, convenience and advantage.

I have genuine sympathy with those in the South who are sincerely working to bring about a change, in an orderly way, and with the least possible dislocation.

But most of all, I have sympathy for those long-suffering individuals—Americans like you and me—who, for all of their lives have endured the whiplash of discrimination and segregation. They are the ones whose plight calls for our first concern. They are the injured, to whom justice must be rendered.

Through the lowering darkness of this present crisis, the light of hope shines true. This is a right cause. Justice is on our side.

We may hope that God is on our side, too. At least, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, we can hope that we are on His side.

We must proceed, and are proceeding, without hate or rancor. Compassion and understanding are written on our banners. But we will not stay our efforts or be stayed. We are the upholders of the law, and we will not be denied.

Immigration or Invasion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address which I delivered at the 66th national congress, Sons of the American Revolution, on Memorial Day, May 30, 1956, at the Sagamore Hotel, Bolton Landing on Lake George, N. Y.

The address follows:

This year—like all election years—brings us that most bipartisan of all political games: The courting of the minorities. It is again played with great fervor by those candidates for elective office who believe that organized minority groups wield enough power to clinch the vote in so-called close districts and States.

There appears to be an irresistible fascination in the belief that when a certain congressional district or a State elects a Democrat one time and a Republican another by a small margin of ballots, the minority groups are responsible for the result.

Consequently, as predictably as night follows day, we are confronted again in this election year with the peculiarly American sport of claiming at political rallies, at fundraising banquets, and in political propaganda pronouncements that this country does not admit a sufficient number of immigrants of one or another nationality.

We do not admit enough Greeks, they say, or enough Chinese. Not enough Italians or Rumanians or Portuguese. We should admit more people from India, more from Indonesia, more from Pakistan, or from Iran.

If we ask how many we should admit, the answer is always the same cry—more. And if we ask more of whom, it turns out that the speaker always means more of the people of that national group which the immigration auctioneer is addressing at that particular moment.

All right then, 5,000, 50,000? No. Sixty thousand? Or that part of the number of immigrants which another nationality has not sent to this country? No. Still not enough; and around and around we go.

And now this quadrennial numbers lottery is on again. The irresponsible, lusty auction has started already this year, exactly as we heard it in 1952 and in 1948—just as we heard it earlier, and in between the presidential election years as well.

The auction is being conducted in the usual uninhibited manner by the presidential aspirants, by governors facing election, by Senators whose terms are about to expire, and by some of my colleagues in the House of Representatives. It is being carried on by all their assistants and helpers, and by all the professional immigrant-handlers who make a living as paid servitors of various social, religious and charitable agencies which have made a crude business out of the truly noble and humanitarian task of assisting the immigrant.

At the risk of losing some popularity contests within my own political party as well as in my congressional district, I have long ago refused to look upon immigration as a means of winning friends abroad and political support at home.

To me, immigration is first and foremost a matter of the national welfare and national security.

The volume and the type of immigrants coming to the United States must, in my opinion, be predicated solely on unbiased and impartial findings as to how many we should admit and whom we should admit. Findings that are scientific and not political.

The quantity and the quality are of equal importance, and the interest of the American people must be the sole and exclusive yardstick.

Immigrants entering the United States are entering into the bloodstream of the Nation. It is like an injection into the bloodstream of a human being. It can be beneficial to him, increasing his strength and his vitality. But, if the injection is one of improper quality or improper quantity—it could be fatal.

THE PAST

A comprehensive picture of our current problems cannot be presented without an outline of the historical background of American immigration.

From the first settlement of the North American colonies to the end of the Revolutionary War in 1783, immigration to the New World was regulated not by the colonists but by the governments of Europe. The interest of the European ruler was enhanced by the size of the population of his domain. The more abundant the labor force, the greater his profits and the more gold that accumulated in the royal coffers. Consequently, all European rulers tried to prevent the exodus of their subjects, the peons, who were already then attracted by the magnificence of the wide open land and the opportunities beckoning from across the seas.

The new settlers on this side of the Atlantic deliberately encouraged immigration. Here, more people meant more producers, more consumers, and more wealth to be extracted from the newly acquired soil and—last but not least—more people meant increased safety of life and property.

It is estimated that in 1640, the population of the North American colonies numbered 25,000 people and by 1700, it had risen to 200,000. It took another 50 years to bring the population figure to the first million.

When the Articles of Confederation were adopted in 1777, the population of the Thirteen Colonies was well over 3 million, and the first census taken in 1790 put it at 4 million. About two-thirds of the white population were of English, Scotch, and Welsh origin; about one-third were Dutch, French, German, Scandinavian, Spanish, and Portuguese.

Except for a short-lived restrictive period created by the alien and sedition law of 1798, immigration flowed into the United States unfettered by any legislation. The vast growth of the new American economy, its progression to the limitless frontiers of the West and the ready acceptance of the newcomer by the thriving communities—already established—exerted an increasing attraction on poverty-stricken Europeans in the countries devastated by the Napoleonic wars. Recurring famines and the great industrial revolution resulted in increased population pressures and caused a gradual relaxation of the restrictive attitude of the European rulers who suddenly reversed themselves and began to encourage emigration. As a consequence, the first official record of arriving immigrants established in 1820 indicated that the population of the United States had jumped to almost 10 million persons.

By that time, public opinion, both in Europe and in America, became aroused by disturbing reports of appalling conditions on vessels carrying immigrants on their transatlantic journey. Thousands of them were crowded among the horrors of the dreaded steerage space where they died of hunger, thirst, and disease. In 1819, a law was enacted in the United States limiting the number of passengers that a ship could carry and prescribing the minimum amount of water and food that had to be aboard. The master of every ship reaching our shores had to report the number of passengers he had brought and their personal data, such as age, sex, occupation, and country of origin. Thus originated the first immigration statistics in the United States.

But, except for these efforts to humanize transportation of immigrants, no attempt at regulating immigration was made during the first part of the 19th century.

The first legislative enactment which may be considered as relating to the quality of immigrants was passed in 1863. It prohibited Americans from carrying on the trade in Chinese coolies. Later laws, still qualitative in nature, established rules for the exclusion of immoral persons, paupers, and criminals.

A tremendous influx of Chinese immigrants after the discovery of gold in California prompted the enactment of the first Chinese exclusion law in 1882. That trend of legislation continued, as witnessed by the enactment, in 1885, of a restrictive immigration measure aimed at prohibiting the importation of cheap labor from abroad.

A few years later, in 1891, the Congress excluded insane persons, persons likely to become public charges, felons, feebleminded persons, polygamists, persons convicted of crimes involving moral turpitude excepting, however, persons convicted of political offenses.

The ethnic pattern of our immigration began to change in the last two decades of the 19th century. Around the year 1890, there appeared for the first time an appreciable number of immigrants from eastern and southern Europe. They came from the Balkans, from Italy, and from Russia, where the czarist persecution of Jews began to drive them out in ever-increasing numbers.

These changes in the immigration pattern continued until after World War I: While in the decade of 1871 to 1880, almost 74 percent of the immigrants came from northern and western Europe, and only 7 percent hailed from southern and eastern Europe, in the decade of 1901 to 1910 only 22 percent of the immigrants came from northern and western Europe while immigrants originating in southern and eastern Europe contributed up to 71 percent of the new arrivals.

It was about that time that the Congress turned its attention from qualitative restrictions to quantitative restrictions. The first law establishing a ceiling on the number of immigrants—a quota—was enacted in 1921. The second quota law was passed in 1924 and remained in effect with very little change until the enactment of the present law in 1952. The 1924 act was the one that established the much discussed national origin system, a system based on the allocation to every national group of as many immigrants as that national group had contributed to the population of the United States as of 1920.

THE WALTER-M'CARRAN ACT

The 1952 law, commonly referred to as the Walter-McCarran Act, is a comprehensive codification of over 148 laws that were on our statute books when we first began a study of our immigration and naturalization problems in 1947.

We had before us then a hodge-podge of antiquated, and piecemeal immigration and

naturalization laws. They had been often amended, but never codified. They were shot through with loopholes, inequities, ambiguities, and outright inconsistencies. There were discriminatory statutes excluding Japanese, Indonesians, Koreans, and other Orientals. There were laws prohibiting the naturalization of large groups of people permitted to remain in this country forever in an alien status. There were unreasonably strict rules under which no member of a subversive organization, however thoroughly reformed, could remain in this country and become a United States citizen. We were admitting alien wives of our citizens outside of the quotas but we were denying such privileges to the husbands of American girls. The wives of lawfully residing aliens were treated differently from the husbands of females who were admitted lawfully. There was no provision under which brothers and sisters of United States citizens could be placed in a preferential position under the immigration quota. There were no provisions under which even the most highly skilled alien technician, engineer, doctor, or nurse, could come even when urgently needed in this country.

We corrected all of those inequities in the Walter-McCarran Act. All countries of the entire globe were granted—without discrimination—immigration quotas under a formula equally applicable to all areas regardless of the color of the skin or the shape of the eyes of its inhabitants.

At the same time, the Walter-McCarran Act made it infinitely easier to rid this country of foreign-born subversives, criminals, racketeers, narcotic peddlers, professional gamblers, and aliens who have surreptitiously entered this country.

These—briefly—are the main achievements of the law about which there has been so much heat and so little light generated.

DISPLACED PERSONS AND REFUGEES

I am stating my views on immigration frankly and openly because I do not have to defend my record in this matter. During the last decade, since 1945, to be exact, immigration has been one of the major subjects of my activities nationally and internationally.

The guns had hardly stopped smoking when I moved with the American army of liberation into the infamous concentration camps in Europe which nazism had left as monuments of everlasting shame. I was one of the first Americans to see the wretched survivors of Nazi bestiality. I saw Hitler's victims anticipating with hope an opportunity to start a new life in a free land and I saw them committing suicide when forced to return to the lands where Hitler's former ally, Stalin, was busy continuing his program of enslavement and mass murder.

I am rather proud to point to my work on the laws which, since 1945, have brought to the United States almost half a million displaced persons who are now well integrated into our life, and who have caused but a few instances of disappointment.

Let us not forget that this country alone took one-third of all the displaced persons left in Europe by Hitler's reign of terror and Stalin's postwar conquests. We took one-third; yet we have only 6 percent of the land area of the world. It was certainly a little more than what is referred to as "a fair share."

I believe that the record will bear me out when I say that the success of our own national resettlement effort undertaken under the displaced persons laws of 1948, and of 1950, is, in part, attributable to my own activities in Washington, in Germany, and in Geneva, Switzerland.

More than that—and at the risk of exposing myself to the accusation of immodesty—I want to mention briefly that the erection of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration is similarly the result of my personal efforts.

This organization which we set up at Brussels, Belgium, in December 1951, has so far moved to happier lands almost half a million people who had no opportunities of making a livelihood and bringing up their children in the war-ravaged overcrowded countries of Europe. It is good to see that the Committee which had 16 nations as its members at the start, has grown into an efficiently functioning organization with a membership of 26 independent nations. We keep the Committee outside of the United Nations in order to prevent any Soviet interference and we excluded from it any nation under Communist domination.

Australia, Canada, Argentina, and other South American countries have cooperated splendidly with the United States and with the immigrant-sending European countries in the furtherance of the Committee's aims. With the assistance of my colleagues who serve on congressional committees handling foreign affairs and appropriations, I intend to continue my work in behalf of that useful organization.

I now intend to insist, both in Washington and in Geneva, that the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration undertake a determined and sustained effort designed to explore and open up new vast areas of South America and central and southern Africa for the benefit of European migrants who should be resettled in larger numbers on farmlands and not in congested industrial areas.

To bring the unskilled surplus European manpower and families to unsettled lands where they could engage in agriculture, would serve a double purpose. In addition to providing the migrants with new opportunities, it will increase food production for the ever hungry and now increasingly hungrier world.

EXPLOSION OF HUMAN FERTILITY

Let me digress here for a moment and give you an idea of what is going on in the field of human fertility—a marvel that has a decisive import on our immigration problems.

According to statistical data placed at my disposal by experts from the Population Reference Bureau in Washington, D. C., the world is faced today with a true explosion of human fertility. Every morning there are 95,000 new mouths to feed. Every second 1 person dies, and 2 are born. The world's population is growing infinitely faster than the food supply produced by the globe's good earth.

Japan with a land area about equal to the State of Montana has 88 million inhabitants. In order to realize the overcrowding of Japan, one would have to imagine one-half of the population of the United States squeezed into Montana.

Communist China has 500 million people. That is one-fourth of the world's population. If the present birth rate continues in India, coupled with the decreasing death rate, that country will have 450 million people by 1970. The population of our neighbor to the south, Mexico, has increased by 30 percent in the last 20 years, and the population of Mexico is still growing so fast that at the current rate of growth Mexico's present population of 30 million will jump to 60 million in less than two decades.

And now a quick look at our own population picture. According to figures supplied by the Bureau of the Census, the population of the United States on April 1, 1956, was 167,440,000. This figure represents an increase of over 16 million, or 10.8 percent, since April 1, 1950, the date of the last national census. Since 1950 immigration has contributed 1,700,000 to our population increase. Over 4 million babies were born in the United States in 1955. In comparison, births in 1940 numbered 2,800,000 babies.

Statisticians and economists of the Population Reference Bureau maintain that the increase of our population is entirely out of proportion with the rate of accumulation of capital in our country. They say that we are not earning enough capital to expand our production facilities, our housing, our schools, and our highways, so as to accommodate the future generations of our own citizens.

One glance at the world's population picture and the picture reflecting the increase of our own population leads to one inescapable conclusion: Immigration into the United States has long ceased to be a solution to the problem of crowded humanity. The only solution is a bold concerted effort to increase food production on the still virgin continents of the southern hemisphere coupled with an enlightened attempt to limit the uncontrolled increase in the total number of inhabitants of the globe. To pile up more people on top of an expanding native mass of people seeking employment and a decent living in the countries with a population density similar to ours, is worse than folly. It is clearly an invitation to disaster.

THE PHONY REFUGEE LAW

Having told you how proud I am of the part I played in helping to resettle displaced persons and refugees, I want to refer to another legislative enactment with which I had much to do—mostly opposing it. What I have in mind is the much talked about, the deceptively labeled Refugee Relief Act of 1953. The refugee relief law under which no relief was granted to refugees.

I have on many occasions called that law—a "phony" and I still use the same word to describe it. It was a fraudulent gesture of brazen political hypocrisy. For all its purported humanitarian aims the law, rammed down the congressional throat by a new administration seeking popularity which it lacked, is a crudely concocted piece of old-fashioned pork-barreling on international and national level.

Under that law refugees were created as a matter of pure legislative fiction writing. Real refugees were overlooked. Large numbers of nonquota immigrant visas were arbitrarily allocated to certain countries. The allocations were made entirely out of proportion to any acceptable economic or demographic standards or equitable humanitarian considerations. I believe that the numerical visa allocations of the 1953 act are simply in direct proportion to the strength of the political minority lobbies on Capitol Hill and at the White House.

I opposed this inequitable 1953 law, but having been outvoted in the subcommittee over which I now preside and in the committee of which I am the ranking member, I have undertaken on the floor of the House a little salvage operation. I submitted a total of 11 amendments permitting United States citizens to bring to this country their close relatives because even they, the relatives, just as the genuine refugees, were overlooked by the sponsors and pushers of the phony Refugee Relief Act. All the sponsors and the pushers of the 1953 law were interested in was but one thing—getting in good standing with the strong big-city pressure groups.

However, the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 has served at least one good purpose. It provided a perfect demonstration of what happens when immigration visas are distributed—"passed around" would be a better way

of saying it—by politicians instead of mathematicians. It provided the strongest argument against any departure from the present equitable, mathematical formula of distribution of the annual immigration quota in accordance with the national origins of those immigrants who fashioned the fundamental legal and social concepts upon which this Republic has been built and upon which it stands.

As you know, it is this fair, nondiscriminatory method of distributing our annual immigration quota that is under the sharpest attack by the leaders of special interests.

I will resist that attack. We all must resist it just as we would resist a foreign invasion. Yes, invasion—and I shall attempt to convince you that the word I use is not just a figure of speech.

FIGURES TELL THE TRUTH

The participants of the immigration numbers lottery say all over this country—and, indeed, have unfortunately advertised that brazen lie all over the world—that under the present immigration laws, access to this country has been curtailed, if not well nigh closed.

Let us look at the figures rather than listen to the chant of the auctioneers. In the fiscal year of 1955, we have admitted 858,736 aliens, of which 237,790 have come as immigrants to dwell among us for the rest of their lives and to bring into the world native-born American citizens. The corresponding number for the previous fiscal year, 1954, is 774,790 aliens admitted, of which 208,177 were immigrants coming to this country for permanent residence. Going back to the preceding years, the figures indicate a lesser number of aliens admitted to the United States, but looking at the figures for the current fiscal year and even disregarding those that come under special legislation, it is obvious that as the years pass, our annual intake grows larger and larger. It is quite possible that during the fiscal year 1957, possibly even in 1956, we will pass the one million mark of aliens admitted to this country temporarily or permanently.

You also hear from the immigration hucksters that we have closed our doors to foreigners who come to this country temporarily to transact business, to visit or to work here, or to study. Let us again take a look at the figures. In the fiscal year 1955, we admitted 26,288 foreign government officials, 68,696 foreign businessmen, 27,192 foreign students, well over 18,000 actors, artists, lecturers, writers, press, radio and television reporters, 16,077 foreign trainees who came to our colleges, hospitals, laboratories and similar institutions. In addition to these, an imposing total of 332,394 persons came here to visit. Each of the figures which I have just cited represents a 10 to 20 percent increase over the preceding year which in turn represented a similar increase over the fiscal year 1953.

You have also heard much about the "inadequacy" of our total immigration quota. The truth is that due to the extremely liberal treatment we accord under the existing law to natives of the independent countries of the Western Hemisphere and to all wives, husbands, and children of American citizens—regardless of race, color and place of birth—our annual immigration quota has become but a basic premise from which we operate. Nonquota immigration represents almost double the number of immigrants which we admit under the quota.

In the fiscal year 1955, we admitted 82,232 immigrants under the quota and 155,558 immigrants outside the quota. Of the latter only 29,002 came under the Refugee Relief Act.

The numerically unrestricted nonquota immigration is rising constantly. Here are the figures. In 1951 we admitted 49,170 as nonquota immigrants; in 1952—71,273, in 1953—86,259, in 1954—114,079, and in 1955—155,558 nonquota immigrants.

It is safe to predict that in the current fiscal year, we will pass the 200,000 mark of nonquota admissions.

What little bearing the alleged inadequacy of our immigration quota has on the actual number of those who come to this country, is best illustrated by one example. You have heard much about the immigration quotas for the people of Asia. What you probably have not heard is the fact that during the last fiscal year, well over 2,000 Chinese and 2,489 Japanese came to the United States as nonquota immigrants, although the quota for Chinese persons is 105 and Japan's quota is 185. Thus, nonquota immigration from these two countries exceeds the annual quota 10 to 22 times.

THE MEXICAN INFLUX

The most remarkable increase in the number of immigrants coming outside the quota is immigration from Mexico. This is reflected in the amazing increases of 128, 347, and 525 percent, for 1953, 1954, and 1955, respectively, over the annual average of the years between 1946 and 1952. In other words, we are admitting now annually six times as many nonquota immigrants from Mexico as we were admitting in any earlier fiscal year prior to the enactment of the present immigration law.

The great increase in Mexican immigration in the last 2 years is caused to a large extent, undoubtedly, by the closing of our southern border to illegal entrants, which had assumed the alarming total of over 1 million in the fiscal year 1954 alone. In the first instance, thousands of Mexicans who had married American citizens and had American citizen children were living as respected members of their communities despite their original illegal entries. Many of these returned voluntarily to Mexico in the face of the Immigration and Naturalization Service drive for the purpose of obtaining immigration visas, passing inspection, and reentering this country in order to pursue the road toward American citizenship.

Others who had repeatedly entered the United States illegally in the past now faced the necessity of making a legal entry into this country, which includes the method of obtaining an immigration visa for permanent residence. The latter class is swelled by the present operation of the Mexican bracero program under which, except for a small percentage of individuals, the two Governments concerned have not established a mutual system whereby the recontracting and reemployment from year to year of a bracero can be assured. We know that a bracero wants to come to this country and earn American dollars. If both Governments can agree on a method to stabilize the Mexican labor force and if the bracero is assured that he will be able to come to this country for an unlimited number of times to work, I am certain that he will be content to stay in Mexico and remain a Mexican citizen.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service is now engaged in a unilateral operation seeking to achieve this desirable result. Under that system the bracero is inspected, reports concerning him are screened, and if he is found acceptable and satisfactory in all respects, including from the security standpoint, he receives a laminated identification card I–100. This is issued to him with the hope that he will again be selected by his Government the following year for agricultural work in the United States.

Recent reports have been received that in one locality a group of aliens on a farm endeavored to foment unrest among the braceros employed there. None of the suspected subversive aliens in this group was in possession of the laminated identification card. Similar instances have occurred in the past. It is obvious that the protection to the United States which the identification card provides against entries of such aliens, who have infiltrated the bracero program for ulterior or sinister purposes, is essential in the interest of national security.

The Department of State informed me just a few days ago that nonquota visas issued to Mexican nationals will increase this year by 693 percent above the 1946 to 1952 level. This means that we will admit seven times as many Mexican immigrants as we admitted in any single year before the present immigration law became effective.

In 1 single workday, our consuls in Mexico are issuing a peak of 324 visas. This simply means that if our consuls in Mexico work 8 hours a day—allowing a few minutes for a coffee break or a chat with the staff—they are issuing in Mexico 1 immigration visa every minute. However, they are also busy issuing visas to Mexican visitors, and in the last fiscal year they were doing that at the rate of 76,870 visas per year, plus approximately the same number of border-crossing cards, and plus 367,461 cards to Mexican agricultural workers coming to this country.

It would take too long and it would be too tedious to burden you with more figures, but as you may readily visualize, the increase in the number of entries from Mexico—lawful entries only, mind you—reflect a truly vertiginous rise. A graphic chart which the Department of State sent to my office the other day depicts immigration from Mexico in an almost vertically rising line.

What I have not seen as yet is a graphic chart which could reflect in a similarly rising line a like increase in our school facilities, available job opportunities, housing, and four-lane highways.

THE EISENHOWER PROPOSAL

Now, despite all the facts which I have just presented to you, we find President Eisenhower coming before the Congress and recommending, in a message dated February 8, 1956, that the volume of annual immigration intake be considerably increased, possibly trebled.

First, President Eisenhower proposed that we accept the census of 1950 as a new basis for the allocation of annual quotas. That proposal if enacted into law, would by itself mean that our present annual quota of 154,657 immigrants would be increased to 220,000 annually.

Second, in addition to recommending an increase in the total annual quota, President Eisenhower recommends that quota numbers not used by countries to which they are originally allocated, would be made available for use elsewhere. This proposal, if enacted into law, would mean that at all times, all of the annual quota will be actually used although right now, due to the fact that Great Britain, Ireland, Germany, Switzerland, Sweden, Belgium, and a few other countries do not provide a sufficient number of immigrants, there is seldom more than 60 percent of the total quota used in any single fiscal year.

Third, the President recommends that we wipe out the so-called mortgage imposed on about a dozen immigration quotas for the purpose of deducting from the annual arrivals a prorated number of displaced persons already admitted to this country. This would have a net effect of adding about 8,000 immigrants annually.

Fourth, the President does not recommend any change in the present very liberal provisions under which immigrants are admitted outside of the quota.

If we add these figures together, we see that the President's proposal will have the net effect of increasing our present annual immigration intake by well over 100 percent,

and this estimate does not take into consideration the possibility of a further increase in the nonquota immigration from Mexico. If we consider this, too, it is obvious that what President Eisenhower is really advocating is a trebling of our annual immigration. Mr. Brownell, the Attorney General, admitted it in his testimony before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

There is another consideration involved in President Eisenhower's proposals. If we heed his advice regarding the change of the census base and if we continue to follow the same course of action after the census of 1960 is taken and again after the census of 1970, I believe that it would be entirely safe to assume that by, say 1980, we will have much difficulty making ourselves understood in the English language in some parts of this country.

The distribution of immigrants in the United States represents a growing problem. According to a report prepared at the request of the great statesman who is now the Governor of the State of New York, 33 percent of all immigrants entering under the 1953 law remain in New York and according to other reports, as many as 75 percent of all aliens in this country reside in 9 States out of the 48. When the Immigration and Naturalization Service reviewed the postcards received in 1955, under the alien address reports program, they found that all but 20 percent of the resident aliens live in the following States in this order: New York, California, Texas, Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Ohio.

Do not overlook, please, that the most recent figures released by the Department of Labor place—with the exception of California and Texas—all the areas affected with the highest figures of unemployed in exactly those States.

SOME FOOD FOR THOUGHT

Is it wise to permit at the present time the entry of well over half a million immigrants annually? I do not believe that it would be advisable to embark upon such a venture without having first a good look at both the domestic and the international ramifications of such a decision.

The United States is today the richest country in the world. Our standards of living are undoubtedly the highest in the world with the possible exception of but one country—and that one, Switzerland, is a country practicing the most restrictive immigration policy in the entire world.

With the population growth on the rampage all over the world and with the ensuing lowering of standards of living in the overcrowded countries of Europe and Asia, in the absence of any sustained effort on the part of most countries to have their food production increased and also their industrial capacity, the favorable conditions prevailing in our country have upon the hungry and unemployed masses the effect of a magnet placed near a heap of steel shavings.

Obviously, millions and millions of people are attracted by American prosperity and the opportunities which it offers. It is unfair to blame anyone for wanting to come to our shores, but is it wise to create in this country a problem of unassimilable surplus population on top of the problems created by our fast rising birth rate? Is it wise to bring in more people before we arrange our economy so as to take care of the present 3 million average additional citizens born in this country every year? I have no doubt that the United States has ceased to be what international migration experts call an area of resettlement.

Of course, we can afford to extend our hospitality to a sizable number of victims of totalitarian persecution. We can well live up to our tradition of opening the doors of the land of the free to people who love freedom and want to remain free. Many of those have already joined forces with us in our struggle for survival which we are waging against the cunning attack of a godless conspiracy. Many more want to come to our shores in their quest for asylum. We shall welcome them, although we would expect other free nations to do likewise, and we would expect that they stop insisting that we take once again an unproportionate share of political refugees.

It is also true that we can afford to permit immigrant families to be united and to bring their closest relatives. The present immigration law has been written with that thought ever present in the minds of its authors.

But—we must resist with courage and determination the attempt to convert this country into a disorganized, multilingual, overcrowded dumping ground for the unwanted rejects of the rulers of those countries who selfishly refuse, or neglect, to cope with the problem of their own fast growing population. We must tell those governments that after having spent approximately $50 billion of our taxpayers' hard-earned money to rehabilitate their lands, we would expect them to provide employment and food, to provide improved farmland and modernized industry for their own people instead of conveniently, yes, brutally, seeking to simply "get rid" of them and "send them to America."

Overcrowded and impoverished, torn apart internally by conflicting ideological concepts of uprooted immigrants swarming across our sea and land borders in excessive numbers, the United States could not maintain its present position in the world. The United States will be unable to stay strong, to remain the bulwark of liberty, the standard bearer of the free world and humanity's last reservoir of spiritual and material strength able to repel the onslaught of the atomic age Huns. We must resist the invasion in our own interest as well as in the interest of those who need our assistance.

This Nation cannot afford to play the immigration numbers game. The stakes are too high.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, June 4, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rabbi Samuel J. Fox, Lynn, Mass., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord, our God and God of our fathers: In this great hall of decision, where the fate of the many lies in the hands of the chosen few, do we assemble to seek out Thy divine wisdom in the course of human deliberation. Great is our task in this thermonuclear age, when man has assembled such great powers of destruction. Heavy is our responsibility in an era of shifting values when man is questioning the validity of tradition. Through this haze of confufusion and misunderstanding have we been selected to steer the ship of legislation toward the port of decision.

Help us, O God, to turn our sails of destiny into the winds of Thy spirit so that we may navigate safely through storms of disagreement into the sunny waters of harmony. In a sea of chaos help us to chart the course of order. Amongst waves of fear help us to find the lane of security. Against gales of threat help us to hold a steady vessel of promise.

From the shores of faith help us to sail for the land of fulfillment. From the bridge of courage help us to sight the landmark of hope. Through the ocean of care help us to find the harbor of peace.

For Thou, O Lord, art the Captain of Providence. Under Thy colors do we sail, and Thy good will do we seek. Help us on this voyage of eternity for the sake of a better world, a satisfied humanity, and a peaceful civilization. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 4, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 4, 1956, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 460. An act to amend section 4482 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U. S. C. 475), relating to life preservers for river steamers;

S. 743. An act to authorize biennial inspection of the hulls and boilers of cargo vessels, and for other purposes;

S. 1378. An act to clarify and consolidate the authority to require the establishment, maintenance, and operation of aids to maritime navigation on fixed structures in or over navigable waters of the United States;

S. 1790. An act to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize more liberal propelling power allowances in computing the net tonnages of certain vessels;

S. 1791. An act to amend section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940 (54 Stat. 164), relating to the lights required to be carried by motorboats;

S. 1970. An act for the relief of Kim Boksoon and Anke Naber;

S. 2151. An act to provide for the segregation of certain funds of the Fort Berthold Indians on the basis of a membership roll prepared for such purpose;

S. 2562. An act to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended;

S. 3315. An act to amend section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; and

S. 3524. An act to give effect to the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries signed at Washington September 10, 1954, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting

sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, subject to a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ON DUTY WITH DEPARTMENT OF ARMY AND ARMY GENERAL STAFF

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of the number of officers on duty with the Department of the Army and the Army General Staff on March 31, 1956 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR STUDY OF JURISDICTION OVER FEDERAL AREAS WITHIN THE STATES

A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States, dated April 1956 (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, Department of State, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1954 and 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF COMPENSATION AND PENSION PROGRAM, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Review of Compensation and Pension Program, Washington Offices, Veterans' Administration, Dated July 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED MANAGERIAL CONTRACT, MOUNT MCKINLEY NATIONAL PARK, ALASKA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a proposed managerial contract with National Park Concessions, Inc., for temporary operation of the McKinley Park Hotel, Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska, covering the period May 14, 1956, to September 30, 1956 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Andrew Foh Chung Jean from a report transmitted to the Senate on July 18, 1955, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of his immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Purita M. Johnson from a report relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on January 17, 1955; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

UNIFORM PAY SYSTEM FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide a uniform premium pay system for Federal employees engaged in inspectional services, to authorize a uniform system of fees and charges for such services, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a petition signed by a large group of citizens of the State of New York in favor of the so-called Langer liquor bill, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the States under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages. At a time when 1 out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic there should be no encouragement to increasing the use of such beverages. Children and youth are being misled to consider them harmless, especially by the powerful audio and visual suggestions of radio and television.

THE LATE SENATOR ALBEN W. BARKLEY—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, the Democratic Party and the Democratic League of the State of Delaware recently adopted, in assembly, memorial resolutions expressing profound sorrow over the death of one of our most beloved colleagues, the late Alben W. Barkley.

I ask unanimous consent to have these resolutions printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF RESPECT ON THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE ALBEN W. BARKLEY

Whereas the Lord God Almighty in His infinite wisdom and mercy has seen fit to call to Himself from this mortal world our beloved associate and leader, Alben W. Barkley, a great and devoted and dedicated Christian servant; and

Whereas he was our warm friend, our inspired leader, and a faithful public servant of the people of the United States; and

Whereas our hearts are full of sadness and grief for the great loss which we the people of Delaware share with his widow, his family and the people of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Democratic Party of Delaware in convention in Dover, Del., this day, do sincerely and reverently express our deep sympathy to the widow of our former Vice President of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be delivered to our United States Senator, J. ALLEN FREAR, JR., and our United States Congressman, HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR., requesting them to spread it upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in token of the esteem and affection of the people of Delaware for our former Vice President and friend.

Sincerely and sympathetically,
GARRETT E. LYONS,
State Chairman.
MARY B. CAHALAN,
Secretary.

Drawn at directed in convention at Dover, Del., May 25, 1956.

MEMORIAL

At the regular meeting of the Democratic League of Delaware, held Monday, April 30, 1956, the following resolutions were unanimounsly adopted:

"*Resolved,* That as members of the Democratic League of Delaware, we recorded this expression of our sorrow at the death on Monday, April 30, 1956, of our fellow member, Alben W. Barkley.

"His long and unselfish service both to the Government of the United States and to the Democratic Party made him known, respected, and loved by all who hold dear the finest traditions of our American way of life. His vigorous and tireless efforts to further these traditions will ever live as one of the outstanding glories of the democratic ideal. Though we have lost his sparkling companionship and though his eloquent voice is now forever stilled, yet shall his memory live in our hearts as the symbol of the best of American initiative, political courage, and moral force.

"*Resolved,* That we extend to his family our most heartfelt sympathy in their bereavement, and that a copy of this memorial resolution be sent to them."

For the Democratic League of Delaware:
JOHN J. CLARKE,
President.
JOHN A. HULL,
W. R. STEWART, Sr.,
HARRIS O. BUNEL,
FRANK T. DICKERSON,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2827. A bill for the relief of Hazel Elizabeth Scott (Rept. No. 2103);

S. 2864. A bill for the relief of Waltraud Grete Schramm (Rept. No. 2104);

S. 2959. A bill for the relief of Edith Johanna Augusta Kienest (Rept. No. 2105);

S. 3000. A bill for the relief of Francesco Zammuto (Rept. No. 2106);

S. 3009. A bill for the relief of Kiyoshi Kinoshita (Rept. No. 2107);

S. 3100. A bill for the relief of Marianne Eder Dunbar (Rept. No. 2108);

S. 3208. A bill for the relief of Moses Rosenberg (Rept. No. 2109);

S. 3402. A bill for the relief of Roberto C. Bargas and Rosenda C. Bargas (Rept. No. 2110);

S. 3579. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth M. A. de Cuevas Faure (Rept. No. 2111);

H. J. Res. 565. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens (Rept. No. 2123);

H. J. Res. 581. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens (Rept. No. 2124); and

H. J. Res. 590. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immmigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens (Rept. No. 2125).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 374. A bill to provide for extension, and suspension in certain cases, of statutes of limitation on false swearing by Government employees with respect to subversive activities and connections (Rept. No. 2112);

S. 2069. A bill for the relief of Hsu Jen-Yuan, also known as Joseph Jen-Yuan Hsu (Rept. No. 2113);

S. 2793. A bill for the relief of Waclaw Tadeusz Nowosielski (Rept. No. 2114);

S. 2805. A bill for the relief of Harriet E. Van Tassel (Rept. No. 2115);

S. 2943. A bill for the relief of Moses Rakocinski (Rakoczynski) (Rept. No. 2116);

S. 3617. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities (Rept. No. 2117);

H. J. Res. 535. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens (Rept. No. 2126);

H. J. Res. 555. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens (Rept. No. 2127);

H. J. Res. 566. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens (Rept. No. 2128); and

H. J. Res. 580. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens (Rept. No. 2129).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 782. A bill to prevent citizens of the United States of questionable loyalty to the United States Government from accepting any office or employment in or under the United Nations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2118);

S. 2294. A bill for the relief of Maria Veronica de Pataky, Coloman de Pataky, Oscar Beregi, Oscar Beregi, Jr., and Margreth Leiss von Laimburg (Rept. No. 2119);

S. 2954. A bill for the relief of Christina Arutunian (Rept. No. 2120);

S. 3212. A bill for the relief of Kappaka Sita Rao and her minor child, Kappaka Vijalakshmi Rao (Rept. No. 2121);

S. 3235. A bill for the relief of Cleopatra Vasiliades (Rept. No. 2122);

H. R. 7763. A bill to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to expedite the final determination of the claims, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2132);

H. J. Res. 472. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens (Rept. No. 2130); and

H. J. Res. 533. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens (Rept. No. 2131).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H. R. 7225. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes; with minority and individual views (Rept. No. 2133).

Mr. BYRD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that permission be given for the presentation of minority and individual views on H. R. 7225, the Social Security bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment:

S. Res. 263. Resolution extending greetings to the Bundestag of the West German Republic for the unveiling of a bust in honor of Carl Schurz (Rept. No. 2134).

By Mr. FREAR, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

H. J. Res. 607. Joint resolution to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2135).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 3698. A bill to amend the act of June 4, 1920, as amended, providing for allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2137).

By Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 3778. A bill to amend the act for the protection of walruses (Rept. No. 2136).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 3527. A bill authorizing the State Highway Commission of the State of Maine to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada (Rept. No. 2141);

H. J. Res. 501. Joint resolution to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (Rept. No. 2140); and

H. Con. Res. 232. Concurrent resolution extending greetings to the American National Red Cross on the occasion of its 75th anniversary (Rept. No. 2139).

By Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments:

S. 3581. A bill to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service (Rept. No. 2142).

AUTHORIZATION FOR AN APPROPRIATION TO PROVIDE FOR CERTAIN COSTS OF PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL BUREAU FOR PUBLICATION OF CUSTOMS TARIFFS

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably an original joint resolution (S. J. Res. 178) to authorize an appropriation to provide for certain costs of United States participation in the International Bureau for the Publication of Customs Tariffs, and submitted a report (No. 2138) thereon, which was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of April 1956. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, APRIL 1956 AND MARCH 1956, AND PAY, MARCH AND FEBRUARY 1956

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for April 1956 submitted to the Joint Committe on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In April numbered—	In March numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In March was—	In February was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,359,611	2,352,657	+6,954	$886,726	$838,266	+$48,460
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,191,193	1,188,075	+3,118	448,681	424,101	+24,580
Department of Defense	1,168,418	1,164,582	+3,836	438,045	414,165	+23,880
Inside continental United States	2,154,446	2,148,220	+6,226			
Outside continental United States	205,165	204,437	+728			
Industrial employment	693,055	693,916	−861			
Foreign nationals	297,790	297,197	+593	27,017	26,311	+706

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside continental United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside continental United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type-employee activities by executive agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by overseas agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1956, and comparison with March 1956, and pay for March 1956, and comparison with February 1956*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	April	March	Increase	Decrease	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	80,554	78,838	1,716		$26,836	$24,732	$2,104	
Commerce [1]	44,253	43,702	551		19,244	18,280	964	
Health, Education, and Welfare	45,339	45,181	158		17,749	16,891	858	
Interior	49,255	48,154	1,101		19,825	18,627	1,198	
Justice	30,363	30,534		171	14,828	14,123	705	
Labor	5,609	5,537	72		2,537	2,427	110	
Post Office	511,933	511,915	18		187,240	176,329	10,911	
State [2]	29,703	[3] 29,688	15		11,244	10,873	371	
Treasury	82,325	82,114	211		34,399	32,439	1,960	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	374	369	5		208	194	14	
Bureau of the Budget	417	414	3		275	268	7	
Council of Economic Advisers	30	30			20	22		$2
Executive Mansion and Grounds	70	69	1		25	22	3	
National Security Council [4]	27	27			18	17	1	
Office of Defense Mobilization	278	278			169	165	4	
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	6	6			4	4		
President's Commission on Veteans' Pensions	26	34		8	24	24		
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Committee on Weather Control	14	25		11	8	7	1	
Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission	11	10	1		5	4	1	
American Battle Monuments Commission	733	718	15		96	89	7	
Atomic Energy Commission	6,436	6,407	29		3,325	3,208	117	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	565	562	3		278	264	14	
Boston National Historic Sites Commission	2	2			1		1	
Civil Aeronautics Board	591	588	3		326	307	19	
Civil Service Commission	4,080	4,019	61		1,941	1,786	155	
Commission of Fine Arts	9	9			1	1		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	172	171	1		103	97	6	
Farm Credit Administration	1,043	1,043			518	506	12	
Federal Civil Defense Administration	1,026	1,024	2		559	524	35	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	8	8			4	4		
Federal Communications Commission	1,127	1,126	1		593	564	29	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,133	1,137		4	548	530	18	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	678	669	9		316	294	22	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	341	345		4	242	227	15	
Federal Power Commission	681	677	4		370	346	24	
Federal Trade Commission	616	617		1	349	344	5	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	124	134		10	66	68		2
General Accounting Office	5,530	5,546		16	2,554	2,447	107	
General Services Administration	26,322	26,252	70		9,376	8,856	520	
Government Contract Committee	22	18	4		7	6	1	
Government Printing Office	6,640	6,666		26	2,970	2,775	195	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,003	10,012		9	4,622	4,587	35	
Indian Claims Commission	13	13			10	7	3	
Interstate Commerce Commission	1,918	1,923		5	979	936	43	
Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission	3	3			2	2		*
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,679	7,697		18	3,611	3,425	186	
National Capital Housing Authority	255	256		1	98	95	3	
National Capital Planning Commission	31	30	1		16	15	1	
National Gallery of Art	334	333	1		112	99	13	
National Labor Relations Board	1,106	1,107		1	630	613	17	
National Mediation Board	109	105	4		69	74		5
National Science Foundation	243	236	7		124	109	15	
National Security Training Commission	4	4	M		3	3		
Panama Canal	15,110	15,595		485	3,661	3,599	62	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,210	2,240		30	866	853	13	
Renegotiation Board	471	469	2		293	283	10	
Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission	5	6		1	3	3		
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	26	27		1	27	19	8	
Securities and Exchange Commission	718	712	6		403	383	20	
Selective Service System	6,833	6,836		3	1,696	1,611	85	
Small Business Administration	792	791	1		458	244	34	
Smithsonian Institution	705	697	8		264	253	11	
Soldiers' Home	1,009	1,005	4		232	220	12	
Subversive Activities Control Board	32	30	2		20	20		
Tariff Commission	206	206			118	113	5	
Tax Court of the United States	143	143			94	91	3	
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,052	14,387		335	6,504	6,375	129	
Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission	3	3			2	2		
U. S. Information Agency	10,772	10,714	58		2,962	2,820	142	
Veterans' Administration	177,940	177,830	110		61,600	58,375	3,225	
Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission	2	2			1	1		
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,191,193	1,188,075	4,258	1,140	448,681	424,101	24,589	9
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			3,118				24,580	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,927	1,925	2		1,123	1,074	49	
Department of the Army	431,783	431,635	148		155,991	149,188	6,803	
Department of the Navy	395,610	396,441		831	159,498	149,851	9,647	
Department of the Air Force	339,098	334,581	4,517		121,433	114,052	7,381	
Total, Department of Defense	1,168,418	1,164,582	4,667	831	438,045	414,165	23,880	
Net increase, Department of Defense			3,836				$23,880	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,359,611	2,352,657	8,925	1,971	886,726	838,266	48,469	
Net increase, including Department of Defense			6,954				$48,460	

[1] April figure includes 494 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

[2] April figure includes 7,780 employees of the International Cooperation Administration, as compared with 7,973 in March, and their pay.

[3] Revised on basis of later information.

[4] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1956, and comparison with March 1956*

Department or Agency	April	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	79,289	77,624	1,665	
Commerce [1]	41,197	40,732	465	
Health, Education, and Welfare	43,532	43,380	152	
Interior	44,228	43,319	909	
Justice	29,832	30,008		176
Labor	5,483	5,405	78	
Post Office	509,428	509,412	16	
State [2]	7,844	7,779	65	
Treasury	81,333	81,116	217	
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	374	369	5	
Bureau of the Budget	417	414	3	
Council of Economic Advisers	30	30		
Executive Mansion and Grounds	70	69	1	
National Security Council [3]	27	27		
Office of Defense Mobilization	278	278		
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	6	6		
President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions	26	34		8
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Committee on Weather Control	14	25		11
Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission	11	10	1	
American Battle Monuments Commission	15	15		
Atomic Energy Commission	6,421	6,393	28	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	565	562	3	
Boston National Historics Sites Commission	2	2		
Civil Aeronautics Board	587	584	3	
Civil Service Commission	4,063	4,000	63	
Commission of Fine Arts	9	9		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	172	171	1	
Farm Credit Administration	1,031	1,031		
Federal Civil Defense Administration	1,026	1,024	2	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	8	8		
Federal Communications Commission	1,100	1,099	1	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,132	1,136		4
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	678	669	9	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	341	345		4
Federal Power Commission	681	677	4	
Federal Trade Commission	616	617		1
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	124	134		10
General Accounting Office	5,478	5,495		17
General Services Administration	26,216	26,145	71	
Government Contract Committee	22	18	4	
Government Printing Office	6,640	6,666		26
Housing and Home Finance Agency	9,854	9,859		5
Indian Claims Commission	13	13		
Interstate Commerce Commission	1,918	1,923		5
Independent agencies—Continued				
Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission	3	3		
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,679	7,697		18
National Capitol Housing Authority	255	256		1
National Capital Planning Commission	31	30	1	
National Gallery Art	334	333	1	
National Labor Relations Board	1,085	1,086		1
National Mediation Board	109	105	4	
National Science Foundation	243	236	7	
National Security Training Commission	4	4		
Panama Canal	541	549		
Railroad Retirement Board	2,210	2,240		30
Renegotiation Board	471	469	2	8
Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission	5	6		1
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	26	27		1
Securities and Exchange Commission	718	712	6	
Selective Service System	6,641	6,639	2	
Small Business Administration	792	791	1	
Smithsonian Institution	703	695	8	
Soldiers' Home	1,009	1,005	4	
Subversive Activities Control Board	32	30	2	
Tariff Commission	206	206		
Tax Court of the United States	143	143		
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,052	14,387		335
Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission	3	3		
U. S. Information Agency	2,402	2,396	6	
Veterans' Administration	176,692	176,573	119	
Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission	2	2		
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,128,522	1,125,255	3,929	662
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			3,267	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,865	1,864	1	
Department of the Army	363,681	363,796		115
Department of the Navy	363,741	364,653		912
Department of the Air Force	296,637	292,652	3,985	
Total, Department of Defense	1,025,924	1,022,965	3,986	1,027
Net increase, Department of Defense			2,959	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,154,446	2,148,220	7,915	1,689
Net increase, including Department of Defense			6,226	

[1] April figure includes 494 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.
[2] April figure includes 1,612 employees of the International Cooperation Administration, as compared with 1,605 in March.
[3] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1956, and comparison with March 1956*

Department or Agency	April	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,265	1,214	51	
Commerce	3,056	2,970	86	
Health, Education, and Welfare	1,807	1,801	6	
Interior	5,027	4,835	192	
Justice	531	526	5	
Labor	126	132		6
Post Office	2,505	2,503	2	
State [1]	21,859	[2] 21,909		50
Treasury	992	998		6
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	718	703	15	
Atomic Energy Commission	15	14	1	
Civil Aeronautics Board	4	4		
Civil Service Commission	17	19		2
Farm Credit Administration	12	12		
Federal Communications Commission	27	27		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1	1		
General Accounting Office	52	51	1	
General Services Administration	106	107		1
Housing and Home Finance Agency	149	153		4
National Labor Relations Board	21	21		
Panama Canal	14,569	15,046		477
Selective Service System	192	197		5
Smithsonian Institution	2	2		
U. S. Information Agency	8,370	8,318	52	
Veterans' Administration	1,248	1,257		9
Total, excluding Department of Defense	62,671	62,820	411	560
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			149	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	62	61	1	
Department of the Army	68,102	67,839	263	
Department of the Navy	31,869	31,788	81	
Department of the Air Force	42,461	41,929	532	
Total, Department of Defense	142,494	141,617	877	
Net increase, Department of Defense			877	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	205,165	204,437	1,288	560
Net increase, including Department of Defense			728	

[1] April figure includes 6,177 employees of the International Cooperation Administration, as compared with 6,368 in March.
[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1956, and comparison with March 1956*

Department or Agency	April	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	2,617	2,764		147
Commerce	2,527	2,451	76	
Interior	8,393	8,271	122	
Treasury	5,590	5,642		52
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	145	145		
Federal Communications Commission	13	13		
General Services Administration	1,011	975	36	
Government Printing Office	6,640	6,666		26
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,679	7,697		18
Panama Canal	7,415	7,873		458
Tennessee Valley Authority	11,303	11,622		319
Total, excluding Department of Defense	53,333	54,119	234	1,020
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			786	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside continental United States	[1] 201,150	[2] 201,221		71
Outside continental United States	[1] 35,900	[2] 35,786	114	
Department of the Navy:				
Inside continental United States	225,553	226,320		767
Outside continental United States	6,222	6,338		116
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside continental United States	164,870	164,400	470	
Outside continental United States	6,027	5,732	295	
Total, Department of Defense	639,722	639,797	879	954
Net decrease, Department of Defense			75	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	693,055	693,916	1,113	1,974
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			861	

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under United States agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of April 1956 and comparison with March 1956*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	April	March	April	March	April	March	April	March
Denmark	9	9					9	9
England	7,078	6,967			32	31	7,046	6,936
France	23,994	24,172	16,498	16,824			7,496	7,348
French Morocco	6,065	6,160	201	208	1,013	1,009	4,851	4,943
Germany	109,941	108,794	86,309	[1] 85,112	1,986	1,966	21,646	21,716
Japan	142,952	142,917	81,530	81,530	18,513	18,493	42,909	42,894
Korea	6,523	6,942	6,523	6,942				
Libya	198	209					198	209
Netherlands	47	44					47	44
Norway	17	17					17	17
Saudi Arabia	445	445					445	445
Trinidad	521	521			521	521		
Total	297,790	297,197	191,061	190,616	22,065	22,020	84,664	84,561

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

NOTE.—The Germans are paid from funds provided by German Governments. The French and English reported by the Army and Air Force are paid from funds appropriated for personnel services. All others are paid from funds appropriated for other contractual services.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of April totaling 2,359,611. This was a net increase of 6,954 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of March. This was the fourth monthly increase since August 1955.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1956, which began July 1, 1955, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July	2,384,595	307	
August	2,385,043	448	
September	2,366,069		18,974
October	2,365,183		886
November	2,362,158		3,025
December	2,343,227		18,931
January 1956	2,346,750	3,523	
February	2,351,371	4,621	
March	2,352,657	1,286	
April	2,359,611	6,954	

Total civilian employment in civilian agencies during the month of April was 1,191,193, an increase of 3,118, as compared with the March total of 1,188,075. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in April was 1,168,418, an increase of 3,836, as compared with 1,164,582 in March.

Civilian agencies reporting the major increases were: Department of Agriculture with an increase of 1,716, Department of the Interior with an increase of 1,101, and the Department of Commerce with an increase of 551. Decreases were reported by the Panama Canal with a decrease of 485 and the Tennessee Valley Authority with a decrease of 335.

In the Department of Defense the Department of the Navy reported a decrease in civilian employment of 831. The Department of the Air Force reported an increase in civilian employment of 4,517. This was the 12th consecutive monthly increase in civilian employment by the Air Force; the total cumulative increase for these 12 months was 32,761. The Department of the Army reported an increase in civilian employment of 148.

Inside continental United States civilian employment increased 6,226 and outside continental United States civilian employment increased 728. Industrial employment by the Federal agencies in April totaled 693,055, a decrease of 861.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies, as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,359,611 civilian employees certified to the committee by the Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in United States Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 297,790 foreign nationals working for United States military agencies during April who were not counted in the usual personnel report. The number in March was 297,197. A breakdown of this employment for April follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Denmark	9			9
England	7,078		32	7,046
France	23,994	16,498		7,496
French Morocco	6,065	201	1,013	4,851
Germany	109,941	86,309	1,986	21,646
Japan	142,952	81,530	18,513	42,909
Korea	6,523	6,523		
Libya	198			198
Netherlands	47			47
Norway	17			17
Saudi Arabia	445			445
Trinidad	521		521	
Total	297,790	191,061	22,065	84,664

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Frederick A. Seaton, of Nebraska, to be Secretary of the Interior.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unani-

mous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 3994. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the excise tax on television receivers capable of receiving 50 or more ultra-high-frequency television channels; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 3995. A bill to authorize United States attorneys to institute denaturalization proceedings by filing a verified complaint; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 3996. A bill for the relief of Tadeusz Gasowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNAMARA (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 3997. A bill to extend and amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951; to the committee on Finance.

By Mr. FLANDERS (for himself and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 3998. A bill to provide for the development of the Federal Fish hatchery, known as the Holden trout hatchery, at Pittsford, Vt.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 3999. A bill for the relief of Esterlee Hutzler Weinhoeppel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

S. 4000. A bill to extend the readjustment and rehabilitation benefits provided for persons who served on active service in the Armed Forces during the Korean conflict period to certain Air Force ROTC graduates who commenced an extended tour of training duty as Air National Guard officers prior to the end of such period; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and Mr. JENNER):

S. 4001. A bill to terminate military and economic assistance to Yugoslavia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCARTHY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. J. Res. 178. Joint resolution to authorize an appropriation to provide for certain costs of United States participation in the International Bureau for the Publication of Customs Tariffs; placed on the calendar.

(See reference to above joint resolution when reported by Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, which appears under a separate heading.)

FILING OF VERIFIED COMPLAINT BY UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS TO INSTITUTE DENATURALIZATION PROCEEDINGS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize United States attorneys to institute denaturalization proceedings by filing a verified complaint.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3995) to authorize United States attorneys to institute denaturalization proceedings by filing a verified complaint, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the bill deals with a very important problem which grows out of a decision of the United States Supreme Court handed down on April 30, 1956. The import of that decision is to make it very difficult, if not impossible, for the United States Government to proceed with denaturalization proceedings against individuals who fraudulently receive citizenship papers in this country.

I should like to quote briefly from the dissenting opinion by Justices Clark, Reed, and Minton. I commend these Justices for their clear-cut opinions. This was a split decision. Mr. Justice Clark, speaking for himself, Justice Reed, and Justice Minton said:

The Court's ruling today seriously obstructs the Government in filing denaturalization proceedings in this type of case. It reverses a long line of cases in the lower Federal courts and disregards a consistent administrative practice of over 30 years' standing, a period which includes two recodifications of the immigration laws. Furthermore, the identical point on which the case today is decided was present in two earlier cases where it apparently was not considered important enough to be presented to this Court.

This ruling of the United States Supreme Court is especially dangerous from the standpoint of Communists in this country, because it is well known that it is very difficult to obtain the affidavits upon which the Court insists, from the standpoint of identifying individuals as members of the Communist Party.

Quoting further from the dissenting opinion:

If these evidential methods of proof—the testimony and identity of undercover agents—must be disclosed in an affidavit—

That appears to be what the majority of the Court is insisting upon—

the Government must choose between foregoing denaturalization cases and drying up its source of information before the proceeding can be brought.

It is common knowledge among law-enforcement officers that witnesses are affidavit-shy, particularly in cases involving subversion. Often, testimony can be obtained only in court with the aid of compulsory process. The difficulties in requiring exposure by affidavit are overwhelming and decisive in cases of this type.

At a time when we are spending billions of dollars on security against communism abroad, and spending a tremendous amount of money and manpower on security against communism at home, I recommend that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary act promptly on this piece of proposed legislation, which would correct the situation growing out of this unfortunate decision by the Supreme Court on April 30, 1956.

Eternal vigilance is not only the price of liberty—but it must begin at home. When the Supreme Court rules so as to make vigilance difficult, Congress must act with increased dispatch.

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire decision of the Court, both majority and minority opinions, printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the decision was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—No. 213—OCTOBER TERM, 1955

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PETITIONER, v. ETTORE ZUCCA, ALSO KNOWN AS MARIO SARNI, ALSO KNOWN AS ETTORE SARNI ZUCCA

(On writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit)

(April 30, 1956)

(Mr. Chief Justice Warren delivered the opinion of the Court:)

This is a denaturalization proceeding under section 340 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.[1] The sole question is whether section 340 (a) makes the filing of the "affidavit showing good cause" a prerequisite to maintenance of the suit. The district court held that it does and ordered the complaint dismissed unless the Government filed an affidavit showing good cause within 60 days. As this was not done, the complaint was dismissed without prejudice to the Government's right to institute an action to denaturalize the respondent upon filing the affidavit (125 F. Supp. 551). On appeal by the Government the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit affirmed, adopting the opinion of the district court (221 F. 2d 805). We granted certiorari (350 U. S. 817), because of an asserted conflict with decisions of the Seventh[2] and Ninth[3] Circuits and because of the importance of the question in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws.

Respondent Ettore Zucca was naturalized on January 4, 1944. In 1954, the United States attorney for the southern district of New York, proceeding under section 340 (a), filed a verified complaint in the United States district court in his district seeking revocation of respondent's naturalization on the grounds of illegality, concealment of material facts, and willful misrepresentation.

The complaint alleged that respondent, at his naturalization hearing and in his petition for naturalization, had falsely sworn "that he did not belong to and was not associated with any organization which teaches or advocates the overthrow of existing government in this country," that it was his "intention in good faith to become a citizen of the United States and to renounce absolutely and forever all allegiance and fidelity to any [foreign powers]," and that he was and had been "attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States." This was followed by a general allegation of membership in the Communist Party and "other organizations affiliated with or controlled by the Communist Party of the United States from 1925 to 1947," and equally general allegations that respondent procured his naturalization by concealment and willful misrepresentation in that he concealed the facts relating to his membership in the Communist Party and affiliated organizations and otherwise swore falsely as to his intentions and beliefs. The pleader concluded that "good cause exists for the institution of this suit." The complaint, no part of which was alleged on information and belief, was verified by an assistant United States attorney. When respondent sought to take depositions of this attorney, he was met with an affidavit in

---

[1] 66 Stat. 163, 260, as amended, 68 Stat. 1232, 8 U. S. C. (Supp. II), sec. 1451 (a).

[2] *United States* v. *Tuteur* (215 F. 2d 415).

[3] *Schwinn* v. *United States* (112 F. 2d 74, affirmed per curiam, 311 U. S. 616).

opposition denying personal knowledge.[4] Respondent then filed his motion to dismiss on the ground, inter alia, that section 340 (a) required the filing of an affidavit showing good cause and that this requirement had not been complied with. As stated above, the motion to dismiss was granted on this ground.

The Government argues that a reading of the statute and its legislative history leads to the conclusion that the filing of an "affidavit showing good cause" is not a prerequisite to maintaining denaturalization proceedings under section 340 (a). We do not agree.

The affidavit provision with which we are here concerned first appeared in section 15 of the act of June 29, 1906.[5] Without substantial change, it was carried forward in the laws of 1940[6] and 1952,[7] currently reading as follows:

"SEC. 340. (a) It shall be the duty of the United States district attorneys for the respective districts, upon affidavit showing good cause therefor, to institute proceedings in any court specified in subsection (a) of section 310 of this title in the judicial district in which the naturalized citizen may reside at the time of bringing suit, for the purpose of revoking and setting aside the order admitting such person to citizenship and canceling the certificate of naturalization on the ground that such order and certificate of naturalization were procured by concealment of a material fact or by willful misrepresentation."

Were we obliged to rely solely on the wording of the statute, we would have no difficulty in reaching the conclusion that the filing of the affidavit is a prerequisite to maintaining a denaturalization suit. This conclusion is not altered by a consideration of the Government's highly speculative suggestions as to the meaning of the legislative history. On the contrary, we think that it is entirely consistent with the Court's statement in *Bindczyck* v. *Finucane* (342 U. S. 76), that Congress acted "[w]ith a view to protecting the Government against fraud while safeguarding citizenship from abrogation except by a clearly defined procedure."

The natural meaning of the language used in section 340 (a) is that filing of the affidavit is a procedural prerequisite to maintenance of the suit. In the Bindczyck case, this Court held that section 338 (a) of the Naturalization Act of 1940, predecessor of section 340 (a), sets forth the exclusive procedure for denaturalization.[8] Despite that decision, the Government would have us hold now that the grant of power to maintain denaturalization suits is found in the general duty of United States attorneys to prosecute all civil actions in which the United States is concerned,[9] and that section 340 (a) merely imposes the "additional duty * * * to act, not alone on their own knowledge and judgment, but on the basis of an affidavit of good cause furnished by private citizens." In effect the Government argues that the affidavit is required only when the proceeding is to be brought on the complaint of a private citizen. We need not decide whether a private citizen may ever file such a complaint. The short answer in this case is that the Government laid its complaint expressly under section 340 (a).

While arguing that the words of section 340 are words of limitation on the discretion of the United States attorney, the Government apparently concedes that the venue and notice provisions of the section are generally applicable to denaturalization proceedings. Its argument overlooks the fact that the affidavit and venue provisions are in the same sentence. If the affidavit were required only when the United States attorney proceeded on the complaint of a private citizen, then only in such a case would the venue be restricted to the district of the defendant's residence. We could accept such a limiting construction of the statute only upon a very clear showing that Congress meant something other than what it said.

The original act of 1906 was the culmination of many years of study by Congress and a commission of which the Attorney General was a leading spirit and his assistant the chairman. Shortly after its enactment, the same Attorney General rendered an opinion to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to the effect that the filing of an affidavit was "necessary to give a United States attorney authority to institute proceedings in any court for the cancellation of a naturalization certificate."[10] In such circumstances, a contemporaneous construction of a statute by the officer charged with its enforcement is entitled to great weight. *Fawcus Machine Co.* v. *United States* (282 U. S. 375, 378); *Norwegian Nitrogen Products Co.* v. *United States* (228 U. S. 294, 315). Over a period of years, however, there has been some conflict among the circuits concerning the affidavit requirement.[11] The Government relies particularly on our affirmance of the decision of the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in *Schwinn* v. *United States* (311 U. S. 616). The Court decided that case on the sole ground of illegal procurement. Although the necessity of the affidavit was considered below in view of the Government's failure to offer proof in support of its allegation that an affidavit of good cause had been furnished, the question was not presented to this court.[12]

Prior to the decision in the Schwinn case the practice of the Justice Department seems generally to have been to institute denaturalization proceedings upon affidavit showing good cause. The Government does not now contend that it has abandoned that practice. It merely claims the right not to do so when it chooses, as clearly appears from portions of a Department of Justice memorandum which has been brought to the Court's attention.[13] We are unimpressed by the reasoning of that memorandum. We think that the public interest is not served by taking such liberties with a specific statutory requirement designed for the protection of naturalized citizens. And we fail to see that the requirement imposes a burden on the Government. At this term, it has been represented to us that the usual practice is that, "if sufficient grounds are shown, an 'affidavit showing good cause' (see sec. 340 (a) of the act) is prepared and executed, and

---

[4] The affidavit read as follows:

"George C. Mantzoros, being duly sworn, deposes and says as follows:

"That he is one of the Assistant United States Attorneys on the staff of J. Edward Lumbard, United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York in charge of the above-entitled case.

"That the only knowledge or information which he has in this case has been obtained through files turned over to him for use in preparation of the complaint.

"That he has no personal knowledge of any of the facts herein and is not a prospective witness.

"That on information and belief his superior, the said J. Edward Lumbard likewise has no personal knowledge of any of the facts herein and is not a prospective witness.

"That he has carefully reviewed the files in this case and finds nothing therein which would indicate any special or unusual circumstances requiring the production of the documents requested by the defendant in his notice to take depositions, dated July 8, 1954.

"That many of the documents in said files are privileged because of their confidential nature." (R. 8.)

[5] 34 Stat. 596, 601.

[6] Section 338 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940, 54 Stat. 1137, 1158.

[7] 66 Stat. 163, 260, as amended, 68 Stat. 1232, 8 U. S. C. (Supp. II) § 1451 (a).

[8] The specific holding, that sec. 338 (a) of the 1940 act overrode local rules concerning time limitations upon the power of State courts to reopen their judgments, was abrogated by sec. 340 (j) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 163, 262). The underlying philosophy of Bindczyck remains intact.

[9] 28 U. S. C., sec. 507 (a) (2).

[10] Letter of Attorney General Bonaparte, March 26, 1907 (unpublished, National Archives), cited in a contemporary treatise by a recognized authority on the statute. Van Dyne, Law of Naturalization (1907), 138. The letter is reproduced at p. 50 of the brief for the United States.

[11] The Courts of Appeal for the Third, Fifth, and District of Columbia Circuits had taken the position adopted by the second circuit in this case. *United States* v. *Richmond* (17 F. 2d 28); *United States* v. *Salomon* (231 F. 928); *Cohen* v. *United States* (38 App. D. C. 123). The seventh and ninth circuits favored the contrary position. *United States* v. *Tuteur* (215 F. 2d 415); *Schwinn* v. *United States* (112 F. 2d 74, affirmed per curiam, 311 U. S. 616); *United States* v. *Knight* (291 F. 129 (U. S. D. C. Mont.), affirmed 299 F. 571); *United States* v. *Leles* (227 F. 189).

[12] On two prior occasions this court has had occasion to notice the affidavit provision without suggesting that it was not an essential procedural step in the denaturalization proceeding. See *Johannessen* v. *United States* (225 U. S. 227, 242); *Schneiderman* v. *United States* (320 U. S. 118, 159, n. 54).

[13] "As indicated below in IV: Pretrial Procedure, the defendant can probably obtain most of the Government's evidence by a proper utilization of the methods of discovery provided in rules 16, 33, and 34. It, therefore, may be advisable at the outset to furnish him with a reasonable amount of the Government's evidence in order to reduce the chance of these discovery rules being employed, and thus avoid the ensuing delay. If this is done, it would seem that the affidavit rather than the complaint is the proper place in which to recite evidence.

"In the event it is decided in a given case to furnish the defendant with some of the Government's evidence, it is recommended that an affidavit be prepared and served with the complaint and that in the affidavit there be recited briefly the nature of the evidence to be relief upon. This recitation of evidence should be of a general nature but sufficient to reduce the ordinary chance of the discovery rules being employed and at the same time to reduce the likelihood of the Government having to oppose a motion for a bill of particulars. On the other hand, it should not be so complete as to provide the defendant with the names of witnesses and possibly can be so phrased as not to disclose their identity. Similarly, it may be disadvantageous to make it so complete as to identify specific instruments or writings, for this may increase the likelihood of a demand for their production under rule 34. It would seem sufficient to set out the general substances or type of statements or writings known to have been made without quoting them. It would also seem proper to aver generally membership and leadership in the German-American Bund or other un-American organizations, refusal of military service, general propaganda activities, etc.

"If it is believed undesirable to attach an affidavit to the complaint and to serve it upon the defendant, as discussed above, in that instance no reference should be made in the complaint to an affidavit having been prepared and as constituting the basis of the action." Circular No. 3663, Department of Justice, supplement No. 9, April 6, 1943 (mimeographed).

is forwarded as an aid to the formal judicial proceedings." [14]

Lastly the Government contends, as an alternate ground for reversal, that no harm is done to the defendant because the complaint itself is verified and, therefore, accomplishes the function of the affidavit. With this we cannot agree. The complaint, under modern practice, is required merely to allege ultimate facts while the affidavit must set forth evidentiary matters showing good cause for cancellation of citizenship.[15]

In the Bindczyck case, supra, the Court summed up the purpose and approach to denaturalization proceedings as follows:

"[W]e cannot escape the conclusion that in its detailed provisions for revoking a naturalization because of fraud or illegal procurement not appearing on the face of the record, Congress formulated a selfcontained, exclusive procedure. With a view to protecting the Government against fraud while safeguarding citizenship from abrogation except by a clearly defined procedure, Congress insisted on the detailed, explicit provisions of section 15.

"If citizenship was granted, it was to be proof against attacks for fraud or illegal procurement based on evidence outside the record, except through the proceedings prescribed in section 15. The congressional scheme, providing carefully for the representation of the Government's interest before the grant of citizenship and a detailed, safeguarded procedure for attacking the decree on evidence of fraud outside the record, covers the whole ground. Every national interest is thereby protected" (342 U. S., at 83, 84).

This proceeding was concededly brought under section 340 (a). We hold that this is the only section under which a United States attorney may institute denaturalization proceedings, and that the affidavit showing good cause is a procedural prerequisite to the maintenance of proceedings thereunder.

The mere filing of a proceeding for denaturalization results in serious consequences to a defendant. Even if his citizenship is not canceled, his reputation is tarnished and his standing in the community damaged. Congress recognized this danger and provided that a person, once admitted to American citizenship, should not be subject to legal proceedings to defend his citizenship without a preliminary showing of good cause. Such a safeguard must not be lightly regarded. We believe that, not only in some cases but in all cases, the District Attorney must, as a prerequisite to the initiation of such proceedings, file an affidavit showing good cause. The district court below correctly dismissed the proceedings in this case because of the failure of the Government to file the required affidavit and the judgment of the court of appeals is therefore

Affirmed.

(Mr. Justice Harlan took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

DISSENTING OPINION

(Mr. Justice Clark, with whom Mr. Justice Reed and Mr. Justice Minton join, dissenting:)

The Court's ruling today seriously obstructs the Government in filing denaturalization proceedings in this type of case. It reverses a long line of cases in the lower Federal courts [16] and disregards a consistent administrative practice of over 30 years' standing, a period which includes two recodifications of the immigration laws. Furthermore, the identical point on which the case today is decided was present in two earlier cases where it apparently was not considered important enough to be presented to this Court.[17]

The only authority for the Court's action is an unpublished, informal, and somewhat ambiguous interdepartmental letter of the Attorney General written in 1906. While any Attorney General might well be proud to see his views given such lasting effect, he undoubtedly would be surprised to learn that the authority of such an informal statement could overrule later court decisions and a 30-year, firmly established position of the Department of Justice. Many cases witness the fact that the Court has often given little or no weight to carefully drawn opinions of the Attorney General on questions of statutory interpretation.

But my major objection to the decision today is the extreme burden placed on the Government in cases such as this. The Court construes section 340 (a) of the Immigration and Naturalization Act to require something more than was filed in the present case. The complaint here was verified; the Assistant United States Attorney swore that the facts alleged in the complaint were "true" and "that the sources of his information * * * are the records which are on file in his office." Thus the complaint in this case was supported by the jurat of a notary public and the sworn statement of an assistant United States attorney, who held office by virtue of his oath to carry out his official duties fairly and impartially. No more was present in *Schneiderman* v. *United States* (320 U. S. 118).

The complaint alleged that Zucca had lied in his alien registration statement in 1940, and in his preliminary naturalization examination and testimony before a naturalization examiner in 1952. He is alleged to have stated under oath that "he did not belong to and was not associated with any organization which teaches or advocates the overthrow of existing government." The complaint then alleges that Zucca "was a member of the Communist Party of the United States including the Workers Communist Party * * * from 1925 to 1947." Under section 305 of the Nationality Act of 1940, the complaint continues, Zucca's naturalization was illegal.

But the majority declares that these sworn allegations are insufficient. It makes a vague reference to the pleading of "ultimate facts, while the affidavit must set forth evidentiary matters showing good cause for cancellation of citizenship." From this statement I can draw only one conclusion. As petitioner contends, "good cause" means "that the Government must furnish the Court with sworn statements by persons having personal knowledge of the facts * * * Congress could not have intended that the courts be required to accept the secondhand statements of investigators." [18] Apparently neither the United States attorney nor anyone in the Immigration Service or the FBI can make such an affidavit unless he has personal knowledge of the facts. This would limit verification by these officers to cases based on prior undisclosed criminal convictions, arrival age where controlling, etc.

But in proceedings based solely on membership in the Communist Party substantially different conditions prevail. Invariably, membership can be proved only from the testimony of other members concerning attendance at meetings, payment of dues, etc. There are no membership cards in the party and have been none for more than a decade. If these evidential methods of proof—the testimony and identity of undercover agents—must be disclosed in an affidavit, the Government must choose between foregoing denaturalization cases and drying up its source of information before the proceeding can be brought. It is common knowledge among law-enforcement officers that witnesses are affidavit-shy, particularly in cases involving subversion. Often, testimony can be obtained only in court with the aid of compulsory process. The difficulties in requiring exposure by affidavit are overwhelming and decisive in cases of this type.

I do not believe Congress ever intended such a rule. To me section 340 (a) is clear and unambiguous. Its plain reading is that proceedings may be filed by the United States attorney upon affidavit showing good cause therefor. Here the attorney swore to specific charges which certainly do constitute good cause. The sworn statement that petitioner was a member of the Communist Party and the Workers Communist Party from 1925 to 1947 alleges a prima facie case. To me it seems obvious that the purpose of section 340 (a)—to reduce the possibility of spurious denaturalization proceedings—is fully served by such a sworn statement.

Nor did the Congress intend that there should be two trials of issues of fact in these cases. To require the filing of evidential affidavits implies, as Zucca contends, extensive testing of their sufficiency before trial. The defendant is thus given two chances at the Government's case. There is no comparable requirement for an indictment in a criminal prosecution (*Costello* v. *United States* (350 U. S. —)). But denaturalization is only a civil proceedings to withdraw a privilege wrongfully obtained. There has always been the requirement of proof under cross-examination of charges against the naturalized citizen, but apparently in this case the Court authorizes an additional procedure. Before his trial in this denaturalization proceeding Zucca may file a bill of particulars and take depositions of each witness signing a "good cause" affidavit. The scope and reliability of the affidavits are then made the subject of judicial inquiry.[19] If the Government proves its case at this stage, it may then go to trial, where the same evidence is considered again. To my way of thinking, this clearly frustrates an important congressional program, a part of the broader one designed to protect our country from Communist infiltration.

In my opinion section 340 (a) requires the United States attorney to allege in a sworn

---

[14] Brief for the United States, *United States* v. *Minker* (350 U. S. 179 (No. 35, October term, 1955), at p. 34).

[15] *United States* v. *Richmond* (17 F. 2d 28); *United States* v. *Salomon* (231 F. 928).

[16] *Schwinn* v. *United States* (112 F. 2d 74 (C. A. 9th Cir.), aff'd 311 U. S. 616); *United States* v. *Tuteur* (215 F. 2d 415 (C. A. 7th Cir.)); *United States* v. *Knight* (291 F. 129 (D. C. Mont.), aff'd 299 F. 571 (C. A. 9th Cir)); *United States* v. *Collins* (131 F. Supp. 545 (D. C. S. D. N. Y.)); *United States* v. *Shinkevich* (131 F. Supp. 547 (D. C. E. D. Pa)); *United States* v. *Jerome* (115 F. Supp. 818 (D. C. S. D. N. Y.)); *United States* v. *Lustig* (110 F. Supp. 806 (D. C. S. D. N. Y.)); *United States* v. *Schuchhardt* (48 F. Supp. 876 (D. C. N. D. Ind.)); *United States* v. *Lales* (227 F. 189, 236 F. 784 (D. C. N. D. Calif.)); *United States* v. *Rodzie* (14 F. R. D. 151 (D. C. S. D. N. Y.)); *United States* v. *Favorito* (7 F. R. D. 152 (D. C. N. D. Ohio)).

[17] In *Schwinn* v. *United States* (112 F. 2d 74), the ninth circuit held that the filing of the affidavit was not "jurisdictional," and passed on the merits. We granted certiorari and affirmed summarily "on the sole ground" that the certificate had been illegally procured (311 U. S. 616). In *Schneiderman* v. *United States* (320 U. S. 118), we considered the merits at length, even though the "affidavit" filed in that case by the immigration inspector revealed that his information was based, as here, solely on the Government's files, and was in exactly the form used here.

[18] The trial judge held that before a United States attorney may institute a denaturalization proceeding he must be furnished with an affidavit of good cause.

[19] The trial judge held, "But, the protection afforded by the requirement of an affidavit of good cause would be seriously impaired if the defendant in a denaturalization action could not examine it and test its sufficiency by motion before trial."

complaint sufficient factual information to show a prima facie case for denaturalization. At most it should be sufficient for an officer of the Immigration and Naturalization Service familiar with the case to make such allegations under oath. If the Court would require this paper to be headed "Affidavit" and contained in a separate blue backing, I would have no objection, though I see nothing to be gained from such a technical labeling. But as I read the Court's decision today it goes much further than this, and it may well submerge the denaturalization procedure established by Congress in a morass of unintended procedural difficulties.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT, RELATING TO CERTAIN USE OF BROADCASTING STATIONS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 29, 1956,

The names of Mr. MORSE and Mr. MURRAY were added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 3962) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the use of broadcasting stations by presidential, vice presidential, and congressional candidates, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. SPARKMAN) on May 29, 1956.

AMENDMENT OF THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 1948—WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the motion which I heretofore entered to reconsider the vote by which the bill (S. 3638) to amend the Educational Exchange Act of 1948, passed the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3638) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by amending the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, Eightieth Congress).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not plan to object—it is my understanding that this request has been cleared with the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; it has been cleared with him. In fact, this action is being taken at his request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no objection. I merely wished to have the RECORD show that the minority leader had approved this request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Address delivered by Senator CASE of New Jersey at the dinner of Patterson branch, NAACP, on May 21, 1956.

Address delivered by Senator CASE of New Jersey before 78th annual convention, New Jersey Federation of Labor, in Atlantic City, N. J., on May 30, 1956.

By Mr. POTTER:

Article entitled "Port of Muskegon," written by him and published in the April 1956 issue of Marine News.

Address delivered by Hon. Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, before annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped on May 17, 1956.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON H. R. 2128, PATENTS EXTENSION BILL

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the hearing commenced on May 4, 1956, will be resumed on Wednesday, June 13, 1956, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on H. R. 2128, to authorize the extension of patents covering inventions whose practice was prevented or curtailed during certain emergency periods by service of the patent owner in the Armed Forces or by productior. controls. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and myself, chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON VARIOUS CIVIL-RIGHTS PROPOSALS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the committee will resume hearings on the various civil-rights proposals beginning at 2:30 p. m., Tuesday, June 12, 1956, in the committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 126, PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATIVE TO BALANCING THE BUDGET, AND SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 133, TO LIMIT THE SPENDING POWERS OF CONGRESS AND TO PROVIDE FOR REDUCTION OF THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, June 14, 1956, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on Senate Joint Resolution 126, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget, and Senate Joint Resolution 133, to limit the spending powers of the Congress and to provide for reduction of the national debt.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. Persons desiring to testify should notify the subcommittee counsel in order that a schedule of witnesses may be prepared.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], chairman, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and myself. The chairman of the subcommittee has asked me to preside over these hearings.

DEATH OF MATTHEW WOLL, LATE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE AFL–CIO

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it was with a feeling of deep sorrow that I learned last Saturday of the death of Matthew Woll, vice president of the AFL–CIO.

My friendship with him began during World War I; since that time I have always admired and respected this great labor leader.

Besides being a militant force in the labor movement for over 50 years, Matthew Woll was an authority on international affairs and an effective opponent of communism.

His record of service in these and many other fields is an extraordinary one.

His leadership and advice will be sorely missed by millions of Americans and friends of labor the world over.

As a member of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee who has conferred many times with Mr. Woll, and as one who had the privilege of knowing him as a friend, I wish to express my deep regret at his passing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, an article from the New York Times of June 2 entitled, "Matthew Woll Dies at Age of 76."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MATTHEW WOLL DIES AT AGE 76—CONSERVATIVE LABOR LEADER FOR HALF A CENTURY WAS A PROTEGE OF GOMPERS—HAD HEADED ENGRAVERS—TOP AFL OFFICER BECAME A VICE PRESIDENT OF GROUP AFTER MERGER WITH CIO

Matthew Woll, a vice president of the AFL-CIO, vice president of the International Photoengravers Union and a labor leader for more than 50 years, died yesterday in New York Hospital, where he had been a patient since April 2. His age was 76.

Mr. Woll was usually identified with the most conservative wing of the American labor movement.

He had been a protege of Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor. When the latter died in 1924, Mr. Woll had hoped to succeed him. The selection of the late William Green as Mr. Gompers' successor proved a great disappointment to him.

In the nineteen twenties and thirties, Mr. Woll was often in the newspaper headlines as a vociferous supporter of the Republican Party and as an opponent of Government interference in collective bargaining. He was an intense anti-Communist.

He mellowed in his conservatism in recent years and supported efforts by former President Harry S. Truman to obtain national health insurance legislation. In the international field he headed committees seeking to abolish slave labor in the totalitarian countries.

In 1947 Mr. Woll criticized the Argentine Government of President Juan D. Perón for having allegedly established dictatorial rule over the Argentine Confederation of Labor.

A COLORFUL ORATOR

Mr. Woll was a florid and colorful orator. He wore wing collars and frock coats and affected a William Jennings Bryan hair style. He was nimble minded and energetic and served on scores of labor, civic, political, fraternal and cultural committees.

His financial acumen earned him the respect of business leaders. As president of the Union Labor Life Insurance Co., he helped it become one of the most prosperous insurance firms of its kind.

Mr. Woll was a top-level officer of the AFL for more than 30 years and a member of many of its standing committees. When the federation was merged with the Congress of Industrial Organizations in 1955 he became a vice president of the unified group.

He was born in the Duchy of Luxembourg on January 25, 1880, the son of Michael and Janette Schwartz Woll. He was 11 years old when he came to the United States with his parents. He attended school in Chicago. From 1901 to 1904, Mr. Woll was a student in the College of Law of Lake Forest University, and then learned the photoengraving trade.

Two years after leaving college he became president of the International Photoengravers Union of North America. He held the president's post until 1929, when he retired to become vice president of the union.

SERVED UNITED STATES AGENCIES

In World War I Mr. Woll served as a member of the War Labor Board. During World War II he was a member of the National War Labor Board. He was a member of President Harding's Unemployment Conference and of President Truman's Labor Management Conference.

In recent years, Mr. Woll served as chairman of the Free Trade Union Committee, an AFL affiliate engaged in helping anti-Communist labor forces throughout the world. He also was chairman of the AFL International Relations Committee, and director of the federation's legal bureau. After the merger with the CIO, he served as co-chairman of the AFL-CIO International Affairs Committee.

Mr. Woll was editor of the Photo Engravers and a former editor of the American Federationist. He served as a fraternal delegate to two metings abroad of the International Confederation of Trade Unions.

In other fields, Mr. Woll was a member of the National Committee on Prisons and Prison Labor, the National Academy of Political Science, the New York State Insurance Advisory Board and a trustee of the Public Education Association, the Chicago Tuberculosis Institute and the National Tuberculosis.

He was chairman of the board of directors of the Sportsmanship Brotherhood and a director of the Health Insurance plan of Greater New York. He was a member of the Knights of Columbus.

Survivors include his widow, the former Elenor Dugas; 2 sons, J. Albert Woll, general counsel of the AFL-CIO, and Willard M. Woll, both of Chicago; 5 grandchildren, and 3 great-grandchildren.

CABINET COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, last Friday President Eisenhower announced the creation of a Cabinet Committee to help the Nation's small-business firms. This committee will have as members the Secretaries of Defense, Commerce, Labor, the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The Chairman of the Committee will be the Honorable Arthur F. Burns, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

The Cabinet Committee which the President has established will serve to coordinate the several programs now in operation which assist small businesses in the solution of management problems, provide financial assistance to small business, and aid in obtaining Government procurement contracts. The new Cabinet Committee is designed to strengthen existing programs where necessary, and to recommend such new programs and measures as may be best suited to provide small business with new opportunities.

President Eisenhower, in his letter to Chairman Burns, cites the objectives toward which the Cabinet Committee will work, when he writes in part:

It is my wish that the Federal Government keep fully abreast of developments that affect small businesses. Its programs and policies aimed at assisting small business should be carefully reviewed at this time with the object of strengthening them where necessary, and of making recommendations for steps that will provide such enterprises with additional constructive assistance. * * * The Committee is to have the continuing assignment of making specific recommendations to me for administrative actions, and where necessary for additional legislation, to strengthen the economic position of small business and to foster their sound development.

Mr. President, the decision of President Eisenhower to give Cabinet-level prominence to the problem of small business again demonstrates the determination of the administration to do everything within the limits of its authority to stimulate and assist small businesses so that their important contribution to the national welfare may continue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of President Eisenhower's letter to the Honorable Arthur F. Burns, designating him as Chairman of the Cabinet Committee on Small Business.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
May 31, 1956.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The important contributions made by small-business concerns to the progressive spirit and vitality of the American economy have repeatedly been stressed in my Economic Reports to the Congress and on various other occasions. Such enterprises, of which there are some 4 million currently in operation, serve continuously as a dynamic influence in our enterprise system. It is often through them that new products and new processes are first brought into use. Equally important, it is in small concerns that many men and women find an opportunity to demonstrate their ability to serve constructively in the business world. For these and related reasons, Government policies that make it easier for new businesses to be established and that foster the growth of small concerns enhance the welfare of the whole economy.

The Federal Government has a number of programs now in operation that are significantly helpful to small businesses.

The Department of Commerce helps constantly in the solution of management problems for small businesses through its Office of Technical Services, Office of Area Development, Business and Defense Services Administration, and Office of Business Economics.

Financial assistance is available to small concerns through the Small Business Administration.

Jointly with the Department of Defense and with other Federal departments and agencies, the Small Business Administration assists small concerns in obtaining Government procurement contracts.

Many small construction companies and related businesses benefit from the home-financing programs administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The Office of Defense Mobilization seeks to strengthen the production potential of small firms in our defense programs.

Through its enforcement of the antitrust laws, the Department of Justice helps maintain the competitive environment that is essential to the Nation's economic welfare.

These and other programs and policies of the Federal Government facilitate the establishment of new concerns and foster the growth of small businesses. Yet the conditions of our modern economy are such that many small concerns confront substantial hindrances to their growth. It is my wish that the Federal Government keep fully abreast of developments that affect small businesses. Its programs and policies aimed at assisting small businesses should be carefully reviewed at this time with the object of strengthening them where necessary, and of making recommendations for steps that will provide such enterprises with additional constructive assistance.

To this end I am establishing a Cabinet Committee on Small Business, of which I would like you to serve as Chairman. By copies of this letter I am designating the Secretaries of Defense, Commerce, Labor, the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency as members. Other department and agency heads will participate on an ad hoc basis as may be deemed desirable. The Committee is to have the continuing assignment of making specific recommendations to me for administrative actions, and, where necessary for additional legislation, to strengthen the economic position of small businesses and to foster their sound development.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

AMERICAN FISHERIES INDUSTRY

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, Congress at this session has devoted considerable and long overdue attention to the problems facing the American fisheries industry. The Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has held extensive hearings on the fisheries, and has taken testimony from interested persons representing all segments of the industry and all areas of the Nation. These hearings resulted in passage by the Senate 2 weeks ago of 2 important fishery bills. The first of these, S. 2379, which I introduced, would authorize an education and training program for the commercial fisheries; while the second, S. 3275, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], would place the responsibility for the fishing functions of the Federal Government on a higher level in the executive hierarchy.

During the period when the above-described activities were taking place, several other important developments occurred, all of which served to focus attention on the need for greater Government recognition of our fisheries. In March the 12 New England Senators sent a joint letter to President Eisenhower urging the creation of a Division of Fisheries in the Department of the Interior.

Mr. President, it is with the greatest pleasure that I call to the attention of the Senate an announcement made by the White House late yesterday afternoon. The administration, after long study of the situation, has ordered the creation of a Bureau of Fisheries in the Department of the Interior, effective July 1, 1956. The New Bureau will take over all of the fishery responsibilities now vested in the Fish and Wildlife Service. The announcement also indicated that the administration will propose legislation to continue the Saltonstall-Kennedy fishery research program, and to provide a $10 million revolving fund for loans to fishermen.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that the text of the White House release be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 4, 1956.

The White House today announced a series of actions designed to benefit the United States fishing industry.

The new program, which is the result of several months of intensive study within the administration, will be implemented in two steps.

First, Department of the Interior officials will undertake immediately the necessary preliminary steps for the creation within the Department of a new bureau with sole responsibility for Federal programs related to the fisheries. The new bureau, which will be called the Bureau of Fisheries, will come into existence on July 1, and will take over administration of all fishery responsibilities now vested in the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Secondly, the administration will request Congress to enact into law a comprehensive commercial fisheries program which will provide a broad charter for the new agency. The administration bill, which in some respects is modeled after the so-called Saltonstall-Kennedy Act due to expire next year, would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct needed investigations and research into all phases of fishing activities including oceanographic, biological, statistical, and economic studies of the distribution and abundance of fishery resources, the development of new and improved methods of fishing, and the development of improved handling methods and techniques. In addition, the bill would authorize research into the nutritive value of fish and fishery products, and many other activities designed to promote the flow of fishery commodities in domestic and foreign commerce.

The provisions of the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act dealing with the transfer of certain funds from the Department of Agriculture under section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935, would be continued on a permanent basis and the present $3 million limitation on expenditure of these funds would be removed.

Finally, the administration proposal includes the establishment of a special $10 million revolving fund to be used to make loans for the maintenance, repair, and equipment of fishing vessels. Loans made from the fund will carry interest rates of not less than 3 percent and could be made for periods of up to 10 years.

Implementation of these proposals will strengthen the Government's efforts to assist the fishing industry and underlines the administration's desire to give greater recognition to the vital role the United States fisheries play in the Nation's economy.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, it is extremely encouraging to see this recognition being given to the commercial fisheries industry. At long last a positive start is being made toward helping the industry to achieve a sounder economic status. The White House announcement is in line with legislation on which I and many of my colleagues have been working during this session of Congress. It is also substantially in agreement with the recommendation made by the 12 Senators from New England. In view of the President's decision, further action on S. 3275 would seem to me to be unnecessary. However, I am hopeful that the fishery education and training bill which I introduced, and which has been passed by the Senate, will be enacted by the Congress this year. The measure is a logical part of an integrated approach to fishery problems, and will fit into the new organization very well, indeed.

President Eisenhower and the administration are to be commended for the action which has been taken to assist the commercial fisheries industry in regaining its economic status as a vital segment of our national economy. The fisheries are, after all, our Nation's oldest industry, dating from the establishment of the Jamestown and Plymouth colonies. The problems of this proud industry are being recognized. The administration's action should go far toward solving those problems.

LIBERALIZED SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on tomorrow, June 6, there will open in Madison, the Governor's Conference on the Aging Population, a splendid meeting ground for considering the problems of our senior citizens.

Similarly, Mr. President, one of the subjects in which I personally have been deeply interested down through the years has been the task of doing something for the aging by actually strengthening our Nation's old-age and survivors insurance system.

Fortunately, 71 million Americans are now included in the wise social-security program—so as to help banish the nightmare of insecurity in later years. Eight million Americans are receiving some type of benefits—pensions or assistance.

UNFORTUNATELY, MILLIONS ARE NOT COVERED

The problem is, however, that a great many of these modest benefits are at near-starvation levels. The benefits are grossly inadequate in these high-cost-of-living days.

A further problem is that millions of Americans who should be covered under old-age security are not now covered. We must remember that more than 10 percent of our population is today 65 years of age or older—more than 14 million of our fellow citizens.

Shortly, we in the Senate shall have an opportunity to help remedy this problem. We shall have a chance to strengthen the inadequate pension program and to provide a fair break for those whose "hair has turned to silver."

I personally pledge my continued support for the purpose of strengthening the program.

My fervent support is not a new thing; actually, ever since I came to the Senate, in January 1939, I have fought for liberalizing changes in the old-age pensions system.

WISCONSIN'S SUPPORT OF WILEY EFFORTS

Hundreds of letters from my State have poured in expressing grateful appreciation for my assistance to our senior citizens. I am proud of such letters.

A particular flood of enthusiastic support rolled in from the Badger State when on June 21 of last year I introduced Senate bill 2279. The Wiley bill is designed to provide comprehensive grants-in-aid to the States for pilot projects for assisting old folks in finding jobs, improving their health, getting better housing, enjoying educational and leisure-time activities.

"Do not put our old folks on life's dump heap," I pleaded. "Do not neglect their years of accumulated wisdom and skill. Do not let them sit around, idle, ignored, untended, often ill, undernourished, and heavy with burdens and cares. Let us give them a chance. Let us give them decent benefits. Let us use some of the surplus foods in our Government warehouses and make it available to the needy."

HOUSE BILL BETTER THAN SENATE VERSION

Mr. President, an important new bill is coming before us from the House side in the form of H. R. 7225. Unfortunately, however, the Senate Finance Committee has knocked out some of the House's key pension provisions.

I believe that the House of Representatives had great merit in its position in voting for needed liberalizing changes in the social-security system. Included in such House changes was the making available of benefits, at age 62, instead of 65, to elderly women, including working widows.

Moreover, the needs of the permanently and totally disabled were likewise sympathetically handled by the House.

To me, it is inhuman to tell a man of 35 or 40, who has been injured permanently and totally, and is lying flat on his back in a hospital bed or in his own home, that he must wait as long as 20 or 30 years before he can draw a dime of old-age benefits.

ELDERLY WOMEN CANNOT FIND WORK

It is inhuman, moreover, to tell an elderly woman—single or married—who cannot possibly find a job, that she must wait until she is 65 before she can draw a nickel of her own benefits. I ask: How many women these days can actually find a job, even after age 45, much less after the age of 50, 55, or 60? How many factories or offices will employ elderly women?

Recognizing that grim situation, I personally, a long time back, introduced a bill to make women eligible for benefits

at the age of 60 onward—not just at 62, but at 60.

WISCONSIN SUPPORTS LIBERALIZATION

The people of my State support liberalization. Wisconsin has always prided itself on being one of the first States to enact needed social-insurance legislation.

LETTERS FROM BADGER UNION OFFICERS

I have before me now a great many messages from my State, supporting liberalization. These letters come from individuals in all walks of life. They come, for example, from AFL–CIO union presidents and other officers. The officers point out that their members are deeply disturbed about insecurity and want in their later years.

As a matter of fact, it is an unfortunate fact that with considerable unemployment today, especially in automoible centers, it is harder than ever for both older persons and younger men who have been laid off to find jobs.

AFL–CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY SUPPORTS ACTION

This is not just a Wisconsin situation; it is a national problem.

AFL–CIO President George Meany has personally commented on the seriousness of this old-age problem, as have leaders in many other sectors of our economy, including some forward-looking leaders of business, as well.

So, Mr. President, I send to the desk excerpts from many of the Wisconsin letters which have poured into my office, urging reform and improvement of the pension program. I ask unanimous consent that these excerpts be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

The first letter is from President George Meany; and then follow letters from union officers, as well as from private individuals. In the instance of letters from private folks, I have respected their privacy; I have omitted their names but have listed the county from which they wrote.

Following the most recent letters, I have included the text of several wonderful letters which I received from my State last year in praise of the Wiley bill, S. 2279.

There being no objection, the letters and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., May 28, 1956.

(Executive council: George Meany, president; William F. Schnitzler, secretary-treasurer; Walter P. Reuther; Harry C. Bates; William C. Doherty; Emil Rieve; William L. McFetridge; Dave Beck; Jacob Potofsky; A. Philip Randolph; Joseph A. Beirne; Matthew Woll; James B. Carey; David Dubinsky; Charles J. MacGowan; Joseph Curran; Maurice A. Hutcheson; A. J. Hayes, Willard S. Townsend; A. L. Spradling; George M. Harrison; William C. Birthright; David J. McDonald; Herman Winter; James C. Petrillo; L. S. Buckmaster; Joseph D. Keenan; Richard F. Walsh; O. A. Knight.)

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Member, United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: No measure before the Congress this year commands greater interest on the part of working people than H. R. 7225. This bill, amending the Social Security Act, has just been reported by the Senate Finance Committee, but stripped of two of its major provisions. I refer, of course, to the provisions to pay the primary retirement benefit to workers over age 50 who are permanently and totally disabled, and to lower the age of eligibility for women from 65 to 62.

I am sure it is not necessary to remind you that most of the people of this Nation who work for their livelihood and the support of their families look to the social-security system as their major defense against economic disaster in the event they are no longer able to work. The biggest gap in that program of protection of family security is the failure thus far to insure them against income loss due to permanent and total physical disability. They know the value of this protection and are perfectly willing to pay their share of the increased cost.

There will be an effort made on the floor of the Senate to restore the major provisions of the House bill. This effort will present you and every Member of the Senate with the opportunity of providing this much-needed improvement in the social-security protection afforded the working people of this country.

I most earnestly and respectfully urge that you support the restoration of these key provisions, especially the disability feature.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE MEANY,
President.

WISCONSIN STATE NURSES ASSOCIATION,
Milwaukee, Wis., May 24, 1956.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: We note in one of your newsletters that you were in favor of the provision of House approved H. R. 7225 which would provide old-age and survivors insurance payment to disabled persons at the age of 50 and lower the retirement age of women to age 62.

We understand the Senate Committee on Finance recommended lowering of the retirement age to widows only and also that it appears quite certain an attempt will be made to reinstate the disability clause and to lower the retirement age to all women.

We want you to know the members of the WSNA hope you will vote favorably on this amendment if and when it comes before the Senate, as by the very nature of our profession we would like to see these women in question given assistance and particularly the women of our organization, many of whom because of their strenuous life are forced to retire early.

Any favorable consideration to this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

EDITH M. PARTRIDGE, R. N.,
(Mrs. C. D.)
Executive Secretary.

From Ozaukee County:

"MAY 26, 1956.

"The Honorable Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
"United States Senate,
"Washington, D. C.

"DEAR SIR: As a voter in the State of Wisconsin, and as a victim of cerebral palsy, I hope that you will give your support to the proposal of RUSSELL LONG, United States Senator of Louisiana, which would provide social-security benefits to women at age 62, instead of the present age 65, and which would also provide social-security benefits for the physically disabled at age 50.

"Please be assured that you will have my support in the forthcoming senatorial election.

"Very truly yours."

From Dane County:

"Mr. ALEXANDER WILEY,
"United States Senate,
"Washington, D. C.

"DEAR MR. WILEY: According to the papers the social-security bill has been revised by the Finance Committee, in favor of widows only.

"I wonder why the unmarried woman is completely forgotten? My sister and I are now semi-invalids who gave up marriage to care for our aged parents and an aged aunt for years.

"Due to many illnesses ourselves, plus those of our parents, we have contracted a huge debt.

"My sister (63 years of age) can only work a few hours a week. For her, social security at an earlier age would be a blessing from God.

"I am rapidly becoming more crippled each day from rheumatoid arthritis.

"There are many other unmarried women like us who need this earlier aid.

"Most widows have insurance or property left to them by their deceased husbands. Also, they often have children to care for them.

"When this bill comes up for debate, I shall appreciate anything you may be able to say in behalf of the many unmarried women who have given up their lives for others.

"Very truly yours."

From Sheboygan County:

"MAY 30, 1956.

"The Honorable Mr. WILEY,
"United States Senator

"DEAR SIR: I am going to do all I can to see you get the nomination.

"I would like to see you vote yes on the improvement of social security, especially the bill giving social security to persons unable to work at age 50. This is the wish of many, many of my friends.

"Much success to you, sir.

"Thank you.

"Sincerely."

WISCONSIN DIVISION,
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN,
April 4, 1956.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Wisconsin State Division of American Association of University Women, representing 3,600 Wisconsin members, respectfully urge, relative to H. R. 7225, social security amendments, that you support lowering of disability age to 50, support continuation of benefits to disabled children beyond the age of 18, oppose lowering to 62 the age at which women would be eligible for social security benefits.

We are confident that you are personally aware of why AAUW takes this position on these three vital points and we respectfully urge your active support.

Respectfully submitted.

ALICE P. MORRISSY,
Mrs. P. B. (Alice) Morrissy,
Wisconsin Division Chairman, Status of Women Committee, Elkhorn, Wis.

RAE EVANS,
Mrs. Herbert P. Evans,
Wisconsin Division Chairman, Legislative Committee, Madison, Wis.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *May 28, 1956.*

Hon. Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The officers and the entire membership of local 407 strongly urge you to take immediate action to save the main provisions of the social-security bill (H. R. 7225), namely, lowering the retirement age for women from 65 to 62 and payment of social-security benefits to those permanently and totally disabled at age 50. I am sure that you will do your utmost in this endeavor.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH POLLAK,
Recording Secretary, Local 407, UAW–CIO.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *May 28, 1956.*
Hon. Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As political action chairman representing approximately 2,000 workers at the Heil Co. in their Milwaukee plants we have passed a resolution requesting our State's two Senators to press for the lowering of the retirement age for women from 65 to 62 years and the payment of social-security benefits to those permanently and totally disabled at the age of 50.

In short, we urgently request you to save the main provisions of the social-security bill (H. R. 7225) and work for passage at this session.

If I can be of any service, feel free to contact. We thank you.

LE ROY ZIMMER,
Political Action Committee Chairman, Heil Co.

CHIPPEWA FALLS TRADES AND LABOR COUNCIL,
Chippewa Falls, Wis., May 28, 1956.
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE MR. WILEY: We, of the Chippewa Falls Trades and Labor Council, respectfully urge you to support an attempt to restore the two major provisions of bill, H. R. 7225.

The two major provisions in question are the lowering of retirement age of women from 65 to 62 and payment of social-security benefits to those permanently disabled at age 50.

Thanking you for any support that you may be able to render us.

Very respectfully,

ROSA M. HOLMES,
Recording Secretary.

From Chippewa County:

"MAY 23, 1956.

"DEAR MR. WILEY: This is only a short note to tell you that a small group of women in this city who had hoped to get social-security benefits at 62 are bitterly disappointed in the pruning of the bill in the Senate Finance Committee.

"They want to know why only widows of insured workers will get benefits at 62 and not the single and married women, not widows, but who are usually supporting sick husbands.

"It does not seem fair to them. They have worked hard at day (or night) labor jobs, they are tired, and want to stop working.

"They will appreciate your interest in this bill when it finally gets to the Senate; and hope you can get restored to it the age 62 at which they can receive the benefits.

"I thank you for all of them.

"Sincerely yours."

From Racine County:

"APRIL 11, 1956.

"DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I was urged to write our Senators asking them to support the bill H. R. 7225, and hope that many other working people are doing the same.

"What can a family of two do when the husband is totally disabled and cannot work, and it is impossible for his wife to work? If this bill would reduce the age of eligibility for retirement, in the case of women, from 65 to 62, and there would be an increase in the payments for both men and women, it would make a lot of people happier. Seventy-nine dollars a month isn't a lot when there is rent, food, clothing, fuel, and other bills to pay. With my support and the support of others, I am sure that something can be done.

"Yours very truly."

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *April 16, 1956.*
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: The Women's Auxiliary No. 2 of Local No. 75, UAW, are urging you to support bill H. R. 7225, as it will provide the following security for women and disabled persons:

1. Monthly payments to disabled workers at age 50 or older.

2. Retirement benefits for women at age 62 instead of 65.

3. Reduction to age 62 from 65 of eligibility of widows whose husbands were covered by Social Security Act.

4. Continuation of benefits for disabled children beyond the age of 18.

We would urge you to use your influence in bringing this bill, H. R. 7225, out of committee and working for full support of this bill.

Fraternally yours,

MARGUERITE WEBB,
Legislative Chairman,
Women's Auxiliary No. 2, UAW–CIO.

From Kenosha County:

APRIL 10, 1956.

"Senator WILEY,
of Wisconsin:

"DEAR SIR: Being one of the many totally and permanently disabled persons in the United States, I am taking the opportunity and privilege to express my feelings in words toward the bill H. R. 7225, which is now before the Senate Finance Committee.

"I am a fellow citizen, only 57 years of age, who has worked in a factory for 24 years, but, having been stricken with an incurable chronic disease, I am unable to earn a livelihood. I have been disabled for the past 5 years now, and, with a family and many expenses facing me, it is impossible for me to make ends meet.

"Being very much in need of financial help, I sincerely urge you to support H. R. 7225, the social-security bill for the disabled, for this benefit would be a godsend to me and for the many disabled persons of America. Thank you.

"Yours truly."

CITY OF KENOSHA, WIS.,
March 22, 1956.
Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senator from Wisconsin,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our city council, on March 19, took the following action:

They voted unanimously to express their desire to have you do everything in your power to increase the benefits of old-age pensioners due to the fact that their compensations are set, which causes an undue hardship in meeting the rising cost of living.

Very truly yours,

J. R. SAWICKI,
City Clerk.

SMITH STEEL WORKERS,
FEDERAL LABOR UNION,
LOCAL 19806, A. F. L.,
Milwaukee, Wis., April 13, 1956.
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Bill H. R. 7225 will shortly come to the Senate floor for action.

We are very concerned about the powerful opposition to this bill. How there can be any doubt that the passage of this bill would be greatly beneficial to a large segment of very deserving people and also extremely helpful to our economy is beyond our comprehension.

We are therefore asking you to do everything in your power to bring this bill to a vote on the Senate floor, and in behalf of our 6,000 members I want to strongly urge you to give this bill your wholehearted support.

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR LECLAIR,
Secretary-Treasurer.

OFFICE EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL UNION, LOCAL NO. 9,
Milwaukee, Wis., April 2, 1956.
The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We sincerely request you to support and vote for bill H. R. 7225 which would lower the pension age of women and widows from 65 to 62 years and would also provide benefits to workers 50 years and older when totally and permanently disabled.

Our local union is comprised of office, clerical, and technical employees employed in many companies in Milwaukee. A number of our members are above 65 years of age and would like to retire but cannot afford to because their wives have not reached age 65 and the social security benefit to which they would be entitled is not adequate to live on. If these workers were to receive the combined social security benefits for man and wife many of them would retire and thus provide jobs for younger men.

This bill H. R. 7225 which merely sets forth a minimum program for improvement of the Social Security Act and passed by the House by the overwhelming vote of 372 to 31 deserves to be passed by the Senate.

We sincerely hope that you will use your influence to help pass this bill and to vote down any crippling amendments which may be made during the course of debate.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD E. BECK,
Business Representative.

BUILDING SERVICE EMPLOYEES' INTERNATIONAL UNION,
Chicago, Ill., March 31, 1956.
Senator ALEXANDER R. WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I am writing you to ask for your support of bill H. R. 7225, currently before the Senate. I am thoroughly convinced this bill will make an important contribution to our Social Security System.

I have represented organized labor for many years and am currently the representative of the above international in Wisconsin. The many locals I service in this State are greatly interested in the passage of this bill. I sincerely ask your support in its passage.

Yours very truly,

RODERICK MACDONALD,
International Representative, BSEIU.

EAU CLAIRE COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
Eau Claire, Wis., April 16, 1956.
Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILEY: We believe the matter is coming up again reducing the age retirement for women to 62 years, on social security.

If the age could be reduced to 62 years, which was opposed at one time in Washington, it would be greatly appreciated by all welfare directors in the State of Wisconsin. In cases where a husband is 65 years of age, and is receiving social security, and he has a wife 2 or 3 years younger somehow or somewhere we have to work out a budget to include the wife. Sometimes it is necessary to make plans to have her go on general relief or make some other plan. It would greatly simplify matters if the wife's age, or, rather, the retirement age for women, could be reduced to 62 years and make them eligible for social security.

Will you please do what you can in this matter if it again comes up?

Yours very truly,

A. C. PETERSON, *Director.*

RACINE, WIS., *March 26, 1956.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Racine AFL–CIO council, representing some 15,000 workers in this community seriously request that you vote favorable on bill H. R. 7225 re social security. This is a much needed improvement in the law and should merit your utmost support. Would appreciate your reply.

HAROLD J. THOMPSON,
Secretary.

BREWERY WORKERS LOCAL UNION NO. 9,
Milwaukee, Wis., April 17, 1956.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Brewery Workers Local Union No. 9 took action, at the regularly scheduled union meeting of Sunday, April 15, 1956, to ask you, and to urge you, to use your good office to see that bill H. R. 7225, which has been passed in the House of Representatives by a large majority, be brought out of committee and acted upon by the Senate. You are probably aware that this bill will reduce the age for eligibility of retired women from age 65 to age 62, and also provide social-security payments to eligible persons who became permanently and totally disabled.

Here in the city of Milwaukee our brewery local of some 8,200 people has dropped to around 7,000. Even though the number of people has dropped some 1,200, there is more production in the Milwaukee breweries than ever before. This is due to the many technological improvements which have resulted in beer being bottled and canned at high rates of speed. It is important that if the economy of this country is to continue that older workers, upon retirement, be provided with sufficient income.

As it is usually the case where the woman of the family is a few years younger than the man, workers reaching age 65 are hesitant to retire because of the fact that their wives are not yet eligible for social-security payments. Reducing the age of eligibility for women could result in the men retiring on reaching age 65, which in turn will provide work for the younger workers who are building homes and raising families. We in brewery feel this would be a very important change, and hope that you also will consider it as such.

Many workers becoming disabled are provided with little or no means of income. Workers in the fifties, in many cases, are still raising families or have children in school. This change is also of great importance as disabled workers only become wards of the community in which they live.

Again, in closing, the Brewery Workers hope that you will do your utmost in seeing that these two changes are passed in the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. SCHMITT,
Recording Secretary.

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF UNITED BREWERY, FLOUR, CEREAL, SOFT DRINKS AND DISTILLERY WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Oshkosh, Wis.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you in regards to bill No. H. R. 7225.

I and many brothers of local No. 90 agree, that if this bill were passed, it would greatly benefit women, widows and disabled children.

We also think that any disabled person who has paid enough into social security should quality for payments.

We think that bill H. R. 7225 is a start in the right direction, if passed.

If you see it possible to support this bill, it would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

ANTON L. ROHL,
Recording Secretary, Local No. 90.

WISCONSIN'S FAVORABLE REACTIONS TO WILEY BILL

GOLDEN AGE CLUBS OF MILWAUKEE,
Milwaukee, Wis., July 10, 1955.

(Sponsored by Milwaukee Public Schools, department of municipal recreation and adult education, 1111 North 10th Street, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mrs. Ida H. Witt, director of golden-age program; all-city council officers: Mr. Henry Eller, president; Mr. Frank Kraemer, vice president; Mrs. Elsa Weidenbacher, secretary.)

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
The United States Senate,
Committee on Foreign Relations,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I read with great interest your bill on "let life really begin at 60 or 65" and wish to congratulate you on your personal deep regard for the vast number of senior citizens we have suddenly become confronted with. It should be the aim and responsibility of every community to concern itself with its aging population.

We are proud of Milwaukee's program and of the work both the public and private agencies are doing through the recreational department. We now have 35 golden-age clubs with 2 members from each club represented on the council. In view of this, may we request about 200 copies of this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD S. 2279 for distribution?

You can certainly count on me personally to support and promote this very worthwhile issue. If we can be of service in any way, please do not hesitate to let me know.

The best of luck to you.

Sincerely,

IDA H. WITT,
Director, Golden Age Program.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
Madison, July 12, 1955.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I am in complete agreement with the views you presented in your speech in Congress. The proposal you make for aid to the States for services for the aging and aged is very much in line with my thinking. Your statement of the problem is one of the best I have seen.

With personal regards.

Sincerely,

EDWIN E. WITTE,
Professor of Economics.

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
Madison, July 12, 1955.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Have received a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dealing with aging problems. I am very grateful to you for it. I wholeheartedly agree with the articles as you have set them forth, and I am interested in, and appreciate the fine work you are doing in regard to this problem.

I thought you might be interested in some of the work that is being done for the aged in the county homes along the recreational activity line. I am enclosing a copy of the Oldsters, a little newsletter that is published every other month and sent to the county homes to aid them in establishing an activity program within their own institutions. Also a copy of the activity program for the aged in the county homes in Wisconsin.

Very sincerely yours,

C. RAYMOND BOWERS,
County Home Program Consultant,
Division of Public Assistance.

COMMUNITY WELFARE COUNCIL,
Madison, Wis., July 6, 1955.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senator, State of Wisconsin,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We are extremely pleased to receive your remarks made on the floor of the Senate of the United States on Tuesday, June 21, 1955, regarding State and local services for our aging population.

We have read with considerable interest your remarks, as well as your proposals of Federal grants to States to assure more adequate National, State, and community planning to better meet the needs of our aging.

As you probably know, we in Madison have been working in this area for the past 6 years. We would like to call to your attention some of the work of the committee on aging of the Community Welfare Council of Madison, Inc. Inasmuch as Wisconsin is your home State, you should be pleased to learn that the program being carried on here in Madison has received nationwide attention, and the enclosed report regarding Madison's program has been published in the series, "Notable Papers on Aging," of the national committee on the aging of the National Social Welfare Assembly. This report should provide you with some background as to how our community came to recognize the need for a community plan for our aging citizens and how this plan has grown. We also would like to call your attention to our monthly newsletter, "Aging," which is sent to some 1,200 persons throughout our community, as well as to many persons throughout our Nation.

We heartily endorse your statement of the need for State government assuming its responsibility in planning for the aging and in providing leadership and technical assistance for smaller communities. We have seen a great need for this in our work, but unfortunately, have been unable to get any action on the State level. We have countless demands made upon us from other communities in Wisconsin to provide information and help in order that they may begin such programs. We are pleased to note your efforts to encourage the State to broaden this area of concern and to coordinate activities.

If we can be of any service to you in providing information about what we are doing here in Madison, please do not hesitate to let us know.

We would appreciate 50 copies of your remarks and proposed bill for distribution among our committee members. We would also be pleased if you will keep us informed as to the progress of your bill.

Cordially and sincerely,

MINNETTA A. HASTINGS,
Mrs. William A. Hastings,
Chairman, Committee on Aging.
WALTER M. BEATTIE, Jr.,
Director, Community Services to the Aging.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Sentor from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I am delighted to hear the statement the Senator from Wisconsin has made. I wish to assure him that a minority of the committee are opposed to striking out the disability provisions of the bill, and favor retaining in the bill provision for women to have the right to retire at age 62. The Senator from Wisconsin has joined some 45 others of us in sponsoring an amendment by which we seek to provide additional assistance for the needy who are not covered by the present social-security program.

I shall welcome the assistance and support of the Senator from Wisconsin when that measure comes before the Senate.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as the Senator from Louisiana knows, I am not a member of the committee. But both the statement I have made and the history of this matter show that for years I have sensed the serious condition confronting our aged. For instance, the dollar has depreciated in value, and today is worth only approximately 45 or 50 cents, as compared to its value at the time when many of the present pensions went into effect. Furthermore, the many aged persons who depend upon insurance find that the value of their insurance dollar has seriously declined.

As a result, some of our best people find that, through no fault of their own, they are in desperate circumstances. They have a valid claim upon our rich Nation, which has an income of $327 billion, to step into the situation and do an adequate job.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to join in supporting the observations of the Senator from Wisconsin; and I wish to pay a very much deserved compliment to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], for the great fight he put up in his committee in the effort to have the committee report some decent legislative provisions for the aged of the Nation.

In my 12 years of service in the Senate, I do not know of any committee report which has been so disappointing to me as the report on this entire matter by the majority of the committee. I am particularly disappointed in the report because of my interest in seeing that justice is done to the aged. The report cannot stand analysis, and it will be thoroughly debated on the floor of the Senate when action on this proposed legislation is called for.

I hope that a large number of Members of the Senate will rally around the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], because he is making a splendid fight which needs to be made for the aged of our country.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I also wish to associate myself with the Senator from Wisconsin, and to compliment the Senator from Louisiana. I am very glad, indeed, to be a cosponsor of the provisions to which reference has been made. I shall have a great deal to say on this subject when the bill is called up for consideration by the Senate within the next few days.

I also wish particularly to compliment the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the President pro tempore of the Senate, who now is presiding. His leadership in this matter has been of the greatest assistance, and I shall be very proud to join in supporting the amendments which I know he intends to bring up.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for the statement he has just made, and I wish to associate myself with his remarks. I am one of the cosponsors of the Long resolution, and I also wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I wish to say that North Dakota was the first State in the Union to pass an old-age pension law. That was done long before anyone ever heard of the Townsend plan.

The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has been in our corner on this fight for a long time, and I appreciate very much the fact that he has been fighting in the interest of the aged and those who are disabled. I am delighted to be associated with him.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. As I previously stated, I have been in this fight a long time. The bills on this subject which I have introduced in the Senate indicate that my interest in it is not something new. Everywhere I go I recognize that when people reach a certain age they are no longer wanted. However, many of them are still able to do good work. I have relatives whom I aid because they have passed age 65, although they are in perfect health, and could even resume work in their profession of school teaching. However, the provisions of the law are such that they are not permitted to do so.

I have talked before about the imperative challenge to the community. The community itself must make sure not only that these people have adequate food, clothing, and the other necessities, but also that provision is made to keep their minds occupied and to make it possible for them to engage in other activities, and so forth.

Mr. President, I should like now to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN WISCONSIN—ADDRESS BY ROBERT MOSES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, among the strong reactions which I have received from my State in protest against the Republican convention of May 26 is the text of an important radio address which was delivered by Mr. Robert Moses. This informative talk by Mr. Moses, who is radio director of the Farmers' Union Radio Council of my State, went out over a 10-station radio network.

With regard to the Farmers' Union itself, I may say that down through the years I have worked with it on a great many issues on behalf of the farmers of my State—such as adequate farm parity, rural electrification, the St. Lawrence Seaway, rural phones, and the like.

It is a fact, however, that the Farmers' Union and I have differed on some few issues. So, naturally, I am particularly appreciative of the splendid support which was given to me in Mr. Moses' hard-hitting radio address, which came after the recent debacle in Milwaukee.

Mr. President, as I have indicated, I have not always seen eye-to-eye with the Farmers' Union. I claim to be an independent legislator, weighing the facts in each instance.

I send to the desk excerpts from the address by Mr. Moses, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM A BROADCAST OF FARMERS' UNION ON THE AIR, MAY 28, 1956, GIVEN ON 10-STATION RADIO NETWORK OF WFU

ALEXANDER WILEY can now join the ranks of Fred Zimmerman, the La Follettes and Walter Goodland, Wisconsin officeholders who were outside the realm of the kingmakers, as Assembly Speaker Catlin put it. Here in Wisconsin, things are never seen in the same perspective as the way folks from outside Wisconsin see the same things. Yet the developments which took place in Milwaukee last Saturday must leave the 47 other States and the free world slightly baffled. What took place at the State GOP Convention, where Senator WILEY was denied endorsement for a fourth term by the party he had served so long and so faithfully, was one of the coldest blows that could be inflicted upon a public servant. Saturday was the kingmakers' day—the day when the rich Wisconsin industrialists and WILEY-hating Wisconsin Congressmen * * * repudiated the senior Wisconsin Senator. But if Saturday was the day for a handful of party bosses, next September's primary may yet be ALEXANDER WILEY's day, if previous elections are an indication. Wisconsin voters have a tendency to champion the underdog, and with the campaign kitty and State leaders stacked against him, WILEY does go into the September primary as an underdog. Pitted against him will be a man who had not even campaigned for the Senate nomination—the young Congressman from the second district, Representative GLENN DAVIS. After four other Republican hopefuls had campaigned for WILEY's seat with great vigor, it was Congressman DAVIS who snuck in at the last minute with the prize plum—the support of the large industrialists and the other right-wing elements of the party of Abraham Lincoln, Teddy Roosevelt, and Bob La Follette. The coming campaign will—by the standards of the events leading up to the Saturday affair—be a bitter one. It appears that ALEXANDER WILEY's main crime, in the minds of those who denied him a fourth term endorsement on Saturday, is that he has supported the President of the United States on foreign policy matters. Those in Wisconsin who don't like WILEY's foreign policy are simply too weak-livered to admit that it's President Eisenhower they are really mad at, not WILEY. WILEY and Eisenhower, together with a majority of Republicans and Democrats, belong to the school of thought that a firm understanding of America's role in international affairs is here to stay. It was Arthur Vandenberg, the late great Republican statesman from neighboring Michigan, who made the statement back in the early years of the cold war: "Bipartisanship in foreign policy begins at the shores of the United States." It was under a democratic administration that the Republican Vandenberg led the way for a clear bipartisan approach to foreign policy. The Michigan Senator was responsible for leading the Congress through the stormy days of the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, and the Berlin blockade—all features of the cold war and America's responsibility to a free world. There were always a few hangovers of traditional Middlewestern isolation from both parties standing in the way of Vandenberg's leadership. When Vandenberg died a few years ago, it was his fellow Midwesterner, Senator WILEY, who carried on in the spirit of Vandenberg. The theme of the Wisconsin Senator has been: "It's closer from Moscow to Milwaukee, via the North Pole, than from Moscow to New York." The dinosaur wing of the Grand Old Party paid little heed to these warnings. The crew that did ALEX WILEY in over the weekend seemingly has forgotten that it was way back in 1492 that Columbus crossed the Atlantic Ocean. They

selected as their endorsed candidate a man who stands for everything in foreign affairs that Arthur Vandenberg, Alexander Wiley, and Presidents Truman and Eisenhower stood against. To the other 47 States and the free world, this political event on Saturday was a blow. The leaders of the Western European nations—men like Konrad Adenauer, and former Premiers Churchill, of England, and Mendes-France, of France—must begin to wonder what is happening in the United States when a man of WILEY's stature in world affairs is given a literal slap in the face by a handful of partisans. Certainly President Eisenhower must be puzzled when the man who directed foreign affairs for the Nation during the first 2 years of his administration is not endorsed for office. It was only last Wednesday that Time magazine, a strong backer of the Eisenhower administration, came out with a flat statement that the President would support a number of his stanchest backers in the Senate, including ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin. It must have been quite a shock to the Republicans in the United States Senate, with whom our senior Senator has served for 18 years. Of the Republicans, only the veteran STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, has been a Member of the Senate longer than has WILEY. The main issue at stake in the coming primary campaign will not be a partisan one. Basically, it will be a continuation of the bipartisan approach to foreign affairs, as characterized by Senator WILEY, or a return to splendid isolation, as represented by Congressman DAVIS.

The rest of the country and the free world * * * will be watching our Wisconsin primary election next September. It will be an interesting one as the Wisconsin voters decide which century they are living in.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me for a moment?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to say that Robert Moses is the son of former United States Senator John Moses, of North Dakota, a Democrat.

Mr. WILEY. I am glad to learn more about Mr. Moses, because, so far as I am concerned, anyone who wishes to state, either on the radio or in the press, the facts regarding the situation, will be welcomed; I welcome them to get into this battle.

Mr. LANGER. I may say that Mr. Moses was an outstanding citizen of North Dakota, and 2 years ago was a candidate for secretary of state of North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President, it is always gratifying to a legislator to receive support from the newspapers of his State.

I know that it is extremely gratifying to our colleague, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] to note the strong support which he has received from the newspapers all over the country.

The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin was called from the Chamber before he had concluded his remarks. In his behalf, at his request, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with his remarks a number of editorials be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hudson Star-Observer]

Our Wisconsin State Republican Convention shocked a great many thoughtful people in the western part of the State when party endorsement of ALEXANDER WILEY for return to the Senate was withheld.

This action, we feel sure, reflects the thinking of a few callous professional politicians who believe that this year they can ditch the "grand old man" of the Senate without rousing the ire—or losing the votes—of ordinary people.

Senator WILEY is one of the ranking members of our highest legislative body. Perhaps the fact that, as chairman of the all-important Foreign Relations Committee in the Congress before the present one, he showed something besides isolationism, has to do with his abandonment by the party.

The minds of men are short. The leaders of the Republican party come from the eastern part of the State, the heavily populated areas that stand to benefit most by the St. Lawrence Seaway project. Have these leaders forgotten that Senator WILEY fought that seaway measure through—in behalf of this State? Do narrow minds prohibit their thinking of friendly relations with foreign nations when the very profit of the seaway development to eastern Wisconsin depends on foreign shipping?

Senator WILEY will run. The electorate hasn't spoken yet. But one thing is sure: the State's GOP bosses will know they're in a dogfight before the primaries are past.

[From the De Pere Journal-Democrat]

WILEY LOSES REPUBLICAN SUPPORT—KEEPS VOTES

Senator WILEY has been a key man in the Eisenhower administration as head of the Foreign Relations Committee. This refutation of the Senator represents a slap in the face to the administration by the Wisconsin segment of the President's own party.

Yes, Senator WILEY has lost the support of his party. However, we feel that Mr. WILEY, a man who will represent righteous thinking in a troubled world, has gained the support of good thinking Wisconsinites. After all, it is not the Republican Party or the Democratic Party who elects their representatives in government, but John Q. Public. We look for Senator WILEY's return to the Senate in November—not through the Republican Party, but the voters of Wisconsin.

[From the Milwaukee Journal]

PRETTY SHABBY TREATMENT

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY received his reward Saturday for more than 20 years of faithful service to the Republican Party. He was dumped, scornfully, by both the official and the self-anointed leadership of the Wisconsin Republican organization. He was refused endorsement for reelection to a fourth term by the State convention.

WILEY will run against his endorsed opponent, Congressman GLENN DAVIS, in the September 11 primary. But he will do it under tremendous odds. DAVIS is assured of all-out support by the statewide organization, the party leadership, the party's other candidates, and the party's plentiful campaign funds.

Many injustices are done in politics, a rough, tough game. Injustice such as that done to Senator WILEY, however, is seldom paralleled.

He has always been a Republican, and a working one. He stopped the New Deal surge in Wisconsin in 1936 by defeating F. Ryan Duffy, the Democratic Senator who sought reelection. In 1950, he turned back the most promising Democratic challenger of recent times, Thomas E. Fairchild.

He rose, over the years, to be one of the most influential Republicans in the Senate. He is now the second ranking party member. As chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee during the 83d Congress, he attained the highest committee post any Wisconsin Senator has ever reached.

When the GOP came to power in 1953 under President Eisenhower, he became Senate spokesman for the administration on foreign policy. He supported President Eisenhower through thick and thin with speech and vote on practically all major issues. He has always worked hard in the interests of Wisconsin industry and agriculture. He can properly claim much credit for finally getting the St. Lawrence waterway legislation through Congress, and waterway construction underway.

This long and consistent record of Republicanism has not been enough, however, to satisfy the "kingmakers" of the Wisconsin GOP and the convention delegates they move about like chess pawns.

WILEY has always been too independent to please such as these. He has insisted on making his own decisions. He has refused to kowtow to their pressures despite the campaign funds they offer as bait.

And, sin of all sins to the cynics in control of the Wisconsin GOP, he has courageously and doggedly insisted on being loyal to President Eisenhower in fact as well as by mouth. This in a State where this Republican leadership considers the President a party interloper of suspicious liberal leanings and where it is the accepted GOP policy to praise Ike, but to oppose most of the important things Ike stands for.

At the 1953 Madison convention these Wisconsin Republicans booed and formally reprimanded WILEY because of his support of key measures of the Eisenhower program. There was no doubt after this that they would dump him in 1956 if a likely opponent could be inveigled. The intensity of their opposition is shown by the fact that 638 delegates could cast ballots for a Wiley opponent who faces charges of unethical conduct filed by the State Board of Bar Commissioners.

The final chapter of this story is not written, of course. Wisconsin voters will decide on September 11 whether they approve of the shabby treatment that has been given the State's senior Senator at Milwaukee.

[From the Beloit Daily News]

A SENATOR GETS THE BOOT

The Republican hierarchy couldn't do much about Senator WILEY until the State convention. There, however, it was planned to stage the execution.

It was a bitter pill for him to swallow, considering he did so much to promote the St. Lawrence Seaway project, which farmers and industrialists hold will be a great boon to the midcontinent, and that he once served as chairman of the powerful Foreign Relations Committee and was still, under a Democrat-controlled Congress, the ranking Republican member of the committee.

He may find solace in the fact that when Representative DAVIS sampled opinion earlier about running for the Senate the Second District Representative failed to find the enthusiasm he anticipated and decided not to run. He changed his mind only after senatorial aspirants, including Mark Catlin, Jr., couldn't muster sufficient strength at the convention to unseat Senator WILEY.

Repudiation, it seemed, wasn't enough. Senator WILEY's opponents booed him, insulted him, and even demanded that he not run.

Despite this treatment, Senator WILEY vowed he will carry on the tradition of the late Fred Zimmerman and Walter Goodland, who, though repudiated by their party, went to the people to be elected to office.

This split in Republican ranks isn't doing the party any good, but as long as GOP leaders choose to make the September primary a battleground, then those who support President Eisenhower and the administration's program should rally to the support of Senator WILEY.

The Daily News feels Senator WILEY has served Wisconsin and his country with credit and distinction during his 18 years as United States Senator; that he always has had the interests of the State and its people uppermost in mind; and, because he is recognized as a key figure in the first Republican administration in two decades, that he deserved much better than the shameful treatment he received at the hands of the delegates at the Milwaukee convention.

[From the Eau Claire Leader and Telegram]

Make no question about it, isolationism, America Firstism, if you prefer the term, is still dominant in Wisconsin Republicanism. Gone were any thoughts of Senator WILEY's years of effort to make the St. Lawrence Seaway a success, gone were any praise of his years of effort for dairy farmers, and other things outside his support of the presidential foreign policy. Nothing else counted. * * * Senator WILEY has no intention of withdrawing from the race, and he is very likely to show the Nation that Wisconsin is not as isolationist as the rulers of the State's Republican Party wants it to be.

[From the Madison Capital Times]

It was such a spectacle of hypocrisy as to defy description. * * * For all the shabby, shoddy and rude treatment they accorded Senator WILEY and his wife at that debacle in Milwaukee, these Republicans do not hate WILEY. They showed that it is really Eisenhower they hate. They merely took it out on WILEY. They can't afford to kick the man on whose back they are riding.

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel]

The lateness of DAVIS' entry, his open support by a group of well-known industrialists, the mention of a $150,000 campaign fund, the fact that most delegates had only a few minutes to make up their minds how to vote—these inevitably gave rise to angry talk of "kingmakers" and provided Democrats and WILEY supporters alike with a political weapon which has frequently been lethal in Wisconsin. By reason of this political blunder, Senator WILEY becomes even more of a martyr in the eyes of the independent voter. Drama and sympathy will now surround his fight against the so-called machine. His chances of winning out over the party organization, as Walter Goodland and Fred Zimmerman did before him, are enhanced. He becomes the kind of candidate that Wisconsin voters like.

[From the Monroe Evening Times]

The selection of Representative DAVIS * * * was carried out in a way which may widen whatever disagreement was caused by the defeat of WILEY. We think convention endorsements are a mistake, that many times the delegates who vote such endorsements do not represent the thinking of rank and file party members of their areas. * * * Just the same, the all-out negative fight to sidetrack him was, we believe, a perfect example of all that is wrong with the party convention endorsement system as carried on in Wisconsin.

[From the Oshkosh Northwestern]

Already Democrats are calling the Republican tangle a big money raising and spending affair. And they hope to profit by painting a picture of big industrialists and big money as backing the DAVIS candidacy. If the bitter party split is not mended soon, the Republicans could be in danger of losing a Senate seat to the Democrats next November.

[From the Wisconsin State Journal]

Now that they are back home * * * Wisconsin Republicans may be prompted to take a second look at their weekend convention doings. And a good many of them may wonder how wisely they wrought in slapping down ALEXANDER WILEY, their vote-getting senior Senator. * * * In all of these stands, it must be said, WILEY represented the wishes of the White House and the same President Eisenhower for whom all Wisconsin Republicans will work and vote this year.

[From the Monroe County Democrat]

What is there about Republican Senator ALEXANDER WILEY of Chippewa Falls that has made him distasteful to the State Republican convention in 1956?

In his current term, Senator WILEY has risen to the highest position of congressional influence ever achieved by a Wisconsin Republican. He was chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Why defeat WILEY? Because WILEY, more than any other Wisconsin Republican in Congress, has stuck with the program of President Eisenhower, both on foreign policy and on the major issues generally.

Senator WILEY not only says he supports the President. He also votes that way. GLENN DAVIS says he supports Eisenhower. But he doesn't vote that way on the major issues—just on the trivia.

The Democrat must insert a word of praise for the Monroe County delegation to the State Republican convention. This newspaper does not support their men (Eisenhower and WILEY). Nor does it support their viewpoints. But they made their support of Eisenhower honest by supporting WILEY. Every candidate seeking the Senate endorsement, except WILEY, was actually an opponent of President Eisenhower. Each made it clear he would have done his best to defeat Eisenhower objectives on the major issues in Congress. If you support Eisenhower, it is a little difficult to support candidates who clearly challenge his position on major issues.

[From the Racine Journal-Times of May 29, 1956]

"KINGMAKERS" PICK THEIR MAN

What happened in Milwaukee last Saturday afternoon, when the Republican State convention was stampeded into an endorsement of Congressman GLENN R. DAVIS for the United States Senate, is a most powerful argument against endorsement prior to primary elections.

The question is one which has long been argued in Wisconsin. This State has an open primary law that permits all candidates to submit themselves to the voters for nomination. It has been argued effectively that endorsement is a moral violation of this open primary, in that it gives party support and, more important, party funds, to one candidate in preference to others, before the voters of the party have had a chance to name their candidates in a primary.

Congressman DAVIS' endorsement was secured last Saturday in a behind-the-scenes maneuver that apparently had gone on for several weeks before the convention, although it had been given no publicity and the rank and file of the delegates to the convention were unaware of the movement until it was unveiled on the floor of the convention. DAVIS actually had withdrawn from senatorial consideration before the convention. He had not campaigned for the endorsement, nor did he appear before the district caucuses.

But a small clique of Republican leaders determined to "get" Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, maneuvered to make DAVIS the convention's choice. When it became apparent that they could not secure the endorsement for Mark Catlin, they threw DAVIS' name to the convention without even the formality of a nomination. The convention was stampeded in a few hours.

In repudiating WILEY, Wisconsin Republicans turned their back on a man who has a proven record of supporting President Eisenhower and a record of 18 years of service to his State and his party.

Effort probably will be made in the next few months to "prove" that DAVIS is an administration supporter. But these facts stand out: DAVIS has not supported Eisenhower on the important issues of foreign policy which are a prominent part of the administration's great effort to maintain world peace. DAVIS did not vote for the administration's foreign-aid program. DAVIS favors the Bricker amendment which would tie the President's hands on foreign policy. DAVIS' friends at the convention, and the men who promised to raise $150,000 for his campaign, are avowed isolationists and bitter critics of Eisenhower.

Against that record, Senator WILEY stands out as a friend and a supporter of the Eisenhower administration and its important policies.

Fortunately, the voters of Wisconsin and not a little clique of "kingmakers," will decide the Republican nomination for Senator in September. They will decide whether WILEY, who votes for Eisenhower policies, or DAVIS, who votes against them, will be the most suitable representative of this State in Washington.

[From the Ladysmith News]

WILEY FOR SENATOR

It appears to this editor that by far the greater portion of the Republican opposition to the nomination and reelection of Senator WILEY stems from his support of President Eisenhower on most questions. The President has been too liberal to suit some old-line Republicans, although not liberal enough to suit the more socialistically-inclined Democrats, but all recognize that Eisenhower's popularity is the most potent asset the Republicans have in the 1956 campaign.

While Senator WILEY has not supported the President on every proposition, particularly on the recent farm bill, he has been a most important factor in the passage of most of the legislation favored by the present administration.

With his many years of seniority, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY is one of the most influential Members of the upper House of Congress. As a resident of Chippewa Falls, he is particularly aware of the problems of upper Wisconsin and has never lost sight of the needs of this area and of the State as a whole. He was one of the strongest workers in Congress on the successful battle of several years' duration to put over the St. Lawrence deep waterway project.

Wisconsin people are indebted to Senator WILEY for the years of sincere effort he has put in in our behalf.

Let's give this neighbor our loyal support.

[From the Sheboygan Press]

DAVIS VERSUS WILEY

Delegates to the Republican State convention at Milwaukee last weekend may have done Senator ALEXANDER WILEY a favor in refusing to endorse him for a fourth term as United States Senator.

Representative DAVIS was brought into the picture after it became clear that none of Senator WILEY's four announced opponents could receive the endorsement. The State Board of Bar Commissioners' charge that Assemblyman Mark Catlin, Jr., of Appleton had engaged in unethical conduct made futile all efforts to obtain the endorsement for Catlin, the strongest of the four challengers.

The Davis boom was supported by a group of Wisconsin industrialists who have guaranteed to raise a $150,000 campaign chest in his behalf. At a limit of $5,000 each, it will take 30 of them to fill the campaign chest. We seriously question, however, whether the

voters will want a Senator who would owe his nomination and election to such a group of industrialists.

The endorsement of DAVIS is the work of a group of Republican leaders, who, we are convinced, seek to use the popularity of President Eisenhower to elect candidates who are not fully in agreement with the President's foreign policies. They are, for instance, supporters of the proposed Bricker amendment, which is opposed by both the President and Senator WILEY. DAVIS, according to a tabulation made last year, has followed the Presidential lead on only 14 percent of the foreign policy roll calls. He is for the Bricker amendment or something similar.

Senator WILEY is a supporter of a bipartisan or nonpartisan foreign policy. He is the former chairman of the influential Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate, and since the Republicans lost Senate control, he has been the ranking minority member of the committee. If reelected and the Republicans regain control of the Senate, he would return to the chairmanship by virtue of seniority. It is doubtful whether a freshman senator would even gain apopintment to this important committee.

The convention ignored Senator WILEY's major role in the St. Lawrence Seaway legislation and his sponsorship of legislation for deepening the connecting channels.

Frequently in a campaign a candidate benefits from an underdog role. Senator WILEY has such a role as the result of the convention action and the pledge of the industrialists to provide a $150,000 fund for his opponent. He will be on his own—no money from the party machine—which means that he will arouse deep sympathies from the voters. The comments we have heard since Saturday support this contention. Republicans themselves have said that they believe Senator WILEY will win the nomination.

ALLEGED IMPROPER CONDUCT BY SENATOR YOUNG

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, early in February of this year the Leader, a North Dakota political publication, leveled some vicious charges against me—charges involving bribery and improper conduct as a Member of the United States Senate.

On May 24, 1956, the Special Committee To Investigate Political Activities, Lobbying, and Campaign Contributions, gave K. W. Simons, the editor of this publication, and Mr. R. C. Nathan, a member of the board of directors, every opportunity to provide evidence in support of their accusations. They both testified under oath that they had no evidence to support their charges.

Nevertheless, K. W. Simons, editor of the Leader, is now claiming through television, radio broadcasts, and otherwise, that I am still guilty of wrongdoing—and, furthermore, that he and Mr. Nathan were not given a fair chance to state their case when they appeared before the Senate committee.

Mr. President, there is a great deal of interest in North Dakota with respect to these vicious, false accusations. I believe the people of my State should have the opportunity of reading the Senate hearing on the charges by the Leader, as well as all of that part of the hearings held by the House Ways and Means Committee in 1952 dealing with the same subject. Neither of these hearings is available to the public at the present time.

I ask unanimous consent to have the complete record of the hearings held on May 24, 1956, by the Senate Special Committee To Investigate Political Activities, Lobbying, and Campaign Contributions inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the transcript of the hearing was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVESTIGATION OF POLITICAL ACTIVITIES, LOBBYING, AND CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

(United States Senate, Special Committee To Investigate Political Activities, Lobbying, and Campaign Contributions, Thursday, May 24, 1956, Washington, D. C.)

The special committee met in executive hearing at 10:30 a. m., pursuant to Senate Resolution 219, agreed to February 22, 1956, in Room 357 of the Senate Office Building, Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat, Arkansas; Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, New Mexico; Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, Massachusetts; Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, New Hampshire; Senator EDWARD J. THYE, Republican, Minnesota; Senator WILLIAM A. PURTELL, Republican, Connecticut; Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, Arizona.

Staff members present: George Morris Fay, chief counsel; John J. McGovern, associate counsel; Paul E. Kamerick, chief investigator; Vivien McConnell, chief clerk.

PROCEEDINGS

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Before we proceed further, the Chair wishes to make a brief statement. I trust the witnesses who are present and their counsel will listen before we proceed with taking of any testimony.

The special committee, at the request of Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, has determined to hear the witnesses in connection with the charge contained in the Leader newspaper that "Young sells out again."

The committee has voted to examine all of the evidence that has any bearing on the issue relating to Senator YOUNG's vote on the Harris-Fulbright bill, particularly any facts or information that would have any relationship to an improper or illegal influencing of the Senator's vote.

This committee at this time is not interested in testimony relating to the old Grunewald matter, which was the subject of public hearings by a subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives in 1952. The testimony concerning that matter is contained in the published volumes of those hearings which are available for examination by anyone interested in it. So that the record may clearly show what this committee is undertaking to inquire into today, I will read into the record at this point the minutes of the meeting at which this hearing was ordered:

"The subject: Senator YOUNG's Request for Hearing.

"After discussion, the following motion was made:

" 'Senator THYE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee proceed to bring the two gentlemen in on this question and that they be interrogated relative to the alleged statement as appears in the headline of this publication inferring an improper or illegal sellout by Senator YOUNG in connection with lobbying on the gas bill.

" 'Senator ANDERSON. I second the motion.

" 'Senator THYE. The chairman stated it well, and I concur in his every expression about how and what we should investigate here. It is only the question as it may relate to the gas bill.

" 'Senator BRIDGES. Senator ANDERSON and I agree on this generally but I think in this case as it affects personally a Senator, it certainly ought to be in executive session, and then we can have a public hearing and we can make our findings and report.

" 'Senator THYE. That is reasonable because the committee will make its determination at that time.

" 'The CHAIRMAN. Will you amend your motion?

" 'Senator THYE. I include that in my motion.

" 'Senator ANDERSON. That is satisfactory.

" 'Senator PURTELL. Do I understand that the motion was that we would hear these men in executive session and at that time determine whether a public session should be held subsequently?

" 'The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.'

"The motion was put to a vote and carried unanimously. The following proxy was read from Senator GOLDWATER: 'I hereby appoint Senator BRIDGES my proxy with full power to vote on the matter of secret hearings re Young.'

"The proxy of Senator GOLDWATER was reported by Senator BRIDGES, and was recorded as voting for the above motion."

Does any Senator wish to add anything here before we proceed? I just made this statement as chairman, and, of course, any member of the committee may make any observation before we proceed.

Senator ANDERSON. Well, I hope nobody tries to rule out some words. The statements of the two individuals who have been asked to come here have already been prepared and they may have something in here relating to the Grunewald case.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not ruled that. I am trying to admonish the witnesses and the interested parties what the nature of this hearing is and what its limitations are.

Senator ANDERSON. That I agree with thoroughly.

The CHAIRMAN. I do think in the beginning of the hearing it is proper for the record to show what the purpose of the hearing is, and what the committee is interested in, and what it proposes to inquire into. Is there any further discussion?

All right, the Chair has in mind that since Senator YOUNG requested this hearing he should be the first witness. If it is agreeable with the committee, Senator YOUNG will now take the witness stand.

Senator, will you be sworn, please? Do you solemnly swear that the evidence you shall give before this Senate Special Committee shall be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Senator YOUNG. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator YOUNG, the Chair has indicated in his preliminary statement and in the reading of the minutes of the meeting that we have granted your request for a hearing to the extent that your request relates to the charge in the Leader that you have "sold out again." Now, that is what we are inquiring into, and I can appreciate that from the nature of the article you may have to refer to some other things as a basis for whatever statement you make.

But I wanted all of the interested parties and the witnesses to understand that this committee is inquiring into the charge that Senator YOUNG "sold out again," as it related primarily, of course, to the gas bill, which is the first order of business of this committee, to inquire into lobbying and improper influence in connection with that legislation.

Senator YOUNG, you have submitted a prepared statement to the committee. If you desire, you may proceed to read it.

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR MILTON R. YOUNG, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Senator YOUNG. First, Mr. Chairman, I would have hoped that the investigation could have been broader, but I will abide by the decision of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. If you observed the Chair's statement, I said "at this time." Now, whether it will ever be broader or not, if it is ever broadened, it will require further action of the committee. It is limited at this particular hearing to that charge and whether it will ever be broadened or not will be a matter of further consideration by the committee.

Senator YOUNG. I hope and feel sure that my statement is in line with that decision.

I deeply appreciate the opportunity to appear before your committee in regard to certain accusations made against me in the Leader, a North Dakota publication. I am delighted that your committee has taken action to investigate these charges.

I have been elected to public office in North Dakota continuously for more than 34 years. During 13 years of this long period, I was a member of the North Dakota State Legislature and for the past 11 years I have been a member of the United States Senate. This marks the first time during all that period of public service that anyone has questioned my honesty and integrity.

A number of years ago I voted for the Kerr natural gas bill. During the present session of Congress I voted for the Fulbright bill dealing with the same subject. I carefully considered both of these measures and I voted my convictions.

On February 9, 1956, the Leader, a North Dakota political paper, in the story dealing with the natural gas bill, carried headlines across its front page reading as follows: "YOUNG sells out again—CASE bribe recalls $5,000 MILT YOUNG got from Dutchman." The CASE referred to in the headlines and the article is, of course, Senator CASE from South Dakota. It should be remembered that on February 9, 1956, there was a great deal of publicity throughout the country in connection with the natural gas bill and the contribution which was offered to Senator CASE and refused by him.

The article in the Leader refers to the Fulbright-Harris bill as a gas-racketeering measure and by plain implication, it indicates that I sold my vote on this bill and that I had previously done the same thing. In March of this year R. C. Nathan, who has been called before this committee, stated at a political meeting at Bismarck: "If you want to see more about the bribe that YOUNG received from the Dutchman Grunewald, you can read it in the Leader."

The facts are these: I have never ever received a bribe from anyone. I do not know Mr. Grunewald. I have never talked with him either personally or on the telephone, and he has never paid me or my campaign committee a single dollar. In 1952 a committee of the House of Representatives went thoroughly into this matter. The testimony there was undisputed. It was to the effect that I had no connections with Grunewald, that I did not even know him, and that he had made no contributions to me or to my campaign committee. All of this is in the printed record and it has been available to the Leader for more than 4 years.

I voted for the Fulbright-Harris measure because I believed that the bill was a proper one. Not a single person, association, or corporation either contributed or offered to contribute to me in connection with the Fulbright-Harris bill. The charges made in the Leader that I had either sold out in the past or that I had sold out in connection with the Fulbright-Harris bill are completely and entirely false.

If the charges made against me were true, I would feel disqualified from further service in the Senate. If they were true, it would be a reflection on the Senate itself. You will recall that during the passage of the legislation authorizing this committee, I spoke on the floor of the Senate and I asked that the charges of the Leader be made your first order of business. It was I who insisted that Mr. Simons and Mr. Nathan be called before your committee to either support their charges or disavow them.

As far as I am concerned, anything that I have done during my 34 years of public life is open and above board. I am perfectly willing that you ask me any questions that occur to you. You can be sure that my answers will be complete and forthright. The charges made against me are false, unscrupulous, and wicked. There is not one iota of truth to them.

If any member of this committee feels that there is the slightest substance to any of these charges, or if any member feels that I have been wrong in any respect, I ask the committee to go into the matter in a most thorough fashion. I offer you my fullest cooperation.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator Young.

The Chair overlooked to inquire if you had counsel present.

Senator YOUNG. Yes; I have.

The CHAIRMAN. If so, will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. VOGEL. For the record, my name is Philip Vogel, and I am a lawyer from Fargo, N. Dak.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator YOUNG, the Chair has indicated that the committee action does not authorize the committee at this time to go into what we term the Grunewald incident. I appreciate that it is necessary for both sides to refer to it from the standpoint of a basis for a discussion and an inquiry into the real crux of this investigation, which is that you sold out again.

Now, you have made a positive statement that your vote in connection with the gas bill was not influenced, as I interpret your statement, by any improper means whatsoever. It was a matter of your judgment and your conviction on the merits of the bill.

Senator YOUNG. That is correct, and I voted for it because I believed in it.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you comment further with respect to any lobbying with you, and I use the term "lobbying" in its commonly accepted sense, of any organization, group, person, or association, corporation representative, or anyone? Did anyone undertake to, in that sense, lobby with you to influence your vote on the gas bill, in any way that could be regarded as an attempt at improper influencing you as a Senator?

Senator YOUNG. No, sir, Mr. Chairman. Not in the slightest—actually not more than 2 or 3 people on either side—that is, the gas people or the gas-consuming companies—ever contacted me at all. I asked to have breakfast with one representative of an oil company myself.

The CHAIRMAN. With whom?

Senator YOUNG. I personally asked—I might as well give you the whole story. Early in this discussion, there was some relation to a pending measure in North Dakota involving a gasline. Amerada Oil Co., one of the major oil companies in the United States, was involved in that. I called up the president and I said, "Sometime when you are in Washington I would like to discuss this issue with you." I wanted more information on the North Dakota situation. He was probably 1 of 2 or 3 that I talked with during all of this period in any respect with respect to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the fact that someone may contact you and ask you to vote for or against a bill, that may be regarded in some quarters as lobbying, and the Constitution may regard it as petitioning the duly elected representatives of Congress. So long as there is no impropriety, and no attempt to coerce, intimidate, or to influence for a consideration, I do not know that there is anything wrong with it. But here is a charge against you that you sold out, and so far as I can interpret the article the "sells out again" is related to the gas bill. I think that it is proper, and I think that you should take advantage of this opportunity to make a full and complete statement with respect to any lobbying with you, or any effort to influence your vote on either side, that could have the slightest suggestion of any impropriety or any illegal attempt to influence you.

Senator YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I would be very happy to do that. I received about as much mail on one side of this issue as I did on the other. As I recall, 2 or 3 people contacted me on behalf of the gas companies, the distributors of gas. Not more than 2 or 3 gas companies or oil companies altogether contacted me. It was only by way of information. Not a single one of them insinuated that they might give me a contribution later—at the present time or later if I voted for it.

Not anyone contacted me until some 2 or 3 weeks before the vote. There is not the slightest evidence any place that any effort was made to influence my vote. In fact, there was less pressure, so far as I was concerned, on this legislation than almost any other legislation which we considered in Congress for many years. Perhaps part of the reason is due to the fact that I voted for the Kerr bill some 5 or 6 years ago, and because of that not many contacted me because they assumed, I suppose, that I would be voting for the Harris-Fulbright bill, a very similar piece of legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator, I think that, if any representative of any association or group that was making a concerted effort to either support the bill or influence votes for the bill, or to influence the votes against the bill, contacted you, it would be well for you to state for the record who contacted you.

Senator YOUNG. As I said, I called Mr. McCullough, president of Amerada Oil—he is general manager or president—and there was an effort to discuss the gasline. The Harris-Fulbright bill, in fact—I do not think that they had too much interest in it. That is true of most of the oil companies doing business in North Dakota. We have—the oil companies there have invested perhaps $200 or $250 million, but we do not have much natural gas there, so that the oil companies quite naturally were not as concerned probably as they were in other areas.

The CHAIRMAN. You initiated the contact in that case?

Senator YOUNG. Yes. There were three other fellows, and I had the names of them. One is with an independent company at Bismarck, N. Dak., and he was in Senator LANGER's office and Senator LANGER called me over to his office to see him. I will supply his name for the record. It is an independent petroleum organization in North Dakota representing the independent people. (Hugh Palmer.)

Now, the only other one that I recall is Charley Simons, from Texas, and I do not know what company he is with. I think he is with an association of companies. I have known him for a good many years. He called me when he was in Washington, and I personally asked him to come to my office.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, you mentioned three. Do you recall any others?

Senator ANDERSON. Could that have been Charley Francis rather than Charley Simons?

Senator YOUNG. No; Charley Simons is an uncle of one of the witnesses here today.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; the Chair will now defer to other members of the committee. Senator Bridges.

Senator BRIDGES. I have no questions.

Senator ANDERSON. Well, I am a little disturbed by the Chair's statement that rules out any questions on this Grunewald matter.

I thought we had had a thorough discussion and while we were not planning to bring it up, Senator YOUNG has brought it up now, and unfortunately all of the material that was said in that meeting cannot be before us, but I stated quite frankly that nobody would ever persuade me under any circumstances that Senator YOUNG had ever taken a bribe, nor any sensible person would ever offer him one, and I think some of the members of the committee will recall it. But I do feel that if a witness comes before this committee and raises a question that we had hoped to leave out of it, that questioning on that is entirely proper.

The CHAIRMAN. The Senator probably misunderstood the Chair. I am not ruling out any question the Senator wants to ask or any statement the witness wants to make. But according to the motion made and the vote taken, this committee was primarily interested in the subject matter of whether he had "sold out again" in connection with the gas bill, because we made the gas bill the order of business.

I stated very clearly in the beginning that whether we would later broaden the hearings to include the Grunewald matter was a matter that addressed itself to the committee.

Senator ANDERSON. The proceedings of that day are not transcribed. If they were to be transcribed, I think that they would indicate that the suggestion was made that if the Grunewald matter arose, that was a matter of official record on which testimony had been taken. It was on that basis that I said that I would be quite willing to leave it out of this discussion if it were not otherwise brought in, because we had full opportunity to go back and examine the House records.

But now Senator YOUNG has said, if I may just read this, "I never received a bribe from anyone." I have already said that I would underwrite that statement myself, being an insurance underwriter.

"I do not know Mr. Grunewald. I have never talked with him either personally or on the telephone, and he has never paid me or my campaign committee a single dollar."

Then subsequently I think that he says, "He has made no contributions to me or to my campaign committee."

Now, a former Member of the United States Senate, when he was then a Senator, under oath testified that Mr. Grunewald did give $5,000 to the Young committee. I simply want to ask Senator YOUNG again if he means by this language, where he says, "He has never paid me or my campaign committee a single dollar," do you mean to state that your campaign committee never received from Grunewald a single dollar?

Senator YOUNG. That is correct. My campaign committee or myself never received a dollar in contributions from Henry Grunewald.

Senator ANDERSON. Could you clear it up or is it something that we do not desire to clear up? What happened to the $5,000 that Brewster testified concerning?

Senator YOUNG. I wonder if the committee would permit me to read into the record the testimony on the House side, because I think that clears it up completely.

Senator ANDERSON. If it is in the record, I do not need it. If the same statement that you make is already in the record, I will be happy to see it. I have never seen it. I only want to say I do not remember what happened, and I was on the Senate floor as I recall it, when somebody came back and said that Senator Brewster had given some sort of statement that involved a loan to the national committee for the purposes of making a campaign contribution to Senator NIXON and to Senator YOUNG. I have been chairman of the Senatorial Campaign Committee for the Democrats and I have been acting chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and I understand that campaign contributions are made and I saw nothing improper in the fact that campaign contributions were made. But I am worried by this plain contradiction. If Senator YOUNG says it is in the record, I am completely satisfied.

The CHAIRMAN. I would suggest, if it is agreeable with the committee, I would suggest that the House hearings, that document of House hearings, be made a document of this committee, an exhibit to this committee for reference.

Is there any objection?

Senator KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, my recollection of our motion on Senator YOUNG's request was that our consideration would be confined solely to the gas bill. Now, I think if we get into the Grunewald matter—and I do not know anything about it, because I was not in the Senate at the time—the representatives of the Leader will give their side of the story, Senator YOUNG will give his side of the story, and the controversy will then be in our laps and this committee will be called upon to make another determination on it. Frankly, that is not the matter before this committee. In my opinion, whether Senator YOUNG brought it up or not—perhaps he should not have brought it up—we now should draw the line and say we are not interested in any degree in the Grunewald matter and confine ourselves solely to the Harris-Fulbright bill.

Senator GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the philosophy of your thesis, but the headline says, "YOUNG sells out again." Now, that means that there must have been another time that the Leader thought he had sold out. I do not think that we can completely disregard the Grunewald matter, although I agree with the chairman that we should not discuss it unless it is brought up as part of the testimony by both Senator YOUNG and the editors of the Leader.

Senator KENNEDY. I do not think it is any of our business. I know the headline, and the "again" referred back to Grunewald, but I do not think this subcommittee or this select committee should get back into that phase of it, because I am afraid that if we do we are going off on a lengthy pursuit, and we will be called upon to make some judgment at the end of it. I do not think that we have the time.

Senator GOLDWATER. I do not think we have to investigate the Grunewald end of it but I do not think that you can drop the name "Grunewald" from these hearings because it is inferred all of the way through the Leader's article and all of the way through the statement of the editors of the Leader too.

Senator KENNEDY. I do not think we should be called upon to make a judgment on that. I think we have so many things to do connected with this job that has been given to us, that to go back into a matter which I understand was thoroughly investigated I think would be a mistake. I think that we should just confine it to the "selling out" charge dealing with the Harris bill.

Senator THYE. Mr. Chairman, if Senator KENNEDY is through, it is obvious that we have a committee report before us because it was handled by one of the staff. I do not know how lengthy the reference would be in the committee report referring to the incident of where Mr. Grunewald's name came into the question relative to the campaign committee of the Senate, of which Senator Brewster then was its chairman. Senator Brewster, if he made available any of this, or made available any funds to the YOUNG campaign—if that is not too lengthy, it would certainly aid me in my thinking if I had exactly what the committee statement was relative to that incident.

The CHAIRMAN. What the Chair had in mind was making it an exhibit for reference, and there was no need to reprint that whole record in our record. That is all I was trying to do, but when you make it a document for reference, it is then before the committee for such consideration and use as it cares to make of it. I am just trying to avoid reprinting the whole record.

Senator ANDERSON. Senator Brewster said at the time in the Senate that, "I have the check which I gave Mr. Grunewald for $10,000. I have copies of the two checks which Mr. Grunewald made to the two individuals who were the ones to handle the fund, $5,000, apiece, 1 to Senator NIXON and 1 to Senator YOUNG." He either did have them or he did not have them. I recognize that this is not an ordinary campaign contribution. This is an advance for a primary. I do not think that there is any mystery about it at all. The money was sent out to his campaign committee because the Republican National Committee—and we all know this to be a fact—would not want to take part in a primary. It would only want to take part after the primary was over, as a national committee, or as a Senatorial campaign committee.

I am very willing to state, as I am sure Senator GOLDWATER would state, since he served as chairman of a campaign committee of the Senate, that that matter arises frequently. Somebody will say, "I want to contribute to his primary," and you say, "I am not in the primary, and I cannot be in the primary. And if you want to send him some money, send it to so-and-so who is his campaign manager."

I think that that is all that happened in this instance.

Senator THYE. Does the record show whose funds were involved in the checks now referred to? My memory is somewhat vague on this, but it seems to me that somehow the funds were a loan. If my memory serves me right, in the Grunewald incident, there was a loan involved in connection with that, and Senator Brewster obtained it as a loan. Therefore, it was not Mr. Grunewald's money. It was a loan which was initiated by Senator Brewster which became a part of the funds going out to finance a primary campaign.

Now, I have not read the record, but my memory seems to bring this back to me.

Senator ANDERSON. I think that is correct. Senator Brewster said, "I went to the bank, and I borrowed $10,000 with the assistance of Mrs. Brewster's endorsement, which was required to make me a good credit risk, at the Liberty National Bank here, where I do my banking. I took the $10,000 and I gave $5,000 to each of these candidates. I did not want to do it directly myself, because I was then chairman of the committee, and I thought it might lead to even more misunderstanding."

Senator THYE. My memory has been refreshed, because that was my recollection of it. Therefore, it was not Grunewald's money that was involved.

Senator ANDERSON. I agree completely. He said, "I had known Mr. Grunewald for a good while, and I had understood he was more or less a Democrat although he, I think, gave one contribution of $1,000 to a Republican candidate." I might skip a couple of lines. "So I spoke to Mr. Grunewald and asked him whether he would arrange as a conduit for the transaction. I gave him the $10,000. He made out two checks for $5,000 each to these two individuals or to their campaign committee and in the course of time, for which I was profoundly grateful, they were nominated."

Senator THYE. That is my recollection, also. I thought that is what the incident was, and you are reading the record of the committee hearing.

Senator ANDERSON. My question to Senator Young was directed to that point. There was $5,000 sent to his campaign, and he recognized it as coming from the national committee and not from Mr. Grunewald, and he subsequently found that Mr. Grunewald was merely the transmission line.

Senator YOUNG. That is different from what you said a while ago, that I received a contribution from Grunewald. I did not receive a contribution from Grunewald.

Senator ANDERSON. I am trying to say that the contribution came through the hands of Mr. Grunewald. That is all I am trying to say. If that is not correct, then Senator Brewster—what is the polite term?—under oath to the committee made a misstatement.

Senator YOUNG. That is correct, that he used, unfortunately, Mr. Grunewald as a conduit to send the funds out to me. I never heard of Grunewald at that time, and I never heard of him until 6 or 8 months afterward, and I never saw the check. The check was mailed to someone handling funds for a committee for me in North Dakota. Had I seen the check, the name "Grunewald" would not have meant anything to me.

Senator ANDERSON. It would not have meant anything to me.

Senator GOLDWATER. I might say to bear out what Senator ANDERSON has said, that that practice not only has gone on, but it goes on today, and it is a very necessary part of financing campaigns. Many, many people come to me, some Democrats even, I am happy to say, and say, "I would like to get some money into Senator X's campaign." We tell them that it is a primary problem and we are not interested in the primary, and we keep out of it. But if he is interested in getting the money into it, we suggest that he see so-and-so, who would be very glad to handle it. That comes up on both sides of the aisle, and it is one of the ways that money is channeled around into the primaries, and it will happen in the general elections, too.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair make a suggestion that will probably solve this for the present and expedite these proceedings.

I suggest that we proceed to interrogate the witnesses in the way of cross-examining them on anything that they present in their statements. This is an executive hearing, but the motion was, and the Chair understood, and the minutes reflect—and I never read the minutes until yesterday afternoon—that the committee's purpose was to be limited to make a determination as to the question, "Did YOUNG sell out again?" That is what I thought we were going into.

Now the committee can at any time, after it hears this testimony in executive session, if it wishes to, initiate a full-scale investigation into the first time that he was alleged to have sold out. But for this hearing, the committee is seeking information that will help it to determine whether he sold out again.

Senator BRIDGES. I think Senator ANDERSON has now clarified for the benefit of the committee what transpired, which has been confirmed by Senator YOUNG. Therefore, I now agree with Senator KENNEDY that we should proceed on the issue at hand, rather than the other.

Senator ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I agree completely with Senator BRIDGES. However, if this record was subsequently made public, I did not want somebody to say that Senator YOUNG made a statement that he never received any money from Mr. Grunewald, when the record is here in the House. Senator YOUNG's statement is completely clear now, and I am satisfied with it. That is all I was trying to do. I do not want to sit on this committee and have somebody say that "He has not sense enough to ask a question," when something seems to be contradictory. I understood the situation perfectly at the time it was explained to me in complete detail, and I had, I might say, an interest in it because I was active as chairman of a campaign committee and I wanted to know exactly what was done in that particular transaction.

Senator THYE. Mr. Chairman, before we proceed, may the record reflect the vote as cast in the Senate on the Harris-Fulbright Act. Actually, the yeas were 53, and Senator YOUNG was one voting yea, and the nays were 38, and I, a member of this committee, was among those voting nay on that bill. Then the official CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflects "not voting, 5."

Senator ANDERSON. I think far more important would be to read the vote of the Kerr natural-gas bill, which came several years previously. I have known Senator YOUNG a long time and he is not a man that it is easy to get him to change his mind. I have been trying my best to educate him agriculturally for a long time and I have had miserable luck.

Senator THYE. I have been endeavoring to change your views for a number of years, and I have been likewise unsuccessful.

Senator PURTELL. I think we are far afield.

The CHAIRMAN. Does anyone make a motion that the vote on either bill or both bills be incorporated in the record at this point?

Senator BRIDGES. I so move.

Senator GOLDWATER. I so second.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the Fulbright-Harris bill and the Kerr bill. The vote as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on both the Harris-Fulbright bill at this session of Congress, and the vote on the Kerr gas bill, I do not know it by number, without objection, will be incorporated in the record at this point. (See Kerr gas bill vote reported in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD March 29, 1950; Harris-Fulbright vote reported in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD February 6, 1956.)

The CHAIRMAN. Now, the matter the Chair suggested a while ago about making this document over here an exhibit for reference has not been acted on. We can proceed, and in the course of the hearings, if anyone thinks favorably of that suggestion, we can do that.

Senator ANDERSON. I will move that the suggestion of the chairman be followed, that it be made an exhibit for reference.

Senator PURTELL. I second the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that part of part 4 of the hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, 82d Congress, 2d session, on Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws, relating to the subcommittee's investigation of the so-called Grunewald-YOUNG incident, shall be made an exhibit for reference for this committee.

All right, are there any questions? Senator THYE?

Senator THYE. I have none.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator KENNEDY?

Senator KENNEDY. Are you a candidate for election this year?

Senator YOUNG. Yes; I am.

Senator KENNEDY. At the time the gas bill was up before the Congress, had a committee been organized to receive funds on your behalf for the election?

Senator YOUNG. Well, yes and no. The committee that I had 6 years ago was still in being and it was carried over.

Senator KENNEDY. And what is the title of that committee?

Senator YOUNG. The La Moure County Young for Senator Committee.

Senator KENNEDY. That committee was in continuous operation since 1950?

Senator YOUNG. Well, they had not gone out of existence. We reorganized it only about 3 weeks ago, and the membership was a little bit different.

Senator KENNEDY. Had they received any campaign contributions for the 1956 election before the Harris bill was considered in the Senate?

Senator YOUNG. Not to my knowledge; no.

Senator KENNEDY. You do not know whether they received any contributions from anyone connected on either side of this issue?

Senator YOUNG. I know this to be true, that they received no contributions from any oil company or anyone outside of the State because I asked them to notify me any time a contribution from someone outside of the State was offered to them.

Senator KENNEDY. You do not know how much money they have been able to raise prior to the Harris bill or since this?

Senator YOUNG. I do not think any.

Senator KENNEDY. And since the Harris bill?

Senator YOUNG. Since then?

Senator KENNEDY. Let me be more specific. Since the passage of the Harris bill, there has been no contribution from anyone who would have any interest pro and con in this bill to your knowledge?

Senator YOUNG. That is right. All we have raised altogether since then is $500.

Senator KENNEDY. I see. That is all.

Senator PURTELL. I do not want to belabor the point, but since the testimony at the House hearing indicated that Mr. Grunewald was a conduit, I gather that that was your interpretation, and was that the reason, therefore, that you stated that "He made no contributions to me or my campaign committee"? You considered that what action he took was that of a conduit or perhaps as a messenger. Was that your thinking, or what was your thinking?

Senator YOUNG. That is correct. I think the House committee went into that fully. The testimony there indicated very clearly that Senator Brewster and his wife borrowed the money at the bank, and, unfortunately, they used Mr. Grunewald as a conduit and he sent the check to the Fargo, N. Dak., campaign, and in the fall when my regular $5,000 contribution was made by the Republican senatorial campaign committee, this $5,000 was returned. So there could not possibly be any contribution on the part of Grunewald.

Senator PURTELL. That is all.

Senator GOLDWATER. I have a few questions. Do you recall a full-page ad that was run in the local papers here by the UAW–CIO prior to the consideration of this bill?

Senator YOUNG. Yes; I do.

Senator GOLDWATER. Urging people to write their Senators against it? Do you know if the Leader ran a similar ad?

Senator YOUNG. No; I do not. I would be surprised if they did not, though.

Senator GOLDWATER. Do you know of any North Dakota papers that ran that ad?

Senator YOUNG. I would not know that without checking it, Senator.

Senator GOLDWATER. No, you said in your statement that you had received a large amount of mail pro and con.

Senator YOUNG. Yes, sir.

Senator GOLDWATER. Would you have any way of recalling when this movement of mail started? Did it start prior to the running of this ad, or did it start after the ad?

Senator YOUNG. After the running of the ad. That is when most of the out-of-State mail came.

Senator GOLDWATER. I am talking only of your State mail.

Senator YOUNG. Well, it ran about the same all of the time. I think the great majority of my mail was for the natural-gas bill.

Senator GOLDWATER. Would you say that you received an unusual amount of North Dakota mail on this measure?

Senator YOUNG. About average for an important controversial measure.

Senator GOLDWATER. But there would not be anything unusual in the amount of mail that you received from North Dakota?

Senator YOUNG. No.

Senator GOLDWATER. But did you receive a lot of mail from all over the country?

Senator YOUNG. Most of the out-of-State mail was against the measure.

Senator GOLDWATER. Would you say that you received more mail from out of State than you received from in the State?

Senator YOUNG. About the same amount.

Senator GOLDWATER. Did these letters use figures and statements that would lead you

to believe they came from the UAW-CIO ad?

Senator YOUNG. They used about the same argument, and it would indicate that they got all of their information from that ad.

Senator GOLDWATER. Now, I have just one other question. You voted for the Kerr bill when it was up, and have you ever had occasion in your public utterances in North Dakota to allude to that fact that you voted for it?

Senator YOUNG. Yes. The Kerr bill became an issue in my election 6 years ago, and it was referred to by many of the opposition candidates.

Senator GOLDWATER. So that the people of your State knew where Senator YOUNG stood on the matter of Federal control of gas at the wellhead.

Senator YOUNG. That is correct.

Senator GOLDWATER. They had the opportunity to know.

Senator YOUNG. Surely, because it was an issue in the last campaign.

Senator GOLDWATER. Did the Leader, at the time that you made these statements to the people of your State, comment on it?

Senator YOUNG. No, they did not.

Senator GOLDWATER. Did any of the press of your State comment on your stand against Federal control of the gas at the wellhead?

Senator YOUNG. Yes, many newspapers did. In fact I had a running controversy with the Public Service Commission, and the majority of the Public Service Commission was opposed to the Fulbright-Harris bill, and an exchange of letters was published in the North Dakota newspapers. That was some 2 or 3 weeks before the vote.

Senator GOLDWATER. The date of the Kerr bill slips my mind. Was that 6 years ago?

Senator ANDERSON. Yes, approximately. I think it was 1950.

Senator YOUNG. I think it was previous to the last election because the question was raised in my last election.

Senator GOLDWATER. The people, when they went to the polls in North Dakota, the people who elected you know that Candidate Young was against Federal control of the gas at the wellhead.

Senator YOUNG. That is correct; and everything I have said since that time was along the same line. I have always been opposed to that kind of control. I believe firmly that the Fulbright-Harris bill, among other things—and I so stated—would return more control of the gas and oil industry to the people of our State. We are an oil-producing State, not much gas, but quite a little oil.

Senator GOLDWATER. The reason for that question was that many of us in our campaigns have made public statements either for or against Federal control of this or that. You made the statement in your last campaign that you were against the Federal control of gas at the wellhead. So that the people, when they went to the polls, knew exactly where you stood.

Senator YOUNG. Yes, sir, and I went so far as to say that I did not believe the oil business was an illegal and dishonorable business in North Dakota.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions?

Senator KENNEDY. It is your understanding of the words in their statement which they printed that it explained that their words "sell out" were in reference to selling out the interests of the people of that State. They disagreed with the position that you had taken. It is your understanding that in making the charge "sell out," they were charging you received financial or other considerations for your vote. You make that distinction?

Senator YOUNG. That is correct, Senator. If they had only been referring to a sellout of a vote, as it is sometimes referred to, I would have paid no attention to it. In fact, there have been many charges leveled against me during my many years in politics, and I paid no attention to them, or I would say little attention to them. But I felt these charges ran to my honesty and integrity, and were the kind of charges that I could not ignore. I checked with some of the top lawyers in my State and they all said it was a clear reference to a bribe.

Senator KENNEDY. Are you planning or have you initiated litigation in this matter?

Senator YOUNG. No; I have not. Through my attorney, I have served papers asking for a retraction.

Senator KENNEDY. Was the retraction that was printed the retraction that you asked for or was it claimed to be by the Leader?

Senator YOUNG. Well, there was no answer in writing, and they published something and you have seen that.

Senator KENNEDY. You did not accept that as a retraction?

Senator Young. No; I did not.

Senator KENNEDY. And you have received no answer to your request for a retraction directly from them, nor have your attorneys?

Senator YOUNG. That is correct; no answer whatever.

Senator BRIDGES. I have one question. When you voted for the Kerr natural gas bill, were you accused of selling out at that time by this paper or by anybody else?

Senator YOUNG. Well, yes; there were were some references in the campaign to "YOUNG sold out to the oil companies or the gas companies," but it was in no way associated with a bribe.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions?

Thank you very much, Senator YOUNG.

Mr. K. W. Simons, come around, please sir.

Mr. Simons, will you be sworn? Do you solemnly swear that the evidence you shall give before this special Senate committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. SIMONS. I do.

TESTIMONY OF KENNETH WILLIAM SIMONS, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, JOHN H. SCHAFER, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Simons, will you state your name, your place of residence, and occupation for the record?

Mr. SIMONS. My name is Kenneth William Simons, and my place of permanent residence is 811 Mandan Street, Bismarck, N. Dak., and my occupation is high-school teacher.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Simons, you have a prepared statement which you submitted to the committee, within the rule, some 48 hours before this hearing. The Chair may say he has read your prepared statement as he has read Senator YOUNG's prepared statement, and has advised counsel before any conversation was had here, that the Chair had in mind to permit the full prepared statements to be read. So if you choose to do so, you may read your statement. Before you do, the Chair would like to have counsel identify himself for the record at this point.

Mr. SCHAFER. John H. Schafer, of Washington, D. C.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, Mr. Schafer.

You may proceed if you choose to read your statement in full.

Mr. SIMONS. Before the United States Senate Select Committee on Lobbying and Campaign Contributions. Statement of K. W. Simons, Bismarck, N. Dak., appearing under subpena.

My preliminary statement:

My name is K. W. Simons, 811 Mandan Street, Bismarck, N. Dak. I have been associated in the editing and publication of The Leader, a political newspaper owned and controlled by The Leader Publishing Co., a North Dakota corporation, for a period in excess of 1½ years last past.

During the debates in the Senate on the natural gas measure interested stockholders of The Leader stated to me, as volunteer copywriter and editor, that they believed this was a proper time to issue an article revealing the contrast between the candor and open frankness of Senator FRANCIS CASE of South Dakota and the absence of candor on the part of Senator MILTON YOUNG, in regard to substantial political contributions.

Senator CASE learned of the receipt by political friends of $2,500. Senator CASE, after reasonable time for inquiry, returned this contribution, and made a full statement of the facts surrounding this contribution on the floor of the United States Senate before the press, fellow Senators and heavily packed galleries.

In preparation of this article, copies of which I understand your committee has received, I did necessary research to refresh my memory about a $5,000 contribution received by the personal representative and campaign manager of Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, of North Dakota.

I diligently searched for any statement to the press or public or in any Senate proceeding to learn whether or not Senator YOUNG at any time after the 10th of May 1950, and before March 13, 1952, had revealed the source of this contribution and whether or not it had been returned to the contributor.

I found no such public statement. It is my belief that there is no such evidence of such a public statement by the junior Senator from North Dakota.

Statement of facts

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG has occupied a seat in the United States Senate since March of 1945.

During 1949 the United States Senate directed one of its major committees to inquire into reports that an attempt had been made to tap a telephone of the former Senator Bailey, of North Carolina. The hearings of this committee, executive and public sessions, revealed that a well known Washington personality (the Dutchman), Henry Grunewald, had taken part in or was guilty of complicity in this invasion of Senator Bailey's personal and public communications.

A major Washington newspaper, reported to me to be the Washington Post, ran a prominently displayed series of articles during or after these hearings in its newspaper.

It is our position that Senator YOUNG could not have been without knowledge of the prominence and character of Grunewald. Reasonable men most certainly will not differ with this reasonable assumption.

Nevertheless, Senator YOUNG received and made use of $5,000, contributed to his 1950 primary campaign fund, by Henry (the Dutchman) Grunewald. This money was received in the form of a personal check drawn upon the personal account of Grunewald in the Munsey Trust Co., Washington, D. C. The check was dated on or about May 9, 1950, and was deposited to the account of Senator YOUNG's campaign fund at the Dakota National Bank at Fargo, N. Dak., a few days thereafter.

There is nothing in any record, transcript or proceeding that I can discover, revealing that this substantial contribution was refused and returned.

Senator YOUNG did not make any statement about this money and its contributor during his primary campaign in 1950, nor during the fall campaign of the same year.

In November 1950, Senator YOUNG was reelected to the United States Senate.

There is no record, transcript, or proceeding which I am able to discover, revealing that Senator YOUNG made public this $5,000 received from Grunewald.

The junior North Dakota Senator had no comment to make upon this matter until some time during the month of April 1952.

His statement on the subject of this contribution was not prompted by his own voluntary act; the statement that he made was a result of newspaper reporters inquiring after the testimony of Joseph Stearns, Washington, D. C., before the House of Representatives King committee, revealed that this money had been paid to Senator YOUNG and Senator RICHARD NIXON. Joseph Stearns was testifying as personal accountant of Henry (the Dutchman) Grunewald. His testimony is revealed in part 4 of the hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, 82d Congress, 2d session.

These same proceedings contain the testimony of Senator Owen Brewster, then United States Senator from Maine. Senator Brewster's testimony reveals the fact, unequivocally stated, that Henry (the Dutchman) Grunewald contributed $5,000 to the primary campaign of Senator YOUNG and Senator RICHARD NIXON on or about the 9th of May 1950.

The February 9, 1956, issue of the Leader contained a front page article which conveyed and intended to convey that Senator YOUNG, in belief of the Leader, and myself as volunteer editor, had failed to serve the proper interests of North Dakota voters in his vote on the natural gas bill, failed in his duty to North Dakota voters in his votes upon other legislative matters, and had failed, in contrast to the more laudable conduct of Senator CASE, to reveal to his constituency the receipt by him of a campaign contribution 100 percent in excess of the amount received by Senator CASE at and during the time that he was placing himself before the voters as a candidate for a high public office bearing with it a trust and requiring a sense of responsibility of the highest order.

This was the import of the articles to which Senator YOUNG on February 18, 1956, took exception and at which time he announced, through all of the daily newspapers, raido, and television stations in North Dakota, that he had appointed counsel, consulted with them, and elected his remedy to sue in a North Dakota court.

Thereafter, on about the 29th day of February 1956, the junior Senator, through his attorneys, served a demand for retraction upon all members of the board of directors of the Leader Publishing Co.

This demand, under North Dakota law, is a statutory prerequisite to commencement of suit for libel. This committee is well aware that Senator YOUNG, on the 22d day of February 1956, made a specific request on the floor of the United States Senate, that he be permitted to appear before this committee.

This committee should take note that the Senator, after asking the majority leader of the Senate for a promise that this matter be "the first one this committee investigate" had his attorney serve the demand for retraction on the Leader board members.

It is our contention that the junior Senator from North Dakota, by his own actions, has waived his right, or his privilege, to come before your committee.

It is further our position, without any intent of disrespect to the United States Senate, or to your committee, that our appearance here is, or may be, in derogation of our right to a single, separate defense before a North Dakota civil court to the charge of libel leveled against the Leader Publishing Co.

We are aware that Senator YOUNG, on February 18, 1956, stated to the press, in such words as to constitute an admission, that $5,000 had been received and used in his 1950 primary campaign, and the identity of the contributor was revealed as Henry (the Dutchman) Grunewald.

On April 16, 1956, we are also aware the junior Senator from North Dakota announced that he would not sue the Leader Publishing Co.

On May 19, 1956, Senator YOUNG stated in a published telegram to the Leader: "Your charge that I received a $5,000 contribution from Henry Grunewald is false."

Your committee, as well as the Leader Publishing Co., must be in doubt as to Senator YOUNG's real intentions. We do not know what use he intends to make of my testimony, or that of any other witness who may appear in this hearing before your committee.

We believe it is incumbent upon your committee to seriously consider, and in the interest of simple civil justice, refuse to permit the Senator to make any statement on this record bearing on the issues set out in the Notice to Retract.

If this committee, however, sees fit to conduct a hearing into this dispute and the impending lawsuit which the Leader Publishing Co. must at all times be prepared to defend, we then most seriously and sincerely request and urge your committee to make available to all parties those records, exhibits, and witnesses requested in our communication to your chairman of May 16, 1956.

We are not dissuaded in our position as to the scope of this hearing by the recent publicity releases in which Senator YOUNG subverts his own original purpose in appearing before this committee by belatedly charging that the Leader accused him of accepting a bribe.

There has been no such allegation in any statement on the part of the Leader Publishing Co.

In summary, we assure this committee that Senator YOUNG and the Leader Publishing Co. can receive full and fair treatment at the hands of North Dakota jurors and judges. We are prepared to rely upon these normal instruments of justice. In North Dakota, as we believe is true of this committee, the truth is an absolute defense.

Senator YOUNG knows this is true. We are certain that he is prepared to let the truth be known and abide by the verdict of a North Dakota jury.

If after such lawsuit, or if this committee proceeds with a full review of the facts involved in this case, it is found that Senator YOUNG failed to exercise proper judgment and maintain open frankness with the voters of his State, we believe that he should be retired from public life.

If these facts are found to be true, after a full hearing here upon all the contents of the article to which he took exception, we believe that he should resign his endorsement for reelection to this, the highest legislative body in the world, and permit the voters of the State of North Dakota to exercise their electoral preference for some other candidate or candidates.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Simons. In the Chair's opening statement, we tried to make it clear as to what the committee had determined it was interested in. As to the Grunewald incident, the committee would have jurisdiction to investigate it if it decided to do so.

This investigation at the present time is primarily related to the so-called Harris-Fulbright gas bill, and to your statement, the statement in big headlines in the February 9, 1956, issue of your paper, the Leader, Bismarck, N. Dak.: "Young Sells Out Again."

(The article referred to is as follows:)

[From the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Leader of February 9, 1956]

"YOUNG SELLS OUT AGAIN—CASE BRIBE RECALLS $5,000 MILT YOUNG GOT FROM DUTCHMAN

"MILT YOUNG, the junior Senator from North Dakota, has carved a nice political niche for himself by playing off both sides against each other.

"Although a Republican, he has made great public pretense of blasting Brother Benson and his collapsible price-supports system. Meanwhile, behind the scene he plays footsie with Benson and Benson's boys pausing occasionally to step into the limelight with praise for Eisenhower—never bothering to mention, of course, that it was Eisenhower who appointed Benson in the first place and that it is only at the pleasure of Eisenhower that Benson remains in office.

"As a result of all this clever political footwork, some well-meaning but not-too-well-informed people have gotten the idea that Milt is a liberal and for the common man and the farmer.

"Every now and then, though, Milt is forced to show his colors. Like this week, for example, when he announced the would vote for the Fulbright-Harris bill to exempt natural gas producers from regulation by the Federal Power Commission, a bill that will cost gas consumers a cool six-hundred-million-plus if it passes. BILL LANGER is going to vote no on the same measure.

"Milt knows the gas gouge bill is a hot one, particularly for a Senator faced with a tough fight to keep his seat, so in announcing how he was going to vote he laid down a smokescreen of pious declarations about how failure to pass the Fulbright-Harris bill would take away from the North Dakota Public Service Commission its right to regulate gas prices. In so doing, Milt brazenly ignored the majority declaration of the PSC that defeat of the Fulbright-Harris gas racketeering measure would help, not hinder, the PSC in protecting the public interest.

"But facts like these never bother Milt, who is certain the public's memory is so short and the integrity of the North Dakota press so rotten that he is not likely to be tripped up on his contradictions, misrepresentations, and outright lies.

"Now a new twist has come along to plague Milt. Senator CASE of South Dakota has been offered a $2,500 bribe by the wealthy, influence-buying oil and gas lobby. This sent the Washington press corps to ask the other Senators who are not opposed to Fulbright-Harris bill if they, too, have been offered bribes. For the sake of the record, the press boys asked the same question of those Senators who oppose the measure, but this was strictly procedural because the reporters know the real graft is to be found among the stooges of the oil and gas lobby.

"According to the Associated Press, YOUNG replied 'No, certainly not' when asked Saturday if he had ever been approached about a campaign contribution in return for his support of the oil and gas racketeers.

"THE DUTCHMAN PAYS

"But to YOUNG as well as a lot of North Dakotans, it brought back memories of 1950, when Henry 'The Dutchman' Grunewald, convicted king of the five percenters, slipped $5,000 to Milt to help him finance his last campaign.

"YOUNG didn't have the honesty to tell the voters of North Dakota about that money. The story didn't come out in the open until a year after Milt had been elected to his current term and 'The Dutchman' was in the process of being indicted and convicted for influence peddling, which is the polite phrase for bribery.

"If he is to stand any chance of keeping his Senate seat, YOUNG is going to have to do some fast explaining to the electorate as to what the story is behind that $5,000—'The Dutchman' slipped him, as well as about other facets of his political life."

Now, Senator YOUNG has construed that as meaning that he had accepted a bribe. I believe there was some statement made by one of your associates, some public statement that has been referred to, and possibly is in another paper, from your State, in which the word "bribe" is used in connection with the Grunewald case.

If you did not intend to imply that a bribe was involved by this big headline, "YOUNG Sells Out Again," what interpretation do you place upon that headline?

Mr. SIMONS. Chairman MCCLELLAN, out in North Dakota, the term "political sellout" is bandied about quite often, and I have heard Senator LANGER on many occasions use the phrase "political sellout" and most recently I believe at Raleigh, N. Dak., a little less than a year ago. We have never accused Senator YOUNG of accepting a bribe from anyone. We charged clearly, and I think our explanation in the subsequent issue there, the message to MILTON YOUNG whichever issue that is——

The CHAIRMAN. You say that you have never charged that Senator YOUNG took a bribe?

Mr. SIMONS. It is in our issue of Thursday, March 1, 1956. I think we make it clear that we have never accused Senator YOUNG of accepting a bribe.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you now accuse him of having accepted a bribe?

Mr. SIMONS. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. At any time?

Mr. SIMONS. At any time.

The CHAIRMAN. You have never wished to convey that impression to the readers of your paper?

Mr. SIMONS. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know any way that you could come nearer doing it?

Mr. SIMONS. You say do I know of any way?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, except to say in bold headlines "YOUNG Takes a Bribe." Is there anything nearer an approach to saying "YOUNG Takes a Bribe" then saying "YOUNG Sells Out Again"?

Mr. SIMONS. I don't agree that those are the same things.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know any nearer approach that could be interpreted, any statement that you could make short of saying "YOUNG Takes a Bribe," other than the one you used, "YOUNG Sells Out Again"? Is there anything in between the two?

Mr. SIMONS. Is there any difference between the two?

The CHAIRMAN. No. Is there any borderline between the two that you could identify?

Mr. SIMONS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Any other terms

Mr. SIMONS. Yes, sir; I feel definitely.

The CHAIRMAN. Other than "YOUNG Sells Out Again"?

Mr. SIMONS. I feel definitely there is a difference between saying "YOUNG Sells Out Again" and saying "YOUNG Takes a Bribe." I think there is all of the difference in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. You think that there is all of the difference in the world?

Mr. SIMONS. That is correct, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything in that borderline of difference that you can identify?

Mr. SIMONS. It is a little difficult to sit here and try to spell it out. It all depends upon what term or what your definition of "sell out" is. In North Dakota it is quite different.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know the definition of "sellout"?

Mr. SIMONS. I don't believe I have ever looked it up in the dictionary.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I think an editor should have some responsibility in that regard. According to the dictionary I have in my office, Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, "sell out" means to part with by sale, to dispose of wholly or entirely, as an example, "he had sold out his corn." That is one example.

"No. 2, to sell up, to sell the goods of the debtor in order to pay his debts from the proceeds."

"No. 3, slang, to barter for a compensation, the cause or associates with whom one is identified." As an example, "to sell one's commission in the army."

"No. 5, exchanges, to sell in open market stocks or commodities for one who fails to make good his margin. Purchase or obligation in respect of them, charging him with any deficit. Also, to sell the stock or goods of a person in this way."

Now, what connotation do you put on the term "sellout" when you use that as a charge against a public official?

Mr. SIMONS. In North Dakota, sir, when one politician charges another politician with "selling out," what is clearly meant, and I think it is clearly understood by everyone in North Dakota, it is meant selling out the best interests of the public.

The CHAIRMAN. When you use the term "sellout" in this instance, and then immediately referred to the Grunewald incident, did you mean the Grunewald incident was another sellout?

Mr. SIMONS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you mean "again," and when was the other time that you say he sold out?

Mr. SIMONS. There have been a number of instances, and I believe we outlined it here, on the Taft-Hartley Act, it was Senator YOUNG, as I understand it, who was called back to the floor of the Senate and cast the deciding vote on the Taft-Hartley Act that put it on the books.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you refer to everyone who votes contrary to your views as "selling out"?

Mr. SIMONS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you regard everyone who voted in favor of the Taft-Hartley Act as "selling out"?

Mr. SIMONS. The public interest?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. SIMONS. Definitely.

The CHAIRMAN. You think everybody who disagrees with you on these issues is a "sell-outer"?

Mr. SIMONS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean?

Mr. SIMONS. Well, I say that when the issue is clearly drawn, there is room for honest political difference.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you accord to others that right to have an honest difference of opinion?

Mr. SIMONS. Well, I tend to be a little narrow about some things, perhaps, in the minds of a great many people.

I would draw a closer interpretation. For instance, I don't think there is anybody here that feels that there is any question, for example, that totalitarianism is inferior to democracy. I think we are all agreed on that. Likewise, I think in my estimation, I realize that in a sense there is room for honest difference of opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. In a sense?

Mr. SIMONS. On a matter such as Taft-Hartley and on the Fulbright-Harris bill, but as far as I was concerned, it was a clear sell-out on the part of anyone who voted for the Fulbright-Harris bill.

The CHAIRMAN. You meant to convey that to your readers.

Mr. SIMONS. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. And you now take the position that you did not mean that he received some compensation, some consideration for his vote?

Mr. SIMONS. I take the position that I had no knowledge of any compensation to Senator YOUNG on any vote whatsoever.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, what did you refer to, or why did you refer to the Grunewald incident to support the headline charge that he sells out again?

Mr. SIMONS. Well, originally the headline didn't read "Young Sells Out Again". Let me tell you what happened.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. SIMONS. Let me explain what happened there.

Originally, the Leader has a reputation of being a hell-raising newspaper for 40 years. The original headline on it read "YOUNG for Oil Trust", and I decided that it didn't have enough punch, and I re-wrote the head in to "YOUNG Sells Out Again". Frankly, I can assure you at the time that the full impact of the tieup, I wasn't even looking at that drop head on it when I wrote that banner. I was in a hurry and it was late Sunday evening. I work for the Leader on weekends and I do not get paid, and I never received a dime in salary from the Leader, and I think about $50 expense money in the past year. I spent a lot more than that, I might add.

It was late in the afternoon, I was in a hurry, and I decided that the headline "YOUNG for Oil Trust" didn't have enough punch to it, and so I rewrote it in "YOUNG Sells Out Again".

The CHAIRMAN. You spoke of your paper as having a reputation of being a hell-raising paper. Is that correct?

Mr. SIMONS. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it hell-raising at the expense of people's character and reputation? Is that what you mean?

Mr. SIMONS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You were trying to destroy Senator YOUNG's character and reputation by this article.

Mr. SIMONS. Well, the newspaper is not favorably disposed toward Senator YOUNG.

The CHAIRMAN. I did not ask you that. But this headline, you said to make it more vicious, or to use your expression, to have a bigger "punch", was the purpose of it to try to destroy his character and reputation by casting the strongest implication you could that he had sold out and taken a bribe, without actually using the word "bribe"?

Mr. SIMONS. It was not.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the purpose?

Mr. SIMONS. Our purpose was frankly to politically embarrass Senator YOUNG.

The CHAIRMAN. To politically embarrass him?

Mr. SIMONS. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. You used a term that carried an implication that you now refute, so that you might publicly embarrass a United States Senator, is that true?

Mr. SIMONS. We sought to politically embarrass him.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that your type of journalism?

Mr. SIMONS. I would say that generally speaking, the Leader tries to keep its copy fairly punchy, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That is your explanation of it as of now, that you did not mean to infer or imply that Senator YOUNG had taken a bribe?

Mr. SIMONS. At no time whatsoever has the Leader ever accused, or has the Leader or I personally ever accused Senator YOUNG of accepting any bribe whatsoever.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the fact that you must know, and I will ask you if you don't know, that that headline did carry with it a connotation that Senator YOUNG had accepted a bribe, don't you know that it did among your readers?

Mr. SIMONS. Not in North Dakota, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that no one in North Dakota thought you were charging him with taking a bribe?

Mr. SIMONS. I won't say no one, but in North Dakota the term "political sell out," it is one of Senator LANGER's favorite phrases.

The CHAIRMAN. There are charges of bribery, and so that is not anything new, to say someone took a bribe, but the question is what you intended to convey by this article, and what this headline did convey.

Mr. SIMONS. I intended to convey that Senator YOUNG has sold out the public interest, a quite common way of stating the case in North Dakota when a person votes contrary to the way you feel he should have voted.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, would the taking of a contribution from Grunewald, your reference to that, to support your view—would

you regard that again as a sellout or as a bribe?

Mr. SIMONS. I would not regard it as either, and I would regard it as a campaign contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is Mr. Nathan?

Mr. SIMONS. We have never charged, Senator, that the Grunewald matter was——

The CHAIRMAN. Who is Mr. R. C. Mahon?

Senator KENNEDY. What is the end of the statement?

Mr. SIMONS. Certainly, Senator KENNEDY. We have never charged that the money that Senator YOUNG received from Mr. Grunewald was a bribe or a sellout, either one.

The CHAIRMAN. Here is another paper, and that is the Tribune, published in Bismarck. Are you familiar with that paper?

Mr. SIMONS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I quote from an article in that paper on Wednesday, March 28, 1956. It says, "At Tuesday night's advisory council meeting, R. C. Nathan, Jamestown, a member of the board of directors of the Leader, official league newspaper, leveled a direct charge of bribe against United States Senator MILTON R. YOUNG. Referring to the controversy between YOUNG and the Leader, Nathan asserted that he was sure YOUNG was bluffing in his threat to file a libel action against the Leader. YOUNG was bluffing and we have called his bluff,' Nathan told the county chairmen and spectators.

"He invited leaguers to read the Leader to 'see more about' the contribution of $5,000 he alleged YOUNG had received from one Henry 'The Dutchman' Grunewald, which he referred to as a bribe."

Now, what do you say about that? Is that article correct or is it true?

Mr. SIMONS. That article? I have no knowledge of that article whatsoever.

The CHAIRMAN. What has Mr. Nathan's association with your paper been?

Mr. SIMONS. Mr. Nathan is a member of the board of directors.

The CHAIRMAN. Of the board of directors of the paper?

Mr. SIMONS. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. If Nathan made that statement, and if that statement is true, wasn't a member of the board of directors referring to the Grunewald incident as a bribe? And didn't your leadline "YOUNG Sells Out Again" refer to another bribe?

Mr. SIMONS. Well, with respect to the forepart of your statement, there, if that statement is true, as reported in the Bismarck Tribune, which Mr. Nathan comes here prepared to state is not true, and not an accurate quotation of him, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. If that statement was made, then that would indicate that it was the intent of your paper and the article you published to charge that YOUNG had accepted another bribe.

Mr. SIMONS. Well, Mr. Nathan would have to speak for himself on that.

The CHAIRMAN. You and Mr. Nathan are associated together in the publishing of this paper.

Mr. SIMONS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, if a member of your own board of directors places that connotation on the article, then how can you say now that you did not so intend it?

Mr. SIMONS. Well, I am not going to speak for Mr. Nathan.

Senator ANDERSON. That is not in his paper.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a quote from a speech made by Mr. Nathan.

Mr. SIMONS. Frankly I did not consult with him before I wrote the article in question, and furthermore I was not at the meeting referred to in that clipping from the Bismarck Tribune.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought you had some knowledge of it.

Mr. SIMONS. The first I saw of that clipping was when the snowplow came through and delivered the mail and I read it in the paper myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we will have to find from Mr. Nathan whether he made the statement or not. I don't know. But I am pointing out that the other press picked up this article and Nathan's statement, and so carried it as a bribe.

Mr. SIMONS. Well, that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The papers may be unfriendly.

Mr. SIMONS. I understand that.

The CHAIRMAN. But I am trying to show, if it is true, that the impression was from your article that Senator YOUNG had accepted another bribe or sold out again.

Mr. SIMONS. There were four newspaper reporters there, and the other three did not say a word. Certainly if Mr. Nathan made the statement, it was a sensational charge, and a reporter was there from the Minneapolis Tribune, Mr. Frank Wright, and Mr. Gifford Herron, and Mr. William Allen from the Grand Forks Herald. They were all there, and I have not talked to those gentlemen personally about the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Neither have I, and I do not know what they published.

Mr. SIMONS. I also would like to bring to the attention of this committee the fact that the editor of the Bismarck Tribune is a former administrative assistant to Mr. YOUNG.

The CHAIRMAN. That could be true, and that is a fact that you should bring out, or any other fact.

Mr. SIMONS. I can also state that while I was not at that meeting that night, I have been to enough Nonpartisan League meetings to know that the commotion and excitement must have been terrific. I can assure you that the reputation of North Dakota for wild and woolly politics is not exaggerated. Lately things have been tightening down out there, and I can imagine if the Leader is a hell-raising newspaper, that that was a double hell-raising session that they had that night. Mr. YOUNG was roasted and boiled in political oil from one end to the other, and I am confident of that without ever having been there.

The CHAIRMAN. You don't mean to imply there may have been exaggerations in a double hell-raising meeting?

Mr. SIMONS. Senator, you have been to enough political meetings to know how they go.

The CHAIRMAN. I see.

Mr. SIMONS. I presume that Arkansas has its share. I would say our Senator LANGER is typical of the people of North Dakota interested in politics, and you are well aware of the colorful reputation enjoyed by the senior Senator from North Dakota.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator BRIDGES, do you have any questions?

Senator BRIDGES. It has been reported in the papers or it has been called to my attention that before you wrote the article "YOUNG Sells Out Again", you discussed it with Mr. Nathan and Mr. Burdick.

Mr. SIMONS. No, sir, I did not discuss it with either Mr. Nathan or Mr. Burdick.

Senator BRIDGES. Now, you have testified under oath that the word "sellout" has nothing to do with anything corrupt at all. That is, bribery or corruption, and it has purely to do with a common political phraseology used in North Dakota. I hold in my hand the same article from the Leader, YOUNG Sells Out Again, and I will read you this. This is down about half-way or two-thirds through it:

"Now a new twist has come along to plague Milt. Senator CASE of South Dakota has been offered a $2,500 bribe by the wealthy, influence-buying oil and gas lobby. This sent the Washington press corps to ask the other Senators who are not opposed to Fulbright-Harris bill if they, too, have been offered bribes. For the sake of the record, the press boys asked the same question of those Senators who oppose the measure, but this was strictly procedural because the reporters know the real graft is to be found among the stooges of the oil and gas lobby."

Now I ask you, if you see that headline, "YOUNG Sells Out Again," and you read that paragraph in the same article which the headline represents, how you can make a statement that this is just a phraseology that is common in North Dakota? Didn't your headline have reference to the story? That is the point that struck me. When I read that part of the story, the headline gets entirely different connotations than if it had appeared on some other story.

Mr. SIMONS. Senator, there are two elements to that story. One is dealing with Senator YOUNG's vote on the bill, and the other deals with the CASE matter.

Senator BRIDGES. That raises a question. When you see the headlines, and the headlines head the story which I have just read you, which talks about bribes and graft and so forth and so on, anybody who reads the headline and the story could not help but think you were rather far afield in the testimony you have just given us that there is no reference between the two. That is hard for me to follow. The headline alone, without being attached to the details of the story, would mean one thing to me, but when it is attached to the same story, certainly it could mean another.

Mr. SIMONS. May I be allowed to bring this in. Further in that same story there, I have a paragraph which reads this way:

"According to the Associated Press, YOUNG replied, 'No, certainly not' when asked Saturday if he had ever been approached about a campaign contribution in return for his support of the oil and gas racketeers."

Now, do you think, Senator, anyone reading that article could gain the impression or that anyone who read the article—now I agree that perhaps reading just the headline alone, that would be a matter for court interpretation, of course, as a matter of valued judgment there. But anyone who read the full article certainly realized that we were not accusing Senator YOUNG of selling out for a monetary consideration. Senator YOUNG's own former administrative assistant, the man who wrote that article in which he makes false allegations or false quotations of Mr. Nathan, John Hjelle, sat in his office 3 weeks ago and he told me, "Hell, you did not libel MILT YOUNG." And I said, "I know it, and Senator YOUNG knows it, and everybody else knows it." Certainly he wishes now that he had never started the libel action. That is what I told Mr. Hjelle, Mr. YOUNG's former administrative assistant, and now editor of the Bismarck Tribune, and author of that article referred to here.

Senator BRIDGES. What was your object in writing all of this about bribes and graft and stooges and so forth in the same article then if it didn't have some reference to the thing?

Mr. SIMONS. Senator CASE was from South Dakota, a neighboring State, very similar in terms of geography and number of square miles and people and the breed of people and so forth, and it just naturally popped into my mind.

Senator BRIDGES. Do you think Senator CASE was bribed or attempted to be bribed?

Mr. SIMONS. I think it is quite clear that an attempt was made to bribe Senator CASE.

Senator BRIDGES. In spite of the fact that Senator CASE testified, and the committee which investigated it, found it was not true?

Mr. SIMONS. I would rather take Drew Pearson's interpretation of it. Mr. Pearson has indicated rather strongly that he considered it a bribe. That is my recollection of the matter. Or attempted bribe, put it that way.

I would like to suggest to the committee that this whole matter is a squabble between two sets of politicians.

The CHAIRMAN. May I say this to you: This committee is not trying to determine anything about the politics out there. This committee has a duty to investigate any improper influence. Your article implied that from the standpoint of the chairman, at least, and I think from the standpoint of the committee, and we are charged with that duty as a special committee set up to investigate it.

Now, the United States Senator against whom the charge was made took the same view, and requested the committee to go into it. As to a lawsuit, I can say to you so far as the chairman is concerned, I do not care if you are sued or not sued, or who wins or who does not. I am not interested in a lawsuit.

Senator ANDERSON. You said you were a high school teacher?

Mr. SIMONS. That is right.

Senator ANDERSON. What do you teach?

Mr. SIMONS. I teach—this shows the need for the Federal aid to education bill in my estimation, but I teach general math, and I teach present day problems and world history, and I teach general science and I teach English I. On top of that I coach the boys basketball team, supervise the production of the high school paper, and also run the annual school play.

Senator ANDERSON. I need not ask you what you do with your spare time, I guess.

Mr. SIMONS. I live in Bismarck. That is my permanent home, and it is about 80 miles from Pettibone, N. Dak., where I teach school, and I go into Bismarck on the weekends. From Monday through Friday I stay away from politics, and on Saturday and Sunday I work on the Leader.

Senator ANDERSON. How many directors does the Leader have?

Mr. SIMONS. We have a board of directors of seven.

Senator ANDERSON. Do you exercise any editorial supervision over what they say at Nonpartisan League rallies?

Mr. SIMONS. Do I exercise any editorial supervision?

Senator ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. SIMONS. No, nobody exercises any supervision of any kind over what anyone says at a Nonpartisan League rally, Senator.

Senator ANDERSON. Did you exercise any supervision over what the Bismarck Tribune was reported to have said this individual stated at the rally?

Mr. SIMONS. No, I formerly was a reporter for the Bismarck Tribune. My mother is still a stockholder in that, but I have no control over the Bismarck Tribune, and I do not seek to influence their reporting of any political events. That is beyond answering what questions the Tribune reporter might happen to put to me. I am kind of a contact man, and they come to me and ask me a lot of questions about what is going on.

Senator ANDERSON. You stated that the Minneapolis Tribune had reported the same meeting.

Mr. SIMONS. I am under the impression, that is several people have told me that Frank Wright, of the Minneapolis Tribune, who is their correspondent stationed in Bismarck, was at that meeting, and also Mr. Gifford Herron of the Fargo Forum, and Bill Allen of the Grand Forks Herald.

Senator ANDERSON. You are not able to testify whether they were or were not there?

Mr. SIMONS. No, I can't testify on the basis of personal knowledge, first hand. I cannot, sir.

Seator ANDERSON. If you could tell us of your own personal knowledge that they were there, and were willing to state that they did not hear any such statement made, that would be one thing. But if there is no evidence that they were at the meeting, I don't think that it should be dragged in here.

Mr. SIMONS. Perhaps Mr. Nathan who certainly was there could testify as to whether Mr. Herron and Mr. Allen and Mr. Wright were present. I will put it this way. I have been reliably informed, I don't know, perhaps Senator YOUNG's counsel has some knowledge as to whether they were there or not.

Senator ANDERSON. In your article which has been referred to many times, you state that you did not intend to imply in any way that you felt that Senator YOUNG had taken a bribe at any time. Is that correct?

Mr. SIMONS. That is correct.

Senator ANDERSON. You do not now believe that he ever did?

Mr. SIMONS. That is correct, I have no knowledge of it.

Senator ANDERSON. Do you have any information that he has been casting his votes in such fashion that he might financially profit from them?

Mr. SIMONS. Well, I don't know. I have no information of any contributions received by him.

Senator ANDERSON. I am trying to get to this headline. All of us are a little sensitive on the charge that because we vote as we see fit we have sold out our convictions. I voted for the Harris gas bill, and I voted for the Kerr bill, and when I voted for the Kerr bill, I said, "If you don't pass it, the price of natural gas will have to go up because exploration will be restricted." Natural gas prices did go up, and I don't think that convicted me of selling out my convictions. I am only trying to find out whether you feel that any of these things involved a sellout of his convictions.

Mr. SIMONS. No, I have never implied that he sold out his convictions. We use the word in North Dakota, the word "sellout" when you use it against a politician, it frankly and bluntly means that you feel he has sold out what in your opinion was the public interest. Senator LANGER has used it thousands of times, and it is a stock in trade of BILL LANGER, and everybody knows it out in North Dakota. Perhaps you people, anybody east of North Dakota is an easterner to us, and Senator THYE is an easterner in the eyes of some North Dakotans, perhaps you put a different interpretation on it.

Senator ANDERSON. I come from South Dakota which is not east of North Dakota, and I have participated in a little politics up there. I keep somewhat in touch with it and I am not worried about whether you say it a thousand times or not. I am trying to find out if you believe that there was any sellout involved in the actions of Senator YOUNG.

Mr. SIMONS. Absolutely none whatsoever.

Senator ANDERSON. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Thye.

Senator THYE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ascertain from Mr. Simons how long he has lived in North Dakota.

Mr. SIMONS. All my life.

Senator THYE. How long have you been a teacher of a high school?

Mr. SIMONS. For the past 2 years.

Senator THYE. For the past 2 years?

Mr. SIMONS. Yes, sir.

Senator THYE. What did you do prior to that?

Mr. SIMONS. I was editor of the Leader on a full time paid basis.

Senator THYE. When did you finish college?

Mr. SIMONS. I finished college in 1953.

Senator THYE. In 1953, and then you were editor for a while and then you became a high school teacher?

Mr. SIMONS. That is correct.

Senator THYE. How old are you?

Mr. SIMONS. I will be 29 on July 24 of this year.

Senator THYE. What did you have in mind when you said, "Milt brazenly ignored the majority declaration of the PSC that defeat of the Fulbright-Harris gas racketeering measure would help, not hinder, the PSC in protecting the public interest," when there were 53 yeas for that measure, and 38 nays for it?

Mr. SIMONS. The majority of the North Dakota Public Service Commission, Senator, took the opinion that the Fulbright-Harris bill was clearly not consistent with the public interest.

Senator THYE. Now I will continue reading the article that appears in the Leader, of which the headline reads, "YOUNG Sells Out Again." In reading further on, in your own article, "But facts like these never bother Milt, who is certain the public's memory is so short and the integrity of the North Dakota press so rotten that he is not likely to be tripped up on his contradictions, misrepresentations and outright lies."

What did you have in mind as a high school teacher, a college graduate and a lifetime citizens of North Dakota? What did you have in mind when you wrote an article like this? That is "contradictions, misrepresentations and outright lies," and then referred to the American press as so rotten? Just what did you have in mind as an intelligent young American, college graduate, entrusted as a teacher and instructor in a high school?

Mr. SIMONS. Well, Senator YOUNG publicly professes to protect the public interest, which is I believe the duty and oath of a Senator, and it is my opinion that he has not fully protected the public interest.

Senator THYE. But the record of the United States Senate indicated that there were 52 other men voting identically as Senator YOUNG voted on this measure, and that they were a decisive majority, casting that vote. There were only 39 nays against the measure. And you, a college graduate, would cast a reflection upon all of these 52 other gentlemen by the very statement that you print here in your press, "But facts like these never bother Milt, who is certain the public's memory is so short and the integrity of the North Dakota press so rotten that he is not likely to be tripped up on his contradictions, misrepresentations and outright lies." What are we as Members of Congress to think when you, a college graduate and instructor in a high school and a publisher of a paper will refer to your press in such language, and put such headlines in the paper as you put?

Mr. SIMONS. Senator YOUNG—I wish I had the newspaper clippings here—but I believe that with respect to the Public Service Commission, he took a contradictory position. Mention was made of it to me, and I did see the clippings on it, which indicated clearly that with respect to the oil and gas regulation he seemed to be saying one thing at one time and another thing at another. I regret I do not have the clippings here before me on this desk and we do not have them with us.

Senator THYE. Mr. Simons, do you intend to cast any reflection upon the votes cast by all of these other Members of the Senate who voted for the Harris-Fulbright bill?

Mr. SIMONS. It is my own contention that anyone who voted for the Harris-Fulbright bill clearly did not vote within the public interest.

Senator THYE. That is your opinion?

Mr. SIMONS. That is my opinion.

Senator THYE. I happen to be one that voted against the measure.

Mr. SIMONS. That is right.

Senator THYE. And I recognize that other men who voted contrary to me were just as sincere and honest in their convictions. But who are you, sir, if I may ask that question, who can publish papers and then refer to this vote and to the press in a State to be "so rotten that he is not likely to be tripped up on his contradictions, misrepresentations and outright lies"?

Mr. SIMONS. Senator THYE, I am not here to contend that anyone who voted against the Fulbright-Harris measure or the Kerr measure did so because they had their palm out for money from the oil industry. It may or may not be true. I could realize that some people cast votes out of sincere conviction. There may have been votes cast, put it this way, at a bare minimum there may have been votes cast for the Fulbright-Harris measure that were cast by Senators on the basis of pure convictions, honestly trying to do their duty to uphold the oath of their office.

Senator THYE. Even though you have placed such a headline "YOUNG Sells Out Again," and, even though in your own writing which I have quoted, where you make this charge against the press in your State—and the charge as it reads here is "tripped up on his contradictions, misrepresentations, and outright lies"—even though you had such an article printed in a publication of which you are responsible, and you are an intelligent person or you would never have graduated from college, and you must have certain public responsibilities as a teacher—even in view of all of this, you are telling this committee under oath that you never charged Senator YOUNG with a sellout or of accepting a bribe of any kind?

Mr. SIMONS. We charged him with a political sellout, Senator.

Senator THYE. You charge him with a political sellout, but you are an intelligent man, and your own conscience must dictate to you what is right or wrong regardless of whether you represent one political party and Senator YOUNG happens to represent another political party. You are an intelligent person, and therefore you know the difference between a political sellout and a slanderous charge, "YOUNG sells out again," in a publication.

Also, the article that is beneath this headline—an article that refers to the press in your State as being so rotten, and refers to Senator YOUNG, and I quote it, "and outright lies"—you just say that is all just a political activity on your part?

Mr. SIMONS. Senator THYE, I am aware of two things. That is, that I would say a good 99 percent of the people who read the Leader are aware of the fact that we are politically opposed to Senator YOUNG. Secondly, I am sure and I would have a bad conscience as a matter of fact if I was not sure that anyone who read that full article, and they certainly would be motivated I think by the liveliness of the headline and the drop head to read the full article—I can't conceive of anybody reading that full article and not coming to the conclusion that we had not accused Senator YOUNG of taking a bribe.

Senator THYE. That you had not accused him?

Mr. SIMONS. That is right. His own administrative assistant told me that.

Senator THYE. Sir, the administrative assistant is not under oath, and he is not testifying, but you are the gentleman that is testifying.

Mr. SIMONS. He read the article, though, sir. He read the article and he told me. He said, "You didn't libel MILT YOUNG."

Senator THYE. Mr. Chairman, I am not interested in the statements of anybody else. What I am interested in is Mr. Simons' interpretation of his action as publisher of the Leader when he wrote the headline, "YOUNG Sells Out Again." You read the entire article, the headline of the article, "CASE Bribe Recalls $5,000 MILT YOUNG Got From Dutchman," and then you go down further in the column, and you read the statement, "Milt brazenly ignored the majority declaration of the PSC that defeat of the Fulbright-Harris gas racketeering measure would help, not hinder, the PSC in protecting the public interest."

Mr. Chairman, when you consider that 53 members of the Senate voted for the measure which was an overwhelming majority of votes cast, and then you read further, "But facts like these never bother Milt, who is certain that the public memory is so short and the integrity of the North Dakota press so rotten that he is not likely to be tripped up on his contradictions, misrepresentations, and outright lies." You want this committee to believe that that is just a typical issue of the Leader and representative of your political activities in North Dakota, and that we should recognize it as a political activity on your part; and that we should pass it over and just accept it as your kind of politics. And you are a high school teacher and a college graduate.

Mr. SIMONS. Do you pose that as a question or not?

Senator THYE. It can stand as my comment of what I have read of your publication.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

Senator KENNEDY. Does the Leader receive support from the Nonpartisan League?

Mr. SIMONS. The Leader is the official newspaper of the Nonpartisan League.

Senator KENNEDY. Who supports the paper? Is it supported by advertisements?

Mr. SIMONS. Well, to a limited extent by advertising.

Senator KENNEDY. Do you receive any direct contribution from candidates for office other than the ads they put in?

Mr. SIMONS. No, sir, we do not.

Senator KENNEDY. But the league itself contributes to the paper.

Mr. SIMONS. The Leader is published by the Leader Publishing Co., which is a North Dakota corporation, owned cooperatively. Now, I am sure that everyone who is a stockholder in the Leader is also a member of the Nonpartisan League. It has always been the policy of the Leader to support Nonpartisan League candidates.

Senator KENNEDY. As I understand it now, as to the point of this hearing, you have no evidence that Senator YOUNG received money from any oil company in order to influence his vote?

Mr. SIMONS. That is correct.

Senator KENNEDY. I just want to say as someone who voted against the Taft-Hartley bill, and against the Kerr bill, and against the Harris-Fulbright bill, that I think this case is close to the most irresponsible journalism, in view of your last statement, that I have ever seen.

Senator PURTELL. Mr. Simons, you have told us, I believe, that when you use the word "sellout," you mean a political sellout; is that correct?

Mr. SIMONS. That is correct.

Senator PURTELL. Mr. Simons, we have had evidence here that 53 Senators voted for the Harris-Fulbright bill, I happen to be one who voted against it. I voted against it and fought vigorously against it also. I was very much opposed to it.

Mr. Simons, do you therefore feel that every one of the 58 Senators who voted for it is guilty, or would you charge them with political selling out?

Mr. SIMONS. Well, yes, I would charge them with a sellout of the public interest.

Senator PURTELL. Do you know of any way in which Senator Young differed from the other men, the other 52 in this political selling out that you describe?

Mr. SIMONS. No, sir.

Senator PURTELL. In other words, there is nothing that you know that Senator YOUNG did that was not done by the other 52 Senators; is that correct?

Mr. SIMONS. Yes, sir, that is correct.

Senator PURTELL. You blanket the whole 53, including Senator YOUNG, and you don't put Senator YOUNG out as having done anything that the other 52 did not do?

Mr. SIMONS. That is absolutely right.

Senator PURTELL. Now, let me ask you this question, sir. You read a part of this article, and let me read further in the article:

"According to the Associated Press, YOUNG replied 'No, certainly not' when asked Saturday if he had ever been approached about a campaign contribution in return for his support of the oil and gas racketeers."

Now, you have explained what you think "sellout" means. Will you tell me what "pays" means? You have the heading of the next paragraph, "The Dutchman Pays." What did you mean by "pays"?

Mr. SIMONS. That was a reference to the contribution.

Senator PURTELL. Well, now, is a contribution a pay out or is it a pay or what do you mean by "pay"?

Mr. SIMONS. I don't even recall. I don't recall for sure whether I wrote that.

Senator PURTELL. Mr. Simons, I am talking about the article that was published in the Leader. Will you look up and see what "pays" means in the dictionary, please, sir? I am anxious to find out what was meant by the word "pays."

Mr. SIMONS. I don't recall, sir. If that is in a subhead, I don't recall whether that is my subhead or not.

Senator PURTELL. You don't know whose subhead it is. I know it is in the article and the wording is "The Dutchman Pays." I am anxious to find out what is mean by "pays." Did you mean contribution, or did you mean what the dictionary says, and we can shortly find that out?

Senator ANDERSON. Have you established that he wrote the subhead?

Senator PURTELL. It has not been established that he wrote the subhead. I think the witness said he didn't remember, is that correct?

Mr. SIMONS. I honestly don't remember. I know that I wrote the story. That story appears principally as I wrote it.

Senator PURTELL. What does "pay" mean? What I am trying to do is establish what you had in mind when you used the word "pay."

Senator GOLDWATER. There are various interpretations of the word "pay," and in fact the first one that is offered could be used in a wrong way, I believe. It is, "To smear or coat, as a vessel's bottom." I don't think that is the one that you are seeking.

There is another one. "To pacify, appease, satisfy, content, gratify, or please; to satisfy for service rendered." I think that is what you had in mind.

Senator PURTELL. I was most anxious to determine from Mr. Simons what he had in mind.

Mr. SIMONS. Let us presume for just a moment that I did write that subhead, and I don't recall whether I did, but let us presume that I did. Clearly it was a reference to the money which Senator YOUNG received from Mr. Grunewald.

Senator PURTELL. Usually isn't "pay" associated with remuneration for services rendered in the minds of the public?

Mr. SIMONS. I don't know how many definitions there are.

Senator PURTELL. I am talking about the common usage of the word. The man received his pay on Saturday.

Mr. SIMONS. Senator GOLDWATER has pointed out, in Webster's International Dictionary, that you can find all kinds of definitions.

Senator PURTELL. You previously told us that you were not sticking to Webster's International Dictionary when you said what the people in your State would consider "sellout" means, and now I am asking what you think the people in your State would consider "pays" meant.

Mr. SIMONS. It would depend on how you use it.

Senator PURTELL. I will show you the article and ask you how it was used there.

Mr. SIMONS. It was used there to indicate Senator YOUNG received $5,000 from Mr. Grunewald.

Senator PURTELL. But do you think that it meant paid in the commonly accepted term of paying for something received?

Mr. SIMONS. No.

Senator PURTELL. So what you meant when you said "pay" was what?

Mr. SIMONS. That he received $5,000, and now you said "when I said." Now, it has not been established that I did say it. I don't recall for sure that I did.

Senator PURTELL. Will you tell me what you think the word "pay" would convey to your readers, whether you used it or not, since you told us what you thought?

Mr. SIMONS. From that article it would indicate that he received $5,000 from Mr. Grunewald.

Senator PURTELL. That he received it?

Mr. SIMONS. Yes.

Senator PURTELL. Would you think the word "pay" conveyed something else?

Mr. SIMONS. I would not.

Senator PURTELL. You would not?

Mr. SIMONS. No. That is an indefinite thing. There are a lot of subheads indefinite; and that is typical.

Senator PURTELL. That is all I wish to ask.

Senator GOLDWATER. Mr. Simons, where did you graduate from college?

Mr. SIMONS. University of North Dakota.

Senator GOLDWATER. What is the circulation of the Leader?

Mr. SIMONS. Well, it has jumped since our controversy with Senator YOUNG, and it is now up to 5,200, I am informed.

Senator GOLDWATER. That is a paid circulation or does it come through membership in the league?

Mr. SIMONS. We have a combination. You can buy the Leader separately, or for $10 you can get a 20-year membership in the Nonpartisan League and a 2-year subscription to the Leader as a joint package.

Senator GOLDWATER. You heard me ask Senator YOUNG about the UAW-CIO ad. Did you run that full-page ad in your paper?

Mr. SIMONS. I am quite sure we did not.

Senator GOLDWATER. You can't say definitely yes or no?

Mr. SIMONS. I can say definitely no, as a matter of fact. I think that I have seen every issue of the Leader, and there are times when I am snowed in out in this small town where I teach school. In fact, I would go on record as saying without fear of perjury whatsoever that we did not run that UAW-CIO ad. I wish it had been sent to me. If it had been sent to us, we would have been most happy to.

Senator GOLDWATER. I would not blame you, because they pay you for it.

Mr. SIMONS. We are sympathetic to the UAW-CIO.

Senator GOLDWATER. Where did you get the information that you have in your article that "A bill that will cost gas consumers a cool six hundred million plus if it passes"?

Mr. SIMONS. That was a quotation of Senator DOUGLAS and it appeared in the daily press.

Senator GOLDWATER. You are merely repeating Senator DOUGLAS?

Mr. SIMONS. That is correct.

Senator GOLDWATER. Now, I want to get back to this statement of yours that Senator BRIDGES read, because I don't think we have completely cleared it up. I am not going to read it all, but I will just quote this last part of it. "But this was strictly procedural because the reporters know the real graft is to be found among the stooges of the oil and gas lobby."

Who are the stooges in your opinion of the oil and gas lobby?

Mr. SIMONS. I would not be able to identify any one in particular.

Senator GOLDWATER. Well, are they the 53 Senators who voted for this bill?

Mr. SIMONS. I don't know.

Senator GOLDWATER. Well, you used the word "stooges," and you sat down, and you were thinking when you wrote this, and you used the word "stooge." Who are these stooges?

Mr. SIMONS. The stooges of the oil and gas lobby, people I would say like Uncle Charles Simons, to whom Senator YOUNG alluded here. I regard my Uncle Charley frankly as a stooge. Charley will take any position the oil-and-gas industry wants him to take. He is paid by them, and paid well.

Senator GOLDWATER. Do you consider Senator YOUNG a stooge of the gas and oil business?

Mr. SIMONS. Yes.

Senator GOLDWATER. Because he has taken money from the gas and oil business?

Mr. SIMONS. No; I have no knowledge of it.

Senator GOLDWATER. You have no knowledge of that?

Mr. SIMONS. He seems to go along with them.

Senator GOLDWATER. I am a stooge of the oil and gas lobby?

Mr. SIMONS. Did you vote for the Fulbright-Harris bill?

Senator GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. SIMONS. Yes; correct.

Senator GOLDWATER. And any one of us who voted for the gas and oil bill, therefore, we are stooges? That is a pretty strong word.

Mr. SIMONS. Yes.

Senator GOLDWATER. A stooge is a foil; it is also used as a part of a comedy act, the straight man.

Mr. SIMONS. I have no knowledge of your record on oil and gas legislation, and I presume from what I know of you, Senator, that you probably vote consistently with the oil and gas industry. I have no detailed knowledge of that, however, but with respect to Senator YOUNG, he goes right down the line with the oil industry.

Senator GOLDWATER. All right, Mr. Simons; you say that the real graft, there is another strong word, is to be found among the stooges. So there is graft to be found in Senator YOUNG's dealings and mine. You are inferring that by this article.

Mr. SIMONS. Not necessarily.

Senator GOLDWATER. I disagree with you. You have just said that Senator YOUNG, in your opinion, is a stooge of the gas and oil people, and you have said that Senator GOLDWATER is. You have inferred that 51 other Members of the United States Senate are.

Mr. SIMONS. I did not say Senator GOLDWATER was.

Senator GOLDWATER. Well, I asked you if you thought I was a stooge, and you said yes, and I don't care whether you think so or not.

Mr. SIMONS. But I further outlined that I am not aware of your detailed voting record, and I think if I checked into it, I probably would be able to say accurately that I think that you are a stooge of the oil and gas industry.

Senator GOLDWATER. We will leave Senator GOLDWATER out of it, because there is no one in your State that can vote for me. But you have said that you think that Senator YOUNG is a stooge of the oil and gas lobby. Then you say that there is graft to be found among the stooges of the oil and gas lobby. So that in your mind when you were writing this article, and you said "YOUNG Sells Out Again," there must have been the attempt to imply that graft was connected with Senator YOUNG's vote.

Mr. SIMONS. Senator GOLDWATER, I have no knowledge that Senator YOUNG either has or has not received any money. He may have received some money from oilmen, and I don't know anything about it, and I have no knowledge.

Senator GOLDWATER. But you make a statement, and you are a newspaperman, and you are writing a story for a paper that is going to be read by 5,200 people. You say that the real graft is to be found among the stooges of the oil and gas lobby. Now, what were you trying to imply there, if you were not trying to imply that Senator YOUNG, who, in your mind, is a stooge of the oil and gas lobby, was connected with graft? What were you trying to get across to 5,200 people?

Mr. SIMONS. That that is where it is to be found.

Senator GOLDWATER. In other words, if they want to find the real graft, they should go to Senator YOUNG?

Mr. SIMONS. No.

Senator GOLDWATER. Well, I don't follow your reasoning a bit. You say or testified under oath earlier that you did not mean to imply by "YOUNG sells out again" that there was any monetary inference at all, or any reference to money?

Mr. SIMONS. That is right.

Senator GOLDWATER. Yet, down here in the same article that you wrote, you say that the real graft is to be found among—and I will substitute the word "YOUNG"—that is among the stooges of the oil and gas lobby. I think that is a very, very slanderous statement. If you can't prove it, I think if we press this thing far enough you could be sued by 53 Senators. I don't know what you are trying to imply if it isn't bribery when you say "the real graft is to be found among the stooges," and in your mind the stooges includes Senator YOUNG. The implication or meaning of the word "graft" is certainly clear to anybody in this country. I think that is one of the most damaging statements that is contained in the whole article. Frankly, as a United States Senator, I know this means nothing to you, but I resent that, and I think it is very detrimental to the press of this country to have that kind of statement made in columns where you cannot prove it. There has been a thorough hearing into the so-called Keck matter, and it was labeled stupidity and not graft, and yet you charge one of your Senators from your State with being a stooge of the oil and gas lobby, and accepting graft.

Mr. SIMONS. Drew Pearson clearly indicated that in the Keck matter.

Senator GOLDWATER. You are entitled to your opinion of Drew Pearson, and in my opinion I have proven three lies on him this year, and I have not even tried. So if Drew Pearson is your prophet, you stick to him. I am not going to believe anything he says.

Now let us go a little bit further. You say that he sells out. Let us forget this inference of money that is contained in this statement. You heard Senator YOUNG testify under oath that he explained many times his position on this gas bill, and on other Federal controls of natural resources, to the people of his State. I might say that I did the same thing, and I campaigned on the tidelands issue, and I was for the tidelands bill, and I campaigned on the issue and I was elected, and Senator YOUNG was elected. So the majority of the people of your State knew what Senator YOUNG stood for, and they voted for him, and they put him here as a United States Senator. Yet you say that he sold out. Now, he certainly did not sell out, and in fact I think he would have sold out if he had come here and voted against the Harris-Fulbright bill after having told the people of his State that he was going to vote for it or implying that he was going to vote for it, and after having voted for the Kerr bill. How do you square that up?

Mr. SIMONS. Well, would you rephrase your question, sir?

Senator GOLDWATER. How can you charge a man with selling out when he is only doing what he promised the people of his State to do?

Mr. SIMONS. Like I said before, we regard it as a clear sellout of the public interest. You implied, sir, that Senator YOUNG campaigned on those issues, and that the public heard them, and that they still saw fit to

send Senator YOUNG back to Washington in 1950, the last time he was up for reelection. Well, may I add there that the quality of the opposition in 1950 was substantially less than it is this year.

Senator GOLDWATER. That does not enter into it at all. The fact is that Senator YOUNG told the people of North Dakota that he, Senator YOUNG, felt this way about Federal controls of the natural resources. I never heard one of his campaign speeches, and he may or may not have been specific, but certainly his vote on the Kerr bill and his statements to the people contained in the press and carried over the radio told the people of that State that he was coming to Washington to do the things he told the people he would do, and that was one of them. Now, how can you interpret that as a sellout?

Mr. SIMONS. I think he is going to go to the public with the same story this year, and I confidently hope he will be defeated for reelection.

Senator GOLDWATER. That does not enter into it. We are trying to find out why you used the words "sell out," and you say it is a political phrase. I understand what sellout is, and how it is used in politics, and all of us at times probably have engaged in it. But you put your case on the fact that it is a political phrase. Yet here is a man who has come here and done what he told his people he was going to do. I think that he ought to have a pat on the back, and I don't think that he ought to be kicked around.

Now, you evidently must have high political ideals, and do you think a man should come to the United States Congress or the Senate and vote contrary to what he led the people of his State to feel he would vote?

Mr. SIMONS. A man who serves in the United States Senate should vote the way his conscience dictates.

Senator GOLDWATER. Then you condemn Senator YOUNG for doing that.

Mr. SIMONS. I have no way of knowing whether his vote on the natural-gas measure was based on his honest convictions or not.

Senator GOLDWATER. Well, have you any reason to doubt that he voted according to his conscience?

Mr. SIMONS. I don't know, and I have no access to Senator YOUNG's conscience.

Senator GOLDWATER. Have you any reason to assume he would vote against his conscience from his votes in the past?

Mr. SIMONS. That he would vote against his conscience?

Senator GOLDWATER. Against his conscience.

Mr. SIMONS. I don't know, and I don't have any access to his conscience. How should I know? How can I determine what your conscience is, sir?

Senator GOLDWATER. You have no way to know what my political philosophy is other than what you read in the newspapers, and you are not from my State.

Mr. SIMONS. It may or may not be true what they say about you.

Senator GOLDWATER. But you are from Senator YOUNG's State.

Mr. SIMONS. That is right.

Senator GOLDWATER. You have had access all of your life, or for 34 years, which is more than your life, to the political philosophy of MILTON YOUNG. Now you don't agree with him, and that is your privilege, and we are not arguing that point at all. But you know what MILTON YOUNG stands for. The people of your State know what he stands for. Do you say that he should come to this Congress and vote contrary to the way he has told his people he would vote?

Mr. SIMONS. I say he should vote according to his conscience.

Senator GOLDWATER. I think he has voted according to his conscience, and of course what we think should not enter into this, so we won't put it this way. It is clearly evident that MILTON YOUNG came to Washington and voted exactly as he told the people of his State he would. And yet you say that he sold out, and you infer in one paragraph that he sold out for money, and you infer by your statements here that the sellout meant political. I don't want to pursue this any further and I want to ask you a further question. Are you a member of the Americans for Democratic Action?

Mr. SIMONS. I am not, sir. I regret I am not. I endorse the organization, and nobody has asked me to join, or I would.

The CHAIRMAN. I have just 1 further question or 2. As we conclude your testimony, do you now charge that Senator YOUNG was unduly or improperly influenced or illegally influenced in his vote on the gas bill.

Mr. SIMONS. I do not, sir, because if I did, I would have used it in the Leader.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any knowledge or any reliable information or source of information that you would suggest that this committee pursue that would lead to any evidence that Senator YOUNG accepted a bribe or was otherwise improperly or illegally influenced in his vote on the gas bill?

Mr. SIMONS. I would like to see the committee go into the Grunewald matter.

The CHAIRMAN. That has nothing to do with the gas bill, as you know. I am talking about the gas bill.

Mr. SIMONS. Not in connection with the gas bill; no, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you make any charge that he was in any way corrupted or unduly or improperly influenced in connection with his activities and vote on the gas bill.

Mr. SIMONS. I make no such charge whatsoever.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions?

Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. Nathan, will you come around, please, sir. Do you solemnly swear that you will tell the truth before this special Senate committee, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. NATHAN. I do.

TESTIMONY OF R. C. NATHAN (ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, JOHN H. SCHAFER, WASHINGTON, D. C.)

The CHAIRMAN. State your name and your place of residence, and your occupations, please, sir.

Mr. NATHAN. My name is R. C. Nathan, 302 10th Avenue, Northeast, Jamestown, N. Dak. I am a lawyer and at the present time I am employed as the claims representative for an insurance company at Jamestown, N. Dak. I practice law on the side, and make my major work in claims.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that you are a lawyer, but do you have counsel representing you?

Mr. NATHAN. Yes, sir; I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The same counsel that represented Mr. Simons?

Mr. NATHAN. Yes, sir.

Senator PURTELL. Do we have copies of Mr. Nathan's testimony, or were copies supplied?

Mr. NATHAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I received a copy this morning after I arrived at the committee meeting. Counsel has advised me that there is no reason why it should not be received.

All right, Mr. Nathan, do you wish to read your prepared statement?

Mr. NATHAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You may do so.

Mr. NATHAN. This is the statement of R. C. Nathan, of Jamestown, N. Dak., appearing under subpena.

Preliminary statement

My name is R. C. Nathan of 302 10th Avenue NE., Jamestown, N. Dak. I am a member of the board of directors of the Leader Publishing Co., serving a 3-year term which expires on January 31, 1958. The Leader Publishing Co. publishes a political newspaper known as the Leader.

The board of directors of the Leader Publishing Co., consists of seven members. The board of directors in 1955 decided to discontinue the services of a full-time editor and it was their further decision that management of the Leader be delegated to Mr. O. W. Zetter, secretary-treasurer of the board of directors, and that Mr. K. W. Simons be authorized to submit material on a volunteer or contributing basis.

Publication at that time was also discontinued from a weekly basis to a twice per month basis.

On February 6, 1956, while in Bismarck, N. Dak., I was contacted by Mr. O. W. Zetter, at which time he submitted and asked me to read an article which had been written by K. W. Simons for publication. This article was the same story which appeared in the February 9, 1956, edition of the Leader.

The article, as submitted to me, did not contain the headline "YOUNG Sells Out Again." It contained the subhead "CASE Bribe Recalls $5,000 MILT YOUNG Got From Dutchman." I did not see the headline prior to its publication. Since I was aware at that time that Senator YOUNG had received $5,000 from one Henry "the Dutchman" Grunewald, I saw nothing libelous in the article and so advised Mr. O. W. Zetter.

Later Senator YOUNG served notice on myself, as well as the other members of the board of directors, to retract the alleged libel statements in this article. We, at that time, authorized K. W. Simons to prepare a clarification to what the words "sells out" in the headline were intended to mean.

On March 27, 1956, at a meeting of the board of directors and stockholders, I was called on by the chairman to discuss the Young-Leader affair for the benefit of stockholders and board members present. I had no advance notice that I would be asked to discuss this issue and had not prepared any remarks.

In addition to the board of directors and stockholders, there were present a number of other people, as well as 4 or 5 representatives of the press. I outlined the controversy at this meeting as it had progressed to that date, and among other things pointed out that not all political contributions were bribes and that Senator YOUNG had admitted receiving $5,000 from Grunewald and that a contribution this size should have further explanation.

That it was not only the right and duty of the Leader to further press Senator YOUNG for an explanation of this contribution but that the Leader would continue to discuss the relationship between Henry Grunewald and the junior Senator from North Dakota. I invited the persons present to read the Leader as we would continue to press the Senator for a full explanation of this matter.

I do not recall, nor did I intend to refer to, this contribution as a bribe. The word "bribe" was used in my remarks as Senator YOUNG in some of his press releases after the article appeared in the Leader stated that he had been accused by political opponents of accepting a bribe.

I did not, as it was later reported in the Bismarck Tribune, charge Senator YOUNG with accepting a bribe. Since this story appeared in the Bismarck Tribune I have checked with other persons and newspapermen present and their versions of what was said does not check with the story appearing in the Bismarck Tribune.

At no time during my remarks before this group did I mention Senator YOUNG's vote in connection with the Fulbright-Harris bill, nor was any mention made that we felt his vote on the Fulbright-Harris bill had been influenced.

We, of course, do not have any evidence that Senator YOUNG received any money in connection with his vote on the Fulbright-Harris bill, but the last time we know of he received any money he received it from a notorious five percenter, Henry Grunewald.

The CHAIRMAN. From your prepared statement, as I understand, you refute the accu-

racy of the article in the Bismarck Tribune to which we have heretofore referred?

Mr. NATHAN. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. I believe that I read it to Mr. Simons, that part of the article in the Tribune.

Mr. NATHAN. I recall.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, these are the things that cause us to do a lot of hard work. The committee has no special desire to take a lot of time going into this matter. But since it was, or appeared to be, a charge of bribery, selling out, or charge against a Senator or charge as to his conduct and his vote in connection with the gas bill that precipitated the necessity of action of the Senate in creating this committee, it became the duty of this committee as the committee determined to look into this charge.

At that time, at the time the committee made the decision or subsequent thereto, there came to the committee this article in which the word "bribe" is used. It says:

"At Tuesday night's advisory council meeting R. C. Nathan, Jamestown, a member of the board of directors of the Leader, official league newspaper, leveled a direct charge of bribe against United States Senator MILTON R. YOUNG."

I ask you under your oath whether that statement in the Tribune or that article is true or false?

Mr. NATHAN. It is false.

The CHAIRMAN. Then I read further:

"Referring to the controversy between YOUNG and the Leader, Nathan asserted that he was sure YOUNG was bluffing in his threat to file a libel action against the Leader."

Then you are purported to be quoted as follows:

"YOUNG was bluffing and we've called his bluff," Nathan told the county chairmen and spectators.

"He invited leaguers to read the Leader to see more about the contribution of $5,000 he alleged YOUNG had received from one Henry 'The Dutchman' Grunewald, which he referred to as a bribe."

Do you say that statement is true or false, that you referred to the $5,000 as a bribe?

Mr. NATHAN. I say it is false.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you in that speech, whether in the language here quoted or not, did you in that speech charge directly that Senator YOUNG had received a bribe in either instance, with respect to the gas bill or the Grunewald matter?

Mr. NATHAN. No; I did not, and the Fulbright-Harris bill, the gas bill was not discussed that evening.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not interested primarily in the Grunewald matter, except if you charge a Senator with receiving a bribe. You say positively that you did not in that address charge Senator MILTON YOUNG with receiving a bribe?

Mr. NATHAN. No, I did not.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, you can appreciate, in view of the previous article in the Leader and some having accepted it, even members of this committee, charging certainly by the strongest inference that Senator YOUNG had received a bribe in selling out in connection with his vote on the gas bill, that if you place that interpretation on it yourself in a speech, then I cannot see how you can take the position now that you did not intend for others to infer from the article that you were charging him with receiving a bribe.

So, the point is, if you made this statement, if you charge that he received a bribe in reference to these matters in that public speech after the article was published, it would be pretty convincing to me that the article definitely was intended to charge him with a bribe, which is according to my interpretation the forceful implication of it.

Mr. NATHAN. Well, Senator, that is not true. That was not my intention, Senator. Of course, being a lawyer I do not like to use the word "bribe," and I checked the original article, to make certain that the word "bribe" was not used in it, because we could not charge Senator YOUNG with accepting a bribe.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me see. That reminds me of an incident when I was trying a case one time, and I was prosecuting attorney and I was doing my best to send a fellow to the penitentiary. The lawyer got up on the other side and made some kind of an objection, and in the course of the argument on the objection he said, "My friend here, JOHN MCCLELLAN, can get up the closest to the border line of rascality without getting over it, of anybody I ever saw."

So, may I suggest that you were getting up just as close to the borderline of bribe as you could without actually saying so.

Mr. NATHAN. No. We have no evidence.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand you say now you have no evidence of a bribe?

Mr. NATHAN. At the time I made that speech, I used the word "bribe" but I think I was perfectly free in using it because I was quoting Senator YOUNG in his news releases in which he had stated that the Leader Publishing Co. had accused him or his political opponents had accused him of accepting a bribe.

The CHAIRMAN. In that speech did you say that you had not accused him of accepting a bribe?

Mr. NATHAN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, your statement is completely contradictory to the article that says you did accuse him or refer to him as having accepted a bribe. Now, you state you told them in that speech that you did not accuse him of accepting a bribe.

Mr. NATHAN. Well, Senator, I was not very emphatic about that, because what the persons there were interested in was as to whether or not Senator YOUNG was going to file a libel action against the newspaper. There were a lot of people there, many of the readers of the newspaper who undoubtedly had not read the issue. They had read the Fargo Forum or the Bismarck Tribune, and all of the other daily newspapers, in which Senator YOUNG had stated we had charged him with accepting a bribe.

Some people were somewhat concerned over whether we had actually done so.

The CHAIRMAN. What would you say now? Do you think the people of North Dakota who read these articles think that you charged him with accepting a bribe?

Mr. NATHAN. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. What would be your impression of it?

Mr. NATHAN. Well, I do not think so. I do not think that they would. In the first place, Senator, the circulation of the Leader is small and nobody would have paid any attention to the publication if it had not been for the fact that Senator YOUNG made a number of press releases in which he stated that we have charged him with accepting a bribe.

From then on, everybody was interested in the controversy.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean now, that nobody would have paid any attention to it if Senator YOUNG had not said that? Do you mean your paper has no influence, or it does not carry news?

Mr. NATHAN. It does not have as much influence as it should have, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. I can well understand that you may feel that way about it. Here is my problem and I am not interested in any law suit, but I just cannot understand a press that will carry scurrilous articles like this and then come in and say, "Well, we were innocent, we did not mean any harm, and we did not mean the common acceptation of the phraseology we used. We wholly are innocent in our intent."

Then, you refer to it as a hell-raising paper and it just is a little bit inconsistent. If you can say anything further to clear up what to me is an inconsistency, I would be very glad to have you say it for the record.

Mr. NATHAN. I believe that this committee should go into the Gruenwald matter. As I understand it, when the subcommitee, the House Subcommittee on Ways and Means——

The CHAIRMAN. That is not in response to my question, but go ahead.

Mr. NATHAN. Uncovered the Grunewald matter, it was in connection with the administration of the internal revenue laws. That committee was not set up to investigate lobbying and campaign contributions, and it was checking into the administration of the internal-revenue laws.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, will you pause a moment. Let me ask you, suppose that the committee followed your suggestion. What testimony can you offer or where would you direct the committee to go to get testimony that would refute the already sworn record before another congressional committee?

What would we be doing?

Mr. NATHAN. Well, I think first Grunewald should be called in and I would like to know where the $5,000 came from.

The CHAIRMAN. You have the sworn testimony before another committee hearing as to where it came from, and a congressional committee has already discharged a responsibility with reference to that issue. Now, if we reopened it, if this committee went into it, where do you say that you have anything to contradict that sworn record?

Mr. NATHAN. Well, I am not impressed with some of the remarks Senator YOUNG has made, that the money was borrowed. I believe that there is an inconsistency in Senator YOUNG's statement that once the money was loaned by the Senate Compaign Committee to Senator YOUNG and transmitted through Grunewald, and then later on he issued a statement that Brewster, former Senator Brewster, borrowed the money from somewhere, and turned it over to Grunewald to transmit to North Dakota.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that you may not be impressed, but that was a United States Senator who testified that he did borrow the money, that his wife joined him in signing the note so as to make his credit good at the bank with which he did business, and that he issued a check thereon, on that borrowed money, to Grunewald who in turn delivered half of the amount to Senator MILTON YOUNG, and half to the now Vice President NIXON.

Now, you do not want to accept YOUNG's testimony, you say, but there is the sworn testimony.

Mr. NATHAN. Of a former Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. That a congressional committee examined, and went into for the purpose of ascertaining about it.

Mr. NATHAN. It is the testimony of a former Senator. Then, I have one other question. It is apparently quite proper, from what I have heard here this morning, and it is a proper way to transmit money. But why use a fellow like Grunewald whose reputation was known here in Washington at that time?

The CHAIRMAN. Now that might be something to suggest to Senator Brewster, and he has explained, and I can well understand, and if you have any knowledge of politics at all, contributions may be sent to you by someone and you may not even know at the time who the contributor is. If Senator YOUNG was busy in a campaign and he had a committee, and it was received by the committee and used under the circumstances that have been testified to, he probably knew nothing about having received it at the time, except that he was getting a loan from the committee.

I am just trying to point out that you asked us to reopen it, and now when we reopen it, if those are the facts, what would we accomplish?

Mr. NATHAN. Well, I think that we cannot presume that those are the facts.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I think that you can when you have it under sworn testimony, unless you have something that you can present under oath to refute it.

Now, have you anything under oath that you can present to refute what the record is today in a hearing conducted by a congressional committee by taking of sworn testimony of the people who had the most information and knowledge of the facts? If you have any testimony and can come in here under oath to refute it, and can present it, then I would think that this committee would give some consideration to reopening it.

I do not say that they would, and I cannot speak for the whole committee, but until something is presented under oath that refutes this sworn record, I do not think that the committee has any business going into it.

Since we have been asked to reopen it and go into it, I though I would make those comments.

At this time, the Chairman will insert in the record the article that has been referred to here in the Leader, Bismarck, N. Dak., Thursday, February 9, 1956, headlines, "YOUNG Sells Out Again." We will print it at the appropriate place.

There may also be printed in the record immediately following, that part of the article which the chairman has read from the Bismarck Tribune, of Wednesday, March 28, 1956.

Mr. NATHAN. Senator, may we also get into the record the clarification which is the March 1, 1956 issue?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be published in the record.

(Without objection, the following articles are also printed at this point in the record:)

[Excerpt from article in Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune of March 28, 1956]

At Tuesday night's advisory council meeting, R. C. Nathan, Jamestown, a member of the board of directors of the Leader, official League newspaper, leveled a direct charge of "bribe" against United States Senator MILTON R. YOUNG.

Referring to the controversy between YOUNG and the Leader, Nathan asserted that he was sure YOUNG was bluffing in his threat to file a libel action against the Leader.

"YOUNG was bluffing and we've called his bluff," Nathan told the county chairman and spectators.

He invited leaguers to read the Leader to "see more about" the contribution of $5,000 he alleged YOUNG had received from one Henry "The Dutchman" Grunewald, which he referred to as a bribe.

A MESSAGE TO MILTON YOUNG

MARCH 3, 1955.

TO MILTON YOUNG:

Your demand for a retraction of the article appearing in the February 9, 1956, issue of the Leader has been received. The Leader endeavors at all times to print the truth. The facts are, that you received $5,000 from one Henry (The Dutchman) Grunewald, the convicted king of the 5 percenters. There can be no retraction of these facts, which are embarrassing to you. The people of North Dakota are entitled to know the conditions under which you received the $5,000. We believe that you, as a public servant, should tell the people how and why a convicted 5 percenter would give you $5,000.

In regard to that portion of the article that refers to your selling out, we intended to convey, and we believe we did convey, the fact that on many occasions you have not voted in the best interests of the people of North Dakota. Included in such voting was your vote for the Reed-Bulwinkle bill, the effect of which is to strengthen the railroad monopoly and increase freight rates to the farmers of this State; your vote for the Taft-Hartley Act has the effect of reducing the standard of living of the working people; and now your vote for the Fulbright-Harris is an attempt to saddle increased costs upon the gas consumers of this country.

Your announcement that you would place this matter before a congressional committee indicates that you have no faith in the courts and juries of this State, or that your case is without merit. We invite you to bring your action as soon as possible, in any court in this State, and we suggest further that you bring Grunewald with you, so that he may be available for cross-examination, and so that the people of North Dakota will be in possession of all the facts.

THE LEADER PUBLISHING CO.,
By K. W. SIMONS,
Contributing Editor.

Senator BRIDGES. I think that there was some confusion here between your testimony and that of Mr. Simons, as to whether or not you saw or passed on the article, "YOUNG Sells Out Again."

Mr. NATHAN. Yes, sir, Senator; I read the article, but I guess most newspapermen attach a headline to an article they are going to run and all I saw was the subhead, and I had never seen the headline, "YOUNG Sells Out Again," until after it was published.

Senator BRIDGES. That would explain the difference in interpretation that might be put on your testimony and the testimony of Mr. Simons.

Mr. NATHAN. That is right. The article was submitted to me, and it was submitted to me on the basis of whether it was libelous.

Senator BRIDGES. Do you know Quentin Burdick?

Mr. NATHAN. Yes, sir.

Senator BRIDGES. Who is he?

Mr. NATHAN. He is an attorney at Fargo, N. Dak.

Senator BRIDGES. Is he associated with you?

Mr. NATHAN. Well, we work together defending lawsuits, and I have known Quentin Burdick for a long time.

Senator BRIDGES. Did he pass on this article, too?

Mr. NATHAN. No, he did not.

Senator BRIDGES. And are you associated in any way with the Farmers Union?

Mr. NATHAN. Yes. I work for the National Farmers Union Property & Casualty Co. which is an insurance company.

Senator BRIDGES. But you do not work for the Farmers Union directly, and this is a company that is owned by the Farmers Union?

Mr. NATHAN. That is right.

Senator BRIDGES. Does Mr. Burdick work for that same company?

Mr. NATHAN. Mr. Burdick works for the North Dakota Farmers Union, and he is the general counsel for the North Dakota Farmers Union.

Senator BRIDGES. He works directly for them?

Mr. NATHAN. Yes, sir.

Senator BRIDGES. That is all.

Senator PURTELL. Well, you mentioned here, Mr. Nathan, on page 2 of your testimony, "The article submitted to me did not contain the headline 'YOUNG Sells Out Again'." You also said that the article was submitted to you to find out whether or not it was libelous, is that correct?

Mr. NATHAN. That is correct.

Senator PURTELL. Can headlines be libelous, or in your opinion can headlines be libelous?

Mr. NATHAN. Yes, certainly. I do not think standing alone, Senator.

Senator PURTELL. Then, may I ask you this question: Since you emphasize the fact that you did not see the headline, had that headline, "YOUNG Sells Out Again," been submitted to you with the rest of the article to pass upon whether or not it was libelous, would you have told them to go ahead with the headline, "YOUNG Sells Out Again"?

Mr. NATHAN. Well, I do not know. I do not know what I would have done.

Senator PURTELL. You would have given great thought to it, would you not?

Mr. NATHAN. Yes, I gave some thought to the article.

Senator PURTELL. But you emphasize here that when the article was submitted to you it did not contain the headline. Why do you emphasize that here? So that it will be clearly understood that you had no association with or passed upon this headline?

Mr. NATHAN. Why I come in here?

Senator PURTELL. Why you mention, "The article as submitted to me did not contain the headline 'YOUNG Sells Out Again,'" and I wonder what your reason was for emphasizing that, and having it in your statement here. What importance do you attach to it?

Mr. NATHAN. I wanted to give you all of the facts.

Senator PURTELL. What importance do you attach to the fact that you did not see the headline?

Mr. NATHAN. None whatsoever. I just wanted to come in to tell you exactly what happened, and I mean I wanted to be open about it and that is exactly so.

Senator PURTELL. You, however, already answered the question which I asked you. Would you have suggested that that headline be changed if it had been submitted with the article? You have answered that, have you not?

Mr. NATHAN. Yes, I said I do not know.

Senator PURTELL. Now, you said, "We at that time," referring to a meeting I believe of your board of directors, "authorized K. W. Simons to prepare a clarification as to what the words 'sell out' in headlines were intended to mean." Then, there was some question in your mind, was there, sir, as to what the people would think it meant, or was there a clear understanding of what "sell out" meant anyway as we understood was testified to before.

Mr. NATHAN. No.

Senator PURTELL. Why did you think it was necessary if everybody understood what "sell out" means (and the word "political" was not attached thereto, as I understood it in your article)? Why did you say at that time "We authorized K. W. Simons to prepare a clarification as to what the word 'sell out' in the headlines were intended to mean"? Let me put it this way, sir, and of course, all we are looking for is just what the facts are.

Mr. NATHAN. Let me be candid about it, that we wanted to protect ourselves from a libel suit, and that is my only interest.

Senator PURTELL. So, you thought there was a possibility of a libel suit on the basis of the words "sell out"; is that correct?

Mr. NATHAN. There is always a possibility of a libel suit, Senator.

Senator PURTELL. But you felt it was important enough anyway to authorize K. W. Simons to prepare a clarification?

Mr. NATHAN. That is right.

Senator PURTELL. Would that lead one to believe, reading this testimony, that maybe the people of North Dakota did not exactly know what "sell out" meant, and it needed clarification?

Mr. NATHAN. I would be interested in a jury of 12 people.

Senator PURTELL. I have one more question.

You said, "I invited the persons present to read the Leader." Now, were you referring to a particular article in the Leader, or a particular issue in the Leader? You are speaking now of this meeting, at which you are reported to have said or charged Senator YOUNG with a bribe.

Mr. NATHAN. Yes, sir.

Senator PURTELL. And you say in your testimony, "I outlined the controversy at

the meeting of the progress as of that date," and you go on and you say that it was only the right and duty of the Leader to further press Senator YOUNG for an explanation of this contribution but that the Leader would continue to discuss relationships between Henry Grunewald and the junior Senator from North Dakota, and then you said, "I invited the persons present to read the Leader as we would continue to press the Senator for a full explanation of this matter."

Now, what issue of the Leader, if any, were you directing the people to read?

Mr. NATHAN. Future issues.

Senator PURTELL. Did you have in mind this particular issue, however?

Mr. NATHAN. No.

Senator PURTELL. You did not?

Mr. NATHAN. No.

Senator PURTELL. You say that you did use the word "bribe"?

Mr. NATHAN. Yes.

Senator PURTELL. Your statement says you did use the word "bribe"?

Mr. NATHAN. I used it in quoting Senator YOUNG.

Senator PURTELL. Can you tell us now how you quoted him, since there is some question as to what you really did say, as reported by one newspaper and what you have testified to as to what you said?

Mr. NATHAN. No; I do not recall.

Senator PURTELL. Well, do you recall whether you said, "As Senator YOUNG said—quote"?

Mr. NATHAN. When you speak, you do not speak in that manner.

Senator PURTELL. I do usually if I am quoting somebody else, but I do not know what practice other people have.

You simply said or you referred to it as a bribe; is that correct?

Mr. NATHAN. No; I think that I stated that Senator YOUNG has accused us of accepting a bribe.

Senator PURTELL. That is what I wanted to get at—how the word "bribe" came into your talk?

Mr. NATHAN. That is right.

Senator PURTELL. And you feel that was the extent of the use of the word "bribe," at this meeting, by you?

Mr. NATHAN. I am sorry. What I stated, Senator, was that Senator YOUNG has stated that we are accusing him of accepting a bribe, and the reason I made that statement is that a number of people who had not read the article had read the Fargo Forum and some of the other dailies and were inquiring as to what the controversy was all about.

Senator PURTELL. So, when you used the word "bribe" at this meeting which has been reported, as you testified, erroneously, you simply were using the word "bribe" or used the word "bribe" only in reference to what Senator YOUNG had said about it?

Mr. NATHAN. That is right.

Senator PURTELL. And that was the limited use of the word "bribe," is that correct?

Mr. NATHAN. Yes, sir.

Senator PURTELL. Except perhaps to explain. Did you at that time explain that you did not make a charge of bribery?

Mr. NATHAN. That is right.

Senator PURTELL. At that meeting?

Mr. NATHAN. That is right. We have some other members on the board of directors who were a little bit concerned over the matter, and they wanted an explanation. In other words, the Senator was threatening us with a law suit, and there was some interest as to what the controversy was all about and as to what had happened.

Senator PURTELL. Now, in the last paragraph of your statement, and I shall read it because I am sure that you probably would want to comment on it after I have asked the question, you say:

"We, of course, do not have any evidence that Senator YOUNG received any money in connection with his vote on the Fulbright-Harris bill, but the last time we know of he received any money, he received it from a notorious five percenter, Henry Grunewald."

Now, did you indicate or did you mean to indicate by that, that that might have been for a vote on some other matter?

Mr. NATHAN. I do not know.

Mr. PURTELL. But you know what you said here, and did you mean it was received in connection with a vote on something else, because you tie them up with a vote and it is all one sentence. You say, "We, of course, do not have any evidence that Senator YOUNG received any money in connection with his vote on the Fulbright-Harris bill, but the last time we know of he received any money, he received it from a notorious 5 percenter, Henry Grunewald."

Do you wish to construe that as meaning that he might have received it at that time for a vote from Grunewald, since you refer to a vote in the first instance?

Mr. NATHAN. No. I prepared that statement this morning, sir.

Senator PURTELL. I thought you would like to clear it up while you are here.

Mr. NATHAN. That is right. No, that should be a separate sentence.

Senator PURTELL. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Senator GOLDWATER. I have nothing, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair ask one further question. I have received a letter from Mr. Hjelle, John O. Hjelle, of the Bismarck Tribune Co., Bismarck, N. Dak., dated May 14, 1956, in response to an inquiry the Chairman made as to just what was said at this meeting when you spoke. He said, and I quote from it, "My notes show that Mr. Nathan stated, 'If you want to see more about the bribe that YOUNG received from the Dutchman Grunewald, you can read it in the Leader.' "

Did you make that statement?

Mr. NATHAN. No, I did not.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, he goes on in his letter and he says, "He made the comment in telling about the controversy between Senator YOUNG and the Leader. That is the official publication of the Nonpartisan League. The quote above is a direct quote and I am sure it is exactly what he said."

You still say that that is untrue?

Mr. NATHAN. No, I did not say that, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. He also said that Senator YOUNG was bluffing when he spoke of a libel action and predicted the Daily Press would "play the whole thing down," and concluded, "Before the Leader is through, YOUNG will be running around defending Grunewald instead of his voting record. There is no question in my mind that before the campaign is over the Leader is going to make him come in and tell under what circumstances he got that $5,000 from that notorious five percenter, Grunewald."

Is that part of his statement correct?

Mr. NATHAN. The last part is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The last part is correct?

Mr. NATHAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And the other where you referred to the bribe, "See more about the bribe that YOUNG received from the Dutchman Grunewald," is untrue?

Mr. NATHAN. That is untrue.

The CHAIRMAN. The other part is accurate?

Mr. NATHAN. Well, I do not recall talking about the bluffing, either, but I do remember stating that we were going to continue to press the Senator on the Grunewald matter.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, Counsel wished to ask you a question.

Mr. FAY. I think the record ought to show, also, Mr. Nathan, how old are you?

Mr. NATHAN. I am 35.

Mr. FAY. And what law school did you attend?

Mr. NATHAN. The University of North Dakota.

Mr. FAY. When did you graduate?

Mr. NATHAN. 1949.

Mr. FAY. You are a member of the bar?

Mr. NATHAN. That is right.

Mr. FAY. The bar of North Dakota?

Mr. NATHAN. That is right.

Mr. FAY. Are you a member of the bar of any other State or jurisdiction?

Mr. NATHAN. No.

Mr. FAY. As an attorney you know the difference between facts and conclusions?

Mr. NATHAN. That is right.

Mr. FAY. And as the chairman asked earlier, you know of no facts which are in your possession or available to you anyplace that in anywise would be a lead for this committee to follow with respect to any improper influence on any vote of Senator YOUNG in connection with any vote he might have cast?

Mr. NATHAN. No.

Mr. FAY. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions?

Thank you, very much, Mr. Nathan.

May I ask the witness to stand by for a few hours, or an hour or two until after lunch, until the committee can have an executive session to discuss further action.

At this time, the Chair is not prepared to say.

(Thereupon at 1:30 p. m., the hearing adjourned.)

(Thereafter, at an executive session, held at 3 p. m., March 24, 1956, it was unanimously voted by the committee to release the testimony in lieu of holding public hearings on the matter.)

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD that portion of the House hearing dealing with certain charges regarding a campaign contribution of $5,000 made to me by the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee in 1952. This document is known as Hearings Before a Subcommittee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, 82d Congress, 2d Session, on Administration of Internal Revenue Laws, Part 4. The part which I ask to have inserted commences on page 2915 with the subtitle "Testimony of Joseph Stearns, Washington, D. C." and goes to the middle of page 2943, ending with the line "Chairman King. You are welcome."

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF JOSEPH STEARNS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. DEWIND. I think Mr. Stearns, that you were just completing an answer to a question that had been put to you by a member of the committee. Do you remember what you were just talking about at the recess?

Mr. STEARNS. No. I thought I had finished.

Mr. BYRNES. I think the last question I asked him was when they made the last examination of Mr. Grunewald's income-tax return—that is, covering that period of 1948—and I think your answer was, in October 1949.

Mr. STEARNS. That is about right; yes, sir.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Stearns, I have here a photostatic copy of two worksheets which have been noted at the top, "J. Stearns work papers," and it says "Henry W. Grunewald, 1950 income tax." Could I show you this copy, Mr. Stearns? Is that a copy of the worksheet you prepared in connection with the 1950 income tax?

Mr. STEARNS. That is correct.

Mr. DEWIND. The only copy of it. Why don't you take it, and I will ask you some questions about it.

On that worksheet, Mr. Stearns, you have noted bank deposits; is that correct?

Mr. STEARNS. That is right; total deposits.

Mr. DEWIND. Total deposits. In going over those items, it seems to me that there were some items there that were not covered in the deposit slips that you went over before. Could you start and run through from the top of that and just explain to the committee how you set up those worksheets?

Mr. STEARNS. Who has the deposit tickets, Mr. DeWind?

Mr. DEWIND. Off the record.

(Off the record.)

Mr. DEWIND. On the record.

What is the first entry at the top of the 1950 worksheet?

Mr. STEARNS. The first entry. On January 3, I have under the column "total deposits" $1,000, and it is carried out into the cash column, $1,000.

Mr. DEWIND. I see. So you show the deposit and then identify it as cash or check?

Mr. STEARNS. That is right.

Mr. DEWIND. The first column shows the deposits, the second column shows cash, and the third column shows the checks; is that right?

Mr. STEARNS. That is right.

Mr. DEWIND. Working down through there, can you just identify each of those?

Mr. STEARNS. Yes. January 4 there is a deposit of $3,000, which was a check from Mr. William P. Maloney.

Mr. DEWIND. What is the date of that check?

Mr. STEARNS. A deposit for January 4, for $3,000.

Mr. DEWIND. That is identified on your worksheet as a check from Mr. Maloney.

Mr. STEARNS. That is right; that was returned by the bank—no funds.

Mr. DEWIND. So that check was returned by the bank, no funds, and then it was marked off as not a receipt.

Mr. STEARNS. That is right.

Mr. DEWIND. Do you know what that matter involved, that particular check?

Mr. STEARNS. Yes. It was the return of a loan. It was supposed to have been money which Mr. Maloney had borrowed from Mr. Grunewald.

Mr. DEWIND. That particular transaction washed out?

Mr. STEARNS. I am not sure about that. It may have been a note that Mr. Grunewald may have endorsed for Mr. Maloney.

Mr. DEWIND. All right, go ahead.

Mr. STEARNS. On January 13, there is a $5,000 cash item.

Mr. KEAN. Will you explain that check again.

Mr. STEARNS. The check of Mr. Maloney?

Mr. KEAN. The check of Mr. Maloney, yes.

Mr. STEARNS. On January 4 there was a deposit of $3,000 on the Pennsylvania Exchange Bank, and that was the check of Mr. William P. Maloney.

Mr. KEAN. Deposited by Mr. Grunewald?

Mr. STEARNS. That is right. That was returned by the bank—no funds.

Mr. KEAN. No funds or insufficient funds?

Mr. STEARNS. I have it marked down here "returned, no funds."

Mr. KEAN. That was a bank notation, "no funds"?

Mr. STEARNS. I think so. This is my notation on the stub here, on my worksheet, "no funds." There might have been insufficient funds, but I just put "no funds" there.

Mr. KEAN. If a man draws a check on a bank where he has a bank account, and if it is for more money than he has, it is returned marked "Insufficient funds." It would be sort of unusual for anybody to draw a check on a bank that didn't handle his particular account.

Mr. STEARNS. This might have been no such funds. I just marked down "returned, no funds," on the worksheet for my own information.

Mr. DEWIND. How were you informed that that was a purported repayment of a loan?

Mr. STEARNS. I think Mr. Grunewald endorsed a note for him, and Mr. Grunewald may have paid the note off. I am just a bit hazy on that. It may have been an outright loan that he had made, returning it.

Mr. DEWIND. Who told you that?

Mr. STEARNS. I saw a slip of paper some place in the file. It should be in the jacket, form 50 jacket.

Mr. DEWIND. That was another note given to you by Mr. Grunewald?

Mr. STEARNS. It might have been a notice from the bank, notice due, and it may be Mr. Maloney paid it with this check and maybe did not.

Mr. DEWIND. Let's come back to that later. Anyway, you have identified that as the repayment of a loan, except that the check bounced.

Mr. STEARNS. That is right.

On January 13, a deposit of $5,000 cash.

January 17 we have a deposit of $16,750 cash. That was to pay the installment of January 15 income tax due on 1949, final estimate for that year. That was an actual deposit.

On January 30 there was a $1,000 deposit in cash.

February 3 there was a deposit in the Riggs Bank of a check for $149.65.

On February 3 there was a deposit of $5,000 cash. The deposit has a notation "Spring Lake house."

On February 14 there was a deposit of $5,000 cash marked "Spring Lake house."

Mr. DEWIND. Do you know what "Spring Lake house" means?

Mr. STEARNS. That was to pay for the construction of the house, I dare say.

Mr. DEWIND. The house had been built in 1950?

Mr. STEARNS. That is right.

On March 10 there was a check deposited, $1,580, which is to Pan American.

On March 16 there was a deposit, a check, $9,745.20, which was a loan, I understand. He gave a mortgage on one of those properties.

April 25 there was a cash deposit of $600.

May 5 there was a cash deposit of $500.

Mr. DEWIND. What was that one?

Mr. STEARNS. It is unidentified, cash $500.

On May 12 there was a deposit of a check, $4,063.50.

Mr. DEWIND. On one of your other worksheets here there is an indication of a deposit slip in between there. Do you have that one?

Mr. STEARNS. $10,000, and it is marked "Brewster check." That was what I got from Mr. Grunewald when I made the entry. He gave me later on the name Brewster, that is all.

Mr. KEAN. What is that?

Mr. STEARNS. May 9 there was a deposit of $1,000 on my worksheet, but I don't have the duplicate deposit ticket for it.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Deposit by whom?

Mr. STEARNS. Brewster check, that is all; a check marked "Brewster."

Mr. DEWIND. I think there is a deposit slip there for that.

Mr. STEARNS. Here it is; yes. May 9, a check for $10,000, and I have written on there "Br," Brewster.

Mr. DEWIND. Is that in your handwriting?

Mr. STEARNS. That is my handwriting; yes, sir.

Mr. DEWIND. What is that item? Do you have an entry for it?

Mr. STEARNS. He just told me it was the Brewster check, with no explanation.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Who is that Brewster; do you know?

Mr. STEARNS. You will have to ask Mr. Grunewald. He just said the Brewster check. I marked down there "Br."

Mr. DEWIND. You have no copy of the check that was covered by that item?

Mr. STEARNS. Do I have a copy of the check?

Mr. DEWIND. That is what I am asking. I assume not.

Mr. STEARNS. That would be in the form 50 jacket which Mr. Davis has, if I do have it.

Mr. DEWIND. This would be, presumably, not Mr. Grunewald's check but a Brewster check.

Mr. STEARNS. It is a check for $1,000, and I have put down in the corner "Br" for Brewster.

Mr. DEWIND. You do not have a copy of that check before you?

Mr. STEARNS. No, sir. That was one item I had marked off for discussion with Mr. Grunewald when I went over the papers with him.

Mr. DEWIND. Did you discuss it with him?

Mr. STEARNS. Yes; because he told me Brewster, and I put "Br" on it and that was all.

Mr. DEWIND. What did he say about the item?

Mr. STEARNS. He said it was not a taxable item; it was just an exchange of checks.

Mr. DEWIND. He told you it was an exchange of checks?

Mr. STEARNS. That is right.

Mr. DEWIND. And nontaxable?

Mr. STEARNS. That is right.

Mr. DEWIND. What did he mean by "exchange of checks"?

Mr. STEARNS. He might have given his check for this check or something like that. He might have put out $10,000 and gotten a check back for it.

Mr. DEWIND. Do any of the checks in the Grunewald bank account show a repayment of this sum?

Mr. STEARNS. I think it does. I think my work papers show it there; it may.

Mr. DEWIND. What is the date of the check?

Mr. STEARNS. The deposit was May 9.

Mr. DEWIND. Yes; but I mean you say there is evidence that there was an exchange.

Mr. STEARNS. No; I am just guessing at that. I would have to look at my work papers first to recollect that.

Mr. DEWIND. Here is a photostatic copy of worksheets that were prepared by representatives of the Bureau of Internal Revenue listing all of the checks drawn on the Grunewald bank account in the year 1950. Would that serve to help you identify the exchange—the Brewster exchange?

Mr. STEARNS. This is a copy of my worksheet.

Mr. DEWIND. That is a copy of your worksheet?

Mr. STEARNS. That is right.

Mr. DEWIND. That is in your handwriting?

Mr. STEARNS. No; it is not my handwriting.

Mr. DEWIND. This photostat I just handed you, then, is a copy, in the handwriting of an internal-revenue agent, of your worksheets that were originally prepared by you?

Mr. STEARNS. I think it was. Except for the remarks on the side—except for the remarks.

Mr. KEAN. What year is this?

Mr. DEWIND. 1950.

Mr. KEAN. This is one of the later examinations?

Mr. DEWIND. Yes.

I guess you know the question I have in mind. Can you find on there the identification of the exchange item by which the $10,000 was returned to Brewster?

Mr. STEARNS. It may have been a cash transaction for all I know. I just don't recall the facts now.

Mr. DEWIND. Do you find any check there?

Mr. STEARNS. No, sir.

Mr. DEWIND. A check around October 19? Let's see if there is any evidence there of a check.

Mr. STEARNS. There is a check October 19 for $2,500.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Louder.

Mr. STEARNS. There is a check which is dated October 19 for $2,500, made out to Owen Brewster, and the agents remarked here "Endorsed to Dorothy Brewster, New York Trust Co.," I think. That is what it looks like. That is for $2,500.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Stearns, there is here a photostatic copy of a canceled check dated October 19, 1950, drawn to the order of Owen Brewster in the sum of $2,500, and signed Henry Grunewald. The check is unnumbered. It is drawn on the Munsey Trust Co., Washington, D. C. Could I get you to look at this check and see if you can identify whether or not this is Mr. Grunewald's signature on the check?

Mr. STEARNS. That is his signature.

Mr. DEWIND. Is that part of this so-called exchange item?

Mr. STEARNS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DEWIND. That only accounts for $2,500 out of the $10,000.

Mr. STEARNS. I will have to see my own work papers. Of course, this is the agent's papers. I don't have my papers.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Chairman, may this photostatic copy of this check be made part of the record at this point?

Chairman KING. If there is no objection, that is so ordered.

(The document referred to as follows:)

[Document omitted in the record.]

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Stearns, do you have your work papers for 1950?

Mr. STEARNS. No, sir.

Mr. DEWIND. Where are the work papers for 1950?

Mr. STEARNS. They were turned over to one of Mr. Grunewald's attorneys, William E. Davis. I will give you the exact date, December 7 or 8.

Mr. DEWIND. That is December 7 or 8 of 1951?

Mr. STEARNS. That is right.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. William E. Davis asked——

Mr. STEARNS. That is right; he asked for the file. It was right after the agents returned the file to me.

Mr. DEWIND. Prior to December 7, I gather from what you have said here, the internal revenue agents must have examined those work papers.

Mr. STEARNS. Yes, sir. November 30 Special Agent McCarthy and Revenue Agent Albrecht came into my office unannounced and said they wanted to see Mr. Grunewald's file for 1949 and for 1950. I gave them the file and they looked through it and I said, "Take it along with you, and when you are through with it bring it back." They kept it a week and returned it the following Friday. The next day, Saturday, Mr. Davis picked it up.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Stearns, when you were requested or received a subpena last year to produce any records in your possession of Mr. Grunewald's, these were records that you had of Mr. Grunewald's which you were not able to produce under that subpena?

Mr. STEARNS. That is right.

Mr. DEWIND. What steps have you taken to recover possession of these work papers?

Mr. STEARNS. I spoke to Mr. Davis about it. He says he has them and refuses to turn them over to me.

Mr. DEWIND. He refuses to turn your own work papers over to you?

Mr. STEARNS. That is right. He has them. He is one of the attorneys for Mr. Grunewald.

Mr. DEWIND. When did you ask Mr. Davis to return these work papers?

Mr. STEARNS. I never asked him, exactly. I told him I was going to appear before the committee and they would ask me questions about the work papers. He said, "Well, they are in my possession, and I want to keep them."

Chairman KING. Did you notify this committee or any of its staff, Mr. Stearns, that pursuant to that subpena you were unable to produce these documents and papers?

Mr. STEARNS. When I was served with the subpena I came right down here. I think it was Mr. Levine, was it?

Mr. DEWIND. I think that is right, yes.

Mr. STEARNS. He came to my office, and I said, "I will get Mr. Grunewald's file." I showed him what I had down there. I told Mr. Levine that the 1949 and 1950 papers were not then in my possession so I couldn't bring them down here. I think you remember that.

Mr. DEWIND. That is entirely right, I will say, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Stearns has furnished everything that he has told us he has been able to produce and has in every way been entirely cooperative with the staff.

Mr. Stearns, you said that this October 19, 1950, check for $2,500 was part of this exchange transaction which started in May, on May 9, with the receipt of this Brewster deposit for $10,000. How did you know that those two transactions are part of the same exchange?

Mr. STEARNS. I am taking Mr. Grunewald's word for it.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald told you it was?

Mr. STEARNS. That is right. I am taking his word for that.

Mr. DEWIND. Then it is your conclusion from that information that the deposit of $10,000 on May 9, 1950, was on a check of Owen Brewster; is that right?

Mr. STEARNS. I think it was. I didn't see the check but I suppose it was.

Mr. DEWIND. Where is the balance of that exchange transaction? That leaves $7,500.

Mr. STEARNS. In my work papers which I think you have—you have a photostatic copy of it there—I can point it out to you.

Mr. DEWIND. I have a photostatic copy here.

Mr. STEARNS. Here it is. August 7 there is a $3,500 deposit here, August 21 there is a $1,500 deposit.

Mr. DEWIND. These are deposits by Mr. Grunewald in his account?

Mr. STEARNS. That is right. And August 21 there is a $5,000 deposit.

Mr. DEWIND. Just a moment. $3,500 on August 7, $1,500 on August 21?

Mr. STEARNS. That is correct.

Mr. DEWIND. And $5,000 on August 31?

Mr. STEARNS. August 21, the same day, it looks like.

Mr. DEWIND. Those are deposits which total $10,000; is that right?

Mr. STEARNS. That is right. I have marked that "Exchange out $10,000."

Mr. DEWIND. I beg your pardon?

Mr. STEARNS. I have a notation here, "Exchange out $10,000." That is just my own information, that it was to be eliminated from his tax——

Mr. DEWIND. Those are deposits that Mr. Grunewald made?

Mr. STEARNS. That is right.

Mr. DEWIND. Where are the withdrawals?

Mr. STEARNS. I don't have my work papers. I can't answer without my work papers.

Mr. DEWIND. Are you working on the assumption that there were offsetting checks totaling $10,000 drawn against——

Mr. STEARNS. Yes. I think altogether there were about $12,500. That is Mr. Grunewald's information to me. Altogether it was about $12,500.

Mr. DEWIND. Of checks drawn to the order of Owen Brewster?

Mr. STEARNS. I don't know who they were drawn to, but it was a deposit inside his account of about $12,500 and withdrawals of about $12,500. That was his explanation to me.

Mr. DEWIND. How were the withdrawals made?

Mr. STEARNS. I can't tell without my work sheets, and that is in my file which Mr. Davis has.

Mr. DEWIND. Here are some photostatic copies of the work sheets that were copied by the Internal Revenue Bureau. Let me show you all of these and see if you can gain any assistance from those. You have told me, have you, that these photostats copied by the agents are of no help to you?

Mr. STEARNS. That is right.

Mr. DEWIND. Could you do this: Could you look at this list of checks drawn on the Grunewald accounts for the year 1950, that was copied from your work papers by the internal revenue agents, and say whether there is any other check on there drawn to the order of Owen Brewster except the check of October 19, 1950, for $2,500?

Mr. STEARNS. No, all you find is one check for $2,500.

Mr. DEWIND. All I find in the year 1950 is the receipt of a Brewster deposit of $10,000 and a check drawn against that back to Owen Brewster for $2,500.

Mr. STEARNS. That is right.

Mr. DEWIND. Taking the photostatic copy of this check of October 19 can you make out the endorsement on that check and the banks through which the check cleared?

Mr. STEARNS. Endorsement "for deposit only to credit of Dorothy Brewster" and Owen Brewster, and some other name there.

Mr. DEWIND. Is that an endorsement possibly "Dorothy Brewster"?

Mr. STEARNS. It could be. There is a "Dorothy Brewster" and an "Owen Brewster," and then some other name. I don't know what that name is. Is that "Dorothy Brewster"?

Mr. DEWIND. That could be the endorsement after the endorsement to her order.

Mr. STEARNS. It says "For deposit only to credit of Dorothy Brewster" and Owen Brewster, that is right, and she might have signed it "Dorothy Brewster."

Mr. DEWIND. You can't make that out for sure?

Mr. STEARNS. Not very well.

Mr. DEWIND. Can you make out through which banks the check cleared?

Mr. STEARNS. It looks like the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston.

Mr. DEWIND. Federal Reserve Bank of Boston.

Mr. STEARNS. But that is just the clearing.

Mr. DEWIND. In what bank was the check deposited for collection?

Mr. STEARNS. Bangor Trust Co.

Mr. DEWIND. Bangor Trust Co.?

Mr. STEARNS. No; any bank or trust company. It is all smeared up and you can't make it out very well. It is not very clear.

There is a notation here on the worksheet, the "Day Trust Co.," with the bank serial number, 51–86, I think it is.

Mr. DEWIND. Did Mr. Grunewald give you any further identification as to the identity of the Owen Brewster involved in this transaction?

Mr. STEARNS. No. He told me he received in all $12,500, and he paid back $12,500.

Mr. DEWIND. From whom?

Mr. STEARNS. From Brewster. He never told me that——

Mr. DEWIND. But did he identify him?

Mr. STEARNS. No; he didn't identify him.

Mr. DEWIND. Did he identify who the Owen Brewster was?

Mr. STEARNS. No, he didn't tell me it was Senator Brewster. He merely said Brewster. It never occurred to me it might be Senator Brewster.

Mr. DEWIND. Have you been able to identify the bank through which that check cleared?

Mr. STEARNS. It says "Day Trust Co."

Mr. DEWIND. D-a-y?

Mr. STEARNS. D-a-y, that is right; the serial number is 51–86.

Mr. DEWIND. Can you make out or does it state the location of the bank through which it cleared?

Mr. STEARNS. That seems to be smeared up somewhat. I can't make it out very well.

Mr. DEWIND. Have you got any further way of identifying the persons involved in this transaction and what the transaction is all about?

Mr. STEARNS. No, sir. I think I made a notation in my own work papers, something about $12,500, and I said, "Clears through Brewster."

Mr. DEWIND. How can it be $12,500? The incoming check that was deposited in May was $10,000; is that right?

Mr. STEARNS. I am trusting to memory now. I would have to see my work papers.

Mr. DEWIND. The deposit slip shows $10,000.

Mr. STEARNS. That is right.

Mr. DEWIND. Then you find that there were cash deposits in August, 3 cash deposits totaling $10,000, but you find no checks drawn against those deposits, that is, no checks to Owen Brewster in August or September, but you do find a $2,500 check on October 19 drawn to the order of Owen Brewster by Henry Grunewald.

Mr. STEARNS. Let me see. There are listed here 3 items which he explained to me, August 7 and August 21, which total $10,000, as exchange of $10,000. I recall it might have been exchanges with Brewster.

Mr. DEWIND. Is that what Mr. Grunewald said?

Mr. STEARNS. It is my understanding that that is his explanation of that; that is right.

Mr. DEWIND. What is the $2,500 check in October of 1950?

Mr. STEARNS. A check that he paid out. That is part of the $12,500, as I remember it, altogether.

Mr. DEWIND. Are you able to show any other amounts coming in, the $10,000, in the Brewster exchange?

Mr. STEARNS. No, sir.

Mr. DEWIND. Are you quite clear in your recollection that Mr. Grunewald identified the August cash deposits as amounts that he intended to use in the exchange transaction?

Mr. STEARNS. I have them marked here "Exchange" and crossed out $10,000, and that is all——

Mr. DEWIND. In order to pin that down, do yon not have to find withdrawals in the form of either checks to Owen Brewster or at least checks to cash which might have been cashed and the money turned over?

Mr. STEARNS. That is what might have been.

Mr. DEWIND. Were there any checks, whether drawn to the order of Owen Brewster or to cash or in any other way, in the sum of $10,000 after August 21?

Mr. STEARNS. Here is an item here. August 16, Liberty National Bank, $6,500.

Mr. DEWIND. I beg your pardon?

Mr. STEARNS. For instance, here is an item. August 16, $6,500 to Liberty National Bank, and then it says "Bank statement notation, Br."

Mr. DEWIND. Is that a deposit in the Grunewald account?

Mr. STEARNS. No; that is a check issued by Grunewald.

Mr. DEWIND. A check issued by Grunewald on August 6?

Mr. STEARNS. On August 16.

Mr. DEWIND. August 16.

Mr. STEARNS. At least cleared through the bank then; $6,500 Liberty National Bank. It says "Bank statement notation, Br." That means on the bank statement which we received from Munsey, someone put a notation next to it, "Br." That I think is the Brewster check.

Mr. DEWIND. What is the Liberty National?

Mr. STEARNS. I don't know. That is just a notation.

Mr. DEWIND. Was the check drawn——

Mr. STEARNS. It says check drawn to order Liberty National Bank, the payee, $6,500. Then on the Munsey statement showing the check canceling through the bank is "Br." written next to it, which meant Brewster.

Mr. DEWIND. Was that in your handwriting?

Mr. STEARNS. No; I don't think so, because this notation is in the agent's handwriting, and it says "Bank statement notation, Br.".

Mr. DEWIND. That was not a check to the order of Owen Brewster?

Mr. STEARNS. No.

Mr. DEWIND. But a check to the order of Liberty National Bank?

Mr. STEARNS. It says payee; yes, sir.

Mr. DEWIND. Where is the Liberty National Bank?

Mr. STEARNS. At 15th and I Streets.

Mr. DEWIND. In Washington, D. C.?

Mr. STEARNS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DEWIND. Leaving that for the moment, Mr. Stearns, you were running through these worksheets for 1950, and you had gotten down as far as May 9 when we got into this transaction.

Mr. STEARNS. May 12 there is a deposit of a check, $4,063.50. That is from the Marsh estate.

June 1 there is a check for $300. That as I explained before was made payable to Mr. Grunewald, and he paid his check to Mr. Burke.

Mr. DEWIND. What was the name on that, Mr. Stearns?

Mr. STEARNS. June 1, $300.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I can't hear you. I am interested in this.

Mr. STEARNS. There is a notation on the slip here, "Commission"—or "C-o-m-m."—"to C. Burke from D. Dahl."

That check was made payable to Mr. Grunewald, and I told him to deposit that check and give Mr. Burke his own check to keep the record straight.

Mr. DEWIND. Do you know what that transaction was?

Mr. STEARNS. No. He told me it was given to him for a check. I said, "The check was made payable to you, so you put it in and gave Burke your own check."

Mr. DEWIND. Is Mr. Burke an employee of Mr. Grunewald's?

Mr. STEARNS. C. Burke.

Mr. DEWIND. He is a chauffeur?

Mr. STEARNS. I think he is, that is right.

Mr. DEWIND. He is Mr. Grunewald's chauffeur so far as you know?

Mr. STEARNS. That is right.

June 9 there is a deposit of cash, $1,000.

June 14 there was a cash deposit of $1,250.

June 22 there is a cash deposit of $500, and with the notation, "Redeposited, check withdrawn."

Cash for $3,000 withdrawn June 21, 1950. That was a redeposit. In other words, he took out $3,000 from the bank and then put back $500.

June 27 there is a deposit of cash $3,500. On the back of it there is a notation to me: "Henry withdrew two checks covering this deposit: $2,500 income tax, $1,000 hotel. E. A. M." That must have been Eddie Martin.

Mr. DEWIND. I couldn't hear that, Mr. Stearns.

Mr. STEARNS. On this deposit slip here, June 27, there is a $3,500 cash deposit, and attached to the deposit slip is a statement made out to me. It says, "Henry withdrew two checks covering this deposit: $2,500 income tax, and $1,000 hotel. E. A. M."

Mr. DEWIND. Who is "E. A. M."?

Mr. STEARNS. I suppose it is Eddie Martin.

Mr. DEWIND. Is that an attorney for Mr. Grunewald?

Mr. STEARNS. That is right. He was his attorney at one time. I think he still is. I don't know.

On July 6 there was a deposit of a check for $300, Dahl's check for Burke, the same thing as before, $300 again.

On July 21 there was a deposit, $1,000 cash, and it was marked "Exchange," some check. I have a notation here "Redeposit for check issued June 9, for $1,000."

August 7, here is a deposit ticket. I don't have the deposit ticket, but there is a deposit ticket for $3,500. August 21, $1,500, and August 21 again, $500.

Mr. DEWIND. Are those cash deposits?

Mr. STEARNS. They were cash deposits, yes.

Mr. DEWIND. $10,000 of cash deposits?

Mr. STEARNS. That is right. That was marked "Exchange out," that is, exchange out $10,000.

Mr. DEWIND. That notation of "Exchange out" is something you got from Mr. Grunewald at the end of the year?

Mr. STEARNS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DEWIND. After you had worked up the worksheets?

Mr. STEARNS. Yes; that is right.

Here is a deposit ticket, "Br." and checks as follows: $5,000 and $1,500.

Mr. DEWIND. What is the date on this one?

Mr. STEARNS. Wait a minute. This is August 14, but I have here August 21 for some reason on my worksheet, yet the deposit ticket here shows a $6,500 deposit on August 14.

Mr. DEWIND. Is there a check of Owen Brewster?

Mr. STEARNS. It says just $5,000 check and a $1,500 check and it is marked "Br." next to it.

Mr. DEWIND. In whose handwriting is "Br."? Can you tell?

Mr. STEARNS. I think that is my handwriting. It looks like my handwriting. He must have told me that.

Mr. DEWIND. Are those two items cash deposits?

Mr. STEARNS. No; they are check deposits.

Mr. DEWIND. Two checks were deposited?

Mr. STEARNS. I listed the checks. They are not shown in the cash column here.

Mr. DEWIND. There were 2 checks deposited on August 14; 1 for $6,500?

Mr. STEARNS. No; 1 for $5,000 and and 1 for $1,500.

Mr. DEWIND. Totaling $6,500?

Mr. STEARNS. That is right.

Mr. DEWIND. Can you identify those as being checks of Owen Brewster?

Mr. STEARNS. I can't identify them; no. I have them listed down here. I didn't know what they were. Later on this was shown to me, this deposit ticket.

August 28 there is a deposit of $2,500 in cash, and I have a shorthand note down here marked "borrowed." That is what he must have told me.

Mr. KEAN. What is that?

Mr. STEARNS. A shorthand notation, marked "borrowed," b-o-r-r-o-w-e-d.

September 12 there was a $1,000 cash deposit.

September 15 there was a cash deposit of $1,250.

September 25 there was a cash deposit of $500, a notation on this slip, "In re Democratic National Committee."

October 2 there was a deposit in cash of $5,080.

October 5 there is a deposit in cash of $4,600.

I have a notation of $1,000 for which we cannot find the slip. That was taken from the bank statement, no doubt.

On October 19 I have a $2,500 deposit, exchange check. There was a check for $2,5000, and at the bottom is the notation, "Exchange check, Stern to B, $2,500."

Mr. DEWIND. In whose handwriting is that exchange check?

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Grunewald's handwriting.

Mr. DEWIND. That is the only identification there is?

Mr. STEARNS. That is right.

This is the one I think you handed me separately.

Mr. DEWIND. That is the October——

Mr. STEARNS. That is right, that is the October 19 check.

Mr. DEWIND. Just a moment. What is this you are holding up there?

Mr. STEARNS. On the back of it here is an account which says: "Dakota National Bank, Fargo, N. Dak. Henry Grunewald credit account, William Stern (?) (you), $100 sight check."

Mr. DEWIND. May I see that, please?

Mr. Chairman, this is a photostatic copy of a statement furnished by the Munsey Trust Co., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. It has at the top No. A-72378, and then it says, "Dakota National Bank, Fargo, N. Dak. Owner: Henry Grunewald, credit account." Then down below, "Date received October 1950, payer, William Stern (?) (you)." Then below that is says "No protest, please remit, airmail, amount $2,500. Due, sight. Documents, check. Your number or date, 10-19-50." Then it is stamped, "Disposition: The item hereon described is October 25, 1950, paid and credited." Down in the lower righthand corner it says, "$2,500 net amount."

That is attached to a deposit slip on the Munsey Trust Co. dated October 19, 1950, for $2,500 on which there is written "B exchange," which Mr. Stearns identified as Mr. Grunewald's handwriting, and below that it says, "Exchange check, Stern to B, $2,500."

Mr. STEARNS. That might have been for my information.

Mr. BYRNES. Does anybody know who Stern is?

Mr DEWIND. Can you identify Mr. Stern?

Mr. STEARNS. Other than it might have meant me.

Mr. BYRNES. Will somebody explain that last transaction?

Mr. DEWIND. I am not able to explain it, Mr. Byrnes.

Mr. BYRNES. Can the witness explain it at all?

Mr. STEARNS. Let me say, here is what the record shows. On October 19 there was a deposit made of $2,500, and that was for a check or a draft which must—I think it was made by the Munsey Trust Co. on the Dakota National Bank from Fargo, N. Dak., for Mr. Grunewald's credit. That is what this looks like to me.

Mr. KEAN. A draft on the bank?

Mr. STEARNS. Yes, sir. Here it says: "Dakota National Bank, Fargo, N. Dak., Owner: Henry Grunewald, credit account, date received Munsey Trust Co., October 19, 1950." and the "payer, William Stern, to Mr. Grunewald for $2,500 on sight." Then with the rubber stamp of the bank, "The item herein described is paid and credited October 25, 1950."

Mr. BYRNES. Did Mr. Grunewald have an account in the Dakota bank?

Mr. STEARNS. No; I don't think so. I never knew of it. It looks like a sight draft on the bank in North Dakota to Mr. Grunewald's credit.

Mr. BYRNES. Yes. But it would be an order on the bank in Dakota to pay out of their funds.

Mr. STEARNS. To Mr. Grunewald.

Mr. BYRNES. To Mr. Grunewald.

Mr. STEARNS. That is right, and Munsey collected the account for Mr. Grunewald and deposited it in Mr. Grunewald's account.

Mr. DEWIND. Do you have any further information concerning this transaction?

Mr. STEARNS. No; just what you have here. That is all I know.

Mr. DEWIND. You don't know what was involved, what was the reason for it?

Mr. STEARNS. No, sir.

Mr. BYRNES. Wouldn't it appear from that that Mr. Grunewald had some funds or amounts due him from the Dakota bank?

Mr. STEARNS. I would think so.

Mr. BYRNES. You don't know, to your knowledge at least, of any account that Mr. Grunewald maintained at that bank?

Mr. STEARNS. I don't think he did. I don't know that he had an account there.

Mr. BYRNES. You cannot very well draw a draft on a bank that you don't have any funds in, can you, and have it clear and get money as a result of the draft?

Mr. STEARNS. I never heard of any account that he had there.

Mr. BYRNES. If he did not have an account they would not honor it.

Mr. STEARNS. I don't know why they would honor it. There was a collection account. They credit Mr. Grunewald's account. That is all I can explain to you.

Mr. BYRNES. The explanation would be that he had funds in the North Dakota bank or at least had a credit.

Mr. STEARNS. He might have had a credit. He had no funds in it, I am almost certain about that.

Mr. BYRNES. Could they have had an item out there for collection——

Mr. STEARNS. No, sir; not that I know of.

Mr. BYRNES. For Mr. Grunewald?

Mr. STEARNS. I don't know how this originated or what the purpose of it is.

Mr. BYRNES. You never got any explanation from Mr. Grunewald as to that transaction?

Mr. STEARNS. Outside of the fact that this was part of that $12,500 exchange of checks.

Mr. BYRNES. The Brewster transaction?

Mr. STEARNS. Yes, sir.

Chairman KING. Mr. Stearns, you knew nothing about this transaction for him to explain, or you to inquire, how a bank in the State of North Dakota would be in the transaction? Was it the usual thing for transactions of Mr. Gruenwald to entail financial institutions——

Mr. STEARNS. It is not usual; no sir. When I asked him, he said it was merely an exchange of funds. That was his explanation to me.

Chairman KING. That is as far as you pursued it?

Mr. STEARNS. That is right.

Chairman KING. Have you any knowledge of other transactions of Mr. Gruenwald which entailed——

Mr. STEARNS. The record doesn't show any.

Mr. KEAN. He had a home in Miami, and he had a home in Spring Lake. As far as you know, he had no bank account in either of those places?

Mr. STEARNS. I will accept his word for that because I have known him for 30 years, and I have never known him to be a liar.

Mr. KEAN. He didn't tell you?

Mr. STEARNS. I never knew him to be a liar. I have known him for over 30 years.

Chairman KING. He either told the truth or he did not talk; is that it?

Mr. STEARNS. That might be it.

Mr. BYRNES. In that connection he told you that he made all this 90 percent and 100 percent at times of his income for a whole year at gambling. Do you believe that they were horse-race winnings?

Mr. STEARNS. When I asked him if he had been winning for several years and I didn't believe him, at the same time I didn't tell him that I believed him, but I said, "I will have to report it." All I was concerned about was to get it on the return; that is all.

Mr. BYRNES. I mean, as far as his honesty and integrity is concerned, did you believe that that was where he made, for instance, over $100,000?

Mr. STEARNS. It is a lot of money to make, but that was his explanation to me of those things. He never lied to me about anything with regard to his financial matters. I was never concerned about how he made the money or just where it came from as long as we got it in the return; that is all.

Mr. BYRNES. I would like to get your impression as to whether or not you believed that Mr. Grunewald was stating the facts when he told you that this $100,000, for instance, over $100,000, that he made in this 1 year recently, was income from gambling and horse racing?

Mr. STEARNS. You say do I believe it?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes.

Mr. STEARNS. It is pretty hard to believe; I tell you the truth.

Mr. BYRNES. That is the way it occurs to me, too.

Chairman KING. The committee will recess for 5 minutes.

(Brief recess.)

Chairman KING. The committee will come to order.

Mr. BYRNES. There is one more thing, Mr. Stearns, I would like to go back to, and that is the so-called draft or memorandum on the North Dakota bank. This in itself is not in the form of a legal instrument, is it, such as a draft or a promissory note or order?

Mr. STEARNS. Here it says "Please remit, air mail."

Mr. BYRNES. Isn't it more in the form of a memorandum that probably accompany a draft?

Mr. STEARNS. I couldn't answer that, but——

Mr. BYRNES. It is not a draft in and of itself.

Mr. STEARNS. No, sir.

Mr. BYRNES. There is no order to anybody or to anybody.

Mr. STEARNS. That is right.

Mr. BYRNES. It is more likely to be some kind of a bank form——

Mr. STEARNS. That is right.

Mr. BYRNES. That they use either to accompany a draft or to put into their files showing information that was on a draft that was sent out.

Mr. STEARNS. That might be; yes, sir.

Mr. BYRNES. So there is no way that you can determine from that exactly on whom the draft was drawn nor to whose credit it was drawn or against whose credit it was drawn?

Mr. STEARNS. That is right.

Mr. BYRNES. All we know is that there are those various names, such as Sterns.

Mr. STEARNS. Not me.

Mr. BYRNES. That is not you?

Mr. STEARNS. No, no.

Mr. BYRNES. You do not know what Stern it is?

Mr. STEARNS. It is William Stern, a banker in Fargo, N. Dak.

Mr. BYRNES. What?

Mr. STEARNS. It is William Stern, a banker, of Fargo, N. Dak.

Mr. BYRNES. William Stern is an individual?

Mr. STEARNS. No; he is a banker in Fargo, N. Dak.

Mr. BYRNES. He is a banker?

Mr. STEARNS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BYRNES. And it is the same bank?

Mr. STEARNS. The Dakota Bank, at Fargo, N. Dak.

Mr. BYRNES. He is an officer of that bank?

Mr. STEARNS. He is president of the bank.

Mr. BYRNES. I see. We do know from that and from the deposit slip that apparently that had something to do with the $2,500 deposit that was made to Mr. Grunewald's account in the Munsey Bank in Washington.

Mr. STEARNS. That is right.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Grunewald told you that it had something to do with a Brewster transaction?

Mr. STEARNS. That is right.

(Senator Brewster entered the room.)

Chairman KING. You may be excused temporarily, Mr. Stearns. Will you remain about?

Will you come forward, Senator Brewster, please?

Will you be sworn, sir? Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you will give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Senator BREWSTER. I do.

TESTIMONY OF HON. OWEN BREWSTER, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MAINE

Chairman KING. Be seated, Senator. You know, of course, that in the course of the testimony today your name has been brought in involving financial matters. That is all. You may proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Senator BREWSTER. I want to express my appreciation to you for affording me the courtesy of so prompt a hearing. Your counsel, Mr. DeWind, called me some weeks ago, and I explained to him about this transaction about which he apparently was then informed, and told him that I would be very happy to make myself available to the committee at any time for any discussion of it which was desired. So I appreciate your courtesy in hearing me so promptly, so there may be no misunderstanding regarding the circumstances of this case.

Mr. DEWIND. Senator, do you wish to make a statement concerning this?

Senator BREWSTER. I do not know precisely what has been brought out here. I understand there is a question of some checks.

Mr. DEWIND. Yes, the subcommittee has been examining Mr. Stearns with respect to finance transactions with Mr. Grunewald as to which we could get no information from Mr. Grunewald himself. In the course of that, in going through various items, Mr. Stearns has referred to a $10,000 deposit made in May of 1950 which is identified in his record as the Brewster deposit. He said he could not identify it beyond that.

Senator BREWSTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DEWIND. He then identified a check, photostatic copy of a check dated October 19, 1950, in the amount of $2,500 drawn to the order of Owen Brewster.

Senator BREWSTER. Yes?

Mr. DEWIND. And he said he knew nothing more about that check. Then there were some other entries in his work papers indicating cash deposits in Grunewald's bank account and check deposits which he was unable to identify as to the source of the deposit except that one of the deposit slips was marked "Br" which he said indicated Brewster.

Senator BREWSTER. Do you remember the date of that?

Mr. DEWIND. Yes; they were in August. On August 14, 1950, Mr. Stearns has said there were 2 deposits, 2 checks deposited, 1 in the amount of $5,000 and 1 in the amount of $1,500, and on the deposit slip is written "Br." Then there are 3 cash deposits made in August, during the month of August 3 different cash deposits totaling $10,000, which he said Mr. Grunewald told him were part of a Brewster exchange transaction.

Senator BREWSTER. I am not familiar with all of these. I have the records of this $10,000 item of which you speak, which is covered by my check of May 8, 1950, I believe.

Mr. DEWIND. Would it be helpful to you, Senator, to describe all financial transactions you have made?

Senator BREWSTER. Yes; perhaps that would be the best way of clearing it up.

I would like in justice to Mr. Grunewald to exempt him from any degree of responsibility and culpability so far as these transactions are concerned, as they were made entirely at my own request, and in a matter in which Mr. Grunewald had no interest whatsoever. The circumstances were that I was chairman of the Republican senatorial campaign committee, and two of the candidates in that were more concerned with the primaries than they were with their elections. They besieged me, as it was customary for us to provide $5,000 for candidates, to see if they couldn't get some assistance in advance of their being actually nominated. That was not allowed under the practices and the rules of our committee. We had taken a very firm vote that we would not do that kind of thing, to advance money to candidates in the primary before the election. These two men were ones for whom we had high regard. Under the circumstances of the case I took the perhaps somewhat unusual procedure of intervening myself, personally. I went to my bank. I borrowed $10,000 with the assistance of Mrs. Brewster's endorsement, which was required to make me a good credit risk, at the Liberty National Bank here, where I do my banking. I took the $10,000 and I gave $5,000 to each of these candidates. I did not want to do it directly myself because I was then chairman of the committee, and I thought it might lead to even more misunderstanding. I had known Mr. Grunewald for a good while. I have understood that he was more or less a Democrat, although he, I think, gave one contribution of a thousand dollars to a Republican candidate. That is the only other transaction I believe I have had with him of a financial nature. For one of the candidates in that election he made a contribution of a thousand dollars, and I think the check ran to me, as I recall it.

So I spoke to Mr. Grunewald and asked him whether he would arrange as a conduit for the transaction. I gave him the $10,000. He made out two checks for $5,000 each to these two individuals or to their campaign committees, and in the course of time, for which I was profoundly grateful, they were nominated. If they had not been I might have been in a little difficulty myself. But having been duly nominated they were then entitled to the $5,000 grant from the committee which was duly made and they repaid me the money which they had thus received. I don't think all the money came through Mr. Grunewald. I think some of it was made direct, as I recall it. I haven't the records of all that transaction here. I think some of it was made direct so that the note was taken care of. I think the October 19 date was probably about the time when the thing was cleaned up. I know there was some in August. I can't be sure about all the details of just how the money was repaid, but I got it all back.

There was this other transaction, I think $1,000 that Mr. Grunewald contributed for one candidate in the election of the Republican ticket.

Mr. DEWIND. Did you say, Senator, that you had the details of the transaction with you?

Senator BREWSTER. I have some of them. I haven't all of it. I have the check here which I gave Mr. Grunewald for $10,000. I have copies of the two checks which Mr. Grunewald made to the two individuals who were the ones to handle the funds, and I have the dates, I believe, of some of the repayments. My record shows $1,500 on August 3, $2,000 on August 7, and $6,500 on August 16.

Mr. DEWIND. Can you identify from your records where these repayments came from?

Senator BREWSTER. No; I couldn't. I don't think I have all of the information on that in the records which I had. I think some of them came through Grunewald, and I think some of them came direct by checks from the people rather than through Grunewald.

Mr. DEWIND. The three items you mentioned, Senator, I am not sure I got them right. There were $1,500, $2,000, and $6,500; is that right?

Senator BREWSTER. That makes the $10,000; yes.

Mr. DEWIND. That makes the $10,000.

Senator BREWSTER. Some of that may not have all been in the course of these requirements. I mean I didn't care to have a note outstanding, and I think I retired it as promptly as I could, so I don't know that all of those came for repayments in this transaction.

Mr. DEWIND. Have you got the dates of those repayments?

Senator BREWSTER. I have the dates here, which show August 3, $1,500; August 7, $2,000; and August 16, $6,500.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Stearns' testimony I think was that on August 14 there was deposited in the Grunewald account $6,500.

Senator BREWSTER. That may be the August 16 that I have, that I made the repayment of $6,500 on the note on that date.

Mr. DEWIND. Then there was a check to your order drawn on October 19, 1950, in the amount of $2,500. Does that relate to this same transaction?

Senator BREWSTER. I think that was probably belated payment. I think I probably retired the note to get it out of the way so my wife wouldn't be in my hair, and that he later repaid that. I think that is probably the way it came through.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Stearns has identified from his work sheets deposits in the Grunewald bank account on August 7 of $3,500; August 21, $1,500; August 21, $5,000; adding up to $10,000, as having related to this $10,000 exchange transaction. That all took place in August. Then the October 19, 1950, check of $2,500 might at least appear to bring the total to $12,500, and Mr. Stearns stated it was his recollection there was $12,500 involved.

Senator BREWSTER. No; I am very positive there was not. Would you give me those dates in August again?

Mr. DEWIND. The dates of the deposit in the Grunewald account were August 7, $3,500; August 21, $1,500; and August 21, $5,000.

Senator BREWSTER. On those last two I do not understand the 21st, because I made this payment of $6,500 on August 16.

Mr. DEWIND. The deposit slip Mr. Stearns had on those for August 21 I think he said was dated August 14. I don't know why it is here as August 21.

Senator BREWSTER. I think it is because they didn't clear them through. I found they sometimes take some time to clear them through if the check is on out-of-town banks, and things of that character. They probably don't credit them. I think that probably explains it.

Mr. DEWIND. The deposit on August 14 of two checks totaling $6,500?

Senator BREWSTER. That probably ties with my payment of $6,500 on August 16.

Mr. DEWIND. The August 7 deposit of $3,500—does that tie in?

Senator BREWSTER. There I have $1,500 on August 3 and $2,000 on August 7. That would be $3,500.

Mr. DEWIND. That would indicate the entire $10,000 came from Mr. Grunewald.

Senator BREWSTER. Yes. I am not quite clear about that. It may well be that it was, that they made the checks through that way. I would have recalled that it was different. I don't understand this October 19, 1950——

Mr. DEWIND. In connection with that item there is attached to the deposit slip, which is dated October 19, a communication between the Munsey Trust Co. and the Dakota National Bank of Fargo, N. Dak., "Owner Henry Grunewald, credit account." It shows "William Stern (?) (you), $2,500 due on sight, check, October 19, 1950," "The item hereon described is Oct. 25, 1950, paid and credited."

Senator BREWSTER. I think that is very clearly the one because William Stern was one of those who was a participant in this transaction.

Mr. DEWIND. You mean he was one of the candidates?

Senator BREWSTER. No. He was one of the campaign managers. He was the one to whom the original check ran for $5,000. That ties with the October 19 and also with the payments to the candidate for the amount. I don't understand these other items unless there is also a $1,000 item there

of the other candidate for whom he made a contribution.

Mr. DEWIND. Would it be a possibility that Mr. Grunewald had advanced you the $2,500 in August to complete the $10,000 payment and then awaited this payment to reimburse himself?

Senator BREWSTER. Either he did or I advanced it myself, but I don't recall his ever doing any such thing. I have no recollection of it. I had the impression that I had some money which I paid on this note before the repayment arrived. That was my recollection, and that would seem to be confirmed by this. What his records show I don't know, and I don't understand.

Mr. BYRNES. What note are you talking about, Mr. Senator?

Senator BREWSTER. My own note for $10,000 to the Liberty Bank——

Mr. BYRNES. I see.

Senator BREWSTER. Which I put in there to get this $10,000 and which I asked Mr. Grunewald to transmit for me.

Mr. BYRNES. I see.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Stearns testified to a check drawn on the Grunewald account to the order of the Liberty National Bank.

Senator BREWSTER. That is another Stearns, I understand.

Mr. DEWIND. Yes.

Senator BREWSTER. I do not want to confuse the two gentlemen. I have never seen this Mr. Stearns before.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Stearns, can you recall the amount of that check drawn on the National Liberty Bank and the date on it?

Mr. STEARNS. If you will give me that work sheet.

Senator BREWSTER. I think that is clear. The item which he point out to me now is the item of—he shows it as August 16, which conforms with my records of $6,500 to the Liberty National Bank—the bank statement notation, "Br." That would correspond with my own notation as to the payment on this note at that time, $6,500 on August 16.

Mr. DEWIND. Was that amount paid by check that Mr. Grunewald drew directly to the Liberty National?

Senator BREWSTER. According to his record that would be so. I asked the bank about the payments on the note and they showed me that that was the date on which this was paid. What I want to see are these other items which didn't seem to check in the statements which you made. That item, I think, is clear.

Mr. DEWIND. That would indicate that the two deposits of $5,000 and $1,500 were used to pay Liberty National Bank.

Senator BREWSTER. That is right.

Mr. DEWIND. That leaves the $3,500 deposit made on August 7.

Senator BREWSTER. What were those? Were those his checks?

I gather from what he shows here that according to his records the entire $10,000 was paid out, was paid back on these two dates, August 7, as he shows, August 21, although the other record shows August 16. That was the date the bank actually endorsed money on the note. This October 19 seems to be an entirely distinct transaction. He said it was from Bill Stern to Henry Grunewald. Apparently Henry—Mr. Grunewald—had previously paid me that money. I don't think I realized that he had put it in himself. I didn't know that such a thing had occurred. I should want to check a little further, but according to these records that was apparently what happened. It certainly was not a second $2,500 for me above the $10,000.

Mr. DEWIND. Let's see. That explains $2,500 out of $3,500. Mr. Grunewald put up $3,500 of his own funds at that time to make the repayment to Senator Brewster; is that right, Mr. Stearns?

Mr. STEARNS. There were three deposits—August 7, of $3,500, August 21 of $1,500, and August 21 of $5,000.

Mr. DEWIND. In regard to the deposits on August 21, were those cash deposits?

Senator BREWSTER. I don't think so.

Mr. STEARNS. I am not certain, because I got this from the bank statement.

Mr. DEWIND. I thought you identified them as check deposits?

Mr. STEARNS. They were.

Mr. DEWIND. Those would be checks of these candidates or their campaign managers?

Senator BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. DEWIND. There is the $3,500 cash deposit.

Mr. STEARNS. That might have been cash; I am not certain, because I didn't see—do you have a deposit ticket there?

Mr. DEWIND. Possibly so.

Senator BREWSTER. Those would be on Mr. Grunewald's account. It would not affect the transaction at the Liberty Bank. My records would not clarify this other later transaction. It doesn't, apparently, as far as I see, have any relation, except the fact it was a check of William Stern, who was one of the parties in it, according to his record. Whether that had been a matter which I had taken care of earlier out of my own funds and then repaid it, I am not clear.

Mr. DEWIND. Perhaps this would clarify the situation: On the deposit slip covering this $2,500 item, it is marked "B exchange," which Mr. Stearns said referred to Senator Brewster, and it says, "Exchange check, Stern to B, $2,500."

Senator BREWSTER. I don't know. I should have to look in the records further. My only explanation would be that I had paid this money on these accounts. I am very positive there was never any advance by Grunewald in connection with a transaction, because there was no reason why he should. He was not involved in any way. I had known him for some time about town here and through mutual friends. That was the reason for my requesting him to assist in this transaction.

Mr. DEWIND. Might I ask why you believe Mr. Grunewald would be available for this sort of a transaction as a person you could rely on for it?

Senator BREWSTER. I had every reason to have complete confidence in him. I had known him originally through Mr. Marsh, who was his benefactor, and with whom he was formerly associated. Mr. Marsh was a man I had never met, but who had contributed at various times to the campaign funds. Later I met Mr. Grunewald. He was apparently well known to Members on both sides of the Chamber. I think the one who originally spoke highly of him to me was Vice President Barkley, who has also known him and thought well of him, as well as Senator HOLLAND, of Florida, who was the attorney for Mr. Marsh and the executor of the estate. He also had spoken to me of Mr. Grunewald and his high regard for him. So I had every reason to believe he was highly reliable as far as the financial transactions were concerned. I might have picked most anybody else. Perhaps it wasn't a happy selection, but I still have confidence in Mr. Grunewald's financial responsibility.

Mr. DEWIND. Was this hight regard for Mr. Grunewald in some business capacity of his, that is——

Senator BREWSTER. No. I had known him only as I know many other people about Washington. He had taken an interest in things around here, and apparently was quite well known to many Members on the Hill.

Mr. DEWIND. In what business is he known to be engaged?

Senator BREWSTER. I have never had any transactions of any character, other than this one.

Mr. DEWIND. His reputation around the Hill was not based on any particular business activity?

Senator BREWSTER. No. He never intervened in any matters with which I was familiar. I think he had hoped he might be able to get a job for a chauffeur, but a Republican doesn't rate that much on the Hill at this time, so I wouldn't be able to do it.

Mr. DEWIND. It has been stated Mr. Grunewald has served as an investigator, or engaged in the business of investigations. Was that known?

Senator BREWSTER. I have understood that he was formerly with the FBI or in some associated activity, and served in the armed services and had done work of a confidential character for Mr. Marsh over a period of many years.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald has declined to answer any questions of this subcommittee. The committee is trying to find out the answers to some questions about his activities.

Was this the first transaction you had ever had with him of any business or financial sort?

Senator BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. DEWIND. And I gather from what you say, the only one?

Senator BREWSTER. As I said, I think he gave me $1,000 to give to a senatorial candidate in that campaign, which I transmitted, and I think the man duly reported it as having received $1,000 from Henry Grunewald. That is the only other transaction of which I know, which I now recall. I think that is correct.

Mr. DEWIND. As I understand it, your selection of Mr. Grunewald for this particular transaction was based not on your prior acquaintance with Mr. Grunewald, but on the reputation he had?

Senator BREWSTER. Well, it was a question of someone outside of the Republican ranks that wouldn't at any rate be associated with the Republican senatorial campaign committee, of which I was then chairman. I could have made the check myself direct, but I thought it would call in some question. I could have asked anybody else to do it, but I happened to ask him.

Mr. DEWIND. That indicates a degree of confidence which was based solely on what you had heard about him, and not your personal appraisal of him?

Senator BREWSTER. Only as I had seen him from time to time. I used to run in to him both in the corridors, occasionally, or I think he had been in my office perhaps 2 or 3 times a month, and then I wouldn't see him for a long time. He always took quite an interest in anything that was going on.

I had no reason to think he was not entirely reliable. I still have no reason to doubt that.

Mr. DEWIND. Can you identify, Senator, the matters in which Mr. Grunewald was interested, of which you had any knowledge, as a result of his visits to your office, or otherwise?

Senator BREWSTER. Well, it was simply, as far as I recall, general matters that were pending. He seemed to have an interest in political affairs. The only personal request that I recall he ever made was this matter about getting a job for a chauffeur, which I was not able to do anything about.

Mr. DEWIND. Based on this, Mr. Grunewald recommended himself to you as a discreet person for the conduct of this sort of transaction, which you wished to be confidential?

Senator BREWSTER. I didn't realize all that was involved, but if I wanted to get a man who had a capacity to keep his mouth shut, I think he was the one. I didn't realize he was that good.

Chairman KING. You did not go wrong there.

Senator BREWSTER. I apparently couldn't have placed my confidence in a better one in that respect, although there was nothing, to my knowledge, irregular about the transaction.

Mr. DEWIND. I did not mean to suggest that; it simply was a transaction requiring some discretion and discreet treatment.

Senator BREWSTER. That was right. That was the idea. I could have had one of the secretaries in my office do it, but I don't think that was advisable—for someone who was immediately associated with me.

Mr. DEWIND. Am I correct in concluding then that both from your personal contact with him, and what others have told you, he had been recommended as a person who could be asked to engage in transactions requiring discretion?

Senator BREWSTER. That is right. He was well spoken of.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Senator Brewster, who were the candidates that Grunewald was supposed to give the money to?

Senator BREWSTER. Senator NIXON in California and Senator YOUNG in North Dakota. He did give the money to their campaign representatives.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Did you instruct Mr. Grunewald as to how to advance these funds to these two candidates?

Senator BREWSTER. I think I just asked that he send the checks to them. I don't know whether he sent them or he gave me the checks and I sent them. I can't recall about that.

Mr. O'BRIEN. It was done by check?

Senator BREWSTER. They were by check, yes.

Mr. BYRNES. Checks to the individuals or to the campaign committee?

Senator BREWSTER. To their campaign representatives.

Mr. DEWIND. Senator, to your knowledge, did Mr. Grunewald frequently or generally hold himself out or actually engage in transactions involving a situation where he acted as confidential intermediary?

Senator BREWSTER. Not as far as I was concerned. As I said in opening, if there is any discredit in any way attached to this transaction, I want to assume full responsibility for it. I am sorry now I asked Mr. Grunewald as a friend to do this because, if it added in any degree to his embarrassment, I would not have. As I told counsel, Mr. DeWind, when he first called me up, I said I wanted to assume full responsibility for all that occurred, and also I would say the same thing about the Senators involved, as they, too, were in no way participants, except they asked me to see if I could arrange to get this money, which I did arrange, and which I gave to them.

They had nothing to do with the selection of Mr. Grunewald as the intermediary. Their campaign representatives simply were happy to accept the checks to take care of it, and they subsequently repaid them, in accordance with the understanding.

Mr. DEWIND. I was not referring to this particular transaction, but more generally whether Mr. Grunewald was known to be available as an intermediary in transactions involving discretion.

Senator BREWSTER. No. There was never any question of that. It was entirely my business. He did not show any reluctance. He apparently was glad to accommodate me in any request, but he certainly was not seeking an opportunity to add to the complications of his transactions.

Mr. DEWIND. Your decision to select him for the purpose was one you arrived at entirely by yourself?

Senator BREWSTER. Yes, indeed. He had no knowledge and he had nothing to do with the request in any way. I don't think he knew YOUNG or NIXON or knew anything about it, or had anything to do with the suggestion that perhaps it would be a good idea to get some money for them.

Mr. DEWIND. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Senator, can I ask a question?

We have evidence in the record of the receipt by Mr. Grunewald of some $1,500 from Pan American Airways in 1950. Can you tell us anything about that transaction?

Senator BREWSTER. No, sir; I have no knowledge of it whatsoever.

Mr. O'BRIEN. During the time you were using Mr. Grunewald in these transactions——

Senator BREWSTER. I might add that I have paid the Pan American Airways some $15,000 or $20,000 for aerial transport, which is the only transacation I have ever had with them.

Mr. O'BRIEN. During the time you were using Mr. Grunewald in these transactions, wasn't his reputation brought into question by the Senate District Committee?

Senator BREWSTER. Would you repeat that?

Mr. O'BRIEN. During the time you were using Mr. Grunewald in these transactions, wasn't his reputation brought into question by the Senate District Committee?

Senator BREWSTER. Not to my recollection. This was in the summer of 1950. I think it was in 1951 the Senate District Committee had some queries of Mr. Grunewald, a year later.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Did you have a hard time finding Mr. Grunewald when you wanted him?

Senator BREWSTER. He, I believe, spent some time in Florida and some time in New Jersey. I have never seen him at either of those places. I have heard he was there occasionally, and had places there.

Mr. O'BRIEN. In 1950 the District Committee had a hard time finding him; is that a fact?

Senator BREWSTER. I didn't recall that, but it may be; I am not sure. I am very sure it hadn't happened at the time I turned this $10,000 check over to him, because I think certainly I would have paused about it. It may be later on during that summer there were some questions raised.

Chairman KING. Are there any further questions?

Mr. BYRNES. These payments to campaign committees, they were in the form of a loan rather than in the form of a contribution, as I understand it?

Senator BREWSTER. Well, it was in a somewhat nebulous state. I was uncertain what would happen if they didn't get nominated, because there would have been some problems about repayment then. I was advancing it out of my own personal funds. Naturally, I expected to be taken care of. If they had not been nominated, I don't know just what might have happened. That was where I stuck my neck out.

Mr. BYRNES. So the record might be clear——

Senator BREWSTER. There was no note.

Mr. BYRNES. I was wondering as to whether or not there was an understanding with the people to whom the check was sent.

Senator BREWSTER. There was no note.

Mr. BYRNES. As to whether it was considered an advancement or a loan or a contribution?

Senator BREWSTER. Well, there was no note or anything of that character. They understood the situation that I was raising money myself. I certainly would have wished to treat it as an advance, although I was conscious at the time if anything went wrong, why, it might be a troublesome question.

I took that much hazard for the sake of getting what we thought were two good Republican candidates for the Senate nominated. I was very grateful when they were elected. That seemed to vindicate my judgment.

Mr. BYRNES. Was the understanding, however, that at least if they were nominated that you would be reimbursed for this advancement?

Senator BREWSTER. Surely. That was the understanding, if they were nominated, that then they were entitled to a $5,000 grant from the campaign committee and they would use that money to repay me for the advance made. That was what actually happened. That was the way it worked out.

Mr. DEWIND. Do you happen to know how candidates who receive moneys of this sort are required to report them, if at all?

Senator BREWSTER. No. That rests with the laws of the several States. That was in a primary. I don't think we have any regulations in the Congress about primaries; so it rests with the law of the State involved. I do not know what that law is. I left that entirely to their campaign representatives.

Mr. DEWIND. In connection with Mr. Grunewald, at the time of these repayments, in August, did you see Mr. Grunewald yourself at that time?

Senator BREWSTER. I could not tell about that, whether he sent the checks or how it was handled.

Mr. DEWIND. Were you in touch with him by telephone, or did you otherwise speak to him at that time?

Senator BREWSTER. I could not say. I got these dates on the repayment, but I couldn't tell how I received them, whether he mailed them to me or what was the transaction.

Mr. DEWIND. Mr. Grunewald appeared before the Senate District Committee in September, as I recall, when the committee had been looking for him since July 1950. I wondered whether he had been available to see you in connection with these transactions in August. He testified before the Senate District Committee, as I recall, and the substance of this testimony was that he had been told by his doctor to take it easy from July on, and had not been aware of the fact that the Senate District Committee was looking for him.

Senator BREWSTER. I don't recall how these payments came about, except as I checked them at the bank on the payments on the note. I couldn't tell how I received them. Sometimes I would see Mr. Grunewald 2 or 3 times in a month. At other times I would not see him for 2 or 3 months.

Mr. DEWIND. Did you have any diary or record or any recollection that would establish for the committee as to whether Mr. Grunewald was around in July, August, or September?

Senator BREWSTER. No; I wouldn't. I was certainly around during that time. That was a rather busy period. I was available.

Mr. DEWIND. Senator, just one more question.

I believe you referred to a contribution that Grunewald himself made, a $1,000 contribution?

Senator BREWSTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DEWIND. Do you know what campaign, what candidate received that?

Senator BREWSTER. I think that was for Joe Talbot, up in Connecticut. He was a candidate for the Senate. He was a former Congressman.

Mr. DEWIND. Was that in the 1950 election?

Senator BREWSTER. I think so. That was reported by Mr. Talbot. I forwarded it along to him and he reported it as received from Mr. Grunewald.

Mr. DEWIND. Senator, might I ask: Do you have any further information concerning any activities of Mr. Grunewald? You understand the difficulty the committee is faced with?

Senator BREWSTER. I have read a good deal about him in the paper, so I don't assume you would refer to that.

Mr. DEWIND. I meant matters that you personally knew about.

Senator BREWSTER. No; the things which have been going on—almost everything which has happened when he has seen me

has been talked about at various times. I wouldn't have any direct information regarding his activities outside of his contacts with me.

Mr. DEWIND. Do you know of any connection or transactions he may have had with Lieutenant Shimon, of the Washington Police Department?

Senator BREWSTER. No; I believe he was acquainted with him, but my only connection with Lieutenant Shimon, not involving Mr. Grunewald, was when I found that I was being shadowed by a character here in town. I reported it to one of my fellow Senators, Senator BRIDGES, who requested the police department to investigate.

Lieutenant Shimon came to my office and secured a description of the man, identified him, and later reported that he had found out that he was a rather well-known character about town. He showed me his FBI portrait and identified him, and told me we wouldn't hear any more from him. That was a matter that happened, and was rather explored at length a year or two ago.

Mr. DEWIND. You know of no connection Mr. Grunewald had with Lieutenant Shimon or any part in that transaction?

Senator BREWSTER. No; not as far as any of his connections with me were concerned.

Mr. DEWIND. I am not quite sure I understood that.

Senator BREWSTER. I said, as far as I was concerned.

Mr. DEWIND. You don't know of any connection Grunewald had with Shimon?

Senator BREWSTER. No. Shimon came to my office twice, and once before this and once afterward. Later I appeared before the grand jury and gave a complete statement of the situation, and subsequently two representatives of the District Attorney's office came to me and wanted to know if I would testify in a trial to convict this man of perjury, the man who had been shadowing me. I told them I would be glad to. I gave them the names of several responsible parties in this community who could verify my statements and trace the entire matter to its source.

I never heard anything more about the matter thereafter. If the reports I read were true, they would have uncovered a good many of the transactions which I think the Crime Committee is still interested in. The matter was dropped at that point.

Mr. DEWIND. That is all the questions I have.

Senator BREWSTER. I may add that I have this $2,500 item here from my correspondence, as it was apparently covered by two checks in October, the October 19 items, that I sent the $2,500 from the campaign committee out there to Mr. William Stern on October 17, which my records shows. Apparently these checks were endorsed over and I should judge from the record that it then came back and may have passed through Mr. Grunewald's account simply as a cash transaction, if it had already been paid, though my own recollection would be that I had made it myself. There is some complication in the thing, but I think that explains the October 19 transaction.

Mr. DEWIND. It was on October 19 that Mr. Grunewald sent you $2,500, or drew a check to your order for $2,500?

Senator BREWSTER. I don't know whether it was a check, but I find on October 17 I sent—Senator YOUNG sent me the two checks covering the $2,500.

Mr. DEWIND. This check for $2,500 drawn to your order on October 19 is endorsed "For deposit only, credit of Doris—Brewster, Doris Owen Brewster" or something like that, and below that "Dorothy Brewster."

Senator BREWSTER. Evidently the $2,500 checks which I referred to in this letter of Senator YOUNG on October 17 must have been endorsed to Henry Grunewald, though it had already been paid, so we gave the checks to him and he gave me his check in return.

You say that is made out to Dorothy Brewster?

Mr. DEWIND. Made out to your order and endorsed over by you.

Senator BREWSTER. She associated with me in the endorsement of the note. So I think that is what explains that October 19.

Mr. DEWIND. I was trying to tie it into the deposits that were deposited back in August, which totaled $10,000, as having been——

Senator BREWSTER. It was my recollection that I had put that money in myself and that Grunewald has subsequently paid this. His records would apparently indicate that he had paid it. In either event, I am certain it was only $10,000 altogether.

Mr. DEWIND. I guess the mystery persists, then. It would look as though even in October, having paid it in August, there is another $2,500 turned over to you by Mr. Grunewald in October.

Senator BREWSTER. The fact that Senator YOUNG forwarded me these checks for $2,500 at that time involved in this transaction leads me to think that record is correct. I think the record is more likely in that earlier $3,500 item. I think that is where a mistake, if any, has been made, either in their records or in mine.

Mr. DEWIND. You are inclined only to believe $7,500 was received by you in August and $2,500 in October?

Senator BREWSTER. Yes; or else this was simply a wash transaction, the $2,500 having been earlier paid, but I don't think that was the way it happened.

Mr. DEWIND. It doesn't seem to be so since this check was endorsed over by you to Mrs. Brewster.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, when they went over these checks, the accountant went over these checks with Mr. Grunewald. Mr. Grunewald just picked out certain items which he said were refunds or exchanges. Knowing there would be an exchange of $2,500, he very well may have picked out a $2,500 item up in August and not the actual amount, but paid it back in October.

Senator BREWSTER. I think that probably happened. He saw these all together and thought that.

Mr. KEAN. And marked them "Br" or whatever he did.

Senator BREWSTER. I think that is probably what happened.

Thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to appear so promptly in the matter.

Chairman KING. You are welcome.

Mr. YOUNG. The pertinent part of these hearings having a direct bearing on the North Dakota controversy commences on page 2931 with the testimony of former Senator Owen Brewster. My purpose in inserting in the RECORD all of the hearing, however, is to make it possible for anyone interested in this controversy to have full and complete information on every detail.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the report of the United States Special Committee To Investigate Political Activities, Lobbying, and Campaign Contributions, dated May 24, 1956.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, chairman, and Senator STYLES BRIDGES, vice chairman of the Special Committee To Investigate Political Activities, Lobbying, and Campaign Contributions, announced today that the committee had heard testimony from Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, K. W. Simons, and R. C. Nathan in connection with the charge "YOUNG Sells Out Again," which was headlined in the February 9, 1956, issue of the Leader, a Bismarck, N. Dak., publication.

Mr. Simons and Mr. Nathan both testified in substance as follows:

(a) That they never made any charge that any vote made by Senator YOUNG on any measure was motivated by dishonest motives or improperly influenced and they emphasized the fact that at no time had they ever charged directly or indirectly that Senator YOUNG had accepted any bribe of any kind.

(b) That although the contents of the statement in the paper might lead one to infer that Senator YOUNG had accepted a bribe, the explanation made by them was that in North Dakota no such inference would be drawn by the average reader. They contended that the phrase "sold out" or "sell out" has been in common usage in North Dakota for many years and are merely loose expressions to indicate that the legislator voted the wrong way on a particular bill.

(c) That the Leader had a circulation of approximately 5,000; that it was issued twice monthly; that it was definitely a political newspaper; and that it was the intention of the Leader to embarrass Senator YOUNG politically.

(d) Mr. Simon and Mr. Nathan knew of no facts or of any evidence that would show that Senator YOUNG was influenced improperly or illegally on any vote during his tenure in the Senate.

(e) They both acknowledged that they knew of no facts which would controvert the testimony under oath given before the Subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee in 1952 relating to the delivery in 1950 by Henry Grunewald of campaign funds from Senator Owen Brewster, then chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, to Senator YOUNG's campaign chairman.

Both the chairman and the vice chairman announced that it was the decision of the committee that the statements made against Senator YOUNG were completely unsupported by any evidence whatsoever and merit no further action by the committee. The transcript of all testimony taken at the hearings in executive session this morning was by unanimous vote of the special committee ordered released and made public.

Senator MCCLELLAN personally stated that the article (in the Leader, a Bismarck, N. Dak., publication) charging Senator "YOUNG Sells Out Again" is that sordid and irresponsible type of journalism that resorts to the poison pen to contaminate the news and pollute the stream of public information through the media of a free press. Now that it has been exposed for what it really is, it deserves no further attention of this committee.

THE AMERICAN JEWELED WATCH INDUSTRY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report is in the process of holding hearings on the criteria for defense essentiality of industry under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. I understand that the American watch industry is being used as a guinea pig to develop the assumptions. Since my State is one of the largest producers of American watches, I am naturally very interested. I am particularly glad that the American watch industry is under scrutiny because I am certain that the committee will surely be convinced that it is vital to the interests of the United States to keep this small but

essential industry alive. I think the Members of the Senate will be interested in some of the basic facts concerning this industry which I shall now place in the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a further statement which I have prepared, dealing with the American jeweled watch industry.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The jeweled watch industry is a small industry that does not have any appreciable significance in our total trade program. There are only three companies now making jeweled watches commercially, where once there were over a score. Total watch employment is about 4,200, as against over 10,000 in 1949. The industry has currently less than 20 percent of the American market (19 percent in 1954) and very little export business, whereas some other industries now complaining about imports have over 95 percent of the American market, and a large foreign market. Also, all three of the American companies are forced to import part of their watches.

The American industry's difficulties are not due to lack of manufacturing or merchandising skill, but to the fact that it pays an average wage about three times the average in the Swiss industry. The Bulova Watch Co. produces watches here and in Switzerland. It is the largest merchandiser of watches in the country and is recognized generally as the most succesful. Yet Bulova reports that it has the same problem in preserving its relatively small American production as the other American companies.

This small industry has been declared essential to our national security by four different studies of qualified Government groups: The Munitions Board, the National Security Resources Board, the Office of Defense Mobilization, and the Senate Armed Services Committee. In addition, it is a business basic to our whole industrial, economic, and social life.

It has been fighting a losing battle with one of the most tightly controlled cartels in the world, the Swiss watch trust. This trust has the openly declared purpose of preventing competition wherever it is found outside of Switzerland. It is now the defendant in an antitrust suit under our laws, which is pending in the United States district court in New York.

Now consider the other side of the trade question: Have we given the Swiss a real benefit in the American market under our trade program?

According to Tariff Commission reports, in 1936, the year of our trade agreement with Switzerland, the Swiss had less than 50 percent of the American market and sold us 1,700,000 jeweled watches as against 1,800,000 domestic watches. In 1953, the Swiss had 81 percent of the American market and sold us 9,900,000, as compared with domestic production of 2,250,000. Thus, Swiss watch sales in America had increased over 500 percent while American production was up by only 25 percent.

The Swiss are seeking to hide this rather startling benefit by the claim that many of their jeweled watches are not competitive with the American watches. They make no acknowledgement of the good thing they have been given, but only complain that they are not left free to secure more. They have berated the United States action in making a modest increase in tariff. They tried to circumvent the action by encouraging upjeweling of watches after importation, to avoid duties, and complained when the Treasury Department asked for legislation to plug a legal loophole that permitted this practice. And, most ungraciously, they have accepted reductions in United States tariffs on other Swiss exports, which were made expressly to compensate for the watch tariff increase, without any lessening of their criticism or their efforts to undercut the protective action of our Government. These substantial compensating benefits have been simply ignored.

The Swiss industry supplies about 95 percent of all watches in the world excepting the United States market and Russia. Published figures show that the number of all watches exported by Switzerland in 1955 was greater than in any year in its history, and that the total value of these exports was only 3 percent less than in its previous record year, 1953. The industry has had to import foreign workers and keep employees beyond normal retirement age in order to have enough labor.

How, in the face of these facts, does it happen that the Swiss seem to be able to persuade some people in this country that the United States is making a mistake in seeking to preserve a small watch industry?

It seems to me this is one of the outstanding demonstrations in modern times of the power and ruthlessness of a cartel. And, unfortunately, a cartel legalized, and supported to the hilt, by the Swiss Government, which owns 30 percent of the stock of the top holding company of the trust.

The cartel is well organized and financed for such an effort. In addition to its use of the full power of the Swiss Government, and, of course, the very active cooperation of the importers of Swiss watches here in the United States, it employs at least two large American public relations firms. Its propaganda agency is a branch of the trust called the Watchmakers of Switzerland. The work of this agency is financed by a levy of about 12½ cents on every jeweled watch exported from Switzerland, a total of around $3 million each year.

In Washington, these allies are trying to convince the Executive and the Congress that the United States doesn't know what it is doing. They say the Office of Defense Mobilization and the other groups which have found the watch industry essential are mistaken. They try to weaken the last essentiality report, by ODM, with the claim that the Department of Defense disagreed, although that Department clearly concurred and the Secretary of Defense has said so repeatedly. They have even claimed that this report under the present administration must have been merely a political report, although the NSRB report, issued under President Truman's administration, was just as strong, if not stronger.

They are now actually engaged in attacking the entire mobilization plan of the Government as unnecessary, simply because the American watch industry is an important part of the mobilization base under present mobilization concepts.

Having failed to fool the Government directly by all this, they are now trying to fool the press and the public, in the hope of exerting pressure on Congress. In this campaign they are placing advertisements in newspapers and magazines throughout the country that are designed to persuade various economic groups that the sales of their products to Switzerland have been or will be curtailed as the result of action to preserve the American watch industry.

The caliber of this misleading propaganda is best illustrated by the threats made to Maryland tobacco farmers. These farmers were told that the increase in the duty on watches would result in reduced sales of Maryland tobacco to Switzerland. Yet Department of Agriculture statistics show the Swiss bought more Maryland tobacco in 1955 than in any year in history.

Again it was claimed that sales to Switzerland from the Detroit area were adversely affected, while an examination of the statistics shows substantial increases in Swiss purchases of all important categories of goods from that area.

They are now running advertisements in southern newspapers in an effort to make the cotton interests believe that the recent drop in Swiss purchases of American cotton is the result of governmental action respecting watches. The deception involved is apparent if one realizes that last August, world cotton prices dropped from 4 to 8 cents below the United States price, and that this price situation is responsible for a present low level of cotton exports generally—not just to Switzerland.

All of this, of course, has nothing whatsoever to do with Swiss watches. The average of Swiss purchases of all products in the United States in 1955 was up about 6 percent over 1954. The Swiss actually have a dollar surplus and could buy American cotton if they were not buying it more cheaply elsewhere.

The ironical thing about this advertising campaign against the United States policy of preserving a watch industry is the fact that Swiss newspapers refused to carry a paid advertisement offered by the American industry in 1954 to explain the watch decision to the Swiss people—and on the ground that it was contrary to the policy of their government.

This whole effort to mislead the American people is a shameful distortion. The Swiss have taken advantage of the United States trade policy on this commodity to their immense benefit, while not joining in its spirit. They have already the great majority of the American jeweled watch market and in effect are asking that the Swiss watch cartel be left alone to take the rest from the American producer. The inevitable result would be elimination of domestic competition and complete exposure of our country to a foreign monopoly. To seek such a license in the name of free trade and free competition is a prostitution of terms and principles. And when one considers that we are dealing with an essential industry, this attitude of the Swiss and the importers appears presumptuous, to say the least.

I, like Americans generally, am fond of the Swiss people, and I regret very much that the interests of the Swiss watch cartel are allowed to put them in such a questionable position with their American friends. It would be much better for all concerned if this problem were settled on a factual basis and within the bounds of reason. Tactics like those now being used cannot succeed in a country such as ours.

TAKE THE ACADEMIES OUT OF POLITICS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled, "Take the Academies Out of Politics." The article was written by the very distinguished and able junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and was published in the June 2 issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

It is an excellent article, and I highly commend its reading to the Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAKE THE ACADEMIES OUT OF POLITICS

(By Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY, United States Senator from Massachusetts)

Gen. George C. Marshall never went to West Point because his family and their Congressman were on different sides of the political fence.

Ulysses S. Grant almost lost his chance at the Academy because his father and Congressman did not see eye to eye politically.

Today, as hundreds of service-academy openings go begging, potential George Marshalls and Ulysses Grants all over the country are devoting their talents to other fields less vital to our national security and less challenging to their ability—all because they feel they don't stand a chance to enter West Point or Annapolis under the ancient congressional appointment system. Members of Congress, by default or indifference, are failing to fill vacancies at the two service academies that are worth thousands of dollars, and, more important, are costing the Nation vitally needed leaders for the atomic future.

Here are the shocking facts: Last year, Members of Congress were entitled to appoint 866 boys to enter West Point. Yet 324 of these vacancies were never filled, either because various Representatives and Senators simply neglected to make any nominations or because they nominated candidates who lacked the necessary qualifications for admission. At Annapolis, in 1955, of 1,134 congressional appointments available, 460 nominations went unfilled.

The same story can be told for previous years. In 1954, for example, 1,279 congressional Annapolis appointments were available; 45 percent went begging; 976 West Point appointments were authorized, and 38 percent went to waste.

When we realize that each cadet and midshipman during his 4-year training at the Academies receives a Government-paid education worth roughly $26,000 to $32,000, the failure of Congressmen to find and nominate qualified boys is appalling.

There are other avenues that lead to West Point and Annapolis—Presidential appointment, competitive examinations among the enlisted ranks and selection of qualified congressional alternates by the Secretaries of the Army and Navy—but 8 out of every 10 West Pointers and 6 out of every 10 midshipmen owe their appointments to their Congressmen. The responsibility for defects in the appointment system is largely ours.

Vacancies are not the only problem—the quality of personnel is just as disturbing. The Coast Guard Academy, which recruits its students by open competition, has 8 or 9 times as many applicants as vacancies—men who in many cases might have gone to the other Academies, but who felt that they did not have the political influence to get an appointment. And in the 3 years in which the same testing service prepared examinations for both the Coast Guard Academy and the Naval Academy, Coast Guard candidates consistently achieved higher scores. A study made for the War Department in 1944 compared the records of cadets who were appointed by Congressmen with those appointed as a result of a competitive examination. Over a 10-year period, the cadets who were not congressional appointees had performed better academically, year after year, than those owing their appointment to a Congressman.

Favoritism, unfairness, and unsoundness in the selection of future officer material are not even avoided by those Congressmen who exclude politics in their appointments by relying exclusively on the results of the competitive examinations offered. The highest grades in these examinations are quite likely to be received by those from relatively well-to-do families who can afford the private tutoring for such exams offered by the so-called cram schools. These cram schools have been established to meet the need of candidates for the Academies to receive additional instruction. A survey made of the Annapolis class of 1942 disclosed that 97.3 percent of the 298 members of the class who qualified by passing the regular entrance examination had preparation supplementary to their high-school courses. That survey substantially confirms four previous studies which have shown that more than 95 percent of the candidates who passed the regular examination had extra instruction in addition to their regular high-school work.

Moreover, such a system places too much emphasis on mere grades to the exclusion of other factors essential for future military leadership. Good grades are not enough. Native intelligence, aptitude, character, and desire are just as essential, if not more essential.

A study of the service records of 1,000 Naval line officers who came from the Annapolis classes of 1912 through 1922, and who were on duty at the time of Pearl Harbor, indicated there was very little relationship between a boy's scholastic record as a midshipman in school and his later achievements as a career officer. In fact, those in the middle or even lower third of their classes frequently turned out to be better qualified Naval officers than their academic superiors when they found themselves in situations where character and leadership really counted.

This, of course, does not apply in every individual case. Among the great naval and military leaders of this country have been men like Adm. Ernest J. King, who ranked fourth in his class at Annapolis; Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, who ranked seventh in his class; and Adm. Forrest Sherman, who was second in his class; Gen. Robert E. Lee, who ranked No. 2 in his class at West Point; Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who was top man in his class; and present Army Chief of Staff Gen. Maxwell Taylor, who was fourth man in his class.

But even General Taylor himself recently told the student body of the Citadel Military College, in South Carolina, that academic proficiency does not insure successful military leadership. When he was superintendent at West Point, General Taylor told the student body at the Citadel, "I often tried to determine a relationship between cadet records and subsequent success in the Army. I would like to report that scholarship—that is, high class standing—accounts for success in the Army. I must report in all honesty that the record proves no such thing. An examination of the records of successful World War II generals indicates that it is only a slight advantage to graduate in the upper half of the class rather than in the lower half. Even the very tail of the class—the immortal goats, as we call them—have contributed their part to American generalship. * * * Several of our most successful generals in World War II were in the lowest academic 10 percent. It took George Patton 5 years to complete a 4-year course."

Unfortunately, the lack of the proper desire, temperament, and qualifications of leadership on the part of many congressional appointees is apparent even before they reach the firing line. Of the West Point class which graduated last June, 665 cadets entered the Academy, but only 470 finished. This was a loss of almost 3 out of every 10 cadets. For the same class at Annapolis, 1,101 midshipmen entered together in 1951. Only 742 were on hand for their commissions in 1955.

In the 4 years in between, "undesirable attrition" had taken its toll. Spelled out, this means simply that poor grades, disciplinary dismissals, physical disqualification, and resignations—evidencing lack of desire—washed out almost one-third of the corps at the two schools. As opposed to this, the normal attrition of an entering class at Harvard College, from the time of entrance until graduating, is in the vicinity of only 15 percent.

Nor is this the end of the waste stemming from unintelligent congressional appointive methods. Those who graduate from the Academies quit the services at a startling rate after being commissioned.

For the Naval Academy class of 1946, the resignation toll, 10 years later, cost the Nation 45 out of every 100 who had been graduated. For the same class from West Point, the resignation rate over the same 10 years amounted to 13 out of every 100 graduates. Millions of dollars' worth of education—at the taxpayers' expense—is thus wasted, at least in terms of its original purpose.

In short, as the result of the present outmoded congressional appointment system at 2 of the finest institutions this country possesses, from one-third to nearly one-half of the possible appointments are never filled; about a third of those nominated never finish; at least 1 out of 7 graduates gives up his military career before completing 10 years' service; and unknown quantities of men—superior to those who do reach the battlefield—are engaged in other occupations less satisfying to them and less essential to our Nation.

I do not mean to imply that Members of Congress are solely to blame. Most Members of Congress give serious thought to the selection of their Academy candidates. And among such congressional nominees in the past have been the Grants, the Eisenhowers, the Pattons, the Kings, the Spruances, and the Radfords. But in spite of the brilliance of these figures, the deficiencies of the present system are still apparent. These men, undoubtedly, would have been selected in any fair competitive system for the Academies, and we do not know how many other talented potential leaders we have lost because of our inefficient and sometimes unfair selection system.

The fact is that Members of Congress are hamstrung by an outmoded selection system which fails, by its very structure, to give the guideposts so necessary in the selection of future military leaders—a system which has remained basically unchanged since the two service Academies were established well over a century ago, when the United States was internationally a snail-paced, homespun nation.

Under that system, each Congressman and Senator has been empowered to fill a quota of 4 West Point cadets and 5 Annapolis midshipmen each year. Beyond that, there has been no rigid yardstick. How he makes his selections—or, for that matter, whether he makes any selections at all—has been solely traditionally a matter for his own conscience. It is not surprising that the history of such a system is replete with abuses of personal favoritism and political back scratching. Cries for reform have been sounded on the House and Senate floors for more than a hundred years.

In 1815, Congressman Cyrus King, of Massachusetts, bluntly declared that "* * * abuses have crept into the institution at West Point—none but the sons of the rich and the powerful can gain admittance there. And the most odious partiality is manifested in some of the appointments in the Navy, particularly of midshipmen."

Five years later, Congressman Newton Cannon, of Tennessee, offered a bill to abolish the Military Academy because of "favoritism." The House Member said he favored a school of military science, but asserted his firm opposition to "confining it to a favored few—a privileged order"—and to this device for "teaching the sons of our most wealthy citizens at public expense."

One of the most forceful appeals for a change was made as long ago as 1863. Calling the service-academy rate of attrition to the Senate's attention, Senator Henry B. Anthony, of Rhode Island, moved to make admission to the Academies dependent on nationwide competitive examinations. "We reject from one-third to one-half of the cadets both in the Naval School and at West Point," Senator Anthony declared. "We go on educating them for a year or two, and that is all thrown away because persons who

have no claims or qualifications are pitchforked in there by favoritism and political influence."

Urging that a board of examiners be created to conduct competitive tests in each State, the Senator concluded, "I think an examination by a board of examiners of all young men who apply cannot be any less likely to get the best men than for a Senator or Representative to select some young man whose father has rendered him some political service, for it is in that way we know that half the appointments are made." His proposal was defeated 32 to 6. "It was," Senator Anthony declared, "one of those propositions that everybody was in favor of and nobody would vote for."

Surely the time has come for Congress to establish a better way to award what are, in effect, military and naval scholarships—to insure that we are producing intelligent and capable leaders we can entrust with the life-and-death decisions of the atomic age.

Some steps to improve selection methods have already been taken, but they fall far short of the desired goal. Civil-service tests, which have been continuously improved, are made available to Congressmen for their use. But, although some 50 percent of the Members of Congress utilize these tests, all too often mere lipservice is paid to their results, and the son of a political friend is appointed to West Point or Annapolis.

An even more important stride forward was taken when a system was devised for picking appointees to go to the fledgling Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs. Each State was given an overall quota of appointees and each House Member and Senator from that State was authorized to nominate candidates. But these appointees were to be finally selected on the basis of merit, following a statewide competitive examination.

In Massachusetts, for instance, the State as a whole was allocated eight vacancies for the first class to attend the Academy. Each of the 16 members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation was allowed to nominate 10 candidates.

These 160 youngsters then compete for the 8 nominations. The Air Force itself, after weighing the examination results, plus such factors as personality, competitive spirit and the intangibles that make a leader, made the final selections.

When the Air Force suggested such a system might lead the way for the two senior Academies, representatives of the Army and Navy turned thumbs down on the proposal, convinced that Members of Congress would begrudge surrendering their right to appoint whom they pleased.

In fact, Congress approved the new competitive system for the Air Force only until such time as the Academy graduates its first class in 1959. Then, Congress indicated, it wants the new Academy to return to the traditional selection method used for the two senior Academies.

What can the individual Senator or Congressman do about this problem, if new legislation is impossible? How shall the right men be encouraged to seek Academy appointment? Should good scores on scholastic tests alone be the basis for selection? Is there any way to make a true objective choice? How can we be reasonably sure that the boys we send to the Academies can pass the stiff entrance requirements, undergo a tough 4-year schooling and then be willing to serve the Nation in the badly needed capacity for which they were trained?

When I came to Congress 9 years ago, I conducted a study of this entire question, comparing among other things the modern techniques used by other governmental, scholastic, and business institutions in their attempt to predict leadership qualities accurately. As a result of this study, I initiated a "pilot" selection system for my Academy appointments which I have used continuously since that time. It may not be the system for every Congressman. It is by no means perfect. But it represents, I believe, one method of eliminating the abuses that have afflicted congressional appointments.

Each year I publicly announce that examinations, open to all, will be held for the appointments I am entitled to make to the Academies. Newspapers, radio, and television media throughout the State cooperate as a public service in carrying these announcements. In addition, the headmaster or dean of every school and college in Massachusetts is informed of the competition and is asked to encourage all interested candidates to apply.

The first step for each boy is to undergo an examination to make certain he is physically qualified for entrance. This is essential, for between 15 and 20 percent of all congressional appointees fail to meet the physical requirements at the service academies each year.

Candidates found physically acceptable are then given aptitude and achievement tests, specially tailored by the Test Development Section of the United States Civil Service Commission. Scholastic records in high school, prep school or college are carefully compiled and evaluated. At that point, every boy's file is processed and screened, and the entire list of candidates is given a competitive ranking.

This is merely the beginning. Objective questionnaires devised to bring out data on the candidate's character and personality are sent to former teachers, employers and others closely acquainted with him. The questionnaires are deliberately and scientifically fashioned to make it almost impossible to give any candidates perfect marks. We want something more useful than a polite letter of recommendation.

With these facts at hand, a special selection board, serving without pay, takes over. This year, for example, my selection board consisted of the headmaster of a preparatory school who is himself a West Point graduate; a clergyman who was formerly an Army chaplain in the combat zone; and a physician with extensive Navy and educational experience.

It is the selection board, not I, that personally interviews each of the highest-ranking candidates and makes the final decision as to selection. It is the selection board, not I, that notifies the boys that they have been nominated, without any opportunity for veto, approval or even review by my office. I have never even met one of my West Point or Annapolis nominees until after he has actually been appointed. I honor the judgment of my selection board without question.

Perhaps my proudest recollection came when I found my system gave the son of a Chinese laundryman the same chance to go to Annapolis as the son of a prominent ex-mayor in my district. That influential political figure—a fellow Democrat—wrote me that his boy wanted an appointment, and asked that I give him "special consideration." He learned from my reply that I could not give anyone's son special consideration, but that his boy—like all boys—was "more than welcome" to enter the competition. And among those competing from that same city was a young Chinese-American boy, the son of the local laundryman. On the basis of sheer merit, the politician's son did not qualify; the laundryman's son did.

A few years ago I learned that one of the boys interested in gaining an appointment was a young soldier stationed on the west coast. After I had arranged for the boy to obtain leave and military-plane travel back to Massachusetts, he succeeded in winning one of my West Point appointments. Only when I received from his father one of the most sincere letters of appreciation I have ever received in my political career did I discover that the latter was one of the most active Republicans in my district.

But these are personal incidents. The overall results of my experience with the system tell an even more encouraging story. Two years ago, for example, I was allowed two West Point appointments. A total of 140 boys sought the nominations. My selection board chose 8—2 as principals, 6 as alternates. Not only did both of my principal appointees make the grade but, in addition, 4 of the 6 alternates were selected for admission under the qualified-alternates system. When you consider that the Army in 1954 admitted only about 50 qualified alternates from its nationwide pool of qualified congressional alternates, the performance of these candidates is obvious. Today, 4 of these 6 boys are on the dean's list, and West Point officials advise me they are doing outstanding work.

The qualified-alternates system is briefly the method by which the Secretaries of the Army and Navy are empowered by an act of Congress in 1950 to fill congressional vacancies by selecting candidates for admission from the nationwide pool of all congressional alternates who qualified for admission.

Last year 190 Massachusetts boys participated in my statewide competition for the three vacancies I was allowed to fill at Annapolis. All 3 of my principles were admitted, and 6 out of the 15 alternates were selected as well. Since the Navy admitted to the Naval Academy as qualified alternates a total of 134 boys from its nationwide alternates pool, again the outstanding performance of these candidates is apparent.

Screened by the same system, my nominations for appointment to the initial class of the Air Force Academy last year won 2 of the 8 places available from the nominees of the 14 Congressmen and the 2 Senators from Massachusetts.

The chief fault in the present system of appointment generally in use does not lie in the fact that Congressmen have most of the appointive power. For this is in keeping with the traditional American concept of civilian supremacy over the military, and it makes certain that the selection of cadets and midshipmen is apportioned throughout all sections of the Nation. But self-reform by Congress itself is long overdue. It is high time that Senators and House Members availed themselves of the scientific testing yardsticks that have been developed in recent years.

Those Congressmen—the great majority—who do give conscientious thought and consideration to the task of selection of Academy appointees should be provided with a more expert, farsighted means of doing so.

There is evidence that the Academy officials themselves are eager to see such a selection system used universally.

In a letter to former Congressman William J. Miller, of Connecticut, who, as far back as 1940, used a method similar to my own, Brig. Gen. Jay L. Benedict, then Superintendent of West Point, declared: "Our own test of determining entrance qualifications is necessarily restricted to tests of mental and physical qualifications. It contemplates that other desirable qualities, such as personality, character, initiative, determination, potential leadership, and so on, be determined by the appointing authority before principals and alternates are designated for our mental and physical tests. Your method should be most effective in accomplishing this."

While I am sure that the Academy officials have since that time made improvements in their own criteria of worthwhile Academy material, the services cannot do this job by themselves. Congress itself must take action, and take action soon, before the present system brings widespread disrepute to our service Academies.

First, a commission should be established to improve methods of selecting Military and Naval Academy appointees, empowered to study and devise aptitude techniques similar to those used by almost every up-to-date business in the United States to pick the best-qualified men.

Second, the present quota system should be changed to eliminate the carryover that presently results when a Congressman fails to make his appointments for that year. Each House Member and each Senator should be allowed to name one boy to each Academy each year. If he fails to do so, then the Academies themselves should be allowed to make the selection and wipe the vacancy off the books. Under the existing system, Congressmen can hoard their appointments over a 4-year period. The Academies themselves have no way of knowing the exact number of new students they will have from year to year.

Third, adequate administrative facilities should be made available to Members of Congress who desire to conduct a competitive-selection system similar to the one I use, in order to encourage them to appoint young men who have been screened mentally, physically and psychologically for the important future that lies before them. The expense for such facilities would be small. The Test Development Section of the Civil Service Commission has had long experience in the field. My own selection board serves without pay, and the newspaper, radio, and television stations in my State are glad to publicize the forthcoming selection tryouts as a public service.

Let us send to our Academies young men who are more than good students, able athletes, or militarily poised robots. By using available modern selective methods, we in Congress can get the type of boys we need to become the guardians of our future security.

For it is the military and naval officers with character and courage who may well prove to be, in the crucial years ahead, this Nation's truly ultimate weapon.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for not to exceed 8 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Pennsylvania may proceed.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, by act of Congress we are celebrating the 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin. Congress authorized the Franklin Commemorative Medal for distinguished service. This medal has been awarded to 71 societies and organizations which Franklin either founded or in whose activities he had an important part. The Franklin Institute of Philadelphia has carried out the plan.

When the plan was made originally to honor the 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, the committee thought of only a small celebration. They expected to limit it to an exchange of ideas among the societies and institutions of which Franklin was once a member, or which he founded or helped.

But such is the stature of the man that the original and limited plan soon developed into a great outpouring of voluntary cooperation in 51 countries of the world. Franklin's spirit and philosophy were never more alive and vital than they proved to be in this year, 2½ centuries after he was born.

Nearly a thousand organizations, with hundreds of thousands of members, seized upon this opportunity to do one of the things Benjamin Franklin believed was necessary to help bring enduring peace to the world. They will cooperate, all during the year 1956, in a free and voluntary communication of ideas to help improve international understanding.

Each group plans its own program, in its own country, in its own way. Ideas are exchanged through addresses, papers, books, and broadcasts through the generous cooperation of many thousand publishers and broadcasters.

Already, the Franklin Institute, which organized this plan, estimated that upward of 500 million people have been reached in the 51 cooperating countries.

This is the kind of plan that Franklin himself once developed for the young United States. He was elected to membership in 28 of the most famous learned societies of his day—in England, France, Scotland, Holland, Russia, Germany, Italy, Spain, and America. Through the transaction of these societies, and the free press, the development of which he so greatly assisted, he took part in the exchange of ideas which helped our young country to grow in the technological world we know today.

Twenty-one of these famous old societies that helped Benjamin Franklin are still in existence today and cooperating in the current program. They have been joined by many others in South America, Asia, and Europe in this modern exchange of ideas.

Franklin believed that it was necesary for the peoples of all countries to communicate with each other, in addition to their governments communicating with each other. He thought that in this way mankind could hasten the day when peace and understanding would replace wars and threats of war.

The Congress of the United States thought of this objective when they met to consider the most fitting tribute they could pay to Benjamin Franklin on the 250th anniversary of his birth.

They felt, as they believe Franklin would have felt, that honor should be paid to those groups which did so much to help make his success in this field possible.

The Franklin Commemorative Medal for Distinguished Service was designed for this purpose. On it appear these words of Franklin's: "Wise and good men are the strength of a nation." The complete quotation adds the words: "Far more than riches or arms."

Someday the world will come to recognize the truth of that statement. The position of a country in the Council of Nations will be determined, not by its material wealth or power of its armaments alone but even more by the contributions of its great men and women to the welfare and progress of all mankind.

Benjamin Franklin believed this more than 200 years ago. He knew and said that the road would be long and difficult. But he never lost faith in the belief that "wise and good men" would be recognized as the "strength of a nation far more than riches or arms." And that this day would be speeded by the free and open communications between the peoples of all countries.

The United States honors that philosophy in the creation of the Franklin medal.

President Eisenhower's plan of talking over the world situation is along the lines advocated by the wise and good Doctor Franklin more than 200 years ago.

Mr. President, I have had the honor of presenting four of the commemorative medals. One of them was presented to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the governor's office at Harrisburg on March 26, 1956. Franklin was twice governor of that State while it was a colony.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the brief remarks I made on the occasion of the presentation of the medals be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN OF PENNSYLVANIA

Benjamin Franklin was the most outstanding of the 101 Governors of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. He was a businessman, a diplomat, a statesman, a politician, an inventor, and organizer of the military defense for the Colonies.

Being interested in welfare, he commenced a hospital, an insurance company, a savings society, libraries, and many other institutions which would benefit mankind.

You, sir, as the present Governor of Pennsylvania, and myself, as a former Governor, appreciate so much what he contributed to the welfare of this Commonwealth, the United States, and the world.

Franklin was first a governor under the title of President of the Pennsylvania Committee of Safety, when our revolutionary ancestors formed this great Government and gave us the priceless heritage of liberty and freedom.

Franklin was the first Governor after the proprietary Governors and served from 1775 to 1776.

Franklin was Governor of Pennsylvania the second time under the title of President of the Supreme Executive Council, from 1785 to 1788.

He was the 56th and 63d Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and was frequently referred to as the President of Pennsylvania.

His work as Governor, as a member of the committee to draft the Declaration of Independence, a member of the convention that wrote the Constitution of the United States, Postmaster General, and as a diplomat representing the Colonies in France during the most critical period of our American independence, will never be forgotten.

In a period when we are all demanding so much from government, we should heed his words:

"They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."

It is a great honor to be chosen to present this medal, struck by an act of Congress, to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, Benjamin Franklin helped organize the first hospital in America.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement in presenting the Franklin Commemorative Medal to the Pennsylvania Hospital in Philadelphia on May 7, 1956, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR MARTIN OF PENNSYLVANIA

It is a great honor to present to the Pennsylvania Hospital the Benjamin Franklin Medal on behalf of the Congress of the United States.

It is most appropriate to present this medal on this day in conformity with the old Quaker custom for this annual assembly on the first Monday in May to discuss the progress of the hospital.

We owe so much to Benjamin Franklin. When he had arrived at the age of 40, he was a most successful businessman. He then started to devote his great talents and energy for the public good. He soon won recognition as an editor, inventor, patriot, diplomat, statesman, and humanitarian.

How helpful it would be in this glorious period of peace and prosperity if more of our people would emulate Benjamin Franklin.

Pennsylvania Hospital is the first to be founded in the United States.

The world owes much to Benjamin Franklin for his many contributions to mankind, but I feel that probably his greatest was in the founding of this hospital. This was really the founding of the public hospital system in our country.

What a contrast when we look back over the years and realize that once the only place for the sick poor was a pesthouse, and then note the Pennsylvania Hospital where rich and poor alike receive the best of care. It meets Franklin's ideal, because he himself once ascribed the highest duty as "doing good to man."

Though Franklin himself, in his autobiography, disclaimed the honor of first suggesting the project for the Pennsylvania Hospital, which he credited to your own Dr. Thomas Bond, nevertheless it was his genius that made this magnificent institution possible.

Let me quote from Franklin's own words to get the story as he told it.

"In 1751, Dr. Thomas Bond, a particular friend of mine, conceived the idea of establishing a hospital in Philadelphia for the reception and cure of poor sick persons whether inhabitants of the province or strangers."

Franklin then pointed out that such a proposal was "a novelty in America, and at first not well understood."

Dr. Bond went to Franklin and asked for leadership to accomplish the project.

I quote again from Franklin:

"At length he came to me with the compliment that he found there was no such things as carrying a public spirited project through without my being concerned in it."

Franklin immediately became enthusiastic and turned his fertile and brilliant mind to the problem of making this dream come true.

Far ahead of his times in the art of what we now call public relations, Franklin conceived that his first objective was, as he said, "to prepare the minds of the people by writing on the subject in the newspapers, which was my usual custom in such cases."

Franklin then set up a three step program and immediately went to work on it. First, the public relations program; second, a fund raising drive; and third, a contribution from the Commonwealth treasury.

His public relations program created the proper climate for the fund raising and money started to come in but salesmanship was not quite adequate to get the direct contribution from the Commonwealth.

Then the political genius of Franklin successfully overcame this obstacle. He conceived the idea, which has since been referred to as "Franklin's cunning."

He got a bill through the General Assembly incorporating the contributors, with a proviso that when they contributed 2,000 pounds, with the interest to be applied to the operation of the hospital, the Commonwealth would provide 2,000 pounds for the founding, building and furnishing of the hospital.

Thus, as Franklin said, "the cause worked both ways since every man's donation would be duplicated."

Evidently Franklin had many a chuckle out of this device, for he later wrote, and I quote:

"I do not remember any of my political maneuvers the success of which at the time gave me more pleasure, or wherein, after thinking of it, I more easily excused myself for having made use of some cunning."

Your own Dr. Francis R. Packard was years later to make a very pertinent comment on this, and I quote:

"If the success of his cunning was pleasing to Franklin it has certainly been of inestimable benefit to many thousands throughout the subsequent years."

I might add that Franklin's maneuvers in this fund-raising project may also be credited with laying a foundation for what is now accepted as a standard method for joint State and public contributions to the care of the poor and needy. This is one of the outstanding principles of our great free-enterprise system in this country that makes our Nation so different from all of the others in the world.

The charter for the Pennsylvania Hospital was granted by the general assembly and approved by the Governor on May 11, 1751, and a meeting of the contributors was held in the State House—subsequently to become Independence Hall—on July 1, 1751. Twelve managers and a treasurer were chosen to serve until "the first second day of the month called May." These meetings have always been so scheduled since that time.

Every time I see the pin worn by your nurses in the Pennsylvania Hospital, the device of the Good Samaritan, I am reminded of the fact that Franklin and Dr. Bond designed that seal, with the inscription "Take care of him, and I will repay thee."

Benjamin Franklin served as the first clerk of the board of managers and as the second president.

The hospital was first located in a private house on Market Street near Sixth, and on May 28, 1775, the cornerstone was laid for the first permanent building—what is now the east wing, at Eighth and Pine Streets.

Now you have here, on the original site, the department for the sick and injured. Across Spruce Street is the Philadelphia Lying-In and Maternity Hospital. Across Ninth Street is the Benjamin Franklin Clinic. In West Philadelphia is the department for mental and nervous diseases and the institute. The fame of your school of nursing is known far and wide. The growth of Pennsylvania Hospital is a challenge to all of us. Each new department or unit has added new luster and fame to an already great name.

This hospital has been responsible for so many medical firsts that it is hardly possible to recount them all. But it should be noted that here the pattern was originated for interns and medical training. Here the first operation planned specifically for appendicities was performed; here was built the first medical amphitheater; here was founded the first public dispensary in the United States; here commenced the new era in the cure of the mentally ill.

Indeed, I doubt if there is any single institution or organization receiving one of the Benjamin Franklin Medals, struck by act of Congress on the occasion of the 250th anniversary of this great American, which more richly deserves this congressional recognition.

Franklin was an intellectual giant among men and certainly among the greatest of all Americans. He influenced or advanced the course of a host of human activities—science, invention, politics, government, statesmanship, diplomacy, literature, and journalism. But I feel that if it were possible to ask him today the contribution he made which gave him the greatest personal satisfaction in being of service to his fellowman, he would say that it is where we stand now at the Pennsylvania Hospital.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it becomes my humble honor to pay tribute to Benjamin Franklin and to the Pennsylvania Hospital by the presentation of the Congressional Benjamin Franklin Medal.

The Congress, in this presentation, also honors all of those "wise and good men," from Dr. Bond on down to today, who made this hospital the magnificent and inspiring institution of service which it is.

To you I say, carry on.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, Benjamin Franklin conceived the idea of the volunteer soldier. I ask unanimous consent that my statement in presenting the Franklin commemorative medal to the Pennsylvania National Guard in Philadelphia May 19, 1956, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR MARTIN OF PENNSYLVANIA

General Biddle, General Baker, and my fellow Americans, it is an honor to present the Benjamin Franklin medal to the Pennsylvania National Guard.

This medal is presented by an act of Congress to organizations which were either founded or influenced by Benjamin Franklin. This is a part of the celebration of the 250th anniversary of the birth of this great American.

There is an enormous significance in making this presentation on the hallowed ground where we now stand. It was here in this very statehouse—now known to the world as Independence Hall—where Benjamin Franklin signed the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

Benjamin Franklin has frequently been referred to as America's first great scientist. He won world recognition as an editor, inventor, patriot, diplomat, and statesman. But the fact is that much of Franklin's most brilliant work was in the application of science and politics to military problems of defense and war.

Essentially a man of peace, Benjamin Franklin himself developed the idea of citizen-soldier as we now know it in the National Guard and in the Reserve.

Benjamin Franklin was the father of the Pennsylvania National Guard.

In witness to this, the soldiers of the fighting 111th Regimental Combat Team wear the full figure of Benjamin Franklin on their regimental insignia.

The 111th Infantry was the first unit of the Pennsylvania National Guard.

How this regiment came to be created years before the formal beginnings of our Nation is one of the many proud stories connected with Franklin and the history of our country.

Since 1739 England had been at war with Spain over British smuggling in America and since 1734 with France over the Austrian succession. By 1744 these wars were coming

close to Pennsylvania. In that year French and Spanish privateers appeared in Delaware Bay, plundered two plantations, captured a ship and murdered its captain.

Philadelphia had no fort, no artillery, and no militia. The Assembly had voted no money for defense.

Typically, Franklin turned from philosophy and electrical research to tackle the immediate and realistic problem of defense for Philadelphia and Pennsylvania.

He concluded the answer was a voluntary association of militia men and he wrote a brilliant pamphlet to stimulate public thinking. In reality it was a recruiting pamphlet such as the Regular Army, National Guard and the Reserves put out today in order to get new recruits.

Franklin estimated that there were available at least 60,000 fighting men acquainted with firearms, many of them hunters and marksmen, hardy and bold.

How many of them he would be able to recruit was then a matter of speculation. But they were English, Scotch, Irish and German—all descended from peoples famous in war. The association spread through the province until there were more than 10,000 members of this first volunteer militia.

They started the traditional one drill night per week, which is characteristic of the National Guard and the Reserve today.

Franklin even organized a lottery to raise funds to build a fort, which he furnished with cannon.

Franklin was especially proud of the success in erecting this fort and arming it. He noted in his writings, and I quote: "I regularly took my turn of duty there as a common soldier."

This was the beginning of the Pennsylvania National Guard, a body of free men voluntarily associated together as citizen-soldiers giving of themselves as patriots to the common defense.

This beginning tradition has been carried on by the 111th Infantry which was organized on November 21, 1747, as the Associated Regiment of Philadelphia, a distinct entity within the Associators.

The Associators became known as the militia in 1777, then as the Pennsylvania National Guard in 1870.

Let us note the history of other well-known Philadelphia outfits.

The 1st Troop, Philadelphia City Cavalry, is the oldest component of the Army of the United States having a record of continuous service.

It is now the 28th Reconnaissance Company of the 28th Division. It was organized November 17, 1774, served during the Revolutionary War, and escorted Gen. George Washington on numerous occasions.

The old 1st Regiment is now the 103d Engineers. They were originally organized at the same time the 111th was organized. They started out as a flank company of light infantry in one of the battalions of Associators organized by Benjamin Franklin in 1747, and have had a gallant record of service since that time.

Time does not permit us referring to historic outfits like the Duquesne Greys, the 108th Field Artillery, the first organization to be known as the National Guard, the 109th Field Artillery, the 110th Infantry, 112th Infantry, and many others in all parts of the Commonwealth. They have fought intelligently and bravely all over the world in order to preserve individual freedom and the dignity of man.

We must always have active spots for these historic units.

We must never forget the morale value of history and tradition of military outfits.

We must also recognize that while we will always improve weapons, we cannot depend upon pushbutton fighting alone to win victories. Victory depends upon men with a will to fight. The volunteer possesses that will.

Benjamin Franklin believed sincerely that people who love liberty must be willing to fight for it.

Great as his many services were, we honor him particularly today as one of the first successful builders of the volunteer system for our national defense.

Many nations have built powerful armies and navies. Compulsory military service has been a requirement in most countries since the dawn of history.

In our own country, we have been faced with the necessity of conscription a number of times. But through it all, we have recognized and known that the heart of our national defense was the proud and voluntary service of American youth.

The Pennsylvania National Guard, the Reserve and all the regular professional services have kept that principle of voluntary service bright and shining for more than 200 years.

You men perform both the duties of citizens and soldiers. You are patriots in the truest sense—the Benjamin Franklin type of patriot.

When Dr. Franklin came out of Independence Hall, this sacred building, after the completion of the Constitution, he was asked by the assembled people, "What kind of a government have you given us?" Dr. Franklin replied, "A Republic, if you can keep it." Those were significant words. It is up to each one of us to keep that Republic as the Founding Fathers intended.

In presenting this medal to the guard, General Biddle, the Congress not only honors Benjamin Franklin, but also the "wise and good men" who have made and are making the Pennsylvania National Guard the leader in voluntary military service for our State and country. It is my proud privilege to give you this medal on behalf of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, Dr. Benjamin Franklin was a devout believer in religious tolerance. His church affiliation was with the Presbyterian denomination.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement in presenting the Franklin Commemorative Medal to the Presbyterian General Assembly, convened in Philadelphia May 25, 1956, be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR MARTIN OF PENNSYLVANIA

I come before you today with deep and sincere appreciation of the honor of addressing the 168th general assembly on the 250th anniversary of the first Presbytery on the American continent.

It is likewise a special honor to be chosen to present to the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America the Benjamin Franklin Commemorative Medal for Distinguished Service.

This medal is granted by the Congress of the United States to commemorate the 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin.

It is not only a tribute to his illustrious career but also gives recognition to the greatness of the Presbyterian Church and its vast contribution to the moral and spiritual strength of our Nation.

Let me say, in all modesty, that it was my privilege to join with my distinguished colleague, Senator DUFF, in sponsoring the legislation enacted by Congress authorizing the Franklin Medal.

The act of Congress directed that 71 such medals be presented to those institutions, societies and other enterprises which were founded by Benjamin Franklin or were aided in their early development by his devotion to the cause of truth, greater knowledge, and the public welfare.

Learned societies in many parts of the world have been designated as recipients of the medal, commemorating the part Franklin played in their history. Twenty-one organizations, dedicated to the promotion of science, agriculture, education, and the arts in which he held membership are still active in England, Scotland, Holland, Germany, Italy, and Spain, as well as in the United States.

It is noteworthy that in 1706, 250 years ago, the same year that Franklin was born in Boston, seven weary and travelstained Presbyterian ministers came to Philadelphia and organized the first Presbytery. These sturdy and courageous preachers knew the toil, hardships, and sacrifice of pioneer life. In order to reach Philadelphia, they pushed their way over rough forest trails.

Sustained by faith in the protection and mercy of God they faced the perils of the wilderness and the danger from savage Indians. In their hearts they yearned for a season of prayer and fellowship.

These men were dedicated servants of God. The influence of their ministry spread rapidly. It gave impetus to the building of churches and schools. It strengthened the early settlers in their love of God and love of freedom as the colonial frontier advanced westward over the mountains.

There has been a great deal of discussion concerning Franklin's religion, but the known facts point with perfect clarity to his broad tolerance and his firm adherence to the principle of religious liberty.

Freedom of worship was a human right that Benjamin Franklin served with all his heart, contributing of his money and effort to every faith and every creed. He fought against bigotry of every kind.

In his autobiography Franklin reveals that his father intended him for the ministry. He was baptized the day he was born and was given religious instruction as a boy. His first adult affiliation was with the Presbyterian Church and he aided materially in the development of the Presbyterian Church here in Philadelphia.

He helped to complete Christ Church where many of the Founding Fathers worshipped. His name led the list of subscribers to the Jewish Congregation Mikveh Israel. He recommended the first Catholic Bishop for America. He raised money to erect a building for any preacher of any faith to talk to the people.

Franklin believed in God. He believed in the immortality of the soul and in divine judgment in the hereafter.

Throughout his life he held fast to the creed he drafted at the age of 22, which he entitled "Articles of Belief and Acts of Religion." In that creed he wrote:

"I believe in one God, Creator of the universe.

"That He governs by His providence.

"That He ought to be worshipped.

"That the most acceptable service we can render to Him is doing good to His other children.

"That the soul is immortal and will be treated with justice in another life respecting its conduct in this."

Many years later, in the evening of his life, he rose in the Constitutional Convention to reassert his faith that God governs in the affairs of men.

Franklin's motion that each session of the Convention be opened with prayer is a historic landmark in the spiritual growth of the American Republic. The custom survives to this day in our Legislative Halls.

Franklin's impressive words are familiar to all of us, but they are worth repeating here.

"If a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?"

You will recall that the Constitutional Convention of 1787 had been in session for 5 weeks but had made little progress. It looked like failure when Dr. Franklin proposed that daily prayers be offered "imploring the assistance of Heaven and its blessing" on the deliberations of the assembly.

From then on, history tells us, real progress was made in framing our Constitution and the establishment of a Republic which recognized social, political, and religious freedom as God's greatest gift to mankind.

Many volumes have been written in praise of the amazing career of Benjamin Franklin. His brilliant achievements as an author, philosopher, scientist, statesman, and diplomat mark him as one of the giant intellects of all time. He attained worldwide renown, but to my mind his outstanding service was in the field of government and politics.

Historians have drawn some interesting and significant parallels between the establishment of constitutional government in the United States and the government of the Presbyterian Church.

It has been pointed out that the church congregation represents local government; the Presbytery can be compared to State government and the General Assembly to the Federal Government.

Each has been kept separate in its duties and functions, yet each has such an important part in the spiritual strength of our people.

The point I wish to emphasize is that today, just as in Franklin's time, civic duty and religious duty are interwoven.

America is a great and fortunate land because in all its history great men—dedicated men of the cloth—have preached the word of God and the way of Christ.

There have always been great preachers to guide the spiritual lives of our people.

There have always been church leaders of great moral courage to fight against evil conditions that bring corruption into private lives and public affairs.

Those men knew that the moral standards of government cannot rise above the spiritual strength of the individual citizen.

They did not hesitate to take an active part in public affairs in order to protect the liberties of the people. They taught that obedience to the laws of God and man is the foundation of good citizenship.

The great need of our times is more willing and more sincere acceptance of Christian responsibility. That is why I am constantly urging every good citizen, every churchgoer, to take a more active, intelligent and patriotic part in government.

That means taking part in politics. It means working for the election of men of integrity and high character. It means working to drive out of office every politician whose objective is personal gain and personal power, rather than public service.

It means taking an active interest in community affairs, in State, National, and world problems.

It means arousing public opinion to a higher standard of morality, to inspire deeper respect for the law and to assure confidence in the integrity of our officials and our courts.

It means working courageously for good, clean, decent, honest government—because good government is the strongest safeguard of all our God-given freedoms—including the most important of all, freedom of religion.

The most effective leadership in that direction should and must come from the pulpit and from the great body of laymen who hold official positions in our church organizations.

It would contribute so much to the greatness of the United States if more of our people would emulate the example of Benjamin Franklin in patriotic citizenship and devotion to the public welfare.

Inscribed on the Benjamin Franklin medal are these words which he wrote:

"Wise and good men are the strength of a nation" and the complete quotation adds the words: "Far more than riches or arms."

These words were carefully chosen for their significance. They have special meaning for all of us here assembled.

They honor not only the memory of Benjamin Franklin but also the "wise and good men" of this church who have done and are doing so much to advance the faith and freedoms by which we live.

It is now my great privilege to present, in the name of the Congress of the United States, this Franklin medal to the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, in this critical period of history I hope that all of us may study the ideas and plans of Dr. Benjamin Franklin for world peace.

COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE AND REPORT ON PROFITS EARNED FROM PRODUCTION OF WEAPONS AND FROM OTHER DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am urging today that the President of the United States appoint a commission to investigate and report on the profits being earned from the production of weapons and from other defense contracts of the United States.

We have just had the report of the Presidential commission, headed by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, set up by President Eisenhower to inquire into veterans' benefits. That commission, in reporting its findings and recommendations, had this to say:

> Military service in time of war or peace is an obligation of citizenship and should not be considered inherently a basis for future Government benefits. * * * The performance of the duties of citizenship cannot be expected to be painless or free from sacrifice.

These are noble sentiments, even when accompanying a report which proposed cutting down drastically on the programs instituted for the benefit of the men and women who have fought America's wars on the field of battle.

But, Mr. President, if a Presidential commission can apply the standard of obligation of citizenship to those called upon to risk their lives for our country during a military emergency, what about the obligations of those who manufacture the armaments which those soldiers and sailors must take into battle?

The President appointed a commission to look into our programs of veterans' benefits. The commission recommended a gradual abandonment of certain benefits for veterans, at least in part, on the ground that military service is no more than an obligation of citizenship which deserves no special economic reward. I now propose that the President appoint a similar commission to inquire into the profits made from defense contracts—to see whether our Armed Forces are being furnished with weapons and material, as well as with servicemen, as an obligation of citizenship and without special economic reward.

I believe such a study would show that never before have there been such vast profits from the production of weapons and other materiel for the armed services. The study should be made. Is the administration going to have one of its commissions say that, under modern conditions, special veterans' benefits have outlived their justification and should be diminished, and yet do nothing to cut down on the immense profits that modern defense budgets pour into coffers of the corporations which are the chief suppliers of defense material?

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS DEMANDED EQUALITY OF SACRIFICE

Mr. President, I well remember hearing, back in my school days, the proclamations of the various veterans' organizations that, in the next war, capital would be drafted as well as men. I am sure that other Senators will recall such statements, as for instance, the following from a resolution adopted at the American Legion's national convention in 1922, calling for an investigation of what were then known as war profiteers:

> The Legion recognizes this as among its immediate obligations, because when the American people are aware of the extent of war profiteering a national determination will have developed that in any future war there shall be a draft not only of servicemen, but of the laboring man and capitalist as well. Had there been such a draft, the fundamental basis of adjusted compensation, now temporarily thwarted by executive action, would never have arisen.

In those years, resolutions and legislation were also repeatedly introduced in Congress on behalf of the American Legion and in response to the sentiments generally of veterans and their families, designed—and I quote from one of these resolutions—to recognize "the duty of Congress to require that the burdens and benefits of war shall be justly and fairly distributed" and "to take the profits out of war and to require equal service for all."

Today, Mr. President, we no longer speak of the benefits of war. We know that war cannot benefit anyone, whether he be on the winning side or the losing. But if there is no one who benefits from war, there are still those who profit from armed peace.

GOP SEEKS TO MINIMIZE ROLE OF DEFENSE SPENDING

There are efforts, of course, to play down the magnitude of these profits and the extent to which the recent prosperity of the manufacturing segment of our economy has reflected continued high defense expenditures. This prosperity, by the way, has notably not been shared by the agricultural and small business segments of the economy, which also share less in the defense budgets. But in any case, the political slogan has been raised that, under the present administration, "peacetime prosperity replaced wartime inflation." Let us examine this claim against the history of our military budgets.

The last year of World War II spending was fiscal 1946, which began July 1,

1945. In fiscal 1947, our national expenditures on military security, which include atomic energy and military foreign aid, were $14.6 billion, about 6 percent of the gross national product. In fiscal 1948 they were $12.3 billion, in 1949 they were $15 billion, and in 1950 they were $14 billion. In other words, in the 4 years of the Truman administration prior to the Communist attack in Korea, our defense expenditures averaged about $14 billion annually. That was about a 5-percent slice of our national economy, which during those same years expanded by $50 billion.

In fiscal 1952, at the height of the Korean war, we spent on defense $42 billion, which was 12.2 percent of our gross national product. In 1953 and 1954, under the present administration, we spent on defense $46 billion annually—the highest amount since World War II. That was 13 percent of the gross national product, 2½ times the slice of the national economy devoted to defense under some of the Truman administration. I might note that, in spite of this record defense spending under the Republican administration, the gross national product actually contracted between 1953 and 1954. Today, in 1956, we still spend at a rate comparable to the years of the Korean war.

This kind of Federal spending has the same effect on our national economy whether the planes and guns are used to shoot at an enemy or not. We all hope that these weapons will become obsolete without having once moved from their storage depots, and without having been needed by our men in combat. But the effect on our economy of producing these weapons is, nevertheless, exactly the same. If on your doctor's orders you buy a pint of some expensive medicine fresh every week, the effect on your pocketbook—and on that of the druggist—is the same whether you swallow all of it, or just put it on a shelf.

Since 1952, through all the years of this administration, we have been riding the crest of a vast armaments boom. For 5 consecutive fiscal years, defense expenditures have averaged more than $35 billion, and that figure appears to be the approximate level for these expenditures next year and in the years ahead. I want it clearly understood that I do not challenge the need for these expenditures. I support the necessary appropriations. But I think it is time for a review of the financial impact of these expenditures on corporate profits, as we have had a review of the veterans' programs.

In the widespread eagerness to claim credit for a great "peacetime prosperity," Mr. President, the economic and financial results of a long-range $35-billion-a-year defense budget have been an inconvenient question, which has simply been swept under the rug.

PRESIDENT SHOULD ORDER A STUDY OF ARMAMENT PROFITS

I maintain, Mr. President, that the Chief Executive of this Nation has the same obligation to inquire into the profits being reaped from the production of essential defense material, which he felt to inquire into the benefits being bestowed upon war veterans. I urge him to appoint, for this purpose, the same kind of commission as the Bradley Commission, which he established for the latter inquiry.

If it is a proper subject of presidential inquiry to determine whether public funds are being profligately spent on benefits for war veterans, surely it is an equally proper subject to determine whether public funds are going with too great a profligacy and generosity to those who manufacture weapons for our soldiers and sailors of today to use in maneuvers, and perhaps even in actual combat.

It is appropriate for us, today, to look briefly at the prosperity being enjoyed by so many huge corporations now devoting substantial portions of their production to filling Government orders.

The greatest supplier of the Government in connection with defense programs has been General Motors, which in the 5 years between July 1, 1950, and June 30, 1955, has had prime contracts of a net value totaling $6,874,000,000—I repeat, almost $7 billion. At the end of the Second World War, General Motors stock sold for around $35. By 1954, it had risen to $99, was split 3 shares for 1, and again reached a high of $54 last year, when General Motors was the first corporation in history to earn $1 billion net, after taxes. General Electric, with $4 billion in military prime contracts over the same 5 years, has seen its shares rise from a level of $37–$50 in 1945 to the equivalent of $170—$57 after a 3-for-1 split.

Similarly, the shares of great suppliers of petroleum products for the armed services, such as Standard Oil of California and of New Jersey, have also quintupled in value since the end of World War II.

Prominent among the largest defense contractors are, of course, the aircraft companies. A dozen of these have had military contracts ranging from $1 billion to $5 billion in the period 1950–55, and these military purchases represent over 90 percent of all aircraft construction orders. These companies, which work almost entirely for the armed services, are outstanding examples of the trend. Their shares have risen fantastically in value.

ADMINISTRATION TAX POLICIES HELP DEFENSE SUPPLIERS

These vast increases in stock values reflect, of course, increased earnings; and these, in turn, to a large extent reflect tax and other policies of the administration. During World War II, we tried to hold profits from war production to a reasonable level by means of excess profits taxes. These have been abandoned, and further generous tax concessions have been granted to corporations and their owners. In 1945, at the end of World War II, the average value of eight leading aircraft companies had risen only 30 percent over their prewar level. The excess profits tax expired, under the present administration, on December 31, 1953. The average value of the 8 aircraft stocks for 1954 was 371.8 percent of the prewar average; for 1955, it was 564 percent. For the first 4 months of this year, these shares—of companies engaged almost entirely in defense production for the United States Government—have averaged 671 percent of their prewar level, or 5 times their value at the end of World War II.

I shall not multiply the available examples of this well-known trend. But I do not recall that Secretary of Defense Wilson, or Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, has expressed any grave concern over the possibility that there may be a relationship between the continued magnitude of our defense needs, the absence of controls over armament earnings, and the vast profit to corporate shareholders.

ADMINISTRATION ENDORSES SACRIFICE BY MEN, BUT NOT SACRIFICE BY CORPORATIONS

They may, of course, prefer to ascribe it all to our new "peacetime prosperity." Yet, at the same time, in the last 18 months, the Eisenhower administration has shown great desire for economy and for sacrifice, where service by men rather than by corporations is involved.

First, we have seen an end to the GI bill of rights, which did so much to raise the educational standards of America, and which gave young servicemen some hope of earning a better future by their service to our country.

Second, last summer, Department of Defense demanded, and got, compulsory and enforceable Reserve duty for all servicemen, for several years after the end of their active duty—a forcible intrusion of the military into civilian life heretofore unheard of in this country.

Now, finally, we have the report of the Bradley Commission for a reconsideration of veterans' benefits, in the light of the principle that military service is "an obligation of citizenship."

Is this a characteristic example of the policies of the administration which frequently proclaims that it is "conservative in economic affairs but liberal in human affairs"?

Mr. President, if we face facts about the international situation, we know that military service is here to stay, probably for our lifetime. When we contemplate the incredible complexity of modern defense technology, we realize that large defense budgets also are here to stay.

Ex-servicemen will continue to comprise a large portion of each generation—even though we hope they will not be war veterans. Likewise, defense expenditures will continue to be a large sector of our gross national product, and particularly of the product of the largest industrial corporations.

The President has considered it wise and necessary to have a commission study the programs appropriate for ex-servicemen in our society. I now call upon President Eisenhower to appoint a Presidential commission, similar to the Bradley Commission, to study the role of defense contracts and defense profits in our economy.

EXEMPTION OF SURVIVOR BENEFITS FROM TAX BASE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for approximately 6 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am making this speech for the attention of the Finance Committee, because I think it is very important that the subject matter which I am about to discuss shall receive the attention of the Finance Committee this week, before it is too late.

Mr. President, on February 2, 1956, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon, I introduced a bill (S. 3119) to provide that certain survivor benefits received by a child under public retirement systems shall not be taken into account in determining whether that child is a dependent for income-tax purposes. On April 19, again with the support of my colleague, I introduced the same proposal as an amendment to the House bill, H. R. 7225, amending the Social Security Act.

I now understand that H. R. 7225 is to be reported at any moment by the Finance Committee. It is my further understanding that although the committee is recommending certain amendments to H. R. 7225, it has not acted on the amendment proposed by Senator NEUBERGER and myself. Indeed, I was told yesterday by the staff of the Finance Committee that the customary departmental reports on S. 3119, which were requested on February 3 from the Bureau of the Budget and the Treasury Department, have not been received. Apparently the administration does not deem our bill very important or worth while.

Viewed as only a small part of the complex of social security provisions, it perhaps is not very important. Judged, however, from the standpoint of thousands of American families headed by widows, it is both important and eminently worth while. There can be no question about the insecure financial position of such family units. Their average income falls far below families of the same size headed by a man, even when all benefits under public assistance and survivor's insurance programs are added to earned income.

Perhaps my colleagues will be as startled as I was, for example, to learn that although $3,560 is regarded as necessary to afford a widow and two dependent children in Portland, Oreg., a "modest" standard of living, the median average income for all families in the United States headed by women is only $2,293.

And yet, curiously enough, Mr. President, the Internal Revenue Code as presently devised penalizes the very families we seek to protect and cherish. A widowed mother with dependent children, who is forced to supplement OASI payments with earned income, is confronted today with an anomaly in the law which, in effect, taxes the survivor's benefits received by her children. Not only is this inconsistent with the intent of Congress in exempting OASI benefits from taxation; it also has an inverse reaction with relation to wealth.

As the law now reads, if a widow under OASI receives more than $600 a year in earned income, she can claim her children as dependents only if she can demonstrate that she is contributing more than half of their support. Since per child OASI payments now range between $288 and $624 a year, this means that a widow with two children, each of whom is receiving, say, $450, can claim them as dependents for income tax purposes only if she can prove that she contributed to their support more than $450 per child. Her total family income may be only $2,500, and yet under the law she is required to show that she has used at least $1,800 of that amount for support of her children in order to avoid paying taxes on earned income above her standard $600 exemption and 10 percent deduction. The effect of this on her precarious financial condition is readily apparent.

Less immediately apparent, but quite as significant, is the fact that this weakness in the Internal Revenue Code does not impinge with commensurate severity on widows with outside nonearned income. Their higher standard of living makes it possible for them to contribute more than half of the support of their children, and thus gain exemptions for whatever income they might earn.

To correct both of these weaknesses, my colleague and I are therefore suggesting that section 203 (a) of H. R. 7225 be amended to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that only those Social Security benefits exceeding $600 per year per child shall be taken into account in determining whether a child receives more than half his support from his mother.

It is my intention, if I am so permitted by the parliamentary situation, to submit this amendment in the debate on H. R. 7225 later this week. I know it will receive the sympathetic support it so clearly deserves.

I was greatly disappointed at the failure of the Finance Committee to see to it that widowed mothers in America are not subjected to this great injustice by requiring them to pay taxes on social security benefits which go to their children. We have been very careful in the Senate, under laws recently passed to see to it that on retirement Senators are protected in receiving much greater retirement benefits than were provided prior to this session. It is about time the Finance Committee of the Senate should give some attention to the deplorable condition in which widowed mothers find themselves. It is an injustice which the Finance Committee should attempt to rectify; and I intend to bring out fully what is being done to these widowed mothers, unless the committee reports to the Senate a bill which contains this amendment.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9390) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 4, 1956, p. 9427, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the bill as passed by the Senate provided $433,876,400 for the Department of the Interior, exclusive of the Bureau of Reclamation. The bill as approved by the conference committee provides for $423,394,100.

I shall be glad to answer any questions Senators may ask in regard to any item of the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I should like to ask a few questions concerning the final report on the bill, as I did not have the privilege of being present when the bill was considered on the floor.

First, I wish highly to commend and thank the Senator from Arizona for his very fine and effective work from year to year with reference to forestry programs which mean so much to all areas of the country, and particularly to the area from which I come, in connection with reforestation, proper forest management, and forestry research, in cooperation with the States along those lines.

Time and time again I have realized how very well the Senator from Arizona understands the problems and how effective he is in having the right program properly supplied with the necessary appropriations. At the same time, he is conservative in the figures which apply to the programs.

Mr. HAYDEN. We have tried to provide the money to do the necessary work, which amounts to a capital investment in our national forests. It has been well worthwhile.

Mr. STENNIS. I agree with the Senator's description, because I certainly believe that it is a capital investment and that it will bring returns over many years.

I am interested in the fund for management and protection. I understand that in part the appropriations approved by the Senate figures are preserved in the pending conference report.

Mr. HAYDEN. These are the increases allowed in conference:

Range resource management	$250,000
Wildlife resource management	135,000
Soil and water management	250,000
Sanitation and care of public campgrounds	902,750

That is a very important item.

Forest fire protection	$225,000
Reforestation	620,000
Revegetation	250,000

Unfortunately, we could not get the whole amount in that instance.

Mr. STENNIS. I have the figures with respect to forest research. There is a $650,000 increase for that highly important item, which makes a $1,800,000 increase for forest research over the current year.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Those figures are approximately correct. That is another item which is highly important.

If I may refer to the next page, there is an increase in the item of cooperative forest tree planting, by reason of the conferees agreeing to a Senate amendment. This is another highly important program.

Mr. HAYDEN. Those items were allowed in amounts above the budget estimates.

Mr. STENNIS. I do not know of any program which is more important for the long-range future or which is a better capital investment. The distinguished Senator from Arizona and the Senators who worked with him are to be highly commended. This is a matter of vital concern and importance to my area of the country.

There has been more interest in the past 10 or 15 years in developing good forestry practices and management than has ever existed before. The expansion in forestry education, forestry research, practical forestry management, and other important forestry programs, combined with outstanding leadership, has contributed greatly to the fine progress which has been made.

Almost one-half of all those employed in manufacturing in Mississippi process lumber, furniture, or paper made from pulpwood. We have 2,000 sawmills, 6 pulpmills, and 150 wood-using plants of various kinds providing a market for the tree products of every woodland in Mississippi. Many farmers and others in rural areas find employment in processing, growing and harvesting timber and transporting forests products.

The Mississippi Forestry Commission, in cooperation with the United States Forestry Service, Mississippi State College, the Forestry Industry, private woodland owners, and many other interested groups, are making real progress in bringing our people to recognize the value of forestry potentials.

There is a real challenge in Mississippi in terms of forestry development. Our timber experts tell us that we can grow three times as much timber as we are now growing. We have 16½ million acres of forest land now growing 32 cubic feet per acre for all trees 5 inches in diameter or larger or 110 board feet on all trees of saw-log size. Under an improved and expanded program our forest land can produce 90 cubic feet per acre per year for all trees 5 inches and larger and 300 board feet or more per acre of saw-log size. In Mississippi we are moving in the direction of bringing our forest program to produce more than $1 billion worth of forest products annually.

I am particularly interested in the pressing need for expanding our forest tree planting program. According to data given in the Timber Resources Review, which is a study of the Nation's forestry developed by the forest service in cooperation with other agencies, there are 60,339,000 acres of land in need of reforestation. Of this total, Mississippi has 4,343,000 acres in need of reforestation. The forest tree-planting program assists our farmers in getting healthy tree seedlings at a nominal cost and is one of the soundest programs being conducted by the Department of Agriculture. Agriculture leaders in Mississippi as well as numerous other States have expressed concern over the shortage of nursery stocks. Recent estimates indicated that the fiscal year output of trees from State nurseries will total about 30,656,000 trees. Orders from Mississippi landowners were so great that these nurseries stopped receiving orders when their request exceeded the 40,000 mark last November. In all, Mississippi landowners will plant close to 70 million trees this year.

Looking at this problem from the national level, the total output of seedlings for this fiscal year will be approximately 575 million, and it is expected to reach 600 million in the next fiscal year. The State foresters estimate that these quantities will be much below the demand expected. This is especially true in many of the Southern States, where tree planting is constantly breaking all records, and certainly indicates that our present demand for seedlings is greatly above production under the present program. I am particularly glad that the Senate figure for this program for fiscal year 1957 has been approved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 9390, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 4, 1956.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 10, 16, 27, 28, and 35 to the bill (H. R. 9390) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes," and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: *"Provided,* That all receipts for the fiscal year 1957 from the operation of the McKinley Park Hotel in Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska, may be applied to, or offset against, costs of managing, operating, and maintaining the hotel and related facilities, and any receipts or other revenues in excess of such costs shall be deposited at least annually into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 18.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a tabulation showing the appropriations for 1956, the budget estimates for 1957, the House allowances, the Senate allowances, and the conference allowances for each appropriation in the bill.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, fiscal year 1957 (H. R. 9390)

Object	Appropriations, 1956	Budget estimates, 1957	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY					
Research in utilization of saline water	$600,000	$600,000	$550,000	$550,000	$550,000
Office of Oil and Gas Division	440,600	413,800	413,800	413,800	413,800
Office of the Solicitor	2,690,000	2,817,000	2,800,000	2,835,000	2,835,000
Office of Minerals Mobilization	225,000	308,000	300,000	225,000	300,000
Total, Office of the Secretary	3,955,600	4,138,800	4,063,800	4,023,800	4,098,800
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT					
Management of lands and resources	14,700,000	18,778,000	18,000,000	18,738,600	18,369,300
Construction	4,300,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
Range improvements	(525,587)	(664,750)	(664,750)	(664,750)	
Total, Bureau of Land Management	19,000,000	23,238,600	22,500,000	23,238,600	22,869,300

Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, fiscal year 1957 (H. R. 9390)—Continued

Object	Appropriations, 1956	Budget estimates, 1957	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
TITLE I.—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued					
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS					
Education and welfare services	$43,635,995	$50,700,000	$50,700,000	$50,720,000	$50,720,000
Resources management	12,882,000	16,100,000	16,000,000	16,200,000	16,200,000
Construction	8,219,003	7,500,000	4,000,000	7,740,000	5,240,000
Road construction and maintenance (liquidation of contract authorization)	7,000,000	11,500,000	11,500,000	11,500,000	11,500,000
General administrative expenses	2,750,000	3,190,000	3,190,000	3,190,000	3,190,000
Distribution of funds of the Creek Indians		200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Relocation of the Yankton Sioux Tribe	56,500				
Payment to Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe of Indians	5,160,000				
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs, exclusive of tribal funds	79,703,498	89,190,000	85,590,000	89,550,000	87,050,000
Tribal funds (not included in totals of this tabulation)	(3,300,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY					
Surveys, investigations, and research	28,285,000	31,602,000	31,602,000	31,602,000	31,602,000
BUREAU OF MINES					
Conservation and development of mineral resources	14,743,000	17,363,000	15,363,000	17,363,000	15,862,750
Health and safety	5,305,000	5,304,300	5,304,300	5,304,300	5,304,300
General administrative expenses	1,030,000	1,030,000	1,030,000	1,030,000	1,030,000
Drainage of anthracite mines	8,500,000				
Total, Bureau of Mines	29,578,000	23,697,300	21,697,300	23,697,300	22,197,050
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE					
Management and protection	10,443,000	11,480,000	11,480,000	11,562,000	11,562,000
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities	9,094,000	10,158,000	10,158,000	10,158,000	10,158,000
Construction	8,425,000	13,550,000	15,000,000	15,250,000	15,250,000
Construction (liquidation of contract authorization)	19,654,300	29,800,000	29,800,000	29,800,000	29,800,000
Jones Point Bridge		13,825,000			
General administrative expenses	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000
Total, National Park Service	48,866,300	80,063,000	67,688,000	68,020,000	68,020,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE					
Management of resources	7,008,500	9,696,000	9,696,000	10,373,600	10,373,600
Investigations of resources	5,102,000	5,065,000	5,065,000	5,105,000	5,105,000
Construction	1,750,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,471,000	2,471,000
General administrative expenses	810,000	852,500	852,500	852,500	852,500
Administration of Pribilof Islands	(1,829,152)	(2,580,000)	(2,580,000)	(2,580,000)	
Total, Fish and Wildlife Service	14,670,500	17,813,500	17,813,500	18,802,100	18,802,100
OFFICE OF TERRITORIES					
Administration of Territories	2,669,500	2,803,000	2,803,000	2,803,000	2,803,000
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	4,500,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
Alaska public works	3,000,000	5,000,000	4,968,000	4,968,000	4,968,000
Construction of roads, Alaska	6,300,000	7,800,000	7,800,000	7,800,000	7,800,000
Operation and maintenance of roads, Alaska	3,500,000	3,625,000	3,625,000	3,625,000	3,625,000
Construction, Alaska Railroad	4,100,000				
Total, Office of Territories	24,069,500	24,028,000	23,996,000	23,996,000	23,996,000
ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Salaries and expenses	2,165,000	2,222,000	2,222,000	2,222,000	2,222,000
Total, Department of the Interior	250,293,398	295,993,200	277,172,600	285,151,800	280,857,250
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES					
Commission of Fine Arts	22,200	31,000	31,000	31,000	31,000
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000
Forest Service, Department of Agriculture:					
Salaries and expenses:					
National forest protection and management	37,990,000	41,668,000	41,668,000	46,063,500	44,300,750
Fighting forest fires	10,500,000	5,250,000	5,250,000	5,250,000	5,250,000
Control of forest pests	6,302,500	5,120,000	5,120,000	5,120,000	5,120,000
Forest research	8,209,000	9,350,000	9,350,000	10,650,000	10,000,000
Subtotal	63,001,500	61,388,000	61,388,000	67,083,500	64,670,750
Roads and trails	24,000,000	24,000,000	24,000,000	24,000,000	24,000,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests:					
Weeks Act	190,000			100,000	100,000
Special acts	(10,000)			(10,000)	(10,000)
State and private forestry cooperation	11,382,129	11,385,000	11,385,000	15,165,000	12,190,000
Cooperative range improvements (special account)	(700,000)	(700,000)	(700,000)	(700,000)	
Total, Forest Service	98,573,629	96,773,000	96,773,000	106,348,500	100,960,750
Indian Claims Commission	121,200	124,600	124,600	124,600	124,600
Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission	100,000	115,000	115,000	115,000	115,000
National Capital Planning Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	149,700	210,000	185,000	210,000	200,000
Land acquisition	500,000	1,500,000	1,250,000	1,500,000	1,250,000
Salaries and expenses, Washington regional mass transportation survey		200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Total, National Capital Planning Commission	649,700	1,910,000	1,635,000	1,910,000	1,650,000
Smithsonian Institution:					
Salaries and expenses, Smithsonian Institution	4,166,000	11a 4,425,000	4,400,000	4,425,000	4,425,000
Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art	1,436,000	11b 1,505,000	1,495,000	1,505,000	1,505,000
Museum of History and Technology	2,288,000	33,712,000	33,712,000	33,712,000	33,712,000
Total, Smithsonian Institution	7,890,000	39,642,000	39,607,000	39,642,000	39,642,000

Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, fiscal year 1957 (H. R. 9390)—Continued

Object (1)	Appropriations, 1956 (2)	Budget estimates, 1957 (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)	Conference allowance (6)
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES—Continued					
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission		$10,000	$10,000	$10,000	$10,000
Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission	$51,500	48,500		48,500	48,500
John Marshall Bicentennial Celebration Commission	82,500				
Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission	10,000				
Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission	120,000				
Boston National Historic Sites Commission	40,000				
Total, related agencies	107,730,729	138,724,100	138,365,600	148,299,600	142,651,850
TITLE III—VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION					
Grants	390,000	425,000	425,000	425,000	425,000
Administrative expenses	(160,000)	(160,000)	(160,000)	(160,000)	
Grand total, titles I, II, and III	358,414,127	435,124,300	415,963,200	433,876,400	423,934,100

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 10003, Calendar No. 2117, the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10003) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 10003) which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce, for the information of the Senate, that the Committee on Appropriations has reported H. R. 9536, the general Government matters appropriation bill for 1957. That bill was reported to the Senate on May 24.

H. R. 9739, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1957, was reported to the Senate on May 24, the same date.

The distinguished chairman of the two Subcommittees on General Government Matters and Independent Offices is the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. The leadership has consulted with the Senator from Washington, and he informs us that the reports and hearings have been available on those two bills for several days, and that it will be convenient for him to have the Senate consider those bills on tomorrow.

Therefore, I should like to notify all Members of the Senate that it will be my purpose to move the consideration of H. R. 9536, the general Government matters appropriation bill, and H. R. 9739, the independent offices appropriation bills, after the morning business on tomorrow. This is in accordance with the policy of the leadership to give appropriation bills priority.

It is hoped we can dispose of at least four appropriation bills in the Senate this week, which will set somewhat of a record.

I understand that the Public Works appropriation bills probably will be reported by next week.

I see the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations on the floor. I should like to ask him the status of the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. The public works section of the bill will be marked up tomorrow. The other section, which has to do with reclamation, will be marked up the next day, Thursday. If we can get that done, I hope that perhaps on Friday afternoon the committee can get together and report the bill. It all depends on whether any controversy develops.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May I make the same inquiry about the Defense Department appropriation bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. I asked the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] about that bill this morning. I was informed that nothing remains but testimony with reference to the Air Force. He said he anticipated no difficulty in disposing of that item very promptly. The bill may be ready next week.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The leadership would prefer to give the Senate an afternoon off to permit conferences to be held on the appropriation bills, so that they may be reported. We are very anxious to get those bills behind us.

I want to commend the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the other members of the committee for their diligence and promptness.

We cannot do anything about the legislative appropriation bill and the foreign aid bill. That is so in the case of the foreign aid bill because the authorization for that bill has not cleared the House and the foreign aid appropriation bill has not been reported yet; but as to the bills which have passed the House, I am hopeful we shall be able to get them out of the way by late next week or the early part of the following week.

I appreciate the fine cooperation of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. No one has had a better record than he has had.

I want the Senate on notice that we shall take up the independent offices and the general Government matters appropriation bills on tomorrow.

Mr. President, I should like to serve notice on the membership of the Senate that it may be possible to move to the consideration tomorrow or the next day of—

Calendar No. 2030, S. 3149, a bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to permit certain air carriers to grant free or reduced rate transportation to ministers of religion;

Calendar No. 2039, S. 3449, a bill relating to the reinvestment by air carriers of the proceeds from the sale or other disposition of certain operating property and equipment;

Calendar No. 2063, S. 3365, a bill to amend section 410 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to change the requirements for obtaining a freight forwarder permit;

Calendar No. 2084, S. 3857, a bill to clarify section 1103 (d) of title XI (Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended;

Calendar No. 2085, H. R. 9824, an act to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability or disease incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean conflict;

Calendar No. 2086, S. 1614, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids," title 21, United States Code, section 321c;

Calendar No. 2089, H. R. 2840, to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas;

Calendar No. 2090, S. 3907, to amend section 345 of the Public Health Service Act;

Calendar No. 2091, S. 3620, to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children;

Calendar No. 2092, S. 3958, to assist in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and practical nurses;

Calendar No. 2093, S. 3430, a bill to promote the progress of medicine and to advance the national health and welfare by creating a National Library of Medicine;

Calendar No. 2110, S. 3307, a bill to amend section 9 (d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to authorize jurisdiction in Federal courts in certain reemployment cases;

Calendar No. 2111, H. R. 6274, an act to provide that no fee shall be charged a veteran discharged under honorable conditions for furnishing him or his next of kin or legal representative a copy of a certificate showing his service in the Armed Forces;

Calendar No. 2112, H. R. 5516, an act to amend title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide that service as an Army field clerk, or as a field clerk, Quartermaster Corps, shall be counted for purposes of retirement under title III of that act, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 2113, H. R. 8102, an act to provide for the disposition of moneys arising from deductions made from carriers on account of the loss of or damage to military material in transit;

Calendar No. 2114, H. R. 8693, an act to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, in relation to the refund of reenlistment bonuses;

And Calendar No. 2115, H. R. 8922, to provide for the relief of certain members of the uniformed services.

I do not give assurance the bills mentioned will be taken up in the order they are listed, and some of them may not be taken up at all, but I should like the RECORD to show, that so far as the leadership is concerned, it is the intention to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the measures indicated, after I have an opportunity to consult further with the minority leader. They may all be taken up tomorrow or the next day, particularly if the hearings and reports on the social-security bill are not available.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10003) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to the District of Columbia appropriation bill be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be considered for the purpose of amendment as original text, provided that no point of order against any amendment shall be deemed to have been waived by the adoption of the agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments of the Committee on Appropriations agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Under the heading "Federal Payment to District of Columbia," on page 2, line 13, after the word "and", to strike out "$1,613,950" and insert "$1,963,950."

Under the heading "Operating Expenses—Department of General Administration," on page 4, line 14, after the word "Incorporated", to strike out "$3,425,000" and insert "$3,475,000."

Under the subhead "Public Schools," on page 9, line 6, after the word "vehicles," to strike out "$32,130,800" and insert "$32,590,750", and at the beginning of line 7, to insert "amount $500,000 shall be payable from the motor vehicle parking fund and."

Under the subhead "Recreation Department", on page 10, line 7, to strike out "$1,892,000" and insert "$1,903,000."

Under the subhead "Department of Public Health", on page 16, line 3, after the word "Commissioners", to insert "not to exceed $1,200 for fire prevention and protective services rendered to Glenn Dale Hospital under conditions to be determined by the Commissioners", and in line 19, after the word "Home", to strike out "$25,434,000" and insert "$25,503,400."

Under the subhead "Office of Surveyor", on page 20, line 13, after the word "Surveyor", to strike out "$164,000" and insert "$170,000."

Under the subhead "Department of Licenses and Inspections", on page 20, line 23, after the word "measure", to strike out "$1,640,000" and insert "$1,658,000."

Under the subhead "Department of Highways", on page 21, line 13, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$6.485,000" and insert "$6,535,000", and in the same line, after the word "which", to strike out "$3,934,304" and insert "$3,966,235."

Under the subhead "Department of Vehicles and Traffic", on page 22, line 3, after the word "years", to strike out "$1,291,000" and insert "$1,303,000."

Under the subhead "Department of Sanitary Engineering", on page 23, line 24, after the word "dumps", to strike out "$10,846,000" and insert "$10,896,200."

Under the subhead "National Guard", on page 26, in line 3, to strike out "$128,500" and insert "$136,500."

Under the heading "Capital Outlay—Public Building Construction", on page 29, line 1, after the word "Northeast", to insert "new Health School for Crippled Children in the vicinity of 13th and Allison Streets, Northwest"; in line 7, after the word "equipment", to strike out "$270,400" and insert "$348,900"; in line 14, after the word "expended", to strike out "$5,200,000" and insert "$6,221,700", and in the same line, after the word "which", to strike out "$2,960,700" and insert "$3,160,700."

Under the subhead "Department of Highways", on page 31, line 15, after the word "designations", to strike out "$14,400,000" and insert "$14,528,000", and in the same line, after the word "which", to strike out "$14,000,000" and insert "$14,128,000".

Under the hearding "General Provisions", in section 5, page 38, line 2, after the word "Commissioners", to strike out the colon and "*Provided*, That the total expenditures for this purpose shall not exceed $83,000, excluding the automobile allowances for the deportation of nonresident insane by the Department of Public Health and the transportation of indigent persons and the placing of children by the Department of Public Welfare."

In section 6, page 38, line 13, after the word "exceeded", to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$25,000."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have a very few brief remarks to make with regard to the District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1957. The bill carries the unanimous approval of the committee. It is $1,217,450 under the 1957 estimates, $3,263,263 over the 1956 appropriations, and only $1,884,250 over the House recommendations.

The sum total recommended to the Senate is $179,797,800, and of this amount $146,969,850 is for operating expenses and $34,712,200 is for capital outlay items of the District of Columbia government.

Included in the $1.8 million increase is a $1 million capital outlay item for construction of a much needed health school for crippled children, and $459,950 in operating expenses for the public schools, and of which amount $272,250 is provided for 55 additional teaching positions in the elementary schools; $75,000 to conduct, for the first time, a school census.

Mr. President, this will be the first complete school census taken of the school children in the District of Columbia for many years, and the first one under the law relating to that subject. Heretofore, censuses have been taken, but in view of the changes which have taken place, the overcrowded conditions, the outgoings and incomings in various areas of the city, the committee deemed it essential, in order to get the proper basis for a new start, that a new, complete census be taken.

Mr. President, $100,000 is provided for essential repairs and maintenance of the more than 100 school buildings and grounds, and the balance, $12,700, for clerks in elementary school level.

Mr. President, there has been a tremendous change in the public school system of the District within the last few years, and to meet the acute educational problems that exist here, it is imperative to do something about it without delay. Additional teachers is perhaps the greatest single need, and next of importance is the availability of sufficient facilities to cope with the overcrowded situation and to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio.

Within the short time allotted for hearings on this bill, there was not a fair chance to get the necessary facts to make a sound, long-range evaluation and recommendation of the public school system. There was conflicting evidence presented from many sources as to what the school needs were, and ways to remedy them. In any event there must be a reevaluation made of teaching position needs and the kind of teachers required to help alleviate the problems involved in remedial and other type work. Closer attention must be paid to the building program, with due regard to the shifting of pupil population.

Mr. President, the bill as recommended to the Senate provides a total of 130 additional teaching positions in the elementary schools. No teaching positions will be transferred from the junior and senior high schools. Although the number allowed is 50 below the number requested by many persons, it is all that can be absorbed within the existing school facilities, and will materially strengthen the educational program at the elementary level. School officials indicated that 126 of the additional teachers would certainly help reduce the overcrowding situation and would make a start toward reduction of the pupil-teacher ratio.

Due to the complexity of the public school problems in the District, the Appropriations Committee considered it essential to have a comprehensive study and report made by some disinterested individual or group not connected with the District government or the District school system. This will be funded by the committee, and the report will be ready for committee consideration before the hearings are held on the 1958 budget of the District government.

Mr. President, one other matter, believed of importance to the Senate, is that sufficient revenues are available to the District to meet the expenses recommended in the bill. The Federal payment of $20 million to the general fund is the same as the House allowance and budget estimate. However, the recent revenue act authorized an increase of $3 million; but any payment under this authorization will wait consideration in the supplemental bill.

The committee also approved an increase of $350,000 in the Federal payment to the water fund, to cover the estimated cost of a fishway in the Little Falls Dam, a project now under construction across the Potomac River.

That concludes my formal explanation of the bill. I shall be glad to yield for any questions.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I notice that some progress is being made toward solving the educational problems of the District of Columbia. I understood the Senator from Mississippi to state that he did not believe that the additional 50 teachers requested could be absorbed at this time. Is that because of inadequacy of classroom facilities?

Mr. STENNIS. The House of Representatives recommended that 50 teachers be transferred to the elementary schools from the senior and junior high schools. The facts and testimony which the Senate committee obtained did not, in our opinion, justify transferring those teachers, but clearly demonstrated the absolute necessity for additional teachers. So we recommend 130 additional teachers for the elementary schools, which are as many as we believe can properly be used with the present overcrowded physical facilities resulting, for instance, from the lack of classrooms.

Mr. LONG. Will any progress be made during the next year toward providing adequate classroom facilities for the children of the District of Columbia?

Mr. STENNIS. Some progress will be made, because one additional building is scheduled for completion this fall. But even with that additional building, the facilities will still be far from adequate, in our opinion. That is one reason why we recommend a comprehensive survey of the educational facilities and other educational needs in the District of Columbia following a proper school-children census, because in so limited a time the committee could not obtain all the facts. We have requested the Appropriations Committee to furnish the necessary funds, and the subcommittee has authority to make this evaluation and to make its recommendation not later than January.

Mr. LONG. I know that in some schools, children of, let us say, the fifth and sixth grades are compelled to share the same classroom, and the teacher uses a method which we know was used many year ago, namely, the teacher tries to give instruction to those in the upper grade, while the children in the lower grade are studying; and then she tries to teach those in the lower grade, while the children in the upper grade are studying. That seems to be an inadequate system.

I believe that in the Capital of the Nation we should be able to furnish an example to the rest of the Nation by providing adequate educational facilities for the children.

Mr. STENNIS. I agree with the Senator from Louisiana. I do not believe that there is in the Nation any city in which the school system needs more attention as regards expanding and physical facilities, providing teachers of the right kind, and making other adjustments which must be made in the school system of the District of Columbia before the conditions here will be improved. The impact of integration and the changes of population in various areas of the city have created problems which cannot be solved quickly. A great deal must be done. That is why we have requested the survey—so as to obtain the facts first, and then try to make the proper recommendations.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit the following amendment: On page 7, in line 3, strike out "$1,053,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,058,440."

Mr. President, before I address myself to the amendment, I wish to pay a compliment to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

I have some knowledge of District of Columbia affairs, because for 16 years I served on the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives—for most of the time as the ranking Republican member, and subsequently as chairman. Some years ago I found myself serving, in connection with my membership in the Senate, on the Appropriation Committee's subcommittee on appropriations for the District of Columbia. In total, I have given some 22 years of service to affairs for the District of Columbia. I know it is something of a labor of love that never is articulated in the form of votes back home. So it becomes an unselfish labor in the interest of the welfare of the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, no one has addressed himself with greater devotion to the welfare of the people of the District of Columbia than has the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. So I publicly make acknowledgement now of the very able work he has done. He has been very patient in listening to every witness, both individual witnesses who appeared in their own behalf and those who represented groups, whether in the field of utilities, in the field of schools, in the field of arts, in the field of recreation, or in the field of administration. He has given freely of his time. In that connection, he has taken time personally to inspect a number of schools in the District of Columbia. He has also inspected the operations of the police department and the fire department.

So, Mr. President, as the Senator from Mississippi brings this bill before the Senate, I wish to state that he does so, not only on the basis of knowledge that is gleaned from the testimony, but also on the basis of knowledge obtained as a result of personal experience.

Therefore, Mr. President, I cannot pay too much praise to the Senator from Mississippi or be too complimentary in my references to him. I may say that my friend, the Senator from Mississippi, has been most outstanding in his service, and it has been an unalloyed pleasure to work with him.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a moment to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to thank the Senator from Illinois for his very generous remarks. It has been a pleasure to work on some of these problems, although it seems that we have just scratched the surface, and have not provided the remedies which are needed.

A great bulwark of strength in our subcommittee has certainly been the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who gives so generously of his time, and has so fine a background of knowledge of the problems of the District of Columbia, the operation of facilities in the District of Columbia, and their relative merits. As a result, his services are extremely valuable to the entire subcommittee, and of course are most helpful indeed to me, personally. So I wish to thank him again for his very fine help and assistance.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I appreciate the kindness of my friend from Mississippi.

With reference to the pending amendment, it calls for an increase of $5,440 in the expenditures of the regulatory agencies, but more particularly the Zoning Commission. Congress heretofore made available $140,000 to completely reorganize and revamp the zoning system for the Federal city. Such reorganization was long overdue. The city has grown by leaps and bounds, and it is necessary, of course, in the interest of health, safety,

ventilation, and light, as well as the security of property values, to maintain certain zoning principles.

In the reorganization of the entire zoning scheme, it is necessary to have adequate technicians. The Zoning Commission is completely overwhelmed with work. They start early and work late. The number of appeals is growing. Under the new plan they will specify not only the area, but the width of a lot, as compared with virtually no limitations heretofore. The work will multiply enormously. That will require some coordination between the Zoning Commission and other agencies in the District Government.

It is fair to assume that as soon as the new regulations and maps are made available there will be a host of inquiries from contractors, builders, lot owners, and people who contemplate building homes. Such inquiries must be satisfied, if any kind of construction within the terms of the law is to be pursued. That requires some personnel. The $5,440 which would be made available by this amendment would provide for one technical coordinator. He would give the Zoning Commission a lift, and help it over the hurdles, enabling it to make adequate response to the inquiries which will come.

I trust, therefore, that my distinguished friend from Mississippi will have no objection to the amendment. I am of the opinion that it was probably left out by inadvertence in the House. On that point, I cannot speak with authority. But certainly there was a budget item for the $5,440 covered by this amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I think there is a great deal of merit in the amendment, and in the very fine logic and statement of facts which the Senator from Illinois has offered in support of it. I think it is justified, and should be adopted. As chairman of the subcommittee, I am very glad to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. For the information of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the paragraph on page 3 of the committee report under the heading "Revenues, Obligations, and Surplus" be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVENUES, OBLIGATIONS, AND SURPLUS

In the bill recommended to the Senate the estimated surplus as of June 30, 1957, is $10,087,496. This sum is distributed as follows: General fund, $7,369,011; highway fund, $1,276,208; water fund, $653,737; sanitary sewage works fund, $65,823; and motor vehicle parking fund, $722,717. The surplus in the general fund is subject to adjustment on the submission of supplementals for 1957. Additional appropriations to meet the anticipated obligations approximate $11,212,000. To offset these additional obligations, the Commissioners propose to request the increase of $3 million in the Federal payment as authorized by the Revenue Act of 1956, approved March 31, 1956, and to increase the realty tax rate from $2.20 to $2.30 per $100 of assessed valuation. This latter item will produce $1,800,000 in revenues during the fiscal year 1957. Based on these proposed actions, the adjusted surplus in the general fund is estimated to be $957,011 instead of $7,369,011, at the end of the fiscal year 1957.

Mr. STENNIS. In further answer to the Senator from Illinois, I ask unanimous consent that a list of the items on page 5, under the heading "Capital Outlay," which are public-school items for construction under the terms of the bill, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITAL OUTLAY

Public building construction: The committee has approved for this item the sum of $6,221,700, or an increase of $1,021,700 over the House allowance of $5,200,000. The additional sum will permit the construction of the new Health School for Crippled Children to be located in the vicinity of 13th and Allison Streets NW.

Distribution of the items follows:

Item	Budget estimate	Senate recommendation
Public schools:		
Elementary school, vicinity of 56th and Eads Sts. NE.	$942,050	$932,050
New Health School, 13th and Allison Sts. NW	1,021,700	1,021,700
Young Elementary School addition	230,300	230,300
Eliot Junior High School addition	920,800	900,800
Elementary school, vicinity of 6th and Chesapeake Sts. SE	982,050	972,050
Paul Junior High School addition	181,650	181,650
Senior high school, vicinity Congress Heights area, Southeast	120,000	120,000
Kenilworth Elementary School addition	788,350	788,350
Elementary school, vicinity of Texas and Burns SE	74,800	74,800
Permanent improvements of existing buildings	400,000	400,000
Department of Vehicles and Traffic: Motor vehicle testing station replacement	650,000	600,000
Total, public building construction	6,311,700	6,221,700

Mr. STENNIS. The total in this list for building construction is just under $5 million for schools alone, which shows that there is a substantial program now in progress for the construction of additional school facilities. Nevertheless, in the opinion of the committee, the sum referred to was not sufficent. So that item is also to be included in the survey and study.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. For 4 years I was chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations handling the District of Columbia appropriation bill. In that position I think I learned something of the difficulties, problems, and burdens connected with the preparation and presentation to the Senate of the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

I have watched with much interest the devoted work of the Senator from Mississippi. He has given much of his time, thought, and attention to this bill. He has done things which I myself would have liked to do, but never seemed to find the time to do. He has visited the schools in the District to see how they operate, what is being done, and what the situation is. He has visited a number of other institutions in the District. I heartily congratulate him for the exceptionally fine work he has done.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Alabama very much. He has been of great help to me. The work which he did as chairman of the subcommittee in past years has been bearing fruit, and has been quite helpful to us. We appreciate it, and thank him for his continued courtesy.

Mr. President, if there is no further debate on the bill, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to the proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments, and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 10003) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. STENNIS, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. FREAR, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. BEALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish especially to thank the clerk of the subcommittee, Mr. Harold Merrick, for his very fine, efficient, competent, and helpful attention and service to the subcommittee in the consideration of the bill and the preparation of the report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I concur in the sentiment expressed by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi with respect to Mr. Harold Merrick, the clerk of the subcommittee. I know of no one who has more devotedly served the subcommittee. He has always had his affairs in good order, and has rendered excellent service to the Senators who serve on the subcommittee. He is to be warmly congratulated. He is a great help to the people of the District of Columbia in connection with the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I associate myself with the statements of the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Illinois. I heartily concur in everything they have said about the fine, efficient service of Mr.

Merrick. He served as clerk of the State, Justice, and Judiciary Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in whose behalf I had the privilege of handling the bill on the floor of the Senate.

I have never known a more faithful public servant.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Mississippi, the Senator from Illinois, and the Senator from Texas, in all they have had to say about Mr. Harold Merrick, the clerk of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia, and also clerk of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, and the Judiciary.

When I was chairman of the subcommittee which handles the District of Columbia appropriation bill, Mr. Harold Merrick was a tower of strength. I do not know of a more loyal or more tireless or more devoted or finer public servant than Mr. Harold Merrick. I am proud and happy today to pay my tribute to him.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1053. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands in the State of Montana to the Phillips County Post of the American Legion;

S. 2498. An act to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Clatsop, Oreg., as a national monument;

S. 3332. An act to amend the Employment Act of 1946, as amended; and

S. 3920. An act to authorize the partition or sale of inherited interests in allotted lands in the Tulalip Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1866. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas V. Compton;

H. R. 4363. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the State of New Mexico; and

H. R. 5237. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ella Madden and Clarence E. Madden.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8123) authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10660) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BUCKLEY, Mr. FALLON, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. DONDERO, Mr. MCGREGOR, and Mr. AUCHINCLOSS on title I; Mr. COOPER, Mr. MILLS, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. JENKINS on title II, were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 3515. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to assist in the provisions of housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces;

H. R. 3255. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to preserve in certain cases the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees whose positions are placed in lower grades by virtue of reclassification actions under such act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8225. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Pipestone National Monument in the State of Minnesota; and

H. R. 9822. An act to provide for the establishment of a trout hatchery on the Davidson River in the Pisgah National Forest in North Carolina.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 5, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 3515) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to assist in the provisions of housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of H. R. 9720, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	Morse
Allott	George	Mundt
Barrett	Gore	Murray
Beall	Hayden	Neuberger
Bender	Hennings	O'Mahoney
Bennett	Hill	Payne
Bible	Holland	Potter
Bricker	Jackson	Purtell
Bridges	Jenner	Robertson
Bush	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Carlson	Kerr	Smathers
Case, N. J.	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Case, S. Dak.	Laird	Smith, N. J.
Chavez	Langer	Sparkman
Clements	Lehman	Stennis
Cotton	Long	Symington
Curtis	Magnuson	Thye
Dirksen	Malone	Watkins
Douglas	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Duff	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Dworshak	McCarthy	Williams
Eastland	McClellan	Wofford
Ellender	McNamara	Young
Flanders	Millikin	
Frear	Monroney	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations has recommended a total of $2,372,023,281 in the pending bill, H. R. 9720, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957. This recommendation from the committee is $75,041,500 over the House allowance, and $3,137,681 over the budget estimates.

We considered budget estimates totaling $2,363,885,400. Of this amount, in excess of $2.1 billion was requested for grants and contributions, or 89.33 percent of the total. These grant programs embrace the unemployment compensation programs in the Department of Labor; and in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, programs for aid to the blind, for vocational education, for payments to agricultural colleges, for payments to school districts for maintenance and operation in the federally impacted areas, for vocational rehabilitation, for general health grants to States, for hospital construction, for grants to individuals, institutions, and colleges for medical research, for payments to States for public assistance, for maternal and child welfare, and for others.

The estimate for grants to States for public assistance was $1,315 million, or 68.27 percent of the request from HEW, and 55.62 percent of all budget estimates in the bill. Under the law the Federal Government has contracted to pay a certain pro rata share of benefits paid by the States for old-age assistance, for aid to dependent children, for aid to the blind, and for aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and the Congress must make available the sums required. Likewise in other programs, unemployment compensation for veterans and for Federal employees, for payments to school districts for maintenance and operation, the Federal responsibility is clearcut to appropriate such sums as are required.

I point out these facts for the information of the Senate so that Senators may know that the laws the Congress has heretofore enacted require definite sums for the Federal contribution, and the extent of our consideration in the committee is as to whether or not the executive agencies have made a proper estimate for the ensuing year.

I call particular attention to several of the committee's changes in the bill.

For the vocational-education program we have added $175,000, to bring the appropriation to the full amount authorized, $29,442,081. In addition, we have added a proviso which would make it possible to use all of these funds in the programs. Heretofore between 4 and 5 hundred thousand dollars have been unused in the programs because the funds could not be reallocated, and if a State had no use for the allocation or any portion of it, the funds reverted to the Treasury.

For the vocational-rehabilitation program we have restored a cut of $2 million for grants to States, and have added $200,000 for additional work in training and traineeships for some special work in a prosthetics education program.

For the general health grant to States, in the item "assistance to States, general," we have added $2,275,000, to make available for this purpose a total of $12 million for the coming year. I call attention to the fact that this grant has been gradually decreased over the past several years. In 1952, the general health grant was $13.5 million; in 1953 it was $13 million; in 1954 it was $10,135,000; in 1955, it was $9,725,000; in the current year it is $9,725,000, plus $4.5 million available only for work on the polio-vaccination program; and the estimate for 1957 was $9,725,000. We feel there is more than adequate justification for the recommended increase.

For grants for hospital construction, the committee recommends the full budget estimate, $130 million, but for which we have a total authorization of $210 million. Evidence showed that a total of $350 million, as the Federal share, could be used in fiscal year 1957.

With respect to funds for grants for hospital construction, there is one facet of the program to which I should like to call attention. Under the Hill-Burton program provision was made to make the appropriations available for a 2-year period, existing law being that funds, unless expressly otherwise provided, were available only for obligation for the year for which appropriated. In the authorizing statute we elected to make the grant funds available for an additional year.

But in the appropriation bill each year has appeared the clause "to remain available until expended," which customarily continues the availability of funds without fiscal-year limitation both for the purpose of obligation and expenditure. But the Public Health Service has seemed to think that the clause mentioned in this item does not continue the availability of hospital construction-grant funds beyond the 2 years stipulated in the authorizing statute. And the House this year in its report on the pending bill made reference to the funds being available for the 2-year period.

When this matter was called to my attention it seemed to me that the appropriation language "to remain available until expended" should make these funds available without fiscal-year limitation, just as it operates when added to any appropriation account, an account which under the law may be available only for a single year.

I directed the staff of the committee to discuss this matter with the General Accounting Office, and we have been informed today that they concur in my view that the words "to remain available until expended" make these funds available for both obligation and expenditure without fiscal-year limitation.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me ask the Senator a question. Does this mean that the 1955 funds appropriated for part G projects, and which the Public Health Service estimates to be approximately $3.5 million, which would have expired under the interpretation of the Department, will continue available for obligation?

Mr. HILL. That is correct. The funds which would have reverted to the Treasury under the Department's interpretation, about $3.5 million, according to their testimony, but perhaps $5 million or more under present indications, will continue to be available without fiscal-year limitation for obligation and expenditure, thus making available for part G projects in fiscal year 1957 $21 million from the 1956 appropriation, $21 million from this appropriation bill, and some $5 million from the 1955 appropriation, for a total of perhaps $47 million.

For the National Institutes of Health, the committee recommends a total of $184,437,000, an increase of $48,912,000 over the House allowance. Of the total amount recommended, approximately 75 percent—74.65 percent, to be exact—is provided for grants to colleges, research institutions, and to individuals for medical research and for training.

Some may think the amount recommended for medical research is too large, just as was thought by some persons last year when the committee recommended $112 million, or $23 million more than the House allowance. But although our figure last year was not supported by the National Institutes of Health, within 2 or 3 months the Institutes recommended not $112 million, but $126 million, for the research work.

Last year we encountered strong opposition from, of all people, officials of the National Institutes of Health, from officials of the Public Health Service, and from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. As a result of that we were not particularly effective in holding the Senate increases in conference, winning approval of only about $8.5 million. But within a few short weeks these same officials were preparing estimates for $126 million, after having objected strenuously to our recommendations for $112 million. The evidence is replete that had the Senate amounts been made available, full and profitable use of such sums could have been made.

While the committee recommendations this year may be viewed in the same light as were our increases of last year, we are hopeful that the availability of these funds will advance our medical research in the coming year to the end that deaths from that insidious disease cancer may be lessened, and that deaths from that No. 1 killer, heart disease, may show a precipitate decline, and that the suffering and misery from mental illnesses and many other diseases may be lessened.

I should point out, too, the action of the committee with respect to an item in the Bureau of Labor Standards, Department of Labor. There was made available in the current year $40,000 to enable the Bureau to do certain work in the field of workmen's compensation. A like amount was requested for the coming year, and allowed by the House. But after the House action, Members of the Senate began to receive protestations from the States, urging that the funds be disallowed, and that the Federal Government leave to the States the work on workmen's compensation standards. The committee so recommended, and our reasons are given on page 2 of the report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc and that the bill as thus amended be considered, for the purpose of amendment, as original text; provided, however, that no point of order against any amendment shall be deemed to have been waived by the adoption of the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments of the Committee on Appropriations agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Under the heading, "Title I—Department of Labor—Office of the Secretary", on page 2, line 14, after the word "only", to strike out "$1,751,000" and insert "$1,767,000."

Under the subhead "Bureau of Labor Standards", on page 3, line 5, after the word "than", to strike out "$155,900" and insert "$167,800", and in line 16, after the word "Standards", to strike out "$911,500" and insert "$960,000."

Under the subhead "Bureau of Employment Security", on page 5, line 4, after the word "expenses", to insert "including purchasing and installing of air-conditioning equipment."

On page 8, line 22, after the word "laws", to strike out "$1,888,000" and insert "$2,125,000."

Under the subhead "Bureau of Labor Statistics", on page 10, line 16, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$6,687,000" and insert "$7,000,000."

Under the heading "Title II—Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Howard University", on page 15, line 15, to strike out "$3,300,000" and insert "$3,410,000."

On page 15, after line 15, to insert: "Plans and specifications: For the preparation of plans and specifications for construction, under the supervision of the General Services Administration, on the grounds of Howard University of a military science-physical education building, and a home economics building, $75,000."

Under the subhead "Office of Education", on page 16, line 11, after "(20 U. S. C. 31)", to strike out "$29,267,081" and insert "$29,442,081"; in line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$29,092,081" and insert "$29,267,081", and in line 15, after the word "year", to insert a colon and *"Provided further,* That the amount of allotment which States and Territories are not prepared to use may be reapportioned among other

States and Territories applying therefor for use in the programs for which the funds were originally apportioned."

On page 17, line 9, after the word "to", to strike out "$925,000" " and insert " "$1,000,000"."

Under the subhead "Office of Vocational Rehabilitation", on page 18, line 15, after the word "amended", to strike out "$35,000,000" and insert "$37,000,000"; in line 16, after the word "which", to strike out "$32,500,000" and insert "$33,500,000", and in line 19, after the word "and", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$2,000,000."

On page 19, line 13, after the word "act", to strike out "$2,750,000" and insert "$2,950,000, of which not less than $200,000 shall be available only for a prosthetics education program."

On page 19, line 21, after the word "films", to strike out "$1,160,000" and insert "$1,260,000."

Under the subhead "Public Health Service", on page 20, line 8, after the word "of", to strike out "$300" and insert "$250"; in line 16, after the word "appointed", to strike out "by the National Institutes of Health", and in line 19, after the word "annum", to insert a colon and *"Provided,* That subsection (g) of section 208 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, is amended by striking out '$15,000', and inserting in lieu thereof '$20,000';".

On page 21, line 6, after the word "General", to strike out "$14,186,000" and insert "$16,461,000."

On page 21, line 17, after the word "determine", to strike out "$3,640,000" and insert "$4,140,000."

On page 21, line 19, after the word "act", to strike out "$6,375,000" and insert "$6,625,000."

On page 22, line 22, after the word "only", to strike out "$6,000,000" and insert "$6,260,000."

On page 23, line 14, after the word "expended", to strike out "$111,000,000" and insert "$130,000,000", and in line 15, after the word "which", to strike out "$88,800,000" and insert "$107,800,000."

On page 24, line 15, after the word "ammunition", to strike out "$35,661,000" and insert "$35,811,000."

On page 25, line 24, after the figures "$38,125,000", to strike out the colon and *"Provided,* That the Surgeon General is authorized to transfer from this appropriation to other appropriations of the Public Health Service such amounts as he may determine are required in such appropriations for Indian health activities."

On page 27, line 20, after the word "act", to strike out "$34,437,000" and insert "$48,432,000."

On page 27, line 25, to strike out "$23,749,000" and insert "$35,197,000."

On page 28, line 4, after the word "only", to strike out "$25,106,000" and insert "$33,396,000."

On page 28, line 8, after the word "conditions", to strike out "$3,471,000" and insert "$6,026,000."

On page 28, line 11, after the word "diseases", to strike out "$13,845,000" and insert "$15,885,000."

On page 28, line 15, after the word "microbiology", to strike out "$8,799,000" and insert "$13,299,000."

On page 28, line 18, after the word "blindness" to strike out "$14,196,000" and insert "$18,650,000."

On page 28, after line 18, to insert:

"Construction of surgical facilities: For the construction and equipment of additional Clinical Center surgical facilities, National Institutes of Health, including the remodeling of existing surgical facilities, and for planning, architectural, and engineering services, $1,630,000."

Under the subhead "Social Security Administration", on page 30, line 12, after the word "only", to insert a semicolon and "and payments, not to exceed $3,800, to Bureau employees to reimburse such employees for expenses incurred by reason of the failure to relocate the Bureau in the District of Columbia"; in line 22, after the word "amended", to insert a colon and *"Provided further,* That hereafter funds available for administrative expenses of the Bureau shall be available for payment of rent for quarters for district offices in the District of Columbia:", and at the top of page 31, after the amendment just above stated, to insert *"Provided further,* That not to exceed $150,000 shall be available for research and development of automatic or electronic equipment, by contract, which shall be coordinated with similar activities and requirements of other Government agencies: *Provided further,* That any such contract shall contain appropriate provisions relating to the disposition of rights in any inventions made or developed in the course of work under the contract."

On page 32, line 2, strike out "$1,698,000" and insert "$1,748,000."

On page 32, line 9, after the word "distribution", to strike out "$1,822,000" and insert "$1,922,000."

On page 33, line 8, after the word "State", to insert a colon and *"Provided further,* That $1,000,000 of the amount available under section 502 (b) of such act shall be used only for special projects for mentally retarded children."

Under the heading "Title III—National Labor Relations Board", on page 37, line 6, after "(5 U. S. C. 2131)", to strike out "$8,951,500" and insert "$9,101,500."

Under the heading "Title IV—National Mediation Board", on page 37, line 24, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$435,000" and insert "$460,000."

Under the heading "Title V—Railroad Retirement Board", on page 38, line 25, after "(68 Stat. 1114)", to strike out "$6,493,000" and insert "$7,000,000."

Under the heading "Title VI—Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service", on page 39, line 21, to strike out "$3,295,000" and insert "$3,390,000."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to increase the total amount for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by $500,000. I had intended to offer an amendment to increase the amount by $1,500,000; but after discussing the matter with the chairman of the committee, the majority leader, the minority leader, and other Senators on both sides of the aisle, my judgment is that I must reduce the amount from $1,500,000 to $500,000. Therefore, I offer my modified amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, at the beginning of line 4, it is proposed to strike out "$4,500,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$5,000,000."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee and as the Senator in charge of the bill, I shall be very happy to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. THYE. I thank the distinguished chairman for accepting the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, a statement I have prepared concerning the amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE

My proposed amendment would increase the funds available to the Office of Education by $500,000. Adoption of the amendment would do no more than provide the full $6 million requested by the President for the service and research functions of this office.

The House allowed the sum of $4.5 million in the bill which we have before us. This bill provides for increases to strengthen the educational services and the statistical reporting services of the Office of Education. However, after allowing for these increases, the bill would provide only $530,000 for research projects. A budget request for research projects was made in the amount of $1,910,000. It is the deletion of funds for these research projects in education which greatly disturbs me.

A few weeks ago I introduced in the Senate a resolution to establish a Joint Senate-House Committee on Scientific Education. Many of my distinguished colleagues have joined in cosponsoring that resolution. It is for the very same reasons I submitted in my resolution that I rise today to protest the deletion of funds for educational research projects.

I have recognized for some time the dilemma we are about to find ourselves in if current trends are allowed to continue.

We have seen the United States assume a position of world leadership largely upon the strength of scientific and technological progress which has been made during the past 10 years.

We are all conscious of this leadership. We follow closely the work of the Atomic Energy Commission in the development of atomic and nuclear energy for peacetime commercial use. We appropriate a budget of approximately $33½ billion to the Defense Department to develop the latest weapons for our modern day. We have recently read of the cooperation between the Atomic Energy Commission and the Rural Electrification Administration in the authorization of two pilot nuclear reactor plants for rural cooperatives. One of these plants will be located at Elk River, Minn.

But underneath these headlines and behind the scenes another development is taking place which presents us with the dilemma I have mentioned.

At the same time that today's progress is being made tomorrow's future is left in doubt because of a dwindling of manpower in the basic science fields. We are not promoting a program which will insure future manpower to assure continued leadership when today's leaders will pass from the scene.

Less and less students of high school age are taking the fundamental courses of mathematics, chemistry, and physics. Less and less teachers are training themselves to teach the basic sciences. Many high school graduates who have a potential in science and technology are not being encouraged to continue their education. Industry is finding it increasingly difficult to find top grade scientists and technically trained people.

These are the reasons why I appeal to the Senate to restore the funds which have been cut out of this bill.

Nowhere did the House deny the need for the funds. Nowhere did the House deny the facts which I have pointed out. In fact, the only apparent reason why the funds were cut is found in the House report which states that there is doubt that the agency could provide for expansion of its activities to use the $1.5 million in 1 year. As a matter of fact, the House report states that the entire budget was soundly conceived.

We all recognize that we can't train the needed manpower overnight or in 1 year. This type of training is a long-range proposition. What the Office of Education is asking for in this request is money to be used in a determination as to how to motivate more able students to enter scientific and technical fields and to continue them in school until they have successfully completed their training. This is one of the fundamental tasks of educational research today. We can be sure that the Office of Education will be criticized if it does not do this job and yet the bill before us does not provide the necessary funds with which to do it.

I remind my colleagues that 2 years ago, in the 83d Congress, we enacted Public Law 531 which specifically provided authority for the Office of Education to contract for cooperative research. The basic purpose of this type of research is to increase the effectiveness of education. We gave the Office of Education statutory authority to contract with our colleges and universities in any cooperative research endeavor that would shed light on our educational problems.

As yet the program has been inoperative for the reason that we have failed to give the Office the funds for this purpose. Two years have passed and still we are asked to hesitate to give the Office of Education funds to undertake cooperative research which we authorized them to conduct. Much could have been accomplished during this 2-year period.

The very existence of this authority to contract for cooperative research completely refutes the only argument advanced for not granting the full budget request; namely, that the Office of Education could not expand its activities in an orderly manner in 1 year. Under cooperative research procedures, all the Office of Education has to do is contract with a college or university or a State department of education to supplement the research being done by personnel in the Office of Education itself. One of the important advantages of the cooperative research approach is that the Office of Education does not have to expand substantially every time it engages in a project to help solve our educational problems.

So that the Office of Education can move forward with the job which it must do, and so that we can begin to meet our future manpower needs in this phase of education, I ask the Senate to go beyond the action of the House and adopt this amendment.

Mr. BUSH subsequently said: Mr. President, I was not present when the Thye amendment was under discussion. I have prepared a statement which I wish to offer in support of that amendment. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD at the appropriate place in connection with the debate on the Thye amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH

I should like to indicate my wholehearted support for the Thye amendment before modification. In doing so I would like to commend the Appropriations Committee and its chairman for the strong support they have given to a number of important programs in the health and welfare field.

But I am constrained by conscience, Mr. President, to question the wisdom of this committee in declining to provide the full $6 million requested by President Eisenhower for salaries and expenses of the United States Office of Education. In a day and age when world and domestic considerations make our educational system a keystone of the national welfare, it seems incredible to me that we should offer less to support the services of the Office of Education than, for example, we have for years provided for the protection and preservation of migratory birds, the wisdom of which I do not question.

And frankly, gentlemen, I find it impossible to follow the logic whereby the Federal Government, by providing mushrooming grants for research in science, medicine, defense, agriculture, and other areas, increases an already extraordinary demand for trained people, while refusing to take the most rudimentary steps to begin increasing research dealing with problems basic to the supply of such persons. I am, as this body well recognizes, delighted that the Appropriations Committee has seen fit to lend its support to the important program of medical research; but we are treated here to the situation of trying not only to build Rome in a day but trying to do it without a thought to the manpower which will be needed to do the building. You simply can't go on increasing the demand for trained manpower without concerning yourself with the source of supply—our national schools and colleges.

Are we at a stage in our lives when our rightful concern for our own heart, liver, and lungs warps our perspective so that we are prompted to appropriate $185 million for medical research alone and less than $1 million for research concerning the education of our Nation's youth? This is not a case of millions for defense and not a cent for tribute; but some might say of such action that it is a case of millions for our aches and pains and not a cent for the golden treasury of the future.

Mr. President, what we decide here today could have a profound impact upon the education and upbringing of generations of our young people. If we fail to take this modest step to support research in this all-important field, we shall stand accused of delaying attention to the needs of children. It may not appear as dramatic as delay in providing Salk vaccine by a year, but the research is aimed at reducing the crippling effect of ineffective or insufficient education on the development of many children.

Mr. President, I would like to say just this much more: In every walk of life, this Nation has come to appreciate the importance of research; in science, in agriculture, in industry, in medicine, we have seen near-miracles result from careful and extensive research. The American people, now aware of and aroused by the need for vast improvement of our educational system, will want to know why this body has refused to employ such an obviously promising weapon in the war upon ignorance. Shall we tell them that we cannot provide even the meager foundations of educational research asked by the President? Shall we tell them we can't afford to, when the Federal Government is spending hundreds of millions of dollars on other nondefense research and when, in the same breath, we vote a hearty "yea" to additional tens of millions of dollars for medical research? Shall we tell the people that we don't need such research; that we already know all we need to know about mental retardation, juvenile delinquency, the development of special abilities, school and college dropout problems, and many other problems with which the people are now struggling? Or shall we tell them that research on educational problems is someone else's job to do?

The answer, simply enough, is that we cannot offer any such feeble answers to a pressing social question like this one. No, we must be counted either for or against undertaking a program of educational research, under a law which we ourselves passed 2 years ago, and for doing what lay citizens and educators have endorsed as necessary to educational progress. A vote for this amendment will be an endorsement of the wishes of the people and a step—however modest—in the direction of strengthening American education.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement I have prepared on the same subject, and also an article entitled "Teachers Chided on Mathematics," written by Benjamin Fine, and published in the New York Times of June 4, 1956.

There being no objection, the statement and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR POTTER

As this body is well aware, I have long been vitally concerned about the shortages of trained personnel in many specialized fields of great importance to the national welfare and, indeed, the national security. This Nation gravely needs scientists, teachers, engineers, and doctors in steadily increasing numbers—to name just a few. Now this increasing demand, as you know, is caused by a variety of factors—an evergrowing economy, rapid technological and social advances, and an increasingly important competition for leadership with certain other nations of the world.

I want to point out that the Federal Government is also contributing greatly to this demand for personnel with advanced training. The demands of such activities as national defense and atomic energy are obvious. But let us look at this very appropriations bill: an increase of 80 percent in the medical research budget of the National Institutes of Health is going to mean a great increase in the numbers of trained personnel required to carry out the work of the Institutes. Now, if all these doctors and researchers for the Institutes' research are to be found in the next year, it will heighten existing shortages in this field.

I am not questioning the wisdom of this increase in medical research. My record of support for this work is clear on that point. But what I do want to question is the wisdom of eternally adding to the demand for trained personnel while continuing to slight the wellsprings of our trained manpower.

We have too long delayed in undertaking a long-range approach to the improvement of the Nation's schools and colleges. It is high time we began to study the major problems in education through systematic and extensive research. For unless we can find better and more efficient methods for meeting the demands of the future, we are going to find ourselves in a situation of ever greater shortages of qualified persons. If we persist in neglecting educational research and related activities. I can picture a day when we are not in a position to appropriate larger sums for medical research, simply because the personnel are not available to do the work.

No major business enterprise would long survive if it refused to appropriate some portion of its budget to research. The small sum requested by President Eisenhower for educational research is only one-third of one-tenth of one percent of our national expenditure for education. We as a Nation can hardly expect to stay in the business of education which today is increasingly competitive in the demands for improved procedures and results, by investing a sum so small as is provided in this bill, toward the vitally important need for research on educational problems. But at least this is a start.

We do the Nation an injustice and discredit ourselves if we fail to adopt the proposed amendment, and thereby delay our chances for future educational advancement.

[From the New York Times of June 4, 1956]

TEACHERS CHIDED ON MATHEMATICS—STUDY FINDS THEM DEFICIENT, CURRICULUM OUTMODED AND PUPILS HOSTILE OR BORED

(By Benjamin Fine)

The teaching of mathematics is in a deplorable state, according to a year-long survey sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation.

The survey found that a large number of mathematics teachers not only did not know how to teach the subject effectively, but also were barely able to keep ahead of their students.

As a result, it was noted that mathematics was one of the poorest taught subjects on the elementary and secondary levels and that the students voted mathematics as their most hated course.

The survey, conducted by the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, made a firsthand study of 60 classrooms in 5 States. Thirty-six of these were at the elementary level, and 24 at the secondary.

The study was under the direction of six educators, headed by Prof. Samuel S. Wilks of the Princeton University mathematics department. The Carnegie Corp. gave $21,000 for the project.

Among the findings were these:

Of the 60 mathematics teachers reached in the study, only 10 were competent; the other 50 were confused and unable to teach the subject.

The mathematics curriculum is outmoded and must be brought up to date if mathematics is to take its rightful place in the public schools.

Most students are not only indifferent, they are downright hostile to the teaching of the subject.

Most of the teachers do not like mathematics and teach it only under compulsion or under protest.

These conclusions are particularly serious, the survey suggests, because of the need for trained engineers, scientists, and technicians in the atomic era. Mathematics is the basis of engineering.

The study notes that most students "back away" from mathematics at an early year. Even superior or gifted students are indifferent. It has the dubious honor of being the least popular subject in the curriculum.

The study lays much of the fault at the feet of the teacher. A sampling of 211 prospective elementary schoolteachers showed that 150 had a longstanding hatred of arithmetic.

The survey found that half of a random sampling of 370 candidates for elementary school positions failed to solve a simple problem in fractions.

"It seems pretty clear that many elementary schoolteachers have a hard time keeping even half a jump ahead of their pupils," the report stated.

The survey continues: "Future teachers pass through the elementary schools learning to detest mathematics. They drop it in high school as early as possible. They avoid it in teachers colleges because it is not required. They return to the elementary school to teach a new generation to detest it."

Toughening up requirements for professional certification would be only half a solution, the surveys says.

The Princeton survey proposes the creation of a remedial mathematics course for teachers of mathematics, designed to unravel the teacher's numerical neurosis.

NOT THE ENTIRE SOLUTION

But, the survey concedes, not all the trouble can be eliminated by retaining teachers.

"When our observer visited 60 classrooms to verify at first hand what the books and the experts were saying about the deplorable state of mathematics teaching," the survey says, "he found 10 in which the teaching was reasonably effective.

"In the other 50 the instruction was so confused that learning of any kind seemed to be largely accidental and unillumined by any learning theory whatever."

The survey is quick to add that the teachers themselves could not be censured for the conditions under which they work. Most of them were struggling with classes of 35 to 40 pupils who sometimes spread over 2 different grade levels and almost always ranged widely from the bright but bored to the dull and bewildered.

The curriculum is taken to task, too. The survey notes that it has changed very little during the past century.

"The high-school curriculum today shows few, if any, signs of the important developments that have taken place in mathematical science since the 17th century," the report says.

The results have been devastating. An engineering school reports that 72 percent of its students entering last September were found so inadequate mathematically that they had to take a review of high-school mathematics before they could qualify for the regular freshman course. Similar complaints are frequently heard.

"Many things will have to be done and discovered before the general population can achieve literacy in mathematics comparable to its literacy in the mother tongue," the survey says.

The importance of research is stressed. However, the survey agrees that "the suggestion that the way out of the mathematical mess is through educational research is likely to try the patience of those who want immediate action."

The "big need," then, becomes a comprehensive study of the whole problem of how to improve the teaching of mathematics.

It will take a generation or two to make a sizable dent in the problems of mathematical education, the survey warns. But, it maintains, the issues should be examined immediately.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement I have prepared concerning the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

In connection with the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] I wish to make a brief statement. It has been called to my attention that in the report of the Committee for the White House Conference on Education there were several references to the Office of Education and its budget. I would like to read a few of these:

1. "There is a general feeling that the United States Office of Education has never received enough support to perform all [its] services fully. This Committee believes that a far stronger United States Office of Education is needed if necessary research on schools is to become available" (p. 20).

2. "The * * * research services of the Office of Education should be expanded" (p. 22).

3. "It was recommended 'that the plans of the United States Office of Education for research in school-building needs be supported by adequate appropriations of funds'" (p. 29).

4. "State boards of education and the United States Office of Education should seek to stimulate local studies, and to organize and conduct studies at the State and National levels" (p. 45).

5. "More research should be directed to getting and keeping enough good teachers. Sufficient funds should be provided for the United States Office of Education, and that agency should assume primary responsibility (a) in conducting research directly; (b) in contracting with agencies, professional organizations, and others qualified to do effective research; and (c) in stimulating, encouraging, and coordinating a continuous program of study at all levels of government" (p. 46).

6. "We recommend that the funds available for the support of the United States Office of Education be sufficient to enable it to perform its functions adequately. The United States Office of Education has important functions to perform in the development of American education. It is the only official Government agency available for providing comprehensive nationwide information concerning the schools. * * * Inadequacies apparently result partly from a lack of funds and staff in the United States Office of Education necessary to carry on the needed research activities. We believe that the United States Office of Education can make important contributions to the development of American education through leadership and research" (pp. 60–61).

7. "The United States Office of Education should be adequately staffed to perform the functions it is now performing in making reports on the progress of education throughout the Nation, in carrying on essential research activities, and for providing promptly needed statistical information."

8. "Consideration should be given to the strengthening of the position of the Office of Education in keeping with the importance of education to the Nation."

It is difficult to see how we can keep faith with the broad cross-section of Americans who made these recommendations, unless we restore at least a portion of the full amount requested by President Eisenhower for the United States Office of Education.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have some questions to ask in regard to various sections of the bill before I discuss a proposed amendment, but first I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] on his devotion to the general public welfare as demonstrated by his unceasing work as chairman of the Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and Related Agencies Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee. The Senator's efforts in this respect are evidenced by his success in having brought about an increase of $2 million for the item of "Grants to States and Other Agencies" in the appropriations for the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

We find this item on page 18. I invite the attention of the Senate to the subject matter, starting on page 18, under the "Office of Vocational Rehabilitation."

The importance of the vocational rehabilitation program is so well understood and its relationship to human values and to the welfare to our Nation as a whole are so well known that little would be served by reemphasizing these points at this time. other than to say that I think we, the Congress, and for that matter all healthy Americans, have for too long a time overlooked the sad plight of our unfortunate fellow Americans who have suffered some degree of disability.

To appreciate the importance of the subject matter to which I am addressing myself, all we have to do is to look at

the alarming number of disabled or partially disabled fellow Americans. If we consider the question from the standpoint of economic loss, we must agree that the loss is tremendous, because a great many of such persons, if rehabilitated, could be brought back to productive pursuits.

I desire to discuss the situation from the standpoint of human loss. I have done a considerable amount of work in this field as a Senator, so far as personal investigations and surveys of what is taking place in some of our vocational rehabilitation centers are concerned. All we have to do, I think, is to go through a hospital which cares for disabled persons—and there is a great pilot plant within a stone's throw of the Capitol. I should like to suggest to my colleagues in the Senate, busy as they are, that some day they take a couple of hours off, go to the Anderson Clinic in Arlington, Va., and see there some of our fellow Americans who find themselves bedridden and, in my judgment, also find themselves too much forgotten by healthy Americans.

Mr. President, is it not a rather sad thing that too frequently so many of us never think about the other fellow who is in a more unfortunate position than we are, until misfortune strikes down either us or someone dear to us? I want to have the Senate look upon the question as a common social problem and also a common moral obligation which belongs to each one of us.

Congress makes the appropriations for so many things of so much less consequence than appropriations whose objective is to better the lot of our unfortunate fellow citizens, whether such appropriations are for vocational rehabilitation or for some other features of the bill. I intend to say something about those matters in a few moments, as I get to the provisions where they are found, and I am not interested in a rapid passage of the bill this afternoon. I think there ought to be some discussion of the obligation of the American people, acting through their representatives in Congress, to provide more adequate amounts of money for research, in connection, for example, with great causes of death and disability such as cancer and cardiac disease, in both of which there has been a terrible increase.

Important as is the increase provided in the bill over what has been provided in the past, I do not believe it is sufficient, Mr. President. The American people have the right to have a larger percentage of public funds, taxpayer dollars, go into great medical research centers for intensified research in those fields.

Money for care of those who are already afflicted is important, too. I shall make a plea later this afternoon for more funds for research, because the health problem will not be solved until we know more about the causes of disease. I have talked to doctors. I have read their reports. I shall quote from one later this afternoon.

Important and valuable as is the work which has been done by the committee, I still say the appropriations for medical research provided in certain sections of the bill are inadequate.

Mr. President, as I speak and look around the Chamber, at the men and women sitting here this afternoon, I am reminded that the chances are better than even that 1 out of 7 will die from cancer. And that is typical of our whole population. Then I ask what we are doing as a Government in the matter of research in the field of cancer. The only answer to that question should be, How much can be soundly spent for cancer research? That is the amount we should appropriate. The American people are entitled to know that. Give me the amount which can be soundly spent on scientific cancer research, and that is the amount the Congress should appropriate in 1956 for the American people.

In the case of research in heart disease, give me the answer to the question how much can be soundly spent, and that is the amount the American people can afford to spend in 1956, because the American people cannot afford to spend less. Mr. President, that is true even if the matter be looked at only from the materialistic standpoint of economic loss, although I hope we shall never reach the time in the Senate of the United States when we appropriate money for purposes involving great human values, such as these subject matters involve, on the basis of materialism or materialistic considerations. I still hope that here in the Senate of the United States we shall always be motivated by a dedication to great moral values.

The bill which the eminent Senator from Alabama is handling is pregnant with moral value. The Senator from Alabama, time and time again, as he has stood on the floor of the Senate, fighting for greater governmental support for programs which seek to bring some relief and help to the stricken in our country, to the less fortunate members of our population, has performed a fine public service, a public service which has not been surpassed by anyone in the Congress, in my judgment, for the past quarter of a century. That is the record of the Senator from Alabama.

I want him to understand, as I raise certain questions, as to appropriations in the bill, that I am not raising the questions because of my disappointment in or as criticism of the great job which he and his committee have done. I have a hunch, an intuition, I may say, that the committee felt it had gone as far as it could go if it could hope to have accepted the amounts recommended in its report.

That is why I think some of us who are not on the committee ought to give the committee greater assurance by raising questions as to whether they have gone far enough. I do not believe they have gone far enough, particularly in the matter of medical research, because time is wasting, and we cannot justify the wasting of the time. If you think so, Mr. President, come with me as I take you through great hospital centers. Take a look at the human suffering and economic loss our failure to provide adequate money for medical research has cost. Then I think I shall have made my point clear, because I do not think one can believe it until he sees it.

A few years ago I spent a great deal of time at the great health centers in Bethesda, Md., where I had an opportunity to see the great job being done, to listen to doctors, and to hear what more could be done if we provided the funds with which to do it.

So I am making my plea today for more funds because I do not think too much can be spent, and the spending is sound from the standpoint of governmental responsibility for health.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. First, I wish to thank the Senator for his very kind remarks about the Senator from Alabama. Secondly, I should like to point out that the basis for arriving at the funds recommended by the committee was not what the Senator from Oregon may have thought. The amounts were not limited by what the subcommittee or the full committee thought would be acceptable to the Senate and to the Congress as a whole; the amounts were arrived at after hearing testimony from leading and distinguished scientists and doctors in the fields of heart disease, cancer, mental illness, and other fields, and after they told us how much they thought was needed and could be properly expended.

The amount provided was by far the largest amount ever recommended or carried in a bill. If the Senator has an opportunity to check, he will notice that the fund for cancer research is twice what was provided for the current fiscal year.

The committee heard from Dr. Sidney Farber, of Boston, Mass., as to the work which had been done in trying to find an answer to the problem of leukemia, particularly leukemia in children.

The committee had before it Dr. Wendell Stanley, a Nobel prize winner, and now at the University of California. We had Dr. Harry Weaver, of the American Cancer Society, and other distinguished medical men. We asked them, "What do you need? How much do you think you can do? How much money can you profitably expend?" Let me say that in each case we accepted their figures.

Mr. MORSE. That is the next question I wished to ask.

Mr. HILL. We did not cut their figures. Instead, we accepted them.

To show how far we went in this case, let me say that, as the Senator from Oregon knows, under the law, each of our National Institutes of Health has an advisory council. For instance, the National Cancer Institute has an advisory council. On that advisory council are many distinguished doctors and scientists, who are devoting their lives to the cause of trying to find a cure for cancer or the means of preventing cancer. The council made out their estimates of what was needed and what they thought could profitably be spent. Those figures were submitted. Afterward they submitted some revisions of the figures, saying that since they had arrived at the first figures, they had secured information which led them to believe they could make proper use of even larger sums of money. In each

instance, our committee voted them the larger sums.

So I say that the appropriations we now recommend to the Senate are based on what the leading doctors and scientists in these various fields of health have recommended to our committee, saying, "This is the amount we feel we can profitably spend."

Mr. MORSE. Let me ask the Senator from Alabama whether these recommendations are based on both those of the so-called practitioners of medicine and those of the representatives of public institutes of medicine?

Mr. HILL. The answer is that they are based on the recommendations of both. When the Senator from Oregon uses the word "public" in that connection, I assume he has in mind the officials of the National Institutes of Health. Of course, these figures go far beyond those suggested by the National Institutes of Health, because the Institutes are restricted by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. MORSE. That is what I wished to bring out.

Mr. HILL. These figures are practically $58 million above the budget estimates.

Mr. MORSE. That is what I wished to bring out, namely, that today the committee is bringing before us recommendations which, insofar as the Federal Institutes of Health are concerned, are in excess of the amounts the spokesmen for those institutes recommended. As the Senator from Alabama has said, the institutes are restricted or limited necessarily by the President's budget message, which calls for considerably less than the amounts of money the Senator's committee has recommended. I understand that the Senator's committee has recommended the larger amounts because, upon investigation, the committee thought the amounts provided should be substantially larger.

Mr. HILL. Yes; we thought the amounts should be substantially increased. In the case of each institute, we allowed the maximum amount which any witness on behalf of the Institute requested or in any way believed could profitably be spent. In fact, I will say that our committee went beyond the Institutes' recommendations. For instance, in connection with tuberculosis, we found that Dr. Sams, now in California, and formerly in the United States Army, and formerly the public health officer for Japan, when Japan was occupied by our forces, and Dr. Selikoff felt that with the expenditure of approximately $1,200,000, there could be developed in the United States a vaccine for tuberculosis, known as BCG, one which has been studied and worked on for years in Britain. In fact, the British Medical Journal for February 25 contains a report on the 5-year trial of the vaccine in Britain. On the basis of the testimony of Dr. Sams and Dr. Selikoff and what we found had been done in Britain, we recommended the appropriation of funds to carry on in the United States such research work on this and other vaccines.

As the Senator from Oregon well knows, we have vaccines for many other diseases. So why should not we have a vaccine for tuberculosis? Therefore, our committee recommended an appropriation of funds for that purpose, although no reference whatever was made to the matter, insofar as the Institutes of Health were concerned.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to comment on a report, which reached my desk a few minutes ago, dated June 4, 1956. The report is on the medical sciences, and reads in part as follows:

Senate Appropriations Committee late Friday approved bill that gives an unprecedented 80 percent increase to National Institutes of Health for research, bulk to go for grants in aid. Compared with $102.1 million available this year, committee voted for $184.4 million. This is $48.9 million more than total allowed by the House and $57.9 million above sum requested by the White House. Almost double the 1956 funds are allotments for cancer ($48.4 million), mental health ($35.2 million), neurology and blindness ($18.6 million), and heart ($33.4 million). The $6 million earmarked for dental health activities in Public Health Service, including research, is nearly 3 times the 1956 budget.

Is that an accurate report of the contents of the bill?

Mr. HILL. Those are accurate figures.

Mr. MORSE. It is to that subject matter I am addressing myself, and it is because of those increases that I made the statements of commendation of the Senator from Alabama and his committee.

Mr. HILL. I just said those figures are accurate. I should say the figures are stated in round numbers, and are substantially accurate.

Mr. MORSE. Yes, in round numbers they present the picture before us.

Mr. HILL. Yes, in round numbers they show what the committee has done; that is correct.

Mr. MORSE. This particular report does not deal with research in the Veterans' Administration medical centers, does it?

Mr. HILL. That research comes under the appropriations for the Veterans' Administration, which are contained in the independent offices appropriation bill. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is chairman of the subcommittee handling that bill, and he will inform the Senator from Oregon about those appropriations.

Mr. MORSE. So those of us who are disturbed about the reports we have received as to the inadequacy of funds for research work in veterans' hospitals should reserve our comments on that matter until the time when the Senator from Washington brings up the appropriations affecting the veterans' hospitals. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I merely rise to say that the Senator from Alabama and myself, who have for a long time been interested in this particular phase of the appropriations, have tried to correlate the direct appropriations to the National Institutes of Health and the appropriations for the Veterans' Administration. The latter are handled by the subcommittee of which I am chairman.

I think the Senator from Oregon makes a very good point. Funds for research are carried in the pending bill, but they should be correlated with the funds for research in the Veterans' Administration hospitals. The appropriations for the Veterans' Administration run close to $5 billion, for many purposes. The amount provided for research has, in my opinion, been inadequate. Last year I tried to have it increased. I did not receive much support from the committee, although the Senator from Alabama supported me. Two years prior to that we had very little success.

If the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Oregon will permit me to do so, I should like to state that the Veterans' Administration has the greatest potential research facilities to be found in any of our public institutions. In its hospitals there are thousands of beds. Research can be done very effectively in the Veterans' Administration hospitals, and all of that work should be correlated with the work done in the National Institutes of Health.

When we were considering the budget in that connection, we were acting on the advice of such eminent men as Dr. Stanley, Dr. White, Dr. Heller, of the Cancer Institute, Dr. Little, Dr. Rhodes, and others. In addition, there are advisory committees composed of lay members. The Cancer Institute has a committee of six lay members. These offices rotate. The committee members come to Washington from time to time. We were taking the advice of these workers. They agreed that the Veterans' Administration facilities could be used as a proving ground for more research, which would be correlated with the work of the advisory committees and the National Institutes of Health.

Consider cancer alone. During the coming year it will cost us $243 million to provide bed space in veterans' hospitals for veterans who are cancer patients. We are devoting very little money to cancer research. We suggest that an expenditure of $5 million or $10 million might reduce the cost, and that it would be an economy in the long run. The National Institutes of Health wish to conduct projects in Veterans' Administration hospitals, where this vital research work can be done.

I commend the Senator from Oregon. This has been a long fight. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has been in it for a long time. I started very early as a Member of the House, when he was also a Member of the House. The first institute established was the Cancer Institute. From that beginning has grown one of the greatest medical institutes in the world, at Bethesda, Md.

I think it would be interesting to Senators to know that at the time the Cancer Institute was established—and at that time the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] was in the Senate—we could obtain only $1 million. In those days Congress would not appropriate money for land. A very generous woman by the name of Mrs. Wilson owned an estate in Bethesda. Her husband had died of cancer. She donated the first bit of land, and we started the Cancer Institute.

It would do all of us good to go there and see what is being done. Sometimes we are criticized for the amounts which

we appropriate for these purposes. To be brutally frank, we have been criticized by Senators who, a few months later, found themselves stricken with the same disease we were trying to eradicate. Sometimes it is very difficult for us to show results. They are very intangible.

An amazing thing has happened this year. We have been obtaining definite results in connection with cancer, heart disease, mental illness, muscular dystrophy, and other diseases which plague the people of the United States. Such progress has been made possible because of research.

In connection with Veterans' Administration hospitals we have been gradually eliminating tuberculosis wards, as will be seen tomorrow when the appropriation bill for the Veterans' Administration is before the Senate. Tuberculosis is passing out of existence because of this research program.

If we could persuade sufferers from venereal diseases to come forward for treatment, they could be cured almost immediately. We are still plagued with three great killers, namely, heart disease, cancer, and mental illnesses, which cause many complications. But we are making progress.

The testimony on this subject furnishes the most interesting reading. It shows that in the field of biochemistry it has been possible to isolate certain drugs. Even since the budget hearings, certain new drugs have been isolated. Seven teams of top scientists and medical men are traveling all over the United States demonstrating the use of the newer drugs. There are 2,700 human volunteers. The drugs have worked perfectly on mice and other animals.

In the field of hormones, in connection with cancer research, it has been found that certain parts of the body are more susceptible than others. Great strides have been made.

The critics usually ask, "What are we getting for our dollar?" We cannot always point out the results. For the first time these research activities are being correlated. When the Senator from Alabama and I started years ago there was a small laboratory in Chicago. Dr. Little was working in Maine. The Mayo Bros. Institute was conducting certain work. However, these research activities were not correlated.

We are making definite progress. Certain drugs have been discovered which, before many months have passed, may prove very useful in the treatment of leukemia.

I wish to compliment the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], who have done yeoman work.

Mr. MORSE. I shall discuss later the work of the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] has been very helpful.

Sometimes we have been reluctant to come to the Senate asking for money. It is pretty difficult to answer the question, "What are we getting for these expenditures?" All of us feel very proud that, after all these years, we now can show some results.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say. I felt so keenly on the subject that I could not resist this opportunity for commenting.

Speaking of results, I will say to the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Alabama that sometimes they are intangible. Another cold, hard fact is that because of the medical-research program, in which the Government has played a most important part through these expenditures, in the period of 16 years from 1937 to 1954, life expectancy has increased 9 years. I know of no one anywhere in the world who would not give a few paltry dollars for 9 years more of life.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Washington. I shall have something to say in a moment regarding his record.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I have been following the discussion relative to the funds which have been appropriated for the various items which come under the National Institutes of Health. I think it would be enlightening to those who read the RECORD if there were inserted in the RECORD at this point a tabulation showing the appropriations made in 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1955, and 1956, and the amount recommended in the bill for 1957. Those figures show a constant increase over the years. With respect to this year, we have followed the recommendation of the National Cancer and Heart Institutes.

I know it will be enlightening to anyone who reads the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to have it in the RECORD, particularly because it bears upon one major point I wish to emphasize in these few remarks this afternoon, namely, the inadequacy of the appropriations in the past and the fact that now at last we are taking some forward steps in an effort to provide the kind of support the American people are entitled to in improving their health conditions.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the tabulation be printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

National Institutes of Health appropriations, 1950–57

	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	Estimates, 1957	House allowance, 1957	Senate allowance, 1957
Operating expenses, NIH	$12,075,000	$15,750,000	$15,756,500	$16,598,750	$4,675,000	$5,674,000	$5,929,000	$11,922,000	$11,922,000	$11,922,000
National Cancer Institute	18,900,000	20,686,000	19,656,750	17,887,000	20,237,000	21,737,000	24,978,000	32,437,000	34,437,000	48,432,000
Mental health activities	[1] 8,666,000	10,000,000	10,561,737	10,895,000	12,095,000	14,147,500	[2] 18,001,000	21,749,000	23,749,000	35,197,000
National Heart Institute	10,725,000	14,750,000	10,082,650	12,000,000	15,168,000	16,668,000	18,898,000	22,106,000	25,106,000	33,396,000
Dental health activities	1,780,000	2,090,000	1,617,654	1,650,000	1,740,000	1,990,000	2,176,000	2,971,000	3,471,000	6,026,000
Arthritis and metabolic disease activities	[3]	[4]	[4]	[5] 4,568,900	7,000,000	8,270,000	10,840,000	13,345,000	13,845,000	15,885,000
Microbiology activities	[3]	[4]	[4]	[5] 5,475,200	5,738,000	6,180,000	7,775,000	9,799,000	8,799,000	13,299,000
Neurology and blindness activities		[4]	[4]	[5] 1,537,300	4,500,000	7,600,500	9,861,000	12,196,000	14,196,000	18,650,000
Total	52,146,000	63,276,000	57,675,291	59,030,750	71,153,000	81,268,000	98,458,000	126,525,000	135,525,000	184,437,000

[1] Excludes $2,946,000 for support of narcotic hospitals at Lexington and Fort Worth which was subsequently transferred.
[2] Includes $250,000 supplemental.
[3] The operating expense, NIH appropriation included funds in 1950 for arthritis and microbiology and are not identifiable in this year.
[4] The operating expense, NIH appropriation included funds in 1951 and 1952 for arthritis, microbiology, and neurology and are not identifiable in these years.
[5] The identifiable programs included in operating expense, NIH appropriation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like the attention particularly of the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who have spoken earlier about the work the committee has done in this field in trying to obtain justice and equitable and needed appropriations for the health needs of the American people in the field of medical research and in the field of public hospital care. I would not be duly appreciative in my remarks if I did not recognize the work the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Washington have done.

A problem such as this requires leadership in the Senate. Unless such leadership is provided in committee by those who are willing to exercise leadership, very little progress can be made. Certainly without such leadership having been provided, we would not have made the progress we have made so far.

What we are now doing represents a very great step forward as compared to the somewhat dragging-of-heels attitude, which has characterized this effort in the past. I am talking about the work the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] has done, because I happen to know—and she does not know that I know it—of some positions she has taken within the committee this year, when an argument of false economy crept into the committee's deliberations on the part of some persons who questioned whether we were not moving too fast, and when the old bugaboo was raised as to whether we would not be moving in the direction of socialized medicine if we were to appropriate taxpayer dollars for research in an attempt to find the answer to such great menacing threats to the health of our people as cancer and cardiac diseases.

Therefore I wish to pay this tribute to the Senator from Maine, and also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point some editorials published in Maine newspapers.

The first one is entitled "How About One Billion for Health?" published in the Bangor Daily News of July 12, 1955; the second one is entitled "Our No. 1 Evasion," published in the New York Post of December 18, 1955; and the third editorial is entitled "Let Us Raise Our Sights," published in the Bangor Daily News of November 19, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bangor Daily News of July 12, 1955]

HOW ABOUT ONE BILLION FOR HEALTH?

There are occasions when we feel Congress is too generous about spending the taxpayers' money. But today we'd like to point out an instance in which we think the Federal legislators are being downright niggardly. We refer to funds for medical research on major killing diseases. Congress hasn't yet decided on a final figure, but the largest amount we have seen proposed is $24 million.

Why not $1 billion? This may sound startling, at first. Yet, what better investment could be made for the welfare of the Nation? Let us suppose the sum found the answer to dreaded cancer, for instance. Suppose it gave us new information on heart ailments and their treatment. Suppose it speeded up improvement of the Salk polio vaccine. Wouldn't research funds help the battle against cerebral palsy? Wouldn't it hasten the development of marvelous new atomic weapons for the war against disease?

It occurs to us that we Americans may have lost our perspective as to the relative importance of things. A Federal highway program running into many billions undoubtedly will be put on the books within a short time. We are spending billions upon billions for national defense. Other billions have been poured overseas in the form of foreign aid. Yet, we discuss medical research in terms of only millions.

The suggestion of allotting 1 billion Federal dollars for vital medical research is in nowise linked to the philosophy of socialized medicine. The latter is something we oppose. We suggest the research funds be distributed as grants to appropriate college and medical research laboratories. The project should be carefully organized, just as our generals and admirals would plan war against an aggressor.

It need be no more socialism than was the Government's spectacular success in developing atomic energy. This was a wartime emergency, and the immediate goal was to make atomic bombs, but it spelled the dawn of the atomic age—an age which we hope will be peaceful and prosperous. The Federal atomic know-how is now being gradually passed along to private enterprise for peaceful use of atomic energy.

We startled and frightened the world with the atomic bomb. Would we not win the gratitude of the world if by a billion-dollar research program we were able to give the human race the answers to the diseases that kill and cripple?

We'd like to see the billion-for-medical-research idea catch on in Washington. If you like the idea let President Eisenhower and the Maine delegation in Congress know how you feel. Write direct or care of Bangor Daily News, Bangor.

[From the New York Post of December 18, 1955]

OUR NO. 1 EVASION

The delusion that New York State sets the pace for all other States perists. Are we victims of our own propaganda about the hicks being in the sticks? Or of the long-range effects of Tom Dewey's publicity machine? What, for example, have we been doing about mental health?

In terms of the State's annual operating budget, this is problem No. 1. It is costing more than any other single function of State Government. How does New York rate with other States in trying to get to the root of the problem? Admittedly we have more medical schools and celebrated psychiatric research centers than anywhere else. Yet, as an authoritative voice has just reminded us, the State of Kansas, the land of the Menningers, has the top mental health program in the Nation. Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, even Florida are not far behind. New York isn't leading any one but the footdraggers.

The bleak news was presented to the Joint Legislative Committee on Problems of the Aging by Mike Gorman, Director of the National Mental Health Committee.

New York spends only $16.50 per year on research for every mental hospital inmate. But we spend $1,364 per patient for bed, board, window bars, and keepers.

"New York must start betting on brains rather than bricks," Gorman pleaded.

A congress of State governors has recommended that at least 10 percent of each State's mental health budget be set aside for research and training. On this point, New York's budget is woefully out of joint. Out of $160 million this year, the State is marking only about $2 million for research on deep-seated causes and cures of mental illness.

Gorman says the choice is simple and grim. We can keep on doing what we're doing until we face another bond issue of several hundred million dollars for more mental institutions for more people. Or we can "invest $10,445,000 a year in buying new knowledge and on training new people to apply it to patients * * * [to] reverse the trend and start reducing the patient population."

Take the Kansas example. Kansas spent millions for psychiatric personnel training over the last few years. In Kansas today there is 1 doctor for every 67 mental patients, as against the New York ration of 1 doctor for every 191. The daily expenditure per patient in Kansas is $4.66, as against $3.70 in New York. The result? In the past 4 years, despite increased admissions, Kansas mental hospitals have reduced their patient population by about 400 people; there are vacant beds in the State system.

Governor Harriman must certainly be aware that Republican Governor Fred Hall of Kansas and his legislative colleagues have spent an immoderate amount of money, by Albany standards, to achieve this spectacular result. Even Ohio's conservative Governor Lausche and his legislature have launched what Gorman cites as one of the largest training programs in the world—more than $10 million in the next 2 years for training and recruiting psychiatric personnel alone. This is to say nothing of Governor Mennen Williams of Michigan, who managed an immoderate appropriation of almost $5 million just for research and training—a program which makes our budget look like something for a backward area.

The choice now is whether to continue to make a token effort—or really give Mental Hygiene Commissioner Hoch the funds for an all-out war.

[From the Bangor Daily News of November 19, 1955]

LET'S RAISE OUR SIGHTS

Last July we suggested that Congress appropriate $1 billion for health having in mind greatly expanded activity in the field of medical research. The idea brought favorable responses from several sources. And now we have come across recent reports by three health groups which make us think that we're on the right track for sure.

Here, in part, is what the National Health Education Committee says about our research needs:

"While we have made great strides in certain directions, we need to spend much more to find the answers to the life-and-death questions which still remain: heart disease, cancer, mental illness, arthritis, palsy, epilepsy, sclerosis. More funds—both public and private—are necessary if we are to find these answers, which are long overdue.

"President Eisenhower's illness revealed how meager is our knowledge of America's prime killer, heart disease. Yet we spent in 1954 only some $16 million in research on the heart—while we spent four times that amount on ballpoint pens."

Now see what the American Public Health Association says in an article dealing with the Albert Lasker awards for research achievements:

"If present conditions continue to prevail 24 million Americans now alive may be expected to die of cancer. In the face of this situation we are spending 25 million a year on research—which is 15 million less than we spend on lipsticks.

"* * * Mental illness is another piece of unfinished business. * * * The cost of this human tragedy is staggering—2.8 billion a year in care, lost wages, and other sundry items. We have been content to bear this burden while spending but 10 million on research."

There are pages more in a similar vein, showing by facts and figures that we are niggardly when it comes to investing in medical research. The third organization, the American Foundation, makes a special plea for basic medical research in such fields as biology and chemistry. It, too, stresses the need for more funds.

One health organization, in commenting on our original editorial, raised the point that medical research isn't prepared to absorb $1 billion in a hurry. If this is so, why not then have Congress earmark $1 billion for research grants? Let the President appoint a representative committee of research leaders to work out a program and dispense the funds. The important thing is to set our sights higher and get busy.

We know that a single billion-dollar appropriation isn't going to win the war against disease, any more than a single billion can win a modern war between humans. But it would be a starting point. It would put the problem in proper perspective. There's something wrong in our thinking when Americans spend more on lipstick than on cancer research, more on ballpoint pens than on heart studies.

We are flatly opposed to socialized medicine, but we do feel that medical research is a field in which the Federal Government is best fitted to carry the money burden. It could be done without adding a cent to the budget if Congress would eliminate the Federal frills and waste brought to light by the Hoover Commission.

What are we waiting for?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the editorials speak for themselves. However, in essence the editorials clearly demonstrate what we would find to be the enthusiastic reaction of the American people if we presented to them the quotation: "How much should we spend of your taxpayer dollars for medical research?" I reassert that the American people would answer: "The very last dollar that can be spent profitably; the very last dollar that can be spent efficiently."

On this issue there is no division among our people so far as public opinion is concerned. There is no partisan division. There is no ideological division. The American people are rightly alarmed

about what they are finding out concerning the threat of cancer and the threat of cardiac diseases and the growing threat of mental diseases. They recognize it to be a governmental obligation to do what the Government can do for the people by providing adequate funds for research in these fields.

There are other Senators who have been very helpful, but the ones I have mentioned, I know from my own knowledge, have done yeoman service for all of us on the Committee on Appropriations in behalf of more adequate research funds. That is why we have this progressive appropriation bill before us today. The only question I raise is whether we are going far enough. It is very reassuring to hear the Senator from Alabama say that in the pending appropriation bill the committee has provided the top dollar which was recommended by the leaders in the field.

I am glad of that. However, I say to the Senator from Alabama that I, too, have talked to some medical authorities, and they have pointed out that one of the reasons why we are not going faster is a tremendous shortage of doctors.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct. We are providing the top dollar for this research work. We are also providing a great deal of money in the bill for traineeships, for training men for research in the various fields.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator from Oregon will yield to me on that point, I should like to say that later on, after we furnished support for the National Science Foundation, that work also was correlated, and researchers are located in various medical institutions, both private and public, and fellowships also are provided.

I see on the floor the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], who also worked zealously in trying to correlate this work with the work that is done in veterans' hospitals. Although we should not spend too much time telling each other what a fine job we have been doing, it is nevertheless a fact that sometimes we approach these problems with a great deal of reluctance and trepidation. Nevertheless, all of a sudden, we see some light all around.

Mr. HILL. Light is breaking through the clouds.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Light is breaking through the clouds; yes. A great job has been done by our two committees. At least we did what we thought should be done.

Mr. MORSE. I intended to say something about the work of the Senator from from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] in connection with this appropriation bill, particularly with respect to the Veterans' Administration. I will say it now, because I think the matter will come up tomorrow, and it is perfectly proper to correlate the Hill appropriation bill with the Magnuson appropriation bill.

The Senator from Washington has already said something about the need for greater medical research within our veterans' hospitals. I wish to say to the veterans that some of their representatives seem to be of the opinion that research in veterans' hospitals is not of great importance to the care of the veterans. They are dead wrong about that, Mr. President. Some of them also seem to be of the opinion that perhaps research in veterans' hospitals will make guinea pigs out of veterans who are hospitalized in those hospitals. When they say that, they merely show that they do not know what research is.

When we talk about funds for research, we are not talking about experimentation or about experimenting upon the veterans who are patients in veterans' hospitals. We are talking about placing in veterans' hospitals, to work with the doctors in such hospitals, research experts who can be of assistance to the doctors in giving the veterans better care.

If in my remarks today there is one point I wish to emphasize more than any other, let it be that our veterans' hospitals are tending too much to be domiciliary hospitals and are becoming too much homes for veterans instead of true medical hospitals, in which veterans are supposed to get medical care.

I have worked for and voted for domiciliary institutions for veterans wherever they can be shown to be needed, and I shall continue to do so. However, I am inclined to believe, from the study I have made on the subject to date, that there has been a decline in the standards of veterans' hospitals in recent years from the standpoint of medical care. One of the reasons, in my judgment, is that research work in the hospitals has been neglected. The trend ought to be in the other direction. We need more money for medical research within the veterans' hospitals if we are to give to veterans, to whom we owe so much, the very best medical care they can have.

We must dispel the notion, which seems to be developing in the minds of some of the rank and file veterans' organizations, that augmented funds for medical research in veterans' hospitals means that veterans will become some kind of guinea pigs for treatment and experimentation. That is not so. I am asking for the kind of reseach which is provided at Bethesda and at Walter Reed and at the National Health Institutes and at other great hospitals. Without a strong research center in a hospital, the patients do not begin to get the kind of medical care to which they are entitled.

I say to the Veterans' Administration from the floor of the Senate today, "You should fight harder than you have been fighting for more funds for research in the veterans' hospitals and build up the research sections of those hospitals, if you want the veterans to have the kind of care which they are entitled to receive."

I had intended to make these comments tomorrow, but I am making them today because I happen to know that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] fully entertain the same views and see the direct relationship between mental research and mental care for our veterans, and they see the importance of stemming the tide of turning our veterans hospitals into what may be called rest homes or domiciliary homes or convalescent homes, rather than hospitals.

I ask the Senator from Michigan, if I have in anyway misrepresented his point of view or have overemphasized it, to correct my remarks. But I am sure I have not, because I know the fine service he has rendered, the valuable contributions he has made and the earnest attention he has given to this important subject. I hope the point of view I have expressed this afternoon may be translated into action by the Senate for an increase in appropriations this year for medical research in the hospitals of the country.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator for his kind and warm remarks, and I concur in his position 100 percent. If the Senator could have heard the testimony which the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and I heard concerning the alarming rate at which the veterans have been afflicted by mental disturbances of one kind or another, I know he would agree with us that as a result of the research carried on in the past 2 or 3 years gains have been made, but there is a great field of endeavor which must be undertaken and which should be worked over in a dynamic sort of fashion. It cannot be a patchwork program. If we look at it only from a mercenary standpoint, the dollar value of the rehabilitation of the veteran, enabling him to become a self-sustaining taxpayer, is of great importance, to say nothing of the humanitarian aspects of rehabilitation. That is one category among mental diseases in veterans hospitals.

I was most interested in the observation made by the distinguished Senator, which is so true, that veterans' hospitals are tending to concentrate on custodial care of veterans, without getting at the real core of rehabilitation and making it possible for veterans to return to their home communities.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the only reason why I am taking the time of the Senate to participate in this debate is that it has been my observation that too frequently nonmembers of committees do not give to members of committees the support to which they are entitled, and too frequently bills go through the Senate without being properly pointed up. I think the members of committees should be aware of the fact that other Members of the Senate who are not serving on the committees with them are watching them.

Just as I made some observations about my keen disappointment regarding what the Finance Committee was doing, so I think that if other committees are not doing what we think they should do, we should make our views a matter of record; and when a committee has done such a grand job as the Hill committee has done and as the Magnuson committee is doing, we should rise on the floor of the Senate and say we have been fol-

lowing their work, and if there is some hesitancy on their part, about an appropriation, we might say, "This is smaller in amount than, on the merits, it should be."

I have a few more points, and I shall be through, but, first, I yield to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, first, let me say that I agree with everything which has been said on the floor with regard to our hospitals for veterans and the need for this particular appropriation.

I wish to commend the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. They have always been at the plow, so to speak, trying to do something in the field of health. May they continue to work in that field.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, recurring to my colloquy with the Senator from Alabama, I wish to say to him that it was my intention, based upon conversations I have had with medical authorities, to suggest increases in some of the appropriations, particularly in connection with the Heart Institute, the cancer work, and work in mental health. Perhaps most important of all is the field of mental health, because of the need for more adequate support for mental health facilities.

I wish we could take the American people by the hand and lead them through the mental hospitals of America. If I could get every taxpayer to spend 3 hours, or half a day, in observing conditions in mental hospitals in my judgment, the public response would be such that they would say to us in the Senate, "Listen, you fellows. Get busy and start spending money to meet this mental health problem, or do not come home."

In view of the appropriations we have made in the past, we are lucky that the people do not know the true facts about the mental health situation. If the people knew how close we still are to the medieval ages in the matter of mental health, they would demand that the funds in the appropriation bill this year be increased even more than they have been. I agree that we can go only so far at a time. The Senator from Alabama has done much this afternoon to remove one of the great fears I have about this bill, namely, are we denying the people who have the facilities and the competency to spend the money, adequate amounts to spend this next year in the various health fields. I am directing my attention particularly to the field of mental health.

I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from Alabama. If I should offer an amendment which I intended originally to offer, increasing the amount for mental health by at least $750,000, would I be confronted with the answer, "Where would we get the personnel, and where would we get the facilities?"

Mr. HILL. I may say that very definitely the Senator would be confronted with that answer. I would say that the amount recommended by the committee, $35,197,000, for mental health, is the top figure, the maximum figure, which the doctors, the scientists, and those who are working and laboring in research in the field of mental health believe can be invested at this time.

The mental-health appropriation in 1950 was $8,656,000. Last year the appropriation was $18,001,000. This year we have brought it up to $35,197,000.

The committee had before it some very able and dedicated men in the field of mental health. One of them was Mr. Mike Gorman, executive director of the National Mental Health Committee and author of that great eye-opening, provocative book entitled "Every Other Bed."

Another witness was Dr. Kline, head of one of the great hospitals of New York State. There appeared other witnesses of that character and type. The figures now reported were the maximum figures which they submitted to us. These were the amounts they thought could be used profitably at this time.

I appreciate what the Senator from Oregon has said, as I appreciate also the interest he has shown in this subject, not only this afternoon but throughout the years. The light is beginning to break in the field of mental health. For too long persons suffering from mental illness were thrown into institutions which were called insane asylums. The doors of those places were closed too often even to the members of the patients' own families, and the patients became the forgotten people. That is not true today. Our doctors, our chemists, our scientists are all working diligently to find cures. Many new drugs have been discovered. One of them is known as reserpine, and comes from India. Other drugs come from France and Belgium. We know them by the name of tranquilizing drugs.

By the use of these drugs, it is now possible to discharge from 5 to 7 percent more persons than were being discharged before these drugs became available. There are some instances of patients who were classified as violent, and who had been in institutions for as long as 30 years, having been restored, through the use of these drugs, to a condition which will enable their being released from the institutions. So, although there is yet much to be done in the field of mental health, progress is very definitely being made.

A very interesting incident which came to our attention was an experiment carried on in the excellent medical school at Tulane University, under the direction of Dr. Heath. Many persons, as we know, suffer from a mental disease known as schizophrenia. Dr. Heath took the blood of a schizophrenic and injected it into some normal persons, and those persons developed symptoms of schizophrenia. This is strong evidence of the fact that much of what we refer to as mental illness comes from what might be called physical disability.

Today, more and more research doctors and scientists are engaged in the field of chemistry of the body, the field of metabolism. Much of the work which is now in progress is connected with a program which has been launched in the field of chemotherapy and is concerned with research in the field of cancer. Last year Dr. Cornelius P. Rhoads, who is head of the research division of the Sloan-Kettering Institute, came before our committee and brought with him some white mice. The mice had cancer. At the institute the mice were caused to develop cancer. This year the institute sent the committee a picture of one of the mice, together with the names of certain chemicals or drugs which were used on the mice, and with which the cancer was cured.

So it can be seen that progress is being made in the field of cancer research. But much remains to be done, as the Senator from Oregon has suggested. Nevertheless, I repeat—and I feel certain the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] will confirm what I say—that in each one of these categories of disease, we have provided in the bill all the funds the doctors, the scientists, and the research workers have told us can be profitably used at this time. We have given them every dollar they have asked for.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Alabama, who is chairman of the subcommittee, and his associates, for the amounts which have been recommended for the National Institutes of Health and other activities. I was deeply interested in what my colleague from Oregon said about the mental health activities, because during the many years I was Lieutenant Governor and Governor of my State, I think there was no other single subject to which I gave so much of my time, attention, and thought as that of mental illness.

In the State of New York alone more than 110,000 persons are receiving treatment in the State mental hospitals. They are in addition to those who may be receiving treatment in private clinics and under private care.

I believe New York State spends today about $150 million for the custodial and medical care of the persons in the State mental hospitals. The item for the care of the mentally ill is the largest item in the entire State budget, with the exception of the items of State aid for schools and State aid for other activities.

I do not agree with my colleague when he says it is fortunate that the people of the United States cannot go through the hospitals to see for themselves the terrible, tragic plight of the mentally ill. I think it would be most salutary if they did go through them. I recall very vividly the first time it was my duty to visit the State mental institutions. That was 25 years ago. Since then, happily, conditions have greatly improved. But what I saw then came as a shock to me. I can barely describe the force of the shock. I can only say that I was sick for a week after I visited the first hospital which I had the duty to inspect. I think that the more people who knew the unfortunate and tragic plight of

those in the mental hospitals, the better off we would be.

I cannot tell the Senator from Alabama, the Senator from Washington, and the other Senators how delighted I am at the more adequate appropriations which have been recommended by the committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I appreciate deeply what has been said about the Senator from Alabama; but we have had wonderful teamwork in procuring these funds for research. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who formerly was the chairman of the subcommitee, have been a tower of strength. No committee could have been more devoted and indefatigable in its work than the members of this subcommittee, who have been helping to wage the battle for many years. All of them have been working, pulling, and fighting together for the necessary funds.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am aware of the work all my colleagues on the committee have done in connection with this appropriation. I do not think I can more adequately express my satisfaction, my approval, and my deep gratification at the amount of the appropriations which are recommended in this bill than by saying that I have served on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare under the chairmanship of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], for the past 7 years, and I fully appreciate his ability.

I had not dared to hope, a few years ago, in spite of all the testimony which was presented to our committee, that we would be able in this year, 1956, to obtain from Congress the appropriations which are here recommended. It is a fine piece of work. It marks great progress. I think we can all be truly gratified with the progress which has been made.

I cannot express more strongly my sense of appreciation and gratitude on behalf of the people of my State and the people of the Nation generally for the increased appropriations which will make it possible to carry on the work of the National Institutes of Health in even a more comprehensive and better way than it has been carried on in the past. I again congratulate the members of the subcommittee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to add, if I might, a word to the comments just made by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. Mental illnesses in veterans' hospitals and elsewhere have increased at an alarming rate. A few days ago General Hershey testified that of the thirty-some percent of our youngsters rejected in the draft, some 37 percent of those rejected were turned down because of mental illness.

Mr. MORSE. In addition to what the Senator from New York has stated, I wish to say that I share his delight over the increases in the appropriations, and I share his commendation of the committee. I also wish to say that I still should like to be able to see the taxpayers of America actually spend from 3 to 4 hours in visiting mental hospitals, because, although the progress on which the Senator from New York has commented is a far cry from the progress we must make, we shall not be able to make it until we get the necessary appropriations with which to build the facilities and train the personnel to do the much better job which needs to be done. I am merely repeating the comments and attitudes of leading mental hygienists and psychiatrists, who say they will be able to do much better just as fast as they can get increased personnel and money to carry on their work.

My point in suggesting that the taxpayers go through the mental hospitals was that after they had done so they would make it perfectly clear to the Senate that we had better supply the additional appropriations for the personnel.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I merely desire to correct the impression the Senator from Oregon must have inadvertently obtained. I understood the Senator from Oregon to say he was glad the people of the Nation could not go through the hospitals, because the shock would be too great.

Mr. MORSE. No. I urged that they should go through them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield. I should like to refer to something the distinguished Senator from New York spoke of earlier. I think he might be interested in knowing that as a result of the drug research we have had, and which we hope can be greatly increased, in New York State there has been a 19-percent increase in discharges from State mental hospitals, and it is anticipated that there will be another substantial drop in admissions, merely as the result of the use of the two drugs which have been developed in the little research which had been done, money for which was grudgingly provided by the Congress last year. There has been a 19 percent increase in discharges.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Alabama to two other matters. A few minutes ago we started a colloquy on the question of personnel. The Senator from Alabama made the point, and I am sure I paraphrase him correctly, that the appropriation bill provides for the maximum amount of money the experts testified could be spent with available personnel. Will the Senator from Alabama tell the Senator from Oregon what the appropriation bill provides with reference to training, and the increase in personnel which apparently is so much needed?

Mr. HILL. For all the different categories of disease, the bill not only carries funds for research work—some of which is to be carried on by the Institutes at Bethesda; the greater part of which is to be carried on in medical schools and universities—but the bill also carries funds in each one of those categories for traineeships, that is, to provide for the training and preparation of young doctors and scientists for research work.

Mr. MORSE. That is what I desire to stress, Mr. President. I shall be brief. I speak now to the medical profession of the country, because I think the medical profession owes it to itself to correct what I am satisfied is a misapprehension of its own attitude on the question of increasing personnel for training in the medical sciences. I think the medical profession is responsible for the misapprehension. It must take a much more objective and forthright stand than it has taken up to date. The matter of increasing medical personnel and scientific personnel and nursing personnel affects vitally America's health problem. If we should get into a war tomorrow, the scarcity of doctors would be simply alarming.

I do not believe in make-work programs, whether they be in the field of labor relations or any other field; and I do not believe in make-work programs in the medical field. I do not believe there can be a denial of the fact that there are a great many young people in this country with particular aptitudes and capacities to work in the field of science and in medicine who would enter those fields if they could get some encouragement to enter them, and if they could get some financial support to enter them. There is no creeping socialism involved in appropriations for the public good, seeking to enlarge the base of personnel so essential for more of the type of work in the whole field of health, which the Senator from Alabama has sought today in the pending appropriation bill.

We ought to face the fact that no doctor in America ever began to pay anywhere near the cost of his medical education. You and I pay for it largely, Mr. President, through taxes. We know medical students have to pay a great amount out of their own pockets for medical training, but I have seen an analysis of the problem of cost. If there are taken into consideration the facilities which are utilized in the training of a doctor and which are made available for his training, the schools which charge the highest tuition rates do not begin to charge enough to pay for the training.

The result has been that the American medical profession has been subsidized to a remarkable degree in the training of doctors in the first instance. I am for that. I am for an increase of the subsidy, for that matter. In doing that, we would not weaken the private practice of medicine, but would strengthen it. In my judgment, we shall strengthen the private practice of medicine when we provide greater facilities for the training of a larger number of doctors.

Let me say to the medical profession from the floor of the United States Senate, that I think one of the greatest

threats to the private practice of medicine today is the failure of the medical profession itself to increase the number of doctors and to enlarge the number of medical facilities in America, because if the American people ever reach the conclusion that there is not the fullest of cooperation from the medical profession in supplying the number of doctors needed to meet the health requirements of the country, then for the first time will the private practice of medicine be threatened.

Those of us who are fighting for a larger appropriation for the training of more personnel in the sciences are the ones who are fighting in real fact, for the preservation of the private practice of medicine, in coordination and cooperation with great public health services, such as the medical health institutions which the Senator from Alabama is supporting in the appropriation bill pending before the Senate today.

In my judgment—and if the Senator from Alabama thinks I am wrong, I want him to say so—what this appropriation means, although it has made great strides over last year's appropriation, is that we are appropriating the amount which can be spent in line with existing personnel; but, in my judgment, we should be spending much more on cancer research, much more on cardiac disease research, much more on mental disease research. The reason why we are not spending much more, if I understand the Senator from Alabama correctly, is that we do not have the personnel which would justify the larger appropriations. If that be true, I wish to say that come 1957 the Congress of the United States ought to ask the question, in considering appropriations, "What has happened during the past year to justify an increase in the number of trained personnel, so that we can appropriate more money in order to advance research more rapidly?"

Does the Senator from Alabama follow my argument?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I follow the argument of the Senator from Oregon. I must say that he is absolutely correct in stating that a limit on what can be done today in research results to a very large extent from the lack of trained personnel.

Mr. MORSE. Yes. For instance, let us consider the medical schools. We find that we are confronted with a vicious circle, for one of our problems is to obtain a sufficient number of doctors in the medical schools to do the teaching in order that there may be an increased number of medical students.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. We have spoken of the crying need for more research and more work in the field of mental health and more care and more attention to the mentally ill. Currently, we are turning out 1 psychiatrist a year for every 350,000 persons. Of course that indicates the woeful shortage. We need many, many more.

Mr. MORSE. That is a dramatic illustration of my point. With the terrific problem of mental health which exists, we are turning out 1 psychiatrist a year for every 350,000 persons. That cannot be justified in a country such as ours. The number of personnel must be increased, so a better job can be done. That is why I say, as I have said many times during the past 12 years, that rapid increases should be made in the number of students trained in the medical schools, in order to increase the number of doctors, because the existing shortage of doctors is alarming. Therefore, I shall continue to do all I can to help the medical profession increase its own number, so it can avoid the criticism which is bound to occur if the medical personnel and medical facilities of the country are not increased.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. What I have in mind is very much in line with what the Senator from Oregon has stressed. A few minutes ago I praised the committee for recommending appropriations which represent a very substantial increase over the amounts voted last year for these purposes.

There is one item on which I differ, and regarding which I have grave reservations, and must express disappointment over the recommended appropriation. I refer to one of the recommended appropriations for the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. The item to which I refer appears on page 38 of the report, under the heading "Training and Traineeships."

Last year, $2,075,000 was appropriated for this item. This year, it is recommended that the item be increased to $2,950,000, or an increase of $875,000. Percentagewise, that would seem to be a very substantial increase.

I think the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, will remember that on many occasions in the past I have questioned the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare about this item, whenever the Secretary appeared before us, and I have expressed the belief that the amount allowed has been totally inadequate.

Today, there are in the United States 2 million physically handicapped persons. The number is increasing each year by 250,000. However, in the face of that situation, we are rehabilitating less than 60,000 physically handicapped persons a year. In other words—and I intend to stress this matter when I speak on the subject of social security, too—we have not made any dent whatsoever in the backlog of more than 2 million physically handicapped persons; and at the present time we are taking care, through rehabilitation, of less than 25 percent of the annual increase of 250,000. Those figures are very, very conservative.

At the hearings which the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has been holding over the years, it has been testified that for every dollar the Federal Government spends on the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped, the Government recoups $5 in the form of taxes and other contributions made by the men and women who have been rehabilitated and who, because of rehabilitation, again become self-supporting and contributing members of society.

I have never understood the logic of being so niggardly in our appropriations for the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped. In all the discussions we have had, I have been met by the same argument as the one to which the Senator from Oregon has referred, namely, that it is impossible to obtain sufficient personnel to train the physically handicapped. Of course, without trained personnel, very little headway can be made in rehabilitating the physically handicapped.

I wonder whether the Senator from Alabama feels that an increase in this appropriation, by means of the adoption of an amendment calling for, let us say, an increase of $1 million in the item for training and traineeships, would be perfectly practical and advisable. Small appropriations for the purpose do not make sense to me, when we are told that for every dollar spent to rehabilitate the physically handicapped men and women, the Government gets back $5 through tax receipts and in other ways. Yet we refuse to provide more than a niggardly amount for training and traineeships, which constitute the key to this situation, as I believe the Senator from Alabama will agree.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have deep sympathy with all that the Senator from New York has said, and I wish to see this program move forward just as expeditiously as possible.

Last year the appropriation for this item was $2,075,000.

Mr. LEHMAN. I realize that.

Mr. HILL. And this year the committee has recommended an appropriation of $2,950,000, or an increase of almost $900,000. Then we went further, and earmarked $200,000 for a prosthetics-education program.

The committee considered this item very carefully. The committee also voted to add $2 million to the grants to the States.

As chairman of the committee, and in view of the consideration the committee gave to this item, I do not believe I would be in a position at this time to accept the amendment suggested by the Senator from New York, because the committee did consider this item; it provided for appropriations amounting to $875,000 more than those made last year, and it earmarked $200,000 for a prosthetics-education program.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will not the senior Senator from Alabama agree with me that there was much testimony from highly responsible medical persons, lay persons, social workers, and others, that for every dollar invested by the Government in the rehabilitation of the

physically handicapped, the Government would recoup several times that amount?

Mr. HILL. The testimony before the legislative committee, to which the Senator referred, as well as the testimony before the Appropriations Committee, showed that this program is a good investment, that it pays off well. We considered the testimony of the representatives of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. I do not think we have a finer, more devoted public servant than Miss Mary Switzer, Director of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. We considered the testimony of the other witnesses, and after considering it we provided $875,000 more than was provided for last year. It was the consensus of the committee that that was the sum which was justified for this year.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Will not the Senator from Alabama agree with me that the question of providing trained personnel—and they can be trained only if they receive training through traineeships—is the key to this situation?

Mr. HILL. There must be trainers and teachers to do the job. As the Senator knows, in years past we have had testimony from Dr. Howard Rusk, of New York, on the subject of training these workers. We had excellent testimony on this subject this year from Miss Mary Switzer. I know that members of the committee are most sympathetic toward this program. I do not know of anyone in the United States who has a deeper interest in this subject than has the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER]. After consideration in a most sympathetic way, the committee arrived at the figure of $875,000. As the agent of the committee, I do not believe that I am in a position to accept an amendment calling for additional funds at this time.

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course, I do not wish to press an amendment which does not meet with the approval of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. I understand that, while he is entirely in sympathy with the point of view I have expressed, he does not feel that he can take the amendment to conference, as I had hoped he would do.

Mr. HILL. The distinguished Senator from New York and I serve on the legislative committee together. He knows how sympathetic both of us feel toward the program of rehabilitation.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. I commend the Senator from Oregon for raising this issue; also I commend the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. HILL]. We are all very much concerned over this program.

Is it not a fact that the administration asked for the maximum amount for this purpose, and that the amount has been reduced? If we had followed the administration's recommendation, there would be no cut in this item.

Mr. MORSE. My understanding is just the opposite.

Mr. HILL. We did not cut the administration's figure for this program. The truth is that the budget estimate—the administration figure—was $2,750,000. The pending bill, as recommended by the Senator Committee on Appropriations and the subcommittee, provides $2,950,000. So the item is $200,000 more than the recommendation of the administration.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Alabama, the Senator from Michigan, and I felt that perhaps the amount should be more, but there was a question as to how many trainees could be obtained. The question of trainees was raised by the Senator from New York and the Senator from Oregon. Those in charge of the program will take another look at the situation. I believe the members of the subcommittee resolved in their own minds that if more personnel could be obtained, we would allow more money in a supplemental bill. However, because of the difficulty in obtaining personnel, it was felt that there would be difficulty in using more than the amount recommended.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr LEHMAN. I know the great sympathy the Senator from Washington has for this program. I know that it is his own personal desire, as it is the desire of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and myself, to allow larger appropriations for the program.

So far as concerns the testimony of those who say they will study the subject further and see whether or not more trainees can be obtained, I have heard that argument in the legislative committee for 7 years. Undoubtedly that argument was made long before I came to the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It was not a question of further study. The question involved the search for more personnel.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. I commend my colleague from Washington and all the other Senators who have spoken on this subject.

I think I am correct in saying that the administration initiated the request for additional appropriations, and it asked for what it thought it could get. The fact is that the administration has evidenced an interest and a concern in the entire program. I appreciate the contributions of Senators to this discussion. The need for this program is most urgent.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am speaking about a problem with which we have been dealing in the Senate for the entire period of 12 years during which I have been a Member of this body. This is an annual problem. We have been seeking for 12 years to increase the appropriation year by year. I am about to ask the Senator from Alabama a few questions about certain action we took several years ago in connection with another subject.

Mr. POTTER rose.

Mr. MORSE. First I yield to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

In response to the inquiry made by the Senator from New York, I think there has been a great increase in interest in physical medicine over the past 3 or 4 years. I thoroughly agree that one of the great needs has been to bring trained people into the field of physical medicine. It is difficult to attach a dollar sign to this program and to say whether or not a certain number of trainees can be absorbed at this time with the facilities which are presently available. Senators have knowledge of my interest in this particular field. I should like to see as many trainees as can possibly be trained, as many as can possibly be accommodated with the available facilities.

However, the evidence before the committee was such that we felt that the funds we recommended were sufficient at this particular phase. We wish to push these programs as fast as we can. Yet they must be built on a gradual basis, because there are so many tangential factors. The program must be built up as an entirety. I assure the Senator from New York that irrespective of partisanship, the committee is most sympathetic toward his own viewpoint. Our physical medicine program should have the personnel which it needs.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I appreciate what the Senator from Michigan has said. I am depending somewhat on my memory as to the testimony which was given last year. If my recollection is not playing me false, it was testified, I believe, by Dr. Rusk that in the entire country there were only 72 experts trained in the art of rehabilitation, and that 36 of them were in the city of New York.

Mr. POTTER. I think the Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. No matter how many arguments are made, I do not believe that in this great country of 165 million people, most of whom are literate, educated, and interested, we cannot increase beyond the figure of 72 the number who can be trained as experts in rehabilitation. Such an argument does not make sense.

The reason I am emphasizing this point is this: I do not know whether I shall be here next year. If I am not, I hope someone else will continue the fight which many of my colleagues and I have been waging, to bring about an increase in the training program in connection with rehabilitation. That is the key to the entire problem.

I express to the Senator from Alabama and to the committee, my very sincere thanks for having restored the item of $100,000 for salaries and expenses in the Children's Bureau. I believe it will go a long way toward helping to control the great problem of juvenile delinquency.

Mr. HILL. The distinguished Senator from New York appeared before the subcommittee and made a very strong

statement in behalf of this item. The committee agreed with the Senator from New York, and we were delighted to restore the item of an additional $100,000 in the appropriation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it will take me only 4 or 5 minutes to complete the legislative history on this particular point that I wish to get into the RECORD. I am making this legislative history on behalf of the two Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON] as well as myself.

The Senate will recall that a few years ago we included in an appropriation bill some funds for the establishment of a rehabilitation pilot plant in Arlington, Va. It is known as the Anderson Clinic. It is a clinic which is community-supported in the sense that many groups in the community have donated their services and many hours of labor toward building up this rehabilitation clinic. It is a clinic which follows the rehabilitation point of view of a great rehabilitator in the American medical profession, Dr. Engh, who holds to the point of view that when a disabled patient enters the hospital for treatment, he should leave the hospital rehabilitated. In other words, under one roof, so to speak, there should be provided medical care and a retraining of muscles and a retraining of the rest of the body of a person who has been crippled or who has suffered a great injury, and he should be physically rehabilitated for a gainful occupation. Dr. Engh contends that muscular training should go on at the same time the patient is being medically cured; and that whether his new job is to be that of watch repairing or furniture repairing or upholstery, all the rehabilitation should take place under one roof.

To that end, the service clubs in Alexandria and Arlington and church groups and labor groups have donated their services for some time in building up this great pilot plant, to determine what can be done in the field of vocational rehabilitation under the so-called one-roof approach.

I should also like to stress, as I have in the past, the Federal interest that is involved. Let us consider for example, civil service employees of the Federal Government who have suffered a great injury; and, to use a hypothetical case, let us suppose that this afternoon a civil service employee in the Department of Justice falls down an open elevator shaft and is badly crippled as a result. Under this proposed program, the Anderson Clinic can serve as a rehabilitation center for that civil service employee.

Therefore there is that Federal interest and, in my opinion, a Federal responsibility to make sure that that kind of rehabilitation center shall be operated.

With what I have said thus far as a review of our debates of the past, I wish to read a very brief statement and then ask for comments by the Senator from Alabama on the statement, for the purpose of legislative history. My concern, as the Senator will see, is over the word "initial" in past legislation. It raises a question as to whether the initial appropriations are to be looked upon as temporary appropriations, or whether we shall continue to support this pilot plant so long as it can demonstrate, as it has demonstrated in the past, a very sound use for every Federal dollar which goes into it.

The restoration of $2 million to the original budget request of $37 million for "Grants to States and Other Agencies" will enable the Federal Government and local people to carry on the work of the pilot demonstration and rehabilitation center in the metropolitan Washington area which the Senator from Alabama and I, as well as the Senators from Virgina, have followed so closely in recent years.

The House recommendation of $35 million would have been short $2 million and, as indicated in the memorandum of appeal filed by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, would have excluded an item of $200,000 requested by that agency for support of the national pilot demonstration center authorized by section 4 (b) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

It is encouraging to me to read the testimony of Miss Mary Switzer, Director of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, on this point. On March 12, 1956, Miss Switzer testified before the Senator's subcommittee and when she was asked by the Senator from Alabama for a report on the status of the national pilot demonstration project, in Arlington, Va., the following colloquy occurred:

Senator HILL. Could you tell us the status of that project now?

Miss SWITZER. Well, that project is going forward. Of course, I should say that the $2 million has in it an amount, as nearly as we can estimate, that would be necessary to carry this project forward as we spoke of it last year.

The building is progressing. The organization of the staff is proceeding. Dr. Engh has, I think, now, all of the key members of the rehabilitation staff team on board and he is hoping to get the rounded-out program under way by late spring. He did not use as much money this year as he thought he was going to, but he was made a grant of about $200,000, and we have tentatively thought that perhaps that level of support, perhaps a little more, if things move along, would be about what he would want next year, to carry forward on the plans we have all agreed to. Of course, that money would be in the $2 million requested for special research projects and, if $1 million is cut it wouldn't be possible to do anything at all, I think, to carry on what we have given him. It wouldn't be possible to go forward. It is very important from that end that it be restored.

Senator HILL. Of course, that project is just an example of the number of other projects throughout the country.

Miss SWITZER. Yes; and this project we hope will have far-reaching results as a demonstration project, and eventually as a training center for much-needed personnel.

Based upon the testimony given by Miss Switzer on March 12, does the Senator from Alabama feel that there is any danger that the Arlington pilot demonstration project would be dropped by the Federal Government in the near future?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I would say to the Senator from Oregon absolutely not. In a case like this, when the Federal Government invests large sums of money, when the Federal Government has received such complete cooperation, when there has been an investment of such large sums of money on the part of the people of the community, when we have the benefit of the skilled guidance and direction which has been supplied by Dr. Engh, and when the project has been so worthwhile and so beneficial, and doing all that we hoped it would do, I would say there is no likelihood of such a worthwhile project being dropped on short notice.

Mr. MORSE. I was certain that that would be the position of the Senator from Alabama, but I thought it was very important to have this legislative history made. I have one more point.

Section 4 (b) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act refers to the fact that "sums made available for such a pilot demonstration center in the Washington area may be used during such initial period as the Secretary may deem for such services as hospitalization, domiciliary care, and rehabilitation training and other services essential to the program, as in the discretion of the Secretary deemed desirable."

Does the Senator from Alabama regard the word "initial" as used in the language just quoted as being susceptible to the interpretation that the pilot demonstration center for the metropolitan Washington area could be abandoned within a few years insofar as future Federal appropriations are concerned?

Mr. HILL. I would say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon, no, indeed. The word "initial" as used in connection with a pilot demonstration center of this type would be construed, it seems to me, in connection with the context in which it appears. In the language just quoted, reference is made to a pilot demonstration center. The program of such a center is necessarily of long-range variety. It takes years to build up a full program in a facility of this type. In my opinion, it would be most unreasonable if the Federal Government were to withdraw assistance to this project within a short span of years after the Government, local organizations, and individuals have devoted so much money and such great efforts toward bringing this center into the fine operating unit that it is today.

I would say further to my distinguished friend from Oregon that, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare of the Committee on Appropriations, I would bend every effort to increase and extend the facilities of this pilot demonstration project. An effort to cut it off summarily from Federal assistance would meet strong objections on my part, and I am sure that there are many other Senators who would join in such objection.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much. I was sure his position was as he has stated it, but I thought, for the purpose of clarification, in behalf of the two Senators from Virginia, we should make this legislative history today.

In yielding the floor, Mr. President, I wish to say, without one syllable of flattery in my language, that I think the entire Senate is greatly indebted to the Senator from Alabama and to the members of the subcommittee for what I think is one of the most progressive steps

of statesmanship, so far as appropriations are concerned, that I have ever seen taken by the Senate of the United States in my 12 years as a Member of this body.

Mr. President. when we pass this appropriation bill we shall be carrying out what, after all, is the most important function of the United States Senate, namely, in fulfilling our oath of office, to do those things which will promote human values, because this great political society of ours was organized and designed to protect and to promote such values. That is what we mean, Mr. President, when we talk about this country of ours, under the Constitution, as a country with a government of the people. If it is to be a government of the people, the elected representatives of the people must always do those things which are necessary to protect the human values we find symbolized by the people. When we do a task such as this, I think we participate in a rich spiritual experience, because here today we are answering to the American people as we should answer to them in carrying out our responsibilities of promoting the general welfare by appropriating the largest sum of money which has ever been appropriated by the Senate of the United States in the field of human endeavor where we seek to extend a helping hand to those in our citizenry who are less fortunately situated. We should keep in mind that only by the grace of God are we able to sit here today in our state of health, and that we owe a responsibility to those who are not so fortunate, and should be willing and glad to live up to what I call the great moral obligation of the elected representatives of a free people to do for the public welfare what the facts show need to be done.

Under the leadership of the Senator from Alabama, Mr. President, I think the Senate of the United States has risen to great spiritual heights.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODES OF 1939 AND 1954—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6143) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that for taxable years beginning after May 31, 1950, certain amounts received in consideration of the transfer of patent rights shall be considered capital gain regardless of the basis upon which such amounts are paid. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6143) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that for taxable years beginning after May 31, 1950, certain amounts received in consideration of the transfer of patent rights shall be considered capital gain regardless of the basis upon which such amounts are paid, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 3.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 2 of the Senate engrossed amendments, beginning with "For" in line 5, strike out all through line 12, and in lieu thereof insert the following: "In applying section 291 (a) (relating to additions to the tax for failure to file a return) in any case to which paragraph (b) of this section applies, the term 'reasonable cause' shall include the filing of a timely incomplete return under circumstances which led the taxpayer to believe that no tax was due on amounts received under a settlement with the United States.

"(b) The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1948, notwithstanding the operation of any law or rule of law (other than section 3760 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 or section 7121 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to closing agreements, and other than section 3761 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 or section 7122 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to compromises). Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, no claim for credit or refund of any overpayment resulting from the amendment made by this section shall be allowed or made after the period of limitation applicable to such overpayment, except that such period shall not expire before the expiration of one year after the date of the enactment of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: On page 3 of the Senate engrossed amendments, beginning with line 12, strike out all through line 24 and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"(2) If any portion of a distribution of property by a corporation to its shareholders, with respect to its stock, is a dividend solely by reason of the last sentence of subsection (a), then—

"(A) paragraph (1) shall not apply to such distribution, but

"(B) such distribution shall be considered to be a distribution which is not a dividend (whether or not otherwise a dividend) to the extent that the fair market value of such property exceeds the Subchapter A net income referred to in the last sentence of subsection (a), adjusted as provided in such sentence.

In applying this paragraph, distributions described in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (3) shall be taken into account before other distributions."

On page 4 of the Senate engrossed amendments, in line 12, strike out "1939." and in lieu thereof insert the following: "1939, except that it shall not apply to any taxable year of a shareholder which was a corporation and which filed a return for such year reporting dividends in accordance with publicly announced litigation policies of the Secretary or his delegate which had not been revoked at the time such return was filed."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 4. Trademark and trade name expenditures.

"(a) Part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by inserting after section 176 thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 177. Trademark and trade name expenditures.

"'(a) Election to amortize: Any trademark or trade name expenditure paid or incurred during a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1955, may, at the election of the taxpayer (made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate), be treated as a deferred expense. In computing taxable income, all expenditures paid or incurred during the taxable year which are so treated shall be allowed as a deduction ratably over such period of not less than 60 months (beginning with the first month in such taxable year) as may be selected by the taxpayer in making such election. The expenditures so treated are expenditures properly chargeable to capital account for purposes of section 1016 (a) (1) (relating to adjustments to basis of property).

"'(b) TRADEMARK AND TRADE NAME EXPENDITURES DEFINED.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term "trademark or trade name expenditure" means any expenditure which—

"'(1) is directly connected with the acquisition, protection, expansion, registration (Federal, State, or foreign), or defense of a trademark or trade name;

"'(2) is chargeable to capital account; and

"'(3) is not part of the consideration paid for a trademark, trade name, or business.

"'(c) TIME FOR AND SCOPE OF ELECTION.—The election provided by subsection (a) shall be made within the time prescribed by law (including extensions thereof) for filing the return for the taxable year during which the expenditure is paid or incurred. The period selected by the taxpayer under subsection (a) with respect to the expenditures paid or incurred during the taxable year which are treated as deferred expenses shall be adhered to in computing his taxable income for the taxable year for which the election is made and all subsequent years.

"'(d) Cross reference:

"'For adjustments to basis of property for amounts allowed as deductions for expenditures treated as deferred expenses under this section, see section 1016 (a) (16).'

"(b) The table of sections of part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof

"'SEC. 177. Trademark and trade name expenditures.'

"(c) Subsection (a) of section 1016 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to adjustments to basis) is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (15) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by adding at the end of such subsection the following new paragraph:

"'(16) for amounts allowed as deductions for expenditures treated as deferred expenses under section 177 (relating to trademark and trade name expenditures) and resulting in a reduction of the taxpayer's taxes under this subtitle, but not less than the amounts allowable under such section for the taxable year and prior years.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted

by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 5. Livestock sold on account of drought.

"(a) Section 1033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to involuntary conversions) is hereby amended by redesignating subsection (f) thereof as subsection (g) and by inserting after subsection (e) of such section the following new subsection:

"'(f) Livestock sold on acount of drought: For purposes of this subtitle, the sale or exchange of livestock (other than poultry) held by a taxpayer for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes in excess of the number the taxpayer would sell if he followed his usual business practices shall be treated as an involuntary conversion to which this section applies if such livestock are sold or exchanged by the taxpayer solely on acount of drought.'

"(b) The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1955, but only in the case of sales and exchanges of livestock after December 31, 1955."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

HARRY F. BYRD,
By R. S. K.,
ROBT. S. KERR,
J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.,
E. D. MILLIKIN,
EDWARD MARTIN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JERE COOPER,
W. D. MILLS,
NOBLE J. GREGORY,
DANIEL A. REED,
THOMAS JENKINS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I assume the Senator from Oklahoma has conferred with the minority leader?

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. POTTER. I have no objection, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I should like to call up for the consideration of the Senate the conference report on H. R. 6143.

The conferees accepted with clarifying and technical changes all of the Senate amendments to the bill except amendment No. 3, which would have eliminated the transportation excise tax on amounts paid for the transportation of poultry from the farm to a local processing plant. This amendment was not accepted by the conferees because of difficulties in applying the exemption and because the conference was informed by the Department of Agriculture that the amendment would disrupt traditional practices of marketing poultry.

The first Senate amendment relates to limiting the surtax on amounts received on unpaid claims from the United States. The conferees made certain clarifying changes to this amendment to better carry out its purpose.

The second Senate amendment provides that corporate distributions of property shall not be taxed as dividends to the extent that the distributions exceed the earnings and profits of the distributing corporation. The conferees made a clarifying change consistent with the purposes of the amendment to take care of certain problems affecting personal holding companies and further provided that the amendment was not to affect taxpayers who filed their returns in accordance with publicly announced policies of the Internal Revenue Service.

The third Senate amendment, as previously explained, was not adopted by the conferees.

The fourth Senate amendment permits taxpayers to amortize over a period of at least 5 years expenditures connected with trade names and trademarks. The conferees made various technical and clarifying changes in this amendment in order to conform it with similar provisions in the Internal Revenue Code by adding specific provisions relating to basis and the starting time of the amortization period.

The fifth Senate amendment would permit farmers selling livestock on account of drought conditions to defer reporting gain if the amounts received are reinvested in similar livestock at a later time and such sales occurred in areas determined by the President and the Department of Agriculture to be entitled to emergency drought relief. The conferees amended this provision to eliminate the area determination required by the President and the Department of Agriculture in order that farmers not living in emergency relief areas could come within the provisions of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9720) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I wish to express my commendation for the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare and Labor, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama, for the magnificent job he has done in handling the appropriations bill now before the Senate. Perhaps the most evident proof of the tremendous amount of work he put into this bill is gained in a glance at the bound hearings, the thickness of which I believe is one of the greatest of all appropriations hearings.

How he presided so intelligently, patiently, understandingly, efficiently, and effectively for many weeks is indicated in the printed record of the hearings. But that does not tell the entire story. It would not be possible to express in words the true character of his performance as chairman of the subcommittee. I think I can speak with greater conviction than anyone else on this point, since I attended practically all of the hearings and was second only to him in attendance.

His performance is best summed up by saying that the senior Senator from Alabama has truly done his country a wonderful service on the objective of improving the welfare, the health, the education, and the working conditions, not only of the Nation, but individually of the 167 million Americans.

Republican leadership on the subcommittee has been admirably provided by the senior Senator from Minnesota, who for many years has been acknowledged because of his great work to be an informed authority and an unexcelled advocate in the fields of health, welfare, education, and labor. It has been a real honor and distinct privilege to serve under him on this important subcommittee and to follow his leadership.

Praise is also due Mr. Herman E. Downey, who so effectively handled the staff work for the subcommittee. In his quiet manner, he kept the subcommittee well informed and the hearings well organized. Without him the subcommittee surely could not have accomplished what it has.

Mr. President, this year has been my most active year on the Subcommittee on Health and Labor. The increase in my active participation on the subcommittee has meant that I had less time for other subcommittees and committees. Such a shift in the allocation of my committee and subcommittee time has been prompted by my desire and drive for an expansion and extension of medical research.

Last fall I proposed a 5-year medical research program that would increase funds for medical research by $200 million a year. I called it a billion-dollar medical research proposal since the aggregate increase would be $1 billion for the 5-year period.

I proposed a threefold increase and expansion. Leadership on two parts of my proposed program had already been taken by the senior Senator from Alabama and others in the introduction of S. 849 for the construction of laboratories and other medical research facilities and S. 1323 for aid to our medical schools.

I incorporated those two bills with my revisions into an omnibus bill S. 2925 that I introduced—changing the provisions of S. 849 to make the program proposed under it a 5-year program instead of the 3-year program, and increasing the amount to $150 million for the 5-year program instead of the $90 million for the 3-year program in S. 849—and changing the provisions of S. 1323 to increase the authorized funds of that program by $20 million a year from the annual amount of $50 million proposed by S. 1323 to the annual amount of $70 million proposed by my S. 2925.

I have been hoping that the House would act to amend S. 849 to include my proposed upward revision of it by increasing the program from 3 years to 5 years. When S. 1323 comes before the Senate I hope it can be amended to increase the authorized funds as I have proposed on the basis of the estimate made by the National Fund for Medical

Education of which Herbert Hoover is honorary president.

There is nothing basically new in what I offered in these respects and I certainly claim no originality or leadership but rather acknowledge that that is due the senior Senator from Alabama and others. There were only two distinctions. One was that I proposed an increase and an expansion in programs already proposed. The other was that I proposed an integrated omnibus approach instead of the piecemeal, bill-by-bill approach.

The third part of my threefold medical research proposal was to increase the appropriations for the National Institutes of Health from the 1956 amount of $102 million to an amount of $200 million for the next 5 years.

On this objective I want to express my deep gratitude to the subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee for approving an amount that gratifyingly approaches my target of an annual budget of $200 million for the National Institutes of Health since the amount in this bill is $184,437,000—an increase of 80 percent over last year's budget for medical research by the National Institutes of Health.

This action represents a growing realism and perspective on medical research. In fact, it represents a farsightedness on the importance of medical research and of the great dividends that it returns in the lives saved—yes; and in terms of economy, in the dollars of savings returned for each dollar invested in medical research.

To anyone who might feel that too much money is being appropriated in this bill for medical research, I want to address these remarks. First, let me say that my interest in economy and saving has been indelibly registered in my voting in the Senate over the years. Every year that the Council of State Chambers of Commerce has rated Members of Congress on their actual voting records on spending versus economy, it has voted me as one of the top champions of economy in the Senate.

I have looked at medical research first from the humanitarian standpoint and in my emphasis on saving lives—whether in medical research, in highway safety, in the prevention of war, or in other endeavors. But I have also looked at medical research from the standpoint of economic justification—from the standpoint of saving dollars and human resources and of preventing the economic losses which illness and death cause.

To put it to the acid economic test, let us ask the question whether the proposed spending for medical research would be a sound investment for a banker. I think the statistical proof in answer to that question will be found completely convincing.

Over the past decade alone, medical research has added 5 full years to the life expectancy of the average American. Let me repeat that statement, because that fact alone justifies increased spending for medical research. Over the past decade alone, medical research has added 5 full years to the life expectancy of the average American.

This increase, which encompasses a reduction in deaths for all causes of about 10 percent, occurred between 1944 and 1952. We all know something of the wonders of penicillin, streptomycin, isoniazid, cortisone, and a host of other battlers against disease. I am confident that the results of these miraculous products of medical research have been personally witnessed by each Member of this body with their families or friends.

Along with new surgical techniques and blood plasma, the new drugs have brought about these percentage reductions in the death rates of some of the major killers and cripplers: Influenza, 77 percent; appendicitis, 69 percent; acute rheumatic fever, 66 percent; syphilis, 56 percent; tuberculosis, 50 percent; pneumonia, 50 percent; and kidney diseases, 43 percent.

Now let us translate these figures into terms which a hard-headed businessman can appreciate. During the 8 years I have mentioned, a total of 845,000 American lives were saved. These 845,000 people, who would have died if research knowledge had remained constant, earned and added approximately $1½ billion to the national income in 1953 alone.

And from these earnings in 1952, the Federal Treasury received approximately $234 million additional in income and excise taxes. Please note that this increase in tax receipts was more than 7 times the $33 million spent on research in 1952 by all the major institutes of the United States Public Health Service.

Putting it very simply, medical research has returned $7 in Federal taxes for every dollar spent by the United States Public Health Service; in other words, a return of $7 for every dollar invested. I ask where an investment will be found that will pay such a return.

It has been officially established that 4 diseases alone—heart, cancer, tuberculosis, and arthritis—have resulted in an annual loss of 370 million man-days of work and that the annual cost to the Nation from all illnesses is roughly equivalent to the total income-tax revenue, or $30 billion a year. In comparison, the $184 million provided for medical research in the bill would seem to be a very modest investment.

Moreover, it would seem to be modest when compared with the $1,700,000,000 which was appropriated for research on military weapons alone in 1954. This is approximately 10 times as much as is provided for medical research in this bill to save lives rather than to create destructive power.

I could speak at great length giving many impressive comparisons and convincing facts, but I believe I have given enough to convince the most skeptical, and I do not wish unduly to delay Senate action on the bill now before us.

Let me conclude my remarks with these pointed and terse observations. When Americans last year spent $10 billion for cocktails and liquor; $5 billion for tobacco; $264 million for chewing gum; $40 million for lipstick; when one of the Armed Forces built up a 25-year supply of hamburgers, and another spent hundreds of millions of dollars on a fighter plane that could not fly—when these things have happened, then I say we can afford to appropriate funds to give our children and our children's children the best in medicine.

Surely this is a wise investment in the future of America—a wise investment that American taxpayers will gladly and unstintingly make and give.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I commend the distinguished Senator from Maine for her remarks relative to the appropriation bill. I know of no Senator other than the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who spent so much time in the committee hearings as did the Senator from Maine. Unfortunately, it was not possible for me to attend all the hearings on the bill, because I was dividing my time between the hearings on military appropriations and the hearings on Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations. But when I was present at the hearings on the appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Senator from Maine was always there, as was the chairman.

Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Maine for her statement that this appropriation is an investment rather than an expenditure. It is an investment in research for health, and for education, and will result in substantial returns for every dollar spent.

I was disappointed today when it became obvious that my amendment to increase the appropriation by $1,500,000 would be defeated. Therefore, I modified the amendment to provide for an increase of $500,000. I feel that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has never been provided with sufficient funds to enable it to do the type of research necessary to carry on progressively aid to education, so that our youth may become qualified to assume the great responsibilities which they must assume as they enter upon adult years. We are living in a mechanical age, an age requiring highly scientific and specialized qualifications in everyday life.

Again I offer my commendation to the Senator from Maine for her services on the Committee on Appropriations, as I offer them also to the Senator from Alabama, the chairman of the subcommittee, who is also chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which deals with the legislative questions in this field.

Mr. President, it has been a real pleasure to have listened to the remarks of the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. If my distinguished colleague from Alabama will permit me to thank the Senator from Minnesota for his very generous remarks concerning me, I shall be glad to yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. HILL. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Maine for her very kind and generous words about the Senator from Alabama. It has not only been a pleasure, but it has been an inspiration, to serve on the committee with her. She was at the meetings of the

committee day after day. She was always there taking an active part in the hearings, and vigorously participating in the work of the committee, and making many fine contributions to the deliberations of the committee.

Mr. President, it is said that where there is no vision, the people perish. I only wish we had more people with the vision of the Senator from Maine. She demonstrated it time and time again in our work on the bill. She was tremendously helpful in every way. I warmly and heartily thank her and commend her.

I also wish to pay tribute to my predecessor as chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. He said he had not been able to attend as many meetings of the committee as he would have liked to attend, because of conflicting meetings of other committees. The Senator from Minnesota has labored so long and so valiantly in the vineyard and in the great work of the committee that, whether he is able to attend meetings when hearings are held or not, he has such a wonderful store of information and he has so much knowledge of the matters which confront us that he is tremendously helpful in the work of the committee. I want to commend him heartily.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I should like to thank my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the subcommittee. The reason why there is before the Senate such a fine bill, which provides for constructive progress in the matter of medical research, is that the cooperative spirit evident here this afternoon has been seen every day in the committee.

Mr. NEUBERGER obtained the floor.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For what purpose does the Senator from Michigan arise?

Mr. POTTER. I should like to send an amendment to the desk.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield to the Senator from Michigan for that purpose.

Mr. POTTER. I send an amendment to the desk, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, line 10, it is proposed to strike out the "$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,100,000."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I may say I have discussed the amendment with the Senator from Michigan. It does not add $1 to the appropriation. It does make it possible to have a better inspection and a little closer watch on the expenditure of many millions of dollars which will go into the construction of new schools in federally impacted areas.

Therefore, I shall be happy to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for his usual courtesy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared in connection with the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR POTTER

I offer an amendment under the head "Assistance for School Construction."

This amendment does not constitute an additional appropriation of funds. It is merely an increase in an authorization to use funds previously appropriated. The item concerns the technical services which are provided by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator in connection with the design and construction of school buildings in federally impacted areas.

I believe that the committee amendment on this item did not fully take account of the present situation. I am advised that these are the facts:

1. The 1957 authorization request in the budget was a reduction of more than 50 percent from the current year, on the assumption that workload would be less in similar measure.

2. In fact, the construction inspection workload has increased by almost one-third over expectations as a result of factors beyond the control of the Agency.

3. If the budget estimate is not restored, the Agency would not be in the position to maintain an adequate staff of field engineers to perform an effective job of project supervision. Engineering inspection at the project site would have to be cut from the present average of about 1 per construction month to an average of about 1 every 2 to 3 months.

It seems to me that everyone concerned will suffer if adequate inspection and engineering services are not provided. The local school authorities and the Office of Education would get very little effective technical assistance and the risk of defective or inferior construction would be materially increased. There would be less effective enforcement of prevailing wage requirements; there would be delays in payments to local contractors as Government engineers come to the project site at greater intervals to inspect and certify work in place.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, before I relinquish the floor, and if the distinguished Senator from Alabama will bear with me, I, as a junior member of the subcommittee, should also like to pay tribute to the Senator for the work of the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

He has a profound knowledge of many of the health problems which come before the committee. He has more than a layman's knowledge; he has almost a professional knowledge of many health problems with which the committee is confronted.

Likewise, I should like to pay my respects to the distinguished ranking minority member of the subcommittee the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who has worked for many years on the problems involved in the bill. The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] has had the main responsibility for our side of the aisle in carrying on the work of the committee. If I recall correctly, it was the senior Senator from Maine who offered the amendment in the subcommittee to increase the funds for the Institutes of Health. Her leadership has been a great inspiration to the other members of the committee. She also has a deep knowledge in this field.

It was with a great sense of pride that I, as a junior member of the subcommittee, learned that the committee is a thoughtful one, which considers the problem before it not on a partisan basis, but having in mind the best interests and the welfare of the country.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks about the Senator from Alabama. I wish also to say, as one who has the privilege of being chairman of the subcommittee, that the distinguished Senator from Michigan has been one of the most faithful and devoted members of the subcommittee. He has always tried to do his part of the work of the subcommittee, and has made very splendid contributions to it. If this team has been in any way a winning team, much of the credit for what it has done must go to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. I thank my distinguished friend, and I thank the Senator from Oregon for yielding to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] on page 17, line 10.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, there are several questions which I believe are important to the future of appropriations in the vital field of health. I am not going to take the time of the Senate to add to the encomiums which have been paid to the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and other Senators.

I should like to say that perhaps the last grim and terrible riddle of our time, next to the permanent elimination of war, is the cure of diseases which have thus far failed to submit to successful medical care. It is an anomaly that man can master the waters of the sea, master the air, and master almost all of his environment, and yet there are diseases which, when persons are stricken by them, result in their being virtually, if not literally, under the sentence of death.

I was impressed, in listening to the eloquent and able remarks of the Senator from Maine, when she pointed out how we had made gains in life expectancy for the average person. Compared to that achievement, it seems to me that other things, such as may be done by this Congress, are trifling indeed. If something can be done to add to the comfort of people in their later years, in their ability to live longer, nothing else has much relevancy compared to that almost cosmic achievement.

This is what I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. The most terrible disease of our time, insofar as it strikes large numbers of people, is cancer and the allied diseases, such as leukemia, which the chairman of the subcommittee has mentioned.

The committee has provided a substantial gain in the appropriation for the National Cancer Institute in the field of cancer research. I regret that the advances are not as great as those proposed by the Senator from Maine [Mrs.

SMITH], but certainly they are increases which must be respected and admired, because the sum of $48,432,000 is virtually twice that provided in the 1956 appropriation. Certainly very few committees have voted to double a fund from one fiscal year to the next.

All of us recall that in the field of atomic energy, for decades men spoke of the time when the atom would be cracked, or expressed the hope that it might be cracked; and that subject was discussed by great scientists such as Dr. Einstein and his associates, in Europe, and great scientists in the United States. Then, suddenly, President Roosevelt, pressed by the urgency of war, set aside $2 billion, I believe, which was assigned to the Manhattan project; and the atom was cracked, and there has come about the most terrible weapon mankind has ever developed and also some new methods of treating disease. Is it not possible that in the future, instead of providing $48 million for cancer research, if we were to provide hundreds of millions of dollars for cancer research, with the control and cure of cancer as a goal, we might thus bring nearer the time when this terrible disease will be conquered?

Mr. HILL. Of course money is a very important factor; but in and of itself, money will not do the job, as the Senator from Oregon knows. In addition, there must be sufficient personnel and there must be devotion and talent and genius and hard work.

We arrived at the figure $48,432,000 on the basis of testimony from what we believed to be the best brains in this field. There appeared before us Dr. Harry Weaver, of the American Cancer Society, and Dr. Sidney Farber, a member of the National Advisory Council of the Cancer Institute, and one who has devoted his life in Boston, Mass., to endeavoring to find the answer to leukemia. We also had before us Dr. Wendell Stanley, of the University of California. I may say that in 1946 he won a Nobel prize in chemistry. We had the benefit of the testimony of those men and other men of that type. We said to them, "Give us the story; tell us what you can do; tell us what you need; tell us how far we can go and what can be done." We accepted, and we have recommended, the amounts they proposed; and the pending bill contains the top amounts they believed could be used at this time in the fight on cancer.

I wish to say that we are making progress. I do not wish to be too optimistic; but the evidence before our committee shows that we are making progress in this battle.

Earlier in my remarks I referred to the fact that a year ago Dr. Cornelius P. Rhoads, who is the head of the Sloan-Kettering Cancer Institute of New York, and also the head of the Memorial Hospital in New York, testified before us, and showed us some white mice in which cancer had been induced. This year we were shown photographs of a mouse which had had cancer, but from which, through the use of chemicals and chemical compounds, the cancer had been eradicated. Of course, as the Senator from Oregon knows, the fact that a mouse is cured of cancer does not necessarily mean that similar treatment with chemical compounds will achieve the same results in human beings.

But a year ago we provided the necessary funds and setup, under the chairmanship of Dr. Sidney Farber, a committee on chemotherapy, or on the use of chemicals or drugs in the field of chemistry, and having particularly to do with studies of the chemistry of the human body. That committee is carrying forward its work at this time. We asked the members of the committee how much money they needed. The amounts voted by the committee represent the top figures they recommended to us.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In other words, those eminent medical scientists and physical scientists did not believe that additional funds would bring any nearer the time when this grim disease will be controlled?

Mr. HILL. That is certainly the deduction I drew.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask a further question. Of course, I know the chairman of the committee is much more experienced and wise in this respect than I am. Although looking toward the situation in the next fiscal year, would not it be advisable for the committee, together with the scientists who advise it and who are allied with it, to consider in the next fiscal year the fact that even the gains, particularly in the field of cancer, which have been made as a result of the appropriations made thus far, are but a beginning in the march toward an ultimate goal?

Mr. HILL. Yes, this represents an onward march.

To illustrate what I have in mind, let me say that the funds recommended in this bill for appropriation for this item—namely, $48,432,000—are twice the amount appropriated for the present fiscal year in connection with the fight we are waging against the insidious disease of cancer. These funds represent another great, forward step in this battle. When the researchers, scientists, doctors, and technicians testify before our committee next year, we shall be prepared to go along with them in continuing this forward march and in increasing it and expanding and expediting it wherever possible.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, before I yield the floor, I would like to mention that at the present time Mrs. Neuberger and I are the immediate next-door neighbors of the Surgeon General of the United States. In the words of the fable, I am sure that the ears of the Senator from Alabama and other Senators would burn if they could have heard the Surgeon General talk, the other day, upon his return from Europe, about the work being done there in this most important field.

Cancer inspires such justifiable fear among the people, that I believe that any funds, no matter how large, appropriated by the Government for work in the field of cancer research, would be supported by the American people. No matter what sacrifices would be required of the people as a result of the making of such appropriations, they would be supported by the taxpayers of the United States, if someone such as the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], were to certify to them that he was informed by our medical and physical scientists that such funds could be used to good advantage.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that according to the testimony before our committee, unless we can do something more about cancer than we have been able to do thus far, 40 million Americans now living will have cancer; and out of those 40 million, approximately 25 percent will be able to undergo successful treatment, either by surgery or by radiation. In the case of another 25 percent having cancer of that type, successful treatment of that sort will be impossible, because in their case the disease will have advanced too far. Of course, the insidious thing about cancer is that all too often, pain is not felt until it is too late to provide successful treatment. The remaining 50 percent will have some form of cancer which, today, we do not know how to treat.

As I have pointed out, the funds recommended for this purpose by the committee are twice as large as the funds appropriated for this item for the present fiscal year.

We are advancing; we are marching forward; we are definitely making progress.

I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for his great interest in this matter and for the very fine support he gives the committee and gives to the cause of waging the battle not only against cancer, but also against all the other terrible diseases which cause so much misery and suffering and so often result in death.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have learned a great deal today from the chairman of the committee. I doubt if there can be any greater challenge in our time than that to which he and his committee have responded.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and his fellow members, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and others, in giving recognition to the great humanitarian program exemplified by the expansion in health activities, not only in connection with research, but in connection with Indian health, and many other features of the bill. I am certain that the increase in expenditures will result in new gains on new fronts, in connection with diseases with respect to which a cure was believed impossible.

With specific reference to the attention which the Senator from Alabama has given to the problem of education, is it not a fact that in increasing by more than $3 million the appropriations of last year for the development of vocational education we are bringing the appropriations up to the limit of the authorizations for the great vocational education program?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. The Senator will recall that he appeared

before our subcommittee at the time we were holding hearings, and made a strong and eloquent plea to the subcommittee, recommending the full appropriation authorized by law. The committee has done the very thing which the Senator from Oklahoma so strongly urged it to do.

Mr. MONRONEY. Has not the committee also provided, by reallocation of the unused portions of funds allocated to the States, for an additional half million dollars, approximately, which otherwise could not have been utilized, and now will be reapportioned to the States desiring to make the maximum use of this great program?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. That, in effect, will be the result of the committee's recommendation if the provision now written into the bill becomes law.

Mr. MONRONEY. Those of us who know the Senator best know of the leadership which he has always given to this fine program, which is giving emphasis and accent to farm leadership, through Future-Farmer Clubs, vocational business education clubs, and other activities which create a reservoir of great skills which otherwise might not have been created had it not been for the great program of vocational education.

The distinguished Senator also has the privilege of heading the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I should like to ask him a question. If next year efforts are made to increase the authorizations for vocational education, will the Senator look with favor upon an expansion of that program?

Mr. HILL. Let me say to my distinguished friend from Oklahoma that I share his deep interest in the cause of vocational education. In connection with any movement for the expansion of vocational education programs, I assure the Senator that he will find most sympathetic response from the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. MONRONEY. We must consider increased authorizations to meet the needs of school districts which wish to expand their programs in this field. These districts in turn usually pay for two-thirds of the cost of the program, the Federal Government paying only a third or a fourth of the cost. Thus, I hope consideration will be given, as the new authorization legislation is prepared, to adding to the vocational agricultural program and the other vocational programs a new program of basic science instruction in high schools.

Otherwise, these schools could not offer instruction in the basic sciences. I am sure the distinguished Senator realizes that not only in defense work, in aviation, in engineering, in nuclear science, in physics, and in medicine, but in connecton with almost every other branch of science, there are ever-increasing needs for more and more scientists. Our schools, particularly the smaller ones, are unable to provide laboratories, classrooms, and, above all, science teachers to give the foundation courses upon which the higher branches of science must rest.

It is the good fortune of the Senate that the distinguished Senator from Alabama is chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I wonder if, in his other capacity, he would give consideration to adding basic science to the vocational education program.

Mr. HILL. There is no more devoted or tireless friend of vocational education than the Senator from Oklahoma. He is always on the battleline fighting for vocational education. Not only do I believe that such consideration can be given in connection with basic sciences, but I think it should be given.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator for his kind words, and also for the assurance that a study will be made in connection with the bill which my colleague [Mr. KERR] and I have introduced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 9720) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HILL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. THYE, Mr. MUNDT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. POTTER conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSTRUCTION OF MODERN GREAT LAKES BULK CARGO VESSELS—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for myself and the distinguished minority leader, and with the approval of the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], I submit a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That, effective on Wednesday, June 6, 1956, at the conclusion of routine morning business, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 3108) to encourage the construction of modern Great Lakes bulk-cargo vessels, and that debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the proposed unanimous-consent agreement shall be agreed to by the Senate, then after the Great Lakes bulk-cargo vessels bill has been disposed of, it is planned to call up H. R. 9536, the general Government matters appropriation bill, and H. R. 9739, the independent offices appropriation bill.

When those bills have been disposed of, it is hoped that the Senate will have available the report and the hearings on the social-security bill, which will be made the unfinished business.

The distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], chairman of the Committee on Finance, will make the opening statement on the social-security bill on Thursday next.

I call this to the attention of all Senators so that they may adjust their plans accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered.

ADDRESS BY FORMER SENATOR STROM THURMOND BEFORE SOUTH CAROLINA JUNIOR STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a speech made by Senator Strom Thurmond at Myrtle Beach, S. C., before the annual convention of the junior State chamber of commerce on May 20.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT PRICE FRIENDS?

(Address by Strom Thurmond to the annual convention of the junior State chamber of commerce, at Myrtle Beach, S. C., May 20, 1956)

President Risher, distinguished guests, members of the junior chamber of commerce, and other friends, it is a pleasure to have the opportunity to speak to this fine group at your annual convention. It is rare that we find a dynamic community program under way which is not being spearheaded by young men like yourselves. Certainly the Jaycees of South Carolina have distinguished themselves as young men who know how to get a job done. The excellent result of these endeavors has been the molding of South Carolina into a better State in which to live.

Even while my duties for the past 2 years have kept me in Washington, I have made it a point to spend as much time as possible among the people of our State. I have been

constantly impressed with the programs supported by the Jaycees. I have witnessed your safety checks on vehicles. I have followed with great interest your efforts to raise the salaries of the teachers of this State. In addition, your programs on mental health, the Voice of Democracy, Our Stake in Better Government, the Teenage Road-E-O, sports, the securing of tourist trade, and the encouragement of industry, have certainly brought lasting results to the people of South Carolina.

It has also been my pleasure to have received many communications from some of your project chairmen, club presidents, State officials, and other leaders, who sought my assistance in your civic endeavors. I hope that you will continue to call upon me for whatever service and encouragement I might render.

While some conventions turn out to be gruelling work, I trust that yours here has been a festive one as well as one of accomplishment. I have already been hearing of the shrewd political maneuvering that characterizes your election of State officers, and I feel sure that this is a healthy situation and one from which you all should benefit.

As you know, I am unopposed in the approaching primary election, and the situation reminds me of a story about two colored women. One of these women was telling her friend that her daughter was going to have a baby, and of course her friend was quite thrilled to learn of this news. The proud mother than added, "And she's married too, and that do make it nice." [Laughter.] Well, I kinda feel like that colored woman—here I am with no opposition, and "that do make it nice."

In a more serious vein, I am deeply humble that the people of South Carolina have seen fit to allow me to become the United States Senator-nominate for the Democratic Party without opposition. As I have said in the past, I will do all within my power to fulfill this responsibility.

I would like to talk with you for a few minutes today about a matter that may at first seem distant to your problems here in South Carolina. Yet I think that you will soon realize, as I have, that this problem is indeed very close to home.

The matter of which I speak is that of foreign aid, and I ask you the question, "What price friends?"

Since the end of World War II this country has poured out $51.3 billion of the American taxpayers' money in foreign aid to nations in every corner of the world.

While we all can recognize the great good that has come from the Marshall plan in the precarious years that followed the close of World War II in 1945, I would remind you that this is 1956—11 years later.

But where are we going today? The Congress is now faced with, and being urged by the administration to pass, a $4.9 billion foreign aid bill for this year alone.

I pose the question again—What price friends? Surely, if we do not know in the beginning that we could not buy friends with dollars, we should certainly know by now.

Only last month we all felt the impact of the heavy tax load imposed upon us as we filed our income tax returns. A reduction in foreign aid would enable us to cut taxes, which are now taking a third of our total income. It would enable us to begin paying our national debt, which is larger than the combined debts of all the nations in the world.

However, before we start using this money, let's examine just where this huge program of support for other countries has brought us today, how many friends we have won and what it has done to strengthen our position in the free world.

We may ask ourselves what has been the result of foreign aid in our close ally Britain, the struggling nation of France, the neutral power of India, Tito's Yugoslavia or a small Asian nation like Ceylon.

First, a close look at the situation in Britain will reveal that one of the worst things that happened to that nation was the $4 billion loan made in 1946, which helped put their Socialist government in office, and later aid helped keep them in office.

Most Britons will tell you that they would have gotten rid of their Socialist government—which brought them to the brink of ruin—much sooner than they finally did without our interference.

The case of France is far more striking. Since the close of World War II this country has given France about $10 billion in economic and military aid. But 26 percent of the people of France, with an average of $1 billion a year in help from the American taxpayers during the past 10 years, voted in favor of the Communists in recent elections.

You might now justifiably ask the question I have been asking—What price friends? What kind of ally is this to depend upon when a half-million American boys are in Europe prepared to give their lives to halt a sweep from the Russians in the east? Truly, we can say that France was a better ally before she received a dime in American foreign aid.

Take the situation in India. Since 1950 this country has shelled out $500 million in aid to this important, and newly independent nation. Now, how do the Indians feel about the United States?

They favor turning Formosa over to the Communists; they are supporting Red China in her fight to gain admission to the United Nations; they have recently entertained the Russian leaders and placed them on exhibition before the world as lovers of peace and nonviolence; they oppose nearly every defense measure employed by this country to keep the Red menace in check.

Recent visitors to India report that there is agitation within that nation for more trade with the Soviets. The press and people ignore American benefactions or take them for granted.

After all our aid to India, after the American taxpayers have dug deep into their pockets—our prestige in India has now fallen to a new low.

A more striking result of the problem surrounding foreign aid was very pointedly made recently when a newspaper of great influence in Ceylon was quoted as saying, "If the United States withdrew its offer of aid that would be the price Ceylon would cheerfully pay to maintain her independence."

This comment is a typical one, for the people of Ceylon—and those of other countries to which we extend this aid—cannot believe that we extend support without harboring motives of gaining control and influence in their governments. This very simple trend of thinking has resulted in suspicion on the part of the people of most all nations we have assisted.

A further look into this basic problem which has manifested itself in Ceylon is revealed even more by another quote from the Ceylon paper, which read: "If any country in the world offers Ceylon aid without strings she will gladly and gratefully accept, as Nehru's India has done, but she cannot be bought, sold, or bartered. After all, we have survived without American aid all these years, and our self-respect cannot be bought with dollars."

More and more we find that nations are responding to American aid as the Ceylon newspaper does, namely, that when a country accepts foreign aid from the United States it feels that it is doing this country a favor.

If some of the countries receiving American aid are so blinded with pride that they don't know the difference between Communist oppression and American generosity, then the time has come to stop injuring their pride with gifts of American dollars.

Moving on to our examination of the results of foreign aid in some countries, let us take a look at Yugoslavia.

This nation, once under the influence of Russia, has in the past few years received millions of dollars in aid from America. Even when this aid was given, Tito was operating almost the same kind of Communist state that this country so strongly opposes in the nation of Russia.

Today, after those millions have been turned over to Yugoslavia, we can only hope, at best, that Tito's country would take a neutral stand if the situation came to a showdown.

In fact, we will be fortunate if the same guns, ammunitions and supplies we have furnished a great number of these nations will not be used against us. What assurance have we that this will not be the case?

Surely, after 10 years of this sort of thing, we must now admit that our charity has not made us the most popular Nation in the world. From practical experience we all realize that in many cases the debtor has no love for the creditor, or vice versa.

While it would be wrong to state that this $50.3 billion in foreign aid has not done this Nation some good, it would be equally wrong to assume that the free world expects this country to indefinitely continue this giveaway program. Indeed, it now seems that we have very much overdone ourselves.

Still, with our NATO program and other vital programs not yet completed it seems that a certain amount of foreign aid not only should, but must, be continued.

However, we now find ourselves in the undesirable position of increasing this foreign aid rather than drastically reducing it.

Congress is now being asked to approve an increase in foreign aid. The administration proposes appropriations of $4.9 billion next year compared with $2.7 billion this year. This means that the administration is committed to continue this foreign-aid program at a high level of spending.

We ask again, What Price Friends? It is time we realize we cannot win friends with an aid program that is bringing uncertain returns. More important, it is time that we realize we had best be giving more attention to our economy at home.

Certainly, with a national debt of $280 billion, with appropriations greatly exceeding revenues, with our people paying almost one-third of their incomes in taxes, with the need for new roads, new schools, and new hospitals, and with many other economic and social problems facing us, the time has now come for the United States to bring to an end this long overextended program. No one can argue that the best assurance we have for preservation of freedom in this world is the maintenance of a strong America, and if this strength is to be sustained and maintained, then we must reduce our foreign-aid program and attend to some of these demanding problems which face us on the home front.

Furthermore, if given the chance, private investment could replace foreign aid in many nations.

Some feel that the greatest hindrance to foreign investment is fear of confiscation. I do not agree. I think the greatest hindrance is foreign aid. Private capital does not go to a country whose economy is choked with sterile capital that yields no profit.

The largest receiver of Federal handouts since World War II has been Western Europe, and it has been the smallest receiver of new investment funds from private sources.

Western Europe received close to 70 percent of the $51 billion foreign-aid program. But the ratio of American private investment there runs only about 14 percent. Two and four-tenths percent of the foreign-aid program went to Latin America, but it received 35 percent of United States private investment. Only an invisible amount of aid went

to Canada, but 34 percent of our foreign investment has gone there.

If investment capital is to be stimulated, foreign aid must be cut off. Private investment has been encouraged everywhere through the faith that we may have a lasting peace.

The changeover from the charity dollar to the investment dollar would have a stimulating effect, and inspire the nations we have been trying to help with confidence and new hope.

Aside from this, it would release thousands of foreign aiders and bureaucrats, which, in itself, would be a worthwhile accomplishment.

In summary of my comments on foreign aid, let me say that I favor a reduction in the size of this program now, not tomorrow, next year, or in 1960—but now.

America should continue to help faithful and loyal allies in Europe and Asia. Unless it is essential to our national security, however, there is no obligation that requires the American people to be taxed to maintain the peoples of other nations, friendly or not.

As your United States Senator during the last year, I voted for every amendment to reduce our foreign-aid program, and after these amendments were defeated on the floor of the Senate, I voted against the entire foreign-aid bill.

When I return to Washington, it shall be my purpose to continue to fight to curb our foreign-aid program and work toward drastically reducing these appropriations.

In closing, let me once again say that I appreciate the opportunity to speak before this outstanding group of young men and women. The future of our State, to a great extent, depends upon your leadership and the exemplification by you of the high ideals for which your organization stands.

CONSTRUCTION OF MODERN GREAT LAKES BULK CARGO VESSELS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is there now in effect a unanimous-consent agreement to make Senate bill 3108 the unfinished business tomorrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order was to make it the unfinished business after the conclusion of the morning business tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3108.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3108) to encourage the construction of modern Great Lakes bulk cargo vessels.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES IN KOREA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on May 10, I made a brief speech in the Senate raising certain questions as to policies and procedures existing in Korea. I stated that as one who has supported American aid to Korea, and will continue to support American aid to Korea, I thought it important that our State Department proceed to investigate the situation in Korea and find the answers to certain questions which I raised in my May 10 speech.

Dr. Robert T. Oliver, who appears to represent the Korean Government in public relations in the United States, took exception to some of the remarks I had made, and wrote to the Washington Post and Times Herald in criticism of some of the views I had expressed.

I had no intention of replying to Dr. Oliver, because I thought the fallacies in his letter were self-evident.

However, Mrs. Dorothy W. Allan, assistant to the president of the Korean Affairs Institute, has sent me a letter, under date of May 29, 1956, in which she included a copy of a letter which she had sent to the Washington Post and Times Herald, commenting upon Dr. Oliver's letter to the Post and Times Herald.

I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Allan's letter to me and her letter to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald, dated May 29, 1956, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOREAN AFFAIRS INSTITUTE,
Washington, D. C., May 29, 1956.

The Honorable Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A letter by President Syngman Rhee's professional apologist, Dr. Robert T. Oliver, appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on May 28 attacking not only my letter of May 21 but also a speech you made on the floor of the Senate on May 10. I had quoted at length from your speech.

Since my reply to the Post and Times Herald contained documentary material upholding your contentions as well as mine, I feel obliged to send you a copy.

Respectfully yours,

DOROTHY W. ALLAN
Mrs. Dorothy W. Allan,
Assistant to the President.

MAY 29, 1956.

EDITOR, WASHINGTON POST AND TIMES HERALD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Dr. Robert T. Oliver, commenting (May 28) on your editorial of May 8 and subsequent letters to the editor by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris (May 14) and myself (May 21), seeks to divert attention by making the question of whether or not the Republic of Korea is "an obedient satellite of the United States" appear the chief issue. While it is axiomatic that the United States has no "satellites" it is no secret that South Korea is supported almost completely, and logically so, by the United States. In fiscal year 1955–56, alone, this aid amounted to $478 million in economic assistance and unreported military expenditures in quantities large enough for President Rhee to say May 26, "The United States is our arsenal."

What makes all events in Korea of major importance to the entire world—as Dr. Oliver well knows—is the fact that military forces of the East and West still face one another in an uneasy truce at the 38th parallel. The U. N. Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (UNCURK) stated in its 1955 report to the U. N. General Assembly that "The attitude of the Republic of Korea to the armistice is based on its conviction that a solution to the Korean problem * * * will be reached only by force." As long as this situation prevails, any capricious sallies by the ROK Government could conceivably engulf the world in an atomic holocaust.

Dr. Oliver may be dutybound to apologize for President Rhee, but certain truths cannot be altered.

The 10 questions which Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon asked the State Department to look into as the basis for "a thorough investigation of Korean-American relations" were not "loose charges presented * * * without any shadow of evidence."

I share Dr. Oliver's enthusiasm over "the successful evolution of a workable party system" as demonstrated by the recent election of opposition Democratic candidate Chang Myun (Dr. John M. Chang) as Vice President. What is "truly phenomenal," however, is that the will of the Korean people made itself felt despite the dictatorial methods employed by Dr. Rhee in the election campaign—which Senator MORSE questioned and which the international press reported from Korea.

If President Rhee's police force and military did not play an active role in the election campaign, then why did Democratic presidential candidate Shin Ik Hi charge in an interview (New York Herald Tribune, May 6) only a few hours before leaving for Iri, where he died of a heart attack May 5, that "national police were trying to intimidate voters into casting their ballots for Mr. Rhee"? Why was Progressive presidential candidate Cho Bong Am "in hiding—fearful of his life" (United Press, May 15) for over a week before the election? Why did Democratic vice presidential candidate Chang Myun go "into hiding on election eve because of 'fears for his safety'" (Reuters, May 20)? Why did Mr. Chang tell New York Times correspondent Foster Hailey May 8 "he was hopeful, now that a major threat to the President's reelection for a third term had been removed, that the police in rural areas (where Dr. Rhee's largest vote came from) would not be so industrious in seeing that citizens 'voted right and often.' Dr. Chang charged that Dr. Rhee's Liberal Party was spending enormous sums of money, especially in rural districts, and that government leaders had ordered the National Police to aid and 'obstruct' the Opposition"? Why did 25 Democratic National Assemblymen charge March 29 that the scores of "spontaneous" rallies and demonstrations urging Dr. Rhee to run for a third term were "fabricated and instigated" by the National Police "directly or otherwise"? Why did Police Security Chief Kim Chang Hung say April 19 that the police were staging a campaign "to enlighten voters," though such activities were not to "interfere with voting"? For the Korean people's will to have penetrated such flagrant interference was indeed truly phenomenal, as was the fact that a dead man and an ex-Communist polled more votes in the big cities—where the voters are more politically astute and there are more foreign observers—than did the hardy perennial for whom so many "spontaneous" rallies were held.

The contention that President Rhee "has never altered the constitution" and "cannot do so" and that it has been amended only by "due process of law" is erroneous. Amending the constitution to provide for such changes as direct election of the President by the people and establishment of a bicameral legislature are naturally not moves in the wrong direction, but the methods Dr. Rhee used to effect these changes were unlawful. The effecting of these particular amendments according to the will of the people on July 4, 1952, entailed the establishment of martial law and the jailing of 14 National Assemblymen in contradiction to article 49 of the constitution. (Dr. Rhee also suspended Voice of

America broadcasts and banned the June 9 issue of Newsweek, among other things.)

President Truman sent a strong personal note June 3 reportedly expressing "shock" and urging Dr. Rhee to take no irrevocable steps, while U. N. Secretary-General Trygve Lie said June 6 that the U. N. "cannot remain unconcerned when arbitrary methods are used which threaten to destroy the roots of democratic government." UNCURK wrote Dr. Rhee June 7: "The Commission notes that you base your actions on what you consider to be the will of the people. But it is the basis of every constitutional democracy that the will of the people can be expressed validly only in the ways provided for in the constitution, for example, by a free and secret ballot at the times prescribed in the constitution, or by the votes of the freely elected representatives of the people in the appropriate bodies. History has taught that such methods of gaging the will of the people as mass meetings, demonstrations, and petitions are generally used where a real respect for constitutional rights and duties is lacking."

Are such actions governed by the due process of law?

That Dr. Rhee does in fact exercise ironclad control over the press has been established for some time. During the aforementioned period of martial law in 1952, Dr. Rhee ordered (June 14) teams of censors to ink out news in all incoming publications unfavorable to his administration, and Premier Chang Tak Sang instituted (July 11) a thorough investigation of some big newspapers in view of their vicious attempt to disturb the public and to make world opinion unfavorable to the Republic of Korea. Just before the National Assembly election in May 1954, the New York Times reported from Seoul that "in Pusan, the police entered the office of the leading newspaper, Kukje Shinbo * * * and took 36 reporters to police headquarters for questioning concerning their draft status. All were later released. It was considered more than a coincidence that Kukje Shinbo was the only Pusan newspaper that reported fully the incident of the campaign worker who had died after being held by the police." Dong A Ilbo, a highly respected conservative newspaper in Seoul, was suspended for a month in the spring of 1955 for making a typographical error in a headline. Other such incidents are legion. Moreover, the International Press Institute did not invite the Republic of Korea to its Asian conference in Tokyo last March because it is considered among the nations lacking freedom of the press.

Finally, it is unfortunate that Dr. Oliver tries to equate criticism of President Rhee with criticism of the Republic of Korea. It is only because some of us want to see a really free, healthy, democratic Korea that we take the time to point out the unsavory truths which are holding that little nation back from its rightful destiny in the sun.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. DOROTHY W. ALLAN,
Assistant to the President, Korean Affairs Institute.

UNITED STATES AID TO YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, for several years our Government has pursued a policy of aiding Yugoslavia in the hope that with our encouragement Marshal Tito's defection from the Soviet camp would become permanent. I myself voted for aid to Yugoslavia in the hope that we could thereby help divide our enemies. It is now clear, Mr. President, that that policy was ill advised, and that those of us who supported it were mistaken.

It is now clear that Marshal Tito's defection from the Comintern was nothing more than a family squabble—that, at heart, Tito was every bit as dedicated to furthering the international Communist revolution as the leaders of the Soviet Union with whom he momentarily fell out. It is clear that Tito, after reaping the benefit of American financial support, has made his peace with the Soviet Union, is now ready to train the guns we have bought for him against us.

Last Saturday, June 2, Marshal Tito and other members of the Yugoslav Government arrived in Moscow on a visit of state to the Soviet Union. The purpose of this visit was to consummate the rapprochement between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia that has been in the making since Khrushchev and Bulganin visited Belgrade last year. Let me quote from the address delivered by Marshal Tito on his arrival in Moscow:

Referring to the temporary break between Russia and Yugoslavia, Tito said:

We were greatly pained, but we believed that the time would come when everything separating us would be overcome and when our friendship would receive a new and still more firm foundation. This time has come, thanks to the Leninist policy of the government and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The arrival of Comrades Khrushchev, Bulganin, Mikoyan, and others in Belgrade, the talks with them, the declaration which was drawn up on that occasion, and afterward the courageous and farsighted foreign policy of the collective leadership of the Soviet Union are, in my profound conviction, a guaranty that nothing of the kind will ever happen again between the two countries marching along the path of Marx, Engels, and Lenin.

And at the end of his speech, Tito cried:

Long live the Soviet Union. Long live the friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.

Surely, Mr. President, it is clear—at long last—what America's policy toward Yugoslavia must be. When Tito proclaims that Russia and Yugoslavia are now marching together "along the path of Marx, Engels and Lenin," he is proclaiming that Russia and Yugoslavia are marching together toward their joint goal of destroying the United States. No one today can deny that the "path of Marx, Engels, and Lenin" is a path that leads to Communist conquest of the world and the overthrow of our free, capitalist society. This is freely conceded even by the Soviet leaders who are peddling the current Communist coexistence line. Even the most conciliatory remarks in recent months by Khrushchev and Bulganin have included a reminder that, whether by forcible revolution or otherwise, the Communists mean to rule the world.

Yesterday's newspapers, Mr. President, carried accounts of how Tito and the Soviet leaders are working out the details of their new friendship pact. I submit one such article for the RECORD—from the New York Times—which points out that in Moscow "Marshal Tito has undertaken to press hard for ideological contact between the Soviet and Yugoslav [Communist] Parties."

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITO SAID TO SEEK CLOSER SOVIET TIE—YUGOSLAVS REPORT HIS AIM IS REFORM OF STALIN LINE ON THE SATELLITE PARTIES

(By Jack Raymond)

Moscow, June 3.—Marshal Tito has undertaken to press hard for ideological contact between the Soviet and Yugoslav parties, a Yugoslav source disclosed today.

The premise of the Yugoslav President in talks with Soviet leaders was said to be that such a contact would encourage a continued reform of Stalin's attitude toward the non-Soviet Communist Parties.

Soviet Yugoslav talks that had been scheduled to begin Tuesday were believed to have been initiated informally this afternoon.

The Yugoslav leader and Nikita S. Khrushchev spent a great deal of time together today. The Soviet Communist Party chief exchanged toasts at a luncheon with Marshal Tito. Later they toured the agricultural fairgrounds together in the company of other Yugoslav and Soviet leaders.

In the evening, when Marshal Tito and Mr. Khrushchev strolled along a Moscow street, an excited crowd struggled to get a glimpse of them and they took refuge in an ice cream parlor where they seemed to enjoy themselves immensely. Twenty minutes later they emerged and drove off in a limousine.

NO PRESS BRIEFING SET

No arrangements have been made to brief the press, even as sketchily as has been the case during previous top-level meetings here. However, an informed Yugoslav source said that the relations and philosophies of the respective Communist Parties were high on the agenda of the coming meetings.

Marshal Tito, who made a triumphant reappearance in Moscow yesterday, is pressing for an intimate exchange of ideological views with Soviet party leaders, Yugoslav sources said. Last year the Yugoslav leader had insisted that negotiations be limited to governmental relations.

It is the visit of reconciliation to Belgrade made last year by Mr. Khrushchev and Premier Nikolai A. Bulganin that Marshal Tito is now repaying. But from a party and ideological viewpoint, it was noted that he is reaping a reward for the adamant manner with which he withstood Stalin's mistake in forcing Yugoslavia's expulsion from the Soviet-led Cominform in 1948.

The Cominform, a coalition of Communist Parties formed after World War II, was liquidated in April, largely at the behest of Marshal Tito.

According to a Yugoslav source, the talks will range over four main topics: the implementation of the Belgrade declaration of last year, the extension of existing economic agreements, international affairs and Communist Party relations.

[After the Soviet-Yugoslav talks in Belgrade last June, the leaders of the two Communist nations issued a joint declaration that called for a European collective security treaty, the prohibition of atomic weapons, the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and the admission of Communist China to United Nations membership. The declaration also proposed solutions of the German and Taiwan (Formosa) questions.]

The Yugoslavs are said to believe that "even a blind man must see" that important changes have taken place in the Soviet Union's internal development.

It is the Yugoslav view that these changes will be strengthened and developed in a suitable fashion if the Soviet leaders carry

out their promise of "exchanging Socialist experience" with like-minded political groups outside the Soviet Union, particularly with Yugoslavia.

It is for this reason, it is said, that Marshal Tito, who a year ago refused to be addressed as "comrade" by the Russians and refused to take part in a discussion of ideology, now earnestly wants to compare political notes with Mr. Khrushchev.

What Marshal Tito wants, it is said, is to create a new relationship with Moscow as an example to other Communist Parties. Some observers believe the Yugoslav leader has set a major task for himself, but they concede that so far it has been Marshal Tito who has correctly called the turn in relations with the Soviet Union.

When Marshal Tito was escorted to the agricultural fairgrounds he took note of the bright sunshine and said to Mr. Khrushchev:

"Let us take an open car, or, better still, let us walk around the fairgrounds."

"We will wear out our legs," the Russian leader replied. He ignored Marshal Tito's offer to have a race and led the party to the open Zis limousines.

Mr. Khrushchev's wife, son, and daughter were present, but they soon departed. Madam Josip Broz, wife of the Yugoslav President, remained with the party.

She wore a lavender silk suit and gold jewelry. Marshal Tito was nattily dressed in a gray suit and a fedora hat. They watched a horse show and sipped soft drinks on a terrace.

During a visit to an industrial section at the fairgrounds Marshal Tito saw a model atomic reactor. Premier Bulganin remarked that it was "similar to the one we are building for you." He was referring to the reactor that was promised Yugoslavia last year.

Vyacheslav M. Molotov, former Soviet Foreign Minister, who joined with Stalin in engineering the break with Marshal Tito in 1948, also was present. He stood beside the Yugoslav leader from time to time, but he talked mostly with Dr. Eduard Kardelj, the First Vice President of Yugoslavia.

Yugoslav sources said Marshal Tito had begun today a series of visits that were politically significant.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, it is unnecessary for me to press this point. The whole world knows that Marshal Tito's government is once again firmly allied with the Soviet Union. It is, therefore, perfectly obvious that no further justification exists for hoping that, through American financial aid, Yugoslavia can be bought off. That aid has been bestowed in great abundance in the past, and our reward has been Tito's public profession of the Marxist-Leninist faith, and a declaration of his solidarity with the Soviet Union.

Together with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] I am therefore introducing a bill this afternoon which provides for the immediate termination of all American aid to Yugoslavia. I am informed that as of February 1 of this year there were $30 million in unobligated United States funds which had been previously appropriated for Yugoslavia. There may be, in addition, some obligated funds for Yugoslavia which have not yet been expended. My bill provides that funds in both categories shall be held up, and that not one additional cent of American money shall be used for the purpose of supporting an avowed member of the world Communist conspiracy.

As to the question of future appropriations for Yugoslavia, I believe this matter can be handled when the Senate considers this year's foreign aid bill.

This is not a matter, Mr. President, about which I propose to make a brief statement, send a bill to the desk, and let it go at that. Because of the stark immorality involved in a policy of continuing to aid our avowed enemies I shall do everything in my power to obtain quick congressional action on this measure. If, for some reason, the Foreign Relations Committee cannot take prompt action on this bill, I shall feel obliged to reintroduce the measure on the floor and ask for its immediate consideration. I am sure that the Senate wants prompt action. I cannot believe that a single Member of this body is in favor of continuing to give American money to a nation that is publicly committed to destroy our country and our way of life.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Wisconsin will remember that a year ago, when the Senate considered appropriations for foreign aid, the question of aid to Yugoslavia came up, and at that time it developed in hearings before the Appropriations Committee that for a period of more than a year previously Yugoslavia had refused American inspection of the end use of American aid we had provided to that country.

In other words, Yugoslavia was in a different position from any other country on the face of the globe to which we gave aid, because every other country to which we gave military aid allowed American inspection and knowledge of how the aid was carried out. So the committee wrote into the bill, which the Senator from New Hampshire helped to foster, a restriction by which we said that no further aid would be given to Yugoslavia until that point could be ironed out. It was carried into the conference with the House. After that, as the result of conferences, our Government worked out a plan for, and Yugoslavia permitted, for the first time in a long period, inspection on the end results of military aid. We wrote that provision into the law last year, and I think, in consideration of Tito's statement that nothing would separate him from the Kremlin, in fairness to America, in fairness and in justice to other nations which are our real allies, as well as to the taxpayers of the United States, we should reappraise the whole Yugoslavia situation before we start pouring more military equipment and machinery into that nation. I do not know whether the Senator has stated the amount, but it runs into the hundreds of millions of dollars. For that reason, I think it well to point up the issue in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the able Senator from New Hampshire very much, and I agree wholeheartedly with everything he has said.

Mr. President, let me mention one further reason why prompt and favorable action on this bill is desirable. We must cut off aid to Yugoslavia, yes; but we must also utilize this opportunity to put the world on notice that America is no longer prepared to dole out her precious wealth indiscriminately to any nation that turns up the palm of its hand. We are engaged in a battle for national survival; and financial means for waging that battle are not unlimited. We cannot afford to expend one penny of our wealth on foreign aid that will not help us achieve victory over world communism. Since dollars cannot win the minds of men, it follows that no nation should receive American aid that is not already committed to opposing the Communist conspiracy. A congressional declaration of policy that the American people are no longer prepared to subsidize nations that try to work both sides of the street is long overdue. Consequently, if my bill is construed as a general warning to neutralist nations that if they want our aid, they must join the free world's cause, so much the better for that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Wisconsin has performed a service in calling this matter to the attention of the Senate. I believe it was apparent to every Member of the House as well as to every Member of the Senate that, certainly, a searching reappraisal should take place. The only respect in which the Senator has been a little too lenient is on the question of neutral nations. I think there might be some circumstance where neutral nations who were true neutrals might receive consideration. While I would differ with them if they failed to recognize the dangers which confront the world, I would think it would be most unfortunate, but, at least, there might be occasions when certain types of aid should be given neutrals. But the situation in this case, as in some others, has been that this so-called neutral has gone around the world visiting various countries, seeking to pull out of the selective security system which we have been trying diligently to build up, not only in Europe, but in the Far East, and trying to encourage other countries to get out of the collective security system, or, if there were some thought that they might join us in common defense, to discourage them from so doing.

That is hardly being neutral, because, whether it is acting in conformity with suggestions from the Kremlin or not, it is at least a parallel policy, and if Tito were acting in conformity with Kremlin directions he could not give more aid and comfort to the Kremlin than in seeking to break down the collective security system.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from California very much.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish to add a word to what the distinguished minority leader has said with reference to neutral countries.

While we should like to have countries on our side, I realize there is some justification for neutrality, if it is true neutrality. But what we have been up

against and are now up against is the fact that some of the countries which pose as neutrals are with the Communists seven-eighths of the time. That kind of neutrality I do not believe we can countenance under any circumstances.

I think the Senator from Wisconsin has done well in pointing up this issue for us today. We must remember that this is mutual security. Mutual security means just what the name implies. That is the theory of our foreign-aid program—a mutual effort for the security of the free world. We must insist, instead of raising a battle cry against all foreign aid, as some people are doing, on making it more selective and putting it on a purely mutual basis.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4001) to terminate military and economic assistance to Yugoslavia, introduced by Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and Mr. JENNER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, unless some other Senator wishes to address the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 6, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 5 (legislative day of June 4), 1956:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Arthur Kline, of Wyoming, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term of 5 years, expiring June 22, 1961, vice Claude L. Draper, term expiring.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Brig. Gen. Lyle E. Seeman (colonel, Corps of Engineers) to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, vice Brig. Gen. William E. Potter.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

R. Jasper Smith, of Missouri, to be United States district judge for the western district of Missouri, vice Charles E. Whittaker, elevated.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be captains

Abbruzzese, Peter A., O62553.
Adams, Dwight L., O62649.
Adams, Walter E., O62528.
Aguilar, Domingo I., O69578.
Ahearn, Charles E., O69579.
Aitken, Lowell A., O60951.
Albrecht, Erwin F., Jr., O67636.
Alexander, John T., O61609.
Allan, Abraham N., O62440.
Allen, Edwin W., Jr., O61226.
Allen, John W., Jr., O62698.
Allen, Milton, O63006.
Alley, Bernard J., O61916.
Allgood, Charles N., O61488.
Ambrose, Bernard J., O61273.
Anderson, Charles H., Jr., O61616.
Anderson, Charles L., O63011.
Anderson, James R., O67638.
Anderson, William A., O71755.
Apple, Clarence E., O61149.
Arnold, George H., O61283.
Ash, Ned R., O62072.
Astarita, Orazio J., O61388.
Attaway, John D., O61872.
Attmore, Charles M., Jr., O65943.
Aull, Luther B., 3d, O62428.
Austin, Thomas A., 3d, O62548.
Bachus, Walter O., O61582.
Bagley, James E., 3d, O61619.
Baish, Charles F., Jr., O62411.
Baldwin, Daniel L., O70260.
Ball, George L., O62485.
Ball, Thomas H., O62737.
Banister, Grady H., Jr., O62420.
Bardos, Phillip G., O62686.
Barker, Arthur C., Jr., O62513.
Barnes, James C., Jr., O62704.
Barnet, John A., Jr., O62597.
Barry, Raymond N., O62617.
Barry, Thomas M., Jr., O62364.
Bashore, Boyd T., O62552.
Bassett, Cyrus W., O60945.
Bateman, Benjamin F., O62037.
Baughman, Richard A., O60244.
Baxley, William J., Jr., O62583.
Beaumont, Robert B., O61464.
Beck, Robert H., O66134.
Beckner, David A., O61634.
Beddoe, William A., O60920.
Begley, John L., O62777.
Begley, Thomas F., O60897.
Belford, Robert E., O61411.
Bennett, Karl F., O65750.
Benson, Donald J., O68077.
Berenbaum, Esai, O61442.
Bergstrom, Richard H., O67645.
Berner, Lyle C., O61379.
Berry, Elbert D. H., O62369.
Berry, William T., O61537.
Beverly, Sidney E., O69590.
Bice, William S., O63025.
Billingsley, Jack D., O61591.
Birk, Elmer L., O62305.
Bjork, Harlan LeR., O62850.
Black, Lorne S., O61562.
Black, Sammy J., O68326.
Black, William C., 3d, O61700.
Blair, Arthur H., O62349.
Blank, Harold L., O62472.
Bloss, William H., Jr., O62767.
Blount, John B., O61705.
Blumhardt, Howard J., O61838.
Bobzien, Gerald B., O68081.
Boggs, William D., O67646.
Bohn, Donald L., O62611.
Bolduc, Lucien E., Jr., O62359.
Bolson, Carl D., O61587.
Bolte, Philip L., O62407.
Borys, Stephen J., O67790.
Boyer, Robert E., O73238.
Boylan, James F., O62331.
Boyle, Charles E., Jr., O70281.
Boyle, Garrison J., O71450.
Bradley, William M., O63026.
Brandes, William F., O62290.
Brantley, Charles S., O62011.
Breed, Charles R., O65302.
Breitwieser, Albert G., 3d, O62544.
Brenner, John A., O60861.
Brent, Walter I., O61446.
Brice, Lawrence S., O60867.
Brinkerhoff, John R., O62287.
Brinson, Remer Y., O61980.
Broderick, John P., O67649.
Brooke, Stafford R., Jr., O65955.
Brown, James L., O61886.
Brown, Lloyd J., O69602.
Brown, Richard M., O61086.
Brown, Robert L., O61272.
Brown, Vance S., Jr., O62429.
Brumme, Gunther A., O62853.
Bryan, John A., O61163.
Buccolo, Joseph P., O62648.
Buchanan, William J., O61439.
Buckley, Francis R., O71649.
Buckley, John L., O65288.
Buckner, Garrett D., O62679.
Bullard, Murray N., O62020.
Bunn, Dudley T., O61902.
Burack, Emanuel, O61905.
Burgess, Burr E., O60302.
Burgin, Wilfred S., O69607.
Burke, Lloyd L., O61246.
Burkhardt, Ellwood W., O61418.
Burnop, George T., O63010.
Burns, James R., O69610.
Burt, Robert F., O61530.
Burtchett, Howard D., O62055.
Bush, Charles C., 3d, O62103.
Busson, James C., O60944.
Butler, Charles L., O62588.
Byers, Andy J., O62436.
Caffrey, James V., Jr., O61263.
Cain, John H., O70294.
Cameron, David H., O62296.
Cameron, Stephen F., O62328.
Campbell, John W., O69613.
Campbell, Wayne C., O69615.
Caras, Louis S., O61827.
Carignan, Robert E., O70296.
Carlisle, David K., O62321.
Carr, Thomas W., O61918.
Carrejo, Joe T., O61481.
Carrick, Julian B., Jr., O68084.
Carroll, Danford S., O65499.
Cary, Richard L., O61389.
Casper, Paul N., O60255.
Chadick, Harold M., O65963.
Chamberlain, Robert L., O60954.
Chamberlin, Robert G., O61354.
Chambers, Robert M., O62660.
Champion, Fred R., O61020.
Chandler, Malcolm W., Jr., O62618.
Chapman, Herschel E., O62471.
Chegin, Lee J., O61890.
Cheney, Robert A., O62692.
Childers, Charles N., O61646.
Childers, John C., Jr., O67655.
Christensen, John F., O72842.
Clark, Herbert E., O61215.
Clark, Raymond G., Jr., O67657.
Coakley, Paul E., O62863.
Coffey, Jimmy, O67658.
Cohen, Jacque D., O61780.
Colebank, Albert E., O71772.
Collins, Arthur H., Jr., O65500.
Collins, Joseph E., O61909.
Collis, Lester L., O61523.
Comstock, Keith G., O61376.
Conroy, Bernard J., O61249.
Cooper, Claude W., O61542.
Cornay, Florian O., O62493.
Corsentino, Leonard J., O61461.
Coursen, Edward O., O60309.
Covach, John, O61893.
Cowden, John E., O61606.
Cox, Arthur L., O65305.
Cox, Charles P., O62877.
Cox, Joice O., Jr., O67662.
Coxe, Robert L., O61261.
Coyle, Harry M., O62309.
Coyle, Marcus W., O71470.
Craft, Clayton, O61394.
Cragin, John M., O62412.
Crawford, Albert B., Jr., O62295.
Creuziger, Donald P., O62386.
Crews, Harry C., Jr., O61871.
Crist, William E., Jr., O62444.
Cristo, Anthony B., O62849.
Crittenberger, Dale J., O62432.
Crockett, Edward P., O62497.
Crooks, Eugene F., O65971.
Crowe, George J., O61026.
Culbertson, Edward L., O62886.
Culpepper, Joseph T., O65972.
Culpepper, John S., Jr., O61223.
Cuneo, Victor N., Jr., O62674.
Cunningham, Charles C., O62599.
Currier, John W., O70319.
Curtis, James A., O62624.
Curtis, James W., Jr., O67665.

Danilavez, Robert L., O62474.
Darland, Lloyd E., O62471.
Darrington, Kenneth R., O62876.
Dasch, William E., O63027.
Daugherty, William L., O62546.
Davis, David H., O61765.
Davis, Edward P., Jr., O65975.
Davis, James H., O61142.
Davis, L. Conrad, O61848.
Davis, Reed E., Jr., O62623.
Davis, William D., O62621.
Day, Harvey C., Jr., O61433.
DeBellis, Anthony C., O60862.
De Camara, Donald R., O61108.
DeGraf, William B., O62282.
Denison, Allen R., O70323.
Detherow, Ralph H., O62666.
DeVane, William L., O61887.
DeZafra, Charles R., O61245.
Dickerson, Charles F., Jr., O62589.
Dielens, August J., Jr., O62563.
DiGrazia, John E., Jr., O62602.
Dissek, John, Jr., O61034.
Dixon, Louis F., O62473.
Dobbins, John P., O61146.
Dodge, Harry E., O62653.
Dolan, Pierre J., O61814.
Doleac, Philbert C., O61304.
Dolezal, Thomas R., O63120.
Dolzski, Andrew, O65983.
Donahue, Phillip H., O62441.
Donald, James W., O66146.
Donovan, James C., O62401.
Dotson, J. T., O61678.
Doughtie, Claude H., O62535.
Douglas, John J., O62080.
Douglas, Robert J., O61990.
Douglass, Robert W., 3d, O62507.
Dowe, Ray M., Jr., O62650.
Dowling, James, O65985.
Downes, Thomas W., Jr., O61432.
Downey, Neil B., O61717.
Dreisonstok, Thomas F., O62682.
Drewry, James C., Jr., O62447.
Dreyer, Carl W., O61366.
Druener, Hanz K., O65310.
Duba, William T., O69636.
DuBose, Glover A., O61812.
Duffy, Thomas E., O62029.
Duggan, Roy H., Jr., O66147.
Duggins, Frank H., Jr., O62629.
Dunley, James E., O61503.
Dunn, James F., O62771.
Durham, William L., O61043.
Durrant, William L., O60858.
Durst, Jay B., O62311.
Easley, Roy W., Jr., O62631.
Eastman, Robert W., O62413.
Eberhardt, Guy A., O69639.
Ebner, Kenneth R., O62505.
Edner, Lewis V., O60919.
Edwards, Robert C., O62613.
Eek, Lauris M., Jr., O62482.
Effertz, Edward H., O61413.
Ehrlich, I. Robert, O62352.
Eichorn, William N., 2d, O62702.
Elian, Arthur J., O60946.
Elliot, Charles W., O62727.
Elliott, Joe F., O62454.
Ellis, Calvin W., O63005.
Emerson, Henry H., O61053.
Emmert, Robert W., O62851.
Ensley, George H., O61667.
Eshelman, Charles O., O62283.
Eustis, Thomas B., O61597.
Ewan, Richard C., Jr., O62342.
Fahey, Donal A., O62427.
Fahs, John L., Jr., O62422.
Fahy, John W., O62754.
Farmer, Raymond L., O61668.
Farrar, Julian D., O69483.
Farrell, Peter B., O62580.
Fastuca, Salvatore E., O62699.
Faust, Elmer F., O69644.
Feek, William A., Jr., O66149.
Feicht, Victor R., O61686.
Felder, Pelham L., 3d, O61036.
Ferguson, Robert B., O62366.
Fern, Albert J., Jr., O62525.
Fette, James H., O62715.
Fields, Darrel R., O62862.
Fife, Thomas W., Jr., O62388.
Fifield, George C., O62667.
Fincher, Herbert A., O61353.
Finkelstein, Zane E., O73068.
Fischer, Philip D., O62683.
Fisher, Emil, Jr., O61759.
Fitts, William T., 3d, O62652.
Fletcher, Tyler H., O61884.
Flynn, Allan S., O62576.
Foerster, Merlin W., O65289.
Fooshe, James F., 3d, O62688.
Forbes, Dennis L., O67677.
Ford, Charles D., Jr., O61760.
Forney, Leslie R., Jr., O61221.
Fox, Edward J., O62675.
Fox, John E., O62392.
Frandsen, Herbert L., O62083.
Franklin, Joseph R., O62893.
Freedman, Edward P., O62384.
French, Cecil R., O61155.
Fronczak, Edward L., O61833.
Fulghum, James T., O60267.
Fuller, John L., O60873.
Fullerton, George R., O62329.
Funke, Robert D., O60284.
Fye, Richard S., O62446.
Gainey, Maurice A., Jr., O61258.
Gainok, Elmer J., O65999.
Gaiter, Leonce E., O61447.
Gaither, James L., O66151.
Gallivan, William G., O61832.
Gappa, Joseph A., Jr., O62520.
Gard, Robert G., Jr., O62355.
Gaurnier, Paul L., O61337.
Gearan, William K., O62434.
Genuario, Louis V., O62696.
George, Richard E., O61316.
Gerber, Martin, O62859.
Ghormley, Thomas A., O70343.
Gibson, Ross J., O61398.
Glauber, James M., O61134.
Glenn, Arthur B., O69656.
Glenn, Russell A., O62375.
Glover, William D., O61673.
Godsey, James P., O65307.
Goldsmith, John W., O62709.
Goodspeed, George F., Jr., O60272.
Gorman, Paul F., O62379.
Gormley, Daniel J., Jr., O61406.
Gotowicki, Paul P., O60910.
Gradoville, Edward J., O62416.
Graefe, Carl W., O65749.
Graham, Charles P., O62354.
Graham, Willis B., O61873.
Grammer, William C., O71501.
Grange, David E., Jr., O69660.
Gravois, Francois D., Jr., O62009.
Green, Calvin E., O60913.
Green, William A., Jr., O61456.
Greenberg, Robert A., O61458.
Greene, Joseph E., O61031.
Greer, James F., O61922.
Greer, Robert L., O60262.
Greer, Thomas U., O62299.
Gregg, Edmund F., Jr., O69662.
Griebling, Alfred L., O62360.
Griffin, Joseph T., Jr., O62711.
Griffiths, Samuel E., O61813.
Griswold, Frederick H., O61985.
Gross, Melvin G., O62044.
Grow, Robert M., O62570.
Guelker, Clarence W., O71795.
Guest, Marion I., O60856.
Guion, James L., Jr., O62726.
Gulley, Robert H., O61435.
Gurnee, Paul L., O62668.
Guth, Carrol W., O67689.
Haas, Kenneth R., O61109.
Haberman, Fredric W., O62550.
Hall, Kenneth W., O62680.
Hamlin, Frederick J., Jr., O62301.
Hammond, Lyman H., Jr., O62489.
Hanlon, Charles W., O61349.
Hanna, Mark J., O62760.
Hansen, Marcus W., O61377.
Hansen, Ray S., O62318.
Hanson, James M., O60999.
Hargreaves, Charles DeG., O60875.
Harmon, Benjamin F., O61218.
Harper, Philip H., O62750.
Harris, Brady R., O61563.
Harris, Louis A., O61556.
Harris, Richard W., O62866.
Harris, William McC., Jr., O73268.
Hatch, James B., O61156.
Hay, Solomon L., Jr., O70366.
Hayes, Ernest T., Jr., O62892.
Hayes, Errol E., Jr., O61032.
Hayes, Robert T., O61338.
Haynes, Robert F., O70367.
Hays, Marcus D., O67695.
Hayward, Charles W., O62495.
Hazen, Franklin K., Jr., O61494.
Heder, Robert T., O60863.
Hedrick, Herbert J., O61216.
Heffelfinger, Edwin C., O72895.
Heiker, Joseph H., O61133.
Henderson, John K., O61625.
Hendry, John R., O62317.
Henley, Ralph G., O61407.
Henning, Frank A., 3d, O62582.
Henry, Thomas M., O68112.
Herbert, Morris J., Jr., O62424.
Hergert, Louis G., Jr., O62460.
Hermes, Elmer R., O69680.
Herring, Wilton A., Jr., O66017.
Hetz, Robert A., Jr., O62443.
Hewitt, Wilbur J., O63123.
Hicks, David A., O61868.
Hicks, Richard G., O62033.
Hill, James G., O71513.
Hinds, Sidney R., Jr., O62772.
Hinds, William M., 3d, O62409.
Hirsch, Irvin S., O62642.
Hirsch, Peter J., O71804.
Hobson, Thomas B., Jr., O61105.
Hoch, John J., O65287.
Hodges, Robert C., O62878.
Hoey, Matthew W., O71806.
Hoff, Wilford J., Jr., O61794.
Hoffman, Richard G., O62298.
Hogan, Willard D., O66020.
Hoisington, Robert H., O62587.
Holcomb, Leslie P., Jr., O62761.
Holder, Louis L., O61558.
Holeman, John S., Jr., O68118.
Holko, John M., Jr., O61284.
Hollinger, John, Jr., O69683.
Holston, Alfred, O63240.
Holt, Hugh C., O62554.
Hoppe, Robert B., O61497.
Hord, William J., O60289.
Horn, Clifton A., Jr., O61579.
Horton, George C., O61013.
Horton, William S., O66022.
Houston, Bruce K., O61308.
Howard, Francis E., Jr., O62745.
Howard, John D., O62639.
Howden, James A., O61471.
Howe, William S., Jr., O62330.
Howell, James G., O62565.
Hubbard, George H., 2d, O62547.
Hubbard, Norman F., O62763.
Hudson, John E., O61350.
Huestis, John L., O71681.
Huff, Cecil R., O60866.
Hughes, David R., O62721.
Hughes, Robert B., O62307.
Hughes, Thomas W. L., Jr., O62577.
Hulburt, Charles W., O61331.
Hunt, Richard L., O62357.
Hunter, Charles M., O61014.
Hurst, John E., Jr., O62310.
Hutcheson, Philo A., O62459.
Hutzler, Charles T., O62016.
Hyatt, Douglas P., O70389.
Ingalls, Robert E., O61803.
Irons, James V., O62644.
Irvine, Joseph M., O60308.
Irwin, John F., O62732.
Isley, George H., Jr., O61505.
Jackley, Lawrence W., O62568.
Jackson, Marvin LaR., O67701.
Jacobson, Gerhard L., O62456.
Jennings, Allen B., O62365.
Jennings, John R., O62697.
Jensen, Richard W., O61675.
Jewkes, Lorus D., O61534.
Johansen, Eivind H., O61615.
Johnson, Edward L., O61491.
Johnson, Erik G., Jr., O69701.
Johnson, George M., O60285.
Johnson, James H., O61923.
Johnson, Malcolm D., O62303.
Johnson, Norman G., O63239.

Johnson, Ralph R., O68018.
Johnson, Richard L., O62487.
Johnson, Walter A., Jr., O66029.
Johnson, William E., Jr., O61473.
Johnsrud, Melvin H., O62426.
Johnston, George W., O60877.
Johnston, Richard Y., O60286.
Jolley, James A., O61373.
Jones, Briggs H., O62693.
Jones, Clarence Q., Jr., O62746.
Jones, Clinton D., O61352.
Jones, John G., O62417.
Jones, Mark E., O62681.
Jones, Nelson H., O69703.
Jones, Richard L., O63745.
Jones, Roy C., O61213.
Jones, William R. D., O62596.
Joy, David D., O62685.
Kackley, Roy L., Jr., O66030.
Kaplan, Phillip, O70398.
Karns, Andre M., O61974.
Kaso, George E., O61003.
Kastner, William H., O61044.
Keeley, Arthur R., O61528.
Kellar, Robert S., O63238.
Keller, Morris J., O61368.
Kelley, George L., O60914.
Kelley, Gerald P., O62383.
Kelley, Johnny W., O61904.
Kelly, James L., O62289.
Kelly, Victor J., O67706.
Kennedy, Edwin L., O62590.
Kennedy, James E., Jr., O67708.
Kenney, Donald E., O61029.
Kessinger, Howard E., Jr., O62541.
Kessler, Robert F., O61807.
Kilpatrick, Paul E., O69710.
King, Armand M., O61767.
King, David B., 2d, O62633.
King, Francis, O62539.
Kingston, Robert C., O71534.
Kinney, Ludie E., Jr., O61828.
Klie, George D., O62527.
Knapp, William L., O62627.
Knauer, Glenn W., O62464.
Knipp, Arthur L., Jr., O70400.
Knopp, Daniel W., O70401.
Koehler, John J., Jr., O62756.
Koffler, Carl A., O69519.
Koontz, Joseph, J., O60254.
Kornet, Fred, Jr., O62854.
Kramer, Richard L., O62890.
Krause, Roger A., O61692.
Kubby, Robert S., O62325.
Kuckhahn, Karl O., O62634.
Laffoon, Donald M., O61478.
Lambert, Clifford V., O62857.
Lamdin, William R., O62529.
Larsen, John W., O71693.
Larson, Donald W., O61361.
Lassetter, Stuart H., O61521.
Laube, Thomas R., O61297.
Lear, George E., O62374.
Leary, Robert P., O62406.
Lee, Burke W., O62294.
Lee, Carl A., O69724.
Lee, Emmett C., Jr., O62341.
Lee, James M., O62578.
Legate, Harvey A., Jr., O61642.
Legate, Robert E., O61457.
Leighty, Ralph McD., O61412.
Leiser, Bruce J., O62770.
Leishman, Carl A., O61599.
Lemke, Merrill M., O61396.
Levitt, Robert J., O61455.
Lewandowski, Richard H., O62594.
Lewane, Leonard L., O61744.
Lewis, Bennett L., O62314.
Lillard, James A., O63004.
Lillibridge, John L., O61405.
Lilly, James H., O61636.
Lindberg, William J., O61855.
Lindsay, Samuel M., 2d, O61682.
Liston, Ronald A., O67714.
Listro, Paul C., O62526.
Lively, Charles H., O61403.
Lobe, Thomas J., O62747.
Lockhart, William J., O62025.
Lockwood, Kilbert E., O62430.
Lodewick, Lawrence S., O62339.
Lokken, George S., O62087.
Lombard, Reginald T., Jr., O62437.
Long, Charles H., O61120.
Long, William E., O61748.
Longsdorf, James E., O60975.
Looby, Robert W., O61586.
Loper, Thomas C., O62395.
Lounsbury, Roy E., O62438.
Love, Joseph B., O62492.
Luke, Charles W., O62022.
Lumsden, Lonnie H., 3d, O62350.
Lundy, James T., O67719.
Lunger, Raymond R., O62469.
Lunn, Robert J., O62475.
Lunsford, Paul R., O61052.
Luse, William M., O66042.
Lynch, James E., O62362.
Lynch, Robert J., O60253.
Lynn, James F., O66043.
Lytle, Wayman H., O60921.
Mackmull, Jack V., O62677.
Mahan, John C., Jr., O69734.
Maj, Edward S., O61360.
Major, William McL., Jr., O65312.
Maladowitz, Raymond, O62586.
Malcolm, Ben S., O63033.
Mallett, Peter, O62512.
Mangas, Cloyce L., O62343.
Mangum, Wiley M., Jr., O62645.
Mann, Howard H., O60259.
Marks, Raymond A., O60991.
Marsh, Jack R., O61422.
Martin, Clark C., O62663.
Martin, Elmer C., O61474.
Mason, George, O61862.
Mason, John H., O60287.
Mastoris, William, Jr., O62521.
Mather, Bruce D., O68135.
Mather, Linwood B., O62449.
Mattera, Ralph A., O66047.
Matthey, Bernard P., O62723.
Matthiessen, Clarence J., O62523.
Maxwell, John C., Jr., O62361.
Mayfield, Ross F., Jr., O62575.
Mayo, Walter L., Jr., O60978.
Mays, John M., O62005.
McBride, Robert D., O62735.
McBride, Thomas E., Jr., O62510.
McCandlish, Robert H., O62442.
McCleary, John E., O62514.
McClure, Ardie E., Jr., O66048.
McCormick, Otto L., O66049.
McCoy, Joseph L, O61243.
McDaniel, Dan R., O62461.
McDaniel, Paul B., O62463.
McDowell, William R., O62391.
McFarland, Andrew J. B., Jr., O62776.
McGuire, Mark, O62593.
McKinney, John T., O62655.
McLean, Neil T., O73273.
McLeod, Purdy B., Jr., O67724.
McNeil, Daniel F, O60277.
McNeill, Ulmer L., O61110.
McNiff, James E., O61793.
McSherry, Walter C., O62404.
Meade, Terrence S., O61225.
Means, Charles F., O62632.
Means, Charles R., O61618.
Meengs, Philip G., O72761.
Mendheim, Billy J., O61460.
Mendieta, Hector H., O66053.
Meredith, David S., 3d, O62591.
Meredith, John D., O61214.
Merritt, Carl L., O66054.
Metzger, Edward H., Jr., O61498.
Meyer, George H., O61113.
Middleton, Edward D., Jr., O61107.
Middleton, George R., Jr., O62457.
Mielenz, Lloyd E., Jr., O62581.
Milbee, Paul G., O61425.
Miles, William C., O67726.
Milia, Carmelo P., O62462.
Millener, George A., O61600.
Miller, Daniel L., O61228.
Miller, James I., O61426.
Miller, John E., O62671.
Miller, Richard S., O62015.
Miller, Robert L., Jr., O62502.
Miller, Robert N., O71843.
Million, Glenn W., O61307.
Minter, James M., O62019.
Mitcham, James R., Jr., O62728.
Mitchell, Bradford W., O72345.
Mitchell, Howard S., O62518.
Mittino, John A., O60305.
Moak, Donald W., O60902.
Modisett, Charles B., O61448.
Monihan, David M., O62707.
Moody, Charles S., Jr., O60927.
Moon, Walter H., O63424.
Mooney, George P., O65295.
Moore, Lee B., O62026.
Morgan, John J., Jr., O61912.
Morris, Carl E., O60956.
Morris, George T., Jr., O62665.
Morris, James F., Jr., O71568.
Morrison, Robert C., O62555.
Motiska, Paul J., Jr., O61300.
Mueller, Paul J., Jr., O62288.
Mundorf, William C., O67731.
Murphy, John M., O62610.
Murphy, Kenneth E., O62757.
Murphy, Paul J. B., Jr., O66186.
Murphy, Thomas A., O61973.
Murray, Ralph E., O73475.
Nachtsheim, Henry J., Jr., O61139.
Nave, Nicholas R., Jr., O61907.
Neal, Barney K., Jr., O61735.
Neal, William B., O61989.
Neller, Herbert F., Jr., O63003.
Newcomb, Charles W., O62405.
Newcomer, Lloyd H., Jr., O62018.
Newell, Henry C., O61564.
Nicewander, Dennis R., O71580.
Nichols, Wesley G., O61010.
Nicholson, Robert N., O61414.
Nickerson, Fred E., O62453.
Nielsen, Leo W., O61551.
Nienstadt, John J., O67732.
Nigro, George A., O59270.
Nix, James H., O69758.
Norris, Eugene V., O65292.
Norton, John McN., O61041.
Nutting, Wallace H., O62468.
O'Brien, Emmett J., O61629.
O'Brien, John E., O62423.
O'Connell, Robert K., O62327.
O'Connor, Andrew R., O61103.
Odneal, Billy L., O62065.
Ogilvie, John C., O63491.
Ojendyk, Robert T., O60976.
Oliver, George S., O62336.
Oliver, James S., O61416.
Olson, Ronald R., O69759.
O'Quinn, Frank M., O61049.
O'Shea, Richard, O69761.
Osterndorf, Charles J., O62358.
Owen, Merrill R., O61499.
Pachl, Max F., Jr., O62064.
Padley, Harry E., O70464.
Palmer, William D., Jr., O61648.
Palmer, William W., O62494.
Paquin, Jean C., O67735.
Parish, John V., Jr., O62334.
Parks, Howard N., O62607.
Parmenter, William H., O66066.
Parmly, Oliver W., O62501.
Parsons, Tarlton F., 2d, O62516.
Passmore, Hunter W., O62519.
Pate, Henry A., Jr., O61217.
Patterson, Robert W., O71854.
Paulger, Albert McL., O62488.
Pederson, Duane M., O62542.
Peeples, Minor, Jr., O60915.
Pencola, Paul A., O65300.
Pender, Frank M., O61253.
Perecko, Paul J., O61317.
Perricelli, Vincent J., Jr., O61399.
Peters, George E., Jr., O61975.
Peters, Robert L., O61978.
Peterson, Daniel A., O61785.
Peterson, George W., O66190.
Petree, Bruce E., O62559.
Pettit, David P., O62477.
Pflueger, Willard T., O62008.
Phares, Raymond E., O61270.
Phifer, Clifford J., O61254.
Phillips, Ernest E., Jr., O60942.
Phillips, Wendell E., O62511.
Pick, Lewis A., Jr., O62571.
Pickarts, John M., O62057.
Pickett, Theodore R., Jr., O60899.
Pieper, Frederick A., O66192.
Pierce, Edward M., O62373.
Pierce, James M., O62050.
Pierce, William F., O62748.

Pierson, Frank A., Jr., O62687.
Pilgrim, Stanley I., O63002.
Pink, Jack T., O60869.
Pinto, Ralph D., O62616.
Pirkl, Joseph R., O60898.
Ploshay, Bernard J., Jr., O65309.
Poag, Alvin A., Jr., O62023.
Poage, Douglas W., Jr., O62476.
Pogue, James V., O60973.
Pohler, Norman G., O61428.
Polden, Donald F., O65308.
Porcher, Arthur G., 2d, O62738.
Porter, Vernon R., O61804.
Potter, Richard J., O61549.
Powers, Robert A., O62869.
Pratt, Clarence W., O61227.
Prentiss, Louis W., Jr., O62592.
Price, George L., Jr., O62385.
Price, Walter E., O62670.
Prillaman, Richard L., O66073.
Pritchard, Denzil L., O60163.
Pritchett, Clifton A., Jr., O62615.
Prouty, Stanley M., Jr., O62615.
Pruden, Jip M., 2d, O62070.
Pullano, Anthony L., O62047.
Purcell, Benjamin H., O61035.
Purdy, William T., O62024.
Quantz, Manfred R., O69773.
Quarstein, Vernon A., O62483.
Quinn, Edward B., O62377.
Radford, Loren E., O61798.
Rainville, Rodman C., O69546.
Rajala, Ernest A., O62010.
Randolph, John R., O62109.
Rawlings, Henry W., O61393.
Ray, Morton, O62739.
Ray, Oliver A., O66079.
Raybould, Lynn R., O61709.
Read, William E., O62308.
Redford, James C., O65298.
Reed, Robert D., O62769.
Rees, George C., O62669.
Rees, Marvin W., O62490.
Reese, Thomas W., O61882.
Regan, John F., O60859.
Rehfeld, Rodney R., O61724.
Rehm, Harold W., Jr., O66080.
Reilly, Frank A., O67743.
Reilly, Neil A., O62091.
Reimold, Wallace L., O61808.
Rein, Richard A., O62534.
Reinhardt, Gouch C., O61754.
Reinhart, Stanley J., O62286.
Reinken, Louis A., Jr., O62678.
Renick, Roderick D., Jr., O66081.
Replinger, Richard T., O61277.
Revels, Delzie C., O67744.
Reybold, Philip C., O62718.
Reynolds, Tom H., O62017.
Rhoads, Mark C., O62540.
Rhodes, Nolan C., O61430.
Rice, Robert H., O66083.
Richardson, Nehemiah E., O61790.
Richbourg, John A., O61118.
Riesterer, Lavern R., O68397.
Rising, Lucien E., O62481.
Ritter, Nelson F., O62719.
Roach, Paul A., Jr., O62605.
Roberts, Charles R., O61255.
Roberts, Claude LeR., Jr., O66085.
Robie, Frank D., O61369.
Robinson, Carleton J., O62860.
Roehm, John F., Jr., O62410.
Roemer, Walter R., O61593.
Rogers, Manley E., O62333.
Rogers, Richard C., O70494.
Romaneski, Albert L., O62291.
Romano, Frank, Jr., O71862.
Romine, Aubrey L., O61402.
Rondepierre, Jean R., O61633.
Roseberry, Robert A., O62078.
Rosin, Al S., O61645.
Ross, Blair A., Jr., O62419.
Ross, Harry R., O61391.
Ross, James A., Jr., O62491.
Ross, James R., O67747.
Ross, John E., O61321.
Round, Roswell E., Jr., O62480.
Roush, Maurice D., O62348.
Rowell, Milo D., O62729.
Roysden, Brunn W., O62867.
Ruehe, Richard W., O61594.
Rupple, Lindsay C., O62647.
Rush, Benjamin, 3d, O67749.
Rushing, Robert O., O61286.
Ruskin, Daniel F., O67347.
Rutherford, Andrew M., O62608.
Rutledge, John, Jr., O62806.
Saalberg, John J., O62418.
Sachers, Henry S., O62643.
Sailer, Francis A., O62765.
Salt, Terry C., O60265.
Sampson, Donald E., O62630.
Samsey, Philip B., O62397.
Sanders, Ben L., O63008.
Sanderson, Alfred L., O62479.
Santry, John P., O61310.
Sapp, Alfred G., O61256.
Sargent, Wayne B., O61671.
Savage, Lawrence L., Jr., O62027.
Sawyer, Richard H., O61979.
Scamehorn, Richard D., O61520.
Scandling, John D., O62661.
Scarborough, Wesley C., O60916.
Schall, Joseph F., O65301.
Schneider, Howard E., O61654.
Schnoor, Dean F., O62673.
Scholl, Allan P., O62637.
Schopper, Jared B., O62315.
Schott, Homer E., Jr., O61626.
Schrank, Lawrence L., O62861.
Scioscia, Oreste S., O67753.
Scithers, George H., O62363.
Scott, Joseph J., Jr., O67754.
Scovill, Thomas M., O65311.
Seely, Theodore A., Jr., O62458.
Seelye, Robert A., O61805.
Sehorne, James D., Jr., O61889.
Seltzer, Sherman M., O61666.
Setian, Zadig Y., O66095.
Severin, Roy R., O61390.
Shade, Robert A., O62421.
Shaffer, George B., O62370.
Shaffer, John R., O62762.
Shaffield, Joseph H., 3d, O60299.
Shambora, William E., Jr., O62450.
Shank, Richard G., O69790.
Shanley, Paul M., O69791.
Shannon, Donald J., O61714.
Sharp, Jere W., O62316.
Shear, Harold W., O61513.
Sheehan, William D., O69555.
Shemwell, Arthur L., Jr., O62714.
Sherman, Lee M., O71597.
Shirey, Stewart, O67755.
Shively, Charles B., O72427.
Sibbles, Graham McL., O62531.
Sibley, Nathan C., O61628.
Sidney, Wilbur A., O71599.
Siewert, Jack R., O61372.
Simmons, John W., O61305.
Simon, Henry, Jr., O60886.
Simpson, Howard J., O60987.
Singer, Raymond P., O62313.
Singleton, Millard H., O62433.
Skelton, Winfred G., O62598.
Skolen, Clarence E., O61752.
Slavins, William E., O62758.
Slyman, Samuel, O66100.
Small, Martin J., O62701.
Smarr, Albert W., Jr., O71602.
Smaw, Daniel G., 3d., O65306.
Smith, Charles R., Jr., O62891.
Smith, Clark, O62543.
Smith, Jerry E., O69796.
Smith, LeRoy W,. Jr., O66202.
Smith, Phillip B., O60911.
Smith, Roddy L., O66203.
Smithers, Samuel W., Jr., O62579.
Snoke, Myron D., O62320.
Soden, Robert E., O61378.
Spence, Clyde W., Jr., O62504.
Spencer, David R., O61330.
Spiller, Robert E., O61854.
Spitler, Joseph V., Jr., O66103.
Squires, John L., Jr., O61539.
Stahl, Kenneth L., O61451.
Stallcup, Max R., O60279.
Stampley, Charles D., O61662.
Stanton, Walter C., Jr., O62734.
Stapleton, Samuel L., O62368.
Stark, Karl F., O60929.
Starker, Joseph B., O63034.
Statham, Richard W., O61313.
Steele, Sidney R., O62466.
Stefanik, Edward P., O62332.
Steinberg, William A., O62641.
Steuart, Richard G., O62712.
Stevens, Phillip H., O67763.
Stevens, Wayne M., O62090.
Stewart, James W., O61248.
Stewart, Warren F., O61453.
Stith, Stephen W., Jr., O63501.
Stoecker, Francis J., O66106.
Storer, Ivan M., O61592.
Stough, Richard B., O71878.
Strickland, Henry E., Jr., O62569.
Strider, Carroll D., O61363.
Strider, Thomas P., O62435.
Strohm, Hans W., O61612.
Stroman, Samuel D., O61415.
Sturm, Earl C., O70518.
Sussel, Malcolm A., O67764.
Talbott, Marshall D., Jr., O62574.
Tankersley, Will H., O62744.
Tart, Robert W., Jr., O67767.
Tassie, Lawrence R., O60964.
Tate, Grayson D., Jr., O62566.
Tate, Lester K., O61574.
Taylor, Robert R., Jr., O62847.
Teener, David R., O60871.
Tenhet, Joseph N., Jr., O70123.
Therrien, Francis X., Jr., O62658.
Thibeault, James H., O69814.
Thigpen, Henry S., O60264.
Thomann, Charles E., O61005.
Thomas, Grace G., Jr., O62503.
Thomason, Myron M., O61610.
Thompson, James M., O62284.
Thompson, Nelson L., O62345.
Thurmond, George E., O61585.
Tilson, George P., O62403.
Tindall, Hal E., O60918.
Todd, William R., O61712.
Tomlinson, Hugh P., O61429.
Torgersen, Thorveld R., O69818.
Tormey, James H., O62351.
Tracy, Thomas E., O61573.
Trayers, James L., Jr., O62381.
Trefry, Richard G., O62572.
Triem, Paul D., O62326.
Trigg, William G., O67771.
Tropf, William J., Jr., O60860.
True, Richard D., O60864.
Truesdale, John H., O62603.
Turley, William DeW., O61479.
Turner, Edward B., Jr., O70536.
Turner, John T., O70538.
Turner, William F., O60957.
Tuttle, William H., Jr., O62455.
Tyrrell, William C., O70541.
Tyus, Willie L., O60306.
Underwood, Herbert P., O62522.
Valla, Lawrence, O70542.
Vail, James M., O65061.
Vance, James W., O61454.
Vanderbleek, Jack, O61685.
Vanderslice, Robert D., O61841.
Van Riper, Irving K., O69821.
Van Sickel, Vincent, T., O60257.
Vanston, John H., Jr., O62372.
Vanture, Paul S., O62731.
Vaughn, Billy M., O60893.
Veatch, Austin K., Jr., O62506.
Vestal, John L., O69823.
Vickers, Willard M., O61544.
Vincent, James A., O71737.
Vinson, Euell M., O63237.
Viskochil, Ralph H., O62515.
Waddell, Thomas K, O61266.
Wade, David E., O61506.
Wagner, John E., O62390.
Wahle, Charles G. F., O61269.
Walker, James B., O67775.
Walker, Luther G., O61440.
Walsh, James J., O61386.
Wanek, Robert F., O61424.
Ward, Ira J., O62302.
Ward, James W., O61299.
Warner, Volney F., O62620.
Warnock, James F., Jr., O61524.
Warren, John W., O61452.
Warren, Wilbur M., 2d, O62557.
Wassenberg, John F., O62537.
Watson, James R., O61581.
Watson, John W., Jr., O62720.

Watson, Kenneth, Jr., O61233.
Watters, Clarence M., O62567.
Webb, John V., O61595.
Weber, Karl B., 3d, O62346.
Weber, Warren J., O61420.
Weber, William E., O65592.
Wegner, Leonard W., Jr., O62402.
Welch, Earle M., Jr., O61298.
Welty, Rex G., Jr., O61280.
Werder, Vincent C., Jr., O67778.
Werner, Robert R., O62337.
West, Edward C., O62356.
Whan, Vorin E., Jr., O61786.
Wheaton, James R., Jr., 062773.
Whelan, James M., O70559.
Whelan, William J., O60857.
White, Ben O., Jr., O60291.
White, Charles J., O65314.
White, Francis W., Jr., O62752.
White, Robert R., O62622.
White, William E., O61465.
Whitelaw, Landon P., O61362.
Whitelaw, Robert E., O67779.
Whitfield, Marcus L., O61230.
Wickham, John A., Jr., O62394.
Wiegand, Allen W., O63762.
Wilde, Adna G., Jr., O60865.
Wilder, Stuart F., O67780.
Williams, Don J., O61294.
Williams, Edward T., O60958.
Williams, Edwin S., O61334.
Williams, Francis L., O61427.
Williams, Kenneth J., O63014.
Williams, Robert C., O60266.
Williams, Wayman E., O66125.
Williamson, Lyndall C., O65234.
Willingham, Chester M., Jr., O62508.
Wilson, Durward S., Jr., O62725.
Wilson, Gail F., O62614.
Wilson, Louis, O61384.
Wilson, Patrick W., O62600.
Wilson, Robert M., O62285.
Winlock, William C., O61375.
Wisdom, Selwin DeR., O62856.
Wise, Cecil E., O61527.
Wolf, Rene A., O62304.
Wolfe, Walter G., O63423.
Wondolowski, Francis R., O62335.
Wood, Marion M., O61128.
Wood, Marion T., O61820.
Wood, Stuart, Jr., O62486.
Wood, Walter A., 3d, O62742.
Woodman, Richard T., O61779.
Woodrow, Ronald, O61371.
Woods, Thomas G., O67783.
Workinger, George S., O71431.
Workman, James F., O62378.
Wretlind, Clayton L., O60931.
Wright, Robert E., O61404.
Wyatt, Thomas C., O66128.
Wyllie, Douglas R., O60304.
Wyrough, Richard R., O62415.
Yacavone, James L., Jr., O60263.
Yoder, Robert A., O60970.
Young, Bruce C., Jr., O61279.
Yow, Harold D., O61831.
Zilian, Carl M., O71635.
Zurth, Frederick R., O65290.

To be captains, Chaplains

Burgreen, Charles L., O71905.
Combs, Richard L., O73140.
Devanny, William G., O71913.
Eyler, Mervin S., O71917.
Farrow, Alpha A., O71668.
Kelly, Orris E., O73451.
Killinger, Joseph G., O71687.
LeBlanc, Paul J., O71694.
Lewis, Francis R., O73164.
Massey, Charles M., Jr., O73216.
Ruback, John C., O72643.
Wakefield, John F., O71966.

To be captains, Women's Army Co

George, Delma G., L00405.
Ledbetter, Julia E., L00392.
Metcalf, Elsie J., L00342.
Putnam, Lois C., L00343.
Riggs, Cheryle M., L00399.
Scott, Betty E., L00464.
Strube, Bernice M., L00333.
Weir, Frances, L00406.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be first lieutenants

Beasley, Linton C., O73284.
Bell, Robert S., O73285.
Buckner, Allen M., O73299.
Cunningham, Martin J., 2d, O73311.
Font-Portocarrero, Jorge M., O73329.
Henslick, James R., O73344.
Hingst, John M., O73345.
Keaton, Jack L., O73353.
Kupec, Edward W., O73360.
Larson, Harry D., O73452.
Owens, Joe S., O73384.
Ricker, Norman H., Jr., O73390.
Salguero, Manuel M., Jr., O73394.
Smith, Dan R., O73403.
Smith, Donald L., O73404.
Strand, Vincent W., O73411.
Vorba, Richard G., O73419.
Watson, Jack D., O73423.
Watts, William D., O73424.
Watts, William E., O73425.
Wier, Melville B., O73428.

The following-named officer for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Cole, Alberta M., N2720.

The following-named person for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade specified, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title IV, Career Compensation Act of 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.):

To be colonel

Mitchell, John D., O12713.

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified:

To be captains

Lukens, Walter P., O50801.
Peckham, Robert D., O50740.

To be first lieutenant

Myers, William G., O59658.

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States, without specification of branch, arm, or service, in the grades specified:

To be captain

Costello, Thomas A., O65132.

To be first lieutenant

Bomberger, Richard W., Jr., O71904.
Leach, Bertram G., O67098.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), section 201, title II, Public Law 365, 80th Congress, as amended by Public 497, 84th Congress, Public Law 759, 80th Congress, Public Law 625, 80th Congress, and Public Law 36, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress, and Public Law 294, 84th Congress:

To be captains

Bethany, Charles W., Jr., JAGC, O442795.
Chilcoat, William J., JAGC, O533421.
Coffey, Michael J., MC O991906.
Dalton, James B., MC, O1893358.
Hall, Rupert P., JAGC, O969016.
Minis, Carol E., JAGC, O967437.
Richardson, James W., Jr., JAGC, O2271278.
Stagg, James F., MC, O945335.

To be first lieutenants

Andrews, James L., DC, O4034174.
Baugh, Joseph H., MC, O4016516.
Brown, Stuart M., MC, O4045783.
Calcagni, Doris M., ANC, N805532.
Duckworth, Dorothy S., ANC, N792586.
Fuller, Raymond E., MC, O4055984.
Glasgow, Richard J., JAGC, O1877830.
Goddard, Ross M., Jr., JAGC, O2275446.
Hargis, Harold W., DC, O2274754.
Herrington, Peter N., MC, O4067689.
Higgins, Mary E., ANC, N901152.
Horan, Thomas B., Jr., MC O2200297.
Houghton, Jean M., ANC, N901574.
Lewis, Betty J., ANC, N901459.
Lilly, Gilbert E., DC, O2275644.
Nauman, James D., MC, O2268944.
Neinast, William H., JAGC, O1920475.
Newman, Stanley, MSC, O2274009.
Novack, Tevor D., MC, O4039826.
Price, Helen E., AMSC, R20151.
Rasmussen, Donald L., MC, O4050810.
Rosch, Paul J., MC.
Trushel, David H., JAGC, O2277873.
Tyler, Charles L., MC, O4034594.

To be second lieutenants

Tiernan, Pauline E., ANC, N902295.
White, Jocelyn A., WAC, L1010725.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 201, title II, Public Law 365, 80th Congress as amended by Public Law 497, 84th Congress, subject to completion of internship:

Augerson, William S., O1874469.
Billingsley, James G.
Bowler, Donald L.
Brugger, Archie M., O2275392.
Davis, Frederick S., Jr., O2275601.
Goldblatt, Harry.
Harris, Richard J.
Harris, Stanley C., O1651925.
Jacobson, Eugene D.
Kinney, Richard D.
Lambert, Cary J.
McCollum, Kenneth B., O2275389.
Petty, Charles R., O2275400.
Riggs, Byron L., O2275581.
Snyder, Jerome A., O2275353.
Strockbine, Melvin F.
Stromberg, LaWayne R., O2211775.
Sweeney, George H.
Tanous, James C.
Williams, Robert B., O2275345.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Dental Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 201, title II, Public Law 365, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 497, 84th Congress, upon receipt of doctor of dental surgery degree:

Griffith, John G. II, O2282509.
Hartman, Robert L., O2282508.
Johnson, Thomas R., O1888086.
Karren, Keith O., O2275898.
Larson, Olaf O., O2282503.
Mertz, Harry L., Jr., O2277874.
Michaud, Edward C., Jr., O2276572.
O'Toole, Edward T., O2282507.
Paul, William H., O2282502.
Saal, Richard A., O2282637.
Schallhorn, Robert G., O2282504.
Schuller, Gary D.
Scott, Walter J., O2275902.
Smith, Raymond B., O2282506.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

To be first lieutenants

Ackerman, David G., O2265041.
Bills, Joe, O4013561.
Brakenridge, Edward K., Jr., O990888.
Brown, Thomas R., Jr., O1887583.
Burnett, Otis E., O994761.

Burt, Donald L., O990133.
Butterworth, James R., O1690981.
Conway, Donald J., O1885757.
Easton, Byron S., O2030432.
Elliott, Robert H., Jr., O2205676.
Elmore, Donald J., O1931800.
Fox, John G., O1926490.
Gardner, Morris L., O1914696.
Georger, John F., O1340362.
Gerard, Robert J., O1925174.
Gittleman, Warren E., O2033020.
Hayden, Charles W., O1688714.
Hembree, Jack E., O1929091.
Husa, Richard F., O1935134.
Hyde, Richard G., O1930880.
Irvin, Matthew W., O1917990.
Johnson, Robert R., O2211367.
Keller, George A., O2206215.
Kotite, Richard S., O1338355.
Lancaster, William A., O1885155.
Logan, Donald G., O4009088.
MacMillan, William D., IV., O1341021.
Matson, Hugo W., O4005476.
May, Edwin M., Jr., O1925946.
McIntyre, Lawrence A., O1874708.
Merrell, William L., O1894073.
Meyer, Frederick F., Jr., O1883990.
Michel, Werner E., O1329861.
Miller, David C., O1884010.
Moffett, Norman A., O4018679.
Myers, Lawrence S., O2104321.
Olson, Arthur G., O1884035.
Osborn, George K., III, O2102867.
Palmer, George E., O1881689.
Pedersen, Alfred L., O1926314.
Phillips, Shepperd H., O2004109.
Pritchett, Robert G., O1339310.
Puckhaber, Herman F., Jr., O1915506.
Reade, John C., Jr., O4005347.
Rodriguez, Joseph C., O2103097.
Routon, Lewis A., O1877271.
Rundell, Walter, Jr., O1933543.
Schultz, Reed S., O1936073.
Shelby, Roy E., O1885773.
Sleeper, Julian R., O1919999.
Smith, William D., O2266060.
Specker, Robert W., O1872364.
Stevenson, William J., O1936725.
Stidham, James A., O970475.
Strawn, William M., Jr., O2021145.
Suess, Philip M., Jr., O1885898.
Tourtillott, Raymond J., O1885799.
Vidrick, Robert L., O4001758.
Wagers, Robert W., O2102796.
Wallace, Robert G., O2265108.
Whelan, William E., O1933684.
Wright Jermy B., O995359.
Willey, Oliver A., Jr., O1922603.
Williams, Roy L., Jr., O1894209.

To be second lieutenants

Allen, Vincent H., Jr., O4009377.
Applewhite, Ray, O988526.
Baldwin, Jessie E., O4026485.
Beaube, George P., O4023721.
Blazzard, Trevelyn G., O4019331.
Bockman, Leonard I., O4023860.
Cleary, Arthur C., O4003248.
Einseln, Aleksander, O4031215.
Engram, Edwin J., O4023793.
Erickson, Eric A., Jr., O4016148.
Esplin, Willard B., O4013878.
Green, David E., O4011928.
Greer, Richard B., O4013302.
Higgins, Alan R., O4017289.
High, Charles S., W2206308.
Hoffman, William J., O4009886.
Jones, Glenn W., O4009366.
Jongebloed, Nicholas H., O4003160.
Kinney, Philip R., O999600.
Kyburz, Edward P., O2208386.
Madigan, John J., III, O4001030.
McLaughlin, Thomas J., O4006461.
Mendenhall, Robert L., O2206144.
Merrick, Philip B., O4006743.
Mulvanity, Donald C.
Osborn, John A., O4030997.
Palermo, Frank J., Jr., O4009718.
Ragains, Robert L., O4015962.
Rogers, Roland B., O4009580.
Sherron, Gene T., O4013188.
Shilko, Edwin M., O4010601.
Shuman, John N., O4043385.
Smith, John A., O4000757.
Spry, Alfred E., O4006472.
Stevenson, Thomas A., O1880783.
Tunmire, Dana, O4023736.
Ulrich, Charles F., O4003899.
Wall, Frank B., Jr., O2204799.
Watson, Richard W., O4015247.
Wheeler, William C., Jr., O4017010.
Williams, Lawrence A., O4006378.
Wilson, Parks W., Jr., O1940088.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Hoerning, Robert W., O4058338.
Muth, Arnold J.
Sandstrum, Allan W.
Smith, Bobby P.
Spencer, Robert A.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1956, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Abruzzese, John P.
Adams, Donald S.
Albright, Edward M. Jr.
Allen, Edward R.
Amerson, Hinton S.
Anderson, Duane F.
Anderson, George W.
Baldwin, Robert C.
Balint, Barry T. J.
Barnes, Theodore F.
Barry, John W.
Bennett, Michael J.
Booth, John P., III
Brill, James H.
Brister, Delano R.
Broder, Nathan S.
Brown, Fred D.
Brown, Robert M.
Buckley, Raymond H.
Callahan, Kenneth R.
Campbell, Joseph R.
Carson, Lawrence E.
Clark, Stephen E.
Clowe, John F., Jr.
Cobb, Hollis F., Jr.
Coffman, Richard L.
Cooke, Sidney B.
Cooper, Harold B., Jr.
Correll, Ralph T.
Craig, Joe H.
Crisp, Richard A.
Curran, Jan D.
Del Vecchio, William P.
Dickson, William R.
Doar, James M.
Dougherty, Maurice F.
Dreeben, Lionel
Druit, Clifford A.
Egan, Douglas M.
Feeney, Richard L.
Frisbie, James G.
Gately, Michael P.
Gayler, Earl D.
Gear, James N.
Goetz, George W.
Gonzalez, Alvaro R.
Gorman, Robert G.
Gross, Woolf P.
Gullen, John P.
Hallinan, James M., Jr.
Harbuck, Eugene L.
Hardegree, Bobby L.
Harig, John A., Jr.
Haupert, Francis J.
Hearn, Peter
Hill, Theron H.
Hodkinson, Peter, III.
Irwin, James T.
Johanknecht, George P.
Johnson, Gerald K.
Johnstone, Robert L., III
Keating, Thomas E., Jr.
King, James A., Jr.
King, Thomas H.
Kingsley, Donald E.
Koonce, Philip H.
Kubas, Michael J.
Larimer, Charles L.
Larimer, Merlin W.
Leath, Lewis T.
Macdonald, Donald L.
Mayotte, Clifford J., Jr.
McAden, Henry J., Jr.
McCormick, James M.
McDonald, Robert E., Jr.
Meyer, Charles V.
Mikk, George
Miller, Spencer R.
Murray, Jackson S.
Owen, Thomas D., Jr.
Paas, Alfred O.
Parker, Richard G.
Perry, James R.
Perryman, Jack P.
Pertain, George H., Jr.
Peters, Clifford L.
Peterson, Walter R., Jr.
Pharr, Joe B.
Pierce, Isaiah B., Jr.
Pinkston, William R., Jr.
Plum, Matthias, Jr.
Price, Roger J.
Raskob, Anthony W.
Reeder, Richard E.
Reeves, George E.
Reichel, James E.
Rodenmayer, John P.
Rupp, James E.
Ryan, Francis J.
Schroder, Ottomar
Smith, James H.
Solley, Charles W.
Steinhauser, Wilmer A.
Stewart, Robert C.
Stewart, William R.
Strom, George P.
Tate, Thomas N.
Tengler, John A.
Thomas, Harry L.
Thompson, Thomas T.
Thurmond, George E.
Vaughn, William V., Jr.
Ventzek, Robert E.
Walker, Tommy L.
Ward, Jerry E.
Wetherington, Bernard J.
Whitt, Lawrence H.
Wiley, Chester J.
Wiser, Bobbie M.
Wright, Charles M.
Wynd, William R.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Rev. Melville D. Nesbit, Jr., pastor, Clarendon Presbyterian Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, who hast knit all nations and peoples into one, we pray Thee for Thy will to be done this day through each one of us. Thou alone knowest fully our individual and corporate problems—the spirits that are tired, the temptations to water down truth, the narrow aims of many strident interests. We beseech Thee, give us courage to walk in the light as we see it, without fear and without betrayal. Hold before us the needs of the whole people, and make us to serve their interests. Enable us to remember Thy purpose as it is witnessed for all men in the principles of our Nation. Make the heritage of this land to be a glowing brand in our hearts, that we and all citizens shall practice what we preach. Above all, bring to pass in us and through us the graciousness of Jesus Christ and the leading of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McBride, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3255. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to preserve in certain cases the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees whose positions are placed in lower grades by virtue of reclassification actions under such act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8225. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Pipestone National Monument in the State of Minnesota; and

H. R. 9822. An act to provide for the establishment of a trout hatchery on the Davidson River in the Pisgah National Forest in North Carolina.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1873. An act to increase the minimum postal savings deposit, and for other purposes; and

S. 3920. An act to authorize the partition or sale of inherited interests in allotted lands in the Tulalip Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes.

PARTICIPATION BY PRESIDENT CASTILLO ARMAS, OF GUATEMALA, IN RESCUE OPERATIONS

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, the courage of the present Government of Guatemala in overthrowing the previous Communist regime and in moving effectively to stabilize the security and economy of the country has evoked the admiration of the whole free world. President Castillo Armas is a leader who is determined to make the Guatemala experiment a living reality and an example for the millions of people now behind the Iron Curtain who yearn for freedom and independence.

A recent incident illustrates the personal interest which President Castillo Armas takes in the affairs of his country and in the people of Guatemala. On May 24, there occurred a tragic airplane accident in the mountainous and dangerous region of Sierra de las Minas. The site of the accident is some 80 miles northeast of Guatemala City, the capital. Thirty people were killed and only one survived. Learning that the Chief of the United States Air Mission to Guatemala and his pilot had both discovered the site of the accident, personally took able to take photos due to poor visibility and bad weather, President Castillo Armas, after securing the details from the Minister of Defense, left Guatemala City at 5 a. m. Monday morning, May 28, in his own plane for Zacapa. From there he flew in a helicopter with the Chief of the United States Air Mission over the site of the accident, personally took control of rescue operations, and efficiently organized and directed the rescue patrols. All the dead were identified and removed from the scene by the rescue patrols.

Despite his heavy responsibilities and official workload, President Castillo Armas considered the identification of the individuals involved in the crash and subsequent rescue operations to be of sufficient importance to warrant his personal supervision and direction. This personal regard for the welfare of his people is typical of President Castillo Armas. I know that many of my colleagues in the House join with me in commending President Castillo Armas.

FOREIGN COMPETITION DESTROYING OHIO POTTERY INDUSTRY

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, for a long time the pottery industry of southeastern Ohio has been having a rough time keeping its head above water in competition with the foreign importation of pottery products. And what is true of pottery is also becoming a reality with regard to the ceramic tile industry. I was most interested to read a statement of Roy E. Jordan, Jr., president of the Mosaic Tile Co. of Zanesville, Ohio, presented before the National Tile Contractors Association at its annual convention in Denver, Colo.

Mr. Jordan pointed out that today foreign tile imports have increased by 763 percent during the past 6 years. Mr. Jordan goes on to say that the steady increase in ceramic-tile imports made by low-cost foreign labor is a definite threat to the long-range prosperity of the domestic tile industry.

That industry, Mr. Jordan points out, is an important segment of the construction industry which is so vital to the well-being of our national economy. In his opinion, the current tariff regulations are wholly inadequate to cope with the situation which has developed. Mr. Jordan said we, in the industry, expect Congress to take a hard look at the unprecedented tile imports with a view to taking action.

Mr. Speaker, it is most disheartening to see one industry after another in southeastern Ohio suffer from the invasions of foreign competition, especially when these invasions have come about because of the policies inviting such invasions which have been inaugurated over the past decade. It is high time that Congress took a very close look at the situation, not only with regard to foreign tile imports, but the effect that our policies with regard to foreign trade are having upon many, many industries. I would recommend a wholesale congressional investigation of the effect of foreign imports upon American industry. The problem needs to be faced squarely, not just as an adjunct of some legislative proposals. Congress has committees which deal with and study un-American political activities. Congress should also constantly study activities which may tend to adversely affect American economic and industrial welfare.

A FALSE CHARGE OF GAS AND OIL SUPPORT IN WISCONSIN POLITICS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's RECORD, beginning at page 9411, there are eight pages in which the charge is made by a Member of the other body from Wisconsin, if not directly, at least by innuendo, that a Member of the House, our distinguished colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], would receive the benefit of a campaign fund of $150,000 contributed by the gas and oil interests on the theory that he had supported, and presumably would support, legislation which those interests advocated and in which they were financially interested.

The absurdity, the falsity of that charge is apparent if the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is consulted. In July of 1955, when the so-called gas bill was before the House, I supported it, both on the motion to recommit and on final passage. My vote was cast in that manner because I believed the proposed legislation to be good legislation. My recollection is that when the bill was before the House in 1955 the administration was supporting it.

Our colleague from Wisconsin had convictions to the contrary, and as always he voted in accordance with his convictions.

That there may be no misunderstanding as to the falsity of the charges made yesterday from the floor of the other body, permit me to cite the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 9, page 11929. When the bill was reported back from the Committee of the Whole to the House for action, Mr. WOLVERTON moved to recommit the bill to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for further study. On the rollcall, our colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] voted to recommit.

Immediately after that vote was taken, the bill was up for final passage, and on the rollcall the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] cast his vote against the bill.

The record not only shows that the charge made by the gentleman from Wisconsin speaking in the other body yesterday is not only without foundation in fact, but it shows that our colleague who was so unjustly charged with being influenced by interests which it was said were willing to contribute to his present campaign for a seat in the Senate, voted against, not in favor of, the position of those alleged contributors.

What I am wondering, if I may be permitted to speculate, is whether the gentleman from Wisconsin who spoke yesterday in the other body using those eight pages to make that false charge knew what he was talking about, knew how our colleague voted, or whether he deliberately made the statement which appears in the RECORD this morning. My assumption is that he was not familiar with the record.

TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a document which raises questions of such a fundamental importance to the preservation of our Republic that I feel it should be read and studied by every loyal citizen.

The Committee To Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations revealed much that should disturb Americans. Still, to my knowledge, it did not uncover an instance of a foundation being sued for libel. I question whether those who established the privilege of tax exemption ever dreamed of such a contingency. After all, was not this privilege to be extended to only those who, without profit to themselves, sought to advance the general welfare? And how could the general welfare conceivably be advanced by libeling a citizen?

The citizen who alleges libel is Dr. Bella V. Dodd, former Communist, who.

unlike so many unrepentant conspirators, has given unstintingly of her time to all branches of our Government at great cost to herself. While in the party, Bella Dodd lacked not for finances nor prestige, nor accolades from the groups and individuals who today vilify and attack her. But once she came to the aid of our Republic in its hour of crisis, forsaking the Red dictatorship which plots our end, we find a different story.

From that day forward Dr. Dodd has existed on the paltry return she could achieve from a greatly reduced law practice and teaching career, supplemented by occasional fees for lectures.

But the friends of the Red Fascists begrudged her even this and sought to turn all against her. In May 1955 the Fund for the Republic circulated 25,000 copies of a reprint from Harper's magazine entitled "The Kept Witnesses" to labor officials and business executives. This article is the subject of the complaint I hold in my hand, naming the Fund for the Republic, its officers and trustees, and Harper's magazine as defendants in a suit for damages.

However, the article "The Kept Witnesses" is also an all-out attack on our national-security program and on the agencies of our Government which Dr. Dodd has so often helped. Dr. Dodd fights not only to rectify a wrong to herself, but to defend the very agencies which loyally strive to preserve us as a sovereign Nation.

And here let us pause to note the most amazing fact of all. Whereas Dr. Bella Dodd courageously rides into this legal battle at great expense which must be borne by her, and by her alone, she fights our Nation's battle alone, no tax money, no tax-exempt privilege, no multimillion dollar gifts, no support.

But what of her opponents who attack the security program of our Nation? They march to battle with millions of dollars of tax-exempt funds, withheld to promote the general welfare.

Alice in Wonderland was never like this. What American could ever have dreamed that one day the United States would subsidize the destruction of those who would defend them?

In this unequal battle Bella Dodd could easily be crucified, alone and unaided. What magnificent courage prompted her to undertake it. May God help her and our country.

By consent, I am inserting the complaint against the Fund for the Republic in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, COUNTY OF NEW YORK, BELLA V. DODD, PLAINTIFF, AGAINST HARPER & BROTHERS, CASS CANFIELD, FRANK S. MACGREGOR, JOHN FISCHER, RUSSELL LYNES, CATHERINE MEYER, THE FUND FOR THE REPUBLIC, INC., ROBERT M. HUTCHINS, PAUL G. HOFFMAN, DAVID F. FREEMAN, W. H. FERRY, AND RICHARD H. ROVERE, DEFENDANTS—COMPLAINT

The plaintiff, Bella V. Dodd, by her attorneys Dodd, Cardiello & Blair, alleges as follows:

1. That at all the times hereinafter mentioned the defendant, Harper & Brothers, was a corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York.

2. That at all the times hereinafter mentioned the defendant, Harper & Brothers, was engaged in the publication of the magazine known as "Harper's Magazine," and that such magazine is published for circulation and was circulated throughout the United States, Canada, Great Britain, Mexico, and all countries participating in the International Copyright Convention and the Pan American Copyright Convention, and was read by the general public, including those who are active in the fields of politics, business, and labor.

3. That at all the times hereinafter mentioned the defendant, Frank S. MacGregor, was president of the defendant, Harper & Brothers, and actively participated in its business operations including the circulation of Harper's magazine.

4. That at all the times hereinafter mentioned the defendant, Cass Canfield, was chairman of the board of directors of Harper & Bros. corporation.

5. That at all the times hereinafter mentioned the defendant, John Fischer, was editor in chief of Harper's magazine, and the defendant, Catherine Meyer, was an editor of Harper's magazine, and were in direct charge of the preparation and publication of various articles published in Harper's magazine.

6. That at all the times hereinafter mentioned the defendant, Russell Lynes, was managing editor of Harper's magazine and in such capacity selected and determined what material and subject matters were to be printed and published in Harper's magazine for circulation to the general public.

7. That at all the times hereinafter mentioned the defendant, Richard H. Rovere, was and is a resident of the State of New York.

8. That at all the times hereinafter mentioned the defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., was a corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York.

9. That at all the times hereinafter mentioned the defendant, Robert M. Hutchins, was president of the defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., and as such determined the projects and subject matter to be investigated by the Fund for the Republic, Inc.

10. That at all the times hereinafter mentioned the defendant, W. H. Ferry, was vice president and David F. Freeman, was secretary-treasurer of defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., and on information and belief, participated in determining the program of the Fund for the Republic, Inc., and deciding on what subjects were to be investigated and what books, articles, and other literature were to be distributed.

11. That at all the times hereinafter mentioned the defendant, Paul G. Hoffman, was chairman of the board of directors of defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., and participated in deciding the policy, what subjects were to be investigated, what books, articles and publications were to be distributed.

12. That upon information and belief the defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., is a corporation having its principal office within the city of New York.

13. That upon information and belief the defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., is exempt from tax under the revenue laws of the United States, and under applicable State taxing legislation and does not contribute financially for the support, maintenance, and defense of the United States of America.

14. That at all the times hereinafter mentioned and for some time prior thereto, the defendant, Richard H. Rovere, was the author of the article entitled "The Kept Witnesses," published in the May 1955 issue of Harper's magazine, and upon information and belief had been engaged and employed by the defendant, Harper & Bros. Corp., agreed to and did pay a consideration to the said Richard H. Rovere.

15. That upon information and belief the defendant Richard H. Rovere, for and on behalf of and at the instance of the defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., did write the article making specific references to the plaintiff as shall more particularly hereafter appear.

16. That in the May 1955 issue of a magazine known as Harper's magazine, defendant Harper & Bros. published the heretofore mentioned article under the title of "The Kept Witnesses."

17. That at all the times hereinafter mentioned the facts of the plaintiff's good reputation were known to, or should have been known to, or could readily be ascertained by defendants, Richard H. Rovere and Harper & Bros., and the Fund for the Republic, Inc.

18. That the aforementioned article entitled "The Kept Witnesses," published for general circulation in the May 1955 issue of Harper's magazine, did contain libelous statements and insinuations about and concerning the plaintiff, Bella V. Dodd.

19. That said libel did consist of libelous statements directly and indirectly reflecting upon plaintiff's character, honesty, truthfulness, integrity, professional practice, social, and economic standing.

20. That plaintiff was libelously attacked in that said article attempted to create a public impression in regard to plaintiff's character, honesty, truthfulness, integrity, professional practice, social and economic standing, by using a device popularly referred to as "guilt by association" or "libel by association," and that such article tended to hold plaintiff up to public scorn, ridicule, and hostility.

21. That among the persons mentioned in said article was one Whittaker Chambers, a former Communist, and that the defendant, Richard H. Rovere, inserted explanatory matter after the name of said Whittaker Chambers, which explanation stated that said Whittaker Chambers was not guilty of the same alleged crimes, sins, acts, and motivations as defendant, Richard H. Rovere, attributed to the other persons grouped or associated by said article.

22. That the defendant, Richard H. Rovere, owed plaintiff a duty, when he included her name in said article, to explain to the public that plaintiff was not guilty of the alleged crimes, sins, acts, and motivations defendant Rovere attributed to the other persons grouped or associated by said article.

23. That the defendant, Richard H. Rovere, by use of plaintiff's name in said article was purposely and with malice attempting to associate plaintiff with the alleged crimes, sins, acts, and motivations attributed by him to others through the said article, and to libel her by association and to create the impression that she was guilty by association, and to create in the public mind an attitude of scorn, ridicule, and hostility toward the plaintiff.

24. That upon information and belief, subsequent to publication of the said article in said magazine, defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc. distributed, through the mails and otherwise, at least 25,000 copies of said article.

25. That upon information and belief, such distribution of said article was made mainly to labor officials, business executives, Government personnel, and professional people.

26. That on or about May 31, 1955, the defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc. published and issued a report of the activities and financial condition of said defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc.

27. That upon information and belief, the officers and staff and the members of the board of directors of the defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., are as follows:

Robert M. Hutchins, president, W. H. Ferry, vice president, David F. Freeman, secretary and treasurer, Hallock Hoffman, assistant to the president, Edward Reed, Joseph P. Lyford,

Thomas J. Gardner, assistant treasurer, Winifred G. Meskus, assistant secretary, Bethuel M. Webster, counsel, Paul G. Hoffman, chaiman, George N. Shuster, vice chairman, Harry S. Ashmore, Chester Bowles, Charles W. Cole, Arthur H. Dean, Russell L. Dearmont, Erwin N. Griswold, William H. Joyce, Jr., Meyer Kestenbaum, M. Albert Linton, John Lord O'Brien, Jubal R. Parten, Elmo Roper, Mrs. Eleanor B. Stevenson, and James D. Zellerbach.

28. That said officers, staff, and directors of defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., knew, could have known, should have known, and must be considered to know the contents of the said report of defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc.

29. That said report of defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., in the appendix thereof, did set forth as an activity and accomplishment of defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., a list of books, articles and other material distributed by the Fund for the Republic, Inc., by title, author, source, number of copies distributed, and main audience to which they were distributed.

30. That said list did include as an article distributed by said defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., the aforementioned article The Kept Witnesses in these words—"The Kept Witnesses, by Richard H. Rovere. Article. Harper's, 25,000 copies. Labor officials, business executives."

31. That on the basis of the information contained in said list in said report only one other book, article or other material received a greater distribution.

32. That upon information and belief the officers and/or directors of defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., did select the material that was so distributed.

33. That upon information and belief the officers and/or directors of defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., did pass upon and approve of the distribution of material distributed by defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc.

34. That by selection of the books, articles, and other matter distributed by said defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., said fund was acting with malice and intent to discredit, malign, intimidate, and otherwise persecute witnesses who cooperated with congressional or governmental investigating agencies, of whom plaintiff was one.

35. That said report of defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., lists and sets forth the names of 17 books, articles, and other material distributed by said fund, among which is the said article, The Kept Witnesses.

36. That upon information and belief the said 17 books, articles, and other material distributed as set forth in the said report of the defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., all deal with the general subject of communism and investigations into communism.

37. That upon information and belief at least seven of said books, articles, and other material distributed by defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., dealt or were concerned with congressional or governmental investigations into communism.

38. That upon information and belief each one of the books, articles, or other material distributed by defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., as recorded in said report of said defendant and dealing with the subject of congressional and governmental investigations, and witnesses testifying before such investigations, is part of a program designed to unfavorably influence public opinion in regard to the necessity of such investigations, and the character, honesty, truthfulness, integrity, professional status, social or economic standing of those witnesses who testified before and cooperated with such investigations, particularly former Communists, including the plaintiff.

39. That upon information and belief the above referred to books, articles, and other material all tend to and attempt to so present the subject matter referred to in the preceding paragraph as to influence public opinion in opposition to congressional and governmental investigations, and to vilify and hold up to contempt the witnesses testifying or cooperating with such investigations, including the plaintiff.

40. That upon information and belief the publication and distribution of said books, articles, and other material was part of a program designed to influence public opinion against the necessity, usefulness, and integrity of congressional or governmental investigations into communism, and to create in the mind of the public an attitude tending to hold up to scorn, contempt, ridicule, and hostility those witnesses who cooperated with congressional or governmental investigations, of whom plaintiff was one.

41. That such program was known to, or should have been known to the officers and directors of the defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc.

42. That upon information and belief the various books, articles, and other material above mentioned, and the writers, of the above-mentioned books, articles, and other material do quote from and mention in the various books, articles, and other material distributed by said defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., the other books, articles, and other material distributed by said defendant in an attempt to create a general atmosphere of authority for the books, articles, and other material so quoted or referred to, and attempt to pyramid and compound the effect and impression that any one such book, article, and other material may have in the public mind, and to create the impression that any one book, article, and other material is a greater and more reliable authority in reference to the matter dealt with by any such book, article, and other material than is actually the case, or than such book, article, and other material would have were it not referred to or quoted in the various other books, articles, and other material distributed by defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc.

43. That since the original distribution of the aforesaid article, The Kept Witnesses, the defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., has continued in the distribution of said article to the general public.

44. That upon information contained in the annual report of defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., hereinbefore mentioned, every project planned by this defendant for the future deals with the general subject of communism and/or its investigation.

45. That upon information and belief the defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., will continue to carry out with the distribution of articles and other means, its program to influence public opinion belittling the danger of communism and of the necessity, usefulness, and integrity of congressional or governmental investigations into communism, and to create in the mind of the public an attitude tending to hold up to scorn, contempt, ridicule and hostility those witnesses who cooperate with congressional or governmental investigations, of whom plaintiff has been, and may again be one.

46. That the distribution of said article, The Kept Witnesses, did tend and attempt to create and, in fact, did create in the minds of the general public an association between plaintiff and the other persons mentioned in said article, and did tend and attempt to and, in fact, did associate witnesses who cooperated with congressional and governmental investigations into communism and its infiltration into our social, political and economic life, with the same alleged crimes, sins, acts and motivations as were set forth in the said article, or implied in said article, of the plaintiff and the other persons named in said article.

47. That further distribution of said article, The Kept Witnesses, will increase in the minds of the public the scorn, ridicule and hostility and false, libelous impression of the plaintiff, and each such article distributed is a separate and distinct libel.

48. That distribution of books, articles or other material by the defendant, the Fund for the Republic, Inc., subsequent to distribution of the aforementioned article, The Kept Witnesses, and dealing with the same subject matter as dealt with in said article and distributed to those who received distribution of the aforementioned article, will tend to recall to mind, refresh the memory of, strengthen, lend weight to, increase the authority of, or otherwise increase, pyramid and compound the scorn, ridicule, and hostility which the aforementioned article, The Kept Witnesses, attempted to and did create in the minds of those who read said article affecting plaintiff particularly.

49. That upon information and belief the defendants have used the device of guilt by association in libeling the plaintiff, and there is indication that future actions of the defendants will result in a continuing publication of the original libel as well as the publication or distribution of other material that will tend to increase and compound the public scorn, ridicule, and hostility to plaintiff that was engendered by the original libel and libel by association.

50. That such future continuing publication or republication of the libelous article constitutes a continuing wrong against plaintiff.

51. That the past action complained of and the future plans of the defendant, The Fund for the Republic, Inc., as presented in the aforementioned report of said defendant indicates that there is reasonable probability that future action of said defendant will injure plaintiff by use of the device of libel by association with the plaintiff's clients, potential clients, and the general public.

52. That as a result plaintiff has suffered and is threatened with libel of a continuing and cumulative nature that has greatly injured and further endangers her professional standing and practice, her financial earning capacity, her social status, and her health.

53. That the libel and cumulative effect of past and future libel by association is a wrong against plaintiff that has caused and will in the future cause her irreparable harm.

54. That the libel and cumulative effect of past and future publication of said libel by association is a wrong against plaintiff that can result in a multiplicity of suits and for which plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law.

55. That a copy of the aforementioned article The Kept Witnesses is attached to and made a part of this complaint, and that said article does libel plaintiff.

56. That without being all inclusive, the following phrases and sentences from said article do libel plaintiff, falsely reflect upon her honesty, truthfulness, integrity, reputation and professional ethics, and do injure her professional standing and practice, her financial possibilities, and her economic and social status.

See page 34, column 2, top:

"No man, for example, has had any greater influence on the public view of the Communist problem than Louis F. Budenz. On the basis of his reputation as the Government's leading witness in Smith Act cases and before congressional committees, he has established an almost universal acceptance of himself as a high authority and of his books, articles, lectures, and television discourses as bearing some imagined seal of official approval. Elizabeth Bentley, J. B. Matthews, Benjamin Gitlow, Howard Rushmore, Bella Dodd, and Joseph Kornfeder run not very far behind. (Whittaker Chambers has also

been enormously influential, but of him it must be said that his writings lend more authority to his testimony than his testimony lends to his writings. He is not, therefore of this company.)"

See page 34, column 2, middle:

"Lesser witnesses have established lesser reputations on the strength of their endorsement by the Government. Moreover, they have had and are having a direct influence on policy and law—not through appeals to public opinion but through direct appeals to the governing powers. Paul Crouch tells the Senate what to do about Hawaii and how the Army should be run. Matthew Cvetic is called by the Senate Rules Committee to advise on the thorny question of rules for congressional investigations."

See page 27, column 2, paragraph 2:

"Whether the list is complete is not known. It was specified that the 83 named were all under contract to the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department."

See page 28, column 1, paragraph 1:

"At all odds, the Department of Justice had at least 83 kept witnesses in 1954."

See page 28, column 1, paragraph 2:

"Of the 83 persons retained by the Department in 1954, all were, by their own admission, former members of the Communist Party. Some, like Benjamin Gitlow, one of the first American Bolsheviks and once Communist candidate for Vice President, had been true believers; others, like Matthew Cvetic."

See page 28, column 1, top:

"The people who receive them are carried on the books, not as kept witnesses but as 'expert consultants.' But kept witnesses is what in fact they are; such usefulness as they may be said to have derives from their ability and readiness to identify people as Communists, to describe Communist activities for the enlightenment of judges, juries, and security panels; and to interpret Communist doctrine in such a way as to bring it within the area proscribed by the Smith Act."

See page 29, column 1, middle paragraph 1:

"Hiring as expert consultants of the former Communists and police agents who make up the Department's corps of professional witnesses."

See page 29, column 2, middle of last paragraph:

"The Department of Justice is subsidizing testimony."

See page 30, column 1, about one-third from top:

"But the professional witness up to now has made an appearance only as the creature of disreputable law firms and private detective agencies."

See page 30, column 2, paragraph 2:

"The cloak of suspicion is a garment that must be wrapped several times around the witnesses for whose services the Department of Justice has contracted. For one thing, their pecuniary interest assuming, for the moment, that $34 a day constitutes one—has the unusual character of a continuum."

See page 30, column 2, last paragraph:

"As Whittaker Chambers, who has given testimony but has never become a professional."

See page 31, column 1, paragraph 3:

"Louis Budenz, a former editor of the Daily Worker, who has testified that his income from all sources as an anti-Communist witness and publicist has exceeded $10,000 a year."

See page 32, column 2, bottom:

"A considerable number of the professional witnesses are disaffected Communists and clearly carry the stigma and disabilities along with the special insights, of their kind."

See page 27, column 1, paragraph 2, middle:

"And if it is a good racket for anyone, it is a racket for which the Government of the United States must bear the heaviest responsibility. For it is the Government of the United States—'that august conception,' as Samuel Taylor Coleridge once called it—that originated this racket and that continues to encourage and pay for it."

See page 27, column 1, middle last paragraph:

"The Government won't talk. It does not, because plainly it cannot, plead that the safety of the Nation would be imperiled if it revealed the number and the identity of those whom it hires to testify according to the wishes of its lawyers. It does not plead the right to withhold the names on the ground that these people are confidential informers."

See page 29, column 1, middle:

"It reflects not at all on their present condition of rectitude and probity to say that their pasts reek of subversion and sedition and that a number of them are convicted felons."

See page 29, column 1, bottom:

"And as witnesses in other proceedings, the professionals play a crucial role in determining many things. There is, indeed, no end to the number of places where they may turn up in the course of their service to the Department of Justice, and apparently in fulfillment of their agreement with it."

See page 29, column 2, middle:

"One of the most ubiquitous of the breed."

See page 29, column 2, bottom:

"It is a novel arrangement, this hiring of people to take a solemn oath and testify favorably to the Government."

See page 34, column 2, bottom:

"The kept witnesses have been given an opportunity to foul American due process and quite a bit else besides."

Wherefore, the plaintiff, Bella V. Dodd, demands judgment against the defendants, and each of them, jointly and severally, in the amount of $150,000, and that the defendants, Richard H. Rovere, Harper & Bros., and the Fund for the Republic, Inc., be enjoined from publishing or distributing said article or any book, article, or other material dealing with such persons as the aforementioned article, The Kept Witnesses, which mentions or alludes to plaintiff libelously, and that the defendants, Harper & Bros. and the Fund for the Republic, Inc., be compelled to give publication and distribution to an article approved by the plaintiff exonerating plaintiff from the implications and innuendoes contained in the aforementioned article, such corrective article to receive distribution and publication equal to the distribution and publication of the aforementioned article.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO STATE OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4363) authorizing the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the State of New Mexico, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 9, after "emergency", insert "declared by the President or the Congress."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIMITING THE APPELLATE JURISDICTION OF THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation which would reestablish and reaffirm the basic constitutional doctrine of the separation of powers between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government.

For some years the Congress has observed with growing alarm an increasing tendency on the part of the Supreme Court to usurp the power of the legislative branch to make the laws of the land. The school segregation cases of May 1954 and the Steve Nelson case rendered by the Court a few weeks ago are cases in point.

Under article I, section 1, of the Constitution, "all legislative powers shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives." Section 8 of that article enumerates the various legislative powers and then concludes by declaring that it shall be the power of Congress "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or officer thereof." Article V provides that amendments to the Constitution shall be proposed by the "Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary."

A cursory examination of the school-segregation cases and the Steve Nelson case will indicate to any thoughtful person that these cases represent a gross invasion of the legislative authority vested in Congress by the Constitution and a usurpation of power on the part of the Supreme Court.

In the school-segregation cases, the Court sought to promulgate an additional constitutional amendment without its having been proposed by Congress and in violation of article V. The law, at the time of those decisions, was well established that the doctrine of separate but equal educational facilities complied with the provisions of the 14th amendment. The Court, in ruling as it did in those cases, in effect adopted an additional amendment, for the decisions were contrary to the established law of over 100 years.

In the Steve Nelson case, in which the Court applied the preemption doctrine, a sedition statute of the State of Pennsylvania was invalidated by the Court. In so ruling, the Court wrote into the Federal Code—Smith Act—provisions which it is patent were unintended by the Congress which enacted the law. The Court was thereby constituting itself as a legislative body in enacting laws in violation of article I, section 1, of the Constitution.

It would appear, Mr. Speaker, that these abuses by the Court can result only in sounding the death knell of our constitutional system of government. It is time that we Members of the legislative branch of our Government enacted measures to counter this great threat. It is incumbent on us to serve notice on the Supreme Court that we wish them to confine their activities to the powers granted to them under article III of the Constitution, that is, "The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court." We must make it plain that we intend for the Supreme Court to limit itself to the exercise of judicial powers only.

The bill which I introduced today will serve this purpose. Constitutional authority for my legislation rests in the second paragraph of section 2, article III, of the Constitution, "the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction both as to law and fact, with such exceptions and under such regulations as Congress shall make." It is quite clear that Congress can limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Court.

In my bill, it is stated that—

> It is the purpose of this act to reestablish and reaffirm the basic constitutional doctrine of separation of powers between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government.

In implementing this statement of purpose, section 2 affirms that the established law of the United States shall be revised, or changed, only by legislative enactments by Congress or by constitutional amendments. This section turns back to Congress the power of enacting legislation and of proposing amendments to the Constitution, thus, in effect, repudiating the action of the Court in the school segregation cases and in the Steve Nelson case.

Section 3 of the bill provides "that the courts of the United States of America and the courts of the several States of the United States shall not be bound by any decision of the Supreme Court of the United States which conflicts with the legal principle of adhering to prior decisions and which is clearly based upon considerations other than legal."

The import of this section is considerable. Under our constitutional power to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, we are saying to the inferior United States courts and the courts of the various States that they will not be required to follow any decision of the Supreme Court which is not based upon the doctrine of stare decisis and which is decided counter to established law. In placing this limitation on the Supreme Court, we are instructing them, as is our constitutional right, that they must base their decisions upon prior decisions and upon legal considerations. It is hoped that we will be able to bring to a halt the practice of the Court to base its decisions on socio-psychological and other nonlegal principles.

It is my considered opinion that this legislation is vitally needed to correct a gross abuse of power under our constitutional system. I shall request that hearings be held on the bill immediately.

H. ROY CULLEN, OF HOUSTON, TEX.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include an address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I intend to put in the RECORD an address by our great friend, H. Roy Cullen, of Houston, Tex., and include therein a speech that he delivered on June 4, 1956, to the South Texas Colleges of Law and Commerce at the River Oaks Baptist Church at 8 p. m.

I have read this speech very, very carefully and it is a wonderful, wonderful speech, which should be very, very helpful not only to the young people in the great South Texas Colleges of Law and Commerce, but to every one that reads it in this RECORD, which goes to every beat in the United States and to all of our great libraries, where many, many men and women, boys and girls will read about what our friend, Roy Cullen, has had to say.

He not only talks, but really and truly does things. I believe he has given away more money to our schools and hospitals, our churches and to charity, than any other man I have ever known. God has blessed him for what he has done, what he is doing, and what I hope and pray he will have strength to keep on doing. I wish all of you knew this great man as I know him, so you could appreciate what he is saying in this speech that I hope will be helpful to everyone that reads it.

ADDRESS OF H. R. CULLEN, SOUTH TEXAS COLLEGES OF LAW AND COMMERCE, RIVER OAKS BAPTIST CHURCH, 8 P. M., JUNE 4, 1956

I am honored to have been selected to make the commencement address to the South Texas Colleges of Law and Commerce.

It was 15 years ago that I last addressed a group of graduates of this worthy institution. Many of the things I said on that occasion would be appropriate to repeat this evening, for we are confronted with many of the same problems. I am happy to say that some have been eliminated, yet sad to relate that many have been compounded.

When reviewing my speech file, I discovered the address I made to the graduating class 15 years ago, and I must admit that I was tempted to repeat it with merely a few extra comments, adjusting it to the present day. Even though I resisted that temptation, the theme is the same.

I realize there is nothing quite so boring as the repetition of an old story, and you may wonder why so many of us oldsters keep on repeating the same tales year after year. Recently I read a brief editorial released by the Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association which makes so much sense that I believe I will read it in part:

"Some may wonder why the circus keeps coming back year after year. After all, the acts and the animals and the clowns and all the rest of it are pretty much the same.

"One reason is that a great new audience comes into being in this country each year. Last year, for instance, 4 million babies were born—and none had ever seen an elephant.

"In other words, the circus comes back because the American scene is forever changing."

And so we need to remember that millions will never see an elephant if the circus doesn't keep performing, just as millions may never know the blessings of freedom if we don't keep selling the philosophies and ideals based on the principles that have made our country great.

Today marks an important milestone in your lives. You have studied and worked through a course designed to fulfill the requirements of a complicated pattern of life. Naturally you are eager to apply those things you have learned.

What can you expect from the life that you have dreamed will await you upon your graduation?

You can rightly expect to fill the niche reserved for all industrious people in a world anxious to accept fresh talent. Of course, you know that learning is a continuous process and so you will not completely close the school door, but merely change the location of your study activity. You can never expect to rest on your laurels, for the world moves on and you must move with it.

But you may ask, what lies ahead in a world divided between the struggle of atheistic communism on the one hand and our Christian free enterprise system on the other, with the forces of socialism, that Trojan horse galloping along beside?

The young people of today are the masters of their destiny to the extent they are willing to conquer their fears and overcome through faithful diligence. By diligence, I mean that hard core of resistance, that willingness to work for your happiness and reject the theory that is so prevalent that the government or somebody else owes you a living.

You cannot for 1 minute forget that the provisions of security by a centralized, socialized bureaucracy will be the damnation of the soul of our great Nation. There is no true middle ground between the forces of evil and those of right. You cannot ignore the history of 19 fallen civilizations.

Some will say, "But this is different—we are living in a period of revolution. We cannot turn back the clock. We must change in the name of progress." Don't let anyone fool you that there is anything new about a planned economy and guaranteed security, which we have been hearing so much about for the last quarter of a century. There is nothing in my book which indicates that a change is necessarily progress.

A great many have been deceived by the planners, and so we have been experimenting with providing social welfare for all the people. This has been tried on numerous occasions during the past 6,000 years, so history tells us. Augustus Caesar planned carefully for his people, and started many social reforms, but the Roman empire disappeared into the oblivion of the Dark Ages.

Our forefathers even experimented in the first colonies of Jamestown and Plymouth. Many people who theorize on the wonderful dream of freedom from want, don't even know that two of the most colorful examples of the failure of socialism existed right here in the United States. And these should have thrived, if there could be a reason for socialism to work anywhere, because these colonists had a common religious heritage and their Christian philosophy of sharing from the common stores, certainly ought to have proven more successful than any other attempts.

However, the unwillingness of Jamestown men to work, waiting to be fed and clothed, was almost fatal to that band of 105 who landed on the banks of the James River in May 1607. As you could expect from such circumstances, the people began to die from disease and starvation, and the only thing that saved the colony was Captain Smith's proclamation, which in short, meant: He who will not work, will not eat.

When the common stock of the Puritans at Plymouth began to dwindle, they were in the same straits as those in Jamestown. But by 1623 when their economy had changed to free enterprise, Governor Bradford was

able to report that they not only provided for their own, but had enough to sell to others, and by the next year, the colony even exported a boat load of corn.

Man is a creature of desires and a most important economic fact is that not many of his wants are supplied in the amounts required without effort on his part. Thus, when men work without the full benefit of their labors being realized, with only a dole for existence sake, and with those who do not work receiving the same, laziness and shirking become the order of the day. Therefore we can see the futility of the socialistic state and learn from the examples that history relates, that the results of socialistic controls follow a very definite pattern. The capacity as well as the necessity for savings start to decline. There seems no need for hard work or storing up for a rainy day, when the people are led to believe that the Government will take care of them no matter what befalls. The outcome is decreased production and finally—want.

The real tragedy of the whole situation is the difficulty of turning back once the die is cast. It has been said that experience is a dear teacher, but let me say here it is too dear when we are threatening not only our lives but those of future generations.

England's experiment with socialism failed, but theirs was the good fortune to have the United States Treasury to fall back upon.

Our forefathers were fortunate to survive those early winters of famines and tyrannies to leave us a heritage of freedom to worship God under our great Constitution with the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

A fallacy which exists today is spread by those so-called liberals who have taken the Constitution to guarantee happiness in the form of prosperity for everyone. The Constitution reads, "the pursuit of happiness," and always remember that nine-tenths of happiness rests in the pursuit thereof. If each of you had been guaranteed a place in society with all your wants supplied when you came into this world, how many of you do you suppose would be graduating tonight? If everyone had such a guaranty, just how good would that guaranty be?

When I spoke to the graduating class at South Texas Colleges of Law and Commerce in 1941, I dealt at length with our Bill of Rights. We were at war against a totalitarian state, and yet we were threatened with the loss of our rights as guaranteed by the Constitution and Bill of Rights in our very efforts to preserve our freedom. The spirit of sacrifice brought on by the war almost lost to a totalitarian government at home the very principles we were fighting to protect on foreign soil. Indeed, we had so many emergencies and so much "must" legislation that we were on the verge of losing our cherished Bill of Rights.

After the war, the people became aware of the deception of must legislation and emergencies when they persisted in spite of peace, and the people voted overwhelmingly against our continued loss of freedom. They proved beyond a shadow of a doubt in 1952 that they wanted a change. In many respects, we have had a change. The people have been awakened to the dangers of big Government and many of the Hoover Commission recommendations are being put into practice. There is an awakened and enlightened citizenry with many patriotic organizations sounding the principles of sane legislation, including necessary amendments to protect our form of Government. We can never afford to be complacent for a minute for the forces of communism are working from within with every conceivable method to weaken our resistance. We must never forget that eternal vigilance is truly the price of liberty.

In 1941, it was the third article of the Bill of Rights that was of so much concern. Today, it is the 10th article. Our greatest bulwark against communism has been the 48 States with the 10th article of the Bill of Rights protecting their sovereignty. Suppose a strong centralized Government had had complete control during World War II when Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White were such prominent figures in our Federal affairs. There is no doubt but that we would be under Communist dictatorship today.

Yet with each passing day, we seem to be sitting back and permitting the Supreme Court to diminish those very State rights which have in the past saved us from destruction. Unless we can amend the Constitution to provide Justices with judicial background instead of pure political appointees, I greatly fear for our future.

Our great Constitution was written and adopted on the principle that this would be a nation governed by laws and not by men. Our deep concern today over the usurpation of States rights by the decisions of the Supreme Court, were voiced long ago by the father of the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson, who said:

"The germ of dissolution of our Federal Government is in the constitution of the Federal judiciary; an irresponsible body working like gravity by night and by day, gaining a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step like a thief, over the field of jurisdiction, until all shall be usurped from the States, and the Government of all be consolidated into one. To this I am opposed, because, when all government, domestic and foreign, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it will render powerless the checks provided of one government on another, and will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated."

Article 6 of the Constitution states, in part, "all judicial officers * * * shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution."

By applying this constitutional test, in my opinion, every member of the Supreme Court could be impeached. And I say they should be, for the Supreme Court's usurpation of the power to legislate, which was delegated to Congress by our Constitution, smacks of facism, nazism, and communism. Congress should act at once to correct this situation, and any candidate for Congress who will not accept this responsibility should be defeated in this coming election. Until we are able to find a way to protect our States and the people from the baseless decisions of the Court, we are a nation governed by men and not by law. And who can say what whim may prevail over the so-called nine old men tomorrow?

Certainly if our Constitution guarantees us any rights, it provides for the right to work. And yet, the Supreme Court a few days ago, ruled against the right to work laws of the various States.

The time has come when it is imperative that we appraise our national situation with relation to capital and labor. Too great emphasis has been placed on the distinction between these two factors of production. This dividing line is being drawn more clearly each day by some labor leaders due to their personal ambitions, and others because of lack of knowledge, who are using the labor unions to build a political machine. Samuel Gompers, the father of the labor unions and highly respected by all who knew him, bitterly opposed this, as do many of the well informed labor leaders. But the acts of a few labor leaders are hurting labor's cause.

Evidence is on hand at every turn to prove this, but to cite an instance—take the position of the employees of Ford Motor Co. during their last labor dispute. If the union leaders had accepted the management's proposal of ownership of stock in the company instead of the union leader's proposition, they would have benefited by about 42 percent more than they actually received in hourly cash benefits.

An important factor in analyzing this labor-management situation, is to recognize that there is no clearcut distinction between the people involving the four factors of production—labor, land, capital, and management—for the truth of the matter is that any individual in a community can be described in relation to one or more of these factors. For instance, every laborer who so much as owns a car is also a capitalist, and it is not infrequent for one individual to be a landowner, laborer, capitalist, and manager.

Let us take a look at what the so-called laborer will have if he permits his labor boss to completely dominate the production scene. The manager is the one who performs the function of organizing, planning, and bearing the risks of production. If through strikes, closed shops, and other means that labor uses of forcing management to increase wages and benefits, the margin of profit becomes too low or becomes a loss, what will become of capital and management? It is ridiculous to assume that management will continue to organize and plan and bear the risks of production when there is little or no chance for profit. The next step is Government ownership and complete socialization.

The laborer's greatest friend and the greatest statesman of this generation in my opinion, Bob Taft, is now deceased, but the benefits of the Taft-Hartley labor law live on. Under the old Wagner Act, some of the cruel labor leaders were using goons to beat up the laborer and their families to make them conform to their ideas, and under that act the laborer had no protection under the law. The Taft-Hartley law changed this situation, and naturally the selfish labor leader wants to weaken the law. The Taft-Hartley law may need some improvements, but I do not believe the laborer will ever want to weaken it and go back to the days of the Wagner Act, because he has come to realize that his success depends more upon the success of the company for which he works than upon his labor boss.

The laborer cannot ignore the absolute truth that his welfare is bound to the welfare of management and capital. Plain common sense calls for labor and management to join hands for their mutual progress.

There are not many ills in our Nation today that could not be cured by a good dose of constructive thinking followed by a round of concentrated activity. Our greatest weakness is within us—as a nation we have grown complacent because of materialistic success. The advances we made under a free enterprise economy, we are jeopardizing without much thought.

To think, one must be informed. Thomas Jefferson said: "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, it expects what never was and never will be."

And Plato said: "The penalty good men pay for indifference to public affairs, is to be ruled by evil men."

Along with your life's work, it is your duty and privilege to take an interest in your local, State, and national governments, and in doing this, you should avoid every form of socialism, old-fogyism, and middle-of-the-roadism. You must never become narrow-minded, but always be willing to compromise on circumstances, but never on principles.

In conclusion, I wish to say that you have every right to be cheerful as you go forth to meet the new challenges in an exciting and creative age. One of you may possess a dream that will advance the human race. Make it your business to remain informed, to use all your powers to think and act, but never from a selfish viewpoint. Above all, never permit the sin of indifference to enter your lives to destroy your souls.

DISCHARGE PETITION ON CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have this day placed upon the Clerk's desk a discharge petition which would in effect make it possible for the House, lacking prior action by the Rules Committee prior to that time, to cast a decisive vote on the bill, H. R. 627, involving civil rights.

Mr. Speaker, I urge at this time that the Members refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 31, page 9365 in order to understand that the filing of this discharge petition is done with the greatest possible respect to members of the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, finally may I say that this discharge petition is placed on the Clerk's desk in the very firm conviction that the matters which are covered by H. R. 627 are of the greatest importance to the future of our country and to the welfare of all of the citizens of the United States.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, last month, in his address to a joint session of Congress, the President of the Republic of Indonesia ably and forcefully reminded us that, as he put it:

> In our contemporary, world, the impact of America is felt more and more. The influence of the American with his outlook, his ideas, his technical and scientific advances, reaches to almost every corner of Asia and Africa.

President Sukarno then asserted in admirable terms his faith in the America of the Declaration of Independent, the America of Washington, of Jefferson, and of Lincoln.

It is hardly necessary to add that it is not only the admirable, the idealistic, the progressive side of America and American traditions that is having a worldwide impact. Every one of us who has traveled abroad knows full well the international repercussions of the racial and religious intolerances and injustices that unfortunately still persist throughout America—in the North as well as the South. I venture to suggest that each of us who has traveled in Asia, Africa, or Latin America can easily recall being confronted with very embarrassing questions about the second-class citizenship so widely accorded the American Negro.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot forget—or if we do forget, it shall be at great peril to the future of our country—that the great bulk of mankind is nonwhite. America surely cannot retain its position of leadership among the democratic nations of the world if we in the United States Congress do not take action to correct the injustices under which American Negroes have suffered for 90 years. Ninety years is a long time for free Americans to wait for justice at the hands of their fellow citizens.

The provisions of the so-called civil rights bill favorably reported by the Judiciary Committee are mild, indeed. They herald no revolutionary developments. The bill, H. R. 627, simply provides for a Commission on Civil Rights with powers to investigate injustices, an additional assistant attorney general to take charge of civil-rights work, and authorization of the attorney general to bring civil actions in Federal courts to prevent or redress practices which violate civil-rights statutes.

This bill should be acted upon in this session of Congress, if we are to keep faith with millions of Americans as well as with those millions of people throughout the world whom we profess to lead in the cause of democracy. Statements by our President about "the dignity of man" will soon lose their appeal if we fail to give elementary protection to the dignity of man throughout our own country.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge every Member of this House, regardless of party, to sign the discharge petition which will bring H. R. 627 to the floor of the House. Let us make the practice of American democracy more nearly consistent with the high principles upon which it is based.

SOIL-BANK BENEFITS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald carries an Associated Press dispatch from Beaver Dam, Wis., which I believe is going to come as a considerable shock to a number of Members of the House who supported and voted for the soil-bank proposition in the hope it would put some money in the pockets of the farmers in their areas this year.

The Secretary of Agriculture is quoted in this dispatch as warning the farmers not to look to the new soil-bank program for drought relief, flood relief and credit needs.

He is quoted as saying:

> I intend to see that the Nation gets a dollar's worth of surplus reduction or a dollar's worth of conservation for every dollar paid out.

The article goes on with this interpretation:

> Benson's remarks would seem to rule out farmers whose crops appear destined to failure because of drought or flood damage, a group which had been expected to make up the bulk of the participants this year.

In short, if we can believe this Associated Press dispatch and the interpretation of the Secretary's remarks, the farmers who are most in need of a soil-bank program to put cash in their pockets this year, the farmers who are suffering because of reduced or diminishing crop prospects as the result of drought or as the result of flood, are going to be excluded from this program.

I hope the Secretary has been misquoted or misunderstood in his remarks because I am certain that was not the intent of Congress in passing the soil-bank provision and directing its implementation this year.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate on tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL LIFEBOAT RACING TROPHY

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce to the House that an American lifeboat crew has won the international lifeboat race. I will include in my remarks a telegram sent to the members of this crew and a reply to the telegram. The race was won by a crew from the Esso tanker fleet of the Standard Oil Co.

HOUSE MERCHANT MARINE
AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE,
June 4, 1956.

ESSO LIFEBOAT CREW,
Care of Mr. M. G. Gamble,
President, Esso Shipping Co.,
New York, N. Y.:

We in Congress interested in the American merchant marine are proud and happy over your accomplishment in bringing back to America the trophy recently won by you. We send you our congratulations and best wishes and join you in pride over your accomplishment.

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman, Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, House of Representatives, United States.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 4, 1956.*

Congressman HERBERT C. BONNER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Reference your telegram of June 4: Your most generous and thoughtful praise of our boat crews accomplishment in bringing back to the United States the international lifeboat racing trophy is deeply apreciated by the Esso lifeboat crew and by all of us in the management of the Esso Shipping Co. The satisfaction and pride in winning the race is greatly enhanced by recognition from Members of Congress and particularly from a leading statesman such as yourself.

With warm personal regards,

Sincerely,

MILLARD G. GAMBLE.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of May 30, 1956]

FOR SAFER BOATING

The remarkable development of small-boat activity in recent years—especially in the power-craft category—has been accompanied by an increase in the number of boating tragedies throughout the country. The situation has become so serious that two of the larger boating organizations have joined in urging Congress to study the problem, with a view to promoting water safety. The move is timely, for it is predicted that more inboard and outboard pleasure craft will be operating this summer in salt and fresh water recreational areas than ever before.

It has been estimated that there are now about 25 million small-boat enthusiasts who spend their week ends or vacations enjoying their favorite sport. Many of these are novices whose unfamiliarity with vagaries of weather and water and with elementary rules of navigation and boating safety may be expected to result in more accidents and drownings in the next few months. There is no regulation of small boating by the Coast Guard, and few local authorities exercise any effective control. But, as Chairman BONNER of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee remarked, the rise in serious boating mishaps indicates "a possible need for greater precautions to be taken by both State and Federal Governments" in the small-boat field. The program might well include an extension of safety inspections by the Coast Guard to include boats smaller than the 16-foot-and-under group (now exempt) and tightening up by State and municipal authorities on safety requirements in recreational waters under their jurisdiction.

The proposed inquiry has the support of the National Association of Engine and Boat Manufacturers as well as of the Outboard Boating Club of America. This teamwork between industry and customers is logical, for both groups have an interest in making boating safer and more popular.

CIVIL-RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the remarks of my colleague from California announcing that a discharge petition on the civil-rights bill has been filed, I will say that I have not had an opportunity to study this bill, but it is my understanding that one of its chief provisions is the centralization of power in Washington in the Justice Department. It is interesting to note that the Soviet Union, having tried the same experiment, has recently decentralized, so while we are urged to move in the direction of centralization they are moving toward decentralization of power. I think it would be well for the advocates of civil-rights legislation to bear that in mind.

FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 10660) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees on title I of the bill: Mr. BUCKLEY, Mr. FALLON, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. DONDERO, Mr. MCGREGOR, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS; and the following as conferees on title II: Mr. COOPER, Mr. MILLS, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. REED of New York, Mr. JENKINS.

MR. AND MRS. THOMAS V. COMPTON

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1866) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas V. Compton, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 7, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ELLA MADDEN AND CLARENCE E. MADDEN

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5237) for the relief of Mrs. Ella Madden and Clarence E. Madden, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, lines 7 and 8, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

AMENDING FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2364) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

SIMPLIFYING ACCOUNTING, FACILITATING THE PAYMENT OF OBLIGATIONS, ETC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9593) to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, except as otherwise provided by law, (a) the account for each appropriation available for obligation for a definite period of time shall, upon the expiration of such period, be closed as follows:

(1) The obligated balance shall be transferred to an appropriation account of the activity responsible for the liquidation of the obligations, in which account shall be merged the amounts so transferred from all appropriation accounts for the same general purposes; and

(2) The remaining balance shall be withdrawn and, if the appropriation was derived in whole or in part from the general fund, shall revert to such fund, but if the appropriation was derived solely from a special or trust fund, shall revert, unless otherwise provided by law, to the fund from which derived.

(b) The transfers and withdrawals required by subsection (a) of this section shall be made—

(1) not later than September 30 of the fiscal year immediately following the fiscal year in which the period of availability for obligation expires, in the case of an appropriation available both for obligation and disbursement on or after the date of approval of this act; or

(2) not later than September 30 of the fiscal year immediately following the fiscal year in which this act is approved, in the case of an appropriation which, on the date of approval of this act, is available only for disbursement.

(c) For the purposes of this act, the obligated balance of an appropriation account shall be the amount of unliquidated obligations applicable to such appropriation less the amount collectible as repayments to the appropriation as of the close of the fiscal year as reported pursuant to section 1311 (b) of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 830; 31 U. S. C. 200 (b)). Collections authorized to be credited to an appropriation but not received until after the close of the fiscal year in which such appropriation expires for obligation shall, unless otherwise authorized by law, be credited to the appropriation account into which the obligated balance has been or will be transferred, pursuant to subsection (a) (1), except that collections made by the General Accounting Office for other Government agencies may be deposted into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(d) The transfers and withdrawals required pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be accounted for and reported as of the fiscal year in which the appropriations concerned expire for obligation, except that such transfers of appopriations described in subsection (b) (2) of this section shall be accounted for and reported as of the fiscal year in which this act is approved.

SEC. 2. Each appropriation account established pursuant to this act shall be accounted for as one fund and shall be available without fiscal year limitation for payment of obligations chargeable against any of the appropriations from which such account was derived. Subject to regulations to be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, payment of such obligations may be made without prior action by the General Accounting Office, but nothing contained in this act shall be construed to relieve the Comptroller General of the United States of his duty to render decisions upon requests made pursuant to law or to abridge the existing authority of the General Accounting Office to settle and adjust claims, demands, and accounts.

SEC. 3. (a) Appropriation accounts established pursuant to this act shall be reviewed periodically, but at least once each fiscal year, by each activity responsible for the liquidation of the obligations chargeable to such accounts. If the undisbursed balance in any account exceeds the obligated balance pertaining thereto, the amount of the excess shall be withdrawn in the manner provided by section 1 (a) (2) of this act; but if the obligated balance exceeds the undisbursed balance, the amount of the excess shall be transferred to such account from the appropriation currently available for the same general purposes. A review shall be made as of the close of each fiscal year and the transfers or withdrawals required by this section accomplished not later than September 30 of the following fiscal year, but the transactions shall be accounted for and reported as of the close of the fiscal year to which such review pertains. A review made as of any other date for which transfers or withdrawals are accomplished after September 30 in any fiscal year shall be accounted for and reported as transactions of the fiscal year in which accomplished.

(b) Whenever a payment chargeable to an appropriation account established pursuant to this act would exceed the undisbursed balance of such account, the amount of the deficiency may be transferred to such account from the appropriation currently available for the same general purposes. Where such deficiency is caused by the failure to collect repayments to appropriations merged with the appropriation account established pursuant to this act, the amount of the deficiency may be returned to such current appropriation if the repayments are subsequently collected during the same fiscal year.

(c) In connection with his audit responsibilities, the Comptroller General of the United States shall report to the head of the agency concerned, to the Secretary of the Treasury, and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, respecting operations under this act, including an appraisal of the unliquidated obligations under the appropriation accounts established by this act. Within 30 days after receipt of such report, the agency concerned shall accomplish any actions required by subsection (a) of this section which such report shows to be necessary.

SEC. 4. During the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which this act becomes effective, and under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, the undisbursed balance of the appropriation account for payment of certified claims established pursuant to section 2 of the act of July 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 407; 31 U. S. C. 712b), shall be closed in the manner provided in section 1 (a) of this act.

SEC. 5. The obligated balances of appropriations made available for obligation for definite periods of time under discontinued appropriation heads may be merged in the appropriation accounts provided for by section 1 hereof, or in one or more other accounts to be established pursuant to the act for discontinued appropriations of the activity currently responsible for the liquidation of the obligations.

SEC. 6. The unobligated balances of appropriations which are not limited to a definite period of time shall be withdrawn in the manner provided in section 1 (a) (2) of this act whenever the head of the agency concerned shall determine that the purpose for which the appropriation was made has been fulfilled or will not be undertaken or continued; or, in any event, whenever disbursements have not been made against the appropriation for two full consecutive fiscal years: *Provided*, That amounts of appropriations not limited to a definite period of time which are withdrawn pursuant to this section or where heretofore withdrawn from the appropriation account by administrative action may be restored to the applicable appropriation account for the payment of obligations and for the settlement of accounts.

SEC. 7. The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

(a) The proviso under the heading "Payment of Certified Claims" in the act of April 25, 1945 (59 Stat. 90; 31 U. S. C. 690);

(b) Section 2 of the act of July 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 407; 31 U. S. C. 712b), but the repeal of this section shall not be effective until June 30, 1957;

(c) The paragraph under the heading "Payment of Certified Claims" in the act of June 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 358; 31 U. S. C. 712c);

(d) Section 5 of the act of March 3, 1875 (18 Stat. 418; 31 U. S. C. 713a); and

(e) Section 3691 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 715).

SEC. 8. The provisions of this act shall not apply to the appropriations for the District of Columbia.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, (a) the account for each appropriation available for obligation for a definite period of time shall, upon the expiration of such period, be closed as follows:

"(1) The obligated balance shall be transferred to an appropriation account of the agency or subdivision thereof responsible for the liquidation of the obligations, in which account shall be merged the amounts so transferred from all appropriation accounts for the same general purposes; and

"(2) The remaining balance shall be withdrawn and, if the appropriation was derived in whole or in part from the general fund, shall revert to such fund, but if the appropriation was derived solely from a special or trust fund, shall revert, unless otherwise provided by law, to the fund from which derived: *Provided*, That when it is determined necessary by the head of the agency concerned that a portion of the remaining balance withdrawn is required to liquidate obligations and effect adjustments, such portion of the remaining balance may be restored to the appropriate accounts established pursuant to this act: *Provided further*, That prior thereto the head of the agency concerned shall make such report with respect to each such restoration as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may require.

"(b) The transfers and withdrawals required by subsection (a) of this section shall be made—

"(1) not later than September 30 of the fiscal year immediately following the fiscal year in which the period of availability for obligation expires, in the case of an appropriation available both for obligation and disbursement on or after the date of approval of this act; or

(2) not later than September 30 of the fiscal year immediately following the fiscal year in which this act is approved, in the case of an appropriation which, on the date of approval of this act, is available only for disbursement.

"(c) For the purposes of this act, the obligated balance of an appropriation account as of the close of the fiscal year shall be the amount of unliquidated obligations applicable to such appropriation less the amount collectible as repayments to the appropriation as reported pursuant to section 1311 (b) of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 830; 31 U. S. C. 200 (b)). Collections authorized to be credited to an appropriation but not received until after the close of the fiscal year in which such appropriation expires for obligation shall, unless otherwise authorized by law, be credited to the appropriation account into which the obligated balance has been or will be transferred, pursuant to subsection (a) (1), except that collections made by the General Accounting Office for other Government agencies may be deposited into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(d) The transfers and withdrawals made pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be accounted for and reported as of the fiscal year in which the appropriations concerned expire for obligation, except that such transfers of appropriations described in subsection (b) (2) of this section shall be accounted for and reported as of the fiscal year in which this act is approved.

"SEC. 2. Each appropriation account established pursuant to this act shall be accounted for as one fund and shall be available without fiscal year limitation for payment of obligations chargeable against any of the appropriations from which such account was derived. Subject to regulations to be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, payment of such obligations may be made without prior action by the General Accounting Office, but nothing contained in this act shall be construed to relieve the Comptroller General of the United States of his duty to render decisions upon requests made pursuant to law or to abridge the existing authority of the General Accounting Office to settle and adjust claims, demands, and accounts.

"SEC. 3. (a) Appropriation accounts established pursuant to this act shall be reviewed periodically, but at least once each fiscal year, by each agency concerned. If the undisbursed balance in any account exceeds the obligated balance pertaining thereto, the amount of the excess shall be withdrawn in the manner provided by section 1 (a) (2) of this act; but if the obligated balance exceeds the undisbursed balance, the amount of the excess may be transferred to such account from the appropriation currently available for the same general purposes. A review shall be made as of the close of each fiscal year and the transfers or withdrawals required by this section accomplished not later than September 30 of the following fiscal year, but the transactions shall be accounted for and reported as of the close of the fiscal year to which such review pertains. A review made as of any other date for which transfers or withdrawals are accomplished after September 30 in any fiscal year shall be accounted for and reported as transactions of the fiscal year in which accomplished.

"(b) Whenever a payment chargeable to an appropriation account established pursuant to this act would exceed the undisbursed balance of such account, the amount of the deficiency may be transferred to such account from the appropriation currently available for the same general purposes. Where such deficiency is caused by the failure to collect repayments to appropriations merged with the appropriation account established pursuant to this act, the amount of the deficiency may be returned to such current appropriation if the repayments are subsequently collected during the same fiscal year.

"(c) In connection with his audit responsibilities, the Comptroller General of the United States shall report to the head of the agency concerned, to the Secretary of the

Treasury, and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, respecting operations under this act, including an appraisal of the unliquidated obligations under the appropriation accounts established by this act. Within 30 days after receipt of such report, the agency concerned shall accomplish any actions required by subsection (a) of this section which such report shows to be necessary.

"SEC. 4. During the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which this act becomes effective, and under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, the undisbursed balance of the appropriation account for payment of certified claims established pursuant to section 2 of the act of July 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 407; 31 U. S. C. 712b), shall be closed in the manner provided in section 1 (a) of this act.

"SEC. 5. The obligated balances of appropriations made available for obligation for definite periods of time under discontinued appropriation heads may be merged in the appropriation accounts provided for by section 1 hereof, or in one or more other accounts to be established pursuant to this act for discontinued appropriations of the agency or subdivision thereof currently responsible for the liquidation of the obligations.

"SEC. 6. The unobligated balances of appropriations which are not limited to a definite period of time shall be withdrawn in the manner provided in section 1 (a) (2) of this act whenever the head of the agency concerned shall determine that the purposes for which the appropriation was made has been fulfilled, in any event, whenever disbursements have not been made against the appropriation for two full consecutive fiscal years: *Provided*, That amounts of appropriations not limited to a definite period of time which are withdrawn pursuant to this section or were heretofore withdrawn from the appropriation account by administrative action may be restored to the applicable appropriation account for the payment of obligations and for the settlement of accounts.

"SEC. 7. The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

"(a) The proviso under the heading 'Payment of Certified Claims' in the act of April 25, 1945 (59 Stat. 90; 31 U. S. C. 690);

"(b) Section 2 of the act of July 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 407; 31 U. S. C. 712b), but the repeal of this section shall not be effective until June 30, 1957;

"(c) The paragraph under the heading 'Payment of Certified Claims' in the act of June 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 358; 31 U. S. C. 712c);

"(d) Section 5 of the act of March 3, 1875 (18 Stat. 418; 31 U. S. C. 713a); and

"(e) Section 3691 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 715).

"(f) Any provisions (except those contained in appropriation acts for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957) permitting an appropriation to remain available for expenditure for any period beyond that for which it is available for obligation, but this subsection shall not be effective until June 30, 1957.

"SEC. 8. The provisions of this act shall not apply to the appropriations for the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 9. The inclusion in appropriation acts of provisions excepting any appropriation or appropriations from the operation of the provisions of this act and fixing the period for which such appropriation or appropriations shall remain available for expenditure is hereby authorized."

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAWSON of Illinois to the committee amendment:

Page 7, lines 19 and 20, strike ", upon the expiration of such period." Line 21, insert immediately after "(1)" the following: "On June 30 of the second full fiscal year following the fiscal year or years for which the appropriation is available for obligation," and substitute "the" for "The."

Page 8, line 3, strike "The remaining" and insert in lieu thereof "Upon the expiration of the period of availability for obligation, the unobligated." Line 10, strike "remaining" and insert in lieu thereof "unobligated." Lines 11 and 12, strike "remaining" and insert in lieu thereof "unobligated." Lines 12 and 13, strike "established pursuant to this act." Line 17, strike "transfers and." Line 18, insert "(2)" immediately following "(a)."

Page 9, lines 9 to 11, strike "as reported pursuant to section 1311 (b) of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 830; 31 U. S. C. 200 (b))." and insert in lieu thereof "; the unobligated balance shall represent the difference between the obligated balance reported pursuant to section 1311 (b) of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 830; 31 U. S. C. 200 (b)), and the total unexpended balance." Lines 13 to 17, strike "close of the fiscal year in which such appropriation expires for obligation shall, unless otherwise authorized by law, be credited to the appropriation account into which the obligated balance has been or will be transferred, pursuant to subsection (a) (1)" and insert in lieu thereof "transfer of the obligated appropriation balance as required by subsection (a) (1) of this act, shall, unless otherwise authorized by law, be credited to the account into which the obligated balance has been transferred." Line 17, insert "any" immediately following "that" and substitute "collection" for "collections." Line 20, strike "transfers and." Line 21, substitute "subsection (a) (2)" for "subsections (a) and (b)."

Page 9, lines 23 and 24, substitute a period for the comma. Strike "except that such transfers of appropriations" and insert in lieu thereof "The withdrawals."

Page 10, lines 23 to 25, strike "may be transferred to such account from the appropriation currently available for the same general purposes" and insert in lieu thereof ", not to exceed the remaining unobligated balances of the appropriations available for the same general purposes, may be restored to such account."

Page 11, line 1, substitute "restorations" for "transfers." Line 2, insert after "required" the words "or authorized." Line 6, substitute "restorations" for "transfers." Line 9, substitute a colon for the period and add the following: "*Provided*, That prior to any restoration under this subsection the head of the agency concerned shall make such report with respect thereto as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may require." Lines 10 through 20, strike all of subsection (b). Line 21, renumber subsection "(c)" to "(b)."

Page 12, line 9, substitute "obligated" for "undisbursed." Lines 12 and 13, strike "closed in the manner provided in section 1 (a) of this act" and insert in lieu thereof "transferred to the related appropriation accounts established pursuant to this act and the unobligated balance shall be withdrawn." Line 16, insert after "may" the following: ", upon the expiration of the second full fiscal year following the fiscal year or years for which such appropriations are available for obligation."

Page 14, lines 2 and 3, strike "to remain available for expenditure for any period beyond that for which it is available for obligation" and insert in lieu thereof "which is limited for obligation to a definite period of time to remain available for expenditure for more than the 2 succeeding full fiscal years."

Page 14, line 6, strike the period after Columbia and add the following: "or appropriations to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT TO PROVIDE MENTAL HEALTH STUDY GRANTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9048) to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to improve the mental health of the Nation through grants for special projects to develop improved methods of care, treatment, and rehabilitation of the mentally ill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL HEALTH SURVEY ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3076) to provide for a continuing survey and special studies of sickness and disability in the United States, and for periodic reports of the results thereof, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS OF UINTAH AND WHITE RIVER BANDS OF UTE INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7663) to provide for settlement in part of certain claims of the Uintah and White River Bands of Ute Indians in Court of Claims case No. 47568, through restoration of subsurface rights in certain lands formerly a part of the Uintah Indian Reservation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That after acceptance by the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, in Utah, of the provisions of this act and the filing by the Uintah and White River Bands of Ute Indians of an amendment to the petition in Court of Claims case No. 47568, as provided in section 5 hereof, all right, title, and interest in and to the subsurface, including mineral and oil and gas resources, of the land described in section 6, shall be restored to tribal ownership and vested in the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah. Valid oil and gas leases outstanding on this land as of the effective date of this act shall continue in force and effect according to their terms, but any extension or renewal

thereof, except as required by the terms of said leases, shall be subject to the approval of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, and all rentals, royalties, or other payments received by the United States under or on account of such leases after the effective date of this act shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservations, in Utah, pursuant to the provisions of the act of May 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 560), as amended (25 U. S. C., sec. 155), and shall be available for such purposes as may be designated by the Uintah and Ouray Tribal Business Committee and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Upon the lapse, surrender, expiration, or termination of any such lease, the subsurface rights covered thereby shall be vested in the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, in Utah, in accordance with the terms of this act.

SEC. 2. The Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, in Utah, may prospect, mine, drill, remove, process, or otherwise exploit any or all of the subsurface mineral and oil and gas resources of the land described in section 6 of this act that are not covered by valid leases, locations, or other claims as of the effective date of this act; may sell or otherwise dispose of any or all of the production obtained through the exploitation of such resources by said tribe; and may issue leases or permits for the prospecting, mining, drilling, removal, or processing of such resources. Each such action shall be in accordance with the provisions of law and of the constitution, bylaws, and corporate charter of said tribe, that would be applicable to the taking of like action with respect to mineral resources within the Uintah and Ouray Reservation. Any operations conducted pursuant to this section or under a lease or permit issued pursuant to this section shall also be subject to the direction and control of the Secretary of Agriculture to the extent provided in section 3 of this act. The mineral resources of the land described in section 6 shall not be subject to disposition otherwise than as provided in this section, except in pursuance of valid leases, locations, or other claims existing at the time this act becomes effective and thereafter maintained in compliance with the laws under which the same were initiated.

SEC. 3. The term "direction and control of the Secretary of Agriculture" as used herein means such administrative supervision by the Secretary of Agriculture as is reasonably necessary to prevent serious injury to the surface resources of the land described in section 6, or the adjoining lands of the Uintah National Forest, but shall not be construed to prohibit the use of the surface, under accepted engineering or mining standards, for prospecting, mining, drilling, and removing subsurface resources, including (but without limitation to) installation and operation of mining, drilling, or pumping equipment and machinery, building and maintaining roadways, and free ingress and egress for prospecting, exploiting, and removing such surface resources to market.

SEC. 4. The benefits herein granted to the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, in Utah, shall be in partial settlement of the claims of the Uintah and White River Bands of the Ute Indians pending before the Court of Claims in docket numbered 47568, and upon acceptance, as provided in section 5, shall have the effect of releasing the United States from any claimed liability for the payment of such damages as might be based upon the subsurface resources or value thereof attributable to the lands which are the subject matter of that said action. Any jurisdiction of the Court of Claims to make an award of damages including or based upon subsurface values in docket No. 47568 shall be withdrawn upon this act's taking effect as provided in section 5, and jurisdiction of the Court of Claims in docket No. 47568 shall thereafter be continued only as to a claim for just compensation based upon the value of the surface rights of the lands which are the subject of that action: *Provided*, That the standard of liability and measure of damages in such action shall in all other respects be determined by the provisions of the Ute Jurisdictional Act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209), as amended by the acts of July 15, 1941 (55 Stat. 593), June 22, 1943 (57 Stat. 160), June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 255), and sections 1, 2, 11, and 25 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049), except that any money heretofore received by the United States, for or on account of the patenting or other disposition, without reservation of mineral rights, of any of the land covered by the claim, and paid over to or expended for the benefit of the Uintah and White River Bands shall be deemed to be in lieu of compensation for the subsurface values thus disposed of and shall not be allowed as a payment on the claim or an offset against any recovery which may be awarded as compensation for the surface rights.

SEC. 5. This act shall not become effective unless and until (1) the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, in Utah, accepts its provisions, in such manner as may be designated by the Secretary of the Interior, within 1 year after the approval hereof; (2) the Uintah and White River Bands present to the Secretary of the Interior a release, satisfactory to him, of any claims they might have because the Uncompahgre Utes are permitted to share in the benefits of this act; and (3) an amendment to the petition in docket No. 47568 is filed with the Court of Claims limiting the prayer for relief as to the claim presently stated therein to just compensation based upon the value of surface rights only, in accordance with section 4 hereof. Such amendment when filed shall relate back to the date of filing of the original petition in docket No. 47568.

SEC. 6. The land covered by this act is that portion of the one million and ten thousand acres of the former Uintah Reservation added to the Uintah National Forest by Executive order dated July 14, 1905 (34 Stat. 3116), which was not included for payment in the act of February 13, 1931 (46 Stat. 1092), having been separately classified therein as coal lands and described as comprising thirty-six thousand two hundred and thirty-three acres; excluding, however, such portions thereof as having been patented or otherwise disposed of into private ownership without reservation of mineral rights as of the effective date of this act; the said area being more particularly described as follows:

Township 1 south, range 8 west, Uintah meridian, Utah: North half, and the north half of the south half of section 16; section 17; lots 2, 3, and 4, and the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter, and the east half of the southwest quarter, and the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter, and the south half of the northeast quarter, and the southeast quarter of section 18; lot 1, and the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter, and the north half of the northeast quarter of section 19.

Township 1 south, range 9 west, Uintah meridian, Utah: Southeast quarter of the northeast quarter and the half of section 13; south half of the south half of section 14; south half of the south half of section 15; the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter, and the south half of the south half of section 16; southwest quarter of the northeast quarter, and the south half of the northwest quarter, and the south half of section 17; section 18; lots 1, 3, and 4, and the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter, and the east half of the southwest quarter, and the north half of the northeast quarter, and the southeast quarter of section 19; section 20; section 21; section 22; section 23; north half and the southwest quarter, and the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 24; the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 25; the north half of section 26; north half of section 27; the north half of section 28; the north half and the east half of the southwest quarter and the north half of the southeast quarter of section 29; lots 1, 2, and 3, and the east half of the northwest quarter, and the northeast quarter of section 30.

Township 1 south, range 10 west, Uintah meridian, Utah: The south half of the south half of section 10; the south half of the south half of section 11; the south half of the south half of section 12; section 13; section 14; section 15; section 16; the northeast quarter and south half of the northwest quarter, and the south half of section 17; the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter, and the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter, and the southeast quarter of section 18; section 19; section 20; section 21; section 22; section 23; section 24; the north half and the north half of the south half of section 25; section 26; section 27; section 28; section 29; the east half and lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, and the east half of the west half of section 30; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, and the east half of the west half and the east half of section 31; section 32; the north half and the north half of the southwest quarter of section 33; and the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter, and the west half of the northeast quarter, and the northwest quarter of section 34; the north half of the north half of section 35.

Township 1 south, range 11 west, Uintah meridian, Utah: Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, and the east half of the west half, and the southeast quarter of section 18; section 19; the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter and the south half of the northwest quarter and the southwest quarter and the west half of the southeast quarter of section 20; the east half and the east half of the northwest quarter and the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 25; the west half of the southwest quarter and the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter and the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter, of section 28; section 29; section 30; the northeast quarter, and lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, and the east half of the west half, and the southeast quarter of section 31; section 32; section 33; section 34; the west half of section 35; the northeast quarter and the east half of the southeast quarter of section 36.

Township 1 south, range 12 west, Uintah meridian, Utah: Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, and the south half of the south half of section 12; section 13; section 24; the northeast quarter, and the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 25.

Township 2 south, range 10 west, Uintah meridian, Utah: Section 4, section 5; section 6; section 7; section 8; section 9.

Township 2 south, range 11 west, Uintah meridian, Utah: Lots 3 and 4 of section 2; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, and the south half of the north half and the south half of section 3; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, and the south half of the north half and the south half of section 4.

SEC. 7. This act is for the purpose of effecting partial settlement of the claims asserted by the Uintah and White River Bands of Ute Indians against the United States in Court of Claims case No. 47568 and shall not be construed as giving recognition to any rights or title of the Uintah, White River, or Uncompahgre Bands of Ute Indians except as provided for in this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, strike all of line 9 and insert the words "mineral and oil and gas resources of."

Page 2, line 2, following the words "in the" insert the words "United States in trust for the."

Page 2, strike all of lines 3 to 9 inclusive and insert in lieu thereof "and Ouray Reservation in Utah, subject to valid leases, loca-

tions, or other claims that are outstanding as of the effective date of this act and that are thereafter maintained in compliance with the laws under which they were initiated, and all rentals, royalties, or other payments."

Page 2, strike all of lines 16 to 22 inclusive and insert in lieu thereof "shall be subject to division between the fullblood and the mixed-blood groups, and shall be available for advance or expenditure, in accordance with the provisions of sections 10 and 11 of the act of August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 868)."

Page 2, line 24, following the word "Utah," insert the words "acting by the tribal business committee representing the fullblood group, and the authorized representatives of the mixed-blood group (in accordance with section 10 of the act of August 27, 1954, 68 Stat. 868)."

Page 2, line 25, strike the word "subsurface."

Page 4, strike all of lines 4 to 9 inclusive and insert in lieu "or mining standards, for installation of mining equipment or machinery, building and maintaining roadways, free ingress and egress for mining and removal of subsurface resources to market, and the mining and removal of subsurface resources, including the sinking of shafts, driving tunnels or other standard mining methods, except that strip or hydraulic mining shall be permitted only if, and under conditions, approved by the Secretary of Agriculture."

Page 4, line 17, strike the word "subsurface" and insert the words "mineral and oil and gas."

Page 4, line 21, strike the word "subsurface" and insert the words "mineral and oil and gas."

Page 6, line 8, add the following sentence: "Upon the approval of this act, and pending acceptance or rejection of its provisions by the Indians as provided herein, the land described in section 6 shall be withdrawn from lease, location, entry or any form of disposition under the public land laws except disposition pursuant to valid leases, locations, or other claims that are outstanding as of the date of approval of this act and that are thereafter maintained in compliance with the laws under which they were initiated."

Page 6, line 16, strike the words "thirty-three" and insert "twenty-three."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEFINITION OF "NONFAT DRY MILK"

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5257) to amend the act entitled "An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids" (21 U. S. C., sec. 321c).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY AIR POLLUTION STUDY COMPACT

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 511) granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to confer certain additional powers upon the Interstate Sanitation Commission, established by said States pursuant to Public Resolution 62, 74th Congress, August 27, 1935.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to confer upon the Interstate Sanitation Commission, established by said States pursuant to authority given by Public Resolution 62, 74th Congress, August 27, 1935, the power to make studies of smoke and air pollutions within any or all of the territory served by said Commission, such studies to include surveys of the sources and extent of such pollution, property damage caused thereby, the effect upon public health and comfort and relevant meteorological, climatological, and topographical factors.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the act of August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 932) is amended by striking out section 2 thereof and inserting the following new sections:

" 'SEC. 2. The further consent of Congress is given to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to confer upon the Interstate Sanitation Commission, in accordance with chapter 286 of the Laws of the State of New York (1956); chapter 46 of the Laws of New Jersey (1955), as amended by chapter 23 (1956); and Public Act 27 of the Laws of Connecticut (1955); the power to make studies of smoke and air pollution within any and all of the territory served by the Commission. Such studies shall include surveys of the sources and extent of the pollution, property damage caused thereby, the effect upon public health and comfort, and relevant meteorological, climatological, and topographical factors.

" 'SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend or repeal this act, as amended, is hereby expressly waived'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY AIR POLLUTION STUDY COMPACT

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the 15th District of New York, which I represent, includes Staten Island and the Bay Ridge part of Brooklyn. The westerly boundary of Staten Island is the New York-New Jersey Channel, and across that water are two New Jersey districts, the northerly one represented by Congressman HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., and the southerly one by Congressman PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

In recent years, air pollution has become a very serious problem in many parts of the country. Congress recognized this last year by authorizing and providing funds for substantial research in the field to be conducted by or under the supervision of the Public Health Service. The areas on both sides of the New York-New Jersey Channel are heavily industrialized and are also rapidly growing as residential communities. Air pollution has become an especially acute problem in both areas.

For some time past, the authorities in the States of New York and New Jersey have been concerned about air pollution and have felt the need for a basic study of the causes and effects thereof. In each State, there are local authorities and State authorities having some jurisdiction with respect to local and intrastate phases of the problem, but it is clear that air pollution in the areas I have mentioned is really an interstate problem. There are other situations along the boundary between the two States where somewhat similar conditions exist.

By Public Resolution 62, 74th Congress, approved August 27, 1935, consent was given to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to enter into the compact set forth in the resolution. That compact dealt with prevention and regulation of water pollution in designated waters and it authorized the three States to establish a commission called the Interstate Sanitation Commission. That commission was established promptly; it has an effective technical organization; and it has made a good record of efficiency and accomplishment.

Two of those States, New York and New Jersey, desire to have the Interstate Sanitation Commission make a preliminary basic study of that air pollution problem in the New York-New Jersey area and have appropriated funds for the purpose. Connecticut, the third party to the compact I have mentioned, is not concerned with the air pollution problems in the lower harbor but is willing that the commission be authorized to make such a study if Congress will assent to that degree of broadening of the specified jurisdiction of the Interstate Sanitation Commission which Connecticut considers to be presently limited to water pollution. All three States have enacted legislation for the purpose which is referred to in the resolution now before the House, House Joint Resolution 511.

Following enactment of the Connecticut statute last December and at the instance of the Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation of New York State Legislature, I prepared and introduced House Joint Resolution 466, on January 6, 1956. Duplicate bills were introduced by Representatives FRELINGHUYSEN, THOMPSON, WILLIAMS, RODINO, and ADDONIZIO, all of New Jersey.

On January 31 last, a duplicate bill was also introduced in the Senate by Senators IVES and LEHMAN for New York and Senators SMITH and CASE for New Jersey. With that bill, Senator LEHMAN placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 1648 and 1649, the statement of reasons for the passage of the resolution which had been prepared by the New York Legislative Committee I have mentioned.

Thereafter, the Governor of New York, through his counsel, and the Governor of

New Jersey, by personal letters, wrote to urge the adoption of that resolution. The letters are in the committee files.

Hearings were held by Subcommittee No. 3 of the Judiciary Committee on House Joint Resolution 466 and the other House resolutions above mentioned. The committee amended the opening statement and chose to refer out to the House House Joint Resolution 511 which had been introduced by Representative RODINO, a member of that committee.

The resolution now before the House, House Joint Resolution 511, is very simple. That resolution has great merit; it will not jeopardize any existing Federal jurisdiction; and it is very much in the interest of the States affected. I hope it will pass by unanimous vote.

AMENDMENT OF EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9764) to amend the Employment Act of 1946.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 3332, be considered in lieu of the House bill. I may say there is only a change in the time involved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 (a) of the Employment Act of 1946, as amended (relating to the time for filing the economic report of the President), is amended by striking out "at the beginning of each regular session (commencing with the year 1947)" and inserting in lieu thereof "not later than January 20 of each year."

SEC. 2. Section 5 (a) of such act and the heading thereof are each amended by striking out "Joint Committee on the Economic Report" and inserting in lieu thereof "Joint Economic Committee"; and any other statute in which the name "Joint Committee on the Economic Report" appears is amended to conform to the foregoing change in the name of the Joint Committee.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 9764) was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7552) to amend sections 220 and 221 (d) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 220, Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended (42 Stat. 114, 48 U. S. C. 714), be further amended by adding a new paragraph thereto to read as follows:

"To enable the construction of irrigation projects which will service Hawaiian homelands, either exclusively or in conjunction with other lands served by such projects, the commission is authorized, with the approval of the governor, to grant to the Hawaiian Irrigation Authority, or to any other agency of the government of the Territory or the United States undertaking the construction and operation of such irrigation projects, for such term of years as is required for amortization of the costs of such projects, licenses for rights-of-way for pipelines, tunnels, ditches, flumes, and other water conveying facilities, reservoirs and other storage facilities, and for the development and use of water appurtenant to Hawaiian homelands; to exchange available lands for public lands, as provided in section 204 (4) of this act, for sites for reservoirs and subsurface water development wells and shafts; to request any such irrigation agency to organize irrigation projects for Hawaiian homelands and to transfer irrigation facilities constructed by the commission to any such irrigation agency; to agree to pay the tolls and assessments made against community pastures for irrigation water supplied to such pastures; and to agree to pay the costs of construction of projects constructed for Hawaiian homelands at the request of the commission, in the event the assessments paid by the homesteaders upon lands are not sufficient to pay such costs. Such payments shall be made from, and be a charge against the Hawaiian home-operating fund."

SEC. 2. Section 221 (d), Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920 (42 Stat. 114, 48 U. S. C. 715 (d)), is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the words "Government-owned water upon the island of Molokai, and" appearing therein between the words "charge" and "Government-owned", and by deleting therefrom the words "any of the water upon the island of Molokai, and" appearing therein between the words "charge" and "any."

SEC. 3. Said section 221 (d), Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, is hereby further amended by adding a new paragraph thereto, to read as follows:

"Any funds which may be appropriated by Congress as a grant-in-aid for the construction of an irrigation and water utilization system on the island of Molokai designed to serve Hawaiian Homes Commission lands, and which are not required to be reimbursed to the Federal Government, shall be deemed to be payment in advance by the Hawaiian Homes Commission and lessees of the Hawaiian Homes Commission of charges to be made to them for the construction of such system and shall be credited against such charges when made."

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect upon its approval.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, lines 3 and 4, strike the words "for such term of years as is required for amortization of the costs of such projects."

Page 2, line 20, after the word "costs", change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided*, That licenses for rights-of-way for the purposes and in the manner specified in this section may be granted for a term of years longer than is required for amortization of the costs of the project or projects requiring use of such rights-of-way only if authority for such longer grant is approved by an Act of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALE OF PUBLIC LANDS UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES WITHOUT PUBLIC AUCTION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7887) to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands under certain circumstances without public auction.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended, be further amended by adding a new subsection to read as follows:

"(r) Whenever any remnant of public land shall be disposed of, the commissioner of public lands shall first offer it to the abutting landowner for a period of three months at a reasonable price, to be determined by a disinterested appraiser or appraisers, but not more than three, to be appointed by the governor; and, if such owner fails to take the same, then such remnant may be sold at public auction: *Provided*, That if the remnant abuts more than one separate parcel of land and the owners of these separate parcels are all interested in purchasing said remnant, the remnant shall be sold to the owner making the highest offer above the appraised value.

"The term 'remnant' is defined as a parcel of land no larger than five thousand square feet in size in an urban area one and one-half acres in size in a suburban or rural area, and land locked or without access to any public highway."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on and after the date of its approval.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, following the word "price" insert the words ", in no event to be less than the fair market value of the land to be sold,."

Page 2, line 2, strike the word "auction:" and insert "auction at no less than the amount of the appraisal:."

Page 2, line 4, following the word "and", insert the words "more than one of."

Page 2, line 5, strike the word "all."

Page 2, strike all of lines 8 to 12, inclusive, and insert:

"The term 'remnant' shall mean a parcel of land landlocked or without access to any public highway, and, in the case of an urban area, no larger than five thousand square feet in size, or, in the case of a suburban or rural area, no larger than one and one-half acres in size."

Page 2, line 13, strike the words "and after."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6332) to amend the act of October 11, 1949, to specify the fee which will be paid for services performed by United States commissioners with respect to the commitment of individuals to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the detention, care, and treatment of persons of unsound mind in certain Federal reservations in Virginia and Maryland," approved April 11, 1949 (D. C. Code, title 32, secs. 32–417 to 32–417g), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 9. The compensation of a United States commissioner for all services rendered in connection with each proceeding under sections 1 and 2 of this act shall be $25 and shall be exclusive of any statutory limitation

or pay increases granted under Federal Employees Pay Acts and shall be payable from funds appropriated for the maintenance and operation of the United States courts."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike the word "April" and insert in lieu thereof the word "October."

On page 2, line 2, strike out "$25" and everything thereafter down to the word "Acts" on line 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$15 but shall be subject to any statutory limitation relating to commissioners' compensation."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN RESERVE MINERAL DEPOSITS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6501) to amend the act of July 17, 1914, to permit the disposal of certain reserve mineral deposits under the mining laws of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GAVIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Colorado can tell us what this bill is all about.

Mr. ASPINALL. I would say that the explanation which is given in the report is about as concise a statement as could be given. It is as follows:

If enacted, H. R. 6501 would amend a 1914 act of Congress so as to permit holders of valid and subsisting rights to certain mineral deposits acquired by discovery and location made under the mining laws of the United States prior to the date of February 25, 1920, to perfect the title thereto by obtaining patent to the mineral estate only. This would obviate the present requirement, impossible to meet in some cases, that holders of such claims, in order to obtain patents thereto, must first obtain the outstanding interest of the surface owner and thereafter reconvey the surface estate to the United States; a patent to the mining claim, including both mineral and surface estates is then issued to the mining claimant.

This provides for the multiple use of certain small areas of land in the West. There are only a very few of them. The bill was introduced at the request of a gentleman in California who had perfected his mining claim under the law previous to 1920 and found that he had to get the consent of the surface owner before he could get his patent, to which he was entitled under the law under which he founded his claim for the mineral rights. The surface owner would not cooperate with him, so he was left there holding a claim properly located and valid but unable to secure final title by patent. Under present conditions it is necessary for the locator to take care of the annual assessment work on claims in this category, yet he is denied the right to proceed to a patent. This bill would make it possible for a very few individuals in that category to come in and receive patent to the minerals, at the same time leaving in the surface owners the rights to which they already have a patent.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6024) to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain land at Kaakaukukui, Honolulu, Oahu, T. H.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all of the following-described land, together with improvements located thereon, situate at Kaakaukukui, Honolulu, Oahu, T. H., which forms a part of the public lands ceded and transferred to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii under Joint Resolution No. 55 of July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750), is hereby restored to the possession, use, and control of the government of the Territory of Hawaii;

Beginning at the northwest corner of this parcel of land at a point on the harbor line, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Punchbowl" being 4,861.99 feet south and 6,392.17 feet west, and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

(1) 309 degrees 00 minutes 214.10 feet along the remainder of submerged area transferred to the General Services Administration by the Secretary of the Army by letter dated November 12, 1949, as provided in the act of June 16, 1949 (Public Law No. 105, 81st Congress);

(2) 38 degrees 46 minutes 253.18 feet along the remainder of land transferred to the General Services Administration by the Secretary of the Army by letter dated November 12, 1949, as provided in the act of June 16, 1949 (Public Law No. 105, 81st Congress);

(3) Thence along the remainder of land transferred to the General Services Administration by the Secretary of the Army by letter dated November 12, 1949, as provided in the act of June 16, 1949 (Public Law No. 105, 81st Congress), on a curve to the left with a radius of 110 feet, the chord azimuth and distance being: 353 degrees 54 minutes 10 seconds 155.19 feet;

(4) 309 degrees 02 minutes 20 seconds 196.57 feet along the remainder of land transferred to the General Services Administration by the Secretary of the Army by letter dated November 12, 1949, as provided in the act of June 16, 1949 (Public Law No. 105, 81st Congress);

(5) Thence along the remainder of land transferred to the General Services Administration by the Secretary of the Army by letter dated November 12, 1949, as provided in the act of June 16, 1949 (Public Law No. 105, 81st Congress), on a curve to the left with a radius of 100 feet, the chord azimuth and distance being: 281 degrees 01 minutes 10 seconds 93.96 feet;

(6) 253 degrees 00 minutes 157.01 feet along the remainder of land transferred to the General Services Administration by the Secretary of the Army by letter dated November 12, 1949, as provided in the act of June 16, 1949 (Public Law No. 105, 81st Congress);

(7) 219 degrees 00 minutes 59.33 feet along the remainder of land transferred to the General Services Administration by the Secretary of the Army by letter dated November 12, 1949, as provided in the act of June 16, 1949 (Public Law No. 105, 81st Congress);

(8) 218 degrees 57 minutes 1,102.61 feet along the remainder of land transferred to the General Services Administration by the Secretary of the Army by letter dated November 12, 1949, as provided in the act of June 16, 1949 (Public Law No. 105, 81st Congress), and along remainder of land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army, portion of Presidential Executive Order No. 5487 and portion of land transferred to the War Department by the Secretary of Labor (by letter dated December 16, 1939);

(9) 309 degrees 00 minutes 224.49 feet along the remaining portion of immigration station lot;

(10) 264 degrees 25 minutes 161.35 feet along the remaining portion of immigration station lot;

(11) 174 degrees 25 minutes 17.53 feet along the remaining portion of immigration station lot;

(12) 264 degrees 25 minutes 132 feet along the remaining portion of immigration station lot, along land transferred to Department of Labor by the Secretary of War (by letter dated December 20, 1939);

(13) 354 degrees 25 minutes 185.08 feet along the west side of Ala Moana Road to concrete monument No. 2;

(14) 325 degrees 17 minutes 192.75 feet along the west side of Ala Moana Road to concrete monument No. 3;

(15) 52 degrees 23 minutes 329.02 feet along city and county sewer pumping station to concrete monument No. 4;

(16) 322 degrees 23 minutes 199.75 feet along city and county sewer pumping station to concrete monument No. 5;

(17) 52 degrees 23 minutes 797.92 feet along the remaining portion of the land of Kaakaukukui, L. C. Aw. 7712, Apana 6 to M. Kekuanaoa for V. Kamamalu (quitclaim deed, Hawaiian Government to the Bernice Pauahi Bishop estate, dated September 9, 1891, and recorded in liber 135, page 38), to concrete monument No. 6;

(18) 52 degrees 23 minutes 2,470.94 feet along the remaining portion of the land of Kaakaukukui, L. C. Aw. 7712, Apana 6 to M. Kekuanaoa for V. Kamamalu (quitclaim deed, Hawaiian Government to the Bernice Pauahi Bishop estate, dated September 9, 1891, and recorded in liber 135, page 38), over submerged area;

(19) 145 degrees 00 minutes 200.98 feet over submerged area;

(20) 189 degrees 25 minutes 1,206.87 feet over submerged area;

(21) 219 degrees 00 minutes 1,435.55 feet over submerged area and along the extension of the harbor line to the point of beginning and containing a total area of 69.90 acres, reserving, however, to the General Services Administration (United States Public Health Service), Corps of Engineers, and other departments and agencies having the use and control of areas set aside to the United States by Executive order, a nonexclusive right-of-way forty feet wide for vehicular and pedestrian traffic from the Ala Moana Road to said areas and from said areas to the Ala Moana Road.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect upon the payment to the United States by the Territory of Hawaii of the fair appraised value, as of the date of approval of this act, of the buildings then remaining on the land described in section 1, such appraised value to be determined by three appraisers whose compensation shall be paid by the Territory of Hawaii and who shall be appointed, one by the Secretary of the Army, one by the Governor of Hawaii, and the third by the two appraisers so appointed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 6, line 8, strike the word "Road." and insert the following: "Road, reserving also to

the United States the right to use approximately .10 acre of land in the northwest corner thereof now occupied by building known as No. 61 for so long as the present building remains on this property."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING CERTAIN EASEMENTS TO CHINCOTEAGUE, VA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8552) to authorize the Secretary of Navy to grant to the town of Chincoteague, Va., permanent easements on certain lands for the purpose of taking subterranean water.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to grant to the town of Chincoteague, Va., permanent easements over any portions of the United States Naval Air Station, United States Aviation Ordnance Test Station, Chincoteague, Accomack County, Va., for the construction, drilling, operation, and maintenance of water wells, together with such piping and pumping facilities, as may be necessary to permit the town of Chincoteague, Va., to take subterranean water from under such land for use for domestic and industrial purposes, and such easements shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Navy deems necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PREVENTION OF WATERFOWL DEPREDATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7641) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal and non-Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to objection, I should like a brief explanation as to what this bill purports to do.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REUSS. This bill is designed to use surplus grains in the custody of the Commodity Credit Corporation which have deteriorated, for the purpose of preventing depredations to farmers' crops.

Mr. GROSS. This in no way changes the relationship between the Federal conservation officers and the State conservation officers as to the conservation and control of wildlife; does it?

Mr. REUSS. It in no way changes that relationship.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of preventing crop damage by migratory waterfowl and at the same time of avoiding the depletion of our waterfowl resources by allowing shooting over baited waters in violation of the Federal regulation banning the shooting of waterfowl lured to or over the shooting area by bait, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available to the Secretary of the Interior such wheat, acquired through the price support operations and certified by the Commodity Credit Corporation to be in such condition through spoilage or deterioration as not to be desirable for human consumption, as the Secretary of the Interior shall requisition pursuant to section 2 hereof. With respect to wheat thus made available, the Commodity Credit Corporation may pay packaging, transporting, handling, and other charges up to the time of delivery to one or more designated locations in each State.

SEC. 2. Upon a finding by the Secretary of the Interior that any area in the United States is threatened with damage to farmers' crops by migratory waterfowl, whether or not during the open season for such migratory waterfowl, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to requisition from the Commodity Credit Corporation and to make available to Federal, State, or local governmental bodies or officials, or to private organizations or persons, such wheat acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation through price support operations in such quantities and subject to such regulations as the Secretary determines will most effectively lure migratory waterfowl away from crop depredations and at the same time not expose such migratory waterfowl to shooting over areas to which the waterfowl have been lured by such feeding program.

SEC. 3. With respect to all wheat made available pursuant to section 2, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be reimbursed by the Secretary of the Interior for the acquisition cost of the wheat to the Commodity Credit Corporation or the current support price (whichever is lower), plus the costs of any packaging, transporting, or handling required for delivery of the wheat pursuant to section 2 which the Commodity Credit Corporation determines to be in excess of the normal costs incurred in moving such agricultural commodity into normal commercial channels, and less an allowance determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be appropriate to cover the deterioration of the wheat. Expenditures authorized by this act may be made by the Commodity Credit Corporation in advance of appropriations and shall be entered on the books of the Corporation as accounts receivable.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are required for the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That (a) for the purpose of preventing crop damage by migratory waterfowl, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available to the Secretary of the Interior such wheat, corn, and other grains, acquired through price-support operations and certified by the Commodity Credit Corporation to be available for the purposes of this section or in such condition through spoilage or deterioration as not to be desirable for human consumption, as the Secretary of the Interior shall requisition pursuant to subsection (b) of this section. With respect to any grain thus made available, the Commodity Credit Corporation may pay packaging, transporting, handling, and other charges up to the time of delivery to one or more designated locations in each State.

"(b) Upon a finding by the Secretary of the Interior that any area in the United States is threatened with damage to farmers' crops by migratory waterfowl, whether or not during the open season for such migratory waterfowl, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to requisition from the Commodity Credit Corporation and to make available to Federal, State, or local governmental bodies or officials, or to private organizations or persons, such grain acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation through price-support operations in such quantities and subject to such regulations as the Secretary determines will most effectively lure migratory waterfowl away from crop depredations and at the same time not expose such migratory waterfowl to shooting over areas to which the waterfowl have been lured by such feeding program.

"(c) With respect to all grain made available pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be reimbursed by the Secretary of the Interior for its expenses in packaging and transporting such grain for the purposes of this section. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for its investment in the grain transferred pursuant to this section."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 403 (b) OF THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9592) to amend section 403 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to permit air carriers and foreign air carriers, subject to certain conditions, to grant reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

RELATING TO THE DISTRICT COURT OF GUAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10630) relating to the District Court of Guam.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence of subsection (a) of section 22 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 389; 48 U. S. C. 1424) is amended to read as follows: "The District Court of Guam shall have the jurisdiction of a district court of the United States in all causes arising under the Constitution, treaties, and laws of the United States, regardless of the sum or value of the matter in controversy, shall have original jurisdiction in all other causes in Guam, ju-

risdiction over which has not been transferred by the legislature to other court or courts established by it, and shall have such appellate jurisdiction as the legislature may determine."

SEC. 2. Section 22 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 389; 48 U. S. C. 1424) is futher amended by inserting at the end of subsection (a) thereof the following additional paragraph:

"Appeals to the District Court of Guam shall be heard and determined by an appellate division of the court consisting of three judges, of whom two shall constitute a quorum The judge appointed for the court by the President shall be the presiding judge of the appellate division and shall preside therein unless disqualified or otherwise unable to act. The other judges who are to sit in the appellate division at any session shall be designated by the presiding judge from among the judges assigned to the court from time to time pursuant to section 24 (a) of this act. The concurrence of two judges shall be necessary to any decision by the District Court of Guam on the merits of an appeal but the presiding judge alone may make any appropriate orders with respect to an appeal prior to the hearing and determination thereof on the merits and may dismiss an appeal for want of jurisdiction or failure to take or prosecute it in accordance with the applicable law or rules of procedure."

SEC. 3. Subsection (a) of section 24 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 390; 48 U. S. C. 1424b), as amended, is further amended as follows:

"(a) The President shall, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint a judge for the District Court of Guam who shall hold office for the term of 8 years and until his successor is chosen and qualified unless sooner removed by the President for cause. The judge shall receive a salary payable by the United States which shall be at the rate prescribed for judges of the United States district courts.

"The Chief Judge of the Ninth Judicial Circuit of the United States may assign a judge of the Island Court of Guam or a judge of the High Court of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands or a circuit or district judge of the ninth circuit, or the Chief Justice of the United States may assign any other United States circuit or district judge with the consent of the judge so assigned and of the chief judge of his circuit, to serve temporarily as a judge in the District Court of Guam whenever it is made to appear that such an assignment is necessary for the proper dispatch of the business of the court."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RENTAL OF INADEQUATE QUARTERS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 5731) to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and their dependents, to occupy inadequate quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters, the next bill on the Calendar, be stricken from the Calendar since it involves a larger amount of money than the rules covering bills on the Consent Calendar permit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

TO ASSIST MENOMINEE TRIBE OF INDIANS TO PREPARE FOR THE TERMINATION OF FEDERAL SUPERVISION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6218) to authorize payment by the Federal Government of the cost of making certain studies necessary to assist the Menominee Tribe of Indians to prepare for the termination of Federal supervision.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of section 6 of the act entitled "An act to provide for a per capita distribution of Menominee tribal funds and authorize the withdrawal of the Menominee Tribe from Federal jurisdiction," approved June 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 250), is amended to read as follows: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as the Secretary shall deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this section."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the last sentence of section 6 of the act entitled 'An act to provide for a per capita distribution of Menominee tribal funds and authorize the withdrawal of the Menominee Tribe from Federal jurisdiction,' approved June 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 250), is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and by adding 'and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as the Secretary shall deem necessary to reimburse the tribe for the expenditure of tribal funds pursuant to this section, or for any other expenditure of tribal funds approved by the Secretary for the purpose of carrying out the purposes of this act.'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR DISPOSITION OF A PORTION OF SHARPE GENERAL DEPOT, STOCKTON ANNEX, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9970) to provide for the disposition of a portion of Sharpe General Depot, Stockton Annex, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey on or before January 1, 1957, by quitclaim deed to the Stockton Port District that portion of real property under his jurisdiction located at the Stockton Annex, Sharpe General Depot, Calif., consisting of approximately $96^{85}/_{100}$ acres and $2^{3}/_{10}$ acres of easement together with all appurtenances pertaining thereto and all improvements located thereon.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to convey on or before January 1, 1957, by quitclaim deed to the Stockton Port District that portion of real property under his jurisdiction located at the Stockton Annex, Sharpe General Depot, Calif., consisting of approximately one hun- Calif., consisting of approximately $138^{56}/_{100}$ acres together with all appurtenances pertaining thereto and all improvements located thereon.

SEC. 3. The conveyances herein authorized shall be made a monetary consideration determined by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force, respectively, to represent the fair market value of the property to be conveyed and shall be made upon such terms and conditions and shall include such reservations as the respective Secretary shall determine to be in the public interest.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 8 and 9, strike "and $2^{3}/_{10}$ acres of easement."

Page 2, line 3, strike the word "Annex" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Air Force Station."

Page 2, line 5, following the word "acres", insert "and $2^{3}/_{10}$ acres of easement."

Page 2, strike section 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 3. The conveyances herein authorized shall be made at the fair market value of the property as determined by the Secretary of the Army, and shall be made upon such terms and conditions and shall include such reservations as the respective Secretary shall determine to be in the public interest."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the disposition of the Stockton Air Force Station and the Stockton Annex, Sharpe General Depot, Calif.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO DISPOSE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN THE STATE OF MONTANA TO THE PHILLIPS COUNTY POST OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1053) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands in the State of Montana to the Phillips County Post of the American Legion.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior may dispose of the southwest quarter southeast quarter and the east half southeast quarter southwest quarter of section 35, township 32 north, range 32 east, Montana principal meridian, comprising 60 acres, to Phillips County Post, No. 57, of the American Legion, Department of Montana, under the provisions of the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, as amended by the act of June 4, 1954 (68 Stat. 173).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORT CLATSOP, OREG., A NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2498) to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing

Fort Clatsop, Oreg., as a national monument.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if there is a member of the committee present who is familiar with this bill. The reason I ask that is not that I have any particular objection to this investigation, but there is an aspect of this that I think raises a question. My understanding is that the Historic Sites Buildings and Antiquities Act of 1935 provides for the Department of the Interior to make investigations of various sites that might be desirable to establish as national monuments. My understanding is that the Department has no objection to making the investigation and intends to make the investigation of this particular proposition. What I wondered about is why we should have the expense of going through the process of passing a bill directing the Department to make a specific investigation. I imagine this particular bill went through at least two or three printings in the Senate; a committee report; the time of a Senate committee was taken up, and then we have two more printings here and the preparation and printing of the report of the House committee, all merely for the purpose of suggesting that the Department do something which it should do anyway and which it says it will do. I am wondering why that expense to the taxpayers is incurred.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield

Mr. ENGLE. This is a Senate bill, and inasmuch as we had the bill before us, rather than let it be delayed we just pushed on. It originated on the other side. There is no harm in passing it, because the expense has been incurred already.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The Secretary has the discretion to make the investigation.

Mr. ENGLE. But this bill tells him to do it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I do not know who the author of the bill is, but he could have gotten the information by simply writing a letter to the Department and they would have advised him whether they thought it was the necessary and proper thing for them to investigate, without coming to the Congress. Does not the gentleman agree?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes, but perhaps the author would think that this bill would put a little fire under the Secretary that was not there before.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would hate to estimate the cost of putting that fire under the Secretary. It certainly is a pretty costly fire, and I would venture to say an unnecessary fire. The horrible part of it all is that the taxpayers are the ones who have to foot the bill.

The point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, is that this bill is an example of useless, unnecessary waste of the people's money.

I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the advisability of establishing Fort Clatsop, located in Clatsop County, Oreg., as a national monument.

SEC. 2. As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of the Interior shall report to the Congress the results of such investigation and study made by him under the first section of this act, together with such recommendations as he deems appropriate. Such report shall contain specific findings with respect to (1) the national historical importance of the proposed memorial, (2) the size, present status and condition of Fort Clatsop, and (3) the estimated total cost of establishing such memorial.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PINE RIDGE SIOUX TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk call the bill (H. R. 5838) to provide that payments be made to certain members of the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians as reimbursement for damages suffered as the result of the establishment of the Pine Ridge aerial gunnery range, and to provide a rehabilitation program for the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PLAN FOR CONTROL OF PROPERTY OF MENOMINEE INDIAN TRIBE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9280) to provide for the formulation of a plan for control of the property of the Menominee Indian Tribe, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to make an inquiry or two concerning this legislation, inasmuch as the information I have available indicates that the Department of the Interior is opposed to enactment, and that the Bureau of the Budget concurs in the recommendation.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. REUSS. I am the author of this bill. I can readily understand how the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], might have come to that conclusion by a quick reading of the report. I think, however, my explanation of what happened will set the gentleman's mind at ease. The original report of the Department of the Interior, dated February 24, 1956, which is contained in report No. 2246, did, indeed, as the gentleman has suggested, oppose the bill in its condition at that time. Thereupon an amended bill was introduced containing additional language. That amended bill, which bore the number H. R. 10634, was referred to the Department of the Interior. On May 3, 1956, the Department of the Interior wrote a report on the amended language contained in H. R. 10634. That letter of May 3 is contained on pages 6 to 8 of the report No. 2246. In that May 3 report the Department said that if two amendments were made in the language of H. R. 10634 there would be no objection on the part of the Department of the Interior.

Those amendments in the exact language formulated by the Department of the Interior were made and then that total language was substituted for the original bill to which the Department of the Interior had objected. Therefore it can truly be said that the objections made by the Department of the Interior have been met in the bill, as amended, which is now before this House.

Mr. FORD. In other words it would appear to me that what we really have before us is H. R. 10634, as amended.

Mr. REUSS. That is correct; the gentleman from Michigan states that accurately. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs preferred to use the original number and substitute for the language of H. R. 9280 the language of H. R. 10634, as amended, to meet the requirements of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. The Menominee Indian Reservation is located in my congressional district, and I would just like to state that this bill H. R. 9280 has been amended in line with the recommendations of the Department of the Interior, of the Menominee Indian Tribe, and of the Menominee Indian Study Committee which was created by action of the Wisconsin Legislature in 1955.

I think that the gentleman from Michigan on close examination of the bill will find that everything following the enacting clause of H. R. 9280 has been stricken, and in lieu thereof there has been inserted the amendments suggested by the Department of the Interior and the Wisconsin Menominee Indian Study Committee.

I do agree with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], that the title of the bill is somewhat misleading. The title was not amended by the committee and if the gentleman has no objection I think it should be changed. The title presently reads: "A bill to provide for the formulation of a plan." This bill does not provide for the formulation of any plan; that was provided for under Public Law No. 399 passed by the 83d Congress. This bill merely relates to the plan which the Menominee Indian Tribe is required to formulate by Public Law 399. If there is

no objection I would like to suggest a change in the title to read: "Relating to the formulation of the plan for control of the property of the Menominee Indian Tribe."

This bill as amended by the committee merely provides that the plan formulated by the Minominee Indian Tribe, as provided in Public Law 399 of the 83d Congress, will be submitted to the Secretary of the Interior by December 31, 1957. It further provides that the Minominee Indians must include in their plan of control and operation provisions for sustained yield management of the tribal forest.

The tribal representatives have testified that no hardship will be involved by requiring submission of their plan of operation on or before December 31, 1957. The Minominee Indian Tribe and the Wisconsin State Study Committee are also on record favoring sustained yield management of the tribal forests.

I do want to call attention to the House that in agreeing to this bill today we cannot assume that the December 31, 1958, termination date for Federal supervision of the Minominee Indian Reservation can be met. It is possible that after the important studies underway in Wisconsin are completed further amendments to Public Law 399 of the 83d Congress will be most necessary.

Mr. FORD. I appreciate the statements made by the gentlemen from Wisconsin. They have straightened out the situation so that the history of this legislation is understandable.

I have no objection to the consideration of the bill and I certainly have no objection to the amendment of the title if that is desired by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. REUSS. I am sure there is no objection on my part to the proposed minor change in the title of the bill just suggested by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act entitled "An act to provide for a per capita distribution of the Menominee tribal funds and authorize the withdrawal of the Menominee Tribe from Federal jurisdiction." approved June 17, 1954 (Public Law 399, 83d Cong.), is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as the Secretary shall require in order to compensate such specialists and otherwise assist the tribe in preparing such studies and reports."

SEC. 2. Section 7 of such act of June 17, 1954, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. The tribe shall as soon as possible formulate and submit to the Secretary a plan for the future control of the tribal property and service functions now conducted by or under the supervision of the United States, including, but not limited to, services in the field of health, education, welfare, credit, roads, and law and order, and for all other matters involved in the proposed ultimate withdrawal of Federal supervision. The Secretary is authorized to provide such reasonable assistance as may be requested by officials of the tribe in the formulation of the plan heretofore referred to including necessary consultations with representatives of Federal departments and agencies, officials of the State of Wisconsin and political subdivisions thereof, and members of the tribe: *Provided,* That the responsibility of the United States to furnish all such supervision and services to the tribe and to the members thereof, because of their status as Indians, shall cease on December 31, 1958, or on such earlier date as may be agreed upon by the tribe and the Secretary. The plan shall contain provision for a viable economy for the tribe, for a method of compensating enrolled members of the tribe who may wish to sell or otherwise dispose of their beneficial interests in the tribal property, and for the preservation forever of the tribal assets of forest (on a sustained yield basis), water, soil, and fish and wildlife. To the extent necessary, the plan shall provide for such terms of transfer pursuant to section 8 of this act, by trust or otherwise, as shall insure the continued fulfillment of the plan. The Secretary, after approving the plan and after securing the approval of the plan by the Governor of Wisconsin, shall cause the plan to be published in the Federal Register."

SEC. 3. Section 8 of such act of June 17, 1954, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. The Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the tribe, immediately following the date of publication in the Federal Register of the plan formulated pursuant to section 7 of this act, the title to all property, real and personal held in trust by the United States for the tribe: *Provided, however,* That if the tribe obtains a charter for a corporation or otherwise organizes under the laws of a State or of the District of Columbia for the purpose, among any others, of taking title to all tribal lands and assets and enterprises owned by the tribe or held in trust by the United States for the tribe, and requests such transfer to be made to such corporation or organization, the Secretary shall make such transfer to such corporation or organization. The Secretary is also authorized and directed to transfer to the tribe, or to a legal entity organized by the tribe, clear and unrestricted title to all buildings and roads equipment utilized on the Menominee Reservation in all cases where there is any uncertainty respecting ownership by the tribe."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following language: "That section 7 of the act entitled 'An act to provide for a per capita distribution of Menominee tribal funds and authorize the withdrawal of the Menominee Tribe from Federal jurisdiction,' approved June 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 250), is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 7. The tribe shall as soon as possible and in no event later than December 31, 1957, formulate and submit to the Secretary a plan for the future control of the tribal property and service functions now conducted by or under the supervision of the United States, including, but not limited to, services in the fields of health, education, welfare, credit, roads, and law and order, and for all other matters involved in the withdrawal of Federal supervision. The Secretary is authorized to provide such reasonable assistance as may be requested by officials of the tribe in the formulation of the plan heretofore referred to, including necessary consultations with representatives of Federal departments and agencies, officials of the State of Wisconsin and political subdivisions thereof, and members of the tribe: *Provided,* That the responsibility of the United States to furnish all such supervision and services to the tribe and to the members thereof, because of their status as Indians, shall cease on December 31, 1958, or on such earlier date as may be agreed upon by the tribe and the Secretary. The plan shall contain provision for protection of the forest on a sustained yield basis, and for the protection of the water, soil, fish and wildlife. To the extent necessary, the plan shall provide for such terms of transfer pursuant to section 8 of this act, by trust or otherwise, as shall insure the continued fulfillment of the plan. The Secretary after approving the plan, shall cause the plan to be published in the Federal Register. The sustained yield management requirement contained in this act shall not be construed by any court to impose a financial liability on the United States.'"

SEC. 2. Section 8 of such act of June 17, 1954, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 8. The Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the tribe, on December 31, 1958, or on such earlier date as may be agreed upon by the tribe and the Secretary, the title to all property, real and personal, held in trust by the United States for the tribe: *Provided, however,* That if the tribe obtains a charter for a corporation or otherwise organizes under the laws of a State or of the District of Columbia for the purpose, among any others, of taking title to all tribal lands and assets and enterprises owned by the tribe or held in trust by the United States for the tribe, and requests such transfer to be made to such corporation or organization, the Secretary shall make such transfer to such corporation or organization. The Secretary is authorized, in his discretion, to transfer to the tribe or any member or group of members thereof any federally owned property acquired, withdrawn, or used for the administration of the affairs of the tribe which he deems necessary for Indian use, or to transfer to a public or nonprofit body any such property which he deems necessary for public use and from which members of the tribe will derive benefits'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAIRD: Amend the title of the bill to read: "Relating to the formulation of a plan for control of the property of the Menominee Indian Tribe and for other purposes."

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TULALIP RESERVATION, WASH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11456) to authorize the partition or sale of inherited interests in allotted lands in the Tulalip Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to make a statement as a member of the committee. I voted for this bill only because of the urgency that has been demonstrated. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that this permits a complete termination of Federal guardianship over Indian property.

Under the complex heirship situation there may be many Indians who have an

interest in a piece of property. Some may be illiterate, many will not have been adjudged competent. Yet any single one of these coowners, under the provisions of this bill, can force all the others into court, have the property sold, and require all the owners to accept the proportionate share of whatever the property brings at an auction sale. Rights that the Indians enjoy such as exemption from taxation would be cut off. In many cases service would be by publication and Indian coowners who are incompetent to handle their own affairs by definition would be served by publication and no one appointed to represent them.

Many Indians who are illiterate, who are incompetent, under such legislation as this could have their property taken away from them. If it were not for the urgency of the bill and the fact that this particular tribe of Indians, as stated in the report, is competent and the Indians themselves are competent to administer their property, I would feel it necessary to object.

I do not want this body, Mr. Speaker, to feel this bill sets a precedent for further termination or the proper means of disposing of the Indian heirship problem. It is better to handle these matters under comprehensive legislation such as many of us have pending in the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, S. 3920, an identical bill to the House bill, be considered in lieu of H. R. 11456.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any owner of an interest in any tract of land in the Tulalip Reservation, Wash., in which any undivided interest is now or hereafter held in trust by the United States for an Indian, or is now or hereafter owned by an Indian subject to restrictions against alienation or taxation imposed by the United States, may commence in a State court of competent jurisdiction an action for the partition in kind or for the sale of such land in accordance with the laws of the State. For the purpose of any such action the Indian owners shall be regarded as vested with an unrestricted fee simple title to the land, the United States shall not be a necessary party to the proceeding, and any partition or conveyance of the land pursuant to the proceedings shall divest the United States of title to the land, terminate the Federal trust, and terminate all restrictions against alienation or taxation of the land imposed by the United States.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of the constitution and charter of the Tulalip Tribes of the Tulalip Reservation, any lands that are held by the United States in trust for the Tulalip Tribes, or that are subject to a restriction against alienation or taxation imposed by the United States, or that are hereafter acquired by the Tulalip Tribes, may be sold by the Tulalip Board of Directors, with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior, on such terms and conditions as the Tulalip Board of Directors may prescribe, and such sale shall terminate the Federal trust or restrictions against alienation of taxation of the land: *Provided,* That the proceeds from the sale of any tribal lands acquired otherwise than by purchase shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Tulalip Tribes and shall not be expended until otherwise specifically provided by Congress.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H. R. 11456) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROSEBURG, OREG.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8123) authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "section 2 of this act" and insert "such reservations and restrictions as may be necessary to protect the interests of the United States."

Page 2, strike out all of section 2.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of bills on the Private Calendar be dispensed with at this time due to the fact that the committee did not receive reports from the Government Printing Office in time to consider such reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I can understand the committee's problem in that regard, but I wonder if it would not be possible to put the Private Calendar over for a period less than the full 2-week period inasmuch as we are getting toward the end of the session? There are some bills on this calendar which might get lost in the last minute rush lest we get them from here over to the other side of the Capitol.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Alabama and I had a brief conference on the floor in relation to the inquiry made by my friend from Michigan. I told both of my colleagues that I would ask unanimous consent that it be in order to call the Private Calendar on Monday next. The gentleman's request is a very fair one, to which I responded favorably immediately. The position of the gentleman from Alabama is absolutely correct. I do not know what caused the delay. The Public Printer has been very cooperative. They have done a remarkable job throughout the years, and I am sure there will be no more delays in the future in connection with reports being printed in adequate time for the objectors committee to consider them, as it is their duty to do so. The objectors committee on both the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar perform an outstanding task for the House. It is work that they assume over and above their work to their districts and their committee work, and it is very burdensome. I want each and every Member of the objectors committee on the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar to know that the leadership on both sides profoundly appreciate the work that they are doing, which is really beyond their line of duty.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Private Calendar to be called on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CLAIMS OF VATICAN CITY FOR LOSSES AND DAMAGES CAUSED BY UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES DURING WORLD WAR II

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 10766) to authorize the payment of compensation for certain losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces during World War II.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay the sum of $964,199.35 to the Vatican City in full and final settlement and discharge of all claims of the Vatican City for losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces in the Papal Domain Castel Gandolfo during the course of hostilities conducted by such forces against German armed forces in Italy in 1944.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $964,199.35 to carry out the purposes of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the bill, but in order to get a hearing, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 10766, to authorize the payment of compensation for certain losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces during World War II, is a measure which I hope will receive the unanimous support of this House. Its purpose is to compensate the Vatican for losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces during World War II. During the course of attacks by United States planes on military targets near the Papal Domain Castel Gandolfo, the papal domain was accidentally damaged on four different occasions—on February 2, February 10, May 31, and June 4, 1944. The original claim made by the Vatican for the damage was in the amount of

$1,525,810.98. The Foreign Affairs Committee has reduced this amount to $964,199.35. This reduced amount is the exact amount which the United States Army Claims Service considers a reasonable assessment.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this bill is an eminently fair and just one and constitutes an action in keeping with our American tradition of equity and justice. As evidence of the bipartisan support which this bill has, I would like to point out that this bill was introduced by the distinguished majority leader of the House, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, and an identical bill, H. R. 10767, was introduced by the distinguished minority leader, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN.

The amount in this bill is small, but the good will involved in it is large. It deserves our wholehearted support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the pending bill, H. R. 10766, is a deserving measure and one that should pass both branches of the Congress and be signed by the President. A similar bill, H. R. 10767, was also introduced by my distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the minority leader. So, this bill should properly be known as the McCormack-Martin bill.

The report of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs clearly presents the justification for the passage of this bill. Former Speaker MARTIN and I received a memorandum from the State Department, which is as follows:

WAR DAMAGE TO PAPAL DOMAIN CASTEL GANDOLFO

In a letter of July 10, 1943, President Roosevelt wrote to Pope Pius XII as follows:

"By the time this message reaches your Holiness a landing in force by American and British troops will have taken place on Italian soil. Our soldiers have come to rid Italy of fascism and all its unhappy symbols, and to drive out the Nazi oppressors who are infesting her soil.

"There is no need for me to reaffirm that respect for religious beliefs and for the free exercise of religious worship is fundamental to our ideas. Churches and religious institutions will, to the extent that it is within our power, be spared the devastations of war during the struggle ahead. Throughout the period of operations the neutral status of Vatican City as well as the Papal domains throughout Italy will be respected.

"I look forward, as does Your Holiness, to that bright day when the peace of God returns to the world. We are convinced that this will occur only when the forces of evil which now hold vast areas of Europe and Asia enslaved have been utterly destroyed. On that day we will joyfully turn our energies from the grim duties of war to the fruitful tasks of reconstruction. In common with all other nations and forces imbued with the spirit of good will toward men, and with the help of Almighty God, we will turn our hearts and our minds to the exacting task of building a just and enduring peace on earth."

On February 2 and 10, May 31, and June 4, 1944, the Papal Domain Castel Gandolfo was hit by bombs dropped by United States planes incidental to an attack upon legitimate military targets in close proximity thereto.

A property damage claim for $1,523,810.98 was presented by the Vatican City authorities on December 10, 1948. According to a survey by the United States Army Claims Service, a fair and reasonable assessment of the property damage, based upon the costs of labor and materials for April 1945 is $964,199.35. It is understood that the principal reason for the difference between the Vatican figure and the Army figure is that the latter does not take account of the cultural and artistic value of the destroyed or damaged property.

The Vatican City authorities were subsequently informally informed that since the papal domains were not territory of a neutral state but had the status of a neutral diplomatic mission located in the territory of a belligerent (just as, for example, the Swiss Embassy in Berlin), there exists no legal basis on which to recommend to the Congress the payment of the claim.

It is believed that any payment to the Vatican City should be made as a matter of grace so that it cannot be regarded as a precedent.

The message that the late President Roosevelt sent to Pope Pius XII, particularly in looking "to that bright day when the peace of God returns to the world," is just as applicable today as it was when sent by the late Franklin D. Roosevelt to His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, on July 10, 1943.

The enactment into law of this bill will carry out a moral obligation on the part of our Government. It is also an act which brings about a feeling of understanding that cannot be estimated in terms of material values.

I want to express my appreciation to the members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs for reporting this bill, as a result of which the bill is now before the House for consideration. I strongly urge the passage of the bill. I hope, with the passage of the bill in this body, the Senate will quickly consider and pass the same.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that this bill and an identical bill, H. R. 10767, were introduced by our distinguished majority leader, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, JR., and the distinguished minority leader, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, respectively. I know it is typical of both sides of the aisle to join together when it comes to foreign policy considerations. I fully support this bill which will compensate the Vatican City for the damage sustained to the papal domain Castel Gandolfo during World War II from bombs dropped by United States planes during attacks upon targets close to Castel Gandolfo.

I feel that this gesture on the part of the United States Government is one which is really typical of our American way of life. Fundamentally, we judge matters on the basis of what is morally right and morally wrong. It is morally right that the United States compensate the Vatican for this damage. Although it is a small amount of money involved in this bill, it means a great deal to Castel Gandolfo which people from all over the world and from all walks of life have taken such great pleasure and spiritual joy in visiting.

I feel that the sum agreed upon by the committee of $964,199.35 is a fair compromise. It represents the assessment of the damage made by the United States Army Claims Service based upon the prevailing conditions as of April 1945.

I hope that this bill will receive the unanimous endorsement that it justly merits.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DANGEROUS EROSION OF STATE SOVEREIGNTY BY DECISIONS OF SUPREME COURT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, the past 15 years have witnessed dangerous erosion of State sovereignty by decisions of the Supreme Court. This has been accomplished by reading into acts of Congress an unexpressed intention to supersede State law. In so doing the Court has turned its back on the salutary principles announced by Chief Justice Marshall and followed for more than a century. In *Cohens* v. *Virginia* ((1821) 6 Wheat. 264, 443), Marshall enunciated the tests to be applied in determining whether Congress has so exercised its powers as to control and limit State laws for the punishment of crime.

To interfere with the penal laws of a State—

He wrote—

where they are not leveled against the legitimate powers of the Union, but have for their sole object the internal government of the country, is a very serious measure, which Congress cannot be supposed to adopt lightly or inconsiderately. The motives for it must be serious and weighty. It would be undertaken deliberately and the intention would be clearly and unequivocally expressed. An act * * * ought not to be construed as to imply this intention, unless its provisions were such as to render the construction inevitable.

For sixscore years, the Supreme Court faithfully adhered to this doctrine. In 1937, Chief Justice Hughes declared on behalf of a unanimous Court in *Kelley* v. *Washington* ((1937) 302 U. S. 1, 10) that—

The principle is thoroughly established that the exercise by the State of its police power, which would be valid if not superseded by Federal action, is superseded only where the repugnance is so direct and positive that the two acts cannot be reconciled or consistently stand together.

But in 1941, the Supreme Court cavalierly thrust these precedents aside. By a 6 to 3 decision it struck down the Pennsylvania Alien Registration Act in *Hines* v. *Davidowitz* ((1941) 312 U. S. 52, 67). In attempting to justify this decision, Mr. Justice Black disposed of prior cases to his own satisfaction by saying:

> There is not—and from the very nature of the problem there cannot be—any rigid formula or rule which can be used as a universal pattern to determine the meaning and purpose of every act of Congress. This Court, in considering the validity of State laws in the light of treaties or Federal laws touching the same subject, has made use of the following expressions: conflicting; contrary to; occupying the field; repugnance; difference; irreconcilability; inconsistency; violation; curtailment; and interference. But none of these expressions provide an infallible constitutional test or an exclusive constitutional yardstick. In the final analysis, there can be no one crystal clear distinctly marked formula. Our primary function is to determine whether, under the circumstances of this particular case, Pennsylvania's law stands as an obstacle to the accomplishment and execution of the full purposes and objectives of Congress.

Mr. Justice Stone vigorously dissented in an opinion in which two other Justices joined. He pointed out that the existence of national power to conduct foreign relations and negotiate treaties does not foreclose legislation dealing exclusively with aliens as such. This Court has consistently held that treaties of the United States for the protection of resident aliens do not supersede such legislation unless they conflict with it. He went on to say:

> As construed and applied by the opinion of the Court the Federal act denies to the States the practicable means of identifying their alien residents and of recording their whereabouts and it withholds from the States the benefit of the information secured under the Federal act except insofar as it may be made available to them on application to the Attorney General.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Every act of Congress occupies some field, but we must know the boundaries of that field before we can say that it has precluded a State from the exercise of any power reserved to it by the Constitution. To discover the boundaries we look to the Federal statute itself, read in the light of its constitutional setting and its legislative history.
>
> * * * * *
>
> But no words of the statute, or of any committee report, or any congressional debate indicate that Congress intended to withdraw from the States any part of their constitutional power over aliens within their borders. We must take it that Congress was not unaware that some 19 States have statutes or ordinances requiring some form of registration for aliens, 7 of them dating from the last war. The repeal of this legislation is not to be inferred from the silence of Congress in enacting a law which at no point conflicts with the State legislation and is harmonious with it.

Within a year this decision was followed by another which paralyzed State power in a field equally vital to the welfare of its citizens—the enforcement of sanitary standards in the manufacture of food products. By a bare majority, the Court held in *Cloverleaf Butter Company* v. *Patterson* ((1942) 315 U. S. 148), that Alabama could not seize spoiled packing stock butter held by a manufacturer for the production of renovated butter. The reason assigned for this startling conclusion was that it conflicted with a Federal law which authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to inspect renovated butter sold in interstate commerce. To be sure, Congress had not expressed any intention to supersede State law. Enforcement of Alabama's statute would not have interfered in any way with Federal inspection. Nevertheless, by some mysterious course of reasoning the majority came to the conclusion that Congress hardly intended the intrusion of State authority during the very preparation of a commodity subject to the surveillance and comprehensive specifications of the Department of Agriculture. Once more Justice—now Chief Justice—Stone dissented, together with three of his colleagues. He pointed out that the decision was, in his words, "a radical departure from the salutary principle that Congress, in enacting legislation within constitutional authority, will not be deemed to have intended to strike down a State statute designed to protect the health and safety of the public unless the State act, in terms or in its practical administration, conflicts with the act of Congress or plainly and palpably infringes its policy." Bluntly he insisted that "not only is there a complete want of conflict between the two statutes and their administration, but it seems plain that the Alabama statute both by its terms and in its practical administration aids and supplements the Federal regulation and policy. Consequently, there is no room for any inference that Congress by its enactment, sought to stay the hands of the State in the exercise of a power with which the Federal act does not conflict."

Mr. Justice Frankfurter said of the decision that "if ever there was an intrusion by this Court into a field that belongs to Congress, and which it has seen fit not to enter, this is it."

But Chief Justice Stone was fighting a losing battle. In the decade since his death the Court has pursued ever more relentlessly the course of reducing the States to insignificance. This has been particularly true in the field of labor legislation. The first step in this direction was taken in 1945, while Stone was still on the bench. In *Hill* v. *Florida* ((1945) 325 U. S. 538), the Court, in a sweeping decision denied the authority of Florida to require a business agent of a labor union to be a citizen of the United States for more than 10 years, to be a person of good moral character, who has not been convicted of a felony; to require such business agents to be licensed with the payment of an annual fee of $1, and to require labor unions to file a written report with the Secretary of State disclosing its name, the location of its offices and the names and addresses of its officers. In vain, Mr. Justice Frankfurter protested that—

> The rights Congress created, the obligations it defined, the machinery it devised for enforcing these rights and securing obedience to these obligations, all were exclusively concerned with putting the strength of the Government against this (forbidden) conduct by employers * * *. There is not a breath in the act referring to any aspect of union activity unrelated to employer interference therewith. By refusing to legislate beyond that, Congress did not forbid the States from so legislating."

Next the Court ruled that the New York State Labor Relations Board had no jurisdiction to certify a union as collective bargaining representatives of foremen—*Bethlehem Steel Co.* v. *New York State Labor Relations Board* (1947) 330 U. S. 767).

It underscored its complete departure from the principles followed from the time of Chief Justice Marshall to that of Chief Justice Hughes by saying that—

> Congress has not seen fit to lay down even the most general of guides to construction of the act, as it sometimes does, by saying that its regulation either shall or shall not exclude State action.

It has overthrown the certification of a union as a bargaining agent for employees of a local telephone company, on the ground of supposed conflict with the National Labor Relations Act, even though the National Labor Relations Board had not undertaken to determine the appropriate bargaining representative for the employees of that company—*La Crosse Telephone Corporation* v. *Wisconsin Employment Relations Board* ((1949) 336 U. S. 18). It struck down the strike vote provisions of Michigan's labor mediation law which was designed to avert strikes with the States by requiring approval of a strike by a majority vote of the employees before it could be called, *Automobile Workers* v. *O'Brien* ((1950) 339 U. S. 454). Although three members of the court noted that the national emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act indicated that the principle of collective bargaining should to some extent be subordinated to the public interest, and found no indication in that act that the States were not equally free to protect the public when in State emergencies, the Court denied the authority of Wisconsin to protect its people against interruption of essential public utility services by banning strikes which would cause such interruptions—*Bus Employees* v. *Wisconsin Employment Relations Board* ((1951) 340 U. S. 383). And the Court has not been content to strike down State laws which by dubious inferences it has found in conflict with an imputed although unexpressed intention of Congress. It has denied the authority of State courts to afford a remedy for conduct which was forbidden by both State and Federal law. In *Garner* v. *Teamsters Union* ((1953) 346 U. S. 485) it held that a State court could not enjoin picketing intended to coerce an employer into compelling or influencing his employees to join a union in violation of both Federal and State statutes which forbade such coercion. One sentence in this opinion shows how far the Court has moved from the principle formerly applied—that State laws were superseded only in case of direct and positive conflict with Federal law:

> We must spell out—
>
> The Court said:
>
> from conflicting indications of congressional will the area in which State action is still permissible.

Acting on the same tenuous inferences it reversed a State court decision enjoining picketing in a jurisdictional dispute between two unions which violated the State law against restraint of trade—*Weber* v. *Anheuser-Busch Inc.* ((1955) 348 U. S. 468).

Serious as these cases are in their denial of State power to deal with the particular problems involved, they pale into insignificance in comparison with the flagrant and indefensible denial of State power in the recent Nelson case—*Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson* ((1956) 350 U. S. 497). There the Court reversed the conviction of Steve Nelson, an acknowledged member of the Communist Party, for violation of the Pennsylvania sedition law.

Despite the fact that Congress had inserted a provision in the criminal code declaring that "Nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof," the Court said that the Federal statutes touched a field in which the Federal interest is so dominant that the Federal system must be assured to preclude enforcement of State laws on the same subject. Despite the fact that 42 States have sedition laws, and that the sponsor of the measure declared at the time of its adoption that it would not affect State laws, the majority of the court held that "the scheme of Federal regulation" is "so pervasive as to make reasonable the inference that Congress left no room for the States to supplement it." Disregarding the fact that the Attorney General of the United States had advised that the State laws did not impede enforcement of the Federal law and urged that they be upheld, the majority of the Supreme Court concluded that "enforcement of State sedition acts presents a serious danger of conflict with the administration of the Federal program."

There is not a word in the Smith Act which justifies the decision in the Nelson case. As Justice Reed pointed out in his dissenting opinion:

> In the responsibility of national and local governments to protect themselves against sedition there is no dominant interest. * * * Mere fear by courts of possible difficulties does not seem to us in these circumstances a valid reason for ousting a State from exercise of its police power. These are matters for legislative determination.

Obviously, decisions based on such nebulous grounds are not legal decisions; they are dictated by disapproval of the policy of the State laws in question. As a recent writer in the Michigan Law Review puts it:

> It is obvious from a reading of the opinions that a judge's determination on the issue of preemption is profoundly influenced by view as to the wisdom or constitutionality on other grounds of the State act in question. * * * Stern disapproval of the State laws, moreover, stands out all through the majority opinions in *Hines* v. *Davidowitz* and *Commonwealth* v. *Nelson*. Since judges, like many other informed persons, differ sharply on the question of how best to meet the problem of internal subversion, it may be confidently predicted that considerations of this kind will continue to influence the decisions of these cases. (Hunt, Federal Supremacy and State Antisubversive Legislation, 53 Michigan Law Review 404 (1955).)

These cases are having many serious consequences. The greatest evil is, of course, the breakdown of State authority and State responsibility over matters of direct and immediate concern to its own people. But in addition to the State laws which are nullified under this doctrine, the tenor of such decisions, and the fact that they rest so largely on subjective judgments rather than on objective legal standards, encourages resistance to every State law in any field even remotely affected by Federal law. Thus, even where State authority is eventually upheld, its enforcement may be stymied during years of expensive litigation.

Moreover, these decisions are multiplying the burdens of Federal courts and Federal prosecutors.

With Federal dockets already congested, and backlogs of undecided cases growing ever longer, it is folly to close the doors of State courts on matters of immediate local concern which they are peculiarly well fitted to handle.

The remedy lies in the hands of Congress. There is now pending in the House of Representatives a bill, H. R. 3, introduced by Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia, which is designed to furnish that remedy. The bill states clearly that—

> No act of Congress shall be construed as indicating an interest on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which such act operates, to the exclusion of all State laws on the same subject matter, unless such act contains an express provision to that effect.

It further stipulates that—

> No act of Congress shall be construed as invalidating a provision of State law which would be valid in the absence of such act, unless there is a direct and positive conflict between an express provision of such act and such provision of the State law, so that the two cannot be reconciled or consistently stand together.

Thus, this bill would put an end to the practice of striking down State statutes because of supposed inconsistency with purposes read into Federal statutes by implication. No longer could the court justify its refusal to enforce State law by the claim that in so doing they were carrying out the will of Congress. In any case where a State law would be invalid even if Congress never legislated on the subject, this bill would not save it. It would affect only those cases where the States have power to legislate so long as they do not come in conflict with Federal law.

It would not give the States power to do anything they do not already have constitutional power to do. It would not allow them to defeat the expressed will of Congress in any matter on which Congress is competent to legislate. Under the supremacy clause, State laws would still be suspended to the extent that they conflict with express provisions of Federal law. It would simply prevent the frustration of State law by extravagant extension of Federal law on the basis of vague inferences as to the supposed intention of Congress. It would deprive the Supreme Court of the opportunity to kill State laws under the pretense that it is carrying out the policy of Congress.

If this doctrine of preemption is carried to its logical conclusion, the result can only be that the States will shortly be stripped of all of their authority, and the Federal Government would be made completely supreme in every field. It it not at all inconceivable that the States could be deprived of their authority to punish criminals, to levy taxes, and to act for the general welfare of their people.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to act in a way that will make it clear that we respect the historic position of our States in the Federal Union and to provide that no statute passed by Congress have the effect of repealing a State law unless there is a clear conflict between the two. History has shown us that there is little question but what the best and most effective form of government is that which is the closest to the people and that in many fields the States can act more effectively and efficiently than can the Federal Government. If the States are to be anything more than mere provinces completely subservient to Federal law, then it is necessary that we reaffirm in the States their constitutional rights.

Mr. Speaker, if the integrity of our whole constitutional form of government is to survive, the sovereignty of the States must be maintained.

COMMERCIAL APPLICATION OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, so many bills on the commercial application of atomic energy have been put into the hopper during the current session that I find it difficult to keep informed on even a small part of them. Some of these bills are without question necessary to the national welfare, but others would astonish Nostradamus. His rhymed prophesies were arousing great interest 4 centuries ago; if he were alive today some of the atomic-energy proposals going into the hopper—without rhyme or reason—would make him look like a person completely devoid of imagination.

There is no denying it, atomic energy opens the door to new hopes and promises that can fulfill many of mankind's dreams. In looking into its potential, however, we must exercise every care to avoid the extreme dangers that are also present in the field of fissionable materials. Mythology explains that when Pandora opened the forbidden box she let out all the evils that have since plagued man. Only Hope remained inside the box. There is ample hope within the atom, but we must handle it with caution and not become so greedy about enjoying its benefits as to risk its incipient dangers.

One pitfall which could quickly react to the decided disadvantage of this Nation if the hurry-up proposals were adopted without due regard to other considerations is the economic peril which lies directly ahead. The United

States is in no financial position to underwrite an unnecessary multibillion dollar undertaking at this time. Despite the preelection promises of the so-called economy administration, the national debt has risen in the past 3 years. So long as the cold war continues, we need not look for any sharp reduction in this deficit; it is therefore incumbent upon all Members of Congress to attempt to effect savings wherever possible outside the defense budget.

I do not object to the Federal Government's vast expenditures for an atomic defense program. It is necessary to assure our own survival. We must continue to invest whatever sums are necessary in weapons of destruction so long as the Soviet menace threatens. By retaining superiority in this field, we may be able to avert further aggression on the part of the Communist horde.

The proposal to make Federal funds available for the rapid development of electrical energy through fissionable material is completely unrealistic at this time. Some protagonists of the all-out atomic energy program apparently desire to have the Government go into the electric utilities business on a large scale through this device. Others are willing to promise Federal funds as a stimulant to private development of the reactor program. Before committing the Federal Treasury to further outlays in this regard, a little commonsense must be injected into the affair. Representatives from coal States have for some time been aware of the fact that somebody along the line is trying to promote an industry that could put coal miners out of jobs if enough Federal funds were poured into the project. It is time that our colleagues from other areas take a look at what is going on so that they will be able to recognize the danger that can confront their people, too.

One of the bills that has come up for grabs recently is the measure to provide Government-financed disaster insurance for areas in which reactors would be installed. I strongly resent bureaucratic entry into this field of private enterprise. If the atomic power plants are too dangerous for private insurance companies to underwrite the risks, then such plants should not be established until the hazards can be reduced—through research conducted at experimental stations. There is no reason to speed the establishment of an atomic electrical industry. There is enough bituminous coal in this country to last for a thousand years. If certain isolated areas in this country are so in need of a less expensive power than is now available, I would prefer to subsidize transportation of coal so that steam plants would generate electricity at predetermined costs rather than to embark on this spending spree into the uncharted spaces of atom land. It would certainly be less expensive to the taxpayer. As for those portions of the populace which presumably would benefit by bringing reactors into their areas, I question whether they would welcome such a plan if all of the involved factors were made known in advance. For instance, if a resident of your community realizes that the rates of insuring against disaster potential in a reactor are so high as to make Government contribution necessary, it is highly improbable that he would be willing to subject his family to such conditions. Tell him what some of the leading scientists have to say about the dangers to the mind, as well as to the body, that are inherent in atomic radiation. Tell him how contaminated objects must be disposed of. Read to him the recent statement of the scientist who told the Royal Society of Health in England that, if widespread disaster is to be avoided, then the atomic waste produced at a plutonium plant in that country must not be dumped into the sea for 600 years.

On May 22 the United Press reported that a building in Cincinnati contaminated by radioactivity in 1951 is still not safe for human use. Contaminated machinery was crated in lead and shipped to Oak Ridge for atomic burial. Do the people who are earmarked to welcome reactors into their communities understand the attendant dangers? Under the circumstances it is reasonable to assume that beneficiaries would prefer to pay the going rate for power generated by conventional fuels rather than to subject themselves, their families, their friends, and future descendants to the indescribable horror that might follow an accident in an atomic electric power plant.

Keep in mind also, if you will, the fact that very little saving will be effected in the price of electric power regardless of how much progress is made in the development of reactor plants. Fuel accounts for only about one-sixth of the cost of getting electricity into your home, so savings are going to be very small regardless of the advances that may be made in the power plant in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is about time we put a clamp on the perpetrators of this sideshow. Let us get the facts to the people on the atom as a fuel for generating electricity. When this is done, then maybe we can get down to the rational business at hand on Capitol Hill.

Under special permission to extend my remarks, I submit for the RECORD the following statement by Mr. Tom Pickett, executive vice president of the National Coal Association, to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on May 18, 1956. This statement is particularly pertinent in that it sets forth some reasonable limitations which should be adopted if the Government insists on providing indemnification against the disasters that might result from a large-scale reactor program.

STATEMENT OF TOM PICKETT, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL COAL ASSOCIATION, TO THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, MAY 18, 1956

Mr. Chairman, my name is Tom Pickett. I am executive vice president of the National Coal Association with offices in the Southern Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. The National Coal Association is the trade organization of the bituminous coal mine owners and operators, whose total production is two-thirds of all the commercial bituminous coal produced in the United States.

When at an appearance before this committee in February of this year, I set forth at some length the position of the bituminous coal industry with respect to the development of atomic energy. Since the purpose of the present hearing is to determine what legislation is necessary to cope with the possibility of atomic disasters in the power program, I will not repeat the details of the coal industry's position which have previously been submitted. However, in general, the coal industry recognizes the need for Government support of the national laboratories to conduct the basic and applied research in atomic energy; recognizes the need for continuation of the Government's power demonstration program up to certain limits; recognizes that public interest requires atomic energy be utilized principally in ways or processes that contribute efficiently to the energy requirements of this Nation and the world; and recognizes that, in so doing, the national laboratory effort be directed toward minimizing fuel processing costs, increasing the safety factors against the public hazard and developing high temperature materials of construction.

Let me remind you at this point that the United States is one of the few nations of the world blessed with sufficient reserves of fossil fuels to meet the Nation's power requirements at low cost for centuries to come. In the United States the most economic source of steam generated electric power in the foreseeable future will be plants fueled by coal, oil, or natural gas. The coal industry stands ready to meet the Nation's power needs for many centuries to come, without subsidy in any form and without endangering the safety of our citizens.

We are concerned, as we believe all citizens should be, with the problem immediately under consideration, and we hope that our views will be of some assistance to this committee in determining upon a proper course of action.

Within certain limits, we believe the Government should undertake to indemnify, to the extent that money can compensate for the injuries and loss of life which may arise, against injuries and damages which may occur in the operation of nuclear power reactors.

From the information available at this time, it seems apparent that the extensive development of nuclear power cannot go forward unless the Government either (1) agrees to indemnify the operators of such plants against liability arising from disasters, or (2) undertakes the ownership, construction, and operation of all nuclear plants. It appears that insurance against atomic disasters will be available in amounts limited to $50 million or $60 million per disaster, whereas the possible liabilities range from hundreds of millions of dollars to billions of dollars.

It would seem that it matters little to the people who may be affected by an atomic disaster whether the nuclear power program proceeds under private enterprise with Government indemnity or under outright Government ownership. In either event, the burden of risk must fall upon Federal Government because no other possible adequate source of indemnity is available. The development of atomic energy should be kept within the principles of our free enterprise system insofar as it is possible to do so. Keeping the nuclear power program within the principles of the free enterprise system to the greatest extent possible will result in a lower financial burden on the Federal Government. For these reasons, the bituminous coal industry feels that the Federal Government should provide indemnity against liabilities arising out of atomic disasters within certain limits to be prescribed by law.

The limitations upon the Government indemnity should include a requirement that the owner or operator of a nuclear facility should be required to purchase insurance to the greatest extent available, and Government indemnity should be available only in-

sofar as the actual liabilities exceed the insurance purchased.

Government indemnity should be available only for one of each basic type of the reactors which constitute a part of the present atomic energy development program. The legislation enacted should not authorize Government indemnity for plants which may be subsidized under a simple expansion of the present experimental program. If such an expansion of the experimental program becomes necessary, the Congress should reserve to itself an opportunity to reconsider the disaster indemnity question by requiring new legislation at that time. This opportunity to reconsider will be available if the legislation now under consideration is limited as herein set forth. In the present state of uncertainty it would by unwise to commit the Government to such an unusual program for an extended period of time.

We want to emphasize here two points. First, Government indemnity against disaster, and all other subsidies of atomic development, should be available only for plants which will produce new information, information which will supplement existing knowledge and contribute to the advancement of the nuclear power art. The Government should not subsidize in any way projects which appear to duplicate each other.

Second, Government indemnity against atomic disasters, and all other subsidies of atomic development, should not be available to nuclear power plants which may be constructed after atomic energy is considered to have passed the experimental stage and reached the competitive stage. If and when the development of the atomic energy art reaches the point where it can contribute to the energy requirements of this Nation on a competitive basis, then all Government subsidies should cease.

We think that Congress should require that experimental and developmental nuclear plants constructed with the aid of Government indemnity against disaster liabilities, or with the aid of other Government subsidies, be constructed in isolated areas remote from large centers of population. It is probably true that the over-all operational costs of such plants would be somewhat greater because the power produced would have to be transmitted longer distances. However, it has been stated by many authorities that nuclear power can be expected to be competitive first in remote areas where conventional fuels are not readily available. Therefore, requiring a reasonable degree of isolation from large concentrations of prospective disaster victims would give actual operational experience in those areas where these plants are expected to have their earliest break-even point, as well as minimize the hazard to the public.

The overall operational costs of isolated plants may be somewhat greater if the power produced has to be transmitted longer distances to reach the point of consumption in large metropolitan centers. However, these plants cannot be justified on the basis of economics, because everyone expects that the power which they produce will cost more than power from conventional fuels. The only justification for the construction of these plants is found, not on the basis of economics, but on the basis of research. Since they are research projects, the requirement of isolation would in effect be a protection to the public in the research and development program. The fact that this protection might cost an additional sum of money should not deprive the public of this protection, inasmuch as it in no way detracts from the progress which might be attained in the atomic energy art.

We doubt very seriously that the Government has any moral right to subject its citizens to all the risks attendent upon an atomic disaster, especially where those risks can be minimized by the payment of a reasonable price for additional protection. If and when the atomic energy art advances to the point where there can be some reasonable estimate of the public risk involved, then a decision can be made as to whether or not such plants are justified in close proximity to large centers of population. As stated in the Columbia University report on Financial Protection Against Atomic Hazards, published in March 1956, "Should atomic accidents happen at such frequency that they become a real threat to the economy, we can then reexamine the question of full protection. Indeed, we can then reexamine whether the rapid development of peaceful atomic energy is worth the cost."

Under date of February 11, 1956, there appeared in the publication Human Events an article entitled "Nuclear Nonsense," which was written by David Shea Teeple, a former assistant to AEC Chairman Lewis L. Strauss. We believe Mr. Teeple's views on the propriety of isolation of experimental plants warrant repetition here. He said:

"Generally, when we change techniques of manufacturing, it is because we achieve a better or a cheaper product. Are either of these yardsticks applicable to the development of atomic power? The product is going to be the same—the hazards are going to be increased, and the cost is going to remain constant or, if anything, increase.

"Why, then, the hysterical rush to develop this program? What is wrong with pursuing the problem in an orderly, scientific fashion, in isolated sites already established for that purpose?

"Some of us have spent many an hour inside reactor buildings and know that every conceivable safety device is employed. The possibility of disaster is remote but nevertheless ever present. The old saying still applies to the effect that nothing can be made so foolproof that a big enough fool can't disrupt it."

Industry normally includes in the competitive cost of production the expense of the risk involved in the particular type of enterprise. The public liability risk is relatively small in most industries. However, where the risk is great the premium for liability insurance is substantial. For example, the explosives industry pays a high premium for insurance against public liability in its manufacturing, handling, and transportation.

It is obvious that no actuarially sound rate can be established for atomic-disaster insurance over and above the limited amount available from private enterprise until such unfortunate time when experience will have provided an indication of the total cost of such disasters. In addition, the reactors being planned under the present program could not bear the cost of such insurance even if it could be determined on a precise basis, because they are expected to be noncompetitive even without the insurance cost. Under these circumstances it seems reasonable for the Government to assume, for the limited number and type of experimental reactors already discussed, the additional subsidy of the undetermined cost of the indemnity under discussion.

Notwithstanding these considerations, we should not entirely lose sight of the healthy principle already endorsed by the AEC that "financial assistance to private power reactors should be in a form which can clearly be identified and measured." Unless the amount of Government subsidies involved in the production of atomic power is measured and made public, the public will never be in a position to evaluate the economic desirability of a Government-financed atomic power development program. The legislation now under consideration should provide machinery to establish, with the most accuracy possible under the circumstances, the reasonable cost of the free indemnity being furnished by the Government. This legislation should also direct that all official calculations of comparable costs of electric generation include such reasonable cost of the indemnity subsidy for atomic powerplants.

We feel there are a large number of vital problems with respect to which the Government should secure the greatest possible amount of information before enacting legislation dealing with the atomic disaster situation. Before such legislation is enacted, it should first be determined whether the Government will merely indemnify the nuclear reactor operator against his liabilities to the public arising out of an atomic disaster. As an alternative, will the Government attempt to afford financial compensation to the public for all of the actual damages which may result from such a disaster, including those injuries for which recovery cannot be had under existing law because they cannot be proved to be the direct result of the particular disaster in question, or for other reasons with which existing law is unable to cope. We agree with the Columbia University report, previously referred to, which states that "in discussions of the problem to date, the vulnerable position of the public has not been sufficiently articulated." Whatever legislation is enacted should attempt to define the injuries and the damages for which compensation will be paid by the Federal Government. Existing law and legal concepts may be sufficient to determine the damages arising as a direct and immediate result of any blast which might occur in an atomic reactor. However, new concepts, based upon yet-to-be-developed information and techniques, will be required to determine the extent of actual injuries arising out of the escape of radioactive poisons in an atomic disaster.

Under date of April 16, 1956, the chairman of this committee delivered an address before the northeastern regional meeting of the American Bar Association. In that address he listed in detail a number of the perplexing problems which should be considered by the Congress in connection with this matter, if proper consideration is to be given to the public interest. We commend that speech to the attention of this committee, and point out that the questions therein raised are not mere legal braintwisters, they are questions which must be solved if the public is to be relieved of any substantial part of the financial burden of atomic power disaster. For example, if the Government decides to grant only indemnity against liability under existing law, how can the victims of an atomic disaster prove negligence in the operation of a reactor? How can damage from radiation be proved, in the face of the statute of limitations? Will the cost of evacuation and decontamination of a contaminated area be recoverable? If radiation causes damage to the genes in a parent, to whom does the right of action belong, the parent or the deformed child?

We do not have the answers to these questions and the many equally difficult questions which can be raised in connection with legislation to reimburse the public for injuries and damages caused by nuclear reactors. They should be answered in a manner which will furnish adequate financial protection to the general public before the Government proceeds with the construction or subsidization of atomic power reactors near large centers of population.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BEAMER, for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, June 12.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 60 minutes, on Wednesday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACHROWICZ and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas.

Mr. METCALF in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BONNER and to include an editorial and extraneous matter.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON (at the request of Mr. HIESTAND) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VURSELL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $880.

Mr. POLK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT).

Mr. WATTS and to include a speech by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF].

SENATE BILL REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1873. An act to increase the minimum postal savings deposit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3255. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to preserve in certain cases the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees whose positions are placed in lower grades by virtue of reclassification actions under such act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8225. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Pipestone National Monument in the State of Minnesota; and

H. R. 9822. An act to provide for the establishment of a trout hatchery on the Davidson River in the Pisgah National Forest in North Carolina.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3515. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to assist in the provisions of housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 1, 1956:

H. R. 11177. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

On June 4, 1956:

H. R. 1671 An act for the relief of Clement E. Sprouse;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Elizabeth Doherty;

H. R. 2216. An act to amend the Act of June 19, 1948 (ch. 511, 62 Stat. 489), relating to the retention in the service of disabled commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army and Air Force;

H. R. 3996. An act to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945;

H. R. 4229. An act to provide running mates for certain staff corps officers in the naval service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4437. An act relating to withholding for State employee retirement systems purposes, on the compensation of certain civilian employees of the National Guard and the Air National Guard;

H. R. 4569. An act to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes;

H. R. 4704. An act to provide for the examination preliminary to promotion of officers of the naval service;

H. R. 5268. An act to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the payment of mileage allowances for overland travel by private conveyance outside the continental limits of the United States;

H. R. 6268. An act to facilitate the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and like projects;

H. R. 7679. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Muskogee, Okla.;

H. R. 8477. To amend title II of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, by providing flexibility in the distribution of women officers in the grades of commander and lieutenant commander, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8490. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Bonham, Tex.;

H. R. 8674. An act to provide for the return of certain property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.;

H. R. 9358. An act to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to issue a deed to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for certain land heretofore conveyed to such city, removing the conditions and reservations made a part of such prior conveyance; and

H. R. 10251. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to deed certain land to the city of Grand Junction, Colo.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 6, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1922. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of the number of officers on duty with the Department of the Army and the Army General Staff as of March 31, 1956, pursuant to section 201 (c) of Public Law 581, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1923. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the report of the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1924. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, transmitting a printed copy of the report of the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1925. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, Department of State, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1954 and 1955, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1926. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on review of compensation and pension program, Washington offices, Veterans' Administration, July 1954, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1927. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting for informational purposes, a contract which has been negotiated with National Park Concessions, Inc., for the temporary operation of the McKinley Park Hotel, Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska, covering the period May 14, 1956, to September 30, 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1928. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide a uniform premium pay system for Federal employees engaged in inspectional services, to authorize a uniform system of fees and charges for such services, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1929. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting additional information relating to the case of Andrew Foh Chung Jean, A–7841161, involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1930. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting additional information relating to the case of Purita M. Johnson, A–6072679, involving suspension of deportation, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Part 2, minority views on H. R. 11356. A bill to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 2213).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 8657. A bill to amend the act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568), and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2261). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 10504. A bill to allow a homesteader settling on unsurveyed public land in Alaska to make single final proof prior to survey of the lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 2262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 10946. A bill to provide for the disposition of surplus personal property to the Territorial government of Alaska until December 31, 1958; with amendment (Rept. No. 2263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 11592. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effects of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ABERNETHY (by request):

H. R. 11593. A bill to revise the act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 11594. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 11595. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, to provide for the allocation of unused visas; to admit certain aliens afflicted with tuberculosis; and to provide relief to certain aliens under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 11596. A bill to amend section 26, title I, chapter 1, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (48 U. S. C., sec. 381); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 11597. A bill for the sale at fair market value of the McNary Dam townsite to the port of Umatilla, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 11598. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 11599. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall purchase certain oil paintings of the Nez Perce Indian leaders for display at the site of the Chief Joseph Dam in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 11600. A bill to limit and regulate the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE (by request):

H. R. 11601. A bill to provide for examination, licensing, registration and regulation of dispensing opticians and optical technicians in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 11602. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the life and perpetuate the ideals and teachings of Booker T. Washington" to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in connection with the celebration of the centennial anniversary of the birth of Booker T. Washington; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York (by request):

H. R. 11603. A bill to amend certain financial provisions of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 11604. A bill to provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 11605. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 11606. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 11607. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 11608. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the life and perpetuate the ideals and teachings of Booker T. Washington" to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in connection with the celebration of the centennial anniversary of the birth of Booker T. Washington; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 11609. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall purchase certain oil paintings of Nez Perce Indian leaders for display at the site of the Chief Joseph Dam in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 11610. A bill to promote and to establish policy and procedure for the development of water resources of lakes, rivers, and streams; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 11611. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Pea Ridge National Military Park, in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 11612. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of certain vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 11613. A bill to authorize the loan of naval vessels to the governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Portugal, Spain, and friendly Far Eastern nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 11614. A bill to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to appoint and employ retired officers without affecting their retired status; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. J. Res. 633. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built tankers; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. J. Res. 634. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional commitee to investigate racketeering and related activities within certain labor unions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. J. Res. 635. Joint resolution providing for a study of the possibility and desirability of establishing a university of the Americas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BENTLEY: Resolution of House of Representatives of the State of Michigan memorializing the Congress of the United States to implement the Tripartitie Declaration of the United States, Great Britain, and France guaranteeing the borders of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 or rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 11615. A bill for the relief of Bertha Gabriel Y. Martinez Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 11616. A bill for the relief of Frederika Anna Elizabeth Leitl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H. R. 11617. A bill for the relief of Carmela Andreone Hoover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virgina:

H. R. 11618. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katherine E. Colbert and her minor children Larry C. Colbert and Barbara A. Colbert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J, Res. 636. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 637. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 638. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain fiancees of United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 639. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1101. By Mr. ASHMORE: Petitions of Paul E. Smith and 912 other residents of Duncan, Lyman, Greer, Landrum, Greenville, Travelers Rest, Taylors, Tigerville, Pelzer, Belton, Simpsonville, Owings, Gray Court, Woodruff, Fountain Inn, Marietta, and Slater, S. C., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1102. By Mrs. CHURCH: Resolution of the General Federation of Women's Clubs in annual convention at Kansas City, Mo., recommending that clubs study carefully the details of the report of the second Hoover Commission and resolving that the General Federation of Women's Clubs support congressional action which would implement those provisions in the report which are in accord with duly established policies of the general federation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1103. By Mr. HALE: Resolution of the Thomas W. Cole Post No. 19, the American Legion, Sanford, Maine, requesting consideration by the Committee on Veterans'

Affairs of the war veterans security bill, H. R. 7886, and favoring its prompt passage; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1104. By Mr. VORYS: Petition of 45 residents of Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Hon. Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, before the annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped on May 17, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY MARION B. FOLSOM, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED, DEPARTMENTAL AUDITORIUM, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 17, 1956

It is a privilege and personal pleasure to meet today with the President's Committee. I want you to know the important work you are doing is deeply appreciated by all of us in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The President's Committee and our Department are both working toward a common goal for the handicapped person—a useful, productive place in life. One of the essentials in this common cause is an active and forceful program of public education about the people who are handicapped and their rightful place in the world of work, because lack of public understanding and acceptance still presents great obstacles to vocational rehabilitation. Your Committee is carrying on an effective program to tell the American people the facts about our handicapped citizens, and for these efforts we are grateful.

Our mutual concern for handicapped people raises many questions about the broader problems of disability among our people—problems which should be the common concern of businessmen, organized labor, and your local, State, and Federal Governments.

This century has seen a tremendous breakthrough in medicine, just as in air flight, nuclear energy, and many other fields. Medical research and preventive medicine have opened great new frontiers. Dramatic advances in curative medicine and surgery, too, have made it possible for thousands of individuals to survive illnesses and injuries which would have been fatal a few decades ago.

For example, around the time of World War I, the death rate for young diabetics at age 20 was 400 per 1,000. In other words, about 3 out of 5 survived. Then came insulin. Experience in the last few years shows that 99 out of 100 live.

Nevertheless, the diabetic persons' problems of living today are still serious. When he applies for a job, he must say, "Yes, I am a diabetic." And the employer must ask himself, "Will I hire a diabetic?"

For these and many hundreds of thousands of other disabled persons, the progress of medicine has brought new problems of living. This very success in medical science contributes to the mounting number of handicapped people who have survived serious illness and injury only to find that there may be no place for them in our social, industrial, or business life.

Disability raises many problems far beyond the direct question of medical care—problems which are felt more keenly each day in our homes, offices, and factories. These problems are reflected in the work of your local, State, and national governments, and in the taxes you pay to support them. The so-called catastrophic illnesses and injuries mean more than a catastrophe of the body. They mean the financial collapse of thousands of hard-working, thrifty families every year. When income is halted while medical costs mount and living expenses continue, then another family faces destitution.

As a nation, we provide some measure of financial protection against this hazard through a variety of means—the voluntary and private charity groups, various forms of insurance, workmen's compensation, and others. Through the public assistance agencies, we try to see that no person in serious want is ignored and that basic financial needs are met. To the extent that money payments can help, we have taken many steps in the right direction.

However, we are now reaching a stage of greater maturity, I believe, in our approach to many social problems. In the administration of public-assistance programs, for example, we have enough experience to realize that cash payments, by themselves, are not a satisfactory solution for either the people who receive them or the taxpayers who provide them. Our efforts so far have been to alleviate the effects of personal misfortune—but we have only recently begun to move against the causes.

With this in mind, the President this year recommended that Congress enact legislation which would lend the support of the Federal Government to this concept of getting at the causes of public dependency. The administration has proposed an approach which will encourage research to produce more facts, along with a broadening of public welfare services to help people overcome their problems and advance to a place of self-support and dignity.

There is no better example of the constructive results of this approach than the experience of the vocational-rehabilitation program. In recent years, this program has given an increasing amount of its attention and resources to restoring and reestablishing disabled people who are dependent upon public assistance.

The State rehabilitation agencies are contending with an enormous problem, in relation to their resources, for disability ranks high among the causes of dependency. About 1 million people, including some 325,000 dependent children, must look to the public assistance agencies for support because the family breadwinners are disabled—some of them with permanent impairments, others with short-term conditions. Payments by the public welfare agencies to maintain these individuals have reached nearly a half billion dollars annually.

No one knows, of course, just how many of these disabled men and women could be rehabilitated. But as experience accumulates, it becomes increasingly evident that an all-out effort in rehabilitation could make a substantial reduction in the number of disabled people who must depend upon public support.

The financial gains for both the disabled men and women and the public would be substantial. In 1955, over 11,000 disabled people who had been on the public assistance rolls were rehabilitated and placed in employment. To leave them on the welfare rolls would have cost almost $10 million a year. To rehabilitate them cost less than $8 million. Estimates indicate that these persons will pay in Federal income taxes alone much more than the funds spent on their rehabilitation. Far more important than the economic advantages, however, are the human rewards for a life of independence and self-reliance.

The value of this program has been widely recognized, but this recognition has not always been followed by adequate support. One of the first legislative proposals made by the President was to expand and improve this program. Congress enacted a new Vocational Rehabilitation Act without dissent in either the House or Senate—a rare occurrence on such important legislation.

Under this broadened act, the program already has made progress toward its goal of bringing the Nation's rehabilitation resources abreast of the needs of the handicapped. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation reported an increase in the number of disabled people restored last year and another increase is expected during the current year. Meanwhile, we have been building a foundation for much greater advances in the future.

To take full advantage of the new act, the Federal and State Governments and many voluntary groups have joined in a cooperative effort to bring more and better services to those who are disabled. Nearly 150 nongovernmental organizations have launched projects—some to expand the range and volume of their services, others to undertake research and other developmental work—to widen the horizons for the whole field of rehabilitation.

These voluntary groups include such fine organizations as the crippled children's societies, Goodwill Industries, and their nationwide system of affiliates, local units of the American Heart Association, and many others. In these projects now going forward with the support of the Federal and State rehabilitation agencies, the voluntary organizations are investing their own funds as well.

Several research projects are seeking answers to employment problems. In New York, a project is now under way to analyze hiring practices among a representative group of employers. Another investigation is aimed at learning the extent to which a rehabilitation team can improve the employment outlook for persons who are confined to their homes.

In Massachusetts, another study will try to find improved techniques for preemployment evaluation and work preparation of those who have chronic rheumatic disease. In California, the vocational rehabilitation agency has sponsored a project to develop ways of speeding the rehabilitation of injured employees under workmen's compensation.

In making grants for these special projects, our Office of Vocational Rehabilitation

has the benefit of the advice and recommendations of a National Advisory Council on Vocational Rehabilitation—an outstanding group of national leaders in medicine, education, rehabilitation, industry, and labor. In helping to shape the direction of this new research and demonstration program, the Advisory Council has performed a valuable public service for which we in the department are grateful.

Many other benefits of the new Vocational Rehabilitation Act are becoming apparent each day. Under the new training grant provisions of the act, 90 colleges, universities, and special institutions have joined forces with the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation to augment their teaching programs in rehabilitation and to develop new ones. From these schools, located in 30 States, will come the bulk of the professional workers we must have to provide more and better rehabilitation services in the coming years.

Services for the blind, particularly in the vending-stand program, have been greatly strengthened by the 1954 act. The cooperative work between the Department of Labor, our own Department, and the President's committee—which long has been important in developing new job opportunities for the handicapped—has been recognized formally by the act. Out of this new relationship came a series of cooperative projects during the past year—all aimed at improving job opportunities for those who are disabled.

Another portion of the new law provided for staffing each Employment Service office with at least one person specially qualified to direct placement efforts for the handicapped.' Under this provision, the United States Employment Service and the State employment services have substantially increased the number of handicapped individuals placed in jobs.

The progress made under the new law during the past year and a half has been possible because many persons and organizations have devoted themselves wholeheartedly to the interests of the handicapped men and women of this country. Many of the people in this auditorium this afternoon have played important parts in this progress.

We have a responsibility now to look at the situation in its entirety and to understand the size of the task still before us. If the vocational rehabilitation program is to achieve its full potential, if it is to accept all the people needing services each year, then we must increase by 300 percent the number of persons restored to employment annually.

This constitutes tremendous growth, and it cannot be accomplished overnight. We are, however, dealing with a problem whose magnitude we have only recently begun to appreciate. Growth will be measured each year—and our task now is to provide for full, healthy growth each year.

Under the new act, Congress has voted increased funds for rehabilitation each year and has indicated its support of expanded services to restore more disabled persons. In this State-Federal program, the degree to which the States give their support—financial and in other ways—provides the key to successful expansion. Many States already have responded vigorously to the opportunities provided in the new law. In less than 2 years, the amount of State financial support has increased by more than 50 percent for the country as a whole. But some States still have not seized the opportunities that are open.

There are great variations among the States in the funds invested in this constructive work. To illustrate: the per capita expenditure for vocational rehabilitation in one State is 26 cents. At the other end of the scale, one State is devoting only 3 cents to rehabilitation of its handicapped people. It is noteworthy that there seldom is a relationship between the amount devoted to rehabilitation and the per capita income of the States concerned. In fact, some of the low-income States are far surpassing the higher-income States in the funds they are investing to rehabilitate their disabled people.

The rate of growth of the rehabilitation program reflects to a large degree the extent to which we have been successful in our educational efforts. Even today, rehabilitation is not always recognized widely and used effectively. Thus, there is a challenge in public education for all of us and, particularly, for the President's Committee, which has done so much to foster a better understanding of handicapped people.

It is important that we help the public to understand the many ways in which the restoration of disabled people is contributing to the progress of our country. The rehabilitation and reemployment of handicapped men and women is not simply a question of doing something for them. They, in turn, are doing much for us.

Last year, in the midst of a growing shortage of engineers, 212 disabled people completed their rehabilitation programs and went to work as engineers—proving that a man can have a disability and still be a good engineer. In the same year, another 60 were restored to the practice of medicine and surgery.

As a result of last year's rehabilitation effort, our country acquired 74 chemists, 163 trained nurses, 370 laboratory technicians, 390 draftsmen, and nearly 1,300 teachers. Thousands of other disabled people now are performing just about every type of work found in this country. Our national life has been enriched and our productive might has been strengthened because these trained individuals had a chance to reestablish themselves in useful work.

In the years ahead, hundreds of thousands of men and women will win their battles with illness and injury. They will travel the difficult road to recovery and rehabilitation. Most of them will be looking toward that all-important day when they are ready for a job.

At that critical point, their futures will rest with the employers of the Nation. At that time, an employer must decide whether a welfare payment or a useful job is the answer. This should be a challenge to American business and industry, large and small.

I join the President's Committee in its appeal to the Nation's employers to recognize the ability that so often seems obscured by a disability.

For the wonderful work which the Committee is doing, and for this opportunity to participate in your meeting today, I thank you.

Civil Servant From 18th Texas District Awarded for Outstanding Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today the Department of Agriculture is presenting awards for superior service to those employees of the Department who have made outstanding achievements in their roles as public servants. It is with a great measure of pride that I am able to announce that one of these awards is being given to Miss Nettie Sims, of Clarendon, Tex., in the 18th District of Texas, an employee in the county office of the Farmers Home Administration in Texas.

Miss Sims is being presented with the United States Department of Agriculture superior service award for "her unusual efficiency and dependability in conducting the duties of a county office clerk so that borrowers are given prompt, courteous service."

Mr. Speaker, in paying tribute to Miss Sims I would like to pay tribute to that great army of hardworking, conscientious, able Federal employees who carry on the work of Government and deal directly with the people. I have always been very firm in the belief that the people are entitled to every proper consideration and courtesy when doing business with any Government office and, for the most part, employees in the Federal service strive to give that kind of service. I am glad that the highest award for such service goes to one of these workers in the district I have the honor to represent in the Congress. I congratulate Miss Sims in being thus recognized, and I am sure her achievement will be a great inspiration to all Federal employees to strive ever to do a better job for the people whom it is their duty to serve.

Address by Hon. Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey, at Dinner of Paterson Branch, NAACP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], on Monday, May 21, 1956, at the Alexander Hamilton Hotel, in Paterson, N. J., made an address to the Paterson branch of the NAACP.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY SENATOR CLIFFORD P. CASE, REPUBLICAN, OF NEW JERSEY, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT DINNER OF PATERSON BRANCH, NAACP, MONDAY, MAY 21, 1956, AT ALEXANDER HAMILTON HOTEL, PATERSON—SENATOR CASE RECEIVING A CIVIL RIGHTS CITATION FROM THE BRANCH

Meetings such as this play a significant part in helping men and women of America find ways of bringing equality and justice to all Americans. But, in addition, they also make a contribution to the foreign policy of this country; for it is by evidence of such concern and such progress that other nations recognize the worth of our democratic form of government.

Let us not forget that all through the world, nations are stirring. They are restless, watching closely the movements of the two major powers—United States and Russia—and evaluating whose example offers them the best chance for self-realization—for the fullest flowering of their potentiality. Each day they read in their newspapers of

events in the field of racial relations in this country. A Government official who visited our office recently after a tour through Africa told us that such news was reported at length and with great prominence and that unfortunately, most of it emphasized the conflict and violence of racial relations.

This is not a criticism of the press; if we want a better press with the nations of the world, we must do the things which earn it. We cannot convince the colored people of the world that we are their friends as long as we deny the colored people of this Nation the rights accorded to all others. We can only win friends by deeds, not declarations.

We had a chance to see this in practice in Washington this week. President Sukarno, of Indonesia, one of the new and uncommitted nations of the world, came to Washington at the invitation of President Eisenhower. He addressed Congress warning that the mainspring of the nations of Asia and Africa is the drive toward freedom and that unless these aspirations are recognized "no amount of thinking, no torrent of words, and no Niagara of dollars will produce anything but bitterness and disillusionment."

After a tremendous welcome by the people of Washington, the Indonesian President responded with this comment—and I think it bears repeating—"Today I am in Washington for the first time in my life and I feel that here, and I am sure in all America, democracy is a reality. I saw the faces of the people along the street and the hospitality given me.

"Look here, I am a brown man, an Indonesian, an Asiatic. I am the son of a nation only recently emerged into the world of national existence. Yet you accept me as a friend; you accept me as a human being and perhaps you accept me as a brother."

That word "perhaps" bothered President Eisenhower and he indicated this at a meeting Thursday night. He emphasized that the secret for success of the foregn policy of the United States is to convince other nations that "we are all brothers under the skin." He said that if we, as a nation, "can convince every other nation that when they refer to us as a brother, they won't have to say 'perhaps,' they will see a real democracy."

About this there can be no doubt. We are making progress toward this ideal—it is slow; it is hard, but we are moving in the right direction. And with this progress comes great responsibility, for Negroes now are pioneers—the first to enter a white school or college; the first to become a policeman or city councilman; the first to stay at a particular hotel or attend a certain theater.

The record made by these trailblazers is bound to have great effect on the acceleration of progress toward our ideal. The path cut by them will be traveled by thousands of others who have waited long to obtain the full benefits of our country. They must be strong; they must be dignified; they must radiate integrity. A great stake rests on their shoulders.

We have before us many fine examples already, and in thinking about our Nation's foreign policy, there are, for example, Ralph J. Bunche, the Under Secretary of the United Nations, and J. Ernest Wilkins, Assistant Secretary of Labor for international affairs. Mr. Wilkins, in addition, was recently honored by election as chairman of the judicial council of the Methodist Church, the highest lay body of the church. We all recall the late Walter White, for so many years head of the NAACP as well as a representative of the United States abroad, officially and unofficially. Their achievements are the greater because of the handicaps they have surmounted.

Their presence on the international scene as citizens of the United States should go far toward convincing the two-thirds of the world populated by people of other colors that we are trying in this country to prove that we are all sons of God and that recognition will be accorded by accomplishment, and not color.

Indeed, the united voice of American Negroes raised against the distortions of international Communist propaganda is a great demonstration of courage and foresight by your people.

All Americans concerned about the attitude of other countries toward us are in the deepest debt to those Negro leaders who have spoken out firmly against Communist racial propaganda used against our Nation overseas.

Our Negro leaders have denounced the ceaseless efforts of the Communists to paint all Americans with the brush of bigotry, and to make us lose face with the nations of Africa and the Middle and Far East. We have our faults, but we are struggling toward their elimination. It is palpable nonsense for the Soviets, with their slave camps, their programs and their grinding down of all minorities to the will of Moscow, to set themselves up as the champion of civil rights. The American Negro has recognized this false propaganda for what it is, and his forthright rejection has benefited his country, even more than himself.

In my heart, there is the constant hope that you and I will yet enjoy the day when no Negro mother in America need to tell her son that he is "different"; that he cannot enter the school or profession of his choice, or the polling place of his district. When Negro mothers can be spared this painful hour, I will be glad to join you all here for a dinner of thanksgiving. Until then, we must continue to strive toward this end.

Statement Re Encouraging the Construction of Passenger Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, when we last met on Thursday, May 31, I introduced a bill (H. R. 11554) to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of passenger vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936, and all major maritime legislation subsequently enacted, has recognized the vital importance of passenger ships in the American merchant marine.

We have been repeatedly advised by our highest defense authorities that, because of its potential for troop transport, the national security demands an adequate modern passenger ship component in our active oceangoing merchant fleet. Such ships are expensive, complicated, and take a long time to create by either new construction or conversion. Yet, they are needed immediately in the event of emergency.

Only three new passenger ships have found their way into the privately owned merchant marine since World War II. Fortunately, today, with an upsurge of consciousness of the necessity for replacement of our merchant fleet, we are assured of the new construction of several modern passenger vessels as replacements in existing services. Even so, the introduction of these fine, more advanced and larger vessels will still leave us seriously deficient in the passenger carrying category.

I have just been advised, within the past 2 weeks, that from the standpoint of initial mobilization requirements, the Joint Chiefs of Staff estimate that there is, today, a deficiency of 15 large passenger vessels in the active merchant marine.

This situation prevails at a time when passenger travel by ship is increasing, but in the important passenger trade between the United States and the tourist mecca of northern Europe, American passenger ships in 1954 were carrying only about 18 percent of the waterborne traffic. Today the percentage is undoubtedly even less, in view of the new foreign ships which have entered the service.

There are only two American flag passenger ships in the North Atlantic service and one of them is becoming obsolete. Forty-one foreign passenger vessels are now taking the bulk of this business.

With higher incomes creating an expanding market for homes, durable goods, and many items once considered luxuries or nonessentials, have come new opportunities and new demands for travel. Within the past week I have read that 2 million Americans will visit Europe this year. And rehabilitation of European economies is making it possible for our friends across the Atlantic to visit the United States in increasing numbers. Yet this country, providing most of the travelers, has no transatlantic passenger ships to compete for the growing one-class tourist trade.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 provided for direct Government financing to aid in building up our merchant fleet on essential trade routes. Within the past several years this authority has been implemented by additional authority aimed at providing for private financing of merchant marine operations. It was the goal of the sponsors of this legislation that the Government be relieved of the necessity for requesting appropriations for the direct financing of necessary shipping projects and that the greatest possible participation therein be made available and distributed to private interests. This law, which is title XI of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, provides for 90 percent Government guaranty of ship mortgages on 75 percent of the cost of a new vessel. However, all testimony on the legislation bore out the unlikelihood of securing the use of private investment funds in new ventures involving special-purpose vessels unless the Government would insure 100 percent, of the loan covered by the mortgage. Accordingly, as an incentive for needed new construction the law provides for full Government mortgage insurance on loans for the construction of special-purpose vessels. Whatever the reasons may be the term "special purpose" has been construed as not covering passenger vessels, despite their limited purpose and despite their special adaptability for immediate military use in time of emergency.

The bill I have introduced, H. R. 11554, would place passenger vessels in a position to receive the same Government guaranty of privately financed construction as other special-purpose vessels. Existing provision for 100 percent Government financing will still be available as an alternative to the attraction of private capital.

It is too soon to tell just how successful Government-insured private financing is in comparison with direct Government financing which has been responsible for the present strength of our merchant marine. One thing has become clear, however. That is that the extremely specialized nature of passenger ships, the long period of construction, and their great cost is clearly a deterrent to attracting the use of private funds without the maximum of Government guaranty.

There is at least one well-qualified operator ready, able, and willing to initiate a new type of passenger service on an essential trade route in the North Atlantic not now served by an American-flag operator, whose plans may be frustrated if the Government is unable to participate in the venture to the extent of insuring his mortgage over the long pull, and for reasons of policy is unwilling to provide direct Government mortgage aid.

There are indications of other passenger services which could be expanded or initiated under private financing methods if the special problems of the passenger trades were recognized by according the same degree of Government insurance as is provided in the case of other special-purpose vessels.

Despite the present demands for transocean passenger accommodations, it is unreasonable to expect that private investment sources should make available its funds in great amount for long periods of time and also assume a heavy portion of unsecured risk on a national asset such as a modern version of the great steamship *United States*. The development of atomic energy and other advanced ideas in ship propulsion and design make understandable the reluctance of private interests, such as insurance companies, to enter upon extensive long-term commitments in an industry which has traditionally been one of feast and famine.

Yet the Government's stake and its need is both real and immediate as long as deficiencies in our mobilization base exist.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. POLK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, the foreign aid bill, H. R. 11356, authorizing an appropriation of $3,563,475,000 for foreign aid during the next fiscal year is unacceptable to me and I believe it should be recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Affairs for further study and further reduction in the total amount of authorizations. I am aware that the committee has recommended $1,109,000,000 less than was requested by President Eisenhower, and for this I wish to congratulate and commend them. Nevertheless, I believe the whole question of foreign aid should be further reexamined and reconsidered in the light of present-day world situations and conditions. Changing world conditions make it obvious that policies and practices that may have been justified in 1948 or 1950, or even later, are no longer sound arguments for foreign aid in 1957.

It is a well-known fact that today many of the so-called NATO countries are presently enjoying very substantial economic prosperity.

Most of these countries have declined to comply with their military commitments for the defense of Western Europe. Under these conditions why should we continue foreign military assistance to those countries who are no longer willing to spend money for their own protection? Greece, Turkey, and Iran have continued to show an interest in national defense and probably deserve the $170 million defense support allotted to them.

How can anyone defend the proposition to give Tito, of Yugoslavia, $30 million for defense support? Only last Saturday Tito is reported to have said in Moscow, "Never again will our two countries be divided." He was speaking of Russia and Yugoslavia; and all prudent and realistic appraisals of Tito should convince us that in time of trouble between the United States and Russia he would most certainly be found at the side of and in support of communism. How can our State Department and the administration be so naive as to believe the United States will ever receive any benefit from the military assistance scheduled for Yugoslavia next year? Should war arise between the United States and Russia, this military assistance most certainly would be used against us.

I am in favor of an appropriation to finance the export and sale for foreign currencies of surplus agricultural commodities or products. In view of the very generous authorizations for other purposes carried in this bill, I question the advisability of the provision that not less than $250 million shall be used for this purpose in 1957. For the present fiscal year the amount specified for this purpose was not less than $300 million. Why not make it $300 million for 1957?

I have noted the statement in the committee report No. 2213, beginning near the top of page 9, on the question of the Status of Forces Treaty and Agreements. The report states:

> The committee considered an amendment to this bill which would require the President to terminate any assistance being furnished under the Mutual Security Act to a nation which exercises criminal jurisdiction over United States service personnel stationed within its boundaries by reason of any treaty or international agreement. This proposal was not accepted by the committee.

I would be remiss in my duty as a Representative if I did not express my resentment against the fact that American boys are being tried in foreign courts and imprisoned in foreign jails. I am firmly convinced this should not be permitted. I believe the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the House of Representatives and the United States Senate should forthwith take suitable action to insure that the United States shall exercise exclusive criminal and civil jurisdiction over all American military personnel stationed in foreign countries. The President has full authority now to take such action. In view of the failure of the administration to act in this disgraceful situation, it is the duty of Congress to act, and to act now.

Mineral Leases in Superior National Forest in Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, on page A4177 of the May 24 daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] called our attention to Warren Unna's excellent summary of Republican Giveaways in the current issue of Harper's magazine.

Mr. Unna devoted one section to The Gifts Already Given.

In this section he included a mineral lease now being developed by agencies of the Department of the Interior with the International Nickel Company of Canada, Ltd.—Inco—for lands in the Superior National Forest in Minnesota.

Mr. Unna put it this way in his article:

> (3) At least one parcel of the National Forest in Minnesota has gone into private hands through a secret long-term lease.
>
> International Nickel Co., anxious to justify investing $56 million for nickel and copper mining in northern Minnesota's Superior National Forest, had asked the Democratic administration for a 99-year lease on 12,000 acres. It got nowhere. Once the Republicans came in, the company confronted the Forest Service with an Office of Defense Mobilization letter declaring the national welfare would be endangered if the mining were not permitted. International Nickel next visited the then Assistant Interior Secretary, Orme Lewis. In the presence of a former high-ranking Bureau of Land Management official, Lewis told the company officials:
>
> "If you gentlemen draft the kind of lease you want, we'll be glad to look it over."
>
> The 50-year option they gained is an irrevocable commitment by the Government. Yet Lewis E. Hoffman, top minerals official of the Bureau of Land Management says that as far as his records go International Nickel has only a 2-year prospecting permit, and that the memorandum of conversations with Assistant Secretary Lewis "is in the confidential file of the Secretary (McKay)."
>
> Fifty-year leases in the national forest are unheard of, yet M. A. Hanna Co., formerly headed by Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey, and Kennecott Copper, have similar agreements pending with Interior for Superior National Forest land.

I have just addressed several questions on this lease to the Secretary of the Interior in the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 5, 1956.

Hon. FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has come to my attention that agencies of the Department of the Interior are now developing a mineral lease with the International Nickel Company of Canada, Ltd. ("Inco"), for lands in the Superior National Forest in Minnesota.

From what I have been able to learn of this proposal, it involves grave questions of national defense, conservation, monopoly, a critical shortage of an indispensable metal and the attendant injury to small business.

I will appreciate your answers to the following questions:

1. When will the lease become effective?

2. What provisions are made in the proposed lease for the stimulation of production during a period of emergency such as we are experiencing now? I consider this a most important question in view of the allegations of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee in Document No. 4, 82d Congress, with respect to Inco's monopoly position in nickel production and distribution.

3. Has your Department had access to a copy of the Office of Defense Mobilization letter to the Forest Service on the desirability of stimulating nickel production in the national interest?

4. Has your Department examined the assays of samples from the diamond drillings by Inco in the Superior National Forest? If so, what did they show? Were minerals in addition to nickel and copper found in commercial quantity? What were these minerals? What royalty provisions for all minerals involved are contained in the contemplated lease?

5. In view of the current emergency, has ODM been consulted with respect to the terms of the proposed lease?

6. Is Inco to have an undivided interest in the lease? If not, what other companies will have an interest and how much?

7. In view of the Senate subcommittee's finding that Inco is "one of the most formidable monopolies the subcommittee has found," has the proposed lease been referred to the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice for determination as to whether Inco's monopoly would be enhanced by this lease?

8. Is there a requirement in the proposed lease that the plant, which will process this ore from public lands, be located in the United States?

In addition, I would appreciate a copy of the proposed lease.

In view of the importance and widespread interest in this matter, I intend to place this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I shall do the same with your reply which I would like to have within 10 days.

Very truly yours,

LEE METCALF.

The introduction of Senate Document No. 4 of the 82d Congress read as follows:

The Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee has for some time been studying the effect of foreign strategic material monopolies on the preparedness program of the United States. One of the most severe shortages, both current and foreseeable, that the subcommittee has encountered has been in nickel. And one of the most formidable monopolies the subcommittee has found has been the International Nickel Co. of Canada, Ltd. ("Inco"), which produces over 85 percent of the free world's nickel.

The current shortage has resulted from the collision of a rapidly increasing civilian and military demand for nickel with the relatively fixed supply produced by Inco. The foreseeable shortage, however, is even more serious. Nickel has important alloying qualities which are indispensable in steelmaking and the production of certain types of aircraft engines. The large increases in the production of these industries, which have now become basic to our survival as a free nation, depend substantially on a similar increase in nickel production.

Yet Inco through the years has displayed, in the opinion of the subcommittee, a conservative approach to the expansion of its productive capacity. The glutted markets after World War I and the sharp decline in the demand for nickel during the depression appear to have been an important factor in shaping Inco's approach to expansion. Inco is now operating at full capacity and has professed to be unable substantially to increase its productive capacity because of vexing mining and metallurgical problems.

It is therefore essential to the preparedness program to stimulate the production of nickel from other sources. While this need has been recognized for some time by the responsible agencies of our Government, the subcommittee has observed a very leisurely approach toward accomplishing this program.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the many grave questions—including national defense, conservation, monopoly, a critical shortage of an indispensable metal and the attendant injury to small business—make it imperative that this proposed lease be carefully scrutinized.

Address by Hon. Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey, Before 78th Annual Convention, New Jersey State Federation of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], delivered an outstanding address before the 78th annual convention of the New Jersey State Federation of Labor at the Traymore Hotel in Atlantic City on May 30, 1956.

I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CLIFFORD P. CASE, REPUBLICAN, OF NEW JERSEY, BEFORE THE 78TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, NEW JERSEY STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR, AT THE TRAYMORE HOTEL IN ATLANTIC CITY

It is always pleasant to address a labor meeting, and particularly so when our economic barometers are registering fair weather and relatively clear skies ahead. Things generally are going well. Certainly, there are soft spots in the economy where things are not working properly, but last month this Nation had 64 million people working at jobs—a new record. And each month, these working men and women are bringing home pay checks of near-record size. In addition, the cost of living has been stabilized during the Eisenhower administration so that the pay raises are real—not illusory.

Basically, the situation is good. This is a testimonial to our dynamic economy—to the leadership of our great President, to the unflagging efforts of the various segments of our economy, management, labor and capital and to the general advantages of our form of government.

This economic good health offers a fine opportunity for making further improvements in our way of life—for bringing more benefits of our economy to more people. There are some who are doing well and who have given up one of the Nation's greatest assets—vitality and enterprise. Their position is quickly stated in this way: "Things are going fine. Why look for changes now?" Such complacency is often harder to defeat than an organized campaign by vociferous interests aimed at holding back the clock of social progress.

The obstacles delaying the enactment of adequate school construction, health, housing, flood insurance, civil rights and minimum wage legislation are formidable, but not impossible. We should make progress on these basic matters and there is no better time to do so than when the Nation's economy is at an alltime high and the Nation's energies can be devoted to improving the peace. There is no credit for either Republicans or Democrats in a record of "no progress" on social welfare legislation.

It seems to me that this period is just the one in which we should constantly press forward for improvements, solid steps in the right direction. Social welfare legislation has worthy goals and, in addition, it provides resources to keep our economy rolling.

The achievement of real progress in the social welfare field, it seems to me, depends on two areas of activity: the first is the enactment by Congress of the legislation which I have just mentioned. The second is the organization of the unorganized workers in the South and elsewhere. With less than a third of our 64 million workers in organized unions there is plenty of potential.

On the legislative front, there are several bills before Congress now which could use a good shot in the arm. President Eisenhower has given us a list. The legislative department of the AFL–CIO has given us another one, not too dissimilar. There are good bills on both lists and I know many of my colleagues in the House and Senate are eager to vote on them.

What then is the problem? The major one is apathy—people are talking politics and candidates, but are not giving equal attention to the legislative issues. Another side of the problem is the deep-freezing of legislation by unsympathetic committee chairmen. I need not remind a labor meeting of the cooling-off treatment extended by the southern Democratic chairmen of such committees as House Labor, House Rules, and Senate Judiciary.

Secretary of Labor Jim Mitchell has been hitting his head against a stone wall in trying to get hearings on the tiniest pieces of labor legislation in the House. Labor groups have recognized the fine work of this New Jersey man. The Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America even nominated him for another term as Secretary of Labor, regardless of who is President. I join with President Potofsky in his evaluation of Jim as an outstanding public servant. A few days before that, President Dubinsky, of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, praised Jim, too, and added similar words for Newell Brown, director of the Labor Department's Wage and Hour Administration. Mr. Dubinsky said that although his union had opposed Brown's appointment, Brown had turned out to be the right man in the right place and a man of integrity, intelligence, and understanding.

Such kind words from two union officials who have had some other things to say about the Eisenhower administration in the past are most appreciated. I am glad to see that as these union people get to know some Republicans better that they find they are rather nice folks. Sometimes, I feel that the Republican Party is in the same boat as some minority groups in this country and that if only we could be measured by the yardstick of individual worth, we could receive a lot more support.

In addition to speeding action in the legislative arena, there is a big job to be done by the labor unions for themselves and the Nation—that is the organizing of workers in the South. The disparity between wages and working conditions of the South and the North is a constant threat to the security of workers in this part of the country. As long as this gap continues there will be employers closing up shop here and moving South to the land of no-unions and low wages. The continuation of the South's lower economy has social and political implications for the whole country.

Unions traditionally have brought higher living standards to their members—both Negroes and whites. Accompanying this there is usually a greater interest and awareness about the right to vote. Such a change could interfere with the present security of officeholders in these districts. More Democrats with enlightened views would stand a chance for election for the first time and perhaps even a Republican could squeeze in now and then. But the big gains would be for the country at large—gains in terms of a more widespread prosperity and an alert electorate. For remember this: Laws in Congress are voted on by all, not just those from our section of the country.

There is much to be done by all of us toward bringing the benefits of our great democracy to each American. Working together in a spirit of modernization and good will, we shall make progress. This is our opportunity—and our duty.

The Need for Action on Equal Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower has repeated his hope that the Congress will enact legislation to stop wage discrimination that is based upon the sex of the worker.

In his state of the Union message, the President said:

> Legislation to apply the principle of equal pay for equal work without discrimination because of sex is a matter of simple justice.

Again on May 24 the White House listed this legislation among the 28 bills which the President hoped would receive favorable action this year.

Both political parties favor such legislation. Each has had equal pay planks in its platforms for many years. In this, the 84th Congress, both Republicans and Democrats have introduced bills. Four identical measures were sponsored by Mrs. GREEN, Mrs. ROGERS, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, and Mr. HAYWORTH. Identical bills expressing the administration's concept have been introduced by Mr. KEARNS, Mr. RHODES of Arizona and myself.

In my study of the similar bills I find wide areas of agreement among us. There are provisions in each which could lessen unfair competition among employers, raise living standards, contribute to maximum labor force efficiency and increase the prestige of the United States among the nations of the world. A meeting of minds would therefore not seem to be difficult.

These bills were proposed in good faith for the benefit of the women who work outside their homes. The principle of equal pay is generally accepted as a matter of simple justice. It is a basic principle of our whole free enterprise way of life, important to both employees and employers alike.

The benefit to employees, which is obvious, often obscures the gains to be made by employers if this legislation were enacted. It is to industry's advantage that workers be able to move freely, as the situation demands, from one job to another. But the artificial barrier set up by unequal wage rates prevents industry from employing workers on the most efficient basis. The widespread establishment of a rate for the job, irrespective of sex, would make a genuine contribution toward creating labor mobility and increased industrial efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, my belief that this legislation will be in the public interest prompts me to urge that the Committee on Education and Labor, to which these bills are assigned, schedule hearings with all possible speed. The hearings will focus public attention upon the need for this legislation and will produce greater understanding of the subject.

I hope people everywhere—especially the leaders of those fine organizations which have worked so hard for this legislation in the past—will request their Members of Congress to act on equal pay before the close of this session.

Development of St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I am sure that my colleagues in this august body, as well as the people of my own State of Michigan, are well aware of my continuous and enthusiastic support of the development of the Great Lakes as this Nation's fourth coastline. Knowing that this interest is shared to a high degree by many others, I should like to take this opportunity to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which the Marine News graciously published for me in its issue of April 1956. This is the thrilling story of what enterprising and forward-looking communities of Michigan can expect from the economic impact of the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway and the opening of the Great Lakes to world trade.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON TRADE ROUTE 32—PORT OF MUSKEGON
(By Senator CHARLES E. POTTER)

Almost from the time of the discovery of this Continent the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes have been of great importance to the history of this country. This system of waterways has provided transportation. It has played a strategic part in the wars between the early settlers. It was one of the main highways leading to the opening and exploration of the great heartland of this continent. All my life I have been interested in the activities on these lakes and thrilled by the thoughts of their potentialities as great seaways for world commerce and as a fourth coastline for the United States.

Today we are nearing the realization of that idea. The St. Lawrence Seaway will be completed soon. I fully expect that the channels connecting all the Great Lakes will be adequately deepened to provide for free passage of ocean-going vessels to the many ports situated in the Great Lakes. World trade routes have been authorized for the Great Lakes putting such ports in direct contact with ports all over the globe. I expect action will be taken which will insure the building and maintenance of an adequate fleet of United States ships to be operated on such trade routes from the Great Lakes and their ports.

As a sidelight, we will realize within a few years the completion of Michigan's Marine Highway. That would be the completion of a series of harbors of refuge being built all around the coastline of Michigan to accommodate small craft. This is of particular interest to the thousands of water tourists who then can travel the entire coastline of the Lower Peninsula with the greatest of safety and convenience.

All this means the spurring of new industry both commercial and tourist. New businesses will be born and will start to grow along our shores. With particular reference to the commercial aspect of this growing business, I have picked one Michigan city, as an example, to show the potentialities of such growth for the entire State of Michigan. Naturally my interest is broad and encompasses all of the State of Michigan, I forsee great things for many ports in our State. I have urged repeatedly that our various port cities or potential port cities along our shorelines take action now to do the necessary planning and projecting for the future so that they will be ready when this opportunity for prosperity knocks at their door. As an example, then, let us take the city of Muskegon to see what can happen in some measure to many cities in our great State of Michigan.

Muskegon, located on the eastern shore of Lake Michigan just south of the parallel bisecting Lake Michigan between the Straits of Mackinac and Gary, Ind., has one of the most ideal natural harbors throughout the lake waterway chain.

The town grew in early lumber days on the south shore of Lake Muskegon, an inland lake connected to Lake Michigan by dredged channel approximately 1 mile long. The Muskegon River, flowing into the eastern head of Muskegon Lake, was utilized in these early days to float down logs, and by 1880 Muskegon had over 16 lumber mills along this eastern and southern shore of Lake Muskegon.

With 33 sawmills, a thriving lumber port developed which built Chicago and a hundred prairie towns. But by 1890 the lumber had completely disappeared and Muskegon was faced with the problem that has pressed many similar cities of either developing new

industry or reverting to a small tourist and agricultural community.

The people of Muskegon favored industry, and with their strategic location and natural harbor advantages pushed forward to become a leading industrial center. During the last 50 years a diversified industrial economy rapidly developed.

Water transportation continued to play an important and vital part in Muskegon's program. Pig iron to supply the foundries was brought in from Gary, South Chicago, and Cleveland. Aggregates and limestone, so important to construction, were brought down from the northern peninsula. High quality sand used in the production of steel developed as an important export. Petroleum products were brought in, and about the same time oil was discovered near the head of Lake Muskegon, thus petroleum became an import and export product. Later, as the automobile industry grew in Michigan, a thriving traffic in new cars and tourist trade across Lake Michigan to Milwaukee and the Northwest became an important asset to Muskegon's development.

Using cost-per-ton figures for the various commodities averaged for the year, Muskegon's water commerce total is estimated at $250 million. A preliminary survey by the harbors department of the chamber of commerce indicated the 1955 value total would show at least $275 million. The value totals do not include car ferry shipments, since there is no reliable estimate or value due to the wide variety of products carried, and difficulty of getting value statistics.

Muskegon's 21 commodities in lakewise, foreign, and overseas shipments consisted of fish and fresh products, canned fruit juice, woodpulp, bituminous coal and lignite, motor fuel and gas, gas and oil distillates and fuel oil, crude petroleum, kerosene, residual fuel oil, building cement, limestone, crushed rock, sand and gravel, pig iron, scrap iron and steel, standard newsprint paper, manufactured metal parts, construction mining machine parts, motor vehicles, other commodities, and valued shipments.

Along with tonnage increase, 1956 will record a rise in the number of foreign flag vessels calling here. Purchase of the steamer *E. C. Collins* from the Kineman Transit Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, has been announced by Paul H. Townsend, president of Huron Portland Cement Co. The *Collins*, a 440-foot bulk ore carrier formerly owned by the Pittsburgh Steamship Division of United States Steel Corporation, was built by American Shipbuilding Co. in 1904. Huron Portland reported it had no definite plans for reconstruction of the *Collins* into a self-unloading cement carrier. The steamer *Presque Isle*, which was purchased last year by the company, is being converted from an ore carrier at Sturgeon Bay, Wis., and will be ready to sail next spring. Purchase of the *Collins* brings total number of ships owned by Huron to six. The Huron fleet calls regularly at the company's Muskegon Lake terminal.

Harbors Department of the Chamber of Commerce will launch a major drive this month to secure for the Port of Muskegon a larger part of the growing volume of foreign and Canadian wood pulp shipped in for the vast Kalamazoo Valley paper mill complex.

Woodpulp shipped to the Kalamazoo mills has risen steadily in volume since World War II and is increasing at a rate which will easily surpass the 50 to 60,000-ton level of the prewar period within a few years. Estimates see Valley wood pulp volume increasing to over 100,000 tons a year.

Surveys show the import of wood pulp to the Kalamazoo mills is the largest single commodity—including newsprint shipments—currently carried to Lake ports from overseas.

Estimates indicate the seaway will be carrying as much as 800,000 tons of wood pulp to Lake ports by time of completion of the deep-draft waterway, and that the Kalamazoo Valley, one of the top three areas in the Upper Lakes in total pulp use, would eventually take off 100,000 to 200,000 tons of this total, and possibly more.

The port of Muskegon will have a new dock available for open cargo operations by the start of the 1956 shipping season.

Emery Toth, president of the Great Lakes Dock & Material Corporation, has announced filling of swamp and water-covered land in its 1,750 feet of lake frontage on Muskegon Lake and reported that by spring it will have a completed slip 1,000 feet long and 100 feet wide, dredged to a 24-foot depth.

The slip and dock facility will be ready by this month (April) to handle all types of cargo suitable to open dock movement. About 225 feet of sheet steel piling will bulwark the dock facing, and the slip width will be extended to 240 feet in operations during the year. The existing 100-foot width is sufficient to accommodate most lakes vessels.

In addition to this development, the corporation has completed about 80 percent of fill work in the corporation building and operations area west from the new slip to a second planned slip of 180 feet in width and 800-foot length. This slip will be dredged to 24-foot depth to accommodate one ship, with the major slip area beyond that dredged to 8 feet to provide a small marina which could accommodate scores of small craft. It is expected fill work on this section can be completed this year.

A Chesapeake & Ohio Railway spur has been laid from the rail right-of-way to the main dock section adjoining the slip now nearing completion. Long-range plans call for four docks to accommodate all types of Lakes shipping. Existing facilities, with the new slip, will accommodate four vessels.

The private industry development has taken place gradually and without fanfare since 1953. The firm started filling and dredging work in September of that year, developing four acres and a dredged slip 800 feet long and 100 feet wide by 24 feet deep. By March of 1954 company offices, equipment storehouses, and other facilities were constructed on the reclaimed land. First ship to use the dock arrived April 21, 1954.

Future operations call for considerable expansion of terminal facilities. Warehousing facilities have not yet been installed and initial operations will be limited to open dock movements which do not require storage.

Plans outlined by the corporation for the Michigan Corporation Securities Commission envisage a major terminal operation, including facilities for repair, construction and renovation of vessels, the stevedoring and warehousing operations, as well as general construction work. The completed dock and slip system under present plans will accommodate five vessels.

Final figures for economic 1955 indicate Greater Muskegon has enjoyed the best year in its history in a majority of fields which make up the business picture.

The outlook for the first quarter of 1956, with total employment expected to rise over the 50,000 mark and unemployment to drop to the lowest level since May 1947, presages another boom year.

New all-time records were posted in the categories of bank debits—within nudging distance of the $1-billion mark—postal receipts, residential building, air traffic volume, utilities service expansions, department store sales, and other factors.

Total factory and utility workers' income for the year aggregated $139,938,953, second highest in history and exceeded only by the $1,600,000 margin of the record $141,538,953 of 1953.

The above figures are based upon statistics from a special year-end survey by Greater Muskegon Chamber of Commerce, and are based on an average industrial work force averaging 29,800 for the year. The special survey included some 30 industries which do not report regularly to Muskegon Manufacturers' Association and hence reflects somewhat higher figures than those recorded in the regular chamber indices. According to the special compilation, worker's average income for the year was $4,695.

Muskegon's shipbuilding program got its start 2 years ago with the local industry task of converting the former Government C–4 vessel steamship *Marine Star* into a multimillion dollar lakes passenger liner, the *Aquarama*.

Muskegon's harbor has played a vital role in the industrial development of west Michigan. With the advent of the St. Lawrence Seaway project, Muskegon's port operations offer Michigan's industry new and greater opportunities for expansion and development of world markets.

In considering the potential expansion of trade that will result upon completion of the seaway, it is interesting to note Michigan's early history. The State's economic development is traced directly to the completion of the Erie Canal which gave access to the Hudson River and the completion of the Soo locks which provided the means for Michigan's vast mineral deposits to economically traverse the lake waterways.

The seaway is the final link in this lake chain which opens new horizons to Midwest industry.

CONCLUSION

This, then, is the story of one of Michigan's port cities. This story is not the exception but rather it is an example of what many cities of Michigan may expect. Again I say, the Great Lakes are the fourth coastline for the United States. The development and realization of the potentialities of this coastline will write a thrilling chapter in our Nation's history and those cities which are prepared for it and plan for it may well play a major part in writing that chapter.

Frozen Orange Concentrate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I am placing in the RECORD the transcript of a radio broadcast I made recently in Illinois, pointing out the great benefits that have been brought to the orangegrowers of the State of Florida, as the result of the work of our research scientists in the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the Florida Citrus Commission, which I believe will be of interest to most Members of Congress:

This is your Congressman, CHARLES W. VURSELL, in my ninth broadcast in this session of Congress, on the value of agricultural research and extension service to the farmers of our country.

Today, I want to show you how research found a market that greatly increased the price of the farmers' product of an entire State, making it possible for the farmers to more than double their production of that product. I refer to one you have been using in your homes during the past few years—frozen orange concentrate.

This popular drink was developed in 1944 at Winter Haven, Fla., by the United States

Department of Agriculture and the Florida Citrus Commission. At that time there was a surplus of oranges. The price was low and orangegrowers were in a bad way financially. The growers needed a new outlet for their crop. Now let's see how this concentrate development helped that situation. Commercial production of frozen orange concentrate was increased so rapidly that production jumped from a quarter-million gallons in 1946 to 31 million in 1949, 47 million in 1952, and to 65 million in 1955, and it's still going up. That is enough to give each person in the United States 9 of those frosty little cans of frozen orange concentrate which, when reconstituted with water, would make 36 glasses of orange juice for each person in this country.

But that's not all. Every gallon of concentrate uses one 90-pound box of fresh oranges. In 1948, Florida produced 58 million boxes of oranges, but only 8 million went into the frozen concentrate since it was just getting started. But by 1952 the story was different. That year Florida produced 72 million boxes of oranges and 32 million went into the frozen concentrate. In 1955 they produced 88 million boxes and 44 million or about half of the crop went into concentrate. In other words, this one piece of research has developed a new market for half of the entire Florida orange crop, which has almost doubled as a result of the development of the concentrate, and the orange-growing farmers are happy.

There are several reasons why frozen orange concentrate has been such a success. One of these is that it tastes like fresh orange juice. Then, too, it is so easy to handle. The housewife does not have to squeeze the oranges. She just opens a can of frozen concentrate, adds three cans of water, stirs it up a little, and she has delicious, ice-cold juice. This development has given the children and adults of this country a wholesome, nutritious orange drink with the fresh juice taste and the vitamin C content of fresh orange juice.

After a satisfactory product was developed, it was necessary to solve a number of problems in transporting and distributing it, from the processing plant to the consumer. Railroad cars refrigerated with ice did not provide sufficiently low temperatures for the ideal handling of the frozen concentrate. This fact stimulated the development of mechanically refrigerated railroad cars and trucks which can provide any temperature desired.

There are also large savings in transportation costs to the producer and consumer. For example, 1 carload of frozen concentrate contains the equivalent of 12½ carloads of fresh oranges. Transportation costs, including refrigeration, from Lake Wales, Fla., to Chicago is about $715.50 for a carload of concentrate. But this same movement for the 12½ carloads of fresh oranges would cost over $8,000, or more than 11 times as much.

With the solution of the transportation problem it became necessary to provide more freezer storage space in warehouses. Wholesale frozen food distribution plants had to be established and properly equipped. Research people helped determine the best design for these facilities and the most efficient equipment for handling products in such facilities. Frozen food cabinets had to be installed in retail stores throughout the country.

The development of the new product of satisfactory quality, convenient to use, and the facilities necessary to handle it properly throughout the marketing channel brought a tremendous expansion in the market for Florida oranges. Since the juice keeps indefinitely in frozen storage, Florida orange juice became available throughout the year, instead of only a part of the time. With lower transportation costs the area of distribution increased. With its convenience to serve, consumption was increased both in the home and in public eating places and soda fountains where dispensers were installed. Research people even helped with the development and installation of the dispensers in order to make sure that a satisfactory product was served, and that their use would increase sales.

The research which went into the development of this new product, and the research to provide proper transportation, storage, handling, and marketing facilities cost the United States Department of Agriculture about $300,000. The success of the program is indicated by the fact that the housewife is now paying less for frozen orange juice than she paid for orange juice 8 or 9 years ago, despite the rise in the general level of prices. At the same time Florida growers have received an average on-tree price during the past 8 seasons of $1.44 per box, which is more than twice the amount received in the 1947 season. Florida orange production during this same period has increased by 62 percent. Hence, the growers are not only receiving a better price per box, but they also have more boxes to sell. Yes, research pays back big dividends.

I have recited the frozen orange concentrate story today because it shows clearly what research can do to help us find new and more profitable uses for our agricultural products. But we should not wait until the surpluses are breaking the backs of our farm people before we start the research. I'm in favor of keeping our research going all the time in the hope that we may be able to prevent some of the surpluses from developing.

For example, our scientists are now working on a tomato powder, as well as powders from other fruits and vegetables. Right now these things are mostly peeps around the corner but they are encouraging peeps, and our committee believes it would be a dividend-paying investment for us to continue research in these promising agricultural fields. The results will not only help our farmers and consumers, but will also contribute to the steadily rising standard of living of all our people.

Our Attitude on the Trial of Young Rumanian Anti-Communist Patriots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, on the night of February 14–15 of last year a group of young anti-Communists, in utter desperation at being unable to contribute in any organized anti-Communist action, decided to act by themselves. They seized the Red-occupied Rumanian Legation in Bern, Switzerland.

They had information that the new political setup in the Kremlin was in the process of sending fresh instructions to their various organizations and agents in the free world, one of these being the MVD chauffeur of the enslaved Rumanian Legation. They thought a raid in that Communist den would surely yield valuable clues in that direction. In fact it uncovered the espionage activities of the Red diplomats. An entire arsenal was found in the legation: a shortwave radio transmitter, automatic guns, all kinds of projectiles, time bombs, rockets, and a large quantity of ammunition.

During the time the young men held the legation the tension and excitement were at their height in Bern. The morning after the coup about 2,000 Swiss were gathered in front of the building and 200 Swiss police surrounding it. As the young patriots refused to surrender at first, the Swiss authorities, under heavy pressure from the Communists, organized a veritable siege against these lone anti-Communists, surrounding the premises with barbed wire and bringing up an infantry battalion and an armored tank.

The young patriots had made a vow to obtain the release of five men from Communist jails, a cross section of the persecuted leaders of the Rumanian resistance behind the Iron Curtain, among whom was the heroic Bishop Suciu. In these five men, they were symbolically asking the liberation of their people from the curse of Soviet slavery. It was a cry of these patriots which stemmed from the same source as that of a Patrick Henry, as it voiced the eternal struggle for individual freedom and national independence.

Finally, after 42½ hours, this action, which had caused such an impact on public opinion, came to an end. The young men, before entering the police car, in full view of the crowd, nailed upon the wall of the legation the insignia of Free Rumania. And inside they left a note saying, "We shall return."

As an immediate result of the Bern affair, the authorities in Sweden, alerted by this incident, on closer investigation uncovered also an important spy ring centering around the Rumanian and Czechoslovak Communist Legations in Stockholm, thus bringing an added proof of the results of the action in Bern. In a recent report by Newsweek, on information furnished by the young patriots, the Swiss police sized two fat dummy accounts in an obscure farmers' bank in the mountains of Switzerland. The Communists were using the money to run far-reaching spy nets in West Europe. The accounts have been traced back to Bucharest.

On information given by the League of Free Rumanians, the Armstrong Circle Theater gave a television show, the Five Who Shook the Mighty, the story of the Bern incident. It will be repeated June 26 with the latest additions, after the trial of the young anti-Communists, which will take place in Bern, Switzerland, from June 11 to June 21.

It is an experience of deep meaning to talk to the disinherited and to find in them an unshaken faith in the ultimate victory of freedom and its values, while many of those more fortunate around them in the free world seem indifferent to it and tired of everything, even the truth. The flame of resistance burns in the oppressed. Here we have fresh proof that this spirit cannot be killed. The miracle is that this seed of liberty is germinating in the youth who have undergone for 10 years intensive Communist indoctrination.

Reports from Rumania tell of anti-Communist resistance groups in high

schools. One lad of such a group is one of the boys who are going on trial June 11 in Switzerland. These youthful heroes, members of the League of Free Rumanians, now in prison awaiting their trial, considered life no longer worth living in face of the complete oblivion and abandonment of their country by the free world. They were willing to risk their lives and liberty in a blow against their country's oppressors, themselves directly, as being the only way they could be useful; that is, by focusing world attention on the tragedy of Eastern Europe. It was a dramatic demonstration of the revolutionary spirit of freedom fermenting under the boot of Soviet despotism. These young men, who recently fled their country, were messengers of widespread popular feelings and of the embedded hostility to communism of that Latin country.

Let us help these youthful patriots who risked their lives and willingly took calculated risks to prove that the Soviet Union carries on against the free world constant espionage and subversion.

Let us encourage other patriots to bring out with them vital documents by aiding the cause of these young men and we will encourage others to perform like acts of heroism in the name of freedom and liberty, thus producing vital intelligence that will inform the free world of premeditated acts of treachery.

These patriots have a message for the still free world. Trials throughout history have altered the course of history, and this trial can insure a great victory on the side of humanity, Christianity, and freedom.

This action of the young anti-Communists has aided freedom wherever freedom still exists. Their cause is the cause of freemen everywhere. The moral drama of these patriots, their youthfulness, the eldest among them being 31 years of age, aroused the sympathies of Europe.

The right to liberty is the cornerstone of our civilization, of its very existence and of its progress. The right to resist oppression is inherent in the foundation and development of liberty. Parts of the world and notably eastern Europe are now under the rule of absolute despotism, which has replaced the concept of equality of men and the law which is the protection of all, by the inequality of men and the persecution of all at the hands of a tyrannical Communist oligarchy.

Men everywhere behind the Iron Curtain are fighting against tremendous odds for liberty through recurring acts of resistance at the risk of imprisonment, forced labor, deportation, and death.

Our civilization needs be solidly with this struggle for liberty or lose its spiritual and political roots and driving force, disintegrate through materialistic discords and fail in its universal mission. This solidarity should express itself through a positive policy recognizing the right of the enslaved peoples to self-determination and human liberty by every moral and material assistance the free can muster for this purpose.

Let us not forget that our own great country has been founded on the passionate desire for liberty which animated our forefathers and for which they willingly died. So let us not fail to extend a helping hand and sympathetic understanding to these patriots in their fight for freedom, so similar to the fight of the fathers of our country. For our country would not be free today if they had not fought, with whatever means in their power, as do their prototypes today in the anti-Communist resistance movements, against the foreign invaders and oppressors of the people.

Annual Memorial Day Program, Altoona, Pa., May 30, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, as principal speaker at the annual Memorial Day program at Fairview Cemetery, Altoona, Pa., May 30, 1956, under the auspices of the Blair County War Veterans Council, I delivered the following address:

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SIX MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS DELIVERED BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, FAIRVIEW CEMETERY, ALTOONA, PA., 11 A. M., MAY 30, 1956

As a past commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, it is an honor to join you, my fellow veterans, and my fellow citizens, in this Memorial Day ceremony.

Memorial Day places a serious obligation upon any speaker.

It is not an easy assignment to be our war heroes' spokesman.

Perhaps thoughtlessly we have come to regard Memorial or Decoration Day mainly as a holiday, a day set apart for amusement and recreation.

But when we pause to give thought to its purpose and significance, we become conscious that it should receive a more fitting observance.

The men we honor today marched forth into the fire and hazard of battle to secure and safeguard the rights, privileges, and benefits which we today enjoy.

The holiday-minded public needs to be halted long enough to hear and heed the words uttered at Gettysburg: "That from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause to which they gave the last full measure of devotion."

Memorial Day is a day of memories and a day of rededication.

We Americans know that the man who dies in the service of our great Nation makes this sacrifice in order that the hopes and ambitions of our Founding Fathers might be realized, and that the Constitution upon which our form of government is based might stand today—strong and triumphant—and as the bulwark of our Nation.

We not only pay honor to those patriotic men and women who have given their lives for America, but we pay honor to all, living and dead, who unselfishly contributed their services in order that we, our families, our children, and posterity, might enjoy the blessings of liberty.

Let us not forget the thousands of disabled veterans—many still confined to hospitals—their dependents, and the widows and orphans of those deceased veterans whose lives were shattered in our Nation's behalf.

Let us pay tribute to the doctors and nurses in our veterans' hospitals whose work is often overlooked, but who are giving the best of their energies, their knowledge, and their skills in order to help and comfort our sick and disabled war veterans.

Those whom we honor were adequate to the challenges before them.

This is a day for the living to resolve that we will be adequate to meet the challenges which are before us in 1956.

Thereby can we best honor those who have gone before.

Our basic responsibility is to determine just how we can be adequate to meet the problems before us.

How can we with assurance go forward to preserve the priceless heritage which has been bequeathed to us?

Are we accustomed to accept the blessings of a free constitutional government as a matter of course?

Do we complacently use our freedom under the protecting arm of a great government as if we, by our own efforts, had gained it?

Do we forget that thousands of men gave their lives and other thousands of men and women suffered and sacrificed to establish and maintain our free institutions?

How often have we returned thanks and expressed appreciation or gratitude to those to whom we owe so much?

We Americans write and speak and think freely.

We may worship God as we please.

We are free from unlawful searches and seizures.

We enjoy freedom of elections through which we select those who are to administer and legislate for us, and we fix conditions and limitations to their authority.

We are secure in our legitimate property rights and in the making and carrying out of plans for our lives.

These great privileges, among others—far from being a matter of course—were never enjoyed by any nation until 169 years ago.

Are the fortunate and happy conditions in which we live entirely of our own making?

They are not.

Ought we not bow and bare our heads in grateful memory and reverent homage to those brave men who gave their lives that we might have these great privileges?

They are gifts from the dead—not entirely conquests by the living.

We properly set aside certain days to commemorate individual men whose deeds have justly placed their names high upon the rolls of the great.

Most of these men received honor and distinction during their lifetimes from their fellow citizens in recognition of their services and accomplishments.

Today we commemorate no single man, but the thousands whose names are not written on the scroll of fame, who gave their all without recognition or reward, and who served as devotedly as those whose names are sung and whose deeds are acclaimed.

Our debt to them is great.

Let us pause in the comfortable and secure round of our daily activities, at least a few hours in the year, to acknowledge it.

Let us not only acknowledge our debt, but let us try to pay it.

There is one way in which we can at least make some small payment on this great debt.

These men gave their lives for our Nation and the principles upon which it was founded.

We cannot preserve our way of life, our priceless heritage, unless we know precisely of what it consists.

Our Constitution, instituted 169 years ago, has stood the acid test of time.

It has been the symbol for all people who believe in opportunity, in freedom, and in tolerance.

What a breadth of vision our Founding Fathers showed when they wrote "We, the people."

Our long journey as a nation began with steps that were slow and laborious.

These first steps were taken by American patriots who wrote a document that history has proven to be a colossal monument to freedom and free enterprise.

We have been able to preserve not only the inherited words of the Constitution, but also the living laws contained therein.

We cannot forget that in our infancy we were a weak and struggling nation, exposed to external and internal perils of the gravest character.

Until 1803, we were hemmed in on the west; first by Spain, and then France.

Until 1815 our relations with the two greatest powers of Europe—Britain and France—were stormy.

We fought wars with both, were invaded by one, and saw our Capitol burned by a hostile British Army.

Sectional, party, and class divisions shook the fragile ship of state until its timbers seemed about to break.

Many believed that no popular government could prove durable.

Even the most hopeful found the experience of administering so huge a country full of difficulties.

Yet at an early date a hopeful sentiment began to develop.

As our Nation grew stronger, our self-confidence increased.

A pride in the United States as a world example grew up in the people.

Americans began to feel that their Republic was placed upon a stage for all mankind to observe and imitate.

In the Declaration of Independence we find an expression of this idea.

Jefferson had used the words "a decent respect for the opinions of mankind."

We began to develop that respect.

But it developed only when our individual citizens grew in their respect for each other, and in turn, their international neighbors.

We can honor America's dead by understanding our heritage, and further, by preserving unity among the living.

We known, as Lincoln knew, that "a house divided against itself cannot stand."

Our heritage cannot continue to stand if we pay heed to those who cause dissension among us, wittingly or unwittingly.

There are those on the home front who would divide us, class against class, race against race, religion against religion.

There are others who would divide us from friendly nations, and who are blind to the consequences of their acts.

As we rededicate our lives to those we memorialize today, let us resolve that unity will prevail.

If ever there was a time in the history of the world that America needed to understand herself and to understand her friends and to be understood by them, it is now.

Just so long as we are vigilant toward those who would mislead us into surrendering our national heritage, just so long will we continue to be a free powerful America.

The example of suffering and sacrifice by America's sons and daughters who would not surrender our national heritage should help us to rededicate ourselves to the preservation of peace for this Nation and all mankind.

If our honored dead could tell us what reward they would wish of us, they would, I believe, with one accord say: "Continue the fight in peace for the cause for which we gave our lives."

Surely this we must be willing to do.

Let us, therefore, both for ourselves and in memory of them, pledge ourselves to the preservation of our institutions in their essential purity and integrity.

Once we in this land could sit back and rest in comparative safety.

Two oceans—one to the east and another to the west—protected us from invasion.

We felt secure in our isolation from the world.

But that was before the atomic age, before the age of aerial warfare.

London, Paris, Berlin, Moscow, Manila, Hong Kong, Tokyo are all but a short distance by plane from our own land.

Once Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Detroit could laugh at the thought of a threat from a foreign invader.

But no longer.

If ever an invader come to our shores again, it will be by air, and inland cities, as well as coastal ones, will be easy targets.

When we dropped two atomic bombs over Japan and thus blasted her out of the war, we proved that isolationism is dead and gone forever.

The world is at our doorstep for better or for worse.

Those who gave their lives while in the uniform of our armed services cannot return to protect us against new dangers.

We cannot again know the security of two oceans.

However, the courage of our war dead has made possible a way of life which gives us the opportunity to develop the peaceful use of rapid flight.

We who discovered and developed atomic power recognized its vastly greater and better side—the good it could do for humanity.

It is good for the world that this secret was entrusted to a nation that recognized a moral obligation in this trust imposed on it.

Atomic energy will change the entire economic life of the world.

Certainly when this great power has been subdued to man's will as it must be, man should reach a sort of economic heaven.

Certainly work will not be so difficult nor so tedious.

There will be few hours of labor.

Man will have more time for recreation, for play, for study, for further research.

He will have more time to educate himself, to broaden himself, to travel, to enjoy life.

Perhaps the cycle will swing back and the tempo of life will taper off.

Perhaps we will learn to take it easy with atomic energy.

But these things are of the future.

What of the moment?

We need a true, righteous, and just peace to bring this old world back to an even keel.

We need a lasting peace from war.

Here at home we need peace from internal strife.

Could all our millions of war dead around the world speak, what would they say?

Their language would be legion, but their message would be one little word—"peace."

Our heroes died to establish and maintain institutions where justice among freemen was the great objective.

They made the supreme sacrifice for the perpetuity of a government, the object of which is the freedom and welfare of the citizen, not its own power and greatness.

With the increasing complexity of our civilization, the problem of preserving the freedom of the citizen is of increasing difficulty.

This does not absolve us from our obligations to the honored dead whom we commemorate.

We cannot, with clear conscience, fail them.

The blessings of sound government, which the sacrifices of other men have provided for us, we must in all good faith and justice pass on unimpaired to those who follow us.

It would be little less than cowardly for us to provide comfort and safety for ourselves at the cost of ruin and destruction to those who are to come after us.

As good citizens and true men, we cannot rob the future for our own benefit.

Rather let us try to pass on a government better for our having lived.

Our Nation may be destroyed as thoroughly in time of peace as by ruthless enemies in time of war.

It may be destroyed in time of peace by subversive doctrine, by abandonment of fundamental principles, by surrender of the rights and privileges of the citizens, by an economy which denies to men their political freedom, or by a vicious and wasteful fiscal system which destroys individual initiative.

Perhaps it is easier to defend this fair land against alien enemies than against slowly creeping insidious doctrines, gradual surrender by a careless or inactive citizenship.

Against the armed enemy we rush forward to do our part in defense of our country.

Often peacetime undermining of our civic structure comes in such pleasing disguise as to lead many to give it welcome and encouragement.

We are apt to forget that history teaches that government by the people is not eternal and that such governments have fallen victim to internal decay due to careless and inactive citizenship.

In paying our debt to the heroes in whose honor Memorial Day is dedicated, let us be as vigilant in protecting our country against our own apathy as against foreign foes.

May we, as citizens of this great Nation, be inspired in peacetime with the same spirit of loyalty, service, and sacrifice which is demonstrated in wartime.

In our hearts, may we give assurance to our honored dead, that we make no distinction between wartime patriotism and peacetime patriotism.

The American form of government is only for those who appreciate it, who deserve it, and who are not only willing to fight for it, but also able to defend and maintain it against all enemies at home or abroad.

Let us resolve, that no matter what the cost, we will deserve our form of government, that we will protect it, and pass it on without impairment to those who are to follow us.

Tomorrow and tomorrow, next week, next month, let us take time to recall in grateful appreciation the services and sacrifices of those who have made possible for us the blessings of the free institutions which we enjoy.

Let us make Memorial Day truly a dedication day.

Minority Views on the Foreign Aid Bill, H. R. 11356

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the minority views of my colleagues MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, E. ROSS ADAIR, and myself, that

were filed to accompany H. R. 11356. The report follows:

In 3 previous years we have felt compelled to express our strong conviction that passage of a multibillion-dollar mutual security bill of this nature was not and could not be the answer to our basic national need for peace and security.

In our minority report on the Mutual Security Act of 1953, 3 years ago, we asked the following questions:

"What magic formula is there in this program that is going to transform millions of insecure people throughout the world into valiant, invigorated, and dependable allies? Is it United States money? No. We have tried that one many times—with no success. Is it United States armed might? No. Our forces have been bearing the brunt of the fight in Korea on behalf of the principles of sovereignty, independence, and freedom—and still the peoples of Asia waver. * * *

"It would therefore seem to us particularly essential that we evaluate the present program in the light of what similar programs in the past have failed to accomplish; and from the point of view of whether or not it offers fulfillment of pledges made to the American people." (H. Rept. 569, 83d Cong., 1st sess., pt. 2, p. 8.)

In 1954, when the Mutual Security Act attempted to exchange the existing patchwork of foreign aid programs for a permanent form, we stated with equal emphasis:

"There exists in our minds a grave and fundamental question concerning the wisdom of enacting now what is considered permanent legislation. This is particularly so in view of the unsettled world conditions which become even more unsettled with each passing day and the widespread uncertainties in high places as to our own foreign policy. The House Foreign Affairs Committee is a legislative committee, a policy committee. The sole purpose of the committee in reviewing past programs and proposed programs is to determine policy. To carry out that responsibility has been the function of the committee in bringing out this bill. But how can we determine legislative policy as a directive and framework of action for the executive branch without being fully apprised of executive branch policy to give root and substance to what, after all, amount only to the cold words of a statute?" (H. Rept. 1925, 83d Cong., 2d sess., pt. 3, p. 2.)

In 1955 we felt again constrained to speak these words:

"In the past we have urged what to us has semed natural and logical—a thorough study, a reappraisal, a redefining of foreign policies, techniques, and statutes concerned with the goal of international peace and security, which we all seek. The executive branch has not seen fit to do this before submitting this bill to the Congress; nor has the Congress of the United States itself, which is directly responsible to the people who foot the bills, make the sacrifices, and fight the wars, undertaken such an analysis." (H. Rept. 912, 84th Cong., 1st sess., pt. 2, p. 2.)

And now in 1956, with still no reappraisal of the problems, of the policies, or of the programs, we are again asked to accept a multibillion dollar authorization based on a concept whose validity is outmoded, if, in fact—as we would deny—such validity ever existed. We could only wish that we had been wrong; that our fears of the inefficiency of the approach had been proven groundless. We would be the first to hope that this mutual security legislation might have proved to be the effective weapon for American security and world peace that it was advertised to be.

Events, statements by foreign officials and expressions by our own leaders in the executive branch and in the Congress confirm the fears which we expressed in our three previous minority reports.

Nothing that has happened has changed our conviction that mutual security legislation of this nature is not and cannot be an adequate or right answer to our need for national security and world peace. The program continues to reveal an inherent failure in basic philosophic intent, a failure in direction and approach, and a failure to interpret the shifting nature of world events and to combat successfully relentless Soviet policy. It is increasingly apparent that the policy and the programs to be authorized by this legislation have proved to be not only wanting but actually self-defeating.

It is not that we have failed to pour out money and pour it out generously. One glance at the following table, listing the money yet to be obligated and spent, indicates our unrestrained generosity and spending:

Estimated unobligated and unreserved balance June 30, 1956

	Estimate in March 1956	Estimate in May 1956
Military	$297,000,000	$195,500,000
Nonmilitary	106,600,000	190,000,000
Total	403,600,000	385,500,000

Estimated unexpended balance June 30, 1956

	Estimate in March 1956	Estimate in May 1956
Military	$4,765,100,000	$5,000,000,000
Nonmilitary	1,678,200,000	1,800,000,000
Total	6,443,300,000	6,800,000,000

Source: H. Rept. 2213, 84th Cong., 2d sess., p. 6.

A complete and detailed breakdown of United States generosity will be found in the appendix to this report.

This year, with mounting dissatisfaction and disillusionment with this policy among the people of the United States and their chosen Representatives in Congress, the program in this bill nevertheless plunges along, in its frustrated way, not knowing what its future course, size, or policies will be.

We feel that this bill is particularly objectionable in that the only certainty contained in it is its duration—"permanent." Those who approve this legislation have inserted into the program the mysterious, magical formula which they call "permanent legislation" as if "permanent" were synonymous with "sound." The philosophy contained in the statement of policy in section 7 of the bill is particularly objectionable in this regard. It puts the Congress of the United States on record and commits the United States to pursue programs of assistance as long as Communist danger to the peace of the world and the security of the United States persists. In other words, the United States is to take upon its shoulders, and the American people are to assume, the tax burden of supporting the free world indefinitely. No mention is made of what other nations are to do in order to keep the free world free. No clue is indicated as to our future course with respect to the nations who do not see fit to commit themselves with the free world.

The time is long overdue when the American people—and particularly the Congress, which carries a basic responsibility for the future of this country—must face hard facts with courage. Despite the outpouring of billions of dollars, an honest appraisal of the world situation and of our relationship to it should give ample warning, even at this late date. To continue the philosophy and policies so far provided in mutual security legislation at a greater sum and for a longer period of time can only mean an ultimately disastrous continuation of the all too apparent failures of the program.

It is impossible to list in this brief report, either all inclusively or at sufficient length, the total reasons that call for serious questioning and opposition to House Resolution 11356, the Mutual Security Act of 1956, currently under consideration. Suffice it to say that even former strong proponents of the program—and certainly the American people—are now demanding a reappraisal and rescrutiny of the purpose and policy, based on the following disturbing record:

1. It has failed in its futile attempt to make an appropriation of money a solution for a problem.

2. It has failed to expand the area of the world which may be called free world. On the contrary, that area is being steadily constricted while the area of uncommitted or neutral nations is steadily expanding. "Neutralism" makes it easier for the Communists to increase their influence while the efforts of the free world are made more difficult.

3. Despite the mutual security program we have failed to convince peoples seeking their freedom and newly independent nations that we are sincere in opposing colonialism.

4. It has proved deficient in wise programing, sound fiscal practices, satisfactory presentation to the Congress, adequate implementation of congressional intent, and understanding execution in the field. This is amply indicated by the testimony of the Hon. Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the mutual security program on May 21, 1956.

Further, this bill reflects the increasing tendency to lump money, areas, and programs together, thus giving blank check authority to the Executive. Because of the diffusion of delegated power which this bill makes possible, both the President and the Congress are steadily losing control of the spending and operations of the program.

5. It has failed to achieve for the free world the expected defense against Soviet military power. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was organized as a defense against Soviet military power. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is losing power when it should be increasing it.

The Secretary of State, in a news conference on April 24, 1956, stated "Broadly speaking, it is our view, and I think has been our view, that an organization of this kind [NATO] either grows or tends to dry up." With each Soviet smile, another crack appears in the NATO armor.

6. It has failed to solve the problem of how to reach the peoples themselves in the underdeveloped nations.

7. It has intermingled the valuable technical cooperation program, which is a sharing of knowledge, skills, and know-how with the peoples of the underdeveloped countries, with a huge military program that deals with arms and the implements of war. These are two totally different programs in magnitude, in philosophy, in intent, and in approach.

Study should be made of how best to emphasize the importance and long-range character of the technical cooperation program. Some thought should be given to separating this vital program from the other phases of the mutual-security program. In fact, the advisability might be considered of setting it up as an independent agency.

8. It has failed to consider sufficiently the present importance and the potentialities of our Latin American neighbors. The peace and security of the Western Hemisphere is vital to the preservation of the entire free world.

9. Finally, it has failed to convey to the world, and even to our friends, the real meaning of American traditions, principles, and ideals—those attributes which have made us a great Nation and a great people.

In the face of this honest questioning even by former proponents of the program and

by the public, and in the face, as well, of what seems to us also an undeniable failure in principle, policy, and performance, we cannot go along with the proposal to appropriate more billions for a longer time for more extensive programs of the same nature. What is needed is a stern, realistic reappraisal. In fact, returning from a recent study mission around the world, the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs stated with sober emphasis in its report:

"If it is to succeed, the United States must do more than reappraise its programs; it must subject to minute rescrutiny its policy and its determination" (H. Rept. 2147, 84th Cong., 2d sess, p. 212).

There has been introduced in the Congress a concurrent resolution calling for a congressional committee, 6 members from the Senate and 6 from the House, to study, reevaluate, and give relentless judgment on the policies and programs that have been carried on under this mutual security legislation; and to produce, following such study, sound suggestions for better implementing our national desire for peace and security.

We urge the Congress to join with us in insisting upon a rescrutiny of our foreign policies and programs as the basic need of this hour. What is actually now at stake is not the mere continuation of programs or appropriations, but the very peace and safety of this country and the whole free world.

LAWRENCE H. SMITH.
MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH.
E. ROSS ADAIR.

On the Understanding of Aging, by Hon. Edith Green, of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, on May 31 our colleague the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] presented an important and timely address on one of the major problems of this generation—that of our aging.

She spoke at a community meeting sponsored by the Arlington Soroptomist International Club and the Silver Age Club.

As Mrs. GREEN points out, we are undergoing a "quiet revolution." There are four times as many Americans over 65 today as there were 50 years ago, and the number of people over 65 is increasing twice as fast as the total population. There are 14 million people over 65 in America today. There will be 21 million by 1975.

Until recently, far too little attention was paid to their special problems, which include inadequate average incomes, job discrimination, housing and medical care.

But there is a growing awareness of the needs of our older people and of our responsibility to them. Mrs. GREEN'S bill to set up a special agency devoted to comprehensive study of and action on the problems of aging is evidence of this.

Because we all share Mrs. GREEN'S concern for what is rapidly becoming our neglected generation, I call my colleagues' attention to her address, which follows:

ON THE UNDERSTANDING OF AGING

Members of the Soroptimist and Silver Age Club, when your chairman invited me to join you tonight I was very glad indeed to have the opportunity, even though it commits me to stand before you for a few minutes and talk on a subject of which, very honestly, I know far too little. I'd be more embarrassed to admit this if knowledge of the real facts and problems of aging were widespread. But my ignorance is, I'm afraid, shared by young and old across the country. We just don't know much—not nearly enough—about one of the biggest things that is happening to us; as former speakers have said, we, as a nation, are growing older. But because we have so much to learn and since this is an occasion for learning together, I was very pleased to come and willing to display my scanty understanding of the subject. I am told, too, that there is to be a question and answer period after I finish. That is what I came for—I have a lot of questions to ask.

I understand I'm to talk, for a few moments, though, before the questions start. Let me say frankly, that my experience in the short time I have been in Congress has made me much more aware of the problems of the elderly citizens. The most vivid single lesson I have learned came this past fall and winter after the end of the session, when I was in Portland and working in my office there. Day after day, there in Portland, the reality of this subject unfolded itself to me in the real, living people who came through my door—a steady stream of older people, coming to talk to me about their specific problems and, sometimes (more generally), about the challenges facing older people. In those months, as I talked with these friends and neighbors, I think I learned a great deal. First of all, I learned how little I knew, and how much needs to be done and how little I or any of us have so far been able to do. Many of these people had problems on which, I am sorry to say, I could offer little help. With some, I was gratified to be able to do something. But when I came back to Washington, I came back with a new awareness of how much there is to do, and how urgent it is that we begin to do some of these things—to start now.

It seems to me that a gathering like this one, a few years ago, would have been a rarity. Today, thoughtful people are increasingly thinking about, discussing the puzzling questions raised by the facts of growing older. In a few more years, I hope, such conversation will become commonplace; and by then, we will understand a great deal more than we do now.

Of course, we have made progress. We've even got some shiny new words—like gerontology. And, because words are the coin of discourse, new ones are a sign of educational prosperity—not, I hope, of educational inflation. They mean, I trust, that we are learning something. It's high time. Twenty-five hundred years ago, in the brilliant culture of classical Greece old age was given comfort and honor—Plato entrusted the leadership of his ideal society, for instance, to a council of elders (to whom a 40-year-old vice president would have been unthinkable, if you will pardon a little campaigning). In some primitive societies, whatever the time and place, special reverence and privilege for old age has been a frequent characteristic. So, as our 20th century high civilization begins a belated concern with old age, we are only catching up with 400 B. C. and with the civilization of darkest Africa.

What I would like to do, however, is not to survey our progress in dealing with this tremendous upsurge of longevity in our Nation, encouraging as progress is. Instead, I would like to dwell for a moment on the basic condition on which progress, now and in the future, depends. Beyond that I want only to examine briefly some of the major fields in which local and nongovernmental groups are at work—like the Soroptimists here and across the Nation, and many groups of older people like your Silver Age Club who have joined together in many cities for mutual pleasure and usefulness—projects like the recreation centers that are in successful operation in New York, for instance, and in my own city of Portland, Oreg., or the retired businessmen's group in St. Louis that has done such fine work in counseling and advising young businessmen out of their own experience and wisdom. And I want to say a word about the role and responsibility of government, as I conceive it, in this great human and social adventure that is overtaking us.

THE DIMENSIONS OF UNDERSTANDING

I say "great human and social adventure." I think that's what it is. We live in an age when life expectancy has increased explosively. We live in an age in which more and more of us are living longer and longer. Children being born today can expect to live a third again as long as their grandparents born in 1900. Those new years—this gift of added life—are the stuff of a great adventure. Along with them we are gaining new knowledge of the meaning of growing older. We are learning, for instance, that getting old and old age are purely relative notions; that modern gerontology bears out the old proverb that "you are only as old as you feel," for the facts are that aging is a process that begins in youth; that psychologically and physically we begin to slow down in the late twenties and early thirties. So in a sense most of our life is spent aging; and the added years we are being given in our contemporary society are simply a prolongation of the best years of our lives, our maturity. And these are not simply rose-colored views. They are what the experts say aging can and should mean if we understand it and if we age wisely and gracefully.

But if growing old is to be a rewarding adventure—if we are to use well these added years we are gaining—a great deal of change needs to be made in our social and individual outlooks. More than that, of course, there have to be some drastic changes in some of our habits and institutions—in some of the facts of life. We have to begin to live and plan our lives around the change in life span.

But the facts of life are usually a product of our understanding of life—in the field of aging as in other fields. It seems to me that, in confronting the challenges of growing older what we need now, above all, is new and greater understanding. That is what I meant a little earlier by referring to the basic condition on which progress depends. We are all going to school (in a sense) and the name of our course is on the understanding of aging. Sometimes I think that as a society we are dangerously near flunking the course. But I'm an optimist—I think we'll learn. People like you here tonight who are actually doing something—learning at first hand—are at the head of the class. We all have much to learn from you.

I say that our progress depends on understanding. Well, what is it we have to grasp, to comprehend? It is, I think, what I have sometimes called the quiet revolution. That's part of the trouble, of course—it's the noisy revolutions that get attention—and this is a quiet one. I don't want to repeat to you a lot of statistics—I am sure you know them as well or better than I do. Yet, I think we all have to learn them, relearn them—repeat them over and over until we genuinely understand them in the fullest sense. Until they have become for us facts with the urgency they warrant and the kind of urgency only facts felt and understood really have for us.

THE FACTS OF UNDERSTANDING

So at the risk of repeating the familiar, let us go over together a few of the familiar facts that mark this quiet revolution—for quiet though it is, it is truly a revolution. There are four times as many Americans over 65 today as there were 50 years ago. In fact, the number of people over 65 is increasing twice as fast as the total population. If over 65 is old people (and that phrase itself needs some reunderstanding) then there are 14 million old people in America today—by 1975 there will be 21 million. Those figures and the millions of older Americans they stand for are the ultimate reality of the situation we are dealing with.

Yet ours is a society too much geared to youth in its values, its habits, its prejudices and fashions, its allocation of resources. It is a society that has delayed too long its adjustment to the quiet revolution. Old age is becoming more and more important to more and more of us—yet we have neglected, to a truly shocking extent, to adjust our society to that change.

Let us simply review some of the inventory of facts that bear out that statement. Our older people have far too little money income. Their average family income is only about two-thirds that of younger families. In recent studies, the figure for an emergency budget—not even a minimum, decent standard, mind you, but an emergency standard of living—the figure for an emergency budget for a city couple to exist on has been estimated at $1,200 a year. Yet among older people, over a fourth of all couples, a third of all single men, and a half of all single women, live on incomes below even this emergency figure.

There are other facts to be learned and learned again. We know that the homes of older people are, consistently, inferior to those of their younger neighbors. We know that for older people with no homes of their own, living circumstances are often difficult or even desperate, spiritually as well as physically. Yet even the inferior homes that so many of our older people must live in are beyond their means. The cold, hard figures indicate that the cost of housing, for most of them, consumes a third or more of their income. Contrast this with the familiar rule of thumb that no one should spend more than a fourth of his income on housing. The obvious conclusion is that older people are spending far too large a share of their scanty incomes just to obtain a home, however inferior it may be.

We know that too often the position of older people in the community reflects our out-of-date understanding and our outmoded values and prejudices. Too often, older people do not get the respect and social recognition they deserve—too often, they are ignored and shunted aside. Their needs for recreation and social life are sometimes neglected, their willingness and ability to contribute to the community wasted. Medical care and group medical insurance are limited and expensive. Although older people are only one-twelfth of the population, they occupy one-fifth of the hospital beds. Yet 2 of every 5 older people cannot meet their medical bills even for present inadequate levels of care. Voluntary medical insurance plans include hardly a third of our older citizens. Yet, in the face of these sad statistics, it is precisely our older people who most need adequate medical care and have the least financial resources for obtaining it. With the problems they face and their inability to meet their needs, is it any wonder that mental illness among older people is increasing more than three times as fast as the national average?

JOB DISCRIMINATION: AN OBJECT LESSON

And to this audience of all groups, I need not spell out the shortcomings of job opportunity, the sad facts of job discrimination. We all know that the number of older people in jobs is declining drastically; and that the obstacles of discrimination are geting higher and harsher at ever earlier ages. In 1890 more than two-thirds of all men over 65 were gainfully employed. Today, only 4 in 10 hold jobs. Able and experienced workers find too often that they are automatically barred from a new job at 45, even at 35 or younger. These prejudices are far too widespread. Many school systems, in spite of the shortage of qualified teachers, will not hire a teacher over 40 or 45. In Government, which should lead the way in elimination of discrimination, I am sorry to say such policies are far too common. Some of us in Congress have been trying for several years successfully to write into law prohibitions against discrimination on account of age in civil service. For when the schools, the armed services, the civil service, in their hiring, discriminate against the older worker, we can hardly expect private employers to lead the way.

It is precisely here, though, in an area we are most familiar with and whose facts we know most about, that my point about the importance of understanding can be brought home most clearly. For the job problem of the older worker is, to a very great extent, a product of poor understanding and poor education. Here is one of the crucial sectors in which the breakthrough of the quiet revolution must come. Not only is job opportunity an ideal point for understanding and education to strike—it is a very important barricade, morally and psychologically as well as economically, that must be stormed and captured if the quiet revolution is to be won.

Job discrimination is for the most part a product of poor education. Why do employers discriminate against older workers? You have had some experience with this and I will be interested to know if your experience bears me out. It is said that older workers lack physical steadiness and dexterity. But there are ample facts to show that workers as old as 70 can be as steady physically as the young. It is said that older workers are more prone to injury. The facts show just the opposite. It is said that they have poorer absentee records. The facts show just the opposite. Their efficiency and their reliability, contrary to misunderstanding and prejudice are equal or even superior to those of younger workers. In an economy in which skill, reliability and maturity grow constantly more important than sheer physical energy, the older worker should be more and more sought after.

If he is not, why not? The answer is simple. There is a job of education to be done, understanding to be communicated. This is, I think the most important single job presently to be done in our education for aging, as a society. And you are doing it. If I can presume to advise you as to what you can do—and I think it is presumptuous, in light of your interest and achievements—I would tell you to go on just as you are. What you are doing is the great job of education of yourselves and your community—and crucially, of employers who must themselves learn the facts about the value of older workers. As they learn those facts, they will learn others. They, and you, and others like you across the country, as you continue to interest yourselves in these issues, will bring about that "understanding of aging" which is the basic condition of progress. In the best sense you are propagandists—persuaders propagating important and much needed facts, promoting understanding of our quiet but enormously significant revolution.

And that is what we need—to make these important and pressing facts familiar facts of our existence; to develop a sense of shock at the facts of neglect and underprivilege; to become so aware of and impressed by these facts that, grasping them, we are immediately impelled to act vigorously to do something about them. That is what I mean by "understanding of aging."

I do not want to dwell further on this subject of understanding. But I do want to take a few moments to apply it. Where does understanding as we acquire it, lead us?

In the field in which you have done the most, it is leading us, I think, toward some substantial progress. We know, of course, that educating employers is not the whole of our problem. Often, older people have real problems of adjustment or retraining to prepare for new jobs. In a pilot study in New York State for instance, a special section was set up in the employment service, to give better and more intensive job counseling and retraining to older people than was ordinarily done in the employment service. The results were impressive: Of the older people who went through this special placement service more than twice as many found jobs as among those who went through only the regular placement service. Plainly, this indicates a need for improved job placement service.

Also, we know that industrial pension plans, for instance, sometimes discourage an employer from taking on older workers. So studies are being made to learn how, without damaging pension systems, older workers can be brought in to the job and into the pension system. These are details, of course. There are many others. But I believe we are on our way to reversing the trend—the doors of job opportunity, which for decades have been closing, are going to swing open again. People like yourselves, doing the work and gaining the knowledge, all over the country, are going to bring this about.

I would like briefly, too, to mention an activity in which the Soroptimists of my own city of Portland have been doing some fine work. Working with the city's bureau of parks and public recreation they have for some time been maintaining and operating a recreation center for Portland's older women. A variety of special social events and a regular program of craftwork are among their activities. Every month, the center has become a more important part of the social life of its members. Every month the center serves nearly a thousand women and monthly attendance in craft classes runs to several hundred with activities that range from making lampshades to aluminum artwork. The Soroptimists recreation center fills a real place in the social life of our older women. And again, let me point out it is doing more than filling a present social need—it is serving as a center for building understanding, for educating, for propagandizing. And so, it is contributing to the massive social adjustment that we must make. It is significant that the center, in Portland, has drawn visitors, who come to observe and learn, not only State officials working in related fields, but observers from Germany, the head of a working girl's program in Greece, an adult education director from Singapore.

THE PLACE OF GOVERNMENT

The programs and experiments we have talked about are primarily local—the people of the community, young and old together, working to adapt to the new society. And this is as it must be. We live locally, after all, our needs and our problems are local. Adjustment and acceptance of this revolution must be molecular—a change in every community, and every neighborhood—and must depend on genuine local understanding and effort. But there is a role for government, too. And before I end I would like briefly to touch on that, because, as a Member of Congress, it particularly concerns me.

Of course, anything that government does is, in the last analysis, only possible and only worthwhile if it promotes and cooperates with local activity. But there are many ways in which government has a very special

and important role to play. In the field of housing, for instance, there is an obvious need for government. The size and scale of our housing needs and the problems of financing them have long been admitted to require government participation. But only this year, for the first time, it looks as though we will get what has long been overdue—a Government housing program that clearly and specifically recognizes the housing needs of older people. Housing bills in both the Senate and the House deal with this. The housing programs of the past have simply not been designed for the needs of older people; the conditions for FHA-guaranteed mortgages, for instance, have not been suitable for older people to buy homes; the limitations on single people in public housing projects have kept the many older people who live alone from taking advantage of this low-cost housing they should be eligible for. Now, however, the proposals call for mortgage terms adapted to the circumstances of older people; for special Government loan programs for building nonprofit housing especially designed for older people, with few or no stairs, nonskid floors, handrails, and the other conveniences that can make so much difference. Provision is to be made for older people, single or couples, in low-cost public housing. And increasingly, the designers and the builders are giving thought to the special needs and problems of older people and some real advances are being made.

Now here is one good example of a responsibility Government can and should accept. It is an example, too, of the interdependence of Government and local action. For in housing, success depends on cooperation between local housing authorities and local builders and the Government. But this is only one example. We should think of the role of Government in broader terms. I think we are beginning to do so. In a social change as great and complex as this one we need thinking and planning, and coordination on a large scale. Government should have a major responsibility here. We need, too, a kind of nationwide conversation—a national classroom—in which this understanding of aging can be stimulated and promoted. When problems get national attention focused on them—when they begin to occupy the attention of Government and, so, the news of politics and Government—that kind of national education is greatly stimulated. We are beginning to get this now, and the housing debate is only one example. Of course, there are differences of opinion and arguments in Government on how to proceed. That is understandable and all to the good. Argument is the road to education. For example, the administration is opposed to this expanded housing program for older people; it wants a much more limited concession to the housing needs of the aged. The majority in Congress, however, seems inclined to move more boldly, recognizing, I think, the real size and importance of the problem. And, of course, being part of the majority in Congress, I take that view.

THE NEGLECTED GENERATION

This present concern with the housing problems of older people is encouraging—but it is late in coming. All our concern with the aging is on a badly delayed schedule. The fact is, we are in a painful transitional stage in our social policies and we have not yet caught up with the realities that make transition necessary. My mail bears this out—and I am sure every Member of Congress has the same experience. Letter after letter brings me the problems of the older people whose circumstances have left them unprovided for in our current programs—often very bitter problems indeed. These are people whose primary earning years are behind them—whose middle years came while our social policies were only beginning and were even more inadequate than now. For most of them, health insurance and other such benefits now becoming available were simply not to be had when they might have established eligibility.

Even now, less than half of all men, a third of all women over 65, are covered by social security. And the benefits many of them draw are based on the low schedules of past years, completely out of tune with present high living costs. My mail tells me over and over of the difficulties of getting by with scanty benefit payments—or even worse, of people who, through technicalities or their special circumstances, simply do not qualify. It is all very well to say that these probems will be eased after a few more years of operation of the social-security program and of expanded private-pension programs. This is cold comfort to the many people who are trapped in the shortcomings and the failures of our present benefit programs, here and now. And even for the long run, there must be substantial improvements in the social-security system to make it live up to its name and provide real security for our older citizens. The current effort in Congress to lower retirement age for women to 62 and to authorize disability payments beginning at age 50 is an example of what we must do—and more—if we are to have real social security.

Meanwhile, the present generation of older people, the first wave of the quiet revolution, suffers from our delay and neglect. They are in danger of being a lost generation. One of the most pressing burdens on our conscience should be the special problems of these people, now, quite apart from long term plans. Here is a special responsibility of government—for it will take wise and vigorous government action if we are to help them in time. They cannot wait; the policies of 20 years from now will do them little good.

A PROGRAM FOR ACTION

My own thinking about all these problems has led me, at least at this stage of my understanding, to a more comprehensive approach, which reflects the things I have said here tonight and which is embodied in a bill I, along with several others, have sponsored in this session of Congress. What we propose to do is set up, in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, a special agency devoted to comprehensive study and action in the total field of the problems of aging. We feel that such an agency, staffed by professional people who can combine study with practical experience and experiment is the best and quickest way to make progress. It is, we think, a way to promote that basic education and understanding and at the same time to set in motion some of the practical programs that understanding must produce. Because the field is new and complex, we are willing to make a modest start—but above all, we want to make a start. Here again, we disagree with the administration. It has appointed a "Federal Council on Aging" to study the field. We feel that, too often, these study groups are only a way to postpone serious action and tend to have the effect only of discouraging the kind of specific, concrete action we are urging. This Federal Council, for instance, is simply an additional duty for men who have regular jobs in the different Federal agencies concerned. They expect to hold a conference of Federal and State officials this June. Now we don't object to conferences—we think the more discussion and publicity and exchange of ideas there is the better. In fact, our bill calls for a major conference, after several years, to evaluate our experience from the actual working program we propose. For instance, we want to provide some limited funds—a few million dollars for the first 5 years—for grants to the States, working with the Bureau of Older Persons—to get some expanded action and programs stimulated, so that we will have more experience on which to confer—real knowledge as the basis for a conference. But we disagree with the administration in its position that part-time councils, and conferences are a substitute for action and experience. We don't feel that they have given sufficient serious consideration to the need for such an agency and program, any more than we feel they are sufficiently bold in moving to meet the housing problem for older people.

But the important and encouraging thing here is, in spite of disagreement and what we feel is the administration's lack of vigor and imagination—the important thing is that interest in this quiet revolution is growing. We are all learning more and more, talking and experimenting more and more—we are moving toward that "understanding of aging" which—I come back to it again—is the first great step. I think the signs are abundant. And so I am hopeful that we are slowly but surely moving to that great—and overdue—social adjustment to these new facts of life. Your presence and interest here tonight—and your activities, are a further and a very important and heartwarming evidence of that same fact.

I have talked far too long for a person who admits that she knows little about this big and difficult topic. But I hope you will forgive this as simply an indication of my real interest—and because, I hope, I have talked with the purpose of promoting, as far as I can, that understanding of aging that I call the basic condition of progress.

Address by Hon. Frank Chelf, of Kentucky, Before the Lebanon, Ky., High School Graduating Class

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. WATTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a transcribed ad lib speech made by my colleague, FRANK CHELF, on Monday night, May 28, 1956, to the Lebanon, Ky., High School graduating class, of which his oldest daughter, Caroline, was a member.

The speech follows:

Superintendent Johnston, distinguished members of the school board, members of the faculty, you fine graduating class of Lebanon High School, my old and dear friends of Lebanon and Marion County, and you good ladies and gentlemen who have honored us tonight by your presence from the adjoining counties, I have had many thrills in my time, believe me, certainly many, many more than I have ever deserved. I can recall not too many years ago—but certainly enough, at that—when I was a barefooted, ragged, dirty-faced youngster out in an orphanage, and I never shall forget the greatest thrill that had ever come—the first real thrill of my lifetime. It was when Babe Ruth came to see the youngsters at the home and he was knocking fly balls out into the outfield, and as a youngster and member of the team I put my heart into catching one of those balls, because the rule was if you caught a ball you could come in and Babe would autograph it and shake your hand. Well, I want you to know, boys and girls, that I caught one of those balls. I made it my business, Jim, to catch one. And

you talk about a fellow rocking, rolling, wheeling, and dealing—I really came in from that outfield into that infield and got in there and shook Babe Ruth's hand. He autographed that ball, and today I have it as one of my most prized possessions in a glass case there on my desk in Washington. Someday, if little Frank behaves himself, I might pass it on to him. That was a great thrill.

Then, you know, 30 years ago tonight I graduated from high school, and that, too, was a real thrill. Of course, I was so young when I graduated—fact is, I was only round about 9—well Jack Benny is only 39. Well, Caroline looked at me pretty closely, so maybe it was twice 9, Caroline. At any rate, it was a happy occasion, believe you me.

And then later on, as my good friend Denny pointed out here, I had some other wonderful things happen to me—when you good people here elected me as your county attorney and later when Miss Lou agreed to walk down the aisle with me; and later on, it was a real thrill when Caroline, our first baby, came, and then Bonnie and then Frank—oh, what a wonderful thing it was. Later, yes, I had my shingle hung out; the war came thereafter and I did what I could to help win it. I shall never forget the thrill that came to me the day of our graduation from Officers Candidate School when I got my commission, and when I was promoted to a captain and later to a major. When I came back, you good people rallied around me here in Lebanon and Marion County and throughout this great Fourth Congressional District and you gave me the nomination and elected me as your Representative in Congress. Oh that was a thrill—that was the high-water mark in my life, make no mistake about it.

Then still later on, by hard work, I was permitted to serve as the chairman of a subcommittee that won some national prominence and they were kind enough to me to let it be called the Chelf Investigating Committee. All that was wonderful. It was fine, my friends, when I was permitted to meet the great Franklin Roosevelt, shake his hand and to serve with him in his Congress and later, President Harry Truman and now President Eisenhower. They were wonderful things to happen to me but I want to say to you from the bottom of my heart, the greatest thing that has ever happened to FRANK CHELF is to be permitted to come here tonight and to address this fine graduating class in our hometown—56 fine young men and women representing one for each year from the beginning of the 20th century. I think it is a good omen, Mrs. Johnston—I do indeed and I am so happy, so pleased, and I am so proud that you were able to hold your line and to keep them all together. I understood that one dropped out but later one more came and took the place. I was happy and I know that all of you thrill because of that. To me, I repeat—that is a good omen—believe me it is.

What I have to say to these fine young men and women tonight probably will be old stuff to you fathers, mothers and you loved ones and certainly to the members of the faculty and you teachers. It will be old stuff, yes, and so if you want to tune me out, go to sleep or drive out to the Parkette, it is all right with me; we will go right ahead here with this thing. I know there have been times when you wanted to say something to the youngsters but maybe they were going to a dance, going to that football game or that basketball game, or maybe they were headed out the door to class and maybe what you had to say to them didn't quite register at the time. Then on the other hand, maybe you were too busy to get it over, as I have been, and it really is a shame that I haven't had more time with my family. If you haven't seen me at home as much as I feel that I ought to be, just bear with me and please understand that you good people elected me to represent you in Washington and there are certain things that go with public life that you must make in the way of sacrifies. My family has borne the brunt of that sacrifice by my not being with them as I would like to be. My dear friends, tonight we have this happy senior class here on the stage. They can't run out on us tonight, Mrs. Johnston, they can't go to any dance and they can't get away from us until they hear my plea. We have got them cornered tonight—they can't leave us tonight—so on behalf of you fathers, mothers, and you loved ones and the members of the faculty, I am going to tell them off for you tonight for just a few moments—bless their hearts.

Yes, this is the first appearance that I have made in the way of a commencement address in 12 long years and the reason for that is when there is a rollcall in Washington that means something to our people—to our farmers—and there is a vacant seat there where CHELF sits—I think that that is just about the most inarticulate and just about the worst representation that people can have. That's the reason I have tried as best I could to stay there and be on the job when legislation that you needed most was before the Congress for action. I was trying as best I could to set an example for other youngsters who came along behind me because I shall never forget, Pauline, when I was elected to Congress that a lot of my dear friends voted for me with their tongues in their cheeks. I know they thought this boy is too young, he is a good boy, but he is too young, and they were afraid. I know in their hearts they worried about me, and that was probably the thing that drove me and made me work as hard as I have worked—certainly to my own detriment from the standpoint of my health but, nevertheless, it did drive me on and on to prove that a young man or a young woman could do a job if it was entrusted to them. I had in mind the fine young men and young women who were coming on behind me. I knew that if I didn't make good, then the people might not consider opportunities for those who followed me. Therefore, it was incumbent upon me to make a success and I had to do it.

Tonight I have no prepared speech. I am going to talk from the bottom of my heart, what's in my heart and on my mind. I don't have a prepared speech because I remember the story of Senator Barkley many years ago when he said that he was honored when he was a young county attorney to make the commencement speech to one of the little high schools in McCracken County. He worked so hard, oh, he stayed up several nights preparing his speech and he thought that he had a masterpiece when he had finished and so, on the day in question, he delivered the speech. When it was over, he waited for the congratulations and the applause and none came. He was rather disappointed; he waited a little while longer and no one came to congratulate him and even the superintendent of the schools stood by and said nothing. So finally he couldn't stand it any longer and he said: "Superintendent Jones, how did I do—did you like my speech?" The superintendent said: "Do you want the truth or do you want me to tell you something that you want to hear?" The Senator said: "I want the truth." The superintendent then said: "Well, it was terrible. There were three things wrong with it. You read it, you read it poorly, and it wasn't worth reading to begin with." So, tonight, I am just going to tell you what is on my mind and in my heart.

I was fortunate, I guess, after all is said and done. I don't claim any credit for anything that I may have been able to do because I think that those things are in the cards. Sometimes, I think that what is to be, most generally will be, but certainly we want to try to help things along, as best we can. The point I am making is this—I can remember when I was just a little fellow around about 5 years old, and shortly before Dad died—my dear, sweet old Aunt Lucy took me into the courthouse where my father was circuit judge and I saw him there on the bench (ill though he was) and I made up my mind then and there that I wanted to be a lawyer. From then on, I worked hard because I knew what I wanted to do; I knew where I wanted to go, and I charted my course and I set my sails and I worked hard for it. Well, it is something that helps and I don't think there is any doubt about that. I believe that young folks sometimes by not having their minds definitely set upon the thing that they want to do, who are willing to let it ride along until after they have graduated from high school before they will even discuss it or talk about it—sometimes these young folks allow the other fellow to get a jump on them. I believe this sincerely—that deciding early in life what one's goal is to be keeps to a minimum, shall I say, at least confusion, indecision, and certainly delays.

I am reminded of a story—speaking of confusion—about when I was a youngster working on a farm, during the summer months, a friend of mine with whom I was staying that summer asked me to go over to the neighbor and borrow a clock. He said that the clock he had there had quit running, his neighbor had three, and they were all running pretty well. So I went over to the adjoining farm, borrowed a clock, and brought it back. Well—the clock didn't seem to do so well. After about a week, everybody in the Woodward household was really in a state of confusion and almost shock over that clock. Finally, Mr. Woodward asked me to take the clock back, thank the man for its use, and tell him that he would take his own clock into town as soon as he could and have it repaired. I took it back and told him what Mr. Woodward had said. He thanked me for bringing it back but he said, "Frank, I will tell you something, that is a good clock and it runs; it does all right but the trouble with it is, I forgot to tell you about its peculiarities and idiosyncrasies." He added: "You know, that clock runs well but I forgot to tell you that when both hands stick up to high noon and it strikes 3, that means it is 6 o'clock." When you fine young men and women have both hands up at high noon, I don't want you striking 3 and saying it is 6 o'clock. That is most confusing.

There are five things that I would suggest here tonight. Your parents have traveled the road before you. I have no secret formula to offer to you for success, though I wish I could give you one. I know that the teachers do not have a secret formula for you. We can't wave a magic wand. If we could save you one tear or one disappointment, we would be delighted to do it.

While I am talking, I want to congratulate you fathers and you mothers tonight, for raising such fine young men and young women. I know of the heartaches and the sacrifices a lot of you have made. I know of those things and I am sure this fine class does, too. By the same token, I want to congratulate the members of the faculty—each and every one of the teachers—for the wonderful, magnificent contribution, the selfless devotion to duty given throughout all the years that this class has been in school and other classes who have gone before and the ones who are yet to come. I, personally, want to thank them on behalf of you good people assembled here tonight for the love and the devotion given and the sacrifices that they also have made. Young men and young women, you may not realize it now but the time will come when you will appreciate them all the more and with each passing year, they will become more dear to you. I know that maybe you haven't thought

about it, but I am sure that you realize that every one of them, with their qualifications, their intelligence, their ability, and their integrity, could go to Louisville and get a job there with almost any organization or company and make twice, three times, maybe four times the salary that we are able to pay them here. This is not because we don't feel that they are not worth it here but because after all is said and done, the tax dollar can go only so far. I want to say this to you—and thank heaven, I am not on the ballot tomorrow and nobody can say it is politics. I do think you are entitled to know that I have always been for some form of Federal aid to education. I am for it now and I shall continue to be, because I think that you good people are the most underpaid and, sometimes, I am afraid the least appreciated folks that we have—and you are the ones who mold the character of our future citizens. I have not forgotten you and I know that these parents here will always remember what you have done for their loved ones.

Yes, I repeat, young men and young women, that I can't give you a magic formula but if I can save you one heartache or one tear—just one—I will be grateful for this opportunity tonight. I know that when Caroline last fall wanted me to take her out to Columbia, Mo., to see Christian College which she hopes to attend this fall, we became lost—hopelessly lost. We got off the main road and we were floundering. I pulled into a filling station and I asked the man if he had ever been to Columbia, Mo., and he said yes, he had traveled the road before. I asked him to get me straightened out and get me on the right road. He did and we went on without losing any more time at all. It was just that simple. As you travel life's highway, if you become doubtful, if you momentarily lose your bearings, if you get a wee bit "off stroke," or if you feel that you need some advice or counsel, don't hesitate to go to your father, to your mother, to your grandmother, or to some member of the faculty, or even write me. I would be delighted and would consider it a real privilege, an honor, and a pleasure to try to advise and counsel you even by mail, to try to help you, to guide you.

As you travel along life's highway—or any highway, for that matter—if you watch your guideposts and signposts, you are not as likely to wreck or to get into trouble or to get hurt, if there is a sign that says "dangerous curve ahead," "slow down," "deadend street," "roadblock," or a "one-way bridge." Those suggestions that I would make would be five—and only five—and the first roadsign that I would suggest is that you take the Lord into your confidence; let Him be a part of your life, let Him be a partner in your business and always remember the Golden Rule and say a prayer each day. Youngsters of 18, 19, and 20 in World War II prayed and they did it unashamedly, too. No. 2, I would suggest to you that you work hard, work very hard. There is no, absolutely no, substitute for hard work. Speaker RAYBURN of the House of Representatives has often said that he doesn't want the most intelligent man from a given congressional district to come to represent his people in Congress but has said: "Give me the man with average intelligence, just average intelligence, but one who will work hard—real hard and I'll show you one of the most successful Representatives in the United States of America."

As you will remember, I told you good people when you elected me 12 years ago to Congress that there were probably 350,000 people in Marion County and in the Fourth District who were smarter than I, but that I guaranteed you one thing—if you would send me there, nobody would work any harder or as long as I would to try to give you the representation to which you were entitled and to try to make up the difference in what I may lack in the way of experience, training, brains or talents. No. 3, I would say not to hold grudges, not to hate. That reminds me of a story about the old gentleman who was at a revival meeting, sitting there, 105 years old—Uncle Jim, by name. The minister said: "Is there anybody here in the sound of my voice in the church-house tonight that can truthfully stand up and say to all mankind and everybody here assembled that he loves everybody, that he has no ill-will toward anyone, that he holds no grudge against anybody?" Finally old Uncle Jim stood up, tottered on his cane, and said: "Parson, I love everybody and I don't hate anybody." The minister said: "Tell everybody—we want to know the formula, Uncle Jim, because we all need to know." Uncle Jim said: "I've outlived all of the dang rascals." Now, you don't have to do it that way—you don't have to feel like Uncle Jim. You want to do it honestly from the bottom of your heart.

The fourth road sign is to be honest, be fair, keep your word—let your word be your bond. Then you won't have to explain—you won't get caught in any lies. Elbert Hubbard says: "Never explain, your friends don't need it and your enemies won't believe you anyhow." You know, I have developed a theory over the years, and I will pass it on to you for what it is worth. I have often said—never ask a friend to do something that will hurt him spiritually, morally, mentally, physically, socially, financially, politically, or any other way. A man just doesn't ask his friend to do something he knows in his heart is going to hurt him. If you will remember that, I think it will help a little bit, too.

Last, but not the least, of the five signposts—let us be courteous, kind, and sympathetic—to the blind, to the lame, the halt, the widow, the orphan, the aged, the infirm, the sick, the indigent, and to the downtrodden. You do that, and you just don't know the real deep-down satisfaction and joy that you will have. I was in Washington the other day, walking down the street, and a man came up to me. I thought he was a typical panhandler. He tapped me on the arm, and said: "Mister, can I have a little money for some food?" I gave him some money, and then I turned to walk away. He stopped me, and said: "My friend, I appreciate this very much. I am down on my luck now—I haven't got a dime but I am going to remember what you did for me tonight, and when I am back in my luck I am going to pass this on to some other poor unfortunate fellow." That stopped me in my tracks. I turned around and I looked at that man—it really impressed me. That was the first time in all of the years that I have been trying to help folks that I had had that kind of an answer. I guess the reason it startled me was because it was that sort of thing that I wanted to do myself—to try as best I could, within my limitations, to help others. Be kind, be sympathetic, be understanding, say a kind word to people. Courtesy is the least investment that you will ever have to make on anything and it will pay you the greatest dividends. The fact is, courtesy costs you absolutely nothing and the dividends that come back to you are wonderful. It reminds me of the story about the preacher who had been away because of an operation for quite some time. He was gone about 2 months, and when he came back he gave a rousing sermon that morning in church. When it was over everybody was impressed, and one of the members of the congregation came to him and said that it was a wonderful sermon, that it was magnificent, the finest he had ever preached. The preacher said: "Now, listen, save those compliments for the young minister who took care of you while I was away—it will give him some incentive, some inducement, and some encouragement to go ahead and to develop; why, those compliments for us old duffers is just like pouring water on a duck's back." She replied: "Yes, parson, but the ducks, they like it."

The ducks—we all—like a compliment, and it doesn't cost us anything. Let's hand one out occasionally as we go along. I am told by a fine old gentleman, Mr. Ancil Basham, of Louisville, Ky., now in his late eighties, that some 60 years ago my father, Caroline's grandfather, made this statement: "It is never too soon to do a kindness because you never know how soon it will be too late." That is really something to think about. I appreciate very much this grand old gentleman's writing me and telling me about that phrase which my father had coined.

Don't ever let anybody tell you that you are living in terrible times in the atomic age. You ought to thank God that you were born when you were because all the world is looking to America today for leadership and for guidance. We are one of the few countries that are left that have freedom, decency, democracy, and Christianity—that haven't been gobbled up behind the Iron Curtain. Those poor people who are behind the Iron Curtain are looking, praying, and hoping that some day, somehow, praise God, America will show the way to those who have no freedom. How can we show the way, Jim? We can't show the way unless you youngsters who are coming on now will take over because the job is going to be yours. You graduates of high schools, and, later on, of college—it will be your job. You stand on the threshold of life—young, eager, able, and sincere, and you want to do a job. You have it within your power this minute to make it a good life, a decent life, and a better life—a Christian life, on the one hand, or you can make it a bad life, a sorry life, a miserable life—a complete failure, on the other hand. It is within your grasp. Your parents and your teachers have done all they can for you. You are just about to be on your own.

Remember one thing more, please. Kentucky is the second State in the Union to grant to you at the age of 18 the right of suffrage. Tomorrow is election day. I am not on the ballot and I thank the Lord that I am not because, as I say, I don't want to be accused in any way, shape, form, or manner of bringing in politics, but I do think that since you are about ready to cast your first vote, no matter whom you vote for, vote for somebody tomorrow. Please do that and always set aside and dedicate an election day as a memorial day to our forebears who at Valley Forge, Yorktown, and New Orleans fought and won for us our liberty—and for those fine young men and women who gave their all in World War I in St. Mihiel and the Argonne Forest—and for those brave young men and women in World War II who gave their lives at Guadalcanal, in Sicily, Italy, and at the Normandy beachhead, so that we could be free and could vote—and later on, in Korea, to the tune of a million casualties in blood and $200 billion in gold and in treasure in order to preserve and protect the integrity and the decency and the Christianity of this freedom that we have. Oh yes, we inherited it but we have to fight this day and age in order to preserve and protect it. Tomorrow, please go vote for somebody and, as I say, every election day, dedicate that day as a memorial to those who willingly gave their lives that we—you and I—may be free.

And now I want to take this opportunity, once again, to recap the five road signs: (1) Take the Lord into your confidence; (2) work hard; (3) don't hate anybody; (4) be honest, be fair—let your word be your bond; (5) be courteous and kind. If you observe these, I will certainly have no worries about your success.

I want you to know that this night has been for me a decided honor, a real privilege. It has been a real thrill to have been

able to come here to be with you on this occasion. In conclusion may I say—make friends and keep them always. As a lad, I learned this little poem:

"Making friends is a lot of fun,
Shaking hands with everyone,
Hearing what each has to say
As we meet them—day by day
Swapping smiles and trading cheer
Makes us happy while we're here
'Cause all the joy of life depends
Just on the art of making and keeping our friends."

I want to congratulate you for the splendid job that you have done and I hope and pray that the Master above who holds in the hollow of His hand the destiny of all men, all lodges, and all nations will keep you, that He will cause His face to shine upon you and give you peace, happiness, prosperity, contentment, long life, and success. Good luck. And may the Lord of Hosts bless you always.

Testimony of Cotton Industry Before Committee on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony of the cotton industry before the Committee on Agriculture:

MR. GATHINGS. Mr. J. P. Henican, Jr., New Orleans Cotton Exchange.

Mr. HENICAN. May I ask Mr. Knell, who is representing the New York Cotton Exchange, to come to the witness stand with me? We will give testimony for both exchanges.

Mr. GATHINGS. Both of you want to make a statement?

Mr. HENICAN. We will talk together.

STATEMENT OF J. P. HENICAN, JR., NEW ORLEANS COTTON EXCHANGE, NEW ORLEANS, LA., ACCOMPANIED BY FRANK J. KNELL, NEW YORK COTTON EXCHANGE, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. HENICAN. We of the cotton exchanges very definitely believe that this amendment will broaden the futures markets, and therefore make them more serviceable to the respective commodity industries.

Mr. Chairman, whereas I am president of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange, I am also a partner of Merrill, Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane, so I am interested in all commodities, other than cotton, but, having been born in New Orleans, my No. 1 commodity is cotton. I think I know it best.

As said, I am interested in all commodities, as a partner of Merrill, Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane, so what I believe of cotton I believe also of the other markets.

We think that this amendment is going to broaden the volume in the markets, and therefore make them more serviceable to the various commodities industries.

Mr. GATHINGS. The exchange will handle considerably more business, sir?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes; we think so, sir.

Mr. GATHINGS. What percentage increase in cotton will you anticipate?

Mr. HENICAN. That is very difficult to say, because I think it will depend entirely on the conditions in the market place at any particular time.

On that score, Mr. Chairman, there are 2 or 3 gentlemen here who represent cotton mills, and who would use the market under these conditions.

Mr. Emmett from Dan River Mills is here, Mr. Kirby from Dominion Textile Co., Canada, is here in the room, too, at the present time. Also, Mr. Robinson is here. He is the mill man representing the ACMI, American Cotton Manufacturers Institute.

Those people are vitally interested in the amendment, and make use of the markets on the basis suggested by the amendment. I think they are far more capable of intimately explaining to you how they will make use of these markets under the amendments.

I think it is very difficult to explain to you now how the volume will be increased, because it will depend on the conditions in the market place at any particular time.

Last October there was a 2-cent break in the cotton market. That break caused prices to go below the Government loan level. I think under those conditions we could say these people would have been in the futures market had they been allowed to do so. If this present amendment had been in effect, and if they had not been limited to a maximum of 30,000 bales of speculation.

I do not entirely agree with what Mr. Kauffman said about only a relatively small amount of organizations would be interested in this amendment because as the director of the commodity activities of Merrill Lynch, I receive frequent calls from people in the butter and egg business, for example, and in other commodities, that are investigating the possibility of pricing their commodities on an extended period.

They are not familiar with the present CEA Act and want to discuss it. When it is pointed out to them they are limited to certain positions in the market, they then do not go into the positions. I do not think that those kind of people consult with the CEA. Therefore, the CEA does not come in contact with those inquiries.

Mr. GATHINGS. We would like to hear from these individuals who are interested in this amendment. But we do not want to preclude either of you gentlemen from proceeding with your statement.

Mr. HENICAN. That is why we asked them to come, so you could hear them, as to the practical use of the proposed amendment.

Mr. GATHINGS. Do you want to ask any questions?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I would like to ask one question. How many cotton mills in the United States have a normal annual consumption of 30,000 bales or more?

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. ABERNETHY, frankly, I do not know the correct answer to that question. But as a rank guess, I would say in excess of 100 mills consumed or processed an excess of 30,000 bales annually.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Well, are there any?

Mr. HENICAN. Any?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes.

Mr. HENICAN. Well, certainly.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Have you any idea how many?

Mr. HENICAN. I think there might be in excess of 100.

Mr. ABERNETHY. There are a lot of them?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I did not think there were so many.

Mr. HENICAN. But you ask these gentlemen when you have them on the stand.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, would it be all right to put that question to the audience and see if anyone back there could give a direct answer to it?

Can anyone in the audience give us a direct answer to that question?

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. Robinson, how many cotton mills consume in excess of 30,000 bales of cotton a year?

Mr. ROBINSON. I was going to say 100 mills. That is a guess. I do not know. But there are numerous cotton mills, large enough to use 30,000 or more, that is, of bales.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Might we identify who the witness was that answered that question?

Mr. GATHINGS. Would you state your full name?

Mr. ROBINSON. Ralph S. Robinson, member of the cotton committee of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute.

Mr. GATHINGS. Thank you.

Mr. Robinson, you are an assistant to Mr. Jackson, are you?

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is the organization with which Mr. Robert Jackson is connected?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. ABERNETHY. One of my constituents, incidentally.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. MCINTIRE.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Henican, I was impressed with Mr. Kauffman's statement of the fact that if this bill were passed, this broadening of the trading area, that it would have to be encompassed somewhat by some regulation in order to keep it within bounds.

You mentioned that you are in charge of some of the commodity work of Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner and Beane, and that concern I am sure is known widely for its part in trading activities, and is a member of these exchanges, I am sure.

Mr. HENICAN. That is right.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Now, in representing clients who wish to trade in commodities, to what extent does a broker for a member, as Merrill Lynch, assume some responsibility in making sure that the client whom they are representing in the trading activity stays within the boundaries of the regulations laid down by CEA.

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. MCINTIRE, we do that very, very actively. In other words, as a partner of Merrill Lynch, I do not want to lose my capital and, therefore, I want to keep these positions in bounds and well margined, depending upon the credit ability of the client, or the integrity of the client, his history in the industry and so on.

And we do not want to take undue risks. So, therefore, even if it is General Motors that wants to buy unlimited number of contracts, for example, we would limit our risks. We would try to spread our risk and supervise it to that extent, very definitely so.

That is why I like to use the word that the processor or manufacturer will be allowed to buy a reasonable percentage of his year's requirements, or anticipatory requirements, a reasonable percentage.

What is that reasonable percentage? I think it will vary, depending on each individual organization. And I like to put it on a personal basis for each account, very definitely so.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Do you think that it is a moral obligation then that rests very heavily on the broker that they not permit their client to, participate in any trading activities that is in violation of the trading principles that surround that commodity on the Board?

Mr. HENICAN. Very definitely so; very definitely.

Mr. MCINTIRE. I am not acquainted with any provision of the law which perhaps penalizes that broker, but do you not think he ought to have some responsibility under the law that if he permits a client to violate the trading practices of board that should subject him to perhaps being thrown out as a client that that brokerage concern ought to bear some of that responsibility, too?

Mr. HENICAN. Very definitely, Mr. MCINTIRE, because the way I personally feel about it is that if I allow my client to violate the law the controlling exchange is coming back to me for the violation and I subject myself to suspension, expulsion, fines, and so on.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Would you have any objection, as you see this responsibility on the part of a broker, of the law providing that the broker should be suspended if they permit their client to do any such thing as that?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCINTIRE. You would be in accord with that?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Thank you.

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. McINTIRE, I am not going to allow any customer to buy an unreasonable amount, I mean to take an unreasonable market position on my books and to clear those contracts for him beyond his normal year's requirements or ability to finance, very definitely so. Merrill does not want that risk. I personally do not want that risk.

Mr. McINTIRE. I think that is a sound position. And thank you very kindly.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Do you feel that the language recommended by the Department improves the bill?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes; in substance. I have a disagreement on the question of liquidation. I recognize the fact that there are people who will purchase large amounts, possibly, to try to manipulate prices or influence prices to their own personal benefits. And, therefore, we have to provide safeguards to regulate or supervise those type of people. There is no doubt about that.

But, nevertheless, as a broker, I do not want to be too controlled as to liquidation, for example. You see, the proposed amendment says, "provided they liquidate in accordance with the provisions laid down by the CEA," the CEA Administrator.

For example, if there is a position in my books that is in financial difficulty, I do not want to have to go to Mr. Kauffman and have him say, "You can only liquidate under certain conditions." I want to get rid of that position as fast as I possibly can, to save my capital.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Let me put it this way: I can understand your position there.

Would you say that the language proposed by the Department is reasonable?

Mr. HENICAN. Generally reasonable; yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. But you would prefer the language of the bill?

Mr. HENICAN. No; I would not.

Mr. ABERNETHY. You would not?

Mr. HENICAN. No. I think we can go a little further than the language in bill H. R. 9333. I think we can go a little further than that for protection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. You say a little further—do you mean as far as the recommended amendment goes or even further than that?

Mr. HENICAN. No, no; than the original bill, H. R. 9333. We go further than that—than H. R. 9333—to give the CEA supervision. I recognize that the CEA must have certain supervisory authority to take care of people who do not play the game fair. I do not want to be too restricted about the restriction, because as I say, of financial difficulties that they may come into play. I do not want Mr. Kauffman to tell me how I must liquidate.

Mr. GATHINGS. Do the regulations now provide liquidation that you would be willing to work out with?

Mr. HENICAN. There are no restrictions in the present act.

Mr. GATHINGS. In the language here contained in this recommendation here would broaden the authority in the Department by using these words "that such purchases made and liquidated in conformity with such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe."

That is broader authority than they have today.

Mr. HENICAN. That is correct. I do not know of any restrictions that tells us how we have to liquidate under the present act.

Mr. KNELL. There are none at all.

Mr. HENICAN. None today.

Mr. ABERNETHY. But this would reach all of the act now—that amendment would; would it not?

Mr. HENICAN. I do not know. I am not an attorney. And, therefore, I do not know whether this applies to the whole act or only section "C."

Mr. HAGEN. It just applies to "C."

Mr. GATHINGS. It is an amendment to "C."

Mr. HENICAN. I would like to point out one thing.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Before you do that, may I go back and ask one question and then I will be through. I want to put to you the same question I put to Mr. Kauffman.

Is there any benefit in your opinion, directly or indirectly, for the consuming public in this legislation?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What is it? I am not trying to trap you.

Mr. HENICAN. No; I know that. Don't you think it might be advisable for me to forego that answer, because there are 2 or 3 men here who have the responsibility of acquiring raw materials for their factories and therefore for the public.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am perfectly agreeable to that.

Mr. HENICAN. Therefore, they are better able—they are experts in that line—they can tell you how they may be able to make sheets and pillow cases, et cetera, cheaper—

Mr. ABERNETHY. All right.

Mr. HENICAN. They are trying to acquire raw material every day. They live with it every day. And, therefore, I think they are more capable.

There is one thing I want to comment on. There has been a certain amount of fear, I think, indicated, that these large positions in the futures market might adversely affect the price from time to time. But it is factual that any of these people can acquire unlimited amounts of cotton in the form of actual cotton or actual grain without supervision, without any supervision whatever.

I think it would be better for them, better for the general market place, if they are allowed to acquire this with the supervision. Mr. Knell and I went through 2 or 3 rather bad experiences and Mr. ABERNETHY no doubt remembers what we refer to as the Jordan year when the price for cotton went down from 38 to 26.

At one time during that period we checked with all fo the brokers to determine whether or not the liquidation had been completed, and both of us slept that night because we were confident that the liquidation in the futures market had been completed, but the following morning when we arrived, there was about 300,000 bales of futures for sale that represented hedges against spot cotton that the banks had been financing that they wanted to protect.

We had not seen that 300,000 bales. We didn't see that position in the futures market. But it was there nevertheless. I think you made that point, sir, that it can be done now in spots. It cannot be done as conveniently or as easily as buying contracts but it can be done and these big positions can be accumulated in spots today without supervision and therefore unknown and unseen.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Knell, would you make your statement?

Mr. FRANK J. KNELL. There is one point that I would like to make in regard to differences between the Commodity Administration bill now proposed, and that proposed by yourself, H. R. 9333. I seem to feel that this provision that such purchases are made and liquidated in conformity with regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe may defeat the purpose that we are aiming at.

The question of accumulating any such line of long cotton or long commodities appears to have been approached on the idea that a mill or a spinner of any type is going into the market and is going to buy 50 or 100,000 bales at one swoop. That is not what we expect at all.

Some of the gentlemen who will testify will point out that their accumulations are arrived at piecemeal as the prices come to where they believe it reasonable to accept. And in liquidation it is much the same. When the price reaches a point where they feel that it is better for them to be in an even position in futures and take the spots, they are liquidated piecemeal.

It gives them a right to develop a position and if they need to hedge. It is very, very doubtful whether any such position is ever going to be liquidated in whole. And one of the big points that we are counting on in this, by allowing a spinner to take a position of this type, if he wants them to turn to spots, he can get a thousand bales from shipper "a" and a thousand from shipper "b" all around through the smaller trade, whereas, the assumption is made here that he is going to take 100,000 bales from one man.

Well, in that case he could only take it from a very large shipper and it would react against the small man. We hope that this proposal will protect the small shipper. And we hope that there is some middle ground that we can get to that if there must be regulations, those regulations will be clear that the mills know before they attempt to go into a position, and will not prevent them in their liquidation, because the liquidation is just as vital to them as the accumulation of the position.

Further than that, in section 4 (A) 3, you have paragraphs A and B, both of which I believe are controlled and regulated at the present time by the Commodity Exchange Administration.

This proposal as proposed in the bill would be section C and it seems that that would be on the same restriction and same control that the Commodity Exchange have today under "A" and "B."

So I wonder why the need of this last sentence at all.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Knell, you or Mr. Henican, presented me with a copy of a draft I would like the other members to see, that you are submitting to someone over in the Senate for introduction.

Mr. HENICAN. That is correct.

Mr. GATHINGS. Do you have a copy of that before you?

Mr. KNELL. Mr. Henican has.

Mr. HENICAN. Yes.

Mr. GATHINGS. This is the suggested bill that was to be introduced in the Senate?

Mr. HENICAN. That is right.

Mr. GATHINGS. Did you confer with the Department officials?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes; they have copies of that.

Mr. GATHINGS. They have seen this?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is this draft?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes.

Mr. GATHINGS. This is quite lengthy here. I wish you would point out the differences between the recommendation of the Department and this particular recommended draft.

Mr. HENICAN. I think that the intent is identical except that there is no provision that the Department will set up rules and regulations of how positions have to be liquidated. That is all. That is the only difference I see.

But the intent is exactly the same. The wording is maybe a little different but the intent is the same.

Mr. ABERNETHY. A casual glance at this indicates that what you are doing here, you write some regulations into the act itself. Is that right?

Mr. HENICAN. That is pretty clear.

Mr. GATHINGS. Requiring these reports. I wonder what Mr. Kauffman had to say about this. We did not discuss this with you when you were in the witness chair a while ago. I wonder what your feelings would be as to the effect of this?

Mr. KAUFFMAN. I think there will have to be some regulations obviously with respect to the operation of it. I received a copy of this draft, I presume it is the same, the one that you have, and it just occurred to

us that it would be better procedure to simply have the statute set forth the general principle and then have the Department promulgate regulations after conferring with the members of the trade concerned, rather than to try to spell out all of these details in the statute itself.

So for that reason we preferred the more general provision that is suggested in the Department's report of May 7.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Assuming you are not limited to the spelling out as it appears in this draft now before us, what is your opinion as to the contents of the draft but not limiting yourself to it?

Mr. KAUFFMAN. It looks all right to me; that is my curbstone opinion.

Mr. GATHINGS. Without the word "liquidation" being used?

Mr. KAUFFMAN. No; I was assuming that there would be regulations, that the Department would be required to promulgate regulations. I think there should be general regulations respecting the liquidation as well as the acquisition.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What you have said you say is a curbstone opinion, as you described it, you have approved of this language but you do not desire to be limited to it.

Mr. HENICAN. So far as it goes.

Mr. KAUFFMAN. That is correct.

Mr. HEIMBURGER. Mr. GATHINGS, I would just like to discuss this matter of liquidation with the gentlemen for a moment because I wonder if in arriving at their position, that liquidation does not need to be controlled, or probably, should not be controlled because they are not concentrating just a little bit on cotton, and forgetting some of the other or overlooking for the moment some of the other commodities that might be included and let us think specifically of oats where, I do not know, but I would just guess that in the oats business there are probably two or three manufacturers who use, let us say, a great proportion of the oats that goes into processed foods.

If we, by enacting this amendment, give these two or three persons or corporations the right to go into the futures market and make transactions, engage in them, which are far larger than those which can be assumed by any other trader in the market on a hedging position, do you not think that they ought to have some means of regulating the disposal of those blocks of contracts?

You assume, as I do, that in the normal course of business they will liquidate those things in an orderly manner as they conduct their business. But nevertheless, sometimes people do not always operate as we think they will or should, and if they have the perfect legal right for some reason or other to dump their entire holding overnight, it could be an upsetting factor, do you not think?

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. Heimburger, I think I admitted the fact that there are going to be people that don't play the game fair and they need to be regulated. We recognize that.

At the same time, I feel they are going to be in the minority, the great minority. They will be the exceptions. That the organizations that are going to make use of this amendment, are going to be the large national organizations that have a problem in acquiring their raw material and they consequently will conduct themselves in a very ethical manner.

It is beyond my imagination or belief that people I want to handle business for will do anything that is questionable by liquidation because if they go into a position and then, let us call it dump the position, they are going to defeat the purpose, the original purpose of why they went into the position.

Mr. HEIMBURGER. That is true, but it could conceivably be to their interest at the moment to defeat the original purpose, could it not?

Mr. HENICAN. Well, it is possible, yes. I don't think it is probable.

Mr. HEIMBURGER. No, neither do I. I agree with you that it is not probable and yet I am just questioning whether you believe it would be wise to remove all authority for the CEA to regulate liquidation. Perhaps it needs to be hedged and circumscribed. I just wonder if you believe it would be wise to give this unusual right to the trader without some corresponding power in the CEA to regulate the manner in which he exercises it.

Mr. HENICAN. I think I have admitted the necessity for supervision. I think possibly as Mr. Knell pointed out, maybe it did not strike you, but we are inclined to believe that the CEA has that power today in the act. It is in the act now. Now, as a broker, the CEA visits my office about on an average of once a year and if there are any unusual positions on my records they can go back to the principals to find out what it is all about. They are doing that now. And they have the right to make them liquidate if it is a violation.

So they possibly have that power right now in the present act.

Mr. HEIMBURGER. I certainly would not argue for a duplication of authority in this if there is adequate authority now in the act. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HAGEN. I want to ask a question that is probably quite aside from what you are talking about at the moment. But what elements in the cotton business, for example, normally engage in dealing in the futures starting with the man that grows the cotton.

Mr. HENICAN. The man that grows the cotton, the grower, the merchant, the shipper, the mill.

Mr. HAGEN. They all engage in futures operations?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir; for various reasons. And I think you could say the same thing about any other commodity.

Mr. HAGEN. Including co-ops which market cotton for their members?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir; the co-ops.

Mr. HAGEN. Are we going to hear from other elements in the cotton business on this bill?

Mr. GATHINGS. It has been widely announced last Friday and has had broad publicity as to the meeting of this committee and we do not want to deprive anyone from the privilege of testifying.

Mr. HENICAN. There is one other statement I would like to make. I think that this amendment is important also from a tax angle, because the courts have consistently ruled that where the positions are a legitimate hedge, a future transaction is a legitimate hedge, the results therefrom are considered as ordinary income and expense. But when it is considered as a speculative transaction it is then thrown into a category of a capital transaction, a long-term or short-term gain or loss. That is a problem for the accounting angle.

I do not think that point has been stressed enough. The famous case, of course, that Mr. Kauffman mentioned is the Corn Products case and there have been two conflicting court decisions in the Corn Product case.

One court said it was a hedge and the other court said it was not a hedge. I do not think that point can be stressed too forcibly, namely, the problem of taxes. I think these gentlemen whose function it is to acquire raw materials and price their raw materials for their principals will bring that point home as far as the taxes are concerned.

Mr. GATHINGS. I think so.

Are there any other questions?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think Mr. Kauffman came to his feet back there just now to say something.

Mr. KAUFFMAN. If I may be permitted, I would like to make one observation with respect to my comments on the draft which I understand Mr. Henican left with you as a possible substitute draft. That is, that draft applies not only to processors and manufacturers but also to distributors. That is a very important difference which I overlooked.

Mr. HENICAN. No. May I correct you? That has been eliminated.

Mr. KAUFFMAN. In the draft I have before me that is in there. We never had any showing with respect to the need of distributors. I would not want to even give informal approval to legislation affecting the distributors as distinguished from processors and manufacturers.

Mr. GATHINGS. Thank you. Distributing should be deleted in (C), line 3.

Mr. HENICAN. That was eliminated.

May I also make this observation, Mr. GATHINGS. That is, I think that the exchanges and the two gentlemen from the CEA see eye to eye on this whole thing. I think we are in agreement on the spirit and intent of what should be done. We are only about just a short distance apart on the question of this supervision; that is all. It is only a degree.

Actually, I think we recognize the necessity for supervision but the degree of supervision is questionable.

Mr. KNELL. The degree of supervision of acquiring the position.

Mr. HENICAN. And liquidation.

Mr. KNELL. The question I raise is mostly as to liquidation.

Mr. HENICAN. I think you asked Mr. Kauffman why the Senate turned down a similar proposal to amend the act some years ago. This is the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second District decision in the Corn Products case, that was handed down on April 13, 1956. Giving the legislative history of it it says this:

"An amendment introduced in the Senate by Senator Murphy to the bill which became the Commodity Exchange Act would have enlarged the definition of hedging so as to permit manufacturers and millers to buy futures in anticipation of futures manufacturing of milling requirements, even though they had no present offsetting sales. The amendment was opposed 'for the reason that it extends the power to hedge far beyond the definition contained in the original act.' "

Of course, that is what we want to do. We want to broaden the definition in the original act.

He also quotes Mr. Mehl who was the predecessor of Mr. Kauffman at the CEA, "Mr. Mehl, the Assistant Chief of the Grain Futures Administration, explained that the present definition 'of course, is not broad enough to cover the purchase of futures material against anticipated sales of a packaged good goods.' "

(Off the record.)

Mr. GATHINGS. It is 18 minutes to 12. How long would it take these representatives of the manufacturers?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is their testimony more or less in line? They might be seated at the table at the same time.

Mr. GATHINGS. That might be well.

Mr. EMMERT. My name is A. B. Emmert. I am vice president of Dan River Mills at Danville, Va.

Mr. KIRBY. My name is Q. B. Kirby, from Dallas, Tex., president of the Howard Cotton Co. The Howard Cotton Co. is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Dominion Textile Co. of Montreal, Canada. The Dominion Textile Co. probably manufactures 50 percent, slightly more than 50 percent, of the cotton goods made in Canada.

Mr. ROBINSON. My name is Ralph S. Robinson, member of the cotton committee of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc.

Mr. GATHINGS. Would you care to make the first statement?

* * * * *

Mr. GATHINGS. Are there any questions?

I just wondered now if we could not adjourn over until 10 in the morning and come back here then. Has anyone indicated to you, Mr. Kauffman, that they would like to be heard other than this? What about the oats people and wheat people?

Mr. KAUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the language of the bill would apply to all commodities, I should think that the grain exchanges would undoubtedly be interested in it.

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. KAUFFMAN. I say grain because they are the Chicago board of trade, particularly, which is the largest grain-futures market.

Of course, Kansas City board of trade and Minneapolis grain exchange rank second and third in grain futures.

Mr. GATHINGS. I think we want to hear from the grain folks, by all means.

Mr. HENICAN. In that respect, sometime ago I prepared what I thought was an explanation of the proposed amendment that maybe the Congressmen of the committee could use. I would like to offer it for the record.

May I offer this for the record?

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Supplemental to your testimony.

"EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT

"At the present time the Commodity Exchange Act defines a 'hedge transaction' as:

" 'Sales of any commodity for future delivery on or subject to the rules of any board of trade to the extent that such sales are offset in quantity by the ownership or purchase of the same cash commodity or, conversely, purchases of any commodity for future delivery on or subject to the rules of any board of trade to the extent that such purchases are offset by sales of the same cash commodity.'

"The definition is the classical dictionary one. It is very narrow and in the opinion of well informed persons, who are students of the Commodity Futures Markets, should be broadened. It is the thought that, if the definition is broadened to make possible the use of 'anticipatory hedges' by processors or manufacturers, the Commodity Futures Markets will become more liquid and thereby be of more service to those who make use of them for hedge purposes.

"An 'anticipatory hedge' may be defined as to the purchase of a commodity futures contract in lieu of the raw commodity by an organization 'in anticipation' of its processing or manufacturing requirements during a stated period in the future.

"Thus, for example, the cotton mill that processes raw cotton bales into sheets, pillowcases, etc., and has on the average of the past 5 years consumed 300,000 bales of raw cotton per year, would be granted the privilege of purchasing cotton futures contracts against a reasonable percentage of 300,000 bales to be consumed during the year 'in anticipation' of purchasing its raw material requirements. Under the present act, such purchases of futures contracts would be considered as a speculation, simply because the cotton mill does not have, at the time of purchase of the futures contract, firm fixed sales of processed goods in equivalent quantity to offset the purchases of futures contracts.

"More frequently than otherwise, the cotton mill is quite satisfied with the prevailing price of raw cotton and, if it were possible, would purchase its full season's requirements at a given time at given prices. It generally is not possible to acquire a full season's requirements, at any given time, of raw cotton. Either the farmer has not harvested his crop, or the merchants or shippers do not have the particular quantities in inventory.

"In contrast, however, the commodity futures markets are a daily continuous trading affair, in which large quantities of contracts are bought and sold. Under ordinary circumstances, the cotton mill would be able to purchase sufficient futures contracts to hedge its 'anticipated season's requirements' and later to convert those contracts into the actual raw bales of cotton.

"Such a transaction is not a speculation, but sound business. It is exactly the opposite of speculation because it will allow the cotton mill to anticipate its season's requirements at prices assuring a reasonable margin of profit between the raw and finished goods and at a time when it would not be possible to acquire the actual raw bales in the quantities desired.

"Under the present act, a cotton processor is allowed to maintain a maximum of 30,000 bales in any position in any cotton futures market without having an offsetting sales commitment. The maximum of 30,000 bales is a statutory limitation. As said, the act is not sufficiently broad in this respect, and further such positions are designated as 'speculative positions.'

"The differential between 'speculative positions' and 'anticipatory hedge positions' is most important from an accounting angle. The Internal Revenue Department has consistently contended that a processor who purchases commodity futures contracts without an offsetting sales commitment, is speculating and that therefore the results from such speculative positions are considered for taxes as capital gains or losses. In contrast, however, Internal Revenue has consistently held that the results from 'hedge transactions,' be considered as 'ordinary income and expense.'

"Recently the Second Circuit Court of Appeals has held that the corn futures contracts purchased by a corn processor, despite the fact that there were no firm offsetting sales commitments, were an 'anticipatory hedge' and part of its actual inventory. The relationship of the raw and futures corn markets were so intimately related, and because the function of the particular organization was exclusively that of processing raw corn, there could be no differentiation between the raw and futures contracts as inventory, said the court. Thus, a United States court has for the first time given recognition to an 'anticipatory hedge' as a legitimate futures market transaction, and has taken it out of the speculative category.

"The necessity to differentiate between a speculative and anticipatory transaction is essential.

"1. Because of taxes.

"2. Because certain organizations will not and do not enter into transactions in violation of the laws, although on frequent occasions in the past the purchase of commodity futures contracts under certain conditions would have proven sound business.

"What has been said above about the cotton mill processor applies to all other raw commodity processors; the flour mill; the processor of cereals from grains; the refiner of vegetable oils making shortening, margarine, salad and cooking oils, etc.

"Such an amendment would also be of assistance to the processor-distributor type of organization.

"For example, a large distributor of food at either wholesale or retail who, over a stated period will distribute through retail or wholesale stores 1,000 carloads of eggs or butter, or 5 million pounds of coffee, and so forth. Under certain conditions the processor-distributor would find it profitable to acquire the full period requirements, when available, at a given price in either the raw state or through purchases of contracts in the commodity futures markets. Presently such is not allowed under the act because there are statutory limitations as to position, which are generally very small, and further such positions are now considered as speculative, with all the implications above.

"Some may contend that the accumulation of large positions in the commodity futures markets by processors or manufacturers will cause wide and unnecessary price gyrations. First, when the positions are acquired prices would be forced to high levels and, later, when the positions are liquidated prices would be forced to low levels.

"When such positions are acquired, the reason for their acquisition is because of certain circumstances prevailing as to the attractive level of prices, availability of quantities, etc. Should there be an utter disregard of sound business practices in the acquisition of these positions, the reason for them will have been eliminated. It is most unreasonable to assume that a processor who desires to initiate such a position will conduct his activities in a manner that would unduly advance prices. Such an advance of prices would eliminate the sound reason for such a position.

"In contrast, a processor holding an anticipatory position, that is with the ownership of a large quantity of futures contracts, would not endeavor to liquidate them in a manner that would unduly depress prices. Rather, the liquidation would be based on the acquisition of the equivalent raw commodity. Because it is rarely possible to acquire, for example, 300,000 bales of spot cotton in 1 block and at 1 price, the position in futures contracts would not be liquidated by indiscriminately selling 300,000 bales of futures contracts. Rather, the 300,000 bales of raw cotton would be acquired in small blocks—500 to 1,000 bales at a time—and the long futures contracts liquidated in the equivalent quantities, which certainly would not have an appreciable effect on the prices for the futures contracts.

"Neither the acquisition of an anticipatory position nor its liquidation will be handled in a manner to cause undue gyrations of prices by established nationally known organizations which are the organizations most likely to take advantage of such operations.

"In addition, the amendment proposed provides that such organizations which would use the anticipatory hedge must justify the reason for the positions through detailed reports to the Commodity Exchange Authority, and under the present law the CEA has full power of investigation and supervising such positions.

"Finally and most important these anticipatory hedge positions will be of considerable benefit to producers and farmers, because they would tend to stabilize prices at a time when stabilization is urgently needed. It is most likely that processors or manufacturers would take anticipatory positions only when prices of the raw commodity are considered by them to be cheap in relation to the prevailing finished-goods prices or when the difference in prices between the raw material and the finished goods assures them a reasonable margin of profit. Thus this buying of commodity futures contracts by processors or manufacturers in anticipation of their season's requirements would most likely develop at a time when prices were under pressure and declining, and at a time when such a demand is urgently needed. In contrast, it is not likely that the positions will be liquidated only as the equivalent raw material has been acquired or when prices are advancing, thus again offering the possibility of a stabilizing influence. The producer or farmer because of these positions will thus greatly benefit through these stabilizing influences."

Mr. GATHINGS. I wish that Mr. Henican would come forward and answer some questions.

Now, Mr. Henican, at the close of yesterday's session you submitted a brief, Explanation of Proposed Amendments.

Now, in that explanation you have given us the difference between speculative hedging and anticipatory hedging.

STATEMENT OF J. P. HENICAN, JR., NEW ORLEANS COTTON EXCHANGE, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mr. HENICAN. Yes.

Mr. GATHINGS. I wish that you would explain the difference between speculative hedging and anticipatory hedging.

Mr. HENICAN. It might take me 2 years to do that, Mr. Congressman. I do not think there is such a transaction as speculative hedging. I think there is a speculative market position, but there is no such thing as speculative hedging, in my dictionary.

As to anticipatory hedging: the processor, or manufacturer, when he starts a year or a session is actually short of his raw material, even though he has not a written fixed-price sale. A national organization that has been in business for many years is going to process and manufacture a certain volume of raw material, so when he begins his season, or his fiscal year, he is actually short a certain percentage of raw material. This amendment is to allow him to acquire a percentage of his normal requirements—average requirements, by buying commodity futures contracts.

Mr. GATHINGS. I just wonder whether or not the actual goods would have to be in being.

Mr. HENICAN. I do not think so. In the matter that we quoted yesterday with regards to the Corn Products Co. Over a series of many years their economists had only a 5-percent error in forecasting their annual average requirements of raw material even though there were no sales made at the time the forecast was made; consequently I think it is possible in these large national organizations for either the vice president in charge of purchases, or the vice preseident in charge of sales, or the economist, or the board of directors to pretty well forecast how much finished goods they are going to process and manufacture and distribute during the year. So, on that basis they can then estimate how much raw material they are going to have to acquire.

Mr. GATHINGS. Can you not do that under the present law?

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir.

Mr. GATHINGS. You cannot anticipate?

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir. You must have a fixed commitment, a sales commitment in order to be long of futures contracts. As Mr. Kauffman and Mr. Bagnell explained yesterday, you must have a fixed commitment to buy beyond a certain number of cotton contracts, or require a certain number of contracts in the futures market; otherwise the position is considered a speculative position in the market, not a speculative hedge. I think a national organization that has been in business for a considerable period of time, that has had that experience in the past, knows the average they handle. As Mr. Kirby said yesterday, 200,000 bales of cotton a season. Unless we have a very deep depression in 1957, the Dominion Textile Co. is going to process around 200,000 bales of cotton. Therefore, when they start in 1957 they are theoretically short of approximately 200,000 bales of raw cotton. They want the opportunity when it presents itself, even though they do not have fixed sales on the opposite side, to take advantage of that opportunity, either in the futures market, or the spot market. They can do it in the spot market now, but they have not been able to do it in the futures market, which eliminated a certain amount of flexibility.

Mr. GATHINGS. Just try to explain to a layman how this thing works.

Mr. HENICAN. Let us go back to October 3, 1955, when we had a rather drastic decline in cotton prices. There is no use trying to decide why they declined, but they did. Cotton prices in the futures market were considerably below the Government loan at the lowest of the decline. Now, if one believed that the Government loan was going to continue, he had to assume that prices would eventually come back to the Government-loan level and that, therefore, they were at a discount under what the largest buyer in the world would pay for cotton—the United States Government.

Mr. GATHINGS. In dealing with these contracts you would have to figure whether it was going to be 90 percent of parity or 82½ percent, and so forth?

Mr. HENICAN. The percentage of parity loan had already been established and announced. The Department of Agriculture had already announced a 90-percent support program as of August 1, which support program was good for the balance of that season.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is right.

Mr. HENICAN. So the facts were known when prices declined on October 3, 1955.

As I say, the prices on the New York and New Orleans Cotton Exchanges at the lowest of the decline, that temporary decline, were about 2 cents to 4 cents under the 90-percent support loan as announced by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. GATHINGS. For what month?

Mr. HENICAN. All months, practically all months.

Now, why did they go down? Your opinion is as good as mine. I think they were trying to anticipate a change in the program and a change in conditions.

Mr. GATHINGS. What effect did that have on the New Orleans Exchange in transactions handled?

Mr. HENICAN. Let us go back to your question. If the cotton mill that processes, say, 200,000 bales had sales with no raw materials, it could, under the present law, buy futures at that discount to cover its short position, and that would be a legitimate hedge. Assuming that it had no sales, it was prevented from taking advantage of that discount in price. There was no provision in the present law for an anticipatory hedge. If this amendment had been in effect, the cotton mill could have bought futures contracts at that discount under the Government loan in anticipation of the percentage of its requirements for the balance of the season. It could have taken advantage of that decline in price.

Mr. GATHINGS. What would that mean now to the producer of cotton and the stabilization of the price of cotton?

Mr. HENICAN. I think, Mr. GATHINGS, had this provision been operative, it is possible that we would not have had the decline to the extent we did at that time, because those buying orders for the account of anticipatory hedges would have been in the market place, and they might have prevented some of it, maybe not all of it, in my opinion. I personally contacted during those days—and there were 2 or 3 days of that decline—many mills, pointing out to them the cheapness, in my opinion, of the futures contracts as compared to the Government loan.

Mr. GATHINGS. As a matter of fact, you advised purchases?

Mr. HENICAN. I advised purchases, but the mills said they could not enter into the purchases because they did not have a legitimate hedge. They had nothing sold and therefore it would be a speculation on their part. However, if this amendment had been in effect, I think that a fair percentage of those whom I contacted would have purchased contracts that day and would have offset some of the selling that developed and therefore would have tended to stabilize the price to the benefit of the producer.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Henican, what happened to spots on those days?

Mr. HENICAN. Spots went down but not as much.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Did the millowners move in and buy spots?

Mr. HENICAN. I think that some did during that period, yes.

Do not forget, we are trading in futures contracts that endeavor to discount what is going to happen in the future, so therefore, futures are probably more sensitive to developments than the immediate spot price is.

There was a question asked of Mr. Kauffman about initiation and liquidation of these positions about which I would like to comment. We who are executives of exchanges want the positions to be initiated and also liquidated in as orderly and in as businesslike manner as possible, because we are very conscious of the fact that when there are unusual fluctuations we are subject to public criticism, congressional investigation, and so forth. We want these positions to be entered into and liquidated in as sound a manner as possible. We at the exchanges are going to see to it, or attempt to see to it, that that is done.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Henican, what kind of requirements does the New Orleans Cotton Exchange set up for those traders who go on your board and do business? What do you have? How do you become a member? How are you going to operate in the New Orleans Exchange?

Mr. HENICAN. How do you become a member of the New Orleans Exchange?

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes.

Mr. HENICAN. We require an application for membership, a formal written application to become a member. The candidate appears before the membership committee and he must meet certain financial requirements.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is what I am getting at.

Mr. HENICAN. The application is screened by the membership committee through the usual banking circles, credit information bureaus, and so forth. The application must be endorsed and approved by two members in good standing who also appear before the membership committee to verify for the financial and moral integrity of the applicant.

Mr. GATHINGS. How often does your membership committee change in its composition?

Mr. HENICAN. I think most of the exchanges operate in the same way. We try to have overlapping members of the committee so that the policy and the customs and the habits are continued for 25 to 50 years.

Mr. GATHINGS. Do you get a Dun & Bradstreet report on these applicants?

Mr. HENICAN. We get a Dun & Bradstreet report, a banking report, and a recommendation from 2 or 3 outstanding people in the cotton industry from the local communities. For example, if there is an application from Dallas, we communicate with members of our exchange in the Dallas cotton market and ask their opinion of the candidate. We try to maintain very high ethics and standards.

Mr. GATHINGS. You know these people. You are going to know whom you are dealing with?

Mr. HENICAN. That is pretty much of an unwritten rule of our exchange, though it is not in the books. The two individuals who endorse the applicant or the application of the new member, it is presumed know the applicant. One of the questions that the chairman of the membership committee asks the endorser is, "How long have you known this candidate?"

Mr. GATHINGS. How many actual members do you have?

Mr. HENICAN. We have 331 members in the New Orleans Cotton Exchange.

Mr. GATHINGS. How many did you have 10 years ago?

Mr. HENICAN. About 400.

Mr. GATHINGS. Your requirements are more strict, or stringent?

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir; they are approximately the same. We are trying to maintain

the same high standards. The membership has declined on the New York Cotton Exchange as well as on the New Orleans Cotton Exchange because we have not had a profitable volume of business due to the interference of the Government loan programs. We are in a squeeze.

Mr. GATHINGS. If you get this legislation passed, it is going to broaden out operations and you will get more business?

Mr. HENICAN. We hope that it might lead to some broadening in the market place; yes.

Mr. GATHINGS. What does a seat cost now?

Mr. HENICAN. In the New Orleans Cotton Exchange we have no seats. We are a corporation just like General Motors. When you join the New Orleans Cotton Exchange you must own a share of stock in the corporation.

Mr. GATHINGS. One share?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes.

Mr. GATHINGS. How much is it?

Mr. HENICAN. The present market value on that stock is about $800. That gives you an interest in all the assets of the corporation. The assets of the corporation presently consist of the building with no mortgage and cash in the bank.

Mr. GATHINGS. How often do you change your members on the board of directors?

Mr. HENICAN. Usually every 2 years. It has been customary to elect a president and a board of directors for 2 years, 1 year, and a continuation for the second year if they behave. There is usually an overlapping of directors.

Mr. GATHINGS. You have a sort of a closed fraternity, do you not?

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir.

Mr. GATHINGS. How many applications do you ordinarily receive in the course of a year?

Mr. HENICAN. I am not posted on that figure. I can tell you what the record has been since the 1st of December when I took office as president of the exchange. We have had 8 new members and we have had 4 resignations of members since the 1st of December 1955.

Mr. GATHINGS. Have you ever expelled a member because of his bad financial standing or for any other reason?

Mr. HENICAN. For bad financial standing and bad business practice, attempting to manipulate markets, manipulate prices—anything they may have done that is not a good business practice. Yes, we have.

Mr. GATHINGS. Under your charter just how is he expelled?

Mr. HENICAN. I think that it is pretty well spelled out. We have what we call a business conduct committee that supervises the conduct of members. If there is a charge made by a member that another member is not conducting himself with proper ethics, the business conduct committee considers it. The member charged has the right of appeal and then he has further recourse to the board of directors.

Mr. MCINTIRE. All trading on the floor must be performed by members of the exchange?

Mr. HENICAN. At public outcry?

Mr. MCINTIRE. They operate on their own behalf as traders, trading members, and as representing customers in the capacity of broker?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes. There are 2 or 3 categories of members. Those whom we call ring traders, who trade for their own account in and out; then there are those who arbitrate between the various markets; that is, if the prices are out of line in Liverpool, Bombay, or New York as compared to New Orleans. Then there are those who perform dual functions representing customers and trading for their own accounts, and finally like my own firm, Merrill Lynch, we only handle customers accounts. We act exclusively as brokers. We do not take any position for our own account.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Do the rules require that all margins and everything must be paid on the date of the transaction, or what lines of credit are extended to participating members?

Mr. HENICAN. Not only participating members. Under our rules, brokers are also allowed to extend a credit accommodation up to $10,000 based on $5 per bale against legitimate hedge transactions to cotton-trade accounts, members or nonmembers. In extending credit we are required to have a hedge certificate from the principal stating that any contracts that they enter in the market represent legitimate hedge transactions, but for Bill Brown, or Joe Smith, speculator, who may be an attorney or a doctor, he must deposit original margins within a reasonable time.

Mr. MCINTIRE. What is interpreted by the board as a reasonable time?

Mr. HENICAN. I'd say that a reasonable time is by the close of the market the next afternoon.

Mr. MCINTIRE. In other words, the following day?

Mr. HENICAN. The next afternoon, yes.

Mr. MCINTIRE. If that happens to be the last day of the week, it would be on the next opening day?

Mr. HENICAN. Monday. In addition to that, we have just recently passed rules stating that margin funds must be "readily available." We have a practice that developed whereby customers would mail a check from a very distant point and it would not reach us for 2 or 3 days. It would be on a local bank and when we sent it back for collection it would take another 2 or 3 days. Now we say that customers have to make funds readily available and within a reasonable time.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Your trading rules do not permit one to come in in the morning and trade all day and close out at night without putting up any money?

Mr. HENICAN. Not necessarily.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Not necessarily, but is that permitted to be done?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes. I think some brokers do it. Merrill Lynch does not do it in all instances. It depends upon the financial responsibility of the individual. In your case, Mr. Congressman, you do not have to put up margins right away and you can give it to me this afternoon. But in my case I put it up ahead of time. My financial condition is not as good as yours.

Mr. MCINTIRE. I think the record should show that I do not trade.

Mr. HENICAN. O. K., sir.

Mr. GATHINGS. Now, the exchange is well fitted and able to handle these credit transactions?

Mr. HENICAN. Credit is a question of each individual broker, not the exchange.

Mr. GATHINGS. Let me ask you this: What regulations of the department would cover credit transactions?

Mr. HENICAN. Of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes.

Mr. HENICAN. I think they have no regulations covering credit. That is an exchange matter.

Mr. GATHINGS. Solely an exchange matter, and as far as I know, it never has been questioned.

Mr. HENICAN. I think so. Three or four years ago there was an attempt. Somebody introduced a bill to give the CEA control over margins and credit, but it was thrown out. I recall coming here and testifying against it.

Mr. MCINTIRE. On that point, you were dealing with two different things, you were dealing with margins and you were dealing with credit.

Mr. HENICAN. Yes.

Mr. MCINTIRE. And the bill that you referred to permitted the CEA to regulate margins as well as credit?

Mr. HENICAN. Right. Mr. Kauffman and Mr. Badnell can answer that.

Mr. KAUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Commodity Exchange Act confers no authority with respect to margin requirements. The point at which the Commodity Exchange Act confers any jurisdiction with respect to margins is after they are deposited with the broker. The statute requires that the broker must treat and deal with customer's funds and equities as belonging to the customer, he may not commingle them with his own funds, and he must use the funds deposited by customers for the benefit of the customers and not for the purpose of extending credit to customer B. But as to the amount of margin that is deposited, the statute is silent and confers no jurisdiction whatever.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is not being considered here at all, and I do not want to raise the issue. I just wanted to get Mr. Henican's view. I just wanted to determine in my own mind how the exchange operated.

Mr. HENICAN. I agree with the statement you made yesterday that Mr. Kauffman and Mr. Bagnell and the personnel at the CEA had done an outstanding job. They have been very cooperative with the exchanges. I personally would have been satisfied with the language they proposed in the amendment yesterday if I thought Mr. Kauffman and Mr. Bagnell would be there for life. I do not know who is going to follow them and how the man who follows is going to interpret the amendment. We want that slightly clearer explanation to satisfy some of the people who feel the same way about it. If I could be assured that these gentlemen would be the heads of the CEA as long as I am alive, I would be satisfied to take their wording of the amendment. Exchanges can operate with these two gentlemen and have operated with them, and as far as I am personally concerned, we want them there.

Mr. GATHINGS. Thank you. I read your explanation of the proposed amendment. I wonder if you would, in different language, give us an explanation in a few words.

Mr. HENICAN. I thought that I pretty well covered it before. It would be much easier if you would ask the questions.

Mr. GATHINGS. I wish that you would explain to the committee what benefits would accrue with respect to income taxes if anticipatory hedges are permitted as contained in this amendment.

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. GATHINGS, I think the courts have pretty consistently ruled that the monetary results from a legitimate hedge transaction represent ordinary income and expense, but they have also ruled that the results from a speculative position in the market represent a capital transaction. A processor, or manufacturer that has a speculative position in the market really has two accounting systems, one for capital gains or losses and one for ordinary income and expense. As Mr. Emmert, of Dan River Mills, said yesterday, by eliminating that speculative result, or the capital gain result, and recognizing it is as ordinary income or expense, it would either reduce the cost or increase the cost of his raw cotton. Naturally, he thinks it will reduce the cost of his raw cotton by so handling it that way. That is one of the reasons why on October 3, 1955, some of the people that I personally contacted did not want to buy contracts at that time, even though the price appeared very attractive, because they would say, "That is a speculation." The results would be a capital gain or loss as far as our accounting is concerned. It would not be ordinary income and expense as the courts have recognized the results from a legitimate hedge transaction.

Mr. GATHINGS. I wonder what the Bureau of Internal Revenue would think about this matter? What would be your view on that?

Mr. HENICAN. We have consulted with them on it. What do you think, Frank?

Mr. GATHINGS. I asked whether the Internal Revenue Bureau has been consulted about this amendment, and what they think of it.

Mr. KNELL. Well, I think that it is a confusing tax matter that we are trying to avoid rather than an evasion. It is a clarification of handling taxes that we are seeking.

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. GATHINGS, I will make this observation: In all the tax decisions I have reviewed as to the commodity futures markets, the Judge has gone right back to the Commodity Exchange Act for his answer to the problem.

In other words, in this Corn Products case that we quoted yesterday, the Judge quoted the definition of a hedge in the present act and then commented that the transaction involved was not a hedge—that it was an anticipatory hedge which is not recognized in the act.

If the act is amended to include this, I think the Internal Revenue Bureau will recognize it because, as I say, in all the tax cases that I have read that have to do with results from commodity market activities, the Judge has referred to the Commodity Exchange Act for his answer.

Mr. GATHINGS. Let us get back to the operations of the exchange. What are the benefits of an anticipatory future contract to a producer or to a shipper or to a cotton factor or to a manufacturer? I wonder if you would give us in a few words just what would be the benefits which would accrue.

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. GATHINGS, you have to eliminate the first three categories which you mention because this does not cover a producer, a shipper nor a factor. It only covers a processor and a manufacturer.

Mr. GATHINGS. All right.

Mr. HENICAN. It allows him to anticipate his normal or average season's requirements of raw materials. The other three categories are not involved at all.

Mr. GATHINGS. The testimony yesterday was to the effect that——

Mr. HENICAN. We think that because the processor and manufacturers are allowed to acquire these contracts in anticipation of the raw material which they need, that their activities will indirectly help the others by stabilizing prices, but the other three categories will not be able to use the markets under this amendment.

Mr. GATHINGS. I believe it was stated yesterday that all segments of the cotton industry are interested in going in there and buying these futures.

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir.

Mr. GATHINGS. Is not that right?

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir; only the processors and manufacturers.

Mr. GATHINGS. I will have to get that record and see just what they said.

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir; that is right.

Mr. MCINTIRE. I am not sure that I have this clearly in mind. Without this legislation the average mill buyer is faced with the fact that he can go into the futures market and purchase up to 30,000 bales of cotton and any purchases beyond that have got to be shown that they have fixed sales or else it is considered speculative?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Now, if they want to go beyond that, they are perfectly at liberty to go to the spot market and buy as much spot cotton as they want?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCINTIRE. But a large consumer of cotton, if he considers going into the spot market to cover his needs to any substantial degree, finds himself faced with the problem of dealing with holders of cotton who may not want to deal in the quantities in which that manufacturer normally wishes to deal in on the spot market?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCINTIRE. If he were to press for that position in the spot market, he would likely be required to divide his total desire for purchases into a number of transactions with a number of individual holders of cotton in order to avoid what might be a premium if he were to place that order with one substantial holder who did not want to sell that much cotton?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCINTIRE. This legislation would provide a vehicle of relief to him in that situation whereby he could move in on the futures market and accomplish that same objective and thereby naturally improve the volume of transactions on the futures board in which you are interested and would also provide for him a vehicle of avoiding the situation of paying premiums to cover himself on the spot market. Is that about what it would be?

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. MCINTIRE, you made a misstatement. You said you did not understand the amendment. I do not see how I could describe it more perfectly. Your explanation is absolutely perfect.

Mr. GATHINGS. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. GATHINGS. I wonder if you would not follow through on a transaction which will furnish to us some additional information on this matter? I would like to have you take a hypothetical case and show us just how it is going to work out when initiated as well as when liquidations will take effect. I wish you would explain that.

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. GATHINGS, in answering your request, I am now thinking in terms of Mr. Kirby's statement of yesterday to the committee. I think he had made a very good explanation. So let's start. For example, the board of directors of a cotton mill decides that they are going to process through the next year 200,000 bales of cotton and they decide that the demand for goods is going to be such and the textile prices are going to be such that they can afford to pay 30 cents a pound for their raw material. Therefore they instruct Mr. Kirby that as soon as possible, or when market conditions will justify it, to buy 200,000 bales of cotton at 30 cents per pound or lower.

The mill buyer, Mr. Kirby, immediately gets busy and contacts all his sources of supply—the merchants, Mr. POAGE, of Dallas, Houston, or Muleshoe, Tex., or any market place else like that—and he buys some spot cotton, but he only buys a very small percentage of the 200,000 bales.

In the meantime the futures market is at or below the equivalent of 30 cents per pound. So in order to cover himself, he buys futures contracts up to whatever is allowed under the law, with the purpose of fixing the cost of his raw materials. In other words, the directors have said to him, "We think the goods markets are going to be such that we can buy raw cotton, process it, and make a profit on the basis of 30 cents a pound for our raw material." However, when buying futures contracts, that is done with the intent of eventually converting those futures contracts into spot cotton.

After the contracts are acquired Mr. Kirby is still contacting all the merchants, spot brokers, and f. o. b. people, as well as producers in the State of Texas, and is looking for the specific quality of cotton that he wants. Hence, as he acquires the quality of cotton required, he liquidates the equivalent in the futures market.

I do not think it is going to be possible for that processor or manufacturer to buy 100,000 bales of cotton in any one spot, not even from our mutual friends, Mr. POAGE, or Anderson-Clayton & Co., except at a premium. So he looks around and he buys it from several or many small merchants, shippers, farmers, and so on, in medium-sized lots.

As I say, as he acquires spot cotton he then liquidates his futures.

I cannot believe in this ghost that some talk about, that the futures position, once acquired, is going to be recklessly liquidated. I cannot believe that 100,000 bales of futures, for example, is going to be recklessly dumped on the market, because that would defeat the entire purpose of the transaction, in my opinion, and that it, therefore, is going to be liquidated in an orderly manner.

As these small blocks of spot cotton are acquired the comparable amounts of futures will be liquidated in an orderly manner.

Mr. GATHINGS. But only a small percentage of these contracts will be delivered upon; is that right?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes; because with regard to deliveries against futures contracts, 100 years ago trading in futures contracts evolved as the best method of doing business that was to be consummated at a future time. The trading has been substantially the same through this 100 years. There have been refinements. It should be perfectly obvious that I as a buyer of contracts cannot buy 1 grade and 1 staple or 1 quality of wheat or 1 quality of corn or the 1 quality of any other commodity, because nature may not have given us that quality during that growth year.

However, as trading in these contracts evolved, they allowed delivery of a range of grades and staples or a range of quality so there would not be a squeeze, and so that there would not be an undue manipulation of prices. Thus a range of qualities are deliverable. It should be perfectly obvious that if I have in mind a particular quality when buying a futures contract, it is possible that it will not be delivered because it is not convenient for the seller to deliver it. He may not have that particular quality; that particular quality might not have been produced that particular year. But, deliveries are allowed of a wide range of qualities on the basis of premiums and discounts. The best quality or the better qualities are deliverable at a premium and lower qualities at a discount.

Mr. POAGE. I dislike having to start this class back in the third grade, but I pretty nearly need to do it if I am going to keep up with you gentlemen.

I am just wondering if you will not take this fellow who is going to buy 100,000 bales of cotton and go through the entire procedure? Of course, he is buying a lot of cotton.

Mr. HENICAN. Well, he has consumed on the average of the past 10 years in excess of 200,000 bales.

Mr. POAGE. Not many of them do that.

Mr. HENICAN. We decided yesterday there was in excess of 100 mills which consumed in excess of 30,000 bales a year.

Mr. POAGE. Let us take the 100,000 bales of cotton which he is going to buy and follow through for me and tell me just what he does.

Assume that he goes out today and buys on the futures market, or that is what he would like to do, at least, as I understand it, and he buys it. Does he buy it for delivery all in the same month?

Mr. HENICAN. I do not think so. I do not think that would be a businesslike basis on which to do it. He is going to consume the 200,000 bales in probably equal monthly quantities over a 12-month period. So, he would scatter his purchases through, let us say, October, November, March, May, and July, probably in equal amounts.

Mr. POAGE. Let us assume that he has to have some cotton to go to work on immediately and that he has to buy spots of the quality which he wants. Of course, when he buys these futures, he just buys cotton, as I understand it.

Mr. HENICAN. He fixed the cost of his raw material. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. POAGE. I understand that. In other words, he buys that at 30 cents and that is probably on a fifteen-sixteenths Middling basis?

Mr. HENICAN. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. But if he wants an inch and an eighth, he pays the premium on that?

Mr. HENICAN. Pardon me a second. You are familiar with the fact that beginning with the new season, August 1, 1956, the base of the futures contract is Middling inch, which is a change from Middling fifteenth-sixteenths inch.

Mr. POAGE. Whatever the basis is, if he wants something better, he pays that premium for it; does he not?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. That is, if they deliver him something better. In other words, he does not have any choice over what he gets?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. He gets whatever they deliver.

Mr. HENICAN. Within a range as prescribed in the contract and under the rules of the exchanges.

Mr. POAGE. In a prescribed range, and within the differentials that are prescribed?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. But he has no choice as to what they deliver and they deliver whatever they want to.

Mr. HENICAN. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. That, of course, is one good reason why he would not want to take delivery on that contract, because it may not be something which he can use.

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. Then, he might want short staple, or he might want seven-eighths, and get the benefit of the price on it.

Mr. HENICAN. He might want other factors, too, which do not show up in the contract, such as micronaire and other characteristics of the cotton, as well as textile characteristics, and so on.

Mr. POAGE. So he would go out and try to buy the cotton he wants, and he probably cannot buy it in any sizable blocks, as you pointed out.

Mr. HENICAN. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. In other words, he would find a thousand bales of cotton at Muleshoe, Tex., that he wants, and he would buy that cotton and let us assume he has to pay something more than 30 cents for that cotton next week. Let us further assume that he is buying 1-inch cotton, and he is buying Middling. He would have to pay about 34 cents for that; would he not?

Mr. HENICAN. What grades or staple did you say?

Mr. POAGE. I said 1-inch Middling.

Mr. HENICAN. It is about 155 points premium over Middling fifteenth-sixteenths inch—1.5 cents—or 31.5 cents would be the approximate cost.

Mr. POAGE. It would not be at 33 cents?

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir.

Mr. POAGE. In other words, he has to pay 31½ cents for that?

Mr. HENICAN. 31.5 cents.

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. HENICAN. That is, under the present differentials between Middling fifteenth-sixteenths inch and Middling inch.

Mr. POAGE. He has to pay 31.5 cents on that. Now, how does that hedge help him?

Mr. HENICAN. Well, obviously, it would not help him. So, therefore, he would not buy his futures at 30 cents. He would wait until they got to 29 cents, or to 28.5 cents.

Mr. POAGE. Well, he waits, but he does not have his hedge if he waits.

Mr. HENICAN. That is right. He would not enter into the position under those circumstances, and I think that is one of the controlling factors of the orderly manner in which these positions are going to be handled.

Mr. POAGE. Well, that is where you get me. You say he would not have to take a position. what do you mean?

Understand, I have never traded in these markets, and I do not know anything about it, except what I hear.

Mr. HENICAN. I think Mr. MCINTIRE can explain it better than I can. Jokes aside. What you describe is the reason I have not believed in this ghost in the closet. Let us go back to our original premise and that was to the effect that the board of directors told the mill buyer that they could use 200,000 bales of cotton profitably next year, provided those raw materials could be acquired at 30 cents. Then that mill buyer is going to use his very best efforts to buy that cotton at 30 cents a pound, and he is not going into the transaction until he can average about that price.

He is not recklessly going in and buy futures if the future price is above that level. Later the board of directors may change their minds and realize that cotton is not going to be available at 30 cents and say "go ahead and pay 32 cents for it," but the buyer is not going to recklessly buy a lot of futures contracts when the management has indicated that they are going to make a profit based on buying the raw material at 30 cents a pound.

Mr. POAGE. They are talking about 30 cents a pound cost to them for the grade of cotton they want?

Mr. HENICAN. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. He does not go out and buy futures, then, at 30 cents a pound?

Mr. HENICAN. No; he does not. He would not buy them at 29.5 or 28.5 under this proposal.

Mr. POAGE. All right. Now, let us assume that he is able to buy and, of course, if he was able to buy any, I guess he would buy the whole 200,000 bales, would he not, on the futures market?

Mr. HENICAN. He probably would. I would imagine, however, he would now be able to buy some cotton at prices desired under those circumstances. So, he would not have to buy the entire 200,000 bales, but assuming he could not buy spots, he would probably buy all his futures——

Mr. POAGE. What I am trying to do is to follow it on through, and see just what he does. He does not actually buy the 200,000 bales of cotton on the futures market. He probably only buys a part of that?

Mr. HENICAN. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. What would he buy, or what would we expect him to buy?

Mr. HENICAN. The amount he is going to be allowed to buy as covered by this last sentence in the proposed amendment: "In conformity with the regulations as the Secretary may prescribe." We do not know what that is as yet. We have discussed a "reasonable percentage" of his normal season's requirements with Mr. Bagnell and Mr. Kauffman and they, just thinking out loud, have indicated it might be 50 percent under certain conditions, and 40 percent under other conditions. I do not think that under any set of circumstances we would want a position of 100 percent coverage. Yet, on the other hand, a smaller operation—say for instance a mill that produces or processes only 20,000 bales or 15,000 bales—the situation would be different, and 100 percent coverage would not be unreasonable or unbusinesslike.

Mr. POAGE. He is not affected by this bill anyway, is he?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes; I think he is.

Mr. POAGE. I thought some one said he could buy 30,000 bales.

Mr. HENICAN. That is right, but that is a speculative position, and we want to take it out of a speculative position because of the tax result. Such a mill with, say, a small consumption logically would not unduly affect prices either up or down. I can see no reason why he cannot buy 100 percent of his season's requirements.

Mr. POAGE. I understand this 30,000-bale deal, but if he bought more than 30,000 bales it is not considered speculative; is it?

Mr. MCINTIRE. It is considered a speculative position.

Mr. POAGE. Please understand, gentlemen, that I just walked in and I do not know this background information. Therefore, someone has to tell me about it.

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. POAGE, according to the Commodity Exchange Act, a hedge is defined as a long future against a fixed sale or firm sale or a short future against ownership of a spot commodity. Those are what the CEA Act defines as bona fide hedges, and any contracts over that, not evenly balanced, are considered speculative positions either long or short.

Speculative positions are limited to 30,000 bales maximum.

Mr. POAGE. You cannot have more than 30,000 bales of speculative cotton; is that right?

Mr. HENICAN. That is correct. It is possible that a mill could have 100,000 bales long, and the equivalent of 100,000 bales sold in the form of processed goods, but beyond that, under the present act, he can also own only 30,000 bales, which is considered a speculative position.

Mr. POAGE. This would allow him to own more than 30,000 bales?

Mr. HENICAN. This would allow them to own a reasonable percentage of what they have normally processed over a series of years.

Mr. POAGE. When you say "a percentage," what percentage do you have in mind?

Mr. HENICAN. That is what the CEA is going to tell us, or what they think is sound. The wording on the proposed amendment is, "It is a sound commercial practice."

Mr. POAGE. But except for that, if the man had 200,000 bales which he expected to use he could buy that now under the present law, and that is not a speculative position?

Mr. HENICAN. If he has something sold against it; yes, sir. If there are no fixed sales, the positions are limited to 30,000 bales, despite the fact the mill annually processes 200,000 bales.

Mr. POAGE. Then he can turn around and except for that proviso, if the Department imposed any limitation, he could go ahead and buy another 200,000 bales without having anything sold?

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir.

Mr. POAGE. He could not do that without having sold against the 200,000 bales?

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir. Do you mean under this proposal?

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. HENICAN. Well, I do not think so. I do not think the Department is going to allow full coverage.

Mr. POAGE. I understand, but I said except for that provision, and unless the Department acted, he could under this bill buy another 200,000 bales without it being called speculative; is that right?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes; if the maximum coverage is allowed, that would be correct.

Mr. GATHINGS. However, as the situation exists now, one cannot have but 30,000 bales?

Mr. HENICAN. That is right.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is, he cannot have but 30,000 bales at any one time?

Mr. HENICAN. Over and beyond the bona fide hedges; that is correct.

Mr. POAGE. You cannot have more than 30,000 bales without being in a speculative position?

Mr. HENICAN. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. You can have more than 30,000 bales; can you not?

Mr. HENICAN. No; only if you have some offsetting transactions, Mr. POAGE.

Mr. POAGE. You mean you cannot buy but 30,000 bales and remain outside of the speculative position?

Mr. HENICAN. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. Then, it is not like I stated, the matter a minute ago. I think I was wrong. I said that he could buy under this proposal 200,000 bales and he could buy 200,000 bales against his sales here if he had to, and then he could buy another 200,000 bales and still

would not be in a speculative position. However, he would, in fact, be in a speculative position in the second 200,000 bales?

Mr. HENICAN. I do not think so.

Mr. POAGE. That is what I want to get straight. What difference does it make if he is not going to be in a speculative position because the 30,000 bales merely relates to the limit of speculative cotton he can hold; does it not?

Mr. HENICAN. May I ask you a couple of questions?

Mr. POAGE. Surely.

Mr. HENICAN. Do you thing that such an organization as the Dan River Mills is going to continue in business?

Mr. POAGE. I assume they will.

Mr. HENICAN. They have been in business for a long period of time; have they not?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. HENICAN. On the average they have processed, say, for the last 25 years, 200,000 bales of cotton per year.

Mr. MCINTIRE. That is, 200,000 bales of cotton per year.

Mr. HENICAN. 200,000 bales of cotton per season. Is it not normal to expect that if we do not have a severe depression or adverse economic conditions that during 1957 they will process around 200,000 bales of cotton? That has been their experience for, say, 25 years, and they should do it again next year.

When they start the year, they are theoretically short 200,000 bales of raw cotton on a normal expectation, or the anticipation of the goods which they are going to process. So, by buying that additional 200,000 bales that you mentioned, I do not think it would constitute speculation. I think they are merely insuring their price against that which they anticipated producing based upon sound facts and sound records.

Mr. POAGE. What I have said—and I want to go back over it again because I am not sure now whether I was right or wrong, because I am more confused now than I was when I started—was in an effort to get this clear in my mind. Let us assume that the Dan River Mills has succeeded in selling the equivalent of 200,000 bales of cotton.

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. That is they have contracts for their goods to that extent.

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. They go ahead and buy 200,000 bales, as I understand it, on the futures market, and that is not speculative?

Mr. HENICAN. Totally exempt.

Mr. POAGE. That is right. I understand that, but as I understand it under this proposal if we leave out the proviso or if we assume that the department is not going to act on it, Dan River Mills can turn around and buy another 200,000 bales, which makes 400,000 bales, and that is not speculative either? Is that right?

Mr. HENICAN. In my opinion under the circumstances we are discussing, and if I understand them correctly, in my opinon, it is not speculation, because that second 200,000 bales is bought against what they anticipate processing during 1957 based on what they have done for the past 25 years, and they bought those contracts to insure the price level.

Mr. POAGE. I do not understand that, because they have already sold the 200,000 bales and they have contracts to sell another 200,000 bales because that is what they anticipate processing.

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. Obviously, that is not speculative, and we understand that, but then, as I understand it, this second 200,000 bales which they could buy under the terms of this porposal would be declared not to be speculative under the terms of this bill.

I do not see how you can attribute to it the speculative feature when you already have contracts to sell. That would mean they would have to raise their position to 400,000 bales of goods or the equivalent of 400,000 bales of cloth.

Mr. HENICAN. Let me say this: I misunderstood your question. You were a little bit too much ahead of me. I am just a country boy, as you know. You were ahead of me. You put both transactions into one. I see it now. You put both the transactions into one year.

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. HENICAN. That would be prevented, in my opinion, because I am pretty certain, or I am as reasonably certain, that the CEA is going to set down proposals or rules whereby the organization making use of the amendment will have to show a necessity to use it, and there is no necessity for the second 200,000 bales in 1957, and therefore that would be prevented.

Is that a fair answer?

Mr. KAUFFMAN. I believe the answer is that that anticipated requirement would already have been filled by the purchase of 200,000 bales.

Mr. HENICAN. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. It would seem that way to me.

Mr. HENICAN. That is correct. There would be no necessity for the second 200,000 bales and, therefore, they would not be allowed to purchase the second 200,000 bales in 1957, let us say, or in the same year.

Mr. POAGE. But that would depend upon the order which is issued by the Department; would it not?

I mean as far as this bill is concerned, they could buy the second 200,000 bales if there was not any order prohibiting it?

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir.

Mr. POAGE. They could not?

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir.

Mr. POAGE. I was just reading this proposed amendment——

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. Poage, may I refer you to the wording in section (c) there?

Mr. POAGE. You are looking at the printed bill, or this last one?

Mr. HENICAN. This last one. Under Section (c) in the third paragraph, the first word in the third line is "shall not exceed unfilled production for 1 year."

In the proposal that you made the anticipated requirements had already been filled for the year. Therefore, the second purchase would be out of order.

Mr. POAGE. I suppose that is right.

Mr. HENICAN. That is right; it would be out of order. In your case he sold on the average 200,000 bales, and he bought his 200,000 bales as futures, and he is finished for that year. He has no more unfilled requirements.

Mr. POAGE. All right.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I have one further question: I think, perhaps, the record ought to show what effect the placing of an anticipatory hedge would have under the 30,000 bale limit. What is your understanding of this legislation, Mr. Henican, if, for instance, I was a small-mill operator? Could I purchase my anticipated needs and have it classified, or have it defined for tax purposes if I were operating under the 30,000 bale limitation, as is contained in the regulations now?

I take it from what you have said that there is no thought that there would be some different interpretation for tax purposes on an anticipatory hedge as contrasted with a speculative hedge.

All of our conversation yesterday and today has been very largely at least dealing with these transactions which are above the 30,000 bale limit. I think perhaps the record will indicate at this point that that was where an anticipatory hedge started, and that up to the 30,000 bales, if a mill manager was buying in excess of their firm sales that that for the record ought to show whether under 30,000 it would be defined as an anticipatory hedge, or whether you were speculative in the 30,000 bales and beyond that point you can come into the definition of an anticipatory hedge?

Mr. HENICAN. I do not know. That is a very interesting question, of course, and it is a question that, frankly, I do not have the answer for. I would like Mr. Bagnell to answer it.

Mr. BAGNELL. I believe, sir, that this proposal comes in section (c) under 4 (a). You have two other forms of hedges, one being the growers hedge. You have under (a) the amount of such commodity such person is raising.

Mr. MCINTIRE. What page are you on?

Mr. BAGNELL. Page 5 of the act.

Mr. MCINTIRE. I have the same thing.

Mr. BAGNELL. Half way down the page is paragraph (a). Then you have paragraph (b) which covers another form of hedge, and now you bring in here paragraph (c).

Mr. MCINTIRE. All right. What is your thought as to the interpretation on that point?

Mr. BAGNELL. My thought is that that would take the same form and start figuring it exactly the same as these other forms of hedges from zero on up but not from 30,000 on up. In other words, a grower is allowed a hedge. There is no limitation on it. It is regarded as a hedge against his growing crop.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Yes, sir; that is right.

Mr. BAGNELL. Then you have your second form, and now you take on this. I would assume that if a man in the category you mentioned, let us say he needed 15,000 bales.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Yes.

Mr. BAGNELL. Heretofore he would not be in violation of the CEA if he were under the 30,000 bales. Now anything he did would be regarded as a bona fide hedge. At that time it might be regarded as a speculation.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Well, then, to rephrase that in my own words, do I understand correctly there that under existing regulations that a purchase of less than 30,000 can be made and described as a hedge unless there are firm transactions against that?

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Well, I would not think so.

Mr. BAGNELL. No; that is just it.

Mr. MCINTIRE. However, it is your thought that this legislation would permit that?

Mr. BAGNELL. It would permit that; yes, sir. It would describe a transaction such as you have just mentioned as a hedge. Heretofore it would be a speculation.

Mr. HENICAN. However, Mr. MCINTIRE asked a further question and that was whether this amendment, as I understand it, Mr. MCINTIRE, whether under this amendment this account would be allowed to buy 15,000 bales which they could put under hedge, and an additional 30,000 as a speculation.

Mr. MCINTIRE. He is always free to buy the 30,000 as a speculation; is he not?

Mr. HENICAN. Yes, sir; I would imagine so. You can do it as an individual now, if you wish.

Mr. MCINTIRE. What I was getting at for the record was how as it stands now this would take place. It is my thought, if I understand it correctly, that a hedge must be, in order to meet the definition of a hedge, such that you have firm sales of goods to cover the raw material?

Mr. HENICAN. That is correct.

Mr. MCINTIRE. That is regardless of any quantity?

Mr. HENICAN. That is correct.

Mr. MCINTIRE. And the 30,000, of course, is a speculative limit, but I was just wondering if this definition of anticipatory hedge would come into play below the 30,000 or whether it would be a speculation up to 30,000 and an anticipatory hedge above 30,000?

Mr. KAUFFMAN. May I answer that question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes. sir.

Mr. KAUFFMAN. Our thinking on that is that if a manufacturer has an unfilled requirement of 45,000 bales for an operating season, he can now purchase 30,000 bales. So,

under this provision he would be entitled to an additional 15,000. In other words, he would not be given 75,000. He would be given a total of 45,000 including the purchase of the present limit of 30,000, because there would be no occasion to provide for any larger quantity than that. That is our interpretation of it.

Mr. POAGE. He could buy the 45,000 without any element of speculation entering into it?

Mr. KAUFFMAN. No. Understand, he has no season fixed sales commitments but based on his records he anticipates that he can dispose of the equivalent of 45,000 bales of cotton. He has no season previous sales commitments.

So, he cannot place a hedge order in the market or acquire a hedging position that will qualify as such under the statutory definition of bona fide hedging. So, the most he can do is buy 30,000 bales of futures at present. Under this provision he would be permitted to buy an additional 15,000 so that he would have a total long position of 45,000 bales, which would be equivalent to his unfilled anticipated requirements.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Let me ask a question at that point if I may, for the matter of the record.

Does he hold 30,000 speculatively and 15,000 on an anticipatory hedge, or does he hold 45,000 on an anticipatory hedge?

Mr. KAUFFMAN. Well, he undoubtedly holds 45,000 and he regards it as an anticipatory hedge and he probably would report it to us as such.

It would just be a matter of nomenclature.

Mr. MCINTIRE. By the same token, he can hold 20,000 as an anticipatory hedge if he can show that is needed in his operation.

Mr. KAUFFMAN. Yes; if he has to avail himself of this provision.

The important fact is that we would not start counting with the first bale, but rather after 30,000. The 30,000 bales which he already had under the present law we would assume would be included in the 45,000 that he needs, and would not be added to the 45,000.

Mr. MCINTIRE. With reference to this tax business, can he declare now if he is under 30,000 and does not have the contracts to show against it? He cannot declare that now as a legitimate hedge?

Mr. KAUFFMAN. Yes; but not as a bona fide hedge under the Commodity Exchange Act. However, in the Corn Products case, which was decided by the United States Supreme Court on November 7, 1955, the Corn Products Refining Co. against the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, that case involved that precise point. Both the United States Tax Court and the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit found that the Corn Products Refining Co.'s futures transactions, which they engaged in these anticipatory hedges, they found those transactions to be an integral part of its business designed to protect its manufacturing operations against a price increase in its principal raw material, and to assure a ready supply for future manufacturing requirements. Although those transactions did not qualify under the Commodity Exchange Act as bona fide hedges, both the Tax Court and the Court of Appeals and the United States Supreme Court held that they were for the purpose of price protection, and they were an integral part of the petitioner's manufacturing operations and, therefore, for the purpose of the Revenue Act they were to be regarded as true hedges and were subject to the provisions relating to ordinary losses and not capital gains.

Mr. MCINTIRE. That covers the point. Thank you.

Mr. GATHINGS. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. Kauffman, I think it would be well to put the Supreme Court decision into the record at this point.

Mr. KAUFFMAN. In that connection, Mr. Chairman, there was a companion case which I am sure would be of interest to the committee, and it bears even more directly on the purpose of the Gathings bill. That was the case in which the Corn Products Refining Co. was taking an exactly opposite position to what they took in the tax case. In the tax case they were contending that the positions were not hedging transactions, but in the CEA case against them they were contending that they were hedging transactions.

The Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit on April 13, 1956, handed down a decision sustaining the Department of Agriculture's position in the matter to the effect that those transactions do not qualify as bona fide hedges under the Commodity Exchange Act. I will also leave a copy of it here.

Mr. GATHINGS. If you would file copies of those decisions for the record, we would appreciate very much having them.

Mr. KAUFFMAN. I will furnish the reporter a copy of the Supreme Court decision in the other case also.

Mr. GATHINGS. Are there any further questions of Mr. Henican?

(No response.)

Mr. GATHINGS. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Is Mr. Robert C. Liebenow present in the room?

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. Chairman, he was here earlier this morning, but he told me he had an engagement at 11 o'clock which he would have to keep.

Therefore, he is not present.

Mr. GATHINGS. I understood he desired to make a statement.

Mr. HENICAN. He did, sir, but he told me that he would be glad to prepare for the committee a letter setting forth his views with reference to this proposal.

Mr. GATHINGS. We would like to have such a letter from him on file, and any statement which he would like to make for the record.

Mr. HENICAN. I am a member of the Chicago Board of Trade, and he personally gave me authority to act for him. I know that that institution is in favor of this amendment that we have proposed, and that we have agreed to here. I would just like to get that into the record at this point.

Mr. GATHINGS. Have you received any communications from any other commodity group with respect to this legislation since it was introduced?

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. GATHINGS, I have informally discussed this proposal with the executives of most of the Commodity Exchanges that are regulated by the Commodity Exchange Act, and in my opinion, they are all in favor of this bill. I have made it a point to discuss the matter with the president or the executives and vice presidents of substantially all of the institutions that are under the supervision of the act, and they are all in favor of it.

Mr. GATHINGS. Is there anything further, gentlemen?

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I have one more question. This matter of liquidation is one that I do not get too clearly and distinctly in my mind, but I would draw this thought from your testimony, Mr. Henican.

This legislation being somewhat restrictive in its use in that it is directed toward the manufacturers and processors and to other elements who may be participating in the futures transactions that in itself is somewhat of a degree of insurance on the pressure of liquidations and the fact that the mill management, through its representative, is in on a futures transaction as price insurance protection; that their relative position between the price in those futures transactions and the spot market is sufficiently closely related so that the pressure of a quick liquidation is not likely to occur. Is that correct?

Mr. HENICAN. That is the way I feel about it; yes, sir. In my experience it is not possible to cover the exact quality required in any commodity in large amounts which would necessitate immediate liquidation of a large volume of futures that may be in the market.

It could be done in small blocks as the spots are acquired.

Mr. MCINTIRE. You cited this case of mill management setting a price of 30 cents a pound for cotton, and instructing their purchasing representative there to use that as a guide in relation to the actual cost of cotton which goes into their manufacturing process and that 30 cents a pound may or may not be a controlling factor on the purchase of futures.

Mr. HENICAN. That is right.

Mr. MCINTIRE. However, you think that there is a close enough relationship between the level of the price of futures and the spot market, so that it will not distort these positions enough to serve as an incentive to get out of the futures in bigger blocks than would be orderly?

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. MCINTIRE, those relationships get out of line once in a while, but I think on the average over a series of years they are pretty close together. We are talking about a business transaction and, in my opinion, it has to be conducted in a business-like way—otherwise, they would not be entered into or liquidated.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, we are spending a great deal of time in discussing cotton and using it as an illustration as to what this law would cover when we are actually covering other commodities.

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes.

Mr. MCINTIRE. This type of close relationship between the futures pricing and the spot market would not necessarily hold true in other commodities.

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. MCINTIRE, if you recall what I said yesterday, I am fairly familiar with most of the commodity markets but having been born in a cottonpatch I know that industry better. I think the relationship between the commodity markets and all commodities—that is, futures and spots—works substantially the same.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Well, could I ask your observation there as to whether you think the relationship in trading on such commodities as wheat, and cotton, and oats, and barley, are comparable to the relationships and the trading on onions, potatoes, and some of the other perishable commodities?

Mr. HENICAN. Mr. MCINTIRE, when talking about the functioning—I break down the commodity industries into two categories, major and minor. I put in the category of major commodities those commodities which we produce in America in large surplus such as cotton, wheat, corn, and a few others, and in the minor commodities I put the perishable commodities such as onions, potatoes, and so forth—the smaller commodities. There probably should be a third category called "import commodities" such as cocoa, coffee, hides, and so on. Quite naturally, the volume in those minor commodity markets are not the same, and from a commonsense angle there is a larger volume of trading in the major commodity markets where those commodities are produced in big surplus in this country. Therefore, in my opinion, the relationship and the functions of those latter markets is much better and much more efficient than in the smaller commodities.

I am quite familiar with the situation in onions and also in potatoes. Personally, I am not in favor of some of the things that are happening there.

Mr. MCINTIRE. You have a lot of company on that point, in my opinion.

Mr. HENICAN. O. K. I know of some of the things you have in mind. As I told you

earlier, Merrill Lynch does not take a position in any of these markets. What we are interested in is a fair and equitable contract for buyers and sellers because we know that if they are one-sided in either respect we cannot do business. We are interested in a large volume of business in order to get our percentage of it.

Mr. McINTIRE. I was getting to the fact that our responsibility under this legislation is much broader than cotton, but that is what we have spent our time on, and I was just wondering about the other commodities.

Mr. HENICAN. Let me ask you this question:

I wish you would clear up some of my ignorance because you originate from that territory. Is there such a thing as an onion processor or manufacturer?

Mr. McINTIRE. I do not know. I do not come from an onion territory.

Mr. HENICAN. Would he qualify under this?

Mr. McINTIRE. No; I do not think so.

Mr. HENICAN. I can see a possibility. There are potato processors and manufacturers.

Mr. McINTIRE. Very definitely.

Mr. HENICAN. I have handled some long contracts for a potato-chip manufacturer where the potato price was such that he could fix his cost and fix his profits. I do not think there is such an organization as an onion manufacturer or processor. So, he would not qualify under this amendment; would he?

Mr. LAIRD. We do have these french-fry potato plants which are processors.

Mr. McINTIRE. And, of course, there is likely to be more of it as time goes on. That is the direction in which marketing is moving in those commodities.

I am wondering, and I just wanted to get your thought, as to whether or not the discussion we have had here particularly on cotton has equal bearing and an equal relationship with the other commodities which are affected under this act?

Mr. HENICAN. I think so.

Mr. McINTIRE. Do you think this bill should be amended to include only cotton?

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir; I am very strongly opposed to amending this to include cotton only. It should include all commodities because as you recall yesterday the gentleman from CEA mentioned the fact that the first time this came up was many years ago. It had to do with a Quaker Oats matter, and later the Corn Products matter, and it has only recently been involved with cotton.

There is another case in which I was personally involved which had to do with the Mexican Government in regard to wheat. I would be very much opposed to limiting this amendment to cotton only.

Mr. McINTIRE. Thank you.

Mr. GATHINGS. Are there any further questions?

(No response.)

Mr. Kauffman and Mr. Henican, I just wonder if you gentlemen think that the record is complete or if you had any further suggestions?

Mr. KAUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is complete insofar as the Commodity Exchange Authority is concerned.

Mr. GATHINGS. Thank you.

If there are no further questions, the subcommittee will stand adjourned to meet again at the call of the Chair.

(Thereupon, at 12 o'clock, noon, the subcommittee adjourned.)

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 6, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, June 4, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, the might of them that put their trust in Thee, amid all the subtle dangers that beset us, save us from the fatal folly of attempting to rely upon our own unaided strength and devices. The world is aghast at the revelation of the ruthless depravity of a dictator who sought to mold a system with Thee excluded, with Thy law and Thy love ignored. Such a baneful career but confirms Thy word that without Thee "The human heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked." In a world so uncertain about many things we are sure of no light but Thine, no refuge but in Thee.

The din of words assails our ears in this agitated world. Grant us an inner calm undisturbed by any outer commotion because our minds are stayed on Thee. Give us the courage to seek the truth honestly and the reverence and obedience to follow humbly the kindly light that leads us on. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 5, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6024. An act to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain land at Kaakaukukui, Honolulu, Oahu, T. H.;

H. R. 6218. An act to authorize payment by the Federal Government of the cost of making certain studies necessary to assist the Menominee Tribe of Indians to prepare for the termination of Federal supervision;

H. R. 6332. An act to amend the act of October 11, 1949, to specify the fee which will be paid for services performed by United States commissioners with respect to the commitment of individuals to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 7552. An act to amend sections 220 and 221 (d) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920;

H. R. 7641. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal and non-Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7663. An act to provide for settlement in part of certain claims of the Uintah and White River Bands of Ute Indians in Court of Claims case No. 47568, through restoration of subsurface rights in certain lands formerly a part of the Uintah Indian Reservation;

H. R. 7887. An act to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands under certain circumstances without public auction;

H. R. 8552. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the town of Chincoteague, Va., permanent easements on certain lands for the purpose of taking subterranean water;

H. R. 9280. An act relating to the plan for control of the property of the Menominee Indian Tribe, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9593. An act to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9970. An act to provide for the disposition of the Stockton Air Force Station and the Stockton Annex, Sharpe General Depot, Calif.;

H. R. 10630. An act relating to the District Court of Guam;

H. R. 10766. An act to authorize the payment of compensation for certain losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces during World War II; and

H. J. Res. 511. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to confer certain additional powers upon the Interstate Sanitation Commission, established by said States pursuant to Public Resolution 62, 74th Congress, August 27, 1935.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 6024. An act to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain land at Kaakaukukui, Honolulu, Oahu, T. H.;

H. R. 6218. An act to authorize payment by the Federal Government of the cost of making certian studies necessary to assist the Menominee Tribe of Indians to prepare for the termination of Federal supervision;

H. R. 7552. An act to amend sections 220 and 221 (d) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920;

H. R. 7663. An act to provide for settlement in part of certain claims of the Uintah and White River Bands of Ute Indians in Court of Claims case No. 47568, through restoration of subsurface rights in certain lands formerly a part of the Uintah Indian Reservation;

H. R. 7887. An act to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands under certain circumstances without public auction; and

H. R. 9280. An act relating to the plan for control of the property of the Menominee Indian Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6332. An act to amend the act of October 11, 1949, to specify the fee which will be paid for services performed by United States commissioners with respect to the commitment of individuals to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 10630. An act relating to the District Court of Guam; and

H. J. Res. 511. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to confer certain additional powers upon the Interstate Sanitation Commission, established by said States pursuant to Public Resolution 62, 74th Congress, August 27,

1935; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7641. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal and non-Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 8552. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the town of Chincoteague, Va., permanent easements on certain lands for the purpose of taking subterranean water; and

H. R. 9970. An act to provide for the disposition of the Stockton Air Force Station and the Stockton Annex, Sharpe General Depot, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9593. An act to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 10766. An act to authorize the payment of compensation for certain losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces during World War II; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and by unanimous consent, the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and consider the nomination under the heading "New Report."

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar under the heading "New Report" will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frederick A. Seaton, of Nebraska, to be Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to say I think the President made a very fine nomination when he named our former colleague, Fred Seaton to be Secretary of the Interior. I served in this body with him for a short time. I found him to be a man of sterling integrity and keen intellect, one who was very conscious of the obligations he owed to this country, which had done so much for him. I am very glad to see him elevated to a high position in the President's Cabinet.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should also like to commend the President for his nomination of Fred Seaton, our former colleague in this body. I have known him for a good many years, and knew him long before he became a Member of the Senate. I served briefly with him in this Chamber. I believe he has the capability to make an outstanding Secretary of the Interior. I am glad that the committee has very promptly recommended the confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I voted in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for the confirmation of the nomination of ex-Senator Seaton to be Secretary of the Interior because he is a man of good character, and because I believe the President of the United States is entitled, except under unusual circumstances, to have an official family of his own choosing and preference.

However, I believe the RECORD should show that many pertinent questions, asked by members of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, were left unanswered by the man who is about to become the chief custodian of the natural resources of the United States.

Mr. Seaton becomes Secretary of the Interior following a regime which, in my opinion, has done more damage to true conservation values than has any other Interior Department administration during the modern era.

I believe that six major challenges face the new Secretary. They are these:

First. To halt—and possibly rescind—the widespread oil and gas drilling which perverts the original and primary purpose of our great system of national wildlife refuges.

Second. To save the Hells Canyon hydroelectric power site, the finest left on the continent of North America, from piecemeal private exploitation.

Third. To cancel the Al Sarena mining claims, which have resulted in no mining of ore, but only in the cutting of over 2 million feet of valuable public fir and pine timber in the Rogue River National Forest, and to support legislation which will in the future preserve national forest timber from going to mining patentees.

Fourth. To deny secretarial sanction to efforts to bring about commercial invasion of our scenic system of national parks and monuments.

Fifth. To reverse administration plans for choking off the migratory fish runs, elk grazing ranges, and wilderness areas of the Clearwater River watershed.

Sixth. To withhold secretarial approval from such anticonservation legislation as the Ellsworth-Cordon timber exchange bill and the Hope-Aiken grazing bill.

How Mr. Seaton measures up to these issues, Mr. President, will decide in history whether he is to be another Douglas McKay or possibly another Gifford Pinchot.

Mr. MALONE subsequently said: Mr. President, on June 5 the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported unanimously the nomination of Frederick A. Seaton, of Nebraska, to be Secretary of the Interior.

I wish to commend the committee for a unanimous report to the Senate, and the Senate for unanimous confirmation of former Senator Seaton.

It has been traditional for many years that the Secretary of the Interior should come from a Western State.

Nebraska is a Western State. As a member of the National Reclamation Association of the 17 Western States, west of a line through central Dakotas, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas, it is semiarid requiring irrigation. I believe that Senator Seaton understands western problems and will make a fine Secretary of the Interior. He has integrity and the experience necessary for that important position. He has served as a member of the Senate and in many other important posts of public service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the nomination today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, following a brief announcement I desire to make, there may be the usual morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, subject to a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce, for the information of the Senate, that following the disposition of the unfinished business, which is Calendar No. 1896, Senate bill 3108, to encourage the construction of modern Great Lakes bulk cargo vessels, on which there is a debate limitation agreement, the Senate will take up the following bills:

Calendar No. 2065, H. R. 9536, the General Government matters appropriation bill for 1957;

Calendar No. 2064, H. R. 9739, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1957;

Calendar No. 2030, S. 3149, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, in order to permit certain air carriers to grant free or reduced rate transportation to ministers of religion;

Calendar No. 2039, S. 3449, relating to the reinvestment by air carriers of the

proceeds from the sale or other disposition of certain operating property and equipment;

Calendar No. 2063, S. 3365, to amend section 410 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to change the requirements for obtaining a freight forwarder permit;

Calendar No. 2084, S. 3857, to clarify section 1103 (d) of title XI (Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended;

Calendar No. 2085, H. R. 9824, to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability or disease incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean conflict;

Calendar No. 2086, S. 1614, to amend the act entitled "An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids," title 21, United States Code, section 321c;

Calendar No. 2089, H. R. 2840, to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas;

Calendar No. 2090, S. 3907, to amend section 345 of the Public Health Service Act;

Calendar No. 2091, S. 3620, to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children;

Calendar No. 2092, S. 3958, to assist in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and practical nurses;

Calendar No. 2093, S. 3430, to promote the progress of medicine and to advance the national health and welfare by creating a National Library of Medicine;

Calendar No. 2110, S. 3307, to amend section 9 (d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to authorize jurisdiction in Federal courts in certain reemployment cases;

Calendar No. 2111, H. R. 6274, to provide that no fee shall be charged a veteran discharged under honorable conditions for furnishing him or his next of kin or legal representative a copy of a certificate showing his service in the Armed Forces;

Calendar No. 2112, H. R. 5516, to amend title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide that service as an Army field clerk, or as a field clerk, Quartermaster Corps, shall be counted for purposes of retirement under title III of that act, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 2113, H. R. 8102, to provide for the disposition of moneys arising from deductions made from carriers on account of the loss of or damage to military material in transit;

Calendar No. 2114, H. R. 8693, to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, in relation to the refund of reenlistment bonuses;

Calendar No. 2115, H. R. 8922, to provide for the relief of certain members of the uniformed services; and

Calendar No. 2076, H. R. 6376, the Alaska mental health bill.

We hope that on the disposition of the bills I have enumerated the Senate may proceed to the consideration of the social security bill. It may be that we can have a general statement on that bill by the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee on tomorrow or perhaps on Friday, or it might even go over until Monday. Although there will be votes on the pending bill, and a quorum call, and perhaps yea-and-nay votes on some amendments and on the question of final passage, so far as the leadership is aware, there is no great controversy which will require yea-and-nay votes on any of the measures I have announced today.

So Members who desire to make plans for the weekend may know that we do not anticipate that we shall have before us any controversial measures requiring a number of yea-and-nay votes on either Friday or Monday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order entered, routine morning business is now in order.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET, 1957, FOR THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL—PROPOSED PROVISION FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, MILITARY FUNCTIONS (S. DOC. NO. 127)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1957, in the amount of $889,400, for the Architect of the Capitol, and a draft of a proposed provision for the Department of Defense—Military Functions, which with the accompanying papers was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

RESOLUTIONS OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on May 14, 1956, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States against accepting or taking action upon the findings and recommendations of the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States against accepting or taking action upon the findings and recommendations of the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions

Whereas the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions, established on January 14, 1955, under Executive Order 10588, submitted its final report, including findings and recommendations, to the President of the United States on April 23, 1956; and

Whereas the findings and recommendations of said Commission are detrimental to the best interests of all veterans; and

Whereas any action taken favoring the recommendations as submitted by said Commission would be unfair, unjust, inequitable and contrary to the concept of benefits to veterans: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the President of the United States to take no action upon the report of the Commission on Veterans' Pensions; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States reject any legislation submitted to it based upon the report of the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

LUMINOUS MARKING OF RAILROAD CARS TO PREVENT ACCIDENTS—LETTERS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have received from George W. Dewey, executive secretary of the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation, a copy of a resolution which deserves the most careful consideration. What the Farm Bureau suggests, Mr. President, in their resolution, would undoubtedly reduce the number of deaths that occur annually from people running into freight cars because of the difficulty of seeing them at night.

I referred the question to the Interstate Commerce Commission a few weeks ago. Their position is explained by their Director of the Bureau of Safety and Service in a letter he has written in answer.

I am sure that if the board of directors of one of the Nation's railroads were to take the initiative in marking their cars with some luminous paint, as suggested in the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation resolution, that particular railroad would gain for itself not only the thanks of untold thousands but an immense amount of favorable publicity and good will throughout the country. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this letter from Mr. Dewey embodying the resolution, and the letter from C. W. Taylor, Director of the Bureau of Safety and Service of the Interstate Commerce Commission, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
May 4, 1956.

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: At the last annual meeting of the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation, the voting delegates, representing 8,000 farm and ranch families in Oregon, included in the policy a resolution pertaining to the equipping of railroad cars so that they can be readily seen at night.

The resolution is as follows:

"Highway railroad crossings, at night, pose a danger to motorists due to poor visibility, and there have been a number of fatalities due to accidents at these crossings in Oregon.

"As this condition also exists in other States, we recommend that the Interstate Commerce Commissioner put into effect regulations that would compel the railroads to mark their flat, box, or log cars by means of reflectors, luminous paint, or other means."

This resolution came through the resolution process of this farm organization because of the many rural crossings in Oregon that are unlighted, creating not only a serious traffic hazard but causing fatalities as well.

Two bills have been introduced, H. R. 2399 and H. R. 8899. We would appreciate your comments as to the status of the bills as well as your own personal feeling with reference to this type of regulatory legislation.

With every good wish, I remain,

Very truly yours,

GEORGE W. DEWEY,
Executive Secretary.

MAY 23, 1956.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: This is in reference to your letter of May 17, relative to the resolution passed by the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation, pertaining to the marking of the sides of railroad cars with reflectors or luminous paint to minimize the possibility of accidents at railroad-highway grade crossings.

This is a matter over which, under existing law, the Commission has no jurisdiction and accordingly I am without authority to take any administrative action placing into effect the terms of the resolution.

With reference to proposed legislation embodied in H. R. 2399 and H. R. 8899, which you mention, it is my opinion that either bill would provide the protection which the Federation seeks, as expressed in its resolution, but that H. R. 8899 more nearly coincides with our thinking for the requirements of such legislation.

I shall be glad to furnish any further information you may desire with respect to this matter.

Very truly yours,

C. W. TAYLOR,
Director.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. 3681. A bill to modify certain restrictions with respect to holding more than one office under the United States (Rept. No. 2143).

By Mr. HOLLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment:

S. 3559. A bill to amend the act of August 31, 1954, as amended, so as to extend the availability of emergency credit to farmers and stockmen (Rept. No. 2144).

By Mr. HOLLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

H. R. 10285. An act to merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for supervision of production credit associations; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2145).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments:

H. R. 9052. An act to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 2 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports (Rept. No. 2147).

DOMESTIC TUNGSTEN, ASBESTOS, FLUORSPAR, AND COLUMBIUM-TANTALUM PRODUCTION AND PURCHASE ACT OF 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 3982) to provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 2146) thereon. I recommend that the bill, as amended, be passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

EXTENSION OF THE 1953 MALONE-ASPINALL ACT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The committee report on the bill was unanimous?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; and the committee reports the bill favorably, with two amendments.

Mr. MALONE. I understand that the bill is a simple extension of the 1953 Malone-Aspinall Act, with the addition of fluorspar and with the exception of the mineral provisions included in the 1953 act, which Dr. Arthur Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, and also a member of the National Security Council, has testified before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that he can and will continue to purchase during the life of the legislation, or until the President's Cabinet Committee on Minerals presents a permanent acceptable plan.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 4002. A bill to provide for the establishment of additional animal disease laboratory facilities at or near Montana State College; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 4003. A bill to extend Federal recognition posthumously to Lt. Col. Lee J. Merkel, Air National Guard of the United States, as a colonel, Air National Guard of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLEMENTS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 4004. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend the repayment period on certain disaster loans made under the provisions of such act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 4005. A bill to disclaim any rights of the United States to the Island of Navassa; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 4006. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yong Nak Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 4007. A bill for the relief of the Sorensen Fish Co.; and

S. 4008. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marion Huggins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 4009. A bill to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. ALLOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 4010. A bill to provide increases in monthly rates of compensation for service-connected disability and death, and pensions payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration and to liberalize the requirements for awarding additional disability compensation to veterans who have dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. J. Res. 179. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim certain property in Coahoma County, Miss., to the Home Demonstration Club of Rena Lara, Mississippi, Inc.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ANIMAL DISEASE LABORATORY FACILITIES NEAR MONTANA STATE COLLEGE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment of additional animal-disease laboratory facilities at or near Montana State College, located at Bozeman, Mont.

Originally it was proposed by the Department of Agriculture that these facilities be located at the Beltsville, Md., Agricultural Research Center. A budget request of $18,915,000 was included for this item. However, the Senate Appropriations Committee disallowed the request, asking that the project be reviewed by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and that specific authorization be provided for a site other than Beltsville.

Today, the Secretary of Agriculture, in accordance with the expressed wish of Congress, has taken steps toward selection of a site for the additional animal-disease laboratory facilities. A site committee consisting of representatives of the livestock industry, land-grant colleges, the veterinary medical profession, State departments of agriculture, livestock sanitary officials, and other livestock interests is to hear proposals as to prospective sites at a meeting in St. Louis on June 27. This committee will then choose from 3 to 5 locations for on-the-ground consideration. Members of the site committee will visit these proposed locations and will present their recommendations to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, the press release issued today by the Department of Agriculture, and a telegram I received this morning from Dr. R. R. Renne, president of Montana State College. The criteria to be considered by the site committee, as set forth in the press release, are amply met by Montana State College. I may add that animal-industry leaders of Montana strongly support Senator MANSFIELD's and my proposal to establish these needed facilities, which will

be of great help to the livestock industry not only in Montana and other Western States, but throughout the country. Our colleague from Montana, Representative LEE METCALF, is today introducing a companion bill in the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the release and telegram will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4002) to provide for the establishment of additional animal-disease laboratory facilities at or near Montana State College, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The release and telegram, presented by Mr. MURRAY, are as follows:

SITE TO BE CHOSEN FOR NEW ANIMAL-DISEASE LABORATORY

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson today took initial steps toward selection of a site for construction of new facilities for work on animal diseases. The action is in accord with suggestions from leaders in both Houses of the Congress.

Originally, it was proposed by the Department that such facilities be located at the Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Md., and $18,915,000 was included in appropriation requests for construction purposes. Congress, in considering this request generally favored the new facilities, but at a location other than Beltsville.

The suggestion was made that the United States Department of Agriculture—in cooperation with the livestock industry and allied interests—select a site located close to centers of livestock production, near or in conjunction with one of the State land-grant colleges having a strong veterinary medical program, and away from concentrated metropolitan centers. The Secretary, following these suggestions, today invited submission of site proposals and set up procedures to consider them.

Notices of interest and preliminary proposals are to be in the hands of the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service, Washington 25, D. C., by Thursday, June 21. This deadline does not, however, preclude consideration of other proposals or presentations directly to the site committee. All proposals and oral presentations will be considered by the site committee at a meeting in St. Louis, Mo., beginning on June 27 at the Statler Hotel, at 9 a. m.

The site committee will consist of leaders in the livestock industry representing beef cattle, swine, dairying, sheep, and poultry, and representatives of the land-grant colleges, the veterinary medical profession, State Departments of Agriculture, livestock sanitary officials, and other livestock interests. The site committee is to have full freedom of action in making its recommendations but will be guided by certain factors related to the functions and operating economy of the laboratory, as follows:

1. Scientific center: Near a land-grant college or university having a veterinary school or a strong animal-disease research department, which would provide the advantages of library facilities and opportunity for cooperation and association with other scientific work.

2. Human population: Near a community that could readily absorb 100–200 new families and having adequate personnel to fill 100–200 nonscientific positions; not close to an industrial, metropolitan strategic area.

3. Accessibility: Near major railroad and airline connections on a site adjacent to permanent hard-surfaced roads.

4. Land: From 200 to 400 acres is needed.

5. Construction costs: High-cost areas will be avoided.

6. Utilities:

(a) Water: 250,000 to 300,000 gallons of potable water per day required.

(b) Sewage: Provision for disposition of 150,000 to 200,000 gallons of sterile and treated effluent per day required.

(c) Electricity: 4,000 to 4,500 kilowatts per hour connected load required.

7. Availability per year of 1,000 each locally produced cattle, swine, sheep.

After hearing all proposals presented at St. Louis, the site committee will choose from 3 to 5 locations for further on-the-ground consideration. The members will then visit each of these proposed locations and will review the advantages of each of them. They will present their recommendations to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The new animal disease facility as planned will include laboratories for research simultaneously on 25 different animal diseases so arranged that there will be no possibility of exposure of animals in one section to any of the diseases on which work may be underway in another section. Complete protection for laboratory workers against diseases that may be communicable to humans will be included. Safety measures also will be adopted preventing the escape of disease organisms from the laboratory that might infect livestock herds and flocks or humans. In addition to the research, the facility will have space and equipment for testing and diagnostic work required in the livestock disease control and regulatory activities of the Department.

The livestock industry and agricultural leaders consider the need for the new laboratory to be urgent as a result of the necessary abandonment of 50-year-old inadequate facilities in Washington on July 1, 1955. This action, on the recommendation of an inspection committee of three widely known research experts on communicable diseases, resulted in the closing down of research on tuberculosis, anthrax, and other diseases of animals that also can affect humans. Similar work at Auburn, Ala., and Denver, Colo., also has had to be discontinued because of antiquated and inadequate facilities.

BOZEMAN, MONT., *June 5, 1956.*

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Reurtel Montana Veterinary Research Laboratory at Montana Agricultural Experiment Station, Bozeman, in existence since 1929 is conducting as extensive research program livestock diseases as can be found in any land-grant college in Nation. Additionally, Mr. Wallis Huidekoper recently gave research foundation at Montana State College 110-acre irrigated ranch at Big Timber with all equipment to be used exclusively for livestock disease research. Location of national animal disease research facility adjacent to research center in animal diseases much more important than location adjacent to veterinary medical school where resources heavily diverted to teaching purposes. Many strong reasons to support location national laboratory in Montana. National Institute of Health Laboratory at Hamilton would be near and could importantly supplement animal disease research center.

More important that a disease research facility be located close to strong research facilities in chemistry, biology, bacteriology, physics, or consultation than to be located close to veterinary medical teaching facilities.

Livestock disease regulatory work in Montana under Montana Livestock Sanitary Board is model for State control of infectious animal diseases and is among foremost of this type of agency in Nation and has been for many years. This also offers strong argument for effective collaboration from State agency if located in Montana.

In January 1956 meeting of some 50 representatives various organizations from 11 Western States met Salt Lalk City consider possibility establishing federally financed animal disease research laboratory in western region. Decided such laboratory of great importance and acted to explore all feasible means for its establishment. Group elected Dr. A. P. Schneider, Boise, Idaho, chairman and Dr. K. J. Peterson, Salem, Oreg., secretary. Dr. Schneider appointed committees in each of 11 Western States to work through State organizations to promote such western laboratory in all feasible ways.

Location of animal disease research facility in western range State not only would result in more adequate study of diseases peculiar to range livestock but sparsity of population would be important in disease isolation and as national security measure. Land facilities readily available and at nominal cost. If strong support for such a Federal animal disease research facility somewhere in 11 Western States exists, strong arguments can be advanced for Montana as the location. Sending airmail confirmation this wire to Montana congressional delegation.

R. R. RENNE,
President, Montana State College.

POSTHUMOUS PROMOTION OF LT. COL. LEE J. MERKEL

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend Federal recognition posthumously to Lt. Col. Lee J. Merkel, Air National Guard of the United States, as a colonel, Air National Guard of the United States, and for other purposes.

Lt. Col. Lee J. Merkel, killed on January 31, 1956, was a veteran Kentucky pilot. Born in 1918, Merkel was graduated from Du Pont Manual High School and the University of Louisville. He enlisted in the Air Force in 1941 at age 23. A year later he won his wings as a military pilot. During World War II he served as squadron flight leader in six campaigns in north Africa, Sicily, Italy, and France. Merkel flew a total of 143 missions and on 1 occasion was shot down in Italy behind enemy lines. For his combat performance he received the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal with 5 Oak Leaf clusters, and 2 Distinguished Unit Citations.

In 1948 Merkel became base commander for the 123d Fighter-Interceptor Group, an Air National Guard unit located at Standiford Field. This unit was called to active duty in October 1950 and served in England as a fighter-bomber wing. It was returned to its Kentucky base in 1952. Lieutenant Colonel Merkel was widely recognized as one of the best pilots in the Air National Guard. As base detachment commander, a full-time job, he worked hard to persuade the State legislature to grant funds for lengthening runways to accommodate jet aircraft at Standiford. Prior to accepting full-time duties as base commander in 1948, Merkel was training officer in the Vocational Rehabilitation Service in the Veterans' Administration regional office. Civil defense and survival were strong interests of Merkel and he aimed to arouse public interest in the formulation of more adequate defense plans and train-

ing. In 1955 he headed the public employees division of the community chest campaign. He was president of the Kentucky Air National Guard Association.

Lieutenant Colonel Merkel's F–51 crashed near Bedford, Ind., on a test flight. Witnesses reported his plane was smoking, and he apparently attempted an emergency landing. He is survived by his wife, Catherine, and four children at 1104 Manning Road, Louisville, Ky.

Prior to his death and on July 12, 1955, Lieutenant Colonel Merkel appeared before a promotion board at Standiford Field and was approved for promotion to the rank of colonel, which grade was authorized for a T/O assignment as fighter group commander. Pursuant to the finding of the promotion board Lieutenant Colonel Merkel was promoted to the rank of colonel on State orders issued by the military department, Commonwealth of Kentucky, on July 4, 1955.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to grant Federal recognition to the late Lieutenant Colonel Merkel as a full colonel in the Air Force. In view of the unselfish and distinguished service of this officer both in peace and war, and in view of the nature of his command, it is fitting and proper that this promotion be granted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4003) to extend Federal recognition posthumously to Lt. Col. Lee J. Merkel, Air National Guard of the United States, as a colonel, Air National Guard of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CLEMENTS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

LICENSING OF PAWNBROKERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared explaining the legislative history and purposes of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4009) to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

STATEMENT PRESENTED BY SENATOR ALLOTT

In essence this bill, which is similar to H. R. 11002, the pawnbroker bill, is a copy of the original pawnbroker act for the District of Columbia, approved March 2, 1889 (25 Stat. 1006) as amended March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. 841). From 1889 to 1913 pawnbrokers were licensed and carried on business in the District. During the same period unlicensed moneylenders carried on a very extensive business in the District, charging exorbitant rates of interest on small loans. The voracity of these unlicensed lenders was so great that the public demanded relief. The act approved February 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 657) was enacted primarily to drive these unlicensed moneylenders out of the District. It sought to accomplish this purpose by reducing the authorized interest rate on small loans to one percent per month on loans of $200 or less. In the case of *Newman ex rel Prender* v. *United States* (41 App. D. C. 37) the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia held that the act of 1913 repealed by implication the Pawnbrokers Act of 1889 and that since the 1913 act authorized the making of loans on collateral security of any kind, tangible or intangible, it covered the pawnbroker business as well as the small-loan business. The net effect of the act of 1913 was to drive legitimate capital out of the District of Columbia so far as small loans and the pawnbroker business was concerned, with the result that persons who would otherwise have patronized licensed lenders were driven to unlicensed, high-rate lenders in the District or to licensed lenders outside of the District.

The background of this legislation is as follows:

Congressman KEARNS of Pennsylvania requested the corporation counsel to assign an assistant to help him draft a small-loan bill for the District of Columbia. Mr. Chester H. Gray, Principal Assistant Corporation Counsel, was designated to assist Mr. KEARNS.

A bill was drafted to authorize loans of $600 or less in the District of Columbia on which an interest rate of 3 percent per month on the first $150, 2 percent on the next $150, and 1 percent per month on the next $300 of a loan in the total amount of $600 was provided. That bill was introduced by Congressman KEARNS as H. R. 114, 84th Congress, 1st session.

The bill was referred to the House Committee on the District of Columbia which then asked the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for a report. The Commissioners referred the bill to the Citizens Advisory Council which conducted hearings on the bill and at those hearings Deputy Chief Scott, Metropolitan Police Department, recommended amendment of the bill by adding provisions relating to pawnbrokers. Deputy Chief Scott pointed out that the Police Department had for many years been relying heavily upon evidence secured from so-called pawnbrokers (in fact dealers in secondhand property) for evidence of larceny and other felonies committed in the District of Columbia. He testified that a number of serious crimes, including murder, had been solved with evidence the starting point of which was the tracing of personal property which had been pawned. Mr. Jerome Livingston, the only licensed money lender in the District of Columbia who engages in the pawnbroker business, also testified respecting the need for regulation of the pawnbroker business, pointing out that many secondhand dealers are actually engaged in the pawnbroking business, by the process of entering into agreements with persons selling them secondhand personal property to sell the same property back to the seller at stipulated higher prices, the difference, of course, representing interest at astronomical rates.

On the recommendation of the Citizens Advisory Council, Mr. Gray, accompanied by Deputy Chief Scott reported to Representative KEARNS in substance the testimony of Deputy Chief Scott and as a result Mr. KEARNS requested the drafting of the necessary amendments to include pawnbrokers in the small-loan bill.

A study of small-loan and pawnbrokers laws revealed that these activities are entirely separate and distinct phases of the money-lending business, operating under completely different procedures. The small-loan business is conducted solely on the security of written or printed evidences of indebtedness, whereas the pawnbroker business is conducted on the security of the pledge and possession of tangible personal property.

In view of the different techniques employed it was considered desirable to rewrite H. R. 114 so as to provide one title for the small-loan business, a separate title for the pawnbroker business, and a third title for regulatory provisions common to both types of business. The bill as so rewritten was introduced as H. R. 6775. After hearings by the Subcommittee of the House District of Columbia Committee, the bill was favorably reported by the committee and was passed by the House on July 25, 1955. Nothing having occurred since the submission of H. R. 6775 to the Senate, it was considered desirable by its sponsors to have that portion of H. R. 6775 which deals with the pawnbroker business introduced as a bill separate and distinct from the small-loan bill. As many of the regulatory features common to both types of loans had been set forth in title I relating to small loans and merely incorporated by reference in title II relating to pawnbrokers it was necessary to extract those features and specifically incorporate them in the pawnbroker bill to provide complete coverage. A bill containing the pawnbroker provisions as passed by the House and as thus completed was introduced in the House on May 3, 1956, by Mr. KLEIN as H. R. 11002.

Section 1 of this bill, which I have previously indicated is similar to H. R. 11002, contains definitions of terms used in the bill.

Section 2 prohibits engaging in business as a pawnbroker without first obtaining a license from the Commissioners. It further prohibits the use of the word "pawnbroker" or the display of any symbol commonly used by pawnbrokers by any unlicensed business.

Section 3 sets forth qualifications for license, including the requirement that applicants have available for use in the business of making loans cash capital of at least $20,000.

Section 4 requires applicants to file a bond running to the District in the sum of $5,000 conditioned upon the compliance by the applicant with provisions of the act and all rules and regulations made pursuant thereto. It authorizes any person injured by noncompliance with law or regulation by a licensee to maintain suit in his own name and recover on the bond such damages as shall be adjudged.

Section 5 provides that after investigation and after satisfying the Commissioners of his qualifications the license shall be issued to the applicant and that the annual license fee shall be $500.

Section 6 provides for the revocation, suspension, and renewal of licenses.

Section 7 imposes upon the Commissioners the duty of enforcing the act; authorizes the Commissioners to investigate the business and records of licensees and authorizes the Commissioners to require by subpena the production of books, papers, and records and the attendance, and examination under oath, of all persons whose testimony they may require relative to loans or business of licensees.

Section 8 prohibits false or misleading advertising respecting the pawnbroker business.

Section 9 is the interest section. It directs the District Commissioners to investigate from time to time the economic conditions and other factors relating to the business of making pawnbroker loans; to ascertain pertinent facts necessary to determine what maximum rate of interest may be permitted upon the basis of such ascertained facts and to fix by regulation the maximum rate of interest on pawnbroker loans which will induce efficiently managed commercial capital to be invested in such business in sufficient amounts to make available adequate facilities to individuals seeking such loans at reasonable rates of interest and which will afford those engaged in such business a fair and reasonable return upon the assets.

Pending the determination of such rates by the Commissioners, the bill authorizes

pawnbrokers to charge not exceeding 2 percent per month, or fraction thereof, upon any loan not exceeding $200, or more than 1 percent per month, or fraction thereof, upon any loan exceeding $200 and not exceeding $1,000, and 8 percent per annum (the maximum statutory rate now in effect) on any loan in excess of $1,000.

Section 10 prohibits the charging of interest in excess of the existing statutory rate of 6 percent per annum, or 8 percent per annum upon an instrument in writing, by any person except a licensee under the act and declares invalid any instrument evidencing a loan made in the District in violation of the provisions of the bill.

Section 11 requires every pawnbroker to record in a book at the time of each loan an accurate account and description of the goods pawned, the amount of money loaned thereon, the time of pledging the same, and the rate of interest to be paid on such loan, the name and residence of the person pawning such goods together with a description of such person; requires that the book at all reasonable times be open to inspection by the Commissioners; and prohibits disclosure by any officer of the District of entries in such book to any person other than an official having a right thereto in his official capacity.

Section 12 requires every pawnbroker at the time of each loan to deliver to any person pawning any goods a memorandum signed by him containing the substance of the entry required to be made by him in this book.

Section 13 prohibits any pawnbroker from selling any pawned article until the same has remained 1 year in his possession, unless with the consent of the pawner. It also provides that all sales shall be made at public auction and shall be made or conducted by licensed auctioneers.

Section 14 requires that notice of every such sale be published at least 6 days prior thereto in 1 or more daily newspapers printed in the District, such notice to specify the time and place where such sale is to take place, the name of the auctioneer and a description of the article to be sold. In addition the pawnbroker is required to mail to the pawner a copy of such notice.

Section 15 provides that the surplus money, if any, arising from any such sale, after deducting the interest then due and the expenses of advertising any such sale, shall be paid over by the pawnbroker to the person who would be entitled to redeem the pledge in case no such sale had taken place.

Section 16 provides penalties for violation of the act of fine of not more than $300 or imprisonment for not more than 90 days; declares that any contract of loan from which any act shall have been done which constitutes a violation of the bill shall be void and that the lender shall have no right to collect or receive any principal or charges whatsoever on account thereof.

Section 17 authorizes the Commissioners to make and enforce such regulations as they deem necessary to carry out the purposes of the act.

Section 18 exempts from application of the act, firms, stock companies, and credit unions doing business in the District of Columbia under the supervision of the Federal Reserve System, Comptroller of the Currency, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, or to loans made by them.

Section 19 repeals the act of February 4, 1913, as amended, insofar as the same applies to the business of lending money on the security of pledge and possession of tangible personal property.

Section 20 provides if any provision of the act be held invalid the remainder of the act shall not be affected thereby.

Section 21 provides that the act shall take effect at the expiration of 60 days after the date of its approval.

It is my hope and belief that this bill will assist the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to protect the citizens of this area from exorbitant interest rates when it becomes necessary for them to acquire money immediately by pledging personal property, and that it will assist the Police Department of the District to secure necessary information for the prosecution of criminals.

CARE OF MENTALLY ILL OF ALASKA—AMENDMENT

Mr. LANGER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 6376) to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, on yesterday the Senate Committee on Finance filed its report on H. R. 7225, the social security bill, which will be before the Senate today or tomorow. In the main, it is a good bill, and contains many excellent provisions. However, I regret that the bill as reported to the Senate fails to contain some of the best provisions of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives. It was the judgment of the Senate committee that all provisions relating to social security insurance for disabled persons should be stricken from the bill. It was also the judgment of the committee that all provisions relating to retirement of working women, wives, and dependent mothers at age 62 should be stricken from the bill. It was also the judgment of the committee that amendments to the public-welfare program, even though one particular amendment was sponsored by 46 Senators, should not be included in the bill as reported.

Mr. President, these amendments will be submitted. The distinguished dean of the Senate and its President pro tempore [Mr. GEORGE], who now is presiding over the Senate, intends to submit, for himself, the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], an amendment restoring to the bill the disability provisions. On behalf of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], I submit the amendment, and ask unanimous consent that it be received, printed, and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators GEORGE, BARRETT, BENDER, BIBLE, BUSH, CHAVEZ, CLEMENTS, DANIEL, DOUGLAS, EASTLAND, ELLENDER, GREEN, HENNINGS, HILL, HOLLAND, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, KEFAUVER, KENNEDY, KERR, KUCHEL, LANGER, LEHMAN, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, MCCARTHY, MCCLELLAN, MONRONEY, MORSE, MURRAY, NEELY, NEUBERGER, O'MAHONEY, PASTORE, PAYNE, PURTELL, SCHOEPPEL, SCOTT, SMATHERS, SPARKMAN, STENNIS, SYMINGTON, WELKER, and YOUNG, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to House bill 7225, which would increase the Federal matching for State welfare purposes. I ask that the amendment be received, printed, and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. LONG. Also, Mr. President, on behalf of myself, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me, to House bill 7225, to restore to the bill the provisions to lower the retirement age for working women, dependent mothers, and also wives of retired workers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. LONG. I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that, although the committee report is rather lengthy, the minority views appear at the end of it. Beginning at page 127 of the committee report are the minority views of three members of the committee, namely, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], former chairman of the committee, who has had much experience with the social security and public welfare provisions of our law, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the junior Senator from Louisiana. The minority views are signed by all three.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Address delivered by him on May 30, 1956, at De Pere, Wis., Memorial Day patriotic observance.

Address delivered by him over radio station WGN, Chicago, Ill., June 3, 1956, discussing his 20-point legislative program.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF SENATOR CAPEHART

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, today is the birthday anniversary of the distinguished Senator from Indiana, HOMER CAPEHART. [Applause.]

I feel that I speak for all Members of the Senate in wishing for him many happy returns of the day and a continuation of his distinguished career for many years to come.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to join the distinguished Senator from North Dakota in felicitating the distinguished Senator from Indiana on the anniversary of his birth and in wishing him many happy returns of the day.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thank the able Senators from North Dakota and Texas.

TWELFTH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I think it is fitting to note that this is the 12th anniversary of D-day—the

day that our soldiers and our allies invaded the continent of Europe.

Just 12 years ago, American soldiers landed on the beachheads of Normandy to face the dreaded strength of Hitler's armies. It was the mightiest invasion of history—one that has no parallel in size or in courage.

To the enslaved people of Europe, it represented a glorious day, for which they had been waiting many long years. To the tyrants who had enslaved them, it represented the beginning of the end.

In the years that have passed, D-day and Normandy have become a chapter in history. But they are more than that. The sacrifice of life—American life—represented the stake this country has in freedom, and such a stake is too precious to be lost.

It is a fresh and vivid memory to thousands of Americans who participated in the heroic battle. It is also a fresh and vivid memory to two of our most distinguished correspondents, William S. White and Don Whitehead, whose coverage of the battle gained them worldwide fame.

I am proud to count both of them among my friends.

This is not just a day to recall past glory, however. It is a day in which to draw inspiration from the sacrifices of the past in order to face the problems of the present—problems fully as great as those which were before our Nation on June 6, 1944.

We can hope and pray that never again will American soldiers have to walk into the jaws of death and destruction. But we can also resolve that we will face up to the issues of the present with the same high courage that was the hallmark of the men who fought at Normandy.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR HIRAM BINGHAM

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I have just learned with deep regret of the death of former United States Senator Hiram Bingham, whom I recall as an old friend of the President pro tempore of the Senate.

Hiram Bingham was a man of great distinction in my State. I first knew him when he was a professor at Yale University before World War I. I was one of his pupils. I studied under him in his courses on South American history. I also served under him when I was a private in the Connecticut National Guard and he was a captain, in 1916.

It was interesting to me that Hiram Bingham should have entered the Connecticut National Guard at that time, when our country was in danger of war along the Mexican border. Although he was a somewhat older man, he offered his services, and served with distinction in that organization.

Later he became interested in politics in the State of Connecticut. He became lieutenant governor, then governor, and then United States Senator. He served with distinction in this body for a number of years. Later he served as chairman of our loyalty board at the Federal level. I believe that his work in that field was of a high order, and commanded the respect of all who came in contact with it.

I say with deep regret that Connecticut has lost one of her great sons. To members of his family, many of whom I know and who are friends of mine, I offer my very deep sympathy, and the assurance that Members of the United States Senate mourn the passing of an eminent American and a distinguished former Member of this body.

DEATH OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE FOSTER STEARNS

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, on yesterday news was received in Washington of the death of the Honorable Foster Stearns, a former Representative in Congress from the Second District of New Hampshire.

Mr. Stearns had a long and distinguished career of public service. In his earlier years he served in the State Department, and later he filled various assignments in our Foreign Service—military attaché to Belgium, third secretary of our Embassy in Constantinople, and second secretary of the American Embassy in Paris. A lieutenant in the 16th Infantry, 1st Division, during World War I, he was wounded in action and received decorations for valor. A faithful Catholic, he was knighted by Pope Pius XI.

Mr. Stearns entered the New Hampshire Legislature in 1937. In 1939 he was elected to the Congress of the United States, where he served with distinction for 6 years. His background of experience in diplomatic posts made him a most effective and useful member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

It was my privilege to represent the same congressional district after his retirement, and to enjoy the benefit of his friendship and counsel. New Hampshire has lost a devoted citizen, a brave soldier, and an able public servant.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, my colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] has announced to the Senate the passing of former Representative Foster Stearns, of New Hampshire. I wish to add my word of tribute to the tribute paid him by my colleague.

Foster Stearns had a long and distinguished career. He was the son of the Mr. Stearns who was so closely associated with Calvin Coolidge. He played a part in the affairs of the years preceding and following 1920. He represented this country ably and well for many years in the Foreign Service.

He was chosen to reorganize the library of the Vatican. He served for 6 years, from 1938 to 1944, in the House of Representatives, and since that time played a prominent part in many civic activities. I join my colleague in expressing regret at his passing, and I am happy to pay this tribute to him.

THE ALASKA MENTAL HEALTH BILL

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, House bill 6376, the Alaska mental health bill, has been favorably reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and is scheduled for early action by the Senate, possibly today.

I am certain that every Member of the Senate who has read the committee report—and I hope all Senators have read it—knows that the Senate committee's version of the bill strikes from the House version all of the controversial commitment and care provisions. Among the organizations that voiced strenuous objections to the provisions of the bill as it passed the House was the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, with headquarters in Chicago.

I am happy to be able to report to the Senate that the President of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons now has written to me, as chairman of the committee, expressing approval of the bill as reported to the Senate. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the association president's letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *June 2, 1956.*

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Thank you very much for your letter of May 10 and the copy of the hearing for the bill for the Alaskan Mental Hospital. I was very much pleased to see the thoroughgoing manner in which all of the material and the opinions had been worked over by the committee.

It was extremely unfortunate that there was so much intemperate expression on both sides of this matter. I believe that there were some instances in which the bill was faultily worded and I believe that these faults have been corrected. I feel quite certain also that they could have been corrected without much of the heat that has been engendered. I do not honestly feel that either side had a corner on the choice of injudicious and intemperate expressions. I don't believe that there were any points of difference that could not have been settled coolly, rationally, and in open discussion. So far as I can see, the Members of the Congress and the committee conducted themselves in a manner that might have been taken as a good example by the proponents and the opponents on the outside. I believe that the bill as it is now recorded will be satisfactory and I hope that it is passed.

Yours sincerely,

CHARLES W. PAVEY, M. D.,
President, Association of American Physicians and Surgeons.

SELECTION OF SITE FOR ANIMAL-DISEASE LABORATORY

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, today the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, took the initial steps toward the selection of a site for construction of an animal-disease laboratory.

During the debate in the Senate on the agricultural appropriations bill, which was handled by the able junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], there was considerable discussion and a rather extended colloquy on voting additional funds for the construction of additional facilities at Beltsville.

I think it is generally agreed by the Congress that these new facilities should be located in the Middle West. The Department of Agriculture has taken the

same view in its release today. The Department of Agriculture in its release today mentions several items that would be given consideration in the selection of the new location for the animal-disease laboratory. Principally among them was the statement that the facilities should be located at least close or adjacent to one of the land-grant colleges or universities having a strong school of veterinary medicine or a strong animal-research program.

Mr. President, the Kansas State College, at Manhattan, is a land-grant college; it was established in 1863, and it has a veterinary school that is listed as No. 1 in the Nation. This college is already conducting a great animal-research program. It is staffed with competent persons, and has proof of the character of the education at its veterinary school. I submit only the fact that students from all over the Nation make every effort to enter this veterinary school, which at all times has a waiting list.

Every other requirement mentioned by the Department of Agriculture can be met at the Kansas State College, at Manhattan, and the community surrounding it.

Manhattan is in the geographical center of the United States; it is on a major railroad, and has major airline connections. The location of this research laboratory at the Kansas State College would place it in the center of the great livestock-producing areas of the Midwest. On the south we have the great Flint Hills pasture section, which is nationally known; and on the north and west we have the great grazing and range country of the Sand Hills of Nebraska; on the east we have the great cattle- and hog-producing areas of Nebraska, Missouri, and Iowa.

Mr. President, I and others will be giving the site selection committee this and any other additional information they need.

I had intended to ask unanimous consent to have the release issued today by the Secretary of Agriculture printed in the RECORD, but I am informed that it has already been so printed on request of the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] in connection with a bill which he introduced today.

SENATOR WILEY OF WISCONSIN

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, while we all realize it is difficult for any of us here to participate in intrastate politics in any State other than our own, I feel I want to make a few remarks with regard to the situation in Wisconsin.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I have enjoyed, and value highly, my association with our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]; and with him, I have worked closely in supporting the foreign policies of the Eisenhower administration. We have been together on the Committee under the chairmanships of Senator Connolly, Senator Vandenberg, Senator George, and Senator Wiley himself. I feel that those of us who have the international viewpoint appreciate the courage and loyalty of our colleague, in representing a State such as his, which has a less international point of view, for standing by his convictions and making the fight for the principles in which he believes, irrespective of the effect on his own political future.

FORMER SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR DOUGLAS McKAY

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I happened to be present in the Chamber a few moments ago when the nomination of Mr. Frederick A. Seaton to be Secretary of the Interior was considered and confirmed.

I join with other Senators in their fine statements regarding Mr. Seaton. However, in the course of the discussion, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] made some reference to a former Secretary of the Interior. I believe that Bernard Baruch once said that every man has a right to his own opinion, but no man has a right to misstate the facts.

The fact of the matter is that it was my privilege in the other body to serve on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, where it was my good fortune to come in contact with Mr. McKay and his work. I do not know of any more conscientious man who has ever served in the Cabinet. I do not know of any member of the Cabinet who has ever possessed finer qualities than he possesses.

All the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the House regarded him with high esteem. The President has been fortunate in the selection of members of his Cabinet. They are men of unimpeachable integrity and high character.

I am sure that all of us will agree that Mr. McKay was one of the best.

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE DOMESTIC PARITY PLAN FOR WHEAT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, my attention has just been called to an interesting survey made by the Uhlmann Grain Co., of Chicago, in regard to the domestic parity plan for wheat, sometimes known as the two-price system.

The Uhlmann Grain Co. is one of the old, established firms in the grain trade, with offices and connections in the principal cities of the Nation, and has extensive contacts in every area of our Nation.

This company mailed a postal card to approximately 4,000 farmers, country elevator operators, terminal elevator operators, and other miscellaneous individuals and firms, such as processors, merchandisers, brokers, and so forth, expressly asking the question whether they were or were not in favor of the domestic parity plans for wheat.

On the basis of the reply cards which were returned to the company, 88.6 percent of the farmers from whom it received replies indicated their approval of the domestic parity plan; 80.3 percent of the country elevator operators, 91 percent of the terminal elevator operators, and 86.7 percent of all others indicated their approval of the plan. Overall, 86.3 percent of those who returned cards stated they were in favor of the domestic parity plan for wheat.

The survey covered the main wheat-growing areas of the United States, including the Southwest, the Far Northwest and Northwest, the Central States, and some Eastern States. Personally, I was most pleased to get the information contained in this survey, as it confirms previous surveys and studies that I have made on my own account.

During the debate on the farm bill, I stated that I did not believe that either the flexible or rigid price support would solve the wheat problem. It is my contention that wheat is one crop that must be solved on a commodity basis.

The present acreage restrictions, the present costly system of export subsidies, and the continuous building up of our wheat surpluses will completely destroy the wheatgrowers of this Nation. Under the domestic parity plan, the wheat producer would secure full parity for the part of his crop consumed at home. The natural forces of supply and demand would be the basic factors in determining production, and the huge supplies of surpluses that have been such a depressing price factor would not continue to be harvested. Acreage allotments and other Government controls would be discarded, and the American farmer would again be the master of his own production plans and desires.

It is a program that must again have consideration in the next session of Congress.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF SENATOR GORE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the new Federal highway construction bill which the Senate passed last week is a monument to the hard and dedicated efforts of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] as much as any other person. I am sure that other Senators were as impressed as I was with the tremendous knowledge and the unfailing comprehension of every aspect of the highway bill which the Senator from Tennessee displayed in guiding this bill, hour after hour, through its long debate on the Senate floor.

At the same time, while devoting untold hours to this vast project, the Senator from Tennessee has found time to display valuable leadership in such other important fields as the great necessity for Federal initiative in the development of peaceful use of atomic energy and the reform of our methods of election financing.

These accomplishments of the junior Senator from Tennessee were the subject of a column by the noted reporter of our national scene, Miss Doris Fleeson, in the Washington Star of June 4, 1956, and I ask unanimous consent to have this column reprinted in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GORE MAY BE ON NATIONAL TICKET—LIBERAL RECORD IN HOUSE AND SENATE COULD EARN HIM VICE PRESIDENTIAL BID

(By Doris Fleeson)

When Senator ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, assured a Massachusetts rally that the State's junior Senator, JOHN F. KENNEDY, would ornament the Presidential ticket in either spot at any time, GORE was only repaying a compliment.

Senator KENNEDY'S own answer to questions about his vice presidential ambitions has long been a suggestion that the post would go to GORE and a good thing too.

The press galleries would agree that from the standpoint of character, ability, and industry, the junior Senator from Tennessee stands very near the top of the heap. He is also very well placed geographically, being from a border State between North and South which is the political bridge Democrats like to build in a national ticket.

The care and diligence with which GORE has constructed a national liberal record in 6 terms in the House and his present first term in the Senate speak for his ambitions. But outside the circle of his associates, his political possibilities have been overshadowed by the unflagging Presidential aspirations of his colleague, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER.

KEFAUVER is 53, GORE 49. In many respects their careers have run parallel; KEFAUVER also served a long apprenticeship in the House. Both represent the new South and are internationalist. Both have an unusual degree of personal independence.

GORE'S superior standing with his colleagues rests in large part on his capacity and willingness to work at the hard, dull tasks as well as the things that make headlines. Yet GORE is no pet of the reigning Southern conservative leaders as was proved by their refusal to back his plans for the Senate Lobby Committee of which he was originally chairman. When they refused, GORE, also acting in character, quit.

GORE'S most recent achievement is the new highway bill, the biggest the Federal Government has ever undertaken. He began with the financial aspects, a probable reflection of his long and close association with Bernard M. Baruch, the economic elder statesman. GORE substituted a tax plan for the President's proposal to raise the money by floating bonds. After that he worked out the compromises.

A public power advocate, being from the Tennessee Valley, GORE has also been pushing for federally built atomic powerplants. The General Intelligence Agency has backed his contention that this country is lagging in that field behind the Soviets.

GORE and KEFAUVER have both behaved with great circumspection toward each other. GORE will no doubt stand aloof at Chicago until the senior Senator's fate is settled.

The KEFAUVER-style campaign against Adlai Stevenson has made one thing certain. Stevenson would not take the Senator in second place on a Stevenson slate. There or with Gov. Averell Harriman might be GORE'S opportunity.

AWARD OF HONORARY DOCTOR OF LAWS DEGREE TO SENATOR KENNEDY BY ROCKHURST COLLEGE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, we in Missouri are proud of our fine universities and colleges. Among our outstanding institutions of higher learning is Rockhurst College, at Kansas City.

Last Saturday, June 2, Rockhurst College honored our colleague the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] by presenting to him the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Before Senator KENNEDY visited Kansas City, to be honored by this outstanding liberal arts college, the Kansas City Star on May 27 carried a fine article entitled "Likeable Senator KENNEDY To Speak Here Saturday," written by John Cauley, a member of the Star's Washington Bureau. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIKABLE SENATOR KENNEDY TO SPEAK HERE SATURDAY

(By John R. Cauley)

WASHINGTON, May 26.—When JOHN FITZGERALD (JACK) KENNEDY, the junior United States Senator from Massachusetts, arrives in Kansas City for a speech next Saturday, midwesterners will have an opportunity to see one of the most attractive personalities in public life today.

KENNEDY is a man with political savvy and intellectual achievements. He is 38 years old, 6 feet tall, lean and erect as a West Point cadet. He has a boyish countenance which could enable him to pass for a man 10 years his junior. His heavy crop of brown and informally combed hair adds to the impression of boyish exuberance.

Indeed, when Jack first came to the Senate in 1953 and attempted to board the subway car which runs between the Senate Office Building and the Capitol, a guard sternly instructed him, "Stand back, son, and let the Senators get on first."

Tourists in the Senate galleries often are astonished when they are told that KENNEDY is a Senator. That lad, they remark, looks as if he just got out of college.

SPEECH ON WDAF-TV

Kansas Citians will have an opportunity for a first-hand appraisal of young KENNEDY when he delivers the principal address at the fourth annual Rockhurst Day dinner at the Hotel Muehlebach June 2. His speech will be televised over WDAF-TV.

Despite his youthful demeanor and appearance, Senator KENNEDY, a Democrat, is a rising political star. He is regarded by veteran observers here as one of the most able men in the Senate. In addition he is the author of a best seller, Profiles in Courage, a thoughtful and persuasive book about some Senators of the past who in moments of crisis staked their principles against the tides of bigotry, sectionalism, and conformity.

JACK KENNEDY is one of a family of nine children born to Mr. and Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy. The elder Kennedy, a spectacularly successful businessman, who among other projects, now operates the Chicago Merchandise Mart, was formerly Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission in the early New Deal days, and from 1937 to 1941 was American Ambassador to the Court of St. James in London. His mother is the daughter of the former mayor of Boston, John F. (Honey-Fitz) Fitzgerald.

The second child in the family, Jack attended public schools in Brookline, Mass., a suburb of Boston. He was graduated with honors from Harvard, and also took courses at the London School of Economics and at Stanford University.

When he attempted to enlist in the Army in 1941, he was rejected because of football injuries suffered at Harvard. After a series of strengthening exercises he was accepted by the Navy and wound up in the South Pacific as a PT boat commander.

HEROISM IN PACIFIC

One dark night KENNEDY'S boat was rammed and cut in two by a Japanese destroyer in a dramatic engagement off the Solomon Islands. When the boat sank, KENNEDY towed one of his wounded crewmen to a small island 3 miles away by holding a strap of the man's Mae West with his teeth.

Then, according to the Navy citation: "During the following 6 days he (KENNEDY) succeeded in getting his crew ashore and after swimming many hours attempting to secure food and water, finally effected the rescue of his men."

For this courageous action KENNEDY was awarded the Navy and Marine Corps Medal in addition to the Purple Heart. Jack himself suffered severe injuries to his spine in this engagement and during his ensuing career spent many months in the hospital and in recuperation at home. He is now fully recovered.

Originally it seemed that JACK KENNEDY was not destined for a political career. He was more the quiet, scholarly type, liked to write and some day had a hankering to be a newspaperman. However, when his brother, Joseph Kennedy, Jr., a Navy pilot, was killed in action in Europe, Jack stepped in to carry on the political tradition of the family for which Joe, Jr., had been groomed. Besides, what he had seen in the war and his travels around Europe had given him a new incentive to contribute his energies and talents to public life.

And Jack could afford to be independent. The elder Kennedy had set up million-dollar trust funds for each of his children so that they would not have to be governed by the need of money in seeking a career.

A REPRESENTATIVE IN 1946

In 1946, in his first campaign for public office, KENNEDY was elected a Member of the House from the 11th Massachusetts District by a vote of 69,093 to 26,000 for his opponent. He was reelected in 1948 and 1950.

The Kennedys, who have a fierce competitive spirit besides a shrewd political instinct, had bigger things in mind for Jack. In 1952, with the aid of almost his entire family, Jack took on another distinguished name in Massachusetts, Henry Cabot Lodge, for the United States Senate. Undaunted by the immense backing and political prestige of Lodge, the Kennedy family put on a campaign which is still the wonder of Massachusetts. Mrs. Kennedy and three of her lovely daughters gave tea parties in many communities of the State to which the women voters were invited to meet Jack and the family.

A younger brother, Robert F. Kennedy, a political comer in his own right and now chief counsel for the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee, spearheaded an organization which reached into every city and hamlet of the State.

On the occasions when the other Kennedys were mingling with voters in other parts of the State, Bob would take the platform at a meeting by himself and put the issue to the audience in this succinct manner:

"My brother Jack couldn't be here. My mother couldn't be here, my sister Eunice couldn't be here, my sister Pat couldn't be here, my sister Jean couldn't be here, but if my brother Jack were here he'd tell you that Lodge has a very bad voting record. Thank you."

When the returns were in, KENNEDY had unseated Lodge by 69,000 votes, a remarkable feat because Eisenhower carried the State by 208,000 against Adlai Stevenson, and another Republican, Christian Herter, defeated the incumbent, Paul A. Dever, a Democrat, for the governorship.

In recent days there has been considerable speculation in Washington and in the East about the possibility of KENNEDY'S being

drafted as a running mate for Adlai Stevenson, should the former Illinois governor win the Democratic presidential nomination. KENNEDY is a strong supporter of Stevenson.

Jack would seem to have many qualifications for the job. He is a liberal, but no radical. He is young and handsome, articulate, intelligent, makes a good appearance on television. He's an extremely effective campaigner.

In this connection it is interesting to note that a document is being quietly circulated among Democratic leaders pointing out that a survey shows that 7 percent of President Eisenhower's vote in 1952 was made up of Catholics who had voted Democratic in preceding national elections. This analysis contends that if this vote had remained Democratic, Stevenson would have won.

The purpose of this document is obvious: KENNEDY is a Catholic and as a vice-presidential nominee might be able to bring back that part of the Catholic vote which switched to Eisenhower in 1952, especially the heavy Catholic support in the Northern States where KENNEDY would run strongest.

The analysis furthermore points out that KENNEDY attracts young voters and appeals especially to the women.

"I'M STILL YOUNG"

As he leans back in his office chair, stretches out his long legs and tilts his glasses back into his bumper crop of hair, Jack philosophizes about his political future.

"I'm still young and I like it here in the Senate," he says. "I would take it (the Vice Presidency) if I were asked, but I don't think I will be asked."

Without putting it into so many words, KENNEDY gives the impression that perhaps the times are not yet propitious for a Catholic on the Democratic ticket, and that if he accepted the post and Stevenson, for example, was defeated, the onus might be on him.

KENNEDY'S strongest attribute as a Senator is that it is difficult to pin a label on him. He tackles every issue with an open mind and there is no one who can say that he has JACK KENNEDY'S vote in his pocket. KENNEDY is reluctant even to suggest in what category he might be placed in the Senate because he votes his conscience and best interests of the country and his State, but he explains, "I suppose you might class me with such men as ALBERT GORE, LISTER HILL, and MIKE MANSFIELD," all of whom are liberals with wide flexibility and on the moderate side.

Jack is a prodigious worker. He keeps his office doors open to all comers, travels extensively and answers his correspondence faithfully—all hallmarks of a good Senator.

For several years he was considered the most eligible bachelor in Washington, but this state of affairs was ended in September 1953, when he married Jacqueline Lee Bouvier, a pretty, dark-haired Vassar alumna and a former member of the staff of the old Washington Times-Herald.

He is a voracious reader, specializing in history and biography. He drinks sparingly and he and his wife entertain occasionally in their colonial-style home in nearby Langley, Va., the former residence of Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, Senator KENNEDY in turn honored Kansas City and Missouri by his presence and acceptance of this degree. At the annual Rockhurst Day banquet on Saturday night, in a statesmanlike address, Senator KENNEDY urged that this Nation speak out boldly for the freedom of all people.

Since that address, I have received from Kansas City and other places in Missouri many telephone calls and letters commenting on the fine impression made by our distinguished colleague.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his stimulating address be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR JOHN F. KENNEDY, FOURTH ANNUAL ROCKHURST DAY BANQUET OF ROCKHURST COLLEGE, KANSAS CITY, MO., SATURDAY, JUNE 2, 1956

In recent years, key farm States such as Missouri have been visited by an increasing number of politicians from all over the country. But I must confess that this is my first trip to this State—and I am thus deeply gratified for the honor that Rockhurst College has bestowed upon me in presenting me with an honorary degree.

Much is different between Missouri and Massachusetts. We live on a beachhead on the cold Atlantic; you live deep in the heartland of America. We harvest the rolling sea, you harvest the rolling prairie. You send us hogs and corn; we send you carnations and cranberries.

Yes, much is different, but much is the same—the same sense of self-reliance, the common determination to see our country progress, the mutual recognition of the responsibilities as well as the privileges of self-government. Indeed, many citizens of your State and mine are descended from the same hardy forebears who forged the Union in which both States now unite.

I have not been unfamiliar with the history of Missouri and her statesmen—and I think one episode is of considerable relevance to those of us commemorating this fourth annual Rockhurst Day. It was little more than 88 years ago today that Senator John Brooks Henderson, of Missouri, faced a decision more difficult than any he had ever known and more far reaching in its consequences than any he would ever have to make. That issue was the impeachment of President Andrew Johnson by the radical Republican movement dedicated to his destruction and to the exploitation of the defeated Southern States. Senator Henderson, then but 41 years old and the second youngest Member of the Senate, had already achieved national prominence. He was one of the most influential leaders in keeping the State of Missouri in the Union and the sponsor of the 13th amendment to the Constitution abolishing slavery. He was in 1868 no stanch follower of Andrew Johnson—on the contrary, he was a supporter of the Tenure-of-Office Act which had led to the impeachment charges and a severe critic of Johnson's conduct of office. He was, on the other hand, noted for his political independence—he had, for example, defied his party by becoming the only regular Republican to vote against the bill restricting the President's authority as Commander in Chief of the Army.

Thus the radical Republicans knew that John Henderson's vote was not as certain as they might hope, and every effort was exerted to obtain from him an advance committal to vote guilty. Only Edmund G. Ross, of Kansas, endured more pressure and abuse than John Henderson. Missouri newspapers assailed him, party leaders bullied him, spies hounded him during his every waking hour. Finally the full delegation of Republican Congressmen from Missouri, accompanied by a prominent State legislator, called upon the Senator and demanded that he vote for the President's conviction. To do otherwise, they warned, would be to rebel against the nearly unanimous wishes of his party and State, and insure his own defeat for reelection the following year. Beset by doubts as to his proper responsibility under a representative form of government, and feeling trapped in his own office by his friends and associates, Henderson wavered. He meekly offered to wire his resignation to the governor, enabling a new appointee to vote for conviction; and, when it was doubted whether a new Senator would be permitted to vote, he agreed to ascertain whether his own vote would be crucial.

But an insolent and threatening telegram from Missouri restored his sense of honor, and he swiftly wired his reply: "Say to my friends that I am sworn to do impartial justice according to law and conscience, and I will try to do it like an honest man."

John Henderson voted for the President's acquittal, the last important act of his senatorial career. Denounced, threatened, and burned in effigy in Missouri, he did not even bother to seek reelection to the Senate. Years later his party would realize its debt to him, and return him to lesser offices, but for the Senate, whose integrity he had upheld, he was through.

It seems to me that, as the people of Missouri and indeed the Nation look back upon the courageous but tragic career of Senator Henderson, they will better appreciate the special contribution to our society made by Rockhurst and similar institutions. For in 1956, as in 1868, the individual citizen has an urgent but difficult responsibility to determine the facts and the policy decisions to be based upon those facts. And yet he knows that his political leaders, and most of his newspapers, are stating the facts from their own point of view—not dishonestly, not carelessly, and frequently not even knowingly—but simply because their role is the role of the advocate, not the judge. Even Government finds it difficult to present the truth in an age when truth has become a weapon in the struggle for power—truth that is bent, twisted, and subverted to fit the pattern of national policy. Frequently we in the West feel ourselves forced by this drumbeat of lies and propaganda to be discriminating in our selection of what facets of the truth we ourselves will disclose.

Thus the responsibility of a free university to pursue its own objective studies, to carry on the continuing search for the truth—both for its own sake and because only if we possess it can we really be free—is even more important today than ever before. Rockhurst College has succeeded in carrying out this mission, so that today it stands as a bulwark on the North American Continent in the battle for the preservation of Christian civilization.

I would like to discuss with you today in more detail an example of one of those issues where the truth and the right frequently are very difficult to determine—and where the use of catchwords and equivocal terms has made more possible the misunderstanding of this issue by American citizens. The issue to which I refer is the growing and recurrent problems of colonialism, nationalism, and the attitude of the United States and her allies.

Since World War II rudely shook our attitude of isolation, we have, for the sake of our own security, found our destiny to be closely linked with that of the British and the French, the Dutch and the Belgians—nations which still hold under their subjugation large areas of the world upon which they feel their ultimate security depends.

And thus we have been caught up in a dilemma which up to now has been insoluble. We want our allies to be strong; and yet quite obviously a part of their strength comes from their overseas possessions. We want the uncommitted peoples of the Middle East, Asia, and Africa to remain free from the ever-reaching tentacles of Soviet influence and responsive to the leadership of the United States and our allies—and yet those uncommitted peoples look upon those allies with at least as much suspicion in most cases, and more in some, as they do the Soviet Union. We fight to keep the world free from Communist imperialism—but in doing so we hamper our efforts, and bring suspicion upon our motives, by being closely linked with Western imperialism. We want—indeed we

desperately need, if the deterrent power of our Strategic Air Command is to have any meaning—to maintain Western bases in Cyprus, in North Africa, and in all the other areas around the borders of the Soviet Union—and yet we stand to lose those bases if the Communists are able to captivate the nationalistic movements that seek to drive out all vestiges of Western domination. We have permitted the reputation of the United States as a friend of oppressed people, in short, to be hitched to the chariot of the conqueror; because we have believed we could have it both ways.

As a result, our policies and statements on these matters have too frequently been characterized by indecision, confusion, haste, timidity and an excessive fear of giving offense. In the United Nations we have abstained on some key issues, vacillated on others, and prevented others from being even placed on the agenda. Our Secretary of State has spoken of Goa, and our Ambassador to France has spoken of Algeria, in terms which have led our motives and our sympathies to be questioned by those who seek the end of colonial rule. This is not a new pattern—our course in Indochina under the Democratic as well as the Republican administrations antagonized the Vietnamese people, refueled the propaganda machines of the Vietminh Communists and in the long run proved to be a disservice to the free world as a whole and even to France itself.

This policy—if it can be called a policy—of trying to look both ways at once, of trying to bury our heads in the sand when a colonial issue arises, of trying to please everybody and displease nobody—this is the policy which our Department of State likes to call "neutrality" on colonial issues. And when asked about it at a recent news conference, Secretary Dulles had this to say: "We expect to continue to take a position of neutrality because that is our general policy with relation to these highly controversial matters which involve countries both of whom are friends and where we ourselves are not directly involved."

I must respectfully disagree with the able Secretary, though I stress again the fact that this is no partisan matter. We are directly involved, deeply involved in these issues. They may not involve our possessions—they may not involve our treaties—they may not always even involve our military bases. But we are directly involved—our standing in the eyes of the free world, our leadership in the fight to keep that world free, our geographical and population advantages over the Communist orbit, our prestige, our security, our life, and our way of life—these are all directly involved. How then can we be wedded to this do-nothing policy called "neutrality." How can we be afraid to touch these "highly controversial" disputes between two friends, when their continuation—and our reluctance—only serve to strengthen the hand of the mutual enemy of us all?

I do not wish to oversimplify an endlessly complex problem. Nor do I wish to deny the success we have had in helping free countries remain free, and the value of the steps we have taken in the right direction on this subject. But the time has come for the United States to take a more forceful stand.

I urge, therefore, that this Nation, acting within appropriate limits of judgment and discretion, inform our Allies and the world at large that—after a reasonable period of transition for self-determination—this Nation will speak out boldly for freedom for all people—whether they are denied that freedom by an iron curtain of tyranny, or by a paper curtain of colonial ties and constitutional manipulations. We shall no longer abstain in the United Nations from voting on colonial issues—we shall no longer trade our vote on such issues for other supposed gains—we shall no longer seek to prevent the subjugated peoples of the world from being heard. And we shall recognize that the day of the colonial is through.

Of course such a stand will displease our allies—but it will displease the Soviets even more. For whether our allies like it or not, and whether they act to impede it or not, sooner or later, one by one, the traditional colonies of the western powers are breaking free. The primary question is whether they will then turn for association and support to the West—which has thus far too often hampered and discouraged their efforts for self-determination—or turn to the Communist East—which has (however hypocritically, in view of its own colonial exploitation) inflamed their nationalistic spirits and assumed the role of freedom's defender. I emphasize again that I do not fail to appreciate the difficulties of our hard pressed Allies—but I feel that their present colonial policies only serve to make easier the way of the Communist transgressor.

The path I suggest for this Nation will not be easy. We will find our policies hailed by extremists, terrorists and saboteurs for whom we could have no sympathy—and condemned by our oldest and most trusted friends who will feel we have deserted them. We will encounter the most difficult problems of government and justice known to man—the fate of the large and justifiably alarmed European minorities in North Africa—the lack of preparation for self-government on the part of many peoples eager to govern themselves now—the likelihood of this Nation being forced to take the place of the present colonial powers in providing the economic assistance which these new nations will need for many years—and the danger to western naval and air bases located in these key areas.

But we have faced difficult problems before—and we have faced them successfully whenever we were resolutely determined to take the hard, bold steps necessary for their solution.

If we are to secure the friendship of the Arab, the African and the Asian, we cannot hope to accomplish it solely by means of military pacts and assistance. Neither can we purchase it through extensive programs of economic grants and subsidies. We cannot win their hearts by making them dependent upon our handouts. We cannot keep them free by selling them free enterprise. Describing the perils of communism or the prosperity of the United States will be to no avail. No; the strength of our appeal to these key populations—and it is rightfully our appeal, and not that of the Communists—lies in our traditional and deeply felt philosophy of freedom and independence for all peoples everywhere. Whatever restraints may have been imposed upon this philosophy in our foreign policy pronouncements during the past decade, there can be no doubt that it still represents the basic attitude of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

Today this issue confronts us in Algeria, Cyprus, West New Guinea, and elsewhere. Tomorrow it may be in Portuguese Goa or Singapore—and the next day it may be in Tagoland or Tanganyika.

There are some who recognize these issues but dismiss them as unimportant. What has all this to do, they say, with the threat of war in the Middle East or the deterioration of our position in the Far East? The answer is, I believe, that these issues are fundamental to practically every crisis now occurring or which will occur in the next generation. For whatever the dispute may be that creates the headlines—we can never escape the fact that we are dependent upon the decisions of people who have hated, as their ancestors before them for centuries hated, the white men who bled them, beat them, exploited them, and ruled them. Perhaps it is already too late for the United States to repudiate these centuries of ill will, and to firmly but boldly press for a new generation of friendship among equal and independent states. But we dare not fail to make the effort.

NEED FOR MANDATORY POULTRY INSPECTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, 2 persons died and 62 became extremely ill in a severe psittacosis or parrot fever epidemic in Oregon during February and March. This terrible outbreak, as I reported to the Senate on March 29, was caused by diseased poultry on farms in rendering plants and in processing plants in the Portland area.

Most Americans do not realize that poultry which is served on their family tables is not at the present time subject to careful inspection. This is creating a serious health problem. We find that this practice does not meet with the favor of poultry raisers. Poultry raisers, who are very desirous of protecting their industry, wish to have much more careful supervision, from the health standpoint, of the slaughterhouses which prepare poultry for the family table.

I believe there is involved such a serious threat to the health of the Nation that we in Congress should take the necessary steps to bring to the poultry raisers the assistance for which the economic welfare of the threatened industry is crying out.

Reports from the Salem region indicate that Oregon may suffer still more from this dread poultry-caused illness. For 16 more men and women who processed poultry in the Salem area are now ill with what is suspected to be psittacosis. Health authorities are currently checking further.

Mr. President, these epidemics are not something about which we can shake our heads, say how terrible it all is, and then forget. These outbreaks can happen anytime and anywhere, spreading death and destruction. The International News Service carried a story on April 2 in which scientists of the Department of Agriculture make this point clear. INS said:

> Agriculture Department scientists have warned that the Nation's turkey industry is now threatened by an epidemic that has already led to two human deaths and sickness to 62 poultry workers * * * according to one official, "there is no doubt as to the potential danger to other turkey-producing States." He emphasized that the deadly virus could now erupt in any State anywhere at any time.

A further reason why the Congress cannot forget about this epidemic, and similar ones in other States, is that much of the human suffering can be prevented. The use of the mandatory poultry inspection, as outlined in the bill introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], S. 3176, of which I am a cosponsor, would minimize, if not completely end the human dangers coming from psittacosis-infected poultry.

I believe, Mr. President, we in the Congress must act and act fast on this measure. We must enact it in this session. The experience of Oregon has duplicated the previous experience of Texas, Nebraska, New Jersey, Virginia, and Iowa.

Epidemics in other States may in the future duplicate the experience of Oregon.

An excellent on-the-spot report of the Oregon epidemic has been published in the Butcher Workman, the official publication of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, AFL–CIO. Many of the persons who were made ill in the Oregon psittacosis outbreak are members of that union who work in poultry processing plants.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Butcher Workman entitled "Death Lurked in the Turkey Feathers," be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEATH LURKED IN THE TURKEY FEATHERS

A mysterious outbreak of psittacosis among Oregon poultry flocks during March has dramatically demonstrated why Congress should pass the Amalgamated-backed Murray-Priest-Hayworth bill which provides for Federal poultry inspection.

Before the antibiotic, aureomycin, stopped the pneumonialike disease, the sudden psittacosis epidemic had created havoc among Oregon's turkey handlers, many of them Amalgamated members, and was threatening to cripple the State's multi-million dollar "gobbler" industry.

In its wake the disease left this casualty list: some 61 human illnesses, including many Amalgamated members, 2 human deaths in which psittacosis was a "factor"; loss of more than 2,500 turkeys, an embargo on Oregon turkeys, and a virtual consumer boycott of the gobblers.

Yet, as this report will point out, the entire epidemic could have been prevented by proper inspection.

Instead, what happened was the worst psittacosis outbreak since the infamous Texas epidemic of 1954. And it happened in a State where poultry standards are high and in a situation in which the turkey industry itself was not to blame.

The "villain" was ignorance, which resulted in failure to recognize the baffling virus before it was too late. It would have been discovered had a proper inspection program been in effect.

This doesn't help the many turkey handlers who were stricken with the vicious virus—and the two men who died after handling the diseased birds. It doesn't help Mrs. Josie Phillips, a member of Local 231, Egg, Candle and Poultry Workers, who is fighting for her life today in a Portland hospital after being stricken with psittacosis in the turkey-picking room at Portland's Fresh Foods Co. Mrs. Phillips' blood count still is low, and she has been responding to treatment with painful slowness.

But this case does offer graphic and conclusive proof that the Nation's health will be further endangered if Congress does not enact the legislation advocated by Senator JAMES MURRAY, of Montana, Representatives J. PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee, and DON HAYWORTH, of Michigan. Their bill would establish a Poultry Inspection Service under the United States Food and Drug Administration. It would inspect poultry before and after slaughter and guard against outbreaks such as the Oregon epidemic.

"This case clearly demonstrates the desperate need for this legislation," declared Oregon's two United States Senators, WAYNE L. MORSE, and RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, after conferring with Amalgamated leaders and other officials on the psittacosis situation. "While no one actually was at fault, it is evident that proper inspection would have prevented the outbreak."

Senator MORSE, a cosponsor of the Murray Senate bill along with seven other Senators, plans to use the Oregon case to show other solons the need for proper Federal poultry inspection.

To get a clear picture of exactly what happened, the Butcher Workman carefully investigated the Oregon case and uncovered these facts:

The two infected turkey flocks which precipitated the outbreak had been losing birds for more than 3 months before the disease was recognized and reported to State authorities.

Had the disease been recognized and the aureomycin treatment given 3 months earlier, the following could have been avoided:

1. Suspected human cases of psittacosis placed at 61 by the Oregon State Board of Health with 2 deaths in which psittacosis is listed as a "factor."

2. Loss of over 2,500 birds, plus heavy loss of income from hatching eggs to both of the sick flocks.

3. An embargo by the State of Washington against all Oregon turkeys, poults and hatching eggs.

4. A sharp slump in sales of dressed turkeys as a result of public reaction, virtually knocking out a "turkey for Easter" campaign planned by the turkey industry. One grocery chain placed 2,000 gobblers on sale and sold only 6 birds.

The first contact with the diseased birds was made on November 8, 1955, at the State animal disease control diagnostic laboratory at Oregon State College. A group of birds from the Lyons Triple B turkey ranch at Sauvies Island in the lower Columbia River were being given a routine blood test for pullorum disease; it turned up a suspicious reaction on three turkeys.

But an autopsy examination showed no symptoms of any disease. The birds were found normal except for parasitic worms and the flock pronounced pullorum clean.

A week later, on November 15, Loren Johnson, a turkey grower from Scapoose in northwestern Oregon, brought six dead birds to the same laboratory and reported 20 were sick. Examination showed severe hemorrhagic, enteric and air sac conditions. A tentative diagnosis of fowl cholera was made, and sulfa drugs were prescribed.

During January, the Oregon State laboratory ran bacterial cultures for cholera on several batches of turkey legs from birds that had died in the Johnson flock. On January 31 a dead bird from the Lyons flock on Sauvies Island showed peritonitis and enteritis and sulfa was prescribed.

But in these cases, bacterial checks for cholera turned out to be negative—and the turkey losses continued.

By February the losses had increased to a rate of 30 to 40 birds daily, and truckloads of them were being hauled to a Portland rendering plant to be boiled down for tallow, feed, and fertilizer. Laboratory veterinarians at the Oregon State Laboratory continued to double check for cholera with negative results.

At this stage the situation started to erupt. On February 24 Dr. Samuel Osgood, epidemiologist for the Oregon Board of Health, received a call from a physician at the Portland Veterans' Administration hospital to report "a patient under treatment for pneumonia of an unusual character." The doctor suspected psittacosis, since the patient had been handling sick turkeys on Sauvies Island.

Dr. Osgood called Dr. Kermit Peterson, Oregon state veterinarian, who then called the State laboratory which had been investigating the mysterious malady. Tissue from the dead birds was put into mice. The diagnosis was psittacosis. This later was confirmed by United States Public Health Service laboratories in San Francisco and Montgomery, Ala.

Oregon health officers immediately swung into action, checking turkey handlers for signs of psittacosis infection. They found a remarkably high rate of human illness, particularly in the rendering plants. At 1 plant out of 32 employees, 24 became ill, a dozen were hospitalized. At other plants there were 29 cases. Two died, and Dr. Osgood credits psittacosis as a factor in their deaths. Confirmation of other suspected cases is awaiting the outcome of blood tests being made by the United States Communicable Diseases Center.

Amalgamated members, of local 231, Egg, Candle, and Poultry Workers, who were stricken by the disease included Ida Jackson, Gladys Bradley, Ida Miller, Josie Phillips, Johnnie Mae Hastings, Mary Murphy, Heber Holtorf, Ruth Beck, Mina Farris, Ruth Curtis, Fred Di Filippo, and Syble Enquist.

The diagnosis of psittacosis and the epidemic were announced to the press on March 9, and the Oregon Department of Agriculture promptly quarantined the diseased flock. Both flocks were placed on a heavy diet of aureomycin—which can cure both men and birds of psittacosis. (Before aureomycin, 20 percent of human cases ended in death.)

Within a week the psittacosis outbreak was cured by putting almost a pound of aureomycin in every ton of turkey feed. Most of the human victims (with a few exceptions, such as the Amalgamated's Josie Phillips) were cured with aureomycin treatments.

But, in the wake of the mysterious malady, one big question remained: Why weren't the Oregon State College veterinarians able to spot the disease which they first came in contact with on November 8, 1955?

The answer to that question is one main reason why Federal poultry-inspection legislation is needed now. The fact is poultry diseases are difficult to diagnose, as this case clearly proves. Although Oregon State College boasts one of the West's finest veterinary laboratories, it was unable to discover the disease in 3 months of diagnosis of the dead birds.

What does this reveal? For one thing, it clearly demonstrates that poultry diseases are so obscure that highly trained specialists—such as would be provided by the proposed United States Poultry Inspection Service—are needed to diagnose them. You wouldn't ask a general-practice doctor to diagnose a rare human disease. Yet this is what the Oregon State technicians were attempting to do with the diseased turkeys.

The Oregon veterinarians offer these theories as to why the disease was not discovered earlier:

1. It was camouflaged by other diseases. Erysipelas was present in one flock, and there also was a question of cholera.

2. Many facets of psittacosis still are unknown. This was the first known case in turkeys in Oregon (California, incidentally, had a similar outbreak at the same time).

3. The psittacosis virus may be fairly common in turkeys and other fowl, but in a mild form. It became virulent as it was able to attack birds weakened by other diseases or by exposure to severe winter weather. This virulence increased—became "hotter"—as it spread through the flock until finally healthy birds were succumbing. Tests are under way in California to find out if the mild virus from other birds can be "made hot" by passing it through turkeys.

Just how the disease happened to hit the Sauvies Island and Scapoose flock still is a mystery. Dr. Sam Osgood, Oregon State epidemiologist, believes that psittacosis may have been present in the area as long as 1946 and existed in latent form.

But the most prevalent theory is that the psittacosis microbe was transmitted to the turkeys by wild birds—principally ducks and seagulls—which swarm along the lower Co-

lumbia. These birds frequently mooch food from the turkey runs.

Recently United States Public Health Service specialists ran tests of wild game at Sauvies Island. They took out the internal organs of 20 wild ducks and from another 30 birds—ducks and seagulls—they took blood samples. These tests were repeated on seagulls in Portland garbage dumps.

"The problem," said Dr. Donald Mason, United States psittacosis specialist, "is to determine how this virus is being introduced into a flock of domestic birds." He suspects water birds because the 1954 Texas outbreak, which he investigated, indicated the infection came from gulls and willets in that area.

But, on the basis of his Texas experience, Mason admits that it may be hard to actually pinpoint the culprit. "We may never know," he told the Butcher Workman, "whether ducks or gulls gave it to turkeys, or vice versa."

Mason and other United States specialists point out that psittacosis is more than just a passing problem. Turkey psittacosis has been recorded in 6 States and outbreaks have occurred among other poultry species.

Human cases—in which the microbe is passed from bird to man—also appear to be on the increase. So far this year the State of Washington has recorded seven psittacosis cases—more than in several previous years.

The one encouraging development in the Oregon case was the prompt way that United States and State health and agricultural officials, the Amalgamated, and the industry moved to set up safeguards against future ravages from psittacosis.

Prevention of a repetition of the situation, with its hazards to human health, now seems assured, thanks to the effective leadership taken by amalgamated representatives, headed by W. R. (Bill) Davisson, secretary of Portland local 231, and Shirley Barker, international poultry director, who flew in from Chicago to investigate the epidemic.

Davisson and Barker demanded an antemortem inspection of all turkeys by the State department of agriculture. Dr. Kermit Peterson, State veterinarian, agreed that this was a just request. He has promised to provide licensed veterinarians for antemortem inspection of all turkeys grown in Oregon.

Other points of the control program adopted by the State, the Amalgamated, and the turkey industry:

1. Wide dissemination of information about the disease among all interested groups, including turkey handlers, so an outbreak may be recognized and reported immediately.

2. An immediate hold order on suspected flocks, with a strict quarantine following laboratory confirmation.

3. Prescription for aueromycin treatment, with safeguards to prevent spread of the disease through hatching eggs and poults. (The use of 50 to 100 grams of an aureomycin compound per ton of turkey feed will prevent the microbe from taking hold in flocks.)

The two recovered flocks will be handled in accordance with the procedures set up in this new control program. Eggs can be hatched in any Oregon hatchery that handles only eggs from those two flocks. The poults can be sold for raising as market birds by any Oregon grower. Neither eggs nor poults can be shipped outside the State.

At the end of the hatching season, turkeys from the two flocks must be slaughtered in an approved processing plant, having veterinary inspection approved by public health officials. Any sign of infection means that processing will be halted and the birds returned to the farm until lesions disappear.

In conclusion, the Oregon outbreak proves two points:

1. It demonstrates that psittacosis, or other baffling poultry diseases, can happen anywhere—not merely in a State where poultry conditions are substandard, such as Texas. Conditions in Oregon are excellent, yet psittacosis occurred anyway.

2. It shows that there is a definite nationwide need for a United States Poultry Inspection Service, as advocated by the Amalgamated. This situation would have never happened had such an agency existed.

The next move is up to Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the factual coverage of this article leaves no doubt about the serious nature of the epidemic in the poultry industry and it emphasizes the urgency of immediate action on the part of the Government to deal with the dangers incident to diseased poultry. The article supplies strong supporting evidence in favor of the immediate enactment of the bill S. 3176.

Mr. President, I close with this plea to the committee which has jurisdiction of S. 3176: "The health of your fellow Americans calls for an immediate report of the bill by your committee, so that the Senate may take action very quickly on this health-protecting measure."

CONSTRUCTION OF MODERN GREAT LAKES BULK CARGO VESSELS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further morning business to be transacted, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 3108.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3108) to encourage the construction of modern Great Lakes bulk cargo vessels.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, so that the Senate may take action on the nomination previously passed over.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the nomination passed over.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles J. Lowen, Jr., to be Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination? [Putting the question.]

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allott	Gore	Monroney
Barrett	Green	Morse
Beall	Hayden	Mundt
Bender	Hennings	Murray
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bible	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pastore
Bridges	Hruska	Payne
Bush	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Jackson	Purtell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kerr	Scott
Clements	Knowland	Smathers
Cotton	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Laird	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Langer	Sparkman
Douglas	Lehman	Stennis
Duff	Long	Symington
Dworshak	Magnuson	Thye
Eastland	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Frear	McCarthy	Williams
Fulbright	McClellan	Wofford
George	McNamara	Young
Goldwater	Millikin	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

POLITICAL SITUATION IN WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at his press conference this morning President Eisenhower, in reply to a question asked by a member of the press, said that he does not believe the Chief Executive should intervene in primary elections. I fully agree with the President. I adhered to the substance of that statement

when I was interviewed in Wisconsin during the week following the convention. The people of any State would resent being told how to vote. This was clearly demonstrated in past administrations when attempted dictation boomeranged in a number of instances.

On the other hand, the people of a State are interested in a President's factual evaluation of a public servant's services. Such evaluation—very kind and favorable—has been made by the President of my services, including three of his past letters which I reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And on other occasions, the President has been kind enough to express his warm, personal regard for my loyal efforts. Perhaps he may choose to do so again in the future without, of course, attempting to interfere.

I do not believe that a candidate such as myself should put the Chief Executive of our country in a corner, and I would never do so.

I reiterate that it is the function of the people of my own State of Wisconsin to make the choice. I am campaigning as a loyal supporter of the President who believes in him as a great statesman. And I shall continue to fight for his policies, come what may.

I repeat the plain fact that the people of Wisconsin overwhelmingly support the President. They know, however, that the minority in our State, which consists of Eisenhower haters, is behind my opponent.

In any event, I am confident that I will be overwhelmingly renominated in September.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9720) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FOGARTY, Mr. FERNANDEZ, Mr. LANHAM, Mr. DENTON, Mr, CANNON, Mr. TABER, Mr. HAND, and Mr. JENSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 1866. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas V. Compton;

H. R. 8123. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; and

H. R. 9390. An act asking appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

CONSTRUCTION OF MODERN GREAT LAKES BULK CARGO VESSELS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3108) to encourage the construction of modern Great Lakes bulk cargo vessels.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has the morning hour been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning hour has been concluded, and the unfinished business has been laid before the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Do I understand correctly that the Senate is now operating under a time limitation in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the time limitation is 30 minutes on each amendment and 1 hour on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield the floor.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 4, after the word "in", it is proposed to strike out "the lowest cost foreign yard" and insert in lieu thereof "a foreign shipbuilding center which is deemed by the Secretary to furnish a fair and representative example for the determination of the estimated foreign cost of construction of vessels of the type proposed to be constructed, and".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER].

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I have discussed the perfecting amendment with the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. It is an amendment which brings the determination of the cost of construction of vessels built in foreign shipyards into conformity with the formula for determining the cost of constructing salt water vessels. I shall use the time allocated for the amendment to discuss the bill briefly.

Senate bill 3108 was introduced jointly by myself, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. Hearings were held before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the bill was reported unanimously by that committee.

With the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway, a new element will be brought into the Great Lakes shipping area. At present, shipping in the Great Lakes consists of movements between American port and American port, or between Canadian port and American port. The Welland Canal makes it impossible for foreign shipping to enter the Great Lakes in an attempt to take over that trade.

It is well known that there has been a shift in the use of ore deposits in North America. There are great ore deposits in the Labrador area, and there has been a shift from the use of ore from the Mesabi Range to the use of Canadian ore. That shift will become more intensive as the years go by.

As I stated previously, after the St. Lawrence Seaway is completed, it will open up the Great Lakes to foreign ore carriers, which will be able to move in and engage in the freight traffic between Canada and the United States. During peacetime that is of little consequence, other than as it affects the domestic industry. But we know that today, on the drafting boards of many foreign shipyards there are plans for construction of ships for that particular trade.

We are all conscious, I am sure, of the great part the Great Lakes ore-carrying fleet played in the successful prosecution of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war. We know that foreign-flag ships would, in time of emergency, seek to stay within their own national waters, and would not be available for the very necessary shipments of ore in time of emergency.

If it were not for its national-defense features, I would say the bill should not be before the Senate of the United States; but it is necessary that the bill be enacted into law because of our defense needs. In the event of a national emergency, we would have to call upon the Great Lakes ore-carrying fleet to maintain the lifeline in bringing ore from the mines to the mills.

What does the bill do? The bill simply does for the Great Lakes that which we now do for salt water operators. The domestic ship operators know that the future is not bright, and that it is not feasible for them to compete, on an economic basis, with foreign-built and foreign-operated ships in this particular trade. The bill allows American ship operators who are forced to construct ships in American yards to receive a cost differential as between the actual cost of constructing ships in American yards and the cost of construction in foreign yards. That determination is to be made by the Maritime Commission, and the differential will vary, but, normally, it will be between 40 and 45 percent of the cost of construction.

Mr. President, that arrangement is nothing new. It is the same type of formula which is now used for offshore shipping. It will afford shipping operators on the Great Lakes and yards which will build ships for the Great Lakes trade the same protection afforded salt water operators who have the same competition with foreign operators and foreign ship manufacturers. That is the national maritime policy.

Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong the debate for any length of time. Therefore, I shall conclude my remarks on the amendment. If the Senator from Delaware wishes to speak on the amendment or on the bill, he may do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a few moments to me on the amendment?

Mr. POTTER. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have discussed this amendment with the Senator from Michigan. We are in complete agreement. I think the amendment should be adopted, and I certainly support it. Without the adoption of the amendment, the bill would provide that one of the determining factors, in arriving at the cost of ships constructed abroad, would be based not on a bona fide bid submitted by a responsible yard, but on a bid from any yard which used to build ships and which may not be in the shipbuilding business now. The amendment does nail the formula down to a more realistic basis. It is the same formula provided in the shipping act. Therefore, I think the amendment certainly improves the bill.

I may have other objections to other features of the bill which I shall state later; but I am in complete agreement with the Senator from Michigan on this amendment, and I hope the Senate will adopt it.

Mr. POTTER. Is it agreeable to the Senator from Delaware that the amendment be disposed of at this time?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I yield back the time remaining to me on the amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, if no other Senator wishes to speak on the amendment, I yield back the remainder of the time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The Senator from Tennessee yields back all the time remaining to him.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield back the time remaining to him?

Mr. POTTER. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time remaining on the amendment has been yielded back.

The Chair understood the Senator from Tennessee to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. GORE. I withdraw the suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee withdraws his suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

No credit shall be allowed under the provisions of this subsection, and no credit shall be allowed or payment made under any other provision of this act or of any other act providing Government assistance in the acquisition or construction of vessels, with respect to any vessel the contract for acquisition or construction of which is entered into after the effective date of this subsection, unless such contract shall have been entered into as the result of competitive bidding and awarded to the lowest responsible bidder.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have discussed the amendment with the Senator from Michigan. I think he is willing to accept the amendment. It merely provides that any contract issued for the construction of any ships which are subsidized by the United States Government must be awarded on a competitive-bid basis and to the lowest responsible bidder. I think the amendment should certainly be part of this or any other bill dealing with a similar subject.

I understand the Senator from Michigan has no objection to the amendment, in which event I shall not speak further on it.

Mr. POTTER. If the Senator from Delaware will yield, I should like to say I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield back the time remaining to me on the amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield back the time remaining to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time remaining on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have one further amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. I might say that if the Senator from Michigan will agree to it as easily as he did to the last amendment, we shall soon dispose of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the appropriate place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. *Provided, however,* That the trade-in allowance shall be the original cost of the ship to the purchaser minus usual or recognized depreciation rates.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes on the amendment.

I agree with the Senator from Michigan that we do need an American merchant marine. But if we are going to subsidize it, let us do so aboveboard, spell out the formula, ascertain what the cost will be, and see if the American people want to pay for it.

The Senator from Michigan pointed out that the bill would extend to the Great Lakes shipping industry the same formula now applied to the salt water shipping industry. That statement is partly true, but not quite completely. I think the Senator will agree with me that there can be no question if we adopt the principle of subsidizing the Great Lakes shipping industry by allowing it the differential between cost of ships constructed in this country and abroad, we shall later be asked to adopt the same formula with regard to operational subsidies. If one is worthy of subsidy, the other one must be given consideration. They go together. There can be no question about that. This bill is just an entering wedge and embraces a principle which will ultimately cost the taxpayers millions if approved.

Likewise I point out that the bill contains a vastly different formula. The formula for the oceanic shipping industry provides that the trade-in allowance shall be the fair and reasonable value of the ship. Then there is an additional formula which provides that the Government shall pay the shipping company the differential between the cost of building the ship in an American shipyard and the cost of building it abroad. But those are two separate formulas.

The formula contained in the pending bill has no connection with the formulas which apply to the oceanic shipping industry. The pending bill merely provides that a shipping company may make use of any old hulk and, if it is able to tow it into a port—regardless of the condition of the ship, regardless of whether it still has any machinery in it, and regardless of the additional cost of placing the ship in usable condition—may have that ship qualify under the provisions of the bill, and be given an allowance of three to four million dollars. This may be many times more than the original cost. I think the Senator from Michigan will agree with me that that is the effect of the bill.

The Maritime Commission has pointed out that the average subsidy paid under this formula would be approximately from $3,500,000 to $4 million a ship. Some of these ships were sold originally to the Great Lakes shipping industry by the United States Government for as little as $102,000 apiece. After the company has operated such a ship for a number of years, should the Government now pay $4 million for it?

If we are going to give subsidies to the American merchant marine, let us do it openly, not in the concealed manner provided by the bill.

I point out that 302 ships of various types in the Great Lakes fleet are eligible for the proposed subsidy; and if the proposed subsidy is carried to its extreme, it would cost more than $1 billion.

Let me also point out that 58 of the eligible ships are owned by the United States Steel Corp.; and I think we can agree that the United States Steel Corp. is able to build the ships it needs and is able to pay for them. Fourteen ships which will be eligible for the subsidy provided for in this bill belong to the Bethlehem Steel Co.

Three of the ships belong to the Hanna Coal & Ore Co.; 4 of the ships belong to the Inland Steel Corp.; and 2 of the ships belong to the International Harvester Corp. Others are owned by various ore companies. All these companies are able to pay the proper prices for the ships they need. Certainly those companies are able to pay the necessary differential and are able to pay for the construction of any ships they need.

The subsidy program proposed by the pending bill is a new one. It would be a grave mistake for us to adopt it here without proper study.

If we are to adopt the principle of subsidizing shipping on the Great Lakes,

let us do so in an open manner, and let us state what subsidy shall be paid.

In answer to the Senator's argument that the bill is in the interest of the national defense, I remind the Senate that that is always a good argument to make, but it so happens the Secretary of Defense is not in favor of the bill. Every Government agency has recommended against enactment of the bill and has done so on the basis that there is no justification for its enactment. Certainly those agencies have some responsibility for the national defense and are in a position to know what is good for the country.

Again I say that if the pending amendment is not agreed to, the potential cost of the bill to the American taxpayers will be in excess of $1 billion, and, furthermore, we shall have no real control over the program after it goes into effect, because then it will be said that we have authorized the Maritime Commission to make these contracts, and that therefore the Appropriations Committee must recommend the necessary appropriations. We have heard that argument made time and time again.

Therefore, now is the time to make the proper decision.

Mr. President, either my amendment should be adopted, or the bill should be defeated.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. Does this amendment apply to the building of vessels in the coastal shipyards, or does the amendment apply only to Great Lakes shipping? It does not apply to transports built in the coastal shipyards, does it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The present amendment applies only to the Great Lakes shipping industry. But I point out that the law applicable to the oceanic shipping already provides a similar formula, by means of which the owners of oceanic ships traded in to the Maritime Commission are allowed the fair and reasonable market value of the ships, and then the construction differential subsidy is paid as such. It is defined as such; and no back-door "gimmick," such as is proposed in the pending bill, is used.

Under the pending bill, it is conceivably possible that the construction differential subsidy would be less than the trade-in allowance, in which event the manufacturer could, unless the formula were more carefully spelled out, get a larger differential subsidy than would actually be justified. The bill does not provide any limit on it.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield at this point?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. It is indicated, then, that the amendment of the Senator from Delaware goes beyond the requirements—even though similar to them—for ships built in the Atlantic coast shipyards and receiving the subsidy from the United States Government. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It goes beyond that, to this extent: If this amendment is adopted—and I wish to be perfectly frank about the matter—it will delete from the bill the subsidy provisions, because there is no other section of the bill which provides that the Government shall pay to the Great Lakes shipping industry a construction differential subsidy computed as such, and one which could be audited by the General Accounting Office as such. It is my argument that that is an entirely different question. If we are going to adopt such a subsidy provision, then let it be incorporated in a separate bill, and let the proper committee hold hearings on it and then report it to the Senate. But let us not bring in such subsidy formula through the back door in such a manner as would be done by means of the pending bill. That same point was emphasized by the Comptroller General. Under the provisions of this bill, there would be no control over the extent of the subsidy. The subsidy would be the loosest kind of subsidy authority ever made.

Mr. McNAMARA. Then the practical effect of the amendment would be that no ships would be built on the Great Lakes. Instead, and logically, the ships would be built only in places to which the amendment did not apply.

Let me say that I think the amendment is a most unfair one.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I do not think it follows that if the amendment is adopted ships would not be built on the Great Lakes. Is the Senator from Michigan attempting to tell me that the steel companies will not build ships in which to transport their ore? Such a statement would be ridiculous. All of us know that the steel companies will build the ships they need. They must do so. But if we are to provide a subsidy for the steel industry, let us recognize it as such; and if that is what you want, say so.

We should remember that the companies bought many of these ships from the Government in the first instance. I have called attention to the case of a company which bought for $102,000 apiece, three ships which were only about 4 years old when the company bought them. They had cost the Government an average of more than $7,500,000 apiece. The Government sold the ships to the company for $102,000 apiece. How much more subsidy does the company want? Instead of having my amendment apply, the company now wants the Congress to pass a bill under which the company will be paid approximately $3,500,000 for each of the ships, after the company is through with them.

Mr. McNAMARA. If the Senator from Delaware is asking me how much further subsidy the companies want, let me say that I think the Great Lakes shipbuilding industry should be entitled to the same subsidy that the coastal shipbuilding industry enjoys. I understand that is the aim of those who framed the bill.

In reply to the question, "What do they want?", let me say that I want the Great Lakes shipbuilding industry to receive the same treatment as that received by the coastal shipbuilders.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then a bill to that effect should be introduced separately, and should be considered by the appropriate committee, and should be reported as such. Then you can explain to your constituents, who will be paying the bill, just where their money goes and who gets it.

It is said that the bill applies only to ships operated on the Great Lakes. However, the bill contains no provision which would prevent ships to which the bill applies from later being placed in the oceanic shipping service and perhaps even operated there under foreign flags.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware is 100 percent in error.

In the first place, when an American operator turns his ship in to the Government, the Government does not pay him for the ship. He turns it in for the American fleet, without costing the Government one nickel for that. The cost to the Government is the differential between the cost of construction in an American yard and the cost of construction in a foreign yard. That forces our operators to build their ships in American yards. The distinguished Senator from Delaware knows that in the case of ships for the oceanic service, the companies can obtain a Government allowance, and then can turn around and have the Government pay the differential between the cost of construction in an American yard and the cost of construction in a foreign yard.

I may add that, so far as the Department of Defense is concerned, we had no testimony on the bill. We received testimony from the Department of Commerce, which said, "We recognize that there is a problem. We recognize that there must be an American-owned flag fleet on the Great Lakes in case of national emergency. We do not know the answer."

It so happens that our committee includes among its membership the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who is probably one of the best informed Members of Congress on maritime matters, and other Senators who have been very diligent in this field. We have a competent staff. It is the best judgment of the committee that this is the type of legislation which is needed to assure and safeguard an American-flag fleet on the Great Lakes.

By 1960, more than 213 vessels, or 62 percent of the fleet, will be 50 years of age or older. The Senator from Delaware knows that a serious problem of obsolescence confronts us at the present time.

The Senator from Delaware sets up a straw man when he says that some 300 ships will be turned in. The Senator knows that we do not have facilities on the Great Lakes to handle construction in such numbers. I predict that in the next 5 years not more than 20 ships will be built under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is there anything in the bill which provides that the ships must be built in the Great Lakes area?

Mr. POTTER. Yes; there is.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The provision is that they must be built in American shipyards.

Mr. POTTER. I invite the Senator's attention to the language on page 2, beginning in line 10:

A vessel shall be considered a "new vessel" for purposes of this subdivision if it (A) is constructed after January 1, 1956, in a Great Lakes shipyard within the United States——

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will yield, I respectfully remind him that the amendment which was agreed to, and to which the Senator assented, provides that the construction of all ships must be based upon competitive bidding by American shipyards, and that covers the entire United States.

Mr. POTTER. I had assumed that the Senator's amendment, which we discussed, included Great Lakes shipyards.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The amendment provided for competitive bidding by American shipyards. It was not limited to Great Lakes shipyards. There would be no bona fide competitive bidding if it were limited to certain areas.

Mr. POTTER. There is a limitation at present. Competitive bidding is limited to east-coast shipyards with respect to east-coast construction, and to Pacific-coast shipyards with respect to Pacific-coast construction. There are at least five shipyards on the Great Lakes. It is the intention that under the terms of the bill, ship construction will be confined to the Great Lakes shipyards. I am sure the Senator did not plan to be devious, and that he will accept an amendment confining the construction to the Great Lakes shipyards.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; it was my intention—as it was in connection with the amendment I previously offered—that there should be bona fide competitive bidding. It is not bona fide competitive bidding if we say that the competitive bids must be based upon construction in certain yards. Some of the shipyards are owned by the companies which are to operate the ships. The steel for the ships will be furnished by companies which will be beneficiaries of the subsidies. Surely we are not going to say that the United States Government can accept a bid only from a certain company which may be even going to operate the ships.

Mr. POTTER. I know of no shipyard which is owned by one of the companies which is operating on the Great Lakes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator will admit that the steel for the ships will be furnished by the companies just referred to, will he not?

Mr. POTTER. Perhaps so; but the steel companies do not own the shipyards.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair assumes that the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Michigan have been yielding themselves time by agreement with the acting majority leader.

Do both sides yield back the remaining time?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, if there is no further debate, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator mean to yield back the remaining time?

Mr. McNAMARA. Not at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There must be some agreement with respect to the time consumed by the quorum call.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a quorum call without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I withdraw my unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator's withdrawing his request to rescind the previous order? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will continue the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from Delaware has 4 minutes remaining, and the opposition to the amendment has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I personally have no objection to the Senator's unanimous-consent request. However, I know that there is a standing objection on this side of the aisle to requesting a yea-and-nay vote by unanimous consent. Therefore, if the Senator persists in his request, I shall have to object.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I realize that there are not enough Members on the floor to have the yeas and nays ordered without unanimous consent. Therefore I renew my request for a quorum call. I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask that the time be not charged to either side.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I did not hear the Senator's request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have suggested the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 4 minutes remaining, and the opposition has 9 minutes remaining. Does the Senator from Delaware request that the time consumed in the quorum call be not charged to either side?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I make that request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, what is the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 4 minutes remaining on the amendment. The opposition to the amendment has 9 minutes remaining. The Senator from Delaware has suggested the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time consumed in the quorum call be not charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request of the Senator from Delaware is that a quorum call be had, and that the time be not charged to either side.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has all time for debate on the amendment been consumed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes remain for debate in favor of the amendment, and 9 minutes remain for debate in opposition.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Why not consume all the time on a quorum call? Then the Senate can proceed in the regular order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. So far as I am concerned, all I shall require is 1 or 2 minutes when more Senators have come into the Chamber.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We are prepared to yield back the remainder of our time. I suggest that both sides yield back the remainder of their time and that then there be a quorum call.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no objection, if we may have a few minutes for debate on the bill when more Senators have come into the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no objection to the Senator's request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will call the roll. The time consumed in the quorum call will not be charged to either side.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 4 minutes remaining, and the majority leader has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I merely wish again to point out that my amendment simply proposes, with reference to trade-in allowances, that there be allowed the fair and reasonable market value, taking into consideration the cost of the ships to the persons who originally bought them, minus the usually recognized depreciation rates.

If the amendment is not adopted it will be possible, under the bill, to allow an average of approximately $3½ million or $4 million for each ship, regardless of its age and condition. I previously pointed out, as one glaring example, the fact that 3 ships cost approximately $7½ million apiece to build, and after they were 4 years old they were sold to one of the Great Lakes operators for

$102,000 apiece. If the pending amendment is not adopted we shall be authorizing the Government to pay from three and a half to four million dollars apiece for these same ships after they are worn out. There is no justification for that.

Mr. President, I again ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. After all time has been yielded back, will it be in order to suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the majority leader yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER].

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware would completely destroy the bill. It would introduce a new factor. Under the bill, the Government would not pay one nickel for the ships traded in. The allowance given would represent the cost of construction in an American yard, where American operators are forced to build their ships, as compared with construction in a foreign yard.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. POTTER. I cannot yield; I do not have the time.

Under existing maritime policy with reference to salt water ship construction and operation, the Government does give an allowance for the ship which is turned in and does give a differential between the cost of constructing a ship in an American yard as against constructing it in a foreign yard. The bill makes no provision for any allowance for a turned-in ship. It is turned over to the Government for a reserve fleet. Even with the passage of the bill our Great Lakes operation would not be on a parity with the generous, and, I think, necessary action in the handling of our salt water maritime problem.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In the event a ship is not acquired by someone who wishes to operate it on the Great Lakes, it might well be anchored somewhere as surplus, declared to be obsolete, and probably towed out and sunk. There is before us now the question as to what we shall do with surplus vessels. I think it would be sound economics to put them into the fleet on the Great Lakes rather than to anchor them in some harbor further to deteriorate as the years go by.

Mr. POTTER. The Senator from Minnesota is absolutely correct. He knows that during times of emergency we must have all the cargo ships we can obtain. It is not always possible to have a ship-construction program during an emergency. It will be remembered that during World War II we did not have the necessary ship construction.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware provides that an allowance shall be made on the actual cost of the vessel, minus depreciation. Sixty-two percent of the vessels are 50 years of age or over. Ship construction 50 years ago was considerably different from ship construction today. Most of the vessels have already been depreciated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, does the Senator from Delaware desire to answer the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to read what the Comptroller General said about this bill. He likewise approves bringing this subsidy out into the open.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield myself 2 minutes. The Comptroller General said in his letter to the committee:

> To the extent that the credit allowances computed under the bill exceed the fair and reasonable values of the obsolete vessels traded in, the Government's payment of the difference will constitute a subsidy—a hidden subsidy. The 1936 act was conceived with the sound idea of putting an end to the hidden or disguised subsidies contained in the old ocean-mail contracts. Accordingly, we recommend against favorable consideration of this measure and urge that any subsidization of the costs of constructing new Great Lakes vessels or preferential treatment to Great Lakes shipyards which is deemed necessary or desirable by Congress be provided in express terms.

That is exactly what I have been saying all afternoon. If we are to pay a subsidy for these ships, let us do it openly and aboveboard, and not hide it under some little "gimmick" by which an allowance would be made far in excess of what a particular wornout ship was worth.

Regardless of what the Senator from Michigan says, there is an average trade-in value of from $3,500,000 to $4 million a ship. A broken-down, wornout ship can be towed into port or one in good condition can sail into port under its own power, and there is absolutely no difference at all in the trade-in allowance. There will be no relationship to the original cost, the age, or the condition of the ship. That certainly is an unsound practice and is not recommended by any agency of the Government.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time. Before I suggest the absence of a quorum I renew my request for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader still has time under his control. Does he yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will yield back the time on this side provided the Senator from Delaware will yield back the remainder of his time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we ascertain if we can have the yeas and nays ordered?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I object.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allott	Gore	Monroney
Barrett	Green	Morse
Beall	Hayden	Mundt
Bender	Hennings	Murray
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bible	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pastore
Bridges	Hruska	Payne
Bush	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Jackson	Purtell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kerr	Scott
Clements	Knowland	Smathers
Cotton	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Laird	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Langer	Sparkman
Douglas	Lehman	Stennis
Duff	Long	Symington
Dworshak	Magnuson	Thye
Eastland	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Frear	McCarthy	Williams
Fulbright	McClellan	Wofford
George	McNamara	Young
Goldwater	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I renew my request for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have one further amendment which I should like to submit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to say to the Senators that I shall take only a few minutes to speak on the amendment, and I should like to have the yeas and nays on the amendment. I shall then have no further amendment to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

> SEC. 2. That the Shipping Act of 1916 is amended by adding a new section, as follows:
>
> "SEC. 45. No common carrier by water subject to this act (the Shipping Act of 1916)

shall directly or indirectly issue any ticket or pass for the free or reduced-rate transportation of any passenger in foreign commerce or in commerce between the United States and its Territories and possessions, or directly or indirectly give any free or reduced rate transportation to any such passenger, except, under such terms and conditions as the Federal Maritime Board may prescribe, to its directors, officers, and employees and their immediate families; witnesses and attorneys attending any legal investigation in which such common carrier by water is interested; persons injured in accidents at sea and physicians and nurses attending such persons; persons rescued at sea; and any person with the object of providing relief in cases of general epidemic, pestilence, or other calamitous visitation. Nothing contained in this section shall prohibit any common carrier by water, under such terms and conditions as the Board may prescribe, from interchanging with any other common carrier by water free tickets, free passes, or free or reduced-rate transportation for the directors, officers, and employees and their immediate families. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any common carrier by water with respect to any vessel that is both documented under the laws of a foreign country and owned, leased, or chartered by a person who is a citizen of a foreign country."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Delaware yield to himself?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I request the yeas and nays on the amendment, while there are a sufficient number of Senators present on the floor of the Senate. Certainly, the Members of the Senate will not mind voting on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested by the Senator from Delaware.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is very simple. It incorporates into the Shipping Act of 1916 the same language and same provision which is applicable now to railroads and airlines; namely, that no Member of Congress, nor any other official of the Government working in any capacity, nor any member of their families can be given free transportation or sold transportation at a reduced rate by any shipping company which has been the recipient of the benefit of any construction differential subsidy or any operational subsidy on its ships.

This will apply to any shipping company affected under the provisions of this act or those affected by any other act previously enacted by Congress wherein that company would be the beneficiary of a Government subsidy.

Simply stated, it prohibits the American shipping industry from subsidizing the vacations of any Government official.

The Senate, by its previous action, has approved the subsidy provision of the pending bill. I recognize that the ships involved are mostly cargo carriers, and that passengers will not be involved to any great extent. However, the amendment offered is applicable to all water transportation, oceanic or on the Great Lakes. Any passenger-carrying ship which is being subsidized by the American taxpayers will not in the future, if the amendment is adopted, be permitted to carry at reduced transportation fares any Member of Congress, or any Government official in any capacity, or any member of their families.

Certainly the amendment should be adopted. Years ago Congress recognized the danger of the practice whereby railroads were giving free passes to public officials who were in a position to vote on the amount of railroad subsidies. Congress has extended a subsidy to the shipping industry and the same rules should apply. Let us provide that no one in a position to rule on the amount of the subsidy a company will get shall obtain from that company a reduced fare either for himself or for members of his family.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I have no objection to accepting the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If this amendment can be adopted——

Mr. POTTER. The Senator is referring now to passenger fares; is he not? The amendment has nothing to do with cargo.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly; a person goes as a passenger, not as freight. The amendment affects only passenger rates. However, while the language is not contained in the amendment, it would be the intent of the amendment that if a person carried any freight with him, he would have to pay the same rates for freight that everyone else had to pay. I have never heard of a reduction being put into effect in that manner, but if so, it would be prohibited.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back the time remaining to him?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield back the time remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan if he has an understanding with the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. POTTER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does that make the bill acceptable to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The amendment is certainly acceptable.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Delaware still oppose the bill? Does the acceptance of the amendment clear up the Senator's objection to the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. I am not in favor of extending subsidies to the Great Lakes shipping industry, but acceptance of the amendment will greatly improve the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the time remaining to me with the understanding that there will be a voice vote on the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is satisfactory. All that I want is the passage of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield time to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have been very happy to be a cosponsor of Senate bill 3108, because I know something of the situation facing the Great Lakes vessels operators today.

I should like to take these few moments to summarize the situation.

A large majority of the vessels comprising the Great Lakes fleet were built prior to 1920, many during the period from 1905 to 1910. The hulls of these vessels are structurally sound and well maintained, but by modern day standards they are relatively inefficient and obsolete, and should soon be replaced. Yet vessel operators are reluctant to undertake new construction, for good reason.

Mr. President, the backbone of Great Lakes commerce is iron ore. Last year better than 23 million tons of iron ore were imported for consumption in the United States. Most foreign sources are producing in excess of estimated rates, so that the supply of foreign ore will be more than sufficient to take care of the increased demand brought about by our expanding economy. Where these ores move to seaboard ports in low-cost, foreign-flag vessels, such ships are in competition with Great Lakes vessels in the movement of Lake Superior ore.

Great Lakes vessels must also compete with Canadian vessels in the international commerce in bulk commodities between the United States and Canada. This commerce already totals nearly 30 million tons annually, and is growing from year to year. Already American operators are losing out to their Canadian competitors because Canadian costs are only about two-thirds of ours. Once the seaway is completed, the vessels of other nations will be able to engage in this trade. Because of the decided cost advantage which such vessels will have, it seems reasonably certain that they will drive the American-flag vessels from this trade entirely.

Consequently, with the shifting trade picture and increased emphasis upon international trade with Canada, American operators are reluctant to assume the high cost of constructing vessels in Great Lakes shipyards. Without Government aid which will enable them to

obtain new vessels at a price comparable to that paid by their foreign competitors, American operators cannot survive in the international trade with Canada.

S. 3108 is designed to accomplish two things. First, it will enable American operators to turn in uneconomic vessels in exchange for an allowance of credit which will put the cost of a new vessel on a parity with foreign cost. Second, it will establish a reserve fleet for use in an emergency, when, in an all-out war, foreign or overseas sources of iron ore and other strategic materials will undoubtedly be cut off.

Mr. President, my colleagues know that I have long been a stanch advocate of freer international competition. The one exception—a clearly demonstrable one, in my opinion—is in the case of national defense. Considerations of the national defense require that we maintain sufficient bulk-cargo vessel capacity to move over the sheltered route of the Great Lakes the quantities of iron ore and other basic bulk materials required by heavy industry.

At the minimum, the Great Lakes fleet should be maintained at a level where it is capable of moving at least 185 million tons of bulk commodities annually. On the basis of peacetime requirements alone, experts predict that by 1960 the Lake Superior district will be producing about 81 million tons of iron ore, Canada will be producing 20 million tons, and other foreign sources an additional 21 million tons. The Great Lakes fleet should be capable of moving not only our domestic ore, but at least half of that normally produced in Canada. Moreover, sufficient excess vessel capacity should be maintained to absorb the increased demand which would be thrown on the lake fleet in the event overseas sources of ore were cut off. When we add to this at least 73 million tons of other essential commodities, such as coal, limestone, and grain, it becomes readily apparent that a seasonal capacity of 185 million tons is, indeed, conservative.

At the present time in a normal navigation season—that is, from April 15 to November 30—vessels of the Great Lakes fleet, if employed in their usual trades, have a theoretical, maximum seasonal capacity of about 178 million tons. Last year, better than 3 million tons of seasonal capacity were retired because of obsolescence. It is not to be expected that this anual rate of retirement of old vessels will remain constant. The ages of the vessels are such, however, that it will continue, so that, as of now, it may be said that by 1960 the minimum need for new vessels will be about 19 million tons of annual carrying capacity. It is interesting to note that this need will be only slightly less than one-half the probable Great Lakes United States-Canadian commerce in bulk commodities at that time.

If our Great Lakes vessels are unable to participate in this international trade, it is not to be expected that the old vessels which are retired will be replaced. The result will then be that our fleet will diminish to a point where it will be sufficient only to transport our domestic peacetime Great Lakes commerce. In the event of war, there would be a tragic shortage in United States vessel capacity. Among other things, S. 3108 would prevent this shortage by encouraging the construction of new vessels and creating a reserve for the old vessels.

Mr. President, these are the reasons why I believe that pasasge by the Senate of S. 3108 is in the national interest. I think enactment of this bill is essential to the maintenance and development of privately owned United States-flag vessels on the Great Lakes in the quantity and quality necessary to supply the demands of essential industries with basic bulk commodities, both in peacetime and in the event of a future national emergency.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from Minnesota will remember that 4 or 5 years ago the Government turned 10 vessels over to Great Lakes operators.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, I recall that.

Mr. LANGER. And the Senator from Minnesota will also remember that shortly thereafter, an effort was made to ship wheat in the vessels, but the statement was made that they could not be used for that purpose, because they were under contract with the ore companies. As a result, no space was available for the shipment of wheat.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say that I was one of the cosponsors of the so-called package-freight bill or less-than-carload-lot shipment bill, which was passed. At the time when the freighters to which the Senator from North Dakota refers were to be placed in operation, the Korean war broke out, and, therefore, the ore companies had to utilize the ships for the shipment of the urgently needed iron ore. That is the only reason, let me say, why the incident the Senator from North Dakota brings to our attention was not taken care of in the manner for which the bill was originally designed.

Mr. LANGER. Then am I to understand that if the pending bill is enacted, and if in the future some of my constituents wish to ship wheat, and if no war is in progress, I have the guaranty of the Senator from Minnesota that it will be possible to ship the wheat on the Great Lakes?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I assure the Senator from North Dakota that no one is more interested in the shipment of such commodities on the Great Lakes than I am, and I assure him that I share his view regarding the desirability and necessity of such use in the case of the ships authorized under the pending proposal. I respectfully assure him that wheat will be shipped and will be well cared for.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require on the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I merely wish to say that I have just received the assurance of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that we shall be able to ship our wheat. May I have the same assurance in regard to flour?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in reply, let me say that, although I will not be owning the ships, nevertheless, I am happy to state that I feel sure that the owners of the ships will be glad to cooperate in all matters of commerce.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I remind the Senators that no provision of the bill requires the owners of the ships to transport 1 pound of agricultural commodities. Instead, the ships could be used entirely for the shipment of ore, if that were desired, and the owners of the ships would still be able to receive the subsidy.

Do not let anyone be confused that this billion-dollar new subsidy program is being supported as a benefit for the farmers. All that the farmers get out of this bill is the right to pay taxes and underwrite the cost.

The large steel companies are the major beneficiaries and every Member of the Senate knows that is true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I respect the judgment of the Senator from Delaware, of course. But for one who believes as much as the Senator from Delaware does in free enterprise, I cannot imagine that he would wish to attempt to dictate to the owners of the ships as to what would be hauled in them. I assume that they will use the ships legitimately, in legitimate commerce.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the free-enterprise system must be willing to assume its own responsibilities. The free-enterprise system cannot remain free and continue to unload on the Government all its obligations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We only ask that the Great Lakes shipping industry be allowed the opportunity it needs. We are sure that the Great Lakes shipping industry will operate the ships in the proper way.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of the time available to me, if the other side is prepared to do likewise.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Delaware desire to have 5 minutes yielded to him?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assume that the Senator in charge of the time for the other side will yield time to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I think the Congress will be making a great mistake if it adopts a new principle of a subsidy for the Great Lakes shipping industry without giving it more study. I think there is no question but that if the bill is passed and is enacted into law, in a few months we shall be asked to subsidize not only the construction but also the operations

by paying the differential in the cost of American labor and foreign labor.

Furthermore, the bill contains no limit. It provides a subsidy of about $3.5 million or $4 million for each ship; and according to the Department of Commerce approximately 300 ships are eligible for the subsidy. If the subsidy were carried to its extreme, ultimately it would cost the Government over $1 billion.

Nor can it be claimed that the bill is in the interest of the national defense, because the defense agency and every other agency have testified that the bill is not needed in the national defense.

Certainly the steel companies do not need such a subsidy in order to transport their own ore.

The adoption of the two amendments—one providing for the awarding of the contracts to the lowest responsible competitive bidder and the other amendment prohibiting further subsidized vacations for Government officials—did greatly improve the bill. However, the rejection of the other amendment still leaves the bill providing for a multimillion dollar new subsidy program, and in my opinion this cannot be justified.

I think it is ridiculous that we are being asked to subsidize the operations of these companies to that extent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all unused time yielded back?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I will yield back the remainder of my time on condition that the acting minority leader do likewise, following which I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. POTTER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been consumed or yielded back.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 3108) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized (subject to the provisions of this section) to acquire any obsolete Great Lakes vessel or vessels in exchange for an allowance of credit to be applied upon the purchase price of a new vessel. A vessel shall be considered an 'obsolete vessel' for purposes of this subsection if it (1) is enrolled and licensed under the laws of the United States for trade on the Great Lakes and has been so enrolled and licensed for a period of at least 10 years; (2) is designed to transport in such trade dry bulk commodities such as iron ore, limestone, grain, or coal; (3) is of not less than 3,000 gross tons; and (4) is owned by a citizen or citizens of the United States and has been so owned by such citizen or citizens for at least 3 years immediately prior to the date of acquisition hereunder. A vessel shall be considered a 'new vessel' for purposes of this subsection if it (A) is constructed after January 1, 1956, in a Great Lakes shipyard within the United States; (B) is capable by reason of design of transporting bulk commodities such as iron ore, limestone, grain, or coal between ports on the Great Lakes, including the whole of the St. Lawrence River and the Gulf of St. Lawrence as far east as a line drawn north and south through the west end of Anticosti Island; and (C) is documented under the laws of the United States.

"The allowance of credit for an obsolete vessel or vessels acquired under this subsection may equal but shall not exceed the excess, as determined by the Secretary, of the fair and reasonable cost of constructing the new vessel (excluding the cost of any features incorporated in the vessel for national defense use, which shall be paid by the United States) over the fair and reasonable estimate of cost of constructing the new vessel, if it were constructed under similar plans and specifications (excluding national defense features as above provided), in a foreign shipbuilding center which is deemed by the Secretary to furnish a fair and representative example for the determination of the estimated foreign cost of construction of vessels of the type proposed to be constructed, and where vessels have been built or are likely to be built, as found by the Secretary, for engaging in the transportation of any bulk commodity in competition with any Great Lakes United States vessel, whether the movement of such commodity be over the Great Lakes or other waters. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as restricting the trade in which such new vessel may be used. With respect to a new vessel, the construction of which was contracted for after January 1, 1956, but before the effective date of this subsection, such allowance may be paid to the owner notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b). The full credit on the cost of the new vessel shall be allowed only upon the trade-in of an obsolete vessel or vessels having gross tonnage at least equal to or greater than that of the new vessel: *Provided*, That the gross tonnage of such obsolete vessel or vessels may exceed the gross tonnage of the new vessel in a ratio of not in excess of 1.25 to 1, if the Secretary finds that the new vessel, although of less tonnage, will provide utility value equal to or greater than that of the obsolete vessel or vessels. If the gross tonnage of the obsolete vessel or vessels is less than that of the new vessel, the allowance of credit shall be reduced proportionately. If the gross tonnage of such obsolete vessel or vessels exceeds the gross tonnage of the new vessel, then, subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of this section, an additional allowance of credit shall be determined with respect to such excess in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d) of this section.

"Any obsolete vessel acquired by the United States under the provisions of this subsection shall be placed in a national defense reserve fleet of Great Lakes vessels, subject to the provisions of section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 App. U. S. C., sec. 1744), unless, in the opinion of the Secretary, it is of insufficient value for commercial or military operations to warrant its further preservation.

"Except as they may be inconsistent with this subsection, all the provisions of subsections (a) through (g) shall be applicable to the acquisition of an obsolete vessel or vessels as provided in this subsection.

"No credit shall be allowed under the provisions of this subsection, and no credit shall be allowed or payment made under any other provision of this act or of any other act providing government assistance in the acquisition or construction of vessels, with respect to any vessel the contract for acquisition or construction of which is entered into after the effective date of this subsection, unless such contract shall have been entered into as the result of competitive bidding and awarded to the lowest responsible bidder."

SEC. 2. That the Shipping Act of 1916 is amended by adding a new section as follows:

"SEC. 45. No common carrier by water subject to this act (the Shipping Act of 1916) shall directly or indirectly issue any ticket or pass for the free or reduced rate transportation of any passenger in foreign commerce or in commerce between the United States and its Territories and possessions, or directly or indirectly give any free or reduced-rate transportation to any such passenger, except, under such terms and conditions as the Federal Maritime Board may prescribe, to its directors, officers, and employees and their immediate families; witnesses and attorneys attending any legal investigation in which such common carrier by water is interested; persons injured in accidents at sea and physicians and nurses attending such persons; persons rescued at sea; and any person with the object of providing relief in cases of general epidemic, pestilence, or other calamitous visitation. Nothing contained in this section shall prohibit any common carrier by water, under such terms and conditions as the Board may prescribe, from interchanging with any other common carrier by water free tickets, free passes, or free or reduced-rate transportation for their directors, officers, and employees and their immediate families. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any common carrier by water with respect to any vessel that is both documented under the laws of a foreign country and owned, leased, or chartered by a person who is a citizen of a foreign country."

GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 9536, the General Government matters appropriation bill for 1957.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9536) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry General Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this is the first of two appropriations involving General Government matters and independent offices.

House bill 9536 provides funds for the Executive Office of the President, under various items; for the American Battle Monuments Commission; for the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission; and for the Subversive Activities Control Board.

As reported to the Senate, the total amount of the bill is $14,969,975. This is $44,500 under the budget estimate, and represents an increase of $120,700 over the House allowance. Seventy thousand dollars of the increase is to restore the budget estimates for the Council of Economic Advisers in the Office of the President, expenses of management improvement, and for the expenses of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. Fifty thousand dollars was added over the budget estimate for the American Battle Monuments Commission, for starting a program to furnish the next of kin a photograph of the cemetery and grave where a deceased veteran is buried.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill, as thus amended, be considered, for the purpose of amendment, as original text; provided, however, that no point of order against any amendment shall be deemed to have been waived by the adoption of this unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Under the heading "Title I—Executive Office of the President—Council of Economic Advisers—Salaries and Expenses," on page 4, line 9, after the figures "$300", to strike out "$350,000" and insert "$365,700."

Under the heading "Funds Appropriated to the President—Expenses of Management Improvement", on page 7, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$50" and insert "$75", and at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "$350,000" and insert "$400,000."

Under the heading "American Battle Monuments Commission—Salaries and Expenses", on page 8, line 1, after "$1,140,000", to insert "of which $10,000 shall be immediately available for printing relating to the dedication of World War II memorials."

Under the subhead "Construction of Memorials and Cemeteries", on page 8, line 24, after the word "travel", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,050,000."

Under the heading "Foreign Claims Settlement Commission—Salaries and Expenses", on page 9, at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$10,000"; in line 15, after the word "Commission", to insert "and employment of aliens", and in the same line, following the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$795,000" and insert "$800,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, let me say very briefly, in connection with the American Battle Monuments Commission, inasmuch as some inquiry may be made relative to that item, that the program is underway. It should be completed sometime this year, so that the families of American veterans who gave their lives on foreign soil and whose bodies have not been brought back to this country will receive from the Government at least photographs of some of the beautiful cemeteries and parks all over the world where deceased veterans from past wars are buried.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, it is my good fortune to be a member of the Battle Monuments Commission. One of the complaints we have received is that the parents or loved ones of deceased veterans have not been able to receive any documents or pictures relating to the burial grounds where veterans have been interred. This new program of the American Battle Monuments Commission is a program which I know will be appreciated by the families and relatives of the deceased servicemen.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We also suggested to the Commission, that it might explore the possibility of having the pictures in color, and they are doing that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 9536) was passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. KNOWLAND conferees on the part of the Senate.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 9739.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9739) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the pending bill makes appropriations for the independent offices of the Government, and provides funds for 17 agencies and five Government corporations. As reported to the Senate, the bill totals $5,916,997,258. That amount is $93,546,032 under the House allowance, and $265,052,642 under the appropriations for 1956, but is $133,293,258 in excess of the budget estimates for 1957.

The principal item accounting for most of the differences is the payment to the civil service retirement and disability fund. For this item the estimate of the Budget Bureau was $295 million; the House provided $600 million and the Senate committee recommends $440,438,000.

Other items accounting for the difference are $6 million for disaster relief; $50,000 for the Federal Trade Commission, $610,108 for the Interstate Commerce Commission, and $1,221,000 for the Veterans' Administration.

The remainder of the bill is $12,144,742 under the budget estimates.

Restoration to the full budget estimates are provided for the following items: Federal Civil Defense Administration, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Federal Power Commission, Housing Administrator, Public Housing Administration, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, National Capital Housing Authority, National Science Foundation, National Security Training Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, Selective Service System, and Veterans' Administration medical funds.

There are two amendments which I shall offer, and which I shall explain.

With that brief preliminary statement, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc; and that the bill, as thus amended, be considered for the purpose of amendment as original text; provided, however, that no point of order against any amendment shall be deemed to have been waived by the adoption of this agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment at this time on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL]. I have discussed the amendment with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, with the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, and with the ranking minority member of the full committee. It involves 2 hospitals, 1 at Nashville, Tenn., and the other at McKinney, Tex. If the Senator from Washington will accept the amendment, we can include it in the bill at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; we discussed the amendment at some length in committee. Personally, I see no objection to taking the amendment, which is in the language of the House bill, to conference. There was some suggestion made in committee that we ought to appropriate the money in a general way for the veterans' hospital construction program. However, I see no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? Without objection, the Secretary will state the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] on behalf of himself and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL].

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 32, line 2, in the committee amendment it is proposed to strike "$48,135,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "$51,635,000, of which $2 million shall be used for technical services for the major alteration, rehabilitation, and modernization for the continued operation of the hospital at McKinney, Tex., and $1,500,000 shall be

available for technical services for rehabilitation of the general medical and surgical hospital at Nashville, Tenn."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that the language of the amendment is agreeable to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; it is agreeable to me. I have not discussed it with all the members of the committee, but I have talked to some members about it, and it is agreeable to them. The Senator from Illinois is a member of the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it occurs to me that at least a brief legislative record should be made with respect to the pending amendment. I should say at the outset that I have not the slightest objection to taking the amendment to conference. I know the language of the amendment appeared in the House bill as it came to our committee.

I believe I should say, Mr. President, that as early as 1950, when the veterans' hospital at Dallas, Tex., was authorized, the Veterans' Administration had in mind that when that hospital was completed, the hospital at McKinney, Tex., would be deactivated. It is entirely possible that the Veterans' Administration will need these additional beds at McKinney. However, I have learned from the Veterans' Administration that there will be no deactivation of that hospital at least for a period of 2 years, because it will take that long for the Dallas hospital to be constructed.

In any event, on the basis of the testimony which has been presented by the Veterans' Administration, but notwithstanding that fact, and in conformance with the desires of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, I am agreeable to taking the amendment to conference, to see what can be worked out in conference in connection with it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate what my friend, the Senator from Illinois has said. I should like to say that this hospital performs a vital role in a section of Texas where the population is increasing rapidly and where veterans in need of hospitalization have great difficulty in finding hospital beds open to them. There is already a long waiting list for both the McKinney and for the Dallas hospitals.

In the words of the American Legion department service officer in Dallas, it is a continuous fight to get sick veterans in either the McKinney or the Dallas hospital.

Each of these hospitals has a long waiting list. Only dire emergency cases are admitted on application.

I quote further from a letter I have received from the Dallas department service officer of the American Legion:

> There are plenty of veterans who the VA admits need hospitalization, but not on an emergency basis, and they are thus placed on the waiting lists. It takes them forever to get in.

Mr. President, I am not one who feels that every appropriation of money asked for in the name of American veterans should automatically be granted by the Congress. I strongly believe that every such request should be backed up by facts proving conclusively that it is justified.

This, in my considered opinion, is such a request.

The need for the services offered by the McKinney Hospital is real and urgent.

Nor does any person familiar with the situation deny the pressing need for major repair and rehabilitation of the hospital.

Mr. President, I respectfully urge in the strongest possible terms that the Senate act to restore the $2 million for this purpose as approved by the House.

It is my understanding that the modification is agreeable to the committee, and if so, I should like that it be made prior to action by the Senate on the chairman's motion. The modification would restore $2 million for repair, rehabilitation, and modernization work at the McKinney, Tex., Veterans' Hospital. In effect, it is simply a restoration of the language in the bill as it passed the House.

I thank the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], on behalf of himself and the junior Senator from Texas, to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc? The Chair hears none, and the committee amendments will be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments, agreed to en bloc, including the one on page 32, beginning in line 2, which was amended and agreed to on motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, are as follows:

Under the heading "Title I—Independent Offices—Civil Service Commission", on page 2, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$29,000", and in line 20, after the word "amended", to strike out "$17,282,500" and insert "$17,532,500."

On page 2, line 25, after the numerals "1943", to strike out the comma and "or for the compensation or expenses of any member of a board of examiners (1) who has not made affidavit that he has not appeared in any agency proceeding within the preceding 2 years, and will not thereafter while a board member appear in any agency proceeding, as a party, or in behalf of a party to the proceeding, before an agency in which an applicant is employed who has been rated or will be rated by such member; or (2) who, after making such affidavit, has rated an applicant who at the time of the rating is employed by an agency before which the board member has appeared as a party, or in behalf of a party, within the preceding 2 years: *Provided*, That the definitions of 'agency', 'agency proceeding', and 'party' in section 2 of the Administrative Procedure Act shall apply to these terms as used herein."

On page 3, after line 14, to strike out:

"No part of appropriations herein shall be used to pay the compensation of officers and employees of the Civil Service Commission who allocate or reallocate supervisory positions in the classified civil service solely on the size of the group, section, bureau, or other organization unit, or on the number of subordinates supervised. References to size of the group, section, bureau, or other organization unit or the number of subordinates supervised may be given effect only to the extent warranted by the workload of such organization unit and then only in combination with other factors such as the kind, difficulty, and complexity of work supervised, the degree and scope of responsibility delegated to the supervisor, and the kind, degree, and value of the supervision actually exercised."

On page 4, line 12, after the word "organizations", to strike out "$450,000" and insert "$525,000."

On page 5, line 17, after "(5 U. S. C. ch. 14)", to strike out "$600,000,000" and insert "$440,438,000."

On page 5, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$186,700."

Under the heading "Federal Civil Defense Administration", on page 6, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$10,000", and in line 17, after the word "conclusive", to strike out "$15,560,000" and insert "$21,700,000."

On page 7, line 9, after the word "prescribe", to strike out "$42,000,000" and insert "$64,000,000."

On page 7, line 16, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$14,500,000."

On page 7, line 25, after the word "thereto", to strike out "$1,540,000" and insert "$6,000,000."

At the top of page 8, to strike out:

"No part of any appropriation in this act shall be available for the construction of warehouses or for the lease of warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed specifically for the use of the Federal Civil Defense Administration."

Under the heading "Funds appropriated to the President—Disaster relief", on page 8, line 11, after the word "disasters", to strike out "$5,386,030" and insert "$6,000,000", and in line 12, after the word "expended", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That not to exceed $6,000,000 shall be expended in any one State."

Under the heading "Federal Communications Commission", on page 8, line 25, after the word "travel", to strike out "$7,800,000" and insert "$7,828,000."

Under the heading "Federal Power Commission", on page 9, at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "$5,200,000" and insert "$5,250,000", and in line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$325,000."

Under the heading "Federal Trade Commission", on page 9, at the beginning of line 23, to strike out "$227,000" and insert "$237,000", and in the same line, after the word "travel", to strike out "$5,400,000" and insert "$5,550,000."

Under the heading "General Services Administration", on page 11, line 7, after the word "travel", to strike out "$122,694,200" and insert "$128,084,500."

On page 12, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "$42,565,550" and insert "$42,638,000."

On page 13, line 16, after the words "exceed", strike out "$81,000" and insert "$160,000", and at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "$2,809,400" and insert "$2,959,400."

On page 14, line 9, after the word "travel", to strike out "$14,270,000" and insert "$14,770,000."

On page 14, line 21, to strike out "$6,818,650" and insert "$6,893,650."

On page 14, after line 21, to insert:

"Survey of Government records, records management, and disposal practices: For necessary expenses in connection with conducting surveys of the records of Federal agencies and of records management and

records disposal practices in Federal agencies, pursuant to section 505 (c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, $100,000."

On page 15, line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$3,351,000", and in line 25, after the word "the", to strike out "purposes" and insert "purposes,".

On page 17, at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "$9,278,200" and insert "$9,802,550."

On page 18, after line 15, to strike out:

"During the current fiscal year, no part of any money appropriated in this or any other act shall be used during any quarter of such fiscal year to purchase within the continental limits of the United States typewriting machines (except bookkeeping and billing machines) at a price which exceeds 90 percent of the lowest net cash price, plus applicable Federal excise taxes, accorded the most-favored customer (other than the Government, the American National Red Cross, and the purchases of typewriting machines for educational purposes only) of the manufacturer of such machines during the 6-month period immediately preceding such quarter: *Provided,* That the purchase, utilization, and disposal of typewriting machines shall be performed in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended."

On page 19, after line 5, to strike out:

"The Administrator is authorized, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to place ten positions, in addition to those otherwise authorized, in grade GS–16 in the General Schedule established by said act, and the salary of the Comptroller shall be at the salary rate of grade GS–18 so long as such position is occupied by the present incumbent."

Under the heading "Housing and Home Finance Agency—Office of the Administrator", on page 19, line 22, after the word "Agency", to strike out "$6,000,000" and insert "$6,450,000."

On page 20, line 19, after the word "amended", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$2,000,000."

On page 20, line 24, after "(40 U. S. C. 462)", to strike out "$6,000,000" and insert "$9,000,000."

Under the subhead "Public Housing Administration", on page 21, line 7, after the word "Administration", to strike out "$9,700,000" and insert "$10,700,000."

On page 21, line 13, after "(42 U. S. C. 1410)", to strike out "$90,000,000" and insert "$96,000,000."

Under the heading "Interstate Commerce Commission", on page 21, line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "forty-five" and insert "sixty"; in line 22, after the word "and", to insert "not to exceed $1,049,000 for"; in line 23, after the word "travel", to strike out "$13,900,000" and insert "$14,610,108", and in line 24, after "(a)", to strike out "not less than $1,939,000 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out railroad safety and locomotive inspection activities, and" and insert "not less than $1,230,178 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out railroad safety activities and not less than $849,500 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out locomotive inspection activities, and."

Under the heading "National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics," on page 22, line 24, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$61,475,000" and insert "$63,200,000"; and in line 25, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$600,000" and insert "$1,500,000."

On page 23, line 6, after the word "Committee", to strike out "$13,000,000" and insert "$15,000,000."

Under the heading "National Capital Housing Authority," on page 23, at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "$37,000" and insert "$39,000."

Under the heading "National Science Foundation," on page 24, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "$35,915,000" and insert "$41,300,000"; and in line 6, after the word "expended", to strike out the colon and *"Provided,* That of the foregoing amount not less than $9,500,000 shall be available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection with a program of supplementary training for high-school science and mathematics teachers."

On page 24, after line 9, to insert:

"NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the National Security Training Commission, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of $50 per diem; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; $75,000."

Under the heading "Securities and Exchange Commission," on page 25, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$750" and insert "$1,500"; in line 5, after the word "law", to insert "purchase of one passenger motor vehicle;" and in line 8, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$5,700,000" and insert "$5,749,000."

Under the heading "Selective Service System," on page 25, line 15, after the word "of", to strike out "nineteen" and insert "thirty-eight"; in line 21, after the word "Specialists", to strike out "$28,442,000" and insert "$29,050,000"; and in the same line, after the word *"Provided",* to strike out "That of the foregoing amount $20,586,050 shall be available for registration, classification, and induction activities to local boards; *Provided further."*

On page 26, after line 4, to insert:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the officer of the Army now serving as Director of the Selective Service System shall, effective upon the day preceding his retirement, be considered to hold the grade of lieutenant general for all purposes, without regard to any limitations on the number of officers in that grade, and shall receive the pay and allowances of an officer of that grade and his length of service, and when retired under any provision of law shall be advanced on the retired list to such grade and shall receive the retired or retirement pay at the rate prescribed by law computed on the basis of the basic pay which he would receive if serving on active duty in such grade."

Under the heading "Veterans' Administration," on page 27, line 9, after the word "employees", to strike out "$162,118,260" and insert "$163,936,000"; in line 10, following the amendment just above stated, to strike out "of which not less than $17,640,042 shall be available for such expenses as are necessary for the loan-guaranty program", and in line 13, after the word "of", to strike out "twenty" and insert "fifteen."

On page 28, line 8, after the word "equipment", to strike out "$16,099,600" and insert "$16,453,000."

On page 32, line 2, after the word "expended", to strike out "$50,935,000" and insert "$51,635,000."

On page 32, line 12, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$4,447,000" and insert "$4,533,000."

Under the heading "Title II—Corporations—Federal Home Loan Bank Board," on page 36, line 24, after the word "of", to strike out "$978,400" and insert "$1,095,000", and on page 37, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$42,400" and insert "$51,500."

On page 38, line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$532,000" and insert "$596,000."

Under the subhead "Housing and Home Finance Agency," on page 40, line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$318,000" and insert "$418,000."

On page 41, at the beginning of line 2, strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$2,310,000", and at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "$7,900,000" and insert "$8,400,000."

On page 41, at the beginning of line 22, to strike out "$3,700,000" and insert "$3,850,000."

On page 43, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$11,550,000" and insert "$12,800,000", and in line 22, after the word "travel", to insert "purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U. S. C. 2131)."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, lines 23 and 24, it is proposed to insert "$14,797,196" in lieu of "$14,610,108"; on page 22, line 4, to strike out "and"; and on page 22, line 6, after the word "law", to insert the following: "and (c) $187,088 shall be available for salaries and travel and other expenses for 22 additional inspectors for the Bureau of Motor Carriers."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the committee has held long hearings on the work of the Interstate Commerce Commission with reference to the question of safety and both motor-carrier and railroad inspection. The appropriations have been inadequate for some years, and the committee saw fit to increase the number of safety inspectors so that they can handle more work than could be handled in times past.

In the field of motor carriers the growth of the industry has grown so rapidly that the inspectors have not been able to catch up.

The effect of this amendment would be to add $187,088 to the bill for the Bureau of Motor Carriers in the Interstate Commerce Commission. I consider this increase to be absolutely essential if this agency is to carry out its responsibility to the public in the field of motor safety, in the field of safety on our highways.

This $187,088 will provide for 22 additional safety inspectors. The bill as reported to the Senate allowed for a total of 78. This additional sum will bring the total force to 100.

Unless this amount is added there will be at least 12 field offices in the United States with no safety inspectors, and another 10 offices will be badly undermanned.

Since my committee marked up this bill new information has come to light which more than justifies the action I am requesting. Had this new information been fully available to the committee at the time we were marking up the bill I am certain this additional amount would have been in the bill when it came to the floor.

The new information to which I refer comes as a result of a nationwide safety check made by the Bureau of Motor Carriers.

I quote from a news release by ICC which presents a summary of their findings. The lead on the story reads: "ICC

road check finds defects in 90 percent of vehicles."

I read from the release:

The Bureau of Motor Carriers of the Interstate Commerce Commission announced today its nationwide road check of interstate motor vehicles showed that 7,021 vehicles or 90.8 percent of the 7,734 checked had one or more defects or deficiencies.

The 5-day check by 131 district supervisors and safety inspectors of the Bureau's field staff was made to obtain information for the commission on the extent of noncompliance with ICC safety regulations. Each vehicle was checked as to 58 possible violations.

In its preliminary findings, the bureau noted that the relatively small number of vehicles checked and the random method of selection did not provide a true cross-section of the estimated 1,150,000 interstate trucks.

The Bureau found, however, that the study developed valuable information as to leads for further investigation of carriers or classes of carriers which are permitting their trucks to operate on the highways in an unsafe condition or without proper regard for safety practices. It also provided information on which the Bureau may base future educational activities or punitive action.

Of the total inspected, 4,603 vehicles were operated by carriers holding ICC operating authority while 3,131 were operated by private or "exempt" carriers—under the so-called agricultural exemption—which are subject only to the Commission's safety and hours-of-service regulations.

Mr. President, the lives of people are involved. It is imperative that motor vehicles, subject to the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Motor Carriers, be in safe operating condition when they are on the highways.

I move the adoption of the amendment to add $187,088 to the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Since the committee marked up the independent offices appropriation bill the Senate has considered the Federal highway bill. In connection with that bill, I notice that if fatalities on our highways continue at the rate experienced in the first few months of 1956, probably 42,000 men, women, and children will lose their lives in traffic accidents this year. That is a ghastly total, which probably comes into better perspective when we think of it as 10 times the number of persons who were killed in the bombing of Pearl Harbor in December 1941.

The additional money requested by the chairman of the committee relates to only one facet, namely, motor carriers licensed by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Notwithstanding that fact, it is a component in the overall safety picture. The insane death and accident toll on our highways simply cannot be ignored, because some day there will be real revulsion on the part of the American public. In prior years we have appropriated inadequate funds with which to carry on the work.

I have no objection to the amendment, and I shall be glad to have the proposal go to conference for final adjudication.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Washington a question or two. I ask, first, for information, whether this is the proper time at which to raise an appropriation question relative to an increase in the number of personnel for the Interstate Commerce Commission for policing the use of boxcars.

As the Senator from Washington knows, the committee has held rather extensive hearings with reference to the boxcar shortage, and the testimony showed very clearly that so-called service agents are in such short supply that in Portland, Oreg., for example, there is only one service agent acting for our State, and he has not been supplied with even a stenographer, so that he has to sit down to his typewriter and spend a great deal of time typing his own reports to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Thus, has little time for policing boxcars.

I am convinced that one of the major reasons for the shortage of boxcars is the gross inefficiency of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

If ever there was an independent agency of the Government which needed a shaking down or a shaking up, it is the Interstate Commerce Commission. Each year when a boxcar shortage occurs, and there arises the issue of getting an adequate number of service agents to police the distribution of boxcars, I get a little weary of having the Interstate Commerce Commission tell me, "Mr. Senator, we do not have enough help to do the job."

My reply has been, "Have you asked for the help, in the first place; and have you been denied the help after you have asked for it?"

I ask the Senator from Washington two questions: First, is this the place to raise the issue in regard to additional service agents for the Interstate Commerce Commission; and if it is, has the Interstate Commerce Commission asked for additional service agents? Second, what did the Senator's committee do about it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That matter was looked into by the committee. I feel as the Senator from Oregon feels about the situation, probably a little more keenly, because every year in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce we are confronted with the same situation.

Congress has supplied a tax incentive. The committee has brought railroad and Interstate Commerce Commission representatives before it. We have tried to do something to remedy the condition. But the result has been that there are fewer boxcars in operation today than there were when the matter first came to our attention.

The committee held hearings about 2 weeks ago on a bill which would give the Interstate Commerce Commission the authority to move the boxcars around with greater flexibility. I have learned from figures which have been supplied to me that we in the West feel the impact of this situation more than do the people in the East.

The cost of building a new, modern boxcar is about $8,000; and of a reefer, about $12,000. The demurrage rate now as between railroads is $2.40 a day. The president of the Northern Pacific Railroad, for instance, told me only a few weeks ago that he could not justify spending $8,000 of the railroad's money and getting back only $2.40 a day in rental.

The movement of freight cars from east to west runs in a ratio of about 60–40. The Pennsylvania, for instance, keeps on its line more cars of other railroads than it turns back to the western railroads. The same thing is true, I believe, of the New York Central and other large eastern roads.

So the committee has before it a bill which would allow the Interstate Commerce Commission to take some action to remedy that condition. I think the committee will act on the bill at its next session. What the Senator from Oregon has stated is correct. Another facet of the situation is the failure of the Interstate Commerce Commission to make sufficient car inspections. The committee added $165,000 to the Interstate Commerce Commission appropriation to provide for 20 additional car service agents. The senior Senator from Washington thought the Commission should have 30 agents. But the Interstate Commerce Commission took the position that it requires a little time to train such persons, and the Commission thought it could operate satisfactorily this year with 20 additional service agents. I do not know whether that number will be sufficient, but it will be a start; and for that purpose we have added $165,000 to the appropriation.

Mr. MORSE. I made a pretty fair investigation of this question myself. In my judgment, the argument of the Interstate Commerce Commission that they cannot use more than 20 additional agents is about as phony as are most of the arguments which have been made to us in connection with the boxcar shortage matter. The country would be in a better position with respect to the boxcar shortage if the Interstate Commerce Commission staff were not so honeycombed with former railroad employees. That is one aspect of the problem in connection with the boxcar shortage.

The shippers of the Nation have not been getting from the American railroads the cooperation they are entitled to receive; and in part the difficulty lies in the Interstate Commerce Commission, where too many of the personnel are heavily saturated with the railroad point of view rather than with the public point of view.

It is not true that trained personnel are not available to the Interstate Commrce Commission. Do not forget that during the war there were considerably more than 100 boxcar service agents throughout the country. I have gone into the matter sufficiently to satisfy myself that the agents are available to the Interstate Commerce Commission if the Commission will only employ persons who are not saturated with the railroad point of view, but who can be hired to represent the public point of view.

The Commission's own communications, in response to requests which have

been made to them in recent years to get more help in order to relieve the boxcar shortage, are replete with repetition after repetition of the statement that the difficulty is that the Commission has not had sufficient appropriations to enable it to employ an adequate number of persons to do the work.

If the Commission is asking for only 20 additional persons this year, let me say that that will not make a dent; it will not begin to solve the problem. I think this is a matter which calls for at least some discussion in conference.

May I ask the Senator from Washington if he would be willing to accept an amendment to increase the amount in the bill to equal the cost of 30 rather than 20 additional car service agents, to be made available to the Interstate Commerce Commission?

I would not speak so emphatically on this subject if I had not been engaged in this fight for several years on behalf of the shippers of my State, shoulder to shoulder with the Senators from Washington and the Senators from California, because those three Western States, particularly, have had to sustain great losses by reason of the failure of the railroads to provide an adequate number of boxcars.

I see on the floor the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. The shippers of his State have been in the same tight fix experienced by the shippers of the west coast, so far as the boxcar shortage is concerned.

I think this is the year to make the record so crystal clear to the Interstate Commerce Commission that never again will they give to a single Senator the alibi that they are not doing a better job of servicing the boxcar supply because they do not have the personnel.

I have asked them in numerous letters, "Did you ask for them? Did you request appropriations for them?" I have gone to the Senator's committee in the past and have found that the Commission had not begun to ask for appropriations in sufficient amounts to provide them with the number of agents they need.

I say most respectfully that an additional 20 are not enough when the whole Pacific area—Zone 25—today is being served by three service agents, and they are not supplied with even a stenographer to help them with their reports and other clerical work. That ought to serve as an example of why there is a boxcar shortage.

The Senator from Washington stated that the Congress had helped the railroads by establishing a tax amortization program. I am for that. I will vote for more of it if only the railroads will build more cars. But that is not what they have done. They have decreased the number of cars under the tax amortization program. While they have built new cars, they have taken out of operation old cars which ought to have had slight repairs made to them in order to keep them on the tracks.

The railroads admit this. They admit, when they are confronted with the question, that as a result of the tax amortization program, amounting to many millions of dollars, there are fewer boxcars in America today than there were when the program started.

I do not know why Senators, because of this condition, should have to take a beating year after year from irate shippers—and they have reason to be irate. But the Interstate Commerce Commission keeps passing the buck to us, for the correspondence which the shippers send us is to the effect that Congress did not give the Interstate Commerce Commission the personnel necessary to do a proper police job.

I say that the addition of 20 agents is not sufficient. I ask the Senator from Washington if he would be willing to take to conference an amendment to the Interstate Commerce Appropriation which would provide for 30 instead of 20 additional agents.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. In my section of the country a continuous boxcar shortage has existed ever since the close of the war. Conditions are no better today than they were 3 years or 5 years ago.

While we have a surplus of wheat, during most of the year our wheat cannot be shipped out, thereby causing our farmers to lose a large sum of money on the premiums they could have received on the top-quality wheat.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I suppose the Senator from Washington can be said to be taking a beating, because day after day, for at least 10 days, I sat in the committee listening to testimony relating to this situation.

I thought the addition of 30 persons would be a good start. I am perfectly willing to add 30 to the bill. It will be necessary to have a conference with the House anyway. This matter is very vital to all of us.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I sympathize with those who are confronted with the problem of the boxcar shortage. When the Senator from Washington proposed an increase of 20 in the number of such employees——

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from New Hampshire thought I was going a little too high then, did he?

Mr. BRIDGES. I thought the Senator was going a good distance then. I thought we were making an excellent start when we agreed upon an increase of 20. But when the distinguished Senator from Oregon rose and proposed 10 more, he somewhat startled me, because I thought we were going a long way when we proposed 20.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We shall have to have a conference with the House, anyway. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will not oppose the amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not intend to object. I was saying I thought we had made a major start when we provided 20 additional service agents. I thought a good enough job had been done so that next year it would not be necessary to ask for more.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to say, in support of the amendment, that we have an extraordinary situation on the Pacific coast. We are approximately 2,000 miles away from the center of population and the center of distribution of merchandise in the United States. Most of our forest products and agricultural products have to be shipped over half the width of the continent in order to be sold. That is an unusual condition. People in the South, in New England, and even in the Middle West, are not confronted with that problem. It does seem to me that anything which will enable the use of more freight cars will help our people in the West. It is extremely urgent that the problem be met. Many persons in our State have to send their products 2,000 miles to find a market for them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may add that our western railroads are penalized economically because of the impractical way the cars are moved about.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Of course, the whole transportation system of the Far West often is penalized. For instance, the 10 percent tax on freight transportation may not be very important to other areas of the country. But in the State of Oregon, and I am sure it is true in other Pacific Northwest States, the transportation tax on products amounts to actually more than the net return received by some farmers, when one considers the taxes paid, the cost of the land, and the cost of irrigation pumping, if it is arid land. The situation is critical. We have lumber operators and farmers in our State whose whole solvency is imperiled when we encounter a critical shortage of freight cars.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be taken to conference, with the understanding that the amendment has to do with the empoyment of more car service agents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Oregon proposing to amend the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is a separate amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has not acted on the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered is an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Washington. My amendment simply changes the figure on page 21, line 23, from "$14,797,196" to "$14,879,696", for the purpose of adding 10 additional car-service agents to the 20 already added by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall certainly not object, I should like to say

that I do not concur in the sentiments uttered by my distinguished friend from Oregon with respect to the point of view of the personnel in the Interstate Commerce Commission. I think in the main they have served the country and the Government eminently well. I have served on the subcommittee on independent offices for years, indeed, I believe it is all of 18 years ago that I first encountered the appropriations and the requests for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

It should not be forgotten that, in connection with those requests, first they must go to the Budget Bureau. After the Budget Bureau makes its determination, the requests come to the Congress, and the figure so transmitted is the one on which Congress takes testimony. I have, in all of the 18 years, had no occasion to believe that the employees and the Commissioners of the Interstate Commerce Commission did not have a thoroughly public viewpoint, and that they did not undertake to do that which was in the interest of the public, and particularly in the interest of the shippers of the country.

They have a full understanding of the fact that in proportion as freight is moved, as commerce is generated, it is reflected in the tax receipts of the Treasury. They are not insensible of that fact. So I should not like to see them charged with an oblique view.

I remember, from earlier experiences, that they were practically starved in the appropriations for a good many items, and I think, as a matter of fact, the junior Senator from Illinois, who is now speaking, has on occasion used the surgeon's scalpel in order to cut back some of their appropriations. I still believe the Commission serves the country well, and that its viewpoint is one of essential public interest.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The important thing, in my judgment, is that the Senator from Illinois and I agree that we as Senators ought to do the best we can to supply a sufficient number of agents to service the business of the shippers. The Senator from Illinois and I may disagree on the kind of job the Interstate Commerce Commission is doing. I do not fully share his views with regard to that matter, but I am delighted to have the assistance and support of the Senator from Illinois in regard to the amendment. His assistance is always cherished.

In fairness to the RECORD, I think I should say the criticism I have made of the Interstate Commerce Commission in regard to boxcar policing is the result of information I have obtained from within the Commission itself, when members of the staff who have visited me have stated that the difficulty has arisen, at least in part, because of an attitude to see to it that the railroads get what they want rather than what the public ought to have.

Therefore it is important, when providing for personnel such as service agents, that those hired have not been previously in railroad employment. It does not follow that, in order to understand the problem of boxcar service, the agents must be persons who have formerly been employed by railroads.

Be that as it may, I daresay that if the Senator from Illinois will read the criticisms from shippers in my part of the country, and read the answers which the Interstate Commerce Commission has sent to them, his blood will boil when he interprets the replies as simply passing the buck to the Congress, and alibiing to the shippers that the reason why they do not get better boxcar service is that the Congress has not appropriated enough money for that purpose.

For these reasons the amendment ought to be taken to conference and there thoroughly discussed. I believe the 30 additional boxcar service agents will be less than the number needed to serve adequately the shippers of the country.

I respect the fact that the Senator from Illinois does not agree with my view of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Unfortunately I have not had too many happy experiences with the Interstate Commerce Commission affecting shippers in my part of the West.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Probably no Member of the Senate or of the House has not harassed—politely, of course—the members of the Commission in the peak shipping seasons, because of boxcar shortages. That statement applies to the Fruit Belt, the Potato Belt, the Cereal Grain Belt, the Corn Belt, and other areas. I know that over a long period of years I have contacted the Commission time and time again, in an attempt to get the necessary rolling stock so that perishables could be gotten to market. I think the Commission has done a good job under the circumstances. If the service can be improved by the addition of personnel, I am delighted to go along with the proposal.

I think the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] stated the case well when he said he thought we were making a substantial start when we added 20 new service agents; but I say, let us agree to the additional 10 sought by the Senator from Oregon. Then the amendment can be taken to conference, additional data can be obtained from the Commission, and we shall then be able to determine what ought to be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], on page 21, line 23.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington, as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in view of the adoption of the amendment as amended, it will be necessary, on page 21, line 23, to strike out the numeral "$1,049,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,085,000." That is the limitation on travel expenses. The amendment will not add to the cost of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to some legislative language on page 26 of the bill. It relates to the Selective Service System. Even though the language is legislative in character, the committee included it in the bill because the committee sought to express to a very distinguished public servant its appreciation for the long and faithful service he has rendered in a highly sensitive position. I refer to General Hershey, who for 16 years has been Director of the Selective Service System.

The committee thought it should follow the precedent of a pattern which was established many years ago, and should make provision for General Hershey, so long as he is the incumbent, to receive some additional retirement benefits.

Since this provision was written into the bill, I understand that an announcement will soon be made, and probably will care for this matter without having this provision included in the bill.

I yield now to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, in order that he may make the announcement.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the other Members of the Senate that I concur in the general objective of the provision. General Hershey has rendered long and distinguished service to the country in a very difficult role. I believe that service warrants his promotion as he reaches the retirement age and passes out of the active service.

As the Senator from Illinois has said, there is precedent for making a promotion in the way proposed, although it is not the usual way to make it.

On yesterday at the White House this matter was under discussion. This morning, at a conference in the Pentagon, the matter was also under discussion. I think I am at liberty to say that at the White House meeting the President authorized the statement I am making. This morning the Secretary of the Army, Mr. Brucker, authorized—although not in the specific words I shall use—a statement to the effect that it would be preferable to handle this matter in the manner in which promotions are usually handled.

I understand that if this provision is deleted from the bill, within the immediate future there will be forthcoming from the Department of the Army, to the White House, and from the White House to the Senate, a nomination. In fact, I understand that while I have been speaking the nomination from the President has been received here. I now read it:

THE WHITE HOUSE.

Nomination sent to the Senate on June 6, 1956:

The following-named officer under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated

by the President under subsection (b) of section 504, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Lewis Blaine Hershey, O6530, United States Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

Therefore, Mr. President, there is no need for me to speak further about the matter; the nomination is an actual fact.

Consequently, I suggest to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that the language of the committee amendment on page 26 be eliminated, and that the nomination be handled in the usual manner.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment: On page 26, strike out the language in lines 5 to 16, inclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is an agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I have known General Hershey for a long time. In the past 22 years I have known many administrators. I doubt that I have ever encountered any who knew his business so well and who knew so well the statutes under which he was operating, and who operated with such a firm and fair hand. I think it is only proper that we testify to the efficient services of General Hershey in one of the most sensitive spots in the Government. Mr. President, this advancement, with the additional retirement benefits, is a richly deserved honor for him.

I merely wished to make this additional statement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to say that personally, and in conjunction with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and other Senators, I suggested this language. I am glad the nomination has now been made, and that the matter has been handled in that way. I could not say whether the nomination would not have been made if we had not suggested this language. However, we have now served our purpose, and I think the honor to General Hershey is a well-deserved one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I wish to use 30 seconds to add my voice in expressing appreciation of the service General Hershey has rendered his country.

When I first came to Washington, I took up with General Hershey a number of problems. I have never found anyone in the Federal Government more understanding, more sympathetic, or more anxious to be of service than General Hershey. So I am delighted that he has been given this recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio, who has an amendment to submit.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 32, after line 8, it is proposed to insert: *"Provided,* That the construction of the hospital at the Wade Park site is to furnish not less than 800 G. M. and S. beds."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I took up this matter with the chairman of the subcommittee and its ranking minority member. I believe the amendment is satisfactory to them.

As I understand, it was intended to have the bill provide for 800 beds. In fact, in the House of Representatives it was the feeling that certainly the Cleveland area needs this consideration more than does any other area in the country—as has been testified to amply by experts in the medical profession.

I believe we are, by means of this amendment, merely taking out a little insurance. I hope the amendment will be taken to conference. I shall appreciate it very much if the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee will accept the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I shall be glad to accept the amendment and take it to conference. As the Senator from Ohio has said, it relates to language already in the bill. So I think the matter can be worked out with the conferees on the part of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota, who wishes to submit an amendment.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment: On page 15, line 3, strike out "$100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$200,000."

Mr. President, the amendment would restore the amount of the budget estimate.

Let me say that because of the conflict of committee work, it was not possible for me to be present at the meeting of the Appropriations Committee when this item was considered by it.

This amendment relates to the item for a survey of Government records, records management, and disposal practices, which constitute one of our major and most extensive problems. This work results in the compilation of documents and the saving of hundreds of millions of dollars. According to the Hoover report, in the first year this work would save up to $15 for every dollar spent on it, and thereafter the ratio would be approximately 50 to 1.

I think such work should continue, and I was sorry to see a cut made in the amount of the budget estimate.

I hope the chairman of the subcommittee will take the amendment to conference.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am not inclined to disagree with the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota. The committee held rather long discussions regarding the value of this work. It is true that the General Services Administration's representatives testified regarding the matter, and there is before us a record to the effect that they feel they will save approximately $14 for every dollar that is spent on this work.

The increase called for by the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota is not a large one, when we consider the billions of dollars' worth of appropriations with which we are dealing.

I personally think this has been a good program. The House had some doubts about it. I do not know whether it included anything for this item; but I think the House struck it all out. So obviously we shall have a little trouble with our friends on the other side of the Capitol. I am perfectly willing to accept the figure of $200,000, which is the budget estimate, and see if we cannot convince the House conferees that this work should continue. The General Services Administration feels that it is a fine work.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared in support of my amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR YOUNG

Could I have been present as a member of the committee when the Independent Offices bill was considered, I would there have moved an amendment to increase from $100,000 to $200,000, the money available to GSA for its further promotion of the program to weed out more of the tremendous waste involved in the management of Government records, said by the Hoover Commission to be costing us $4 billion a year. I respectfully ask the committee to accept such an amendment now. It would only restore the budget estimate.

Two years ago we appropriated $300,000 for the initiation of this program to give GSA help in its program to fight these costs. The result of that expenditure is revealed by the printed hearings on the pending bill, from page 260 to 285. Included in these pages is a letter and papers submitted to the committee by our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Government Operations Committee, urging the continuation of the records management work. He has submitted with his letter a report on the subject by the staff director of his committee, along with a letter from the Administrator of GSA, which letter is found on page 278 of the hearings. A breakdown of the report on results of our earlier expenditure of $300,000 on that page, reveals that the money bought actual and immediate savings of about $15 for every dollar spent, and that once all the recommendations made were implemented the saving would be close to $50 for every dollar spent. I am advised that much of this annual saving is recurring, a saving coming each year as a result of this single expenditure.

I trust my amendment may win the approval of the committee and that there will be insistence upon holding the item in conference and making the full budget estimate available to GSA for the effective work it wishes to continue. Any thoughtful reading of the hearings on the subject seems to dictate enthusiastic approval of the full amount. Certainly the hearings constitute an overwhelming justification for continuation of these projects. Indeed, they would appear to justify larger appropriation and broadening of the approach by GSA with outside expert help.

This is a showing of accomplishment revealing that there are ways to spend money in Government to ends that actually save money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has an amendment to offer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 31, line 2, immediately before the period it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That payment received from Federal funds for a fellowship from the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Academy of Science, the National Institutes of Health, the United States Public Health Service, or any other agency of the Government shall not constitute duplication of benefits under section 232 (h) of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 for persons whose graduate studies were interrupted by service in the Armed Forces during the period beginning June 27, 1950, and ending February 1, 1955."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I must reserve a point of order on this amendment. I think it is legislation, and clearly subject to a point of order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from Minnesota explain his amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this amendment is a proviso such as is incorporated in bills of this type time after time.

The amendment would permit those who, because of unusual talents, have been granted fellowships or scholarships for postgraduate study, to retain their privileges and rights under the GI benefit program. If a student goes to a college or university under the provisions of the GI bill of rights he is entitled to certain allowances as a matter of right and law. However, if the same veteran is given a scholarship for graduate study, a scholarship based upon the merit or quality of his basic background and intelligence, he is denied the opportunity to receive benefits under the existing veterans laws.

More succinctly, this amendment would have the effect of permitting graduate students whose graduate studies were interrupted by military service during the Korean conflict and who are entitled to education allowances under Public Law 550, 82d Congress, the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, to receive payment from Federal funds for a graduate fellowship in any of the several Federal fellowship programs. Among these programs are those of the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Academy of Science, the National Institutes of Health, and the United States Public Health Service.

I offer this amendment because the law, as it now reads, penalizes some of the most brilliant of our young scientists and engineers who are undergoing graduate training today.

The shortage of scientific and engineering personnel has now reached crucial proportions. There are many proposals before the Congress to deal with the problem, and I again want to express my deep interest in these proposals. By comparison with the Soviet Union's program of training such personnel, our own program is dangerously lagging.

This amendment, Mr. President, offers a small and partial, but nevertheless real and immediate, solution to the problem of this growing shortage of scientific personnel.

Furthermore, this amendment would remove a serious injustice to certain young men whose graduate studies were interrupted by military service during the Korean conflict.

For example, let me cite the case of a young man of my acquaintance, in Minnesota, who has been forced to relinquish his educational allowances under Public Law 550 because of his acceptance of a research fellowship from the Public Health Service. This young man, like so many other graduate students whose careers were interrupted by military service between 1950 and 1955, is married and has children—a burden which is exceedingly difficult to carry through graduate school.

This young man has won his fellowship because he is a brilliant student. He is a promising scientist. Yet because of his talent, because the Federal Government sees in him the possibility of important research on problems of public health, he and his family are forced to exist on a far smaller income than they would have had if he had taken other employment.

This young man could have chosen work as a shoe salesman or a ribbon clerk or any number of perfectly good jobs which carry no research responsibilities and contribute nothing to the advance of science. In each case he could have retained his GI benefits.

Mr. President, I ask whether this is either just or intelligent. So far as I am concerned, to deprive a young man whose brilliance is first rewarded by a Federal research fellowship and then penalized by removal of his GI benefits, simply does not make sense.

How many other cases like this exist, I do not know. Presumably they are relatively few. The category is rather narrow—graduate students whose graduate studies were interrupted by military service between 1950 and 1955. Yet by this amendment we have the opportunity to correct a hardship and to right an injustice. We have an opportunity to encourage, rather than discourage, the development of at least one group of promising young scientists.

I am confident that there must be hundreds of such cases. The situation boils down to this: If the Government of the United States sees in a man great qualities and promise in the field of research and science, and he is given a Federal research scholarship, he loses all his GI benefits. Yet he could take a job in private industry, as a research student or as a scientist, and still retain his GI benefits. I am sure there must be a sense of justice adequate to meet this situation. It seems to me that the place to meet it is in the pending bill. That is why I have offered the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that I am thoroughly in sympathy with what he is trying to accomplish in this connection. However, I must say to him that the proposed amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill, and that it is subject, I believe, to a point of order.

I would be willing to take the amendment to conference. I am afraid that the House might insist on taking it out of the appropriation bill, but it would at least highlight the situation. No one is more interested in the subject than I am, because I was the author of the Science Foundation legislation. I know that in some cases men who are brilliant enough to receive scholarships become pinched.

If the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has no objection, we might discuss the amendment in conference, and it might lead to a modification of the veterans legislation which would take care of the injustice.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should greatly appreciate it if that were done, even if it were done only by way of highlighting what I consider to be a gross inequity in the law. Whether or not an agreement could be reached on the amendment in conference may be problematical. However, at least something should be done for the long-term future. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have no doubt that injustices such as those described by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota arise from time to time. I can clearly see the injustice in the case he cites. However, we have had no testimony on this subject. There is no way of determining how many persons may be involved. Hundreds of thousands of veterans have had the benefit of the GI Assistance Act. We have not the slightest information as to the number of persons who might be affected, or the degree to which they might be affected. Consequently the amendment enters an undefined field, which should be legislatively explored.

I quite agree that something should be done; but this is not the place to do it, because it involves a question of policy, which has no proper place in an appropriation bill.

Reluctant as I am, and distressed as I always am when I depart from the footsteps of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Washington, I must renew my point of order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator from Illinois will yield while the Senator from Minnesota is present, let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that as a result of discussing this question in the conference, we might, in the report, call attention to the situation and call upon the Veterans Bureau to bring the facts before us. Then we could correct the situation legislatively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). The present occupant of the chair regrets that the amendment is not in order. He would personally

favor it if the parliamentary situation were such that it could be considered. However, the amendment is clearly legislation. It would change the existing law. Under paragraph 4 of rule XVI, the Chair regrets that he must sustain the point of order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota understands the ruling of the Chair, and he will subsequently offer the amendment in the form of new legislation, so that it may receive proper consideration. I hope that the committee in its report on the overall bill will allude to this injustice and thereby highlight it, so that we may get further consideration of the subject.

I should like to call to the attention of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee language in the pending bill at page 10, lines 4, 5, and 6. At that place in the bill it is provided: *"Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for a statistical analysis of the consumer's dollar."

That language relates to the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission.

Is it not correct that this provision is legislation on an appropriation bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct that it is legislation. However, that language was placed in the bill by the House. Therefore it is not subject to a point of order in the Senate. If it had been inserted by the Senate committee, it would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then I offer an amendment to strike from the bill the language I have read on page 10, beginning on line 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is in order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have just a word or two to say on the amendment. If anything is necessary today in terms of statistical analysis by the Federal Government, it is an objective and responsible statistical analysis of the consumer's dollar.

We heard a great deal about the consumer's dollar during the debate on the farm bill, and we heard a great deal about the problems the American farm producer faces. We heard the charge made that his problem was primarily due to labor costs. We heard rebuttal from labor to the effect that that was not true. Then we heard the statement from industry that industry was not responsible.

It is about time the Government of the United States discharged its responsibility by providing an economic analysis and showing what is happening to the consumer's dollar, and how the consumer's dollar is being divided.

It will be recalled that the Federal Trade Commission is authorized to make such an analysis, provided that there is not a specific limitation placed on the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission.

This subject was brought before us some years ago and was debated very vigorously in the Senate. By a very close vote, as I recall, the language contained in the bill was sustained. Since that time, however, there has been a considerable amount of rethinking about the subject. Certainly, in the light of what has been happening in terms of inflation and in terms of our agricultural problems, there is a great need for a study of the consumer's dollar.

If the language had been inserted by the Senate committee, it would be interpreted as legislation on an appropriation bill and as not germane. Merely because the language I have referred to was inserted in the bill by the House is no reason why we should let it stand. Therefore, I offer my amendment to strike that language from the bill, because it should not be a part of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for some words of commendation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am always glad to yield for such a purpose. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. There are many words of commendation I could say to the chairman and to the other members of the subcommittee.

I went over the bill very carefully. I wish to say particularly that there are many provisions of the bill which deserve special credit, but special testimonial statements on the bill would take too much time today. Therefore, I will say that it is a source of great satisfaction to me to learn that the Subcommittee on the Independent Offices Appropriation Bill and the Committee on Appropriations have restored in H. R. 9739 the figure requested for the National Science Foundation in the President's budget, $41,300,000. The amount approved by the House of Representatives was $35,915,000, and was $5 million less than the figure requested, and I am personally most happy that the Senate committee has restored the full amount.

The problem of the shortage of scientists and engineers has been a problem which I have frequently discussed on the Senate floor. It was my concern with that problem which originally led me to be particularly interested in the appropriations this year for the National Science Foundation. I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point in my remarks a letter that I sent to Dr. Alan T. Waterman, the Director of the National Science Foundation, in which I requested the compilation of the accomplishments of that Foundation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. On that point I wish to say that every member of the committee is concerned by the lack of scientists in this country. In the past few months it has become apparent that Russia is moving far ahead of us in many fields. The National Science Foundation, as the Senator well knows, makes awards mainly of graduate fellowships in connection with projects which require men who have been trained for a long time and who are doing fine work.

The House reduction would not allow the Foundation to go ahead with some of the projects.

We also get down to the real problem of basic scientists and teachers. We feel that the National Science Foundation should award fellowships to help persons become teachers of science. I am almost of the opinion that in order to develop basic scientists we will first have to do something about getting them to go to school. I believe the best way to do that is to give parents who have children who are pursuing their education in these fields an exemption in their income taxes. I believe it would pay us in the long run to do so. I hope the House will accept our figures.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thoroughly agree with the figures the committee has inserted. The Senator from Washington was the original sponsor of the National Science Foundation, and has had an abiding interest in it.

I have asked unanimous consent that my letter to Dr. Waterman, the Director of the National Science Foundation, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 6, 1956.

Dr. ALAN T. WATERMAN,
Director, National Science Foundation,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. WATERMAN: The problem of the shortage of scientists and engineers concerns me as I am sure it does you. Its complexity is such—extending as it does all the way back to our secondary schools—that I think it really can be dealt wtih only in a large way. For that reason I suggested to the President a few months ago that the appointment of a Presidential commission might be the best approach to the problem.

However, I would like to do whatever can be done in a legislative way to alleviate the shortage. If you have any recommendations I would be most interested in learning of them.

There is one other matter which I have been thinking of for some time; I would like to place in the RECORD a compilation of all the accomplishments, so far, of the National Science Foundation. If this is agreeable, I wonder if you could have someone on your staff prepare such a report for me. There is no hurry, of course, though it might be helpful if I could have it before the time when appropriations for the Foundation are being considered. Use your best judgment on what should be included. I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress a full account of the fine work the National Science Foundation has been doing over the years.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Dr. Waterman replied to my letter on January 16, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that his reply be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D. C., January 16, 1956.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Thank you for your letter of January 6 in which you refer to the shortage of scientists and engineers and indicate that you would like to place in the RECORD a compilation of the accomplishments of the National Science Foundation.

We shall develop a statement of the kind you suggest and send it to you shortly. If we have any recommendations with respect to legislation, we shall also certainly keep in mind your kind offer of assistance.

We are sincerely grateful for your understanding and continuing support of science and the National Science Foundation.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN T. WATERMAN,
Director.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on April 11, 1956, Dr. Waterman wrote me again, enclosing a copy of a letter written by him to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the independent offices appropriation bill, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. I ask unanimous consent that the copy of the letter be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the copy of the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D. C., March 16, 1956.

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee in Charge of the Independent Offices Appropriation Bill, 1957,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: In reply to your letter of March 2, 1956, the National Science Foundation requests the following changes to H. R. 9739 entitled, "Independent Offices Appropriation Bill, 1957":

Page 23, line 6, delete "$35,915,000"; insert "$41,300,000", the amount contained in the President's budget.

Lines 6–10, delete that portion which reads: *"Provided,* That of the foregoing amount not less than $9,500,000 shall be available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection wtih a program of supplementary training for high school science and mathematics teachers."

The total appropriation approved by the House is $5,385,000 less than the amount recommended for the Foundation in the President's budget. As indicated by the Committee Report No. 1847, the House strongly endorsed the Foundation's program for the training of high school science teachers, which is one part of the education in the sciences program, and increased this item over the amount requested in the budget.

The net reduction in the appropriation was apparently accomplished by increasing that part of the education in the sciences program related to the training of high school science teachers by $5,650,000; and by reducing the allowances for other programs of education in the sciences by $1,025,000, the activity "National science policy studies" by $50,000, the subactivity "Grants for research facilities" by $3,500,000, and the subactivity "Grants for research projects" by $6,460,000.

The amount, $41,300,000, contained in the President's budget provided for a balanced program directed to the several problem areas in science now confronting the Nation. This should be noted in considering the House action, i. e., the programs of the Foundation are all closely related and are directed to the common objective of improving the national position in science. Although some parts of the total problem may have become more urgent than others, we believe it is imperative to maintain a balanced program that will permit us to move forward in all essential areas to the maximum extent that our resources—both manpower and money—will permit.

Progress in science depends in the long run on the supply of trained scientists; on a strong national effort in basic research; and on the availability of necessary research facilities. The training of an adequate supply of competent scientists for the immediate future depends to a considerable extent upon the opportunities available to younger scientists to continue their studies through graduate school and by participation in research projects. In the long run, for the maintenance of an adequate level of research, and for the training of a sufficient number of skilled scientists to fill our technological needs, we must depend upon a full supply of competent science teachers in our high schools and colleges. More able college teachers are needed to train more able high school teachers. Together they provide the stimulation and the quality of instruction necessary not only to improve the scientific education of our students, but also to motivate more students of high ability to pursue careers in science.

SPECIFIC EFFECT OF HOUSE ACTION

Education in the sciences

The Foundation's program, "Education in the sciences," is directed to the long-range problem of increasing our scientific and technical manpower both in numbers and in competence. The program is divided into three principal subprograms:

1. Strengthening present science teachers (p. 94 of the budget justification): This program is directed to improving the quality of science teaching through providing year-long training for high school teachers at universities and through summer institutes for both school and college teachers. The House bill apparently limits such training to high school teachers.

2. The improvement of science curricula (p. 99 of the budget justification): The provision of improved courses of study which will contribute to better teaching is fundamental to the problem of securing more highly competent scientists and science teachers. The Foundation proposes to attain this objective through such means as the development of science curricula, subject matter syllabi, and supplementary teaching aids for science teachers.

3. Motivation of able students to consider careers in science and science teaching (p. 104 of the budget justification): This program is directed toward identifying young people with aptitudes for science and encouraging them to study science either for careers in research or in teaching. Included in this program are programs for the support of student participation in science activities and provision for distinguished scientists to serve as visiting lecturers at schools and colleges.

The limitation proposed in the House bill requires that $9.5 million of the appropriation be expended for the supplemental training of high school science teachers only as compared with the $3,850,000 contained in the President's budget for such training of high school and college teachers. Furthermore, the President's budget contained $1,525,000 for the two other subprograms of education in the sciences; the House action would apparently allow only $500,000, a reduction of $1,025,000.

The Foundation concurs with the House committee that there is need for accelerating the high school science teacher training program. We believe, however, that if we are to be successful in attacking the serious scientific manpower problem now confronting the Nation, we must move ahead with vigor in several areas simultaneously. If we are to assure that the Nation is adequately supplied with capable scientific personnel, efforts to improve the quality of science teachers at the high school level alone are not sufficient. We must insure that the quality of science teaching in our colleges will be adequate to develop further the potentialities of the high school students who will be the scientists and science teachers of tomorrow. We must develop and support programs which will give to the teachers better curricula, and more effective teaching aids. We must not only stimulate our present teachers to become better teachers of science, we must also increase the number of science teachers for the future. Therefore, we must encourage a larger number of our most capable youth to enter science as a career both in teaching and in research. Finally, we must insure that a young research scientist, on completing his academic work, is provided with the opportunity and the necessary tools to use his talents for the conduct of research.

The net effect of the limitation in the House bill is to concentrate our effort on the supplementary training of secondary school science teachers. Important as this is, it is strongly felt that the long-range problem of increasing our scientific manpower potential requires more attention also upon the other aspects just discussed.

Grants for support of research projects (p. 49 of the budget justification)

The programs carried on under this subactivity make two significant contributions to the scientific potential of our Nation through the support of individual research projects:

1. The support of basic research projects provides the means for increasing the fundamental knowledge which underlies our technology and, therefore, the national security, welfare, and economy.

2. It also provides advanced training in science for students who have already chosen science as a career, thereby providing prompt increase in our output of scientific manpower.

The reduction proposed by the House would eliminate the support of approximately 500 individual basic research projects and the advanced training of approximately 1,200 graduate students in science and engineering.

Grants for support of research facilities (p. 59 of the budget justification)

The President's budget requested $7 million for the construction and support of research facilities, including the following: $3,500,000 for the construction of a radio astronomy facility; $1,900,000 to partially support the procurement by universities of nuclear reactors and electronic computers; $600,000 for studies preliminary to the construction of a modern optical astronomical observatory; and $1 million for the support of biological field research facilities. The House recommended that the amount be reduced to $3,500,000 for all facilities. The report further stated that the committee "expects that the Foundation will not start a project unless it has all the funds available that are required for it to be completed."

Although the report stated that "the committee does not want to specify approval as to specific projects" the net effect of the language would, for example, prevent the Foundation from beginning construction of the radio astronomy facility. Restoration of the total amount of the appropriation request would permit the Foundation to proceed with the research facilities requested and urgently needed for the advancement of science and for the training of additional scientists.

National science policy studies (p. 10 of the budget justification)

The House report states "the budget estimate includes $800,000 for making national science policy studies. The committee reduced the item by $50,000, which is indeed a very small amount and it will expect the agency to greatly reduce this item next year."

While the reduction recommended by the House is small, the Foundation is seriously concerned that the House committee expects that these studies be greatly reduced in future years. The studies carried out under

this activity provide necessary factual information and analyses for the determination of policies with respect to the role of the Federal Government in science.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Foundation strongly recommends that—

(1) the appropriation be restored to the $41,300,000 requested in the President's budget; and

(2) the limitation providing "that not less than $9,500,000 shall be available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection with a program of supplementary training for high school science and mathematics teachers" be eliminated.

In making these recommendations, the Foundation does not propose that each item discussed above be restored to the specific amount requested in the President's budget. Approval of these two recommendations will enable the Foundation to conform to the spirit of the House action and the committee recommendations and will provide the balance and flexibility necessary for the development and conduct of well-balanced programs in all areas important to the national scientific effort.

It is requested that the Foundation be granted a hearing before your subcommittee to discuss these matters in greater detail.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN T. WATERMAN,
Director.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Finally, Mr. President, the National Science Foundation in answer to my request has prepared an excellent summary of its record to date. This summary is so important and helpful to the growing number of people in the Senate and in the country who are interested in the activities of the Foundation, that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks, together with the accompanying letter from Dr. Waterman.

There being no objection, the letter and summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D. C., April 11, 1956.

The Honorable HUBERT M. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Enclosed is a statement on the activities of the National Science Foundation which you suggested that we send you some weeks ago. You indicated that there was no hurry about it but that it might be helpful if you could have it before the time when our appropriations are being considered.

As you may know, the House increased our appropriation this year to $35,915,000 from last year's figure of $16 million. This is still $5 million less, however, than the figure requested for the National Science Foundation in the President's budget—which we are asking the Senate to restore. Enclosed is a copy of our letter on the subject to Senator MAGNUSON.

I should like to say again that we are really grateful to you for your interest in the program of the Foundation.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN T. WATERMAN,
Director.

ACTIVITIES OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

INTRODUCTION

Dr. Vannevar Bush, wartime Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, recommended in 1945 the establishment of a National Science Foundation as the essential part of an action program to meet the crisis in scientific research existing at the end of World War II. He said, in part, in his report entitled "Science: The Endless Frontier":

"The Government should accept new responsibilities for promoting the flow of new scientific knowledge and the development of scientific talent in our youth. These responsibilities are the proper concern of the Government, for they vitally affect our health, our jobs, and our national security. It is in keeping also with basic United States policy that the Government should foster the opening of new frontiers, and this is the modern way to do it. For many years the Government has wisely supported research in the agricultural colleges, and the benefits have been great. The time has come when such support should be extended to other fields.

"The effective discharge of these new responsibilities will require the full attention of some overall agency devoted to that purpose. There is not now in the permanent governmental structure receiving its funds from Congress an agency adapted to supplementing the support of basic research in the colleges, universities, and research institutes, both in medicine and the natural sciences, adapted to supporting research on new weapons for both services, or adapted to administering a program of science scholarships and fellowships.

"Therefore, I recommend that a new agency for these purposes be established. Such an agency should be composed of persons of broad interest and experience, having an understanding of the peculiarities of scientific research and scientific education. It should have stability of funds so that long-range programs may be undertaken. It should recognize that freedom of inquiry must be preserved and should leave internal control of policy, personnel, and the method and scope of research to the institutions in which it is carried. It should be fully responsible to the President and through him to the Congress for its program."

The new agency recommended by Dr. Bush was established by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950.

During the 5-year period when legislation concerning the Foundation was being considered by Congress, support of basic research was undertaken by such agencies as the Office of Naval Research, the National Institutes of Health, and the Atomic Energy Commission. Outbreak of the Korean war in 1950 resulted in increased emphasis upon applied research and end-item development with a relative decrease in emphasis on basic research. Increased support for basic research now being provided by the National Science Foundation is tending to decrease this imbalance in the Nation's scientific effort. Other activities of the Foundation, described below, are proceeding in consonance with the objectives outlined by Dr. Bush and the functions outlined in the National Science Foundation Act of 1950.

Activities of the National Science Foundation

"To develop a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences:"

1. From its inception, the Foundation has had the purpose of planning and administering its research-grant program in such a way as to stimulate the Nation's production of significant scientific knowledge and at the same time to expand the Nation's potential scientific resources. The scientific merit of proposed research projects is critically evaluated in each case by outstanding scientists in the appropriate field. On the basis of these evaluations and recommendations of the Foundation staff, final selection of those proposals to be supported within limits of available funds must be approved by the National Science Board—the Foundation's 24-member governing body. The primary concern of the Foundation is that granted funds be used in a manner which will make maximum contribution to the progress of science.

By this careful review process critical and impartial judgment is thus brought to bear on all proposals for research support—assurance that Foundation funds are directed toward support of the broad requirements of the Nation's economy, welfare, and defenses. Some promising areas of basic research which meet these requirements and which the Foundation has supported during fiscal years 1952–55 are: Radio astronomy, enabling scientists to observe and measure phenomena of outer space, to "see" by means of radio waves what has heretofore not been visible with optical telescopes; new sources of power, energy from the atom nucleus, supplementing the basic research of the Atomic Energy Commission, and from the sun, each of which, when probed more deeply by research in basic science, may yield better sources of heat and power; photosynthesis, basic research into the problem of how plants convert the energy of sunlight to food and fuel, out of which may derive vast benefits for mankind; solid-state research, the mechanical properties of solids, what holds the atoms together in a solid, and the electrical and magnetic properties of solids, high-speed computation, present-day advances in several science disciplines have outdistanced methods of calculation, calling urgently for wider accessibility of the modern, but costly, facilities in high-speed computation; geochemistry, with its promise of new methods of detecting ore deposits through research in the fluids and solutions of matter during geologic processes; geophysical research, using the world as an observing laboratory as in the international geophysical year program. Because none can predict where such promising areas of research may push into the advancing frontier of science, the Foundation supports a comprehensive program of grants for basic research across the science spectrum in the best interests of the Nation's economy, welfare, and defense.

2. Each year the Foundation sponsors scientific conferences in special areas of unusual interest. During the 1952–55 period the Foundation helped underwrite more than 50 such conferences. Proceedings and papers are usually published at the conclusion of the conference so that the value of the proceedings to scientists extends well beyond the limits of the conference itself.

A complete listing of all Foundation-sponsored conferences would be impractical, but the following titles indicate their scope: Astronomical Research and Photoelectric Techniques, High-Energy Physics, Methods of Determination of Steroids, Utilization of Solar Energy, Photosynthesis, Cosmic Rays, Low Temperature Physics and Chemistry, International Arid Lands Symposium, Man's Role in Changing the Face of the Earth, Mechanics in Engineering Education, Radio Astronomy, Mathematical Tables, Evolution of Behavior, Molecular Quantum Mechanics, Problems in Human Communication and Control.

Widely diversified subject matter is indicated by the foregoing titles, covering many areas of physical and life sciences. Often attracted to the conferences were leading scientists of other countries who shared their knowledge with associates in the United States.

3. While vigorously supporting efforts of investigators to dig the known out of the unknown, the Foundation seeks more precise knowledge about the state of scientific activities as a whole in order to obtain intelligent data on the nature and amount of national resources expended in scientific pursuits. Such information is best acquired through the cooperation of panels and committees of experts representative of each field, and often subfield, of a scientific discipline. Four fields of science are currently more formally being surveyed with support

by the Foundation—physiology, psychology, mathematics and demography. In physiology, the survey is analyzing data from 3,500 American physiologists with reference to their educational, social, economic and geographical background; their activities, division of time among research, teaching and administration; personal and motivational factors; in psychology, the survey seeks to evaluate the status of psychological knowledge and an analysis of occupations in psychology; in mathematics, the survey seeks data on research potential and training in the field as a whole; and in demography, the basic objective of the survey is to determine gaps and deficiencies in the fund of knowledge and demography, its theory and methodology, and in its resources and facilities for research and training. Similar comprehensive studies are being considered in other scientific disciplines, complementing and supplementing the above-described conferences in special areas of unusual interest.

4. Since its establishment, the Foundation has been concerned with problems of national science policy, especially the role of the Federal Government in support of science. In attempting to carry out this responsibility, it found that most basic data essential to sound planning were not available. The Foundation, therefore, began the painstaking task of accumulating necessary data concerning the national effort in scientific research and development. Industry, educational institutions, private foundations and laboratories, and Federal agencies supporting research all cooperate in these studies. The studies will provide a firm basis for policy recommendations to strengthen the national scientific effort and furnish guidance to define the responsibilities of Government in the conduct and support of research.

For example, Federal Funds for Science, published annually, provides detailed information on the extent of Government-sponsored scientific research and development, and shows important trends in the level and direction of Federal expenditures for science.

Recently published, the study, Science and Engineering in American Industry, shows that private industry's annual budget for research and development is close to $4 billion ($3.7), and enabled the Foundation, on the basis of accumulated data, to state clearly that total United States expenditure for research and development is more than $5 billion—nearly half of which is supported by the Federal Government.

The Foundation's just-published study, Scientific Research Expenditures in the Larger Private Foundations, covering the 77 largest privately endowed foundations, removed guesswork from assumptions about the amount of support such foundations extend for scientific research. The study indicates that the percentage of support from this source for basic scientific research has declined steadily for the years studied—1939, 1946 and 1953. Medical sciences and social sciences are the fields of first interest to private foundations, at the present time.

Similar fact-finding studies, many nearing completion, will provide a solid base on which the Foundation can build recommendations for future action. These include (a) a report on organization of the Federal Government for scientific activities showing the structure of Federal units and functions performed in science; (b) a survey of Government-university relationships analyzing sources of support for research at colleges and universities and the nature of such research; (c) a survey of research by trade associations and similar organizations; (d) a survey of research at nonprofit institutes and commercial laboratories; (e) a survey of research supported by selected State governments; (f) a survey of the financial support of graduate students and Federal stipends to undergraduate and graduate students in the sciences; (g) a survey of Federal scientific manpower; and (h) a history of science in the Federal Government.

5. The Foundation was asked by the Bureau of the Budget to make a study of indirect costs practices among Federal agencies on research grants and contracts at universities and colleges and to recommend a uniform Government policy. The Foundation recommended to the Bureau of the Budget as follows:

"The National Science Foundation recommends that in supporting research in institutions of higher learning, agencies of the Federal Government, if requested, reimburse these institutions for those indirect costs of research supported."

6. The Foundation enunciated the principle that in making grants for unclassified basic research it will not pass judgment on the loyalty of an individual on the basis of unsupported charges but will make grants upon the judgment of scientists having a working knowledge of his experience, competence, and integrity. The Foundation, however, will not knowingly make a grant in support of the research of one who is an avowed Communist, or anyone established as being a Communist by a judicial proceeding, or anyone who avowedly advocates change in the United States Government by other than constitutional means, or one who has been convicted of sabotage, espionage, sedition, or a similar crime involving the Nation's security.

"To support basic scientific research and to appraise the impact of research upon industrial development and the general welfare":

7. All scientific advances are ultimately dependent on basic research. The Foundation awards grants to support the work of qualified scientists who desire to engage in such research. Grants are given only on the basis of recommendations by advisory panels of specialists in the various scientific fields.

During the period 1952 through 1955, the Foundation made 1,232 grants in the amount of $14.3 million for the support of basic scientific research. These grants helped able scientists in over 250 American colleges and universities to explore new frontiers in the biological, medical, mathematical, physical, and engineering sciences. Requests for support of research submitted to the Foundation during this period totaled more than $66 million. During fiscal year 1956, more than $10 million will be granted in support of about 900 additional projects for basic research. The President's budget for 1957 included $22.8 million to support of this program by the Foundation in fiscal year 1957.

8. In keeping with the Foundation's responsibility for encouraging and stimulating development of the Nation's scientific resources it should be noted that funds in the average Foundation grant support 1 or 2 graduate student research assistants. This support enables young men and women, who might not otherwise have the opportunity, to make their own contribution to research, to become trained in ways of research under direction of experienced research leaders, and to continue their formal academic training. This continuing and immediate contribution by the grants program to the Nation's pool of highly trained scientific talent is of utmost importance to the Nation's future scientific strength. Thus, in addition to contributing to the Nation's store of scientific knowledge, the grants program also provides opportunities to an estimated three to four thousand graduate science students to participate as assistants to mature research investigators and to further their academic training.

"At the request of the Secretary of Defense, to support specific defense research activities":

9. During the current fiscal year, the Office of Naval Research has transferred funds to the Foundation for support of basic research in areas of science in which the two agencies are mutually concerned.

"To award scholarships and graduate fellowships in the sciences":

10. To encourage gifted science students to pursue their studies on a full-time basis, the Foundation during its first 5 years of operation awarded 2,456 predoctoral fellowships and 249 postdoctoral fellowships in the sciences at a cost of approximately $6.5 million. The Foundation awarded over 900 fellowships in fiscal year 1956. Every State in the Nation is represented among fellows of the Foundation, selected by rating panels of leading American scientists. Candidates are judged on the basis of (1) test scores on general ability, scientific aptitude, and competence in their science field, (2) previous scholastic record, and (3) confidential reports and evaluations from the applicant's faculty advisers. Fields of science represented among the fellows are the life sciences, chemistry, engineering, earth sciences, mathematics, and physics, and astronomy. Average annual costs to the Foundation for predoctoral fellows are about $2,500 per fellow, and for postdoctorals, $4,180. In addition to the stipend to the fellow, the award covers tuition costs and allowance for dependents. These fellowships permit the fellow to study for an academic year at the institution of his choice. In addition to these programs, the Foundation has instituted fellowship programs for senior postdoctoral scientists, and will institute fellowships for college science faculty members.

"To foster the exchange of scientific information":

11. Progress in science research is impeded to the extent that lines of communication among scientists are clogged. Investigators in a particular field of science must have access to the research of their associates. Meanwhile, published material in the sciences is reaching large proportions while publication costs are constantly climbing. As a remedial measure, the Foundation has for several years supported scientific publications needing emergency help over difficult periods as they attempted to increase reserves and become self-supporting. It also supports worthwhile research which promises improved methods for processing, storing, retrieving, and providing scientific information.

In addition, the Foundation has sought to open communication channels among scientists by giving support (1) to the improvement of bibliographic tools, (2) to the Library of Congress for preparation and publication of comprehensive lists of United States and Russian scientific serial publications, (3) to the American Institute of Physics for translating and publishing an English edition of the Russian Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Physics, and (4) to investigators working on the mechanization of information searching and machine translations.

12. In cooperation with the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, the Foundation published in 1955 Nicholas DeWitt's definitive study, Soviet Professional Manpower. The book pointed up the fact that the Soviet Union is graduating almost twice as many technical specialists in certain fields as the United States—682,000 professionals in the engineering field between 1928 and 1954 as against 480,000 in the United States during roughly the same period. While serving to focus nationwide attention on the capabilities of other nations in science and technology, the book drew attention as well to domestic problems concerned with identifying and training persons with special aptitudes for careers in science and technology.

"To maintain a register of scientific and technical personnel and to serve as a central clearinghouse for information covering such personnel":

13. Current information about the supply of scientists in the United States is quickly available through the National Register of Scientific and Professional Personnel maintained by the Foundation. The register, which now contains manpower data on all major fields of science, has been compiled with the cooperation of scientific societies in the several fields of science and engineering. Each society collects basic registration information on professionally trained individuals in its field of specialization, whether or not they are members of the society. Societies also maintain individual registers on a current basis. Duplicate copies are sent to the Foundation for the national register. Thus, the Foundation can quickly provide data concerning professional qualifications, training and employment of scientists by field, and can follow trends in the utilization of trained scientists and engineers.

As such manpower data become available and are analyzed, the Foundation from time to time issues reports and bulletins on the supply and characteristics of the manpower in a particular scientific field. These are released under such typical titles as "Manpower Resources in Chemistry," "Manpower Resources in Physics," and cover the several major disciplines in science. In particular demand has been the bulletin on shortages of scientists and engineers in industrial research, and such special reports as highlights of a survey of June 1951 college graduates and highlights of a survey of graduate student enrollments, fellowships and assistantships.

"To evaluate scientific research undertaken by Federal agencies and to correlate the Foundation's research programs with other such programs":

In support of this directive from Congress, underscored by the President's Executive order of March 1954, the Foundation has undertaken to study and evaluate the scientific research programs and activities of the Federal Government, with special reference to the role of the Federal Government in the support of basic research.

14. In conformance with a recommendation of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, a study was made by a Special Commission for Rubber Research appointed by the National Science Board concerning the support by the Government of basic research on synthetic rubber. This now completed study recommended that the Federal Government withdraw further support for research in synthetic rubber, thereby saving the Government an annual expenditure of more than a million dollars.

15. At the request of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, a Special Committee on Medical Research, appointed by the National Science Board, undertook a review and evaluation of the medical research programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The report of this committee has just been released.

16. The worldwide program of special observations of various earth sciences phenomena planned between mid-1957 and the end of 1958—the International Geophysical Year (IGY) is of special interest. Scientists of at least 55 nations will cooperate in making simultaneous observations from a vast network of stations extending over the surface of the earth. The Foundation has responsibility on the part of the Government for obtaining appropriations from Congress and for administering these funds, including coordination of Federal agencies' interest in the undertaking. Federal appropriations to the Foundation to support the United States program may be made available by grant or transfer of funds to other Government agencies and private institutions engaged in the work. Planning and technical direction of the United States program are in the hands of the United States National Committee for the IGY, which exists under the aegis of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council. The world program is coordinated by an international committee, Comité Special Année Géophysique Internationale (CSAGI). Estimates of total world cost of the IGY vary from $200 million to $300 million. The Congress has appropriated $12 million for the United States program and the Foundation is requesting $28 million supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1956, the bulk of the latter to be used for the earth-satellite program undertaken by the United States.

Although lay interest may center on the drama that will surround launching of earth-bound satellites and expeditions to the Antarctica, scientific interest will focus on measured data which will come from worldwide cooperative efforts of scientists who will collect and coordinate geophysical data on meteorology, upper atmosphere physics including the ionosphere, aurora, geomagnetism, oceanography, glaciology, seismology and as a special additional program, redetermination of latitudes.

17. In accordance with recommendations of the President's Materials Policy Commission, the Foundation established an Advisory Committee on Minerals Research which is now making recommendations on a program of minerals research in the United States.

"To cooperate in international scientific research activities":

18. During the 5-year period of operation, the Foundation provided grants for partial payment of travel expenses to enable American scientists of outstanding ability to participate in selected international and scientific meetings. A total of 314 scientists received such grants permitting them to attend 68 different international scientific meetings. Grants average about $580, indicating that recipients must make substantial personal contributions to attend the meetings. Foundation policy stipulates that recipients shall participate if possible in the actual work of the conference. International meetings supported by travel grants are carefully selected, and scientists who receive Foundatoin grants are chosen with equal care by panels of consultants or by appropriate committees of national scientific organizations.

19. The Foundation concerns itself with other aspects of international science as follows: (a) preparation and publication of reports concerned with international scientific activities including a quarterly List of International and Foreign Scientific and Technical Meetings"; (b) certain conferences on important aspects of science which the Foundation helps support are international in character and are attended by scientists from abroad; (c) since successful candidates for Foundation fellowships are permitted to select institutions they desire to attend, a small percentage attend institutions in other countries; (d) a few grants in support of basic research have been awarded to principal investigators, part or all of whose work is conducted outside the United States—example, a grant of $5,000 for 1 year to Dr. A. C. Smith of the Smithsonian Institution, supported his work in descriptive flora of the Fiji Islands; (e) support of translations of foreign scientific papers. In all its relationships with international science, the Foundation works closely with the National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council and with the approval of the Department of State, supporting those programs and projects which relate significantly to the economy, welfare, and defense of the United States.

20. The Foundation is currently undertaking a study of the kinds of activities in which the several departments and agencies engage with reference to international science. The study takes cognizance of the contribution science can make toward lifting the domestic and external prestige of nations, facilitating economic development, easing international tensions, and contributing to a larger world reservoir of scientific knowledge and trained science manpower.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing review of several programs of the National Science Foundation indicates methods by which the Foundation attempts constantly to improve the environment of science and the quality of scientists through support of basic research in the sciences, providing opportunities to improve the training of scientists and engineers, gathering factual data necessary to recommend sound science policies for the Federal Government, maintaining a running account of United States scientific manpower resources, and encouraging a more complete and speedier exchange of information among scientists. However, these identifiable activities represent only part of the story—the very existence of the Foundation and the opportunity it provides for leadership in support of science in the Federal Government may well outweigh specific and tangible items. The position of trust which the Foundation has achieved in the university community is one which rests in part on the confidence built up during the comparatively short period of its existence.

In carrying out its assignment, the Foundation believes strongly that its responsibilities are leadership and guidance, not direction. Only in a free environment are scientists able to do their most creative work. In working out its program of activities, the Foundation has followed the wise admonition of Dr. Bush that "it should recognize that freedom of inquiry must be preserved and should leave internal control of policy, personnel, and the method and scope of research to the institutions in which it is carried on."

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues this splendid report. It is one of the most detailed compilations of the work of the National Science Foundation I have seen to date. It is a report of encouragement and of progress, and one that fully justifies the appropriations which have gone into this very worthwhile and all-important project of our Government.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 27, line 13, to strike the word "fifteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty-two."

Mr. President, this relates to the number of people the Veterans' Administration can employ in public relations work. In 1947, Congress set a limit of 100 for this purpose, and year after year the number has been going down, until finally, in the full committee, on motion of one of the members of the committee, the number carried in the bill was reduced to 15. Obviously, this is too small a number to provide information to the country and to the veterans.

There are 21 million living veterans, and I understand from the so-called Bradley report that there are nearly 1½ million veterans of World War II who are service-connected disability cases who do not receive disability pay today.

There are only two ways in which information relative to the veterans' program can get to the public. One is through contact offices, and the other is through information offices.

In 1947, there were more than 900 offices to which a veteran could go and get the last word on veterans' benefits. Progressively, as a result of diminution in appropriations, the number of contact offices has been reduced from 900 to 300, and the number of officers has been reduced from a ceiling of 100 to a low of 15.

Obviously, Mr. President, if the veterans are going to get some advisory information as to what their rights are and what benefits they can properly enjoy under the law, we must have a few persons who can provide information, in a compact, understandable package, on what the law and the regulations are.

Certainly, Mr. President, as against a potential of 21 million living veterans, 15 public-relations officers are far below the ratio of any service agency in the Government. I think the number ought to be restored in accordance with the request which has been made.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator is completely correct. I wish to raise a question as to whether the Senator has made the figure sufficiently large. There is a difficulty of semantics in this problem. I think it is unfortunate that the phrase "public-relations officers" should be used, because there seems to be a rather negative connotation in connection with that phrase in the minds of many persons. They look upon it as some sort of propaganda or publicity or advertising service. As the Senator from Illinois has stated, it is not that at all.

For what do we primarily need these men? We need them as contact men to be of advisory service to the veterans who are going to lose many of their rights and who are not going to be able to take advantage of the services available to them if someone does not tell them about those services. It is very easy for us to find these things out for ourselves, but we should keep constantly in mind that there are not only the 21 million veterans to whom the Senator from Illinois has referred, but there are a great many fellow citizens who have performed patriotic service for all of us who are not educated men and do not have the advantages of persons who are well educated. They need this kind of a special service.

We should be calling it, I think, an advisory service instead of a public relations service. I do not believe that for want of a better name we should do the injustice which will be done to the veterans if we fail to provide them with an adequate number of advisers. I like to think of it as an advisory service.

I congratulate the Senator on the amendment he is presenting. I heartily endorse it, and I hope it will go to conference.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I appreciate the remarks of my distinguished friend from Oregon.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will prevail, and I hope we shall be able to persuade the distinguished conferees of the House of Representatives of the rightness of our cause.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have one last amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 28, line 9, in lieu of "$16,453,000" to insert "$20,773,800, of which $10 million shall be available for medical research."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, because the amendment involves a considerable amount of money, I think I should briefly advise the Senate of its purpose.

We discussed in the committee at some length the question of medical research by the Veterans' Administration. The Veterans' Administration had submitted its request to the Budget Bureau many, many months ago. I do not know whether the amount requested was cut by the Budget Bureau, but the amount was cut a great deal. It was suggested that they should spend so much money of their vast appropriations—it is quite a large one—for medical research, on the ground that it would be economy, in the long run. We did not, however, add any specific amount to the bill.

Since that time I have discussed the matter with some of the representatives of the Veterans' Administration, who tell me that they might be somewhat handicapped in doing the research they wish to do unless we specify the amount. So I have submitted the amendment.

During the current fiscal year the VA is spending $662 million for the inpatient care of veterans. Over and above this it is spending an additional $82 million for outpatient treatment for veterans. As against this total expenditure of approximately $740 million for medical care—it is spending only $5,679,000 for research.

Mr. President, it is not good sense to spend less than 1 percent of a total medical budget to discover the research answers to the great killers of our day. Unless we find new treatments for these major diseases—America is faced with an annual tax bill of billions of dollars a year just for the care of its veterans.

Let me document this point. The total medical bill of the VA for fiscal 1956 has reached the staggering sum of $3,717,000,000. This sum includes hospital and clinic care, compensation and pensions, and new hospital construction.

Mr. President, this tax load is going up astronomically each year. Let me give you an example. In 1945 the Veterans' Administration spent approximately $38 million for the hospital care of mentally ill veterans. In 1955—only a decade later—the hospital bill for mentally ill veterans had soared more than 500 percent, to an excess of $220 million. And this is not all. Over and above this the Congress is now appropriating more than $400 million annually in compensation costs for service-connected psychiatric disabilities. A Hoover Commission medical task force report recently estimated that our bill for mentally ill veterans would soon reach a billion dollars a year. The three big diseases which afflict veterans are cancer, heart disease, and mental illness. With our veteran population growing older every year, these diseases are taking an increasing toll of our veterans. There is only one way out of the dilemma—to spend money for research to find cures for these diseases. The committee has proposed that the Veterans' Administration submit a plan to the Appropriations Committee for next year outlining their accelerated program against these major causes of death and disability among our veterans in order that hospital costs might be cut, and that the veterans might be returned to normal life—able to work and be self-supporting.

Mr. President, the Veterans' Administration should be spending at least 10 percent of its total budget upon research and upon the training of skilled medical personnel. I use the figure 10 percent because the National Governors Conference on Mental Health in 1954 adopted a statement that research and training should comprise 10 percent of the budget of any public medical facility. If we were to use this yardstick with relation to the Veterans' Administration program, we would find that the Veterans' Administration should currently be spending approximately $66 million this year on research and training.

I propose a gradual pointing up to the 10 percent figure. For next year, I believe the VA could wisely spend a total of $10 million in the major killers and cripplers—heart disease, cancer, and mental illness, which is what this will be for. There are an enormous number of research leads in these fields, and the VA has a magnificent hospital system in which to test new therapies and drugs. In other words some of the best hospitals we have are the VA hospitals. This was proven several years ago when the VA undertook an evaluation of the new drugs against tuberculosis. The magnificent work of the VA in that research project helped to extend the clinical application of these drugs throughout the world and to cut the death rate in the United States from tuberculosis by 75 percent. Several thousand beds in the VA hospital system were released with the advent of these new drugs. More important, several thousand veterans who suffered from tuberculosis are now back at work and are supporting their families. We cannot place any price on the happiness which the research effort against tuberculosis has brought to so many of our veterans and their families.

We must do the same type of research with the remaining big killers. There are thousands of compounds currently being studied against cancer. The VA should engage in a large scale evaluation of these important compounds. There are important leads in heart disease. There are new treatments for arteriosclerosis, including anticoagulance, special diets, and hormones. The VA

must pursue the existing research leads in this field. In mental illness there are new drugs which offer great promise. I am happy to note that the VA has started an evaluation of two of these drugs. However, this work should be expanded tremendously, because more than 50 percent of VA hospital beds are occupied by the mentally ill.

Mr. President, there are sound economic justifications for these expenditures. I have documentation to show that every dollar in Federal research expenditure has brought back $7 in economic productivity and tax returns. If we do not accelerate our expenditure we will, within the next decade, face a total Veterans' Administration bill in the neighborhood of $10 billion a year.

We must act, and we must act now. That is why I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I certainly concur in the objective sought by my friend, the Senator from Washington. I wish, of course, it could have been achieved within the money limitations which were in the bill as it came from the full committee. I think, however, we can take the amendment to conference. Certain it is that there are a good many fields of research which are not covered by tne National Institutes of Health. Only yesterday the Senate passed the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and in that bill a great many additional millions of dollars were provided over and above the budget estimates. But that money is to be used for research in the fields of cancer, heart disease, and all the other diseases which are commonly known to the people.

I think a special field is involved here. Military personnel serving abroad are subject to tropical diseases and diseases which are incident to other countries and other areas of the world. If the increase were not justified for any other reason, that would be a justification in itself.

So while the whole amount may not be retained in conference, I shall be glad, indeed, to go along with it. Then probably we shall be able to secure some additional assistance with respect to this item.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate the statement made by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I support the amendment of the Senator from Washington and agree wholeheartedly with what he has said regarding the ever-increasing need for research in the activities covered by his amendment. I agree also that in the past Congress has been very niggardly in providing necessary funds for this purpose.

Our colleagues may remember that only yesterday the Senate passed an appropriation bill providing funds for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I expressed great gratification over the appropriations which were recommended for the various activities carried on by the National Institutes of Health. They mark a very great step forward.

During the debate the distinguished Senator from Washington pointed out the gains which had been made during the past 2 or 3 years because of the increased appropriations which had been made, particularly for research. He cited figures showing that there had been an improvement of, I believe, 19 percent in the discharges of cured patients from mental hospitals because of the use of the new drugs which have been developed and are now in general use.

The Senator from Washington also gave extremely interesting figures with respect to the hopeful progress which had been made in cancer research and in research in the case of respiratory diseases, and circulatory diseases.

I think that if we do nothing else, we will have taken a long step forward if we continue in Congress to provide as generous appropriations for research work as are possible. We have shown a disposition to increase the appropriations for many activities dealing with the health of the people, but the funds for such work are still insufficient and still inadequate. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

While I am on my feet, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Washington upon his superb work in formulating this appropriation bill. Not only has he been active in this particular department, but he has also worked vigorously in the preparation of the budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which the Senate approved yesterday. I congratulate him and the members of his subcommittee upon their excellent work. It has been work well done.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9739) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I commend my delightful friend, the very able senior Senator from Washington, upon his thorough, statesmanlike work in presenting the two appropriation bills to the Senate today.

I have served on committees of Congress with the senior Senator from Washington for almost 20 years. I know of no person who is more expert in the fields in which he has chosen to operate than WARREN MAGNUSON. I know of no one who is more capable of carrying a bill through either the Senate or the House than the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He is a very valued colleague, and has done outstanding work not only on the Independent Offices appropriation bill, but also on the other appropriation bill for which he is responsible.

I commend him for offering the pending amendment, and assure him of my whole-hearted concurrence in the objective he seeks to achieve.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Washington for a moment, I wish to say I find myself so enthusiastically in support of his amendment that it would be a high honor if he would list me as a cosponsor of it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon may be listed as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have listened with great amazement to the figures on the Veterans' Administration's medical program presented so ably by the subcommittee chairman, the distinguished Senator from Washington.

I think it is about time the people of this country were let in on what is going on in the Veterans' Administration. Many of us sitting here today voted appropriations 11 years ago to create a medical-care program for our veterans second to none in the world. It is my impression that under the first two medical directors of that program—Drs. Paul Hawley and Paul Magnuson—we were well on our way to achieving the goal set by the Congress.

I am therefore disturbed when I hear that the Veterans' Administration is spending only about $5 million a year in medical research, as against a total Veterans Administration medical bill in excess of $3 billion a year.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an explanation of the listing of the Veterans' Administration total medical bill as $3,717,000,000.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF LISTING OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION TOTAL MEDICAL BILL AS $3,717,000,000

Direct hospital cost	$663,000,000
Outpatient care	82,000,000
Hospital construction	48,000,000
Compensation for service-connected disabilities	1,416,000,000
Compensation for nonservice disabilities	468,000,000

The remaining sum is composed of dependents receiving compensation on account of service-connected death of the veteran, pensions to living veterans physically unable to support themselves, and some miscellaneous items. I think all these costs can be attributed to the medical-care program of the VA.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday we voted greatly increased medical-research appropriations for the National Institutes of Mental Health because we were presented with incontrovertible evidence that for every dollar the Federal Government invests in research it receives a return of $7 in reduced costs for medical care and in increased economic productivity. I do not understand why in each of its annual reports over the past few years the Veterans' Administration has pointed up the vital necessity of greatly expanded medical research, but on the other hand, has not yet developed

a decently financed medical-research program.

Let me quote a section on medical research from the 1955 annual report of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs:

> The Department of Medicine and Surgery must conduct research activities in order to provide better patient care. The research program in a hospital serves both as a stimulus to the medical staff and provides an incentive for recruitment. The results of medical research improve the health and medical care of the veteran patient and secondarily supply new and important scientific information. The best patient care is usually provided in those hospitals wherein research and education activities are an integral part of the patient-care program.

I ask you to particularly note, Mr. President, the last sentence in that quotation, emphasizing the fact that the best patient care is provided only in those hospitals where research is an integral part of the program. By that yardstick, then, I seriously question whether the Veterans' Administration is today giving the best medical care to the 118,000 veterans now hospitalized in its institutions.

Further along in the 1955 report I came across the admission by the Veterans' Administration that it has a "serious responsibility" in medical research. Let me quote that section:

> It should be recognized that the Veterans' Administration has a serious responsibility in medical research due to the problems associated with:
>
> 1. The large numbers of hospitalized veterans with a variety of diseases that are not well understood and for which there is no effective treatment.
>
> 2. The large number of veterans receiving compensation or pension for medical disabilities.
>
> 3. Disabilities and diseases of an aging veteran population.

I wonder how many of us realize how serious a problem medical care for our veterans really is. Speaking as past chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I am proud of the record I made during my term in that office in seeking passage and accomplishing the passage in the Senate of a considerable amount of veterans legislation which sought to protect the welfare of the veterans of the United States.

I point out that there are 21 million veterans in this country at the present time. Of these, 118,000 are hospitalized, and several million are receiving compensation for service-connected disabilities.

Furthermore, the problem is seriously aggravated by the increasing age of veterans, with a consequent increase in chronic and disabling illnesses. The average age of the hospitalized veteran is now 48. More than 13,000 hospitalized veterans are over 65 years of age.

My study of the Veterans Administration reports indicate that we are approaching the danger of having the Veterans' Administration hospital system turn into a series of homes for the chronic and disabled. The Veterans' Administration itself has admitted that more than one-half of all hospitalized patients have been in a veterans' hospital for more than 1 year, and that almost one-third of all patients have been hospitalized for more than 5 years.

Yesterday afternoon the Senator from Washington and I engaged in a colloquy in which we discussed the question of domiciliary care for our veterans. I am all for that. I have voted, and shall continue to vote, for any domiciliary hospital the Veterans' Administration requests of the Congress of the United States. But that is not the major obligation of the Veterans' Administration when it comes to medical care. Its major obligation, I may say most respectfully, is to provide such care as will help veterans to recover from a curable disease. In order to insure that, we need to enlarge our appropriations for medical research, because, as the Veterans' Administration's own report shows, it can do a good job of medical care of its patients only to the extent that, through research, there are discovered new ways to treat some of the death-dealing illnesses from which so many veterans suffer.

The Senator from Washington pointed out what we are doing in the field of medical research in connection with cardiac disease, cancer, and the other great death-dealing diseases; but I submit that it is important to build up the medical research services for the veterans' hospitals.

Now the Veterans Administration has some fine words to say about the aging population of veterans, and I quote again from the 1955 report:

> The Veterans' Administration has a responsibility to investigate these chronic and other diseases in order to be able to develop and provide for effective methods of diagnosis and treatment. These methods in turn should and do effect significant economics. A better understanding of patients with long-term illnesses will undoubtedly result only if this opportunity is capitalized.

Mr. President, the Veterans' Administration hospital system is the largest in the world. Medical scientists have testified before congressional committees that it is a superb closed system in which to study disease. Dr. George M. Lyon, Assistant Chief Medical Director for Research of the Veterans' Administration, corroborated the statements of these scientists when he reported in January 1955 that—

> Because of the large number of patients hospitalized, because of the wide variety of diseases and disabilities encountered in Veterans' Administration hospitals, and because of the fact that these are observed within a single hospital system—the largest in the world—there exists the greatest opportunity imaginable for the clinical study of disease in man. The close association of 91 Veterans' Administration hospitals having research facilities with 72 medical schools in which active research programs are also underway makes it possible to pursue the study of disease in the hospitalized patient in a way, and to an extent, never before envisaged.

What is the Veterans' Administration doing with this magnificent opportunity? I cannot find that it is doing very much at all. Each year the Congress appropriates large sums for new Veterans' Administration hospitals; each year the cost to the taxpayers rises astronomically. As my distinguished colleague from Washington has pointed out, the cost of hospitalizing mentally ill veterans alone has gone up more than 500 percent in less than a decade—from approximately $38 million in 1945 to $223 million in 1955.

Look at the figures on heart disease, Mr. President. We are spending more than $200 million annually in compensation payments to veterans afflicted with heart disease. By contrast, the Veterans' Administration is spending only a few hundred thousand dollars for research on heart disease, the Nation's No. 1 killer.

Mr. President, my record shows that I would never economize at the expense of the veteran. However, I want to see that our veterans get the best medical care, which the Congress is duty bound to provide them. It is not good economy, nor is it humanitarian, to spend pennies on medical research and millions and millions of dollars on mere custody. I join my colleague from Washington in supporting a $10 million amendment as a minimum appropriation for the medical-research activities of the Veterans' Administration during the coming fiscal year. Furthermore, I join him in insisting that the Veterans' Administration present to the Congress next year a long-range medical-research program leading to a major attack on the diseases which now disable thousands upon thousands of our veterans.

Last of all, Mr. President, I wish to answer one of the fear arguments which I find has crept into the thinking of some veterans' organizations, in regard to the appropriation of funds for research purposes. Apparently there is a fear that the funds for research will be used to turn the veterans who are hospitalized into guinea pigs; that experimentation will be practiced upon them for no good end except for experimentation.

Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that that is not a part of the medical-research program. There is no ground for a fear among the veterans that a medical-research program in a veterans' hospital will be any different from such a program in any other hospital. Such a program does not constitute a guinea-pig approach, but only puts into practice the findings of medical researchers that will aid in the patient-care of the veteran himself. Therefore, if we vote today for this $10 million amendment, we shall do much to improve the patient-care of a veteran who goes to a hospital in an endeavor to recover from the disease which put him in the hospital in the first place.

I wish to congratulate the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the other members of the subcommittee for what I consider to be the excellent job they have done for the Senate in submitting the bill in such fine form to it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Washington whether he will allow me to be listed with him as a cosponsor of this amendment, which has such an enlightened and worthy a purpose, namely, by increasing the appropriation to do away with the inadequacy of the present medical-research expenditures on the part of the Veterans' Administration. I understand that the senior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] also wishes to have his name listed

as a cosponsor, if that is agreeable to the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I join my distinguished colleague from Washington in his grave concern about the inadequacy of the medical research expenditures of the Veterans' Administration.

I have been interested for a considerable length of time in the problem of cancer and its cruel effects. Figures recently released by the American Cancer Society in its April 1956 campaign indicate that if we do not achieve any major research breakthroughs against cancer in the next few years, approximately 40 million people now alive in the United States will have some form of cancer during their lifetime, and an estimated 24 million of these will die from cancer.

During World War II, cancer took a greater toll than enemy bullets. Almost 2½ times as many people died of cancer during World War II as were killed in action in all of our far-flung battles over the face of the world. Furthermore, in 1 year cancer killed nearly 10 times the number of Americans who were killed in action during 3 years of war in Korea.

We learned a little of the ravages of cancer as we drafted our young men, the healthiest group in the Nation, into service in World War II. Of this group of men between the ages of 18 and 37, the so-called prime of life, 32,000 were rejected for cancer, a number sufficient to man at least 2 Army Infantry divisions.

On the basis of reliable current statistics, 1 out of every 4 veterans now living will have cancer unless medical research discovers some new cures and preventive measures. Since there are now 21 million veterans in the United States, about 5 million veterans will be hospitalized, or will be entitled to hospitalization, for cancer.

If 80 percent of the veterans developing cancer receive full hospitalization from the Veterans' Administration, they will cost the taxpayers a total of $5 billion. If only 50 percent receive full hospitalization, they will cost the taxpayers $3 billion.

Even now the cost of cancer to the Veterans' Administration is mounting astronomically. Hospital care for veterans suffering from cancer now costs about $25 million. In addition, more than $10 million was spent last year in compensation payments to 11,000 veterans disabled by cancer.

In the face of these rising costs, what is the Veterans' Administration doing in research upon cancer? Currently, it is spending less than $1 million a year against a disease whose cost runs into the hundreds of millions of dollars. Even that small expenditure of funds has produced several vital research discoveries. A talented research scientist of the Veterans' Administration has discovered that cancer and leukemia are caused by a virus, and that the virus may be transmitted from parent to children, in whom cancer later develops. This discovery is of fundamental importance because it opens up a whole new avenue of approach. Yet I am convinced that the Veterans' Administration is doing far too little in exploiting that magnificent discovery.

On June 5 we heard the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], in discussing this Nation's medical research program, point out that "recent advances in virus research have opened up the possibility of exploring with unprecedented thoroughness earlier suggestions that some forms of cancer may be caused by, and others may be susceptible to, cure by viruses."

On the basis of this evidence, the Senate Appropriations Committee allocated several million dollars to a pursuit of this exciting lead. But the Veterans' Administration, with the finest hospital system in the world, drags along on a cancer-research budget far less than that of a single cancer institute in this country—the Sloan-Kettering Institute, in New York City.

Mr. President, we heard our colleagues from Washington and Oregon and other Senators refer to the aging of our veteran population. The average age of the hospitalized veteran is now 48. In another 10 years it will be 58. With increasing age, there is increasing susceptibility to cancer.

Mr. President, are we to face a sorry and tragic future in which, for want of research knowledge, we allow 5 million of our veterans to die from cancer? I say this need not be. I join my colleagues from Washington and Oregon in proposing an increase of $5 million for the coming fiscal year for the medical research programs of the Veterans' Administration, and also in insisting that the Veterans' Administration submit to this Congress a long-range medical research program leading to the conquest of the major killers of millions of Americans.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] be added as cosponsors of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], on behalf of himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 9739) was passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. POTTER the conferees on the part of the Senate.

FREE OR REDUCED AIR TRANSPORTATION RATES FOR MINISTERS OF RELIGION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2030, Senate bill 3149.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3149) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to permit certain air carriers to grant free or reduced rate transportation to ministers of religion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to insert "the last sentence of", and after line 4, to strike out before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "and, in the case of foreign air carriers, and air carriers not receiving payments made by the Board under the provisions of section 406 of this act and Reorganization Plan No. 10 of 1953, to ministers or religion" and insert after "such persons" a semicolon and the following: "ministers of religion on a space available basis", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of subsection (b) of section 403 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 is amended by inserting after "such persons" a semicolon and the following: "ministers of religion on a space available basis."

USE OF BOXCARS FOR SHIPMENT OF LUMBER AND OTHER PRODUCTS IN TRANSIT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have several documents dealing with a common subject which I should like to introduce into the RECORD.

We have a problem in the Pacific Northwest over a service order of the Interstate Commerce Commission known as Service Order 910. It deals with the question of the use of boxcars for the shipment in transit of lumber, particularly, although it may apply to other commodities as well. A small lumber mill may load a boxcar and start it in transit for Chicago, and the lumber may be sold en route. One of the controversies is over the question whether or not this practice results in so delaying shipments that it has the effect of creating, to some extent, an additional factor in the boxcar shortage problem.

The lumbermen themselves are in dispute over the question. For the most part, the big lumber operators seem to be in favor of Service Order 910. The small mills are against Service Order 910.

Some of the small mill operators, testifying before the committee of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], claimed that the cancellation of Service Order 910 would result in more time being taken in shipment, because what would be done would be to take the longest route around rather than the shortest route.

Be that as it may, the position I have taken is that the question should be the subject of a public hearing. The shippers should be given an opportunity to present to the Interstate Commerce Commission their points of view on both sides in a public hearing.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am chairman, will make, or is in the process today of making, such a suggestion to the Interstate Commerce Commission. This is too important a subject to be dealt with arbitrarily.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate very much the statement of the Senator from Washington. It will be very helpful.

My position is that there should be a public hearing on the question. The service order is not a sudden decision on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The record is replete with proof that the Interstate Commerce Commission has been planning Service Order 910 for a long time past. Even the court, in a decision which I shall insert in the RECORD, had that thought clearly in mind, as will be seen from the language of the court.

I have been very frank on this subject. I have stated in my correspondence with both big and small lumber operators that such an order issued by an administrative tribunal should be based on a full record. One group wants the order. The other wants it canceled. I have said, "This is an administrative tribunal, which, under the law, has the legal duty and right to issue such an order, but it ought to issue it on the basis of a full record made by the parties in interest."

This question became such a hot issue among the lumber industry in my State that it got into court. A few days ago the court handed down a decision. This decision is by a three-man Federal court.

I ask unanimous consent that the decision be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the decision was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON, CIVIL NO. 8541

DAUGHERTY LUMBER CO., ET AL., PLAINTIFFS, *v.* UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION, DEFENDANTS; ATLAS LUMBER COMPANY, ET AL., INTERVENORS PROPLAINTIFF; STAR LUMBER COMPANY, A COPARTNERSHIP, ET AL., INTERVENORS PROPLAINTIFF; THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL TRAFFIC LEAGUE, INTERVENOR PRODEFENDANT; WEST COAST LUMBERMEN'S ASSOCIATION, WESTERN PINE ASSOCIATION AND CALIFORNIA REDWOOD ASSOCIATION, INTERVENORS PRODEFENDANT

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before: Stephens, circuit judge, and Solomon and East, district judges.

East, district judge.

Acting Chief Judge Albert Lee Stephens, circuit judge, Ninth Judicial Circuit, established this court by order entered on April 16, 1956.

Parties

The plaintiffs, Daugherty Lumber Co., et al., consist of some five business organizations engaged in the business of buying and selling lumber on a wholesale basis and as such utilize railway transportation for the movement of such lumber products from the Pacific Northwest to other portions of the United States. One of the plaintiffs is a manufacturer of lumber products and disposes of its products to the mentioned wholesale lumber brokers.

The intervenors, Atlas Lumber Co., et al., proplaintiff, consist of some 63 business organizations engaged in the sale and transport of lumber products through interstate commerce throughout the United States.

The intervenors, Star Lumber Co., et al., proplaintiff, consist of some six business organizations engaged in the manufacture and distribution of lumber products through interstate commerce originating from the State of Oregon.

The intervenor, the National Industrial Traffic League, prodefendant, is a voluntary national association composed of and representing business organizations engaged in the shipment and receipt of commodities transported by railroads in every State of the United States.

The intervenors, West Coast Lumbermen's Association, et al., prodefendant, are associations representing business organizations engaged in the manufacture, sale, and distribution of lumber products throughout the Pacific Northwest.

The defendants are the United States of American and its administrative agency, the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Commission's order

On March 19, 1956, the Commission issued service order No. 910, to be effective 12:01 a. m., April 9, 1956.

The plaintiffs complained and by order, per East, D. J., dated April 7, 1956, the Commission was temporarily restrained in the execution of said order.

On April 13, 1956, the Commission made a corrected service order No. 910, to be dated as of March 19, 1956. The order, as corrected, to our concern, reads:

"It appearing that an acute shortage of freight cars exists in all sections of the country; that the movement of loaded freight cars is being delayed solely for the purpose of gaining additional time; that present rules, regulations, and practices with respect to the use, supply, control, movement, distribution, exchange, interchange, and return of freight cars are insufficient to promote the most efficient utilization of cars; it is the opinion of the Commission that an emergency exists requiring immediate action to promote car service in the interest of the public and the commerce of the people. Accordingly, the Commission finds that notice and public procedure are impracticable and contrary to the public interest, and that good cause exists for making this order effective upon less than 30 days' notice."

Whereupon the following regulations of concern were prescribed:

"(1) No common carrier by railroad subject to the Interstate Commerce Act shall willfully delay the movement of loaded freight cars by holding such cars in yards, terminals, or sidings for the purpose of increasing the time in transit of such loaded cars.

"(2) Loaded cars shall not be set out between terminals except in cases of emergencies or sound operating requirements.

"(3) Backhauling loaded cars for the purpose of increasing the time in transit shall constitute willful delay and is prohibited.

"(4) Through loaded cars shall not be handled on local or way freight trains for the purpose of increasing the time in transit of such loaded cars.

"(5) The use by any common carrier by railroad, for the movement of loaded freight cars over its line, of any route other than its usual and customary fast freight route from point of receipt of the car from consignee or connecting line, except in emergencies, or for the purpose of according a lawfully established transit privilege (not including a diversion or reconsignment privilege), is hereby prohibited."

Furthermore, the Commission, in deference to the mentioned restraining order, stated in its official report that "No action will be taken to enforce Service Order No. 910 until further order of the Commission."

Authority of the Commission

Section 1 (15) of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U. S. C. A. 1 (15)) reads as follows:

"Whenever the Commission is of opinion that shortage of equipment, congestion of traffic, or other emergency requiring immediate action exists in any section of the country, the Commission shall have, and it is hereby given, authority, either upon complaint or upon its own initiative, without complaint, at once, if it so orders, without answer or other formal pleading by the interested carrier or carriers, and with or without notice, hearing, or the making or filing of a report, according as the Commission may determine: (a) to suspend the operation of any or all rules, regulations, or practices then established with respect to car service for such time as may be determined by the Commission; (b) to make such just and reasonable directions with respect to car service without regard to the ownership as between carriers of locomotives, cars, and other vehicles, during such emergency as in its opinion will best promote the service in the interest of the public and the commerce of the people, upon such terms of compensation as between the carriers as they may agree upon, or, in the event of their disagreement, as the Commission may after subsequent hearing find to be just and reasonable; * * *"

It is conceded by all of the parties that the Commission acted upon its own initiative without complaint and without notice, hearing, or the making or filing of any report except to publicize order No. 910 after issuance in the Federal Register.

Contentions of plaintiffs and intervenors, proplaintiffs

These parties, through plaintiffs' petition, assert that for many years last past plaintiffs and other lumber manufacturers and wholesalers of lumber products situated in the States of Oregon, Washington, and California, have traditionally operated their respective businesses in the following manner:

Upon completion of loading a car of lumber, the bill of lading and ownership of said car has been transferred to a lumber wholesaler or lumber broker who thereupon pays the invoice price of said car even though said wholesaler or broker has no present customer for said car; said wholesaler then normally commences the movement of said car toward the eastern seaboard without instructions to the railroad to expedite the movement of said car, but with instructions to the railroad to keep the wholesaler advised of the progress of said car toward a particular transfer or diversion point; during the eastward progress of said car, the wholesaler finds a purchaser for same, and upon finding such purchaser the railroad is notified to move said car to destination forthwith.

They claim that said Service Order No. 910 of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the subject of this bill, would overnight change this traditional method of buying, selling, and transporting lumber between points on the Pacific coast and points in the eastern parts of the United States without affording to lumber manufacturers or wholesalers an

opportunity, if such were possible, to revise their methods of operation.

Further, "that if said Service Order No. 910 were allowed to become effective, it would seriously and adversely affect plaintiffs in the conduct of their respective businesses in the following manner:

"1. That wholesalers would refuse to purchase cars of lumber from sawmills until such time as they had a specific order for said cars and therefore plaintiffs would have to accumulate large inventories of lumber far beyond their capacity to finance same, or in the alternative, plaintiffs would have to stop production until such time as plaintiffs should receive an order for a specific type of lumber and then proceed to cut same and load the car and invoice the wholesaler.

"2. That said order would prevent plaintiffs and others similarly situated from maintaining an efficient and economic production schedule in that they would no longer be able to set up their respective mills to cut a substantial amount of the same type of lumber but rather would be forced to set up and reset over short periods of time to cut specific orders.

"3. That said Service Order No. 910 would require such large investments of plaintiffs in their respective businesses as to make it impossible for plaintiffs to continue their businesses.

"4. That said Service Order No. 910 will have the effect of eliminating and destroying many small lumber manufacturers and diverting their business to large manufacturers who do not sell their lumber on a diversion basis.

"5. That said Service Order No. 910 would result in requiring small lumber manufacturers to maintain inventories of lumber at their respective yards far beyond their financial capacity to do so and thus discriminate against them in favor of larger and better financed lumber companies.

"6. That purchasers of lumber in the East would also be adversely affected in that they would be unable to control the arrival time of cars upon their spur tracks and thereby prevent economical and efficient unloading of the same and would require large expenditures of such purchasers of additional spur tracks and additional facilities.

"7. That the enforcement of said Service Order No. 910 would tend to bunch loaded cars at switching points thereby delaying the movement of cars requiring expedited service.

"8. That instead of alleviating any actual or contemplated car shortage, the effect of said Service Order No. 910 would be to aggravate the situation.

"9. That there is no actual car shortage at the present time, nor was there at the time the Commission entered said Service Order No. 910.

"10. That if there be any car shortage, this situation is caused primarily by the failure of the eastern railroads to return cars to the West.

"11. That 'slow routine' is not just a convenience for a few isolated shippers, but is in fact a standard integral part of the distribution system employed by a large percentage of the lumber industry; that said practice has been accepted and encouraged by all concerned as the normal and standard method of lumber distribution; that the many small producers and wholesalers in the West, and the small users and retailers in the East, have founded their entire businesses upon the existence of such practice and are inextricably bound to it so that said Service Order No. 910 will result in chaos among the small-business men so engaged."

The defendants and intervenors, prodefendant, through their appearances, admit the alleged factual situation, but, in effect, deny the legal effect thereof.

It has been agreed among counsel, with the consent of the majority of the court, that the issue of law presented by these respective contentions should be submitted to the court upon the record and the briefs of the parties.

Accordingly we accept as true all that the plaintiffs and intervenors proplaintiff allege and contend in their respective appearances.

Legislative emergency

The plaintiffs urge that Service Order No. 910 is invalid for the reason that no emergency existed at the time of its entry. This suggestion causes us to reflect and remind ourselves that the first step of governmental tyranny is through policing and restrictive acts without notice or hearing to the persons thereby affected. In this view one might think that before declaring the existence of an emergency and ordering a disruption of the 20-year existent practice of shipping via railroads by a large segment of the lumber industry of the Pacific Northwest, the Commission would afford prior notice and an opportunity to be heard by those affected by its order. However, this observation of policy is of no import for the reason that Congress has delegated the inquiry of the existence of an emergency in the province and in the opinion of the Commission. See *Avent* v. *United States of America* (266 U. S. 127; 69 L. Ed. 202).

The congressional authority thus granted to the Commission is an implement or enforcement of legislative action. It follows, therefore, that the definition or meaning of "emergency" must be viewed in a legislative sense as distinguished from the commonplace meaning of an "unforeseen combination of circumstances which calls for immediate action."

Legislative emergencies are those situations where the common good or public interest is legislatively declared to be paramount to individual interests. Common knowledge tells us that legislative action effective immediately, has on legion occasions been adopted to correct an adverse public interest situation of long standing. Furthermore, common knowledge tells us that a shortage of railroad cars available to the lumber industry in the Pacific Northwest has occurred during the summer and fall months annually for many years last past. We further know, from common knowledge, that the reason or cause of this car shortage is a contentious question among the railroads and the several classes of shippers. We accept the contention of the plaintiffs that the enforcement of Service Order No. 910 will not alleviate the car shortage; however, this court has no province in the matter as a legislative emergency declared by Congress or one of its administrative agencies is not subject to judicial review upon its merits.

"The commission having based their order on their opinion that an emergency such as was contemplated by the statute existed, it is not within the power of the court to annul their order on the ground that the administrative power conferred on the commission was unwisely or improvidently exercised." (*Baltimore, etc. R. Co.* v. *Lambert Run Coal Co.* (258 U. S. 377, 66 L. Ed. 671).)

The "opinion" of the Commission had to be based upon some information before it and in the absence of a contention that the "opinion" of the Commission was motivated by fraud, wrongdoing or capriciousness, this court has no office to review the "opinion" of the Commission.

"The Commission is the expert in the field of transportation. And its judgment is entitled to great deference because of its familiarity with the conditions in the industry which it regulates."

"Even though, upon a consideration of all the evidence, a court might reach a different conclusion, it is not authorized to substitute its own for the administrative judgment." (*Swayne & Hoyt, Ltd.* v. *United States* (300 U. S. 297, 304). See also *Federal Communications Commission* v. *WOKO, Inc.* (329 U. S. 223, 229); *United States* v. *Pierce Auto Freight Lines, Inc.* (327 U. S. 515, 535–536); *Barrett Line, Inc.* v. *United States* (326 U. S. 179, 199).)

East Texas Motor Freight Line, Inc., et al. v. *Frozen Foods Express, the Secretary of Agriculture, et al.* Nos. 162–164 in the Supreme Court of the United States entered April 23, 1956.

Shipper's right of selecting route of shipment

The Congress has recognized that (49 U. S. C. A. 15 (8)) "the person * * * making such shipment subject to such reasonable exceptions and regulations as the Interstate Commerce Commission shall from time to time prescribe, shall have the right to designate in writing by which of such through routes such property shall be transported to destination, and it shall thereupon be the duty of the initial carrier to route said property and issue a through bill of lading therefor as so directed, and to transport said property over its own line or lines and deliver the same to a connecting line or lines according to such through route, and it shall be the duty of each of said connecting carriers to receive said property and transport it over the said line or lines and deliver the same to the next suceeding carrier or consignee according to the routing instructions in said bill of lading."

Should it be the purpose of the Commission, through the provisions of paragraph (5) of its order, to interfere with this right, ample judicial relief is open to any aggrieved party. The mentioned paragraph (5) is not, in our opinion, so vague or indefinite as to impute such an intent on the part of the Commission that would authorize judicial restraint.

Standing of plaintiffs

The effect and restriction of the order applies to all shippers and is not discriminatory. Therefore, any adverse effect upon one mode of marketing as against another mode not so affected, even though engaged in business competition, is not an infringement upon a legal right. (*Sprunt & Son* v. *United States* (281 U. S. 249, 254–255, 256–257 (1930); *Pittsburgh & W. Va. Ry.* v. *United States* (281 U. S. 479, 486–488 (1930); *Edward Hines Trustees* v. *United States* (263 U. S. 143, 148 (1923); *Merchant Truckmen's Bureau* v. *United States* (16 F. Supp. 998) (S. D. N. Y., 1938).)

It follows that neither plaintiffs nor intervenors proplaintiff have a legal right or interest that is unjustly affected by Service Order No. 910.

Conclusion

Therefore, we conclude that plaintiffs' petition and bill in equity and the petition of intervenors proplaintiff should each be dismissed and the temporary restraining order of this court, dated April 7, 1956, aforesaid, should be vacated as of the date of entry of a judgment of dismissal herein, all without costs to any party.

Counsel for the defendants are requested to submit appropriate judgment order.

Dated this 31st day of May 1956.

ALBERT LEE STEPHENS,
United States Circuit Judge.
GUS J. SOLOMON,
WILLIAM G. EAST,
United States District Judges.

Mr. MORSE. On page 8 of the decision the court said:

The plaintiffs urge that Service Order No. 910 is invalid for the reason that no emergency existed at the time of its entry. This suggestion causes us to reflect and remind ourselves that the first step of governmental tyranny is through policing and restrictive acts without notice or hearing to the persons thereby affected. In this view one might think that before declaring the existence of an emergency and ordering a dis-

ruption of the 20-year existent practice of shipping via railroads by a large segment of the lumber industry of the Pacific Northwest, the Commission would afford prior notice and an opportunity to be heard by those affected by its order. However, this observation of policy is of no import for the reason that Congress has delegated the inquiry of the existence of an emergency in the province and in the opinion of the Commission. See *Avent* v. *United States of America* (266 U. S. 127; 69 L. Ed. 202).

I have no doubt that the court, in the decision which it handed down sustaining the Interstate Commerce Commission and its authority to issue the order, is technically correct. I am not questioning the legal soundness of the decision of the court. What I am seeking to point out is that the Interstate Commerce Commission ought to heed the language of the court in its decison, in which the court, in effect, raises its legal eyebrows at the practice of the Interstate Commerce Commission in not scheduling such questions for a hearing, so that all sides may be heard.

That is all I have ever asked for in this controversy. I appeared before the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate and asked that public hearings be granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission. To date it has refused to do so. Again on the floor of the Senate today I renew my request for a hearing. I do not know what the final decision ought to be with reference to Service Order 910, because I think that will depend upon what the parties themselves offer by way of proof in the record at a hearing. I have heard, for the most part, spokesmen for small mills. They are very much disturbed, and have made strong representations, which I presented before the committee.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a joint letter which the two Senators from Oregon wrote under date of June 1, 1956, to Commissioner Owen Clarke, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, dealing with the decision which was handed down, and with our request that the question be made the subject of a hearing.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 1, 1956.

Hon. OWEN CLARKE,
Commissioner, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER CLARKE: We understand that the Federal court at Portland, Oreg., has dissolved the temporary restraining order issued by the court against Interstate Commerce Commission Service Order 910 and has dismissed the suit for an injunction against that order.

While technically this upholds the authority of the ICC to issue an order of this kind, we have received numerous telegrams and letters from small lumber shippers in Oregon that point out the extreme hardship that would be caused these shippers if the provisions of Service Order 910 were enforced. From a smaller number have come wires and letters supporting 910, indicating the highly controversial nature of the order and underscoring the need for a hearing on the question in the area concerned.

We respectfully request that you arrange hearings in Oregon and any other appropriate places on the Pacific coast to allow shippers to express the varied opinions on transit shipping of lumber.

Once the various points of view have been presented to the Commission, regardless of the final decision, there will be a more gracious acceptance of the Commission's action.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator.
RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks certain excerpts from an article on this subject published in the Traffic World for June 2, 1956. The article appears on pages 37 and 38.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Southwestern Industrial Traffic League, in its annual membership meeting on May 22, at the Buccaneer Hotel, Galveston, Tex., decided to oppose proposed legislation to facilitate establishment of "incentive rates" (low rates on trainloads, multiple carloads or multiple truckloads), gave support to a Senate joint resolution providing for an ICC investigation of car shortages.

* * * * *

ACTION ON CAR SUPPLY PROBLEM

The league discussed, but took no action on, a railroad proposal to increase demurrage charges and bills in Congress to empower the Commission to impose penalty charges on railroads, in addition to daily car rental charges (per diem) in times of actual or threatened car shortages. However, after expressions of concern over the present car supply, the league voted to instruct its secretary to bring to the attention of the United States Senators from the Southwestern States "the inadequate supply and deplorable condition" of freight cars in the Southwest and to urge support by those Senators for Senate Joint Resolution 171. That joint resolution, it was stated, would direct the Commission to investigate in conferences with shippers and carriers the car supply situation, and to make recommendations with respect to, among other things, a proposal for establishment of a separate corporation to supervise distribution and use of the freight-car supply.

The statement was made that the freight-car shortage was now averaging 7,000 to 8,000 a day. Several members of the league agreed in the view that the car service order No. 94, of the Association of American Railroads, requiring expeditious return of empty cars to the owner lines in the West, was unfair to the roads, including those of the Southwest, from which those cars were taken while no provision was made to bring back to those roads the cars they themselves owned which were on "foreign" lines. As a result of operation of order 94 it was said, one industry which normally loaded 100 cars a day had been forced to shut down.

It was agreed, ultimately, that the only way in which the railroads could "help" was to order more cars and step up maintenance of the existing car supply.

Mr. MORSE. The resolution to which reference is made in the article is the joint resolution which my colleague from Oregon and I introduced sometime ago.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an excerpt from a letter which I received from a representative of small lumber operators in the State of Oregon, in which he discussed certain objections which he thinks can be raised to Service Order 910. I think it is only fair that his point of view be in the RECORD. These objections involve arguments which I think need to be developed at a hearing before the Interstate Commerce Commission. How can the Interstate Commerce Commission fully appreciate and understand the effect of Service Order 910 if a small mill operator such as this man represents is not given his day in court, so to speak? When I talk about a "day in court" I am not talking about an informal conference with the Interstate Commerce Commission. I am talking about a hearing of record, where there can be made the judicial record which may be needed in order to follow other legal steps if one decides that he has grounds upon which to take a case to court, on the basis of the arbitrary and capricious exercise of discretion on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Perhaps the decision is right on technical terms, but the effect of the decision is to (a) work a severe hardship on small mills and wholesalers; (b) disrupt a 20-year practice without a hearing; (c) is the first step of governmental tyranny by taking unilateral action without notice or hearing to the persons affected thereby; (d) favors big business—i. e., the railroads; (e) will not alleviate the car shortage, which is simply the lack of adequate cars, and not faster movement thereof; (f) will discriminate in favor of eastern wholesalers, who route cars to the East and then sell them en route, thus causing hardship to western wholesalers; (g) will pinch small western mills, many of whom will go out of business, because of the prices they will receive will be substantially less than formerly; (h) force small mills to sell to large businesses, thus doing away with advantageous prices, and eliminating western wholesalers; and (i) taking of property without due process of law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks certain excerpts from a letter which I received from another representative of small mills in my State. The exerpts are marked in the letter.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

With the office on summer schedule, I am left to do the typing if this is to reach you on Monday morning with a copy of the opinion of the court in *Daugherty Lumber Co.* v. *United States.*

The opinion of the court is enclosed. It concludes that the ICC is vested with statutory power to issue Service Order 910 without prior notice or hearing having been accorded to the affected persons and interests. As I stated at the hearing before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on May 8, WFIA was not challenging the naked legal power of the ICC to issue the order.

In discussing the procedure followed by the ICC, the court finds itself reminded of "governmental tyranny." With this concept, WFIA has also been in accord. We have suggested that the procedure adopted by the ICC in the issuance of its order was a willful evasion of congressional intent, arbitrary, and imperious. We have intimated that perhaps the reluctance of the ICC to hold a hearing in the matter may be reasonably attributed to the embarrassment it might suffer should it appear that the ICC was not acting with adequate knowledge of the situation it was seeking to regulate.

Our prime concern is the fact that the Commission elected to proceed with Order 910 under the provisions of section 1 (15), 49 USC 1 (15) of the Interstate Commerce Act rather than under section 1 (14) of the act. Under section 1 (14), the Commission could not have issued the order without first having held a hearing. Under section 1 (15), no hearing is necessary. But section 1 (15) authorizes the Commission to issue orders without a hearing only when there exists an emergency which requires immediate action.

Here the Commission knew a year in advance that it would issue Order 910. It might then have held a hearing. Certainly it could not then have issued the order without the hearing. But to evade this statutory requirement, to ignore fundamental concepts of fair dealing by a government with its own citizens, to provide a cloak for its own possible ignorance—the Commission waited for the beginning of the annual car shortage. Then, with its anticipated emergency finally at hand, the Commission was able to issue its Order 910 without a hearing. This may be, as the court concludes, legal. But it is sharp dealing. It is imperious and arrogant. It has lead a thoughtful court to reminisce of "governmental tyranny."

To outline the current situation:

Many months ago, the ICC knew that it intended to issue order 910. (See Traffic World, May 12, 1956, p. 30.)

The Commission deliberately awaited the onset of the anticipated car shortage before issuing its order in order to evade the necessity for a hearing.

The Commission, while pointing to gross loss in car-days resulting from transit type lumber shipments, has never considered whether, as many experts contend, there are gross savings resulting from quicker loading of transit cars, more nearly full loading of transit cars, absence of lost days that result from the partial unloadings experienced by firm order cars, etc.

The Commission has not adduced data to show whether there is a net gain or a net loss in car-days resulting from the transit sale technique for lumber.

If there is a net loss, the Commission should have considered the economic impact of its order on many lumber producers and the payrolls and communities they maintain in order to arrive at a thoughtful conclusion as to whether the net loss, if any, in car-days is more harmful to the public interest than is the dislocation and disruption likely to stem from ICC Order 910. It is difficult for us to believe that such information and understanding of the complex economics of this industry could have been achieved without a full hearing conducted locally and a careful, intelligent study of the record. Absent a hearing, we have government by ignorance.

To issue the order without notice and hearing was an arrogant, imperious procedure.

A hearing might have been held at any time before the issuance of the order. A hearing might have been held while enforcement of the order was temporarily restrained by the district court. A hearing might still be held. It is seldom too late to cure the ignorance of those who wish to learn.

Failure to hold the hearing flaunts accepted standards of governmental conduct. Even in the gravest of emergencies, ex parte orders of courts must be followed promptly by hearings. Congress acts only after public hearings conducted by its committees, excepting only instances where national security compels secrecy. In short, the ICC deliberately adopted a procedure which the Court may not, and Congress would not employ.

A hearing held for the lumber industry apparently would accommodate all of the protests received against order 910. (See Traffic World, supra, p. 30.)

* * * * *

Perhaps it is also pertinent to remark that if the ICC had buckled down to the job it is supposed to be doing, it is unlikely that Service Order 910 would even have been considered. Instead of tackling the fundamentals of the car shortage and presenting to Congress a comprehensive plan for assuring that the Nation's industry and agriculture will not be cut off from raw materials and markets, the ICC has stumbled along with makeshifts and piecemeal notions bottomed on the risky foundation of ignorance and speculation. In this connection, the need for Senate Joint Resolution 171 becomes apparent. It is disheartening to think, however, that a joint resolution of the Congress is needed to induce the ICC to do its basic job. Why won't the ICC rush in to do its job without waiting for this additional congressional directive?

Possibly the ICC would hold a hearing on Order 910 if the Magnuson subcommittee or the full committee would issue an appropriate report and recommendation. This would not invade the quasi-judicial functions of the ICC. It would aline the committee clearly with the courts in suggesting that a hearing is in order.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I have received from Mr. J. E. Bauer, a lumberman of my State, who takes strong exception to Service Order 910. I think his point of view should be in the RECORD, and I think he should be given an opportunity to appear as a witness at a public hearing on this subject, called by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR: Reference ICC Order No. 910. May we suggest that you point out on the floor of the Senate that this order is discriminatory against the small-business men in this United States, not only the small wholesaler and mill man in Oregon but retailers and others throughout the United States all of which are small-business men. Also, point out that the three-judge court has declared that they have no province in the matter of suspending ICC Order 910.

At the same time point out that Mr. Eisenhower has time and time again said that the backbone of our economy is the small-business man, and now we would like to see if the administration is going to take the side of the small-business man and do something about ICC and Service Order 910 or will take the side of big business which many contend, as ICC Order 910 is without a question in favor of big business. It will be interesting to see which side the administration will take.

Yours very truly,

J. E. BAUER.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say to the small lumber mill operators of Oregon, here and now from the floor of the Senate, that, given that hearing, if they cannot make a case which on the basis of the preponderance of the evidence supports their view that this order ought to be canceled, then I will say to the Interstate Commerce Commission it should insist that its order go into effect. My criticism of the Interstate Commerce Commission is limited on this point solely to the fact that up to this hour the Commission has not given the lumbermen of my State the hearing which I believe under our system of fair trial in this country they are entitled to have, as is clearly intimated in the language contained in the court's decision.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a telegram I received from the Timberlane Lumber Co., of Eugene, Oreg., sent to me by Mr. R. B. Taylor, dealing with the same subject matter. Mr. Taylor is another lumberman who thinks that at least he ought to have a right to be heard and to make a record on this subject.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUGENE, OREG., *June 2, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Federal court's dismissal restraining order on ICC Service Order 910 apparently means Commission has dictatorial powers allowing no recourse by hearing or through courts; therefore, you are our only hope to prevent the continuation of this tyrannical deprivation of a way of doing business so essential to small-business men in this area. The court in its opinion confirmed our contention that the order was unwise and would not alleviate the car shortage, but said they lacked jurisdiction to stop the order. Obviously, this is another attempt of big business to gain competitive advantage. Can any remedy be found to curb this situation?

TIMBERLANE LUMBER CO.,
R. B. TAYLOR.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, lastly I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement prepared by Aaron Jones, W. C. Kelsay, Russ Fryburg, and Dana McBarron, supplementing their oral testimony of March 29, 1956, before the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

With respect to Service Order No. 910, however, we can not concur in the Commission's judgment. This is not because of lack of respect for the Commission's expert knowledge of carriers. Indeed, we are confident that if the Commission had as much knowledge of the economics of the production and distribution of lumber as it does of the economics of rail transportation, Service Order No. 910 would not have been issued.

Certainly a knowledgeable Commission would not have adopted the imperious procedure used in the promulgation of Order 910. On March 30, 1956, the Commission informally advised us that in October 1955 it began collecting statistics to support the order. Until the Commission releases its statistics, careful analysis of them is premature and impossible. Suffice it to say at the moment that the Commission in gathering its statistics was acting in obvious ignorance of the subject matter because its statistics fail even to allude to the car savings created by lumber transit sales. In effect, the Commission looked only at the liability side of the balance sheet and through ignorance or otherwise ignored the asset side.

But the salient and terribly distressing fact is that in October 1955 the Commission began to gather its inadequate statistics. On March 19, 1956, the Commission issued Service Order 910. For over 5 months the Commission was apparently preparing for the issuance of its order. It is an order which strikes at an industry of which the Commission has no expert knowledge. Indeed,

the order exerts almost its total force against only the small- and medium-sized independent units of that industry. Yet in this entire 5 months' period there was no consultation with these small- and medium-sized business units. Indeed, there was not even a word of warning.

Without prior notice, on March 19, 1956, the order was issued, to become effective April 9. Nor was this gap of a few days intended to afford these stricken people an opportunity to make any adjustments. The Commission's view, as related to us, is that the gap was intended to accommodate only transit cars then en route. The Commission intended that from the moment of notice of its order, transit sales would stop. What the small mills were to do, what the lumber purchasers were to do, what was to become of Oregon's economy, seems not to have been considered. There was no consultation with us—no warning. It is difficult to conceive of discretionary power exercised more arbitrarily, more imperiously.

In the circumstances, we ask the committee to use whatever persuasion or power it possesses to induce a suspension of this Service Order No. 910 until the Commission holds a hearing, formal or informal, in western Oregon, for the purpose of acquainting itself with the economics of the lumber industry it seeks to regulate, and particularly of acquainting itself with all aspects of the transit-sale technique.

AARON JONES.
W. O. KELSAY.
RUSS FRYBURG.
DANA MCBARRON.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to say again to the Interstate Commerce Commission: "Give us a hearing, so that you will relieve the Commission of the just criticism which I believe is implied in the court's decision that failure to accord a hearing in such a matter really lays the foundation for the danger of establishing a trend toward tyranny in administrative law processes in our country."

NEW FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have recently had occasion to mention on the Senate floor the imaginative and provocative study of foreign aid which has been prepared by Max Millikan and Walter Rostow of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Center for International Studies. An excellent and detailed analysis based on this study appeared in the Washington Sunday Star for May 20, 1956. The article discussed first "some misconceptions" about foreign aid as judged by Professors Millikan and Rostow, and then summarizes their proposed program. I ask unanimous consent that this article appear at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY STUDIED

(This article's background: A bold and comprehensive plan for revamping the United States' foreign economic policy was being circulated on Capitol Hill and in the highest echelons of the executive department last week. Its passionately nonpartisan approach apparently has impressed most of the men who are studying it. Authors of the 104-page, 24,000-word proposal are Max Millikan and W. W. Rostow, professors at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Center for International Studies. They make their proposals as private citizens, although the research on which their conclusions are based was conducted by MIT. Their summary of the proposal is given under the heading Some Misconceptions. A provocative tabulation of popular misconceptions about foreign aid, as judged by Mr. Millikan and Mr. Rostow, is given under the heading The Proposed Program.)

SOME MISCONCEPTIONS

Since many of the challenging criticisms of foreign assistance proposals have been directed against what we believe to be misconceptions of the kinds of political and psychological effects that such programs can be expected to have, it is well to take a look at some of these misconceptions.

The simplest misconception is that gratitude for help and assistance extended by us will lead the recipients to act in ways we desire simply because we want them to. Crudely put, the notion is that we can buy friendship and affection and that these in turn will insure behavior in our interest. Anyone who has had experience in the psychology of the grantor-grantee relationship in private charity or in international relations will not consciously fall into this error.

The grantee's sense of dependence commonly produces aggressive feelings of resentment toward the grantor which may easily worsen rather than improve relations between the two. If on other grounds we determine that large-scale assistance is in our interest, we must expect that an incidental result will frequently be less rather than more spirit of cooperation and mutual respect, even and perhaps especially if the aid programs are successful in achieving their objectives.

Many measures can be taken to reduce the severity of these hostile reactions to economic assistance, but they are often the precise opposite of the measures likely to be taken by an official smarting from the hurt of these reactions or spurred by a Congress so hurt. Our public role as donor must be minimized, not maximized; exaggerated credit must be given the recipient for his own contributions; demands for demonstrations of alliance and agreement must be reduced rather than increased.

Aid adds military strength?

A second misconception is that the central purpose of economic aid programs is always to strengthen the economies of the recipient countries to enable them in short order to carry a much larger share of the burden of military buildup against Communist armed forces.

There is, as we have already recognized, a good case for military assistance to allies who, as in Western Europe, have real industrial potential. This idea has been extended much too uncritically, however, to the less developed areas. The first trouble with it is that the resources of most of the underdeveloped areas are so limited that even with massive aid the contribution they can make to defense against open military aggression by the Communist nations is inevitably going to be very small.

We must face squarely up to the fact that resistance to determined military aggression by the Soviet bloc powers is a job for the United States with help from NATO powers of Western Europe. The hope that we can create and maintain such a defense cheaply by organizing the manpower masses of Asia, that we can prevent aggression by getting Asians to fight Asians, is largely illusory because Free Asia (perhaps excluding Japan) does not now have and cannot in the near future create, even with our assistance, the economic potential to suport a major military effort.

In the second place, while these countries can help to resist minor aggression and should be able to maintain order internally, weapons and military potential are ineffective without the will to use them. Some of the underdeveloped areas appear to have this will, others clearly do not.

Aid bolsters private enterprise?

There is an expectation frequently associated with American aid programs that they can and should be used to halt or reverse the trend toward socialism present in many underdeveloped areas.

We agree with those who hold that a private market system with maximum opportunity and incentive for individual enterprise will in the long run promote self-sustaining growth better than a highly bureaucratized system dominated by central government. But we believe paradoxically that we shall promote ultimate reliance on private incentives more effectively by not insisting on any particular economic philosophy as a condition of aid than by attaching private enterprise strings. A favorable environment for private investment can, in some cases, be established only after a period of rather heavy capital formation under Government auspices.

This is what happened in Japan in the decade after 1868, and, more recently, the whole set of measures instituted by the Indian Government in the period starting in 1951 have, by 1956, created an environment in which the Indian private sector is undergoing rapid growth.

Thus we believe on the one hand that crude attempts to force a free private enterprise philosophy on recipient countries as an explicit or implicit condition for aid are almost certain to be self-defeating; on the other hand we believe there are good reasons for expecting countries now avowedly Socialist but determinedly democratic to move toward greater reliance on private incentives as their development proceeds.

Communism springs from hunger?

A final and serious misconception which exposes proposals for economic programs to effective attack is what may be called the Marxist fallacy underlying the thinking of many conservative people on the role of economic change in political development.

Crudely stated, it is held that revolt and protest are the result of hunger and poverty and that relieving hunger and reducing poverty will therefore reduce revolutionary pressures. In other words, if we can supply the wherewithal to feed people better, they are much less likely to support Communist or other extremist movements.

The implied picture of the forces affecting social and political change is so naive as to be vulnerable to attack from a number of directions.

In the first place, the spirit of revolt does not breed easily among people who are chronically destitute. In the rigid feudal societies which still characterize some parts of the world those at the bottom of the scale have for generations accepted a fatalistic view that it is in the nature of things that they should be poor. People do not organize and conspire to promote change when they believe change to be inherently impossible.

These facts are well understood by the Communists, who concentrate their efforts not among those who are hopeless but among those in whom expectations have already been aroused.

The first and most powerful effect of economic development efforts is likely to be to dislodge convictions and habit patterns which have in the past insured stability. A further factor contributing to unrest is the education which accompanies economic change. With a growing understanding of the huge discrepancies in rewards customary in backward societies comes a growing awareness that these discrepancies are not the inevitable result of God's will.

The proposed program

As we see it there are two priority tasks for United States foreign policy. The first of

these is to meet effectively the threat to our security posed by the danger of overt military aggression. This danger arises, at the moment, from the capabilities and possible future intentions of the Communist bloc countries.

It is to be met primarily by maintaining or increasing United States military strength and second by solidifying alliances with other countries in a position to contribute significantly to American strength. One of the instruments to be used in this effort is military and economic assistance to countries with important industrial potential, mainly the NATO powers, designed to make that potential militarily more effective. This is part of our current policy and need not be discussed further.

The second priority task of our foreign policy is to use our influence to promote the evolution of a world in which threats to our security and more broadly to our way of life are less likely to arise. Success in this task would mean the freeing of a large volume of resources from military to more constructive uses. More important, it would mean freeing our society from the oppressive pressures inevitably associated with a garrison state, pressures which threaten our most cherished values.

The components

We may summarize the component parts of our proposals thus:

The United States should launch at the earliest possible moment a long-term program for sustained economic growth in the free world. This program would make available to the underdeveloped areas sufficient additional capital and technical assistance to satisfy all likely demands for such assistance which meet fairly high standards of eligibility based on the prospective productivity of investment. The levels of investment assumed would be sufficient to make possible an overall one percent annual increase in real income per capita for all the underdeveloped countries of the free world. In practice, some would grow faster, some slower, than this rate.

As part of this program the United States Government should offer to provide a new long-term capital fund of from $10 to $12 billion to be available for loans and grants over a 5-year period to accelerate economic growth in underdeveloped areas. Although an initial 5-year allocation is recommended, the plan would look ahead for a longer period, at least a decade.

This sum would be accompanied by commitments from the advanced countries to make additional loans and grants of from $2 to $3 billion over the same time period as part of a unified free world program.

Concerted measures should be taken to enlarge the international flows of private capital. Such measures might yield an addition over present level of $3 to $4 billion during the first 5-year period.

These sums must be made available to free world countries without any military or political strings, but under strict business-like criteria.

Recipient countries must show evidence of widespread popular support of the broad goals of the programs.

It is most unlikely, if such criteria are enforced, that the whole of the sums offered would be taken up. It is essential to the plan, however, that availability of the full amount be guaranteed in order to remove capital as a bottleneck to economic growth and to provide maximum stimulus for the governments and peoples of the underdeveloped countries to expand their capacities to use capital effectively.

A systematic plan should be worked out for establishing international stocks of agricultural surpluses to be made available for development purposes. Such a plan must contain certain provisions designed to insure that distribution of such stocks would not interfere with the normal markets of exporting countries.

Loans and grants should be administered by existing national and international agencies, including the Export-Import Bank, the International Bank, the Colombo plan organization, etc. New machinery is required, however, to set the ground rules and lay down the criteria for the investment program.

The program would include the following features:

1. To restore and maintain an efficient international division of labor, insuring for industrial countries sources of agricultural products and raw materials and markets for their products.

2. To stabilize in the interest of the supplying countries raw material and foodstuff markets and prices.

3. To liberalize United States trade policies by progressive stages.

4. To achieve free world currency convertibility.

5. To achieve a common free world policy on East-West trade.

Sharp edge of policy

This program will not achieve its basically political and psychological purposes unless its fundamental features are preserved. The sharp edges of policy which must be preserved appear to be these:

The additional sums envisaged must be large enough to remove capital as a bottleneck to growth, under the tough criteria of productivity envisaged.

There must be no tie between economic aid and military pacts, and no explicit political conditions within the free world beyond the requirement that development goals be democratically established. An aid program with strings yields satellites, not partners.

The plan must look to a long future and envisage a sustained United States effort.

There must be a real measure of international contribution and international administration.

Without these elements, the proposal would probably be rejected by some nations we would wish to see join in the effort, e. g., India. With these elements maintained, we believe this plan will go far toward restoring and maintaining the unity of the free world.

THE RUSSIAN DEEMPHASIS OF STALIN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of our gifted and outstanding former colleagues of this body recently delivered an important speech to the Overseas Writers' Club here in Washington. Speeches and articles by former Senator William Benton are always stimulating and this one is no exception. Senator Benton criticizes the administration for its failure to take full advantage of the historical opportunity offered the free world by the new Russian deemphasis of Stalin. This important and significant speech has not yet attracted the attention it deserves.

As Senators will recall, former Senator Benton recently visited the Soviet Union for an extended period of time, and some of the observations he made on his visit have been very informative and educational to the American people.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY WILLIAM BENTON, PUBLISHER, ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA, OVERSEAS WRITERS' CLUB, HOTEL STATLER, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 30, 1956

These past few months the American people have suddenly awakened to the fact that our influence and prestige abroad are skidding. At the same time Soviet influence and prestige are, on net, going up. The Middle East turmoil; Iceland's request that we withdraw our troops; the defeat of its strongly pro-Western government by Ceylon; French Premier Molle's sharp criticism of our foreign policy; all of these have come as a surprise to most Americans and as a shock to some.

Not all the voices asking whether we are losing the cold war are those of Democratic Party presidential hopefuls. Even the Eisenhower administration seems alarmed. A new note has appeared in recent speeches by President Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles. Obviously some very serious reappraisal, maybe even agonized soul searching, is taking place in this city. The hunt for ideas seems to be on. I'd therefore—on my first visit to Washington in some months, occasioned by testimony tomorrow before a subcommittee of the Atomic Energy Committee—I'd therefore like to throw out a few ideas as a good will offering from a defeated Democrat to a victorious Republican administration.

The focus of the world struggle has shifted to the field of propaganda. Its focus is likely to remain fixed on propaganda and economic policy and appropriations, for a long time to come. When he has put his mind to it President Eisenhower has been, and can be, a great propagandist. His atoms for peace speech before the United Nations in December 1953 was a top propaganda move—in the best sense of the word. So, judged strictly as propaganda, was his aerial inspection plan for armament control. I personally favored his proposal for an atom peace ship—though many opposed it. Such a ship could be worth a dozen in the Navy. President Eisenhower can compete with Bulganin and Khrushchev as propagandists—if he wants to—and I'm not suggesting he undertake the strain of world tours. Secretary Dulles seems to enjoy the latter chore, and good for him, because such tours are greatly needed.

But first the President must appreciate the importance of competing. He has discovered, and I'm sometimes perplexed as to whether gladly or sadly, that he must be the chief propagandist of the Republican Party. He must now discover that he is the essential man as the chief propagandist of the free world, and this involves a more aggressive propaganda world role than any since Wilson, including Franklin Roosevelt with his four freedoms. The world-wide propaganda of the West is no longer a job for a second- or third-ranking Assistant Secretary. It is for the President himself who must speak out. He must speak often and well, continuously carrying the refrain of the fight for freedom. Only he can speak for America in a voice that all the world will listen to. Even the Soviet press has now conceded that it must let its readers know what Eisenhower is saying. And that means that when he speaks, he can speak to the Soviet people and to the satellite people directly.

Jack Raymond of the New York Times was in the Ukraine last week. He talked to the mayor of Odessa. This is how Raymond describes what the mayor had to say:

"He declared he had obtained his first inkling of Stalin's role in a statement made by President Eisenhower that was published in the Soviet press. He said the President had asserted that upon Stalin's death the

'Stalin era' had ended. This expression set him to thinking, he declared."

How revealing this is. The Times could have livened its editorial page by comment on Raymond's dispatch. The President of the United States makes a speech. It gets printed in the Soviet press. It starts the mayor of one of Russia's biggest cities to thinking along new lines. And are we to suppose that the mayor was the only one who started thinking? There's quite a lot of new thinking going on today in Russia and in Eastern Europe. And our job is to help that thinking along, to provide it with fresh facts and new ideas.

An enormous—a historic—opportunity has opened up to us. Will we take advantage of it? The anti-Stalin campaign is shaking Russia psychologically in a way it has not been shaken in the 38 years of the Soviet regime. For decades, the people of the U. S. S. R. were told that Stalin was the wisest, the kindest, the sweetest, the greatest man who ever lived. In a word, that he was infallible. Ever since World War II that theme has been hammered into the captive peoples of East Europe. Now the word is that he was a maniac; he was also a murderer and a monster. His victims are being released from jail, or posthumously "rehabilitated." Books, movies, plays, poems, and pictures produced during his lifetime must now be scrapped. What was yesterday's white is today's black.

Only last week Khrushchev's attacks on Stalin were reported to be growing still tougher. Stalin is alleged to have been more anti-Semitic than Hitler, with all Jews having been scheduled for deportation to Siberia. Can and should we now assume that the Soviet people are so stupid that they will not draw conclusions from the evidence given them by their own leaders, now laid each week before them, of how a madman deceived them, of how he lied to them and of how he even killed their brothers and sisters, their fathers and mothers?

For an American parallel we have to imagine how Americans would have felt in 1789, the year of our Constitution, if they had suddenly found out that George Washington was a British spy, and Benedict Arnold a patriotic American whom Washington had framed.

The men in the Kremlin are concerned about this shock. Look how slowly and carefully they are releasing the news to their people. Look at the happenings in Tiflis last month, when Soviet troops had to machinegun Stalin's countrymen in the streets. Even in the Soviet Communist Party there has been a reaction which caused Pravda to denounce what it calls "rotten elements" in the party. These elements, we can hope, may be those who have been stimulated to doing some thinking for themselves.

In Poland, the news has been given to the people straight, not slowly and carefully as in Russia. Here's what the Polish radio had to say a few days ago:

"The cult of Joseph Stalin. How strong was the reaction of every one of us when the figure of this man emerged before us in the full glare of historical truth. Many of us experienced this with as much pain as if it were a blow delivered to ourselves. For thousands, for millions of people Stalin was the personification and symbol of justice, infallibility, genius, and goodness. The reaction was strong and painful. It sometimes started with rebellion. People said in factories the following: "We shall not allow Stalin to be taken from us."

Then the broadcast continued:

"Recently we read in the weekly paper Poprostru the statement by one of the young leaders: 'As a result of bitter reflection on the subject of the cult of personality, I came to the conclusion that no authorities exist, beginning with the secretary of the basic party organization and ending with the Secretary of the Central Committee.'"

Mind you, this is a Communist radio commentator speaking, a Communist commentator in Poland where Stalin has been glorified only for 10 years. How much sharper, how much more explosive must be the present psychological reaction among Soviet youth where most of the population can't remember a time when they were not told that Stalin was the personification of all that is noble.

Can it be that because of the tremendous successes of the Communist propaganda since 1917 and even before—can it be that the Soviet leaders have now at last overestimated the power of their propaganda? When they now tell the youth of Russia about Stalin, when they tell the youth of Russia that Stalin was not infallible—may they not be sowing the seeds of unbelief in the Soviet propaganda? I like a phrase of Allen Dulles'. He writes me of his "cautious optimism." I agree. From such seeds as the present cynical reversal on Stalin, from these may we not hope that future disbelief and discord may develop. The question before the Eisenhower administration is how to cultivate this hope, how to seize it and develop it, and in this area we should now be seeking the ideas for the President and his administration.

Khrushchev is worried. It is now 2 months since he delivered his secret speech to the Communist Party Congress. The speech has not yet been published anywhere. Moreover, it must be clear to many Russians that the full story of Stalin's crimes has not been told, even by Khrushchev. Khrushchev and his associates are trying to preserve part of Stalin's past reputation in order to hang on to Soviet material gains which Stalin's crimes made possible. Moreover, they have a personal interest in preserving part of Stalin's reputation: They were his proteges who might be nothing today if it were not for Stalin. So far as we know, Khrushchev and company still have not publicly answered the key question: Why didn't they stop Stalin while his crimes were being performed? For them this is a question of the stop-beating-your-wife variety. They don't propose to answer it because the answer is obvious. Theodore Kaghan printed an amusing anecdote on this point, which he reported is circulating in Europe. While Khrushchev was at the height of his denunciation of Stalin, while the congress was in executive session so to speak, a note came up to the rostrum. Khrushchev opened it and read aloud: "Where were you while all this was going on?" Khrushchev raised his eyes and said, "Will the comrade who sent this note please stand up." No response in the congress. Khrushchev said "I demand that the comrade who sent this note stand before I give a count of 3." Still no response. Khrushchev then said, "Comrade, you have my answer. I was just where you are today."

This anecdote, if true, as it may well be, helps show Khrushchev's talent with a phrase; his own skill as a propagandist.

The attack on Stalin helps bring into the open, it helps define the opportunity now before the American people through their President. I suggest that President Eisenhower now authorize a series of statements directed to the Soviet people, and to the people in the satellites. The theme should be Stalin himself, and only Stalin. This is the theme forced upon us by the Soviet leaders themselves. The top issues in the world today, as defined by these leaders, are Stalin's crimes, Stalin's lies, Stalin's aggression, and Stalin's personal responsibility for the cold war, the arms race, and most of the world's troubles.

Ideally, the President himself should make these statements, perhaps in the form of personal broadcasts carried by the Voice of America. As I think we here today can agree, his is the one voice that speaks most effectively for the United States, and his words, as President, are the only words the Communist press might not now dare to ignore. However, I have been around Washington enough to know that one does not demand that the President "must" do anything, and today I have no wish of any kind to add to the strains upon a busy man who quite understandably has much else on his mind in this election year. Perhaps a series of statements under his signature or made for him by the Secretary of State, will break through to the Soviet and satellite peoples.

Here are some of the things the President could say with productive results to the free world:

First, he ought to call on Khrushchev to make public the secret speech he made before the party congress. He might even suggest that it would not run counter to the "spirit of Geneva," the great new propaganda slogan of the U. S. S. R., if the Communist leaders quit treating the Soviet people like political infants who can only be fed one drop of the truth at a time.

Second, he ought to tell the Soviet and satellite peoples that the true history of the past several decades was far, far different from what they have been taught. Did you see the news reports on the textbooks I brought back from the U. S. S. R., given me by Mr. Kairov, then Minister of Education? They don't mention the United States in the victory over Japan in World War II—and they state flatly that General Eisenhower only launched the Normandy landing after the heroic Soviet armies had defeated the Nazi armies.

The President ought to discuss in detail such Stalinist crimes as these:

The Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939.

The German-Soviet partition of Poland.

The destruction of the Baltic States independence by the Red army.

The deliberate way Stalin let the population of Warsaw be murdered by the Germans during the Warsaw uprising while the Red army stood nearby and did nothing to help the heroic Polish underground in 1944.

The Katyn Forest massacre in which Stalin murdered the flower of the Polish Army officer corps.

The enslavement of the captive states after 1945; and the destruction of the freedom of Czechoslovakia in 1948.

The attempted takeover of northern Iran in 1945 and 1946.

Soviet atomic espionage against the United States.

The Communist aggression against South Korea.

The germ warfare lie campaign.

Third, the President should explain to the Soviet people how it is difficult for us to trust the present Soviet leaders who were Stalin's henchmen throughout the period of his worst crimes. The members of the Presidium were picked and trained by Stalin. We have no guaranty that they will not repeat his treachery if given a chance.

Fourth, the President should make clear that we of America and the free world have no intention of interfering in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union. At the same time he should make clear our belief that Soviet collective leadership, as it is practiced today, is only collective dictatorship. He should stress that we fear the power of a dictatorship to deceive its people, and to misuse the nation's resources for political, economic, and military aggression. He should set forth and underscore our belief that only a democratic regime in Russia, or in any other country, can make certain that the people's yearning for bread and peace will be met.

Fifth, the President should openly challenge the Soviet leaders to present his words to the Soviet people, in full and not in part,

To the best of my knowledge, Secretary Byrnes was the first to do this, when I was serving under him a decade ago. He got away with it, too, in one critical speech.

The President can again remind Khrushchev and company that their speeches are printed here in the United States in full, that they are available to every person who wants to read them. He should stress that, if they suppress his messages, world public opinion will know there is no sincerity in their present talk of peace and coexistence. The President should speak bluntly, and over more so, as bluntly as did Khrushchev in London last week when he boasted of Soviet hydrogen bombs and intercontinental missiles.

The President's theme to the Soviet people must be direct and simple: That Stalin committed not only the crimes Khrushchev admits, but also many that Khrushchev has not admitted, and that it is this great bundle of crimes which forced us to arm in self-defense, and to create overseas bases and defensive alliances. As never before, the President's messages to the enslaved peoples of the world can carry conviction because even the Soviet people have at long last been set to thinking, to questioning and doubting. Because they already have been told that Stalin bamboozled them, and have had a partial documentation, they are prepared to hear more.

The possibility of such an approach by us must have occurred to the Soviet leaders. On the record, they've been much smarter propagandists than we have. They must be unhappy and even uneasy about the possibility. Take a look at some of Premier Bulganin's remarks in Great Britain last week. He suggested we Westerners should let bygones be bygones, and not discuss past responsibility for international tension too much. It's easy to understand why he feels that way, but it would be stupid and foolish for us to acquiesce and submit. The Soviet crimes of the past are the basis for much of the world's present unhappy situation and for our present fears. That is what the Soviet people must be told.

In the past week or two both President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles seem to have made a start along the lines I am recommending. The President called for rectification of Stalin's crime in enslaving the captive nations. Mr. Dulles mentioned Stalin's lies about the Korean war and germ warfare. But these were individual paragraphs in long speeches devoted primarily to other topics. In that context the paragraphs could have little or no impact upon the Soviet people.

What I feel is urgently needed is a series of top-level speeches, dealing with Stalin and Stalin alone, backed up by and promoted by every available media and every publicity and promotion technique. Such speeches should be directed specifically to the Soviet and satellite peoples and not to American public opinion. In them, I hope our Secretary of State will look abroad, instead of toward Madison Avenue and November 1956. As a graduate of the Avenue, 21 years ago, I urge upon him the viewpoint that by this rearrangement of viewpoint, he may astonish his advertising agencies and do a better job of public relations and even win a better chance of victory. I agree, however, that we must use one advertising technique: We must repeat our story time and time again, using every medium we can, to get it into the Communist empire and to keep it there. The Soviet propagandists, like American advertisers, know the value of repetition. Our Government must learn it and apply it as well.

Some may argue that what I am proposing is undiplomatic, that it is tactless, that it will offend the Soviet leaders and lessen the chance for peace. My reply is "Nonsense." I do not deny that there is often the need for tact and diplomacy in dealing with the Russians. But the Soviet leaders do their best every day to speak to the peoples of the free world over the heads of the free world's leaders. Their own conduct can serve as a precedent and a justification for what I propose, although I don't like to advance their conduct as either a precedent or justification for anything.

The Soviet people are thinking. They are asking questions. They are breaking out of old patterns of passive belief and acceptance. This gives to us of the free world a historic opportunity and one we may not soon get again. If we grasp this opportunity boldly and exploit it imaginatively we can, I am confident, achieve gains of the first magnitude toward our objective of peace and international understanding. If we let the opportunity slip by, a new equilibrium may be created in the Communist world, a new set of myths can develop, and rather quickly, to dominate the thinking of the Kremlin's subjects so that our future messages will again go unheeded, even if not unheard. The opportunity is now here. The time to exploit it is now. I do not understand the delay. Can it be attributed to the upside-down world described by an official so high ranking that he shall be nameless? His topsy-turvy substitution occurred before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He gave us a new version of victory, a version which made him sound more like a Madison Avenue public-relations man than a statesman. He flatly denied that the Soviet leaders are leading from strength and suggests that their hand is a Yarborough.

The decision to take the needed action is up to the President of the United States. I pray to God he will grasp that opportunity for the good of all humanity. He has the kind of understanding for the problem if he will but apply it. I well remember his understanding and his eloquence in this area. When I was Assistant Secretary of State, in the toughest job I ever tackled, and when he was Chief of Staff, he was my favorite witness before congressional committees. He understood the kind of issues I'm discussing today—as also did Generals Marshall and Bedell Smith—far better than did the top officers of the State Department. I hope he will unleash his understanding and leadership in this field of communication of ideas—I hope he will unleash it again through his leadership at this time.

THE BOXCAR SHORTAGE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a few moments ago the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] addressed the Senate on the subject of the recurring boxcar shortage. On May 9, 1956, I invited the Senate's attention once more to that crisis which seems to hit us on a seasonal basis every year. Hearings have been conducted on Senate 2770 by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I am certain that a great many Senators are waiting for action on this matter as impatiently as I am. I earnestly hope that the committee will report this measure favorably in the very near future so that this critical situation will be alleviated after these months and years of postponement.

I join with other Senators today in asking the Interstate Commerce Commission to do whatever it can to stimulate, first of all, the proper movement of boxcars into markets, so that the available supply can be properly used; and, secondly, to do whatever it can to encourage the railroads to fulfill their responsibilities in providing boxcars, which are urgently and desperately needed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I sincerely join the distinguished Senator from Minnesota in asking for prompt action on the bill to which he has referred.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say that I have concluded hearings on the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We know the Senator has concluded hearings.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is on the agenda of next Wednesday's regular meeting of the committee. I hope we can report the bill then, because I am afraid the ICC will not do anything unless we pass the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to commend the Senator from Washington for what he has done to expedite the processing of the bill. I testified before his subcommittee. The Senator has had many other duties to perform, as was exemplified by the appropriation bills today. My point was merely to join with my colleagues in urging favorable action by the committee and, once the bill is reported and placed on the calendar, prompt action by the Senate.

Two articles which describe the boxcar shortage from a Minnesota viewpoint appeared in the Minneapolis Star on May 28 and 29. They are written by the Minneapolis Star staff writer, Herb Paul. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Star of May 28, 1956]

BOXCAR SPEEDUP SOUGHT IN CONGRESS

(By Herb Paul)

Congress has been asked for immediate legislation to help speed movement of present supplies of railroad boxcars to prevent upper midwest market-bound grain from becoming "mired by the most drastic boxcar shortage it has faced."

E. L. Peterson, director of the Minneapolis Traffic Association, called on grain dealer and farmer country elevator associations to make their members' voices heard in Washington in a concerted effort to obtain such legislation before Congress adjourns.

"We are again confronted with another boxcar shortage," he said. "Every indication tells us it will be more severe than last year."

A survey conducted by L. L. Crosby, chairman of the Minneapolis Grain Exchange Car Supply Committee, of nearly 2,400 country elevators showed these results:

Out of the first 300 replies received by the end of last week, 78 country elevators reported they were plugged with old grain because of inability to obtain boxcars.

Of this number, 35 were in North Dakota, 7 in South Dakota, 16 in Minnesota, and 20 in Montana.

Nationally, Peterson said, the car shortage is rapidly getting worse. As of May 7, 1955, the average daily boxcar shortage was 3,578 cars, while on May 5 of this year it was 4,603 cars, an increase of 1,025 cars.

Peterson, to hasten congressional action, urged Senator MAGNUSON, Democrat of Washington, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to seek immediate passage of the bill he introduced

permitting penalty per diem charges during boxcar shortages.

Per diem charges are rental charges on cars used by non-owning roads and today are fixed at $2.40 per day by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The ICC, Peterson said, is powerless to further increase the per diem charges and the responsibility rests with Congress to which the ICC answers.

Hearings started on the bill in March, at which time Peterson urged its approval. But a group of railroads opposed the bill as it was written, although reported in sympathy with its objectives, and a substitute bill was offered.

Peterson said the grain trade and country shippers feel passage of either bill would speed up and stimulate the return by eastern railroads of cars owned by western roads.

Pointing out both bills involve the matter of per diem on car rental charges, Peterson called Magnuson's attention to the fact railroads now are in the process of formulating substantial increases in their demurrage rules and charges.

This is the charge a railroad imposes upon a shipper who takes more than a "reasonable" number of hours to load or unload a car. Peterson believes that because of the demurrage increases, grain shippers are justified in asking increased rentals be imposed on railroads using another line's equipment.

Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, already has cited the seriousness of the boxcar shortage and he urged MAGNUSON'S committee to expedite action "so that we may at last be saved from the seasonal recurrence of a boxcar shortage this year."

HUMPHREY inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a story in the Minneapolis Star on the action of the executive committee of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners (NARUC) demanding congressional action on the car shortage. The NARUC has backed the bill.

It also appealed to the Office of Defense Mobilization to extend the amortization program for rapid tax write-off on new equipment which was terminated last year so more boxcars could be included in its provisions.

[From the Minneapolis Star of May 29, 1956]

BOXCAR SHORTAGE BLAMED ON EAST

(By Herb Paul)

An insight as to how the boxcar shortage situation applies to the upper Midwest was presented by two Minnesota railroad experts at the convention of the Midwest Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners at Omaha, Nebr.

They were M. J. Galvin, public relations counsel for Minnesota railroads, St. Paul, and E. S. Ulyatt, general superintendent of transportation of the Northern Pacific Railway.

Speaking at the invitation of Paul A. Rasmussen, chairman of the Minnesota Railroad and Warehouse Commission, president of the association, Galvin and Ulyatt discussed what they termed is a most troublesome subject as far as our industry and a great segment of shipping public are concerned.

"Particularly," Galvin said, "because we raise and market grain and other agricultural products which come at certain peak or load seasons and have to be moved to concentration or processing points over comparatively short periods of time."

One main cause of the perennial boxcar shortages, he said, is the fact the upper Midwest, as a producing country, ships a great amount of products to the concentrated population in the East—and has difficulty getting its boxcars back.

As a result when western lines request return of their cars each spring, they find by July they have only about 80 percent of ownership available. And by October this drops to about 75 percent.

Today, with mechanized harvesting, much of the grain goes to market immediately so the impact on country elevators, rail shipping, and storage facilities in the rural areas has been terrific.

Grain that goes to the terminal market must be sampled, graded, and offered for sale, either stored or diverted to other destinations, all of which takes time.

Galvin believes this situation only can be remedied effectively by additional storage facilities in rural or other points close to the harvest and not readily remedied by boxcar supply.

It would be simply transferring the congestion from rural areas to terminal points where the headache might be greater.

"If the railroads had on hand all boxcars needed to move the grain at harvest time stored on the rail sidings," he said, "it would only be a matter of days when the terminals would become so plugged with cars awaiting inspection, sales, and switching for diversions or unloading that the headache would be much greater than it is today."

Another thing that contributes to the boxcar shortage, Galvin said, is the fact that all Commodity Credit Corporation grain loans come due the last of April.

When the time comes for the Government to take over the grain when the loan is above the market price, the CCC must start to process its paper, he said.

"A couple of years ago they moved the loan paper to central points where, we have been told, it sometimes takes as long as a month to process the paper and take over the grain.

"Then we often find the movement of that grain to terminals is delayed into June and July, tying up boxcars that otherwise would be available for movement of the current crop."

Galvin believes southern and northern crop loans might be made for the same period of time and not all come due on one date.

Ulyatt said car rental per diem charges are an important factor in the car supply and distribution.

"We favor legislation (by Congress) which would authorize and require higher per diem charges during car shortages, as well as high per diem generally, upon the ground such higher charges will provide an incentive for increased ownership."

He said increased per diem charges during a car shortage partially will offset the revenue loss sustained by a railroad when its cars are appropriated by other roads, and will promote quicker movement of freight cars at all times.

He said that "as long as it is cheaper to rent a car than it is to own one (and that is the situation today) underbuilding will be the policy of the strategically situated (eastern) railroads. And construction of new cars will be held to minimum requirements."

Ulyatt said Northern Pacific generally operates with below 80 percent ownership of its cars, which places a severe handicap on the shippers it serves.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, 8 years ago Senate Resolution 175 was considered in committee at a hearing over which the late Senator Reed of Kansas presided. More than 500 witnesses testified in favor of the very thing that is now in the bill to which the Senator has referred. At that time the ICC promised to see to it that cars would be provided to haul grain in early spring. And I believe the Senator from Washington will recall that there were 50,000 bushels of flax on the Montana prairies, and a great number of bushels of wheat. At that time we secured from the Interstate Commerce Commission every promise that it could make to regulate the use of railroad boxcars. Nevertheless, today the situation is as bad as it was at that time. That is why I am so eager to join the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Minnesota in asking prompt action. I have had telegrams and letters from all over the Northwest urging action on the bill.

INTERNATIONAL FARM YOUTH EXCHANGE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most constructive and imaginative efforts now being conducted in the whole field of international exchange of persons is the program sponsored by the National 4–H Club Foundation called the International Farm Youth Exchange. In the interest of removing the causes of world tension and promoting peace, this International Farm Youth Exchange program arranges for the exchange of rural youth between the United States and nearly 50 countries throughout the world.

Wearing blue jeans and work clothes, the boys and girls who participate in this program live and work as regular members of the family in such diverse places as the farming villages of Western Europe and the rice paddies of Japan. Demonstrating by their deeds that the American people have not lost touch with our heritage of manual labor, these young Americans are correcting a common misconception about us widely held abroad—the assumption that everything in the United States is machine driven or machine run.

At the same time, youths from Europe, Latin America, Asia, and the Near East have come to this country to live as members of farm families in nearly every State of the Union. They are sharing the day-to-day pleasures and hardships of American farm life, and in this process they are having an opportunity to feel the pulse of rural life in our own democracy. Minnesota farmers alone have been hosts to 41 exchanges from countries throughout the world.

Mr. President, I think it is important to note that the cost of operating the International Farm Youth Exchange is not paid by the United States Government. The National 4–H Club Foundation, which sponsors the exchange, obtains contributions from 4–H clubs, civic groups, farm organizations, foundations, American industry, interested individuals, and others who feel that through this program they can contribute in some measure to the establishment of better understanding at the family level, which must be the basis for a lasting peace.

The International Farm Youth Exchange will soon be conducted out of the National 4–H Club Center, which is being developed in Chevy Chase, Md., by the National 4–H Club Foundation. 4–H Club members themselves are giving a dime each to help establish this "working" 4–H shrine. When the

4–H Center is in operation, we, as Members of Congress, will have the opportunity to meet there with 4–H Club members from our States. At this national 4–H shrine, symbolic of the dignity of agriculture, we can discuss the operation of our national Government and help 4–H'ers from our States to prepare to serve their country as good citizens in a democracy.

Those who take part in the International Farm Youth Exchange have broadened their perspectives through the down-to-earth experiences they have shared in the homes and on the farms of this country. Without a doubt they form the nucleus of a well-informed democratic leadership in the rural society of their native lands. We can see, too, in the Americans who left rural communities for this overseas experience, a corps of enlightened citizens well aware of the problems and perplexities of this ever-shrinking world. Moreover, we should not overlook the thousands of farm families who, as host families, have acquired a better understanding of their world neighbors.

Mr. President, this is the 9th year of the International Farm Youth Exchange, under which 630 of our rural youth have gone abroad to live and work with our rural neighbors in other lands. This year 300 exchanges will be conducted with nearly 50 countries.

I feel that the National 4–H Club Foundation, the Cooperative Extension Service, and the farm people themselves are to be commended for the success of this unique and worthwhile program.

As one Senator, I hope it will continue to grow and to serve the cause of peace in the years ahead, and I join with others in commending it for an outstanding program of service to our country.

FREE OR REDUCED AIR TRANSPORTATION RATES FOR MINISTERS OF RELIGION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3149) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act in order to permit certain air carriers to grant free or reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 232, extending greetings to the American National Red Cross on the occasion of its 75th anniversary. I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 232) extending greetings to the American National Red Cross on the occasion of its 75th anniversary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, although this is a House concurrent resolution, it was unanimously approved by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. There are certain reasons why the American National Red Cross wishes to have the resolution agreed to this week. I therefore ask for its immediate consideration. Nothing is involved in it except congratulatory recognition of the American National Red Cross.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 232) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress extend its greetings and felicitations to all the members of the American National Red Cross on the occasion of its 75th anniversary, express to them its appreciation for their services to humanity, and urge the continued voluntary participation by the American people in the work entrusted to the organization by the Congress and the Government.

The preamble was agreed to.

PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICE IN RURAL AREAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2089, H. R. 2840. I call the attention of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] to the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2840) to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. A similar bill has been reported by the committee in previous sessions, and it has been passed by the Senate previously.

The bill has now been passed by the House. What we seek to do is simply what the Senate has already done before.

The bill provides for public library services in rural areas. There are presently approximately 27 million Americans without access to any local public library services and 90 percent of these people live in rural areas. Additionally, about 53 million people have local library services which are deemed by competent persons to be inadequate.

The bill has for its purpose the development of public library services in rural areas, providing modest funds in grants for a period of 5 years which will stimulate the States to develop methods of providing library services to residents of small towns, villages, and farming communities which now totally lack them or where they are inadequately supplied.

The committee wishes to emphasize the 5-year nature of this program. It is anticipated that 5 years of Federal assistance should be sufficient to energize a program for expansion of library services so that at the end of the period the States and localities will be able to provide adequate services. John S. Richards, president of the American Library Association, in testifying in favor of this bill, assured the committee that his organization believed that the program should be limited to 5 years and that in that period of time the States would be stimulated to solve most of their rural library problems.

The cost for this program of stimulating State extension of library services to rural areas—incorporated or unincorporated communities of 10,000 population or less—will be $7,500,000 for each of 5 years.

It should be stressed that because of greatly developed professional cooperation among librarians and the institutions they serve, the mere provision of library services in rural areas almost immediately opens up enormous library resources to these areas. Librarians have worked out cooperative methods of lending their books and files and other materials to such a degree that there can be a constant flow of valuable library materials to these rural areas once the outlets are established for their utilization.

Another expected result for this legislation lies in the chain reaction which comes about from demonstrating to communities the values of library services. Where no library services exist, communities cannot be expected to fully understand their value and importance. Once acquainted with what an adequate library does for them, people will be able to evaluate and hence work for continuation of the services with local resources.

The money appropriated under this bill will be allotted to the States in the following manner: Each State will receive a basic allotment of $40,000, except the Virgin Islands, which will receive a basic allotment of $10,000. The balance of the appropriation will be divided among the States on the basis of their rural population as compared with the rural population of the United States. The allotment for each State must be matched by the State on the basis of the per capita income of the State as compared with the national per capita income.

In order to receive funds each State must prepare a State plan for the further extension of public library services to be submitted to the Commissioner of Education, who is required to approve the State plan if submitted to him by the authorized State agency and if the plan complies with the specifications set forth in the act. The State plan may

use any method for extending public-library services that it determines will use the funds to maximum advantage. The State plan may make use of public libraries in local rural areas so long as the funds granted under the bill go for the extension of public library services to adjacent areas. In order to be eligible a State plan must certify that the State appropriation to the State library agency has not been reduced below that of the year previous to the one in which Federal funds are to be received. The State has complete authority in the selection of books, materials, and personnel. The determination as to whether or not library services are inadequate will be made by the State library agency.

One of the Senators most interested in the bill is the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. I am happy to yield to him at this time.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama, the chairman of the committee, which gave such gracious consideration to the bill which came from the House.

If the bill is to be effective, the States must cooperate, and they must do their share in order to participate in its benefits. The need for the bill was, I think, shown quite adequately before the committee. More than that, one of the most interesting comments about the bill, to my mind, was that in my correspondence concerning the bill I found I received letters from not only professional teachers or professional educators, but also from ranchers, farmers, and even mechanics, from my own State and other States adjacent to it. All these persons were interested in the bill.

I feel certain this is a step in the right direction, a step which I think should have been taken, perhaps, a long time ago.

I pay my tribute to the distinguished Senator from Alabama for his consideration and active support of the bill.

Mr. HILL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado for his kind words; and I again express appreciation for the deep interest which he has taken in the bill.

I wish also to express appreciation to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] who also demonstrated great interest in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I express appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, for the cooperation the committee has had in trying to develop some of the health bills and also the library bill during the past month or two, and publicly, on the floor, I wish to acknowledge our indebtedness to the Senator from Alabama for the fine teamwork he has elicited in the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FREE OR REDUCED AIR TRANSPORTATION RATES FOR MINISTERS OF RELIGION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2030, S. 3149.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3149) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, in order to permit certain air carriers to grant free reduced rate transportation to ministers of religion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there are no other Senators who desire to address the Senate at this time, I am prepared to move that the Senate stand in recess.

Before doing so, I again call attention to the announcement made previously today that the Senate will consider tomorrow the various bills to which I alluded when the Senate convened today.

It may be that if the Senate can complete the consideration of these bills in time tomorrow, we can proceed to the consideration of the social security bill. If not, the Senate will probably go over until Monday and resume the consideration of the unfinished bills on Monday, and then begin the consideration of the social-security bill.

Mr. President, I should also like to announce the possibility that on Monday next there will be a call of the calendar.

Pursuant to the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, June 7, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 6 (legislative day of June 4), 1956:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (b) of section 504, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Lewis Blaine Hershey, O6530, United States Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended, and sections 303 and 306 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law:

Major to lieutenant colonel

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

Butterfield, Charlotte Gage, 21244W.
Ray, Elizabeth, 21324W.
Blalock, John Wilmer, 6043A.
Rodzankas, John Frank, 6044A.
Turner, Egbert Snyder, Jr., 6122A.
Lambert, Floyd Aubrey, 5721A.
Imig, Paul Jacob, 6211A.
Krogh, Laurence Bertram, 6254A.
Swenson, Shirl H., 6371A.
Little, John Preston, 6373A.
Callaway, Roy Lavert, 6374A.
Peterson, Lee Lieske, 6376A.
Deppen, William Christian, Jr., 6379A.
Haas, John A., 6381A.
Allen, Stanley Ernest, 6382A.
Ray, Wilbur Richard, 6383A.
Lemons, Joseph Pascal, 6384A.
Ceely, William David, 6387A.
Feile, Clarance William, 6388A.
Carstensen, Dale Lafayette, 6389A.
Bruner, Frederick William, 6391A.
Collins, Harold Colbert, 6392A.
Lathan, Noel Olin Elder, 6394A.
Morgan, Fred Arthur, 6395A.
Ellis, Bythel Laurence, 6399A.
Dickens, Thomas Nolan, 6400A.
Mattie, John Duane, 6401A.
Johnston, Charles Harvey, 6402A.
LaRowe, John Simon, 6403A.
McCullough, William Edward, 6404A.
Sheehan, Roy Hampton, 6405A.
French, Russell Leroy, 6406A.
Benson, Frank Tipton, 6408A.
Royce, Clare Howard, 6409A.
Spencer, Harold Melville, 6412A.
Guider, Herbert Neal, 6415A.
Morat, Charles David, Jr., 6417A.
Lanning, George Richard, 6418A.
Wooster, Vernon Oliver, 6419A.
Sharpless, Thomas Frank, 6421A.
Kernan, Robert Mills, 6422A.
Smith, Sidney George, 6423A.
Burnett, Robert Leon, 6425A.
Bear, George Harold, 6427A.
Swanson, Richard Walter, 6429A.
Walter, Clarence Douglas, 6430A.
Norton, William Nicolson, 6431A.
Lawton, Kenneth, 6432A.
Pash, Robert Norman, 6434A.
Neff, Charles Laban, 6435A.
Woinowsk, Russell Kenneth, 6437A.
Abercrombie, John Woodrow, 6438A.
Risher, John Randall, 6439A.
Short, Howard Earl, 6440A.
Smith, Everett Hensel, 6441A.
Reeder, Vendor Harvard, 6442A.
Simonetti, Lino David, 6444A.
Merrill, Woodrow Taylor, 6446A.
Whitehead, Chauncey Brownloe, 6451A.
Jones, John, Jr., 6452A.
Lasly, Walter D., 6453A.
Thabault, George Bernard, 6457A.
Hoke, Peter Joseph, 6458A.
Crosson, Norman Robert, 6461A.
McDowell, Glenwood, 6462A.
Stewart, Carl W., 6464A.
Higginbotham, Harold Kenneth, 6466A.
Dell Angelo, John Andrew, 6467A.
Reeder, D. M., Jr., 6468A.
Forsblade, Kenneth Dave, 6469A.
Adleman, Julius J., 6470A.
McDonnell, Heston, 6471A.
Hay, Frank Olmested, 6472A.
Reed, Henry George, 6473A.
Reese, James West, 6475A.
Riddle, Charles Lewis, 6477A.
O'Bert, John James, 6478A.
Creo, Andrew Bartholomew, 6479A.
Swanson, Theodore Benedict, 6481A.
Drew, Troy, 6482A.
Long, Alan Guy, 6486A.
Lumpkin, William Hiram, 6487A.
Bray, Jack William, 6491A.
Hefling, Robert James, 6494A.
MacGregor, Wallace Fletcher, 6496A.
McFarlan, Frank August, 6497A.
Habeck, Carl William, 6500A.

Wright, Julian Carleton, 6501A.
Prevatte, James Osborne, 6502A.
Moore, William Weatherly, 6503A.
Deppe, Ralph William, 6505A.
Ferrell, Frank Ellington, 6507A.
Hart, Malcolm Detraz, 6508A.
Sprawls, Philip Claudius, 6509A.
Akins, Dudley Stephenson, 6510A.
Sweigart, Bert LeRoy, 6511A.
Stallings, Guy Harrison, 6512A.
Chiarella, James Santo, 6516A.
Mills, Thomas Harris, 6517A.
Sanders, Roy Clifton, 6518A.
Sensenbrenner, Ralph Debald, 6519A.
Moore, George Eugene, 6520A.
Driver, John James, 6522A.
Dacko, William, 6525A.
Strauss, William, 6526A.
Jones, Hubert Ledyard, 6527A.
Rudolph, Ray Harding, 6532A.
Kerr, Jean Louth, Jr., 6533A.
Weisbrodt, Charles Richard, 6534A.
Snaider, Himey Jones, 6536A.
Warthman, Jack Dussell, 6537A.
Milholland, George William, 6538A.
Salisbury, Stanley Gordon, 6540A.
Rhode, Storm Charles, Jr., 6542A.
Hight, James Lester, 6543A.
Ondo, Michael, 6544A.
Calof, Donald Robert, 6546A.
Christenson, Richard Andrew, 6548A.
Johnson, William Melbourne, 6549A.
Funk, Carl Franklin, 6550A.
Sullivan, Arthur Joseph, 6553A.
Johnson, Lycurgus Waldemar, 6557A.
Douthett, Elwood Moser, 6559A.
Taylor, Henry Weston, Jr., 6560A.
Hunt, Seaborn McDonald, 6526A.
Cole, Edward Lee, 6563A.
Elliott, Charles Robert, 6564A.
Barrett, Alfred William, Jr., 6565A.
Jacobson, James Louis, 6566A.
Bean, James Otto, 6571A.
Tansel, Dave Collins, 6572A.
Schold, George Bertie, Jr., 6573A.
Harper, Harmon Hicks, 6574A.
Edelen, Henry Hill, Jr., 6576A.
Slough, James Carl, 6577A.
Ireland, Melvin J., 6578A.
Ofner, David Bernhard, 6579A.
Elston, Ernest Woodrow, 6580A.
Poole, George Irvin, Jr., 6581A.
Turbak, Chester, 6582A.
Bass, Feris Achile, Jr., 6584A.
Clark, DeLair Aubrey, 6585A.
Creyts, Harold George, 19548A.
Campbell, William Joseph, 6587A.
Gray, Leon Walton, 6589A.
Nye, Richard Sadler, 6590A.
Topper, Morse, 6591A.
Gibson, Robert Duane, 6592A.
Price, Andrew Henry, 6594A.
Tilghman, Marvin Hugh, 6596A.
Wagner, Wilfred William, 6597A.
McLaren, William Aiden, 6599A.
Bryan, William Tagg, 6601A.
Fincher, William Walter, 6603A.
Edwards, Kenneth Rhea, 6604A.
Kremer, Harry Darwin, Jr., 6608A.
Zorka, Jack Carl, 6609A.
Ellis, Ollie McLaurin, 6610A.
Schobel, Sumner, 6611A.
Blackman, Richard Orchard, 6612A.
Brown, Frank Lobdell, 18085A.
Sirney, John Ashton, 6613A.
Browning, John Robert, 6616A.
Riggs, Carl Nelson, 6617A.
Krause, Harris F., 6619A.
Bradford, Carl Walker, 6620A.
Dascombe, Charles Burr, 6621A.
Boddie, James Warner, 6622A.
Stringer, Robert Dillon, 6623A.
Lindsay, Andrew Gowen, 6624A.
O'Hern, Luther, 66251A.
Burt, Joseph Autry, 6627A.
Bright, David Morgan, 6628A.
Stallings, McLendon Montgomery, 6629A.
Hartwig, Robert Louis, 6630A.
Thompson, Arthur John, Jr., 6631A.
Patterson, Warren Shaw, Jr., 6632A.
Swindler, Harold, 6633A.
Dehner, Joseph Harvey, 6635A.
Saville, Wesley Thomas, 6636A.
Deane, William Boyd, 6637A.
Dennis, Larry Denton, 6638A.
Buechner, William Austen, 6639A.
Jarrell, Robert Edward, 6640A.
Barber, James Luther, Jr., 6641A.
Schulherr, Richard Modglin, 6643A.
McCormack, Bailor Daniel, 6644A.
Linko, George Andrew, 6645A.
Parks, Bernard Grant, 6646A.
Hunt, Earl Gilbert, 6647A.
O'Donnell, John Thomas, 6648A.
Carpenter, John Woolsey, 6649A.
Shipley, Edward Vail, 6651A.
Boselli, Theodore John, 6653A.
Riddick, James Walter, 6654A.
Gaylor, Don Gordon, 6656A.
Yoder, Harry David, 6658A.
Chauvet, Jack Sydney, 6659A.
Robinson, John Henry, 6660A.
Andrews, John Albert Cornelius, 6662A.
Nevling, Gilbert, 6665A.
Murphy, Robert Marshall, Jr., 6666A.
Tattini, Leno, 6667A.
Quattlander, Frank Paul, 6668A.
Wilson, Irl Donaker, Jr., 6669A.
Fontana, Robert Edward, 6670A.
Porter, Lester Williams, 6672A.
Crutchfield, James Oscar, 6673A.
Turk, Laurel Agee, 6674A.
Castle, Vernon Henry, 6675A.
Murden, Charles Holt, Jr., 6676A.
Zurek, Walter John, 6677A.
Andersen, Homer Paul, 6678A.
Poe, John Everett, 6680A.
Miller, Lynus Parker, Jr., 6681A.
Grending, Carl Nelson, 6682A.
McCleary, Robert Joseph, 6684A.
Bohman, Thomas Spare, 6685A.
Kellerman, Jack Hickman, 6686A.
Reinhardt, Herbert Wilton, 6687A.
Fox, Robert Winston, 6690A.
Ritter, Herbert Waldemar, 6691A.
Herrington, John Athol, 6693A.
Deterding, Floyd Milton, 6695A.
Edwards, James Thomas, 6696A.
McGlasson, Robert Bruce, 6697A.
Ivey, Maury Herbert, 6698A.
Kafer, Ernest Emanuel, 6699A.
Austin, John Florea, 6700A.
Parker, Van Robison, 6701A.
Francis, Tim Benton, 6702A.
Morgan, Russell Dodson, 6703A.
Fussell, James Glen, 6705A.
Hill, John Theodore, 6707A.
Moe, John Gillette, Jr., 6708A.
Ragon, Dale Ambrose, 6710A.
Johnston, Robert Edward, 6711A.
Pryor, Daniel Franklin, 6712A.
Jennings, Elton Jordan, 6714A.
Hall, Thomas William, 6715A.
Allen, Ed Crow, 6716A.
Chandler, George William, 6717A.
Mona, Reuben Edward, 6718A.
Stewart, John Leger, 6719A.
Cartwright, Everett Jackson, 6720A.
Slater, Ralph Phipps, 6721A.
Wilson, Woodrow, 6722A.
Hamilton, Samuel Davis, Jr., 6723A.
Konin, David Harry, 6724A.
Rogers, Dale Edward, 6726A.
Spohn, Clifford Adams, 6727A.
Kruge, William Arthur, 6728A.

MEDICAL CORPS

Bilotta, Laurence Alexander, 19227A.
Kloess, Edward John, 19806A.
Kennett, Donald Michael, 19228A.
Wright, Paul Eugene, 19229A.
Perri, Frank Adrian, 19230A.
Twichell, Gilbert Alfred, 19231A.
Johnston, Maurice Blair, 19232A.
McFall, Voris Francis, 19234A.

DENTAL CORPS

Hutchinson, William Rex, Jr., 18899A.
Dilley, Harold Edward, 18900A.
Ekstrom, Maurice Fred, 18901A.
Connell, Thomas Benton, 18902A.

VETERINARY CORPS

Sasmore, Daniel Paul, 18995A.
Bills, William Edward, 18996A.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Lee, William Henry, 18082A.
Lunnie, Francis Melrose, 19435A.
Kretschmer, Ernest Theodore, 19461A.
Farrell, Thomas Augustus, 19436A.

NURSE CORPS

Peschon, Ida Elaine, 20904W.
Zeller, Dorothy Nellie, 20915W.
Conroy, Elizabeth Julia, 21925W.

CHAPLAIN

Powers, William Edward, 18760A.
Cameron, George James, 18763A.
Fulkerson, Maurice Dale, 18764A.
McWilliams, Alfred Edward, 18765A.
Cutress, Albert Leo, 18766A.
Holt, Maurice Robert, 18767A.
McArthur, Luther Wheeler, 18768A.
Pennington, Henry Clay, 18769A.

First lieutenant to captain

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

Smith, George Washington, Jr., 28026A.
Hogue, Norman Kirkland, 28027A.

CHAPLAIN

Ansted, Harry Burton, 27662A.

Second lieutenant to first lieutenant

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

Wells, James Paschal, 28619A.
Troutman, Clarence Walter, 28618A.
Moody, Stanley A., 28620A.
Reed, Robert Harvey, 28631A.
Samples, Wheeler Dewey, Jr., 28622A.
Thulin, John Harold, 28626A.
Bohn, Lowell Fred, 28623A.
Stone, Denver, 28624A.
Foster, Dudley John, 28621A.
Christman, William Charles, 28628A.
Black, Harley Samuel, 28627A.
Stone, Lewis Walter, 28629A.
McNeill, Royce Houston, 28630A.
Phelps, Harold Lawrence, 28625A.
Evans, Richard Earl, 28641A.
Frazier, John F., 28632A.
Townsley, William Harter, 28647A.
Clark, Robert Scott, 28636A.
Hope, Joseph Jessee, 28643A.
Enzian, Richard Bryan, 28640A.
Greenleaf, George Henry, 28642A.
Blake, Thomas Aubin, 28634A.
Enney, James Crowe, 28639A.
Morgan, Frederick John, 28644A.
Chadwick, Elbridge Gerry, 28635A.
Dauenhauer, Ervin Francis, 28638A.
Abney, Kenneth Lee, 28633A.
Thomas, James Carroll, 28646A.
Cole, Charles Owen, Jr., 28637A.
Owens, Eugene, 28645A.
Watson, Everett B., 28648A.
Thomas, Cornelius Alexander, 28649A.
Roberts, Ben Allen, 28650A.
Hickenbottom, Richard, 28651A.
Moore, Arthur M., 28652A.
White, John, 28655A.
Ulrich, Donald Eugene, 28654A.
Vehling, David Read, 28653A.
Thomas, Lloyd Edward, 25450A.
Rosburg, Charles Reed, 27907A.
Fanning, Robert Wayne, 28657A.
Jordan, Walter Fritz, Jr., 28658A.
Burgdorf, William, 28659A.
Liethen, Frank Elmer, Jr., 25155A.
Haggard, Thomas Gene, 28660A.
Hennessey, Charles B., 28662A.
Holloway, William Victor, 28663A.
Hook, Cecil M., Jr., 28661A.
Patterson, Kenneth Morris, 27909A.
Collins, James Quincy, Jr., 27908A.
Bateman, Thomas Scott, 28664A.
Hildebrant, Verne B., 27910A.
Caleb, Phillip I., Jr., 28665A.
Alexander, Fernando, 28666A.
Kimsey, Melbourne, 27148A.
Simpson, John Edwin, 25642A.
Andrada, Thiophilos, 27911A.
Doherty, Robert Edward, 27912A.

McGouldrick, Francis Jay, Jr., 28667A.
Brown, Gordon Richard, 27914A.
Fincher, Donald Blake, 27151A.
Webber, James Hugh, 27149A.
Bennett, James Robert, 27150A.
Harwood, James Thomas, 27152A.
Rigney, James Hinds, Jr., 27153A.
Carter, Donald Eric, 27917A.
Craft, Roby Robert, 27915A.
Welch, Henry Owen, Jr., 27918A.
Matthews, Frank Alvin, 27916A.
Wilkes, John August, Jr., 28668A.
Pluenneke, Harold Curtis, 28673A.
Zoerlein, Ralph Walter, 28671A.
Bennett, Robert Bernard, 28674A.
Delvecchio, Vincent E., 28670A.
Pytel, Stanley J., 28672A.
Davis, Frederick E., 28669A.
Kakacek, John Gerard, 27919A.
Kroen, Edward J., 28675A.
Gindoff, Alan Solomon, 27920A.
Martin, Billy, Jr., 28676A.
Batten, John Marshall, 28677A.
Davis, Paul Edwin, 28678A.
Stone, Gordon E., 28680A.
McGovern, Charles E., 28679A.
Elmore, Willie E., Jr., 28681A.
Baisden, James K., 28682A.
Walters, Neil Ince, 28684A.
Thoburn, Russell Eugene, 28685A.
Lyons, Albert Eugene, 28686A.
Turek, Edward H., 28683A.
Ingalsbe, Orville, Don, 28687A.
Weidner, Charles Herman, 28690A.
Pinson, Charles R., 28689A.
Tice, Fred R., 28688A.
Kerr, Thomas Bailey, 28691A.
McClellan, Robert Joseph, 28693A.
Lewis, George F., 28692A.
Kott, Richard Francis, 27922A.
Butler, Gunning, Jr., 28694A.
Lockwood, Frederick St. John, 3d, 28695A.
Martino, Joseph P., 28696A.
Ralph, William Delbert, Jr., 28697A.
Walborn, Chester Alden, 27154A.
Timm, Robert Herman, 27923A.
Norman, Russell, 27926A.
Needham, Paul Eugene, 27925A.
Pinchuk, Lanis, 27928A.
Pedjoe, John Paul, 27927A.
Miller, Carl William, 28701A.
Tucker, Lester W., 28703A.
Duncan, Clyde Eugene, 28698A.
Kennedy, Charles Roy, 28700A.
Mills, Billie B., 28702A.
Wiegand, Karl Leo, 28704A.
Falkner, Donald Clark, 28699A.
Millson, Chris, Jr., 28705A.
Hudson, John A., 28707A.
Byrkit, Robert Allen, 28706A.
Shugart, James Elmer, 27938A.
McClain, Larry David, 27937A.
Rutscher, John Jerome, 27934A.
Carnahan, Jerald Dean, 27935A.
Hancock, Gordon Kjolvik, 27931A.
Boughton, Alain George, 27933A.
Gill, Linden Lee, 27929A.
Kimbriel, John Ruell, 27930A.
Crowder, Calie Gene, 27936A.
Tudino, Frank Anthony, 28070A.
Matthes, James R., 28712A.
Lee, Vernon R., 28715A.
Thomas, James Herman, 28709A.
Culp, Kenneth C., 28714A.
Wold, James W., 28717A.
Jenson, Henry J., 28716A.
Schaffhauser, Carl N., 28711A.
Watson, John F., Jr., 28719A.
Gentry, Roy L., Jr., 28713A.
Baker, James D., 28708A.
Knoke, Frederick L., 28718A.
LaPorte, Donald C., 28710A.
Drennon, Philip Rodney, 27940A.
Josephson, Kent Alan, 27941A.
Noe, Philip Sanford, 27939A.
Gerber, Richard A., 28721A.
Wood, Milton Boyd, 28720A.
Irwin, Donald L., 28722A.
Fitzpatrick, Richard L., 28724A.
Kuska, Robert J., 28723A.
Hayek, Allan Donald, Jr., 27942A.
Witt, Raymond Julian, 27943A.
Weber, Kenneth Lewis, 28725A.
Landry, Edward B., 28726A.
Humke, John W., 28728A.
Scarlett, Bobby Reldue, 28727A.
Morris, Jack Allison, 28729A.

(NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

IN THE NAVY

Paul A. Weber, Jr. (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps), to be an ensign in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefore as provided by law:

Lieutenant commander

Herbert D. Steinbeck

Lieutenant

William C. Dempsey
Francis Gilbert
Wilford D. Hoofer

The following-named Reserve officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Commander

Orville F. Nielsen

Lieutenant commander

Thomas S. Marks

Lieutenant

Robert D. Cordier
Samuel O. Cornell
Vernon N. Houk
Walter M. Johnson
Harold R. Schumacher
Robert W. Steagall, Jr.
Joseph E. Stitcher

The following-named Reserve officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Commander

Edward J. Copping, Jr.
Gordon H. Rovelstad
Winthrop F. Smith

Lieutenant commander

Theodore E. Carlson
Sun R. Cloud

Lieutenant

Robert E. Forner
Joseph C. Gleeson, Jr.
Louis R. Pistocco
Austin Robbins
Carl J. Swanson
Joseph F. Williams

Manuel A. Benero, United States Navy, retired, to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, pursuant to title 37, United States Code, sections 275, 276, 277, 403 (a), 406 (a), 407 (a), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve aviators) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Edwin C. Adamson, Jr.
Kenneth L. Ahlgren
George W. Allen
Stephen O. Armstrong, Jr.
Robert B. Arnold
Carl G. Austin
Harold Barnes
Frederick R. Bartlett
Richard D. Bishop
Walter H. Blaseck
Charles G. Bostwick, Jr.
Darrell H. Brooks
Gerald G. Buc
William McK. Burnett
Raymond M. Burris
John K. Cammall
Karl L. Carlson
James F. Carroll
Richard J. Cavicke
Robert T. Chase, Jr.
Norman B. Chezem
Eugene M. Clemens
Robert O. Conroy
Lawrence W. Coor
Gordon L. Cox
Donald G. Crabtree
Elmer M. Cranton
Merrill E. Critz
Hubert D. Daily, Jr.
Russell E. Davis
Modestino R. Defeo
Gerald M. Dempsey
James R. Derda
Morris C. Drees
Richard C. Drummet
Robert G. Duff
John F. Dunn
Thomas W. Durant
Kenneth C. Eckerd
James W. Ehl
William K. Erickson
Thomas D. Eyres
Fred J. Ferrazzano
James M. Foley, Jr.
Arvid E. Forsman
Thomas J. Foster
Henry J. Fox IV
Richard W. Fox
John L. Frederick
George Gedney, Jr.
Ernest H. Gleim
Erwin A. Goschke
Malcolm N. Guess
Arthur J. Hack, Jr.
Roger H. Hageman
Wilbur G. Hager
Winfred F. Hampton, Jr.
David L. Harlow
Francis A. Hiser, Jr.
Robert L. Hollingsworth
Bill "J" Hoskins
Edward J. Jacobs, Jr.
Alfred C. Johnson, Jr.
Robert E. Johnson
Robert H. Jones
Larry L. Jongewaard
Donald E. King
Hollis H. Kirkpatrick
Donald O. Knerr
Frank A. Krisman
Joe V. Lacefield.
David S. Langner
Willis I. Lewis, Jr.
Cleland V. McBurney
Walter H. McCall
Rodney F. McCartney
Thomas W. McElrath
Robert D. McLin
Patrick P. Marsha, Jr.
Robert M. Matta
Bernard L. Minetti
Thomas G. Moore
Kendall E. Moranville
Samuel W. Morey
George M. Mulvany
Jack H. Nichols
William V. Patterson
Robert M. Pedersen
Ralph E. Poore
Raymond W. Porter
Lorenzo J. Rathke
John J. Richard
Kenneth J. Rieder
John K. Ritchie
Ray Roff, Jr.
Theodore A. Santuae
Douglas D. Schaadt
Estill E. Schnetzler, Jr.
Paul F. Selby
Eugene L. Soldwedel
James R. Spohnholtz
Russell E. Stearns
Duncan P. Stevens.
John D. Stich
Thaddeus J. Szpara
Don W. Taylor
Eli L. Tucker, Jr.
Thomas A. Tucker
William C. Uelman
Raymond A. Vohden
Billy V. Wheat
Irving M. Wiltse
Robert O. Wirt
Robert J. Wuebler

The following-named enlisted personnel to be ensigns in the line (aviation ground) of the Navy, for temporary service, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Gillard W. Apgar, Jr.
William H. Appley
Samuel B. Aston
John H. Bailey, Jr.
Albert Barre
Dale F. Bear
William T. Bocim
James F. Bowlin
Donald C. Breuer
James S. Broos
John R. Burgoon, Jr.
Lloyd B. Camp
Louis J. Cason
Fred L. Clark
Samuel W. Cobean
Judson K. Cokefair
Richard "L" Conn
Walter G. Cronise, Jr.
Thomas V. DeMarino
Henry J. Demers, Jr.
Norman L. DeNoon
William G. Dugan
Jewell H. Eastham
Abe P. Fennell, Jr.
William T. Fenton, Jr.
Raymond F. Fitzpatrick
Harold E. Ford
Richmond D. Garrett
John D. Gilbert
Gordon E. Gilmore
Gail E. Gundersen
William F. Hale
Thomas S. Herring
Harvey Herzog
Carl M. Hill
Chester H. Holleman
Frederick Hoole
Robert S. Hughes
Irvine D. Irby, Jr.
Edward H. Johnson
James L. Jordan, Jr.
William R. Kane
James P. Kavin, Jr.
Lewis D. Keller
Clyde T. Kirkman
Robert A. Laabs
Paul J. LaClair
Donald R. Larkin
Richard R. Leaverton
Darrell A. Lightner
Morton Lockwood
Charles B. Lufburrow
Hans W. Lunder
Dale W. Lynch
John J. McAloon
Joseph F. McMullin
Eugene P. Moccia
Clarence T. Morris, Jr.
Joseph M. Morris
John G. Muller
Richard E. Nevins
Neil F. O'Connor
John A. O'Shaughnessy
Gerald D. Parham
Bennie Rangeo
Raymond E. Reames
Paul G. Richter
Ray Rigmaiden
Charles C. Roberts
Daniel P. Roper
Samuel V. Roper
Joseph Ropiak
James F. Southerland
Ernest B. Snook, Jr.
Arthur J. St. Martin
Henry W. Stoke
George R. Stradley
Vincent Sylvester
Warren N. Tache
DeWayne A. Thomas
Donald M. Tucker
James A. Vyskocil
Calvin W. Wade
Sidney K. Weaver
Marshall E. Windham
Bernard "J" Womack
Robert L. Wright
Walton E. Yates
Charles T. Young

The following-named warrant officers to be ensigns in the line (aviation ground) of

the Navy, for temporary service, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

George C. Adams
Ellis E. Austin
Charles S. Carter
Francis L. Gilmore
Fred "B" Glover
William C. Guthrie
William B. James
James R. Kay
William J. Mitchell
James A. Moore
Jacob W. Pangle
Joseph F. Riley

The following-named chief warrant officers to be ensigns in the line (aviation ground) of the Navy, for temporary service, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Robert F. Ace
Gordon K. Ayres
William H. Brown
James Carpenter
Richard W. Carter
Billy M. Harkins
Norman O. Keesling
William R. Lander
Francis C. Norris, Jr.
James C. Petersen
Charles M. Quinlan
Charles E. Savo
Anthony J. Schiavone
Robert F. Tucker

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to, and permanent appointment in, the Supply Corps of the Navy in the grade of lieutenant:

Charles L. Gillis
Lowell T. Hughes
Norlin A. Jankovsky

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to, and permanent appointment in, the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (jg.) and the temporary grade of lieutenant:

Charles W. Barrett
Robert R. Harvey, Jr.
Frank T. Maynard
George L. Stansbury III

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to, and permanent appointment in, the Supply Corps of the Navy in the grade of ensign:

James G. Farrell
Joe Mook
James L. Stidham

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to, and permanent appointment in, the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the grade of ensign:

George M. Gans, Jr.
Carleton C. Hoffner, Jr.
Horace B. Jones, Jr.
John P. Jones, Jr.
Raymond E. Paulsen
Paul A. Petzrick

The following-named officers in the Supply Corps of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (jg.), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Walter T. Meyers
John N. Postak
William J. Ryan

William H. Alexander, Supply Corps, United States Navy, for transfer to, and permanent appointment in, the line of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (jg.) and in the temporary grade of lieutenant.

Norman E. Beck, Supply Corps, United States Navy, for transfer to, and permanent appointment in, the line of the Navy in the permanent grade of ensign.

(PERMANENT PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY)

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant:

Lieutenant, line

Smith, Jack D.
Averitt, Gordon F.
King, Cecil
North, Sylvester F.
Pegues, John K., Jr.
Stenke, George
Peugh, Everett R.
Criner, James E.
Halleck, William L.
Leibold, William R.
Bramblett, John J., Jr.
Bish, Arthur A.
Thomson, William O.
Pescott, Robert
Leach, Everett N.
Ramsey, Walter A.
Christensen, Earl D.
St. Marie, Joseph
Gale, Robert D.
Hobbs, James B.
Waterfield, Willard F.
Mosley, Aulcey D.
Tillotson, Ted K.
Garrett, Bernard H.
Hounihan, John C.
Childs, John T.
Thomas, Preston G.
Padgett, James P.
Cobern, Ernest L.
Wilkinson, Raymond O.
Sandberg, William G.
Tomsky, Jackson M.
Pinning, Joseph E.
Reid, Albert R.
Antar, Albert
Goebel, Herman E., Jr.
Fuchs, Julius E.
Mikkelsen, Richard E.
Lewallen, John D.
Peterson, Loyd G., Jr.
Evans, George J.
Birdsong, Harold S.
Jacks, Robert G.
Powers, Wilbur P.
Whitman, George W.
Dievendorff, Frank
Lilienfeld, Joe J.
Church, John H.
Read, Garlin R.
Macauley, George W.
Villines, William M., Jr
McGuire, Eugene J.
Murdock, Lloyd E.
Jackson, Robert G.
Christensen, Donald A.
Turner, James D.
Callaghan, Jerry E.
Stradtman, John F.
Johnson, Robert M.
Woods, Searle W.
Faver, Walter M.
Askin, Thomas B. H., Jr.
Ingersoll, Richard W.
Roush, Randall C.
Perl, Burton K.
Jarrett, Alonzo C.
Turpin, Lander H.
Dersin, Clement
Gire, Howard A.
Rowland, Mervin
Clark, Andrew
Willis, Chesley E., Jr.
Murphy, Gerald E.
Selby, Howard K.
Forrester, James H.
Brackney, Louis S.
Raymer, Edward C.
Roberts, Douglas H.
Law, Thomas L.
Winant, Barent P. III
Davis, Ralph E.
Babine, Arthur L., Jr.
Rozell, Curtis J.
Sneed, Beckom U.
Saxton, Frank
Ravan, Landrum E.
Thomas, George C.
Russell, William D.
Burnham, Rowland E.
Waterloo, Francis C.
Hirz, Joseph D.
Riba, Robert
Kaiser, Karl D.
Arp, Phillip S.
Weaver, Edward H.
Koch, Joseph
Wheeler, James W., Jr.
Gerlach, Richard E.
Madeo, Joseph F., Jr.
Hunter, Glenn A.

Lieutenant, Supply Corps

Davis, Harold R.
Reade, Lowell A.
Reed, Clarence E.
McKenzie, Charles H.
Nelson, George W.
Abraham, Donavon E.
Rains, William D.
Needham, Thomas P.

Lieutenant, Civil Engineer Corps

Bodtke, David H.
Martin, Robert A.
Fail, Raymond P., Jr.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Abele, Henry F.
Abercrombie, Jerry T.
Abrahams, Thomas P.
Abrahamson, Dean A.
Adkins, Kenneth G.
Adler, Ronald E.
Adorney, Frank
Ahlquist, Stanley W.
Aiau, Harvey C. K.
Albers, William P.
Albright, Richard K.
Alexander, Robert C.
Alldredge, Donald L.
Allen, William D.
Allyn, Richard H.
Altee, Thomas M.
Amendt, John H.
Ammerman, Don J.
Anderson, Andrew G., Jr.
Anderson, Curtis O.
Anderson, Forrest P.
Anderson, Robert C.
Anderson, Robert N.
Andrews, Frederick C.
Appich, William H., Jr.
Apted, George L.
Armel, Lyle O., II
Armstrong, Philip M., Jr.
Arnold, John E.
Arrington, Robert A.
Ash, Leonard C.
Ashley, Bruce H.
Aucoin, Leonard L.
Aumuller, Richard W.
Avary, James C., Jr.
Avrit, Richard C.
Babcock, Donald E.
Baciocco, Albert J., Jr.
Bagby, Hallam O.
Balderston, Buele G.
Baldwin, Charles C.
Ball, Courtland D., III
Barke, Arthur R.
Barnes, Harry G., Jr.
Barnes, Robert G.
Baron, Charles R.
Barry, Thomas M.
Barthelenghi, George H., Jr.
Bassett, Melvin S.
Bates, David H., Jr.
Bauchspies, Rollin L., Jr.
Bean, Edward W., Jr.
Beard, Donald W.
Beat, Robert O.
Bedworth, Wilfrid J.
Beers, Robert C.
Beeton, Harvey J.
Bein, George E.
Bell, Bill J.
Bell, Clyde R.
Bell, Gershom R.
Bell, William R.
Belton, Jack G.
Benner, Leslie W., Jr.
Bennett, Richard L.
Bennett, Richard W.
Bennie, Donald B.
Benning, Carl J., Jr.
Bentley, William C.
Bergbauer, Harry W., Jr.
Berge, Norman K.
Berger, James K.
Best, Eddie F.
Betsworth, Brian C.
Bierer, Bion B., Jr.
Bird, Joseph W., Jr.
Bivens, Arthur C.
Bizon, Joseph E.
Blackmore, Thomas A.
Blanchard, Robert C.
Blandine, Robert E.
Blasczak, Walter J.
Blum, Frederick J. III
Blundell, Peveril
Bocock, Kenneth S.
Bodling, Paul F., Jr.
Boggs, Steve V.
Bohannan, William L.
Boncer, Lawrence
Booth, Roger G.
Booth, Theodore W.
Boris, Andrew Paul
Borthwick, Robert B.
Botten, James R.
Bottenberg, Foster L.
Botula, Bernard C.
Bourdeau, Paul T.
Bowers, Donald L.
Bowling, Roy H.
Boyd, John H., Jr.
Boyer, Walton T., Jr.
Boyett, Stephen G.
Boyle, Darrell D.
Bradbury, John I.
Braden, Melvin E., Jr.
Bradshaw, Robert D.
Brady, Francis T.
Bredehoft, Charles M.
Breland, Ernest W., Jr.
Britton, William L.
Brooks, Edwin H., Jr.
Brown, Larry J.
Brown, Walter H., Jr.
Browning, Siras D.
Broz, George A.
Brubaker, Russell E., Jr.
Brummage, Richard L.
Brunskill, Robert J.
Brunson, Wright A., Jr.
Buck, Charles W.
Bucy, John T., Jr.
Bull, Joseph L. III
Bullard, John R.
Bullock, William A.
Burgess, James A.
Burt, Thomas E.
Bush, Lawrence A.
Bushong, Brent
Bussell, Robert B.
Butcher, Nathan T.
Butcher, Paul D.
Butler, Charles T.
Butler, James K.
Butrym, Stanley B., Jr.
Buys, Jay R.
Bynum, Frank B., Jr.
Byrd, Sam R.
Byrnes, Robert E.
Byron, Robert S.
Callaghan, Joseph M.
Callicott, Jack D.
Calnan, Eugene T.
Campbell, Bruce H., Jr.
Campbell, George R.
Campbell, Jack
Campbell, Robert E.
Campbell, Robert J.
Campbell, William N.
Camplin, Paul E.
Cannell, Donald T.
Cannon, David E.
Cannon, Leo J.
Cannon, George A. III
Cardwell, John J.
Carlson, Olef M., Jr.
Carlstrom, Richard H.
Carothers, Phillip F., Jr.
Carpenter, Arthur J.
Carr, John H.
Carr, Nevin P.
Carrier, Willis H. II
Carrington, James H., Jr.
Carson, George L.
Carter, Charles C.
Carter, James D.
Carter, Robert D.
Carterette, Robert T.
Cassell, Dean G.
Catlett, Jack C.
Cauble, Donald K.
Chadbourne, Harland A.
Chadwick, John K.
Champlin, Gerald B.
Charest, Alexis N.
Charest, Philip G.
Chase, Edgar M.
Chase, Warren A.
Check, Robert T.
Chesley, James F.
Chewning, Robert W.
Chisum, Albert, Jr.
Christensen, Eugene J.
Christensen, Raymond J.
Cirbus, Dominic E.
Clark, Charles R.
Clark, David P.
Clark, Edwin B.
Clark, Lynn R.
Clark, Richard G.
Clarkin, James J.
Clements, Billy R.
Clinton, Thomas G.
Coe, David C., Jr.
Cole, Edgar E.
Cole, William S., Jr.
Coleman, James O.
Colgan, John G.
Collier, Larry D.
Collins, Philip K.
Conolly, Robert D.
Conrad, Charles, Jr.
Conrad, Peter C.
Converse, Douglas
Coogan, John M.
Coogan, Richard D.
Cook, Vernon H., Jr.
Cooke, Donald L.
Cooley, Arthur W.
Corbett, Eugene A.
Corbin, Malcolm R., Jr.
Corboy, Michael R.
Cornell, Arthur F.
Coskey, Kenneth L.
Coughlin, Paul G.
Cour, Edward E.
Crader, Clifford L.
Craig, Earl C.
Cramton, Philip B.
Crane, Leonard B., Jr.
Crater, Ray F.
Crepeau, George A.
Cricchi, John V.
Crinklaw, Douglas L.
Crook, Richard W.
Cross, Charles H.
Cross, Lorin R.
Crouch, Michael B.
Cruden, David S.
Crum, Paul M.
Cuccias, Leo P.
Culver, Eugene A.
Cunningham, Edward F.
Curl, Kent W.
Curtis, Fayne E.
Dally, David F.
Dalton, Richard V.
Daly, Harry P., Jr.
Daly, Richard G.
Daniels, James M.
Davidson, Robert P.
Davis, Bill N.
Davis, John B.
Davis, Michael C.
Davis, Robert C., Jr.
Davis, Walter J.
Davison, John W., Jr.
Deal, Walter C., Jr.

Dearborn, Richard E.
Dearman, Kermit E.
Debit, Dion G. B.
DeHart, William
DeLamar, Dean O.
Delaney, William E.
DeMartini, Edward J.
Denman, Charles C., Jr.
Derby, Arthur E., Jr.
deSaulles, George A.
Devereaux, John R., Jr.
Dickman, Jerry A.
Dickson, William T.
Dierdorff, Loren M.
Diesel, Charles N.
DiGiacomo, Joseph G.
Dillard, Marvin B.
DiNola, Michael J.
Dixon, Edward R.
Dixon, Norval W., Jr.
Dixon, Osmund W., Jr.
Dodds, Robert M.
Doelling, Robert D.
Dolan, John G.
Dolan, William R.
Donahue, Paul F.
Donaldson, Robert J.
Donaldson, Robert S.
Donnelly, Robert G.
Donovan, Daniel D., Jr.
Dooley, Bobby J.
Douglas, Lee W.
Douglass, James G., Jr.
Dowds, Donald H.
Dowe, William J., Jr.
Doyle, Ingell H.
Dozier, Charles D.
Drago, Anthony J., Jr.
Drain, John F.
Draper, Frazier
Drew, Russell C.
Dubino, Andrew D.
Dudley, Paul L., Jr.
Duffy, Bernard A.
Duffy, Paul G.
Duhrkopf, Don J.
Duke, Bobby G.
Duke, Marshal D., Jr.
Dunaway, John A., Jr.
Dunbar, Vance O.
Dunkin, Ray L.
Dunn, Charles B.
Durbin, Peter
Dwyer, George M.
Eckhart, Franklin F.
Ecklund, Glenn L.
Eddy, Denver D.
Eddy, John A.
Edwards, Jerry J.
Eibert, Don C.
Elliott, Orville G.
Ellis, David E.
Ellis, Donald F.
Ellis, John H., Jr.
Elmore, John F., Jr.
Elster, James M.
Emmerling, Henry C., Jr.
Endlich, John
English, Edward V.
Evans, Boyce D.
Evans, Ralph M.
Evans, Robert C.
Everts, Ronald J.
Ezzell, Leon J.
Fagan, Donald F.
Fahlstedt, Barry R.
Falconer, Alastair S.
Farber, Karl H.
Fawcett, Craig R.
Fead, Louis M.
Feeney, Richard L.
Fehl, Frederick C., Jr.
Feller, Allan C.
Fellowes, Frederick G., Jr.
Fellows, Charles D.
Felt, Donald L.
Feltham, John C., Jr.
Ferguson, Albert E.
Ferguson, William W.
Fergusson, Ernest W.
Fette, Estal J.
Field, Harford, Jr.
Fischbein, Ernest
Fischer, David H.
Fisher, John C.
Fitzgerald, Thomas W.
Fitzgerald, David
Fitzpatrick, Edward C.
Fleming, Raymond T., Jr.
Flood, Francis A., Jr.
Florance, John E., Jr.
Flynn, Francis P.
Flynn, Michael D.
Foley, Edmund F.
Foley, John E.
Font, Carlos G.
Fossum, Paul G.
Fox, Charles W., Jr.
Frank, Benjamin L.
Fraser, George K., Jr.
Fraser, Robert E.
Frederick, Donald R. A
French, Fred H.
Frick, Joseph F.
Friedel, Gordon W.
Frier, John M., Jr.
Friesen, Floyd A.
Frost, John F. III
Fudge, David A.
Furey, Laurence T.
Furgerson, John A.
Furmanski, John A.
Gallagher, Hugh L.
Gallagher, Robert
Gallup, Shelley P.
Galvin, Bernard J.
Gandy, John D.
Gantt, Richard G.
Gardner, Harvey E.
Gardner, Louis J.
Garnett, Walter W.
Gehman, Robert S.
Gibbs, Charles E. J.
Gildea, Joseph A.
Gillette, Halbert G.
Gilmore, Arthur H.
Glazier, Alvin S.
Godek, John
Godfrey, Forrest J.
Goldner, Robert R.
Goldsmith, Watson W.
Goodreau, Robert W.
Goodrich, John R.
Goodwin, William D.
Gordon, Bruce J.
Gordon, Ralph L.
Gordon, Richard F., Jr.
Gowing, Richard M.
Gradel, Robert
Graf, Frederic A., Jr.
Grahlert, Walter H.
Graveson, George L., Jr.
Greeley, Michael T.
Green, Harry J.
Green, Thomas B.
Greer, Marvin S., Jr.
Greer, Wayne C.
Gregory, George B.
Griggs, Norman E.
Grinstead, William C., Jr.
Groenert, Frederick E.
Groff, Peter F.
Gross, Arthur J.
Gruber, Robert A.
Gunning, Patrick J.
Gurnsey, Ronald A.
Hackney, Benjamin F. III
Hackney, Thomas M.
Haggquist, Grant F., Jr.
Hahn, Frederick, Jr.
Haig, Robert B.
Haley, Robert J.
Hall, Donald F.
Hall, James N.
Hall, John P.
Hall, Philip L.
Hall, William C.
Halsey, Charles H., Jr.
Halverson, Richard K.
Hamilton, Glenn D.
Hamm, Clement D., Jr.
Handford, Richard C.
Hanegan, Ralph E.
Hangartner, Lyle G.
Hansen, Rodney V.
Hanson, Albertlea
Harney, Russell F.
Harris, Frank B.
Harris, James W.
Harris, Richard A.
Harris, Robert K.
Harrison, Donald K.
Harvey, Charles O.
Harwood, John B.
Harwood, Lewis D.
Haskin, Robert E.
Hatch, Harold G.
Hatcher, Robert E., Jr.
Hatfield, William R.
Hawk, Arthur L.
Hayes, Albert M., Jr.
Hayes, Jerome B.
Hays, Estel W.
Head, William N.
Headland, Carl B.
Hebbard, LeRoy B., Jr.
Heise, Paul R.
Helgeson, Harry E., Jr.
Helmandollar, Allen W.
Helvey, Julius L. II
Hempel, Robert E. III
Henderson, Nathan S. J.
Hendrick, David R.
Henley, John R.
Henson, John M.
Herkner, Richard T.
Herring, "E" Belmont
Herriott, Donald M.
Higginbotham, Allen B.
Higgins, Hugh W.
Higgins, Thomas G.
Hill, Earl E., Jr.
Hill, James J.
Hill, John H.
Hill, Marshall E.
Hiller, Melvin L.
Hincks, Herbert A.
Hines, John C.
Hinman, Albert H.
Hobgood, Ray A.
Hoch, John E., Jr.
Hocking, James R.
Hodges, George P., Jr.
Hodges, James W., Jr.
Hodson, Theodore L., Jr.
Hoffman, Harley E.
Hoffman, Robert B.
Hogan, Walter V.
Holcomb, Gordon B.
Holcomb, "M" Staser
Holian, James J.
Holland, Elbert R.
Holland, William A.
Hollen, Frederick M.
Hollenbeck, Gerald R.
Holley, Melvin M., Jr.
Holt, Ivey B., Jr.
Holt, John J.
Holt, Kenneth N.
Hoover, John S.
Hope, Edgar G., Jr.
Hopkins, David F.
Hopkins, Daniel J.
Horton, Robert L.
Hostettler, Stephen J.
House, Edward C.
Houston, Albert W.
Howard, Albert W., Jr.
Howell, Harry E.
Hoyt, Richard L.
Hozey, Ira D., Jr.
Hubal, Augustine E., Jr.
Hubbell, Walter, B.
Huber, John J., Jr.
Hudson, Roland W.
Huffman, Malcolm L.
Huffman, Sam H., Jr.
Hughes, Kenneth P.
Hukill, Henry D., Jr.
Hullryde, Donald
Humphreys, Felton M., Jr.
Hunzeker, Myron E.
Hurd, John B.
Hurley, Robert J.
Hurt, Thomas W.
Hussey, Clifton M.
Hutchinson, Kenneth F.
Inskeep, William F.
Irving, Leo H.
Jacobs, Edward J.
James, Joe M.
James, Joel L., Jr.
Jamison, Billy D.
Jaynes, Jack K.
Jefferis, Allen S.
Jenkins, Folsom
Jenkins, James R., Jr.
Johnson, Allen L.
Johnson, Arne C.
Johnson, Clarence A. E., Jr.
Johnson, Eldon D.
Johnson, Henry C., Jr.
Johnson, William R.
Johnston, John M.
Johnston, James I.
Jones, Alfred L., Jr.
Jones, Arthur L., Jr.
Jones, Donald S.
Jones, "T" Embury, Jr.
Jones, Thomas W., Jr.
Jordan, James S.
Joyce, Bernard K.
Judd, Roy L.
Kaai, Samuel W.
Kaiser, Dean E.
Kane, Paul E.
Karcher, Robert K.
Kassel, Robert H.
Kattmann, Roger H.
Kauderer, Bernard M.
Kaye, Michael C.
Keefe, Jerome M.
Keester, Louis J.
Kehoe, Thomas J., Jr.
Keimig, Allen D., Jr.
Kelley, Alfred G., Jr.
Kelley, Roy A.
Kendrick, William O.
Kennedy, William E.
Kern, Robert A.
Ketzner, Harry T.
Kiddle, Bradley D.
Killian, Donald J.
King, John E., Jr.
Klee, Robert E.
Kloepping, Herbert E.
Knapp, William R.
Knight, Robert H.
Knipp, Walter J.
Kniss, Donovan E.
Knoerr, Don H.
Knotts, Philip L.
Koch, Donald F.
Koch, James R.
Koci, Vaclav H.
Koenig, Edgar F.
Kotick, Robert E.
Kowalski, Robert J.
Kratz, Marshall L.
Kretzschmann, Curt H.
Krochmal, Alfred F.
Kruse, Charles H., Jr.
Krusi, Peter H.
Kucyk, Peter M.
Kuffel, Robert W.
Kunstmann, Clarence M.
Kurth, Donald A.
Kutzleb, Robert E.
LaBarre, Richard E.
Lafferty, Jerry D.
Lage, Robert L.
Laib, Ernest E., Jr.
Lake, Walter W.
LaLonde, William F.
Lammers, Francis E., Jr.
Langer, Donald A.
Lanier, Robert J.
Lanphear, Roy E.
Lardis, Christopher S.
Larrew, Marvin F.
Larsen, John H.
Larson, Howard J.
Lashbrook, Durwood E.
Latham, William B.
Laughlin, Gerald F., Jr.
Lawler, Frederick W.
Lawler, William A.
Lawrence, Donald S.
Leavitt, Horace M., Jr.
Ledbetter, Reid
Leenerts, Rolland E.
Leicht, Joseph, III
Lemmon, Virgil J.
Lenihan, Edward L., Jr.
Lent, Willis A., Jr.
Lepper, James R.
Levey, Sanford N.
Libby, Charles D.
Lichlyter, Stanford E.
Lina, Robert A.
Lindsay, Robert B.
Lipford, Charles E.
Litwin, William S.
Lloyd, Theodore L., Jr.
Locke, Barrie B.
Logan, Joseph B.
Lohr, Chester H.
Low, Frederick M.
Lowry, George C.
Lucas, Milton A.
Luthin, Richard B.
Lyman, John S., Jr.
Lynch, William A.
Lyon, Peter W.
MacGregor, John
MacIntyre, Donald
Mahony, Wilbur J.
Malone, Thomas L., Jr.
Manion, James H.
Margeson, Alan J.
Markham, Lewis M. III
Markley, Edward K.
Marsh, William C.
Marshall, Lawrence J.
Marshall, Richard M. III
Martin, Charles W., Jr.
Martin, Charles W., Jr.
Martin, Frank L., Jr.
Martin, Robert C.
Maser, Walther G.
Mason, Sidney F.
Mason, Wesley R.
Matais, George R.
Matheson, Eugene C.
Mathews, Bobby D.
Mathews, Donald W.
Matteson, Max R.
Matthews, William B., Jr.
Mattison, Ralph M.
Mauldin, Richard A.
Mauthe, Benjamin C.
Maxim, Rodney E.
Maxwell, Philip H.
May, Charles T., Jr.
Mayberry, Thomas A., Jr.
Mays, Clayton P.
McAllaster, Archie F.
McCanna, Marvin G., Jr.
McCarty, Charles M.
McComb, Robert B.
McCormick, Daniel G.
McCoy, John F.
McCrane, Brian P.
McCullen, John G., Jr.
McCurdy, William E., Jr.
McDaniel, Johnny B.
McDonald, Clovis K.
McGovern, Joseph J.
McGreevy, Walter J., Jr.
McKee, Jack V.
McKenna, Patrick
McLaughlin, Bernard R.
McNaughton, James M.
McQuesten, John T., Jr.
McVay, Donald H., Jr.
Meacham, Arthur J.
Mead, George R.
Meador, William A.
Melton, Edward C., Jr.
Mercer, Donald M.
Meredith, Stuart T.
Merget, Andrew G.
Meyer, William C., Jr.
Mhoon, John E.
Middleton, Charles O. III
Milani, Louis F.
Milano, Vito R.
Millard, Grant A.
Miller, Curtis W., Jr.
Miller, Donald M.
Miller, Evan K.
Miller, Floyd H., Jr.
Miller, Grant W.
Miller, Joseph J., Jr.
Miller, William V., Jr.
Mills, James R.
Mills, Merle E.
Mirman, Joseph E.
Mitchell, Carroll K.
Mitchell, Howard C.
Mitchell, Jerry L.
Mittell, David P.
Mock, Roy L.
Monroe, William D. III
Moonan, Raymond L.
Mooney, John B., Jr.
Moore, Carlton H., Jr.
Moore, Clarence E.
Moore, Milton W., Jr.
Moore, Rufus J.
Moran, Thomas M.
Moreau, Arthur S., Jr.
Morelli, Frank P.
Morgan, James D.
Morgan, Joseph R.
Moriarty, Edwin S.
Morris, Robert D.
Morrison, John H., Jr.
Morse, Edward A.
Moss, Irvin R.
Moulton, Daniel B.
Mowery, Dale H.
Muench, Gerald W.
Muka, Joseph A., Jr.
Mullender, Thomas J., Jr.
Mumford, Charles E.
Murdoch, Alan G.
Murphy, Elbridge F., Jr.
Murphy, Gordon F.
Murtagh, Thomas J.
Musorrafiti, Francesco A.
Naylor, Frankie L.
Nelson, George E., Jr.
Nelson, Keith
Nelson, Teddy N.
Nesbitt, Harry J.
Nevarez, Antonio
Neville, Paul E.

Nielsen, Donald E.
Nolan, Richard W.
Nomady, Verne G.
Norby, Merlin R.
Nord, James R.
Nordhill, Claude
North, Robert R.
Northrop, Robert E.
Nuss, Charles R.
Nutter, Andrew T. J.
Nystrom, Frederic L.
O'Connell, John D.
O'Keefe, James L., Jr.
O'Leary, John B., Jr.
Oliver, Perry S., Jr.
Olsen, Harold L.
Olson, Conrad B.
Olson, John R.
Olson, John S.
O'Rourke, Daniel, Jr.
Osborne, Charles N.
O'Shea, John A., Jr.
Ostronic, Francis J.
Owens, Robert M.
Pacia, Erwin
Padgett, Harry E.
Palmieri, John J.
Paolucci, Donald C.
Pape, William J. II
Park, Carroll W.
Park, John B.
Parker, Thomas C., Jr.
Parkes, Joe
Parr, Donald R.
Paulk, John E.
Pearlman, Samuel S.
Peckworth, Dana
Pederson, Alton A.
Perot, Henry R.
Perrey, Philip L.
Perry, David L.
Perry, James W., Jr.
Perry, Lowell E.
Personnette, Alan J.
Pertel, Joseph A.
Pestcoe, Joseph
Peters, Edward R.
Peters, William J.
Petersen, Edwin J., Jr.
Petersen, Leroy E.
Peterson, George E., Jr.
Peterson, John W.
Petrie, Roland A.
Petry, William A.
Pettit, Thomas E.
Phelps, Robert L.
Phillips, Charles A.
Phillips, John T.
Phillips, Walter M., Jr.
Piazza, John R.
Pickett, Gordon D.
Pickett, Thomas R.
Place, Allan J.
Platt, Alvin W.
Platt, Ralph E.
Ploss, John H.
Poland, James B.
Pollum, Edgar W.
Poor, Robert A.
Pope, Daniel K. IV
Pope, James F.
Porter, David N.
Porter, Jerome K.
Porter, William H.
Porterfield, Robert E.
Potter, Arthur M., Jr.
Powell, Julian B.
Prell, Raymond B.
Prentice, Paul N.
Prentiss, Dickinson
Preston, John L.
Prewett, William T.
Price, Walter P.
Prickett, Bruce L.
Priddy, Clarence L., Jr.
Prieb, Charles R.
Profilet, Clarence J.
Pugh, Richard
Purdum, William H.
Purser, Fred O., Jr.
Purvis, Ronald S.
Quirk, John T.
Quirk, William J.
Raffaele, Robert J.
Ramsey, Gayle
Ramsey, William E.
Randall, Howard F., Jr.
Randall, Howard W.
Ratcliff, Stephen D.
Rawlings, Lawrence J.
Reddick, Robert E., Jr.
Reed, Charles A.
Reeg, Frederick J.
Refiitt, Raymond E.
Reid, Jack M.
Reilly, William F.
Reith, George, Jr.
Reynolds, James H.
Rhodes, Randolph L.
Rice, Daniel W.
Rice, Harry E. III
Rich, Robert T.
Richards, Lloyd W.
Richardson, Harold M.
Rieken, Richard G.
Rigdon, Roland H.
Riley, Raymond T.
Rinne, Keith D.
Ritz, Merlin C.
Roach, Francis L.
Robbins, Noel
Roberson, George D.
Roberts, Lytle C. III
Robinson, William A.
Robson, Harry E.
Rodgers, James B.
Rodgers, James R.
Roe, Charles W.
Roepke, John R.
Rogers, Charles E., Jr
Rogers, Ralph E.
Rogers, Warren F.
Roland, Gerald K.
Ross, William T., Jr.
Rubb, Milton R.
Ruch, Martin, Jr.
Ruddick, George R., Jr.
Rudolph, Francis A., Jr.
Rusch, John M.
Russell, Charles T.
Rutzler, Joseph A.
Ryan, James A., Jr.
Ryan, William A.
Sanders, Ben T.
Sanks, David R. III
Sargent, Richard E.
Sassano, John P.
Sawyer, Charlie H.
Schaaf, Thomas W.
Schafer, Edward D., Jr.
Schaller, Robert A.
Schasteen, James C.
Schermerhorn, James R.
Schmid, Herbert H.
Schmidt, Walter P.
Schmitz, Richard J.
Schulte, Jean H.
Schultz, Eugene D.
Schuster, Dale G.
Schweitzer, Robert J.
Scott, Edward T.
Scott, Kenneth M.
Scott, Norman H.
Sebring, Leland H.
Seeba, Herman A.
Seeger, Charles R.
Seitz, Richard L.
Selz, George O.
Seward, John K.
Seymour, Conrad L.
Seymour, Ernest R.
Shakespeare, Franklin B.
Shappell, John R.
Sharrah, Ronald L.
Shaw, John H.
Shay, Fred L.
Sheeley, Elmer E., Jr.
Sheets, Jean P.
Shilling, John D.
Shirley, William B.
Shoopman, Bertram H., Jr.
Showalter, Louis R., Jr.
Shrewsbury, Lawrence H., II
Shropshire, Edwin D., Jr.
Shuck, Thomas L.
Shughrou, John J., Jr.
Sima, Frederick F., Jr.
Simmons, Arlis J.
Simmons, Clayton M.
Simmons, Reginald C.
Simpkins, George C.
Skelton, Stuart A.
Skerrett, Robert J.
Skillman, Charles F.
Skolnick, Alfred
Skomsky, Louis J.
Sladky, James A.
Slater, Donald L.
Slyfield, Frederick J.
Smiley, Charles B.
Smiley, Douglas I.
Smith, Alfred A.
Smith, Delvin W., Jr.
Smith, Donald B.
Smith, Frederick D., Jr.
Smith, George L.
Smith, James T.
Smith, Joseph C.
Smith, Morgan H.
Smith, Norman A.
Smith, Thomas J.
Smith, William L.
Smith, William L.
Smithberger, Thomas J.
Smitter, Clarence H.
Snee, John J.
Snelgrove, Edward R.
Snively, Abram B., III
Snouse, William H.
Snuffin, Jerry A.
Snyder, Aaron W. S.
Snyder, Herman L., Jr.
Snyder, Ned C.
Sokol, John
Solan, Thomas V.
Sonnenburg, Paul N.
Sonniksen, Ronald G.
Southerland, Thomas C., Jr.
Spar, Edwin F.
Speelman, Thomas W.
Spencer, Roy S., Jr.
Spicer, Oscar F.
Spiegler, Felix R.
Spiller, Fraser W.
Spohr, Carl J., Jr.
Stafford, Frank R.
Stafford, Kenneth B.
Stallings, Clyde, Jr.
Starcher Charles W., Jr.
Starnes, Billy G.
Stead, Kenneth A., Jr.
Steinke, Harris E.
Stevens, James P.
Stewart, David H.
Stillwell, Robert L., Jr.
Stoner, John W., Jr.
Storm, Richard E.
Strange, William M.
Strasheim, Don N.
Strawn, James H.
Stride, William F. A., Jr.
Strohecker, Franklin M.
Strong, Dean L.
Struven, Robert L.
Studebaker, Clayton A.
Stuntz, John R.
Sturgeon, William J. III
Sullivan, William W.
Sutherland, Doyle L.
Sykes, Lewis B.
Talbot, Frank R., Jr.
Talbot, James R., Jr.
Tall, Charles H. III
Tally, Billy F.
Tarlton, Joe E.
Tarpley, William A.
Tavis, Lee A.
Taylor, Edmund B., Jr.
Taylor, Reeves R.
Taylor, Thomas H.
Templeman, William E.
Terry, Daniel G. W.
Thies, Walter L.
Thole, Charles P.
Thomas, Clifford C., Jr.
Thomas, Don W.
Thomas, Earl G.
Thomas, Frederic J.
Thomas, George R.
Thomas, John C.
Thomas, John D.
Thompson, William M.
Throop, James R.
Thweatt, Freddie J.
Toadvine, Stephen P. III
Toland, Hugh J. C., Jr.
Tolman, Milton H.
Tomlinson, Alva C.
Tortora, Anthony M.
Trammell, Webb D.
Traweek, Billy B.
Trawick, Charles V.
Treat, Richard A.
Trost, Carlisle A. H.
Truax, Evan C.
Trueblood, William E.
Tuttle, George S.
Tuttle, John R.
Umberger, Robert C.
Upshaw, Donald E.
Vahlkamp, Eugene W.
Vail, Joseph L.
Van Allsburg, Donald E.
Van derGoore, Jacob L.
Vanhoof, Eugene R.
VanWestendorp, Steven
Varner, Duane L.
Vaughan, Edgar III
Velazquez - Suarez, Francisco A.
Vining, Albert D., Jr.
Visnich, Sam
Voelker, Donald C.
Vosseller, John H.
Voyer, Irving L., Jr.
Wachtel, Joseph J.
Wagner, David F.
Waldorf, Daniel M.
Walker, Charles S.
Walker, Harold E., Jr.
Walker, James B., Jr.
Walker, Peter R.
Walker, Wilmer E.
Wall, Joseph E.
Wall, Richard H.
Wallace, Thomas M.
Walling, Eugene K.
Wallner, Michael P.
Walshe, Edward C., Jr.
Walters, Harold L., Jr.
Walters, Isaac J. III
Ward, Gene P.
Ward, Hugh W., Jr.
Ward, Robert B.
Warren, James W., Jr.
Warren, Thomas C.
Waters, George H.
Watson, Lawrence H., Jr.
Weaver, Jerold Q.
Weaver, John H.
Webb, James I.
Webster, James M.
Weddington, George L., Jr.
Wehrman, Philip W.
Wellings, John F.
Wells, Don V.
Wells, Walter H., Jr.
Westmoreland, Ralph M.
Wetrich, Charles R.
Wheeler, James B.
Whitcomb, Richard A.
White, Charles E.
White, Donald C.
White, Frank L.
Whittier, James F.
Will, Otto W.
Willenbrink, James F.
Willever, Edward L.
Willhauck, Marion
Williams, David W.
Williams, James B.
Williams, Louis A., Jr.
Williams, Ralph T.
Williamson, James, Jr.
Williamson, Harry H., Jr.
Willis, Jack R.
Wilner, Jack D.
Wilson, Glenn A.
Wilson, Harry A.
Wilson, Jack L.
Wilson, James A., Jr.
Wilson, James G.
Wilson, Richard V., Jr.
Wilson, Vaughn E., Jr.
Wilson, William F.
Winfield, Gordon T., Jr.
Winfree, Herman D., Jr.
Wisdom, Robert W.
Wise, Peyton R. II
Wise, Richard S.
Witcher, John R.
Withrow, John E., Jr.
Wittrock, Henry L.
Wolff, William F.
Wolke, Victor B. C.
Wong, Raymond W. C.
Wood, Edgar K., Jr.
Wood, John P.
Woodall, Franklin T., Jr.
Woodberry, Earle B.
Woodburn, Craig E.
Woods, Robert C.
Workman, Harry E.
Worth, Edward R.
Wray, Walter D., Jr.
Wright, Charles H., Jr.
Wright, James D.
Wright, Kenneth L., Jr.
Wright, Richard T.
Wright, William F., Jr.
Wright, William W.
Yanaros, John O.
Yeager, Donald R.
Young, Alfred A. III
Young, David B., Jr.
Young, Joseph A.
Youngjohns, Richard P.
Youse, James A.
Zahn, Raymond C.
Zebrowski, Joseph P.
Zirps, Christos
Barrett, Patricia F.
Bradley, Nancy M.
Campbell, Jean L.
Carter, Joanne G.
Coleman, Rose E.
Dickey, Barbara J.
Dunham, Dixie L.
Matthes, Maureen D.
Erhart, Dorothy L.
Gilbert, Amarette H.
Hartington, Pauline M.
Higgins, Sarah P.
Hilyard, Effie J.
Kearney, Carolyn E.
Kunce, Genevieve D.
Lewis, Nancy A.
Lotspeich, Mary J.
Masback, Margery E.
Mogge, Marjorie H.
Radyx, Sylvia G.
Shapland, Georgia L.
Smith, Cecily J.
Swing, Eleanor S.
Vradenburg, Joanne P.
Watkins, Joann E.
Wilson, Lois J.
Young, Sue E.

SUPPLY CORPS

Almen, Richard E.
Badger, George R.
Bailey, Donald P.
Boyer, Charles L.
Brain, George W.
Brainard, John W.
Bruyneel, Louis K.
Bryant, Robert K.
Canon, Roscoe H., Jr.
Christopher, Robert N.
Coleman, Ernest B.
Corn, James R.
Curtis, Richard E.
Dempster, Darrell D.
Donzell, Richard J.
Ebert, Scott W.
Fishback, Burney L., Jr.
Freese, Ralph F.
Frost, Shirley D.
Gilmore, Roger W.
Gilpen, Franklin M.
Girod, Roy O.
Govan, David M.
Greenwood, Joseph L., Jr.
Gunther, Roy W.
Hemmert, George V.
Hodges, William J.
Hoffner, Carleton C., Jr.
Hohenstein, Charles R.
Jernigan, Joseph W.
Johnson, Richard L.
Jones, Glenn
Jones, Horace B., Jr.
Jordan, Alva F., Jr.
King, Braxton R.
Kispert, Lane A.
Kollios, Achilleas E.
Kuhlmann, Dietrich H.
Larson, Nelson S.
Lathrop, Charles F.
Lemly, William D.
Lenderman, James L.
Lenz, Allen J.
Livermore, Robert E.
Lovell, Donald E.
Malone, Joseph L., Jr.
Massie, Samuel P.
McCandless, Claude C., Jr.
McCrabb, Donald E.
McGee, James E.
McNeill, Neil E.
Mercier, Arthur G.
Merrill, Kenneth E.
Miller, Richard K.
Morehouse, Charles W.
O'Donnell, Terrence F.
Olson, Harvey T.
Osborn, Robert H.
Pardau, Orville J.
Paulsen, Raymond E.
Paulson, Raymond L.
Ranken, John T., Jr.
Rohleder, Richard P.
Rothenberger, Donald J.
Russell, Frederick R.
Salgado, Paul R.
Sankey, Harry W.
Sawyer, Preston, Jr.
Schlaufman, Louis C.
Schucker, Robert M.
Schwenz, Richard W.
Scolpino, Frank J., Jr.
Sullivan, Joseph P.

Temte, Knute P.
Thalman, James E.
Thomas, Norman C.
Thweatt, John G., Jr.
Vanscoyoc, James S.
Wadsworth, Ben A., Jr.
Waid, Stanley B.
Weber, Robert J.
White, Frank L.
Wilczynski, Jeremiah
Williams, Raymond L.
Williams, Rex M.
Wong, Ronald M.
Woodward, Ralph C.
Woodworth, Edward T.
Woolley, Herbert T.
Avary, James L.
Collicott, Purnel L.
Davidson, William I.
Faust, Delbert L.
Merrick, Walter F.
Taylor, Bayard A., Jr.
Wood, Lee, Jr.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Agee, Aaron B.
Allen, Roy L.
Bigelow, David S.
Burns, William J., Jr.
Chourre, Jack M.
Coates, Edward E.
Cottingham, Edward L.
Crowley, Irwin D., Jr.
Deady, Ralph E.
Falk, Harvey A., Jr.
Gaulden, Roy D., Jr.
Hartell, William K.
Haycraft, William R.
Haynes, Howard H.
Hughes, Edmund C.
Huston, Robert J.
Jones, Thomas K.
Koblos, Michael C.
Kreshin, Lawrence
Lapolla, Joseph
Lewis, Frank H., Jr.
Merica, Charles A.
Mitchell, Thomas J.
Morse, James W., Jr.
O'Leary, John F.
Ormond, Jay K.
Reedy, Roger F.
Reeves, Ronald B.
Robinson, Charles F.
Shaw, Robert W., Jr.
Smith, Matthias J.
Stewart, Stanley P., Jr.
Stump, Edward J.
Trunz, Joseph P., Jr.
Tyhurst, James E.
Verdi, Stanley N.
White, Robert K.
Wiederecht, Donald A.
Wilson, Dean G.
Yoshihara, Takeshi
Blough, Loney L.
Parrish, Oscar F., Jr.
Pinch, William C.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Adams, Chauncey C., Jr.
Bailey, Jack S.
Bauerschmidt, Alan D.
Cook, Paul E.
DeGrotte, Henry C., Jr.
Diaz, Gilbert A.
Dobbs, George I.
Feith, Joseph
Furrey, William R.
George, Robert E.
Howard, Vaughn
Jones, Daniel M.
Jordan, Ray D.
Nyman, George A.
Roach, Leon M.
Roller, Billie
Rowell, Dalton A.
Smith, Bill J.
Storms, Jack R.
Turner, David H.
Wagner, Carl M.
Wetzel, Orval B.
Wimberly, Clyde O.
Livingston, Lois R.

NURSE CORPS

Mueller, Dona D.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Edward J. Thullen
Theodore J. Toben, Jr.

The following-named (Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert B. Bittner
Donald L. Macleay, Jr.

The following-named Marine Corps Reserve officers for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Albert G. Borlan
Walter R. Brown
Pasquale L. Cacace
Willard I. Crumback
John L. Driefer
Robert D. Flint
Joseph F. Golden
Jesse R. Greer
Arthur R. Hickle
Harold F. Jones
Robert P. Leslie
Robert E. Lewis
Willie L. Lowe, Jr.
Jack "L" Maxwell
Melvin W. McCoury, Jr.
William I. Morgan, Jr.
Harry L. Myers
Paul J. Pardy
Oswald V. Scott, Jr.
Robert M. Sweeney
Lester D. Widick, Jr.

The following-named Marine Corps Reserve officers for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Albert G. Borlan
Walter R. Brown
Pasquale L. Cacace
Willard I. Crumback
John L. Driefer
Robert D. Flint
Joseph F. Golden
Jesse R. Greer
Arthur R. Hickle
Harold F. Jones
Robert P. Leslie
Robert E. Lewis
Willie L. Lowe, Jr.
Jack "L" Maxwell
Melvin W. McCoury, Jr.
William I. Morgan, Jr.
Harry L. Myers
Paul J. Pardy
Oswald V. Scott, Jr.
Robert M. Sweeney
Lester D. Widick, Jr.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 6 (legislative day of June 4), 1956:

ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS

Charles J. Lowen, Jr., of Colorado, to be Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Frederick A. Seaton, of Nebraska, to be Secretary of the Interior.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 6, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who alone art acquainted with our many needs and knowest that we are not sufficient of ourselves to meet them, grant that in our walk and work during this day we may be guided by Thy infallible wisdom and guarded by Thy infinite power.

We beseech Thee to bless our President, our Speaker, and the Members of the Congress with Thy bountiful grace and prosper all the efforts that are being made to maintain our country's honor and security, health and strength.

May the hardships and adversities, which we are encountering in the great adventure of establishing peace on earth, never cause us to doubt Thy care or disturb our faith in Thee, but may we be strong and of good courage, assured that Thy divine providence will continue to protect and preserve us.

Hear us in Thy love and mercy through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3638. An act to promote the foreign policy of the United States by amending the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9720. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HILL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. THYE, Mr. MUNDT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. POTTER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10003. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill disagreed to by the House, and agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STENNIS, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BIBLE, Mr DIRKSEN, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. BEALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1026. An act for the relief of Nihat Cengiz; and

S. 1244. An act for the relief of Eva Gershbein Rubinstein.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6143) entitled "An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that for taxable years beginning after May 31, 1950, certain amounts received in consideration of the transfer of patent rights shall be considered capital gain regardless of the basis upon which such amounts are paid."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9390) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18 to the foregoing bill.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9720)

making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. FOGARTY, FERNANDEZ, LANHAM, DENTON, CANNON, TABER, HAND, and JENSEN.

KANSAS CITY, KANS., PRIME RIBS OF BEEF

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], who has a pleasant announcement to make.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker—

You have tried the rest, now taste the best: Kansas City, Kans., prime ribs of beef.

That is the first paragraph of a letter which should be on your desk and the desk of every Member of the House of Representatives. In case you have not seen it, the next paragraph, and the most important one, of the letter reads as follows:

You are invited to be my guest for the meat portion of your lunch Thursday, June 7, in the House restaurant, and enjoy a serving of Kansas City, Kans., prime ribs of beef. This taste treat is made possible through the courtesy and cooperation of the Kansas City, Kans., plant of Armour & Co., a recovered flood victim, the Kansas City (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce and a group of friends.

Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out in my invitation, you have had Wisconsin cheese, Indiana tomato juice, Idaho and Maine potatoes, Texas onions, California and Florida orange juice, Georgia watermelon, Virginia peanuts, and last, but by no means the least delectable, fish-sticks from Gloucester, Mass. They were all good. I trust you will find that this Kansas City, Kans., prime ribs of beef is the best yet.

I feel quite sure good beef is one subject that Republicans and Democrats alike will agree on, and I will be delighted to have you as my guests tomorrow.

FOREIGN AID BILL

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have some remarks I wish to make about the bill which we take up in the House today, the foreign aid bill.

From the very beginning I have questioned the wisdom of trying to buy the friendship of other nations. Nevertheless, I was willing to give it a trial. I voted for this program with serious misgivings during my first term here in Congress. I am now convinced that history has shown that my doubts were fully justified. The time has long passed when there is any justification for burdening American taxpayers with economic aid for nations all over the face of the earth, and I have for a long time been voting to eliminate this burden. We have even given a half billion dollars to Communist Yugoslavia, over my protest, and $52 billion of our $27 billion national debt represents money we have given to foreign nations since the end of World War II.

It is alarming to me that we are blindly pursuing a course that is contrary to the fundamental principles on which this country was founded. A wise man may make a mistake. Only a fool refuses to recognize that he has made one.

We have spent billions on various forms of foreign aid. Today we have fewer friends than we had at the start. It is admitted that we are slipping from international leadership in many ways. I think it is high time that we stop and reconsider. We must do that before we lose all of our friends.

I said that our present course in international relations is opposed to the fundamentals upon which our Nation is built and I repeat it. We built a nation on the integrity and effort of the individual. We are proud of the fact that basically we are an honest, God-fearing, business-like people. It seems to me that we are forgetting these principles in our use of dollar diplomacy.

You cannot buy true friendship nor does any decent, self-respecting person like to be put on charity. Yet that is exactly what we are trying to do to all of our allies and friends. We are trying to make them wards of our charity. We are trying to put them on the dole and expect them to like it. They want our respect not our charity.

We state that our aid has stopped communism in many countries. We brag, openly for all to hear, that we have been able to buy elections in other nations. Have we forgotten that buying elections is a crime in this country? Do we have two sets of morals, one for us and one for the rest of the world? It would seem so.

Of course, others want our money. But they resent being made wards of an international charity. What decent, self-respecting nation would not?

We have been running a multibillion-dollar giveaway program, an international WPA program. Those initials mean it "Won't Produce Anything."

I am opposed to what we are now doing. I am opposed to the way we are doing it and the results we are getting. It does not make sense to me to spend money to get what you do not want. I think a good title for this measure would be a bill to spend money and lose friends.

I do not quarrel with what is supposed to be the intent of this measure, but I am violently opposed to the method. We can accomplish the intent—to increase world markets and make friends. We can do that without sacrificing any of our American ideals. But first of all, we must start treating all the nations as nations, not as wards of our charity or as corrupt political machines to be bought with our dollars.

This entire program can be handled as a business venture. We can introduce good, sound, American business practices into it and make friends instead of losing them.

First of all, we should say to each nation, we need certain raw materials and you need help to develop your resources. We will help you develop your resources as an investment. In return we expect, through trade arrangements and payments, to get our money back, plus a reasonable rate of interest. That is no more nor less than sound business. It would also remove the stigma of the dole. In other words, we would treat them as partners in a business venture. Both sides would be expected to profit directly, just as we do in this country.

We could then say, if you need any technical advice or assistance we can help you arrange for it at cost. Such help would be limited to the needs of the country and its ability to finance the project. This could be handled just as a management or industrial engineering firm assists private industry in this country.

I recognize that this would call for an about-face in our international diplomacy. I realize that it means practicing abroad what we preach at home. I firmly believe that if we did so we would gain respect in the eyes of the world. We would do so because we would be doing unto others as we do unto ourselves.

If such an approach were taken I would gladly lend my support. But it is long past the time to put an end to the bungling method we have been pursuing, of scattering taxpayers' money to every corner of the world while losing friends all the time.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE LATE WILLIAM E. LEAHY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of William E. Leahy is felt with deep regret by his many friends. One of the ablest lawyers of the country, Bill Leahy devoted his unusual talents for the benefit of country and mankind. He was a great American.

His activity in civic affairs and charitable activities were known to all. His charming personality endeared him to all who knew him.

Bill Leahy was a man of deep faith. He loved and served God and country.

He was a devout communicant of the Catholic church.

An active practicing attorney for 42 years as prosecutor and as defense attorney, Bill Leahy was recognized by the bench and the bar as one of the outstanding lawyers of our country. His profound knowledge of law, his great ability in examination of witnesses, particularly in the important field of cross-examination, coupled with his eloquence in argument to court or jury and his keen analytical mind and charming personality—qualities very seldom possessed by one man—earned for him his preeminence as a lawyer. As has well been said, "His arguments to juries were considered masterpieces of oration."

I first met Bill Leahy shortly after I first came to Congress 28 years ago. A friendship blossomed at our first meeting which strengthened as the years passed. I valued his friendship very much.

Bill Leahy was always willing to do a favor for a friend, to help the sick, the afflicted, the unfortunate. Bill was loyal to his friends. He was a man of charity.

The death of Bill Leahy takes from the city of Washington one of its outstanding citizens. His death leaves to his friends a gap that will never be filled.

I shall miss my dear friend very much. Mrs. McCormack joins with me in extending to Mrs. Leahy and to his sisters and other loved ones our deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may desire to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD following my remarks in relation to the late William E. Leahy, and that other Members may have 5 legislative days to do the same thing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 515) providing for the consideration of H. R. 11356, a bill to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one day, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 57]

Barrett	Harden	Patman
Bell	Herlong	Philbin
Berry	Heselton	Pillion
Bolling	Hillings	Polk
Brooks, La.	Holifield	Powell
Brownson	Holt	Prouty
Burnside	Jackson	Reed, N. Y.
Davis, Wis.	Johansen, Mich.	Scherer
Dawson, Ill.	Jones, Mo.	Seely-Brown
Deane	Kearney	Shelley
Diggs	Kelley, Pa.	Sheppard
Donovan	Kilburn	Sieminski
Dowdy	Krueger	Sikes
Doyle	Lane	Simpson, Pa.
Durham	McCarthy	Steed
Eberharter	McConnell	Taber
Frazier	Magnuson	Thornberry
Gamble	Miller, Calif.	Utt
Gubser	Miller, N. Y.	Wharton
Gwinn	Morrison	Wilson, Calif.
Hagen	Moulder	Winstead
Hale	Nelson	
Halleck	O'Hara, Minn.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 359 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for an open rule and 1 day's debate on the bill.

H. R. 11356 authorizes an appropriation of $3,563,475,000 for foreign aid deemed essential to the security of the United States.

The authorization for military assistance, that is, weapons, equipment, and training is $1,925,000,000. The Foreign Affairs Committee reduced the President's request by $1,109,000,000. The committee expressed the view in its report that if equipment already financed from prior appropriations and now scheduled for Europe is diverted to Asia, the Near East, Africa, and Latin America, this amount is adequate to carry forth the military programs in these countries. According to the latest information available, November 30, 1955, $6,405,643,000 of undelivered military items were in the pipeline. Of this amount $3,634,303,000 of military equipment was scheduled for Europe.

The amount for defense support to those countries receiving direct military assistance, and who are financing military programs too large for their own resources to support, is $1,147,700,000. Funds are also authorized for development-assistance programs in the amount of $243 million. This amount is for loans except when funds are used to finance sales of surplus agricultural commodities. There are 3 technical-assistance programs in which the United States participates for which a total of $157,500,000 is authorized. These are mainly in the fields of agriculture, health, and sanitation and education.

Other programs covered in the bill include the President's special fund of $150 million which may be used in furtherance of the purposes of this act or any act if the President determines that such use is important to the security of the United States; another $100 million is authorized to be made available to the President to take care of unforeseen contingencies affecting the security of this country.

Funds are earmarked for financing the export and sale to foreign countries of surplus agricultural commodities. Provision is also made for the payment of ocean freight on surplus agricultural commodities and relief packages. Two million, three hundred thousand is the contribution for 18 months for the United Nations refugee fund. Seven million dollars is provided for the United States escapee program to provide care, maintenance, and resettlement assistance to anti-Communists in Europe and the Far East. The United States contribution to the United Nations Children's Fund is $10 million.

Provisions under existing law relating to the investment guaranty program are broadened. It is hoped to encourage a long-term policy that will involve private investment, thus reducing the cost to the Government.

The atoms-for-peace program is included in three different parts of the security program—the Asian nuclear center is financed from the President's fund for Asian economic development; the training of individuals in the peaceful uses of atomic energy is financed from funds for the technical cooperation program, and section 11 of the bill provides the means to assist free nations in acquiring research reactors for the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

Section 7 of the bill contains a statement of policy, that is, of continuing aid to free nations as long as danger to the peace of the world and the security of the United States persists. It is the belief of the Foreign Affairs Committee that this will give assurance to the free nations of the continued backing of the United States and, at the same time, permit the Congress to evaluate the situation each year and act accordingly.

I fully realize that the expenditure of billions of dollars in cooperating with free nations is a controversial problem and many Members of Congress, including myself, are apprehensive as to the degree and the extent that this Mutual Security program should be modified and curtailed. We have already spent billions since the shooting war stopped to help rehabilitate and reestablish the economy of nations that were bombed and annihilated during the shooting war. I am not in sympathy with those who say that most of this money was wasted. The people of the Nation realize that if this money had not been spent, the Communist dictators could easily have

all Asia, Europe, and Africa under their domination today. In fact, General Eisenhower in 1950 returned from Europe to testify before the House and Senate Foreign Relations Committees in behalf of the mutual security program. At that time, as general and leader of the European defense, he stated that the Marshall plan aid to Greece and Turkey and other expenditures and aid which had been spent since the end of the war, no doubt, saved Western Europe from capitulating to Soviet communism. I do not think it is proper to label these expenditures as gifts to foreign nations because the United States is recognized as the world leader and our future liberty and freedom depend upon curtailing the spread of world communism. The dollars that we are spending in a program of this kind is not only a contribution to the freedom of other peoples in the world, but it is an expenditure as insurance against the loss of our own freedom, liberty, and self-government.

I am very much in favor of the Members of the House giving close scrutiny and unlimited debate to different provisions of this legislation and especially the section of the bill that refers to mutual aid to Tito and Yugoslavia, considering the recent developments of the close relations and cooperation between Tito and the Kremlin. I believe the House should pass this rule without delay so that we can go into Committee of the Whole and debate and offer amendments to this legislation so as to continue a practical program of mutual security with other free nations in our program to preserve freedom for all mankind.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. As I understand it, the 10-year program insisted upon by the Administration is out of this bill. Is that correct?

Mr. MADDEN. That is my understanding.

Mr. GROSS. But substituted therefor is a statement of policy which provides that this program continue on an unlimited basis, perhaps for 20 years. Is that correct?

Mr. MADDEN. That is not my understanding. The committee reports that it can be reviewed from year to year by the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but the statement of policy has no time limitation. Is that correct?

Mr. MADDEN. The statement of policy can be reviewed from year to year by the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. A 10-year program could be reviewed from year to year by the Congress if the Congress was so disposed. One session of Congress cannot bind another.

Mr. MADDEN. It is not my understanding that it is not binding the Congress for any set period of time beyond 1 year.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not true that the statement of policy has a time limit, that is, that we are going to stick to this thing as long as the danger of international communism to our own security persists? We are not going to lie down while that danger continues. That is the limitation of time in there.

Mr. MADDEN. That is my understanding, with the Congress reviewing this program each year.

Mr. GROSS. In the light of past experience, does the gentleman think this thing will ever end?

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman would not be in a position to determine what international complications may happen in the future.

But, if we should happen to get into a war next year or in the future, it is hard to tell when that war would end and what would be the consequences as to the future of our country and the free world if such a catastrophe should hit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the House has heard the description of the bill as given by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN]. I come before the House now to urge the adoption of this rule which provides for a full day of debate on the Mutual Security Act of 1956. The committee in its report on page 2 has this rather condensed statement regarding the bill:

> The funds authorized in this bill, together with the funds already available from previous appropriations, and the changes in existing law which this bill provides should make it possible for us to meet our commitments to our allies, to help those newer governments which cannot continue to be free and independent without economic and technical assistance, and to take whatever other action may be necessary to counter new efforts by the men in the Kremlin and in Peiping to bring free nations and peoples under their domination.

Mr. Speaker, after having put in considerable time and effort to determine to my own satisfaction just what is involved specifically in this bill, I have come to the conclusion, and I believe the Members of the House will have to come to the same conclusion, that there is not enough information contained in the report on the bill or any other documents available to us to really permit a clear and careful determination in each of our own minds as to just exactly what we do when we pass this authorization bill. In other words, I think we have to take this particular legislation on faith. The foreign policy of our Nation, as we all know, is a matter for determination by the President and the executive branch. We ourselves cannot enter into a study of each and every detail of a program of this kind, and it is not our function. We are now in the process of considering the recommendations brought to us by the Chief Executive. In endeavoring to determine what those recommendations are we run into many difficulties, as I have said. I would like to know just exactly how much money is allocated to each of the separate countries under the various heads. I turn to the table on page 3 and I find, where the dollar figure should be, nothing but X's. I made inquiry as to why those figures are not given, and the response was they are considered to be classified. I then tried to find out, as some of you may have, what the relationship is between the aid incorporated in this bill and the total expenditures of other countries which we are aiding, to find out what the relation of our contribution is to their total. That is likewise classified material. The question is, Shall the recommendation of the President be approved? That is just about what it amounts to.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. MASON. Have we not for the last 11 years taken on faith the appropriations we have made for these foreign giveaway programs of something over $50 billion, and have we not been disappointed in many respects in our faith in Tito, in India, and in many of the nations to whom we have handed out these gifts?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The gentleman is correct, certainly on one point. That is that we have every year taken this entire subject on faith, just as we are required to take it on faith this year.

Mr. MASON. I am a man of little faith, and I have not taken any of it during these last 10 years.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman read from page 2 of the committee report in which it is stated that this authorization bill and subsequent appropriations is necessary to meet our commitments to our allies.

On page 11 of the same committee report I call the gentleman's attention to the following language:

> In nearly all of the countries where our troops are stationed a speaker receives hearty applause if he speaks against subservience to the United States and urges his government to follow an independent course.

In the light of that statement, I wonder what our commitment should be to our so-called allies.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. To give an answer in the way of a comment to the gentleman's question, we must all realize that you just cannot buy friendship with money from the United States Treasury. I think it is quite a misunderstanding to consider that we are expending this money for the purchase of friendship. I look upon the money authorized in this bill and the money appropriated for this purpose as being expended in intelligent self-interest.

In other words, with this money we hope to support the operation in other countries of 200 infantry divisions, 300 air wings, 2,000 naval ships, which we, I think, have a right to consider may be of help in preserving our own national security. It is this practical self-interest that motivates us, rather than any effort to buy anybody's friendship.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. peaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Now that the gentleman has mentioned the military aspect, was the Rules Committee given any information as to what has happened to 50 divisions that were supposed to be in NATO by the end of 1952? Does the gentleman think there are 50 divisions in NATO today?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I will have to say to the gentleman that the Rules Committee did not inquire into that detail. That is a matter that I think the general debate on the bill will have to reveal to the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I may say in answer to part of the question raised by the gentleman from Iowa that in a number of instances some of these indignities and insults hurled at our boys across the water have been Communist inspired and do not come from the leaders of the people of the country to which this aid is going.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I think there is no doubt about that, and those of us who have traveled abroad know that there are demonstrations of all kinds against the United States arranged by the Communists.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to discuss the merits of the legislation before us, but I think it might be quite appropriate at this time to call attention to the fact that when the final gavel falls on this session it will bring to an end an illustrious career in this House, the exceptional service rendered by the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, JIM RICHARDS, as we know him.

Recently an article appeared in the New York Times of Friday, May 18, and the writer went on to tell something about the history of JIM RICHARDS. That article is entitled "A Quiet Congressman." I call particular attention to the last paragraph:

He's just a real old down-to-earth South Carolinian who loves to hunt and fish, loves his farm, and loves his cows.

I would love to add: "And he loves his fellow man." What more can be said of any man?

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that later on at the conclusion of this session of Congress tributes will be paid to our distinguished colleague, but it seemed to me appropriate that as we get into the final phases of this, the last bill with which he will have something to do, that we call attention to the fact that he is leaving us. All the members of our committee have a high regard for him. He has so conducted the affairs of his committee that hardly at any time has there been any question of party politics. I think that is a splendid tribute to a great man, a great American, a soldier, a patriot, and a great statesman.

I call your attention to the full text of the article which I insert at this point:

[From the New York Times of May 18, 1956]

A QUIET CONGRESSMAN: JAMES PRIOLEAU RICHARDS

WASHINGTON, May 17.—The Pittsburgh Pirates lost a budding prospect for their outfield a few decades back when JAMES PRIOLEAU RICHARDS chose law over baseball.

As a result of that decision, Mr. RICHARDS now is winding up 23 years in Congress in a style that can only make the Republican administration wish he had stayed with baseball.

Today, as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Representative RICHARDS was in the vanguard of congressional forces that dealt the President's foreign-aid proposals a severe defeat. President Eisenhower, who was a pretty good pitcher at West Point, might well be wishing tonight that Mr. Richards had accepted that offer from the Pirates.

The foreign-aid action and the coming fight on the House floor will be Mr. RICHARDS' curtain bow on the congressional stage. He is quitting this year and going back to South Carolina to practice a little law, hunt, fish and tend to his cattle.

Though his position makes him one of the most important men in the House of Representatives, he remains relatively unknown compared to his compeer, Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

RICHARDS' ANGER RECALLED

The reasons for this are two:

First, Mr. RICHARDS, a persuasive southern internation nationalist of judicial training, is not given to the political grandstanding of which Washington headlines are made.

Second, the House committee never has attained the pivotal importance of the Senate group, largely because the Constitution charges the Senate with the greater responsibility for overseeing the conduct of foreign affairs.

On occasion, the administration tendency to treat the House group as a poor cousin of the George committee has moved Mr. RICHARDS to jealous defense. Last February, for example, he denounced the administration for treating the House like a "weak-minded, illegitimate son" and got an apology from the State Department.

The Capitol consensus is that the House committee has gained fresh prestige under his direction.

Mr. RICHARDS, born in Liberty Hill, S. C., in 1894, is now a robust 61 years old. He is a big man, tall and powerfully built, and his carriage still is that of the athlete. A full shock of silvery gray hair and a deep ruddy complexion round out the picture of a politician who even now would not look out of place in the role of baseball manager.

He began as a farm boy and took a year at Clemson College with the idea of mastering the agricultural sciences. At the end of the year, he was interested in law and shifted to the University of South Carolina.

By 1921, he was in practice back in Lancaster, near his home, and a year later he was launched into politics as county probate judge. He held that office until South Carolina sent him to Congress in 1933.

In World War I, he enlisted a few days after President Wilson's declaration, served in France with a trench mortar battalion and rose from private to second lieutenant.

His appointment to the Foreign Affairs Committee came in 1935. As chairman, he shares with Senator GEORGE the chief burden of congressional responsibility for this country's international affairs. The position also calls for him to share in the formulation and development of foreign policy through prior consultations with the executive branch.

The job is a full-time one and leaves little leisure for the hunting and fishing that are his favorite pastimes. He lives with his wife, Mrs. Katharine Wylie Richards, in Georgetown, and has a son and a daughter in college and another son practicing law in South Carolina.

He has not been entirely lost to farming. When he leaves Washington this summer, he will divide his time between law practice and his cotton and cattle farm at Health Springs, near Lancaster.

An old friend, summing him up today, said:

"He's just a real old down-to-earth South Carolinian who loves to hunt and fish, loves his farm and loves his cows."

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the views expressed by the gentleman from Wisconsin. As he has so well pointed out, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] has presided over the House Committee on Foreign Affairs at all times in a friendly, fair and equitable manner. We are all aware of the fact that sometimes when tensions were a little great and feeling ran somewhat high, his gentle humor in many instances relieved the tension and enabled a relaxed committee to reach proper decisions. He shall be missed by this House but his wise counsel and leadership will be long remembered. We wish him many pleasant years in his beloved South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the gentleman in his tribute to our chairman. Mr. Speaker, I confess that I come to the floor of the House at this time with a bit of a lump in my throat as I realize that Chairman DICK RICHARDS is headed for the last roundup as far as this mutual security legislation is concerned. I want to join with the gentleman from Wisconsin in the tribute he has paid and I want to commend the gentleman for bringing this up early in these proceedings today.

DICK RICHARDS is a great American and a good fellow and my very dear friend. I have fought with him toe-to-toe and shoulder-to-shoulder and I might say that I would rather be shoulder-to-shoulder with him than toe-to-toe. But wherever he stands in a fight you will find he is a fair fighter, a fast friend and a true American. I join in the tribute the gentleman has paid DICK RICHARDS.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I know what he refers to when he says he has fought toe-to-toe with him. I only hope that in this debate on the program now before us I do not become involved with the gentleman from South Carolina in such a way that he might use the old swamp owl treatment on me.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I want to join in the tribute of the gentleman from Wisconsin and the other gentlemen which has been paid to the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs who is retiring from the Congress after the present session. When the history of these difficult years that have followed World War II is written, the contribution DICK RICHARDS has made in the buildup of the strength of the free world, in the maintenance of unity in the United States, in developing this foreign policy that is so difficult a burden to carry legislatively, will rank equally with that of any other Member of either body.

A lot of tributes have been paid in the past to various Members of Congress. But DICK RICHARDS has carried a large part of this burden. He has carried it so well that he has received comparatively little attention from the press of the country. He has been like the ballplayer who makes the hard plays look easier.

Certainly when the analyses are made of the foreign policy program of any administration in power in the last few years that has been carried into effect with the cooperation of the Congress, the contribution of DICK RICHARDS will rank as the greatest of all.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Hon. JAMES P. RICHARDS, the very able chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. I have served with Mr. RICHARDS as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for the past 6 years. I feel that no one has given me a greater insight into the problems of our country and of the world than has Mr. RICHARDS. I am proud to have served with him, to have known him. He is a man of great ability, integrity, and honesty. I feel very badly that the State of South Carolina did not demand that he return to the halls of this Congress. I feel he has added much to our great institutions and that he alone is responsible for carrying us over this very difficult period in our history. However, since he has made this determination to retire, I hope that he, his wife, and family will enjoy health and happiness in the years to come.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I desire also to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman who has paid great tribute to our very beloved friend, DICK RICHARDS, of South Carolina. I wish him and his family well and every success in the future.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] is one of the outstanding Americans of this trying period. His service in this House of Representatives has been constructive and of a nature to occupy prominent pages in the history of our country when the history of this period is written, particularly when it can be written in an objective manner removed from the emotionalism of this period. I am sorry that the gentleman is voluntarily retiring from the Congress. He and I have been close personal friends for many years. He has been one of the strong chairmen of the important Committee on Foreign Affairs. Fortunately we have had great chairmen during my 28 years of service here, but none have been greater or stronger or more able than our distinguished friend from South Carolina. We shall all miss him very much, and we wish him every happiness and success for countless years to come. We hope he will come back to the House and visit us frequently in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join my colleagues in giving recognition to our highly esteemed chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]. As chairman of the Far East Study Mission last year, I first heard of the voluntary resignation of Mr. RICHARDS when the study mission was in Teheran. All members of the group were deeply moved and disappointed. We wired Mr. RICHARDS and asked him to reconsider. His reputation is known throughout the world. As we traveled on throughout the Middle East, Southeast Asia, the Far East and Western Pacific, wherever we visited, everybody expressed regret at the news of Chairman RICHARDS' decision to retire. I join with my colleagues in wishing him well for many, many years to come.

He has served the people of this State and our Nation with exceptional distinction for over two decades. His wise counsel and leadership will be sorely missed in the Halls of Congress. It is the hope of many that in the future our Nation will have the continued benefit of Mr. RICHARDS' wide experience and ability.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying a tribute of appreciation to DICK RICHARDS. I have served under Chairman RICHARDS during his entire time as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. His wisdom and forethought have given guidance and direction to the work of this great committee; not only to the committee but also to the entire House of Representatives. I wish for Chairman RICHARDS and his family the greatest happiness.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard with deep regret the decision of the Honorable JAMES P. RICHARDS, Democrat from South Carolina, to retire from the House of Representatives.

Mr. RICHARDS has served his country with exceptional skill and devotion as a Member of the House of Representatives since the 73d Congress. Early in his congressional career—the 74th Congress—he became a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and it has been my privilege to know and serve with him on that committee since the 78th Congress.

On May 15, 1951, following the death of the late Judge Kee, Mr. RICHARDS was elected chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which chair he filled with particular distinction for the remainder of the 82d Congress and again during the present Congress.

During his long tenure, Mr. RICHARDS has consistently won the admiration of Members on both sides of the table with his fairness, his firmness, his innate good sense, his leadership. We shall all miss this wonderful friend and leader.

Our beloved chairman retires from this House with the respect of all and with the best wishes for the well-being and happiness of himself and his family wherever they are and whatever they do.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity afforded me again to express my admiration, appreciation, and keen respect for the great public service rendered the Nation by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee. It has been my pleasure to know the gentleman for nearly 14 years and during that time I have observed many occasions when he has exercised that unusual quality of leadership which marks the statesman. Only last year at a time when our national affairs were being allowed to drift into the dangerous paths of believing that there was merit to the Communist proposal for peaceful coexistence, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina stood in the well of this House and delivered a stirring and moving warning on the dangers confronting our Nation as a consequence of the latest shift in tactics of the Kremlin. At that time I remarked that it took unusual courage and great dedication to duty to make such a bold and forthright analysis of the effort being made to manipulate our national affairs so as to make impossible any real opposition against the Communist propaganda and political offensive. We Members of the House have seen many other occasions when the able Chairman rose up to meet issues having a critical bearing on the future security and welfare of our Nation. To-

day he has again demonstrated that his first consideration is the national interest and that he allows no part for partisan consideration on questions that have to do with the security and welfare of the American people.

We will sorely miss this high quality of leadership in future sessions of Congress, but we will never forget our good friend and colleague and the high standard he has set for those who will follow in his footsteps. I join with my colleagues in wishing our esteemed colleague every happiness in the future.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by you to all Members to extend our remarks in the body of the RECORD following the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] I shall make a few on comments concerning the distinguished chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

In the House the word "distinguished" is referred to many Members rather loosely. However in the reference to JAMES P. RICHARDS, the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, considering the position he occupies and the contributions he has made in the field of foreign affairs, "distinguished" is the only word that properly applies to the gentleman.

I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. RICHARDS shortly after I became a Member of the House. I listened to what he had to say with much interest and respect. Here was a man who after mature deliberation, after hearings in his committee, was willing to speak his mind and tell the House what his conclusions or recommendations were. From others, especially one Member who is now deceased, I was told that "RICHARDS is courageous, honest, and reliable. You can count on what he says as being his real convictions." I think it is fair to state who this Member was as I feel certain that Mr. RICHARDS must have known the high regard the man had for him. That Member was Karl Stefan, of Nebraska, who was the subcommittee chairman of the Appropriations Committee that considered the needs of the State Department and made the appropriations therefor, after its recommendations had been approved by the Appropriations Committee.

Then later I came to know Mr. RICHARDS because my daughter married a fine young man who lived in the city of Lancaster, where Mr. RICHARDS and his fine son had their law office.

It is unfortunate that after all this comment on Mr. RICHARDS that I should differ with him slightly concerning his stand on the bill before us. This is because I have so much faith in what President Eisenhower wants to do that I simply cannot deny his request. He undoubtedly has a wider view of this problem than the distinguished chairman of the committee. Also, what he suggests sounds so reasonable to me that I think we should give him what he has requested, with one reservation. If an amendment is offered to delete from the President's requests or suggestions any amount for Tito of Jugoslavia I feel I must vote for such a minor amendment.

The distinguished chairman has been a distinct success in every field of human endeavor in which he has participated. As a husband, as a father, as a friend, as a legislator, and as a committee chairman he has been tops.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I support the adoption of this rule only because it should prove interesting to hear those who profess so much concern for the American taxpayer try to justify a continuation of this multi-billion-dollar giveaway program.

It will also be interesting to note who among the leaders of Congress, regardless of political complexion, who trooped to the White House last evening, will come into the well of the House today and tomorrow and attempt to restore the puny cuts made by the committee in this extravagant program which will have some $7½ billion available for the next fiscal year if not a single dime of new money is authorized through this bill.

Will these leaders resort to the old wheeze and assumption that communism has been and will be halted by continued flights into the realm of fancy; that patriotism, love of country, freedom, and national morality are items for the auction block and can be purchased with American dollars?

Incidentally, if and when these leaders take the floor to do the bidding of the executive department, let them state for the record what millions upon millions of dollars, bled from our taxpayers, has accomplished in Yugoslavia. It will be remembered that last summer Secretary of State Dulles, hat in hand, paid a visit to Dictator Broz, alias Tito, who brought out his newest speedboat and gave Dulles a fast ride. The spray had hardly settled when it was announced some 20 or 30 million dollars had been allotted the Yugoslavia dictator to build a nice, new, superhighway. For American taxpayers, this is one of the most expensive boat-rides they have ever given one of their public officials.

But the real payoff came a few days ago when the Yugoslav dictator, strutting in all his splendor in Moscow and Russian way points, announced to the wide world that never again would anything happen to divide him from his pals in the Kremlin. Who in this House now covets the role of apologist for Tito?

And let those who now seek to increase the giveaways under this program and continue these indefinitely, for the declaration of policy in this bill does just that, tell us where stand our so-called free world friends in terms of firm military support for NATO, upon which we have lavished hundreds of millions of dollars. Let them tell us what became of the 50 divisions that were promised for NATO by the end of 1952. Or, with the appointment of NATO's "three wise men," none of whom is a representative of this country, it is proposed to make this an economic and social organization—another spout to the funnel through which additional billions of American tax dollars will evaporate?

It will be interesting, too, if we may hear from our leaders where in the heavily populated areas of Asia our money has bought reliable allies.

Yes, let us vote this rule and then hear from these spokesmen the cold, hard facts of what has been accomplished and what has not been accomplished since the end of World War II through this program and the spending of more than $60 billion. This money has been gouged out of the taxpayers and they are entitled to a full accounting. It is the responsibility of this Congress—at long last—to provide the facts rather than assumption, presumptions, and flights into a dream world as has been the story of the past.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11356, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 40 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I first want to express my appreciation for the kind remarks that have been so generously made relative to my service here.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us this afternoon H. R. 11356, the 1956 mutual-security bill. It contains authorizations for $3,563,475,000. Although it is $1,109,000,000 less than the Executive requested, it is larger than the amount authorized a year ago by $277,675,000 and larger than last year's appropriation by $860,133,250.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has held extensive hearings on the bill and has considered it very carefully. It is by no means a rubber stamp of the recommendations of the Executive. There have been important changes in the nature of assistance offered and in the conditions under which it is available. The committee voted 24 to 4 to report

this bill. It is my sincere conviction, and I believe it is shared by all of us who voted to report the bill, that the funds authorized are absolutely essential to the security of the United States.

Let me take a minute to remind you what the money in this bill is going to be used for. About 54 percent of the total—$1,925,000,000—is for military aid. This is used exclusively to supply tanks, airplanes, guns, ammunition, and training to the forces of other nations. The bill limits the amount of this military money that can be used for Europe to $450 million. All of the rest of it—almost a billion and a half—has to be used in other parts of the world. More of it will go to Korea than any other country.

The Executive does not permit us to make available the amounts of military assistance planned for individual countries. They maintain that it is essential to our security that this information should not be made public. We have to observe their requirements in this matter.

I would like to point out, however, that we have made available this year everything that we could. I was pleased to note that the Washington papers, on April 20 last, published a report entitled "Secret Hearings on Hill Decline," in which the records of the committees of the House and Senate in respect to the holding of public hearings were compared. This compilation showed that the Committee on Foreign Affairs was high on the list of those who held a great proportion of its meetings in open session. I believe that this record indicates clearly our effort to make available all possible information to the House and to the public.

In addition to this direct military assistance in the form of weapons, tanks, and airplanes which I have just mentioned, the next biggest amount in the bill, $1,147,700,000, is for defense support. Defense support is economic aid, but it goes only to countries which have definitely committed themselves to our side in the struggle against communism. This money goes to poor countries which are maintaining armed forces that are too big for them to support. Only two countries in Europe get any defense-support funds, Spain and Yugoslavia. The committee cut the authorization for Yugoslavia by 50 percent—from $30 million to $15 million.

The largest amount of defense support going to any country is $300 million for Korea. The other big recipients of defense support include Turkey, Greece, Formosa, Pakistan, Thailand, and the Philippines.

This means that over $3 billion of the funds authorized, including direct military aid and defense support, about 86 percent of the money, goes to support military programs in countries that have not the resources to keep the men under arms that they now have. The maintenance of these forces is an essential element in the defense strategy of the United States.

Now let me summarize what the remaining 14 percent of the money is for. There is an authorization of $243 million for development assistance. This is available only to countries in Asia and Africa, either on a loan basis or in the form of United States surplus agricultural commodities. Countries which need outside help to develop their resources can receive help under this authorization regardless of whether they have committed themselves to our side or not. This is about 7 percent of the total funds in the bill.

There is an authorization of $157,500,000 for technical cooperation. This is the point-4 type of operation and is limited to technical assistance. It does not include financing imports or the building of dams. Less than 4 percent of the funds in the bill go for this purpose.

The remaining authorizations cover administrative expenses, contributions to the care of escapees, the Children's Fund, and so forth. They are continuations of what we have been doing before. A detailed tabulation of all the authorizations appears on pages 5 and 6 of the committee report.

Let me emphasize that the big money authorized by this bill is not going to be spent on international psychological projects. There is so much talk about what Nehru says, and about where Khrushchev and Bulganin are going, and about the French Cabinet, that people think the cold war has become a sort of diplomatic fencing match.

Consider the situation in Korea. Let me remind you that this bill authorizes $1,925,000,000 for strictly military assistance, and that of this total by far the largest single amount for any country is for Korea.

A state of war still exists in Korea. American boys face Communist soldiers across a neutral zone only 4 kilometers wide. Although shooting stopped on July 27, 1953, when the Armistice was agreed to, no permanent settlement with the Communists has been arrived at and none is in sight. The Communists have flagrantly violated their armistice commitments. They have constructed airfields and based an air force in North Korea after agreeing not to increase their strength there. They have built up their forces in other ways.

All is not quiet along the Armistice line in Korea. Continuous patrolling and probing is going on. There are frequent incidents. The Communist policy is to shoot first and ask questions afterwards.

Our own boys are facing the enemy in Korea, but the largest part of the line is manned by Korean troops. This Korean Army is the largest force in Asia under arms in opposition to communism. General Lemnitzer, our commander in the Far East, says that the Korean forces are excellent. They are experienced in combat, well trained, and well equipped. His testimony before the committee includes this statement:

> I feel very strongly that the continuance of United States military and economic assistance to the Republic of Korea and military assistance to Japan is absolutely vital to the maintenance of our entire military position in the Far East, as well as to the security of Korea and Japan. The Republic of Korea armed forces and the Japanese self-defense forces have already assumed a substantial share of the defense responsibility for their respective countries. As they become stronger, they will be able to assume progressively greater responsibility for their defense. In the absence of these Korean and Japanese forces, we would have no alternative to maintaining sizable additional United States forces in this key area to insure its security in the face of a continuing Communist threat.
>
> It is also important to remember that the cost of maintaining the Republic of Korea armed forces and the Japanese self-defense forces, in their homelands is substantially less than the cost of maintaining comparable United States forces in these areas.

All this leads me to this question: Have we any choice as to what we do about Korea? Does anyone in this House believe that we should abandon Korea to the Communists? Does anyone here want to give up without a struggle the territory which thousands of American boys gave their lives to defend? I believe that Korea has become a symbol to the people of the free world. I believe that 99 percent of the American people are determined that Korea shall be defended until the world struggle against Communist domination has been won.

I repeat that we have no choice but to hold the line in Korea and this means that we have no choice but to give to Korea the very substantial assistance that this bill contains.

In the first place, the United States has to provide the equipment for the Korean Armed Forces. Korea is a poor country with limited resources. It was completely wrecked by the war. In addition, Korea is maintaining a military force much too big for its size. It has too much of its manpower in uniform and the country does not have a big enough tax base to support such a force. The resources just are not there.

In order to keep Korean troops manning most of the defense line the United States has to pay a large part of the bill. We have to supply their military equipment and pay about half of the military budget of the Korean Government.

Second, in addition to our direct support of the Korean military forces, we have to underwrite the Korean economy. We have to contribute substantially to repair the devastation resulting from the war, and we have to provide capital equipment so that the country can make some progress toward maintaining itself. We are paying for factories, including fertilizer plants. We are paying for part of their imports because they produce very little foreign exchange of their own, although I would like to point out that in this instance our dollars have a double value. The counterpart which is derived from the sale of these imported commodities is used to maintain the budget of the Korean Government as well as to pay part of the cost of internal development projects.

I am fully aware that no one is satisfied with the situation in Korea. Everyone of us wishes that things had worked out differently there than they have. It is easy to indulge in hindsight and to point out how things might have been handled differently. The fact remains, however, that the situation we face today is as I have just outlined it. I believe that there really is no choice as to what we do

about Korea during the next fiscal year. The program which this bill provides was worked out very carefully by the United States military commanders in that area and the skilled staff of the United States civilian officers. I think they know what is necessary to keep things going in that poor and devastated country. There is no doubt but what we want to hold what we have, and I think also there is no doubt that we can do so if we contribute our share.

Think for a moment about other countries such as Turkey, Formosa, Thailand, Pakistan, and Iran. Each of these countries is right up against the Communist guns. Each one has chosen sides in the struggle against world communism. Each one of them knows that if it stands alone it cannot hope to survive against a Communist military attack. Each of them is depending on us for help. None of them could have a military establishment such as it now maintains without our equipment and without our support of its economy. We certainly do not want them to quit. It is inconceivable that we abandon them.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that so far I have been retelling a story that you have heard before. We have all heard it before because the same old reason for the whole thing is still with us. I feel sure that everyone in this House believes that the Communists are still our enemies and that they are determined to subjugate the United States as well as all other nations not yet under their control. Their military strength is greater than ever. As long as the Soviet Union and its satellites maintain their enormous military forces in constant readiness for an attack we have no choice but to continue a worldwide defense effort.

Although much of the program is familiar, I want to make clear that the committee is aware that there have been important developments during the past year. The bill which we have reported has been adjusted in recognition of what has happened.

We are aware, in the first place, of the Russian smile. We have not been so attentive to the smile that we have lost sight of the Russian guns, but we know that the Soviet leaders are smiling and that many nations have responded to the smiles.

In Europe there is less feeling of danger and less enthusiasm for defense than there used to be. I wish this was not so. I wish the United States could in some way change this situation. We have to face reality, however. There is no use going ahead with a program for Europe as though nothing had happened. A large part of the French Army is tied down in north Africa. Germany has not yet passed the legislation for calling up the forces which we have planned to equip. The British are restricting their use of conscription. Italy cries for more economic aid and less emphasis on defense items.

There is no way we can make up for diminished zeal by increasing the flow of arms. The committee has cut the military authorization requested by $1 billion and set a ceiling on the amount of this which can be used for Europe. This action was taken because, according to the latest figures we were given, there were still about $3 billion of planes, tanks, and weapons and equipment already financed from prior appropriations awaiting delivery to Europe.

I believe that the thing to do under the circumstances is to slow down our deliveries to Europe and to divert some of this equipment that is in the pipeline to the countries of Asia and to Turkey. The cut in military funds should give assurance that action along this line will be taken.

I want to make clear that it is not intended to pressure on the nations of Western Europe in any way. Their present attitude is such that they do not place a very high value on military aid. When and if that attitude changes, I think we should respond and help them where needed and where they cannot meet the need themselves. As long as their present attitude persists I do not believe we can properly or prudently ignore it.

In speaking of the adjustments which we have made in the program for Europe in response to recent developments, let me remind you that we have cut the defense support—this is economic aid—to Yugoslavia by 50 percent, from $30 million to $15 million. The committee is fully aware that the gyrations of Marshal Tito during the past year do not inspire too much confidence. At the same time, our military strategists insist that it is in the best interests of the United States to continue its program for Yugoslavia. The committee has, therefore, not attempted to cut off the program altogether but has restricted the economic side of it.

Another problem which the committee has carefully considered is the problem of giving aid to neutrals, particularly to nations like India. Many citizens of this country do not like the attitude of the leaders of India in this world struggle against Communist domination.

The fact remains, however, that they have not joined up with the Russians. India is one of the largest nations in the world. It is better for us to have India outside the Soviet orbit. There is no advantage to the United States in taking any action which would force Nehru into the Soviet camp.

At the same time we have to recognize the uncertainties in the Indian situation, and we have to make sure that we do not treat countries better if they push us around than if they cooperate. The bill before you contains provisions to deal with these problems.

In the first place, we say that development assistance to countries to build up their capital equipment—such as railroads, highways, dams, and factories—has to be either on a loan basis or in the form of surplus agricultural commodities. There will be no more grant aid to such countries which permits them to take our money this year and deny any obligation to us next year. I am not sure that we will get all our money back in the future, but at least the country accepting our help has to sign a solemn agreement to pay us back, which will be called to its attention in the future.

Furthermore, we have put in a requirement that in the future nations getting development assistance will have to sign an agreement providing satisfactory assurances that they will permit the participation of private capital and private enterprise in their development.

Let me say just a further word about the Aswan Dam in this connection. No funds have been requested by the executive for the Aswan Dam for fiscal 1957, and no funds for this purpose are included in this authorization. The President has used his discretionary authority to set aside $54 million previously authorized and appropriated for other purposes to be used to finance part of the cost of the first phase of the construction of the dam should Egypt decide to go ahead with the project. According to the latest information available to the committee, the United States does not know whether Egypt intends to build the dam or not.

The United States has made an offer to help finance the later phases of the construction of the dam. No funds have been requested by the executive for this purpose. Although the President has great authority to transfer funds under existing law, I do not believe that it will be possible for the United States to finance the construction of the Aswan Dam without giving Congress an opportunity to pass on this matter.

I would like to call your attention to section 7, which appears at the bottom of page 11 of the bill. This section is a statement of policy which is intended to give to the free nations of the world assurance that the United States is ready to back them up in the future in their efforts to resist Communist aggression. At the same time it makes clear that such future assistance will be subject to action by the Congress in light of the situation existing at the time.

The Executive requested a more specific authorization to enter into future commitments, which the committee rejected. The language proposed by the Executive would have authorized the use of any nonmilitary funds appropriated for the mutual security program in the future to fulfill commitments previously made to foreign governments. This would have meant that in a case such as the Aswan Dam, our officials could enter into a commitment this year with Egypt but ask no money for such purpose. Next year, without asking for any specific authorization for the Aswan Dam, nonmilitary funds authorized for other purposes could be diverted to pay for such construction.

Although I opposed the authority which the Executive requested to enter into long range commitments, I am firmly convinced that it is essential to our own security that we give to other nations assurance that we are ready to back them up in the future. They are all glancing in our direction to see what our reaction to the Russian smiles is going to be. They are reluctant to continue to stand up against Communist pressure if there is any danger that our support will not be available to them in the future.

This statement of policy written into this bill by the Foreign Affairs Committee recognizes the realities of the situation which confronts us. The future of the foreign aid program is determined by the future danger to United States security. We are fooling ourselves and misleading our constituents if we say that this is the last year of foreign aid, or that we should limit ourselves to a 3-year or even a 5-year program. The fact is that we are going to try to counteract the thrusts of the Soviet leaders as the Communists pursue their objective of world domination. Since this in fact, we should go on record as to what our policy is so that other nations need have no doubt as to where we stand.

In urging the passage of this bill I freely admit that there are many uncertainties in the situation which confronts the United States today.

Let me say this in general about the bill which is before us. We are confronted with a choice between doing something to counter the new Communist strategy or doing nothing. We are not yet sure that we know exactly what to do next year or in the next several years. There is no escaping the fact that this is in certain respects an interim bill. As I have already pointed out, most of the money in this bill is going to support military programs of nations in Asia which are right up against the Communist guns. There is nothing new or uncertain or interim about what we are doing or what we should continue to do there.

Nevertheless, this bill does authorize a lot of money for carrying forward an effort that has not been fully mapped out. I have indicated that there are a number of situations in the world which make it clear that we should not continue to spend our money in the same old way or in the same old places as we have in the past. We believe that we have made cuts in this bill which will reduce the programs which should be curtailed. We believe that the materials in the pipeline, plus the new money authorized in this bill, will permit us to meet any new situation which may arise between now and next January.

The Foreign Affairs Committee cannot and, under the Constitution of the United States, should not attempt to invent a strategy for meeting the new Russian threat. That is the responsibility of the executive branch of the Government. It is something that cannot be done by legislation. We have had two basic jobs to do. First, we had to check very carefully what our foreign policymakers were planning to do next year to make sure that we were not voting money to carry on programs that have become out of date. We all know that there is a tendency for the bureaucratic wheels to continue grinding away in the same old manner as long as the funds are supplied to keep them going.

Second, we had to provide the executive with the authorization necessary to take the measures which are essential to continue our efforts to meet the Communist threat.

The bill before you, in my judgment, does both of these jobs.

It is no less true today, however, than it was when the Marshall plan began in April 1948, and in the year 1951 when the United States made its largest appropriation for foreign aid—over $7,900,000,000—that the biggest problem confronting the United States is the maintenance of our security in the face of Soviet aggression. This bill should be evaluated strictly in terms of its contribution to United States security. The test of this bill is what it does for the United States and not what it does for foreigners. It is good if it helps solve the problems which confront the United States. Whether or not it solves or fails to solve the problem or problems of any particular nation, or any particular area, is significant only to the extent that the solution of such problems is important to the security of the United States.

Some of our people have a tendency to lose sight of the fact that I have just mentioned. There are some who seem to forget which side is which. They apparently feel that if you do not like Nehru you should vote against this bill; if you disapprove of Nasser, vote against this bill; if you want to show some foreigner what you think of him, vote against this bill.

Let us, in our consideration of this bill, look at the problems with which it deals from the point of view of the security of the United States. I do not say that we will see all of them the same way, but I do say that we are not so likely to be carried away by our prejudices and emotions if all of us are careful to start from the same place.

I am afraid that many of our columnists and commentators fail to distinguish between what is wrong with the world and what is wrong with the mutual-security program. I recognize that there is something wrong in any part of the world that you look at.

That does not mean, though, that if we are dissatisfied with conditions in the world we ought to vote against this bill; that a vote for the bill means that we are voting approval of the situation in the world today. The reason we have a mutual-security program is that there are things wrong in the world.

Some of you probably are saying that I miss the point—that people are not opposed to the foreign-aid program because they are dissatisfied with conditions in the world today; they are opposed because they are dissatisfied with the progress that the United States is making in dealing with these unsatisfactory situations throughout the world.

Let us consider this argument a minute. How many of us are satisfied with the progress that is being made against cancer? I do not suppose any one can say that he is satisfied until a cure has been found. But I don't suppose that anyone argues that we should stop trying to find a cure just because we are dissatisfied with progress.

That is really the sort of choice that confronts this House today. It is whether we are going to try to oppose the Communists in their efforts to subjugate the world or not. Even if we are dissatisfied with progress, shall we keep a program going and try to make the necessary adjustments to meet the changing situation, or shall we abandon the whole effort?

Let me say just a word about this matter of making progress. Consider the argument that because we find something wrong in almost any part of the world that we look at, the mutual-security program has failed. It seems to me that this is about the same as arguing that after getting rid of the bears and mountain lions, your program against these maneaters is a failure because you are now having a lot of trouble with skunks.

The big danger that confronted the free nations of the world in the early 1950's was Soviet military attack. Many nations were so weak that all the Soviet forces had to do was march in. I do not believe that the Communist leaders believe that there are any pushovers in the world today. Our foreign aid program is largely responsible for that fact. It may be that the Soviet smile is a greater danger than the threat of armed invasion was. All I say is that our program did effectively meet the military threat to weak countries. It is not a failure just because today we are confronted with a different danger. Our problem is to equip ourselves to meet the new threat.

I am primarily for this bill because I believe it is necessary for the security of the United States. Admiral Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, made this statement to the committee:

> The military assistance program for fiscal year 1957 has been thoroughly coordinated with overall United States military planning and is approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.
>
> The program is designed to achieve the same objectives as our own military program and is an essential part of the defense of the United States and of the free world. In planning military programs of the United States, the existence and scope of the military assistance program is fully considered. There is no duplication. They supplement each other.
>
> Both are essential to our own national defense. By the cooperation of our allies, we obtain a far better defense at lower cost to ourselves than if we tried to do the job alone.

Secretary of States Dulles told us:

> The President, the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and I, myself, the Secretary of State, are all convinced that this expenditure is necessary for the security of the United States. The Mutual Security part of this program is a contribution to our security just as is our own defense establishment.

In the years since World War II, the period 1946 through fiscal 1956, the Congress has voted $345 billion for our Defense Establishment. During this same period we have appropriated $51,336,208,000 to provide assistance to other nations. Let me mention in passing that 82 percent of the foreign aid money last year was spent to purchase items in the United States so that there has been an important benefit to many of our industries as a result.

The House should not forget that a little over $11 billion worth of the products of our farms have been supplied to foreign countries since the war under the Mutual Security program and our earlier aid programs. If we include loan transactions and barter arrangements, the total exceeds $12 billion.

Let me get back to my point, however. It would have cost us a lot more than $345 billion for defense, and we would be a lot less secure than we are if we did not have our foreign bases, if we did not have access to the minerals of the Congo and Asia, and if the industrial potential of Western Europe was under Soviet control. It is possible that we could pull back to a defense of the Western Hemisphere, or even of the North American continent. I do not believe any qualified military strategist could advocate such a course. These are the alternatives that we might have to consider as a last resort. Surely we are not ready to quit trying to retain access to the resources of the free world. Surely we want the cooperation of other free nations in a common defense effort as long as we find nations who desire to cooperate with us.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that no one concentrate so hard on the shortcomings of this program or his initiation over instances of lack of appreciation and gratitude abroad, that he will fail to see how vital it is to our own security. Let us remember our strategic bases overseas, and that there are millions of people throughout the world who are on our side and who are dependent on our continued support.

Nothing has happened which could justify abandoning this program when we face the facts.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wish the gentleman would stop addressing his remarks to that side of the aisle. You have converted over there. Here on this side of the aisle is where the conversion needs to take place and I wish the gentleman would turn this way.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that in his opinion if a nickel were not appropriated, there is enough in the bank now to run this program for 2 years?

Mr. RICHARDS. There is no question about that.

My friend here asked why I did not address my remarks to this side of the aisle. It happens to be that I am on this side. I happen to be a Democrat. I figure our Republican brethren will try to convert people in their own house. Sometimes people on that side do not like Democrats trying to convert them. I figure there will be a little missionary work done on that side. I do not know whether I am going to have trouble with my good friend, JOHN VORYS, over there today. He is a great fellow, he is a great friend of mine. I do not know whether he is going to stick by some of the doctrines he has been preaching to me for the last 3 or 4 years or not. I do not know. I do not know whether somebody has been blowing on his neck or not.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. May I congratulate the gentleman on his statement and say that I thoroughly join with him. I believe the cuts are necessary. When the Comptroller General of the United States says before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that he feels there are $400 million held by this agency illegally, and that there should be a resurvey, we in the Congress should listen. I believe the gentleman is right. I would like to point out further that these amendments are bipartisan amendments.

As a matter of fact, my amendment was a $1 billion cut, so it was a Republican amendment, and under the leadership of our good chairman was joined in on a bipartisan basis. We Members who have been working on this program are for it completely and we want to see it succeed, but we do not want to overspend. So, I believe the cut is necesary, and I want to join with the gentleman.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the gentleman. That statement is correct. It was the gentleman's amendment. There were also some other amendments. Some wanted to cut military assistance more than $1 billion. The amendment to cut more than $1 billion originated on the Democratic side. The amendment of the gentleman which was finally adopted was an amendment to an amendment. Our acceptance of this amendment proposed by a Republican shows bipartisanship.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I think, sir, if some on this side are getting hot breaths on their necks, that you should give a little hot breath on their faces to kind of even up the thing.

Mr. RICHARDS. I hope you will help me out.

Mr. MASON. And I would welcome that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Prior to this time I did not know the prowess of the gentleman as an evangelist. He certainly has converted me, and I am glad to join with him in cutting the spending under this bill.

Mr. RICHARDS. I want to say that anybody who converts the gentleman against his will has great evangelical power.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I want to say to the gentleman that there are a lot of us over here that do not need to be converted. There are a lot of us who have voted against these foreign aid things for the last 8 years on this side of the House when perhaps we did not have anybody from your side associate themselves with us. I do not know the reason.

Mr. RICHARDS. Oh, we had plenty of gentlemen on this side just like yourself who are honestly opposed to it. It was not all on one side.

Mr. NICHOLSON. There were only 12 of us the first time. It has gradually gotten better, and I certainly hope we have arrived at the time now when we can spend money for our own defense without taking care of these foreigners.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman says there were only 12. Remember, there were only 12 disciples, but they succeeded in preaching their doctrine all right. Do not forget that.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. I want to congratulate the gentleman and the committee upon this reduction. Last year I was opposed to the committee 100 percent. On the program this year I am only opposed to it three-quarters of 100 percent. I agree on the 25 percent.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is heartening.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take up any more of your time. There will be plenty of time to discuss the different aspects of the bill as we go along, and there are other Members who want to speak. But, in closing I want to say I would not have anyone misinterpret what I have said, particularly my good friend from Massachusetts. I have not weakened in any way my original opinion that this program is part of the security program of the United States. Each of us has an obligation to his people and the committees of this House have an obligation to this House. The Committee on Foreign Affairs held long hearings on this bill. We held session on 31 days and heard 74 witnesses.

The various amounts involved were carefully considered and thoroughly debated. The figure for military aid was reached after voting on several amendments which proposed different amounts.

I do not see how the Committee could fulfill its obligation to the House if it did not support the authorizations which are contained in the bill as reported.

I have great respect for the President of the United States and for the objectives of his foreign policy. He has too many duties and responsibilities, however, to know all about the bookkeeping which the Pentagon does.

The program which was submitted to the committee was the result of work begun by the executive department more than a year ago, before many of the developments which disturb us today occurred. I do not believe the program was adjusted by the Executive to reflect the new situation, and I do not believe the President is familiar enough with the details of the program to be aware of its shortcomings. He has to rely on the recommendations of his subordinates.

The committee discovered some of the weaknesses in the program, and we have made adjustments to correct them.

I believe that it is absolutely essential that we go ahead with this program and we will need the money which the bill authorizes if we are to do so.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the last year of the mutual security program. This bill contains a provision which gives formal recognition to the realities of the situation. Section 7, beginning on page 11, contains a statement of purpose which makes clear to other nations which today are wondering whether we may be relaxing a little as a result of the Russian smiles that it is the intention of the United States to continue this program as long as international communism is a menace to free government and free people. It states that it will continue to be our policy to help those nations abroad that need help, that request it and can effectively use it, as long as it does not endanger the financial integrity of the United States. It makes no specific commitment to anyone. It would be unwise to promise any other nation anywhere, any amount, for any specific project for the years ahead. The Congress has an obligation to review the situation each year and to make the necessary adjustments. As soon as it is safe for us to do so, we should stop the whole thing.

Let me repeat, however, that I believe, from the bottom of my heart, that a reasonable program, including this cut of $1,109,000,000 is as essential as any part of our defense program. It will do more than an equal amount of dollars added to our own defense program to combat the wave of international communism that is sweeping some areas of the world with such force that people fear that they will be unable to stand up against it.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersay.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to my friend from South Carolina that in 1950, when we had before this House a bill to provide Mr. Tito's government in Yugoslavia with some $38 million, it was argued by those in charge of the bill that Mr. Tito's break with the Kremlin was incurable. I argued otherwise. We know now that that break was not incurable.

I rise to ask the gentleman how much money there is in this bill now before us for Mr. Tito's government in Yugoslavia.

Mr. RICHARDS. There was a certain amount of military money proposed for Yugoslavia in the bill, but the figure is classified. The economic aid to Europe goes to only two countries, as I have said; a small amount to Spain and some to Yugoslavia. There was $30 million of economic aid requested for Yugoslavia. The committee cut out half of that—$15 million. $15 million remains in the bill for Yugoslavia.

Mr. CANFIELD. Would the gentleman be good enough to tell us how much money the American Congress has appropriated for economic and military aid to the government of Yugoslavia?

Mr. RICHARDS. I have not those exact figures at hand. I could get those figures but the figures for military aid is classified.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RICHARDS. Perhaps the gentleman from Wisconsin has those figures. The gentleman from New Jersey is talking about aid going all the way back to the beginning of the program?

Mr. CANFIELD. Yes.

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I might say to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] that in the appendix of the minority views the gentleman will find a tabulation showing the money that we have spent on the program since its beginning.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am told that the figure runs close to $1 billion.

Mr. RICHARDS. I have not the figure here going all the way back to the beginning, but I remember that it is a large amount. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that it has been a mistake to give assistance to Yugoslavia, even if Yugoslavia is a neutral and remains a neutral. The money was well spent, if in case of war Yugoslavia merely tells the Russians it insists on maintaining its neutrality.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to refer for just a minute to page 17 of the bill. Is it proposed to pay the costs of health and accident insurance for foreign participants in any exchange-of-persons program? Is that something new?

Mr. RICHARDS. This is new. It applies only to the few foreign students and leaders who come to this country at our expense. These people do not have money to finance a trip to this country and when they get sick or have an accident here it creates a very serious problem.

Mr. GROSS. This reads as follows:

> United States Government agencies are authorized to pay the costs of health and accident insurance for foreign participants.

Does that mean individuals?

Mr. RICHARDS. That means individuals who participate in this program.

Mr. GROSS. Then that does mean foreign nationals who participate in this program?

Mr. RICHARDS. Foreign nationals who are engaged in this program, if you pay them out of American funds.

Mr. GROSS. So that we are going to pick up the bill for health and accident insurance costs for foreigners?

Mr. RICHARDS. Only those who come here at our expense, because we believe that the reports they will give to the folks back home justify the cost to us.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I do not want to leave the opinion with the Members of this House that there is only $15 million in this bill for Yugoslavia. Will the gentleman agree that there is an undistributed amount?

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Will the gentleman also agree that there is another secret amount?

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes; this military fund I just mentioned is classified.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. It is classified?

Mr. RICHARDS. The committee did not want to classify any of these figures, but the Defense Department classified them, just as the executive department classifies the Defense bill figures. I do say there is only $15 million economic aid for Yugoslavia. The gentlewoman is right; there is military aid in addition.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is this report antedated then? On page 3 of the committee report it is noted that there is $30 million in the bill for Yugoslavia. Is that correct?

Mr. RICHARDS. The table on page 3 shows the amount requested by the Executive, which was $30 million. The committee cut this to $15 million.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Going back to the Yugoslav question, the question the gentleman from New Jersey raised about the amount in this bill, $15 million, is it not a fact there is likewise in the pipelines considerable for Mr. Tito?

Mr. RICHARDS. Yes. I believe that there is a lot in the pipeline. There is $3 billion-plus in the military pipeline for Europe and Mr. Tito is included in that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I should like to express my very deep regret that the gentleman is leaving the Congress of the United States. He has been an extremely able and extremely courageous Member. I am very sorry that being in the minority I could not serve on the Foreign Affairs Committee under the leadership of the able chairman. I worked with the gentleman for years. I greatly admire his integrity, his fairness, his kindliness, and his great love of America. He will be terribly missed.

Mr. RICHARDS. I deeply appreciate the gentlewoman's kind remarks.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TUMULTY. Do I correctly understand the gentleman to say that it is the opinion of the administration that Yugoslavia is still neutral? How close to communism do you get and still retain neutrality?

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not think it is a partisan matter for one of the leaders of the world today to visit Russia. The Soviet leaders came to Tito and apologized and begged his pardon. He did not go to them.

Mr. TUMULTY. Does that make any difference to us if he goes against us?

Mr. RICHARDS. I believe in a conflict with Russia Yugoslavia would be neutral. That is my personal opinion for what it is worth.

Mr. TUMULTY. If you are going to buy somebody, does not the gentleman think they ought to stay bought?

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not think you can buy anybody's neutrality.

Mr. TUMULTY. Then it is foolish to try. Yet that is what we have been doing.

Mr. RICHARDS. The question is whether or not it is good for the United States. The military people think it is.

Mr. TUMULTY. Do you think, under the circumstances, when Tito visited Moscow and where he said that the Kremlin and Tito will never be divided again, that we should continue to supply money to a Communist who has said that he will never be divided from our enemy?

Mr. RICHARDS. Well, if Mr. Tito were over here—and he may come—I would expect that he would say that the United States and Yugoslavia would not be divided again for that matter. It is not a question of what Mr. Tito wants. It is a question of what the military people say it would be worth to us for him and his divisions to stay neutral.

Mr. TUMULTY. I am not concerned now with what the military people said. I want to know what you believe and not what the military believe. I want to know what you think—whether you think that money should be extended to a Communist who has gone to our enemy and said that he will not be divided from them again. Should any money go to Yugoslavia under those circumstances, sir?

Mr. RICHARDS. There is $15 million of economic aid in this bill for Tito's Government. I would not have voted for it if I had not thought it is wise. I may be wrong. I have no affection for Mr. Tito. I think it is a good investment and that we are justified in taking the chance.

Mr. TUMULTY. That is the same thing we have been doing for the past 10 years. Tito declared war on us the day he became a Communist.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I join in the applause that took place just now on the termination of the speech of our beloved chairman, Mr. RICHARDS. I call him Chief. I want to say to the Chief, "You have made a great speech. I disagree with parts of it, but I agree with roughly 85 percent of it." He said something about somebody breathing down my neck to change my views on what the military amount in this bill ought to be. I would like to remind my beloved chairman that I tried to breathe down the necks of the committee to make a cut of a half billion dollars in this program, and while I am willing to be convinced, to date I have not changed my mind on the amount this bill can stand.

This is a $3½ billion bill. Our chairman wanted a $1 billion cut. I wanted a half billion dollars cut. That is $500 million between us, about 15 percent of the bill. I figure he is 85 percent right on this bill—and he has to concede, I think, before I am through, that I am at least 15 percent right.

He quoted the criticism made by the Comptroller General of the administration and accounting of the military funds in this bill. It is certainly true that we ran into a hassle last year when the Committee on Appropriations cut out nearly $600 million from this bill, not because the program was unjustified but because of the method of accounting in the Department of Defense. Since the program was not criticised, that put a $600 million dent in the pipeline supplies that must go forward on long leadtime in order to keep this mutual-security program current. The Comptroller General referred to $400 million that had been retained in violation of law prior to June 30, 1954. Administrative actions in the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Defense have more than offset any such amounts erroneously certified prior to June 30, 1954. Defense has corrected criticisms which he made. I understand the allegations as to the $400 million are not yet supported by documentary evidence furnished the Department of Defense.

After the speech that has been made, and in view of those that will be made, I simply want to make a few general observations about this legislation, then run over parts of it, and then answer questions if I have time.

I want to remind the committe that this is a package bill. It is not just one proposition. It is 19 different programs involving 54 countries, 36 of them with military programs. It includes in the 19 programs 4 connected with the United Nations Organization nations, which may affect 78 nations.

It has to do with the military support in other allied countries of 200 divisions: The United States has 20.

Two thousand Naval craft: That is more vessels than are in the United States Navy.

Three hundred air squadrons: That is about the same number of squadrons that we have in the United States Air Force.

As to the economics of this bill on the military side which is part and parcel, says Admiral Radford, of our own defense; it costs the United States $6,600 a year to maintain an American soldier abroad without a gun in his hands, that is, his maintenance without any arms. This bill will cost us $789 to maintain one of our allied soldiers for a year with a weapon in his hands, at the place where our Joint Chiefs say it is vital to our own security as well as the security of the country he serves. So that when you figure the cost of an American soldier abroad and of helping to support a foreign soldier allied with our own mutual defense, you can see that there is economy in this plan, as was pointed out by Admiral Radford.

I want to point out also that this is a policy bill. It does not appropriate a dime. All we do in this bill, as far as amounts are concerned, is to place limits on the amounts we are later going to let ourselves appropriate. When it comes to appropriations, we can second guess. We do it all the time with our deficiency bills and supplemental bills, but we do not do that ordinarily on legislation. So that it is important at the policy level, which is involved in this bill, that we do not tie our hands too tightly, that we give the Committee on Appropriations a chance to review this program.

This bill deals with foreign aid in terms of American security. I received a letter about this bill, which referred to this year's "donations abroad." The Governor of Utah is conducting a revolt against paying taxes for what he calls these give-away programs.

I want to say, on the constitutional question involved, that in my opinion the Congress has no constitutional right to give away the taxpayers' money to foreigners. Every dime of this program is to promote our own security, our own welfare, or it is not justified at all. I think that since that is the situation, we make a mistake to make anyone, in this country or abroad, think it is mere generosity, bighearted charity. It makes the foreigners suspicious and it makes our own people mad. Both of them say "What right has Congress to be charitable with other people's money," when we are not being charitable. We are promoting our security and our own welfare. It is all for our own selfish interest. Generous, enlightened, farsighted self interest, sometimes failing of its objective, but the purpose is the security and welfare of the United States of America.

Since it is not charity, we cannot expect much gratitude. We cannot buy friends and we cannot buy subservience, but we can arrange things so that other nations find it worth their while to stay in the free world and defend themselves and develop themselves, not because they love us, but because our mutual security is good for them, as well as for us. We help countries in war, hot or cold, because they can resist more effectively. We help them in peace, because developed countries make better customers.

Now, how are we doing? I have heard some woeful wails, and we will hear some more about how everything we are doing is such a failure.

We are told that the Communists are outsmarting us everywhere. If they are so smart what do they think of what we are doing on the military front? They think we are doing so well with mutual security that they have not started a war for 6 years. They think that NATO is so good that their whole European policy is aimed at breaking up NATO. If NATO were the feeble instrument that has been suggested by some Americans, we would not find the Kremlin aiming its diplomacy at breaking up NATO.

On the nonmilitary front the Communists think we are doing so well that they have started to imitate our programs of economic aid and technical assistance. As Secretary Dulles says, if imitation is the sincerest flattery we should be flattered with what they are doing.

Their new look creates new problems for us, but it creates a lot of new ones for them, too.

Now a few moments of time to review the program. First I want to pay my tribute to John B. Hollister, the Director of the ICA, a former Member of this House, former law partner of Bob Taft, longtime friend and associate of Herbert Hoover, Executitve Director of the

Hoover Commission, level-headed, fearless, with vision and commonsense. I saw him in action in five countries in the past year, observing the programs and the reaction of the people in the countries involved in our programs, hearing the problems of his field force, and hearing him explain to them the policies that are developed in Washington.

On the military side of this program I want to pay my tribute to one who is the head of it, who has been in the business of mutual security for some time and had considerable experience. He has had the experience of waiting abroad for promised supplies from the United States to come to NATO. He is a man named Eisenhower, formerly General Eisenhower, now President Eisenhower. He was the head of SHAPE. He was, as we call it, in MAAG, himself, part of a military-assistance advisory group. He understands this program and its worldwide significance in extraordinary detail and is deeply interested.

I have seen the work of these people, the MAAG's, and the ICA people, in 25 countries in the last few years. Of course, there are misfits, but for the most part they are devoted Americans, trying their best, working hard.

As for the program, let us look at the bottom of it first. Let us look at page 22 of the bill and page 52 of the report, and talk about the last item "Foreign research reactor projects," $5,950,000. This is a dramatic, imaginative atoms-for-peace program which challenges the interests of the whole world. The only nation in the world that has dropped an atom bomb in wartime leads the world in establishing a program of atoms for peace. We are going to contribute up to $350,000 each for these reactors, and they are to be labeled as coming from the United States. Each one is to have a 9-pound core of uranium that costs $60,000. This is leased, not given, to other countries. The uranium core is of nonweapon character. The power generated will equal that required to run 2 electric ironers or 1 electric stove. The core can be reprocessed every 2 or 3 years. Therefore, this hunk of uranium will last somewhere between 200 and 300 years. That is one of the important imaginative items in the bill that may not have attracted your attention in this bill.

In the latter part of the bill you will find an item for ocean freight for voluntary relief. There is $1,400,000 to ship voluntary relief packages abroad that last year totaled $28 million. There is $14 million for shipping abroad agricultural surpluses. There is $10 million for the children's fund. Then there is economic aid.

Of the $3,563,475,000 total, $1,550,700,000 is for furnishing military weapons, equipment, and training; $2,012,775,000 is for other purposes. This year, economic aid for direct forces support in the amount of $374,300,000 was carried in the general military assistance request of $2,925,000,000. Even though this request has been cut to $1,925,000,000 in section 2 of the bill, I understand that the Executive is not planning to cut the spending for direct forces support, which is economic aid—food, clothing, gasoline, and so forth, for the support of troops.

Thus the authorizations for economic aid in the bill are as follows:

[In millions]

Direct forces support	$374.3
Defense support	1,147.7
Development assistance	243.0
Technical cooperation	157.5
Other programs	90.3
Total (rounded)	2,012.8

The first two items are for support of military effort. Every item is designed to promote our own security. Most of the money authorized, however, is for economic aid, not weapons and training. The amount for guaranties is increased $400 million in the bill, but is a contingent item and therefore is not shown as an increased authorization in the totals. If we add this amount to the authorizations available for economic aid under this bill, the total would be $2,412.8 million for economic aid compared to $1,550.7 million for strictly military aid.

This bill involves a considerable reappraisal of the executive requests for economic aid, especially as to long-term aid to underdeveloped countries.

There is no termination date in the mutual-security law and therefore, any amendment expressed in terms of years would be shorter in duration, technically speaking, than the law it amended. We also realize that no Congress can pass a law its successor cannot amend or repeal.

Therefore the committee adopted a carefully worded statement of policy—see section 7 of the bill—of continuing aid to free nations as long as the danger to the peace of the world and our own security persists, and then rearranged and combined the various programs of development assistance.

Assistance for economic development of their resources has been furnished to many countries in the past, including countries carrying on military programs as part of their defense support—see title I. This can be done under the present bill. In recent years, however, the words "development assistance" have come to have a special meaning: substantial economic aid in addition to technical assistance in countries which do not have military programs in the common defense. This applies especially to underdeveloped countries.

This year a number of separate programs of this character were requested. The requests were for $370 million, as follows:

President's Asian fund	$100,000,000
Title II—Development assistance:	
Near East and Africa	63,000,000
Asia	80,000,000
Latin America	27,000,000
Total, title II	170,000,000
Middle East	100,000,000
Development assistance request	370,000,000

We put the request for Latin America in title I—Defense support, as being more appropriate for neighbors who are joined together in treaties for defense against communism, even though they may not be carrying on joint military programs. We increased this amount by $5 million. This left $370 million in the development assistance category, as follows:

Development assistance request	$370,000,000
Deduct Latin America (transferred)	27,000,000
Development assistance request	343,000,000

We reduced this total request by $100 million and, in section 4 of the bill, authorized $243 million to remain available until June 30, 1960, for economic development in free Asia, the Middle East, and Africa. We did not divide the amount among these regions, but not more than 25 percent is to go to any one nation. All of it is to be in loans or surplus agricultural commodities, except for regional projects involving two or more nations. We wish to encourage regional projects, but, although the present law requires preference for such programs in the Asian fund, we learned—hearings, page 453—that only one-third of the $66.6 million programed is for regional projects.

The present law provides in three places that the program shall emphasize loans rather than grants, wherever possible. The efforts this year have been disappointing, to quote Mr. Hollister, Director of ICA—hearings, page 49—probably about the same as last year's $209 million.

The requirements of the development-assistance section should improve this record.

The Soviets furnish all of their economic aid, except for technical assistance, in the form of loans or barter deals. There is little or nothing in the record to show that we need to make outright grants to compete with them in neutral underdeveloped countries.

There is a popular misconception, stimulated by banking minds and by giveaway enthusiasts, that aid loans amount to grants, are never paid, and create hard feelings.

The record is otherwise. For instance, we received last year $502 million in principal and $273 million in interest on foreign-aid loans made since World War II, according to the Department of Commerce. About one-fifth of our postwar aid of $53 billion has been in credits. Under the mutual-security program and its predecessors 50 loans to 23 countries, totaling about $1,868,000,000, have been made. This year $15,126,672 is being paid on principal and $37,651,945 in interest on these loans.

We are becoming a have-not country in essential raw materials. Any long-term development plans for other countries should include long-term repayments which can be made in raw materials we will need increasingly. This bill stresses this policy.

This bill—section 6 (k)—provides authority to guarantee $400 million in private investments by an amendment I offered, in addition to the estimated $100 million which will be issued by June 30. A fractional reserve is set up, in line with insurance practice instead of a 100-

percent reserve. In addition to insuring convertibility of currencies, and against expropriation or confiscation, coverage may include losses caused by war, revolution, and insurrection.

Up to date we have had no losses on investment guaranties, and the reserve is maintained by issuance of notes which do not require appropriations. Over $293 million in applications are now pending. We charge a fee for guaranties. Our whole foreign-aid program is to assure that we will not have a war, and that we will end up with a peaceful free world where people respect private property and pay their debts. If we can secure private investment in underdeveloped countries by charging a fee to protect the investor against the risks we have spent billions to prevent, we can cut the amount of Government-aid programs.

Up to date Government officials and bureaucrats here and abroad, and also businessmen here and abroad, when given the choice of grants, loans, or guaranties in foreign-aid programs, have usually chosen grants. In this case, flexibility has been expensive. When the choice has been loans or nothing, they choose loans. As grant money has been reduced, interest in guaranties has increased. By tightening up on grants, but opening up on loans and guaranties, for economic development, we hope to encourage a long-term policy that will involve private investment costing our Government nothing, or loans, where we are repaid. That is the capitalistic system that developed our country and most of the free world. We believe it is better than the Communist system, and will prove itself in competition.

Last, a few words as to the military program. Strictly speaking, $1,550,000,000 of the present bill is for military purposes. There are fixed charges of $378 million to come out of that amount. That leaves only about $1,172,000,000 to spread around.

The European military program is $760 million. Even if this were reduced, look at the other areas.

The Asian program alone, where we have Korea, Formosa, Vietnam, Pakistan and other countries, amounts to $1,168,000,000. Can we cut those countries? The Middle East—Greece, Turkey and the northern tier of nations—calls for $471 million. Can we cut these countries? Then there is $530 million requested for advanced weapons. This is vitally important. Do we cut this out?

When you try to cut all this a billion dollars, I think you are cutting too much.

As has been said, we recently passed a defense appropriation bill providing $36 billion by a vote of 377 to nothing. We passed a military construction bill for over $2 billion, including $780 million for overseas bases, by a vote of 377 to 3. Many people do not think we have enough money in our own military program. We recently passed the defense production bill, continuing priorities, by a voice vote. No one wanted even to challenge the vote. But, when we come to this, which Admiral Radford says is "an essential part of our own defense," being "part and parcel of our own defense," we cut off 33⅓ percent, or if you want to include only military weapons and training, we cut it 40 percent. I say that is too big a cut, and those that are interested in the defense of their country, who voted unanimously or nearly so, for these other items for our own defense, should not cut so deeply this item which is for our own defense.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I listened very carefully to the gentleman's statement, and I think the gentleman has made a very fine statement. But certain questions were directed at the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], in respect to this Yugoslav question. I notice the gentleman passed that over. I wonder if the gentleman is in a position, after his White House briefing, to state the administration's position on this aid to Communist Tito.

Mr. VORYS. I understand that the administration's view is that it would not be wise to eliminate all aid to Yugoslavia.

Mr. BOGGS. Is that the administration view, after the meeting of Tito and Bulganin and Khrushchev on this weekend?

Mr. VORYS. I am just going to give you my own theory about Yugoslavia. Here is the point. When Tito is recognized as an independent Communist, that sets a pattern that must soon be followed in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria, because you cannot continue to have satellite Communist states and independent Communist states very long. So, the problem is, should Tito become the head of a satellite state or should he remain, as he claims he is going to be, even while he is being wined and dined in Moscow, head an independent state? If we have independent Communist states among the satellites we start to break down the monolithic Soviet system. That is worth thinking about before we determine to eliminate aid to Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I asked the gentleman to yield in order that I may pursue my questioning of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]. Did I understand the gentleman from Ohio to say that it is the administration's position that the administration approves of continued aid to Communist Tito?

Mr. VORYS. I said that I understood the administration's view to be that they would not favor a further cut in the amount for Yugoslavia.

Mr. BOGGS. Then, one other question and I shall not bother the gentleman any further. It was my understanding that the gentleman contends, even after the recent meeting, that Tito is independent of Moscow. Is that correct?

Mr. VORYS. I cannot tell what the gentleman's understanding of what I said is, but I stated my own views a minute ago just as well as I could.

Mr. BOGGS. May I ask the gentleman one further question? Was this matter specifically discussed at the briefing this morning?

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I am attempting to be courteous to the gentleman——

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman can be whichever way he wants although he is always courteous——

Mr. VORYS. I am attempting to be courteous to the gentleman but also to refrain from discussing what was said at the White House. I did not intend and do not intend to discuss what the President said or anybody else said at that meeting.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I think it is perfectly in order at this point that the American people know the position of the administration on this issue which is now before the House. That is why I asked the questions. For my own part I am opposed to aid to communism of any brand. I will support the amendment to be offered to strike aid to Tito.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TUMULTY. I was wondering if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] who has just been addressing himself to the queries of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] would not answer this question. How does he explain the administration's position in continuing aid to Yugoslavia, a potential enemy, a probable enemy and refusing military aid, as the report says on page 9 thereof, to a friend—Israel?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I should like to point out to my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] that I do not know what was said at the White House this morning, but there is considerable on the ticker about what the President said at his press conference, and if the gentleman is too busy to go out and read it, I think he might have it brought in to him. It is about Yugoslavia and I think it might be very enlightening.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, the legislation we have before us has a long history. It began as the Marshall plan in 1948, when the Russian Communists threatened to take over all of Europe after we had withdrawn all but a handful of our Armed Forces from the European theater. At that time President Truman warned Congress of the grave danger of another world war unless the Communist aggressors were stopped. Consequently the Marshall plan began as a program to stop Communist aggression and to preserve democracy, free institutions, and civilization as we know it.

Each year since 1948 Congress has had before it a major piece of legislation authorizing foreign aid assistance and foreign military assistance. During that time the management of the program has changed names several times and

today it is administered by the International Cooperation Administration. Members of the House are quick to recognize that the authorizing legislation before us is among the most complex ever to confront the Congress.

During these years I have strongly supported foreign aid programs and foreign military assistance programs because I felt they were necessary to the security of the American people. I have on several occasions in past years directed attention to what I considered to be phases of this law completely inconsistent with the original purposes of the original plan, to wit: The strengthening of the security of the United States and other free people. I refer specifically to the tragic misuse of American public funds to support the Communist dictator Tito, and to strengthen his hold over the good people of Yugoslavia.

I believe it is timely that we ask ourselves how far away from its original purposes has the foreign aid program slipped since 1948. I think it is imperative that we know whether the United States public funds put in to our foreign aid and foreign military assistance programs are intended to defeat communism or whether there is some new objective which has crept into the program of which the American people have not yet been informed. I raise these questions because of the following reasons:

First. The legislation now before us contains several authorizing provisions for continuing assistance to Communist dictator Tito of Yugoslavia. According to unofficial information which I have received, there is $50 million plus buried in this bill for the tyrant Tito. While the information made available to Congress only lists $15 million as going to Tito, I am reliably informed that another $35 million for Tito is hidden in this legislation and kept from Members of Congress and the American public by virtue of a completely unjustified claim that it is necessary to keep such information classified.

Second. One of our sister republics right here in the Western Hemisphere, Guatemala, occupied for almost 10 years by the conspiracy of communism, less than 2 short years ago tore loose the tentacles of communism through a genuine revolution led by a group of national patriots. When the revolutionary leaders marched on the capital city of Guatemala, the Communist occupiers fled, but before they did they looted the national treasury and left this little country very deeply in debt. The victory of individual liberty and human decency over the conspiracy of communism in that Central American republic gave great hope to the friends of freedom everywhere in the world. At the time of the revolution many authorities stated that the defeat of communism in Guatemala was a major stroke in turning back the tidal wave of Russian communism. Yet this sister republic has had a tremendous struggle on its hands during these past 2 years to build a solid, stable, and free economy and to make possible a fuller life for the people of Guatemala than they have had under Communist tyranny. It is strange to me that the technicians in the Department of State regard the cause of Guatemala as relatively unimportant to the ultimate defeat of communism because they recommended to Congress that United States assistance to this country be limited to $5 million. The House Foreign Affairs Committee increased that sum by another $5 million, but it is apparent to me that we are being penny-wise and pound-foolish in our efforts to help the democratic leaders of Guatemala build a solid and free economy for their people. The funds now contained in this bill fall short, in my judgment, of what is needed to help Guatemala speed up its recovery from the occupation, exploitation, and looting by the Communists who are now thrown out of this country.

Third. This legislation also contains authority for the United States escapee program to continue the misuse of United States public funds in the Far East. I refer to the use of the American taxpayers money to pay the ocean transportation through Hong Kong of so-called White Russians now living in Red China to various countries of the free world. I appeared before the House Foreign Affairs Committee and there presented to it irrefutable evidence to the fact that contrary to the requirements of the law, there is no security investigation whatever made on these White Russians before they leave Red China because no security investigation is possible on the mainland of China. Even the International Cooperation Administration admitted this to be the fact in a written report to the House Committee on the Judiciary.

Moreover, the vast majority of these so-called White Russians are traveling on valid passports issued by the Kremlin—a fact which is indeed startling because only the trusted friends and agents of the Kremlin are ever given such passports. In addition, these so-called White Russians have no difficulty whatever securing an exit permit from the Chinese Communists in order to leave the Chinese mainland, but it is amazing that our own American civilian and military personnel imprisoned and detained there find it impossible to leave because they cannot obtain an exit permit and most of those Americans who have received such permits have paid exorbitant ransom fees for them. These incredible circumstances are climaxed by the hard, cold facts that at least one top espionage agent of the Kremlin who posed as one of the so-called White Russions in order to get into a Latin American Republic has been uncovered, apprehended, and deported from that country. This so-called White Russian was, in fact, the Russian security agent in the Polish Communist Embassy in Peking.

I find myself at a distinct disadvantage in discussing the bill before us and I am sure my feeling is shared by many of my colleagues. This results from the fact that the veil of secrecy has been placed over so much of the information as to how the funds we are asked to authorize will be used, the amounts that are to be received by each country, and the specific purposes and uses each country shall make of these funds. As Members of Congress, all of us are faced with the necessity of going before our constituents this fall to give an accounting of the manner in which we have discharged our responsibilities. One of the greatest responsibilities shared by every Member of Congress is the study of, the debate, and action on the foreign-aid legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that so much vital information in regard to this bill is being withheld from Congress by the Departments of State and Defense under the pretext of security, that it is virtually impossible for all individual Members to properly discharge the high responsibility with which our constituents have entrusted us.

It is apparent that certain reasonable restrictions must be placed on information to be given out publicly on vital military matters, but I fail to see why, Mr. Chairman, the shield of secrecy should now be employed to cover not only the so-called defense support program, but even the development assistance program as well. I would like to know why the Congress of the United States is not entitled to know how much each of the various countries is to receive in defense support and the purposes for which the money is to be spent. I should also like to know why Congress should not be informed as to how much economic aid is proposed for Guatemala or Israel and the Arab countries of the Middle East. Finally I see a grave danger in using the cloak of secrecy to withhold from the American people knowledge of the amount of their money that is proposed for Yugoslavia for military assistance or any other purpose. Surely there is no Member of this House who doubts for a single moment that the Russians will be informed down to the last plane, tank, rifle, or pencil as to every dollar Communist dictator Tito receives from the United States and for what it will be spent. Moreover, I believe it is childish for us to assume that the recipient countries under this proposed legislation do not already know the exact amount of money for whatever purpose which is included for every other one of the recipient countries.

There can be no question of the need for exacting security measures to be applied to projects carried out here in the United States such as the former Manhattan project and the need for keeping secret the development of certain programs in foreign countries which have a bearing upon the security of the free world. However, the maintenance of secrecy on such matters has nothing whatever to do with keeping from the American people knowledge of how much of their money is to be spent in each foreign country. Khrushchev and Bulganin know how much Tito will try to milk the American taxpayers for this year, but the poor American taxpayer is not permitted to know how big a bite Tito is going to be permitted to take out of our public funds this year.

I am sure that every Member of this House is aware of the love feast now taking place in Moscow between the Communist dictator Tito and the Kremlin leaders. Only last Monday dictator Tito, according to the daily press, stated

in Moscow that never again would there be any separation of Yugoslavia from the Communist camp of nations. Yesterday Tito said that Moscow was the city of his first love and that he was most enthused to be back again in the center of world conspiracy where he had spent so many years in the past preparing for his role as Russian proconsul over the good people of Yugoslavia.

This is an appropriate time to recall that just a year ago Khrushchev and Bulganin visited Tito in Belgrade following which there is reason to believe that several secret understandings were entered into between Tito and the crowd in the Kremlin. One of those evil understandings has been made current by a United Nations report made public yesterday which points up the likelihood that all Titoists who sought refuge in Yugoslavia shortly after the Cominform stated that Yugoslavia had been expelled from its ranks, would be forcibly repatriated. Last year I had the privilege of appearing before the distinguished members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, at which time I drew attention to this secret agreement between Tito and the Kremlin crowd as an indication of the unreliability and treacherous character of the dictator Tito. It is important that we Members of Congress keep in mind that Tito, who some people claim to be a friend of the United States and an enemy of Communist aggression, is about to hand over to the crushing caress of the Russian bear all those who took asylum in Yugoslavia and who opposed the Russian autocrats.

It is also important to recall that during the time of the Khrushchev-Bulganin visit to Belgrade last spring, the joint communique, joined in by Tito and the Russians, contained, among other statements, these two anti-American proposals:

First. That Red China be admitted to the United Nations;

Second. That the use of nuclear weapons be outlawed and permanently barred—under the infamous Russian formula.

The Russian formula, of course, authorized the Russians to go ahead full speed with their program of creating an atomic stockpile and a huge airport to deliver the A- and H-bombs on the people of the United States and all other free people, while the United States is required to destroy its stockpile of defensive power. It will be interesting to see what Tito and the crowd in the Kremlin call for in their communique that will conclude the renewed oath of allegiance that Tito has taken to the banner of the international Communist conspiracy. Of one thing we can be certain, that communique will call for action calculated to weaken the cause of human freedom and individual liberty while advancing the Russian dream of world empire.

But some good is bound to come out of Tito's oath of renewed allegiance to world communism. I am hopeful, now that the true character and intentions of the dictator Tito are clear to the world, that all the talk and nonsense about Titoism as a third force has been laid to rest. It now should be clear beyond any reasonable doubt that it is impossible to be a Communist and at the same time a national patriot and that all Communists owe their final allegiance to a small band of tyrants in the Moscow Kremlin. If we can learn the lesson of not falling into another very obvious Russian trap such as that posed by Tito, then it can be said that some good came out of Tito's return to his beloved Moscow.

I hope and pray that the illusion that Tito, while a Communist, is a different kind of Communist, which has engulfed so much of our officialdom, has finally come to an end. This illusion has caused untold damage to the cause of human freedom. This illusion has permitted the Russian agent Tito to send his deputies throughout all of the free world, and to plant the evil seeds of Communist propaganda and espionage. This illusion caused our Department of State to maneuver our proven allies, Turkey and Greece, into an unnatural alliance with a trojan horse of the Kremlin. This illusion has, in fact, given birth to the equally false notion that communism and human freedom can coexist and that through a process of political evolution, a new civilization will eventually take root on this earth. The illusion of Tito as a friend of human freedom and an enemy of the Russian despots is as false as the new theory of political evolution which presupposes that by some accident of nature, evil can be mixed with decency and that the future civilization it heralds can be at the same time both good and evil. I trust that the misguided advocates of this unworkable concept of political evolution will have learned, through their experience with Tito, that it is impossible to mix fire and water.

Two years ago I offered an amendment to the Mutual Security Act which read as follows:

Provided, That no part of these funds shall be used for or on behalf of Yugoslavia.

The obvious purpose of this amendment was to prevent the dictator Tito from using United States public funds to assist the international Communist conspiracy. I regret to say that amendment was rejected. Last year I was informed in advance of debate on the bill that there was very little likelihood that if I offered a similar amendment it would have any chance of adoption. This was due to the persistance of the illusion on Tito which has so misguided many of our decisions in the past. Consequently I offered an amendment which provided that no funds would be given to Tito unless and until members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee made a complete on-the-spot investigation in Yugoslavia of the end use of our funds and equipment theretofore given to Tito by the United States Government and that a favorable report thereon was submitted to the Congress. The wording of that amendment was and I quote:

No loan or assistance shall be made or given to Yugoslavia under this act, until the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives completes an on-the-spot investigation of all the military installations, depots, roads, and railroads in Yugoslavia, and certifies to the Clerk of the House that continued assistance to Yugoslavia is in the security interest of the United States.

This amendment was defeated. However, I then introduced a second amendment which made it mandatory on all recipient governments to grant to the United States the right of complete inspection of the end use of all grants and assistance. This amendment was adopted and incorporated into the act.

Tomorrow at the appropriate time, I intend to submit an amendment to the foreign aid bill, the object of which is to deny to Tito any aid whatever. I feel this amendment merits the support of every Member of this House and I ask my colleagues to give careful thought to it between now and the time it comes up tomorrow.

Our feeling with respect to the cause of Guatemala is, of course, directly opposite to that which I have expressed on Tito. Guatemala has demonstrated its allegiance to the cause which the United States has been called to lead throughout the world. Guatemala has thrown out the Russian "stooges" who only a short 2 years ago held control over the government. The Government of Guatemala today is struggling to overcome the blows to its national life struck by the Communists, and to bring about a prosperous, free-enterprise government. In my judgment Guatemala presents a splendid opportunity for us to demonstrate that life is better and more full when it is free and under a representative form of government than it ever can be under a Communist dictatorship.

Throughout Latin America the agents of the Kremlin are working unceasingly in an effort to undermine representative government and to bring about chaos and class conflict. This conspiratorial movement was given a setback when the Communists were thrown out of Guatemala because there is abundant evidence to demonstrate that Guatemala, before delivering itself of occupation, was a center of Communist intrigue and espionage throughout all of Latin America. But the Communists now consider their setback in Guatemala to be only a temporary one. At a Marxist meeting in New York City on April 13 of this year the principal speaker, touching on events throughout the world of importance to Marxists, stressed the fact that Guatemala was a focal point and at the same time deplored the temporary setback to Marxism in Guatemala. The former Communist president of Guatemala is now living behind the Iron Curtain in Prague, Czechoslovakia. It is a known fact that the Communists are preparing an effort to reoccupy Guatemala.

In face of this great opportunity which I believe we have to exploit freedom's victory in Guatemala, it appears as though we are not aware of this opportunity or that we are unwilling to cause a rapid economic advance in this recently emancipated country. I believe that the democratic leaders of Guatemala will put to maximum use for the cause of human freedom and decency and against the conspiracy of communism every single dollar authorized for Guatemala in this legislation. It is also my understanding that an amendment will be offered from the floor tomorrow increasing the grant to Guatemala. I intend to

support that amendment and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

I refer back to my earlier statement on the misuse of funds through the United States escapee program for so-called White Russians residing in Red China who are attempting to infiltrate the free world through the crown colony of Hong Kong. Last year I spent 8 weeks in the Far East on an official inspection trip for the House Committee on the Judiciary. In that capacity I uncovered the misuse of United States public funds authorized under the legislation now before us and reported this violation of law to the House Judiciary Committee. I called for an immediate correction of this disregard for both the letter and the spirit of the law. I also appeared before the House Foreign Affairs Committee to present all the evidence available to me on this subject. For all those who would be interested in the details of this violation of law, I invite attention to page 925 of the committee hearings on the Mutual Security Act of 1956.

I am advised that the only way to prevent the further use of United States public funds to pay the transportation costs from Red China to countries of the free world of any more Communist espionage agents is by amending the law to expressly prohibit the use of United States public funds for that purpose. Therefore I will offer an amendment tomorrow to close up this dangerous breach in the security of the free world.

It is shocking to me to find that funds authorized by Congress to defeat the Communist conspiracy are, in fact, being used to open the doors for a wave of Russian espionage and propaganda agents to invade some 30 countries of the free world. Under the cover of what appears to be humanitarian action, a grave blow has been struck at the very foundation of the free world. I urge you, my colleagues, to look into this matter so that you can raise questions with me tomorrow in order that this scandalous matter can be given a full public airing and stopped forthwith.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

M. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. May I congratulate the gentleman on his statement and inquire if his amendment will cut out current deliveries? Over the past years I have tried time after time to prevent the shipment of United States jet airplanes to Tito.

Mr. FEIGHAN. The amendment which I propose to offer will stop forthwith any delivery, that in the pipeline as well as what might be provided otherwise under the bill.

Mr. FULTON. I will be glad to support the gentleman's effort.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. With respect to Guatemala, does the gentleman know that I offered an amendment in the committee to increase defense support or economic development aid to Guatemala by $5 million, and that it carried?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes; and I heartily support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I, too, support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORANO].

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the question of what shall be our national policy with respect to foreign aid is again before Congress for consideration and decision.

The principal issues to be decided are as to the amount that should be appropriated and how long the extending of aid should continue. With each succeeding year there is more and more controversy as to how much, and, for how long, are we to continue to pay out large sums as aid to our allies throughout the world. The decision of these two questions should be based on how great is the necessity for a continuation of such aid.

Following the end of World War II, there was almost general approval of a policy of giving aid to our allies who had been so terribly distressed by the war. There was little doubt in the mind of anyone following the conclusion of World War II that a great need existed to rehabilitate and strengthen the war-torn countries of Europe. Their industries and their homes had been in large measure destroyed. Accordingly, the so-called Marshall plan was adopted. It was adopted, however, with the thought that it was to be temporary only. There was no intention that it should become permanent or even long extended. However, it seems that year after year reasons, both new and old, have been given, or, necessities shown that have caused a continuation of appropriations to be made. Thus, from the day that the Marshall plan was adopted, we have continued to extend aid, but, in a constantly reducing amount. However, notwithstanding, the reductions that have been made in the appropriations during the intervening years, the amount is still great.

It cannot be denied that there is a constantly growing thought that the time has come when there should be a substantial reduction. It does seem that a giveaway program, whether it be for domestic or foreign uses, is hard to discontinue.

Those who are of this opinion point to the fact that the Allies for whom we inaugurated the policy have been substantially, and, in most cases, fully rehabilitated. This may be true, generally speaking, with reference to industrial rehabilitation. It is gratifying to realize that such is the case, and, that our financial aid has really brought beneficial results.

It should also be kept in mind that the cause for all this aid is not alone to rebuild the industrial economy of the distressed nations, but, also to stave off and prevent communism from moving in and taking over these distressed nations and their peoples as a result of their distress. In this objective, I am glad to say, we have been as successful as we also have been in improving the economic stability of the European nations.

Now, it seems that the military necessities of not only European nations, but, also of Asia are being pressed as the reason to continue, or, to extend the area, in which financial aid is to be given by us. In this connection, it is to be noted that in many parts of Asia, as well as in the island nations contiguous thereto, there is also a growing demand for industrial and economic aid, and not military aid alone. Again the reason is advanced that such economical, as well as military aid, is necessary if we are to stop the growth and influence of communism in that part of the world. And, so it seems to go on and on.

Unpleasant though it may be for our people to be called upon to make these contributions, yet, we have done so with the feeling that we are thereby doing our part to prevent another war. The destruction of material things, and, above all, the tremendous loss of life, that would result from another world war, is beyond our power to estimate in this day of highly perfected weapons of war. To contrast the cost of war, on the scale it would have to be fought, with what we are spending in foreign aid to build a more peaceful world and to strengthen those whom we would expect to have as allies in case of war, is relatively small in the latter case, although we cannot help but feel that our financial sacrifice is great.

Although the cause of peace and foreign aid have a close relationship to one another, and, although we acknowledge an obligation to improve and strengthen our allies, yet, we cannot be entirely unmindful of the needs that are so pressing in our own land, and, that because of our generosity to others, are not being met as fully as we would like. We need hospitals, nursing homes, facilities to improve the welfare of our handicapped persons, both mental and physical, and, our aged. These are but a few of the needs that are apparent in our land. Too often we find that our world obligations are curtailing or preventing the fulfillment of our domestic obligations. It is conditions such as these that make it imperative for us to give close and careful consideration to maintaining a proper balance between our foreign and our own domestic obligations.

Our Nation cannot be accused of being stingy in foreign aid. During the 10 years that have intervened since the conclusion of World War II we have contributed more than $50 billion. As I have already said, this has produced some gratifying results, but, now that there has been such a substantial economic recovery and military strength regained by our allies, it seems that the time has come when he should make a careful reexamination as to what further commitments should be made for foreign aid. Certainly, there is no need, in my opinion, for an increase in appropriations for this purpose, nor, any justification for legislation that would provide a

future 10-year program of foreign aid. We should go carefully, making certain that aid should not be extended one year longer than is absolutely necessary, nor, for any amount greater than is necessary.

Last March the Congress was asked to appropriate $4,900,000,000 for foreign aid. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs has reported this bill with $1,109,000,000 cut from the sum requested. I am in accord with the action of the committee. I believe it is fully justified. As a matter of fact, in my opinion, the cutback could have been larger as all of the appropriations for the preceding 2 years have not as yet been expended in full. The committee has also shown good judgment in refusing to commit our Nation to a future 10-year program.

I have always supported the foreign-aid program under previous administrations, as well as this present administration. I do so now, but, I am convinced the time has come when there can be some reduction, and, I hope the time is not far distant when the necessity to continue making such appropriations at all will disappear.

Of course, whatever our policy it must of necessity give full consideration to the aims and purposes of the Soviet Union in world affairs. If Russia continues to think and plan from the standpoint of world domination, then, we must act accordingly and do all that is necessary in the matter of financial aid to make certain of our own security and the peace of the world. And, it is hoped that all the aid we extend will be helpful in maintaining our own security.

If we could only be assured and feel safe in accepting what seems to be a new Russian policy as 100 percent sincere, it would make possible a much larger reduction in the appropriation for foreign aid than the $1,109,000,000 now contemplated. In view of our long experience in broken promises by Russia, we cannot take too much for granted. Certain it is that we, as a peace-loving nation, will be glad to find that Russia is really sincere this time, as it would mean not only an increased peace of mind for everyone, but also a decreased need for large appropriations for armaments at home and aid abroad. The coming of such a day cannot be too soon for me, and, I know I speak the mind of all our people in this respect.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD], ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I favor the passage of H. R. 11356 to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954. These are difficult times for the American people, for the Congress, and for the executive branch—when international affairs are viewed against the permanent peace and security yet to be attained. Events move swiftly but the usual Soviet tactics continue, sometimes in this direction and sometimes in that direction, but always taking advantage of the developments in world affairs. I feel it is particularly important at this very time for the United States to be steadfast in its continuation of the mutual security program.

Let us remember the deteriorating situation and almost chaotic conditions which existed in the world at the end of World War II. Communism was running rampant, subversion was the order of the day, government treasuries were empty; many people were ill-fed, ill-clad, and psychologically ripe for conversion to Communist doctrine. Today, through the mutual security program and its predecessor programs, the economy of Europe has been substantially restored, Communist subversion has been minimized, and Soviet armed power is confronted with the deterrent power of NATO. Deterrent power, however, must not only be continued but must be increasingly strengthened in every possible way because the dangers which we face from Communist imperialism continue as before.

I know that there are some who are disillusioned with the mutual security program. In support of their disillusionment they cite the insecurity which still exists and the continuing threat from the Soviets. But I want to point out this fundamental principle which they overlook. No program of foreign aid or mutual security can, in itself, wipe out the danger confronting the free world. What it can accomplish, however, is to prevent the danger from coming to life and by making it clear to the Kremlin leaders that the cost to them of aggression would be too great for them to bear. This, I feel, the military part of our mutual security program has accomplished and is accomplishing today. It is for that reason that I opposed in committee the cut of $1 billion in military aid which the White House and the Pentagon say is essential to the security of the United States. Funds for military assistance in the mutual security bill are in reality for our own defense. I think this is an essential fact which cannot be too strenuously emphasized. I feel that the cut of $1 billion was a grave mistake. The cut of $1 billion in military funds is cutting the very heart of our military effort and to that extent will diminish the deterring effect of our program. This is the very time, when despite the diminishing efforts of other countries, our own efforts must, if anything, be increased so as to give the world leadership and reassurance. I hope that at least a substantial portion of the cut will be restored when this bill finally reaches the President's desk for his approval. However, I want to point out that I voted for a $500 million cut.

I likewise feel that the nonmilitary aspects of the mutual-security program are vital to the security of the United States. While these programs do not involve guns and ammunition, they involve fulfilling to some extent the basic needs of people and to fight not a military fight but a human fight against hunger, poverty, disease, and illiteracy.

I am pleased to note that the committee voted $5 million in additional funds for defense support in Latin America, which amount is to be added to the amount requested for Guatemala by the executive branch. Guatemala stands in the unique position of being the only country in the history of the world which has been able to throw off the yoke of Communist tyranny. This country is a vital and much needed anti-Communist bastion in an area which is definitely linked to the security of the United States and the whole Western Hemisphere. Certainly, defense support assistance to Latin America to help nations maintain internal defense and economic and political stability is vital to our own peace and security and deserves the support of all of us.

Because the mutual-security program is so important, and because its policies and objectives are so vital to our own security, it is essential that they be constantly reappraised and, wherever possible, improved. That is why I proposed in committee an amendment to the bill including a provision which would give congressional sanction to the creation by the President of a Commission on Mutual Security. I do not look upon such a Commission as an abdication of congressional responsibility and control. It is the responsibility of the Congress, and particularly of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, to study and evaluate on its own the effectiveness of existing programs. But I do feel that such a Commission as proposed by the President, particularly if it is made up of individuals of high caliber and unquestioned qualifications, could do much to assist not only the Executive in the formulation of foreign policy, but also the Congress in making the implementation of that policy possible.

There are still many world problems left unsolved. The world still faces in the Soviet menace the greatest danger it has ever confronted. But the main reason we are now at peace is because of the deterrent effect of the mutual-security program against Soviet aggression. Without such a program, without the United States assuming the responsibilities of leadership, and without the moral impulse behind our efforts, we would be faced not only with a grave danger but with chaos. The mutual-security program has thus far been successful. Just because of the Soviet's blandishments that they want peace is no reason we should cripple or abandon the program at this crucial time.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio yield me a minute?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask for this opportunity to make an inquiry of the ranking minority member of this committee. Many people have been of the impression that when foreign aid was allocated to certain foreign governments the money actually went to those governments and was spent there. Would the gentleman from Ohio comment on that?

Mr. VORYS. Some people have the idea that we ship dollars all over the world. As a matter of fact, the dollars stay here. In the 1955 program, 82 percent of the commodities purchased were bought right here in the United States; that is 82 cents out of every dollar was spent in the United States.

As to offshore production where we purchased equipment overseas, and salaries paid our overseas people, of course, the dollars are of no value until they are finally spent in the United States. That is why people in other countries want dollars. But the idea that the dollars themselves are shipped around the world is a mistake. At least 82 percent of them stay right here and the rest of the money comes home soon after.

Mr. SCHENCK. As I understand the comment of our colleague from Ohio it is that the money allocated in this bill is actually to be spent in this country and produce employment business and industry in this country.

Mr. VORYS. It goes to American industry, business, and agriculture. For instance, here are examples of ICF purchases in Dayton, Ohio, in the gentleman's district, that I have learned about since the gentleman spoke to me on this matter earlier today:

Dayton Rubber Co	$900,000
Master's International, Inc	60,000
Globe Tool Co	73,000
International Clay Machinery Co	180,000
Garrison Machine Co	16,000

This does not include subcontracts, or purchases made through exporters. The following companies produce under defense contracts—I understand that part of their output goes to this military defense assistance program—National Cash Register Co., Dayton Rubber Co., International Tool Co., Chrysler Corp., Standard Register, Globe Industries, General Motors, United Aircraft Products.

Mr. SCHENCK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, before addressing myself to the bill under consideration, I want to pay tribute to our distinguished and beloved chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]. This is the last large bill to be piloted through the House by Mr. RICHARDS. For myself this is an occasion of personal regret. In the 16 years we have served together in the House and on the Committee on Foreign Affairs I have enjoyed his friendship, his warm personality and wise counsel. We are a committee of 32 members, rugged individualists, each with firm ideas and strong opinions. But under Mr. RICHARD'S leadership we have moved forward as a group and emerged from sharp debate without any ill-feeling on the part of the members. He has the unusual and happy faculty of keeping all of us in the best of humor during long and tedious sessions. More than that, he abounds in commonsense and good judgment. These are qualities that everyone of us appreciates and all of us will miss. I wish him and his dear wife only the happiest days.

From this side of the House we have heard the clear analytical speech of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]. With his usual zeal and diligence he has plunged into the details of this bill. I know of no other Member who has the capacity to analyze elaborate statistics and to derive from them a better understanding of the ramifications of this program. On the basis of his detailed analysis, he is able to put into succinct and colorful language the essence of each part of the bill, and thereby make it more intelligible for us to follow. He has been the real workhorse of the committee on this bill.

This bill that we are considering today authorizes the appropriation of $3,563,475,000 to carry forward the mutual security program. This is $1.1 billion less than the Executive request. I was 1 of the 11 members of the committee who voted against the drastic cut on the basis that it was far too severe and that careful enough analysis of all the factors involved had not been made. Anyone who has watched the development and spread of communistic power since 1917 and even before as I have done, cannot but recognize this last change of tactic as just another and exceedingly dangerous approach to the goal from which they have never swerved—that of complete control of the world. It would be folly for the free world to relax its vigil. It would be disastrous to lessen our military strength. That strength does not emanate from the United States alone. It is a combination of strengths of all the nations of the free world. To the end that we may continue building security for freedom, we are here today to consider H. R. 11356.

I shall not repeat the many points made by those who have spoken before me.

Mr. Chairman, as in other years we begin by emphasizing the controversial parts of this legislation. We should place great emphasis upon the things we do to help countries wanting to uphold freedom—but we should not fail to paint the picture of those things we are doing that are unbelievably good and constructively successful.

I do want to emphasize two areas, the Near East and Africa, which are important to the West, and I use the word synonymously with "the free world." In these African areas we have airbases and listening posts. Any slackening of our determination to hold these for the west would be suicidal. In addition, I must repeat what you have often heard—the importance of the areas of the Near East, from Turkey down, the great bridge between the East and the West. I must remind you that the Communist leapfrog tactic, going on at the same time that they were changing the external look of their method into one of greater friendliness, is a most dangerous one. It is my earnest hope that nothing will be cut out of this bill that could make for strengthening of this area.

It is my intention to discuss other parts of H. R. 11356—parts which have to do with development assistance, technical assistance and some of our activities within the United Nations. The development-assistance program has as its purpose to help meet economic crises which are considered a threat to the United States and to the interest of the free world. These build those greater values and uphold those ideals that the people of the world seek—the nonmilitary aspects of living which are necessary if supplies and commodities and funds are to be available in these freedom-loving countries.

To me it is more than just serious that the cut included one of $100 million in the development-assistance program. That money is intended to serve as a catalytic agent to strengthen the desire and the capacity in the countries of the Near East and southern Asia that they may stand firmly against Soviet penetration. The rather small sums that we are giving them provide the incentive for them to use far larger amounts of their own money to make the effort that will assure a more orderly development of their economy and so of their strength. It is in keeping with the traditional and historic method of the United States in the world.

The committee gave especially serious study to the portion of the bill having to do with technical assistance and made no cut. If one considers the far-reaching implications one cannot but feel that technical assistance programs are perhaps the greatest achievement of the world today—the greatest contributions we can make to our civilization. The sharing of our trained technical know-how with other countries of the world which have not been able to develop their national and human resources to the extent that they are in a position to meet the national need of their people, the provision of trained peoples of other countries in leadership capacity and preparation to return to their own country to assume roles of leadership in the years to come perhaps will be the greatest contributions of this small program. While it accomplishes this, it is building understanding between the United States and freedom-loving nations that have dared to share in such programs. Technical assistance programs are helping to meet the aspirations of the people, not by costly and ill-conceived ventures, but by small, sound demonstrations and the exchange of information.

Because I spent more than 3 months in Africa and the Near East, I shall confine myself to putting before you the results of my own experiences in a number of individual countries. I can assure you it was good to see our people working side by side with natives in the different countries, teaching them simple techniques to improve their agriculture, to raise their health standards, and to provide elementary education.

Few Americans understand how down to earth our technical assistance programs are. The ordinary transient who visits the capital cities has no opportunity to observe the diversity of our activities and no occasion to understand the appreciation with which our efforts are met. Let me illustrate my point by reference to our programs in a few countries in a part of the world with which I am familiar.

Egypt is essentially a country of desert. More than 90 percent of its 22 million inhabitants are concentrated in the narrow valley of the Nile River. In order to provide for its increasing population, the Egyptian Government is reclaiming sandy areas as water becomes available, determined to become a more

than one-crop country. Her uses of the new acreage are going into general food supplies to feed her own people.

In the western desert the Government of Egypt has set aside a 25,000-acre area that will serve as a pilot project in desert range development. Already forage production on parts of the area has been increased as much as tenfold. Fencing, reseeding, water-spreading and other soil and water conservation practices have been used to accomplish this. To complete the project, sound methods of grazing must be adopted and demonstrated and improved animal handling and breeding practices introduced. Like many other governments of underdeveloped countries, Egypt has undertaken extensive agricultural extension service. Already 510 Egyptian extension workers are on the job. It is expected that this number will shortly be raised to 1,000. Extension projects have been started in 3 of the 15 Provinces. The purpose is to show the actual operations of all phases of a planned extension program.

Training schools have been set up on the national and the provincial levels. Underground water development and drainage improvements are an important part of Egypt's soil reclamation program. Drainage studies are in progress in a pilot area of 43,000 acres. Crop improvement is being studied through field and laboratory research with a view to finding efficient varieties of the various crops commonly grown in Egypt. One of the most important developments to date in this field has been the introduction of hybrid maize.

The United States is contributing to the health activities of the Institute of Public Health in Egypt. Our work there is essentially of a technical character, providing assistance in the training of personnel and the operation of equipment. In talking with individuals who are working in this field I was told that already there are plans to reduce our personnel as trained Egyptian personnel take over. In the field of education the training of teachers for rural elementary schools has been made possible by our assistance. This project embraces all phases of elementary education, including health education, the preparation and utilization of visual aids, and the planning of buildings and facilities. United States technicians are helping to develop a pattern of general education on the junior-high-school level and, with the assistance of the Ministry of Education, are developing plans for training centers for secondary schools teaching homemaking, agriculture, and industry.

In Ethiopia our program has been established principally around the fields of general education and agricultural education. During my visit to Ethiopia last fall, I visited a number of the projects in the field of agriculture. I came away with a feeling that our work there was based upon sound principles that contributed to the economic development of the country. Ethiopia is one country in which we have a number of small projects in the field of agriculture, but all of them are coordinated toward the development of its agricultural base. The agricultural college and extension service have benefited from the technical-assistance advice which we have given. A countrywide system of agricultural extension and agricultural experimental stations has been started. To meet the perennial problem of locust control, a special pest-control unit has been set up in the Ministry of Agriculture. Demonstration work with farmers in one of the areas near Addis Ababa is devoted to the improvement of livestock breeding and marketing of cattle. Ethiopian coffee has been increasing in popularity in the last few years. Our contribution has been to improve the methods of producing, processing, and marketing this important item. In one of the Provinces of Ethiopia an urban health center has been established to serve as a demonstration of a modern public-health department. Included in this project is the construction of a health-center building, the provision of technicians, and the training of Ethiopian nationals to staff the unit. Perhaps one of the most thrilling sights is to see the contribution which we have made in the field of education in Ethiopia. Technical assistance is being provided to the Ministry of Education for the development of a modern educational program and a school system adapted to the needs of Ethiopia. Education technicians are now working in several activities, including visual aids, school publications, and curriculum development. Teacher education is being provided for a very modest amount. Next year we are planning to spend $15,000 for the establishment of a training school in the capital. Ethiopians, like many other peoples in Africa, have an unusual talent for handicraft work. Unfortunately, the products have a limited market. Through our technical-assistance program we are training Ethiopians to make their products adaptable to foreign markets. A vocational trade school and a nurses' training school are two other projects in which the United States is playing an important part. As is so frequently the case, the success or failure of the program depends upon the quality of personnel. I am aware that last fall and running on into this year there were certain personnel problems that slowed up our technical-assistance programs in Ethiopia. Mr. Hollister's alert office in Washington, aware of this situation, has taken steps, through the transfer of various individuals, to make it possible for our program to operate more smoothly.

United States technical cooperation program in Israel is designed to promote maximum utilization of Israel's total resources through the improvement of its technology principally in management of industry, minerals development, irrigation, and transportation.

I wish you could have been with me in Israel. I wish you could have gone with me to the many installations where the Hadassahs work. There was a wonderful school where boys in their early teens were learning how to make precision instruments and at the same time learning how to be foremen. There was a little 14-year-old boy who was teaching two 13-year-old boys how to make a precision instrument, and it was one of the most exciting things I have ever seen; he was so proud.

Then there is another school where men who had finished their army service and were learning how to make equally important but a little cruder machinery. This particular project has help from our point 4 program.

One need only move around Israel to see the importance of our contribution to that country's growth. Our technicians are helping Israel in a wide variety of fields of activity. Up to the present the greatest emphasis has been on agriculture, with considerable progress made in plant breeding, animal husbandry, soil conservation, water spreading, and irrigation. Emphasis is now being shifted to industry where contributions have already been made in the textile industry, chemical and fertilizer production, glass and ceramics manufacture, and metalworking. For the next year our programs of assistance will be in the development of managerial skills, the technology of industrial engineering and industrial design. Assistance will be continued in mining and public administration, and on a slightly decreased scale in such other fields as public health and sanitation, education, transportation, and community development.

Liberia is the only independent nation in West Africa. The United States played a leading role in its formation. Peoples south of the Sahara are now seeking to achieve the political status now over 100 years old in Liberia. Everywhere they are on the move, politically and economically. The effect of our technical cooperation programs in Liberia is certain to have a profound influence on the opinions of the United States held by large populations of native peoples in Africa.

The prime objective of our aid is to help Liberians locate and recognize the potential wealth of their country and to assist them in learning ways of doing things to develop their resources more fully. The country is rich in agricultural, mineral, and forest resources. With technical guidance the Liberians will be able to gain income from these resources with which to help themselves, to support and improve education, health, and other public-service programs essential to their continued growth.

Until our program was inaugurated, Liberia was deficient in many of the essential phases of government administration and organization by which its programs could be effectively administered. A department of agriculture has been built up and a basic staff trained in the rudiments of operating an extension service and a central experiment station. A successful demonstration of swamp-rice production has shown the way to high rice yields on former unused land. The first step in developing plans for the utilization of its potential forest resources was the development of a bureau of forest and conservation. A highway department has been established and most of the basic staff trained. Within the last few years the discovery of large iron deposits in the interior of the country has increased the interest of private investors in Liberia. The exploitation of these resources requires the progressive development of a trained labor force as well as

the training of professional people. Through contracts with American universities initiated under our aid program, professional and technical services are being developed to provide the requisite training.

The program in Iraq conforms more nearly to what a technical assistance program should be. This situation arises from the fact that the Government of Iraq has adequate revenues of its own in the form of oil royalties. During the current year, for example, it will have at its disposal about $140 million, which is almost exactly the equivalent of the rest of the Government's regular budget. The big need of Iraq is the services of competent technicians to assist in implementing its development program. For that reason the United States has eliminated practically all equipment, including demonstration equipment, and has concentrated its small budget of about $2 million in supplying technicians and providing training assistance for Iraqis to go to the United States. United States personnel is assisting in organizing and staffing the newly established agricultural college. They are serving in advisory and policymaking positions to the irrigation directorate. They are providing guidance and program direction in agriculture extension and in the use of agricultural machinery. To meet the pressing transportation needs of the country American personnel are establishing a modern bureau of roads. Practically the entire field of public health is being developed under United States guidance and according to United States standards. Iraq is one of the few countries in the Near East capable of absorbing more people on the land. One of the factors delaying the settlement on public lands is the lack of administrative talent in providing developed land sites for the people. With the assistance of American technicians, extensive plans are under consideration for the implementation of a countrywide program that will provide for the settlement on these lands. Iraq's problem is not one of money, as I have indicated earlier. Rather, it is the wise use of this money that has troubled the Iraqi Government. The Iraq Development Board, which is an overall planning organization controlling the economic development of the country, draws heavily upon American technicians both at the executive and advisory levels to give guidance in its expenditures for development purposes.

In presenting in some detail the programs in each of these five countries I have tried to show the variety of projects in which our Government is engaged. Naturally there are some real problems which we face. Frequently the local governments desire to progress more rapidly than is physically possible and are disappointed if results are not forthcoming promptly. They tend to place too great emphasis on physical construction and not enough emphasis on human values. There is, too, a lack of appreciation of the necessity for adequate preparation and coordination. In other cases, a shortage of appropriately educated personnel who can be given further specialized training by our technicians is an obstacle to progress. We are, for example, constantly scraping the bottom of the personnel barrel in engineering, agriculture, public health, and many other areas. It is difficult to find appropriate counterparts as there is too great a demand for their services everywhere. There is also too great a tendency to rely on foreign technicians. Finally, rather frequent political changes have impeded the orderly progress and operation of the programs.

Most of these problems are basically the kind of problems we like to have. They are growing pain problems—problems arising from a rapidly developing economy. They are problems of guidance and coordination in making a moving economy proceed in a balanced manner. These are much easier to deal with than the problems of stagnation, depression, and inertia. While it is easy to criticize many features of these programs, the basic fact remains that from the total point of view the elements of strength far outweigh the demerits.

All of the programs which I have described heretofore are bilateral programs, that is, between our Government and the local government. This bill carries a small authorization of $15,500,000 for United States contributions to the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance. Judging from the inquiries which I have received there is some confusion in the public mind that this sum represents a reduction from the amount which the Congress voted last year. I would like to clear up any confusion on this point. The United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance operates on a calendar year basis. Last year the Congress voted $24 million to cover the United States contribution for 18 months, that is to say, for the period running through December 1956. Of that amount $8,500,000 was pledged for the last half of the calendar year 1955 and $15,500,000 has been pledged for calendar year 1956. The amount requested in this bill, therefore, is identical with that pledged for the current calendar year. The Congress has stipulated that United States pledges for this program can be made only on the basis of funds appropriated. This coming October there will be a meeting of the United Nations Technical Assistance organization to lay the plans for its program for calendar year 1957. In order that the United States may make a pledge at that time it is necessary that we authorize the sum in this bill. The committee's comments on its reasons for recommending this program will be found in the committee report. Because they succinctly express our views I should like to quote them:

> United States leadership in the United Nations is strengthened by our continued strong support of this program. The substantial contributions made by this Government have been interpreted by other countries of the free world as evidence of our good faith in desiring to promote the economic development and well-being of underdeveloped countries. Indication of the appeal of the program is the Soviet "about-face" toward it. For several years the program was denounced as a tool of "United States imperialism." Since 1954 the Soviet has pledged 4 million rubles, equivalent to $1 million. Similarly the satellites have made pledges. The committee was informed by the Hon. Francis O. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, that "No payment would be made to Soviet bloc experts from the United States contribution to the United Nations technical assistance program." (Hearings, p. 483.)
>
> In the light of this participation, it is more important than ever that the United States continue its support.

One other portion of our mutual security program that shows the concern of the United States for the human element is our continued support of the United Nations Children's Fund. This marks the 10th anniversary of the Fund. Originally established as an emergency operation to help meet the conditions of hunger and want among children in Europe following World War II, the Fund has expanded its interests and resources in recent years to assist the less advanced countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America in the development of permanent child health and welfare services, and in the control and eradication of debilitating diseases.

An estimated two-thirds of the world's estimated 9 million children still live in areas where malnutrition and disease and outmoded maternal and child health practices threaten to deprive them of an opportunity to develop into healthy self-supporting adults. From a global, long-range standpoint, raising the children of today to be productive and good citizens of tomorrow is a most important consideration in our total effort to achieve worldwide peace and economic stability.

The underdeveloped countries lack the financial means to cope with the vast problem of restoring and improving the health of children. Outside assistance is sorely needed. The Children's Fund has been the focal point through which international aid for children has been provided. It is in our Government's interest to continue its support of the Children's Fund, both for humanitarian reasons and for the abundant good will which the United States has gained through its participation in the program.

Prior to this year, the Soviet Union remained completely aloof from the program. In recognition of the good that has accrued to countries aided by the Fund, the Soviet Union last summer announced a pledge of 2 million rubles, the equivalent of $500,000 to the calendar year 1955 program of the Fund. Now that the Soviet Union has come into the program, it would be unfortunate if the United States allowed its position of leadership to weaken.

Mr. Chairman, there is little in this bill that is new. In one form or another most of it has been before us for a number of years, though there is some shift in emphasis. The course of international events has necessitated other adjustments. But the basic philosophy has remained consistent through the years.

No one who supports this measure will represent it as a cure-all for the world's ills. But it is a constructive program responsive to the challenges we face today.

I have spoken of the necessity for the large military funds, and of my op-

position to so drastic a cut in our national security. But it is equally important for our national interest that we not pin all our security to armaments. Men live by faith more than by guns. It is our responsibility as a world leader to offer constructive alternatives. This is the purpose of the nonmilitary funds in this bill. Some critics of this program say callously that we are trying to buy friends. I reject this suggestion. We are offering to those who are free and want to remain free some hope that freedom has advantages infinitely greater than subservience and slavery.

This bill provides modest amounts, not to buy freedom, but to build freedom. In the process of building there will be trials and errors; mistakes that all of us deplore. But we must never lose sight of our goal.

I sincerely trust that this House will see fit to restore a large part of the cut, and will pass the legislation with few changes.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman from Ohio yield?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentlewoman has made a brilliant analysis of an area with which she is familiar. I should like to ask this question. Through her own studies and travels in the Near East and Africa, she has made many of us feel that the great continent of Africa is the new frontier, culturally, economically, and perhaps militarily. Would that be an accurate statement?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. The gentleman expresses it exceedingly well. To my mind, Africa is the great new frontier. She is becoming a tremendous force in the world. Do not forget that she has all the raw materials that we need so desperately.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentlewoman yield to me?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. May I congratulate the lady on her excellent statement and say that she is awakening America as well as Africa to the prospects of this great new continent.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I thank my colleague from Pittsburgh very sincerely.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, approval of the bill before us will launch an international race in competitive economic aid. The dangers that lurk in such a program must be obvious to all. It could bankrupt the economy of our country and with it demoralize existing economies abroad.

Communist aggression is chiefly political and it is time that the makers of foreign policy understand that fact of life. Yet we seem to be at a loss to meet that issue. On the other hand, the Communists know where they are going. Their economic policies are always slanted toward the political and therein lies their strength. Conversely it is our weakness.

The Soviet theme or propaganda line alleges that the West or the free world is imperialistic; that the Western Powers are determined to insure policies favorable to a continuance of colonialism. Colonialism is feared by all Asians as we must know. It is true that they are not yet afraid of Communist imperialism but they still remember the British, French, and Dutch who at one time were their absentee rulers and with whom we are now allied.

They know or should that the historic policy of the United States is opposed to colonialism but nevertheless they make the charge on the basis of guilt by association. In short the argument goes: All capitalist nations are imperialist—therefore the conclusion that we are imperialist. This is utterly false; but millions of Asians and north Africans believe it.

Soviet propaganda presents a positive picture of world policy and offers economic aid within a wide ideological framework. It broadcasts daily that it stands for a world without domination by any one nation over another. It blatantly states that all peoples under the Communist banner will cooperate in creating a peaceful brotherly international order based on Socialist and Communist principles. All this, they say, will certainly raise the living standards of people everywhere.

Mr. Chairman, if we are so foolish as to enter into a competitive economic aid race with the Communists, we will come out second best. We know that they can offer a sales program that promises the moon or everything that the peoples of Asia desire. They continue a constant harangue to the effect that capitalism is bound to fail and that communism offers the only real program for survival and a better way of life. In short their approach is not based upon the principle of fear but upon the principle that communism is bound to succeed.

Our approach, on the other hand, Mr. Chairman, is negative. It is based on fear and it is defensive. We in the United States by our advocacy of the legislation before us, state unequivocally that this program of necessity involves our own security and that we must give assistance to the underdeveloped areas in order to keep them out of the Communist orbit. This is purely a self-interest approach and I believe is self-defeating. Why should other nations be asked to assist us in the matter of our own security?

I would call attention, Mr. Chairman, to a phase of the legislation before us which I think is fatal to the establishment of sound relationships with other nations in the world. We should know that the people of Europe and Asia too do not want war. Yet the emphasis in this bill is primarily upon the military or military assistance to support it. We are blind if we fail to recognize at this time that other nations will not fight to preserve our national security. "Neutralism" is on the march among our friends in Europe and Asia. There is some doubt at this time that they will fight at all, even though they are associated with us in military alliance.

One writer recently made a pertinent observation on this very point, and I quote:

> In all this welter of western insistence upon self-interest and self-defense, one looks in vain for any consistent exposition of a positive policy of foreign aid, for some general political philosophy to match Communist confidence in world brotherhood based upon Socialist production, some framework of solidarity between givers and takers of aid, some aspect of common concern beyond the narrow limits of common fear.

We need not necessarily agree completely with that statement but we must admit it contains some thoughts that should have the attention of the free world. I repeat that our only policies today are based on fear and that is a completely negative concept.

Mr. Chairman, for 12 consecutive years now, the Congress has considered foreign-aid authorizations and appropriations. This program was initiated at the close of World War II and except for a few changes in terminology, its purpose and objectives are the same.

In this long period of time the people of the United States have assumed the burden of foreign aid hardly without complaint yet with highly questionable results. Communism marches on and is expanding its perimeter not by war but by political infiltration. Our "one-two" punch has been reliance upon increased military appropriations and economic aid. Today we are being told when the question is asked that a termination date of this program cannot be fixed. In other words, the program goes on and on and on. There are those so bold as to suggest that it might be a 50-year program, yea, a permanent program ad infinitum.

At this point, I shall include a brief summary of foreign-aid money paid out by our taxpayers from July 1, 1945 to June 4, 1956. This covers the postwar period of World War II to date. It also shows the amount of foreign-aid funds available from July 1, 1955, to this time.

[In millions]

Grants paid out July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1955	$41,842
Grants unexpended as of June 30, 1955	8,700
Appropriations provided for fiscal year 1956	2,703
Total grants	53,245
Less: Returns on grants to June 30, 1955	1,493
Net aid in grants	51,752
Loans paid out July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1955	12,117
Grants converted to loans and not included in grants above	2,256
Loans authorized but not paid out June 30, 1955	2,433
Total loans	16,806
Less: Principal collected on loans to June 30, 1955	3,386
Net aid in loans	13,420
Total net aid	65,172

This year, Mr. Chairman, the Congress has been asked to consider a much larger request than it did for fiscal 1955

and 1956. The President asks for $4.9 billion which is $2 billion more than requested in the 2 previous years. I submit that there has been no adequate explanation to justify this request.

Again this year we are confronted with a recurring condition, namely, that of large unexpended balances in the fund. It is evident that the executive department cannot spend the huge sums of money that Congress has been authorizing and appropriating. The fact seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that neither the executive department nor the Congress has but little knowledge of the real situation that exists under this program so far as spending goes. Is it fair to charge that the Congress is guilty of fiscal irresponsibility? The situation can be corrected if we set our minds to it. However, under this bill no relief in that regard is suggested.

Our committee has cut more than $1 billion from the total amount requested by the President. It was prompted, I am sure, by the large unexpended balances from previous years. If I understand the figures correctly it appears that there will be approximately $6.8 billion unexpended at the end of the present fiscal year—and if the amount now provided in the bill before us is approved, there will be available in excess of $10 billion for fiscal 1957.

Mr. Chairman, the special task force under the Hoover Commission which was assigned to make a study of overseas economic operations submitted a report to Congress a year ago in which it expressed great concern over the continuing large outlays for foreign aid. The Commission made this pertinent observation, and I quote:

> Surely, after almost 10 years, the time has come to apply some brakes to this overseas spending program. We believe, therefore, that the Commission should recommend substantial reductions in expenditures for this purpose. By no other means will the growing trend toward permanent foreign spending be halted.

It was, Mr. Chairman, with some surprise to many that notwithstanding this admonition by the Commission the President and the Secretary of State should recommend increased spending for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us may be divided into three parts: First, military; second, economic; and third, technical assistance. I shall not take the time now to discuss the details of the program and especially the military aspects of it. I shall limit myself to a very brief statement regarding economic and technical assistance.

Economic aid if offered at all should be approved on a loan basis and not in the form of gifts except where there may be a showing of absolute necessity on the part of the recipient country. Such a case might be Korea and there may be others.

Mr. Chairman, the heart of the foreign aid program, if it has one, is in the so-called technical assistance field, but this is a field which does not require the expenditure of huge sums but rather limited appropriations, perhaps over a long period of time. The original philosophy behind technical assistance was the transmittal of knowledge, skills, and know-how to the peoples of the underdeveloped countries.

I regret to say, Mr. Chairman, that as the program has developed in the last few years, the administrators of it have gone far afield from the basic philosophic concept. Last week, I was surprised, no, not surprised but shocked, when Mr. Hollister, the Director of International Cooperation Administration, testified before the Senate committee as to the extent that his agency intended to disburse tax dollars on projects overseas. He was quoted in the press as saying when asked how the money was to be spent on several schemes:

> These include the $20 million nuclear research center in the Philippines; harnessing the Mekong River to control floods, provide transport and bring power to Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam; building roads between India and Nepal and Afghanistan and Pakistan; and constructing piers to help India ship iron ore to Japan.

This kind of program, Mr. Chairman, is, as I see it, a perversion of the philosophy underlying technical assistance and it is an unjustified waste of American tax dollars.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that as the debate on this bill continues, there should be a searching analysis on the provisions of it and I am satisfied that it would not be necessary to authorize the spending of another dollar this year—without damage to the program.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN].

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. RICHARDS]. During the short period of time I have been a member of this committee, I have learned to admire and respect the chairman. As you know, the chairmanship of the Committee on Foreign Affairs carries with it great responsibilities and Chairman RICHARDS has always discharged those responsibilities in a fair and statesmanlike manner. It was with deep regret that we learned he would not seek reelection and I, for one, shall sorely miss his wise counsel and warm friendship. I join with his many friends in wishing for him and his charming wife many future years of happiness and good health.

Mr. Chairman, the contents of the mutual security bill, which is now before us, comprise a number of items. Many of them had their origin at different times in separate pieces of legislation. But all the items have a common purpose. The annual cycle of authorizations and appropriations for mutual security has become so much a part of our legislative routine that this purpose is often forgotten or obscured by our attention to the details.

This program has developed to meet the postwar challenge of the Soviet Union. For almost a decade that challenge was presented in military terms. The Soviet Union took over the Baltic States. The governments of eastern and central Europe were brought under its domination. It threatened the nations of Western Europe. In Iran, in Korea, in Vietnam, in Laos, in Indonesia, and in other countries of Asia and the Middle East the Soviet Union directly or indirectly has sought to overthrow established governments.

In the last year, however, the Soviets have reversed their tactics. Many people in the free world have interpreted the smiles and sweet words of the latest Soviet leaders as a new Soviet philosophy. I cannot agree with this conclusion. All of the present leaders of Russia owe their survival and positions to strict adherence to the teachings of Lenin and Stalin. None of them has denounced or even questioned any part of basic Communist doctrine. Only last fall, Nikita Khrushchev told the East German Communists:

> If anyone expects us to forget the doctrines of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, he is making a tremendous mistake.

There is no real evidence that the Soviet changes in tactics constitutes a change in basic policy, and the awareness of this fact by the people of the United States is reflected in the extraordinary appropriations voted by Congress for our own Department of Defense. Only recently the House approved without a dissenting vote a defense appropriation for fiscal year 1957 of $33.6 billion in new funds.

The defense plan of the United States envisions a coordinated effort by ourselves and our allies to repel Soviet aggression. The only difference between our own defense appropriations and the military funds contained in the mutual security bill is that the former supports American forces while the latter assists friendly foreign forces. The purpose is the same—to maintain and increase the military position of the free world.

We have been advised repeatedly that if we fail to assist our allies in strengthening their forces with the military assistance supplied through the mutual security program then our own defense expenditures must be greatly increased. This is easily understandable when we realize that it costs the United States at least eight times as much to maintain a United States solider overseas as it does to contribute to the support of a foreign man in uniform.

Mr. Gordon Gray, Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs, Department of Defense, emphasized these facts in his testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee this year when he said "but for the military forces generated, stimulated, and assisted by our military-assistance program, to attain the same measure of military security in the world our own forces would have to be larger."

Admiral Radford pointed up the close relation between the two programs when he informed the committee that the mutual-security program "is an essential part of the defense of the United States and of the free world. In planning military programs of the United States the existence and scope of the military-assistance program is fully considered. There is no duplication. They supple-

ment each other. Both are essential to our own national defense."

Secretary Dulles, as the final witness before our committee, summed up the interrelation of our own defense expenditures and those provided for in this bill in the following words:

The total figure for all forms of national security, domestic and foreign, is about $40 billion. Of this, about 90 percent is spent on our own United States Military Establishment. Approximately 10 percent is spent through foreign governments, for the most part to help our allies hold positions which are vital both to us and to them. This 10 percent makes up what we call a mutual-security program.

The testimony of these and other key officials that mutual security military funds are vital to our own defense caused several members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, including myself, to attempt to ascertain the reasons for including these military-aid funds in the mutual-security bill rather than in the Defense Department's annual appropriation bill. Most of the witnesses failed to present any substantial reasons for the procedure now being followed. In fact, Mr. Gray said that "the Defense Department could live under either structure."

Therefore, in the preparation of the committee's report, I suggested that there be included a recommendation that military-assistance funds be henceforth included in the Defense Department's annual appropriation bill. The committee adopted this idea. Although the language in the report is not as strong as I would like it, I believe it is a step in the right direction.

It is never too difficult, Mr. Chairman, to criticize a large-scale operation such as is involved in the mutual security program. There are instances of overprograming, inefficient staffing, delivery lags and mistakes in planning and judgment. Some projects have not only failed to add to the strength of our friends but may have even weakened them.

Yet, we can point with equal emphasis to the program's accomplishments. There is little doubt that the Marshall plan—the forerunner of the mutual security program—put Europe back on its feet and created in those Western nations a will to resist Communist advances. Turkey is a stronger ally as a result of our aid. So is Spain. The strongest non-Communist military force in Asia is the battle-tested Korean Army. Without the aid of our mutual security program, Korea could not have withstood Communist pressures. Formosa has been able to remain as the visible symbol of free China only because of the mutual security program. This is also true in other areas.

The program is not all black or white, not all pluses or minuses. It is necessary to balance the failures against the successes in order to arrive at a reasonable assessment of the program's worth. Using that test, Congress has reached the conclusion each year that the mutual security program is in our national interest and has continued it.

The recent shift in Soviet tactics has emphasized to us all the immediate need for a comprehensive review of the entire mutual security program by the Executive. Pending such a review, it would, in my opinion, be extremely unwise at this critical stage to abandon the program.

The possibility of executive review does not lessen, however, the responsibility of the Congress and, in the first instance, of the committee, to seek a full justification of the authorization request that has been made by the executive branch of our Government. This should not be a pro forma exercise but a full inquiry into the program's past performances as well as future plans.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has made every effort to measure up to their responsibility. For a period of more than 8 weeks we carefully examined the requests of the Executive. During the period of time, we received testimony from representatives of every branch of the Government connected with the administration of this program. At the close of the hearings, the committee voted to authorize an appropriation for the mutual security program of $3,563,475,000 for the next fiscal year, a decrease of $1,109,000,000 from the Executive request. Of this amount, $109 million was cut from the economic assistance program and the remaining billion dollars from the military. These reductions were adopted by a bipartisan committee vote.

Protests against these cuts in our mutual-security program have been made by the Executive, as well as by Members of Congress, since the committee's action. Statements have been issued that the program will be seriously impaired or even wrecked unless funds are restored. It is interesting to note, however, that in the 7-year period between 1950 and 1956, inclusive, Congress has reduced the requests of the executive branch of the Government for the mutual-security program anywhere from $600 million to $1.9 billion each year.

Each time these reductions have been made, protests similar to those now being voiced have been heard. Yet the program has continued to operate and, at the end of the present fiscal year, it is estimated that the program's unexpended balance will be approximately $6.6 billion. That amount is sufficient to continue the mutual-security program without any further appropriation for nearly 2 years.

These indisputable facts have conveyed to many the impression that on occasion more funds are requested than are necessary or that can be spent. This impression was strengthened when the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Joseph Campbell, testified recently before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. He accused the International Cooperation Administration, which handles nonmilitary aid, of "overprograming" and said it frequently has asked Congress for more money than it could spend in the subsequent fiscal year. He was equally critical of the Defense Department's handling of funds allocated for military aid, as is evidenced by his following remarks:

The program for furnishing military support to designated foreign countries is based on a projection of troop strength which such countries have agreed to supply. In many instances this commitment by the foreign country is not met, requiring the reprograming of items to be furnished within fund authorizations already approved by the Congress. The planned force goals for the several countries are contained in various State Department documents. Estimates as to when the countries will bring the desired units into being have been overoptimistic.

In addition to the problem of reprograming, the failure on the part of the countries to meet their strength commitments also resulted in the creation of excesses in certain of these countries. These excesses are both of an actual nature where inventories are available for distribution subject to the willingness on the part of the country to permit its return or redistribution to other countries, as well as "paper" excesses which represent items in the hands of troops which have been diverted for use in specific conflicts.

In another portion of his testimony, Mr. Campbell made this point:

At least $400 million of military-assistance appropriations, representing unpaid obligations overstated at June 30, 1954, has been retained by the Department of Defense in violation of the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954.

Notwithstanding this information, other important factors indicated a substantial reduction in the military was justified. Almost $5.6 billion of unexpended military funds is now in the so-called pipeline. Of this amount, more than $3.6 billion is earmarked for European programs. Most of these programs were worked out when German rearmament was scheduled to follow a more accelerated pace, before France moved a large part of her forces to North Africa, and before several NATO countries indicated contemplated reductions in their military budgets.

These facts, coupled with the knowledge that the equipment to be supplied by the European pipeline funds can be transferred to other areas, were sufficient to convince me and other members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that a reduction in military funds could be made without injuring the program.

Accordingly, I initiated the amendment to cut that portion of the bill by $750 million. This amendment was further amended and the military part of the bill was reduced by $1 billion. The committee also removed the delivery ceilings on military equipment for the four principal geographic regions. Together with provisions in the law giving the President authority to transfer limited amounts from one title or function to another, the funds recommended by the committee should be ample to carry forward programs which must be reexamined constantly in the light of new attitudes and capabilities on the part of our allies.

Of the $1,925,000,000 remaining in the bill for military assistance, $374,300,000 is intended for direct forces support. This is a term that covers soft goods for friendly military forces, items such as food, uniforms, and other consumables. Even though it is carried under military assistance, it is a form of economic aid. By deducting this sum from the $1,925,000,000, military assistance in the form of military equipment and training is $1,550,700,000.

The balance of the $3,563,475,000, or $2,012,775,000, is nonmilitary money. The programs for which this money is authorized are designed to keep the resources of the free world from falling under Communist control and to strengthen the ties of cooperation with the economically underdeveloped nations of the world.

Among those classified as nonmilitary are the technical-assistance programs. These programs, modest in amounts, are designed to improve the economic basis of the underdeveloped countries. Through demonstrations of techniques in agriculture, health, education, and other basic fields, technical-assistance programs bring to these countries some of the skills that have marked the development of our own country.

In developing technical-assistance programs the mistake has been made in some countries of encouraging and assisting an expansion of agricultural output beyond the requirements of the country itself. This has resulted in the production of surplus commodities in foreign countries that are now in direct competition on the world market with our own surplus products.

I called this matter to the attention of Mr. John B. Hollister, Director of the International Cooperation Administration, when he appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Mr. Hollister assured the committee that he was "fully alive to the fact that we ought not to be spending directly to weaken or decrease the possibility of our distributing to the world market our agricultural surpluses." He assured the committee further that—

> In certain countries where their chief product is one of those commodities of which we have surpluses, we are attempting to divert some of the acreage into other agricultural crops which are needed for a more balanced diet.

The members, particularly from agricultural districts, will, I believe, be interested in Mr. Hollister's full statement on this subject. I therefore quote from the hearings:

> Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman. Mr. Hollister, are we continuing under this new program to give technical assistance to any nations who have now expanded their agricultural crops beyond their own requirements?
>
> Mr. HOLLISTER. That is a very big question. We are doing our best to see that the technical assistance and the development assistance we give does not directly affect the ability of countries to export the things that our country has in surplus, or decrease the amount of imports that those countries would have with respect to those agricultural commodities of which we have surpluses.
>
> It is obvious that if we have an agricultural training force some place in this country, or our experts go abroad with general agricultural measures and fertilizer, it cannot help but affect all kinds of production.
>
> But we are fully alive to the fact that we ought not to be spending directly to weaken or decrease the possibility of our distributing to the world market our agricultural surpluses. That is the thing you are interested in?
>
> Mr. SELDEN. Yes.
>
> Mr. HOLLISTER. Any work that is done around the world to raise the standard of living of a country disturbs to some extent the equilibrium of the world market. But we do our best to see that we do not directly contribute to that situation.
>
> Mr. SELDEN. I would like for just a moment to call your attention to the following paragraph on this particular subject that was included in the report of this committee's study mission to Europe:
>
> "An aspect of United States policy which, in the judgment of the study mission, should be carefully reexamined and reconsidered is our policy of giving technical assistance and other aid to nations to help them continue to expand their production of agricultural crops beyond their own requirements. In Greece (a comparable situation exists in Turkey for wheat and certain other crops) the production of cotton for export is being assisted even though such cotton competes with United States cotton in the markets of the world. We cannot object to any nation producing and selling cotton or other goods on a competitive basis, provided we do not subsidize this production. The situation is entirely different, however, when we spend our own funds in a manner which aggravates one of our most difficult problems and adds to the financial burden of our taxpayers."
>
> This is very important for those of us who live in agricultural regions where we have surplus agricultural commodities.
>
> Mr. HOLLISTER. We are fully alive to that. I would like to give you a copy of the memorandum which has been sent out to all of our people on this subject, because it is something that we have been watching pretty closely.
>
> I want to add that we have even tried to work the other way. In certain countries where their chief product is one of those commodities of which we have surpluses, we are attempting to divert some of the acreage into other agricultural crops which are needed for a more balanced diet. It is not easy, but we are trying that out.

Development assistance is a relatively small part of this bill. Its purpose is to promote economic development or to deal with other problems whose solution is necessary to create or maintain economic and political stability. It is limited principally to countries which do not receive military assistance. Under this part of the program the United States has given assistance to a wide range of projects such as road building, irrigation systems, and the construction of industrial plants. Hitherto development assistance has been made available to other countries on either a grant or loan basis.

The bill before the House continues this program but changes the rules. Development assistance under the terms of this legislation is entirely in the form of loans except when funds are used to finance the sale of surplus agricultural commodities. Grant assistance is limited to regional projects, i. e., projects involving two or more nations. Not more than 25 percent of development assistance may be used to assist any one nation. We have added a further condition—a nation to receive development assistance loans must enter into a written agreement permitting participation by private enterprise in conformance with the provisions in the Mutual Security Act dealing with the encouragement of free enterprise and private participation.

The amount authorized for development assistance represents a merger of the funds recommended by the administration for that purpose together with the money for the Asian economic fund and the Middle East Fund. The sum of $243 million that is authorized in the bill constitutes a reduction of $100 million in the Executive request.

According to information submitted to the committee, not more than 10 million of the $100 million in the present Asian fund will be obligated by the end of this fiscal year. Section 201 (a) continues the availability of the unobligated amount of that fund. Thus, to the $243 million in this bill can be added $90 million of unobligated money in the present Asian fund. Also, the course of events in the Middle East makes the planned use of money requested for the Middle East Fund most unlikely. Moreover, in section 6 (f) of this bill we are continuing an authorization of $45.3 million already appropriated for the relief, rehabilitation, and resettlement of the Palestine refugees. That is the No. 1 problem in that area. Other projects will depend upon the solution of that problem before they can be initiated. Finally, should there be opportunities to move forward quickly with projects, the President can always draw upon the special funds voted to him under section 401 of the Mutual Security Act. In view of the availability of these other funds, I offered the amendment that made possible the $100 million reduction. This amendment received strong bipartisan support in the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, the mutual security bill, as reported to the House, has been greatly improved by the actions of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. However, there are other improvements that I feel should be considered. These are set out in the supplemental views that were prepared and signed by me and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

In the supplemental views published more than a week ago we stated, among other things, that:

> We are also opposed to the inclusion of certain so-called neutralist countries such as Yugoslavia and India. In the first instance, Yugoslavia, a Communist country, has been drawing closer and closer to the Soviet orbit since the death of Stalin. We are opposed to aid to any Communist dictator as a matter of principle and we do not feel that the United States has any assurance that Tito would be on our side or would even remain neutral in the event of another war.
>
> India, although only receiving economic assistance, also apears to be swinging more and more into line with Communist thinking. On almost all issues of foreign policy, she follows the Soviet and Chinese Communist line quite closely. Although the United States has given or loaned to India since 1950 nearly $600 million, the United States has not achieved gratitude, friendship, cooperation or even genuine neutrality. We feel that our foreign policy, of which foreign aid is an arm, has failed in this instance.
>
> The real danger in continuing to help such countries as India and Yugoslavia is the attraction which the United States places on neutralism, even of a technical variety. If the United States desires to win and to hold allies, it should not make it so advantageous or profitable for a country to be neutral. There is a very definite trend toward neutrality in the world today and this country appears to do nothing to discourage it.

The events of the last few days, highlighted by Tito's statements that has been made during his visit to Moscow, only strengthen my views on further aid to Yugoslavia. The amendments that will be offered to reduce or eliminate funds to these nations deserve the serious consideration of this House. Other proposals that are offered in an effort to improve rather than wreck this legislation should also be carefully considered.

The very fact that the administration has proposed an overall study of foreign aid is compelling evidence that we should move with caution in voting increased sums for the program. This proposal in itself suggests to me that the administration is uncertain, not about the need for a mutual security program, but the emphasis that should be given to the various parts of it. If an emergency arose within the next few months, it would necessarily have to be met from money previously appropriated. Should there not be an emergency, the funds in this bill are ample to keep the program moving steadily, at least until it can be carefully reexamined.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, after 2 months of careful review, has presented a mutual security bill they feel is in the best interests of this Nation. I trust the Congress will uphold the committee's action.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW].

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I support H. R. 11356, the Mutual Security Act of 1956, as an expression of United States leadership in world affairs, which gives the executive branch the essential tools required by it in order to carry out our foreign policy.

The mutual-security program has given the United States and the free world positive advantages and accomplishments which must be continued and even increased. I regret that the committee saw fit to cut $1 billion out of the military assistance funds which President Eisenhower requested to fulfill the military aspects of our mutual security responsibilities around the world. I hope that in its wisdom Congress will restore this amount and thus give the President the congressional backing which is so essential to our position of leadership in a world beset by critical problems.

The other aspects of the mutual-security program are equally as important as the military. This is particularly so in view of the fact that the Soviet Union has recently adopted new tactics in the economic arena, while retaining its fundamental philosophy and objectives of world domination. It was my privilege to serve, with my colleague on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Honorable BROOKS HAYS, on the United States delegation to the 10th General Assembly of the United Nations which met from September 20 to December 20, 1955. In that capacity I had occasion to view at first hand and observe closely the actions and deliberations of the Soviet delegation. The tone of voice has become somewhat less harsh, but it was clear to all of us that they remain dedicated to the destruction of the free world through subversion, propaganda and discrediting of our foreign policies and programs. Cognizant of the success which the mutual-security program has achieved, they are now concentrating their efforts in the same nonmilitary fields as our own. This made a tremendous impression on the United States delegation to the United Nations and compelled them to send the following communication to the Secretary of State:

> Impelled by a unanimous feeling that economic and social questions are assuming increasing importance on the international scene, the United States delegation to the 10th General Assembly has joined in framing this statement.
>
> The present period in history may one day be recognized as a major turning point in the struggle between communism and freedom. It appears to be clearly a shift in the cold war, in which economic and social problems have moved to the forefront.
>
> Members of the United States delegation during this General Assembly session have observed the effectiveness of Soviet tactics under these new conditions. This can be seen both in the way the Soviet bloc delegates work in various United Nations meetings, and also in the voting that occurs in many committees. As we observed maneuvers, we were conscious that the Soviet Union, elsewhere in the world, was using economic and social collaboration as a means for jumping military as well as political barriers. Examples of this can be found in India, Egypt, and Burma.
>
> We believe that the United States must counter these Soviet efforts. We can succeed, not by outbidding communism in sheer amounts of economic aid, but by making newly independent and newly articulate peoples feel that they can best satisfy their wants by becoming and remaining part of the community of free nations.
>
> We welcome more emphasis on economic and educational endeavors, for we have a proven experience in these fields.
>
> We are in a contest in the field of economic development of underdeveloped countries which is bitterly competitive. Defeat in this contest would be as disastrous as defeat in an armament race.
>
> We could lose this economic contest unless the country as a whole wakes up to all its implications.

The Secretary of State, at the express wish of President Eisenhower, made the statement public on January 11, 1956.

As we consider the Mutual Security Act proposed for 1956, it is essential that we crystallize the economic leadership of the United States as we encounter the new tactics of the Soviet Union. I am of the firm conviction that United States participation in the United Nations and its specialized agencies, always increasing in effectiveness, is one of the major means whereby we can meet effectively the new Soviet challenge. In referring to the United Nations, President Eisenhower said in his message to Congress of this year:

> In the pursuit of our national purposes, we have been steadfast in our support of the United Nations, now entering its second decade with a wider membership and ever-increasing influence and usefulness.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I prefer to finish my statement before yielding, if the gentleman please.

Many years ago I began advocating the formation of an international organization to preserve the peace. Prior to the inception of the United Nations I said in many speeches throughout my State and other parts of the country that man must develop an international organization to help in preserving the peace. In response to the new order of affairs produced by the nuclear era, men in the field of political activity have developed the United Nations and its specialized agencies. As a supporter of this system, the United States has a unique opportunity for exercising leadership in this troubled world.

The United Nations has completed its first 10 years. This is an exceedingly short span in any political institution. The United Nations has grown and developed during the past 10 years and has a long array of worthwhile accomplishments to its credit. I can testify to the fact that during the Tenth General Assembly great progress was made by the United Nations including: the admission of 12 new member states; the endorsement of President Eisenhower's open-sky proposal for the exchange of military blueprints and mutual aerial inspection; the adoption of a method for charter review, and the adoption of a method which will establish an international atomic energy agency which was urged by the President of the United States before the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MERROW. In a moment, please.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and two Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from New Hampshire will proceed.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, as recently as April 18, 12 nations completed a 2 months' drafting conference on the atoms-for-peace agency. Next September there will be a conference at the United Nations headquarters for the ratification of the charter by all the member countries of the United Nations. Thus the United Nations has made another great accomplishment at the suggestion of the President of the United States. As evidence of the success of United States leadership in the United Nations, under the able statesmanship of Ambassador Lodge and his predecessor, Senator Austin, the United States has never suffered a reverse on an issue of major importance. With the passing of each day, the United Nations grows in influence and effectiveness. The United States can be proud that she has played such an important part in this international organization.

The big four specialized agencies of the United Nations are the Food and Agriculture Organization with headquarters in Rome, the International Labor Organization and World Health Organization in Geneva, and the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization in Paris. These agencies are combating hunger, poverty, disease and illiteracy. What an opportunity for leadership. Half the world is undernourished. Over half the world is illiterate.

Poverty stalks the earth in many places. Millions are racked with disease. Certainly we have a moral obligation to give assistance within our capabilities and to provide leadership in fighting these scourges. Communism thrives on discontent and on human misery. To the extent that the impact of these scourges is mitigated, to that extent will we be successful in helping to stem the tide of communism.

We can well be proud of the United Nations and the role the United States has played in establishing this organization. We can justly be proud of the leadership which the United States is giving in its participation in the United Nations and that the General Assembly is backing the President in his suggestions on the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

The United Nations programs contained in this bill are small when considered from the point of view of authorizations involved: $2.3 million for the United States contribution to the United Nations Refugee Fund; $10 million for the United Nations Children's Fund; an authorization of the carryover of the unobligated balance of $45.3 million for the United Nations Relief and Work Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, and an increase in the United States contribution to the Food and Agriculture Organization from $2 million to $3 million. These are programs which bring much good will and understanding of United States efforts in areas where such understanding is very much needed. These are "grass roots" programs which permeate to the people involved. These United Nations programs give strength and meaning to the whole mutual-security program. They prove conclusively that the United States is ready, able and willing to cooperate with all other nations of good will in helping to solve the difficult problems which face the millions upon millions of people in the world. As we stated in our report:

> This is an area in which our leadership can be very effective and very potent, for the United Nations itself deals with political issues and is a great forum for developing world opinion, and the specialized agencies are fighting hunger, disease, illiteracy, and poverty. When we consider the fact that the total United States per capita cost for calendar year 1955 of the United Nations, the specialized agencies and the voluntary programs was 40 cents, it is obvious that the cost is not exorbitant. What a tremendous opportunity for our Republic, the leader of the free world, to make a historic contribution to this worldwide struggle to insure the continuation of free civilization and its expansion for the millions of peoples in the world who are now struggling to attain their freedom and security. Never has a nation had a greater opportunity to make its influence and power felt for the well-being and happiness of all mankind.
>
> We are engaged in a great international effort to spare our children from the holocaust of a battlefield in a nuclear era with the utter devastation that such a battle would bring. That effort requires the cooperation not only of nations with one another but of individuals themselves who make up the nations. To us the support by the United States of the United Nations and its specialized agencies constitutes a great crusade for peace and freedom. Only by viewing the United Nations system in that light can we understand its implications for the future of the world. (H. Rept. 1980, 84th Cong., pp. 30, 31.)

At a time when there is talk of a reappraisal and the possibility of establishing a commission to study mutual security, I hope that whatever study is made will consider the ways and means whereby United States leadership in the United Nations and its specialized agencies can be made even more effective. As our participation increases in effectiveness, so our mutual security will increase. In the long run, I believe such effective participation and full support will make possible a diminishing demand on our own resources.

I hope this bill will receive the overwhelming support it deserves.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McVEY].

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, we have before us for consideration today the Mutual Security Act of 1956, which, in more understandable terms to the public, means our foreign-aid spending program. This bill authorizes an appropriation of $3,563,475,000 to carry forward the mutual-security program. The amount of aid extended to foreign countries since the inception of this program has reached staggering proportions. It seems appropriate that we reexamine our commitments thus far and attempt to arrive at the correct position in regard to a continuance of these expenditures.

The aid which this Government has extended to all countries and international organizations for the period covering World War II and the postwar period ending June 30, 1955 amounts to $108,847,779,000. This total does not include United States capital investments in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—$635 million—and the International Monetary Fund— $2,750 million.

Summary of aid

Lend-lease, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1955	$48,767,777,000
Grants-in-aid, July 1, 1940 to June 30, 1955	43,459,158,000
Net loans, July 1, 1940 to June 30, 1955	16,620,844,000
Summary total	108,847,779,000

The foreign aid program began with the lend-lease shipments on July 1, 1940. In the postwar years, one appropriation after another has followed in rapid succession until our foreign-aid spending program, together with the taxes that are paid for carrying it, amounts almost to one-half of our Federal debt.

The extension of these huge sums during World War II in foreign aid is understandable. We were engaged in all-out war, and we felt the need of winning it at any cost. But let us look at the aid extended since the close of the war. Between July 1, 1945, and June 30, 1955, the United States disbursed gross foreign aid in the amount of $60,719,482,000. It is difficult for the average individual to understand the impact upon our economy of such huge sums. If we were to spread this postwar cost over the householders of the Nation, it would be found this program will cost every householder of the Nation $1,277.

When one is trying to reach a decision relative to his vote on the mutual security aid legislation, he is faced with many cross currents of opinion. Just about everyone feels there are nations in the world which deserve our assistance. This program, however, is just about all-inclusive. We have extended help to many nations which are in better financial position than we are. Not only that—we have extended help to nations which have never aided us in a military conflict and which have profited from our own involvement. Examples in this category are Brazil, which has received $381,686,000, and Sweden, $116,220,000.

An analysis of our foreign-aid spending program reveals that through our lend-lease program from July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1945, 62 nations and territories were assisted by this program. In the years that followed, July 1, 1945, to July 30, 1955, 24 nations participated in our lend-lease program. The grants-in-aid during this postwar period reached a total of 88 nations and territories.

It should be noted that not all of these nations are friendly. The following countries which are certainly not allies have benefited by our mutual security program:

China	$2,861,376,000
Czechoslovakia	1,211,837,000
Yugoslavia	750,730,000
Russia	11,241,614,000

Most of the aid received by Yugoslavia has been extended during recent years while that country has been under a Communist dictatorship. The aid extended to Yugoslavia amounts to more than $44 for every man, woman, and child in that country.

There is a general impression that the corporations and the rich pay the bulk of these expenditures. This, however, is not the case. The President in his budget for 1957 reveals that more than one-half of the taxes collected by the Federal Government are derived from individual income taxes.

It should be remembered, too, that a considerable sum is collected in hidden taxes. Taxes upon about every purchase made: theater tickets, transportation, purses, jewelry, alarm clocks, hand lotions, and many other articles. Telephone companies have calculated that taxes on each telephone installed in the home amount to more than $3 per telephone. Yes, we meet these taxes at every turn, and it is time the working men and women become conscious of the inroads of taxes upon their economy.

No one would challenge for one moment the motives behind this giveaway program. The nations of Europe had been devastated by the ravages of war. Their industrial potential had been largely destroyed. In the rebuilding process, our aid was badly needed. However, this program began, 1948, supposedly, for a 5-year period, but it has continued in force until the present day—notwithstanding the fact that many of the original recipients of aid have been balancing their budgets and reducing taxes. This situation has occurred in recent years when our own budget was running a deficit.

In the light of facts here presented, it seems that, in addition to our efforts to

make our Nation secure, we must make certain that we keep our economy strong and our currency sound. Would it not be better to think more of the homefront for awhile and take a vacation from foreign aid grants? We may be surprised how well other nations can get along without us.

H. R. 11356 is an omnibus measure. No one knows where all of this money will eventually be spent. The time has come when I feel we must begin to think of safeguarding our economy in this country in order that we may continue strong economically as well as militarily. It is most difficult to support a program of this nature, although there are certain countries of the world one would like to assist. In view of the fact that there is a considerable backlog of spending already available for the Mutual Security Agency, it is my belief that this bill should not receive the favorable support of the Congress.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is appropriate during the debate on this foreign aid bill to briefly discuss a subject of far-reaching importance to this country and to the free world. I refer to what is being done, and what is not being done, by the West in the encouragement of students to attend college and receive other training on this side of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

At this time an alarmingly large number of young people are flocking behind those curtains to take advantage of educational opportunities offered inside Red China and elsewhere. I am thinking now of the area located in southeastern Asia—a most vital and crucial spot in the whole world picture today.

I am informed that some 7,000 overseas Chinese students went behind the curtain in 1954. Of this number, two-thirds were in regular courses and one-third of them took makeup courses—an introduction to and the learning of spoken Chinese.

In the fall of 1955 the number increased to 10,000 of the overseas Chinese. I am informed by the State Department that comparatively few of that number included Malayan, Burmese, Indochinese, and so forth.

It is also reported that comparatively few of those students who go in ever return to the free world. Most of them, once they finish their technical courses and graduate go right into Chinese industry in China.

It is interesting to note that only 700 to 1,200 of the overseas Chinese in that area go to Taipei. Most of those who do go to Formosa for their training are from Hong Kong and the Macao area.

Now, I am not raising this question for the purpose of offering a remedy. I do think it is somewhat alarming and should be considered when methods and techniques are sought whereby we can cope more advantageously with the Communists in this battle over human minds. These college and technical students are all potential leaders of the future.

I have talked and corresponded with Dean Knowles A. Ryerson, of the University of California, about this problem. He is well informed on conditions in the area and he is very much alarmed. He thinks that if we spent more money on school facilities for the students I am speaking of, the investment would pay a much bigger dividend over the long run than other expenditures we are making in this foreign aid bill.

Dean Ryerson points out that there is a shortage of facilities of this type in Taiwan. Also, existing institutions in Malaya, Hong Kong, Manila, and Bangkok, can be expended to attract more of these students. It is not known what can be done in Manila, but the College of Agriculture at Los Banos had quite a reputation as an international center for southeast Asia before the war.

This same authority—Mr. Ryerson—for whose judgment I have high regard, speaks of the tremendous importance of building up centers for native leadership.

Comparatively small amounts of money go a long way in construction of facilities in many of these places. For example, in Taiwan, where costs are presently going up, a dormitory to house 485 students, which cost $70,000 2 years ago, is now estimated to cost $120,000. A dormitory to house a similar number in this country would cost well over $1 million I am informed.

I am not prepared to say just what we should do, or what we should not do. But, again, in considering the foreign assistance program, it does seem to me more attention should be given to this phase of the problem, as viewed from the standpoint of the West.

Dean Ryerson reminds that there are large numbers of American-trained Chinese from our best institutions that are already at the University of Taiwan or in other activities there, who could teach. Would it be to our interest to spend a little more money in the expansion of the university facilities in the National Taiwan University and in the provincial colleges such as Engineering, with which Purdue already has a technical aid contract? And the Teachers College at Taipei, where the Pennsylvania State University has a small contract with the thought of supplying a small staff?

It is only natural that the Free Chinese are very anxious to provide facilities for "overseas Chinese." Since the proposed university at Singapore under the direction of Dr. Lin Yutang was definitely thwarted through Communist activities, there is more reason than ever, it seems to me, why it is important to provide opportunities for these students elsewhere, and thereby save them from the fate of gravitating behind the Bamboo Curtain. I am not saying that we should underwrite that sort of thing, but I am saying some solution should be found for it.

In any countries that have counterpart funds, it may be that at least a portion of the costs of expanding educational facilities can be met from that source. If buildings and facilities, and then scholarships, can be provided, there is no doubt but that a substantial number of students can be induced to take advantage of such opportunities—students now going to Peking for their training.

I have heard it said that strong efforts are being made now to entice Chinese university people away from Taiwan and back on the mainland because the shortage of such people is so great inside Red China.

Moreover, I understand that in Saigon there is a wide-open field for development of schools and technical training centers.

Obviously, the matter of providing schools and educational facilities is essentially a local responsibility. We have our hands full here at home with overcrowded schoolrooms and other shortages. But so long as we are spending billions overseas to help secure the free world from the ravages of communism, and in that way to add strength and stability to the people who believe in freedom, let us consider this phase of the problem in the proper perspective.

We are reminded that under the United Nations technical assistance program the Soviet Union is setting up a technical school in Bombay for technical training of Indians. And, earlier this year, following the visit of the Russian officials to India and Burma, the Soviet Union made a gift to Burma of a large building, technical equipment and a technical staff for training the Burmese. News reports at that time referred to similar offers made to Afghanistan.

Again, I am not here critizing anyone. I am simply raising some questions that occurred to me in looking at this entire picture of foreign aid, and the purposes for which this money is being expended.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, first I want to join the other members of my committee and of the House in paying tribute to our very able and distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, DICK RICHARDS. He is not only a wonderful leader of the committee but he is as fine a gentleman as I have known. When our study mission in Asia last fall heard that he had announced his intention to retire from the Congress, we sent a cablegram urging him to reconsider. Unfortunately his mind could not be changed. It is a great loss. We certainly wish him well in the years ahead.

Mr. Chairman, it is too bad that the many good programs in this bill about which there is little or no controversy are therefore given very little discussion by us or attention by the public. The result is that a lot of people here and around the world, in their preoccupation with the things we argue about, do not realize a fraction of the real good that is being done by the programs carried on without fanfare which really represent our country at its best.

It is hard in a democracy to put our best foot forward, because even if a bill finally goes through with all the funds that have been asked, the things that are said in debate sometimes hurt so badly that they partially neutralize, if not more than offset, the good that our money and other forms of aid do.

But, since most of the money authorized in this bill goes for military assistance of one form or another under title I, and since most of the opposition this year seems to be to that portion of the bill, I, like the rest, have to give priority in these remarks to the military considerations.

Why has the Executive requested funds for a military-assistance program, which is roughly three-fourths of the bill as it now stands? There is only one reason, and that is because the security of the whole free world, and that means the security of our Nation, are gravely threatened.

There is only one threat, and that is, of course, the avowed purpose and the unwavering will and the increasing capacity of the Communist world conspiracy to seize control of the whole world by one method or another.

Lest anyone have any misunderstanding on that point, Mr. Khrushchev recently reaffirmed it, stating that Communists would abandon their concepts and their program of world communization only "when shrimps learn to whistle."

Mr. Chairman, there can be no real peace or relaxation for us until the Communist movement fades or changes.

Our peace and freedom can be secure only when their purpose is changed or their will is weakened, or their capacity to conquer the world is reduced.

We cannot do much directly about changing their purpose or weakening their will; those must be done from within the movement or by pressures within the countries already conquered. But we can do something about reducing their capacity—their ability to impose their will on the free world. And the whole mutual defense assistance title of this bill, of course, has to do with that one task. It is to keep our enemies from ever getting to the point where they have the power to cow or to conquer the world.

There are two main means by which we can try to achieve that objective. One is to prevent the enemy from winning any more victories that will make him stronger. That is why we must resolutely oppose resumption of trade with Communist countries. That is why we must oppose the admission of Communist China into the United Nations. We must not do anything that will give the Communists more prestige, more power, more influence, because that would build up the capacity to destroy us of an enemy that is openly dedicated to our destruction.

The other means is the positive effort to keep our own country strong and sound, and to help other free countries become strong and sound also, so that they can defend their independence and block any further gains by the Communist cancer anywhere.

In a sentence, our job is to prevent any increase in the strength of our enemy and to build up the strength and unity of ourselves and our allies.

How well is the Kremlin doing? And how well are we doing in this worldwide struggle?

Let us look first at the overall picture with the individual countries and problems of which the various sections of the bill deal. It seems to me, looking at it in the large, the Kremlin is making three major shifts in the tactics by which it pursues its never-changing objective of world conquest and follows its never-changing strategy of world revolution. Each of these three shifts, if successful, will increase our danger, not decrease it.

The first is a geographic shift from West and East to South. The Kremlin naturally tried to push to its west following the end of the war, because Western Europe is the most important prize, second only to ourselves. It tried to get Greece as a means of flanking Germany and picking off weakened, infiltrated, and divided Italy and France. We met the push with firm resistance in Greece.

The Kremlin then tested us with the Berlin blockade—which served also to divert our attention from its operations in China. The West responded with the Berlin airlift, refused to be intimidated, and the Kremlin backed off.

It then threatened all sorts of disasters if we did not abandon NATO. But we did not fold up. We do not give in to threats; it is when they smile and talk peace that we seem to lose our heads. We went steadily ahead to build and arm NATO. It did not lead to the threatened disaster. The Kremlin made no move against NATO.

Then the Communists everywhere warned that if we and Western Europe were to organize the Western European Union and allow Germany to regain her full independence and to rearm, there would be dire consequences. To underline its threat, the Kremlin unilaterally abrogated the Soviet Union's pacts of friendship and nonaggression with Britain and France. But the Western World kept its nerve and stood firm. The Paris pacts were signed. Germany was given her independence and authority to rearm. Did it lead to war as predicted? No, indeed. Instead, the Kremlin proposed a chummy little conference to settle peacefully the problem of Austria.

It was clear that faced with strength in the West, the Soviet leaders were not going to start a war there. They promptly changed their approach and said, "Let us work out a stabilization of the European front. Let us have a security pact. Let us neutralize Germany."

Anything to free themselves from having to tie down most of their strength facing the West, because the fishing was not very good in Europe for the time being.

At the same time they were pushing to their east. They got control of Manchuria at Yalta. They got North Korea just before V–J Day. They pushed ahead like a glacier over weakened and exhausted China, while we were bemused by the myth that we should not help resist them in earnest because they were not really Communists, only democratic agrarian reformers, eager to improve the lot of the long-suffering Chinese, and to cooperate with us in building freedom and peace in Asia.

When they had overrun China, they moved into South Korea from which the blind and the faithless had persuaded us to withdraw our forces. Once more we responded as we generally do to brazen aggression, and turned them back. Once more they played their usual trick when faced with firmness. They said, "Let us have a truce." It was not, of course, because they wanted to end the struggle, but because they hoped to win at the conference table what they could not win on the field of battle. They wanted to shift from Korea, where they could not win, to Vietnam, where they had a better chance. They got North Vietnam.

The two objectives that they wanted next, naturally, were the great natural resources of Southeast Asia and the industry of Japan. China's great usefulness is to furnish the base and the manpower with which to move to control of Southeast Asia and of Japan. But there was one major obstacle standing in the way. That was the island of Formosa, with a good many strong airbases on it. Unless they can seize Formosa or persuade us to neutralize it, so as to get its airfields and armies off their flank, they do not dare go too far south or move against Japan. That is why they have to get Formosa, if they can. That is one reason why we cannot let them have it.

Just as they had done when we gave military aid to Germany in Europe, they blustered that if anyone gave military help to Free China, it would greatly increase the danger of war; and that nobody could stop them from taking Formosa. Our President said in a press conference, "Well, they will first have to run over the 7th Fleet." Apparently they took a good look at the 7th Fleet and decided not to attempt to seize Formosa. Instead, they pulled the same old trick again—it seems always to work. They went down to Bandung and said, "Let us have peace."

Confronted with strength and firmness on their west and strength and firmness on their east, they shifted their major efforts for the present, to their south. Here they face, in the Middle East and in South Asia, not strength and firmness, but awful weakness, division, and disunity.

In the Middle East three explosions are taking place, all made to order for the Kremlin: First, Greece against Turkey and England over Cyprus. Anything that weakens Greece, anything that weakens Turkey, anything that weakens good relations between them, and between them and Britain can only hurt them and help the Kremlin.

Then there is the Arab-Israel explosion. It involves an area with more than half of the known reserves of oil in the world. It is the bridge across to Africa, that great, undeveloped but stirring giant of a continent about which the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] spoke so illuminatingly and instructively this afternoon. And through it runs the Suez Canal, control of which would enable the Kremlin to cut East from West. Obviously, here is a prize, second only to Western Europe. Besides, mastery of it by the Kremlin would lead relatively easily to mastery of Europe.

Then there is the third explosion, the North African colonies against France.

One can hardly imagine a more ideal situation than the Middle East and North Africa for the Communists to exploit with their usual pattern of stirring up even greater trouble and disorder than

already exists. If the Kremlin can gain control in the Middle East now, it can come back to its eastern and its western fronts later.

In South Asia are other weak spots. Here is a vast area, from the Middle East clear over to New Guinea and the Philippines, which was controlled for centuries by European powers. While they differed among themselves, they still maintained, throughout the area, order of a fairly uniform pattern.

The European controls with their stabilizing influence are ended and the area, as someone has put it, has been Balkanized, just as Southeastern Europe was by the breakup of the Austro-Hungarian Empire after World War I.

Here are these newly independent countries with a fourth of the world's population—Pakistan, India, Ceylon, Burma, Vietnam, Malaya, and Indonesia—all striving to pull together their internal factions, develop national unity, establish sound political institutions, and build sound economies.

Their first desire is to preserve their freedom from alien control; their second is to improve the lot of their people by industrialization, better agriculture, health, education, and so forth; the third is to develop democratic government. We wish them well in all three. In the meantime, they are weak, divided, and insecure. The cohesion of the area has been destroyed. They might be easy prey to Communist machinations and guile, bribes and threats. Naturally the Reds, both in Moscow and in Peiping, want to fish in those troubled waters to their south.

And naturally most of the governments there want to be neutral in what seems to some of them to be only a foolish quarrel between the United States and the Soviet Union, with both of whom they would like to be friends. Some of them are as blind to the Communist threat as many in America have been—and still are. What they need, as many of them see it, is just a chance, with friendly assistance from the outside, preferably from both sides, to try to get their own internal houses in order.

Obviously South Asia offers several ideal trouble spots for the Communists to exploit with their plausible prescriptions of quick cures for all ailments.

One of the special weaknesses in the area is the fact that several of the countries are so preoccupied with ancient feuds with their immediate neighbors that they fail to appreciate the overall Communist peril. For example the Indians seem more disturbed about their dispute with Pakistan over Kashmir than they are about the Communist glacier moving down on them from the north.

A couple of weeks ago we heard here an eloquent and moving address by the President of Indonesia. His country already has 80 million people, the sixth largest population in the world. The 2,000 islands are spread over an area 3,000 miles long and 1,500 miles wide. They have vast undeveloped natural and human resources. You would think Indonesia's internal problems would be enough to keep the country's leaders busy for some time. But many of them are more concerned with their dispute with the Dutch over a million or so Papuans in West New Guinea, whom they do not have—perhaps half of whom are still living in the trees—than they are about the 80 million people they do have.

In the whole area from Korea and Japan to Greece and Turkey, there are these local feuds which loom so large to the participants that the Communist danger is considered secondary, or even not fully realized.

This is true also of the Arab-Israeli dispute. What each side needs most of all in order best to serve its own people's need is peace and a settlement of the differences between them so that they can stand together against the common enemy of both—the Soviet Union.

Yet the bitterness and the hatreds and prejudices, and the suspicions and fears, and the sense on each side that it has been done a great historic injustice by the other—these keep them so preoccupied with the conflict between themselves that the Kremlin seems to have almost an open door, or even an invitation, to move in and destroy the independence of all.

I do not say this in criticism. It is a human reaction. It is like a patient who goes to a doctor with a painful boil. The doctor on examination finds the patient has also TB or a cancer. The doctor tends to forget all about the boil in his concern to tell the patient what he has to do to prevent this more serious affliction taking his life. But it is the boil that is causing the patient pain. His main interest is in relief from that and he will go to some other doctor who will take care of his immediate discomfort due to the boil rather than worry just now about the possible danger to his life from the cancer.

In contrast to these weaknesses in Asia which the Kremlin can so successfully exploit to its advantage, there are some strong points in that area. This bill has a lot to do with preserving and further strengthening them. One is Korea, one is Formosa, one is Pakistan, another is Turkey. In those four bastions, lying around the Communist bloc, are more than 2 million well-trained and equipped soldiers. It is possible for those countries to keep them in the field only because of the assistance provided in this bill.

Korea has the second largest standing army in the free world, Turkey the third, and Formosa the fourth. In these major bastions, plus Japan, the Philippines, Thailand and Iran, there are two and one-quarter million soldiers right on the job. They have splendid morale and the will to defend their countries, but they cannot do so unless they have assistance and support from the United States.

Occasionally somebody comes along and claims that we are using other countries' men to fight our battles. That is categorically untrue. We are not trying to get other people to fight our battles for us. We are trying to give other peoples, in response to their request, the capacity to fight for themselves, to defend their own freedom. That does serve our interest, to be sure, just the same as our aid to Mr. Nehru, if it enables him to keep his country free and out of the control of the Communists, serves our interest in addition to serving his. But our objective is not to get other countries to provide cannon fodder for us, as our enemies charge; it is an effort to give these people the ability to retain their own independence—even their neutrality if they prefer that.

There is no reason why we should refuse to help a friend just because it also helps ourselves. In fact, it is my conviction that whenever we do what is right for others, it will turn out to be beneficial to ourselves, too.

About one-third of the military assistance in the original Executive request this year for $3 billion was scheduled to go to those four bastions I have mentioned. If we vote to cut down the assistance to those allies, I do not think, Mr. Chairman, we are going to be saving money. I am sure it will mean still greater expenditures.

For example, we had eight divisions in Korea. Now we have two divisions there. Why? Only because we have built up and are supporting 21 South Korean divisions. It costs about 10 times as much money to keep an American soldier on duty for a year—disregarding the dislocation to his life and income and family from his being in the service—as it costs to keep one Korean or Free Chinese soldier in the field. If we cut funds for Korea so that it has to reduce drastically its armed forces, then we will certainly have to send more American units back into Korea. Does anyone want that? It will cost more money, not less, than we are authorizing in this bill.

I get letters, and so do you, saying, "Why send all this aid abroad? Why not use the money to build highways, hospitals, schools, and give better old-age assistance to needy Americans, or to reduce our taxes here at home?"

The argument is based on the belief that, if we do not spend this money for our defenses abroad, we will have that much more to spend on ourselves here at home. Unfortunately, it is a false belief. We will not have more to spend for things needed by civilians here; we will have to put all that money, and more, into expansion of our own Armed Forces. We will have less to spend for the well-being of our people, or for reducing the national debt or cutting our taxes.

This mutual-security program is about 10 percent of our total defense budget; that is all. If we reduce this 10 percent for those countries that lie around the only threat there is to our security, and those bastions are weakened, I do not hesitate to predict that it will cost us far more just to rebuild enough power of our own to approach the strength we now have through the existence and the combined strength of these allies.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I would prefer to complete my statement.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman going to have any time in which he can yield?

Mr. JUDD. I do not know. I am willing to stay here, no matter how late, to answer questions.

Mr. GROSS. So am I. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and five Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, the first shift that the Kremlin is making, lessening for the moment its pressure against Germany and Europe on its west, and against Korea, Formosa, Japan, and Southeast Asia on its east, does not mean that the Communist threat to those areas is removed or even reduced. It means the Soviet Union is merely accepting temporary stabilization of its eastern and western fronts where it is confronted with strength, in order to press to its south and into South Asia where it is confronted only with weakness and disunity. In my opinion, its present tactics make it more dangerous to us rather than less dangerous; and permit less relaxation of tension on our part, rather than more.

The second shift that the Kremlin is making in its world maneuvering is from power to deception, from threats to tricks. It is doing exactly what a good football coach does when he has tested out his opponent's strength by a few power plays and finds he cannot break through the line. Stopped on the ground and unable to make gains through the line, the coach does not spend the rest of the afternoon calling the same power plays that do not work. No, he shifts to end runs and forward passes and trick plays. That is what the Communists are doing.

Our Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, has said the Kremlin has been compelled to make these shifts because of the success of our policies. That is true. But, the fact that we have stopped its power plays on the ground does not mean that we can let down, assuming that we will be equally successful in stopping their trick plays and their open field offensives.

Furthermore, if we relax or open up too much in order to defend ourselves against their passes and their deception type of warfare, they can promptly shift back to power plays and come right through our line. They have not weakened their military power. That is, they are at least a double threat now, instead of a single threat.

They could not easily get through Turkey and the northern tier in the Middle East, so they threw a forward pass over it right into Egypt's arms.

They met firm resistance in Southeast Asia, so they are seeking to throw a forward pass over Southeast Asia to Indonesia.

Faced with firmness in Germany and Austria, they are seeking to throw passes to infiltrated France and Italy; or to flank Western Europe, including Spain, by an end run through North Africa.

The fact that we have pretty good defensive plays to block their power plays does not mean there is any guaranty—unless we are extraordinarily smart, clever, and on top of the ball every minute—that we will be equally skillful and successful in defeating this new tactic.

Then there is a third shift that the Kremlin is carrying out, namely, a shift from vinegar to honey. Our mothers taught us we could catch more flies that way. Apparently the new leaders in the Kremlin are belatedly learning it, too—learning that Stalin's old policy of intransigence and threats was a mistake. It only stiffened our resolve. So they are making a drastic change in approach. They could not intimidate us with their tough tactics; we do not fold up under threats. So they are shifting from vinegar which only kept us awake and made the free world stronger and more united, to honey which regularly has lured the tired, or the gullible, or the peace dreamers into their traps.

What does this mean for us? It means that we have got to have better honey than they have—not necessarily more honey, but better honey.

Our programs must be clearer, more attractive, and more convincing.

Mr. Chairman, when we are faced with a situation like the dangerous and frustrating one that confronts us in this year of 1956—every year the fundamentals are the same but the details this year are different—there are about three courses, it seems to me, that we could decide to follow.

First, we could say that since the mutual-security program has not succeeded as we wished—here we are with at least as great trouble as in previous years—therefore, let us give up the program as a failure and stop all aid.

Second, we could say that since we have not yet achieved the security and the unity in the free world which we hoped for therefore we should double our aid—more of the same.

I do not think that either of those is the way or would give us any hope of improvement. The first would abandon the rest of the free world to the Reds; the second would only complicate the confusions and irritations that are developing. Either of them, in my opinion, would worsen our situation.

The third course is to improve our aid. We should take a good look at it and determine what parts are succeeding, are hitting the target; what portions are not succeeding, are not hitting the target; and then readjust the whole effort accordingly.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced and I think our study mission from the Committee on Foreign Affairs was convinced during its trip last fall through 25 countries and colonies from the Dardanelles to Japan and Korea, that the key thing in making the program more successful today is not the amount of our aid, but the manner in which it is given.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], who accompanied us, used to say, it is not so much how much we give as how we give it.

What we must have is not necessarily a bigger program but a better one.

The first question almost everyone asked when we returned was: How much do you think we should appropriate for foreign aid this year? But that is not the essential or the most important question. It is not the size of the program, but the intelligence of it, the quality of it, that will determine its success or failure.

How can we make it a better program—one that gets down to the grassroots better than it has done heretofore? The answer to that question will not be found in recriminations or regretting the past or bemoaning those projects which were ill-conceived or badly managed and therefore quite properly failed.

Rather, the answer is to be found in hard-headedly restudying the whole enterprise. In the beginning we were pretty much venturing into a new field without blueprint or even compass. Now we have been at it for 8 years; we have accumulated a great deal of data based on experience. We need to do a lot of homework on what that experience can teach us. We must make a long overdue reappraisal, not to assess blame for the past, but in order to win the future.

May I make about five main suggestions:

First, we must ask ouselves, what is our primary target? What are we trying to accomplish? I believe our primary target is, or should be, not just to make people fatter or healthier or stronger or richer or more productive; rather it is to win their hearts and minds, their confidence, both in the countries being helped and behind the Iron Curtain.

This is where the Communists generally have left us far behind. They have spent much less money; they have done far less to improve the economic condition of other peoples; but somehow they have been more skillful in their approach to those peoples.

We have done a better job with the tangibles; most countries we have helped are better off economically and stronger militarily. The Communists have done a better job with the intangibles; they have often given the impression of being more interested than we in the welfare of the people rather than in the power of their military establishments.

Surely the greatest paradox of our time is that we who believe and are constantly saying that our remarkable material achievements are the result of spiritual causes, have somehow got ourselves before the world as trusting primarily in material things—food, guns, and dollars. Whereas the Communists, who proclaim themselves materialists and even deny the existence of spiritual forces or values, have nevertheless managed to get themselves before much of the world as idealists, challenging men to forego material things, at least for the present, in order to work for things of the spirit—equality, comradeship, "democracy", "peace", "relaxation of tension", and so forth.

Sometimes I wish our mutual security agencies had in them more men who had run for office. For the first task of the personnel of our International Cooperation Administration is the same as that of the office-seeker, namely, to win voters—to win the confidence, the loyalty, the support of people. Whatever other qualities the candidate may or may not have, he succeeds only if he is able to win the confidence and support of a majority of the voters in his city or district. That is the job of those who work in ICA all around the world. The material improvements we bring are good in them-

selves, but their objective is also to win people's confidence so that they will want to stand together with us for freedom and security and prosperity for all.

Only as our programs win the hearts and minds, the confidence of people, and strengthen their will to defend their freedom, are we justified in spending all this money to increase their capacity to defend that freedom—their economic well-being and their military strength. To increase their capacity without winning their confidence is, in my judgment, an act of self-deception on our part.

Second, having determined our target—the winning of people's hearts and minds—we have to streamline the program to the essentials. Whatever hits that target, strengthen it, give it greater emphasis. Whatever fails to hit that target, or even worse, alienates people, drop it, or modify it.

In many countries we are doing too many things. And we are trying to do them too fast. We are like a teacher who would try to advance a pupil from the 2d grade to the 12th grade in 2 years. We have to be a little more patient and not expect spectacular results overnight. We are dealing with people with long histories, strong traditions, deep suspicions. To crowd them too much is to defeat our own efforts.

We have to learn more about them; and be willing to learn from them. After all, they know quite a bit about their own country and have some ideas as to what to do about their problems. Our ignorance, and the resulting arrogance, lead us into a subtle form of imperialism, unrecognized because we know our purposes are benevolent.

There is also such a thing as an imperialism of efficiency. In our enthusiasm to help, we almost take them over. A man in Burma told us in 1953, "You Americans are so aggressively friendly."

An efficient American arrives, looks around, and promptly starts in, "This is what you ought to do about your agriculture, your railroads, your schools, hospitals, and housing." Our very zeal produces an irritation that in some countries is approaching resentment. That is, we lose rather than win confidence.

These peoples have fought up to 300 years to get freedom from one alien control, that of Europe; they react violently against what sometimes seems to them almost another alien control—this time by us. They want first of all their full independence, no matter how much they need our material aid, our technical skills.

In Vietnam, we found our representatives working hard and selflessly—at 89 different projects. When we suggested that might be spreading ourselves a little thin, one said, "But it's much better than it was. We did have 240."

Now, Vietnam is a country that has survived thus far only by a near miracle; it is hanging on by a thread. Some 10 or 15 main projects may well determine whether it pulls through or goes down. Why not simplify the program to those life-or-death essentials? If the country makes it for 5 years, then we can go ahead with the frills, with more elaborate developments. The immediate need is the basic programs; too much beyond them only scatters our efforts, complicates our operations, and confuses the people of Vietnam.

Third, we have to have a long-range program. Why? Because we have a long-range problem. One does not solve a long-range problem with a short-range program.

But a long-range program is not the same as long-range commitments or contracts for specific projects.

What did we do after Pearl Harbor? Did we say, "Let us declare war for 1 year; and then we will stop and debate for 2 months whether or not to fight Japan a second year"? No; we declared war to fight until we won. We committed ourselves to a long-range struggle.

But we did not commit ourselves to specific operations or strategies. We did not lose flexibility in the conduct of the war. We did not decide right then that we would put greatest emphasis for the whole war on landpower or on airpower or on naval strength. We retained control of the operation. But the world knew, both our allies and our enemies, that we had declared war to the finish. The world could count on us and so had confidence in us.

That is the intent of the amendment prepared by our chairman, the new statement of purpose and policy in the bill before us. It says to people who may be uncertain about us that as long as the threat to our common freedom exists, we are in it to win.

The program must have both continuity and flexibility—as the President's mutual-security message to us pointed out. The two are not in conflict. Continuity is necessary to keep flexibility on the track; flexibility to give success to continuity.

The most important thing said in this whole cold war period, in my opinion, was said by General MacArthur in this Chamber, "Once you get into a war, there is no substitute for victory." Victory requires long-range purposes and policies.

If we are going to identify ourselves with Korea, then Korea has to pull through.

If we are going to put ourselves on the side of Turkey, then Turkey has to make it.

If we are going to ally ourselves with West Germany, then West Germany has to win.

The world must see that it pays to be an ally of the United States; that we have not only the power, we have the will to stand by our friends; that they can count on us to the extent that they, in turn, are willing to do their utmost.

We have not made that clear to all countries yet. We have got to have long-range purposes, policies, and programs.

Fourth, we have to have better personnel.

They need to be better selected. It is not enough to be good technicians or engineers. They need to be broader gage. Their job is not just to build dams or dynamos or fertilizer plants; it is to win the respect and good will of people. The way some of our men, although highly competent technically, tend to throw their weight around, or deal with the local people with a patronizing, condescending attitude, is thoroughly insulting.

They also need to be better trained and prepared. You do not send out a military man to head a big operation with only a year or so of training. He has gone through West Point or Annapolis. The Communists do not send people into these countries with a few weeks' briefing. They have been trained for months, sometimes years, until they know their jobs. They are all-around professionals.

My dad used to say to me when I was in a big hurry to get something done, "You never lose by taking time to sharpen your tools. You will have more done at the end of the day."

We have been at this program now for 8 years, most of the time on a crash basis. We have not taken the time to sharpen our tools. We would do better and have more accomplished at the end of a year if we devoted more time and effort to training our personnel so that they know more about the people and the language and the history and the overall needs of the country to which they are going.

They need to stay longer. Most go for 2 years, Well, almost anyone is willing to sign up for 2 years to go halfway around the world and have the experience of a lifetime. But by the time he gets adjusted and on top of his job, it is time to go home. Fortunately, more and more are signing up for a second tour when their usefulness will be much greater.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that in general we should not recruit for less than 3 years. Those who are not willing to stay 3 years would select themselves out. In most cases that would be a good thing. More can be done with half as many—if they are the right kind and better prepared.

And then they need to identify themselves more closely with the people. The president of a country that is one of our best friends said, "Your people work long and hard at desks in the capital cities, but our country is made up largely of farmers. They can't come in to see you during office hours; they are out in the fields. Besides they would be reluctant to come into your spick-and-span offices in their bare feet. Why don't you have office hours in the tearooms in the villages one evening or two a week? That is where the Communists are. You work with your papers and blueprints and programs; the Communists work with the people."

Our representatives also need to conduct themselves less ostentatiously than some of them do. Their success will depend not so much on how much they do for, as on how well they work with, the people among whom they are to live. To win the confidence of those people, we must identify ourselves with them.

Once we have determined more clearly our target, streamlined the program to its essentials, set ourselves to the long-range task, and secured better personnel, then, fifth, we need to decentralize much of the controls now held too tightly in Washington. Too often, operations get bogged down in redtape. In our proper concern to avoid mistakes or waste, almost everything has to come

back to Washington for decision or approval. But that takes too long. The fiscal year is half over before the year's program gets started. More decisions need to be made in the field. If we have more first-class men there who are better trained and know their job, they can be given greater authority, and can make more decisions on the ground.

Mr. Chairman, in summary, about three main facts stand out as we evaluate the years of effort in scores of countries. One fact is that some of the projects unquestionably have failed. Some of our personnel have produced more antagonism than goodwill.

A second fact is that, despite the failures, most of the world is still free—and it would not have been free without this mutual-security program. Therefore, it has succeeded remarkably well in its overall objective.

The third fact is that the program has saved us money, net. Without it, we would have had to spend more, not less, because we would have had to expand greatly our own Armed Forces. If MSA were to be cut off, we would not have more money for schools, hospitals, highways, old age assistance, or tax or debt reduction here at home, as many assume; we would have less.

The question, therefore, is not whether to continue the program; but how. How can we improve it so that it will do a better job in the future than in the past?

This whole problem is not a test of our strength, as a nation, or of our resources; it is a test of our character.

It is a test of our maturity, our decisiveness, our steadfastness.

Our relations with some of the nations still on the fence, even with some of our closest allies, have not been going too well. It is a time of testing of them, yes, but equally of ourselves. We must make it clear to all that those who stand by us will never be let down.

One thing that tends to pull some toward the Communist side is the fact that the Communists do not hesitate to speak right up for those who lean in their direction—witness today in the Middle East and South Asia. For us to appear indecisive, unable to differentiate between our real friends and our enemies, will lose us the friends and not win over the enemies.

Mr. Chairman, our difficulties are largely because we have not quite identified our basic problem. We have measured it too much in terms of supplying food, guns, and dollars. That we have done and can do. But men do not live by bread alone—or guns or dollars. We have not paid enough attention to the things of the spirit.

Men want to be apart; but they also want to be together. They want to be free; but they also want to belong, to be important, to be needed, to be appreciated. The Communists have understood that better than we have.

We have been able to succeed with the individual problems which we understood and set our hands to. Once we identify as our greater problem this task of winning the confidence of men, their minds and hearts, and set ourselves to accomplish that, I have no slightest doubt that we can and will succeed with it too.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to bring to the attention of my colleagues a problem which goes to the very heart of congressional consideration of the mutual-security legislation which we have before us today. It is a problem which I believe requires not only serious consideration, but also positive action in the form of an amendment to this legislation.

This bill authorizes the expenditure of nearly $4 billion for the mutual-security program for the coming fiscal year. This is a huge sum of money from any standpoint. However, not alone the huge sum of money involved, but larger questions of the role of the various programs covered under this bill in furthering our national security place grave responsibilities on each of us as we conduct this debate and as we ultimately cast our votes.

How well we fulfill our responsibilities will depend in large measure on how well we are informed about the purposes of this bill, the activities to be carried out under it, the results which have been obtained in the past, and the results that may be expected in the future.

Let me pose this question for you: How much do most of us really know about the foreign-aid program? We are told by the executive branch about its importance. Of that few of us can have any doubt. But we have been told by the executive branch a number of other things about this program. We have been told, according to the information presented to the Foreign Affairs Committee and published by them, of various activities undertaken in the past and of the successes which have accompanied those operations. How complete and accurate is that information? Is it in sufficient detail to give each of us, or even the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, a reliable picture of what has been done in the immediate past? I have reason to think not. As chairman of the International Operations Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, I, with my colleagues on that committee, have had occasion to examine some of these programs in detail. We have found a number of instances in which the information supplied to the Congress and to the House Foreign Affairs Committee is far from the full picture which Congress needs to make informed judgment about these programs. Let me cite you an instance:

We studied the conduct of our technical-assistance programs in Latin America last year, and we issued a detailed report on March 29 last. On April 13 of this year representatives of the Department of State and of the International Cooperation Administration appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee and reported on their work in Latin America in technical assistance. They reported to the committee that there were in operation 56 joint bureaus, known as servicios, in Latin America, and that 19 of these bureaus had been terminated since the program began down there in 1942. The termination of these bureaus is one measure of the completion of some of the programs carried on in technical assistance. These figures were submitted to the Foreign Affairs Committee, and they were accepted by the committee and appear in their report—on page 21, House Report No. 2213. But the report omits reference to certain details which, in my opinion, are very important and significant. Did the committee ever find out whether some of these supposedly successful programs were terminated because they failed? Did the committee ever learn that nearly half of those reported as terminated have been reactivated so that the figures are meaningless? There is nothing in either the record or the committee report which indicates that the executive branch made this clear.

Let me mention another point: The same presentation—hearings, page 298—and the same report—page 21—mention the number of projects undertaken—something more than 3,000—and refer to 1,853 completed and transferred to the host government. It does not indicate that some of these are not completed projects at all, but are merely bookkeeping transfers, and a number of others represent actual counting of projects which were closed out almost before they began.

Even the record of host-country cash contributions does not indicate that the computation was made at inflated exchange rates, which tend to exaggerate the contributions of the host countries. Let me show you how this works out. The committee's report on page 21 mentions that Latin American host-country contributions in the form of cash were about $21.8 million. But the report does not state that these figures are based on assigning International Monetary Fund par value to the host-country currencies. If you return to page 330 of the hearings on the subject, you will see an interesting table. It shows that the free rate of Bolivia's currency is 4,600 bolivianos to the dollar. Yet Bolivia's contribution is computed at 190 to the dollar. Brazil's cruzeiro is rated at 18½ to the dollar, while its free rate is actually 70.5. Similarly, Chilean currency is valued at 110 to the dollar, while its free rate is 487. The most favorable of these works out to about one-fourth of the value imputed to them. If this average holds, Latin American contributions are more nearly $5 million than $22 million.

Even when the very capable members of our Foreign Affairs Committee ask for supporting information for some of the statements made by executive branch witnesses, they do not get much that is truly helpful. I point to the effort of Mr. VORYS to find out in detail what we were spending $45 million on in connection with budgetary assistance to Iran in fiscal year 1954. The executive branch witnesses promised the committee an answer. What did the committee get? It got a document which said $10 million was used to help Iranian imports, $10 million was provided to temporarily support Iranian currency, $14.5 million was made available to Iranian importers, and the rest of the information was no more

detailed than this. Each of these items needs much more detail.

The $10 million which was provided to support Iranian currency was an unusual transaction. The Iranians needed to issue local currency, but under their law they could do so only if they had an equivalent amount of foreign exchange in their vaults. The $10 million we granted was used to supply that backing. It was, however, a temporary device, and the note issue was retired in a matter of months as their financial situation improved. Nowhere have I been able to find that the Congress has been informed as to what was eventually done with that $10 million when it was no longer needed to back the Iranian currency. The evidence is that it went into the general program, but we still cannot tell what it was spent for.

Can we in the Congress make informed judgments with no more than this kind of information before us? Can even our distinguished Foreign Affairs Committee do much more than report to us the same general statements that have been given to them? I think the answer in very large measure is "no."

Why does this kind of vague and misleading information so consistently make up the record upon which we must base our judgments? I think a very real answer to it lies in the nature of mutual-security legislation and the customs which have grown up in connection with it over the years. These, I suggest, make it incumbent upon us to take corrective action in amending this law in certain respects.

I think it is generally conceded that in the interest of flexibility in the execution of mutual-security programs the Congress has relaxed many of its traditional controls. It has written broad authorizations into the legislation. It has granted a number of exceptions to time-tested controls by making it easier for the executive branch to transfer funds from one appropriation to another or from one purpose or area to another. It has, in effect, delegated to the executive branch much of its own discretionary power over the expenditure of funds. It has done so because it has recognized the need for the executive branch to be in a position to take prompt action to meet rapidly changing situations. It has accepted the statements of the Executive that in many cases programs could not be carefully and completely prepared and presented to the Congress in advance. Thus it is that in recent years we in the Congress have regularly appropriated money for mutual-security purposes based on illustrative programs. These, as we all know, make no pretense of being firm programs, but are instead statements of intent on the part of the executive branch, illustrating what it hopes to do with the money Congress gives it.

Let me make it clear that I am not at this point questioning the need for either flexibility in the legislation or the use of the illustrative program technique. I merely want to emphasize the fact that our foreign aid legislation has this unique character. And it has this unique character because the Congress has accepted the argument that the executive branch needs this latitude in order to perform its tasks under this program.

The granting by the Congress of this kind of power; indeed, the fact that it represents a delegation by the Congress of some of its own discretionary prerogatives carries with it obvious implications. Certainly, under the circumstances Congress has a special right to know in detail just how such powers and prerogatives have been exercised and to have made available to it appropriate documents, papers, communications, and other records which, taken together, give an accounting of the stewardship exercised over programs so conducted. It is to insure that such documents, papers, communications, and other records are made available that I shall offer an amendment to the bill. In the course of experience of our committee, this amendment appears to be necessary because of an inclination on the part of the executive agencies involved in the nonmilitary assistance aspects of the mutual-security program to withhold information concerning the details of operations they have undertaken. My amendment reads as follows:

On page 13, after line 12, insert the following:

"(d) After section 514, add the following new section:

"'SEC. 515. Access to records by certain legislative committees: (a) Before any funds authorized under any title of this act may be expended or obligated after the date of the enactment of this section, the President shall issue such directions to the agencies and officers involved as will ensure that all documents, papers, communications, and other records on the basis of which any action is taken or any determination is made under such title will be freely available to any committee of Congress which has the duty of studying the operation of activities under such title.

"'(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the continuing availability to appropriate committees of Congress (pursuant to directions issued under subsection (a)) of all documents, papers, communications, and records relating to operations under any title of this act shall be a condition of the exercise of any authority to expend or obligate funds under such title.

"'(c) The provisions of subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply in the case of funds authorized under chapter 1 or 2 of title I or unvouchered funds authorized by section 401, or in the case of actions taken or determinations made with respect to such funds.'"

Our committee is currently investigating the operations of United States aid activities in Iran. Although present arrangements for access to appropriate documents and records are satisfactory, we were able to work them out only with a considerable amount of effort. Moreover, we have no promise that the time consuming and somewhat difficult process involved will not have to be repeated for our next study. Since we do have, under the Legislative Reorganization Act, the duty of auditing these programs unless special recognition is given to the special circumstances created by mutual security legislation a formidable obstacle will remain in our path and in the path of the Congress in its attempt to exercise adequate control over expenditures. I do not mean by this to suggest that the application of this amendment is only to the work of our committee, but I do point out that it strikes at the very foundation of the work we must perform.

I think I should also make it clear that this amendment does not raise any question about the constitutional separation of powers. As I have mentioned earlier, the requirements of mutual-security programs have been such that Congress relinquished to the executive branch some of its constitutional powers. All that this amendment seeks to do is to assure that Congress will be frankly, fully, and accurately informed of how the executive branch has exercized the discretion which Congress has allowed it.

As Congress has recognized the special need of the executive for latitude in initiating mutual-security programs, this amendment seeks only to insure that the executive branch will likewise recognize the special needs of the Congress in reviewing such programs. Because it arises specifically in the context of our mutual-security programs, I think the amendment should form a part of this bill.

I think the amendment which is proposed and the action which is required by it will reinforce rather than weaken that constitutional separation of powers which has so long been a foundation stone of our freedom. I urge its adoption as a necessary means of assuring that the Congress can exercise its traditional powers in this very important area of our Government operations. Without this amendment we are, I am afraid, in danger of abdicating rather than delegating a fundamental power vested in this body.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the distinguished member from South Carolina, Mr. JAMES P. RICHARDS, for his diligence, his remarkable patience, and his great ability.

It has been a privilege to serve on the Foreign Affairs Committee under his leadership, and I regret very much that he has announced his retirement from Congress. He is a kind gentleman.

By disposition he is moderate and fair; by intellectual standards capable and perceptive, and when these qualities are joined with accrued knowledge based on long experience, we have all the attributes of a great legislator.

The bill which we have under consideration today is his more than that of any other member of the committee, and I am pleased to say that I will support it on the floor of this House.

But I am frank to admit that there are policy questions and questions of operation in this legislation concerning which I should like to make my own position clear on the record.

Concerning the request made by the Administration for a long-term commitment, I want the record to show that I have examined with care the testimony of the witnesses who appeared before the committee and I do not find that a good

case has been made out for a long-term commitment by Congress with respect to our foreign-assistance program.

There has been some fuzzy thinking and talking about long-term planning with respect to this program. The Executive Department can and should do the long-term planning and Congress should not be asked for a long-term commitment which it cannot and should not make.

For the life of me, I do not understand how one session of Congress can commit successive sessions of Congress to a long-term program, and no witness who appeared before our committee gave us any real help with respect to this basic and fundamental problem.

We are living in a world in which changes take place rapidly. Tito and Yugoslavia are good examples of what can happen in a year.

Neutrals of today may be our enemies of tomorrow, and, since it is constantly suggested that one of the great needs of our times is flexibility with respect to rapidly changing world situations, it seems reasonable that the Congress could be expected as a matter of flexibility to take a careful legislative look at our foreign-aid program at least every 2 years.

And lest there be those who doubt the good faith and the word of the United States with respect to projects which may cover several years, the statement of policy on this question in the bill is assuring enough for our friends and convincing enough for our enemies.

It is worth reading as follows:

> The Congress of the United States, recognizing that the peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered as long as international communism and the nations it controls continue by threat of military action, use of economic pressure, internal subversion, or other means to attempt to bring under their domination peoples now free and independent and continue to deny the rights of freedom and self-government to peoples and nations once free but now subject to such domination, declares it to be the policy of the United States to continue as long as such danger to the peace of the world and to the security of the United States persists to make available to free nations and peoples upon request assistance of such nature and in such amounts as the United States is able to provide compatible with its own stability, strength, and other obligations, and as may be needed and effectively used by such free nations and peoples to help them maintain their freedom.

I particularly approve of that part of the committee report which suggests that the military portion of the mutual security program be placed in the Department of Defense budget next year.

A careful review of the testimony before the Committee on Foreign Affairs leads me to believe that the requested appropriation has been inflated.

Besides, the Administration itself says, and I agree, that there is a great need for reevaluation and analysis of this entire foreign assistance program.

And, it is a fact that there is available some $5 billion carried over in unexpended appropriations from former years.

Consequently, it is commonsense to say that the Administration cannot spend the amount of money it has asked for in 2 years.

More importantly, it cannot even spend the accumulated balances of some $5 billion in 2 years and under this bill, the Administration has been given considerable flexibility and freedom of movement with respect to the transferability of funds from one purpose to another.

Actually, not even 2 years is involved as a new session of Congress will open in January which is a matter of only 7 months. If in January it can be demonstrated that there is a real need for additional moneys, I am confident that Congress will make such moneys available.

The Comptroller General, an Administration appointee, told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently that overoptimistic foreign aid planning had resulted in appropriation of more moneys than could be spent.

One result, he said, is that the Defense Department is holding at least $400 million in foreign aid funds in violation of the law. That money, Comptroller General Campbell said, should revert to the Treasury.

Finally, but most importantly, the tax burden upon the people of the United States is already burdensome and crushing, and surely there is a point of diminishing returns and of economic collapse even for the richest and most resourceful of nations.

It is my considered opinion that the Communists are hopeful that the United States will recklessly spend itself into bankruptcy.

Therefore, until the program has been reevaluated and carefully analyzed and while billions of unexpended funds are available, I consider it to be a part of patriotic good sense to hold this appropriation within reasonable limitations.

It is difficult for me to understand our failure to make a more substantial appropriation for Guatemala. The administration request for Guatemala was completely inadequate and although the committee by its own action raised the amount of money available for Guatemala, it appears to me that the amount authorized by the committee should be increased.

Guatemala is a country located in the Western Hemisphere, and in June of 1954 it overthrew a Communist government which was a Red beachhead in Central America. As a result the Government of Guatemala is in great need of economic assistance.

Guatemala must be made exhibit A in the contest between the free world and Communist slavery.

It is the first country to actually rid itself of Communist tyranny.

In Guatemala, we of the United States have an opportunity to prove that a nation which throws off the tyranny of communism will not be deserted and moreover, that it will be given substantial aid and assistance by the United States of America.

Guatemala should be more than exhibit A in the contest between freedom and Communist slavery. It can and should be made a showpiece, for its neighbors in Central and South America, who are constantly resisting Communist enticements and Communist pressure. Guatemala is our friendly neighbor and we should help it to recover and at the proper time in the consideration of this bill, I intend to offer an amendment to increase the money available for assistance to Guatemala, and I hope that the majority of the Members of this House will support that amendment when it is offered.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. I wish to associate myself with the remarks the gentleman is making with respect to Guatemala. As he knows, I offered an amendment in committee to increase the money for defense support and economic aid for Guatemala by $5 million. I still do not think that is enough, and I intend to support the amendment that the gentleman expects to offer tomorrow to increase that amount by even more.

Mr. DODD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DODD. I have great respect and a feeling of friendship for my friend from Iowa and, although I have not much time left, I want to give him some of my time if I can. I hope he does not detain me too long.

Mr. GROSS. First of all, I want to commend the gentleman for discussing the provisions of this bill. He is one of the few speakers on the part of the committee who this afternoon has given particular attention to the provisions of the bill itself. On pages 8 and 9 of the bill I note this language:

> In subparagraph (B) (ii), before the semicolon at the end thereof, insert "or by reason of war, revolution, or insurrection."

Does this mean that this provision of the bill will provide that American investments in foreign countries will be guaranteed against destruction or damage by reason of war, revolution, or insurrection?

Mr. DODD. I believe that it does. I have not found the place. I am sorry.

Mr. GROSS. Page 9 of the bill.

Mr. DODD. I believe that it does from what I have heard the gentleman read.

Mr. GROSS. They already guarantee to provide for indemnity against expropriation; is that not true?

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Now we want to carry in this bill indemnification for war, revolution, damages or destruction resulting from war, revolution, and insurrection. "Insurrection," I think the gentleman will agree with me, is a very, very broad term.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. That language is the exact language used by the President of the United States in his message to the Congress. He recommended that that language be inserted.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that I am not interested in the language used by the President of the United

States. I am interested in what we are doing here with this bill ourselves.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. That is the exact language that has already been passed by the House on three occasions but eliminated in conference at the insistence of one Member of the other body. The purpose of the proposal is to save money for the American taxpayers. We are already gambling billions of dollars on the survival of these free countries. If we can get American private capital to go in, taking along its own management, with the understanding that if there should be destruction due to war, revolution, or insurrection, the Government will reimburse them for their losses, we can cut down correspondingly the amount of taxpayers' money to be put into the countries. That is, we will need to use public funds only if things go wrong. Now we spend public funds every year, and the gentleman is opposed to that. It is a possible expenditure of taxpayers' money against a certain expenditure.

Mr. DODD. That is my understanding. I think it will encourage American private capital.

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I wonder who has the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman should tell of his own amendment put into the private enterprise section of the bill, which helps to strengthen the bill.

Mr. DODD. I thank my friend from Ohio. It is a very simple matter. I offered an amendment, which I think the committee adopted unanimously, which should make more secure the investment of American private capital because it alleviates somewhat the fear or risk of discriminatory treatment at the hands of the government of the country where the investment is made.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. I wanted to say to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut that he has been a very able member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and while I have not always agreed with him, I do regret the fact that he is going to leave that distinguished committee.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much, indeed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. DODD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know of any law on the statute books of this country that provides for the indemnification of an American businessman for damage or loss sustained because of war, or insurrection, or revolution, in this country?

Mr. DODD. In this country? I think our insurance companies take care of that.

Mr. GROSS. I think it is written out in every insurance policy specifically and I believe the gentleman will agree with me.

Mr. DODD. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Last year when the foreign aid program was before us, I supported the committee's recommendation that assistance be continued to Yugoslavia. I did so on the basis of the calculated risk which our military experts had urged us to take. At that time, I pointed out that I had grave doubts about the position of Yugoslavia with respect to the free world.

Recently, it appears that Tito has moved toward a reconciliation with the Soviet rulers in Moscow. The doubts which I expressed last year are compounded in view of recent events. Only on the basis of self-interest and a calculated military risk was I able to go along with the recommendations for assistance for Yugoslavia in 1955. In view of recent developments, plus the fact that Yugoslavia is a truly Communist state with all of the evils of communism including the suppression of freedom, the continued assaults on religion, and the destruction of family life, I have more than grave doubt that we should continue to appropriate funds for Yugoslavia.

The calculated risk on Yugoslavia of last year takes on the appearance of an irresponsible gamble this year.

Surely in our own interest and in the interest of the cause of freedom it is difficult to reconcile continued assistance to Yugoslavia and meager appropriations for Guatemala.

Conscience compels me to state that I am disturbed about the flagrant gap which exists in the committee report with respect to a major crisis in our foreign relations; namely, the steadily deteriorating situation in the Middle East.

Failure to express these views would be tantamount to agreeing with the evasive language contained in the report, entitled "United States Foreign Policy in the Middle East." That section of the report includes a series of quotations from the hearings and from Secretary Dulles' speech of August 26, 1955.

I am amazed that this is the extent of the committee's consideration and recommendations with respect to the explosive situation which exists between the Arab States and Israel, nor is there any consideration of how to meet the steady infiltration of the Arab States by international Communists.

Soviet and Iron Curtain arms are pouring into Egypt. Egypt has recognized Red China. Nasser flouts the United States while he embraces the Bulganin-Khrushchev-Chou En-lai axis. Nasser has announced that he will soon visit Communist China, accompanied by a military mission to Peiping.

Syria is flirting with the Communist world and, according to all reports, is about to recognize Communist China. Moreover, she is negotiating an agreement for the purchase of arms from the Communist bloc.

Yet the committee report remains silent.

The Arab States, in their avowed purpose to annihilate the State of Israel, have embarked upon a campaign, growing more successful each day, to supplement substantially their arms and ammunition by acquiring jet planes and submarines for obviously offensive purposes. "Blockade," "nonrecognition," and "annihilation"—these are the three terms uppermost in the minds of the Arabs in relation to the existence of the state of Israel.

Recently Premier Ben-Gurion of Israel has offered to meet Premier Nasser of Egypt at any time and in any place, including Cairo itself, to discuss a settlement of the problems between the two countries and achieve peaceful relations between them.

Ben-Gurion is willing to discuss the question of borders, Arab refugees, and other political, economic, and military matters. The desire of Israel for settlement and peace is clear and unequivocal.

In order to induce the Arab States likewise to understand the necessity for reaching a solution of problems through the means of a peace conference, on April 10, 1956, our colleague, Congresswoman EDNA KELLY, of New York, introduced House Joint Resolution 600, requesting the President to instruct the permanent representative of the United States to the United Nations to request the Security Council without delay to convene the Arab States and the state of Israel and other interested nations in a peace conference.

I endorse that resolution as an essential step toward peace and security. But no mention is made in the committee report of the necessity for a peace conference.

This I completely fail to comprehend. I can only construe it as an abdication of congressional responsibility of the highest order, in which I cannot join.

From the quotations referred to in the committee report, there is no indication whatsoever of what United States policy is with regard to the area.

It is not enough to say that our policy is peace and security.

It is not enough to say that our policy is to maintain impartial friendship to both sides.

It is not enough to say that the behavior of the Soviet Union in the Middle East is "not so good."

It is not enough to say that this is an area "which is of great importance to the United States."

It is not enough to say, "The United States is trying to continue its foreign relations in a responsible manner."

It is not enough to say that "We want to maintain friendship with all the peoples of the Middle East."

By policy, we mean the plans and programs, if any, which the United States has in mind to carry out its objectives. Putting it another way, what steps are we preparing to take that will induce the Arab States to sit down with Israel, a state which has demonstrated that it is

essential to the well-being and security of the entire area and of the Arabs themselves. The committee report gives no guidance whatsoever on these questions except for the statement contained in it: "the committee has been reassured both on and off the record that the program does not include any money or plans for military aid to Israel or to the Arab States bordering on Israel." This did not reassure me, nor can it reassure Israel, whose preservation our Government has promised to maintain.

It is because of this gap in the committee report that I have felt compelled to state these views and to refer to the findings and recommendations which were made on this vital problem by a special study mission of the Foreign Affairs Committee last fall.

I was a member of that study mission which went to Israel and made its report. In that report we said:

> The study mission is convinced that the United States should and will continue to give full support to Israel. Under present conditions the United States must also feel the gravest concern over Communist infiltration of the Arab States. We, of the study mission, believe that the United States should make it possible for Israel to obtain the defensive weapons which Israel has requested. These she must have to protect herself against the offensive weapons being sold at ridiculously low prices to Egypt and offered to the other Arab States by the U. S. S. R. We object to an arms race in this area. Our objective is a peaceful solution to the problems of all the nations in the area. This must be accomplished by diplomatic negotiations at a peace conference where all the issues of the Middle East can and must be solved. The Tripartite Pact of 1950 should be reaffirmed with emphasis on the security for this area.
>
> The policy of the United States in the Middle East must be reviewed to effect a settlement of the problems existing there. Continued unrest and hostility among these nations and the recent campaign of the U. S. S. R. to penetrate economically and diplomatically into the affairs of the Middle East could spark a worldwide conflict. It is no secret to observers that the U. S. S. R. will use any nation as a pawn to suit its purpose of world domination.

I do not believe in a policy of assisting those who openly defy us and align themselves with the Communist bloc while we leave an avowed friend naked and alone. Such a policy could end in disaster. We know that every member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and every Member of the Congress, and every American wants to avoid such a disaster in the Middle East. The avoidance of such a disaster, however, will require firm, courageous, honest, aboveboard action by our Government and adherence to the moral principle of fair play which has made us such a great Nation and a respected people.

Mr. Chairman, thus far I have attempted to discuss some of the controversial factors involved in this legislation. But it seems to me that differences of opinion with respect to long-term planning, the adequacy of appropriations, the size and type of assistance, and the selection of particular areas for help, while of great importance, all fail to reach the root problem of our foreign assistance program.

And until we solve this problem our foreign aid program will not be fully successful.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. LAWRENCE SMITH, quoted, I believe, this afternoon on the floor of this House from the writings of the distinguished British authoress, Miss Barbara Ward, who has suggested in a recent article that the complete absence of any political or philosophical basis is the greatest weakness in our foreign aid program. I believe this is a just criticism and that it strikes at what I have described as the root problem.

Our foreign-aid program should not be based solely on expediency, self-interest, Communist competition or the cold war, but rather upon conviction and principle.

We have discovered in the last century one key to a shared sense of moral solidarity in the principle of the general welfare. This is the principle upon which our entire foreign-aid program should properly rest, for involved in it is the idea of universal brotherhood of men.

Over and over again we have heard it said that the problem of coping with communism is primarily an ideological or a spiritual one. And this is why we must found our foreign-aid program on a great moral principle.

If the basic cause of communism and its threat to our society is on a spiritual and ideological plane, the missing element in our policy of coping with it must be spiritual and ideological.

We can find this missing element in our foreign policy by rediscovering why we hold our democracy so dear and why we should endeavor to share its underlying principles and beliefs and blessings with our fellow men. Democracy is based on a Judaic-Christian ethic concerning the nature of man, his essential worth and dignity, and his inherent God-given rights and freedoms. Man is a valuable being.

Here is where we find the real reason for a foreign-aid program. Thus, we understand that we are engaged in this tremendous project not only because we must resist communism, not only because we must make ourselves secure, not only because we must have strong defenses, but more importantly, because it is the right thing to do.

This is what actually motivates us in the conduct of our affairs at home.

This is why we will not discriminate on the basis of race, creed, or national origin in our immigration laws.

We will oppose segregation in all its forms as a violation of the basic rudiments of Christian charity and another form of Hitlerlike racism.

We will support measures to eradicate slums from our large urban centers which to our friends abroad are incomprehensible in the light of our high standards of living.

If God has blessed us with fertile land and a population with a high degree of technical skills and initiative, we shall recognize our responsibility to find ways and means of sharing our surpluses and skills with other peoples of the world who are less fortunate.

Thus, in our foreign aid programs, we should be prepared, when asked, to tell our foreign neighbors who need assistance why we want to help them—that one of our principal motives is to help them establish and maintain a free society. We should be able to tell them why we attach such importance to freedom, and why we are interested in sharing it with them; that it is the nature of man which is at issue.

We should discuss these matters in our churches and civic groups, in our schools and universities.

We should call for volunteers and, like the Communists, develop cadres of young people to dedicate their lives in whole or in part, to serve these ends, both here and abroad. We have never lacked for volunteers when wars, in the traditional sense, have broken out.

But this is a new kind of war—the cold war—but a war nonetheless. And it is a war to the finish between freedom and tyranny.

The American people should realize that these problems are not to be confined to Government action only; we all have a stake in the outcome and we all have a role to play.

Those who recognize these things, have a responsibility to act and to give leadership to others.

We need bold and imaginative leadership to infuse and permeate our foreign policy with this vitalizing element. The people of the United States are ready for it. For this is not a suggestion to introduce an element not already existing on the American scene. It is rather a suggestion to recognize it, and to draw more heavily from our spiritual ideals in the shaping of our foreign policies and our objectives, in the conduct of our foreign-aid programs, and in the content of our propaganda. Let us not be ashamed to explain our ideals publicly, and, above all, let us act as though we really believed in them.

If such a dynamic or positive element were infused into our national thinking on foreign policy it would tend to emphasize the quality rather than the quantity of our assistance programs.

The magnitude of aid would not be so much the measure which is often based on immediate threats of loss to the Communists.

The measure would rather be the economic and social needs of the country or area and our own ability to help on a long-term and consistent basis.

The people who receive our cooperation would not be made to feel that they are simply pawns in an international power struggle between the East and the West.

They should feel that we are doing these things because it is the right thing to do.

And I suggest that the American people and their Representatives in Congress would be more willing to appropriate the necessary funds for these programs if they had sufficient confidence that those in charge of our foreign policy had clear objectives and knew what they were doing.

What these people need above and beyond all the technical skills we can give them is to find a way of life which will have some meaning and idealism in it.

They need to discover the essential worth and dignity of the human person, to develop a sense of self-respect as well as earn and receive the respect of others.

The personnel which we send abroad either under Government programs or through private organizations should be carefully selected on the basis of their suitability and capability to express and demonstrate these ideals to the people in the underdeveloped countries.

If we continue to flounder and drift in the conduct of our foreign affairs, we shall ultimately lose all the respect which our present position of leadership requires.

Should this happen, the cause of freedom and justice in the world will be lost.

I earnestly and devoutly believe that we of the United States have the greatest responsibility in this struggle. We are on the right road, and the legislation which is before the House will assist us in reaching our proper objective.

That objective is a world at peace under law. A world in which free men use and enjoy the blessings of creation and live in harmony with God and each other.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORANO].

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, ever since I have had the privilege of serving on the House Foreign Affairs Committee I have been especially interested in Latin American affairs. During the present Congress I have been serving as a member of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs. I have always considered this assignment a tremendous challenge and an opportunity.

From the point of view of its moral values, strategic importance and tremendous potentials, Latin America is a vital and essential link in the whole fabric of free world unity. While general statements along this line are made from time to time both in the Congress and in the executive branch, I feel compelled to say that we have not always shown by action that we believe what we say.

The programs for Latin America contained in the mutual security bill now before this House fall short of what I would consider adequate. They constitute what I consider only a very small demonstration on the part of the United States that we recognize the fundamental importance of Latin America not only to the security of the Western Hemisphere but also to the security of the whole world.

The 20 Latin American Republics have a combined area approximately 2½ times larger than that of the United States. Latin America is second only to Western Europe in its imports from the United States and it is the principal source of imports into the United States. The Organization of American States made up of each of the Latin American Republics and the United States is the oldest regional organization devoted to securing the integrity and maintaining the defense of an important free world area. In 1950 the population of Latin America for the first time since the colonial period exceeded the population of the United States. The present rate of growth of 2.5 percent per year exceeds that of any major region of the world. The population is increasing at a rapid rate. These are facts we would do well to remember.

No one can dispute the fact that strategically, morally, and economically it is essential to keep on the side of the free world a strong and dynamic Latin America. It is essential that we maintain a strong and prosperous Latin America if the 20 Republics and the United States are to gain any mutual advantage in two-way cultural, moral, and trade relations between them and us. And it is vital to the free world defense against Communist tyranny.

As recently as 1954 we witnessed the successful overthrow of the Communist supported Arbenz government in Guatemala. This was a government under the domination of international communism, not in the Far East but in our very backyard in Central America. We should all pause and give thanks to President Castillo Armas of Guatemala for having succeeded in overthrowing the Communist regime and for his efforts to restore that country to a position of stability and growth. This is all the more commendable when we remember that at the time President Castillo Armas took office he found the treasury looted, a huge public debt, and widespread unemployment; in fact, chaos was facing the country. Guatemala is the only country the world has ever seen which has been able to overthrow a Communist regime. I shudder at the thought of what might have happened if the Communist regime had continued in power. I shudder at the thought of what might have happened in other countries in Central America which form a connecting link between us and South America. Certainly, the present government in Guatemala deserves the full support which they are entitled to expect from us. We can do no less.

While I favor the other programs in this mutual security bill, I feel it is my duty to call attention to the relatively small amount which we are making available to our neighbors in Latin America. The total nonmilitary assistance authorized in this bill for all the countries of Latin America is only $65,850,000. That is for defense support, technical cooperation and the Organization of American States. The amount requested by the executive branch for military assistance for this area was $35,546,000, which amount may well be cut because of the overall cut of $1 billion in military funds for the entire military assistance program. When we compare these figures for Latin America with the total authorization in this bill of $3,563,475,000 it is clear that not enough emphasis is being given in the planning and execution of programs for Latin America.

Mr. Chairman, our friends in Latin America follow very carefully the course of congressional consideration of the mutual security program. To them, and I think there is much justice for this view, our lack of apparent attention to this hemisphere is something which they cannot comprehend. This they do not understand, not only from the point of view of their own best interests, but from the point of view of the best interest of the United States itself.

I feel that many of the shortcomings in our policy arise because of the cross-current of information which our various ambassadors to Latin America send back to Washington. This is no criticism of them, for I feel that in the main they constitute a body of extremely able and dedicated diplomats. However, I think it is essential that we consider United States policy and programs in a particular country of Latin America not in a vacuum but as part of our overall policy with respect to all of Latin America. It is for this reason that I am today urging that the President appoint a special representative to Latin America with the rank and status of ambassador, whose function it will be to consider United States-Latin American relations in the broad context of the best interests of the hemisphere. It would be his function to circulate among the countries of Latin America as special circumstances might warrant. It would be his job to explain clearly and quickly the policy of our country should that policy be open to serious question or misunderstanding or should it need special emphasis. He would not, of course, replace our ambassador to a particular Latin American country but would rather speak for all our ambassadors to Latin America, in a sense, on matters affecting all of Latin America. Appointment of such a special representative would strengthen and buttress the action of a United States Ambassador in a particular Latin American country through affording additional support at the highest level. It would give clarity to United States foreign policy in the area and would remove the confusion which frequently results from conflicting statements from time to time by various United States representatives on particular United States policies. Furthermore, such an appointment would give greater impetus to United States fulfillment of mutually desirable objectives sought by hemispheric conferences and meetings and would strengthen the position of the United States representative to the Organization of American States.

This post would require an experienced, imaginative, humane, astute, and understanding diplomat. I suggest to the President and Secretary of State Dulles that our present Ambassador to Italy, Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, would be an ideal choice.

No ambassador in our history faced the difficulties which confronted Mrs. Luce upon assuming her post as ambassador to Italy. Within a year's time, prejudices against her sex had not only vanished, but she had become one of the most loved and respected ambassadors we have ever sent to any country. Her brilliant record of achievement has been acclaimed by all. Her successful efforts to combat the spread of communism and to perpetuate democratic government, her job of weaning a floundering people from Communist arms into the western orbit, her just and laudable part in the settlement of the thorny Trieste problem, stand as impregnable testimony to a job well done.

Clare Boothe Luce has earned the reputation as one of America's frontline diplomatic representatives. Latin Americans would welcome her with pride.

While I do not know the future plans of Mrs. Luce, aside from the fact that she intends to return to her post in Italy as soon as she has taken the rest so justly deserved, I do know that she would be ever willing to serve her country in any capacity requested by the President.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORANO. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I am happy to hear the gentleman pay this fine tribute to our former colleague, Mrs. Luce. I want to join him in all that he has said regarding the truly extraordinary job she has done for our country in a very difficult situation in Italy. But we who knew her in the House were not surprised because we had come to recognize and admire her qualities and capabilities and had learned to expect that kind of superlative performance from the able and charming and distinguished lady.

Mr. MORANO. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MORANO. I know that the President is cognizant of the tremendous importance of Latin America to future hemispheric peace and security. It is for that reason that the President plans to attend the Special Sessions in Honor of the Presidents which will be held by the Council of the Organization of American States in Panama City, Panama, June 25 and June 26, 1956. The announcement that the President will attend this important meeting has given new hope to the Latin American Republics. The appointment of a roving ambassador such as I have suggested will do much to fulfill this hope.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM].

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I stand before you, my colleagues, after 8 years as a member of this most important Foreign Affairs Committee. I only regret that I am severing my membership with this committee and with this House, but I must say this retirement is not of my own choosing. During these long, tedious, and important deliberations I was in the district in North Carolina most of the time campaigning; but I tried to keep up with the hearings and have spent many hours during the last 10 days in reviewing the testimony, the deliberations, and the report.

I think I can speak with some intelligence on these affairs because after beating around the world during a great part of my life, and after several years in the Navy in World Wars I and II, I have very definite conclusions about our place in this world of ours, our responsibilities as leaders of the free world, and our obligations to our people of the United States of America.

The cutting of these amounts requested in this bill does not mean that this money will be saved. If we keep the same level of defense, it may cost us from 2 to 3 times the amount by which the bill is cut. Planes, tanks, ships, guns, uniforms, and other items cost a great deal more here than from our allies.

This country came out of two world wars infinitely stronger, materially and physically, than we went in. Statistics show that we would have lost 16 million men killed in World Wars I and II if we had lost the same percentage as did Britain and France. We lost more men killed in the War Between the States than in both World Wars. Our allies are bankrupt in men—the best young men get killed first.

The question of international peace is completely tied in with the questions of domestic peace and prosperity, because if we are to continue to stand off the forces of evil now abroad in the world, and at the moment being confessed in such an astonishing manner by the leadership of the Kremlin, we have got to follow a course that is charted for us by our President, our State Department, and the Department of Defense, using the checks and balances we hold in this and the other body based on our experience and commonsense. There are so many angles involved that it would be impossible to name them all; but these angles include domestic peace between labor and management, between the farmer and the consumer, between all racial groups, and a united front and the endeavor to follow the long-range plan that is best for the United States of America.

God has so blessed us that we are prone to hide our heads and say to each other that all is well and that we should forget other nations and look to our own knitting. Today, by chance, is the anniversary of the landings on the Normandy Beaches, and there was an example of cooperation by the allies that should set a mark for us to aim at during a time of so-called peace, but during a time when we have never lived more dangerously.

Under the leadership of General Eisenhower, who was given a free hand to organize this supreme effort to invade the continent of Europe, we achieved victory; and under his leadership today I hope, and pray with you, that we are traveling toward an ultimate victory of universal peace.

The example of victorious nations at the end of World War II will be noted in history as a turning point in world affairs, because instead of trampling the conquered, as has been done in the past, we loaned them a hand of sympathy and help and encouragement and brought about a strength and feeling of goodwill that has not been known before.

General Eisenhower is now our President Eisenhower, and he is my President and your President; and in a bipartisan manner I am proud to try to follow the course he and his peacetime staff have charted as the best American course toward peace. I have not always agreed with him and his advisers, but I have agreed that he is honestly and sincerely working, at great peril to himself, to make us realize that we have world responsibilities and that we must face them as we should face our personal responsibilities, down to each individual.

I have been amazed at the caliber of the men of this body generally. I compliment my colleagues on your hard work and intelligence, but I say to you in all frankness that what we do on this Mutual Security Act of 1956 may well mean our survival in a storm of unknown proportions. It is no time for loose talk or political partisanship or vindictiveness or personal preference, but rather a time for a prayerful request for guidance in behalf of our country.

The men who have testified before our committee have been picked for their experience, patriotism, character, and standing in this country of ours; and whether in the civilian components of the Department of State or Defense or in the military components of the Department of Defense, I give them credit for as much sincerity and as much patriotism as any of us. For some reason we have arrived at a situation where the general talk gets around to the topic of sincerity in these requests and to statements that "They always ask for more than they expect." How much better it would be if we took these gentlemen as a group at their word, as you would the managers of any business or organization of individuals united for a common purpose, and said to them in effect, "We take what you have said to us as facts, and we hope and expect that you will spend these moneys in the most competent and sensible way possible. And if there is any left over, you will come to the Congress and say to us, 'Here it is. We were able to do the job with less than we asked for'." That has happened many times in the moneys that have been allocated to the Foreign Affairs Committee and other committees, for expenses, and I am proud once again to be a member of a committee that has turned back moneys that could have been spent.

It has always embarrassed me to have outstanding leaders appear before a committee of Congress and questioned in a manner that would indicate their lack of sincerity. Men who have risked their lives in war and men who have made enormous sacrifices in peace are not usually at the top of various departments of the Government unless they have proved their ability as well as their patriotism. I do not believe our President would say to a group from both sides of this House, as this morning's papers reported after the meeting at the White House last night, that a cut such as proposed by the committee could endanger the security of our country unless he meant it. I take him at his word.

I give every man the right to his own opinion, but I have always said to my constituents when they have criticized me that at the same time I expect some constructive suggestions. We have had long experience in working with our allies; and it has been my conclusion, and is my conclusion today, that we need them far more than they need us. In Europe, in the Near and Middle East, in Asia, we have firm friends; and we have stuck to a policy of mutual security between friends and have upheld the United Nations as the best avenue of

peace; therefore, I cannot blame our allies for doubting our intentions when loose talk and rash statements come out of Washington that seem to belie our own sincerity.

I think few of you will disagree with me that our enemies respect strength, and what man does not respect strength. Individually we like to follow strong leadership. Individually we like strong and firm friends to lean on, and in our personal life we doubt the sincerity of those who talk about us in order to gain personal importance. As a Government we have had enough experience now in world affairs to believe that we as a Nation are young in diplomacy, and in the ways of the world, and we must realize that in our population, made up of so many strains and root stocks, we have various and diverse currents that run athwart our charted course.

Would not it be different if we had as many citizens of French or Spanish descent in our country as those of English descent? Would not it be different if we had as many of Arab descent as those of Jewish descent? Would not it be different if we had as many of Slavic descent as Italian descent?

Take the question of Yugoslavia. I have sat with 1 or 2 of my colleagues here with Marshal Tito in Belgrade and heard him say that in case of aggression he would fulfill his obligations to the United Nations. Is he not the only so-called satellite leader that has been called a traitor, a murderer, a deserter, and given unspeakable insults, to stand up and fight the Soviet leadership and by a show of strength win out to the point where he is fawned upon in Moscow and regarded as one who personifies strength and cannot be defeated by such talk. The papers reported yesterday that he said in Moscow that his people had fought so hard for democracy that through this experience he believed the United Nations was the final answer to peace. Then why should we try to throw overboard a country who has felt the disasters of world war acutely and has come out of it strong and with the respect of both the world of light and the world of darkness.

I remember a famous Marine colonel in World War II, Col. John W. Thomasson, Jr., of Texas. We were having a big argument down in the Navy Department in early 1942 about the situation in Argentina. I was outspoken in condemning the leaders down in Argentina for not coming in with us. After all our opinions were finished, Col. John Thomasson said:

> I'll tell you what is the matter with those Argentinians—they are pro-Argentine.

I think Tito is pro-Yugoslavia, and I want us to be pro-America; and I want us to attract and hold every ally we can get in our camp. The stronger they are, the better off we will be.

My mature belief is, as I stated, that we need our allies in the free world more than they need us. What do you think would happen to our country if certain of our strongest allies would announce, as Hitler did in 1939, that they had signed an alliance of nonaggression with the people of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. I imagine the same foreboding wave would surge over our land as surged over Western Europe when Hitler made his announcement. I respect the right of every one to state his own opinion, but I do not respect those voices that are abroad in our land that chant a constant theme of "give-away" and "pouring money down a rat hole" and such similar statements.

Weapons are changing and being modified at a faster pace than ever in history. Aside from our need for fighting men and equipment, such as ships, planes, guns, tanks, and various war materials, we most desperately need brains—the brains of research and development from every point of the compass.

I want to call to your attention something that I have known since the end of World War II when I was associated with one of the greatest men of our times—the late James Forrestal. It was brought out at the end of both wars by our own miliary, and frequently discussed that we, the United States, had not originated any of the main weapons that won war. I think it will be interesting to you to have an incomplete list of these weapons because many of you who served in that war will identify them, and many of you who served at home will be familiar with them and their importance. Here are a number of offensive and defensive weapons originated outside the United States and which were of the utmost importance in bringing us victory. They were, in fact, the main tools of victory which were later developed by American ingenuity and know-how and used with such intelligence by soldiers, sailors, and airmen:

First. Atomic bomb—British.
Second. Jet plane—British.
Third. Radar—British.
Fourth. Tanks—British.
Fifth. Electric torpedo—British.
Sixth. Forty-millimeter Bofors—Swedish.
Seventh. Twenty-millimeter Oerlikon—Swiss.
Eighth. Acoustic torpedo—German.
Ninth. Magnetic mine—German.
Tenth. Degaussing—British.
Eleventh. Torpes—British.
Twelfth. Sonar—British.
Thirteenth. Depth charges—British.
Fourteenth. Hedgehog—British.
Fifteenth. Jeep carriers—British.
Sixteenth. Motor torpedo boats—Italian.

I am not belittling our research, and am praising our development and our productive capacity, which has been made possible through our system of free enterprise; but I do not want you to ever believe that we have a patent on ingenuity and ideas.

I am going to support the President's request for the full amount of foreign aid. If we are going to keep a certain level of defense and cut this amount materially, it will cost the people of the United States from 2 to 4 times the amounts of the cuts to attain this level of defense. I am going to place my confidence in our leadership, who are working as patriotically as we, and harder than most of us, to bring our diplomatic and military organizations to the highest points attainable. I want to plow under any soil banks we may have of hypocrisy and demagoguery and build up the most important soil bank of all—that of the strength of these United States, based on cooperation, hard work, and a spirit of sacrifice, if necessary, to maintain our position of leadership among nations. I ask you to purge your minds and hearts and make your decisions based on what is good for our country and good for our children and generations yet to come. The Bible says, "When a strong man, armed, keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace." I interpret that to mean moral as well as physical strength; and I am willing to go down fighting for any cause that I believe just.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TUMULTY. Do I understand from the gentleman's speech that he endorses Marshal Tito's rule over Yugoslavia?

Mr. CHATHAM. I endorse Marshal Tito's stand against the Kremlin.

Mr. TUMULTY. Does the gentleman endorse Tito after he shot down our fliers?

Mr. CHATHAM. I take no part in that argument. I stated that I endorse his stand against the Kremlin and they are giving way to him.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, some of us here have filed minority views with respect to this bill. This has been, in our opinion, necessary in the past, and we regret we found it again to be so. These were filed not with any sense of pleasure that we thought it appropriate to do so. We did it, rather, with a sense of sadness that, in our opinion, the program had not been successful and, therefore, it was our obligation as members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and as Members of the House of Representatives to point out at least some of those things in which we thought the legislation had been deficient.

Obviously, it is impossible in a few minutes even to suggest all of the things in which we think this legislation has failed to achieve its announced goals. However, there are some points which I think are of so much importance that ought to bring them to the attention of this body. Accordingly, in the first place, let us ask ourselves in which direction this program has been moving.

Mr. Chairman, we have moved—and I think this is important—constantly in recent years in the direction of greater concentration of power in the executive department. And, notice I did not say in the hands of the President but in the executive department. We have tended to lump together money, areas, and programs to such an extent that it is difficult, if not impossible, for many people to understand what is proposed by the legislation here before us at this time. I am sure that there are Members of this House who have read the proposals which are here before us and have tried, in their own minds, to understand what they mean. They must have found

that it was difficult to tie them in with existing legislation and it was at the same time difficult, if not impossible, on the basis of information available to say "Well, this much is going to such a country and this much to another country and so much to another," and so on down the line. In other words, how is this House going to legislate intelligently with respect to this proposed legislation if there is not the detail before it upon which it can operate? Not only that, but there is a constantly increasing tendency to place more power, more very broad powers, in the hands of the executive.

Let me point that out by only two quotations. In the legislation as it now exists, and I am reading from section 418, which has to do with the President's fund for economic development, these words are found:

> The President is authorized to utilize the appropriations made available for the fund to accomplish in the free Asian area the policies and purposes declared in this act and to disburse on such terms and conditions, including transfer of funds, as he may specify to any person, corporation, or other body of persons however designated, or to any friendly foreign government, agency, or organization or group of friendly governments or agencies as may be appropriate.

In other words, under existing law the President has the power, under that section to give these funds to any person, corporation, et cetera, that he may deem appropriate. It does not say public corporation. It could be a private corporation. It could also be a private person. When that question was raised in the committee, the committee took steps; I may say, however, that the committee, in my opinion, took steps in the wrong direction because the language which is now proposed does not impose even that degree of limitation.

As proposed by section 201 it is simply this:

> The President is authorized to utilize the funds hereafter made available for purposes of this title to accomplish in these areas policies and purposes declared in this act, and to disburse them on such terms and conditions, including transfer of funds, as he may specify.

In other words, in the existing law we have said that he can give the funds to persons, corporations, et cetera. In the proposed law we do not put any such limitation on it at all. The funds made available under section 201, $243 million, can be used in any way the Executive may see fit within the terms of that section. Heretofore we have spoken about the so-called blank-check authority, the authority which exists in the Executive to use funds and authority with little or no limitation. Certainly we are carrying that authority in this legislation far beyond anything that up to now has existed. What I am saying to the Members of this House is that in this proposed legislation we are finding further evidence of the fact that there is an increased loss in the Presidency as well as in the legislative branch to control these funds and the policies of the program.

The previous speakers this afternoon have pointed out that heretofore errors have been found in this program. It is not at all difficult to understand why that is true when we have legislation written in such broad and sweeping terms as this.

A thing which you will find strongly urged in the minority views is that there is need for a restudy and reappraisal of this whole program. That was proposed, as I think all of us are aware, by the President himself when he suggested to the committee that it might be appropriate for us to authorize the appointment of a body to restudy this program. That authority is not given in this bill. But certainly I am one of those—and there must be many of us here—who feel that if we are going to have this program with all of the shortcomings which many of us find in it, certainly it should be subject to the most careful and objective study and reappraisal. If there is a program, which, as many of us believe, has not been successful in the past, then let us at least ask ourselves what we can do to make it more successful in the future if we are going to have the program.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I offered an amendment to set up a commission to study this program; it was reconsidered and taken out of the bill.

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is certainly correct. He did offer an amendment which would have provided such a commission. The committee finally decided not to include it in the bill.

Our eloquent friend, the gentleman from Minnesota—and we have the greatest admiration for him; I know of no one who is more diligent, loyal, and patriotic than he—many times has used the illustration, and a telling one it is, of the patient who has been kept alive by certain medicine, although he is very ill. He points out that that may be the situation with respect to the world today. Here is a sick patient—the world—and, as the gentleman says, here is a medicine—foreign aid—which has kept him alive. I should like to take that a little further and say that it is not enough simply to keep a patient alive. We must call a consultation of physicians. We must call people in and see if we cannot get the patient well. We must change the medicine. If one kind of medicine has for a number of years done nothing more than keep the patient alive, let us see if we cannot find a new medicine, one which will provide a cure.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is it something different from the blood transfusions that have been taken from the American taxpayers?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is the gentleman in favor of continuing the medicine during the consultation, or does he want to stop the medicine entirely?

Mr. ADAIR. No, I want to review the whole situation and then try to find a medicine which will be successful.

Mr. JUDD. What are you going to do during the review process, stop the program?

Mr. ADAIR. Not at all. As the gentleman so well knows, there is enough medicine on the bedside table right now to last 2 years or thereabouts. We do not need for an instant to stop the program. It can go along.

As has been repeatedly pointed out, it is not so much the money which these nations throughout the world—and many of them are true and loyal friends and allies—most need, because many times the mere giving of dollars takes away self-respect from nations as it does from individuals. We need something beyond that. We need, and it is my hope that we may be able to achieve, the importing to these nations of the American philosophy of self-reliance and liberty—of the American belief in the freedom and the rights of the individual. That is what we must do, not rely on dollars alone, but to strive for better understanding among persons and peoples throughout the world and, above all, to rely, as did our forefathers, upon a philosophy and a faith.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. I would like to see him count them again.

The CHAIRMAN. A quorum is not present.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 58]

Arends	Forand	McDowell
Baker	Frazier	Machrowicz
Barden	George	Mack, Wash.
Barrett	Gubser	Magnuson
Bates	Gwinn	Mason
Belcher, Okla.	Hagen	Miller, Calif.
Bell	Hale	Miller, Nebr.
Berry	Halleck	Miller, N. Y.
Bolling	Harden	Moulder
Bolton, Oliver P.	Harvey	O'Hara, Minn.
Boykin	Hays, Ohio	Patman
Brooks, La.	Hayworth	Perkins
Brooks, Tex.	Herlong	Philbin
Brownson	Hillings	Phillips
Budge	Hinshaw	Pillion
Burdick	Hoffman, Ill.	Polk
Cannon	Holifield	Powell
Carnahan	Holt	Prouty
Celler	Hope	Reed, N. Y.
Chase	Horan	Seely-Brown
Christopher	Jackson	Shelly
Clevenger	Jarman	Sheppard
Davis, Tenn.	Johansen,	Sikes
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Ala.	Simpson, Pa.
Dawson, Ill.	Jones, Mo.	Taber
Deane	Kearney	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	Kelley, Pa.	Thomas, Tex.
Dolliver	Kilburn	Thompson, Tex.
Dondero	Kluczynski	Thornberry
Donovan	Krueger	Utt
Dowdy	Lane	Vinson
Doyle	Lankford	Watts
Eberharter	LeCompte	Wharton
Engle	Lipscomb	Wilson, Calif.
Fallon	McCarthy	Wilson, Ind.
	McConnell	Withrow

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair,

Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11356) and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 313 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not here to defend the bill before the Committee. The next time I speak to you on the foreign-aid program, it will be with relation to the money bill from the Committee on Appropriations. At this time I am expressing my own views and my own convictions; I am not speaking for the members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations handling the money part of this legislation.

I should like to pay my respects to the very able chairman handling this bill; he is not only a great chairman, but a splendid gentleman, the Honorable JAMES P. RICHARDS, of South Carolina. It is my understanding that this is the last year our distinguished colleague will handle this legislation. I am convinced he reported out what he believed to be a good bill. It is not unusual for us to disagree, but in so doing we are not disagreeable.

I must state that I am very disappointed in the large amount requested in the bill before you.

The bill calls for $3,563,475,000, and notwithstanding the fact that the committee made a reduction of $1,109,000,000 below the request, the proposed authorizing legislation is still $860 million above the amount appropriated by the Congress last year.

In my opinion, there is even more confusion in the several departments handling this program this year than in previous years. If the Members will take time to read the hearings, not only of the Committee on Foreign Affairs but of the Appropriations Subcommittee, my statements will be borne out to them, notwithstanding the many tears being shed by some of the participants from the top echelon down.

Time will not permit me to go too far into many of the obvious irregularities and inconsistencies of the program, but confusion is still prevalent in most phases of the program.

Department heads are overemphasizing the importance of the loan provisions of the program. The report of the committee, based upon testimony made before the Foreign Affairs Committee, may leave you under the impression that there has been a very large amount of money repaid on these loans. I observe one figure indicating for this year that $15,126,000 has been paid on loans made made under this program. The testimony is erroneous; the departments are including a lot of bona fide loans made years prior to this program. There has been only $568,000 paid back on the principal on loans under the present program. The largest appropriation for foreign aid is for the military. Under the military there are no loans, and none of the money is to be repaid.

The same thing is true under the technical aid program. Any loans would be under the economic aid section. Let me quote verbatim from a statement of Mr. John B. Hollister, the Director of International Cooperation Administration:

> Our efforts this year to increase the volume of loans made under the program have had somewhat disappointing results. We have found that the use of a loan rather than a grant is frequently, for either political or economic reasons, inconsistent with the attainment of our objectives, unless the loans are so soft, that is, their terms are so liberal, that they constitute partial grants.

The amount of money being paid back on the loans made under this program would not, in fact, finance the overall program for 12 hours. So let us be realistic about this matter.

Last year, when the Congress reduced the foreign-aid appropriation by $500 million, many were lamenting that the program had been ruined. What happened? This year every witness in the top echelon who has appeared before the Appropriations Subcommittee has testified, in effect, that the reduction last year did not handicap the program.

Last year, after hearings by the Foreign Affairs Committee and by the Appropriations Committee and while the bill was in conference, we discovered the Air Force had a check in the amount of $302 million belonging to the foreign-aid program. The FOA Administrator did not know what to do with the check. Inasmuch as he did not know this money was due until hearings were completed and the bill passed.

This year is no different than last year. Confusion is the order of the day. Last year we had a beautiful letter from the Defense Department which obviously was purposely written to confuse members of the committee. It meant one thing at one time and another thing at another time. It was written to be interpreted two ways. Do you remember that incident of planned confusion?

Let me say this: Of the total amount available for fiscal 1955, 22 percent of the entire annual appropriation was obligated on the last day of the fiscal year. To be more specific, 22 percent of the entire annual appropriation was obligated during the last hour of the last day of the fiscal year. Confusion? I would say so. But they hollered just as loud last year as they are hollering now.

Let me quote from an editorial that ran in many of the newspapers throughout the Nation only recently:

> Now the General Accounting Office, which keeps track of how the money is ultimately used, reports that the foreign-aid program suffers from poor planning, lack of accountability, poor coordination, overestimating capabilities of recipient countries, and overambitious programs.
>
> These critical remarks could be multiplied many times to prove that the present American-aid program is in dire need of reexamination and revision.

Another quotation is as follows:

> Yugoslavia's Marshal Tito, who is next on the list of Kremlin red-carpet visitors, suggested on the eve of his departure for Moscow that American aid henceforth should be in the form of long-term loans rather than outright grants.

Are we going to force Yugoslavia's Tito to accept free grant aid after his statement?

May I quote very briefly from a United Press release from Moscow:

> President Tito of Yugoslavia said today he is sure there will never again be a split among Communist countries such as occurred when he broke with the Kremlin in 1948. The spirit of Lenin's principles of collective leadership are such that I am sure there will never again be misunderstanding among the nations of the socialist camp, he declared in a speech broadcast from Kievsky station in Russia.

This bill actually includes money for Yugoslavia. When the chips are down, where will Tito be?

I believe there is sufficient evidence to justify additional cuts below the committee recommendation. When I heard today that there was a lot of lamenting the reduction proposed and pleading to increase the amount recommended by the committee, I could hardly believe the story.

The distinguished chairman of this committee knows that I am going to vote against this bill. That is why I said at the beginning of my statement that the next time I speak to you I will be representing the Committee on Appropriations and not necessarily expressing my own views.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman for the statement that he is making. I wonder if in the brief time that he has he would address himself to the testimony of the Comptroller General of the United States before the Foreign Relations Committee of the other body concerning the $400 million the Department of Defense has illegally held of mutual assistance funds since 1954.

Mr. PASSMAN. I should not like to do that, but I should like to say that you have all the proof you need that this program is just as confused this year as it was last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that no one will get the idea from the remarks that I am about to make that I am an isolationist or that I am unsympathetic to the economic and social problems facing the world today. Nor do I want anyone to think that I am unmindful of the magnificent contributions made by our allies during World War II and the part these nations have played since that time to uphold the principles of freedom.

Nothing could be further from the truth. I sincerely appreciate the great sacrifice made by our allies during World War II to secure the peace, and

I am fully aware of the economic pressures confronting them in their struggle to hold back atheistic communism. I am also aware of and have a sympathetic understanding of the economic and social problems facing certain nations today who were not associated with us in the great war, but who are either neutral or allied with us in our effort to halt the spread of communism.

Mr. Chairman, no one can say that we have not been generous in sharing our wealth with these nations. Believing that we shared a common objective, namely the establishmjent of a free world, the United States has poured out its wealth in a never ending stream. Since 1940, this Nation has given allied and neutral countries over $100 billion in economic and military aid. Year after year we have seen bills come before the Congress to appropriate this huge sum of money and the Congress has always responded.

Roughly breaking down the money we have spent for military and economic aid, we find that we spent some $50 billion during World War II, some $26 billion for postwar relief and approximately $26 billion has been spent since the beginning of the Korean war. Since World War II we have actually spent more for military and economic aid than we spent for such purposes during the war. These billions of dollars have gone to pay for everything from tanks for France to plows for Iran.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the time has now come for this country to reevaluate the whole field of our foreign-aid spending. I believe the time has come when we should make an honest effort to ascertain if the huge spending programs we are approving year after year are actually accomplishing their purpose, namely, halting the spread of international communism, or if they are falling short of their objectives. And while we are examining foreign-aid spending, we might take a sober look at what it is doing to the financial condition of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons advanced by the proponents of foreign aid is that it cements friendship for the United States and the ideals for which it stands. However, experience in a number of countries has taught us that this argument is not sound. The bitter truth is that American prestige in many of the countries we have been so generous with is lower now than at any time since World War II. Our dollars have not made us popular in India, Iceland, Burma, Greece, France, and Ceylon, to name a few countries.

The United States News and World Report recently had an article which vividly illustrates this point in connection with India. The article pointed out that since 1950 the United States has given India $64.3 million for iron and steel, $42.6 million for irrigation and power, $38.9 million for railroads, $24.5 million for grain, $20.9 million for fertilizers, $16 million for cotton, $15.8 million for technical services, $15.1 million for malaria control, $12.8 million for village development, $12.2 million for schools and training, $4.9 million for sanitation, $2.3 million for airports and $21 million for other projects. This makes a total in gifts to India of $291 million. In addition to this huge amount, we have loaned India since 1950 $190 million to buy wheat and $40 million in connection with a world bank loan. The grand total of aid to India since 1950 amounts to the staggering figure of $521 million. At this point, I would like to say that $521 million far exceeds the amount of money it took to run the State of North Carolina in all its departments during the year 1955. This huge sum is far more than the $380 million it took to construct the Panama Canal and would build two Hoover Dams at $172 million each, with millions to spare.

Now how much friendship and popularity has the expenditure of this $521 million bought for the American people in India? Well, let us examine the record. India opposes practically every objective we have in the Far East. She trades with Communist countries and during the first 6 months of 1955 her trade with Red China alone more than doubled. India champions the seating of Red China in the United Nations and is in favor of giving her Formosa. She has welcomed with open arms Soviet technicians to work in her 5-year plan of internal development. She seeks arms from Russia while at the same time she opposes our arming of Pakistan, a stanch friend of the United States and freedom in the Far East. Indian newspapers praise Russia and hail her as a benefactor while seldom mentioning the tremendous aid the United States has been giving India. Now, what has Russia done for India to merit all the praise and expressions of warm friendship she is receiving in that country? Again let us look at the record. Since 1950 Russia has given India $500,000 for electrical equipment and $200,000 for disaster relief. In addition Russia has loaned India $100 million to purchase a steel mill as yet unbuilt. Total Soviet aid to India amounts to $100.7 million in contrast to the $521 million we have put up. Though United States aid to India has been five times greater than that of the Soviet Union, still the Russians get the praise while all we merit is criticism and obstruction in the Far East.

Now let us examine what has been our experience in another country in our attempt to help that country combat communism and regain economic strength. Let us take a look at Greece. During the past 12 years we have poured over $1.8 billion of economic assistance into that country. This amounts to approximately $214 for every man, woman, and child in Greece and is the highest per capita amount of aid we have given to any country on the European Continent.

Mr. Henry Gemmill, writing in the Wall Street Journal for January 26, 1956, states that this huge sum of money has put Greece back on her economic feet—no doubt about that—but as far as winning friends and influencing people the high investment must be rated a dubious success. Mr. Gemmill says that today the sentiment of the Greek people toward the United States ranges from mild exasperation to violent opposition. And in recent months this feeling has been intensified through our neutralist stand with respect to the island of Cyprus.

In Ceylon we have spent American taxpayers' money and in that country the West is having trouble. Recent elections in Ceylon have resulted in a neutralist landslide.

In Iceland there is a mounting feeling among the people for the removal of American soldiers. We are continually being blamed by that country for her economic ills. I have no doubt in my mind that the criticism is well founded. It would be impossible to pour the money we have into Iceland without disrupting the economy of her 160,000 people.

There are other examples where the United States is coming out second best in her policy of spending money to influence people, but I will not burden the House with a discussion of them at the present time. Sufficient is it to say that dollars will not buy friendship in the family of nations any more than it will in the private relationship between individuals.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it has been said that the tremendous sums we have been spending overseas are necessary to halt the onward march of communism. Has our spending, then, been successful in this objective? Apparently not, for at the beginning of 1945 there were less than 200 million people enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. Now, 11 years later, over 900 million people are Communist ruled. In addition, countries representing over 500 million people have elected to follow a neutralist course rather than to join in collective security. Many of these countries now behind the Iron Curtain were recipients of generous American aid in the past. At the present time we are giving or lending money to every one of the so-called neutralist nations.

The proponents of foreign aid also advance the argument that it is our duty to raise the economies of foreign countries because poverty among the working class of people breeds communism. But this line of reasoning is also subject to questioning. In France over one-fourth of the voters cast Communist ballots this year. The past 4 years have seen rising wages and prosperity in that country. Yet, where do we find the French Communists? Not among the poor class of workers. The greatest Communist strength is among the highest paid French workers. The same thing holds true in Italy. Communism is strongest in the high-wage industrial cities of northern Italy and lowest in the poverty-stricken southern portion of the country. The billions we have poured into France and Italy have given those countries their greatest level of prosperity, but the money has failed to halt the growth of internal communism. Communism will be halted in these countries, as in any other country, when the will of the people is strong enough to resist it and not before.

Mr. Chairman, I now turn to what I consider to be the most important factor in any discussion of our foreign-aid spending, or, for that matter, in any domestic financial undertaking this Gov-

ernment enters into. And that is the relation of continued Government spending to the financial health and economic stability of the United States. As much as we desire to spend here at home, we must never do so to the extent that the financial security of the United States is undermined. The well-being of this generation of Americans as well as the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity rests upon the continued solvency of the United States. Strike down or in any way impair this Government's financial integrity and you will open the United States to Communist enslavement as sure as if the struggle had been lost on the field of battle. And all too well do we realize that if this Nation weakens and falls, Christian civilization with all its blessings of liberty and justice, with all its promise of the future, will perish from the earth and not be known again in our time.

It behooves us, therefore, to adopt and steadfastly maintain as our first consideration, and under all circumstances, the continued economic health and well-being of the United States. So long as the United States maintains her economic health, there will be hope for the rest of the world, whether free or enslaved.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the total debt of the United States now stands at the tremendous figure of $276 billion. This is more than the combined national debts of the nations of the free world. Our debt amounts to approximately $1,600 for every man, woman, and child in the country. It hangs over our heads like a giant threatening cloud and casts a shadow far into the future. If we should work a miracle and balance the budget at this session of the Congress and start paying off our national debt at the rate of $1 billion a year, it would take us 276 years to retire it. This statement takes on added significance when we realize that the United States is only 181 years old. If we could be fortunate enough to retire our national debt at the rate of $2 billion a year, it would take us 138 years. It gives us something to contemplate when we realize that in 1913 the total cost of all activities of the Federal Government was only $1 billion whereas today the interest alone on the national debt exceeds $6 billion.

Mr. Chairman, if we cannot make a start toward the reduction of our national debt and at the same time lessen the load of our tremendous annual interest charge during this period of great prosperity, then when will we ever be able to do so. I am afraid that those who come before us and advocate continued long-range foreign aid spending have no concern over the national debt. I am afraid they follow the easy path and abandon the burden of debt to future generations of Americans as yet unborn.

Foreign aid spending for the past several years has been costing every American family, from the richest to the poorest, approximately $105 per year. Every billion dollars we appropriate adds another $24 to the family burden. When we pause to consider that the average median income for the American family is $3,400 a year, a yearly foreign aid contribution of $105 or $130 is hard to realize. But, of course, not every American family pays its foreign aid contribution every year. However, it pays its share and the rest is made up from those with higher incomes and the balance is tagged onto the national debt.

Mr. Chairman, we hear so much about tax relief for the American people. Well, if we want to give them tax relief all we have to do is scale down or better still, eliminate unnecessary foreign aid spending. To do so would lighten the tax burden for the American people to the extent that millions of small income Americans could forget about paying Federal income taxes.

I cannot vote for any program that reaches down in the pockets of the textile workers and farmers of my congressional district and takes dollars to subsidize Communist-sympathizing India or Communist-dominated Yugoslavia under Tito. I cannot support any program, foreign or domestic, which continues to pile debt upon debt and thereby undermine the financial foundation of this Republic.

Mr. Chairman, the people of my congressional district are 100 percent opposed to communism. They stand ready, within reason, to help those who have the will and the national pride to help themselves. My people feel that they have not been ungenerous with the oppressed peoples of the world. Rather they feel that they have been, in many instances, generous to a fault and that the time has now come for a cold, realistic reexamination of our foreign-aid spending. The people of the Ninth Congressional District of North Carolina are willing to assist less fortunate people of the world in their quest for freedom and a higher standard of living but they are not willing to destroy the United States in the attempt.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I, too, should like to join those who have spoken before me paying tribute to our distinguished chairman whom we are losing this year, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]. I think almost everything has been said that could be said about him, but I want to say, speaking personally, like my colleagues, we will miss him very much in the years to come.

Mr. Chairman, for the first time since coming to Congress, I rise in support of mutual security legislation and, more specifically, in support of H. R. 11356, the bill now before us.

This bill reminds me somewhat of the agricultural legislation recently passed by the House. As was stated at that time, this is not the best piece of legislation which we could devise but it is the best which could pass this House. I hope to see it improved at such a time when amendments are in order but if it remains in its present form, I shall feel able to vote for it.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that all sorts of dire predictions have been made regarding the effects the committee reductions of slightly more than a billion dollars would have on our foreign-aid program. I understand that administration spokesmen have been urging the appropriate committee of the other body to restore the cuts. Now I would like to read the opinion of an outstanding Eisenhower supporter, Mr. John S. Knight, publisher of the Knight newspapers which, I am sure, are known to many of my colleagues. I quote from Mr. Knight's editorial of May 27:

> The House Foreign Affairs Committee has, by a 24 to 4 vote, approved a billion dollar cut in the administration's nearly $5 billion foreign aid bill.
>
> This slash is long overdue and should be supported by both Houses of Congress. Our foreign economic and military aid programs beg to be reappraised and revised downward.
>
> It was originally intended that military aid would help get our allies started on rearmament, just as Marshall plan economic help was supposed to be of temporary duration until Europe was rehabilitated.
>
> Both now appear, under one form or another, to have become a permanent part of our foreign policy, with the time-worn rationalization that these programs bolster the free world against communism.
>
> If Europe cannot now, with its present prosperity, support a military defense establishment, what kind of allies do we have? Many of France's American-financed divisions have been sent to quell the North Africa revolt.
>
> Germany is years behind her commitments to the European defense plan.

Mr. Chairman, since John Knight is not only not an isolationist but has, on occasion, even been criticized for being too much of an internationalist, I felt his words were particularly appropriate at this time.

Now if this is to be a permanent program, a permanent part of our foreign policy and one designed to outlast even the cold war, I believe its primary purpose should be designed to advance American interests in the world, the welfare and security of our own people.

I think our foreign-aid program would be better understood and respected abroad if it gave more priority to what was strictly in the best interests of the United States. Such a course of action might not always gain us friends but the realistic pursuit of our own interests would be a policy which anyone could understand. As the Saturday Evening Post said in a recent editorial:

> What we do in this field will be more effective in all respects, including the cooperation of the recipients, if we lay it on the line that our generosity is at least as closely related to our self-interest as the willingness of others to accept it is to their self-interest. Once that were made clear, we should soon find ourselves less frequently accused of using foreign aid to further some dark and devious imperialistic scheme.

It is very simple, Mr. Chairman. The average native in a middle or far eastern country is unable to understand our foreign-aid program as conducted on its present basis. With his hidden fears of colonialism, he is suspicious of whatever he does not understand and immediately suspects and looks for an ulterior motive. Finding none, he increases his suspicion, both of the giver and the motive of the gift. This is due to the fact that we have failed to show, by our words and deeds, that our investments are expected to return something of benefit to the United States.

Now let me return to the question of the billion dollar cut in military aid. I noticed that recently the director of the International Cooperation Administration declared that this cut, if retained, would be unfortunate because it would upset administration planning. But it was my understanding that administration policy in this matter was now at the crossroads. How else can one reconcile the intention of the Executive to appoint a commission for the purpose of reviewing and reappraising this entire subject? Frankly, Mr. Chairman, this is nothing but an interim policy which we are considering today. It is a form of marking time while important policy decisions are being considered and prepared for the future. But I cannot reconcile a $4.6 billion authorization request with marking time.

This was a reduction in military aid. Now the administration has indicated a belief that the Soviets have altered their own policy, from one of force to the so-called competitive coexistence. The administration is apparently willing to go along with this presumed switch to a certain extent as shown by the decision to let General Twining visit Moscow, a decision, which, incidentally, I thoroughly deplore. But if it is now believed that the Soviets represent no military threat at present, why was it thought necessary nearly to double the request for the military part of the program?

Many will say that we must not trust the Soviets and that we must keep our guard up. I thoroughly agree with such statements. And I would be very happy, Mr. Chairman, to take this billion dollars which the committee has cut and vote to increase our own defense budget by such an amount. I would much rather see that money, if it is needed for defense, be spent for American weapons than to put it into the hands of other peoples who are perfectly capable of protecting themselves. If the British want to kill Cypriots or the French to shoot down Algerians, they may have a perfectly valid reason for being compelled to do so. But I cannot believe that our financing such accomplishments adds thereby to our own national security.

I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the President has been quoted as saying that the committee's billion-dollar cut "would be dangerous to national security." Now I would like to make my position perfectly clear. Although I have been known as an opponent of foreign aid in the past, I have never attacked the program as a whole but only what I considered its undesirable features which, to me, have included its size.

My own congressional polls of my district have, in the past, shown a majority of my constituents to be opposed to foreign aid. This year, for the first time, a majority indicated acceptance of the program at present levels, that is, the levels of the past year or slightly under $3 billion. My missionary work has, apparently, done some good. But, after convincing my people that a program of that size is needed for some time to come, I am not going to turn around and vote for a program of nearly $5 billion in the absence of more justification than I have hitherto received. It is going to be difficult enough to vote for a $3 billion authorization as it is.

I certainly concur with the minority views that a stern, realistic reappraisal of the program is needed. I hope that the administration's announced intention to make such a reappraisal will soon be forthcoming. During the interim period, I can support an interim program of the size which we have approved in the past. But I do not regard an interim program as one which includes a more than $2 billion increase over last year in spite of a 2 years' normal supply in the pipeline. I, frankly, see no reason to add to the pipeline at this time when we have no assurance that, following the administration's reappraisal, the pipeline may not be diverted or indeed stopped altogether.

Mr. Chairman, with the exception of this one issue, I will put my record in support of the administration up against that of any other member, Republican or Democrat. But I could not in good conscience justify voting for the original program any more than I can justify voting money for the Communist Tito or the Fellow Traveler Nehru.

This whole program, Mr. Chairman, badly needs a long-overdue improvement. We are not going to get that improvement as long as we take the unsupported statements of those whose jobs depend upon keeping the program going at higher and even higher levels. I very much fear that improvement, if it does come, will arrive only where drastic congressional action forces a so-caled "new look." I believe that our committee action this year has been drastic enough to shock certain people and to impel reconsideration of the overall program. If the House maintains this attitude and supports the action of its committee, I think we may begin to get some real improvement in the program. It is on that basis, and only for that reason, that I will vote for this program this year.

I offered the original amendment in committee for the billion dollar reduction which was at that time defeated. Upon reconsideration, I was unable to offer it again through a technicality. However, its adoption by a narrow vote was one of the reasons that I am going to vote for this bill in its present form. Other reasons are set forth in the supplemental views to the committee report which were signed by myself and the gentleman from Alabama.

As we said in those views, Mr. Chairman, we believe that this program could be reduced further without crippling it. We further deplore the continued inclusion in the program of so-called neutrals such as India and Yugoslavia. We reserve the right to initiate or to support amendments which, in our opinion, will further strengthen or improve the program. But, if the program remains in its present form, we will feel able to vote for it since it represents so great an improvement over what has gone before.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the mutual-security bill which we have before us represents an investment in freedom. Few reponsible persons would doubt the urgency, in the complex situation confronting us now, of continuing this program of assistance and aid to friends and allies. Though we may have wistful moments of wanting to go back to the simpler past when we could wholeheartedly devote ourselves to our own development and to exploration and expansion of our own frontiers; to the time when the fates of other nations were not irrevocably bound up with our own, we cannot regress. History has chosen us for world leadership. We cannot escape the responsibilities that have fallen to us, no matter how burdensome or perplexing they may be. This is the age when America must display the courage and wisdom of maturity.

The bill we have before us represents congressional recognition of this fact. It does not represent a great new departure in American foreign policy, since foreign-policy decisions are not initiated in the Congress. It is a vehicle by which the American people, through their elected representatives, have studied the existing mutual-security program and recommendations of the administration for the continuation of that program.

While the administration has indicated its deep awareness of the intense fluctuations in the world scene and has also suggested a searching study of the aid program and its effectiveness, it has not specifically proposed any essentially new ideas. The Congress might well have expected a new approach to the program, in the light of the change of Soviet tactics from military belligerence to economic, psychological, and political penetration and subversion. Indeed, some in the Congress may think a new approach is overdue, since the so-called New Look in Soviet tactics is in reality not very new. There is evidence that it began to appear as early as 1952, before the death of Stalin and the end of the Korean conflict. But while we hear that a reappraisal of the techniques and direction of our foreign policy has been taking place within our executive branch, no major new concepts have yet been proposed.

The administration did request a firm commitment by the Congress to a long-term aid program. While some felt that the Congress could not commit its successors to a program, this year's mutual-security bill does include a statement of policy, which arises out of an amendment proposed by Chairman RICHARDS, of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The statement "declares it to be the policy of the United States to continue as long as danger to the peace of the world and to the security of the United States persists to make available to free nations and peoples upon request assistance of such nature and in such amounts as the United States is able to provide compatible with its own stability, strength, and other obligations, and as may be needed and effectively used by such free nations and peoples to help them maintain their freedom."

Though the United States has been engaged in aid and assistance programs for several years, there has never before been included in the mutual-security legislation a statement of policy like the present one. This statement is a significant addition. For some years it has been obvious that the competition between tyranny and freedom is not a momentary phenomenon but will be the condition of international life for years to come. Many of us are well aware that we cannot dodge the necessity of a continuing, full mobilization of our physical and mental energies in this competition. We are not engaged in a crash program. As the statement of policy indicates, we recognize our commitment to continue the ongoing struggle for freedom—for as long as is necessary. It states clearly that we are in the struggle for freedom to stay and to win.

I believe that approval of the statement by this Congress will be a landmark in modern history. It will show the world that we fully accept the unrelenting duties of the leadership that has come to us. Our friends and allies will be heartened by this definitive evidence of our absolute determination to help them in their continuing efforts to work out their problems and destinies within the framework of freedom.

The statement is also a basic step in appraising realistically what our course in today's world should be for it makes evident that we must begin by accepting some enormous and even terrifying facts. This is a world in which weapons of incredible new dimensions are available. It is a world in which ancient patterns are not only changing but exploding.

And from Iceland to Japan, the seemingly benevolent tactics of the so-called new look on the part of the Soviets have been melting the periphery of the cold war. The great alinement of free world allies and friends is slipping and sliding, cracking and splintering like an ice field moving into warmer waters. In the Middle East, the Soviets have made inroads of inestimable importance. From this bridgehead, which they have long coveted, they can extend their operations into North Africa and south Asia where many new nations are in the first throes of independence. The Soviet entrance into this area is probably the most momentous event since the Korean conflict, and may ultimately prove crucial in the struggle between tyranny and freedom. The possibility of all-out conflict between Israel and her Arab neighbors may be our most immediate concern in that area, but it must not be our only concern. If it were, we would be dangerously underestimating the significance of the Soviets' penetration and influence in a part of the world where they have not been a factor before. It is a part of the world that is strategically vital and where domestic conditions may provide particularly fertile ground for Communist infiltration.

In Algeria, huge numbers of French troops diverted from the NATO forces are engaged in continuing hostilities over the Algerian claim for independence. Cypriots, Greeks, Turks, and British are spilling blood in the struggle over the Cyprus claim for union with Greece—and again, NATO suffers through the weakening of its southern anchor and enmity between its members.

Iceland's Parliament, the Athling, favors withdrawal of NATO forces from that country, which would mean the closing down of American bases in a strategically vital area. In Germany, Chancellor Adenauer's strength has declined, and many voices are calling for negotiations with the Russians for unification. The forces of economics in heavily-populated Japan are exerting tremendous pressure on the government to trade with Japan's nearest great market, Communist China.

These facts are complex and discouraging. How can we meet them? How can we reverse or offset our growing sense of having lost irretrievable ground to the Soviets?

Leaders everywhere are calling for answers to these questions. President Gronchi, of Italy; Chancellor Adenauer, of Germany; Premier Mollet, of France; Canadian Prime Minister Pearson, and Secretary-General Hammersjkold, of the United Nations, are only a few of those who have emphasized the critical need for constructive new answers. Every leading newspaper in the West publishes articles and editorials suggesting new plans, pleading for new approaches. In line with the thinking of many who fear the complete deterioration of NATO, I have introduced a resolution calling for the strengthening of the nonmilitary functions of NATO. This resolution suggests development of a jointly financed program for economic and technical assistance to non-Atlantic areas, for the more effective utilization and combination of scientific and technological resources of the Atlantic nations, for a jointly operated information effort and for educational and cultural exchanges.

The resolutions I've introduced along with suggestions that are coming from concerned people all over the world, arises from one of history's fundamental lessons—that an alliance whose original stimulus was a military threat tends to disintegrate when that threat recedes. This is what we see happening to NATO today. Yet we cannot afford to let the NATO apparatus crumble into disuse. Through it many nations have developed the techniques of cooperation, techniques which could now be directed toward extending to the underdeveloped nations the kind of help which has been so successful in reviving Europe.

My proposal also arises out of my belief that it could be a vehicle for transmitting skills and convictions to that great uncommitted area of the world where the demands for self-determination and the desire for independence are now multiplying. Through our participation and leadership in such a program as I suggest we could revitalize those moral and ethical convictions which led to the birth of our Nation. We are splendidly equipped for this leadership, as our mutual security program has already demonstrated, because America is the proof that the struggle for self-betterment and fulfillment of innate talents is not in vain. Throughout our nationhood we have been devoted to the cause of freedom and individual opportunity. The American Revolution, after all, is the great revolution that did not end in a new corruption, tyranny or moral bankruptcy. It is the revolution that did not produce an Emperor Napoleon, a Lenin, a Stalin. Instead, it produced a democracy with a daring belief in the ability to conquer any odds and to find a practical solution to any problem. This democracy is the idea that has revolutionized the modern world. We see other nations modeling their constitutions on ours, comparing their productivity with ours, measuring their liberties by ours, gauging their standards of living by ours .

The great giant that is America has also learned well how to gird its industrial sinews for battle. Now it must once again make use of its brilliant genius and resourcefulness in the production of ideas which alone can win the current fight for freedom.

The crises of a decade ago led to the very program we are considering today. World War II left Europe devastated and destitute, with its industrial equipment shattered and its cities in rubble. Shortly after the end of the war, the Russians began attempts at penetration of Iran, Turkey, and Greece. The Berlin blockade was a Soviet effort at strangling off the allied hold in that part of Germany. Pessimism and defeatism pervaded the atmosphere of Europe and gave the Communists fertile ground for attempting to capture control of the Governments of France and Italy. The Marshall plan, Greek-Turkish aid, NATO, the Berlin airlift—all these vital efforts, which within only a few years reinvigorated the West, were responses to Soviet initiatives.

The Soviet strategy has been changing again, and so must ours. We cannot be guilty of "too little and too late," for the fate of humanity is at stake. If we will but recognize it, the challenge which has been thrown down by the so-called Soviet "new look" is an opportunity to demonstrate again that democracy has the flexibility and creativeness to move speedily and produce lasting solutions to the world's problems.

We cannot win this titanic contest by being self-righteous or displaying a feeling of superiority. Great nations, like great men, accomplish most when their self-esteem is leavened by humility and the realization that no matter what they have done it is only a scratch on the infinite surface of human capabilities.

As we again give our consideration to our mutual-security program, we might reexamine the motives that led us to undertake this program. Did we intend it to be a dole to impoverished allies who might be expected to flatter our national ego with displays of gratitude? Did we mean it to be a pure philanthropy? Did we hope that the countries we helped would fall into the habit of thinking unanimously or simply echoing our thinking?

No. The program is based on none of these things. The program represents that special blend of practicality and idealism which is particularly American. It recognizes that a poor and hopeless

nation can lose pride, vigor, and the ability or desire to defend itself. It recognizes that freedom flourishes in an atmosphere with a rising horizon. It recognizes, too, that no industrial nation, including our own, can be self-sufficient. Rubber, copper, tin, manganese, industrial diamonds, and a multitude of other products without which our industry cannot function must be imported. The high-level skills in other countries are invaluable to us as we explore the growing realms of technical and scientific advances. The Russians may claim that they have independently invented everything from alphabet soup to sulfa drugs, but we know that international exchange of technical, scientific, and cultural ideas is indispensable.

The program we are considering includes an awareness that in this day of atomic weapons and jet travel, our ocean borders are no longer inviolate and that the combination of readiness by other countries' forces and bases for our own forces in those countries constitutes a first line of American defense.

Most of all the program is, as I have said, an investment in freedom, that priceless quantity without which the most splendid endowment of resources and talents would be worthless. The fact is that since the inauguration of such efforts as the Marshall plan and NATO, no European nation has fallen to communism, and the revival of Europe has given us allies, not satellites. In nations like India and Indonesia, our technical and economic assistance has been important in helping new governments meet internal problems while at the same time keeping the strength of domestic Communists minimal. Our aid has been essential to our Central American neighbor, Guatemala, which so courageously expelled the Communists who had taken over its government.

Now, I know that there are individuals in the United States who pronounce the words "foreign aid" in acid tones. In their misunderstanding of our mutual-security program, they call it a bottomless drain on the American taxpayer. I believe that these are the people who would like to have the United States run away from its role of world leadership and return to a state of mind suitable to a frontier and provincial nation.

I am glad to say that the congressional district which I represent is one of those in which the main body of public sentiment strongly favors continuance of the mutual security program. In a questionnaire which I sent out earlier this year, some 70 percent favored continuation of economic and technical assistance. It seems to me that this attitude arises from an awareness of the importance of our relations with friends and allies in part of our country where world trade makes a recognizable impact on almost every life. I believe, too, that the high level of understanding which typifies my district is the result not only of increased education but of political knowledgeability and a concern for world peace which is natural to an area which could well be a target of enemy attack.

One of my regrets regarding the bill we are considering is that it does not include an authorization for United States participation in the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development, an institution which has not yet come into being.

SUNFED would be the instrument for multilateral action on economic development projects. These projects are not of the type that would or could be undertaken by private capital. Roads, railways, canals, port installations and sources of power, clearing, irrigation, housing, schools, hospitals, etc.—these are not profitmaking enterprises, but they are the necessary preconditions for the establishment of sound economies, stable governments, and social progress. Expert information shows that the gaps between the economically advanced countries and the underdeveloped countries are widening, not narrowing. This is because the rate of development is faster in already developed countries.

The multilateral approach has the advantages of greater flexibility and greater acceptability. Also, in the speedily changing situation in which we now find ourselves, it is becoming increasingly obvious that we must have new ideas, new means to help the underdeveloped countries reach the point where they can help themselves. As is pointed out in the famous report which was done by Belgian banker Raymond Scheyven for the 1954 session of the U. N.'s General Assembly:

> It is * * * necessary to introduce structural reforms, while maintaining full respect for the sovereignty of the underdeveloped countries. It might be easier to carry out such structural reforms through an international organization, which is in a better position to spare national susceptibilities. The intervention of any one country in reforms of this nature would be a very difficult matter, as is illustrated by the reactions which have been aroused whenever lending countries have sought to make their investments conditional upon stipulations which the borrowing countries regarded as infringements of their sovereignty.

As our Ambassador to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, has said:

> Multilateral aid offers a way to prevent the so-called auction which some are trying to promote between the United States and the U. S. S. R., as to which will spend the most in an underdeveloped country.

Mr. Lodge continued:

> One advantage is that a sound multilateral program would provide no cover for engaging in political penetration which is what the Communists do and which we are unjustly suspected of wanting to do.

SUNFED, like the implementation of the economic, scientific and information functions of NATO which I have proposed in House Concurrent Resolution 216, would provide the kind of new impetus which we so desperately need today. The H-bomb stalemate between the United States and Russia has diverted Communist efforts to economic penetration. I believe that international economic cooperation therefore assumes the greatest urgency, and I had hoped that it would be included in the administration's recommendations to the Congress. I believe delay in making the necessary contribution to participate is expensive in the long run.

The legislation does include provision for our continuing support of a number of important international activities, such as the United Nations Refugee Fund, whose major objective is to make refugees useful and productive members of society in the countries in which they now reside; the United Nations Children's Fund, which currently devotes its resources to assisting less advanced countries in development of child health and welfare services and in the control and eradication of diseases. The ceiling has been increased on our annual contribution to the Food and Agriculture Organization, in which none of the members of the Soviet bloc participate.

The atoms-for-peace program is included in three different parts of the mutual security bill. The Asian nuclear center is financed from funds authorized for Asian economic development; training of individuals in various aspects of the peaceful uses of atomic energy is financed from funds for the technical cooperation and technical exchange programs; and the proposal to offer research reactors to friends and allies.

The bill also continues the United States escapee program, which provides care, maintenance, and resettlement assistance to recent anti-Communist escapees in Europe and to selected escapees in the Far East and other areas bordering the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

In concluding I want to reiterate my conviction that if the contest between tyranny and freedom is to be conducted on the economic and political levels, we have a powerful advantage. Clearly, our devotion to individual liberty and integrity is shared by the vast majority of the people of the world. But this advantage is ours only if we make dynamic use of it. Much more can and must be done to take advantage of the opportunities open to us, as I have attempted to indicate. The mutual security program represents a minimum effort in continuing the sound policy which has developed over the past decade. Those who oppose this measure provide only the Fortress American concept as an alternative. That concept in mid-twentieth century is not only impossible to maintain but would constitute an unequivocal repudiation of our traditional belief in freedom and democracy for all. As Thomas Jefferson said early in our history:

> The preservation of the holy fire is confided to us by the world, and the sparks which will emanate from it will ever serve to rekindle it in other quarters of the globe.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I have consistently supported the mutual security program ever since the enactment of the Mutual Security Act of 1951. While improvements in a program so widespread and so global are always possible I nevertheless feel that it has been a major factor in achieving the foreign policy objectives of the United States and of the free world. The bill authorizes an appropriation of $3,563,475,000 to enable the executive branch to continue with the program. Last year there

was appropriated $2,765,875,000, including a carryover of $62,533,250. Thus, the authorization in this bill is some $800 million more than the appropriation last year. I feel that the amounts authorized should be more than adequate to enable the executive branch to accomplish the purposes of mutual security and to continue its effectiveness in deterring Soviet aggression. But this will require sound fiscal practices, the prudent use of appropriated funds, wise programing, and cooperation with the Congress.

I supported in committee the cut of $1 billion in military funds which leaves an authorization of $1,925,000,000 for military assistance. The bill limits new military funds for all of Europe to $450 million, of which $48 million is specifically earmarked for Spain. However, it should be pointed out that the bill at the same time specifically repeals the existing area ceilings on military funds previously made available. This has the effect of giving greater overall flexibility with respect to the use of the unexpended military funds, which amount to approximately $5 billion.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I fully support the action taken by the committee in increasing the economic development assistance request for Latin America from $27 million to $32 million. While I regret that this sum is $6 million less than that appropriated for the comparable purpose last year, I am glad that we have given recognition to the gallant fight being waged by Guatemala to rid itself of the evil effects left behind by the previous Communist regime. The $5 million increase in funds for Guatemala over the executive branch request should help the Government continue its great task of restoring the economy of the country and giving the people a stable government.

The action of the committee in transferring the classification of this assistance from "development assistance" to "defense support" is a forward step in the recognition of the flexible nature of defense support in the light of particular area requirements. In Latin America all of the 20 republics have joined with us in common hemispheric defense by ratifying the inter-American treaty of reciprocal assistance. Nineteen of the twenty Latin American Republics have adhered to the resolution of 1954 entitled "Declaration of Solidarity for the Preservation of the Political Integrity of the American States Against the Intervention of International Communism." Thus the economic assistance made available to Latin America, largely to Bolivia and Guatemala, should help immeasurably in enabling the governments of these two countries to lend strength to the reciprocal assistance treaty and the declaration of solidarity. The report makes clear congressional intent that the defense support funds in this area may be used for the purposes originally planned under the category of development assistance. I believe that an area in which our foreign policy must show imagination, vision, and more effectiveness is in our relations with our Latin American neighbors. I hope that the executive branch will give this aspect of our foreign policy particular attention and care which will be reflected in the program submitted to the Congress next year.

My own view of the solid friendship which Latin America demonstrates to the United States was confirmed in a report issued by two colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Hon. BROOKS HAYS and Hon. CHESTER E. MERROW, on their experience as delegates to the 10th General Assembly of the United Nations in New York last fall. Referring to the support given by Latin America to the United States position at the General Assembly, my colleagues stated:

> Things did not come easy for the United States and its position of leadership. Support for the United States on major problems could never be taken for granted. This is no criticism of our friends in the United Nations. The United States does not want satellites. On the contrary, we expect our friends to question our position, to discuss it with us, and then arrive at a judgment based on their own mature consideration. It was interesting to note in this connection how steadfastly our Latin American neighbors stood with us in the 10th Assembly. This support was extremely important when it is remembered that it represented, with its membership of 20 states, one-third of the then 60 members of the United Nations.

While I feel it is essential that we consider carefully United States relations with peoples in other areas of the world, it is essential that we not do so at the risk of forgetting our own neighbors to the south.

The authorizations in the bill for the United Nations Refugee Fund, the United States escapee program, and the United Nations Children's Fund surely are highly justified in any program of mutual security.

In this bill the committee has substantially broadened the private-enterprise provisions of the mutual-security program. This is a clear recognition that United States private enterprise has a definite place in the foreign policy of the United States, a place which must be strengthened, for in the long run it can reduce the necessity for huge grants-in-aid and thus reduce the drain on the American taxpayer. The committee has increased the total guaranties which can be given on American private investment abroad from $200 million to $500 million without requiring appropriation of funds. The risks covered have been expanded to include the risks of war, revolution, or insurrection. Many segments of American private enterprise have emphasized that such a broadening of guaranteed risks will do much to stimulate a marked increase in American private investor participation abroad.

A companion program, the informational media guaranty program, has also been expanded by providing new means for financing it. The Director of the United States Information Agency, who administers the information media program, is authorized to take over $28 million of the $200 million of notes previously issued for guaranties and to use them as the basis for financing the program. He is further authorized to finance guaranty payments out of a special revolving fund to be set up with the proceeds of the sale to the Treasury of the notes originally executed by the ECA Administrator and now assumed by the director. The informational media guaranty program provides a market for informational materials from the United States in areas overseas which, because of the shortage of dollar exchange, would not be available to United States publishers and exporters. Thus, books, magazines, films and newspapers, telling the history of the American way of life find their way overseas and constitute an important source of informatien about America.

I feel that the various elements in this mutual security bill are well devised, amply provided for by the Congress, and sufficiently flexible to permit the executive branch to carry forward the program of mutual security. Provisions of law by themselves are meaningless. In the final analysis they can only serve as a framework of action and guideposts for the executive branch in conducting our foreign affairs. Let us hope that those charged with these heavy responsibilities act resolutely and in the best interests of our people.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOSCH].

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Chairman, on several previous occasions, I have expressed my concern over the further large-scale foreign aid, commonly referred to as mutual security, handed out to virtually all comers. Over the past few years, in questionnaires sent to the constituents of my congressional district, it has become evident that many of our people are wary of the success which can be or has been derived from this program.

A look at the record is necessary to properly analyze the present request for an additional $4.9 billions which our respected and diligent Committee on Foreign Affairs has reduced by $1.09 billions. The foreign aid funds paid out during the postwar period from July 1, 1945 to June 30, 1955 and foreign aid funds available from July 1, 1955 to date total close to $65.2 billion, more than 25 percent of our total national debt. We have been told this help was essential to withstand the threat of communism. The record fails to disclose that this high hope has been realized.

Now, specifically, the following is just an indication of what has happened in some of the places wherein these funds were expended in an endeavor to buy friendship:

First. Most recent and most glaring: Tito, the Yugoslav dictator who has already received $1 billion in aid, is blustering to the leaders in the Kremlin of his faithful adherance to the Communist cause and that said friendship shall never again be wedged or broken. Let us also not forget that within the last year he refused to let us even see what he does with the military goods we keep sending him, spouting that he does not need our help.

Second. This same Tito is today charged by the United Nations Commissioner of Refugees of planning to surrender to Red slavery those who sought refuge in Yugoslavia from anti-Titoist purges at home.

Third. Great Britain has most recently permitted its Malayan and Singapore Governments to lower the bars on the sale of rubber and other strategic materiel to Red China. Yes, this makes it easier and cheaper for the Peiping regime—they now get their materiel direct.

Fourth. Since the end of World War II, France has received over $10 billion in economic and military aid. The unstable actions of the French Government, to wit, the withdrawal of troops from NATO, its large Communistic vote makes one wonder what help she will give if, God forbid, the half million American boys stationed in Europe are attacked by the Soviets to the East. Speaking frankly, it would appear our aid has been for nought.

Fifth. Since 1950 we have given India over one-half billion dollars and what is her attitude today? Turn Formosa over to Communist China, admit Red China into the United Nations and a policy of increased trade with the Soviet world—that is her attitude, that is what she is doing and advocates.

Sixth. In the report recently submitted by the General Accounting Office it said that foreign aid was plagued by unrealistic planning, by conflicting policy decisions and by Egyptian reluctance to cooperate. Yet, we are currying day in and day out to try to outbid the supposed offer of aid and assistance by Communist Russia.

It is also interesting, from a strictly financial stable program, to remember that there are in unexpended balances for foreign aid from prior years, which will be available for expenditure after June 30, 1956, the sum of $6.8 billion.

It has been argued that we cannot relent in this program for, if we do, Communist Russia will take up the slack, but nowhere, at no time, have we endeavored to put Communist Russia to the test of a program of assistance such as we have undertaken and carried on for the past 10 years. I do not believe that Communist Russia could in any manner fulfill an obligation such as this program entails.

The bitter experience of the past, which clearly demonstrates we cannot buy friends, prompts us to consider whether the time isn't at hand to pay more attention to our economy at home. Without this program we could make substantial strides in reducing taxes, which now take one-third of all income, as well as reducing the national debt. We can be assured of the preservation of freedom in this world only so long as we remain economically strong and we cannot hope to maintain a stable government if we continue to scatter our resources all over the globe.

In view of all the foregoing and in good conscience, having in mind the welfare of our American Nation and its peoples, I am compelled to vote against this foreign aid legislation.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

PEACE, PEACE, EVERYWHERE (IN REPUBLICAN PARTY PROPAGANDA) BUT NOT A PEACEFUL MOMENT ANYWHERE

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, may I take a moment to pay a sincere tribute of appreciation and gratitude to the very distinguished chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the learned and able gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]. His keen intellect and his fine sense of humor will be missed in future Congresses. We wish him well in whatever he undertakes and to him and his gracious wife, a long, happy, and healthy future.

This mutual security bill we are considering today is most important. The members of the Foreign Affairs Committee have labored long, hard, and diligently on it. Whether we agree with part, all, or none of the bill, they are entitled to our heartfelt thanks for a most difficult task accomplished in the true American spirit of trying to accomplish the greatest good for the greatest number. They did their arduous work in and out of session.

I met many of them during the recess last year in various parts of the world, seeking to obtain first-hand knowledge of facts that would help them enact good legislation. They were worn, tired, and haggard, not from play but from hard work and uncomfortable travel. Even illness did not deter them from pursuing their tasks.

Only one who has traveled into out-of-the-way places, backward, and underdeveloped, rich in nothing but misery, can truly understand the magnitude of their devotion to duty.

They have earned the thanks of our people.

Defeat of this bill could well initiate the end of our civilization. Its passage, however, may only postpone that destruction.

We here can only legislate. The executive department, the President, and his Secretary of State must administer.

Continued maladministration of this program will destroy us and the free world. That is why I say that passage of this bill will not, ipso facto, give us the peace and security we so much desire.

Passage of this bill is the first step. Good, decent, honorable administration is the second and most important step. Unfortunately in that respect our President has failed us and the world. He has given lipservice to the principles we have enacted, but no implementation.

I say that, because the failures of his Department of State are his failures. He may argue that there are no failures but he must concede that the responsibility is his.

His Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, has failed us and failed us miserably.

Wherever you go, in this election year, we hear Republican officeholders, campaigners, and politicians chanting the issue on which they will win in 1956, "Peace and prosperity." I will talk about the Republican prosperity of big business and the bankruptcy of small business at another time.

Today I want to destroy the Republican myth about peace.

We could have peace or at least make progress toward real peace if our Secretary of State paid more attention to the realities in this world and heeded the facts available to him.

We Democrats are Americans first. We want peace—real peace. We will cooperate fully and completely without partisanship toward that end. We do not intend to sit idly by, however, and let Republicans, in or out of office, prate about peace and give the American people nothing but talk.

Now, let us see where we have this peace or rather do not have it.

I invite your attention to the record. The record of the hearings on this very bill before the distinguished committee handling this legislation.

On May 10, 1956, pages 980 and 981 of the record, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles speaking, I quote:

> We have an armistice in Korea, but no formal peace. In Taiwan (Formosa) there are almost daily military engagements * * *. In Vietnam, there is an armistice, but no formal peace.

In his public release of his testimony and in his direct testimony he referred merely to "peace." The corrected record now refers to "formal peace."

He also referred to the Middle East situation.

What do you think this forthright Secretary of State talked about in the Middle East? He talked about everything except the daily fighting. He did not mention Cyprus, or Morocco, or Algeria, or Israel.

Is there a single person in this Chamber so foolhardy as to suggest that there is peace in the world today?

Is there peace in the Holy Land?

Is there peace in the Far East?

Is there peace between Pakistan and Kashmir?

Is there peace in Algeria and Morocco?

Is there peace in Cyprus?

If peace were in these places could freemen be at peace anywhere, while millions of our brothers are enslaved throughout the world by Communist dictators?

I say to Mr. Dulles:

"Wake up, Mr. Secretary. Stop double-talking. Stop fiddling while the world burns. Start acting. Start by cleaning out the deadwood of your Department, who find out what is happening abroad by reading the American press; then eliminate those who put oil dollars ahead of world peace; with them throw out all who try to make friends of our sworn enemies at the expense of our sworn friends; kick out those who use foreign aid money to make more jobs for American personnel abroad and with them, those who think it more important to keep warehouses filled with medicines and medical supplies rather than to use them to heal the sick.

"This is a good program. You have failed to make it work."

Mr. Chairman, this bill, no matter how improved by amendment, if it can be improved, will be just another law on our statute books, unless the President and the State Department vastly improve its administration.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST].

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the committee for the marvelous job they have done on the bill that is before us today.

It is no news to the House of Representatives that I favor construction by the Federal Government of a high Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River. But some of you may be interested to know that I will also favor giving American dollars to the Egyptian Government to build the high Aswan Dam on the Nile River, when, as, and if this Republican administration overcomes its split personality and stops insisting that what is good enough for the Egyptians in northeast Africa is too good for our citizens in Idaho and the northwestern United States.

Right now while we are considering this mutual security bill is a good time to do some straight thinking—and some straight talking. After years of study of the Hells Canyon project, subcommittees of both the House and the Senate have endorsed and recommended authorization of the high Hells Canyon Dam. The administration, and its soul mates in the power lobby, are doing their level best to stop us so they can complete one more giveaway of another great natural resource—the priceless Hells Canyon Dam site.

Yet Secretary of State John Foster Dulles has demanded that we wake up and approve the Aswan Dam as a crash program. Or else, he says, the Russians may build it, which would be bad. He may be right. However, some people are beginning to wonder if Bulganin, Khrushchev, and other touring Communists will have to come to Moscow, Idaho, for a conference before this administration will wake up to the importance of building the high Hells Canyon dam. I am confident this will not be necessary, because I am convinced Congress is going to see that the high Hells Canyon dam is built without the assistance of any visiting Russian tourists.

Aswan Dam is probably a good project—notwithstanding the fact that this administration would no doubt call it creeping socialism since it would produce public power. Aswan Dam, like Hells Canyon, provides for full potential development of water and power resources instead of partial development by inadequate low dams that waste forever our limited, God-given natural resources. However, Aswan Dam will cost about four times as much as the high Hells Canyon Dam—the actual figures are $1,300,000,000 for Aswan and approximately $308 million for Hells Canyon—and the two dams will produce about the same number of kilowatts of electric energy. In fact, Aswan Dam is just a king-size Hells Canyon Dam wrapped up in a new economy style package. Except that the American taxpayer would be making an outright gift of a good part of the Aswan Dam costs—while on the other hand funds for the high Hells Canyon Dam are in the form of a loan that would be repaid to the Federal Treasury with interest. Yet we are told we cannot afford the high Hells Canyon Dam.

I believe in first things first. I think Hells Canyon Dam should come ahead of Aswan Dam.

I think it is time for this administration to stop doubletalking and get the high Hells Canyon Dam under construction. In fact, if they really want the daily double they can make authorization of Aswan title II of the Hells Canyon bill already written and reported by two subcommittees in this Congress.

Any of you who share my sentiments and believe that what is good enough for the Nile River and Egypt is not too good for the Snake River and the United States are invited to join with me in furthering this enterprise.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I have consistently supported a continuation of foreign aid to assist friendly free countries in resisting Communist aggression.

It is my belief, however, that assistance of this character should be temporary, of an emergency nature, and should be so administered as to encourage the development of internal economic stability and strength so that friendly countries may stand on their own feet, finance their own defense, without being a continual and permanent burden on American taxpayers. For this reason and in the belief that aid has been too generous in the past, and too loosely administered, I have consistently voted for reductions in the amount of aid.

I have also believed that our greatest contribution to the assistance of friendly free countries is the encouragement of the establishment of sound and vigorous free enterprise economies and that this goal can be achieved best through the efforts of individual citizens and business firms in natural and profitable economic undertakings with the dual benefit of relieving overburdened taxpayers and the promotion in the world of our free enterprise philosophy. We should continually seek by demonstration, as contrasted with exhortation, to prove the superiority of a productive system based upon freedom and initiative of individuals over the totalitarian, state-controlled Communist system.

Mr. Chairman, my attitude on this legislation is well known to my constituents. Just about a year ago I discussed this subject in my weekly newsletter, a copy of which I insert at this point in my remarks:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 1, 1955.

DEAR FRIEND: How long should we continue to give money to friendly, free countries in resisting Communist aggression?

The Mutual Security Act of 1955, which passed the House this week 273 to 128, exemplifies how a Congressman must weigh considerations for and against a proposal and then vote although, in its final form, he does not regard the bill as satisfactory.

Since entering Congress in 1951, I have supported the continuation of foreign aid. But continually I have sought to reduce the size of the program. Our country and the rest of the free world are threatened by Communist imperialism. Under modern world conditions we cannot go it alone. Countries, particularly those adjacent to the Communist bloc, without outside help, might easily slip behind the Iron Curtain.

On the other hand, I have always regarded financial aid to such countries as a temporary stimulant to develop internal strength to enable them to stand on their own feet and resist Communist military, economic, and subversive assaults.

This year, for the first time, foreign aid is advanced as a permanent program. The bill before the House had objectionable features. It authorized $3.3 billion in new money although $8.7 billion of previous appropriations remain unspent. By authorizing transfers from one fund to another it gives the executive branch of the Government a blank check in expenditure of public funds.

I tried to insert in the legislation a provision designed to increase the investment of private capital in foreign economic undertakings, reducing the need for government-to-government grants and loans, and promoting the free competitive enterprise system in friendly foreign countries. Although many colleagues agreed with my objective, the managers of the bill opposed my amendment. It was defeated.

There must be a better way of helping friendly countries to strengthen themselves than indefinitely to dole out American dollars. Until such a method can be found, however, I believe we must continue the present aid program aimed at resisting Communist aggression, although the legislation as written is not wholly satisfactory.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

Mr. Chairman, my efforts to encourage the creation of a climate abroad favorable to the investment of private capital has been one of my major efforts since joining this body in the 82d Congress. I have repeatedly offered amendments and discussed this subject both before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and in debate on the House floor. A list of references to these efforts is incorporated at this point in my remarks:

BILLS INTRODUCED

H. R. 3798, 82d Congress.
H. R. 4199, 83d Congress.

AMENDMENTS, SPEECHES, DEBATE, INSERTIONS (IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD)

April 23, 1951: Speech introducing H. R. 3798, an affirmative American foreign policy, volume 97, part 3, pages 4209–4213.

July 3, 1951: Speech, Let's Export Independence, volume 97, part 6, pages 7606–7609.

July 10, 1951. Letter from Nelson A. Rockefeller, volume 97, part 13, pages A4246–A4247.

July 12, 1951: Correspondence with Paul H. Appleby, volume 97, part 14, pages A4318–A4319.

July 18, 1951: Correspondence with Spruille Braden, volume 97, part 14, page A4494.

July 19, 1951: Miscellaneous letters, volume 97, part 14, pages A4502–A4505.

August 13, 1951, Statement of Howard S. Piquet, volume 97, part 14, pages A5071–A5072.

August 16, 1951: Amendment to Mutual Security Act of 1951, volume 97, part 8, pages 10179–10180.

August 17, 1951: Amendment to Mutual Security Act of 1951, volume 98, part 8, pages 10289–10290.

May 21, 1952: Debate on Mutual Security Act, volume 98, part 5, pages 5670–5673.

May 23, 1952: Amendment to Mutual Security Act of 1952, volume 98, part 5, pages 5912–5913.

June 9, 1952: Letter from Mrs. H. Richard Blackwell, volume 98, part 10, page A3519.

March 26, 1953: Introduction of H. R. 4199, volume 99, part 2, pages 2339–2344.

May 5, 1953: Speech re President's recommendation for a Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, volume 99, part 4, pages 4556–4558.

July 23, 1953: Debate on Trade Agreements Extension Act, volume 99, part 7, page 9707.

May 28, 1954: Speech by H. C. McClellan, president, NAM, daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages A4014–A4016.

June 30, 1955: Amendment to Mutual Security Act of 1955, volume 101, part 7, pages 9633–9634.

March 29, 1956: Speech on Report of Subcommittee on International Operations on Technical Assistance in Latin America, pages 5862–5867.

May 22, 1956: Fortune editorial, The American Game, pages 8753–8754.

TESTIMONY

July 20, 1951: Testimony before House, Foreign Affairs Committee on mutual security program, 82d Congress, 1st session, pages 778–819.

April 28, 1952: Testimony before House Foreign Affairs Committee on mutual security program, 82d Congress, 2d session, pages 869–882.

Mr. Chairman, I regret to say that my efforts have met with only limited success. I believe that a bipartisan commission, on the order of the Hoover Commission, could best study and recommend solutions for the problem of eliminating or minimizing artificial barriers to private capital investment overseas.

In the Mutual Security Act of 1951, section 516 (c), an alternative study was ordered to be made by the Department of Commerce. That study resulted in submission of a report in two parts. The first part, a survey of factors limiting United States investments abroad, was published in 1953, and a second part, an analysis of views of American businessmen on impediments to overseas investment, was published in June 1954. Those were useful documents and I have no doubt they contributed materially to the increased flow of American capital overseas which resulted in American foreign investments being doubled in the decade following World War II.

I favor a study by a commission, because I believe any government department will be at a disadvantage in studying and possibly criticising either its own activities, or lack of them, or those of sister agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

In the extension of the Trade Agreements Act of 1953, title III created the Randall Commission to study foreign trade and overseas investments. Unfortunately the Randall Commission absorbed itself so overwhelmingly with trade that it did little to advance the attack on impediments to investment beyond the point which had been reached by similar previous studies.

Mr. Chairman, since I doubt the House of Representatives will accept a proposal I have repeatedly made to establish a bipartisan commission to encourage the increased flow of investment capital in strengthening the economies of friendly free countries, I have decided to attack this problem in the current mutual security legislation in a somewhat different manner, hoping that it will appeal to the judgment of my colleagues.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I intend to offer two amendments to H. R. 11356 which together, if adopted, should stimulate the activities of our citizens and business firms in contributing to the economic development of friendly foreign countries through their business undertakings.

The first amendment is to section 413 (a) of H. R. 11356, and reads as follows:

Page 8, after line 17, insert the following:

"(j) Amend section 413 (a), which relates to encouragement of free enterprise and private participation, by inserting '(1)' after '(a)' and by adding the following new paragraph:

"'(2) It is further declared to be the policy of the United States to ensure that the expenditure of funds under this act will effectively contribute to the achievement of the goals of United States foreign policy, and for that purpose to eliminate or minimize international barriers to investment and trade, to facilitate the creation in foreign countries of a climate favorable to the investment of private capital, to discourage the extension of socialism and nationalized industries by declining to commit United States funds to the support of Government-owned and Government-operated industrial and commercial facilities, and in general to avoid the expenditure of funds in support of erroneous policies and practices of foreign governments which, without our financial support, would eventually have to be corrected or eliminated by the force of circumstances'."

And redesignate succeeding subsections accordingly.

This amendment would clearly, and beyond any question of doubt, instruct the administrators of aid programs to eliminate or minimize international barriers to investment and trade, to encourage the creation of climates favorable to the investment of private capital and to discourage socialism and Government-owned commercial and economic enterprises and thus to contribute to the achievement of goals of United States foreign policy. At the same time, this amendment would instruct our officials not to use aid funds to underwrite unsound policies and practices of foreign governments which, without our financial support, would eventually have to be corrected or eliminated by the force of circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, the second amendment would also amend section 413 by adding a requirement that the Commerce Department shall again conduct a study of impediments to private investment abroad and make recommendations of means whereby those impediments may be removed or decreased. The text of that amendment reads as follows:

Page 11, after line 5, insert the following:

"(l) Amend section 413 by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c) The Department of Commerce shall, in full cooperation with private business groups and governmental agenices (including the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development), conduct a thorough study of the legal and other impediments, foreign and local, to private investment abroad, and the methods and means whereby those impediments can be removed or decreased, and shall make recommendations thereon to the Director of the International Cooperation Administration.'"

And redesignate succeeding subsections accordingly.

On May 22, 1956, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—pages 8753 and 8754—an editorial from Fortune magazine which I think is very significant, because Fortune's editorial emphasized the role that private capital and free enterprise can play in the development of stable and strong economies in friendly foreign countries. Let me just quote three sentences from that editorial. It states:

The fact is, however, that Government aid, while having a place in the American response to Moscow, is a sideshow, not the main show. The real source of America's strength lies in its own flexible and dynamic system of private enterprise, and in the projection of that system abroad. What is needed is not another Government plan, by which the Soviets set so much store, but rather a foreign economic policy that will enlist the support of the American people and capitalize on American assets.

Many of you have noticed in the appendix to the minority views on H. R. 11356 tabulations prepared by the Legislative Reference Service showing foreign aid grants and loans since 1940, that is, since World War II and the postwar years, to be in excess of $111 billion. Frankly, I think that figure is somewhat low, because it does not take into account the surpluses overseas which we practically donated to many foreign governments.

But during that same period the investment of American private capital overseas has increased by only $15 or $16 billion.

I say we have the cart before the horse. The increase in investments of private capital should have been far greater and the expenditure of Government funds—not capital but grants and loans—should have been far less. To reverse that emphasis is the purpose of my amendments. What fault can you find with it?

We in America believe that economic and political stability are achieved through a flourishing free-enterprise system depending on private capital rather than socialistic governmental operation and control of economic activities. That has been officially announced as United States Government policy in Latin America by the Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, Mr. Henry Holland, in the following words:

What are our convictions as to the role of Government in the economic field? What kinds of programs and policies do we believe will produce strong economies? The answers are probably apparent. The people of the United States believe in the private enterprise system. We are convinced that we ourselves can do more than any government can to make business enterprises grow, to create new ones, to create more employment at acceptable wages, and to raise the standards of living of our people. We believe that our Government helps the national economy most when it creates those conditions which give us, the working men and women, the farmers, the businessmen of the country, the greatest opportunity to carry on all those processes of private enterprise which have brought us to the point where we now are.

This means that there are certain things that we expect our Government to do and some that we expect it not to do. We rely on our Government leaders to follow sound fiscal and taxing policies, policies that will maintain a stable currency, policies that will combat the evil disease of inflation, policies that will assure to investors a fair chance to make a reasonable profit if they risk their capital in industry or commerce. We expect

our Government to supply those public facilities and services which are needed in a free-enterprise system, but which are not in themselves attractive to private investors. These include such things as roads, schools, hospitals for the poor, irrigation systems, port works, and things of that nature.

GOVERNMENT VERSUS BUSINESS

Of equal importance are the things that we expect our Government not to do. We strongly believe that except in special situations our Government should stay out of the field of business. When government enters a particular industry or commercial activity, private enterprise generally withdraws. This is because onerous regulations are usually imposed on the private enterprise in order to insure the survival of the less well organized and operated Government enterprises which cannot compete without special advantages. Our experience has convinced us that as a rule Government-run enterprises are not as strong and do not make as great a contribution to the national economy as do their counterparts operated by private citizens. Therefore, we feel that governments should invade the field of industry and commerce only where essential and then, if possible, only on a temporary basis.

Our Government's chief emphasis will be on those kinds of economic cooperation that contribute to the creative efforts of private individuals, particularly nationals of the other countries. We believe they are the greatest hope for progress in the other American Republics. The most effective contribution that our country could make to the economic development of Latin America would be to help private enterprise throughout the hemisphere. It is responsible for our inter-American trade which each year provides our neighbors with about $3½ billion in cash and credits. Our own private investors have supplied some $6½ billion of capital for the economic development of the area. In addition they are also providing technical knowledge, equipment, and marketing opportunities for Latin America's growing industries.

From that general statement of United States policy certain broad principles can be enumerated to serve as guides to all American officials stationed throughout the world.

Any activities and related expenditure of United States tax funds should have clear and specific relationship to the achievement of the goals of foreign policy as above stated. Efforts of our diplomatic representatives, our information poeple and our technical assistance officials should seek constantly to promote development and investment of private capital in economic undertakings; to eliminate or minimize barriers to investment and trade and to facilitate creation of a climate favorable to the investment of private capital. On the other hand, by all appropriate diplomatic means they should seek to discourage the extension of socialism and nationalized industries and should decline to commit United States funds to the support of Government-owned and Government-operated industrial and commercial facilities. They should likewise avoid expenditure of our funds to support erroneous policies and practices of foreign governments which, without our financial support, would sooner or later have to be corrected or eliminated by the force of circumstances.

The foregoing is not intended to advocate or condone meddling in internal affairs of other countries. Obviously all of our activities should be carried out with full regard for the sovereignty of friendly nations and by methods and actions calculated not to offend. Yet there should be no hesitation on the part of our officials from top to bottom under the guidance of the President's representative in each country—the Ambassador—to let it be known that United States funds are trust funds exacted through taxes from the American people; that they must be devoted to ends calculated to promote the common defense and general welfare of the American people; that they were appropriated by the Congress, not for the purpose of pure philanthropy but for the security and interests of the United States, in the belief that the threats of Communist imperialism and subversion can best be met by promoting the stability of free peoples so that they may be able to defend themselves against aggression and subversion.

Aside from our commitment to the philosophy of free economic and political institutions and our economic interest in trade and commerce with free peoples as contrasted to totalitarian-controlled economies, we are convinced that economic and political stability are promoted by free enterprise institutions and are weakened by socialist institutions.

Just last week on May 31, 1956, Mr. Robert Murphy, Deputy Under Secretary of State, appeared before the Hardy committee in hearings on American aid to Iran, which totaled some $200 million in technical assistance, so called, in a 4-year period. I asked Mr. Murphy to repeat a passage of his prepared statement announcing that it was American foreign policy to encourage the creation of a climate attractive to private capital. This is what he said:

Mr. MURPHY. This is a task, Mr. Chairman, which, under our system, we would normally expect private capital to do. Indeed, much private capital today does flow into the less developed countries, but only in cases where the economic and political risks make it attractive. In many parts of the world, the risks are such that private capital is not ready to take them, but we, as a nation, still have a strong security interest in those areas.

Then I asked Mr. Murphy this:

Mr. MEADER. I do not recall your saying it specifically, but I wonder if you could state it is our policy in conducting these programs and normal diplomatic activities and information activities to encourage the creation of circumstances that would favor the time when this will come under private capital.

Mr. MURPHY. Oh, I would like to emphasize that is our policy. We have tried to favor the use of private enterprise wherever we can.

Mr. MEADER. And, with whatever tools and bargaining powers are available in the aid program or to our diplomatic missions and Information people, they are clearly instructed, are they, to encourage the creation of a climate favorable to private capital?

Mr. MURPHY. I can say that our State Department representatives abroad are clearly advised about instructions to that effect, but I could not tell you offhand about the Information people. I know it applies to the ICA and, I believe, to the Information, but I do not know. I touched lightly upon that when I said "We must seek the expansion of trade and investment throughout the free world." We are talking about private trade and its investment there.

Mr. MEADER. And would it follow as a necessary corollary, in your opinion, that it would be our policy to discourage the extension of nationalized industries and governments operating in the economic and industrial fields?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes. Well, we have clearly indicated our lack of sympathy for those. However, we do operate in areas where there is that, shall I say, political philosophy. I think our views on that subject are known pretty well in every nook and corner.

Mr. Chairman, why should anyone oppose an amendment which seeks to announce that it is American foreign policy to encourage our traditional way of conducting economic and commercial operations. Who is going to say they oppose it? Are we favoring socialism or fighting communism with these aid funds? Why should it not be written into the act so that there is no misunderstanding of the policy of Congress, so that no Administrator can refuse to follow and obey statements of policy such as those made by top officials, which I have just quoted.

Now, let me say something. I have heard it said by people close to ICA, and I think from my own experience with the Hardy committee and otherwise, that it is substantiated, that the ICA is being run today by three ghosts: Hoffman, Harriman, and Stassen. They saddled that organization with their own people. Many of them are do-gooders and visionaries. They are still running the organization today, and many of them are not in sympathy with the philosophy I have just expressed. They need instructions, clear instructions from the Congress of the United States, to carry out the American free enterprise philosophy in their dealings abroad. I think it should be written right into the law so that there can be no question.

I have just received information that I hope I can substantiate this evening and present to the House tomorrow that some of the ICA people abroad have been encouraging the extension of socialism and nationalized industries and the commercial operations of governments, through their administration of American aid funds.

I hope the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, especially the chairman and ranking minority member, will give careful consideration to this proposal and accept my amendments when they are offered tomorrow.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, a highly respected and great American statesman not so many years ago declared that politics should stop at the water's edge. It was his belief that the American people should speak with a united voice to the world so as to have maximum effectiveness against the enemy who would like to divide and conquer them. This is an occasion, Mr. Chairman, when the solidarity of the American Nation should be particularly firm. When the very freedom and independence of this Nation are at stake I can find no justification for those who would seek partisan advantage in opposing a policy for the

protection of our homes, our liberty, and our traditions. Party politics should not intrude in matters as crucial as foreign aid, and that is why I am going to give my full support to the President's request for the foreign assistance program and will introduce the amendments necessary to restore the $1.1 billion slash made by the Foreign Affairs Committee. I shall give my wholehearted backing to the entire $4.9 billion the President has requested and will do so even if I am the only man that does.

In backing the President in this matter, however, I wish to make clear that I am giving no blanket endorsement to the administration's policies in foreign relations, nor do I maintain that the slogans of bipartisan foreign policy should be used to muffle intelligent debate in the formulation of policy. But the decision to extend military and economic assistance to other nations, in the ultimate interest of contributing to the security and welfare of our own country, has now become a settled policy of our Government. Those who would constantly like to "reexamine" or "rediscuss" this policy do so in many cases, I strongly suspect, because they would like to discuss it to death.

As the Members of this House so well recall, the birth of United States foreign aid as a consistent, coordinated program took place 8 years ago when the European recovery program was enacted by a far-sighted Congress controlled by one party and acting in concert with an administration controlled by another. Now that the Marshall plan has become history, the United States Congress has no regrets for having supported it, for it has proved to be one of the most magnificent strokes of government policy and at the same time of humanitarian generosity in the annals of American democracy. United States assistance to Europe has been an astounding success and a major contribution to world peace. Since 1948, the year the Marshall plan began, industrial production in the recipient Western European countries has just about doubled, whereas the quantity of aid, which ran to an appropriation of about $4 billion in the first year, has this year dwindled to only a very minute percentage of this sum. Not a single Western European member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is scheduled during the forthcoming fiscal year to receive any economic-type aid, except for minor technical exchanges. This fact plus the recent disclosure that nine United States aid offices in Europe were closed during the current fiscal year is concrete proof that American assistance can be brought to a successful conclusion and that it is not interminable.

The inauguration of the Marshall plan was soon followed by another program which furnished another instance of the ingenious statesmanship of our people—the so-called point 4 program of technical assistance. This "bold, new program" was sweeping and courageous in concept and, in view of the tack which the cold war now seems to be taking, may yet prove to be one of the most far-sighted policies adopted by the United States in our time.

With the sudden, shocking outbreak of the Korean conflict in June 1950 American aid underwent a radical change in character. The shift in emphasis went to the military phase of foreign aid in order to shore up shaky defenses of independent nations around the globe that were, or might be, menaced by the Soviet Union. With the termination of the Korean conflict and the increasing build-up of the armed defenses of our allies military aid could be reduced, and it was. But for reasons which I do not condone but which I will not dwell upon at this time, during the past couple of years it was reduced more than it should have been, thus creating what might be called the problem of the pipeline.

Because the amount of new foreign-aid money appropriated for this current year, $2.7 billion, is considerably less than the current rate of expenditure, about $4.5 billion a year. The pipeline of goods that is flowing to the countries we are assisting is in danger of being depleted unless an increased appropriation is made for the next fiscal year.

In order to maintain the proper backlog to keep the pipeline going at the desired rate, the President has requested $4.9 billion—no lesser amount will do the job. Four billion five hundred million dollars will not do it, nor will $4 billion. And certainly the $3.8 billion provided by the committee will not do it. The $1.1 billion pared off the foreign-aid bill by the committee will jeopardize the pipeline and, what is more pertinent, will weaken the defenses of many economically enfeebled nations the preservation of whose independence is essential to our own.

The responsibility, Mr. Chairman, is a grave one, and it seems to me it has already been treated too irresponsibly by those who have in the past not properly tended the pipeline and allowed it to fall into its present peril. However, this is no time for recriminations. I, for one, do not intend to pile irresponsibility on irresponsibility and imitate those who have already endangered our aid program. If the stream of aid has been hampered by the delinquency of those in whose charge it is, then it seems to me that the duty incumbent upon Congress is to correct the delinquency and not perpetuate it.

But why do we have to keep the pipeline flowing at such a rate, some might inquire, is not there a new look behind the Iron Curtain? Has not Stalin disappeared from the scene and have not his heirs repudiated his legacy and set a new course of peaceful coexistence for the Soviet Union? The answer is clear. There is no evidence that behind the Communist rulers' new preachments of harmony and light there has been any genuine alteration of their ultimate aims. But there is plenty of evidence that the old purposes of communism are just as strong, just as deadly, and just as enduring as they have ever been. After the Geneva Conference at the summit last year Khrushchev told the East Germans that the Communists were in favor of a relaxation of tension, "but if anybody thinks," he asserted, "that for this reason we shall forget about Marx, Engels, and Lenin, he is mistaken. This will happen when shrimps learn to whistle." I personally have not yet heard of anybody who has recently come across any whistling shrimp. Certainly there were none whistling at the sessions of the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party early this year when the Red leaders mapped out procedures for subverting democratic governments through popular fronts and by capturing democratic parliaments and transforming them into genuine instruments of the peoples' will. Mikoyan openly boasted of how the Communists had subverted free governments in Czechoslovakia and other Eastern European countries now bent under the Red yoke. The announced intent of the Communists to continue to pursue the same tactics in the future does not strike me as evidence of any change.

The Muscovite chieftains proclaim that they can win their goals without war, and that communism can emerge triumphant in an era of peaceful coexistence. But the so-called peaceful gestures they have made have cost them little or nothing, and when put under scrutiny are obviously false and hollow. The withdrawal of their military forces from Austria and from Porkkala in Finland were highly dramatized, but they had no business being there in the first place and these outposts had lost their usefulness. Let them withdraw from Poland or 1 or 2 other captive countries and permit genuine free elections, and I might begin to put some credence in a real change. Likewise the recently highly propagandized cutback in Red army manpower is hardly a sign of pacific intent when Soviet science and industry are pushing ahead so energetically and alarmingly in long-range bombers, guided missiles, and nuclear explosives. The Soviet Union, despite the manpower reductions, is still the most powerful country militarily in the Eastern Hemisphere.

The de-Stalinization campaign, Mr. Chairman, proves essentially nothing, except that victims of a tyrant of the blackest hue can safely turn on him once he is dead. Stalin always was "de-Stalinized" in my book, and I can see no particular merit in partially recognizing him for the villain he was. I do not think that the dispelling of the pack of lies we call the Stalin myth is the bright dawn of a new day. Nor do I consider the release of many political prisoners as the sudden advent of Russian democracy. Obviously there have been changes in the Soviet Union since the demise of the man of steel. It would have been astounding if there had not been. We cannot propel ourselves on the wings of wishful thinking to believe from a few shreds of evidence or from a few superficial corrections of the rankest injustice that the confirmed totalitarian has reformed or that "shrimps can now whistle."

From all indications, therefore, the Soviet "new look" is nothing but old-fashioned expediency designed to break down the defenses of free peoples and lull them into a complacency where they can be easily destroyed, like a snake hypnotizes a chicken before gulping it down. The prime target of Soviet tac-

tics is NATO and the other military coalitions lined up against the Communist threat. As a corollary, one of their fondest hopes is to cripple the mainstay of these alliances, this aid bill we are now debating. I know that all of us are foes of communism and I know we are all imbued with the sincerest and most patriotic of motives, but there is nothing the Soviet leaders want more than for us to do than blow large holes into this measure. It would be a sharp rebuff to the Soviet rulers and help tremendously to thwart their "new look" foreign-policy tactics if this aid program were approved in its full and undiminished version. The world would then be on notice that we do not intend to falter in those purposes of international security, tranquillity, and justice that we have so often proclaimed.

The theory that the Soviet Union's recent gambits in the economic aid field in Asia and Africa and its greater stress upon political penetration into these areas indicate that the Communist strategists are placing less emphasis upon the military, is not based on solid evidence. If its surge forward in hydrogen weapons and if its spectacular gains in intercontinental bombers and guided missiles add up to less emphasis upon the military, then I fail to see it. The U. S. S. R. today is militarily stronger than it ever was, and I can see no logical reason for stemming the flow of tanks and guns to our allies. Saber rattling is not in my line, and I think the United States should always shrink from actions savoring of warmongering. But to cut back our military assistance at a time when Soviet capabilities have not diminished but increased, would be to gamble on the lives of the American people and to put liberty on the wagering board.

When the defense appropriation was discussed on this floor a few weeks ago I pointed out the sad plight into which our Armed Forces were getting. They are rapidly becoming the second best defense forces in the world. The trouble is there is not any prize for second best in a war. Perhaps the most disturbing aspect of our present defense position is our slippage in long-range strategic bombers. To correct this I proposed a $1 billion increase in the B–52 program. The argument was then made that the increase was unnecessary because of the military assistance being furnished through the foreign-aid bill. It would be the acme of inconsistency now to reduce military aid, when we have not taken the steps necessary to assure our defense superiority. To cut military assistance now, after refusing to give our own Defense Establishment the sinew it needs, would be to compound obstinacy and multiply blindness. I cannot understand pennypinching when the security of the country is at stake.

From my attitude on the military segment of this program please do not conclude that I believe we can put our faith solely in arms and soldiers and bombing planes. Hungry bellies often have a way of spreading Communist influence even more than the threat of force or the promise of subversion, for the man in desperate straits sometimes thinks a radical solution is his best out when the methods of reason and democracy appear discouragingly slow. Food, shelter, and clothing are the foundation stones of freedom and orderly society—today as they have always been. Unfortunately many millions in the vast continents of Asia, Africa, and even in Latin America do not enjoy minimum standards in these essentials of life. Consequently, it is understandable how the example of Soviet Russia can have superficial appeal to many peoples in underdeveloped lands. The Russians point out that only a relatively few years ago they had a backward economy, too, and that they have built it up to its present level in only three decades, and this despite the handicap of a devastating war. The "miracle" of communism can do the same, they say, for the people of other countries, and the latter, often poorly informed on democracy and the American brand of capitalism, find an attraction in this propaganda.

A major purpose of our economic aid is to give these people an alternative, to convince them that communism is not the way out, to demonstrate that freedom is more bounteous than slavery, and that the only gift Moscow can give is a new and more terrible colonialism. Tractors, cement and technical skills have become weapons in the cold war, and we cannot be niggardly with them any more than we can with the military hardware we are sending to our allies.

We need both an economic and a military assistance program and we need it in sensitive areas all around the globe. I am no special pleader for Asia, or for Europe, or for Latin America. Those who try to pare back aid for one area in order to concentrate it in another that happens to be their momentary favorite can easily end up, when you add up their efforts together, by mangling the entire bill and wrecking the aid program. We cannot afford to quibble over this area or that area. With the Soviet Union on the loose the whole world is in danger. If we appropriate the full amount the President requests, then there will be an adequate sum for every area and there will be no need to worry whether this or that one is getting enough.

Moreover, we can afford it. How many of us sit down and carefully ponder the implications of the fact that with only 7 percent of the world's population we have nearly 50 percent of its wealth. Our gross national product is now running about $400 billion a year, which is about 8 times the GNP of the United Kingdom and 100 or 200 times that of some countries in Southeastern Asia. Moreover, our productivity is increasing by leaps and bounds—our GNP has almost doubled since the end of the war. We are on the threshold of the atomic age, an era of virtually unlimited power, where the only limit to the American economy will be that imposed by the horizons of science. Not only can we afford this program, but we can't afford not to have it. If we thought the cost of the last war was high, it will be nothing compared to the next. The price we will pay the next time will be the national heritage of our people, perhaps the very structure of civilization itself.

These are all very practical considerations. As a member of the Appropriations Committee I have long been aware of problems of Government finance, and the virtues of a balanced budget have long since made a vivid impression upon me. But at the same time I also know the futility of a government which balances its budget and goes down to defeat. Frankly I am more interested in the balance of power than I am in a balanced budget, and in seeing that the American Nation does not end up as a has-been in the merciless scrolls of history.

There is also the timeworn line that the Reds are trying to break our economic back, that they are trying to get us to spend ourselves into destruction. I have heard this rationalization of economy-minded gentlemen time and again, and know it inside out. The surprising thing is that the Soviet line can also be interpreted to be just the opposite of what the opponents of aid would like. On the basis of statements by Communist spokesmen at the recent 20th Congress, one could also say that they are trying to get us to curtail our defense and foreign assistance expenditures, because it is these expenditures that are sustaining our economy. Personally, I hold no brief for either line, no matter how you interpret it. The economy of this country is too big, is too virile, and I have more confidence in it than to believe that the magnitudes with which we are here dealing in this bill will shake or break our financial stability.

Mr. Chairman, please do not permit what I have said to convey the impression that I do not think defense is costing the American taxpayers a lot. But we are a business-minded people, we know that you cannot get something for nothing and we know the value of making prudent investments in enterprises that pay off. Actually, this foreign aid measure is an expensive premium on a very vital and worthwhile insurance policy. It will pay off in the highest return we can get—the protection and security of our people.

That is the only payoff we need or want. We are not looking for fame or glory or for gratitude. To hear some critics rail at the assistance we are giving to other countries you would think that we were in some sort of popularity contest and that aid money was a sort of bribe to the judges. You cannot purchase friends any more than you can buy the love of a woman. In fact, it is grossly insulting to suggest, by attitude or otherwise, that a man's gratitude or loyalty can be bought, and insofar as we may make such an inference we are thwarting the purposes of our assistance measures. The rewards we are primarily seeking in our foreign aid are not ephemeral things like popularity and gratitude. Our foreign policy is conducted on a more serious level than that. Our goal is that other nations should be democratic, independent, and strong, and able to live out their lives in security, peace, and freedom. If I thought that by so doing we could guarantee these results from our aid, I would be willing to extend it anonymously—for after all these are the

results that will most redound to our welfare and safety. I do not decry the value of good public relations, and naturally I would much rather have other peoples like us than dislike us. And please, Mr. Chairman, do not overlook the fact that hundreds of millions of people around the globe do like and admire us. But if at the same time we are criticized and maligned to an extent we never were before, I fail to understand the logic that attributes this to foreign aid. It seems to me it arises more from the central position of leadership that events have thrust upon us than from the presence or absence of an aid program.

Whether we like it or not the old comfortable days when we could fade unobtrusively into the wallpaper are gone. The standard of leadership is now in our hand and we cannot lay it aside without grave peril to ourselves and to our children. We are committed to all the sacrifices, the headaches, the anxieties, and attacks that have since the beginning of time beset those in positions of high responsibility. This program has made steady progress during the past 8 years toward its goal of enduring peace with justice. As the President said in his message to the Congress we cannot now falter in our quest for peace. The need is urgent because the enemy is still rampant, and more crafty and guileful than he ever was before. We should thank Heaven that our great people have been endowed so richly with the stamina, the resolution and the skill to carry on the struggle. For carry on we must. The alternative before us is simple, we can either lead or we can quit. And Mr. Speaker, Americans have never been quitters.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Mutual Security Act of 1956."

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT] having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY HONORS HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on next Sunday, June 10, our able and respected majority leader, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, will receive the honorary degree of doctor of laws at commencement exercises of the Catholic University of America. This is, indeed, a remarkable tribute, for no person holding public office other than a President of the United States has ever before received an honorary degree from Catholic University.

We who know our majority leader so well can easily understand why the university selected him for such honors. We recognize that the tribute being accorded him is one which is richly deserved and fully merited. JOHN MCCORMACK'S entire public life, including his years in the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and his 28th consecutive year here in the United States House of Representatives, has been exemplified by an unsurpassed devotion to duty coupled with a strict observance of the highest Christian principles.

Other honors and awards have come to Congressman MCCORMACK over the years. He has been awarded the peace medal of the Third Order of St. Francis. He is a member of the Order of Malta First Class. Honorary degrees have been received by him from the following:

Boston University, Boston, Mass.
Holy Cross College, Worcester, Mass.
Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass.
Villanova College, Villanova, Pa.
Tufts College, Medford, Mass.
Providence College, Providence, R. I.
Stonehill College, North Easton, Mass.
Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.
Staley College, Brookline, Mass.

That he is now to be so signally honored by Catholic University pleases me personally, as I am sure it does every Member of this House. Perhaps our thinking is best described by the following editorial which recently appeared in a Boston newspaper:

A DESERVING HONOR

When the Catholic University of America confers an honorary degree on Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK on June 10 this eminent institution of higher learning will recognize officially the life and accomplishments of one of the greatest Americans of our time. As the holder of the most important offices in the National House of Representatives, Mr. MCCORMACK has endeavored with conspicuous success to be a spokesman for all Americans, and his influence has invariably extended far beyond the boundaries of his own party. It has been said that this outstanding son of Massachusetts could have had all of the major appointive positions in the land, including that of Supreme Court Justice. But he always chose, even against the wishes of two Presidents, to continue as a Member of Congress and as an active participant in the enaction of humane and progressive legislation. "The Catholic University has never honored a more deserving statesman."

OIL IMPORTS

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in a letter made public recently, Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, asked oil importers to lower their planned imports of crude oil in the current quarter in order to maintain the ratio to domestic production recommended by the Presidential Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources last year.

At the same time, Mr. Flemming announced that the Committee formula which pegs oil imports at the same ratio they bore to domestic production in 1954 will be reviewed by September 1 in the light of changing economic and national defense requirements. If the Committee finds as a result of this review that import programs are threatening to impair the national security, the Office of Defense Mobilization proposes to hold a public hearing under the national security section of the Trade Agreements Act. This provides that the President adjust imports when he finds that they are threatening to impair the national security. It is Dr. Flemming's responsibility to advise the President when he believes such a condition may exist.

The control of oil imports through a perversion of powers of the Defense Production Administration and the national security section of the Trade Agreements Act is obvious. The President's Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources is nothing more than the legalization of a domestic petroleum cartel to the advantage of the domestic producers who already have received more lush inducements than any other industry—by way of the 27½-percent income-tax depletion allowance and quick amortization certificates.

How can national security be enhanced by restricting the importation of crude oil? Today, this country's petroleum reserves have been lagging critically behind the increased demand. The shortage of domestic oil is properly the concern of every American—known reserves can take care of current needs for less than 12 years. As a matter of fact, domestic production is inadequate to take care of current needs in industrialized America by 278 million barrels per year. The alarming fact is that during the past 10 years oil consumption has increased 80 percent while domestic oil production has increased only 40 percent. Demand has increased twice as much as production.

The only argument that can be sustained to control imports is that America's security depends on the development of a sufficient domestic industry. But the oil searchers are already stimulated by protected prices and the tax benefits which they uniquely enjoy. After being located and determined, the best place for American oil is in American earth, located but preserved. If our imports should be cut off by reason of critical world conditions, we will be able to sustain our oil-hungry economy and perhaps survive with oil we have providently saved for that day. It is in the interests of the national security that

American oil be saved for that contingency.

Import oil is abundantly available at one-third less the domestic price. The domestic oil producers' cartel, operating through the President's Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources, is seeking to restrict oil imports in order to fix higher prices and profits for domestic oil. How much more gouging can the American oil consumer tolerate?

The work of the President's Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources should be more carefully scrutinized by Congress. In whose interests does the Committee really operate? There is too much government in America by committees which are private instrumentalities and which owe their primary obligation to the industry which compensates them rather than to the public trust.

PRESIDENT PLANS ACTION AGAINST UNION RACKETEERS

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely pleased to note an article by Mr. A. H. Raskin which appeared on the front page of this morning's New York Times. I should like to call it to the attention of my colleagues. According to this account, President Eisenhower is planning to take special action aimed at racketeers inside certain labor unions. I should like to insert the full text of Mr. Raskin's article at this point in my remarks:

EISENHOWER PLANS ACTION AGAINST UNION RACKETEERS—SPURRED BY BLINDING OF RIESEL, PRESIDENT ASKS FOR LABOR CONFERENCE—MEANY WELCOMES CONSTRUCTIVE INQUIRY

(By A. H. Raskin)

President Eisenhower plans White House action against underworld infiltration into unions, authoritative labor sources reported last night.

The President was said to have informed George Meany of his intention in a private conversation at the dedication of the new $4 million headquarters of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations in Washington on Monday.

Mr. Meany, who heads the united labor movement, told the President that labor would support any constructive investigation of racket inroads into union ranks.

The specific spur for the President's expression of determination to act, it was reported, was the blinding of Victor Riesel, crusading labor columnist, by an acid-hurling assailant in midtown Manhattan 2 months ago.

The conversation between the President and Mr. Meany was summarized by one source, as follows:

The President said he had watched Mr. Riesel on the Meet the Press television program Sunday night, and had been much impressed by his demands for Federal action against union racketeers. The President declared that he wanted to do something about the problem. He expressed a desire to meet with Mr. Meany soon to discuss the subject in greater detail.

The AFL–CIO head replied that he welcomed the President's interest and would be glad to meet with him. Mr. Meany said labor's sole concern was that any investigation be directed at ridding unions of corrupt elements and not at weakening unions.

In the television interview that aroused the President's interest, Mr. Riesel made a dramatic, fist-clinched appeal for establishment of a permanent congressional committee to root out union crooks.

He praised Mr. Meany and other top officials of the merged labor organization as men dedicated to clean unionism, but he said they lacked power to do an adequate job without Government help.

No indication was given by the President of what action he might take. However, one possibility discussed in labor circles was the appointment of an impartial committee of distinguished citizens to hold hearings in major industrial cities.

Such a committee could be armed with power to subpena witnesses and to initiate contempt proceedings against those who refused to cooperate. It might function along the lines of the State crime commission, which conducted the waterfront investigation here in 1952. Its findings led to the enactment of the New York-New Jersey compact against waterfront crime and to the expulsion of the International Longshoremen's Association from the old AFL.

The AFL–CIO has an ethical practices committee of its own to keep its ranks free of racketeering. Mr. Meany is expected to recommend specific measures for increasing the effectiveness of this self-policing machinery at the meeting of the AFL–CIO executive council in Washington this week.

However, the merged labor group has repeatedly expressed its willingness to back Government action designed to provide additional safeguards in areas outside direct union control. Mr. Meany recently endorsed the basic provisions of legislation recommended by a Senate labor subcommittee to curb abuses in union-management welfare funds. The subcommittee was headed by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois.

It is not clear just what steps the President may recommend. Mr. Raskin's article suggests the possibility of establishing an impartial committee of distinguished citizens to hold hearings on this matter. In line with this approach, I am today introducing a joint resolution to establish a special, nonpartisan, Hoover-type commission to investigate labor racketeering.

I have already introduced several resolutions authorizing Congress to undertake such an investigation. As a Member of Congress, I personally think it would be appropriate for Congress to take action on this important problem. On May 24 I introduced House Resolution 512, which would authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to take action. On May 31 I introduced House Resolution 518, authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to make inquiry as to whether the blinding of Victor Riesel was an infringement of the freedom of the press. Yesterday I proposed, in House Joint Resolution 634, that a special joint committee of Congress undertake an investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it matters greatly who undertakes this investigation. These various proposals will provide a variety of choices as to the best course to take. In my own opinion, Congress has a responsibility and might well take some action. Any inquiry, if it is to be undertaken, should be thorough, constructive and objective. I have no particular preference as to whether the investigation should be handled in or out of Congress. The important thing is that it be undertaken. It is also important that any investigation be aimed at racketeering inside some labor unions—and not at labor itself.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that Mr. Raskin states that Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, would welcome a constructive inquiry into labor unions. A number of us have expressed similar expectations here on the floor. It is encouraging to be furnished this additional evidence of Mr. Meany's statesmanship.

Mr. Speaker, it is extremely heartening to read of the President's interest in this subject. Under the circumstances perhaps action can be taken in the near future.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for today be vacated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FIRST SECTION OF MUTUAL SECURITY BILL CONSIDERED AS READ

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the first section of the mutual-security bill on which we have had general debate today be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

FOUR YEARS OF WORK AND ACCOMPLISHMENT IN CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. THOMPSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, during my first two terms as United States Representative, I feel that I have exerted every effort in the development of proper representation of the people of the Seventh District of Louisiana. I have received every kind consideration from the membership of this body and, with what I hope to be pardonable pride, through my efforts and the assistance of others, we have accomplished those things that were necessary to be done.

I have been honored by being selected to serve on two major committees—the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries—on which committees I now hold positions of seniority. I am also a member of three subcommittees and chairman of one special committee of the Congress. As my seniority grows on these committees, I feel that I can be of

ever-increasing value to my district. Certainly, my service on these committees adds to the number of hours I must spend each day, and even during times of adjournment of the Congress, at my work. However, I feel that my activities in these connections will redound to the benefit of my district and State.

Of course, there are many problems still facing us. Some of them are local in nature, yet of national importance, and there are the greater problems affecting our very existence as a Nation of free men which some day, with the help of God, we hope to solve.

The things that are particularly pressing at this time, Mr. Speaker, insofar as my people are concerned and things on which I shall continue to work, are the lowering of the great tax burden which is now higher even than the taxes on many of the peoples that we are assisting through our foreign aid programs. We must help our farmers in order that they may take their proper place in our overall economy, as without a prosperous farmer, we cannot long expect a prosperous America. We must continue our work to see that both labor and management are able to receive returns commensurate with their efforts. Especially must we protect that great segment of our economy which is "small business." We must continue to conserve and develop our natural resources to the ends that we will make the best use of these God-given bounties. We must develop more and better institutions of learning to see that every child receives the maximum of education to prepare himself for the day when he will assume our responsibilities. And yet, Mr. Speaker, we must be very careful to preserve the rights of the individual States in the development and operation of their own institutions.

Also, we must not continue to steal from other nations their ambitions and pride by the giving of ever-flowing grants to them as an incentive not to develop. We must one day help them to assume responsibilities which are theirs.

My service in Washington as Representative of the people of my district has not been without accomplishment. I take great pride in the fact that I was reelected to my second term by an overwhelming majority because of the efforts I had put forth in behalf of my constituents. Because I have been asked by many to make available my record of accomplishments, I feel that there is no better way to impart to all the people of the District the efforts I have made in their behalf than to make available to them some of the representations that have been made to me by letter and telegram.

Now, in the case of my activities concerning the problems of our farmers, I think it is generally known that I have waged a continuous battle for our cotton, rice, sweetpotato, and truck farmers, and for the great cattle industry which is developing in Louisiana. I led the fight in the House and was successful in getting an additional 39,000 acres for our rice farmers last year and 9,300 additional acres this year, and was able to have legislation passed at this session guaranteeing 475,094 acres for rice plantings in 1957 and 1958. We were also able to get an additional 4,835 acres for our cotton farmers this year and to have the cotton acreage frozen so that the farmers will know their acreage will not be further cut. I personally believe that a rigid price support of 90 percent of parity on basic commodities is the best approach that has been suggested yet to the farm problem. After all, parity is defined as meaning what a farmer should receive as compared to what he must pay out, and 90 percent means even less than everyone agrees he should get.

I refer you to letters I have received in regard to my efforts for the farmers, which I think will indicate the general feeling of the people in my areas who are interested in the farmers and their welfare:

ACADIA PACKING CORP.,
Church Point, La., October 16, 1953.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: We wish to take this opportunity to thank you for the splendid manner in which you handled our request for help pertaining to the sweetpotato inspector. You did a magnificent job.

Cordially,

A. F. DAVID.

CHURCH POINT WHOLESALE GROCERY CO., INC.,
Church Point, La., January 22, 1954.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I note that Congress has just completed action on the cotton-acreage bill, which is now ready for the President's signature. This will immensely benefit our cotton farmers and especially the small tenant cotton farmers.

Please accept my heartfelt thanks for your fine efforts in furthering this needed legislation and I know that all of our cotton farmers will thank you and remember your efforts in their behalf at a time when they really needed a good Representative in Washington.

Sincerely,

P. ROY HORECKY.

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *April 28, 1955.*
Congressman T. A. THOMPSON,
Washington, D. C.:

The rice producers gratefully acknowledge your outstanding leadership in the correction of acreage inequities and its impact on rice farmer economy is so great that its monetary value cannot be estimated.

AMERICAN RICE GROWERS CO-OP ASSOCIATION,
D. B. WINTERMAN, *President.*
H. G. CHALKLEY, *Vice President.*
GEORGE BLAIR,
Secretary-Treasurer.

JENNINGS PRODUCTION CREDIT ASSOCIATION,
Jennings, La., September 28, 1954.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: The board of directors of this association, at their regular meeting last Friday, requested that I write you expressing their appreciation for the great service you have rendered to the rice industry in having the takeover date for rice moved up to February 28. I, too, would like to add my personal thanks to you for your cooperation in bringing this matter to a satisfactory conclusion.

Very truly yours,

L. P. THERIOT, Jr.,
Secretary-Treasurer.

KELLY, WEBER & CO., INC.,
Lake Charles, La., August 7, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I received your telegram and am giving all publicity possible to this very important meeting to be held at the courthouse in Crowley, La., Wednesday, 10 a. m., August 11.

The farmers need help right now and I am sure all of them appreciate the interest you have shown in their behalf.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR L. GAYLE,
President.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, April 28, 1955.

DEAR MR. CHALKLEY: Thank you for your telegram of this date with reference to the adoption of a 1955 rice acreage allotment increased by the House.

I much preferred the House version as written by the House subcommittee on rice, but the lateness and the problem of getting any increase lead me to the 2 percent increase rather than the original 5 percent.

It was a pleasure to work with Representative T. A. THOMPSON, who has been in the forefront of the studies and determinations on this matter. Certainly Representative THOMPSON did a most valiant service to the rice growers.

With cordial good wishes, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

E. C. GATHINGS,
Democrat of Arkansas.

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *April 28, 1955.*
Congressman T. A. THOMPSON,
Washington, D. C.:

Your outstanding leadership in the writing and handling of the rice acreage legislation is one of the most striking examples of dynamic action we have seen in the legislative branch of the Government. The rice producers are most grateful for your help.

LOUISIANA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
H. O. CHALKLEY,
Chairman, Rice Committee.

CHURCH POINT, LA., *October 28, 1955.*
Hon. T. A. THOMPSON:

The board of directors of Farmers Bank and Trust Co., Church Point, have requested me to thank you for your efforts in securing approval of Department of Agriculture to purchase surplus sweet potatoes. I and other leaders join the bank in expressing appreciation. We all feel it will help thousands of small distressed farmers in sweetpotato area.

M. W. SCANLAN.

JENNINGS ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
Jennings, La., May 3, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: On behalf of the Jennings Association of Commerce, I want to congratulate you and thank you for your successful effort to secure an increase in the rice acreage quota.

Your constituents here are very appreciative of the fine job you have done.

Sincerely yours,

L. E. BLOCH,
Secretary-Manager.

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY AND AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE,
Baton Rouge, La., March 27, 1956.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I was glad to receive your letter of March 23 and to note the fine piece of advertising you are giving to Louisiana products. Certainly, your interest in these crops will mean a lot to the growers in your area.

I am taking the liberty of sending you under separate cover a copy of our annual report on our sweetpotato research.

It has been a pleasure to meet and talk with you on occasions and particularly at the Yambilee.

Anytime I can be of help to you, please let me know, and with personal regards and best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

JULIAN C. MILLER,
Head, Horticultural Research.

LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE AND IMMIGRATION,
Baton Rouge, La., April 3, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: This will acknowledge receipt of yours of March 23 written on your new stationery. I think this was a wonderful idea and will be very beneficial. I wish that each one of our officials up there would do the same thing.

Thanks so much for your efforts in getting the proper officials to purchase the yams from us. You did a wonderful job.

You are doing a good job and I certainly hope no one will run against you this time. If they do, you can count on me and I will do everything I can to help you and I won't be ashamed to say so.

Sincerely yours,

DAVE L. PEARCE, *Commissioner.*

EVANGELINE PARISH POLICE JURY,
Ville Platte, La., August 27, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In behalf of the Evangeline Parish Police Jury, Ville Platte, La., I wish to extend by this letter our sincere appreciation and gratitude for the support of the agricultural research and extension bill which has been passed by the United States Congress.

Our local county agent office has advised us that an additional assistant county agent has been approved for Evangeline Parish and we are deeply grateful for your work on this bill.

Sincerely yours,

TANZAY VEILLON,
Secretary and Treasurer.

CAMERON, LA., *August 25, 1954.*

Congressman T. A. THOMPSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: It has long been felt that one man is needed to look after 4–H club work and another to do the adult work. Through your cooperation this is being realized here in Cameron Parish. The extra appropriation which Congress voted for an expanded extension program has enabled us to obtain another man who will be principally responsible for 4–H club work. Cameron Parish has had only one man agent up to this time.

Please be assured that your support for increased funds for agriculture extension work is appreciated and will be used to a good advantage.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

CONWAY LE BLEU,
Chairman, Cameron Parish Agriculture Extension Advisory Committee.

SOWELA VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL SCHOOL,
Lake Charles, La., April 13, 1954.

DEAR MR. MITCHELL: Our friend and Congressman, T. A. THOMPSON, fired the opening shot in our fight for vocational funds in the United States Congress on March 22, 1954. He did not wait until the subcommittee met but registered his intention on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I am sure you will join me in thanking T. A. for the stand he had taken and encourage him to continue his fight. He needs our backing in order to make an effective fight for us.

We should be proud of the fact that our Congressman was the first to go on record in favor of continued Federal support for vocational education.

Very truly yours,

REX H. SMELSER, *Director.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Baton Rouge, La., September 15, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I wish to express my appreciation to you for having made the addition of agricultural extension work personnel possible by your support of the move for additional funds for agricultural extension work.

I personally supported this move and it was unanimously approved by the police jury.

Very truly yours,

ALVIN DYSON,
State Representative.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Ville Platte, La., August 25, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We have noticed your work in the United States Congress in regard to agriculture. We want to commend you for helping to pass the bill which gave additional funds to Agricultural Research and Extension Service.

With the passage of this bill, you have helped to better equip and staff our experiment stations and have added extra extension personnel to bring to the people on the farm necessary information.

Evangeline Parish farmers are grateful for your fine work toward the passage of this bill.

Yours very truly,

A. V. GUILLORY,
Chairman, ASC Committee of Evangeline Parish.

LIONS CLUB,
Cameron, La., August 16, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: On behalf of the Cameron Lions Club I wish to express our sincere appreciation for having supported the bill which dedicates more funds to agriculture extension, research, and marketing.

Cameron Parish is getting another man to help with adult and 4–H Club work. Up to this time Cameron was the only parish with only one man extension agent in the southwest district. We feel that with the added personnel, the county agent's office will be in a much better position to give to the farm people the service they need and want.

Thanking you again for your cooperation, I am,

Sincerely yours,

L. B. WELCH, *Secretary.*

LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE AND IMMIGRATION,
Baton Rouge, La., September 2, 1954.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: In behalf of the Louisiana Department of Agriculture and Immigration please accept my thanks and appreciation for your assistance concerning the 1955 Federal budget for the plant pest control and plant quarantine branches of the Agricultural Research Service.

Your interest in this appropriation has resulted in the continuation of this vital and important work.

With kind regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

S. J. MCCRORY, *State Entomologist.*

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
AND AGRICULTURAL AND
MECHANICAL COLLEGE,
Baton Rouge, La., March 27, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: In reference to your letter of March 22, I wish to congratulate you on your novel idea regarding the promotion of Louisiana rice and yams. This continual reminder to people throughout the Nation will be a good way to expand our promotion efforts for these two commodities.

If possible, I would like to receive about 25 sample copies of your stationery with this stamp to use in suggesting a similar approach to certain process houses and public offices in the Louisiana rice and sugar areas.

Sincerely yours,

J. N. EFFERSON, *Director.*

DEZAUCHE & SON, INC.,
Opelousas, La., May 11, 1956.

FRIEND THOMPSON: I had intended writing you first part of April when I received your letter—carrying the "new look" on your stationery.

Thought it was a mighty good idea and certainly will serve to attract attention to Louisiana rice and yams.

It's a "yam" good idea.

Sincerely,

J. F. DEZAUCHE.

TRI-PARISH BANK & TRUST CO.,
Eunice, La., March 26, 1956.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I have your letter of March 22, 1956, calling my attention to your "new look"—bring rice and yams before the public on your stationery. I think it is a splendid thought and would like to copy your idea if you have no objection. Please have the firm who prepared or made your art work write me direct and quote price on duplicating your art work if it meets your approval.

You are to be complimented on this original idea and more people in our district should carry on such fine work.

Regards and best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

M. J. FRUGE,
Executive Vice President.

EDMUNDSON-DUHE RICE MILL,
Rayne, La., March 26, 1956.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Thank you for your letter of March 22.

Congratulations on your "new look" in stationery. Your slogan adds to the attractiveness of your stationery, besides being good publicity and advertisement for two industries, rice and yams, that are in great need of increased domestic consumption. Your efforts are appreciated by both industries.

Kind regards.

Very truly yours,

J. OTTO BROUSSARD.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *March 27, 1956.*

DEAR T. A.: Thank you for your letter of March 23 with reference to your new look in stationery. You are certainly to be complimented for such wise vision which is a definite expression of your interest in Louisiana's agriculture.

I am looking forward to working with you during the next 4 years and assuring you my full and wholehearted support.

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY J. MCCRORY,
Commissioner-Elect of Agriculture.

THE RICE MILLERS' ASSOCIATION,
New Orleans, La., March 30, 1956.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: You are to be commended for your thoughtfulness and action in promoting Louisiana products, rice and yams. Every bit of publicity helps, and if your new look in stationery will tend to develop some new consumers for Louisiana rice and yams you will have rendered a distinct service to the people of your district and State.

On behalf of the segment of the industry which we represent, please accept our thanks for this splendid cooperation.

With all good wishes.

Cordially yours,

W. M. REID, *President.*

JENNINGS ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
Jennings, La., April 2, 1956.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I know your efforts to advertise rice and yams by use of the cut on your stationery will be sincerely appreciated by your constituents in this area.

Perhaps it will be of interest to you that the agriculture committee of this organization recently addressed letters to both the major oil companies as well as independents,

suggesting that they give consideration to the use of rice as a premium instead of sugar in connection with service station openings. I am glad to say that the response thus far has been favorable.

With best personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

L. E. BLOCH, *Manager.*

KELLY, WEBER & COMPANY, INC.,
Lake Charles, La., March 29, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am glad to have your letter with reference to the "New Look" on your stationery, and want to congratulate you on this. This letterhead is the last word. It certainly is an idea to advertise the products of your district, and as suggested by you, it will reach a lot of people without any cost to the taxpayers.

Last night's American Press carried a very nice article about this.

With best wishes for continued success, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

ARTHUR L. GAYLE,
President and General Manager.

LOUISIANA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, INC.,
Baton Rouge, La., April 3, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I congratulate you on the "new look" stationery with Yams and Rice printed on the envelope. You are a good Louisiana booster.

Yours very truly,

MALCOLM S. DOUGHERTY, *President.*

MERMENTAU RICE MILL COMPANY, INC.,
Mermentau, La., March 26, 1956.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Your "new look" stationery is not only artistic and complimentary, but it should give favorable advertising to both yams and rice.

It is a unique idea and these two Louisiana industries, I am sure, appreciate the thought and the efforts you are giving them through this medium.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Yours very truly,

B. C. DELAHOUSSAYE.

ABDALLA'S, INC.,
Opelousas, La., March 27, 1956.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of March 23 and have indeed noted your "new look" in stationery.

I am very pleased with the appearance and wish to commend you for this fine job you are doing. I do hope that this effort on your part will be well rewarded and that our problems regarding the development of greater domestic consumption of rice and yams will be minimized as a result of your action.

Sincerely yours,

ANTHONY ABDALLA.

TWENTY-SEVENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA,
Opelousas, La., March 26, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am in receipt of your letter with the "new look."

As a producer of sweetpotatoes, I wish to express my appreciation for your interest in the yam and to congratulate you on the excellent and novel idea. I am sure that we are going to benefit from this added publicity feature.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

LESSLEY P. GARDINER, *Judge.*

"PRONTO" LIQUID FERTILIZER CORP.,
Eunice, La., March 27, 1956.

DEAR T. A.: I am in receipt of your letter of March 22 and was very happy to hear from you.

I have read the contents of your letter and believe that the idea is very good and is another step forward in promoting sales of our Louisiana rice and yams. You just can't do too much in this direction to help our farmers and thereby reduce our vast surplus in these commodities, whereby the farmers may be able to get back in their old and accustomed manner of raising all that their soil will produce, without any strings tied to them.

You are to be highly commended for the fine work and efforts put forth by you in this great and worthy cause.

We are ready and willing to cooperate in any way that we can and we don't want you to hesitate one bit to call on us if you need us for anything.

With kindest regards and best wishes from Phil and me, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

ED UZZO.

COMMITTEE FOR RICE SALES PROTECTION,
St. Martinsville, La., April 7, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I want to thank you for your kind letter showing and telling me of your "new look" in stationery. Throughout the Rice Belt I have heard many complimentary remarks about your stationery. I wholeheartedly concur with you in that full advantage should be taken of every opportunity to call attention to our fine foods here in Louisiana and compliment you on the time, effort, and expense you have put into the promotion of our Louisiana rice and yams.

I definitely agree with you that this "new look" stationery and all of your other efforts will positively assist in the development of greater domestic consumption of rice and yams.

Thanking you for your interest and with kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

ALLAN DURAND,
Executive Secretary.

LOUISIANA SWEET POTATO ADVERTISING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION,
Opelousas, La., March 27, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Your effort to further popularize Louisiana yams and rice through a message on your stationery is certainly of interest to us. We thank you for your interest and active support.

We also want to thank you, Congressman WILLIS and Senators ELLENDER and LONG for the assistance that you rendered the sweet potato industry in getting the Government to initiate a surplus purchase program for our product.

If available send us a newspaper mat or photograph of the "rice and yam message" and we will be glad to use it in an early issue of our Yamgram.

Sincerely yours,

J. J. ARCENEAUX, *Director.*

VILLE PLATTE, LA., *May 28, 1956.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I want to thank you for your efforts in getting the 9,300 additional acres for the rice farmers for this year. We were mighty proud of you last year for your efforts in getting us additional acreage and this year's increase in acreage will keep many small rice farmers from going broke. You are really a friend of the farmer. Keep up the fine work you are doing for the district.

Sincerely,

KERELL VIDRINE.

LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND IMMIGRATION,
Baton Rouge, La., April 6, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Knowing your interest in our fine State, I have asked Mr. Gasquet to develop some pictures for you to hang in your office which I hope you will be pleased with. I have found that a picture is worth a lot of words.

I want you to know that I personally appreciate the cooperation you are giving our department, and also I appreciate the fine work you are doing for our State.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

DAVE L. PEARCE, *Commissioner.*

MERMENTAU RICE MILL CO., INC.,
Mermentau, La., June 4, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Please accept my appreciation for your telegram of the second from Ville Platte advising that the distribution of the additional State acreage is now in the hands of our State committee for distribution.

I appreciate very much the personal attention you have given this matter and I think that the rice farmers of southwest Louisiana should be very grateful to you for your efforts to help them on every and all occasions.

With kindest regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

B. C. DELAHOUSSAYE.

Our State of Louisiana is blessed with lots of fresh water and many navigable streams. While these are a blessing to us and add to our wealth, they also present problems in the matter of flood control. I have worked untiringly for the better development of ports and waterways and have been successful in the acomplishment of long-needed flood control and drainage projects. I firmly believe that through my continued efforts, many of our smaller streams can be charged with greater quantities of water from our larger rivers, enabling the entire district at some future date to have available to it navigable streams that will induce industrial development and assist our farmers in their irrigation problems.

The following communications which I have received should indicate to this body and to my people the reaction of some to my efforts:

OPELOUSAS ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
Opelousas, La., January 22, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Let me congratulate you on the splendid work you have done in the interest of flood control for this area. We are very pleased with the Cocodrie-Courtableau-Teche projects included in the budget.

Sincerely,

BILLY M. SMITH, *Manager.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1955.

DEAR ASHTON: Now that I've had a chance to get my breath since our fight in regard to civil functions, I want to express my appreciation for the fine work that you did in this fight.

Cordially,

FRANK E. SMITH,
Member of Congress,
Democrat, of Mississippi.

COURT ST. FRANCIS, NO. 1519,
CATHOLIC DAUGHTERS OF AMERICA,
Iota, La., June 8, 1953.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You and other Congressmen of Louisiana have done a wonderful job to help the flooded area of Louisiana. We thank you a million.

Wishing you good health and success in your undertakings, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ANNA BOURGEOIS,
Legislative Committee Chairman.

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY FLOOD CONTROL ASSOCIATION,
Memphis, Tenn., July 8, 1955.

DEAR PAULIN: I have just heard the good news that you are the new president of the Courtableau Association.

As you perhaps know, we were in great jeopardy of losing a substantial part of our appropriation in the House last month. The two House Members involved, Congressman WILLIS and Congressman THOMPSON, were among the leaders in the successful fight to restore the funds. They did a magnificent job, which if left undone would have seriously delayed your project. Now the Courtableau project can be a reality!

With warmest regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

BRUCE TUCKER,
Executive Vice President.

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY FLOOD CONTROL ASSOCIATION,
Memphis, Tenn., June 27, 1955.

DEAR CLIFF: Since your board has jurisdiction in St. Landry Parish, the people there should know how hard Congressman T. A. THOMPSON worked to restore our appropriations cut. He was energetic and enthusiastic and contributed materially to the success of our effort.

With warmest regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

BRUCE TUCKER,
Executive Vice President.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, August 1, 1953.

DEAR T. A.: I was very pleased to cooperate with you and the other members of the Louisiana delegation in securing approval by the House Public Works Committee of the resolution authorizing a study of the adequacy of the existing improvement program for flood control and drainage of the streams and structures of the Atchafalaya Floodway.

You will be interested to know that the cost of this study, while relatively small, is the highest figure approved by the committee in connection with a survey at any time this year. You and the Corps of Engineers representatives made such a compelling statement about the urgency of this study that the committee decided to ignore the unwritten rule under which it has been acting in regard to cost and to approve the res-

I certainly hope that the study will result in the development of plans which will bring about correction of the program now under way.

Cordially,

FRANK E. SMITH,
Member of Congress, Mississippi.

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 10, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Because of the great interest you displayed in connection with the development and passage of legislation authorizing the Sabine River Compact between the States of Texas and Louisiana, I am happy to present to you my gavel which was used on the occasion of the final passage of S. 3699.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes for the successful development of this natural resource, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker.

LAWES, CAVANAUGH & HICKMAN,
Lake Charles, La., June 14, 1953.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Please accept my thanks for the copy of the United States Statutes at Large covering the sessions of the Congress 1950 through 1952.

I appreciate your expression of confidence in my apopintment to the court of appeals to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Judge Dore. Judge Dore had been my friend for a long time, and his death is a great loss to the bench and bar of the State.

You have done a great service to this district in assisting the people who have lost everything they had by the recent flood. I have heard so many mention your activity and special interest in the matter.

I was sorry I did not get to see you when you were here on your last visit, but I know you had to cover the district and see the places where the people were suffering most.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

A. B. CAVANAUGH.

We all know that as long as Communist Russia is working constantly to influence the world with the ungodly philosophy they espouse, we will have to be ever alert to the problems of our own defense. I wish that the day would come when all military installations could be disbanded and closed, yet as long as we must have them, our areas should share in the distribution of these installations where many of our tax dollars can be spent and put back into circulation in our own economy.

Since I have been a Member of Congress, the Lake Charles Air Force Base has been made into a permanent Strategic Air Command installation. The money disbursed by the Government at this installation exceeds even the great industrial benefits in that area. My people all remember that Camp Polk was closed for the second time and through the joint efforts of myself and others of the Louisiana delegation, we were successful in having it reopened, not as a camp, but as a permanent base to be known as Fort Polk. It is now one of the Nation's most important training areas for our ground forces.

All of this redounds to the benefit of our entire district and State, and the following letters were received by me regarding my efforts in connection with these two installations.

REINAUER'S REAL ESTATE,
Lake Charles, La., July 22, 1954.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I am most appreciative of the telegram you sent me advising me that the Lake Charles Air Force Base has been made a permanent installation. I do appreciate your prompt attention and personally informing me by telegram.

I want to congratulate you on the good work of securing this base for Lake Charles. I feel sure it is a great step forward for the city and know it took a great deal of your personal time and attention.

With best wishes for your continued success, I remain,

Very truly yours,

JULES REINAUER.

VINCENT & WELCH, INC.,
Lake Charles, La., April 9, 1954.

DEAR T. A.: I am very sorry that I did not get to see you before you left Lake Charles. For myself and on behalf of an overwhelming majority of citizens in this community, let me express our appreciation for your untiring efforts put forth in helping us try to have the Lake Charles Air Force Base made a permanent installation.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

LEE WELCH.

OFFICE OF DISTRICT ATTORNEY,
30TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT,
Leesville, La., June 21, 1955.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of myself, my family, and all of your friends here in Vernon Parish, I want to thank you from the bottom of our hearts for the great service you have rendered us in connection with Camp Polk. The reopening of this camp on a permanent basis will be a great boon to this whole parish and to surrounding parishes. If there is anything we can do to repay you for your great work, do not hesitate to call on us.

Yours very truly,

PETER S. ANDERSON,
District Attorney.

LAKE CHARLES ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
Lake Charles, La., April 9, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Your visit to Lake Charles in connection with the Air Force installation here is deeply appreciated. It was a real pleasure for me to meet you and have an opportunity to become acquainted. I am thoroughly convinced that this area is ably represented in Washington, and I hasten to assure you that it will always be my desire to cooperate with you in every instance.

We all are deeply grateful for your interest in our problem and for your assistance in our efforts to have the Lake Charles Air Force Base designated as a permanent installation.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

J. WALKER OWENS,
General Manager.

THE CALCASIEU-MARINE NATIONAL BANK,
Lake Charles, La., July 22, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Needless to say the news announcing the permanency of the Lake Charles Air Force Base was most gratifying to the entire population of the city of Lake Charles.

As a citizen of Lake Charles, may I express to you my appreciation for your untiring efforts and the time given to this worthwhile project, as I know it was through the efforts of you and our other representation in Washington that brought the permanency of the base to a final conclusion.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CECIL K. COLON,
Executive Vice President.

DEPARTMENT OF MILITARY AFFAIRS,
New Orleans, May 15, 1956.

DEAR TOM: As I relinquish the position of adjutant general of Louisiana, a post I have held for 24 years, permit me to thank you for the fine assistance you have rendered me as a member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

With your help our military department today occupies a place second to none in the Nation. Through your generous help the great training area known as Fort Polk has been made a permanent installation of the United States Army.

For all this and more I thank you and pray God's richest blessings upon you and yours.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND H. FLEMING,
Major General, The Adjutant General.

LAKE CHARLES ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
Lake Charles, La., March 9, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: We feel certain that you are apprized of the fact that the citizenship of our community overwhelmingly voted in excess of $13 million in bonds to provide drainage and donate land etc. as required by the criteria of the Air Force when our aviation committee was in Washington to make our local Air Base a permanent installation.

We, in Lake Charles and Southwest Louisiana, consider this a red-letter day in our community activity. However, we want you to know that we would not have accomplished the objectives had it not been for your counsel, advice, and assistance with ours and the police jury committee's on the various trips to Washington when the plans were made with the Air Force to make this base permanent.

In behalf of our association of commerce and the citizens of southwest Louisiana, we

want to again thank you for the splendid assistance given us in this instance, as well as the cooperation you have always extended to us.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN L. MILLER, *President.*

We of the Seventh District of Louisiana are fortunate in having unlimited resources of oil and natural gas. This, along with our navigable waterways and vast numbers of enlightened people available for work, is drawing more and more industries to Southwest Louisiana. I have been constantly alert to encroachment by the Federal Government into those things which are properly ours. I participated in the successful battle waged in regard to tidelands ownership. Our tidelands oil alone has meant more than a hundred million dollars to Louisiana already. Through our continued efforts in Washington, it is my hope that we will succeed in establishing ownership of tidelands to the 10½-mile historic boundary. These are the funds which should properly be used for the many basic necessities in Louisiana, such as public education and the program of much-needed salary increases for teachers, bus drivers, and others, and for other such worthy causes. The continued development of these tidelands will mean thousands of jobs for our people.

Below are some of the acknowledgments I received pursuant to my work in these matters to indicate the feelings of my constituency:

MID-CONTINENT OIL & GAS ASSOCIATION,
Baton Rouge, La., August 10, 1955.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: The Louisiana-Arkansas division of the Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association is deeply indebted to you and your staff for the courageous stand which you took in supporting the Harris bill.

We want you to know that we deeply appreciate the fine work you did, and we realize that without your help this bill could not have been passed.

We wish you continuing success in the fine work you are doing in our Congress.

Sincerely,

L. LEE WELCH, *President.*

ST. LANDRY DRILLING CO., INC.,
Eunice, La., July 28, 1955.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: We take note here of a wonderful job you are doing in Washington, and we wish to compliment you on it.

Very truly yours,

IVAN WEST.

OIL, CHEMICAL, AND ATOMIC WORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION,
Maplewood, La., June 28, 1955.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: The members of Calcasieu Parish, Local No. 4–500, Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union, CIO, meeting in regular session, June 7, 1955, have directed that this communication be sent to you, wholeheartedly thanking you for your efforts toward settling the recent Southern Bell Telephone strike.

You may feel sure that you have earned the confidence and admiration of all members of our union who champion the cause of democratic principles in our State and in our Nation.

Sincerely,

PERCY L. ROGERS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

The problems encountered by many of our veterans and families of boys in the service are great. My office has ever been open to anyone seeking assistance in the matter of what is due them from their Government. I have never failed to respond to these problems and have been successful in seeing that they all received prompt attention by the appropriate agency or department of the Government. An indication of the response given me as a result of my intervention in these cases can be seen in the following letters:

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *May 25, 1955.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: This is to express appreciation for your obtaining for me copies of my flight examinations while in the service.

Again I thank you for your persevering efforts in my behalf.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES W. WEST.

DE QUINCY, LA., *January 10, 1955.*

HON. MR. THOMPSON: We are today in receipt of a check from the Finance Department of the Army covering my wife's part of the corporal's pay earned by me while in the Army.

Many thanks for efforts made by you and your staff in securing for us the above-mentioned check.

Sincerely,

HUEY P. SHIRLEY.

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *July 20, 1955.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: We would like to express our appreciation for what you have done for us. We know that you had to take time out in writing those letters when you had more important work to do. We have found out that you are a kind and just person, and are ready to help anyone in need of something important.

Again we thank you.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. GEORGE L. JONES.

RAYNE, LA., *April 12, 1954.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Having received your last two letters, I wish to take this opportunity to thank you for your trouble in helping me to get back into the Air Force.

Thanking you ever so much, with all my heart, for going to any trouble for me.

If ever you wish something and I am able to assist you, please advise me.

Sincerely yours,

RODNEY J. BARONET.

SULPHUR ELECTRIC, PIPING & PLUMBING CO.,
Sulphur, La., December 7, 1955.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: In reply to your Mrs. Harrison's letter of December 1, I want to take this opportunity to thank you on the way that you have made the claim of Jim's travel pay possible, for without your assistance, I'm convinced that the claim would have gone untouched.

I would also like to express my feeling for the hospitality and the consideration I was given by your Mrs. Harrison when I was in Washington recently.

If at any time we can be of service to you, please feel free to call on us.

Respectfully yours,

FRANK LANGLEY.

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *January 8, 1956.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I finally received my pension check, and I want to thank you kindly for getting it for me. I certainly feel that you are responsible for it. I am very sorry that I was such a bother to you. If I can ever be of any service to you in any way, please call on me or any of my family. We all want to say thank you again.

OSCAR W. HALE.

OPELOUSAS, LA., *May 18, 1953.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I wish to thank you for all you have done in behalf of my brother, Carrol Lavergne, in his attempt to get a hardship discharge from the Navy. We realize now how difficult they are to obtain. I assure you that you were right in assuming that my brother is badly needed at home as we expressed in our letters. But thanks again for your efforts and your kind interest. We really appreciate it.

Again, may I express my best wishes for your success in Washington.

Sincerely,

MRS. FRANK O. QUIRK.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Lake Charles, La., December 16, 1953.

Re Smith, Carroll E.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: This is to acknowledge the receipt of your telegram of December 14, 1953, on the above-named veteran, and to advise that we have obtained all the necessary information.

I wish to take this opportunity to thank you and your competent staff for the assistance received by this office during the past year and to wish all a Merry Christmas and Happy New Year.

Sincerely yours,

SAM P. FONTANA,
Assistant Calcasieu Parish Service Officer.

TOBERT SLACK, LANDSCAPE ENGINEER,
Lake Charles, La., August 10, 1955.

DEAR ASHTON: I received your letter of August 5 enclosing the letter dated August 4 addressed to you from The Adjutant General of the Army with reference to Capt. W. F. Martin.

Many thanks for your effective and very efficient efforts in our behalf. Really, I did not intend for you to go to so much trouble. You certainly got results in a hurry and I can assure you that both Martin and I appreciate it.

When you visit Lake Charles again, come by to see us.

Sincerely yours,

TORBERT SLACK.

CROWLEY, LA., *February 9, 1955.*

DEAR MR. THMOPSON: I received your letter and also a check for $421.67 from the Veterans' Administration in payment of my claim for education and training benefits. I appreciate your help very much and again I thank you.

Sincerely yours,

JOHNNY MAYFIELD.

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *April 23, 1953.*

Hon. T. A. THOMPSON,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Received your wire April 20 expressing deep gratification to the family of M. Sgt. Walter McCullom of Lake Charles. The mother, father, relatives, and friends deeply appreciated the interest shown in their son being released as POW in Korea.

T. C. PRICE, *Mayor.*

ARNAUDVILLE, LA., *March 24, 1953.*

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the citizens of the Arnaudville and Leonville communities of St. Landry Parish, I would like to express our sincere thanks for your efforts in having our only resident physician, Dr. Robert L. Morrow, deferred from military service. Our people will forever be grateful to you for your interest and help.

Trusting that some day we can be of value to you, I beg to remain

Sincerely yours,

MURRAY L. RABALAIS,
President, Citizens Committee.

PLAUCHE & STOCKWELL,
Lake Charles, La., September 8, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: We acknowledge with thanks receipt of your letter of September 2 and the attached letter from the Comptroller General of the United States relative to the case of Dr. William Smith.

Dr. Smith and I wish to express our sincere appreciation for the courtesy and help extended by you to us in this matter, and we are happy to know that if the need arises, we may call upon you in the future.

Yours very truly,

FRED H. SIEVERT, Jr.

OPELOUSAS, LA., *May 13, 1956.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: With reference to your letter of May 8, I have received my combat pay. I thank you very much for your interest and your help in this matter.

Yours truly,

JOSEPH W. ROBIN.

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *August 19, 1953.*

DEAR SIR: This is to express my sincere appreciation for your assistance in making application for a uniform allowance that was due me.

Recently I received a check in settlement for my claim. This was much speedier action than I would have received otherwise, I am sure.

Thank you very much.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT F. JONES.

OPELOUSAS, LA., *March 11, 1953.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I have received my military pay records and all necessary information. Thank you for the excellent service.

Sincerely yours,

TERRY BERTRAND.

PARKS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIF.,
September 3, 1953.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I want to thank you for your kindness and appreciation of my problem and also your prompt reply to my request. By your reply and from later developments, I have been able to make a decision which I hope is a correct one. From all reports, it seems to be highly possible that I will be given an early release from active duty.

I want you to know that I appreciate very much the trouble you have taken to help me.

Sincerely,

S. Sgt. GEORGE HICKS, *USAF.*

I have saved many of our small post offices from closing by being able to convince the authorities in Washington that these offices are truly the center of activity in many of our smaller communities and serve a real purpose. I feel that many of my people have seen the results of my efforts in securing the extension of mail routes throughout the District to serve them better.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I was instrumental in beginning the first projects of public buildings that had been undertaken since the beginning of World War II. The legislation under which this nationwide building program was authorized was originally authored by me and is called the Lease-Purchase plan. Because of my efforts in these regards, I was able to have approved a $2 million post office and Federal court building for Lake Charles as the first such project in the United States. I am looking forward to more of this much needed construction in other parts of the district.

I have assisted in the development of civilian airports throughout our district and helped to sponsor ever-improving air service for our people.

The work of a Congressman in our modern day life is varied and exacting. My activities in Washington for my district have been many. I have welcomed to my office all groups from the district who have visited Washington and have always attended to the extent that I could to the needs of my constituents having business in the Nation's Capital. I have received groups of school children and have always endeavored to see that they were given every opportunity to learn the workings of their Federal Government because I believe this to be of major importance in their education.

Louisianians in Washington each year sponsor a Mardi Gras Ball, one purpose of the Ball being to advertise Louisiana. The queens of all our Louisiana festivals are presented, which goes a long way toward calling attention nationwide to the products of Louisiana. I have been active in our Louisiana State Society and was able one year to have our Ball dedicated to rice, which served well in assisting in the plans for promotion of that product.

I have worked toward the development of legislation concerning soil conservation, reforestation, more liberal farm loans, rural electrification, better highways, better farm-to-market roads, establishing of rural telephone service, legislation for the benefit of our trapping and fishing industries, better weather reporting facilities in the Gulf areas, and I have constantly engaged in a battle for more economy in Government.

My 18 years of experience in State government before becoming a Member of Congress has served me well and I feel it qualifies me to engage in all of the facets of governmental work required of a United States Representative. I have no other business or interest and therefore, am able to put in full time service for my people. My only purpose and ambition in Washington is to continue to serve the people of southwest Louisiana in a manner that will reflect credit upon them and gain for them those services that a deserving people should receive from their Government. The following letters are indicative of the response I have received for the type service I have given:

ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
Jennings, La., June 5, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Thanks very much for your letter concerning additional boxes for the Jennings post office.

Perhaps you know that on Tuesday, June 8, bids will be opened on the installation of additional boxes at the Jennings post office. I want to assure you that we very much appreciate your interested handling of this matter for us.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

L. E. BLOCH, *Secretary-Manager.*

SUNSET, LA., *January 23, 1956.*

DEAR SIR: I want to thank you and all who made it possible for us to get back our mail route.

Yours truly,

PERCY VAUTROT.

KINDER, LA., *June 7, 1954.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Your letter of May 24 received with great pleasure, telling us of the approval of mail service for our community. It was the most welcome news we have had in a long time. Thanks to your efforts, we received what the postal people told us was going to be hard to get.

Thanks again, and we hope to have the pleasure of your visit soon.

Sincerely,

RICHARD BROTHERS.

ARNAUDVILLE, LA., *November 10, 1953.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Through the kind interest of Mr. Walter C. Smith and your prompt attention to his letter requesting a mail route between Leonville and Arnaudville, we are now enjoying rural delivery in our community. We thank you sincerely on behalf of our neighbors for your efforts to serve the people of the seventh district and hope you continue doing so for many years.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. CLESS EMOND.

UNITED STATES POST OFFICE,
DeQuincy, La., April 4, 1954.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Please accept my thanks for your timely assistance in the matter of getting the Department to grant me an allowance to cover the cost of a step-ladder which we need in the Post Office. I have now received the allowance for this item, due, I am sure, to your assistance.

Again thanking you and assuring you of my appreciation for the fine way you are looking after the interest of your people, I am

With kindest regards,

M. A. KENT, *Postmaster.*

LAWTELL, LA., *March 25, 1956.*

DEAR T. A.: Thanks a million for the favorable report on the extension of the rural route I requested.

Sincerely,

SID

(Sidney Sylvester, State representative).

LAKE CHARLES AMERICAN PRESS,
Lake Charles, La., August 17, 1954.

DEAR T. A.: I am enclosing the letter you received from Speaker JOE MARTIN and you will notice that I have commented on it in today's column in the American Press.

I repeat what I said when you were here—it is an accomplishment of which you may be justly proud.

Hoping to see you again soon, I remain,

Yours truly,

KENNETH L. DIXON,
Managing Editor.

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 10, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: The interest you have displayed in the development of legislation providing for the construction of postal and Federal court facilities in areas where they are needed is appreciated.

I am happy to present to you my gavel which was used in final approval of the conference report on H. R. 6342, the lease-purchase bill. This legislation is a definite accomplishment of the 83d Congress.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.

KELLY, WEBER & CO., INC.,
Lake Charles, La., July 28, 1953.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I note with a lot of interest the work you are doing to try to get a post office and office building for the Government here at Lake Charles.

There is no need to tell you about our need for such a building, but let me know what the thinking is in Washington as to what the citizens of this community can do to further this program.

Kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

ARTHUR L. GAYLE, *President.*

LAKE CHARLES ASSOCIATION
OF COMMERCE,
Lake Charles, La., June 17, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Attached is a copy of a resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the Association of

Commerce on Wednesday, June 15, concerning the location of the proposed new post-office building for Lake Charles.

In sending this resolution to you, we would also like to express our deep appreciation to you for your untiring efforts to help us secure this new facility which we have needed so long. Without your interest, your continued support, and your diligent efforts, it is doubtful that this project could have been consummated as rapidly as it has.

Please be sure of our continuing interest in this matter and of our sincere thanks for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN L. MILLER, *President.*

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *December 12, 1955*

Representative T. A. THOMPSON:

Would like to express sincere appreciation to you on behalf of the entire Lake Charles delegation for the excellent assistance offered in our behalf before the air-space panel. Your assistance and that of your office secretary contributed in a large manner to our success.

LEE WELCH,
Chairman, Airport Advisory Committee to Calcasieu Police Jury.

LAKE CHARLES ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
Lake Charles, La., September 28, 1955.

Mrs. CLARA I. HARRISON,
Secretary to T. A. Thompson.

DEAR MRS. HARRISON: We are deeply grateful for your cooperation in checking with the Civil Aeronautics Board on the status of the Trans-Texas renewal case.

It was our understanding, following the hearing, that it would probably be a month or so before the Board could render a decision. However, we are interested in pursuing this matter as closely as possible and we are most grateful for your help in keeping in close touch with the CAB.

Thanks again for your courtesy and kindness during our visit in Washington and please be sure of our sincere thanks for your continuing interest in our efforts to secure new airline service for Lake Charles.

With sincere good wishes and kindest regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

J. WALKER OWENS,
General Manager.

EARL K. LONG,
STATE CAMPAIGN HEADQUARTERS,
New Orleans, La., May 27, 1955.

MY DEAR FRIEND: I have sent Otto and Ed a recent photograph of me and would be glad to send one to you if you want it. However, Blanche tells me we had only a limited number and they are gone; but I will have more—probably by the time you reply—if you want one.

We enjoyed seeing you and Mrs. Thompson and hope to have the pleasure of doing so again soon.

With every good wish, I am,

Most sincerely yours,

EARL K. LONG.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Baton Rouge, La., March 31, 1953.

DEAR T. A.: Thanks for your letter of recent date . . .

You are doing a fine job in Washington and any time I can be of help to you, please let me know.

Sincerely,

HORACE LYNN JONES,
State Representative.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF LOUISIANA,
Alexandria, La., March 11, 1955.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON: During my visit to Washington the first week in March I was happy to visit your office and to visit with you during my brief stay.

I was particularly pleased to be with you, as a guest of the Louisiana Department of the American Legion, at the national rehabilitation conference banquet on Thursday evening, March 3.

We are grateful to you for your kindness and continued support of our efforts in behalf of the veterans of this great country.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

PERCY A. LEMOINE,
Department Rehabilitation Chairman.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT MARITIME COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., June 2, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: We have read with great interest in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 24 your very excellent address before the annual meeting of the Rice Millers Association. Your analysis and treatment of the cargo-preference provisions were indeed timely and gratifying. Yours is the kind of support the American merchant marine needs and we take this opportunity to say "thanks."

Respectfully yours,

EARL W. CLARK,
HOYT S. HADDOCK,
Codirectors.

LAKE CHARLES ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
Lake Charles, La., February 8, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: This is a note to express to you our sincere thanks and appreciation for the many courtesies and kindnesses extended our delegation during our visit to Washington last week.

We are deeply thankful for your continuing interest in our community problems and for your gracious cooperation in helping us to solve them.

It was extremely kind and courteous of you and your staff to extend us the hospitality of your offices, and we want you to know that we appreciate it very much.

Please let me know if we can be of service to you in any manner whatsoever.

Cordially yours,

J. WALKER OWENS,
General Manager.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *March 1, 1955.*

MY. DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I want to thank you for appearing with us before the Federal Communications Commission relative to the educational TV matter for the State of Louisiana. I know how busy a Congressman is and that makes your effort all the more appreciated by my friends and me.

Again thanking you and wishing for your success during your administration, I am

Your friend,

WILLIAM J. DODD.

THE CALCASIEU-MARINE NATIONAL BANK,
Lake Charles, La., May 21, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: You have certainly rendered a fine service to southwest Louisiana during the past 4 years and I know that we can expect you to continue this good work.

I certainly appreciate the courtesies which you and Mrs. Thompson extended to Mrs. Blackman and Mrs. Field during their recent visit in Washington.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

FRANK FIELD, *Vice President.*

SOWELA VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL SCHOOL,
Lake Charles, La., May 22, 1956.

DEAR T. A.: I want to thank you for the courtesies shown me during my recent trip to Washington. It was very kind of you to arrange the conferences, and your interest in our work is appreciated.

I wish you would extend my appreciation to your staff for being so nice to Dr. Mobley and me.

Sincerely yours,

REX H. SMELSER, *Director.*

SUNSET, LA., *May 17, 1955.*

DEAR MR. AND MRS. THOMPSON: First of all, let me thank you for the enjoyable time we spent in Washington. I could not choose the proper words that would fully express our gratitude to you. I know that we could not possibly have covered all the points of interest in Washington as we did, had you not given us so much of your time. The students, their parents, and many friends who are so grateful to you have asked me to say "thank you."

Whenever you are in Louisiana, don't forget your many friends in Sunset. Come to see us and in some way let us repay the kind favors you showered upon us.

Sincerely,

Mrs. FLOYD DOMENGEAUX.

SHILSTONE TESTING LABORATORY,
New Orleans, La., May 30, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I wanted to tell you how much I enjoyed our short meeting in my recent visit in Washington.

I hope this letter to you will be rather unusual from the many you must receive, as I am not asking for anything, you are not in my district and it isn't collect. Truly, I just wanted to say to you that I feel privileged to have the opportunity of chatting with you personally.

If there is anything I can ever do to further your aims and career I shall consider it a privilege to do so as I was very much impressed with your conception of your responsibilities.

Most sincerely,

CECIL M. SHILSTONE.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Jennings, La., January 19, 1955.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I want to thank you for the things you did to make our trip to Washington so enjoyable. We found it all very interesting. I gave one of the pictures to the Jennings News so I am sure they will have it in the paper before long.

Tell Mrs. Thompson hello for us and tell her how much we appreciate her doing so many nice things for us too.

Drop by and see us the next time you are in Jennings.

Sincerely,

CLAUDE KIRKPATRICK.

AMERICAN RICE GROWERS COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Elton, La., February 29, 1956.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I have never had the pleasure of meeting you, however, I have long admired you for your conscientious and competent service to the people of Louisiana, and especially to us in the rice industry.

Aside from my work with the Rice Growers Association, I am an active member of the Louisiana Highways Users Conference. Our secretary, Mr. Jimmie Major, and I were discussing your highway bill. While I am not too familiar with your bill, he assured me and convinced me you are on the right track. Needless to say, I am very interested in anything that will affect our rice farmers, be it declining farm prices or highways restriction.

Mr. THOMPSON, I want you to know that the American Rice Growers membership are very appreciative of your efforts on behalf of the rice farmers in this rice acreage problem we are now experiencing. If we can be of help in this fight, feel free to call on us.

With sincere best wishes, I am,

Your very truly,

SHELTON LA FLEUR,
Division Manager.

RICKERT RICE MILLS, INC.,
New Orleans, La., February 23, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Thank you very much for sending me a copy of the program of the Louisiana Mardi Gras ball just recently held in Washington.

I feel sure that this colorful event and the publicity that goes with it, will bear home the importance that rice plays in our everyday life down South; we all feel very grateful for the interest you are taking and the efforts you are making for the well being of our great industry.

Thanks again for your thoughtfulness. With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

CYRIL R. C. LAAN, *President.*

OPELOUSAS, LA., *June 6, 1955.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: We have had an extension of the REA light lines and now practically everyone on the grant has electric lights.

We wish to thank you for the cooperation and courtesy extended us, and me have all come to the same conclusion, and that is that we have a very good representation from Louisiana in Washington.

Yours truly,

MARTIN COSGROVE.

JEFFERSON DAVIS ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.,
Jennings, La., January 25, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Your past efforts, hard work for REA, and fine representation of the people is appreciated by us. For the future, I wish you a very successful, prosperous, and continued career.

Sincerely,

J. S. ROBBINS,
President, Louisiana Electric Cooperative Association.

POLICE JURY, PARISH OF ALLEN,
Oberlin, La., April 7, 1956.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: We acknowledge your letter of April 3, with enclosure, and are happy to say that the Army has delivered the 655 cubic yards of washed gravel to complete our claim for damages during Exercise Sagebrush in Ward 4.

We want to thank you for the kind interest you manifested and the promptness which has brought this matter to a close.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

GRACE A. RHORER,
Secretary-Treasurer.

ST. CHARLES ACADEMY,
Lake Charles, La., October 26, 1955.

DEAR SIR: We received the material that you recently sent to us on the debate question. My fellow colleagues and I wish to thank you sincerely. This material has proved a wonderful source of evidence. We wish to again extend our many thanks.

Sincerely yours,

HELEN JO MAXEY,
Debate Secretary.

EUNICE, LA., *September 15, 1953.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for your prompt and courteous attention in assisting me in obtaining a passport.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. GEORGE F. KARL, Jr.

STARKS, LA., *August 2, 1955.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Thank you very much for your letter of July 29, along with the copy of the letter Mr. Agate wrote. I am contacting the person he recommends for the FHA loan.

I wish to take this means to let you know that we certainly do appreciate the interest you have shown us in this matter, and we will not forget it.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. WAYNE STANDLEY.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *May 11, 1956.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: My family and I wish to thank you for the help you have given them through the welfare department. They are now receiving $75 a month, which is not as much as we had prayed for, but it is a great help.

Again, let me tell you we are most grateful for your help.

Sincerely,

(Name withheld.)

PORT OF LAKE CHARLES,
September 13, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: It was certainly nice of you to make us a gift of the flag which had flown over the United States Capitol and we appreciate very much receiving this and your thinking of us. I am enclosing picture from the American Press which was taken here last Friday.

Again thanking you for presenting us with the flag and with kind personal regards, I remain,

Yours very truly,

ERNEST CHRISTMAN,
Director of Port.

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *May 18, 1956.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: It was a great deal of pleasure to receive your letter about the Agriculture Yearbooks. We have an aggressive Agricultural Committee and these books should certainly stimulate more interest for the boys along these lines.

The village will more than welcome any publications or information which you might send, and will leave it entirely to your discretion as to what you might think appropriate and useful to the boys.

Sincerely yours,

W. S. GUILLORY,
President, Boys' Village.

ROADSIDE DEVELOPMENT,
DeRidder, La., August 15, 1955.

MY DEAR MRS. THOMPSON: Thank you and Congressman THOMPSON so much for the wealth of material which you sent to me from Washington on Roadside Development.

Thanking you for this and for all the favors which you and the Congressman have rendered to the people in our section, I remain,

Most sincerely yours,

Mrs. LOUISE M. HANCHEY,
Seventh District Director.

THE MULLER CO., LTD.,
Lake Charles, La., May 15, 1956.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: It was very kind of you to take time from what we know is a very busy schedule to think of us.

May we in turn express our respect for the fine work that you have done in Washington and particularly for your active sponsorship of every project for the betterment of Lake Charles and southwest Louisiana.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

ADOLPH S. MARX, *President.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., August 8, 1955.

DEAR ASHTON: I do not want the long labors of our Public Works Committee to fade from memory without expressing my appreciation and admiration for your outstanding work as a member of that committee.

Very few Members of Congress ever have a duty assigned them of such great magnitude as was encompassed in our committee deliberations on the proposed highway legislation in the session of Congress just ended. While accomplished legislation did not result from our many and long sessions, I feel that that should not detract from our earnestness in wrestling with a problem of such controversial nature. Possibly our labors will yet bear fruit.

Serving with you, my friend, in the world's greatest parliamentary body, and especially on the same committee, has been an enjoyable experience.

May I wish you a pleasant vacation and a happy return to Washington in January.

Sincerely,

BRADY GENTRY,
Member of Congress.

THE CALCASIEU-MARINE NATIONAL BANK,
Lake Charles, La., January 30, 1953.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are all well pleased with your appointment as a member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. We all feel that this is a very important committee and especially so since you hail from the gulf coast area.

T. A., I have been hearing some good reports from your activities in Washington, and I want you to know that your friends in the Seventh Congressional District are very proud of the man they selected to represent them in Congress.

With every good wish to you and Mrs. THOMPSON, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT L. JAMES, *President.*

FISHERMAN'S COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
May 9, 1956.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On behalf of the boatowners, fishermen's unions, and citizens of this area, it is my pleasure to write you with appreciation for your introduction of a fisheries bill.

This legislation has the blessing of all segments of the fishing industry and, as far as I can ascertain, has no outspoken critics. I certainly hope that our combined efforts will see the legislation through this session. To this end, please notify us at once should an occasion arise where we may be of particular assistance.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MASON CASE, *Manager.*

NEW ORLEANS AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
New Orleans, La., June 20, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I wish to thank you for your time and efforts in connection with the Gulf Weather Station, particularly our session with the Weather Bureau last Tuesday. We feel convinced that we are now well on the way to the establishment of the Gulf Weather Station as a permanent operation.

It was indeed a pleasure to see you, and I hope to have the opportunity again soon on the occasion of one of your visits to New Orleans.

Sincerely yours,

S. S. MORRIS,
Director of Aviation.

OZIO FISHERIES,
Morgan City, La., July 13, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: The interest you have shown in our weather-reporting service is highly commendable.

Such service will mean a saving to the oil companies and to shrimping interests and in no small way will make the lives of the men who go to sea in both industries much less hazardous.

The bill which you have introduced into Congress providing for an appropriation to establish ocean station weather service in the Gulf of Mexico has our fullest support, and it is our earnest hope that your efforts toward its enactment will meet with success.

Yours truly,

TOM OZIO.

MATHIESON CHEMICAL CORP.,
Lake Charles, La., January 11, 1955.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 5 to which was attached a copy of Mr. Reichelderfer's statement incorporated in his letter to you of January 4.

We wish to thank you for the interest that you have exhibited in this matter and feel that as a result of that interest we may expect to continue to receive the quality of services from the weather bureau that we have enjoyed in the past.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I remain,

Very truly yours,

C. C. HIGHTOWER.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Lake Charles, La., July 30, 1953.

DEAR T. A.: The people of Lake Charles are through with swatting and slapping and are singing and clapping because of your help. Consequently, this note to say thank you for your fine cooperation with our "Operation Mosquito." We were sprayed this morning by a United States Air Force plane, and I know that 50,000 or more people in Lake Charles join me in saying thank you.

Cordially yours,

SIDNEY L. GRAY, *Mayor.*

AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY,
Crowley, La., June 7, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: It gives our American Legion Auxiliary great pleasure to know you have our interest at heart.

Thank you very much for your generous donation to our Poppy Day Program.

I also wish to thank you for your letter paying tribute to the outstanding work being done by the members of the American Legion Auxiliary in your home State of Louisiana.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JERRY ASHLEY,
Department President.

MAY 22, 1956.

(Memorandum from George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, Washington, D. C.)

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Congratulations are due you in behalf of small business, in affixing your signature to House Resolution 414.

It is more important than ever to protect the future of independent business of this Nation. Destroy the effectiveness of the Robinson-Patman Act and small business can close its doors.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
FIELD OFFICE,
Lake Charles, La., August 3, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Tomorrow completes my services with this Bureau, with the exception of some administrative details required in turning over my official duties to the new district manager of this office who will be Mr. Donald E. Saulnier of Welsh as acting manager.

May I take this opportunity to express both my personal and my official appreciation for the many courtesies which you and your staff have extended to me, and I sincerely hope that in the years to come that the friendship which we have created will remain.

I know that the same excellent spirit of cooperation will continue to exist between you and the new district manager.

Sincerely yours,

M. MILES SNIDER.

IOWA, LA., *May 2, 1956.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: This letter is to thank you for helping us. I suppose you have forgotten helping me get a scholarship for my little girl after she graduated from high school. One of the most important things in my life was to send Joyce on to college, and so with your help and the help of Mrs. Bryan, the Lacassine teacher, we have sent her through college. She didn't take summer vacations, but studied and worked and now she has signed her contract for a teaching position in Lake Charles for next year.

I'm sure you will never know how much I do thank you for I would never have had the the privilege of sending her to college without your help. Many, many thanks and may God bless you throughout life. If there is anything I can do for you or someone of your choice, please let me know.

Thanks a million times.

Sincerely,

MRS. DELLA HOFFPAUIR.

TURO INFIRMARY,
New Orleans, La., August 12, 1955.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: It gives me great pleasure to advise you that Miss Julia Maum, Route 2, Box 251, DeRidder, La., was accepted into the School of Nursing July 21, 1955.

Miss Maum proved to be a very intelligent, well-poised, lovely young lady. We are very fortunate to have her in the School of Nursing. Thank you for the recommendation.

Yours very sincerely,

ZELMA ALLEN, *Registrar.*

SULPHUR, LA., *March 9, 1955.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I would like to thank you for the attention and action you have taken to find scholarship aid for me at Parks College. I am extremely grateful for your consideration and feel sure that you can help me. If there is anything I can do, please let me know.

Thank you again for all you have done. I sincerely hope you can help me.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. ARNOLD,

WEST POINT, N. Y., *August 4, 1954.*

DEAR SIR: I would like to express again my deep appreciation and thanks for the appointment that you obtained for me and for the chance to enter West Point.

I have completed my first summer of training known as New Cadet Barracks and am about to begin my first academic year.

I assure you that I will strive, to the best of my ability, to attain the high standards that I know you expect of me and that I, myself, owe to you. Thanking you again, I am,

Sincerely yours,

FRANK M. SMITH, *Class of 1958.*

GRAMBLING COLLEGE,
Grambling, La., October 4, 1955.

DEAR SIR: We are in receipt of your letter dated September 21, 1955, concerning Miss Sevelle Landers of Ville Platte, La., who is desirous of work aid in order to attend college.

We shall be happy to be of some help to you and Miss Landers by providing a job for which she can earn at least half of her expenses.

We shall inform this student that we are trying to make some kind of work provisions for her.

Very sincerely yours,

R. W. E. JONES, *President.*

RAYNE, LA., *August 27, 1955.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: My dad and I recently asked your assistance in securing a job at Bossier Base for A. F. Stamm, Jr. Although he did not get the first job he applied for, he will get further consideration when another job is open.

This is due mainly to your efforts to assist us, and we want you to know that we appreciate all that you have done on Stamm's behalf.

Sincerely,

ARNOLD AND ALFRED KAHN.

WELSH, LA., *June 6, 1953.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As you already know, the proposed budget cut of the Labor Department and Federal Security Agency will mean a cut of $4,624,391 for carrying out the provisions of the George-Barden Act which will severely cripple vocational education in Louisiana.

Please don't let me down for I need this report. As for your efforts in fighting this cut, I know you well enough to know that you will be in there fighting for the cause of education.

Keep up the good work. You are doing a fine job. I am proud that I had a small part in getting you there. With best wishes and kindest personal regards, I remain,

Very truly yours,

MARION VALLEE.

DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE
AND FISHERIES,
New Orleans, La., May 28, 1953.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON: The enclosed is for your information in the event it becomes necessary for us to seek your support in obtaining the property described for use by this Department.

This is of vital concern to the State of Louisiana and would mean much to our conservation program. We know that in the past you have always supported every undertaking in behalf of wildlife conservation and that we will have that support again when we request it.

Thanking you and with best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

L. D. YOUNG, Jr., *Director.*

CROWLEY, LA., *April 29, 1955.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I will be very grateful if you use your influence for a prompt House committee hearing on H. R. 3792.

I have been reading about all the nice things you are doing for our farmers and others.

Thanking you and hoping when in Crowley, I will see you.

Very truly,

MRS. ERIN DORE CANAN.

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *November 5, 1955.*

HONORABLE SIR: I wish to thank you for the material which you sent me pertaining to Federal aid for higher education. From this literature that you have sent I have found much valuable information which will be of great help to our debate team.

Respectfully yours,

RUSSELL FONTENOT.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Baton Rouge, La., March 25, 1955.

DEAR T. A.: I appreciate your letter of March 16, 1955, and your cooperation with reference to H. R. 3322. Thanks for your interest and cooperation in behalf of public education. This will help your district very much.

Let us hear from you at any time your State Department of Education can be of assistance to you.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

SHELBY M. JACKSON,
State Superintendent.

LOUISIANA LIBRARY ASSOCIATION,
Baton Rouge, La., May 18, 1956.

DEAR ASHTON: Thanks very much for telephoning your congratulations on the passage of the Library Services bill in the House. We are highly pleased.

We deeply appreciate your continuing support of this legislation which will certainly accelerate the library development program in our State. Funds under this act will make public library service available within 5 years to every citizen in Louisiana.

The legislation is designed, as you know, to promote library development in rural areas. In this connection, I think you will be particularly interested in knowing that last year in Louisiana one-third of the total books borrowed were checked out from bookmobiles. One-fourth of Louisiana public library readers are bookmobile patrons.

My best regards to you.

Cordially,

SALLIE FARRELL,
Chairman, Federal Relations Committee.

NEBO OIL CO., INC.,
Good Pine, La., June 30, 1955.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I would like to express my appreciation and thanks to you for the help that you rendered in securing a special appropriation of $300,000 for research in the longleaf-slashpine belt of the Deep South. I am sure all of us in Louisiana who are interested in forestry feel that you were particularly helpful in obtaining this appropriation.

I was very glad that I was able to meet you when I was in Washington earlier in the year to testify on behalf of this appropriation and hope that I may again have the pleasure of talking to you and thanking you personally for your help.

Very truly yours,

W. M. PALMER, Jr., *Chief Forester.*

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Baton Rouge, La., May 22, 1953.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I called at your office while in Washington on May 14, to thank you personally for having appeared before Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Labor Department and the Federal Security Agency in interest of vocational education.

I have read in the published hearings before the subcommittee the remarks that you made and the exhibits that you filed regarding the need for continued Federal support for vocational education. You may be assured that all of us are grateful to you for your efforts and we sincerely hope that we may still be able to secure as much money in 1954 as was made available this year.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am

Yours very truly,

A. E. ROBINSON,
State Director, Vocational Education.

DERIDDER, LA., *August 31, 1955.*

DEAR SIR: I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for all Home Demonstration Club members of Beauregard Parish for your part in having funds restored to home economics research.

We, as well as homemakers over the country, look to our home demonstration agent for homemaking information. We realize that our agent cannot obtain this information without home economics research.

Again, may I say, "Thank you."

Sincerely,

MRS. A. E. FRANCIS,
President, Home Demonstration Council.

The people I represent in the Seventh District are an enlightened people. They have earned every gain that has been made. The future holds for our areas many great things and with my ever-mounting seniority in the Congress, it is my hope that I can play a part as their representative in the accomplishment that will be ours.

MIDDLE EAST PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachuetts. Mr. Speaker, developments unfavorable to the cause of peace in the Middle East took place this week in the Security Council of the United Nations.

American policy has sought progress toward peaceful solution of the real issues between Israel and her Arab neighbors, such as those relating to Arab refugees and Jordan River developments, and others.

Actions in the Security Council this week were unfavorable in respect to progress along such lines.

With Russia's support, the Arab States refused to accept a British resolution looking to the consolidation of the gains made by U. N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold's recent Middle East peace mission. The resolution was accepted only after having been changed in two important respects.

The resolution in its original form urged that Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold should continue to use his good offices in connection with the Israel-Arab dispute. It expressed hope for a "peaceful settlement on a mutually acceptable basis."

As finally adopted, the reference to a peaceful settlement was eliminated, and the provision urging the continuation of the Secretary General's good offices was toned down to limit his good offices mainly to matters relating to the recent cease-fire, and to the reduction of border incidents. The opposition evidently did not wish his authority to be broad enough to include the more basic issues in the dispute between Israel and her Arab neighbors.

A British-Russian statement about Middle East problems issued at the time of Mr. Khrushchev's recent visit to London had agreed on the desirability of a "peaceful settlement on a mutually acceptable basis." Yet in the Security Council, Russia supported Arab opposition to these same words in the British resolution in its original form.

Statements made in the debate by Arab spokesmen were also disquieting. They indicated a continued unwillingness to negotiate with Israel, or even, in their most extreme form, to accept the existence of Israel.

In mitigation of these developments, it was pointed out in debate that the Secretary General, under his general powers, could make broad use of his good offices in seeking peaceful solutions.

These events are a further indication of the difficulties confronting those who are seeking a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. They seem to call for a further development of American policy. They give added weight to the arguments of those who have urged a firming up of American policy through the furnishing of defensive arms to Israel, a refusal to furnish arms to the Arab States so long as they refuse to negotiate in good faith with Israel for peace, and through measures to buttress existing security guaranties.

America's national security can best be served by finding the road to peace in the Middle East and by promoting an atmosphere in which the new democracy of Israel can develop and prosper.

THE EISENHOWER - REPUBLICAN PARTNERSHIP POLICY IN WATER-RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, in the 1952 presidential campaign Dwight D. Eisenhower said in a speech in Seattle:

> We need resource development, and we need it on a river-basin basis. We need resource development, not to the limit of the whim of any administration in power, but to the limit of the capacity of the region to benefit. And to do that we need partnership to the limit of everyone's ability.

This policy of partnership in water-resources development was also officially announced in the President's annual state of the Union message to Congress in January 1953. The President said:

> The best natural-resources program will not result from exclusive dependence on the Federal bureaucracy. It will involve a partnership of the States and local communities, private citizens, and the Federal Government, all working together. This combined effort will advance the development of the great river valleys of our Nation and the power they can generate.

Since that time this policy has been further defined and enunciated by the President and other members of the Cabinet and Republican leaders in Congress.

Recently the meaning of partnership in resource development has taken on a broader concept not limited to describing merely those projects in which local interests and Federal interests share financing and responsibility. Partnership, according to the broader definition, means maximum utilization of the capacity of Federal, non-Federal, and private agencies.

The basic argument for partnership is that this policy of encouraging everyone to do as much as he can will remove any artificial limitation from the development of our resources. The antipartnership idea, which would restrict resource development to only that which might be undertaken by the Federal Government, would place a serious restriction on how far our country can progress.

Specifically, the question of Federal non-Federal cooperation and whether or not such an idea can be made to function can best be answered by pointing out that such cooperation has a long and successful history.

PARTNERSHIP IS NOT A NEW DEVELOPMENT

It should be made clear that partnership is not a new development in our country. As early as 1908, when Theodore Roosevelt was President, the Reclamation Bureau planned three small hydroelectric plants in connection with a Utah irrigation project in the Strawberry Valley. One, the first, was built by the Bureau and 2 by the water users. These plants are all operated by the local water users. This general plan was repeated at several other projects during the Taft and Wilson administrations.

In 1935, during the Roosevelt administration, the Kanawha Valley Power Co. became a partner with the Federal Government and installed the power facilities at a cost of $1,440,000 while the Federal expenditure was $3,269,000 for navigation facilities on the Kanawha River.

PARTNERSHIP DURING NEW DEAL DAYS

In the same year this private power company was a partner installing the

power facilities costing $1,403,000 at the Marmet lock and dam on the Kanawha River where the Federal cost was $3,566,000.

The New Deal also granted the same private utility a partnership power production license at the Winfield locks in West Virginia where the Federal cost was $6,340,000 and the cost to the utility $1,903,000.

The Roosevelt administration in 1941 approved a partnership at the Harry L. Englebright Reservoir project in California where the Federal cost was $4,003,000 and the cost to the partners for the installation of the power facilities was $1,500,000. The partners were private hydraulic mining interests and private utilities, the Sacramento Valley Utility Co. and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Under the Truman administration in July 1950, the Federal Government began replacement of a navigation lock and dam at St. Anthony Falls, Minn., which cost the Federal Government $9,743,000. The partnership was entered into with the private utility, Northern States Power Co., which remodeled and installed power facilities at a cost of $1,535,000.

It is important to note the number of these partnerships during the New Deal and Fair Deal administrations and that they were with privately owned utilities.

It seems to me that the reasoning of the Eisenhower administration on this matter is very sound—the Eisenhower administration advocates partnership power development with the Federal Government as a matter of policy and encourages publicly owned utilities in States, municipalities, and other subdivisions to enter into partnership arrangements and does not hold this field open solely for privately owned utilities.

POWER PROBLEM IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

It has been estimated that 25 million kilowatts of electric capacity economically could be constructed in the Columbia Basin. An additional 15 million kilowatts of very high cost hydro power could conceivably be installed sometime in the future.

The economic hydro potential in the Pacific Northwest has been approximately 20 percent developed. There is about 5 million kilowatts of installed hydro capacity now functioning in the region. Nearly 70 percent of this is contained in federally owned and operated plants.

Rapid population growth and the expansion of electrical use by all classes of consumers in the region have brought about a tremendous increase in the demand for power. The region now faces an unprecedented requirement for even more energy in the future.

Peak electric load for the area in 1920 was about 700,000 kilowatts. Since that time, there has been a continuous rise. In January 1954 the peak load had risen to 7,160,000 kilowatts, and in January 1955 it was 7,750,000 kilowatts.

Load estimates made by Federal and non-Federal utility systems in the region indicate that the requirements of the region will continue to grow in the future at a rate which equals or exceeds that of the past.

The total area requirement in 1961 will be 11,750,000 kilowatts; in 1964, 13,550,000 kilowatts, and in 1969 the load will be 19,150,000 kilowatts, nearly 12 million kilowatts more than is presently available.

POWER NEEDS IMMEDIATE

Construction of a major new hydroelectric project requires from 3 to 8 years, and the average construction period is 5 years. This means that the problems of 5 or 10 years must be faced at this time and that planning of future generation must begin immediately.

There are either under construction or definitely scheduled, projects which will provide enough energy to keep pace with the load growth until 1960–61. Unless other new projects are started immediately, however, the region will suffer critical shortages beginning in 1961–62, and the years following.

In order to assure carrying all loads in the years following 1961, nearly 1 million kilowatts of new capacity will be required in excess of that which is now under construction. By 1964, the requirement for additional resources will have risen to 2½ million kilowatts.

This means that during this period, there must be added to generating capacity of the region each year a new plant with the capacity equivalent to that of Bonneville Dam, i. e., 500,000 kilowatts.

MONEY REQUIREMENTS

All agencies which bear a share of the responsibility for providing electric energy to the people in the region are generally agreed on the area's predicted load requirements.

These utilities, public, private and Federal, also agree that the annual expenditure necessary to finance construction of projects which will supply this energy is in the neighborhood of $250 to $350 million.

An objective analysis of the situation establishes beyond question that this financial responsibility cannot be borne by any single class of utility now serving the Pacific Northwest.

Federal appropriations for water resources projects in the Pacific Northwest during the past 10 years have averaged 140 million dollars annually. This is less than half of the average annual requirement indicated for the future 10 years. There is no evidence that Federal appropriations in this field will be increased. There is, in fact, considerable evidence that such appropriations might be reduced below that level. The appropriation bill for 1956, for example, contained about $120 million for the purpose under discussion. This is $30 million below the 10-year average; is the smallest amount the region has received since 1948; and is $180 million less than the annual requirement.

WHY PARTNERSHIP?

In view of the staggering amount of money required to keep the Northwest even with its demands for electric power, it is obvious that the Federal Government cannot be expected to carry the entire burden. It is equally obvious that the non-Federal utilities in the region cannot assume the entire responsibility. What will be required is all hands participation by both the Federal Government and non-Federal agencies.

This then is the basis of the partnership program of the Eisenhower administration. The Federal Government will do what it can, and the non-Federal agencies must be encouraged and permitted to do what they can. In some cases, where a project especially lends itself to that type of development, the Federal Government and non-Federal agencies ought to cooperate in the construction or financing of such projects.

In view of the tremendous need for new projects in the region, projects which will require the annual expenditure of $250 to $350 million, it is urgent that the utilities in the area and the Federal Government each do its utmost to provide needed electric power.

It is to provide rapid, comprehensive, and adequate development of our resources that the Eisenhower partnership policy is directed. All of the major private utilities in the area, plus the city of Seattle, the city of Tacoma, the city of Eugene, Oreg., the Grant County PUD, and others, including the Bonneville Power Administration, have agreed that the adoption of this policy is the only way by which the Pacific Northwest can properly develop its water resources.

The success of this policy, however, can be measured only in terms of the new kilowatts it creates. Politics is of paramount importance to those who oppose this partnership program. They seem to be willing to sacrifice the welfare of the people for questionable political gain.

THE BLOCKADERS

Recently, one of our great Oregon daily newspapers applied the description of blockaders to the small group of public-power advocates who want total Federalized power—or nothing.

This small, but vocal segment of blockaders oppose partnership power development regardless of whether it is initiated by public or private power agencies.

This group still holds to the unrealistic concept that Uncle Sam should and must supply us with all the money we need to meet our growing power needs.

The blockaders believe that an all-Federal dam is wonderful, but a partnership dam is no good. They are fighting the municipal power operations. They fight the private companies. They will fight the public utility districts if they attempt to supply their own power needs.

The blockaders cannot seem to realize that the public today is not interested in an all-Federal-or-nothing battle. Their motheaten and dogeared battle cries today do not count any more. Kilowatts do. Apparently, everyone but the blockaders have learned this vital lesson.

The voters of the Northwest are not interested in an obstructionist idealogical battle. They know how critical are our power needs. And, these needs must be met by cooperative action. The Federal Government simply cannot do it all.

There is no question but that the partnership idea will work. The basic philosophy that people working together can accomplish more than people working separately has been demonstrated time and time again.

CURRENT PRESENT APPLICATION OF THE PARTNERSHIP

At the present time there are many proposals which fit into the general theme of partnership.

Among those which can be described as Federal-non-Federal cooperation, are several which have been enacted into law. These include the Priest Rapids development, the Markham Ferry project, and the Coosa River development.

Included among the proposals which are now being considered are Cougar, Green Peter, Trinity River, John Day, and Bruces Eddy.

ARGUMENTS FOR PARTNERSHIPS

First. It is the surest method by which the Pacific Northwest can get the electric power it needs, when needed.

Second. The requirements of the Pacific Northwest for additional electric power will be over 500,000 kilowatts per year for the next 10 years.

Third. The money requirements for this additional power will be nearly one million dollars per day, every day for the next 10 years.

Fourth. It is doubtful that this amount of money will be appropriated by Congress. It is more than twice as much as the average appropriation for the past 10 years and almost 80 percent of the total appropriation for public works in the entire United States.

Fifth. There is no reason for a public-versus-private-power dispute here. Many of the partners in the cooperative developments are public agencies. No one is suggesting that the Federal Government "get out of the power business." The partnership idea merely encourages and permits total cooperation in the responsibility for providing desperately needed power. Otherwise, we will experience crippling power shortages and brownouts.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BUSH (at the request of Mr. FENTON), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COON, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. MEADER, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. BYRD, for 10 minutes, on tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LANHAM and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDMONDSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHENCK.

Mr. KEARNS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENKINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COOPER and to include a press release issued by him today.

Mr. WICKERSHAM.

Mr. MEADER, to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MERROW in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COLMER (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) and to include a speech by Senator STENNIS.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3638. An act to promote foreign policy of the United States by amending the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1866. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas V. Compton;

H. R. 8123. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; and

H. R. 9390. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3255. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to preserve in certain cases the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees whose positions are placed in lower grades by virtue of reclassification actions under such act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8225. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Pipestone National Monument in the State of Minnesota; and

H. R. 9822. An act to provide for the establishment of a trout hatchery on the Davidson River in the Pisgah National Forest in North Carolina.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 7, 1956, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2, of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1931. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 3, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of Floyd River and its tributaries, Iowa, submitted in response to a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on March 29, 1944, requesting a review of reports on Floyd River, Iowa, with a view to determining if improvement in the interest of flood control is advisable at this time (H. Doc. No. 417); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with five illustrations.

1932. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 20, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a survey of Port Townsend, Wash., submitted under the authority of the River and Harbor Act approved on May 17, 1950, for a preliminary examination and survey of Port Townsend, Wash. (H. Doc. No. 418); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1933. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 5, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a survey of Amite River and tributaries, Louisiana. This report is submitted in final response to the authority for a preliminary examination and survey of Amite River and tributaries, Louisiana, for flood control and other purposes, contained in the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944. It is also submitted in partial response to the authority for preliminary examinations and surveys of Amite and Tangipahoa Rivers and tributaries, Louisiana, for flood control and other purposes, authorzied by the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 419); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1934. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1957 in the amount of $895,000 for the General Services Administration and the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 420); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1935. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend section 28 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1936. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting certification that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the land in the Ventura River project, and that the land to be irrigated is susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Seventeenth intermediate report on the General Accounting Office (Rept. No. 2264). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4652. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer certain property to the Panama Canal Company, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2265). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 6245. A bill to authorize the Panama Canal Company to convey to the Department of State an improved site in Colon, Republic of Panama; without amendment (Rept. No. 2266). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 9801. A bill to authorize and direct the Panama Canal Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over the Panama Canal at Balboa, C. Z.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2267). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 7811. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code by the addition of provisions relative the registration of the practice of architects and professional engineers; with amendment (Rept. No. 2268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 11619. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs and marihuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 11620. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs and marihuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 11621. A bill to modify and release certain conditions and limitations on the use and disposition of land conveyed to the town of Montgomery, W. Va., pursuant to the act of Congress approved June 14, 1938 (52 Stat. 675); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 11622. A bill to provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H. R. 11623. A bill to provide that veterans may continue to accrue eligibility for education under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 for so long as conscription continues, and that hereafter the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall pay tuition charges for veterans receiving education under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 11624. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 11625. A bill to prescribe administrative procedure for the government of the District of Columbia, to require the maintenance of an official publication for said government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 11626. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Western Research Laboratory for the study of animal disease at or near Montana State College; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 11627. A bill to authorize research by the Fish and Wildlife Service to determine methods of, and to provide for grants to the States to assist approved research or other projects for, control or extermination of sea nettles and jellyfish in marine waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 11628. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army in certain cases to undertake small river and harbor improvement projects not specifically authorized by Congress; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 11629. A bill authorizing retroactive payments in lieu of taxes by the Housing Authority of the city of Sacramento, Calif.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 11630. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, to provide nonoccupational group major medical expense insurance for Federal employees and their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 11631. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the life and perpetuate the ideals and teachings of Booker T. Washington" to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in connection with the celebration of the centennial anniversary of the birth of Booker T. Washington; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 11632. A bill to provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 11633. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, to provide nonoccupational group major medical expense insurance for Federal employees and their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 11634. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 11635. A bill to amend chapter 3 of title 18, United States Code, relating to animals, birds, and fish; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 11636. A bill to amend chapter 3 of title 18, United States Code, relating to animals, birds, and fish; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 11637. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 11638. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 11639. A bill relative to transfer of surplus property within the Fort Sill Indian School Reserve, Okla., to Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Tribes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. J. Res. 640. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Labor Racketeering; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. J. Res. 641. Joint resolution providing for a study of the possibility and desirability of establishing a University of the Americas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. Res. 524. Resolution disapproving the sale of the alcohol butadiene manufacturing facility at Louisville, Ky., Plancor No. 1207; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Res. 525. Resolution requesting the Secretary of Labor to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 11640. A bill for the relief of James D. Laingor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS of Tennessee:

H. R. 11641. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jane Henderson Cannon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. R. 11642. A bill for the relief of Erma Murer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 11643. A bill for the relief of Shmuel Zwi (Herman) Adler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 11644. A bill for the relief of Ennio Gerin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 11645. A bill for the relief of Chow Liang Ting-Wei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 11646. A bill for the relief of M. Neil Andrews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 11647. A bill for the relief of Raul Hernandez; to the committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 11648. A bill for the relief of Fred Chia-chun Hung and Hwa Ching (Lok) Hung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUCK:

H. R. 11649. A bill for the relief of Vasiliki Elefantis Kritselis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. J. Res. 642. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim certain property in Coahoma County, Miss., to the Home Demonstration Club of Rena Lara, Miss., Inc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1105. By Mr. RABAUT: Petition of F. E. Anderson, Detroit, Mich., containing the sig-

natures of 45 residents of Detroit urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1106. Also petition of Homer S. Bruce, Detroit, Mich., containing the signatures of 45 residents of Detroit urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows, and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1107. Also, petition of Frank A. Constable, Detroit, Mich., containing the signatures of 45 residents of Detroit urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows, and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1108. Also, petition of Alfred Hanson, Harper Woods, Mich., containing the signatures of 45 residents of Detroit urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows, and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1109. Also, 3 petitions from Peter E. Harris, Detroit, Mich., containing the signatures of 135 Detroit residents urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1110. Also, petition of Fred W. Keat, Detroit, Mich., containing the signatures of 27 residents of Detroit urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows, and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1111. Also, petition of Fred Kohn, Detroit, Mich., containing the signatures of 45 Detroit residents urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows, and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1112. Also, petition of George A. Miller, Detroit, Mich., containing the signatures of 45 residents of Detroit urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1113. Also, petition of Joseph A. Schiappacasse, 2505 Baldwin Avenue, Detroit, Mich., containing the signatures of 45 residents of Detroit urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows, and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1114. Also, petition of William J. Schwartz, Detroit, Mich., containing the signatures of 45 residents of Detroit urging immediate enactment of separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1115. Also, 2 petitions from the Eddie Stinson Post 2407, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Detroit, Mich., containing the signatures of 90 residents of Detroit urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows, and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1116. Also, petition of George W. Zedd, Detroit, Mich., containing the signatures of 47 Detroit residents, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows, and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1117. By Mr. SILER: Petitions of 4,484 residents of the counties of Ashtabula, Butler, Carroll, Champaign, Clark, Clermont, Clinton, Columbiana, Crawford, Cuyahoga, Defiance, Delaware, Fayette, Franklin, Fulton, Greene, Guernsey, Hamilton, Hancock, Allen, Lucas, Highland, Huron, Jefferson, Licking, Logan, Lorain, Mahoning, Marian, Miami, Morgan, Muskingum, Perry, Ross, Sandusky, Seneca, Stark, Summit, Trumbull, Tuscarawas, Union, Warren, Wayne, Wood, and Wyandot, Ohio, urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1118. Also, petitions of Margaret C. Smith, Kentucky legislative representative, BRC, and some 227 other residents of Louisville, Ky., and that area, urging enactment of H. R. 10578 and H. R. 9065, to help relieve the economic distress of railroad people dependent upon annuities for their sustenance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1119. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry J. Molony, and others, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging the adoption of the proposed Bow amendment to the Mutual Security Act (H. R. 11356); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, at De Pere, Wis., Memorial Day Patriotic Observance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a Memorial Day address I delivered on May 30, at the De Pere, Wis., patriotic observance.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULFILLING THE MEANING OF MEMORIAL DAY, 1956: MORE B–52's, B–47's, GUIDED MISSILES ESSENTIAL NOW FOR OUR DEFENSE

(Excerpts of address delivered by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, at De Pere, Wis., patriotic observance, May 30, 1956)

Today, we decorate the graves of America's heroes of its past conflicts.

We lay flowers—in fact and in spirit—on the final resting places of those who made the supreme sacrifice that this Republic might endure.

We witness the proud marching formations of America's uniformed servicemen—the minutemen of defense of the atomic age.

HONORING HEROES WITH DEEDS

But I know that all who are in this audience would agree with me today on this: If we are truly to decorate the final resting places of our honored dead, if we are truly to cooperate with our Armed Forces, we must do so with constructive deeds, and not mere words, however sincere as truly those words are.

The challenge is, therefore, for everyone who is grateful to the heroes of Memorial Day—to rise to his or her own responsibility to help defend our beloved land.

FOUR-POINT PROGRAM OF DEFENSE

I should like to suggest a 4-point program by which we may prove worthy of the tradition which they left us.

1. Our first step is to protect this Republic from the menace from within.

That means promoting real brotherhood in America. It means strengthening the legislation by which we cope with the subversive, troublemaking forces in our midst.

Thus, a number of important anti-Communist bills are now pending before the Congress, including legislation to tighten penalties against seditious conspiracy (which I personally have cosponsored). This legislation must be enacted before Congress adjourns.

2. As a second step, we must fulfill our deep obligations to the Nation's 22 million exservicemen, and their families. Calvin Coolidge once stated, "A nation which forgets its defenders will itself be forgotten."

We must make sure that the compensation and pensions which our veterans have earned by their deeds of valor remain intact and are improved. We must make sure that pensions are brought up to date, are modernized wherever inflation may have so depreciated their purchasing power as to make them currently inadequate.

3. Our third step is to make sure that we are today thoroughly informed of the Soviet military danger to our country, and (4) that we are thoroughly prepared against it.

In past times, as you and I know, we did not need to concern ourselves with what was occurring beyond the broad Atlantic and Pacific Oceans—on foreign shores.

We Americans are, after all, not meddlers. We do not and did not believe in interfering in other people's problems.

OUR NEARNESS TO THE ENEMY

But in 1941, a ruthless enemy streaked thousands of miles across the Pacific, and, on a quiet Sabbath morning, blasted the American flag at Pearl Harbor. And so, with World War II, the age of America's isolation drew to a close.

Today, every single newspaper, every radio broadcast and telecast confirms our nearness to the world—our nearness to a still more ruthless foe, the atheistic force of aggressive communism.

Already, 900 million people are in its iron grip, and it reaches hungrily for the one-third of the world which is still free and which is committed against it. It reaches as well for the so-called neutral one-third of the world.

COMMUNISM'S LETHAL CLAWS

Its reach has deadly claws—super-modern intercontinental bombers, 400 submarines, fast developing missiles, the largest ground forces in the world.

Under these circumstances, it would be tragic folly if we lagged in our own defense. We must and will therefore step up our production of B–52's, of B–47's, of guided and ballistic missiles and every other weapon of offense and defense, including protection devices for our own cities.

OUR DEFENSE PACE MUST BE SPEEDED UP

We are definitely not doing enough right now. Despite the best of intentions and the

best of military leadership, we are not advancing our defenses and our research at the necessary pace.

Remember, at this very minute, we here in De Pere are but a half-dozen hours away from jet bases in Soviet Siberia. Moreover, the Communists are on their way to developing an intercontinental guided missile which will bring us within 30 minutes' time of the Red rocket launching sites.

Under these circumstances, we dare not be uninformed, and we dare not be unprepared—or second best.

PRESERVE OUTER RAMPARTS

Throughout the world, we have erected outer ramparts of defense. Why?

So as to protect the weak and helpless. Moreover, our aim is simultaneously to keep the potential battlefield as far from our own shores as possible.

I am sure that everyone in this audience will agree, that if war should come, we would prefer not to have to fight it on our own continent, if possible. We would prefer to fight it at far distances from our own land.

And so we have erected these outer ramparts of our defense—far-flung ramparts on Formosa, on Okinawa, Iceland, Greenland, North Africa and elsewhere in the world. These ramparts are today threatened—not only from without but from within. In many places, Communist agitators are at work trying to stir up hatred so as to kick us out of our outer defenses. The Reds are trying to force us back to our own land, so as to reduce our overseas air bases and so as to make us more vulnerable to direct attack.

But, in cooperation with our friends, we must protect our outer ramparts. Our bases must remain intact.

Consider this analogy: There is no one in this audience today who has not seen fire engines rushing across town in order to put out a blaze before it reaches our own home.

So, today, we and our allies have set up an international fire department to try to put out blazes before they get to our shores. We have made military pacts with 45 nations to protect them and to protect ourselves from the Communist arsonists. Only a fool would sit back in his own home and ignore a fire, simply because it seems small and because it is still on the other side of the town. Once a fire breaks out, however small—once it goes unchecked—then every house everywhere is endangered.

COMMUNISM HAS NOT CHANGED

Today, communism—despite Joseph Stalin's death and the so-called Soviet new look—is still a form of deadly arson. Communist arosnists, firebugs, are lighting flames in north Africa, in south Asia, and elsewhere.

Meanwhile, they are spreading the false line that Soviet communism has actually changed for the better. They have denounced the memory of Joseph Stalin, but they have not denounced Stalinism.

They have not denounced the slaughter of Polish soldiers in the Katyn Forest or the mass murder of millions of Russian peasants in the mania for collectivization.

Moreover, they have not freed Poland or East Germany or the Balkans or the Baltics.

Why then should we accept their sirupy words at face value. Why should we be so naive as to swallow their lies?

We dare not be; we must not be; we will not be naive.

CONCLUSION

And so, under these circumstances, we must be both well-informed and well-prepared against the Communist menace.

By fulfilling a comprehensive program of defense, we will, in truth and in action, honor America's war dead.

If our heroes of the Civil War, of the Spanish-American War, of World Wars I and II, and the Korean conflict, could arise, they might say this: "We are grateful for your remembering us, but do not honor us with lip service; do not simply praise us with words. Praise us by your deeds. Preserve the Republic for which we died. Give to it your all, as we did. Make any sacrifice, financial or other, so that Old Glory will keep flying. Support the National Guard; support the Reserve; support the Armed Forces of our country—keep the Stars and Stripes proudly aloft forever."

This then, is the message of the heroes of Memorial Day in the year 1956, the 11th year of the Atomic Age.

Results of the 1956 Poll for the Fourth Congressional District of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks I have been conducting a poll of my constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of New Jersey. This was done to ascertain their opinions on the many important issues facing the Nation on which Congress will be called upon to make decisions.

This poll was mailed to a cross section of the voters in my district representing all shades of political opinion. The response was quite good, indicating a freshening of interest in national political issues in this election year. Significantly, of those answering the poll, the two questions receiving the greatest number of "Yes" or "No" answers as opposed to "No response" were those dealing with the deepening of the Delaware River Channel to Trenton from Philadelphia and the question of governmental sponsorship of a flood-insurance program. The question on which those polled showed least interest was that dealing with the Taft-Hartley Act.

I feel that the results of this poll will be of interest to my colleagues in the House of Representatives, and I include as a part of my remarks the questions which were asked, together with a breakdown by percentages of the responses I received. These percentages are based on a total return of 5,387 questionnaires. The results follow:

Questions	Percent							
	Total		Democrat		Republican		Independent	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Do you think Congress should set up a system of flood insurance so long as private companies are unable to provide it?	78	22	87	13	71	29	76	24
2. Charges have been made that Federal and State authorities have been lax in preventing the denial of civil rights for minority groups, including preventing Negroes from voting. Do you think Congress should establish a bipartisan commission to investigate these charges?	72	28	73	27	62	38	81	19
3. Do you think Congress should investigate possible abuses of union welfare funds to see whether legislation is needed to protect the contributors?	89	11	88	12	90	10	91	9
4. Do you think Congress should support the President's recommendation for a 1-cent increase in 1st-class mail rates to reduce postal service deficits?	62	38	54	46	67	33	64	36
5. What policy should Congress follow toward immigration:								
(a) Reduce present yearly quotas?	34	xxx	38	xxx	31	xxx	33	xxx
(b) No change in present law?	19	xxx	20	xxx	24	xxx	14	xxx
(c) Increase in present quotas along the lines recommended by the President?	25	xxx	15	xxx	33	xxx	28	xxx
(d) Replace present quota system with one not based on national origins?	22	xxx	27	xxx	12	xxx	25	xxx
6. Farm prices and income have been dropping. Do you think Congress should increase Federal spending this year to help farmers cut back surplus production?	55	45	70	30	49	51	47	53
7. What policy should Congress follow regarding the Taft-Hartley law:								
(a) No changes?	31	xxx	18	xxx	40	xxx	35	xxx
(b) Remove injustices claimed by union leaders?	21	xxx	29	xxx	11	xxx	23	xxx
(c) Put greater restrictions on labor unions?	30	xxx	20	xxx	40	xxx	29	xxx
(d) Repeal the law?	18	xxx	33	xxx	9	xxx	13	xxx
8. Do you think Congress should establish a Presidential fund for sending outstanding representatives of American culture—art, music, literature, education, industry, etc.—abroad on good-will tours?	54	46	59	41	47	53	54	46
9. What policy should Congress follow on public housing for low income groups:								
(a) Build less public housing?	11	xxx	06	xxx	12	xxx	14	xxx
(b) Build more public housing?	36	xxx	49	xxx	25	xxx	36	xxx
(c) Stop building public housing?	15	xxx	08	xxx	21	xxx	15	xxx
(d) Continue to build public housing at the present rate?	38	xxx	37	xxx	42	xxx	35	xxx
10. Do you favor reduction of the national debt, even if it means no tax cut this year?	83	17	70	30	90	10	90	10
11. What policy should Congress follow on economic aid to other countries?								
(a) Increase aid?	14	xxx	15	xxx	10	xxx	18	xxx
(b) Decrease aid?	32	xxx	32	xxx	35	xxx	29	xxx
(c) Keep aid at present level?	38	xxx	38	xxx	42	xxx	33	xxx
(d) Stop all aid?	16	xxx	15	xxx	13	xxx	20	xxx
12. Do you favor deepening the Delaware River Channel to Trenton?	91	09	95	05	86	14	90	10

NOTE.—Party percentages for those answering poll: Democrats, 43 percent; Republicans, 32 percent; Independent, 25 percent.

Memorial Day Address of Hon. Chester E. Merrow, of New Hampshire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the Memorial Day address which I delivered in Rochester, N. H., on May 30, 1956:

Ladies and gentlemen, I was glad to receive an invitation from my good friend Dick Cooper to speak here in Rochester at these Memorial Day exercises. I have been here on several occasions and it is always a pleasure to participate in Memorial Day ceremonies in your city.

SIGNIFICANCE OF MEMORIAL DAY

Today is one of the most significant days of the year. It is Memorial Day and we have gathered here to pay tribute to our honored dead who have made the supreme sacrifice that this Republic may live and to honor those still among us who have borne the strife of battle for the glory of our country. By appropriate ceremonies which are being held in every portion of this great free land, we commemorate the valor and the sacrifice of the veterans of all our wars, from the Revolution to the conflict in Korea.

Although Memorial Day came into existence folowing the Civil War, it is fitting and proper that we remember all those who have died for the United States of America from the earliest days of this great Nation to the present hour. We think, today, of those who have fought and bled and died that the people of this Nation may be free. In retrospect our minds turn to the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, the First World War, the Second World War, Korea, and all the other wars in which our country has been engaged. We know that because of these struggles and the great, decisive victories which were achieved, we live in the finest Nation on earth and in the world's greatest citadel of democracy the world has ever known.

IN COMMEMORATION

At this season of the year, we commemorate the valiant deeds of our fallen heroes by placing American flags above their graves, by heaping beautiful floral tributes on their last resting places, by Memorial Day parades, by statements and speeches apropos to this occasion, and by appropriate ceremonies, religious services and affairs such as these in which we are participating. How feeble our attempts to do them honor when what they did and what they have accomplished speaks far more eloquently than anything which may be said on this Memorial Day in 1956.

A DAY OF DEDICATION

Not only is this a day of doing honor and paying tribute—not only is this a day when we recall with ever-deepening pride the many valorous acts performed by so many patriotic Americans on the battlefields throughout the world. Actually this is a day of dedication. We dedicate our minds, our hearts, and our lives to the cause for which so much has been sacrificed.

A day of tribute and a day of dedication. This is the abiding and eternal theme of Memorial Day ceremonies. As Abraham Lincoln said: "It is for us the living rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus so far nobly advanced." These words are eminently applicable at this hour. What is the work our honored dead of all wars have thus so far nobly advanced? It is the work of preserving the American heritage of freedom. It is the work of building a constantly better democratic society. It is, today in the middle of the 20th century, the work of world leadership among the nations of the free world. It is the work of continuing with unabated and unrelenting vigor the struggle against the diabolic forces of Communist tyranny until freedom is known to all men around the globe.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PRESENT WORLD

We live in a world of illimitable power and in a world which is sharply divided between the free and the enslaved. On May 21 the United States Air Force dropped a hydrogen bomb over a desolate area in the Pacific. The explosion which followed dwarfed all previous man-made explosions. It was by far the most stupendous release of energy that man has ever made. Forty miles from the explosion the luminosity exceeded 500 suns. The power of this bomb was from 15 to 20 megatons—a megaton being the equivalent of a million tons of TNT.

Tremendous power is within our hands and in my opinion, with this power we are in a position to give leadership in a world gravely dangerous. This power has terrifyingly augmented our responsibility.

This is a divided world. The tyranny of communism seeks to annihilate freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of religion and the opportunity of the individual to develop according to his innate ability. The issue confronting us was well stated in what is now known as the famous Declaration of Washington issued on February 1 by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Anthony Eden and President Eisenhower. They stated: "We are conscious that in this year 1956 there still rages the age old struggle between those who believe that man has his origin and destiny in God and those who treat man as if he were destined merely to serve a state machine." We propose to win this struggle. We must and we are determined to win this struggle.

RESOLVE TO KEEP THE FAITH

The United States is the indisputable leader of the free world in this universal struggle to ensure the continuation and the spread of freedom. In this world of power and Communist tyranny, we must ever be on the alert and constantly rededicate ourselves to the cause for which our honored heroes of all wars sacrificed so much — many of whom have given the "last full measure of devotion." We must not be misled by the blandishments of communism and by the new tactics of the Soviet Union—by their soft words and by their fabrications. Their fundamental principle is the same. They seek to destroy the free world. I am glad that the House of Representatives on May 10 passed a military apropriation bill amounting to $33,635,066,000 by an overwhelming vote of 377 to 0. This certainly is one resounding answer to the Communist endeavor to subjugate the world. It is telling evidence that we are not going to be deceived by their change of tactics which are designed to accomplish their nefarious goals.

On this Memorial Day in 1956 we recognize that our heritage of freedom and democracy so dearly bought by blood and sacrifice is in danger if we do not remain constantly alert, vigilant and adequately prepared for any emergency. We are fully aware that we face one of the gravest and most sinister challenges to human liberty that free men have ever experienced. We can best do honor and pay tribute to those who have fought in the wars of our country by being firmly resolved that we will rise to the occasion of world leadership, that we will employ our strength and our influence in exercising this leadership in the military field, the economic field, through the United Nations and its associated agencies and that we will give leadership spiritually—steadfastly determined that we will keep the faith with those who have maintained the republic on many a bloody battlefield throughout our history. This is a day of consecrated dedication—a day in which we evaluate the current struggle—a day in which we will endeavor to envision the future—and a day of firm resolution to be successful in the endeavor to maintain and add to our heritage of freedom.

Much has been accomplished but there is much to be achieved. As we contemplate our objectives we know full well that in their realization the accomplishments of the future will be something of which all Americans can be proud. Ours is a civilization based on religious faith. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in a speech to the 4-H Club in Chicago on November 29, 1954, said: "The reality of the matter is that the United States, by every standard of measure, is the world's greatest power not only materially but spiritually. We have national policies which are clear and sound. They fit a civilization based on religious faith."

We say to our honored dead and to those who have fought that this Nation may live: Our faith in the ideas and the ideals for which you sacrificed so much is a living, vital force as we seek to solve the problems that confront us. We believe today as you believe, in the achievement of a better way of life for men, women, and children wherever they may live. We accept the challenge on this Memorial Day in 1956. We will preserve our heritage against the ruthless and unconscionable tyranny of Communism and with zealousness we will seize the opportunity to give leadership in building a better world. We say to all those whom we are honoring today, we derive inspiration from what you have done and we hasten to exercise our leadership in the many phases of world affairs by rededicating ourselves to the ideas and the ideals which have made this Republic what it is—the ideas and the ideals which are the core of democracy and for which you have fought unflinchingly with no thought of self. We pledge our determination to carry on the work which you "have thus far so nobly advanced" and we pledge to you that in the years which are given to us, we will continue to strive as you have striven to bring into existence the realization of the very thing for which you have prayed and we are praying: "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven."

Vote, It Is Your Patriotic Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, we should make a start in taking an earnest interest in self-rule, and thereby insure for the future generations the implanting of a mighty good habit—that of being a real good citizen. It is a serious responsibility to be a citizen. Your first ethical duty in the field of public service is your duty as a voter. Use, protect, and cherish this right.

If we are to maintain a government of the people, by the people, and for the

people, we must vote. Democracy depends upon it. A democracy is a group of people who get together in a common enterprise for the purpose of governing themselves.

Registered adult citizens, regardless of property or poverty, may vote. Our wishes can be best expressed through the ballot. You do not have to be a king or of nobility to have a part in our Government.

We, as American voters, should not be derelict in our duty, and we must not be negligent about taking part in our elections. Under a democratic system of government like ours, the character of the Government is largely what the voters make it. Every voter is a part of the Government. As such, he has a distinct moral duty to exercise his franchise in such a manner as to bring about the best welfare of the Nation as a whole.

As a result of 50 years of agitation by those who felt that the discrimination against women was unjust and unreasonable the 19th amendment to the Constitution was adopted, giving women equal suffrage with men. Since then women have taken a deep interest in elections.

You mothers, fathers, wives, sweethearts, and relatives of veterans, should remember that the ballot is just as essential to the maintenance of good government in time of war and peace as arms and a willing soldier in time of war, especially when our servicemen have been sacrificing their lives for the freedoms we enjoy.

There should be no indifference on our part. If popular government is to be a success, we must have an electorate, not only intelligent and honest but also wide awake and vigilant at all times.

Among the greatest dangers of popular government are indifference and neglect on the part of voters. We should be greatly concerned about the failure of our friends to vote. You should contribute your share by going to the polls and voting and urging your neighbors to do likewise.

We have no right to criticize unless we do take part in elections. To fully participate in the official activities of our Government is a patriotic duty, privilege, and opportunity no citizen can afford to shirk because the majority rule is determined by the will of the people.

Schenck To Confer With Residents of His District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, it is my great privilege and honor to represent the people of the Third District of Ohio here in the Congress of the United States. I am humbly grateful for this opportunity to be of service, and it is my constant aim to serve my constituents in the very best way possible. As their Representative in Congress it has been my constant policy to keep in close contact with the people of the Third District so that I may know how they feel about the many important issues facing us here in Congress.

Our Third District is the largest congressional district in Ohio and one of the largest in the United States. Its great importance, however, is not dependent on size alone, but rather on the outstanding contributions of its fine citizens to the general welfare of our Nation. Not only is it the birthplace and cradle of aviation, but many of its other products and inventions are serving people throughout the world. Our people are highly skilled in many ways, and we have a district in which scientific projects, manufacturing, and agriculture are developed to an unusually high degree. As the Representative of this great district, I have considered it my duty not only to be well informed of the opinions of my constituents, but also to be of the greatest possible service to persons having problems dealing with agencies or departments of our Federal Government.

Five years ago I initiated the idea of holding "grassroots conferences" throughout our district, and I have continued this practice each year during the time Congress is in adjournment. I also have a full-time congressional service office at the United States Post Office Building, in Dayton, where I can meet with people personally at any time that my official duties permit me to return to the district.

During the time I am in Washington, attending to legislative and official duties, a competent secretary is in charge of my district service office to assist callers and to help them with requests for aid in dealing with the Federal Government so that I can be of every proper assistance to them.

In these ways I have sincerely tried to keep well informed as to the personal opinions of my constituents, and I have also tried continuously and sincerely to be of every proper service to them.

Members of Congress are constantly called upon to give careful and earnest consideration to legislation dealing with many complex national and international problems. These day-to-day decisions often affect the lives and living of every citizen in our Nation. Consequently, these personal and private conferences help me to serve all of the people in my district in a much more effective manner.

This year during our official congressional recess, I am again taking time to hold these "grassroots conferences" throughout our district at convenient public buildings. I deeply appreciate the fine cooperation of the many officials who have made these meeting places available to me as an aid in rendering this public service.

This is the schedule I have arranged:

Dayton Post Office, room 314: September 10 and 11, 9 a. m. to 4 p. m.

Miamisburg City Building: September 13, 4 p. m. to 8 p. m.

Germantown City Building: September 14, 4 p. m. to 8 p. m.

Hamilton Court House: September 17 and 18, 9 a. m. to 4 p. m.

Middletown American Legion, 116 South Main Street: September 19 and 20, 9 a. m. to 4 p. m.

Oxford Municipal Building: September 21, 4 p. m. to 8 p. m.

Fairfield, Butler County, City Building: September 22, 4 p. m. to 8 p. m.

Brookville City Building: September 24, 4 p. m. to 8 p. m.

Each year an increasing number of our folks have visited with me at these conferences, and the attendance has been most encouraging. It is sometimes surprising to see how much can really be accomplished when a citizen and his Congressman can sit down face to face and talk over problems of national concern.

Special appointments are not necessary for these conferences, and I sincerely urge individuals or groups to meet with me on the date and at the place most convenient to them. The knowledge obtained through those "grass roots conferences" will help me to render better service—both legislative and personal—to all of the people of our important Third District here in the Congress of the United States.

Proposed Changes In Excise Tax Administrative Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERE COOPER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means today resumed consideration of the report of the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems. As I have done in the past, I will insert in the RECORD at this point a release which I issued as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to the action taken by the committee today.

The committee will meet in executive session on Friday, June 8, 1956, to resume consideration of the subcommittee's report, as set forth in the press release:

CHAIRMAN JERE COOPER OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS ANNOUNCES TENTATIVE DECISIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXCISE TAX TECHNICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS

The Honorable JERE COOPER, Democrat, of Tennessee, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, announces the tentative decisions reached today by the committee with respect to the recommendations contained in the report of the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems. Previous announcements with respect to earlier decisions of the committee were issued on May 10, 14, 16, and 17, 1956. These announcements are printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS for May 10, 15, 16, and 17, 1956, and appear on pages A3818, A3918, A3965, and A4020, respectively.

Chairman COOPER stated that the committee would resume its consideration of the subcommittee's report in executive session at 10 a. m., on Friday, June 8, 1956. A table

of revenue estimates relating to the subcommittee's recommendations is printed in the subcommittee report, beginning on page 13. A more detailed explanation of the recommendations appears in the subcommittee report beginning on page 16. The decisions reached by the committee today are as follows:

XI. TOBACCO AND ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE TAXES

1 through 3. The committee deferred further action with respect to these paragraphs until Friday, June 8, 1956, at 10 a. m.

4. Cigar manufacturers should be authorized by the Treasury Department to shift over to a daily return basis for reporting receipts. This should be optional with each manufacturer and should be effective July 1, 1956.

5. Refunds or credits for the tax attributable to losses of distilled spirits, beer and wine in a disaster, as declared by the President, should be made available directly to retail liquor and beer dealers as well as to manufacturers and wholesalers.

6. The phrase limiting refunds or credits in the case of alcoholic beverage or tobacco product losses attributable to a disaster, to the tax paid on products condemned by a "duly authorized health official of the United States or of a State" should be broadened to include health and police officials of cities and towns.

7. Refunds or credits in the case of the tax paid with respect to losses of alcoholic beverages or tobacco products in the floods and hurricanes on the east coast of the United States in 1955 should be made available in the same manner as is proposed for the future where a disaster is declared by the President. In addition, the committee adopted an amendment to allow refunds for beer lost, destroyed, or condemned as a result of the Mississippi and Missouri Valley floods of 1951, along the line of the refunds already allowed as a result of those floods in the case of distilled spirits.

8. The committee deleted the subcommittee recommendation which would have disapproved a proposal included in the ATTD revision which would extend to breweries operated by different corporations the right to transfer beer from the plant of one corporation to the plant of another corporation if the controlling interests in each of the corporations is owned by the same person or persons.

9. Under present law a drawback is provided under the distilled spirits tax with respect to $9.50 of the total tax of $10.50 in the case of spirits used in the manufacture of medicines, medicinal preparations, food products, flavors, or flavoring extracts which are unfit for beverage purposes. The language of the drawback provision should be changed to provide a refund of all but $1 of the distilled spirits tax, so this provision will not need to be changed with each change in the distilled spirits tax.

10. Provision should be made for the tax-free withdrawal from bond of alcohol for any pathological laboratory exclusively engaged in making analyses, or tests, for hospitals or sanitariums.

11. The right of the Treasury Department to waive the application of any internal revenue provisions relating to distilled spirits (except the taxes) where the Secretary of the Treasury deems it desirable from the standpoint of national defense expires July 11, 1956. The committee acted to extend this authority for 3 years to July 10, 1959.

XII. ADMINISTRATIVE

Action by the committee with respect to recommendations 1 through 3 of the subcommittee was deferred pending receipt of a report from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue on the information covered by these recommendations. It is expected that this report will be available by June 15, 1956.

XIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

The committee took no action at this time with respect to matters referred to in this section of the subcommittee report.

XIV. MANUFACTURERS' EXCISES

The committee acted to reconsider its previous action with respect to recommendation 11 (f) under section I, Manufacturers' Excises. This recommendation as previously approved by the committee would impose on tubeless tires a tax rate 1 cent a pound higher than tires requiring separate inner-tubes. The effect of the committee's action today is to delete this recommendation.

The committee adjourned to meet again in executive session at 10 a. m., June 8, 1956, at which time consideration will be given to recommendations 1 through 3 in section XI of the report pertaining to tobacco and alcoholic beverages taxes. Following the consideration of these recommendations, the committee will give consideration to those recommendations which had previously been passed over by the committee.

Congressional Secretaries To Visit New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, June 8, 9, and 10, the Congressional Secretaries Club, which includes the secretaries of nearly all Members of Congress, are making their annual trip to New York City. This annual pilgrimage has become traditional with our secretaries. Since I have the honor to represent a sizable portion of our fair city in the United States Congress, and since a large number of the secretaries making this trip are my personal friends, I want to extend a very hearty welcome to them and my sincerest wishes for a most enjoyable visit in New York.

I am naturally very proud of our great city of New York. I think it is about the greatest place in all the world, and there is no equal to it. I am also very proud of our employees here at the Capitol who assist us so ably in taking care of the needs of our constituents back home. Therefore, it is my distinct pleasure to welcome the "best" to the "best."

Mr. Speaker, as you and all our colleagues know, the Congressional Secretaries Club was formed in 1935 for the purpose of helping to obtain information so that the secretaries could better serve their Congressmen. The organization has grown from 25 members at the first meeting in 1935 to over 1,200 members last year. Practically every congressional and senatorial office is represented in the club by one or more of its staff members.

This year's trip has been arranged with the kind cooperation of my good friend Milton H. Berger, one of the most outstanding public relations men in New York, whose efforts have always been directed towards the public good and the welfare of the Nation. He has been extremely helpful in setting up part of the itinerary, particularly the visit to Steeplechase Park in Coney Island, which is often described as the "Playground of the World."

The visit to Steeplechase Park is scheduled for Sunday, June 10, and this means fun in the sun, hot dogs, cotton candy and the like for the entire party. Mr. Berger has reserved combination tickets free for the entire group, including the amusement rides, food, and soft drinks.

I believe it is of interest to note that Steeplechase Park, which opened on May 19, is now in its 60th year of existence. It was founded by the late George C. Tilyou, one of America's greatest showmen. This amusement mecca for millions covers 25 acres in Coney Island and employs a crew of over 350 men to operate the park and its numerous rides and other attractions.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert at this point the itinerary of the Congressional Secretaries Club during the coming weekend:

CONGRESSIONAL SECRETARIES ANNUAL TRIP TO NEW YORK, JUNE 8, 9, 10

This is the complete itinerary as to the time of each of the planned functions. The time given is the departure time and it is suggested that you be a few minutes early on each occasion in order not to be left.

FRIDAY, JUNE 8

9:45 a. m., District of Columbia time: Special train will leave by B. & O. from Union Station. Sign will be on gate. Mr. Bob Petzold, of B. & O., will be with us the entire trip for any service he can render. Luncheon will be served on the train.

1:45 p. m.: Arrive at Jersey City. Board buses for transportation to Hotel Governor Clinton, 7th Avenue at 31st Street. Hotel rooms will be assigned on train and it is urged that each person mark their name and room number on the baggage stubs which will be given them on train in order that bag may be placed in room on arrival at hotel.

3:30–5 p. m.: Cocktail party by Frank L. Sundstrom, of Schenley Industries, Inc., on the 37th floor of the Empire State Building, 350 Fifth Avenue. Tickets for the observation tower of the Empire State Building will be available for those who wish to visit the observation tower through the courtesy of Mr. Sundstrom. Transportation will not be furnished as Empire State Building is only 3½ blocks from Hotel Governor Clinton. Arrive at your leisure.

5 p. m.: Leave by bus from Empire State Building for Whitehall Club, 17 Battery Place, Manhattan, for cocktail party as the guests of the United States Lines. Buses returning to the hotel will leave at 7 o'clock from the Whitehall Club.

Rest of Friday evening open.

SATURDAY, JUNE 9

8:30 a. m. Buses will leave Hotel Governor Clinton at 8:30 for B. Altman's Department Store for breakfast and style show for ladies only. The show and breakfast will be in the beautiful Charleston Garden Restaurant at 9 o'clock. Charge of $1 additional is required for payment of breakfast. Corsage and door prizes will be given. After style show you will have free time for shopping, etc., until 12. Independent transportation back to hotel.

12:15 p. m.: Buses will leave Governor Clinton for pier 1, North River, Manhattan, to embark on Coast Guard cutter for cruise around Manhattan Island, and luncheon. Lt. Cmdr. Frederick Goettel will be acting commanding officer. Those having tickets

to Perry Como dress rehearsal will debark by tug at pier 9. Others will continue to pier 1 and debark. Buses will take both parties to their destination.

Rest of Saturday evening open.

SUNDAY, JUNE 10

11 a. m.: Brunch at Governor Clinton Hotel.

12 noon: Those in party desiring to do so may visit Steeple Chase Park, Coney Island, through the courtesy of Mr. Milton Berger of that company. Tickets have been reserved for our entire group and should be requested upon arriving at the ticket office at Steeple Chase Park. They are being given a complete list of members and guests on the trip. To get to Steeple Chase Park, Coney Island, walk east to 33d and Broadway. Take BMT downtown express to Coney Island (ask subway cashier for route number of train). It is estimated that it will take 45 minutes each way. It is suggested, therefore, that those going to Coney Island leave by 3:30 in order to check out of the hotel and board last bus which leaves at 4:45.

4:45 p. m.: Board bus for Jersey City. Train leaves at 5:45. Dinner will be served on train and is included in your ticket.

9:45 p. m.: Special train arrives in Washington, D. C.

Those having tickets to Steve Allen show, "Tonight," Friday night, are required to be in the Hudson Theater, 141 West 44th Street, at least by 10:45. The shows lasts 1 hour and 30 minutes.

Those having tickets for the Perry Como dress rehearsal Saturday afternoon are required to be at the Century Theater, 57th Street and 7th Avenue, by 4:45. As we only obtained 100 tickets to each of the above shows, members can choose which show they wish to attend as long as tickets last. Tickets for these shows will be distributed by Bob Petzold at the Whitehall Club cocktail party.

Tickets to Radio City Music Hall and Roxy Theater will also be available when we get to New York.

Your tickets cover cost of hotel room. However, upon checking out please see cashier and pay incidentals such as telephone calls, room service, etc.

We will see that your bags are placed in your room upon arrival, but it is up to you to see that your bag is placed on bus when you check out. Customary tip is 25 cents per bag.

Buses are furnished to us by the courtesy of Mr. John E. McCarthy, president, New York City Omnibus Corp.

LONG-RANGE WEATHER FORECAST

New York City temperatures will average near or a little below normal. The highest temperature will be near 80° and the lowest near 63. Friday will be warmer, turning a little cooler late Saturday or Sunday. Scattered showers Saturday or Sunday. Not more than one-fourth inch precipitation expected.

Soil-Bank Plans Need Clarifying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, most members of the Oklahoma delegation are deeply concerned by the uncertainty in the Department of Agriculture concerning the soil-bank program.

Yesterday we read in the press a report on Secretary Benson's speech in Wisconsin which indicated that only limited use of the soil bank could be expected in drought and flood damaged areas. The reason given was the Secretary's desire to get a dollar's worth of value out of every dollar invested in the soil bank.

Today we read that the Senate Majority Leader has been advised by the department that no soil-bank applications will be accepted before June 15, although we had been promised "immediate" inauguration of the program once enacted.

A Member of this House on the minority side, who has read the full text of the Secretary's Wisconsin speech, today assured me that Mr. Benson did not in any way intend to curtail the soil-bank program in drought or flood areas, but merely stated it was not intended as a "relief" program.

According to this colleague, a farmer in a drought or flood area will be given the same opportunity to participate in the soil bank as any other farmer—and can do so by all the means provided for by the law, so long as he signs up for the full period required in the acreage reserve.

I earnestly hope this is true, and the farmers who are victims of drought or flood are not to be discriminated against in the new program. It is not so much a question of "relief" as it is a matter of equal opportunity without penalty due to adversity.

The farmer who lives in a drought or flood area, and who puts land in the soil bank, should get the same "normal yield" credit as the farmer in a more fortunate section of the country—and to provide otherwise would surely be unfair and discriminatory.

Yesterday seven members of the Oklahoma delegation wired the Secretary of Agriculture to urge that he clarify at once his position in this regard.

We hope for an early answer to this wire, the text of which follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 5, 1956.*

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.:

Under provisions of Public Law 540 as enacted last month you were given clear mandate to put soil bank in effective operation this year and all allotted acreage was made eligible by law for participation in soil bank. Legislative history clearly indicates intent to include farmers who are victims of adversity, as evidenced by remarks of Congressman POAGE and others on floor of House May 23. Associated Press now quotes you in Wisconsin speech with remarks indicating soil-bank plan will not be offered in drought or flood-damaged areas where full value in conservation or crop reduction not available to government. Please reply by wire clarifying your intentions in drought and flood disaster States and sections. We are reluctant to believe you intend to penalize farmers already victimized by disaster by reducing or limiting in any way their opportunity to participate in soil-bank program. This would deprive farmers most in need of assistance at critical time, and certainly would violate intent of Congress in passing this legislation. Under your reported interpretation soil bank would be reserved only for prosperous or fortunate farmers while denying farmers who are victims of natural disaster a chance to participate.

ROBERT S. KERR,
United States Senate.
A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
United States Senate.
ED EDMONDSON,
Member of Congress.
CARL ALBERT,
Member of Congress.
TOM STEED,
Member of Congress.
JOHN JARMAN,
Member of Congress.
VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Member of Congress.

Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Presents 20-Point Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an address delivered by me over radio station WGN, Chicago, June 3, 1956, in connection with my 20-point legislative program.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN, PRESENTS 20-POINT LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—URGES BACKING OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER WITH REAL DEEDS, NOT PHONY LIPSERVICE

Senator WILEY. Your United States Congress has but 2 months or so before it recesses its current session. During these next 60 days we must, therefore, act on a great many important issues. These issues affect the 48 individual States, affect the Midwest and other areas, and, most important of all, contribute to the well-being of our entire country.

I believe that each Senator and Representative should offer his own ideas of a constructive program for the Congress to enact during these remaining 2 months. And each of us legislators should not only have such a program, but he should and must fight for that program.

And so I would like to use the next few minutes to describe what I regard as an essential 20-point program.

I am going to urge my colleagues in the Senate and in the House of Representatives to enact what I regard as this vital program before Congress' adjournment.

Now, friends, I am going to answer some questions about this 20-point program. And I want to invite you, my listeners, to write in and give me your personal reactions to it.

Tell me what you frankly think—about peace, about our efforts against communism, about tax reduction, etc. It will be a pleasure to hear from you.

DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN PLANKS ESSENTIAL

Question. Senator WILEY, broadly speaking, what are the major parts of the program?

Answer. They are very simple—two in number. First, the program consists of en-

lightened action on our own domestic front—for a prosperous, sound, healthy America. And, second, there must be action on the world front on behalf of the great goal of peace—avoidance of atomic war.

AN EISENHOWER PROGRAM FOR AN EISENHOWER-MINDED AMERICA

Question. How would you characterize this program in general?

Answer. Basically, this program is an Eisenhower program.

It is not a partisan program. It is designed to carry out the type of clear, American, middle-of-the-road thinking, as well as the specific suggestions, of the great President of the United States.

I personally have pledged the President my continued loyal support. Of course, I don't believe in mere lipservice—in emptily praising our President in words and not backing up with deeds. I believe in carrying out my pledges. And I think my record proves it.

But some people do believe in mere lipservice for the President. They believe in giving only token support. They pretend to be Eisenhower supporters in their words, but they try to sabotage him with their actions. In particular, they try to sabotage his great efforts for world peace.

We've got to combat such sabotage.

We've got to rally behind Ike in the fight to avoid war. We Americans hate war.

Question. That, then, is the first point on your program—the sincere promotion of President Eisenhower's efforts for world peace.

WHAT MODERN WAR COULD MEAN

Answer. Absolutely. We must avoid war, avoid it with honor, with strength, not with dishonor or appeasement.

That, then, brings us to the second point of my program—invincible military strength.

Question. How would you define this strength, Senator WILEY?

Answer. I am referring to invincible strength in the air, with our long-range and medium bombers; invincible strength on the sea, with atomic submarines and surface craft; invincible strength on the ground. As regards our land forces, I don't want to see obsolete mass armies, armed with "pea shooter weapons." I want our men equipped with the strongest, most modern weapons in the world, so that they can be effective against the Communist menace, if ever it should strike again.

Question. Peace and invincible military strength against the Communist menace—points 1 and 2. Now, what is the third point on your program, Senator WILEY?

DON'T BE BLIND TO ANY PHASE OF RED THREAT

Answer. I have referred to the Communist menace abroad. That brings us to the Communist menace at home, because it is part and parcel of the worldwide threat. I say, enact every needed bit of anti-Communist legislation. Complete action on the Wiley bill for more effective registration of Communist foreign agents.

Use every law that we already have on our statute books, including the Smith Act, for an unending crack-down on the 22,000 Reds in our country and on fellow travelers.

Question. Peace, combatting communism abroad, combatting communism at home. What are the other elements of your program, Senator?

SPEED UP SEAWAY CHANNEL WORK

Answer. In the few remaining moments, I am going to just run down a few of them, briefly.

The next point—the fourth—is to complete as speedily as possible the 2,300-mile St. Lawrence Seaway, and to complete action on the Great Lakes connecting channels—the channels to the upper lakes.

Question. That is certainly an immensely important point. Now, how about other issues, Senator, on the home front? How about the farm problem?

Answer. Yes, indeed. Point 5 on my program is to halt the serious decline in farm income, the drop in agricultural purchasing power. This is June Dairy Month. Dairying provides the greatest single source of cash income of American agriculture as a whole.

The city man cannot prosper unless the farmer prospers. And so, I am taking action in this June Dairy Month and in every month to help the farmers of America's Dairyland—my own State—and to help the farmers throughout America.

I am glad that at least we are beginning to get some action under the new soil-bank law. It is unfortunate, however, that provision was not made to provide for prepayments to farmers this year who cooperate with the soil-bank program. But this is only part of our program.

What we must do is, of course, to increase our citizen's consumption of farm products. That means—eat and drink more wholesome, nutritious dairy products—milk, butter, cheese, ice cream, nonfat dry milk solids.

VETERANS, OLD FOLKS, SMALL BUSINESS

Question. Now, turning to other groups in our population, Senator, how about the veterans, how about the old folks, how about the small-business man?

Answer. Yes; how about them?

Congress must assure a square break for them. Taking the old folks first, Congress must and will liberalize the inadequate social-security system. Inflation has seriously depreciated the purchasing power of old folks' pensions. Not enough people are covered under these pensions. Elderly women are not provided a fair break. And so we must strengthen the pension system.

Now, as regards our veterans, the 22 million Americans who have saved this country on the field of battle with their heroism, Congress must reject—I stress—reject the unwise recommendations made by the Commission which would slash veterans' benefits.

Instead, Congress must take action as I have repeatedly recommended, to strengthen the program, particularly for combat-disabled veterans.

I have mentioned old folks and veterans. Now, I want to turn to another group which has also been having a hard time. That is, of course, the small-business man. I am a cosponsor of legislation to ease taxes on them. Right now, they are hit by a terrific 52 percent tax which prevents them from expanding and competing with bigger business.

If we are truly to prevent the dangerous growth of monopoly in our country, if we are to keep small business alive—small business which is the real backbone of our free enterprise economy—then we should enact this amendment to ease the taxload on small business.

Question. Those are three additional points. How about taxes, generally, Senator?

Answer. Well, as a ninth point of my program, if we have sufficient surplus in the Treasury, I see every reason for us to provide a tax break for our people this year.

We should ease taxes particularly on the low-income brackets to the greatest extent possible. We should enact various liberalizing deductions.

Question. Thus far in your program, Senator WILEY, you have mentioned 9 points of your overall 20-point program. You have discussed the battle for world peace, the battle to support President Eisenhower, rather than simply giving him lipservice.

You mentioned your fight against communism abroad, because of the desire of the Reds to conquer the two-thirds of the world which is still not Communist ruled. You have turned to communism on the home front urging action on the WILEY and other antisubversive bills. You have mentioned the St. Lawrence Seaway which is appropriately titled the Wiley seaway law. You have referred to the battle for fair dealing for old folks, for veterans, for the small-business man, and for 50 million American taxpayers.

Now, would you mention some of the other points in the program?

Answer. Yes. Here they are:

10. Floods: Complete action on legislation to provide insurance against flood disaster which have taken a terrific toll on our country.

11. Roads: Complete action on the Federal highway bill to modernize our horse and buggy interstate road system which is choked with 60 million cars and trucks.

12. Schools: Ease the terrific crowding of the Nation's classrooms by expanding school construction.

13. Health: Expand health research. Strengthen our hospitals and medical schools, so as to improve the health of our people.

14. Conservation: Strengthen our program to preserve the United States outdoor heritage—its wildlife refuges, its national parks and forests. Protect these beautiful national assets from being despoiled.

Question. What are the remaining points on your program?

Answer. Here they are.

15. Fair dealing: Pass civil rights legislation, legislation to assure a fair break for all Americans, regardless of race, creed, or color. But to do so with reason, with judgment, and with maximum voluntary—I emphasize—voluntary cooperation by men of good will.

16. And now, the mighty atom. Spur domestic development of atomic energy. That means providing insurance, so as to help cover the risks which are inevitably involved in dealing with this powerful nuclear force.

17. Here is point 17. Combat the underworld. Fight the hoodlums, the racketeers, the thugs who, for example, threw acid in the face of columnist Victor Riesel. Pass the Daniel-Wiley bill against the terrible narcotics evil, the dope problem in our country.

18. Housing: Liberalize Federal credit so as to expand United States housing construction. This year, 1.2 million homes will be built, but with proper sound credit, that figure might well be increased.

19. My next to the last point is for clean elections legislation. The present bill before the Senate must be amended to include clean primaries, honest primaries, with all campaign contributions fully reported. In that way, the people will be aware of any dishonest lobby dealings.

20. And finally, my last point relates to governmental streamlining, Federal efficiency. I mean economizing whenever possible, by genuine reorganization and improved businesslike management.

CONCLUSION

Question. Senator, you have mentioned your 20-point progam for Wisconsin, for the Midwest, for all America. I know that your listeners have enjoyed your remarks. And I know, too, that they will take you up on your invitation by giving their reactions to your program.

I know that you mean this program and that you intend to carry it out. That it is not simply a paper program, but one which you will fulfill with all possible effort.

Answer. That is indeed my purpose in presenting it tonight. This is an action program, a battle program. I will be helped on it by hearing from my listeners.

I want to thank station WGN for its kind courtesy in carrying this broadcast. And I want to thank each of you for listening to it, and I hope, for giving me your reactions.

This is Wisconsin's senior Senator, ALEX WILEY, signing off from Washington.

Congressman Carroll D. Kearns Reports on His Mission to the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I submit the following report on my recent mission to the Far East:

CONGRESSMAN CARROLL D. KEARNS REPORTS ON HIS MISSION TO THE FAR EAST

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to take this opportunity to pay high tribute to the United States Air Force and its capable Secretary, the Honorable Donald A. Quarles, for good discretion in sending the United States Air Force Symphonic Band to the Far East on a mission that was cosponsored and approved by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. The mission was not only timely but will prove to be a great investment in the years to come.

I want to pay special tribute to Col. George S. Howard, his staff, and the members of the band—whom I call our music ambassadors—for the marvelous performances they gave on this mission.

I know that each and every Member of Congress, and each and every citizen of the United States, would have been happy and proud if they could have seen these representatives abroad. In fact I find it is practically impossible to envision any American product which, when presented for the consideration of foreign nationals, could meet with such an overwhelming unanimity of acclaim.

The band's tour of the Far East—and unfortunately I could not accompany the group on the first part of their tour—began in Hawaii on April 12 where a concert was heard by 25,000 people, breaking all previous attendance records for a musical event in Honolulu. The impression that the United States Air Force Symphonic Band made in Hawaii will last for a generation. Mrs. ELIZABETH FARRINGTON, the Delegate from Hawaii, suggested that this band should repeat its tour of the Pacific and Far East, and emphasized that its friendly efforts are in a different but supplementary field from those of previous international aid programs.

Next stop was Japan and the tour there was a colossal success. Besides playing for nearly 100,000 people, and turning away almost an equal number because of inadequate seating capacities, the band had a radio audience of 32 million and a television audience of close to 5 million.

Thus practically everyone in Japan either heard—or heard of—the United States Air Force Symphonic Band. Press coverage of the events was the widest and most prolonged ever accorded a visiting artist or cultural group, and the concerts proved even greater than anticipated.

In Hiroshima, for example, where the memory of the atom bomb is vivid 11 years after the war, 6,000 Japanese jammed into Peace Memorial Hall that normally seats 1,800. Another 15,000 had to be denied tickets and were turned away for lack of standing room.

Mayor Watanabe, of Hiroshima, who previously had never attended a concert by foreigners, wrote to an Embassy official: "The band certainly brought music nearer to our hearts than has any other great orchestra visiting this city and thereby has brought the hearts of our nations closer together."

Throughout Japan the band set startling attendance-breaking records. In Kyoto, cultural capital of Japan, the largest crowd ever assembled for a single event turned out for the band. 20,000 crowded into an open-air theater that normally would hold only 5,000. Outside, students perched in trees; old men clambered to high places to see inside; and women with babies on their backs (traditional Japanese style) pushed and jostled to get inside. The overflow was so great that the mayor, as a last resort, got up on the stage and announced that thousands of people would have to leave before the concert could proceed because serious injury might result to the mass assembled.

In Fukuoka, where the concert was held in one of the largest indoor arenas in Japan, 10,000 secured seats. They were the lucky ones; they had stood outside in queues 3 blocks long, 5½ hours before concert time.

Press comments throughout Japan, all of them favorable, filled hundreds of columns of newspaper space. What amazed the critics most was the versatility of the band. "They have something for every musical taste," one said.

Marcel Grilli wrote in the Nippon Times: "In its physical makeup this 84-piece combination is a purely military band, though its spirit is far from martial. In its musical conformation it is a far cry, too, from the days of such stalwart bandmasters as John Philip Sousa and Arthur Pryor. * * * From romantic music to jazz, and from operatic arias to folk songs, this ensemble can elicit the special flavor of different musical styles."

Masato Yamamoto, chief of band music of the Tokyo Academy of Fine Arts, wrote: "We who are concerned with band music certainly learned much from the performance of the United States Air Force Symphonic Band. From now on we should give up our old concept of band music, stop imitation, and bend our efforts toward the development of this new form of band music."

The newspaper, Nishi Nippon Shimbun (circulation 452,000), cosponsor of the band in Nagoya, reported for days after the concert that letters of appreciation were flooding its offices. Commented the official in charge of special events: "We have never had this kind of response before to any project."

Our Ambassador to Japan, the Honorable John M. Allison, said in a letter to me that the cultural acumen of the members of the United States Air Force Symphonic Band, coupled with their great professional ability and polished manner, generated a good will towards the United States, particularly to our military units in Japan, that would have far-reaching developments in Japanese-American understanding. Mr. Walter Nichols and Mr. Robert M. Allen of the United States Information Service in Japan made a great contribution to the success of the tour.

Following this phenomenal and unprecedented reception in Japan, the band took to the skies for its next stop, Korea. 50,000 people turned out for the concert at Seoul. Colonel Howard told me afterward that in his very wonderful conference with Syngman Rhee, the veteran President informed him that more Koreans went out and attended the concert of the United States Air Force Symphonic Band than any public performance heretofore held in Korea. Public Affairs Officer John P. McKnight, cabled the State Department: "This concert of the United States Air Force Symphonic Band was received with even more enthusiasm than the NBC Symphony of the Air concert last spring. Korean audiences, normally undemonstrative, received the symphonic band with great enthusiasm and insisted on several encores."

Next on the itinerary was Okinawa, our supreme fortress of the East, where everyone, our military personnel, the Okinawans, and even the schoolchildren were unanimous in their enthusiasm for the band. The visit there was beautifully summarized by Father Kevin Smyth of the Catholic Mission at Naha who wrote: "Being in close contact with the Okinawan people, I can say that such concerts do more to promote good will than many other direct methods. Here representatives of our Government meet the Okinawan people in mutual respect and share the riches of culture in a language that all can understand."

The next stop was Taipei in Taiwan, known to us as Formosa, where a 1-night concert was scheduled. That was where I joined the tour. Our distinguished Ambassador, Mr. Rankin, very graciously met us upon our arrival, and at 5 p. m. I had the pleasure of accompanying him on a visit to the President, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The Generalissimo and his lovely wife told me that this visit of the United States Air Force Symphonic Band marked a new milestone in our cultural relationship that had not previously existed. The response to the concert that evening certainly upheld Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's evaluation. Although rain fell all day long and into the evening, 15,000 people crowded into the semisheltered Armed Forces Stadium (again breaking all existing attendance records), and despite a leaking roof that made it necessary for the performers to wear raincoats—I recall loaning mine to one of the trumpet players—the concert was played to one of the most genuinely enthusiastic audiences of our entire tour.

The next morning found the band boarding our C–124 Globemaster bound for Hong Kong, the international city of the Far East, and probably the most fabulous city in the world. The first of our three concerts there was a VIP concert in honor of His Excellency, the Governor of Hong Kong, Sir Alexander Grantham, Mrs. Grantham, and our American Consul General, the Honorable Ernest F. Drumright and his wife. This VIP concert was held at the beautiful Empire Theater, with appropriate appointments for a concert of this type, and was attended in formal dress. The program began at 9:30 p. m. with a definite understanding that His Excellency, the Governor, had to leave at 11:23 p. m. The music proved so tasteful, however, that the Governor decided during intermission to abandon his 11:23 p. m. departure. He stayed for the entire program, and even remained an hour on the receiving line following the concert.

The other two concerts at Hong Kong were public concerts and were played for capacity audiences of civilians and schoolchildren. Here is the reaction of the Hong Kong Standard music critic, Mr. K. C. Harvey: "My few hours' association with the United States Air Force Symphonic Band has confirmed my original belief that in this somewhat unique combination of symphonic and military band, chamber music and instrumental group, dance and rhythm band, lies a near perfect answer to music for every occasion." The United States Air Force Symphonic Band will long be remembered in Hong Kong.

From this international city we headed skyward for a visit to Clark Field, which is located on the large island of Luzon in the Philippines. There the band played to 5,000 wildly cheering military and civilian employees of the base.

The next morning, Sunday, May 6, at 8 o'clock, Colonel Howard and I greeted Gen. Laurence S. Kuter, Commander of the Far East Air Forces, who arrived from Baguio with the chiefs of staff of the 12 nations assembled at Clark Field to inspect the Air Force equipment of their countries. The inspection took 4 hours and was followed by a luncheon at the officers' club, after which I flew to Manila with General Kuter and the chiefs of staff in the general's private plane. General Kuter was kind enough to tell me on our flight to Manila that the repeated presence and sustained interest of a long-time Member of the United States Congress like myself was a source of inspiration to the members of the band and to all the members of the Far East Air Forces. In his opinion the fact that I traveled right

with the band and personally conducted some of their brilliant numbers added greatly to the national stature and public acceptance of the Air Force Band.

At Manila that afternoon the greatest air show since World War II was given, participated in by all 12 nations of the Far and Near East, and witnessed by nearly everyone in the Philippines. One of the highlights of the show was the exhibition put on by Gen. Tiger Wang, of Taiwan, Commander of the Chinese National Air Force, who had his pilots do acrobatic stunts 10,000 feet in the air.

As the shadows of evening started to fall, thousands of people began to stream to Luneta Park in Manila, and by 6:30 p. m. some 200,000 had assembled to hear the concert of the United States Air Force Symphonic Band. On the stage was the Vice President of the Philippines, together with the chiefs of staff of the 12 nations, in full dress; and, of course, our boys were in full dress too. It was a most glorious concert, and all numbers were intermittently interrupted by wild applause from the crowd, indicating their approval of the repertoire which Colonel Howard had selected for this important concert. Following the concert, President Magsaysay entertained the chiefs of staff, Colonel Howard, and me at a formal dinner at his mansion. During my conversation with him at dinner, President Magsaysay expressed his gratitude to the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Donald Quarles, and the State Department for sending this marvelous musical organization to the Philippines. He said it had written another chapter in the great sincere feeling between the Philippines and the United States, which had been expressed in the afternoon in the might of the military, and in the evening by the beauty of music.

From Manila we flew to Saigon in South Vietnam, a country that just recently obtained its independence. The concert site was at the city hall, where stands had been erected and an audience of 20,000 heard the concert. It may be said here that the visit of the United States Air Force Symphonic Band during the early days of the independence of South Vietnam was highly significant and really made a terrific impression. President Diem was loud in his acclaim of the band and personally expressed his deep appreciation to Colonel Howard and me for this visit of the music ambassadors from America, saying it had had a wonderful effect upon his people.

The next morning, because of transportation difficulties, only part of the band could go to Phnom Penh in Cambodia. The others left in our C–124 for Bangkok in Thailand. The concert at Phnom Penh was most unique inasmuch as it was given at the Royal Palace with the royal family in attendance, along with a record-breaking crowd of 50,000 Cambodians. Here Colonel Howard was awarded the highest decoration ever given to any foreigner, with the exception of Vice President NIXON. Colonel Howard, in accepting the honor, was most gracious and told the people how pleased he was, but explained that he accepted it not for himself but for every citizen of the United States of America who would share the honor with him.

Next was Bangkok, Thailand (often called the Venice of the East), where the band was reunited and a VIP concert was given the first night, which was attended by the Prime Minister. It was his first appearance in his box at a concert given by foreigners. Seated with him were members of the royal family, Ambassador Max Waldo Bishop and his lovely wife, and Col. Ben Garland, the United States air attache, who had assisted with arrangements, and Mrs. Garland.

Our Ambassador, in introducing the band, praised the United States Air Force for sending their music ambassadors to Thailand and paid tribute to Colonel Howard and me for our musical talents and abilities. He stressed that there is much to be gained in the way of understanding, and mutual respect and regard, through cultural exchanges such as this—good things in life that come to us from our strength and from our freedom.

The people of Thailand obviously had not had much opportunity to hear classical music and seemed especially interested in the music of a lighter vein, particularly, American jazz; however, they were most enthusiastic about the numbers they liked and we evaluated our mission to Thailand as one of a pioneer nature which can be effectively developed in the future.

The Prime Minister told me later that he had never attended a concert that he enjoyed as much, and he thought the band had brought to the people of Thailand a new concept of appreciation of the works of American composers. The Princess also expressed delight at the concert and said she had spent one of the most enjoyable evenings of her life.

We had two public concerts at Bangkok, attended by 25,000 people each night, and then returned to Tokyo for a command performance, which unfortunately was rained out. So the band left Tokyo on Tuesday, May 15, for the United States.

In all, 32 concerts were given, and the total personal attendance was 500,100, making an average attendance per performance of 15,625. In all cases admission was free of charge. Of the 500,100 persons who heard the band, 200,000 were Filipinos, 91,500 were Japanese, 50,000 Koreans, 50,000 Cambodians, 34,000 Okinawans, 22,000 Hawaiians, 20,000 South Vietnamese, 18,000 Thais, and 12,000 Chinese. Wherever they went, they made friends for America.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the annals of American history will show that the United States Air Force Symphonic Band was the pioneer organization in what may be known in the future as "Cy-War"—that is, fourth dimensional or psychological warfare.

The role the Air Force Symphonic Band played exemplifies our boy in uniform—his rearing, education, specialized training, and many talents and gifts. He, by preference, enjoys sharing his talents and performing so that he can bring happiness to many, many people, not only at home but abroad. In the need of combat, however, he is just as effective and willing to perform. Thus there was a double significance to this great symphonic band, in full dress military uniform, putting aside military tactics to play the national songs of the countries they visited.

As a Member of Congress, I have been privileged to have one of the greatest experiences of my life, and I wish that each and every one of my colleagues would consider sometime during his tenure in Congress accompanying Colonel Howard on a tour like this so that he could fully realize the appreciation and affection overseas for our famous Air Force musicians.

The personnel of the United States Air Force Symphonic Band on this highly successful tour of the Far East is as follows:

Col. George S. Howard, conductor.

Maj. Samuel Kurtz, project officer.

Capt. Robert L. Landers, director, The Singing Sergeants.

Lt. Harry H. Meuser, assistant conductor.

M/Sgt. Michael R. Mudre, advance representative.

M/Sgt. Floyd E. Werle, arranger.

Clarinets: Russell A. Mitchell, Charles T. Foster, Oscar A. McGregor, George L. Dietz, Anthony J. Grado, Harold J. Rigg, Glenn J. Valmont, Leslie R. Ticknor, Bertrum S. Glick, Robert E. Gerken, Jay Hauenstein, James B. Preus, Robert C. Barker, Alan A. Dore, Raymond E. Stahura, George D. Yeatman, Robert J. Luther.

Cellos: Boleslaw D. Zukowski, Bert Kuschan, Chester G. Wood, Charles A. Baker, Carleton B. Spotts.

Harp: Phillip M. Young.

Flutes: Robert E. Cray, Erich R. Seehafer, Warren F. Halt, Jack V. Tuk, Thomas P. Perazzoli.

Oboes: Oscar Ghebelian, William J. Weber, Roger W. Sutherland.

Bassoons: Franklin M. Biskey, Stanley D. Petrulis.

Cornets: Arthur R. Will, Ivan D. Genuchi, Joseph A. Latinski, John A. Maiocco, Delbert A. Dale.

Trumpets: Robert J. Markley, Charles J. Gorham.

French horns: Joseph Freni, George E. Roberts, Frank A. Dearstyne, John I. Strylowski, Edward E. Searle, Jr., Peter W. Siverson, Robert N. Drake, Harrison C. Raper.

Baritones: Edward J. Whitfield, Robert A. Sadler, Karl T. Humble.

Trombones: Edward J. Zeman, John A. Velke II, Alexander Nichiporuk, Bruce C. Whitener, Harry S. Beltz, Jr.

Percussion: Robert F. Moore, Paul M. Dolby, Frank D. Rinaldi, Jr., Ronald K. Holmstrand.

String basses: William J. Zschunke, Frederick Sollner, Jr., Edward C. Skidmore.

Tubas: Edward G. Grace, Glenn Orton, Raven E. Corn, Robert J. Chab, Jr.

Soloists: William K. Dupree, tenor; Thomas M. Edwards II, harmonica; Joseph R. Soprani, accordian; Robert D. Kerns, baritone; Edward G. Grace, typewriter.

Singing Sergeants: William S. Brower, Jr., Paul V. Hull, Howard J. Ruff, Harry H. Haywood, Jr., Henry E. Gerhart, Robert L. Conforti, Donald L. Boothman, William S. Jennette, Jr.

In conclusion, Colonel Howard and I, and each and every member of the band, are most grateful to the fine crew that piloted us safely on this tour of the Far East. Under the command of Col. Hollis B. Tara, this C–124 operation was a model of efficiency, safety and dependability. The fact that they were operating the world's largest production model transport did not concern them in the least. They handled their Globemaster at gross weights up to 190,000 pounds just as if they were flying an ordinary transport aircraft. The names of this efficient crew are as follows: Col. Guy Cooke, Jr., Maj. William E. Shelton, Capt. Henry G. Henderson, Capt. Wilbert C. Oltman, Capt. Wilkes A. Wilk, Lt. George R. Adams, T. Sgt. Marshall Purcell, S. Sgt. Glen Moore, S. Sgt. Garry Wilson, S. Sgt. Ted Grosshopf, S. Sgt. Harold E. Kozee, A1c. Terry Cassidy, A1c Robert Cantrell, A2c Thomas J. Wilson, Jr.

Textile Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including a letter written by Mr. L. W. Turner, Jr., president of the Southern Garment Manufacturers Association, of Nashville, Tenn., to the Washington Post and published under the heading of "Letters to the Editor," in the June 5 issue of the Post as follows:

TEXTILE IMPORTS

Our attention is called to your editorial of May 27 to the effect that the Senate Finance Committee takes the position imports of textiles and apparels from Japan

are not offering sales competition to domestic industry. The Tariff Commission apparently has little grasp of the ruinous effect of these imports. Total imports of women's blouses and men's and boys' shirts alone in 1955 and thus far in 1956 seriously approach domestic production figures.

Japanese imports of men's and boys' shirts and ladies' blouses were several million dozen. What the Tariff Commission evidently does not understand is that it takes only a relatively small quantity of cheaper priced goods or articles to set the market price in a given market. In other words, 1,000 dozen men's and boys' Japanese shirts and ladies' blouses can set the market price for all American competitive garments in the city of Washington.

It is in this manner that Japanese imports of apparels and textiles are setting the market price for such domestic-made goods, thus pulling down the price structure with consequent discouragement to American producers. This we have seen happening right along for more than 1 year. Some plants are closed, the owners say, because of Japanese competition and some are running on short time for the same reason their owners say.

The Tariff Commission has rendered disservice in not getting the full facts and ascertaining the effect of Japanese competition on the textile and apparel industry which we have herein briefly explained.

There is reason to wonder whether textile or apparel industry has any friends at all connected with the Government.

L. W. TURNER, Jr.,
President, Southern Garment Manufacturers Association.

This letter is very timely and has my wholehearted approval.

I too wonder, as Mr. Turner does, whether or not the textile or apparel industry has any friends at all connected with the Government and by that I mean the administrative branch of the Government and not the Congress.

The Congress has refused to pass the OTC bill which would, in effect, approve all that GATT has done in strangling the American textile and garment industry. Because we have not had the backing of the textile industry in our efforts to get legislation passed to prevent the destruction of this great industry, we have not been able to get such legislation reported out of committee. We can and will continue to fight OTC which, as I say, would be a ratification of the GATT agreements.

Apparently the administration believes the textile industry is expendable for the benefit of the steel, automobile and other huge industries which want all tariff barriers removed. They too are calloused and unconcerned just as the executive department of our Government is about the problem of the textile and garment industries.

The Tariff Commission, now dominated by the executive department although it is allegedly an arm of the Congress, has refused to get all the facts about the effects of Japanese competition on the textile and apparel industry and has apparently abandoned these industries to their fate.

It is often said that because Japan buys some of the American farmer's cotton, the cotton farmer of the Nation ought to support the disastrous agreements which permit the importation of textiles from countries where wage scales are so low that our own textile and apparel industries simply cannot meet the competition. However, if the textile industry in America is destroyed, 60 percent of the farmer's market for his cotton will go down the drain with the textile industry.

It is encouraging to see now that Mr. Robert Jackson, the president of the ACMI, has learned the lesson that he cannot expect any help from the administration although rumor has it that most of the industry supported Mr. Eisenhower and his party. We Members of Congress who are so vitally interested in the preservation of the textile industry have been trying to convince Mr. Jackson and the ACMI of this fact so that we might get the necessary backing for legislation that would do what the administration fails and refuses to do. It is rather late now for any such legislation to be passed. It is understandable, however, that the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute was loath to turn to the Congress for protection before all avenues of relief in the administrative department had been explored and found closed. We have at least been successful in holding up action upon the bill which would create a "super-duper" international organization in which the United States would have only one vote to control our foreign-trade policies.

Will Soviet Union Confess the Katyn Massacre?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I presented before the political action committee of the Polish-American Congress at Philadelphia on Thursday, May 31, 1956:

WILL THE SOVIET UNION CONFESS THE KATYN MASSACRE?

Again and again my voice and my petitions have been heard crying out in my own country, to the nations of the world and to the high heavens, against the enormity of the crime perpetrated by the Soviet Union and known in the catalog of international outrages as the Katyn massacre. It may be asked of me in the Department of State in Washington, or they may ask it in the United Nations, or in the Kremlin itself: When will I forbear raking up old wounds, when will I cease the clamor for justice and the law? My answer, I am pleased to avow before this, the Polish-American Congress, is as simple, and as fair, as devoid of rancor and vindictiveness, and as righteous as the facts testify. My answer is that neither I, nor the Congress of the United States, nor any international tribunal in the United Nations, can shut its eyes to the horror of the calculated mass murder of the Polish officers and civilians in the forest of Katyn until the truth shall have been acknowledged by the perpetrators or their associates and successors and due contrition observed. For me or for any just official, or for any government in the free world, not to press for adjudication in this wise of an atrocity so enormous, is to make one's self a kind of passive accessory to the crime after the fact.

This I shall never be and thus I stand here today symbolizing, if you please, the conscience of the Congress of the United States and the people of this country. It is not enough that the select committee of which I was a member found unanimously in its investigation and study of the facts, evidence, and circumstances of the Katyn Forest Massacre that there was irrevocable and conclusive proof that this horror had been committed by the Soviet NKVD or People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs. It is not enough to establish the date as not later than the spring of 1940. It is not enough to conclude as the select committee unanimously concluded that the "Soviets had plotted this criminal extermination of Poland's intellectual leadership as early as the fall of 1939—shortly after Russia's treacherous invasion of the Polish nation's borders." I am quoting House Report No. 2430, 2d session of the 82d Congress, which goes on to say: "There can be no doubt this massacre was a calculated plot to eliminate all Polish leaders who subsequently would have opposed the Soviets' plans for communizing Poland."

I say it is not enough to have probed for the truth, unearthed it, exposed it, proclaimed it. For what is involved here is the very heart of the moral values for which World War II was fought, a war that cost mankind 40 million lives and $2 trillion. If we merely find the truth, as we have here, and then tell it and let it pass into history like a forgotten page in a book that is out of date we shall have performed a disservice to western civilization and the free world. For that is only half of the task. We shall have acted weakly and ineffectively and in a manner destined to make us look vapid and hypocritical in the eyes of posterity and pusillanimous before the bar of world opinion. It is one of the major prides of my career in the Congress of the United States that I have not permitted this matter to sleep in the archives of government. Nor could I rest comfortably in my conscience knowing that the job of the select committee, magnificiently accomplished both on American soil and in Europe, might evaporate without a fixed result, like a case tried adequately before a qualified court but without the resultant improvement to society that litigation is expected to yield.

If there is genuinely a new policy in the Kremlin since the death and desanctification of Stalin, I was determined to put it to the acid test.

Thus it was that on May 3 of this year—1956—I wrote Secretary of State John Foster Dulles asking that he transmit to the Polish Government the report of the select committee which is now a public document of the United States. I asked also that the Secretary of State transmit to the United States delegation of the United Nations the same report "so that all members of the United Nations," my letter to the Secretary said, "may be officially aware of the existence of this public document." And finally I asked Secretary Dulles that the report and hearings record of the select committee be placed in all our embassies and libraries overseas through the Secretary's efforts and that of the United States Information Agency.

Since then I have heard from Theodore C. Streibert, Director of the United States Information Agency, indicating that the Voice of America had broadcast my statements and that of my colleagues in the House to Poland and other Iron Curtain countries, in connection with Polish Constitution Day. Likewise Director Streibert in that same letter of May 18, 1956, informed me that on last

April 13 they had broadcast a special commentary on the anniversary of the Katyn massacre. Other broadcasts, the letter said, were forthcoming that might be useful should the Polish Government initiate an investigation of its own into what may be termed one of the outstanding atrocities of the Soviet Union in World War II.

On May 18 of this year the Department of State in response to my letter informed me by letter that they had given practical effect to my suggestions. I was informed that the Department had even before my letter instructed Ambassador Lodge on January 30, 1953, to transmit to the Secretary General of the United Nations 70 copies of the select committee's report. Ambassador Lodge was instructed to send a note, the Department's letter to me said, to the Secretary General of the United Nations describing the work of the select committee and asking him to transmit a copy of the report to the representatives of each member of the United Nations. This was done, and other steps were taken to reveal definitely before the pertinent body of the United Nations the details of the outrage which concerns us here.

As for the possible establishment of a Soviet or joint Soviet-Polish commission to examine the Katyn Forest massacre; that, the letter from the Department of State informs me, is still in the rumor stage with nothing to confirm the rumor's authenticity.

And that brings me to the issue of the day.

What we are in fact asking for is a second and a honest investigation from behind the Iron Curtain of all the facts behind the Katyn Massacre. The first investigation made by the Soviet Government yielded findings which perpetuated the fraud that sought to absolve the Soviet Union from guilt. We know, and the Russians know, and the Germans know—all the world now knows—that the Kremlin has murder on its hands for the Katyn Massacre. What justice and history, what the ethics of a religious society demand, is that the alleged new masters of the Kremlin who repudiated Stalin, now stand up and be counted. They are asked to give mankind for all time on the basis of a thorough investigation of their own the confession of guilt without which this case cannot be said to be closed. Abundant evidential materials and witnesses still exist. And on the basis of this confession the guilty should be asked to make whatever retribution is yet possible.

It is to this end that in my letter to Secretary Dulles on May 3, of this year, I asked that the Polish Government be furnished anew the report and hearing record of the select committee. It is easy enough to make the findings we made, powerful and conclusive as they are, and to now drop the matter. But this course of placid acceptance of a frightful wrong does violence to the most elementary precepts of justice that have evolved in our civilization since the dawn of time. We did what we could in the circumstances, but we must not stop now. The issue before the United States and the world is a strategic one and can be lifted now to the highest vantage point of international drama. It can be lifted to this exposed area because the Kremlin has professed to reform. Whether this is true or just another Communist fraud may now bluntly be determined by a simple question from the President of the United States to the so-called collective leadership of the Soviet Union. The eyes and the ears, the heart and the conscience of mankind, are riveted on these two mighty centers of executive power: the Kremlin and the White House. If Khrushchev and Bulganin mean what they say then let the President ask him to admit forthrightly the guilt of the unspeakable Stalin—on the corroborative evidence they must have in their archives—of this atrocity that brought the record of crime, even in war, to a new all-time high. This crime of crimes must be exposed for what it was just as world society had at Nuremberg condemned the overwhelming crimes of Hitler and his unmentionable associates.

But this time it should be done by confession arrived at by authenticated evidence, from within the Kremlin's own walls, not because the crime needs further authentication, but because this proposed open confession, voluntarily arrived at, is one of the basic penalties communism should be willing to pay in the interests of justice and as proof of the sincerity of its protestations of reform. We have to remember that when the Soviet Union sat in as a judge during the international military trials held in Nuremberg after World War II it came with blood on its hands and guilt in its heart. The adjudications of that court, in my judgment, were the adjudication of the outraged conscience of mankind and were valid, sound, and merited. But the Soviet Union, on the basis of its conduct in the forest of Katyn, came to the judgment table with an unclean soul. Moreover, the 20th century has been the special victim of the type of national fake by which the perpetrator of murder, arson, and torture fabricates the evidence and then the propaganda blaming his crime on the enemy.

The solution of the Katyn crime, in accordance with my suggestion, will help conclusively to nail this type of lie to the masthead of international publicity, so that in the future it will be more difficult to perform this kind of international fraud. Khrushchev and Bulganin must not be invited to come to the United States. They must first be persuaded to go to Canossa in contrition and in penance. Unless a world of justice and righteousness rubs the nose of mankind's ruthless enemies in the ghastly evil of their own deeds, what chance is there for moral progress? I ask you, the Polish American Congress, to join with me in an unrelenting and persistent determination to keep this crime alive in the conscience of the world until the Soviet Union shall have confessed and made amends even at this late date for an outrage that is beyond atonement.

The Administration's Foreign Policy Wins Tremendous Victory in Egypt (Serendip-style)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, 1956, James Reston's article in the New York Times on "Serendipity in Capital" advised us of the cure-all the administration has discovered. A remarkable elixir originally found by the English writer, Horace Walpole, it gets its name from his fairy tale, The Three Princes of Serendip. The three princes were never dismayed by misfortune, but always managed to discover the most wonderful things.

In the prevailing fashion in Washington these days of always creating the impression that all is well in the world I have come to the startling conclusion that our foreign policy has just won for us a tremendous victory in Egypt.

Mr. Speaker, for reasons of state it is not likely that the future American historian will take special note of the 5-day celebration that began in Cairo last Wednesday, June 13. This is a period of rejoicing in Egypt where they are celebrating the most glorious event in their modern history. That event is the departure of the last British soldier from the Suez Canal base and the transfer of the canal to Egyptian hands. To mark the end of 74 years of British guardianship, the Egyptians climaxed their celebration on Monday by naming it Evacuation Day.

This day should be marked in our own diplomatic history as a milestone in American Middle East policy, for we were primarily responsible for persuading our British allies to give up this life line of empire. Apparently we also insisted that no conditions were to be attached to this generous gift of a powerfully equipped military base and a critically important international waterway.

At the same time the American people were assured that a new day was dawning in the Middle East. Egypt was going to be made safe for democracy and freedom, and we could believe her claim of being an enemy of Communism. Egypt could not be any other than our everlasting, grateful friend. With our help, living standards would go up and American technical know-how would speed the modernization of Egypt. We were told that under Naguib and Nasser a grateful Egypt would surely be a cooperative Egypt and that as a result tensions in the Middle East would disappear.

The author of this profound policy was our former Assistant Secretary of State for the Near East and present Ambassador to Egypt, Mr. Henry Byroade. To him must go the applause for inspiring this spectacular change, and its execution should have earned him at least the eternal gratitude of Egypt. Mr. Byroade is now in Cairo. And no doubt the Egyptians planned to honor somebody on Evacuation Day. But these Egyptians are a strange people. They did not respond the way Mr. Byroade said they would. The guns they fired during the celebration were Communist guns, and the jet planes that flew overhead were Soviet MIG fighters. Furthermore, the man they invited to help them celebrate Evacuation Day was not Mr. Byroade, but Mr. Dmitri Shepilov, the new Foreign Minister of Soviet Russia. Perhaps Mr. Shepilov will suggest to his new Egyptian friends that they rename Monday, June 18, Byroade Day.

No doubt there is some logical explanation for Egypt's choice of Mr. Shepilov in place of Mr. Byroade. It may have something to do with the mercurial nature of the Egyptian rulers who find such extraordinary ways to show their devotion to freedom and democracy. No doubt Mr. Byroade has an explanation.

But if he has, he should come home to enlighten us. And if he has not, he should come home to tell us why he has not. Either way, it is high time that Mr. Byroade, who started the administration's last agonizing appraisal of our Near East policy, step aside to let someone devise a program, more appreciative of the danger and more faithful to America's own best interests.

Radio Corporation of America Dedicates Enlarged Plant in New Jersey Expanding Capacity To Aid National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the Radio Corporation of America has made an enviable contribution to the cause of science by its continued and far-reaching research over a period of many years. Its numerous and varied activities in advancing the art of communications and related subjects has been of incalculable value to our Nation and its people in time of peace and war.

In its ever-expanding program and creation of new and additional facilities, to enable it to give even greater assistance in the cause of science, RCA on Friday, May 4, 1956, dedicated a major enlargement of the RCA missile and surface radar engineering plant at Moorestown, N. J., representing an important expansion of RCA's capacity to aid national defense.

The ceremonies, which included demonstrations of some of RCA's latest developments in military electronics, were witnessed by military and Government guests, representatives of the press, and more than 1,500 employees at the RCA plant.

During the program Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the RCA board, announced RCA activity in the new defense missile program, as well as development of RCA's abilities to design and produce complex electronic systems for the military services.

General Sarnoff said RCA is developing and producing, under contracts with the Department of Defense, land-based tactical launching and guidance systems for the Talos guided missile, a defense weapon designed for use against enemy aircraft. This surface-to-air guided missile is being built for the United States Air Force by RCA, which also has the responsibility for a portion of a shipboard system for the United States Navy.

RCA'S GROWING RESPONSIBILITIES

RCA's growing responsibilities in guided-missile activities were commemorated by meetings at the Moorestown plant of the board of directors of RCA, the National Broadcasting Co., and RCA Communications, Inc.

General Sarnoff presided at the meetings and later joined with Frank M. Folsom, president of RCA, and other executives to welcome Government and military guests who included Maj. Gen. F. L. Ankenbrandt, director of communications-electronics, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and myself as a Member of Congress.

Also present for the dedication were New Jersey State Assemblyman C. William Haines, Chairman W. J. Hall, and Moorestown Township Committee Members Thomas Cunningham, Irving Hollingshead, and J. Aubrey Sutton; Donald Dunn, administrative manager of Moorestown, and the Reverend Mr. Victor S. Griggs, pastor of the Second Baptist Church of Moorestown and president of the Moorestown Council of Churches, who delivered the invocation.

Climaxing the ceremonies General Sarnoff unveiled a plaque which officially commemorates the RCA Moorestown plant as a missile and radar systems center.

In accordance with the consent granted by the House, I now wish to include as part of these remarks, the address of General Sarnoff, and that of General Ankenbrandt, Dr. Engstrom, and T. A. Smith.

General Sarnoff, in his address, declared:

During the past decade, developments in electronics have revolutionized the ancient art of warfare. Foremost among these has been the development of the guided missile to a stage of perfection that makes it awesome in its capacity for destruction.

The German buzz-bombs that rained from the skies of Britain during World War II were as BB-gun pellets, compared with our modern guided missiles. The sobering fact is that our vast oceans and Arctic wastelands have been converted into highways for weapons that can destroy cities and their populations on a scale never before experienced by man.

The Soviet leaders Bulganin and Khrushchev have openly boasted of their "mighty guided missiles." We in the United States have no rational alternative but to meet the menacing competition whereby world communism has perverted science and technology to its evil purposes. For the sake of our own security and the survival of our civilization, we dare not permit the Kremlin to gain even a temporary monopoly on such appalling weapons.

The Radio Corporation of America has long been dedicated to the principle that our prime responsibility is to serve the Nation—by providing the Armed Forces with equipment vital to the success of their operations.

In line with this principle, we recently concentrated the engineering and production of military equipment in an operating unit devoted exclusively to this mission. This is our defense electronic products unit, and the organization here at Moorestown is a part of this unit.

"TALOS" PROJECT

General Sarnoff, in announcing the "Talos" project, stated:

RCA is developing and producing, under contracts with the Department of Defense, land-based tactical launching and guidance systems for the "Talos" guided missile. We have as partners in this program the American Machine & Foundry Co. "Talos" is a surface-to-air guided missile developed by the Johns-Hopkins applied physics laboratory for the United States Navy Bureau of Ordnance. The initial land-based "Talos" system was developed by RCA under contract with the Navy Bureau of Ordnance.

RCA is building land-based "Talos" systems for the United States Air Force and has responsibility for a portion of a shipboard system for the United States Navy. This "Talos" project at the Moorestown plant represents one of the most comprehensive of all electronic systems, and utilizes the latest techniques developed by RCA.

This plant, and the people who give it meaning and significance, symbolizes RCA's effort in the fulfillment of our foremost responsibility—to serve the Nation.

And so it is with a deep sense of pride in RCA's work on behalf of our national defense that I unveil this plaque, dedicating the RCA Moorestown engineering plant as a missile and surface radar development center.

REMARKS BY GENERAL ANKENBRANDT

In his remarks, General Ankenbrandt declared:

For some time it has been recognized by the military that the essential elements for true national defense include far more than the Department of Defense and the military departments themselves.

This realization has grown from a very small beginning in the years leading up to World War II, on through that war and the succeeding days to the present, when all of us in the military are very conscious of the essential part being played by our partners—science and industry. That this realization has grown to its present proportions has been due in considerable measure to the expanding activities of such fine organizations as AFCEA (Armed Forces Communications and Electronics Association), NSIA (National Security Industrial Association), IRE (Institute of Radio Engineers) and the like. Parenthetically, as most of you know, the theme of this year's AFCEA annual convention in Boston later on this month is "military and industry: partners in progress."

However, in greatest measure, this realization has come from the positive results which have accrued to the military from this partnership—the tremendous outpourings of scientific, engineering, production, and servicing assistance from American industry, without which our present-day advanced weapons systems for defense would not exist or could not be operated efficiently.

It is with this background that I take great pleasure, on behalf of all of us in the military, in participating in the dedication of this new and great facility here in Moorestown of RCA, devoted as it is to the creation of highly sophisticated systems for the defense of our Nation—systems involving, as most now do, heavy radar and complex electronic fire-control elements for missiles and weapons of all types—ground, sea, and air based.

I congratulate you, General Sarnoff, the board of directors of RCA, and all the members of your company, and this city who had a part in providing this forward-looking facility—a splendid testimonial to the teamwork of industry and military working together for our common national defense.

REMARKS BY DR. ENGSTROM

Dr. E. W. Engstrom, senior executive vice president of RCA, in his remarks preceding his introduction of General Ankenbrandt and General Sarnoff, said:

I am honored to participate in these ceremonies; for today we dedicate not merely a building, or a facility, but a major national resource in the field of missile and surface radar operations—one that is probably unequaled in the world. In these critical times, the significance of this operation to our Nation and to our traditional way of life cannot be overestimated.

RCA's pioneering in radar has contributed much to the extraordinary growth of this primary instrument of national security.

Our work in radar has continued and is continuing for the Navy, the Army, and the Air Force.

On this occasion, I think it is appropriate to point out the extent of RCA's engineering and productive capacity not only here in the Delaware Valley, but also throughout the State of New Jersey. Our activities here, for example, are closely integrated with the corporation's David Sarnoff research center in Princeton, N. J. We also have important plants and associated activities, for military

or civilian goods, in eight other major locations in the State—Camden, Cherry Hill, Harrison, Jersey City, Woodbridge, Rockaway, Somerville, and Clark Township.

Total RCA employment in New Jersey, excluding Princeton and Clark Township, is 26,700 persons. The annual payroll is more than $135,000,000. As a former resident of Camden County, now residing at Princeton, I believe I can speak for all RCA employees in expressing deep pride in the contributions that we make to the economy of our State.

REMARKS BY T. A. SMITH

Theodore A. Smith, vice president and general manager, RCA defense electronic products, who welcomed guests to the dedication ceremonies, declared:

It seems only yesterday that we stood at this location to dedicate the original buildings in December 1953. At that time we expressed the hope that this was only the beginning of our expanded program in the broad field of radar, and that we would grow and flourish with the community.

Now, 2½ years later, much of that healthy growth has been accomplished. Our engineering capacity has been virtually doubled. From an employment standpoint we have grown from 600 to more than 1,500 persons. Far more important than physical statistics, however, is the fact that we are now equipped to make substantially increased contributions to national security.

DEMONSTRATION OF MILITARY ELECTRONIC PRODUCTS

To symbolize RCA's varied research and development activities for national defense, a program of demonstrations disclosed three major RCA developments in the field of military electronics:

A portable electronic detector for "nerve" gas—developed by the Army Chemical Corps and RCA. The first such detector accepted for military use, the unit not only can serve as a field alarm for military personnel and installations, but also can be utilized for gas-detection protection of population and industrial centers. It has possibilities as a detector for hazardous industrial and commercial gases.

An RCA-developed wide-spaced image orthicon tube, or television camera tube, which can be used for televising scenes and objects under light conditions as low as those of a moderately cloudy moonlit night.

Noise-canceling microphones and headsets for aircraft intercommunications systems, which RCA has developed and is producing for the United States Air Force. The highly selective and sensitive equipment provides clear communication under noise conditions which would make intelligible conversation virtually impossible by other known means.

The electronic "nerve" gas detector was demonstrated by special detachment of the Army Chemical Corps under the command of Lt. Col. Oliver R. Hertel, Chemical Corps, Engineering Command, Army Chemical Center, Maryland.

Described, but not demonstrated at Moorestown, was the RCA "cat eye"—an electronic light intensifier which is capable of seeing objects in the dark to produce sharp and clear television pictures. The Air Force has announced that the "cat eye" enables airmen to see in the dark with almost daylight clarity and that it is expected to become a valuable aid to the Air Force as a reconnaissance device.

SERVICE GUEST LIST

In addition to General Ankenbrandt, officers of the armed services attending the Moorestown dedication included:

Army: Maj. Gen. V. A. Conrad, commanding general, Ft. Monmouth, N. J.; Brig. Gen. Marshall Stubbs, commanding general, Army Chemical Center, Edgewood, Md.; Brig. Gen. H. V. Gaskill, Office of Chief of Research and Development, United States Army, Washington, D. C.; Dr. Colin Hudson, Office of Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, Washington, D. C.; Col. C. A. Poutre, Signal Corps Supply Agency, 18th and Locust Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.; Col. H. M. Murray, Frankfort Arsenal, Bridge and Tacony Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.; Lt. Col. O. R. Hertel, Chemical Corps, Engineering Command, Army Chemical Center, Edgewood, Md.

Navy: Rear Adm. F. S. Withington, Chief, Bureau of Ordnance, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.; Capt. R. L. Taylor, Bureau of Ordnance, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.; Capt. A. C. Packard, Bureau of Aeronautics, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.; Rear Adm. H. C. Bruton, director, Naval Communications Division, Office of Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.; Capt. D. O. Lacey, United States Navy Aviation Supply Office, 700 Robbins Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.

Air Force: Maj. Gen. G. R. Acheson, commander, Middleton Air Materiel Area, Olmstead Air Force Base, Pa.; Brig. Gen. I. L. Farman, Assistant for Electronic Supporting Systems, deputy commander, Weapons Systems Headquarters, Air Research and Development Command, Post Office Box 1395, Baltimore, Md.; Brig. Gen. S. T. Wray, ADES Project Officer, 220 Church Street, New York, N. Y.; Col. A. R. Shiely, Air Research and Development Command, 220 Church Street, New York, N. Y.; Col. Jay Jaynes, Office of Deputy Chief of Staff, Development, United States Air Force, Washington, D. C.; Col. W. J. Adams, Eastern Air Procurement, 1411 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

PRESS ATTENDANCE

Newspapers, wire services, magazines, and television stations represented at the RCA Moorestown program included: The Associated Press, United Press, Tele-News, station WRCV, station WRCV-TV, station WFIL-TV, the New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, Wall Street Journal, Aviation Age magazine, Tele-Tech magazine, Popular Mechanics magazine, Radio and TV Daily, Aviation Week magazine, Electronic Design magazine, Research and Engineering magazine, Philadelphia Inquirer, Philadelphia Daily News, Philadelphia Afro-American, Philadelphia Tribune, Camden Courier-Post, Pittsburgh Courier, Moorestown News Chronicle, Mt. Holly Herald, American Aviation magazine, Electronics magazine, Popular Science magazine, Broadcasting magazine, Aeronautical Engineering Review, Radio Electronics magazine, Electrical Engineering magazine.

The 730th Air Force Band, under the direction of Chief Warrant Officer Dieter, Maguire Air Force Base, Trenton, N. J., participated in the ceremonies.

Progress Toward the Integration of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a speech given by me before the First Regional Model Assembly of the Council of Europe in Rochester, N. H., Saturday, May 19, 1956. The speech is entitled: "Progress Toward the Integration of Europe":

Mr. President and members of the Model Assembly of the Council of Europe: It is a great pleasure, a high privilege and a distinct honor to be here in the Spaulding High School Auditorium this afternoon to address the High School Model Assembly of the Council of Europe under the sponsorship of the New Hampshire Council on World Affairs and the International Relations Club of the University of New Hampshire. I am delighted to have the opportunity of delivering the closing address to the members of this assembly.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the New Hampshire Council on World Affairs, the International Relations Club of the University of New Hampshire, and the students of the participating high schools in New Hampshire for your efforts in making this Model Assembly an outstanding success.

I am greatly pleased that New Hampshire has a Council on World Affairs. We need to devote our attention to international problems since they affect our everyday life. Whatever happens in one part of the world sends repercussions around the globe because of the closeness of the continents in this age of rapid scientific advancement. I notice that in the brochure put out by the New Hampshire council entitled "World Affairs Are Your Affairs," it is stated that the purpose of the organization is to "create an informed public opinion as the democratic basis for a sound foreign policy, to operate as a ccordination point and service center for interested organizations, advocating no specific policy or action, and to promote the widest possible understanding of world affairs as an essential step toward lasting peace." I hope this organization continues to grow and that it will have a wide membership in every section of the State, for we certainly need to have the broadest possible understanding of foreign affairs in this nuclear era.

I know of no more worthwhile endeavor than the organization and the holding of a Model Assembly of the Council of Europe. This interest in foreign affairs is most encouraging and it is most important, since the United States of America, this Republic, is the leader of the free world. We are in foreign affairs to stay and as the days come and go, we will find that it is necessary for us to have an ever-increasing understanding and to take an ever-increasingly active part in the solution of international problems.

We need to know more and more about foreign affairs and the shaping of foreign policies because the future of the world will depend directly upon how wisely the United States exercises its destiny-given position of leadership in the new role in which the Republic finds itself.

REPORT OF STUDY MISSION

My specific object this afternoon is to discuss with you the progress toward the unification and integration of Europe. This is a subject in which I have long been interested. In the fall of 1953 I had the opportunity of being the chairman of a study mission to Europe. The mission made a thorough study of the specialized agencies of the United Nations, also a complete survey and appraisal on European unification and integration. In the section of our report dealing with European integration, we gave detailed information on the Benelux Economic Union, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the European Coal and Steel Community, the Western Union, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the proposed European Defense Community, and the Council of Europe, all having the purpose of bringing about a closer unity among the nations in Europe.

NEED FOR UNITY

In our report dated February 25, 1954, the study mission stated: "At the end of World War II, the concept of unity took on new meaning and significance. * * * Cooperation among the nations of Europe had become more than an ideal or a dream. It had become a matter of life and death for free peoples. The formidable obstacles to unity, so long recognized, were at last challenged by the overwhelming need for unity.

"Since the closing days of the war, efforts toward increased cooperation among the European nations have followed many different lines and assumed many different patterns. These have ranged from consultation among national governmental representatives on international committees to the surrender of portions of national sovereignty to supranational organization, with one objective in mind: To achieve peace, security, and economic prosperity through the joint action of two or more nations."

In an article entitled "United States Leadership in a Divided World," which I wrote for the 1953 September issue of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, I stated: "As I think of the disunity in Europe and as I think how important the achievement of unification—political, economic, and military—has become, my mind turns to the history of the 1860's in which Abraham Lincoln gave leadership to his country. His farsighted statesmanship prevented the division of our country and made certain the continuation of the United States."

Had it not been for Lincoln's leadership the United States today might not be in existence and our continent would undoubtedly be an atomized continent, with many divisions, and instead of one nation we might find ourselves hopelessly factionalized. Happily, this is not the case. Although it would be impossible to make one nation out of the European countries, nevertheless, a much greater degree of unity is possible and a much greater degree of unity is essential if Europe is not to perish in a maelstrom of differences, rivalries, dissensions, and conflict.

INTEGRATION IMPERATIVE

By the end of World War II it had become perfectly apparent to thinking people that a greater integration of Western Europe was imperative if the nations on that continent were to survive the threat of communism and if they were to preserve the culture developed over so many years. The Soviet Union insisted upon maintaining large standing forces. The policy of Moscow was intransigent and aggressive. The Soviet Union presented a threat that was far beyond the ability or capacity of any of the European states to meet as individuals. Collective action was the only way that the countries could be preserved. It was also apparent that Europe by itself could not survive.

With United States help and by moving together, the countries had the possibility of achieving a power sufficient to form a balance. The economic problems created by a series of small States separated by tariff barriers and trade restrictions seemed to mean continued economic difficulties for all, while integration offered the efficiency and economy of a mass market and specialization. Integration, in short, seemed the one logical way of meeting a number of different problems. It is my purpose to trace the development and the contribution made by various European organizations toward a greater integration of the continent, economically, militarily, and politically.

BENELUX

In 1944 the first attempt at integration economically was the so-called Benelux group, consisting of Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg. These countries established a customs union which merged, to some extent, the economies of the member States. The agreement provided for the elimination of tariffs existing between the member countries and the establishment of common tariffs on imports coming into the union. Complete union has not been achieved, since all trade barriers have not been eliminated.

ORGANIZATION FOR EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COOPERATION

Three years later, in 1947, steps toward a broader economic integration occurred when 16 countries in Europe cooperated to create the Organization for European Economic Cooperation. This organization, established to implement United States economic aid under the Marshall plan, had four aims: First, to reduce trade barriers; second, to facilitate the distribution of essential materials; third, to promote economic stability; and fourth, to utilize more effectively European manpower.

In our report on the unification and integration of Europe, our study mission stated that "the long-term aim of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation is the achievement of a sound European economy through the economic cooperation of its members. In pursuing this goal, its immediate purpose was to insure the success of the European recovery program through cooperation with the United States." The program was most successful and in the present mutual-security bill there is no economic aid programed for Europe.

EUROPEAN COAL AND STEEL COMMUNITY

Another of the organizations making an outstanding contribution to economic integration is the European Coal and Steel Community. It is particularly important because it created the first effective supranational agency. For the first time nations surrendered a sufficient amount of their national sovereignty to the new organization, the authority of which was considered superior to the individual authority of each member state.

The members of the European Coal and Steel Community include Belgium, Italy, France, Western Germany, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands. Its purposes are: First, to enlarge the European market; second, to encourage the increase per capita steel consumption; third, to pool their resources; and fourth, to assist member states to adjust their economies to an intensified competition in Europe and elsewhere. In establishing a dominion over the distribution of coal, iron ore, steel, and ferrous scrap within the political frontiers of the member countries, the European Coal and Steel Community is a real supranational authority and is making a valuable contribution to the economic integration of Europe.

THE EUROPEAN PAYMENTS UNION

Another organization contributing to economic integration was founded in July 1950. This was the European Payments Union. The Union provides a common currency pool for balancing international payments on a multilateral basis. In this way a freer flow of currencies and goods has been made possible.

WESTERN UNION

The establishment of the Western Union on March 17, 1948, by France, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, was the first step toward the postwar military integration of Europe. Under this pact the countries pledged themselves to give immediate military assistance to any party against which aggression might occur.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

On April 4, 1949, a treaty was signed in Washington, D. C., which brought NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, into being. By negotiating this treaty, the North Atlantic Community reaffirmed its faith in the purposes of the United Nations Charter, seeking to stabilize the North Atlantic area by organizing for collective defense to keep the peace and maintain the security of the community. The treaty aimed to strengthen the free institutions of European nations and to encourage economic collaboration within the framework of cooperative consultation.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization has been an outstandnig success. At the moment the following nations—Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Western Germany—are members of the Organization.

In the military sphere the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is accomplishing the principal task for which it was intended, that is deterring Communist military aggression in Europe, insuring the territorial integrity and political independence of the European nations and enabling those nations to stabilize their respective economies. However, events of recent months have clearly demonstrated that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization needs to become more than a military alliance. The threat of the new look Russian foreign policy demands that new life and broader vision be given to NATO.

RECENT NATO ACTION

In view of the new tactics of the Soviet Union, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has taken some recent and significant action. At a meeting of NATO in Paris on May 5, it was decided to set up a committee of 3, including Foreign Ministers Gaetano Martino of Italy, Lester B. Pearson of Canada and Halvard M. Lange of Norway, to make a study of NATO problems and to develop ways and means of defeating communism. As suggested by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles to the NATO meeting in Paris, this high level council would sit permanently, dealing with political and economic problems confronting the Atlantic community. Thus, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has reacted to the new situation created by the change in the tactics of the Soviet Union—a change which is, of course, calculated to help them in their fundamental objective of world domination, which does not change.

Today perhaps more than ever before, Europe is aware that its very survival rests on the strengthening of economic, military and political ties within the Atlantic community. European nations must realize that there are issues involved that require the sacrifice of certain nationalist goals and de-

sires. For Europe to assume her rightful place in any international negotiations and decisions, she must work effectively and soon toward greater integration and unity.

Guy Mollet has said: "Russia's cold war has shown the need for a Europe united militarily; Russia's new look calls even more loudly for a Europe united politically." Progress has definitely been made toward European integration. Europe has moved toward the idea of a common market. A common coordinating authority will act as a spokesman for the common European interest, although a "United States of Europe" with executive, legislative and judicial powers is far from a forseeable realization. An agency coordinating on a supranational level to give Europe the strength she needs for survival and effective international cooperation is a reasonable expectation.

REJECTION OF EUROPEAN DEFENSE COMMUNITY

The foregoing is a brief summary of the principal successful European ventures since the termination of World War II. Concomitant with these successful ventures have been certain projects and proposals which have not fared so well. The aura of success which tends to surround these union efforts of postwar Europe must not blind us to setbacks which have occurred.

For one thing, I refer to the rejection by France of the European Defense Community. Although France had led the way in proposing the European Defense Community, the proposal for pooling the Armed Forces of the 6 member nations into a common army was turned down by the French assembly in 1954. Among the principal reasons for this rejection of the European Defense Community was the French fear that Germany would dominate it, being potentially more capable of developing military predominance in Europe. Of course, the concept of supranationalism associated with all these schemes for integration has always run headlong into the competing nationalisms of the respective countries. For this reason all the interested European nations have approached this concept with caution.

With the rejection of the supranational European Defense Community, the countries fell back upon a more orthodox military alliance. Some years earlier, Britain, France and the Benelux countries had signed a defensive alliance called the Brussels Treaty Organization. With this Organization as a basis, the Western European Union was established at the Nine Power Conference held in London in the fall of 1954, consisting of Britain, France, the Benelux countries, Germany and Italy. Since this alliance was a substitute for the European Defense Community, it naturally had the same purpose to add Western German strength to that of the allies and at the same time to control that strength. As stipulated in this Western European Union, Western Germany is pledged to abide by a continental arms control, not to manufacture atomic, biological or chemical weapons, to conduct its foreign policy in accordance with the United Nations Charter and never to resort to force to achieve German unification. Thus, although the Union does have certain aspects of supranationalism, it does not have such extensive ones as those the defunct European Defense Community would have had.

THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

In the report of the study mission several paragraphs were devoted to the Council of Europe. As you all know, it was in March 1948 that the French Parliament adopted a resolution calling for a European Constituent Assembly to establish a European federation. Established on May 5, 1949 with the aim of promoting "greater unity among the European countries in order to facilitate their economic and social progress," the Council of Europe now includes the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Italy, Ireland, Saar, the Scandinavian countries, Greece, Turkey, Iceland, and the German Federal Republic.

The major organs of the Council are: the Committee of Ministers, composed of the Foreign Ministers of the member States or their deputies, which meets at least twice a year in closed sessions; the Consultative Assembly, consisting of 132 delegates with delegations varying in size according to the relative sizes of the member countries, which meets in open sessions annually for 1 month in Strasbourg, France; and the Secretariat. Before the Consultative Assembly can make recommendations to the Committee of Ministers, a two-thirds majority vote is required, and such recommendations, if unanimously approved by the Ministers, are then transmitted to the member governments. A system of "partial agreements," agreements among certain members which do not bind those who abstain, which slightly modifies the unanimity rule, has only recently been adopted by the Ministers.

Because of the existence of other international organizations with functions similar to those of the Council of Europe, which in essence is a clearinghouse of ideas for the means of advancing European unification, the Statute of the Council provides that the work of these other organizations be kept in mind when the Assembly is planning its agenda, thus avoiding a duplication of effort.

PROSPECTS FOR FURTHER PROGRESS TOWARD INTEGRATION

We may now ask ourselves what are the prospects for further progress toward integration in Europe. In the first place, the new habits and institutions established within the European Community have taken root and have been accepted by Europeans and the world. The European idea has captured the imagination of even the once skeptical European. A new consciousness of "Europeaness," so to speak, about the common background of the European civilization has been realized by Europeans themselves.

More and more one hears Europeans speaking in terms of common interests and a common market. From the beginning of the Marshall plan the matter of a common market has persistently appeared. When Robert Schuman's plan for pooling coal and steel resources was accepted by the 6 European nations in April 1951, it was establishing a common steel and coal market for regulating production and eliminating trade and other restrictions. It is felt that this 6-nation common market of 150 million in a united Europe should increase production and prosperity by creating a larger and greater demand for new goods. Coal and steel were selected as the first sector to be pooled because these two resources are the major ones upon which the heavy industries of both France and Germany exist. By September 1955 progress had been made toward stabilizing the common market, as well as toward integrating other fuel and power resources into the plan. For the future there is talk of integrating transport, other conventional fuel and power, and even nuclear energy.

TOWARD THE FUTURE

In the report of the special study mission on International Organizations and Movements and on the unification and integration of Europe issued in 1954, we stated in our last paragraph: "The United States has steadfastly encouraged and supported unification and integration movements in free Europe. In the final analysis, however, these movements must spring inwardly from the will of the Europeans themselves. United States policy is premised on that will. But if the passage of a reasonable length of time indicates that such a will does not exist, the United States would be compelled—not by its own choosing—to readjust its policy."

I like to believe that there is springing from the hearts of the Europeans a desire for a closer integration and unification. The events of the past several months have posed new problems and in view of this, the United States is in the process of readjusting its policy, not because we have lost faith in the unification of Europe, but because we recognize that into the existing organization, particularly the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, there must be breathed a new life and a new vitality.

That Europe is endeavoring to come to grips with this problem is evidenced by the recent appointment of a committee of NATO members to study and report to the Council, which I mentioned previously. That we are coming to grips with this problem is evidenced by a suggestion which Secretary of State Dulles offered in his speech closing the mutual security hearings on May 10 of this year. The Secretary stated that consideration is being given to the establishment of a committee to conduct an independent study of various aspects of the mutual security program. In listing the topics under consideration, he included: "The relative role of the State and Defense Departments in administering the program; whether we should seek to put more of our program on a loan rather than a grant basis; whether the program needs to be enlarged and given greater continuity to meet the new Soviet tactics." Thus, the free nations of the world, because of the recent change in Soviet tactics, are endeavoring to shape policies to meet the new situation.

STATEMENT MADE BY THE UNITED NATIONS DELEGATION TO SECRETARY OF STATE DULLES

In connection with this shift in Soviet policies, the United States delegation to the 10th General Assembly of the United Nations, of which I was a member, submitted to the Secretary of State on December 9, 1955, a statement on foreign policy. In this communication we stated:

"The present period in history may one day be recognized as a major turning point in the struggle between communism and freedom. It appears to be clearly a shift in the cold war, in which economic and social problems have moved to the forefront.

"Members of the United States delegation during this General Assembly session have observed the effectiveness of Soviet tactics under these new conditions. This can be seen both in the way the Soviet bloc delegates work in various United Nations meetings and also in the voting that occurs in many committees. As we observed maneuvers, we were conscious that the Soviet Union, elsewhere in the world, was using economic and social collaboration as a means for jumping military as well as political barriers. Examples of this can be found in India, Egypt, and Burma.

"We believe that the United States must counter these Soviet efforts. We can succeed, not by outbidding communism in sheer amounts of economic aid, but by making newly independent and newly articulate peoples feel that they can best satisfy their wants by becoming and remaining part of the community of free nations.

"We welcome more emphasis on economic and educational endeavors, for we have a proven experience in these fields.

"We are in a contest in the field of economic development of underdeveloped countries which is bitterly competitive. Defeat in this contest could be as disastrous as defeat in an armaments race.

"We could lose this economic contest unless the country as a whole wakes up to all its implications."

CONCLUSION

Europe must continue its drive with constantly increasing intensity to become more

united economically, militarily, and politically, if the threat of communism is to be effectively met and destroyed. The Council of Europe, which is the political organization for the purpose of developing ways and means to bring about political unity, can well become the most important instrument for the realization of more cooperation among the countries of Europe. The unification of Europe has widespread support not only in Europe but throughout our own country. I know of no better way to become familiar with the problems inherent in the various moves calculated to bring about European unification than to make a study of this many faceted problem through a Model Assembly of the Council of Europe, such as you have held here today.

Europe is an integral part of the free civilization which it is our privilege to possess. Stretching back over the centuries, the nations of Europe have made a growing and an enduring contribution to the culture and the civilization of the West. From these countries we have received enrichment in art, music, literature, and many of the fields of human activity.

The revolution in scientific fields, particularly aviation and nuclear energy, is demanding that equal progress be made in the field of economics and politics. As the organizations we have been talking about become successful, we will find in the future a strong and invigorated continent continuing to make a contribution to the civilization of the West. This is our hope for Europe. We thoroughly believe in European unification and integration. We are endeavoring to shape our policies to bring about this desired end. I have confidence that we will be successful and I am certain that the nations of Europe, which are already hearing the clarion call of destiny, "unite or perish," will rise to the occasion in this mid-20th century, and will, with our help and our encouragement, move ever closer to unification and integration until the peoples of those countries are completely secure from the sinister threat of communism, are able to live free from the fear of war and are able in a peaceful environment to help in the bringing about of a prosperous and peaceful world community.

A Reappraisal of the Life of Jefferson Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on May 5 last a memorable occasion was held at Fort Monroe, Va. At that time the dedication ceremonies were conducted by the United Daughters of the Confederacy dedicating the Jefferson Davis Memorial Park.

On that occasion an outstanding citizen of the South, my distinguished colleague, Senator JOHN C. STENNIS, was the principal speaker. This was most appropriate since that great southern leader of the Confederacy, Jefferson Davis, was a Mississippian.

In view of the wealth of information concerning this truly great man contained in the address, it is appropriate that the remarks of Senator STENNIS on that occasion be given wider circulation. The address itself was a splendid one honoring this Mississippian, the leader of the Southern States in that unfortunate fratricidal strife.

Senator STENNIS' address is as follows:

A REAPPRAISAL OF THE LIFE OF JEFFERSON DAVIS

The United Daughters of the Confederacy do well to honor the spot where the very last drops of the lifeblood of the southern Confederacy were drained off, and the one man who was the symbol of that mighty cause suffered the ignominy and torture of chains and imprisonment.

The ironing of Jefferson Davis at Fort Monroe, where at first he was thrown to the stone floor and held down by four soldiers while a blacksmith riveted heavy shackles on his ankles, was as a cup of vinegar to the South, as much as it was a mortifying and painful attack on the body of the President of the Confederate States of America.

But even the rigors of this Gethsemane never daunted the spirit of Jefferson Davis.

There he was:

That great and good man from my own home State of Mississippi; that gallant soldier who had been the outstanding military figure of the Black Hawk and Indian wars; that renowned hero who had given luster to American arms in the war with Mexico at Monterey and Buena Vista; that calm and dispassionate scholar who had been the friend and confidante of America's great military captains, and friend and advisor to three Presidents of the United States; that wise and provident counselor who had stood on the floor of the United States Senate with Webster, Clay, and Calhoun, and pleaded for measures of justice and conciliation that might have saved the Union and saved it without bloodshed; and finally that stalwart, towering, and lonely figure, called by 13 American States to share their brilliant but tragic destiny in their second war of independence.

What could the stone walls and iron bars of Fort Monroe do to a spirit like this?

In spite of chains, imprisonment, and utter defeat, the President of the Confederate States of America was no lost leader of a lost cause.

The South was fighting, not for slavery, not for any white-pillared aristocracy, not for its own independent economy. She was fighting for a principle as old as the hills and as sacred as the covenants of all God-fearing peoples. She was fighting for autonomy and local self-government, something that men call freedom, something known as liberty, which men had fought and died for since the dawn of civilized man.

The truth is, the frightful and bloody fratricidal war she was called upon to wage in defense of her soil and rights to self-government, was merely a single engagement in the still greater and continuous war, which has been waged for centuries by freemen everywhere for freedom, for the right of self-determination, for local self-government, and for freedom from colonialism and empirical controls.

For his spirit to live, Jefferson Davis had to be a great man. And he was.

Governor Brown of Mississippi in proffering him a seat in the United States Senate referred to his military career in these words:

"The people will never cease to remember with pride and gratitude that to you, sir, and the brave Mississippians under your command, is our State indebted for honors as imperishable as the soil on which you won them; honors which shall last as long as chivalry is respected or valor has a place in the hearts of men."

Perhaps, as one who occupies the honored position of a successor to Jefferson Davis in the United States Senate, and as one who has as his desk on the Senate floor Jefferson Davis' own desk, my own mind dwells with singular propriety on the great career the Mississippian carved out for himself as a statesman in that body.

Davis was only 39 years old when he first took his seat in the United States Senate. In a few brief years, he came to rank well up with such towering figures as ex-President John Quincy Adams, Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, and John C. Calhoun. When Calhoun, the acknowledged Southern spokesman, died in 1850, Davis was immediately recognized as his successor.

His spirited defense of Daniel Webster, a political enemy, when for cheap partisan advantage Webster's integrity was challenged in the Senate; his tireless efforts, as member and chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, to enlarge and strengthen the Armed Forces of the United States; his wise and courageous battle against the Wilmot Proviso; his lengthy, brilliant, and arduous debates in behalf of a strict construction of the Constitution as to powers ceded to the Federal Government and those reserved to the States; and his magnificent resentment of the abolitionists and their attacks on the South, in and out of the Senate—all these marked Jefferson Davis as undisputed leader of the South and Southern thought.

But Davis was far and above the position of a mere sectional or partisan leader. He was well in the forefront of the national expansionists. It doesn't seem necessary more than merely to mention in passing the hiatus in Davis' Senate career when he went home to run for the Mississippi governorship and was defeated by 999 votes. For, when Franklin Pierce came to the Presidency in 1853, the Mississippi ex-Senator was literally drafted for renewed public service as Secretary of War in the new Democratic Cabinet. He became one of the outstanding War Secretaries in United States history.

With the termination of the Pierce administration, on March 4, 1857, Jefferson Davis resumed his career in the United States Senate, 24 hours after he had ceased to be Secretary of War, and 4 days before the Supreme Court rendered the Dred Scott decision.

From this time to the day when he had to rise in the Senate and announce the secession of his own beloved Mississippi, Jefferson Davis strove in every honorable way possible to find some way to preserve the Union as well as southern rights.

Jefferson Davis returned to Mississippi and offered his services to the State, and was made a major general of the Army of Mississippi.

But he had a rendezvous with an uncompromising and relentless destiny which was not to be denied; for on that fateful day of February 10, 1861, a messenger from Vicksburg arrived in hot haste with a telegram notifying him that he had been unanimously chosen President of the Confederate States of America. He thus became the leader, commander-in-chief and historical standard bearer of the most bloody, costly, and devastating revolution of modern times.

The whole life and career of this man, it would seem in historical retrospect, had been a schooling and preparation for such a climax. As Senator Yancey said, "The man and the hour have met."

Certainly, he had been one who never turned his back but marched breast forward.

I shall certainly not here pursue all the brilliant strokes of genius and doubtless grievous errors of judgment, of his tenure as President of the Confederacy. I do want to point out now that, on assuming the exalted office of President of the Confederate States of America, President Davis said:

"I come with diffidence and distrust to discharge the great duties devolved on me by the kindness and confidence of the Congress of the Confederate States. I will devote to the duties of the high office to which I have

been called all that I have—of heart, of head, and of hand."

History records that in every sense of the word Jefferson Davis lived up to that pledge.

As he left the city of Richmond that he had so long and so magnificently defended, he had the right to look the world in the face and say, "I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course. I have kept the faith."

Today a bronze statue of President Davis, presented by my State of Mississippi to the Federal Government, stands in the Vicksburg National Park, which surrounds that heroic city. Also, his likeness stands in Statuary Hall in the United States Capitol as the greatest Mississippian. By his side stands the great and peerless Gen. Robert E. Lee, placed there by a grateful Virginia. These men live on forever; their greatness inspires us with patriotic pride. Our southern way of life will continue inspired by the thoughts and deeds of the heroic men of Davis' day.

For nations, as with individuals, times change. Old problems are solved, or pass off the scene. New ones arise. But principles live and remain the same.

As worthy descendants of our illustrious forebears of the time of Jefferson Davis, we must turn our faces not to the past, but to the problems of our own future. To these problems, we must apply the same high principles of public trust, personal honor, and devotion to duty, as were applied by that generation. We must have the courage of heart and mind to do more, regardless of the odds against us, for the great principles of government which we believe are sound and essential to our Nation's welfare.

Jefferson Davis, a man of vision, saw the necessity of preserving the powers of the States. Otherwise and inevitably a strong centralized government would eventually destroy personal freedom.

That truth was never better expressed than in the following words of the late Raleigh C. Minor, formerly of the University of Virginia Law School, and truly one of the great law teachers of our Nation:

"If a power is one reserved by the States, and, after long and patient trial and experiment, the States prove incompetent to exercise it properly and it is essential that it be so exercised, then let the power be transferred to the Federal Government by amendment to the Constitution. If the necessity is not great enough and evident enough to induce the legislatures of three-fourths of the States to assent to the transfer, it may be fairly assumed that the transfer is not so essential after all.

"But in any event let it not be accomplished by a forced construction of the Constitution. This is even now the canker that is slowly but surely eating away the reserved rights of the States and sapping their powers. If the process be not checked, the time must certainly come when the sovereign States will be nothing more than mere municipal corporations with only such powers left them as their Federal Government may choose to allow. God save the fair fabric of the Constitution from such a fate."

These words, written in 1913, were applicable in the days of Jefferson Davis, and they apply as well today.

If we would truly honor our forebears of that generation, we will face the responsibilities that come to our generation.

If liberty and freedom and sound principles of Government are to be preserved, it will be through the efforts of our generation—not the generation of Jefferson Davis nor the generation that is to follow us, but those of us who are living now.

God give us the insight to see our duty and our opportunity, and the courage to act.

Thus and thus only can we preserve constitutional government.

Statement By Hon. John E. Henderson, of Ohio, in Opposition to H. R. 5550, Before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on March 7, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, when the Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member, was considering H. R. 5550, Congressman JOHN E. HENDERSON, of Ohio's 15th District, appeared before the committee to express his vigorous opposition to this measure. H. R. 5550 would authorize the United States to join an international organization known as the Organization of Trade Cooperation. The OTC would, in turn, have as its principal function the administration of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The seven counties of Representative HENDERSON's district in southeastern Ohio have suffered seriously for many years as a result of policies which have lowered tariffs on those products which they and adjacent areas of our State produce. Although H. R. 5550 would not, in itself, authorize further tariff reductions, it would, in my opinion, authorize participation in an organization whose actions and policies would soon accomplish this end.

I believe Mr. HENDERSON's testimony before the committee is an excellent treatment of this complex subject. It is as follows:

My purpose in appearing before your committee during the hearings on H. R. 5550 is to urge that the committee and the Congress act with extreme caution in consideration of this legislation.

The bill before you would, if enacted, authorize the United States to be a party to the Organization for Trade Cooperation among whose duties are the administration of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

I should like to point out at the very beginning of my remarks that the average citizen looks to Congress as the responsible agency for those things which control his commercial activities. He feels that if remedial action is needed in any phase of Government he can look to Congress for that action. Especially does he feel that the question of the regulation of trade rests within the purview of the Congress for he knows that the Constitution of the United States, brief as it is, has specifically enumerated the question of tariffs for especial treatment when it says in article 1, section 8:

"The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imports, and excises * * * to regulate commerce with foreign nations."

This is a definite assertion of congressional responsibility for the regulation of duties and commerce with foreign nations.

The average citizen is somewhat bewildered to learn that the economic pinch that he feels because of a reduction of protective tariffs on the goods he manufactures has not been brought about by action of the Congress but by an international agreement which the Congress has not ratified.

The average citizen remembers that the courts at one time had declared that there were some powers which Congress could not delegate. He is confused to learn that today he is faced, not with a simple delegation of authority, but a complex delegation from the Congress to the Executive and, thence, from the Executive to an international entity known as GATT—to the end that even the executive branch, in becoming a party to the agreement, has lost some of the authority that had been delegated to it.

That is the state of affairs prior to the enactment of the legislation which is now before us.

At the time that H. R. 1, the Reciprocal Trade Act extension, was under consideration in the first session of the 84th Congress, many of us expressed ourselves on the subject of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and what it had done to weaken the economic position of the United States.

In the first place, it was pointed out that the entire GATT program had been directed toward the reduction of United States tariffs and toward the establishment of economic advantages of one sort or another for many of the nations who were parties to GATT. Seldom, if ever, has this organization worked to the economic advantage of the United States.

Parenthetically, I would like to endorse the statements which have been made by the two speakers who immediately preceded me that these agreements have worked more specifically for the advantage of other nations.

We have progressed to the point now where our tariff rates are among the lowest throughout the world.

Those who advocate low tariffs will say that the benefits lie in three categories. First, that it encourages world trade. To this some of us must answer that our exports as related to our national productivity have reached such a low ratio that the benefits cannot outweigh the detrimental effects of wrecking home industries and rendering jobless the pottery worker, the glass worker, the worker in our clay tile industry, and the coal miner. In other words, the price we pay for world trade places a great and unequal burden on many of the important industries of our Nation.

Secondly, it is argued that by giving economic advantages to other countries, we are helping them without expense to our own taxpayers. To this must be given the answer that such economic concessions will cost us far more in terms of lost income to American industry and ultimately in the tax revenues our Nation receives.

Let us not forget that every dollar of corporate profit in the United States means at least 50 cents in tax revenues. Where our tariff practices have reduced the profits of the American pottery, tile, and glass industries by a certain figure, those same practices have reduced the taxes paid by those industries by at least one-half.

Thirdly, the advocates of low tariffs will say that American industry is more prosperous than ever and shows no signs (except in certain specific industries such as pottery, glass, coal, bicycles, textiles, wool, etc.) of being hurt by the program. To this we must answer that we are enjoying prosperity not because of but in spite of our trade practices. The ill effects are slow to show themselves. In spite of our dollar export figures our quantity export figures have not kept pace.

All of which leads me to the point of saying simply that GATT and the concomitant low tariff policy has done nothing to help the American economy and that GATT and its international attitudes has done several things which may only be interpreted as harmful to notable segments of our industry

and the men and women who depend upon these industries for their livelihood.

First, it has reduced America's bargaining position to something less than its wealth and prestige would reserve for it at diplomatic level. Though our world position as a nation among nations is one of great influence, as a signatory to GATT it approaches the same degree of influence as the weakest member. Secondly, it has weakened the constitutionally granted authority of the Congress to regulate foreign commerce. You and I know, Mr. Chairman, that in recent years the Congress has been repeatedly cautioned that it must follow certain selected paths and that failure to do so would lead to embarrassment because of concessions which our Nation had granted through GATT. To say that GATT has no power to work its will upon congressional policy is ignoring reality. Each time that a cautious Congress attempts to look under the covers of a trade policy all sorts of taboos, both large and small, are raised.

Yes; it is literally true that Congress has not ratified or officially recognized GATT; that Congress can yet act in matters of foreign trade. But will it be true if H. R. 5550 is enacted?

In enacting this bill Congress will be authorizing membership in an agency that will have as its chief duty the administration of GATT. The bill clearly states that purpose. Since it has this as its chief function, do we not at the same time ratify the contract which it administers? True, the organization has other duties, but they are lesser duties and they are ones which can be ably performed in some other manner.

Let us ask ourselves several questions before we act upon this measure. First, do we want to continue down this pathway to ever-lower trade restriction? As we answered the rollcall on H. R. 1, many of us said we did not. Our industries, particularly those which produce our handmade products, our pottery and clay tile, our glass, and the industries which prepare our natural resources, coal and oil, and the thousands of American workmen engaged, or until recently engaged, in such production say that we do not. Secondly, do we want our trade practices so completely divorced from congressional authority through this process of double delegation to the point that we relinquish our prominence in the world today by being out-voted in a contractural arrangement such as GATT? As I see it, if we want an agreement, do we want this one? The Congress has never had an opportunity to express itself directly on this point. Thirdly, do we want to join this specific club, this organization, OTC?

Perhaps we have reached the point in civilization's march when we should direct more of our attitudes to internationalism—a march which has been fraught with disappointment in the past. But if we concede that we must now express ourselves as one unit of an international confederation, and must not only join, but, in return for some advantages must surrender sovereignty in some degree or other—if that is so, aren't we still privileged to carefully investigate the club we will join? Perhaps this organization which seems so bent upon bringing advantages to other nations is not the one for us. Possibly one can be fashioned which will meet our needs far better—one which will not reduce this Nation of ours to the voting position of a second or third rate power. For as surely as we concur in OTC, and indirectly in the activities of GATT, we will be reduced to that position in other things.

Mr. Chairman, the day has not yet come when American industry cannot find markets within our borders and among our growing population. The day has not yet come when other nations will not procure our goods just as we will buy that which we must have from other nations. The day has not yet come in America when we would, as a measure of national policy, say to coal miners and pottery workers that you will be deprived of your jobs and you must sell your homes and leave your established communities to find new fields of work, forgetting your skills and accomplishments, because of the decisions of an international organization to which your elected Representatives in the Congress gave such authority.

The people of the 15th Congressional District in southeastern Ohio, which I have the honor to represent, have suffered grievous economic hardship because of the tariff policies of the past several decades.

My constituents have written and called on me to urge that your committee proceed on this legislation with extreme caution. Mr. Chairman, in appearing here today, I am speaking for them.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 7, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, June 4, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Father Joseph F. Thorning, D. D., Frederick, Md., honorary professor in the Catholic University of Chile, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, King of our hearts and Saviour of our souls, look down with favor upon the Presiding Officer of the Senate and all the Members of the Congress of the United States.

Let the light of Thy countenance shine brightly upon all the Presidents of the American Republics who, in the final week of this beautiful month, will gather in historic conference in our sister Republic of Panama.

Grant to these gifted leaders, inspired by the ideals of the great liberator, Simon Bolivar, the vision of a Western Hemisphere where neighbors, partners, and friends freely can exchange ideas, skills, services, and the products of their toil.

Vouchsafe to the American Chief Executives and to all who counsel them the conviction that the divine revelation imparted in the Bible is the best fountainhead of freedom for the sons and daughters of the New World and for all humanity.

Do Thou, Most Holy Spirit, inspire every citizen of the American Republics to offer daily prayers throughout June that God's choicest blessings and graces may be showered upon our statesmen whose responsibility it is to advance the cause of brotherly love.

Confident in Thy holy protection, we seek these favors in the name of the Prince of Love and Peace, the Christ of the Andes. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 6, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 421)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying document, referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

This message is submitted pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended.

Under the authority of the trade agreements legislation, the United States entered into a trade agreement at Geneva, Switzerland, on May 23, 1956, with other contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. A copy of that agreement is submitted herewith. The United States received tariff concessions from other countries on various products exported by the United States in return for tariff concessions by the United States.

On two products the United States by separate action negotiated increases in the existing rates of duty. In one case, involving certain fur-felt hat bodies, a court decision had in effect nullified tariff increases which were proclaimed a few years ago as the result of an escape-clause investigation. In its peril-point investigation on these hat bodies, the Tariff Commission found that the lower rates resulting from the court decision should be increased. The negotiated increases raise the rates of duty to the peril points found by the Tariff Commission, and in general restore the rates which had been applicable under the escape-clause proclamation prior to the court decision. In the other case, involving liquid sugar, there has been no peril-point finding that an increase was necessary; the objective was to equalize the rates applicable to dry and liquid sugar.

In the other two cases—certain tungsten alloys and violins and violas—in which the Tariff Commission reported that increases in existing rates of duty were required, it was found that the advantages of negotiating the increases would have been outweighed by attendant disadvantages which made it undesirable to accomplish the increases by this means. Also, in the case of tungsten alloys, only one group was listed for negotiation while others, including ferro-tungsten, the most important in terms of imports, was not listed. Increasing the duty on the listed alloys would thus have unduly complicated our tariff structure without adequate economic justification. For these reasons, increased rates on tungsten alloys and violins and violas were not included in the trade

agreement. These considerations would not be a bar to applications by domestic producers of these products for escape-clause action under the provisions of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 7, 1956.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nominations of Beulah M. Kitchens and Spencer H. Mayes to be postmasters at Greenwood, Nebr., and Graham, Tex., respectively, which nominating messages were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9536) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1026. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 1053. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands in the State of Montana to the Phillips County Post of the American Legion;

S. 1244. An act to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 2498. An act to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Clatsop, Oreg., as a national monument;

S. 3332. An act to amend the Employment Act of 1946, as amended;

S. 3920. An act to authorize the partition or sale of inherited interests in allotted lands in the Tulalip Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes;

H. R. 4363. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the State of New Mexico; and

H. R. 5237. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ella Madden and Clarence E. Madden.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, subject to a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF REVISED ORGANIC ACT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 28 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CERTIFICATION OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION, VENTURA RIVER PROJECT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, certifying, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Ventura River project, California, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MAJ. CLARENCE E. WOODS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Maj. Clarence E. Woods (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting pursuant to law, a report with respect to the administration of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, as amended, dated June 1, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

J. A. ZACHARIASSEN & CO., ET AL., *v.* THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, that court's opinion in the case of *J. A. Zachariassen & Co., et al.*, v. *The United States*, dated June 5, 1956 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such suspensions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 701 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to simplify the procedures governing the prescribing of regulations under certain provisions of such act, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on file in the Veterans' Administration, which are not needed in the conduct of business, have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF PENNSYLVANIA LEGISLATURE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

Resolution 163

The Upper Allegheny River Valley last week suffered the most disastrous flood since 1865. The Borough of Warren alone has been damaged reckoned in money far in excess of a million dollars. Most other upriver communities have suffered in proportion.

In contrast, Pittsburgh and the lower Allegheny Valley have incurred but little damage. The reason clearly is that sizable heads of water were held back by the system of flood-control dams in operation for the benefit of the lower river.

This system was authorized 20 years ago by the 74th Congress of the United States. However, the flood-control dams for the upper river still remain in the preliminary planning stage, notably the great dam to be built athwart the Allegheny above Warren reportedly near Kinzua.

Continued in action in proceeding with the construction of the upper river flood-control system commencing with the main dam above Warren means a heavy handicap to the northwestern Pennsylvania area, an ever-to-be-reckoned-with threat to life and property, and an active and deadening threat to the economic development of the region: Therefore be it

Resolved (the senate concurring), That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to expedite to the utmost the appropriations and any additionally needed enabling legislation to bring into

being the main upper Allegheny Dam and other uncompleted units of the Allegheny Valley flood-control system without further delay; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

HIRAM G. ANDREWS,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
BENJAMIN L. LONG,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.
CHAS. L. LATHUO,
Librarian of the Senate.

RESOLUTIONS OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEYS GENERAL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the National Association of Attorneys General, together with the letter of transmittal.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEYS GENERAL,
Chicago, Ill., May 28, 1956.

Hon. WILLIAM N. LANGER,
Senate Judiciary Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing herewith copies of resolutions concerning H. R. 5649, S. 3617, and S. 3143 which were adopted by the National Association of Attorneys General at their annual meeting in Phoenix.

Thanking you for your consideration of these resolutions, I remain

Cordially,

JOHN BEN SHEPPERD.

RULES OF CONSTRUCTION TO GUIDE THE SUPREME COURT

Whereas members of this association have expressed alarm on several occasions in recent years over the increasing tendency of the Supreme Court of the United States to hold that enactments by Congress operate to exclude or supersede any State laws on the same subject matter and to preempt the field for Federal occupancy; and

Whereas such extensions of Federal power by judicial interpretation have impinged and continue to impinge directly upon the powers reserved to the States and the citizens thereof by the 10th amendment to the Constitution, and thus present a real threat to the continued independence and integrity of the States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 50th annual meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General, That this association approves the enactment by Congress of legislation to clarify its intent that no future act of Congress shall be considered to exclude any State laws on the same subject matter unless such congressional act contains an express provision to that effect, nor shall such congressional act invalidate a provision of State law which would be valid in the absence of such act unless a power expressly granted to the Federal Government by the Constitution of the United States is involved; and be it further

Resolved, That this association extends to the Members of Congress who have introduced H. R. 3 and S. 3143, now pending in the 84th Congress, its sincere appreciation for sponsoring legislation designed to accomplish the objectives set forth above, and the secretariat is requested to bring this resolution to the attention of the Presiding Officers and to the appropriate committee chairmen of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States as well as to the sponsors of the named bills.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Be it resolved by the 50th annual meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General, That this association endorses the enactment of Federal legislation authorizing the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities, involving State or National Governments or either of them; be it further

Resolved, That the secretariat is requested to forward copies of this resolution to the presiding officers and the appropriate committee chairmen of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

HABEAS CORPUS

Whereas this association at its annual meetings commencing in 1951 has discussed and expressed its concern with respect to the abuse of the office of the writ of habeas corpus; and

Whereas this association, through appropriate committees, has cooperated with the Federal Judicial Conference and the Conference of Chief Justices in finding appropriate remedy for the problem through amendment of Federal law, and a bill to carry out the objectives commonly sought by these three cooperating groups (H. R. 5649) has passed the House of Representatives and presently is in the Senate Judiciary Committee; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 50th annual meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General, That this association records again its concern with the problem and its sincere hope that the Congress of the United States will complete the passage of House Resolution 5649 before adjournment; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of this association are urged to indicate to the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee as well as to their delegations in the United States Senate the desire for early consideration by the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

S. 3363. A bill for the relief of Miroslav Slovak (Rept. No. 2148).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H. R. 4873. A bill for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Mortimer T. Clement, Medical Corps, United States Navy, retired (Rept. No. 2149).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 2572. A bill to authorize the interchange of lands between the Department of Agriculture and military departments of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2152);

S. 2585. A bill to authorize an exchange of land at the Agricultural Research Center (Rept. No. 2155);

S. 3120. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (Rept. No. 2154); and

S. 3314. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of an Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation (Rept. No. 2153).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment.

S. 2732. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal and non-Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2156); and

S. 3669. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (Rept. No. 2157).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

S. 2530. A bill to repeal the authority of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to issue bonds, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2158);

S. 3032. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Middle Atlantic interstate forest fire protection compact (Rept. No. 2159);

S. 3046. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, and the act of March 3. 1905 (33 Stat. 1264), as amended, to eliminate the requirement of certain notices thereunder, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2160); and

S. 3145. A bill to require the Bureau of the Census to develop farm income data by economic class of farm (Rept. No. 2161).

By Mr. CLEMENTS, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment:

S. 3261. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (Rept. No. 2151).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 3344. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the Territory of Alaska certain lands in the city of Sitka, known as Baranof Castle site (Rept. No. 2150).

By Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

H. R. 7913. A bill authorizing the Administrator of General Services to effect the exchange of properties between the United States and the city of Cape Girardeau, Mo. (Rept. No. 2162).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 3723. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey certain land in the county of Alameda, Calif., and to accept other land in exchange therefor (Rept. No. 2163).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

H. R. 2452. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the State of Wisconsin (Rept. No. 2164).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H. R. 8709. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended (Rept. No. 2167).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

H. R. 5590. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Gustaf E. Lambert (Rept. No. 2168).

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine, from the Comittee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H. R. 3744. A bill to amend an act of July 1, 1947, to grant military leave of absence with pay to substitute employees in the postal field service (Rept. No. 2165); and

H. R. 9838. A bill to authorize transfer of officers of the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve to the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2166).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 4011. A bill to amend section 650 of title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," relating to the Coast Guard Supply Fund; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MALONE (for himself and Mr. BIBLE):

S. 4012. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada acting for the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MALONE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. MORSE, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. LAIRD):

S. 4013. A bill to establish on public lands of the United States a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, to provide for the protection and administration of the areas within this system by existing Federal agencies and for the gathering and dissemination of information to increase the knowledge and appreciation of wilderness for its appropriate use and enjoyment by the people, to establish a National Wilderness Preservation Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 4014. A bill to advance the scientific and professional research and development programs of the Departments of Defense, the Interior, and Commerce, to improve the management and administration of certain departmental activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 4015. A bill for the relief of Antoinetta Aurora Mattera Berg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 4016. A bill to designate the dam to be constructed in connection with the Eagle Gorge Reservoir project on the Green River, Wash., as the Howard A. Hanson Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 4017. A bill to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 4018. A bill to extend the requirements for inspection of vessels to tugboats, towing boats and freight boats navigating on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; and

S. 4019. A bill to extend the vessel inspection laws to dredges and barges navigating the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 4020. A bill to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of passenger vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSION OF INSPECTION LAWS TO CERTAIN VESSELS AND DREDGES ON THE GREAT LAKES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills to include diesel-powered tugs and lake dredges within the jurisdiction of the United States Coast Guard to inspect vessels for safety. I believe in prompt action. The need for this proposed legislation came to my attention Monday of this week. I immediately requested that bills be prepared to handle the problem and I am, therefore, very happy today to be able to introduce them, just as I am about to leave for Wisconsin for a week of speaking engagements.

The need for this proposed legislation was brought to my attention by our able United States attorney for the eastern district of Milwaukee, Edward G. Minor.

A terrible tragedy which killed nine crew members occured on a large dredge being towed in Lake Michigan from a point near south Milwaukee to the Milwaukee Harbor.

When a storm came up, the towing tug and the dredge were quite unprepared. The dredge was like a sitting duck and the force of the storm destroyed her. A public hearing conducted by three officers of the Coast Guard later developed the facts leading up to this unnecessary tragedy.

When the captain of the tug realized the mounting danger to his craft and his crews, he tried to call aid from the Coast Guard only to find that his radiophone was out of order. This defect would have been discovered, had the tug been subject to Coast Guard inspection.

Why was it not subject to Coast Guard inspection like other vessels? Because the law is antiquated in that respect. The original law required inspection of steam vessels to guard against boiler explosions. It has never been amended to include diesel tugs. So steam tugs are included, but diesel-powered tugs are excluded. The danger to the crew from improper safety protection is the same for both types. That was proved in this case. The bill which I have just introduced would cure this antiquated defect.

The dredge was at the end of a 900-foot towline being pulled into the wind. The towering derrick was in danger of capsizing from the force of the gale. The dredge crew realized an hour and a half before the tragedy that they were in danger and put on life preservers. However, these were not enough. There was only a small 14-foot rowboat on board. It was not large enough to hold all the dredge's crew. Although some were saved, hours after the capsizing, by a Coast Guard cutter, it was then too late for the nine who drowned for lack of an adequate lifeboat.

If this dredge had been subject to Coast Guard inspection, there would have been on board an adequate lifeboat and life rafts which would have undoubtedly saved the lives of the crew. And why was the dredge not inspected? Because it was exempt from inspection by the Coast Guard. The law requires such inspection of seagoing dredges, but not of lake-going dredges. Anyone who has ever seen Lake Michigan in a storm will realize the silly distinction between bodies of water, both of which can be ravaged by serious storms. My bills will cure this defect.

Peculiarly enough, there was no method of communication from the dredge to the tug and from the tug to the dredge. There was no radio-phone on the dredge. There was no telephone line in the cable running from the tug to the dredge. The captain of the tug could, therefore, not coordinate the efforts of the dredge crew with those of his own tug. If this type of safety equipment is not required by the Coast Guard to be placed on dredges, I shall ask the Federal Communication Commission why they do not require it.

The "lake-faring" men risk their lives on our large inland lakes and are just as precious to their country and their loved ones as are sailors going to sea. The workingmen on board the tugs are just as important to us as are the passengers who are protected by laws concerning passenger vessels. They are ever so much more important than the freight which is protected by laws governing freight-carrying vessels. The loved ones on shore have a right to feel that their men are being protected by the very best and the very safest equipment known to man.

And I intend to see that this is so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. WILEY, were received read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

S. 4018. A bill to extend the requirements for inspection of vessels to tugboats, towing boats, and freight boats navigating on the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; and

S. 4019. A bill to extend the vessel inspection laws to dredges and barges navigating the Great Lakes, and for other purposes.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I submit two amendments, intended to be proposed by me, to House bill 7225, the Social Security Amendments of 1956. I ask that the two amendments be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. LEHMAN. One of these amendments reduces the retirement age for women. The other deals with disability insurance benefit payments.

I ask unanimous consent that the two amendments be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. LEHMAN to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide

disability-insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 17, beginning with line 13, strike out all over to and including line 4 on page 18, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"RETIREMENT AGE FOR WOMEN

"SEC. 102. (a) Section 216 (a) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

" 'RETIREMENT AGE

" '(a) The term "retirement age" means—

" '(1) in the case of a man, age 65, or

" '(2) in the case of a woman, age 62.'

"(b) (1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (4), the amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply only in the case of monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after August 1956 and in the case of lump-sum death payments under section 202 (i) of such act with respect to deaths after August 1956.

"(2) In the case of any individual whose entitlement to wife's or mother's insurance benefits under section 202 of the Social Security Act (as in effect prior to the enactment of this act) ended with a month before September 1956, the amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply, for purposes of subsection (b) or (e) of such section 202, only in the case of monthly benefits under such subsection for months after August 1956 and then only if an application is filed by such individual after August 1956.

"(3) For purposes of section 215 (b) (3) (B) of the Social Security Act (but subject to paragraph (1) of this subsection)—

"(A) a woman who attained age 62 prior to August 1956 and who was not eligible for old-age insurance benefits under section 202 of such act (as in effect prior to the enactment of this act) for any month prior to August 1956 shall be deemed to have attained age 62 in 1956 or, if earlier, the year in which she died;

"(B) a woman shall not, by reason of the amendment made by subsection (a), be deemed to be a fully insured individual before September 1956 or the month in which she died, whichever month is the earlier; and

"(C) the amendment made by subsection (a) shall not be applicable in the case of any woman who was eligible for old-age insurance benefits under such section 202 for any month prior to September 1956.

A woman shall, for purposes of this paragraph, be deemed eligible for old-age insurance benefits under section 202 of such act for any month if she was or would have been, upon filing application therefor in such month, entitled to such benefits for such month.

"(4) For purposes of section 209 (i) of such act, the amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to remuneration paid after August 1956."

On page 57, beginning with line 23, strike out all over to and including line 2 on page 58 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Section 5 (f) (2) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out 'age 65' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'retirement age (as defined in section 216 (a) of the Social Security Act.' "

On page 68, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

"STANDBY PAY

"(k) Section 3121 (a) (9) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

" '(9) any payment (other than vacation or sick pay) made to an employee after the month in which—

" '(A) in the case of a man, he attains the age of 65, or

" '(B) in the case of a woman, she attains the age of 62, if such employee did not work for the employer in the period for which such payment is made; or.' "

On page 68, line 11, strike out "(k)" and insert in lieu thereof "(l)."

On page 69, line 2, after the period, insert the following: "The amendment made by subsection (k) shall apply with respect to remuneration paid after August 1956."

Amendments to be proposed by Mr. LEHMAN to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability-insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 3, line 3, strike out "223" and insert in lieu thereof "223 (c)."

On page 3, line 17, strike out "223" and insert in lieu thereof "223 (c)."

On page 4, line 4, strike out "223" and insert in lieu thereof "223 (c)."

On page 5, line 1, strike out "223" and insert in lieu thereof "223 (c)."

On page 6, beginning with line 20, strike out all through line 23 on page 12.

On page 14, line 14, strike out "(l)" and insert in lieu thereof "(h)."

On page 28, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

"DISABILITY INSURANCE BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN DISABLED INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE ATTAINED AGE 50

"SEC 103. (a) Title II of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting after section 222 the following new sections:

" 'DISABILITY INSURANCE BENEFIT PAYMENTS

" '*Disability insurance benefits*

" 'SEC. 223. (a) (1) Every individual who—

" '(A) is insured for disability insurance benefits (as determined under subsection (c) (1)),

" '(B) has attained the age of 50 and has not attained retirement age (as defined in section 216 (a)),

" '(C) has filed application for disability insurance benefits, and

" '(D) is under a disability (as defined in subsection (c) (2) and determined under section 221) at the time such application is filed,

shall be entitled to a disability insurance benefit for each month, beginning with the first month after his waiting period (as defined in subsection (c) (3)) in which he becomes so entitled to such insurance benefits and ending with the month preceding the first month in which any of the following occurs: his disability ceases, he dies, or he attains retirement age.

" '(2) Such individual's disability insurance benefit for any month shall be equal to his primary insurance amount for such month determined under section 215 as though he became entitled to old-age insurance benefits in the first month of his waiting period.

" '*Filing of application*

" '(b) No application for disability insurance benefits which is filed more than 9 months before the first month for which the applicant becomes entitled to such benefits shall be accepted as a valid application for purposes of this section; and no such application which is filed in or before the month in which the Social Security Amendments of 1956 are enacted shall be accepted.

" '*Definitions*

" '(c) For purposes of this section—

" '(1) An individual shall be insured for disability insurance benefits in any month if—

" '(A) he would have been a fully and currently insured individual (as defined in section 214) had he attained retirement age and filed application for benefits under section 202 (a) on the first day of such month, and

" '(B) he had not less than 20 quarters of coverage during the 40-quarter period ending with the quarter in which such first day occurred, not counting as part of such 40-quarter period any quarter any part of which was included in a period of disability (as defined in section 216 (i)) unless such quarter was a quarter of coverage.

" '(2) The term "disability" means inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or to be of long-continued and indefinite duration. An individual shall not be considered to be under a disability unless he furnishes such proof of the existence thereof as may be required.

" '(3) The term "waiting period" means, in the case of any application for disability insurance benefits, the earliest period of 6 consecutive calendar months—

" '(A) throughout which the individual who files such application has been under a disability, and

" '(B) (i) which begins not earlier than with the first day of the 6th month before the month in which such application is filed if such individual is insured for disability insurance benefits in such 6th month, or (ii) if he is not so insured in such month, which begins not earlier than with the 1st day of the 1st month after such 6th month in which he is so insured.

Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this paragraph, no waiting period may begin for any individual before July 1, 1956; nor may any such period begin for any individual before the 1st day of the 6th month before the month in which he attains the age of 50.

" 'REDUCTION OF BENEFITS BASED ON DISABILITY

" 'SEC. 224. (a) If—

" '(1) any individual is entitled to a disability insurance benefit for any month, or to a child's insurance benefit for the month in which he attained the age of 18 or any subsequent month, and

" '(2) either (A) it is determined by any agency of the United States under any other law of the United States or under a system established by such agency that a periodic benefit is payable by such agency for such month to such individual, and the amount of or eligibility for such periodic benefit is based (in whole or in part) on a physical or mental impairment of such individual, or (B) it is determined that a periodic benefit is payable for such month to such individual under a workmen's compensation law or plan of a State on account of a physical or mental impairment of such individual, then the benefit referred to in paragraph (1) shall be reduced (but not below zero) by any amount equal to such periodic benefit or benefits for such month. If such benefit referred to in paragraph (1) for any month is a child's insurance benefit and the periodic benefit or benefits referred to in paragraph (2) exceed such child's insurance benefit, the monthly benefit for such month to which an individual is entitled under subsection (b) or (g) of section 202 shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the amount of such excess, but only if such individual would not be entitled to such monthly benefit if she did not have such child in her care (individually or jointly with her husband, in the case of a wife).

" '(b) If any periodic benefit referred to in subsection (a) (2) is determined to be payable on other than a monthly basis (excluding a benefit payable in a lump sum unless it is a commutation of, or a substitute for, periodic payments), reduction of

the benefits under this section shall be made in such amounts as the Secretary finds will approximate, as nearly as practicable, the reduction prescribed in subsection (a).

"'(c) In order to assure that the purposes of this section will be carried out, the Secretary may, as a condition of certification for payment of any monthly insurance benefit payable to an individual under this title (if it appears to him that there is a likelihood that such individual may be eligible for a periodic benefit which would give rise to a reduction under this section), require adequate assurance of reimbursement to the trust fund in case periodic benefits, with respect to which such a reduction should be made, become payable to such individual and such reduction is not made.

"'(d) Any agency of the United States which is authorized by any law of the United States to pay periodic benefits, or has a system of periodic benefits, which are based in whole or in part on physical or mental impairment, shall (at the request of the Secretary) certify to him, with respect to any individual, such information as the Secretary deems necessary to carry out his functions under subsection (a).

"'(e) For purposes of this section, the term "agency of the United States" means any department or other agency of the United States or any instrumentality which is wholly owned by the United States.

"'SUSPENSION OF BENEFITS BASED ON DISABILITY

"'SEC. 225. If the Secretary, on the basis of information obtained by or submitted to him, believes that an individual entitled to benefits under section 223, or that a child who has attained the age of 18 and is entitled to benefits under section 202 (d), may have ceased to be under a disability, the Secretary may suspend the payment of benefits under such section 223 or 202 (d) until it is determined (as provided in sec. 221) whether or not such individual's disability has ceased or until the Secretary believes that such disability has not ceased. In the case of any individual included under an agreement with a State under section 221 (b), the Secretary shall promptly notify the State of his action under this subsection and shall request a prompt determination of whether such individual's disability has ceased. For purposes of this section, the term "disability" has the meaning assigned to such term in sections 223 (c) (2).'

"(b) Section 222 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"'REHABILITATION SERVICES

"'*Referral for rehabilitation services*

"'SEC. 222. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that disabled individuals applying for a determination of disability, and disabled individuals who are entitled to child's insurance benefits, shall be promptly referred to the State agency or agencies administering or supervising the administration of the State plan approved under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act for necessary vocational rehabilitation services, to the end that the maximum number of such individuals may be rehabilitated into productive activity.

"'*Deductions on account of refusal to accept rehabilitation services*

"'(b) Deductions, in such amounts and at such time or times as the Secretary shall determine, shall be made from any payment or payments under this title to which an individual is entitled, until the total of such deductions equals such individual's benefit or benefits under sections 202 and 223 for any month in which such individual, if a child who has attained the age of 18 and is entitled to child's insurance benefits or if an individual entitled to disability insurance benefits, refuses without good cause to accept rehabilitation services available to him under a State plan approved under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. Any individual who is a member or adherent of any recognized church or religious sect which teaches its members or adherents to rely solely, in the treatment and cure of any physical or mental impairment, upon prayer or spiritual means through the application and use of the tenets or teachings of such church or sect, and who, solely because of his adherence to the teachings or tenets of such church or sect, refuses to accept rehabilitation services available to him under a State plan approved under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, shall, for the purposes of the preceding sentence of this subsection, be deemed to have done so with good cause.

"'*Service performed under rehabilitation program*

"'(c) For purposes of sections 216 (i) and 223, an individual shall not be regarded as able to engage in substantial gainful activity solely by reason of services rendered by him pursuant to a program for his rehabilitation carried on under a State plan approved under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. This subsection shall not apply with respect to any such services rendered after the 11th month following the 1st month during which such services are rendered.'

"(c) (1) Section 202 (a) (3) of such act (relating to old-age insurance benefits) is amended to read as follows:

"'(3) has filed application for old-age insurance benefits or was entitled to disability insurance benefits for the month preceding the month in which he attained retirement age,'.

"(2) Section 202 (k) (2) (B) of such act (relating to entitlement to more than one benefit) is amended by striking out 'who under the preceding provisions of this section' and inserting in lieu thereof 'who, under the preceding provisions of this section and under the provisions of section 223,'.

"(3) Section 202 (n) (1) (A) of such act (relating to denial of benefits in certain cases of deportation) is amended by inserting 'or section 223' after 'this section.'

"(4) Section 215 (a) of such act (relating to computation of the primary insurance amount) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(3) Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), in the case of any individual who in the month before the month in which he attains retirement age or dies, whichever first occurs, was entitled to a disability insurance benefit, his primary insurance amount shall be the amount computed as provided in this section (without regard to this paragraph) or his disability insurance benefit for such earlier month, whichever is the larger.'

"(5) Section 215 (g) of such act (relating to rounding of benefits) is amended (A) by striking out 'section 202' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 202 or 223' and (B) by striking out 'section 203 (a)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'sections 203 (a) and 224'.

"(6) The first sentence of section 216 (i) (1) of such act defining 'disability' for purposes of preserving insurance rights during periods of disability) is amended by striking out 'The' at the beginning and inserting in lieu thereof 'Except for purposes of sections 202 (d), 223, and 225, the'.

"(7) The first sentence of section 221 (a) of such act (relating to determinations of disability by State agencies) is amended by striking out '(as defined in sec. 216 (i))' and inserting in lieu thereof '(as defined in sec. 216 (i) or 223 (c)).'

"(8) Section 221 (c) of such act (relating to review by Secretary of determinations of disability) is amended by striking out 'a disability' the two places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'a disability (as defined in sec. 216 (i) or 223 (c))' the first place it appears and 'a disability (as so defined)' the second place it appears.

"(d) (1) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after December 1956.

"(2) For purposes of determining entitlement to a disability insurance benefit for any month after December 1956 and before June 1957, an application for disability insurance benefits filed by any individual after January 1957 and before July 1957 shall be deemed to have been filed during the first month after December 1956 for which such individual would (without regard to this paragraph) have been entitled to a disability insurance benefit had he filed application before the end of such month."

On page 58, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

"(c) Section (5) (f) (2) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out 'section 202' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'title II.'"

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I also submit three amendments, intended to be proposed by me, to House bill 7225, the Social Security Amendments of 1956, and ask that they be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I submit two amendments, intended to be proposed by me, to House bill 7225, the Social Security Amendments of 1956. One would give all women the right to retire at age 62, regardless of whether they are married, single, or widowed. The other amendment would give everyone the right to retire at age 62, provided he is disabled and unable to work.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the first bill I introduced as a new Senator, on January 18, 1955, was the bill (S. 521) to reduce from 65 years to 60 years the age at which women may become eligible for social-security benefits. Today, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I submit the same proposal as an amendment to House bill 7225, the social security amendment bill passed by the House of Representatives and now before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. NEUBERGER. As passed by the House, H. R. 7225 included a provision to lower the eligibility age for women to 62 years. This provision has been eliminated from the bill by the majority of the Senate Committee on Finance, except insofar as it applies to widows. It is my intention, at the appropriate time, to offer my amendment to lower this age provision to 60 for all women, as proposed in the bill I previously introduced for myself and 10 other Senators. Other Senators have indicated their intention to offer amendments to restore the House-passed provision for eligibility at age 62. If my amendment should not be adopted, I shall, of course, support that step as a worthwhile compromise.

However, Mr. President, careful study has convinced me that an eligibility age for women of 60 years can be justified. I am, of course, prepared to support

whatever increase in contributions will be necessary to meet the actuarial cost of the change, and I am sure that the covered employees would also accept the additional cost of such a beneficial plan.

I ask that my statement in introducing S. 521 on January 18, 1955, be reprinted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, my first bill since becoming a Member of the Senate. It is introduced on behalf of myself, my colleague the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA].

At the same time Mrs. EDITH GREEN, Representative in Congress from the Third Oregon District, is introducing a companion bill in the House.

The bill would lower the social-security qualifying age for women from 65 years of age to 60.

This, in my opinion, is a matter of simple fairness and equity. Wives are usually a few years younger than their husbands. If the husband dies at age 65, his widow, unable to receive benefits because she is a few years younger, must prove her poverty and seek public assistance to carry her to age 65. It should be noted that this turning to public assistance increases the burden on general taxation, instead of allowing the widow to draw from funds to which she and/or her husband contributed directly for this purpose.

Requiring a wife to be 65 before the benefits can be received means that only about one-fifth of the married men in America who retire at 65 have wives immediately eligible for wife's benefits. We are all aware that insurance benefits—the husband may possibly be drawing as much as $660 a year—do not cover the cost of even the most modest living for an elderly couple.

Many families must, therefore, live on inadequate benefits for several years before the wife becomes eligible. They may be forced to prove poverty and turn to old-age assistance. If women could qualify at the age of 60, about three-fifths of the families would draw benefits for both husband and wife immediately when the husband reached the age of 65 and retirement.

I believe that women who are working should also be eligible for social-security benefits at the age of 60. It is difficult for women between 60 and 65 to hold jobs, or to find new ones. Older women do only half as well as men in holding onto jobs once they are past the age of 60. This fact should be recognized by giving them the protection they cannot otherwise obtain.

It is well to consider thoroughly the fears of some who are opposed to lowering the age of eligibility to 60 for women workers. They contend that if 60 is the age of eligibility, so, too, will it be the age of dismissal. When that event does occur, it is as a result of company pension plans, not social security. The remedy against that hardship lies in revising inequities in company-pension plans, rather than in leaving inequities in the social-security structure.

On the matter of costs, I have obtained informal estimates which indicate that the cost of the benefits—for working women, wives, and widows at 60 instead of 65—would total 1 percent of the payroll. Employees would contribute one-half, and the employers would contribute the other half. It might be mentioned that both of our largest labor organizations have declared that their members are ready and willing to assume that cost.

There are other features of social security which should be expanded, Mr. President, but this gain for women is the most imperative at this time.

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 7225, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CONSTRUCTION OF MODERN GREAT LAKES BULK CARGO VESSELS—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill (S. 3108) to encourage the construction of modern Great Lakes bulk cargo vessels, was passed by the Senate on yesterday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion will be entered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The only reason why I enter the motion, Mr. President, is that it involves a matter which I think can be worked out satisfactorily. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] offered an amendment which would apply to the question of competitive bidding in connection with the construction of ships. The amendment was accepted. But it also provided, as I learned from a study which I made this morning, that it might extend to all other merchant marine laws. I am sure that was not the intention of the Senator from Delaware nor the Senator from Michigan, because it would seriously hamper, particularly, the west-coast differential.

I am sure we can work out the question satisfactorily. If not, we can have some agreement that when the bill reaches the House it can be ironed out there.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY:

Press release issued by him on June 6, 1956, on the subject of the Yellowtail Dam resolution.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address delivered by him at 75th anniversary of Thorp Methodist Church, Thorp, Wis., on May 27, 1956.

Address delivered by him before the Racine (Wis.) Education Association dinner on May 28, 1956.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address delivered by Hon. Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, at Commonwealth Club, San Francisco, Calif., on June 1, 1956.

UNVEILING OF BUST IN HONOR OF CARL SCHURZ

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 263. The resolution was unanimously reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, and my friend, the distinguished and able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], has a brief statement he should like to make, but it is important, and he has asked me to read the statement for him.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 263.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 263) extending greetings to the Bundestag of the West German Republic for the unveiling of a bust in honor of Carl Schurz.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment in line 2, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to strike out "West German Federal Republic" and insert "Federal Republic of Germany", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Senate hereby conveys friendly greetings to the Bundestag of the Federal Republic of Germany on the occasion of the unveiling of a bust on the campus of the University of Bonn in honor of Carl Schurz.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the resolution was submitted by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] on May 14. It was reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations by the Senator from North Dakota on June 5.

Senate Resolution 263, which was reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment, but without objection, on June 5, conveys the friendly greetings of the Senate to the Bundestag of the Federal Republic of Germany on the occasion of the unveiling of a bust of Carl Schurz on the campus of the University of Bonn.

The interest of the Senate in adopting this resolution which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] submitted on May 14, the anniversary of the death of Carl Schurz, is attributable to the fact that this German immigrant to the United States became one of this Nation's greatest statesmen. Carl Schurz served as a Member of the Senate and as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations from 1869 to 1875. He served in various capacities as a member of the Cabinets of Abraham Lincoln and President Hayes.

Carl Schurz has become a symbol of the bonds of friendship between the people of the United States who owe so much to their ancestors who crossed the ocean and the people of Germany. It is fitting that the Senate should today express its appreciation to the Bundestag for its thoughtfulness in commemorating that great American of German ancestry, Carl Schurz.

Mr. President, I have made this statement on behalf of my friend from North Dakota, and at his request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution extending greetings to the Bundestag of the Federal Republic of Germany for the unveiling of a bust in honor of Carl Schurz."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas.

SENATOR WILEY'S PROGRAM FOR 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, down through the years I have on many occasions presented my constructive programs for the people of my State and of the Nation.

At the present time, I send to the desk a series of points in brief outline form spelling out what I propose to do for my State.

These are not new issues for me. They represent tasks which I have long undertaken and on which I am glad to say considerable results have already been accomplished.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY'S 25 POINT PROGRAM FOR WISCONSIN

1. Channels: Speed action on deepening and improving of Great Lakes connecting channels. In that way, Wisconsin and the entire upper Middle West can get the quickest possible benefit from the 27-foot Great Lakes waterway, throughout the entire 2,300 miles of this mighty project.

2. Prosperity: Help attract more industries to Wisconsin and help expand existing industries. Already, thanks to official encouragement and to local development work, more than 10,000 new jobs have been created in our State. These jobs involve a welcome annual payroll of more than $30 million. Twenty-eight local industrial development foundations or corporations have been established in 1955 to help provide credit for attracting industries and expanding industries in Wisconsin. My goal is more companies and more jobs for Wisconsin, more Government contracts, more defense orders.

3. Social security: Liberalize social security.

Provide a fairer break for the 194,000 Wisconsinites who are now receiving old-age pensions. Improve these pensions so as to catch up with the rising cost of living. Provide better maternal and child welfare. Bring additional people, for example, lawyers, under social security. Give a fairer break to Wisconsin workingwomen, widows, to the permanently and totally disabled. Enact the Wiley bill for aid on better housing, better health, better job training for old folks—the 10 percent of our population over 65 and the great numbers approaching that age.

4. Roads: Help speed administrative action under the new Federal highway-construction law.

This 13-year $37 billion law will mean more than a third of a billion dollars for Wisconsion roads. These roads are essential for 1,100,000 cars and trucks jamming our Badger highways. The road program will help cut down on highway accidents, improve farm-to-market distribution, increase tourism.

5. Tourism: Continue to boost wonderful Wisconsin—56,000 square miles of top United States vacation land. Continue to get the best possible national publicity for Wisconsin hunting and fishing, swimming and boating. Already, tourism is our second greatest dollar provider. Keep those cash register ringing merrily in Wisconsin hotels, motels, restaurants, lodges, gasoline stations.

6. Tax relief: Reduce taxes on our people, particularly in the low-income brackets insofar as our budget surplus permits. Wipe out the 10-percent theater admission tax which has already closed so many theaters in Wisconsin and elsewhere in America.

Liberalize tax deductions; for example, provide a deduction for the millions of Americans who pay premiums on their life-insurance policies to protect their loved ones. Pass the Wiley bill for tax credit to parents who pay the high expense of putting youngsters through college.

7. Health: Strengthen the health of our people, expand research against the diseases which afflict mankind. Strengthen Wisconsin's great public and private hospital system.

8. Schools: Help relieve the serious classroom shortage which exists in Wisconsin and elsewhere in our Nation.

Our youngsters are our most precious national asset.

9. Antidelinquency: Combat juvenile delinquency. Pass the Wiley bill for Federal grants in aid to the States, to help cut down the appalling crime rate (which today involves more than 1,300,000 youngsters getting into trouble with the law every year.)

10. Anticrime: Combat the underworld. Pass the Senate Crime Committee bills which I have cosponsored. Enact the Daniel-Wiley antinarcotics bill. Crack down on the hoodlums, the thugs, the racketeers.

11. Veterans: Strengthen, rather than permit the weakening of the veterans' pension and compensation program. Continue to fight down the line for our 462,000 Wisconsin veterans, including our 51,126 vets receiving pensions and other benefits. Oppose arbitrary slashes in veterans rights and benefits, such as the Bradley commission unwisely recommended. Speed construction in accordance with the Wiley bill for a new facility for the 1,027 patents in the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Wood, Wis., and the 1,506 in the domiciliary there.

12. Housing: Expand United States housing. Pass the Wiley bill to extend the GI home loan benefit beyond its expiration date next year. Liberalize credit for home repairs.

13. Small business: Strengthen small business by improving our antimonopoly laws. Help the small-business man save his earnings by reducing the crushing taxload which now presses down upon him. (Thus, pass the Fulbright-Wiley tax relief amendment for small enterprise).

14. Proconsumers: Continue to protect our consumers by assuring adequate Federal regulation of natural-gas rates. Prevent any evasion which might nullify the President's wise veto of the notorious natural-gas rate increase bill.

15. Atom: Spur the peaceful development of atomic energy. Increasingly utilize the great research laboratory system of Wisconsin, our corporation and university laboratories. And otherwise tap the investive and research skill of individual scientists and technicians.

16. Armed Forces: Strengthen America's Armed Forces; make sure that we are invincible in the air, on the ground, on the sea. Give our men the best possible, the most modern weapons, which are second to none. Strengthen defense of the Continental United States. Utilize our great facilities at Camp McCoy to the fullest.

17. Ports: Improve Wisconsin's already great port and harbor facilities. Assure adequate funds so that Wisconsin cities can strengthen their existing water facilities, so that they can get the fullest benefits from the Wiley Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway Law. Meanwhile, continue to assure sound Great Lakes water levels by battling, as I have in the past, uninterruptedly, against the notorious "Chicago Water Steal."

18. Aviation: Because this is an aerial age, further modernize Wisconsin's great airport system so as to speed modern transportation. Strengthen our Wisconsin Civil Air Patrol, which already has a splendid communications net of 83 fixed base stations, and 183 mobile transmitters and receivers for disaster patrol and related services.

19. Antifloods: Complete action on the Wiley suggestion for a flood survey on the Trempealeau River and on other Wisconsin river valley systems where floods have repeatedly cost terrific damage. Complete action on overall flood-insurance legislation now before the House.

20. Farm parity: Raise parity support on manufactured milk to $3.45 per hundredweight, as I recently suggested to Secretary of Agriculture Benson. Modernize the overall farm parity formula (which does not accurately reflect the farmers' higher current costs of production). Make sure the farmer gets his real cost of production plus a reasonable profit.

21. Research: Continue to fight the diseases which cost the farmer a fortune—the livestock disease like brucellosis. Thus, expand upon the existing Wiley bill for knocking out Bangs disease and keep up the fight against plant diseases as well. Pass the Wiley bill for a dairy research laboratory at Madison to find new uses for milk and milk products.

22. Lunches: Strengthen our school milk program, so as to build the bodies of our youngsters and put our available milk supply to best possible use. Expand upon the Wiley bill for this purpose.

23. Outdoors: Strengthen America's conservation program. Protect our wildlife refuges, our national parks and forests, against all influences which would despoil these great assets. Expand the program against stream pollution.

24. Civil rights: Enact civil-rights legislation to assure a fair break for all Americans, regardless of race, creed, or color.

25. Efficiency: Streamline Government. Reform obsolete Federal budget and accounting practice, so as to get greater economy, greater efficiency in the vast 2¼-million-man Federal establishment.

LETTER FROM WISCONSIN STATE DIVISION OF AAUW

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the outstanding women's organizations in our land is, of course, the famed American Association of University Women.

This organization has constantly been in the forefront of constructive efforts at home and abroad in which the thinking women of our Nation are deeply interested.

I was pleased to hear today from Mrs. Herbert P. Evans, State legislative program chairman, and Miss Bernice Scott, State international relations chairman, conveying the mandate of the Wisconsin division of the association on behalf of continued support of sound efforts of United States leadership in mutual security.

I definitely agree with the views which are expressed in this letter, and I ask unanimous consent that its text be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN STATE DIVISION,
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN,
May 31, 1956.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The Wisconsin Division, American Association of University Women, understands that the Mutual Security Act of 1956 is soon to be considered. We believe you should be advised now as to the stand of our organization regarding it. The Wisconsin Division, AAUW, whose membership consists of over 3,700 women college graduates living in Wisconsin, participated in the adoption of the following as part of our national legislative program for 1955–57:

"Support of a constructive foreign policy * * * designed to develop conditions favorable to democracy, economic wellbeing, security, and peace throughout the world, through such measures as * * * continuation of a sound technical assistance program."

Furthermore, it is our considered judgment that the foreign aid program will and should be a part of the United States foreign policy for many years to come. In our view foreign aid is neither a charitable nor a philanthropic undertaking but a constructive answer to world problems of an economic, social, and military nature. And we believe that in the long run the mutual security involved in nonmilitary aid—for development assistance, for technical assistance, for UNICEF, and for U. N. programs to relieve refugees, etc.—will be the best investment the United States could make for world security.

For these and many other reasons you are fully cognizant of, we urge you to vote in favor of the Mutual Security Act of 1956 when it reaches the floor of the Senate for action.

Very truly yours,
Mrs. HERBERT P. EVANS,
State Legislative Program Chairman, Madison, Wis.
Miss BERNICE SCOTT,
State International Relations Chairman, Sheboygan, Wis.

COMMENTS BY PUBLISHER OF PARENTS MAGAZINE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have previously commented on the floor of the Senate on the importance of strengthening our system of social insurance, both as regards old folks, dependents, widows, children, the blind, and so forth.

I was pleased, therefore, today to receive from the distinguished publisher of Parents magazine, the leader of the American Parents Committee, Mr. George J. Hecht, an important telegram urging strengthening of maternal and child health and welfare provisions in connection with the pending social security bill.

I urge my colleagues to give their sympathetic consideration to Mr. Hecht's suggestion.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this telegram be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Social security bill should have more provisions for children. H. R. 7225, as reported, contains no amendments to title V relating to maternal and child health and welfare. Such measures were proposed by the administration in S. 3297. An amendment to H. R. 7225 was also introduced by Senator LEHMAN increasing authorization for the children's programs. Neither measure was reported by Finance Committee. If Senate passes bill without provisions to improve child health and welfare and the House accepts the Senate bill in conference, these needed amendments are lost. We urge you to support Senator LEHMAN's amendment to title V when he calls it up on the floor.

GEORGE J. HECHT,
Publisher, Parents' Magazine.

SENATOR MAGNUSON, OF WASHINGTON

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Senate the very great tribute which recently has been paid to our colleague, the senior Senator from the State of Washington, and the distinguished and very able chairman of the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate, Mr. WARREN MAGNUSON, through the citation by the Propeller Club of the United States, Port of Washington, D. C.

Mr. President, it seems timely to make reference to Senator MAGNUSON'S distinguished service. The Propeller Club applauds Senator MAGNUSON'S valuable and consistent leadership over a period of 19 years in strengthening and maintaining the effectiveness of our fourth arm of national defense, the United States merchant marine. The membership of this patriotic organization commends the Washington Senator outspokenly, and its commendation of him is expressive of the sentiments of Members of this body who have observed the accomplishments of our colleague over the years.

It is unquestionably true that Senator MAGNUSON has been devoted to the interests of his country and has looked beyond sectional considerations in emphasizing the great need for buttressing the forces of our Nation for its successful defense in the event of dire emergency. His farsightedness and his understanding of the maritime needs of the United States are proven by his advocacy of 31 measures considered and acted upon by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, under his able direction.

It is to be understood that Senator MAGNUSON'S ardent support of measures for the efficient operation of the merchant marine in the national interest does not tell the whole story of his outstanding congressional service. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, he has been vigilant in providing for the functioning of different branches of our Government. This experience has afforded him an understanding of the functioning of the various agencies and departments of the governmental structure.

The Magnuson subcommittee played an effective part in the preparation of the Japanese Peace Treaty. Currently, the appropriations subcommittee of which he is chairman decides upon the necessary provisions for such governmental agencies as the Veterans' Administration, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Atomic Energy Commission. The senior Senator from Washington has sponsored social and educational legislation and measures for scientific research, cheap electric power, and resource development. His proposals for social reforms have been written into the social-security system of our country, in addition to which he has authored proposals for access roads to forests and mines, and for the establishment of a Pacific mutual security pact.

It is no exaggeration to state that as the result of his continuing contacts with the operations of the various administrative agencies, he is enabled to represent his constituency all the more satisfactorily, and at the same time to render valuable service to the Nation as a whole. In order that the entire membership of the Congress, and of the country generally, can be informed of the impartial estimate of the abilities and of the statesmanship of the senior Senator from Washington, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the citation presented on behalf of the Propeller Club by W. Bruce McNamee, its president, be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONIAL TO SENATOR WARREN G. MAGNUSON BY THE PROPELLER CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES, PORT OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

Whereas the existence of an adequate American merchant marine, both for the preservation of the security of the United States and for the expansion of international trade, is the paramount goal of the Propeller Club; and

Whereas Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of the State of Washington, has been the outstanding leader in the efforts to achieve this goal and has been highly successful in advocacy of measures which have proven beneficial to the national interest as well as to all segments of the maritime industry; and

Whereas Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, by his statesmanlike presentations in the United States Senate, has created a better understanding of the fourth arm of national defense, and has, through skill, devotion to duty, and untiring effort, been responsible for constructive legislation for the maritime industry of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Propeller Club of Washington, D. C., salutes Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON and expresses its great esteem of his ability, patriotism, sound judgment, and dedication to duty; and be it further

Resolved, That the Propeller Club give public expression to its confidence in Senator MAGNUSON by the formal presentation to him of this scroll embodying the sentiments herein expressed, naming him the "Man of

the Year" in United States merchant marine activities.

W. BRUCE MCNAMEE,
President.
CHARLES F. KRAFT,
Secretary.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished majority leader in the tribute just rendered the senior Senator from Washington, WARREN MAGNUSON. Those of us who come from the Northwest look upon him as our leader; and I know that in the fields of irrigation, reclamation, flood control, and power, he has proved to be an outstanding exponent. The Senators from the States of Wyoming, Montana, and Oregon, as well as the junior Senator from the State of Washington, have looked to him for guidance and advice down through the years. He has never overlooked the interests of the State of Washington and the Northwest in general.

I am happy to take this opportunity to extend to him my personal congratulations on a job well done in his many years of service while representing his State in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I also wish to congratulate my good friend, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], upon his selection by the Maritime Press Association, in Seattle on May 29, as the Maritime Man of the Year.

From my long association with Senator MAGNUSON, I know that he deserves that high honor. Throughout the 19 years he has served in the Congress of the United States, he has been a devoted public servant, and has rendered to both his State and the Nation valuable and faithful service.

It has been my great pleasure to work with Senator MAGNUSON, to solicit his views, and to discuss with him the subject that is so important to the people of both our States—water. We share an abiding interest in water development and the further expansion of America's water resources; and, from this experience, I know how effective Senator MAGNUSON has been as the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and as a member of the Appropriations Committee.

In my humble opinion, Senator MAGNUSON possesses in great measure the attribute of true leadership—vision. He was among the first to sponsor and support legislation calling for the application of nuclear power in shipbuilding. He has clearly seen that the United States needs a strong merchant fleet to do business with the world and to strengthen our lines of supply. Because of his work and the work of other Members of this body, our west coast is a true gateway to the Far East, one that meets America's need today, and will continue to do so tomorrow.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield with pleasure to my distinguished friend, the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing my great admiration for the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. I have worked closely with Senator MAGNUSON ever since I came to the Senate, 7 years ago. It has been a great privilege and an inspiration to work with him in the many fields of activity in which we have a common interest.

The senior Senator from Washington is a man of vision and of deep social consciousness. He is industrious, and always is devoted to the interests and the welfare of the people of his State and of the Nation as a whole.

Of course, it is impossible to enumerate the many, the almost countless, activities in which Senator MAGNUSON has interested himself and has taken a leading part in connection with the consideration and passage of legislation. But certainly no man has exceeded him in his devotion to the principles and development of public power, reclamation, regulation, conservation, flood control, and the other activities which are so important to the preservation and development of our natural resources.

The senior Senator from Washington has long been a member of the Appropriations Committee, and has been chairman of several of its subcommittees. In that work he has shown an unusual degree of intelligent study and devotion. During the last 2 days we have outstanding examples of his work in the Senate. On Wednesday, we had before us a highly important bill, appropriating large sums of money for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The senior Senator from Washington is a member of the subcommittee handling that bill, of which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is chairman. The bill, as reported, marked, in my opinion, a great step forward in dealing with the serious problem of the health of our people. Up to this year, the appropriations for that purpose have been shockingly inadequate. But this year we have taken a very long step forward by greatly increasing our appropriations for research to combat dread scourges like cancer, heart disease, mental illness, respiratory diseases, and many others of a deeply serious character.

On yesterday, the senior Senator from Washington was the floor manager of an appropriation bill which involved more than $6 billion. He did his work on the committee as its chairman and on the floor of the Senate with such skill and with such fairness and patience that that great bill, involving the enormous sum I have mentioned, was passed unanimously by the Senate when it was put to a vote.

Again I wish to express not only my admiration for the senior Senator from Washington, but also my appreciation of the privilege I have had today in expressing my affection for him and my confidence in him. I am very glad, indeed, to have had this opportunity.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as one of the Senators from the State which is most closely associated in geography, resources, and population with the State of Washington, I desire to join briefly in these deserved tributes to the senior Senator from Washington.

A great deal has been said about his achievements in the realm of maritime commerce, and I shall not duplicate those statements. I desire to address myself to his very beneficial activities in three other important realms.

To begin with, his own State of Washington is the State which is the most nearly allied with our great Territory of Alaska. The entire Alaskan trade stems very principally from the ports of Puget Sound, and the senior Senator from Washington has taken a leading role in his region and in the country in helping to develop Alaska, to build up Alaska, and, most importantly, to work as a leader and a guide in the long and persistent effort to bring about statehood for Alaska.

Furthermore, the senior Senator from Washington has always distinguished himself in the efforts to bring about public development of our great water resources in the Pacific Northwest. Such projects as Bonneville Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, McNary Dam, and Chief Joseph Dam, which are either in whole or in part in his own State, would not have been built nearly as speedily or nearly as effectively, had it not been for the work of the senior Senator from Washington in fighting to defend these great undertakings. He has always stood for water-resource development in the public interest.

In conclusion, there is an area in which the senior Senator from Washington has been a leader that is more important than anything I have yet mentioned. He was one of the legislators who helped to found the National Institutes of Health, where such great pioneer work has been done looking toward the final solution of the grim riddle of cancer. Only this week the Senate doubled the annual appropriations for cancer research. Furthermore, the Senate doubled the appropriations for research in our veterans' hospitals, searching toward the solution of such killing maladies as cancer and heart disease. Both these accomplishments are tributes to the senior Senator from Washington, because of the very active role he has played in bringing about appropriations for the training of needed scientific personnel to undertake medical research in these vital fields.

I know that all of us hope that the senior Senator from Washington will be able to continue his very important and outstanding role in these fields for many years to come.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am very happy to join my colleagues who are today paying tribute to the very able and distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. It is my very great privilege to serve with him on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of which he is chairman. The statistics and facts reveal today that he is the busiest chairman of any committee of the United States Senate. Under his guidance and leadership, the committee has held more days of hearings and taken more testimony on a greater variety of subjects than has any other committee of the Senate. Over the course of years the senior Senator from Washington has shown an understanding of more different subjects than probably any other Senator.

As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, he was the man who, in effect, broke the "freeze" which existed for many years with respect to television. There was a time when only a few cities in the United States were privileged to have television stations in operation, so that only those people who lived in these areas could benefit from the new medium of entertainment and education. The Senator from Washington began to see that this "freeze," which had been instituted by the Federal Communications Commission, was depriving many people of the benefits of adequate TV service. He put his shoulder to the wheel, and, almost singlehandedly, brought about a break in the "freeze," a relief from the log-jam, and made it possible for the people of the United States to enjoy the benefit of a greater number of television stations.

It goes without saying that the senior Senator from Washington has been "Mr. Merchant Marine" for the past decade. He was the one who developed the so-called 50–50 formula in connection with the shipment of goods to overseas nations, particularly goods which had been paid for by this Government, requiring that at least 50 percent of such goods be shipped in American bottoms. Because of that particular formula we have today an active United States merchant marine. I have heard many persons who are familiar with that subject say, in great detail, that the Senator from Washington has been the salvation of the American merchant marine.

As chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, he has, in addition, evidenced a great awareness of the importance of aviation in the development of the Nation by continually striving and exerting all efforts to improve the operations of the CAA and the CAB. Through his efforts the safety and operation of our airlines has improved immeasurably. For such devotion to duty and sincerity of purpose he justly deserves—and I am sure he has—the undying gratitude of all those in the aviation industry, as well as those who use air transportation.

I consider it a great personal privilege to serve under his guidance. He has at all times evidenced a very warm understanding, not only of the problems of his particular area and his particular State, but the problems of the entire Nation.

In other legislative fields, he appreciates the plight of small business and the small farmer and always goes out of his way to be helpful to them in efforts to see that legislation is enacted which will be helpful to that segment of our population.

The honor which the Propeller Club has bestowed upon him is one which he justly merits for he truly exemplifies the dignity and sincerity of public office. And I am sure all of his colleagues wish him continued success and know that he will be returned by the people of his great State to serve in the United States Senate for many years to come.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to associate myself with other Senators who have said kind words about the Senator from Washington.

I think I know the senior Senator from Washington about as well as does any other Senator. What I admire about him most is the fact that he is the beneficiary of all that is best in America. He was not born with a silver spoon in his mouth. Whatever he has made of himself has been accomplished through his energy, attention to duty, hard work, and American opportunity. He is the beneficiary of American opportunity.

We all know the oath of office which we take as United States Senators. The Senator from Washington understands that oath. He is a United States Senator. It so happens that he comes from the State of Washington and in part, represents the State of Washington in the United States Senate.

I have worked with him on the Committee on Appropriations and other committees. I can vouch most sincerely that WARREN MAGNUSON not only faithfully performs his duty to the country, but also takes good care of the interest of the State which he, in part, represents in this body.

I congratulate the Senator from Washington.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. President, I consider it a delightful privilege to join in this fine accolade and tribute to my colleague and affectionate friend, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], with whom I have been privileged to serve on the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I knew WARREN MAGNUSON only slightly before coming to the United States Senate in 1950. He honored my State by addressing a very important meeting which was held there during the time when it was my privilege to serve as Governor of the State of Rhode Island. I need not tell Senators how much he impressed the citizens of Rhode Island by his sincerity of purpose, his devotion to duty, and his fine sense of patriotism.

He exemplifies the best there is in America in discharging his responsibility as a representative of the people of this great country. He exemplifies the American spirit. He is an example of the American story.

What I like most about WARREN MAGNUSON is the fact that he has always protected the little fellow, the consumer. He has always assisted in alleviating the plight of the underprivileged, the young, and the aged. He has always played an effective and an important part in the great programs of social welfare.

His leadership of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is marked by patience, a keen understanding of the complex problems before the committee, a sense of fair play at all times, and a tremendous capacity to meet the challenge of the heavy workload that besets the committee.

I am happy to join in this tribute to the senior Senator from Washington. I wish him many years of continued good health and success. I am confident that those who know him best, the people whom he represents in the Senate, the fine citizenry of the State of Washington, will send him back to the Senate for many years to come to represent them in the finest tradition of our American representative form of government.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wish to join my colleagues in paying due tribute to the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. When I first came to the Senate 12 years ago, I served with him on the Committee on Interstate Commerce, as it was called at that time. I saw that he was sincere in what he was trying to do. He was always trying to help those in need.

I also learned, in that committee and on the floor of the Senate, that he was always in favor of building up the various areas of the United States, and in particular, his section of the United States.

His section is a new part of our great united Nation. Being new, it needs a certain amount of help from the Federal Government. The aid of the Federal Government is necessary to preserve certain resources in his particular State. He has always been for conservation in his State, in his section, and in all the United States. He has always been in favor of the Federal Government stepping in and helping to develop his State and other States which need help.

I have always admired his stand, because it has always been very close to my way of thinking. So today, when I make these remarks about the senior Senator from Washington, I can speak with sincerity when I say that not only has he done a wonderful job for his State, as well as for his section of the United States, in particular, but he has also helped needy people throughout the Nation. I would be derelict in my duty

if I did not say something of the great work he has done in the Senate during the past 12 years.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the great senior Senator from the State of Washington, WARREN MAGNUSON.

I first came to know Senator MAGNUSON when a member of the executive branch of the Government. When he called at the various departments with which I was connected, he always brought the facts of the case or cases in which he was interested.

Most people think of Senator MAGNUSON as an expert on maritime matters and on such subjects as resource conservation and fisheries, and they associate him with his many duties as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

But Senator MAGNUSON is also one of the foremost authorities on aviation. Perhaps one of the reasons for that is that his State probably manufactures more airplanes for the Federal Government than any other State except the State of California.

There is no more popular Senator in the Senate than WARREN MAGNUSON. He is a kind and generous friend. I believe all Senators, on both sides of the aisle, agree that he is one of the most constructive and intelligent Members of our body.

I look forward to the pleasure of serving with him after the next election, being confident the good people of his great State will return him to the Senate.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. I have been in the Senate during all the time he has served his State as a Senator. I know of the splendid record he has made. He has supported all the programs for multipurpose development of the water resources in his State and in other States of the Nation. I recall that he was one of those who supported and helped to secure the enactment of the measure providing for what is known as Grand Coulee, which is the greatest multipurpose dam in the world.

Largely because of his vigorous efforts there has been brought about a change in the economic situation in the State of Washington so that it has become one of the great States of the Nation, whereas formerly it was somewhat in the nature of a colony whose resources were made the subject of exploitation. He has also cooperated with his fellow Senators from other States in the West in carrying through programs of a like character.

No Senator enjoys to a greater extent the respect and confidence of his colleagues than does the distinguished senior Senator from Washington. I am very happy to be here today and to hear the commendations which are being paid to him. They are all well deserved. I join with my colleagues in saying that the service he has rendered has been very worthy indeed, and he is certainly entitled to be reelected to the Senate so that he may continue his fine service for his State and his country.

Mr. JACKSON subsequently said: Mr. President, today several of my distinguished colleagues have taken the floor to pay tribute to my good and hard-working friend, the senior Senator from the State of Washington, for the honors that have been accorded him by the maritime industry.

I do not have to tell the Senate that I am not surprised by these honors that have come to WARREN G. MAGNUSON. I am certain no other Member of the Senate is surprised, either. For Members on both sides of the aisle know WARREN MAGNUSON to be the best informed and hardest working expert on maritime affairs in Congress.

I know of no man who has done more for our merchant marine and the maritime industry—at all levels—than WARREN G. MAGNUSON. It is significant that not only has the Propeller Club of the United States named him Man of the Year in United States merchant marine activities, but also in his hometown, Seattle, the Seattle Maritime Press Association has named him its Man of the Year.

One does not come by these honors easily. One does not fool working newspapermen, and does not fool the people in the industry. These awards are given for only one reason—accomplishments—and on this score Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON is without peer.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will permit me to join with him in the tribute which he has paid to his senior colleague from Washington, I wish to say that the great record of WARREN MAGNUSON in the Senate of the United States speaks for itself. But his chief characteristic has been accomplishment for the people of the State of Washington, irrespective of party affiliation. I have heard it said very often that WARREN MAGNUSON is one of the best Republican Senators who ever came from the State of Washington to the United States Senate. We all know that he is one of the best Democratic Senators who ever came from the State of Washington to the Senate. WARREN MAGNUSON does not stoop to party politics when it comes to the handling of legislative issues in the Senate of the United States which affect the welfare of his State and of the Nation.

I am very proud to join with the junior Senator from Washington in expressing my very high regard for WARREN MAGNUSON, the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Washington.

NOTICE OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the completion of morning business on Monday next, there be a call of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 2047, the point at which the last call was left off.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on Monday next we shall try to complete action on all bills which have been announced but which have not been reached. This specifically includes Calendar No. 2085, H. R. 9824, and Calendar No. 2090, S. 3097, through Calendar No. 2093, S. 3430; as well as any other bills which may have been cleared by the distinguished minority leader and the majority leader.

It is also anticipated that we will begin the debate on the social-security bill, either late in the afternoon on Monday next or on Tuesday. I previously announced to the Senate that it is my hope that there will be no yea-and-nay votes on Monday, and I reiterate that announcement, so that all Senators may have notice of the plan.

FREE OR REDUCED AIR TRANSPORTATION RATES FOR MINISTERS OF RELIGION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 3149.

The Senate resumed the consideration of S. 3149, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to permit certain air carriers to grant free or reduced rate transportation to ministers of religion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendments of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 3, after the word "That", it is proposed to insert "the last sentence of", and after line 4, to strike out before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "and, in the case of foreign air carriers, and air carriers not receiving payments made by the Board under the provisions of section 406 of this act and Reorganization Plan No. 10 of 1953, to ministers of religion" and insert after "such persons" a semicolon and the following: "ministers of religion on a space available basis", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of subsection (b) of section 403 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 is amended by inserting after "such persons" a semicolon and the following: "ministers of religion on a space available basis."

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to make a brief explanation of the bill. As Members of the Senate know, ministers of the gospel have for a long time been given the privilege of riding on certain transportation systems, both bus and railroad, and even on inland waterways, at reduced rates. The basis for allowing them to do so, of course, is that most of them are very poorly paid, that in some cases they are not paid anything at all, and that many of the parishes and

churches and communities are very hard pressed. Therefore that privilege has been extended to them by the railroads and bus companies.

All the bill would do would be to allow—it is permissive—air carriers to allow certified ministers of the gospel to ride at reduced rates. It is merely permissive legislation and brings the air carriers in line with other forms of transportation in this regard.

There is one thing which I wish to make clear as a matter of legislative history. In committee we assumed that the bill would include all types of ministers of the gospel. However, the suggestion has been made that because we did not specifically include accredited lecturers of Christian Science, who are accredited by the mother church, that they may not be included. I therefore wish the legislative history to show that we intended to include them as well. I believe the language of the bill does include them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3149) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to permit air carriers to grant free or reduced rate transportation to ministers of religion."

HOSPITALIZATION AND CARE OF THE MENTALLY ILL OF ALASKA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2076, House bill 6376.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6376) to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "Alaska Mental Health Enabling Act."

TITLE I—AUTHORITY OF THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA IN THE FIELD OF MENTAL HEALTH

Powers of the Territorial Government

SEC. 101. For the purpose of vesting in the Territory of Alaska authority comparable in scope to that of the States and other Territories of the United States in the field of mental health, the Territorial legislature is hereby authorized to enact such laws on the subject of mental health as it may deem appropriate, and such legislation may supersede any of the acts cited in section 301.

Functions of Courts

SEC. 102. In carrying out section 101, the Territorial legislature is authorized to confer upon United States commissioners, as ex officio probate judges, and upon the United States District Court for the Territory of Alaska, such jurisdiction, functions, and duties as it may deem appropriate for such purpose.

Effective Date

SEC. 103. This title shall become effective on the date of enactment of this act.

TITLE II—GRANTS

Special grants to Alaska for mental health

SEC. 201. Title III of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding thereto a new part as follows:

"Part H—Grants to Alaska for mental health

"Grants for Alaska Mental Health Program

"SEC. 371. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated the following sums to be available to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for the purpose of making grants to the Territory of Alaska to assist it to carry out plans, submitted by the Governor of the Territory or his designee and approved by the Surgeon General, for an integrated mental health program for the Territory, including outpatient and inpatient care and treatment: For each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1958, and June 30, 1959, the sum of $1 million; for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961, the sum of $800,000; for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1962, and June 30, 1963, the sum of $600,000; for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1964, and June 30, 1965, the sum of $400,000; and for each of the years ending June 30, 1966, and June 30, 1967, the sum of $200,000.

"(b) The Surgeon General shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or such shorter period as the Surgeon General may find necessary, estimate the cost of carrying out the approved plan, on the basis of estimates furnished by the Territory, including estimates of the amount of contractual obligations for hospitalization, and on the basis of such further investigations as he may find necessary. From the amounts appropriated for any fiscal year, the Surgeon General shall pay to the Territory the amount requested by it but not to exceed the amount so estimated by the Surgeon General for each such period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this section) by which he finds that the amount paid for any prior period was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid. The amount of any balance of payments made to the Territory under this section and remaining unobligated on July 1, 1967, shall be repaid to the Treasury of the United States.

"(c) Whenever the Surgeon General finds, after affording opportunity for hearing, that the Territory has failed to comply substantially with any provisions of the approved plan, he shall notify the Governor that no further payments will be made under this section (or that further payments will not be made for parts of the plan affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure.

"(d) For the purpose of facilitating the administration of the Territory's mental health program, the Surgeon General is authorized to enter into arrangements with the Territorial government to provide for the care and treatment, in hospitals operated by the Service, of patients requiring hospitalization. Such arrangements shall be subject to the availability of suitable facilities therefor and shall provide for charges to the Territorial government in amounts determined by the Surgeon General which shall be sufficient to cover the full cost of such care and treatment. Upon payment by the Territory the amount of such charges shall be credited to the appropriation from which such costs were incurred: *Provided*, That, during the period of grants under this section, payment may be effected by deductions from the amount of such grants otherwise payable to the Territory, with such deductions to be credited to the appropriation from which such costs were incurred.

"Payments for Construction of Hospital Facilities

"SEC. 372. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated an amount not exceeding the total sum of $6,500,000, to remain available until expended, to enable the Surgeon General to make payments to the Territory of Alaska as the total contribution of the Federal Government to be used in defraying the cost of construction of hospital and other facilities in Alaska needed for the carrying out of a comprehensive mental health program.

"(b) Such facilities shall be scheduled for construction in accordance with a comprehensive construction program, developed by the Territory in consultation with the Public Health Service and approved by the Surgeon General. Projects shall be constructed in accordance with such approved program and in accordance with plans and specifications for the project approved by the Surgeon General.

"(c) Upon certification by the Territory, based upon inspection by it, that work has been performed upon a project, or purchases have been made in accordance with approved plans and specifications, and that payment of an installment is due, the Surgeon General shall certify such installment for payment: *Provided, however*, That the Surgeon General may cause the project to be inspected at any time, and if such inspection indicates that the project is not being constructed in accordance with approved plans and specifications, he may, after notice and affording opportunity for hearing, withhold further payment until he finds that adequate corrective measures have been taken.

"(d) The term 'cost of construction' means the amount found necessary by the Surgeon General for the construction of a project and includes the construction and initial equipment of buildings (including medical transportation facilities), architects' and engineering fees, the cost of land acquired specifically for the purpose of the project, and on-site improvements.

"(e) If, within 20 years from the date of completion of construction, any hospital or other medical facility constructed with the aid of grants under this section shall cease to be a publicly owned facility operated for the care or treatment of patients under the Territory's mental health program, the United States shall be entitled to recover from the Territory the then value of the hospital or other medical facility, reduced, however, proportionately to the extent to which the Territory may have contributed to the cost of construction thereof."

Land Grant

SEC. 202. (a) The Territory of Alaska is hereby granted and shall be entitled to select, within 10 years from the effective date of this act, not to exceed 1 million acres from the public lands of the United States in Alaska which are vacant, unappropriated, and unreserved at the time of their selection: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall affect any valid existing rights. All lands duly selected by the Territory of Alaska pursuant to this section shall be

patented to the Territory by the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) The lands authorized to be selected by the Territory of Alaska by subsection (a) of this section shall be selected in such manner as the laws of the Territory may provide, and in conformity with such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe. The authority to make selections shall never be alienated or bargained away, in whole or in part, by the Territory. All selections shall be made in reasonably compact tracts, taking into account the situation and potential uses of the lands involved. Upon the revocation of any order of withdrawal in Alaska, the order of revocation shall provide for a period of not less than 90 days before the date on which it otherwise becomes effective during which period the Territory of Alaska shall have a preferred right of selection, subject to the requirements of this act, except as against prior existing valid rights or as against equitable claims subject to allowance and confirmation. Such preferred right of selection shall have precedence over the preferred right of application created by section 4 of the act of September 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 748; 43 U. S. C., sec. 282), as now or hereafter amended, but not over other preference rights now conferred by law. As used in this subsection, the words "equitable claims subject to allowance and confirmation" include, without limitation, claims of holders of permits issued by the Department of Agriculture on lands eliminated from national forests, whose permits have been terminated only because of such elimination and who own valuable improvements on such lands.

(c) All grants made or confirmed under this section shall include mineral deposits.

(d) Following the selection of lands by the Territory pursuant to subsection (b), but prior to the issuance of final patent, the Territory shall be authorized to lease and to make conditional sales of such selected lands.

(e) All lands granted to the Territory of Alaska under this section, together with the income therefrom and the proceeds from any dispositions thereof, shall be administered by the Territory of Alaska as a public trust and such proceeds and income shall first be applied to meet the necessary expenses of the mental health program of Alaska. Such lands, income, and proceeds shall be managed and utilized in such manner as the Legislature of Alaska may provide. Such lands, together with any property acquired in exchange therefor or acquired out of the income or proceeds therefrom, may be sold, leased, mortgaged, exchanged, or otherwise disposed of in such manner as the Legislature of Alaska may provide, in order to obtain funds or other property to be invested, expended, or used by the Territory of Alaska. The authority of the Legislature of Alaska under this subsection shall be exercised in a manner compatible with the conditions and requirements imposed by other provisions of this act.

Effective Date

SEC. 203. This title shall become effective on the date of enactment of this act.

TITLE III—TRANSITIONAL AND GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendments and Repeals

SEC. 301. (a) Such of the following acts or parts thereof as the Governor by proclamation shall declare to be superseded by a law or laws hereafter enacted by the Territorial legislature are repealed as of the effective date (specified in such proclamation) of such superseding law or laws, or as of the 210th day after the date of enactment of this act, whichever is later:

(1) Section 8 of the act of January 27, 1905 (33 Stat. 616, 619; 48 U. S. C. 47);

(2) The first sentence of section 7 of the act of February 6, 1909 (35 Stat. 600, 601), as amended by section 2 of the act of October 14, 1942 (56 Stat. 782; 48 U. S. C. 46);

(3) The act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 852; see 48 U. S. C. 46b);

(4) The act of April 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 322), as amended by sections 4 and 5 of the act of October 14, 1942 (56 Stat. 782, 783; 48 U. S. C. 50, 50a); and

(5) Sections 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, and 9 of the act of October 14, 1942 (56 Stat. 782, 783–785; 46 U. S. C. 46c, 47a, 47b, 47c, 48, 48a).

(b) (1) The acts and parts of acts listed in subsection (a), except the act of June 25, 1910, are, pending their repeal as provided in subsection (a), amended (A) by striking out the words "Secretary", "United States", "Congress", and "Department of the Interior" wherever these words appear, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Governor of Alaska or his designee", "Territory of Alaska", "the Legislature of Alaska", and "Territory of Alaska", respectively; (B) by inserting immediately before the word "Treasury", wherever it appears, the word "Territorial"; (C) by striking out the word "Federal"; and (D) by amending section 1 (a) of the act of October 14, 1942, to read as follows: " 'Governor' means the Governor of Alaska or his designee:": *Provided*, That the words "United States" where they appear as a part of the term "United States Veterans' Bureau facility" in section 6 of the act of October 14, 1942, shall not be struck.

(2) The amendment, by this subsection, of any act or part of act specified in subsection (a) shall take effect on the 210th day after the date of enactment of this act and shall cease to be effective upon the repeal of the act or part of act which it amends, as provided in subsection (a).

(c) Effective upon the date of enactment of this act, section 3 of the act approved August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 512; see 48 U. S. C. 24), entitled "An act to create a legislative assembly in the Territory of Alaska, to confer legislative power thereon, and for other purposes", is amended by inserting the following at the end of the first sentence of such section, immediately before the period: "or to prevent the legislature from altering, amending, modifying, or repealing section 8 (relating to commitment of insane persons) of the aforesaid act approved January 27, 1905."

(d) (1) Any vested rights or liabilities existing, and any commitment proceeding commenced, under any act or part thereof prior to the effective date of the amendment or repeal of such act or part thereof by this section shall not be affected by such amendment or repeal.

(2) With respect to the money or property of any patient who has died or eloped prior to the enactment of this act, or who will have died or eloped prior to the 210th day following such enactment, the functions of the Secretary of the Interior under the act of April 24, 1926, as amended (48 U. S. C. 50, 50a), and the requirement of certification of the claim to Congress if established more than 5 years after such death or elopement, shall remain in effect notwithstanding the amendment or repeal of such act by this section.

EXISTING CONTRACT AND APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 302. (a) Within 30 days after the date of enactment of this act, the Secretary of the Interior, with the concurrence of the Governor of Alaska, shall either (i) assign all of his rights and duties under contract No. 14–04–001–81, entered into on June 18, 1953, between the Secretary of the Interior on behalf of the United States, and the Sanitarium Company of Portland, Oreg., to the Territory of Alaska, such assignment to become effective on the 210th day after the date of enactment of this act, or (ii) terminate the said contract in accordance with the terms thereof. Upon the effective date of any such assignment, such contract shall have the same binding effect upon the Territory as it had upon the United States prior to such assignment.

(b) On the 210th day after the date of enactment of this act, so much of all unexpended balances of appropriations as are available to the Department of the Interior for the care of the Alaska insane shall be transferred to the Governor of Alaska to be available for expenditure by him for the administration of the acts specified in, and in part amended by, section 301 and for the administration of the laws of the Territory of Alaska enacted pursuant to section 101 of this act, and the Secretary of the Interior shall, upon such transfer or as soon as practicable thereafter, transfer to the Governor of Alaska all papers and documents used primarily in the administration of all laws pertaining to the Alaska insane. For the remainder of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior for transfer to the Governor of Alaska such additional sums as may be necessary for the care of the Alaska insane during that fiscal year.

(c) Until July 1, 1957, expenses for the transportation to a mental institution outside of Alaska of all patients to be hospitalized pursuant to a commitment under section 8 of the act of January 27, 1905 (33 Stat. 616, 619, 48 U. S. C. 47), or to be hospitalized in such a mental institution pursuant to a commitment under a law of the Territorial legislature superseding such act of January 27, 1905, shall be paid by the Department of Justice.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Territories of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I present H. R. 6376, the Alaska mental-health bill.

H. R. 6376 as reported by the committee is a clean bill, with all of the House language stricken and new provisions written by the committee inserted in lieu thereof. It also is a simple bill.

It has but two main provisions: First, it vests in the people of Alaska responsibility for enactment and eventual full financial support of a mental-health program for Alaska; and, second, it provides certain limited grants-in-aid to the Territory for launching its own mental-health program.

As passed by the House, H. R. 6376 contained, in title I, detailed provisions for the commitment and care of the mentally ill of Alaska. These provisions were patterned after model legislation drafted by the United States Public Health Service. They were endorsed by the technical agencies of the administration, and by such private organizations as the American Medical Association, the American Psychiatric Association, and the National Association for Mental Health.

However, certain sections were widely misunderstood and misinterpreted. Partly as a result of this widespread misunderstanding, but more because the members of the committee were convinced that the people of Alaska are fully qualified to stand on a basis of equality with other American citizens and assume responsibility for their own mental-health program, the committee adopted the amendment initially proposed by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

The Goldwater amendment strikes out all the controversial commitment procedures contained in title I of the bill as it came from the House.

Title I of the committee's bill vests authority in the people of Alaska with respect to mental health comparable to that of the people of the States and all of the other territories of the United States, including Guam and the Virgin Islands.

Title II provides for the limited grants-in-aid to assist the Territory in launching its program. These grants include authorization for appropriation of $6½ million for construction of mental health facilities in Alaska. There are no such facilities there now. Appropriations of $6 million, over a 10-year period, to aid in support of the program also are authorized.

A third form of grant-in-aid is a provision authorizing the Territory to select 1 million acres of the vacant, unreserved, unappropriated public lands out of the 375 million acres comprising the Territory of Alaska. This million-acre grant is in exactly the same category, and has the same legal status as the grants of public lands which have been made to all of our Western States for public schools and other public purposes. It is to be administered by the Territory of Alaska as a public trust, and the mental-health program will have first call on the income and proceeds from it.

Title III provides the necessary repeal provision.

Mr. President, I urge Senate approval of H. R. 6376 as amended by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Washington for the fine job he has done. As originally introduced, the bill was long and complicated, but as a result of the fine work of the Senator from Washington and of the staff of the committee, we now have before us a fine bill.

However, Mr. President, I wish to call up my amendment identified as "6-6-56—A" and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 50, line 6, it is proposed to change the period to a colon and to insert the following:

Provided, however, That mineral deposits in lands which on January 1, 1956, were subject to public land order numbered 82 of January 22, 1943, shall not be included in said grants, but shall continue to be reserved to the United States.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I discussed this amendment with the distinguished Senator from Washington, and I think it is agreeable to him.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I think it is a very helpful amendment, and I shall be very happy to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, although my State is losing a payroll because of the passage of this bill, I rise in support of the bill. Moral and ethical principles of justice are sometimes more important than payrolls. Alaskans who are mentally ill have been confined for years in a private hospital in Portland, Oreg. This is wrong—morally wrong. Men and women afflicted with mental illness should not be forced to undergo confinement 2,000 miles from their homes and families.

Therefore, I back this legislation which will permit the Territory of Alaska—and, eventually, the state of Alaska—to establish its own mental hospital facilities.

I introduced the original bill looking toward this goal. It was steered successfully to passage in the House by the able and competent Congresswoman from my district, Mrs. EDITH S. GREEN. In the Senate Interior Committee, it has benefited by distinguished guidance from the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. I commend his enlightened interest.

The action the Senate is taking today is only simple fairness to fellow human beings. As a lifelong resident of Oregon, I had strong pricks of conscience whenever I passed the Morningside Hospital and realized that its inmates were Alaskans, who has been uprooted from their distant homes and native realm. What American State would tolerate for long the indignity of having its mentally ill citizens shipped over half the width of a continent, for confinement? Why should such an imposition be foisted upon Alaska?

I want to emphasize in conclusion that my remarks in no way imply any criticism of the treatment which residents of Alaska have received at Morningside Hospital in Portland. This hospital has served an important and useful purpose. But mankind marches onward, and social justice is a shining goal. We are achieving social justice today, as we pass this bill to authorize an Alaskan mental hospital within the boundaries of Alaska, and subject to the supervision and management of the fine people of Alaska.

I thank my colleagues who have joined with my illustrious senior colleague [Mr. MORSE] and myself in working for so worthy a cause. I also want to emphasize the splendid interest taken in the bill by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Furthermore, Mr. President, I should like to mention the splendid fight waged so valiantly for a mental hospital in Alaska by Alaska's own Delegate in Congress, E. L. BARTLETT. It is not easy to be a voteless Delegate in a body of nearly 440 Members, yet Delegate BARTLETT has persisted in his righteous demand that the people of Alaska shall own and operate their own custodial facilities for those among them who become mentally ill. We have sinned against Alaska in many essentials. For example, even the lonely Yukon Territory of Canada has a voting member of the Canadian Parliament at Ottawa, but Alaska is denied such voting representation in Washington, D. C.

Despite these handicaps, E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT has played a prominent and continuing role in the long crusade for an Alaskan mental hospital, which at last is culminated in this Chamber today. He deserves much credit and acclaim.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wonder if I might ask the Senator from Washington a couple of questions about the pending bill.

Mr. JACKSON. I shall be very happy to try to answer the questions of the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I was one of the Senators, and I presume there were many others, who received considerable correspondence about this bill. In all the letters the writers stated they were very much concerned that the bill might create a "Siberia asylum" in Alaska, and might be used for ulterior purposes. I wonder if the Senator will explain the "Siberia in Alaska" charge.

Mr. JACKSON. Of course, there is no foundation for such a charge. Of all the bills which have come to my attention since I have been a Member of the Senate and of the House, the pending bill has been as widely misinterpreted as any piece of proposed legislation which has ever been presented to the Congress. I should like to call to the attention of the distinguished junior Senator from Florida the statement which appears on page 4 of the report accompanying the bill. It is headed "Siberia, U. S. A." and I quote from the report:

> A number of persons communicating with the committee expressed the fear that this million-acre land grant would be used for a Siberia-like concentration camp in Alaska, to which political opponents of those in power in the several States and the Federal Government would be sent. The bill affords no reasonable basis for this fear, which was based on a complete misunderstanding of a section of the House measure that has been stricken by the committee amendment.
>
> While there is nothing in the bill to prevent the construction of a mental hospital on a fractional part of the lands granted to the Territory, the committee points out that such hospitals usually are built near centers of population where other facilities are available, and where patients are accessible to their families and friends. Therefore, it is unlikely that any part of the grant will itself be used for physical facilities for the mentally ill of Alaska.
>
> The purpose of the grant is to afford revenues to the Territory for support of its mental-health program. If such revenues are in excess of needs for the program, they may be used as a public trust for other public purposes.

I call attention to the fact that land grants for this purpose are not new. For example, in connection with legislation enacted by the Congress, assistance in this form has been made available to the States of Idaho, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming. In the case of Idaho, 50,000 acres were made available to provide means for the care of the insane; 100,000 acres in Utah; 30,000 acres in Wyoming; and 200,000 acres in Oklahoma.

I might add that the land grant proposed in this bill comprises only 0.27 percent of the total land area of Alaska.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it proposed that the land shall be sold to some private

interests to pay for the mental institution?

Mr. JACKSON. The land may be sold. The purpose of granting 1 million acres is the same as in all other similar grants, such as the public-school land-grant program. The income from sales or leases will be used to support the mental-health program in Alaska. The income will be held in trust for that purpose. Any money received over and above the need for the mental-health program may be used for other public purposes.

Mr. SMATHERS. The granting of the acreage is merely for the purpose of financing the mental institution, is it not?

Mr. JACKSON. It is a resource set aside, and income from it will be dedicated to the support of the mental-health program in Alaska.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is there any truth to the charge that many of the mentally incompetent from institutions scattered throughout the United States will be transferred to this particular institution in Alaska, without permission of their guardians?

Mr. JACKSON. There is nothing in the bill which would authorize any such transfer at all.

Mr. SMATHERS. In other words, it could not be done?

Mr. JACKSON. No. There exists in the various States reciprocity arrangements whereby a person who is not a legal resident of a particular State but is admitted to a hospital in that State can be sent back to the State of which he is a legal resident, for the purpose of mental treatment. That is a normal interstate reciprocity arrangement. The purpose of that kind of reciprocity agreement is to protect a State from receiving too many outside patients, and having to foot the bill, so to speak. There is nothing in the pending bill which would authorize anything along the line of the procedure mentioned by the distinguished junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it correct to say that the mental institution will be built wholly for the purpose of taking care of the mentally incompetent and those in need of mental treatment in the Territory of Alaska?

Mr. JACKSON. Only those persons. That is exactly correct. If a legal resident of another State became mentally ill while in Alaska, naturally, he would be treated in Alaska. The bill is not for the purpose of taking a citizen from any one of the 48 States and shipping him to Alaska for mental treatment.

Mr. SMATHERS. If persons who happened to be traveling in Alaska became mentally ill and needed treatment there, they would be transferred back to their home States upon request of their relatives; would they not?

Mr. JACKSON. I am sure they would. Let us put it this way: They would be treated in the same way as they would be if the incident had occurred in any one of the 48 States.

Mr. GOLDWATER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared on the Alaskan mental-health bill be printed in the RECORD, following the remarks of the chairman of the subcommittee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

H. R. 6376, the so-called Alaskan mental-health bill, has been the subject of a vast amount of correspondence to Members of Congress in the past several months. The House of Representatives passed this legislation on January 18, 1956, after which the bill was referred to the Territories Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

To understand the need for legislation such as now being considered, it is necessary to go into the background of the mental health situation in the Territory of Alaska. The Territorial Legislature of Alaska is, by the Alaskan Organic Act, specifically prohibited from legislating with regard to the care, commitment, and treatment of the mentally ill. Alaska is the only one of our Territories with such a disability. Under the present law, the Secretary of the Interior is vested with the responsibility for the care of the mentally ill in the Territory of Alaska. Presently there are no facilities in Alaska for such care and for more than 50 years the Secretary has contracted with a private institution in Portland, Oreg., for hospitalization, care, and treatment. This necessitates that Alaskans ajudged insane must be sent far from their home environment in the Territory to the State of Oregon for hospitalization. All costs of such commitment and care, as well as transportation to and from Portland, are at the expense of the Federal Government. Current appropriations for such expense amount to a little less than $1 million a year.

The commitment procedures under which the Territory of Alaska presently operates were described in the hearings before the subcommittee as archaic and inhuman Bills to amend these laws have been before Congress for some years. In the 83d Congress, H. R. 8009, which was similar to H. R. 6376, passed the House of Representatives and was favorably reported by the Senate Interior Committee after hearings, but no action was taken by the Senate prior to the adjournment of the 83d Congress.

In the 84th Congress a number of bills designed to accomplish the purposes of the previous measures were introduced in both the Senate and the House, including one by Delegate BARTLETT, of Alaska. H. R. 6376, which was sponsored by Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, of Portland, Oreg., in whose district the Morningside Hospital is located, is the bill upon which the House finally acted. The bill, as it came to the Senate, consisted of three titles. The first title was made up of some 39 pages of commitment procedures which were based on draft legislation submitted by the administration in an executive communication. Title 2 consisted of a land grant to the Territory of Alaska of 1 million acres of land to be selected from the vacant, unappropriated lands in the Territory. Title 2 also provided for $6 million over a 10-year period to establish a mental-health program in Alaska, which money was under the control of the Surgeon General of the United States. Title 2 also provided for $6.5 million for the construction of physical facilities in Alaska, such facilities to be approved by the Surgeon General. Title 3 contained the necessary repealing provisions and provided for the transitional period in which Alaska was to assume the responsibility for care, commitment, and treatment of the mentally ill. This bill passed the House of Representatives without a single dissenting vote and at the House hearings both in Alaska and Washington there were no witnesses in opposition to the legislation.

After the bill was referred to the Territories Subcommittee, a wave of opposition developed. The opponents of the legislation maintained the commitment procedures in title 1 were an invasion of constitutional liberties and the bill was designed as a vehicle for the transfer to Alaska of eccentrics and political wrong thinkers The phrase, "Siberia, U. S. A.," was coined by a California newspaper and was repeated throughout the country. Senator JACKSON, chairman of the Territories Subcommittee, called for public hearings on H. R. 6376 and these were held on February 20, 21, and March 5. At that time much opposition was expressed, all directed toward the commitment procedures and the land grant of 1 million acres. It is significant to note that at the same time this opposition was being expressed, the provisions of H. R. 6376 were being endorsed by experts of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and by the Alaskan mental-health authorities. The provisions were also approved by the American Medical Association, the American Psychiatric Association, and the National Association for Mental Health. The bill also had the approval of the Department of the Interior, which had the administrative responsibility for the bill, and was also approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The committee also noted the unanimous endorsement of the people of Alaska including the Alaskan Territorial Medical Association and the Alaskan Hospital Association.

At the conclusion of the hearings I made a study of the testimony and of the House-passed bill and noted one significant feature of title I in the original Alaskan mental-health bill. This section gave the Territorial Legislature of Alaska the power to annul or amend any of the sections of title 1 relating to care, commitment, and treatment of the mentally ill at any time it saw fit. For this reason, I submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute to H. R. 6376, which is in principle the bill which we are discussing today. It was, and is, my feeling that the Territorial Legislature of Alaska is the proper legislative group to prescribe procedures for the care, commitment, and treatment of the mentally ill of Alaska.

It seemed ridiculous to me for Congress to pass a long, complicated bill relating to commitment procedures in Alaska and in the same bill give the Territorial legislature the power to annul or amend the congressionally passed law. For that reason, the bill which was reported by the Senate Interior Committee in title 1 authorizes the Territory of Alaska to prescribe procedures for care, commitment, and treatment for the mentally ill of Alaska. This title contains none of the language of the House-passed bill.

The remainder of the bill, reported by the Senate Interior Committee, is practically identical to H. R. 6376, as passed by the House. In title 2 the bill provides $6 million for a mental health program over a 10-year period and $6.5 million for the construction of physical facilities in Alaska. It further provides for a 1-million-acre land grant to the Territory of Alaska to be selected within 10 years from the vacant and unappropriated public lands. This provision, which as I mentioned was widely misunderstood, is intended to give to the Territorial government a tax base and an income with which to finance the continued mental health program in Alaska and is not, as has been suggested by opponents to the bill, to be used as a vast concentration camp. It may well be that part of this million acres will be used as a site for a mental hospital but that is not necessary. Alaska consists of 375 million acres of land of which 99 percent is federally owned. If Alaska receives the 1 million acres provided for in this bill, the Federal Government will still own some 98 plus percent of the total acreage. Since the

purpose of the Alaskan mental health bill is to transfer to Alaska the responsibility both fiscal and administrative for the care of the mentally ill it can be seen that the Territorial government must have some revenue source.

The income from the million acres is not earmarked solely for mental health but may be used for other public purposes. Title 3 of the Senate reported version of H. R. 6376 contains the necessary repealing provisions and provides for the interim period between the date of enactment of H. R. 6376 and action by the Territory. In effect the status quo is maintained for 210 days and then the authority of the Secretary of the Interior is vested in the Governor of Alaska with regard to commitment, care, and treatment of the mentally ill until such time as the Territorial legislature, which meets this coming January, makes other arrangements.

In conclusion let me say that I feel the Territory of Alaska is entitled to adequate mental facilities and that the bill presently being considered is a forward step in that direction, and can in no way be construed as a constitutional invasion of the rights and privileges of the citizens of the United States.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in connection with the statement I have submitted for the RECORD, I wish to recognize the services which were rendered, in connection with this measure, by Mr. Stewart French, the counsel for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and those rendered by my own legislative assistant, Mr. Dean Burch.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6376) was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to confer upon Alaska autonomy in the field of mental health, transfer from the Federal Government to the Territory the fiscal and functional responsibility for the hospitalization of committed mental patients, and for other purposes."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have before me a list of a dozen more bills which I serve notice we expect to have the Senate consider.

For one reason or another, Senators are asking that the consideration of various bills be held up. Mr. President, if the Senate is to conclude this session before the end of December, we shall have to take action promptly on these measures. The consideration of 3 or 4 bills is held up because one Senator cannot conveniently be present on Thursday. The consideration of 3 or 4 more bills is held up because some other Senator prefers to have them taken up on Tuesday, instead of on Friday.

I hope to accommodate all Senators; but we have a schedule for the Senate, and we must act on the bills which have been reported to the Senate and placed on the calendar. If Senators wish to object to proposed legislation, they should make their appearance in the committees handling the bills, and, of course, they also have a right to oppose the bills on the floor. But Senators should not ask that bills remain on the calendar and be carried over and postponed from day to day.

So I hope all Senators will aid me in helping to expedite the business of the Senate.

FEDERAL SHIP MORTGAGE INSURANCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I think all hands are agreeable to having the Senate proceed at this time to the consideration of Calendar No. 2084, Senate bill 3857. Therefore, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of that bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3857) to clarify section 1103 (d) of title XI—Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance—of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the pending business is S. 3857. I might say just briefly, for the information of the Senate, it is a bill which had the unanimous support of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It merely corrects an error in the Ship Mortgage Insurance Act regarding insurance on special purpose vessels. Several lines, including Alaska Steamship Co. and the Pan-Atlantic Steamship Corp., are in process of building special purpose vessels, and it was pointed out by the Comptroller General that there was an error in the act in relation to that type of vessel. All the bill does is correct that error.

The passage of the bill has been recommended by the Maritime Administrator, and it has been characterized by all of us as clearly made necessary as a result of inadvertence. The bill will clarify the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there is no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3857) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That effective September 3, 1954, section 1103 (d) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of the interest on and 90 percent of the unpaid balance of the principal amount of each mortgage and loan insured under this title, but in the case of special-purpose vessels certified by the Secretary of Defense to be essential to national defense, the faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of the interest on and 100 percent of the unpaid balance of the principal amount of each mortgage and loan insured under this title if the insurance contract obligates the United States to pay the interest on and 100 percent of the unpaid balance of the principal amount of such mortgage or loan."

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS TO THE COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION OF NEVADA, FOR INDUSTRIAL, RECLAMATION, AND OTHER PURPOSES—ELDORADO VALLEY, FORMERLY DRY LAKE VALLEY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas obtained the floor.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada—Eldorado Valley, formerly Dry Lake Valley—to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada acting for the State of Nevada, for industrial, reclamation, and other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4012) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada, acting for the State of Nevada, introduced by Mr. MALONE (for himself and Mr. BIBLE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior shall issue to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada acting for and in behalf of the State of Nevada, upon the payment by the State of Nevada into the Treasury of the United States, not more than 10 years after the Secretary has notified the State of the purchase price, of an amount equal to the fair market value of the lands to be conveyed as determined by the Secretary upon the appraisal of those lands, a patent to the following described lands, situated in the State of Nevada and comprising approximately 126,775 acres:

(1) All of south one-half, township 23 south, range 63 east, with the exception of the following areas: east one-half section 22; four 5-acre tracts located in section 26 and described as follows: S½SE¼NW¼NW¼, N½NE¼SW¼NW¼, N½SW¼NE¼NW¼,

and S½SW¼NW¼NW¼; and those portions of the northeast one-quarter section 23, and north one-half section 24, within the Lake Mead National Recreation Area.

(2) Fractional sections 25 and 36, township 23 south, range 63½ east.

(3) All of sections 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34, township 23 south, range 64 east.

(4) Fractional sections 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35, township 23½ south, range 64 east.

(5) All of southeast one-quarter of township 24 south, range 62 east.

(6) All of township 24 south, range 63 east.

(7) All of township 24 south, range 64 east, except sections 1, 12, 13, 24, 25, and 36.

(8) All of township 25 south, range 62 east.

(9) All of township 25 south, range 63 east.

(10) All of sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, township 25 south, range 64 east.

(11) All of sections 1, 2, 11, 12, 13, and 14, township 26 south, range 62 east.

(12) All of northwest one-quarter, township 26 south, range 63 east.

All range references contained in the foregoing refer to the Mount Diablo base and meridian.

SEC. 2. The Colorado River Commission of Nevada, acting on behalf of the State of Nevada, is hereby given the option, which may be exercised at any time during the 10-year period provided in the first section of this act, of having patented to it a portion of the described area upon payment of the pro rata appraised value thereof: *Provided*, That no such purchase shall be for less than 10,000 acres.

SEC. 3. The conveyance authorized by this act shall be made subject to any existing valid claims against the lands described in the first section of this act, and to any reservations necessary to protect continuing uses of those lands by the United States.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from the report of the Colorado River Commission of Nevada, dated January 1, 1927, to September 1, 1935.

Let me state that I wrote this industrial report for the southern Nevada area during my nearly 9 years as State engineer and the engineer member and secretary of the Colorado River Commission for my State of Nevada.

The excerpt which I wish to have printed in the RECORD is from pages 21 to 22, inclusive, of the report, showing climate for each month of the year, prevailing winds, and weather.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLIMATE

In colder climates thousands of dollars are spent and lost annually by manufacturing plants in combating snow, ice, and freezing weather. This is an item of expense that will never be felt at Boulder Dam and there will never be a cessation of operations on account of weather.

It is true that the weather is quite warm in the months of June, July, and August. A temperature of 110° to 118° in the middle of the day is not unusual in these months. Temperature comparisons, however, do not mean much, unless humidity and other conditions are considered. At Boulder City and Las Vegas temperatures ranging from 105° to 118° are not as trying as temperatures above 90° in the more humid places. Modern air-conditioning and water-cooling devices, too, are a great aid to comfort in the hot summer months.

In the months of December, January, and February, the temperature in some years gets a few degrees below freezing, the minimum being 12° to 15° above zero, which occurs only at long intervals. The following data on climate were supplied by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Weather conditions—Air temperatures

	Boulder City		
	Maximum	Minimum	Mean
December 1930	55	25	40.9
January 1931	65	30	44.1
February 1931	67	39	49.1
June 1931	107	56	82.9
July 1931	118	72	97.9
August 1931	110	62	88.2
December 1931	56	27	42.7
January 1932	60	28	41.7
February 1932	75	27	48.9
June 1932	107	53	82.7
July 1932	111	66	88.2
August 1932	109	67	88.8
December 1932	64	17	40.6
January 1933	58	28	42.2
February 1933	63	12	40.8
June 1933	106	52	83.7
July 1933	112	66	92.9
August 1933	112	67	89.9
Year 1931	118	26	67.3
Year 1932	111	17	66.4

Precipitation	*Inches*
Total precipitation in 1932	3.95
Total precipitation in 1933	2.69

The snowfall is light, seldom staying on the ground more than 24 hours. The maximum snowfall recorded to date is 5½ inches.

WIND

The wind blows from the south in the summer and from the north in the winter. A few violent winds usually occur in the spring months.

HEALTH

The abundance of sunshine and the possibility of year-round outdoor activity makes the locality an ideal one from the standpoint of health.

SIXTEEN RECLAMATION AND INDUSTRIAL PROJECTS, COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION REPORT JANUARY 1, 1927, TO SEPTEMBER 1, 1935

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from pages 119 to 123 of the report. Dry Lake Valley is described in the report and shown on a map at No. 16 of 16 areas included in my report of the work of the Colorado River Commission as adapted to reclamation and industrial development.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECLAMATION

Investigations to date have shown an approximate gross area of 190,000 acres with a maximum pump lift that would seem to be feasible, considering the plan of the Federal Government for subsistence homesteads in connection with industrial plants at the dam. Reducing this by 20 percent, 150,000 acres net would remain with a maximum pump lift of 800 feet. A considerable area could be irrigated by gravity flow.

It is contemplated by the Government, in line with industrial planning, making unit areas self-supporting, and the decentralization of industry, to establish reclamation tracts to the end that workers may be sold areas, from one-half acre to 5 acres in extent, where families can be partially self-supporting. This would also provide a "cushion" in the event of another decline in industrial activity. There is approximately a 10-month growing season in this area.

The Bureau of Reclamation has just completed a preliminary survey of this area and very soon will continue its work in more detail, so that in the reasonably near future the exact net irrigable acreage should be known, together with the pump lift for each area.

AREA

The following data have been compiled from information furnished by the Bureau of Reclamation, and from private sources:

Sixteen separate areas were investigated, including four tracts that are now irrigated from the Virgin River lying above the high-water line of Boulder Dam Reservoir.

These tracts are shown on the accompanying map. The areas as herein discussed correspond with the area number on map No. 4.

Area No. 1 consists of approximately 1,300 acres of alluvial bottom land in the vicinity of Mesquite, irrigated by water from the Virgin River.

Area No. 2 consists of a long, narrow strip of river bottom land in the vicinity of Bunkerville, irrigated by gravity from the Virgin River. There are about 900 acres in the tract.

Area No. 3 is a 60-acre tract just below Riverside station along the river bottom.

Area No. 4 is a 1,600-acre tract on the right-hand side of the Virgin River in T. 15 S., R. 68 and 69 E., between the 1,500-foot contour and the river. The best method of serving this area would be by pumping from the Virgin River.

Areas Nos. 5 and 6 contain about 12,000 acres on Muddy River and Meadow Valley Wash above Glendale and below Warm Springs. To irrigate this area it would be necessary to use the water from the Warm Springs by direct application and storage in the reservoir on Meadow Valley Wash during the nonirrigation season. This water is now in use below the narrows. It has been estimated that the annual discharge of the springs amounts to 34,000 acre-feet, and that this amount could be made available for these lands by pumping from Boulder Reservoir for the remaining lands outside of the reservoir to which this water is now being applied. This water supply may be augmented if further investigation should develop that either the flood waters of the Muddy River or the Meadow Valley Wash are sufficient to justify the construction of catchment reservoirs. The soils are similar to those in the lower Muddy Valley. The area can be served by a gravity system diverting water below the lowest spring. The canal on the left-hand side of the stream would serve the Meadow Valley Wash area and deliver water into the reservoir from the Meadow Valley Wash. Eight hundred acres of this area are now irrigated.

Area No. 7 consists of the land now under the Muddy Valley Irrigation Co.'s canals, with additional lands up to the 1,500-foot contour. This area contains approximately 8,600 acres.

To substitute a new irrigation system for the land heretofore irrigated and develop the new land, it would be necessary to locate a new pumping plant near the narrows on the Virgin River in section 1, T. 17 S., R. 68 E., carrying a canal up the left-hand side of the Muddy River Valley. The pump lift would be from 275 to 350 feet to cover the entire area. The water depth in the reservoir at this location is about 100 feet and slopes steeply, making it favorable for working out a pumping plant.

Area No. 8 is a tract of approximately 2,800 acres located about 4 miles east of St. Thomas on the east side of the Virgin River. Sixteen hundred acres of this area can be reached by a 200-foot pump lift. The balance requires a 350-foot lift.

Area No. 9 is a 600-acre tract in T. 19 S., R. 68 E. The area extends for 3 miles along the shoreline below the 1,500-foot contour. There is a good location for a pumping plant. The reclamation of this area is considered economically feasible.

Area No. 10 is a tract located on the east side of the Virgin River nearly opposite its

junction with the Colorado River. There are about 400 acres in this tract. Due to the favorable pumping location the tract is considered economically feasible for reclaiming.

Area No. 11 is a tract of 1,200 acres located about 14 miles east of Las Vegas along a branch of the Las Vegas Wash. It is fairly level, and the upper margins of the area are not more than 2 miles distant from the shoreline of the reservoir. A good location for a pumping plant exists near the tract. The pumping lift would be 350 feet. It is within a reasonable distance of Las Vegas and would be valuable for trucking purposes, and its reclamation will not be expensive.

Area No. 12 consists of approximately 60,000 acres of fertile land lying in the Las Vegas Valley. The city of Las Vegas being in the west part of the tract, all of which lies below the 2,000-foot contour.

Many acres are now, or have been, under cultivation, but owing to the shortage of artesian water most of that portion under cultivation has been abandoned.

There is no doubt the water can be pumped from the Boulder Dam reservoir in sufficient quantity and at a minimum cost to water this land. With the coming of industry in the Las Vegas Valley this land, when brought under water, will provide homes and sustenance for thousands of families.

Areas Nos. 13, 14, and 15 consist of 63,000 acres divided between bottom and bench land. All of the bench land lies below the 1,500-foot contour. The bottom land lies at the average of 25 feet above normal river level.

The bottom land is rich and fertile, having been deposited by the annual overflow of the Colorado River. Now that Boulder Dam is built, these bottom lands should never overflow again. This particular area is heavily covered by mesquite, willow, and cottonwood. The necessary pumping height to irrigate this land would not exceed 25 feet. The bench land lying between the 1,500-foot contour and the westerly half of the bottom land would require three pumping heights, 275 feet, 600 feet, and 1,000 feet.

The land is very fertile, as shown by the date trees planted by the United States Government. These date trees are 5 years old and are full-grown and bearing. Twenty acres of land were leveled on the bench in 1933 and a pumping plant was installed to allow the planting of an additional 20 acres of dates. The Agriculture Department has had a man stationed at the experimental date farm for several years, sending in soil samples and taking the weather and temperatures, and the lowest temperature noted was in the winter of 1933, a temperature of 29 above zero, the only frost in 3 years.

The soil tests made by the Government, both on the bottom and bench land, show that the area could be made into one of the most fertile and productive tracts in the Southwest.

Area No. 16 consists of the following: A small dried lake with an area of about 10 square miles lying approximately 5 miles south and west of Boulder City. The floor of the lake is at an elevation of 1,709 feet. From 2 miles north of the lake to 15 miles south lies a valley of approximately 40,000 acres, ranging inward from 3 to 8 miles.

The soil is rich and free from any excessive amount of alkali. There are no boulders or hummocks of consequence, and the entire area slopes gently toward the high lake in the valley. The nature of the soil is such that even though these last several years have been unusually dry the bunch grass for grazing purposes has been especially good. There are two ways that water could be delivered to this valley:

First, to install a system of pumps and pipelines taking water from above the Boulder Dam out of the reservoir at an elevation of 1,100 feet (when the lake is full and subject to the rise and the fall of the lake) up the Hemingway Wash and deliver the water through a system of canals and ditches to the valley. This pipeline would be approximately 7 miles long and the delivery end would be at an elevation of 2,400 feet.

Second, to pump from the Colorado River proper below the dam and from an elevation of 600 feet through a line to the summit at an elevation of 2,375 feet. This pipeline would be approximately 5 miles long. There would be some advantage in this plan, as the water would be delivered to the valley at a better point of distribution and there would be no trouble at the suction end of the first pump stage, as there would be no fluctuation in the source of supply.

Regardless of which plan might be used, there are numerous sites for storage reservoirs in order to run the plant all year, allowing for greater plant efficiency as well as being able to take advantage of low peak electric rates.

INVESTIGATIONS

The Bureau of Reclamation has made arrangements for a more detailed investigation of these areas, together with an estimate of the cost of reclaiming the lands and a soil analysis. The Colorado River Commission will continue to study the various features.

WATER CONTRACTS FOR IRRIGATION

In the absence of a lower basin States' agreement on the division of the water allotted to them by the Colorado River Compact, and since the State of Arizona did not sign the proposed seven-State agreement, thereby declining to take any responsibility under the compact, the Colorado River Commission should at once prepare a contract providing for sufficient water to irrigate the irrigable lands in this area for submission to the Secretary of the Interior. Such a contract should be similar to the contracts already secured by certain southern California municipalities and districts.

COST OF PUMPING WATER

The cost of pumping water at a given price for power depends on the length and size of the pipe and the height to which the water must be elevated, and the rate at which the water is pumped. The ultimate cost, including amortization, will depend on the size of pipe and cost per ton, cost of installation, and rate of interest.

The following estimate of the cost of pumping against various heads and for different load factors assumes an 18-inch cast iron pipe 5 miles long, having 4 bends, with the water pumped at the rate of 10,000 acre-feet per year, power at 2.5 mills per kilowatt-hour, pipe at $50 per ton deliverd, and labor at $8 per joint. These will be, approximately, the requirements for delivering reservoir water to a point from which it will flow by gravity to the lands to be irrigated.

Until surveys are made and plants decided, definite estimates cannot be given, and these will serve as a rough guide for preliminary work.

In the accompanying table the first line of figures in the heading designated as "kw." represents kilowatts; the second line designated as "h., f." represents head in feet:

Yearly load factor	Hours pumping	Cost per acre-foot							
		474 kw. 100 h., f.	591 kw. 200 h., f.	708 kw. 300 h., f.	824 kw. 400 h., f.	941 kw. 500 h., f.	1,059 kw. 600 h., f.	1,176 kw. 700 h., f.	1,293 kw. 800 h., f.
10	876	$14.64	$15.94	$17.35	$18.81	$20.47	$22.35	$24.31	$26.88
20	1,752	7.84	8.61	9.45	10.31	11.26	12.33	13.44	14.85
30	2,628	5.57	6.17	6.82	7.47	8.19	9.00	9.82	10.85
40	3,504	4.44	4.95	5.50	6.05	6.66	7.42	8.01	8.84
50	4,380	3.76	4.02	4.71	5.21	5.74	6.32	6.92	7.64
60	5,256	3.31	3.73	4.20	4.96	5.13	5.65	6.20	6.84
70	6,132	2.98	3.38	3.81	4.24	4.69	5.18	5.68	6.27
80	7,008	2.74	3.06	3.52	3.93	4.36	4.82	5.29	5.84
90	7,884	2.55	2.92	3.31	3.69	4.01	4.54	4.99	5.50
100	8,760	2.40	2.75	3.13	3.50	3.90	4.32	4.75	5.33

Cost of pumping 10,000 acre-feet per year (13.8 second-feet) against various heads and for different load factors. 18-inch pipeline 5 miles long having 4 bends.

COST OF TRANSFORMER EQUIPMENT

The feasibility of using Boulder Dam power at isolated points along the proposed transmission lines will depend to a large extent on the cost of transforming equipment to reduce the power from the high voltage to the voltage required for the operation of pumps and for other purposes.

The following information on the cost of such equipment was supplied by the Industrial Department of the General Electric Co. in Salt Lake City, Utah.

"FEBRUARY 12, 1935.

"In high voltage transformer equipment the major cost is in the insulation against the high voltage, and accordingly there is a rather definite point below which there is little reduction in price by reducing the capacity.

"We have prepared some estimates on 3-phase transforming equipment, including the simplest possible switching and protective equipment for stepping down from 132,000 volt, 3-phase, 60-cycle, to 440-volt, 3-phase, 60-cycle. These estimates are as follows:

"Capacity:	*Approximate cost of equipment*
2,500 kilovolt-amperes	$24,200
1,500 kilovolt-amperes	20,200
500 kilovolt-amperes	15,700
300 kilovolt-amperes	14,700

"Three hundred kilovolt-amperes is about as low as it is possible to go and get any kind of a reasonable cost for 3-phase equipment. For 100 kilovolt-amperes loads or less it would seem advisable to consider handling the load with single-phase equipment rather than 3-phase. The necessary transforming equipment to handle a 100 kilovolt-ampere single-phase load would have a cost of approximately $7,700."

RETAIL SALES—BUSINESS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the 1954 retail sales for the State of Nevada, Clark County, and the city of Las Vegas, and the percentages of State and county, respectively.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

1954 retail sales for State of Nevada, Clark County, and city of Las Vegas, and percentages of State and county totals for Clark County and Las Vegas, respectively

Kind-of-business group	State total	Total for Clark County	County percent of State total	Las Vegas city total	Las Vegas percent of State total	Las Vegas percent of county total
1. Food stores	$66,017,000	$29,537,000	44.7	$24,129,000	36.5	81.7
2. Eating, drinking places	39,872,000	12,909,000	32.4	7,950,000	19.9	61.6
3. General merchandise	30,100,000	10,058,000	33.4	9,691,000	32.2	96.4
4. Apparel, accessories stores	20,613,000	10,194,000	49.5	9,112,000	44.2	89.4
5. Furniture, home furnishings appliance dealers	14,440,000	6,504,000	45.0	6,165,000	42.7	94.8
6. Automotive group	57,907,000	23,015,000	39.7	20,876,000	36.1	90.7
7. Gasoline service stations	33,458,000	12,854,000	38.4	8,128,000	24.3	63.2
8. Lumber, building materials, hardware, farm equipment dealers	20,519,000	7,620,000	37.1	6,957,000	33.9	91.3
9. Drugstores, proprietary stores	17,029,000	4,962,000	29.1	3,893,000	22.9	78.5
10. Other retail stores	26,596,000	10,403,000	39.1	8,635,000	32.5	83.0
11. Nonstore retailers	3,516,000	1,668,000	47.4	1,480,000	42.1	88.7
Total	330,067,000	129,724,000	39.3	107,016,000	32.4	82.4

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce 1954 Census of Business Report, Retail Trade, released Jan. 13, 1956.

LAND CLASSIFICATION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing Land Capability Subclasses—Dry Lake Valley, designated as area No. 16, project No. 4, shown on the map No. 4, dated February 20, 1935, from the Nevada-Colorado River Commission Report, dated January 1, 1927, to September 1, 1935.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Land capability subclasses—Dry Lake Valley

Land capability units	Soil name (series, type, phase)	Mapping symbol	Acreage
I	Ireteba loam, 0-2 percent slope	1M42-X13/A-2	551.5
	Total, class I		551.5
II	Forlorn sandy loam, 0-2 percent slope	1L57-X10/A-R	1,304.8
	Lathrop sandy loam, 0-2 percent slope	1L53-X8/A-1R	514.6
	Dry lake loamy fine sand, moderately deep over Ireteba soil material, 0-2 percent slope, hummocky	1L52-X11/AA-1R	361.6
	Total, class II		2,180.0
III	Forlorn loamy fine sand, 0-2 percent slope	1C76-X10/A-2	1,587.1
	Forlorn loamy sand, 0.2 percent slope	1C7-X10/A-R	2,821.9
	Knob Hill loamy fine sand, deep over gravel, 0-2 percent slope	2C5Z-F9/A-2R	1,493.4
	Searchlight loamy fine sand, moderately deep over Ireteba soil material, 0-2 percent slope	1C64-X9/A-1	558.8
	Ireteba fine sandy loam, 0-2 percent slopes, slightly saline	1L52-X13/A-2-S_1	3,067.2
	Dry Lake loamy fine sand, moderately deep over clay, 0-2 percent slope, hummocky, slightly saline	3L6V-X11/AA-R-S_1	458.4
	Total, class III		9,986.8
IV	Forlorn loamy sand, 2-4 percent slope	1C7-X10/B-R	4,046.4
	Forlorn loamy fine sand, moderately deep to deep over opal soil material, 2-4 percent slope	1C64-X10/B-R	448.8
	Knob Hill loamy sand, 2-4 percent slope	1C56-F9/B-R	1,739.2
	Total, class IV		6,234.4
VIII	Alunite stony gravelly sand	1vC7-F7/C-2	2,531.0
	Aztec gravelly loamy fine sand, 2-8 percent slope	1gCS-F8/BC-2R	1,158.7
	Hoover clay, 0-2 percent slope, strongly saline, eroded	5HV-T11/A-3-S_3	507.2
	Hard fine sandy loam, shallow to very shallow, 2-15 percent slopes, eroded	4L5R_1-T8/BD3	830.4
	Mead clay, 0-2 percent slope, strongly saline	5HV-B1/A-1-S_3	1,075.0
	Stony steep land, basalt	5XB-M1/E-1	656.1
	Opal loamy sand, shallow, 2-15 percent slope	4L5R_1-F6/BD-3	260.4
	Peeper stony fine sandy loam, very shallow, 0-2 percent slope	5LR$_1$-T12/A-2R	603.2
	Searchlight gravelly loamy sand, shallow to moderately deep over fortification soil material, 2-4 percent slope.	4gC4R$_1$-X9/R-2	16,452.3
	Searchlight gravelly loamy sand, 0-2 percent slope	1gC7-X9/A-2	15,998.0
	Searchlight gravelly and stony loamy sand, 0-2 percent slope	1vC7-X9/A-2	1,534.0
	Searchlight stony gravelly sand, 0-4 percent slope	1vC7-X9/AB-2	3,416.7
	Pittman stony loamy sand, 4-8 percent slope	1vC7-F3/C-2	1,642.6
	Pittman stony loam, 0-2 percent slope	1vM7-F3/A-2	823.3
	Searchlight gravelly loamy sand, 2-4 percent slope	1gC7-X9/B-2	1,123.6
	Total class VIII		48,612.5
	Total mapped		67,565.2

THE FUTURE OF NEVADA

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have been working on industrial and reclamation projects in southern Nevada, beginning early in 1927 as State engineer, engineer member and secretary of the Colorado River Commission and engineer member of the Public Service Commission.

In 1928 I predicted that the population would exceed 100,000 people within 25 years. It has exceeded expectations.

I have said many times since entering the Senate that the population of this great area may double in the next 15 years if we can keep the necessary water and power available at a price feasible for industrial development.

Mr. President, I also call to the attention of this body an industrial report on southern Nevada by Alfred Merritt Smith, who followed me as State engineer in 1935, and who is now my administrative assistant.

Mr. President, in 1951, on April 9, the 1st session of the 82d Congress, I introduced 5 bills, numbered Senate 1297 to 1301 inclusive, and provided for 5 reclamation projects including areas Nos. 1 to 16 and projects 1 to 5 on map No. 4 included in the report of the Colorado River Commission.

Area No. 16, project No. 4, was included in Senate bill 1300, April 9, 1951, 1st session of the 82d Congress.

Mr. President, I was unable to arouse sufficient interests in the project at that time, and am highly gratified that we can confidently predict that this project will now be developed.

On June 28, 1952, in the 2d session of the 82d Congress, I introduced Senate bill 3425, including project No. 6.

Mr. President, at my request the Bureau has recently made a survey of area No. 12, project No. 3 in the immediate Las Vegas area and there is no doubt that this project can be joined

in bringing additional domestic water for the city and consummated at an early date.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas for yielding to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I always welcome an opportunity to befriend my colleague, the Senator from Nevada, who is so courteous and cooperative with the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

REVIEW OF FOREIGN POLICY, VI—AFRICA: THE BEGINNINGS OF POLICY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this is the sixth in a series of discussions which I began last January under the general description "Review of Foreign Policy." In these discussions, I have sought to call attention to situations in various regions of the world and the policies which we are pursuing with respect to them.

My purpose in undertaking this review is threefold. I hope that my observations, in concert with those of other Members, will enlarge our common understanding of the international issues which face the Nation. I hope they will contribute in a similar fashion to the understanding of these issues by the American people. I hope, finally, that they will serve some constructive purpose in improving the foreign policies on which the Nation heavily depends for our peace and well-being.

In previous statements, I discussed in succession our relations with southeast Asia, North Africa, the Middle East, and, most recently, with Latin America. In all those statements, it was possible to describe a pattern of American policy. It was not always an effective or consistent policy. Nevertheless, there was at least an understandable base to build on—frequently a faltering, uncertain base, but at least a recognizable base.

That is less the case with respect to the area which I propose to consider today. For Africa, and for sub-Sahara Africa in particular, we have barely the beginnings of a policy.

I say that, not so much in criticism, but merely to emphasize a fact that is of great pertinence in our relations with that region. Much of Africa has long been beyond the horizon of our direct interest; and, in consequence, we have given it little direct consideration in our policy. For the most part, we have approached that continent through the European nations which exercise sovereignty over a great part of it.

That this is the case is clearly reflected in the organization of the Department of State. The African Division has been tacked on, like an afterthought, to the Bureau of Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs. I may also note that, despite his wide and far-flung travels, the Secretary of State has somehow managed virtually to overlook the second largest continent in the world. On second thought, I believe his plane did set down briefly in Cairo, at one time, on the way to somewhere else, or coming from somewhere else.

What might be termed this official unawareness of Africa is not confined to the executive branch; it is shared by the Congress. Africa has been the subject of almost no discussion in the Senate in the last decade. That is, to say the least, a most unusual phenomenon for this body. As the Members know, our range of interest has otherwise been broad enough to cover in great detail a range of such diverse subjects as daylight saving time in the District of Columbia, the awe-inspiring power of atomic energy, and Presidential critiques of music critics.

Very few Senators in their travels abroad have found occasion to retrace the paths of Stanley and Livingstone through Africa, and I hasten to add that I am as guilty as others of this negligence. It has remained for the intrepid gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], in the other House, to blaze a congressional trail through the dangerous recesses of that vast continent.

In all seriousness, this neglect of Africa seems to me to create a gap both in our understanding of the total international situation and in our foreign policies. In the past, the gap might have had few significant consequences. Today, however, it seems to me that it is one which we can ill afford.

Circumstances change rapidly in the world, regardless of whether the executive branch and the Congress choose to ignore the changes. Then, sooner or later, we are face to face with their accumulated impact. What usually follows is a new round of crisis diplomacy.

Current reports in the press and elsewhere suggest that something of this sort may be building up in Africa. Not entirely unlike Asia of the past decade, the continent of Africa is now in major transition. The circumstances in the two situations are not precisely the same, and therefore the outcome is not likely to be precisely the same. But the transition in Africa, like that of Asia, arises from the same powerful source. Concepts of national and human equality have entered in force into the awareness of Africa. So, too, have concepts of modern material progress. Many in Africa now know that life elsewhere offers more than a predestined and unchangeable status of servitude, whether it be servitude to alien political power or servitude to sickness, superstition, and starvation.

They have learned that men have human rights lodged in them by God. They have learned, too, that modern technology points the way out of the long night of fearful struggle for mere animal existence. The Africans who know these truths—and they are still comparatively few in number—are passing them on to their kinsmen. The ideas are spreading irresistibly through the continent.

These concepts—the concepts of national and human equality and of modern progress—are just beginning to take root in Africa. But experience elsewhere in the world teaches us that, once planted, they are concepts which are not likely to be eradicated from the minds of men. They may be twisted, turned, and trampled on; but they will not die.

What will issue from these concepts in Africa is uncertain, for every people gives to them a unique imprint. What is certain, however, is that the Africa of tomorrow will be vastly different from the Africa of today, just as Africa today bears little resemblance to the Africa of 50 years ago.

I believe it essential that, now, at the beginnings of policy with Africa, we recognize the origin of the concepts which are stimulating these changes. They are not the product of an unseen or conspiratorial hand. They arise out of the total experience of civilized man. They are the lifeblood of freedom, the same concepts which have underlain the development of America and, in a larger sense, of all western culture. They are the same concepts which time and again all over the world have rallied whole peoples to resist or to overthrow tyrannies.

I stress the universal and especially the western source of these concepts. I do so because I believe we are about to witness the beginning of an attempt to twist and turn the transition of Africa into channels of totalitarianism. Press reports indicate that the Soviet drive into the Middle East is moving beyond that area, deeply into Africa, above and below the Sahara. It is being pursued on cultural, diplomatic, and economic fronts, and, as has happened elsewhere, the concepts of freedom itself have been usurped and are being used by the Communists to spearhead this drive.

The free nations may deplore this development. If we are honest with ourselves, however, we shall acknowledge the fact that it has been the inadequacies of western policies in interpreting our own political, social, and economic ideals in Africa that have afforded, in large part, the opening wedge.

The Soviet drive will not be stopped by a wringing of hands. It will not be stopped by military measures so long as it remains nonmilitary in nature. Least of all will it be stopped by a further retreat from our own finest beliefs. If we and other free nations fail to uphold those beliefs in our relations with Africa, in deed as well as word, then we shall have no one to blame but ourselves if the emergent continent turns not toward the West, but toward totalitarianism, Communist or otherwise.

That is the principal reason why this country must remain alert to the present African transition. Until now, Africa has been largely what might be termed a political neutron, inert and acted upon by others. It is now beginning to move as an independent force in international life. What takes place there in the years immediately ahead will, in effect, determine whether the area of human freedom in the world shall be enlarged or contracted by the addition or subtraction of much, if not all, of that continent.

At this moment we can foresee only dimly the consequences to our own direct national interests which will stem from one or the other development. Some immediate effects of the transition, however, are already visible in their impact on our international relations elsewhere. The transition has involved our relations with the principal European democra-

cies. And as the Bandung Conference of Asian-African nations so clearly demonstrated, it has involved our relations with the numerous peoples in Asia and elsewhere who have recently achieved national freedom or who are moving in that direction.

Later in my remarks I shall deal in greater detail with the transition in Africa and what I believe to be its meaning for American policy. First, however, I wish to sketch briefly the background against which this transition is taking place.

The continent consists roughly of three zones of change. Across the north, along the shores of the Mediterranean, are peoples in such areas as Egypt, Libya, Algeria and Morocco, who are tied closely by history to trends in the Middle East and Europe. I have already dealt at considerable length with that region in previous remarks on North Africa on March 20, and the Middle East on April 18. I shall not cover the same ground in detail again today.

At the extreme south of the continent is another district zone in the form of the Union of South Africa. This independent commonwealth marks the area of most intense European penetration. Of its 12 or 13 million inhabitants, some 3 million derive from Europe, largely from the United Kingdom and the Netherlands. Members of the Senate are well aware of what is transpiring in that region at the present time. There, in acute form, is presented the problem of adjustment, each to the other, of three groups—Asian, African and European. So far the attempt, based upon intensifying their separation, has produced a tragedy compounded of fear, arrogance, injustice, and alienation. Our own great difficulty with the problem of segregation, however, constrains us to a great humility in discussing this matter when it involves others.

Between the northern zone of Moslem peoples and southern zone of European penetration lies the heart of Africa and the core of the African transition. A map of this region, of sub-Sahara Africa, reveals a patchwork of independent nations, United Nations trusteeships, and colonies in various stages of dependency on European powers. It shows, for example, an independent Ethiopia, restored at the end of World War II, a Sudan recently set free by the United Kingdom, and a Liberia occupied by descendants of former American slaves, set free and returned to Africa many decades ago.

Mapmaking, like other honorable professions, has its own unique traditions. Certain colors, for example, have been assigned consistently over the years to certain countries. In keeping with this tradition, current maps of Africa, as did their predecessors, show a number of red patches. These patches, I hasten to add, refer not to Communist-sponsored states but to ancient and honorable British possessions. In addition to Britain, France, Portugal, Belgium, and Spain, all have dependencies in the region. Certain of these countries also administer trusteeships over which the United Nations exercises a considerable degree of supervision.

Each of the European nations has reacted to the recent pressures for change within Africa in its own unique fashion. The United Kingdom, for example, has met the growing demand for national equality by adjusting promptly in some instances to bona fide nationalist movements which promise to lead to stable self-government or independence. Under this policy the Sudan has already achieved political freedom in peace, and the Gold Coast and Nigeria have moved close to that goal in the same fashion. By contrast, in the east African dependency of Kenya, the stirrings of African discontent have led to the brutal and violent conflict of the Mau Mau uprisings.

France has sought to meet the pressures for change by a policy of assimilation, an attempt to absorb the colonies and their inhabitants into the French Union. The effort has not been conspicuously successful in North Africa, and has now been altered in Morocco and Tunisia so that it conforms more closely to the British example. Elsewhere in the French possessions, however, the policy of assimilation remains. Belgium has reacted by what might be termed a policy of reverse equality; it has denied to Belgian nationals in the Congo all political participation just as it denies such participation to the indigenous inhabitants. The Portuguese dispute the reality of the pressure for change, and their colonial policies are little different now than they were centuries ago.

Regardless of these differences in approach, I believe it is correct to state that all the European nations have, at one time or another, recognized one or more of the principal factors which are involved in the present transition in Africa. There is no question, for example, that the process of political adjustment is well advanced in many British possessions. On the other hand, in the Belgian Congo, where no political expression is permitted and the young are not encouraged to expose themselves to the political beliefs of the West, there has nevertheless been a great advance in indigenous education, in health, and other social services. And in the French, Spanish, and Portuguese colonies, racial bars to human equality have been largely eliminated.

I do not know how effective these adjustments are likely to be in the face of mounting pressure for change, whether they will suffice or not. I do know, however, that we ought to avoid superficial judgments of them. It is easy enough, from the vantage point of distance and noninvolvement, to be critical of the European colonial nations. Their past record in dealing with the primitive peoples of Africa is not, in many respects, an admirable one. But then neither is ours in North America, nor the British in Australia, nor the Spaniards in Latin America, nor the Chinese in southeast Asia, nor the Russians in Central Asia, nor the Mongols in Europe, and so on into history.

The point I am trying to make is that past injustices cannot be undone. The most we can hope to do is to put them in reasonable perspective and go on from there. It seems to me fruitless to engage in debate over whether the balance of African colonialism lies on the side of benefit or harm to the indigenous peoples. Certainly, the Europeans have made contributions to Africa and certainly they have exacted in return contributions from that continent. Or perhaps it is more correct to put it the other way around.

What matters most, however, is not the past. What matters most is whether the policies of the colonial powers, and the policies of other free nations, including our own, are effectively adjusted now and in the future to the transition which has been set in motion by the awakening of the inhabitants of Africa to the modern world.

We ought not to underestimate the complexity and the magnitude of this task of adjustment, particularly for the European colonial powers. I mentioned earlier that the situation in Africa was somewhat analagous to that in Asia a decade ago. It is, in the sense that nationalism versus colonialism was the decisive issue in many Asian countries at the end of World War II. In a similar fashion, it is or is becoming the decisive issue in many parts of Africa.

In drawing the comparison between Asia and Africa, however, we ought not to overlook the differences in the two situations. European colonialism in Asia was superimposed for the most part on sophisticated civilizations with long histories of cultural development. The ideas and the techniques of the West influenced the existing way of Asian life, but they did not obliterate or suffocate it. In Africa, however, the Europeans opened a continent inhabited largely by peoples, who, like the North American Indians, existed apart from the mainstreams of history.

To cite another significant difference: In Asia, colonialism was not accompanied by massive European settlement. There was never—as there are in South Africa, in Kenya, or in Algeria—anywhere near the same large bodies of settled Europeans. These settlers see their future and their children's future in Africa, not in Europe. Many are uncertain of that future. Their fears not infrequently lead them to resist being cut away from sources of military and political power which lie largely in Europe, or the sharing of any significant political power with the indigenous peoples of the continent.

I am not condoning this fear; I am merely recognizing its existence, for it poses a major problem for the European colonial nations. In a previous statement I dealt at some length with this problem as it confronts France in north Africa. But any responsible European government which attempts to adjust its policies to meet the demands of the African transition, faces tremendous internal political pressures over the same question.

If we contrast the peaceful political progress in the Gold Coast and Nigeria on the one hand with the strife in Kenya and the regression in South Africa, the point should be clear. The contrast, I believe, is due in large measure to the fact that in the Gold Coast and Nigeria,

there are few permanent European settlers. In Kenya and in South Africa, however, Europeans and descendants of Europeans are settled in great numbers.

If the European nations face a formidable task in adjusting to the transition, so, too, do the leaders of African nationalism. To them falls much of the responsibility for shaping the changes which are bound to occur in Africa. They, too, face tremendous pressures. In some cases, their responsibility involves literally moving whole populations from the Stone Age into the 20th century with great rapidity.

Modern African leaders are themselves awake to the meaning of national and human equality and modern progress. Their own enlightenment, however, can have lasting significance only if it is shared with their own peoples. They will need great compassion and patience for that. They will also need wisdom if they are to choose with discrimination from among the welter of ideas and ideologies which bear down on Africa from all sides, those which will benefit their peoples. As the Soviet drive into the continent gains momentum, the pressures on these leaders will increase and the confusion of alternatives will be further compounded.

I believe it will be well to recognize that while the ideological choices which are made will be those of the African leaders and their peoples, the policies of the free nations will profoundly influence them. To the extent that these policies reflect a firm devotion to the concepts of freemen—to the concepts of national and human equality, to the extent that they reflect a willingness to assist in the progress of the African people—they can make a great contribution to the growth of human freedom. By the same token, irreparable harm can be done if these policies are short-sighted, fearful, and repressive.

It seems to me that a foreign policy which serves the total interests of this country, must welcome the present transition in Africa and the inevitability of change which it brings. We have already had an expression of congressional sentiment to that effect with regard to all dependent people throughout the world. In the 84th Congress, a resolution was adopted unanimously by both Houses calling for the administering of foreign policies and the exercising of our influence in support of other peoples "in their efforts to achieve self-government or independence," House Concurrent Resolution 149, 84th Congress, 1st session.

I can conceive of no long-range interest worthy of this country which would be at variance with this fundamental expression. How could it be otherwise? Can we reject the desire for national equality on the part of any people? Similarly, can we frown upon their desire for human equality? Or can we deprecate their efforts to improve their social and economic existence? To those who can answer these questions in the affirmative, I respectfully suggest a rereading of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

National and human equality, and progress—these are the basic concepts of this Nation. In signing the Charter of the United Nations we gave endorsement to these same goals as legitimate for all people. That endorsement must remain the guiding principle, the anchor of our policies with respect to Africa. It imposes on us—indeed it imposes on all nations which have signed the charter—an obligation with respect to Africa which, in the light of our own history, if for no other reason, we ought willingly to sustain. It is an obligation to strive in our policies with respect to that continent to contribute to, rather than detract from, the achievement of these goals by the African peoples themselves.

At the same time, we ought to have clearly in mind our limitations in this connection. The achievement of rights is primarily the responsibility of peoples directly involved, both African and European. We can assist but we cannot impose.

I fully realize the difficulties of interpreting the principles of the charter, as they apply to Africa, in the countless decisions which must be made by the executive branch of the Government. It seems to me, however, that we have compounded these difficulties by our own neglect, by clinging to what seems to me to be an outmoded approach to that continent.

I would suggest, therefore, that the first step toward a more effective policy on Africa involves an increase in the flow of direct information on that continent into the formulation of policy. Would such a flow not be facilitated if the African Branch of the Department of State were separated from Near Eastern and south Asian affairs and constituted as a bureau under an Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs? And would the Senate not be better equipped to advise with the President on African matters if more Members found occasion to include Africa in their travels abroad?

Even with the limited and inadequate knowledge we now possess, it is possible to see the beginnings of a sound policy for Africa.

As I have already noted, the growing aspirations of the African people for national and human equality must have the consistent sympathy of this country. This sympathy must be reflected more clearly than is presently the case in the general course which we pursue in the United Nations and elsewhere. I hope that few occasions will arise in which we will be at variance with the western Europeans on this matter. When they do, however, our position ought to be forthright. If we disagree with them, let us disagree honestly. And if overriding circumstances compel us to accept temporary compromises, let us be equally prepared to acknowledge them frankly. Accommodation has a place in the foreign policy of this Nation, no less than in that of others, but hyprocrisy does not.

I believe this country should also be prepared to enlarge the technical assistance program in Africa if it is clear that such assistance can be effective and that it is sought by the indigenous peoples. If other practicable ways can be developed which will hasten the economic and social progress of the African peoples, we should be prepared to give them sympathetic consideration. Again, the test of any such measures must be their contribution to the development of national and human equality in Africa and to the well-being of the African people.

I noted earlier in these remarks that we were at the beginnings of policy on Africa. Because we are, we have an unusual opportunity to set a firm foundation for our future relations with that continent. If we do so, we shall serve the interests of this country far beyond the present generation.

The key to an effective policy on Africa, I believe, will be found in the perception with which we treat the developing transition on that continent. If we understand and appreciate its vast implications and assist in the adjustments it requires, we will facilitate the emergence of a new Africa. It will be an Africa which will do willingly what it cannot be coerced into doing. It will be an Africa which will pour its original and as yet incalculable contributions into the general progress of freemen and into the maintenance of world peace.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Montana for his extremely intelligent and interesting remarks concerning the continent of Africa. During the war it was my duty to serve in various parts of Africa. Although I did not see all of Africa, I did have occasion to see a good portion of it, and I saw the things of which the Senator from Montana speaks today. I therefore wish to compliment him on his foresight in calling these problems to the attention of the American people.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I express my thanks to the acting majority leader, the Senator from Arizona, for his comments. I also express the hope that in his capacity as a member of the Subcommittee on Technical Assistance Programs, he may bring his great knowledge and interest and sympathy to bear on the problems, so that we in this country may develop a better understanding of the great continent of Africa, which is becoming more important as time goes on.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Montana that it was my pleasure to visit Egypt last fall. While I recognize the fact that Egypt is only a small part of the continent of Africa, nevertheless, my visit to Egypt is some indication of the interest in which I hold that country, which has some similarity to my own State of Arizona.

Mr. MANSFIELD. One of the reasons why I raised the point I have stressed was that I knew the Senator had done such a fine job when he visited north Africa. Therefore I should like to see him develop an interest, if he could find the time to do so—and I know he is a very busy man—and undertake a study of the situation in other parts of the African Continent.

Again I wish to express my deep thanks to the acting majority leader, the Senator from Arizona, for his kind remarks.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum and yield briefly to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PAYNE. I wish to join my colleague, the Senator from Arizona, in commending the Senator from Montana for another one of his excellent speeches on foreign policy. I have had the pleasure on many occasions to listen to his remarks on the subject. Although I was not present during the earlier part of his address today, I did have the pleasure of looking over an advance copy of it, and I wish to say that the Senator's utterances today have been most constructive, and deserving of the attention of the entire membership of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I express my thanks to the distinguished Senator from Maine for his comments, and my appreciation for the interest he has shown in the field of foreign policy over the past several years.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be delighted to yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. During the course of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Montana he inadvertently referred to me as the acting majority leader. He was a little premature in that reference, but come next November we shall do all we can to bring that situation into being.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall see that the RECORD is corrected on that point, but may I say to the Senator that we expect to increase our majorities in both the House and the Senate. I am glad to pass that information on to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEFINITION OF NONFAT DRY MILK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2086, Senate bill 1614.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1614) to amend the act entitled "An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids," title 21, United States Code, section 321c.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there is no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law No. 244, 78th Congress, 2d session, approved March 2, 1944, title 21, United States Code, section 321c, entitled "An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids" is amended to read as follows: "For the purposes of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 26, 1938 (ch. 675, sec. 1, 52 Stat. 1040), nonfat dry milk is the product resulting from the removal of fat and water from milk, and contains the lactose, milk proteins, and milk minerals in the same relative proportions as in the fresh milk from which made. It contains not over 5 percent by weight of moisture. The fat content is not over 1½ percent by weight unless otherwise indicated. The term "milk," when used herein, means "sweet milk of cows."

JURISDICTION OF FEDERAL COURTS IN CERTAIN REEMPLOYMENT CASES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2110, Senate bill 3307.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3307) to amend section 9 (d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to authorize jurisdiction in Federal courts in certain reemployment cases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment.

AMERICA'S LATIN AMERICAN NEIGHBORS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on repeated occasions I have stressed the importance of further strengthening friendly ties with our Latin American neighbors if we are to continue to enjoy their good will, which is so vitally essentional to our own economic welfare and security.

Today Latin American progress is seriously endangered by such chronic weaknesses as lack of a diversified economy, low per capita incomes, low literacy rates, poor health and sanitation conditions, lack of elementary educational facilities, low rates of savings, and lack of capital. All of these factors create the condition of economic instability in which this area finds itself today.

This situation should be a salutary reminder that our eyes must now be turned south on more frequent occasions than they have been in the past.

It has always been a puzzle to me that this region, which is of supreme importance to the United States from the standpoint of trade, raw materials, and cultural relationships, attracts so much less interest than do other parts of the world. This factor alone has particular significance when we know that we are in fact equally important to each other's survival.

Let us briefly examine the treatment accorded our Latin American neighbors in our foreign-aid program—neighbors, mind you, Mr. President, who seek no handouts, but only financial assistance which they can and will repay.

The total United States nonmilitary grants and credits in the postwar decade amounted to around $37.4 billion. Of that sum, the American Republics received about $1 billion, or only 2.8 percent. When grant aid alone is considered, the American Republics fared even worse, receiving $317 million of a total of about $26.5 billion, or only 1.2 percent. This year, as in the past, the administration request for Latin America amounts to an infinitesimal portion of the total economic aid program. In this year's $4.9 billion mutual security authorization program, Latin America's share is $96.4 million, of which $35½ million is for military assistance, $33.9 million for technical assistance, and $27 million for emergency development assistance. These figures represent 1.1 percent of the total foreign aid authorization for the fiscal year 1957.

This small percentage of the total can hardly be said to be a realistic program for further improving and strengthening Latin American ties, when we think of $851 million recommended for Europe, $884 million for the Near East and Africa, $2.3 billion for Asia, and $781 million for nonregional programs. If nothing is done to correct this situation, I am sure our Latin American friends will be justified in concluding that once again they are relegated to the position of last in line at the teller's window. We cannot continue this policy of neglect toward our friends to the south without disastrous consequences.

I have been following with growing concern the trend of events in Latin America. The report to the President by Dr. Milton Eisenhower in 1953, and the report of the International Development Advisory Board under Eric Johnston the following year both emphasized the importance to the United States of a stable, productive, friendly Latin America. According to the Johnston report, Latin America "is our indispensable and irreplaceable ally. It could be lost to communism. It needs our help now to build the higher standards of living which are the surest safeguards against Communist penetration and subversion."

Yet, in spite of the Johnston and Eisenhower reports, and in spite of the very real Communist dangers in Guatemala and certain other Latin American countries, Secretary Dulles as late as February 24 of this year, said, with regard to the new Soviet nonviolence policy, "Even Africa and South American countries are receiving Soviet economic propositions." In the light of the many official reports of Soviet machinations below the Rio Grande, it is certainly remarkable that the Secretary of State should show surprise that the Soviet

Union is turning its new weapon of economic penetration upon the 20 Latin American Republics. Latin America most certainly figures in the worldwide Communist conspiracy. We cannot afford to take for granted the friendship and cooperation of the other Americas.

This great region is almost three times the size of the United States, and has surpassed us in population. Moreover, the population has been increasing at an annual rate of 2.5 percent a year, faster than any other major area of the world. By the end of the century, just 44 years away, it is expected to climb to 500 million, or twice that of the United States and Canada combined.

In the meantime, the whole area is undergoing a far-reaching social and economic revolution. The people are determined to free their antiquated economies and secure decent living conditions for themselves and their children. They have already made a spectacular start. From 1945 to 1953, the average per capita income rose at the rate of 3.3 percent a year. Output per person is now 54 percent higher than 20 years ago. Probably as much of 90 percent of the invested capital that made the postwar growth possible was Latin America's own savings.

By 1951, however, progress began to slow down. Savings accumulated during the war were used up, throwing the countries back to depending on their exports for the foreign exchange to plow into development. In 1951, prices and demand for many of Latin America's chief exports declined, and Latin American leaders once again became aware of their critical reliance on too few export items. Venezuela, for instance, counts on the exports of petroleum for 95 percent of its foreign exchange. Cuba depends on sugar for 86 percent. El Salvador and Colombia earn more than 80 percent of their cash from coffee, while Haiti, Guatemala, and Brazil all count on the same commodity for more than 50 percent of their foreign exchange. Copper accounts for about 60 percent of Chile's exports. Any fluctuation in the world price or demand for any of the principal commodities mentioned can have disastous effects on the economies of the countries which depend upon their sale for the purchase of vital necessities and capital equipment for developmental purposes.

The Latin American people have been trying to broaden the base of their economies. They have been trying to undertake the necessary expansion by hydroelectric power and the building of roads, dams, ports, and industries. With or without Communist encouragement, the Latin Americans are determined to overthrow the traditional pattern of their lives. They will no longer acquiesce to having annual per capita incomes of less than $200 a year, with the accompanying evils that go with poverty—illiteracy, low productivity, hunger, and disease.

We have sympathized with them in their attempts to diversify production, and in the past we have helped through technical assistance and loans for worthwhile projects. I believe it is in our own self-interest to give Latin America all the cooperation, technical and otherwise, that is really needed and can be used to improve the productivity and living conditions of its own people. Moreover, how can we abandon our traditional friends while at the same time professing interest in the well-being of peoples in distant regions? In the last analysis the fate of democratic institutions south of the Rio Grande rests on whether decent standards of living can or cannot be provided under democratic procedures.

The low priority assigned to Latin America in the distribution of economic aid funds is generally excused on the ground that the need there is presently less urgent. This may have been true at the time when we undertook to rebuild the shattered economy of war-devastated Europe, but it no longer is a valid argument for the immense imbalance between assistance programs for Latin America and other regional assistance programs. By allowing conditions in Latin America to worsen through neglect, one day we may find ourselves running southward to patch up the ruins of an explosion. A little more judicious assistance while there yet is time could perhaps save us billions of dollars at a later date; or, as the Johnston report put it, "Clearly we cannot afford to sit and wait."

Mr. President, as evidence of what is happening in Latin America, I point out that this morning there appeared in the Washington Post—and it also appeared at the same time in other newspapers—an article pointing out that Mr. Bulganin, in correspondence with the Mexican Government, stated that the Soviet Union is undertaking a program of long-range economic assistance to the countries of Latin America with no strings attached. The dispatch is by the Associated Press. I should like to read it, and make it a part of my remarks at this point. The article reads as follows:

RUSSIA SAID OFFERING LATINS AID

MEXICO CITY, June 3.—A correspondent for the newspaper Excelsior quotes Premier Bulganin as saying Russia offers "economic collaboration" to Latin America. Bulganin contrasts this with United States aid he says is subject to "conditions of an economic or military character."

Excelsior printed a dispatch yesterday from Moscow by Hugo Latorre Cabal, a writer who is winding up a tour of Iron Curtain countries, including Red China. Bulganin granted him an interview.

The correspondent quoted Bulganin as saying "what the United States offers is aid, ours is collaboration based on mutually beneficial conditions, free of political intent and much more, from any military involvement."

INDUSTRIAL AID

On such collaboration with Latin America, Bulganin added:

"We can lend technical collaboration, sending experts and exchanging our industrial experience in transport, agriculture and science.

"Also we can collaborate in industrial projects, in their creation and development, in their initial technical supervision and in the training of local personnel to operate them. This collaboration is based on the idea of finding the best way to observe equality of rights, without damaging the sovereignty of either one of the parties. As to Latin American countries, we should have the widest relations in the field of petroleum, mines, and electric power."

Latorre quoted Bulganin as saying Russia could enter into barter agreements, exchanging industrial products for coffee, cocoa, fruit, wool, hides, and meat.

So we see that today the Soviet Union is moving into that field in Latin America, in an attempt to fill the vacuum we have left there.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I was interested in the Senator's figures regarding the total amount of assistance granted to Latin America since the end of World War II.

Time magazine this week gives the amount of military assistance and economic grants which have gone from the United States to Yugoslavia. I have no objection to aid to Yugoslavia. In the last few years, excluding UNRRA aid following World War II, which amounted to half a billion dollars, United States military aid to Yugoslavia since its break with Stalin is estimated by Time magazine—and these figures are somewhat classified—to be $1 billion. The amount of United States economic aid to Yugoslavia since 1951 has been $590 million, or approximately $600 million—making a total, in those two categories, of approximately $1,600,000,000 which has gone from the United States to Yugoslavia, since the break with Stalin.

The figures the Senator from Florida has given—and I wish to say that I realize he has been interested for many years in this question—indicate that since 1945, all the countries of South America, which traditionally have been friends of ours, and still are, have received from the United States less aid than Yugoslavia has received from us in the past 4 years. Is that correct?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator from Massachusetts is absolutely correct, and I very much appreciate his pointing out that fact. We have given Yugoslavia an enormous sum of money, but at the same time we have turned our backs on the people of Latin America, who are our traditional friends. Furthermore, in the future we shall need their friendship very greatly, because they constitute the markets of the future for us.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is it not a fact that if the South American countries were now to go under Communist control or if they were now Communist and might be considered as being under the direct control of the Soviet Union, the amount of assistance granted to them by us would be increased many times? Merely because certain countries have been intimately associated with us, I think it is a mistake for us to give aid to them a priority which is so low, in comparison with that given by us to aid a country which today has intimate ties with the Communist bloc.

I think these figures are illuminating, and I am glad the Senator from Florida has produced them today, as he has done in the past.

Let me say that I hope the amendment the Senator from Florida intends to propose will be agreed to.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts very much. He points out what I think has always been a basic weakness in our program. The minute a country begins to act as though it is about to do business with the Communists, or enter into some relationship with the Soviet Union, for the first time we begin to give that country a certain amount of assistance, whereas, when it really needs assistance, even though historically it has been our friend, for some reason we do not take that fact into account. We always allow an emergent situation to arise before we try to take care of it. What I am trying to do by the amendment I intend to offer to the mutual security bill for this year is to take care of conditions which now exist in Latin America, before another crisis develops in that area, and to do it in sufficient time.

I do not know why it is that we always seem to turn our backs on our Latin American friends. As I pointed out, we give them less than 1.1 percent of the total economic aid authorized in the present bill, which is the same small percentage they have been receiving since 1945.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First of all I wish to commend the Senator from Florida for again emphasizing the importance of our relationships with our Latin American neighbors and friends.

The Senator may recall—and I am sure he does—his remarks of last year, which resulted in some inquiry in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. When we looked into our aid program with respect to Latin America, we found that it was pretty much restricted to Bolivia and Guatemala, with some emergency aid to Haiti. The aid to Bolivia was directed toward State-owned tin mines, and the aid to Guatemala came after that country had ousted the Communists. There was very little aid to Guatemala before the Communists took over. Once the Communists got in, and once a successful revolution took place, we took an interest.

I assure the Senator, as one member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, that his remarks will be brought to the attention of the committee in executive session. We shall go over the bill as it relates to foreign aid with respect to Latin America, point by point, on the basis of the very well sustained position of the Senator from Florida. I think he is rendering a valuable service to the Congress and to the country. Our relationships with the Latin American countries are second in importance only to the relationships among the 48 States, and our relationship with our neighbor to the north, Canada. Hemispheric solidarity must be more than a treaty or a pact. It must have the substance of economic aid, technical assistance, and closer political understanding between the United States and her friends to the south.

I assure the Senator that I wholeheartedly support his efforts and his proposal.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota very much. I am certain that all our Latin American friends will take heart from the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota, because we all realize and recognize, and are very happy over the fact that he is a very influential member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. After having made this assertion, I know that he will do all in his power to see that our Latin American friends receive the fair treatment which they so well deserve.

In that connection, I am sure the Senator realizes that there are some countries in Central and South America, including some at the far end of South America, which have not been quite so friendly toward us as we would like. However, I am sure the Senator will agree that a certain kind of neutrality is desirable. It does not follow that, merely because a country says it is going to be a neutral, we should not help that country. If a country is genuinely neutral, in many respects that is a thing we should hope for. If a country is completely neutral it means that its people have the type of government which they desire, and are doing the things they wish to do. They do not wish to become involved on either side of any dispute. We must recognize and respect the natural aspiration of the people of such countries. If they do not wish to make themselves over in our image and likeness, that is all right with us, so long as they do not desire to make themselves over into the image and likeness of the Soviet Union and have a Communist government. If they wish to be genuinely neutral and develop their own national aspirations, we should not cut them off from consideration at our hands.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I respect that point of view. The Senator from Florida has done an admirable piece of work in explaining what sometimes happens in a position of neutrality, in which the will of the people is being manifested through their elected government.

Some of the neutrals in the world are our closest friends. I refer to such neutrals as Sweden, Ireland, Switzerland, and Finland, to mention four. They are wonderful friends of the United States. Without any writings, without any treaties, we can always depend upon them for the closest type of cooperation. The fact that they have free institutions of government stands as a powerful political force in our struggle against communism. The examples of Sweden, Ireland, Switzerland, and Finland, and of many of our Latin American neighbors contribute greatly to the strengthening of our foreign policy.

Mr. SMATHERS. Again I express my gratitude to the Senator from Minnesota for his remarks, and particularly his last remarks. After all, some of the best friends we have in the world, economically and politically, still insist upon their neutrality. The fact that they do so is no reason why we should in any way take a dim view of their very plausible request to us for economic and technical assistance.

It is abundantly clear that we must effectively assist our neighbors to the south in the solution of their difficulties or be prepared to suffer from the consequences of our neglect. It is for this reason that I introduce at this time a proposed amendment to the mutual security authorization bill, which would create an economic development fund for Latin American countries with an authorized appropriation of $100 million to be utilized by the President over a period of 5 years to promote the economic development and stability of this area. This fund, which emphasizes loans rather than grants wherever possible, would be in addition to the recommended authorizations for Latin America under the bill and would be available to help solve such problems as shortages of power and transportation facilities, the need for public health and sanitation facilities, and to assist in creating a healthy economic atmosphere which will encourage the flow of private investment capital.

There is nothing novel about the creation of this fund. We have in the past set up a similar fund for Asia and this year the administration recommends the continuance of this fund, and in addition recommends the creation of another such fund for the Middle East. It is high time that we arouse ourselves from the slumber of the past and give to Latin America the treatment which it so justly merits. The setting up of a regional economic development fund for Latin America will give to this area the special treatment which it has so long deserved in our foreign-aid program, and at the same time will demonstrate by deed that our good-neighbor policy is more than just a play on words.

I sincerely trust that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Congress will act promptly and favorably on the proposed amendment and thereby contribute immeasurably toward the economic welfare and security of not only Latin America but the United States as well.

I send my amendment to the desk and ask that it be printed and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Florida to the so-called mutual security bill will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of David A. Hamil, of Colorado, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

WILDERNESS PRESERVATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish on public lands of the United States a National Wilderness Preservation System.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4013) to establish on public lands of the United States a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, to provide for the protection and administration of the areas within this System by existing Federal agencies and for the gathering and dissemination of information to increase the knowledge and appreciation of wilderness for its appropriate use and enjoyment by the people, to establish a National Wilderness Preservation Council, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do this in accordance with the remarks I made to the Senate on February 29, 1956. At that time I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a selection of comments that had been received regarding such a proposed wilderness preservation system from people in many walks of life—lay people and professional people, educators, physicians, scientists, conservationists—people with a deep concern to preserve their heritage of the magnificent, almost untouched, natural areas in our national parks and monuments, our national forests and wildlife refuges. Since then, additional comments urging the need to preserve wilderness have been received. The proposal of which I then spoke has now been given bill form, preliminary drafts have been referred to interested and competent persons, and I am now happy to be able to join with a number of my colleagues in introducing in the Senate this measure that gives expression to a policy which has long been a reality in the minds and hearts of the American people but has never yet been embodied in legislation.

It is indeed fortunate that after the centuries we have spent in developing this continent we do still have some large areas of wilderness. It is doubly fortunate that many of these areas are federally owned and are also included in parks, forests, or refuges, or other kinds of reservations within which the wilderness has so far been preserved in keeping with the purposes of the reservations.

Some 50 or so national parks and monuments have within them unspoiled areas large enough to be called wilderness. Some 20 or so of the national wildlife refuges and ranges do too. Within the national forests there are some 80 areas that have been designated by the Forest Service for protection as wilderness. Indian reservations contain 15 areas that have been classified as roadless or wild areas.

Putting all these together, we have 165 or so areas of wilderness that are in Federal ownership or control and that also, I wish to emphasize, are inside areas within which wilderness can be preserved consistently with other purposes, as part of what might be called a multipurpose wilderness preservation program.

At present, however, there are no laws of Congress which protect these areas of wilderness as wilderness. Even in the national parks and monuments the pressures for roads and nonwilderness recreational and tourist developments threaten in many places to destroy the primeval back-country wilderness. In the national forests the wilderness, wild, primitive, and roadless areas have been set up administratively and could be abolished or greatly reduced by a future Secretary of Agriculture. Wilderness within the national wildlife refuges is in a precarious position because the refuges themselves lack adequate legal protection against pressures for commercial or exploitative encroachments. In fact, none of our Federal wilderness has the protection which Congress could give by providing for wilderness preservation as a national policy applied to a definite system of areas.

I note at this point that one of my reasons for introducing this bill on behalf of myself and the cosponsors—and one of the cosponsors is the Presiding Officer, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD]—is the rapid growth of our population, and the resulting tremendous pressures for opening up these wilderness areas for commercial and economic purposes. If that trend continues, it will mean that our Nation, in the years to come, will be without our great system of national parks, recreational areas, wilderness areas, and forest preserves, which mean so much to the mental health, as well as to the physical health of our people.

ESTABLISHING A POLICY

It is accordingly the first purpose of this bill to establish firmly a clear-cut national policy for preserving, for both the present and the future, some of what remains of our resource of wilderness. In line with such a policy the Congress in this proposed measure will give its sanction to the policies and programs of the Forest Service, the National Park Service, and our other Federal conservation agencies under whose wise administration a great resource of wilderness has so far been preserved. Finally, this measure proposes a way whereby this policy and this sanction can take effect in a practical program.

Of central importance in this program is the establishment of what is to be called our National Wilderness Preservation System, to be made up of areas of primeval America that are still wilderness and in Federal ownership or control and capable of being kept that way without interfering with other present purposes now being served by these lands. I hasten to emphasize that this will not involve any further acquisition of wilderness areas by the Federal Government. Nor will it mean any transfer of areas from one agency of Government to another, nor any change of jurisdiction. No new land-administering agency will be created. The fact should be emphasized that this National Wilderness Preservation System will be made up of areas that are already in Federal ownership or control and are already within parks, forests, refuges, or reservations.

Furthermore, it must also be stressed, for clear understanding, that the areas within this proposed System are areas where wilderness conditions have so far been preserved while, at the same time, the various purposes have been realized for which these parks, forests, refuges, and reservations were established. It is our purpose, therefore, that this preservation continue and be made secure for the future. The establishment of the National Wilderness Preservation System will be a recognition of this purpose, a recognition of the importance of continuing to preserve the wilderness character of these selected areas.

This selection, this recognition, will give each of these areas its place in the System. Each such area will remain, as at present, park, forest, or refuge, as it is now administered. It will continue to serve the multiple purposes it now serves and under the jurisdiction of the same agency that now protects it. The difference will lie in the fact that from now on the agency having jurisdiction over any area within this System will have the sanction and encouragement of Congress and the legal responsibility for preserving the area's wilderness character. It will have the responsibility for seeing that other purposes continue to be served in such a way as to prevent damage to the wilderness.

Each such area will thus come under special protection as part of the Nation's still unspoiled heritage of the primeval.

A WILDERNESS COUNCIL

In order to provide a focus for the interest in the wilderness character of these diverse areas that will be serving multiple purposes there will be established by this measure a National Wilderness Preservation Council. The agencies that administer the areas in our wilderness system have various purposes and many interests. Their concerns with wilderness may represent only one phase of multiple purposes. Our proposed wilderness council, therefore, will provide a center for all these various interests, interests in the many wilderness values of different kinds of areas.

The Council will not have any administrative jurisdiction whatever over any of these areas, nor over any of the agencies that do have such jurisdiction. It will provide a repository for the files that pertain to the National Wilderness Preservation System and will serve as a gatherer and disseminator of information regarding wilderness preservation and use. It will make an annual report to Congress. The Council will be made up of representative legislators, administrators, and citizens all concerned with wilderness preservation, and will thus

represent our special and distinctive national interest in our wilderness resource.

In administering national park areas of wilderness, the National Park Service will continue to think of their administration for the recreational use and enjoyment of the people. In administering national forest areas, the Forest Service will continue to be concerned with the multiple-purpose program it now operates with prime concern for the protection of watersheds and preservation of forests. The Fish and Wildlife Service will continue to administer the areas of wilderness within its jurisdiction as areas for wildlife, areas that may have no legitimate use at all for the kind of recreation that is the principal activity in a national park, for example.

The various units of the National Wilderness Preservation System, though protected as wilderness, will thus be managed for various purposes. Within the National Wilderness Preservation Council, the heads of the various administering agencies, the ranking members of the Senate and House committees concerned, and representative citizens, will bring to a wilderness-preservation focus all the various and appropriate interests.

A MULTIPLE-PURPOSE PROGRAM

Besides giving expression to a national policy, providing for the establishment of a wilderness preservation system, and creating a National Wilderness Preservation Council, this bill also, Mr. President, describes and provides for the proper use of the areas of wilderness it is designed to preserve.

In this connection, I should like to emphasize at once that this proposal is not one for any "special-use," or "special-privilege" legislation.

The first and topic sentence of the section of this bill that relates to uses of the areas within this System expresses a key concept in this proposal. It states firmly that "nothing in this Act shall be interpreted as interfering with the purpose stated in the establishment of any national park or monument, national wildlife refuge, Indian reservation, or other Federal land area involved, except that any agency administering any area within the National Wilderness Preservation System shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area."

Under this proposal, for example, the parts of the national forests involved would continue under the same kind of administration they now have. Grazing permits, for instance, could be continued as at present. The basic multiple purposes of the national forests would be maintained. These purposes are defined as watershed protection and forest preservation. Giving these areas a permanence as wilderness will thus not interfere with the multiple purposes they now serve but will actually help to realize the dominant use of the national forests for water conservation.

National parks, national wildlife refuges, and any other areas would also, as already pointed out, continue to serve their own distinctive purposes.

No use privileges of any kind will be created by this proposed law. The only added responsibility of each administering agency will be to see that the areas in the System under its jurisdiction remain wilderness—as they now are. I reiterate, this bill deals only with preserving wilderness as such in connection with various other land uses and does not create any "special privilege," nor provide for any special users.

Existing uses and privileges are respected in this bill, and private rights are protected. It is true that no mining or prospecting will be permitted except where it is already in existence and represents a private right. Otherwise, or perhaps I should say, even so, this is not essentially a reform measure but rather a measure to insure the preservation of a status quo which fortunately includes a great resource of wilderness.

THE BILL DESCRIBED SECTION BY SECTION

This bill comprises five sections which may be described as follows:

The opening section defines the term "wilderness" both in the abstract and as used specifically in this bill and, recognizing the hazards to wilderness in the midst of our civilization, declares it to be a desirable policy for our health, welfare, and happiness to preserve wilderness as an enduring resource for the benefit of present and future generations. Accordingly, the continued preservation of federally owned areas of wilderness is given congressional sanction and a National Wilderness Preservation System is established to "serve the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservational, and historical use and enjoyment by the people."

Section 2 names the areas that will constitute this System, and makes provisions regarding additions, modifications, or eliminations. It takes cognizance also of the fact that within certain of the units of this System there are needs for designating portions of the areas to be used for roads and certain other installations that are exceptions within wilderness. Section 2 comprises 6 subsections.

NATIONAL FOREST WILDERNESS

Subsection (a) designates 27 areas within the national forests to become units of the National Wilderness Preservation System. These are not entire national forests; they are special areas inside the forests. The Forest Service has found them to have highest value as wilderness. Three of these areas are named roadless, 14 are wild areas, and 10 are called wilderness. In addition, there are 52 areas now classified as "primitive" that are earmarked to be included in this System when the Forest Service has carried out its plans to reclassify them as either "wilderness" or "wild" areas. A 10-year period is provided for this reclassification program. Including all these primitive areas which are to be added eventually, this System will have within it special areas within some 80 of the 149 natural forests. Out of the 181 million acres in our national forests some 14 million acres will be in this System. Practically as at present, the administration of the national forest areas will be in accordance with regulations by the Secretary of Agriculture. This bill, either in section 2 or in section 3, makes provisions that in effect give sanction to and continue the present regulations that have been so ably developed by the Forest Service for the sound administration and protection of wilderness. An additional safeguard against an undesirable elimination of any wilderness is provided in that, after completing the process for such action as now provided by Department regulations, such proposed action will have to be reported to Congress, where for 120 days it is subject to disapproval. Additional areas may be designated by the Secretary of Agriculture, and such additions must also be reported to Congress, and for 120 days be subject to disapproval by either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

WILDERNESS IN THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

Subsection (b) of section 2 designates 49 out of the 181 areas in the National Park System as units of the National Wilderness Preservation System, 26 of which are national parks, 21 are monuments, 1 is a recreational area, and 1 is a memorial park. Our national parks and many of our national monuments include within them our superbly beautiful pristine areas of wilderness. The chief threats to their preservation as such, under our present legislation, come from prospects for the extension of roads and the intrusion of recreation developments, perfectly good in themselves, that nevertheless are out of place in wilderness. Unless provision is made to protect the primeval within the parks, eventually the developments may take over. This process may be gradual, but, nevertheless, it is a prospect against which we can now set guards with no sacrifice. There are other places for the development of our recreation facilities that require roads and other conveniences. Our parks are reservoirs of wilderness.

It is true, however, that certain portions of the parks must be used for the roads and accommodations that make them accessible and hospitable. Accordingly this bill provides for the designation of such portions for this purpose. A 10-year period is provided for the several designations, and the provisions of this law will not take effect for any park or monument until the designations have been made. The National Park Service, under its so-called Mission 66, is undertaking to provide systematically during the next 10 years for the proper and economical development of the roads and accommodations within the parks and monuments. The designations of the areas provided for in this bill can thus be made, park by park, as the plans for Mission 66 materialize, and provision will in this way be made for the proper handling of developed areas but also for the protection, without development, of our wilderness in the back country.

If ever additional areas are needed for developments, they can be designated, but only after a public notice that will give all concerned an opportunity to weigh the importance of diminishing the area of wilderness. In any case, wilderness preservation becomes a congressional policy in the specified national parks and monuments. The primeval

back country receives an added protection. At the same time, this bill takes care to point out that within the areas designated for developments the present protection afforded by the National Park Act of 1916 is not affected.

Additions of national parks and national monuments to the Wilderness System could be made by the Congress or the President. Only Congress could remove a park or monument from the System.

WILDLIFE REFUGES

Subsection (c) of section 2 designates 13 national wildlife refuges and 7 ranges as parts of this System. As with National Park System areas, provision is here made for designation by the Secretary of the Interior of areas that are required for roads and installations inconsistent with wilderness. In this instance these are required for administration of the refuge or range for wildlife. Refuges or ranges could be added to the System by the Secretary of the Interior, subject to congressional disapproval within 120 days. Only Congress could remove a refuge or range from the System.

THE INDIANS' WILDERNESS

Subsection (d) of section 2 designates 12 roadless areas and 3 wild areas within Indian reservations as possible units in the National Wilderness Preservation System, but no such area will actually become a part of the System unless its inclusion is approved by the Indians. The consent of the Indians is also required for the regulations by the Secretary of the Interior that are to govern the administration, addition, modification, or elimination of areas. This subsection is so drawn as to give the Indians the privilege of having included in this System their areas that have been classified as roadless or wild, but the principle of doing nothing with regard to Indian lands without Indian consent has been observed. Care is taken also to say that no Indian treaty is abrogated nor any hunting or fishing rights affected.

Subsection (e) of section 2 recognizes that Congress may designate additional areas within the wilderness System and also provides for the designation of such areas within any Federally owned or controlled areas by appropriate officials.

Subsection (f) of section 2 provides for reports to Congress of certain additions, modifications, or eliminations, and it also authorizes the acquisition of any privately owned lands within units of this System.

Throughout section 2 provisions are made for reports to be made to the National Wilderness Preservation Council that will be established by section 4 and will be the repository for files pertaining to this System.

USE OF THE WILDERNESS

Section 3 specifies the proper uses of areas within the System and the practices that are to be excluded. It includes special provisions with regard to existing "nonconforming" uses of areas of wilderness included in the System. At the outset this section says that nothing shall be interpreted as interfering with the purpose for which any of the lands involved were set aside, except that "the wilderness character of the area" is to be preserved. This concern, it may be noted, is not with any special use or user, but with the character of the area. Hunting, for example, will continue to be a major recreation within many national-forest units of the System and will be prohibited in national parks. Where there is hunting, it will be wilderness hunting. Uses will thus continue to vary in the various kinds of lands involved. The common concern is that wilderness conditions shall persist whatever the uses. The System will be devoted to public purposes that are summarized as recreational, educational, scenic, scientific, conservational, and historical. All use will be in harmony with the wilderness environment and its preservation.

Special provision is made for the protection of existing rights and privileges on any areas involved. Grazing within the national forest areas is provided for as at present, and existing uses authorized or provided for in refuges are also permitted. The termination of nonconforming uses is provided for whenever this is agreeable to those making the uses.

With one main exception, this bill thus proposes, not reform, but such security for what we have so far preserved as we can achieve without disrupting our present administrative and other practices.

The exception to which I refer has to do with mining. It relates primarily to the areas within the national forests. Spokesmen for the United States Forest Service, as well as other conservationists, have long and insistently warned that a prime threat to the preservation of wilderness within the national forests comes from the prospect of mining. After careful thought it seems unwise to propose wilderness legislation that does not deal with this threat in these national forest areas. Accordingly this bill provides that there shall be no mining—although, of course, existing private rights are protected in this case as in all others.

A WILDERNESS COUNCIL

Section 4 will create a National Wilderness Preservation Council to serve as a focus for the various interests in wilderness represented in the System, to provide an information clearing house and a headquarters for the records relating to the System as such, and to provide a medium through which information regarding wilderness and its use and preservation may be gathered and made available. The Council will have no administrative jurisdiction over the areas of wilderness within the System, nor over any of the agencies that will continue to have such jurisdiction. The Council will not even have any coordinating responsibilities with regard to the administration of these areas. It will comprise legislators, administrators, and citizens, and will represent our special and distinctive interest in our wilderness resource as wilderness and will make annual reports to Congress regarding the System.

The legislators on the Council, four in number, will be the chairman and ranking minority members of the respective Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives. The administrators will be the heads of bureaus that administer areas within the System—Forest Service, National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Indian Affairs Bureau—and also the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. Six citizen members will complete the 15-member Council.

The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution will be the secretary of the Council, and will maintain its files and provide its headquarters. This arrangement will help make clear that the Council is not responsible for any area or agency administration. Involved with no land areas within the System, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution will not be concerned with any interagency administrative problems regarding such areas. Selection of this official as secretary of the Council further emphasizes the function of the Council as an information focus and a repository of records. It likewise will serve to bring to attention the scientific interest in wilderness preservation and the values of wilderness areas as living museums.

Section 4 provides that the members of the Council shall serve in this capacity without compensation, but receive transportation expenses and a per diem for attendance at meetings of the Council. Provision is made for the expenses of the Council.

Section 5 specifies a name—"National Wilderness Preservation Act."

A CAREFULLY THOUGHT-OUT PROPOSAL

I know that this bill will be carefully studied by conservationists and other interested groups and by the agencies of government under whose jurisdiction the areas of the proposed National Wilderness Preservation System are administered. This is a far-reaching, carefully thought-out proposal. It deserves and requires the consideration of all who are concerned with the values that we place on our wilderness. Many of its details are concerned with the central effort to provide for wilderness preservation without disruption of our status quo. Particularly I invite the sympathetic consideration of this bill by administrators within our Federal conservation bureaus. I know that early tentative drafts of this legislation have not been thoroughly understood and have raised questions. I trust the bill, as it is now clarified and revised, will be more readily understood, and that its proposals will receive the concerted support of the administrators and other conservationists who are so deeply interested in wilderness.

Two years ago, at the 1954 annual meeting of the Society of American Foresters, Dr. James P. Gilligan, from the forestry department of the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, speaking on wilderness preservation, commented as follows:

> Wilderness supporters have been chiefly defense minded, rushing to prevent developments that may have been carefully drawn and justified. The majority of areas now called wilderness exist because recreational or industrial developments have not, as yet, been economically feasible. If there were well defined purposes and plans for a national wilderness system which could generate common support, the wilderness movement might well be irrepressible. As it is,

the disagreement among wilderness proponents is a highly important deterrent to wilderness preservation in this country.

Here is a bill which I trust can generate this support.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, and be followed by a statement both summarizing and quoting comments on this proposed wilderness preservation measure.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 4013) and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to secure for the American people of present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness, there is hereby established a National Wilderness Preservation System. As hereinafter provided, this System shall be composed of areas in the United States and its Territories and possessions retaining their natural primeval environment and influence, which areas shall serve the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservational, and historical use and enjoyment by the people in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness.

(b) The Congress recognizes that an increasing population, accompanied by expanding settlement and growing mechanization, is destined to occupy and modify all areas within the United States, its Territories, and possessions except those that are set apart for preservation and protection in their natural condition. Such preservation of areas of wilderness is recognized as a desirable policy of the Government of the United States of America for the health, welfare, and happiness of its citizens of present and future generations.

It is accordingly declared to be the policy of Congress (1) to secure the dedication of an adequate system of areas of wilderness to serve the recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, and conservation needs of the people, and (2) to provide for the protection of these areas in perpetuity and for the gathering and dissemination of information regarding their use and enjoyment as wilderness. Pursuant to this policy, the Congress gives sanction to the continued preservation as wilderness of those areas federally owned or controlled that are within national parks, national forests, national wildlife refuges, or other public lands, and that have so far retained under their Federal administration their primeval character. It is pursuant to this policy and sanction that the National Wilderness Preservation System is established. Within the units of this System designated for inclusion by this Act, and in those that may later be designated in accordance with its provisions, the preservation of wilderness shall be paramount.

(c) A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a member of the natural community who visits but does not remain and whose travels leave only trails.

For the purposes of this act the term "wilderness" shall include:

(1) The wilderness, wild, roadless, and primitive areas as presently designated by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Chief of the Forest Service within the national forests;

(2) Those units within the National Park System herein or hereafter designated as units of the National Wilderness Preservation System, except those portions set aside hereunder for roads and accommodations for visitors;

(3) The national wildlife refuges and ranges herein or hereafter designated as units of the National Wilderness Preservation System, except those portions set aside hereunder for roads and installations of buildings and other facilities;

(4) The areas within Indian reservations classified as roadless or wild and included in the National Wilderness Preservation System with the consent of the tribal council or other duly constituted authority; and

(5) Such other areas as shall be designated for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 2. The National Wilderness Preservation System (hereafter referred to in this section as the System) shall comprise (subject to preexisting private rights, if any) the Federally owned or controlled areas of land and water provided for in this section and the related airspace reservations.

(a) The System shall include the following roadless, wild, and wilderness areas within the national forests: Caribou, Little Indian Sioux, and Superior Roadless Areas, Superior National Forest, Minn.; Chiricahua Wild Area, Coronado National Forest, Ariz.; Galiuro Wild Area, Crook National Forest, Ariz.; Sierra Ancha Wild Area, Tonto National Forest, Ariz.; Mount Zirkle Dome Peak Wild Area, Routt National Forest, Colo.; Gates of the Mountains Wild Area, Helena National Forest, Mont.; San Pedro Parks Wild Area, Santa Fe National Forest, N. Mex.; Linville Gorge Wild Area, Pisgah National Forest, N. C.; Gearhart Mountain Wild Area, Fremont National Forest, Oreg.; Kalmiopsis Wild Area, Siskiyou National Forest, Oreg.; Mount Hood Wild Area, Mount Hood National Forest, Oreg.; Mountain Lakes Wild Area, Rogue River National Forest, Oreg.; Strawberry Mountan Wild Area, Malheur National Forest, Oreg.; Goat Rocks Wild Area, in portions of Gifford Pinchot and Snoqualmie National Forests, Wash.; Mount Adams Wild Area, Gifford Pinchot National Forest, Wash.; Mazatsal Wilderness Area, Tonto National Forest, Ariz.; Superstition Wilderness Area, in portions of the Crook and Tonto National Forests, Ariz.; Marble Mountain Wilderness Area, Klamath National Forest, Calif.; Bob Marshall Wilderness Area, in portions of the Flathead and Lewis and Clark National Forests, Mont.; Gila Wilderness Area, Gila National Forest, N. Mex.; Pecos Wilderness Area, in portions of the Santa Fe and Carson National Forests, N. Mex.; Eagle Cap Wilderness Area, in portions of Wallowa and Whitman National Forests, Oreg.; North Absaroka Wilderness Area and South Absaroka Wilderness Area, both in the Shoshone National Forest, Wyo.; Teton Wilderness Area, Teton National Forest, Wyo.

Additional wilderness and wild areas may be designated for inclusion in this System by the Secretary of Agriculture. Such designations shall be reported, with maps and descriptions, to the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council established hereunder. These designations by January 1, 1966, shall include, but shall not necessarily be limited to, the areas within the national forests classified as primitive by the Department of Agriculture on January 1, 1956, with such modifications in boundaries as may be made upon reclassification as wilderness or wild.

The administration and any proposed addition, modification, or elimination of wilderness, wild, or roadless areas shall be in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish in conformity with the purposes of this Act, and any such proposed addition, modification, or elimination shall be reported with map and description to the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council established hereunder. Any addition, modification, or elimination, except as provided in section 3, subsection (c), paragraph (1), shall take effect as provided in subsection (f) below.

(b) The System shall include the following units of the National Park System: Acadia National Park, Maine; Arches National Monument, Utah; Badlands National Monument, S. Dak.; Big Bend National Park, Tex.; Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument, Colo.; Bryce Canyon National Park, Utah; Capitol Reef National Monument, Utah; Carlsbad Caverns National Park, N. Mex.; Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, N. C.; Channel Islands National Monument, Calif.; Chiricahua National Monument, Ariz.; Colorado National Monument, Colo.; Crater Lake National Park, Oreg.; Craters of the Moon National Monument, Idaho; Death Valley National Monument, Calif. and Nev.; Devils Postpile National Monument, Calif.; Dinosaur National Monument, Colo. and Utah; Everglades National Park, Fla.; Glacier National Park, Mont.; Glacier Bay National Monument, Alaska; Grand Canyon National Park and Grand Canyon National Monument, Ariz.; Grand Teton National Park, Wyo.; Great Smoky Mountains National Park, N. C. and Tenn.; Hawaii National Park, T. H.; Isle Royale National Park, Mich.; Joshua Tree National Monument, Calif.; Katmai National Monument, Alaska; Kings Canyon National Park, Calif.; Lassen Volcanic National Park, Calif.; Lava Beds National Monument, Calif.; Mammoth Cave National Park, Ky.; Mesa Verde National Park, Colo.; Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska; Mount Rainier National Park, Wash.; Olympic National Park, Wash.; Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument, Ariz.; Petrified Forest National Monument, Ariz.; Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo.; Saguaro National Monument, Ariz.; Sequoia National Park, Calif.; Shenandoah National Park, Va.; Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, N. Dak.; White Sands National Monument, N. Mex.; Wind Cave National Park, S. Dak.; Yellowstone National Park, Idaho, Mont., and Wyo.; Yosemite National Park, Calif.; Zion National Park and Zion National Monument, Utah.

Additional units of the National Park System may be designated for inclusion in the System by Act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President. No unit of the National Park System shall be removed from the System except by Act of Congress.

Ninety days after giving public notice the Secretary of the Interior shall designate within each unit of the National Park System named for inclusion in the System such area or areas as he shall determine to be required for roads and accommodations for visitors. A notice of each such designation together with a map and description of the affected area or areas shall be forwarded to the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council established hereunder. Each such unit of the National Park System shall become part of the National Wilderness Preservation System when this designation has been made. Designations shall be made not later than January 1, 1966, or within 2 years after the unit has been added to the System, whichever is later. Should the Secretary fail to make such a designation for any such unit of the National Park System within the time limit specified, that unit shall automatically then become a part of the System.

No designation of an area for roads and accommodations for visitors shall modify or affect the application to that area of the provisions of the Act approved August 25, 1916, entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes."

(c) The System shall include the following national wildlife refuges and ranges: Aleutian Islands National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska; Aransas National Wildlife Refuge, Tex.; Bogoslof National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska; Cabeza Prieta Game Range, Ariz.; Cape Romain National Wildlife Refuge, S. C.; Charles Sheldon Antelope Range, Nev.;

Delta National Wildlife Refuge, La.; Desert Game Range, Nev.; Fort Peck Game Range, Mont.; Kenai National Moose Range, Alaska; Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska; Kofa Game Range, Ariz.; Moosehorn National Wildlife Refuge, Maine; National Bison Range, Mont.; Nunivak National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska; Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge, Ga.; Red Rock Lakes Migratory Waterfowl Refuge, Mont.; Seney National Wildlife Refuge, Mich.; Sheldon National Antelope Refuge, Nev.; Wichita Mountains National Wildlife Refuge, Okla.

Additional national wildlife refuges and ranges may be designated by the Secretary of the Interior for inclusion in the System. Such designations shall be reported, with maps and descriptions, to the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council established hereunder. No wildlife refuge or range shall be removed from the System except by Act of Congress.

Ninety days after giving public notice the Secretary of the Interior shall designate within each national wildlife refuge and range named for inclusion in the System such area or areas as he shall determine to be required for roads and buildings and other installations for administration and protection of the refuge or range for wildlife. A notice of each such designation together with a map and description of the affected area or areas shall be forwarded to the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council established hereunder. Each national wildlife refuge and range named for inclusion shall become part of the National Wilderness Preservation System when this designation has been so made for that national wildlife refuge or range. Designations shall be made not later than January 1, 1966, or within 2 years after a refuge or range has been added to the System, whichever is later. Should the Secretary fail to make such a designation for any such national wildlife refuge or range within the time limits specified, that refuge or range shall automatically then become a part of the System.

(d) The System shall include the following roadless areas and wild areas on Indian reservations and such additional roadless and wild areas on Indian reservations as the Secretary of the Interior may designate, but no such area shall be included until the tribe or band within whose reservation it lies, through its tribal council or other duly constituted authority, shall have given its consent to the inclusion of the area within the System: Black Mesa Roadless Area, Navaho Indian Reservation, Ariz.; Black River Roadless Area, Fort Apache and San Carlos Indian Reservations, Ariz.; Columbia-San Poil Divide Roadless Area, Colville Indian Reservation, Wash.; Fort Charlotte Wild Area, Grand Portage Indian Reservation, Minn.; Goat Rocks Roadless Area, Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash.; Grand Canyon Roadless Area, Hualapai Indian Reservation, Ariz.; Grand Portage Wild Area, Grand Portage Indian Reservation, Minn.; Mesa Verde Roadless Area, Consolidated Ute Indian Reservation, Colo.; Mount Adams Wild Area, Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash.; Mount Jefferson Roadless Area, Warm Springs Indian Reservation, Oreg.; Mount Thomas Roadless Area, Fort Apache Indian Reservation, Ariz.; Mission Range Roadless Area, Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont.; Painted Desert Roadless Area, Navaho Indian Reservation, Ariz.; Rainbow Bridge Roadless Area, Navaho Indian Reservation, Ariz.; Wind River Mountains Roadless Area, Shoshone Indian Reservation, Wyo.

The administration and any proposed addition, modification, or elimination of roadless and wild areas on Indian reservations shall be in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior shall establish in conformity with the purposes of this act subject to the consent of the several tribes or bands, through their tribal councils or other duly constituted authorities, each with regard to the area or areas within its jurisdiction. Any addition, modification, or elimination shall be reported, with map and description, to the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council. Nothing in this Act shall in any respect abrogate any treaty with any band or tribe of Indians, or in any way modify or otherwise affect existing hunting and fishing rights or privileges.

(e) The System shall also include such units as Congress may designate by statute and such units as may be designated within any Federally owned or controlled land and/or water by the official or officials authorized to determine the use of the lands and waters involved. The administration, modification, and elimination of such units shall be as prescribed by Congress or in accordance with regulations that shall be established in conformity with the purposes of this Act by the official or officials authorized to determine the use of the lands and waters involved.

(f) Any proposed addition to, modification of, or elimination from the National Wilderness Preservation System otherwise than by Act of Congress, except on Indian reservations and except as provided in section 3, subsection (c), paragraph (1), shall be reported to Congress by the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council upon receipt of notice and shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of 120 calendar days, of continuous session of Congress, following the date on which the report is received by Congress; but only if during this period there has not been passed by either House of Congress a resolution opposing such proposed addition, modification, or elimination. Within any Federally owned unit within the National Wilderness Preservation System the acquisition of any privately owned lands is hereby authorized and such sums as the Congress may decide are hereby authorized to be appropriated for such acquisition out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

SEC. 3. (a) Nothing in this act shall be interpreted as interfering with the purpose stated in the establishment of any national park or monument, national forest, national wildlife refuge, Indian reservation, or other Federal land area involved, except that any agency administering any area within the National Wilderness Preservation System shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area. The National Wilderness Preservation System shall be devoted to the public purposes of recreational, educational, scenic, scientific, conservation, and historical uses. All such use shall be in harmony, both in kind and degree, with the wilderness environment and with its preservation.

(b) Except as otherwise provided in this section, and subject to existing private rights (if any), no portion of any area constituting a unit of the National Wilderness Preservation System shall be devoted to commodity production, to lumbering, prospecting, mining, or the removal of mineral deposits (including oil and gas), grazing by domestic livestock (other than by pack animals in connection with the administration or recreational, educational, or scientific use of the wilderness), water impoundment or reservoir storage, or to any form of commercial enterprise except as contemplated by the purposes of this Act. Within such areas, except as otherwise provided in this section and in section 2 of this Act, there shall be no road, nor any use of motor vehicles, or motor boats, or landing of aircraft, nor any other transport, or delivery of persons or supplies, nor any structure or installation in excess of the minimum required for the administration of the area for the purposes of this Act.

(c) The following special provisions are hereby made:

(1) Roads over national forest lands reserved from the public domain and necessary for ingress and egress to or from privately owned property shall be, and roads over national forest lands otherwise acquired may be, allowed under appropriate conditions determined by the forest supervisor. Upon allowance of such roads the boundary of the area shall thereupon be modified to exclude the portion affected by the roads. The new boundaries shall be reported, with a map, through the Chief of the Forest Service to the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council. All such changes shall be included in the next following annual report of the Council but need not be separately reported to Congress.

(2) Within national forest areas grazing of domestic livestock and the use of airplanes or motorboats where these practices have already become well established may be permitted to continue subject to such restrictions as the Chief of the Forest Service deems desirable. Such practices shall be recognized as nonconforming use of the area of wilderness involved and shall be terminated whenever this can be effected with equity to, or in agreement with, those making such use.

(3) Other provisions of this Act to the contrary notwithstanding, the management of the Superior, Little Indian Sioux, and Caribou Roadless areas in the Superior National Forest, Minnesota, shall be in accordance with regulations established by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the general purpose of maintaining, without unnecessary restrictions on other uses including that of timber, the primitive character of the roadless areas, particularly in the vicinity of lakes, streams, and portages.

(4) Any existing use authorized or provided for in the Executive order or legislation establishing any national wildlife refuge or range may be continued in accordance with permit granted under such authorization or provision, but any nonconforming use of the areas of wilderness involved shall be terminated whenever this can be effected with equity to, or in agreement with those making such use.

SEC. 4. (a) A National Wilderness Preservation Council is hereby created to consist ex officio of the persons at the time designated as the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Chief of the United States Forest Service, the Director of the National Park Service, the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and also six citizen members known to be informed regarding, and interested in the preservation of, wilderness, 2 of whom shall be named initially for terms of 2 years, 2 for terms of 4 years, and 2 for terms of 6 years, by the President. After the expiration of these initial terms, each citizen member shall be appointed for a 6-year term. When initial or subsequent appointments are to be made to this Council any established national organization interested in wilderness preservation may make recommendations to the President regarding candidates any of whom would be deemed suitable for appointment to the Council. The Council shall choose from among its members a chairman who shall serve for a 2-year term. The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution shall be the secretary of the Council and, subject to the Council, shall maintain its headquarters.

(b) The Council shall serve as the repository for, and shall maintain available for public inspection, such maps and official papers regarding the National Wilderness

Preservation System as may be filed with it. Upon receipt of a report of a proposed addition, modification, or elimination of an area as required under section 2 of this Act, the secretary of the Council shall report such proposed action to the Senate and to the House of Representatives. The Council shall serve as a nonexclusive clearinghouse for exchange of information among the agencies administering areas within the System. The Council shall make, sponsor, and coordinate surveys of wilderness needs and conditions and gather and disseminate information, including maps, for the information of the public regarding use and preservation of the areas of wilderness within the System, including information and maps regarding State and other non-Federal areas which the Council shall consider important to wilderness preservation. The Council is directed to consult with, advise, and invoke the aid of the President, the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture, and other appropriate officers of the United States Government and to assist in obtaining cooperation in wilderness preservation and use among Federal and State agencies and private agencies and organizations concerned therewith. The Council, through its chairman, shall annually present to Congress, not later than the first Monday in December, a report on the operations of the Council during the preceding fiscal year and on the status of the National Wilderness Preservation System at the close of that fiscal year, including an annotated list of the areas in the System showing their size, location, and administering agency, and shall make such recommendations to Congress as the Council shall deem advisable.

(c) The Council shall meet annually and at such times between annual meetings as the Council shall determine, or upon call of the chairman or any three members. Members of the Council shall serve as such without compensation but shall receive transportation expenses and in addition a per diem payment to be fixed by the Council, not to exceed $25 a day, as reimbursement for expenditures in connection with attending any meeting of the Council. A sum sufficient to pay the necessary clerical and administrative expenses of the Council and its members, not to exceed an annual expenditure of $50,000, and such additional sums as the Congress may decide for carrying out the purposes of the Council, including printing, are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. The Council is authorized to accept private gifts and benefactions to be used to further the purposes of this Act, and such gifts and benefactions shall be deductible from income for Federal tax purposes and shall be exempt from Federal estate tax.

SEC. 5. This Act shall be known by the short title "National Wilderness Preservation Act."

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM—A SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT

When a draft of the wilderness preservation bill was presented at a conference held in Portland, Oreg., by the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs on April 7, 1956, the conservationists present felt that a historic step was being taken. I was greatly encouraged to receive the following telegram from the federation's president, Dr. Karl Onthank, of Eugene, Oreg.:

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 8, 1956.*

The Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Conference on Northwest Wilderness, in session in Portland, Oreg., has heard the proposed national wilderness preservation bill outlined and discussed and has responded with enthusiasm to the opportunity it presents for a historic step in American conservation.

Your initiative in bringing about the formulation of this bill has been warmly commended, and we all wish to express our appreciation of your leadership in bringing it to the attention of Congress. We eagerly await the introduction of the bill and opportunity to support you in working for its enactment.

As president of the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs, which has sponsored this conference, I am also writing a letter in support of the proposed measure to the Senators of the Western States where the federation's 31 organizations with a total membership of more than 25,000 have been working for years toward the opportunity that you have now helped so greatly to create.

KARL ONTHANK,
President, Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs.

David R. Brower, executive director of the Sierra Club, who was present at that Portland conference, when this wilderness system was discussed, said: "There was something that made us sense that we were participating in an event of special significance." Mr. Brower wrote as follows, on the letterhead of the Sierra Club from its headquarters at 1050 Mills Tower, San Francisco, Calif.:

APRIL 11, 1956.

The Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I write you as a constituent, believing that I am in a way a constituent of any Member of Congress who acts in behalf of a National Wilderness Preservation System. I believe a great many citizens from all over the country must feel the same way. I saw much evidence of this at the Conference on Northwest Wilderness, just held in Portland, and attended by conservationists from Oregon, Washington, California, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Maryland, Virginia, and British Columbia—more than 200 all told, and I am not sure that I am calling the roll of all the States represented.

The proposal to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System, in which your role is so prominent, was presented to us and talked about in great detail at the conference banquet—its first unveiling before the general public. Then, and all the following day, there was something that made us sense that we were participating in an event of special significance. There were some of the elements of the famous Yellowstone campfire where the idea took form of preserving, for a noble public purpose, national parks for all the people. We were reminded of other conservation milestones—the setting aside of the reserves that became the national forests; the creation of and protection of a National Park System by the 1916 act.

The Sierra Club helped establish the national forests, and it was on a Sierra Club outing in the wilderness country around Mount Rainier that Steve Mather formulated the idea of a National Park Service.

We take special pleasure in the wilderness bill because it constitutes a step toward which our organization, together with many other groups and individual conservationists, has been working so long. The four biennial wilderness conferences we sponsored were all moving in that direction. The enclosed copy of the proceedings of the fourth conference tells something of this effort, and how broad the interest has been. The people who value the things that make America beautiful will be ever grateful for what you are doing to translate these plans into actual legislation.

In this National Wilderness System, under whatever jurisdiction the various elements will be, we are confident that the future will see one of the finest examples of multiple use of land without using up its wilderness resource. The system will provide the best possible protection of all-important watershed. It will constitute the best of outdoor laboratories, that need never depreciate, for scientific study of the natural equilibrium between all forms of life and the land. It will be a sanctuary for man himself, who needs periodic renewing such as wilderness recreation can give. This wilderness system will be and will remain what we might call the national gallery of primeval art, the carefully guarded treasure of the finest natural scenes left in America.

We thank you for your leadership and offer you our support in creating and strengthening the National Wilderness Preservation System. You have our gratitude, and as the proposal becomes widely known, we are sure that others mindful of the permanent public good will share the enthusiasm we have. I'm confident that you'll have posterity's gratitude, too.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID R. BROWER,
Executive Director.

The president of the Sierra Club, Dr. Alexander Hildebrand, of 738 South Bright Street, Whittier, Calif., had earlier expressed endorsement of the club. On April 6, 1956, he had wired:

"The Sierra Club strongly endorses the objectives of this bill. We have no criticisms or suggestions at this time but will let you know if any arise after more detailed study. The Sierra Club has sponsored four biennial wilderness conferences which have urged the form of wilderness protection which appears to be skillfully embodied in this bill. We appreciate your role in furthering it."

The president of the National Parks Association, Mr. Sigurd F. Olson, from his headquarters in Ely, Minn., had also commended this proposal, saying he feels strongly that this is the last chance to preserve the wilderness on this continent. Later, on May 10, 1956, at its annual meeting, the National Parks Association adopted a formal resolution saying:

"The preservation of wilderness areas to perpetuate unspoiled examples of the natural American landscape is one of the most essential requirements for the continued well-being of the American people. While several agencies are administering lands under their jurisdiction under excellent policies that protect the wilderness resource, the board of trustees of the National Parks Association believes it desirable that the integrity of such reservations, and the importance of the wilderness concept as an attribute of fundamental American culture, should be given congressional recognition. The board is in sympathy with the purpose of suggestions that have been formulated to achieve this objective, and urges that they be submitted to the people and their representatives in Congress for thoughtful consideration."

The full text of Mr. Olson's letter was as follows:

ELY, MINN., *April 3, 1956.*

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HUBERT: I was glad to get your letter asking my opinion of the bill you plan on introducing to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System. I have worked closely with Howard Zahniser and others for some time on this measure and feel that in view of the mounting pressures of population, commercialization, and industrial expansion, that the only way to assure future generations that there will be any wilderness left for them to enjoy is to give such areas congressional sanction now.

To be sure, wilderness has been given protection in the national parks, national forests, and wildlife refuges, but such protection has never been actually spelled out. In all the services concerned there has been a

sincere desire to protect the wilderness character of the regions entrusted to them but this has largely been because of a concept of administrators enforced by departmental policy. While a splendid job has been done in many areas, it seems to me that it would have been much easier to hold the line, had the issues been clear. The National Wilderness Preservation System bill will clarify the complex problems constantly arising through giving congressional approval of the wilderness concept.

In short the bill will give approval to policies the services have inaugurated and have fought for against tremendous odds for a long time. It will enable the departments to say:

"Now for the first time, the preservation of wilderness has assumed the stature of a congressional mandate. Above political or industrial pressures, it is no longer subject to the vagaries of administrative change. Now we have the strength and assurance that what we had planned is the will of the people and with that knowledge can look far ahead."

I feel strongly that this is the last chance to preserve the wilderness on this continent for we are on the verge of an era where the pressures to destroy or change it will become greater than anything we have ever experienced. All of us concerned are appreciative of your great interest and you can be assured of our support.

Regards.

Sincerely yours,

SIGURD F. OLSON.

A noted photographer and outdoorsman of the Far West, Mr. C. Edward Graves, of Carmel, Calif., the western representative of the National Parks Association—has also expressed appreciation of this proposal to establish a national wilderness system. On May 28, 1956, he wrote as follows:

"The Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY,

"Senate Office Building,

"Washington, D. C.

"DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I should like to express to you my sincere appreciation of your sponsorship of the proposal to establish a National Wilderness System. There is no question but that we need to protect our fast-vanishing wilderness by law. There is equally no question but that the proposal will meet with opposition from commercial groups who are continually professing to be afraid of 'locking up' our natural resources. Personally I should welcome a showdown fight on the subject and I am glad to know that you are willing to back us up.

"Population pressure to build roads and develop every last bit of our rapidly receding frontier is hard to resist. We need a weapon such as your bill, if it becomes law, will give us. Think, for instance, of what will happen to our wilderness, when in perhaps 50 years from now, certainly within the lifetime of the oncoming generation, people will own helicopters or flying saucers as commonly as they now own automobiles. We shall certainly need legal protection, well tested by efforts to overthrow it, in order to maintain the small amount of wilderness that we have so far been able to save.

"I am glad that there are legislators with the vision to see this, and I am delighted that you are willing to take a position of leadership in this group.

"Very sincerely,

"C. EDWARD GRAVES,

"Western Representative, National Parks Association."

The president of The Wilderness Society, Dr. Olaus J. Murie, wrote as follows from his headquarters in Moose, Wyo.:

MOOSE, WYO., *May 3, 1956.*

HON. HUBERT HUMPHREY,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Needless to say, I am much interested in your bill to give congressional backing to the growing popular interest in our wilderness places. I grew up in your State, Minnesota, and I remember so vividly how we youngsters gloried in the woodlands along the Red River near Moorhead. Our country was new then, and I can remember some pieces of original unbroken prairie, where the prairie chickens used to boom, and we saw the red foxes. And about 4 miles south of Moorhead was a piece of woods that we young people knew as "The Wilderness," where we used to camp and fish for catfish and goldeyes.

It would take more than the skill of a poet to put into words what that life meant to us, as we went barefoot and carefree, and enjoyed the "freedom of the wilderness," to use a term that perhaps characterizes our way of life. I am certain that those earlier days have left in our lives certain influences and memories that have helped to mellow our later years.

More recently those circumstances, those opportunities, have gone, in much of our country. But people are trying to retain some of the frontier beauty of our country, for the satisfactions that are inherent in such environment. Sportsmen of our country, seeing the habitat for much of our wildlife disappearing, joined with other like-minded people, and over the years have succeeded in establishing a system of national wildlife refuges. This proved to have a more widespread importance than was at first anticipated, for now in many of those refuges are bits of wilderness that contribute to those satisfactions that we as youngsters enjoyed on so large a scale.

We have our national parks, now visited by millions who have in them that racial, nostalgic craving for nature's beauty in the out-of-doors. We also have certain wilderness areas on our national forests, and on the Indian reservations there are some. These last seem all the more appropriate, since they appear to be an expression of the original world of those first Americans, who came to this continent and found it good.

These are the areas we Americans cherish. But unfortunately, circumstances arise when other considerations take our attention so that we forget for the moment these higher aspirations. We have had to defend these areas against some of the commercial drives of some of us. And especially, those earnest people throughout our country who strive to keep alive our deep and worthy human impulses, must defend the quality of our use of these areas.

Therefore, Senator HUMPHREY, we come to the important mechanics of the kind of government we have set up in the United States. These wilderness areas, of several kinds, are the product of the thinking of people. In our form of government there is one ultimate resource the people have, where they are directly represented, and that is Congress. Those of us who have been interested in our America have had amicable cooperation with many of the administrative agencies. We have reached the high point where we now are, through such close cooperation. But we have come up against situations in which the immediate administrator found himself helpless and without voice. And we people, on the outside, have found ourselves floundering and doing the best we can to defend these areas and their policies.

We have a Government based on checks and balances. We believe that such an important question, involving the kind of place we people shall continue to live in and enjoy, should have the sanction of Congress. We do not ask any changes in the actual administration of these areas. But we cannot anticipate what may occur in future years, and we would like to have a place to go in the last resort, our Congress.

These are some of the thoughts I have on the wilderness bill you are introducing. Needless to say, you will have the well wishes of people from all parts of our country, and I am sure that people in other countries also will be much interested in the outcome.

Sincerely,

OLAUS J. MURIE,

President.

The president of the Izaak Walton League of America, Mr. L. H. Dunten, wrote as follows from the league's headquarters at 31 North State Street, Chicago, Ill.:

APRIL 4, 1956.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In reply to your letter of March 29 with reference to a proposed bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System, permit me to thank you in behalf of the League for permitting us to see a draft of this Act. As you realize, the time permitted to analyze the Act is quite limited as you wanted a reply by April 10. Consequently, I have not been able to submit it to technical people in the League.

From my examination of the bill, I believe that it is completely in line with Izaak Walton League policies. Personally, I should like to see the Act completely abolish grazing in any of the wilderness areas.

With reference to section 4, my feeling is that the language is not strong enough to prohibit the exploitation of wilderness areas under the guise of prospecting.

Most sincerely yours,

L. H. DUNTEN,

President.

(The bill's provisions regarding prospecting have been strengthened, as Mr. Dunten suggested, but no attempt has been made to "completely abolish grazing.")

Concluding his opening address at the North American Wildlife Conference in New Orleans, La., on March 5, 1956, Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, president of the Wildlife Management Institute, described this bill as then "in preparation" and as "of interest to many groups." He said: "This bill may well represent a tremendous advance forward both for those who are interested in wilderness recreation and for those who are interested in wilderness wildlife and its values."

The comment of the press has likewise been an encouragement. Some weeks ago, in the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press for April 1, 1956, Jack Van Coevering, devoted his Woods and Waters column to a discussion of our proposed National Wilderness System. Mr. Van Coevering, one of our foremost outdoor writers, wrote as follows:

"Beginning with grade school, people are taught that the wilderness is something to be conquered. The pioneers did it. That's how they built this country.

"Now that the wilderness is almost gone, a change of sentiment is creeping across the Nation. If we lose the last remnants of wilderness, people are saying, we will lose certain values that our civilization needs.

"As a result of this realization, groups interested in saving remnants of wilderness are ready to introduce a bill in Congress to create a national wilderness system.

"This bill will not set up new bureaus of bureaucrats. It will simply establish a commission (something like the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission) under whose guidance wilderness areas may be established and protected.

" 'This may represent a tremendous advance both for those who are interested in wilderness recreation and wilderness wildlife,' said Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, president of the Wildlife Management Institute.

"The effort to save the last bits of wilderness before it is too late is typical of the way we do things.

"In this State, we have a few acres of pine forests as museum pieces of the past.

"We make a great to-do about saving trumpeter swans when they are about to

perish. We begin worrying about prairie chickens when they are on the skids. When it seems as though roadbuilders and developers will take over the last big tract of wilderness, we begin to act. We prize these 'pieces of long ago.' We do not want to lose them.

"There is something downright practical about the desires of many people to save the wilderness, too. It is still the best environment for physical adventure.

"In a wilderness a person cannot buy transportation or services. He must provide his own.

"This, if nothing else, gives not only opportunity to develop self-reliance but also to brush off any false sense of self-sufficiency. These seemingly opposite facets of character are essential if we are to develop well-rounded qualities of leadership.

"Probably the most profound values of wilderness are educational. In the wilderness are opportunities for gaining true understanding of our past, ourselves, and our world.

" 'Only against a perspective of wilderness can we enjoy the conveniences and liberties of our urbanized, mechanized, industrialized civilization, and yet not sacrifice an awareness of our human existence as spiritual creatures nurtured and sustained by and from the great community of life that comprises the wilderness,' is the way Howard Zahniser, secretary for the Wilderness Society, said it.

"Objectives of wilderness devotees, as set forth in the bill to come before Congress, are twofold:

"1. To preserve an adequate system of wilderness areas.

"2. To allow nothing to alter the wilderness character of the preserves.

"This will set aside wilderness areas in our national parks, national forests, Indian reservations, wildlife refuges, even in State parks and other areas that are already being protected in a way to safeguard wilderness."

The Sunday Journal of Portland, Oreg., on April 15, 1956, commended this proposal in its leading editorial and also devoted its cartoon that day to this same subject. The editorial, entitled "Value of Wilderness," was as follows:

"Outdoor recreationists in the United States include a breed of men and women who love on occasion to escape the sight and sound of civilization and all its comforts.

"In relation to the total, their number is not large, but it is growing—and so is their influence.

"They are concerned that steps be taken to preserve for all time certain wilderness areas which are now units of national parks and monuments, national forests, wildlife refuges, and Indian reservations.

"Their efforts have found their way into a bill presented to Congress by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, which has bipartisan backing, to establish a national wilderness preservation system.

"The legislation would not create a new land administrative agency, nor call for any changes in jurisdictions. It would simply charge the agency administering an area designated as a unit of the system with preserving its wilderness character. It would give congressional sanction to keeping unchanged existing wilderness areas, thus guaranteeing them against encroachments of a commercial nature.

"Senator HUMPHREY'S bill is the culmination of a campaign born a year ago last May in a paper delivered at a Washington, D. C., conference by Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of The Wilderness Society, a headline speaker, incidentally, at the Portland conference last weekend of the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs.

"Zahniser's presentation of his wilderness philosophy was like a stone tossed into a pool. It has been gaining converts ever since. And the proposed legislation which it inspired won the unqualified endorsement of the federation meeting here, representing 31 organizations with more than 25,000 members in Western States.

" 'Out of the wilderness has come the substances of our culture,' says Zahniser, 'and with a living wilderness we shall have also a vibrant vital culture—an enduring civilization of healthy, happy people who renew themselves in contact with the earth.'

"Like Zahniser and his cohorts, we believe there is value in having places where man can get away from all the reminders of his workaday life. At present, areas of this character are not guaranteed that their borders will not be violated by the markings of civilization. Passage of the proposed legislation will give them this guaranty."

The reference to Mr. Howard Zahniser's paper delivered in May of 1955 is to the address which I had the privilege of inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 1, 1955, an address entitled "The Need for Wilderness" delivered by Mr. Zahniser at the National Citizens' Planning Conference on Parks and Open Spaces for the American People, in Washington, D. C., on May 24, 1955. The Oregon Journal's editorial reference to this address as being "like a stone tossed into a pool" suggested a cartoon to the artist Bonelli. For the paper's editorial page cartoon on April 15, he drew a beautiful wilderness scene, tall evergreens beside an unspoiled lake. On the surface of the deep pool of the lake the widening circles that follow the tossing of a stone are drawn and labeled: Increasing demands to preserve certain wilderness areas perpetually free of commercial encroachment.

Two weeks later, on Sunday, April 29, 1956, the New York Times, in an editorial entitled "Man Needs Nature," added the weight of its endorsement. The Times called attention to the fact that "Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, in cooperation with the Council of Conservationists and some other leading conservation groups, has been working on a bill that would give duly designated wilderness areas the permanent legal protection that would safeguard them for the enjoyment of future generations of Americans, who will need unspoiled natural areas even more keenly than their forefathers do today." The Times commended "the desirability of establishing on a statutory basis a national wilderness preservation system." Said this editorial:

"As our urban, mechanized society spreads itself with increasing speed and destructiveness across the land, the human need for preserving contact with natural areas, with living, wild and growing things, becomes more explicit and more pervasive. As natural areas rapidly diminish, the battle to keep the best of the remaining ones intact grows more intense."

Later, an article by John B. Oakes, entitled "Wilderness Areas," appeared in the New York Times conservation department for Sunday, May 13, 1956, as follows:

"WILDERNESS AREAS

"Civilized Americans are becoming increasingly conscious of a paradox that affects us all: our mechanistic society is rapidly destroying every vestige of primitive and unspoiled nature, while we daily realize with ever greater force the need for maintaining contact with the natural community. While we are pushing the frontiers of nature further and further back, we are at the same time being starved for contact with nature, a basic need of the human animal. This isn't just a question of city folk seeking outdoor recreation, or enjoying spectacular scenery, or breathing unpoisoned air. It goes much deeper; it springs from the inextricable relationship of man with nature, a relationship that even the most insensitive and complex civilization can never dissipate. Man needs nature; he may within limits control it, but to destroy it is to begin the destruction of man himself. We cannot live on a sterile planet, nor would we want to.

"TO PRESERVE THE WILDS

"A conservationist philosophy such as this could not fail to be sympathetic with the movement, spearheaded particularly by The Wilderness Society, to establish permanent legal protection for such remaining unspoiled wilderness areas as this country still possesses. Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota—who has the superb Quetico-Superior wilderness area in his own State—is sponsoring a bill that would set up a national wilderness preservation system, largely out of lands already contained in our national parks, forests, Indian reservations, wildlife preserves, etc., that are already under jurisdiction of the Federal Government. The relatively few wilderness areas that are already so designated by administrative order would be expanded and merged into a vast system of rigidly protected natural preserves. The idea is certainly worth exploring—if what is left of our country in a natural state is worth saving, as many of us believe it is."

The Conservation News, published by the National Wildlife Federation, contained in its May 1, 1956, issue an article entitled "Senator HUMPHREY Drafts Wilderness Bill," which effectively introduced this subject as follows:

"No outdoorsman needs to be reminded that wilderness is a rapidly disappearing thing in America. Places where a man may get himself lost in the woods, hunt without fear of plugging a friend, fish without hooking a buddy, hike without dodging automobiles, or camp beyond earshot of roaring trucks, are becoming increasingly hard to find.

"The special value of wilderness is difficult to define, but it is nonetheless real to those who know it. It is an intangible thing sorely missed by a certain stripe of man and deeply needed by many others for whom it unfortunately is often an unknown hidden hunger—especially important in these days when the pressures of everyday living cause queues at the prescription counters for equinol.

"Probably all who go hunting and fishing feel the need for wilderness to a greater or less degree. So do hikers and mountain climbers and the youth groups to whom adventure in the outdoors is so important. In fact, nearly all Americans have some interest in the wilderness because of their outdoor backgrounds and its prominent part in our history."

Commenting that fortunately there still remain some large areas of wilderness, the article then pointed out:

"Some 50 or so national parks and monuments have within them unspoiled areas large enough to be called wilderness. Some 20 or so of the national wildlife refuges do, too. Within the national forests there are some 80 areas that have been designated by the Forest Service for protection as wilderness. Indian reservations contain 15 areas that have been classified as roadless or wild areas.

"Putting all these 165 or so areas together, out of more than 2¼ billion acres in our total land area (of which 741 million acres are federally owned), we have a total of about 55 million acres of wilderness in Federal ownership or control. They are parts of public lands within which wilderness can be preserved consistently with other purposes, as part of what might be called a multipurpose wilderness preservation program."

The National Wildlife Federation article emphasized the need for legislation as follows:

"At present, however, there are no laws of Congress that protect these areas of wilderness as wilderness. Even in the national parks the pressures for roads and nonwilderness recreational and tourist developments

threaten in many places to invade the primeval backcountry. In the national forests the wilderness, wild, primitive, and roadless areas have been set up administratively and could be abolished or greatly reduced by a future Secretary of Agriculture. Wilderness within the national wildlife refuges is in a precarious position because the refuges themselves lack adequate legal protection against pressures for commercial or exploitative encroachments. In fact, none of these areas has the protection that Congress could give by providing for wilderness preservation as a national policy applied to a definite system of areas."

Then summarizing the proposals of this bill, the article said:

"This System would be made up of the areas of primeval America that are still wilderness and in Federal ownership and capable of being kept that way without interfering with other purposes now being served by these lands. The areas to be included are named in the bill. These areas would continue to be administered by the existing Federal agencies that now handle them. Uses now being made of the areas would be permitted to continue, but the administering agencies would be charged with responsibility to protect the areas as wilderness. There would be no new overhead or coordinating agency created, but there would be a commission to serve as a clearinghouse for information and a repository for the maps and official papers having to do with the System."

After pointing out the bill's purpose to protect all wildernesses from mining, the article said that "otherwise the bill is not a reform measure" and continued:

"The grazing now permitted on national forest wildernesses, for example, could continue; special uses now permitted on some refuges would also not be interfered with. National parks would remain inviolate as to mining, grazing, or other such uses. The Secretary of the Interior would designate the parts of each park and monument needed for roads and visitor accommodations, and then the rest of each park would be preserved as wilderness. The bill thus proposes to take the wilderness now suitable for the purpose and provide for its permanent protection under congressional sanction."

The article concludes as follows:

"Proponents of the Humphrey bill have emphasized that the proposal is not special-use or special-privilege legislation.

"National forest areas involved, they point out, would continue to be administered under the present Forest Service regulations (which provide, for example, for grazing permits), and these areas also would continue to serve the basic purposes of the national forests. These purposes are defined by law as watershed protection and forest preservation. Setting these areas aside as wilderness, it is explained, will thus not interfere with the multiple purposes they now serve but will actually help to realize the dominant use of the national forests for water conservation.

"National parks, national wildlife refuges, and any other areas would also continue to serve their own distinctive purposes. No special-use privileges of any kind would be created by the proposed law. The only added responsibility of each administering agency would be for seeing that the designated wilderness under its jurisdiction remain wilderness.

"The title of the bill describes it as 'for the permanent good of the whole people' and the enacting clause says that the National Wilderness Preservation System is 'to serve the public purpose of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use and enjoyment by the people.'

"The section of the bill dealing with uses says that nothing within the Act shall be interpreted as interfering with the purpose for which any of the lands involved were originally set aside, 'except that any agency administering any area within the National Wilderness Preservation System shall in its administration for whatever other purpose be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area.'

"'The areas within this System,' says the bill, 'shall be devoted to the public purpose of recreational, educational, scenic, scientific, conservation, and historical uses and all such use shall be in harmony, both in kind and degree, with the wilderness environment and its preservation.'

"The executive committee of the Council of Conservationists, which is active in support of Senator HUMPHREY'S proposal, includes David R. Brower of San Francisco, Ira N. Gabrielson and Howard Zahniser of Washington, D. C., Carl O. Gustafson and Fred Smith of New York, and Joseph W. Penfold of Denver. Gabrielson and Zahniser are also chairman and vice chairman, respectively, of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources which also has espoused the wilderness bill as one of its positive projects."

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I want to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for his introduction of this bill. I feel privileged to be listed as a cosponsor of the measure. The Senator from Minnesota will be interested to learn that he is introducing this bill at an extremely appropriate day. This morning, before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I am a member, one of the most illustrious women in our land testified in favor of a resolution that would commemorate the First Governors Conference on Conservation, which was called at the White House nearly half a century ago by President Theodore Roosevelt.

This very outstanding woman in the life of our country is Mrs. Cornelia Bryce Pinchot, the widow of Gifford Pinchot, the founder of the United States Forest Service, and perhaps the greatest conservationist produced by our country in modern times, if not, indeed, in the entire history of the United States. I think if Gifford Pinchot were here today, he would be a cosponsor of the bill of the Senator from Minnesota. I recall with pleasure standing in the company of Mrs. Pinchot at LaWisWis Forest Camp in the Pacific Northwest, when the great Gifford Pinchot National Forest was dedicated some years ago to the memory of her late husband. The dedication, as I recall, was supervised by Lyle F. Watts, one of my distinguished Oregon constituents, who then was Chief Forester of the United States. Mr. Watts, incidentally, was a protege in the Forest Service of Gifford Pinchot.

Unfortunately, no country has used up its natural resources in so short a time and as quickly as has the United States of America. Only a century and a half have gone by since Lewis and Clark crossed our continent. They were the first Americans to reach the Pacific coast and fly our flag beside the shores of the Pacific Ocean. Yet in that century and a half, the people of this country, oftentimes recklessly, wantonly, and profligately, have made terrible inroads on our natural resources.

When Lewis and Clark crossed the country, there were around 60 million bison on the American plains. When Theodore Roosevelt and others formed the American Bison Society, shortly after the turn of the century, they had a difficult time finding 6 or 8 hundred bison scattered over this vast country which could be used to breed a few captive herds, so our boys and girls could in the future see what bison looked like.

Passenger pigeons once were so numerous that their flights darkened the skies and broke the branches of trees. There is not a single passenger pigeon left. No matter how long mankind remains here on this planet, there never will be another passenger pigeon. The last one died, I believe, in the Cincinnati Zoological Gardens in 1914.

Yet, despite these lessons which have come down to us from very recent history, we still continue to make mistakes. Right at this very hour, as the Senator from Minnesota stands here, having completed the introduction of the bill, oil drilling and gas leasing are taking place on lands which were set aside for nesting and breeding for the flights of migratory fowl, which take place between the Canadian Arctic and the birds' winter homes in the Caribbean and South America. Therefore, we have relatively few resources left from which to set aside a wilderness reservation system, such as the Senator from Minnesota and his cosponsors are now proposing.

I believe that if such legislation is not proposed today or in the immediate future it will be too late; that there will not be left the great upland solitudes and the great forests and the timbered lake areas, such as there are in the State of the Senator from Minnesota, as to which the bill can be put into operation.

Actually, it is almost the 11th hour so far as the wilderness system in our country is concerned. It seems to me that the Senator from Minnesota has rendered a distinct public service by working with various conservation groups, such as The Wilderness Society and others, to develop and formulate legislation such as this. I want him to know that I consider myself very highly privileged to work in the ranks with him, and under his guidance, toward this great goal.

The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] said this is a Teddy Roosevelt fight. I think it is not only a Teddy Roosevelt fight, but also is a fight for the things that enlightened Americans in our generation must stand for, if we are to fulfill our obligation to the next generation of Americans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an introduction I wrote to a pamphlet entitled "Conserving Our Great Outdoors," which was published under the auspices of the Tamiment Institute, of New York, as a public service. The pamphlet was written by me in an effort to acquaint the American people with the need for the type of conservation principles which are embodied in the bill introduced today by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

There being no objection, the introduction to the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When I am at my desk in the Senate Office Building, I look out on a world of concrete, steel, and asphalt. Massive temples of Government dominate the horizon. Torrents of traffic pour along the streets. Civilization has crowded nature into the distant background. When I take a train to New York from Washington, I ride for over 200 miles through a continuous avenue of factories, switching yards, crowded tenement districts, and warehouses. This is where we have paved the ground, clouded the air with soot and smoke, and breached rivers and lakes with our wharves and gravel fills.

Yet, there comes a time when the teeming spectacle mercifully fades, and a totally different vision appears. I may be looking at a squat blast furnace where hundreds of men are employed, but my thoughts flee to the mile-deep canyons where the Salmon and Snake Rivers unite in a cavernous union. My wife and I are trudging with knapsacks to Heaven's Gate Lookout, which commands this majestic panorama. Butterflies dot the mountain sky, and lodgepole pines sway in the breeze from out of the twin chasms. We are alone, many miles from the nearest neighbors. The mule deer foraging on the steep slopes are safe. In this secluded heart of Idaho's Nez Perce National Forest, mighty ridges split the clear air like the humps of a gigantic camel cavalry. Lightheartedly, we cook our supper of eastern brook trout and fried potatoes in a grove below the frowning ramparts of He-Devil Peak.

Or we are on the twisting Lolo Trail, where Lewis and Clark nearly starved to death 150 years earlier. We stand beside three jumbled rock cairns in a waving meadow of white bear-grass. These are relics of the first westbound Americans, yet the cairns still dot the high divide above the rumbling Lochsa fork of the Clearwater River. The rush of civilization has passed them by. Reading from the explorers' famous Journals, we try to build our campfire exactly where the ashes of some bleak bivouac must have lain on that original trek. When Maurine puts on her bathing suit and frolics beneath an icy waterfall, we wonder if it was in this brook that Lewis and Clark filled the rusty iron kettle which boiled a scraggly timberwolf that was their only food. And did the mournful howl from beyond the fire's flickering circle last night come from some remote descendant of that historic beast?

Perhaps, in my reverie, I am off to the north, on the unfortified boundary between British Columbia and the State of Washington. I am walking along the corridor of spruce and Douglas fir which marks the international border. Snow powders the needle boughs and branches. Mount Baker hovers like a domed citadel in the sky. At my side is red-headed John Piper, staff sergeant in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, who shares my pride in the dark shawl of evergreen forests sprawling across the frontier. If only such magnificent trees might endure forever.

I am at the spray-spattered foot of the hissing column of water known as Yosemite Falls, with a friend named Adlai Stevenson. We do not speak, for no human voice is stentorian enough to be heard above this thunder. But why words, after all? Can mankind have any except a single thought amid the sublime grandeur of a waterfall half a mile in height? What is the mystery of the Creator's infinite wonders, which dwarf and shame the works of mankind? * * * And would the musings of my companion be different from those of another friend, the late Haldane (Buzz) Holmstrom, when he and I stood on the north rim of the Grand Canyon of the Colorado and looked down into that abyss, which only Holmstrom ever had traversed alone by boat?

FIFTY MILLION CAR OWNERS CAN'T STAY HOME

Public life often can be a sort of prison, so my visits to these beautiful places today are rare, indeed. Yet it reassures me to know that they continue to exist—that, somewhere, the sparkling Lochsa foams toward the sea with the same lilting resonance and over the same mossy rocks as when Capt. Meriwether Lewis called it Kooskooskee, the river which flows fast and clear.

I know that millions of Americans feel likewise. They gain both security and comfort from the fact that a segment of the old original wilderness has been saved. The whole continent has not yet been tilled, paved, or settled. Some of these people may never see the real wilderness; their sentiments are purely vicarious. But they are aware of it, nevertheless—just as Mount Everest and K–2 inspire pride among people in remote parts of India.

Still, the attention to our own outdoors becomes less intangible and more direct with each passing day. Americans now own more than 50 million motor cars. Bryce Canyon and Mount Hood are just beyond everybody's radiator cap. The call of the open road is heard in millions of apartments and bungalows. In the past, much of our travel was dependent upon common carriers like trains and buses; an extra ticket had to be bought for each member of the family. But, in an automobile, the same fuel and monthly down-payments transport father, mother, children, and in-laws—perhaps even the family dog or cat. Widespread ownership of automobiles has widened the vista and the travel radius of every American household.

The pressure on our recreational resources was never so great, and this is but the beginning. If we do not spare these resources—nay, expand and also improve them—we shall find that eventually our families have no place to go, despite finer and faster automobiles and more leisure time.

Maurine and I sat with my mother at the hearthfire of a quaint little lodge in the fairy-like Yoho Valley of British Columbia. Our companions, whom we had met a few hours earlier beside the roaring Yoho River, were a refugee doctor from Europe and his pretty blonde wife. "At the start," said the doctor, "we went to many of your national parks and national forests. But now they are so very crowded—how you say it? Like Coney Island, maybe. Thus, we turn to Canada, where it is not yet elbow to elbow in the most wonderful places to see."

When we came down out of the uplands on a Canadian Pacific train, an item in the press told us that Canada's Minister of Resources had rejected flatly a request that the mining of a great lode of uranium be permitted inside the borders of Banff National Park. The park was reserved for recreation, said the Minister, and that ended the matter. Yet Canada has far more of its area devoted to outdoor pastimes than has the United States, particularly when comparative populations are considered. Are we letting commercialism and exploitation rob us of our chance for unfettered enjoyment under the blue heavens and the stars?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as I conclude, I merely wish to express my gratitude and appreciation to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] for his cosponsorship of this measure and for his very enlightened and thoughtful remarks relative to the bill which has been introduced today.

I think every Member of this body recognizes in the junior Senator from Oregon one of the foremost conservationists in the land. His writings prior to his coming to the Senate gained him national recognition and fame. His intimate knowledge of the great natural resources of the United States and of what has been happening to them has been heralded many times by universities and conservation groups and by the American press and journals.

So, Mr. President, in introducing this bill, I am merely acting as the catalyst, so to speak. In bringing this matter to the attention of Congress, I have had the advice and counsel of both the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. I consider myself very fortunate to be able to work with these two fine Senators, who have placed the principles of sound conservation at the top of their public service, as priority items not only for the Americans of today, but for generations yet unborn.

During the delivery of Mr. HUMPHREY's speech:

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I may say that it is a great honor to join the Senator from Minnesota as a cosponsor of the bill. I have the suspicion that as we introduce the bill today its full implications will not immediately catch the imagination of the American people. In my judgment, the Senator from Minnesota is adding another great foundation stone to his record of public service in the Senate. Once again he is demonstrating that one of the responsibilities of statesmanship is the duty to look ahead to the needs and the benefits and the problems of future generations of Americans.

Sometimes I feel that in our day, the mad race to make money, the mad race to feed the economic appetites of the people, is causing us to forget to protect the greater values.

The Senator from Minnesota is talking about one of those greater values, which are essential to human happiness. I say that because if we, in our generation, do not do the kind of conservation job the Senator is calling for in the bill he is introducing, of which I am honored to be a cosponsor, the history of our generation as it will be written by future generations of American boys and girls would not make pleasant reading for any of us if we could return from our graves.

Although many people do not seem to realize it, it is clear that one of the great issues, one of the great problems confronting us, is the fulfilling of our trusteeship over the natural resources God has given us.

The natural resources which are referred to in the bill do not belong to us; neither do they belong to the private utilities to which the present administration has given so many of them. Neither do they belong to the oil companies which have been permitted by the administration to rape some of the natural resources, as is shown by the record which the administration has made in its leases of refuges in the wilderness areas.

So when the Senator from Minnesota raises this issue today, he is raising one which is of great concern to the happiness of future generations of American boys and girls.

Let us look at history for a moment, for the sake of the record today. I want the Senate to consider what has happened to some other great civilizations of centuries gone by. They had wilderness areas, too. They had forests, too. They had great water resources, too. Yes; they had deep topsoil, from which could grow a surplus of food so essential to a high civilization.

The Senator from Minnesota has heard me say this before, but it needs to be repeated in connection with his bill. No civilization can climb except with surplus food. Yet the American people are being given the impression by the present administration that in our time surplus food seems to be a great national calamity and liability. But food is one of the greatest essentials to a high standard of living, in a climbing civilization.

The Senator from Minnesota and I in fighting for the bill are really fighting for the carrying out of a trusteeship obligation which our generation owes to American boys and girls yet unborn.

What we are doing by the bill, if we can get our colleagues to raise their sights high enough today to do some thinking in terms of the next 100 years, is making a plea to preserve the natural resources of the United States for the human happiness of boys and girls who will follow us, instead of depleting them and economically raping them for a profit of a few hundred dollars which will not serve our Nation well after we have gone.

China once had plenteous natural resources. China's mountains were once covered with forests and great wilderness areas. China once had deep topsoil. China once had surplus water resources. China once was a great natural resource country. China had the greatest civilization on the face of the earth when it had those gifts of God and treasured them and protected them.

I happen to believe that we ought to take an intellectual approach to the matter of the Nation's natural resources; that we ought to learn from history; and that we ought to see to it, before it is too late, that this is the generation which will assume the obligation of stopping the serious trend toward the depletion of America's natural resources.

The Senator from Minnesota and I are not the only persons in the history of the Senate who have raised voices in a plea to protect and conserve the interests of America. There were greater men before us, on both sides of the aisle, in the history of this Chamber, and also in the administrative branch of the Government, who fought for the protection of the natural resources of the United States. There were great conservationists who preceded us in this Chamber—a Hiram Johnson, of California, a Bob La Follette, of Wisconsin, a George Norris, of Nebraska, to mention only a few. There were great statesmen in the executive branch of the Government, such as the great Republican, Gifford Pinchot, who is recognized really as the father of the modern conservation movement in America; Teddy Roosevelt, who fought the interests, too. That monopoly-buster did a job that Dwight D. Eisenhower ought to try to emulate. In Teddy Roosevelt's day, the monopolist tried to do to the heritage of the American people the injury the monopolies in 1956, under Dwight D. Eisenhower, are succeeding in doing to the Nation's natural resources under the Eisenhower give-away program.

I am perfectly willing to take all the abuse, criticism, and castigation for standing on the floor of the Senate and the platforms of America and saying that Eisenhower is doing a tremendous disservice to future generations of American boys and girls in the field of natural resources. Does the Senator know why? Because Eisenhower simply does not understand the true meaning and value of natural resources. He has never comprehended the problem. He does not know the history of natural resources; and he has demonstrated it time and time again by the terrible record of disservice which he has performed as President of the United States in the field of natural resources.

So when we support the bill today, we are making a Teddy Roosevelt fight; we are making a Gifford Pinchot fight; we are making a George Norris fight; we are making a fight to try to awaken the American people again, before it is too late, to the fact that the natural resources, of which we are the trustees, are being depleted across the land, and as we deplete them we chip away at the foundations of our very civilization itself, and, as a people without natural resources, we become a decadent people. That is history. Dwight D. Eisenhower cannot rewrite history in the field of natural resources. He cannot deny the effect of natural laws upon a civilization.

When we consider our natural resources, it is either to preserve them, conserve them, and develop them for the benefit of the people, or to strike a blow at the standard of living of the people, which is how China lost her once high standard of living. Let me say that we had better be on guard lest we bring about an eroded America, as there has been brought about an eroded China. We had better be on guard lest we have a devastated America, as China has become a devastated nation. We had better be on guard lest we waste or destroy the potentialities of the water resources of America, because within the field of natural resources water is dominant when it comes to maintaining the high standard of living of the people.

The difficulty confronting us is to get the people to think in terms of these basic principles. The average American citizen simply takes water for granted. Most Americans never stop to think about our obligation to develop, preserve, and conserve the water resources of our country. The Senator from Minnesota will remember the debate in the Senate last year on the upper Colorado project, when we began to recognize the water resource phase of that project and the obligation to provide future generations in that area of America with an adequate water supply. We were fighting in our day to provide the boys and girls of a future day with enough water—perhaps just enough water—to make it possible for them to have a decent standard of living, because without enough water there cannot be a decent standard of living.

I appreciate the Senator's permitting me to make these comments in the midst of his speech, but I think the subject is so important that when a major piece of proposed legislation such as this is before the Senate, we should tie it down to its great objective, so far as ideals are concerned. It is a great ideal for which the Senator from Minnesota is fighting. As the Senator knows, I think statesmanship calls upon us to put the ideals into practice. We are putting them into practice in this great conservation bill, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I sincerely thank the Senator from Oregon. If the Senator will permit me to do so, in order to have the RECORD reflect continuity in the section-by-section analysis of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator's observations may follow the completion of my prepared statement on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at this point also, and as a part of my request, I may say that the Senator from Oregon has again demonstrated his fearlessness, his wisdom, and his statesmanship. His support of conservation programs is a tribute to his character and sense of public duty. I could agree entirely, and I do agree entirely, with the Senator's observations relating to the urgent necessity of having this generation of Americans continue—in fact, to step up—our conservation policies and programs. The pressure of economic development, population pressures, the whole period of tension in which we live, can very well get us into a position where we will ignore the God-given resources of land, water, minerals, and timber. If we ignore their preservation now, it will be centuries before they can ever be reclaimed, and some of them may never be reclaimed.

The Senator's comments relating to history are as true as Scripture. Not only are his statements about China true, but if one peruses the Old Testament, he will read about areas in the Middle East which today are arid and barren, but once were fertile valleys and hills covered by green grass and wonderful forests, and rich in fruit and crops. But today they are barren wilderness areas, which have to be reclaimed at tremendous cost in time, money, and energy; and some of them are beyond the capacity of modern man to reclaim.

After the conclusion of Mr. HUMPHREY'S speech,

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for the comments he has made.

Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota needs yield to no other Member of the Senate for the leadership he is

giving the Senate and the country in the field of sound conservation. I am sure I voice the view of my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER] when I say that we are proud to join forces with the Senator from Minnesota in carrying out what I referred to earlier in my remarks as our trusteeship, for our generation, over the natural resources of the country.

Mr. President, I turn now to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

THE UNITED STATES CAN LOSE THE ATOMIC POWER RACE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, possibly no issue is of greater importance to the future of the free world and our domestic economy than the rapid development of economic power from the atom.

The Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the private utilities have pursued a dangerous policy of drifting and of unwatchful waiting, while the Soviet Union pursues an aggressive program of building atomic reactors.

Many of us who serve in the Congress advocate an all-out Federal program for the development and operation of demonstrator plants to get the United States program "off the ground." The Gore-Holifield bill would do just that.

Mr. President, this proposal, which I strongly endorse, has caused consternation in the ranks of the Atomic Energy Commission and the private utilities. The basic data on this controversy appear in the hearings on the Gore bill, which were held by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I wish to compliment the chairman of the joint committee, the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], on those hearings and on related hearings which were held in an effort to lay before the public and the Congress the status of our program and that of the Russians.

The committee has been hampered by the secrecy of the Atomic Energy Commission. Reportedly, the Atomic Energy Commission has been classifying material from Soviet sources. What can be the purpose of keeping such data from the American public? If the data comes from Soviet sources, obviously Russia already knows about the data, and the American people should have them. Of course, that is only another example of the dangerous trend, under the Eisenhower administration, toward government of secrecy. Let me say that freedom and government by secrecy cannot be reconciled.

Mr. President, the Atomic Energy Commission and the private utilities are continuing their campaign to attempt to persuade the public that atomic power is premature, and that they are making all possible speed. However, the facts belie their propaganda. The picture is one of a man who, although running furiously, remains in one place.

Mr. President, I have before me a series of articles which bring into focus a few salient points which I believe should be considered by every Member of Congress and every American citizen. I desire particularly to commend the Portland Oregonian, which is not a "Morse newspaper," but which has written a fine editorial on this atomic energy program, under the heading "Get Off Our Backs." In fact, I wish to commend the Portland Oregonian for the leadership it has been giving to public opinion in my section of the country, in support of the development of atomic power reactor resources at Hanford, where the American taxpayers have a tremendous investment. Let us not forget that in the country as a whole the American taxpayers have an investment of $14 billion in the atomic energy program. We, the taxpayers, have paid for it, lock, stock, and barrel. It belongs to the American taxpayers.

Here is one Senator who does not propose to give it away to the private utilities, but who believes that, in cooperation with private industry, we should proceed with all possible speed to the maximum development, in the shortest possible period of time, of the atomic energy resources of science. That means, Mr. President, that we should proceed with some so-called pilot reactor plants for the Government, because—as I said the other day in my testimony before the Gore committee—the record is perfectly clear that the private utilities are not going to do it for years, and that if they do it, we shall have to subsidize them. Their scheme—by way of tax benefits and insurance benefits and requests that the Government assume all the risks of liability which may develop from a private utility's building a reactor—is in large measure to have the taxpayers pay for the reactors, which then would belong to the private utilities. It is the same old private-utility shell game, Mr. President, which they tried to play to too great an extent in this administration—but to too great an extent to get by with, Mr. President—in the field of hydroelectric power. We should stop them before they start in the field of atomic power.

Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Portland Oregonian for the support it has been giving to at least one issue for which I have been fighting in the Senate; I completely endorse the Portland Oregonian's editorial, under the heading "Get Off Our Backs," which deals with the question of the need for the development of atomic reactors by the Government itself. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have both that editorial and a series of articles dealing with the same subject matter, and taken by me from the press, printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland Oregonian of June 4, 1956]

GET OFF OUR BACKS

President Eisenhower's request for an $82,500,000 boost in Atomic Energy Commission funds, partly for an accelerated program of civilian reactor development, is good news for those who believe this phase of Federal atom research has been wrongly deemphasized.

The current attitude of a majority of the AEC parallels that of the private electric power industry that Uncle Sam should not get too deeply involved in the business of generating electricity with nuclear energy. Any large-scale Federal experimentation and construction, private interests feel, might put the Government even farther into the power business than it already is.

But the private utilities are not ready to handle the atom by themselves. The technology of atomic power generation is not yet sufficiently advanced to make it attractive to risk capital. Problems of insurance and the extent of liability for mishaps are unsolved. Thus the net effect of the restrictive attitude held by private interests and accepted by the AEC is to delay the solution of these problems.

A good example of how this dog-in-the-manger policy works against the public interest is the situation at the Hanford, Wash., plutonium plant. This plant drains a secret, but admittedly enormous, amount of power from the Bonneville system. But in the process of manufacturing plutonium the plant generates and wastes enough heat to run steam generators capable of producing all the electric power it needs and then some. A great new block of power would become available for Northwest homes and industries if this were done.

In recent testimony on behalf of the Gore bill, which would authorize construction of six new Federal demonstrator atomic power plants, including a dual purpose power-plutonium reactor at Hanford, Senator WAYNE L. MORSE pointed out that the present AEC budget calls for expenditure of many millions of dollars for modernization and improvement of the Hanford works, but without the power-generating facilities that would take its power load off Northwest backs.

Senator MORSE said this seems to him to be "the height of improvidence." It seems that way to us, too.

[From the New York Times of June 3, 1956]

CURTAINS PARTED ON SOVIET SCIENCE; UNITED STATES EXPERTS SAY RUSSIAN HOSTS LET THEM VISIT ANY ATOM SITES THEY WISHED

(By Harrison E. Salisbury)

The recent visit of United States scientists to Moscow produced probably the most intimate picture of Soviet science ever obtained by outsiders.

The Americans mingled freely with about 1,000 leading Soviet physicists. They were entertained in the homes of their Russian colleagues. Both groups spoke freely not only of scientific problems but also of many personal problems and questions of principle that concerned physicists dealing with the atom.

The American physicists spent 10 days in Moscow. They were permitted to visit any physics experimental facilities and laboratories they desired. They said there was no restriction on what they were permitted to see.

"They asked us to tell them what we wanted to see," one scientist said. "We saw everything we wanted. They answered every question. We were permitted to bring our cameras right into their experimental laboratories and take pictures of everything we wanted."

The Americans learned at firsthand the difficulties that many Soviet scientists encountered during the Stalin era. Some of the most brilliant Russian physicists, it was learned, were kept under surveillance, arrested or exiled during the years between the end of World War II and Stalin's death.

Prof. Victor F. Weisskopf, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who speaks Russian, said Soviet research was already benefiting from the return to universities and institutes of scientists who had been held in labor camps.

"The camps have been opened," he said. "Tens of thousands of ordinary citizens have already passed through special restitution

courts, which have expunged their detention from the record. These people are reappearing at the universities."

Professor Weisskopf said the release of prisoners, both scientists and ordinary citizens, had gone far to eliminate the atmosphere of fear in the Soviet Union.

One American who had extensive private conversations with one of the most distinguished Soviet experimenters said that he was amazed to find that "Russia had its own versions of the Oppenheimer case."

He was referring to the case of J. Robert Oppenheimer, American physicist prominent in the development of the atomic bomb, who on the ground of principle, opposed research leading to the development of the hydrogen bomb. Dr. Oppenheimer was dismissed from his post with the Atomic Energy Commission on the ground of being a security risk.

"Russia had parallel cases," the American physicist reported. "I learned of Russian scientists who were subject to similar treatment—or worse—by the Soviet Government because they refused to engage in certain lines of weapons research which the government demanded."

SOVIET LEAD REPORTED

The American scientists reported the Soviet Union had achieved a lead in high energy physics research that the United States probably could not overcome within the next 10 years.

One scientist predicted the Soviet Union would lead the world in pure nuclear research within the next decade.

Both these statements refer to pure research, not nuclear weapon production. However, the development of nuclear weapons and nuclear power is based, in general, on the level of research in technique and theory.

These observations are based on the first-hand look that the group of 12 American physicists had at Soviet research in high energy physics at a Moscow conference.

High energy physics is the study of subatomic particles accelerated by so-called atom smashers to very high energy levels. The study of cosmic rays is included in the field.

Dr. Jack Steinberger of Columbia University said the Soviet had already virtually assured a world lead in high energy physics for the next decade. He said Russia had achieved this position by winning an equipment and construction edge over the United States that the Americans would not be able to overcome.

Dr. Steinberger described the great new physical research center the Russians are building at Bolshoya Volga, near the junction of the Moscow-Volga canal and the upper Volga River.

SUPERIORITY ACKNOWLEDGED

The center, known as the Institute for Nuclear Problems and the Electro-Technical Institute, has a 680-million-volt cyclotron, which Dr. Steinberger said was superior to similar American machines.

A new 10-billion-volt accelerator (proton synchrotron) was shown to the Americans at this center. Construction is virtually complete but it has not yet gone into operation. This is almost twice the size of the largest comparable American machine, the 6-billion-volt accelerator at Berkeley, Calif.

The Soviet apparatus, Dr. Steinberger said, weighs about four times the Berkeley apparatus, cost well over $100 million (at American cost figures) and was built in about half the time it would have taken in the United States.

Dr. Steinberger said the design and construction of these huge Soviet physical apparatuses was superior to that in the United States.

"Moreover," he said, "they have vast amounts of money at their disposal. Here we have to consider what we can build with the amount of money we can get. There they decide what equipment they need and the very best manner of building it and the government gives them whatever money they need."

Despite the excellence of Russian equipment, however, Dr. Steinberger felt that the level of Soviet experimental work was no higher than in the United States and in some respects possibly inferior.

Dr. Steinberger said that the Americans and other foreigners mixed freely with Russian scientists such as Dr. Peter Kapitza, L. D. Landau, Vladim Veksler, I. E. Tamm, E. L. Feinberg and scores of others.

[From the New York Times of June 7, 1956]

UNITED STATES UTILITIES SET UP TASK FORCE TO PUSH ATOMIC POWER REACTORS

(By Gene Smith)

ATLANTIC CITY, June 6.—The Nation's electric utilities organized formally here today in answer to critics of their private atomic development programs.

The action was taken on recommendation of the Edison Electric Institute's committee on atomic power. It was approved unanimously by the institute's directorate at their annual meeting held in conjunction with the institute's annual convention, which ended today.

The directors called specifically for establishment of a technical appraisal task force on atomic power reactors, a conference of presidents of the member companies within 90 days, and named Max M. Ulrich a full-time executive secretary for the committee on atomic power.

Donald S. Kennedy, chairman and president of Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co., was elected president of the institute, succeeding Harllee Branch, Jr., president of Georgia Power Co. J. W. McAfee, president of Union Electric Co., St. Louis, was named vice president. Edwin Vennard, former president of Middle West Service Co., took over formally as vice president and general manager of the institute, succeeding Col. Howard S. Bennion who retired.

Utility executives are known to have been smarting under recent attacks leveled against their private nuclear power programs by Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee. Senator GORE sponsored a bill that would have the Federal Government build six test reactors in scattered sections of the Nation.

Today's action by the investor-owned utilities is taken by many to be in direct answer to the Tennessee legislator. The concept of the task force was first advanced in Senate hearings by Philip A. Sporn, president of American Gas & Electric Co. Mr. Sporn led the fight for a strong industry program to enable the utilities to counteract unfavorable criticism that has been attached to the congressional hearings.

TO STUDY REACTOR TYPES

As established here today, the task force will consist of independent nuclear engineers and scientists, plus executives of both institute member companies and equipment manufacturers. Its duty will be to review various reactor types and designs and recommend to member companies reactors that would be worth developing for their own use.

Spokesmen for the committee said they expected this task force would result in a further expansion of reactor-building groups but emphasized that there would be no efforts to bring about a crash program such as was advanced by critics of the utilities.

Institute directors also endorsed the formation of a national evaluation group comprised of representatives of the utilities, manufacturers, scientists, and Government on extremely high levels. This group would supplement the task force and provide atomic know-how for the Nation.

SEEK PUBLIC SUPPORT

In a morning session in Convention Hall, James F. Fairman, vice president in charge of engineering for Consolidated Edison Company of New York, told members they had the support of both investors and utility personnel in their nuclear-power programs to date but warned that "the general public is not yet with us in the application of atomic energy to the generation of electricity."

He urged that in the remaining 4 years before the majority of the proposed powerplants come on line "we make the most of our opportunity to explain the facts of atomic life to the public."

Alan H. Temple, executive vice president of the First National City Bank of New York, speaking on the utilities and the capital markets, noted that this spring "savings have fallen short of meeting inflated capital requirements."

He defended Federal Reserve authorities against charges that they are taking a position against economic growth and predicted that their actions "in the near future will show that their policy is flexible."

Representative FREDERICK R. COUDERT, JR., Republican of New York, told another session that in order "to put our fiscal house in order," Congress must regain control of the budget. He called for constitutional amendment to limit Government expenditures to annual tax collections.

Mr. COUDERT was unable to attend the convention. His speech was read by Charles B. Delafield, vice president of Consolidated Edison.

Mr. Ulrich, the new secretary of the committee on atomic power, has been an administrative assistant on the institute staff since his discharge as a captain from the Army's Corps of Engineers. An honor graduate of West Point and of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Mr. Ulrich has specialized in atomic matters for the institute.

The industry also honored Washington Water Power Co. with presentation of the Charles A. Coffin award for its success "in the struggle for survival of free enterprise in the electric industry." It marked the fourth time Kinsey M. Robinson, its president, has received the award.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 6, 1956]

ATOM POWER RACE WITH RUSSIA HIT

PITTSBURGH, June 5.—Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, said today it would be foolish for the United States to embark on a "crash program" of building atomic powerplants just to keep ahead of Russia in a "kilowatt race."

Speaking at commencement exercises of the Carnegie Institute of Technology, he criticized proposals in Congress to launch a major Government-financed program of building atomic powerplants.

Without mentioning names, he also commented on remarks by his fellow AEC Commissioner, Thomas E. Murray, and some congressional Democrats who have charged that the AEC, under Strauss' leadership, is forfeiting atomic power leadership to Russia.

Strauss said there is "no foundation in known fact" for the "professed apprehension that the United States is losing out to Russia in a kilowatt race."

"The United States leads the world today in the state of its development of peaceful uses of atomic energy, including the development of atomic power," he said. "We are not engaged in a kilowatt race."

Strauss said the United States, with an abundant supply of conventional power, does not have the "urgent" need for nuclear power that exists in some countries. Therefore, he said, it makes more sense for this country to devote its efforts to "improving the technology" of power reactors instead of "freezing it by large monetary commitments to existing uneconomic types of reactors."

Strauss noted that Russia has announced plans for "very large nuclear installations in the 1960's." He said the United States "unquestionably could begin now and build" far more atomic powerplants than Russia has announced.

"But it would not be economically competitive power and would contribute very little toward advancing the day when we and others will reap the benefits of the research now actively conducted in our laboratories."

Instead of diverting scarce manpower into a crash program of building reactors according to present primitive designs, Strauss said, "the AEC plans to go ahead with its present program of building experimental prototypes of every promising reactor concept, seeking to find the safest and most economic."

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 7, 1956]

ATOMIC POWER LEADERSHIP

I was glad to see your thoughtful editorial of May 31 on Atomic Power Leadership. You are entirely correct in your view that it is dangerous to be overly complacent about the United States rate of progress in atomic power.

In this connection, perhaps we should be less concerned about where we stand today, vis-a-vis Russia, Britain and other countries, than with where we may stand in 4 or 5 years. If we now have world leadership in atomic power technology, it is because of programs which the Government decided to undertake in past years. Our decisions today on the nature and pace of the atomic power development programs, Government and private, will determine our position in the so-called "atomic power race" several years hence. If we are faint-hearted now there is apt to be little question later as to which country is ahead, quantitatively or qualitatively.

The recent congressional hearings on the Gore bill elicited many objections to some Government-financed atomic power demonstration plants which, in my opinion, represent weak excuses for a limited effort rather than valid objections to the type of program proposed by Senator GORE. I was sorry to see that some of these arguments crept into your editorial.

There is, for example, the contention that the Gore bill proposed a crude quantitative race whereas we should abjure this and seek to excel qualitatively. I believe that this is an inaccurate representation of the purpose of the bill. The point of the Gore bill is that we cannot learn how to build and operate atomic power stations economically unless we build some, and that the sooner we get started, the more rapidly we will learn. Respectable scientific opinion supports this view.

The abnormally high costs associated with these first developmental plants require the utility industry in common prudence to proceed more slowly than would the Government, with its much larger resources. If the Gore bill were enacted, AEC surely would endeavor to build plants that would contribute a maximum to the qualitative improvement of the power-reactor art, and could afford to try more advanced designs than can the private utilities. The conservatism of most of the private utility designs has been testified to, in the recent hearings, by Dr. Walter Zinn, perhaps the leading reactor designer in the United States, and by the eminent atomic scientist and one-time member of the Atomic Energy Commission, Dr. Henry D. Smyth.

I thoroughly agree with you that we need a "clear sense of direction" and a "heroic effort," and that the program should not be "bedeviled by doctrinaire notions." The American Public Power Association has long advocated some Government demonstration plants, in addition to the non-Federal projects, for the reason that this is the most effective way to advance rapidly in the technology. Moreover, we have urged that this question not become entangled in public versus private power controversies.

Unfortunately, it has been so entangled, largely because the private utility industry insists on believing that the principal issue is not the development of the technology but the prevention of electric-energy production by the Government through the use of the heat of nuclear fission. A review of the testimony before the joint committee indicates that this is the underlying reason for the monolithic opposition of the private utilities to the Gore bill, and their continuing efforts to prove that this country is probably incapable of doing anything more on atomic power than the utilities already have proposed.

The central point of the Gore bill, which tends to become obscured, is that the private industry with which we must be chiefly concerned and which the Gore bill aims to stimulate is the power-reactor manufacturing industry. This industry and not the utility industry is the key to technological development; the utility industry represents the market for new types of plants, not their developer.

Under the program proposed by Senator GORE, AEC would be expanding the market for the reactor manufacturing industry, and its opportunities to learn by doing. Having learned, the manufacturers would be able to supply practical plants to the utilities, domestic and foreign, private and public. However, to advance the art, the equipment manufacturers need firm contracts for plants, rather than plans and proposals. The Gore bill proposes to provide additional contracts now.

Another misleading objection to the Gore bill is the argument that the current shortage of scientific and technical manpower would be worsened by the initiation of projects by the Government. As a matter of fact, the manpower shortage should be a reason for undertaking additional projects rather than an argument for holding back. Historically we have trained our reactor engineers through designing and building reactors. Additional projects would serve to enlarge our pool of experienced reactor designers and builders, especially if they were undertaken with the deliberate policy of expanding the number of power reactor contractors.

There is of course the additional fact that a number of responsible firms are eager to undertake power reactor projects but have not yet been able to break into the business. During the recent war, we found that the manufacturing industry if given contracts is able to respond magnificently and to overcome such supposed obstacles as manpower and materials shortages once the decision is made that somehow they have to be overcome.

I can't resist commenting, finally, on the closing paragraph of your editorial. I am curious as to why it might be imprudent to concentrate available scientific skills and scarce materials on the six reactors in this country proposed by Senator GORE but possibly meritorious to build demonstration power reactors abroad. I would suppose that the construction of prototype plants abroad would take the same amounts of materials as domestic projects and probably be a heavier drain on our scientific and technical manpower because of greater geographical scattering.

I am not objecting to aiding our friends abroad but I cannot follow your argument that a foreign experimental plant program would somehow be less difficult to accomplish than a similar program in this country.

ALEX RADIN,
General Manager, American Public Power Association.
WASHINGTON.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the acting minority leader, with the statement that my plans for the afternoon are to make my major speech on educational problems for this session. However, as always, I am delighted to cooperate with the leadership; and I shall be glad to postpone my speech until whatever hour is necessary, in order to accommodate the leadership, in the interest of completing the business of the Senate.

I understand that the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] has an item or two to present to the Senate. Without losing my right to the floor, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the leadership of the Senate for the transaction of whatever business the leadership wishes to have transacted, with the understanding that at the conclusion of the transaction of such business my right to the floor will be preserved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for his willingness to yield under those conditions. The majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] had previously given notification with respect to 4 or 5 bills of a noncontroversial nature, which are under the charge of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. Twice she was called to the Chamber to have the bills taken up, and each time, upon arriving, she found that speeches were beginning or in progress. There has been continual interruption. I know that she, too, will very much appreciate the courtesy which has been extended.

JURISDICTION OF FEDERAL COURTS IN CERTAIN REEMPLOYMENT CASES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3307) to amend section 9 (d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to authorize jurisdiction in Federal courts in certain reemployment cases.

Mr. PAYNE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment of the Committee on Armed Services will be stated.

The amendment was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 9 (d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, is amended by striking "or" immediately following "subsection (b)", inserting a comma in lieu thereof, striking the comma immediately following "subsection (c) (1)" and inserting in lieu thereof "or subsection (g)".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall take effect as of June 19, 1951.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement on the bill which I have prepared be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE

This bill is intended to make the reemployment rights conferred on training duty reservists by the Universal Military Training and Service Act enforcible in the Federal courts.

Training duty reservists are those on active duty for training only, other than those reservists who are performing 6 months of active duty for training under the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, whose reemployment rights are prescribed in that act. The training duty reservists affected by this bill are those performing active duty for training of 2 weeks, weekend training, or training performed in any of the 48 drills required annually by the Reserve Forces Act of 1955.

The reemployment rights of these reservists are prescribed by paragraph (3) of section 9 (g) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. Unlike other sections of this act dealing with reemployment rights, this paragraph does not specifically provide Federal jurisdiction for the enforcement of these rights. A recent Federal district court decision held that in the absence of specific language conferring Federal jurisdiction that the Federal courts cannot enforce the leave of absence rights that training duty reservists have under paragraph (3) of section 9 (g). This bill would confer that jurisdiction retroactively to the effective date of the 1951 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

The bill is favored by the Department of Labor, the Department of Defense, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and probably by other veterans organizations.

ELIMINATION OF FEE FOR FURNISHING VETERANS CERTAIN CERTIFICATES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2111, House bill 6274.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6274) to provide that no fee shall be charged a veteran discharged under honorable conditions for furnishing him or his next of kin or legal representative a copy of a certificate showing his service in the Armed Forces.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared regarding the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE

The purpose of H. R. 6274 is to provide that honorably discharged veterans, or their legal representatives, may be furnished without payment a copy of the veteran's certificate of military service.

At the present time, military departments, based on an interpretation of existing law, furnish veterans with one copy of their certificate of service without charge. This procedure however gives rise to the administrative burden of determining for each request whether the veteran has already been furnished a copy of his certificate. Surveys conducted by the Department of Defense indicate that more than 90 percent of the requests are initial requests on the part of the serviceman. This bill in effect provides that the veteran may be furnished more than one copy, but only one at a time. This legislation, in addition to reducing the existing administrative burden, will recognize the legitimate requests of veterans for copies of their certificates of service.

ELIGIBILITY FOR RETIREMENT UNDER ARMY AND AIR FORCE VITALIZATION AND RETIREMENT EQUALIZATION ACT OF 1948

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2112, House bill 5516.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5516) to amend title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide that service as an Army field clerk, or as a field clerk, quartermaster corps, shall be counted for purposes of retirement under title III of that act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement on the bill which I have prepared be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE

The purpose of H. R. 5516 is to recognize the service as an Army field clerk for the purpose of Reserve retirement under title III, Public Law 810 of the 80th Congress which is sometimes known as the Reserve Retirement Act.

Field clerk service is already recognized for purposes of retirement under certain other statutes including title II of Public Law 810, the Warrant Officer Act of 1954, the statutes relating to retirement for enlisted men and for certain individuals under the Career Compensation Act of 1949. This bill would merely recognize the same service as field clerk for the purposes of title III.

The Department of Defense advises that the cost of this legislation would be nominal since only a small number of individuals could possibly be affected due to the fact that the duty of field clerk ceased to exist following the passage of the act of April 27, 1926.

The enactment of this bill will enable the small group of former field clerks who are retired under title III of Public Law 810 to receive the same treatment as those field clerks who are retired under other statutes.

Mr. SMATHERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCREASE IN RETIRED PAY OF CERTAIN FORMER MEMBERS OF THE LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2165, S. 3581.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3581) to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments.

THE NATION'S STAKE IN EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I announced earlier this afternoon, I propose for the next hour or so to present my major discussion in this session of Congress of my views on the issue of education. I shall discuss it under the general speech title "The Nation's Stake in Education."

Just before Congress adjourned last summer, I spoke to the Senate about our failure to act on legislation that would help the States bear the cost of education. Not only did I express my great disappointment at this omission in our legislative record, but I called upon the President to call a special session for the purpose of adopting legislation on this subject. That was not done, as we know. The conditions that prevailed in the Nation's schools then, prevail now. Overcrowding, half-day schedules, an extremely high rate of turnover in the teaching profession, and the use of unqualified persons as teachers continue to characterize the American school system at the primary and secondary levels.

Mr. President, I cannot stress too strongly the teacher shortage. I believe the figures will show that 23 percent of the high schools of America do not offer courses in chemistry and physics. Let us ponder the implications of that fact for a moment. Twenty-three percent

of the high schools of America do not even offer courses in physics and chemistry.

How can we, in this scientific age, keep ahead of Soviet Russia when, under the Russian educational system, scientific training is the major emphasis and the major goal?

One of the reasons why there has been such a letdown in scientific training in American high schools is the difficulty of keeping science teachers in the high schools. Because of the great shortage of trained personnel which are so vital to the operation of our private-enterprise system, a high-school science teacher does not have to remain in a high-school science laboratory or in a high-school classroom in order to make a living—such a living as is afforded by a high-school teacher's salary. I have talked to many high-school science teachers. Most of them can walk out of a science classroom into private industry at from 50 to 100 percent more in salary, to start with, than they are getting at the present time in their teaching jobs.

Mr. President, I speak of high schools which offer no courses in physics and chemistry. I do not have the figures showing the percentage of the high schools which offer only one of those science courses. Some high schools offer 1 subject 1 year and the other the next year, and other high schools offer only 1 of the subjects year in and year out.

Having mentioned in the very introduction of my speech the teacher shortage, I wanted to apply it to the field of scientific training. We had better face that situation before it is too late, because in the years ahead, which will be marked by the great contest between freedom and totalitarianism, we cannot afford to waste brainpower; we cannot afford to fail to develop the brainpower of every child of capacity in America.

I may sound like an old schoolteacher today, and I did teach for 21 years, but, Mr. President, that educational training has given me at least some appreciation of the seriousness of the problem which I am discussing today. We know now that with the development of testing techniques the abilities, capacities, aptitudes, and intelligence of children in the grades can be tested with surprising accuracy. It is remarkable what scientific research in the field of mental testing and aptitude testing has brought forth. The fact is, Mr. President, a pretty good job of detecting the potentialities of a child to be a nuclear physicist can be done when he is still in the grades. A pretty good job can be done of detecting the potentialities of scientific aptitude in boys and girls who are still in the grades. We are wasting them by thousands.

Mr. President, as you and I sit in the Senate Chamber this afternoon, we should keep in mind the frightening fact that we are denying tens of thousands of American boys and girls a college education. You and I are doing it; the American taxpayers are doing it; American public opinion is doing it, because, for some reason, there has been a failure to stir the imagination and the understanding of the American people and to make them realize the serious import of the educational problem, and what its proper solution will mean to the future history of the Republic.

Mr. President, we cannot justify human wastage. We cannot justify brainpower wastage. With the foreign-policy problems which will confront us in the years ahead, we cannot justify wasting the potentialities of a single nuclear physicist, biochemist, engineer, or any other scientifically trained mind.

Do you know why, Mr. President? Because we have to keep ahead of Russia in brainpower. We cannot keep ahead of her in manpower; but we had better see to it that we are ahead of her in brainpower in the hundred years ahead, because the fight for freedom will be won with brainpower, and in no small measure it will be won by scientifically trained men and women.

That is why in the introduction of my speech this afternoon, I make this plea for more teachers. That is why I make this plea for better salaries for teachers, better employment conditions for teachers, because these great public servants are entitled to much better treatment than they are receiving from the American taxpayers.

When I make my argument this afternoon for a greatly enlarged Federal-aid-to-education program, Mr. President, I am pleading the cause not only of the boys and girls of America, but of the teachers of America. I am not only pleading their cause, but I am pleading for a strong America of the future. It is a deep conviction of mine that America will not be strong in the great struggle between freedom and totalitarianism if we continue to waste potential brainpower.

I shall have more to say about the implications of this thesis later in my speech, but I thought it was important to strike a blow for it at the very beginning, and to ask the oratorical question, What Senator can stand on the floor of the Senate and put a price tag on a nuclear physicist? What Senator can tell the American people what a biochemist is worth? Where is the Senator who thinks he can evaluate, for example, the worth to America of nuclear engineers? We are wasting them in the sense that we are not affording an opportunity for the development of potential biochemists, nuclear physicists, and engineers, because, as a result of the low standards of education in some of the high schools and grade schools of America we are denying to potential scientists what they must have in order to qualify and succeed in college.

We are denying this opportunity to students numbered in the tens of thousands, on the basis of one of the most fallacious of all the propaganda arguments of the reactionaries in the field of social science in America—the argument of creeping socialism. Unfortunately, the reactionary political forces of the United States have sold that bill of goods to millions of Americans, and they are cheating Americans by the false propaganda cry of creeping socialism. Anyone who stands on the floor of the Senate, as I am standing this afternoon, and raises his voice against it, should be ready to read the editorials about how dangerous and radical he is and how he is striking at the very foundation of the little red schoolhouse at the crossroads of America. You would think, Mr. President, that the words I utter here, and the views I express, would tear the schoolhouse apart, according to the thinking of the reactionaries who are living in the Neanderthal age and have not done their homework. Those reactionaries speak, for the most part, out of gross ignorance. They are the best exhibit I can offer of the need of higher standards of education in America, because they demonstrate that they have not received education of the quality for which I am pleading this afternoon.

Creeping socialism, Mr. President? I can remember when the great Senator Taft, with whom I disagreed on a great many issues, but with whom I worked shoulder to shoulder on this issue, used to stand at the desk now occupied by the acting minority leader and answer the castigation that was brought against him to the effect that he was a creeping socialist because he favored Federal aid to education. I can remember as though it were yesterday how Bob Taft used to stand at his desk, shake his finger at the Senate, and say, "If anyone wants to have written into this bill any language he thinks is stronger and will give greater guaranty to the school districts of America and to the States of America of continued control over their educational system, give it to me and I will write it into the bill."

And then Bob Taft used to go on to say, "Of course, my challenge will not be met in the Senate, because no one can write language stronger in protecting the States than is the language I have in my Federal-aid-to-education bill."

I am paraphrasing him accurately, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, if one will refer to the RECORD and check his argument.

Then he used to go on to say, "How can there be Federal domination of the school system of America if we write into the bill the section which provides, in effect, that any Federal money which is allocated to the States by way of Federal aid to education shall be commingled with State funds, and spent by State officials in accordance with State education policies?" That is the complete answer to the cry of "creeping socialism," which is always raised as a bogeyman and scarecrow on the whole subject of Federal aid to education.

I want to answer that point very early in my speech, because I do not believe it is justifiable to deny to American boys and girls an equality of educational opportunity by maintaining across the land schools which will provide a minimum standard of education, and will inadequately develop the educational potentialities of the child. It is not justifiable, I say, to use such a fallacious argument as that Federal aid to education is "creeping socialism." I speak advisedly when I say that, for in my book

that argument of the reactionary is true subversion.

Mr. President, if we want to consider a subversive influence which is undermining the very foundations of the Republic, take a look at the argument of the reactionary who tries to maintain that Federal aid to education along the lines of the Taft bill in 1949 constitutes some form of creeping socialism. Such a statement is subversion, in my judgment, in the sense that it strikes a serious blow at the future of the Republic, because the future of the Republic is dependent upon the development of the maximum manpower potentialities of the American people when they are in school.

Oh, certainly, the reactionaries do not like to hear that said about them; but I have always been at a loss to understand their objective. For the life of me, I cannot understand what they hope to accomplish by the adoption of a reactionary educational policy which will cheat American boys and girls out of the full development of their educational opportunities.

Oh, yes, on this subject, too, there is raised the old bogey of States rights. How many times have we heard it said on the floor of the Senate that Federal aid to education in some way interferes with States rights? That is another highly fallacious argument which is thrown around loosely from time to time by our colleagues in debate on the floor of the Senate.

It is always interesting to hear the user of the States rights argument stutter and sputter and fumble around when he is asked the simple penetrating question, "Is such a bill unconstitutional?" No States rights argument has any standing as such since Marbury against Madison, unless the proponent of the argument wants to show that the bill which is being offered is unconstitutional, in that it gives to the Federal Government powers not delegated to it.

I have said before in the Senate, but it needs to be repeated on this subject, that no one will fight for States rights quicker than will the senior Senator from Oregon any time anyone wants to show me that a proposed piece of legislation violates the rights of the States under the Constitution of the United States. But as the Morrill Act was constitutional, there can be no question, in my judgment, that the Bob Taft bill of 1949 was constitutional. It fell within the delegated authority of the Federal Government to be of assistance to the States in the field of education, so long as the control was left to the States.

Mr. President, if we ever started to eliminate from the statute books, on the basis of the States rights argument, all laws which provided aid to the States by the Federal Government, pandemonium would break loose in the Senate of the United States—and the States righters would be among the very first to try to stop the repeal of such legislation.

Yes, Mr. President, Bob Taft was right in the matter of Federal aid to education; and before I finish my speech this afternoon I shall offer anew the Bob Taft bill of 1949, revised in order to bring it up to date in the light of the assistance, advice, and suggestions I have received from some of the great educators and educational organizations of this country.

As one who disagreed with Bob Taft on many issues, I am exceedingly proud to stand on the floor of the Senate today and support a contribution which Bob Taft made in the United States Senate in the field of education. It was one of his greatest contributions. I regret that he did not live long enough to see the great battle he waged for Federal aid to education bear fruit by the passage of a law to implement and effectuate it. In my judgment, the issue is such a nonpartisan one that I am particularly proud, as one who generally is considered as having been an opponent of so much of the political philosophy of Bob Taft, to fight on the floor of the Senate this afternoon for this part of Taft's point of view, which I think is unanswerable, is sound, and represents a policy which I believe ought to be enacted.

One more word on the States rights argument. Of course, what most of the States righters really mean is that they do not think the policy is good public policy. That is a quite different thing. The matter of semantics is very important. The matter of verbal definition is very important. If a Senator wants to argue that he thinks from the standpoint of public policy Federal aid to education should not be adopted, I am perfectly willing to meet him on that argument and respect his point of view. But when he tries to bring in the fallacious argument that Federal aid to education violates States rights, then, I repeat, he immediately assumes the burden of showing that the proposal is unconstitutional; because if the Federal Government has the constitutional power to do what a given bill calls for, no State right is violated. The situation is merely one in which the Federal Government is exercising constitutional rights delegated to it by the Federal Constitution.

A little more than a year ago, as I recall, the Senate was considering a bill having to do with branch offices of Federally chartered building and loan associations. As I sat in the Senate, I listened with amazement to a couple of colleagues make the old eagle on the dome of the Chamber flap its wings as they made their argument about States rights. They claimed that the Federal Government was interfering with States rights in the field of banking. I thought the argument was very amusing.

So, as the RECORD will show, I asked one of my colleagues if he was ready to show that the bill before the Senate was unconstitutional and if it provided for the exercise of Federal power denied to the Federal Government under the Constitution. One of his colleagues came over to me later, sat down, laughed, and said, "We were waiting for someone to wrap that argument around our necks. We recognize that in that sense the bill does not violate States rights. You are quite right. What we mean is that we think the matter ought to be left to the States, although we recognize the power of the Federal Government in the field of building and loan legislation." I said, "I do not see how you can very well deny it, because the courts have already sustained the constitutionality of the original act, and this is an amendment of the original act. It in no way encroaches upon any constitutional power of the States."

I have made this point because it seems to me those of us who have been fighting for Federal aid to education have not sufficiently answered the scarecrow shibboleths and fallacious arguments which take the form of reactionary political propaganda against the welfare of America's boys and girls and their teachers; and I wanted to make these comments very early in this speech, because I think it is very important to recognize that, as a Federal Government, we have the right, under the Constitution, to proceed with the type of legislation for which Bob Taft fought so valiantly in the Senate.

UNITED STATES SAGS; SOVIET SPURTS

So now, returning to my prepared remarks, Mr. President, I want to say a few words under the topic, "The United States Sags While the Soviet Union Spurts in the Field of Education."

At the same time that the United States is failing even to hold its own in providing a sound, fundamental education to its youth, the Soviet half of the world is devoting special attention to the training and education of its young people, particularly in the sciences. In 1955, we spent a percentage of our national income on education, equaling the 1930 level for the first time, after 25 years of depression and war that laid the inevitable penalty on education, as our energies and resources were diverted into other channels.

LAG IN SCIENCE TRAINING

The result has been that in an age of the most rapid scientific development and advancement in the history of mankind and the increasing necessity for communication among the people of all countries, 23 percent of American public high schools offer neither chemistry nor physics, and 46 percent offer no foreign language. In the 1955–56 school year, 58 percent of our public elementary and secondary teachers had less than 4 years of college preparation. One in 14 of those teachers does not meet the minimum requirements in his State for a teaching certificate, and holds an "emergency" certificate. Let me say, Mr. President, that we are lucky to have these teachers. I cast no reflection on them. I think we would find that most of them, if they were given the opportunity and the financial assistance they need, would have the full teacher's qualifications.

Yet the services of those teachers have become an integral part of the total teaching staff, and in fact their employment is no longer regarded by the Office of Education as an emergency measure.

These men and women have, of course, performed a service to the Nation by entering a profession for which they were not formally and specifically prepared.

But the fact that they are so urgently needed indicates our failure to maintain our own standards in educating our young people.

Both the National Education Association and the White House Conference on Education point out that the teacher shortage is most crucial in the sciences and mathematics at the high school level. Specifically, the number of men and women graduating from college with training to teach mathematics is 42 percent less this year than in 1950; and the number of people trained to teach science is 51 percent less than the number graduated in 1950. Even from these fewer trained men and women, only between one-half and two-thirds actually enter teaching.

LOCAL FINANCING PROBLEMS

As has been recited time and again on this floor and in committee hearings on education bills, our population has increased more rapidly than have the revenues from the sources ordinarily used for education, and will continue to do so in the foreseeable future. We are now educating nearly 38 million children. A conservative estimate by the Census Bureau is that by 1965 we shall have 48 million children in the 5 to 17 age group, out of a population of 190 million. It is also significant to note that a disproportionately large share of these children will be in high school, the most expensive level to maintain. In 1965, there will be 12 million boys and girls of high-school age, compared to 9.4 million today. Where a 4 percent increase in the 5 to 7 group is anticipated, and a 34 percent increase in the 8 to 11 group, we shall have 54 percent more children of 12 and 13, and 58 percent more of 14 to 17 in 1965 than in 1954. Therefore, it must be anticipated that the cost of education per child will rise more than the simple projection of today's expenditure per child until well into the 1960's. These figures, I might point out, are the total school-age population, not just the estimate of public school enrollment or average daily attendance. They are estimates of the total obligation of the American people in terms of education of its youth.

The estimates of the increasing bill for education are calculated by the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools in various ways. By projecting the present outlay per child to the 1965 population figures, the Commission concludes that we shall have to spend $13.5 billion a year where we spend $10 billion today, just to keep pace with the population increase.

This has nothing to do, Mr. President, with the need of improving the low standards of education to which tens of thousands of American boys and girls are subjected today. The figures I have just given are figures which show only what has to be done by way of expenditures to keep pace with the population increase, even if the low standards were not improved one whit.

The amount the Commission estimates as the future cost would do no more than maintain the 1954 expenditure level of $278 per child. To raise the per child expenditure in every State to the national average would require a total outlay of $14.7 billion in 1965, or $1.2 billion more than the total would be if today's level of spending is only continued. Right now, $910 millions is needed in addition to what we are spending to raise the 23 low States to the current national average per child outlay of $278.

At the same time that our population will be increasing, so will our anticipated gross national product. This same Citizens Commission cites a conservative estimate by the Department of Commerce that the gross national product in 1965 will be $525 billions, a 44 percent increase over 1953. When compared to the anticipated increase in the number of school-age children of about 37 percent, there should be little cause for worry as to the availability of wealth to finance education. In total, overall national terms, that is true, barring a war or economic collapse. But we do have something to worry about when it comes to whether the money will actually be raised, and how it will be raised.

One major difficulty we are encountering in the financing of education is the historic reliance upon the general property tax as the major source of money. As recently as 1930, 84 percent of the financial support for the public schools came from the general property tax. Even during World War II, it raised 65 percent of the money for education at the primary and secondary levels. Today the percentage has declined to about 52. The income to a community from the general property tax has not reflected the rising national wealth which has boosted costs and accompanied a growing school-age population. It is also relevant to point out that the general property tax must support nearly all the services of local government, since it accounts for 90 percent of the tax revenues of local governments in the United States.

The overall result of the inadequacies of the general property tax has been that, as a percentage of personal income, its yield has declined from 7.1 percent, in 1930, to 3.3 percent, in 1950. As used today, it simply does not raise money where it is needed, and in the amount needed. This is not to say that the general property tax cannot produce more revenue, or that all local tax sources are exhausted. But it is costly and difficult for local governments to tap their intangible wealth; and that is the form that must increasingly be tapped, if we are to have a good standard of education for our boys and girls.

As we know, the inadequacy of the property tax has been made up by the States themselves. In many regions of the country the States have always assumed the greatest responsibility for providing the money for education. This is particularly true in southern and western States, where the pattern of tax development was different from that in New England and the Middle West. But today the State governments furnish about 40 percent of the money spent for education, as compared with 17 percent in 1930; and this increase comes from rising State contributions to education in all States.

INCREASING STATE USE OF SALES TAX

As the States took over a larger part of the costs formerly borne by local governments, they had to find new tax sources. And as they relinquished the property tax, they increasingly have shifted to types of levies that are even less in accord with ability to pay than the property tax. They shifted to gross-receipts taxes, selected sales taxes, and general sales taxes, the most regressive type of taxation invented, the one that takes the most, relative to disposable income, from the people least able to pay. Some States have levied income taxes, but with a far less degree of progressivity than the Federal income tax; and even in 1955, only 18.2 percent of all State revenue came from income, estate, and gift taxes. Before 1930, the gross-receipts tax and general sales tax were unknown at the State level. Today, they account for 23 percent of State funds; and, combined with other forms of sales taxes and excises, they raise 60 percent of State money. Because of this increase in the State use of sales taxes, and the increased State share in the financing of education, the National Education Association estimates that sales taxes of various kinds are financing education to the extent of 23 percent. Twenty-five years ago, no education money came from such taxes.

I believe these figures support the general statement that, although, in the final analysis, today we are spending about the same part of our wealth on education as we did before the depression, we are raising the money at the State level, rather than at the local level, and we are doing it with sales taxes, rather than with taxes based on ability to pay. This is a fairly recent development in governmental finance, and it shows every sign of continuing to develop in the same direction unless we make a conscious effort to change it. That is what I propose we do. I believe that expenditures for education must be increased, but not by taking more money from the people with low incomes—which is what will happen if in financing education we stay wholly within the existing State tax structure.

FAIR SHARING OF COST OF EDUCATION

In 1895, the Federal Government provided 5.5 percent of the funds for education; today, it provides only a small fraction—2.6 percent—although it collects nearly 70 percent of all tax revenues. This figure has been reached, not only because of additional Federal activities and responsibilities, but also because the Federal Government is the only level that can assess and levy a tax on the kind of wealth that now characterizes our economy. Estimates for 1955 show that corporate and individual income taxes and estate and gift taxes, all of which are based on ability to pay, accounted for 79 percent of Federal receipts. At the State level, they accounted for only 18.2 percent of State receipts. Because our economy is a national one that can be assessed most accurately and taxed most fairly at the national level, I believe the Federal Government must come through with the funds that will

have to be added to current State and local efforts if in the decades ahead our children are to have a good education. I do not suggest that the States cannot or will not raise for education more money than they are now raising, but, if they do, it will be at the expense of those least able to bear the burden of additional taxes, whereas, if the Federal Government takes over the added cost, it will be borne in proportion to income and ability to carry the burden.

The many precedents—which amount, in effect, to a tradition of Federal assistance to promote education—need not be stated now. Last year, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a compilation of Federal-aid bills going back to 1919. Other congressional documents that outline the history of Federal measures going back to the Northwest Ordinance are available. I should also like to remind my colleagues of Senate bill 772, the oil-for-education bill, of which I am a cosponsor. That measure would devote to education the proceeds from leases and royalties from our natural resources under the sea, in the Continental Shelf. I am informed that the receipts from the minerals in the Federal part of the offshore lands will amount to close to $6 billion. At that rate, it could shoulder almost the entire cost of this program for some time to come.

WHAT THE EDUCATION ACT OF 1956 WOULD DO

The measure I am introducing today is a moderate one, in terms of the need. In proposing the expenditure of $1 billion a year, I do not suggest that the States will be relieved of any of their task in providing funds for education. But, when added to their own efforts, it will give our boys and girls a little more than the bare essential of a primary and secondary education, which is all that many can now look forward to; and far too many cannot look forward even to that.

Judging from the amounts proposed in school construction bills and teachers' salary bills in recent years, one billion dollars is the very least that is needed for all educational costs. School-construction legislation for the most part would allow around half a billion dollars a year in appropriations. Teachers' salary bills have proposed as much as $600 million a year, and that amount was proposed as long ago as 1947 to equalize teachers' salaries. So a bill making money available for these purposes and for all other costs of maintenance, books and equipment, transportation, and whatever else a State spends its own educational funds for, calls for a bare minimum of $1 billion a year, in my judgment. This amount was also selected because it is roughly what is needed to raise the low States to the national average, in terms of expenditures per child. This year, $910 million more are needed to educate every child at the rate of $278 a year, the current national average. By 1965, the need will be for $1.2 billion a year more than is expected to be spent, unless the States embark on some prodigious new efforts of their own. Of course, under the provisions of the bill this money would not be distributed entirely to the low States. But it need not be, since in many of these States, more education can be bought with a low expenditure per child.

THE FORMULA

In the bill, I have provided that of the 95 percent to be distributed by formula, half shall be distributed on a flat grant basis. Each child, wherever he or she may live, will receive from the Federal Government an equal amount to help pay for his or her education. The other half will be distributed in inverse ratio to the income per child in each State, which is the measure of the resources the State has to draw on. The distribution of funds by this method would result in a variation in the allotment per child from the poorest State to the richest State of just about 2 to 1. That provides for some equalization of expenditures but also assures the wealthy States that their greater costs per child are also recognized and taken into account. This is not an extreme equalization formula; it is a moderate one. I have selected it because I appreciate that education is expensive everywhere and that standards need to be raised everywhere, but that they need to be raised more in some States than in others.

The formula is well suited to this purpose, but if a better one can be devised, I shall be glad to accept it.

Mr. President, let me digress at this point to say that in fact I take exactly the same position Bob Taft took in 1949, when he introduced the Taft bill, which many of us cosponsored. It is important, it seems to me, that we get to work on the problem. It is important, it seems to me, that we enact some legislation in this field and at this session. It is important, it seems to me, that one who authors such a bill as this should keep his mind completely open and be willing to accept whatever reasonable modification or amendment is offered, so long as it does not in any way destroy the objectives of the bill.

Therefore, I say to the Senate this afternoon that I am not married to this bill. I am perfectly willing to accept amendments to it, if anyone can show that such an amendment improves the bill. However, I will not go along with any crippling amendments which seek to destroy the goals and the objectives of the bill.

STATE CONTROL ASSURED

This precise formula will also enable everyone to figure out how much money will go to each State and how much per child will go to each State; that is the purpose of the bill. It has no string attached; there is no requirement for matching or for minimum expenditures by a State. Neither does it require that the Federal funds be spent for any particular part of the cost of education, or that funds be spent in certain school districts first.

I believe in the sincerity of the States and communities in trying to furnish their children with good education, and in their efforts to raise the money to do it. I have tried to avoid requiring special legislation by a State, though it may be necessary in some States in order to provide for acceptance of the money and its disbursement. The formula leaves almost no discretion or supervisory authority to the Office of Education or any Federal official or agency, and the bill spells out in the same language used by Senator Taft in his aid-to-education bill that the bill endows no power or authority of any kind, size, or shape to a Federal administrative officer or agency in the distribution of 95 percent of the funds appropriated.

The only discretionary power authorized in it is in the arrangements to be made with the Territories and dependencies to give them additional grants, amounting to 3 percent of the funds appropriated, and the determination of which special needs shall be entitled to additional help. Two percent of the money is available for this purpose.

PROVIDING FOR SPECIAL NEEDS

This set-aside was made to accommodate teaching and training programs that may not be offered in the regular elementary and secondary curricula, and to provide a cushion of funds for distribution in the event of natural disasters that so often wipe out schools and school property. One of the greatest shortcomings in our school system is the lack of instruction for children who do not fall within the great mass of boys and girls in capacity to learn. At one extreme are the retarded, who are just as deserving of education to the fullest extent of their abilities as are normal boys and girls. At the other extreme are the exceptionally gifted children who could absorb more education if it were available.

One of the interesting financial facts and problems connected with this educational issue is that the education of the retarded is expensive. It requires a great deal of money to provide the special techniques, the special materials, the special teachers, and the special training to develop to the maximum extent of its potentialities the retarded mind. It is sound economy to make the expenditure. I do not wish to be overstating to emphasize a point. I think I am indulging in an understatement when I say that I am inclined to think that if we were developing the retarded minds among our boys and girls to the maximum level possible, we would save the cost of the extra expense involved in the crime bill of America—not that a good many of the retarded children, developed to the maximum extent possible, would not provide problems of juvenile delinquency and crime. But it is also true—and I speak with a background of many years' experience in the field of crime surveys and the administration of criminal justice—that a very large segment of the crime problem must be attributed to the retarded mind which has not been developed to the maximum extent of its retarded potentiality.

So what I should like to point out in this speech is the interrelationship between the development of the brain power of America to the maximum capacity of our boys and girls, and other problems in our body politic—the problem of juvenile delinquency, the problem of crime, and other problems, as well as the desirability in a republic of having the highest

level of public enlightenment. I think we fail to carry out the primary purpose of our political society if we do not provide the facilities which make possible the maximum development of the brainpower potentials of our citizenry. We cannot have the most enlightened citizenry unless we provide such facilities. We cannot escape the gem of wisdom of Thomas Jefferson when he pointed out—and I paraphrase him—that the strength of a democracy can be no greater than the enlightenment of its people.

I am talking this afternoon about an educational program which seeks to raise to the highest level possible the enlightenment of our people through educational processes. I make a plea at this point in my speech for the retarded boy and girl, to whom, if we have any religious faith in us at all, we owe a great moral obligation.

All I do on this point is to present to the Senate the obligation which constantly confronts us, of implementing spiritual and moral values. This is one of them—the moral obligation that we owe to the retarded boy or girl.

We can see these values a little easier when we are dealing with the boy or girl retarded physically rather than mentally. It is easy, comparatively speaking, to raise considerable sums of money for assistance to the physically handicapped boy or girl. I belong to a great order which does a great humanitarian work among the crippled children of America. Through that order large sums of money are raised each year for crippled children in the United States. In my judgment we cannot do too much for our crippled children. But it is also important that someone raise a voice in plea for the mentally retarded children of America, the children who, in effect, are crippled in their intelligence, who do not have a high IQ. Nevertheless, they are human beings, entitled, in my judgment, to all the generosity which our hearts are able to pour out to them. They have a service to perform for society. They can render a constructive and affirmative service to society if we will but recognize that in our educational processes we should develop to the greatest extent possible their intellectual abilities, retarded though they may be.

So when I make this plea this afternoon for more money for the schoolchildren of America and the teachers of America, who are rendering great public service in the classrooms, I am pleading also for adequate funds for education for the retarded, because if we develop their maximum potentialities we shall find that the greater percentage of them will live useful, law-abiding lives, performing tasks essential to the operation of our economy and our society.

Not only must we pay attention to the retarded boys and girls, and the normal boys and girls, but we must recognize also those at the other extreme, the specially and exceptionally gifted boys and girls. Of course, the cost of their education is high. Yet there is no question about the soundness of this economy. There is no question about the fact that the economic dollars we pour into the training and development of the specially gifted child will return to our country many, many times the cost of the education of the boy or girl.

The great waste and the inexcusable waste is that not one of those boys and girls is given the grade-school or high-school training which they need to develop their special gifts. The interesting thing about mental training is that if the gifted mind, the exceptional mind, which is in the class of genius, is not developed when the child is young, that mind is largely wasted; and it does not attain its potentialities in adulthood.

The interesting thing is that failure to develop the specially gifted mind frequently results in a warped mind, a dangerous mind. The percentage is small, but it is there.

In every penitentiary in America there are gifted minds that became warped. It is interesting how the case histories of many criminals show that as boys or girls they were not given the educational opportunities which would have caused their minds to blossom into a beautiful flower of public service; instead, for lack of educational nourishment, they were allowed to wither and die on the vine.

Mr. President, therefore I plead for a recognition, before it is too late, of the need of additional funds for the benefit of the gifted child.

There are the blind and those with other physical handicaps who require teaching methods and equipment not offered in regular schools. The Commissioner of Education is authorized in this bill to approve grants for special programs of this kind upon application from the State educational authority. He may also allot them to States hit by flood, fire, hurricane, or other disaster. Or he may allot them to States where a new educational service is being started that requires funds not otherwise available. There are many deserving uses for this money and the States may apply for it as they see fit.

DELAY DEEPENS CRISIS

The urgency of action on educational aid legislation is evident. The longer we delay, the more of our children will be denied sufficient training in professional and vocational skills, and in how to use their minds for the benefit of themselves and of society. Inaction today means undertrained citizens tomorrow. Two weeks ago this body passed a bill authorizing the expenditure of $28.5 billion over a 13-year period for new roads. That averages over $2 billion a year. New roads are needed for defense needs, for safety needs, and for commercial needs, and I was glad to support and vote for it. Yet is it any less essential for our national defense, for the safety and preservation of our Republic, and for the expansion of our commerce and industry that our citizens be well trained and educated? Free, required education is an institution that was peculiarly American for a long time. We have historically believed in it as a means of bettering ourselves individually and also as a vital factor in self-government by an informed people. Americans have consistently demonstrated their belief in the value of education, despite some brief eras when we have taken on the appearance of antiintellectualism. That belief and confidence are exemplified by the large percentage of the population who seek and gain higher education; by the enrollments in night classes and correspondence courses; by the public libraries and the free circulation of books. No other people have developed and made use of so many avenues to improve, train, and educate themselves as have Americans. We must continue to expand and develop the means whereby our people can prepare themselves to use their capacities to the fullest, and I view this approach of Federal financial aid as one more such method.

I urge that Congress not compound past sins of omission by postponing and delaying congressional action on aid to education. I call upon the Congress and upon all of my colleagues to join in assuring our boys and girls that we will not fail them by adopting this legislation, or a measure similar to it, in this session of the Congress.

I wish now briefly, in closing, to comment on two other points.

First, I wish to comment on the relationship of my bill to pending legislation such as legislation which deals separately with school construction and separately with teachers' salaries and other services.

I am in favor of that kind of legislation; but Mr. President, I have become tired of waiting for it. I am in favor of that kind of legislation; but it will not do the American boys and girls and teachers of this country any good to have it locked up in committee. I am in favor of that kind of legislation; but we ought to have some action on it. I do not believe that any ancillary issue or any political consideration or any partisan consideration has any place on the floor of the Senate in respect to the rights of American schoolchildren.

It is about time that we respected those rights and did something about them. It is about time that we either get some action on the special pieces of legislation, or pass a general aid-to-education bill such as I am introducing this afternoon.

I happen to believe that this is the best way to do the job. I say we should do the job. I believe we ought to go forward with school construction and teacher salary and service increases in a single piece of legislation.

As I said earlier in this speech, what good is a fine school building if an adequate number of competent teachers are not available for the classroom? Much has been said in the Senate about building schools. That is the old egg-chicken argument. I am not interested in that kind of exercise in semantics. America's boys and girls are entitled to schools and to teachers in sufficient quality, quantity, and competency to give them a high standard of education, so that we can keep ahead of Russia in brainpower. It is that simple and vital to the future of the Republic.

Mr. President, lastly I wish to call attention to the fact that my bill does not deal with what I think is one of the great needs of American education, on which we are going to have some legislation. I refer to the matter of scholarships. I

think, however, that subject is best suited to special legislation.

Mr. President, the wasting of a brilliant mind simply because the individual lacks the economic resources to develop his mind by higher education is an economic waste. It is a cultural waste, of course, but I wish to talk about it for a moment as an economic waste. It is an economic waste which the American people can ill afford. They can afford, Mr. President, the development of every brilliant mind within our citizenry. That is why I now serve notice that I shall support legislation which seeks to establish a system of Federal scholarships.

There are many problems involved in such legislation. I have turned my attention to it in some detail, Mr. President. There is the problem, again, of providing an equitable formula. There is the problem of a distribution formula which will remove the Federal Government from a position of domination. And, yet, in view of the great need for trained minds in this country, who can really justify our failure to send a potential scientist on to college, on to graduate work, and on to research, simply because the boy or girl does not have the economic resources to develop his or her capabilities?

We cannot afford as a society to engage in this sort of waste. I point out that, of course, under our educational system, the boys or girls who do have the means to train themselves as nuclear physicists or doctors or engineers in reality do not begin to pay for their education, even though they pay the costs which are assessed against them. Such costs are not the entire costs of their education. The taxpayers pay a substantial part of the cost of educating a doctor. In fact, doctors do not like to hear me say so, but they are one of the most subsidized professions in America, when we look not only at the cost of their education, a large percentage of the cost of which is borne by the taxpayers, but also at the cost of the facilities in which they carry on their practice after they have entered practice—the cost of hospitals and all the other facilities which go into the treating of the sick. Where would the doctors be economically if they had to pay those costs? And where would we, the poor patients, be if we had to pay the medical fees the doctors would have to charge if they had to pay for all the facilities which are used in getting us back to health?

I am always a little bit amused by some of the criticisms I receive sometimes because of the position I take on this subject, Mr. President, because I do not know of anyone in the Senate who has given greater support to health legislation, which is so sorely needed by the doctors themselves in order that they may carry on the private practice of medicine. I am for the private practice of medicine, but I wish to point out that when we get into the field of scientific training, the individual who is trained does not begin to pay the costs of his training.

That means that we are doing a double injustice at the same time, Mr. President, to the specially gifted boys or girls who could go on and be great scientists if they did not lack economic resources. We are denying to society an opportunity through training and service, to collect a little more by way of percentage in return to society in connection with the cost of the facilities we maintain for the training of scientists.

So, Mr. President, I shall support a scholarship bill, but I did not think it should be made a part of this bill, and it is not included in this bill.

In closing, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an analysis of my bill, section by section, including a table which shows the allocation of $500 million on the basis of per child population and $500 million in inverse proportion to the average income per school-age child, thus making available to Senators the operation of my formula in relation to each State and Territory.

There being no objection, the analysis and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION ACT OF 1956

Section 1 is the enacting clause and short title of the bill "The Education Act of 1956."

Section 2 of the bill makes clear that no direction or control over the States or local school jurisdictions of any kind shall be authorized. I believe the language it contains does explain that clearly; it is taken from the Taft education bill of 1949; but if there is other or additional language that can make this intention more specific or more complete, I shall welcome its inclusion in my bill.

AUTHORIZATION

Section 3 provides for an authorization of $1 billion a year to raise the level of educational standards nationwide and to equalize in part educational opportunities among the States. There is no limitation on the appropriations made under the bill. Neither is there a limitation on the term of the authorization. It shall be up to Congress to determine that this financial assistance is no longer needed.

DISTRIBUTION

Section 4 is the formula for distribution among the States. There is a great variety of possible methods of distribution, and I do not offer this one as the last word, but as a reasonable basis for further refinement. With the exception of 5 percent of the total appropriation which is reserved for other situations, the funds would be divided in this way: Half would be distributed among the States on the basis of school-age population. We know that the cost of education is rising everywhere, in the wealthy States as well as in the poorer States. A wealthy State, in terms of its per capita income, must spend relatively much more per child to give the child the same level of education that a smaller expenditure will provide in a State with lower cost and income indexes. We know, for example, that school construction in States with severe winters is considerably more costly than in States with mild winters, and that construction costs are also raised by higher wage levels and higher cost levels that prevail in some regions. Teachers' salaries that are high in one State as compared with other States, may be low in terms of other wages and salaries within that State. Therefore, I have felt that at least half the funds should be distributed on the basis of school-age population.

But it is also my purpose to equalize to some extent the educational opportunities among the States. That low per child outlay for education results in lower educational standards is evidenced by the high rejection rate of draftees in States with low per capita expenditures for education, and by many similar measures of relative performance. In order to provide additional help to the States having less financial resources on which to draw for educational expenses, I have provided that half the available funds shall be distributed in inverse proportion to the income per school-age child in each State. The outright ratio in per school child income was just about 4 to 1 in 1955, with New York having the highest and Mississippi the lowest; thus, this allotment per child in Mississippi would be four times that of New York. The overall per child gradation from the poorest to the richest State would be just a fraction more than 2 to 1.

SPECIAL PURPOSES

The section also sets aside 3 percent of the funds to be distributed by the Commissioner of Education to Alaska, Hawaii, the Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands and Guam, and the District of Columbia under terms agreed to with their local educational authorities. The remaining 2 percent would also be distributed by the Commissioner of Education to meet special needs that may arise. There is an alarming lack, for example, of programs to train and educate retarded youngsters at least to their full capacities, and our exceptionally bright children, as well. There is too little provision for educating our blind children and those with other types of physical handicap. Too often the boy or girl that varies in any way from the norm and needs or deserves special instruction, goes without because all available money is devoted entirely to the general educational program. It would be my expectation that the Commissioner of Education would receive application for funds for programs aimed at meeting these special needs and would allot them at his discretion. They would also be available for allotment in event of natural disasters—floods, storms, and the like—that so often wipe out school buildings and property at a total loss to the community. With appropriation of the full amount authorized, $20 million would be available for this purpose.

AVAILABILITY

Section 5 sets forth the availability of the funds. I have tried to eliminate all restriction on the States, requiring only that the Federal grant be used for education at the primary and secondary levels. However, some minimum technical requirements for handling the money are included. The State may disburse the money only through its State educational authority, to be designated by the State, and must make arrangements for acceptance of the funds, for reports to the Commissioner of Education and to Congress on how it is spent, and must provide for an annual audit. These State arrangements are listed in sections 6 and 7. I believe that Congress must require an accounting from the States as to how they have used the funds provided them and assure their expenditure in accord with proper legal procedures. But there is no test or penalty in terms of State expenditure from its own sources, no matching requirement, no directive that funds be used for public education, no requirement that funds be used for this or that part of the cost of education, and no requirement that funds be channeled to the poorest districts within the States. I have confidence in the efforts made in every State to improve its educational system. I think every State is conscientiously trying to give its children a good education and is capable of deciding how additional funds could be used most effectively within its borders. Every State knows what its problems are and

where money is most needed. What they need from Congress for education is money, not advice or directives on how to spend it.

Section 8 makes provision for the challenging of allotments as made by the Commissioner of Education by a State and for court determination of disputes that may arise.

Sections 9 and 10 define the terms used herein and provide for separability.

Allocation of $500 million on basis of per child population and $500 million in inverse proportion to average income per school-age child

State	Population aged 5–17, July 1954 (in thousands)	Apportionment of $500 million on basis of col. 2	Personal income per school-age child	Apportionment of $500 million on basis of col. 4	Total allocation per State	Allotment per child age 5–17
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Alabama	827	$11, 515, 540	$3, 959	$20, 493, 267	$32, 008, 807	$38. 70
Arizona	234	3, 258, 327	6, 274	3, 659, 003	6, 917, 330	29. 56
Arkansas	490	6, 822, 992	3, 592	13, 382, 925	20, 205, 917	41. 23
California	2, 540	35, 368, 163	10, 640	23, 419, 802	58, 787, 965	23. 14
Colorado	333	4, 636, 850	7, 592	4, 303, 079	8, 939, 929	26. 84
Connecticut	441	6, 140, 693	11, 698	3, 698, 435	9, 839, 128	22. 31
Delaware	77	1, 072, 184	11, 429	660, 961	1, 733, 145	22. 50
District of Columbia	148	2, 060, 822	12, 736	1, 140, 040	3, 200, 862	21. 62
Florida	703	9, 788, 905	7, 558	9, 125, 147	18, 914, 052	26. 90
Georgia	944	13, 144, 703	4, 725	19, 600, 246	32, 744, 949	34. 68
Idaho	156	2, 172, 218	5, 494	2, 785, 656	4, 957, 874	31. 78
Illinois	1, 867	25, 996, 992	10, 612	17, 259, 907	43, 256, 899	23. 16
Indiana	943	13, 130, 779	8, 239	11, 228, 674	24, 359, 453	25. 83
Iowa	592	8, 243, 288	7, 505	7, 738, 596	15, 981, 884	26. 99
Kansas	438	6, 098, 919	7, 801	5, 508, 271	11, 607, 190	26. 50
Kentueky	767	10, 680, 071	4, 720	15, 942, 067	26, 622, 138	34. 70
Louisiana	746	10, 387, 657	5, 028	14, 555, 756	24, 943, 413	33. 43
Maine	207	2, 882, 366	6, 415	3, 165, 667	6, 048, 033	29. 21
Maryland	572	7, 964, 799	8, 820	6, 362, 368	14, 327, 167	25. 04
Massachusetts	975	13, 576, 362	9, 709	9, 851, 937	23, 428, 299	24. 02
Michigan	1, 573	21, 903, 197	9, 010	17, 127, 554	39, 030, 751	24. 81
Minnesota	710	9, 886, 376	7, 251	9, 606, 197	19, 492, 573	27. 45
Mississippi	600	8, 354, 684	3, 093	19, 031, 043	27, 385, 727	45. 64
Missouri	846	11, 780, 105	8, 418	9, 859, 447	21, 639, 552	25. 57
Montana	147	2, 046, 898	7, 279	1, 981, 242	4, 028, 140	27. 40
Nebraska	297	4, 135, 569	7, 522	3, 873, 600	8, 009, 169	26. 96
Nevada	43	598, 752	11, 791	357, 772	956, 524	22. 24
New Hampshire	118	1, 643, 088	7, 483	1, 547, 026	3, 190, 114	27. 03
New Jersey	1, 046	14, 565, 000	11, 251	9, 120, 771	23, 685, 771	22. 64
New Mexico	214	2, 979, 837	5, 042	4, 163, 918	7, 143, 755	33. 38
New York	3, 024	42, 107, 608	11, 319	25, 209, 887	68, 317, 495	22. 59
North Carolina	1, 123	15, 637, 184	4, 477	24. 608, 432	40, 245, 616	35. 83
North Dakota	159	2, 213, 991	4, 736	3, 293, 644	5, 507, 635	34. 63
Ohio	1, 866	25, 983, 068	9, 267	19, 754, 398	45, 737, 466	24. 51
Oklahoma	527	7, 338, 198	6, 047	8, 549, 919	15, 888, 117	30. 14
Oregon	359	4, 998, 886	8, 025	4, 388, 744	9, 387, 630	26. 14
Pennsylvania	2, 315	32, 235, 157	8, 468	26, 820, 163	59, 055, 320	25. 50
Rhode Island	164	2, 283, 614	9, 305	1, 729, 094	4, 012, 708	24. 46
South Carolina	646	8, 995, 210	3, 737	16, 959, 013	25, 954, 223	40. 17
South Dakota	159	2, 213, 991	5, 629	2, 771, 128	4, 985, 119	31. 35
Tennessee	846	11, 780, 105	4, 816	17, 233, 562	29, 013, 667	34. 29
Texas	2, 027	28, 224, 908	6, 586	30, 194, 187	58, 419, 095	28. 82
Utah	200	2, 784, 895	5, 650	3, 472, 745	6, 257, 640	31. 28
Vermont	89	1, 239, 278	5, 966	1, 463, 518	2, 702, 796	30. 36
Virginia	849	11, 821, 878	6, 206	13, 421, 077	25, 242, 955	29. 73
Washington	553	7, 700, 234	8, 922	6, 080, 709	13, 780, 943	24, 92
West Virginia	530	7, 379, 971	4, 626	11, 239, 874	18, 619, 845	35. 13
Wisconsin	806	11, 223, 126	7, 677	10, 299, 942	21, 523, 068	26. 70
Wyoming	72	1, 002, 562	7, 361	959, 590	1, 962, 152	27. 25
Total	35, 908	500, 000, 000	7, 947	500, 000, 000	1, 000, 000, 000	27. 84

NOTE.—Col. 3 constitutes a flat grant of $13.92 plus per child.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a copy of my bill, and I now send the bill to the desk for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4017) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Education Act of 1956."

SEC. 2. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or to prescribe any requirements with respect to any school, or any State or local educational institution or agency, with respect to which any funds have been or may be made available or expended pursuant to this act, nor shall any term or condition of any agreement or any other action taken under this act, whether by agreement or otherwise, relating to any contribution made under this act to or on behalf of any school, or any State or local educational institution or agency, or any limitation or provision in any appropriation made pursuant to this act, seek to control in any manner, or prescribe requirements with respect to, or authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to direct, supervise, or control in any manner, or prescribe any requirements with respect to, the administration, the curriculum, the instruction, the methods of instruction, or the materials of instruction.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of more nearly equalizing elementary and secondary school opportunities among and within the States, and raising educational standards throughout all the States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated without any limitation of such appropriation or condition inconsistent with or contrary to the terms or purposes of this act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the sum of $1 billion to be distributed among the States as hereinafter provided until the Congress determines that assistance is no longer needed for this purpose.

SEC. 4. (a) Ninety-five percent of the funds appropriated in accordance with section 3 of this act for each fiscal year shall be distributed among the States in the following manner:

(1) From 50 percent of such funds the Commissioner shall allot and authorize the payment to each State of an amount which bears the same ratio to the total of such 50 percent of such funds as the school-age population of such State bears to the total of the school-age populations of all the States. For the purposes of this act the term "school-age population" means with respect to any State that part of the population of such State which is between the ages of 5 and 17, both inclusive, according to the most recent estimates certified by the Secretary of Commerce.

(2) From the remaining 50 percent of such funds the Commissioner shall allot and authorize the payment to each State of an amount which bears the same ratio to the total of such 50 percent of such funds as the weighted school-age population of such State bears to the total of the weighted school-age populations of all the States. For the purposes of this act the term "weighted school-age population" means with respect to any State the school-age population of such State multiplied by the quotient obtained by dividing the personal income per school-age child of such State into the personal income per school-age child of the State having the highest personal income per school-age child. For the purposes of this act the term "personal income per school-age child" means with respect to any State the total personal income of such State, according to the most recent estimates certified by the Secretary of Commerce, divided by the school-age population of such State.

(b) From 3 percent of the funds appropriated for each fiscal year pursuant to section 3 of this act, such additional sums as may be necessary shall be apportioned by the Commissioner and paid to the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, the Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, according to their respective needs for additional funds for elementary and secondary schools, upon the basis of joint agreements made with their respective State educational authorities.

(c) From 2 percent of the funds appropriated for each fiscal year pursuant to section 3 of this act, such additional sums as may be necessary shall be apportioned by the Commissioner and paid to the States for urgent and special educational needs and programs upon application of the State educational authority, except that no State shall be allotted more than 10 percent of the funds apportioned under this subsection.

SEC. 5. In order to improve and more nearly equalize educational opportunities, the funds paid to a State from the funds appropriated in accordance with section 3 and apportioned under subsections (a) and (b) of section 4 of this act shall be available for disbursement by the State educational authority, either directly or through payments to local school jurisdictions or other education agencies, exclusively for primary and secondary education expenses and activities. Funds appropriated in accordance with section 3 and apportioned under subsection (c) of section 4 of this act shall be available for disbursement by the Commissioner, upon application of the State educational authority, for urgent and special educational needs and programs within the discretion of the Commissioner.

SEC. 6. The Commissioner shall certify for each fiscal year the amounts to be paid under this act to each State that has qualified under section 7 of this act to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall, through the fiscal service of the Treasury Department and

prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the treasurer or corresponding official of such State the amount certified for such fiscal year in four equal installments, as soon after the first day of each quarter as may be feasible, beginning with the first quarter of the fiscal year for which appropriations made under the authorization of this act are available. Such treasurer or corresponding official shall pay out such funds only on the requisition of the State educational authority.

SEC. 7. In order to qualify for receiving funds appropriated under this act a State shall by appropriate State action—

(1) accept the provisions of this act and provide for the administration of funds to be received;

(2) provide that the State treasurer or corresponding official in the State shall receive the funds paid to that State under this act and shall be required to submit to the Commissioner, on or before the first day of November of each year, for transmission to the Congress, a detailed statement of the amount so received for the preceding fiscal year and its disbursement;

(3) provide that its State educational authority shall represent the State in the administration of funds received;

(4) provide for an annual audit, and for the submission of a copy thereof to the Commissioner, of the expenditure of funds received under this act, and for a system of reports from local school jurisdictions and other educational agencies to the State educational authority;

(5) provide that the State educational authority shall make reports to the Commissioner with respect to the progress of education, on forms to be provided by the Commissioner, which reports the Commissioner shall transmit to the Congress with recommendations for such revisions of this act as in his judgment the Congress should consider, with particular reference to recommendations arising from changing conditions in our national economy; and

(6) transmit through its State educational authority to the Commissioner notice of acceptance and certified copies of the legislative enactments and the administrative regulations that may be issued by the State educational authority in connection with such funds, and any amendment of such enactments and revisions of regulations shall in like manner be transmitted to the Commissioner.

SEC. 8. In the event a State educational authority is dissatisfied with any action by the Commissioner taken with respect to such State pursuant to this act, or with his failure to take any action with respect to such State pursuant to this act, such authority shall have the right to appeal to the Commissioner to change the action he has taken or to take the action he has failed to take, and to present to him in support of such appeal such statement and other evidence as such authority may deem appropriate. If the action taken by the Commissioner on such appeal is not satisfactory to the State educational authority, or if he fails to act thereon within 90 days after he receives such appeal, such authority shall have the right to appeal to the United States District Court for any district in which any part of such State is located. The court shall receive in evidence a copy of the statements and other evidence presented by the State educational authority to the Commissioner, and such further evidence as the court in its discretion deems proper; and shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgments as the facts and the law may require.

SEC. 9. As used in this act—

(1) The term "State" shall include the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, the Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Guam;

(2) The term "State educational authority" means, as the State legislature may determine, (a) the chief State school officer (such as the State superintendent of public education, commissioner of education, or similar officer), or (b) a board of education controlling the State department of education; except that in the District of Columbia it shall mean the Board of Education, and in the Canal Zone, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, it shall mean the Governor; and

(3) The term "Commissioner" means the United States Commissioner of Education.

SEC. 10. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any State, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to other States, persons, or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I close by saying that I am proud to introduce this comprehensive piece of Federal-aid-to-education legislation. I think it is to be preferred to the piecemeal approach to education which the Senate has been making at this session of Congress. There is still time between now and adjournment to bring my bill to the floor of the Senate, with whatever modifications and amendments the committee may wish to offer, and to vote on the bill before adjournment.

I make the statement most respectfully and kindly, Mr. President, that there is one question which my colleagues can be sure they will be asked in every political forum in this country in the campaign ahead: "What did you do about aid to education?"

The people have a right to know what we tried to do—at least, where we stood on the issue. I have a little hunch in my bones today that if Members of the United States Senate do not do something about it in the closing weeks of this session, they will find that their failure to act, to put it mildly, will meet with the displeasure of their constituents, because our failure to act, in my judgment, will represent a failure on our part to rise to the heights of statesmanship to which the people have a right to expect us to rise.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT OF SENATOR McCLELLAN AS A MEMBER OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY POLICY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). The Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce the appointment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] as a member of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable Harley M. Kilgore, late a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 7, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1026. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 1053. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands in the State of Montana to the Phillips County Post of the American Legion;

S. 1244. An act to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 2498. An act to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Clatsop, Oreg., as a national monument;

S. 3332. An act to amend the Employment Act of 1946, as amended; and

S. 3920. An act to authorize the partition or sale of inherited interests in allotted lands in the Tulalip Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes.

WATER DEVELOPMENTS IN THE COLORADO RIVER BASIN

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, one of the world's distinguished water resource authorities, in an address before the annual convention of the American Society of Civil Engineers, has publicly acclaimed the planning and integrated use features of water developments in the Colorado River Basin.

The authority who made the endorsement was Reclamation Commissioner Dexheimer, a distinguished engineer who has participated in the engineering of some of the world's greatest water resource structures.

In his speech at Knoxville, Mr. Dexheimer made this comment, after reviewing a highly successful pioneering multiple-purpose development on the Salt and Gila Rivers in Arizona:

> This same principle of multiple use has been expanded to the Colorado River Basin, of which the Salt and Gila are tributaries. I believe that the future course of multiple-purpose river development will largely follow the pattern of integrated operation and use which is now well established for the Colorado River.

Commissioner Dexheimer proceeded to describe the development of the water resources of the Colorado, the first major river basin in the Nation whose waters have been divided by multiple interstate compacts and international treaties, to the end that existing and potential storage and diversion projects some day will provide for complete consumptive use of all the available water in that river.

Mr. President, in view of the nationwide interest in multiple-purpose water resources, I request unanimous consent that Commissioner Dexheimer's speech be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in a review of this speech, there will be noted a reference to the subject of rainmaking. Inasmuch as a southern California

Congressman has introduced two bills providing for an increase of this experimental work in the Colorado River Basin. I wish to call attention to this 3-paragraph reference. Mr. Dexheimer stated:

The Advisory Committee on Weather Control is studying the matter of doing something about the weather. In its first report, released last February, this committee reported statistically significant increases in precipitation in selected experimental areas in the mountains of California. Such increases amounted to from 9 to 17 percent of the precipitation during favorable periods.

Quite naturally the investigators selected for their first studies areas where they expected the best chance of finding such increases. These findings do not provide any information as to what can be accomplished in other areas or at other seasons and a great more work will be required before we know what is practical along this line. We hope that it will be found practical, economical, and safe to adjust the weather, even to a minor degree.

If practical, this could be an effective tool in future water-resource development. Even minor increases in precipitation, if extended over a large watershed, could produce a considerable quantity of water. The logical time and place for wringing additional water out of the skies is in the mountains in the wintertime. This would automatically increase the need for reservoir storage space.

This estimate quite effectively belies southern California propaganda that progress in rainmaking had reduced or eliminated the need for the Colorado River storage project. If anything, these early reports indicate that California probably is closer to aid from artifically increased precipitation than is its neighboring States in the upper Colorado River Basin. Furthermore, it implies that even if these experimental efforts produce dependable rainmaking methods for our semiarid area, the need for holdover storage structures of the type provided for in the Colorado River storage project will be augmented rather than reduced.

EXHIBIT 1

PAPER BY COMMISSIONER W. A. DEXHEIMER, OF THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, BEFORE THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS AT KNOXVILLE, TENN., JUNE 6, 1956, AS A PART OF A SYMPOSIUM ON THE FUTURE OF MULTIPLE-PURPOSE RIVER DEVELOPMENT

The future of multiple-purpose river development, whether in this country or other parts of the world, will depend to a large degree on the economic requirements of our expanding population and the technical requirements for water supply for uses in municipalities, industries, agriculture, pollution control, and many other needs. There is very little question but that the primary concern in most of the world today is an adequate water supply and how we can provide this by controlling our major river systems and putting them to the most beneficial use.

In our discussion, we should keep in mind that the most beneficial use of the water resources of a river basin does not always mean for how many different purposes we can use it. The real test is how many times we can use the water from the time it is deposited as rain or snow until it reaches the ocean or is lost by evaporation. In many instances, we can use it over and over again for one or many purposes.

In the United States the development of multiple-purpose river projects has been based on policies and laws which vary considerably between Federal agencies and, of course, vary greatly among the various States. All river basin development in any Federal program must show economic feasibility and national benefit. The benefits to the area and to the Nation must be demonstrated and they must exceed the estimated cost of the works. These principles do not necessarily follow in other countries, although the general philosophy, I think, must always be the same.

Long before the white man came to this continent, primitive Indians had dug canals in the Gila River basin and the Salt River Valley and they had irrigated lands. The first known irrigation on the North American Continent occurred in what is now southwestern Arizona. The Indians' efforts to irrigate crops failed because of the inadequate late season supply of water and the recurrent drought periods. Like many later instances in other arid areas of the world, this demonstrated that large reservoirs were necessary to retain the excess flood flows and have water available for human consumption and irrigation supply, not only during the dry summers, but to provide against extended drought periods.

The need for water storage in the Salt River Valley after the white man came resulted in the construction of the first major multiple-purpose dam and reservoir in the United States. This was the Roosevelt Dam, completed in 1906 by the Bureau of Reclamation. Since that time, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association have added additional facilities until today the Salt River is probably the most controlled and utilized stream in the United States. The Salt River project is an example of maximum water and land conservation and development in a small drainage basin.

There is rarely a drop of water that gets through to the Colorado from the Gila and Salt Rivers without being used over and over again. On the Salt River system alone, 6 dams provide almost 2 million acre-feet of storage space and 73,300 kilowatts of hydroelectric generating capacity. This storage space not only insures a water supply, but flood control in the valley as well. The surface flow is combined with underground water. Hydroelectric power pumps the water and lightens the farm burden. The entire system is under the management of the Salt River Water Users' Association, and the original investment of Federal funds has been repaid by them. Repayment of later additions and improvements is now in progress.

Coolidge Dam on the Gila River and other non-Bureau storage on tributaries give almost complete control of the water resources of the area.

We have recently completed an economic survey which clearly demonstrates the overwhelming worth of projects such as this to the local and national economy, but I will not go into them today. Suffice to say that the Phoenix area, which is dependent upon the Salt River system for its water supply, returns to the Federal Government in income taxes alone, each year, more money than has been invested by the Federal Government in the reclamation project.

This same principle of multiple use has been expanded to the Colorado River Basin, of which the Salt and Gila are tributaries. I believe that the future course of multiple-purpose river development will largely follow the pattern of integrated operation and use which is now well established for the Colorado River.

I must emphasize, however, that there is no single pattern of development which fits all river basins. There are different plans in operation even on the Colorado. We must adapt the overriding objective of maximum use to fit the varying circumstances and needs of the particular basin.

The Colorado River, rising on the Continental Divide, flows southwest approximately 1,200 miles. Eearly in the century, the Colorado River was used for some navigation, irrigation, and municipal water supplies. Having very erratic runoff, varying from approximately 4 million acre-feet per year to 22 million acre-feet, the river was subjected to extreme floods. The extreme low flows were even more destructive to an economy which is based on use of water for growing crops in a hot, dry climate. There is a multiplicity of problems involved in the development of a major river basin. In the West, where water is so essential, one of the most important details is who owns the water. After extended negotiations, six of the States involved in the Colorado Basin entered into a compact in 1922. This compact essentially divided the river into the upper and lower basins, with the dividing point at Lee Ferry, Ariz., and apportioned the water between the upper and lower basins. The upper basin States subsequently, in 1947, apportioned their portion of the water by compact, dividing their portion of the water available among the four States.

The pattern of peaceful solution of the rights to the use of water by entering into compacts has been followed not only in the United States, but in other areas of the world. It is perhaps the most necessary first step toward development of any major river basin. A treaty between the United States and Mexico apportions a share of the Colorado River water for uses in Mexico. Negotiations are underway on many interstate streams in the United States and on many rivers crossing the boundary of the United States and Canada. It is impracticable to plan river-basin development until reasonable assurance is available of each affected State's legal right to use the water.

The multiple-purpose development of the Colorado River commenced with the construction of Hoover Dam in the lower basin as a major flood-control and conservation structure. The Colorado was noted for its wild fluctuations and particularly the very destructive flooding of highly productive agricultural land in southeastern California. Lake Mead, the reservoir behind Hoover Dam, is the largest artificial lake in the world, 30 million acre-feet of storage or sufficient to cover the State of New York to a depth of 1 foot.

The powerplant at the toe of the dam, with 1,354,300 kilowatts of installed capacity, was at one time the largest single hydroelectric installation in the world. A legal prerequisite to construction of the dam was contract commitments for the sale of electrical energy which would guarantee the repayment of power investment in 50 years.

The Boulder Canyon project, as it was known, included not only Hoover Dam and powerplant but the diversion works and a river-size canal, known as the All-American Canal, for irrigation of vast areas of highly productive farmland in the Imperial Valley of southern California. The project authorization specified that storage in Lake Mead should be used, first, for river regulation, navigation, and flood control; second, for irrigation and domestic uses; and, third, for power. Many incidental benefits, such as fish and wildlife development, recreation, and salinity control, are also realized.

National policy and laws governing river-basin development have largely evolved since passage of the Boulder Canyon Project Act. Flood control, navigation, national aspects of fish and wildlife enhancement, have been considered national benefits for which no reimbursement was ordinarily required. Numerous other benefits have also been considered nonreimbursable under special authorizations. They include recreation, sediment control, salinity repulsion, and pollution control. Much present thinking, however, favors cost sharing proportionate to the benefits received.

However, the portion of project costs allocated to irrigation is reimbursable without

interest on the Federal investment, as enunciated in the original Reclamation Act of 1902. The costs of municipal water supply and power development are returned to the Federal Treasury with interest. In addition, power revenues help to carry some irrigation costs which are beyond the ability of the irrigators to repay usually within a 50-year period. There are, of course, many complications in individual areas which require specific legislation.

Although flood control was one of the major purposes of Hoover Dam, it was built with a minimum allocation of $25 million for that purpose. This $25 million is to be repaid after June 1, 1987, as the Congress may determine. There has not been a flood of any consequence below Hoover Dam since it was built, although a runoff of flood proportions has been recorded above the dam several times. At the same time, we have made good use of snow surveys and precipitation data so that maximum use has been made of all available water. Except for testing purposes, no water has been passed over the spillways. The water has gone through the generators to downstream domestic and irrigation users. Downstream consumptive needs have been supplied even during the last 2 years of severe drought when there would have been a critical shortage were it not for long-range holdover storage in Lake Mead.

Since the completion of Hoover Dam, the Bureau of Reclamation has constructed 3 more downstream structures, Davis, Parker and Imperial Dams. Davis is a reregulating and power structure. Parker Dam forms the forebay for southern California's Colorado River aqueduct and supplies power to the system. Imperial Dam is a diversion structure for irrigation water for California and Arizona. Morelos Dam diverts water to Mexico.

The series of dams and reservoirs has changed the lower Colorado from a most unruly and notoriously bad actor among our major rivers to a fully controlled and useful resource. In addition to the control structures, the Bureau of Reclamation has constructed canals and pipelines which may ultimately supply over 700,000 acres of land in California and Arizona with water from the Colorado River alone. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California has constructed the 242-mile-long aqueduct which is supplying most of the southern California metropolitan area with a big share of its domestic and industrial water supply.

This aqueduct, incidentally, and the Hoover Dam were among the 7 modern construction wonders of the United States selected by an ASCE committee last year.

The Bureau of Reclamation, in planning, construction, and operation of various phases of development, dealt with individual agencies rather than any overall agency representing the States. It might appear that the basin has been developed without too much integrated planning or an exact blueprint of the total program.

Our experiences on the lower Colorado River Basin would tend to refute this. Despite its unit by unit authorization and construction, it is notable for efficient operation and maximum utilization of available water and land resources. This has been accomplished by the integration of new projects into a gradually evolving plan of river operation which is based on surveys going back many decades before the first construction was initiated.

The approach to the development of the upper Colorado River Basin has been on a somewhat different basis. The first step by the upper basin States was to reach agreement among themselves as to the allocation of the available water. Then an organization representing the four States, the upper Colorado River Commission, was formed to deal with the Federal Government in developing a basinwide plan for the use of the water.

Planning was complicated by the necessity of providing an unsual amount of storage space to meet downstream compact commitments. The vast and comparatively unpopulated area of the upper basin is truly America's last great frontier of settlement opportunity.

From this cooperative planning came a project, the initial phases of which were authorized by the Congress this spring with the enthusiastic approval of President Eisenhower. It is a project which calls for the multiple-use of the water resources of the upper Colorado. This development will unlock the multiplicity of other resources with which this area is blessed.

The authorized plan calls for four major storage reservoirs with a total capacity of more than 31 million acre-feet. Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir, which will be the principal regulating unit for the delivery of water to the lower basin, will approach Hoover Dam and Lake Mead in size and storage capacity.

The backbone storage system will have about 1,098,000 kilowatts or hydroelectric generating capacity. This capacity will not only be tied together physically through a backbone transmission system but financially by the establishment of a basin account through which revenues will flow into the Treasury in repayment of reimbursable phases of the project. All funds will be appropriated each year by the Congress as they are on other projects.

This basin account will permit the development of a number of participating water-use units within the basin. Because of high cost construction, none of these irrigation units will be able to completely repay themselves financially. Nevertheless, the need for them and their benefits are so clearly demonstrated that they must be built if this "last frontier" is to be opened up as a prosperous contributing segment of our economy.

Even though there was a basinwide approach to the development of the upper Colorado River basin, as contrasted to the step-by-step approach in the lower basin, we are not waiting to learn the exact, minute details of every phase of future need and work. We have a broad general concept of multiple-purpose development and a basinwide approach to financing the necessary work. We are preparing to start work on the initial phases of that development and will fit other phases in as the need develops. Thus, plans are remaining fluid in undertaking this multiple-purpose development which will require several decades to accomplish.

The Central Valley project of California demonstrates the need for not only planning a multiple-purpose development on one watershed, but the requirement for combining watersheds to provide maximum beneficial use of the available water to meet growing needs. Here, the major rivers have a common outlet to the ocean in San Francisco Bay.

The rivers flow from all directions to a common meeting point. Surplus flows rise in the high mountains to the north and east of the great Central Valley causing considerable destruction during the flood season of fast melting snow and unusual, heavy rains. A major part of the year, however, the streams are nearly dry and there is very little precipitation in the whole valley.

Under the Central Valley project, most of the major streams have been controlled by major storage reservoirs. Hydroelectric powerplants are installed and, in addition, canals carry the water to highly productive farmlands during the growing season. In the San Joaquin, or southern part of the Central Valley, this growing season is 11 months of the year and this is the most water-deficient area of the basin. Coordination of the works permits pumping excess flow from near the confluence of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers into canals as it is released from storage on the northern streams. From there it is taken south where the overall water supply is far short of the demand. Exchange and replacement are also fundamental principles of the Central Valley project. To these have been added the transmountain movement of water by the Trinity River diversion which is now under construction.

Numerous structures on streams in the Central Valley were built and operated by different agencies, some Federal, some local, and some privately owned. The closer these assorted facilities can be integrated into an operating whole, the greater will be the potential of maximum beneficial use of the water.

In the Columbia River Basin, development has been by three-way cooperation. The Corps of Engineers has largely concerned itself with the downstream work in which flood control and navigation predominates. The Bureau of Reclamation has worked upstream and on the tributaries, building structures to hold the spring snowmelt as far upstream as possible so the water would be available for irrigation purposes in the late summer and fall and for power generation.

Public utilities are constructing structures where the primary function is the generation of power although they, like the others, may have associated benefits.

In the Columbia River Basin the Congress has authorized the construction of some irrigation projects which will have the assistance of power revenues from unrelated federally constructed hydroelectric facilities along the Columbia and its tributaries. The Government is also studying the possibility of pooling power revenues in the Columbia River area to assist in further multiple-purpose development there without an undue drain on the Federal Treasury.

The Columbia River Basin is one of the few areas in the western United States which is blessed with an abundance of water, rich land, and an extraordinary hydroelectric potential which is only partially realized despite the dam-construction program which has been going on there for the last quarter century or more.

In any look into the future, I can foresee an extraordinary development in the Pacific Northwest in decades to come as these three elements—land, water and energy—are utilized to meet the demands of an expanding national population and economy.

There are only two provisos I would make in qualifying this forecast. One is that ample provision be made for integration of facilities into the overall operating plan of the river, regardless of the constructing agency. The other is that some provision be made for the application of power revenues to help amortize the cost of other development work. This applies not only to revenues which are now surplus to repayment of federally constructed hydroplants, but also to those revenues which will be available when the cost of other hydroelectric facilities is retired.

In this résumé of western basin development, principal emphasis has been placed on water for consumptive uses, hydroelectric power generation, flood control and navigation. It is not my intention to ignore the other benefits which are being realized from multiple-purpose development.

As an example, we have recently completed a survey of the use being made of Bureau of Reclamation facilities for recreation purposes. It appears that we will have some 10 million visitors at our dams and reservoirs this year. While we can't measure the value of human enjoyment in outdoor recreation, we do have something of a yardstick in the amount of money these visitors will spend.

Although we all know that few fishermen get by on $6 per day, we have fixed that figure as the most likely average daily expenditure of all recreation seekers at our facilities. This figures out to an annual expenditure of $60 million which is not an inconsiderable addition to the marts of trade.

Then there are such benefits as salinity control, replenishment of ground water supplies and pollution control, all of which are becoming increasingly important. All of these and other benefits which we now consider rather small, will be major factors in future multiple-purpose development.

It is probable that the soil conservationist and the big dam builder will work together much closer in future decades for their work is equally important. The range management specialist and the forester have proven that they can conserve water for consumptive use by proper management of the vast areas of forest and stock rangelands. Soil stabilization is important not only for the land itself, but because erosion control will extend the useful life of water storage reservoirs by centuries, and will decrease silt deposition in rivers and harbors.

The advisory committee on weather control is studying the matter of doing something about the weather. In its first report, released last February, this committee reported statistically significant increases in precipitation in selected experimental areas in the mountains of California. Such increases amounted to from 9 to 17 percent of the precipitation during favorable periods.

Quite naturally the investigators selected for their first studies areas where they expected the best chance of finding such increases. These findings do not provide any information as to what can be accomplished in other areas or at other seasons and a great deal more work will be required before we know what is practical along this line. We hope that it will be found practical, economical, and safe to adjust the weather, even to a minor degree.

If practical, this could be an effective tool in future water resource development. Even minor increases in precipitation, if extended over a large watershed, could produce a considerable quantity of water. The logical time and place for wringing additional water out of the skies is in the mountains in the wintertime. This would automatically increase the need for reservoir storage space.

However, to date, this is still a questionable process and therefore is not one which we can depend upon or plan for in basin development.

The United States is not alone in a need for comprehensive basinwide development of its water resources. The Bureau of Reclamation has found, through its advisory work with other governments, that a comprehensive approach within nations and between nations is the most effective way to utilize water resources.

The Australians are offering an admirable illustration of interstate cooperation in the execution of their Snowy Mountains plan. There the waters of the Snowy River now flowing through Victoria to the sea will be diverted through the mountains. They will flow into the basins of the Tumut and Murrumbidge to the River Murray which traverses Victoria, New South Wales, and south Australia.

These diverted waters will create great quantities of hydroelectric power for industry, improve navigation, and irrigate thousands of acres of farmland. The Australians are well along on this project and will soon be reaping the same kind of benefits we are realizing from integrated basin development in the United States.

The Litani River in Lebanon is a typical stream which is as yet relatively unused but which offers great returns for the nation.

The Mekong River in southeastern Asia has capabilities approaching those of the Mississippi but its development on a multipurpose basinwide basis will require cooperation and agreement among four countries—Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam. Cooperation in basinwide planning and operation will pay rich dividends there.

Thus, in summary, I anticipate an even greater emphasis will be placed upon multiple-purpose basin development in the future than in the past. I expect it to be approached in an orderly manner with most important phases continuing to come first and provision made for future development as the need arises. Where possible, this future process should fit into an overall basin plan which should be investigated and outlined in advance of construction.

The complexity of trying to build large storage works in river valleys with dense population and industry already established requires a different approach than in a comparatively undeveloped basin. In many of our river valleys, large storage works are excessively expensive in terms of right-of-way costs and valuable property inundated. We must move back to the less densely populated upper reaches of the river system, providing flood control and conservation storage on the tributaries and perhaps replenish underground waters.

Reforestation, small holding ponds, adequate soil-conservation practices, and watershed management must be emphasized as supplementary measures but we must have more knowledge of the effect of these programs on water supply and know more about their economic worth. If well planned and consistently carried out, these measures will undoubtedly help conserve water where it falls, both for water conservation and flood protection.

As the pressure for water grows, I anticipate there will be an expansion of projects diverting water from one basin to another. We have some of these at the present time. More will be necessary to transport water from areas of surplus to areas of shortage.

I anticipate greater local and State participation in planning, construction, and operation of multiple-purpose facilities, although by the very nature of interstate rivers and problems connected with their development, strong national leadership is essential. This, I am sure, will continue to be forthcoming, just as this Nation will continue to set the pace and provide a pattern for other nations in raising their economic status by proper development and use of their natural resources.

SELECTION OF HON. FREDERICK A. SEATON TO BE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the people in the 17 public-land States, where more than 50 percent of the land surface and mineral wealth is owned by the Federal Government, take considerable interest in the selection of the Secretary of the Interior.

I am pleased to report that the nomination and confirmation of Fred A. Seaton to be Secretary of the Interior met with a high degree of satisfaction in my State, which is 70 percent federally owned.

As evidence of the grassroots comment on this nomination from a typical public-lands State, I call attention to two editorials from Salt Lake City newspapers commenting on the Seaton nomination, one in the Salt Lake Tribune, and one in the Deseret News.

It is significant that both of these editorials pointed out contributions to conservation made by Republican administrations. In spite of the tremendous misrepresentation in the propaganda "giveaway" smear directed against Secretary McKay, it is significant that informed editorial writers in the West recognize Republican interest in and support for conservation and wise use of our natural resources. This Republican program, launched by Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot, has a long and distinguished background and is a positive, constructive program that was carried forward by Secretary McKay, and will be continued by Secretary Seaton.

The Eisenhower administration believes in an enlightened partnership approach to use and conservation of our resources, and the States that are most deeply affected approve that program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two editorials to which I referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake Tribune of May 30, 1956]

INTERIOR SECRETARY FACES REAL CHALLENGE

The proof of the Interior Department pudding will be in the eating.

It seems to us that the newly appointed Secretary of the Interior, Fred A. Seaton, of Nebraska, and the whole Eisenhower administration have an opportunity now to erase the giveaway label that was attached—rightfully or wrongfully—to the Department under Douglas McKay.

Even though they had worked hard for the elevation of Under Secretary Clarence Davis to the top position, Utah's two United States Senators have hailed the appointment of the 46-year-old publisher and radio operator in a surprise and apparent compromise move by President Eisenhower. Conservationist and political foes of Secretary McKay were also highly critical of Mr. Davis, who was out in front in several controversial matters, notably the so-called Al Sarena timber steal in Oregon.

More consequential, perhaps, Mr. Davis was allied with Mr. McKay and Agriculture Secretary Benson in opposing Attorney General Brownell's program to establish Federal control of water resources. Despite powerful western opposition, the Brownell forces appear to have the upper hand at present in this bitter struggle within the administration.

Mr. Seaton seems to have an advantage at present in that his position on several controversial matters relating to natural resources is not on record. He has said that he supports the administration's water and power policies but whether this means the lofty pronouncements of President Eisenhower or some decisions made by Secretary McKay relative to wildlife refuges is not yet clear. He said specifically that the partnership power policy of the administration "not only makes sense but will make progress." This seems to indicate no radical change of attitude toward Hells Canyon and public power generally.

Interior is the catch-all Department of the Federal Government and is frequently in conflict with various and competing interests, sometimes internally. Its administration extends from mine safety to operation of the Alaska Railroad; from the national parks to the Bureau of Reclamation, activities sometimes in conflict.

Because he is the center of intense pressures, the Secretary of Interior's tenure has averaged 3¼ years, the length of time Mr. McKay held office before deciding to run for Senator in Oregon. The Department was first set up in 1849 to administer patents, Indian affairs, pensions, public lands,

and the census. Since activities were concerned with domestic affairs, it was known for a time as the home department. Later such activities as education, administration of Territories, geological surveys, national parks, reclamation, Bureau of Mines, Wildlife Service, and others were added. Some of these have since reverted to other departments, but because of the vast amount of public land and resources administered, Interior is vitally important to the West.

Two Secretaries came under a cloud for failing to conserve natural resources against the encroachments of private interests—Richard A. Ballinger in the Taft administration and Albert B. Fall under Harding.

Actually, however, past Republican administrations have a proud record in resource preservation. Yellowstone Park was created under President Grant; the first national forests under Harrison; the organic law for administering the forests under McKinley; formal establishment of the United States Forest Service and the Reclamation Service under Theodore Roosevelt; expansion of the national forests under Taft; establishment of United States game refuges and regulation of fisheries under Coolidge, and authorization for the first major public power and multiple-purpose dam (Hoover) under Hoover.

"Where conflicting interests must be reconciled the question will always be decided from the standpoint of the greatest good for the greatest number." Thus said Teddy Roosevelt, referring to the national forests. The words apply to every other natural resource—the Nation's treasure.

The Secretary of Interior should be a watchdog for the interests of the American people. He should be a combination of Gifford Pinchot and Harold Ickes, holding the line against all potential despoilers but keeping the overall good constantly in mind. Mr. Seaton and the Eisenhower administration face tremendous responsibilities and a challenge.

[From the Salt Lake Deseret News of May 30, 1956]

BIG JOB NEEDING A BIG MAN

Without intending to disparage Fred A. Seaton's qualifications for the job, it must be said that his appointment as Secretary of Interior neatly takes the Eisenhower administration off a political hook.

Vigorous charges of giveaway had been leveled against Secretary Douglas McKay before his resignation to run for the Senate in Oregon and against his Under Secretary, Clarence A. Davis. The administration has vigorously denied the charges. Yet it is instructive to note that instead of appointing Mr. Davis Secretary, as had been generally expected, President Eisenhower named a man whose lack of connection with resource policies will greatly dull the giveaway issue.

That noted, it may then be said that Mr. Seaton seems reasonably well qualified for the job. Into his youthful 46 years, he has crowded successful careers in publishing and radio, two terms as Nebraska Representative to Congress, part of a Senate term, an assistant secretaryship in the Defense Department and 3 years of relationship as adviser to President Eisenhower. Obviously, he is a man of ability.

Moreover, he can qualify as a westerner closely acquainted with western reclamation problems through his farm magazine. Interior is primarily a western job. It needs a westerner.

Mr. Seaton faces a tremendous challenge and responsibility. Except for activities of the Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture and the Corps of Engineers of the Army, his Department has almost sole Federal responsibility for conservation and development of the Nation's resources.

The Bureau of Reclamation, Geological Survey, Bureau of Mines, National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management, Office of Minerals Mobilization and all Federal hydroelectric marketing activities are under his direction.

In managing them under a Republican administration, he is heir to a great tradition of resource management in the public interest. President Grant of his party created Yellowstone as the first national park. Harrison created the first national forests. Theodore Roosevelt established the United States Forest Service and secured passage of the Reclamation Act. Taft extended the national-forest system beyond the West. Coolidge established Federal refuges for migratory waterfowl and set up fisheries regulation. Hoover led the way to authorization of the first major multipurpose dam, and Eisenhower did the same for the greatest reclamation project (Colorado River storage project) ever authorized in this country.

Mr. Seaton has the opportunity and challenge to give similar far-sighted leadership for use, development, and preservation of resources.

In doing so, he faces two great problems.

One is the controversy over public versus private development. His boss, President Eisenhower, has laid down the basic formula for this problem in these words:

"We shall continue to advance in a spirit of helpfulness to localities and in a spirit of cooperation with local citizens. Where local enterprise can shoulder the burden, it will be encouraged and supported in doing so, and where local action cannot or should not fully meet the need, we shall have Federal action * * * the best natural resources program will not result from exclusive dependence on Federal bureaucracy. It will involve a partnership of the States and local communities, private citizens and the Federal Government, all working together."

So the first big challenge to Mr. Seaton is to continue the partnership formula for resource development with such fairness, intelligence, and far-sightedness that the public will pay no attention to the giveaway charges that will inevitably come from those who think the Federal Government should do all things for all men.

The second and even greater challenge is to steer a wise middle course between the pressures of those who would lock up western resources inviolate for all time and those who would exploit them without regard to public interest.

This is a tremendously difficult task, as virtually every one of the 36 Secretaries who have served since the Interior Department was created in 1849 have discovered. Dams to conserve and develop water resources can alter and damage scenic and wildlife resources. Drilling for oil and gas can damage wildlife refuges. Protection of migratory waterfowl can mean tremendous damage to farmers who have no way of driving the ducks out of their fields. And so it goes, in virtually every field with which Interior is concerned.

These problems will multiply as increasing population exerts ever-increasing pressure for water, land, and mineral development on one hand and for preservation of more parks, wilderness areas and wildlife habitat on the other. It will take a man of vision and courage to do a job worthy of the foundation built by such great conservationists as Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot.

For the Nation's sake, may Fred A. Seaton prove to be such a man.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield the floor?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR MONDAY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I wish to announce that on Monday there will be a call of the calendar of bills and other measures to which there is no objection; several bills which have been cleared by the respective calendar committees will be brought up on motion, and probably the opening debate on the social security bill will take place.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10003) making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RABAUT, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. CANNON, Mr. WILSON of Indiana, Mr. JAMES, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2840) to promote the further development of public-library service in rural areas, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DURING THE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate until Monday next, the Vice President or President pro tempore be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE TO REPORT BILLS AND FILE NOTICES OF MOTIONS DURING THE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate, the Appropriations Committee be authorized to submit

reports and to file notices of motions to suspend the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, pursuant to the previous order, I move that the Senate now stand adjourned.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, June 11, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 7 (legislative day, June 4), 1956:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

David A. Hamil, of Colorado, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for a term of 10 years, vice Ancher Nelsen, resigned.

BOARD OF PAROLE

John E. Henry, of Montana, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1962. Mr. Henry is now serving in this post under an appointment which expires September 30, 1956.

Scovel Richardson, of Missouri, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1962. Mr. Richardson is now serving in this post under an appointment which expires September 30, 1956.

William G. Juergens, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Illinois, vice Fred L. Wham, retired.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate June 7 (legislative day, June 4), 1956:

POSTMASTERS

Beulah M. Kitchens to be postmaster at Greenwood, in the State of Nebraska.

Spencer H. Mayes to be postmaster at Graham, in the State of Texas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 7, 1956

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who didst watch over us during the night and hast brought us to this new day, we rejoice that Thou are willing to accept our prayer and answer every sincere petition.

We pray that our whole life may be adorned with the noble virtues of gratitude and humility, of patience and perseverance, of fidelity and courage, of love and good will.

Defend and fortify our minds and hearts against the devastating moods of cynicism and doubt. May we always be disposed to follow Thee in faith and in faithfulness.

Guide us in the difficult decisions which we are daily called upon to make and may we discharge all our duties and responsibilities in devout obedience to Thy holy will.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On May 22, 1956:

H. R. 7228. An act to amend title II of the Act of August 30, 1954, entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes"; and

H. R. 8130. An act to designate the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River in the vicinity of Jones Point, Va., as the "Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge."

On May 24, 1956:

H. R. 2057. An act for the relief of Edwin K. Stanton;

H. R. 2893. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Graphic Arts Corporation of Ohio, of Toledo, Ohio;

H. R. 5535. An act for the relief of S. H. Prather, Mrs. Florence Prather Penman, and S. H. Prather, Jr.; and

H. R. 7164. An act for the relief of Lt. Michael Cullen.

On May 28, 1956:

H. R. 2284. An act for the relief of Maj. Robert D. Lauer;

H. R. 2904. An act for the relief of Maj. Orin A. Fayle;

H. R. 3268. An act for the relief of Comdr. George B. Greer;

H. R. 3964. An act for the relief of Kingan, Inc.;

H. R. 4026. An act for the relief of James C. Hayes;

H. R. 4604. An act relating to the issuance of certain patents in fee to lands within the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 4640. An act for the relief of James M. Wilson;

H. R. 5047. An act to increase the compensation of trustees in bankruptcy;

H. R. 6137. An act for the relief of Herman Floyd Williams, Bettie J. Williams, and Alma G. Segers;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of Lt. P. B. Sampson;

H. R. 7186. An act to provide for the review and determination of claims for the return of lands, in the Territory of Hawaii, conveyed to the Government during World War II by organizations composed of persons of Japanese ancestry;

H. R. 8309. An act for the relief of Col. Henry M. Zeller;

H. R. 9257. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the punishment of persons who assist in the attempted escape of persons in Federal custody; and

H. R. 10875. An act to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956.

On May 29, 1956:

H. R. 1471. An act for the relief of William J. Robertson;

H. R. 3366. An act for the relief of Mary J. McDougall;

H. R. 4162. An act for the relief of Kahzo L. Harris;

H. R. 7030. An act to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9207. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands.

On May 31, 1956:

H. R. 8904. An act to amend certain laws relating to the grade of certain personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps upon retirement.

On June 4, 1956:

H. R. 1016. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ida Bifolchini Boschetti;

H. R. 1779. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Juniper division of the Wapinitia Federal reclamation project, Oregon;

H. R. 3054. An act for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives;

H. R. 5478. An act to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 5652. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army and Air Force, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5862. An act to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation;

H. R. 6084. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians, California, to the Palm Springs Unified School District;

H. R. 6374. An act to repeal legislation relating to the Gallup-Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navaho Indian Reservation;

H. R. 6623. An act to amend the act of July 1, 1952, so as to obtain the consent of Congress to interstate compacts relating to mutual military aid in an emergency;

H. R. 6990. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America;

H. R. 7540. An act to provide for the sale of a Government-owned housing project to the city of Hooks, Tex.;

H. R. 7678. An act to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Eleventh Annual Instrument-Automation (International) Conference and Exhibit, New York, N. Y., and the Americas' New Frontiers Exposition, to be held at Oklahoma City, Okla., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8810. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, equip, maintain, and operate a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Miles City, Mont.;

H. R. 11177. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 261. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to donate surplus supplies and equipment for memorial purposes to The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2840. An act to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; and

H. Con. Res. 232. Concurrent resolution extending greetings to the American National Red Cross on the occasion of its 75th anniversary.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is

requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9536. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message also announced the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. KNOWLAND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

S. 9739. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. POTTER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF PRESIDENT AND SUNDRY GENERAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1957

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 9536) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, line 9, strike out "$350,000" and insert "$365,700."

Page 7, line 3, strike out "$50" and insert "$75."

Page 7, line 9, strike out "$350,000" and insert "$400,000."

Page 8, line 1, after "$1,140,000", insert ", of which $10,000 shall be immediately available for printing relating to the dedication of World War II memorials."

Page 8, line 22, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,050,000."

Page 9, line 9, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$10,000."

Page 9, line 11, after "Commission", insert ", and employment of aliens."

Page 9, line 12, strike out "$795,000" and insert "$800,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 9536, as passed by the other body, is $120,700 over the amount originally approved by the House. The increases in detail are, first, $15,700 for the Council of Economic Advisers; second, $50,000 for the President's fund for expenses of management improvement; third, $50,000 to initiate a very worthwhile project in the American Battle Monuments Commission; and, fourth, $5,000 for salaries and expenses for the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

The committee is in agreement with the changes made, and the present total of the bill, $14,969,975, remains below the budget estimates by the sum of $44,500.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 59]

Bell	Gray	Norblad
Berry	Gubser	O'Hara, Minn.
Bolling, Mo.	Gwinn	Patman
Bush	Hale	Pilcher
Cannon	Harden	Pillion
Carlyle	Herlong	Polk
Carnahan	Jones, Mo.	Powell
Dawson, Ill.	Kee	Reed, N. Y.
Deane	Kelley, Pa.	Shelley
Diggs	Kilburn	Sikes
Dowdy	Lane	Thompson, La.
Eberharter	Lankford	Thornberry
Frazier	Lesinski	Velde
Gamble	Mack, Wash.	Wharton
Gordon	Miller, Calif.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 379 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

BROOKLYN SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, 127 years ago, the Brooklyn Sunday School Union was founded. Every year since then on the first Thursday in June, all the people of the great borough of Brooklyn provide a celebration of that event that has become known as Anniversary Day. This day is unique in Brooklyn and probably does not have its counterpart anywhere else in the world. Brooklyn is affectionately known far and wide as the Borough of Churches, and past many of these beautiful edifices 120,000 men, women, and children will march today to mark the event. Those churches are of many denominations, and the adults and children in the impressive parade will represent various faiths and creeds. There will be colorful floats and banners proclaiming the faith of Brooklyn in God and country. Although basically a religious celebration, the event has a distinct civic aspect, and many of the persons in the line of march, as well as in the reviewing stands, will be leaders in all walks of life.

It is truly an inspiring occasion. Brooklynites of faiths not represented in the Sunday School Union are equally glad that they live in a community where such a manifestation of faith can be made with no untoward incidents to mar the event. No one is forced to march—and no one prevented from participating—against his will.

Anniversary Day embodies the spirit of the first amendment to the Constitution that provides that Congress shall make no law representing an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. This celebration epitomizes that goal of our Founding Fathers. It is the spontaneous participation of people blessed with the right to worship as they please, but even more than that it demonstrates that although Congress may not establish a state church, we are essentially a religious people, and it was with this knowledge and in this spirit that the Constitution and the first amendment were written.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11356, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read section 1 of the bill. If there are no amendments to this section, the Clerk will read.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, the proponents of this annual authorization bill seek to justify it on the ground that it will retard Communist aggression. I do not presume that there is any advocate of this bill who would be so enthusiastic

as to suggest that it will stop Communist aggression. They assert that if it had not been for this foreign-aid appropriation in the past, far more territory and population would have been absorbed by the Soviet Union.

Mr. Chairman, it is doubtful that the Communists would have acquired much more territory regardless of these appropriations. As a matter of fact, since 1945 the Soviet Union has acquired by annexation or by subversion and revolution more than 700 million people and 5 million square miles in 17 countries. There never has been in the history of the world a record of conquest to equal this record.

The difficulty the Soviet Union is experiencing is not one of acquisition but of digestion. I do not believe that our efforts in recent years to halt this aggression by the annual appropriation of foreign-aid money have been justified by the results that have been achieved. Too much of these funds have been wasted or spent unwisely to warrant me to vote for this bill especially when it is undisputed that it will require 2 or 3 years to spend what we have already appropriated.

It is true that in the beginning of the program we were justified in seeking to aid the distressed countries of Europe who had just passed through a devastating war and who needed help to help themselves, but the time of the effectiveness of this program has passed. We are seeking to do something that is not possible and is not practicable. This program as now administered reminds me of a middle-aged fat officeholder, well supplied with funds, trying to defeat with money an aggressive, crusading, dynamic young man. However much he spends in newspaper advertising, in radio, and in television, he cannot defeat the enthusiasm, the zeal, and the fighting qualities of his young opponent. To combat communism effectively we must emulate the zeal of the Communists in converting vulnerable areas and peoples to the great principles of freedom and independence.

While we have scattered our money broadside throughout the world the Soviet Union by the same tactics and the same technique which it employed so successfully in our own country for more than a decade has been winning one country after another. In fact, the Western World has given independence to 22 countries and abandoned 694 million people in an area of 9 million square miles. While America was giving independence to the Philippines, influencing Britain to withdraw from Egypt and the Suez, and France to withdraw from Indochina, and the Dutch from Indonesia, while this process was going on among the western empires, the Soviet Union was steadily replacing the colonialism of the Western Powers with the new type of colonialism of the Soviet Union, which is far more ruthless than anything these people have experienced in the past.

We cannot dispute the history of Russia. It began in 1460 with a tiny principality of 15,000 square miles. Under the Czars it expanded by conquest until by 1917 Russia had acquired 145 million people and 8 million square miles. Fifty nationalities, 80 separate languages; almost a constant state of rebellion and ruthless extermination of nationalities; the Russification of all the vast people that fell under the iron heel and the mailed fist of the Czars—these were the chief results of Russian aggression. Then, when the Communists employed the technique of the fifth column their conquests exceeded anything that Ivan the Terrible, Peter the Great, or Catherine, or any of the other rulers of Russia had ever been able to accomplish. Under the Communists Russia now controls more than one-third of the population of this earth. Great Britain has shrunk from one-fourth to one-twentieth, and we in our desperation and paucity of imaginative programs have sought to stem the tide by an expanded WPA. If these funds had been spent wisely to help these people help themselves by practical programs of development the results achieved might have justified this bill.

I have not had the privilege of traveling over the world. In fact, I have never been outside of the United States, and I doubt seriously that those of my colleagues who have had that privilege were able to obtain an accurate picture that is necessary to form a sound conclusion. But I have made it a point to talk with disinterested and impartial people who are acquainted with the situation, and I am not convinced that this money has been spent wisely and that we are justified in continuing it. We act as though there is no limitation to our natural wealth. We proceed on the basis that for some reason America has resources to continue to dump billions of dollars all over the world. We stubbornly refuse to accept the fact that America owes more money than all the rest of the world put together and that we are burdening our own people, not only with excessive taxation today, but that we are bequeathing to our posterity the most staggering burden of public debt ever known in the history of the world.

I know that President Eisenhower wants this program, but President Eisenhower is not infallible. He has made some errors with respect to the Soviet Union in the past. I need only quote excerpts from speeches and writings of the President. During the critical period, to illustrate that the President was under a serious mistake with reference to the Communist Union, for instance he said in 1945:

> Americans at that time (autumn of 1945), or at least we in Berlin—saw no reason why the Russian system of government and democracy as practiced by the Western Allies could not live side by side in the world.

Again, on November 16, President Eisenhower said:

> The Russians would have nothing to gain from a war with the United States. Nothing guides Russian policy so much as a desire for friendship with the United States.

He said in 1952:

> There is no more reason to fear the 190 million backward people living on the Eurasian continent than there is to fear pollywogs swimming down a muddy creek.

I could go on and quote from various statements of the President not to condemn him but simply to show that President Eisenhower during that critical period was laboring under the same illusion, the same misapprehension as were many other leaders, and that he had refused to accept what the Russian leadership had announced repeatedly to the world as being their chief objective, namely, the conquest of the world. Mr. Chairman, this money provided in this bill cannot be used for 2 or 3 years. During this period we can reexamine and reappraise this entire program and put it on a sound and defensible basis; we can at least limit these funds to our actual and potential friends where there will be some assurance of concrete results. Until this is done, Mr. Chairman, I cannot, in good conscience, spend my constituents' hard-earned money or mortgage their future to finance this program.

By unanimous consent the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 2. Title I, chapter 1, of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to military assistance, is further amended as follows:
>
> (a) In section 103 (a), which relates to authorizations, add the following new paragraph:
>
> "(3) In addition, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out the purposes of this chapter not to exceed $1,925,000,000, of which not less than $48 million shall be used to provide assistance to Spain and not more than $402 million may be used to provide assistance to other European countries, and which shall remain available until expended."
>
> (b) In section 105, strike out subsections (c) and (d).

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: On page 2, line 2, strike out "$1,925,000,000" and all that follows down through line 6 and insert in lieu thereof "$2,525,000,000, which shall remain available until expended."

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HAYS of Arkansas was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment raises the total figure for military aid by $600 million. It also removes the limitation on assistance for Europe in order to achieve greater flexibility in the program; and removes the requirement for a fixed amount for Spain. There would be no doubt whatever about Spain's receiving the amount carried in the bill but my amendment removes the reference since the increase would provide for it.

It is with reluctance that I take the floor today. That is partly due to the fact that I find myself opposed to my beloved chairman. While I would not embarrass him by repeating things that were said yesterday, I know his heart is warmed by the tributes that have been paid him as a great legislator.

The State of South Carolina has contributed many distinguished men to the national service, but none has exhibited a finer quality of statesmanship or added

greater luster to its fame. I make this personal reference to indulge myself the pleasure of a tribute to a dear friend. And yet, in all the 14 years we have worked together in this House he has never asked me to do anything that was not consistent with what I regarded as my legislative duty.

This is a matter of conscience. I was prepared to support some reduction in the request for mutual security funds. I determined in my own thinking early in the hearings, however, that the figures had been pretty carefully evaluated and that in view of continuing dangers the committee should consider proposals to cut with a sense of caution.

There are two reasons for my feeling that $600 million of the $1 billion cut should be restored. One is that this is an authorization, not an appropriation bill, and I would like to leave to our skilled Appropriations Committee as much latitude as possible with a measure that is so vital. I do not labor the point because I am not sure they can find room for much reduction.

The President of the United States, who is not only the Commander in Chief but one who led us in the greatest war in history, regards the figure I have included in my amendment as a minimum. I feel we should yield to his judgment on this point. I am not abdicating my own responsibility. I have taken responsibility in past legislative differences for my own views which differed from that of the President of the United States. But in this area it seems to me we should give great weight to his recommendation.

He did not call the leadership on both sides of the House into conference a few hours ago for a pleasant conversation. It was only the sense of gravity about our Nation's security and the future of our freedom that dictated his remarks on that occasion. We all know in substance what was said at that time.

So I offer this as one of the principal reasons for supporting an increase in the amount as reported by the committee.

We just heard an address by a distinguished Member of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], and we always listen with great interest to him. He speaks of the terror of the Soviet machine, and who can doubt that? But has my friend forgotten that since the end of 1947 not a single square yard has been taken from the free forces of Europe? And the chief element in that was, of course, the help we extended to our allies and our friends in this struggle for survival.

I know that $600 million which I propose to add to this bill is a lot of money. But it should be considered in relation to the productiveness of the Nation. It is fifteen one-hundredths of 1 percent of our gross national product. If this should be a mistake we would have added but a slight strain on the tremendous capacity of our Nation to produce the sinews of defense. We are not engaged in war. We are engaged in building a deterrent to war. These efforts are justified on no other basis.

The President on January 11 released a statement that had the unanimous support of your delegation to the United Nations in the 10th General Assembly. We had prepared that statement not for publication, but some weeks after we sent it to the Department of State the President released it to the public with his approval. Our delegation included five members, all of whom had legislative experience, Mr. Merrow, of New Hampshire, and myself, representing the House, Senator Pastore representing the Senate, a former Member of the House, Colgate W. Darden, of Virginia, and Henry Cabot Lodge. Our statement pointed out that the Soviets are shifting from military threats to an economic emphasis and that to meet it we must prove what we have proved in the past, our superiority in this field. We ought to welcome that shift. The question is, however, Shall we in changing our policy in order to meet a new threat, weaken ourselves in the military field? If the Communists find that we are weak now, where they have not conquered, they will move back into the military field and press for advantages all over the world.

Senator Vandenberg said one time that it will not help a man in a 20-foot well to throw him a 15-foot rope. And, that applies to this situation. It is better to err on the side of the larger amount than to go in the other direction. I have praised the chairman and other members of our committee for trying to find a place to save money, and that is something we owe to the tax-burdened people of the country, but let us, in acknowledgment of our grave responsibility, speak frankly to them. How much is our freedom worth? And, if we believe what the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] so eloquently said yesterday that the fight continues, then it seems to me that his logic leads to the larger figure.

I ask my friends on the Democratic side—and this is with no taint of partisanship—to remember that when we asked the people of this country to elect a Democratic Congress we assured them we would continue to act responsibly, and I cannot see how we can fulfill that commitment if we turn down a request from the Executive in the field of military operations where the issue is so grave, where the continuing crises demand firm action on our part. On that basis I support this larger amount, and I believe only in so doing will we assure those who are allied with us in this terrific struggle that this is indeed a fight to the finish. Not until the threat is ended will the United States cease to use its resources of every kind, its industrial, its moral, its intellectual resources in a struggle to put down the evil that we know exists in our world.

Mr. Chairman, we are passing through a tunnel. There is light ahead, and we must not permit any rocks to get in our way. I agree that a reevaluation of foreign policy should be made, and I will support such a measure, provided it is a legislative evaluation, for the primary responsibility is ours. But, I submit, that in any altered policy we will not reverse our movements. There may be a departure in this direction or that, but we will not conclude, surely, on the basis of achievements to date, that there has been anything essentially wrong in our policies of the past, our linking our resources with those who are identified with us in the fight.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. BENTLEY for the amendment offered by Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: On page 2, line 2, strike out "$1,925,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,425,000,000."

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think we are getting all the facts before the committee at the present time. My good friend the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS], whom you just heard speaking so eloquently, has offered an amendment to increase the amount for military aid above the committee figure by a total of $600 million. The substitute amendment which I have offered would decrease the committee figure for military aid by an additional one-half billion dollars.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think if we are willing to support the cut that the committee so wisely made, in my opinion, of $1 billion, we can find just as much justification for a cut in military aid of $1.5 billion. In the first place, I think we should all realize that what we are being called upon to decide and consider and deliberate on today is nothing more or less than an interim program. Now, we have had ample testimony, I believe, before the committee, and it has also been said here in the well, that we have in the pipeline, particularly for military aid, sufficient money for at least 2 years.

We have heard a great many of the distinguished gentlemen say, especially yesterday, that we have got to keep the pipeline built up, we have got to keep the goods flowing through the pipeline. Mr. Chairman, 2 years from now, when the present pipeline will expire, we do not know now whether we will then have a pipeline or in which direction it will be going. That will depend upon the results of the review and the reappraisal and the reevaluation which I think we are all agreed upon are necessary. But we do have a 2 years' supply in the pipeline, and, taking that fact and the fact that nobody knows 2 years from now where the pipeline will be going, whether in military aid or economic aid or no aid at all—taking those facts into consideration, I maintain that it is ridiculous to expand the present pipeline, as the administration is asking us to do.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to call attention of the members of the committee to the supplemental views on page 97 of the committee report, signed by myself and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN].

In the second paragraph we state that—

According to the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures, the program's unexpended balance as of July 1, 1956, will be about $6.6 billion.

The expenditures which the administration contemplates, the new authorizations which it requests, would result at the end of the next fiscal year in a total of almost $7 billion, which would

mean a net increase in the pipeline of about $400 million.

I maintain that that is ridiculous. If we are going to put our emphasis on military aid, then let us come out and say so. If, on the other hand, we are considering a possible shift from emphasis on military aid to emphasis on economic aid; if we are prepared, for example, to try and achieve more peaceable relations with the Soviets, as the exchange of visits of the Air Chiefs of Staff would seem to indicate, as the proposed exchange of visits of the Secretaries of Defense that I read about would seem to indicate, then why this emphasis on military aid? Are we talking peace on the one hand and militarism on the other? That I cannot understand.

I should like the committee to accept a few figures for comparison. These are the figures that the administration has asked for. The figures that the administration wants in this foreign aid program would be six times as much as the Federal Government is currently spending for highways; twice as much as this year's outlay for farm price supports. It would pay the operating expenses of all the regular departments of the Government for almost 3 years. It would come close to the annual cost of veterans' aid and benefits. It is about four times the amount being spent on flood control, reclamation, public power dams and the development of the Tennessee Valley put together. Those estimates are from the December 30 issue of the U. S. News & World Report.

As I say, I think we are all agreed upon the necessity for a review and a reevaluation of this program. I think we have ample funds at the present time to keep this program going during the interim period, during the review period. But I maintain that it does not make sense—at least to me—to increase this program, as we are being asked to do—nearly twice the amount that we appropriated last year—when we are going to be considering the direction in which the program should be going. We do not even know whether the emphasis is going to be on military aid or not.

I strongly urge the committee to adopt my substitute amendment. I do not believe it will cripple the program. I believe the program has ample funds to keep it going for the necessary time. I think that the $1.5 billion cut can be amply justified.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. Chairman, first I want to say, not facetiously, that I hope the reporters and others will get it clear that it is my good friend the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] who is sponsoring this increase and not HAYS of Ohio.

I think this is the first time in the seven and a half years I have been in Congress that I have come down in this well opposing any sum of money, even as much as a dollar, for foreign aid, but I certainly think the committee was justified in the cut it made, and I think it would be an error if we increased that amount here on the floor.

The committee held hearings for, I am sure it must have been all of 2 months, and there were many, many, executive sessions, and this matter was pretty thoroughly thrashed out in committee. We had much more information than we can possibly get here on the floor.

I think the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas made one point which probably ought to defeat his amendment, if nothing else, and that is, he said that the Soviets are shifting from the threat of war to economic penetration. And what do we propose to do? We propose to meet that by increasing the military appropriation.

Most of the free nations of the world are more interested in strengthening their economic foundations at the present time than they are in having more weapons which may be antiquated and outmoded by the time, if the time ever comes, that it is necessary for them to use them. So what do we propose to do? We propose to put guns into the hands of people that do not have enough food in their stomachs, and then we propose to close our eyes and say that they will be on our side when the showdown comes. I do not know how much more you can delude yourself than that, but it seems to me that is going pretty far.

The people on my left need not listen to this, but I should like to talk a little political sense to my friends on my right. Much is being made of the fact that the President wants this cut restored, but if you have half as much imagination as I have, you can see his face on the television this fall, with that famous Eisenhower smile, saying, "Give me a Republican Congress to put through the legislation I want." But do not forget that the cut we are proposing to restore came from his own side of the House. I heard him say it in 1954, after I had been down in the well defending his program a half dozen times. So if there is any political value in the thing, you had better think it over a couple of times before you think you are on the right side politically, if there is any political merit in this.

I would ask you another thing. I would ask you to check your mail. If you can find a single letter in the mail that has come in asking you to raise this amount, any of you, I would appreciate your bringing it around, because I have gone over my mail thoroughly, and I cannot find the first one, but I can find plenty of them asking us to go slow and be modest and be moderate.

They talk about filling the pipeline. The military testified that the pipeline is full for 2 years. If you can believe half the propaganda the Pentagon puts out, they are going to have so many new revolutionary weapons they say they cannot even talk about coming into effect 2 years from now that anything they are going to order now will be obsolete.

I just wonder how the military can say, "Well, last year $3 billion plus was enough, but for 2 years from now we are going to need $5 billion," when they say and the proponent of the amendment says that the trend is away from the military to the economic. There is some twisted logic in there somewhere.

I just want to tell you something else. I do not know. This came up to our committee as unclassified information. Somebody has probably classified it by now. In all the voluminous stuff they sent up we found the sum of $75,000 to set up the beginnings of military assistance groups in two Arab countries that do not have them now. Get that. Pay attention to that. Military assistance groups to two Arab countries in the Near East. Somebody on the committee staff caught that, and the Pentagon was queried. This will shock you, I think. Do you know what the Pentagon said? "We don't know how that got in there. That was a mistake."

The Pentagon said, "That money for those two Arab nations was a mistake. We do not know how it got in there."

Now, did any of you ever send anybody a check for $3,000 for an automobile that you did not buy and when the agency called you up and asked you about it say it was a mistake? I know I never did.

I was talking only on Monday of this week to General Gruenther, and he was asking me to do what I could to restore this cut. I told him he was talking to the wrong person. I said I am opposing any more money than what the committee reported out. In other words, I am standing for the cut. I said, "One of the reasons I am standing for it is because the Pentagon does not level with the Congress." Do you know what his answer was? He said, "I cannot defend the Pentagon system of bookkeeping." I think General Gruenther is a great general. I consider him a friend of mine. I am sorry I cannot go along with his request, but I think it was significant when he said, "I cannot defend the Pentagon system of bookkeeping." Who in the name of heaven can defend it? Yet the Pentagon, who can make a mistake by proposing to send money to two Arab countries in which we have never had military-assistance groups, and I hope we never will, if they can make that kind of mistake do we need to say that they are infallible, when they say they need six or seven hundred million more than the committee proposes to give them? That is the fundamental question. In spite of all the speeches you will hear pro and con about it, that still remains the fundamental question. Can they effectively use the money, and what do they propose, effectively, to do with it, and should we give them an increased amount when it is said the shift is to economic problems?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] has again expired.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I voted in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to report H. R. 11356, and I will support the measure in passage through the House. The decision to do so has not been an easy one in spite of the substantial cuts in the authorization made in committee. However, and on balance, I see no constructive alternative to support of the measure at this

time if military and economic chaos is to be averted in a dozen lands. I do feel, however, that I would be remiss if I did not at this time make certain observations relative to the subject of our international efforts to assist others.

My principal concern with the general subject of foreign aid is not related to its dollar magnitude, but to its announced purposes and to the failure of the program to achieve the ends for which it was originally designed. The peace of the world and the welfare of those peoples allied with us in an effort to resist the cruel domination of the Soviet rulers cannot be measured in terms of dollars and cents, and any effort to relate freedom to the capacity of the United States Treasury is bound to bring frustration and confusion to the debate upon and the implementation of any program.

Friendship in its highest expression connotes a sincere regard both as between individuals and nations alike. Inherent in friendship is a mutual purpose tenaciously pursued, together with a common regard for certain principles in life. In our own national history this mutuality was best expressed by the framers of the Constitution who, with but a single purpose and out of dissension and bitter controversy, welded together the individual parts of the Constitution into a coherent and magnificent whole.

In the world of today as it is affected by the impact of our assistance efforts, military and economic, there exists in large part dissension and controversy, unleavened by the common purpose save as the law of self-preservation operates as an expediency. Into this conflict of national interests—into a vacuum of selfish concern—this Nation has poured billions of dollars, sometimes wisely and, on many occasions, injudiciously, in an effort to compound an amalgam of spirit, international in form, dedicated to collective effort and to the security of that portion of the earth outside the orbit of Soviet influence.

The tragic truth attendant on our efforts is that only a few of the many peoples we have attempted to aid have returned our investment with the currency of good will and cooperation. In other quarters we have been repaid with invective, envy, and the sullen disquietude that has always marked the relationships between the eager giver and the reluctant receiver.

Further, our course of action has been one which has served to confuse our own people and those abroad. We have not well distinguished between proven friends and those who have given every indication of a neutrality benevolent to our only possible foe. For many years we have stressed that the granting of assistance to any nation did not carry with it the requirement that a nation need necessarily adopt or even approve the American system of free, legal, and competitive enterprise. I do not accord with the idea inherent in our aid programs, that we can make America stronger by lending aid to socialism abroad, but this we have done and continue to do throughout the world. We have relaxed our insistence that allies receiving aid under the provisions of the Mutual Security Act refrain from trading with the enemy, on the plea that the economies of the countries concerned are dependent, in large part, upon the market places of the Soviet world. We may expect to hear more on this score when the advocates of admission of Red China to the United Nations become more voluble on the subject than they dare to be at present.

Bookkeeping procedures in the MSA have become so involved that a mathematician of the keenest intellect cannot burrow through the maze of figures to arrive at the truth relative to pipeline deliveries, offshore procurement, infrastructure, lead time, carryover, and many another complex phase of the operations. The Comptroller General of the United States literally admitted the inability of the General Accounting Office to keep pace with MSA fiscal matters, in testimony before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations 2 weeks ago. What is the average Member of the House or of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to do in a situation which is so vast and confused that the trained accountants in GAO cannot keep pace with the past, current, and proposed expenditures?

It is contended that military aid to foreign countries is an integral part of our own defense activities. If the program is to be justified before the people of this country, this must necessarily be the case. Many of us believe, and the majority report expresses the wishful hope, that military funds provided in MSA appropriations in future years will be included in the Defense Establishment budget. In that way, and only in that way, can the various remaining items be properly titled and considered by the Congress. However, those who vote against H. R. 11356 will, in effect, say to Turkey, Korea, the Republic of China on Taiwan, Spain, and others who have brought determination to the fight, that we propose to leave them to the mercies of our mutual enemies. This is the unfortunate aspect of the choice each Member must make. Can we afford to relinquish all military and economic interest in the Republics of Latin America? Granted that some of our allies have brought no spirit of determination to the global conflict, can we afford to let the willing and determined fall prey together with those of little or no stomach for a possible conflict?

I have weighed the matter carefully in my own mind and have reached the conclusion that I have no alternative but to support the measure now before us. The consequences to be reckoned are too great to be lightly considered. However, the Congress can and must look to the future of the program and bring to our assistance effort a degree of realism heretofore sadly lacking. We cannot, for an unpredictable number of years, continue to underwrite the national experiments in global socialism now being undertaken in many lands. As the Socialist theories in practice sap the productive capacity of a people, so does socialism sap the national will to rise to unforeseen emergencies and dangers.

We should expand our efforts within the Western Hemisphere to the end that those nations which are cast with us in a common geographic mold may be enabled better to resist the lures of the Soviet Union. The red flames of Communist aggression were checked in Guatemala before they could spread to other republics, but we should not await the sound of crackling flames elsewhere in our hemisphere before reaching for the extinguishers. The provision of $5 million in additional aid for Guatemala is constructive and designed to indicate to the people of that country that not only are we concerned with the blaze until such time as it has been extinguished, but that our friendship continues through the burdened period of reconstruction.

The so-called neutrals—those nations who appear ready and willing to play off the aid of one country against the promises of another—should be promptly informed that the United States does not intend to be one of the pawns in an international chess game, where the Soviet holds the major pieces. Nationalism, neutralism and diplomatic guile are poor offerings to bring to the table of collective security.

H. R. 11356 should be passed; not because of its defects, but in spite of them. The world and its peoples, friends and foes alike, will interpret the vote on this measure as an indication of the collective thinking of the American people in the era of the Khrushchev-Bulganin smiles. Circumstances have combined to force many to vote for a measure which may well create new envy, new indecision, new hatreds, and new problems. But it will serve to indicate no letdown on the part of the American Congress in our true allies or in the assessment by the Congress of the new Soviet tactics.

Mr. PILCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Hays amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is very seldom that I come into this well, but I feel so deeply on this subject I have to say something in defense of our chairman and in opposition to the pending amendment. I am not a lawyer, but I believe I am a pretty good bookkeeper. I have supported foreign aid and mutual security for years before I came to Congress. I made speeches all over my district for it. If I thought that cutting this bill, as the committee did, would in any way jeopardize the defense of this country, I would not rise in opposition to the Hays amendment. But after listening to these hearings for 2 months, after studying the testimony of all of the witnesses, I can tell you truthfully that this cut of $1 billion will not jeopardize the defense of our country one single dime. To restore this cut is a direct repudiation of one of the finest men I have ever known.

DICK RICHARDS has fought for this program over the years. He has been a Member of the House for a quarter of a century. Ever since mutual security started, he has fought for this program, both in Republican and Democratic administrations. So far as his knowledge of the program is concerned, and so far as knowing where this money goes or whether they need it or not is concerned, in my opinion, he knows more about it than even the President of the United

States, because his information comes to him from other people.

Recently we voted $34 billion for the Defense Department. They have $6 billion in the pipeline and approximately $3 billion more in this bill. I cannot understand why we want to add more money to this program when the farmers all over the Nation are going broke, when small business is going broke, when taxes have reached the saturation point, when even the administration itself admits that a new study has to be made of this program.

You have heard much of what the Comptroller General said. Here is just one statement in reference to what he said before the Foreign Affairs Committee:

Comptroller General Campbell told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee over-optimistic foreign-aid planning has resulted in appropriation of more money than could be spent.

One result, he said, is that the Defense Department is holding at least $400 million in foreign-aid funds in violation of the law. That money, Campbell said, should revert to the Treasury.

"Two main factors," Campbell said, "contribute to 'overprograming' foreign aid." He said the International Cooperation Administration "apparently does not consider realistically the available resources and capabilities of both the United States and individual recipient countries." He also said "there is sometimes a preponderance of political over economic and financial considerations in determining the level of country programs."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. And the Comptroller General in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee said that this represented unpaid obligations, overstated as of June 30, 1954. Does the gentleman know whether this $400 million is still being held by the Pentagon?

Mr. PILCHER. No; I do not.

Mr. GROSS. This money is held in violation of the law. I should like to hear someone here today tell us whether this $400 million is still being held by the Pentagon in violation of the law.

Mr. PILCHER. Well, if this cut is restored, it is going to put a good many Members like myself in a position of having to vote against the entire bill. That is something I did not think I would ever see, but I cannot conscientiously go back to my people, with the condition they are in, and appropriate more money, I know, than they can spend or need to spend.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Hays amendment and speak for the amount of the bill for foreign military aid as the Foreign Affairs Committee has reported it.

I disagree with my good friend, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS], as I believe that we have looked this bill over thoroughly in committee. The committee by a vote of 24 to 4 reported out this bill in this amount after 6 weeks of thorough hearings. That is the first point.

Secondly, as to $1 billion of the proposed cut of $1,109,000,000 in the Foreign Affairs Committee, it was my amendment, which certainly places on me as well as the other members, a real responsibility to justify our action to this House. I have certainly tried to keep my amendment out of politics, and have even gone so far as to not make the original announcement but requested the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], who supported the amendment, to make the announcement. So, I disagree with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] who would like to make it possibly a matter of political capital or to have some effect upon the coming election in November. Politics should not be any consideration whatever when the security of our country is involved.

This amendment has been bipartisan in origination. It was sponsored by myself originally and was adopted by the committee, but there were other amendments proposed by members seeking to cut the proposal by various amounts. So, this has been a committee action rather than an individual or a political or partisan action.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. I dislike very much to interrupt, but the gentleman from Arkansas made the statement that since 1947 the Communists had not been successful in their aggression. He forgets Indochina. More Indonesians vote Communist than any country outside of the Iron Curtain countries. He forgets what is happening in Egypt. And I just wanted to correct that statement, because the gentleman is simply mistaken.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. If I did not say in Europe, I intended to.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman did say in Europe.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. That is correct.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I think the gentleman does not want to give the impression that the committee voted 24 to 4 for this cut of $1 billion. That vote was 18 to 11. We all voted 24 to 4 to report the bill out in the form it was in in the hope we could amend it and increase the amount. But, the vote to cut was 18 to 11. Is that not correct?

Mr. FULTON. Yes, that is right. The committee, by a vote of 24 to 4 adopted this amount in voting to report, in order to get the bill to the floor, although the original vote was 18 to 11 on the amendment as amended.

The serious question comes, Why did we make the cut? We made the cut because we thought the proposed amounts would be wasting money, unless a thorough resurvey of the foreign aid program be made in the light of fast changing world conditions. I cannot tell you the procedure, because it is secret, but this cut reduces the proposal to approximately the amount that was originally requested by this agency for this fiscal year; and the figure was later increased.

We should not speak of this as a cut because last year the appropriation for this foreign aid was $2,730 million. This year the Foreign Affairs Committee is increasing the amount in this program by approximately $800 million. Even with my cut of $1 billion in this bill there is approximately $3,500 million of new funds for fiscal 1957 for the foreign aid program. That means that the committee is actually increasing the program $800 million for the coming year. I feel there is some increase due. But how can the people who propose a further increase, such as my good friend from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS], reconcile that with the fact that the Secretary of State and the President now say that our foreign affairs are in much better condition this year than they were last, and each succeeding year in this administration they have been better; but now all of a sudden the International Cooperation Agency wants a $2 billion increase in the foreign aid program over last year, largely for military items?

We on the committe have felt that this program is long overdue for a thorough resurvey and reexamination. My position is this. I admire Gen. Al Gruenther very much. I have full confidence in him. I want NATO kept. I would not in the least hurt it. But we should be careful of getting the reputation of throwing money loosely around this world. It hurts the program. When the administration resurvey has been made, there is ample time to request Congress for further consideration, and I certainly promise my full cooperation.

When we cut previously, this House sustained the committee in spite of dire predictions that we were ruining the country and that world affairs would be pulled down around our heads, this program has developed and developed comparatively well.

Let us look at the items in this $1 billion cut. First there is $400 million concerning which testimony was had before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee from the Comptroller General of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Comptroller General of the United States Campbell, before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the other body, said that $400 million of these funds should be returned to the United States Treasury as these funds held over from previous years, were being held illegally by this Agency, the International Cooperation Agency. In addition, there is no question—and I can say it, I believe, without any fear of contradiction—that there is $190 million that is held over from the current 1956 fiscal year that is not even planned for

or obligated. The Agency could not reasonably find a program to put it in, so they had that amount left over, and are to be congratulated for saying so.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, a year or so ago the Committee on Appropriations came up with evidence of faulty bookkeeping. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], said here yesterday that they turned up $500 million as an item of faulty bookkeeping in the Department of Defense. Yes, and last year we on the Committee on Foreign Affairs heard the Department of Defense say to us that there was $145 million in a kitty that the Department had simply held in this foreign-aid program as a revolving fund. It was my amendment that cut that $145 million out. The committee adopted it and this House sustained that cut, even though the other body had already approved a higher amount.

Mr. Chairman, if you will recall, in previous years we on the committee have likewise cut this bill and it has not hurt. For example, in 1952, May 21, here on the floor I said:

> We on the Foreign Affairs Committee have already cut the administration's figure by $998,900,000 for foreign aid.

That was under Harry Truman. But what do we do when the Presidents themselves disagree? For example, Harry Truman stated he wanted $7,600,000,000 for the next fiscal year for foreign aid in his request just before President Eisenhower took office.

President Eisenhower came in and reduced the request for the first fiscal year in his term by $1,772,000,000 to a figure of $5,828,000,000. We on the committee then asked the Mutual Security Administration under Stassen to explain this proposal to us; many of us on the committee felt even that figure was high. Stassen himself voluntarily cut out $354 million and we on the committee again cut the request. The committee that year adopted 3 of my amendments of $100 million apiece, totaling $300 million, so we have respected our responsibility to the United States taxpayers in our deliberations on the Foreign Affairs Committee. We on the committee that year cut the proposal $476 million on top of Stassen's cut.

We say to you that we on the House Foreign Affairs Committee have examined and worked with this program. We have supported it. This is the eighth year that I have argued for this program, beginning with the Marshall plan. We have investigated these countries. We have looked at it in detail. When we say to you, "Resurvey this program for the next 6 or 7 months," and to the administration, "Come back here in January after a resurvey and we will hear further your request for the money," that is not asking very much. As the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], the chairman of the committee, has said, at this moment in the foreign-aid pipelines there is enough money to run this program for 2½ years without another cent being added.

I urge the House to sustain the Foreign Affairs Committee in its decision on this legislation, and I heartily support our chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] in his stand for the cut of $1,109,000,000 in the proposal, pending a resurvey and reevaluation of the United States foreign-aid programs abroad.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. FLOOD to the amendment offered by Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: On page 2, line 2, after "exceed", strike out "$1,925,000,000" and insert "$2,925,000,000"; and on page 2, line 4, strike out "$402,000,000" and insert "$589,500,000."

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, not long ago a great and distinguished American said that politics should end at the water's edge. I believe, having had my friends to the right encourage my friends to the left in my presence here during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations to believe this, that it is only fair under these circumstances that I join with my friends on the right in asking you on the left to do it today, and at the same time ask my friends on the left to join with me in asking my friends on the right to see how consistent both sides can all be after the last 8 years of discussing these foreign aid bills. Just where do both of you stand? My amendment gives you the opportunity to see how much you value the jewel of consistency on this program.

I have listened to my very dear friend from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] and I agree with everything he said up to the point of his amendment, and for precisely his argument. This cut as requested by the committee cannot be supported and for precisely those reasons the President's request should be met by the House.

Several speakers here today and yesterday want to do this in dribs and drabs, take a little bit here and a little bit there.

Not long ago in one of these historic and classic debates on the farm bill—God save the mark, at least this is not the farm bill—one of my farmer friends told us about the farmer and his cow. The cow was eating too much hay and the farmer decided he would teach the cow not to be so expensive, so he reduced the hay for the cow day by day, year by year. Finally he had the cow down to a couple of handfuls of hay a day, just as you are doing, or want to do. Well, it worked out very well. He had a very economical cow, but the cow died.

Now you want to cut this established program at a period of time when you say the world is in danger and you bate your breath to tell me how evil the world is. There is no sign that military tension is lessening, none at all. Quite the contrary. My friends to the right say, despite what my friends to the left say, "There is no peace in the world." Well, if there is no peace in the world, in Formosa, in Vietnam, in the Middle East, if all the things you say are true, then how can you touch military aid to Pakistan, military aid to Laos and Cambodia and Turkey? How can you do that? How can you touch military aid if you say there is no peace in the world? You cannot blow hot and cold in the coming campaign or out of it. You cannot have it both ways. You cannot vote to cut military aid and then go to this campaign and say, "These fellows are wrong. The world is not at peace." Remember the record will show that vote.

As for you to the left—well, well, well. I stand here asking you to back your President.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I cannot yield just now. I stand here asking you to follow the great general, the recognized expert on military affairs. As a member of the Defense Appropriations Committee, I stood in the well of this House and went the limit and more to back your President on military and defense matters. I asked you to give more for B–52 bombers. I told you what the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs said. I told you what the Joint Chiefs of Staff said. I told you what the Secretary of State said. Now I come here and I give to you the plea, I give to you the request, I give to you the sincerity, ability, skill, and leadership of General Eisenhower and of President Eisenhower, in this field. Do you dare substitute, in view of what you have said—do you dare to substitute your unskilled opinion in view of what you say to us this day for purposes other than the welfare of the Nation, for purposes other than the opinion of your leader, our President, do you dare cut in military and economic aid to the request of the President of the United States who, by the Constitution, sets and leads our foreign policy?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I will not.

If I am the only man in this House who votes to support the President of the United States under these circumstances at this time on the foreign-aid bill, I will cast that vote. I see no reason why you can substitute one opinion for another. They tell me that there are deodorants of various kinds, but they have nothing to cure halitosis. They merely substitute one odor for another.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. If I can get more time, I will yield interminably.

Mr. GROSS. Right now?

Mr. FLOOD. Not at this time.

Now I say, Mr. Chairman, that when I defended the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense I said I would support the President's request in the foreign-aid bill for military and economic aid. What you are doing if you support a cut, you are in effect cutting billions out of the defense budget, in ratio, under this act. Nobody in this House would cut the defense appropriation bill $10 billion. You are doing that here. The reason the defense appropriation bill was not billions more than it was, the reason we did not have a bigger bill for defense, is because of

the President's military-aid program—this program.

Now what do you do? Do you want to cut 6 inches off the bottom of a blanket and sew it on the top because the blanket is not long enough? You cannot have it both ways. You refused to increase the defense appropriation bill. Now you want to cut this one. Yet I have it, upon the authority of the President who leads foreign policy, I have it upon the authority of General Gruenther who now leads NATO, I have it upon the authority of General Eisenhower who established NATO, that this bill is necessary as he brings it up, necessary to the national security, the general welfare, and safety of this Nation. And do I understand that this House in 1956, after only 6 weeks of hearings, will deny the President and his military advisers, and I love my friend from South Carolina, I served when I first came to the House on his committee, and whatever knowledge or skill or awareness I have of the subject I learned at his feet, and my heart is heavy with yours when he leaves us this year. But even he could be wrong; even I could be wrong. But I am not wrong this time, that is the difference.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. FLOOD. That is a good time to ask me to yield. Even I must yield at that point.

Mr. FULTON. In the gentleman's figure there is, of course, military aid for Yugoslavia. What does the gentleman think our Italian friends think of building up further military establishments in Yugoslavia, their jet-plane program, giving them one of the largest jet-plane squadrons in the world? Is the gentleman in favor of that?

Mr. FLOOD. I suggest the gentleman address that question to our Italian friends, not to me.

Mr. FULTON. It is in the gentleman's amendment. I wonder how the gentleman felt about it.

Mr. FLOOD. I love my Italian friends; I have thousands of them in my district.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. If I am not mistaken there is going to be an opportunity later in our action on this bill to meet this Yugoslav question.

Mr. FLOOD. There will be, and there will be an opportunity later when we come to page 3. I propose to offer an amendment to restore the cut, $100 million, to give the President the right to use his discretion in the exercise of this fund for the Middle East, Africa, and Asia.

Mr. Chairman, on May 25 last the Committee on Foreign Affairs reported out H. R. 11356, the Mutual Security Act of 1956, which authorized the appropriation of funds to carry forward the program during the fiscal year 1957. The report of the committee contains some very interesting language and some conclusions which I believe to be unwarranted.

The committee reported:

This is a bill to implement the foreign policy of the United States.

It said further that all of the mutual security programs "are designed to promote the security of the United States and of the free world." In addition the committee said that "we should continue the program and strive continually to improve it."

For these very same reasons the President had recommended the appropriation of $4.8 billion of new funds and a carryover of old funds to make a total mutual security program of $4.9 billion for the fiscal year 1957.

Of this nearly $5 billion, $3 billion was for mutual defense assistance in the President's request. Mutual defense assistance is usually referred to as military aid. It consists mainly of weapons and training which are supplied to our military allies and partners. The Committee on Foreign Affairs said: "The sums authorized in this bill for military purposes are for the defense of the United States" and yet it cut the President's request for military aid by one-third.

Nobody in this Chamber would think of cutting 30 percent out of our domestic defense budget—of reducing defense appropriations by more than $10 billion—and yet such a meat-axe approach has been taken in that part of the United States military program which is concerned with other nations.

Everyone who has studied the subject of military assistance, so-called, has come to the conclusion that this is one of the most effective, cheapest, and best ways to advance the interests of the United States in military security.

We all know that there are various strategic spots around the world which must be held if the United States is to be secure. Do we serve our country better by drafting American boys to hold these spots or do we serve it better by helping other freedom-loving people to defend their own soil, and in defending it, to defend us, too?

Does anyone think the military threat to the United States and its partners has departed? Has the capacity of the Soviet or the Chinese Communists to launch an aggression diminished?

There is talk of sweetness and light from Khrushchev and Bulganin and we hear reports of alleged cuts in the Soviet military machine. Even should the reported cuts in manpower prove true, this does not mean that the capacity of the Soviet machine, or the firepower it can bring to bear, has gone down one bit.

We have been told in our own country that it is possible to get a "bigger bang for a buck," that with reduction in the numbers of our Armed Forces, we are actually stronger than ever. I take it the same reasoning can be applied to the Sino-Soviet bloc and that, even with less manpower, they are able to produce "more rubble per ruble."

I have heard it said that the President's request for military assistance funds should not be granted in full because there is a vast backlog of unexpended funds. I would remind the Members of this House that the backlog of unexpended funds for military assistance is at the lowest point in recent years. I would remind them, also, that a worldwide cooperative military program involving scores of sovereign nations cannot work if one partner tries to turn it on or off like a garden hose.

Decisions on the levels of Armed Forces needed to defend strategic locations, decisions on what it takes to equip and maintain those forces, decisions on how the bills are to be paid, decisions as to what the United States will do, decisions on committing military-assistance funds—in other words, ordering the necessary equipment, waiting for it to be produced, and then seeing that it is delivered to our allies—and then training allied forces in its effective use—this is a vast and complicated process and one that involves a great deal of time.

I mention the element of time because a stop-start approach or a slowdown approach to mutual security means that we have to use more time to get less results than if we were to go along with the President's request. I do not think we can afford the time nor do I think that we can afford, through inaction on our part, to weaken the free world military alliance which has been successful, for 6 years, in deterring new military aggression by Communist forces.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has recommended that slightly less than $2 billion be appropriated, of which not less than $48 million shall be available only for Spain and not more than $402 million for military assistance to other European countries.

What would such a cut mean, especially to Europe—an area which the Secretary of State has characterized as so important to United States security that we even have United States troops stationed there?

If funds available for our NATO allies in Europe amount to only $402 million, and were used entirely to make up losses through attrition, to pay for spare parts and maintenance, not even these needs could be met. Even worse, there could be no progress on a program for advanced weapons, a program which is considered to be important not only for reasons of military tactics, but also for psychological and political reasons.

Furthermore, if the funds for Europe were expended entirely for advanced weapons, there could be no upkeep on the immense investment already made in European defenses by the United States.

If the presently authorized funds were divided between the advanced weapons program and the maintenance program, neither program could advance and both would suffer.

We are told that some of our European friends hold an erroneous belief that the Soviet military threat has ended. Should we encourage them in that belief by cutting down the military program for Europe to the point where it cannot operate? Are we trying to hold the NATO alliance together, or to help it disintegrate?

Other countries for whom a major share of the military assistance funds are programed include Korea, Taiwan, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Pakistan, and Turkey—each of them within clawing distance of the Dragon or the Bear. Are we in the business of encouraging individual weakness or are we trying to create collective strength? If we are trying to do the latter, I confess I cannot

see how countries whose military strength depends upon arms and equipment from the United States can become stronger if the funds to pay for such arms are cut down by one-third.

The facts are that our worldwide expenditures in recent years for military assistance have been larger than appropriations. We have been depleting the reservoir of military aid faster than we have been filling it up.

Cuts can be made—there is no question about that. The question is, what will be the effect? Let us not forget the fable of the man who thought his cow was eating too much and, in an effort to save money, started cutting down on the cow's food. Every day he gave the cow a little less to eat. Eventually, he was successful; he got the cow down to two wisps of hay per day. The success of this experiment in economy was somewhat eclipsed by the fact that when the cow got down to this money-saving ration, the creature died.

The other major cut in the President's request is a cut of $100 million in economic funds available for the Middle East. The President had originally proposed a special fund of this amount for the area.

The committee consolidated the program of development assistance, the President's fund for Asian economic development, and the special fund which had been requested by the President for the Middle East. There can be no objection to the consolidation of the various funds, but are we wise in cutting down the amount available for the Middle East by $100 million?

Here, in this area, according to all newspaper accounts, is the most volatile situation to be found anywhere in the world. Here the Soviet bloc is making a major effort of a nonmilitary character. Here the situation changes rapidly, and it is here that emergencies may arise or opportunities may come up which require fast and flexible action if advantage is to accrue to our side and not to the Soviet bloc.

The President had requested another string to his bow to help him carry out his constitutional responsibilities in respect to the foreign relations of the United States. By denying the President the $100 million for the Middle East, the committee has, in effect, denied him this extra bowstring.

Not only did the committee deprive the President of funds he had requested, but it also deprived him of an element of flexibility in the use of funds by requiring that all development-assistance funds be made available to other nations either in the form of loans or in the form of United States surplus agricultural commodities.

These mandatory provisions apply to the Middle East. Where the maximum discretion should be left to the President, should we tie his hands with inflexible legal provisions?

Where speed can be a decisive factor, should we guarantee that the United States cannot act with speed because of the need for lengthy negotiation about terms of loans or use of United States surplus products?

Mr. Chairman, I believe the interests of the United States will be promoted more effectively—and over the long run at less cost to the taxpayers—if we give to the President the funds he has asked for and do not burden him with legal provisions which hinder his ability—his duty— to act fast when fast action is required to protect the security of our country.

Mr. VORYS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] rise?

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hays amendment and against all the rest of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, when I first heard that this bill provided over $2 billion more for military aid than we had last year, I started to study how it could be cut. I think I have the best attendance record at the hearings of our committee of any member of the committee except possibly our great chairman. I am supporting the Hays amendment, and I am against all the rest of the amendments because I feel quite confident that the executive branch can live with the Hays amendment but will be in trouble with any of the rest of them.

As to the Flood amendment, for instance, it has been found by the Defense Department that there is $129 million of savings that can be made in the authorization. That is reflected in the request to the Appropriations Committee now.

As to the $400 million that the Comptroller General said was illegally held over in June 1954, I understand he has not yet furnished supporting data to the Defense Department. Far more than that has been taken out of the Defense Department appropriations since then, not only by action of the Budget but by action of the Congress since then.

I had this chart brought in because it shows the way the appropriations have been going, where they took a great big dip here and the way the expenditures have been going.

We have made a reduction since 1953 in the annual expenditures. Remember, this is "part and parcel of our own defense," according to Admiral Radford and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. A lot of people think we are cutting our own defense expenditures too low, but in any case this administration has tried to hold down defense expenditures at home and abroad, and has done pretty well. We still need, however, a pipeline of expenditures in excess of $2.5 billion a year to supply and maintain this program. But when we made the cut of nearly $600 million last year we put a dent in the pipeline, and it was not because the Congress said the program requested was bad but because Congress wanted to punish the Defense Department for inaccurate bookkeeping. We made this $600 million dent in the flow of the long lead items needed to keep this defense program going. This had to be added this year. Then when it was determined that we were to launch a program of $530 million for advanced weapons—those are nuclear weapons we are talking about for this program—why, of course, that made an increase for this year.

So I went over the figures they proposed this year, as carefully as I could.

It is not $6 billion, it is $5 billion estimated to be unexpended by June 30. All but $195 million is obligated, programed, reserved, tied up in this program for various places all over the world. We have gone over the secret books telling where all this is to go; $374 million of the program is for direct forces support. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] said that we give them guns, but nothing to feed them. There is food money in direct forces support, for the forces in Korea, Formosa, and Vietnam, for food, uniforms and that sort of thing. As I shall explain, that cannot be cut.

I got in touch with the Defense Department when there were talks of cuts. I asked, "Where would you apply the cuts?" They said, "Of course, cuts of the size you are talking about would require 5 or 6 months of reprograming to figure accurately. We would have to go over the whole program in detail." However, they made the best estimates they could in the time available.

These are some figures they gave: $255 million are for fixed charges, for shipping for our committed share of infrastructure for the costs of our military advisory groups in each country for some programs that cannot be discussed fully on the floor.

Even with a $1 billion cut, direct forces support of $374 million, would not be cut.

Here is the difference between the effect of a $500 million cut and a billion dollar cut. Every one of these following items would be reduced by a $500 million cut, but an additional cut of $500 million would eliminate:

Seventy-five million dollars in spare parts to keep the equipment moving that we have already furnished;

Fifty million dollars in ammunition, for training and a war reserve;

Fifty-two million dollars in naval aircraft;

Ninety million dollars in naval vessels; and

Twenty-six million dollars in other materials.

Two hundred million dollars in advance weapons. That is the program that is so vital in an era of nuclear warfare where we have various sizes of nuclear weapons.

Even with a billion dollar cut training money is cut only $7 million because of its vital importance to get these forces all over the world trained in the use of our equipment and in our methods.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is it fair to say that regardless of the appropriation requested, the expenditure figure, which is really the guiding figure, is only $500 million more in fiscal 1957 than in the current fiscal year?

Mr. VORYS. That is correct.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is it also fair to say that $500 million is just about the

amount that is allocated to the new advance weapons program which is considered so vital from the standpoint of the defense of the free world?

Mr. VORYS. That is right. We need more than $2½ billion a year to keep this going. If we try to ride it out with what we have, we will have nothing for long lead items 2 years from now for advance weapons which we will not be able to procure even if we start now.

I have given an estimate of the weapons that will be cut, unless we restore at least $500 million. I have not attempted to determine the countries that will be cut. The Defense Department has not done so. Those who vote for the cuts should realize that cuts will have to be taken off somewhere.

Where are you going to take off the billion dollars you are talking about?

For Europe there is requested $760 million. It is said, well, we can cut a lot in Europe. You are going to have to cut there even with the Hays amendment.

The Near East request is $471 million. Are you going to cut Greece, Turkey, the northern tier of countries, that are holding the line to the south of Russia? Asia is in here for $1,066,000,000. Are you going to cut the forces of Korea facing the Communist build-up across the armistice line? They have 20 divisions in their army, the same as we have. Are you going to cut the forces in Formosa, and on Quemoy and Matsu? Are you going to cut the forces in Vietnam, or in Japan? Here are 4 places where peace exists merely by a cease-fire, and an uneasy cease-fire in every case. Are you going to let those Asians down? If you are going to make any of these cuts, you will have to take out part of the military money for these countries.

It will take months to refigure the final impact of any cut. I am relying on Admiral Radford, who knows something about it. Above all, on this program I am relying on a man who has been in this business, President Eisenhower. Since he led our forces to victory in World War II, he has been back over to Europe. He does not have the advantage that somebody has suggested of never having been abroad. He has been over there. He sat there in SHAPE headquarters and waited for weapons that the United States promised but did not ship. On some questions you can say, "Well, the President is ill advised; he does not know about it." But, we are talking about an old soldier who has served abroad in the mutual security program and who says we have got to have this as part and parcel of our own defense. Only 3 of you voted against the military construction bill, which includes $780 million for overseas bases. Not a soul of you voted against our own defense bill, and we did not cut that at all. We make a great mistake when we attempt to be experts and fly in the face of the man who knows what he is talking about on this program more than anybody here. He has studied this, he knows and he says we need this for our security. So, I am supporting the Hays amendment and I am against the others.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell us how much the United States is contributing to the French to carry on their war in North Africa?

Mr. VORYS. Nothing.

Mr. GROSS. Nothing?

Mr. VORYS. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me how much of a cut he suggested in this bill, or did he suggest any cut to it at any time?

Mr. VORYS. Yes. Half a billion in committee, and I am supporting this cut, which is a $400 million cut, because I think that cut can be handled based on the studies I have made, I have tried not to shoot in the dark, not to just make general estimates but to try to figure where we are coming out on this.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman spoke of a breakdown of figures. Where in the committee hearings—and I have tried to go over them carefully—are those figures?

Mr. VORYS. The figures on what the cut would amount to were not in the committee hearing, because the Defense Department was presenting a program that did not involve any cuts. I have sought out and obtained those figures since then. I have put a part of them in the record. But, of course, the figuring on this sort of cut, these gigantic cuts, has not been made in advance.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. There is no breakdown of your appropriations.

Mr. VORYS. The Defense Department is before the Committee on Appropriations. Let us not forget what we are doing today; we are not appropriating a dime. We are just deciding whether we want to tie our own hands in advance as to what the Committee on Appropriations does. I think we better not tie our hands any tighter than we do with the Hays amendment.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the statements of my good friend, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS], particularly in reference to his most generous and fulsome praise of our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I was wondering, when he was praising him, just what he had in mind, whether it was consistent to praise his good friend and distinguished chairman, whom we all love, from one side of his mouth, and from the other side at the same time say that we could not trust him in this instance.

In fact, I am thinking of a story that my good friend from Arkansas loves to tell, one that I am sure most of you have heard, but nevertheless I think very apropos under the circumstances. He tells a story about a man catching a catfish and he puts him up on the table and then he takes a butcher knife, and the catfish begins to wiggle around, and he says, "Now just hold steady, old boy." He says, "I ain't going to do a thing but gut you." I am sure that that is not exactly what my friend had in mind when he was praising the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]; but it amounts to the same thing.

Mr. Chairman, I came to this House the same year the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] came here. I have had the privilege of serving here with him all those years. I wish I had the time, in my own feeble way, to give you my own evaluation of him. But that is not really the point here now. The point is that the gentleman from South Carolina has served 24 years on the Foreign Affairs Committee of this body and has come from the foot of the committee table up to the head of the table, to become the chairman of this great committee.

I doubt that anyone has contributed more to the cause of our international relations than has DICK RICHARDS. It is true that he was not serving in another body where he would have had a better sounding board. Had that been the case I am sure he would now receive the recognition he is so justly entitled to as the outstanding authority on international affairs. But the fact remains that for 24 years he has devoted his time and effort and talents and his good, sound judgment to a study of the controversies that have confronted this great country of ours in a controversial world.

I know what he is up against here. I know what you and I and the rest of us are up against here who subscribe to his recommendations in this matter. We have on the one hand the distinguished gentleman at the other end of the avenue who is asking for a restoration of the funds which he requested. If I understand the situation correctly, we have the leadership on both sides of the aisle in line with that request. It is a rather difficult thing to oppose the White House and the leadership on both sides of the aisle. But that has been one of the characteristics of this man RICHARDS throughout his long service here. Sometimes I like to compare him with another Richard, Richard the Lionhearted—a man who has the courage of his convictions.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I can truthfully repeat for the record here today what I have often said privately. Congressman RICHARDS has few equals and no superiors as a statesman in this House. He is truly a statesman in the proper sense of the word. He is a Democrat in party affiliation, but where the welfare of his country is concerned he is neither Democrat nor Republican. He is a patriotic American first. His conduct during the years of his service in this House has been of the highest order. That conduct here has been in line with his experiences on the battlefields of France defending his country. A high sense of duty, a fervent love of country, and an unwavering devotion to his family and his God have transcended party affiliation and a personal desire for political aggrandizement.

This together with his sound judgment, his fearless courage, and his genteel consideration of his fellow man has all resulted in the high esteem in which he is held on both sides of the aisle of this House.

If the pending amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] is defeated and with the great odds under which my distinguished colleague and friend is fighting, with the leadership on both sides and the President of the United States alined against him, it will be because of the respect and confidence the membership of this House has in the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. Chairman, one of the great compensating factors that I have received as a result of my service in this body was the opportunity to know and be associated rather closely with my colleague from South Carolina. I am sure that I bespeak the sentiment of all when I say that the Congress and the country will suffer tremendously by the voluntary retirement of our friend at the end of this session. I join with you, my colleagues all, in wishing for him a deserved, contented, and extensive period of retirement with his splendid family in his beloved hills of South Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the fact that the distinguished President of the United States, for whom I have a great respect and admiration, knows something about this situation. I recognize that the distinguished leadership on both sides of the aisle have a knowledge of this situation. I recognize that the military have a knowledge of this situation, but I make the statement without fear of successful contradiction that none of us know more about the true situation that exists in this controversial foreign field than the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, who has devoted the major part, the better years of his life, to the one study of our foreign relations, while these other gentlemen have had so many, so multitudinous duties and problems to confront them and to solve.

Now, what has happened here? The gentleman from Arkansas wants to restore these funds, in the amount, I understand, of $1,109,000,000. The gentleman from South Carolina, who is a great authority on this subject, wants to leave it as the committee reported it out. This is $277,675,000 more money than we appropriated last year. I had hoped that somewhere down the line we would be able to taper off, but instead, apparently, year after year, we are increasing this foreign aid.

Mr. Chairman, in 1945, even before the beginning of this foreign aid under the Marshall plan, as chairman of the Post War Economic Policy and Planning Committee, I recommended that some financial aid be extended by this country to the less fortunate war-ridden victims of the Nazis. I thought then that some aid was necessary to aid those countries in rehabilitating themselves. For the first few years I supported this program, with reservations because of the gigantic sums involved. On several occasions I endeavored, by appropriate amendment, to cut down on what I regarded as unnecessary and stupendous amounts of the taxpayers' money. Failing in these efforts, for the past several years, I have opposed and voted my protest against the entire bill. What started out to be a reasonable program has grown into sums that were not, in my opinion, justified. In fact, since this program started, we have sent to these foreign countries more than $50 billion. Surely, even this rich country cannot continue that program. Even the three billion dollars plus in this bill, without this amendment, cannot be justified. Therefore, regardless of the action taken on this amendment, I shall continue my protest by voting against the bill.

Mr. Chairman, at the risk of being boresome, I repeat again what I have stated on many occasions on this floor and elsewhere. The real danger to this country lies not in the fear of a Russian invasion, but in the destruction of the economy of this country by the continuous deflation of our currency and reckless spending with the resultant destruction of our economy. Certainly, it is time for this Congress, the representatives of the people, to stop a little while, consider a little while, and take a true evaluation of our own situation. For, if we destroy our own economy by becoming too generous with all others, who will come to our aid?

Finally, I think that if we have learned anything out of this whole program, we have learned that you cannot buy friendship abroad anymore than you can buy it at home. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, there is no question of the honesty of motive of any Member involved in the consideration of the bill today. Nobody questions the motives of any Member. So, we can rule that out. It should not be the subject of further discussion by any Member, whether they are for an increase or against the bill, or anything else. We are all sitting here as Americans, trying to do the best we can under the circumstances. We may have our different views, but where there is a difference we respect the views that everyone entertains. That is the spirit of America and that is the spirit of decency.

As I view the question, we are discussing a military question today. We are discussing something that relates to the national defense of the United States. There are some who honestly believe we should never have done anything in the past. I respect their views, but if we had not where would the world be today? We would probably be alone, with the world dominated by the Communists. I certainly do not want to see a Communist-dominated world. I would never admit that a Communist-dominated world could defeat my country, but I would not want to see my country placed in the position of having to defend itself against such a situation.

Politically, it is probably the best thing to vote against all appropriations. That is the line of least resistance. I can remember in this Chamber a few months before Pearl Harbor on the bill for the extension of the Selective Service Act, that it barely passed this body by a vote of 202 to 201. Politically it would have been better to vote against it, those who voted for it, and in all probability the 201 who voted against the bill were just as good Americans as I and the others who voted for the bill. But I have often wondered how they would have felt after Pearl Harbor if the extension was defeated by 1 or more votes, instead of being passed in this body by the thin margin of 1 vote.

So, we are discussing essentially something of a military nature. General Gruenther says we need $600 million as a minimum. Are we going to disregard General Gruenther? President Eisenhower, who we all admit is a great military leader and who some of my friends in the Republican Party say "I like Ike," in their district, but they vote against him in this Chamber—he is a great military man. He pleaded with us the other night. Nobody present at that meeting could forget the feeling that the President of the United States put into what he had to say about the importance of it. I asked the question that developed the fact that a minimum of $600 million was necessary. That is how the $600 million was arrived at. My friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] will remember I asked "What is the minimum needed?" It developed to be $600 million. The President of the United States is my President. He may be a Republican in politics but when he occupies the office he does, he is my President. We sat there as Americans and we are serving him as Americans.

This is a matter concerning foreign affairs and concerning the national security of our country. It was Senator Vandenberg who said "bipartisanship exits." I agree with him. We do not want to see it destroyed or weakened. Those who are voting for the $1,100,000,000 cut—I do not say they want to weaken it, but I say the results will have a weakening effect. We do not want to take a chance. I would rather err on the side of strength than on the side of weakness. Let us not be deceived by the smile and the slap on the back by the Communist leaders. Let us realize there is tension going on behind the Iron Curtain. It is up to us to capitalize on those tensions. Let us realize that everything is not all happy behind the Iron Curtain. There are millions in the Soviet Union who have been indoctrinated for years with the fact that Stalin was a superman. I do not think they are going to take this campaign to destroy him very easily. It will create division in the minds of those people. They are not going to destroy him overnight; there are divisions there and we should capitalize on them to the fullest extent we can,

bring about discontent, then division; that is the thing for us to do. Then the effect upon Poland. Ninety-five percent of the people of Poland hate the Communists. Lithuania, squelched out. Latvia, Estonia also—you do not hear anything about those countries, they are not given even satellite status. Probably 85 percent of the people of Czechoslovakia hate the Communists and are waiting for deliverance. They are waiting for America.

Those are the things we Americans can do, Mr. Chairman. We are making our contribution. History is being made. How? The future will tell. What we do makes our contribution, and we should grant the increase of $600 million the President, the President of the United States, asks be restored. I am not thinking about bailing the President out in this matter; that is not in my mind; I am thinking about the national interests of my country as I view it.

The President says it is necessary; Gruenther says it is necessary; the Joint Chiefs of Staff say it is necessary. Who am I, a layman, to say that they are wrong? They are the men I must look to and that you must look to and other people also to lead our forces and defend our country in case of another war.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If that is so where are the details that support these things? That is what I am looking for and that is what the Congress wants.

Mr. McCORMACK. Where are the what?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The details to support the request the gentleman is making.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman in his own time can tell what the details are.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No, I am asking you.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman can express his own views; I am expressing mine.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am asking the gentleman to tell me.

Mr. McCORMACK. The details of this? It means there will be a stockpile of nuclear weapons over there in those bases. It means that the B–47's which cannot fly from continent to continent can make 10 trips a month in case of attack—we cannot leave that out—instead of 3 or 4 trips a month otherwise by the B–54's.

There are six divisions of Americans over there, our own boys. The psychological effect of appropriating this $600 million is going to be very great on the morale of our own 6 divisions over there if those monsters should decide to move, and you know they will do it if they think they have a chance to be successful.

Then there is Korea. Major General Bard the other day ordered the truce teams out. I do not know whether they will be kept out, but I hope he is supported, I hope there is no withdrawal from his position.

We know what the delegates from Czechoslovakia and Poland have been doing.

Secretary Robertson only the other day in a speech referred to what is happening in South Vietnam and the violation of the truce there by the Communists.

You and I know what is happening. This is a time for strength, this is the time to show firmness, if for no other reason than a psychological one. Frankly, I will support that amendment, and we as Members of the House charged with the responsibility that we are, if from no other angle than the psychological angle should realize how necessary it is to put back the $600 million that everyone familiar with the military aspect says is absolutely essential and is the minimum amount in the national interest of our country.

I am not voting that money just to help some other country; I am voting for it because I think it is in the national interest of my own country, and I am doing it because of the national interest of my own country. I do not care whether the President who recommends it is a Republican or not; that is immaterial to me. The question is: Do I think it is in the national interest of my country? And I do.

The viewpoint of the President, whoever he is, will receive my serious consideration; the viewpoint of the Joint Chiefs of Staff will receive my serious consideration; the viewpoint of General Gruenther will receive my serious consideration. Based upon the evidence I have before me, my conscience says to vote on the side of strength and not on the side of weakness. Therefore I hope the amendment increasing the amount by $600 million will be adopted. I appreciate the effort of my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], but I think the best thing to do is to get behind the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I opposed the cut in the committee and was in favor of providing the full amount for the mutual security program. In my opinion, the entire amount should be restored by the Congress and I hope it is restored.

I agree with preceding speakers that it certainly would be very disastrous to go below the amount provided in the amendment offered by my colleague from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

I would like to draw attention to some figures in connection with our defense program. For the fiscal year of 1957 I call attention to the fact that expenditures were estimated by the President at $65.9 billion. The purposes of these expenditures are as follows: 64 percent for protection, 21 percent for civil benefits, 11 percent for interest, and 4 percent for civil operations and administration.

Mr. Chairman, I know of no better way of putting our military leadership in the world in its proper and dramatic perspective than to point out that of the $65.9 billion included in the budget to be spent during the next fiscal year for the purpose of operating the Federal Government, $42.4 billion was set aside for protection. I would like to call attention also to the fact, as has been mentioned here today, that on May 10 by a vote of 377 to 0 this House passed the defense appropriation bill making appropriations of $33,635,000,000 for the Defense Department for the ensuing year.

Mr. Chairman, the difference between the $33,635,000,000 and $42.4 billion as suggested in the budget is made up by the mutual security and other programs in connection with defense. The point we ought to keep in mind is that the mutual security program is only about 10 percent of the entire defense program and it is part and parcel of the defense program. So, if we are going to pass a bill by a vote of 377 to nothing, as we did for the defense program with reference to our Military Establishment, I cannot see how we can reason that the remainder of the defense program should be cut by the amount that was cut in the committee.

I think, as we carefully look over the program as it has operated during the past years, we must agree that the program has been successful. We are in a particularly crucial period in our history, with tremendous power resulting from the nuclear revolution in which we find ourselves. Because of this extremely crucial period it is necessary to continue this program which has been successful. The program should not be hurt at this particlar time, at a time when the Soviet Union has adopted new tactics but has not changed its fundamental philosophy. We should not hesitate at a period when we are on the verge of great victories in our mutual security effort.

Furthermore, the greatest military genius of our time, the President of the United States, has constantly advocated and requested the full amount of the mutal security program. I, for one, Mr. Chairman, do not want to take the responsibility of cutting the funds which the President says he needs in order to implement the foreign policy of the United States. Projected against the background of our expenditures for defense, this is a small amount of money. One billion dollars against $42.4 billion or against the money—$33.6 billion—that we appropriated for the Departpartment of Defense only a few weeks ago in this House is not large in comparison. It would be of tremendous psychological advantage, Mr. Chairman, to retore this amount.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Hays amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the administration has proposed an overall review or restudy of the mutual security program. This indicates that the administration is uncertain, not about the need for a mutual security program, but the emphasis that should be given to various parts of it. This uncertainty is caused by shifts of Soviet tactics that have taken place in the past year or 18 months. I feel that the administration's proposal is not only warranted but that this restudy and review must take place. Pending and during such a review and restudy, I recognize the fact that a reasonable mutual security program should and must be continued.

The possibility of executive review does not, however, lessen the responsibility of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Congress to seek a full justification of the authorization request that has been made by the executive branch of our Government. The Committee on Foreign Affairs, under the able leadership of our chairman, has accepted that responsibility, and after some 2 months of very careful review recommended the bill that is now before the House.

The decrease in military funds by $1 billion was adopted by an 18-to-11 bipartisan committee vote. Almost two-thirds of the members of that committee who were present voted in favor of the reductions after having heard testimony from representatives of every branch of our Government connected with the administration and the planning of this program. But in spite of the committee's recommendations a last-minute effort is being made to restore more than half of the reduction that the committee recommended. Statements have been issued that this program will be seriously impaired or even wrecked if these funds are not restored to the bill.

Yet, each year since this program has been in operation, the Congress has voted less than the amount requested by the Executive. In 1950, the Congress reduced the request of the Executive by $583 million. In 1951 it was reduced by $813 million. The reduction in 1952 was $1,217,000,000. In 1953 the cut was $1,888,000,000. In 1954 the Executive's request was again cut, this time by $1,297,000,000. In 1955 the reduction was $894 million. Last year the request of the Executive was reduced $826 million by the Congress.

Each year that these reductions have been made, protests similar to those now being voiced have been heard. Yet the program has continued to operate and, at the end of the present fiscal year, it is estimated that the program's unexpended balance will be approximately $6,600,000,000. That amount is sufficient to continue the mutual security program without any further appropriation for nearly 2 years. Yet the committee is recommending in this bill an authorization of an additional $3,600,000,000 that it sincerely believes will keep the so-called pipeline safely in operation.

Notwithstanding this past history, the committee did not make reductions indiscriminately. Other important factors indicated a substantial reduction in the Executive's request was justified. Almost $5,600,000,000 of unexpended military funds is now in the so-called pipeline. Of this amount, $3,600,000,000 is earmarked for European programs. Most of these programs were worked out when German rearmament was scheduled to follow a more accelerated pace, before France moved a large part of her forces to North Africa and before several NATO countries indicated contemplated reductions in their defense budgets.

These facts, coupled with the knowledge that the equipment to be supplied by the European pipeline funds can be transferred to other areas, were sufficient to convince almost two-thirds of the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, including our distinguished chairman, that a reduction in military funds could be made without injuring this program. I therefore urge the House to uphold the committee's action and defeat the Hays amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, for 14 years now I have been hearing the same story. When I came here in 1943 it was lend-lease. The same arguments, the same tactics that were used at that time are being employed now.

In fact, after the war ended, and including 1950, even when the war started in Korea, the pipe line was still filled with war implements going to Joe Stalin in the Kremlin—up to and including the Korean war.

Then, of course, when lend-lease proved such a dismal failure, they had to come out with a new gimmick. They just changed the name of it to UNRRA and the administration of that was so disgraceful that that lasted only 2 years. They knew they could not put that program over in the Congress any more, so they dug up with another kind of gimmick called the Marshall plan. And, believe it or not, when the original Marshall plan was proposed in this Congress, even the Kremlin was invited to come in and get its share. But the arguments for all of these were the same. In the clutch always the big wheels came over here to the floor and said, "If you do not give these billions awful things are going to happen to the future and the security of America." The big wheels try to scare the hell out of you if you do not go along.

Then when the Marshall plan proved such a dismal failure, they just brought in still a new gimmick, dressed it up under another name, and now called it mutual security. There is nothing mutual about it, and if anybody finds any security in it I would like to find out where it is.

The amendment to restore part of this cut, the very wording of it, even if anyone were partial for restoration of the cut, is such that all Members of Congress should vote against it. Mind you, if this amendment is adopted, it would give the Department of State and the Pentagon practically a scot-free voice on what they will do with that money, that is the $2,500,000,000, that could be used for military expenditures in European countries. It will knock out any earmarking of any funds to Spain. Do not let the leaders fool you about Spain. The only reason Spain is getting aid today from the United States is not because the Pentagon wanted it, not because the State Department wanted it. I remember in 1947 when I offered the amendment to include Spain in the Marshall plan the Pentagon and the State Department almost had a hemorrhage. The only reason Spain is receiving aid today is that the Congress of the United States of America in its wisdom jammed it down their throats, earmarked the money, and said, "You must spend it for that purpose and that purpose only." Even after it was appropriated by this Congress it took 3 years before the Pentagon and the State Department unloaded one dime in the country of Spain. That is how much they were interested in mutual security with Spain.

I have not been there, but you Members of Congress who have made a study of all these foreign assistance programs will verify that the only place we are getting our money's worth is in Spain. And remember we jammed it down the throats of the leaders of our country. They did not want it. The Congress in its wisdom forced it upon them. If you adopt this amendment, Spain is not going to be earmarked for any money. Since they did not want to do it in the first place we have reason to believe they will not do it unless it is earmarked. They will have $2,500,000,000 to spend at their discretion, which very likely means that they will have some $48 million more to give Marshal Tito, which is probably their plan. Why they are doing that I do not know, is madness and needs the attention of expert psychiatrists.

We all know that communism has a new look. Let us examine that new look. The man who is really going to deliver the new look all over the world, the man who has set the stage for it, the man who was selected to do the job, is Marshal Tito, who now is arm in arm with the Kremlin. His present visit to the Kremlin quotes him as saying: "Nothing will ever divide us again, nothing will ever come between us again, even the $1 billion I got from Uncle Sam. Nothing will come between us again. We are one now and forever."

What is Tito's purpose under this new look under communism? With the taxpayers' money, the United States of America has built for the Kremlin a Communist showcase in Yugoslavia that they can show all over the world, to prove that you can be a member of the Communist orbit, that you can be in the family of the Kremlin, and you can still get billions of dollars from Uncle Sam.

Why do you suppose Tito went to India? Why do you suppose he went to Egypt? Why do you suppose he went to France? Why do you suppose he went to England? For his own good? Do not be naive. He has a mission to perform. Tito now has a billion-dollar showcase in Yugoslavia built with American money and armed with American jet planes. He is going to all of these countries and saying to them, "Look, this idea that if the Communists take over, that if your country goes Communist, you are going to get all your orders from the Kremlin, that is all hogwash. Look at me. I am a member of the Communist family, I am a member of the Communist orbit. I do as I please. I got a billion dollars from Uncle Sam. Why don't you join the Communist orbit and do the same thing? You can be a good Communist and faithful to the Kremlin and still get billions from Uncle Sam."

Tito today is being used as a super salesman of what can be done with a

country if it joins the Communist orbit. If Congress is going to continue to give Tito the $300 million which I understand is still in the pipelines, there is something wrong upstairs. Yet in this bill some $30 million more earmarked for Tito in economic aid. How much military aid he is being given is supposed to be a secret. But, mind you, he certainly is telling the Kremlin right now how much mililtary aid he is getting from the United States and what chumps we are.

Right now Tito is telling the Kremlin how much military aid he is getting from the United States. It is all right for the Kremlin to know how much military aid he is getting, but we Members of Congress are not supposed to know. We are not supposed to know how much aid Tito is going to get. We are not to be trusted. But Tito is.

Now, I hear a lot about "Follow the leader." I respect my leaders, but if I went home and told my people I was going to just sit in my office and draw $22,500 and let my leaders do the thinking for me, tell my people that I am not going to do any reading or any thinking, that I am just going to do what the leaders tell me, do you know what my people would do to me? They would do what I deserve to have done. They would kick me out. I was sent here to do my own thinking. Is there anybody in this Congress who will deny that our State Department and our military have committed blunder after blunder throughout the world? Is there anybody here who will deny that? Then why should we follow them? Just as they were wrong on this Spanish aid issue—they talked about this foreign-aid program stopping communism. The queerest thing is that the places where we have given the least aid are the places where we have had the least trouble with communism. Spain is one. Norway is another. Sweden is another. The "funny" part is that the countries we have given the most money, France and Italy, have more active members of the Communist Party than they have in Russia itself. Even though they say they are stopping communism with this foreign-aid program, you have more active, signed-up members of the Communists than in Russia itself. That is where we have poured in most of our billions of dollars under this foreign-aid program. If this bill passes with a continuation of aid to Tito, you are doing for the free world a damage which no amount of billions of dollars or human lives will ever repair, because he is the man that they are now depending upon under "the New Look" to get other countries of the world into the Communist orbit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] has again expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, in a great many instances emotionalism and rock-and-roll tactics on the part of the leadership can be more convincing than actual facts and good sound logic.

Last year, when the Congress in its wisdom reduced the budget request by an amount in excess of $500 million, it was bemoaned that we had wrecked the program. May I assure each member of the committee that we did not wreck the foreign-aid program; rather we helped it. I have asked at least 20 witnesses who appeared before the Subcommittee on Appropriations handling the money phase of this bill if the reduction last year actually hampered the program in any way. Without exception the answer was "No." Make no mistake about it, we did not hamper the program in any way by making a reduction of in excess of $500 million last year.

You will remember there was one item of $200 million for the Far East. Our committee was informed that if this item were reduced the President's hands would be tied and the program greatly handicapped.

Notwithstanding that report, we reduced the request from $200 million to $100 million. Did we hurt the program? No. Witnesses before the committee this year said that notwithstanding the fact that the Congress allowed only $100 million, they were able to obligate only $6 million of the $100 million, or, only 6 percent.

Let me give you some facts which were borne out by your own able chairman and which will be borne out later by the Appropriations Subcommittee.

The average lead time covering military items in this program is 24 months. That is, 2 years elapse from the time the Congress appropriates the money until the equipment is delivered to the recipient nations.

It has been established that if the annual appropriation is approximately $2.5 billion, the average annual expenditure is $2.5 billion, and the lead time is 2 years, then certainly $5 billion in the pipeline is adequate. Using round figures, subject to correction, the Department charged with spending these funds expended $2.3 billion in fiscal 1955 and $2.2 billion in fiscal 1956.

It is anticipated the appropriation this year will be $2.7 billion, still maintaining the average of approximately $2.5 billion. As long as you keep $5 billion in the pipeline unexpended you have a well-functioning program and no harm will be done. That fact was well established in testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee.

At the close of the fiscal year on June 30, according to very recent estimates, there will be in excess of $5 billion in the pipeline, and if you allow $2.5 billion for fiscal 1957 then there will be available for this phase of the program more money than can be spent. This fact was also well established by testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee.

Will you please keep in mind that approximately $500 million of the funds requested for fiscal 1957 is for weapons still in the planning stage. It may be many years hence before even one dime of the $500 million requested for these special weapons will be expended.

We should not be lifted off our feet by rock-and-roll tactics of emotionalism.

I just cannot understand, I cannot comprehend why anyone would argue that even $1 of the reduction made by the committee should be reinstated in the bill. I can assure you that the request for reinstatement is not based on facts and figures.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to ask the committee some questions, but before doing so I want to point out that in the past I have voted for many of these authorization bills. I am in favor of the general principle behind the mutual security program. Eliminating the oratory in behalf of this particular bill I agree with its purposes, but to me the question is to get into the details to find out what we are actually accomplishing.

In the past I regret to say that the committee's reports themselves indicate that they cannot get into the details. I have gone through these hearings, this report and listened to the debate yesterday to try to find out what the details are. The committee members themselves say it is precious little, in fact it has been stated that we must take this on faith. But the Congress was not set up to take things on faith; the Congress was set up as an instrumentality of the people who cannot dig into this for themselves, who cannot come down to Washington and do it for themselves. They send us as their representatives to do this for them. If we fail in that function we fail in our basic function. Someone has said that we have a provision in here which will stop some of these socialistic programs that we have been engaged in abroad. The term "socialism" is a vague one, a hard one to define. It is defined not by words. You have to go into and examine each program specifically to find out what the administration, whoever the Executive is, whether it is Truman or Eisenhower, proposes. We have to know what the specific programs we are talking about are. The Congress must examine into them through its committees and find out whether they meet with American principles as the people's representatives see them.

I should like to ask a few questions, and I will direct them to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] because I know he has studied this aspect of the matter as carefully as anyone could. There has been a lot of discussion about pipeline figures. On page 13 of the committee report is found a pipeline figure of 6.4; then right below there we have the unexpended balances at 5 billion. The question is, Are those figures to be added together, or how much of the pipeline figures actually include unexpended balances of military funds?

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman will note that the first figure of 6.4 was the estimate on November 30, 1955. It was broken down by areas. The latter figure of $5 billion is as of June 30, 1956 and that estimate was made on May 16, both of them referring to unexpended balances.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. In other words, in this instance pipeline and unexpended balances are synonymous?

Mr. VORYS. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman. I was unable to find other figures in the hearings. Of course, all I could do was to flip through the hearings as best I could. How much of the military expenditures will go for off-shore procurement? The reason I ask that is this: After all, the off-shore program is also going to assist these countries in their economic situation; therefore, it is a figure that becomes quite important in viewing this program.

Mr. VORYS. Is the gentleman directing a question to me?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. VORYS. On page 648 of the hearings are the figures on offshore production; $110 million for this year—that is fiscal 1956—and $75 to $80 million for next year.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is a very small amount. Is that the best you have been able to do?

Mr. VORYS. Yes. We had very large figures for the offshore program during the Korean war when our own munition plants were loaded up. Then there was considerable criticism of the offshore procurement program because many members wanted to keep the business at home. So the offshore procurement program has dropped down very sharply.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The general program certainly is a way of assisting these countries economically; is that true?

Mr. VORYS. That is true, but that is a secondary, indirect purpose. Our main purpose is to build up their own defense production. For instance, included in the offshore program for next year, or possibly in addition, is a provision for weapons facilities. What we want to do is to get them going through the offshore program to provide production lines so that they can start producing their own ammunition and weapons.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. The countries in Europe are spending about $12 billion a year compared to a request here of $760 million for Europe from our own country. It is my hope, and I think it is the plan, that through the offshore program we give them some economic aid, but we also provide production lines so that they will increasingly take on the burden of providing their own weapons and ammunition. They will be doing this, at least in Europe, in a few years.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. One other specific question before I ask a general question. How about a breakdown of the common use items for the military as opposed to other military end items?

Mr. VORYS. In the military assistance amount of $1.925 billions there is $1.55 billion in the committee bill for military weapons, equipment, training, and shipping. Included in the military figure is $374 million for direct forces support, which is common-use items, food, clothing, and things like that.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Of course, if you dig into those allegedly military items, I think experience will show and I am sure the Committees on Appropriations and on Armed Services agree, that a lot of those are common-use items. This is the procedural error in having the Foreign Affairs Committee attempt to go over military programs.

Mr. VORYS. There is $374 million for direct forces support.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I meant in addition to that sum.

The final question is this. Last year there was considerable criticism in the committee report and hearings and on the floor directed at the failure of the executive departments to support their requests by details; in fact, charges of fiscal irresponsibility were made. I made a floor speech directed to this subject last year. Has the presentation this year been any better?

Mr. VORYS. I think so. Perkins McGuire, an able businessman who was president and director of Allied Stores, and was in charge of procurement for that great organization, is now sitting on top of that end of it, and I believe we have an increasingly reliable accounting system. May I just say this, when you try to get figures on this, you are shooting at a moving target. There is material moving all over the world, and when you call for a report on a given day, it is different by noon on that day. Mr. McGuire has pointed out the difficulty of presenting accurate figures unless you have a running account going on all the time and have a lot of people doing nothing but figuring.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman. I regret that the reports, hearings, and the debate on the floor to date do not give much support to this conclusion. I believe progress has been made, but not the progress that this Congress must insist upon in order to discharge its responsibilities. Last year we failed to insist that the executive departments come forward with accurate accountings, although there was plenty of time to do this. Each year that the Congress fails to insist upon proper accounting from the executive departments we make matters worse, not better.

Regretfully I state that special conferences between the Chief Executive and the leaders of the House do not take the place of orderly presentation of detailed facts and figures to the congressional committee charged with digging into these details. If the Chief Executive feels that more money than the committee recommends in this bill is needed for the mutual security program, let the committee be called back—this bill recommitted—and let the details sustaining such a position be presented to it for orderly and proper consideration.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, before this Congress plunges the treasure of the American people, under the title of foreign aid, into the greatest financial ambush in the history of international delusions, and before we here deliberately decoy ourselves into this multi-billion-dollar anti-American snare, I plead to be permitted to offer a few words of warning.

To me, foreign aid represents perhaps the most tragic mistake in the history of American Government. It is the diversion of America's liquid wealth, technical know-how, highly prized American talent, skill, labor, and resources, into the bottomless pit of European and Asiatic hate. But who can gainsay the obvious fact that the dollars we spend abroad by this complicated system of gifts and near gifts must in the end play a mighty role in the goal of Europe, Asia, and the Kremlin to beggar the American people?

We are, in truth, using American dollars, earned by Americans, to build up a colossal wall of foreign competition against the interests of American management, American capital, and American labor. We are using our American dollars to buy foreign competition against ourselves.

We are not only buying competition—we are building it from the ground up, and then keeping it subsidized.

The insidiousness that foreign aid implies is all the worse for the fact that it wears the face of being kind and doing good for the backward and depressed peoples of the world. What backward peoples, and for what purposes are we helping them?

Those American dollars did not grow in the fields, all stacked and counted, ready for the greedy hand that in the next moment would not, and does not hesitate to strike at us. Those dollars came from the sweat and labor of 167 million American people.

I beg that this House remember that fact with reverence and caution before it even begins to think of turning over the amount the President has asked for—upward of $5 billion—for foreign aid, which I call the greatest global fraud since money first became a medium of barter and exchange. "Foreign aid" is a misnomer. If it is a question of foreign aid in the real sense, then we have more than fulfilled our obligation to our own conscience and the conscience of every European and Asiatic.

When England stood with her back to the wall; when the Russian people were fighting the Nazis within 25 miles of Moscow; when France was, as a nation, wiped off the face of the earth, and the streets of Paris echoed to the Prussian goosestep, we gave our wealth as if it were water, our economic strength as if it were endless, and the lives of American youth to rescue them from tyranny and slavery.

What more do they want? What more do they have the right to ask for?

Mr. Chairman, is this to go on forever?

Already we are being asked to furnish foreign military and economic aid

programs—not on the basis of a current need—but more; on the basis of long-term commitments.

This is not fighting communism, if that is the purpose. Communism cannot be fought by enriching people less prosperous.

What good does it do when our profession for interest for others is blackened by the continuing colonialism of France and the imperialism of Britain?

The fact that they can both point the accusing finger at the Kremlin's even more diabolical colonialism merely provides the world with another wrong that does not add up to a right.

Any one of the presumably anti-Communist countries would, at the drop of a hat, boldly do business on the biggest possible scale with Communist Russia. Only the other day were not the top Government officials of both England and the Soviet Union lunching, dining, and toasting one another in London? Yet we are being asked to pour vast fortunes into the coffers of those who turn their backs on us when our enemy bows to them, and, who face us, hat in hand, waiting for our cash. The folly of the past in our foreign-aid program stares at us in cold, incredible figures. It bought us—not allies, but envy; it bought us—not friends, but enemies; it bought us—not gratitude, but resentment.

The average mind cannot encompass the fabulous arithmetic of foreign aid. United States foreign aid to all countries for the period covering World War II, and the postwar period ending June 30, 1955, came to $9 billion.

I am not flattered by being told that this is the greatest Nation on earth, since the Roman Empire, or that we have wealth unparalleled in all time.

The figure I have just given you is beyond all reason. I shall never be convinced that any government has the moral right to hand out such vast sums of the people's money to nations of dubious loyalty—to nations which only yesterday, as history counts time, were our bitterest and most relentless foes.

While with one lavish hand we are putting our money up in bales to send abroad, we are with the other figuring our devices for providing our farmers with less and less. To that important segment of our population that has, since 1952, been suffering from loss of income—the stepchild of prosperous America—we have been talking of instituting soil banks. Our growers of rice, tobacco, cotton, and potatoes, our growers of wheat and livestock are in trouble. In the plight of our farmers our attention is concentrated not on them, but on helping to finance, among other things, the greatest architectural structure of all times—the Aswam Dam project, so that the Egyptians can grow more and better cotton to compete with American cotton. Here on American soil we talk of reducing farm acreage, while we talk of spending billions for dams to enable the Egyptians to irrigate their soil to grow more and more of the very product for which we have no market.

Is this right? Is this moral? Is this justice to ourselves?

The very critics who have declared the New and the Fair Deals to be just so much socialism are now most active in sponsoring this foreign-aid program, the most internationally socialistic scheme ever devised since Lenin foisted Marx on Russia, and the Soviet Union upon the free world.

We in America must begin to be deeply concerned about the plight of our aged population. There is a vast fool's paradise in the story of America's prosperity, accentuated by what is perhaps the deepest tragedy of America's pride in her wealth. It is the problem of our aged, which shames America's boast of economic prowess and endless resources. If Congress is looking for people who need help, I ask that we turn our eyes inwardly—not in the direction of Pakistan and Peru, but right here on America's aged and infirm. It should shock our sense of justice to its foundations that the 14 million among us over 65 years of age have an average income—for man and wife—of less than $1,500. To a population reared in self-respect this tells a humiliating story of conditions existing among our own people. Will we let this go on? And in so doing will we continue to empty vast mountains of our treasure to peoples in far-off countries? The savings of these elderly folk in our midst are less than $500. Great gains have been made in the past 20 years, but against the votes and the influence of those who called social security socialism, and who today reluctantly render it lip service. They now find that social security has been proved not only sound, but politically profitable. I find that while the Federal Government employs over 2 million people, only 9 of these are working on the problems of old age. Again the fat hand that is so full of largesse for the people on the other side of the earth turns thin and scrawny when it comes to dealing with the pressing problem in the midst of our own population. Hundreds of thousands will be employed to further foreign aid, but only nine on the future of our mothers and fathers—and, eventually, of ourselves.

Let us, I pray, first set our own house in order. Let us do what we Democrats have long advocated—reduce to 62 the age when women, including the wives or widows of men covered by social security, may be entitled to their benefits. Let us add the provision to the social-security program that an employee 50 years old, or older, be awarded his or her benefits in the event he or she is totally and permanently disabled. Let us set ourselves like flint against the influence of those who would cut down the social-security program.

To me there is something distinctly unpleasant and intensely distasteful in an administration which with one voice asks for nearly $5 billion for foreign aid, while with another throws a roadblock in the path of social security.

I notice that on the question of special housing for the aged, the champions of the self-respect of our elderly population turn out to be none other than our own Democratic stalwarts. Before I would advocate expending support to foreign aid I would use it all up for low-rent housing projects for older American families. Instead of supporting foreign aid I shall find myself supporting medical care for the aged—right here in the United States.

When the Congress of the United States has lived up to its principles as the representative of a great Nation by first taking care of those in need at home, it will have won, by its example, the respect of all mankind. This is the kind of respect I should like to see America earn for herself—the kind of respect that cannot be bought with foreign aid. This is the respect that will help us in the leadership of the free world. It is this kind of respect that will help all mankind.

In Congress it is my endeavor to speak for those who cannot speak for themselves—the lame, the halt, and the blind; the weak and afflicted, and those who have no one to speak for them.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I want to compliment the gentleman on his very able presentation of the case against this international giveaway program, particularly at a time when the gentleman's constituents, the little cotton and rice farmers, are sweating and laboring under an income of less than $1,000 a year.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. And in addition we vote money to sink 2,000 artesian wells in arid India not to produce food for the starving people of India but to produce cotton in competition with Louisiana cotton.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a good many today have expressed the hope they had when mutual security was started that by this time, 11 years after the end of the war, we could greatly cut down this program by which we are trying to help other nations defend their own independence and remain part of the free world. I certainly understand and share in that feeling of regret that we are not able as yet to taper off this program as we had hoped. Everybody here wishes we could reduce our expenditures for mutual security, just as we wish and hope the day will come soon when we can reduce our own defense budget.

You will recall that right after the end of the war we brought our forces home, demobilized them, and cut our defense budget down to about $13 billion a year. Then, partly because we withdrew so quickly and did not carry on a program of this sort, weak spots were left in the world and the Soviet Union moved into them. It instigated a war in Korea which immediately forced our own defense budget up to above $50 billion a year. It has been running about 34, 35, or 36 billion dollars annually. It came down somewhat after Korean fighting ended, but this year it has gone back up again because the threat is greater.

We have seen recently the interesting phenomenon of a great many Members contending our own defense budget is

inadequate and advocating that we appropriate more money for planes and missiles and weapons of defense; but at the same time they are urging that we cut down this program which builds the defenses of our allies. In short they urge that we make the same mistake we made 10 years ago of failing to maintain a strong world. But if by weakness anywhere we encourage new Communist aggression, it will require that we spend billions more—not billions less. It is not real economy.

Mr. Chairman, I think our country is in greater danger today than at any time since the end of the war. Both Communist strength and Communist trickery and seductive appeal are greater than ever before. I do not think it was necessary that we be in this position. I tried my best all during the years to get changes in certain policies which I feared would lead, unless changed, to the losses in Asia which have brought us to right where we are.

But that is water over the dam. We have to deal with the facts as they are. And there are two plain facts: One, the Kremlin's military strength is greater today than it has ever been. Two, it is operating more effectively and dangerously, and entering in a larger way the economic field, seeking to beguile, deceive, bribe its intended victims as it maneuvers to gain control of ever larger portions of the world.

Those are the facts. It does no good to regret or lament or bewail them. There they are. My country, I believe, is in greater danger than it has ever been. I cannot accept responsibility for increasing the danger by accepting this billion dollar cut.

I recall a similar situation in August 1949, when there was a bipartisan amendment to increase military aid to the forces trying to prevent Communist conquest of China. During that debate I said, "We are not trying to throw money away as charged. We simply recognize that Communist conquest of China will be a mortal peril to all Asia; and conquest of Asia will constitute a mortal peril to Europe and to the United States. I cannot accept responsibility for not making every possible effort myself and authorizing the President and the Secretary of State and our Armed Forces to make, within reason, every possible effort to accomplish this end."

The amendment was defeated. China went down. That changed the balance of power in the world, made possible the Korean war, and has already cost us scores of billions of dollars. We must not be so shortsighted again.

Someone has said today that he could not go back to his district and tell his farmers who are hard up and others who are in financial difficulties that he has voted to increase the amount of their money to be spent for foreign aid. I certainly can understand that. My people are tired, too. They need plenty more things for themselves. Some of them believe that if we spend less for foreign aid we can spend more for ourselves at home. But that does not follow. On page 7 of our report is a quotation from testimony by the Honorable Gordon Gray, of North Carolina, former Secretary of the Army in a Democratic administration, and now Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs in a Republican administration. He testified that "but for the military forces generated, stimulated, and assisted by our mutual assistance program, to attain the same measure of military security in the world, our own forces would have to be larger." To expand our own forces really takes money.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot conscientiously go back to my people in the Fifth District of Minnesota and say that by voting against the Hays amendment, I voted to reduce their security in Minnesota; I voted to endanger their country; I voted to require more of their boys to spend longer periods in our Armed Forces. I cannot go back to them and say that I voted to require them to spend more, not less, of their precious earnings for the defense budget of our Nation—and still have less security because we would have fewer advanced bases close to the potential enemy.

This proposed billion-dollar cut will require cuts of between 14 and 27 percent in our programs to various countries whose defense establishments are vital to our own security. And what will it do to their morale and their confidence? Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe it is wise to make such a cut. For myself I can see no other course than to do all I can to support the duly chosen officials of our country in their terrible responsibilities. If I am to err I would rather err on the side of greater security for my country than on the side of lesser security. I hope the Hays amendment to restore $600 million of the cut will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has expired.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, Shakespeare once wrote a play entitled "Timon of Athens." In this play Shakespeare presented the picture of a wealthy man, a man who was possessed of lands and servants and much of this world's goods. Timon had many erstwhile friends. He was careless, however, in the spending of his wealth. He bailed his friends out of prison; he contributed dowries to those who wanted to get married; he had many elegant banquets at which he wined and dined his fair-weather friends. Plutus, the God of gold, was but his steward. No need, but he repaid sevenfold above itself, and no gift to him but it assured the giver "a return exceeding all use of quittance."

Repeatedly, his faithful servants came to him and implored him that the time had long since passed when he should begin to pay his bills and give some attention to the demands of his creditors. But Timon, out of his big heart, continued in his foolish ways. There came a day, however, when he had to face the facts, but it was too late. And then when he was bankrupt he sent his servants to beseech his friends to contribute to him 50 talents or some other sum in order that he might pay his debts. Not one of his friends responded with a gift. Each had an excuse. Timon's lands were sold to discharge his debts, and the once proud and good man was forced to seek shelter in a cave outside of Athens.

I shall not belabor you with a continuation of the story, but there are two important points that I want to impress upon you: Firstly, Timon foolishly and recklessly squandered his wealth; and, secondly, when it was too late, he found that his wealth and his gifts had not brought him friends.

The lesson in Shakespeare's play could very well be applied at this moment. Like Timon of Athens, the United States for a long time has contributed its resources and its wealth to erstwhile friends and allies. Fortunately, although we are not yet bankrupt, we have already learned the lesson that money cannot buy friends.

As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I supported the committee amendment and voted to report the bill as amended. During my 4 years here I have consistently supported mutual-security legislation. I intend to vote for this bill on passage, provided the House sustains the committee action which reduced the administration's request by $1,109,000,000.

Some Members of this body are against the committee amendment only because the President objects to it. They cite his military genius and his leadership as their reasons for opposing the reduction. I welcome the advice of our leaders, but our leaders are not infallible; they are made of common clay just as you and I. The President has made mistakes in the past.

Most Members of this House have had more experience in Government than has our President, and regardless of whether or not he may be a military genius, as some claim—and that is debatable—I contend that your constituents and mine sent us here to follow the dictates of our own conscience and the course that our own judgment would suggest.

So, let us put aside this idle talk that we can disclaim the responsibility which is ours. This great committee held hearings over a period of 8 weeks, and in its wisdom concluded that this cut should be made.

The committee has cogent reasons for reducing the figure. For one thing, it is estimated that at the end of this fiscal year there will be an unexpended balance of approximately $6.8 billion. Moreover, there will be about $5 billion in the military pipeline. Even with the committee amendment reducing the figure by $1,109,000,000, the authorization will yet be $860 million greater than the appropriation last year. On top of these cogent reasons, may I cite the fact that the flexibility provisions in this bill make it possible for the President to transfer adequate funds to cover any contingencies that might develop.

Mr. Chairman, it can be recalled that the Congress has reduced the requests of the executive branch each year anywhere from $6 million to $1.9 billion, and each time these reductions have been made, protests were heard similar to those that are being voiced today. This year's apropriation is merely to perform an interim function. Why then should we have such a greatly increased authorization over the appropriation last year, when it is evident that we cannot be certain as to how we shall proceed with the program until after there has been a revaluation?

One easily gets the impression that more funds are often requested than are necessary or than can be spent. Did the Comptroller General of the United States not accuse the ICA of overprograming during his recent testimony before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations? Did he not make the statement that that agency, which handles nonmilitary aid, has frequently asked Congress for more money than it could spend in the subsequent fiscal year? Was he not equally critical of the Defense Department's handling of funds for military aid?

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to throw aside the judgment of the committee, if we are going to disregard its findings and its recommendations based on 8 weeks of hearings and arduous study, and if we are just going to blindly acquiesce in the wishes of the executive branch, then the time has come when we ought to discharge this committee, admit that constitutional government no longer exists, fold up our tents and go home.

I went with my subcommittee last fall on a study mission, and in country after country I found that people seemingly have the wrong impression of our intentions and of the purposes of our foreign-aid program. Many of these people seem to think they are doing the United States a favor by accepting aid. In France I found that the people do not comprehend the threat of Russian aggression. The French nation appeared to me to be a decadent nation, no longer possessing the will, the determination, or the desire to resist a powerful aggressor. American money can never supply moral and spiritual purpose, and this is the foundation of a nation's strength.

Mr. Chairman, the United States has an estimated $1 billion foreign-aid investment in Yugoslavia. Yet, Tito has responded to Russian overtures and debonairly accepted a hero's welcome in Moscow. He has promised that the Communist nations would never again be split and declared that the fates of Yugoslavia and Russia are inseparable.

Then there is Egypt. Did she not extend diplomatic recognition to Communist China on May 16?

And what about India? According to a statement in the February 6 issue of the Department of State Bulletin, since August 15, 1947, the date of India's independence, United States Government aid to India has totaled $477,934,000. Of this total, more than half, or $242,934,000 has been in the form of grants. The American people have shown their friendship for India. But is Nehru grateful? Is he a friend of the West? Is he really neutral?

Mr. Chairman, in the light of definite failures, shortcomings, and noncooperation on the part of some of our Allies, it is difficult for me to do other than to support the proposed reduction in the authorization. The attitude of fence-sitting, appeasement, and neutralism is so disappointing that I am approaching the time when I shall find it exceedingly difficult to go along with this program. Were it not for certain stanch Allies such as Turkey, Greece, Israel, Pakistan, Korea, and Formosa, and a few others, I would vote against this bill now, because after all our great contributions to victory and to rehabilitation after victory we have a right to expect wholehearted cooperation and a will to resist the common enemy.

Many of the beneficiary nations are currently enjoying higher living standards than ever. Some have balanced their budgets with the aid of our funds. They enjoy a greater prosperity than before World War II. Some of them have not hesitated to sacrifice principle and friendship in order to increase trade with the Reds. NATO nations have not built the defense force that was contemplated. The nations of Europe, generally speaking, act under a pall of fear and are afraid of drawing down the ire of the Soviets. Some of these same nations, which we now look upon as allies, may declare themselves neutral in order to avoid total destruction in an atomic war. In the final analysis, we can probably rely with assurance only upon our own country and our own people to fight any future war to a victorious climax. So, Mr. Chairman, I say, let us not be like Timon of Athens and learn the truth too late. Let us conserve our resources while there is yet time. Let us sustain the action of the committee in reducing the requested authorization, and it will be an exemplary lesson to our European friends and others throughout the world. It is the kind of thing they need to bring them to a realization that there is a limit to the patience of the American people and a limit to the resources of the American taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that I will vote for the pending bill provided the committee cut is sustained.

In conclusion, I want to pay tribute to my chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]. I have served with him on the committee for some time, and I have learned to respect his judgment and to love him. This is the last time that he will pilot the mutual-security bill through the House. His decision to retire after this year means that this House will lose the services of a great American. But he has left his impression, an indelible one, upon all the members of the committee and it is an impression that will never cease to make itself felt in the Halls of Congress.

I am confident that I speak the sentiments of all Members of this House when I say to my chairman, in the words of the poet:

The roses, red, upon my neighbor's vine
Are owned by him, but they are also mine.
His was the cost, and his the labor too,
But mine, as well as his, the joy, their loveliness to view.
They bloom for me and are for me as fair
As for the man who gives them all his care.
Thus I am rich because a good man grew
A rose-clad vine for all his neighbors view.
I know from this that others plant for me
That what they own, my joy may also be.
So why be selfish when so much that's fine
Is grown for me upon [DICK RICHARDS'] vine.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, it appears that I will not be able to remain until the finish of this bill, but I would like for the RECORD to show that if I were present and voting, I would vote against the amendment and against the bill on final passage.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, I was unable to be here yesterday during general debate because of illness. Quite frankly, I do not think I would be here today if it were not for the fact that I wanted publicly to pay tribute to my friend, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]. It has been a privilege and an honor and a great pleasure for me to serve under his always impartial and inspiring leadership. His absence next year is going to be regarded by all of us as a great loss not only to the Congress but to his State and Nation. We hope that he will enjoy many years of good health and happiness.

Mr. Chairman, having said that, may I assure the distinguished chairman of the committee that only the most sincere motives compel me to take a position which is different from his on this particular bill. I am supporting the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS.] During the committee hearings I offered an amendment which would have reduced the military appropriations by about $625 million. The effect of the Hays amendment will reduce the overall appropriation to a level which I considered justified and which apparently is acceptable to those charged with the responsibility for the defense of this country.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that none of us would place a price tag on freedom. Nor would we attempt to evaluate American rights in terms of dollars and cents, but I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that because of the confusion which surrounds the mutual-security program some of us may inadvertently be doing just that.

Now, what is the purpose of the program? To understand this I think we must recognize that we live in a very small world—a world in which man has developed weapons of such terrible destructive power that if we were to become involved in an atomic war, we are not even sure that any man, woman, or child on the face of the earth would survive.

So a principal objective of the program is to serve as a deterrent to war. At the present time there is no deterrent

to war except our capacity for retaliation, and until we have iron-clad controls which will make another war impossible, we have no alternative other than to rely upon military power as a principal means of preserving the peace.

We are not trying to buy friends. Everyone knows that that is impossible. We are not engaged in a huge giveaway program with all benefits accruing to the people of other nations. We are concerned with the security of the United States as well as that of our friends in the free world. And make no mistake about it, they are contributing a major share to the defense of freedom. Based on gross national product, I think you will find that many of these nations are making almost as great a contribution to the defense of the free world as we are, and, in a sense, a greater contribution because their resources are far smaller than ours.

A great deal has been said about the failure of this program since its inception. Of course, there have been failures. We have not achieved all our objectives, but neither have the Communists. We may be sure of one thing, however. The Communists are not going to let down in their effort to dominate the entire world. Unless we are willing to make whatever sacrifices may be necessary in support of our principles and ideas the future will indeed be bleak.

This is not a giveaway program. It is an integral part of our own national defense. I think the people of the country and many Members of Congress should be more cognizant of this fact. We are engaged in a great struggle to protect American freedom, and the freedom of people everywhere who want freedom.

This is a responsibility we must accept. The efforts of Communists to take over one country after another, piecemeal must be curbed not simply in the interest of these countries but in our own interest as well. For if we have to go it alone, without friends who will fight and help if the means are available to them, one cannot overestimate the seriousness of our own position as a Nation.

The mutual-security program has the unqualified support of our top military leaders and the President of the United States. Do we dare ignore the advice of such men as these on a matter of such vital importance to our national security?

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour, with the understanding that the Speaker of the House will have 10 minutes, the distinguished minority leader will have 10 minutes, and the chairman of the committee will have 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. RABAUT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, some time ago a similar situation arose and there were some 30 to 35 Members on the floor standing. A motion was offered that debate close in a period of time that would have allowed a minute or a minute and a half to each Member. I gave notice at that time that if that procedure was attempted to be followed again, I intended to do everything I could to prevent the choking off or the gagging of Members of the House. I am going to do that. I am going to insist on it. Those who want to make arrangements for Friday may make them, but I do not want them to take Friday as a holiday at my expense.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I want everybody to have whatever time they feel they need, but I think we should try to get along with this section. I am willing to amend my request to an hour and a half; that is, add 30 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have not relinquished by reservation of objection. I have another objection and that is that during general debate all day yesterday, committee members took most of that time. Today, at least in the last few minutes, at least 2 committee members asked and were given an additional 5 minutes to speak. I am not going along with any procedure which will cut the rest of us off from an opportunity to debate a bill of this kind.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman referred to the general debate we had yesterday. If the gentleman had been present, he could have had plenty of time, all the time he wanted.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All the time he wanted? You did not have anybody here to listen to it, until I made the point of order that a quorum was not present. Does the gentleman think I want to talk to an empty House?

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in an hour and a half, with the understanding as I stated that 10 minutes each be reserved to the Speaker, the minority leader, and the chairman of the committee. That will leave an hour for the other Members here.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a reservation of time cannot be made in a motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in an hour and a half, with the understanding that the Speaker, the minority leader, and the committee chairman be given time as I have suggested.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I object, Mr. Chairman, and make the same point of order that the gentleman made on that. He cannot do it that way.

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, how much time does that leave for those who are not given preferential treatment under the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. RICHARDS. If the Clerk will count the number of Members standing, outside of the three I have mentioned, we can see how many there will be.

The CHAIRMAN. There are 15 Members standing other than the 3 who have been designated with respect to time. That would give about 4 minutes apiece. Under that situation, is there objection?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 2 hours, under the stipulation I have just made as to time for the Speaker, the minority leader, and the committee chairman. That would be 5 minutes for every Member here who rose.

Mr. CANFIELD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, does this have any effect on the discussion which will follow on the proposed amendment in regard to Tito?

Mr. RICHARDS. It has nothing in the world to do with that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with the other members of my committee and the many Members of the House who are taking this opportunity to pay tribute to our retiring chairman, JAMES RICHARDS.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. RADWAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may extend their remarks in praise of the chairman at any point in the RECORD they may desire.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Chairman, it is said that some men are born great, that some achieve greatness, and that some have greatness thrust upon them. I am not prepared to say which of these categories would apply to JIM RICHARDS, but I think we can all agree that when the gavel falls for adjournment of the present session, this legislative body will have lost the services of a great man. It has been my good fortune and privilege to have served with Chairman RICHARDS on the House Foreign Affairs Committee and to have received the benefit of his fine leadership. My best wishes go with him as he leaves us for greener pastures.

Mr. Chairman, it is because I hold JIM RICHARDS, our illustrious committee chairman, in such high esteem, that it is all the more difficult for me to disagree with him at this time. Yet I was among those who, in committee, supported President Eisenhower's original request, and I want to lend my support at this time to the Hays amendment which would restore a substantial portion of the cut made by our committee. JIM RICHARDS would be the last person to expect one of his colleagues to act contrary to his firm legislative convictions.

I have always believed in the wisdom of our mutual-security program. I most firmly believe today that this program has been a success from its inception under a Democratic President, to its present state of development under a Republican President. I mention this, Mr. Chairman, because I recognize no partisanship in the field of international affairs. That is why it had my sincere support under a Democratic President just as a great number of Democrats now support it under the leadership of President Eisenhower. I have accepted this pro-

gram because it coincides with my firm convictions. Even if it did not, I think I could still do so on faith. I speak of my faith in the leadership of the United States of America, and that leadership today is President Eisenhower. As that great American and distinguished Democrat, the illustrious Speaker of this House, Mr. SAM RAYBURN, has pointed out, we have only one President of the United States. He is the voice of America, or we have no voice in the world.

This program is essential to our national security and well-being as a nation and could be justified solely on the basis of our own self-interest. If this program were a part of our defense budget, no Member here today would vote against it. Yet, who can deny that it is just as essential to the defense of this country as are the dollars which we have appropriated for defense this year? It is an absolute fact that the money which we include here for foreign military aid represents a present and future saving in our defense budget. It could just as well be appropriated under the heading of defense. At the present time, we have only 2 divisions in Korea, compared with 6 a few years ago. Why? Simply because the Koreans themselves now have some 20 divisions in the field thanks to our aid and help.

It is as simple at that. It costs us far, far less to equip a Korean soldier in Korea, or a Turkish soldier in Turkey, to hold the line against Soviet communism, than it does to wrench an American boy from his family, and send him off to some foreign land, at the end of a supply line thousands of miles long. The foreign military aid requested by this administration would support about 200 divisions in the armies of our cooperating allies. That is many times the strength of the American Army. Yet those who would cut that request of President Eisenhower today, are the very ones who express great fear that our defense budget is being too drastically curtailed. The fact is that if we were to eliminate $2 billion in foreign military aid this year, our defense budget would have to go up at least $6 billion. You cannot "rob Peter to pay Paul". Neither can those who express fear that our foreign military aid program is too large, and that our defense appropriations are too small, blow out of both sides of their mouths at the same time.

President Eisenhower is not only our present Commander in Chief, but he led us to victory in the greatest war in history. I do not follow him slavishly when I suggest that his recommendations are entitled to great weight.

There is no lessening in world tension. Everyone agrees that we must remain strong to survive. We are alarmed that some of our European friends feel that the Soviet military threat has ended. Yet there are those who would encourage them in that belief by cutting down the military program for Europe to the point where it cannot operate.

The $600 million which Representative HAYS would restore to this bill by his amendment is a lot of money, by any standard. But measure it against the productiveness of this Nation and our faith that it will survive and flourish. That sum is only fifteen one-hundredths of 1 percent of our gross national production. And we do not offer it in a world-destroying war. We are asked to appropriate it as a deterrent to war. On that basis alone, it is justified. Add to this, the overseas markets we create for our own products, with resultant prosperity in our own land, and add to this the strength we provide to those underdeveloped nations which would otherwise fall prey to Russian communism, and the arguments against the President's recommendations must fall.

The peace of the world and the welfare of those peoples allied with us in an effort to resist the aims of world communism cannot be measured in dollars and cents.

In brief gentlemen, passage of the Hays amendment is essential to the future security of our country.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the recent statement by Eugene R. Black, president of the International Bank, that the United States had won a great "tactical and diplomatic victory" in persuading Premier Nasser, of Egypt, to accept Uncle Sam's offer of a gift of $200 million to start the famous Aswan Dam on the Nile River is the subject of comment today.

At the same time our Government was negotiating with Egypt's Premier to give away $200 million of American taxpayers' money to start the world's largest dam, with a promise of loans of additional hundreds of millions to assure its ultimate completion, while western Oklahoma and other nearby States were experiencing severe dust storms, droughts, and serious water shortages, rain finally came recently accompanied by flash floods.

It will be of little consolation to Oklahoma farmers, who in the past have been hauling water for their livestock, to know that their Government has won this so-called diplomatic victory in the form of magnanimous handouts to Egypt. Egyptian farmers along the Nile managed to finance and construct their own dams many centuries before this Nation was born. No doubt farmers of the Nile Valley could use more water. But so could Oklahoma farmers, who are helping pay the bill. They do not want charity, but only an opportunity to help themselves.

I have, therefore, introduced in Congress several bills for the construction of 11 additional irrigation, reclamation, and flood-control projects and several upstream Soil Conservation Service projects in western Oklahoma that, when completed, will cost only a fractional part of the outright gift of $200 million plus the loans that may ultimately cost $1,300,000,000, which is the estimated cost of Egypt's dam. These Oklahoma projects will not only help fill our urgent need for irrigation, reclamation, flood-control and upstream detention dams but will supply much-needed water for several Oklahoma towns. These towns and cities are not asking for a handout, but will pay back all loans for that part of such projects in connection with water supply.

I have requested that our two able Senators join me.

I will add that I expect to continue my fight for flood control, irrigation, and reclamation and upstream soil conservation projects similar to the Sandstone Creek, Branitz Creek, and other Soil Conservation Service projects on the Washita, as well as agricultural conservation practices such as terracing, contouring, green manure, crops, deep plowing, plowing under legumes, and so forth, as practiced by the ASC at home for the benefit of American farmers and other tax-burdened American citizens, rather than waste American dollars in a bold but futile attempt to buy Egypt's friendship under the guise of a diplomatic victory.

Mr. Chairman, since Marshal Tito is leaning toward Russia now, the administration should reconsider its loan policy and now "veto Tito."

I am voting with the committee to reduce the original request by $600 million.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, that there may be no misunderstanding, permit me to join in all the commendatory statements that have been made or which will be made dealing with the wonderful service which has been rendered by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. RICHARDS.

Mr. Chairman, it may be assumed that some of us have no knowledge of medical treatment. It must also be assumed that the ordinary individual has some knowledge of what is good for one's health and for the recovery of anyone who is afflicted with sickness. Assume you had a son and a daughter. That the son had some infection in his foot and it became necessary, in the opinion of the physician who was a well-qualified gentleman, to give a transfusion of blood. Assume the physician kept on giving blood transfusions for a long, long time, but the infection kept going up and up the leg and the son kept getting worse. That the physician has taken so much of the blood of the daughter that she began to fade away and it appeared that both, if the treatment was continued, would be in the hands of the undertaker. What would you do? Would you get another doctor? Would you change the remedy?

It would occur to me that, while the recovery of the son was of tremendous importance, a justifiable apprehension that the daughter might be bled to death—as some rumors insist was the cause of the death of the father of our country, George Washington—his physicians repeatedly blooded him—would come to mind.

While I might still have confidence in the physician or physicians who were treating them, I would at least begin to inquire as to whether blood transfusions were the proper remedy. If I had confidence in the physician I might not discharge him but I might suggest that my commonsense told me that perhaps the physician should take a look at some other remedy, at some other procedure.

There is no question but that our President is one of the greatest military experts in the world. Concede that. But what does he know about where a tax dollar comes from? Did he ever lack

food, clothing, or shelter because he did not have the money with which to purchase it? Was he ever forced to practice strict thrift in order to provide for his future?

Great as is my respect for the President and his judgment, knowing from experience the value of a dollar and how the average individual earns that dollar, and the necessity, if he is to survive and live under the American standard, that a certain part of it must be reserved for his own use, it occurs to me that perhaps the President—wise as he may be, and we will say is—has just simply forgotten, or never knew accurately the extent of the ability of the American people to produce, just how much of what they produce they must retain if our economic machinery is to be oiled, greased, kept running, and, when obsolete, replaced. He is not, in my judgment, getting a complete picture of the whole situation. He is a specialist, and like all specialists, places altogether too much stress upon one phase of the situation which today confronts us.

No one questions the sincerity of the President. No one questions but that he is convinced that the better way to prepare for national defense, to stop the spread of communism, is the adoption of this present bill.

But again permit me to call attention to the fact which so many forget, that while the President has had a wide and a varied experience in other countries, and we might add, throughout the world, while he commanded in World War II, so far as can be recalled, since the day when he graduated with honors at West Point, he has never had the experience of earning his own livelihood with his muscles, through sweat, and the accumulation of calluses.

Do not misunderstand. There is no thought that as a military man he has not worked hard, conscientiously, and ably for the sum which the taxpayers have paid him or that he did not earn each dollar that he received.

There is no question but that our Secretary of State is a learned man of wide travel throughout the world. He has had a world of experience in foreign affairs. He belongs to a group in New York which has made fabulous sums—legitimately, honestly, and honorably. Is there any reason why that should not affect his thinking? That of his associates? None at all.

The training of our Secretary of State undoubtedly influences his decisions. This is said without any questioning of his motives or his sincerity. Having been a lawyer in the East and having among his clients many whose interests are abroad, and no doubt the representatives of some foreign governments seeking aid, a considerable portion of his legal business coming from those who are interested in aid of all kinds to other countries, it is inevitable that consciously or unconsciously his views should be influenced by his clients and by those with whom over the years he has associated. Hence, he, too, has difficulty in seeing the need for a change in our foreign policy.

And so we have someone in the Department giving us advice and telling us what to do and how to treat communism who again does not know anything about how you dig dollars out of the dirt, how you earn them in the factory, how you accumulate them in business. Nevertheless, they are telling us how to spend our money.

So, assuming that I know nothing about foreign policy, how to treat this disease called communism, nevertheless I do know something about from whence comes the money to meet these appropriations. I do know how people work day after day and week after week to save a little for the future.

Our colleague from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, spent many years in China rendering—we are told—a great humanitarian service. He is said to be an expert on foreign affairs, especially in the field of our dealings with Asia and her people. If memory serves correctly, he has always advocated the giving of what might be termed our lifeblood, that is, our natural resources, to other countries. It seems to some of us that, at times, in making this financial transfusion, he has tapped not a vein but an artery, and, to some, a large and vital one.

Just as there is a limit to the amount of blood which can be drawn from a donor, there is a limit to what may be safely drained from the financial and economic resources of a nation.

I admire very very much our great colleague from Minnesota. For 20 years he devoted his life to helping the Chinese, a wonderful humanitarian service. There is no question about that; none at all. Now he comes along and he is prescribing what is, he thinks, good for the country here at home when he knows comparatively little about what was happening here in the many long years he was in China—well, I should change that and say not too much or at least not all of what was happening while he was serving in China.

His hobby is helping the Chinese and the nations of Asia, a fine laudable Christian purpose, but I do not want him to cut my throat, figuratively speaking, nor the throats of our people while he is prescribing billions of dollars to cure the sickness of China or other nations.

There is a limit:

True, we are a great and a powerful nation. But, when our foreign-aid program and the operations of our Federal Government take from an overwhelming majority of our taxpayers at least a third of their income; when the people of America as a group are forced to give 4 months of their working time each year to meet the demands of their Government, it occurs to some of us that the time to change our foreign policy has arrived.

This is especially true when, as our colleague from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, will admit, and as others are constantly reminding us, the countries we have so generously and continuously aided have been and are drifting into the arms of our enemy.

The world's cancer, communism, instead of yielding to treatment, has, we are told, been growing ever larger. More and more countries have fallen under Russia's influence, and, as they fell, and we have a very recent example, they have taken with them into the Communist-controlled orbit much, if not most, of the assistance which we have given them.

So the gentleman goes along and he asks us to go along with the State Department and with its policy, and where is he getting? And who is actually formulating our State Department policy? Let us take a look at that question.

Just a few days ago, testifying before a Senate committee, he told us in substance that the policy of the State Department, while it bore the imprint of the Secretary of State and perhaps of a few of his top assistants, was actually formulated and made by those in the Department of State who, down in the lower ranks, collected, evaluated, and passed on the information upon which the Secretary and his assistants acted.

Then our colleague, testifying before that committee, added that many of those who so collected, compiled, and evaluated this information and upon which the Secretary of State formulated his policy, were leftwingers, were all too often advocates of near-Communist doctrine.

So, from our own House expert on the affairs of the East and on foreign policy, we have this strange, illogical statement that we should continue to follow the policy of the State Department, apparently approved as it is by the President, even though that policy was the result of the suggestions and the advice of individuals who were swayed by and had accepted communistic teachings.

An absurdity on its face. As well, might I—watching at the bedside of my son and my daughter, seeing both weakening, because of the original infection in the son and the blood transfusions from the daughter, knowing that both were on the way to an appointment with the undertaker, advocate a continuance of the blood transfusions, no different treatment for the infection.

What has been said may sound crude. It does, however, illustrate why my present convictions are entertained.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No. You have had ample time.

Mr. JUDD. I think in fairness the gentleman should yield. Look at the transcript.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have had the press reports and, in my judgment, have given a fair and accurate summation of what the gentleman said on the point to which I am making reference.

The gentleman has taken much of the time given to the discussion of this bill. You have had plenty of time in which to advocate your philosophy, to justify your position.

So what is the result? Just look at the logic in his argument. He says that Mr. Dulles makes the policy and to make the policy he accepts the information collected and evaluated by these under boys whom the gentleman said—if he did not say they were Communists he came pretty close to it—were Pinks. So we have the policy of the State Department based on the opinion of these employees down below who are to a certain extent disloyal to their country, yet the

gentleman asks us to follow the policy which they originate which comes to us through Dulles.

We have reached the limit.

To other countries since July 1940 and until December 31, 1955, we have made available over $111 billion, either in funds, munitions of war, or military and economic aid. We are today told there is on hand, available and unexpended for national defense, some $5 billion. This bill asks us to give an additional four billion, nine hundred million to add to that sum.

As was advocated by our learned, intensely patriotic colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] and others on his committee who agreed with him, and by many Members of the House, it is time—it is long past time—for us to consider some remedy for preventing the spread of communism, some defense to meet its aggression, other than the stripping of ourselves of the ability to maintain our economic freedom and to meet any armed assault which may come.

Throughout the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, and I assume the situation is somewhat similar elsewhere, those who are not under the present law on social security, are complaining and insisting upon being brought under the law. Veterans and their dependents are demanding ever increasing billions to relieve their distress.

People of middle age who cannot, because of competition by machines and youthful workers, obtain jobs; who, through no fault of their own, are unable to provide themselves with the necessities of life—food, shelter, and clothing—are entitled to relief.

To me it seems that all of these demands should be given consideration and where possible granted, before we continue to pour our sustenance out to the people of other nations who in return desert us, accept the political philosophy of the Communists.

Because of the present situation, because of the failure of the program which we have heretofore followed, my convictions will not permit me to go along with this present bill, even though I would like to support the administration, and this being an election year, to yield to its demands.

I want no part of a policy or of a philosophy which originates, as our colleague from Minnesota has testified, from subordinates in the State Department who—I think it fair to conclude from his testimony—do not believe in the American system of government, who pass on biased, prejudiced statements in favor of some communistic doctrine, which unwittingly, unconsciously is accepted and handed to us through the Secretary of State.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, even those of us who have long believed and who have always supported foreign aid in the interests of our country have today great misgivings about this particular bill and these particular requests. Some of them stem directly from the fact that we have seen a failure in many places of the moneys which have been appropriated by this Congress toward the stopping of the march of communism.

I would particularly draw attention at this time to the failures that are now occurring in the Near East or the Middle East. I would like to draw attention to the committee report specifically. For instance, on page 13 of the committee report it is stated that there is now in the pipeline for the Near East and Africa $598,149,000. This was as of last November. And it is stated that the Defense Department was not able to provide a more current regional breakdown of the pipeline figures. I wonder why they were not able to give us a more accurate figure or more information. One of the things which makes it difficult for us to support this program is exactly this lack of accurate information.

Then, again, on page 15 you will find that there is a figure of $170 million appropriated under this bill for the Near East and Africa. It does not say how it is divided up. It is stated that this is classified information. But, Mr. Chairman, there is this, to me, a very disturbing sentence in the committee report:

> The amounts for certain countries are omitted because the executive branch regards them as classified.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the committee, Does this mean that we are pledged to continue to give money and arms to the Arab States who in recent days and in recent times have indicated they are playing the Russian game?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Did the gentleman hear my speech of a few hours ago in which I pointed out that the Pentagon had money in the bill for two more Arab States for military assistance that had not had it before? When we called this to their attention they stated that was a mistake. What they are asking you to do is to take it on faith and they will give it to whoever they want to after we vote it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If that is the answer of the committee, we must all be greatly disturbed, because the record in the United Nations in the last few days I think without any question proves that we are losing the battle in the Middle East and that little by little Russia is having its way in lining up the Middle Eastern countries to use our money against our own country. It certainly seems incongruous as it must to the rest of the world when the one nation which has been friendly to us, which has stood up and worked for democracy, and who has been our friend, is denied aid while we hand it to the countries that in the United Nations refused to admit the basic fact of the existence of the State of Israel which we in the United States did so much to bring about.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether any member of the committee will clarify this in the future or not, but I hope they will. For if that is typical of the way in which the moneys of the American people are being spent, then I think this Congress must take a much closer look at what is going on.

Mr. Chairman, I particularly take the floor at this time to record my misgivings over the course of events in the Near East.

Communist forces have seized the initiative in this strategic area. More than 9 months have passed since the Communist bloc started shipping arms to Egypt. They are using the Arab States to further their own propaganda to weaken the prestige and to undermine the defense of the free world. But the West has not yet developed an effective plan to meet the danger.

Within the last few days, we have witnessed a most extraordinary spectacle of Communist hypocrisy at the United Nations Security Council. What happened there has dramatically exposed the Kremlin's fraudulent peace offensive and has shown that the danger to the free world has mounted because we have failed to take vigorous and effective counter-measures.

I refer to the debate which took place on a resolution introduced by the United Kingdom to empower the Secretary-General of the United Nations to continue his efforts in the Middle East to secure compliance with the Arab-Israel U. N. armistice agreements. The resolution originally expressed hope for a peaceful settlement on a mutually acceptable basis.

These words had special significance. On April 17, Mr. Molotov, then U. S. S. R. Foreign Minister, had used these identical words in a press conference in Moscow. Many people were surprised—but pleased—to hear them because he seemed to be saying that the Kremlin wanted to help bring about an Arab-Israel peace, despite its arms shipments to Egypt.

The statement later appeared in the joint communique issued by Prime Minister Eden and Premier Bulganin in London on April 27.

But when these words were used in the British resolution at the U. N. Security Council last week, indignant protests came from Arab delegates who shouted their opposition to any kind of peaceful settlement on a mutually acceptable basis and instead called for the liquidation of Israel.

The U. S. S. R. delegation then quickly bowed to the Arab will and joined in the demand for removal of the offensive words, notwithstanding their Communist authorship.

I regret that the Western powers yielded to the pressure of the anti-peace coalition of the Soviet-Arab axis. The words were removed. As adopted, the resolution has little meaning. But the debate had sinister implications because it revealed very plainly that the Arab States have grown bolder in their outrageous clamor for Israel's disappearance.

Moreover, the U. S. S. R. is now unmasked as insincere and hypocritical. Anxious to pursue the Arabs, it is ready to repudiate its own undertakings as a peace-loving member of the U. N. Its words have no meaning for honest men.

They are cynical camouflage for an unremitting conspiracy against freedom.

Mr. Chairman, this experience demonstrates, above all, that our Government dares not rely on the U. S. S. R. as a partner to promote and preserve the peace in the Middle East. If the administration thought it could avert the rising danger and prevent war in the region by resort to United Nations machinery, it was dangerously deluding itself. For as much as we believe in the United Nations and support that body, we must face the unpleasant reality that action on the Arab-Israel conflict is always impeded and blocked by the perennial threat of a Soviet veto.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would call the attention of the House to editorials on this affair which appeared in the New York Times of June 2 and June 5 and the Washington Post of June 6.

I shall include them at the conclusion of my remarks.

In the light of what happened last week, the administration must take a new and harder look at its own policy in the Middle East.

It may be that the administration has some secret grand strategy to counteract the military imbalance resulting from the Communist arms shipments and their propagandist and subversive conspiracy with some of the Arab leaders.

But if there is such a strategy, it has not been revealed to us. On the contrary, there is a widespread impression that we are not ready and that we are relying largely on hope. The administration has not yet taken any action to implement the Tripartite Declaration of 1950. There is a growing fear that the administration has walked away from the commitments in that declaration. I hope that this is not true. But I wish the administration would give us some positive reassurance.

Early in the year, I thought of offering some kind of legislative program which would reaffirm our determination to stand behind the declaration of 1950, to make it absolutely clear to any potential aggressor in the Near East that we are determined to preserve the U. N. armistice lines and that we will not permit any dangerous arms discrepancy.

But it seemed premature and presumptuous for an individual Congressman to attempt a solution of a problem that was taxing the interests and energies of the Department of State and the members of the congressional committees charged with the problem.

I had hoped that some concrete program might be developed under the Mutual Security Act. I regret that there is not a word in the bill which suggests any recognition of the danger or promises any action to meet it.

The administration is here asking for more money for arms for the Middle East. The testimony shows that the administration plans to provide additional arms to Iraq. A special study mission of the House Foreign Affairs Committee tells us on page 52 of a recent report that "as a member of the Arab League, Iraq opposed the creation of the State of Israel, participated in the war against that state and is still technically at war with her."

It is idle for the administration to explain that Iraq has no common frontier with Israel. The lack of a common frontier did not prevent Iraq from invading Israel in 1948. Furthermore, the report of the committee to which I have just referred shows that the administration offered to give arms to Egypt in July 1953; it offered to give arms to Saudi Arabia in January 1953; it has sold arms to Egypt and it is selling arms to Saudi Arabia now.

Now I am not going to vote against this bill because of the arms shipments to Iraq, despite any reservations that I might have about sending arms to any Arab country in advance of an Arab-Israel peace.

I do ask, however, how the administration can possibly claim to be fair, friendly and impartial in the Middle East when it donates arms to Iraq, a country which can afford to buy them with its substantial income in oil royalties, and at the same time refuse to act on Israel's request for arms which was first submitted more than 4 years ago. From the very moment that the Communists began shipping arms to Israel's hostile neighbors, to Egypt and now to Syria, we should have been ready to meet that challenge by supplying arms to Israel. Of course, none of us like an arms race, but we must not allow the Communists to win an arms runaway at the expense of a little country in the Near East which stands firmly committed to democracy and Western civilization. Let us for once support our proven friends.

Mr. Chairman, we have all heard the argument that if we allow Israel to get arms from us, it may throw the Arab countries into the arms of the Russians, and that we must do nothing that might in any way irritate or provoke the Arabs into that kind of maniacal suicide. But that reasoning is dangerous because of its implications. Does it mean that we will abandon friends any time any country threatens to go Communist? Is this the way to promote democracy in the Middle East? Can we make any impression on the uncommitted millions of the Middle East and Asia, can we win their allegiance to democracy and freedom, if we allow a little democracy to become an expendable hostage to Communist conspiracy and Arab blackmail?

Is there any wonder our prestige and friends are vanishing?

Mr. Chairman, I am also familiar with the indirect approach to this military problem, which is to let our allies provide arms to Israel the while we remain aloof so that we can preserve some kind of independent status as a peacemaker. I don't think this tactic deceives anybody, because the Arab states blame us for anything our allies do. They will be satisfied with nothing less than Israel's complete isolation. Furthermore, I do not believe that we can come into the Middle East in the role of an impartial peacemaker if we have offered and supplied arms to one side and refused them to the other. We cease to be impartial when we are immobilzed by Arab threats. The result of our inertia is that we have whetted Arab appetites for greater and greater concessions at Israel's expense while the Russians supply them with the weapons to carry out their hostile plans.

Mr. Chairman, we will not meet the Communist threat to the Near East by wishing it were not there, by burying our heads in the scrap pile of expurgated resolutions at the U. N., by accepting Communist protestations even as they are recanting them.

The exhibition at the U. N. last week shows that the situation has deteriorated. The Middle East is further from peace than at any time since 1948. I believe that this is due largely to Communist maneuver and conspiracy. But I also believe that it is partly due to a failure on the part of the West to respond to the threat firmly and effectively.

I hope that the administration will soon take a more realistic and decisive position. Surely the debate at the Security Council argues for a policy which says what it means, says it firmly and vigorously, and then moves forward to carry it out.

[From the New York Times of June 2, 1956]

THE TRUTH ABOUT PALESTINE

The United Nations Security Council has been spending some tedious hours this week wrestling with the wording of a British resolution that expressed hope for a lasting peace in Palestine. The delay that kept the Council working overtime was due mainly to the reluctance of the Arab states—Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and Egypt—to admit that the State of Israel legally exists and to give up, for good and all, their ambition to drive the Israelis into the Mediterranean. For this reason the discussion yesterday, still incomplete, was postponed until Monday afternoon.

Not one Arab speaker said one word to indicate that he felt the awful responsibility of restoring or maintaining peace in the Near East; not one showed the slightest understanding, or desire to understand, the urge that drove so many abused and harassed individuals into the ancient land of Palestine, to set up a new commonwealth and labor for a new hope; not one welcomed the kind of peace that might result from accepting Israel as a neighbor; each, without exception, seemed to be waiting for the ultimate catastrophe that by wrecking the Mediterranean world, and perhaps all the Western World, might destroy the tiny State of Israel.

These assertions are not rhetorical. The fault the Arabs found with the original British resolution was that it used words suggesting, however vaguely, that a peaceful and permanent settlement of the trouble between Israel and her Arab neighbors might be reached. The Arab spokesmen wouldn't have this. They regarded it as an offense for the United Nations to endorse, or the Secretary General to attempt, any solution that might put an end to the suffering and suspense in the Near East and open the way to peace and prosperity for all. They stuck to medieval notions that are now as out of date as chain armor, spears, and battleaxes.

Listen to the Syrian spokesman, Ambassador Ahmed Shukairy, speaking Thursday afternoon. He referred to Palestine—that is, the State of Israel, recognized by our own and most other governments, received in 1949 as a member of the United Nations—as "part and parcel of the Arab homeland." He went on to say:

"To advocate the idea of a mutually acceptable solution must inevitably lead to a reversal of all the resolutions of the United Nations. * * * We must begin from the beginning. We must start de novo on a clean sheet. Everything written by the United Nations should be written off, ever since

November 29, 1947. [This was the date of the U. N. partition resolution.] The establishment of Israel, its membership in the United Nations and all other resolutions will have to be revoked. Then, and then only, the United Nations can look forward to a solution 'on a mutually acceptable basis'."

We have to put this remarkable utterance into the context of a debate over Mr. Hammarskjold's patient and impartial efforts to stop the killing in the Near East. Mr. Hammarskjold reported, as in duty bound. He had kept—so it seemed to most observers—within the limits of the April 4 resolution, under which he had gone to Palestine. He had received assurances from all the parties, the four Arab States necessarily included, that they would try to reduce border squabbles and accept an increased and improved measure of U. N. supervision. There is every indication that the Arab States and Israel gave the assurances in good faith. But if we judge by the Arab arguments in the Security Council this week this good faith was in the Arab case of a temporary nature. Given an opportunity, one had to conclude, the Arabs would pounce on Israel.

Neither side in the Near Eastern troubles has been without blame. Each side has unnecessarily taken innocent lives. But the Israeli are now willing to settle and end the bloodshed. The Arabs, if their spokesmen truly represented them this week, are not ready to do this finally and for all time.

[From the New York Times of June 5, 1956]

U. N. HAS A BAD DAY

The United Nations and the Security Council never seemed weaker than they did yesterday when the Council allowed four Arab States, aided and abetted by Russia, to take out of the Palestine resolution the words that expressed hope for "a peaceful settlement on a mutually acceptable basis."

The Arab States, for which Syria was the most vociferous spokesman, were at least consistent; they have not concealed their desire to get rid of the little State of Israel, which, though they outnumber it 20 times over, they pretend to fear.

The United Kingdom and the United States were not inconsistent, either. They yielded in the interests of "unanimity," and achieved it—a mistaken course, we think, but not an ignoble one. But what is, or ever was, wrong with a "mutually acceptable settlement" in place of bloodshed and hate?

The Soviet Union, denouncing Stalin, as its new rulers are now doing, behaved as that dead and dishonored potentate would have done. On April 17, in Moscow, in a press conference sponsored by Vyacheslav M. Molotov, who was then Foreign Minister, they appealed for "a stable, peaceful settlement of the Palestine question on a mutually acceptable basis." The words were picked up and again endorsed by Russia in the joint communique issued by Prime Minister Eden and Premier Bulganin on April 27. Sir Pierson Dixon, British Ambassador to the U. N., certainly had every reason but one to believe that if he put them in his resolution the Russians would accept them. The one reason he overlooked was that Moscow is seemingly as ready as ever to betray its promises and assurances for a brief and mean diplomatic advantage.

And perhaps it is not even an advantage. Perhaps this episode will show skeptics, by contrast, that honor, courage and pity are in the end winning qualities. Perhaps the U. N. will be the stronger if this one act of folly opens its eyes to the eternal truth that empty compromises win no victories, and that in the end principles worth defending must be defended.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 6, 1956]

AGREEMENT ON AN ILLUSION

Unanimity on the next steps in the Middle East dispute has been purchased in the United Nations at the expense of a resolution so watered down as to be almost meaningless. The Security Council resolution finally filtered through the Arab and Soviet objections, authorizes Secretary General Hammarskjold to continue his good offices to obtain compliance with the 1949 armistice, but pointedly omits any reference to settlement. In effect, Mr. Hammarskjold will be permitted to urge peace as an objective so long as he avoids all mention of specific means for bringing real peace about.

The performance of the Arab States in the U. N. debate set something of a new low. The Arab delegates persistently refused to acknowledge the fact of Israel. Syria established the pattern by asserting that Israel was really a southern extension of Syria. The Syrian Ambassador to the U. N. also insisted that all U. N. actions on Palestine must be reversed and Israel, in effect, be legislated out of existence—a logical companion piece to the disgusting television performance in which the Syrian Ambassador in Washington demanded the erection of a screen between himself and the Israeli Ambassador.

But this performance, while deplorable, was not surprising. What made the difference was the capricious Soviet support of the Arab position. The deleted section of the British resolution, citing consciousness "of the need to create conditions in which a peaceful settlement on a mutually acceptable basis" would be possible, was adapted almost word for word from the Eden-Bulganin communique at the conclusion of the Soviet visit to London. Have the Russians now repudiated their announced willingness to work for stabilization in the Middle East? Does their continued whetting of Arab intransigence mean that they want a little peace but not too much?

Their tactics on the British resolution certainly would indicate as much. That being the case, the question is whether an essentially phony agreement has not been purchased at a high price, and whether it might not have been better for the Western powers to hoist the Russians on the inconsistency of their own words.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join in the well-deserved tribute which has been paid to the highly esteemed chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Hon. JAMES P. RICHARDS. I, too, was very sorry when I learned of his decision to retire from Congress. He is a man of great ability, integrity, and honesty. His adept handling of foreign affairs legislation has earned him a reputation which is known throughout the world. He has served the people of his district, his State, and his country with distinction, and will be greatly missed by this House, but his wise counsel and leadership will be long remembered.

Mr. Chairman, since my election to Congress, I have supported the mutual-security program because I believe that it is necessary to the defense and security of the American people and an essential factor in our fight against the increasing spread of international communism. However, when you look around the world today, it makes you wonder if our money is being spent wisely. Under the present administration our foreign policy has been totally inept and vacillating to such an extent that America is now losing its position of world leadership. We have lost friends all over the globe. Looking around the world we find the state of tension in the Middle East, uprisings in Cyprus, Formosa is in danger of being bombed by Red China, things are not running smoothly in Korea, Cyprus is a hotbed, Vietnam is a state of chaos.

Mr. Chairman, I have followed with growing apprehension the weakness of our foreign policy in countering the effects of Soviet penetration of the Middle East. We have been weakly on the defensive ever since the Communist bloc began to send millions of dollars of jet planes and modern arms to Egypt. The hopes for peace that were raised when we initiated the United Nations mission of Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold to the Middle East have been dashed by our acceptance of the recent U. N. resolution on the Middle East. This has been rendered meaningless by the connivance of the Soviet Union and the Arab States to eliminate the paragraph calling for a mutually acceptable settlement, between the Arabs and Israel. The fact that the Soviet Union yielded to Arab demands and repudiated its own language, which it formulated with Great Britain, should be proof to us that we cannot count on that state for cooperation in working toward peace in the Middle East.

Meanwhile, the Soviet Union is continuing to send arms to the Middle East and is reported to have negotiated an agreement to send Syria over $25 million worth of Soviet-bloc arms. This administration says it wants to preserve peace in the Middle East, yet our country, too, is contributing to the arms race by arming Iraq and including that country in this mutual-security program for additional arms. This will probably stimulate additional shipments by the Communists to Egypt and perhaps other Arab countries, and thus further upset the arms balance to Israel's disadvantage and danger.

The tiny State of Israel is the Western World's bulwark against the atheistic forces of Communism in the Middle East. Therefore, is it not natural and proper for us—as good Americans—to aid and assist our sister republic in that important part of the world?

How can we continue to refuse to send arms to Israel on the ground that we are opposed to an arms race, when at the same time we send arms to Iraq and Saudi Arabia? It does not make sense.

I quote from page 9 of the report on the bill we are considering: "The Committee was reassured both on and off the record that the program does not include any money or plans for military aid to Israel or to the Arab States bordering on Israel." The claim that Iraq does not border on Israel is a specious one. Iraq invaded Israel in 1948 and it has never ceased to hurl threats of war and invasion against Israel. Nevertheless, we are rewarding Iraq for her role in the Baghdad Pact and we are continuing to send

her millions of dollars of arms at the expense of the American taxpayers, although she is well able to pay for these weapons out of the vast proceeds that she receives for her oil.

What we have gained by this one-sided application of our policy of so-called impartial friendship is difficult to understand. Our course in the Middle East should be devoted to the strengthening of Israel as a democratic force capable of deterring aggression, blocking Communist penetration and staving off war by allowing her to obtain here the arms that she needs for her defense. We must make crystal clear to the Arab States that in the interests of freedom and democracy we will permit no aggression against Israel. Only then will it be possible to enter the long path that will result in a just peace for all.

I note in the press that the President says he will reevaluate certain phases of our foreign policy. The bill we are considering here today is an authorization bill. In a few weeks we will receive the appropriation bill containing funds to carry out the Mutual Security program. I hope that when this money bill reaches us, it will not contain any funds for arms to Egypt and the Arab countries.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to make a few observations and comments on certain statements that have been made. A few moments ago the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] called attention to the activities of the State Department. Apparently the State Department has its nose in about everything that goes on in Washington. Witness the fact that that not long ago when the farm bill went through the Senate a Member took the floor and said he was offering three amendments on behalf of the State Department and, furthermore, that the State Department had instructed him to obtain rollcalls on each of the three amendments. The State Department is trying to run the affairs of this Congress, the Pentagon, the farmers, and every other department and agency of Government.

Mr. Chairman, it is going to be interesting this afternoon to find out just how many coattail riders we have in the House of Representatives; to see how fast that population increases. I am for the Bentley amendment to cut this bill, and I want no part of any coattail riding procedure here this afternoon. I will certainly support the committee cut if the Bentley amendment fails.

I have been interested in the fact that at last the businessmen of this country seem to be awakening to the insidiousness of this multibillion-dollar foreign-aid program. The other day I came across a bulletin entitled "Federal Spending Facts," issued by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce. Incidentally, the Texas Chamber of Commerce is a member as well as the Chamber of Commerce of Indiana. I am not sure about Massachusetts. Let me quote briefly from this bulletin with respect to this foreign give-away bill. And, when I say "giveaway" I am using the language of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] as found in the hearings. Let me quote an excerpt or two from that bulletin:

> In a report on overseas economic operations submitted to Congress a year ago by the Hoover Commission, a majority of the Commission expressed concern with the continuing large outlays for foreign aid. * * * They concluded their separate statement in these words:
>
> "Surely, after almost 10 years, the time has come to apply some brakes to this overseas spending program. We believe, therefore, that the Commission should recommend substantial reductions in expenditures for this purpose. By no other means will the growing trend toward permanent foreign spending be halted."

That is from the Hoover Commission. The Council of State Chambers of Commerce says further under the title "Best Hope for Curtailment Is Congressional Action":

> Certainly there is no reason to believe that any real moves to curtail foreign-aid spending will emanate from the bureaucrats who administer the program. Such action simply is not in the cards because the bureaucrat is rare indeed who finds reasons and offers recommendations for abolishing jobs.
>
> Accordingly, large-scale foreign aid is likely to burden the American taxpayer for years to come unless Congress assumes the full responsibility of cutting it off.

No truer words have been written.

A few moments ago the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] spoke of the expenditures for defense by foreign governments as compared with their national gross products, and he said that many foreign countries were spending almost as much as we are. Well, what are some of the figures? We are spending 11 percent of our national gross product for defense. Belgium and Luxembourg, 4.5 percent, Holland, 5.9 percent. Denmark, 3.2 percent. France, only 7.8 percent, although they are in a war, Turkey 5.7 percent, and Spain, 4.3 percent.

Incidentally, I want to call attention to the hearings on this bill. I have read these hearings, and I find that Congress is operating more and more in a vacuum. You will find on almost every page—at least every other page—a dozen off the record discussions and security deletions. Let me read you one of the deletions for alleged security reasons:

> Mr. VORYS. I was asked by a young student yesterday whether it was true that the French divisions in Algeria (security deletion) are armed with American arms and using American ammunition in putting down the rebellion there. I got to thinking. I said, "I don't know where else they have gotten any arms except from the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Here is a question asked by a young student and there is even a security deletion in his question. That is what you have to contend with when you read these hearings. If you can get any real facts out of them, you are better than I am, believe me.

Going back to the figures on national gross product spent for defense, Greece, 6.3 percent; Italy, 4.4 percent. Only one country exceeds the expenditures of the United States out of the gross national product for defense, and that is Yugoslavia. Dictator Tito spends 11.6 percent of that country's national product for national defense. Certainly we are not going to get any help from the Yugoslavs.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] a few moments ago said that unless this bill is approved it will be necessary to extend the period of service for American conscripts. How many foreign countries have extended the period of service for their men? As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] very well knows that foreign countries, upon which we have lavished billions of dollars, are cutting the periods of service of their men. And Great Britain today is threatening to withdraw 1 of its 2 or 3 divisions from NATO, leaving us to hold the sack.

Yes, Mr. Chairman; if we have any genuine regard for the taxpayers of this country this bill ought to be slashed even deeper than the pending amendment proposes. Much too long have we picked the pockets of our own people while these foreign governments dragged their feet.

Our greatest security and the world's greatest security is a strong defense, coupled with the very best offensive weapons, based upon the North American Continent rather than in the hands and under the authority of unreliable allies.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much impressed by the statement made by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] a few minutes ago. It really expressed my own sentiments. I have always supported the foreign-aid program. Every Member knows I am an internationalist. I think what we need more than anything else today is friends throughout the world. It seems to me that since this administration has been in power, however, we have been losing friends all over the world while the Soviets have been gaining them. Yet we have been spending this money. But what good has it been doing?

As I say, we must have friends throughout the world. I know we cannot buy them. But here we are spending all this money and yet we are losing many of these countries. So there is something wrong somewhere.

I supported this program mainly because it was a continuation of the Truman program. And it was effective in the Truman administration. But what is happening today? Since this administration has been in power, it seems we are dissipating all the good feeling in the world toward us. It may very well be that we ought to have this money. I may vote to restore these cuts. But I would be doing it with a good deal of trepidation, because the question in my mind is, are we doing the right thing? Where is the money going? What useful

purpose is it serving? It does not appear that we are getting too much value for our money.

I hope the Members of the House give this matter some thought, because I know that many of them feel as I do, that we have got to help our friends throughout the world. But in some cases, we seem to have spent money which, as has been pointed out by some Members, has been used against us.

Is this not a time to stop and think and reevaluate? I received a letter today from a man in my district who is 87½ years old. He pointed out to me that he has always been in favor of these foreign-aid programs. He gets $57 a month in social security. He says, "How is it possible for me to live on that? We are spending billions of dollars all over the world. Don't we know that charity begins at home?"

I never was a believer in that philosophy. I felt that even if we had to make sacrifices at home we should help our friends abroad because in the long run that would be helping ourselves. But it is not having that effect at this time.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Does the gentleman realize that if he finally makes up his mind to vote to restore this cut, under the vaunted flexibility that they talk about in this program, he would be voting to make it possible for the Pentagon to give even more arms to the Arab States?

Mr. KLEIN. I want to say to the gentleman that I have a great deal of admiration for him. It was his statement here that made me revise my thinking about this, and I have not yet made up my mind.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in the short time I have been here I have supported mutual security and foreign aid, but the further this debate goes the more questions I am finding in my mind. Certainly the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] made a very excellent statement a little while ago with reference to a gentleman in Europe by the name of Tito. I am just curious to know how much of this $600 million increase which the amendment calls for is going to that particular country. If I understand it correctly, the military aid which is being given to Yugoslavia is classified information. May I ask the chairman of the committee or the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] if it is correct that the military aid to Yugoslavia is classified information?

Mr. VORYS. Yes; all military aid is classified.

Mr. SISK. Is it true that Tito is a Communist?

Mr. VORYS. Yes.

Mr. SISK. Do I understand it is all right for the Communists to have information on how much American money they have, still we as Members of Congress and our people are not entitled to that information?

Mr. VORYS. I think Tito knows it, but I doubt if the rest of the Communists know it. It has been the policy not to make those figures public for security reasons, not only as regards our enemies but also because the different countries should not be familiar with what other countries get. That has been the practice for about 9 years.

Mr. SISK. Does the gentleman mean to say that he believes that Tito will not inform Mr. Bulganin and Mr. Khrushchev of the situation that exists so far as financial aid from the United States is concerned, in view of the fact that he is over there right now engaging in a love feast and is fully back in the family?

Mr. VORYS. I doubt whether Tito would tell Bulganin and Khrushchev just what he has got. I think he is still a rather independent character.

Mr. SISK. I want an answer to this question. My people must hold me responsible for spending billions of dollars all over the world, and yet you say that a Communist has a right to know what we are spending money for, but we as Members of Congress may not even know. That I cannot explain to my people.

Mr. JUDD. If the gentleman will yield, I would agree with him that that was an accurate statement regarding funds appropriated previously. I think I might come to the same conclusion regarding information withheld on aid given in the past. But the real reason for the figures being classified for aid in the future is that there is no promise to any single country in this bill, and the administration does not want to have a figure publicized for any country, for then it can say, "The Congress has passed a bill in which it pledged us twenty, forty, or sixty million dollars." The administration properly wants always to have complete control of the program. So they bring us their estimates in confidence. They are classified information. As the thing looks on a given day, they think it would be advisable to allocate so much here and so much there. But those are never fixed figures, and the minute the estimates become public, the nations concerned tend to believe they have a right to those amounts, because they think Congress has pledged them.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SISK was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Evidently the military and the State Department do not even trust in executive session the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. You pick up the newspaper of today and you will find that the article says, "Arms Aid to Tito Bottled Up." Evidently they did not even inform the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in executive session that they were doing it. The point is that they are finally beginning to see the mistake that we tried to have them see a year ago, and they do not have the guts to say they are bottling it up, they say, "We are not working on it any more."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota for a short statement.

Mr. JUDD. Doubtless all these countries know what we have promised them in the past from previous appropriations, but not a single country has a promise of any specific amount of money, economic or military, in this bill before us.

Mr. SISK. Does the gentleman mean to say that the Pentagon and the people who are going to administer this money have no idea how much money they are going to give Yugoslavia or any other country? Are we going to be asked to give them a blank check?

Mr. JUDD. No. They presented to us their estimates. The figures in the table on pages 3 to 6 are the totals of the classified figures for the individual countries. The minute you publicize such a list, however, as the gentleman will immediately recognize, the countries affected will think they have pledges of those amounts. Suppose those in charge of the program want to cut down here or there as situations change. We do not want them frozen. Our Government needs to maintain control of the program. It must have flexibility. That is the reason the exact figures are not stated in the bill.

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. As I understand it, when this colloquy started you had in mind a question about Yugoslavia. Is that correct?

Mr. SISK. That is right. I had.

Mr. DONOVAN. You might be interested in this information I picked up in a Central European country last year from the head or the near head of one of those countries. I asked him point blank, "Do you expect at any time in the near future, in view of the fact that Yugoslavia is 95 percent non-Communist, to ever see the light of day of freedom in Yugoslavia?" He stroked his chin, and he said, "Well, sir, not as long as you in the United States keep bankrolling Tito."

Mr. SISK. Of course, the point I had in mind in taking the Committee's time—because I am not an expert on foreign aid, was that I am going to be held responsible, and I think rightly so, by my constituents as to how I vote on this particular amendment, and I still do not have an answer to the question as to why we as Members of the Congress of the United States, representing 166 million people, are denied information that is given to Communist countries.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I will say to the gentleman that all of this business you have heard about Tito not telling the Kremlin what he is getting, you can put down as so much baloney, because he is not only telling him what he has got, he is telling them what he has already gotten and what he expects to get. He is saying to them, "Are you going to match it or do better?" In other words, he is using that as a lever to pry some assistance out of them. And let me say to you that Mr. Nasser in Egypt is getting wise and doing the same thing. The military came in with a figure, but they say it is classified. Once in a while they slip up and they come in with a

figure that they are going to give a couple of the Arab States that they had never given to before, and when we pinned them down they said, "That is a mistake." The reason they do that is to cover up what they are actually giving.

Mr. SISK. Would not the gentleman agree that that is a good example that we are, in essence, giving a blank check to the Pentagon without any idea of being able to justify what we are doing? Is that not one reason why we are not getting any results?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. That is exactly right, but if the gentleman votes for this amendment he can tell his people "I wrote them another blank check for $600 million."

Mr. SISK. I am not going to vote for this amendment. I am going to vote against it unless someone can give me an answer to the question as to why a Communist country, a Communist leader, a man who is in Moscow embracing the head of world communism, is given information with reference to the spending of American taxpayers' dollars, information that we as Members of Congress cannot have. I think it is ridiculous, unfair, unjust, and an insult to the American people.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. I am about to reveal another secret that has been classified. I find on page 15 of the committee report that they say that the request for defense support for Yugoslavia is $30 million. Did somebody miss up on that? Did they declassify it by mistake? That is defense support.

Mr. JUDD. That is not military assistance.

Mr. MULTER. On the same page, however, they tell us the amounts for the same kind of support to our friends Greece and Turkey are also classified.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. You are going to have an opportunity, shortly I hope, to vote on aid to Yugoslavia. I am introducing that amendment right after this. If you vote to prohibit any aid to Yugoslavia, this section of the amendment will be so increased that you will not have to worry about the decreased cut.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the remarks of the lady. As I say, I have supported foreign aid before. I would like to support it now, but these are questions that I feel are important to the American people, and I know they are important to my constituents in my district.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for an additional minute, that I might show him the sources of the information supporting the estimates.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Here, for instance, is the secret book that has the basic data regarding the military program for Europe, the Near East and Africa. In it are the figures and how they arrived at them, and the basis for their present estimates. Here is the one for Asia, and here the one for Europe. These contain the material on which the estimates are based.

Tito knows what he got in the past; he does not know what he is going to get, if anything, in the future, and neither does any other country.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I would just like to ask the gentleman now that he has been shown these volumes if he knows any more about it than he did before?

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman from Ohio knows because he has seen and studied them in committee.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, we have gone very far afield today. I would like to bring you back for a moment if I may to what we are really considering in a few minutes. We are going to vote upon the amount included in the mutual-aid bill.

Let me emphasize right here I believe if this item had been brought in for the mutual protection of the United States in a defense bill, as it might reasonably have been, there would hardly be a Member of this House dare raise his voice against it. Then the membership would realize we were jeopardizing the whole safety of our Nation.

This item is military aid that we are going to extend to people of other countries. It is to relieve us from bearing the entire burden of a future war.

Do we want to fight a future war alone? Or do we want some allies to aid us in the fight if it comes? We are going to answer this question shortly. That is exactly what we are saying through our votes.

To my Republican friends I would say this is a crucial part of the administration's program. It is the basis upon which is constructed the Eisenhower program for peace.

A few moments ago I received a letter from the President of the United States which I read for the information of the Members:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 7, 1956.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOE: No doubt you and other House leaders on both sides of the aisle realize full well, from our discussions in the White House and from my remarks yesterday to the press, the importance I attach to the pending mutual-security legislation. Nevertheless, to remove any possible doubt as to my feelings, I am sending you this letter. You may, if you wish, bring it to the attention of the entire House membership, so strongly do I believe that the pending issue concerns the security of our country.

Great consequences are involved in this legislation. In the present international situation, the free world can ill afford to move hesitatingly and uncertainly. The United States—the most powerful of the free nations—can afford least of all to take a backward step in this constant battle all of us are waging for a just and enduring peace.

I am deeply convinced that our Nation's security and our partnership with like-minded nations in the world will be seriously impaired by the extent of the proposed cut in the funds requested this year for the mutual-security program. I, therefore, hope most earnestly that the large majority of these funds can be restored. If we fail to do so, we must either eliminate essential programs or so reduce them as to cripple our entire effort.

I know that many conscientious people are of the opinion that there will be no serious results if a severe reduction in mutual-security funds is made at this time. Yet I personally, the Secretary of State, the Director of the International Cooperation Administration, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff are united in the conviction that the proposed cut will be hurtful to the best interests of our own people and to the well-being of our friends throughout the world. I do, therefore, urge that you and your colleagues in the Congress vigorously carry forward your efforts to restore to this legislation the funds needed to maintain the pace of our battle to win a lasting peace throughout the world.

With warm regard,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. Chairman, all of us who attended the meeting at the White House night before last, and it included the leadership on both sides of the aisle, were deeply impressed by the statements of the President of the United States. He is a soldier, he is a man who knows the military picture thoroughly. And I believe he is one of the most sincere friends that peace has in the world today. He is fighting for peace. No one can deny that the establishment of NATO has resulted to a very large extent in peace in Europe. Some nations are free today because the armed forces of NATO have acted as a deterrent to the Communists who were looking forward to see what country they might gobble up next.

We are in a much better era. Let us keep that way. I ask you in this tense period, in this hour of uncertainty, when the whole world is a bit panicky, when no one knows what is going to happen next, Are you going to turn down the views of the President of the United States? He is the only world leader we have whether we be Democrats or Republicans. Are we going to say to him "We are denying the money you say is so necessary for the peace and security of our country?"

I do not believe you are. I just cannot believe it. I do not believe that we want to take this personal responsibility. As one individual I do not want to take that responsibility. Of course, I do not like some of these items that folks have criticized. As far as Tito is concerned, he is not for the moment affected. That battle will be fought out on another amendment to be offered later.

Is the whole security program to be wrecked by this drastic reduction? As the President himself said in the private conference the other night: Are we going to so badly jeopardize the NATO forces of Europe? Are we going to say to Russia because of a few smiles we are quitting in our defense program?

Mr. Chairman, it is just as simple as that. And let me remind you this is not an appropriation, it is an authorization bill. The situation may change from day to day. No one knows what tomorrow will bring forth. Why wreck the program now when in 2, 3 or 4 weeks another bill will come back here for consideration from the Appropriations Committee, at which time we will have a chance to review our judgment? We can have no second chance if the amendment is refused.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members will vote for the Hays amendment to restore what was generally considered to be a minimum the President needs to go forward with his security commitments. This is not all he has asked, but, it is the minimum amount he says is necessary to protect the security of this country. Whether you are a Republican or a Democrat, I do not think you can take lightly the warning from the President of the United States. You are taking on a lot of responsibility if you turn down the President and the result is a deterioration of our world affairs.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the question of any Member's patriotism is involved in how he will vote upon the pending amendments or upon the bill. I think we can start with the assumption that we are all patriotic Americans and want to do the right thing for the security, safety, and the peace of our country and of the world.

I am not a confidant of the President, so I must take my information about what he says from the newspapers. Today I will take my quotations of what he says from a paper which is avowedly Republican but nevertheless fair in its reporting.

From this morning's New York Herald Tribune, I quote President Eisenhower's statement of yesterday. When his attention was directed to the situation in Yugoslavia, with reference to Tito and the Russian Communists, he said:

> However, I do agree that where we stand has to be reevalued.

This business of reevaluation has a familiar ring.

That reevaluation can take place, my friends, only by presentation of the facts. The duty to reevalue is as much yours as his. Today, we have been urged to support the President's request. Nobody has told us why we should do it except that he asked for it. No one has yet given us the facts on which to reevalue and to act.

I have heretofore followed the President's foreign policy requests and relied upon his statements with reference thereto. I think we must leave him now. I do so based upon his statements made at this same press conference. I refer again to the same newspaper. He says that we cannot be too particular about the special attitudes of different countries and to the way his word "neutral" is used when we refer to neutral nations, because our country, said he, had been neutral for the first 150 years of our existence. "We were neutral in the wars of the world," said he.

Well, now, if that is as little as he knows about our history it may be indicative of how little he knows about the facts on which he wants us to act. Without his telling us the facts we cannot follow. We must not follow blindly.

Turn to the same newspaper on page 25. His good friend David Lawrence writes the article "Eisenhower Is Criticized for Theory of Neutralism." You will find there a fine summary of the first 150 years of the existence of this country and the instances when we were not neutral. Of course, we were right in not being neutral. Lawrence concludes his article with the quotation of these words of President Eisenhower:

> The reason we help and assist others is in the belief that this will help us, also.

Now, if we are going to give military aid, let us give it to our friends. The only reason I have been able to justify voting military aid—and this amendment before you is for military aid—the only reason I have been able to justify my voting for military aid for Yugoslavia was because we were told—and I believed it, that we were taking a calculated risk—that when the chips were down she would be on our side.

The chips are down. Where is she?

The same newspaper, headline, front page "Tito Starts Talks, Lauds Soviet Cuts in Arms." And, to quote further from the same newspaper:

> They—

Meaning Tito and Bulganin and Khrushchev—

> are expected to erase any rift remaining between the Yugoslav President and the Soviet leadership.

Who is our friend? Where is our friend?

Economic aid I am willing to give in the hope of winning them over. I will go along with those of you who say: "We will not call it buying friends. We just want to win them over. But military aid to our friends and only to our friends, and once they show they are not our friends, do not give them another dime, do not give them another piece of materiel, do not give them anything that may be used against us or against our friends."

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. The gentleman realizes, therefore, or I gather he does from his remarks, that if this pending amendment passes, it would give the Executive and the Pentagon power to increase military aid to the Arab States and the Arab League if they choose to do so.

Mr. MULTER. That is only a small part of the problem that confronts us. I want to see peace in the Middle East, but I also want to see peace throughout the world. I am not willing to risk it in Africa, Asia, Europe, or any place else.

If this program needs reevaluation, as the President says it does, let us reevaluate it. If necessary, let this Committee on Foreign Affairs, if the situation has changed since they closed these hearings, have some more hearings and get the new facts. Let us act on facts and not on mere requests.

There are political implications behind this, whether you believe it or not. The gentleman from Ohio referred to that. We, on the Democratic side, are asked to come forward and help the bipartisan policy, but the day after we do, we will have our heads handed to us, because we are Democrats.

I, for one, resent any President of our country sending a message requesting congressional action to a member of his own party rather than to the Speaker. The President, when acting officially, is President not of the Republicans but of the United States. The Speaker is not the Speaker of the Democrats but of the United States House of Representatives.

Regardless of protocol, however, I refuse to vote as requested, unless the request is backed up by sound reason fortified by solid fact.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. I do not intend to and I do not want any Member of this House to assume the responsibility of impeding this program. As I said yesterday, it is a good program, but it needs good administration. It demands real leadership. I say in all good faith that none of us can exercise our responsibility until the facts are submitted to us. They have not yet been submitted to us so as to warrant supporting this Presidential request.

I say, let us stay here all summer, if necessary, and get the facts and then authorize on the basis of the facts.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I believe that inherent in the Hays amendment is the fact that there will be full aid included to Tito and Yugoslavia. The gentle lady from New York [Mrs. KELLY] and I are sponsoring an amendment later to cut out United States aid to Yugoslavia. If our amendment cutting out aid to Yugoslavia is adopted, there would then be a surplus of funds which casts doubt on the necessity for the Hays amendment.

It should also be pointed out that this agency has 2½ years supply in the pipeline under this program, and there is almost $7 billion now unspent and carried over from previous years. Congress was originally asked to add $4.9 billion for the current year, which we will do if we vote for the full amount of the request, as provided by the Flood amendment. If the administration reevaluates this current foreign aid program and reexamines it, and then comes back here in January and asks the Committee on Foreign Affairs to reconsider this matter, I am sure that our whole committee will

give any such request every attention. We all certainly favor full support for NATO, and know the good work General Gruenther has done in building up this alliance.

Mr. MULTER. Is there any doubt that the gentleman's committee would resume hearings tomorrow if the President and the Secretary of State said that they had any new or additional facts for them?

Mr. FULTON. There is no doubt our Foreign Affairs Committee would cooperate fully. On the military-aid part of this program the last available figure from the Department of Defense is as of November 30, 1955, and the Defense Department has not been able to provide a more current regional breakdown of the pipeline figures. So nobody knows the figures exactly on this foreign aid program on which we are legislating.

Mr. MULTER. It is time we found out.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Is the gentleman going to vote against this bill?

Mr. MULTER. No, sir; I am going to support this bill as I have supported every similar bill that has come before the House since I first came here in 1947. I believe in this program if properly administered.

Mr. MORANO. If this amendment is approved, will the gentleman vote for the bill?

Mr. MULTER. I will vote for the bill whether the amendment carries or is defeated. But I think the amendment is not a good one. I am referring to the Hays amendment. It is addressed solely to an increase in military aid. I say, let us have some more facts before we act on any more increases to military aid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it has come to be a rather standard practice on the part of some of the Government agencies and departments to send up requests to Congress for more money than they want or expect to get. They anticipate that cuts will be made in the committee, and that when the amount requested has been cut, they will still have left all that they wanted in the first place.

Whether this bill represents such an instance or not, I think that the amount requested is far too much. I am glad that the committee cut $1,109 million from the administration's request. But the amount carried in the bill should be reduced still further.

The Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures has reported that as of July 1 the mutual security program will have an unexpended balance of $6.6 billion. This amount, combined with the administration's requested authorization of $4.6 billion, would push the total up to $11.2 billion. Mutual security expenditures for the fiscal year 1957 have been estimated at $4.3 billion. This would increase the unexpended balance to approximately $6.9 billion.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee is to be congratulated for the $1.1 billion which they cut from the administration's mutual security request of $4.6 billion.

I feel that still deeper cuts could be made, and should be made. There can no longer be any justification—moral, economic or practical—for the continuation of this worldwide free spending program which calls on the American taxpayers to support the entire world.

The inclusion of Communist Yugoslavia in this bill is a serious affront to the American people. I cannot see how, with any sense of conscience, we could possibly allocate $30 million, plus a further sum, the amount and purpose of which is not disclosed in the bill or the committee report, to any country so closely allied with an avowed enemy. At the very time we are sittting in this Chamber, Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia is paying a state visit to Moscow. His antics and his general conduct in that capital erase any doubt that might exist as to which camp he and the Yugoslav nation belong.

On the occasion of this visit, Tito stated that never again will the Communist nations be divided. Thus, he cemented the relationship between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union, binding them once again to the pursuit of their common objectives—destruction of the free-enterprise system and ultimate conquest of the world.

This unofficial alliance seems well in line with the ever-increasing cordiality and spirit of union which has existed between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union since the death of Stalin.

It seems unthinkable to me that we could seriously consider the allocation of military aid to a political system which actively plots our own destruction.

In addition to this mysterious amount which the administration would grant Communist Yuogoslavia, another $80 million has been requested for India. This is a 30 percent increase over the amount which Congress voted to give India last year. Through our foreign aid program, the American taxpayers have financed the expansion of fertilizer factories, have built schools, houses and power projects, dug irrigation wells, rehabilitated India's railroads system, and have made additional loans to the amount of $230 million with which India could buy grain and other commodities on the world market.

During this period, India has come to adopt the attitude that the United States is obligated to send a donation each year as payment for India's not joining the Soviet bloc. The truth of the matter is that the relationship between India and the Soviet Union is such that it is difficult to say that she has not already sided with the Communists. Their pro-Communist position on practically every issue dividing the free world from the Soviet bloc is eloquent testimony to the value of the nearly $600 million in foreign aid which we have given India since 1950.

The triumphant tour of Premier Bulganin and Party Secretary Khrushchev to India raises serious doubts as to whether or not India can still be considered a neutral. The glowing tribute which Nehru paid to these two and to the Soviet system strongly suggests that India has abandoned neutrality altogether, and has become a true friend of communism.

Yesterday, the so-called neutral position taken by India in world affairs was compared to the neutrality of this country during the early days of the Republic. However, it was pointedly ignored that while India professes to be neutral she is, in effect, closely allied with Russia, and has used her middle position to play both ends, taking money from the Soviets, as well as from the United States.

The nearly $600 million in foreign aid which we have given India since 1950 has not achieved friendship. In fact it has not even achieved cooperation.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee report, which accompanies this bill under discussion, carries on page 3 the administration's request for Egypt. As you will note, the total amount which is requested is not disclosed. We know that under title III, Technical Cooperation, the request is $3,800,000. However, under title II, Development Assistance, the amount is held in secrecy. Congress is being called on to approve, and the American taxpayers are being called upon to finance, adventures of some nature the amount of which and the character of which is not to be disclosed to them.

This same example is repeated in nine other countries in the Middle East and Africa. I have been told that the reason for this is to prevent further inflaming the already war-sensitive atmosphere prevailing in the Middle East.

Certainly no reputable bank would lend its depositors money completely without collateral without knowing how the money was to be spent. Yet, this is precisely what the foreign-aid spenders are asking Congress to do—they would have Congress appropriate billions of dollars, a substantial part of which will finance programs which they maintain that Congress and the American people have no right to know about.

Arms shipments from Czechoslovakia to Egypt threaten to upset the balance of power and plunge that entire area into a bloody war which could easily spread to adjacent areas which are of considerable interest to the defense efforts and security of this country.

While it is true that this bill does not include any military aid to Egypt, it must be recognized that any aid will materially add to the economic strength of Egypt, thereby increasing her warmaking potential. I do not want to give the impression that I am opposed to Egypt bettering her economic position. Egypt has every right to want to improve the standard of living. However, I seriously question the wisdom of spending American dollars to strengthen any country which has, in the past several months, drifted closer each day toward the Soviet bloc.

The June 1, 1956, issue of U. S. News & World Report, under the heading "Worldgram," carries a story saying:

The efforts to make an arms deal with Red China is merely another move in the

Egyptian drift toward the Soviet bloc. Not only is Egypt placing major dependence on Soviet satellites for arms. * * * Egypt is also being rapidly integrated into the Soviet economic orbit.

This report goes on to say that Egypt has concluded trade deals with East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Rumania, all under the domination of the Soviet Union, and that Soviet Russia's ambassador has recently made Premier Nasser a gift of a Soviet transport plane.

From any other source, these transactions could be regarded as normal. However, bitter experience has taught us that the Russians are not in the habit of giving anything without receiving heavy concessions in return.

In the hearings held by the Foreign Affairs Committee during March, April, and May of this year, it was revealed that the United States is expecting to obligate itself for $54 million for the Aswan Dam to be constructed on the Nile River.

It is to be a tripartite project with the governments of the United States, Great Britain, and Egypt participating.

As the record of these hearings reveals, Egypt is having considerable difficulty raising her share of the total cost of the dam.

At least one member of that committee was convinced that Britain had withdrawn her support from the project. This leaves the United States squarely in the middle between two forces; one who cannot pay and one who, exercising better judgment, will not pay. What course is open to us if we should obligate ourselves for $54 million only to learn at some later date that additional money would be needed? There is no doubt in my mind that in such an event, the free spenders in the State Department would call on Congress to approve whatever portion Britain refused to pay and whatever portion Egypt could not pay.

The completion of the Aswan Dam will bring under cultivation 1,300,000 acres. The principal export crop in Egypt today is cotton. Thus, simple logic dictates that their leading barter crop will be increased.

Cotton acreage in the United States has steadily decreased during the past 5 years as a result of overcrowded world markets. In 1951–52 cotton farmers in this country harvested 26.9 million acres of cotton. By 1954–55, this acreage had been reduced to 16.9 million acres—a reduction of 10 million acres. During this time, the cotton acreage in Egypt was increased by 264,000 acres and our surplus warehouses have steadily grown larger and larger. The 1,300,000 acres of desert land which the dam will transform into rich farmland will work toward increasing the hardships now faced by the American cotton farmer and will have a serious impact on the entire agricultural economy of this country.

Today our national debt is nearly $278 billion. Of this amount, approximately $55 billion has been doled out to the four corners of the earth in economic and military aid since the end of World War II.

One million dollars of this amount was used to help Denmark retire her national debt, while our own national debt soars at dangerous heights.

Two hundred million dollars of this amount was used to finance a tax cut in England before the last general election. Yet, taxes in this country continue at nearly the confiscatory stage.

These are but a few examples of the extremes to which this foreign aid program has gone since its beginning.

The $1.1 billion which the Foreign Affairs Committee cut from the administration's request is a positive step in the right direction. In my opinion, however, they have not gone far enough with these reductions. I believe further cuts should be made, and could be made, without jeopardizing the security of the free world. The cuts made by the Committee and any further cuts which may be made by Congress would be a great benefit to the American taxpayers. For these and other good reasons, I shall support further cuts in this bill.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, there is one question that I think needs clearing up. When the gentleman from New York was on the floor the distinguished minority leader asked him if he was willing to take the responsibility for gutting this program. Here is how the committee proposes to gut the program. Last year they got $2,700 million. The committee this year proposes to authorize $3,500 million, which is roughly a 30 percent increase over last year.

If that is gutting the program, then if you wanted to have your salary gutted you would get $6,750 a year more than you do now. If that is the gentleman from Massachusetts' idea of gutting something, then I think we ought to put through a salary-gutting program right here.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Likewise, it should be pointed out that the committee figure is the exact figure that the particular bureau or agency first requested, before they increased the request a billion dollars this year.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The gentleman is correct.

The only other point I want to make is that the committee is not gutting anything. The committee is not maltreating anyone. The committee proposes to authorize 30 percent more than they said was adequate last year. If you can believe all of the optimistic statements that the press carried about how much better off we are in the world than we were a few years ago, then it looks to me as if a 30-percent increase is a pretty good proposition. You would think if we are so much better off that we ought to cut it a little. We did not do that, but we did try to get some sensible figure from the welter of confused figures that came from the Pentagon. I am sure the committee does not know exactly what the military proposes to do with the money we propose to give them.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. SISK. The distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN, indicated that the remarks which I and others had made about Tito and the Yugoslavia situation, did not enter into this $600 million amendment we have before us. Will the gentleman state whether or not he feels that any portion of this $600 million military aid might reach Yugoslavia or in any way affect that country?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Well, the people who came up and testified kept asking for flexibility. I think the best testimony came from the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, who said that these are only estimates; that they can do whatever they want to do with it. It is conceivable, but I think highly improbable, that if they wanted to they could give the whole $600 million to Tito.

Mr. SISK. Is it not a fact that the $600 million increase could certainly be of material concern so far as Yugoslavia or other European nations is concerned?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Let me answer the gentleman by saying to you that when the Under Secretary of State came up about the Aswan Dam I said, "It boils down to this. You are not here asking the committee whether we approve. You are here telling us you have already made the commitment." He said, "That is right." So, they can do anything they like.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Of course, the President, under the language of the law now existing, can give most of whatever money is put into the bill to Yugoslavia if he wants to.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. That is true.

Mr. JUDD. Only if there is a later amendment which prohibits any funds going to Yugoslavia will there be any restriction on the use of funds for that purpose.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. SISK. Is it not true that if there is a later amendment which would stop aid to Yugoslavia, that that surplus might reduce any need for this $600 million you are asking now?

Mr. JUDD. The answer to that is that this $600 million increase will only give the minimum that the military people say they must have to operate the program with any safety. As the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] said, they would like to have more.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. But the gentleman will admit they told us that was the minimum amount they could get along with. Now, we see the revised figure.

Mr. JUDD. I think they said that was the optimum. What we are down to now in the $600 million figure is the minimum. If Yugoslavia were to be cut out, there would, of course, be more money for the other countries by that same amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, first let me pay my respects to the President of the United States, to the Speaker, to the majority

leader and the minority leader of this House, and, most especially, the beloved southern gentleman [Mr. RICHARDS] who is chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Next, I would like to say that lest there be any misunderstanding as to why I have taken the floor, I should like to state clearly I am rising in opposition to this amendment. I shall vote against any amendment that provides an increase in this misnamed mutual security program. I shall vote for every amendment that provides a decrease. And at the end, I shall vote against the bill. I did so last year.

This is the first time I have ever engaged in general debate on this floor. I feel very deeply about that of which I am talking. I come from a rural region, but the people there are good people, and they are right thinking.

Let me tell you, they have been thinking very very seriously about what the Congress of the United States has been doing to pull down and destroy this country from within.

I am not afraid of Russia and her might; I am not afraid of Yugoslavia; I am not afraid of India; I am not afraid of any enemy outside the borders of this country. I am afraid of what we will do to ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, this country will never be destroyed unless socialism first takes hold of this country. That is the pattern; that is what has happened in so many countries, and that is what communism is aiming to do to our United States. We are the only stronghold left that will keep communism from enslaving the world. Enemies from within are working day and night to accomplish this purpose.

When the war was over my heart was deeply touched. I would have done anything on earth to restore the ruins left in war's wake in so many countries. To help those people recover from their wounds was a good thing to do, and a thing that the American people cooperated in heartily.

To the Foreign Affairs Committee whose members have traveled so much all over the world, let me say I have not seen the world. I do not know what it looks like, but I can read and I can study; and I know that this program has come to be wrong.

This Congress is going to be turned upside down and every person who votes for this program that is presented here is going to have to face the people of his district when he goes home. The most refreshing thing that has happened to me since I have been privileged to sit with you here is the debate that has gone on today.

Why are you men and women rising to speak? Why are you questioning? Because your people back home are letting you know that they are distressed about this program.

Why was it last year that we could not reduce the income tax of the lower middle-class people of this country to the tune of even $100? Are we trying to destroy them with wastage and throwing away the great inheritance that we have; that came to us by blood, sweat, and tears through the years?

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your listening to me. I do not have anything more to say except that if this House has not felt the deep stirrings in the hearts of the American people all over this country you will feel them soon, because, God helping me, I can stand here and testify that the spirit of independence, the goodness and the commonsense of the ordinary American citizen is not dead. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] is recognized.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, if this were a popularity contest and by my vote or my action I could show my deep affection for the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] I would be the first man in line, because ever since he has been a Member of the House I have valued him as one of my closest and dearest friends and I know he has regarded me likewise.

This is not an issue of personalities. This is an issue of judgment. It is an issue of what is best not for the countries throughout the world but for the national security of the United States of America. To me that is the issue. I challenge the judgment, not the patriotism, not the friendliness, of those members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs who have brought this bill here. I know they love their country just as well as I do. I know they are just as patriotic citizens as I hope to be.

Let me go back just a little. I stood in this well as majority leader in 1938, 1939, and 1940 and pleaded with the Congress to follow the recommendations of the then President of the United States in voting some money to make our country stronger. Most of that money was denied because the people said "Where is there any danger? Who is going to fight us? We have no enemies in the world." And, as our majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], said this morning, a few weeks before Pearl Harbor the House of Representatives by one vote extended the National Draft Act. If by that one single vote we had not extended that act, when we were struck at Pearl Harbor, we would have been breaking our Army down instead of keeping it together. The Japanese knew that we were weak on land and on sea, and that is the reason why they struck us at Pearl Harbor. And, if they had had a little more force, they would have landed at some points in the United States of America.

I am convinced, as the President of the United States is, as the Secretary of State is, as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is, that it is necessary for the security of this country of ours to vote more money than the committee brought in. If I did not believe that, if I believed that this could be cut one dollar and not hurt my country, its status, its leadership, and its power in the world, I would vote to reduce even the amount that this committee brought forth. We just have one President of the United States at a time. He is the voice of America, or America has no voice. And, I have said that for 30 years in this House, it mattered not who was President of the United States. Tremendous and crushing responsibilities rest upon the shoulders of the Commander in Chief of our Army and our Navy. He should know more about it than I do, even though he were not a military man, because he has avenues of learning more about it than I know from the people who surround him.

I think we should make this additional appropriation. I am afraid not to do it, because I do not want to see the flash of guns and hear the hum of planes, with their destruction, over my country, when I think that with a few more million dollars I could deter the aggressor. We were not prepared in 1939, 1940, and 1941. Talk about $50 billion. If it had not been for the Marshall plan and point 4, Western Europe would today be in the bosom of communism and behind the Iron Curtain. We spent those billions. I think it was the best defense money that I ever voted. But, we were not prepared. We were forced into a war, and it cost us more than $400 billion to get out of it and on to victory. And, with that, we had more than a million casualties; 293,000 dead, 144,000 missing, probably dead, and the remainder maimed and crippled. If this $600 million will deter our enemies, then it will be the best investment that you and I have ever voted since we have been Members of this House.

So today, as I have said to you so often, as an old friend who has been in this House now nearly 44 years, through 2 wars and some depressions, in my opinion this $600 million additional is the best defense money that I ever voted for and the best defense money that the Congress ever gave.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate the generosity of the great Speaker of this House who has just addressed you. I admit his utter sincerity in the words he has spoken. I have great admiration and affection for him.

I feel no pleasure in crossing swords with a great man like SAM RAYBURN, if I may take the liberty of referring to him so intimately in my last weeks in this House. The same sentiments apply to JOE MARTIN. They are two great Americans. I have often thought that either of these men would make a great President of our country. That also applies to JOHN MCCORMACK, the majority leader, and the gentleman from Indiana, CHARLIE HALLECK, who has been majority leader when the Republicans controlled the House. It is no pleasure to me to take issue with them, and I would be the last man in this House to criticize them or to impugn their motives. But I cannot help but say that I am deeply distressed and disturbed at the attitude they are taking here today.

Here they are, the former Speaker of the House and the present Speaker of the House, who have said time after time how they loved this House and how they

would fight to preserve the integrity of this House, leading this fight to repudiate what a committee, an arm of this House, has done.

Much has been said of the checks and balances provided between the executive, the judiciary, and the legislative by the Founding Fathers. We all agree that those checks and balances guaranteed us by the Constitution are the bulwark of our liberty, yet these distinguished gentlemen want to disrupt and destroy 2 months of committee work upon an executive request, and are themselves helping to destroy one of the checks essential to the preservation of democratic government, and they are doing it in their own house.

I have great respect for the President of the United States. I go beyond that to say I have affection and admiration for him. I had the same respect for President Truman, but I did not agree with him all the time and fought dictation by him to the legislative branch.

Here we find the executive department of the Government, which can only propose to the Congress of the United States, attempting to dictate to the Congress, and the position is taken by our leaders that we dare not differ with the dollar figures sent here. How many authorizing committees give the executive department everything it asks? Do you want to destroy constitutional government and not let the Congress of the United States scan, even, the figures that the executive department sends up here?

It would be a different matter if I were seeking to destroy this bill or to destroy this country. There is not one single Member of this House who can say that I ever let partisanship enter into any position I have taken in regard to a foreign aid bill, whether a Democratic administration was in power or the Republican administration. If there is such a man or woman, I wish he would rise now. The stakes were too great for anything as cheap as that.

I took the same attitude when I felt that a Democratic President was wrong, because I felt that a proper function of a committee of the House of Representatives and the Members of the House was to scan those executive dollar requests and authorize only those that could be justified. If we do not have that check, if we do not have that balance, then we had just as well not sit here.

Why did the Constitution of the United States place the responsibility of initiating appropriations of funds in the House of Representatives? Because we come directly from the people, directly from the people every 2 years. That is a great responsibility. But this is not an appropriation bill, this is an authorization bill. Our leaders here today say that the authorizing committee of the House of Representatives, in this instance the Foreign Affairs Committee, should abdicate its thinking, should abdicate its power, and they say, "Let the men of good sense, who have some brains, on the Appropriations Committee, work their will on it." The distinguished minority leader and my distinguished friend from Ohio talk about that kind of stuff, "leave it to the Appropriations Committee." What a cowardly thing to propose.

Mr. Chairman, we have come here with what we think is a good bill for the security of the United States. We think our committee has provided plenty of money to do it, $860 million more than was provided last year, to do the job that should be done. I want to tell you solemnly that it is my honest conviction that the money provided here is amply sufficient to continue a proper contribution in the field of foreign aid. Our funds are not inexhaustible.

Sure, you have got to have stuff in the pipelines. We have $5 billion of military aid now in the pipelines. The flexibility provided in this bill can keep the pipelines flowing. Here you find the greatest flexibility power ever given to any President of the United States. He can move funds all over the place, from one side of the world to the other, to meet any emergency. Any President has to have flexibility, and I have fought for that, because he is the President of the United States and Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. If you are going to have this kind of program you have to have all kinds of flexibility. But please do not stand here, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Former Speaker of the House of Representatives, and tell members of the committee who have fought for this program since 1948 that we do not have a right, after all those years of experience and 2 months of hearings on this particular bill, to say to the executive department, "Now, Mr. President, we want to go along with you but we represent our people, too. After careful study, we think you ask too much."

The Speaker, the majority leader, the minority leader, and the former minority leader are great men. They have great intelligence. But they did not sit up there with the committee for 8 long weeks. They know little about the details of this bill, I will tell you that. All they know is that the President called us down to the White House and the military boys sat there and said, "We need more money." The President said, "We need more money." But not one single new reason, new emergency, new figure, new study upon which to base their request. They just wanted more money.

I have great admiration for our military people. I say again that I have great admiration for the President of the United States. But I also have a sense of responsibility as a member of a responsible committee of this House. Instead of building up the prestige of this House and its committees today, I feel that our leaders are contributing to the tearing down of that prestige because they are surrendering to the executive department. In this I hope the membership here will not follow them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the full time, but I want to support the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I understood there was a unanimous-consent agreement that debate on this section be closed after the three speeches by Speaker RAYBURN, Minority Leader MARTIN, and the chairman of the committee, Mr. RICHARDS. Is that not correct?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not correct. The request was made and it was objected to. It was not agreed to by the House.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] the debate close on this section, and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, as $1 billion of this cut in foreign aid was my amendment, I feel I should likewise stand up and say the reason, under these difficult circumstances. I am glad to stand firmly for what I believe to be the right stand of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and am glad to support fully the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], in his courageous action.

The reason is that we members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs feel that the United States foreign-aid program should be efficiently run at present, and should have a thorough reexamination between now and January of next year, as the administration has suggested.

With 2½ years of products and munitions in the pipelines, this current reduction will not endanger this program, because the time is so far ahead that we can still have time to come up with more funds in January and February, in case of necessity, after the resurvey demanded by changing world conditions has been made in our United States foreign policy.

In the Legislative Daily of Tuesday, May 22, here is what is said about the United States foreign-aid program:

> Comptroller General Campbell told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee over-optimistic foreign-aid planning has resulted in appropriation of more money than could be spent.
>
> One result, he said, is that the Defense Department is holding at least $400 million in foreign-aid funds in violation of the law. That money, Campbell said, should revert to the Treasury.
>
> Two main factors, Campbell said, contribute to overprograming foreign aid. He said the International Cooperation Administration "apparently does not consider realistically the available resources and capabilities of both the United States and individual recipient countries." He also said "there is sometimes a preponderance of political over economic and financial considerations in determining the level of country programs."

This statement should certainly be a watch signal to Congress if such conditions exist extensively.

In conclusion, may I say that the House Foreign Affairs Committee after 6 weeks' work on this bill has reported what it feels is a good recommendation to this House by a vote of 18 to 11. This is what we feel is best for the security of the United States, and I sincerely hope the House will sustain the Foreign Affairs Committee and our chairman [Mr. RICHARDS].

The CHAIRMAN. Under the consent agreement, all debate on this section, and all amendments thereto, is now closed.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICHARDS. As I understand it, that amendment is to put the figure back to the original executive request. Is that right?

The CHAIRMAN. That is hardly a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RICHARDS. Well, that is what it does.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLOOD to the amendment offered by Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: On page 2, line 2, after "exceed" strike out "$1,925,000,000" and insert "$2,925,000,000"; and on page 2, line 4, strike out "$402,000,000" and insert "$589,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the substitute amendment. Without objection the Clerk will again read the substitute offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENTLEY as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: On page 2, line 2, strike out "$1,925,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,425,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BENTLEY) there were—ayes 69, noes 178.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RICHARDS and Mr. HAYS of Arkansas.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 112, noes 192.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Title I, chapter 3, of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to defense support, is further amended by substituting a semicolon for the period after "Asia" in subsection (c) of section 131 and inserting thereafter the following: "and for the fiscal year 1957 not to exceed—

"(1) $63,700,000 for Europe (excluding Greece and Turkey);

"(2) $170,000,000 for the Near East (including Greece and Turkey) and Africa;

"(3) $882,000,000 for Asia; and

"(4) $32,000,000 for Latin America.

"Funds made available under paragraph (4) may be used to furnish assistance designed to sustain and increase military or internal defense efforts, and may be used without regard to the requirements of sections 141 and 142 in the case of any nation which is a party to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance and which has adhered to the resolution of 1954 entitled 'Declaration of Solidarity for the Preservation of the Political Integrity of the American States against the Intervention of International Communism'."

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DODD: On page 2, line 19, strike out "$32,000,000" and insert "$37,000,000."

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, in my remarks during general debate yesterday, I said that I would offer an amendment to increase defense support assistance to Guatemala.

The amendment which I have offered increases the amount of money for Guatemala by $5 million.

It seems strange to me that this administration is willing to pour millions of dollars of foreign aid into doubtful areas of the world such as Yugoslavia, but is penurious and miserly about the amount of assistance for a friendly, neighboring western hemispheric country like Guatemala.

Frankly, this is an enigma of our present foreign policy. When the expert witnesses appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee and were asked why they had not recommended at least as much money as was assigned last year, they made a feeble answer to the effect that Guatemala could not absorb such an amount of money. This, I say, is nonsense and the record for last year proves that it is nonsense.

The amount of money allotted to Guatemala last year was less than 3 percent of the gross national income of that country, and I think it is important to point out that most of it last year was, and this year will be, spent right here in the United States for equipment, machinery, and materials.

Is it not shortsighted for us to even propose assistance to Yugoslavia, especially now, and to cut down our assistance to Guatemala, to the only country in history that has been able to overthrow its Communist masters—a country that has come back from the dead and is now forging the sinews of a stable and solid economy?

If Guatemala, the anti-Communist showcase of the western free world, should lose its confidence in our friendship and become disillusioned, it will crack. And when Guatemala cracks, all of Central America is ripe for the Communists. And that means the Panama Canal, too.

I have confidence that Guatemala will use our assistance wisely.

The liberation government of Col. Castillo Armas has been in power only since July 1954. What did it find when it came into power? Two million dollars in the Treasury, barely enough for 2 weeks' expenses, administrative chaos, unrest, financial demoralization, a tottering economy—all left behind by the Communist-dominated Arbenz regime. It takes time for a government to recover from chaos. The Guatemalan Government has done a miraculous job.

Last year Guatemala got $15 million in development assistance from the United States. This year the amount recommended falls far short of that amount. And this is the critical year. My amendment still will not bring the amount for Guatemala up to last year's amount. But I feel that some demonstration on the part of the Congress—even the amount contained in this amendment, small as it may be, is essential to give the Guatemalan Government renewed courage. In fact, such action will give courage to all our friends in Latin America at a time when friends are scarce and neutralists abound. Surely this is an amendment which we cannot afford to bypass.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. While we cannot talk about what this money will do, we can say with assurance that this money will be used to help in the hemispheric defense. Is that not so?

Mr. DODD. Yes; of course that is so.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I heartily join with the gentleman and with his amendment, because there is no doubt that the Communists when they left Guatemala left the country almost bankrupt.

Mr. DODD. Yes; that is right.

One of the best surveys I have seen on inter-American affairs is contained in a report to the President by his brother, Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, entitled "United States-Latin American Relations," and I want to quote what I consider to be a very significant statement from that report. Dr. Eisenhower, in discussing the political aspect of our relationship with Latin America, stated:

The possible conquest of a Latin American nation today would not be, so far as anyone can foresee, by direct assault. It would come, rather, through the insidious process of infiltration, conspiracy, spreading of lies, and the undermining of free institutions, one by one. Highly disciplined groups of Communists are busy, night and day, illegally or openly, in the American Republics, as they are in every nation of the world.

This is even more true today.

This is a small amount contained in my amendment but its significance is as important as anything we do here today.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I want to support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DODD. I am grateful to my friend.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Committee of the Whole approve this amendment, and I hope that it does.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the item provided for Guatemala was $27 million in the execu-

tive request. This committee added $5 million to it on account of the particular situation in Guatemala.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. The item listed for Guatemala is not $27 million. That is for all Latin America. This is just $5 million for Guatemala.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is correct. I misstated it. The addition was $5 million, and it was to apply to Guatemala.

This is 1 of the 2 instances in the bill where the committee raised the executive request. The other was $1 million in another instance.

I just do not want to add any more to this. If the House wants to vote it, all right, and I have the highest respect for the gentleman who offered the amendment, but I do not think we should add an additional $5 million for Guatemala.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment of our distinguished colleague from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] to increase aid to Guatemala. Yesterday on the floor, I stated my disappointment of the fact that the State Department considered shabbily, in my opinion, the cause of Guatemala and the free world and those who are willing to make a strong fight against Communist aggression and in the cause of human freedom and liberty. But at the same time, the Departments of State and Defense recommended about $50 million for economic and military aid to the Communist dictator Tito of Yugoslavia, whose record is one of opposing the forces of freedom such as in the fight against Communist aggression in Korea in 1950. Within the past several days Tito renewed his allegiance to the cause of communism throughout the world in the course of his pilgrimage to Moscow.

In my opinion, we as Members of Congress who have taken our oath to protect the security and welfare of the United States, will become a laughing stock of the free world, as well as the Communist world, if we support the Russian Communist stooge Tito on the one hand and on the other hand fail to give necessary economic aid to our sister Republic of Guatemala in the Western Hemisphere. Guatemala is the only free republic in the evil history of world communism, which has suffered under the tyranny, exploitation, and degradation of communism, and which has overthrown the despotic rule of communism. This is a classic symbol for freedom in this hemisphere and throughout the world. Guatemala is a focal point, as was expressed by a Communist leader in New York in April, in which he expressed the Marxist hope that Guatemala was only a temporary setback and that communism again would prevail in Guatemala. If we are sincere in our desire to stem the tidal wave of communism throughout the world, there is no better opportunity than is presented to us today to give adequate economic aid to the great and free country of Guatemala which has stood up against communism, which has overthrown communism, and which is working for the cause of human freedom and liberty in Guatemala, which of course, will inure to the cause of human freedom and liberty throughout the world.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I rise briefly at this time to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and cosponsored by our colleague the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORANO].

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILLINGS. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. I just want to make it clear that I offered an amendment in the committee to increase it by 10 million and it was cut to 5 million; but the vote to increase it this extra 5 million in committee was just 1 vote different. We lost it by one vote. So I am in favor of this amendment.

Mr. HILLINGS. I appreciate the gentleman's observation. I intended to comment on the fact that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORANO] has long been interested in the problems of Guatemala and the Latin American field and has had much to do with the assistance rendered to that area by the Congress of the United States.

There has been much criticism of the bill before us on the ground that we ought to first consider our own backyard before thinking about spending money in vast fields abroad. Certainly anyone who takes such a position must support this particular amendment, because here is a case where a little country in America's own backyard has thrown off the yoke of communism.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to second the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Connecticut, and I urge, with all of the strength that I can command, that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle support this amendment. I believe we should do so not only because of the great contribution that the present leaders of Guatemala have already made to the cause of freedom, but also because of the immensely valuable contributions they intend to make in the future. I also congratulate my colleagues from Connecticut, Mr. DODD and Mr. MORANO, for their interest in this amendment.

As many Members will recall, I had the occasion to visit Guatemala for on-the-spot studies both before and after the revolution that upset the Communist regime, when I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin America, of the House Select Committee on Communist Aggression. And when I say "Communist regime," I mean just that. There was absolutely no question in my mind, or in the minds of our committee, but that the former Government of Guatemala was completely, and openly loyal to Moscow. And I believe that the report we submitted to this House contained irrefutable evidence that the Kremlin was using Guatemala as a bridgehead in its program to expand, and to subvert all of Central America, the Caribbean, and northern South America, as well as the Republic of Panama. Communists carrying official Guatemalan passports, literally swarmed into the countries of that whole area, carrying instructions and advice from the Red high command to local Communist leaders; transporting tons of propaganda books, leaflets, and newspapers; and agitating among the workers and intellectuals in a systematic program to stir up discontent against established governments.

I think we can give some attention to the present residence of the former Communist President of Guatemala, in Prague, Czechoslovakia, where he recently was interviewed by a group of Latin American newspapermen, and flatly stated that he would return to Guatemala in the near future. I believe we should weigh the importance of his two reported, lengthy visits to Moscow, and the reports that he is being prepared for an important new role in the Communist program for Latin America. We should also take note of the fact that another former Guatemalan Communist president, Juan Jose Arevalo, the man who actually betrayed his nation into Communism, was recently named 1 of the 3-man board to head the Communist labor movement of all Latin America. And this labor movement is probably the most powerful single tool that the Communists possess in their plan to subvert the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Chairman, when the present leaders of Guatemala overthrew that Communist government, they rendered a mighty service to every nation in the Western Hemisphere, including the United States.

Now they propose to join with us in an active program to combat the Communist campaign in the Western Hemisphere, and all of the underdeveloped areas. Many of you will recall that this desire was clearly expressed by the President of Guatemala, when he testified before the subcommittee, shortly after the revolution.

I am convinced that this country can, and will, render continuing and valuable services to the cause of peace, freedom, and security in the Western Hemisphere.

But certainly, Mr. Chairman, and Members of the House, Guatemala cannot make its contribution until it is internally strong, politically, socially, and especially economically. Because of the coffee depression that occurred right after the revolution, and the bankrupt government and excessive debt inherited by the new administration, they need a modest amount of assistance from us. At the request of the United States Embassy and ICA mission in Guatemala, the Government prepared an estimate of the aid they would require. After ruthlessly slashing the estimates of the various experts, the Guatemalan Cabinet came up with the figure of about $17 million.

I strongly believe we should make this amount available with the greatest of good will. After all, this is one of the few allies which is anxious to help us, in our critical and costly ideological struggle against Communist imperialism.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILLINGS. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Has the gentleman encountered resistance somewhere in any

part of the Government to increased assistance to Guatemala?

Mr. HILLINGS. I could not say that I have encountered actual resistance on the part of officials, but it seems that when it comes to dealing with these problems some things do not move as fast as we would like them to or as we think they should.

Mr. JUDD. Has the gentleman found resistance from some of the commercial interests?

Mr. HILLINGS. No; I know of no such resistance at the present time.

Mr. JUDD. I have had some things brought to my attention that made me a little suspicious in both cases, and I feel the Congress ought to pass this and serve notice that we are going to stand by these peoples who have thrown out the Communists and support our way of life.

Mr. HILLINGS. I think we should express ourselves positively in support of these Latin American countries, especially Guatemala, and in an effective way. I hope this amendment will pass.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILLINGS. I yield.

Mr. HOSMER. I wish to commend my colleague from California on the speech he is making and to associate myself with his words. When such countries throw off Communist domination certainly it behooves us if it is possible to support them and thus give proof of our approval. This also would be an example to other nations and lead them to throw off communism.

Mr. HILLINGS. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment which has been submitted by my distinguished friend from Connecticut, a member of the subcommittee dealing with this little country of Guatemala.

Speaking of little countries, I think it is a rather sad thing that in the committee report such great care was taken to exclude the possibility, at least in the report, of any aid to another little country only 8 years old.

If, Mr. Chairman, as the greatest free nation in the world we cannot help other free nations then I know not where we are going. Guatemala is now a free nation. It needs our help, it deserves our help.

The tiny State of Israel is a free nation. It needs our help. It does not need this Congress to specifically exclude it from the report.

I am somewhat amazed by the pious proclamations from the left side of the aisle on the progress being made in the affairs of the world. I am somewhat amazed that our President only a week ago stood up before a large group and said in effect, everything is peachy in world affairs, but do not be complacent about the election.

Everything is not peachy; everything is not peachy in the Middle East, it is oily.

Our policy in the Middle East seems to be revolving around oil rather than democracy and human rights. Our policies in the Middle East are not firm. We have not made commitments to which the little nation of Israel is entitled. She is only 8 years old and she still needs our help desperately. She does not need platitudes, she needs help.

We are a party to the tripartite agreement of 1950. We have heard very little about that. Consider the disintegration of the status of our neighbor and friend England throughout the world, the difficulties of our neighbor and friend France, another guarantor in the tripartite agreement. Look at the situation today, and I ask you, while you are voting for funds to help nations of dubious international stature, how in the name of the Lord we can specifically exclude a nation that is founded on right, that is founded on the blood and sweat of a courageous people who for 2,000 years were oppressed and finally got their place in the sun.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is rather comforting and revealing to hear the words of the gentleman from New Jersey who has just spoken on the need for shipment of arms to the infant State of Israel. I want to remind the Members that on February 26 of this year, 151 Congressmen, Members of the House, more than one-third of the membership of the House, asked for prompt and decisive measures by our Government toward the security guaranties on the sale of defensive arms to Israel. There were 50 Republicans and 101 Democrats who signed that manifesto asking for arms for Israel so that there could be something in the nature of a balance. Republicans urged that the administration take "positive steps toward the protection of free nations such as Israel and toward the dissolution of dangers which, in threatening the peace of Israel, threaten also the peace of the free world." The Democrats likewise urged "that our Government permit Israel to purchase the $50 million of defensive arms which she seeks in the country."

Presently there is a very decided imbalance of arms as between Israel and the Arab States.

These Arab States have refused to enter into any manner or kind of peace negotiations with Israel. They refuse to recognize the State of Israel. They want Israel destroyed and blotted out. Israel to them is expendable. Nasser, the presently, shall I say, Pharaoh of Egypt, has had the temerity to state that Israel is like a condemned prisoner in the dock awaiting execution.

King Saud of Saudi Arabia—January 1954—stated:

> Israel is like a cancer to the human body, and the only way of remedy is to uproot it.

Dr. Mohammad Fadhi Jamali, former Prime Minister of Iraq—April 1955—stated:

> We sincerely hope that * * * all fair-minded peoples in the world will continue to brand Israel as an illegitimate state.

An editorial in Al Gomhouria, Egyptian Government-controlled newspaper—April 11, 1956—stated:

> The only reasonable proposal which Mr. Hammarskjold can make is the obliteration of Israel from the face of the earth.

We hear much about what the Secretary of the United Nations Hammarskjold has recently accomplished by way of a cease-fire order as between Israel and her hostile neighbors. We must remember that basic questions were not resolved. There was a cease-fire order in 1948.

Israel wants more than a cease fire. She wants peace, a lasting peace, with her neighbors. But, if there is a continuance of shipment of arms, particularly from Red sources, to Egypt, there will be no peace. We know that Red arms have rolled into Egypt from Czechoslovakia, and unfortunately we have rolled tanks into Saudia Arabia ourselves. And Red arms are going likewise into Syria, and we have sent arms to Iraq. Both Iraq and Saudi Arabia are members of the so-called Arab League which is bent upon the destruction of Israel. It does not make sense that we, who want to have peace or supposedly want peace with Israel, should at the same time feed into the Arab maw additional arms, arms of destruction, arms that would destroy Israel. And I can assure you that while there may be a temporary truce, Nasser is just awaiting the time when his soldiery will be able to use the Russian MIGs and the British Centurion tanks to march onto Israel.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. Will the gentleman agree to an amendment to section 3, beginning on line 4, page 3, providing language like this: Provided, however, that none of the funds appropriated in this section shall be used in any of the countries that are members of the Arab League except those members of the Baghdad Pact, until they sit down at a peace conference with Israel.

Mr. CELLER. Well, that is a very difficult question to answer. I still have some degree of confidence in the administration which I am now criticizing, and I hope that some semblance of sense will dawn upon Secretary of State Dulles with reference to the Middle East. I am somewhat loathe to give an affirmative reply to the gentleman, and it might be well not to stir up the waters at this time in the way that the gentleman seeks by offering his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. I hope that we will be able to persuade the administration to do the needful in that regard and that it would not be necessary to admonish them, shall I say, by an amendment to this act.

Mr. DONOVAN. I want the gentleman to understand that I do not propose that, but I wanted to know if the gentleman would support such an amendment. I know I would if the gentleman would.

Mr. CELLER. In the light of my explanation, the answer would be rather embarrassing, and I hope that such an amendment will not be pressed. This is not the best road toward peace for all peoples. It is hoped also that we will be able to prevail upon the administration to finally send arms into Israel, because there is only one way to preserve peace in the Middle East, and that is to have a balance of arms. The only reason why we have no holocaust of a third war between the East and the West is because there is something in the nature of a balance of arms. The same thing holds true as between Egypt and little Israel. Let there be a balance of arms there, and there will be no danger. It is rather anomalous that the administration says it does not wish to enter into an arms race, yet the administration hides behind our allies' skirts, which is in the nature of hypocrisy, and says to France "You ship your jets" and says to the members of the NATO alliance "You ship, to Egypt, but we shall not ship directly." It does not make sense, and I still hope therefore that the White House and the Secretary will do the needful. It is true that doubt grows when we see the acceptance by the administration of the latest U. N. resolution on the Middle East.

The Arab States, abetted by Russia, forced the Eisenhower administration to delete the paragraph expressing the need to create conditions in which a peaceful settlement on a mutually acceptable basis can be arranged. This was a further appeasement of the Arabs. The administration seems satisfied with a shortsighted policy of a mere cease fire in the Middle East. The words deleted might have been a basis for a permanent peaceful settlement. Our delegates at the U. N. found themselves in strange company. Soviet Russia likewise wants no peace. She too wants a temporary truce. In the meantime our arms roll into Iraq and Saudi Arabia and Red arms pour into Egypt and Syria. The arms imbalance between Israel and the Arab States is thus widened.

What explanation can Mr. Dulles give concerning Colonel Nasser's latest deal with Red China? Nasser will soon visit Chou En-lai. The Egyptian Army accepts an invitation to send a military mission to Peiping. A Red China trade commission is presently arranging a barter of cotton for arms. Cairo newspapers boast of Nasser's master stroke in circumventing the western idiots.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. It is my very sincere hope that the arguments that have been advanced with respect to the necessity for this additional and relatively small amount to the Republic of Guatemala will receive the approval of the House, and thus the pending amendment will be passed. We should bear in mind that Guatemala represents the one nation in the world today which, having come under the domination of international communism, successfully threw off the yoke and returned to the ways of freedom and of democratic processes.

Guatemala needs the small amount that is here suggested. In many quarters it has been charged that having assisted Guatemala to resist the aggression, we turned our national back on them and with the successful termination of hostilities our interest in the welfare of the people of that country lapsed. Certainly I do know—and I might say parenthetically that I know that small and beautiful republic and its people well—that the people of Guatemala are an industrious and friendly people. They are determined and courageous, and I believe them to be a people who will use this additional amount of money wisely and well if provided by the Congress.

The economy of Guatemala during the period of the Communist regime there was good, largely because of the price of coffee. Unfortunately, since that time the basic single-crop economy has suffered to a substantial degree by reason of a depression in the world market price of coffee. I am confident that Guatemala will make progress under the administration of President Armas. I am certain that it will in due course become a leader in the Latin American world. The eyes of all the republics of Latin America are today on the Republic of Guatemala as they are also upon the United States. What happens in Guatemala will in large part condition the thinking of millions of Latin Americans in all of the republics to the south of us.

It seems to me that in our own national self-interest as well as in the interest of the inhabitants of Guatemala, who are in large part anti-Communist, that we will act favorably on the pending amendment. It is to be hoped that the House will undertake to consider favorably the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to my friend from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman for the statement he has made and also to thank him for the support he gave me when I offered an amendment in committee which, with his help, carried, to aid Guatemala to the extent of $5 million additional.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I was very happy to assist the gentleman in committee, and as those of you who heard me previously speak this morning know, I have not attempted to increase any other item since.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the gentleman from California and also with the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] in favor of the amendment. I have had the privilege of visiting Guatemala. I know something of the conditions there left by the Communists when they were kicked out.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the arguments that the gentleman from California has made and that the author of the amendment has made are so convincing that the amendment ought to pass unanimously. I have made several visits to Guatemala and I hope that little country will survive and become a good, strong, free country again.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. Let me say this, that we have in Guatemala a substantial ally in the Western Hemisphere. We have an ally which has proven itself, which has given a demonstration of the dedication of its substantial leadership to the principles of human freedom. Certainly the amount that is here requested is not great as we consider sums today, in relation to other provisions of this bill. I sincerely urge a vote in support of the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to my colleague from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, from the arguments I have heard concerning the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], I believe that the amendment should be approved unanimously. How can we fail to support the heroic efforts of Guatemala to stamp out Communist aggression. I have been in Guatemala several times. I was there when we had an Air Force station there and we were fearful of what might happen to the Panama Canal Zone. The City of Guatemala was a beautiful city but the rural areas were very primitive and undeveloped. It seems incredible that the Communists would go over halfway around the world to blot out a small country simply to destroy its effort to build a democratic and free country. But we must not forget that this effort on the part of the Communists is primarily aimed at us, as the destruction of the free world is their ultimate aim and the United States is the leader of the free world today.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut, Hon. THOMAS J. DODD, which would increase the military assistance to Latin America from $32 million to $37 million specifically allocated $5 million more to the Republic of Guatemala.

Recent events dealing with the infiltration of the Communists in the Government of Guatemala are well known. It is extremely significant that the first toehold of the Communists in the Western Hemisphere has been repudiated and the Government of Guatemala is now once again among the freedom loving Republics of the world.

I support this amendment not only for the specific reasons which have been enumerated by prior speakers in whose remarks I wholeheartedly concur, but also because of basic principles which

are common knowledge and readily understood and agreed to by all of us.

The solidarity of North and South America is a bulwark of the free world in today's gigantic struggle for freedom. It is of necessity the most important thing related to the freedom of the United States of America.

The spirit of independence which rises from the valleys of the Mississippi and Missouri to the heights of the Rockies rises with equal vigor and intensity from the valleys of the Orinoco and the Amazon to the heights of the Andes. This spirit flows and is joined across the Isthmus of Central America, of which Guatemala is a part.

Therefore, it behooves us to do everything within our power to recognize in every way the fierce spirit of independence and freedom in both North and South America, to nurture it, cultivate it, and assist it in every way.

The Republic of Guatemala which has overthrown the shackles of Communist infiltration would be tremendously assisted not only by the additional finances which this amendment would make available, but also by the recognition we give to the fighting spirit and the desire of a great Latin American people to be free in their own right.

I trust, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the committee will vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and rise in support of the amendment.

It is with considerable pride and enthusiasm that I rise in support of the Dodd amendment providing an additional $5 million assistance to Guatemala.

The pages of history point to Guatemala as a significant example of our inclination to dally with our commitments. This courageous little Republic cast off her communistic yoke of oppression just 1½ years ago. The Communists left this little country's treasury stripped, depleted and empty. Guatemala, which has won the universal acclaim of the world for its mighty titanic struggle for peace and freedom needs prompt and effective help. The assistance given has been slow and highly inadequate. The whole world has been watching her plight and this—our own hemisphere—is particularly alive to the exigencies of the situation. The hour is late, but not too late to remedy it.

I have no misgivings in pointing up the poverty and the loneliness and the frustrations of little nations and little peoples wherever they may be on the face of the earth. I do this in the sense of causing no diminishment to their sovereignty or national pride. It is in seeing a problem that we best can effect a solution. If we are going to render assistance, we must of course appreciate the area that is in need of help.

On the entire national scene, we see today a tournament of hate being engendered by the East versus the West. It might be fitting to pause and see who, actually, among the nations of the world we can count on as being friendly.

It is said that a man is lucky if he ends up with just one friend in a lifetime. I say that in the lifetime of nations, maybe that nation is likewise fortunate if it ends up with just one friend. But it would be to bad if we should limit our whole and total national activities in the acquisition of friends and allies to merely 1, 2, or a dozen or the total of seventy-odd nations that compose the family of countries.

So I am happy to reassert my affection for all of the countries of the Americas. But while we are helping the countries of America, let us not forget the little country of Israel, who today stands as a beacon of friendship and of freedom. Israel has become one of the champions in the fight against international communism. With the entire Middle East succumbing to the threats and blandishments of the Communists we find Israel standing fast behind the same principles of human freedom and dignity on which our own Nation was founded. Today the State of Israel stands alone in Asia and the Middle East as a beacon for democracy, an island surrounded by forces which threaten its life and very existence, forces who see in Israel a threat and living refutation of the systems of despotism and absolutism whether same be the leftism of communism or the rightism of feudalism or colonialism to which most of the surrounding nations are clearly wedded and devoted. Let us ever be mindful of the fact that she is hemmed in by forces who are inimical to our ideology and to our notions of liberty and to our respect for human dignity and human rights. So let us reiterate the position that we took when we signed the petition requesting military help for defensive arms for Israel.

On that note I respectfully request that the Congress today let it be known by their vote on this amendment that it is the feeling of this Congress and we go on record saying we are interested in little people and in little nations all over the world.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that one of the important facts for us to remember today is that we are here considering legislation which simply grants authority to the executive department. One of the basic responsibilities of the executive department, as we all know, is the conduct of our foreign affairs. This cannot be done—nor should it be done—by the Congress of the United States.

Unless I am mistaken, our proper function today is to provide the executive branch with the authorization necessary to continue various programs which are essential to the security of the free world. Frankly, I would have preferred to see this bill give greater emphasis to economic-assistance programs for the underdeveloped nations of the world. It has become increasingly clear in recent years that the decisive battle in the cold war between the free world and the Communist world will be waged in the economic and political arenas. Have-not nations today occupy a position absolutely unique in history. Their potential political potence, clearly demonstrated at Bandung, and their economic importance may well be one of the important chapters in the history of the last half of the 20th century.

Three weeks ago, President Sukarno, of Indonesia, delivered what I believe to be one of the most eloquent addresses in my experience. You will remember that he said:

> Nationalism may be an out-of-date doctrine for many in this world; for us of Asia and Africa it is the mainspring of our efforts. Understand that, and you have the key to much of postwar history. Fail to understand it, and no amount of thinking, no torrent of words, and no Niagara of dollars will produce anything but bitterness and disillusionment.

President Sukarno was speaking of nationalism, Mr. Speaker, but implicit in his stirring message was the declaration that underdeveloped nations now consider political freedom and economic development to be matters of right—not grace.

I think that we will be shortsighted and blind, as a nation, if we do not understand the implications of this fact, and I think that our Government will be guilty of inexcusable shortsightedness and folly if our foreign policies do not reflect this understanding.

Frankly, it is my belief that this administration has been slow to grasp the implications of the vast power struggle in which we are now engaged, particularly in the political and economic areas. The Communist blueprint for infiltration of underdeveloped nations was made public at the 19th party congress, held in the Kremlin in 1952. And the course which was outlined has been scrupulously followed.

I do not agree with President Eisenhower on many matters, but I do concur with his statement that it would be tragic if Congress acquiesced in the $1.1 billion foreign-aid cut recommended by a majority of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I am fearful, Mr. Chairman, that the actions taken by this body today may indicate a lack of responsiveness to a world trend which cannot be stemmed or altered. We must recognize the challenge before us and we must accept it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I share the concern felt by many of my colleagues at the hurried hugger-mugger way the administration has presented this foreign-aid bill to us in this Congress in these troubled times.

I harken back to remarks made by both the Secretary of State and the President, himself, wherein it is admitted not only that our foreign aid program is at best, not fully effective, but that there is need for a searching reappraisal of the whole program. I am going to vote for this bill, but with less than enthusiasm.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have $6 billion in appropriated funds already in the pipeline waiting to be spent. Those expenditures are for 2 years in advance. Certainly this reappraisal can go on while those vast funds are being spent, without the real need for additional funds, which can be later authorized and appropriated without peril either to the program or to the American people. But the administration tells us only that the funds must be authorized at once or the country is periled. That is surely being less than frank with the Congress and the people.

I have always felt that foreign aid, wisely used, was the best possible expenditure for the American people. It worked wonders under President Truman, and saved Western Europe, Turkey, Greece, and other lands from Communist enslavement.

My dear departed father was fighting for foreign aid and the mutual-security program when many whose voices I hear raised on behalf of this bill on the other side of the aisle were still calling such programs waste, boondoggling, and less printable names.

It appears to me, however, that this reappraisal late as it is must come soon, and I hope that the administration is wise enough to recognize that fact, lest they endanger the whole wonderful concept of foreign aid by maladministration and misadministration.

There are two features about this bill however, which are especially distasteful to me—the inclusion of Yugoslavia, and the Arabic States, both either avowed friends of the Kremlin, or announced enemies of the United States and world peace, and the long-established policy of the administration which will preclude arms for Israel under the bill. I need not say that Israel is a friend of America in a place and time where such things are as rare and precious as diamonds.

To address myself to the problem of Mr. Tito, already recipient of over $1 billion in United States aid, who is presently engaged in a "love feast" with his fellow Communists in the Kremlin, I want to first recall to the membership of this House, how Mr. Tito has said that Russians and the Yugoslavs will never again be split.

We hear daily of other joint announcements from the intellectual descendants of Stalin who rule the Kremlin and this one-time friend of America, Tito, announcing to all how the Communists of the world are again united in a common goal. An aim, which we must presume from past Communist announcements to be the ultimate destruction of capitalism, and the destruction of our free American way of life.

Worse, Mr. Tito has been giving aid to the various Arab functionaries in their attempts to destroy both Israel and the peace of the world.

Just what is Mr. Tito's game? Let us analyze it with Mr. Constantine Brown as he does it in his excellent editorial of today's Washington (D. C.) Evening Star:

According to diplomatic observers in the Soviet capital, the renewal of permanent ties between the Soviet duumvirate and the Yugoslav dictator will have important chain reactions which will be noticeable only as time goes on. Among these, it is believed, will be the creation of a new Danubian-Balkan confederation with Marshal Tito as its leader. This has been the Yugoslav dictator's dream for many years and was one of the reasons he stubbed his toe with Joseph Stalin. When he began to press this idea, "Uncle Joe" decided to cut him down to a boy's size. Fortunately for Tito, Uncle Sam was around the corner and rushed to his rescue.

I want to impress upon my colleagues, this danger is a very real one; and in the process of leading up to this program, Mr. Tito has made great strides. He visited France, and has traveled widely in other parts of the world, to India, Egypt, and Burma. Under America's aid his prestige has grown enormous, and I note during his travels, he has consorted with America's enemies, and has had nothing good to say about us "to boot."

As Mr. Brown so well says:

The idea of a Danubian-Balkan confederation within the Soviet orbit is not particularly new in the minds of the men in the Kremlin. It was one of the motives which prompted them to give Austria her full sovereignty in the hope that the little Danubian republic eventually might be forced by economic necessities to join Moscow's satellites.

I recall to my colleagues that no one who has visited this fair weather friend of ours in recent months has been sympathetic to the United States. Note well his politicking with the Egyptian leaders, and observe how he has abetted them in their avowed program for the extermination of the tiny State of Israel. He has been visited by Palmiro Togliatti, leader of the Italian Communist Party, and certainly no friend to America.

Thus the ultimate result of the present conferences between the Belgrade and the Kremlin leaders is expected to be that Marshall Tito will become the dominant figure not only in the Balkans but also in the strategically vital eastern Mediterranean.

This is the ambitious, grasping, "friend" whom we would aid, acting in the time honored custom of all dictators, Communist and otherwise. I say to this Congress that if we are foolish enough to send more arms to Tito, that they may not be entirely lost to the United States. No, indeed, we are very liable to become recipients of the buckshot, bombs, and baled hell that we send Tito sooner than we think. It may very well be used upon American boys, or the young men of countries which are our friends, or loosed upon us at home when we least expect it.

And now to return to an equally unpleasant subject, that of Egypt, which openly accepts arms from Russia and her satellites, and which more openly still announces that Egypt will not rest "until she has cut the Israeli cancer from the Arab heart." Certainly this is no friend and certainly no neutral.

This is one to whom we have extended not only the hand of peace, but to whom we have given vast sums of money, much material and technical aid. We are now in the process of competing with Russia to see whose help will Egypt accept in the construction of the $200 million Aswan Dam. During this time, Egypt not only imports arms, but exploits inflammatory propaganda by all available means, including radio, and printed matter, all aimed at hurting and embarassing not only America but our allies, the British, the French, as well as the Israelis.

Let us use sense, let us reserve our aid for our friends, or for those whom we may hope will become friends.

Israel, however, our friend, an island of democracy and friendship in a sea of hostile Arabs, receives paltry little economic and technical aid, and no military aid worth discussing.

It is a rude shock to realize that with the present complexion of Arab strength and its anticipated growth that the time is not long hence when Israel, with her tiny size can be overrun before her friends could come to her aid.

I warn this administration that we are flirting with another Korea, which can happen at any time. Members of this House of Representatives, Members of our sister body, the Senate, citizens, and leaders in all walks of life have urged as a commonsense measure, that we send arms to Israel the arms which she may defend herself. These arms are not for offense, but only to protect those borders which are as sacred to Israel as our own are to us. I hope that the administration will heed the remarks of my colleagues and I who urge these arms, not for Israel only, but for my own protection and best interest.

I sincerely hope that Yugoslavia will be barred from any aid whatsoever. I will wholeheartedly support any amendment which will accomplish these ends.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the official facts and the equally official statements of administrative spokesmen made as recently as this past fall and early winter, I doubt that I am the only one among our colleagues to be amazed by the request of the Executive for funds with which to carry out United States foreign-aid programs in the fiscal year 1957.

On November 16, 1955, the press of the Nation—as reported by the ever-dependable New York Times—carried headlines to the effect that—

The administration has decided to hold back as much as 20 percent of this year's worldwide economic and technical assistance funds appropriated by Congress.

The New York Times article continued—and I quote:

The withheld money will go into an emergency reserve fund of about $100 million. One of the countries affected is India, where a $50 million economic development program approved by Congress will be trimmed to $40 million. Development programs in the Middle East and in other parts of the world where they are linked with military defense programs will be cut by the International Cooperation Administration. If no emergencies arise, the funds could be returned to the programs before the end of the year, or they might be carried over to next year if Congress agrees. They also might be returned to the Treasury.

I wish particularly to call the attention of our colleagues to this statement in the Times article which—in view of subsequent testimony by certain top administration spokesmen before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House—is, I feel, highly illuminating.

The move—

The New York Times states—

was started by John B. Hollister, Director of the International Cooperation Administration, who has made economy his watchword. He told a recent news conference that despite the threat of Soviet economic offensive, he was hopeful next year's aid program (the program which we are now debating on the floor of the House) could be cut below this year's $2.7 billion.

The Washington Post and Times Herald likewise took note of the decision to withhold appropriated funds in the fiscal 1956 foreign-aid program in an editorial entitled "Penny-Wise Foreign Aid." Said the Post:

The reported division in the administration to hold back as much as 20 percent of the foreign-aid funds appropriated by Congress could not have been more badly timed. If the reports are true, this retrenchment in one of the most significant expressions of foreign policy comes at the very moment of the failure of the Geneva Conference, at the moment when the intensified Soviet economic push into the Middle East and Asia is becoming more and more obvious. In view of the bad psychological impact alone, it is hard to understand how either Secretary Dulles or the President could approve such a course.

The Post ends its editorial with the plaintive query:

Yet the International Cooperation Administration, whose Director has initiated the slash, is responsible to the Secretary of State. Does the left hand really know what the right hand is doing?

As quoted, Mr. Hollister was, I believe, being entirely consistent with the attitude which, in the past, he has maintained toward the foreign economic policies and foreign-aid programs of the present and previous administrations.

For, again referring to news reports in the press—which, like the great majority of the American people, is my principle source of information regarding the administration's foreign policies and practices—the New York Times on October 8, 1955, carried this headline: "Aid Cut Expected From United States Survey—End of European Program Seen and More Trims for Asia Are Anticipated."

Under a Washington dateline the New York Times then stated:

The beginning of the end of United States foreign-aid activities in Europe is expected to result from a survey now being made by John B. Hollister, Director of the International Cooperation Administration. Retrenchment is being planned in Asia, too.

Upon Mr. Hollister's return to Washington after a month's survey in Europe, the Far East, and the Middle East, the New York Times duly headlined: "Hollister Read To Act on Aid Cuts." Interviewed at the airport, the New York Times reports that in response to the question as to whether there were any areas of the Far East in which he thought foreign aid should be increased, Mr. Hollister drew attention to these passages in his prepared statement:

We explained to the countries' leaders the limitations we must necessarily put on the total outlay for world assistance, and this requires careful planning of each country's program and strict allocations to appropriate projects.

At all points he said he had "emphasized the importance of encouraging the investment of private capital, both local and foreign, since Government aid should be considered only a method of priming the pump."

Against the background of such statements, the complete about-face and more-than-enthusiastic support given by the Director of ICA and other top administration spokesmen for the Departments of State and Defense in their testimony before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, becomes all the more astounding.

Repeatedly throughout the testimony of these officials, Congress was urged to relegate more of its powers and control over the authorization and appropriation of funds for the purposes of the Mutual Security Act to the Executive. This, it is declared, would provide the greater flexibility needed by the Executive for the effective planning and administration of foreign-aid programs.

As to this, Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that our principle difficulties arise from the fact that the administration has already exercised too much flexibility in these areas.

According to the evidence of Soviet progress and United States setbacks in the capitals of the world with which we are daily confronted, the fluctuating and vascillating course which the administration has pursued in its foreign economic policies during the past 3½ years, has gravely undermined our influence, lowered our prestige, and made mockery of our hitherto recognized leadership in world affairs.

If we are honest with ourselves, Mr. Chairman, can any Member of the House deny in good faith that we have lost the offensive and that the United States is now on the defensive on both economic and military grounds in the cold war?

In the past I have been proud to vote in support of this Nation's foreign aid programs. With justification I am proud of the inspired and—I might almost say—spiritual quality of the Democratic leadership which produced the Marshall plan, the ECA, and all the many other self-sacrificing acts of the American people to restore the ruined economies of Western Europe and to bring economic progress to the underprivileged nations of the free world.

Granted that some of these programs were also in defense of our own security. Nevertheless I feel that we have demonstrated time and time again our genuine altruism and sincere concern for the welfare, happiness, and independence of people everywhere.

Now, however, I have become convinced that a thorough reappraisal and complete review of the entire mutual security program is in order and should be completed before any increase in United States economic aid is forthcoming. It is not more flexibility and more money to be expended that is required for the success of our relations with other free nations, but a return to the idealism which previously characterized our efforts to assist our allies and to strengthen the moral determination of the underprivileged and new-born nations to defend their liberty and improve their economies.

Over the past three and a half years we have experimented with bombast, bribery, and browbeating. We have swung from threats of "massive retaliation" and "agonizing reappraisals" to belated attempts to outbid the U. S. S. R.'s offers of military and economic assistance. The result has cost us friends and placed us in the ignominious position of being played, one against the other, in competition with Russia for the dubious loyalties of the strategic nations of the Near and Middle East.

I know whereof I speak. Back in 1954, Mr. Chairman, the great State of West Virginia was one of the major sufferers from the business recession which struck the country. The coal industry, one of the mainstays of the State's economy, was grievously hurt.

At one time during this period more than 13 percent of the State's total civilian labor force was unemployed and over 12 percent of its entire population required public assistance and surplus food to exist.

It was during this time that I personally encountered the full force of the administration's preach, promise, and do-nothing policies.

It was in the fall of 1954—and by some strange coincidence, at the height of the congressional election campaigns—that the then Director of the ICA's predecessor, the FOA, announced that his agency, at the direction of the President, would purchase, under the foreign aid program, 10 million tons of coal to relieve the distress of unemployment in the coal-producing regions of the United States.

With the hardship and suffering of the people of my own district staring me in the face, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that I was among the first to appeal to Mr. Stassen for the allocation of orders to purchase some of this coal from the First Congressional District of West Virginia.

For the outcome of my efforts, the good faith with which the FOA/ICA kept its promise to the American people, and the inefficient administration of a Government agency which is now requesting authority to spend billions of the taxpayer's money, I refer you to the committee print, "Relief of Unemployment in Coal Mining Areas—Memorandum of Chairman of the Subcommittee on Oil, Gas and Coal," to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, dated February 15, 1956.

From out of the 10 million tons of coal promised to be purchased for export, at an estimated cost of $150 million, only 1,130,080 tons, at a cost of $34.2 million, was purchased—and this only under the most intensive congressional pressures—from September, 1954, until the program was unceremoniously and secretively abandoned by Mr. Stassen's successor, Mr. Hollister, in December 1955.

Despite their disappointment and disillusionment over the administration's failure to keep its commitment to them—and in the face of their own tribulations during this distressing time—the people of West Virginia continued, as they have in the past and as they most assuredly will do in the future, cheerfully and patiently to bear their share of the tax burden in which the cost of our foreign aid programs plays no small part.

Now the American people are being told that they must not only continue to bear this burden for an indeterminate time far into the future, but that its load must be radically increased.

In a message to the Congress of the United States on March 19, 1956, the President defined the urgency of the mutual security program to defer aggression and to help fortify the economies and military strength of the Nations of the free world. The need is urgent, he said, "because there are still people who aspire to sustain their freedom but confront economic obstacles that are beyond their capabilities of surmounting alone. We must continue to work with other countries to insure that each free nation remains free, secure from external aggression and subversion, and able to develop a society marked by human welfare, individual liberty, and a rising standard of living." Would that the Administration could see as clearly the scope of our own domestic difficulties in coping with these problems here, at home.

In requesting authority of the Congress to make commitments up to 10 years in length to achieve these purposes, the President said that we should be able to assure the nations of the free world that we will continue to participate in a number of military projects and enterprises which will take a number of years to complete.

Mr. Chairman, I would say that, with reference to the appropriation of funds for United States aid of long-range foreign development projects, the time has come to take a much closer look at our own domestic needs in these areas. We are asked to give and to lend our support for the construction of road networks, harbor developments, and power and water resources projects among others.

In the First District of West Virginia, two lock and dam construction projects, authorized by Congress, have been underway for several years. In each year that I have been in Congress it has been necessary for members of the West Virginia delegation to go before the appropriate committees of Congress to request the appropriation of funds to carry out the work on these dams on a year-to-year basis. Moreover, every year we have had to wrestle with the Bureau of the Budget to assure that these projects were not left out of the Executive's request for civil function project funds.

Nationwide, the need for an adequate system of interstate highways and the appropriation of funds, on a year-to-year basis, to carry forward the regular Federal highway aid programs have been problems with which the Congress has wrestled through many a session.

We are still faced with serious and mounting deficiencies of teachers and classrooms for the proper education of our American youth.

And for the protection of the Nation's health and the conservation of its water resources, there will soon come to the floor of the House a bill to amend the Water Pollution Control and Flood Prevention Act. Many of our colleagues have endeavored for years to secure a sufficient appropriation of funds and an effective program of Federal aid to assist our States and local communities in coping with these pressing problems.

I believe that the time has come when Congress' first responsibility is to the American taxpayer—to the improvement of his standard of living, to the meeting of his needs, and—in keeping with the promises of candidate Eisenhower during the 1952 campaigns—to consideration of the right of the average citizen to receive, to control, and to spend as he pleases a little more of the money he has earned to provide for himself and his family.

I earnestly pray that the day will never come when this Nation will refuse the friendly gesture and helping hand to assist another country maintain its freedom and improve its economic circumstances.

Nevertheless, it is high time, I feel, that we attacked our own family problems and with greater vigor pursued more aggressively our program for domestic improvement, before we expend so large a percentage of our energies and our resources for these purposes in foreign fields.

Perhaps when we practice the ideals of democracy at home as fervently as we preach its virtues abroad, we shall have found a far superior way to win friends and influence people than the methods we have lately been following.

I wish most heartily to commend the distinguished chairman and members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House for their realistic approach to the problem of this country's continued foreign-aid program and for the courage with which they have dealt with it.

The American people are indeed indebted for the forthright service which the committee has thereby rendered the Nation.

It is my intention to support the committee's action and to vote in favor of the cuts in the aid program which they have approved and recommended to the Members of the House.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, the discussion in the United Nations Security Council this week on the British resolution that expressed the hope for a lasting peace in the Middle East has shown to the whole world once again that the Arab countries have no desire to reach a peaceful settlement with Israel. The spokesman for the Arab countries, Syrian Ambassador Ahmed Shukairy, frankly stated:

> We must begin from the beginning. * * * The establishment of Israel, its membership in the United Nations, and all other resolutions will have to be revoked. Then, and then only, the United Nations can look forward to a solution on a mutually acceptable basis.

In other words, the Arab States insist on nothing less than the annihilation of Israel and of wiping out the Israelis by driving them into the Mediterranean Sea. This means that the present cease fire is only of a temporary nature and is bound to flare up again in the near future when the Arabs will feel the moment as opportune.

Mr. Chairman, let us keep this well in mind as we are about to vote economic and miiltary assistance for the countries in the Near East. The military balance of this strategic area, which is so vital to our defense structure, has already been upset by Egypt's action in the past year in giving Soviet Russia a foothold in the Middle East. On several occasions during recent months I have urged our Government to adopt a firmer policy in the Middle East and to end its policy of appeasement of the Arabs. The more we appease the Arabs, the less they support us. The more material aid, economic and military, we give to Egypt, to Saudi Arabia, to Syria, and to the other Arab States, the less respect they seem to have for us.

It is high time that we adopt this firmer stand, before hostilities and bloodshed are renewed by the Arabs in the Middle East. They are acquiring arms in huge quantities from the Soviet bloc and from other sources. With each passing week they are becoming more trigger happy and sooner or later will pounce upon Israel. This is the time to make available to Israel the necessary arms for legitimate self-defense in the event of aggression from her Arab neighbors. It does not make sense to provide arms to Saudi Arabia and other Arab countries, as we have done in recent weeks and months, while refusing to sell arms to Israel for purposes of defense.

The policy we are pursuing now is not one of impartiality, but it constitutes a very definite and decidedly partial pro-Arab attitude, This is not the traditional American policy in that area and should be discarded as soon as possible.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that we eliminate from the bill under discussion all economic and military aid to the Arab countries of the Near East until they show a willingness to reach a peaceful solution with Israel. I strongly urge that we should not appropriate a single cent to Egypt, to Saudi Arabia, to Syria, and to the other Arab countries because they have betrayed the cause of the free world by their actions in making possible Russia's intrusion into the Middle East. At the same time, I urge that we should not ignore Israel's present plight when its very existence is being threatened by aggressive neighbors and that we appropriate the necessary military aid for her legitimate self-defense.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment proposed

by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] to increase by $5 million the amount of defense support for Latin America from $32 million to $37 million, with the understanding that the additional $5 million be given to Guatemala.

Not only as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, but also as chairman of its Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I have heard testimony many times convincing me that in Guatemala we have a friend worth having on the side of the free world. Here we have a country who actually has been challenged by the Communists, and who has met that challenge with honor and success. Here we have a country in the Western Hemisphere who has demonstrated its determination to fight and keep free of Communist subversion and domination. We must surely agree that such an enemy of subversion and domination should know our respect and admiration.

When a special study mission to Central America on international organizations and movements, of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, chairmanned by the Honorable A. S. J. CARNAHAN, of which I was a member, visited Guatemala last year, we were informed during a conference with the President, as stated in the report of that study mission—page 15:

> It was the avowed program of the Government to use democratic processes to the fullest extent. The President further stated that it was his desire to prove to the millions of enslaved people behind the Iron Curtain that Guatemala, under democratic government, could provide the decent standard of living which the Communists promised but as usual did not fulfill.

The money we give Guatemala will not be just a gratuitous offering; it will serve a good purpose. It will assist Guatemala, who needs help, as stated by the Assistant Secretary of State for Guatemalan Affairs, Hon. Henry F. Holland, when he testified before our committee on this program:

> The pro-Communist Arbenz government left Guatemala with an empty treasury and a severe unemployment problem. In response to the resulting threat of economic crisis, the United States has been assisting the government in carrying out a number of projects designed to restore normal economic conditions and to promote further economic development.
>
> Urgently needed highway and hospital projects, a rural development program, and a planned area development program are among the most significant of the efforts to mobilize the country's varied economic resources and to demonstrate the government's ability to accomplish major improvements as to which the Communist regime has been unsuccessful. No new activities are contemplated in the coming fiscal year, but the continuation of the projects now in progress is of extreme importance to Guatemala's program of recovery.

Let us show our friends in the Western Hemisphere that we are not fair weather friends. Let us recognize Guatemala's battle for freedom. Let us give Guatemala this help which she needs and deserves.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in the historic debate that has marked the consideration by this body of the bill now before us, sitting as Committee of the Whole, it has been most heartening to hear mention made of the interest of our people in the State of Israel and of our moral responsibility to do all in our power and within our means to safeguard Israel from the dangers that beset her.

Mr. Chairman, it is not within human power to stop progress. The birth and the growth of nations are determined by laws that some may style the natural laws but most of us accept as the laws of a guiding divinity. The State of Israel is much in the same position in which the colonies that later became the States of the American Union found themselves when they had brought the progress of a new civilization into an area held backward by the practices of a dying order. The State of Israel, as I view this young nation of valiant pioneers, is destined in the future to occupy a position of greatness exceeding even the imaginations of her well-wishers. Israel is our hope for tomorrow in an area where now democracy as we know it is beset by many dangers.

Israel will bring into that area where now there is only confusion, and where man has never had the opportunity of attaining the full stature of his dignity, a broadening of the horizons of life for all the peoples therein residing. This I believe. This I have the faith is as certain as that with the passing of tonight, tomorrow morning another day will dawn. The children and the grandchildren and the great-grandchildren of the Arab people in the enjoyment of the blessings of progress ushered in by the State of Israel will give thanks that Israel came into being and through surmounting many dangers endured.

It has been well said that it is part of the character of the American people, part I would say of our mission, always to give a helping hand to the small nations of the world. This is as natural as that a grown man or woman should help a child to exercise and to grow so that when the elder person had grown fatigued with the chores of living another should be ready and developed to take their place. Our own United States of America was once a small nation. Now the responsibility of world power has been given us. In the exercise of this responsibility let us always be guided by the thought that progress is part of growth and that in a nation now young and small may tomorrow be the instrumentality of still greater progress in man's eternal march upward toward the heights.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. CHRISTOPHER: Page 2, line 18, strike "$882,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$382,000,000."

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by praising the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House for what I consider an excellent job which they have done with the mutual-security bill. I would not offer this amendment if it were not for the flexibility that is in this bill and the tremendous amount of funds that they already have in the carryover.

The figures I have are taken from estimates by the International Cooperation Administration. I suppose they are as reliable as can be found, because they are from the administration that is administering foreign aid. They say that the military carryover at the present time is $5 billion. Nonmilitary carryover, $1.8 billion. The 1957 appropriations under existing authority, $187,500,000. Of course the administration has asked for $4,672,475,000 which this committee cut to $3,563,475,000. So we come up with these figures:

If the administration's requests were granted as it came before the committee, the foreign-aid program, so-called, June 30, 1956, would have authorization and appropriated funds totaling $11,659,975,000. But if we support the bill as it came from the committee and add nothing to it or take anything away, the mutual-security program would have $10,550,975,000. If my amendment is agreed to they will still have $10,050,975,000, after we have saved a half billion dollars today.

I like to look at my own country, the United States. Everything we touch is taxed. Every bite we eat is taxed. Every garment we put on our bodies is taxed. Our transportation is taxed. The land, the salary check that we earn, the gasoline that we burn, the electricity we use, the water we drink—there is not anything in these United States that is not taxed. I do not like to see our money thrown indiscriminately all over the world. I have voted consistently on the floor of this House for this mutual aid program, because I have been told it is being used for the protection of our own country but this program has been in operation for many years and no one seems to have any idea when, if ever, we may be able to dispense with or even reduce it.

I have a bill now being considered before the Veterans' Affairs Committee to give war veterans a small pension when they reach age 65. This bill is said to cost $500 million per year if enacted. Here is the place to get the money and not injure anyone.

I still intend to support the committee and vote for it again, but the time may come and that rather soon if I continue to stay in this House, where I will do like some of my colleagues have assured me today they are going to do: Vote for every amendment to reduce the bill and then in the end vote against the bill. I am fast getting to that place.

Look at our own country: Our rivers are not leveed, our land is not terraced,

our land is not limed; we do not have enough schoolrooms for our children; we do not have enough teachers to teach them; we do not have enough hospitals to put our sick to bed.

Look at our rivers, look at our own river right here, the Potomac, that flows between Washington, D. C. and Arlington, Va. Is it a river? No, it is not a river, it is a cesspool, and you all know it. Do not tell me nothing can be done about it. The Army Engineers know what to do with that river to clean it up and make it clear and make it beautiful like the streams are up in the Appalachian Mountains where they are only little creeks; they know what to do about it. Ask why they do not do it and they say: "Oh, it is going to cost so much money."

We never will have any sense of money values or any incentive to be frugal or to guard the taxpayers' money so long as we continue to throw away our resources all over the world. It will never be done in this House or anywhere else in this Government as long as we continue to throw billions and billions of dollars a year into Europe, Asia, and Africa.

I wonder how many of my colleagues from the South want to irrigate the Sahara to raise long staple cotton? It is planned to do this with our money.

I hope this amendment is accepted.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

This amendment would cut out half a billion dollars of the $882 million of defense support for Asia.

If you turn to page 15 of the committee report you will see the countries that are involved. There are 4 amounts that are classified, but there are 4 that are given, and they total $441 million.

This is defense support to help maintain forces in Korea, where they have 20 divisions under arms; $300 million is needed for Korea to help them maintain the economy and pay for their gigantic military effort, to help them continue to rehabilitate themselves from their war losses and to develop so they can become more self-supporting.

There is $25 million for the Philippines. There is $86 million for Taiwan, Formosa, where 10 million people are maintaining the free China that we recognize maintaining land and naval forces sufficient to defend themselves against imminent Communist invasion.

There is $30 million for Thailand. For Vietnam the amount is classified, but, as we know, this heroic, brandnew, magnificent little country of South Vietnam, after Vietnam was cut in two by the surrender which was carried out at Geneva, is maintaining itself in spite of pessimistic reports, under their indomitable President Diem, and maintaining the military force there which it is hoped will resist the force that is building up illegally in North Vietnam.

That is the sort of thing this amendment would absolutely stop, would paralyze. I do not think that the Committee of the Whole wants to stop the resistance to Red Chinese communism in Asia. This amendment would certainly do that. The amendment includes Pakistan, that country that stands stoutly with us. Economic support for other military forces is involved. These are items that would be completely emasculated if the pending amendment were adopted.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Is it not a fact that the flexibility in this bill allows these funds to be transferred anywhere the President and his associates want to transfer them and is it not also a fact that even if the amendment prevailed they would still have over $10 million to spend in 1957?

Mr. VORYS. No. On this flexibility business, you cannot use flexibility to spend the same money more than once. Our chairman, in arguing for the reduction in military aid, has mentioned the importance of the flexibility provision. There is not enough flexibility in this bill to carry out the necessary military changes and then to restore any such amount as a half billion dollars in one fell swoop in one area of the world for defense support. Fexibility covers a multitude of sins but it cannot cover this half billion dollar cut.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Then it must be a fact this bill was designed by some able lawyers so that you could not get anything out of it without destroying it, is that a fact?

Mr. VORYS. This bill is designed so that you cannot get something for nothing.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. That is what I want to know. I do not want to get something for nothing.

Mr. VORYS. This bill is designed, as I said, on the basis that you cannot get something out of nothing. That is the only kind of bill we could have. In order to carry on this program, this program of defense support, you have to have the money to do it with. If you take out money all through the bill then you do not have enough money to transfer under your flexibility provision.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the pending amendment will be defeated.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I am leaving you $10 million. That is something.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as has been pointed out by the gentleman from Ohio and if I understand the amendment correctly, it will cut $500 million of defense support from the countries in Asia that are our stanchest allies; nations that are on the very perimeter surrounding the Communist-bloc countries. If we really want to swing a meat ax and cut off $500 million and thereby punch ourselves squarely in the nose, vote for this amendment. Nothing could be worse for our interests, nothing could hurt us more. I cannot think of any action that could be more damaging to our collective security.

The proposed amendment would cut out defense support for our friendly allies, the Philippines, Laos, Thailand, Vietnam, Pakistan, Cambodia, and Korea, where we have spent millions of dollars in the past to stop communism. Nothing could be more disastrous to our interests and to our security than to vote for this amendment.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I certainly agree wholeheartedly with what the gentleman has had to say. It was my privilege to visit all the free nations of north and southeast Asia last fall. Those countries are doing a marvelous job in the common fight for freedom and liberty. To cut off or reduce aid to these countries would be a hard blow at freedom's cause and a slap in the face for our friends. I certainly hope that the gentleman's amendment will be defeated.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman for his observation. If there is any doubt, I urge the Members to refer to page 15 of the report, the paragraph above the italics "Latin America" and read that, I do not see how anyone could possibly vote for this amendment. The committee clearly emphasizes the reason for the defense support authorization.

Korea and Formosa—Taiwan—provide large armies directly confronting Communist forces. Neither country has an adequate economic base. Pakistan lies close to the Soviet Union and has joined the Baghdad Pact. It is essential that the United States give full assistance to its effort to meet the Soviet threat. Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam are trying to establish themselves as independent nations and to defend themselves against the continued danger from their Communist neighbors. The Philippines has to maintain a military force adequate to maintain internal security and at the same time perform the important assignment in the defense of the Pacific area which its strategic location dictates. The free world orientation of Thailand, its position in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization—SEATO—and the effectiveness of its military organization combine to make it one of the most influential small nations in Asia.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I believe the distinguished gentleman, if he had fully understood the import of what he was trying to do, probably would not have offered this amendment. I think the money he seeks to cut out here is probably some of the most essential in this bill. The committee said in its report that there can be no question but that all of the countries that are to receive defense support authorized here are poor countries, like Korea and the Philippines. It does not refer to India but countries like that who have great defense establishments themselves, and their economy is not strong enough to keep them up. We would be cutting off our noses to spite our faces if this amendment was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. KELLY of New York: Page 3, after line 4, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 4. Title I, chapter 4, of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which contains general provisions relating to mutual defense assistance, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

" 'SEC. 143. Prohibition of assistance to Yugoslavia.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no assistance under this title or any other title of this act, or under any provision of law repealed by section 542 (a) of this act, shall be furnished to Yugoslavia after the date of the enactment of this section.' "

And renumber succeeding sections accordingly.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am one of the Members of the House of Representatives who has sponsored this type of amendment for the past 5 years. My concern dates back to 1951 when I visited Yugoslavia as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Study to Europe. My interest in this amendment is not new and I would like to add at this point the names of those who have supported this action—if they so desire.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I am glad to join the gentlewoman in sponsoring this amendment.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DORN of New York. I would be glad also to join as a sponsor of this amendment.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I thank the gentlemen.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that this action is necessary. This amendment is simple to understand but it is broad in scope.

It cuts off all new money earmarked for Yugoslavia and it prohibits the delivery of any material or aid under previous legislation.

If this amendment prevails, huge, classified, unexpended balance earmarked for Yugoslavia will be restored for distribution elsewhere, thereby markedly decreasing the cut made by the committee.

Why do I sponsor this amendment?

First. I believe that the break of Tito with the U. S. S. R. was not sincere.

Second. Tito said in Moscow recently, "Yugoslavia will never again be split from the Soviet Union by misunderstanding." Therefore, he has no need for military aid. He knows the United States will not be an aggressor, and he now believes the Soviet will not attack him. He needs no military supplies.

Third. I believe that Tito has played his part as a Communist brilliantly and cunningly. No other man has helped to weaken NATO and break up the unity of the West. He refused to take part in NATO yet, at the same time, he has received more aid than any other single nation. He has spread neutralism—agreeing with the Soviets and Red China and condemning every action of the West. Still, he received assistance.

Fourth. He defined the West in Trieste, to which he had no claim, bringing the Communist world into the Adriatic and thus into the Mediterranean.

Fifth. Did he play a part in the Czech arms deal with Egypt? I believe he did.

Sixth. He certainly made the Balkan pact a paper alliance.

Seventh. He has encouraged the Greek-Turkish dispute.

Eighth. He has magnetized the people of Greece to his side, thereby completing the neutral nation bloc from the Baltic to the Adriatic to the Mediterranean, Moscow, Belgrade, Athens, Egypt.

The NATO of Europe has begun. This, Moscow has sought a long time.

Arguments against this amendment are going to be:

Help Yugoslavia remain independent. She is.

Keep Yugoslavia away from the Communists. She is there.

Do not hurt the Yugoslav people. They are hurt. They are enslaved. They have no freedom.

I will vote for economic aid to the Yugoslav people directly—as I have in the past—provided we can distribute that aid to them.

Finally, I believe that this amendment should be adopted in order to prove to the world that we will aid our friends but not those who work to undermine the principles which have made the United States the nation it is.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I should like to congratulate the gentlewoman from Brooklyn and say that I associate myself with her in her remarks; I supported her amendment last year and shall do so again this year.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentlewoman from New York on her forthright and sincere expression on this subject. I shall support this amendment. As a matter of fact, I have an amendment which I shall offer later on which will go a little further to exclude aid not only to Yugoslavia but to India, and Egypt, as well. I think all of these countries have shown their pro-Soviet tendencies, and they are not entitled to the support of this country.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has again expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. SISK), Mrs. KELLY of New York was given 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I just wish to join the gentlewoman from New York in her amendment, and I support the amendment because I certainly believe it to be equitable and just. Certainly to me it is most unfair to continue to pour money into a country which is today back in the Communist orbit. As the gentlewoman has suggested and as I believe, Yugoslavia probably never was out of the Communist orbit. So I am very happy to support the gentlewoman's amendment.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I also wish to commend the gentlewoman from New York for offering this amendment.

I wonder if the members of the committee have been reading the news reports out of Moscow in the last few days. Apparently someone has brought to the attention of Marshal Tito the fact that attempts may be made here to eliminate all of our aid as far as he is concerned. He has been quoted in the press as saying that it is not important, that "our friendship with the United States will remain regardless of these attempts." I suppose you might say regardless of whether he is going to get any aid or not.

I notice also he expresses the desire to visit Washington in the next few months. I am wondering if that is also going to be in the cards.

Seriously, I saw on the ticker just outside a while ago that in Moscow he has signed a trade protocol with the Soviet Union, another example of how closely he is alining himself with the Kremlin at this particular time.

In discussing this matter of aid to Yugoslavia, Mr. Chairman, I think it sort of almost completes the circle that our foreign-aid program has taken in the last few years. When the Marshall plan was originally conceived the Soviet satellites, including Yugoslavia, were all invited to participate. They turned it down. Then we decided we were going to give aid only to our actual allies and our potential allies. Now we are aiding the underdeveloped areas, including the neutralist states, including pro-Soviet states. Continued aid to Yugoslavia under present conditions would be aiding frankly open enemies. I wonder if the next step after aiding Yugoslavia is going to be an offer of aid to the Soviet Union itself, thereby, as I say, completing the circle.

With regard to Tito, I would like to make a few personal comments. I remember Marshal Tito from firsthand experience. I first saw him back in December of 1947, about 6 months before he broke with the Cominform. At that time, and that was only a year, I believe the committee will recall, after he had shot down two American planes, he was hand in glove with members of the Kremlin. The break came 6 months later in June of 1948. I believe the break was genuine. I happened to be living in Eastern Europe at that time. On that basis I supported aid to Tito for a number of years. I even spoke before groups which were avowedly anti-Tito. But all that policy has changed with the death of Stalin.

Today I am firmly convinced that Marshal Tito is back as strongly in the Soviet camp as he was prior to June 1948,

and will remain there regardless of what we do or do not do.

I would also call your attention to one more thing, and that is also, I believe, on the ticker today. Certain prominent Yugoslav emigree leaders testifying before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the other body this morning stated, as I recall the news ticker, that American aid to Tito had been a disaster to their country, that it had created consternation behind the Iron Curtain on the part of people who could not understand our policy of building up the Communist dictatorship, that it had created consternation among the people we are trying to help, the people of Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania, to say nothing of the people of Yugoslavia, itself. They said it was a disaster as far as the entire list of Communist-enslaved peoples were concerned. They sincerely and earnestly hoped that this aid would be terminated and terminated immediately.

They also said one more thing, which I want very strongly to call to the attention of the committee, particularly the Members on my right, and that is they stated categorically that all of the assistance that had gone to Egypt in the past several months in the way of military aid, aid which has so deeply concerned many Members of this House, had been shipped from Czechoslovakia to Egypt via Yugoslavia.

So you can see what kind of friend Marshal Tito is, not only to us but to our allies, such as Israel and those other countries who are trying to remain free.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that this amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BENTLEY was granted 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If this money is left in for Yugoslavia and Yugoslavia refuses to take it, do you suppose it would be forced upon them?

Mr. BENTLEY. I am sure the attempts of the administration to force Tito to accept it will be very great.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. You should have heard what Tito said. He recited a little couplet:

Those to us who aid do send
See no further than the end of their nose.

Mr. BENTLEY. That is a good idea of Tito's opinion of us. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the last 2 years I have introduced an amendment cutting off aid for Tito's Yugoslavia. I made a public announcement a couple of days ago, and also stated on the floor here yesterday, that I was going to introduce such an amendment again this year. At that time I was advised that no member of the Foreign Affairs Committee or Member of the House was going to offer such an amendment. But now I notice that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] has offered an amendment which is identical with the one which I laid on the Speaker's desk when we convened this morning. I am very happy to take this opportunity to urge support for this amendment, because it will put an end to the misuse of taxpayers' money to feather the nest of the Communist dictator Tito. I urge support of this amendment for the following reasons:

It will put an end to the farcical situation in which the American taxpayer is required to pay a large part of the military preparedness bill of an avowed enemy of the United States, Communist dictator Tito.

Secondly, it will bring the foreign-aid program back closer to its original purpose of strengthening the friends of freedom, thwarting the conspiracy of communism, and protecting the security of the American people.

Third, it will save the American taxpayers some money by prohibiting the use of public funds for purposes calculated to advance the evil plan of world Marxist civilization, over which the Russians expect to rule with their typical disregard for humanity.

Fourth, it will put Congress on record as being aware of the obvious fact that there is only one type of Communist, and that all Communists, when the cards are down, will give their wholehearted loyalty to no one but the Communist central authority in Moscow.

Fifth, it will serve notice to the world that the United States refuses to reward nations who publicly pledge their loyalty to communism with large sums of money taken from the American taxpayer's till.

Sixth, it will send up a warning to all those nations now sitting on the fence of the cold war that they cannot maintain a character of neutralism by visiting Moscow or inviting the Kremlin barkers to visit their country. A visit to Moscow or a cozy reception for Bulganin and Khrushchev puts them firmly in the camp of world communism.

Seventh, it will prevent the free world alliances built up after years of great effort and expense from falling apart by making it clear that we have not gone soft on communism and that we regard human freedom and national independence as the only bond which can bind us to other nations.

Eighth, it will deter other still free nations from going soft on communism by taking action which demonstrates that we have not been taken in by the latest Kremlin game of sweetness and light and that we propose to assist only those nations whose leadership is equally aware of this latest Russian beartrap.

Ninth, it will restore a large measure of our national dignity which has been degraded in the past by allowing this Communist carpetbagger dictator, Tito, to slap us in the face before we reward him with a large helping of the largess extracted from the American taxpayer.

Tenth, it will provide the Congress with an opportunity to tell the world it is aware that no Communist can be a neutral in the cold war, because every Communist, regardless of his hue, must be dedicated to the world triumph of communism and the defeat of free institutions, representative governments, and the basic freedoms. This is a hard cold fact of life. There are, in my judgment, governments in this world which honestly seek a neutral position in the cold war, but none of them is or can be Communist. Every Communist is first a Communist and only a neutral if and when that role serves the Communist blueprint for world conquest.

Finally, the enactment of this amendment will herald the beginning of a new era of foreign assistance programs in which the governing criteria will put freedom's cause above all others.

I urge every Member to support this amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey to the amendment offered by Mrs. KELLY of New York: Insert after "enactment of this section" a comma and the following: "unless the President finds (1) that there has been no change in the Yugoslavian policies on the basis of which assistance under this act has been furnished to Yugoslavia in the past, and that Yugoslavia is independent of control by the Soviet Union, and (2) that it is in the interest of the national security of the United States to continue the furnishing of assistance to Yugoslavia under this act."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, this amendment retains the prohibition of aid to Yugoslavia contained in the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York, but adds that if the President affirmatively finds after study that Yugoslav policies have not changed, as we fear today, and that Yugoslavia is still independent of the Soviet Union; and further, if the President affirmatively finds that it continues to be in the national security interest of this country to furnish aid, then it can be given.

I am sure that over the years when aid has been given to Yugoslavia it certainly did not mean that we supported a government regime in that country. We felt, however, that this country that had broken away from the Soviet orbit should be encouraged to stay out of the clutches of Russia; and I am sure it was for those reasons that we did support through aid to Yugoslavia her independence of Russia.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. DONOVAN. As one lawyer to another can we agree that this bill gives complete discretion to the Executive to spend most of the money in this bill as, where, and when he sees fit?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. There certainly is a great deal of flexibility.

Mr. DONOVAN. If that be true, is not the language in the gentleman's amendment merely a glorified statement that takes all of the meat out of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. No; I do not believe that is true.

Mr. DONOVAN. Well, actually, what you say is, "provided the President finds out or determines that it is all right to continue to do business with Tito," is that not correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I will say that we are fearful, hope is dimming that Yugoslavia will stay independent of Russia.

Mr. DONOVAN. Again as one lawyer to another, that is not precisely in answer to the question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. If the gentleman will bear with me, I hope I can explain what I consider to be the import of the amendment.

Mr. DONOVAN. The gentleman's amendment, in substance, says if the President finds out that Tito is on the up-and-up he can still keep giving him money; is that not so?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. If the President finds it is in the national security of this country to furnish aid, he may.

Mr. DONOVAN. And, on the other hand, the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York proposes that it is the will of this House that Tito is unworthy of credence and confidence. What the gentleman actually is doing is giving back to the President of the United States the power to decide whether he is going to give aid to Tito.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I will say to the gentleman that events of the past week have created great anxiety and fear that Yugoslavia is slipping back under the Soviet umbrella. The President suggested, and I agree with him, that we should not act precipitously, that we should study, then decide. That is what would allow the President to do. It would allow him to know more about what is happening in Yugoslavia.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. As one lawyer to another, would not the gentleman say that his amendment requires two findings that the President must make, and if he does not make those findings aid to Yugoslavia is cut off?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. VORYS. There are no such requirements in this law or any other law at the present time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. VORYS. These are two new specific requirements that the gentleman's amendment would place upon the President. It would require him to make findings and if he does not so find, then aid is cut off?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS or New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. I wish the gentleman would explain to me how the President of the United States or anyone in this hemisphere could make a positive determination that Tito and his Government are not under the domination of the Soviet Union? How could that be done?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am sure that is the kind of determination that is made all the time; that is, by analyzing the policies of nations.

Mr. VORYS. A number of our brethren here on the floor yesterday and today have been able to make determinations on that basis partly on what they have remembered from reading a ticker tape.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Does the gentleman not feel it is a gross imposition upon President Eisenhower to ask him to make a finding of fact which should be obvious to each and every one of us right now. We should not ask the President to make a finding that Congress itself would not make and which would be contrary to the national interest. Congress should not throw its "hot potatoes" to President Eisenhower. Congress should decide these matters on their merits and there is abundant evidence for us to make the decision now.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. As I interpret the President's statement yesterday, that is what he was suggesting, that he had to study it and make a finding of fact.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a moment to explain my vote in favor of a cut of $1.1 billion as recommended by the Foreign Affairs Committee, as well as my vote this afternoon in favor of $500,000 assistance for the Republic of Guatemala. I believe that both of these votes indicate some of the questions that have recently been in my mind regarding foreign aid as well as some of the conclusions to which I have drawn regarding the entire program.

Mr. Chairman, in recent days a number of questions regarding this whole matter of foreign-aid spending have been running through my mind. As a result, I have come to the conclusion that perhaps the time has come to reevaluate and to restudy the entire program. I think we should ask ourselves, first of all, if the program is accomplishing in broad measure what it is intended to accomplish. I feel that it is time for constructive criticism of a program which has been in existence for 10 years and which was inaugurated to meet a crisis which has drastically altered in form in the last decade. I believe that this is true, although I supported foreign aid when it was first introduced by President Truman, and I have always voted for its continuance when it was considered in other years by Congress. However, I have come to question whether the foreign-aid program, as it now stands and as it was presented to Congress this year, is needed in 1956.

Mr. Chairman, my suspicions of this program grow when one considers that the foreign-aid program as we have come to know it was instituted to meet the world economic crisis which resulted from World War II. The Truman administration initiated foreign aid in order to help many of the countries which were then flat on their backs. You will recall that many of these nations had just emerged from the war to find their economies destroyed—their transportation systems ruined and thousands of people unemployed. We decided on foreign aid at this point because we wanted to help the rest of the world get back on its feet, and because we knew that foreign aid was necessary to stop the spread of communism which was capitalizing on postwar economic chaos.

However, as we all know, conditions in the world have changed drastically since that time. Many of my colleagues in Congress, for example, have returned from trips abroad to relate that many of the countries which have benefited from foreign aid are now enjoying greater prosperity than they did in the years before the war. They saw many other positive results of our foreign-aid spending and I think that we should be grateful that the money has been so often put to good use. However, since many of these countries we originally helped have obviously recovered to a great extent, perhaps the time has come to ask ourselves how long we should be expected to continue with foreign aid. It may be that we should be thinking now in terms of diverting our money to other useful and constructive channels. These and other questions have bothered me.

In recent years, for example, I have not been in agreement with the tendency to place such a heavy emphasis on military aid rather than on technical assistance. I, for one, do not believe that you can buy friends throughout the world with guns. I do feel however, that we can win friends by providing other peoples with tools, books and know-how, so that they can raise their own standards of living and generally progress. I have always felt that such assistance was a positive approach to this whole foreign aid program and money well spent by the United States. I am reluctant to attempt to win friends abroad with armaments, because I have so often seen it demonstrated in history, that frequently these same armaments are used against the donor. I think that a study of political realities in many parts of the world would alert us to the fact that such an eventuality cannot be excluded in the future, however distasteful it may be to contemplate.

Mr. Chairman, I also believe that we should ask ourselves whether or not our foreign-aid program as it now stands is flexible enough to meet the challenges of the present day and age. For example, in light of recent world events, I think that we should question whether or not foreign aid provides an adequate means of meeting the new Soviet economic challenge. I believe we should question whether parts of our program are not geared to outmoded concepts. Are we, for example, encouraging governments to undertake military and economic burdens which they may have difficulty supporting on their own? Has, as one writer put it, the machinery of the aid program become self-perpetuating and is it so cumbersome that it tends to obscure the objective? Are we, too, for example, spending money on direct grants to foreign countries when low-

interest loans might be better received and make more friends for us?

In view of these and other questions which I cannot go into here, I would like to suggest that the Nation as a whole take another look at the entire foreign-aid program. I believe that the program's military structure as well as its economic structure ought to be scrutinized from top to bottom. I believe that a thorough examination would have a very salutary effect on the foreign aid program, itself. Perhaps we would find, for example, that many of the questions raised about it stem from the fact that there has been no dispassionate, expert look at where we want to go with our foreign aid program and how we got there. A study by both the executive branch and by Congress would help to clear up many of the doubts many of us have about the program and I think serve a very useful and helpful purpose.

I would like to propose, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the President be urged to set up an independent and bipartisan commission to study the entire foreign-aid program. I also believe that Congress should appoint a committee to be made up of Members from both sides of the aisle to investigate and study the entire question of foreign aid. I feel that such a committee would be able to determine just what has been accomplished in the past as well as the road which the country wishes to follow in the future.

Mr. Chairman, having raised all these questions which were in my mind regarding the program, I find it impossible to vote in favor of a retention of $1.1 billion in this foreign aid authorization bill. I think the reasoning which prompted my decision to vote for a cut as recommended by the Foreign Affairs Committee is obvious in view of what I have just said. My vote in favor of a $500,000 assistance for Guatemala, I believe, demonstrates that I am still in favor of foreign aid in those areas where I feel it can be put to the best use to develop a country economically and fight the spread of communism effectively.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MRS. ANNA ELIZABETH DOHERTY

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Con. Res. 247) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill (H. R. 1913) for the relief of Mrs. Anna Elizabeth Doherty. If and when said bill is returned by the President, the action of the Presiding Officers of the two Houses in signing said bill shall be deemed rescinded; and the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed, in the reenrollment of said bill, to make the following corrections: In line 5 of the enrolled bill strike out the figures "3,613.30" and insert in lieu thereof "3,116.70"; and in line 10, strike out "October 31" and insert in lieu thereof "September 30."

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 10003) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. RABAUT, PASSMAN, NATCHER, CANNON, WILSON of Indiana, JAMES, and TABER.

THE YUGOSLAV AND CENTRAL EUROPEAN ISSUE

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to request permission to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the Yugoslav and Central European issue.

The issue is not Tito. It is the mutual security of the United States and the 100 million Christians in Central Europe. These people form a string of nations from the Baltic to the Adriatic. Yugoslavia is the base of this group.

In World War II, each of these nations was picked off one by one. Organized in one block, they might well form a unit of strength to balance the future peace of the East and the West, in Europe and in Asia.

You want self-determination, Woodrow Wilson gave it to the people of Central Europe but he did not give them any strategic defense nor any interlocking defense commitments.

I do not say it is better to deal with neutrals. But let me put it this way. Do you want to deal with neutrals or with satellites?

In our own interest, the people of Central Europe should trust us and believe in our friendship.

Although Germany was our enemy in World War II, today we do not penalize the German Nation for what Hitler and the Nazis did. We believe that by helping the Germans today, we are helping them build a new future based on true democracy.

Tito is as mortal as Hitler was. He is a Communist. We are not. But the Yugoslav people fought on our side during World War II. They were our Allies. They bled profusely. They were entitled to some share in the fruits of victory. We do not want to encourage communism, nor help the Communists. We want the people of Yugoslavia to know that they can count on our friendship and help. We do not want them, for lack of help, to become 100 percent satellites of Russia.

Tito was sincere when he broke with Stalin. I saw in North Korea, in November 1950, a Russian propaganda poster in which Tito was in the same boat with Churchill, Franco, and Uncle Sam under a banner of skull and bones and the dollar sign.

Today, Tito wants peaceful co-existence with Russia. We want it too.

In conclusion, let us remember that our fleet, for the first time in history, patrols and refuels in the Mediterranean. It is, therefore, to our interest to cultivate peaceful relations with every nation in this area.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF DR. ELLIOTT P. JOSLIN

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to one of the very great doctors of medicine in this 20th century. He is not only a great doctor, an eminent specialist in the research and treatment of diabetes, but he is also a very great humanitarian.

Mr. Speaker, in this world of recent times, when so much substance and effort has been expended in the cause of destruction of mankind, it seems very fitting and proper that all of us here in Congress, and that the people throughout the Nation, and in a very large measure, throughout the world, should pause for a few moments to do honor to a very great man whose entire lifetime has been devoted to benefiting and helping mankind.

On Wednesday, June 6, Dr. Elliott P. Joslin, of Boston, Mass., celebrated his 87th birthday. An eminent scientist, a very distinguished doctor of medicine, his tremendous efforts and contributions to the health of mankind all over the world began in Victorian days over 60 years ago. Through the duration of the 20th century, his great achievements for human beings have made it possible for many to live and enjoy life who might otherwise not have been able to do so.

Many of his great achievements have taken place in the research and treatment of diabetes. In this field of medicine his knowledge and judgment and contributions are recognized throughout the world. His eminent authority is recognized not only because of his accomplishments in the field of medicine, but also because of the use of his knowledge

in the consideration of the whole man. Kindly, thoughtful, genuine, and always completely interested, Dr. Joslin, in all of his study and research and treatment, never has forgotten that mankind is made up of human beings with nerves, and a mind, and a spirit. Always he is cognizant of the fact he is dealing with life made in the image of God.

During these many years of service to his fellowmen, the eminent leadership of Dr. Joslin has been internationally recognized, not just for his specialty in the research and treatment of diabetes and the interrelationship of the whole man in the treatment of his ills, but also for his eminent qualities as a gentleman and a leader among men during this, his time on earth.

More intimately, Dr. Joslin is revered and loved by the countless patients who have passed through his great clinic in Boston bearing his name—the Joslin Clinic—and the countless people whose lives he has touched in his long, notable service throughout more than three score of years.

Not only is he an eminent man of medicine, but Dr. Joslin is a distinguished teacher and a great scientist. As a professor in the Harvard Medical School, many distinguished doctors today recall with reverence and appreciation their great teacher when they were students in the Harvard Medical School. His teaching and lectures have taken place in many of the great medical centers of the world. In the great profession of medicine, Dr. Joslin's place is secure.

In this age of materialism and conflict of values, the high accomplishments of so distinguished a man and specialist are indeed above praise. Admired, respected, and revered not only by everyone in his profession, but also by men and women everywhere, Dr. Joslin indeed has reached the pinnacle of greatness. In the history of his great and noble profession, and in the history of his country, his name will rank with Osler, Trudeau, Kelly, Welch, Halstead, Ehrlich, Cushing, and others who have done so much to permit men and women throughout the world to live normal, happy lives.

During this long life of service, Dr. Joslin has been blessed with the love, cooperation, encouragement, and understanding of a wonderful lady, his wife, Mrs. Joslin. It is my wish, and my hope, just as it is for countless individuals everywhere, that Dr. Joslin and Mrs. Joslin will be blessed with many more years, to do all that they love so well, which is to give health to the ill, strength to the physically weak, courage to the depressed, and happiness to mankind. Because he lives so do countless others.

On his 87th anniversary, I know he has received congratulations and best wishes from people all over the world. It is an honor for me to extend to him my congratulations and I know the congratulations of the entire Congress and Government of the United States of America.

ENCOURAGE SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, every American rejoices in present peak employment of our citizens and the unprecedented peacetime prosperity which the Nation is enjoying at this time.

There are many factors responsible for present conditions and prosperity not only involving the huge impact and substantial stimulating effects of the multi-billion-dollar defense and foreign spending programs but also entailing the tremendous growth of the Nation in terms of increased population, scientific research and development, and the emergence of new needs and new demands growing out of scientific and industrial advancements and the generally very great impetus which the American economy has received as the result of the new age of remarkable invention and progress into which we have entered since the end of World War II.

Great changes have occurred in industry and industrial technique which are bringing about fabulous transformations of industry, the economy and the direction and scope of our productivity and our lives. Where these remarkable changes will end, it would be impossible to predict. But it is clear that the trend is steadily and speedily toward such additional scientific and industrial growth and expansion that continued basic changes in our industrial, as well as our social life as a Nation are inevitable. We must be prepared for it.

This new era necessitates urgent consideration of measures to so direct the challenge of this growth and these changes as not to produce major dislocations in our productive system. Just as important, more so perhaps, is the need for guiding the truly revolutionary developments in science and industry so that the results they bring will be socially beneficial and productive of new and better opportunities and higher standards for all Americans. How these ends can best be achieved is necessarily among the challenging problems which this Congress, working with the executive branch of the Government, must determine, and in the process we can lose no time because it is most essential that both the law and jurisprudence already in some question, and administrative patterns, should at all times be fully implemented and adapted to the rapid growth and the new features of scientific, industrial development.

A present question we should ask is whether in this period conditions are developing in the Government and in the country which especially favor big business and militate against small business. Is there likelihood of the American economy developing principally into a relatively small number of large units tending toward monopoly, ultimately weakening, and finally destroying independent small business as we have known it in the past? Every industry should be judged on its merits or demerits, not with reference to its bigness alone, but principally with reference to how it is serving the Nation and the people.

Scientific progress is necessary, industrial growth is desirable. Both will ensue in the years ahead in greater measure than ever before. But how will they serve the people, how will they promote the freedom, economic health, and social welfare of the individual? How will they be adapted to our free way of life? Can the trend toward bigness in American industry continue without finally excluding smallness altogether, without destroying, or greatly impairing and sapping, the vitality of some four million, two hundred thousand small business firms throughout the Nation which are, we are told and believe, the very backbone of our free enterprise system?

How can we interpret the high failure rate of small business and the current acute problem of taxes, labor relations, and reduced profits to which they are subjected? Can incentive of the individual continue in the face of management problems, extortionate taxes, financing difficulties, labor competition from big units, and higher operating costs?

In a sense, such problems are fairly academic so far as big business is concerned, but they can be and are matters of life and death to the small concern.

Big business can command the services of highly skilled managers and experts. It has the means of attracting the best brains from our colleges and universities and from the business world. Small business frequently has to take what is left, indeed a decreasing number of highly skilled leaders are willing to venture into the stormy seas of small business.

Big business has a much easier way of coping with tax problems not available to small business. It can also solve its labor problems on a broad, general basis and pass the burdens along to the consumers. Most small businesses cannot follow this course.

Big business has little difficulty securing new financing, whereas it is becoming increasingly difficult for small business to finance current operations, let alone embark upon new ones. Big business can get an infinitely larger share of Government procurement and can pay able representatives to keep in constant contact with Federal Government needs and opportunities. As a general rule small business has to take what is left.

It is not surprising therefore that, according to late statistics, the profit margin before taxes for corporations with more than a hundred million dollars worth of assets before taxes was 13.4 percent while for firms with less than $250,000 assets, it was only 2.6 percent of sales. Big business enjoys all the benefits of large-scale operations, cheaper prices for its raw materials, and cheaper distribution costs, and cheaper per unit market outlet. Small business is caught in the competitive squeeze and suffers disadvantage and detriment all along the line.

Is big business more efficient? Perhaps it is in some instances, not all. But efficiency is not the only standard by which American industry should be

measured. We must consider the effect on the individual, the effect on our way of life, the ultimate effect of giant trusts and combines vested with billions of assets exercising great power throughout the Nation and in the Government. We must consider whether these acompaniments of bigness will, in the long run, benefit our democratic system, promote social justice, and conduce to our free way of life. Or will they result in too much power and too much wealth vested in the hands of a few, the creation of an economic oligarchy, all powerful in the affairs of government, exercising monopolistic control over the American economy and American working men and women, steadily getting bigger and bigger, and finally constituting a giant industrial and financial network that will completely enmesh the individuality and the incentive as well as the opportunity of the average American?

Many of us remember the industrial merger period of the twenties and the final economic cataclyism of 1929. We are told that we have controls now which prevent the evils which grew out of that situation but that seems hardly an answer to the declining fortunes of small business in this country.

As one who believes that small business is indeed not only the backbone but the test and the proof of our free-enterprise system, I urge upon this Congress very early consideration of pending measures to insure small business in its essential right under our system to continue to exist and to be safeguarded against the monopolistic and unfair competition and governmental discrimination which so often besets it in our times.

These remedies lie in the field of taxation, Government procurement, and other fields. They should be pressed now. They should be pressed for the economic and social welfare of the Nation and for the sake of preserving freedom of individual action in all its legitimate essentials.

SOMETHING TO CELEBRATE

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, notable anniversaries of two outstanding national events are now sufficiently close upon us as to be subjects for attention by the Congress. Both, undoubtedly, will be celebrated on a nationwide scale under congressional sponsorship. To properly and thoroughly prepare these celebrations in the best American tradition requires an early start. As a basic preliminary, authorization by the Congress is essential to permit the Government departments concerned to take any action. Hence the facts are here presented:

These two top-ranking anniversaries are the sesquicentennial of our National Anthem, the Star-Spangled Banner, and the golden jubilee of the opening of the Panama Canal, exactly 1 month apart.

The year is 1964, 8 years away; but as preparations must be complete by 1963, and another year may be lost in the pressure of the current presidential campaign, there may be actually only 6 years. Procrastination causing later hurry can greatly diminish effects, and at the same time disproportionately boost costs.

Another pressing reason for an early start is that in the same year, 1964, come other important anniversaries of national interest, celebration plans for which already have been underway more than a year. These include the Tercentennial of Founding of New York and New Jersey as American Colonies, the 350th anniversary of the Settlement of New York City, and the 300th of that city's present name.

The New York-New Jersey Tercentennial Association, in its campaign of preparation, announces that it intends celebration of the two national anniversaries in its own program. It is, however, entirely willing to subordinate its own interests within the national plans which Congress may desire to promulgate, pledging full support.

Recognizing the vast possibilities of an adequate celebration of these national anniversaries, I also realize that two of our most populous and economically important States form a center around which about one-third of the national economy revolves. Therefore, I propose that the Congress take action to stimulate preparation for these outstanding national celebrations. At the coming session, I expect to introduce bills to authorize the various Federal Departments to further these preparations so far as they are affected.

A further reason for a beginning is that the tercentennial group already has proposed a world's fair for 1964, and proclaims its intention of creating popular interest and demand for such an event. It has arranged some very unusual means of spurring this interest.

The Tercentennial Association is not asking congressional aid. It is a nonprofit corporation under the laws of New Jersey, having no stock or shares nor any authority to carry on profitmaking activities. Its officers serve without salary. Its basic idea is maximum celebration of the several anniversaries in the best American tradition. Rather than seeking assistance, it desires to extend to the Congress full advantage of the local and sectional enthusiasm being churned up to provide greater power and effect for the national anniversary celebrations. It desires the national anniversaries to take first place, and offers to do all in its power toward their success.

BACKGROUND OF THE CELEBRATIONS

The Star-Spangled Banner was written by Francis Scott Key, inspired by the fact that the Stars and Stripes still floated proudly over Fort McHenry, at Baltimore, after a British fleet had pounded the fort with shot and shell for a day and a night. On finding "By the dawn's early light that our flag was still there," on the morning of September 14, 1814, he penned the first stanza on the back of an envelope, completing it the day following.

The Panama Canal was opened to the traffic of the world on August 15, 1914, following 10 years of construction. Its effect has been worldwide to the benefit and credit of the United States. These two highly significant anniversaries are worthy of the Nation's best effort at celebration.

The Colonies of New York and New Jersey were created by King Charles II of England through grant to his brother James, Duke of York and Albany, on March 12, 1664. Shortly thereafter they were seized by the English from the Dutch who had made settlement earlier. At the time of seizure, the name New Amsterdam, given by the Dutch, was changed to New York City. It had been settled in 1613–14.

The plans of the New York-New Jersey Tercentennial Association include local observance of these anniversaries on various dates throughout 1964, together with celebrations of the more local anniversaries of municipal founding and incorporation.

Because of the many celebration dates and the intended magnificence of pageantry to continue throughout the year, 1964 has been named "the year of splendor."

It is as a most important part of this year of splendor that the Tercentennial Association desires the Congress make an initial move toward nationwide celebration of these two national anniversaries.

TRADE AGREEMENTS — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 421)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

This message is submitted pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended.

Under the authority of the trade agreements legislation, the United States entered into a trade agreement at Geneva, Switzerland, on May 23, 1956, with other contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. A copy of that agreement is submitted herewith. The United States received tariff concessions from other countries on various products exported by the United States in return for tariff concessions by the United States.

On two products the United States by separate action negotiated increases in the existing rates of duty. In one case, involving certain fur-felt hat bodies, a court decision had in effect nullified tariff increases which were proclaimed a few years ago as the result of an escape clause investigation. In its peril point investigation on these hat bodies, the Tariff Commission found that the lower rates resulting from the court decision should be increased. The negotiated increases raise the rates of duty to the peril points found by the Tariff Commission, and in general restore the rates

which had been applicable under the escape clause proclamation prior to the court decision. In the other case, involving liquid sugar, there had been no peril point finding that an increase was necessary; the objective was to equalize the rates applicable to dry and liquid sugar.

In the other two cases—certain tungsten alloys and violins and violas—in which the Tariff Commission reported that increases in existing rates of duty were required, it was found that the advantages of negotiating the increases would have been outweighed by attendant disadvantages which made it undesirable to accomplish the increases by this means. Also, in the case of tungsten alloys, only one group was listed for negotiation while others, including ferrotungsten, the most important in terms of imports, was not listed. Increasing the duty on the listed alloys would thus have unduly complicated our tariff structure without adequate economic justification. For these reasons, increased rates on tungsten alloys and violins and violas were not included in the trade agreement. These considerations would not be a bar to applications by domestic producers of these products for escape clause action under the provisions of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 7, 1956.*

ENACTMENT OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT AND CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION ACT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 526, Rept. No. 2282), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7992) to enact certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act and the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

POSTAL RATES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 527, Rept. No. 2283), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11380) to readjust postal rates and to establish a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. O'NEILL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 528, Rept. No. 2284), which was referred to the House Calendar, and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9540) to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

DEFEAT H. R. 5550

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, with the administration using every possible device to promote the Organization for Trade Cooperation, we Members of Congress should utilize every opportunity to point out the dangers of the scheme to encroach upon our constitutionally delegated powers. Only by cooperative effort can we counteract the preachments of those ambitious Federal nabobs who are going forth throughout the land attempting to convince the public that Congress is short-sighted, stupid, or selfish in refusing to renounce a trust inherited from those to whom we owe the very existence of this republic.

Perhaps what Congress should have is a series of liaison offices at the White House from which to lobby for principles in which we believe. Certainly it has become the custom of the various Government departments to bring every pressure possible upon the legislative branch. In addition, the administration sends its spokesmen hither and yon in espousal of the various schemes concocted for the purpose of enabling the bureaucrats to absorb an increasing number of functions and operations, whether or not these aspirations are in conformity with the precepts of the Constitution.

The State Department has taken a particular fancy to international trade. Whereas for almost a century and a half there was no challenging the right of Congress to regulate foreign commerce, the State Department through a series of unusual manipulations gradually seized an increasing amount of this vested power and now wants to share it with diplomatic connivers from all over the world.

Various other Departments have been solicited in this bold attempt to convince Congress that it should strip itself of the prerogative specifically assigned to it by our Founding Fathers. Members of the Cabinet and their respective entourages make repeated safaris to Capitol Hill to appear before congressional committees advocating legislation that would transfer congressional duties into the greedy hands of State Department personnel.

Cabinet members and their hirelings also seize every opportunity to attempt to contradict Members of Congress on such policy matters as our attitude toward the Organization for Trade Cooperation. Speeches made by the Secretaries and Department personnel are, of course, widely publicized by public information specialists who have become part and parcel of this modern bureaucratic establishment.

I note particularly that the Secretary of Commerce is very active on speakers' platforms on the subject of the OTC. His recent speeches before the World Trade Conference in New Orleans and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in Washington were devoted almost exclusively to the promotion of the OTC. Members of Congress who have witnessed the damage created by unfair trade policies realize the danger in placing further tariff powers in the hands of the State Department. The Secretary of Commerce says in effect that our findings are not authentic.

We West Virginians have had an expensive lesson from the State Department's foreign trade policies. We have seen thousands of miners and railroad workers thrown out of their jobs because of markets lost to foreign residual oil. We know that our great chemical industry, which is centered in my district, would suffer tremendous harm without proper tariff protection. The same situation applies in the case of pottery, glass, and other industries which constitute the economy of our state. Yet the executive department is contemptuous of these circumstances in its conspiracy to effect passage of H. R. 5550, through which our abdication in the matter of foreign commerce would become complete.

I am convinced that H. R. 5550, the bill to take the United States into the OTC will experience formidable opposition in the House if it gets to the floor. It is particularly pleasing to note that a growing number of colleagues from New England and the South have become alarmed at the latest attempts to place the executive department's thumb on the scales that were created to provide a balance of

powers between the departments of the Government.

The administration is also cognizant of this attitude on the part of Congress. That is why the Secretary of Commerce and other officials of the Federal Government are being sent around the Nation taking issue with our position.

As a duly elected Representative of the people of West Virginia, I resent the administration's tactics in this regard. I think it unfortunate that the administration persists in its campaign to neutralize public opposition to the attempted further usurpation of congressional powers. I trust that every Member of Congress who recognizes the dangers involved in State Department foreign trade policies will be on guard until H. R. 5550 is pigeonholed or defeated. Meanwhile, we must continue to resist the deplorable activity of the administration's pressurized Cabinet and the ever-growing Government lobby to which we are constantly exposed.

WALTER REUTHER

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers, and a vice president of the AFL–CIO, is a distinguished citizen of my native Detroit, of the State of Michigan, of our Nation, and of the world. He is respected and loved by the friends he has made in more than 20 years of courageous and untiring championship of the cause of labor; likewise, Mr. Speaker, as with my own father, the late Congressman John Dingell, he is known and admired for the enemies that he has made.

All over America and wherever workingmen organize or seek to organize to improve their lot throughout the entire world, Walter Reuther is respected for his idealism, his ideas, his practicality and his ability in translating the dreams of today into the realities of tomorrow, in terms of take-home pay, security on the job and increased human dignity in the shops, in the community and in the affairs of the Nation, for wage earners regardless of race, religion, color, national origin or ancestry.

Walter Reuther is also known for his high integrity and for his successful efforts in his own union and in the CIO throughout its existence to keep both organizations clean of both Communist influence and racketeering. Both these evils are equally destructive of those human values which, only this week in the observance of the 20th anniversary of the union he helped to found, he said is the real reason for the existence of his or any other union.

I would like to set forth for the RECORD some documents which make clear Mr. Reuther's position and action in fighting against crime and corruption in the labor movement.

The first of these is an excerpt from his speech at the UAW convention in 1953 in Atlantic City and the second is his keynote speech to the CIO convention in Los Angeles, Calif., in 1954.

In both utterances he stated his position and that of the UAW. It was that a determination to cleanse and keep clean the labor movement of racketeering was a condition of labor unity.

ON LABOR UNITY—EXCERPT FROM REMARKS BY UAW AND CIO PRESIDENT WALTER P. REUTHER TO THE UAW 14TH CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION, MARCH 22, 1953, ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.

What are the other things we think need doing? The CIO had a problem, a serious internal problem. Overwhelmingly, the CIO, its leadership and its membership was not communistic; yet we had a small Communist minority. We did everything in the CIO we could to get those Communist-dominated unions to clean up their own house and put their own affairs in order.

After the CIO had given them proper notice and every opportunity to straighten out their own house, and they failed, we said, "You cannot act in behalf of the Communist Party and use the good name of the CIO on your banners."

When these unions would not clean house, after due process in Cleveland, we in the CIO kicked the Communists out of the leadership of the CIO.

We look with hope at the action of the American Federation of Labor at its Miami meeting some weeks ago. The AFL looked at the New York dock situation, where racketeering and underworld influence is rampant, and said they were going to move in there.

We in the CIO don't believe the kind of labor movement we belong to can tolerate racketeering any more than we are willing to tolerate communism in the leadership of our own movement. We believe we can command the respect of the rank and file as well as the general public only if we keep these kinds of unsavory elements out of leadership.

These are some of the principles we are going to think about when we enter these negotiations. We will do everything in our power to extend the hand of fellowship to the American Federation of Labor. We hope we can get together.

EXCERPT FROM KEYNOTE SPEECH BY CIO PRESIDENT WALTER P. REUTHER, DECEMBER 6, 1954, OPENING THE CIO CONVENTION, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

We pray that such a sound, honorable and principled basis for labor unity will be possible, and we pledge to this convention that we shall do everything humanly possible to bring about such a sound, principled, and honorable basis for labor unity at the earliest possible time.

The past year has brought into sharp focus another serious problem inside the labor movement. The question of unethical and corrupt practices on the part of certain anti-social elements that found their way into the American labor movement has been called to our attention, and I am proud to be able to join with other CIO leaders in saying that the CIO has a clean labor movement. I am equally proud to say we are going to keep it that way. Just as we stepped up to the problem and the challenge and the moral responsibility of meeting the problem of communism, so we will meet this problem of corruption with the same courage and the same determination. If there is corruption in the CIO, it is in a few isolated places that we haven't found out, and when we do find it we will deal with it without fear or without favor because we will not tolerate it. To facilitate the CIO's work in this field, we have created a special committee on ethical practices, headed by our good friend, the president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, Jack Potofsky, and supported by the president of the NMU, Joe Curran, and the vice president of the United Steelworkers, Brother Jim Thimmes.

We in the CIO consider the leadership in the CIO nationally and in the leadership of any of our affiliates as a matter of public trust, as a sacred obligation and responsibility to the rank and file whom we have the privilege and the honor of representing. We respect the autonomy of our affiliated unions and we shall do everything we can to protect that autonomy. But we in the CIO are unwilling, under the slogan of autonomy, to look the other way and permit corruption to be practiced under the slogan of autonomy. A CIO charter is not a license that people hang on the wall so that they can do anything they please. A CIO charter is both a privilege and an obligation, and we say if you want the right to have the good name of CIO, then you are required to conduct yourself in keeping with the ethical and moral standards of the CIO. No one in our movement will be tolerated if they attempt to put personal gain above the welfare of the membership.

This convention, I am confident, will take action and make it crystal clear not only in the CIO, to the CIO members, but to the public generally that we in the CIO will not tolerate Communists or crooks in the leadership of our movement. We have said many times that when you find a corrupt labor leader who has taken bribes or who has carried out unethical practices relating to the administration of welfare funds, or any other trade union responsibilities, that that corrupt labor leader ought to be kicked out of the labor movement and he ought to be put in jail. But, we go farther than that. We believe that the employer who bribed the corrupt labor leader ought to occupy the next cell in the same jail. And we believe further that where insurance brokers who perform no necessary social functions in the negotiation of collective bargaining agreements as they relate to insurance programs, are guilty of unethical practices, of bribes, and kickbacks, in the corruption of labor leadership, there ought to be a third cell reserved for them so that they can put the three of them in a row, because they belong together.

We know that corruption in the labor movement comes about because these anti-social elements begin to apply the ethical standards of the business community to trade union leadership. It may be perfectly all right for a businessman to make a deal and get a kickback on insurance policies, but in the labor movement that runs contrary to the basic moral code that we believe in, and therefore we cannot tolerate it.

The American labor movement will either create machinery within its whole internal structure to deal with the problem of corruption, we will either clean the house of American labor ourselves with a stiff, strong broom—or our enemies will try to clean it with an ax in an effort to destroy or weaken the American labor movement.

I say this is the hour when labor had better step up to this responsibility with courage and take care of this problem themselves within the house of labor so that no one else will have to clean our house for us.

Mr. Speaker, I want also to enter a copy of a letter which Mr. Reuther sent to Mr. Max Greenberg, president of the Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union, CIO, on September 16, 1954, in which he directed Mr. Greenberg to correct immediately certain malpractices which had appeared in that union in connection with welfare funds and they were forthwith corrected:

TEXT OF LETTER FROM CIO PRESIDENT WALTER P. REUTHER TO PRESIDENT MAX GREENBERG OF THE RETAIL, WHOLESALE, AND DEPARTMENT STORE UNION, CIO, PUBLISHED SEPTEMBER 16, 1954

I have read with deep concern newspaper reports of obvious malpractices by certain local officials of the Retail, Wholesale, and

Department Store Union, in connection with the administration of welfare funds.

According to the reports of official hearings by the New York Insurance Department, officials of a number of local unions of your international organization have admitted to practices which cannot be condoned by any decent trade union.

Welfare funds administered by union officials are a sacred trust. The funds are set up for the specific purpose of creating security and health protection for the members of the organization and their families. It is shocking beyond words to find any single instance of these funds being used as a special financial preserve with which to enrich the officers of the union or the administrators of the welfare fund.

I have always been proud of the CIO's record of integrity, and its freedom from this or any other type of corruption and racketeering.

Through the years, the Congress of Industrial Organizations has adopted, and reaffirmed as CIO policy, a statement of ethical practices, which asserts, "the determination of the CIO and its affiliated unions to wage war on unethical practices within and without the trade-union movement."

That statement of CIO policy will not be—so long as I serve the CIO as its president—a deadletter statement. I have said time and again that I will fight corruption wherever I find it—within or without the labor movement.

I believe that the union official who preys upon the rights or funds of union members has no place in the labor movement and should be sent to jail.

It has been a matter of deep concern to me that during the past 3 days there has been no statement from you or other responsible officials of the Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union concerning these shocking revelations and admissions before the insurance department of New York State.

It is clear that this situation requires prompt remedial action by the international officers of your union.

The national CIO in years past has concerned itself with Communist domination of affiliated unions. The national CIO has the same moral obligation to concern itself with evidence of racketeering in its affiliated unions.

So far as the CIO is concerned, we do not recognize any autonomous right to practice the corruption of crime or communism. We in the CIO cannot and will not tolerate crooks or Communists in the labor movement.

Accordingly I call upon you, as president of the Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union, to take prompt remedial action against the local officials involved in the malpractices disclosed at these hearings. I am placing this matter on the agenda of the meetings of the executive committee and the executive board of the Congress of Industrial Organizations at our headquarters in Washington on October 4–5; and I will expect a full report of the corrective action taken by your union against individuals named in these hearings and any others against whom there is a legitimate charge of racketeering or maladministration.

On the basis of that report the executive committee and the executive board of the Congress of Industrial Organizations will make a determination as to their future course of action in this matter.

This position was restated again in his report to the CIO executive board February 24, 1955, an excerpt of which I enter in the RECORD. By this time his proposition of a determined fight against racketeering had become a part of the merger agreement between CIO and AFL.

THE QUESTION OF CORRUPTION

(From The New Beginning, an address by President Walter P. Reuther, February 24, 1955, to the CIO executive board, discussing the merger agreement between the CIO and AFL which was subsequently approved by the CIO executive board)

We come to section (g) of the agreement dealing with the question of corruption. I don't want to belabor that. On repeated occasions the CIO has demonstrated its dedication to keeping the labor movement free and clear of corruption and communism and all other forms that find expression in the kind of evils, the kind of destruction of the moral and social and ethical values that we believe in. We said that we would fight corruption without fear or favor. We said that a charter granted to an autonomous union is not a license that you hang on the wall and go out and do as you please in advancing the selfish interests of people in positions of leadership and power. A charter is not only a grant of rights, it is also a fixing of obligations and moral and social responsibilities. We made this very clear, and at the CIO convention in Los Angeles I said that if the labor movement did not create internal machinery to clean up its own house with a stiff broom, then we could get repressive legislation, and antilabor forces would do the job with a meat ax and try to destroy our labor movement in the process.

We have laid down in this document the constitutional declaration that we are determined to keep the united labor movement free of corruption and racketeering, free of Communist penetration, and we provide appropriate internal machinery to implement those principles. The agreement is very specific. It says, "The merged federation shall establish appropriate internal machinery with authority effectively to implement this constitutional determination to keep the merged federation free from any taint of corruption or communism."

Now, I have not been around as long as some of our old friends here today, but I have been around long enough to know that keeping the labor movement clean is not an easy job. We live in a society in which the acquisition of material wealth and personal gain is considered the measurement of success. In a society with an acquisitive philosophy it is perfectly understandable how a labor movement can become corrupted, and it becomes corrupted when you apply within the labor movement the standards of personal conduct that are accepted as perfectly proper in the business community. When a businessman makes a fast million dollars, he is looked to as a real sharp, successful businessman. But when a labor leader makes a fast buck, he is corrupt. In a society in which getting ahead in the world and accumulating material wealth and making personal gain—when that is the measurement of your success, when those are the moral standards, when those are the social values by which you measure people in our society, it is understandable that the impact of that philosophy obviously has a bearing upon the labor movement.

Therefore, let us understand that it will clearly require bold courage to cleanse the labor movement of corruption, and it will require eternal vigilance to keep it clean. It is not an easy job, and if you think a united labor movement is going to mean we can sit back and say we have the declaration, we have the machinery, the job is won, you are deluding yourselves. This is a matter of constant struggle and vigilance because it means fighting little compromises that lead to big compromises, and big compromises to corruption. The most corrupt unions in the old labor movement didn't get that way overnight. It is not a conscious process. It is a process of little compromises, cutting corners here and cutting corners there until finally the values are so confused that people are going down the wrong road. We have the tools but they need to be used with courage.

I think I know something about the forces that we will have to meet, but I think the job can be done. I think there is a lot of good will in the AFL. There are a lot of honorable people in the AFL leadership, and I think with the leadership that is in the AFL, in cooperation, in good faith and good will with the leadership of the CIO, we can meet this problem, although it will be difficult and it will challenge the best that we have within us. I think, however, that we are equal to that challenge.

On the question of structure, I think that we have laid the basis for a sound structure within the united labor movement. Section 3 provides that there shall be created a Council of Industrial Organizations. That will be a body to which any industrial union may affiliate. It means that CIO industrial unions, it means that unions in the AFL who are industrial in character, can belong. That will be the machinery within the united organization through which we can coordinate and develop the kind of practical working liaison between the industrial unions dealing with their common problems.

The scope of the activities of that council is a matter which we can determine. It depends on the resources we want to put into it. It depends upon what we think its proper functions ought to be. That is a matter that we can talk out among ourselves and I think work out an agreement and a meeting of the minds.

In nominating Mr. George Meany as president of the merged labor movement at the AFL–CIO convention, December 5, 1955, in New York City, Mr. Reuther stated his position again in this matter, and I would like to enter that excerpt from his nominating speech.

EXCERPT FROM SPEECH BY WALTER P. REUTHER, PRESIDENT, UAW, NOMINATING GEORGE MEANY FOR PRESIDENT OF AFL–CIO, DECEMBER 5, 1955, NEW YORK CITY

Through years of dedicated service he has won the loyalty and the respect and friendship of millions of workers throughout our great country. He is a man with great courage and deep conviction, a man of intelligence, a man of courage and integrity. He loves justice, but he hates injustice and all forms of tyranny. His has been the strong and clear voice speaking out against racial intolerance and discrimination in our national life. His has been the voice warning labor that it must clear its house of corruption and those who would compromise the ethical and moral values which have symbolized the greatness of our free labor movement. He has made an outstanding contribution not only in America, but in the world labor movement. He has served as a vice president of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, and in that capacity has made a great contribution mobilizing forces of the free world in the struggle against the vile, ugly, and immoral forces of Communist tyranny. His was among the earliest voices in the ranks of labor urging unity, making it understood that no one should have a vested interest in division and disunity. He understood from the very beginning that the whole labor movement transcends in importance the interests of any section of the labor movement, even though it may be your own section. He believed within the family of a united labor movement there would be worked out a proper, harmonious, and con-

structive relationship between both craft and industrial unions, both being recognized as equal and necessary, both having a great deal more in common than they have in conflict.

In Look magazine, February 28, 1956, Mr. Reuther said:

THE UAW IS CLEAN OF RACKETEERING

(Statement by Walter P. Reuther, UAW president, to Look magazine, February 28, 1956)

The problem raised by Look magazine in its current issue is one that must receive and is receiving the most serious and grave attention of responsible elements in the American labor movement.

The UAW is proud of its record in this respect. It has been kept clean of all racketeering and other forms of corruption. We are going to keep it that way.

The only irregularity on the part of a CIO union in this area during the history of my presidency of that organization was corrected as soon as the CIO officers had knowledge of it by prompt and vigorous action. This was the case of a local union of retail workers in New York City where misuse of welfare funds was brought to light. As CIO president, I directed officers of the international union to correct the situation within 48 hours and when they failed to do so, the CIO itself acted promptly and effectively.

It is true that the officers of international and national unions affiliated to the AFL–CIO have the first responsibility in keeping their unions clean. When they fail to act, however, it is the responsibility of the officers of the parent organization to protect the welfare of the members of all AFL–CIO unions against the misuse and abuse of its reputation and good name.

Any such action must be based on facts—not hearsay. But when the facts are there, the officers of the AFL–CIO have the responsibility to take action with courage and conviction through the machinery created for that purpose—the ethical practices committee of the executive council. The ethical standards set up in the AFL–CIO constitution must be applied equally to all unions without fear or favor, regardless of size or influence.

Although I am not a member of the ethical practices committee, I was one of those who pressed for its establishment as an integral part of the merged organization. It has had and will continue to have my full support and cooperation in eliminating any corruption that exists within the labor movement.

Leadership in the American labor movement must be considered a sacred trust and there must be no place or tolerance for either crooks or Communists.

The autonomous rights of every affiliated union must be respected and protected. However, autonomy must not be used by affiliated unions to shield corrupt practices nor must the leadership of the merged labor movement use autonomy as a convenient excuse for inaction and indecision.

It was on the initiative of Mr. Reuther that the applications of two unions for affiliation with the industrial union department of the AFL–CIO, of which Mr. Reuther is president, are being held up because a question of racketeering in their ranks has been raised, as shown by a New York Times news report of March 16, 1956, in which Mr. Reuther said, "We are going to keep this department clean." I insert the text of that item at this point in my remarks:

LABOR UNIT DELAYS ENTRY OF TWO UNIONS

WASHINGTON, March 15.—A unit of the merged labor movement questioned today the ethics of two unions.

The executive board of the industrial union department, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, held up their membership applications until it was determined whether the applying unions' ethical practices conformed with the principles of the federation's constitution.

"We are going to keep this department clean," said Walter P. Reuther, IUD president, at a news conference after the board's first meeting.

He refused to identify the two unions.

The IUD perpetuates in symbol and practice the old CIO within the merged organization. Three applications approved today raised the total affiliates to 72 with a membership of nearly 7 million.

The three unions admitted were the Transport Workers Union of America, the Stove Mounters International Union of North America, and the American Federation of Hosiery Workers.

And finally, within the last few weeks, in speaking before the convention of the Textile Workers Union of America here in Washington on May 17, 1956, Mr. Reuther pledged his complete support to all efforts to rid the labor movement of corrupt elements. I enter this excerpt from that speech:

NO ROOM FOR CROOKS OR COMMUNISTS

(Excerpts from address by UAW President Walter P. Reuther before the Textile Workers Union convention, May 17, 1956)

I believe that the united labor movement needs to take effective and determined steps to free the American labor movement of those unethical, corrupt elements inside the leadership of the unions.

I believe that the great and vast majority of the leadership of the American labor movement is composed of honest, dedicated trade unionists, people who have made great sacrifice in a personal sense to build the labor movement, but unfortunately there is a handful who have attached themselves to the labor movement, not to build the movement, not to advance the welfare of the rank and file, but to feather their own nests. I say that just as we in the CIO did a good job of cleaning Communists out of leadership, we need to do the same kind of thorough job to clean out the crooks and racketeers.

There should be no room in the leadership of American labor for either crooks or Communists, and we need to meet this challenge without fear or favor. As long as this small handful continues to corrupt and blacken our name, so long shall we be vulnerable in the eyes of the American public, so long will the reactionary political forces, who strangely enough play politics with the most corrupt elements in the American labor movement, exploit this problem and use it against us.

I believe that we need to support the efforts of George Meany at the head of our organization, and of Al Hayes as chairman of the ethical practices committee, and courageously implement the kind of program that will effectively deal with the problem of corruption and racketeering wherever we find these ugly and immoral forces, whether in small or large unions.

I have unlimited confidence that George Meany and Al Hayes with our support will and can do this kind of a job.

We ought to say to the people of America when we catch a crook inside of the labor movement, he ought to go to jail.

And when we find an employer who has bribed a corrupt labor leader, that crooked employer ought to be put in the next cell, in the same jail.

The kind of free labor movement that we believe in must make leadership a sacred trust, and not an opportunity to feather one's nest and make a fast buck. If these people want to get rich, if they want to make a fast, easy buck, that's their business, but we must insist that they do it outside of the American labor movement and not inside the American labor movement.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MCCONNELL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for 6 weeks, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. JARMAN, for 1 hour, on June 12.

Mr. DINGELL, for 15 minutes, on today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. SULLIVAN and to include two letters.

Mr. DODD.

Mr. JENNINGS and to include an address by Mr. WRIGHT, of Texas.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. JUDD and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2480. An act to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas;

H. R. 4363. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the State of New Mexico; and

H. R. 5237. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ella Madden and Clarence E. Madden.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1026. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 1053. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands in the State of Montana to the Phillips County Post of the American Legion.

S. 1244. An act to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 2498. An act to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Clatsop, Oreg., as a national monument;

S. 3332. An act to amend the Employment Act of 1946, as amended; and

S. 3920. An act to authorize the partition or sale of inherited interests in allotted lands in the Tulalip Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 6, 1956, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1866. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas V. Compton;

H. R. 8123. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; and

H. R. 9390. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 8, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1937. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and certain schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380), as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

1938. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Maj. Clarence E. Woods"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1939. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Kim Chung Hi"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1940. A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the court's opinion rendered in the case of *Tom R. Hickman and Nannie Conley and Husband, Jack Conley* v. *the United States* (Congressional No. 3-54), pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and pursuant to House Resolution 491, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1941. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1942. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1943. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress, amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917; as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1944. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1945. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1946. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOYKIN: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 221. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery in western Oklahoma; with amendment (Rept. No. 2269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOYKIN: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 9742. A bill to provide for the protection of the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge, Ga., against damage from fire and drought; without amendment (Rept. No. 2270). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1275. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to designate employees of the District to protect life and property in and on the buildings and grounds of any institution located upon property outside of the District of Columbia acquired by the United States for District sanitariums, hospitals, training schools, and other institutions; without amendment (Rept. No. 2272). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 11487. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937, as amended; without amendment (Rept. 2273). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 11488. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2274). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 11002. A bill to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 2275). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4697. A bill to amend the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act of the District of Columbia of 1934, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2276). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 11320. A bill to amend certain laws effecting the control of narcotics in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2277). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1739. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix rates of compensation of members of certain examining and licensing boards and commissions, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2278). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Eighteenth intermediate report pertaining to the effect of Department of the Interior and REA policies on public power preferred customers (Rept. No. 2279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5712. A bill to provide that the United States hold in trust for the Pueblos of Zia and Jemez a part of the Ojo del Espiritu Santo Grant and a small area of public domain adjacent thereto; with amendment (Rept. No. 2281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 526. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 7992, a bill to enact certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act and the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2282). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 527. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 11380, a bill to readjust postal rates and to establish a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2283). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 528. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 9540, a bill to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2284). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 11489. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Institute of Architects in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2271). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4993. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain im-

provements to business property situated in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 11650. A bill to amend part III of subchapter O of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 11651. A bill to establish the principle of a basic single salary wage scale in the Canal Zone for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 11652. A bill to amend the act of December 2, 1942, and the act of August 16, 1941, relating to injury, disability, and death resulting from war-risk hazards and from employment, suffered by employees of contractors of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11653. A bill to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States courts and before United States commissioners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11654. A bill to amend section 752 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 11655. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a) to permit payment of the burial allowance where discharge requirements are or have been met through a change by competent authority; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 11656. A bill to amend the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, to authorize the Hawaiian Homes Commission to approve and guarantee additional loans to Hawaiian Homes' homesteaders by private financing institutions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 11657. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a wife or widow, or a dependent husband or widower, may be entitled to benefits thereunder even though not actually living with the insured individual at the time required for entitlement to such benefits if found to have been abandoned or deserted by such individual; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 11658. A bill relating to certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines (excluding coal and lignite mines) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 11659. A bill to amend Public Law 587, 83d Congress, by authorizing the Federal Government to defray the cost of assisting the Klamath Indians to prepare for termination of Federal supervision; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 11660. A bill to amend Public Law 587, 83d Congress, by deferring implementation requirements and requiring report by management specialists; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 11661. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, to provide that, with respect to beach-erosion projects, the deposit of sand fill shall be considered to be construction under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. R. 11662. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 11663. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 11664. A bill to enable the people of Alaska to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York (by request):

H. R. 11665. A bill to amend section 28 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 11666. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to provide for the payment, to States and political subdivisions with respect to low-rent housing projects, of certain additional amounts in lieu of taxes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 11667. A bill to amend paragraph 1530 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the classification and rate of duty on certain footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 11668. A bill to provide for an additional payment of $165,000 to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., toward the cost of the water filtration plant constructed by such village; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 11669. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada acting for the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALEY (by request):

H. R. 11670. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Ottawa Tribe of Indians in the State of Oklahoma and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 11671. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 11672. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Peoria Tribe of Indians in the State of Oklahoma and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 11673. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall establish a national cemetery in Fort Reno, Okla., on certain lands presently under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 11674. A bill to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 11675. A bill to provide for the donation of certain cotton and cotton materials to States for use by needy persons; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. J. Res. 643. Joint resolution to provide for an investigation of the need for a geophysical institute in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. Res. 529. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 2279, a report of the Committee on Government Operations on the effect of Department of the Interior and Rural Electrification Administration policies on public power preference customers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. Res. 530. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of racketeering in labor unions within the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred, as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting that appropriations be expedited and that any additionally needed enabling legislation to bring into being the main upper Allegheny Dam and other uncompleted units of the Allegheny Valley flood-control system, etc.; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of the rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 11676. A bill for the relief of Sarah Reid (Maria Luise Brenten); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 11677. A bill to provide for the advancement of Maj. Gen. Hanford MacNider, USAR (retired), to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLT (by request):

H. R. 11678. A bill for the relief of Myer Leveen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 11679. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Russo Roca Marsilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 11680. A bill for the relief of Ahm Me Cha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. Res. 531. Resolution to refer the bill H. R. 5461 to the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

1120. Mr. CRUMPACKER presented a petition of Mr. R. M. Morris, of Elkhart, Ind., and other residents of Elkhart County, Ind., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows and orphans, which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Racine Education Association Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Monday night, May 28, 1956, it was my privilege to speak at the Racine Education Association dinner at Racine, Wis. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I made on that occasion be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY STRESSES EDUCATION AS KEY TO PROGRESS; URGES SEAWAY FUNDS, SUPPORT OF ENLIGHTENED EFFORTS AGAINST WORLD COMMUNISM

(Excerpts of address by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, Chippewa Falls, before the Racine Education Association dinner at Racine, Wis., May 28, 1956)

Good evening, I'm delighted to be here.

I'm always inspired, and challenged, when the opportunity arises to speak before an educational group, such as is assembled here tonight.

You, and the multitude of educators you represent, play a unique role in the development and progress of our citizens and our country.

Our future hinges, to a great degree, on your success in the field of education.

EDUCATION LEADS THE WAY

As you so well know, education leads the way for each of us, and for all mankind. Its guiding light pierces the dark mystery of the unknown—in the physical and the social sciences. By knowledge, we find a path among the "sticks and stones" of life's travels and among the world's dilemmas.

Our teachers and schools make an outstanding contribution to the welfare of our Nation. Our educational institutions give us scholars, teachers, scientists, engineers; undergird our industrial and technological progress; sustain our cultural pursuits; contribute knowledge through research in chemistry, biology, physics, yes, or—in psychology, sociology and the other social sciences, as well as in all other fields essential to our national progress.

Upon the graduates of our educational system we depend for the skill and vision to guide us through the future, to hurdle obstacles in our path, and to strengthen the foundation for continued peace and progress.

WE NEED MATURE AMERICANS

Upon your shoulders lies the burden of developing truly educated citizens. They must not simply be people with vast stores of facts, but, far more important, as you know, people who are genuinely mature—physically, socially, intellectually mature—grownup adults in every sense of those words.

REDUCE THE NUMBER OF IRRESPONSIBLES

You and I can see occasional instances of immature people around us—people who have unfortunately not fulfilled their adult responsibilities. These include shiftless people, lazy people, negligent parents; yes, these grown-ups include lawbreakers and alcoholics.

These are immature people whom society has failed and who, regrettably, have failed society. They are fortunately few in number, but they are nonetheless a drag on society, a burden wherever they live.

You, as builders of men and women, are determined, as I am, to help reduce the numbers of such unfortunates in time to come. It is your aim to develop the finest type of citizen—wide-awake, well-informed, responsible, wholesome, constructive.

A bit later on, I shall refer briefly to the problem of law enforcement and juvenile delinquency.

BUILDING CHARACTER, BUILDING AMERICA

But for now, I simply want to point up the contrast of the decent mass of law-abiding, worthy Americans versus the unfortunate ne'er-do-wells whom we occasionally see.

Real education, real building of character—that is your goal and mine.

But now let me turn to another phase—the building of America—building it, for example, through the St. Lawrence Seaway, the type of outstanding project which all thinking Americans support.

COMPLETING THE SEAWAY JOB

Happily, the major battle for recognition of the value of the seaway is won. The Congress has authorized its completion and acted for the deepening and improvement of the connecting channels to 27 feet, for the accommodation of deep-sea vessels the whole 2,300-mile route. Our major task now is to secure the actual channel funds, in accordance with the authorization, and then to negotiate the toll arrangements for the liquidation of the seaway's costs.

There will be tremendous economic benefits. The seaway power phase is estimated to turn out 12.6 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity a year—more than all the powerhouses of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The trade channels, it is estimated, will carry from 50 to 85 million tons of cargo annually—far more than the Panama Canal.

This reflects only to a smaller degree, the tremendous effects, direct and indirect, which the seaway will have for us.

EXPAND WATERWAY'S CAPACITY

We cannot, however, wash our hands of this and say, "We have won the congressional battle. Now let somebody else carry out the project."

The President, my colleagues, and I in the Congress have fought too hard and long to abandon thought of this tremendous tradeway, just when it is reaching its final stages of completion.

Our effort now must be directed toward resolving the problems of completing the job. You can depend on it; I will be in there pitching: until the last shovel of earth is moved; until each lock is open; until our harbors have been deepened and improved; and until our trade is expanded to the capacity of the seaway.

For example, one problem that we face is that the Welland Canal on the Canadian side of the border is going to be a seaway bottleneck—a serious limit on traffic capacity unless and until its existent locks are doubled.

And here on our side, a great many harbors must be deepened and improved so as to assure fullest seaway benefits.

FULLY UTILIZING THE SEAWAY

The real success of the seaway will depend, to a large degree, on how successfully we utilize this less expensive route to domestic and foreign markets. We must establish new transportation and trade patterns to take advantage of the fullest opportunities offered by this farsighted project.

We must develop and construct a more modern Great Lakes merchant fleet, sailing under American flags and American trade. We must modernize ports and terminals, warehouse facilities, and sidings.

SELLING THE SEAWAY

This requires a selling job. We must sell the seaway to our companies, industries, and people. All must be aware of the tremendous opportunities that will be opened by the seaway.

Agriculture, manufacturing, and other industries—and the related services—can expect to share in the economic boost that will result from full utilization of the seaway.

This will result in a development of existing industry and the movement of new industry into our State. Tremendous opportunities will open in terms of more jobs, better payrolls, and accelerated industrial development. Too, the construction and improvement of highways, railroad, and even airlines to handle the increased traffic will be an economic "shot in the arm."

SEAWAY WILL CONTRIBUTE TO FOREIGN POLICY

The seaway also can contribute greatly to the new philosophy of our international relationship. This new concept means trade instead of aid, for friendly countries. It means meeting the economic challenge of communism in this so-called era of competitive coexistence.

RED DANGER GREATER

Unfortunately, as we are all so well aware, the dark cloud of communism still looms large on the horizons of the free world. Our domestic and foreign policies must—unhappily—continue to be based on combating the serious threat of communism.

There is no turning back in our efforts. There must be no slackening. The danger today is actually greater, because it is more subtle; the Reds are more cunning, more adroit, more skillful, less crude and heavy-handed in their aggression.

Our way must prevail against theirs.

THE INDIVIDUAL—THE STRENGTH OF THE NATION

Our way of freedom, our search for truth, our valuing of human dignity—all this must prevail.

The great strength of our Nation, of course, is the development of the individual, possessing a rich heritage of human ingenuity, imagination, and character.

This is in sharp contrast to the Communist climate, in which—as Khrushchev at one point inadvertently admitted—the price of nonconformity is a bullet in the head.

The recent attempt of Soviet leaders to heap all the crimes of Communist policy upon the dead Stalin has resulted in failure. Exploding the myth of Stalinism—changing him from a godlike symbol to an ogre of infamy, crime, murder, is supposed to cleanse the bloody hand of the Kremlin. But it will not. Stalinism still lives on. The current regime of communism is built upon, and carries on, the traditional brutal concepts and tactics of the deposed villain.

As for ourselves, fortunately, for the most part, we have succeeded in blocking the efforts of communism to militarily take over new lands of the world. However, we must continue to stave off these aggressive tactics.

REAPPRAISE OUR POLICIES TOWARD NEUTRALS

As necessary our policies must be constantly adapted to meet new Soviet economic, military, and political challenges. We must reappraise, for example, our policies in dealing with the vast uncommitted, neutralist bloc of the world—a bloc ably and eloquently described by our current visitor, Dr. Sukarno, the President of Indonesia. He is learning about us, and we, fortunately, are becoming

better acquainted with him and his people and their way of viewing the world.

Like us in 1789, they want to avoid what they feel are entangling alliances.

But unlike us in 1956, they do not realize that they are menaced actively, just as we are menaced today, but as we were not back in the days of our colonial isolation.

Somehow we must more effectively bridge the gap between our thinking and theirs. But this will take patience and understanding not as some people immaturely recommend—bluster or threats or attempted orders to them.

These neutralists are proud, independent peoples, deserving respect and understanding. That is what they are entitled to, and that is what they will receive from us, just as we, in turn, expect and hope for fair respect and understanding from them—from India and Ceylon, and Burma, and Indonesia, and the other neutral powers.

This can, indeed, come about.

CHALLENGE TO NATO

So, too, the challenge to NATO, now only a military alliance, to become a real political and economic instrument of the free world, offers great promise.

If this is successful with NATO, then SEATO—the alliance of South Asian nations—may also similarly operate effectively against communism in the political and economic sphere, as we are hoping it may be able to in time to come.

In other words, our foreign policy is not and will not be rigid or frozen. Rather we must be flexible and adaptable. That doesn't mean that we will compromise it or abandon principle. But it does mean that we recognize that the world scene is changing with breathtaking speed.

As you know, we have military security pacts with more than 45 other nations.

We must be realistic, however, by acknowledging that pacts are only as binding as the good faith of the member nations, and only as they are capable of fulfilling their commitments.

CRITICAL TIMES AHEAD

We face critical times ahead. Currently, the Mediterranean area has become a particular flaming caldron. For example:

1. Algeria resounds with gunshots and the cries of dying men.

2. The Middle East is a tempest—with Israelis and Arabs sniping at each other.

3. Cyprus is aflame with nationalistic riots, resulting in serious bloodshed.

We must, of course, be alert to dangers, not only in the Middle East, but all around the world—in Asia, Latin America, Europe.

To cope with the dangers, we must maintain a strong America. This means that we must iron out whatever shortcomings exist—in domestic or international fields—to meet the present and future demands of our country.

WE NEED OPEN MINDS

Sound action will require sound thinking—the thinking of open minds, enlightened minds—not closed, bigoted, immature minds—not minds which fail to realize that we are living in the 20th century, in the jet-atomic age, when we are but 6 hours away from Soviet bomber bases.

You realize these facts, of course, but there are some Americans—yes, Americans who are nominally very well educated, who have nonetheless closed their minds to the facts of life. They ignore the facts which emerge from the ominous results of the H-bomb test explosions in the Pacific—explosions of perhaps 15 million tons of TNT power. They ignore the significance of jet flights of 1,500 miles per hour speed. They ignore the meaning of the Nike sites around Milwaukee.

And so we need to strengthen American education—adult education and youngsters' education.

We Americans cannot expect to play our full role in world affairs, or to be strong in our domestic affairs, if we fail to adequately solve such problems as now face education in our local communities. Many of our areas, as you know so well, have found themselves continually handicapped by the shortage of trained teachers, and a lack of modern classrooms and equipment.

But, as you well know, too, there is legislation pending in the Congress which may have a vital effect upon our educational sytem and the future role of education in America.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION IS CONTROVERSIAL

The topic, of course, is controversial. As we are all aware, many of the folks in our own State—right here in Wisconsin—feel very strongly about some of the features of the present bill before the House of Representatives.

Principally, of course, I think we can all agree that, whatever steps are taken, we must be careful—very careful—to prevent the long arm of Federal control from extending into our school system.

Second, we know that there have been objections as regards the increased cost of the program, if administered through the Federal Government.

None of us, of course, want unnecessary increases in our already heavy load.

KEY QUESTIONS ON EDUCATION

So, the questions are: How fundamentally is necessary Federal construction aid? Can the States be relied on to meet their challenge? Are the States now doing all that they should do, or are they passing the buck to Uncle Sam? And—Could the States pay our underpaid educators more, without undue financial hardship to the respective State treasuries?

These are far from easy questions to answer. But answer them we must.

And our general task is clear. We must get the facts. We must iron out the difficulties and the misunderstandings. We must weigh a program which will not jeopardize the independence of our school system, and yet which will provide adequately for the education of our children, particularly in very low income States.

How do we do this? That is the challenge which will soon confront the Senate Education and Labor Committee.

A few of the facts of the situation are:

1. We do need new and more schools, and we need them badly.

2. We must provide these in the most economical manner.

3. We must achieve this without Federal control of our school system.

In effect, we must adhere to the fundamental principle, as outlined by President Eisenhower. That is: "Control of education should be as close as possible to parents and citizens in local communities."

CRISIS NOT TEMPORARY

The critical shortage of teachers and facilities is not just temporary. We face increasing demands on our school system, as you are aware.

According to studies made by the Bureau of the Census and other agencies, it is expected that the United States will grow from about 165 million in 1955 to about 190 million in 1965. The school-age population (ages 5 to 17) will increase from about 39 million to over 48 million—an increase of almost one-third of the present total.

OUR WISCONSIN NEEDS

In Wisconsin, for example, it is estimated that 5,975 classrooms will be needed by 1965—at an estimated cost of about $209,125,000. This is an average of $21 million per year.

We, of Wisconsin, rightly pride ourselves in our splendid school system. It is excellent, especially in comparison with that of a great many other States. It is a pacesetter—thanks to you—and you—and you. And yes, to a great and good man who recently passed on—our universally respected friend, John Callahan. God bless his immortal soul.

May we always be inspired by the wonderful innovations he devised, particularly to improve rural education.

The educational pattern in our State, and in America, of course, must constantly adapt to the needs of our changing times. There are many new requirements such as providing facilities for learning on the part of the mentally retarded, the handicapped, the emotionally disturbed, and meeting other special needs.

That includes the needs of the truant, the delinquent, the so-called troublemaker.

AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

We must carefully analyze too, the present pattern of meeting the needs of higher education—including scholarships, fellowships, loans and grants-in-aid, gifts—in addition to the students' efforts to "pay his own way." This is becoming an increasingly important problem and requires a national reappraisal.

IMPROVING RACIAL RELATIONS

We are all aware also of the difficult problem involved in racial relations, especially in the South, both in institutions of higher learning and in primary and secondary schools.

Fortunately, cool heads, sensible heads, understanding heads, will, I believe, prevail over the "hot-heads" in meeting this problem.

Integration is now the law of the land. The Supreme Court has spoken decisively and unanimously. But it has also spoken for gradualism, for steady but careful handling of the problem at the local level, under the guidance of Federal district courts. Under these circumstances, Congress would be ill advised to approve the arbitrary Powell rider to the school bill—which would instantaneously—without gradual adaptation—ban outright all funds to unintegrated schools. However well intentioned, this amendment would violate the spirit of the Supreme Court's decision, and it would probably cause an endless filibuster in the Senate, in any event, thus serving to kill the school bill, entirely.

The Yellowtail Dam Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a press release I issued yesterday concerning Senate Joint Resolution 135, the Yellowtail Dam resolution, and the vacating of the hearing before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on the nomination of Wesley A. D'Ewart as Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JAMES E. MURRAY

The article on the D'Ewart hearing and Yellowtail Dam resolution appearing in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald under the byline of Warren Unna,

staff reporter, is absolutely without foundation in fact. I am surprised that a newspaper with the reputation of the Washington Post would carry such pure fiction as a news story.

The Yellowtail Dam resolution will stand on its own merit and President Eisenhower, I am sure, will have the advice of his department heads as to whether he should sign or veto the resolution. I have not discussed the President's action on the bill with any member of his administration and no one can produce any evidence that I have done so. Certainly I would not be a party to any attempt to imply that the President of the United States would enter into a cheap political deal or horse trade as the Post terms it.

I repeat there is not an iota of truth in the allegation.

As a result of this false charge I have no choice but to vacate the hearing that had been tentatively set on Mr. D'Ewart's nomination. After the President has acted on the Yellowtail Dam resolution I will consult with members of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee as to what procedure should be followed in connection with the D'Ewart nomination.

Address Delivered by Hon. Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address delivered by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Marion B. Folsom, before the Commonwealth Club, San Francisco, Calif., on June 1, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a pleasure to meet with this club which has served as a forum for discussion of public affairs for so many years. I think most people seek something the Commonwealth Club helps to provide—new knowledge and understanding of the changing world about us.

In fact, within the life of this club over the past 53 years, there have been startling growth and change in America—growth and change unmatched by any other major country in history. In this period we have increasingly shifted from an essentially agricultural basis to an industrial basis—with all its economic and social adjustments. We have grown in population from about 80 million people to over 167 million. The number of workers has increased from about 32 million to about 64 million. In terms of constant dollars, the national product has increased more than four times. In the same terms, in actual purchasing power, the average income per man, woman, and child has more than doubled. And most important of all, in all these material advances, we have not neglected the strengthening of the freedoms and moral fiber of our self-governing society.

Nowhere has growth and change been more evident than here in California. In many ways, you in California have been in the forefront of the national advance. As business and professional men, many of you here have demonstrated the essentials of progress—imagination, hard work, a venturesome spirit, a willingness to invest funds and effort in research, in new ways of doing things, in new plants and new products. In your growth and progress, you have shown faith in forward movement. You have not been intimidated by the past; you have grasped the promise of the future.

Because the world is more complex and is changing more rapidly than ever, one thing is clear. If we are to continue to progress as a people, we must keep one eye on today's operation and the other eye on tomorrow's problem. We must not let the tide of changing conditions and new problems sweep over and beyond us. We must plan in the present to keep abreast of the future and meet new problems as they arise. In short, we must make a larger investment in those measures which give us vision and help us build for tomorrow.

The strange notion has been expressed in some quarters that the administration in Washington is interested solely in tidying up the Government and seeing that it operates smoothly and without waste. It has been suggested that the administration is standing pat and not recognizing needs and advancing new proposals to meet them—that forethought and planning are, somehow, the exclusive virtues of others.

To be sure, this administration does think that economy and efficiency are important—and I doubt that anyone will be foolhardy enough to label these qualities as sins in operating the people's business. But we believe something more. We believe that effective self-government demands imaginative and fruitful planning for human welfare in the future.

Acting on this belief, we in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are advancing a wide range of new proposals which we believe will contribute to the future well-being of the people. The administration is earnestly seeking to strengthen, to expand, and improve many of the Federal activities through which individuals may attain improved health, better education, and more economic security. To help achieve these goals, we are proposing a 24-percent increase in the Department's appropriations for the coming fiscal year, including $450 million in new legislation. And this is within the framework of a balanced budget.

This is the largest dollar amount ever sought for these activities in any one year. We are seeking this expansion because we know these programs build a firm foundation for the future. They advance the welfare of the individual human being. As the individual advances in health, education, and economic security, not only is his own life enlarged but the Nation as a whole is enriched. For progress in these fields is fundamental to progress in our expanding economy, our national security, our system of self-government, our very way of life.

In strengthening these programs, the aim is to bring to them a new emphasis, a forward look. We recognize that simply spending more money is far from the answer. We are seeking to emphasize the more constructive aspects of these programs—those activities which are most particularly concerned with the future. The proposed expansion involves new or improved research in every field in the Department. We want to explore some of the hard-core problems that have beset health, education, and welfare for many years. We want to look ahead and head off other problems before they become acute.

One of the best hopes for improving the level of health lies in constantly advancing medical research. Largely through progress in medical research, within the past 10 years the death rate has dropped more than 50 percent for pneumonia and influenza and about 73 percent for tuberculosis. The threat of paralytic polio is being lifted from millions of children. And yet, disease and disability still exact a terrible toll. Cancer, heart disease, and mental illness, for example, still present enigmas to medical science.

Federal funds for medical research, to be sure, have increased greatly in recent years. But they are still too low in relation to the need or the dramatic opportunities for the future. The administration, therefore, has asked Congress for the largest increase in funds for medical research ever recommended in 1 year. The proposal called for appropriations of $126½ million, an increase of $27½ million, for the national institutes of health, the principal research arm of the public health service. A major portion of these additional funds would be used to increase by 47 percent the Government's grants for research conducted by medical schools, hospitals, health agencies, and scientists throughout the country.

In this connection, the number of medical research grants to California scientists already has risen from 140 to 300 over the last 5 years, and the amount of these grants has increased from $1.5 million to $3.7 million.

Clearly, medical research cannot be expanded and improved without adequate laboratories and trained men to do the work. And yet, today, there is a critical shortage of modern buildings and equipment for medical research and training. We have proposed, therefore, a new emergency program of Federal grants to medical schools and other nonprofit research institutions for the construction of modern research and teaching facilities. Under this program, over a 5-year period, $250 million would be provided in grants, to be matched by the institutions. The program not only would provide more and better facilities for research but would help train more scientists and physicians to fill a critical need.

Those of you who are familiar with the Stanford Medical School in this city will know precisely what I mean. The staff is of the highest quality, and if they had more adequate physical facilities they would be able to make a greater contribution to the Nation's medical research program.

The administration's program in the field of health includes many other steps. Proposals are now pending before Congress:

To expand and improve the training of practical nurses, professional nurses, and public health personnel.

To establish a continuing national survey to develop sorely needed basic information on the nature and extent of sickness and disability in the population.

To strengthen the effort to control the pollution of streams and rivers.

To provide grants to finance special demonstration projects to develop improved methods of caring for the mentally ill.

And to encourage the expansion and improvement of voluntary health insurance to help meet the rising costs of medical care.

We are hoping for early congressional action on these and other proposals which are designed to improve the Nation's health.

One of the best examples of constructive action for the future is the Federal system of old-age and survivors insurance, one of the Nation's strongest bulwarks against human distress. It is a program built on the principle that to relieve poverty is good, but to prevent it is better. I recall that at the outset of this program many people, including many businessmen, voiced fears that the social-security system would bog down in staggering administrative costs and redtape. But today the administrative costs are remarkably low—less than 2 percent of the contributions. Fears were expressed that the Social Security System would dampen individual initiative, industry, and thrift. But today, after 20 years of Social Security,

individuals on the whole have built more economic security for themselves—through private means—than ever before.

I recall the fear that political pressures would increase social-security benefits all out of line with a sound program. But the fact is that when this administration took office, we found benefits were too low. They had failed to keep pace with wage increases and living costs.

One of the President's first recommendations to Congress was a major expansion and improvement of the old-age and survivors insurance system. Benefits were increased for everyone under the system, and protection was made available to an additional 10 million workers. Today, 9 out of every 10 American workers can look forward to social-security benefits in their retirement. Should death take the family breadwinner, 9 out of every 10 families are protected with survivors benefits.

It is important to bear in mind that the purposes of old-age and survivors insurance is to provide basic protection—an economic floor upon which workers can build additional security. In the past 20 years, private pension plans have developed rapidly, and they should continue to expand and improve. If it were not for the social-security system and private pension plans, millions of additional persons would be forced to turn today to the public assistance programs to meet their essential human needs.

This administration is following a policy of keeping the social-security system as sound and fair as possible. We look forward to continuing improvements in this program, including extension of coverage to those groups who are still excluded. But we must be especially careful that proposals for new benefits are equitable and can be soundly administered—that they are actually in accord with changing conditions of our times. And we must remember there is a limit to the social-security taxes which should be imposed on the people if we are to retain public support for the system in all the years ahead.

Despite our progress in old-age and survivors insurance, and our prolonged and unprecedented prosperity, about 5 million people in this country today are receiving public assistance. These are the needy aged, the needy blind, the totally disabled, and children deprived of parental support. Under our system of government and the concept of Christian ethics, this assistance should be provided—efficiently, equitably, and with warm consideration for the individual.

But we have a deeper duty to those receiving public assistance than the mere payment of dollars to relieve distress. For those who can benefit, we should invest in services that will help them to build toward independence and a full and richer life. These are the services on which the administration is now placing new emphasis, and they hold the promise of human and economic rewards for the future.

The administration is proposing amendments to the public assistance laws to emphasize that their purpose is to provide services designed to increase self-support and self-care when this is possible. We are asking for Federal funds to help relieve a critical shortage of workers trained to deal effectively with the basic problems of people on public assistance. And we are urging funds to support new research and demonstration projects to shed more light on the factors that cause dependency and to show in actual practice effective ways of helping people overcome dependency.

Already there have been examples which give promise of what may be accomplished with this approach. In Allegheny County, Pa., for example, a demonstration program concentrated on 285 families who had received public assistance funds for as long as 10 years continuously or intermittently. At the end of 11 months, 64 families no longer needed assistance, and 53 families no longer required as much assistance. The other 168 families were receiving vocational rehabilitation services or other special forms of aid. One supervisor and 4 trained caseworkers, whose salaries totaled about $16,000, comprised the staff of the project. The reduction in public assistance expenditures achieved during the 11 months alone was $27,960—and this saving will continue.

In New York City, a skilled welfare staff undertook a 3-year program along similar lines. There were 2,700 cases involving people who had been unemployed from 1 to 19 years. As a result of services supplied in the experiment, 616 persons were restored to independence. The saving in the actual cost of assistance has been $616,000 a year. But far more important than the saving of tax dollars is the promise of a richer life for these men and women.

One of the most striking examples of the wisdom of investing in human resources is the Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation. Under this program, the Federal Government and the States share the cost of restoring disabled persons to productive lives. A few years ago, the number of disabled persons restored to productive employment was declining. The President proposed and Congress unanimously adopted a major expansion and improvement, providing more funds, more facilities, more research, more training of personnel. Now there is a steady increase in the number of persons who are conquering the handicap of disability and finding new hope and dignity in a productive life. We are planning still further expansion and improvement in this program, which brings such rich humanitarian and economic rewards for today and for the future.

In California alone, 1,618 disabled persons were returned to employment and a self-sustaining life through vocational rehabilitation last year. These people were earning less than $186,700 a year when they started on the road to self-support. The first year after their rehabilitation, their earnings were estimated at more than $4.4 million. An unusual aspect of California's record is that 438 of those rehabilitated were receiving public relief payments as their major source of income. That is 27 percent of the total. Many others were receiving some public assistance payments.

In the Nation as a whole, more than 11,000 of those rehabilitated last year had been receiving public assistance payments. It cost about $8 million to rehabilitate this group—but it would have cost almost $10 million each year to maintain them on relief. Relief costs generally were stopped and earnings and tax payments were started, but the richest reward from this program is the conversion of misery and despair into hope, dignity, and a productive life.

Many factors must be employed to assure a bright future. None is more important than the education of children. For in education, we have at stake the quality and character of tomorrow's citizens and, thus, tomorrow's America.

A weakness in education, a failure to achieve full intellectual attainment, is more than a deep personal loss to the individual. The effects of inadequate education cannot be quarantined to a person, or a household, or a community, or a State. Poor education anywhere inevitably weakens our general welfare and retards our national progress.

In any age, it is foolish economy—penny-wise and pound-foolish—to neglect the education of children. In this age of increasing challenge to our society and our way of life, it is doubly dangerous. Surely, as we increase our investments in those programs which enrich the future, we must increase our investments in education.

One out of every four Americans today—almost 40 million—is a full-time student in school or college. We have spent some $30 billion in the physical plant for their education, and we spend about $14 billion each year to operate our educational system, from kindergarten to college. And yet, in view of the fundamental importance of education, in view of the tremendous scope of the educational system, it is a shocking fact that the Federal Government has been investing annually less than half of $1 million in research to help make our educational system more efficient and more effective.

And so this year, President Eisenhower has urged upon Congress a major increase—from about $3 million to about $6 million—in funds for operating the Office of Education. This program would increase many services now provided by the office to schools all over the country, but the bulk of the funds would be employed to provide a comprehensive and far-reaching program of cooperative educational research for the first time in our history. Most of the research would be performed at colleges, universities, and in State departments of education throughout the country. A doubling of funds for the Office of Education may seem to be a big step. But a big step is needed if we are to illuminate some of the hard-core problems that have been retarding the progress of education for many years.

One of the problems we hope to study is waste of the Nation's young talent. Every year about 60,000 of the best students drop out of high school before graduation. And of those who do graduate, about half of the students in the upper half of their class do not go on to college on a full-time basis. We want to end this waste—to find a way to keep students in school until they have reached their highest potential. We need more study and more facts on the critical problems of housing and staffing our schools and colleges. We need research to help find the way to meet the educational needs of families with low incomes. We want to study how schools, having direct daily contact with children, can help detect and prevent juvenile delinquency; how schools can help the retarded child to learn more; and how they can help the child with exceptional mental ability to make the most of it.

Our investment in the future also is short-sighted and inadequate when we fail to provide proper physical facilities for the pursuit of learning. Today, close to a million children are attending half-day school sessions because of the critical shortage of classrooms in some communities across the country. Several million other children are preparing for tomorrow's complex world under the handicap of schools that are too old, too shabby, or too cramped.

One essential fact is clear and unmistakable. The classroom shortage has got ahead of us. And the shortage is acute in many communities.

During the depression we lacked funds for school construction. During World War II materials were not available. On top of this legacy, we are now in the midst of a rapid and sustained enrollment increase which far exceeds any in our history. Every 5 minutes, day and night, a new classroom of children reaches school age. Probably more than 12 million children will be added to our school population within the decade from 1950 to 1960—a 50-percent increase.

The States and communities by themselves have not adequately met the shortages accumulated from the past and the swelling tide of new students. Certainly the States and communities have the major responsibility, and certainly they must increase their efforts. But the fact is that they have already increased their building programs notably. Six years ago, they spent about $1 billion to build 36,000 new classrooms. This year they are spending about $2½ billion to build about 67,000 classrooms. But even so, they are still falling far short of needs.

President Eisenhower for many months now has been urging enactment of a sound and effective emergency program of Federal assistance to help needy communities build more classrooms for our children. The proposal has been designed to avoid any Federal interference whatsoever with State and local control of education. The program has been anchored to the basic principle that Federal assistance should encourage even greater efforts by States and communities. It has been devised so that Federal assistance would be distributed where the needs are greatest and local financial resources are weakest, so that Federal aid would return the greatest benefit not only to the needy local districts but to the Nation as a whole.

But another issue—unrelated to the merits of the school-construction proposal itself—has become an obstacle to progress of the school bill in Congress. This is the issue of racial integration in the public schools.

The commingling of these two issues profits neither school construction nor integration. They are separate issues, and they should not be confused. The problems of integration can best be solved under the procedures and the spirit set forth in the Supreme Court's opinions. The proposal to help wipe out the classroom shortage can best be solved on its own merits.

Children cannot wait. Children of all races need schools now. If we fail to meet this emergency now, the problem will only be compounded for the future. We are hopeful that Congress will act—within the next few weeks—to help build more schools for the Nation's children.

In the meantime, the administration has moved with forethought on another aspect of education—the increasing pressure on our facilities for higher education. Within 10 years we must meet the needs of 5 students in our colleges and universities for every 3 who are there today. While higher education is the responsibility of the States, localities, and private groups and institutions, comprehensive planning on a nationwide basis is needed. To encourage a broad-scale attack on the problems of education beyond the high school, the President recently appointed a group of distinguished citizens to make studies and proposals in this field.

Our education, our health, and our economic welfare cannot be static elements of our national life. They are, in fact, always on the move—in one direction or the other. As you in California have demonstrated, our direction must be forward. For if we fail to move ahead, problems only multiply; one unanswered problem begets many others. And so there is great prudence in progressive investments that look to the future.

What Do Minneapolis People Think on Major Issues?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, some months ago I prepared and sent to each resident of my congressional district whose name was listed in the phone book a questionnaire dealing with the major controversial issues facing us today. The response, totaling almost 13,000 replies, was very gratifying and informative.

In evaluating the replies it may be helpful to know that the Fifth District of Minnesota lies wholly within the city of Minneapolis. It includes the downtown section and what is generally referred to as South Minneapolis. Like most cities, the people range in economic levels from low to considerably above average, but with the preponderance being wage earners, white-collar workers, and professional persons of moderate means.

The returned questionnaires demonstrate reassuringly that residents of my district are vitally concerned with the problems of government and are anxious to help in finding solutions to them. Nearly half took the trouble to add constructive comments alongside the checked answers, some attaching several handwritten sheets. Many added something like this: "This is the first time any officeholder ever asked my opinion on any subject." Or, "I have often thought of writing you my ideas, but never did. Your questionnaire gives me a chance to do so."

Each person was asked to indicate whether he considered himself a Democrat-Farmer-Labor, a Republican, or an Independent. I was disappointed that a smaller percentage of the Democrat-Farmer-Labors in the district replied than of the Republicans and Independents. Perhaps that was to be expected when the questionnaire was being sent out by a Congressman who is a member of the Republican Party. Or it may have been caused in part by failure to make clear that the questionnaire was being sent to all members of all parties and that the views of members of other parties than my own, or of no party, are just as welcome and as useful and helpful to me.

Even so, the percentage of returns from DFLs and Independents is sufficiently large to give a representative and reliable view of their general thinking on the issues covered.

Highly significant, it seems to me, is the high proportion of issues on which the residents of the Fifth Minnesota District, irrespective of party, are in fairly close agreement. This is particularly true with respect to foreign policy questions. They differ sharply as to how well the administration is handling our foreign relations, but they agree largely as to the policies that the country ought to follow.

This similarity in thinking is also found on most major domestic issues. For example, a large majority of both parties believes that the Taft-Hartley Act is not unfair to the workingman; and that it would be unwise to return to high rigid price supports in our farm programs.

The replies also confirm my long-standing conviction that people are more intelligent and more patriotic than the cynics give them credit for. In issues involving the security and the solvency of our country they put concern for national interest above immediate gains for themselves or their pocketbooks. This is demonstrated by the responsible way in which people of all political faiths overwhelmingly place balancing the Federal budget and debt reduction ahead of tax reduction.

The questionnaires point up a problem that people generally have been slow to appreciate fully—the financial difficulty facing many of our senior citizens. Modern medical advances give people 10 more years after retirement than they used to have. What are they to do and how are they to live in deserved comfort and freedom from anxiety?

We have a long way to go in finding adequate answers to these questions for the very persons who have been so instrumental in creating the wealth and strength and greatness our Nation has today. In good faith they thriftily made provision for their retirement, only to find out that inflation has destroyed half of the value of their savings or pensions. To many people, rising wages and prices seemed so beneficial at the time. The end results are so cruel now and so inescapable. There is no easy answer to the problem—but a better solution must somehow be found.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few of the conclusions to be drawn from the summary of replies to my 1956 questionnaire. The replies are most instructive and deserve careful study:

OPINION SURVEY, FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., 1956

Do you consider yourself:

	Number of replies	Percent of total
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	1,261	10
Republican	7,328	58
Independent	3,660	29
Not indicated	376	3
Total	12,625	100

FOREIGN POLICY

1. In general, do you approve or disapprove the way the administration is handling our foreign relations?

[Percent]

	Approve	Disapprove	No opinion
All	74	19	7
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	42	50	8
Republican	87	8	5
Independent	61	27	12

2. In general, do you approve or disapprove the way the United Nations is handling the problems it has to face?

[Percent]

	Approve	Disapprove	No opinion
All	69	21	10
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	68	24	8
Republican	70	19	11
Independent	67	24	9

3. Do you favor or oppose admission of Communist China to the United Nations?

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	13	79	8
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	21	72	7
Republican	9	85	8
Independent	20	72	8

4. In general, do you favor or oppose continued United States assistance to other countries in the free world's struggle against Communist aggression and subversion?

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	83	10	7
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	80	12	8
Republican	84	8	8
Independent	81	13	6

5. Do you favor or oppose continued United States assistance to:

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
India:			
All	66	22	12
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	69	23	8
Republican	65	22	13
Independent	68	23	9
Korea:			
All	81	10	9
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	79	14	7
Republican	83	8	9
Independent	80	12	8
Nationalist China:			
All	68	21	11
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	61	29	10
Republican	72	16	12
Independent	62	28	10
Spain:			
All	49	35	16
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	49	39	12
Republican	50	32	18
Independent	48	39	13
Yugoslavia:			
All	43	39	18
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	45	42	13
Republican	43	37	20
Independent	40	44	16

6. Do you favor or oppose continuation of the reciprocal-trade program of negotiating with other nations to lower world tariffs as a means of expanding world trade?

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	86	6	8
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	84	10	6
Republican	86	5	9
Independent	86	5	9

7. Do you favor or oppose changing our immigration laws to allow more immigrants to enter the United States?

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	32	60	8
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	28	68	4
Republican	32	60	8
Independent	36	58	6

DOMESTIC POLICIES

Farm policies

1. In general, do you approve or disapprove the way the administration is handling farm problems?

[Percent]

	Approve	Disapprove	No opinion
All	69	24	7
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	18	77	5
Republican	86	9	5
Independent	57	36	7

2. Do you favor or oppose direct Government payments to farmers who take land out of production as a means of soil conservation and reducing surpluses?

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	51	42	7
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	49	46	5
Republican	53	38	9
Independent	47	46	7

3. Do you favor or oppose a return to rigid price supports for the six basic crops (corn, cotton, peanuts, rice, tobacco, and wheat)?

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	16	74	10
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	50	40	10
Republican	8	84	8
Independent	20	72	8

Government finance

1. In general, do you favor or oppose a policy of reducing the national debt during years of prosperity?

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	93	3	4
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	88	7	5
Republican	95	2	3
Independent	93	4	3

2. Do you favor or oppose reducing taxes this year:

(a) If it means failing to balance the budget?

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	13	80	7
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	25	67	8
Republican	10	84	6
Independent	15	79	6

(b) If it means failing to make any reduction in the national debt?

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	16	75	9
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	25	63	12
Republican	13	78	8
Independent	18	74	8

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

1. Check the statement which best expresses your view of the National Labor Relations Act (Taft-Hartley law).

(a) It is unfair to the average working man: [1]

	Percent
All	11
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	34
Republican	2
Independent	19

(b) It is not strict enough in preventing monopolistic practices by some unions: [1]

	Percent
All	32
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	17
Republican	38
Independent	27

(c) It may need some changes, but overall is a good law: [1]

	Percent
All	66
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	48
Republican	71
Independent	65

[1] Columns total more than 100 percent as some checked more than one answer.

2. Do you favor or oppose legislation to impose the same restrictions on labor unions with respect to contributions for political campaigns as are imposed on corporations?

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	79	8	13
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	53	32	15
Republican	86	2	12
Independent	76	12	12

GENERAL

1. Please check the six domestic issues which cause you greatest concern today.

(Arranged according to ranking in all replies):

[Percent]

	All	Democrat-Farmer-Labor	Republican	Independent
National defense	57	54	58	57
Communist influence in the United States	57	48	63	46
Balancing the Federal budget	44	23	53	36
Corruption in Government	41	47	38	45
Provision for elderly people	39	54	36	39
Reducing the national debt	39	21	45	33
School construction	39	49	35	45
Labor-management relations	38	36	41	31
Low farm prices	37	52	33	40
Civil rights	33	40	30	39
Federal bureaucracy	32	12	36	30
Tax reductions	32	35	32	32
Cost of medical care	31	43	26	37
Highway construction	30	31	29	32
Slum clearance	27	37	23	31
Public housing	10	20	7	13

NOTE.—Figure indicates the percent of replies on which the particular issue was checked. Some checked more than 6 issues; some checked less.

2. Do you favor or oppose Federal grants to States to construct schools?

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	59	34	7
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	79	17	4
Republican	53	39	8
Independent	65	29	6

3. Do you favor or oppose increasing postal rates in order to reduce the annual post office deficit?

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	71	24	5
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	65	32	3
Republican	73	22	5
Independent	72	23	5

4. Do you favor or oppose legislation granting statehood to:

(a) Alaska:

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	81	11	8
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	86	9	5
Republican	78	12	10
Independent	84	10	6

(b) Hawaii:

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	79	12	9
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	81	13	6
Republican	78	12	10
Independent	80	12	8

5. Do you approve or disapprove of an opinion survey of this type as a means of helping a Congressman know the thinking of his constituents?

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	97	0.5	2.5
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	96	.8	3.2
Republican	97	.3	2.7
Independent	97	.7	2.3

Memorial Day Address at Annual Memorial Day Services, Post No. 591, the American Legion, Houtzdale, Pa., May 30, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to participate in the annual Memorial Day program conducted by Freeberg Post, No. 591, the American Legion, Houtzdale, Pa., at 2 p. m., May 30, 1956, at which time I delivered the principal address.

My address follows:

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SIX MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE ANNUAL MEMORIAL DAY PROGRAM, CONDUCTED BY AMERICAN LEGION POST NO. 591, HOUTZDALE, PA., MAY 30, 1956, 2 P. M.

For the past 88 years it has been our custom—on the 30th day of May—to honor the memory of those who sacrificed their lives on the altar of freedom.

Memorial Day is, therefore, a day of reverence and prayerful meditation.

Memorial Day began in the year 1868 when Gen. John A. Logan, commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, issued his famous order No. 11.

In that order he made official the example set by the women of Pennsylvania and Virginia when they decorated the graves of the Union and Confederate Army dead.

That is how Decoration Day—or Memorial Day—began.

And thus it has been ever since.

On this one day in the year we put aside, momentarily, our prejudices and our important and trivial tasks, to pay tribute to those who have successfully defended our right to think as free people.

Memorial Day is in honor of more than one million Americans who have died in combats waged since the Revolutionary War of 1775.

That is a mighty number.

It is greater than the populations of Boston, Baltimore, Cleveland, or San Francisco.

Those are the heroes of our land.

They gave everything they possessed—and we are the beneficiaries.

So we give them these few moments each year to express the gratitude that fills our hearts.

Our tribute is not lavish.

The words we use are very simple.

The poet, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, described the whole process in these lines—

"Your silent tents of green,
We deck with fragrant flowers,
Your's has the suffering been,
The memory shall be ours."

Yes, our memories extend far back into history—and they span great distances.

Our tributes—are to the Americans—who have died in all the wars of history.

That takes us back more than 180 years and through more conflicts than most of us can recall.

The mortal remains of our honored war dead lie at rest in our homeland and at far distant places.

The American dead—are buried—around the earth.

The sun never sets upon them.

More than 100,000 of them lie under the American flag in Europe and Asia.

Some 30,000 others are buried beneath the waters of the seven seas.

Many of those—are the unidentified dead—known but to God.

Their memories are perpetuated in symbolic fashion by the tomb of the Unknown Soldier erected on the green slopes of Arlington National Cemetery.

Standing before the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, one becomes aware that there are no strangers among our honored heroes.

There the inscription reads—"Here rests in honored glory an American soldier—known but to God."

There is no name upon the tomb.

The constant presence of a lone guard pacing silently, smoothly, briskly, back and forth before the tomb—day and night—signifies our Nation's mighty reverence.

The wreath at the base of the Unknown Soldier's tomb is silent except for an occasional stirring in the wind.

The Capital City in the distance is like a painted backdrop.

The tall slender spire of the Washington Monument and the domed Capitol building represent strength, vision and the law of our land.

Collectively—the whole setting stirs the blood and memories of all Americans.

This setting has great power because it reaches the innermost recesses of our hearts and makes us feel the kinship we have as fellow Americans with the Unknown Soldier.

Then comes the realization that the Unknown Soldier represents every lost comrade who gave to his country the last full measure of devotion.

Truly, there can be no unknown among our honored dead.

We can name each man clearly.

He represents the sons and brothers who have gone—all the schoolmates and comrades who joked and laughed with us.

He is each of them just resting there waiting for us to join him—as surely we shall when we have finished our earthly tour of duty.

This is truly a day of memories.

Some of them are vivid despite the passing years.

Every living man who has lost a comrade in war remembers the particular person, place, and moment of parting.

We are reminded of this when we read the lines written by the World War II soldier who described his experience on the island of Okinawa.

He recalls that following one hard battle he walked silently along the lines of American dead—just before their burial.

And later he wrote these words:

"Yes, I had known them.

"I remembered our intense conversations—our idle talk.

"I remembered their hopes, ambitions, and plans.

"When I have returned to the States there will be times when their voices shall echo across the miles of water to remind me that I had known them—to remind me that they were the price of my future."

Those were one man's memories.

Now we are living that future—in freedom, in peace, and in debt to the millions of friends who did not come back with us.

We are indebted also to the many others who did return—suffering the wounds of war.

Having this special day—this Memorial Day—makes it easier for us to remember those to whom we are indebted.

Surely nothing else in our daily lives can sharpen our recollection or appreciation as clearly as does Memorial Day.

We remember the victories because we were there to cheer and to celebrate the battles won.

Those were the battles for which we took credit.

But if we think that the victories were ours alone, then we have forgotten and our eyes have failed to see the men for whom the poet, Alfred Noyes, spoke when he wrote these lines:

"God, how the dead men grin by the wall,
Watching the fun of the victory ball."

What of the victory?

Have we won it with no strings attached?

Unfortunately not.

There is no absolute victory.

Because the transition to peace is not easy nor is it final.

We who have fought America's wars brought back with us the memories of our tortuous struggles up the steep road to victory.

And we remember those who were lost on the way.

We express eternal gratitude for their spirit, their courage, and their brawn, which enabled us to gain our goal.

Without them we could not have gained victory.

Without this hard-earned victory we would not be enjoying peace today.

We would not have saved our freedom except for the sacrifices of our fallen comrades.

The solemn atmosphere of Memorial Day reminds us of our eternal obligation to these honored dead.

Do we pay our debt to them in full, merely with our thoughts, our flowers, and our eulogies?

The answer to those questions is that the debt is never fully repaid.

The value of a single life cannot be measured with praise, flowers, or monuments.

Only through most worthy deeds can we express in small degree our humbleness and devotion to those who gave so much, so that we could retain the right to live in freedom.

The men we honor on this Memorial Day represent a true cross section of the America we love and cherish.

Even though we cast them in the single role of the dead, they were the vibrantly living youth of our land.

They were the boys who came from our cities, towns, and local neighborhoods; from our schools, churches, and playgrounds.

They were from families rich and poor.

They were the educated and the self-taught.

They were the Protestants and the Catholics, the gentiles and Jews, the native sons and the foreign born.

They were as different as you and I, but in the final analysis they were fellow Americans.

They had the same fine qualities of courage and loyalty.

They fought shoulder to shoulder with us to defend American security, honor, and freedom.

Because of that powerful unity in purpose and strength, binding all the men of our fighting forces, we were able to defeat the enemies of our land.

As a result today we are enjoying continued freedom.

Because of this freedom on this Memorial Day we are paying loving tribute to those who did not return.

But what of the future?

Is our security as a nation assured forever?

Frankly, freedom can never be taken for granted.

We must keep on guarding and fighting for it constantly.

We must remain ever alert to the call to duty—always willing to pay the price of freedom.

Most of us remember 3 ghastly wars waged for freedom within the past 39 years—World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict.

As a result of these devastating wars we know that dictatorships can never be trusted.

Yes, we know too well that we dare not leave American ideals unguarded.

We know we must protect them boldly, positively, and will full awareness of the constant threats to our liberties—otherwise we fall victims to aggression—as have so many other nations of the world.

Truly—freedom is at a premium today.

There are nearly 3 billion people living on the face of the earth.

Less than half of the world's population enjoy individual liberties, which are the birthright of every American.

Those millions now living in virtual slavery have been deceived, overpowered by ruthless foreign aggressors.

Their pitiful plight is a warning so clear and so terrible that we dare not ignore it.

What has happened to the enslaved peoples of the world can happen to us unless we exert constant vigilance in guarding our precious liberties.

These should be our thoughts on this Memorial Day of 1956.

They should impress upon us the costly price of our freedom purchased in the blood of over a million American patriots.

On this day of memories we can hear the voices of those men, reminding us that we knew them and that we should not forget the great contribution they made in freedom's cause.

Finally, on this Memorial Day we should think more clearly of the past and of the future filled with challenges to the American way of life.

With hearts filled with loyalty and gratitude for the legacy of liberty and freedom, let us resolve on this Memorial Day to keep faith with those who gave their all in defense of Old Glory and who by their sacrifices have made it possible for us to utter the prayerful exclamation:

"Thank God, I am an American."

Seventy-fifth Anniversary of Thorp Methodist Church, Thorp, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on May 27 it was my privilege to speak at the 75th anniversary of Thorp Methodist Church, at Thorp, Wis., at which people of different faiths gathered. It was a great occasion, at which many oldtimers came from near and yonder to attend the little church. I am happy, at the request of those who were present, to ask unanimous consent that the remarks which I made on that occasion be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY STRESSES NEED FOR STRONG, SPIRITUAL FAITH TO COPE WITH NEW PROBLEMS OF ATOMIC-NUCLEAR AGE—URGES CHURCH-MINDED AMERICANS TO WAR ON IGNORANCE, PREJUDICE, INDIFFERENCE

(Excerpts of address delivered by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Chippewa Falls, at 75th anniversary of Thorp Methodist Church, Sunday, May 27, 1956, at Thorp, Wis.)

I am happy to be here today.

I deem it a real privilege to join you in this inspiring celebration of the 75th anniversary of your church.

It is always gratifying to observe progress in the spiritual world. This is one of the most basic fields of human endeavor, in which we need to maintain full strength to meet the needs of the atomic-nuclear age.

ROLE OF CHURCHES ACROSS THE LAND

The hundreds of thousands of churches, of all denominations, erected across our great land are symbols of the "Living Faith in God" of the American people.

Dedicated to the higher things of spirit, we have learned that a church is not just an architectured mass of stone, cement, brick, steel, wood, or glass.

The real church is the living spirit of God within each of us.

Ultimately, in time, the mortar and stone will crumble. But the spirit of God, breathed into human life, will live on forever.

It is refreshing for a few hours, to withdraw from material problems, and to meditate upon the enduring values of spiritual life.

Here, in the sanctuary of God, we have the opportunity to explore spiritual problems; and to commune with our souls, with God, and with each other.

SIGNIFICANT CHALLENGE: FULFILLING OUR CREED

One of the most significant challenges for each of us, however, is the problem of relating our spiritual lives to the realities of the outside world.

We face the need for demonstrating modes of conduct which reflect characters of high-spirited principle.

Faith is not a thing apart. What a man really believes, be it good or evil, will be reflected in everyday acts of living.

"By a man's works, ye shall know him."

By the deeds of the members of the Thorp Methodist Church, this community has been enriched. And the name of this church has been honored, through three-fourths of a crowded century, crowded with service to God and man.

STRONG FAITH IN 1956

So, too, the critical year of 1956 is not a time for mere superficial gestures in religious life. We live in a crucial age in the progress of mankind in which the utmost faith, the most profound religious and spiritual understanding, are required.

The church has provided us with great and much-needed source of inner strength, wisdom, understanding to cope with the tremendous problems facing us.

PROGRESS BROADENED HORIZONS

The scientific and technological progress of the world has broadened our outlook, our view, our horizons.

Long ago, man often was hemmed in by the boundaries of his local community, or of his country.

Now, we are familiar with all the areas of the world. Indeed, we are peering curiously into "outer space"—millions of light years away. Soon we will have earth-satellites in the sky—to record the mysteries of the universe.

OUR NATIONAL ATTAINMENTS

Meanwhile, as a nation, here at home, we are making tremendous strides, of course. We possess streamlined automobiles, push-button homes, TV, radar, and supersonic air-travel.

We have changed the face of the earth—by moving mountains, and redirecting the course of rivers.

For example, during the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway—mountains of earth—billions of cubic yards—have been displaced; islands have been removed or cut up; the gigantic flow of river waters has been changed and controlled; a river stairway of locks is being built to lift ocean vessels up the 600 feet between the ocean and the Great Lakes.

We have harnessed atomic and nuclear power—first, for war; and now, we hope for peace.

RELIEVING MAN'S TENSIONS

We have harnessed the mightest forces of nature. But we have yet to harness and put to constructive use the mightiest forces in man himself.

Peace of mind for man, relief from tensions, freedom from worry and anxiety—all this cannot come from men's push-buttons. They must instead come from men's hearts and souls, attuned to the everlasting leadership of God.

THE MIRACLES OF PROGRESS

In the material world, the great advances of today are what seemed, yesterday, to be miracles—just wild flights of the imagination of our prophets and dreamers.

Tomorrow, there will be even greater and more wonderful discoveries.

Yet, we need to realize: "None of this is new." Atomic and nuclear power has existed since God created Heaven and Earth.

EACH NEW AGE UNVEILS MYSTERIES

The people of each new age, however, are discovering more of the mysteries of the universe. Within the potential of the world about us, I believe, there are even greater miracles to be discovered by succeeding generations. Time and progress will unveil these new mysteries.

THE CHALLENGE TO MAN

For each man, the challenge is, within his lifetime, to adjust to the historical era in which he finds himself.

He must mature, as a human being.

He must develop an intellectual and spiritual understanding of himself in relation to the changing world, and he must establish a relationship with God.

THE STRENGTH OF PRAYER

This is not a simple task. It can be accomplished only with the utmost of sweat, study, thought, imagination, and above all, prayer.

Faith, without communion with God, is nonexistent.

We need prayer—the Lord's Prayer, and the voice of our own hearts—rising to God in the spirit of humility, compassion, and love. This means all men in all walks of life—whether you be a farmer, mechanic, storekeeper, musician, and yes, even—or especially, a man in political life.

POLITICS AND RELIGIOUS FAITH

Unfortunately, many people doubt that there is an intimate relationship between politics and religious faith.

However, I can assure you that—to a great many of us—a spiritual faith is a tremendous reserve of strength upon which we must often call.

Our great President, Dwight Eisenhower, often has emphasized, by his own conduct and by his public remarks, the need for a strong moral and spiritual fiber in the life of America.

Too, the prayer—with which each session of the Senate and House of Representatives opens—is not an empty gesture.

It is our realistic acknowledgment of the need of divine guidance in reviewing and resolving the problems facing our Nation.

GODLESS COMMUNISM

We are all aware of the tremendous challenge offered by godless communism throughout the world. Unfortunately, it has a significant effect upon all our lives, because of its constant threat to the freedom of all people.

Currently, the new tone of Russian propaganda, the new siren song of so-called peaceful coexistence, is no cause for us to relax or to lay down our arms. The lamb can still not lie down with the bear.

However, a few, little publicized, but comparatively important things have been occurring. These may contain a promise of more change in the Communist world. There is first, the recent report that, for the first time since 1926, Bibles were rolling off the presses within the Soviet Union. And second, the entrance of more western travelers, including clergymen, within the Soviet orbit may bring more of a touch of the free spirit which will leave its indelible mark upon the imprisoned people.

These may contribute greatly to a force which will require the leadership of the Kremlin to modify its totalitarianism.

COMMUNISM WILL NOT PREVAIL

Of course, whether the Politburo changes or does not change its plans, its wild dreams for world domination are doomed to failure. As a matter of fact, there are hundreds of millions of us who are dedicated to the Kremlin's failure.

In their individual lives, the Kremlin's atheists are forfeiting their souls by committing the unforgivable sin: That of denying the existence of God. By their swallowing of Marxist dogma, they have denied themselves the fruits of Heaven.

Based on inhumanity and utterly disregarding the dignity of individual humans, it it inconceivable that their brutal ways, so contrary to the aspiration of the human heart, could triumph over the moral efforts of mankind to live a free and fruitful life.

BIBLICAL PROPHECY OF WAR

But the Biblical prophecy of "wars and rumors of wars," unhappily, is still applicable to our time. The bullets are flying, and men are dying, in conflicts around the world: In North Africa, Cyprus, the Middle East, and in southeast Asia—in the embattled jungles of Malaya.

WE MUST STRENGTHEN FRIENDS

We are left with no alternative, therefore, but to be strong and to help keep our friends strong.

That is why we want to strengthen the United Nations—to strengthen NATO, SEATO, the Baghdad Pact, the Rio Pact, and other instruments.

Yet we must be realistic in acknowledging that agreements are only as good as the real faith of the signers of the pact.

With that faith, we can keep life in these pacts; without that faith, they become dead letters—scraps of paper.

What we need therefore, and what our friends need, is a revitalized awareness of our responsibilities. We need a revitalized awareness, too, of the presence of the living God.

We should recognize that a bold application of ancient principles based on love of God and humanity would wipe out many of the problems confronting the world. It would provide food for the needy, halt aggression of godless nations, stamp out ignorance, and achieve many of the other worthwhile goals we seek.

THE CHALLENGE TO CHRISTIANITY

Here, then, is a challenge to every churchgoer to fulfill his highest responsibilities, as Albert Schweitzer is fulfilling them in the heart of darkest Africa.

It would be unworthy of the churchgoers, of the Christian, to assert:

"What happens in Africa or Asia or Latin America is no concern of mine."

Rather, the Christian must say, as Schweitzer says, in effect:

"I am, indeed, concerned. I am my brother's keeper. I am not a meddler, but neither am I a shirker. In this shrunken world I will not close my eyes to reality, or to suffering, or to hunger, or to disease, or to insecurity, whenever it exists. My first responsibilities are to my own people—my own kinsmen. But I will not close my eyes to the atheistic, aggressive challenges beyond our shores."

There is ignorance, and we must fight it; prejudice, and we must combat it; indifference, and we must alter it.

No true Christian can turn his back on mankind. No true Christian can believe that we should "live unto ourselves alone," callously ignoring the fate of the world, as some "blind followers of the blind" would have us do.

Such heedlessness would not only be un-Christian; it could prove to be suicidal. For all the rest of the world would then gradually be grabbed up piece by piece by the hungry Soviet bear. That must not and will not happen.

MESSAGE THE WORLD NEEDS

And so the message the world needs is the message which is exemplified by the celebration of the 75th anniversary here in Thorp—a rededication by men of the world to higher things of the spiritual life.

The 75th anniversary testifies to the fact that for 75 years there has been a strong faith, a great spiritual strength in Thorp.

Over the years, the members of the congregation, the ministers, the deacons, the Sunday-school teacher have kept and maintained and fulfilled the mission of the house of God.

The world needs this kind of dedication—to give it the spiritual and intellectual strength so as to handle the great responsibilities which time, progress, and world conditions have placed upon our shoulders.

Over the years, this church has had a profound effect upon the life of the community.

It has been many good things to many people, bringing peace and spiritual guidance, solace and comfort; it has been a place of religious training for the youth, sanctuary of God, and a house of communion and prayer. What higher praise can anyone give of any building which has been constructed? How better can we serve our children in particular than by supporting this type of noble institution?

The greatest gift that we can give our children—the children of all America—is a knowledge of the Bible and the teaching of spiritual values.

Whatever the complications of life they face, they will always be able to use these immortal wisdoms.

FAITH FOR THE FUTURE

And now we must look forward optimistically to the future. To keep faith with our forefathers, we must have the vision to preserve this rich heritage bequested to us. This can be done by maintaining the following: Faith in God, faith in ourselves, faith in our churches, and faith in the future of a great free America.

With this type of deep belief we can go forward to peace and prosperity.

I am happy to have had the opportunity to talk with you.

Thank you, and may God bless you.

The Retired Schoolteacher and Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, now that the Senate is preparing to debate H. R. 7225, the bill which we passed in the House last year to expand and improve the social-security program, I would like to call to the attention of the Congress a situation which I feel requires some very serious study.

This is the plight of the retired schoolteacher who retired before the pension system he or she belongs to was covered in under the social-security program. I mention the schoolteacher in that connection, but of course the situation is one which also affects all retired persons whose retirement plans came under social security at some date after the time these people went on pensions.

The social-security system is far from perfect and certainly does not permit beneficiaries to live in any semblance of luxury. The income limitation, it seems to me, is much too low—assuming it can be justified at all. On the other hand, those who are on social security have been able to look to occasional increases in their pensions through congressional action. In other words when we increase the benefits generally, we usually try to increase the monthly payments to those who are already receiving benefits.

PENSIONS AND SAVINGS SHRANK IN PURCHASING POWER

But the schoolteachers and the other public servants whose retirement plans came under social security after these people had begun collecting pensions apparently have nowhere to turn for an increase in their original pensions. Many of these retirement plans were originally statewide plans or municipal plans. During the years that the now-retired public employees contributed to these plans out of their pay each month, the benefits they looked forward to might have appeared fairly adequate for retirement purposes. But a schoolteacher who retired, say, 10 years ago, when the cost of living was so very much lower than it is today, cannot possibly live on her pension. I just do not see how it can be done. The same holds true for the teacher who retired 5 years ago.

This situation was called to my attention by some retired teachers in St. Louis who pointed out to me that the savings which they may have accumulated over the years to supplement their retirement income just do not go as far or buy as much now as the same money would have done at the time it was saved. What may have looked like an adequate nest-egg and adequate retirement income are not adequate today.

The teacher who is now retiring under social security—that is, among those teachers whose retirement plans have been covered in under the social security system—can look forward in most cases to a much higher beginning pension and

to the prospect of periodic increases in that pension as Congress takes note in the social security laws of the increases in the cost of living from year to year. But the teacher who retired some years ago before her retirement plan came under social security has, in most cases, no prospect of an increase in retirement income.

I raise this question not to propose some easy solution, because I do not have one. I raise it instead because I think if enough of us are thinking about it, perhaps the appropriate committees of the Congress and the Social Security Administration can suggest a practical solution.

LETTER TO SECRETARY FOLSOM

I took this matter up early this year with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Marion B. Folsom. I wrote him as follows:

JANUARY 12, 1956.

Hon. MARION B. FOLSOM,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: A constituent of mine raises a very interesting question concerning the possibility of extending social-security coverage to retired schoolteachers. Of course, all retired persons who retired before their type of work was included in social-security coverage feel now that they would like to be covered, and that is understandable.

But the question I would like to have your social-security people consider is what can be done for the retired schoolteacher in case the teachers now covered by the same retirement plan should vote to have their plan come in under social security. Would there be any adjustment in benefits for those already retired under those circumstances? What thinking has been devoted to that kind of problem?

The woman who wrote to me pointed to the fact that those under social security who are retired have received several increases in benefits by legislation following their retirement whereas, as she points out, the retirement funds for teachers do not allow for increasing benefits once a person is retired.

I am directing this inquiry to you rather than to the Social Security Administration in case you would care to add any comments of your own, from a policy standpoint, to the technical information which the social-security people might provide in answer to my inquiry.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEONOR K. (Mrs. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress, 3d District, Missouri.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that I asked not only for an explanation of the situation as it affects these retired persons but what could be done about it. Particularly I asked what thinking has been devoted to this kind of problem.

I am afraid that not very much thinking has been devoted to it. The Secretary, in his reply, explains the situation and says that it is up to the appropriate State or local governmental unit which originally administered the teachers' retirement fund to figure out a way to supplement the inadequate pensions now being received, compared to the higher benefits which might be paid under social security.

Mr. Folsom states that he has given a great deal of thought to the problem of retired persons who are not covered by social security but that so far no practical solution has suggested itself for extending social security to those who have not contributed to the program during their working years.

SCHOOLTEACHERS CONTRIBUTED TO OWN FUND

I think the schoolteachers are in a slightly different category in that for all of their working years they did contribute—regularly, each month—to a retirement fund which is now combined with social security. It is not as if they never participated in a retirement fund and now ask for something for nothing. Their mistake, if you could call it that, was in being born just a few years too early—had their retirement been delayed a few years, they would now be under the social-security program. As we all know, teachers often have no choice on when they retire.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that this problem is not restricted just to schoolteachers. It touches all of those groups of public servants whose pension systems have recently come under social security, but who retired before the changeover took place. I repeat, also, that I raise the question here because I am anxious to have all Members of Congress made aware of the problem in the hopes that among us all we can devise a practical solution.

I include as part of my remarks Secretary Folsom's letter to me on this subject in reply to my inquiry, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, March 13, 1956.

Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: This is in reply to your letter of January 12, 1956, in reference to a question raised by one of your constituents regarding the possibility of extending social-security coverage to retired schoolteachers. We regret the delay in replying.

As you know, employees who are protected under a State or local retirement system can be covered under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system if a referendum is held among the active members of the system and a majority of those eligible to vote in the referendum vote in favor of coming under old-age and survivors insurance. When a retirement system group is brought under old-age and survivors insurance, coverage is extended only to those who are still working at the time the group is covered and those hired subsequently. Since benefits under the program can be paid only to persons who have worked for a specified length of time in covered jobs, persons who had already retired before their group was covered could not receive benefits under old-age and survivors insurance on the basis of their employment for the State or local government.

The decision as to whether any adjustment will be made in the benefits of individuals who have already retired if the members of a State or local government retirement system are brought under old-age and survivors insurance rests with the appropriate State or local officials. The provisions of the Social Security Act which make old-age and survivors insurance coverage available to retirement-system members do, however, contain a statement that it is the policy of the Congress that the total retirement protection of the members and beneficiaries of a retirement system shall not be impaired by reason of the members' coverage under old-age and survivors insurance.

Your constituent mentions that retirement funds for teachers do not allow for increasing benefits once a person is retired. Generally speaking, the method of financing such retirement systems does not allow for increasing benefits of retired persons unless the State or local government concerned makes a special appropriation for that purpose. Under old-age and survivors insurance, as wage levels rise there is a reduction in the cost of the program, expressed as a percentage of payroll, because the increase in contribution income is relatively larger than the increase in benefit costs. In this kind of situation it is sometimes possible for the Congress to provide for a general adjustment of old-age and survivors insurance benefit amounts without increasing the contribution rate. I have given a great deal of thought to the problem of retired persons who have not been able to qualify for old-age and survivors insurance benefits. On occasion, proposals have been made to pay a basic old-age insurance benefit to all persons over age 65 regardless of whether they have worked in employment or self-employment covered by the law. In making any improvements in the old-age and survivors insurance system, however, it is essential to preserve its basic principles, the most important of which are that it is a contributory program financed by the worker, his employer, and the self-employed during years of active work, and that the benefits received are related in part to the individual's earnings. The old-age and survivors insurance program owes much of its wide national acceptance to these sound principles. Therefore, neither this Department nor the Congress has favored proposals for paying benefits to individuals who do not meet the work requirements of the program.

Thank you for your interest in social security. I hope that this information will be helpful in replying to your constituent.

Sincerely yours,

M. B. FOLSOM, *Secretary.*

Compulsory Inspection of Poultry and Poultry Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, on May 16, 1956, I introduced H. R. 11245, calling for the compulsory inspection of poultry and poultry products by the United States Department of Agriculture. I believe this to be urgent and important legislation.

I would, however, like to emphasize as strongly as possible that my own State of Connecticut has achieved a very high standard in regard to adequate poultry inspection, as have a few other States.

It is unfair to ask these good poultry raisers in Connecticut and elsewhere to compete with poultry raisers in other portions of the country who do not conform to these high standards.

It is important to realize that only a handful of poultry processors are responsible for the unfit products placed upon the market, and are exploiting the present laxity of inspection laws to make a quick dollar.

Since the publication of Upton Sinclair's famous book, The Jungle, in 1906, the public has become increasingly aware of the need for a workable program of

inspection to make sure that no unwholesome meat product ever reaches an American table. Sinclair exposed truly shocking conditions then prevalent in the meat-packing industry, and helped to bring about sweeping reforms.

Today, a housewife can buy almost any meat product from her grocer with confidence that she is not risking the health of her family. Unfortunately this is not necessarily true of poultry or poultry products she may select.

Present laws governing the sale of poultry in interstate commerce are completely inadequate. The average family spends an estimated 12 cents out of every food dollar for poultry, but unlike almost every other important food product on the market, it may be processed and sold with almost complete disregard of sanitary standards or wholesomeness. It is by no means an overstatement to say that effective inspection hardly exists on a Federal, State, or local level.

The problem is of direct concern to poultry farmers, workers, and consumers, all of whom have a community of interest in the achievement of a workable solution. The poultry industry has undergone an almost fantastic growth in the last few years. This is especially true in Connecticut where broiler production increased by 177 percent in the decade between 1940 and 1950. These startling figures indicate both the importance of the industry and the growing need for effective inspection laws on a Federal level.

At the present time one agency of the Federal Government does perform a nonregulatory inspection service for poultry, but only on a voluntary basis and for a fee that must be paid by the processor. It seems obvious that the processor who uses these services and pays for them is at an economic disadvantage with competitors who do not.

The gravity of industrial health hazards to the poultry worker cannot be overlooked. The poultry worker is, of course, constantly exposed to danger of serious infection from diseased products.

Almost a half century ago, largely because of the impetus of Sinclair's book, the Federal Government recognized the need for an effective, compulsory program of inspection to protect the public from unsanitary processing of meat products. Excellent legislation was enacted as early as 1906 that curtailed most of the abuses then prevalent in the industry. Through the years the American public has come to have great and deserved confidence in any meat product backed by inspection of the United States Department of Agriculture.

Unfortunately, at the turn of the century poultry was of minor importance to the diet of Americans, and compulsory inspection of poultry was not included in the provisions of the law. In those days there was no poultry industry as we know it today. The housewife usually bought her poultry directly from the farmer, and did most of the dressing of the bird herself. However, with the development of excellent refrigeration facilities, frozen and pre-cooked foods and other innovations, the industry has expanded to its present prominence in the food field.

We can no longer tolerate the shipment in interstate commerce of any food product of a questionable nature. Once again I would like to emphasize that the great majority of individuals in the poultry industry are honest and sincere. As in every other occupation, however, there are always the few whose only interest is in making a fast dollar, regardless of the cost to the consumer, and ultimately to the industry itself. The occasional sharper among their ranks, by deliberately offering defective products to the public, is endangering the livelihood of all.

It is significant that much of the growing demand that Congress do something about this situation originates from within the poultry industry itself. Every ethical businessman is interested in good legislation that will promote public confidence in his product, and tend to eliminate the few individuals whose methods discredit the entire industry.

I have talked at length with a number of poultrymen from Connecticut who have assured me that the voluntary inspection program of the Department of Agriculture is no longer satisfactory. They are convinced that it is the responsibility of the Government to devise and enforce reasonable standards of sanitation to protect both the industry and the consumer. The cost of voluntary inspection is ultimately passed on to the consumer, making it difficult for inspected products to compete for the housewife's poultry dollar.

I am confident that H. R. 11245 provides a workable solution to the problem of poultry inspection. This bill declares it to be the policy of Congress to provide for the inspection of poultry and poultry products by the Inspection Service of the Department of Agriculture so as to prevent the shipment in interstate commerce of poultry that is considered unfit for human consumption. Under the authority provided by the Poultry Products Inspection Act, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to ascertain from time to time the cities or areas where poultry or poultry products are consumed in such volume as to affect the movement of inspected poultry products in commerce. Whenever, after public hearings, he finds that the designation of such a city or area will tend to effectuate the purposes of the act, the Secretary shall by publication in the Federal Register give public notice of such designation and the effective date. After the effective date, all poultry and poultry products processed, sold, received, or delivered in any such designated city or area will be subject to the provisions of this act.

This measure would also authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make inspections and examinations as he considers necessary, and to destroy poultry found to be unfit for human food purposes. It would also set up a standard of sanitation in the facilities and practices relating to poultry. H. R. 11245 provides for the labeling of poultry products with an official inspection mark giving the name of the product, an accurate statement of the quantity, the weight, measure, and the name of the plant where the product was processed. Further, the sale of uninspected poultry products could be prohibited in areas designated by the Secretary.

The Department of Agriculture has had 27 years of experience in the administration of the present, voluntary system of poultry inspection, and I have no doubt that this branch of the Government is best equipped to undertake the broader program contemplated under H. R. 11245. It would appear highly discriminatory to require the poultry industry to continue to bear the cost of inspection, when the inspection of so-called red meat products is subsidized by the Federal Government. In passing, I must mention the outstanding job done by the Department of Agriculture in the inspection of red meat products. Since the enactment of the Meat Inspection Act of 1906, the public has come to have great confidence in both the integrity and thoroughness of the Department's inspection program.

I am confident that the enactment of H. R. 11245 will be of incalculable value to everyone concerned with the wellbeing of the poultry industry, whether as farmers, processors, or consumers.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. PAT JENNINGS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] recently addressed a series of Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners in my district. His remarks were enthusiastically received, and I believe he expressed the fundamental Democratic philosophy as well as it has been expressed anywhere in recent times.

In fact, I have received numerous requests from those who were privileged to hear him for copies of his speech. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a copy of the address he made on one of these occasions:

JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY SPEECH

(By Congressman JIM WRIGHT)

There are several reasons why I am happy to be here to share this occasion with you this evening.

First of all, I am grateful to you for this opportunity to know your beautiful corner of the universe here in southwestern Virginia. I have a particular pleasure in being here, because I've been wanting to meet the folks who sent PAT JENNINGS to Congress. A fine indication of his leadership and of the esteem in which he is regarded by his colleagues was seen in his recent election to head the 84th Club, composed of the first term members. You are to be sincerely congratulated upon your extremely able representation.

Furthermore, I'm enjoying this occasion because you have made me feel at home.

Meeting some of you earlier and looking into your faces now I can almost imagine that I am talking with folks from my own native plains country. Basically, I think we are pretty much the same—Virginians and Texans—and I think fundamentally we want the same things. We don't ask for any special privileges or selfish political favors from our Government. But we want a chance. We want the right to hold our heads high in a free land. We want to feel that our Government is interested in keeping a strong, healthy economy with jobs enough to go around. We know that prosperity and depression both have always begun at the grass roots, and we want to think that the man who tills the soil is not completely forgotten by his Government in Washington.

I expect one of the reasons I feel so much at home among you folks is because you're Democrats. Now, I'm not trying to tell you that the Democratic Party can do no wrong. That wouldn't be honest. We have made mistakes, and you know it.

Nor do I believe that the standard equipment for all Republicans includes a set of horns and a forked tail. I am one of those who has admired the President of the United States as a man of honest intentions, and I think I know how to place the national welfare above purely partisan interests.

But I do view with considerable alarm the apparent design of many Republican Party leaders to turn the clock back to the days of the Smoot-Hawley tariffs, high interest rates, and 12 million unemployed—back to the days of a national policy which ignored the needs of the average people who make up the country.

PARTY OF THE AVERAGE AMERICAN

And I do believe that the party of Jefferson and Jackson and Wilson and Roosevelt and Truman is the safest custodian of the national welfare because it is the party of the average American. These men are the everlasting symbols of a government responsible to its humblest citizens. Without exception, they have stood for the rights of the many as opposed to the privileges of a few—for the public good as opposed to the private greed.

They knew that the majority sometimes made mistakes. But they counted these mistakes less dangerous by far than the inevitable and vicious mistakes which have always resulted from the rule of a small and tight coalition of privileged men. They believed deeply and passionately that the natural instincts of the common, decent, ordinary human being always and unfailingly prove themselves in the long run to be the highest wisdom and the most reliable judgment available in determining the national interest.

In short, they trusted the people. And the people trusted them.

There have always been some—and they are with us today—who inherently distrust the judgment of the ordinary people. Many of the cultured and learned men of Revolutionary times—Alexander Hamilton among them—regarded this novel idea of a government by the people as something of a "noble experiment" but felt that sooner or later some way must be devised for keeping the actual reins of government in the hands of the privileged and prosperous few.

JEFFERSON BELIEVED IN PEOPLE

But Thomas Jefferson, blessed with almost prophetic vision, saw that such a minority control by the aristocracy would decay and become rotten, exposing this infant Nation to the same corrupt and licentious rule that had driven our forebears from the Old World. So he worked for the extension of suffrage and for a government which heeded the popular will.

He thought that the average man was worthy of freedom and capable of passing on the policies by which the Nation was to be guided. And in Jefferson's day this was a radical thought. The established press of his time, almost without exception, was arrayed in a bitter fight against him. They called him an impractical dreamer, a radical reformer, and worse.

Those who would arrogate to themselves the exclusive right to make all the decisions for the people even had the colossal affrontery to accuse Jefferson and his followers of treason, and to imprison some of his supporters under the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798. And Thomas Jefferson was driven to resign from the Vice Presidency.

Yet Jefferson won his fight—as all such fights are finally won—against minority control. It was he who, more than any other, authored and fashioned and shaped on this continent the infant form which men called democracy, and then breathed into its sails the breath of motion.

JACKSON'S STRUGGLE SIMILAR

Time passed. Men were not eternally vigilant, and once more the control of national affairs was maneuvered into the hands of a group of citizens small in number. It was the time of the great westward expansion. With the legions of the ordinary people scattered all the way from the eastern farms and mills across the broad valleys to the land which lay upon the fertile banks of the Mississippi, a handful of influence peddlers had succeeded in turning the smile of government favor from the average people to a little network of citizens on the eastern seaboard who engaged in merchant shipping and who owned the Bank of the United States.

It was then that a man as democratic as the wide-open spaces and as down to earth as the boots he wore rode to the front bearing the people's cause. Andrew Jackson took up the fight for these forgotten millions of the ordinary people, the hard-bitten pioneers of the West and South and the inarticulate poor of the great cities. For this he, like Jefferson, was reviled as a radical, and anarchist, and a destroyer of confidence. Like Jefferson, he had to contend with the highly organized opposition of the press and the great financial interests of the country—well-entrenched, wealthy, clever, and powerful.

Also like Jefferson, he won his fight, because he was fighting on the side of the people, and their instincts did not fail him. He kept faith with them. And they kept faith with him.

It has never been an easy struggle to carry the flag of the inarticulate and disorganized many against the vocal and highly organized few.

WILSON BROUGHT REFORMS

We know of the great struggle and the great strides under Woodrow Wilson. We know of the fierce enmity he generated when he turned the clear, clean spotlight of public inspection upon those who assumed the responsibility of investing the people's money. We know of the bitter antagonism he aroused when he enunciated the proposition that those who have benefited most from the blessing of our free Nation should share most in the cost of our Government's operation, when he had the audacity to suggest that the exploitation of children in our mines and pits and smelters should be ended, that women should be permitted the right to vote, and that the code of decency dictated there should be a minimum wage below which nobody should be required to work.

We know of the angry personal vindictiveness of those who, representing the privileged few, committed the most irresponsible act in the history of our Nation when, out of personal spite, they killed his dream of a League of Nations and thus made World War II as inevitable as tomorrow's sunrise and broke his heart and sent that great-hearted Virginia Democrat to a premature grave.

And once more the forces of the few gained control. The people were lulled into lethargy by the mad spiral of the stock market until it came crashing down about our feet in 1929. For those who sat in the seats of government had not bothered to realize that no prosperity can last which does not have its base spread among the average people.

REASON FOR THE DEPRESSION

In retrospect, it is easy to see the reason for that imminent collapse. In the dizzy decade which preceded it, the Nation's production gained 56 percent. But wages and individual income gained only 24 percent, and because of rising prices, real buying power gained hardly at all. Can anyone doubt the reason for that terrible event? People simply were not able to buy those things which were produced for their consumption. Hence, the capitulation of the entire economic structure.

I remember a day—a cold and windy March day in 1933. A man rose from a wheelchair and stood with the aid of a cane and looked into the heart of a nation. What he saw there was a picture of stagnation—stagnation and fear. Twelve million men walked the streets looking for work. Countless homes were foreclosed. Farm gates stood ajar on rusty hinges. Children looked to their parents with expectant eyes and hungry cavities in their empty little stomachs. One-third of the Nation was "ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed."

But then he spoke. And into each place where men and women had gathered breathlessly beside a radio, there came a new confidence and a new hope. Here, again, was a man in the White House who remembered them. And the Nation regained its balance as it tottered there on the brink of the abyss of doom. For a steady hand was at the helm, clear eyes watched the waters. And the only thing to fear was fear itself.

ROOSEVELT AND RECOVERY

The national income in that previous year of 1932 had been only $39 billion. But soon the factories began to hum again. The channels of commerce began to open. The banks were safe. There was optimism in the air, and the Nation was whistling a tune called Happy Days Are Here Again.

For 20 years, under the leadership of Roosevelt and Truman, the welfare of the average American was held paramount by his Government. In no 20 years of our history had there been so much solid progress. The national income rose from $39 billion to approximately $300 billion. People had confidence. There was a productive and remunerative job for everyone capable of working. The "bitter enders" adorned their faces with wry masks of gloom and dourly wailed that the dollar would buy only half as much. But every independent statistical study revealed that the average American had four times as many dollars, and so we were clearly twice as well off.

Yet one of the strangest facts of history is man's propensity for experimentation. The crisis met, we are apt to relax our vigilance and wonder if another course might not do just as well.

In 1952, the Republicans, chafing under 20 years of repudiation, brought out a national hero to head their ticket. He didn't exactly please the traditional kingmakers of the Republican high command, but they had to have a winner. Many of them were convinced, besides, that it made little difference who sat in the White House so long as their particular philosophy permeated the Cabinet and the upper echelons of policymaking. And so they nominated the well-known and well-honored general and rode behind the banners of his national appeal.

The Democrats really had very little chance in 1952, because we were opposed by a nationally advertised product. Even so, the average people demonstrated that they had

not entirely forgotten. Even with the tremendous popular personal appeal of General Eisenhower at the head of their ticket, Republicans controlled the House by only a meager handful of votes and the Senate by less than that.

Then 2 years later, the people once again demonstrated that they prefer Democrats to Republicans. The full significance of that election has not been greatly publicized. In popular votes, the Democratic Party won the 1954 congressional elections by the biggest margin accorded to either party in an off-year election since 1934. And in every succeeding election, the Democratic majority throughout the Nation has been increased.

DEMOCRATS BACK BIPARTISAN GOALS

The Democrats have not been blindly partisan. We have not been guided by either hate or spite. Again and again during the last Congress and during the first session of the present one, on the truly crucial issues, it was the Democrats who bailed out the President's program and saved his broader national objectives from defeat at the hands of his own party. On issue after issue, the Democrats supplied Dwight Eisenhower with more support than did Republicans in the Congress.

Last year, it was clearly evident that the reciprocal trade legislation which is the cornerstone of his foreign policy would have been utterly emasculated if it had been left to the Republicans alone.

Last year, according to the Congressional Quarterly, a majority of the Democrats in the Senate had stood with the President on 31 of the 33 major issues on which votes had been recorded. In the House, the picture was much the same.

As good Americans should, we completely submerged partisanship to adopt the Formosa Resolution by an unprecedented peacetime majority. It was a Democratic majority which enacted the reserve training bill, considered a major pillar of the administration's military program. It was a Democratic majority which, at Presidential request, adopted the Career Incentives Act aimed at making military service more attractive to America's young men.

In the Senate, it was Democratic majority leader LYNDON JOHNSON who forced a vote on a Republican-sponsored resolution which would have tied the President's hands on the eve of the Geneva Conference and, by defeating it soundly, empowered the President and strengthened his hand by a tremendous vote of confidence. Only four Senators stood against the President that day. Not 1 of the 4 was a Democrat.

So we have tried to help him, even when his lieutenants have shown the shameful poor sportsmanship and bad taste to refer to the Democratic Party—the party of Jefferson and Jackson and Wilson and Roosevelt—as the party of treason.

POINTS OF DISAGREEMENT

But we cannot, in good conscience or in good faith with our people, aid his or any other administration when it subordinates the public good to the private greed.

We cannot remain silent and submissive while the gross national product, all the goods and services produced in our Nation, decline $12 billions from the year before, as it did in 1954 in spite of a 3 million growth in population.

We cannot share responsibility for the mere sake of bipartisanship when the specter of unemployment begins to stalk our land again, when the total number of unemployed men and women doubled during 1954, when farm income drops 26 percent as it did in 1955, and when the national administration seems more interested in trying to think up arguments to explain these facts away than in trying to think up ways to correct them.

We found it hard last year to take with good grace the shrill cries of "demagoguery" and "fiscal irresponsibility" because we wanted to share with the average American the benefit of a modest tax reduction, when the Republican Congress just the year before had handed out three times as costly a bill of special benefits to the large corporations and higher income taxpayers and dividend earners.

Let me give you one homely illustration of that Republican tax bill of 1954. John and Bill report the same amount of income. John earned his by the sweat of his back or the work of his brow. Bill earned his from the ownership of stocks and investments—clipping coupons. Yet John must pay in taxes one-third again more than Bill pays. Every time Bill (the coupon clipper) pays $75, John (the wage earner) shells out $100. And if you can make any rhyme or reason out of that, there's probably a job waiting for you in the Treasury Department, because Secretary Humphrey has been looking for somebody to try to explain that to the American people.

I've never witnessed a more complete disregard for consistency than that manifest by the Republican leadership in its frenzied fight to kill the Democratic tax proposals.

In 1954, in face of a bigger deficit forecast, they rammed through the $7.5 billion tax reduction for their special friends, and thought it was fine. Last year they called the proposed $2 billion tax reduction to relieve the embattled average American "the height of folly and fiscal irresponsibility."

THE DEMOCRATIC PHILOSOPHY

Let me give you the Democratic philosophy.

First of all, we believe in our system—a free, healthy, capitalistic economy. In such a system we believe that private employment in sound business is preferable to public-works employment.

Yet we know that our Nation cannot increase private employment except as it increases the production of American business.

Obviously, production can enjoy no continuing increase except as consumption increases—except as people are able to buy the things that business turns out for sale.

And what better way could we find to increase the consumption of goods on the part of the American public than by permitting the average American to retain more of the purchasing power he has earned?

Buying power is the oil that lubricates the machinery of prosperity.

This has been called the "percolate up" theory, that national prosperity has to begin on a broad base with the average people—that when they have money they buy more things; thus, they increase demand, and more things are produced; when more things are produced, more people are employed; and when more people are gainfully employed there is a better market for the farmers' goods and the retailers' wares, and everybody benefits.

This philosophy has one thing to recommend it, and that is that it works.

THE REPUBLICAN THEORY

Now, let's contrast this with the Republican philosophy. The "trickle down" theory, it is called. They believe that if we can just shower enough prosperity upon the people at the top of the economic ladder some of it is bound to filter down to all the rest of us.

The only thing wrong with this theory is that it doesn't work. It didn't work in 1929, and it didn't work in 1953 or 1954. It won't work in 1956.

During the past 2 years the corporations of the country increased their income. Yet the Nation's production fell off, and the number of unemployed increased.

Last year corporate profits were up 26 percent, but the take-home pay for the average American was up only 3 percent, and rising prices had wiped this out completely. Rent is up 11 percent, utility rates are up 6 percent, medical costs are up 9 percent. Dividends are up, but family debt skyrocketed to an all-time high in 1955. The prosperity has not trickled down. It is being siphoned away.

And this is the effect of one after another of the proposals of the present Republican administration—the hard-money policy which siphoned off literally hundreds of millions of buying power in excessive interest rates; the Clay commission's highway proposals which would have had us pay out 55 cents in interest over the next 30 years for every dollar's worth of highway we built; the proposal to increase the borrowing of money for school construction; the gesture to help the Nation's health by subsidizing health-insurance companies; the plan to require first-class mail users to bear the burden of an additional subsidy for junk-mail advertisers; and many other similar schemes.

Yet while they talked of a hundred billion dollars for superhighways, they were proposing that we do away with the Federal field activities of the Soil Conservation Service which has returned the American taxpayer a greater dividend on the pennies he has invested in it than has any other activity of our Government.

While natural disasters, such as drought and flood, were taking heavy tolls, the administration was contriving to increase the interest rate for disaster loans.

While the number of small-business failures rose by 21 percent in the year 1955, the Small Business Administration was increasing its interest rates and refusing to process loan applications. Since 1953, some 300,000 individuals have inquired in an effort to secure small-business loans from this agency. Of this entire number, only about 7,000 have ever been favorably acted upon.

This is a rather typical instance of an agency, created under the law to perform a certain task, but now managed by people who are completely out of sympathy with the purpose of the law. It is duplicated in case after case.

Unwilling to suggest publicly that a popular and beneficial program be abolished, the present administration has simply appointed to head the program people who do not believe in it. This process has been called repeal by appointment.

In these and a hundred other ways, the lumbering elephant of the Republican Party has shown not only that it never forgets, but also that it never learns.

Eternal vigilance is, and has ever been, the price of liberty. As a great American, SAM RAYBURN, once said, "Freedom is like an insurance policy; its premiums have to be kept up to date."

As we have seen throughout our Nation's history, it has never been an easy matter to maintain a Government responsible to the needs and responsive to the will of the average people.

We have broken bread together tonight at a Democratic fund-raising dinner. It isn't a $100-a-plate dinner, or even a $25-a-plate dinner. It's a $5-a-plate dinner.

In certain sections of the country, the other party frequently raises the bulk of its funds at $5,000 a clip.

And that is one of its troubles. Let anyone ask himself honestly if donations of that magnitude are made with no expectation of selfish return.

We have the satisfaction of knowing that we belong to a political organization which elicits its main support from people just like ourselves. But I'd rather have a party fund made up from 50,000 people at $5 apiece than from 50 people at $5,000 apiece.

Our way is harder, admittedly. But it is also more satisfying. It is the way set forth by Jefferson 150 and more years ago. It is the people's way. And, with your help, perhaps it will again be our national way in 1956.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 8, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who art our gracious benefactor, grant that we may be more worthy and appreciative of the innumerable blessings which Thou art continually bestowing upon us.

We pray that our President, our Speaker, and our chosen representatives, the Members of Congress, may be richly blessed with health of body and wisdom of mind to sustain and guide them in all their plans and labors to safeguard our freedom.

May they be fearless and faithful, never losing heart or hope, but always manifesting and maintaining an unfailing trust in Thy divine sovereignty.

Inspire us daily to pray and work for the coming of that time of world peace, when nations everywhere shall live in unity and concord, seeking in true fellowship and friendship the temporal and spiritual welfare of all mankind.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5516. An act to amend title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide that service as an Army field clerk, or as a field clerk, Quartermaster Corps, shall be counted for purposes of retirement under title III of that act, and for other purposes; and

H. R 6274. An act to provide that no fee shall be charged a veteran discharged under honorable conditions for furnishing him or his next of kin or legal representative a copy of a certificate showing his service in the Armed Forces.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6376. An act to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1614. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids," title 21, United States Code, section 321c;

S. 3149. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to permit air carriers to grant free or reduced rate transportation to ministers of religion;

S. 3307. An act to amend section 9 (d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to authorize jurisdiction in the Federal courts in certain reemployment cases; and

S. 3857. An act to clarify section 1103 (d) of title XI (Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 56–15.

THE LATE HONORABLE CHARLES EDGAR McKENZIE, SR.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty today to announce to the membership of the House the death on Thursday, June 7, of Charles Edgar McKenzie, Sr., who was my predecessor as Representative in this body from the Fifth Congressional District of Louisiana.

Mr. McKenzie was elected to the 78th Congress and reelected to the 79th Congress, his tenure of service spanning the period from January of 1943 through December of 1946. He gained a wide circle of friends among his colleagues during his 4 years of duty here. I know that all who were among the membership then and are present today join with me and my colleagues of the Louisiana delegation in extending sincere sympathy to his bereaved family.

Charles E. McKenzie, Democrat, was a native and lifelong resident of Louisiana, his home being at Monroe throughout the entirety of his adult life. He was born October 3, 1896, the eldest son of George Edgar and Ella Mulholland McKenzie. Educated in the public schools of Monroe and at Louisiana State University, he became a successful businessman, insurance executive, farmer, and cattleman, as well as a Congressman. He was a veteran of World War I, a member of the American Legion—having served as commander of the Louisiana Department and as a national executive committeeman—of the Forty and Eight, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Military Order of the World War. He was also a member of the Masonic fraternity, Knights of Pythias, and the Order of the Mystic Shrine.

Surviving are his wife, the former Miss Carrie Jack Perry, of Monroe, to whom he was married in 1918, three daughters, and a son. I wish to again express my heartfelt sympathy to each of them. May the Heavenly Father sustain them in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, late yesterday afternoon as the House adjourned I learned of the tragic death of our former colleague from the Fifth Congressional District, Charles Edgar McKenzie. I do not yet have the details of his passing but those of us who knew Charlie, as we affectionately called him here in the House of Representatives, are filled with shock and great sadness.

Charles Edgar McKenzie served the Fifth Congressional District of Louisiana for two consecutive terms as a Member of this body. During this period of time he had an opportunity to make his impress upon national legislation, and those of us who were serving then remember him well. Charlie was always dynamic and forceful in his decisions, and rarely held back his opinion in any vital matter.

Congressman McKenzie was especially interested in flood control, which is so vital to the people of the Fifth Congressional District of Louisiana. He worked long and tirelessly on this matter, and during his brief stay here he contributed considerably to the overall program of making this portion of the State of Louisiana safe from floods. His attention to the many details of his office showed a conscientiousness and ability of a high standard.

I first knew Charlie McKenzie years ago when he was most active in the affairs of the American Legion in Louisiana. He held one office after another in the American Legion until he became department commander in this great patriotic organization. In time he became national committeeman and served in one capacity after another in the affairs of the Legion. He was a most devoted worker and attended all conventions. In recent years I have seen Charlie McKenzie now and then in Monroe, La. He seemed to have the same determination, enthusiasm, and aggressiveness which characterized his work here. As a member of an insurance firm which bore his name, he was well known and well liked by the people with whom he came in contact. He has been in private business for the past few years. His health seemed to be good up until recently. No doubt, a vigorous character accustomed to great activity was depressed by the possibility of sickness and disease.

Charlie was always one to look forward into the future and never one to look backward. Today, if he were here, he would have his face set to the rising sun, ready to meet each new day with courage and enthusiasm. He would have us use the first stanza of that great poem by Alfred Lloyd Tennyson, which reads:

> Sunset and evening star, and
> One clear call for me; and
> May there be no moaning at the bar,
> When I put out to sea.

In this sad and solemn hour, we extend to the devoted widow and members of the family our deep and abiding sympathy in their sorrow.

THE LATE FOSTER STEARNS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that I announce to the House the recent passing of our former colleague, the Honorable Foster Stearns. He served the Second District of New Hampshire from 1939 to 1945 and was residing in Exeter, N. H., at the time of his death. I consider it a great privilege to have had the opportunity of serving with him in the House during the 78th Congress. He was an able Representative and our country has lost one of its most stalwart and courageous spokesmen.

Born in Hull, Mass., on July 29, 1881, Foster Stearns had a varied career before entering the political field, including a long record of service as both a librarian and a member of the Foreign Service. He graduated from Amherst College in 1903 with a bachelor of arts degree. Mr. Stearns received a master of science degree from Harvard University in 1906 and from Boston College in 1915. In 1913 he was appointed librarian of the Museum of Fine Arts of Boston where he served until 1917. At that time he was appointed State librarian for Massachusetts.

After serving in the First World War from 1917 to 1919, during which time he was decorated with the Silver Star and Purple Heart, Mr. Stearns' Foreign Service career began with his appointment as assistant military attaché to Belgium in 1919. In the ensuing 4 years he was with the Department of State in Washington, served as third secretary of the American Embassy in Constantinople and as second secretary of the American Embassy in Paris. After this he was appointed librarian for Holy Cross College in Massachusetts, holding this position until 1930.

Foster Stearns' political career in New Hampshire began in 1937 with his election to the New Hampshire General Court from the town of Hancock. In 1939 he was elected to Congress and was a member of the House until 1945, when he retired from active political life. While a Member of the House, he was on the Foreign Affairs Committee for the entire term of his service. As a member of this committee he demonstrated his understanding of international affairs and his great courage. His deep interest and insight into international affairs enabled him to make an outstanding contribution to the winning of the war.

In the years just prior to the Second World War and during the first years of the war, Foster Stearns' voting record on important issues speaks eloquently of his keen awareness of his duty to his country and his steadfastness in his beliefs. In 1941, when lend-lease legislation was one of the major issues before the Congress, Mr. Stearns voted for the passage of the bill, and voted similarly in 1943 and 1944 for the extension of the lend-lease agreements. In 1940 he supported the passage of the Selective Service Act. It is well to recall that this measure passed the House by a majority of one vote. In 1939 he voted against the passage of the Neutrality Act. A more detailed study of his outstanding record in Congress would indicate his devotion to the welfare of his country.

In order to give a complete picture of Foster Stearns' outstanding career, recognition must be made of his many other activities. After his discharge from the Army in 1919, he was appointed Privy Chamberlain of Sword and Cape to Pope Pius XI and Knight of the Sovereign Military Order of Malta. He was a prominent figure in religious circles and was recognized as one of the foremost Roman Catholic laymen in New Hampshire. He was an active member of numerous clubs and societies, and also an author and translator of many French works.

It is clearly understandable that Foster Stearns, a man with so many diverse interests, had it within his power to make valuable contributions in serving his country. New Hampshire is rightly proud of his long and distinguished record. He will be greatly missed by his host of friends not only in New Hampshire but throughout the country. I extend to his wife, Mrs. Martha Stearns, his mother, Mrs. Emily C. Stearns, and his sister, Mrs. Henry W. Giese, my deepest sympathy in these difficult hours.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was deeply grieved to read of the death of my old friend, Foster Stearns.

Foster Stearns was a sincere and devoted legislator, a gentleman, a man of fine, noble character, and with a personality that strongly attracted others to him. He quickly developed friendships in the Congress. I can see him now greeting me as we met coming in or leaving the Chamber, a whimsical smile on his face. Foster Stearns was one of the finest and sweetest characters I have ever met. I am deeply grieved at his passing and I join with my friend from New Hampshire in extending to his loved ones my deep sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. I want to join with my friend from New Hampshire in expressing my sincere regret at the death of Foster Stearns. He was a fine, kindly citizen and an able legislator. He served with distinction as a Member of Congress and was beloved by all who served with him. New Hampshire and the country have suffered a great loss by his untimely death.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I also was deeply saddened by the news of the death of our former colleague, Foster Stearns. I served with him as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee for a number of years. Mr. Stearns was a great legislator, a true friend—and he had many friends—and a great American. This country has lost an outstanding citizen.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and character of the late Foster Stearns.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, we were all shocked to learn this week that Foster Stearns, who served so ably in this House for three terms, died last Monday. This was a particular loss to me, for I have known and respected Foster Stearns for many years. I live but a few miles from his former home at Hancock, N. H., and am privileged to represent the Second New Hampshire District which he served so ably.

Foster Stearns was a dedicated Christian gentleman whose loss will be felt by his church, his State, and his Nation which he served so well. Following is an article which appeared in the Keene, N. H., Evening Sentinel on Tuesday, June 5, which outlines Foster Stearns' distinguished career:

FOSTER STEARNS, EX-LEGISLATOR, DEAD AT 74

EXETER, N. H.—Former United States Representative Foster Stearns, Republican, New Hampshire, 74, died yesterday. He served three terms in Congress and was defeated in 1945 by the late Senator Tobey, Republican, of New Hampshire, in a bid for the United States Senate.

A native of Hull, Mass., he was one of the foremost Roman Catholic laymen in the State. Stearns served as chairman of the sixth annual New Hampshire Catholic charities drive in 1951.

After his graduation from Amherst College in 1903, he received a master of science degree from Harvard.

He served as librarian of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts from 1913 to 1917 and was Massachusetts State librarian in 1917.

Stearns served in the Army during World War I and received the Silver Star and a Purple Heart.

In 1920, he was appointed to the staff of the State Department by President Wilson and went as diplomatic secretary to Paris and Constantinople before his appointment as librarian of Holy Cross College in Worcester, a job he held from 1925 to 1930.

Stearns' New Hampshire political career began in 1937 when he served one term in the State legislature. He went to Congress in 1939 and served three consecutive terms.

He leaves his widow, Mrs. Martha Stearns, and his mother, Mrs. Emily C. Stearns, of Amherst, Mass.

Funeral services will be held here Wednesday.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 10721) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wonder if the gentleman can tell me whether the million dollars for so-called entertainment is in the State Department appropriation or was some compromise reached on that item?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that all of the conferees have not as yet signed the conference report, I do not believe that I am at liberty at this time to disclose the action of the conferees. I take it that until all of the conferees have signed the conference report, the conference between the House and Senate, it is not yet concluded. I will tell the gentleman from Iowa privately, however, as soon as all have signed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9739) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. THOMAS, YATES, EVINS, BOLLAND, CANNON, PHILLIPS, VURSELL, OSTERTAG, and TABER.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have permission to sit during general debate in the House on Monday and Tuesday of next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, when we are debating mutual security and this vast program to sustain and strengthen certain of the free nations of the world, it might be appropriate to call Members' attention to the discharge petition which is on the Clerk's desk in connection with H. R. 627 which contains three administration requests involving civil rights.

It is to be hoped the Rules Committee will act promptly on this measure, but lest H. R. 627 languish too long in the Rules Committee and thus a blemish is placed on the 84th Congress legislative record, I urge our colleagues to recollect that foreign aid must be accompanied by our actions and examples in our domestic program.

The white race is a minority one and when it comes to making friends abroad, our dollars in our outstretched hands are only as valuable as the spirit in our hearts that motivates our gift.

The pen is mightier than the sword.

Again, I urge—sign the discharge petition on H. R. 627.

FLAG DAY COMMEMORATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Thursday, June 14, for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of observing and commemorating Flag Day in such manner as the Speaker may deem appropriate and proper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 60]

Alexander	Gubser	Nelson
Andersen, H. Carl	Gwinn	O'Hara, Minn.
Ayres	Hale	Patman
Barrett	Healey	Patterson
Bass, Tenn.	Henderson	Pillion
Bell	Heriong	Polk
Bush	Hill	Powell
Cannon	Hoffman, Ill.	Preston
Carnahan	Holtzman	Priest
Cederberg	James	Prouty
Celler	Jones, Mo.	Scherer
Chudoff	Kelley, Pa.	Selden
Corbett	Kilburn	Shelley
Coudert	King, Pa.	Sieminski
Curtis, Mo.	Kirwan	Sikes
Davidson	Klein	Springer
Dawson, Ill.	Kluczynski	Taylor
Deane	Knutson	Thompson, La.
Dollinger	Lane	Thompson, Tex.
Dowdy	McConnell	Thornberry
Eberharter	McDowell	Vursell
Edmondson	McIntire	Walter
Fallon	Mack, Wash.	Wharton
Forand	Madden	Widnall
Gamble	Miller, Calif.	Young
Garmatz	Mollohan	Zelenko
George	Moulder	
	Mumma	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 345 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the majority leader what the program is for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, if consideration of the pending bill is completed today any rollcalls on the bill or any amendment will go over until Monday.

On Monday there will be a call of the bills on the Private Calendar. Thereafter, the bill H. R. 1840, the Rogers bill, in relation to amendments to the Clayton Act, will be called up. That is the same bill that is involved in the Patman discharge petition. The two are the same with the exception of the title.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will they have preference over District of Columbia business?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a matter, of course, I cannot pass on. My impression is that the Rogers bill will be taken up for consideration first. That is the understanding I have.

Mr. MARTIN. But which comes first?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say that whoever the Chair recognizes first. The Chair will probably recognize the Committee on Rules to call up the Rogers bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then that will come ahead of the District bills. The District bills to be called up consist of 11 bills and are as follows:

H. R. 4993, Board of Commissioners, filling-station property.

H. R. 8149, transfer actions, United States district court to municipal district court.

H. R. 10670, Unemployment Compensation Act, extend, certain employees outside District of Columbia.

H. R. 11489, American Institute of Architects, tax-exempt property.

H. R. 11320, amend Narcotic Control Act.

H. R. 11002, Pawnbrokers' Act.

S. 1275, police protection—institutions outside District of Columbia.

S. 1739, examining and licensing board members—fix compensation.

H. R. 4697, amend Alcoholic Beverage Control Act.

H. R. 11488, amend the Traffic Act.

H. R. 11487, District of Columbia Revenue Act, licensing trailers.

Then there is the conference report on the State, Justice, and the judiciary appropriation bill.

Tuesday is primary day in the State of South Carolina and any rollcalls on that day will go over until Wednesday.

On Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday the following bills will be considered:

H. R. 5881, Federal reclamation laws—conference report.

H. R. 4090, installations, radiotelegraph on cargo ships.

H. R. 9952, Armed Forces Reserves, readjustment pay.

H. R. 9540, strengthen Water Pollution Control Act.

House Concurrent Resolution 244, Joint Committee—unveiling Commodore John Barry's statue.

H. R. 11040, advance research and development programs.

I may say that the first order of business on Thursday will be the recess that will take place in connection with Flag Day exercises.

There is the usual reservation that conference reports may be called up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

DAMAGING OR DESTROYING AIRCRAFT

Mr. WILLIS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2972) to punish the willful damaging or destroying of aircraft and attempts to damage or destroy aircraft, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill, H. R. 7886.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11356, with Mr. COOPER in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday there was pending the amendment of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] and the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the Kelly amendment. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment of the gentlewoman from New York and the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey to the Kelly amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. KELLY of New York: Page 3, after line 4, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 4. Title I, chapter 4, of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which contains general provisions relating to mutual defense assistance, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

" 'SEC. 143. Prohibition of assistance to Yugoslavia.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no assistance under this title or any other title of this act, or under any provision of law repealed by section 542 (a) of this act, shall be furnished to Yugoslavia after the date of the enactment of this section.' "

And renumber succeeding sections accordingly.

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey to the amendment offered by Mrs. KELLY of New York: Insert after "enactment of this section" a comma and the following: "unless the President finds (1) that there has been no change in the Yugoslavian policies on the basis of which assistance under this act has been furnished to Yugoslavia in the past, and that Yugoslavia is independent of control by the Soviet Union, and (2) that it is in the interest of the national security of the United States to continue the furnishing of assistance to Yugoslavia under this act."

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Williams amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the Williams amendment will undo the basic purpose of the new section which I have introduced to section 3, title I, of the Mutual Security Act. I feel it is time that the United States serve notice on the world that the people of the United States through their representatives in Congress are resolute in forbidding funds to those nations who are playing both sides of the fence, the East and the West.

I also feel that this section will strengthen the forces of freedom and true independence if we pledge assistance to those who are willing to fight and defend that freedom. I want to say at this point that Yugoslavia has failed in the past to live up to its agreements under which it has received military assistance in the past. It took 4 years or more for us to endeavor to inspect that material which we gave to them through our aid.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw the attention of the Members of the House to page 152 of the committee hearings where the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] brought up in committee the question of inspection that was discussed last year during the debate on the bill. In reference to this question the gentleman from New Jersey stated:

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I just wonder whether the question of Yugoslavia's cooperation in compliance with the law of inspection has come up. I would guess that came up for discussion.

Chairman RICHARDS. It hasn't come up, and it is a good question to raise.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Last year that formed quite an important part of the legislative history.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. MCGUIRE. That is right. General Waters, I believe, in the first week in February went out and made a complete inspection trip, which is the first time that has happened to our MAAG in Yugoslavia.

Inspection is one of the requirements of the law. I do want to say that prior to our planned itinerary which included going into Yugoslavia last year, Secretary Murphy went there, and I feel that in order to get this inspection he promised Tito forty-million-odd dollars worth of agricultural supplies, under Public Law 480. I do not think any aid at this time to Yugoslavia is essential. Therefore, I oppose Mr. WILLIAMS' amendment for the reason that it gives to the President that which he already possesses:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey to the amendment offered by Mrs. KELLY of New York: Insert after "enactment of this section" a comma and the following: "unless the President finds (1) that there has been no change in the Yugoslavian policies on the basis of which assistance under this act has been furnished to Yugoslavia in the past, and that Yugoslavia is independent of control by the Soviet Union, and (2) that it is in the interest of the national security of the United States to continue the furnishing of assistance to Yugoslavia under this act."

I want to bring to the attention of the Members of the House that on page 142 of the hearings, on my question to Mr. Van Dyke, it was brought out that Yugoslavia in the past year or so has received almost $200 million of aid from the U. S. S. R. Some may believe that the United States should endeavor to match those funds, but I do not believe that. I believe that if Tito is going to accept aid from Russia we should cease giving further aid. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Members of this House will review this entire situation as far as Yugoslavia is concerned and vote in favor of my amendment which prohibits any military aid to Yugoslavia and any economic aid. However, my amendment would permit the President, under Public Law 480, to sell our agricultural surpluses to Yugoslavia.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. As I understand it, the gentlewoman is suggesting a reevaluation of our position with respect to Yugoslavia.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I do not suggest any reevaluation at this time. We had a reevaluation last fall prior to our trip into Yugoslavia. When I returned to Paris I went to see General Cook, who said that an evaluation was going on at that time. Later a report was made to us that the Department had deemed it expedient to continue aid. We have had reevaluation after reevaluation, and the fear of cutting off always rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I do want to say that last August, when it was made known that Yugoslavia had returned to the Communist fold, the executive department should not have tried to win her back. Secretary Dulles, during the period of his stay in Geneva immediately rushed to pay Tito a visit. Secretary Murphy rushed there and pledged more aid. Surely this must have been a most discouraging revelation to our other allies.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Is the gentlewoman aware that the President

has asked for the opportunity to restudy the present situation?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I have heard that was reported at the news conference. Yes, I know that the President desired a reevaluation of the foreign policy. He recommended that we include this in the present bill with a stipulation that a report be made by November 15. I was one person who endeavored to delete that because we certainly could not have come to the floor this year asking for this amount of money and at the same time saying that we were not sure what we were doing; let us have a new look.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would be acceptable to the gentlewoman from New York and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] if a substitute amendment were offered which would add a proviso to the Williams amendment to the effect that the President shall forthwith transmit such findings, together with the basis for such findings, to the Congress.

I am greatly disturbed lest the Williams amendment weaken the Kelly amendment. My substitute would require the President to give the Congress the reasons for his findings so that the Congress might have all the facts and be able to take whatever action it decided was in our national interest.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. As far as I am personally concerned, I would not accept any weakening amendment.

Mr. DODD. I wonder if the gentleman from New Jersey would be willing to accept such an amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. It was anticipated in the amendment I offered that the President would make findings and, of course, that we would know what his findings were. I should like to consider for a while the suggestion made by my friend from Connecticut. It is entirely possible it might be advisable to add to my amendment the requirement of reporting to the Congress.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. May I ask the gentleman from Connecticut a question?

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Suppose Congress adjourned before receiving that report, then possibly the State Department could rush in and deliver all those advanced weapons which at this point have not been delivered.

Mr. DODD. The Executive, of course, makes many important decisions during congressional adjournment. But I hope that the responsible officials of the Government will not act on such a matter in which the people of the United States are vitally interested without at least keeping in very close contact with congressional leadership during adjournment.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the statement made by the gentleman from Connecticut, may I say that on our trip throughout Europe many of the leaders of the countries we visited brought up Yugoslavia as an example, telling us that due to the fact that Yugoslavia was playing both sides of the aisle, or East against the West, there was a question in their minds if they should not remain neutral and do the same.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. We took a calculated risk in the beginning when we granted the aid to Tito. We took Tito on faith. Can anyone say that our calculated risk was wise, at this point, that our faith was well-grounded? Certainly the actions of Tito have demonstrated beyond any doubt to me where he stands. I certainly would not want to leave it to the President at this point and let him determine, because the President would have to consult someone in the State Department to find out what their ideas were. We were told by our comrade here, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], that the State Department is still full of Communist sympathizers, and they would determine whether this calculated risk would be warranted.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I agree wholly with my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

In the first instance, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say with reference to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that this so-called calculated risk of which he spoke was, in my opinion, a matter of little calculation, if any, and all risk.

Mr. MASON. I would agree.

Mr. FEIGHAN. In my opinion it would be an act of cowardice and failure to measure up to our responsibilities, in view of the facts that are so well known to us, if the Congress voted to pass the buck to President Eisenhower, whom we all know is already overburdened. In my opinion, we should stop aid forthwith to Tito, the ruthless Communist dictator.

As every Member of the 84th Congress knows, the Congress last year adopted an amendment which I offered to the Mutual Security Act that made it absolutely mandatory that any nation which is the recipient of aid under the Mutual Security Act must permit continous observation and review by United States representatives of programs of assistance, including the utilization of any such assistance.

It was quite obvious to the Members that my amendment was aimed directly at the Communist dictator Tito, who as revealed in the hearings before the Foreign Affairs Committee, steadfastly refused to permit complete inspection of the end use of assistance granted under the Mutual Security Act. The effect of my amendment, of course, applied to every recipient nation.

President Eisenhower signed the Mutual Security Act as amended on July 8 last year. Now let us examine whether or not that mandate of Congress was carried out. The gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] just read from page 152 of the hearings which took place on March 27 of this year, in which the Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs of the Department of Defense said, and I quote:

> General Waters, I believe, in the first week of February went out and made a complete inspection trip, which is the first time that has happened to our MAAG in Yugoslavia.

In view of this fact, as stated by Mr. McGuire, I would like to inquire whether the United States representative had stopped in accordance with the law, the supply of materiel and funds to Yugoslavia during that period from July 8 until the first week of February of this year, which was 6 months later, when, as Mr. McGuire said, it was the first time that a complete inspection trip was made in Yugoslavia by representatives of the United States Government. In view of this flagrant violation of the act of Congress, I should like to inquire if any of the United States armed services personnel or United States representatives in Yugoslavia during that period have been court-martialed or fired for dereliction of duty. In my opinion, what has transpired from July 8 until the first week in February, in Yugoslavia, with reference to assistance provided by American taxpayers' funds is another reason why the Congress should not pass the buck to the President, because the President apparently was not made cognizant of the true situation which existed in Yugoslavia during that period. In my opinion, the Congress would be abdicating its time-honored duties if it fails to take positive action in this matter and passes the buck instead to President Eisenhower. I sincerely hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] will be defeated, and the amendment of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FEIGHAN was granted 1 additional minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Does the gentleman think the security of this country is furthered best by having Yugoslavia independent, or under the heel of the Soviet power?

Mr. FEIGHAN. My answer to that is that in my opinion Tito is nothing but a Russian stooge. He has been for many years a Russian agent. All his life he has studied in Moscow for the purpose of imposing the Marxist doctrine upon the good people of Yugoslavia.

Any idea of his being independent is absolutely contradictory to the facts, because a person cannot be a national patriot and Communist at the same time, because communism means adherence to the Marxist doctrine of world Communist empire.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Then the gentleman has never supported the policy we have followed over the years of trying to keep Yugoslavia independent.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I never thought you could, and that is why the last 2 years I offered amendments to stop any aid to Yugoslavia.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is not the man you are talking about one of our allies to whom we have given billions of dollars? Will not the gentleman's remarks kind of interfere with our foreign policy?

Mr. FEIGHAN. If you strike out the word "ally" I will agree with you 100 percent. I disagree that he has ever been any ally. I think that if the Communists from Moscow went on the march one of two things would happen: Either there would be a revolution by the people of Slovenia, Croatia, Serbia, and Montenegro against the despotic rule of Tito or else they would be forced with Russian guns at their backs to fight against the free world.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I never had any use for any of them.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Williams amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to participate in the debate on this amendment or any amendments thereto, but it seems to me that the debate has come to the place where there is considerable heat and not very much light on just exactly what we are trying to do.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the Kelly amendment it seems to me would make sense unless the House proposes to take over the day-to-day conduct of foreign affairs; and, obviously, that is something we cannot do.

I have disagreed with the President, and I suppose nobody on the committee or off the committee disagreed more than I or more strongly than I did on yesterday in the matter of increasing the amount of this bill by $600 million; but on occasion I have agreed with the President and on occasion I have tried to help get his program through.

There seems to me to be one fact that has been overlooked in this matter. He is the President of the United States; and, as somebody said yesterday, he is the only President that the United States has at this time and if we cannot trust the President of the United States to do what the Congress tells him to do then perhaps we had better pass some kind of law to take over the complete administration and responsibility of the executive department itself and amend the Constitution.

It is simply obvious that we cannot sit here and decide what is going to be done on foreign affairs from day to day. I think a certain amount of direction from the Congress is necessary, but I also feel that a certain amount of flexibility for the Executive is necessary for the day-to-day conduct of this particular piece of legislation that everybody knows we are going to pass.

I hold no brief for Tito; as a matter of fact when I was in Yugoslavia in 1949 one of his assistants in the foreign affairs department cornered me at a reception and he said: "You have a lot of Serbs in your district, do you not?"

I answered: "Well, if anybody ought to know that it is you, for you used to run a Communist newspaper in Pittsburgh, didn't you?"

He stepped back a couple of steps and our Ambassador thought I had wrecked all relations with Yugoslavia. But that was not the worst; he came back for more, and he said, "Well, we want to know what the Serbs in your district think of this regime."

I do not know whether you are familiar with the conduct of internal politics in Yugoslavia, but the Serbs are one nationality, and Tito is a Croatian. The Serbs were loyal to Mihailovich.

I told him, "They think that you are a bunch of thieves, cutthroats, and murderers. That is how you rate in my district; and if they had their way they would hang the lot of you from the nearest telephone pole."

At that the Ambassador nearly had a stroke and he said, "Why, now, you really have ruined things"; and he lectured me for hours and was going to report to Washington about it, probably did for all I know. But do you know what happened? The next day, for the first time, Tito's gang gave a reception for the Americans. I think they appreciated a little straight talk. I do not know what report that particular Ambassador sent back to Washington, but I know what report I gave when I got back to Washington to the then President. It may be a coincidence, but they replaced that Ambassador in Yugoslavia about 10 days later and we sent an Ambassador over there who started talking tough. I do not think anyone on this floor can say that Tito was friendly to Stalin. We helped to keep them separated as long as Stalin lived.

We are hearing a lot of argument now that Tito is friendly with Bulganin and Khrushchev. I do not approve of that, of course, but I cannot tell him who to be friendly with. If you want to go back to a year ago we had a lot of pictures in the paper showing the President of the United States having a smiling conference with Khrushchev and Bulganin. I am not criticizing the President for that. I do not think he had any other alternative. I do not believe the results at Geneva were very beneficial, but I do not believe the President could have refused to go because in the eyes of the world if he had refused everybody would say: Those Americans will not even sit down and talk peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlemen from Ohio has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HAYS of Ohio was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, we have to do things sometimes in the long-range interest of peace that do not seem to be particularly popular at the moment. This matter has troubled me, not only this year but in other years and I am not happy about it. I do think the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will do the thing that needs to be done and will put the burden right where it needs to be placed, on the President of the United States. He will make the decision and I will be satisfied. I have enough confidence in his integrity to let him make the decision. I do not think we can make it here.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. Is it not true that the Mutual Security Act, the organic act, notwithstanding the amendments and the bill as reported this year, provides that the President has that authority anyway?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. That is true, but this points it up.

Mr. DONOVAN. The direction the gentleman's argument is taking is somewhat like the Ambassador in Yugoslavia; it is intended to ruin the very guts of the Kelly amendment.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I may say to the gentleman that you cannot police and I cannot police and the Congress cannot police everybody in the State Department and every Ambassador. Certainly the gentleman who was then Ambassador was probably doing what he thought was best. It just happened I did not agree with him.

Mr. DONOVAN. Is not the design of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey to take the meat right out of the Kelly amendment?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. No. I think it could even be strengthened if both participants, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], would agree to accept the language suggested by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. I believe then the Kelly amendment would be effective and the thing that the Kelly amendment seeks to do would be done. Congress would get a report on why the President made whatever decision he did and beyond that I do not think you can rightfully go.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. The amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York states definitely that we will cut off all aid to Communist dictators, is that right?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. That is not a responsibility of the State Department or of the President. That is the measure that is before the Congress. We have that responsibility. If we vote against aid to Tito, it does not affect the operation of the day-to-day functions of the Department of State. This is a determination which the Congress should have the courage to face up to.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I do not think it is quite as simple as that because what you are proposing to do here, if we follow your argument—I am speaking now to the gentleman from Ohio—is if there is any shadow of doubt at all that Tito is even neutral, you are proposing to say: "We do not want you to be neutral, go on over to Russia, take your troops, and stay there."

Now, I think there is just a shadow of doubt. I think that he is not, after his experience, going to let the Kremlin dictate to him any more, and I think that is worthy of salvaging. I am not too happy with neutrals and all that sort of thing, but I point out to you that

this country right after the American Revolution was pretty neutral. We turned our backs on our ally, France, and I do not think we ought to go around saying to people "You cannot be neutral; you have to be the way we tell you to be or go over to the other side and be against us." Now, that is what it boils down to.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the parliamentary situation, we have an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY], and an amendment to that amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DODD. It would, therefore, not be proper to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey, I take it. It would then be in the third degree.

The CHAIRMAN. It would be in the third degree and would not be in order.

Mr. DODD. Would it be in order to offer a substitute amendment to the Kelly amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. That could be in order. It would depend on how it was drafted, but it could be in order.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. I heartily agree with what the gentleman has said. He has made a very fine presentation of his argument. But, the thing that concerns me in this day and age especially in Europe and Asia, a vast amount of their good-will contacts, socially and even officially, is done at cocktail parties. In their foreign policies many countries in Europe and Asia, are argued, discussed, and even adopted at a cocktail party, over a beer keg, a Martini, or a Manhattan glass. No doubt at this time Tito is in Moscow lapping up vodka like a hog laps up slop. That is what is worrying me most about this particular amendment. This condition also disturbs me about foreign policies of various governments. Nehru has said: "I leave my heart in Moscow." Too bad he did not leave his silly head.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I do not know how much of a vodka drinker Tito is.

Mr. CHELF. They tell me that that stuff is like block and tackle moonshine. You will walk a block and you will tackle anybody. They say that vodka takes your breath away and then makes one reach out and scratch where it does not even itch. I was in Moscow in 1945 and while there I was offered the drink. I refused to take it.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Well, I have been there, too, and I did not lap any of it. I will say that. It is a matter beyond my knowledge as to what is going on drinkingwise.

But, I would like to make one concluding remark. It seems to me you are faced with this alternative of slamming the door shut firmly and saying "We are through; go on over to the other side; we do not want you; forget about it" or maybe taking a chance, maybe a long one, maybe a 10 to 1 shot that he still will not accept dictation by the Kremlin. And, if I am faced with a certain alternative on the one hand and a 10 to 1 chance on the other, it seems worth taking a 10 to 1 gamble in the face of an obvious loss.

Mr. CHELF. The gentleman from Ohio has made a very cogent statement and I want to congratulate and commend him upon his knowledge and hard work on the committee.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Kelly amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the assistance available to Yugoslavia in this bill is comparatively small, but the issue involved may, before action is finally taken on this bill, develop into a major precedent.

Mr. Chairman, first I want to say that I have the greatest admiration and respect for the ability and the good intentions of the gentlewoman from New York. She has been fighting on this issue for a long time. But, let us see what is involved before we act in haste.

I hold no brief for Tito. In fact, in this bill right now as it was reported by the committee he has been handed a pretty heavy jolt. The executive department was after $30 million in economic aid and it has been cut in half by this committee to $15 million. As to the other money he is going to get—I cannot give you the exact figure— the additional military aid in this for Tito is much smaller than some of the figures which have been mentioned in various places. Now, remember this—and I agree with the gentleman who first spoke in that respect—that we want people to be on our side in this world conflict now, but we would rather have nations as neutrals than as enemies if we cannot get them to join us. What would you do if you were the head of Yugoslavia, a small nation just like the United States was after we won our independence? What would you do? Here is one of the poorest countries in Europe. Tito is right there, almost under the guns of the Kremlin. He is the only living dictator of a Communist country that has ever dared to stand up to Stalin and has lived to tell the tale. Do you want to help to drive him, with his 20 divisions, back into the Russian camp? General Gruenther says that Yugoslavia is a crucial point on the front if war should come. Yugoslavia's 20 or 25 divisions, holding that many Russian divisions down, would be invaluable to the allied forces in the event a war came. Do you want to do that?

Well, if you want to drive Tito into the Soviet camp there is no surer way than to take action along this line. You are not investing much. The President of the United States has already said that he is going to reevaluate this situation. It is true that Tito is over there now in Moscow visiting. But they tell me that General Twining is preparing to go over there from the United States. I do not know whether that is the wise thing to do or not; but nobody who goes to Russia is going to say that he does not want to be a friend of the Russians if they really honestly want to be friends themselves. This does not mean coexistence, but we all hope the day will come when we can really be friends with a free people of Russia. We want to raise this pall of a possible atomic war that hangs over the world if we can.

I know that this is not the purpose of the author of the amendment, but if the amendment is approved, Tito will have no choice but to throw in his lot with the Soviet Union. It is true that he is playing both ends against the middle. He wants what he can get out of the United States and he wants what he can get out of Russia. There is no question about that. But where is he to turn except to the United States or to international communism?

If his people are given a free choice and really want communism, that is their business. I would not have any quarrel with Russia and their communism if it was the free choice of the Russian people and if they did not try to subvert other peoples and other governments.

When Stalin had that row with Tito, Tito told him off and said, "I am running this country; I am a Yugoslavian Communist, but I am not trying to dictate to other nations." And he even joined a federation with Turkey and Greece. He thumbed his nose at Stalin. And, believe me, if he did that to Stalin, with all the power that Stalin had in those days, then perhaps those people over there now cannot coerce him into a course of action against his own interest and independence. But let us not push him over to them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to our distinguished Speaker

Mr. RAYBURN. We have a lot of neutrals in the world. We have 350 million of them in one place in the world. Is it not much better to have them as neutrals than to have them as enemies, as the gentleman and I believe this would make Yugoslavia if this action were taken here today?

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that statement, and it is 100 percent true. If we are going to try to kick everybody around because they will not firmly sign up with our side, right at this crucial time, when they are wavering as to which direction they ought to take, we may be making a bad mistake.

Take the great Government of Italy. Is anybody going to suggest that we cut out aid to Italy because at times almost half of their representation in their parliament was Communist, even though they have the influence of the Vatican

right there? It has been touch and go in Italy. Are you willing to cut out aid to Israel because they have seven Communists in their parliament? Are you going to do that? Mr. Chairman, if you are going to do that then we had better just quit this battle and come back here to this country and fortify our own shores.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What evidence is there that Tito is neutral or will be neutral?

Mr. RICHARDS. You just have to figure out, what you think his record means.

Mr. TUMULTY. Do you think he is neutral when he shot down our fliers?

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. May I ask the gentleman from South Carolina this: Is there not a risk that by making neutrality in the case of Yugoslavia and India as attractive as it is we are likely to encourage other countries now our allies to embark on a course of neutrality if they think they can get away with it, countries such as Germany and Greece?

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not know about that, but if you do this to Tito you will certainly discourage other satellites from kicking over the traces, because they will say, "Who have you got to back you up?"

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Is it not correct that, if we deprive the Communist Tito of this aid, such action will be a beacon light to the hopes and aspirations of all the people who want to overthrow the tyranny of communism?

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not think it will work out that way. It will certainly discourage the leaders of the satellite countries.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman from South Carolina has spoken against the Kelly amendment. I wonder if he would mind expressing his opinion as to the wisdom of accepting it if the Williams amendment were embraced in the Kelly amendment.

Mr. RICHARDS. I think that might be helpful. I have not spoken to that amendment. But so far as I am personally concerned, if the Kelly amendment is amended by the Williams amendment, so that the President will have to make a finding, which will leave some flexibility, I do not think it will do too much harm.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I addressed that question to the chairman because I agree, incidentally, with the chairman's viewpoint completely. I think he has reached the heart of the matter. I trust the House will agree with it. I offered this other idea inviting the chairman to agree with the Williams amendment, because it does recognize officially that something may have happened that was not in the committee's mind when we reported even this lower amount, $15 million. So I know the House will be interested in the chairman's views on that. It just seemed to me that was the answer, if we could adopt the Williams amendment.

Mr. RICHARDS. That might be. I would not oppose it if the Kelly amendment is amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Does not the gentleman think the whole question might be very quickly resolved if we could get some commitment from the President or the State Department as to when the reevaluation would take place? We have been hearing about that for 4 years. If they could give us some indication of when they would go to work on it, the question might be very quickly resolved.

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not think we could put the Executive on a timetable and say, "Get your findings up here at a certain date," but I think if the Congress took that step, we would have a reevaluation of that situation right away. I hope that, if the Kelly amendment remains as it is, it will be voted down, but if the Williams amendment to the Kelly amendment is adopted, I would be disposed to accept it.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall support the Kelly amendment with the Williams amendment, to cut off all aid to Yugoslavia unless the President himself determines otherwise.

But I rise primarily to point out that this is a situation from which it seems to me we can learn a great deal as we wrestle with difficult problems around the world. It is important periodically to take inventory on a given operation and draw lessons from our experience.

Our aid to Yugoslavia is an illustration of the truth of Abraham Lincoln's statement that nothing that is morally wrong can ever be politically right. The immoral things that have been done in the Yugoslavia case, beginning with actions by some of our allies during the war, had led us to the difficult position we are in today, where there is no good way out. About our only choice now is to decide which course will do least harm to our country.

It is also a case study in the larger question of whether we can better serve the interests of the United States in the long run by helping Communist dictators retain tyrannical control over their people, or by encouraging and helping the people to resist the dictators.

Tito has opposed and is opposing every one of our policies in Europe, in the Middle East, in Asia, and all around the world that this whole $4 billion program of aid is supposed to promote. He opposes every one of the foreign policies we are trying to carry out today. But still we have continued to help him all these years, until it now may be more dangerous to stop than to go on.

How did we get into such a predicament?

To begin with, some of our European allies sold out another ally, Mihailovitch, a genuine friend, a man of the people, and committed to real democracy, in order to bring to power in Yugoslavia, this Communist dictator Tito, thinking it might shorten the war and save lives. There was little, if any, real gain then; and look at what that betrayal has cost us since and is threatening to do to us today, with Tito rearmed by ourselves and proclaiming publicly his undying union with our mortal enemy, the Communist world conspiracy.

Anything that is morally wrong will not turn out to be politically right. I hope we will learn something from this painful experience.

Then, during the postwar period, we gave vast UNRRA aid to Yugoslavia, whose people were desperately hungry. But we gave it through Tito. Some of us fought then against that system of giving aid to Communist rulers, because food in such circumstances is the strongest and most powerful political weapon in the world. A man will himself stand up against the machine guns of a tyrant; but if the tyrant controls all food and the only way the man can keep his children alive is by signing the tyrant's card, he is likely to sign up. With our food, we enabled Tito to entrench himself and fasten his oppressive rule on the Yugoslav people. Once more a thing that was morally wrong turned out to be politically wrong.

Then in 1949 there was a hard famine in Yugoslavia. It was partly due to peasant resistance to Tito, but there was also a severe drought. For 2 years it did not rain; the ground was baked and barren. Our instinct, of course, was to help hungry people there, as everywhere. But we had to decide whether our sending of food to Tito would bring more good to the people than it would bring them harm in the long run by strengthening his hold on the country. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] led the fight against the aid. I spoke for it, arguing that we ought to try to get some help to the people even if it did also help their oppressor. I suspect the gentleman from Ohio was right. We should have required Tito to give freedom to his people in return for our aid. But we are softhearted. Food seemed more important to us than freedom.

Just about that time Tito and Stalin had their differences. Stalin kicked Tito out.

Let us have this point clear. It is frequently said, as if to Tito's credit, that he broke with the Kremlin and the Communist world conspiracy, that he put his nation's independence ahead of communism. That is not the case. Tito had a personal quarrel with Stalin. He is not a nationalist; he was not trying to save Yugoslavia's independence or working for the well-being of the Yugoslav people. He is an egotist; he was trying to save his own neck.

At that point I thought we should stop aid. Year after year I supported in committee this same effort to cut off aid to Tito which the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] is making today.

The argument that can be made today with validity, namely, that to stop aid just now would leave Tito no choice but to go back to the Kremlin, become wholly dependent upon it and, therefore, under its complete control, did not apply then. In 1950, 1951, 1952, and until Stalin died in 1953, Tito could not go back. He would have lost his head. Stalin never forgave anybody. Tito knew it better than anyone—except perhaps the admitted coward, Khrushchev.

That was the time to shut off our aid and cause Tito's power at home to be weakened so that the freedom-loving people of Yugoslavia could rise up and overthrow the dictator. We could have had now in Yugoslavia a genuinely free government, a democratic government, friendly to the West, under leaders chosen by the Yugoslav people themselves.

But instead, for 4 years, we not only sent Tito food and supplies, but needlessly armed his divisions and sent him scores of jet planes. I say needlessly, because we did not have to bribe him to stay away from the Kremlin. He could not go back as long as Stalin lived.

Within a month after Stalin died, in March 1953, I said in a Town Hall speech, in New York, "I think we can anticipate that Tito will now gradually slip back into bed with the Kremlin and its Communist conspirators everywhere." The reason for the break was gone.

Sure enough, Tito now reveals his true colors and proudly reavows his allegiance to communism. Why should anyone ever have doubted it?

But some protest that he has not gone back to the Kremlin completely. Of course not. Why should he? He would be of far less use to the world revolution if he were openly and completely in the Kremlin's arms. He would be like East Germany and Czechoslovakia and Poland, something of a drain on the Soviet Union. How much more valuable he is to Russia if he can keep us supporting him and building up his armed forces. What sense would there be in the Kremlin making him break with us yet? He would not be any more use to them than are Hungary and Bulgaria and Rumania.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. JUDD was granted 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, Tito's greatest value to the Kremlin is not as a satellite. His greatest value is as a supposed neutral or independent. That gives him all the advantage of being on both sides. We continue to support him, we enable him to maintain large armies in the field, and we help him keep the Yugoslav people under his thumb. Doubtless he can also learn a good deal about our plans and our strength and that of NATO, and of Greece and Turkey. What better arrangement could there be? The free world sustains him and the Communists world reaps the benefit.

Mr. Chairman, there was no justification for our helping Tito as we did while Stalin lived. Tito was dependent on us for his life and his power, not we on him.

But now Stalin is gone. As predicted, Tito has moved back openly into the Kremlin's orbit. But perhaps not completely. That is what makes our predicament and our decision today so difficult. Having given him such vital aid all these years, is this the moment to stop? Should we adopt here today so drastic an amendment as the Kelly amendment which would rule out any possibility of perhaps keeping up some division between Tito and the Kremlin, to the extent that there may still remain some of the division that existed as long as Stalin was alive and kept it going?

Mr. Chairman, I sympathize entirely with what the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] is trying to do as I have all these years. But I think the direction of foreign policy must come from the President, and so I shall support the Williams amendment to allow the President to continue the aid if he determines it to be in our national interest. That unquestionably puts the President on the spot. But that is the proper thing to do; it should be his responsibility to make the decision, just as it is ours to express our views in favor of stopping the aid.

Mr. Chairman, having fooled along with the immoral policy of aiding a Communist tyrant all these years when we did not need to, we have now got ourselves into a position where I believe we ought to accept the Williams amendment and then pass the Kelly amendment as so amended.

But at the same time we should take to heart some of the lessons of this whole unworthy episode—and please God, never get into such a sorry mess again. At this stage of affairs we, and the President, must weigh the possible benefits that may develop with the other satellites, to the extent that our aid to Tito might conceivably encourage other Communists to try to be independent in their communism—if that is not a contradiction in terms, as I suspect it is—against the certain benefits that would occur all around the world should the people of the United States, the Congress, and the Executive, in their proper relationships, decide the time has come to cut off all aid and comfort to any and all Communist regimes. I am sure the latter would electrify hundrers of millions of people, especially those enslaved behind the curtain and those threatened around its borders. It would give them hope and courage to hang on. It would demonstrate that it pays to be an ally of the United States and that it does not pay to pull Uncle Sam's whiskers or to bite his hand while it feeds them.

I do not blame Tito for trying to get us to feed him; I do not blame Tito for biting our hands; I just blame us for being so dumb as to keep on feeding him while he kept on avowing his devotion to communism and opposing all our efforts against communism everywhere in the world.

I have said all these years, and I say it again today, that in the long run only those things counts and will endure that promote the well-being not of tyrants but of people. What we have faced all along is a moral decision. Does the United States stand with the oppressors or with the oppressed?

Do we put our faith for the future in deals with tyrants or in standing everlastingly on the side of their victims and against the tyrants?

We have never yet quite made that decision as a government.

For myself I have never believed the deals would work out, and I do not believe it now. But at the same time, inconsistent as it may seem, I fear it would be unwise for the Congress to cut off all aid to Tito at this particular moment. It is wrong for a person to be given narcotics year after year. But once that has happened, it generally is unwise to stop them suddenly and entirely before one is completely sure of the condition of the addict.

Mr. Chairman, I think the President soon will have to end this aid to Tito, because that is the right thing to do, it is the moral thing to do, and it will prove to be in the end the expedient thing to do. But I think it probably should be done under the procedures set forth in the Williams amendment. That is the proper way for us to carry on the conduct of our foreign affairs.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DODD. Would it be in order to offer a substitute for the Williams amendment to the Kelly amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. That would be an amendment in the third degree and would not be in order.

Mr. DODD. Would it be in order to offer a substitute for the Kelly amendment as amended by the Williams amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It would.

Mr. DODD. I have such an amendment. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if we can reach an agreement on time. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DODD as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mrs. KELLY of New York: On page 3, after line 4, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 4. Title I, chapter 4, of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which contains general provisions relating to mutual-defense assistance, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 143. Prohibition of assistance to Yugoslavia: Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no assistance under this title or any other title of this act, or under any provision of law repealed by section 542 (a) of this act, shall be furnished to Yugoslavia after the date of the enactment of this section.'

"Unless the President finds (1) that there has been no change in the Yugoslavian policies on the basis of which assistance under this act has been furnished to Yugoslavia in the past, and that Yugoslavia is independent of control by the Soviet Union, and (2) that it is in the interest of the national security of the United States to continue the

furnishing of assistance to Yugoslavia under this act: *Provided*, That the President shall forthwith transmit such findings together with his reasons therefor to the Congress."

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, the change that I suggest be made in the Kelly amendment as amended by the Williams amendment is the proviso just read by the Clerk. That proviso contained in my substitute amendment in effect requires the President to notify the Congress whenever he finds that aid to Yugoslavia is in our national security interest and that Yugoslavia is still independent, and to tell the Congress on what basis he so finds.

I feel compelled to offer the substitute amendment, because the Williams amendment to the Kelly amendment weakens the Kelly amendment substantially. In fact, the Williams amendment in essence requires the President to do what he already has the responsibility to do.

The Williams amendment is nothing but a compromise. It is a matter of expediency and an attempt to avoid facing the issue of the Kelly amendment directly.

If the President is going to make any findings on giving aid to Yugoslavia, then the Congress and the American people should be taken into his confidence and should know the basis for such a decision.

The gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] has fought vigorously and gallantly to cut off aid to Yugoslavia. She is to be commended for her action.

I think at this juncture in world affairs we should give particular pause in our dealings with Tito. No one can deny that Tito is a Communist dictator with one of the worst records for suppression of human freedoms and dignities.

We must bear in mind that the responsibility of United States world leadership is being put to the test as never before. The whole free world is watching what we do here today. Our able colleague from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has put it best when he said that this is really a moral problem that confronts us.

The Congress and the people of the United States are justified in their resentment of Tito now that he has yielded to the Kremlin in such a warm embrace. It is essential that what we do here today reflect that resentment.

Since the indication is pretty clear to me that the Williams amendment to the Kelly amendment is going to be adopted, I am anxious that it be strengthened and given substance to the fullest extent. That is the objective of my substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, by adopting my substitute amendment, we will put the executive branch on notice that the Congress is not satisfied with Presidential findings on this important issue in a vacuum. If the President is going to make findings that assistance should be continued to Yugoslavia on the basis that such assistance is in the security interest of the United States and that Yugoslavia maintains its independence of the Kremlin—an independence which I seriously question, in view of what is going on at this very moment between Tito, Khrushchev, and Bulganin—then the President should notify the Congress of such findings and should give us the reasons for those findings. This would put the Congress in a position to review Presidential action and to take its own action based upon the facts.

I feel that my substitute amendment should be acceptable to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and I hope the members of the committee will give it the overwhelming support it deserves.

By doing so, the Congress will be telling Tito that as far as the United States Congress is concerned, no United States aid is to go to Yugoslavia.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. If the parliamentary situation could have been such that I might have accepted the contribution of my friend from Connecticut I would have done so, but it was impossible to get it added to the amendment I offered. However, I would like to say if the vote on the amendment I have offered to the Kelly amendment prevails, I certainly will support the gentleman's substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the substitute offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are in the nature of sops, nothing more or less.

Now, let us face right up to the issue. I recall and I think most Members of the House recall when the Battle Act was passed. We passed that law in all good faith. We said, in effect, that no more aid will go to countries that ship strategic materials to Russia or the Soviet satellites, to Communist countries. I defy anyone in this room here today to cite me an instance of where aid has been denied to any country in the so-called free world, our so-called allies, because they have shipped strategic materials to the Soviet countries. Yet, less than 2 years ago the British, French, and other beneficiaries of lavish American handouts, on the record admitted having sold and shipped strategic materials to Russia. When I contacted the White House and asked why the Battle Act was not enforced, I got the reply that the Battle Act was not being enforced because it was to our enlightened self-interest to continue to give aid to people who were trafficking in strategic materials with the Soviet countries. Let us face right up squarely to the issue here. Either you are for or against cutting off further money, arms, and jet planes to Tito, and the amendment of the gentlewoman from New York puts an end to that program. The Dodd substitute and the Williams amendment are simply sugar-coated pills in the nature of sops.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. As a matter of fact, my friend is in favor of cutting off aid to everybody. Is that not right?

Mr. GROSS. Let me say to the gentleman I am in favor of this Congress saying what it means and meaning what it says. Let us face up to this issue. Let us not kid ourselves that we will be doing anything effective to adopt either of these last two proposals. The President has the authority under the Mutual Security Act to put funds anywhere in the world he wants to, and the gentleman knows it. He has broader authority in the disposal of funds under the Mutual Security Act than any President ever had, authority that I have repeatedly stated no President should have.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognies the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY].

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be yielded to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be yielded to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JACKSON. I should like to call to the attention of the Members of the House, in speaking of the neutrality of Mr. Tito, that in 1948 when two Members of this House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] and I, were brought under Communist fire from Yugoslavia and across the Greek frontier, there was no evidence of good will or benevolence on Tito's part. Tito permitted thousands of guerrillas to pour across the Yugoslavian frontier to frustrate the efforts this Nation was making to assist in keeping the Greek people free. There was no question about Mr. Tito's neutrality at that time, nor is there today so far as I am concerned.

Mr. TUMULTY. Obviously there is some very clear evidence that Tito, the dictator of Yugoslavia, is proving less than a friend, or we would not have three different propositions offered by the House to cut off aid one way or another. The fact remains, however, that the first thing Tito did when he went to Moscow was to lay a wreath on the tomb of Lenin saying, "Long live the Soviet Union. Long live the friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia." He said, "We will march along with Marx, Engels, and Lenin." That means that Tito is going to march in the drive for world revolution founded by Marx, Lenin, and Engels, for the destruction of the system we represent, for the destruc-

tion of this very House, for the destruction of every independent government.

Now, it has been argued that it is to our self-interest to give him money so that he will be on our side. Now, let us not kid ourselves. There is no sense in all these pious platitudes in regard to what we are doing for Yugoslavia. Pious platitudes to the contrary, the money we give to Tito a self-proclaimed world revolutionist is a bribe to get him to sell out the revolution.

We are trying to bribe Tito in the hope that he will forget his dedicated life as a Communist, as a sworn revolutionary and help us defeat the cause he represents.

I assumed when I was elected to this House that I would meet with the most practical, hard-headed men in the world. You will forgive me if I say that I am beginning to wonder. I thought I was elected to Congress. I think I have been elected to never-never land. I never saw such tears, such sympathy for the most ruthless gang of murderers and bandits that civilization has seen, and such pious reasons for sordid business dealings.

Now, if you want to bribe him and you think he will stay bought, that is one thing, but call the action by its true name. But I, for one, do not believe you can keep him bought. I think when he gets up and says he is not going to be bought, it is only commonsense to get our money back, if nothing else.

I have heard a great deal of talk about neutrality. These clichés seem to have almost the influence of dogma on some people. A Marxist, a Leninist Communist is not neutral. When it comes to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, the first one Tito would shoot, if he had the opportunity, would probably be the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

There is no neutrality in the world struggle against atheistic communism. Neutrality is the worst form of hostility in a fight between all who are for Christian civilization and all who stand opposed to it.

It may be that Tito won an argument with Stalin. In other words, one Red won an argument with another Red. But that does not seem to me to be a good reason why we should pour out our gold in order to compliment him on the fact that he has proven to be a better revolutionary than Stalin.

I do not know exactly what type of practical reasoning governs our minds. But when you tell me that he has been independent, you might as well say that I am the fattest thin man that ever existed in the world; because a Marxist never could be independent. It is a contradiction in terms. All I can say is that we ought to start a congressional college for the study of Leninism to find out what we are doing, and what the true nature of the enemy is.

I was shocked when I heard the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs say that it was any country's business if it wanted to be Communist. Is it not a little late to find that out? Have we not spent billions of dollars trying to prevent countries from going Communist? Now we are told that it is their business.

In fact, the new historians say that they are just like our American colonies. We were neutral vis-a-vis France, they will say. I do not understand what has happened to us. There must be some type of brainwashing that has been going on when you can compare the American colonists who were dedicated to the principle of their own self-determination, of their independence, and to God and their sacred honor, to a government which is dedicated to the destruction of everything decent in human life; the destruction of religion, the destruction of the home, the destruction of the family, the destruction of free speech, the destruction of this Congress, unless it first destroys itself. And it seems to me it is on its way to doing so if we continue to vote money to those dedicated to our destruction.

So the proposition is, should we continue in this foolish course? Should we subsidize our enemies? If we do, I suggest that when you go home for the coming fall campaign, give your campaign contribution to your opponent, or give it to his friends who say they are not for you and not for him, but they always work with him and pat him on the back, cheer his speech, and attend his banquets. If you do that, we can look forward to seeing many fresh faces here next year.

Cynics say if you buy votes, they should stay bought. If we are going to buy international prostitutes, we should want them to stay bought. There is no sense in kidding yourself. There is only one reason for giving him money and that is to buy him off. But it does a great deal of harm to us in the eyes of the so-called free world, whatever the odd definition may be of that, when they see us subsidizing world revolutionaries opposed to freedom while proclaiming we are in a crusade for freedom.

So that of the three propositions that of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] certainly puts us foursquare opposed to Tito and totally against all communism. The other two proposals try to do the same thing but by indirection.

It is amusing to me as a Democrat running in this election year to see what great faith Democrats have in the judgment of a Republican President. They seem to be pushing each other aside to say, "Let Ike do it." I want to vote against Tito myself. My people did not send me to Congress to vote according to the judgment of someone else. They sent me here, which particularly concerns the House, to give my judgment. I feel that by and large the great portion of the American people are against Tito, because they recognize him in their wisdom as an enemy of liberty, as an enemy of everything decent in life. The American people want us to stop shaking hands with the devil.

The Dodd and Williams amendments I oppose simply because they do not go far enough, but of the two, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] gets there eventually and lets the Congress have a part in the job. Can anyone tell me what the President can find out about Tito that we do not already know? Is Tito another Budenz, who will come before a congressional committee and confess all? Will he turn out to be a Boy Scout that is a fugitive from a camp fire? Or will he turn out to be a murdering revolutionary and an enemy of the world, as we all know him to be and as he boasts he is?

Consequently, it is my feeling that to give this job to the President to do is to pass the buck, but of the two propositions, at least that of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] does recognize the Congress has a function to perform. After all, we are voting the money, and it is on our conscience that this blood money rests when we give it to the murderer of American fliers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, let us analyze this situation. There is no question in anybody's mind and good judgment that the greatest deterrent to the expansion of communism all over the world has probably been the fear of the people of a country that by joining the Communist orbit they might lose their independence, their sovereignty, and their freedom. The new leaders of the Kremlin know that this has been the greatest deterrent to the expansion of communism all over the world. So they adopted a new look, and in that new look they are using Tito and Yugloslavia as their showcase, as their wonderful sample. They are now going to say to the world that this capitalistic talk about a country losing its sovereignty and its freedom just because it joins the Communist orbit is just some more capitalistic propaganda. The Kremlin leaders are now saying under their "New Look," "we have an excellent showcase in Yugoslavia under Marshal Tito as to how nations can progress in the Communist orbit. It shows how a nation can become a member of the family of the Communist orbit and still maintain its independence and sovereignty. Even the greatest capitalistic country of the world, the United States of America, has gone to the extent of helping us finance that Communist showcase to the tune of $1 billion since the war ended."

That is what you are doing in this bill. While in the Kremlin right now they are cooking up how they are going to put over this new look of communism all over the world, to entice these countries to come in under the Communist orbit, the Congress of the United States is at the same time providing the money to finance that new look and financing the No. 1 salesman and the showcase they are now going to present to the world, saying, "You can become a member of the Communist family and still maintain your independence."

In other words, in my judgment the greatest asset the Kremlin now has in the new scheme they are cooking up in the Kremlin is this foreign-aid bill that is before this House right now. If it is passed as it is written we are going to finance the Communist new look all over the world. If the Kelly amendment is adopted, we are proving to the world that we are onto their new scheme. If we pass the Kelly amendment we are saying to the Kremlin we are onto this new

Kremlin scheme of enticing the countries of world into their orbit and saying, "You can maintain your independence and your sovereignty and still be in the Communist orbit."

Let me tell you something. If you continue to finance Tito, you are taking away from the people of the world the greatest deterrent to joining the Communist orbit, and that is the fear that thy may lose their sovereignty and independence.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, everyone who has spoken today has said definitely that they do not like Tito and they do not like the Government of Yugoslavia. Yet so many of them have ended up by saying, "Let us give $15 million to this man we do not like." I wish they did not like me the same way. You do not like Communist Russia either. Should we give $15 million to Communist Russia? I see no difference between giving to Communist Russia and giving to Communist Yugoslavia. Each say they would like to be friends but neither evidences that friendship. They want friendship only so that they can envelop us in their arms and crush us to death. Mrs. KELLY's amendment would cut off aid to Tito here and now. Mr. WILLIAMS says: "No. We do not want to take the responsibility. We must give it over to President Eisenhower." Yes. I can go along with him and the other Democrats who have spoken so favorably of President Eisenhower. But I believe we should stand on our own two feet here and now and say, "No. No more aid to the Communists, no matter under what guise they appear."

The acts and statements of Tito in Russia yesterday demand that Congress end all aid today. No one can love the devil and God at the same time nor can they love communism and Americanism. Each of us should support the Kelly amendment and say definitely to the world, "We no longer will support Communists. We no longer want communism." I believe very definitely in what someone said years ago to the Barbary pirates: "Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute." Let us not give Tito any more tribute. Let us use this $15 million to build our defenses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], is recognized.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kelly amendment to ban United States foreign military and economic aid to Communist Yugoslavia. As the House knows, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] and myself and others have consistently opposed this aid to Tito's dictatorship over many years. We should remember that Tito was against Stalin and Stalin against Tito, because Stalin looked upon him as an organizer of communism in Western Europe in competition to the Stalin regime. There is no doubt Tito tried to do it.

Secondly, we should also remember that Tito was the personal friend of former Premier Georgi Malenkov in the early student days in Paris when they became Communists, and the two were inseparable friends. As a matter of fact, Georgi Malenkov got Tito the job as secretary general of the Communist Party in Yugoslavia, so Tito has close friendship with the current regime.

Tito says the whole United States foreign aid program should be loans and not aid grants. Yet under our foreign aid program, we are giving him aid grants. Likewise Tito has said just several days ago that these efforts in Congress to cut this program were of no importance to him. So, it is not much for him to lose the Adriatic highway and American surplus foods and jet planes that we are sending him which could under adverse circumstances knock down our bombers. Think of it. We are voting to continue to give this dictatorship one of the largest jet forces in the world.

Listen to what Tito says of aid from the free world. Tito said at a reception of the railroad workers, on January 11, 1951:

> Every machine which enters our country helps to build socialism. We saw how right the Bolsheviks were when they asserted that socialism can be built with the aid of capitalistic states. The American engineers built the largest power combine, Magnitogorsk, for the Russians and it never occurred to anyone to question their loyalty to communism. The aid of the Western capitalists to us has exactly the same value.

Then, on December 30, 1950, the official Belgrade radio on its Hour of Humor, had this to say of aid from America and others in an amusing couplet:

> Those who to us aid do send
> See no further than their noses' end.

How can we say in America that when we simply cut off aid to Tito, we are against him. It is like Senator Barkley once said, "If you have once helped a person, and no longer give them something they may turn against you." In cutting off aid to Tito, we are just being neutral, as far as Tito is concerned, and I therefore ask that the Kelly amendment be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas, [Mr. HAYS] is recognized.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that as a result of the discussions the parliamentary situation is clear. We are not voting upon the question of whether or not aid should be granted to Yugoslavia.

I think that we should recognize the validity of the argument advanced by the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, that there have been good reasons in our own national interests for helping the Tito Government. That is not inconsistent with the fears some of us entertain regarding the effect of the Kelley amendment. In the same position with Mr. RICHARDS is my friend from Minnesota, Mr. JUDD, who while differing with Mr. RICHARDS as to the wisdom of it, nevertheless feels it should be an executive decision and not a legislative decision, and that is the only thing we are passing upon here. It ought to be evident that the House is simply not prepared to say on the basis of the evidence that we have that it is not in the national interest to give some aid to the Yugoslav Government; and if the President under the terms of the Williams amendment, should find that it is in our national interest then we ought not to take some action that would preclude extension of aid that is in our own interest.

As the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] says, we ought to leave it to the executive to determine on the basis of changed conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is recognized.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I think I am the original anti-Tito man, going way back to the time of the first Yugoslav aid bill and the Yugoslav claims bill. When that bill came to the floor I filed a one-man minority report and I had the thing whipped in the Committee of the Whole but lost out on a rollcall in the House. So I have quite a record along that line.

However, much has happened in 7 years. I am for the Williams amendment to the Kelly amendment because I think this is an executive, a Presidential function that is involved. I do not believe that the Dodd amendment requiring the report to Congress is necessary.

Some say that the Williams amendment adds nothing to the President's power. It is perfectly true the President has power under the present law to terminate assistance, but under the Williams amendment he is required to terminate assistance in this instance unless he makes specific findings which are spelled out, and those are the findings which would protect our own security.

Now, the beloved gentleman from New Jersey, the Little Giant [Mr. TUMULTY], has asked, "How can the President find anything we do not already know?" I suppose by "we" he means Congress. Unfortunately for this debate the amount of military aid that has gone to Tito, the amount and character of that which has not yet gone, is classified information. I have just reviewed it a few minutes ago in the secret books presented to our committee. That information is information that the President has, that the Congress in general does not have, certainly not in a form that can be used in debate on the floor. As I say, not only what has been delivered but what has not yet been delivered, is something Congress does not know. It seems to me that we should leave this to the executive branch, to the President. Since those questions cannot be discussed on the floor of Congress, we ought to get smart. People say that the Communists are outsmarting us. I do not think we are getting smart when we attempt to conduct diplomacy or military operations from the floor of this House. That is why I am for the Kelly amendment only if the Williams amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate that there is very little aid to Tito in this bill and there is not too much military aid, which of course, is a classified figure.

I shall support the Williams amendment to the Kelly amendment, and if the Kelly amendment as amended by the Williams amendment is agreed to I will support the amendment as amended. I think it is the wise thing to do and I hope the committee will follow that course.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. KELLY of New York) there were—ayes 97, noes 86.

Mrs. KELLY of New York, Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mrs. KELLY of New York and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 123, noes 95.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] for the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY and Mr. BYRD) there were—ayes 82, noes 97.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RICHARDS and Mr. ROONEY.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 92, noes 96.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] as amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division. I want the record to show so that the world will know how overwhelming is the opposition in this Congress and country to the principle of aid to any Communist country.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can demand a division but hardly debate it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If I am opposed to what the Doctor says—aid—do I vote "aye" now?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to use his own discretion as to how he votes.

The question was taken; and on a division, there were—ayes 183, noes 3.

So the amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. Title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to development assistance, is amended by striking out sections 201 and 202 and substituting the following new section:

"SEC. 201. Authorization: (a) In addition to the funds heretofore appropriated pursuant to the provisions of sections 201 and 418 of this act as in effect prior to the enactment of the Mutual Security Act of 1956, which funds shall remain available for their original purposes in accordance with the provisions of law originally applicable thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed $243 million, to remain available until June 30, 1960, for assistance designed to promote the economic development of free Asia, the Middle East, and Africa, based on self-help and mutual cooperation of friendly nations, and to maintain economic and political stability in these areas.

"(b) The President is authorized to utilize the funds hereafter made available for purposes of this title to accomplish in these areas policies and purposes declared in this act, and to disburse them on such terms and conditions, including transfer of funds, as he may specify: *Provided*, That such assistance shall only be available on terms of repayment, except (1) when such funds are used to finance sales of surplus agricultural commodities under section 402, or (2) when granted for the purpose of a regional project involving two or more beneficiary nations: *And provided further*, That not more than 25 percent of any funds hereafter made available for purposes of this title shall be used in furnishing assistance to any one nation (including bilateral assistance furnished to such nation as well as such nation's proportionate share of assistance furnished for regional projects in which it is involved).

"(c) To be eligible for bilateral assistance from funds hereafter made available for purposes of this title, a nation shall have entered into a written agreement, satisfactory to the President, to permit participation by private enterprise in the accomplishment of any of the purposes of this act in conformance with the provisions of section 413, which relates to encouragement of free enterprise and private participation.

"(d) Funds made available under this title may be used for expenses (other than those provided for under section 411 (c) of this act) to assist in carrying out functions under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1691 and the following), delegated or assigned to any agency or officer administering nonmilitary assistance."

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENTLEY: On page 4, before the period in line 12, insert the following: "and *Provided further*, That none of the funds hereafter made available for purposes of this title shall be used in furnishing assistance to India."

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, if adopted, would take out $70 million worth of development assistance for India from the bill, leaving untouched $10 million for technical cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, I am not very optimistic about this amendment. If the House is willing to continue to permit our taxpayers' money to go to Communist Tito, I am not very optimistic that they are going to deny it to a fellow traveler, Mr. Nehru. But I would like to take the time available to me to let the Committee know just what they are voting for if they vote to continue aid to India.

In doing so I am going to quote from a very distinguished gentleman. He happens to be Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO. In a letter which Mr. Meany wrote to the New York Times and which was reproduced in the April 27 issue of the U. S. News & World Report the following paragraph is contained. Here is what Mr. Meany says:

> Can it be denied that, in his December 13, 1955, joint statement with Soviet Premier Bulganin, Prime Minister Nehru has, in effect, gone into partnership with Moscow in regard to the question of disarmament, atom and H-bomb tests, and German national reunification? Can it be denied that Mr. Nehru has lined up with Moscow on the most vital foreign-policy issues between the free world and the totalitarian Soviet orbit? Is it not clear that Premier Nehru's statement to his Parliament that the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and the Baghdad Pact have tended to encircle India is but an echo of the Khrushchev-Bulganin antiwestern propaganda? This is a Red fairy tale which, unfortunately, still finds credence in some adult quarters.

Earlier in a speech, on December 14, 1955, Mr. George Meany had this to say, and I urge the committee to listen:

> No country, no people, no movement can stand aloof and be neutral in this struggle. Nehru and Tito are not neutral. They are aides and allies (of communism) in fact and in effect, if not in diplomatic verbiage.

Mr. Chairman, we are being asked in this bill to increase the amount for development assistance to India by $20 million over that made available to India in the present fiscal year, 1956, an increase from $50 million to $70 million. The amount requested—and I urge the committee again to bear in mind that this does not touch technical cooperation. The amount requested will go for grain storage, highway construction, transportation facilities, malaria control, sanitation, road improvements, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think we have to have too long memories to recall the position that the present government of India has taken so consistently. I think you will probably recall, for example, that in 1950 when the question of aggression against North Korea was debated in the United Nations the Indian delegate abstained from voting.

I think the Committee can well recall that in the year 1951 when the United Nations voted a resolution of aggression against Communist China that the delegate from India voted against that resolution. And we can go on and on talking about this consistent course that the Indian Government has followed with the Communists, with Moscow on almost every issue of foreign policy that has been brought to the attention of that Government.

I ask any individual member here of the Foreign Affairs Committee who has been a member of our delegation to the United Nations if the Government of India has ever stood with us in the United Nations at any time against the Kremlin, but instead if they have not always consistently sood up and voted with Soviet Russia and Communist Pekin?

There is probably a reason for that, Mr. Chairman, and I think one of the reasons the Indian Government has taken that attitude is because of the policy we have taken over the past several years. We have given help to India to the extent of $538 million. The Soviets have only recently announced a loan of $100 million, or a proposed loan. We all know what the response of the Indian people was to the visits of Bulganin and Khrushchev to India last fall. There is no doubt where the sympathy of the people of India themselves lies.

I will tell you the reason for India's trying to be neutral. Ever since 1947 when India became liberated from Great Britain, India has tried to take a neutral attitude, but because of the fact we have insisted upon pouring this money into India ever since that time to the tune, as I say, of $538 million, the Indian Government in an effort to observe neutrality has felt compelled to go the other way. It is my belief and conviction that if we terminate our aid to India, at least our economic development assistance, if we let India stand on its own feet, the Government of Mr. Nehru would be able to take a more neutral attitude.

So I strongly urge the adoption of my amendment.

I want to refer to two quotations in the record of the hearings of the committee, both statements made by Ambassador Cooper. Quoting from page 868 of the hearings:

> India has chosen a democratic form of government. Its Government is determined that it shall maintain that form of government and that it shall succeed.

The Ambassador said further:

> If the United States does not supply any aid, I think India will make the same effort, with the same determination.

Three pages later, on page 871:

> The Indian Government has adopted what they call a socialistic pattern with respect to the development of their country.

If this House wants to go on supporting, with American tax dollars, socialism as well as communism, it is at perfect liberty to do so, but I think the Committee of the Whole should know what kind of government the present Government of India is according to the word of the American Ambassador himself.

As my good friend from Minnesota said, I think it is about time that this Government and the people of this country ought to stop feeding the hand that slaps us and stop giving into the hands that are pulling the whiskers of Uncle Sam.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, our assistance to India, has contributed to the success of its 5-year plan. India has entered into the second phase of economic recovery. By refusing to give India any additional aid we will in effect force this nation, which is at the very border of Communist China, to go elsewhere. We may not agree with everything that India's leaders have said, but we must bear in mind the 380 million people who live in India. We must bear in mind the future of that country. We must bear in mind that it is vital to the free world that India succeed in achieving economic progress and outshow Communist China. The Soviets are making every effort to see that Communist China may become the most developed nation in Asia. It is in the interest of the free world that India—rather than Communist China—attain that position.

Mr. Chairman, this bill authorizes $10 million of technical assistance for India, and $6 million for development assistance. Under the provisions of this section, only 25 percent of the total money for the area—$243 million—would be available for India. I want to point out to the committee that the development assistance to India is on a loan basis, except for the agricultural surpluses.

India must ask for this assistance, and under section 20, paragraph (c), to be eligible India must enter into a written agreement satisfactory to the President to permit participation by private enterprise in the accomplishment of any of the purposes of this act, in conformance with the provisions of section 413 which relates to the encouragement of free enterprise and private participation.

I think it would be a grave mistake if the United States discontinued all of the assistance to India as this amendment proposes.

Mr BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. I wonder if my friend from Wisconsin recalls the recent statement made by the President of the India League of America in which he urged that India refuse additional aid from the United States because it is a major source of friction between our two countries.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am sure that the gentleman you quote does not speak for India. I am sure that the people of India think differently. Those of us who visited that country last fall can well assure the gentleman from Michigan that India appreciates the aid and assistance they have received from us, and need additional aid. It was pointed out in the hearings that India has only three sources from which to secure finances to continue its development program: by increasing the already high domestic taxes, which is virtually impossible, by getting assistance from us on loan basis and in the form of agricultural surpluses, or by going to Soviet Russia. If the amendment prevails, I am sure India will have no alternative but to turn to Russia.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not also true that the gentleman from India to whom the gentleman from Michigan referred, Mr. J. J. Singh, is opposed to granting aid and making India feel under obligation to the United States, but is in favor of making business transactions between the two countries, such as loans?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is true. Many of the Indian leaders expressed that feeling. There is no question that India needs aid and desires the assistance on a loan basis. The authorization in this legislation provides for assistance to India on a loan basis.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. When the name of Mr. J. J. Singh comes up, I want to say that he has been a long, long time personal friend of mine. I have visited him at his home in Kashmir, and he is as fine a fellow as you could want, a completely democratic-minded individual. He agrees with many Members on this floor that the aid should not be a grant or giveaway but that India should stand on its own feet. India is a democracy, and she is having a very hard time economically at present. She is in competition with the Chinese dictatorship in their respective development plans. And, we feel that the people of India will stand on their own feet, and will be glad to pay for their own development as they progress. I like the self-respect of the Indian people and my good friend J. J. Singh, of New York City.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. It is erroneous to say that J. J. Singh is opposed to a loan.

Mr. FULTON. That is certainly correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. There is a very serious situation with respect to trade between the United States and India. Since India was freed from British suzerainty, the trade treaty which covered India, and by virtue of its being covered by Great Britain and so forth, expired, and now there are no treaty traders in the United States from India and none in India from the United States. Yet, India needs aid, but India also needs trade. She has a cottage industry employing 100 million people a week, and yet the goods from this cottage industry are not available on the American market and they do not compete with our industry. It seems to me that if we would establish some basis so that we could trade with India, much of this aid could be eliminated.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That subject was discussed with Ambassador Cooper, and we were advised that attempts are being made to develop trade with India.

Mr. HINSHAW. That problem is being considered by another committee, but nevertheless I think it is quite important that we reestablish trade relations.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that India has been and is today cooperating with us in many ways. I believe that all of us are aware of the fact that we secure numerous strategic materials from India. This is only one of many instances in which the Indian nation has been cooperating with us.

Another instance, and a very vital one, that I want to mention pertains to the monkeys which we import from India. In spite of considerable native resentment and dissatisfaction with this phase of our trade with India, the Indian Government has steadfastly continued to enable us to secure the moneys which are

necessary for our research activities and for the production of the Salk vaccine.

It is only because of the splendid cooperation which we have received from the Government of India in this regard, that we have been able to produce Salk vaccine in the vast quantities demanded by our people for the protection of our children against that frightening ailment—infantile paralysis. Very few persons realize what difficulties the Indian Government has had to encounter because of its willingness and desire to cooperate with us for the benefit of our youngsters, and for the benefit of mankind.

I wish that it were possible for me to go into detail about some of our other vital arrangements with India. This cannot be done, unfortunately, for security reasons. Nevertheless, I want to say that I have no hesitation in recommending our continued assistance to India in the form proposed in the legislation before us. This assistance is very important to the continuation of the friendly, and mutually beneficial, relations which we enjoy with the Indian nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] has expired.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr Chairman, this is not directly related to the question of India, but I should like to read a dispatch from the New York Herald Tribune, as follows:

NEW YORK.—The New York Herald Tribune said today the Republic of Haiti has rejected a proffered $100 million loan from Russia.

A Washington dispatch to the newspaper gave this account:

Soviet Russia offered the loan to the Negro republic recently as part of Russia's new economic drive to penetrate the Western Hemisphere.

Russian technicians were to go to Haiti to supervise whatever was done with the money, however, and Haiti said, "No; thank you," very firmly, even though it is in the market for more loans to develop its economy.

As we all know, that little Caribbean country is in desperate need of economic aid. While this has nothing to do with the amendment pending at the moment, it does have much to do with the entire bill and the thinking that is still going on. My hat off to the Haitians.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, India is so close to success and to being able to show that it is a workable democracy that it would be shortsighted for us to discontinue assistance particularly since it will be only on a loan basis.

I hope the gentleman's amendment does not prevail.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am very happy that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] whose actions on this floor are always characterized by high principle and very deep conviction has, in spite of the action just taken in the matter of aid to Tito, seen fit to bring his amendment to the floor. With him I am somewhat puzzled about the vote on the Yugoslavia matter. In spite of the fact that the House saw fit to vote the continuation of funds, it promptly marched down the hill again when Dr. JUDD clarified the issue and said that all who stood up on the division would be indicating their opposition to Tito. On that division, all but three in the House stood. It is a confusing climax to a confusing debate. We are engaged in a business of temporizing with people who have no hesitation in showing their dislike, their distrust, and at times their outright hatred of this Nation, of its people, and of our institutions.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] whom I admire greatly, has remarked that after all India is on the very frontier of China and for that reason there are considerations which we should take into account in any contemplation of our program with respect to India. I must and do assume that the gentleman refers to fear on the part of the Indian Government lest the Soviet might make some overt move. I would point out that India is not the only nation in the world confronted by the hostility of the Soviet Union across its frontiers. Special tribute should be paid to Turkey in its firm determination not to give way to the threats of the Soviet Union, although Turkey itself is confronted by the Communist armies across its own frontiers.

When I visited Turkey in 1948 with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], we were assigned as liaison officer from the army of Turkey a general staff major. He made a remark which I have always remembered and which I shall always associate with the spirit of a people who are ready and willing to resist aggression, and who do not seek this cloak of so-called neutrality. The major said, "We want and need United States assistance, but whether or not we receive it, we shall fight to the last man for the freedom of the Turkish people."

That is the kind of talk we need from those whom we support. I said on yesterday that I cannot accord with the idea that there is any such thing in the world today as neutrality in a conflict which is basically between human freedom and human slavery.

Mr. Nehru is about as deserving of United States assistance at this time as is Mr. Bulganin or Mr. Khrushchev. His actions are in no marked degree different from theirs in international affairs, so far as I am concerned. I am very happy that the gentleman from Michigan has had the courage to bring this matter to the floor so that we can face up to it.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. Is not the gentleman from California of the opinion that if we continue to pour out these billions of dollars to our so-called neutral friends, like Tito and Nehru, it is really a slap in the face to those few genuine allies we have such as Turkey?

Mr. JACKSON. Not only that, but we are encouraging throughout the world a spirit of neutralism. If you can get your aid and your benefits without giving friendship or anything in return, why risk the danger of possible hostilities or of incurring the displeasure of the Soviet?

The gentleman from Wisconsin has said among other things that India's monkeys are important. It is true that the monkeys are important, but there will be no shortage of them if we keep on this course of action, because they are making monkeys out of millions of Americans every day. We will have an ample supply of monkey kidneys, and that may well be in the final analysis all that is left to us.

When some element of rhyme or reason is going to enter into this matter of foreign aid to those who are opposed to us I do not know, but I sincerely hope the time will come when we will face up to the matter of so-called neutrality and call diffidence, timidity, and fence straddling by their proper names.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. If it makes no difference with respect to the monkeys, then we must evaluate the $60 million proposed in aid as against 381 million people over there. Probably that amount is not going to make or break their economy. But at the same time when you load this expense together with all our other domestic and foreign expenditures on our people here at home, who are not exactly living the life of Riley with respect to Government expenses, it adds up. The idea of foreign aid as I see it is to bring something of value to Americans by way of a more peaceful world and greater protection against aggressive Communist imperialism. It seems to me if the expenditure fails to bring these people back to true neutralism, let alone into our free world orbit and help us do that job which the free world has to do, then we are not justified in spending American money on them. That is the point I believe the gentleman is making, and I congratulate him on what he has said. From what has so far been said respecting India's position and attitudes I fail to see that the burden of proof has been carried that foreign aid expenditures in India help peace or help protect the United States, therefore I must conclude that we are not justified in making them.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the gentleman.

I think the one point which is apt to escape the attention of a great many people throughout the world today is the fact that there are hundreds of millions of human beings who are under the heel of the Communist state. These captives are looking to the United States, and to the United States Congress to say to their captors and to those who treat with their captors that we will have no part of it, that we intend to stand by

the moral commitments we have made to implement the great things we have said about self-determination and our national and oft-expressed determination to see them freed. Every time we take a step in treating with these neutrals, those whose neutrality is, to say the least, hostile to us, we are saying to those enslaved millions that the fine sounding phrases are expedients and that what we really want to do is to be all things to all men at all times.

What we need is some consistency. What we need to say to these people who are enslaved and who look to us as the only hope for their freedom is that we intend to stand by them and that we do not intend to treat with their enemies, actual or potential.

With the gentleman from Michigan, I assume this amendment will be defeated but I hope that it will continue to be brought to the attention of the Congress and to the attention of this House on every possible occasion in the future. I shall support the amendment, and I welcome the opportunity to do so.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman mentioned the millions of enslaved people back of the Iron Curtain. Is the gentleman in favor of doing nothing to prevent an additional 380 million people being driven back of the Iron Curtain?

Mr. JACKSON. If they were being driven I would do anything to keep them from being driven. I would also do anything to keep them from being led behind the Iron Curtain by their own leaders.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Is it not better to have a neutral India than a Communist India?

Mr. JACKSON. If $60 million is the price Mr. Nehru places upon India's freedom, I say it is not worth it.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. It is not that $60 million is the price, but the discontinuance of needed development aid from the United States could force India to seek assistance from the Communist bloc.

Mr. JACKSON. If human freedom to the leaders of India and to the people of India is worth no more than $60 million, then it is not worthwhile to have freedom in India. Freedom in India, and the determination of the Indian people to remain free is not a matter of money, but of spirit and a fierce love of liberty. If these things were present no dollar price would be too great for us to pay as friends and allies pursuing a common course and a mutual purpose.

I submit Mr. Chairman, that obstruction of the West and of this country is not neutralism but intransigence, coupled with an apparent desire on the part of Mr. Nehru's government to embarrass the efforts of the United States to assist other peoples on the Asian continent.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been made in the debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] so far about neutrality. Apparently the proponents of the amendment take the position that a neutral country is about the same as an enemy country. The United States itself has been neutral on occasion. As a matter of fact, the United States itself is very neutral right at this time on the Cyprus issue. I happen to have some pretty strong feelings about it, but I do not know that it would be wise for the Government of the United States to take sides and threaten to go to war over the thing. The United States itself almost looks ludicrous in attempting to be neutral in the Arab-Israel dispute. We do not know whether we are coming or going on that issue. Certainly the Israelis are disturbed by some of the threats of the Arab countries to drive them into the sea. They can get very emotional about that.

I have not noticed any jumping into the breach to take sides in the Dutch-Indonesia dispute, yet would we like the Dutch or the Indonesians to say that because America does not take our side she is our enemy? What about the French-Algerian situation? Does anybody advocate that we ought to take sides there and send troops in there? I do not think so. It seems to me there is hardly any argument at all to be made over the fact that a neutral is preferable to an antagonist.

You also have to remember that Nehru and his people have not been out of bondage very long. He has a difficult situation with tens of millions of illiterate people who can be swayed easily by promises of the Communists, and he is in a position almost of walking on a tightrope. Not only that, but he is coming here on a visit, at the invitation of the President. I am glad the distinguished minority whip [Mr. ARENDS] is here, because he has more access to the White House than I do, and I hope the next time he goes down there he will say to the President, "HAYS was down there in the well of the House defending you from your political friends." I am in the position of "Lafayette, we are here."

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BENTLEY. I wonder if the gentleman would agree with Mr. Meany in saying that Nehru endorsed Tito?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Let me put it this way, that the gentleman from Ohio agrees with Mr. Meany many times more than his friend from Michigan on most issues. I was a little surprised to find the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] quoting Mr. Meany on this particular issue. If I am going to listen to Mr. Meany, I would be more inclined to listen to him on a matter in which he is an expert, namely, labor questions. I do not want to turn the question around and I do not want to embarrass the gentleman from Michigan, but I wonder if he would listen to Mr. Meany on the subject on which he is an expert, namely, the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. BENTLEY. Are you saying that Mr. Meany should not speak on this subject?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. No. I think he has a perfect right to speak, and I am sure he has valid reasons for the pronouncement he made, and I know he is sincere. It just happens that in this instance I do not agree with him. That is about all there is to that. But I do think it is important that we just do not go around kicking people because they do not happen to agree every minute with what we do. I have tried to point out here that we are in the same identical position in a dozen different places around the world. It is a precarious time in which we are living. Everybody cannot do everything he wants to do. I like the gentleman from Michigan but I do not want to see his football team beat mine, but that does not mean that I am a bum just because we disagree about that. I think we have to consider about this. We have got a great backlog of potential frienship in India. I do not think you can count India in 30 seconds, 7 years, or any other amount of time; but we can count on the work that has been done by literally thousands of Americans who have gone to India as doctors and missionaries over the years and who have built up friendship in the towns and villages and tried to do something for us. I do not think that is going to be destroyed.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I agree with the gentleman on his statement, but I wish the gentleman would comment on a matter where India is not neutral and that is on communism. Nehru has consistently thrown Communists in jail and has said that he is just simply against breaches of the peace. There is no doubt that the Government of India at home has constantly and strictly repressed communism with jail sentences, more so than we in America.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The gentleman is exactly right and it would be nice if we could convert everyone in the world to exactly our way of thinking on all problems, but we cannot do that or cannot even get unanimity of opinion in this House, let alone doing it on an international scale.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is monkeying with my baby, with this development assistance provision, title II which I first suggested in committee and which was then polished up and improved by the committee. This title II is where our committee has done a very substantial amount of reappraising of our policy about undeveloped countries that do not participate in military programs with us from now on.

Under title II as it is written none of the new money can go for grant aid to any particular country; all of it has got to be either loans or sales of agricultural surpluses under section 402 of this bill. None of it can go to a country that has not signed a written agreement as set forth in paragraph (c) satisfactory to the President to permit participation by private enterprise in the accomplishment of any of the purposes of this act.

As to India the program brought to us was for $70 million. There was $343 million in various sections of the draft bill for development assistance, which means substantial economic aid for countries with which we do not have military agreements. We put that all in one section; we did not attempt to designate which area should get it or which country should get it, but we provided that only 25 percent of it could go to any one country.

Then we cut the total $100 million, leaving only $243 million. Part of this cut, of course, is going to apply to the Indian aid program for $70 million, and under the present bill it could get not more than $60,750,000. The Indian program of $70 million was $30 million for agricultural products and $40 million for industrial products. Therefore, India could get agricultural surpluses and loans in the same proportion. To me when we use agricultural surpluses in this program it is a wonderful advertisement of the great wealth and bounty of the United States.

Then the other part, the $40 million industrial part, would be on a loan basis.

So a new look is put on this whole program by this development, section title II of this bill.

You say "India is Socialist." Whether India is Socialist or any other participating country is Socialist, they must at least agree to give private enterprise a chance to participate under the guaranty program, and so forth, before they get in on this development assistance.

And now, to talk about this new look to our world problems caused by the Soviet's imitating us in launching a program of economic aid and technical assistance, to say that we are going to cut off India when we have got this new mechanism that I have just described, would be to me very foolish. Remember that India is the second greatest country in population in the world. It is the biggest country in population in the free world. When you divide up the possible $61 million that could go to India on a per capita basis, our assistance to India is probably the smallest per capita of any country in this whole program. I hope we defeat this amendment and proceed to administer this program under the new-development system.

Mr. Chairman, may I say in conclusion that my wife was born in India of Methodist missionary parents. My interest in India goes away back. I thoroughly agree that the good done by our missionaries in India has done more to keep the Indians friendly with us than many of these other programs. But certainly we ought to continue these programs. All of the missionary people in India want us to continue to aid India and not cut them off as proposed by the pending amendment.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in suppport of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. Everyone in this House will agree that traditionally there has been friendship between the peoples of the United States and India. We would have that continue, we hope it does continue and we believe it will continue; but that does not mean that we must agree with the things which the leaders of India do and the things which they say they propose to do.

As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has just pointed out, in the bill before us there have been included certain restrictions which are beneficial to our program with respect to India. He has pointed those out to the House and it is not my purpose here to repeat them. But we ought to point out what many people believe to be a great danger in the world, perhaps one of the greatest dangers, and that is the spread of so-called neutralism.

A distinction must be drawn between neutralism and that policy which is called neutralism but which is not, in fact, neutral. If a nation says it is neutral and is truly so, that is one thing. If it says it is neutral, but in all of the things it does, in all of the acts it takes as a nation, it has a bias in one direction, then, certainly, that is not true neutrality. That is neutralism. That is the kind of neutralism we find in India today. Mr. Chairman, the danger of that neutralism is manifest throughout the world today as leaders of nation after nation follow the example of the leaders of India. They say in effect: "We can say we are neutral and we can get benefits from the United States and at the same time we can receive benefits from the Soviet Union. Why should we not receive benefits from both the United States and the Soviet bloc?"

That is not true neutrality, and it points up the danger of the policy which India is now following. That danger is that India will lead other nations down this path of so-called neutralism, which is not neutrality. It has been said here today that the Government of India appreciates the aid which the United States has given her. If any of you have been in India recently, as some of us have, and have read the editorials and the news stories in the Indian papers, as we have, and have observed the preparations made for the reception of Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Bulganin, there would certainly be no doubt in your mind as to the attitude of the leaders of India.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I am sorry to interrupt the gentleman. He is making an excellent exposition of true neutrality as opposed to neutralism, which is a menace to the free world today. I wonder if the gentleman has seen the statement made in Bombay, India, on June 1, reported by Reuters, by Mr. Nehru.

Premier Nehru said today many countries were "heading toward a fall" because they were too dependent on foreign aid. "Dependence on foreign aid is a disease in every underdeveloped country. Let us concentrate on eradicating this disease by depending on ourselves and building through our own initiative."

I have sometimes felt that India was going through what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], calls adolescent rebellion. I am inclined to feel that if we were firm toward countries in that stage and which are disposed toward neutralism, we might get, if not true neutrality, at least a better understanding of the things we stand for.

Mr. ADAIR. I thank the gentlewoman and I certainly agree with her.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a technical observation?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. A thing that doctors generally praise is called adolescent revolt. But, we do not like to have it go on to the point of adolescent rebellion. India is in the process of an understandable adolescent revolt against western colonialism. That revolt is a healthy thing. If we do not help her and she gets to the point of adolescent rebellion against the free world, that would indeed be dangerous.

Mrs. CHURCH. I am very glad to have the technical correction. But, when I was dealing with my own adolescents with some firmness, I did not distinguish between revolt and rebellion. It pays to be firm if you have a faith and a philosophy; and I believe we should encourage the countries of the world to stand firm with us on the principles of human freedom, and in support of the free world.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have any idea when Russia will reach the point of mature insurrection now since we have had adolescent revolution?

Mr. ADAIR. I cannot give the gentleman an answer upon that point. Now another thing, when the study mission which was headed by the gentleman from Wisconsin visited India last year discussions were had about the matter of financial aid to that country. The study mission, I think, was startled and surprised thereafter when we got into Burma to find the Government of India, representatives of which had just been speaking to us about financial aid, had only a short time before that concluded a loan to the Government of Burma. That loan was in rupees and was roughly the equivalent of $42 million American dollars, convertible, we were told, into sterling.

The question before the House is simply this: How can we ask American taxpayers to dig into their pockets and to provide aid, even if it is hedged around with safeguards of the kind the gentleman from Ohio has so well pointed out—how can we ask them to do that for a government which on its own part, and I think without the knowledge of our Government, certainly without information to this Congress, made a loan to a neighboring country? I say we simply cannot defend that attitude. We cannot go to our people at home, the taxpayers of this country, and say: "Yes, let us make aid available for India so that she in turn can make loans available to other countries throughout the world." It is time for us to make a decision as to whether we are going to support those countries which are our friends or whether we are

going to spread our aid throughout the world without regard to the attitudes of the nations concerned.

I think we must say: "Let us take a stand with the nations which are our friends and are willing to stand up and be counted." By so doing we will gain stature in the world and move in the direction of the preservation of permanent and honorable peace throughout the world.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] for 4 minutes.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I have consistently supported foreign-aid legislation. I have done so in the belief that in the long-term conflict between our system, our economic and our political system, and the Communist system, we need to assist on a temporary basis those areas in the world that want to be on our side in this ideological contest, to develop their own internal strength and stability so that they can resist military aggression and subversion of international communism.

I think that that attitude toward this legislation is relevant to the amendment before us offered by my colleague from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY]. And I propose, a few minutes later, in section 6, to make clear the intention of Congress that these aid funds and these tax moneys shall be used to promote the free enterprise system and shall not be used to promote socialism.

Mr. Chairman, you have heard reference to Ambassador Cooper's description of India as a Socialist government. There are all degrees of socialism, such as that of the British Labor Party nationalizing the steel industry; other degrees of socialism, nationalizing, perhaps, public utilities, power, communications, railroads, et cetera, all the way down to the extreme of communism where there is no private ownership of property at all. Where is India in that spectrum of socialism? It is pretty far along toward the last.

I want to call your attention to the fine print on page 327 of the hearings on this bill, which is information supplied by the International Cooperation Administration in response to a request in the committee by Mr. BENTLEY, which lists the legal and other impediments and limitations imposed by the various countries receiving aid moneys upon the investment of private capital in those countries.

I should like you to read this for yourself, because my limited time will not permit me to read it all at this point, but the official declaration of the Government of India, on April 6, 1948, reads in part as follows:

> There can be no doubt that the state must play a progressively active role in the development of industries, but ability to achieve the main objectives should determine the immediate extent of state responsibility and the limits to private enterprise. * * * The Government of India * * * feels, however, that for some time to come the state could contribute more quickly to the increase of national wealth by expanding the present activities wherever it is already operating and by concentrating on new units of production in other fields, rather than on acquiring and running existing units.

Just what does that mean? It means rather than seizure and nationalization of existing privately owned industrial activities, the Government of India thinks that it might better spend its Government funds in going into new industrial activities rather than taking those now privately owned for the time being. However, this is only because they have a 7-year plan which they want to advance with the clear threat that just as soon as they can do so they propose to take over all private industry.

I believe it is wrong to take money out of my constituents' pockets to promote socialistic programs. I propose to offer an amendment shortly which I hope the committee will consider very carefully and will agree with me that our policy should be made plain to the people administering our aid funds. More complete remarks on this subject appear in the RECORD of Wednesday, June 6, 1956, on pages 9709–9710.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Bentley amendment, which would cut out development and technical aid for India. The reason I do it is that India is an important and friendly country. We Americans like the Indian people and consider them among our good friends. India is the second industrial nation of Asia. Japan is the first. We need both of them as friends. Likewise, we should remember India is the 10th industrial nation of this world. India is not a country such as ours where they have wealth and many reserves that are developed. India with 380 million people has an annual gross product or income of only $22 billion. Under the current 5-year plan they expect to raise that gross national product to $28 billion. Our funds will help them do it, and reach a higher level of living for the average Indian family.

We should likewise remember that on the current United States technical development assistance program for India there are no grants. There are grants of agricultural products but there are only loans other than agricultural supplies in this year's program for India.

We should also remember, as has been stated here by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], that we are getting the monkeys from India for use in the Salk vaccine program against infantile paralysis, which we in Pittsburgh are so proud to have had developed there. We in the United States could not have operated the mass vaccination program for United States children without India's cooperation on delivery of these necessary animals.

Likewise, we are getting the rare earths for fissionable material from India. We are getting 70 percent of our mica from India, 66 percent of our kyanite, 65 percent of our shellac, and 35 percent of the manganese for our steel industry. Therefore, we in the United States need the friendship of India. We are good customers and can increase our trade on a mutually profitable basis.

We should also remember that while we disagree with the foreign policy of many of our allies we do not disagree with the domestic policy of India because there, as I have said, she is firm against communism and has imprisoned Communists or anyone who makes a breach of the peace to try to destroy by force the Government of India for any reason.

Nehru himself has said that he has a democratic government and wants a democratic method of life and is against dictatorships. I have met Nehru and believe he is a fine, well-intentioned leader under very difficult present circumstances. I am on the board of governors of the India League of America and am interested in maintaining close ties and friendship with the great people of India. I have been to India and I have followed and know what the progress is.

We people who want to be fair on this program certainly cannot keep giving to Communist Tito and then cut India off. Even though India is now neutral in foreign policy, if we will help the people of India develop and get above the terrible poverty level under which the masses are living, we will have a government and country that will be a showcase of democracy in the Far East. We will have the second largest country in the world standing with us in the United States for democratic principles in which the free countries of the world all believe.

I ask the Congress today to give India a chance. Let hed develop. Let her see a friend standing beside her, for this amount of aid in the current program. The Foreign Affairs Committee is guarding closely so that the aid is going for the development and benefit of the whole Indian people. We have this year specifically provided the requirement that United States development funds permit private enterprise to take part in our program.

When we say to India, "Stand with us for democratic principles" even if India joins no military alliances, I think you will find when Nehru comes and talks here with Eisenhower in the early part of July that there is a new course and new opportunity opening for India. We in the House should not take any unfriendly step to cut off our United States aid just before Nehru has a chance to have the planned talks with the President early in July. We American people welcome Nehru's visit to our country to try to work out our mutual difficult problems in a friendly way.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, while we are discussing this amendment which deals with India, I would like to offer something which perhaps is not in the nature of an argument for or against the amendment, but I was intrigued by an article which I read in the Farm Journal. It relates to statements of several Indian girls who are here on the exchange program. One of the lead-

ing articles in the magazine is entitled "You Hurry So Much":

Thoughtful girls from India tell Polly after living on American farms their views on perhaps what is wrong with us.

I sometimes think that we do hurry too much.

I would like to quote what a Miss Cross said. She is an Indian girl who is about to return home to India, after having had a great experience in America with four other Indian girls in American farm homes.

I quote her:

"Americans always seem to do something about things—even rain."

She said "she thinks we'd be happier if we spent more time enjoying what we have, and accepted some things without change."

She added "that Americans don't seem to know much about the rest of the world. You feel superior, and think the whole world should be like this country. You can't have that attitude if you want to create understanding with the rest of the world."

I sometimes think as I have listened to the debate and considered the mutual-security program in committee whether or not we are not extending ourselves a little too far; whether or not we are attempting to try to make over the rest of the world in our image, and it cannot be done.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] is recognized.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment striking out all assistance for India, even loans and sale of agricultural surpluses. We have just voted against cutting off military aid to a country, Yugoslavia, that is under complete control of an avowed Communist, Tito. He does not even pretend to be a neutral. A Communist government, by definition, has to be dedicated to the isolation and destruction of the United States and every other free country.

Having voted against cutting off military aid to an enemy, I cannot see any possible justification for stopping all economic aid to a country, India, which is trying to be neutral. We may not approve India's neutralism, but nobody can say that India is under a Communist dictator or is an enemy of the United States.

What is the aid proposed for India? About $10 million for technical assistance and some $60 million for development assistance. But the latter can be only in the form of loans or the local currencies obtained from sale in India of our surplus agricultural commodities to help the country maintain its independence.

We would rather have India enter into a mutual security agreement with us and other free countries. We believe that would be better for her and for the peace of that part of the world. But India does not agree. She wants to and believes she can be neutral in this world struggle. I doubt that she can succeed indefinitely. As the Communists say, she will eventually have to lean to one side or the other. But certainly it is far better to have India a neutral and better to help her maintain her neutrality, than to have her an enemy.

Why is India so determined to remain neutral?

First, the Indians are more concerned about and more against the western imperialism they were under for so long than they are against Communist imperialism, which they have not been under. That is not a peculiar Indian reaction; it is a human reaction.

We have seen it in France. Millions of Frenchmen would rather take a chance on a Communist conquest, which they have never known, than on a recurrence of German conquest, which they have known. We saw it in Vietnam before it gained its freedom. Millions there preferred to take a chance on Communist control, which they had not yet been under than on a continuance of the French control which they had been under.

Let us remember that India was under England for more than 200 years. Nehru himself was in jail 14 years. His lifework was to free his country from western control; and we are regarded as part of the West. If I were to have that experience, I suspect my reaction would be about the same as his. I would be against the imperialism I had fought all my life.

Many in India and other Asian countries fear that America's aid is given to enable us stealthily to take over the western imperialism, which India fought for more than 200 years. The Communists are constantly telling them that the Americans are coming in as representatives of Wall Street, first, to try to get economic control of their country, then gradually to gain control of their national policies, and finally move into England's place.

This is not a reasonable fear; in fact, it is ridiculous, but it is understandable. You find it in any country recently emerged from colonial control.

Some years ago in Korea, when a prominent leader was voicing to us his great anxiety over our rebuilding Japan's military and economic strength, one of us said, "It appears that you feel that if your choice were to be under Japan again or under the Communists, you would prefer the latter." Without hesitation be replied, "Certainly. We would at least have a different master."

The deep distrust in India following centuries of control by white men rubs off on us. It is a suspicion of us that we do not like but it is understandable and it is inescapable. Our problem is how best to allay it.

A second reason for India's neutralism is wishful thinking—the almost pathetic hope that communism in China will be different from communism in Europe, because the Chinese are Asians. It will not be. It cannot be—because when a man becomes a Communist he ceases to be a Chinese patriot—or a Japanese, or a German, or an American patriot. But I cannot blame the Indians for being intrigued with the vain hope that they can get along with communism in China. Did not plenty of Americans think that too? Some still do.

A third reason is fear. The Indians know that whoever has been master of China has generally been master of Asia. They know the growing power of Communist China and that it lies right above them. They hope they can avoid antagonizing it. Well, did not we do the same?

In a neighboring Asian country, a prominent leader said to us when we were there last fall, "We are trying to be neutral. Not because we are pro-Communist, but because we have a long border with Communist China. There are only two strong powers in the world—you and the Communist bloc. You could win—but you are not winning. We are a small country. We have only about 20 million people. We have been independent only 7 years. We cannot substantially influence the outcome of this world struggle. We have just got to accept whoever is the winner."

He said, "Your former Secretary of State said of a struggle with the Communists in China, 'Wait until the dust settles.' Well, that is just what we Burmese are trying to do; wait until the dust settles in the world struggle and try to get along with whichever side wins."

In the same country in a conversation with a brilliant scientist recently returned from study in the United States, wholly sympathetic with the free world but still defending their attempted neutralism, we asked, "How could you be neutral, or whom would you be neutral between, if we were to try to be neutral too?"

He replied quickly, "We can be neutral if you stand firm."

That, Mr. Chairman, is our task—to stand firm. We will find most of these neutral countries quickly joining our side whenever we convince them we can be depended on to stand firm and to respect fully their precious, newly won independence.

But as of today they see no certainty that the free world will prevail in this great struggle between the free world and the Communist world. They are too weak as yet to influence the outcome. They want to survive—and to try to be friends with both sides appeals to them as the safest and most realistic course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from South Carolina yield me 2 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has 4 minutes to close the debate.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 2 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. The Indians and other peoples throughout Asia say to us, "Is it not strange that you insist that we not be neutral on this Communist issue, but at the same time you insist on your being neutral on many other issues?"

You will remember President Sukarno who spoke eloquently to us here a few weeks ago. We had a visit with him in his reception room in the capitol of Indonesia last fall, and he put the same

question to us: Why does America want to be neutral and yet not want us to be neutral?

When the issue is between France and her North African colonies, the United States abstains from voting. She is neutral. Why?

Because America wants to be friends with both sides.

In the conflict between Greece and England and Turkey over Cyprus the United States is neutral. She wants to help resolve the dispute. She wants to be friends with all three.

In the conflict between Pakistan and India over Kashmir, America is neutral. She wants to be friends with both sides.

In the conflict between Israel and the Arab States, the United States is scrupulously neutral. Why? Because she does not want to antagonize either side.

In the dispute between the Dutch and Indonesia over west New Guinea, the United States is neutral. Why? Because she wants to be friends with both sides.

Again in the dispute between Pakistan and Afghanistan, America is neutral. She wants to be friends with both sides.

Japan wanted us to put the screws on Syngman Rhee over fishing rights, telling us he would have to do whatever we told him to do. In Korea, Syngman Rhee said we should be firmer with Japan over that same issue, that if we were, the Japanese would have to go along with our wishes. But again we are neutral, because we want to be friends with both sides.

With respect to Vietnam we were told that just as we did not want to offend France, so many in Vietnam did not want to offend Communist China, which is stronger and closer to them than France. We can make the sound argument that there is a world of difference between being neutral in a conflict over territory with some right on each side, and being neutral in a conflict between efforts to preserve freedom in the world and Communist efforts to conquer the world. But their experience with the West has been too unpleasant to allow them to see the issue that sharply.

What would be our attitude if we had had the long, hard struggle against the West that these new countries that we are trying to help through this program had had? They hope to be friends with both sides and to help settle what appears to them as only a quarrel between their friends. We must learn to be patient and more understanding while pointing out the risks they are taking.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let us ask ourselves again, what is in our American interest? What are our objectives in this program?

Are we trying to buy friends? No; it is not possible to buy friends.

Are we trying to make satellites? No. That is what the Kremlin does. That is what we are against.

We do not want satellites. We do not want puppets or stooges. Rather, we are trying to help newly independent peoples retain their independence. We are trying to strengthen their will and increase their capacity to stay free, to keep their territory, their manpower, their resources out of the Kremlin's control. That serves their interest; and it serves ours.

Whatever else Nehru is or is not, he is an Indian nationalist, he is an Indian patriot; he has spent his whole life working for the independence of his country. India has won her independence and there can be no question as to her will to maintain it against both West and East. It is going to be a difficult task at best. I believe it is only good sense and good statesmanship to help them do so by providing some technical assistance, some loans, and selling some of our agricultural surpluses for Indian currency. That is what the Indian program is this year. I do not believe it would be wise in any respect, or would even prove to be wise economically, to strike out this program. I therefore urge that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] is recognized to close the debate.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] on offering this amendment. I expect to support it. In the interest of our own self-respect, it is time to stop handing out the American taxpayers' money to a country whose leader insists on kicking Uncle Sam in the teeth at every opportunity.

The United States rejoiced with India when she acquired her independence on August 15, 1947, and since then every assistance has been offered her, and any request of India has been received in the spirit of friendly cooperation.

The American Ambassador to India, Mr. John Sherman Cooper, in an address on January 3 at Bombay, stated according to the February 6 issue of the Department of State bulletin, that United States aid to India had totaled $477,934,000 since 1947. Ambassador Cooper's remarks were made during a ceremony observing the giving of four locomotives to the Government of India by the United States. These four locomotives were part of a total of 100 locomotives being supplied to India through our assistance program. The Ambassador stated that the following day he would participate in a ceremony turning over to India the first of what would number more than 8,700 freight cars. So, the American people have truly shown their friendship and good will for India. But Nehru, on the other hand, has never failed to seize every opportunity to castigate and vilify and criticize our country.

Many reasons have been offered to explain India's attitude toward the West and in particular, toward the United States. Reference is made to India's "dynamic neutralism," not only to avoid the commitments of any alliance but also to reduce world tensions. Another reason advanced is her feeling of deep anti-colonialism which shows itself as a complex against some countries. Then, above all, it is advocated that the country's newly won independence and extreme nationalism, coupled with a desire for India's leadership in Asia, can account for its current attitude. There are other reasons, too, of small and ephemeral importance, such as Nehru's personal ambitions, and even the poor Rhesus monkeys have been disturbed for this purpose.

The fact remains, nonetheless, that India is leaning toward communism, and carefully scrutinized, Nehru's talk of neutrality is anything but substantiated in his actions.

Since India's role in foreign affairs has been through its spoken words, the actions and words of Mr. Nehru should be a cause for real alarm to the free world. Unrecognized today is the Nehru who on October 13, 1949, said:

> Where freedom is menaced, or justice threatened, or where aggression takes place, we cannot be and shall not be neutral.

Since then, however, Nehru has had nothing but insult for the United States. In May 1951 the press quoted Mr. Nehru in a statement in which he opined that the west is India's traditional enemy and that the conflict between communism and the west is not India's concern.

Nehru's relations with Communist China can be cited as manifest proof of his indifference or inability to comprehend the moral quality of communism. Nehru, it should be remembered, ruled out resistance in the case of Tibet and only expressed surprise and regret at the invasion. To his own party he justified his indifference in these words:

> Many things happen in the world which we do not like, and which we would wish were rather different, but we do not go like Don Quixote with a lance in hand against everything that we dislike. We put up with these things because we would, without making any difference, merely get into trouble.

We have been hearing about the doctrine of coexistence. That was conceived in December 1953 when India and China began negotiations at Peking on an agreement for trade and travel between India and Tibet. With the signing of the agreement on April 28, 1954, the five principles of coexistence, or the doctrine of the Panch Shila, were announced to the world. For the sake of the record, let us enumerate them:

First. Mutual respect of each country for the other's territorial integrity and sovereignty.

Second. Mutual nonaggression.

Third. Mutual noninterference in each other's internal affairs.

Fourth. Equality and mutual benefit.

Fifth. Peaceful coexistence.

Does anyone in this great body believe that either Red China or the U. S. S. R. is convinced of the virtue of nonviolence—two powers that have practiced "liquidation" to a point without parallel in the annals of world history? Has either of these powers given notice of its withdrawal from the military alliances to which each belongs? Is either disarming? Yes, if one might be impressed with legerdemain, but in reality they are stepping up their armaments. They have never ceased to prepare for war. The irony of the situation is patent in the fact that the U. S. S. R. let off an experimental hydrogen bomb at the same

time that its spokesmen were praising the Panch Shila and India's splendid lack of provocative alliances and armaments.

The situation might well be summed up for us by Shakespeare in the following quotation from The Merchant of Venice:

So may the outward shows be least themselves:
The world is still deceiv'd with ornament.
In law, what plea so tainted and corrupt
But being season'd with a gracious voice,
Obscures the show of evil? In religion,
What damned error, but some sober brow
Will bless it and approve it with a text,
Hiding the grossness with fair ornament?
* * * * * * *
* * * Ornament is but the guiled shore
To a most dangerous sea; the beauteous scarf
Veiling an Indian beauty; in a word,
The seeming truth which cunning times put on
To entrap the wisest.

The refusal or incapacity of Nehru to fact the facts of present world affairs is manifested continually in his statements. In referring to the world situation he has said:

At present there are two major forces in the world—the fear of the United States of America and a number of western powers of communism and the Communist countries which they think are expansionist and aiming at world domination, and the other the fear of the Communist countries of being encircled and crushed by the expansionist tendencies of other countries. They point to the large number of bases surrounding them from where 'gen bombs can be hurled at them. Whatever the truth may be in these fears.

The indifference so plain in those last eight words calls to mind the hindsight of Louis XVI when he said:

I have seen all this coming for the past 10 years. How was it possible that I never wanted to believe it?

Within the past year we have heard the announcements of nonaggression—proclaimed from Moscow on June 22, 1955, and from India on December 13, 1955. Nehru's blindness in these instances is nothing but a flagrant disregard of the facts and the crimes committed by the other side. How can Nehru and his Communist friends talk of nonaggression in the light of Korea and Indochina? When the Communists spoke of noninterference in each other's internal affairs, did Nehru forget the hapless fate of Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria? Was Nehru pleading ignorance of the long recognized fact that the Communist Party in India gets its orders direct from Moscow?

If Nehru thinks that the Panch Shila can settle any dispute between communism and democracy, he should recall the words of Lenin that in the last analysis the issue between the two will be determined by the fact that Russia, India, and China represent a "crushing" majority of the population of the world.

Events in the past several years portend that, in the Russian scheme, India represents only an enormous silo of human beings who, along with China, will eventually be hurled against the West, in fulfillment of Lenin's teaching. I for one have not read that the Russians have repudiated Lenin. For many years Russia has tried to reach the warm waters of the Indian Ocean, as well as those of the Mediterranean. If the Almighty should permit such a day to come, thanks to Nehru's blindness, who would care to rescue India? The Douay Bible contains a most appropriate warning:

Who will pity an enchanter struck by a serpent or any that come near wild beasts? So it is with him that keepeth company with a wicked man, and is involved in his sins. Ecclesiasticus 12: 13.

The Honorable George Meany, one of our great labor leaders, has tersely stated the issue:

No country, no people, no movement can stand aloof and be neutral in this struggle. Nehru and Tito are not neutral. They are aids and allies [of communism] in fact and in effect, if not in diplomatic verbiage.

Mr. Meany is exactly right. Nehru is not neutral, and I must say that I have heard the word "neutral" used today as a word with many interpretations, and I suppose that, in this way, it covers a multitude of sins. But, the actions of Mr. Nehru do not come within the definition of the word as it is interpreted by Webster's dictionary.

When my subcommittee was in India last fall, Mr. Nehru was preparing for the coming visit of Khrushchev and Bulganin. The streets were being cleaned, the platforms were being constructed, schoolchildren were rehearsing their words of welcome, and the red carpet was really being rolled out for the performance. The invectives hurled at the West by the Russian brigands were printed in the press throughout the world. The Russians really had a field day in India, but did Mr. Nehru express any objections to their vitriolic statements concerning our country? If he did, no one ever heard of it, to my knowledge. I want to refer to a statement from the International Peasant Union concerning Mr. Nehru's words when his captors prepared to depart:

In bidding the Soviet leaders farewell, Nehru declared with a note of emotion in his voice, "An entire generation will remember your visit. Please come back. We will expectantly await you."

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Nehru may find to his sorrow that the visit of the Russians will be remembered by his people beyond the span of an entire generation. We Americans will never forget it, and while I am on the subject, I hope that Khrushchev and Bulganin will never be invited to set foot on the continents of North or South America.

Mr. Chairman, the moment is at hand when we should heed the scriptural passage:

He that is not with me is against me, and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad.

India's leaders have been scattering abroad and carrying water on both shoulders too long, and the sooner we stop bowing and scraping to Nehru and Menon the sooner we will regain the respect of the peoples of Pakistan and Ceylon and other countries who have dared to take a positive stand against communism. It will take a little bit of backbone, but the American people have always had plenty of this.

I trust that the Congress will take the first step on the road back by adopting the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not be adopted. I would just like again to call to the attention of the House that it involves only $60 million to this great country. The amount was cut by $10 million by the committee.

This provision in the bill is the result of a long line of effort by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio who has been fighting for years for providing assistance in the form of loans instead of grants. This particular $60 million to India, to that great country, is only for loans or for surplus agricultural commodities.

This is the first time there has been a restriction of this kind in this bill.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BENTLEY) there were—ayes 28, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the use of United States tax dollars directly by the Government through grants-in-aid and its administrative agencies are of little value in competition with the Communist world.

It seems to me that it would be far better to enlist private capital, know-how, management techniques, and other economic benefits directly from the successful fields of business in the United States, than to depend exclusively upon Government administered and directly financed agencies in the field of foreign economic development.

I confess, Mr. Chairman, that some of these thoughts are not original with me. A friend who is an industrial consultant and who now lives abroad has written to me at some length on this subject. I believe that this Congress should give serious consideration to his suggestions in this matter of meeting the competition of the Soviet bloc in the good old American spirit of free enterprise.

American individuals and corporations are in a position today to export and invest their capital in underdeveloped areas where the interests of the United States require the marshaling of its economic resources, especially in those areas wherein we are today apparently in open competition with the Soviet and its satellites.

Mr. Chairman, there are precedents of long standing which have proved to be practical in our own domestic economy to justify American investments abroad. I refer specifically to the principle of preferential tax treatment. During the war and in a period of extreme crisis, corporations all over the country were

induced to build defense plants and they were allowed depreciation and depletion allowances. The same applies in the field of oil exploration. To stimulate exploration for oil reserves in this country, the prospectors are permitted to take depletion allowances, all of which serve as an inducement for exploration.

I would suggest the following as being applicable to induce American capital that might be invested in underdeveloped areas where we believe we might have an interest:

First. A 3-year tax write-off of capital so invested.

Second. An extension of the 3-year limitation to 5 years on carrying forward of operating losses.

Third. Optional war risk insurance.

It would seem, Mr. Chairman, that these suggested preferential inducements would provide the establishment of a profit motive for American investors, private or corporate. It is a sound law of economics that money will go where it can earn a profit and where it is reasonably safe. It would also permit the development brought about from such invested capital funds to be under the guidance of business policies and know-how carried on by investors, trained personnel and management techniques. This is a field in which government is not proficient. This is the way we have built a strong private economy in this country with the highest standard of living in the world.

Since extreme nationalism exists in most of the underdeveloped areas in the world today, it is much more acceptable and easier for private capital and industry to take over the economic development than for a foreign government to do so, such as the United States through its governmental agencies.

The preferential tax provisions which I have suggested I believe would eventually result in the gradual replacement of United States Government economic assistance with funds collected from the American taxpayer and provided by the United States Treasury. Here we would substitute private initiative and know-how for the present unwieldy Government control. Here, too, we would have a direct investment program with designated administration by private industry and individuals. There certainly would be less political overtones under private management than the efforts being made under the present program directly by Government agencies at a tremendous cost in centralized administration and expense in the field. Then, too, there is a reasonable assumption that the gross tax revenue under this plan accruing to the Government would not, in the long run, be reduced as might at first blush be expected. The fact would seem to be that the investors' ability to pay more taxes would be greatly enhanced and the return from capital gains and earnings of United States investors from development projects would be substantial.

American taxpayers today and many Members of Congress have serious doubt as to the effectiveness of Government promotion in the economic field. There is little doubt that underdeveloped areas of the world should be assisted financially but this should be done on a business basis and not by gifts or grants, all of which are for free. This great country of ours was not built on that basis nor will the underdeveloped areas of the world develop strong economies if they look to other governments to develop their resources for the benefit of their people.

I believe there is an urgent need under existing conditions for a change in our policy, a shift away from Government-sponsored projects to an enlistment of the full resources of American private capital and industry. Such a move is positive and constructive and it is bound to support our diplomatic and military efforts abroad, which will be in the best interest of United States foreign policy.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. Title III of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to technical cooperation, is further amended as follows:

(a) In section 304 (b), which relates to authorization, after "$146,500,000", insert ", and for the fiscal year 1957 not to exceed $140,500,000,."

(b) In section 306, which relates to multilateral technical cooperation:

(1) In subsection (a), which relates to contributions to the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance, strike out all following "1956" and substitute ", and $15,500,000 for the fiscal year 1957, for such contributions;."

(2) In subsection (b), which relates to contributions to the technical cooperation programs of the Organization of American States, strike out all following "1956" and substitute ", and $1,500,000 for the fiscal year 1957, for such contributions."

(c) In section 307, which relates to advances, grants, and contracts, strike out all following "Congress," in the last sentence thereof and substitute "extend at any time for not more than 3 years."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Section 5, page 5, after line 24, add the following new subsection:

"SEC. 309. Study of technical cooperation program: It is the sense of the Congress that there be made, under the direction of the President, an analysis and study of the methods or mechanisms whereby the technical cooperation program can be established on a long-term basis, in view of its basic objectives and purposes, separated from other programs authorized by or pursuant to the Mutual Security Act, as amended, including the preparation of draft proposals for legislation to establish such program under the administration of a new independent agency or Government corporation."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the technical assistance phase of our foreign-aid program has had a popular appeal for some years. I would support this part of the program if it were possible to have a separate vote on it. The parliamentary situation is such that it will be impossible to have such a vote.

When first inaugurated, technical assistance or point 4, as it was then called, had as its purpose to undertake a broad program of self-help to underdeveloped countries and peoples. It was to provide a know-how to those areas of the world where assistance was requested. The nature of it was to be much like our rural extension services under the land-grant colleges in our own country.

In his message to Congress in June of 1954, President Eisenhower said:

Our country's participation in technical cooperation programs must be vigorously advanced. Certain fundamentals are essential to their success. First, they should provide experts and know-how rather than large amounts of funds or goods, although they should not be allowed to fail due to lack of necessary teaching and demonstration equipment. Second, they should be tightly adjusted to the needs of the host countries. Third, they should be so administered as to reach as many people as possible, helping them raise their own standards of living and solve their own problems.

The late Dr. Henry Bennett, administrator of this program who gave his life while serving as director of the point 4 program, said this about the technical assistance program:

The program we have described to Congress and to the public is a simple, down-to-earth, self-help program designed primarily to assist other peoples in increasing their food production, bettering their health conditions, and improving their educational systems. It is my view that the cost of this program; which shall be effective only if it is pitched on a long-term basis, should be enough to finance a broad, dynamic technical cooperation effort, but not to include the large-scale grants-in-aid. This has been my consistent position and conviction and I must be faithful to it.

It is my desire that we press forward as rapidly as possible with all of our programs, but without spending money recklessly. It would be far better for everyone concerned if we turned back unneeded money to the taxpayers rather than waste it on unsound projects.

In recent years administrators of this program have moved far beyond the ideas expressed by Presidents Truman and Eisenhower and Dr. Bennett. Large-scale grants-in-aid to finance power dams, highways, canals, and railroads are being considered. This is a far cry, indeed, from simple, down-to-earth self-help programs. Only a few days ago the Director of ICA said they proposed to spend $20 million for a nuclear research center in the Philippines. They intend to harness the Mekong River to control floods, provide transport and bring power to Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam. They also plan to build roads between India and Nepal and between Afghanistan and Pakistan. Further, they need to construct piers in India so that India may ship iron ore to Japan. Are these simple self-help programs? How can it be said that these kinds of projects are consistent with the President's statement that any of these programs should provide know-how, rather than large amounts of funds or goods? The simple answer is that they do not.

To what extent has our technical assistance program achieved its goals? There seems to be general agreement that this program should continue as an important phase of our foreign policy. In spite of some real accomplishments its success has been limited. There is considerable room for improvement in matters of administration and planning.

One witness who appeared before our committee was Dr. John H. Reisner, at present a consultant to Agricultural Mis-

sions, Inc. This witness had wide experience abroad in the field of agriculture and he also had first-hand knowledge of the operations of the technical assistance programs in South America, the Near East and Asia. Recently he made this pertinent observation about the program:

One of the great weaknesses of the whole technical assistance operation is that we did not take time to learn how we could be most helpful. Moreover, we seem to have thought it necessary to make a crash impact on the country concerned. To succeed in this crash impact, it seemed desirable to put in as many people and as much money as Congress would provide. * * * Granted that needs are varied, great, and pressing, the fundamental problem has always been and still is, how we can help build services and institutions and organizations that will be related to the needs of the people and that can be transferred to the governments as quickly as possible. For example, it does only limited good to spray a whole country once with DDT at our expense, unless the host country can then take over.

In the minds of many people in our own country there is the popular understanding that our technical assistance would be closely related to the needs of the masses of underprivileged people. These masses are largely village people. The only country in Asia where this is not true is Japan, where we have a relatively small program. On the Asian continent our contribution to village development is spotty, at best. In some countries we have barely scratched the surface of the problem of getting help to the villages.

In one country in Asia it is reported that a high United States official once said that conditions in the villages were so bad that an American could not be expected to live there, hence nothing has been done.

Admittedly the problem is extremely difficult. The important point to remember is that our technical assistance has in no large way in a number of countries been reaching people who need it most. American interest abroad is concerned with people, rather than with governments, as I see it.

A technical assistance program properly administered in accordance with its original concepts can become a valuable asset to our foreign policy. Today it is submerged in a military assistance program, defense support, and development assistance programs. It is the least considered yet the most important in the long run.

Technical cooperation, as I have indicated, is essentially a personalized program. It should provide down-to-earth contacts with people upon which understanding and good will must eventually rest. There can be no basis for a lasting peace unless we build upon this premise.

I would like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this is a program for laymen, for devoted men and women, and not for professional diplomats, with all due respect to them. They operate in an entirely different sphere and under entirely different conditions but what we need is a corps of shirtsleeve emissaries who can meet people in the villages and in the rural areas.

Mr. Chairman, qualified people are available if we can organize a sound program. Thousands of fine people are still imbued with the missionary spirit that obviously undergirds the programs, and they are willing to serve their country and mankind.

What is the great need to insure a sound, workable, and efficient program as a vital part of our foreign policy? There is a substantial group of people in this country who feel that it is imperative to give this program independent status, possibly under some form of corporate structure. There is a precedent for this idea in the Institute for Inter-American Affairs created by Congress some years ago. It has been very successful, so I am informed.

Under a corporate structure the technical assistance program could be administered separately from either military assistance, defense support, and development assistance. The huge sums appropriated for these other purposes keep the technical assistance program in jeopardy.

Under a separate entity technical cooperation would be assured on a reasonably long-term basis, dependent upon performance and results. Only a modest sum of money would be required to finance the program.

Personnel policies could be developed to meet the requirements of the program without interference of other programs. This would also apply to administrative and fiscal procedures which should be adopted to requirements in the operating field rather than to standard departmental procedures in Washington.

Mr. Chairman, some such form of reorganization seems imperative. Only such a change, as I see it, will insure the future of the technical assistance program. Money alone will not do it.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress of the United States should tell the people of this country that our effort in the field of technical cooperation is a long one but that it need not be extravagant, wasteful, or expensive. Our modest help will not make other countries over in our image, nor is it our task to do so, but we can bring to people who want our help our very best skills on a friendly cooperative basis.

A most interesting article appeared in the Saturday Evening Post on March 24, written by Mr. Alston Waring. It was a report by an American farmer and his wife who shared the primitive life of Indian villages for 3 years to help introduce them to the 20th century.

Mr. Waring made a pertinent observation indicating that time only will bring a new way of life possibly to teeming millions abroad. In commenting on his own work he said:

For I am sure success in this type of work has chiefly to do with the mind, the way people do things, the confidence they acquire, and ultimately the growth of a certain belief in themselves and their own capacities.

Then further he states:

How will it work out? How will they cross over, these 10th-century men and women, to the threshold of the 20th? I do not think we learned the answer at Barpali, unless it is that these village friends of our will make the transition in their own way and in their own time. We could not hurry them, but we could believe in them and come close to seeing the problem as it appears to their eyes and minds.

Here is a challenge that does not involve arms, guns, nor bombs, but a few million dollars spent over a period of years will make for better understanding and for a better world.

Let us rescue the technical cooperation program from its involvements with military and economic aid. I believe that the establishment of a separate agency will permit it to fulfill its original purpose.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. May I say that as far as I am concerned I certainly have no objection to the gentleman's amendment. As a matter of fact I think it is a good amendment to go in the bill. I have not consulted with our chairman, but, as I said, as far as I am concerned I think it is a good amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am wondering if the chairman would have any objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. I have looked very carefully at this amendment, and in this connection I want to pay tribute to the gentleman who has been studying this subject for a long time. I think he has something worked out here that may do good. It certainly will not do any harm. Personally I am not going to oppose it.

Let me say to the House: I want to announce to the House that it is the intention of the leadership to stay here tonight until we finish; otherwise we will have to go over until tomorrow. I figure we can finish this bill in an hour or two. I just want to give notice to the membership that we expect to stay here until we finish.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am pleased, Mr. Chairman, that there seems to be no opposition to the amendment, and if there is not, I will not labor the Committee longer.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. Title IV of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to other programs, is further amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 401, which relates to special fund, as follows:

(1) In the first sentence of subsection (a), strike out "$50,000,000" and substitute "$150,000,000"; and in the last sentence of such subsection strike out "$20,000,000" and substitute "$30,000,000."

(2) In subsection (b), after "$100,000,000", insert ", and for the fiscal year 1957 not to exceed $100,000,000,".

(b) In section 402, which relates to earmarking of funds, after "$300,000,000", insert ", and of the funds so authorized for the fiscal year 1957 not less than $250,000,000."

(c) In section 403 (b), which relates to special assistance in joint control areas, after "$21,000,000", insert ", and for the fiscal year 1957 not to exceed $12,200,000."

(d) Amend section 405, which relates to migrants, refugees, escapees, as follows:

(1) In subsection (c), after "$1,400,000", insert ", and for the fiscal year 1957 not to exceed $2,300,000."

(2) In subsection (d), after "$6,000,000", insert ", and for the fiscal year 1957 not to exceed $7,000,000."

(e) In section 406 (b), which relates to children's welfare, after "$14,500,000", insert ", and for the fiscal year 1957 not to exceed $10,000,000."

(f) In section 407 (b) which relates to Palestine refugees in the Near East, strike out "for the fiscal year 1956."

(g) Amend section 409, which relates to ocean freight charges, as follows:

(1) In subsection (c), after "$2,000,000" in the last sentence thereof, insert ", and for the fiscal year 1957 not to exceed $1,400,000."

(2) In subsection (d), after "$13,000,000" in the first sentence thereof, insert ", and for the fiscal year 1957 not to exceed $14,000,000."

(h) In section 410, which relates to Control Act expenses, after "$1,175,000," in the first sentence thereof, insert "and for the fiscal year 1957 not to exceed $1,175,000."

(i) Amend section 411, which relates to administrative and other expenses, as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), strike out all that follows "$35,225,000," and insert "and for the fiscal year 1957 not to exceed $35,250,000, for necessary administrative expenses incident to carrying out the provisions of this act (other than chapter 1 of title I and section 124)."

(2) Redesignate subsection "(c)" as subsection "(e)", and insert after subsection (b) the following new subsections:

"(c) Not to exceed $1,500,000 of funds made available under title II may be transferred in the fiscal year 1957 for necessary administrative expenses not otherwise provided for incident to carrying out functions under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1691 and the following), delegated or assigned to any agency or officer administering nonmilitary assistance, and the amounts so transferred shall be consolidated with funds made available pursuant to this section for said fiscal year.

"(d) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State such amounts as may be necessary from time to time for administrative expenses which are incurred for normal functions of the Department which relate to functions under this act."

(j) In section 413 (b) (2), after "to encourage and facilitate the flow of private investment to", insert ", and its equitable treatment in."

(k) Amend section 413 (b) (4) as follows:

(1) After "may make", insert ", through the International Cooperation Administration."

(2) Substitute "June 30, 1967" for "June 30, 1957."

(3) In subparagraph (B) (ii), before the semicolon at the end thereof, insert "or by reason of war, revolution, or insurrection."

(4) Amend subparagraph (F) to read as follows:

"(F) the President is authorized to issue guaranties up to a total face value of $500,000,000 exclusive of informational media guaranties heretofore and hereafter issued pursuant to section 1011 of the act of January 27, 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1442), and section 111 (b) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1509 (b) (3)): *Provided*, That any funds allocated to a guaranty and remaining after all liability of the United States assumed in connection therewith has been released, discharged, or otherwise terminated, and funds realized after June 30, 1955, from the sale of currencies or other assets acquired pursuant to subparagraph (C), shall be available for allocation to other guaranties, and the foregoing limitation shall be increased to the extent that such funds become available. Any payments made to discharge liabilities under guaranties issued under this paragraph shall be paid out of fees collected under subparagraph (E) as long as such fees are available, and thereafter shall be paid out of funds realized from the sale of currencies or other assets acquired pursuant to subparagraph (C) and notes which have been issued under authority of paragraph 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and authorized to be issued under this paragraph by the Director of the International Cooperation Administration, when necessary to discharge liabilities under any such guaranty. *Provided*, That all guaranties issued after June 30, 1956, pursuant to this paragraph shall be considered for the purposes of sections 3679 (31 U. S. C. 665) and 3732 (41 U. S. C. 11) of the Revised Statutes, as amended, as obligations only to the extent of the probable ultimate net cost to the United States of such guaranties; and the President shall, in the submission to the Congress of the reports required by section 534 of this act, include information on the operation of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That at all times funds shall be allocated to all outstanding guaranties issued prior to July 1, 1956, exclusive of informational media guaranties issued pursuant to section 1011 of the act of January 27, 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1442), and section 111 (b) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, equal to the sum of the face value of said guaranties. For the purpose of this paragraph the Director of the International Cooperation Administration is authorized to issue notes (in addition to the notes heretofore issued pursuant to paragraph 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended) in an amount not to exceed $37,500,000, and on the same terms and conditions applicable to notes issued pursuant to said paragraph 111 (c) (2)."

(l) Amend section 415, which relates to assistance to international organization, as follows:

(1) Change "Organization" in the title to "Organizations."

(2) After "the North Atlantic Treaty Organization", insert "and the Organization for European Economic Cooperation."

(m) Repeal section 418, which relates to President's Fund for Asian Economic Development.

(n) Add the following new section:

"SEC. 420. Food and Agriculture Organization: Public Law 174, 79th Congress, as amended by section 1 (b) of Public Law 806, 81st Congress, is hereby further amended by striking out the figure '$2,000,000' in section 2 thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the figure '$3,000,000'."

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FEIGHAN: Page 6, after line 20, insert the following:

"(1) In subsection (a), add the following new sentence: 'None of the funds authorized in this act shall be used to assist directly or indirectly the movement from Communist-occupied China of so-called White Russians and other refugees possessing passports issued by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and exit permits issued by the Communist government of China to countries of the free world, or of any other persons not having a security investigation and clearance based on reasonable standards to insure against Communist infiltration of free nations'."

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I feel it is unnecessary for me to say that I have always been an ardent supporter of intelligent programs to assist refugees. Before the end of World War II, I made a trip, with other Members of Congress, to Germany to see firsthand the sad and tragic plight of the refugee victims of the twin tyrannies of communism and nazism and later I supported the very successful program of President Truman for displaced persons, and also more recently the refugee relief program recommended by President Eisenhower.

I have been and shall continue to be interested in all legitimate programs aimed at giving aid and comfort to bona fide victims of aggression or totalitarianism in any form. But by the same criteria I shall oppose all efforts to impose upon Congress false refugee programs and all authorizations for the use of public funds for refugee programs which are in fact using the taxpayers' money to support activities directly and violently opposed to the national security of the United States.

My amendment prohibits the illegal use of United States public funds to pay any of the ocean transportation costs for residents of Red China including so-called White Russians, who leave Red China in possession of valid passports issued by the Communist regime of Moscow and have in their possession exit permits granted by the Communist occupiers of China to countries of the free world without having any security investigation whatever.

During an inspection trip of the Far East last fall for the House Judiciary Committee I discovered amazing facts about the violation of the law. The majority of these so-called White Russians, as I said, living in Red China, have in their possession valid passports issued by the Soviet Union and are in possession of exit permits issued by the Red Chinese Government. This is all the more amazing when we realize that only the proven friends and allies of communism are ever allowed to hold a valid Russian passport. Moreover, all of these people, leaving Red China, have no trouble getting an exit permit from the Red Chinese, while American civilians, military personnel, and missionaries have been required to wait years for such an exit permit or it has been denied outright to them.

The important thing is that no security investigation is made on any of these people before they are allowed to enter the free world despite the fact that the law under which we have appropriated the funds which are now being used requires that such an investigation be made.

I have in my hand an official report of the International Cooperation Administration which states that no on-the-spot investigation of these so-called White Russians is made because no security investigation is possible on the mainland of China.

This obvious breach in the free world security is climaxed by the fact that at least one of these so-called White Russians has been uncovered in one of our sister Republics of Latin America as a top Russian espionage agent. This Russian espionage agent came out of Red China and was moved to Latin America with no security investigation being made. Then it was discovered that he was a former Kremlin security agent in

the Red Polish Embassy in Peiping. That Latin American Republic has since cut off further admission of any of these so-called White Russians for very obvious reasons.

I want to make this very clear: My amendment would not cut off aid to legitimate refugees. It would make more funds available in fact for bona fide refugees by denying aid to bogus refugees.

Another important factor is that my amendment does not prohibit other countries who may be foolish enough to open their doors to Russian espionage agents, from paying the costs for moving these people from Red China to their country. It only prevents the misuse of American taxpayers' money for that purpose.

This amendment would not in any way affect the successful conclusion of the refugee relief program because none of these so-called White Russians can qualify under that program because of the obvious requirement that a full-scale security investigation be made on all applicants for admission into the United States.

I feel that this is a very meritorious amendment. It will at least, as far as the United States is concerned, stop the misuse of American taxpayers' funds in what I consider to be a very serious breach of the free world security.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I do not question the sincerity of the gentleman. I am sure everyone in the House knows how deeply interested he is that Communists do not migrate to very sensitive areas of the world or migrate to our country. I wonder if the gentleman is aware of the statement that was presented to our committee by the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER on the movement of European refugees from Communist China through Hong Kong under the auspices of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration. On page 962 Mr. WALTER states:

> It is in the humanitarian and political interest of the United States that the effort to rescue these refugees should continue.

Further he states:

> To do otherwise would not only sacrifice the lives of thousands of stanch enemies of communism, but would contribute substantially to current Soviet objectives.

He has also stated that there were no known Communists who have returned to Communist China and that no known Communists have been found who have migrated to any other country.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. WALTER'S complete statement is absolutely in contradiction of the facts. If the gentleman heard what I said, he would know there was at least one Soviet espionage agent who went to Brazil, and he was kicked out of Brazil because it was later found out that even though he was purportedly traveling as a so-called White Russian he had been the Communist security officer in the Red Polish Embassy in Peiping, China.

There is printed in the hearings of the Foreign Affairs Committee my report on the situation as I found it after thorough investigation, checking and rechecking throughout all of the area of southeast and north Africa. I know there is not one single security agency of the United States Government that gives a security clearance on any of the so-called White Russians or any other persons coming from Red China who travel in possession of a valid Soviet Union passport and in possession of an exit permit granted by the Red Chinese.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. As one member of the committee I was thoroughly satisfied with the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] that there is a sufficient security check. Some of us on the committee have had an opportunity to witness some of the processing of refugees. I was personally satisfied that we need not worry about it. I think it would be a mistake if we adopted the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I watched the processing of refugees, but my point is this, that the persons against whom I want to prohibit the use of money for ocean transportation are persons who are residing in Red China and upon whom there can be no security investigation. The basic question involved in my amendment is very, very simple, in my opinion. It is whether Congress approves the misuse of the taxpayers' funds to open up and maintain a serious breach in the security of the free world. There is confusion concerning which committee of Congress, if any, has primary responsibility for looking into the operations of refugee programs and reporting thereon to Congress. Because of this confusion I appeared before the House Foreign Affairs Committee to present the evidence which I developed on the misuse of the taxpayers' money on so-called White Russians living in Red China.

I have requested the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] to conduct full scale public hearings on the refugee program relating to so-called White Russians residing in Red China. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] promised me that he would conduct a full scale public hearing on this matter in Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary of which he is chairman and of which I am a member. I appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee to present the report of my investigation on this scandalous situation. I am very grateful to the chairman and members of the Foreign Affairs Committee who have responded to my request to print the complete report of my inspection which appears in the hearings on page 933 after my testimony which began on page 925. I am firmly confident that the accuracy of my report will be borne out in the future and therefore I am grateful that it is now in the official records of Congress. I am still hopeful that the subcommittee will schedule full scale public hearings on this matter so that some extremely important additional evidence which has subsequently come to my attention may be made known to the American people and so that a number of witnesses may be questioned under oath. One of the witnesses I hope to have appear lives in the Far East, proudly carries an American citation, and can give eyewitness testimony to the wide variety of actvities engaged in by the so-called White Russians in Red China to demostrate their loyalty to the Kremlin and to enhance the cause of Sovietization of the world.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at the end of the debate on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like to find myself in disagreement with my friend from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], who has done so much work on this whole question. He has told me about his experiences and his observations in the Far East since his return last fall, but while many of the circumstances regarding these White Russian refugees from Communist China are as he describes them, I do not think some of the conclusions he has drawn regarding them are accurate.

First, let us look at this group of refugees. These are the first real anti-Communists in the world. These are people who fled Russia in 1917 when the Communists took over. A lot of them were members of the Czarist nobility, the Russian intelligentsia and aristocracy, and officers of the Czarist armies. They fled into Manchuria, down into Tientsin, Peking, and Shanghai. They lived in unspeakable circumstances. I have never seen refugees, even in IRO days in Europe, who suffered more than these people. Yet, they were so opposed to communism by religion and by tradition that almost none of them wavered. They had no legal status. They had no passports. Later they obtained so-called Nansen certificates of identification issued by the League of Nations to stateless persons. Many of the women lived in indescribable ways in order to support themselves and their families until they could get on their feet and reestablish good homes.

When the Chinese Communists in 1949 and 1950 took over the big cities in China, one of the first things the Russians who came with them tried to do was to get these persons to redefect to Red Russia. They offered them Soviet passports. They offered to transport them back to the Soviet Union. All sorts of promises were made, of immunity, of jobs, of reunion with their families. Some, especially among those born in China, decided to accept the promises and went back to the Soviet Union. Most of them disappeared, in the sense that the relatives heard nothing from them. To my knowledge none of them ever got back to China. They were just lost in the Soviet Union.

The great majority of the refugees refused to go back to Russia. Since they had no hopes for the future in Red China, they tried their best to get out of the country. The Soviet Union had given them passports as part of the inducements to go back to the Soviet Union, but they were foreign passports. They permitted the refugees to return

to Russia but would not allow them to travel in the Soviet Union. The passports did, however, give identity to the refugees and allowed them to go from Communist China into Hong Kong, where the British would accept them for transit to other countries.

Second, what about security investigations and tests? Well, the real security clearance for these people is the one given by their fellow White Russians. This little group of anti-Communist exiles has survived only by being most closely knit together. They know each other. They know the enemy and his agents. They know who is anti-Communist, and who is a saboteur or a spy. I would much rather have the testimony regarding one of their number, of that group of individuals who have proved their dependability by almost 40 years of unwaivering anticommunism, than the findings of an American investigator who could not get any real evidence from inside China on which to base his testimony anyway.

Third, look at the record. Several thousand have been resettled and only 1 or 2 have ever caused any trouble. One was in Brazil on his way to Brazil. They have gone to a score of countries, including our own, all over the world, but no group of refugees has been taken care of by IRO or any of its successor refugee agencies has had a smaller percentage of its number go bad or prove unworthy than this tragic group of people, who are, I repeat, the original anti-Communists.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is only decent for us to go ahead and help resettle them, realizing that an occasional impostor or agent will get through. That happens under any refugee operation today. I fear that the gentleman in his commendable concern to prevent Communist infiltration is taking a position like that of the surgeon who is so anxious to save the patient's blood that he does not do the things necessary to save the patient's life. Our big concern is to save lives. I recognize we take a certain hazard, but the occasional mistake need not do too serious harm. These persons will remain under scrutiny wherever they are. It is a small risk, considering the gains. Their record of proved anti-Communism is so extraordinary that it seems to me that we should vote down the gentleman's amendment which would close the door of all hope to these unfortunate victims of almost four decade of Communist tyranny. It would sentence them to the guillotine or whatever is its modern equivalent. The fact that they have again declared their strong anti-Communist stand by their efforts to escape, means they are condemned unless they do escape.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, the substantial question in this legislation before us today is simply this. Shall we, in conscientious regard of the welfare of the American taxpayer, accept and approve the reductions recommended in this bill, as well as some further cuts that will be offered by amendment, pending a reevaluation of the whole United States foreign-aid program. After carefully examining all of the pertinent evidence, I believe that our answer should be a very sober but resounding "Yes."

Preliminary to our continuing action, it might be well to reflect upon the fact that well over a hundred billion dollars of our people's money in principal and interest has been spent on foreign aid since 1940.

It is true that in the beginning of this program to rehabilitate war shattered and torn countries abroad, the American people were willing to reasonably share of their own wealth and resources in Christian generosity and practical wisdom. However, the time has come for the American taxpayer to sensibly ask if the astronomical sums we have been granting to many of these countries is still actually needed. From authoritative statistics here, it is obvious that some of these nations have long reached a point of economic productivity beyond their capacity previous to the war, and therefore, substantial reductions, if not total elimination, are in order. Let us be patriotically mindful that this blessed Nation and its generous people are not possessed of inexhaustible resources, and let us remember our primary duty is to them.

Few, if any, will quarrel with the original basic objectives of this mutual security foreign aid program: to prevent Americans from again having to fight and die on foreign battlefields, to help rehabilitate friendly allies and undeveloped countries, and to secure the safety of ourselves and the free world from any Communist threat. The fundamental purposes of this legislation were and remain Christian to our character and practical to our own self-interest.

In consistent pursuit of such sensible self-interest, the problem confronts us of continuing the laudable aims of our foreign aid and foreign policy in reasonable appropriation retrenchment in accord with what the already overburdened American taxpayer can afford. Mind you, this current authorization is proposed pending the resurvey of the whole program and its policy.

Mr. Chairman, in examining the evidence warranting approval of the reductions proposed in this bill, the first and most impressive fact to remember is that enough money is already and now available to carry on our foreign assistance for at least the next 2½ years. In other words, we are here contemplating the authorization of funds to be expended 2 or 3 years ahead.

The second and most unhappy evidence to influence our action is the sad fact that our foreign aid policy has not been succeeding because of failure of readjustment to the changing conditions in the world. On that score, we need only mention the present activity of Marshal Tito, whom we have so generously supported, and who now appears to be turning back into the Russian fold from whence he came. I do hope that this body will approve the amendment that will eliminate any further aid to him. It was because of suspicion of such developments as the change of Marshal Tito and dangerous signs of progressive unenthusiasm for American military policy that upon the last two occasions when this legislation was before us, I urged both the administration, whose prime duty of explanation it is, and the Congress to initiate a reexamination, restudy, and reappraisal. I earnestly wish that such had been done, and we would be in a better position to more wisely act today on this complex problem.

The symptoms then beginning are now unfortunately in full bloom. Let us wisely remind ourselves here that NATO is now distressingly far from our original hopes, the major portion of the French infantry is engaged in North Africa, Germany has not yet passed the legislation to recruit the forces we planned to equip, the British are talking about drastic restriction or even elimination of conscription, and Italy is manifesting less interest in military assistance and more in economic aid. All these disturbing facts would seem to make it imperative to prudent wisdom that we reasonably retrench vast authorizations for the uncertain future while a critical reevaluation of our foreign-aid program is undertaken.

While such is being conducted, we are still generously carrying out our Christian objectives of contributing to the Children's Fund and giving reasonable aid for development assistance and technical cooperation under the point 4 type of operation. This type of help is undoubtedly the best answer that we can give to any Communist approach to these people and I am certainly in favor of that authorization. It may well prove to be the most strategic field in which to make even greater authorizations in our own interest after the resurvey has been completed.

Mr. Chairman, the further and perhaps most convincing evidence to justify reduction while resurveying comes from no less an authority than the Comptroller General of the United States himself, who stated before the congressional committee that overoptimistic foreign-aid planning has resulted in appropriation of more money than could be spent. In some instances, more assistance was given to certain countries than they could administratively handle.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, let us reemphasize that there are appropriations outstanding sufficient to carry on our foreign-aid program for 3 years. There is overwhelming evidence from the highest authorities that the program has been overexpanded by overoptimistic and unrealistic planning. There is, unfortunately, overwhelming, startling evidence that changes in attitudes and reactions are taking place in too many countries all over the world which we have unhappily failed to properly appraise. There is nothing in this measure before us that will in any way disrupt the continuation of a reasonable mutual security program. Nations that have been and still are friendly to us are being adequately assisted. Those strategic areas where some of our own boys are in danger, such as Korea, are being well

equipped militarily. The most desirable point 4 operation is going and will go on. The substantial objectives of our whole foreign-aid program are not being denied.

We have the Christian duty of giving reasonable help to peoples less fortunate than ourselves, and we are bound in our own self-interest to give assistance to friendly nations for military defense against Communist aggression if it should come.

We also have the further duty and obligation to the American people to take the greatest care of their money and exercise the highest vigilance over the manner in which it is spent. In all appropriations actions, the already overburdened American taxpayer and our own economic stability should come first. We can meet our two obligations of reasonably protecting the American taxpayer and providing security from the Communist threat by adopting this measure containing sensible reductions in foreign aid while the whole program is being reevaluated. Let us remember that the Congress can always act promptly in any sudden emergency. I urge your approval of this bill without further delay.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] may extend his remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, the principal objective of this bill, like that of its legislative predecessors, is to check Communist growth and power throughout the world. Like previous bills, it seeks to strengthen the free world, so-called, so that the nations comprising it will be able to stand up against the various forms of penetration practiced by the world-conquest conspiracy of the Soviet—military, economic, and ideological.

In the first place, I do not believe that the spending of billions of dollars in foreign nations standing by itself has been of any measurable benefit in checking the progress of the world Communist movement. Even the most cursory and superficial glance at the recent growth, increased strength, and expansion of communism and Communist influence and control in the world will prove beyond doubt, in my opinion, that, despite this huge spending program which has continued now for many years at an overall cost to the American taxpayer of more than $60 billion, communism has grown, it has spread, it has expanded, and it is stronger and more menacing than ever in the world. It would be complete blindness to reality as well as national folly to deny that fact.

Some say that the emphasis of the Soviet has shifted from military to economic measures in pursuing its openly announced and scrupulously practiced aim of world domination. That view is not in accord with current happenings and current events in the world. The Soviet is feverishly increasing its military strength. It is frantically implementing atomic-hydrogen techniques, guided missiles and rockets, and other modern weapons.

At the same time it is utilizing every possible available economic weapon of its limited capacity.

It is stepping up its political propaganda, its internal operations in other nations, principally the racial nations liberated by colonialism. Russia is making great headway among these oppressed peoples and in these nations.

It has acquired strong, willing allies and they are not all behind the Iron Curtain. This bill asks us to finance some of them, to help some nations and some dictators who are against us, who are doing everything they can to hurt us, who are with the Communists and the Soviets in this world struggle to preserve human liberty.

Tito is only one who is getting our substantial aid and then lining up on the Communist side. There are others, some more obvious and some devious, deceitful and slick, but definitely alined with the Soviet and its major aims and objectives. Let us not be naive about these matters.

Have we not learned by now that we cannot win the friendship of nations by giving them money? Is it not clear that many of these nations have opposed us in world councils in spite of our great aid and assistance? Are some of them not opposing us this very moment?

Have we not learned that no matter how much aid we give to a nation, it cannot and will not defend itself against communism, externally or internally, unless it has the will, the purpose, the desire and the determination to do so.

Let us have no illusions about communism, its remarkable growth, its power and its allies, willing and unwilling.

If we had spent the huge funds we have put into this program since the start to build our own strength, the defenses and the economy of this Nation, our greatest military assets, would be greatly the stronger and the more powerful for it.

I believe that this program should be completely reevaluated. I am anxious to assist those who are suffering from privation and want within the reasonable capacity of this Government. I want to strengthen the free world against communism. I want to make the free world strong. But I have no illusions about this program. It has many very dubious features. For that reason, I will reserve my right to vote for a sane, sensible, practical approach to this question which will take into account the American taxpayers and the needs of our own Nation.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I believe that we are all agreed on the fact that our foreign policy must be based on the recognition that communism is a serious threat to world freedom and peace, and therefore a threat to our own national security.

As the result of this threat and because of its ever-increasing danger, we have placed a great deal of reliance upon foreign aid. In our determination to counteract these forces we have lost sight of one very important question, that is: Will the continuation of this mutual security program buy us the best insurance against the Soviet menace? The American taxpayers are entitled to know. Can we say with honesty that we have accomplished our goal? Not if we read the daily press—not if we believe what we hear on radio and television. Something is definitely wrong with our program and only a complete review and reevaluation will reveal our mistakes.

Our foreign-aid program should be so planned as to help and encourage the right nations to meet the Soviet challenge—our economic, military, and technical assistance should be so geared as to promote the best national interests of our country and safeguard our national security. In short, we must be not only realistic and cautious but sensible as well. We cannot allow ourselves to become "giveaway happy" in a desperate and futile race with Soviet Russia, nor can we continue to make fools of ourselves by forcing some of these ungrateful nations to accept our aid and receive condemnation and criticism in return.

The United States Government has handed out over $51 billion in foreign aid since World War II, almost four-fifths of which have been outright give-aways. I ask you to stop and think for a moment and remember that these billions are the earnings of ordinary American taxpayers. Most of these taxpayers had taken consolation in the thought that the good that aid could accomplish in meeting communism has already been accomplished, and that we should have been tapering off in the past few years. But we now discover that, instead of curtailing our aid program, we are being asked to expand it.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this expanded program. It is my firm belief that our whole concept of foreign aid must at this time be subjected to a radical reexamination and reevaluation. We must make a thorough study of the entire program to determine whether it is efficiently managed and whether it squares with the realities and the requirements of our national interest.

A study of whether or not the aid program is efficiently managed means scrutiny of the administration of these large sums. It has been brought to our attention time and time again that in certain areas there has been serious disorganization, mismanagement, and poor judgment in the application of foreign aid, with the inevitable result of a terrible waste of dollars. The United States cannot afford the luxury of unstable direction in the foreign-aid program.

The entire administrative machinery through which the foreign-aid program is operating must, therefore, be reappraised. After all, the good name of the United States is at stake in every area where our aid program is operating. And now, at a time when the Soviet Union is also entering the foreign-aid field, we cannot afford to blunder with our precious dollars.

Mr. Chairman, the second point—whether the aid program squares with the realities and requirements of our national interests—is more complicated. I have not in the past and do not now oppose all foreign aid. I know that when certain of our allies were in dire need following the war our timely help saved them from collapsing economically and perhaps falling into the hands of the Communists. But now, in 1956, it

would seem sensible for the Congress in considering appropriations for foreign aid to draw a sharp line of distinction between that portion of foreign aid which we know will contribute directly to our national security and that portion which does not.

This year we are asked to put heavy accent on aid for Asia and the Middle East. The Congress must take a hard look at these proposals. I, for one, strongly object to our giving India any further aid at this time.

India claims to be a "neutralist" country, but India's particular brand of neutralism seems to get more and more antiwestern and pro-Soviet. If our aid to India was intended to weld for us a friendship, then it has clearly failed, and very badly.

Since 1950 India has received from us more than half a billion dollars, which is five times more than Russia has even talked about giving her. Our country gets scant credit in newspapers in India; yet the same newspapers praise Russia as India's friend and benefactor. There is certainly no assurance that giving aid to so-called uncommitted countries will win them to our side. As a matter of fact, past experience points in just the opposite direction. When the Russians announced recently that they will sell—not give, but sell—to India a million tons of steel, the Indian press broke out in loud appreciation. When the Soviet Union gets more support by selling than the West does by giving, it is obvious that something is wrong.

India has made no secret of her dislike for our policy in Asia; she has persistently attacked it. Nehru has expressed several times publicly and openly his opposition to the SEATO pact, which is sponsored by the United States. In fact, he opposes practically all United States defense measures designed to keep communism in check anywhere. He calls for Formosa to be turned over to Communist China. His roving Ambassador, V. K. Krishna Menon, has been trying for years to get Red China into the United Nations.

India has denounced our offer for military assistance to Pakistan; Nehru called for mass rioting to show his displeasure. He has also loudly denounced our Government's expression of concern for peaceful settlement of the Kashmir and Goa disputes. On top of that, Nehru has expressed a desire for closer relations with Communist Czechoslovakia.

Nehru tells his people that the United States is upsetting peace in Asia.

How can we trust Nehru in the light of his outspoken pro-Soviet position and praise of the great Lenin? How long are we to allow Nehru to play us for just plain suckers?

Russia has now promised to build India a steel mill. This spectacle of high Soviet officials carrying on an economic discussion in an underdeveloped country is becoming a commonplace occurrence. India has said "yes" to practically everything Moscow has suggested. As a matter of fact, when he visited Moscow last June, Nehru said that part of his "heart remains in Russia."

I say—if the Indian Government wants to oppose our policies and to accept Soviet aid we should say, "Go right ahead, gentlemen, but you will get no aid from us."

Mr. Chairman, I am also opposed to any further aid to Egypt at this time. There is serious trouble in the Middle East now and our interference can only increase the tension. Since 1951, we have shelled out some $60 million for economic aid to Egypt alone. We have built highways, railroads, waterways, drinking water systems and other health facilities. Meanwhile, Egypt, out seeking power, has disregarded us and made a deal with the Soviet puppet regime in Czechoslovakia for arms—besides expanding over-all trade with the Communist nations. It is most obvious that Egypt seems determined to make trouble with Israel and it seems to me that we should not add to the tension by continuing to give her further aid. More recently, Egypt has joined India in asking for recognition of Red China—despite our known position in this matter.

The recent report from the General Accounting Office gives us an appraisal of our aid program in Egypt for the period 1952 to 1955. This 73 page document deems this program a failure because of unrealistic planning, conflicting policy decisions, and inordinate delays by our officials who were unprepared to handle it.

Even during that period, we are informed, the Egyptians showed great reluctance in their cooperation. Mind you, this failure covers a period before Egypt's coolness toward the West; before her arms deal with Czechoslovakia; and before her recognition of Red China. Yet, in spite of this disturbing report, which clearly demands a review and reevaluation of our aid program in Egypt, we are asked to continue to pour more American dollars into a reluctant and unfriendly country. When are we going to wake up?

This plea to cut off aid to Egypt should receive the wholehearted support of the 151 members who signed the manifesto to Dulles urging arms to Israel.

I am sure they do not want to strengthen Egypt, which is a definite menace to Israel.

I also oppose giving aid to Yugoslavia. We have already strengthened the Tito regime, which is a thoroughly Communist government, by giving Yugoslavia aid. Yet Tito continues to have diplomatic relations with both Soviet Russia and Red China and continues to praise Soviet foreign policy while criticizing ours.

The press headlines of this past weekend screaming Tito's hero reception and remarks in Moscow can leave no doubt of where his heart belongs. Tito's promise to the Communists that there would never again be a split or misunderstanding between Yugoslavia and Russia, and that both countries are now inseparable, should convince the most skeptic Members of this Congress that we are taking a long walk on a short pier in our desperate efforts to keep Tito on our side.

Our attempt to gain Yugoslavia's friendship was nothing more than a calculated risk, and it seems to have failed. All of Tito's most recent actions have revealed a desire on the part of that government to cement closer ties with the Soviet Union. It is obvious to the whole world that once again Tito has moved toward the Soviet fold. Certainly it is the height of folly for our country to send technical aid and military equipment to a nation which may any day be alined against us.

How blind are we when we cannot see what goes on. Tito has repeatedly served notice on the world that he is still a Communist ruler, and you can bet your bottom dollar that when the chips are down, he will not be on our side. Only last night when told of this move to cut off aid to his country, he shrugged his shoulders, and said, "It's not important." Well, if not important to Tito, it should be less important to us.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me very strange that in order to receive massive amounts of aid from us, a country must either be neutralist, seriously threatened with communism, or else have a "schismatic" Communist government, like Yugoslavia. What is this, but an invitation for countries to take a neutralist stand or to permit Communist infiltration? Why should a country form an alliance with us if it can get American subsidies by sitting on the fence?

In view of these experiences, both Congress and the American taxpayer should take a long, hard look at these proposals which are now before us for the expansion of foreign aid. Our aid program must now be redesigned to help and encourage the right nations, ones which have shown themselves to be our friends. Why not say clearly that our help will go to those nations which, in the interest of freedom and democracy, are ready to participate in the common defense against tyranny? I am willing to spend part of the taxpayers' money on foreign aid, but the most effective way to create a solid barrier against the fast-spreading Communist encroachments is to help those who we know will stand stanchly by our policies.

Any government has a right to remain neutral in the struggle between East and West; there is, however, no logical reason why American taxpayers should be bled white for their benefit, especially when their leaders misrepresent our aims and show outright preferences for the ideals of our opponents.

Mr. Chairman, I hold that, instead of pouring so much money overseas we should keep it here at home, where we could use it to much greater benefit. The security of America and of the whole free world lies in our own strength and in the deterrent power of our Armed Forces. A reduction in the foreign aid budget will strengthen our economy and increase our opportunity to make the kind of technological progress that is fundamental to our continued strength.

Prolonged emphasis on foreign aid will unbalance our economy—it will force more and more painful economic adjustment upon us. The people in this country suffer a cruel tax burden. The total tax is now some thirty percent of income. Since the amount that can be collected from high-income groups is limited, no matter how steep the tax progression, the low and middle income

groups are forced to shoulder a heavy burden.

There are endless, crying needs in our own country for the unappreciated billions we are dispersing overseas. A progressive lessening of foreign aid may mean that besides lowering taxes, we may be able to reduce the national debt. We may be able to afford such things as greater benefits to our veterans—the men who fought for us against those very things which even now we seem to be supporting in our eagerness to give assistance to every comer.

The Congress must in all sincerity ask itself certain questions: How long can we assume the burden of supplying limitless billions for foreign aid? Should we continue to support those nations which give us no assurance that they can be counted upon to support our democratic ideals against the tyranny of communism? Exactly where does the security of this Nation lie?

Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the Members of this Congress to carefully weigh the merits of my arguments. I cannot impress upon you too strongly my deep-rooted feelings on this subject.

We must bear in mind that our aim in carrying out and in promoting this foreign aid program has been to make friends and win allies, but instead, all we have gotten out of it has been widespread neutralism which in the words of a leading Soviet authority is "nothing more than one of the elements in the preparation for war."

We owe a duty to the American taxpayers and if we are to be sincere in our responsibility to the American people, then we must have the courage to acknowledge a bad mistake and correct it before it is too late.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman, there was a time in the history of our country when the American patriots of the Original Thirteen Colonies rebelled against being taxed to maintain the military and economic power of a foreign country. The extent and amount of tax monies then being collected to serve a foreign power is a petty sum is comparison to the colossal total sum of $141 billion that American taxpayers of the United States have paid to foreign governments since the beginning of World War II, and published estimates of the total amount that American taxpayers have contributed to foreign countries since the end of the last war range all the way from $51 billion to $67 billion, and I am reliably informed that more than $3 billion of this incredibly huge foreign give-away was actually used to reduce the public debts of the receiving foreign nations when at the same time we were increasing our national debt. In other words, our Government borrowed money to pay the debts and operational expenses of foreign governments. The United States thereby increased its own national debt by $3 billion so that foreign governments could reduce their national debt by the same amount. This single $3 billion item is now costing the American taxpayers $90 million a year in interest charges. Just how much more ridiculous can we afford to be?

Why, if we accept the lowest published amount of our total postwar foreign aid—$51 billion—then on that basis the American taxpayers must in the future dig up more than $1,500,000,000 every year just for annual interest alone on the amount that foreign aid handouts have added to our Federal debt during the past 10 years. Back in the days before we quit minding our own business, $1,500,000,000 was enough to pay all the expenses for all departments of the United States Government for full 2 years.

What have we received in return for the handout of all of these foreign-aid billions? Has the handout program produced good will for the United States and strengthened the defenses of the free world against communism? Is there now any place on earth where affection and respect for the United States is greater and where the prestige of our Government is higher than it was 10 years ago? Where in the free world are those protective bastions against the spread of communism that our multibillion dollar give-aways were supposed to construct?

Right in the face of our continued worldwide generosity, the Kremlin gangsters have quadrupled the population of their slave empire and extended the Iron Curtain to include more than a third of the earth. More than a half-billion dollars worth of our foreign aid went to India. Nevertheless, that country turned the visit of the Soviet dictators, Khrushchev and Bulganin, into a triumphal tour. The most enthusiastic reception of those visiting Communist gangsters was staged in an Indian town built with American money. The weapons we gave to France for her defenses against communism are now being used by the French Government to suppress revolutions for national independence by the native Moslems in France's north African colonies. Because we paid all expenses incurred by France in her futile war to hold French Indochina, France will now ask us to provide additional billions for the suppression of the North Africans.

Meanwhile, France apologizes for the unpardonable act of a French mob that wrecked the United States consulate in Tunis last March 9. Ironically, France offers to pay for the property damages. If these violent foreign outbursts of love and affection for the United States become general throughout the world, still more foreign aid will probably be requested to enable the various governments to reimburse us for incidental destruction of American lives and property.

Just before the last general election in England, we tossed a cool two hundred million to Mr. Eden's government so that Mr. Eden could reduce British taxes and thus win the election. Naturally, there was no suggestion of American self-interest in this item of our give-away program. The English people already loved us $10½ billion worth, that being the amount of our postwar aid to Britain before Mr. Eden's tax-cut bonus. Our foreign-aid experts tell us that we must be carefully considerate of the attitudes of these foreign governments; otherwise, these governments may refuse to take our money. Mr. Harold Stassen said as much to the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee.

I want to know why the Eisenhower administration is giving our foreign-aid money to nations which are selling vital strategic war materials to Soviet Russia and to Red China. It has been revealed that, with the official but top-secret consent of the United States Government, our "allies" have been shipping 200 separate items of strategic machines and machine tools to Communist governments for the past 2 years. Of these items, the chairman of the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee listed four types of mills and machines, some of which sell for half a million dollars each. All of these are indispensably necessary to the manufacture of jet engines, guided missiles, aircraft, artillery weapons, and heavy ordnance.

By permitting the newest machine tools to be sent to the Soviet bloc, we allowed them to save from 3 to 5 years in engineering research and development. One prominent Member of Congress has said "that it would be better for the United States to permit shells, guns, or guided missiles to be disembargoed and sent direct from the United States to the Soviet Union, because these could be used against us only once. However, machine tools can and will be used to make armaments which may be used against us many times."

Mr. Stassen said that if he gave the list of these strategic materials to the United States Senate, he would be "serving the enemy" and "maligning our allies." Please remember that, in many instances, the foreign factories in which these strategic materials are now made were built with American foreign-aid money. Our own American industries are prevented by law from shipping such materials directly to Communist countries.

On the other hand, we are giving the taxpayers' money to foreigners who use that money to produce the prohibited items and then proceed to sell them to our enemies at a profit. Nevertheless, at his press conference on March 7, President Eisenhower insisted that this procedure is desirable. He said that our allies now have an excess productive capacity; that they must continue to export to the Soviet Communists, unless we are to continue to give economic assistance to Western Europe indefinitely. But with or without this Communist trade, indefinite foreign aid is precisely what the President recommended to Congress last January 16. At that time, he urged that our current foreign-aid spending be doubled for what he called a "long-term" program for building and maintaining the economic strength of the free world.

At that time, the President admitted that our foreign spending department had a backlog of seven billion unspent dollars, but this, he said, would be rapidly reduced. So it looks as if the Communists will continue to get their guided missile machines, and the bankruptcy of the United States to boot.

The bill now pending before us for a vote today proposes to give away an additional $3,563,475,000, which amounts to more than the total assessed property

valuation of the States of Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, South Dakota, and Utah combined. During the past 10 years, our foreign-aid program has cost more than the totaled assessed property valuation of the States of New York and Pennsylvania combined.

Each and every one of our 48 States and every congressional district in the States has cities and communities in need of additional educational facilities, school buildings, roads, highways, flood-control protection, hospitals, and other public improvements. And every taxpaying American citizen needs and would like to have his or her taxes reduced.

The deficit of this one foreign-aid bill would save enough money to build many school buildings, roads, highways, and hospitals which are so badly needed.

The surest and most powerful protection we can provide against communism is to keep our own national economy strong and build our own military might so powerful that none will dare to challenge us.

I have opposed this foreign-aid program in the past, and I will vote against this bill H. R. 11356, which authorizes the giveaway of an additional $3,563,475,000 to foreign countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FEIGHAN) there were—ayes 4, noes 37.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 61]

Alexander	Forand	Mollohan
Andersen, H. Carl	Frelinghuysen	Morgan
Ayres	Gamble	Moulder
Bailey	Garmatz	Mumma
Barden	George	Nelson
Barrett	Gregory	O'Hara, Minn.
Bass, Tenn.	Griffiths	Patman
Belcher	Gubser	Patterson
Bell	Gwinn	Polk
Blatnik	Hale	Powell
Bolton, Frances P.	Hand	Preston
Brooks, Tex.	Harden	Priest
Burdick	Hays, Ohio	Prouty
Bush	Healey	Ray
Canfield	Henderson	Reed, N. Y.
Cannon	Herlong	Rivers
Carnahan	Hill	Rogers, Tex.
Cederberg	Hinshaw	Scherer
Celler	Hoffman, Ill.	Scott
Chatham	Hoffman, Mich.	Selden
Chenoweth	Holifield	Shelley
Chiperfield	Holtzman	Sieminski
Christopher	James	Sikes
Chudoff	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Va.
Clark	Kean	Springer
Corbett	Kearney	Staggers
Coudert	Kelley, Pa.	Taylor
Curtis, Mo.	Kilburn	Thompson, La.
Davidson	King, Pa.	Thompson, Tex.
Dawson, Ill.	Kirwan	Thornberry
Deane	Kluczynski	Tuck
Dempsey	Knutson	Van Zandt
Dowdy	Lane	Walter
Eberharter	McConnell	Watts
Edmondson	McDowell	Wharton
Fallon	McIntire	Wickersham
Fernandez	Macdonald	Widnall
Flynt	Machrowicz	Wigglesworth
Fogarty	Madden	Wilson, Calif.
	Mason	Wilson, Ind.
	Miller, Calif.	Zelenko

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 11356, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 299 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, earlier, when fewer Members were present, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], announced that we intended to stay here this afternoon and complete the reading of this bill. If the Members will remain here and keep a quorum present and we have short debate on many of the amendments, which I think should be short, we will be able to close at a reasonable hour.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEADER: Page 8, after line 17, insert the following:

"(j) Amend section 413 (a), which relates to encouragement of free enterprise and private participation, by inserting '(1)' after '(a)' and by adding the following new paragraph:

"'(2) It is further declared to be the policy of the United States to insure that the expenditure of funds under this act will effectively contribute to the achievement of the goals of United States foreign policy, and for that purpose to eliminate or minimize international barriers to investment and trade, to facilitate the creation in foreign countries of a climate favorable to the investment of private capital, to discourage the extension of socialism and nationalized industries by declining to commit United States funds to the support of Government-owned and Government-operated industrial and commercial facilities, and in general to avoid the expenditure of funds in support of erroneous policies and practices of foreign governments which, without our financial support, would eventually have to be corrected or eliminated by the force of circumstances'."

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple; and as the Speaker has said, I do not think it should require extensive debate. I hope it will receive the approval of the leadership of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I discussed this amendment during general debate at some length and together with an amendment which will follow it appears on page 9709 of Wednesday's RECORD.

This amendment simply means that we tell those administering these programs abroad that they should not promote socialism.

It is just that simple.

It is a declaration of policy.

In my statement on Wednesday I quoted two of the top officials in the State Department, the Deputy Under Secretary of State, Mr. Murphy, and the Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, saying that our United States policy is to promote the private enterprise system in those countries we are seeking to help in their economic development to resist more effectively Communist aggression and subversion.

Does it make sense to see dollars taken from the American people to promote socialism in foreign countries when the purpose for which this aid program was conceived was to fight exactly that thing?

I want to read from a letter written by an American who is in India to show just why this amendment is necessary. I read earlier in the debate from the memorandum prepared by the ICA showing that the Indian Government is engaging in industrial and commercial activities and that it is their policy to nationalize industry and that they are discouraging private enterprise. I think it will be of interest to hear this letter, which was written within the last 3 weeks, evidencing that same thing. I will withhold the writer's name lest there be some tendency to take retributive action against him:

As I may have told you the Indian Government has recently been asking questions as to why American concerns do not invest in India. Of course that is a foolish question and the answers are self-evident. However the reaction in the Embassy here has been to request 2 additional assistant commercial attachés plus additional personnel in their economic and commercial sections. At the same time when large American corporations interested in India drop their negotiations in disgust TCM steps into the breach and provides the Indian Government with engineers and technicians so the Indian Government can build a government plant to provide the identical service or commodity. Union Carbon and Carbide have been negotiating for months but now TCM is providing a carbon black specialist to the Indian Government so they can build their own plant. I mentioned synthetic rubber in my last letter. The same for many other companies. Our friend Spang of Gillette blades had a nice business here but TCM brought in a razor blade specialist and now with increased tariff help from the GOI imported blades are being squeezed out. The joke is that you still can't shave with Indian blades.

Two facts may be accepted without question: One, India is determined to socialize or nationalize all industry as soon as possible, and two, there exist more offers of aid from sources other than the United States than India can possibly assimilate or accept. Now why do we use the American taxpayers money to accelerate nationalization of industry in India? The time has passed when they can be converted to private enterprise and all we are buying is a minority interest or liability in a national policy that is ultimately headed for either economic chaos or communism.

I ask my colleagues, Are you going to vote against this amendment and thereby say that you favor using United States taxpayers' funds to promote socialistic systems and nationalized industry? I do not believe you are.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, except for a rehash of parts of section 413, which is the sec-

tion on the encouragement of free enterprise and private participation, which you will find on page 66 of the report, except for a rehash of what is already in the bill and in the law, the amendment will do this—it says:

Decline to commit United States funds to the support of government-owned and government-operated industrial and commercial facilities.

That would cut out India, Spain, Korea, most of Latin America; as a matter of fact, it would cut out most of the countries in this bill, many of which are located in spots where for strategic reasons we want to have military or economic aid flow.

It is that simple. It adds nothing to the bill except one provision that with one stroke would cut out most of the aid to a lot of these underdeveloped countries. Of course, there are a number of these underdeveloped countries that have government-owned and government-operated industries and facilities; for instance, ports, railroads, and things like that. There is not yet available the capital formation for private development of such facilities.

In section 413 of the Mutual Security Act we provide for encouragement of private enterprise, and we provide $400 million that can be used in guaranteeing private enterprise. In the development section I mentioned earlier we say that a country cannot get development assistance any more unless and until it makes a written agreement consistent with the provisions of section 413. This bill, to a larger extent than ever before, stimulates private industry. To come in and pop right into the middle of the bill a provision that is going to knock out aid to most of the governments is an action that I hope the Committee will not take.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. Is it not a fact that this amendment would make the extension of economic systems in foreign countries entirely patterned after the United States?

Mr. VORYS. That is right. The gentleman from Wisconsin read a quotation here a few minutes ago from an Indian girl in which she said, "The trouble is you are trying to make over the whole world; you ought to understand some of the other countries." This amendment would not make over the world in our pattern. This would pull our aid out all over the world and allow the Communists to make over the world in their pattern, because they would have it all to themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 8, strike out line 25, and on page 9 strike out lines 1 and 2.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I understand the House has previously passed this language in one fashion or another, but it has failed of approval in the other body. This time I think the provision ought to be stricken in the House.

My amendment strikes out the provision in the bill which would indemnify American investors in foreign countries against losses by reason of war, revolution, and insurrection—not only war and revolution but in event of insurrection, which has a very broad meaning. I do not understand, and I would like someone on the committee, preferably on this side of the aisle, since I have addressed most of my previous questions to the other side of the aisle, to tell me why you want to extend protection of American investments to include war, revolution, and insurrection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The basic reason is that these less-developed countries, if they are going to be able to stand, have to get capital and machinery and equipment from somewhere. Now, they either have to get it from private sources or they have to get it out of the pockets of the American taxpayers through these grants or loans. If we can make it attractive and reasonably safe for American investors to put their own money in there, then my taxpayers and yours out in the Midwest do not have to put up their money. And, individuals will not invest their private funds, unless there are certain minimum guaranties. There is already the guaranty that, if they make any profit, it can be converted into American dollars. If there is expropriation of their property, if the government of a country adopts a policy of expropriating private property, the United States will reimburse them for their losses.

Mr. GROSS. All right. I think I have a pretty good idea of the gentleman's views. Under what law do we indemnify anyone in this country for loss of property through war, insurrection, or revolution?

Mr. JUDD. I do not know that there is any such law.

Mr. GROSS. And you cannot buy insurance in this country to protect property or investment against destruction by reason of any of those actions, can you?

Mr. JUDD. The reason is because there is no need for such insurance here. We have had security and stability here and private capital has been willing to invest. But, it is hard to get private capital to invest in somewhat shaky countries if there is not some assurance that if worst comes to worst they will be helped by the United States Government. It is not a question between no expenditures of public funds in those countries and what we might have to put up if there should be war, revolution, or insurrection; we are putting all the money in now from taxpayers funds and we are taking a chance——

Mr. GROSS. Just do not take quite all of my time.

Mr. JUDD. All right.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has stated, and it is to be found in the hearings, that these are fuzzy loans and guaranties. Does he mean that we are indemnifying those who may lose on fuzzy loans and guaranties?

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman is talking about investment guaranties?

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly what you are proposing here.

Mr. JUDD. If a country's condition is good and sound and stable, it can go to a commercial bank and get a loan. If these countries could get such loans, there would not be any reason for the economic provisions of this bill at all.

Mr. GROSS. Now do you say that American investors are going into countries with unstable governments, I assume those are the fuzzy loans and guaranties you talked about in the hearings, and you are going to indemnify them with United States taxpayers' money against war, revolution, insurrection and expropriation in those countries?

Mr. JUDD. If their economies were sufficiently sound that they could get a loan, then there would be no Mutual Security Act. It is only to assist countries whose survival is considered important to our security and which cannot get necessary aid elsewhere.

Mr. GROSS. Just a moment now. So, you are going into the worst possible places and not only guaranteeing these investors against expropriation but against war, revolution, and insurrection.

Mr. JUDD. Yes, because we want to save American money.

Mr. GROSS. You want to what?

Mr. JUDD. Save American money. Investment guaranties are to reduce our expenditures of taxpayers' money in countries on which we are now gambling billions of dollars.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot think of a more socialistic, more ridiculous argument for saving American tax dollars. I think you have gone much too far by guaranteeing against war, revolution and insurrection.

Not so long ago, the president of the New York Stock Exchange, Keith Funston, warned that a proposal being considered by the United Nations, for inclusion in the International Covenant on Human Rights, may endanger billions of dollars of American investments abroad.

The U. N. proposal reads as follows:

The right of peoples to self determination shall include permanent sovereignty over their natural wealth and resources. In no case may a people be deprived of its own means of subsistence on the ground of the rights that may be claimed by other States.

And Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, an alternate delegate to the United Nations, who gallivants over this country and the world spreading the glories of the U. N. and all its works, is said to be disturbed. She is quoted as saying this implies "endorsement by the" U. N. "General Assembly of the right of expropriation of foreign capital investment without compensation."

How some people can get excited when their finances and those of their friends may become involved. I am opposed to foreign governments grabbing the property of Americans without just compensation, anywhere at any time. But the warnings of Brother Funston and Sister Lord would come with far more

force if they were equally concerned with the loss of sovereign rights of American citizens through the United Nations, the Covenant on Human Rights, and the treaties and secret agreements by which American soldiers and their dependents, stationed in foreign countries, can be tried in foreign courts, by foreign judges, and slapped into foreign jails and prisons.

I just want to repeat that I am absolutely opposed to this business of guaranteeing American investors in the most unstable foreign countries, with the most unstable foreign governments, against war, revolution and insurrection. It is enough to guarantee them against expropriation. I cannot think of a more socialistic program than this.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This is the fourth time that this provision has been in the bill. It has passed the House each time. A guaranty cannot be issued in a country until the country makes an agreement to protect private enterprise. Thirty countries already have made such agreements.

As my friend from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has said, we have bet about $55 billion in these foreign-aid programs that we are not going to have a big war, and when we simply fractionalize that betting and have an American investor pay a fee for underwriting his end of the gamble, we are encouraging private investment. And, as has been said, by doing that, we are bringing aid to countries in their development which otherwise might have to come under Government loans or which in the past has come through grants. So that this is a provision, which, in my judgment, does not increase the total risk of the United States at all and I certainly hope that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not also true that we have had these investment guaranties for a good many years now and have never had to pay out a single cent?

Mr. VORYS. That is right.

Mr. JUDD. The investor pays a fee of 1 percent of his investment. No claims have yet had to be paid. This is the one provision in the mutual-security program that has made us money.

Mr. GROSS. Then why the guaranty?

Mr. JUDD. Because without the guaranty, the investments would not have been made. We have not had to pay out anything, because there have not been any expropriations. We are giving aid only to countries which need capital but which are not able to get it on their own. Their economies are not strong enough. We would rather have private capital go than public funds. But private capital is willing to go only if it has some guaranty against certain unusual risks which might occur in less stable parts of the world.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Is it a fact that the other body has on previous occasions struck out this provision?

Mr. VORYS. Yes.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. And has the conference agreed to that?

Mr. VORYS. Yes.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Then what the gentleman is saying is that it has been out of the bill and it has not apparently done us any damage before.

Mr. VORYS. May I say that the President of the United States has come out for this provision, as has the National Council of Foreign Trade and the International Chamber of Commerce. We hope in the other body they may learn something some day and we will have more success this year.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RICHARDS. It is a fact that the other body at one time was against guaranties against expropriation. After a long delay they agreed to that.

Mr. VORYS. It took about 3 years to educate them on that.

Mr. RICHARDS. If you are going to help private enterprise against the risks of expropriation you are not taking a much greater risk to offer insurance against war, revolution and insurrection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 28, noes 78.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEADER: Page 11, after line 5, insert the following:

"(1) Amend section 413 by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c) The Department of Commerce shall, in full cooperation with private business groups and governmental agencies (including the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development), conduct a thorough study of the legal and other impediments, foreign and local, to private investment abroad, and the methods and means whereby those impediments can be removed or decreased, and shall make recommendations thereon to the Director of the International Cooperation Administration.'"

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I was disturbed to hear the gentleman from Ohio on the other amendment which I offered indicate to the House that the aid program would have been wrecked if my amendment had been adopted. If Members listened carefully to the reading of the amendment, it meant only that United States tax funds should not be committed to the nationalization of industry. It does not tell India, if they want to have a socialistic system, that they cannot have one and get our aid, but it means they are not going to use our money for nationalizing their industry. If they do not have money of their own to build a synthetic rubber plant, which they want to do, they cannot expect the United States taxpayers to put up money for a socialistic enterprise. That is all it is.

If it is true, as the gentleman from Ohio stated, that in Korea and everywhere around the world we are financing the socialistic enterprises of other governments, then I think it is well that the American taxpayer should know that fact. I do not think it is anywhere near as extensive as the gentleman from Ohio indicated.

The amendment I have offered here is completely different. It orders the Commerce Department to conduct a survey of the impediments to private investment overseas. It is almost exactly the same phraseology that was adopted by this House in the Mutual Security Act of 1951 and resulted in a study on which the first part, entitled "Factors Limiting United States Investment Abroad," was reported by the Commerce Department in 1953.

The second part, published in 1954, consisted of the results of interviews with 366 American business firms doing business abroad to find out, first, what their difficulties were, and second, what their suggestions were for an improved climate for their operations. I think those reports have been of tremendous benefit to the increased flow of capital which has occurred since that time. I think we should have more of it.

I think after a period of 5 years it is time to take another good look and to assemble in one place information which will be of use to our officials in case they do want to promote private enterprise system overseas, that is, our embassy officials and our aid officials as well as our information people operating abroad. It will also be of great benefit to American business, so that they will have assembled in one place a brief summary of the conditions which are unfavorable or which are favorable for the investment of their money in overseas operations. It would help American business firms to do this job of economic development, which in my judgment is where this task rightfully belongs.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I am asking for information. In what respect does the gentleman's amendment differ from the one that was introduced by our former colleague, Mr. Javits, and adopted in 1951?

Mr. MEADER. I do not think it differs in any material respect.

Mr. JUDD. It just does over again what was done then?

Mr. MEADER. It is another survey similar to the one ordered 5 or 6 years ago. I think it needs to be done again.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to disagree with the gentleman about this because I know of his deep interest in it. But I am not disposed to put any more study projects in this bill, as far as I am concerned.

As the gentleman said, in 1951 this kind of study was authorized. The Department of Commerce prepared findings on that study. Since then the whole subject has been reviewed intensively within and without the Government. Nothing has occurred since that period to alter the conclusions arrived at. This matter is under continuous study now, and I just do not believe that, with all due respect to the gentleman, the adoption of this amendment will serve any useful purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. The Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, is further amended by inserting immediately after the first section thereof and before title I the following new section:

"SEC. 2. Statement of policy: The Congress of the United States, recognizing that the peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered as long as international communism and the nations it controls continue by threat of military action, use of economic pressure, internal subversion, or other means to attempt to bring under their domination peoples now free and independent and continue to deny the rights of freedom and self-government to peoples and nations once free but now subject to such domination, declares it to be the policy of the United States to continue as long as such danger to the peace of the world and to the security of the United States persists to make available to free nations and peoples upon request assistance of such nature and in such amounts as the United States is able to provide compatible with its own stability, strength, and other obligations, and as may be needed and effectively used by such free nations and peoples to help them maintain their freedom."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOW: On page 12, immediately after line 17, insert the following:

"It is further the sense of the Congress that the rights of our own citizens guaranteed by our Constitution should not be sacrificed while the rights of freedom and self-government are secured to the peoples of other nations and that in order to insure justice, maintain the constitutional rights and privileges for our citizens who are serving with our Armed Forces in other countries and promote the general welfare that the President should forthwith, as provided for by article XVII of the Status of Forces Agreement, signed at London June 19, 1951, address to the North Atlantic Council a request for revision of article VII of such agreement for the purpose of eliminating or modifying article VII so that the United States may exercise exclusive criminal jurisdiction over American military personnel stationed within the boundaries of parties to the treaty; (2) that the President should take similar action with regard to all other treaties or international agreements to which the United States is a party and which give criminal jurisdiction over our Armed Forces to foreign governments which are parties thereto; (3) that failure of such negotiations to obtain exclusive jurisdiction for the United States should be grounds for the denunciation of or withdrawal from such treaties and international agreements as provided for by article XIX of the Status of Forces Agreement and similar provisions in other agreements."

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment is subject to a point of order and I reserve a point of order against it. I think this is an issue that has got to be met and it might just as well be threshed out here as any place, so I will reserve the point of order rather than make it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina reserves the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee. I believe the amendment is in order. I have spent 2 very long days waiting for the opportunity to address the House and as I saw Members taking 5, 10, and 15 minutes additional I wondered if I would not find myself in the position I am now where Members want to leave and perhaps our time will be limited.

The 2 days we have spent here listening to this debate is a comparatively short time, especially when compared with that of men serving in foreign jails where they have been serving without the protection of the Constitution of the United States.

The amendment which I offer today does not limit in any manner the use of the funds for mutual security. The amendment which I offer has no mandatory provision in it so far as it affects this bill. The amendment which I offer here is completely within the terms of the Status of Forces Treaty in the NATO agreement. It simply says that the President shall do those things which the treaty says he may do. But it is not mandatory. It simply says that it is the sense of the Congress that these things should be done.

The amendment has been sent to the Members and I trust they understand it. I am not going to take my time in discussing the amendment; I would like to discuss some other matters.

The distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, when this subject was before us last year said that if I did not offer the amendment at that time his committee would conduct hearings on House Joint Resolution 309. He kept his word; they conducted hearings, they conducted extensive hearings, but they have done nothing further about it.

In their report on this bill they say we should meet it directly. If they had reported out House Joint Resolution 309 we could have met it directly, but they did not do it. Now they say they have a committee set up to study it further, a very distinguished committee, I may say; the names are printed; but that committee has met once, just a few days before we started this bill so they could at least say they had met before we got to this bill.

In the report on the mutual security bill the committee has referred to the Status of Forces Agreement. That is where they say we should meet it directly, but they debate it in their report. I want to read one paragraph in that report, found on page 11:

In nearly all of the countries where our troops are stationed a speaker receives hearty applause if he speaks against subservience to the United States and urges his government to follow an independent course. It would be difficult for even our most friendly and sympathetic allies to get legislative approval of a new agreement, giving the United States greater jurisdiction over its forces than the present treaty provides.

Imagine. They get great praise when they say they want to try American men under their foreign laws and deprive them of their constitutional protections.

Now, if we are going to make this a question of applause-meter legislation, I ask my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, to go back to their districts and have meetings in their districts and tell them they are going to support legislation which will bring back constitutional rights to American men, particularly that you are going to support legislation which will follow the decisions of Chief Justice Marshall of the Supreme Court of the United States which says we have that jurisdiction. You make a speech of that kind to your constituents and then get out the applause meter and see whether applause for the protection of American soldiers under the Constitution of the United States does not ring clearer in your ears than the applause in foreign nations where they say they will not give up that jurisdiction.

What do the people of this country think about it? I would just like to refer you to that opinion. I will take the breadth of the Nation and give you some idea of what the American people are thinking about the applause-meter approach to this legislation.

I am very pleased to read an editorial from the great State of Indiana. It appeared in one of the newspapers there. I shall not read it at all. It is taken from the Palladium Item of Richmond, Ind. This is what they say:

As citizens of the United States they are entitled to the protection our Constitution gives them as free men. This includes a speedy and public trial by jury, with witnesses to confront them.

Article 8 of the Constitution says: "Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted."

Mr. Chairman, this editorial from an Indiana paper goes on to say:

It is our country that pulled some of these foreign peoples from enslaving disaster in two world wars. Today we stand guard over their homes and their families in addition to supporting their bankrupt governments with billions of dollars poured out in a steady stream since 1948.

Then again it is stated in this editorial:

Respect for the rights of our citizens has reached low ebb when we barter American liberty for temporary use of plots of foreign soil.

That is what they think in the Midwest, in Indiana and in Ohio.

I would like to quote now from the Columbus Dispatch of Columbus, Ohio, in which it is stated:

Another news story is that Representative Bow intends to push hard for enactment of an amendment to the foreign-aid bill now before Congress that will repeal the much-criticized Status of Forces Treaty by which American military personnel stationed overseas are answerable to foreign courts and

subjected to judicial procedures which may vary greatly from those in the United States.

Every reliable indication is to the effect that the Status of Forces Treaty is disapproved by a substantial majority of American public opinion.

Then it goes on further to say:

The Eisenhower administration and the immensely popular personality who heads it both deservedly command wide respect and support. But even so when they are in conflict with basic issues, it is significant that the issues will not down. Nor are they likely to be permanently suppressed.

I will take you now to the east coast to see what the people on the east coast have to say. May I say to the distinguished leaders in this House that I have before me a resolution from the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on March 29, 1956, and adopted in concurrence by the House of Representatives on April 11, 1956, in which it is stated:

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary and pertaining to the repeal of a treaty relative to the prosecution of members of the Armed Forces of the United States serving in foreign countries for alleged violations of the law of such countries.

Their legislature has petitioned us to repeal these statutes. Now we can do it by the sense of the House and it should be done.

A similar resolution was passed by the State legislature of the State of California calling upon the Congress of the United States to do likewise.

In conclusion, I want to bring you up to date on one case that I think is quite important. Recently an American captain in Japan fired four Communists working in an officers' club. These Communists went into the civil courts of Japan and brought an action to have their jobs restored to them. The court said they should have their jobs restored. But the captain refused to restore these jobs to them. They then went into court and got a judgment for their back pay and this American captain is now in the position where they are going to levy against his pay because he would not put them back to work.

In the agreements entered into with Japan, there is a provision that if the captain has property on the base in Japan it is the duty of the United States Government to turn it over to Japan to satisfy that judgment.

Mr. Chairman, here is an opportunity where this body can exercise the sense of the people of the United States and say it is the sense of this Congress that some attempt should be made to renegotiate these treaties. Let us say that we may have the right of waiver. Let us get it down to the American boys serving in the uniform of the United States for the protection of the Constitution of the United States, wherever they go, wherever they are sent to defend the free world, to defend this country and the nations of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina withdraw his reservation of a point of order?

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out in regard to this issue a vital point that I do not think has been adequately explained to the American people. I think in any case where there has been an explanation the American people not only strongly support the idea involved in the Status of Forces Agreement, but they would be violently unhappy if we did not have such an agreement in effect.

In my district, as in many districts throughout the Nation, there is an Air Force base that has upon occasion trained a number of foreign pilots. There is a sprinkling of pilots from our various allies. That is true in other military bases throughout the country, not only through NATO but a program that we have had from time immemorial. Back preceding even World War II we have trained foreign soldiers in some degree. What if any one of those foreign soldiers in my district went on a rampage and committed some crime? Suppose it was a case of rape, murder, arson, or some of the other crimes that we hear about. Would I deny to the people where this crime was committed the right to try that man for that offense, or would I say, "Let us send him back to France, England, Germany, or wherever he comes from. We do not want to touch him."

Let us think about these American soldiers that my distinguished friend was talking about. Certainly they are American soldiers, but we have to accept the fact that just because he is an American soldier does not mean that a man is 100 percent perfect.

TYPICAL CASE INVOLVED

I read the other day of a case where some American soldiers were going to be tried in England. They were going to be tried in the English courts. But, what had they done? They had been in the process of assaulting an English woman. An English civilian had attempted to rescue this woman, and these soldiers had killed this man and brutally assaulted two of his companions. Do you want to save those men?

They should be tried, and, if found guilty, punished by the people in their own community.

And, I say to you that we cannot afford to deny to the American citizens, where we have foreign troops, the right to try those troops who commit offenses against the people of America.

Now, as to this matter of justice being involved, I served a long number of years in the United States Army. In three of those years I was a defense counsel at courts-martial, and I must admit that my ability as a defense attorney was not great or else the system of justice was biased, because of the dozens of men that I represented none of them were ever acquitted. And, as far as the soldier being given a military trial is concerned, he gets off far lighter by going to the civilian courts. Of course the military officials should make sure that legal observers are appointed and make sure that he gets a proper trial. Our Embassies should cooperate with the military along that line to make sure he gets a proper trial.

Mr. Chairman, I think that as the result of the questions that have been raised by the gentleman from Ohio and other Members of the House, who have acted in good faith about this matter, certainly our State Department and our Armed Forces people are more alert to any possible violation of the rights of a soldier. But, certainly, if a soldier drives a car in one of those countries and runs through a traffic light, he should be subject to the same type of police court that we expect here when he commits a traffic violation or any other type of crime up the ladder.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississipi has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH]?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, does the gentleman propose to yield some of that additional time?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I shall be glad to yield some of that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman that he be allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman compare the system of jurisprudence in foreign countries with that of the United States? Does the gentleman know that in foreign courts the accused is presumed to be guilty and not innocent?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I know that in some foreign countries their system is not as good as ours in their courts, but I think we have some courts in this country that are pretty bad themselves sometimes. But, to go back to this situation and the issue involved here. I think there is no question but that some of the American people do not understand that this particular treaty provides certain things. It may have some imperfections, but basically it provides that we shall have the right to try foreign soldiers just as they are given the right in their country to try American soldiers.

We have a right to try foreign soldiers under this treaty and our people want that right. I do not think under any circumstances we should take any step that would deny our people the right to try foreign soldiers who commit these offenses; and they could be very heinous offenses. And to see how heinous they could be, one has only to look down the list of some of the crimes that American soldiers have committed in foreign countries. Some of them are dastardly. I think criminals should be punished.

I am getting tired of people saying that because a man is wearing an American uniform that he is perfect, that he could not commit murder or rape or arson and that if he did, we should forgive him. I think that we should demand that American soldiers who do not live up to

the laws of foreign countries should be subject to punishment.

I, for one, as a Member of Congress do not intend to take part in any effort to defend murderers and worse by this type of indirect action.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think one of the most disgraceful situations and one that we surely must not tolerate involves the innocent child born abroad either in or out of wedlock whose father, a man who wears the uniform of the United States, deserts that child and comes back to the United States and refuses to support him. That, I think, is disgraceful.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I agree with the gentleman about that situation, which has occurred in some of the countries where American troops have been stationed, is a great disgrace and a blot upon American history.

Mr. McCORMACK. And that is done sometimes with the permission, and sometimes the approval, of our Army and Air Force officers.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I think it should be possible for the mothers of these children and the children to have recourse to the law.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. Of course, I do not believe any of us would argue with the gentleman that our servicemen should be protected when they commit these crimes. I would certainly agree with the gentleman, and I am certain that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], the author of the amendment would agree that they should be punished. But in view of the gentleman's statement of his defense record before Army courts-martial it would appear that they are being punished under our system of government; is that not correct?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I think that quite often they have been punished too severely under Army courts-martial. At least, that was my opinion when I was the defense counsel. There is no question here in the minds of all of us that these people should be punished. But by taking this sort of step we are putting ourselves in the position of saying that if a man is a soldier we forgive his crime. We accept the fact that a civilian shall be tried in a civilian court. If an American soldier commits a crime in the United States, that is covered by a statute applicable to civilians, we accept the fact that under normal circumstances he is tried in a civilian court. Certainly we should have that same power to try foreign soldiers. There are situations where under the Army or the Air Force or the Navy system a man might be in a position to get by with a crime, a civilian offense committed abroad, if he knew it would not be properly reported to the military officials.

In the interest of justice, this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio knows of my high regard for him. I know of his long-standing interest in this matter. I am completely convinced of his sincerity in respect to the position he takes.

Since this matter came up in this body some time ago I have taken it upon myself to become informed about it, to see whether the Status of Forces Treaty is as bad as some people say it is; and more important than that, to try to find out just how it has operated. Have our boys been abused? Have they been subjected to cruel and inhuman treatment? Have they been deprived of fair trials under the operation of these agreements?

I must say that after that very careful investigation, while I understand the position of the gentleman from Ohio, unfortunately he is just as wrong about it as he could be.

In the beginning, this is a rather peculiar circumstance. Here is a treaty the negotiation for which began with our present President when he was in Europe starting in this operation. The treaty that was negotiated subsequently was ratified by an overwhelming vote in the other body. That is the way these treaties are made in the first place. It is highly unusual that we begin here in the House of Representatives to undertake to review that matter or to invade a field that actually is not one within our proper jurisdiction.

I know that the people in the other body through their Armed Services Committee are running a continuing surveillance of the operation of these agreements, and I understand their committee over there is going to take up some hearings likewise to make further determinations.

There is something else that bothers me about this. If you do not believe in this program, that will be voted overwhelmingly through the House of Representatives the first of the week, then you could well support this amendment, because, I must again disagree with my friend from Ohio, if this amendment is adopted the ultimate result will be to wreck this whole program, for I am convinced that these foreign countries, these friendly nations, who have rights they believe in themselves, are not going to cede to us and grant to us complete original criminal jurisdiction over our forces abroad.

While it is only the sense of Congress, knowing the President as I do, if this were to become law he would feel himself compelled to take the steps here advocated.

Beyond all of that, the thing that disturbs me more than anything else is that I am afraid there is implicit in the approach of this amendment and in the language of the amendment some sort of an insinuation, at least, if not charged direct or indirect, that the President himself has some lack of solicitude for the welfare of our men overseas in the service and for the protection of their rights.

For my part, I am absolutely convinced that if the operation of any of these agreements should be demonstrated to be harmful to our men in the service and abuses were becoming prevalent, the first man to move as the Chief Executive, the Commander in Chief, would be Dwight D. Eisenhower. I am not going to put myself in a position of saying to him that he ought to do it, whether or no.

Now, you talk about constitutional rights. When a man goes into the Army he quickly loses some constitutional rights that he normally has as a civilian. Certainly when he goes overseas and is stationed in a friendly foreign country, without regard to any argument that may be made about constitutionality, he becomes subject to the criminal laws of that land, and for violations there he is subject to punishment. I think with respect to the Status of Forces Treaty it should be kept in mind that jurisdiction is not left to remain with the host country in those cases where a man is on duty, where the offense is against one of our own people or against the property of the United States. It is only when he is on leave. He may be stationed in Germany. He goes to France and he commits a crime and the French authorities arrest him. The Constitution of the United States does not follow that man over there in those circumstances. I do not have time to read the authorities, but the authorities are all in that direction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HALLECK was granted 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. HALLECK. Now, there is another thing that disturbs me about this. I am afraid that it proceeds originally from the assumption that these troops of ours stationed in France or in Germany or England or Belgium, or any of those other countries, wherever they may be, are over there only to protect the people of those countries, only to keep France or England from being overcome. If anyone believes that sort of thing, he ought not to be for this bill at all; but if, on the other hand, this is truly a mutual security bill—and I say that is what it is—then those men are over there as a measure of protection for the countries involved incidentally, but primarily, as far as we are concerned, they are there for the outpost protection and defense of the United States of America.

I can recall as a youngster we talked about defending America and we said a million farmers would meet an enemy with shotguns and pitchforks. Then we went on to the time when the Navy, controlling the surface of the seas, was our prime protector. But we have passed from those days—while I am still for a good Navy—to the days of fast, high-flying airplanes, carrying atomic and nuclear bombs, taking off from Russia, able to strike the cities of this country, so they say.

How do you defend against them? You do not start at the Atlantic coast or the Pacific coast to defend against that kind of attack. You could not possibly do it that way. I do not think anyone in his right mind would feel that we can. So what do we do? In this atomic and nuclear age, the nation that is isolated is at a great disadvantage. So what have

we done by stationing these forces abroad? We have prevented Russia from isolating us.

Now, when you get ready to establish these bases, with our planes and our bombs and our weapons, how do you do that? You negotiate with friendly nations, many of whom are just as proud of their institutions and their justice as we are proud of ours. So you enter into this agreement. You do not yield anything. Acutally, if we renounced the Status of Forces Treaty, our men would be subject to criminal prosecutions. Supposing a serviceman over there commits a crime and is arrested while he is on leave and the authorities get him. We do not have this treaty. What are you going to do about that? They say they are going to try him. There is nothing we can do about it, unless you pull the troops out. If you want to pull the troops out, that is one thing, but I do not believe we have got to the point where we can do that.

Actually as to how these treaties have worked I had the United States Army in Europe headquarters give me a breakdown on the penalties inflicted on Americans committed as compared with our military courts-martial and courts over there.

Here is an analysis of sentences imposed on United States personnel by criminal courts in France and the United Kingdom, compared with those imposed by general courts-martial:

Offense	GCM	France	UK
Rape	7 years, total forfeiture		21 months.
Adultery	1 year, total forfeiture	$28.57	
Indecent liberties with child under 16.	4 years, total forfeiture	$142.85, 7 months (suspended)	
Robbery	7 years, total forfeiture	3 years (including Keefe and Scaletti; 4½ years each).	$25.20, 11 months (partly suspended).
Larceny	1.5 years, total forfeiture	$19.43, 2 months (partly suspended).	
Forgery	2.75 years, total forfeiture		$4.66.
Aggravated assault	2.6 years, total forfeiture	$57.14, 5 months	1.33 years.
Burglary	3 years, total forfeiture	1 year	
Involuntary manslaughter.	2 years, total forfeiture	$171.42, 3 months (suspended)	2 years.
Possession of narcotics	$200 or 2 years, total forfeiture.	$17.14	
Assault and battery	$150, 3 months	$57.14	
Simple assault	$240, 4–5 months	$17.70	$17.09.
Negligent homicide	$300, 6 months	$114.28, 2 months (suspended)	
Reckless driving (leaving scene).	$480	$28.57	$20.02 for 350 cases; $44.33 for 3 cases; 5 months for 2 cases.
Drunk driving	$150, 8 months	$4.28	
Indecent exposure	$150	$42.85	
Drunkenness	$50, CHL 1 month	$16	

Now, here is a summary giving a comparison of the average sentences to confinement imposed by foreign civil courts and United States military courts for similar offenses, as compiled by the European Command:

Type of offense	Average sentence imposed	
	Civil courts	Military courts
Rape	29.2 months (4 cases)	11 years (8 cases).
Manslaughter (including negligent homicide)	9.6 months (5 cases)	4.5 months (4 cases).
Robbery, larceny, and related offenses	5.5 months (6 cases)	10.2 months (277 cases)
Aggravated assault	9.9 months (13 cases)	13.3 months (77 cases).
Traffic offenses including drunken and reckless driving and fleeing scene of accident.	1.9 months (11 cases)	4.2 months (58 cases).
Offenses against economic laws	4 months (1 case)	11.6 months (14 cases).
Carnal knowledge	6 months (1 case)	5 years (1 case).
Indecent exposure	1 month (1 case)	33.3 months (18 cases).
Resisting arrest	10 days (1 case)	2.2 months (2 cases).
Indecent assault	15 months (1 case)	6 months (1 case).
Use and possession of narcotics	3 months (1 case)	1 year (7 cases).

Here is a comparison, by the same command, of the number of sentences to confinement resulting from trials in foreign civil courts for the 11-month period from July 1, 1954, to May 31, 1955, and the number of sentences to confinement resulting from trials of similar offenses in United States military courts for the 6-month period from December 1, 1954, to May 31, 1955:

	Cases tried		Sentences to confinement		Confinements suspended		Actual confinements	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Civil courts (11 months)	1,098	100	106	9.6	61	5.5	45	4.1
Military courts (6 months)	1,833	100	645	35.5	178	9.7	467	25.4

I know this thing is highly emotional and surcharged. You talk about the serviceman's rights under the Constitution. When I was over there I found out about one case that might shock you. A high Government official got word that a certain sergeant was held in jail and needed $100 to get out. The boy had written to his mother to send him $100 to get him out of jail. So the official got busy and sent for the sergeant. He walked in rather sheepishly and said: "I know what you want me for. I have been playing a little poker and when the game broke up I owed the boys $100. I did not want to tell my mother I had been playing poker, and I thought the easiest way was to write her that I was in jail and needed $100 to get me out." There was terrific excitement in the serviceman's hometown over the false story that the sergeant was in a foreign jail.

I have talked to the men who are trial observers, men who are required to be there to see that our people get a fair trial, and they tell me our servicemen are not being abused. I think the figures disclose from every available source from which you can get dependable information that instead of being abused our men have had fair trials; punishment has not been out of line; and, as a matter of fact, has been a lesser punishment than would have been inflicted by our own courts-martial.

So I say that the amendment should be voted down.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I think it was unfortunate that the United States entered into the Status of Forces Treaty; on the other hand, we did enter into it; it was negotiated with all the formality of a treaty and in accordance with the Constitution it was submitted to the Senate where to be adopted required a two-thirds vote, and it was adopted by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present at the time.

At that time Senator BRICKER, of Ohio, offered a reservation to the treaty which contained one portion of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] that the United States retain exclusive jurisdiction over its troops sent into foreign countries; but it contained the other provision which must necessarily go with the provision the gentleman has included in his amendment. That is, if foreign nations sent troops to the United States they would likewise maintain exclusive jurisdiction over their men while they were in the United States. That was not adopted by the Senate, although it was offered there at the time and the question was thoroughly debated.

I said it is unfortunate that we entered into the treaty. But this provision which the gentleman from Ohio complains of is not the vice in this treaty. It is presented here as if foreign nations acquire a jurisdiction over our troops in their countries because of the Status of Forces Treaty, and because I feel the treaty should not have been entered into I think it is time to examine into the situation.

There may be some doubt as to the exact provision of international law as it is understood everywhere, but I do believe that the better opinion is that recognized practically universally in international law that troops who enter a foreign country as an invading force, for instance, or by invitation, or during combat are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the military courts of their own country so long as they are in column or so long as they are within the cantonment where they are stationed, but not where they are off the cantonment or on recreation off duty. This Status of Forces

Treaty does provide for practically that same situation. It does not cover the man while he is in the discharge of his duties as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States.

This question has been deemed of such importance that at the time our troops entered European countries in World War I and again in World War II, about the time they arrived and even just before they arrived, an agreement was made with each foreign country as to the status of our troops when they arrived there. So that if you did not have the Status of Forces Treaty the sovereign country, of course, has jurisdiction over the people within that country who violate their sovereign law except troops in a foreign country by invitation, while on the reservation or while discharging their military duties.

There are not as many foreign troops stationed in the United States as there are United States troops stationed in foreign countries. It does happen, however, that in my district there are quite a number of them stationed. Some months ago a member of one of the foreign services went down to a town in my district and committed a rather serious assault on a citizen. The question immemediately arose as to where that person could be tried, whether he could be tried in the courts of my State or not. Had the other situation prevailed, if you had given exclusive jurisdiction to the foreign country, then the courts of my State could not have tried that man.

Now, the difficulty in the Status of Forces Treaty is not that they can try these men for violations of their laws when off duty. The only thing in it that should not have been done was the commitment to deliver to the authorities of the foreign country a member of our armed services.

This is not a new question. Every county seat in the United States has this sort of thing arise. Before coming to Congress I was in the State prosecuting office at San Antonio, Tex. At that time we had a large portion of our small military establishment stationed there. If a member of the military should come into town and be charged with the commission of an offense and got back to the post before we got him, you had the same question arise. The question then was how you would get him away from the military where he had gone back to, where jurisdiction had been ceded by the State of Texas to the Federal Government. You only got him because of a comity which existed between the State officials and the military officials. I say it arises in every county and city because so many offenses are a violation of both the Federal and State law. If the Federal Government gets him first the State court can only get him if the Federal Government will agree to let the State have him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. SHORT), Mr. KILDAY was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I would like for the gentleman to discuss the difference between misdemeanors, minor offenses and criminal offenses.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, in practical effect you have the situation of a person charged with an offense that might be a violation of the law of two sovereignties. Who would get hold of him first? I will tell you that when I was a State prosecutor I had far more difficulty with the United States marshal and the United States attorney than I ever had with the provost marshal of any of the military posts within the jurisdiction of the courts in which I prosecuted.

I agree with practically everything the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] has said, and practically everything that he has read from newspapers, except the manner in which you should proceed to do something about this. If I knew more about this situation than the gentleman who wrote the editorials which were read here, I might agree to take such action. The Constitution clearly states that the Constitution and the laws and the treaties enacted thereunder are the supreme law of the land, and that is the situation we have. We have here a solemn treaty entered into with all of the solemnity that the Constitution calls for, including ratification by the Senate with a two-thirds vote.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I should like to point out to the gentleman, if I may, that the agreements under which we are operating in many countries have never been submitted to the Senate of the United States.

Mr. KILDAY. I agree.

Mr. BOW. The agreement we are now operating under with Japan, which is one of the most vicious, was not entered into by the President or the Senate of the United States but by an Ambassador, so we do not have the case there where the Congress has adopted it.

Mr. KILDAY. It is true that in the Pacific area those have not been submitted to the Senate. They are executive agreements. They are agreements of the identical type and character that we had with France, England, and Belgium, and what-not in Europe during World War I and World War II.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Is it not true that if this is a matter of constitutional right, as the gentleman from Ohio says, then it would be incumbent on the United States to defend every American citizen abroad, wherever he was, against foreign jurisdiction of any court? So you might have a case where, if we did it for a serviceman, you would have high-school kids and American businessmen and other Government officials in Embassies that would not be protected.

Mr. KILDAY. Oddly enough, the only time it has come to the floor has been in the reverse in the Committee on the Judiciary with reference of the deportation of our own citizens. But, of course a tourist in a foreign country is subject to the laws of that foreign country just as a foreign tourist in this country is subject to the laws of this country, so that under this agreement our men are hedged with greater safety.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman not think that this is taking quite a different turn than was contemplated when in Japan the Japanese courts levied on an Army officer who had discharged four civilians because they were Communists, who worked on an airbase?

Mr. KILDAY. I heard that detailed here. That is the only information I have with reference to it. I do not know of anything in the Status of Forces Treaty having to do with that civil liability of which you speak. Now, no matter whether this treaty should have been entered into or not, certainly this is not the manner in which to attempt to overcome an improvident treaty that was entered into by the executive branch of the Government and then ratified by the Senate. I forget the exact vote in the Senate, but it was far in excess of two-thirds.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. The gentleman referred earlier, as I understood, to a foreign officer or soldier who was arrested in his State for a criminal offense and brought to trial. Do I understand that was under the American court?

Mr. KILDAY. That is true.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I may have missed it, but did the gentleman say what the outcome was or what the disposition of the case might have been?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not have the slightest idea, and I do not think it has any relationship to the question involved, whether the courts in my State had the right to arrest him and indict him and try him under the procedures of the law in my own State.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Does the gentleman not feel it is important for a man who is in a foreign country, not as a visitor or tourist but there on military assignment and military orders, to have some safeguards against foreign procedures, jurisdictional and judicial procedures?

Mr. KILDAY. Well, the foreign nations had that power before the Status of Forces Treaty was entered into. They had it because they are sovereign nations and they have sovereign authority over every person within their boundaries. They did not have it over a man who was on active duty and performing his duty. But they did have it under international law when he was away from his post for recreational purposes.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] for 3 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] took the floor in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], which I support.

I go back to May of 1954 when there was a bill before the House which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] mentioned in passing, a moment ago, a bill which would have permitted the extradition and deportation of an American tourist who, for instance, while in Europe had committed a misdemeanor and returned to this country.

He or she could have been extradited and deported back to Europe for trial in a civil court, and that also applied to a serviceman or his dependents who had been stationed in Europe and returned to this country.

Quite a fight developed over that bill on the floor. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] voted for it. If you go back to May 10 of 1954 you will find that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], seeking to obtain 5 minutes, offered a motion to strike the enacting clause and the House approved the motion. That was the first and only time since I have been a Member of the House, which is 8 years, that the House has thought so little of a bill that it killed it by striking the enacting clause. A rollcall vote was forced and that particular bill, which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] supported, was defeated by a vote of 228 to 68, demonstrating that this House does have at least some concern in the matter of United States citizens who may be tried in foreign courts under foreign judges.

I should like to point out to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and and gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] who addressed us a short time ago, that there is quite a difference between being tried in a United States court and being tried in a court in France where, first of all you might be arrested by a Communist policeman and then tried by a Communist judge and jury. There is quite a difference between that kind of justice and the justice that a foreign national would get in this country.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield, since I used the gentleman's name in my remarks.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, it is quite apparent that the gentleman does not like me very much, which is perfectly all right; but does the gentleman have any evidence of any instances——

Mr. GROSS. I do not know how the gentleman can read that into my remarks. At no point have I evidenced any dislike of the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman have any evidence of any cases of trials in foreign courts, under the Status of Forces Agreement, where the gentleman thinks the punishment has been beyond that to fit the crime?

Mr. GROSS. I am not now presenting cases and figures, but I think that instead of reading off $28.50 as punishment for some rather serious offense, as the gentleman did, I would have gone into a more logical dissertation in an effort to prove the point that the punishment meted out in foreign countries is so very minor. I will say to the gentleman that I doubt whether, if he had a son in uniform serving in a foreign country, particularly in Japan, as I have, he would like the idea of his son, if he committed some misdemeanor, being tried before a Japanese judge without an American lawyer or an understanding of the language and incarcerated in a Japanese prison.

Mr. HALLECK. It just so happens that I had a boy in uniform for 4 years who is now out of the service. He did not serve in Japan but, from what I have seen of the operation of the Status of Forces Agreements, I do not think he would have been abused. I do not think an injustice would have been done him under the operation of that treaty.

Mr. GROSS. I differ utterly and completely with the gentleman. I think the Status of Forces Treaties and the secret agreements—and some of them are secret—that have been entered into are a shameful, un-American betrayal of United States citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, this of course is an issue full of heartthrobs. As the gentleman from Ohio said, you could go into almost any part of the country and get great emotional reactions. However, I think the facts of the matter should be kept very clearly before our minds, they have not been made clear to many who are honestly and unnecessarily disturbed.

In the first place, as has been pointed out, this would probably do more to wreck NATO and other mutual assistance programs, so vital to our own defense, than if we subtracted a lot of money from the bill. We cannot have partners in this international enterprise that are of two classes. We cannot expect free nations to discard their laws and accept the slight that we consider their administration of justice inferior and unfair.

When the Senate adopted the treaty there were ample safeguards, it seems to me, included in the reservations, which provided that full scrutiny would be maintained. As a matter of fact, only a very small proportion of the cases are tried in foreign courts.

It has been my experience to serve in 2 wars in many foreign nations in various parts of the world and in the last 2 or 3 years I have had an opportunity to look into this particular matter in nearly all of the NATO countries, all of them but Iceland, as a matter of fact, and nowhere have I found any abuse of Americans. Actually, troop commanders anywhere are successful in the long run only if they are known by their men to be their champions and protectors. One never finds a really successful commander hardboiled or otherwise, who does not look after the interests of his men and see that justice is done them. By and large our leaders follow this pattern.

I have talked to many of them throughout the NATO area and elsewhere, but nowhere did I find an officer of high rank or low who felt there was any injustice being done his men under the existing system.

The other body has made an extensive study of this matter. Less than a year ago a special committee headed by Senator Ervin filed a report that is interesting. It examined the operations in all jurisdictional arrangements in which American troops were subject to trial in foreign courts, involving some 60 countries throughout the entire world. The committee reached the following conclusion:

> It is the view of the subcommittee that, generally, the criminal jurisdictional arrangements regarding United States troops abroad are operating satisfactorily and that the exercise of jurisdiction by foreign courts has not had an adverse effect on the morale and efficiency of American troops stationed in those countries.

The report further stated:

> The subcommittee has been aware of widely circulated reports which indicate that Americans have received sentences by foreign courts involving cruel and unusual punishment, such as the cutting off of hands. The Department of Defense was requested to furnish information regarding any case of this nature. In response the subcommittee was advised that the Department of Defense knew of no instance where physical punishment of any nature had been received by an American as a result of sentence by foreign court.
>
> The Department of Defense has indicated that American officials and chaplains visit regularly the 58 Americans who are confined in the institutions in the 5 countries. No information has been received which would indicate that the conditions of confinement are other than satisfactory. In France permission to visit prisoners is granted to friends and members of the prisoner's family. The confined soldiers are being extended adequate medical and dental care and have access to recreational facilities. In Japan a portion of a Japanese prison has been set aside solely for American prisoners who are given preferential treatment over Japanese prisoners, particularly with respect to the type of food provided.
>
> The Department of Defense has issued a directive requiring that military commanders seek to conclude agreements with local officials whereby the American commanders may accord servicemen confined in foreign institutions the same privileges that would be extended to Americans confined to United States military facilities.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX].

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, I am sure we are all trying to arrive at the same ultimate end, as far as the protection of our men is concerned.

I introduced a bill that come out under somebody else's name, but that is the way of things, to provide for money so that we could have counsel for our servicemen when tried in foreign courts. That, I hope, will become law very shortly.

As to this question of giving up constitutional rights, of course, any man going into the service does give up certain constitutional rights. The Consti-

tution does not follow the flag. We have the matter of consular courts particularly. Where those consular courts exercise their jurisdiction the people tried in them are not tried by jury as provided for in the Constitution. That is a well-established point of law.

What would happen if the Bow amendment were to go into effect and the Status of Forces Treaty be no longer in force? We would then go back to general provisions of international law where our troops would not have the protection they have today.

We have greater protection for our men now under the Status of Forces Treaty than we would without its existence; and, therefore, I believe that we are much better off under the present circumstances.

I think most of the points have been covered pretty thoroughly in this discussion. I urge this committee to vote against the Bow amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] is recognized.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, those of us who support this amendment certainly do not want American servicemen who commit offenses to go unpunished, but we want them punished in American courts in the American tradition and under American law. We think they should be tried as they were prior to the adoption of the Status of Forces Treaty. International law heretofore provided that they should be tried by their own military authorities.

I differ with those who have stood in this well today and said that we give our men additional protection by the Status of Forces Treaty. In my opinion, that is not correct. It has been the law that when we sent our military personnel into foreign countries, at the invitation of those countries or with their acquiescence they continued to be under our control.

Reference has been made to the situation in Japan. It has been pointed out that there our men are being tried, not under treaties ratified by the Senate but under executive agreements made pursuant to treaty.

Several of us, including myself, last December stood in the Japanese prison where there were more than 50 American men incarcerated that day. We visited the prison; we talked to the men. The prison was clean. The Japanese authorities were courteous and helpful to us. But here is what we heard: The boys said they were cold. The prison was cold. They said they were denied at all times the use of tobacco even when they were in their own cells in the evening. But more important than that, they told us they were hungry, that they cooked and ate the food that was given to them but they were still hungry. But they said they could take even that if they had had an American trial, even a court-martial—if they had been tried in a court the language of which they could understand, if they had had competent counsel, if they had had a continuous trial and not one consisting of interrupted appearances in court, and if they had had the right to be confronted with the witnesses who testified against them—and they did not have that right.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see how we can in any manner excuse our own actions if we fail to adopt this amendment. We have provided, and very properly so, that our diplomats throughout the world have certain diplomatic immunities—and that is right. But how can we say to a man: "Here, you must put on the uniform of our country, you must go where you are sent, and then we will not extend to you the protection of our laws"?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I do not think anything need or can be added to what has been just said so well by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], who is the chairman of the ad hoc subcommittee set up by Chairman RICHARDS, of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to study this problem. All I can do is to underline the fact which is so generally unrealized, or misunderstood, that when the Status of Forces Treaty was entered into by the United States, we did not surrender any sovereignty or any rights our boys had in other countries. Rather, under those agreements, the countries to which these boys are sent, have voluntarily relinquished certain aspects of their own national sovereignty to give us rights which we did not have.

Of course our men abroad do not find it as good as it would be at home, in this as well as many other respects; but, actually, they are a great deal better off under the Status of Forces Treaty than they would be without it.

Since no independent, self-respecting government is going to relinquish all of its sovereignty within its own borders, for us to insist on full sovereignty over every American soldier off duty wherever he is would require us to withdraw United States troops from all foreign bases. It would mean abandoning the world to the Kremlin. That has been its No. 1 objective all these years—to get the United States isolated and its allies pulled away so that we stand alone. The adoption of the Bow amendment would force us to give up the whole program of world security and withdraw from all our foreign bases. At one stroke the Kremlin would have won.

If we will think coolly about the perilous situation we are in today and the only reason for this bill at all, we will see that to pass the Bow amendment would simply wreck the program and leave the United States in a position where no Americans, whether military or civilian, and whether abroad or at home would have the security that it is our purpose in this bill to try to build up.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, I think I inadvertently said I urge the committee to vote against the treaty. I urge the committee to vote against the Bow amendment, because, in my judgment, we have greater protection of our men under the Status of Forces Treaty than otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who proposes this amendment, on May 31—I was not here at that time—made a rather severe indictment of our committee in the RECORD of that day when he quoted from the committee report, as follows:

> The committee urges that the status-of-forces problem be faced directly and considered on its merits. It should not be used as a device for attacking the mutual security program.

Then he goes on to say:

> Considering the facts, this statement borders on hypocrisy.

Last year when this matter came up I promised the gentleman from Ohio I would give him a full hearing on this subject before the Foreign Affairs Committee. I did that. He admits it. We had 9 days of full hearings. Everybody who wanted to appear was allowed to appear.

On page 11 of our report you will find this statement:

> The hearings did not bring to light a single instance where it is claimed that an American serviceman believed to be innocent has been imprisoned by a foreign court, or an American sentenced for an act which in the United States would not be considered a crime. Neither has any case of mutilation, flogging, or any other cruel, unusual, or excessive punishment been cited.

Now, of course, we are all interested in trying to do something to have adequate protection for our servicemen abroad. And, as has been stated by the gentleman from Maryland, General DEVEREUX, a bill has already passed this House providing for payment for adequate counsel in foreign courts for the benefit of our servicemen. The reason I did not press my point of order against this bill was because I knew this issue had to be threshed out sooner or later. Why do the proponents of this amendment pick on this bill? This bill does not authorize sending United States troops abroad; it has nothing to do with that. The place to deal with the rights of our military personnel overseas is in military legislation. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] knew on March 8 that the Committee on Foreign Affairs had voted 19 to 10 not to report out his resolution. Why did he not propose an amendment to the military construction bill, which was considered on the floor of the House a month later, on April 10, 11, and 12, or why did he not propose an amendment to the defense appropriation bill which was considered by the House on May 9 and 10?

I want to say this in closing. How can anyone who believes our bases abroad are important vote for this amendment? We are in danger of losing Iceland, anyway, and this amendment would make sure of our being thrown out of that country. In the north African bases we are about to begin negotiations with the new government of Morroco for rights to the bases there. This new government will certainly not agree to better terms than were given to us by the French. There will also be negotiations for renewal of agreements with Saudi Arabia. We do not

have any aid for Saudi Arabia. We cannot talk tough to them.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this question will be settled once and for all. The constitutional and legal aspects of the problem have been argued ably this afternoon, and I will not go into them further. This is a dangerous amendment to add to any bill. We should not repudiate our solemn agreements arrived at by our regular constitutional processes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Bow) there were—ayes 30, noes 93.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, during 2 days of historic debate I have remained silent and a listener. I feel now, conscience impelling me, that I must speak. American fathers and mothers have a right to insist that when their sons and their daughters go into the service of our country, whether they serve in foreign lands or in this land, they receive justice.

Now, I am not criticizing the Armed Services as a whole. I think most of the officers in the Judge Advocate Corps are able, fine officers, but occasionally there are those who are of the ruthless type.

A young man from my district is in some trouble. The American Legion in the city of Chicago, through an officer and some of the members of one of the large posts, thinks that this boy is being improperly accused. So they were preparing a defense for him. That naturally took time for investigation and the gathering of witnesses. Then word came that the court-martial was set for today. Only 48 hours' notice had been given. The witnesses were at a long distance. An officer of this American Legion post flew to the base, and from the airport in Chicago telephoned me. I sent a telegram to the serviceman advising him to have his counsel ask for a continuance. I assured him that I thought there would be no difficulty under the circumstances.

Later, I was informed that the judge advocate at that base was insisting that the young man go to trial at 10 o'clock this morning, Washington time, regardless of the fact that his witnesses were miles away. The telegram which a Member of Congress had sent to a young man from his district was undelivered. The telegram was sent at 10 o'clock on the morning of June 6. I was informed by the officer of the American Legion the night of June 6 that my constituent had not received the telegram. On June 7 the young man was told there was a telegram, but at latest advises to me he had not received it.

I do not know of any injustices to our service people in foreign lands, as some have mentioned them in the debate here, that are more violative of the spirit of American justice than an effort on the part of a judge advocate to rush a defendant to trial without any opportunity to prepare his defense. If a Member of Congress cannot send a telegram to a constituent, a perfectly proper message informing him of the proper procedure, without having it sidetracked at somebody's whim, what are we coming to?

Mr. Chairman, I have thought it my duty to bring this experience to the attention of my colleagues. It is our responsibility to safeguard justice to all our men and women in the armed services. It is a serious matter when a telegram from a Member of Congress is withheld from his constituent under circumstances of the nature I have related. It should not be permitted to go unnoticed.

(By unanimous consent the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.)

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. Title V, chapter 1, of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to general provisions, is further amended as follows:

(a) In section 501, which relates to transferability of funds, strike out the last two sentences and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Any funds transferred under this section for the purposes of furnishing assistance under section 201 shall be available only for furnishing assistance on terms of repayment in accordance with section 505, for furnishing surplus agricultural commodities under section 402, or for making grants for regional projects involving two or more beneficiary nations."

(b) In section 507, which relates to availability of funds, after "students),", insert "and other provisions of this Act."

(c) In section 509, which relates to shipping on United States vessels, after "this Act" in the last sentence thereof, insert "or the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1691 and the following)."

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARDY on page 13, after line 12, insert the following:

"(d) After section 514, add the following new section:

"'SEC. 515. Access to records by certain legislative committees: (a) Before any funds authorized under any title of this act may be expended or obligated after the date of the enactment of this section, the President shall issue such directions to the agencies and officers involved as will ensure that all documents, papers, communications, and other records on the basis of which any action is taken or any determination is made under such title will be freely available to any committee of Congress which has the duty of studying the operation of activities under such title.

"'(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the continuing availability to appropriate committees of Congress (pursuant to directions issued under subsection (a)) of all documents, papers, communications, and records relating to operations under any title of this act shall be a condition of the exercise of any authority to expend or obligate funds under such title.

"'(c) The provisions of subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply in the case of funds authorized under chapter 1 or 2 of title I or unvouchered funds authorized by section 401, or in the case of actions taken or determinations made with respect to such funds.'"

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, on the assumption that the other Members are as weary as I am, I hesitate even to present this amendment at this time of the afternoon. The truth of the matter is that I have been waiting for 3 days to try to get an opportunity to present this amendment and to speak on it. I cannot present it satisfactorily in 5 minutes, but I believe I am not going to ask for additional time.

Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment I do so without hostility to the fundamental concepts of the mutual security bill. The record will disclose that our foreign aid programs have generally received my support, which has been based upon a conviction that this is in our own national interest. I have joined with the majority of my colleagues in a realization that the point 4 program of technical assistance has many features to commend it, and I have recognized that economic aid as first pronounced by General Marshall, combined humanitarian considerations with other considerations of both direct and indirect economic concern, in the best interest of the taxpayers of this country. I have been especially a supporter of military assistance to friendly free nations because this program had the objectives of helping the recipient countries to remain free, and at the same time added to the total free world defense a greater capability to resist aggression than would have been possible if similar amounts had been expended by our own defense establishment. In short, in my judgment, military aid funds properly employed, can produce more defense for us, as well as our allies, than could similar amounts achieve, expended in any other manner.

The mutual security bill we are considering today confers broad powers upon the President and certain executive agencies to spend, according to their discretion, moneys which this bill authorizes in lump-sum amounts. In effect, it delegates much of the constitutional power of the Congress to pass upon expenditures in advance. The current bill is not unique in this respect.

Why do we continue to enact legislation which so obviously represents a delegation of congressional responsibilities to the executive branch? The reasons, I think, are plain. The situations with which mutual security programs must cope are ever changing, and if the programs are to be successful, the executive branch must be in a position to take prompt action to shift them as the need arises. Congress has recognized this fact in the broad delegations of power this bill, and its predecessors, contain. It has recognized it and acted accordingly, however, on the supposition that there would be an opportunity for congressional review and scrutiny of expenditures after they had been made. This presumes that we shall know what this current legislation is about and how the funds authorized under it are expended when the program is reviewed a year from now. That is theory, but it is not fact. How much does the Congress know about the details of expenditures made in previous years? Not nearly enough, in my opinion, to make informed judgments. To be sure, presentations are made each year by the executive branch which purport to be an accounting of their stewardship over foreign-aid programs in the preceding year.

As chairman of the International Operations Subcommittee of the Govern-

ment Operations Committee, I have had occasion to go behind some of these presentations and to elicit from the executive branch supporting detail. The picture which has emerged in all too many instances has been different from that presented to the Congress in the normal course of events.

Let me tell you that a great many employees of our State Department and the International Cooperation Administration seem to take the position that they should not be required to tell anybody how these funds are spent. It might be said by some that adequate explanations are given to the Foreign Affairs Committee and to the Appropriations Committee. Let me tell you in all candor that that is not accurate, and let me show you why I say so.

Just as one illustration, to which I referred Wednesday, $10 million of the funds appropriated for fiscal year 1954 was stated to the Foreign Affairs Committee as having been used to support a note issue in Iran. In effect, they served as collateral. The Foreign Affairs Committee apparently accepted that statement as sufficient detail, because there is no evidence that they went behind it. But within a few short months that $10 million was available for expenditure rather than as collateral, and I do not know what it was spent for, and I defy anybody here to produce any tangible evidence as to what it was used for.

It is the duty of my subcommittee to examine the non-military-assistance aspects of our expenditures under this legislation. When in the performance of this duty we have asked for detailed records on such expenditures, we have been confronted at times with citation of an Executive order regarding the availability of executive-branch documents which was never meant to apply to the kind of information we requested. Only with difficulty have we been able to convince the executive branch that access to records of expenditures under this program and documents pertinent to it is a congressional right. I cannot blame the executive branch for wanting to put its best foot forward. That is to be expected and that is what it should do. But large sums of money are involved in this program and great issues are at stake. The amendment which I am proposing here today seeks to insure that we get adequate information in the future. It seeks only to redress the current situation in which the established balance between the respective responsibilities of the legislative and executive branches has been upset by the broad delegations of authority contained in mutual-security legislation.

You have no idea what a job it is to get information that we must have, and under the present order of things we cannot be sure that we are being fully advised. I can show you point after point where the information provided has only been partial; and, if you will but review recent reports issued by the General Accounting Office concerning the procedures followed and the lack of accountability felt by personnel serving us abroad, I am sure you will share with me the same kind of concern which I feel.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. GROSS) Mr. HARDY was permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. HARDY. The purpose of this amendment is very simple. It says to the President, "We are authorizing the expenditure of funds at your discretion. We are delegating to you our authority to pass on these individual programs, but we are saying to you that if you expend this money under the discretionary provisions of this act you must instruct the people in the agencies to supply the committees of Congress, who have a statutory duty to look into your affairs, to give us all of the operational information that is required." That is all it does.

I am aware of the fact that Secretary Dulles has sent a rather lengthy and wordy letter about this matter. I am not impressed by the reasoning of it because much of it has no bearing at all on the amendment. However, I have made a few modifications in the amendment as originally sent around to the Members, in order to meet some of the objections the Secretary pointed to.

He said, for instance, "We cannot operate because restrictions would apply on the effective date of this act and a constitutional question is raised." There is no constitutional question involved in this. But I have reworded the amendment to make it apply 60 days after the act becomes effective. Certainly, within 60 days after, his lawyers can find out what they can do and what they cannot do, and can draw up proper instructions.

There was already enough guaranty that the security requirements would be safeguarded, but I have spelled that out.

Then another provision was put in to permit the President to exclude information at top diplomatic level if in his opinion it was not in the interest of the Nation to submit it.

I think every legitimate safeguard has been provided. I think that if we fail to adopt this amendment we are abdicating our constitutional responsibility, and I firmly believe that we should adopt it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot permit this opportunity to pass without commending the gentleman for the very fine report released only recently, perhaps 3 weeks ago, by his subcommittee, entitled "Administrative Management of the State Department." I certainly recommend this document to every Member of the House and particularly to the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee. This document ought to be entitled "Administrative Mismanagement of the Department of State."

Mr. HARDY. I thank the gentlemen and I would like to call attention to just one point in the report on this bill by the Foreign Affairs Committee. It reports that with respect to Latin America, host governments will contribute about $21,824,000 in cash equivalent to the various point 4 projects. This is the figure computed on the basis of International Monetary Fund exchange rates. These are totally unrealistic and in sharp contrast with the free market rates which should be the basis for comparison. In the hearings on this bill at page 330 is a table comparing IMF rates and free market rates. I wish you would look at just the first three items. The IMF rate for Bolivia is 190 against a realistic free market rate of 4,600. With respect to Brazil and Chile, the next two items tabulated, the relationship is about 4 to 1.

Thus, on a realistic basis if the free market exchange rate had been employed by the committee host government contributions would probably be nearer $5 million than $21 million. I tell you frankly that this is misleading, to say the least.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

First, however, I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] and his subcommittee on the study they have made on Latin America and the one that they are making on Iran. We used the text of the Latin American report to advantage in interrogating witnesses during the preparation of this bill.

As to the situation on the Iran report, the gentleman says that the subcommittee has worked out a satisfactory arrangement.

This amendment strikes at the constitutional separation of powers between the Congress and the Executive as interpreted first by George Washington when the House of Representatives said they wanted to see the papers leading up to the Jay Treaty, all the papers. He sent back word to the effect that the House could not see them because it was an interference with Executive prerogatives.

Ever since then that has been the position that every President has taken and we have wrestled with it here in one administration after the other. We feel that the position is abused at times. There was one President—I cannot give his name but I found this in Cannon's Precedents—who said when the demand was made on him for some papers: "I am not going to send them. I think this is my constitutional duty. The only way that you can enforce your demand on me is to impeach me."

As said in the Secretary of State's letter, and I think this is an accurate statement, the instructions that would be required under this amendment to every agency of Government would provide for the automatic disclosures of papers not yet prepared, of state secrets not yet learned regarding events that have not yet occurred.

The gentleman puts in a saving provision as to certain documents, that is between diplomatic missions and the President and the foreign countries, he says those papers do not have to be turned over—I am quoting from the amendment—if the President shall have determined that the application of the subsections to that particular communication would not be in the public interest. So we have the President sitting up there assorting the diplomatic correspondence, because the President has to determine whether each particular communication should be sent to the congressional committees. As I say, this has come up time and again in the 18 years I have been

here. Presidents have said as to certain classifications and papers that they are not to be shown to Congress.

A similar question is involved here today where a committee of Congress, the Foreign Affairs Committee, has military information which it is not in the public interest to disclose to the rest of the Members of the House. The Atomic Energy Committee constantly is in that situation, so is the Committee on the Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations. But that is one of the things that goes along with the constitutional separation of power. An executive cannot be independent if somebody else has the right to look not only at his mail but at every scrap of memoranda that could conceivably be involved in the preparation of a particular matter. This would cover the CIA because a lot of information that comes from CIA is the basis for economic programs and development programs for various countries.

I hope the amendment will be defeated. If adopted it would certainly cripple this entire program. If adopted it would transgress the constitutional rule first invoked by President Washington.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a most important amendment and I must disagree most emphatically with the statements made by the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. This does not involve any broad constitutional questions, unless it is the right and the responsibility of this Congress to have the facts before it, to consider them carefully and to legislate on the basis of those facts, to require from the executive the necessary information in order that it fulfill its legislative responsibility.

I have been privileged for the past 10 months to serve as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations studying this problem of the withholding of information from the Congress and from the American people. It is a very serious problem. There is evidence of increasing claims on the part of the executive departments that they have the right to determine the information the Congress shall receive. In effect, through the control of information they can closely control the actions of the Congress. If we are to act independently and intelligently we must have this information.

This amendment clearly grants to the President the right to withhold any information upon an affirmative finding that it is in the interest of the security of this Nation.

Mr. VORYS. He has to make a finding as to each paper, does he not?

Mr. MOSS. I think it is proper that he should have to make such finding.

I heard testimony days on end by executive agencies asserting the most broad and bold claims of authority to determine what the Congress may have in performing its legislative function, going beyond determining what we shall have and asserting the right to determine whether or not our request is for legislative purpose. We must through a device such as this reassert the right of the Congress to have the information which gives us the facts upon which to legislate. If we fail to do it with the processes which have been evolved over a period of a great many years, accelerated in the last 30 as the result of two World Wars and the Korean police action, we are going to find it is virtually impossible to get even the most elemental information without Executive censorship.

I wish that the members of this committee could be privileged to sit with us day in and day out in the slow process of digging the facts about the control, the asserted rights of the Executive over the information. A proprietary right is asserted in many instances.

A proprietary right is asserted in many instances, a right which, if left unchallenged by this Congress now, as I have indicated, can effectively cripple us. We are not asking for anything unreasonable. We are asking in this amendment only that the necessary information in connection with this program, which is a delegated authority of the Congress, be given us. It is a different case from that where President George Washington asserted the right to withhold papers in connection with the negotiation of a treaty. The President there was exercising a constitutional function. Here this function that we have given to the Executive is a constitutionally held power of the Congress to appropriate funds, and we have the right, in fact we have the responsibility, to know that every dollar we appropriate is spent, more or less at least, as we intend that it be spent. We have the right and the responsibility to the American taxpayers to tell them that we know the funds have been spent in an intelligent and effective manner. If we do otherwise, if we fail here to again clearly and definitely, without equivocation, assert our right to this information, then we have indeed stripped the Congress of a most important power in performing its legislative function.

Mr. Chairman, I hope sincerely that this amendment is adopted by the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I just want to call attention to a couple of things the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] had to say a while ago with respect to this separation of power between the Executive and the legislative. This amendment seeks to return to Congress some control over the power which it has delegated to the Executive. It does not seek to take away any constitutional power that the Executive has. It simply says "We are giving you discretion which belongs to us. We are delegating to you authority to determine the wisdom of a particular program, but in return for that you must establish a procedure by which we can find out just what you did with the money." That is all this amendment says. It does not require him to do a single thing that the Constitution does not already require him to do. But it says this: If you exercise this authority, then you must make the information available to the Congress, to the appropriate committees of Congress. I appreciate the gentleman's permitting me to clear this point up.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I was very disturbed to hear the statement by the gentleman from Ohio, because I have great respect for his legal ability and particularly as a constitutional lawyer. I am afraid that he has not gone into this subject nearly as thoroughly as he should have before he made that statement, and I hope he never has occasion to regret it. If, sometime, when he may be chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, he is denied information as chairman of that committee to which he thinks he should have access, I hope he will not have these words that he uttered today flaunted in his face as an assertion that he is at the mercy of the executive branch of the Government for the amount of information he can obtain. This is a basic question. I had the privilege of sitting on the Moss committee hearings. Every Member should be interested in this issue. Are you going to be denied the information which you believe as a committee you have all the right in the world to have? Are you going to be at the mercy of some bureaucrat so that he can decide whether you ought to know or not, whether Congress can be entrusted to have the information? That is how basic it is. And, I hope the committee today will not by a record vote here abdicate its constitutional authority to legislate and to have the facts upon which it can legislate intelligently.

Let me say that there is not a Supreme Court decision where a subpena was served by a congressional committee upon an executive officer and he refused to obey the subpena. I can recall when Senator Truman was chairman of the Truman committee at least twice he served subpenas on the Attorney General of the United States, yet when he got down to the other end of Pennsylvania, what did he do? He said to the executive branch generally, if they did not want to give Congress any information, to give it to him and then see if Congress could get it. I do not mind the President taking that position, but hate to see us in Congress admit that we are powerless when some bureaucrat wants to deny us information. All this amendment says is that appropriate committees of Congress shall have available the information they need to conduct their operations, subject to appropriate safeguards on matters of security.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out and to emphasize again that this amendment proposed to this bill is one of the most important

things that this committee could undertake to consider with respect to this authorization. It does more to assist the committee in passing judgment upon the program than any single thing we could possibly do. I sat here for 3 days and heard committeeman after committeeman say, "I am not sure that I got all the facts." Well, for goodness sake, if the committee does not know, how in the world am I expected to know if I do not serve on that committee?

All this amendment does is this. It does not take a single thing away from the President. It says that the committee shall have the information when it requests it but that if the President of the United States feels that it is to the best interests of this country not to disclose that information to a committee of Congress then it shall not be disclosed.

We are not printing handbills and throwing them out the window to the Russians. We are talking about a committee of Congress sitting in executive session. If you cannot trust them, whom can you trust?

Let us read some of this gobbledygook that came down about what would happen to this program if this amendment were adopted. Have you ever heard anything more ridiculous than this?

The issuing of advance instructions of this nature would not be consonant with the President's responsibilities under the Constitution in the field of foreign affairs and as Commander in Chief. Such instructions would provide for the automatic disclosure of papers not yet prepared and state secrets not yet learned regarding events which have not yet occurred.

How in the world could they give information to the committee if they did not themselves know it? So their whole argument falls flatter than the pancake that it was written with.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I should like to ask one question, as to whether the gentleman will agree that this problem with respect to the bureaucracy has existed for more than 3 years.

Mr. FASCELL. I am very willing to agree that it has existed for a long, long time and if Congress does not act now it will continue to exist for the next 176 years.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Is not the amendment in line with the very eloquent speech the chairman of the committee made yesterday looking to the separation of the powers of Government and giving the Congress of the United States the same powers that the President has?

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman very much for that observation. I forgot to mention it in my statement. I cannot think of anything that would complement the chairman's remarks any more than the adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. Of course, one of the things that I had in mind was that very eloquent speech made by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs yesterday with reference to this very matter, and which has been so ably presented by the gentleman from Florida.

I think the time has come when we who are Members of Congress must assert our right to have this type of information, particularly such information as I was questioning the gentleman from Ohio about yesterday, information he never did give me. He never even gave me any reason for not giving me some of the answers that we as Members of Congress should have before spending billions of dollars all over the world.

Certainly, as I understand the proposed amendment that we have here, there is not any violation of constitutional powers nor does it in any way affect the constitutional power of the President of the United States. It simply reasserts the rights of Members of Congress and certainly, as has been so adequately said, if they cannot be trusted, then who in America can be trusted?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. As a matter of fact, would not this amendment be for the benefit of members of the Committee on Appropriations who must appropriate money of this type? If the gentleman will recall last year, when the Committee on Appropriations came to the floor, it learned that the Air Force had hundreds of millions of dollars under this program that it did not know it had. It gave the Committee on Appropriations that information later.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, it comes right down to the question as to how the Congress of the United States is to work its will and to appropriate money equitably without information which a group of bureaucrats have decided to deny them and have been denying them, I might say, for a number of years.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman said that the Congress could be trusted. I would like to ask him if this refusal to give information to the Congress is not based upon the implication that they cannot be trusted. And I would like to ask the gentleman further if he can cite one example where a secret was given to the enemy through a congressional committee or by a Member of Congress, and can he not cite plenty of instances where they have gotten them from one of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree with what the gentleman says. Certainly it is indicated that there are some people in the executive branch of the Government who do not trust United States Members of Congress if we consider their denial of information which is so vital to the Members of Congress in order properly to carry out the duties and obligations of their office.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] for 2½ minutes to close the debate on this amendment.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. RICHARDS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, with the consent and the cooperation of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], who has been Speaker of the House, I should like to say that this thing of having the executive department of the Government report to the committees of Congress instead of the Congress, I think is very, very bad.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I might say that we have discussed this on previous occasions and we both agree.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished Speaker and the distinguished majority leader.

I have the greatest affection and admiration for my friend from Virginia and my committee has tried to cooperate with his committee. But I really think that this is a dangerous amendment. You cannot get around the Constitution; that is all there is to it. And there is a long line of precedents and clear-cut court decisions saying that the legislative branch has no right to demand information of this kind. This language requires them to produce everything, even a secret agreement with the kingdom of utopia.

The gentleman mentions our jealousy about our rights. Certainly a great many of us stated yesterday our jealousy of congressional rights and our determination to protect them against the Executive. But this is a case of the legislative branch trying to invade the executive field. I am just as jealous of the Executive's rights under the Constitution as I am of the rights of the legislative branch. Under our Government, if the President is violating his duty by refusing to release papers that Congress should have, he can be impeached. But so far as demanding that the President turn over to a committee of Congress everything he has, that is a dangerous thing.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The fact of the matter is that the speech the gentleman made yesterday is directly in line with the position he takes here now. He argued yesterday for the separation of powers. The issue here involved is the continuation of the separation of powers and the Executive prerogatives.

Mr. RICHARD. The gentleman is 100 percent right. We are arguing for

the same principle today that we did yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 37, noes 74.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. Title V, chapter 2, of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to organization and administration, is further amended as follows:

(a) In section 521, which relates to delegation of authority by the President, after "subsection (b)" in subsection (a), insert "and section 413 (b) (4)."

(b) Amend section 522, which relates to allocation and reimbursement among agencies, as follows:

(1) Add the following at the end of subsection (b): "The Administrator of General Services is authorized to maintain in a separate consolidated account, which shall be free from fiscal year limitations, payments received by the General Services Administration for administrative surcharges in connection with procurement services performed by the General Services Administration in furtherance of the purposes of this act. Such payments shall be in amounts mutually acceptable to the General Services Administration and the agency administering nonmilitary assistance, and these amounts shall be available for administrative expenses incurred by the General Services Administration in performing such procurement services."

(2) Add the following new subsection:

"(f) Any appropriation made to carry out the provisions of this act may initially be charged, within the limits of available funds, to finance expenses for which funds are available in other appropriations made under this act: *Provided*, That as of the end of the same fiscal year such expenses shall be finally charged to applicable appropriations with proper credit to the appropriations initially utilized for financing purposes."

(c) In section 530, which relates to experts and consultants or organizations thereof, insert before the period at the end of subsection (a) the following: ": *Provided*, That contracts for such employment with such organizations may be renewed annually."

(b) In section 532, which relates to exemption of personnel from certain Federal laws, add the following at the end of subsection (a): "Contracts for the employment of retired military personnel as experts or consultants under section 530 (a) may be renewed annually, notwithstanding section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a)."

(e) Amend section 535, which relates to cooperation with international organizations, as follows:

(1) Insert "Nations and" after "With" in the title.

(2) Amend subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) Whenever the President determines it to be in furtherance of the purposes of this act, United States Government agencies, on request of international organizations, are authorized to furnish supplies, materials, and services, and on request of nations, are authorized to furnish nonmilitary supplies, materials, and services, to such organizations and nations on an advance of funds or reimbursement basis. Such advances, or reimbursements which are received under this subsection within 180 days after the close of the fiscal year in which such supplies, materials, and services are delivered, may be credited to the current applicable appropriation or fund of the agency concerned and shall be available for the purposes for which such appropriations and funds are authorized to be used."

(f) Add the following new section:

"SEC. 537. Provisions on uses of funds:

"(a) Appropriations for the purposes of this act (except for chapter 1 of title I and section 124), allocations to any United States Government agency, from other appropriations, for functions directly related to the purposes of this act, and funds made available for other purposes to any agency administering nonmilitary assistance, shall, except as may subsequently be otherwise provided by law, be available for the purposes specified in section 102 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1956 (subject each fiscal year to the limitations on the amounts of funds which can be used for such purposes), in section 2 of Public Law 495, 83d Congress (with respect to the remains of persons or members of the families of persons who may die while away from their homes participating in activities under this act or other acts directly related to the purposes of this act), and in section 902 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (with respect to chiefs of mission appointed pursuant to section 526 of this act), and for the purchase of passenger motor vehicles: *Provided*, That passenger motor vehicles for administrative purposes may be purchased only as specified in section 102 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1956, or as specifically otherwise provided by law.

"(b) United States Government agencies are authorized to pay the costs of health and accident insurance for foreign participants in any exchange-of-persons program or any program of furnishing technical information and assistance administered by any such agency while such participants are en route or absent from their homes for purposes of participation in any such program."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 16, strike out line 24, and on page 17, strike out all of lines 1 through 6.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike out the provision which reads as follows:

United States Government agencies are authorized to pay the costs of health and accident insurance for foreign participants in any exchange-of-persons program or any program of furnishing technical information and assistance administered by any such agency while such participants are en route or absent from their homes for purposes of participation in any such program.

May I ask this question of the chairman of the committee: Why do we pay for health and accident insurance for foreigners who are coming to this country or in this country?

Mr. RICHARDS. I will answer the gentleman by reading from a paragraph on page 45 of the report:

Health and accident insurance for foreign trainees: This subsection authorizes the payment from applicable appropriations of health and accident insurance premiums for foreign participants while they are away from their homes engaging in any exchange-of-persons program or a program of furnishing technical information and assistance. It does not include military personnel participating in military assistance training programs.

That is the best answer I can make to the question. It is good insurance at a good rate, on good risks, and it will save money in the long run.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me how many foreigners are covered by this sort of insurance?

Mr. Chairman, I know of no reason in the world why as a condition of coming to this country these foreigners, when they obtain a visa, a passport, or whatever credentials they have to obtain, should not take out a health insurance policy themselves rather than saddle this load upon the American taxpayers. They come to this country with a per diem allowance and certainly they should pay for their own insurance.

I will be surprised if this amendment is adopted, but I submit it nevertheless. I have learned during this debate that nothing is too good for foreigners when the freewheeling spenders have their hands in the taxpayers' pockets. Let the record show that I have tried again to save at least a few dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 10. Title V, chapter 3, of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to repeal and miscellaneous provisions, is further amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 544, which relates to amendments to other laws, by adding the following new subsections:

"(c) In section 4 of the act of May 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 111, 5 U. S. C. 151c), insert after the words 'such functions' the following: ', including if he shall so specify the authority successively to redelegate any of such functions.'

"(d) In the first sentence of section 32 (b) (2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1641 (b) (2)), after 'any agency thereof', insert 'including amounts received in repayment of principal or interest on any loan made under section 505 (b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended.'

"(e) Section 933 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1148), is hereby amended by inserting after 'continental United States' where it appears in both subsection (a) and subsection (b) of that section ', its Territories and possessions.'

"(f) Section 1441 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

"'(6) Per diem of certain aliens: No deduction or withholding under subsection (a) shall be required in the case of amounts of per diem for subsistence paid by the United States Government (directly or by contract) to any nonresident alien individual who is engaged in any program of training in the United States under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended,'

"(g) Section 1011 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1442), is amended by inserting '(a)' before 'The Director', by deleting everything after the words 'national interests of the United States', by inserting a period at that point, and by inserting the following new subsections:

"'(b) The Director is authorized to assume the obligation of not to exceed $28,000,000 of the notes authorized to be issued

pursuant to subsection 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1509 (c) (2)), together with the interest accrued and unpaid thereon, and to obtain advances from time to time from the Secretary of the Treasury up to such amount, less amounts previously advanced on such notes, as provided for in said notes. Such advances shall be deposited in a special account in the Treasury available for payments under informational media guaranties.

"'(c) The Director is authorized to make informational media guaranties without regard to the limitations of time contained in subsection 413 (b) (4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1933 (b) (4)), but the total of such guaranties outstanding at any one time shall not exceed the sum of the face amount of the notes assumed by the Director less the amounts previously advanced on such notes by the Secretary of the Treasury plus the amount of the funds in the special account referred to in subsection (b).

"'(d) Foreign currencies available after June 30, 1955, from conversions made pursuant to the obligation of informational media guaranties may be sold, in accordance with Treasury Department regulations, for dollars which shall be deposited in the special account and shall be available for payments under new guaranties.

"'(e) Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph 413 (b) (4) (E) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1933 (b) (4) (E)), (1) fees collected for the issuance of informational media guaranties shall be deposited in the special account and shall be available for payments under informational media guaranties; and (2) the Director may require the payment of a minimum charge of up to $50 for issuance of guaranty contracts, or amendments thereto.

"'(f) The Director is further authorized, under such terms as he may prescribe, to make advance payments under informational media guaranties: *Provided*, That currencies receivable from holders of such guaranties on account of such advance payments shall be paid to the United States within 9 months from the date of the advance payment and that appropriate security to assure such payments is required before any advance payment is made.

"'(g) As soon as feasible after the enactment of this subsection, all assets, liabilities, income, expenses, and charges of whatever kind pertaining to informational media guaranties, including any charges against the authority to issue notes provided in section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, cumulative from the enactment of that act, shall be accounted for separately from other guaranties issued pursuant to subsection 413 (b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1933 (b)): *Provided*, That there shall be transferred from the special account established pursuant to subsection (a), into the account available for payments under guaranties other than informational media guaranties, an amount equal to the total of the fees received for the issuance of guaranties other than informational media guaranties, and used to make payments under informational media guaranties.'"

(b) Amend section 545, which relates to definitions, as follows:

(1) Add at the end of subsection (h) the following: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection (h) and for the purpose of establishing a more equitable pricing system for transactions between the military departments and the mutual defense assistance program, the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe at the earliest practicable date, through appropriate pricing regulations of uniform applicability, that the term 'value' (except in the case of excess equipment or materials) shall mean—

"(1) the price of equipment or materials obtaining for similar transactions between the Armed Forces of the United States; or

"(2) where there are no similar transactions within the meaning of paragraph (1), the gross cost to the United States adjusted as appropriate for condition and market value."

(2) Add the following new subsections:

"(j) The term 'agency administering nonmilitary assistance' shall refer to any agency to which authorities and functions under chapter 3 of title I, title II, title III, or title IV of this act are delegated or assigned pursuant to authority contained in sections 521 and 525 of this act.

"(k) The term 'officer administering nonmilitary assistance' shall refer to any officer to whom authorities and functions under chapter 3 of title I, title II, title III, or title IV of this act are delegated or assigned pursuant to authority contained in sections 521 and 525 of this act."

(c) In section 548, which relates to unexpended balances, strike out "heretofore", substitute "1957" for "1956", and strike out the colon and the remainder of the sentence following "act" the second time it appears and insert a period.

(d) Add the following new section:

"SEC. 550. Special provision on availability of funds: An amount equal to 25 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year for purposes of chapter 3 of title I, title III, or section 403 of this act is authorized to be continued available for 3 months beyond the end of the fiscal year for which appropriated."

FOREIGN RESEARCH REACTOR PROJECTS

SEC. 11. (a) As one means of furthering peaceful uses of atomic energy on an international basis, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1957 not to exceed $5,950,000 for use by the President, on such terms and conditions as he may specify, for research reactor projects undertaken or authorized by foreign governments which shall have entered into agreements for cooperation with the Government of the United States concerning the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

(b) Nothing in this section shall alter, amend, revoke, repeal, or otherwise affect the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

(c) The United States share of the cost of any reactor made available to another government or to other governments shall not exceed $350,000.

(d) In carrying out the purposes of this section the Director, the Atomic Energy Commission, and other United States departments and agencies shall give full and continuous publicity through the press, radio, and all other available media, so as to inform the peoples of the participating countries regarding the assistance, including its purpose, source, and character, furnished by the United States. Such portions of the equipment furnished under this section as may be appropriately die-stamped as a product of the United States shall be so stamped.

Mr. RICHARDS (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the rest of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the debate on the pending bill has been an enlightening one and may conceivably be viewed in the future as the beginning of a great debate on the revision of our foreign policy. As I indicated in my remarks in support of my amendment to restore a portion of the cut in title I, I do not believe that a review of our foreign policy would result in any sharp reversal, but I fully concur in the opinions expressed during the debate regarding the need of a resurvey. I am confident that this will be achieved before the 85th Congress convenes. As we conclude the discussions on this measure I wish to express my views regarding some of the more important phases of this legislation.

AMERICA'S ROLE IN THE FREE WORLD

Mr. Chairman, the current Soviet emphasis on "peaceful coexistence" must not lull us into a false sense of security. It is obvious that the Soviets are using every device to gain trade and political advantages in certain parts of the world through a stepped-up economic program that makes use of deception coupled with a propaganda drive to extend Communist influence throughout the world. The so-called lessening of tensions does not mean any lessening of the aims of international communism. As a leader of the free world, the United States must maintain its attitude of defense as well as contribute to the preservation of free countries everywhere. The theme of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party was that "the ideas of communism will triumph without war." Not only do we have to accept this fateful challenge, but we must strive to roll back whatever advances the Communists have already made. The vitality of democracy and national independence is equal to the task, provided we are aware of the challenge and organize our moral, intellectual, and material resources to meet it.

Any discussion of the Mutual Security Act should make it clear that mutual security means exactly what it says. We live in a world where no one nation has the dominant influence and all free countries are mutually interdependent. We did not seek or want the role of leader of western civilization, but this status became something of a fact before we were aware of it. We have, however, become much better conditioned for the interrelationships of the modern world than we were after the close of World War I. This maturity is now being tested in Congress, Mr. Chairman, since we are again being called upon to contribute to the military and economic potential of the free world. Every representative must undertake constantly to balance those interests that are local and regional in character and those that have a national import. And in these times as America proceeds into a crucial period of transition, accepting rather reluctantly her position as the free world's leader, there is, of course, the obligation upon all of us to think of America's greatness in terms of the welfare of other peoples, and never to measure our greatness and our progress exclusively in terms of our own narrow national interests.

It is doubtless apparent from what I have said that I believe we must not retreat. Now we have come to the position of world leadership reluctantly. The Nation is not yet fully prepared, spiritually, for it, for two oceans separate us

from the quarrels of other continents, and we still wonder why we are inevitably drawn into their conflicts. Our cultures are so different and so many of our purposes seem to conflict. Still we cannot escape them. Our advocacy of participation in world affairs is not born of an intention to serve other nations at the expense of our own, but a recognition that we are inextricably bound up with their destiny. We must not retreat, whatever the temptation, whatever the cost. We must accept as a physical fact our proximity to aggression and our identification with intended victims closest to it. Almost every Member of Congress, whatever his political preferences, recognizes this condition.

MUTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO WESTERN DEFENSE AND PROGRESS

That our assistance to other countries has not been a one-way street may be shown easily. Many of the weapons that now are an integral part of our defense were made available to us by other free nations. The British discovered the radio-locator at the beginning of World War II, which aided the American development of radar. So also was the jetplane invented in England, as well as such other useful weapons of war as the steam catapult for aircraft carriers, antisubmarine sonar weapons and the midget submarine. Just to name a few more, the Belgian automatic rifle was made available to NATO troops, as was the new British Sterling machinegun, the French Mystere plane, and the British Hawker Hunter all-weather fighter. We all know the great contributions made by foreigners in the development of atomic weapons, which now represent our first line of defense. The non-Communist world has become so intimately interrelated that the welfare of each reflects significantly on the welfare of all the rest and no one country can claim self-sufficiency.

Nowhere else is this more evident than in the field of medicine. Antitoxins were discovered by a German and a Japanese in 1890. Insulin was discovered by Frederick Grant Banting and John James Richard MacLeod in England and Canada. The first sulfa drugs were used by Gerhard Domagk on his daughter in Germany early in 1933. In 1928 Alexander Fleming of the University of London discovered penicillin, thus starting an era of "anti-biotics." DDT was synthesized by Dr. Paul Muller in Switzerland in the autumn of 1939. I could go on and on down the pages of medical history to show that the health and welfare of the United States have been advanced by discoveries made in many countries.

THE PERIL IS STILL GREAT

Aggression still threatens. Although great strides have been made since the end of World War II, we are still confronted by totalitarianism. The Mutual Security bill as reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee authorizes $1,925 million for military assistance to our allies and $1,147 million for defense support. These are large sums but are a small price to pay when we realize the alternatives. The Communists would not hesitate to employ physical force or other means of undermining independent governments if they thought we had weakened our defenses sufficiently. The loss of any substantial territory in Asia, Africa, Europe, or even South America would lead to catastrophic results for America. Not only would our standard of living sag, but our ability to defend ourselves would be gravely diminished. So also would our liberties be increasingly sacrificed to the harsh demands of a garrison state.

If many peoples are drawn into a closer political and economic relationship with the Soviet Union, then eventually we would be cut off from the essential raw materials we need to keep our economy running. We are already importing 50 percent of the industrial raw materials required by our expanding industrial machine. We have recently become quite aware that 80 percent of all the oil in the non-Communist world is concentrated within 300 miles of the Persian Gulf. A complete survey of our domestic economic needs would reveal that the expenditure of $3.07 billion raised from our traditional revenue source is a small sacrifice indeed compared to the havoc that would be caused by the stoppage of international trade with countries now menaced by the Communists.

Figures presented to the Foreign Affairs Committee reveal that the NATO countries make a great effort to provide military equipment for their own defense. NATO members have contributed of their own resources about 85 percent of the total cost of the European buildup. Funds from the United States sent through the military assistance program have made up the difference of only 15 percent. Our percentage has currently been decreasing. While the defense expenditures of most European countries represent a smaller percentage of their gross national product than does that of the United States (about 10 percent) the per capita incomes of the others are much lower and the sacrifice is somewhat greater. As General Gruenther pointed out, "one NATO country has an average income of $175 per person per year. By the same method of figuring, the average income in the United States is $2,000 per person per year. Should the basis of contribution be $175 to $2,000?" Certainly the United States must not permit itself to become the leader in reducing expenditures in the face of possible slackening efforts by our allies. We must show our determination to continue our assistance to those who have provided us with strong defensive outposts.

RESPECT FOR NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY AND FREEDOM

One major problem in providing foreign aid is the tendency of the countries of the free world to arrive at mutually contradictory policies. A hazard of freedom that we cheerfully accept is the strain on free world unity caused by national sovereignty. We all know that such strains can be converted into our greatest asset, but in the short run, we must be patient and understanding. We cannot expect to buy the loyalty of any nation or people with aid dollars, no matter how many we spend, or as Chester Bowles expressed it "It is also folly to assume that simply by filling people's stomachs we can automatically turn them into believers in liberal democracy, American brand." Assuming that we have provided for the necessary defense potential, the primary purpose of our economic assistance program should be to help new and struggling nations to create societies which offer a steadily expanding measure of justice and opportunity. We must not demand a uniformity of outlook among the recipients of our aid. It is enough to contribute to the growth of stability and security throughout the non-Communist world. While we are obviously spending large sums to support our allies' defenses and economies, we are also aware of the need to win the respect of all the world's free peoples.

The strengthening of military alliances as such is not the only objective of our foreign aid program. We must constantly reappraise our collective security system to determine how effective and reliable it is. Meanwhile, we seek to provide such countries as India and Indonesia with the help they need to improve the standards of living of their peoples. It should not be difficult for us to understand the desire of nations newly independent, free for the first time in modern history from colonial domination, to have a large degree of independence in their foreign policies. We have also learned that the neglect of have-not nations will only create problems for other regions of the world. Mr. J. D. Zellerbach, chairman of the Committee for Economic Development and one of the leading industrialists of the United States, points out that "foreign aid is not a device for rewarding those governments which agree with us and punishing those which do not." As he sees it:

> You do not initiate and develop an economic policy to produce shiploads of gratitude. You do so to produce shiploads of food and machinery . . . our economic policy was never meant to create expressions of appreciation but to serve serious objectives of mutual interest.

A resident of one of the emerging new nations of the Old World indicated this point of view in answer to the question of an American: "What do you expect of us?" "Respect and rice," he said, adding "and in that order."

UNITED STATES MORAL LEADERSHIP

This leads us to a realistic assessment of the role the United States must play in western civilization. I would like to quote from a speech I made some time ago:

> We must not undertake to dominate the world. Now we have the power, of course, to do great things for all the nations of the world, and sometimes when the requirements seem to overwhelm us, we must remember that our capacity industrially is stupendous. Paul Hoffman gave us this charting of progress recently: Just 50 years ago, America had 6 percent of the world's population and was producing 20 percent of its wealth. Today, with 7 percent, just a little more of its population, we are producing not 20 percent but about 50 percent of its goods, and so by reason of our tremendous material and physical strength we are preeminently the world's leader. The important thing, however, is

that we match these enormous industrial powers with a moral leadership that is commensurate.

We cannot limit ourselves to proposing a policy of foreign aid solely to prevent Russian aggression. We must seek to assist other countries to achieve common ends by means of fostering common values. There are over 1 billion people living in the so-called neutralist countries who are today fully aware of the opportunities for economic advancement available to them through employment of modern technology. Our economic policy must be designed to win their confidence and prove to them the superiority of our way of life.

Woodrow Wilson said that "America was created to unite mankind." And with this purpose in mind, his urgent advice was for Americans not only to think of America, but in order to be truly American, "always, also, to think first of humanity." He warned us that if we seceded from the emerging world community, "there will come, sometime, in the vengeful providence of God, another struggle in which not a few hundred thousand fine men from America will have to die, but as many millions as are necessary to accomplish the final freedom of the peoples of the world." Now that we are aware of our international responsibility, we find the totalitarian Soviet Union offering a fraudulent but rather persuasive vision to much of the world. We can and must win this ideological struggle by proving to the disadvantaged people of the world that the American way of life means self-determination, human dignity, expanding opportunities, and peace. In this way, whatever material assistance we offer will be recognized as part of a genuine effort to assure the preservation and the ultimate expansion throughout the world of the spirit of liberal democracy with its primary regard for the dignity and integrity of man.

If we put into our world leadership this greater moral concept, the 20th century can be ours, just as the 19th century was Britain's. As one of my good friends said, "I am sure it will either be ours or Russia's." If we claim it, it must be said, too, that it was humanity's century. Just as Great Britain, supplying the leadership that seemed essential to holding the world together, gave it the impress of freedom of international commerce, so America in the 20th century must give it the impress of spiritual greatness. I am sure of that.

I believe that out of new devotions to these common ends—the attainment of justice and liberty, the achievement of the rule of law in our world—there will be the grandest demonstration of faith that a people ever had. The tax burdens that Congress places on our citizens for these purposes are heavy and they pain every sensitive person in the Congress, but we must believe that these sacrifices are the only basis for a hope that there can be a world united—if not in our time, in some future period. International aspirations are consistent with the truest nationalism as America knows it. As Lincoln said, it is here that "we may meanly lose or nobly save the last best hope of earth."

Now that a form of military stalemate can be maintained through a sustained defense effort, the ideological dimensions of the Soviet challenge achieve new importance. The Communists are placing renewed emphasis upon propaganda and economic programs, and the United States must not neglect this aspect of Soviet aggression. The United States delegation to the United Nations Assembly of 1955 prepared a statement urging that our own policies be reassessed in the light of this move. We said at that time:

> We believe that the United States must counter these Soviet efforts. We can succeed not by outbidding communism in sheer amounts of economic aid, but by making newly independent and newly articulate peoples feel that they can best satisfy their wants by becoming and remaining part of the community of free nations.
>
> We welcome more emphasis on economic and educational endeavors, for we have a proven experience in these fields.
>
> We are in a contest in the field of economic development of underdeveloped countries which is bitterly competitive. Defeat in this contest could be as disastrous as defeat in an armaments race.
>
> We could lose this economic contest unless the country as a whole wakes up to all its implications.

With special regard to the problems of Asia, Mr. J. A. Villamor, a native of the Philippines but a naturalized American citizen and a lieutenant colonel in our Air Force Reserve, a man of wide military, political, and diplomatic experience in the Orient, has this to say:

> Many times the failures of our foreign aid have been due to our own unrestrained, let's-go spirit; our we-know-what's-good-for-you-better-than-you-do approach; our heavy dependence on material things to answer needs that are often largely spiritual; and worst of all perhaps, our tendency to forget the human problems—of peoples with hearts, minds, and souls, as well as stomachs, just like the peoples of the West.
>
> In my opinion, our foreign aid ought to be directed more to the needs of the underdeveloped peoples as they see their needs, not as we see them.
>
> The importance of paying attention to the attitudes of the people of Asia cannot be overemphasized. To ignore their attitudes, to interpret them only by western standards, to base policies and programs on one-way precepts—this is just about the fastest and surest way to bankrupt American policy in Asia.

Thus an adequate, long-range program of assistance, intelligently keyed to the political and ideological as well as the economic realities of the underdeveloped continents, is essential to our national objectives.

CONTINUING AID

Mr. Chairman, such a program of economic assistance cannot be considered as a temporary thing, or stop-gap against the advance of communism. I wish I might be convincing on this matter of continuing the responsibility of Congress to provide economic aid. We are not doing this because we are being pressured or are fearful, but because such aid is a fundamental part of our long-term foreign policy. I believe that if we were less favored industrially we would also argue that the productive nations have an obligation to provide economic help. The authorization for development assistance is $243 million. This is relatively small compared with the total MSA authorization and a minute percentage of our defense budget. With these funds we help to advance the standards of living in Asia, Africa, and Latin America so that the current gap is at least held constant and possibly improved.

The Soviet Union is now engaged in an all-out effort to use its diplomatic, propaganda, and economic power to attract new subjects, to weaken and divide the free world, and to isolate the United States. It is obvious that the emphasis on peace and relaxation of tensions is basic to the success of this policy. We must not permit ourselves to be deceived into thinking that this new economic warfare is any less dangerous than the old conventional warfare, and we must therefore apply our unique abilities and our resources to speed up free world economic growth and development. The basic obstacle to that growth is the shortage of investment capital available to underdeveloped countries. While we should do much to encourage private long-term low-interest loans in these countries, we must recognize the tremendous need for "infrastructures," the fundamental building blocks of an economy—transportation, power, other utilities, irrigation, basic agricultural industry, and so forth—which can only be created with public capital provided by the "have" countries.

When the proper political stability and favorable industrial environment are achieved, then private capital should be able to supply the funds necessary for the profitmaking enterprises. Until then the United States Government should accept the obligation to bolster the economies of the have-not countries with the financial assistance they need. Such assistance should not be in response to the challenge of Soviet promises, but rather in terms of a positive policy of foreign aid, based on the consistent development of a long-term program to raise the productive potential of the free world. Only in this way shall we be able to avoid a repetition of the experience of the Afghanistan Helmand Valley irrigation project. An ill-conceived attempt to win the support of this politically strategic area, this project was not carefully thought out and the extravagant expenditures there have succeeded only in causing a major political crisis. With professional planning of a balanced economic-aid program, we will provide for the kind of economic development that includes the close participation and training of the people we wish to benefit. We would then gain friends and lovers of freedom by the manner in which we present our defense and economic development programs.

TECHNICAL COOPERATION

It is not enough to provide economic development assistance to the underdeveloped countries of the free world. One of the most difficult problems that face the underdeveloped countries in their efforts to improve the living conditions of their people is the urgent need for acquisition and dissemination of

basic technical knowledge. In the process of economic development, the solution of this problem ranks equally in importance with that of mobilizing the resources necessary to carry out large investment programs. Without such technical knowledge, nations cannot really begin to extract the potential benefits from capital investment. The total authorization for both bilateral and multilateral technical assistance in this bill is $157,500,000. I can think of no money better spent for the purpose of raising the living standards of other nations. While I will consider the problem of whether more money should be channeled through the U. N. in a short while, I should like to point out here that striking contributions to human welfare have been made by our point 4 experts throughout the world. We should all be very proud of the pioneer part the United States has played in the development of the idea of organized exchange of technical knowledge in the international area; we have now reached the stage where this type of assistance can really begin to pay full dividends in terms of free world economic health.

THE MIDDLE EAST

This general discussion of the benefits of our mutual-security program to our freedom-loving friends and world neighbors should not overlook the existence of various "malignancies" around the globe. Grave dangers exist in the Middle East, and the greatest threat to peace arises there. While strategic considerations are obviously of prime importance, we can readily see that the basic cause of the disturbances is economic. We must, of course, do everything in our power to prevent the outbreak of hostilities in the immediate future, but, in the long run, peace in the Middle East is dependent on political and economic stability and security. We are prepared to offer the economic and technical assistance that will aid in gradually raising the living conditions of the area to an adequate level. In the meantime, we shall maintain an attitude of friendship to all the peoples of the region, seeking to arrive at a peaceful and equitable settlement of Arab-Israeli differences through the United Nations. Above all, we will strive to repel the penetration of Communist influences which seek to inflame passions and stir up enmities. There is no other course available to us that will achieve these ends better than contributing to the establishment of strong independent nations, whose peoples are secure, well trained, and well fed.

NATO PROBLEM

We have all recently noticed the increased concern of our allies and our own Government over the effectiveness of NATO. Secretary of State Dulles suggested in Paris at the meeting of the NATO foreign ministers that article II of the treaty be used to give the Organization new life. This would mean employing the NATO machinery to administer economic aid. While there is much to be said for such an expansion of NATO activities, the important thing to realize is that the United States is giving consideration to multilateral means of assisting other nations. That the Atlantic alliance needs strengthening is possibly true, but we must also give long consideration and thought to the problems that would arise if NATO, primarily a military organization, were to be projected into the economic development of unalined countries of Asia and Africa, such as Burma, Egypt, India, and Indonesia.

MULTILATERAL AID

When we talk about the need for multilateral aid for underdeveloped countries, we must always remember that bilateral American aid is not to be contrasted with multilateral U. N. aid. What we are striving for is simply the most effective means of using our foreign-aid money. Both bilateral and multilateral aid should be coordinated to achieve overall economic development in a given region. We need to coordinate our assistance efforts so that they are on a regional and functional basis—that we aid many countries in one area, and that this aid include many operations which transcend borderlines. Thus, not only the U. N. but also the Organization for American States is an international device for getting several countries to consider the same problems. In the report on the 10th General Assembly of the U. N. that Mr. Merrow and I filed with the Congress we did point out that:

It is urgently necessary that in the future we make far greater use of the United Nations system for foreign aid than we have in the past. This would not mean an increased amount of money appropriated for foreign aid but, rather, the channeling of a part of existing appropriations through United Nations machinery.

Some will say that such sponsorship does not give us the advertising and goodwill that bilateral programs provide. However, we would point out that the basic reason for our program of economic assistance is not to purchase affection but rather to strengthen the free world, eliminating the vacuums of weakness into which the Soviet power is trying to move.

We do not, of course, overlook the factor of goodwill, but the leaders of the nations, even the so-called underdeveloped ones, know where help is coming from, and even though the goods are not clearly identified as being of American origin, we believe the people of those countries discern and appreciate our help.

U. N. PROPOSALS FOR DEVELOPMENT

The proposal for the creation of a Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development—SUNFED—reflects the increasingly strong world sentiment in favor of some type of multilateral aid. We voted for the resolution at the U. N. which created an ad hoc committee to carry on the orderly exploration of various relevant ideas and suggestions to establish an international development fund. We believe it premature to try at this time to define precisely what should be the organization and operation of the proposed fund. Heretofore our representations as to such aid have been linked to a worldwide system of disarmament, so that we could use some of the savings thus effected, without remaining inflexible about this mutual connection. As I said then, however:

We feel there is an inherent and logical relationship between an effective move to relieve the world of the heavy burden of armaments on the one hand and an effective effort to use large additional resources to promote human well-being on the other.

With regard to the technical assistance aspects of this program, I believe—that no genuine economic development can take place unless the people concerned work it out for themselves. The goal of the technical-assistance program is to bring out latent aptitudes and skills. Sometimes this means teaching completely new skills. At other times it may mean only helping people recapture skills lost or forgotten because of the tragedies of war, economic misfortune, or physical adversities. In either case technical assistance is the most direct way of helping people help themselves to improve their economic lot. For the future of both economic and technical aid, I wrote Secretary Dulles that in my work in the General Assembly I was struck by the extent to which many of the underdeveloped countries about which we are most concerned would prefer to be helped through the United Nations rather than to receive bilateral assistance which they may view as having "strings attached." This feeling is so strong in many cases as to amount almost to an obsession. Whether we agree with it or not, we must recognize that it exists.

Without abandoning the bilateral programs for economic aid and technical assistance by which we contributed much to raising living standards of other nations we should channel an increased percentage of our aid through the United Nations. We can avoid some of the misunderstandings and misinterpretations by taking this course and we will be more effective in working toward economic goals that are essential to world stability. Francis O. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary of State, who by reason of his legislative experience retains a strong influence on Capitol Hill, testified before the Foreign Affairs Committee that he does not subscribe to the belief held by some that the United States does not benefit as much through its contributions to multilateral activities as through its direct bilateral aid. As he put it "our vigorous support of these popular multilateral programs has been well received by all free countries and has gained for this country a goodwill which I firmly believe could not be developed to as great an extent in any other way. It is an effective answer to Communist propaganda charges that we are seeking to dominate countries in which we have bilateral programs. It is further evidence of our genuine interest in helping to promote the economic development of newly developing countries." In the context of our relations with other governments, the work of United Nations technical assistance has been increasing steadily in significance. It is furnishing a striking demonstration of the potential effectiveness of multilateral action in the economic and social fields. Experts from some 60 nations are working all over the world to bring knowledge of better methods of doing things to people who are eager to learn. These experts are employed by the international organizations of which the newly developing countries are members. This is rather a unique program of organized self-help, certainly the first of its kind to be established on an international organization basis.

FURTHER STUDIES

The difficulties which have arisen in the formation and administration of a consistent foreign-aid policy indicate that there is great need for further studies in this area. One possible method of reassessment would be the establishment of a joint congressional committee on foreign aid "to conduct a thorough factfinding study and investigation of the operation of the foreign-aid programs of the United States in the

past and present," as proposed by Mr. HARRISON of Virginia and Mrs. CHURCH of Illinois. Independent studies by the Foreign Affairs Committee would also prove to be extremely helpful.

Another means of revamping our foreign economic policy is the examination of professional reports, such as the recent one prepared by Profs. Max Millikan and W. W. Rostow, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Center for International Studies. The proposals that these scholars of foreign affairs have made, such as creating a long-term capital fund, enlarging international flows of private capital, establishing international stocks of agricultural surpluses, and so forth, should be given the closest study, and the Congress should be prepared to adopt significant revisions in our current programs, when the studies reveal better ways of achieving our goal of strengthening the free world.

WHAT WE NEED TO DO NOW

Until we have obtained the revised foreign economic policy we seek, however, we must evaluate the current MSA bill in terms of its relation to what we now recognize as essential. The provisions of this act do enable us to help the newly independent countries of Asia, the Middle East, and Africa with their economic development, as well as contribute to the military defense of the free world. The case for foreign aid is still a very strong one, however imperfect the present mechanisms may be, and the money requested will do much to tip the balance in freedom's favor in the countries assisted.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANFUSO: Page 23, after line 21, add the following new section:

"FREE WORLD ORGANIZATION

"SEC. 12. (a) There is hereby created as an agency of the United States of America a body corporate with the name of 'The Free World Organization' (in this section called the 'Organization').

"(b) The purposes of this corporation are (1) to further the general welfare of, and to strengthen friendship and understanding between, the American people and the peoples of the world, (2) to aid people desiring freedom and independence to achieve that goal, and (3) to assist the forces of freedom throughout the world, through collaboration with governments and governmental agencies and individuals, corporations, private agencies, and other bodies of private persons in planning, initiating, assisting, financing, administering, and executing plans, programs, and projects, especially in the cultural, agricultural, educational, social and political fields.

"(c) The Organization, as a corporation—

"(1) Shall have succession for a period of 5 years unless sooner dissolved by an act of Congress.

"(2) May adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

"(3) May make and perform contracts with any individual, corporation, or other body of persons however designated, whether within or without the United States of America, and with any government or governmental agency, domestic or foreign.

"(4) Shall determine and prescribe the manner in which its obligations shall be incurred and its expenses allowed and paid.

"(5) May as necessary for the transaction of the business of the Organization, employ officers, employees, agents, and attorneys in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service and classification laws, except that the Organization may, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, employ, and fix the compensation of, officers, employees, agents, and attorneys of the Organization employed for service outside the continental limits of the United States: *Provided*, That the salary of any person thus employed shall not exceed the maximum salary established by the classification laws, and that the Organization may require bonds of any employee and pay the premiums of such bonds: *Provided further*, That no person who is a citizen of the United States shall be employed under authority of this paragraph (5) until such person has been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation: *Provided further*, That no person not a citizen of the United States shall be employed under authority of this paragraph (5) for service in any country of which such person is not a citizen except with the approval of the Central Intelligence Agency.

"(6) May acquire by purchase, devise, bequest, or gift, or otherwise, lease, hold, and improve such real and personal property as it finds to be necessary to its purposes, whether within or without the United States, and in any manner dispose of all such real and personal property held by it and as general funds all receipts arising from the disposition of such property.

"(7) Shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner and on the same conditions as the executive departments of the Government.

"(8) May, with the consent of any board, corporation, commission, independent establishment, or executive department of the Government, including any field service thereof, avail itself of the use of information, services, facilities, officers, and employees thereof in carrying out the provisions of this section.

"(9) May accept money, funds, property, and services of every kind by gift, devise, or bequest, or grant, or otherwise, and make advances and grants to any individual, corporation, or other body of persons, whether within or without the United States of America, or to any government or governmental agency, domestic or foreign, when deemed advisable by the Organization in furtherance of its purposes.

"(10) May sue and be sued, complain, and defend, in its corporate name in any court of competent jurisdiction.

"(11) Shall have such other powers as may be necessary and incident to carrying out its powers and duties under this section.

"(d) Upon termination of the corporate life of the Organization all of its functions shall be liquidated and, thereafter, unless otherwise provided by Congress, the assets shall be transferred to the United States Treasury as the property of the United States.

"(e) (1) The management of the Organization shall be vested in a board of directors (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board'), 9 in number, 5 of whom shall be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, 2 of whom shall be Members of the House of Representatives, 1 from each of the 2 major political parties, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and 2 of whom shall be Members of the Senate, 1 from each of the 2 major political parties, appointed by the Vice President of the United States.

"(2) The President shall designate one Director as Chairman of the Board.

"(3) The Directors shall hold office at the pleasure of the President.

"(4) The Directors shall receive no additional compensation for their services as Directors, but may be allowed actual necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as Directors.

"(5) The Board shall direct the exercise of all the powers of the Organization.

"(6) The Board may prescribe, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which the business of the Organization may be conducted and in which the powers granted to it by law may be exercised and enjoyed: *Provided*, That a majority of the Board shall be required as a quorum.

"(7) In furtherance and not in limitation of the powers conferred upon it, the Board may appoint such committees for the carrying out of the work of the Organization as the Board finds to be in the best interests of the Organization, each committee to consist of two or more of the Directors, which committees, together with officers and agents duly authorized by the Board and to the extent provided by the Board, shall have and may exercise the powers of the Board in the management of the business and affairs of the Organization.

"(f) The Organization shall be a nonprofit corporation and shall have no capital stock. No part of its revenue, earnings, or other income or property shall inure to the benefit of its Directors, officers, and employees, and such revenue, earnings, or other income, or property, shall be used for the carrying out of the corporate purposes herein set forth. No Director, officer, or employee of the Corporation shall in any manner directly or indirectly participate in the deliberation upon or the determination of any question affecting his personal interests or the interests of any corporation, partnership, or organization in which he is directly or indirectly interested.

"(g) When approved by the Organization, in furtherance of its purposes, the officers and employees of the Organization may accept and hold offices or positions to which no compensation is attached with governments and governmental or private agencies of the other nations.

"(h) The President shall have authority to detail employees of the executive branch of the Government to the Organization under such circumstances and upon such conditions as he may determine: *Provided*, That any such employee so detailed shall not lose any privileges, rights, or seniority as an employee of the Government by virtue of such detail.

"(i) The principal office of the Organization shall be located in the District of Columbia, but there may be established agencies, branch offices, or other offices in any place or places within the United States or within any other country in any of which locations the Organization may carry on all or any of its operations and business under bylaws or rules and regulations.

"(j) The Organization, including its franchise and income, shall be exempt from taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, or any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority. Any contribution or gift made by a taxpayer to or for the use of the Organization shall, for purposes of subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, be considered a charitable contribution (as defined in section 170 (c) of such code) and allowed as a deduction from gross income under section 170 (a) of such code without regard to any of the limitations contained in section 170 (b) of such code.

"(k) The right to alter, amend, or repeal this section is hereby expressly reserved. If any clause, sentence, paragraph, or part of this section shall for any reason be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this section, but shall be confined in its operations to the clause, sentence, paragraph, or part thereof directly involved in the controversy

in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

"(1) The Organization shall be subject to the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act (Public Law 248, 79th Cong.).

"(m) There are authorized to be appropriated, at a rate not to exceed $100 million annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

"(n) This section may be cited as the 'Free World Organization Act.'"

Mr. RICHARDS (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman——

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I waive further reading of the amendment but ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in full in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes to explain the amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman does not mean he wants 5 additional minutes at this time, does he?

Mr. ANFUSO. Yes, I do; I want 10 minutes in all.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANFUSO. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. I would just like to say that the gentleman's amendment is very extensive. I realize that the gentleman has made very extensive studies of this question but the Foreign Affairs Committee has not been able to go into it fully.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 12 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like 15 seconds to ask the gentleman 1 question.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 12 minutes and 15 seconds.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to carry out the intention of Congress as expressed in section 7 of this act.

I want to make it clear at the beginning of my remarks that I believe in foreign aid as a necessary part of our national security, but I do not believe in wasting the American taxpayers' money. I wish to thank my good friend, Chairman RICHARDS, of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and all of the members of that committee who worked diligently on this bill, and I sincerely hope that they will, as well as all the other Members of the House, give serious consideration to the remarks I am about to make.

For a long time I have felt that our foreign-aid program has been in many respects haphazard and that it has not gained for us the friends and allies we had hoped to gain through it. Many countries have accepted our money and our aid which, since July 1, 1943, has amounted to over $54 billion in grants—equivalent to about $323 for every American man, woman, and child—and yet some of these countries have either become Communist or Communist sympathizers. Yugoslavia stands out as a sore thumb in my mind and I am glad of the stand we took today.

I ask my colleagues how do you think other countries, or better still, how do you think organizations and people in other friendly countries feel when we give more aid to our enemies than we do to our friends? The answer is simple. They think we are just plain stupid.

Now I do not believe in giving anything away—not even to our friends. We are engaged in a death struggle which is serious business and we must, therefore, be practical at all times, and not give away one single dollar unless we get a return for it. Frankly, I would not give Tito anything because I do not trust him. I will vote for this additional help if the President wants it, but I wish to make it crystal clear that Mr. Tito should not receive one red cent more until he at least manifests a feeling of neutrality. Perhaps it might be a good idea to invite him here and show him the facts of life. His acceptance of such an invitation extended either by the President of the United States or the Secretary of State could be made advantageous to us from a propaganda point of view.

Remember my friends, Soviet Russia, as you very well know, has never given anything away. Before she makes a grant or sells arms or machinery she demands stiff concessions even from her satellites, and in all cases makes certain that she obtains her pound of flesh.

I believe that for the future security of our country and the world, we must adopt a more realistic attitude in our foreign-aid program. The best way I know of doing this is to pass the amendment I have proposed to aid the people and certain organizations in foreign countries who have demonstrated their friendship to us and their opposition to communism. To do otherwise is foolhardy and a waste of our taxpayers' money. The amendment I propose will authorize the President of the United States to extend direct aid to our friends and organizations in foreign countries who are allied with us and who are bent on preventing the spread of communism.

This is American aid given by Americans to Americans to be distributed among our friends who are joined in the cold war against Soviet Russia.

That is the way Russia is fighting the cold war, by giving her aid to Communists to be distributed among those people in a country willing to adopt their philosophy and work against the best interests of the United States.

Some people may perhaps say that this amounts to interference with the internal policies of other countries, but as I have said Soviet Russia has been doing exactly that ever since World War II ended. She has been giving direct aid to the Communist parties and Communist front organizations in Italy, France, Germany, India, and many other countries.

Only a fool or a Communist would protest our fighting fire with fire. Foreign policy must envision the times. What was acceptable 100 years ago may not be suitable today, especially when our potential enemies have developed entirely different tools of operation.

Some of our American newspapers conscious of the developments throughout the world have asked these questions:

First. Does our foreign-aid program provide adequate means of meeting the new Soviet economic charge?

Second. Are parts of it geared to an outmoded concept?

Third. Are we using the right methods—the right tools?

Foreigners regard Americans as great businessmen, especially when it comes to developing individual enterprises, but they are not regarded as good businessmen when it comes to handling the great business of our country.

Now for the amendment which I have proposed, there is ample precedent. In the 80th Congress we passed Public Law 361, creating the institute of inter-American affairs, establishing a similar corporation "to further the general welfare of and to strengthen friendship and understanding among the peoples of the American Republics."

Throughout the world Soviet Russia is financially supporting newspapers and periodicals to carry out an effective program against the United States and to win peoples and countries over to them. We certainly can do a similar job and I am certain that the free world organization which I propose be created will attract private capital to assist in the support of newspapers and periodicals in foreign countries espousing the cause of freedom. The free world organization can assist private organizations spreading the culture of a free people. In the long run the free world organization will more than support itself and lessen the burden of the American taxpayer. The funds expended will be directed exclusively against our common enemy, and not a single penny will be wasted. It will give stability and strength to our allies. The entire world will have greater respect for us for being more realistic and practical. The friends we have will remain with us and we will make new friends at all times.

In conclusion, I wish to state that I do not want to be critical of this administration or any past administration. Every President of the United States is, first of all, an American President and he wishes to do the right thing at all times. It is for this reason that I regard it as absolutely safe to place the control of the free world organization in the hands of the Chief Executive who, as the amendment provides, has full authority to detail employees of the execu-

tive branch to the organization under such conditions as he may determine.

Another thing my amendment does is to give Congress a "look-in" in these foreign-aid programs because it provides for membership on the 9-member board of 2 Senators and 2 Representatives, 1 of each political party.

Members of Congress should have a "look-in" on these programs because besides being statesmen, as I know you are, you are also practical politicans. If the methods you use to get elected can be applied in other countries to elect leaders sympathetic to our cause the security of the United States and the world will be further guaranteed.

I urge my colleagues not to treat this amendment lightly, but to debate it as long as possible. Our people realize, perhaps more than we think, that the Communists are fighting for keeps and either our way of life or theirs will prevail. If we can destroy Communist philosophy and thinking through effective grants and propaganda, we can prevent the final showdown without the necessity of another world war which, as we all know, would be destructive of all mankind.

I ask of the chairman that this amendment be not treated lightly. It should have been fully debated, because if we can destroy Communist philosophy through effective grants and propaganda, such as this provides, we can prevent the final showdown without the necessity of another world war, which, as we all know, would be destructive of all mankind.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANFUSO. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I want to compliment my colleague on the thought and the work he put into this proposal. I think it is worthy of further consideration by the committee and the Congress.

Mr. ANFUSO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANFUSO. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. We have heard these words "free world" kicked around all over the lot for the last several days. Just what is the free world?

Mr. ANFUSO. Well, I think I explained that a free world is the kind of a world that fits our form of government as against communism.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I assure my dear friend from New York that his amendment will not be treated lightly. It will be taken into consideration and studied by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. But it covers so much territory that I am sure we could not properly consider it here this afternoon, certainly not sufficiently to endorse it and place it in this bill. But I do want to commend the gentleman for his thinking and for his work.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANFUSO. Would you promise to consider it soon? I do want you to consider it properly.

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not want to get tied up in too many promises, but I assure you it will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I assure you of that.

Mr. ANFUSO. And that it will be considered soon; not next year but during this session?

Mr. RICHARDS. And will be considered soon.

Mr. ANFUSO. All right.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 515, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the bill be postponed until Monday next, when it will be the first order of business.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts to go over until Monday next?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; that is in accordance with the understanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, seemingly endless debate, pro and con, drones on and on. At this writing, 3 days of debate have elapsed, with more to come. This lengthy debate is in itself unusual, perhaps demonstrating the nationwide controversy over United States money sent abroad. Many strong views are expressed, only a few Members are objective and dispassionate. Now, here's a ringside digest, brief necessarily—you weigh the arguments.

First the facts: The original $4.9 billion foreign-aid request was cut $1,109,000,000 by the Foreign Affairs Committee. Even so the present bill provides $860 million more than last year. The Mutual Security Act includes 19 programs involving 54 countries of direct aid and 4 programs, through the U. N., affecting 79 nations. Actually, all this money is economic aid strengthening military defense. This huge sum is in addition to the amounts already appropriated this year; namely, $36 billion for defense and $2.9 billion in worldwide military public-works programs.

Arguments for: Foreign aid is needed for the preservation of peace, to combat communism, and must continue while communism is a threat. Foreign aid promotes our own security by giving other peoples the capacity to defend themselves. If other nations defend their own freedom they are at the same time protecting our freedom. Therefore, foreign aid is in our own enlightened self-interest. We need our allies more than they need us; the United States total cost will be greater for our defense if foreign aid is curtailed. Our past program obviously has been successful since Russia has undertaken extending foreign aid. Also, criticism of United States aid could even be Communist inspired. Yugoslavia should receive our continued aid in order to provoke other satellites to break with Russia. India's economy should be bolstered by the United States to compete with Russia's development of China, India's neighbor. Otherwise India will turn to Russia.

Arguments against: The foreign aid program has become too complex. So there is no accurate accounting and bookkeeping. It is too big for thorough understanding. Most dangerous of all, some information is classified as secret, which prevents Congress even knowing the facts and in effect results in Congress being asked to sign a blank check. In United States policy, or lack of policy, in dispensing lavish material aid in the past, there is a failure to sell American ideals and beliefs abroad or to prevent a spread of communism. Our policy is negative, based on fear of communism. Also, in support of the free world we failed to stipulate what recipient nations are expected to do in order to keep the world free. We are bolstering certain governments we should not: Yugoslavia is not our friend and here we are supporting communism; India is not neutral but favors Russia and here we are supporting socialism. Are we arming future enemies under the guise of neutrality? The weakening of United States economy by huge financial expenditures is dangerous; our bankruptcy is the Communist' goal. Our program has failed to develop an adequate defense posture against Soviet military power and has failed to reach the people themselves in underdeveloped nations. Study of our past efforts uncover unwise programing, unsound fiscal practices and lack of understanding in our execution in foreign nations. For these reasons the Hoover Commission advised of the urgent need for a complete study of the program. At least 2 years of military aid money is still on hand unspent, "in the pipeline," without any further appropriation.

NOW, WHAT DO YOU THINK?

Here's what I think—again, necessarily stated too briefly in this space: The many conflicting statements and bookkeeping errors involving hundreds of millions prove the program now needs overhauling. It is high time to revalue this program. In addition to the $38.9 billion for defense here and abroad already voted this year, there is still enough money on hand for 2½ years expenditures in foreign aid at the current

rate. I believe the time has come for the American people to make it plain to the world that we cannot support the world, nor help those who will not, or reluctantly, help themselves. I criticized Congress for debating for too long over how much aid rather than any aid, and the loss of congressional control now over our foreign aid expenditures. A highlight of debate was Chairman RICHARD's denunciation of the joint stand by Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Minority Leader JOE MARTIN when they championed the full amount for foreign aid. Mr. RICHARDS said that they are repudiating the action of a House committee and surrendering to the executive department without facts and figures in a matter about which they do not know. India and Yugoslavia should not be given any aid it seems to me. Most important, it is impossible to cast a vote conscientiously for this program when for reasons of secrecy I, as your Congressman, have not even been given the facts. This reason alone would preclude my voting for this bill. Who could do otherwise?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, in debate last week one of my colleagues said that when a man goes into the Army he quickly loses some constitutional rights that he normally has as a civilian. This is true to a minor degree. The Constitution itself makes an exception of cases arising in the land or naval forces. Is this to be considered as justification for stripping him completely of all constitutional rights when he is serving in the Armed Forces abroad? His brothers in arms who are fortunate enough to remain in this country still have the rights given them by the Constitution, and enumerated explicitly in the Uniform Manual of Courts-Martial.

There are some who still insist that a trial in a foreign court does not deprive an accused American of any of his rights. This is because the enumerated safeguards in article VII of the Status of Forces Agreement are deceptive. It is unnecessary to belabor this point because the Judge Advocate General of the Army has already determined what rights may be lost. I quote from the study made by him of the laws of France:

Certain guaranties are absent in general or specific terms from French law, and the provisions of the code, with experience derived from practice, reveal that there is some likelihood that they may be denied the accused in certain cases in France. They are:

1. Prompt and speedy trial.

2. Privilege of suspect or accused to be silent, burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt on government, presumption of innocence.

3. Guaranty of confrontation by witnesses.

4. Involuntary confessions prohibited.

The proponents of the status agreements have been quick to say that an accused does not have a trial by jury in our military courts. They overlook the similarity in procedure, though by another name. Trial is before a board which can be composed of both officers and enlisted men. The accused has the right to challenge any member of the panel for cause. He has one peremptory challenge. There is no such right in a foreign court.

Critics of our court-martial system also ignore the elaborate system of review and appeal, even to the President. The rights of appeal abroad are only apparent. Servicemen hesitate to appeal because their sentence may be increased. Right now, in France, an appeal is pending in an airman's case, brought by the prosecution for the sole purpose of increasing the penalty imposed.

Mr. Speaker, several times in debate recently, mention has been made in the House of the case in Japan in which the Fuquoka District Court ordered Capt. Lincoln MacKay, liaison officer of the Itazuke Air Base, to reemploy four Japanese who had been discharged for security reasons, and later rendered judgment against Captain MacKay for the amount of their wages had they been working.

I have been fortunate to receive a copy of the court's opinion, and I wish to call attention to one paragraph therein.

(a) An armed force constitutes the fighting power of a country and is a symbol of its dignity. Consequently, it is a well-established rule of international law that an armed force stationed in a foreign country in accordance with a treaty is not subject to civil or criminal jurisdiction of the receiving state. Neither are members of the armed forces subject to the jurisdiction thereof for acts performed in furtherance of official duty, that is, the acts done in the performance of official duty whether such acts were done within the area of their station (barracks) or outside such area. However, stationing of a foreign armed force has considerable effects upon the sovereign rights of the receiving state, and upon the rights of the people thereof. Therefore, it is customary that the fundamental rights, duties and obligations are provided for in detail in agreements concluded at the initial stage. Such agreements are often revised.

The proponents of the status of forces agreements have been saying that without such agreements our servicemen abroad would have been subject to the criminal jurisdiction of foreign governments even for offenses when on duty. I think it is notable that even the courts of Japan have recognized the correct rule of law which would have applied to our troops when off duty, without the so-called administrative agreement with Japan.

This agreement apparently has lost us the dignity which that court thinks a fighting force should have. Instead of protecting our men, the courts are emboldened to ignore our rights under international law and to see how much they can get away with in spite of the terms of the agreement.

INCREASING BASIC COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 533) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective June 1, 1956, the basic compensation of the Official Committee Reporters, House of Representatives, shall be at the rate of $8,300 per annum;

2. The basic compensation of the Assistant Chief Telephone Operator shall be at the rate of $2,580 per annum;

3. The basic compensation of the Administrative Assistants to the Speaker, majority leader, minority leader, majority whip, and minority whip shall be at the rate of $8,800 per annum;

4. The basic compensation of the Cashier, office of the Sergeant at Arms, shall be at the rate of $7,000 per annum; (2) the basic compensation of the two Assistant Bookkeepers, office of the Sergeant at Arms, shall be at the rate of $3,800 per annum; and (3) the basic compensation of the Stenographer, office of the Sergeant at Arms, shall be at the rate of $3,000 per annum;

5. The position of Doorman (16), office of the Doorkeeper, shall be designated as Supervisor of the Pages' Cloak Room, and the basic compensation of such position shall be at the rate of $2,500 per annum.

6. The additional amounts necessary to carry out the provisions of this resolution shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided by law.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill under consideration today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE ACT OF JUNE 22, 1948

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2967) to amend the act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568), and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, except as hereinafter provided, the provisions of the act approved June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568), are hereby extended and made applicable to the following described lands:

Township 61 north, range 6 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 5 to 8, inclusive; west half section 4; west half section 9.

Township 61 north, range 7 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 1 to 12, inclusive.

Township 61 north, range 8 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 3 to 8, inclusive.

Township 61 north, range 9 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 1 to 12, inclusive.

Township 61 north, range 10 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 1, 2, 11, and 12.

Township 62 north, range 3 west, fourth principal meridian: West half of section 3; sections 4 to 9, inclusive.

Township 62 north, range 4 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 1 to 6, inclusive; sections 8 to 15, inclusive.

Township 62 north, range 5 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 1 to 24, inclusive.

Township 62 north, range 6 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 1 to 20, inclusive; north half section 21; sections 22 to 24, inclusive; sections 29 to 32, inclusive.

Township 62 north, range 7 west, fourth principal meridian: Entire township.

Township 62 north, range 8 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 1 to 34, inclu-

sive; north half section 35; north half section 36.

Township 62 north, range 9 west, fourth principal meridian: Entire township.

Township 62 north, range 10 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 1 to 6 inclusive; sections 8 to 17, inclusive; sections 21 to 28, inclusive; sections 33 to 36, inclusive.

Township 62 north, range 11 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 1 and 2.

Township 63 north, range 1 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 4 to 9, inclusive; sections 16 to 21, inclusive.

Township 63 north, range 2 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 1 to 4, inclusive; sections 9 to 16, inclusive; north half of section 17; north half of section 18; sections 21 to 24, inclusive.

Township 63 north, range 3 west, fourth principal meridian: North half section 13; north half section 14; north half, southwest quarter section 15; sections 16 to 21, inclusive; west half section 22; west half section 27; sections 28 to 33, inclusive; west half section 34.

Township 63 north, range 9 west, fourth principal meridian: Lot 3, section 15; lots 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11 and 12 section 16; lots 6 and 7 section 19.

Township 63 north, range 10 west, fourth principal meridian: Section 6, north half section 7; lots 7 and 8 section 24; northeast quarter, lots 1, 3, and 4, southwest quarter southwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, southeast quarter, section 25; lots 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, southeast quarter southeast quarter section 26; lots 3 to 6, inclusive, lot 8, southwest quarter, southwest quarter southeast quarter section 27; lots 5 to 8, inclusive, south half section 28; lots 5 to 8, inclusive, south half section 29; lots 10 to 14, inclusive, southeast quarter southeast quarter section 30; sections 31 to 36, inclusive.

Township 63 north, range 11 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 1 to 4, inclusive; north half of sections 9 to 12, inclusive; lots 9 to 12, inclusive, section 25; lots 5 and 6, section 26; section 35 except lot 3; section 36.

Township 63 north, range 13 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 5, 7, and 18.

Township 63 north, range 14 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 12, 23, and 24.

Township 64 north, range 1 east, fourth principal meridian: Lot 15, section 5.

Township 64 north, range 1 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 21, 22, 27, 28, 33, and 34.

Township 64 north, range 2 west, fourth principal meridian: South half of sections 3 to 6, inclusive.

Township 64 north, range 3 west, fourth principal meridian: South half of sections 1 to 4, inclusive; sections 5 and 6.

Township 64 north, range 4 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 1 to 5, inclusive; sections 8 and 9.

Township 64 north, range 9 west, fourth principal meridian: North half of sections 25 to 30, inclusive.

Township 64 north, range 10 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 19 to 24, inclusive; north half of sections 25, 26, and 27; sections 28 to 33, inclusive.

Township 64 north, range 11 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 8, 17, 21, to 28, inclusive; sections 33 to 36, inclusive.

Township 64 north, range 13 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 14 and 23; north half northwest quarter, southwest quarter northwest quarter section 26; section 27.

Township 65 north, range 3 west, fourth principal meridian: Section 18.

Township 65 north, range 4 west, fourth principal meridian: South half section 6; sections 7, 18, 19, and 30.

Township 65 north, range 5 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 1 to 5, inclusive; sections 8 to 17, inclusive.

Township 65 north, range 12 west, fourth principal meridian; Sections 18, 19, 28, 29, 32, and 33.

Township 65 north, range 13 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 4 to 9, inclusive; sections 13, 14, 16, 17, and 24.

Township 65 north, range 14 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 1 to 3, inclusive.

Township 66 north, range 4 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 4 to 8, inclusive; sections 17 to 20, inclusive.

Township 66 north, range 5 west, fourth principal meridian: Section 1; sections 3 to 7, inclusive; sections 10 to 15, inclusive; sections 21 to 29, inclusive; sections 32 to 35, inclusive; west half section 36.

Township 66 north, range 14 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 29 and 30.

Township 66 north, range 15 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 18 and 19; sections 25 to 30, inclusive.

Township 66 north, range 16 west, fourth principal meridian: Sections 13, 24, and 25.

Township 67 north, range 4 west, fourth principal meridian: Entire township.

SEC. 2. With respect to the lands described in section 1 of this act, the second proviso of section 5 of the aforementioned act of June 22, 1948, is hereby revised to read as follows: *"Provided further,* That the first payment to the State of Minnesota under the provisions of this section shall be due at the close of the fiscal year 1959."

SEC. 3. Section 6 of the aforementioned act of June 22, 1948, is hereby amended by striking the figure "$500,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$2,500,000."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

KLAMATH TERMINATION ACT

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two bills, H. R. 11659 and H. R. 11660, to amend Public Law 587, 83d Congress, the Klamath Termination Act. The Klamath Reservation is not in my district. However, as an Oregonian and a member of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I am vitally concerned that the termination of the United States trusteeship for the Klamath Indians be accomplished as well and as wisely as possible and that the welfare of the Indians be served to the fullest measure.

The objectives of both these bills have been approved by the executive committee of the Klamath Tribe. They have the support and approval of the tribal attorneys. I should like to include at the end of my remarks copies of the two resolutions expressing the views of the Klamath executive committee.

It has become increasingly apparent that the amendments here proposed are necessary and should not be longer delayed. These bills do not challenge the basic purpose of the termination law. They simply amend it to correct certain acknowledged defects and thereby in fact insure that the original intent of Congress will be successfully carried out. These bills should not be controversial, in view of the widespread acknowledgment of their need. I hope, therefore, that they can be expeditiously considered and enacted into law. I should like briefly to explain the background and purpose of these bills.

FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR TERMINATION PLANNING

H. R. 11659 is a very simple measure. Public Law 587 now charges the cost of planning termination against the funds of the Klamath Tribe. In the case of the Menominee Tribe in Wisconsin, a very similar case, this House recently passed legislation to transfer this financial obligation to the United States Government. It is, I believe, generally recognized that in terminating its responsibilities to the Indians and withdrawing itself from the burden of trusteeship, the United States should properly bear the cost of its action. Therefore, the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget made no objection to the similar action in the case of the Menominees. See letter of May 3, 1956, from Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Wesley A. D'Ewart, to Chairman CLAIR ENGLE, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. See also letter from Assistant Secretary to Chairman ENGLE dated February 24, 1956. I trust, therefore, in light of the Department's position and the recent action of this House in the case of the Menominees we will in all fairness promptly act to transfer this financial burden from the Klamath Tribe to the United States Government where it properly belongs, by enacting H. R. 11659.

INSURING ORDERLY TERMINATION

My second bill, H. R. 11660, looks to the anticipated completion of appraisal of tribal assets in February of next year. It is intended simply to correct a defect in the language of the present law which could allow a very unfortunate and premature liquidation of assets following the appraisal. Public Law 587 now provides that immediately upon completion of the appraisal each Indian shall have the opportunity to elect for himself and his minor children whether to withdraw from the tribe and convert his interest in the undivided assets into cash. The Stanford Research Institute which studied this situation for the management specialists appointed by the Secretary of Interior has reported that well over half the tribe will choose to take their individual interests and get out. Now if that should happen, the Secretary of the Interior would be forced to sell assets prematurely, perhaps even on a "fire sale" forced liquidation basis in order to pay them. Any sensible termination plan might then be impossible. That is the plain language of the law. This is why one of the management specialists said recently that "if this bill is carried out as written and strictly followed, one of the finest stands of timber will be destroyed."

The problem has been very well explained by the Washington correspondent of the Portland Oregonian in a recent

article. I should like to include that article by A. Robert Smith at the end of my remarks.

Consequently, as the law now reads, we are confronted with a situation in which by February of next year, the possibilities of orderly and beneficial termination for the Klamaths may be foreclosed by a forced liquidation of assets. In order to prevent this—in order simply to give time for the Congress and the appropriate officials to deal with this situation—H. R. 11660 provides that after the submission of the appraisal to the Secretary of the Interior no action shall be taken to vest individual rights for 9 months. It provides that upon receipt of the appraisal and report from the management specialists on a plan for termination, the Secretary of the Interior shall forward this information to the Congress. The Congress will then have up to 9 months to consider the plan and whatever congressional action may be necessary. In this way, there will be time after appraisal for an orderly liquidation of assets, according to whatever plan may be agreed to.

All this bill intends to do is to provide the time and opportunity for this action. Now, the contract between the Secretary of the Interior and the management specialists provides that the Secretary shall review and approve the appraisal before any further action is taken. It is argued that this will insure that no untimely liquidation of assets will occur. But a contract cannot amend the plain terms of a congressional mandate, and Public Law 587 contains a clear mandate. If the Secretary fails, immediately after the appraisal is made, to provide for the opportunity for election, any Indian could go to court and seek a court order to secure his individual interest. The Secretary has no power to delay such an action.

If we do not amend the law now to provide this time, we will be confronted with a situation at the beginning of next session of Congress where we may have to step in and take emergency action. I do not think we should wait for a crisis to develop. It is perfectly clear that there is going to have to be some time and some study next year on this problem and if Congress is going to have to amend the law to provide that time, then we should act now to make sure that under language of the present law the assets of the Klamaths are not liquidated in a disastrous forced piecemeal manner because Congress did not act in time. We are not deferring termination. We are not challenging the present procedures by which termination is being carried forward. We are only making sure that the termination will be carried forward successfully instead of making a terrible mistake.

Eighty million dollars to one hundred million dollars assets, which the United States Government now holds in trust, are at stake here. One of the finest forests remaining on this continent comprises 90 percent of those assets. It must be preserved by sustained-yield management in this termination. The interest and the welfare of over 2,000 Indians and of all the people who live in the Klamath area depend on termination being carried out wisely.

At the present time, members of the tribe might understandably be anticipating and planning on receiving their substantial shares of this undivided capital at the beginning of next year. Present law would lead them to this belief, yet their own interests require that no such premature vesting be done. We owe it to these Indians to clarify the situation, so that they will know what they can count on, so they can make their plans, and so that they will get the greatest possible benefit from their interests. We should not delay until next February, when they may have made commitments based on the expectation of payment, and then suddenly disrupt their plans.

I do not see how anyone can possibly object to correcting now a serious defect in the law. The excuse that there will probably be time to correct it next year seems to me an irresponsible and careless abdication of responsibility. Why gamble on the chance that Congress may be able to put through a law in the first few weeks of the next session when we can and should act now and when there is absolutely nothing to be lost by doing so? I hope that we will meet our responsibility and pass this measure promptly.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY KLAMATH EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, APRIL 6, 1956

Be it hereby—

Resolved, That the attorneys or the management specialists be authorized to present to Congress an amendment substantially as follows, if in the judgment of the attorneys or the management specialists such an amendment is necessary or desirable:

Section 1, Public Law 587, 83d Congress, is amended by adding the following subsection (6) under section 5 (a):

"Within 3 months following completion of and approval by the Secretary the appraisal required under subsection (1) of this subsection, the management specialists shall report to Congress and the Secretary the action accomplished by them and additional steps planned pursuant to subsections (2), (3), (4), and (5) of this subsection. Such report shall contain recommendations respecting feasibility of implementing the subsections following subsection (1) of section 5, subsection (a); and no further action shall be taken by the management specialists pursuant to such subsections until at least 9 months following submission of such report to the Congress and the Secretary."

RESOLUTION

Whereas in meeting of the Klamath executive committee of March 1, 1955, adopted the following motion: "That steps be taken to make some conservative move whereby ways and means be proposed for the purpose of meeting all probable expenditure that may be required by the management specialists, it being evident that to continue to dig into tribal funds would not serve the required purpose without jeopardizing the welfare of the Klamath people, and, therefore, it is believed that expenditure aforementioned should be obligations borne in full by the Federal Government": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this, the Klamath tribal executive committee, in regular recessed meeting this 16th day of May 1956, go on record urging that all expenditure in administering Public Law 587 be borne by the Federal Government: *Provided,* That any expense to the Klamath Tribe relative to Public Law 587 be refunded to the Klamath Tribe: *And provided further,* That upon the adoption of this resolution that a copy be sent to the tribal attorney in Washington, D. C.

We hereby certify that the above resolution was duly adopted at a regular recessed meeting of the Klamath tribal executive committee held on May 16, 1956, by a vote of six for and none against, such action being in accordance with the constitution and bylaws of the Klamath General Council approved October 10, 1950.

DELFORD LANG.
DIBBON COOK.

[From the Portland Oregonian]

FAST TIMBER CUTTING FEARED

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—Two management specialists who have been wrestling for the past year with the problem of terminating Federal control over the Klamath Indians have come to the tentative conclusion that the Klamath Reservation would be wrecked under the law passed by the 83d Congress. They believe that the law will probably have to be amended if the interests of the Klamaths are to be protected—a position taken by the Oregonian over a year ago.

T. B. Watters and Eugene G. Favell, two specialists appointed by ex-Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay to administer the termination matter, disclosed their views of the problem during the past week in conferences at the Interior Department and on Capitol Hill.

"Our present thinking," said Watters, a Klamath Falls businessman, "is that if this bill is carried out as written and strictly followed, one of the finest stands of timber in the United States will be destroyed."

A precise appraisal of the pine forests on the reservation will not be completed until next February, but rough estimates of the value of the timber run around $40 million. When that is done, the law says each adult tribal member must be given the alternative of cashing in his share of the tribe's assets—which may average $20,000 per member—or staying as a tribal member to receive annual payments from tribal timber receipts. When the specialists count up the number who want to cash in, they will know how much of the reservation's assets must be liquidated to provide ready cash for departing tribal members.

Watters said under this procedure they will be compelled to sell the timber to the highest bidders, who will "come in in droves and buy these small tracts and they will practically clear cut them."

The solution envisioned by Watters and Favell is that the Government buy the reservation from the tribe, possibly with United States bonds, to assure continued sustained-yield cutting of the timber. He said the Fish and Wildlife Service is interested in game refuge potentialities of marshy nontimbered areas.

"I am against the Government owning a lot of land," Watters declared when he explained his idea to the Senate Interior Committee. "It is so radical. It is so different from our 'black Republicans' that it amazes me."

But Watters went on, he sees little chance of preventing the destruction of the finest remaining stand of pine timber otherwise. He said a study made 6 months ago by Stanford Research Institute indicates that 70 percent of the 2,000 Klamaths will withdraw from the tribe if they can get cash for their share "and the ones that remain will be incompetents and minors and older-age people."

"I hope that by this switching to bonds, instead of cash," he said, "that it will perhaps put a damper on the impulse of the Indian to go out and get rid of his money as quick as he would if it was cash."

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat, Oregon, indicated to Watters in the committee session that he was ready to sponsor the necessary change in the law that would allow Government acquisition to protect the integrity of the reservation. But Watters, backed by Indian Bureau officials, said he thought it best to wait until the appraisal had been completed and the management specialists make their formal report next spring.

NEUBERGER said he feared that if the present law ran its course that far without change, tribal members could force a liquidation movement to get their money before Congress could pass amending legislation. But the Bureau insisted there is no need for immediate action, that Congress can take a close look at the Klamath predicament next year in plenty of time to protect the timber from destruction.

VOTE ON MUTUAL SECURITY BILL

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to ask the majority leader a question. What time on Monday does the gentleman anticipate a vote on the bill we had under consideration today?

Mr. McCORMACK. It will be the first order of business. I included that in my unanimous-consent request, as I believe the RECORD will show.

Mr. GROSS. I am sorry, I did not hear it.

MINORITY VIEWS ON H. R. 11380

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], I ask unanimous consent that he may file minority views on the bill H. R. 11380, which has been reported by report No. 2237.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may sit while the House is in session during general debate, on next Tuesday, June 12, and Wednesday, June 13.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HONORARY DEGREES PRESENTED BY SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY TO SPEAKER SAM RAYBURN AND MINORITY LEADER JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include addresses by the Speaker and the minority leader.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 4, the Speaker of the House, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, and the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN were given honorary degrees by the Syracuse University. Needless to say, it was a wonderful experience for the university, and the residents of Syracuse, to have two such outstanding United States statesmen appear together and address the graduating class. I, too, feel honored that they could visit my district. It gives me real pleasure to include in the extension of my remarks the excellent addresses of these fine gentlemen:

EXCERPTS FROM THE REMARKS OF SPEAKER SAM RAYBURN, OF TEXAS, AT THE GRADUATION EXERCISES AT SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY, SYRACUSE, N. Y., JUNE 4, 1956

I am proud of the honor you so graciously conferred upon me this day. I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart. Particularly, I wish to express my gratitude to your esteemed Chancellor, William Pearson Tolley. I have read of some of the things Chancellor Tolley has done since he became your leader, and his record of accomplishment is so vast that I suspect that some of your New York political leaders are pleased that he chose the role of an educator, instead of seeking public office. Certainly, he would have been worthy competition in the field of statesmanship. I am confident that in building up this 86-year-old institution as he has, especially in the last 10 years, that statesmanship, idealism, vision and leadership were the qualities that made it possible. I commend him for his great work. I know of no vocation that is of higher calling than that of preparing the youth of our Nation for the responsibilities they must assume as citizens of this wonderful land.

I also am glad to be here to see the recognition and honor you are conferring upon my friend, JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts.

I treasure the friendship, the personal friendship, that has existed between JOE MARTIN and me over the years. It has been a friendship of understanding, because both he and I believe in the same things when it comes to honesty and truthfulness. There are no degrees in truthfulness. There are no degrees in honesty. You are 100 percent, or you are not. JOE MARTIN is 100 percent on both. I have said before, and I repeat, that I know of no one that I had rather succeed or precede in the high office of the Speakership, than JOE MARTIN. In the execution of the arduous and onerous duties of that office, I have sought to be as fair and impartial as he.

In studying about Syracuse University and about its being one of the Nation's largest privately operated institutions of its kind, I took immense pleasure in learning the emphasis being made on your College of Engineering and in the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs. All of your 16 schools and colleges are important, but I must confess that I have been most interested in recent years in urging more engineers and more individuals qualified and trained for public administration. New scientific developments are coming so fast, and government is developing to such great extent because of new problems that arise from transitions in our mode of life, that this Nation is in urgent need of engineers in all categories and in men and women fitted for the responsibility of public service.

As our Nation progresses, we need more and more highly trained young people for every vocation in life. The older I become, the more I look to the younger generations of our land to carry on in high, responsible positions. I have been around for a long time, and my years are not few, but I'm not going to consider myself old until I find myself sitting around with others bewailing the younger generation and talking about how much better we did things in our day. As a matter of fact, things are getting better all of the time, and it is because the youth of our Nation brings new energy, new creative thoughts, and better life.

I hope that none of you get old and start bewailing the younger generation. That is a blight of hindsight.

Sometime before we entered the last world war, professional croakers were saying that the young men of our day were too soft to fight. They had had it too easy. I never shared these silly doubts. And we know, that when the time came, the young men of our armed services were as good as they ever had been in Andrew Jackson's day.

I am certain, if unhappily, the test on a great scale should come again, that again they will prove that no people excel us in patriotism, devotion to duty, courage, and the willingness to defend this great Nation of ours, whatever the cost.

What is true in this respect of young men is also true of our young women. Thousands of them entered the armed services and the Red Cross and saw service all over the world. Thousands of others of all ages toiled in munitions plants or did jobs of various kinds for the Government. There was no weakness among them, not even when their husbands or sons went off to war, leaving them lonely and waiting, as women are always left lonely and waiting in wartime. They did their duty; and they did it well. I admire them equally with the young men.

Since a country is, first of all, people, and no country is better than its people are, I do not tremble for the future of this country. Ever since Washington wrought, and Jefferson led and taught, we have had moaners and groaners in this country that have been saying that our freedom is imperiled and that our Government is being changed. Some people have said that all of our leaders, from Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln, to now, have been incompetents. They said we couldn't possibly pay our debts.

We couldn't expand any further. It was impossible to find markets for the things we produced, and since Congress was composed of incompetents, you couldn't depend upon them for anything. It didn't matter what political party was in power at any given time.

Well, the country hasn't been ruined yet, and I don't see any prospect of it being ruined. The more the croakers croaked, the more the country grew.

During the depression we were told that grass would soon be growing in the streets of our cities. That hasn't happened.

In my opinion, we're just getting underway in these United States. There is, indeed, little that Americans cannot do, if only they can imagine themselves wanting to do it. It matters not what mistakes any administration in Washington may make, I believe we can overcome them. The potentials of our resources, material and spiritual, have

never yet been tapped to the utmost. We still do not know the limits of our strength. Let those beware, therefore, who think that they will find us easy prey.

Here in the United States we have grown both in bigness and greatness. This was a great country long before it became a big country.

It was a great country in the very beginning because the men who founded it breathed greatness into it. At the time of our Revolutionary War, we were about 3 million people thinly scattered across the face of a huge and largely unknown continent. But small though we were, and weak, we shook 18th century Europe to the core. For at a period when absolutism prevailed nearly everywhere, and few men had rights, we announced the stupendous, earth-shaking doctrine of the rights of men, and so became the light of the world. The more so as the total darkness of communism casts its evil shadows upon larger and larger areas of the earth.

We founded upon this continent a nation without precedent in the history of man. The founders met at Philadelphia in May 1787, and in 4 short months, in September of the same year, they brought forth a document that the great English statesman, Gladstone, said was the greatest document ever struck off at one time by the hand and brain of man. This country was made up of members of all the racial stocks of the world. People of different religious and political faiths, many of them had never been able to live peacefully together in their native homes. But here the lion and the lamb lay down together. Out of unparalleled diversity, we created an incomparable unity. Nor is this all. Our political economic system has given more people more happiness and prosperity over a wider area for a longer period of time than any system ever created by men in their long history.

I do not say that it is a perfect system. I do not maintain that its blessings extend to all alike. I do not claim that it is without aberrations or inequities. But neither do I apologize for it. For this, I believe, is true. Men are not angels. It is not, therefore, criminal that inequities should exist among us. But it would be criminal if we should ignore them. This we will not do.

Farmers, for a long time did not, and they do not now, share in the general prosperity of the country. But by and large, some measure of prosperity has for some time been guaranteed them through various acts of the Government. Organized labor was long repressed in many sections of this Nation. But labor has now become a gigantic force of its own. Similarly, decade after decade, we have extended the boundaries of education. We have made such strides in the field of preventive medicine that we have eradicated diseases that were a scourge but a little while ago. And the life expectancy of the average American is the highest in the world.

I could stand here all day reciting items of our progress, spiritual and material, but that is not necessary. Yet some of us are foolish enough to be put on the defensive by Communists when we have done so much for men, and they have done so much evil to mankind.

There remains a great deal to do, and I believe there exists among us the will to do it. We are a highly competent people. But no American, worthy of the name, thinks that competence is enough. We are also, the Lord be praised, a humane people. And when you add humaneness to competence, you get the unique American civilization that we have created. It is a civilization in which men, remembering God, do not forget their suffering brothers, here or elsewhere.

Let me explain. We who have only recently come into the stream of history are now the leaders of the free world. It is primarily our strength, however indispensable our allies may be to us, that prevents Russian communism from enslaving the world. It is we who, through the Marshall plan, kept Western Europe from falling prey to communism after the end of the last war.

It is we, who, by accepting the heavy responsibility of Korea, have kept communism from engulfing southeast Asia. It is we who, through various military and diplomatic moves, held back the enemy in Italy, Greece, and other points throughout the world. If it is not surprising that we have made mistakes, it is surprising that we made so few and emerged so quickly from our historical isolationism. For nations tend to move slowly in great matters, sometimes taking generations to change over from the past. Yet we have moved with a speed that must seem bewildering to our enemies.

This is a creditable performance, but it must not lull us into complacence, for to be complacent in our world is to court national catastrophe. We live, and we shall continue to live through the foreseeable future, in great peril. We still have much to do. No people can beat us in a short-distance run. But our enemy is a plodder, and he will not run our kind of race.

The hallmark of being adult is that a man understands he must pay a price for everything he wants. Once he understands this, he is at peace with himself and the world. No price is too high to pay for freedom. Who can put a dollar mark on the life of a single American lost in battle? What price did our forefathers pay so that they might bequeath this great country to us? What price, then, are we willing to pay so that we may pass it on, great and free. A high standard of living is a desirable thing. But more desirable—and more enduring—is a high standard of life.

You young people who are being graduated here today will shortly for the first time, so to speak, go out into life. Its primary condition is struggle. It is also a great challenge and a great opportunity to live in a land that is so free that every man, woman, and child can do what he or she wants to do, say what they want to say, write what they want to write, so long as in the doing of these things they do not deprive others of exercising the same rights and prerogatives and the same privileges. You are free to choose your own course.

We have been an immensely fortunate people, and I do not think that we have been unworthy of our gifts. The incidents of geography and space and the fact that others kept the peace of the world so long enabled us to grow and spread and become in time the world's mightiest power.

Founding this country in freedom, and dedicating it to freedom, we have subscribed, and continue to subscribe, to the highest ideals of western civilization. Now this civilization is in imminent peril as it faces a very real threat to its existence at the hands of ruthless totalitarians.

The threat comes at a time when we are the world's mightiest power. Far from bewailing our fate, therefore, I think we should regard it as a high privilege that we have become the great defender of the faith; the best hope on earth. I have no doubt, God willing, that we shall prevail.

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS, MINORITY LEADER OF THE HOUSE, AT THE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY, SYRACUSE, N. Y., MONDAY, JUNE 4, 1956, AT WHICH REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN WAS AWARDED THE HONORARY DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LAWS

It is a high privilege for me to come to this great University of Syracuse to receive an honorary degree. I shall cherish the honor and we shall share through the years a common pride in the onward progress of your fine institution.

Founded as an institution to provide more and better teachers, Syracuse has expanded until today it meets the many demands of a rapidly changing world.

It is not necessary for me to dwell upon the important contributions the colleges, the universities, and the other schools of this Nation will make to the future progress of America. The future of America is wrapped up in scientific progress, and the men and women who are to have an important part in the future must come from these schools.

Today peace is made secure by the advanced knowledge and progress in scientific instruments. The same can be said of industrial progress and economic prosperity. New ideas, a better and more useful product, and moderate prices—these are the basis of the great prosperity of tomorrow. Only the colleges can provide this leadership.

The cost of modern education steadily increases. The boys and girls about whom we are most concerned would find it impossible to bear the entire burden. Neither are the endowments of the past sufficient to meet these needs. Business enterprises, manufacturing and commercial concerns are beginning to recognize that they have an obligation to aid in shouldering these expenses. So have some of our progressive and forward-thinking leaders of labor. From the colleges must come the leadership all need, and as a result we see a growing tendency to contribute to increasing the standards of our colleges.

There are some contributions the Federal Government can make. Indeed we have been making them over the past few years. These, however, must be carefully screened. We in America do not want domination of our schools from Washington. It would spell the end of the type of America we love and fight to preserve.

In these tense days, the forces of liberalism, freedom, and peace have much to worry about. Another ideology repugnant to America threatens our freedom and our ideology of life. Because of the seriousness of this threat, we must expend over $35 billion for the maintenance of our Armed Forces. We recognize only in this way can precious freedom be maintained. It is the one sure way of peace.

To keep the peace of the world we must be strong. No nation will deliberately fight against a foe that is unbeatable, or so strong that retaliation is sure to be swift and terrible.

And I want to tell you that today the United States is strong—militarily and economically. In these trying times we are fortunate to have in the White House a man whose military experience equips him admirably for the task of determining the kind and amount of military strength needed to preserve the peace we now enjoy.

The airpower of the United States has increased in keeping with the development throughout the world of weapons that require air strength for retaliation—the atom and hydrogen bombs, guided missiles, plus newer, faster, more powerful aircraft.

Since 1953, the size of the Air Force was increased from 106 wings to 127 wings. During the coming fiscal year, the Air Force will complete its planned buildup of 137 wings.

The Air Force is working jointly with commercial aircraft manufacturers to develop a nuclear-powered airplane. A General Electric spokesman has predicted such a plane could circle the globe entirely in darkness, keeping pace with the sun, and carry enough atomic fuel to operate indefinitely. A pound of uranium 235 fuel will equal the energy of about 1,700,000 gallons of gasoline.

Continuing emphasis is also being placed on research and development of all types of missiles, modern supersonic aircraft, and continental air defenses.

On the seas, the United States Navy is moving ahead into the atomic age.

Most of the danger spots in the world border on the seas. Naval forces deployed in troubled waters serve as an on-the-spot deterrent to aggression. The Navy is ready to strike immediately and naval forces deployed in international waters can be assembled and employed immediately because they do not operate from bases in foreign territory.

In event of a major war, the Navy must insure the safe arrival of the vast amount of food, weapons, fuel, and reinforcements required by our hard-pressed forces and allies overseas.

The United States has commitments with over 60 nations—all overseas. To back up these commitments we support major Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Force forces on three continents across both the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. In order to live up to worldwide collective security agreements, this Nation must use the seas.

The Soviet threat to United States control of the seas grows, but the power of the United States Navy is growing, too. The Navy is shifting to nuclear power as fast as technically possible. There is now a good atomic delivery capability; guided missiles are replacing guns to knock down enemy aircraft at high altitudes and at long ranges. Surface-to-surface missiles will increase long-range offensive capabilities.

The United States Navy has a complete family of missiles in all four categories, and all are in fleet operational use at the present time.

Faster, better naval attack aircraft is being developed. The United States has the fastest operational fighter in the world. A new high-performance jet seaplane is in production that is fast, has long range, and can carry a heavy load. It can operate from sea areas all over the world using submarines or surface ships for bases. All of these planes will be able to use types of guided missiles or rockets. New technologies are advancing the science of naval warfare at an unprecedented rate. The United States Navy is dedicated to the task of keeping the United States supreme on the world's oceans.

On land, our defenses have been steadily strengthened. The United States Army, at its present strength, has twice as many men as it had at the outbreak of the Korean war. The Army today has more material, is better equipped to fight, and has a higher degree of training than ever before in peacetime.

A new airborne division will soon be engaged in special experiments with new organizations, tactics, and weapons. There will be more Army units armed with new weapons, such as Honest John rocket batteries and antiaircraft units for the continental defense. The Army's battlefield mobility will be improved by more helicopters.

The Army is adding a variety of new weapons and devices developed for atomic defense and attack, including radar detection and control mechanisms, guided missiles, atomic artillery, and new communications methods.

By June 30 the Army will have about 69.7 percent of all its troops in operating combat units—compared with only 58.8 percent in June 1953.

Yes, the Nation today wields a powerful military force for peace, but the cost is high.

We would like to divert some of these huge sums for building schools, improving health, increasing the standards of education, and making life better for all. But as long as the Soviet menace continues we have no alternative but to go on spending huge sums for armaments.

Yet we must not for one moment neglect to seize an opportunity for improving our relations with other peoples of the world. Ultimately the folly of war will dawn upon the peoples of the world. No one gains from war. Both the victor and the vanquished suffer. Peace must be the final objective of our aims.

The day of colonialism, extending one's boundaries and holding other peoples in economic slavery is over. All over the world today people long for freedom and the right to dictate their own affairs. We must not fail to recognize this new order—this new dream all over the world. When the world recognizes the inherent right of freedom for all we will come nearer to the dawn of an everlasting peace.

Why do I speak at such lengths about defense to you who are graduating today?

Perhaps it is to reassure you, to let you know, that, in my opinion, the United States will not soon be plunged into a war which you must fight.

Perhaps it is to remind you that the huge cost of past wars already hangs, and will continue to hang for generations, like millstones around your necks.

Perhaps it is to challenge you, for it is the young who must carry the load of our complicated defense system. It is the young minds who must master the machines of war in this atomic age.

Yes; we need you. We need your brilliant young minds, your sturdy bodies, your keen sense of duty. And we need to make military careers more attractive to youth so we can maintain the American tradition of voluntary service.

President Eisenhower, believing the Nation's youth should be allowed to build its future on a foundation of peace, yet more aware than any man in public life of the need for adequately trained young military personnel, last year called on Congress to set up a program that would assure our necessary military strength without undue personal hardship.

The Reserve Forces Act of 1955, passed on the request of President Eisenhower, provides for the first time a practical program under which the people of this Nation can build and maintain on a voluntary basis a substantial, long-term military defense against the Communist threat.

In allowing the Nation's youth in this manner to deemphasize the military phase of their lives, the administration has sacrificed nothing in the way of defense and national security.

The program has been a success. Enlistments in the Army Reserve have been at a rate of more than 1,700 a week and, according to Secretary of the Army Brucker, the men already in the program are proving its best press agents.

But I should do you a great disservice if I spoke of you today only of your responsibility for protecting the peace so recently won.

Indeed, the future holds so much in store for you young graduates that I envy you.

I envy you your opportunity. You are graduating into a world which needs your services, which eagerly awaits you—contract in hand.

It's a bright picture ahead. The Nation's business community is prosperous and is still expanding. Nineteen hundred and fifty-six was ushered in with predictions of another boom year—predictions which have been proved true. Major corporations have announced plans for unprecedented expansion amounting to billions of dollars.

What does that mean to you? It means more new jobs and more wage hikes, more complex machinery and more skilled young experts to make and operate it.

Today in this country thousands of companies are surveying American college campuses, seeking graduates for employment in all fields. Overall, starting salaries are up $25 a month from last year. Jobs are plentiful. You are wanted—needed.

Yes, in defense, in business, and even in Government, you are needed.

The task of this administration—of any administration—is to take over the stewardship of the Government and under that stewardship to develop something better than it found. This means not only seeing that the economy holds more in store for present and future generations, but that Government must be attractive to them as well.

It is the solemn duty of every administration to keep young Americans interested in Government, to make them want to take part in Government. To assure this, the Government must be morally clean, financially attractive, and basically fair.

I believe that the Federal Government today offers much in the way of attractive and interesting careers for the young leaders of our Nation. I believe also that our young leaders have much to offer our Government which we badly need.

We need your vision, your courage, your inherent sense of moral decency. And I am proud to be able to tell you that this administration is awake to that need.

Since 1953, more than 75 men under 40 have been recruited by the Eisenhower administration for top administrative jobs in Government. Ten of these young men are on the President's own staff at the White House, two of them hold assistant Cabinet posts.

There has been a real effort to interest young people in becoming a part of the Government, and in taking a part in national affairs.

Today there are more young men and women in the House of Representatives, in the Senate, in high political offices, and in gubernatorial seats than at any time in history.

Yes, I envy you young graduates of today—with your brilliant minds and your unlimited opportunities. And as you eagerly step up to take your place in our way of life, I want you to know that us old timers are mighty happy to have you on our team.

MORGAN CITY, LA., HIGH SCHOOL BAND IN WASHINGTON

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call attention to the Morgan City, La., High School Band, now in Washington and which presented a concert on the Capitol steps this morning. This is one of the outstanding high school bands of Louisiana and has also won national recognition. The program given today by this very capable musical organization provided a real treat for all who had the opportunity to hear it.

The trip to Washington is the culmination of months of planning and the sponsoring of numerous benefit activities through which the Morgan City High School Music-Band Boosters Club raised more than $9,000 to defray the expenses of the 103 band members and 8 counselors. In addition, a number of citizens of Morgan City are participating at their own expense.

The band is under the direction of Mr. Calvin Bourgeois who has served in this capacity for the past 9 years. Mrs. Dave Kahn is chairman for the trip which was organized in honor of 25 of this year's graduates of Morgan City High School

who have been members of the band ever since Director Bourgeois took charge and who have contributed so much to the organization's high rating. The trip is also in the nature of a reward for the other members—freshmen, sophomores, and juniors—for their part in the band's success and for their services to the community. Mr. L. T. Holmes is the school principal.

The band members and those accompanying them arrived in Washington, Wednesday, for a 3-day visit during which time they are busily engaged in visiting chief points of interest and serving as good-will ambassadors and boosters not only for the band but also in a big way for Morgan City, a progressive, growing city noted for its waterway transportation facilities, its prominence in oil-producing activities, and as a center for shrimp fishing and marketing and home of the annual Louisiana Shrimp Festival featured by the blessing of the shrimp fleet.

Members of the band are: David Adkins; Bonnie Allbritton; Larry Allbritton; Norbert Allbritton; Kathryn Andrews; Tilton Auenson; Sherwin Beadle; Daniel Belanger; Judy Belanger; Mary Besse; Taymond Billoit; Charles Blanco; Clyde Boudreaux; Louis Boudreaux; Wayne Carpenter; Maxine Chaisson; Leon Cheramie; Eloise Cloutier; Sandy Cope; Dolores Crappell; Patsy Dodson; Brent Driskill; Caroll Joy Dupre; Melvin Dupuis; Ray Eues; Lynn Evans; Glenn Falgout; Ann Forgey; Tom Forgey; Joan Freia; Lynn Giroir; Claire Green; Opal Griffin; Carolyn Grizzaffi; Jack Guidry; Linda Guidry; Bobby Guezzetta; Myrlie Guidroz; Richard Hardee; Lydia Hebert; Sandra Hill; Darryl Johnson; Ivan Jones; David Kahn, Jr.; Dean Kilmer; Adrian Lancon; Goldie Landry; Jimmy Magee; Andrew Marino; Marie Miller; John Neeld; Judy O'Brien; Stanley Plessala; Wybra Price; Emile Robichaux; Ida Robichaux; Ina Robichaux; Joed Robichaux; David Rosson; Ann Russo; James Spangler; Melvin Spinella; Bonnie Templet; Guy Thomas; Jules Thomas; Gus Thorguson; Larry Verrett; Shirley Verrett; Theressa Verrett; Richard Wallis; Dixie Watkins; Billie Witherwax; Sarah Wooters; Jack Wright; Archie Lovell; James Young; Joe DiMaggio; Alvin Adams; Emile Barbier; Lela Mae Beadle; Barry Belanger; Ronald Bruney; June Cloutier; Paul Conner; Martha Cornier; Dalton Delaune; Linda Delaune; Ronald Duffy; John Marc Green; Burl Forgey; Billy Hinton; Jim Humphries; Michael Loeb; Paul Louviere; Leon Resignolia; Terrell Rourk; Jimmie Simmons; Ben Thibodeaux; Max Thibodeaux; Conley Vining; Hal Walters; Alvin Forrest; Lucien Adams.

Adults taking part in the trip to Washington are: Mr. and Mrs. L. T. Holmes, Mr. and Mrs. Calvin Bourgeois, Mr. and Mrs. Dave Kahn, Mr. and Mrs. Harold Besse, Mr. and Mrs. Cyrus Giroir, Mr. and Mrs George Allen Picou, Mrs. Henry Cloutier, Mrs. Dalton Delaune, Mrs. Alton Robichaux, Mr. and Mrs. Gil Guidry, Mr. and Mrs. Asa Wyman, Miss Celeste Gaudin, Miss Nell Egle, Mr. and Mrs. Charlie Miller, Mrs. Adelaide Wartellee, Mrs. Joyce Belanger, Mr. C. J. Peltier, Mr. C. B. Wallis, Mrs. Burl Borgey, Jr., Mrs. Melvin Dupuis, Mrs. Floyd O'Brien, Mrs. Adam Conner.

INDONESIA AND WESTERN NEW GUINEA: A LOOK AT PRESIDENT SUKARNO'S PLEA

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House and of the Senate, convened in joint session on May 17, heard an inspiring address by the chief executive of a newly established but very important nation, the Republic of Indonesia. President Sukarno spoke for a nation of 82 million souls, the sixth most populous country in the world.

But the President of Indonesia was not speaking only for his own great nation. In his address he expressed emotions common to virtually all the peoples of Asia and of Africa, peoples struggling for their freedom, fighting to attain and then to develop their national independence. We know something of this struggle; for we, too, had to fight for our independence against foreign rule. The President of Indonesia knew that he would find an attentive and a sympathetic audience in the United States Congress.

There were several important themes in President Sukarno's address, and all of them call for discussion by the Congress. The President's views on the proper role of economic and military aid to underdeveloped nations and the conditions under which such aid should be given merit the most serious consideration. And his expression of mingled hope and fear on the potentialities and dangers of atomic power is, I am sure, shared by all thinking men, not least by Members of this House.

AFRICAN NATIONALISM

But the principal emphasis of President Sukarno's speech was on the existence and implications of Asian and African nationalism. In the course of that speech President Sukarno made the following statement:

> Nationalism may be an out-of-date doctrine for many in this world; for us of Asia and Africa, it is the mainspring of our efforts. Understand that, and you have the key to much postwar history. Fail to understand it, and no amount of thinking, no torrent of words, and no Niagara of dollars will produce anything but bitterness and disillusionment.

Mr. Speaker, Asian-African nationalism presently shows itself most strongly in a reaction against colonialism. To Indonesia, the continuation of Dutch control over western New Guinea is intolerable. In the words of President Sukarno, in the words of Asian nationalism:

> The territory of Irian Barat, West New Guinea, is still a colonial outpost on Indonesian soil * * *. [P]art of our land * * * is still a colonial cancer in the body politic of our motherland * * *. The return of West Irian is for us the remaining part of our national political aspiration. It is the final installment on the colonial debt.

President Sukarno then appealed for United States support of Indonesia's claim. And like it or not, the problem of western New Guinea is one which affects the interests of the United States, as does any dispute between nations whom we consider our friends and wish to keep as friends. We, of Congress, who heard President Sukarno must give thought to the justice of the claims made for western New Guinea.

HAS POISONED RELATIONS

The western New Guinea dispute has poisoned relations between two nations which should be working in harmony, the Netherlands and Indonesia. The status of western New Guinea has prevented Indonesia's energy and talents from being fully concentrated on its own sorely needed internal development.

But the effects of the western New Guinea dispute are not limited to the Dutch and the Indonesians alone.

The New Guinea controversy affects the defense of southeast Asia.

It affects relations between the United States and its allies in both the North Atlantic and the Southeast Asia Treaty Organizations.

And it affects the attitudes of many African-Asian peoples toward the nations of North America and Western Europe.

The origins of the dispute go back to the foundation of the Indonesian Republic.

In August 1945 the impending Japanese defeat enabled Indonesian leaders to proclaim the establishment of an independent Indonesian Republic in what had formerly been the Netherlands East Indies. After over 4 years of intermittent warfare, the Indonesians, in part because of United Nations and American support, won recognition of their independent national status. The Round-table Agreements of 1949 between the Netherlands and Indonesia provided as follows:

> The Kingdom of the Netherlands unconditionally and irrevocably transfers complete sovereignty over Indonesia to the Republic * * * of Indonesia and thereby recognizes said Republic * * * as an independent and sovereign state.

But these same agreements expressly stipulated that "the status quo of New Guinea was to be maintained" until further negotiations determined its ultimate status.

EASTERN NEW GUINEA

Since 1949 western New Guinea has remained under Dutch control, in spite of continual Indonesian pressure. The western New Guinea problem has, at Indonesia's request, been considered by the General Assembly of the United Nations at its 1954 and again at its 1955 session. The only formal action taken by the General Assembly was a resolution of December 16, 1955, which expressed the hope that the then current negotiations on western New Guinea would "be fruitful." But these negotiations broke down last January, as had many before them on the same subject, and have not been renewed. Dutch-Indonesian relations

remain tense, in large part because of western New Guinea.

The area in dispute, west Irian, as the Indonesians call it, or Netherlands New Guinea, as it is today in fact, is the western portion of the second largest island in the world. The island of New Guinea is located directly east of Indonesia and north of Australia. These two nations are, therefore, in addition to the Netherlands itself, the powers most directly concerned with the destiny of western New Guinea. Eastern New Guinea is divided into two parts: the Territory of New Guinea and the Territory of Papua. These territories are administered as one unit. The Territory of New Guinea is administered by Australia as a United Nations trusteeship; the Territory of Papua is a territory of the commonwealth of Australia. Thus the Dutch control western New Guinea; the Australians control eastern New Guinea.

New Guinea long played no conspicuous part in world affairs, and before the Second World War the disposition of that area may have appeared to be a question of only local importance. Now we know better.

THE PAPUAN CULTURE

When the Japanese made their lightning conquest of southeast Asia in December 1941 and the first months of 1942, they were slowed to a halt in the jungles of New Guinea. American troops fought their way up the New Guinea coast to push the Japanese back on the long road to Manila and Tokyo. The present capital of western New Guinea, the town of Hollandia, long served the Japanese as a major air base. After its recapture by United States forces in 1944, Hollandia became General MacArthur's headquarters.

The inhabitants of New Guinea are primarily Papuans, a Negroid people. Much of the country is still unexplored, but recent reconnaissance flights have resulted in the estimate that perhaps some 1 million Papuans live in western New Guinea. Of these, the Dutch themselves state that only one-fourth have been brought "within government administration"—western New Guinea and the Netherlands, Netherlands Government State Printing Office, September 1954, page 12.

The Papuans are one of the most primitive peoples in the world today. They have not even advanced to the stage of a tribal culture; the family is the only social unit. It is said that headhunting and cannibalism are still practiced in the interior. The Papuans as a whole have no political consciousness whatever, a fact which is not without significance in the dispute for control over western New Guinea.

Western New Guinea is also inhabited by some 15,000 Asians and 13,000 persons of European origin.

HATRED OF COLONIALISM

The vegetation of New Guinea is primarily tropical rain forest—jungle land. The area has economic possibilities, but at present costs the Dutch far more than it is worth in any financial sense. Some oil is actually being produced under Dutch auspices; and deposits of coal, bauxite, and gold have been discovered. It is unlikely that any of these resources could be profitably exploited without large-scale immigration and substantial capital investment.

The Indonesians wish to eject the Dutch from western New Guinea because of their hatred of colonialism. And the Indonesians want the disputed area themselves because, they claim, western New Guinea has long been politically a part of the Indonesian Archipelago.

President Sukarno has told us that "Before colonial days, West Irian was part of the Indonesian national State of Modjopahit, one of the glories of the Hindu-Javanese civilization." But the actual control which medieval Modjopahit exercised over western New Guinea was a shadowy one indeed.

Western New Guinea was admittedly administered by the Dutch as part of the Netherlands East Indies. But the people of western New Guinea are unlike the Indonesians in religion, in language, in culture, and in ways of life and the patterns of thought. Would not the transfer of western New Guinea, without the consent of its people, from Dutch to Indonesian control be but a transfer of a colony from one master to another?

THE 1949 AGREEMENTS

The Indonesians also claim that the roundtable agreements of 1949 only postponed an agreed-upon union of western New Guinea to Indonesia. Mr. Speaker, it is true enough that until the agreement of 1949 the Dutch never indicated that they thought of western New Guinea as being in a separate status from the rest of the Netherlands East Indies. Nonetheless, the agreement transferring sovereignty over Indonesia to the Republic of Indonesia made the following specific statement:

> That the status quo of the residency of New Guinea shall be maintained with the stipulation that within a year from the date of transfer of sovereignty to the Republic of the United States of Indonesia the question of the political status of New Guinea be determined through negotiations between the Republic of the United States of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands. (Round Table Conference, Secretariat General of the Round Table Conference (1949), p. 9.)

That subsequent negotiations on the status of New Guinea have failed is no argument for accusing the Dutch of bad faith. The meaning of the section of the roundtable agreements just cited was, in effect, that the Dutch and Indonesians agreed to disagree on the disposition of western New Guinea.

The Indonesians have won impressive moral support for their claim to western New Guinea. In April 1955, the Governments of Burma, Ceylon, India, Indonesia, and Pakistan convened an Asian-African conference, which met at Bandung, Indonesia. A total of 29 Asian and African countries attended, nations bound together by a common resentment of colonialism. The conference's final communique declared that "colonialism in all its manifestations is an evil which should speedily be brought to an end," and stated that "the Asian-African Conference supports the position of Indonesia in the case of West Irian."

MORE THAN COLONIALISM INVOLVED

But to many other nations the western New Guinea issue is not one that can be judged merely on the basis of a hatred of colonialism. Other factors are involved—among them the welfare of the inhabitants of New Guinea and the security of the free world. The slogan of anticolonialism is no substitute for rational consideration of the issues involved.

The Dutch, in asserting their right to continued possession of western New Guinea, have frequently pointed to the sharp and radical differences between the Indonesians and the Papuans. The Indonesians are for the most part Moslem. Though some Papuans have been Christianized, others have no higher religion, but practice what sociologists call Animism—the belief that each rock, tree, and mountain has its own spirit. The 2 peoples are 2 races, and have different skin pigmentations. They speak different languages. In a word, the two peoples have nothing in common save common experience of Dutch rule, a rule of which the great majority of Papuans have probably been entirely unaware. By what right, then, ask the Dutch, do the Indonesians demand domination of other peoples in addition to their own national independence?

THE U. N. CHARTER

The Dutch also argue that the present status of western New Guinea is far more beneficial to the Papuans than Indonesian control would be. The Indonesians, with very few financial or trained human resources, face a gigantic task in the development of their own economy and society. The financial capacity of the Netherlands for development of western New Guinea is far greater than that of the Indonesians.

Article 73e of the United Nations Charter requires colonial powers "to transmit regularly to the Secretary-General statistical and other information of a technical nature relating to economic, social, and educational conditions in the territories for which they are responsible." The Netherlands has yearly furnished such information on New Guinea. The reports have been regularly transmitted to the General Assembly for consideration and debate. Thus there is provided a channel by which other nations and world public opinion can influence Dutch policy in New Guinea.

Should Indonesia gain possession of western New Guinea, no such safeguard for the interests of the Papuans would exist. West Irian would be part of the Indonesian Republic, and Indonesia would not have to answer to the United Nations for its treatment of this primitive people.

But the most telling argument of the Dutch in favor of their continued possession of New Guinea is the argument of military security. The Australian and Dutch joint possession of New Guinea probably saved Australia from Japanese invasion during the Second World War. Air and naval bases in New Guinea made possible the liberation of the Philippines.

STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE

The strategic importance of New Guinea has in no way lessened in the decade since the end of World War II. Airbases are, in fact, even more crucial now than they were before. At present, western New Guinea is in possession of a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and thus part of the security structure of the free world.

The Republic of Indonesia has repeatedly declared its determination to avoid taking sides in the cold war. This means that at best an Indonesian-held west New Guinea would be denied to the military forces of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.

While Indonesia will in time attain internal stability, it does not have that stability now. The Indonesian Communist Party is the fourth largest party in Indonesia. The Communist Party obtained more than 6 million votes in the recent elections. Until a new government was formed this spring, Communist Ministers sat in the Indonesian Cabinet.

THE AUSTRALIAN POSITION

The Australian Government has backed the Dutch position on western New Guinea with the utmost vigor. Eastern New Guinea is now under Australian control. And the Australians believe that New Guinea is absolutely vital to their own security.

The Australians also fear that Indonesian possession of western New Guinea, with its population of some one million Papuans, would in time lead inevitably to an Indonesian claim to the rest of the island. P. C. Spender, Australian Minister of External Affairs, said in a press statement of August 1950:

> If the claim of Indonesia to Dutch New Guinea were conceded to any degree at all it would be but a matter of time, no matter how genuine may be assurances to the contrary, when the claim will be pushed further so as to include the trust territory of Australian New Guinea and its people.

It should be said here, Mr. Speaker, that the political division of New Guinea between Australia and the Netherlands is a purely artificial one. The Papuans who inhabit the island inhabit all of New Guinea, and give little or no thought to whether they are formally under Australian or under Dutch rule. If political divisions are to correspond in any way to human needs, all of New Guinea should be under one administering authority.

Confronted with the conflict, the policy of our own Government has been to steer a neutral course. The United States took no part in the General Assembly discussions on western New Guinea. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles reaffirmed the refusal of the United States to exert its influence one way or another as recently as last April.

OUR DILEMMA

The reasons for our silence are clear enough. We see no reason explicitly to support Dutch colonialism, being ourselves an anticolonial nation. We do not wish unnecessarily to offend the nations of Africa and Asia. We wish the Indonesian Republic well. The United States supported Indonesia's fight for independence and has helped the Republic financially since that freedom was attained. In addition to the $100 million given Indonesia before 1950, United States assistance, in the form of loans and grants between 1950 and 1956 has amounted to $148 million—House Report No. 2147, 84th Congress, 2d session. Report of the special study mission to the Middle East, south and southeast Asia, and the Pacific, May 10, 1956, page 136.

But we are friends and allies as well, of the Netherlands and of Australia. The Netherlands is a member, and a member in very good standing, of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We have a United States Air Force fighter squadron stationed on Dutch soil.

Australia is a member of our security structure in the Far East, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. She is one of the firmest and most powerful allies we have.

Mr. Speaker, western New Guinea is vital to Australian security. New Guinea is an important link in our defense structure in the Far East. We fought in the Far East in World War II. We fought there again in Korea. Communist China remains grave and menacing, perhaps more menacing than the Soviet Union. Can we afford to let western New Guinea slip from the wardship of one of our allies to a neutralist, not yet stabilized, Indonesia?

HOW ABOUT A CONSTRUCTIVE PROPOSAL?

Nonetheless, we cannot leave the New Guinea question to fester indefinitely. Perhaps our own policy on the dispute should be more creative than it has been. Perhaps we should answer President Sukarno's appeal with a constructive proposal, and not blank silence.

Mr. Speaker, to anyone who has studied the western New Guinea dispute two facts of international life are very clear. The first is that the inhabitants of New Guinea, the Papuans themselves, are not in the present stage of their development capable of administering the island of New Guinea in such a manner as to prevent their land from falling under foreign control. Nature abhors a vacuum, and so does the modern nation-state system. The second fact is that colonialism is repugnant not only to the Indonesians but to most of the peoples of Asia and Africa.

Is there, then, a solution that would be, or should be, accepable to all parties? I think there may be.

Article 77 of the United Nations Charter provides that "the trusteeship system shall apply to such territories in the following categories as may be placed thereunder by means of trusteeship agreements." One of these categories is "territories voluntarily placed under the system by states responsible for their administration."

U. N. TRUSTEESHIP

Why should not western New Guinea, like the territory of New Guinea, become a United Nations trusteeship? Such a transfer would end the onus of colonialism, provide more protection for the interests of the Papuans, and be consistent with the security requirements of Australia and of the free world.

The trusteeship should be a joint one, and not the responsibility of any one power, for any one-power administration might give rise to the suspicion of exploitation. Though the administering authority for most United Nations trusteeships is a single nation, a joint administration does have a precedent. Since 1947 the atoll of Nauru, 1,300 miles northeast of Australia, was placed under a United Nations trusteeship held jointly by Great Britain, New Zealand, and Australia. Might not western New Guinea be placed under a similar arrangement?

Should western New Guinea be made a United Nations trusteeship, Indonesia should surely be one of the trustees. The geographic contiguity of Indonesia is itself a good reason for her exercising some authority. Another power to be included in such an arrangement would be Australia. New Guinea is vital to Australian security, and the rest of the island is already held or administered by Australia.

THE POSSIBLE TRUSTEES

A third power should also be included, to insure that the interests of the Papuans themselves would be cared for. Such a power should be an Asian one, itself newly freed, and therefore, it is hoped, sympathetic to the problems of dependent peoples. Such a choice would also meet the hopes of African-Asian nations for world responsibilities. Might the great republic of India be a suitable partner in trusteeship?

The proposal just outlined presupposes that the Dutch would be willing to relinquish all political control in New Guinea by offering it up as a trust territory under article 77. We must face the fact that such an assumption is of doubtful validity. Dutch industrial enterprises are currently operating in New Guinea. Oil is being produced. The Dutch and Australian authorities in New Guinea are working together for coordination of policy in their respective areas.

The Dutch are in actual possession of western New Guinea. Given the facts of international life, we must recognize that only force can make them leave against their will. Any proposal made must be accepted by the Netherlands if it is to be effective.

In view of this and the continued desire of the Dutch to stay, the proposed United Nations trusteeship might best be exercised by the three powers with the greatest interest in western New Guinea—Indonesia, Australia, and the Netherlands—with India, perhaps, sitting as a nonvoting chairman.

The transfer of western New Guinea from Dutch ownership to a United Nations trusteeship would be a stultifying exercise unless effective provision is made for the eventual right of the Papuans to real self-determination. The United Nations Charter provides that administering authorities for United Nations trusteeships will report annually to the General Assembly on their wards on the basis of a comprehensive questionnaire formulated by the Trusteeship Council. Members of the Trusteeship Council make periodic visits to trust areas. The Trusteeship Council and the General Assembly itself—the body to which the Trusteeship Council is responsible—discuss problems of nonself-governing peo-

ples and frequently make suggestions and recommendations.

Article 79 of the United Nations Charter provides that "the terms of trusteeship for each territory to be placed under the trusteeship system shall be agreed upon by the States directly concerned." These terms of agreement, which vary according to each trusteeship, then have to be approved by the General Assembly. The formulation and approval of the terms of agreement can do much to guarantee the Papuans the consideration and eventual right to self-determination which is their due, as it is the due of all peoples.

NOTHING LIKE TRYING

Would the Netherlands and Indonesia agree to such a proposal? We do not know. But we may hazard the guess that the question of western New Guinea has spoiled Dutch-Indonesian relations long enough. Dutch economic and human interests in Indonesia are great enough to make continuance of the presently strained relationship distasteful and unprofitable to both countries. They both have so much to gain by settlement of this dispute. Western New Guinea is a financial drain on the Netherlands; and the Indonesian Government needs all the help it can get in administering its own affairs and training its own citizens, help which the Dutch by their experience in the area are well suited to provide.

With assistance from other powers, the western New Guinea dispute may yet be settled in a manner which meets the just interests of all parties, including the Papuans.

Mr. Speaker, could not our country encourage the free world by offering its good offices toward a trusteeship solution?

SMALL BUSINESS EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY BILL WILL BE CONSIDERED

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the small business equality of opportunity bill has been programed for consideration by the House on next Monday, June 11, 1956. The Committee on Rules on June 4, 1956, reported House Resolution 521 providing for the consideration of H. R. 1840 to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination. In reporting H. R. 1840 the Committee on Rules provided that it shall be in order to substitute H. R. 11 for H. R. 1840. I am happy, and I know that all the friends of small business are happy, that our Rules Committee was so considerate in that respect. In providing for the substitution of H. R. 11 for H. R. 1840 the Rules Committee recognized, as do all of us, that our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the author of H. R. 11, is the outstanding champion of small business. I repeat, the Committee on Rules was justly considerate in providing for the substitution of Mr. PATMAN'S bill, H. R. 11, for H. R. 1840, when the House considers the small business equality of opportunity bill next Monday, June 11.

When the House considers the equality of opportunity bill the Members will want to participate in the discussion of that important piece of legislation. In order to assist the Members who want to locate materials relating to H. R. 11 and the reasons why it was introduced, I insert in the RECORD at this point references to pages of the RECORD where those materials may be found. The references are as follows:

March 13, 1956: History of Efforts To Give Small Business Equality of Opportunity Prior to Introduction of H. R. 11, pages 4634–4648.

March 15, 1956: Food Canners and Processors Ask for Strong Quality of Opportunity Law, pages 4882–4889.

March 19, 1956: The Life of Independent Wholesale Bakers Depends Upon Immediate Passage of H. R. 11, pages 5096–5097.

March 20, 1956: Stock Prices and Business Failures at Postwar High, pages 5209–5210.

March 21, 1956: Consumer Cooperatives, Original Antimonopolists, Support H. R. 11, page 5300.

March 22, 1956: The Committee on Small Business Needs Advice From the House, pages 5388–5391.

March 26, 1956: Farmers Urge Legislation To Strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act, pages 5602–5603.

March 27, 1956: Wholesale Grocers Remember When A. & P. Collected Dummy Brokerage, pages 5688–5689.

March 28, 1956: Independent Tire Dealers Say It Is Essential That Congress Strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act, pages 5775–5776.

May 3, 1956: Further Judicial Weakening of the Robinson-Patman Act Makes Passages of H. R. 11 Important, pages 7452–7454.

May 7, 1956: Decision of United States Court of Appeals Reveals Federal Antitrust Agencies To Be Working for Monopoly and for Widespread Destruction to Small Business, pages 7644–7645.

THE HERITAGE OF OLD AGE SHOULD NOT BE DESPAIR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, several Congressmen were talking about children when I entered the cloakroom one day last week. One had remarked about how quickly children grow up today, when another Member interrupted to tell about the adolescent whose father decided that the time had come to educate him about some of the facts of life. After much hesitation, the father mustered enough courage to invite the boy into the living room, saying: "Son, you're getting on in years now. I'd like to have a good heart-to-heart talk with you about the facts of life." "Sure, Dad," said the boy, "what do you want to know?"

Youth is so sure of itself. Mark Twain used to describe his feelings toward his father in this way:

"When I was 15," he said, "I thought my father knew so little about so many things. When I became 21, however, my father suddenly became very bright. I was amazed by how much he had learned in the last 6 years."

We cherish youth in this country. We cherish youth so much that we are really quite immature in our attitudes toward our older people. We discard them, perhaps not in the same barbaric manner as some primitive tribes, which drive their older people out of the community, but our treatment is nearly as bad.

PEOPLE ARE LIVING LONGER

The fastest growing population group in our country consists of the men and women age 65 and over. Today there are 13½ million of them. With 1,000 more joining their ranks daily, their number is expected to increase to 20 million by 1975.

For some of them the golden years are the culmination of a rich, rewarding life. They view advancing age with a dignity and charm like that of President John Quincy Adams, who was congratulated on his 81st birthday by a friend who asked: "How is John Quincy Adams today?"

"Quite well, thank you," Adams replied. "John Quincy Adams is quite well. But the house in which he lives is becoming quite dilapidated. Time and the seasons have nearly destroyed it. It is tottering on its foundations and the roof is worn quite thin. Yes, the old tenement is becoming quite uninhabitable and I fear that John Quincy Adams will have to move out of it soon. But he himself is quite well, thank you, quite well."

For most elderly people, however, advancing years bring increased burdens. A recent study by the reliable Twentieth Century Fund reveals that nearly three-fourths of those aged 65 and over either have no income of their own or earn less than $1,000 per year. But this deplorable lack of sufficient funds represents only one aspect of their difficulties. The Council of State Governments reports that they are particularly subject, as well, to unequal opportunity for employment; inferior housing; separation from family and friends; widowhood for more than half the women; inadequate medical care; lack of hospital insurance just when chronic diseases hit; hospitalization in mental institutions because of insufficient nursing homes and rehabilitation facilities; spiritual deterioration because of belief that the community is no longer interested in them. The list is long, the impact heavy.

BIRTH CERTIFICATE SHOULD NOT BE SOLE TEST OF ABILITY TO WORK

Each year, we consign healthy, alert men and women by the hundreds to the scrap heap and to an early physical and mental breakdown for no other reason than their age. The sloughing-off process begins early—at age 45 for men and

35 for women. At these early ages, according to a Department of Labor finding a few years ago, the odds are 6 to 1 against their getting new jobs even in a tight labor market. The Federal Government, which used to be one of the worst offenders in refusing employment because of age, no longer does so because of my amendment last year which prohibited the Civil Service Commission from using age as a qualification. For some time Secretary of Labor Mitchell has made a determined and worthy effort to persuade private industry to abandon its long-standing preference for young people only. I will wager, however, that the 6-to-1 odds have not fallen very much. How unfair it is to judge a person's ability only by his birth certificate. We refuse to recognize the fact that most of our older people want to work and can work, and that a job is the best guaranty of their self-respect and independence.

And then at age 65 comes the culminating blow. If a person has been lucky enough to work until he reaches that age, compulsory retirement takes him out of his job, regardless of his capabilities. A few years ago I received a letter from a toolmaker in Detroit, in which he said:

> I was getting along fine at my job, feeling good and doing my work well. I had worked there for 30 years and I was 64. Along came my birthday and I was out of work. I was good enough at 64; I was not good enough at 65. And yet I was the same man.

Older people are like other people in the respect that they need enough money to live on and to take care of themselves. Obviously this must come from work, savings, social security, or from some kind of public assistance. It is difficult to accumulate enough savings to retire. Most people who reach age 65 will live another 13 years, and if they want to retire on their savings, they will have to have accumulated about $17,000 in order to have an income of $100 a month for the rest of their lives. For most American families who are trying to get along on less than $3,000 per year, this amount is unattainable.

Social-security benefits, even with the increases in recent years, are still inadequate to provide a minimum standard of living. The law itself denies to beneficiaries the right to supplement their benefits by earnings of more than $100 per month, a provision which seems most unreasonable because it permits only a minimum standard of living. Until such time as social-security benefits allow a decent standard of living, beneficiaries should not be prohibited from supplementing their benefits with adequate earnings to permit them to live in independence and dignity.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT LAGGING IN HELP FOR OLDER PERSONS

What is the Federal Government doing to help them? Unfortunately, not very much. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which is supposed to be concerned with their plight, has attacked the matter with all the ferocity and speed of a snail. Last year Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby appeared before the Appropriations Committee and admitted the Federal Government was 10 years behind in its work on behalf of older persons. Yet she requested a budget of only $65,000 to deal with the enormous task.

We hoped for a more sympathetic attitude when Secretary Folsom appeared this year, but there was none. The Secretary said he wanted the same budget and to continue with the same system of using a small general staff and leaving to agencies such as the Social Security Administration, the National Institutes of Health, and the Department of Labor the responsibility for developing adequate programs to cope with the problem. This was the arrangement which brought sharp criticism by the Appropriations Committee upon the Department for its indifference to the needs of older persons, and the demand that substantial progress be made during the next year. But if the committee expects any improvement after having voted the same inadequate budget, it is indulging in wishful thinking. What is needed is a Bureau of Older Persons established within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to help the States make an intensive effort in the field of aging and to coordinate their activities.

BUREAU OF OLDER PERSONS NEEDED

I have filed a bill to establish a Bureau of Older Persons in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to deal with problems of people age 65 and over. The bill also sets up a program of grants-in-aid to the States to encourage them to undertake prompt measures to train needed personnel and to lay out a course of action in handling the problems of our older citizens. The bill recognizes that primary responsibility rests with the States and local communities and that the Federal Government can only help them to help themselves.

The goals sought to be attained by the bill are those recommended by the Council of State Governments, as follows:

First, to assure to older persons an equal opportunity with others to engage in gainful employment which they are physically and mentally able to perform;

Second, to enable older persons to achieve a retirement income sufficient for health and for participation in community life as self-respecting citizens;

Third, to provide older persons, so far as possible, with the opportunity of living in their own homes or, when this is not feasible, in suitable substitute private homes; and in the case of such persons who need care that cannot be given them in their own or other private homes, to provide them with the opportunity to live in institutions that are as homelike as possible and have high standards of care;

Fourth, older persons to receive adequate nutrition, preventive medicine, and medical care adapted to the conditions of their years;

Fifth, to rehabilitate and to restore to independent, useful lives in their homes, to the fullest extent possible, older persons who are chronically ill, physically disabled, mentally disturbed, or incapacitated for other reasons;

Sixth, to assist older persons to have access to social groups and to participate with those of other ages in recreational, educational, cultural, religious, and civic activities;

Seventh, to assure that older persons, in planning for retirement and in meeting the crises of their later years, will have the benefits of such services as counseling, information, vocational retraining and social casework; and

Eighth, to relieve the problems of older persons through an increase of research on the various aspects of aging and the development of special courses in schools and departments of medicine, nursing, clinical psychology, and social work to train professional workers in the field of aging.

REHABILITATION ASSISTANCE SHOULD BE EXPANDED

Mr. Speaker, I have also introduced a bill to broaden the scope of our rehabilitation program by making these services available to millions of Americans who are now ineligible because they are classified as too old to go back to work. I propose to change the name of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation to the Office of Rehabilitation and to reframe its duties so that the new techniques and knowledge on rehabilitation may be made available to all who need it.

I have a deep conviction that there is much more to rehabilitation of people than merely retrieving them for employment, desirable as that objective may be. This is a Nation which is founded upon recognition of the rights of the individual. Correspondingly, we must not overlook the needs of the individual. Surely we can no longer deny our older people who are stricken the opportunity for restoration to independence, usefulness, and pride in daily living. Certainly to require employability as our sole standard for rehabilitation will relegate to oblivion people who can be restored to useful life.

I am greatly concerned with this matter, Mr. Speaker, for all evidence shows that we are condemning too many of our senior citizens to a life of loneliness, neglect, and despair. A recent study points to the fact that many older people throughout the country have been stowed away and virtually forgotten in antiquated public infirmaries or in substandard nursing and convalescent homes.

THE GOLDEN YEARS CAN BE GLORIOUS YEARS

Almost a century ago Benjamin Disraeli wrote in one of his novels:

> Let us hope that the heritage of old age is not despair.

That is still our hope. The golden years can be glorious years if our older people have enough to live on, good housing accommodations, something to keep them active and to give them a feeling that they belong—that the community has not discarded them. We are still far from that goal but it is one toward which we must strive.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DONDERO, on Monday and Tuesday of next week, for 45 minutes on each day.

Mr. SADLAK, for 20 minutes, on Wednesday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HILLINGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COOPER and to include a press release issued today.

Mr. BOW, notwithstanding that it will exceed 2 pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $220.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANHAM (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) in two instances.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. ALBERT).

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3307. An act to amend section 9 (d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to authorize jurisdiction in the Federal Courts in certain reemployment cases; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3857. An act to clarify section 1103 (d) of title XI (Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5516. An act to amend title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide that service as an Army field clerk, or as a field clerk, Quartermaster Corps, shall be counted for purposes of retirement under title III of that act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6274. An act to provide that no fee shall be charged a veteran discharged under honorable conditions for furnishing him or his next of kin or legal representative a copy of a certificate showing his service in the Armed Forces; and

H. R. 9536. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 11, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1947. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the report on borrowing authority for the quarter ending March 31, 1956, pursuant to section 304b of the Defense Production Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1948. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit for the year ended June 30, 1954, of certain operations of the United States Coast Guard yard, an industrial installation for the performance of industrial services for the Coast Guard and other Federal agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1949. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the United States assistance program for Lebanon as administered by the International Cooperation Administration of the Department of State and by the predecessor agencies, for the period from the inception of the program in 1952 through the fiscal year 1955; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1950. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of April 30, 1956, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1951. A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the court's opinion rendered in the case of *Matson Navigation Company, a corporation (1), and Union Oil Company of California, a corporation (2), v. The United States* (Congressional No. 7-54), pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and pursuant to House Resolution 546, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1952. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to encourage the development, marketing, and distribution of domestic fishery resources of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1953. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 422); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1954. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Army industrial fund, Depot Maintenance Division, Richmond Quartermaster Depot, Department of the Army, for the period July 1, 1954, to August 31, 1955; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Part 2, minority views on H. R. 11380, a bill to readjust postal rates and to establish a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2237). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LONG: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2285. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LONG: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2286. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee of conference. S. 2972. An act to punish the willful damaging or destroying of aircraft and attempts to damage or destroy aircraft, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2287). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROONEY: Committee of conference. H. R. 10721. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2288).

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 11127. A bill to clarify the law relating to the grant of certain public lands to the States for school purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2289). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 5147. A bill to change the distribution of Coast and Geodetic Survey charts; without amendment (Rept. No. 2292). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 6025. A bill to amend the shipping laws, to prohibit the operation in the coastwise trade of vessels rebuilt outside the United States, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2293). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 6850. A bill to create an academic advisory board for the United States Merchant Marine Academy; without amendment (Rept. No. 2294). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 9774. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Board of Commissioners of Volusia County, Fla.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2295). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 10261. A bill to provide a further increase in the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service; with amendment (Rept. No. 2296). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 11027. A bill to amend title VII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for experimental operation and testing of vessels owned by the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2297). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 11402. A bill to extend the existing application of the Temporary Promotion Act of 1941, as amended, to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2298). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 11255. A bill to clarify section 1103 (d) of title XI (Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2299). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 2937. An act to increase from $50 to $75 per month the

amount of benefits payable to widows of certain former employees of the Lighthouse Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 2300). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 3265. An act to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for filing vessel utilization and performance reports by operators of vessels in the foreign commerce of the United States; without amendment (Rept. 2301). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 7886. A bill to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards; with amendment (Rept. No. 2302). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 5690. A bill for the relief of Camp Kooch-i-ching; with amendment (Rept. No. 2290). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 10204. A bill authorizing the Commandant of the Coast Guard to transfer certain land to Richard M. Tinney and John T. O'Connor, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2291). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWNSON:

H. R. 11681. A bill to amend section 1481 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to mitigation of the effect of renegotiation of Government contracts) and section 3806 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 11682. A bill to facilitate the control and eradication of certain animal diseases, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural and related programs, to facilitate the agricultural attaché program, to facilitate the operations of the Farmers' Home Administration, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and the Forest Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 11683. A bill to authorize permanent appointments in the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 11684. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in operation of industries affecting commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 11685. A bill to provide for the acquisition of Navaho Indian lands required in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Glen Canyon unit, Colorado River storage project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 11686. A bill to provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 11687. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees of the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 11688. A bill to prohibit the introduction, or manufacture for introduction, into interstate commerce of switchblade knives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. J. Res. 644. Joint resolution to exempt State clubs and fraternal organizations from filing form 990; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. J. Res. 645. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the qualifications for the office of President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FJARE:

H. J. Res. 646. Joint resolution for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. Res. 532. Resolution providing for the printing of certain proceedings in the House Committee on Agriculture; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 11689. A bill for the relief of Yi-Fu Tuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 11690. A bill for the relief of Connie Maria Fennessey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 11691. A bill for the relief of Liesel Rynevicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT (by request):

H. R. 11692. A bill for the relief of Liane Ingrid Neuburger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 11693. A bill for the relief of Livio Senni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 11694. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chana Fudym; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1121. By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Petition of Douglas E. Wells, Little Rock, Ark., and others, urging enactment of separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1122. By Mr. MAGNUSON: Petition of 404 employees in the maintenance-of-way on the Great Northern Railway, Old Cascade division, from Seattle, Skykomish, Mount Vernon, Monroe, Burlington, Everett, Bellingham, Spokane, Edmonds, Granite Falls, Startup, Bow, Sedro Woolley, Lyman, Marysville, Concrete, Cashmere, Blaine, Ferndale, Monse, Sultan, Gold Bar, Index, Alderwood Manor, East Stanwood, Issaquah, Arlington, Bothell, Pinehurst, Silvana, Anacortes, Leavenworth, Wenatchee, Blanchard, Winslow, Lake City, Maltby, Scenic, Mukilteo, Marietta, Maple Valley, Renton, Mansfield, Black Diamond, Lynnwood, Kirkland, Mountlake Terrace, and Tacoma, Wash., in support of H. R. 9065, which proposes to increase by 15 percent the annuities paid to their disabled and retired fellow workers on the railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1123. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution passed unanimously by the City Council of Kenosha, Wis., concerning the solicitation for Government orders in Kenosha to aid labor and industry in that surplus-labor area; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1124. By the SPEAKER: Petition of H. Joseph Mahoney and others, Brooklyn, N. Y., relative to requesting Congress to adopt the proposed Bow amendment to the bill H. R. 11356, pertaining to mutual security; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Proposed Changes in Excise Tax Administrative Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERE COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means today resumed consideration of the report of the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems. As I have done in the past, I will insert in the RECORD a release which I issued as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to the tentative action taken by the committee today:

CHAIRMAN JERE COOPER, OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, ANNOUNCES TENTATIVE DECISIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXCISE TAX TECHNICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS

The Honorable JERE COOPER, Democrat, of Tennessee, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, announces the tentative decisions reached today by the committee with respect to the recommendations contained in the report of the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems. Previous announcements with respect to earlier decisions of the committee were issued on May 10, 14, 16, 17, and June 6, 1956. These announcements are printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 10, 15, 16, 17, and June 6, 1956, and appear on pages 8011–8012, 8205–8206, 8328–8329, 8443, and 9732–9733, respectively.

Chairman COOPER stated that the committee had completed the consideration of the subcommittee's recommendations as set forth in the subcommittee report. The next

action by the full committee on the subcommittee recommendations will occur with the consideration of specific proposed legislative language embodying the subcommittee recommendations as agreed to by the committee. This consideration will occur at such time as the proposed statutory language is drafted. A table of revenue estimates relating to the subcommittee's recommendations is printed in the subcommittee report beginning on page 13. A more detailed explanation of the recommendations appears in the subcommittee report beginning on page 16. The decisions reached by the committee today are as follows:

XI. TOBACCO AND ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE TAXES

1. The full committee approved the subcommittee recommendation for the adoption of the proposed revision in the alcohol, tobacco, etc., taxes as presented by the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division of the Internal Revenue Service with the changes and modifications noted in numbered paragraph 2 below and as noted in the press release of June 6, 1956.

2. The committee approved a subcommittee recommendation that provisions be adopted which will permit distilled spirits of different ages to be commingled in an internal revenue bonded warehouse. Such distilled spirits, however, cannot be less than 4 years old. The date of original entry of the youngest spirits mingled in this manner is to be deemed the date of original entry of all the spirits in any package for purposes of determining the expiration of the 8-year bonded period. In approving this subcommittee recommendation, the committee adopted an amendment which would embody the provisions of H. R. 5367 with an amendment that would substitute a 20-year bonding period for the unlimited bonding period provided in the bill.

3. The committee deleted the subcommittee recommendation which stated that provision should be made in the case of the tobacco and alcoholic beverage taxes to shift from the stamp system for collecting these taxes to a semimonthly return system. This semimonthly return system should be provided for the period from August 1, 1957, to July 30, 1958, and should make provision for the reporting of collections for the first 15 days of each month on the 18th of the same month and for the reporting of collections for the period from the 15th to the end of the month on the 3d day of the following month. Beginning with August 1, 1958, and for subsequent years, a monthly return system should be adopted. Each month's collections would be reported on the 15th day of the following month under this recommendation.

The committee returned to the consideration of subcommittee recommendations that had previously been passed over and took the following action:

I. MANUFACTURERS' EXCISES

Recommendations 1 through 3 were previously approved by the committee.

4. Credits or refunds should be available with respect to the tax on gasoline destroyed as the result of a disaster (as so declared by the President) to the extent that the tax losses are not compensated by insurance or otherwise. The commitee in acting on this recommendation deleted the words "by fire or" from the original subcommittee recommendation so that the credits or refunds would be available only in the case of gasoline destroyed as the result of a disaster.

Recommendations 5, 6, and 7 were previously approved by the committee.

8. In the case of sales by manufacturers directly to retailers, the manufacturers' price on which the tax is computed should be based upon the price at which the manufacturer sells to wholesale distributors. This alternative to the actual price charged by the manufacturer would not be available where sales to the retailer are the normal method of distribution within the industry and would not be available where the manufacturer does not make a sufficient number of sales to independent wholesalers.

9. Present law provides that the base on which the manufacturers' tax is computed is to be constructed where a manufacturer makes a sale (otherwise than at arm's length) at less than the fair market price. In practice a sale to a selling subsidiary in such a case would be presumed to be not at arm's length. This administrative presumption should be codified.

10. The status of cooperative advertising in relation to a manufacturers' tax base should be clarified by a specific ruling of the Internal Revenue Service. The subcommittee has been informed that the Service will issue a ruling providing substantially as follows:

(a) The distinction between national and local advertising is abolished.

(b) Where a manufacturer's selling price to his customer contains an unsegregated advertising charge, it is a part of his tax base.

(c) In the case where a manufacturer makes a separate charge to his distributor for advertising and the proceeds are kept in a separate account earmarked for advertising, the separate advertising charge is not a part of the tax base. This separation can be evidenced by showing that the charge is either listed on the sales invoice or billed separately; the contributions from distributors are set aside as a fund to be used for advertising for the benefit of these contributors and the funds are so used, or the unexpended portion is held in trust or refunded to the contributor upon his withdrawal from the program.

(d) Where the manufacturer makes a contribution to the advertising account in the case of a separate fund, the amount of the manufacturer's contribution may not be deducted in computing the taxable sales price. However, the subsequent allowances against such contributions to distributors for expenditures by them or their dealers for advertising should be treated as readjustments of sales price.

IV. TRANSPORTATION TAXES

Recommendations 1 and 3, previously approved by the committee.

2. Present law imposes a tax equal to 4½ percent of the fare charged for the transportation of oil by pipeline, with an exemption for any movement through pipelines between the premises of a refinery, bulk plant, terminal, or a gasoline plant if the movement is not a continuation of taxable transportation. "Any movement through lines of pipe within the premises," in addition to including any movements interpreted by the Secretary or his delegate as being within the premises under existing law, should also include any movement which constitutes an integral part of the operation of a refinery, a bulk plant, a terminal, or a gasoline plant. In drafting proposed statutory language to carry out this recommendation, the staff was directed to include a mileage limitation prescribing the maximum distance that such transportation may cover without payment of tax.

In addition to the committee action described above, the committee also ordered favorably reported H. R. 11619, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs and marihuana.

The chairman announced that the committee was tentatively scheduled to meet in executive session at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, June 12, 1956, to begin consideration of proposals for the extension of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 as amended.

Rochester Bar Association Pays Tribute to the Honorable Kenneth B. Keating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, on March 20, 1956, the Rochester Bar Association gave a testimonial dinner in honor of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]. Over 700 persons attended the dinner which was held in the Rochester Chamber of Commerce Building. The principal address was delivered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and the toastmaster was Mr. Paul Miller, executive vice president of the Gannett Newspapers.

Mr. Frank Traynor, president of the Rochester Bar Association, presented Mr. KEATING a silver plaque on behalf of the association. It is inscribed:

The Rochester Bar Association, on the occasion of its testimonial dinner to him on March 20, 1956, salutes its distinguished member, lawyer, soldier, and legislator, KENNETH B. KEATING, of whom it is proud to say that everything he does, he does well.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the tribute paid the gentleman from New York by his friends and colleagues and in doing so I wish to bring to the attention of the House the address delivered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and the response of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]. The speeches follow:

ADDRESS OF MR. MARTIN

It is a great privilege for me to come here this evening and join with the bar association and friends of Rochester in honoring a great public servant.

This trip has brought to me many pleasures. It is a privilege to come here in company with these grand Congressmen from New York who are at the head table, every one doing a wonderful service in this great task to keep America free, to keep America on the American track. It is a great privilege to come to this city where back in what I might almost term the horse and buggy days, Frank Gannett and I were trying at the national committee to keep the party alive after the Wendell Willkie collapse of 1940. I am glad to come to this city that I may pay tribute to this great Republican, who in the hours of party need, gave freely of his time and money that this party should live to serve the cause of America.

I am happy, too, to come here that I might see two of my former ex-Congressmen, Congressman Duffy and Congressman Whitley, who labored through the years in Congress, helping to carry America through those perilous days.

But primarily, we come here to honor a great American. A nugget of wisdom from the past says that "a man is not without honor save in his own country." Fortunately, that is not true here, because this great meeting, the men and women who have gathered here to honor KEN KEATING, give tribute to the fact that you do honor him, here in this city of Rochester, where he lives and where he works to make you a better community, and to make New York State and our country a better land.

We need men of the type of KEN KEATING in Washington. Never before was there so great a need for experienced men, men of character, men of ability, men of courage and of conviction, men trustworthy and honest. And that's the type of man you here in Rochester send to the Halls of Congress.

A little while ago I was one of the very few who said that President Eisenhower would be a candidate for reelection and that he would not only be renominated but that he would be reelected. That was because I knew in this tense period, this period when the world and the country needed the man so much, he could not fail to respond to that call of country.

The last testimonial dinner I went to I dropped a torch that caught flame and resulted in the man becoming chairman of the Republican National Committee. And with that thought in mind I'm going to be very careful tonight, that I don't set fires that may like the prairie fires sweep across the country.

I don't know whether KEN KEATING wants to go to the United States Senate or not. He hasn't told me and I'm not going to express an opinion upon that. If you decide to send him, I'll say this, you'll send a very efficient and competent man, a man who'd be a credit to this great Empire State of New York.

But I am a bit selfish. Perhaps it's because I come from New England—we are supposed to be a closed corporation up there in New England—and I am selfish and hope that he'll decline all these blandishments that have come from all over the State, that he'll go back with me, so that he might become chairman of the great Judiciary Committee.

Ah, my friends, that is a high honor, an honor that's not to be underestimated in any degree. To be chairman of the committee that handles more than one-third of all the legislation that flows through the Halls of Congress is a great honor. It requires a great legislator. It requires a man with the knowledge of law and procedure. And so, Ken, I'm not going to bring any pressure on you, but I would not feel badly if you decided—as I decided many years ago—that there was a greater opportunity to serve the people of this country in the House instead of the Senate.

I remember back—and, like an old man now, you know, we reminisce—back in 1936 a substantial group of Republicans and a good segment of the Democratic Party—including the leading newspaper of New England of the Democratic affiliation came to me and wanted me to run for the United States Senate. That was a great temptation, of course, but I resisted because I believed that there in the House a man could find his greatest mission and contribution to his country. I say that not to discourage you in the least bit, Kenneth, but we do need strong men in Washington, and whether he goes to the House or Senate you can be proud of him and you'll be proud of the record that he will achieve.

I cannot help but bring to you just one little message. These are tense days in the history of America. Yes; they are tense days in the history of the world. What we do in the next 2 or 3 years may well determine what kind of a world we are going to have—whether we are going to have freedom or whether we're going to have an ideology that crushes men and women beneath their iron heel. And we here in America will be given the opportunity, in the large sense, to determine that decision, because we are the one Nation in the world today strong enough, either in an economic or military way, to lead this world to freedom.

My dear friends, that's a challenge we dare not shirk. That's a challenge we must accept. I'm not one of those who's a pessimist on the future of the United States. I'm an optimist. I believe in America. I believe in its institutions, its ideals, and its hopes for the future. They are going to be brought into fruition because of the men and women who go into the public service. It cannot be written in the stars that this great Republic shall fail in the crucial period of our history.

O my friends, it may call for sacrifices. It may call for all of us to do a little more than we would desire to do. Those sacrifices must be made, because the world needs men and women, brave men and women, men and women who realize that the moral and other issues involved far transcend materialism.

Only recently, in the last few days, we hear the leaders of a great nation admit that their guiding genius for over 25 years is a murderer and a public cutthroat and everything else besides. We're not going to let that kind of people dominate this free world. That is not the spirit of America. It's not the spirit of America that made this Nation what it is today.

America has become great, not because of the resources and the great advantages that have come here in America, although they do contribute in large measure to that end—America has become great because of men and women who are willing to meet the test and meet it strongly and firmly. And so I am happy to come here, full of confidence in the future, believing that America is going to lead this whole wide world along the pathway of peace to better days in which all people, whether they live in Asia or Africa, may find life a little better. That is the goal for which America is pointing. It's an opportunity for all of us to aid.

Your good friend and my friend, because he is one of my loyal friends, and one who can take my place when the time comes that occassionally, you know, even the leader has to go out of the hall for a little while or lay down temporarily his duties. It's a great privilege for me always to know that I have KEN KEATING substituting for me. I've called him to do that job on many occasions and he always fills the duties with credit and distinction.

Oh, my friends, I'm happy to come here tonight, happy to come that I may offer my personal felicitations to your Congressman, happy also that I might be able to give you this ray of confidence: America need fear no foe. America needs only to make sure which way it goes and to go that way on the side of freedom, peace, and justice.

Ah, my friends, let us realize the great obligation we owe to America. If we do, we will not fail. We will go forward to heights never dreamed of by our countrymen. And it will be a better day for all of us, whether he live in these great United States or in darkest Africa or Asia.

You do well tonight to come and pay this tribute to your Congressman. Too often, men in public life fail to secure the praise and approval of the better citizens of the community until it is too late to do them good. I'm glad to know that that's not the custom here in Rochester. And so, Ken, I salute you. Salute you as a great American, a great legislator, a great public servant. And I know wherever you go in Washington or to some other place in New York, you'll be serving the people and making a contribution to this citizenship which is so desirable in these days ahead. Thank you so much.

ADDRESS OF MR. KEATING

I am deeply grateful and touched by this tribute from the bar association. It is extremely hard, of course, for me to put into words all of my thoughts on this memorable occasion. I hardly know where to begin to thank all those who have contributed so much to this wonderful evening.

I am most grateful to the colleagues who have taken the long trip from Washington to be with me on this occasion. It so happens that all the colleagues here this evening are of my political faith, but you know, one of the finest things about service in the House of Representatives is the wonderful opportunity it affords to form warm and fast friendships, regardless of party affiliation.

Those Members who have come here tonight—HUGH SCOTT, HAROLD OSTERTAG, BILL WILLIAMS, and WALTER RIEHLMAN—have all been very close friends of mine. I don't know how to thank them enough for being here with me.

I am likewise overwhelmed that as busy a man as our minority leader should take time out of his busy life to come up here. This is indeed a fine tribute. I am most grateful to JOE MARTIN and to Judge Wheeler and HUGH SCOTT for the very nice things they have had to say about me and my work.

Since this dinner is primarily given by the bar association, I want to say just a word or two about lawyers. We in the bar association have no politics and it is, of course, among the lawyers of both political parties that I have had my most intimate association over a period of years. It is always a special pleasure when I am able to assist any members of the bar when they contact me in Washington.

You are all aware, I am sure, that it is very fashionable these days to tell stories about lawyers. It seems we hear them all the time. I am reminded of the one about the minister and the lawyer and the doctor who were marooned on an island. They had to get to shore for help, but the waters all around were infested with sharks. So they decided to draw lots as to who would swim ashore, and the lawyer got the short paper. He jumped in and they were about to kiss him goodbye, but when he started to swim all the sharks went in the other direction. The minister said, "That's the most amazing thing I ever saw." And the doctor said, "Oh, that's nothing, it's just professional courtesy."

Yes; we hear a lot of that sort of thing about lawyers. But I'm proud to be a lawyer and I am proud to say a word or two in rebuttal to that kind of talk. It's high time we did a little talking about the generosity of the legal profession.

I knew in my practice and I know now from my correspondence since assuming the role of a legislator, about hundreds and hundreds of cases in Rochester and this vicinity, in which lawyers—who are so often charged with acting only for a fee—have taken cases solely out of the depths of their feelings for someone who could not pay anything. And I know how industriously and diligently they pursue these matters even when they know they cannot possibly collect a fee.

Lawyers should have—and I feel in our community do have—an honored place.

Often we hear that lawyers are interested only in contention and about fights in court. As so many of us who have practiced law know, however, the truth is that much of the most constructive and finest work done by lawyers is performed outside of the courtroom. It is the wisdom and foresight which lawyers so often show in drawing up a will or a trust or forming a corporation that eliminates the risk of litigation. This is a real and positive aspect of the lawyer's role that should not be neglected.

I think lawyers sometimes overlook the vitally important role which they should fill as counsel for themselves. Many lawyers feel that because of the unique standards of their profession, they should not take the credit to which they are not entitled. But perhaps because I am somewhat removed from the active practice of the law, I can say that members of the legal profession in community service, in public life, in their contributions to the welfare of their clients and in living up to the standards

of ethics to which they subscribe, are serving in the finest traditions of our county.

Let us as lawyers, therefore, be more articulate in expressing what we as lawyers do. We must remain faithful to the oaths we have taken as lawyers, but when stories are told such as I've told tonight, let us come back at them.

There has been a lot of talk here tonight about what the future may hold. Of course, I cannot predict what that may be, but I can say that no one could ever have been as fortunate as I have been to have had the honor of representing the 38th Congressional District. No one could ever have held a position of greater importance, or more enjoyment, or greater opportunity for constructive service than my post in Congress. I am proud to carry out that role, just as I am proud to be a lawyer.

I am grateful to so many of you who have helped me to serve in the House of Representatives and to all of you who have honored me so signally tonight. I thank you all from the bottom of my heart.

Bill for $600 Increase for Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to provide an increase of $600 for all postal employees. Last year when we passed Public Law 68 the increase provided was too little and too late. The simple truth of the matter is that the pay increases we have given to our postal employees have not kept pace with the increases prevalent in America today. Our American standard of living is constantly improving.

Business Week, under date of June 2, announces that all United States incomes are up 6.5 percent from last year. Public Law 68, which was intended to bring up the standard of living of postal employees in keeping with that of other people in the American economy, provided increases for some postal employees amounting to as little as 6.1 percent. In some areas, according to Business Week, United States incomes have increased in the last year as much as 11.7 percent.

I also read in the same issue of Business Week that Harlow H. Curtice, General Motors Corp. president, had a salary of $776,400 in 1955; Eugene G. Grace of Bethlehem Steel Corp. had a salary of $705,923; and Albert Bradley, chairman of the General Motors board, received a salarly of $701,525. The salaries plus bonuses of all business executives were higher in 1955 than ever before in history. The increases that these executives have received since 1939 run on the average about 300 percent and in some instances probably run 500 or 600 percent.

The average salary increase since 1939 granted to those who work is around 200 percent; the increases received by postal employees are a mere 120 percent. The increases granted to these good people have not kept pace with the improved standard of living in America and I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to give serious consideration to the legislation I have introduced today.

Two Textile Mills Close—Japanese Imports Blamed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with my own remarks I am including an Associated Press dispatch which appeared in the Evening Star in its issue of Thursday, June 7 entitled "Two Textile Mills Close—Japanese Imports Blamed," as follows:

NEW YORK, June 7.—Consolidated Textile Co. announced today it is shutting down 2 plants—1 in New England and 1 in the South—because of Japanese competition.

Lester Martin, president of Consolidated, said the Windsor Print Works of North Adams, Mass., a subsidiary, would halt operations by the end of the week. It has been processing flannel shirting.

Mr. Martin said Consolidated is also closing a 500-loom print-cloth mill in Martinsville, Va. "We are starting to run it out now," he added.

The textile executive was bitter in his denunciation of low-cost Japanese fabrics. "Japanese goods are cancer and they will kill the entire textile industry," he declared. "They should be kept out of the United States market entirely."

Several weeks ago, he said, Consolidated shut down another subsidiary, the Luther Manufacturing Co. of Fall River, Mass.—also blaming Japanese competition.

Mr. Speaker, here is further compelling evidence that the administration's disregard for the welfare of the textile industry is gradually destroying it. Of course, I realize that the GATT agreements are not the only cause for the troubles of the textile industry, but added to other factors the tariff cuts put into effect by GATT last September have proven, "the straw that will break the camel's back."

It is noteworthy that the State Department has recently announced other reciprocal trade agreements drastically cutting American tariffs. Fortunately for the textile industry the 15 percent cuts made under this latest agreement do not affect the textile industry because last year Senator GEORGE of Georgia got written into the reciprocal trade agreements bill a provision that prevented any further cuts than those then in process of consummation, but which had not been announced at the time of the adoption of Senator GEORGE'S amendment.

The experience of the textile industry this year makes it crystal clear that the escape clause and peril point provisions in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act are not effective. They must be strengthened if the act is continued or not only the textile but other American industries will suffer as a result of the pressure of the huge industries such as steel and automobile for further tariff cuts. The voices of these huge industries are heeded by our Chief Executive and our Department of State while the voice of the textile industry is as of one crying in the wilderness.

The Coordination of Future Airspace Use Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] recently made a significant address in the city of Boston, and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address, as follows:

SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE OREN HARRIS, ON TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 1956, AT A MEETING OF RADIO TECHNICAL COMMISSION FOR AERONAUTICS, BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. Chairman, His Excellency the Governor, distinguished guests, and other friends, I feel highly complimented in having an invitation to meet with you on this auspicious and important occasion. It is good to meet with you on such an interesting subject. I must confess, however, that even though our committee has been deeply involved with this subject matter, and we have sat through many sessions of hearings, public and executive, the technical phase of it is still somewhat baffling to me.

I am delighted to have this privilege of renewing pleasant association with my old friend and former colleague of the House, your Governor, Chris Herter. From reports we get, I am sure he is carrying on with the same force, enthusiasm, and ability as Governor of this great Commonwealth as he did in rendering such a fine service in the Congress of the United States.

Now I fully realize that my time at bat here this morning is in the nature of a pinch-hitter. My able colleague from California, CARL HINSHAW, who is one of your official technical advisors, and I might say who undoubtely is better informed on technical matters affecting aviation than any other Member of Congress, could not be with you for an obvious reason. Today so happens to be primary day in California. I think we have heard or seen something about that in the newspapers. Of course, Carl has no opposition for nomination in his own party, but they have the unusual procedure in California where he as a Republican is trying to get the Democratic nomination too. In view of his problem, I am glad to pinch-hit for him and hope that I can do justice with this discussion.

I have the distinct honor and privilege of serving as chairman of one of the most important committees of the Congress, in my judgment, the Subcommittee on Transportation and Communications of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives.

We have had an exceedingly busy schedule. It has covered many highly technical subjects. Some of our most important problems during this Congress have been in connection wtih matters affecting aviation. We have amended the Airport Construction Act, providing a definite program for the next 4 years.

We have permanently certificated local service airline carriers. We are considering

other bills in the committee at this time which could have far-reaching implications in the field of aviation.

One of our most difficult problems during this Congress has been our investigation of the development of a common system of air navigation and traffic control. Developments over the past few years apparently caused the concept of a common system of short-range air-navigation aids for joint use by civil and military aviation to be jeopardized. The controversy, which threatened the common-system concept, came out in the open in February 1955. A new rho-theta short-range radio air-navigation system, known as TACAN, is definitely being considered and developed presumably to replace the present system commonly known as VOR/DME.

On this issue we had some most interesting hearings. We found that there were a lot of important people who held very definite convictions.

This situation developed, among other reasons, as a result of the jet age into which we are moving swiftly.

As an important aspect to this problem, we found, is the question of airspace. Thus the subject Coordination of Future Airspace Use Planning is most appropriate today.

I appreciate your suggesting that in view of this background that I discuss with you briefly the importance of coordination in airspace use planning.

I should like to say that congressional interest and responsibility in the field of aviation covers all aspects of airspace utilization. These recent events make it imperative that we give more attention and most careful consideration to this vast important subject. It is therefore, appropriate for some of the thinking on coordination of future planning and development be presented here today.

With a group as well informed as you, I am sure I don't need to dwell on the importance of coordination in working out the problem we face. But I thought I would point out some of the mistakes made in the past in the hope they can be avoided in the future. The fact that we are behind in getting required equipment installed would indicate that mistakes have been made.

And I want to stress the point that Congress cannot be overlooked, if the maximum speed is to be achieved in solving the serious problems already facing civil aviation.

Not only must the taxpayers be protected in avoiding duplication of effort, but all concerned—Government and industry—must face up to the fact that we just don't have enough scientists qualified to work on these problems. So we must make the maximum use of both money and brains.

We have come a long way since World War II in meeting the growing problems of air navigation and traffic control. But let me say right now that I think we would have had more progress and fewer problems if there had been more coordination and less competition.

There could have been better coordination among those working on these problems in the executive branch. But equally important, there could and should have been greater efforts to coordinate activities of the executive branch with Congress.

Often it is overlooked that Congress is the policymaking branch of the Government. True, sometimes part of the job of making detailed blueprints is delegated, and rightfully so, to boards and commissions, and in cooperation with Government agencies, but still the basic policymaking responsibility rests with Congress and policy decisions made by Congress can only be modified by Congress.

You might say that too often the coordinators have coordinated with everyone except Congress only to find that after all the taxpayers are going to pay the bill, and Congress must approve the payment. Any effort at coordination which overlooks the fact that the responsibility for making national policies in the public interest rests with Congress may run into trouble, especially when appropriations are needed.

It is important to keep that in mind. We are dealing here with vast sums of money. I am told that the air defense radar system now being installed will cost in the neighborhood of $3 billions. Then the Department of Commerce through the CAA has a program for new equipment that will cost $246 million.

Now, I don't want to imply that the Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics needs a lecture on coordination—you have not been lax in this respect. You are not trying to make policy. You are the fellows who do the work. And a good job you have done, too. Without your help, the marvelous progress of the past decade would have been impossible.

As a result of the TACAN hearings held last session by my subcommittee, I have a speaking acquaintance with the SC-31 report which came out of RTCA. That was a magnificent job and has been followed by many splendid contributions in solving problems in the very difficult field covered by the report.

In passing, I might say that I like the idea of setting up a government-industry advisory group like RTCA to work on these problems. It is better than establishing a special Government bureau to do the job. Through RTCA, we have available the best brains in the country upon request, something that would not be possible even if we went to a lot of expense to set up or expand a Government agency. The Government can't always compete with industry in hiring brains and experience.

No doubt some of you have read the report of our committee on the TACAN investigation. That report makes a very positive declaration on the importance of coordination.

In the TACAN report, the committee said:

"The position taken in 1947 by this committee that there must be but one system of aids to air navigation and traffic control common to all users of airspace in the United States and not a multiplicity of systems is reaffirmed. A multiplicity of systems would constitute both a hazard of large proportions and a burden upon the taxpayers. We insist that coordination among the Government agencies concerned be maintained to prevent overlapping and duplication of effort in the development of the common system concept."

To me, the TACAN controversy is a very interesting example of the difficulties you get into when coordination breaks down in a field as complex as the one we are considering here. I think a brief review of the history of the TACAN controversy will point up the problem facing us in future planning.

Problems follow in the wake of progress. If someone hadn't come up with something he believed was an improvement over VOR-DME, there wouldn't have been a TACAN controversy. Discussion is necessary to solve problems but when discussions reach the stage of controversy we are likely to get more heat than light.

Be that as it may, the TACAN controversy did get out of hand, resulting in two congressional investigations and the threat of several more.

When I was elected to Congress back in 1940, the possibility of being called upon to preside at hearings on a subject as involved and technical as TACAN would have seemed to me fantastic. But I walked into it when I was assigned to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and eventually became chairman of this important subcommittee.

As you know, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has broad, general jurisdiction in the field of transportation and communications. Both subjects are very interesting, as well as important. You could not have the present air transportation system without communications of a highly complex variety.

To me, transportation in itself is a highly interesting subject. When you get into the field of jet-age transportation, the normal interest is multiplied many fold.

I don't need to dwell upon the importance of transportation in maintaining our high standard of living and the country's great industrial activity. Transportation activity is a good indicator of business activity. We have long judged a country town's prosperity by the number of automobiles and trucks on the streets, by the number of railroads and good highways it has. Now we add airport facilities. Businessmen out looking for a new plant site are now passing up cities that do not have adequate airport facilities.

The rapid development of air commerce since World War II is ample evidence that air transportation fills a public need.

Then there is the all-important question of national defense. Without air power, it is admitted that our country would be in a desperate situation today.

Thus, no one questions the importance of a sound aviation program to the national defense and the national economy. Civil aviation and military air power go hand in hand. We have to have both. And they must work together. They must use the same airspace. In World War II, the military would have been severely handicapped without the invaluable aid of civil aviation. Civil aviation again proved its importance in moving men and materials long distances in a hurry when the Korean conflict broke out unexpectedly almost halfway around the world.

We, on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, have spent a lot of time over the years on civil air policy. The committee put in many weeks of hard work drafting the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. That act sought to establish a sound air-transportation system to meet the Nation's present and future air commerce and air-mail needs, and to promote aviation in the interest of national defense.

We think that the vast air transportation system now serving every section of the country and maintaining our competitive position in international aviation is pretty good evidence that we have done a good job.

But the job has not been completed. It would be bad for all of us if we had finished the job. That would mean we had reached the limit of man's ingenuity and that the final ultimate air-traffic control system had been achieved. We know that is not true. We know we need better air-traffic control to handle jets and that we will get it. As air transportation expands, and big jet transports take to the air, we will have new problems, and people such as you will solve them.

In the old days before the Wright brothers, the air and airspace may have been free. When, day and night, we must protect the airspace above us against enemy attack, the air may still be free, but our airspace is not.

With jet fighters guarding the skies above us and a fleet of big transport planes flying nearly 20 billion passenger-miles a year, the airspace in many areas is getting crowded. We have to do what we can to keep these planes moving in safety and to provide for more and faster planes as the commercial jets come off the line.

It is well to remember that there are other users of our airspace besides planes. The Army must practice artillery firing. Radio and TV towers use valuable airspace. The TV tower problem is being considered by our subcommittee this session. The Air Coordinating Committee has been working on the problem and has put forward a compromise. I hope that it is the solution. If it is not, Congress may have to make some positive

policy decisions in this area to protect the public interest.

And there are other users of airspace, too. This points up the big question which we may well ask: "Are we running out of airspace?" which, though rarely regarded as such, is actually one of our most valued natural resources.

Speaking plainly, we must face the sad fact that we are running out of airspace, and it is most interesting as to what is happening to it and how it is being used up. What was once thought to be unlimited in this resource, has now become a critical commodity for specialized training, testing areas and numerous other purposes. It is a diminishing commodity, being rapidly shrunk by modern-day aircraft.

It might seem somewhat farfetched to say that Congress should lay down the ground rules in a field as highly technical as air navigation and traffic control system planning. But a little history will indicate the necessity for this. The same brief history will indicate how the long and bitter TACAN controversy might have been avoided, or at least kept from getting out of hand.

Let me say at the outset that I am not one of those who believes Congress should plot and chart the course of the Nation's economy down to minute details. I am inclined to believe that we often have too much dictation from Washington. That is a field, however, in which we must of necessity act.

We all realize that in certain areas the States and local communities must look to Washington for guidance. The field of transportation is a good example. Without some Federal regulation of interstate transportation, you would have chaos. That is especially true of jet age air transportation. Today a plane can pass through the air space of several States in a few minutes.

In a situation like this, somewhere there must be ground rules. Somewhere the inevitable conflicts must be resolved. From the beginning of the Republic, Congress has had the responsibility of fostering and encouraging the development of communications and transportation facilities. At the end of World War II we encountered a situation in aviation demanding the attention of Congress.

Among the many problems of readjustment which faced the Nation following World War II was that of taking advantage of the strides made in aviation. The art of flying developed tremendously during the war. Larger and faster planes were built.

A great many young men learned to fly. Many thousands more learned the advantages of air transportation as passengers.

Following the war, air traffic on the airlines increased tremendously. For the first time military aircraft became important users of the Federal airways, sharing the air space with commercial aircraft.

Traffic control facilities were under heavy pressure. During bad weather, traffic was delayed or flights canceled, because of inadequate aid navigation and traffic control facilities. Canceled flights not only inconvenienced the public but cost the airlines a lot of money at a time when revenue was badly needed.

It was a dark picture. Traffic delays and cancellations made it hard to sell the public on air transportation.

The pessimists had their day. In 1947 the air transportation bubble burst. A series of fatal accidents occurred. There was an almost complete breakdown of traffic control under bad weather conditions. The overexpanded aviation industry faced economic collapse.

Then as now, we realized the importance of aviation to the country's defense and economic growth. Without airpower we were virtually helpless from a military standpoint. Without adequate air transportation the country could not keep pace, economically, in a world where international competition was being stepped up rapidly.

But what to do about it? That problem was tackled by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House, which made a far-reaching investigation. Congressman HINSHAW, of California, as chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee, submitted a report which made detailed recommendations. It called for a common system of air navigation and traffic control for joint civil-military use.

As a result of these recommendations, the Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics set to work on the problem. As you well know, a group of highly qualified experts, representing all segments of aviation, both civil and military, met in Washington. After long and concentrated effort, RTCA Special Committee 31 came up with the blueprint of a plan for a modern, comprehensive system of air navigation and traffic control for common use by civil and military aviation.

The Congressional Aviation Policy Board and the President's Air Policy Commission, representing the legislative and executive branches of the Government, endorsed the RTCA common-system concept.

We were on the right track. We were getting somewhere.

The Air Navigation Development Board, representing the Commerce and Defense Departments, was set up to develop the common system, using the RTCA blueprint. The CAA set to work installing VHF omnidirectional radio range (VOR), along with greatly improved communications equipment and then distance-measuring equipment (DME). Other items such as the instrument-landing system and ground-controlled approach were installed.

Schedule reliability of the airlines improved tremendously.

While this was going on, the Navy was attempting to solve a very real problem, that of providing a short-range navigation system for carrier-based aircraft. VOR/DME was not satisfactory. That, as you know, was the beginning of TACAN.

We were still working within the common-system concept. Then came the Korean conflict and the Russians also finally succeeded in exploding an atomic bomb. Lessons learned in Korea indicated that VOR, due to citing problems, not only was unsatisfactory for carrier-based aircraft, but was not suitable for tactical operations of the Air Force.

The military, faced with the threat that the continental United States could very easily become a battleground, proposed TACAN as the common-system short-range air-navigation system to replace VOR/DME.

The reaction was immediate. The military was criticized for developing a new system in secret. The Defense Department was challenged to reveal what they had in their little black box. Some went so far as to suggest that the common-system concept be abandoned and the military permitted to go its own way.

At that point, the Subcommittee on Transportation and Communications was forced to look into the matter. We had a heavy schedule of hearings previously arranged. But the subcommittee found time to hear both sides of the TACAN controversy. It was long and tedious and very technical but also very interesting. As we proceeded, it began to appear that somewhere along the way there could be at least a meeting of the minds. The Air-Coordinating Committee came up with a compromise, which the subcommittee and then the full committee endorsed with certain reservations. The principal reservation was that the common system concept remain valid and must not be compromised.

Now, I am convinced that had there been proper coordination in time on the part of the various groups involved, that a great deal of time could have been saved. But that is hindsight.

In view of the magnitude—and the cost—of the job ahead of us, we must work together. There must be continued and full coordination on the part of the various groups involved. And Congress must be kept informed. After all, appropriations must be made and Congress is not going to write any more blank checks in this field.

I am told that there are now over 75 committees, subcommittees, and special committees, working in this field. That is all right. In a field as technical and as complex as this, special problems have to be attacked by groups specially picked for the task. But that situation increases the importance of coordination and makes more difficult the problem of eliminating duplication.

For that reason, I feel that the appointment of Mr. Edward Curtis by the President to coordinate activities in planning in this field is a great step in the right direction.

Admitting that we have problems, I am sure that the industry, as represented by this group here, has the know-how to meet them. By continuing to work together, bearing in mind that we are all working to the same end, I know we will get the job done. We will get the jets into the air and keep them flying in defense of our country and in the interest of the national economy.

Thank you.

Sound Business Principles for Federal Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

SOUND BUSINESS PRINCIPLES FOR FEDERAL POWER

(Address by Hon. FRANK T. Bow at the annual meeting of the Edison Electric Institute, June 5, 1956, Atlantic City)

I am glad to have the opportunity to consider with you gentlemen of the Edison Electric Institute a matter to which I have recently devoted considerable study. I refer to the application of sound business principles to rates to be charged for public power, at least where sold pursuant to section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944.[1]

Specifically, I propose to show that it lies within the authority, and likewise is the duty, of the executive agencies, to establish Federal power rates in accordance with sound business principles; to point out that in this respect those agencies have been greatly remiss; and to examine what would be the effect of really applying sound business principles as prescribed.

In general, this matter of rates for public power has been viewed primarily from the standpoint of the consumer of the power and only to a minor extent from the standpoint of the sellers, being essentially those citizens who pay Federal taxes. In other words, the matter has been viewed from the standpoint of short-term advantage for relatively few instead of the long-term advantage of all of such citizenry.

This is largely because those who are beneficiaries of the existing discriminatory preference are so very vociferous. Rarely is a

[1] 16 U. S. C. 825s.

voice raised in behalf of the taxpayer. Because my State, Ohio, contributes so heavily in proportion, I am all the more inclined to analyze what is involved.

FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1944

Without taking the time to go into the genesis of the policy provisions, being those in section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, I quote the vital first sentence thereof:

"Electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department and in the opinion of the Secretary of War not required in the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rate to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission."

This is the most specific and influential of the several fragmentary and too often inconsistent, statutory statements of Federal power policy. I dip into past history only to the extent of pointing out the interesting fact that the Tennessee Valley Authority policy announced August 25, 1933, included the premise that, in its marketing of power, the controlling consideration should be that of "making power available at the lowest rate consistent with sound financial policy." [2]

The importance of the language I have quoted, from the act of 1944, may be judged from the fact that so prominent and ardent a proponent of so-called public power as former Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes used that language in his memorandum of January 3, 1946, promulgating what he stated to be "the primary objectives of the acts of Congress." Although, strictly speaking, no other act contains just such language, Secretary Ickes cited, not merely the Flood Control Act of 1944 but also, the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, the Bonneville Act of 1937 and the Fort Peck Act of 1938 as authorities for the principle that—

"Power shall be sold at the lowest possible rates consistent with sound business principles."

The criterion established by Congress in the act of 1944 for setting "the lowest possible rates" is neither the practice of charity, in the form of subsidies, nor discrimination between groups of citizens in respect to rates of charge for power, but rather sound business principles. The statute mentions nothing else.

Inasmuch as sound business principles are assumed to apply to the element of rates as set forth in section 5, it is reasonable that the same principles should be assumed to govern in the cases of all of the other elements excepting only where and to the extent that there is an express prescription that they shall not apply. Please understand, however, that what I have to say is regardless of whether the buyer, that is the consumer, of the Federal power is, or is not, in the preferred class prescribed in the same section 5 of the Flood Act of 1944.

Even if we were to consider that "sound business principles" shall control rates in the cases only of Army engineer reservoir projects, there would be involved all Federal power development in the East except those of TVA; practically all of those in the Southwest; and largely those in the Missouri Valley and the Columbia River Basin. In all, taking into account those in operation, under construction and authorized, they comprise almost two-thirds of all Federal hydroelectric power development.

Let us now examine the application of sound business principles to the elements entering into the fixing of rates for Federal power. I take them up in the following order:

Charges for the use of money.
Amortization of investment.
Allocation of cost.
Tax charges.
Allowances for overhead costs.
Actual project income as compared with preconstruction representations.

CHARGES FOR THE USE OF MONEY

Actually it is not a benevolent Uncle Sam or the Government that lends the money for the construction of Federal power projects. It is we taxpayers. The money advanced or invested in these projects comes in the main from the use of Federal income taxes, paid of course by corporations as well as individuals.

But we taxpayers are concerned also in the fact that, up to the present time, some of the funds in point have been procured by borrowings against our combined credit. Fortunately the use of this credit is growing less and less. Indeed, inasmuch as the national budget is now being balanced, present advances for the construction of these power projects are practically all from the pockets of the taxpayers.

A fundamental—a sound—business principle observed by those individuals and those banks and other institutions lending money is that the charge for the use of money shall be at least as great as the cost to the lender. Anything less would lead to bankruptcy. Moreover, the charge must cover costs of all kinds of making the money available, including overheads. For instance, in the case of a savings bank, there are the costs of gathering the savings and accounting for them; also there must be an allowance on account of loans which have "gone sour."

What is the cost of money to the Federal Government, that is, to us taxpayers? Surely it is not merely the direct charge for interest on the respective bonds, certificates, or Treasury bills. The total cost must include that of the floating of the loans, including refunding where that is involved, and of all accounting.

Further, in the case of money raised by income taxation, there is the proportionate part of the cost of the tax collection system.

As to the cost of the use of money expressed in percent of the advances from the Treasury for construction: At no time has even the mere interest on the long-term Treasury borrowings averaged as low as 2 percent; yet the Department of the Interior has used that figure, though more recently 2½ percent. Apparently at present the Army engineers, the marketing agencies of the Department of the Interior and the Federal Power Commission, at the instance of the Bureau of the Budget, are using a 2½ percent rate.[3] Of course, short-term money is cheaper than the long-term money which is involved; yet at present even 90-day Treasury bills yield almost 3 percent. On long-term Federal borrowings, the interest rate exceeds 3 percent.

Estimates of the complete cost of Federal money runs from a minimum of 3½ percent to more than 4 percent.

AMORTIZATION OF INVESTMENT

First we may look at the period or number of years allowed for paying off the loan, that is, amortization of the investment. In section 5 of the act of 1944, the prescription is "a reasonable number of years." The period now used by the Army engineers is 50 years. For the Bureau of Reclamation, a minimum of 40 years is prescribed with a permissible 10-year allowance for getting under way; the minimum in actual practice becomes 50 years.

Increasingly there is pressure for the use of longer periods—60 years, 70 years, and in the cases of recent proposals, affecting power from Army engineer projects in the Southwest, marketed by Southwestern Power Administration, a 100-year period.

Here, too, the matter has been viewed from the standpoint of the borrowers or beneficiaries. However, in applying sound business principles, the matter would be looked at from the standpoint of the lender. If the borrower cannot afford to meet that minimum basis of amortization and particularly that period of amortization which is sound from the standpoint of the lender, the loan is not made. Safety of the loan is the prime consideration.

After all, 50 years is a long time. The past 50 years have witnessed the almost complete disappearance of the streetcar and the interurban trolley; the bankruptcy of many, if not most, railroads; and a tremendous shift of population from farm to city. Most pertinent perhaps is the fact that railroad securities issued 50 years ago have in many cases suffered severely from decrease in amount and value of railroad transportation and hence necessitous reorganization proceedings.

At present we are entering the age of nuclear power. It is my understanding that such power has potentialities of ultimately attaining a cost and hence market price so low as to undercut the overall costs of even hydroelectric power. In view of this prospect, the Power Authority of New York, in floating bonds for its St. Lawrence River power development, was forced to limit the maturity of its bonds to 40 years from the time of issuance.

Various bodies of experts, including the Engineers Joint Council and the pertinent second Hoover Commission task force, have recommended an amortization period of not more than 50 years. Surely, in the light of what is facing us by way of nuclear power, a 50-year period should not be exceeded.

Turning now to the method of amortization, there is no prescription in the act of 1944 or any other pertinent statute.

The present practice—initiated by the Federal agencies, not by Congress—is to use the sinking-fund method which results in equal annual payments for the sum of amortization and interest (on unamortized balances). The reasons are twofold: Convenience of the agencies and leniency to the beneficiaries, that is, the power consumers.

A basic assumption of the sinking-fund method is that the income from the power project will continue at the assumed annual rate throughout the entire period of amortization.

Under the sinking-fund method, the return of the investment into the Treasury, that is, to the taxpayers, begins at a minimum and, if all goes well, reaches its maximum in the last year of the period of payoff. In consequence, the lenders—the taxpayers—during their productive lifetime get the benefit of only a minor repayment of the loan. For instance, during the first half of a 50-year pay-out period, only about one-third is repaid.

But sound business principles require the reverse. Because of the uncertainty in respect of the future, particularly as regards nuclear power, Federal projects should "pay out" at a more rapid rate during the earlier years. In other words, the method of amortization should be one which results in a diminishing financial burden on the project as the years go on.

It seems to me that a sound business means of accomplishing this is that method of amortization which requires equal annual repayments of the Federal investment (not equal annual payments of the sum of amortization and interest on balances). Thus the annual interest requirement, and therefore the sum of amortization and interest, becomes less year by year.

[2] First Annual Report, p. 22.

[3] Federal Power Commission Technical Memorandum 1, November 1955, p. 34.

This method results in a greater amount of amortization during the life of that generation of taxpayers which in effect has advanced the funds for constructing the project. It is to be remembered that, unlike the private investor or money lender, the Federal taxpayer is an involuntary investor. The former can, in general, get back the principal of his loan, or the unrepaid portion of it, by sale at any time in the open market. On the other hand, except as a Federal project during the taxpayer's lifetime makes repayment into the Treasury and thereby lowers taxes or has a corresponding effect on the national debt, the Federal taxpayer cannot recover the equivalent of any part of his contribution to the investment in the power project.

To the consumers of the power from the Federal project in turn, there would be the advantage of gradually decreasing rates for the power. Furthermore, this method of making equal annual payments in amortization of the investment, with consequent decrease in payments of interest year by year, results in a substantially smaller total payment of amortization and interest during the period of amortization than is the case under the method involving equal annual payments of amortization plus interest. In short, here is a method of amortization by which the investment in Federal power projects can accord with sound business principles.

ALLOCATION OF COST

In the cases of Federal multiple-purpose projects, it is necessary to make an allocation of cost against the power purpose or function. Here I step more gingerly than with regard to some of the other elements of power cost and rates. Clearly, however, there should be allocated to power no less than is reasonable. Costs which actually belong to power should not be allocated to functions presently treated as nonreimbursable, such as flood control and navigation.

Recently there has been much clamor as regards the effect of allocation of costs upon the power rates of the Southwestern Power Administration. It has been contended that power should be charged with only its incremental cost, namely, the difference in cost as between a project including the power function and a project not including the power function. A Senator, presumably without thinking the matter through, has suggested that power should not be charged with any part of the costs of the dams.

Needless to say, I am not and do not claim to be an expert in this field, but I do know that

1. A dam and reservoir solely for flood control cannot reasonably serve also for power development.

2. If power development is to be added, the dam and reservoir must be correspondingly enlarged beyond the needs for flood control; that is, there will be much greater cost.

3. Practically the only case where power development is not chargeable with a substantial part of the cost of the dam is where there is developed the waterpower resulting at a dam constructed solely for navigation and constructed to a height no greater than is absolutely essential for the navigation purpose.

Surely departure from these simple propositions cannot be in accord with sound business principles.

TAX CHARGES

The most serious problem involved in the establishment of rates for Federal power is that of the charge to be made on account of taxes.

Under present practice, Federal commercial enterprises, such as power development, and therefore the customers of those enterprises are permitted to be free of Federal taxes and generally to be free of State and local taxes. Practically the only exception in the latter respect is that TVA makes a contribution to the State and local governments in lieu of and as a partial offset to State and local taxes. In the case of Hoover Dam, the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act of 1940 contemplates the possibility that State taxes may be imposed upon some aspect of the project; but it seems fair to say that the annual payments to the States of Arizona and Nevada, specified by statute, are not in lieu of taxes, but were provided because of other considerations.

The equity of participation in the cost of local government and governmental services is recognized in the case of the District of Columbia, to which the Federal Government makes contributions which are the equivalent of payment of local taxes.

This practice has long been recognized with regard to national forests. Twenty-five percent of national forest receipts are distributed to the counties wherein forest lands are situated, for schools and roads. This year the counties will participate in forest receipts to the extent of about $25 million.

The exempting of Federal property and enterprises from taxes dates back as far as 1819 when the Supreme Court [4] held in effect that the sovereign, the Federal Government, could not be taxed without its consent. To be sure, in those days there was no Federal income tax and the Federal Government's acquisition of property outside the public domain had not reached modern proportions. Thus the practical or "sound business" aspect did not come to the fore.

At any rate, as regards Federal lands and structures, it must be recognized that taxation thereof by States or other forms of local government is subject to the consent of Congress. Nevertheless, the exemption of such Federal property from taxation has become burdensome beyond toleration. As an example, pertinent to our present subject, I need only point out that, contrary to the case of private development, Federal reservoir development means removing from local tax rolls the land to be overflowed and the improvements thereon.

It is no wonder that there is a growing movement to require the Federal Government, through local taxes on its property, to participate in supporting local governments and their services. Various bills to that effect are pending before Congress. Some would apply even to the public domain and establishments for national defense.

As to Federal commercial enterprises, for many years the postal service was practically the only one—and is still the outstanding one. Unlike Federal power enterprises, the postal service is expressly authorized by the Constitution; it serves all citizens; and it serves them without discrimination as between classes of citizens. Hence the fact that the postal service is tax exempt has been accepted as natural.

Incidentally, as a matter of sound business, there is earnest endeavor, not merely to make postal service completely self-supporting, but also to make the charges for the service equitable as between the several classes of users.

Next in order of quantitative importance are those with which we are here concerned—Federal power enterprises. I refer of course to the Federal commercial business of producing and supplying power to the public. Unlike the postal service, the Federal power business has no constitutional authority; it is far from serving all citizens; indeed, it actually serves only one segment of the population. About 30 percent of the electric power consumers of the country are served to some extent by Federal powerplants. In most cases the extent to which they are so served is indeterminable; in others it is solely federally produced power which they receive.

Let us turn now to the application of sound business principles in respect to taxation of Federal power enterprises. Outstanding is the principle that all beneficiaries of the services rendered by a given kind of business shall pay their proportionate parts of the cost—plus ordinarily some return or profit, but at least their proportionate part of the cost.

The Government of the United States is business, big business, not commercial, but the biggest of all American businesses. It renders governmental service to its citizenry—all of its citizens.

That governmental service is paid for out of taxes, nowadays mainly income taxes. All of the beneficiaries of governmental service should pay their full proportionate share of those taxes. Any departure from that principle is not merely discriminatory—it is unsound business.

As you know, at least as well as I, each power consumer served by private companies, in paying for his power, must on the average include some 14 percent on account of the Federal income tax which must be transmitted by all such companies to the Federal Treasury. In contrast, Federal enterprises, as we have already noted, are free from Federal income taxes. Thus some 10 percent or so of all of the power consumers of the country are served solely with Federal power and therefore, as power consumers, they contribute nothing at all toward the cost of the Federal Government. Something of the order of 20 percent more of the Nation's power consumers, as we have seen, are served partially with Federal power and therefore, as power consumers, do not pay their full proportionate part of the cost of Federal governmental service.

The amount of Federal tax which in this way is avoided must be made up by other Federal taxpayers, mainly by the customers of private power companies. In short, quite aside from the fact that there obviously is discrimination, here is a violation of a sound business principle.

Such violation would not be tolerated in the cases of services rendered by business concerns. For instance, insurance companies, when the rates for one class of risks do not meet the costs, either raise the rates or drop that class of risks. In fact, if sound business principle did not suffice, State insurance supervision would insist upon such action.

Similarly, in the cases of railroads: Up to the limits of what the traffic will bear, passenger rates must include their proportionate share of all costs, just like freight rates. Indeed at present railroads, interests having large amounts of freight to be hauled and the Interstate Commerce Commission—all are seeking to make sure that in this respect the pertinent sound business principle is observed.

In summary, the present practice in Federal power business, so far as concerns Federal taxes, is inconsistent with the prescribed criterion of sound business principles.

The same thing is true as to State and local taxes. In that respect, of course, any such lack of accord with sound business principles is more readily recognized. Thus in the cases of some counties, and all the more some townships, tax-free Federal reservoir projects, by reason of eliminating agriculturally productive or other lands from the local tax rolls, may impose an intolerable burden upon the local governments and those who continue to pay local taxes in order to maintain road and other services at their prior quality. I have already referred to the growing movement, including bills in Congress, requiring Federal projects, including those involving power, to pay directly or to pay the equivalent of State and other local taxes on property.

[4] *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316).

In contrast to our own practice, Great Britain, with its completely socialized British Electricity Authority and Area Boards, subjects all phases of its power property and operations to any and all taxation to which any other property or business is subject.

As concerns both Federal and local taxes, most of our Federal agencies have within the past year or two advanced in their thinking and practice to the point of requiring that, for purposes of economic evaluation and comparisons with at least non-Federal alternatives, the tax components of true cost be fully taken into account. We find this expressed in the April 1954 agreement of the Department of the Interior, the Army engineers, and the Federal Power Commission on cost allocation; that Commission's December 1955 prescription for evaluating Federal power projects,[5] and the January 1956 report by the Presidential Advisory Committee (the Cabinet Committee) on Water Resources Policy.[6]

But that procedure does not go far enough. Consistency with sound business principles requires that the corresponding taxes, cost, and charges actually be included in the rates for Federal power and therefore be borne in fair proportion by the consumers of that power. This may require action by Congress.

ALLOWANCES FOR OVERHEAD COSTS

Although overheads are not a major element involved in ratemaking, it is as clear as it is simple that sound business principles require that the pertinent overhead costs of all kinds should be charged against Federal power projects and that the rates should be sufficient to cover those overheads. The principle needs to be applied to initial investment as well as to the annual costs of operation and maintenance.

The accounting for the initial investment should include all costs of bringing the given project into being, including the initial investigations, any explorations and all legal services within the constructing agency.

In the initial investment and likewise in the annual costs, there should be included all associated costs of district, division, and Washington offices. Then, there are the expenditures by other agencies, such as the Treasury, the General Accounting Office, the postal service, the Department of Justice for legal services, and the Civil Service Commission for administration of the Retirement Act. In too many cases some, or even all, of the foregoing are not charged against the project for rate-making purposes.

In any event, adequate allowances for the unforeseen, that is, allowances for mishaps and other contingencies, should be included. If provision for such overhead items in detail is deemed to be too cumbersome or expensive, then at least there should be some percentage allowance high enough to cover these overheads.

ACTUAL PROJECT INCOME AS COMPARED WITH PRECONSTRUCTION REPRESENTATIONS

No sound business would tolerate a condition whereunder preauthorization or preconstruction estimates, predictions or representations are forgotten as soon as they have served their purpose of helping to bring the project into the stage of authorization or actually into being. Yet in the case of Federal projects, it is fair to say that, if not forgotten, at least such earlier estimates or representations are in general disregarded.

An outstanding example of what can and does result is the case of three projects (Wolf Creek, Dale Hollow, and Center Hill) on the Cumberland River, constructed by the Army engineers and with the power marketed by the Department of the Interior through its Southeastern Power Administration. The Army engineer estimate of the average annual benefits from the power of these three multiple-purpose projects totaled $11,223,000,[7] whereas the power output was sold to Tennessee Valley Authority for $3,500,000, with subsequent increase to $3,950,000.[8] That is, we Federal taxpayers are annually receiving only about one-third of what the Army engineers estimated to be the average annual value of the output.

To be sure, a different agency, the Department of the Interior, does the marketing, whereas the Army engineers do the constructing—and often the promoting—of the project. But the Army engineers have no excuse for failing to recognize and point out that, up to the present, and whether it be their fault or that of Interior, the financial performance of Federal power projects which they have constructed is all too often woefully below the prediction and representation.

Can it be said to be in accord with sound business principles if the promise is not performed and departments which fail to cooperate are not forced to do so? In some cases, notably in the Southwest, the actual cost of Federal power is greater than the market can afford. In those cases the projects have been badly conceived and probably should not have been constructed at all.

CONCLUSION AS TO RATES

Let us not be so concerned with the impropriety and inequity of it all that we forget the principles involved. The fact is, at least so far as concerns Federal power projects constructed by the Army engineers with the possible exception of including full tax charges in rates, the remedy lies within the authority—indeed the duty—of those administering section 5 of the act of 1944.

It is as simple as this: The plain mandate of Congress, that rates for power shall be fixed according to "sound business principles," is being disregarded. In my view this statement applies to the Army engineers, to the Department of the Interior and its power marketing agencies, and to the Federal Power Commission.

[5] Federal Power Commission Technical Memorandum 1, November 1955, p. 33.

[6] Federal Power Commission Technical Memorandum 1, November 1955, p. 26.

[7] House hearings, Army civil functions appropriation, 1950, pp. 346–351.

[8] Annual Report, Secretary of the Interior, 1955, p. 122.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 11, 1956

Rev. John E. Huss, D. D., pastor, Southside Baptist Church, Spartanburg, S. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we pray for the President of these United States. Grant him a strength equal to the task, and a wisdom sufficient to cope with the problems of high office. What we ask for our President we also request for each of these Senators. Grant also that our present freedom, obtained at so great a cost of American blood, may be preserved. If we become complacent about our blessings, "Lord God of Host be with us yet, lest we forget, lest we forget." In His dear name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 7, 1956, was dispensed with.

REPORT OF APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 7, 1956,

Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, reported it favorably, with amendments, on June 8, 1956, and submitted a report (No. 2169) thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2967) to amend the act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568), and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9739) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. THOMAS, Mr. YATES, Mr. EVINS, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. CANNON, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. VURSELL, Mr. OSTERTAG, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 247) requesting the return of enrolled bill H. R. 1913, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 5516. An act to amend title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide that service as an Army field clerk, or as a field clerk, Quartermaster Corps, shall be counted for purposes of retirement under title III of that act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6274. An act to provide that no fee shall be charged a veteran discharged under honorable conditions for furnishing him or his next of kin or legal representative a copy of a certificate showing his service in the Armed Forces; and

H. R. 9536. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TRANSMITTING VETO MESSAGE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letter

from the Secretary of the Senate, which was read and ordered to lie on the table:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
June 8, 1956.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE:

Attached hereto is a sealed envelope from the President of the United States addressed to the President of the Senate of the United States, said to contain a veto message on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming.

In view of the fact that, as shown by the official records of my office, the 10-day period during which the President, under the Constitution, had to act upon the joint resolution will expire at midnight tonight, and the Senate having adjourned on yesterday until Monday next, I received the veto message today at 2:35 p. m., under authority of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Wright* v. *United States* (302 U. S. 573) on January 17, 1938.

Respectfully,

FELTON M. JOHNSTON,
Secretary of the Senate.

PAYMENT TO CROW INDIAN TRIBE FOR RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR YELLOWTAIL DAM AND RESERVOIR—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 128)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying joint resolution, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the United States Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, Senate Joint Resolution 135, for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming.

The joint resolution would pay the Crow Indian Tribe, Montana, $5 million as "just compensation" for certain tribal lands required for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir. The area of the land comprises 5,677.94 acres and such additional land as the Secretary of the Interior determines to be required for the construction of minimum basic recreational facilities for the accommodation of the public, which it is understood will increase the total area to somewhat more than 6,000 acres.

In essence, this resolution culminates a decade of negotiation and disagreement between the Department of the Interior and the Crow Indians with respect to the amount of compensation to be paid to the tribe for lands required for the Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, for which the initial construction appropriation was made in the fiscal year 1956 and for which an additional $10,850,000 was included in the budget for the fiscal year 1957.

The standard of payment for land acquired by the Government is "just compensation," or "fair market value." However, I recognize that, as a matter of policy, the Federal Government has made awards in excess of "just compensation" in other cases involving Indian lands. If the Congress determines that it wishes to provide for an extra payment in this case, it should not be done under the claim that it is "just compensation." The amount, the method for computing it, and the equitable justification for it, should be clearly established on acceptable premises. Neither the resolution nor the legislative history does this.

According to my information, the acquisition by the United States of the land contemplated will not interfere with the tribal life, except as to a small area used for grazing, and will not displace any of the members of the tribe since the area is not inhabited and consists almost wholly of inaccessible land, largely of bare, precipitous canyon walls. Thus, the only justification for an additional sum over and above "just compensation" arises from the value of the land as a power site. General principles of constitutional law exclude power site values in determining "just compensation" as the Supreme Court recently reiterated in *United States* v. *Twin City Power Co.*, January 23, 1956.

A statutory settlement of this kind of controversy might be acceptable if soundly and equitably premised and if it reflected a substantial measure of agreement between parties to the dispute. I regret that the extravagant nature of the award contemplated by Senate Joint Resolution 135 requires this action which may cause some additional delay in proceeding with the construction of the Yellowtail unit. It is my hope that the Congress can approve a statutory settlement which will permit expeditious action to proceed with the construction of this much-needed project.

For these reasons, I have withheld my approval from this measure.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 7, 1956.*

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] be granted leave of absence from the Senate beginning today and extending through Friday of this week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. ERVIN, and by unanimous consent, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, since the Senate has met today following an adjournment, of course, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that there be a limitation of 2 minutes on statements made during the morning hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PLANS FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT ON WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on watershed protection and flood prevention (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on borrowing authority, for the quarter ended March 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

LAWS ENACTED BY THIRD GUAM LEGISLATURE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Third Guam Legislature, 1956 (second regular session) (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF AIR COMMERCE ACT OF 1926, RELATING TO THE SALE OF GOODS AND SERVICES IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5 of the Air Commerce Act of 1926 to authorize the sale of goods and services by any department or independent establishment to the owner of an aircraft or his agent in an emergency, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DEVELOPMENT, MARKETING, AND DISTRIBUTION OF DOMESTIC FISHERY RESOURCES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to encourage the development, marketing, and distribution of domestic fishery resources of the United States, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of April 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

KIM CHUNG HI

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Kim Chung Hi (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Attorney General on the administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, for the calendar year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT ON ARMY INDUSTRIAL FUND

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Army Industrial Fund, Depot Maintenance Division, Richmond Quartermaster Depot, Department of the Army, for the period July 1, 1954, to August 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR LEBANON

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the United States assistance program for Lebanon, International Cooperation Administration, Department of State, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON UNITED STATES COAST GUARD YARD

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the United States Coast Guard Yard, Department of the Treasury, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated.

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Kansas Veterinary Medical Association, Kansas City, Kans., relating to the recommendations of the Secretary of Defense relative to the Veterinary Corps and the veterinary profession; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the National Association of Attorneys General at Phoenix, Ariz., relating to the escheat of funds or property in custody of Federal officers; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Washington, D. C., signed by Mrs. R. I. C. Prout, president, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 3897, relating to governmental budgeting and accounting methods and procedures, etc.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Anderson (Ind.) Chamber of Commerce endorsing the objectives of the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the Douglas El Segundo Rod and Gun Club, Inc., of El Segundo, Calif., protesting against the enactment of the bill (H. R. 11343) to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to fisheries, to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy, to establish within the Department of Interior a Fisheries Division, to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Two resolutions adopted by the National Association of Attorneys General at Phoenix, Ariz., relating to subversive activities and rules of construction to guide the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition signed by Theodora J. Arnold and sundry other citizens of the State of Colorado relating to the censure of Senator MCCARTHY; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Hawaii County, Hilo, T. H., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the expenditure of $1,700,000 for a deepwater harbor at Kawaihae, T. H.; ordered to lie on the table.

LOAN OF GOVERNMENT WHEAT TO FARMERS—RESOLUTION, LETTER, AND TELEGRAM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a resolution which was adopted by the wheat producers and farmers of Greeley County, Kans., respectfully requesting the Government to loan to farmers, on the basis of the 1956 wheat allotment, wheat the Government already has in storage in the areas which have suffered severely from drought.

Jess Taylor, who has for many years represented Greeley County in the Kansas Legislature, is chairman of the county committee of agricultural agencies.

This wheat, if made available on a loan basis as suggested in the resolution, would be of benefit to the Government and to the individual farmers.

It seems to me this suggestion has much merit and I urge that it be given immediate consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter, together with the resolution I received from Mr. Taylor, and a telegram from Otto A. Epp, editor of the Greeley County Republican, be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter, resolution, and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF KANSAS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
TOPEKA, *June 6, 1956.*

Hon. FRANK C. CARLSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANK: I am enclosing a copy of the proposal that I telephoned to CLIFFORD HOPE yesterday. We are very much interested in this proposal and anything that you could do to help would be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

JESS TAYLOR,
Chairman, County Committee of Agricultural Agencies.

The wheat producers and farmers of Greeley County, Kans., respectfully present to the Congress of the United States and Department of Agriculture authorities the following proposition which we feel will be of great benefit, not only to us as farmers in relieving our financial stress in this time of complete crop failure, but will be a means of cutting down expense to the Government and thus to the tax payers of the United States in that it will eliminate for a time the need for caring for wheat now in bin sites by fumigation, probing, turning and other work that is necessary for caring for the grain. It will remove the old grain now in the bin sites and replace it at a later date with new wheat.

We request that the Government loan to farmers on the basis of the 1956 wheat allotment, wheat from the sites at an amount to be set at 4 bushels per acre of 1956 allotment, which they may sell, feed, use for seed or any other purpose they deem necessary. That said wheat have a dollar value established at the time of the loan, and that an interest rate of not to exceed 3½ percent be charged on such loans, and that farmers taking these loans be allowed to pay the wheat back either at the dollar valuation plus interest, or in bushels of wheat plus a number of bushels of wheat necessary to cover interest, and that said loans be repaid over a period of 3 years.

By making these loans, the old wheat now in bin sites which is subject to deterioration will be exchanged for new wheat, which will be delivered to the sites over a period of 3 years, thus enabling it to be handled in an orderly manner and at less hardship to farmers.

These loans will enable farmers who are not down and out FHA subjects to finance themselves at a lesser rate of interest, and will enable those who are indebted to FHA to put out their fall crops in the fall of 1956 without enlarging their FHA loans, or possibly get their FHA loans on a current basis. Farmers who are not eligible for FHA loans are possibly harder hit than those who are, in that there is only 8 percent money available to them, which with continued crop losses is getting to be more burden than they are able to carry.

We feel that this program would:

1. Provide immediate financial assistance.
2. Reduce Government expense in operating the bin sites.
3. Reduce the tax burden.
4. Provide much-needed financial aid with no increased appropriations by Congress and without additional administrative expense.
5. Provide financial assistance to farmers in a method that would be liquidated with ease in time of production.

We believe that any conscientious taxpayer who would consider this program would be highly favorable toward its inauguration because it is highly probable that aid of one form or another will be forthcoming and this could be done at the least expense.

The above request has been rapidly made and prepared, for it to arrive before the legislative bodies before the passage of the Great Plains law.

JESS TAYLOR,
Chairman, County Committee of Agricultural Agencies.

HORACE, KANS., *June 8, 1956.*

Senator FRANK CARLSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge your support of Greeley County plan to loan Government wheat to distressed farm areas. Any help you can give farmers in dire financial straits gratefully appreciated. It's too simple and practical, only criticism of plan heard here. Some of our best farmers, especially younger ones will have to leave if assistance isn't received soon. That would set us back years in development of area and in control of dust-blowing conditions. Farmers here would like to stand on own feet. This wheat-loan plan best for both farmer and Government.

Sincerely,

OTTO A. EPP,
Editor, Greeley County Republican, Tribune, Kans.

RESOLUTION OF KANSAS VETERINARY MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a resolution I have just received from the Kansas Veterinary Medical Association, which was adopted unanimously by that organization at its semiannual business meeting in Manhattan, Kans., on June 1, 1956.

The Veterinary Corps and the veterinary profession have rendered outstanding and valuable service to our Nation during wartime and peacetime, and I urge the Secretary of Defense to review his previous decision on this matter.

I ask that this resolution be printed in the RECORD as a part of these remarks, and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF KANSAS VETERINARY MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Whereas Secretary Charles E. Wilson's recent press releases recommended and virtually order the discontinuance of the Army and Air Force Veterinary Corps, and that the personnel thereof be assigned to other agencies or turn in their uniforms; and

Whereas Secretary Wilson's press releases have been derogatory to the Veterinary Corps and the veterinary profession; and

Whereas the Chief of Staff of the Army on July 31, 1954, directed the then Assistant Chief of Staff, G–4, to conduct a study of the Army Veterinary Corps; and

Whereas this study was approved and accepted by the Secretary of the Army on March 4, 1955; and

Whereas the Kansas Veterinary Medical Association believes this report to be reasonably accurate and just: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Veterinary Medical Association strongly condemns the recommendations, actions, and remarks of Secretary Charles E. Wilson, relative to the Veterinary Corps and the veterinary profession, and demands that he rescind his orders and retract his unwarranted remarks; and be it further

Resolved, That the officers of this association send copies of this resolution to Secretary Charles E. Wilson, the appropriate committees, legislators, and officials of the United States Government.

Unanimously adopted by the Kansas Veterinary Medical Association at its regular semiannual business meeting in Manhattan, Kans., June 1, 1956.

K. MAYNARD CURTS,
DVM, Secretary-Treasurer.

INCREASED POSTAL RATES—LETTER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the possibility of an increase in second-class mail rates could carry with it a serious inequity if nonprofit newspapers and magazines are to be covered along with ordinary commercial ones. This matter has been brought to my attention by the Minnesota Legionnaire, the official newspaper of the American Legion and Auxiliary of Minnesota. I think the problem raised in this instance is one which is duplicated in many other public service organizations, and I earnestly hope that the Senate when it considers the postal rate increase will make allowances for such organizations and see to it that they are not penalized.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter to me from the department commander of the Minnesota Department of the American Legion dated May 21, 1956, be inserted at this point in my remarks and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA LEGIONNAIRE,
St. Paul, Minn., May 24, 1956.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Before Congress at the present time is a bill for the increase of postal rates. We are particularly interested in the second-class mail rates.

As you know, we publish a weekly newspaper with a circulation of 97,000 Legionnaire subscribers. This paper is owned by the Minnesota Department of the American Legion and is operated on a nonprofit basis. The news columns are devoted entirely to the problems of the veterans and community service. It certainly would work a hardship on an organization such as ours if we found, due to increases in our costs, such as postal rates, that we would have to curtail the publishing of the Minnesota Legionnaire, the only newspaper medium that we have here in Minnesota.

Therefore, our Minnesota American Legion publication board is asking that some type of an amendment be put on this bill which would exempt veterans' newspapers from being affected by any increase in postal rates. Bear in mind, as I stated above, the Minnesota Legionnaire is strictly a nonprofit newspaper medium.

I would appreciate hearing from you relative to our suggestion on this bill now before Congress.

Very truly yours,

DAN FOLEY,
Department Commander, Minnesota Department, American Legion.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. 3866. A bill to facilitate the making of lease-purchase agreements by the Administrator of General Services under the Public Buildings Act of 1949, as amended, and by the Postmaster General under the Post Office Department Property Act of 1954, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2171).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Government Operations, with an amendment:

S. 3388. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the port of Port Townsend, Wash. (Rept. No. 2170).

By Mr. GOLDWATER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. J. Res. 110. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study and investigation of Indian education in the United States (Rept. No. 2172).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1243. A bill for the relief of Kyu Lee (Rept. No. 2173);

S. 2779. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Levenston Harris (Rept. No. 2174);

S. 2833. A bill for the relief of Louis Henri Stassart (Rept. No. 2175);

S. 2836. A bill for the relief of Choh-Yi Ang (Rept. No. 2176);

S. 3029. A bill for the relief of Josephine Langton (Rept. No. 2177);

S. 3050. A bill for the relief of Annemarie Appelt and her two minor children, Karin Amelia Green and Sylvia Green (Rept. No. 2178);

S. 3221. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tscheng-Sui Feng (Rept. No. 2179);

S. 3473. A bill for the relief of Kurt Johan Paro (Rept. No. 2180);

H. R. 5382. A bill for the relief of W. R. Zanes & Company of Louisiana, Inc. (Rept. No. 2201);

H. R. 5453. A bill for the relief of the estate of Robert Bradford Bickerstaff (Rept. No. 2202);

H. R. 6742. A bill for the relief of Rumiko Fujiki Kirkpatrick (Rept. No. 2181);

H. R. 6955. A bill for the relief of Inna Hekker Grade (Rept. No. 2182);

H. R. 8867. A bill for the relief of the estate of F. M. Bryson (Rept. No. 2203);

H. R. 11205. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Roy Cowan and others arising by reason of the flooding of land in the vicinity of Lake Alice, N. Dak. (Rept. No. 2204);

H. J. Res. 591. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens (Rept. No. 2183); and

H. J. Res. 609. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens (Rept. No. 2184).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 2849. A bill for the relief of Janos Schreiner (Rept. No. 2185);

S. 3166. A bill for the relief of Lucie Toehl (Rept. No. 2186);

H. R. 1156. A bill for the relief of John Jordan (Rept. No. 2187); and

H. R. 1963. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence M. Augustine (Rept. No. 2205).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 2863. A bill for the relief of Margarete Lewis (Rept. No. 2188);

H. J. Res. 606. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens (Rept. No. 2189); and

H. J. Res. 611. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens (Rept. No. 2190).

By Mr. MCCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S. 3195. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Rhode Island to the town of North Kingstown, R. I. (Rept. No. 2191);

S. 3768. A bill to amend section 158 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, so as to include the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare among the executive departments there listed, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2192);

H. R. 7896. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land in the city of Hogansville, Ga., to the city of Hogansville (Rept. No. 2193);

H. R. 8404. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former prisoner-of-war camp, near Douglas, Converse County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2194);

H. R. 9377. A bill to provide for the sale to the Eagle Rock Young Men's Christian Association of certain real property located in Los Angeles County, Calif. (Rept. No. 2195); and

H. R. 10417. A bill to amend the Federal Register Act, as amended, so as to provide for the effectiveness and notice to the public of proclamations, orders, regulations, and other documents in a period following an attack or threatened attack upon the continental United States (Rept. No. 2196).

By Mr. MCCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, with an amendment:

S. 2654. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Wyoming to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo. (Rept. No. 2197);

S. 3843. A bill to adjust the application of section 322 of the so-called Economy Act of 1932 to premises leased for Government purposes (Rept. No. 2198); and

H. R. 7855. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to extend until June 30, 1956, the period during which disposals of surplus property may be made by negotiation (Rept. No. 2199).

By Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments:

S. 3316. A bill authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property which has been declared surplus to the needs of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg. (Rept. No. 2200).

By Mr. DOUGLAS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

H. R. 9285. A bill to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, so as to extend for 2 additional years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase United States obligations directly from the Treasury (Rept. No. 2206).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon, pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Frederick Van Pelt Bryan, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, vice William Bondy, retired.

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Frederick O. Mercer, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Illinois, vice J. Leroy Adair, deceased.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PAYNE:

S. 4021. A bill to encourage the development, marketing, and distribution of domestic fishery resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. PAYNE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 4022. A bill to exempt certain purchases by public museums and galleries from the excise tax on jewelry and related items; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 4023. A bill for the relief of Rudolfo Domenico Liubicich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 4024. A bill to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the continental United States and Alaska and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 4025. A bill for the relief of Elfriede K. Freiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 4026. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to issue to the Joe Graham Post, No. 119, American Legion, a deed to certain lands within the Ship Island Military Reservation removing certain conditions heretofore made a part of the conveyance thereof, and providing for the conveyance of a portion of such lands to the United Daughters of the Confederacy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 4027. A bill for the relief of Victor Charles Hunt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 4028. A bill to provide for extension of the time during which annual assessment work on unpatented mining claims held in certain portions of the United States may be made, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 4029. A bill to authorize war-risk insurance for certain foreign-flag merchant vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 4030. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange certain lands in the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 4031. A bill to amend the act providing for the construction of the Markham Ferry project in Oklahoma in order to authorize additional flood storage and pool elevations as approved by the Chief of Engineers; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 4032. A bill for the relief of Necmettin Cengiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLANDERS (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. COTTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and Mr. LANGER):

S. 4033. A bill to amend title VI of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, in order to make certain clinics eligible for Federal aid to diagnostic or treatment centers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 4034. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1911; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mrs. SMITH of Maine when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 280) expressing the sincere hope of the Senate for the complete and speedy recovery of the President from his illness, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

DEVELOPMENT, MARKETING, AND DISTRIBUTION OF DOMESTIC FISHERY RESOURCES

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to encourage the development, marketing, and distribution of domestic fishery resources of the United States, and for other purposes. The bill was prepared by the Department of the Interior to implement the President's fishery program, as set forth in a White House release dated June 4, 1956. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the White House release, the text of a letter from Assistant Secretary of the Interior Wesley A. D'Ewart to the Speaker of the House of Representatives explaining the bill, and the text of the bill itself be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the release, letter, and bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4021) to encourage the development, marketing, and distribution of domestic fishery resources of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PAYNE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The release, letter, and bill are as follows:

The White House today announced a series of actions designed to benefit the United States fishing industry.

The new program, which is the result of several months of intensive study within the administration, will be implemented in two steps.

First, Department of the Interior officials will undertake immediately the necessary preliminary steps for the creation within the Department of a new bureau with sole responsibility for Federal programs related to the fisheries. The new bureau which will be called the Bureau of Fisheries, will come into existence on July 1, and will take over administration of all fishery responsibilities now vested in the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Secondly, the administration will request Congress to enact into law a comprehensive commercial fisheries program which will provide a broad charter for the new agency. The administration bill, which in some respects is modeled after the so-called Saltonstall-Kennedy Act due to expire next year, would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct needed investigations and research into all phases of fishing activities including oceanographic, biological, statistical, and economic studies of the distribution and abundance of fishery resources, the development of new and improved methods of fishing, and the development of improved handling methods and techniques. In addition, the bill would authorize research into the nutritive value of fish and fishery products, and many other activities designed to promote the flow of fishery commodities in domestic and foreign commerce.

The provisions of the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act dealing with the transfer of certain funds from the Department of Agriculture under section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935 would be continued on a permanent basis and the present $3 million limitation on expenditure of these funds would be removed.

Finally, the administration proposal includes the establishment of a special $10 million revolving fund to be used to make loans for the maintenance, repair, and equipment of fishing vessels. Loans made from the fund will carry interest rates of not less than 3 percent and could be made for periods of up to 10 years.

Implementation of these proposals will strengthen the Government's efforts to assist the fishing industry and underlines the

administration's desire to give greater recognition to the vital role the United States fisheries play in the Nation's economy.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., June 7, 1956.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed herewith is a draft of a proposed bill to encourage the development, marketing, and distribution of domestic fishery resources of the United States, and for other purposes.

We recommend that the proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

This Department, which is the Federal agency primarily responsible for conservation of the Nation's fisheries and related activities, has made a careful study of the several legislative proposals that have been presented to the Congress for consideration. These proposals have been studied also by various committees of the Congress and we have been pleased to participate in the consideration of those proposals. The provisions of the enclosed draft of bill should meet with approval from broad segments of our Nation which have been interested in the proper administration of Federal functions in the field of fisheries. We have been equally concerned with problems of recreational and commercial aspects of our fish resources.

We believe it is generally recognized that the Fish and Wildlife Service of this Department has performed many valuable services to the fishing industry. With the growth of our national economy, and with changing international conditions, we recognize that many factors bear upon the welfare of the Nation's fisheries and the industries dependent thereon. A careful evaluation is warranted concerning the proper role of the Federal Government in this field.

We believe this proposed legislation will, in general, be self-explanatory. In recognition of the need to render appropriate financial assistance in this field, section 3 of the measure would establish a fisheries loan fund with initial capital of $10 million, and which would operate as a revolving fund. In this connection, you will note that section 5 of the draft of bill provides that in order to avoid duplication of activities and to minimize expense in carrying out the provisions of the act, the Secretary of the Interior shall use, whenever practicable, the available services and facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government on a reimbursable basis. We anticipate, accordingly, that such authority will be used in administering the loan fund.

We desire also to call your attention, in particular, to section 7 of this proposed legislation. That section will have the important effect of removing the present $3 million limitation now in effect concerning the use by this Department of Saltonstall-Kennedy Act funds for purposes of the act. The authorization for transfer of the funds in question to this Department for the prescribed purposes would be continued on a permanent basis. Section 9 of this proposed legislation would repeal certain acts or parts of acts that, with the enactment of this proposed legislation, will become obsolete and which for the most part will be superseded by such proposed legislation.

We propose to carry out the functions that would be authorized by this proposed legislation through a separate Bureau of Fisheries in this Department. That Bureau will administer our functions in both the commercial and recreational fishery field. We believe this will be in the public interest and will promote good administration. Our activities in this field of public administration can be coordinated appropriately with our other conservation and related activities. At the same time, important questions of policy relating to the fisheries will receive full consideration and attention by this Department.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

WESLEY A. D'EWART,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Be it enacted etc., That it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to promote the conservation and utilization of fishery resources and the efficient production and utilization of fishery products of domestic origin as essential to the welfare of our people; and to promote a sound and prosperous fishing industry as indispensable to the maintenance of maximum employment and prosperity. It is also the intent of the Congress to assist the fisheries in attaining a position in conservation, research and production which will aid in maintaining an equitable balance between the fisheries and other sections of our economy.

SEC. 2. For the attainment of the foregoing objectives and purposes of this act, the Secretary of the Interior, in addition to his general powers and responsibilities, is authorized and directed:

(a) To conduct oceanographic, biological, technological, statistical, and economic studies of the life history, distribution, and abundance of the fishery resources of the United States, including those of the high seas, upon which the domestic fishing industry may be dependent, and to foster the development of means and measures for sustaining such fishery resources at maximum levels of production.

(b) To conduct technological and other studies to promote development of new and improved methods of fishing.

(c) To conduct and foster research, investigation, and experimentation to determine and develop the best methods of processing, preparation for market, packaging, handling, transportation, storing, distributing, and marketing of fish and fishery commodities at all stages from the original taking of fish through to the ultimate consumer.

(d) To conduct research into the problems of human nutrition and the nutritive value of fishery commodities with particular reference to their content of vitamins, minerals, and other constituents that may be found necessary for the health of the consumer and to the gains or losses in the nutritive value that may take place at any stage in their production, distribution, processing, and preparation for use by the consumer.

(e) To conduct research relating to the development of present, new, and extended uses and markets for domestic fishery commodities and byproducts as food or in commerce, manufacture, and trade, both at home and abroad.

(f) To develop and improve standards of quality, condition, quantity, grade, and packaging of fishery commodities and to recommend and demonstrate such needs in order to encourage uniformity and consistency in commercial practices.

(g) To develop and promulgate for the use and at the request of any Federal agency or State, procurement standards and specifications for fishery products and submit such standards and specifications to such agency or State for use or adoption for procurement purposes.

(h) To conduct, assist, foster, and direct studies and informational practices designed to encourage the greater use of fish and fishery products, and to conduct and cooperate in consumer education for the more effective utilization and greater consumption of fishery products.

(i) To collect, tabulate, and disseminate statistics on domestic fishery products including but not restricted to statistics on market supplies, market outlook, storage stocks, quantity, quality, and condition of such products in various positions in the marketing channel, utilization of such products, and shipment thereof, and current information on foreign production and marketing of fishery commodities.

(j) To inspect, certify, and identify the grades, quality, quantity, and condition of fishery products when shipped or received in interstate and foreign commerce under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, including assessment, and collection of such fees as will be reasonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost of the service rendered, except that no person shall be required to use the service authorized by this subsection. Any official certificate issued under the authority of this subsection shall be received by all officers in all courts of the United States as prima facie evidence of the truth of the statements therein contained.

(k) To conduct such other research and services and to perform such other activities as will facilitate the purposes of section 1 of this act.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized under rules and regulations and under terms and conditions prescribed by him, to make loans for operations, maintenance, replacement, repair and equipment of fishing gear and vessels, and for research into the basic problems of fisheries.

(b) Any loans made under the provisions of this section shall be subject to the following restrictions:

(1) Bear an interest rate of not less than 3 percent per annum;

(2) Mature in not more than 10 years;

(3) No financial assistance shall be extended pursuant to this section unless reasonable financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available on reasonable terms.

(c) There is hereby created a fisheries loan fund, which shall be used by the Secretary as a revolving fund to make loans under this section. Any funds received by the Secretary on or before June 30, 1965, in payment of principal or interest on any loans so made, shall be deposited in the fund and be available for making additional loans under this section. Any funds so received after June 30, 1965, and any balance remaining in the fund at the close of June 30, 1965 (at which time the fund shall cease to exist), shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the fund the sum of $10 million to provide initial capital.

(d) The Secretary shall, with respect to the financial operations arising by reason of this section:

(1) prepare annually and submit a business-type budget as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act;

(2) maintain an integral set of accounts, which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions, as provided by section 105 of the Government Corporation Control Act;

(3) determine the character and necessity of expenditures under this section and the manner in which such expenditures are incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to the provisions of law specifically applicable to wholly owned Government corporations.

(e) The Secretary, subject to the specific limitations in this section, may consent to the modification, with respect to the rate of interest, time of payment of any installment of principal, security, or any other term of any loan contract to which he is a party.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this act, any agency of the United States, except any corporation wholly owned by the United States,

is authorized to transfer, without reimbursement or transfer of funds, any vessels or equipment excess to its needs required by the Secretary of the Interior for the activities, studies, and research authorized herein.

SEC. 5. To avoid duplication of activities and minimize expense in carrying out the provisions of this act, the Secretary of the Interior shall, to the extent practicable and with their consent, use the available services and facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government on a reimbursable basis. The Secretary also is directed, as far as practicable, to cooperate with other appropriate agencies of the Federal Government, with State or local governmental agencies, private agencies, organizations, or individuals, having jurisdiction over or an interest in fish or fishery commodities and he is authorized to appoint such advisory committees of the American fisheries industry as he deems appropriate to advise him in the formulation of programs authorized by this act.

SEC. 6. The provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1950 (64 Stat. 1262), shall be applicable to the provisions of this act and the provisions of any other act authorized herein to be executed by the Secretary of the Interior. Any function or activity relating to commercial fisheries currently vested by law in any official, employee, or organizational unit of the Department of the Interior are hereby transferred to the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 7. (a) The authorization for the transfer of certain funds from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary of the Interior and their maintenance in a separate fund as contained in section 2 (a) of the act of August 11, 1939, as amended July 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 376), shall be continued for the year ending June 30, 1957, and each year thereafter, and such transferred funds shall be available for all the purposes of this act;

(b) Subsection (e) of section 2 of the aforesaid act of August 11, 1939, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) The separate fund created for the use of the Secretary of the Interior under section 2 (a) of this act and the annual accruals thereto shall be available for each year hereafter until expended by the Secretary."

SEC. 8. When used in this act the term "fishery resources" includes fish, shellfish, mollusks, crustacea, aquatic plants, and animals.

SEC. 9. The following acts and parts of acts are repealed:

That portion of the act of May 31, 1880 (21 Stat. 150, 151), set out in 16 U. S. C. 746.

That portion of the act of March 3, 1885 (23 Stat. 446, 494), set out in 16 U. S. C. 743.

Those portions of Revised Statutes, sections 4396, 4397, the act of March 3, 1887 (24 Stat. 509, 523), set out in 16 U. S. C. 744.

The act of August 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 692).

The act of June 21, 1916, ch. 160 (39 Stat. 232).

That portion of section 4 of the act of June 16, 1921 (42 Stat. 63), set out in 16 U. S. C. 749.

The act of August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 930; 16 U. S. C. 921), as amended.

The act of August 4, 1947 (61 Stat. 726; 16 U. S. C. 758, et seq.).

Sections 8 and 3 of the act of August 18, 1949 (63 Stat. 616; 16 U. S. C. 759).

The act of August 25, 1950 (64 Stat. 474; 16 U. S. C. 760a–760c).

The act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 4111), as amended.

Mr. PAYNE. In connection with his program I recently wrote to President Eisenhower commending him for this positive action and indicated some of the steps which I believe must be taken to make the administration fisheries program fully effective. Mr. President, I also request unanimous consent that the text of my letter to the President be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 8, 1956.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On June 4 the White House announced your decision to create a Bureau of Fisheries headed by a Director in the Department of the Interior to administer the fishery functions of the Federal Government, responsibility for which has been and is presently vested in the Fish and Wildlife Service. I wish to take this opportunity to commend you for this positive action which will go far toward giving the American Fisheries much-needed recognition.

As you know the problems facing the American fishing industry are manifold and complex. There is no panacea which will resolve these problems, but positive, constructive steps such as those you have recently announced will enable a start to be made toward helping the fishing industry to regain a healthy economic status.

In view of the many problems which do exist, and the inadequate attention given to these problems by all parties concerned in past years, plus the recent focusing of attention on the situation by both Congress and the executive branch. It is my belief that certain responsibilities of the Director of the Bureau of Fisheries should be clearly spelled out and made public in an appropriate Executive order. Therefore, it is my recommendation that the following points be included in the Executive order setting up the Bureau of Fisheries, or put into effect by other appropriate means.

First, the Director of the Bureau of Fisheries should conduct continuing investigations, prepare and disseminate information, and make periodical reports through the Secretary of the Interior to the public, to the President, and to the Congress with respect to the following matters:

(1) The production and flow to market of fish and fishing products domestically produced and also those produced by foreign producers which affect the domestic fisheries;

(2) The availability and the abundance of the living resources which support the domestic fisheries;

(3) The competitive economic position of the various fish and fishery products with respect to each other, to competitive foreign-produced commodities, and to other competitive commodities; and

(4) The collection and dissemination of statistics on food and recreational fisheries.

Second, on the basis of reports prepared pursuant to law or the above responsibilities, or other information available, the Director should study the economic condition of the industry and whenever he determines that any segment of the domestic fisheries has been seriously disturbed either by wide fluctuation in the abundance of the resource supporting it, or by unstable market or fishing conditions from any cause he should, through the Secretary of the Interior, make such recommendations to the President and to Congress with respect to credit relief and other measures as he deems appropriate to aid in stabilizing the domestic fisheries.

Third, the Director should be authorized to make a report, through the Secretary of the Interior, to the President, the Congress, and the United States Tariff Commission concerning the following matters with respect to any fishery product which is imported into the United States, upon a request from any segment of the domestic industry producing a like or directly competitive product:

(1) Whether there has been a downward trend in the production, employment in the production, or prices, or a decline in the sales, of the like or directly competitive product by the domestic industry; and

(2) Whether there has been an increase in the imports of the fishery product into the United States, either actual or relative to the production of the like or directly competitive product produced by the domestic industry.

Fourth, the Director should develop and recommend, through the Secretary of the Interior, to the President and to the Congress measures which are appropriate to assure the maximum sustainable production of fish and fishery products and to prevent unnecessary and excessive fluctuations in such production. The Director should also develop special promotional and informational activities with a view to stimulating the consumption of fishery products whenever he determines that there is a prospective or actual surplus of such products.

Fifth, the Secretary of the Interior should cooperate to the fullest practicable extent with the Secretary of State in providing representation at all meetings and conferences relating to fisheries in which representatives of the United States and foreign countries participate. The Secretary of State should request the Secretary of the Interior to designate at least one member of the United States delegation attending such meetings and conferences, and to the negotiating team of any such delegation. The Secretary of State and all other officials having responsibilities in the fields of technical and economic aid to foreign nations should consult with the Secretary of the Interior in all cases in which the interests of fisheries are involved, with a view to assuring that such interests are adequately represented at all times. The Secretary of the Interior should be represented in all international negotiations conducted by the United States pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, in any case in which fishery products are directly affected by such negotiations.

I cannot too strongly urge your careful consideration toward clearly spelling out the above duties and responsibilities. It is my firm belief that if the forward-looking step which you have recently announced is to achieve maximum effectiveness, a clear delineation of responsibility must be made. Further, the points I have outlined above are essential to an effective program of revitalizing the American fisheries and are fully subscribed to by every segment of the great industry as indicated during extensive hearings held this year by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I am a member. As a result of these hearings, the Senate did pass very comprehensive legislation covering this entire subject, and I am enclosing a copy of this legislation for your information.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. PAYNE,
United States Senator.

AMENDMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES ACT OF 1946, RELATING TO PAYMENT OF TRANSPORTATION COSTS FOR CERTAIN PERSONS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the conti-

nental United States and Alaska and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4024) to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the continental United States and Alaska and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The bill proposes to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, by providing for the payment of travel and transportation costs to a person selected for appointment to certain positions in the continental United States and Alaska, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Philip Young, Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission, requesting the introduction of this bill, and transmitting a sectional analysis of the bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 28, 1956.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
United States Congress.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are submitting for the consideration of the Congress proposed legislation which would authorize the payment of travel and moving expenses for certain new employees of the Federal Government and would also provide for the payment of an applicant's travel costs to a Federal laboratory or installation under certain conditions as a means of encouraging employment. There are enclosed: (1) A draft bill; (2) a section analysis of the proposed bill; and (3) a statement of purpose and justification.

The proposed bill will significantly improve the ability of the Federal Government to attract able scientists and engineers and other personnel in short supply whose skills are essential to the national security effort and to the proper functioning of the executive departments. If enacted, this legislation will place Government laboratories seeking scientists and engineers on a more equal footing with private industry, which for some time has been paying travel and moving expenses for its new employees and the expenses for plant visits as an aid to recruitment. It will also assist Federal departments in securing needed personnel in other shortage occupations. Legislation of this kind is vital to the effective continuation of Federal research and development activities and to other important activities of Federal departments and agencies.

The recommended bill has the full support of the administration. Because of the great urgency of the situation regarding the shortage of scientific and engineering personnel in the Government service, the Civil Service Commission strongly urges the early and sympathetic consideration of this proposed bill by the Congress.

A similar letter is being sent to the Speaker of the House.

By direction of the Commission.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP YOUNG, *Chairman.*

SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 amends section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 808, as amended) which provides for the payment of travel and moving expenses of new appointees, their immediate families, and their household goods from their actual place of residence to duty stations outside the continental United States by adding a subsection (b) authorizing similar payments to stations in the United States and Alaska for new employees in occupations designated as shortage occupations. The same conditions governing the payment of travel and transportation expenses to Federal employees who are transferred at the convenience of the Government, as set out in section 1 (a) and (b) of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, would be applicable to persons receiving travel and moving expenses under this legislation. Also, the same per diem and mileage allowances now provided to Federal employees by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, may be allowed to persons traveling to first duty stations. Travel and transportation expenses could be provided for persons before they are actually appointed but no expenditures under this section could be made unless the person selected for appointment agrees in writing to remain in the Government service for 12 months following his appointment unless separated for reasons beyond his control and acceptable to the department or agency concerned. In case of violation of this agreement, any moneys expended by the United States for travel and transportation expenses would be recoverable from the individual concerned as a debt due the United States. Regulations for administration of this section would be prescribed by the President.

Section 1 of the draft bill further amends section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act by adding subsection (c) which authorizes the payment of travel expenses of persons in shortage categories who are invited to visit agencies or installations for purposes connected with employment. Such payments of travel expenses would be at the discretion of the employing agency and could be made only when it is first determined that the person invited to visit the agency is qualified to perform in a position for which there is a manpower shortage and when it is believed that providing such travel would be instrumental in getting the person to accept employment at the agency or installation. Travel expenses under this section would be provided in accordance with the travel regulations currently applicable to Federal employees.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND JUSTIFICATION OF A DRAFT BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE PAYMENT OF TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION COSTS FOR PERSONS SELECTED FOR APPOINTMENT TO CERTAIN POSITIONS IN THE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES AND ALASKA AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

PURPOSE

To increase the ability of the Federal Government as an employer to attract persons in shortage occupations such as scientists and engineers.

JUSTIFICATION

The need in the Federal Government for scientists and engineers is at an all time peak, and is steadily increasing. Military preparedness today depends in large measure on the products of the research laboratories and in the race for weapons development, our laboratories must have technically trained and highly skilled employees if we are to be successful. Inability to recruit enough scientists and engineers to man important defense-connected research and development activities is one of the most serious problems facing the Federal Government today. There are also serious shortages in other occupations which impede important activities of Federal departments and agencies. It is urgent that all possible steps be taken to recruit for the Federal services more persons who have skills which are in short supply. The payment of moving expenses and travel costs for new employees and the payment of applicants' travel expenses to Federal agencies would increase the ability of the Government to attract such persons.

The problem

In hiring engineers and scientists the Government competes with private employers. Private employers today pay moving expenses for their new employees. The Federal Government does not pay similar expenses for its new employees. To ask a person to absorb a $1,000 to $1,500 moving bill when he joins the Government is like asking him to take that much of a reduction in salary for the first year. With the kind of labor market we have today this simply means that the Government fails to get the number of people it needs to do the important jobs that must be done. Private industry also pays for the cost of an applicant's visit to the plant or laboratory prior to employment. This is an important recruiting tool which is now denied to Federal agencies and departments.

Industry practice on payment of moving expenses

Private industry pays the moving expenses of its new employees.

Atomic Energy Commission Contractors

The practices of the 27 largest AEC contractors were examined. These include the academic as well as large industrial contractors who together hire 75 percent of all private employees on AEC work. These contractors are among the chief competitors of the Federal Government for scientific talent. With two exceptions, these contractors pay all the personal family travel expense and all transportation costs for household goods of newly hired key professional employees, particularly engineers and scientists. In addition, many will pay per diem for each member of the family and often continue it as long as 30 days after the arrival at the place to work. Even in the case of the two contractors who do not cover all expenses, one will pay for the movement of household goods and the other for the personal travel expenses of new employees.

Office of Naval Research Contractors

A survey showed that at least 75 percent of all ONR contractors pay moving expenses and personal and family travel costs for new employees in shortage categories.

Air Research and Development Command Contractors

The Air Research and Development Command has approximately 145 contractors of the large industrial type. Of these firms, 90 percent pay moving and travel expenses for new employees and their families.

In all contracts—atomic energy, naval research, and Air Research and Development Command—moving expenses of new employees are recognized as proper costs of a project and as such the contractor is reimbursed for them by the Federal Government. The practice of paying these expenses is not confined to the contractor's work for the Government, however. It applies to each industrial contractor's private operations as well.

Special Studies on Payment of Moving Expenses to New Employees in Private Industry

The Associated Industries of Cleveland, an association of private firms in the Cleveland area, surveyed the practices of 13 of its member companies. Eleven out of 13 reported that they would pay moving and travel expenses for certain new employees and their families. Twelve out of 13 said they would

do it for employees whose skills were in short supply.

The Midwestern College Placement Association surveyed the practices of about 200 private concerns. A substantial proportion of the firms surveyed paid moving and travel expenses for the new employee and his family even though the employee had just finished college and was completely inexperienced. Also, the number of firms paying these expenses has been growing and has increased significantly since 1953.

What the Private Companies Say Themselves

Companies like General Electric, RCA, Sylvania, Republic Aviation, Sperry Gyroscope, American Machine & Foundry—all large users of scientific and engineering talent—are just a few of the many firms that advertise continuously in newspapers and journals that they will pay the travel and moving expenses of new employees.

Need for payment of travel and transportation costs in the Federal service

There are many specific instances in which the Government has lost numbers of well-trained individuals who might otherwise have made significant contributions to Federal research and development activities.

A nuclear physicist, one of the very few men in the country able to accomplish a particular important assignment without extensive training, refused employment at Dugway Proving Ground because of the Government's failure to pay his moving expense from Santa Fe, N. Mex., to Dugway, Utah.

Engineers living in San Francisco refused employment at Hill Air Force Base, Utah, because of failure to pay moving expenses. They were interviewed in an employment office by Hill Air Force Base and by a private aircraft company, and although interested in the Federal offer, they accepted that of the private company because it included travel and moving expenses.

The United States Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory in San Francisco found a qualified scientist needed for important work. He was willing to join the laboratory but declined when he found his moving expenses would not be paid.

A naval organization in Port Huenene, Calif., had recruited for several years for an applied mechanician. One was found in Chicago who was qualified and willing to take the job. This man accepted a position with a private employer when he found the Navy could not move his family to California while a private employer would pay for moving expenses.

The Redstone Arsenal in Alabama, an important missile center, reports one instance in which a group of engineers released by a private employer in Denver, Colo., did not accept employment on the missile program because the arsenal was not able to pay for their moving expenses. Thirty-nine of the 40 engineers available declined the Federal offer because of the personal expense of moving and accepted jobs with private industry where their moving expenses were paid.

A study of the factors which influenced persons not to accept Government scientific and engineering positions was made by the Pasadena Board of United States Civil Service Examiners. More than 50 percent of the persons surveyed who declined Federal appointments, indicated that one of the reasons for declination was the failure of the Government to pay moving expenses.

Payment of applicants' travel expenses

Well-qualified scientists and engineers don't buy a "pig in a poke" when it comes to deciding on a job. They don't have to in today's market. Private industry has recognized that the kind of equipment a man will have to work with, who his coworkers will be, and the kind of living conditions his family will have can all be important factors in selling him on a particular job. Twenty-one of the 27 largest AEC contractors pay the cost of travel to their plants or laboratories in connection with recruitment for important positions. Contractors for the Office of Naval Research and for the Air Research and Development Command provide such travel expenses and other private firms advertise continuously that expenses of a visit to the company before employment will be paid.

The Government stands to gain importantly from the payment of these expenses. Its laboratories, its equipment, and its physical plant often surpass the best in private industry. These things can be a powerful inducement for able scientists and engineers, but this advantage is lost unless agencies and installations are able to bring qualified persons in to see them.

Other shortage occupations

The need for payment of moving expenses and applicants' travel expenses extends beyond scientists and engineers to all occupations for which there is a manpower shortage today. Many of the support occupations in the scientific and engineering field are also in short supply. There are shortages in the medical field. There are shortages in key professional jobs in many agencies. Some shortages are nationwide, others are purely local.

Industry does not confine these payments to scientists and engineers. Companies use it to increase their ability to attract the people they need. Government agencies should be able to do the same thing. Flexibility to meet varying kinds of shortages is important if this legislation is to be of maximum benefit to the Government.

Administration of the proposed legislation

Regulations governing travel under the proposed legislation would be prescribed by the Director, Bureau of the Budget, who now has the responsibility for prescribing other travel regulations. The Civil Service Commission would determine those positions which fall into the category of "manpower shortage". Agencies would be provided with a list of such positions. This list would include all series of positions for which the Commission has authorized recruitment at rates above the minimum of the grade in accordance with section 803 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. It would also include such other positions which the Commission determines are in a shortage category. Agencies would be authorized to use the authority provided in the proposed legislation without prior approval for any listed position. Use of the authority for any other position would require prior approval based on the need in the particular agency or installation. Funds to pay travel and transportation costs authorized by the draft bill would be secured by individual agencies through their appropriation requests to the Congress. Necessity for justifying funds to be used for these purposes and the generally limited amounts of agency travel funds in relation to travel needs will assure that individual agencies administer these provisions in the best interests of the agency and the Federal service.

New employees are required to agree to a period of 12 months' service before travel and moving costs can be paid. This safeguard is similar to that appearing in the legislation providing travel and moving expenses to overseas stations and assures that the Government will get a fair return for the money it spends on moving new employees.

COST

Cost of the proposed legislation is estimated at $4,500,000 per year.

AMENDMENT OF ACT ESTABLISHING MARINE SCHOOLS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1911.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4034) to amend the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1911, introduced by Mrs. SMITH of Maine, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the bill I have just introduced proposes that Federal appropriations to assist State maritime academies be made available for a period of 4 years.

In short, what I am trying to correct is the situation where State maritime academies operate under the uncertainty each year that Federal assistance may be withdrawn.

This is not realistic and it certainly is not fair to the students entering the State maritime academies for the 4-year courses. In other words, it is obvious that the only fair and realistic way to plan and administer Federal assistance is on the basis of the 4-year term instead of merely 1 year—and instead of keeping the State maritime academies dangling from year to year.

The bill is very simple and because of its obvious justice and realism, I hope the committee to which it is referred will act promptly and report it favorably, and that the Senate will pass it as soon as possible.

CONTROL, APPROPRIATION, USE, AND DISTRIBUTION OF WATER—AMENDMENTS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I submit amendments which I shall propose to S. 863, the bill to redefine the relationship of the Federal and State governments with respect to water law and water rights. My amendments would suspend all outstanding licenses under the Federal Power Act for water-project works on which construction has not progressed to the point of blocking the flow of the stream in question, pending a determination by the Federal Power Commission that the licensee has complied with the requirements of S. 863. I ask that the amendments be printed in the RECORD, so that my explanation of them may be available to Senators considering this proposed legislation, and also to the public.

There being no objection, the amendments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 9, between lines 2 and 3, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 11. Any license or permit issued under the Federal Power Act for the construction of any project works (as defined in such act), which would impound or divert or interrupt the flow of any water (including

navigable and nonnavigable and interstate and intrastate waters), is hereby suspended if such construction has not on the date of enactment of this act reached a stage of completion which effects such impounding, diversion or interruption. Any suspension under the provisions of this act may be terminated by the Federal Power Commission upon a determination by the Commission that all requirements of this act have been complied with by the licensee or permittee whose license or permit is suspended."

On page 9, line 3, strike out "SEC. 11" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 12."

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, while there have been other areas of doubt and possible controversy over water law in our Federal system, the real stimulus for the current interest in legislation such as S. 863 has been a series of court decisions upholding licenses for waterpower projects granted by the Federal Power Commission over the opposition of State agencies. The latest of these was the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States on June 6, 1955, in the case of Federal Power Commission against Oregon, which upheld a Federal Power Commission license to the Portland General Electric Co. to build the Pelton Dam project on the Deschutes River—a wholly intrastate, assumedly nonnavigable stream in Oregon—in spite of the protests of Oregon State agencies which are concerned about the preservation of a great and famous run of steelhead trout on this celebrated fishing stream. Migratory fish may be impeded by these proposed powerplants.

S. 863 has been introduced in the Senate and reported by a subcommittee of the Interior Committee to the full committee as a necessary corrective to the supremacy of Federal power over State water laws which has emerged from these recent court decisions. As a member of the full committee, I shall, of course, give thorough attention to this important bill. But it would be most ironic, Mr. President, from the point of view of the people of Oregon, if the Congress were to enact a law for greater State control over the use of streams and ground water without giving any effect whatever to this law in Oregon, in the situations which furnished the occasions for such legislation. That would be a case of locking the barn door, not after the horse had been stolen, for the dams in question have yet to be built, but of locking the barn door after first permitting some of the horses to be stolen.

PELTON DAM CASE WAS BASIS FOR NEW LEGISLATION

It so happens that Oregon, the State which I help represent in the Senate, is the State most immediately affected by the current controversy over the FPC's licensing power to override State water regulations. We have not only the controversy over Pelton Dam, which went to the Supreme Court, but also the controversy over the Beaver Marsh project of the Eugene Water and Electric Board, on the scenic McKenzie River, as well as the licenses granted to the Idaho Power Co. on the Snake River, along Oregon's border with Idaho. Any bill, such as S. 863, which seeks to reestablish State controls over the use of waters within the State, must in all fairness to my State include reestablishment of Oregon's authority with respect to the Oregon rivers on which licenses have already been granted, but where construction has not yet gone to the point of blocking streamflow.

This has been the objective of bills introduced by my colleague the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and myself to deauthorize the Pelton Dam, S. 3250, and Beaver Marsh projects, S. 2877, on which hearings have also been held. On behalf of the people of Oregon, I intend in the Interior Committee and in the Senate to press for inclusion of that objective in any legislation, such as S. 863, intended to reverse the law as interpreted in the recent judicial decisions. Anything less than this would make such legislation a sham and a delusion, so far as my State is concerned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUTLER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3365) to amend section 410 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to change the requirements for obtaining a freight forwarder permit, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INCREASE NUMBER OF GRADUATE ENGINEERS AND SCIENTISTS THROUGH GRANT OF FEDERAL SCHOLARSHIPS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I was pleased recently when the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] introduced S. 3748, a bill which would provide for 5,000 Federal scholarships a year for 4 years for engineering and science students. I had long thought that such a measure was going to be necessary to enable this country to keep abreast the world's new technology and to match the undeniable achievements of the Soviet Union in the field of technological education.

About the same time the Senator from Kentucky introduced his bill the Research and Development Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was holding hearings on the shortage of scientific and engineering manpower. Those hearings convinced me, as I had not been before, that a Federal scholarship program is one of our most drastic needs. I therefore support the Clements bill wholeheartedly. I think it is a well conceived plan. I think it could go even further, and I herewith offer an amendment to Senate bill 3948, which will accomplish this purpose.

I ask that the amendments be printed and referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, my amendments raise the number of scholarships which could be awarded from 5,000 to 10,000 each year for 4 years. I believe we will have to get that many more persons into science and engineering to meet the demands of our growing technology. In 1954 Russia graduated 53,000 engineers; the United States, 22,000. In 1955, 35,000 new engineers were needed in the United States, but only 23,000 were graduated. The 1956 need is expected to reach 40,000, and to accelerate by 3,000 to 4,000 annually. But while the need accelerates, engineering and science graduates are constituting progressively smaller proportions of their classes. In 1950 they were one-quarter of their class, but in 1954 only 18 percent. By 1960 they are expected to be 15 percent of their graduating class.

Meanwhile, Russia is forging ahead. She turned out twice as many engineers and scientists in 1954 as in 1950, while in the same period our numbers dropped by half. Right now Russia has five times as many students as we have in technical institutions, and in most cases the Russian students are pursuing a more extensive curriculum.

The United States has almost twice as many high schools as has Russia and over a million more high school students. But these boys and girls are not going on to college in sufficient numbers. Only 2 out of 10 high school graduates qualified to do college work actually graduate from college. I do not know all the reasons for this. Maybe our young people are going adverse to work, or are not receiving proper motivation from their parents and in the high schools. But it is certain that the cost of higher education is rising, and that, in many cases, the reason for our discouraging situation is a financial one. That is why I think this bill will help.

Former Senator William Benton was one of the persons who appeared before the Subcommittee on Research and Development. He reported that some 160,000 highly qualified high school graduates each year are unable to get to college solely because of economic difficulties. Mr. Benton had recently returned from a trip to Russia, during which he toured several Russian educational institutions. He is a trustee of a college and of a university, and he understood what he was seeing. He was alarmed by the work the Russians are doing in higher technical education, and he recommends for the United States 20,000 scholarships a year, with the number to be increased to 100,000 a year. Compared with a recommendation of such size, the 10,000 which my amendments would provide is modest indeed.

Besides providing for more scholarships, my amendment allows the 4 years' Federal service to which the recipient would obligate himself to be worked off by academic years accomplished as a postgraduate student or as a teacher in high schools or college, as well as by military service, which is allowed by the bill as it now stands.

I think that, with these amendments the recipients of scholarships will be impelled to go just where they are most needed. The fulfillment of the purpose of the bill will be insured. Graduates will either enter graduate work—and if one thing is needed more than bachelors of science and engineering, it is masters and doctors of science and engineering—or they will enter Government laboratories, or will become teachers and thus provide a cumulative effect to the law. The output of science teachers in the United States declined 57 percent between 1950 and 1955. In 1954, 7,900 science teachers were needed, 3,600 were trained, and only 1,700 became teachers. At least partly as a result of this, 23 percent of our high schools offer no physics and chemistry, which means that graduates of these schools will almost surely not enter the science field. By 1965 almost 2 million new teachers will be needed.

I think that, with my amendments, the bill will go a long way toward correcting several of our technical manpower deficiencies. It will provide more engineers and scientists, more with graduate degrees, more teachers, and more technically trained persons who will be specifically ready to enter our hard-pressed Government research installations.

SOCIAL-SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1956—AMENDMENT

Mr. LEHMAN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability-insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE — AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely:

On page 10, line 23, after "prints;", insert "construction of minimum recreational facilities at reclamation reservoirs to be nonreimbursable."

On page 13, after line 5 insert "Sums which have heretofore been expended for construction purposes on the Boulder Canyon project from operation and maintenance appropriations and revenue receipts shall be considered as having been advanced to the Colorado River dam fund and repaid to the Secretary of the Treasury as of May 31 of the same operating year."

On page 13, after line 5 insert "Funds made available herein and hereafter to the Trinity division, Central Valley project, shall be available for the design and construction of power and hydraulic facilities totaling not to exceed approximately four hundred thousand kilowatts."

On page 13, after line 5 insert "All funds expended for construction, operation, and maintenance of the two thousand-second-foot Wahluke siphon, Columbia Basin project, shall be reimbursable, but repayment of those parts thereof and of other expenditures for said project which the Secretary finds properly allocable to irrigable lands located on the Wahluke slope shall be deferred until they are no longer needed in connection with operations of the Atomic Energy Commission and have been irrigated."

On page 17, line 23, before the colon, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That in view of the physical conditions that developed during construction which increased the cost of land acquisition beyond the legal authority of the city of Grand Forks to provide, the Chief of Engineers is authorized to expend, for land acquisition, not to exceed the sum of $100,000 of the amount herein appropriated for the Grand Forks unit of the Red River of the North project."

On page 17, line 23, before the colon, insert the following: *Provided further*, That in lieu of protecting the Lewis and Clark Irrigation District, the sum of $1,935,000 of the funds herein or hereafter appropriated for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River shall be available for the purchase of lands and improvements in the Lewis and Clark Irrigation District, and the sum of $1,196,000 shall be available for the relocation of highways and utilities therein. The substitution of land acquisition for the protection shall be made and the Secretary of the Army shall acquire such land and improvements if all of the landowners, on or before June 30, 1957, have offered to sell their property on terms agreeable to said landowners, and within the amount provided herein for such land acquisition.

On page 17, line 23, before the colon, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That in lieu of protecting the East Bottom of the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, the sum of $1,341,891 of the funds herein or hereafter appropriated for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River shall be available for the purchase of lands and improvements in and contiguous to the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, and not to exceed $2 million shall be available to the Corps of Engineers for protection of the intake structure of the pumping plant in Zero Bottom and for the construction of bank protection to prevent erosion in the Missouri River adjacent to the Buford-Trenton irrigation project. The substitution of land acquisition for protection shall be made and the Secretary of the Army shall acquire such land and improvements if all of the landowners, except the heirs of Louis Morin, Jr., on or before June 30, 1957, have offered to sell their property on the terms agreeable to said landowners, and within the amount provided for such land acquisition: *Provided*, That the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, is authorized to acquire by condemnation proceedings, in the appropriate United States District Court, the public domain allotment of Louis Morin, Jr., now deceased, described as the west half southwest quarter, section 16, and the north half southeast quarter, section 17, township 153 north, range 102 west, fifth principal meridian, North Dakota, in connection with the construction and operation of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir: *Provided further*, That in the event land acquisition is undertaken in lieu of protection of the East Bottom, that in recognition of the increased per acre annual operation and maintenance cost of the remaining lands in the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, the construction charge obligation assignable to the remaining lands of said district pursuant to the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119), as amended, and the proposed contract between the United States and Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, approved as to form February 23, 1955, shall be nonreimbursable, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to enter into a contract with the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District to transfer operation and maintenance responsibility for project works constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation for the benefit of the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District to such district."

Mr. ELLENDER also submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11319, making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on February 8, 1955, a number of my distinguished colleagues in the Senate joined with me in introducing Senate Joint Resolution 39, the so-called equal rights amendment for women. This joint resolution has been favorably reported by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and is now on the calendar awaiting action. Last July 30 the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] asked unanimous consent to be listed as a cosponsor of the joint resolution. Inadvertently, his name was not added to the list of cosponsors when the joint resolution was reprinted at the time it was reported.

It is my understanding that the supply of Senate Joint Resolution 39 in the document room has been depleted, and it will be reprinted within the next several days. In addition to the names of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], who have heretofore obtained unanimous consent that their names be added as cosponsors of the joint resolution, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH and Mr. PURTELL], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], who are also desirous of being listed as cosponsors of the joint resolution, may be added.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc.,

were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON:

Address delivered by him before the overseas breakfast of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Pa., concerning the world situation and what atomic energy might do to improve it.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Sixth radio report by him to the people of New York State during the 2d session, 84th Congress.

By Mr. SCOTT:

Letters received by him from Edward J. Fanflik, Acting Assistant Chief of Engineers for Real Estate, and Frank J. O'Gara, Regional Director of the General Services Administration, Atlanta, Ga., relative to proposed disposal of land along the inland waterway in North Carolina.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF RAYMOND J. KELLY, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR DIVISION NO. 1, DISTRICT OF ALASKA

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, June 18, 1956, at 2:30 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Raymond J. Kelly, of Michigan, to be United States district judge for division No. 1, district of Alaska, for the term of 4 years, vice George W. Folta, deceased.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and myself, chairman.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until Wednesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to explain that on tomorrow it is expected that several very important conferences will be held: Conferences on the Commerce Department appropriation bill, on the District of Columbia appropriation bill, on the tax provisions of the road bill, and, in the afternoon, on the roads provision of that bill. We shall not have a session of the Senate tomorrow in order that an attempt may be made to clear up some of the work that has to be done in conferences with the House.

On Wednesday it is planned to have the Senate take up the public works appropriation bill. If the Senate passes that bill on Wednesday, we shall then proceed to the consideration of the social security bill, which bill will be temporarily laid aside when the foreign aid bill is reported from the committee, if the social security bill is not passed in the meantime. We hope to be able to act on measures on the calendar today, and to bring up by motion several health bills which will be handled by the Senator from Alabama.

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the address delivered by the Vice President of the United States at the 121st annual commencement of Lafayette College at Easton, Pa., on June 7, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE 121ST ANNUAL COMMENCEMENT AT LAFAYETTE COLLEGE, EASTON, PA., JUNE 7, 1956

I was tempted in preparing my remarks for this occasion to discuss at length the economic prospects for the years ahead.

We are fortunate to be living in a period when for the first time in a quarter of a century we have had three consecutive years of unparalleled prosperity.

The college graduates of 1956 will find available to them the most jobs at the highest wages in the Nation's history.

And it would be fascinating indeed to explore the almost limitless possibilities for expansion of the American economy during the years ahead as we begin to harness the new sources of energy which our scientists have untapped.

Tonight, however, I believe there is a subject of greater importance to this graduating class and to the Nation.

I refer to the titanic struggle between two opposing concepts of life in which we are engaged. The next few years will determine whether we can live in peace and at the same time avoid surrender.

And that question will be answered by how well we are able to meet and defeat the changing tactics of the dictatorial forces which threaten the free world.

From the end of World War II to the death of Stalin in 1953, our problem was a relatively simple one.

Communist leaders all over the world used open threats of force coupled with thinly veiled support of revolutionary and subversive movements in countries designed for conquest. These actions of bluster and abuse inevitably drove the free world together in self-defense.

Then came the death of Stalin and the New Look in Communist foreign relations.

The leaders of the Soviet Union invited the rest of the world to a period of peaceful coexistence. In doing so they seemed to abandon their previous tough line and they have even repudiated some of the excesses of past regimes.

This change of tactics has understandably created considerable confusion in the non-Communist world.

I think there will be little dissent from the conclusion that in view of the record of the men in the Kremlin the lines of military and diplomatic policy that we have hammered out over the past 10 years must continue to govern our conduct at this time.

But, is this the whole answer?

Do we stand pat and leave all the initiative to the other camp?

Do we act as if nothing has happened in the 3 years since Stalin died?

I answer these questions by saying that we could make no greater mistake than to rest on our oars and to ignore the "New Look" in Soviet diplomacy.

If it is made to appear that our primary concern is military hardware, we may find ourselves isolated in a world that has been convinced by the traveling salesmen of the Soviet Union selling other products.

What we face today is a new line which could be far more dangerous in the long run than the Stalin line of bluster and brute force.

It is basically a war for men's minds, a struggle for their allegiance, an effort to win them peacefully to the Soviet camp.

In this struggle, ideas—not guns or aircraft—are the weapons.

In this war, our armies wear the university cap and gown—not the uniform of the soldier.

Books and pamphlets, rather than tanks and battleships, will be decisive in this contest.

One of the major reasons for the change in Soviet policy now becomes apparent.

It was obvious to the successors of Stalin that they could not sell their new line so long as people remembered slave labor camps, mass purges, and the ever-present terror of the secret police.

Yet, to the outside world, there would appear to be a break with the past and a writing off of the handicaps derived from more than 30 years of terror.

And the New Look was sufficiently appealing in contrast to the old that there was every chance of selling this policy to uncommitted nations, and of breaking off one by one those who had allied together in a common policy of defense.

In the cold light of history it seems fantastic that a nation with the Soviet record of terror and aggression could hope to make widespread gains by announcing a simple change of policy.

At the least, one would expect that all non-Communist countries would adopt a policy of watchful waiting and not make any shift of program until the New Look had been tried for 5 to 10 years.

Unfortunately, this is not the case.

We must recognize that there are powerful assets which work to the benefit of the Soviet in this contest. Unless we examine them and face them realistically we may well lose out in the battle for men's minds.

First, let us see what is at stake. Approximately 600 million people live in the so-called uncommitted or neutral nations. It is easy to see that the world struggle will be determined by what happens to these people.

On the basis of my travels through most of this part of the world, may I tell you what I believe the people in the uncommitted nations want and contrast the Communist appeal with our own.

First, there is the desire for peace throughout the world, a desire which is particularly strong in the nations newly freed from colonial ties. This is not merely negative in the sense of war weariness or fear. It is often something much more positive.

They wish the time and freedom to build their countries economically, politically, and culturally.

To such nations the Communist world talks and promises peace. It appears to respect their desire for neutrality.

By contrast we often seem to be talking war and military alliances.

I do not say that these impressions are correct, but they are more widespread and sincerely held than we often realize.

Second, there is the understandable desire for economic progress in nations less developed than those in the West.

To these nations, the Soviet Union holds up the example of its own dramatic industrial progress under communism.

On the other hand, the almost unbelievable prosperity of the United States appears

to many of these nations as a goal impossible of attainment.

Third, there is the desire for recognition, prestige, and independence.

In much of Asia and Africa, strong resentments have been built up against Western nations because of past or present colonial and imperialistic policies.

Often there is the deep hurt that springs from real or imagined racial discrimination.

Here we find that there is a fear of what they term "cultural imperialism," an effort by the West to dominate the thinking of other nations rather than to respect their cultures and religions on an equal basis with ours.

And here again the Soviet has been adroit in recognizing this desire. Compare, for example, the tactics of Bulganin and Khrushchev in dealing with the peoples of the Far East and their tactics in Great Britain.

A fourth point to note is the attitude of many peoples toward material things in contrast to the intellectual and the spiritual. This is difficult to express accurately.

In one sense, all peoples are concerned with economic and material problems. They must produce to live.

Yet, at the same time, there are often profound differences in the relative place assigned to these activities.

In many areas of the world a place of honor is given to leaders in the arts and intellectual fields and in religious activities.

The intellectual is not dismissed as an "egg head." The artist is not called a "long-hair." The minister of religion is not considered an impractical idealist.

Here again we find that many peoples think that we in America are too materialistic to have such ideals. We are considered anti-intellectual, deficient in culture, superficial in religion.

Again, I am not passing judgment on the truth or falsity of these charges. The important point is that they are widely believed.

And what is truly amazing is this—that the apostles of communism can parade as exponents of the very ideals that they accuse us of neglecting when their own philosophy is the ultimate in materialism and the antithesis of religion.

But we find again how cleverly they present their case.

They point out that the scientist and the intellectual is held in high esteem in the Soviet Union.

Artists and writers are among the highest paid and most honored citizens in their regime.

Even the persecution of religion is played down by the claim that worship is free, and that only political activities of the churches are suppressed.

We now come to the basic question: What should our policy be in the light of the new Soviet tactics?

We must, of course, continue to maintain adequate military strength at home and we must try to keep alive our vital alliances abroad.

We must continue our programs of economic assistance and avoid if we can the possibility that less developed nations will be forced to become economic satellites of the Soviet Union.

But our military and economic programs, essential as they are, may not prove to be the most important elements in this battle.

Of this we can be sure. The uncommitted nations are not going to be frightened into alliances with the West by military power, nor can their allegiance be purchased by dollars.

What will probably be decisive in this struggle is not how much each side does but how it is done.

That is why we must, at whatever cost, place additional emphasis on developing the kind of idealogical program which is designed to win the minds and hearts of men.

Before I discuss details of such a program, may I suggest one fundamental condition that can make the difference between success and failure?

Whatever we do we must deal with other people as our moral and spiritual equals.

Nothing is more infuriating or more likely to make our program fail than a boastful or condescending attitude on our part.

It is dangerous to parade our material wealth or economic achievement.

This may merely create envy, rather than admiration, on the part of other peoples.

In a sense, we must deal with other nations with the tact, humility, and friendliness of missionaries.

Indeed, we could learn a great deal in our foreign relations by studying the attitudes and methods of the Christian missionaries who have won friends throughout the world.

They came to help the nations to which they were sent.

They learned their languages and customs.

By taking literally the truth that all men are brothers under God they were accepted into families and homes of distant peoples.

Once we have this attitude, our task is to convince others that democracy and freedom and all the rights and privileges we hold sacred are better for them than is the Soviet way of life.

It is not enough to denounce or expose communism. We must show that we have a better alternative.

We do not do this by parading our superior material standard of living.

It is the total pattern of life that must prevail—not merely one phase of it.

May I make one point clear at this time? There is no question but that we have the better case to sell.

Because basically we are on the right side. The side of freedom and justice, of belief in God—against the forces of slavery, injustice, and atheistic materialism.

Ours is the truly revolutionary dynamic idea. It is the Communist idea which is repressive and reactionary.

How do we get our message across?

I believe that often too much reliance is placed upon the effectiveness of bombarding the uncommitted countries with radio broadcasts, motion pictures, and press releases which present the American viewpoint.

These programs are important and necessary, but, in the long run, I believe there are others which are more effective.

May I emphasize first the overwhelming importance of expanding our program for exchange of persons. This includes high school youngsters who spend a year living with American families and going to our schools, college and university students who get their degrees in American schools, and the leaders program under which each week 50 or more foreign visitors—leaders in business, government, labor, and education—come to the United States as guests of our Government to talk with Americans who are in the same field as theirs.

In this way our guests learn about us firsthand, correcting false impressions they may have had about us.

It is particularly important that we expand this program in countries newly released from colonial status.

Here the need for trained leaders is often the greatest. Many times students will graduate from a university and almost immediately take a high political position in their native lands.

From a long-range point of view, we can gain immensely by programs of this nature.

For the cost of one large bomber we can make friendships that will benefit the free world for generations to come.

President Eisenhower's brilliant proposal that American educational institutions and foundations aid in expanding educational opportunities throughout the world is in line with this approach.

If the free world can teach the leaders of tomorrow in areas that may well dominate tomorrow's world, we need not fear the contest between communism and freedom.

There are those, of course, who may point out the fact that many of those who today oppose Western policies were trained in Western universities.

But they oppose us because we taught them ideals of freedom while we were keeping their lands in colonial bondage.

Now that great areas of the world are free from colonialism, we have a good chance to win back the friendship and loyalty of leaders of these lands.

In addition to Government sponsored activities, it is important that every American who goes abroad or who deals with foreign guests in our own land realizes that he is an ambassador representing our Nation.

All of us must try to be sensitive, understanding, and helpful.

Arrogance and boastfulness make enemies, not friends.

And particularly we must appreciate the high place given to intellectual and spiritual values in many areas of the world. This places a tremendous responsibility upon our tourists and business visitors, upon the exporters of motion pictures and books, indeed, upon anyone who is likely to be taken as a representative of our way of life.

I was reading an article the other day that showed the importance of these attitudes. It concerned the great atomic scientist, Bruno Pontecorvo, who left Great Britain to devote his genius to Soviet atomic research. One of the important reasons for his defection, according to his colleagues, was the fact that he thought he would have more honor, prestige, and even greater freedom of research in the Soviet Union. Likewise, many of the scientists who got caught in the Soviet espionage network in the United States, Canada, and Great Britain, were partially influenced at least by the feeling that they were not sufficiently appreciated in the free world. The world of tomorrow belongs to the nations that lead in scientific research and technical skill. We shall pay a great price if we fall behind in this contest.

In discussing our need to win the war for men's minds, I have said little about direct contacts with the people behind the Iron Curtain.

Today we can have such contacts almost for the asking.

If the present trend continues in the Soviet Union and in many satellite countries, it will be possible to meet broadly with these peoples, to exchange ideas, to compare our respective ways of life.

Many of my fellow Americans are rather skeptical about this new move. They suspect, with some justification, a hidden trick—possibly a device to make communism respectable and to discourage the peoples held in submission by Red armies.

I do not fully share this point of view. I think that the explosive power of freedom is greater than the combined effect of all the atomic and hydrogen weapons in the world today.

Whatever be the motives behind these new moves, I think that in the long run the cause of freedom will be served by breaking through the Iron Curtain wherever an opportunity is presented.

The task ahead of us is a task for all the American people, and not government alone.

In time of war we are prepared to risk our lives serving with the Armed Forces of our country. But the war for men's minds is a real war and just as important as the struggle of armies, navies, and air forces.

You in the academic world are particularly fitted to serve in this contest. May I suggest that you graduates and you of the faculty give thought to the part that you can play.

On an even broader sphere, I hope that the learned societies of the United States with their counterparts in other free nations will devote time and energy to extend their study to this great struggle for allegiance.

Jointly, you should embark upon a peaceful crusade for freedom.

Some should volunteer for service abroad, just as soldiers volunteer for special missions.

The best thought of our best minds should be given to this burning problem.

It was once said that "You shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

This challenge has echoed through the ages. It is as valid today as it was when it was uttered more than 19 centuries ago.

We believe in truth and in the power of truth.

We believe in such basic truths as man's equality under God, the dignity of man, the rights of each individual to live his life in peace, the sacredness of law, the benefits of political freedom including the freedoms guaranteed in our Bill of Rights.

These truths are the great heritage of mankind.

We are confident that they will prevail.

And it is the task of this generation to make sure that our confidence is not misplaced and that all Americans will rise to the challenge that faces us.

"THE TRUMAN SCANDALS"—BOOK WRITTEN BY JULES ABELS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, former President Truman promises to return soon from Europe in order to wage an aggressive campaign in behalf of any Democratic nominee, which may possibly be Mr. Truman himself. The record of the Truman administration therefore assumes added importance as a consideration for the voters of America in the November elections.

A book has recently been published called the Truman Scandals by Jules Abels.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks the comments I have prepared on this book.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

This volume is a factual study of the scandals in the Truman Administration based on records of Congressional investigations and on court records. For the first time, the whole story as it is known to date is presented—mink coats and deepfreezes; RFC and FHA scandals on an unprecedented scale; tax fixes in exchange for campaign contributions; Government contracts and surplus property ladled out to political friends and hacks.

Only when one sees the complete record of the corruption in black and white can one grasp its magnitude. Look at the tax system, for example. The chief tax collector of the United States during the Truman Administration, Joseph D. Nunan, and the assistant chief tax collector, Daniel A. Bolich, have been convicted of tax fraud. The chief tax prosecutor, T. Lamar Caudle, and the President's appointments secretary, Matthew Connelly, are now being tried for tax fraud in St. Louis. The deputy commissioner of Internal Revenue, Carroll A. Mealey, has been indicted for tax fraud and the chief tax counsel, Charles Oliphant, resigned while under fire. Two prominent tax collectors, politically, were jailed and many others were fired when the scandals were brought to light by Congressional committees.

Mr. Abels contends that this was the greatest period of corruption in our history. "Never had there been so much corruption practiced by so many public officials in so many different places." The first count in his indictment is that the corruption was of far greater danger to the Nation than in any previous case because the tax collection machinery of the Nation on which our security and that of the free world rests was infested with graft from top to bottom. The civil recovery in Teapot Dome amounted to $13 million; the amount lost through the wholesale tax frauds, he contends, must have run into the billions.

The second count in his indictment is that the scandals in the Truman administration were epidemic, while Teapot Dome and other cases of corruption were isolated transactions. The cases in the Truman era were a continuous band covering many agencies and localities.

The third count in the indictment is that the frauds were not only epidemic, but they were a disease endemic to the Truman administration because it was a necessary and natural consequence of a philosophy of Government which was in essence political. Since politics invaded every agency of the Government and political considerations were paramount, the frauds were inevitable.

The fourth indictment is that the administration of Harry Truman did not take effective action to wipe out corruption but in some cases protected wrongdoers, in other cases was indifferent, and in other cases used the machinery of the administration to block and thwart the investigators of corruption. The frauds were revealed not because of the administration but in spite of it.

When suspicion of corruption was brought to Grant's attention, he ordered, "Let no guilty man escape if it can be avoided." It is agreed that Teapot Dome crushed the spirit of President Harding and resulted in his death. His successor, Calvin Coolidge, announced, "If there has been any crime, it must be prosecuted. No one will be shielded for any party, political or other reasons." He was swift and earnest in prosecuting the wrongdoers involved in Teapot Dome. But as for Truman? In his recent Memoirs, he dismissed the greatest orgy of corruption in our history in a few words: "Flyspecks on our Washington windows."

THE FALSE LIBERALS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, several weeks ago I addressed myself to the subject of the Liberal Versus the Conservative Today, in an effort to contribute to clearing up the misunderstanding which exists today as to the real meaning of those two terms. On Friday, June 1, Mr. Henry Hazlitt wrote on the same subject in the Wall Street Journal. Because his thoughts are so clearly and so intelligently expressed, I suggest that they should be read by all those who serve in public life today, particularly by my colleagues in this body. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the article to which I have referred, entitled "The False Liberals."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FALSE LIBERALS

(By Henry Hazlitt)

What threatens us today is not merely the outright totalitarian philosophies of fascism and communism, but the increasing drift of thought in the totalitarian direction. Many people today who complacently think of themselves as "middle-of-the-roaders" have no conception of the extent to which they have already taken over statist, socialist and collectivist assumptions—assumptions which, if logically followed out, must inevitably carry us further and further down the totalitarian road.

One of the crowning ironies of the present era, in fact, is that it is precisely, especially in America, the people who flatteringly refer to themselves as "liberals" who have forgotten or repudiated the essence of the true liberal tradition. The typical butts of their ridicule are such writers as Adam Smith, Bastiat, Cobden ("the Manchester School"), and Herbert Spencer. Whatever errors any of these writers may have been guilty of individually, they were among the chief architects of true liberalism.

Yet our modern "progressives" now refer to this whole philosophy as "laissez faire." They present a grotesque caricature of it in order to refute it to their own satisfaction, and then go on to advocate more and more governmental power, more centralization of Government in Washington, fewer and fewer powers for the States or localities, more and more power for the President, more and more discretionary power for an appointed bureaucracy, and less and less power for Congress, which is usually ridiculed by our self-styled "liberals" and given to understand that its sole function is to "support the President"—in other words, to act as a rubber stamp.

And none of this group seem to recognize that they differ from the totalitarians only in that the totalitarians want unlimited government power, complete centralization, unlimited power in the President or "leader," and no legislature at all except as window-dressing, or as sycophants to proclaim the greatness of the leader.

But these difficulties and obstacles go much further, of course, than those created by a reversal in the popular meaning of the word "liberalism." "Oh, Liberty!" Madame Roland is said to have exclaimed as she passed a statue to that goddess on her way to the guillotine, "what crimes are committed in thy name." Looking at the world today, we are tempted to stress the intellectual crimes committed in the name of liberty as much as the moral crimes.

Never were men more ardent in defense of liberty than they are today; but never were there more diverse concepts of what constitutes true liberty. Many of today's writers who are most eloquent in their arguments for liberty in fact preach philosophies that would destroy it. It seems to be typical of the books of our intelligentsia to praise one kind of liberty incessantly while disparaging or ridiculing another kind.

The liberty that they so rightly praise is the liberty of thought and expression. But the liberty that they so foolishly denounce is economic liberty. "Freedom" and "liberty" are the honorific terms for the liberties that the particular writer is defending; "laissez faire" or "license" are the disparaging terms for the liberties he is decrying.

Unfortunately the authors who have fallen into this practice include some of the finest minds of our generation. (I think particularly of Bertrand Russell and the late Morris Cohen.) Such writers seem to me to be at least in part reflecting an occupational bias. Being writers and thinkers, they are acutely aware of the importance of liberty of writing and thinking. But they seem to attach scant value to economic liberty because they think of it not as applying to themselves but to businessmen.

Such a judgment may be uncharitable, but it is certainly fair to say that they misprize economic liberty because, in spite of their brilliance in some directions, they lack the knowledge or understanding to recognize that when economic liberties are abridged or destroyed all other liberties are abridged or destroyed with them. "Power over a man's

subsistence," as Alexander Hamilton reminded us, "is power over his will."

And if we wish a more modern authority, we can quote no less a one than Leon Trotsky, the colleague of Lenin, who in 1937, in a moment of candor, pointed out clearly that: "In a country where the sole employer is the state, opposition means death by slow starvation: The old principle: Who does not work shall not eat, has been replaced by a new one: Who does not obey shall not eat."

Liberty is a whole, and to deny economic liberty is finally to destroy all liberty. Socialism is irreconcilable with freedom. This is the lesson that most of our modern philosophers and litterateurs have yet to learn.

But probably a good half of the books of the last quarter century which attack communism do so on the basis of socialist assumptions. They attack Russian communism as a betrayal of true socialism. (The works of Arthur Koestler are an outstanding example.) They attack even Stalinism as a betrayal of true Leninism.

In fact, most of the best known anti-Communist books, including some that are admirable in other respects, attack the end-product without seeming to realize that it is social ideals that inevitably create this end-product. The authors of these books attack the despotism in Russia, for example, without recognizing that you cannot carry out the centralized economic planning of socialism without despotism. They attack the Communist suppression of freedom of speech and thought without recognizing that once you give government complete power over jobs and employment—the power to promote or demote, to hire or fire, to say, in short, whether a man is to live or to starve—you at the same time give government complete power to control or suppress speech and thought.

They fail to recognize that in prescribing the means they are prescribing the end. They fail to recognize that the immorality and the intellectual and spiritual suppression that they denounce flow inevitably out of the centralized economic planning and governmental omnipotence that they applaud.

Historically, the liberals fought against government tyranny; against governmental abridgment of freedom of speech and action; against governmental restrictions on agriculture, manufacture, and trade; against constant detailed governmental regulation, interference and harassment at a hundred points, against (to use the phrases of the Declaration of Independence) a multitude of new offices and swarms of officers; against concentration of governmental power, particularly in the person of one man; against government by whim and favoritism.

Historic liberalism called, on the other hand, for the rule of law, and for equality before the law. The older conservatives opposed many or most of these liberal demands because they believed in existing governmental interferences and sweeping governmental powers; or because they wished to retain their own special privileges and prerogatives; or simply because they were temperamentally fearful of altering the status quo, whatever it happened to be.

Those who flatteringly call themselves liberals today, and to whom confused opponents allow or even assign the name, are for nearly everything that the old liberals opposed. Most self-styled present-day liberals, particularly in America, are urging the constant extension of government planning.

They constantly press for a greater concentration of governmental power, whether in the central government at the expense of the States and localities, or in the hands of a one-man executive at the expense of any check, limitation or even investigation by a legislature. And they look with favor on an evergrowing bureaucracy, and on the spread of bureaucratic discretion at the expense of a rule of law.

Those who oppose this trend toward a new despotism, on the other hand, and plead for the preservation of the ancient freedoms of the individual, are today's conservatives. The intelligent conservative, in brief, is today the true defender of liberty.

This conclusion should not seem too paradoxical. It was always possible to reconcile intelligent conservatism with real liberalism. There is no conflict between wishing to conserve and hold the precious gains that have been achieved in the past, which is the aim of the true conservative, and wishing to carry those achievements even further, which is the aim of the true liberal.

THE COST OF PEACE—ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Saturday, June 9, 1956, at the Iowa State College commencement exercises, at Ames, Iowa, the Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles, delivered an address entitled "the Cost of Peace."

In light of the importance of this address, which is in regard to our foreign policy, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the address be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Each one of you is going out into a world where you hope to enjoy in peace the blessings of liberty.

That is the kind of a world which United States foreign policy tries to provide.

Today we have peace; no nation is at war with the United States.

Also we have many blessings. We have good relations with most of the nations of the world. We do not fear them nor do they fear us. We trade with each other and our peoples visit back and forth, all to our mutual profit and enjoyment.

For that peace, and for those blessings that we enjoy, we can be profoundly grateful.

But all of this is not to be had for nothing. Others before you have gone out into the world with eager hopes. But those hopes ended on the field of battle. And those at home were heavy of heart. And the means for economic well-being were dissipated in the wastages of war.

That kind of a price, paid in the coin of war, will always be paid unless men are willing, in time of peace, to pay to preserve peace.

That lesson seems never to be learned. The illusion constantly persists that peace is to be had merely by wanting it. If that were true, war would have been abolished many centuries ago. The fact is that to keep peace is as hard, indeed harder, than to win a war. Wars have been won. But lasting peace has never yet been won. To win a final victory over war will take planning and action that is farsighted, well calculated, courageous, and at times sacrificial. Such sacrifice will be required under conditions less dramatic and apparently less urgent than those of war. But peace will never be enduring as long as men reserve for war their finest qualities of mind and spirit. Peace, too, has its price.

I want to illustrate that in terms of one phase of the peace effort our nation is now making. It could be described as a peace insurance policy and it costs about $40 billion a year.

OUR PEACE INSURANCE POLICY

The basic elements of this peace insurance policy are drawn from early and successful American foreign policy. We go back to the Monroe Doctrine.

In 1823 President Monroe proclaimed to the despotic alliance then headed by Czarist Russia that "we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety" and that we would not "behold such interposition, in any form, with indifference."

It was indeed farsighted and bold for our young nation thus to identify its own self-interest with the fate of freedom thousands of miles away. Yet the pronouncement of that principle, Webster recorded, was greeted with "one general glow of exultation."

That princple has now been extended. Its broadest application is found in the United Nations Charter. But because veto power makes United Nations action undependable, many nations have made with each other treaties which embody the principle of the Monroe Doctrine. Within the last 10 years the United States, always acting in a bipartisan manner, has made such treaties with 42 countries of America, Europe, and Asia.

These treaties abolish, as between the parties, the principle of neutrality, which pretends that a nation can best gain safety for itself by being indifferent to the fate of others. This has increasingly become an obsolete conception and, except under very exceptional circumstances, it is an immoral and shortsighted conception. The free world today is stronger, and peace is more secure, because so many free nations courageously recognize the now demonstrated fact that their own peace and safety would be endangered by assault on freedom elsewhere.

However, it is not enough under present conditions for the free nations merely to proclaim their purpose to stand together. There is need for forces-in-being to give authority to those words.

At the outset of World War I and World War II, the United States had little military strength in being. In the case of the Korean war, our initial strength was inadequate. But on these past occasions the conditions of warfare gave us time within which to build up our strength.

But since then man's capacity to destroy has suddenly expanded to a degree that passes comprehension. Today, a single bomb can release destructive power equal to that used in the five years of World War II. Potential enemies could destroy so much, so quickly, if initially unopposed, that we dare not gamble on developing military power after an attack has occurred. To deter aggression, to prevent miscalculation, we need not only to warn, but to back that warning by forces-in-being which include retaliatory striking power. That is why our peace insurance policy is so expensive.

The cost of our United States military establishment, at home and abroad, is about $36 billion a year. That is about 90 percent of the total of a little over $40 billion a year which our peace insurance policy costs.

The other 10 percent, $4 billion, goes to promote strength in other lands under our Mutual Security Program. I want to discuss that program and explain why it is part of our total peace insurance policy.

I shall be speaking in terms of expected expenditures. But to keep going at this rate, we shall for next year need an appropriation larger than expected expenditures, because the appropriation for this year is less than current expenditures by about $1 billion.

THE FAR EAST

The largest expenditures under our mutual security program are in the Pacific and Far East. They help strengthen countries with which we have collective defense treaties. This area is today under obvious hostile pressure.

In Korea there is an armistice. But the Chinese Communists have never been willing to make a peace which would unify Korea through free elections held under the

auspices of the United Nations. So, hostile armed forces face each other across an armistice line.

In Taiwan (Formosa), where the Republic of China now has its home, there is the constant menace of war. The Chinese Communist regime persistently refuses to make a meaningful renunciation of force covering this area.

Then there is Vietnam, where again there is an armistice but no formal peace.

I have already pointed out that we have, by treaties solemnly recognized that an armed attack in these areas would be dangerous to our own peace and security. And Congress, with only 4 dissenting votes, has authorized the President to use United States forces to defend Taiwan (Formosa) if he deems it necessary. But we do not want it to be necessary to fight to save freedom in these areas. Our purpose is to deter war. So, we give military and financial aid to enable the free governments there to maintain their own armed forces to an extent which we and they judge reasonably related to the threat of aggression and our coordinated plans to prevent it.

We expect next year to spend about $1.5 billion for military aid and defense support assistance in this area. It goes mostly to the Republics of Korea and China, and to the three nations of Indochina. There are lesser amounts for other area allies—the Philippines, Thailand, and Japan.

THE MIDDLE EAST

Let me turn now to the Middle East. This area produces the oil required for the industry of Western Europe and for the military establishment of NATO. If this were unavailable, it would involve tragedy for the producing countries, which are largely dependent upon the oil royalties. Also, it would require us to share with Europe the oil resources of this hemisphere; and there would be scarcity instead of plenty.

So we assist those four Middle East countries which hold the gateway to the south where the oil reserves are located; and just beyond is the gateway to Africa.

The estimate of expenditure for military aid and defense support for these countries in the next year is in the neighborhood of $800 million.

NATO

I turn next to Western Europe. There the military forces of NATO stand guard over the greatest industrial and military treasure that there is within the free world except for the United States itself. So important do we consider this area that nearly six divisions of the United States Armed Forces are stationed in Western Europe for its defense. European members of NATO themselves make a large contribution to the defense of the area. However, we help by supplying them with certain types of weapons, the cost of which is in our mutual-security budget.

We help to support West Berlin as a symbol of freedom behind the Iron Curtain. We are developing bases in Spain, and this involves substantial costs. We also think it prudent to help Yugoslavia, so long as it remains determined to maintain genuine independence. It does not have the form of society that we like. But Marshal Tito defied Moscow and won out. And even though that struggle is today calmed, Yugoslavia provides a notable example of national independence in Eastern Europe.

This European aspect of the mutual-security program involves an estimated cost for next year of approximately $1 billion.

The expenditures I have described are designed to make secure, at minimum cost to us, countries whose safety is part of our own safety. The resultant widespread, interlocking system of security provides, as a valuable byproduct, diversified locations around the globe from which we and our allies could strike back at an aggressor if he struck any of us. Diversification, in this respect, is immensely valuable; for launching facilities limited to a single area could be wiped out by an initial assault. Also, the present system enables less expensive planes with shorter range to carry out missions which otherwise would require far more costly planes.

Thus, these expenditures serve our peace and our safety.

ECONOMIC AID

There remains about $700 million to be accounted for, or about 2 percent of our total peace insurance cost. This is so-called "economic aid." The primary purpose is to help newly independent nations and less developed countries to maintain their independence, as against the plotting of international communism.

As the Caracas resolution pointed out in relation to this hemisphere, if international communism obtains control of the political institutions of any nation, that endangers peace and security elsewhere. This portion of the mutual-security program offsets efforts by hostile forces to expand their power by gaining new human and material resources, and new strategic locations. But it has a broader justification.

The United States has far and away the most highly developed economy of any nation in the world. Our productivity almost equals that of all the rest of the world put together.

Always the economically developed nations have helped less developed countries to develop. We were helped from Europe when we were beginning to develop this continent. That is a law of social life and we cannot violate it except at our peril.

The burden on us is lessened by the fact that a considerable part of our economic assistance goes in the form of surplus agricultural products. Also, upwards of $200 million takes the form of repayable loans, not gifts.

The importance of this economic part of our peace-insurance policy is emphasized by the fact that the Soviet Union is now pushing its own interests by means of credits extended to other countries.

The new Communist tactics make it more than ever imperative that we should continue, and perhaps enlarge, the economic phase of our mutual-security program. It would indeed be ironical if we should drop out of that field just at the time when the Soviet Union is moving into it.

These programs which I have described—$36 billion, plus $3.3 billion, plus $700 million—make up the grand total of about $40 billion which is the annual cost of our peace-insurance policy. As to the $36 billion spent on our own Military Establishment, there are differences of opinion as to how it shall be spent. But few deny that this much money should be spent. There is more controversy about the $4 billion which is used, in ways I have described, under our mutual security program.

I should like now to answer some questions about that.

NO GIVEWAY

First of all, is this a giveaway program, whereby Americans are taxed merely to aid foreigners?

Emphatically "no." I hope what I have said already makes that clear. It is quite true that the mutual security money does help others. But no program can properly be labeled "giveaway" merely because it helps others. Often by helping others we help ourselves more effectively than we could do in any other way. That is the case with our mutual security program. It makes our freedom safer by creating an environment of freedom. The decisive reason for each item of expense is our own enlightened self-interest.

Let me be specific and emphatic on this point of motivation—not a single dollar is sought for this program for any reason other than an American reason. Our Nation has recognized, since its infancy, that liberty elsewhere was vital to our own peace and safety. When that liberty has been jeopardized by war, we have gone into war to save it. That is the most costly way to protect ourselves. We hope now to protect ourselves in less costly ways. That is the reason for our mutual security program.

NOT BUYING GRATITUDE

Is our foreign aid wasted because the recipients are not grateful enough, or not subservient to our views? No, because we do not seek either gratitude or subservience. We know that gratitude can never be bought and we do not spend taxpayers' money on the folly of such an effort. Neither do we seek or want subservience. Our policies command wide respect abroad, because of their intrinsic merit. But the success of our foreign-aid program is to be tested, not by gratitude, not by serbservience, but by whether it makes more vigorous the freedoms elsewhere that buttress the freedom of ourselves. By that test, our program works.

AMOUNTS CLOSELY CALCULATED

Another question is whether, assuming the need for a mutual-security program, are the amounts requested reasonable? We believe they are reasonable. Of course no one can prove in advance, that any given expenditure spells decisively the difference between increased peril and increased security, or between war and peace. If we gain security and peace, it can always be alleged that we could have got them more cheaply. And no one can prove the contrary. Only if there is failure can it be seen that we did not spend enough. But then it is too late.

I can assure you that all of us who work on the program are patriotically striving to serve this country and to keep the expenditures down to the lowest level consistent with our national interest. Our judgments are based on far-flung worldwide sources of information, which help us to judge the capability and intentions of hostile elements throughout the world, and the resistant quality of friendly elements. There may be mistakes in judgment, and there is room for honest differences of opinion. But the operation is carefully conducted and reviewed by many agencies of Government and the final result, as submitted to the Congress, reflects the best judgment of the President and the National Security Council. When dealing with the peace and security of this Nation, it is risky to seek bargain-counter prices. Cut prices may not save money—except by increasing the risk of war.

IS ADMINISTRATION EFFICIENT?

Again it may be asked, is this money being spent efficiently? Does our outlay for peace and safety always make the target? The answer must be that there is a certain amount of wastage. How much, I wonder, of the ammunition used in World War II hit its appointed target? Only a small percentage. But we did not on that account refuse to supply our fighting men with ammunition. A part of every program goes for naught. That is the price we pay for human frailties. We constantly strive for increased efficiency. But lack of perfect marksmanship is no reason for denying the dollar ammunition needed to win the peace.

ARE LOCAL FORCES NEEDED?

Another question sometimes asked is, does not the deterrent striking power of the United States make local forces unnecessary, so that their cost could be saved? Certainly our strategic power reduces the need for local forces. It would indeed be impractical to have local forces all around the orbit of the Soviet world sufficient to stop a large-scale attack wherever it might be mounted.

But we cannot rely wholly on centrally located strategic power. Nations that are menaced feel an impelling need to be able to fight in their own defense. Indeed, if they did not feel that way, support from us might not be merited or effective. Also, there needs to be loyal local strength to prevent subversion backed by international communism.

The deterrent to aggression is found, not only in our strategic power, but in the knowledge that subversion cannot be easily achieved, and that an open armed attack would be met at once by brave and competent resistance. This, when reinforced by treaty pledges of collective action, will assure consequences which no aggressor could control or limit. That knowledge is the great deterrent.

This problem of balance between the strategic power of the United States of America and local power is admittedly difficult. Equally difficult is the problem of balance between military and economic effort. These problems are constantly receiving the closest attention of the National Security Council. In each case, the balance is subject to adjustment in the light of changing conditions.

IS THERE AN END?

Finally, it will be asked, will this cost go on forever? Can we see no end to this gigantic expenditure, totaling about $40 billion a year, as the cost of our peace insurance policy?

The answer is that so long as the danger persists, for so long must we pay to combat that danger.

The Soviet rulers are engaged in a gigantic effort to build up their military establishment and to extend the area of their dominance. They maintain a military establishment approximately comparable to our own and spare no cost in striving to excel us. They give military aid to Communist China and to their Eastern European satellite allies. This is measured in terms of billions of dollars. They now woo free nations by offers of credit for economic and military goods. Credits totaling nearly $500 million have already been concluded and several hundred more million have been offered. They devote about $500 million a year to foreign propaganda.

The Soviet Union is spending, for military and foreign policy purposes hostile to us, about 20 percent of the gross product of the Soviet nation. So long as this is going on we may have to expand about 10 percent of our gross national product, as we are now doing, for peace insurance purposes.

We can do so while at the same time raising our living standards. The demonstration of that fact has had a potent influence on the international scene.

Never will a responsible administration put its faith in protestations of peace and good will that have no dependable foundation, or expose the nation to being isolated in the world, or deny it the retaliatory facilities needed to deter surprise attack.

But there are signs that a new day may be dawning. The Soviet rulers now profess to renounce the doctrine that violence is a necessary part of their foreign policy. They are debasing Stalin, who for 25 years was treated as a demigod. Writings of his, which for 25 years formed the Communist creed, are now withdrawn from circulation. This year, for the first time since the Bolshevik revolution, the Christian Bible is being printed and sold in Russia. The Russian people are getting more personal security, and labor is getting increased freedom of choice.

Obviously, there is a rising demand on the part of the captive nations to have more independence, and on the part of the subject people, within and without Russia, to have more freedom from fear, and to enjoy more of the fruits of their labor instead of having those fruits diverted to serve policies of aggrandizement. This popular demand must be broad in scope and intense in degree. Only that can explain the extraordinary exertions being made by the Soviet rulers to make it seem that they are offering a change. Out of all of this there may come—not this year, or next year, but some year—a government which is responsive to the just aspirations of the people and which renounces expansionist goals.

Enough is happening to make us confident that if we remain strong, if we support freedom and make evident the blessings of liberty, that policy will prevail.

The time will never come when we can safely stop planning and working for peace, and making sacrifices for peace. But we can see that, if we remain steadfast, the time may come when the danger will be much less and when the cost can be correspondingly reduced. Until that time is here, the clear course of patriotic duty is to hold fast that which has proved good.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa subsequently said: Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from New Jersey has had printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles at the commencement exercises at Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa, last Saturday. I had intended to request its printing. This speech was a very thorough and well prepared statement of the Eisenhower foreign policy.

The Middle West is in strong agreement with President Eisenhower in his dedication to the maintenance of peace. They endorse strongly the President's policy of insuring peace through the strengthening of our own defenses and through inspiring other nations to strengthen themselves. The success of our foreign policy should effectively convince any aggressor nation that they dare not attack us. In this way we can best protect ourselves and avoid the tragedy and tremendous cost of war.

My colleague, the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who accompanied Secretary Dulles on the occasion of his visit to Iowa State College, joins with me in commending the speech and in the sentiments I have expressed.

THE FOREIGN-AID PROGRAM IS VITAL

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the Newark Star-Ledger of June 9 entitled "The Foreign-Aid Program Is Vital."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Despite an unprecedented 11th hour plea by President Eisenhower, an election-conscious House of Representatives has put its stamp of approval on a billion-dollar-plus slash in the administration's request for $4.9 billion in foreign aid for the coming year.

The vote was by teller's count, not by roll-call, and consequently individual Congressmen are not on record for or against this cut. But there is no doubt that many, many Republicans lined up against the administration on the issue.

It is unfortunate that the House, and particularly its Republican minority, hasn't seen fit to support the President on this vital measure. For foreign aid is of great importance and the program recommended by Mr. Eisenhower cannot be considered as a dole, as some previous programs have been, or as an attempt to bribe other nations of the world to our way of thinking.

The Eisenhower foreign aid program, first, is an integral part of our national defense and should be considered primarily as an essential part of our defense expenditures. The majority of funds in the program are destined to increase the ability of allied nations to defend themselves, and consequently us, against any Red aggression.

Secondly, foreign aid as conceived by the President is also an integral and inseparable part of this Nation's foreign policy. The economic expenditures in the program are not designed to put recipient nations, friendly or neutral, in our debt, but to bolster their economic status so they will be better equipped to resist communism.

The House action happily is still open to reconsideration. There is still a chance to save the Eisenhower foreign aid program and thus give the administration the weapons it needs adequately to combat the new Soviet world peace offensive.

But it will require a show of genuine statesmanship on the part of many Congressmen who will have to put aside partisan and parochial politics, with which they are understandably concerned in an election year, in favor of the welfare of the Nation.

CONSTRUCTION OF HYDROELECTRIC PLANTS IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a dispatch in the Washington Sunday Star of June 10, 1956, describing the construction of vast hydroelectric stations in the Soviet Union. Some of these plants are the largest on earth. They should warn us of the folly of sacrificing a great American site like Hells Canyon, in the Columbia River Basin, for far less than full development. Can the free world compete successfully with the slave Soviet world, when the free world recklessly wastes a beneficial natural resource such as a magnificent location for power production?

For example, the Kuibyshev Dam, on the Volga River of Russia, will exceed even our own colossal Grand Coulee Dam in power production. These facts should give us pause, Mr. President, for the power program of the present national administration advocates favoritism to private utility companies, even at the expense of losing forever kilowatts which could move American industry, light American homes, and mechanize American farms.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VAST SOVIET POWER DAMS IMPRESS INDIAN VISITORS

(By Earl H. Voss)

Dramatic evidence of the high competence and speed with which the Soviet Union is building its economic aid program has reached Washington in recently published reports by Indian water-development engineers who toured Soviet multipurpose dam projects last year.

India sent 15 of its best-qualified dam builders to see what the Soviet Union is doing in water utilization. At their head was Kanwar Sain, a United States-trained engineer considered one of the outstanding men in his field. Mr. Sain and his associates found much to learn, not only in dam building, but in the planning and financing

techniques developed under the Communist system.

Dam construction in Russia is given a different emphasis than in the United States. Here multipurpose projects are primarily for flood control and irrigation. Hydroelectric power is almost incidental. It is included where the public versus private power controversy does not intrude, but it is often omitted where power development would be physically practical but not politically feasible. In the U. S. S. R., however, flood control is not much of a problem—there is too little rainfall. Dams are built primarily for hydroelectric power and for navigation of a great network of inland waterways. Irrigation is included where feasible.

The Soviet system of power distribution from thermal plants, first plotted by Lenin, is one that some United States engineers recommended here in 1952. The Reds are building thermal powerplants at the source of low-grade coal and peat, then dispatching the power by high-voltage wires to far-off industries. This is more efficient than setting up the powerplants near the industries, and using railroads to carry the bulky coal and peat cross-country. This emphasis on power lines instead of railroad cars was turned down in the United States because it would require heavy governmental financing.

SEE WORLD'S LARGEST

The Indian engineers were taken to see the giant Kuibyshev hydroelectric power station on the Volga River. The dam has been completed and the first generator was installed late last year. When all 21 of the Kuibyshev dam's generators are in place, it will be the world's largest hydropower plant, with a capacity of 2.1 million kilowatts and an annual production of 10 billion kilowatt-hours. A 400,000-volt, 600-mile powerline will link some of the dam's power to Moscow.

The Kuibyshev power dam output will be slightly larger than that of the United States present world's record holder, the Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River in Washington State. Its capacity is just under 2 million kilowatts.

The Kremlin has already ordered the start of work on two other dams which will break their own world's record. The Stalingrad hydroelectric station is to have a capacity of 2.3 million kilowatts and 11 billion kilowatt-hours. Last year Soviet engineers broke ground on a still larger one—with 3-million-kilowatt capacity—on the Angara River, near the town of Bratsk in eastern Siberia.

The Kuibyshev and Stalingrad power stations will boost total Soviet power output by 13 percent to an estimated total of 216 billion kilowatt-hours per year. The United States power output in 1955 was 600 billion kilowatt-hours.

Izvestia, the Soviet Government newspaper, recently told of plans for national power production of 12 to 15 trillion kilowatt-hours a year—hydro, thermal, and atomic—by the year 2000. That is 15–20 times the present American output. It would saturate a power grid stretching from the Baltic to the Pacific and from the Arctic Ocean to Central Asia.

INDIANS ARE IMPRESSED

This kind of visionary talk, probably hyperbolic but still impressively backed up by the actual work of Soviet engineers, has produced a profound effect upon the Indian engineers, who also have seen the best the West has to offer.

The Soviet method of mobilizing capital was particularly impressive for Mr. Sain, the chief of the Indian party. "The nature and amount of future capital investment are based upon political considerations which frequently have priority over purely economic factors," he writes.

"The Soviet planners rejected the appropriateness of taking into account interest on capital investments. A private investor in capitalist economy makes decisions by comparing the expected rate of return from an investment with the interest rate that he has to pay for borrowed capital, or that his own capital could earn from investment elsewhere. He invests his capital to get the highest rate of return. In any case he will not invest his capital in a project where it is expected to earn less than the prevailing rate of interest. This type of explicit use of the rate of interest in making decisions is barred in the U. S. S. R. by their ideological opposition to the concept of interest. The Soviet economists have been using instead the concept of 'coefficient of relative effectiveness.'"

Mr. Sain also struck a note of eagerness to study the Soviet techniques and to have other underdeveloped countries learn from the Communists.

"The Soviet economic planning has given birth to new institutions and entirely new techniques for directing economic process," he pointed out. "Economic textbooks intended for the study of the working ideas of a purely competitive system of national economy are not of much use nowadays for analyzing the monopolistic economies prevalent in the Socialist pattern of society.

"A study of all the aspects of the planning technique elaborated in the U. S. S. R. during the last decade, the early mistakes made and the lessons learned therefrom could provide extremely fruitful and instructive data for the revision of many conceptions which pervade academic economic criteria still followed in underdeveloped countries."

OBVIOUS IMPLICATIONS

The implications to be drawn from these competent Indians' impressions of Soviet engineering competence in the water utilization field are obvious. When Moscow sends Dimitri Shepilov to Cairo to offer massive aid in building the Aswan Dam, it is no empty gesture. The Indians found that the Soviet Minister of Construction of Power Houses has some 30,000 engineers and 50,000 foremen, mechanics, and skilled workmen.

And for several years past a special language training program (teaching all languages of the Middle East and Orient) has been going on among these engineers and skilled workers. American foreign-aid engineers may soon be faced with Soviet competition which can operate without the handicap of working through interpreters.

Supreme Court Justice Douglas, who also toured the Soviet Union last year, comments in his new book (Russian Journey; Doubleday) on the worldwide importance of the Russian advances and the use being made of them:

"An American who sees Russia's industrial plant will be surprised that it works as well as it does under the cumbersome Soviet bureaucracy. He may not be impressed at Russian progress.

"But the Asian who sees the same industrial plant will likely be excited. From his starting point, Russia is far in advance. The workers' homes, the medical clinics, the recreation halls, the wage scale, the public schools and parks—these are merely in the blueprint stage in most of Asia. In Russia they are living achievements. The Asian is apt to be overwhelmed at that achievement, forgetting the means used to attain it.

"This is why the impact of the Russian industrial plant on Asia is going to be penetrating and profound. This is why the Russian industrial plant is the most potent force in Asia today."

RETURN OF FOREIGN-OWNED PRIVATE PROPERTY SEIZED DURING WORLD WAR II

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, among the many important and far-reaching post-World War II problems still very alive and unsettled is that of foreign-owned private property which was seized in America during World War II.

Extended hearings and thorough study have been accorded this matter by several committees in several Congresses. In spite of favorable reports and recommendations, action has not been approved or taken to return this property for a full and final disposition of this vital issue.

Mr. President, return of this war-seized property to its alien owners should be achieved at an early date, and for many reasons. Chief among them are these:

First, it is right and just. The inviolability of property rights is the indispensable basis for personal freedom. They must continue to exist if we expect to preserve the free-enterprise system, the capitalistic system. Without them, there is no security, no personal freedom or right, no hope for a better life for all.

The property in question was seized at the outset of hostilities, and rightly so. But the circumstances have long since changed. There are no hostilities any longer. In fact, both Germany and Japan have entered into friendly cooperative alliances and treaties with us. Continued retention of the seized assets runs foursquare into the commandment, "Thou shalt not steal." That commandment came about and has continued forcefully through the centuries of mankind's history as a recognition of the sacredness of property, and as a recognition of the deep truth that when the sacredness of property is destroyed by being deprived of a force of law and public justice to protect it, energy and tyranny surely assert themselves and take over. The moral considerations in this matter are indeed very, very compelling.

Second, Mr. President, the war-seized property should be returned because of American precedents in like instances. The policy of seizure of alien property in time of war is logical and necessary to prevent its becoming an effective weapon in the war effort of the enemy. But for almost 150 years this Republic has subscribed to a policy of nonconfiscation.

John Marshall enunciated it in 1814 in *Brown* v. *United States* (8 Cranch 110). The principle therein stated was found embodied in treaties offered to practically all foreign nations during the first century of our Nation's history. It was exemplified also throughout executive policy as expressed in other international agreements. The same policy was practiced and applied in World War I. We should return to this historic policy.

A third compelling reason to do so is national as well as individual self-interest. Our national policy includes encouragement of investments abroad by American citizens. Instances are constantly arising in many areas of the world wherein rights of owners of private property are being disregarded.

The force of our Nation's protests is certainly and substantially reduced so long as we ourselves continue a confiscation policy. In this way, the billions of dollars of American investments abroad and additional risk capital for the development of world markets are endangered

by our own refusal to make restitution of alien property. This sets an unfortunate precedent for similar action against our own investors in foreign sovereign governments. It would be far wiser for us ourselves to adhere strenuously to the highest standards of conduct in this regard.

It has well been written:

The United States cannot long continue an anomalous policy of supporting confiscation at home and condemning it abroad. Even when the inconsistency of such action does not prove troublesome momentarily, it threatens to plague this Nation and its citizens in the future.

And, Mr. President, it cannot even be said that the inconsistency of this action is not troublesome as of this very moment.

The Omaha World-Herald recently commented on this subject in an editorial entitled "One Just Course." It commented on a dispatch by Dr. John B. Crane from Paris. The editorial and the dispatch graphically and logically present the case for return of private alien assets. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and dispatch were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Omaha World-Herald]

CONFISCATED PROPERTIES STILL HELD BY AMERICA

(By Dr. John B. Crane)

PARIS.—Our Government after the end of hostilities in 1945 confiscated over $500 million worth of foreign-owned private property located in the United States.

These properties belonged to German and Japanese individuals and corporations.

An increasing number of American jurists and political philosophers are asking these questions:

Was it constitutional to confiscate these private properties even if owned by foreigners? Was it morally just to confiscate such properties? If we refuse to return the properties confiscated, how will this affect our relations with Germany and Japan as military partners? What effect will our confiscation have on the safety of the $23 billion of current investments which Americans own in foreign countries?

THIRTY-SIX BILLS INTRODUCED

Since the confiscation of German and Japanese private property in this country, 36 separate bills have been introduced, designed to rectify the situation. Many of these bills call for 100-percent return of all foreign-owned assets which have been seized. Others call for only a partial return.

There are many reasons being advanced for full return of confiscated properties.

The weightiest is perhaps the argument that the American Constitution guarantees private property against confiscation without due process of law. Such a provision of the Constitution says nothing about whether the private property protected is owned by American citizens or by aliens.

Apparently it covers all private property regardless of the nature of the private ownership, whether domestic or foreign, whether individual or corporate.

EFFECT FEARED

In past wars the United States has seized and sequestered foreign-owned private properties located here. But after the wars ended our Government returned such foreign-owned properties to their rightful owners.

World War II has been over for 10 years, so far as the fighting is concerned, but this time our Government has not returned the hundreds of millions of dollars worth of foreign-owned private properties. Why not?

Some observers fear our continued retention of German-owned private properties will have an adverse effect on our future relations with the German Government.

COMPROMISE UNFAIR

Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and Herman Abs, banking adviser to the Adenauer government, have both made trips to Washington to try to get America to agree to return confiscated private German assets, but with little success.

The best they could get was a promise from the United States Department of State to return confiscated assets of individuals up to $10,000 per person.

Such a compromise solution is unfair and discriminatory to both corporations and large private-property owners. It violates the guaranties of the American Constitution.

Most of those who argue for a return of the confiscated properties favor the return of confiscated properties only on condition that war claims of American citizens against Japan and Germany are taken care of.

[From the Omaha World-Herald]

THE ONE JUST COURSE

Writing from Paris, Dr. John B. Crane recently commented on the curious reluctance of the United States Government to return foreign-owned private property seized in America during World War II.

After previous wars the United States gave such property back to its rightful owners. This time it has not done so. To that extent the Morgenthau plan for conquered Germany, concocted by Harry Dexter White and others, has been adopted.

No legal or moral principle justifies the holding of $500 million worth of German and Japanese private property. The administration has virtually admitted as much by agreeing to an arrangement to return up to $10,000 worth of assets to individual claimants. This arbitrary limit was adopted on the dubious assumption that it's proper to take the property of corporations and wealthy people, but wrong to steal less than $10,000.

We think it's wrong to keep any of the property, and for several reasons.

One reason is that the Constitution guarantees private property against confiscation without due process of law, and it doesn't say anything about the property having to belong to United States citizens.

Another reason is that the United States has always believed in protecting private foreign investments. Americans have some $26 billion invested in foreign countries. The United States Government is rightly concerned whenever a foreign government expropriates or confiscates this American-owned property. Our leaders have proclaimed far and wide that property rights must be respected. It is this principle which distinguishes the free capitalist nations from communism.

("You reproach us with intending to do away with private property," wrote Karl Marx in the Communist Manifesto. "Precisely so: That is just what we intend.")

When the United States proclaims that American property abroad is untouchable but foreign-owned property in America can be confiscated, it is thoroughly inconsistent. Naturally this inconsistency presents foreign nations with an excuse for seizing American investments.

Finally, the origins of this odd attitude toward German and Japanese property are suspect. Senator LANGER and others have shown that the prime movers in the demand that the property be confiscated have been Harry Dexter White, Harold Glasser, Lauchlin Currie, and Frank Coe—all gentlemen of fragrant reputation whose affinity for Red causes is notorious. This can hardly be considered a coincidence.

Much has been made of the point that if the United States returned the property it would regain lost goodwill in Germany and Japan. This is very likely true, and certainly America needs all the goodwill it can get.

But a more compelling reason for returning the property, it seems to us, is that it is the only just course to take, the only policy which squares with American constitutional principles and the traditional American attitude.

Congress cannot salve its conscience by making token restoration in amounts up to $10,000. The full amount is due and the United States should give it back.

REAPPRAISAL OF FOREIGN AID

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a clear, concise, and brilliant editorial entitled "Reappraisal of Foreign Aid," published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of June 8, 1956.

I believe that Senators who soon will vote on the question of military aid will be interested in reading the editorial in question.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Congress is currently debating the restoration of a slash of more than $1 billion from the administration's foreign-aid budget.

This paper, over the years, has supported foreign aid. We believe that the time has now come to reexamine the entire basis of our aid program in the light of the world situation today.

Certainly in the first years after the cessation of hostilities it was in our own self-interest to help the war-torn nations of the world rehabilitate themselves. We did it not only because of self-interest but for common humanity as well. A better world cannot be built if there is no food to eat or homes to live in.

In more than a decade, however, this Nation inclined more and more to the proposition that we could cure all the world ills by a few billion dollars of foreign aid, a few Madison Avenue advertising gimmicks, and the establishment of American troops and bases throughout the world—all without sacrificing our standard of living at home.

As Scripps-Howard Foreign Editor Ludwell Denny so wisely pointed out recently, our democracy is not exportable. Democracy is indigenous or it is nothing. We can help others achieve it, but not by trying to make our brand fit divergent heritages and different conditions.

We cannot buy allies. Military aid, he stated, should be concentrated on genuine allies—those determined to fight for their own freedom. Except for charity and the minor nuisance value of subsidies, economic aid should be limited to point 4 technical assistance, and foreign financing should be left to the World Bank and the Export-Import Bank.

* * * * *

For too long the United States has tried to buy allies. We have assumed that what was good for us was good for all the rest of the world. This is just not so. The result is that our wholly warm-hearted effort to force our standard of living and our way of life on the people of the world actually has not bought their love, nor have we bought their respect.

We have only purchased cynicism and a jealousy which makes the United States more envied than loved and, if the truth were

known, more feared in many portions of the world than the Communists.

The time has come to confine our aid to those who will help themselves. If we cannot sell the idea of self-help and the ideal that liberty and freedom are worth striving for, we cannot achieve our ends by forcing it down the throats of foreign nations.

The most that this Nation can hope to do is to preserve our strength. Eleven years is long enough to continue the fruitless experiment of trying to buy friendship. Eleven years has proved that friends among nations, like friends among people, cannot be bought but must be earned.

* * * * *

This is the time to reappraise our entire foreign policy with respect to foreign aid, and to eliminate the enormous waste that saps the vitals of our Nation without achieving either strength, respect, or dignity.

The underprivileged nations of the world must now start to help themselves. We can no longer sap our national vitality by helping those who play us off against the Russians for their own narrow purposes. If they have not been taught in this long decade to do for themselves, then they are no longer our responsibility.

We may share our help where it is wanted, but the essential job of America today is to preserve our strength and solvency and to preserve our faith in human decency, in a world which needs much more than money and propaganda.

The cut in the budget by the House Foreign Affairs Committee is a good place to start. It should be sustained, as the House did yesterday by its 112 to 192 vote in favor of the cut.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY GEN. CARLOS P. ROMULO AT THE UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND, VA.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a very able address delivered by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States, to the 1956 graduating class of the University of Richmond, Va., on Monday, June 4, 1956.

The address is worthy of the attention and the reading of not only every Member of the United States Senate, but also of the persons living in the countries of both Asia and Europe, because in the address the distinguished Ambassador from the Philippines, with the wisdom of the East, has brought home very forcefully the danger of neutralism in the world in which we find ourselves.

There is no doubt that Denmark, Norway, and The Netherlands, which were neutrals in the First World War, and whose neutrality was respected by the imperial Germany of Kaiser Wilhelm II, had the same desire to be neutral in World War II but the Nazi Germany of Hitler did not respect their desire for neutrality.

I believe that Ambassador Romulo has very clearly pointed out the dangers which confront the nations of the world which are prepared to accept some of the benefit of dealing with the United States and the other free nations, but are not prepared to accept their common obligation in defense of human freedom.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When 124 years ago the University of Richmond began its first classes, it was far more than another center of education in a new and vigorous nation. It was the fulfillment of a cherished dream, the flowering of the liberalism of several of the world's great thinkers.

To this graduation class one of Virginia's immortal sons, Thomas Jefferson, is many things. He is patriot, leader, philosopher. He is draftsman of one of mankind's great documents—a doer as well as a thinker. He is revolutionist and statesman. He is architect and writer. He is political theorist and administrator.

Revered and beloved as he is in this great State, part and parcel as he is of the very essence of the American ideal, he is more than that to those who seek freedom in lands where men are oppressed, where freedom is a word or a slogan or a hope and not an actuality.

As you now are about to face the realities of the world, as you depart from these cloisters, as you make hard decisions in a sometimes rugged life, you will find that one of the great sons of Virginia has a special meaning to new nations and to nations yet seeking to be born.

The principles enunciated by Thomas Jefferson are as valid today as they were when he drafted the Declaration of Independence. To many leaders of nations newly free, and to those struggling to be free, the name of Jefferson is a star shining in the dark night. To them Jefferson is not just a great American who played a stellar role in the emergence of your country; he is a symbol of hope to men who struggle to throw off the harness of oppression.

But I wonder whether all of the new leaders of emerging nations, while invoking the principles of Jefferson, really understand him—whether they all comprehend the essence of what he believed and taught. Occasionally we see them use his name as they throw off one imperialism, but remain blind to the danger of another and more perilous imperialism—that of Soviet communism.

Jefferson believed in human dignity, in the freedom of man. He did not believe that one could stand aside when freedom was threatened. To Jefferson freedom was something to be won. And it could not be won or maintained without taking sides.

During the Asian-African Conference held at Bandung in April of last year, President Sukarno of Indonesia and other Asian leaders spoke eloquently and with reverence of the ideas of the men who made Revolutionary America. They invoked the names of Jefferson, of Washington, of Paul Revere. They saw, and rightly so, in the gathering power of 20th-century Asia, a special affinity with the 18th-century American revolutionaries. But they did not always reveal their understanding of the message that came to us of this century from your forebears of another era. Some of the participants at the Bandung Conference used the names of your illustrious men of 1776 to justify a stagnant neutralism in these days of conflict between Soviet imperialism and democratic freedom.

No man, no nation, wanting to be free or to remain free, can be neutral today. Neutralism assumes, by the very meaning of the word, that there is some good in both sides, some evil in both sides. Neutralism means that one can stand aside and let others fight out the great issues of modern man. Neutralism is the wife who watches the bear chase her husband and who says impartially, "Go it, husband. Go it, bear."

Is it really possible to stand aside today? Is it really possible for anyone, anywhere, to be a neutralist?

If there is little difference between freedom and totalitarianism, then the answer is yes.

If there is no important difference between being a free man and being a slave, then the answer is yes.

If slave labor camps, ridicule of religion, suppression of free ideas and thinking, dishonesty and duplicity in human affairs, idolatry of a man as a hero and a patriot for over a decade and then suddenly debunking him as a murderer and a traitor—and this by his former associates and accomplices—if all these mean nothing to us, then the answer is yes, we can stand aside and be neutral.

But no man who has read Jefferson or Madison or Adams, and has understood their words, will ever be convinced that they would be neutralists today. There is no room for choice, if we believe in the dignity and freedom of the human being. We must take sides, whether we be Filipinos, or Americans, or Indonesians, or Indians, or anything else.

We must take sides—because our love of freedom forces us to do so. We must take sides—because our hatred of oppression gives us no choice.

Any nation that seeks to be neutralist is telling the world that it does not recognize the meaning of Soviet imperialism or the way of democratic nations.

We are sometimes told that it is all very well for a rich, powerful, highly developed country like the United States to carry on the fight against Soviet imperialism, but that poor, weak, newly born nations cannot afford such a luxury. We are reminded of America's own history of avoidance of European entanglements throughout much of the 19th century. Leaving aside the question whether this is an accurate description of your country's history, we have a right to wonder whether those who use this argument know what time it is. The year is 1956—let them remember that. The century is that of the hydrogen bomb—let them remember that.

The world of the 20th century is not the world of the 18th and 19th centuries.

In those days there were no H-bombs.

In those days there were no intercontinental missiles.

In those days there were sailing ships but no planes.

Perhaps even more important, in those days the capture of men's minds was not the goal of any nation. Neither France nor Britain, in their stately and bloody quadrille of power politics, was out to fasten a straightjacket on the minds and spirits of men.

In those days there was no plan for the enslavement of men by the use of terror and the multitudinous techniques of subversion.

Only a man who refuses to open his eyes would think that there was anything in the 18th or 19th century to compare with the monsters of the 20th century: fascism and communism. Fascism led to the World War we have not yet recovered from.

Communism prepares for world conquest, whether by war or by the clever uses of cold peace.

To fail to see the difference, superficial as well as basic, between the United States of America and the Soviet Union is to dispute the facts of life of this century.

Is it possible to conceive that Thomas Jefferson, alive today, would be neutral between his credo and the Soviet philosophy?

Yet we find some of the Asian and African neutralists, and Europeans as well, using the principles of America's great men of freedom as argument for neutralism.

What Jefferson and Washington said about colonialism, about man's freedom, is as true today as it was in the days of the American Revolution.

The subjugation of man is as wrong today as it was then.

The evils of colonialism were bad then. They are bad today.

But to use the desire for freedom from an old colonialism to blind oneself to the menace of the new colonialism, communism, is to play the ostrich.

It is worse, for the ostrich has only himself to lose. The neutralist leader today endangers all his own people and the rest of the world as well.

We know now that self-government is the natural state of organized man. It is compounded of self-knowledge, self-respect, and self-control. It is the product of love for one's homeland and for one's countrymen. But it will not work at all without an overriding love of that abstract idea—liberty. You cannot have proper government without liberty, and you cannot have liberty without proper government. That is why I am disturbed by the new neutralism, which accepts the old fallacy that liberty is a sometime thing—like the curate's famous egg, good in spots. There is, I fear, a real danger that we may be placing a higher premium on straightforward nationalism than on straightout devotion to freedom. Our new Asian nations have a nationalism of their own. But no nationalism can be good, lasting or strong unless it is constructive. For a people to develop and maintain a healthy nationalism is both good and normal. But a nationalism which is destructive is a nationalism which will bring ruin down on the heads of those who lead it into darkness.

For a nation to gain its independence in the name of freedom and then refuse to defend freedom is a negation of true nationalism.

The Dutch, the French, the British colonial powers had faults. Refusing to understand the tremendous urge of great peoples for self-government, they stayed so long that they had to be removed, sometimes forcibly.

But if Dutch or British or French imperialism was wrong, how wrong then is Soviet imperialism!

To arrive at independence from Holland or France or Britain and then to become appendages to the Soviet imperialism is to negate and then destroy the freedom that the peoples of Asia worked and suffered for.

Never in the history of man has there been an imperialism so destructive of the free spirit, so ruinous of man's yearning for self-respect, so cynical about the dignity of the individual, so designed to degrade men rather than improve their lives, as the imperialism of the Soviet Union.

This is the big fact of life of our century.

If freedom is worth having it is worth defending. There are various means of defense of freedom. Defense can be by speech, by writing, by education.

But it may also be necessary to defend freedom by arms. And that fact some of our Asian friends don't seem to have grasped despite the fact that the Bandung final communique, after a prolonged discussion, decided that one of the cardinal principles we are pledged to follow is "respect for the right of each nation to defend itself singly or collectively in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations."

Today's neutralists are men who seem to have been misled by Soviet propaganda, which attacks the free world by picturing Russia as a friend of the new nations of Asia and Africa.

The actual purpose of the Soviet imperialists is to destroy the free powers, not to gain freedom for the colonial peoples. The true nationalist leader understands this—he should understand it instinctively. He wants freedom for his people. He knows that communism will give them a deadly slavery. He does not equate the Soviet Union with the free world. He does not insist that the conflict between the Soviet Union and those nations which are still free is no concern of his. He does not say, "I shall walk on the other side of the street."

Instead he says, "I am for freedom; therefore I am against communism."

Some neutralist leaders say to the free world: "We want your help. Give us food. Give us know-how. Give us capital. Give us the tools, and we will build our freedom. But do not ask us to be your partners. We do not want you to give us arms. We want no military assistance. For we are neutral between you and the Soviet imperialists. It is only a matter of degree between you and the Soviets."

I suggest that this kind of appeal is not neutralism, but suicide. The difference between the free world and the Soviet world are not academic. They are real.

What is going on in the world today is not a freshman debate about the relative merits of the horse and the cow. We are talking, rather, about the tiger—who does not walk away if you turn your back on him.

If the neutralists, including some of those patriotic and high-minded leaders who have done so much to help their nations attain freedom, believe in what they have told their people, if they believe in those magnificent principles so nobly enunciated by Jefferson, then they cannot be neutralists.

That is why every nation newly free ought to be glad to obtain military assistance to maintain its freedom. It takes maturity to see that, in our time, we preserve our private independence by recognizing the public interdependence. We of Asia—children of the world's oldest cultures—must now achieve a new and speedy maturity. We must choose our partners, and we must accept the responsibilities of partnership. NATO in the West, SEATO in the East—these are the tools of freedom. We must use them and strengthen them.

That is the heavy responsibility on the shoulders of the Asian leaders today. It is a responsibility they dare not shirk. If they do, all the anguish and struggle and hopes of their people for freedom will be in vain.

The new imperialism which today smiles and bows and tips its hat in courtesy is not interested in Asian freedom or African nationalism. Soviet imperialism is interested only in the advancement of the Soviet Union and the suppression of those ideas which are the basis of the free world, the hope of oppressed people everywhere. It does not allow a special category for those who would be neutral, any more than Hitler or the Japanese did in World War II.

That is the message that Thomas Jefferson and his fellow rebels give to Asia—and to the world—today. The message is clear enough: Take sides. Freedom is precious—defend it. It is not cheap, or easy, or neutral. It is dear, and hard, and real. Take sides—or you will lose it.

PROPOSED INQUIRY INTO FEDERAL TAX LAWS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, pertinent to Senate Joint Resolution 167, which I introduced on May 9, 1956, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the June 5, 1956, edition of the Annapolis (Md.) Evening Capital—one of Maryland's finest daily newspapers.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR BUTLER SEEKS INQUIRY INTO FEDERAL TAX LAWS

Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Republican, of Maryland, has introduced a joint resolution in the United States Senate seeking the appointment of a commission to study and report to the Congress on inequalities and inequities in the Federal tax laws.

His action is somewhat in line with the suggestion recently made by T. Coleman Andrews, former Commissioner of Internal Revenue, who has assailed the present income tax laws.

The Butler resolution which is now in the Senate Finance Committee, calls for a Commission on Federal Taxation, to be composed of 12 members.

Four would be appointed by the President of the United States, 2 to come from the executive branch of the Government and 2 from private life. Four would be named by the President of the Senate, 2 to come from the Senate and 2 from private life, and the other 4 would be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 2 to come from the House and 2 from private life. Any vacancy in the Commission would be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The Commission would elect its own chairman and a vice chairman from among its members, and would have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable.

Members of Congress and of the executive branch of the Government serving on the Commission would do so without extra compensation, but members from private life would be paid $50 per day when engaged in the actual performance of their duties. The members would be reimbursed for travel, subsistence and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties on the Commission.

While the resolution does not specifically call for a study of the Federal income tax laws, it is obvious that these tax laws would be a major source of inquiry, because of their impact on the people.

The resolution directs that the Commission shall make a full and complete study and investigation of the Federal tax laws, with a particular view of determining inequalities and inequities in the laws and of recommending means for removing or ameliorating such inequities and inequalities.

It also provides that the Commission shall, in particular, but without limiting the scope of its study and investigation, examine the effect of the Federal tax laws on low income and middle income individual taxpayers, on small business, in stimulating the growth of monopolies, and in dissipating the incentive for greater productivity, both by individuals and businesses.

The Commission could submit such interim reports as it deemed advisable, but must submit its final comprehensive report and recommendation to the Congress on or before April 15, 1958. It would cease to exist 30 days after making its final report.

The Commission would have broad powers for carrying out the inquiry. It could hold hearings, administer oaths and require the attendance of witnesses and the production of records, and secure needed information and suggestions from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality of the Federal Government.

The Butler resolution differs somewhat from the Andrews suggestion in that it sets a deadline for a report.

Andrews, who contends the present Federal income tax laws are bad, and are slowly but surely destroying the middle class, pointed out that seeking another form of taxation creates a problem that requires long study and analysis.

He said he would like to see a commission appointed by the Congress, without any deadline, without any instructions as to what to come up with—except one, that is that the whole revenue system be thoroughly studied out and that the income tax in particular be given a real going over, with the idea that a substitute be found for it if it cannot be made generally understandable, fair and compatible with our ideals of freedom.

However, the Butler resolution, if adopted, would be a step in the right direction and it gives the Congress an opportunity to show how it stands on the many complaints about the working of the present income tax laws that have been made in recent months. As Senator BUTLER points out the "cry for a

complete overhaul of our tax system gains in momentum."

He also declared that the inquiry proposed by his resolution should not foreclose a reduction in personal income taxes, if conditions permit, prior to the contemplated April 1958 deadline.

IMPROVED BRAKE SYSTEMS FOR INTERSTATE MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter dated May 29, 1956, which I have received from Commissioner Richard F. Mitchell, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, in regard to the problem of additional regulations for improved brake systems on interstate vehicles.

Also, I ask unanimous consent to have printed with the letter a notice dated May 29, 1956, which the Interstate Commerce Commission has issued on the subject of brake regulations, together with an order setting forth the motor carrier safety regulations. This order, I think, should be made available to every Member of the Senate.

Also, in this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "ICC Issues Stricter Regulations for Trailer-Truck Brake Systems," published in the Wall Street Journal on May 31, 1956.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, May 29, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This will supplement my letter of February 20, 1956, in which I replied to your letter of February 9, to Chairman Arpaia concerning the status of rulemaking relating to additional regulations for improved brake systems on interstate vehicles.

I enclose herewith copies of a report and order of the Commission in *Ex parte No. MC–40* which prescribes additional requirements for brake systems. The report was released to the public today.

With kindest regards, I remain,

Sincerely,

RICHARD F. MITCHELL,
Commissioner.

BRAKE REGULATIONS

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 29, 1956.

The attached order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, dated May 21, 1956, prescribes certain requirements relating to braking systems on combination vehicles, in addition to previously existing requirements. The order has an effective date of June 30, 1956, but later dates are set for observance of its principal requirements.

For a complete understanding of the requirements the text of the regulations must be read. Major features are:

1. After June 30, 1956, towing vehicle air and vacuum reservoirs must be safeguarded against leakage in the connection to the source of air or vacuum.

2. On and after January 1, 1957, every towing vehicle must have means for keeping its brakes operative in the event of breakaway.

3. After August 31, 1956, every new vehicle, and after December 31, 1956, every vehicle towing an airbraked trailer shall have both an automatic and a manual means of activating the emergency features of the trailer brakes. After December 31, 1956, every vehicle towing a vacuum-braked trailer must have a second control device for emergency trailer braking.

4. Airbrake systems installed on towed vehicles manufactured after August 31, 1956, must have devices to safeguard the air supply against backflow through the supply line.

5. After December 31, 1956, every towing vehicle using vacuum brakes shall have an audible or visible low-vacuum warning device.

The Commission's order does not preclude the use of additional brake installations.

It should be emphasized that adoption of the new regulations in no way minimizes the necessity for adequate maintenance and inspection procedures as required by Part 196 of the Motor Carrier Safety Regulations.

HAROLD D. MCCOY,
Secretary.

[Title 49, Transportation; chapter 1, Interstate Commerce Commission; subchapter B, carriers by motor vehicle; part 193, parts and accessories necessary for safe operation]

EX PARTE NO. MC–40—QUALIFICATIONS AND MAXIMUM HOURS OF SERVICE AND EMPLOYEES OF MOTOR CARRIERS AND SAFETY OF OPERATIONS AND EQUIPMENT (MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY REGULATIONS)

ORDER

At a general session of the Interstate Commerce Commission held at its office in Washington, D. C., on the 21st day of May A. D. 1956.

It appearing that pursuant to our continuing study of the motor carrier safety regulations and the effectiveness thereof, we issued a notice of proposed rule making, dated November 10, 1955 (20 F. R. 8547; 21 F. R. 39) for the purpose of imposing, at the earliest practicable date, additional regulations with respect to safeguards against parts failures in motor vehicles braking systems;

It further appearing that pursuant to such notice and the invitation contained therein persons desiring to participate in the proceeding have submitted written statements containing data, views, and arguments in connection with the scope and text of a rule which the public interest requires;

And it further appearing that a full investigation of the matters and things, within the scope of our notice of November 10, 1955, having been made in accordance with section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237, 5 U. S. C. 1003) and full consideration having been given the revisions proposed and the data, views, and arguments of interested persons with respect thereto, and the Commission on the date hereof having made and filed a supplemental report herein setting forth the general basis and purpose of the rules adopted, which report and the report and order dated April 14, 1952, are hereby referred to and made a part hereof.

It is ordered that effective June 30, 1956, sections 193.43, 193.50, and 193.51 of the motor carrier safety regulations, revision of 1952 (49 C. F. R. 193.43, 193.50, and 193.51) be, and they are hereby, amended by substituting the following rules in lieu of those which are now in effect:

"193.43. Breakaway and emergency braking: (a) Every full trailer, semitrailer, and pole trailer required to be equipped with brakes, except motor vehicles engaged in driveaway-towaway operations, shall be equipped with brakes of such a character as to be applied automatically and promptly upon breakaway from the towing vehicle, and means shall be provided to maintain application of the brakes on the trailer in such a case for at least 15 minutes. Airbrake systems installed on towed vehicles manufactured after August 31, 1956, shall be so designed, by the use of 'no-bleed-back' relay-emergency valves or equivalent devices, that the supply reservoir used to provide air for brakes shall be safeguarded against backflow of air from the reservoir through the supply line. On and after January 1, 1957, every truck or truck-tractor if used to tow a trailer equipped with brakes, shall be equipped with means for providing that in case of breakaway of such trailer, the service brakes on the towing vehicle will be sufficiently operative to stop the towing vehicle. Every truck or truck-tractor equipped with airbrakes, the date of manufacture of which is subsequent to August 31, 1956, and every truck or truck-tractor equipped with airbrakes on and after January 1, 1957, when used to tow another vehicle equipped with full airbrakes, in operations other than driveaway or towaway, shall in addition to the above be equipped with two means of activating the emergency features of the trailer brakes. One of these means shall operate automatically in the event of reduction of the towing vehicle air supply to a fixed pressure which shall be not lower than 20 pounds per square inch nor higher than 45 pounds per square inch. The other means shall be a manually controlled device readily operable by a person seated in the driving seat, and its emergency position or method of operation shall be clearly indicated. In no instance may the manual means be so arranged as to permit its use to prevent operation of the automatic means. The automatic and manual means of application required by this section may be, but are not required to be, separate.

"(b) Every truck-tractor and truck used for towing other vehicles equipped with vacuum brakes, in operations other than driveaway and towaway on and after January 1, 1957, shall have, in addition to the single controlled by section 193.49 to operate all brakes of the combination, a second control device independent of brake air, hydraulic, or other pressure and independent of other controls, which can be used to operate the brakes on the towed vehicles in emergencies. Such second control is not required by this rule to provide modulated or graduated braking.

"193.50. Reservoirs required: Every bus, truck, and truck-tractor, the date of manufacture of which is subsequent to June 30, 1953, and which is equipped with an air or vacuum brake system, shall be equipped with reserve capacity or a reservoir sufficient to insure a brake application capable of stopping the vehicle within the stopping distance requirements of section 193.52 in the event the engine stops. No such reserve capacity or reservoir shall be required on single vehicles if the braking system is so designed and installed as to provide for application of the service brakes through hydraulic or mechanical means in event of failure of the air or vacuum system or the source of supply of such systems. In addition, every truck-tractor and every truck used for towing other vehicles shall when equipped with air or vacuum reservoirs as required by this section, and regardless of date of manufacture, have such air or vacuum reservoirs so safeguarded by a check valve or equivalent device that in the event of failure or leakage in its connection to the source of compressed air or vacuum the air or vacuum supply in the reservoir shall not be depleted by the leak or failure.

"193.51. Warning devices: Every bus, truck, and truck-tractor equipped with an airbrake system, and on and after January 1, 1957, every truck-tractor and every truck used for towing a vehicle required to have brakes, if the brakes are vacuum-operated, shall be provided with either an audible or visible warning signal to indicate readily to the driver any loss or lack of air or vacuum sufficient to prevent the vehicle from being stopped. A gage indicating pressure or vacuum shall not be deemed to be an adequate means of satisfying this requirement."

Notice of this order shall be given to the general public by depositing a copy thereof in the office of the Secretary of the Commission, Washington, D. C., and by filing a copy thereof with the Director, Division of the Federal Register.

[49 Stat. 546, as amended; 49 U. S. C. 304.]

By the Commission.

[SEAL] HAROLD D. McCOY,
Secretary.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION — EX PARTE NO. MC-40—MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY REGULATIONS[1] (PT. 193)

(Decided May 21, 1956)

Motor carrier brake regulations, sections 193.43, 193.50, and 193.51, modified so as to make provision for added safeguards against the failure of parts of the brake system. Prior report 54 M. C. C. 337.

Ralph E. Kittinger, Robert E. Schoondyke, F. T. Hiller, James E. Moss, R. C. Pitts, Robert Austin, Sam E. Carpenter, Clinton Holeman, J. J. Madigan, R. L. Housley, A. M. Frantz, Harry E. Boot, H. O. Mathews, F. H. Floyd, and L. R. Cyrus for various motor carriers and associations thereof.

Robert E. Swanson for the government of the Province of British Columbia.

Louis E. Bender for the Port of New York Authority.

R. H. Long, Norman C. Williams, P. M. Payne, William E. Wright, John C. Hiemstra, J. George Oetzel, Arthur B. Euga, Charles G. Wearden, Walton Schmidt, Charles W. Steadman, W. L. Moyer, J. F. Tonkinson, Jr., W. L. Keehn, Ray S. Brimhall, R. C. Wallace, Martin Wenes, and James K. Knudson for various motor vehicle and parts manufacturers.

Harold C. Heiss and Charles R. Jamison for other interested parties.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT OF THE COMMISSION

By the Commission:

This report deals solely with the promulgation of an order amending the Motor Carrier Safety Regulations so as to make provision for certain safeguards against parts failures in motor vehicle braking systems.

By notice dated November 10, 1955, a proposed rule was published in the Federal Register as follows:

"§ 193.53 Safeguards against parts failure: Every motor vehicle, the date of manufacture of which is subsequent to September 30, 1956, and every motor vehicle in use after March 31, 1957, if used in a combination of motor vehicles shall, except as otherwise provided in this rule, have its service braking system so designed, constructed, and maintained as to provide that failure of any part thereof shall not prevent the effective application of brakes on more than one axle of the combination except that the front axle brakes of the towing vehicle need not be included in the protected group. The braking system shall be subject to the driver's control at all times by means of the controls which are used in the application of the service brakes, except as provided in these regulations with respect to automatic brake applications. Application of towed-vehicle brakes shall be, and application of towing-vehicle brakes may be, automatic in the event of failure of the source of braking power on the towing vehicle or of the means of applying the brakes, but the system shall not be arranged to permit automatic brake application on the towing vehicle without brake application on the towed vehicle or vehicles, nor to permit automatic brake application on the foremost axle of the towing vehicle in any event. Neither the design, construction, nor installation of the protective features necessary for compliance with this rule shall be such as to interfere with the normal operation of the service brakes under any circumstances. This rule shall not be so construed as to require all wheels of all vehicles to be provided with brakes, where provision to the contrary is made in sections 193.42 or 193.48, nor to constitute an exception to the requirement for automatic braking of towed vehicles in the event of breakaway contained in section 193.43, nor to constitute an exception to the requirements of section 193.48 regarding operative condition of vehicle brakes."

By the same notice, interested persons were invited to submit written statements containing data, views, or arguments concerning the propriety of such rule or some modification thereof which will provide the safeguards needed. The original due date for the submission of such data, January 3, 1956, was subsequently extended, pursuant to request, to February 3, 1956, and thereafter again extended to April 3, 1956. This latter extension was for the purpose of permitting certain groups to complete a number of equipment and road tests and to file data in connection therewith. It now appears that ample testing of all the equipment and methods involved in complying with the regulation as originally proposed will entail a considerably longer period of time. Meanwhile, pursuant to the invitation therefor, a great many parties[2] have filed responses for and against the proposed regulation and have included therein a number of suggestions for modification thereof.

As stated in our notice of November 10, 1955, our continuing study of the Motor Carrier Safety Regulations and the effectiveness thereof, indicates the desirability, in the public interest, of imposing at the earliest practicable date, additional regulations which will provide certain brake system safeguards. Lying behind the aim of this proceeding, and pointing up its urgent necessity, has been a series of tragic brake failure accidents within the recent past involving "runaway" motor vehicles. In some of the motor carrier investigation reports involving such accidents the individual Commissioners who issued such reports on behalf of the Commission have recommended that early action be taken along the lines proposed. The pressing necessity for some effective means of bringing to a halt or of substantially curtailing this type of accident and the tragic results which flow therefrom is not open to serious question. The rule as proposed was based on the results of extensive studies and many conferences between the staff of our Motor Carrier Section of Safety and numerous manufacturers, carriers, and Government officials. It was our hope that by this time adequate practical road testing of the devices required to comply with the proposed rule would have been completed, and that such tests would have demonstrated whether such rule could be adopted with the full assurance that it would achieve the safety purposes which we had in mind, namely, that in the event of a brake system part failure, brakes would not be lost on more than the wheels attached to a single axle, but at the same time, that the means employed would not otherwise be creative of other braking or safety problems.

In responding to the original proposal a great many of the parties vigorously oppose the scope of the regulation. They urge primarily that the proposed rule would increase the possibility of brake-system malfunction through the complexity of its requirements; that compliance with the proposed rule would interfere with normal braking; that there is no adequately tested valve or device which will work properly and effectively, and comply with the proposed regulation without creating new hazards and problems; that any reserve braking control should be separate from the regular service braking controls; that automatic brake application beyond the control of the driver is undesirable and unsafe; that a completely separate system for applying brakes in the event of failure of the regular service braking system should be acceptable as an alternative; that compliance with the proposed rule is impracticable with vacuum brakes; that more time should be allowed for compliance with the regulations insofar as existing equipment is concerned; that the proposed rule would prohibit the use of a number of tried and proved emergency braking systems from being continued or improved; that the wording of the proposed rule should in no event specify or limit the design or application of equipment; that the proposed rule should not apply to existing vehicles because truck owners in general are not prepared to do the necessary remodeling job properly; and that the proposed rule in its present scope is premature, goes too far, and should be deferred pending further study.

A few of the parties filing statements support the rule as proposed and some urge that it should be made to apply to all commercial vehicles including single units as well as combinations. A substantial number of others, however, urge that a rule based on a vehicle-protection concept, in which the failure of brakes on either the towing or the towed vehicle would not affect the brakes on the other vehicle, would afford the protection desired in a more practicable manner than that contemplated by the so-called axle-concept rule. Some feel that a vehicle-protection rule should be prescribed, at least as an interim measure, so as to afford adequate time for further study and ample testing of the devices said to be essential to implement the rule as originally proposed. Most of these latter parties offer their cooperation in the performance of tests and experimental operations which they contend are necessary to rule out a number of shortcomings or undesirable adjuncts which appear to be inherent in the original proposal. Some parties especially urge that any system adopted should make provision for an extra control which would permit the driver to apply emergency brakes at any time ahead of their being applied by the automatic features of the system. A number of manufacturers of various brake systems also submitted diagrams and explanations of certain systems which they respectively propose, urging their adequacy as an answer to the problem. They particularly stress that any rule adopted should not prohibit the use of such system and that it should not deter the development of new and better systems.

The entire problem with which we are faced and the accident reports in connection therewith have been exhaustively studied in the light of the proposed rule and the nu-

---

[1] Short title for the proceeding entitled "Qualifications and Maximum Hours of Service of Employees of Motor Carriers and Safety of Operation and Equipment."

[2] Iowa Food Distributors Association, Iowa Association of Tobacco Distributors, Pittsburgh and New England Trucking Co., American Petroleum Institute, Phillips Petroleum Co., Fleet Maintenance Council of Akron, Ohio, Earl Bray, Inc., Bekins Van & Storage Co., and Bekins Van Lines Co., All-States Freight, Inc., Bender & Loudon Motor Freight, Inc., A. M. Frantz, Bendix products division, Bendix Aviation Corp., Power Brake Equipment Co., P. M. Payne & Co., Wright Gravity Emergency Stop Co., Mid-Western Manufacturing Co., Warner Electric Brake & Clutch Co., Third Brake System, The Maxi Corp., Automobile Manufacturers Association, Fawick Corp., W. L. Moyer, George System; Keehn-A Manufacturing Co., the government of the Province of British Columbia Department of Railways, the Port of New York Authority, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Charles R. Jamison, American Trucking Associations, Inc., Private Truck Council of America, Local Cartage National Conference, Cyrus Petroleum Truck Line, Ray Brimhall Co., Diamond T Motor Car Co., and the Talco Engineering Co., Inc.

merous statements which have been filed in response thereto. The achievement of safety is not in the nature of an exact science and we are acutely aware of the theoretical merit as well as difficulties which aline themselves with the several approaches to the problem. The vigor with which we have undertaken to seek out the means of obtaining maximum braking reserve in the event of parts failures has necessarily been tempered by a reluctance to impose any regulation which would require substantial modifications of existing brake systems until reasonable testing has resolved all substantial practical and engineering controversy over shortcomings which are said to lurk therein.

Nearly all of the accidents which have come to our notice, where the proximate cause thereof entailed parts failures in the braking system, have involved combination vehicles. Also the great bulk of the heavier vehicles with which we are here concerned are equipped with brakes which use compressed air as a source of power, though a fairly substantial number of such vehicles are equipped with vacuum-over-hydraulic brake systems, used in some cases, in conjunction with an air brake equipped trailer. Some tractors with air brakes also draw vacuum braked trailers. The problem is further complicated by the fact that the trailers of some carriers are interchanged and drawn by the power units of other carriers. To be realistic and effective, therefore, our regulations must take cognizance of these facts.

As already noted, the original proposal has been assailed primarily on the following grounds—that its implementation would involve a complex modification of existing vehicles, that this complexity alone would defeat its purpose, that it has not been adequately tested, and that in any event it goes further than is necessary to accomplish the results sought. The manufacturers of vehicles, although supporting the regulation subject to certain clarifications of language, have indicated that it is not suitable for adaption to assistor-type systems such as vacuum-over-hydraulic. There also is much disagreement with certain other provisions including the type of driver controls to be utilized.

From a thorough review of the entire situation we are convinced that the rule as proposed goes further than we are justified on the evidence before us. Meanwhile, the recurrence of "runaway" accidents and the serious loss of life and extensive property damage which flow therefrom leave little doubt that the ends of safety demand that we consider the adoption of a practicable but less stringent regulation along the lines of the so-called vehicle-protection concept. The provisions of such rule which are fully set forth in the order attached hereto will provide a somewhat lesser measure of brake reserve than we had originally hoped to achieve. It, nevertheless, will represent a substantial and worthwhile forward step in putting into the hands of the motor vehicle driver the means of bringing his equipment to a stop after a failure of some part of the braking system. Such a system also has a number of very important advantages at least equal to, and in some respects superior, to those which would result from the original proposal.

(1) It can be made effective at an early date because of its simplicity and because it involves a well-known principle about which there is a minimum of engineering disagreement. The information which has been made available indicates that it can be made effective as to new vehicles within 60 days and most of its provisions can be made effective as to existing vehicles within 6 months.

(2) It can be put into operation by 2 means, 1 manual and 1 automatic.

(3) Its implementation will provide that failure of the towing vehicle brakes will not fail towed vehicle brakes and failure of the towed vehicle brakes will not fail those on the towing vehicle.

(4) The proposal would provide for an automatic application of towed vehicle brakes when the air supply of the towing vehicle drops to a level below which it is unsafe to operate. This was also involved in the original proposal but the limits of reduced pressure within which the automatic application must occur are more clearly defined in the regulation adopted herein. A number of "runaway" accidents have occurred under circumstances which indicate that the driver failed to take timely action when his towing vehicle air supply had dropped to a dangerously low level.

(5) It will provide protection against failure of brake systems which are caused by a rupture of the line connecting the brake power supply reservoir and the source of the power. This will be required on all vacuum and air brake towing vehicles. It is to be accomplished by requiring a check valve or equivalent device to protect the supply in the storage reservoir.

(6) It will require protection against backflow of the power supply stored in towed vehicle reservoirs through the supply line to the towing vehicle. Under the presently required breakaway braking system a sudden drop in air pressure is needed to activate the breakaway brakes. Some recent accidents have occurred where a slow leak allowed the air supply to escape in such manner that the breakaway features were not activated. The "no-bleed-back" feature will afford protection against such failures. Another advantage is that substantially full power will be available when emergency application is required.

(7) It will require controls that are easily accessible and will enable the driver to activate the emergency features of the brakes on the towed vehicles when the means for normal application of service brakes is lost. This is an arrangement already extensively in use and easily can be made effective on all existing equipment, at limited expense, within a short period of time.

(8) It will require in not to exceed 6 months, that all existing towing vehicles be equipped with the tractor protection valve which has been used to implement section 193.43 of the regulations on all such vehicles built since June 30, 1953. This provision will prevent total loss of brakes if there is a failure of the brakes on either vehicle of the combination. The valve supplied by some manufacturers to perform this function incorporates features which will provide greater safety of operation if required for all power units, regardless of age. In fact, numerous tractors now in service are already so equipped.

In our opinion the regulations being adopted are reasonable, are necessary in the public interest, and will go a long way toward accomplishing the objectives of the original proposal. The features thereof will not preclude the use of additional separately energized brake installations, which some of the parties advocate as being the most reliable safeguard against brake failures.

It is our hope that carriers, manufacturers, and others will continue with exhaustive tests of the axle-protection system or others which are designed to produce a greater measure of emergency braking reserve than is contemplated by the rule being adopted. The staff of the Section of Safety of the Bureau of Motor Carriers will observe the conduct of such tests and demonstrations where practicable. Meanwhile, the effectiveness of the rule here being prescribed will be kept under constant surveillance, it being our purpose from time to time to consider the necessity for additional changes which might prove to be necessary and desirable.

We find that the revised brake regulations prescribed and set forth in the order attached hereto are reasonable requirements with respect to the safety of operation and equipment of motor carriers and that such regulations which modify sections 193.43, 193.50, and 193.51 of the Motor Carrier Safety Regulations, Revision of 1952, should be adopted and made effective in accordance with the terms of the attached order.

An appropriate order will be entered.

[From the Wall Street Journal of May 31, 1956]

ICC ISSUES STRICTER REGULATIONS FOR TRAILER TRUCK BRAKE SYSTEMS—TIGHTENING OF SAFETY RULES IS AIMED AT ENDING ACCIDENTS CAUSED BY RUNAWAY VEHICLES

WASHINGTON.—The Interstate Commerce Commission issued new, tightened-up regulations for braking systems on tractor-trailer trucks.

The order is aimed at preventing a recurrence of major accidents caused by brake failures on trucks which rolled downhill out of control.

The rules are a tightening-up of the ICC's safety regulations affecting interconnected air or vacuum braking systems used in so-called "combination vehicles." These are tractor-trailer combinations and trucks towing full-size trailers.

The new regulations are slightly easier than proposals made by the Commission last November. Partly in response to comments from such groups as the American Trucking Associations, Inc., manufacturers and operators, the ICC dropped, pending further study, a proposal that all combination vehicles be equipped with an automatic device which would apply the brakes if the air pressure in only one axle—not including the two front steering wheels—fell below a danger point.

However, the new regulations call for the installation of an automatic means of applying the brakes in the trailer of a combination vehicle if the pressure in the towing vehicle falls below a certain danger point without the driver's noticing it. It would also require the installation of secondary or manual brake control for use by the driver if the regular control system fails.

This new automatic feature, including the provision for alternative manual operation of the brakes, must be installed in every new air-brake vehicle built after August 31 of this year, the ICC said, and must be installed in all existing air-brake vehicles by December 31. By that time all vacuum-brake vehicles must have a secondary control device for emergency application of the trailer's brakes.

The only automatic feature required by the ICC at present is a device which applies the trailer's brakes in case of a "breakaway" from the tractor.

Other provisions of the new safety regulations:

After June 30 of this year the supply of braking power in air or vacuum reservoirs of towing vehicles must be safeguarded against any leakage in the connection leading to the source of the air or vacuum.

By January 1 every towing vehicle must be able to keep its brakes operative in case the trailer breaks away from it.

By August 31 of this year all air brakes systems on newly built trailers must be equipped with a check valve to prevent their air supply from leaking slowly back to the towing vehicle through the supply line. The present automatic application of brakes in the event of the break-away of an air-brake trailer only works if there is a sudden drop in air pressure resulting from the broken connection. However, the ICC said, "slow leaks" have made this automatic device ineffective on occasions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further morning business, morning business is concluded. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, commencing with Order No. 2047, Senate bill 911.

EFTALIA G. STATHIS AND ARIADNI VASSILIKI G. STATHIS

The bill (S. 911) for the relief of Eftalia G. Stathis and Ariadni Vassiliki G. Stathis was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eftalia G. Stathis and Ariadni Vassiliki G. Stathis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

GEORGE PAPOULIAS AND IRENE PAPOULIAS (NEE BIRBILIS)

The bill (S. 1869) for the relief of George Papoulias and Irene Papoulias (nee Birbilis) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, George Papoulias and Irene Papoulias (nee Birbilis) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

DAIVID CHIH-WEI KWOK

The bill (S. 2800) for the relief of David Chih-Wei Kwok was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, David Chih-Wei Kwok shal be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

TOINI MARGARETA HEINO

The bill (S. 2842) for the relief of Toini Margareta Heino was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Toini Margareta Heino may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

SANTIAGO GONZALEZ TRIGO

The bill (H. R. 1402) for the relief of Santiago Gonzalez Trigo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TOM WONG (FOO TAI NAM)

The bill (H. R. 5079) for the relief of Tom Wong (Foo Tai Nam) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOE BARGAS

The bill (H. R. 2045) for the relief of Joe Bargas was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ZOLTAN KLAR AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1104) for the relief of Zoltan Klar and his wife, Vilma Hartmann Klar, and their minor son Tibor Klar, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 8, after the word "fees", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Zoltan Klar and his wife, Vilma Hartmann Klar, and their minor son, Tibor Klar, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fees: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES O. FERRY AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 909) for the relief of Charles O. Ferry and other employees of the Alaska Road Commission, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, line 1, after the name "Buck", to strike out "$1,339" and insert "$1,239."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PAYMENT OF ANNUITIES TO WIDOWS AND DEPENDENT CHILDREN OF JUDGES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 11124) to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I do not believe it would be appropriate to consider this bill on a call of the calendar. I therefore ask that it be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to comment briefly on Calendar 2057, H. R. 11124. I hope the leadership of the Senate will schedule the bill for early consideration, by motion. It would be shameful indeed if Congress should adjourn in the next few weeks without providing necessary relief and doing equity to the widows and children of deceased judges.

I do not wish to make personal reference to the family of any deceased judge, but I do desire to say that we are not doing the decent thing by the widows and families of deceased judges. Judges are most worthy public servants. They are removed from the field of politics. They cannot use political techniques in order to lay the foundation for protecting their loved ones. That is the responsibility of legislators. That is our responsibility. A very serious situation exists with respect to the families of some of our deceased judges. Therefore, I hope that in the interest of common decency the bill now on the calendar, Calendar 2057, H. R. 11124, will receive the favorable consideration of the leadership of the Senate and will

be brought up for early vote by the Senate, so that we will have time to get it through conference, if necessary, and in that way accord the justice for which I am pleading to the widows and children of deceased judges.

HAROLD D. ROBISON

The bill (S. 1893) for the relief of Harold D. Robison was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harold D. Robison, of Pleasant Grove, Utah, the sum of $8,865.35. Such sum shall be in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for additional compensation for the loss of clothing, household furnishings, and other personal property sustained by him, while serving as an employee of the State Department, as the result of the emergency evacuation of State Department personnel, due to enemy action, from Singapore, on February 12, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3365) to amend section 410 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to change the requirements for obtaining a freight forwarder permit was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I ask that that bill go over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 9824) to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability or disease incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean conflict was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, that bill is not properly calendar business. Therefore I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

The bill (S. 3907) to amend section 345 of the Public Health Service Act was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence of subsection (a) of section 345 of the Public Health Service Act (58 Stat. 682, 701; 42 U. S. C., ch. 6A), as added by section 2 of the act approved May 8, 1954 (68 Stat. 79), is amended by striking "1956" where it appears in clause numbered "(1)", and inserting in lieu thereof "1958."

EDUCATION OF MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN

The bill (S. 3620) to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Education is authorized to make grants to public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning to assist them in providing training of professional personnel to conduct research in, or conduct training of teachers in, fields related to education of mentally retarded children. Such grants may be used by such institutions to assist in covering the cost of courses of training or study for such personnel and for establishing and maintaining fellowships, with such stipends as may be determined by the Commissioner of Education.

SEC. 2. The Commissioner of Education is also authorized to make grants to State educational agencies to assist them in establishing and maintaining, directly or through grants to public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning, fellowships or traineeships for training personnel engaged or preparing to engage in employment as teachers of mentally retarded children or as supervisors of such teachers.

SEC. 3. Payments of grants pursuant to this act may be made by the Commissioner of Education from time to time, in advance or by way of reimbursement, on such conditions as the Commissioner may determine.

SEC. 4. For purposes of this act—

(a) The term "nonprofit institution" means an institution owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

(b) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools in the State.

SEC. 5. The Commissioner of Education is authorized to delegate any of his functions under this act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

HEALTH AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1956—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3958) to improve the health of the people by assisting in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and practical nurses and professional public health personnel, assisting in the development of improved methods of care and treatment in the field of mental health, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HRUSKA. May we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation of the bill is requested.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the bill is the so-called omnibus health bill. The distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] cannot be on the floor at this moment. Under the circumstances, I ask that the bill go over for the present.

Mr. HRUSKA. Does the Senator desire to have the bill go to the foot of the calendar?

Mr. HILL. Mr. Presiding Officer, Mr. President, I ask that the bill go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed to the foot of the calendar. The Chair assumes that the Senator is referring to Calendar No. 2092, S. 3958.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

The bill (S. 3430) to promote the progress of medicine and to advance the national health and welfare by creating a National Library of Medicine was announced as next in order.

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 135, FOR CONSTRUCTION OF YELLOWTAIL DAM AND RESERVOIR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Friday, June 8, the President sent to Congress his veto message on Senate Joint Resolution 135, for payment to the Crow Indian Tribe for right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin Unit, Missouri River Basin Project, Montana-Wyoming.

Mr. President, the Presidential veto of this joint resolution directing the Secretary of the Interior to make a just and reasonable settlement with the Crow Indian Tribe for the transfer of lands at the site of Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir was a deep disappointment both here in Washington and in Montana and Wyoming. It is a keen disappointment, also, to my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who has worked so long and hard for this project as well as our able colleague, Congressman METCALF, of Montana.

It is hard to watch something go down the drain so quickly after 12 years of hard work. The construction of the proposed Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir is not a local matter; this project means a great deal to the States of Montana and Wyoming and especially the Midland Empire of my State.

A completed Yellowtail unit would have supplemented the severe shortage of hydroelectric power in the Northwest with an additional 200,000 kilowatts. This unit is an important phase in the flood control planning of the Missouri River basin. In the more immediate locality it would mean the irrigation of 20,000 to 25,000 acres of arid lands. This project would mean new industry, a broadened tax base, additional employment and, in general, it would have given a big boost to the economy of the area.

A firm supply of power for the REA cooperatives in the area is jeopardized and the Crow Indians are being treated in the same old way without due consideration. The administration is again failing to deal fairly with its Indian wards and citizens.

Only recently there has been considerable discussion about rehabilitation of

our Indian population, giving them a chance for a better livelihood. At present, various programs are being studied to bring industry close to reservations which are considered depressed areas. The construction of this multi-purpose project would have meant employment for a great number of the Crow Indians during the building of the dam and with the influx of new business when completed.

It is very significant that the rejection of Senate Joint Resolution 135 is a test of the administration's stand on power policy. The veto by President Eisenhower gives the administration a perfect record against starting any new multipurpose project during the years it has been in office.

In October 1952, at the dedication of Hungry Horse Dam in western Montana, former President Harry Truman predicted that "if a Republican administration comes in, it—Hungry Horse Dam—will be the last such project you will see for a long, long time." To date President Truman's prediction has proven to be 100 percent correct.

The administration professes to favor the construction of a number of multipurpose projects, but there is always one more hitch to forestall construction. Libby Dam in western Montana is a perfect example. The project is approved, but the administration knows that construction cannot be started until the complicated international negotiations with Canada are settled.

President Eisenhower refers to Yellowtail as "this much-needed project," but has rejected an equitable means of removing the one remaining obstacle.

According to President Eisenhower's veto message he feels that the $5 million set forth in the resolution is not "just compensation," lacking in equitable justification and establishment of acceptable premises. I do not feel that this is an accurate judgment of the facts.

As my Senate colleagues know, prior to construction of the Yellowtail Unit a transfer of right-of-way for some 7,000 acres of Crow Indian Tribal lands must be negotiated with the Tribal Council. The dam site is located on tribal lands. Some of their lands will be inundated by the reservoir. Of the 30,857 acres required, 6,997 acres are tribal lands.

The Interior Department offered $1,500,000 in settlement, but this figure was rejected by the tribe. In a resolution on January 11, 1956 the Crow Tribal Council requested a settlement of $5 million. After due consideration, the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], Montana's able Representative from the First District, Mr. METCALF, and I concluded that the Indian request was equitable and fair to all concerned. The only other course of action was condemnation proceedings, to which I am opposed.

As I have stated before, the $5 million figure is not something which was merely pulled out of a hat; there is sound justification for it, and it is not without precedent, nor is it a giveaway in any sense of the word.

The settlement agreed upon by the Crow Indian Tribe was arrived at as a result of an exhaustive study made by a consulting engineer. The $5 million was an alternative to a proposal of annual $1 million payments to the tribe and tribal ownership after 50 years.

In other words, the Government would pay $50 million in rentals and then turn the project over to the tribe.

The precedent to this action was set in the 1930's when the Federal Power Commission issued a license to the Montana Power Company authorizing the construction of Kerr Dam on the Flathead River in Montana. It was necessary for the Montana Power Co. to compensate the Flathead Indian Tribe for power-site values in connection with the right-of-way required for Kerr Dam and Reservoir. Over a period of approximately 20 years payments in the amount of $2,929,000 would be made to the Flathead Indian Tribe as compensation for the use of the land for the power development. The Montana Power Co. is required to renew the lease at the end of 20 years.

In comparison to what the Flathead Indian Tribe is getting for only 2,100 acres of land at Kerr Dam, I do not feel that it is too much to ask that the Crow Indians be paid $5 million for a project which will furnish cheap power, irrigation, flood control, business, employment and security in eastern Montana and northern Wyoming.

The President states in his veto message that the 7,000 acres of land involved is uninhabitated and consists almost wholly of inaccessible land, largely of bare, precipitous canyon walls. This is generally true, but apparently the President and his advisers have failed to give consideration to several important factors.

An irrigation dam at Yellowtail, built by the tribe and paid for out of tribal funds, will be inundated at a loss to the tribe of several hundred thousand dollars. In addition, an important fact to consider is that water belonging to the Crow Indian Tribe will be diverted off the reservation for irrigation of twenty to twenty-five thousand acres of non-Indian lands.

This payment is not based on the estimated actual value of the 7,000 acres of land involved, the site is worth a great deal more than the actual price of the land. The Bureau of Reclamation is paying for the value of the land as a dam site, a sound business venture in view of a multipurpose project which will be fully repayable with interest.

President Eisenhower states in his message that "general principles of constitutional law exclude power site values in determining just compensation."

However, in the Department of Interior report on Senate Joint Resolution 135 dated February 27, 1956, the following policy was set forth:

When the United States seeks to acquire Indian tribal lands for reservoir purposes, however, we believe that principles of just compensation in the constitutional sense are not necessarily determinative of the measure of what constitutes a fair payment and that, accordingly, if at all possible, evaluation and acquisition should be accomplished by administrative and legislative, rather than judicial, means. In particular cases of such acquisition, it is appropriate, we believe, for an executive agency to recommend to the Congress—and it is of course within the province of the Congress to establish—compensation, or the principles to govern its ascertainment, upon the basis of factors additional to those by which just compensation is measurable judicially. We have so concluded because situations involving acquisition for reservoir purposes of tribal property present unique cases.

The Department made its recommendations to Congress, and Congress has established compensation in the amount of $5 million, taking into consideration additional factors to those by which just compensation is measurable judicially.

I still maintain that the Crow Tribe has made an offer that is eminently fair. This offer has been approved by Congress and the majority of interested parties have approved the proposed settlement.

If these land negotiations are forced into the courts, it will mean considerable delay. In addition, such a course will add another black mark on our treatment of the American Indian.

While the future of Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir is very bleak at the moment, I sincerely hope that some means can be worked out whereby construction of this project can be gotten underway, avoiding any unjust treatment of any interested parties.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial indicating the sentiment of the majority of Montanans, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. The editorial comes from the June 8 issue of the Ekalaka Eagle, Ekalaka, Mont.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CROWS AREN'T SILLY INDIANS

The Crow was smart enough never to meet the United States Army on the battlefield, and while their courage was never questioned, their ability to think was respected. They are still proving they are smart.

There is some confusion over who is right regarding the price for the Yellowtail damsite, and the fact that the Indians have stood and spoken their piece is probably a factor in the United States Government not having another black mark against it in its dealings with the original landholders.

Agitation around Billings and Hardin has been somewhat acute of late over the status of the situation. Of course, the prospect of having another $5 million floating around the neighborhood is not one to displease any businessman. Naturally, it is fairly safe to assume that the Billings and Hardin Chambers of Commerce are preponderantly composed of businessmen, so some have been led or misled into the easy belief that the personal self-interest of those who hope to garner in a healthy share of the easy money is responsible for all the fuss, outside that caused by the negotiations between Government and the Crow tribal council.

However, there is more than the above consideration involved in Congress' recent approval of a conference committee recommendation that the right-of-way claim of the Crow Indians be settled for $5 million.

Those who insist that the 7,000 acres is almost worthless as grazing land are probably 100 percent correct in their analysis. They might be even more right if they said it was worse than useless as agricultural land. It might also be a poor spot to set up a department store or a service station. However, the engineers declare that it is a favorable and advantageous spot upon which to build a dam—namely, Yellowtail. Thus, it would seem, a fair way to look

at it, would be to disregard the useless aspects of the land, and evaluate it on the basis of what it is good for—namely, a damsite. If this is so, it seems reasonable to compare the right-of-way price asked for Yellowtail's 7,000 acres, with what has been paid in the past for comparable sites for comparable purposes.

One such comparison comes rather readily to hand, having been, apparently with telling effect, used by most of the Montana congressional delegation. At Kerr Dam, the Montana Power Co., under its present agreement will pay $2,950,000 for a lease for 20 years. This figure, projected over a 50-year pay period, would amount to $7,375,000. This goes to the Flathead Tribe, and the Montana Power Co. only gets a lease instead of an outright sale, there is less acreage involved, and less power output than is expected from Yellowtail.

The $5 million figure was set by the Crows as just. Some Congressmen don't think it's a good deal. As some others point out, there was a fellow named Custer, who once ran into a little trouble with the Sioux who hadn't quite a square deal from some Congressmen, and had had some conditions more or less forced upon them. The Crows are not silly, and it looks like a good idea to accept a fair proposition when it is offered, even though dealing with a peaceful tribe, which has always managed to get along one way or another with the white men.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to have for a moment the attention of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. First, I wish to say that I desire to associate myself with every word spoken by the Senator from Montana in regard to the Yellowtail Dam veto message of the President. I should like to ask the Senator from Montana if he agrees with me that a reading of the President's veto message would seem to indicate that the President based his veto message largely upon his view as to what the commercial value of the land might be, overlooking completely the fact that we are dealing with Indian tribal lands which, to the Indians, are, of course, of much greater value than the commercial value would be to non-Indians.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct; though I will say that so far as the land is concerned, it is not what we would call profitable land at the moment. But the important thing is that the dam site land is worth many times what was involved in the joint resolution vetoed by the President.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator pointed out in his statement that the land is not of great commercial value at the present time. Of course, it has a commercial value which is paramount when the court comes to allow payment for the land.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. The point which needs to be stressed in the debate—and I think this is only the opening of the debate, because the implications of the veto message, in my opinion, are exceedingly serious when it comes to the development of the water resources of our country—is that when we are dealing with tribal land, and we take tribal land away from the Indian tribes, the Indian tribes have no access to other tribal lands. Is not that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Therefore, from the standpoint of the Indian tribes, it is rather difficult for the white man to appreciate fully the fact that limited though the area of the tribal land is, still the Indian nation looks upon it from the standpoint of the Indians' national interest, because in the thinking of the Indians, they still say their tribal land is all that is left to maintain the tradition and respect of the Indian nations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. In a sense, it is the Indians' sovereignty. It represents to the Indian his peculiar status; and when he loses it bit by bit, as he is and has been losing it for decades past, it means that much more is being taken away, and his domain is being reduced to that extent.

Mr. MORSE. That is why the Senator from Montana was so right in emphasizing in his statement the observation made by the Department of the Interior officials themselves, when they pointed out in their report that in their view this is purely a legislative problem; it is a determination which ought to be made through the legislative process, and not through the judicial process.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There can be no doubt about it.

Mr. MORSE. I was very much disappointed by the veto message of the President. I should like to digress quickly to say that what I may say about his veto message has nothing to do with the very deep feeling of concern I have at this moment for the welfare of the President with respect to the state of his health.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to associate myself in that respect with the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I join with all Americans, as I have ever since the alarming and shocking news came over the air in the first instance, in frequent prayers for the complete and quick recovery of the President of the United States.

But we have legislative duties to perform when it comes to carrying on the functions of the Government, and in my opinion, the President of the United States was utterly wrong in his veto of the Yellowtail bill. Moreover, the veto message does not contain a word which indicates that the President recognizes an understanding on his part of the value of tribal land to an Indian tribe.

To talk about tribal land from the standpoint of commercial value to the white man overlooks the whole history of Indian problems. As tribal land it is worth so much more to the Indians than any commercial value which could be put on it by way of a condemnation proceeding.

I think it is alarming that the President of the United States has shown such a complete lack of understanding of this Indian problem. Furthermore, the junior Senator from Montana has performed a service in pointing out the effect the dam will have on portions of the Indian tribal land which is of great agricultural importance to the Indians.

As the President pointed out in his veto message, a great deal of the land is a rocky type and is inaccessible terrain. But the President does not take into account, I respectfully say, the effect of the flooding of the land which is not rocky and is not of rough terrain, but which is of great importance to this Indian tribe.

Lastly, I ask the Senator from Montana if he does not think the veto message will be very welcome to the private utilities, who so obviously desire to slow down, under this administration, the maximum development of the power resources of our country?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Generally speaking, what the Senator from Oregon says is true. But in this particular instance the private utilities in the State of Montana have never opposed the building of the Yellowtail project by the Federal Government.

I may point out, as a comparison between the Yellowtail Dam and the Kerr Dam, that the Kerr Dam was built on land leased from the Flathead Indian Tribe, and is returning more in the way of revenue than would the Yellowtail Dam, even though it would not produce as much in the way of kilowatt power.

I think it ought to be pointed out also that the money which congressional authority would have allowed to be appropriated and obligated to the Crow Indian Tribe would have been fully repayable and would have been a part of the entire cost of the project once it was completed. The Government of the United States would not have lost a penny. Furthermore, after the cost of the project was repaid, with interest, to the Government, the revenues accrued thereafter would go into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. The private utilities are capable of recognizing, apparently from the standpoint of local economic interest, the advantage of going forward with the proposed legislation, apparently in the hope they might gain something from it through other approaches to the situation.

But nationwide the utility forces simply do not want to see any Government projects go ahead for the time being. Therefore, I am satisfied that there will be great rejoicing over the veto message in the offices of the private utilities.

Once again, the message is fuel for the private utilities. No new starts until first they get a monopolistic control over the power resources. Then there will be enthusiasm for new starts, but under the sponsorship of the private utilities.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Three years and six months under this administration and no new starts.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. First, I express my solicitude to the junior Senator from Montana, to his colleague, and to the people of their State over the veto of the Yellowtail Dam bill, so far as it applied to the Crow Indians. I feel the people of Montana are particularly to be commiserated with because, under this administration, our international relationships with Canada on the Upper Columbia have become so deteriorated that the

great Libby project in Montana has been stalled for many years.

Is it the intention of the junior Senator from Montana and his illustrious senior colleague to attempt to have the bill passed notwithstanding the objections of the President of the United States, or has that decision not yet been reached?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Senator MURRAY and I have considered that question, but in view of the fact that the resolution passed the House by a vote of approximately 170 to 130, I regret to say that we do not think the necessary votes could be obtained to override the veto. We considered seriously whether there was a possibility of overriding the veto, but we feel at this moment that the votes to do so cannot be obtained.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The State of Montana has lost in more than one respect under this administration. Not only has the great Libby Dam been held up, because of the very unfortunate manner in which ex-governor Jordan of Idaho has handled the affairs of the International Joint Commission, which is supposed to negotiate with our Canadian neighbors; but now the bill providing funds for the reimbursement of the Crow Indian Tribe has now been vetoed, and the Yellowtail Dam has, thereby, gone by the board, at least for the time being.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Last year Congress appropriated approximately $4 million to start the construction of the Yellowtail Dam. Previous to that, about $2,500,000 had already been spent in preconstruction engineering studies.

The Senate only last week restored $10 million which had been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, but which had been eliminated by the House. So at long last we were in good shape to go ahead, even after 12 years, because the Yellowtail was authorized first in the Missouri Basin project bill in 1944. It is heart rending to have come this close and then be defeated.

All the Indians of the United States are entitled to equitable consideration. The history of the treatment of our Indians during the long period of the Nation's existence has been one of which we should very well be ashamed.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Always it is one excuse, then another excuse, from the administration. In one instance a great multi-purpose dam is not fair to private interests; in another instance, our relations with Canada must be taken into consideration. Always, there is some excuse not to go ahead.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It seems, however, that the administration can advocate the Aswan Dam on the upper Nile, and a "TVA" on the Jordan. But when it comes to serving the American people, what consideration does the administration give them? Why does it not advocate and work for the development of our own resources for our own people? Every project of the type of Hungry Horse, Libby, and Yellowtail is fully repayable. This is no giveaway, I repeat, but an investment in and for America.

Mr. NEUBERGER. High dams are for export only. Under this administration we evidently will finance multipurpose dams everywhere except the United States of America.

MRS. ANNA ELIZABETH DOHERTY—RETURN OF ENROLLED BILL TO THE HOUSE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the resolution (H. Con. Res. 247), requesting the return of enrolled bill H. R. 1913, which was read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill (H. R. 1913) for the relief of Mrs. Anna Elizabeth Doherty. If and when said bill is returned by the President, the action of the Presiding Officers of the two Houses in signing said bill shall be deemed rescinded; and the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed, in the reenrollment of said bill, to make the following corrections:

In line 5 of the enrolled bill strike out the figures "3,613.30" and insert in lieu thereof "3,116.70", and in line 10, strike out "October 31" and insert in lieu thereof "September 30."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE—BILL PASSED OVER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume the consideration of bills on the calendar. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill (S. 3430) to promote progress in medicine and to advance the national health and welfare by creating a national library of medicine?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the present consideration of the bill. I did, however, introduce a bill almost identical in character, providing for the specific location of the library in the city of Chicago. A companion bill was introduced in the House of Representatives. My colleague from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is interested in the bill and is a member of the committee which reported it. Under the circumstances, since he is not present at the moment, I respectfully request that the bill be passed over to the next calendar call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over to the next calendar call.

SUITS FOR DAMAGES BY AUTOMOBILE DEALERS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3879) to enable automobile dealers to bring suit for damages sustained by reason of bad faith with respect to their franchises, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, over, by request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that Order No. 2095, Senate bill 3879, will be brought before the Senate by motion in the near future. We have received several requests that it be brought up by motion.

While I do not expect to take any precipitate action, it is the intention of the leadership in the not too distant future to call up the bill.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I appreciate very much what the majority leader has just said. I think that bill should be a "must" at this session of Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank my friend from Utah. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has spoken to the leadership concerning the bill a number of times. I expect the Members of the Senate to be on notice that it will be considered in the not too distant future.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is quite correct in his observations.

SALVATORE DI MORELLO

The bill (S. 1324) for the relief of Salvatore di Morello was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (9) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Salvatore di Morello may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act. The provisions of this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act.

ALEXANDER ORLOV AND HIS WIFE MARIA ORLOV

The bill (S. 1627) for the relief of Alexander Orlov and his wife Maria Orlov was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alexander Orlov and his wife, Maria Orlov, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

ILEANA ISSARESCU AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1921) for the relief of Ileana Issarescu and her children and others, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "children", to strike out "Stefan Habsburg-Lothringen,"; in line 5, after the name "Habsburg-Lothringen", to insert "and", and in line 6, after the name "Habsburg-Lothringen", to strike out "Dominic Habsburg-Lothringen, Maria Magdalena Habsburg-Lothringen, and Elizabeth Habsburg-Lothringen", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act,

Ileana Issarescu and her children, Maria Ileana Habsburg-Lothringen and Alexandra Habsburg-Lothringen, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Ileana Issarescu and her children, Maria Ileana Habsburg-Lothringen and Alexandra Habsburg-Lothringen."

NINA GREENBERG

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2229) for the relief of Nina Greenberg, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 4, after the numerals "(28)", to strike out "(c) (2)" and insert "(C) (v)," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (28) of section 212 (a) (28) (C) (v) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nina Greenberg may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act. The provisions of this act shall apply only to a ground for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

YVONNE ROHRAN (TUNG) FENG

The bill (S. 2342) for the relief of Yvonne Rohran (Tung) Feng was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yvonne Rohran (Tung) Feng shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ANNIE FIEG HILDEBRAND

The bill (S. 2586) for the relief of Annie Fieg Hildebrand was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Annie Fieg Hildebrand shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MODESTO PADILLA-CEJA AND HIS WIFE MARIA PODILLA-TOSCANO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2999) for the relief of Modesto Padilla-Ceja and his wife Maria Padilla-Toscano, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 4, after the word "wife", to strike out "Maria Padilla Toscano" and insert "Maria Toscano-Padilla", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Modesto Padilla-Ceja and his wife, Maria Toscano-Padilla shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Modesto Padilla-Ceja and his wife, Maria Toscano-Padilla."

DONALD SHANG-PEH KAO

The bill (S. 3024) for the relief of Donald Shang-Peh Kao was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Donald Shang-Peh Kao shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

GARRETT NORMAN SOULEN AND MICHAEL HARVEY SOULEN

The bill (H. R. 1484) for the relief of Garrett Norman Soulen and Michael Harvey Soulen was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ELIZABETH SHENEKJI

The bill (H. R. 7702) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Shenekji was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WAIVER OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 534) to waive certain provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House joint resolution?

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, in regard to Calendar No. 2107, House Joint Resolution 534, Calendar No. 2108, House Joint Resolution 553, Calendar No. 2109, House Joint Resolution 554, and other measures of like nature, following on the calendar, I reserve the right to object, but I shall not object. I wonder if we may have an explanation which will indicate whether these measures are precedent setting, and whether they have been screened at the Senate level rather than at the staff level. I wonder if the Senator from Utah, who I understand handled the measures, will inform the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I wish to inform the Senator from Connecticut that each one of the measures has been individually screened at the Senate level.

Mr. PURTELL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Calendar No. 2107, House Joint Resolution 534?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. R. Res. 534), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 2, line 1, after the name "Ciacio", to strike out "Mrs. Hanum Nigogoshian," and on page 3, after line 22, to insert:

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Hanum Nigogoshian may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time, and passed.

WAIVING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 553) waiving certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 2, after line 8, to strike out:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Emma Green may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 3. That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Emma Green shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

On page 3, line 8, after the numeral "(9)", to insert "and (10)"; at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "this exemption" and insert "these exemptions", and in the same line, after the word "to", to strike out "a ground" and insert "grounds."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution waiving certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, and for other purposes."

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 554) for the relief of certain aliens, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 2, line 23, after the name "Ricardo Valera", to strike out "Bernardo Regino,", and on page 3, after line 17, to insert:

SEC. 5. That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Bernardo Regino. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Bernardo Regino shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 8102) to provide for the disposition of moneys arising from deductions made from carriers on account of the loss of or damage to military material in transit was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, since Order No. 2113, H. R. 8102; Order No. 2114, H. R. 8693; and Order No. 2115, H. R. 8922 are not proper calendar business, I suggest that they go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to Calendar Nos. 2113, 2114, and 2115, and they will go over.

SPECIAL CANCELING STAMP "PRAY FOR PEACE"

The bill (H. R. 692) to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "pray for peace" was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and myself, I ask unanimous consent that a brief explanation of the bill appear in the RECORD after its passage.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANAGER'S STATEMENT RE H. R. 692

The purpose of this bill is to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp bearing the words "pray for peace."

The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in its report on the bill stated:

"The committee, in acting favorably on this bill, considered that the thing of most importance to the unsettled world of today is peace, and any action taken toward achieving it is worthwhile. It was felt that the use of cancellation stamps bearing the words 'pray for peace' would encourage the great body of our people to do so, and to work actively toward its accomplishment."

MRS. WILLIAM A. CURRAN

The bill (S. 40) for the relief of Mrs. William A. Curran was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the civil-service retirement and disability fund, to Mrs. William A. Curran, of Bangor, Maine, the widow of William A. Curran, formerly an employee of the Internal Revenue Service, an annuity equal to the annuity which she would have been entitled to receive had the said William A. Curran elected, at the time of his retirement, under the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to receive a reduced annuity payable to him during his life, and an annuity equal to one-half of such reduced annuity payable after his death to the said Mrs. William A. Curran, as surviving beneficiary, the said William A. Curran having been unable because of physical and mental condition resulting from serious illness to exercise his best judgment in the selection of the most beneficial type of annuity.

SEC. 2. There shall be deducted and withheld from the annuity authorized under the first section of this act an amount equal to the amount of any refund of contributions which shall have been made on account of the death of the said William A. Curran, plus an amount equal equal to 5 per centum of the amount received by the said William A. Curran in annuity payments under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, prior to his death.

SEC. 3. No part of the annuity authorized under the first section of this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with obtaining such annuity, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the bill which has just passed was one which was introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], who is now occupying the chair; and on behalf of him, the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and myself, I ask unanimous consent that a brief explanation of the bill be printed in the RECORD after its passage.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANAGER'S STATEMENT RE S. 40

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize and direct the Civil Service Commission to pay out of any money in the civil service retirement and disability fund, to Mrs. William A. Curran, the widow of William A. Curran, formerly an employee of the Internal Revenue Service, an annuity equal to the annuity to which she would have been entitled had William A. Curran elected, at the time of his retirement, to receive a reduced annuity payable to him during his life and an annuity equal to one-half of his earned annuity payable after his death to Mrs. Curran, as surviving beneficiary.

The distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] is familiar with the pertinent circumstances of this case.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 274) citing Joseph Bruno for contempt of the United States Senate was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 2120, Senate Resolution 274; Calendar No. 2121, Senate Resolution 275; Calendar No. 2122, Senate Resolution 276; Calendar No. 2123, Senate Resolution 277; Calendar No. 2124, Senate Resolution 278; and Calendar No. 2125, Senate Resolution 279 go over as not being proper calendar business. They should be brought up on motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and Calendar Nos. 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, and 2125 will go over.

HAZEL ELIZABETH SCOTT

The bill (S. 2827) for the relief of Hazel Elizabeth Scott was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hazel Elizabeth Scott shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

WALTRAUD GRETE SCHRAMM

The bill (S. 2864) for the relief of Waltraud Grete Schramm was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (9) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Waltraud Grete Schramm, the fiancée of Frank H. Schopfer, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a non-

immigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months, if the administrative authorities find (1) that the said Waltraud Grete Schramm is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Frank H. Schopfer and (2) that she is otherwise admissible under the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Waltraud Grete Schramm, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Waltraud Grete Schramm, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Waltraud Grete Schramm, as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee. The provisions of this act shall apply only to a ground for exclusion under section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act.

EDITH JOHANNA AUGUSTA KIENEST

The bill (S. 2959) for the relief of Edith Johanna Augusta Kienest was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (9) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Edith Johanna August Kienest may be admitted to the United States for permanent residense if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That her marriage to her United States citizen fiancé, Specialists 3 John Anderson, shall occur not later than 6 months following the date of the enactment of this act. The provisions of this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act.

FRANCESCO ZAMMUTO

The bill (S. 3000) for the relief of Francesco Zammuto was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (9) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Francesco Zammuto may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act. The provisions of this act shall apply only to a ground for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act.

KIYOSHI KINOSHITA

The bill (S. 3009) for the relief of Kiyoshi Kinoshita was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Kiyoshi Kinoshita, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of S. Sgt. Robert A. Kremp, a citizen of the United States.

MARIANNE EDER DUNBAR

The bill (S. 3100) for the relief of Marianne Eder Dunbar was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Marianne Eder Dunbar may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

MOSES ROSENBERG

The bill (S. 3208) for the relief of Moses Rosenberg was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Moses Rosenberg may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

ROBERTO C. BARGAS AND ROSENDA C. BARGAS

The bill (S. 3402) for the relief of Roberto C. Bargas and Rosenda C. Bargas was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Robert C. Bargas and Rosenda C. Bargas, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Sgt. Alberto Bargas, a citizen of the United States.

ELIZABETH M. A. DE CUEVAS FAURE

The bill (S. 3579) for the relief of Elizabeth M. A. de Cuevas Faure was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provision of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 352 of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall not be held to be applicable to Elizabeth M. A. de Cuevas Faure: *Provided*, That she return to the United States for permanent residence within 2 years following the effective date of this act.

FALSE SWEARING BY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 374) to provide for extension and suspension, in certain cases, of statutes of limitation on false swearing by Government employees with respect to subversive activities and connections, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, may we have an explanation of that bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation of Calendar No. 2135, Senate bill 374, is requested.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the bill simply extends from 3 to 6 years the period of the statute of limitations with respect to prosecutions against those taking false oaths in subversion cases.

Mr. PURTELL. May I inquire of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina if it is not a fact that it also suspends the statute of limitations for the period of employment?

Mr. ERVIN. The bill in effect provides that. It provides that the statute does not start to run until the individual is discharged from Government service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Calendar No. 2135, Senate bill 374?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to study the bill until the next call of the calendar, but I want to make a statement about my position, which has nothing to do with the particular matter of the crime involved, for no Member of the Senate is more opposed to subversive activities than I am. I stand on my record of 12 years in the Senate in seeking at all times to protect the procedural rights of the guilty as well as the innocent under our system of government, because if we do not do so, we can very well chip away the whole foundation of the judicial process.

In this matter, the statute of limitations is pretty important to free men. It has been put into our law to protect persons under the presumption-of-innocence doctrine. Six years is a pretty long time for a statute of limitations to run, particularly in connection with a criminal matter. Witnesses die, and the human memory fails. We lawyers know how difficult it is to always be sure of the reliability of a witness trying to recall something 6 years after the fact. I wish some other subject matter were involved, though my position would be the same. I should at least like to have time to study the bill. I am not sure that this is the kind of bill which ought to be considered on a call of the Unanimous-Consent calendar. All I am doing, in temporarily objecting to the consideration of the bill, is being consistent with a long record of mine in the Senate on proposals to extend the statute of limitations.

If we study the history of our statutes of limitations, it will be found that great fights have been won in connection with this protection. I have always, as a lawyer, taken the point of view that an efficient and effective prosecutor's office and police department can collect the evidence on violations of the laws within a shorter period of time than that proposed in the extension of the statute of limitations.

Therefore, for the time being, I object, although I shall be glad to have the bill brought up on motion at any time, so that full debate can be had on it, rather than have the discussion limited by the 5-minute rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the consideration of Calendar No. 2135, Senate bill 374, and the bill will go over.

HSU JEN-YUAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2069) for the relief of Hsu Jen-Yuan, also known as Joseph Jen-Yuan Hsu, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding any other provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hsu Jen-Yuan, also known as Joseph Jen-Yuan Hsu, shall be held to be classifiable as a nonimmigrant student under section 101 (a) (15) (F) of the act and permitted to remain in the United States for a period of not more than 3 years, or until such time as he obtains his doctor's degree, whichever occurs sooner.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WACLAW TADEUSZ NOWOSIELSKI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2793) for the relief of Waclaw Tadeusz Nowosielski which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Waclaw Tadeusz Nowosielski. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Waclaw Tadeusz Nowosielski shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HARRIET E. VAN TASSEL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2805) for the relief of Harriet E. Van Tassel, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Harriet E. Van Tassel shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 6, 1950.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MOSES RAKOCINSKI (RADOCZYNSKI)

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2943) for the relief of Moses Rakocinski (Radoczynski), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 3, after the word "paragraphs", to insert "(9) and", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (9) and (19) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Moses Rakocinski (Rakoczynski) may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act. The provisions of this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3617) to amend Title 18, United States Code, to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. I ask that the bill go over, as not being proper calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 782) to prevent citizens of the United States of questionable loyalty to the United States Government from accepting any office or employment in or under the United Nations, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over, as not being proper calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

MARIA VERONICA DE PATAKY AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2294) for the relief of Maria Veronica de Pataky and others, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 4, after the word "Act", to strike out "Maria Veronica de Pataky, Coloman de Pataky,"; and in line 5, after the name "Beregi", to strike out the comma and "Oscar Beregi, Junior,", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Oscar Beregi and Margreth Leiss von Laimburg shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Oscar Beregi and Margreth Leiss von Laimburg."

CHRISTINA ARUTUNIAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2954) for the relief of Christina Arutunian, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 4, after the name "Christina", to strike out "Arutunian" and insert "Arutjuenjan", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Christina Arutjuenjan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Christina Arutjuenjan."

KAPPAKA SITA RAO AND CHILD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3212) for the relief of Kappaka Sita Rao and her minor child, Kappaka Vijalakshmi Rao which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 4, after the word "Act", to strike out "Kappaka Sita Rao" and insert "Sita Koppaka Rao"; and in line 5, after the word "child", to strike out "Kappaka Vijalakshmi Rao" and insert "Vijayalakshmi Koppaka Rao", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of section 203 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sita Koppaka Rao and her minor child, Vijayalakshmi Koppaka Rao, shall be deemed to be accompanying their husband and father, respectively, Kappaka Viswesuara Rao, to the United States within the meaning of section 203 (a) (1), if visas are issued to them at any time within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Sita Koppaka Rao and Vijayalakshmi Koppaka Rao."

CLEOPATRA VASILIADES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3235) for the relief of Cleopatra Vasiliades, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 4, after the name "Cleopatra", to strike out "Vasiliades" and insert "Vasiliadis", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Cleopatra Vasiliadis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Cleopatra Vasiliadis."

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The joint resolution (H. R. 565) for the relief of certain aliens was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WAIVER OF CERTAIN SUBSECTIONS OF SECTION 212 (a), IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT IN BEHALF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 581) to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WAIVER OF CERTAIN SUBSECTIONS OF SECTION 212 (A), IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT, IN BEHALF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 590) to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 535) for the relief of certain aliens, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 4, after the name "Joseph", to strike out "Ezra Chitayat, Violet Chitayat, Georgette Chitayat, Linda Chitayat."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time, and passed.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 555) to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, after the enacting clause, to strike out:

That in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Tokiyo Nakajima, the fiance of Richard L. Brinkley, a citizen of the United States, and her child, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Tokiyo Nakajima is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Richard L. Brinkley and that they are found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Tokiyo Nakajima and her child, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Tokiyo Nakajima and her child, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Tokiyo Nakajima and her child as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fee.

SEC. 2.

On page 2, at the beginning of line 19, to change the section number from "3" to "2"; at the beginning of line 22, to change the section number from "4" to "3"; and on page 3, at the beginning of line 3, to change the section number from "5" to "4."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

WAIVER OF CERTAIN SUBSECTIONS OF SECTION 212 (A), IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT, IN BEHALF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 566) to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, after line 7, to strike out:

SEC. 4. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gertrud Koch, the fiance of Frank J. Kleczewski, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Gertrud Koch is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Frank J. Kleczewski and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws other than the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (28) (C) (iv) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event of the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Gertrud Koch, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Gertrud Koch, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Gertrud Koch as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 4. That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (28) (C) (iv) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gertrud Koch may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That her marriage to her United States citizen fiance, Frank J. Kleczewski, shall occur not later than 6 months following the date of the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 580) for the relief of certain aliens was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 472) for the relief of certain aliens which had been reported from the Committee on the Juciary with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "act", to strike out "Isak Herstig, Constantine George Kaltsoyannis,"; at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "Solomon Joseph Sadakne,"; and in line 7, after the word "and", to strike out "Jose Cristiano Vieira."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 533) to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, after line 7, to strike out:

SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act Ng May Ngon shall be held and considered to be the minor natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Ng Ten Bow, citizens of the United States.

On page 3, after line 3, to strike out:

SEC. 8. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Yoshiko (Clara) Oe, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. Justin Gill, a citizen of the United States.

And on page 4, after line 8, to strike out:

SEC. 14. For the purposes of sections 203 (a) (3) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eugenia Gierik shall be held and considered to be the natural-born minor alien child of Kontsantin Gierik and Theodora Gierik, permanent residents of the United States.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 7763) to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to expedite the final determination of the claims, and

for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I request that the bill go over, on the ground that it is not proper calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 7225) to amend the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I request that this bill go over, on the ground that it is not proper calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

DISPOSAL OF TIN SMELTER AT TEXAS CITY, TEX.—JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 607) to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very desirous that the smelter at Texas City be disposed of to private interests. However, this measure certainly is not of the type which should be considered on the Unanimous Consent Calendar. The joint resolution comes from a committee of which I am a member. If the entire Senate had listened to the discussion which occurred in the committee, it would recognize that this is a measure of considerable import. I think a debate record should be made on it.

Therefore, I object, as of now, to consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

PROTECTION OF WALRUSES

The bill (S. 3778) to amend the act for the protection of walruses was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of August 18, 1941 (ch. 368, 55 Stat. 632; 48 U. S. C. 248), is amended by changing the colon at the end of the first proviso to a comma and by inserting thereafter: "and said skins or hides may be exported from the Territory subject to such limitations on numbers and sizes of skins or hides exported as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe for the purpose of protecting and conserving the walrus herds:".

SEC. 2. Section 1 of said act of August 18, 1941, is further amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and by inserting thereafter: "*Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe by regulations the extent to which, the times when, and the means by which, walruses may be taken for purposes other than food and clothing and the extent to which such walruses or the parts thereof may be possessed, sold, bartered, purchased, or exported. Any regulations so prescribed shall prohibit the hunting of walruses with the use of airplanes and helicopters and shall prohibit the taking of any walrus by a nonnative other than one bull walrus per year which may be taken only when the nonnative is accompanied by a native guide. The meat of any walrus taken by a nonnative shall be given to natives, and the Secretary of the Interior is directed to prohibit the taking of waluses by nonnatives whenever he determines that such taking may endanger the food supply of the natives. No nonnative shall take any walrus under any regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior without first having procured a walrus hunting license which shall be issued in the manner prescribed by subdivision I, section 10, of the Alaska game law of January 13, 1925, as amended (43 Stat. 744; 48 U. S. C. 199). The fee for such license shall be $25 for nonnative residents of the Territory of Alaska and $50 for nonresidents. For the purposes of this act, residence shall be governed by the conditions prescribed in section 3 of said Alaska game law. After deducting the amount that may be retained as compensation by persons authorized to sell such licenses, the amount of such retained compensation to be determined in accordance with subdivision K of section 10 of said Alaska game law, the proceeds from the sale of walrus hunting licenses shall be accounted for and disposed of in the manner prescribed by the said subdivision K."

ALLOTMENT OF LANDS OF THE CROW TRIBE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3698) to amend the act of June 4, 1920, as amended, providing for allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 2, line 1, after the word "by", to strike out "law" and insert "law, including legal rights for access and ways of necessity,"; and in line 2, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and "*Provided however*, That no conveyance ratified, confirmed, or validated by this act shall be construed to convey to the original grantee of any allottee, his heirs or assigns, any mineral rights in the lands to which this act applies. All such minerals, including oil and gas, shall, upon the expiration of the 50-year mineral reservation to the tribe, become the property of the allottee or his heirs or devisees subject to any outstanding leases made by the tribe, regardless of the disposition made of the surface of the allotted land by such allottee, heir, or devisee.", so as to make this bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 2 of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 751), as amended by the act of June 8, 1940 (54 Stat. 252), is hereby repealed. All conveyances heretofore made in violation of the acreage limitations contained in such paragraph are hereby validated, ratified, and confirmed insofar as such acreage limitations are concerned, but the right to challenge such conveyances for any other cause recognized by law, including legal rights for access and ways of necessity, shall not be affected by this act: *Provided, however*, That no conveyance ratified, confirmed, or validated by this act shall be construed to convey to the original grantee of any allottee, his heirs or assigns, any mineral rights in the lands to which this act applies. All such minerals, including oil and gas, shall, upon the expiration of the 50-year mineral reservation to the tribe, become the property of the allottee or his heirs or devisees subject to any outstanding leases made by the tribe, regardless of the disposition made of the surface of the allotted land by such allottee, heir, or devisee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL BUREAU FOR THE PUBLICATION OF CUSTOMS TARIFFS

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 178) to authorize an appropriation to provide for certain costs of United States participation in the International Bureau for the Publication of Customs Tariffs was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State the sum of $44,975 for payment by the United States of certain contributions for the support of the International Bureau for the Publication of Customs Tariffs for the period beginning April 1, 1950, and extending through the fiscal year expiring June 30, 1957.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the point where action was taken on Calendar No. 2161, Senate Joint Resolution 178, a statement which I submit on behalf of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, in explanation of this measure.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE ON BEHALF OF FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Senate Joint Resolution 178 is an authorization for the appropriation of $44,975 for the payment of past due contributions to the International Bureau for the publication of Customs Tariffs.

In January of this year, the Senate approved a protocol to the 1890 convention establishing this Bureau which serves the interests of many nations by translating into five languages and publishing the tariffs and customs laws and regulations of member governments. The protocol increased the United States contribution from some $2,000 per year to about $9,000 per year.

The joint resolution will authorize the appropriation of funds to pay past due contributions from 1950 through 1956.

The total annual cost of operating this technical International Bureau is $163,000. The United States contribution constitutes 5.3 percent of the total annual budget.

The services which this Bureau renders to American business interests engaged in international trade is extremely important. The services are provided at a cost much less than would be the case if the United States were to undertake on its own to render similar services.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 501) to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences of

the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE BETWEEN LUBEC, MAINE, AND NEW BRUNSWICK, CANADA

The bill (S. 3527) authorizing the State Highway Commission of the State of Maine to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State Highway Commission of the State of Maine is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, across the waters between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada, so far as the United States has jurisdiction over such waters. Such construction, maintenance, and operation shall be in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and shall be subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act and to the approval of the proper authorities of the Government of Canada.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the point where we had under consideration Calendar No. 2164, Senate bill 3527, a statement which I submit on behalf of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, in explanation of this measure.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE ON BEHALF OF FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

This bill (S. 3527) authorizes the State of Maine to construct, maintain and operate a free highway bridge across the international boundary into New Brunswick. The cost of construction of this bridge is to be borne by the State of Maine and the Province of New Brunswick. No appropriation of Federal funds is called for by this resolution.

The only purpose in passing this resolution is to give the necessary Federal approval for State action involving the construction of an international bridge.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3581) to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, this bill is the unfinished business. For that reason, I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over. It will automatically be laid before the Senate at 2 o'clock.

MODIFICATION OF RESTRICTIONS RELATIVE TO HOLDING OFFICE UNDER THE UNITED STATES

The bill (S. 3681) to modify certain restrictions with respect to holding more than one office under the United States was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence of section 2 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, eighteen hundred and ninety-five, and for other purposes", approved July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 205), as amended, is amended by striking out "two thousand five hundred dollars" and inserting in lieu thereof "five thousand dollars".

EMERGENCY CREDIT TO FARMERS AND STOCKMEN

The bill (S. 3559) to amend the act of August 31, 1954, as amended, so as to extend the availability of emergency credit to farmers and stockmen, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation is requested of Calendar No. 2167, Senate bill 3559.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this bill would extend for 2 years—that is, until June 30, 1959—the authority to make economic disaster loans under Public Law 727, 83d Congress. In addition to an extension for 2 years, the Department of Agriculture has asked that the amount of $15 million be increased to $65 million. The committee felt that an increase to $50 million would be sufficient, and, with the committee amendment, the bill so provides.

In response to a question asked of me a while ago by the Senator from Connecticut I checked with the Department its past operations under the program which would be extended and expanded by the bill. As of December 31, 1955, the Department has collected 96.6 percent of the matured principal on these loans. As the Senator knows, the program has operated in economic disaster areas. The funds are loaned to farmers in need. The information is that because of economic emergencies in various parts of the country, many applications are now pending; and the Department, as well as every farm organization from which we heard, urgently requested that the bill be enacted.

Mr. PURTELL. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his explanation. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3559) to amend the act of August 31, 1954, as amended, so as to extend the availability of emergency credit to farmers and stockmen, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the word "out", to strike out "the phrase 'aggregating not to exceed $15,000,000,'. Section 3 of said act is amended by inserting in the first sentence thereof, after the words 'this act,' the following: 'but not to exceed $50,000,000 after the enactment of the 1956 amendment of this act,'" and insert "'$15,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$50,000,000'.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of August 31, 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 999; 69 Stat. 223), is further amended by striking out the figure "1957" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "1959"; and by striking out "$15 million" and inserting in lieu thereof "$50 million."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 10285) to merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks, to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks, to provide for supervision of production credit associations, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over. It is not a bill which should appropriately be considered upon a call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3982) to provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, since the amount involved in this bill will ultimately be approximately $89 million, in the opinion of the Senator from Connecticut, it is not appropriate for consideration upon a call of the calendar. However, I have no objection to the bill. I hope it will be taken up on motion, at which time I shall be glad to vote for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 9052) to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 2 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over, on the ground that it is not appropriate for consideration upon a call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED TO FOOT OF THE CALENDAR

The bill (S. 3363) for the relief of Miroslav Slovak was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, we have no report on the bill; and for that reason, and that reason alone, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Connecticut withhold his objection for a moment? The Chair notes that the Senator from North Carolina is seeking recognition.

Mr. PURTELL. I am very happy to withhold my objection.

Mr. ERVIN. There is a report on the bill. It may be that the Senator will be willing to ask that the bill go to the foot of the calendar, rather than be passed over.

Mr. PURTELL. I have no objection to the bill going to the foot of the calendar. However, the report was not available when we went through the calendar today, as late as 12 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut ask that the bill go to the foot of the calendar?

Mr. PURTELL. I ask that the bill be passed to the foot of the calendar, in the hope that we may have time to study the report before the end of the calendar is reached.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

LT. COMDR. MORTIMER T. CLEMENT

The bill (H. R. 4873) for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Mortimer T. Clement, Medical Corps, United States Navy, retired, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN ALASKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3344) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the Territory of Alaska certain lands in the city of Sitka, known as Baranof Castle site.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, lines 4 and 5, it is proposed to strike out: ", within a period of 25 years from the date of the conveyance"; and on page 2, lines 8 and 9, to strike out ", without the consent of the Secretary of the Interior."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. MORSE. All it means is that if the lands are not used for the purposes for which they are held, they will revert to the United States. I see no reason why we should limit the reversion to a period of 25 years from the date of conveyance as the period of time within which the lands may not be used for other purposes. Let Congress decide 25 years from now what disposition it may wish to make of the lands, if it is desired to use them for purposes other than those set forth in the conveyance.

I have no objection to the conveyance, but I believe that the reverter should be general, and should not give the Territory of Alaska the right to hold the lands for 25 years for a certain purpose, and then cease to use them for that purpose, without the lands reverting to the United States after a period of 25 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the purpose of the amendment is that if the Territory of Alaska does not use the land for the purposes intended, even after the period of 25 years, the land will revert to the United States.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF S. 3344

This bill would clarify the title to a small tract in Alaska (slightly in excess of 1⅓ acres) by providing for its conveyance to the Territory of Alaska. This tract, the Baranof Castle site, was the scene in 1867 of the transfer of Alaska from Russia to the United States and is desired by the Territory to be developed as an historic site. The tract was "transferred" to the city of Sitka in 1932 subject to the condition that if it should ever be transferred, or used for commercial purposes, title would revert to the United States. The city of Sitka wishes to transfer its interest to the Territory, but there is some doubt as to the nature of the interest held by the city and whether title would revert to the United States if the city attempted to transfer the tract to the Territory. This bill would clear up these questions by transferring the interest of the United States to the Territory, subject to reversion to the United States if the Territory should attempt to transfer the tract.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to convey, without reimbursement therefor, to the Territory of Alaska, for use as a historic monument site, all the right, title, and interest of the United States to the following described lands, containing 1.349 acres, more or less, and improvement thereon, known as the Baranof Castle site: The tract of land formerly occupied by the Alaska Agricultural Experiment Station, more particularly shown on the plat of Sitka Townsite, Alaska, United States survey numbered 1474, tract A, approved April 2, 1925, as the United States Reserve for Agricultural Investigations and Weather Service: *Provided,* That if the Territory of Alaska shall attempt to transfer title to or control over these lands, or to devote them to a use other than as a historic monument site title thereto shall revert to the United States.

TOBACCO MARKETING QUOTA PROVISIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. (3261) to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the word "of", to strike out "tobacco," and insert "tobacco," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 312 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1312), is amended (a) by inserting in subsection (a) immediately following the words "December 1 of any marketing year" the language "with respect to flue-cured tobacco, and February 1 of any marketing year with respect to other kinds of tobacco" and (b) by striking out in subsection (b) the words "prior to the first day of December" and inserting in lieu thereof the language "not later than the first day of December with respect to flue-cured tobacco and not later than the first day of February with respect to other kinds of tobacco".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ELLENDER subsequently said: Mr. President, in connection with Calendar No. 2174, Senate bill 3261, which the Senate passed a few moments ago, I had overlooked the fact that a House bill in the same language was under consideration by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the votes by which Senate bill 3261 was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, be reconsidered, in order that I may request consideration of the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the votes by which Senate bill 3261 was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, are reconsidered.

Mr. ELLENDER. I now ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 9475, and that the Senate proceed to consider the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is discharged from the further consideration of House bill 9475.

The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9475) to amend the tobacco-marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this bill would extend the time for announcing marketing quotas for tobacco, except flue-cured tobacco, from November 30 to January 31. The bulk of the tobacco crop each year is marketed by the middle of January so that much better information as to the size of the crop is available by the end of January than in November, which is the month when the tobacco begins moving to market. The marketing quota for the next crop can therefore be much more accurately determined in January. Inability to determine the proper quota in November made it necessary for Congress to provide for revision of the 1955 and 1956 quotas for burley tobacco after they had been announced. Passage of this bill, it

is hoped, will avoid the need for such legislation by Congress in future years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 9475?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 3261 is indefinitely postponed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2572) to authorize the interchange of lands between the Department of Agriculture and military departments of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

EXPENSES OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

The bill (S. 3314) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of an advisory committee on soil and water conservation was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to pay expenses of an Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation and related matters, but such Committee members (other than ex officio members) shall not be deemed to be employees of the United States and shall not receive compensation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement explaining the bill that has just been passed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF S. 3314

This bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of the Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation. The Commission's expenses are incurred in furnishing advice to the Department and properly should be borne by the Government. The members of the Commission serve without compensation and will continue to do so. It is further in the interests of the Department that membership on the Commission not be restricted to those able to bear the expense involved in serving on it. The Department estimates that the annual expenditure provided by the bill would be about $5,000.

AMENDMENT OF SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

The bill (S. 3120) to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. This is the usual extension for 2 years, to December 31, 1958, of the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make soil conservation payments. The Secretary was given this authority in 1936, for 2 years, to give the States an opportunity to enact legislation and submit suitable plans for State programs. Twenty-four States and 2 insular areas have enacted laws providing for such programs. The remainder have not acted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h), is amended by striking out of subsection (a) "January 1, 1957" and "December 31, 1956", wherever they appear therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1959" and "December 31, 1958", respectively.

EXCHANGE OF ISOLATED PARCELS, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTER

The bill (S. 2585) to authorize an exchange of land at the Agricultural Research Center was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], am I correct in understanding that all that is involved is a transaction in which the Federal Government is exchanging certain land for land of at least equal value?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. It is land of at least equal value. In fact, it is more valuable, because the land which the Federal Government is obtaining consists of 3,126 square feet, for which it is exchanging 1,375 square feet. The dedication of a road cut these small parcels off from larger parcels of which they were parts, and the exchange would result in their incorporation in larger parcels to which they are adjacent.

Mr. MORSE. I commend the Senator from Louisiana for his explanation. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to convey by quitclaim deed to the Powder Mill Development Co., Inc., a parcel of land containing approximately 1,375 square feet and located on the northerly side of Selman Road, Prince Georges County, Md., and separated from the Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Md., by Selman Road and Cherry Hill Road, in exchange for that parcel of land now owned by the Powder Mill Development Co., Inc., containing approximately 3,126 square feet and located on the southerly side of the said Selman Road, Prince Georges County, Md., and adjoining other lands of the Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Md., *Provided*, That the lands so acquired from the Powder Mill Development Co., Inc., may be acquired subject to such reservations and outstanding interests as the Secretary determines will not interfere with the use thereof in connection with the Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Md.

CROP DEPREDATIONS BY WATERFOWL

The bill (S. 2732) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal and non-Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the bill just announced as being next in order was introduced by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. A house bill involving the same subject is now before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture be discharged from further consideration of House bill 7641, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the Federal and non-Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7641) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal and non-Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all after the enacting clause in H. R. 7641 be stricken, and that the language of the Senate bill, as amended by the committee amendment, be substituted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike all after the enacting clause of the House bill and insert the following:

That, for the purpose of preventing crop damage by migratory waterfowl, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available to the Secretary of the Interior such wheat, corn, or other grains, acquired through price-support operations and certified by the Commodity Credit Corporation to be available for purposes of this act or in such condition through spoilage or deterioration as not to be desirable for human consumption, as the Secretary of the Interior shall requisition pursuant to section 2 hereof. With respect to any grain thus made available, the Commodity Credit Corporation may pay packaging, transporting, handling, and other charges up to the time of delivery to one or more designated locations in each State.

SEC. 2. Upon a finding by the Secretary of the Interior that any area in the United

States is threatened with damage to farmers' crops by migratory waterfowl, whether or not during the open season for such migratory waterfowl, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to requisition from the Commodity Credit Corporation and to make available to Federal, State, or local governmental bodies or officials, or to private organizations or persons, such grain acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation through price-support operations in such quantities and subject to such regulations as the Secretary determines will most effectively lure migratory waterfowl away from crop depredations and at the same time not expose such migratory waterfowl to shooting over areas to which the waterfowl have been lured by such feeding programs.

SEC. 3. With respect to all grain made available pursuant to section 2, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be reimbursed by the Secretary of the Interior for its expenses in packaging and transporting such grain for purposes of this act.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for its investment in the grain transferred pursuant to this act.

SEC. 5. No grain shall be made available by the Commodity Credit Corporation under this act after the expiration of 3 years following its enactment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an explanation of H. R. 7641, as it has just been amended.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF H. R. 7641, AS AMENDED

The bill, with the Senate amendment, permits grain acquired through price-support operations to be used to lure migratory waterfowl from crop depradations. The grain would be requisitioned by the Secretary of the Interior from the Commodity Credit Corporation and made available by him to Federal, State, and local agencies or individuals. It would be effective only for 3 years following its enactment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, S. 2732 is indefinitely postponed.

THEFT OR CONVERSION OF THE SECURITY FOR PRICE-SUPPORT LOANS—BILL PASSED TO FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (S. 3669) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, inasmuch as we have no committee report on the bill, I ask that it go over.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have a report on the bill.

Mr. PURTELL. We had no report on the bill until 12 o'clock, when we concluded our study of calendar bills. A report has been handed to us at this moment, but we have had no chance to study it.

Mr. ELLENDER. The bill is a very simple one. It merely amends the criminal law dealing with willful theft or conversion of property owned by or pledged to the Commodity Credit Corporation by extending the law to cover property pledged to secure obligations which the Corporation has guaranteed or is obligated to purchase and by reducing the offense to a misdemeanor where the value of the property involved is $500 or less.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go to the foot of the calendar, in the hope that before we reach the consideration of bills placed at the foot of the calendar we will have an opportunity to study the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

FEDERAL FARM MORTGAGE CORPORATION LIQUIDATION PROCEDURE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2530) to repeal the authority of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to issue bonds, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments, on page 1, after the enacting clause, to strike out "That the provision contained in the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration Appropriation Act, 1955, under the heading 'Title IV, Farm Credit Administration' (68 Stat. 318), authorizing the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to issue and have outstanding at any one time bonds in an aggregate amount not exceeding $500,000,000, is hereby repealed."

And, in lieu thereof, to insert "That after the enactment of this act, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation shall not issue any bonds under the provisions of section 4 (a) of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation act, as amended (48 Stat. 345, section 14, 48 Stat. 647; 12 U. S. C. 1020c)."

On page 2, line 12, after the numeral "3," to strike out "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any mineral rights of such Corporation which remain in the Corporation on the date of enactment of this act shall be transferred immediately to the Secretary of the Interior", and insert "The Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation shall pay into the general fund of the Treasury, the amount of any capital stock in the Corporation which is owned by the United States upon the enactment of this act"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That after the enactment of this act, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation shall not issue any bonds under the provisions of section 4 (a) of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended (48 Stat. 345, sec. 14, 48 Stat. 647; 12 U. S. C. 1020c).

SEC. 2. During each calendar year, beginning with the calendar year in which this act is enacted, the costs incurred in connection with the liquidation of such Corporation shall be deducted from the amounts received from the Federal land banks on account of the sale or transfer to them of assets of such Corporation, and the balance then remaining shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 3. The Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation shall pay into the general fund of the Treasury the amount of any capital stock in the Corporation which is owned by the United States upon the enactment of this act.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an explanation of S. 2530.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill deals with liquidation of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. With the committee amendments, it would—

1. Terminate the Corporation's authority to issue bonds;

2. Permit the Corporation to use amounts received annually from the bulk sale of its assets to the Federal land banks to pay its costs of liquidation, thereby obviating the need for appropriations for that purpose; and

3. Require the remaining stock of the Corporation to be paid into the Treasury.

The committee amendments (1) revise the first section so that it will be effective to carry out its purpose of terminating the Corporation's authority to issue bonds; (2) provide for payment into the Treasury of the $10,000 representing the remaining stock in the Corporation; and (3) strike out section 3 of the bill, which provides for the immediate transfer of mineral interests to the Secretary of the Interior. Section 3 of the bill, as introduced, was inconsistent with Public Law 760, 81st Congress, which provides for the sale of such interests to the surface owners upon application until September 6, 1957, and for their transfer to the Secretary of the Interior thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSENT TO MIDDLE ATLANTIC INTERSTATE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION COMPACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3032) granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Middle Atlantic interstate forest fire protection compact which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments, on page 2, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out:

"MIDDLE ATLANTIC INTERSTATE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION COMPACT

"Article I

"The purpose of this compact is to promote effective prevention and control of forest fires in the Middle Atlantic region of the United States by the development of integrated forest fire plans, by the maintenance of adequate forest fire fighting services by the member States, by providing for mutual aid in fighting forest fires among the compacting States of the region and with States which are party to other regional forest fire protection compacts or agreements, and for more adequate forest protection.

"Article II

"This compact shall become operative immediately as to those States ratifying it whenever any two or more of the States of Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia, which are

contiguous have ratified it and Congress has given consent thereto. Any State not mentioned in this article which is contiguous with any member State may become a party to this compact, subject to approval by the legislature of each of the member States.

"Article III

"In each State, the State forester or officer holding the equivalent position who is responsible for forest fire control shall act as compact administrator for that State and shall consult with like officials of the other member States and shall implement cooperation between such States in forest fire prevention and control.

"The compact administrators of the member States shall coordinate the services of the member States and provide administrative integration in carrying out the purposes of this compact.

"There shall be established an advisory committee of legislators, forestry commission representatives, and forestry or forest products industries representatives which shall meet from time to time with the compact administrators. Each member State shall name one Member of the Senate and one Member of the House of Representatives who shall be designated by that State's commission on interstate cooperation, or if said commission cannot constitutionally designate the said Members, they shall be designated in accordance with laws of that State; and the governor of each member State shall appoint two representatives, one of whom shall be associated with forestry or forest products industries to comprise the membership of the advisory committee. Action shall be taken by a majority of the compacting States, and each State shall be entitled to one vote.

"The compact administrators shall formulate and, in accordance with need, from time to time, revise a regional forest fire plan for the member States.

"It shall be the duty of each member State to formulate and put in effect a forest fire plan for that State and take such measures as may be necessary to integrate such forest fire plan with the regional forest fire plan formulated by the compact administrators.

"Article IV

"Whenever the State forest-fire control agency of a member State requests aid from the State forest fire control agency of any other member State in combating, controlling, or preventing forest fires, it shall be the duty of the State forest fire control agency of that State to render all possible aid to the requesting agency which is consonant with the maintenance of protection at home.

"Article V

"Whenever the forces of any member State are rendering outside aid pursuant to the request of another member State under this compact, the employees of such State shall, under the direction of the officers of the State to which they are rendering aid, have the same powers (except the power of arrest), duties, rights, privileges, and immunities as comparable employees of the State to which they are rendering aid.

"No member State or its officers or employees rendering outside aid pursuant to this compact shall be liable on account of any act or omission on the part of such forces while so engaged, or on account of the maintenance, or use of any equipment or supplies in connection therewith: *Provided,* That nothing herein shall be construed as relieving any person from liability for his own negligent act or omission, or as imposing liability for such negligent act or omission upon any State.

"All liability, except as otherwise provided hereinafter, that may arise either under the laws of the requested State or under the laws of the aiding State or under the laws of a third State on account of or in connection with a request for aid, shall be assumed and borne by the requesting State.

"Any member State rendering outside aid pursuant to this compact shall be reimbursed by the member State receiving such aid for any loss or damage to, or expense incurred in the operation of any equipment answering a request for aid, and for the cost of all materials, transportation, wages, salaries, and subsistence of employees and maintenance of equipment incurred in connection with such request: *Provided,* That nothing herein contained shall prevent any assisting member State from assuming such loss, damage, expense, or other cost or from loaning such equipment or from donating such service to the receiving member State without charge or cost.

"Each member State shall provide for the payment of compensation and death benefits to injured employees and the representatives of deceased employees in case employees sustain injuries or are killed while rendering outside aid pursuant to this compact, in the same manner and on the same terms as if the injury or death were sustained within such State.

"For the purposes of this compact the term 'employee' shall include any volunteer or auxiliary legally included within the forest fire fighting forces of the aiding State under the laws thereof.

"The compact administrators shall formulate procedures for claims and reimbursement under the provisions of this article, in accordance with the laws of the member States.

"Article VI

"Ratification of this compact shall not be construed to affect any existing statute so as to authorize or permit curtailment or diminution of the forest-fire fighting forces, equipment, services, or facilities of any member State.

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit or restrict the powers of any State ratifying the same to provide for the prevention, control, and extinguishment of forest fires, or to prohibit the enactment or enforcement of State laws, rules, or regulations intended to aid in such prevention, control, and extinguishment in such State.

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to affect any existing or future cooperative relationship or arrangement between any Federal agency and a member State or States.

"Article VII

"The compact administrators may request the United States Forest Service to act as a research and coordinating agency of the Middle Atlantic interstate forest fire protection compact in cooperation with the appropriate agencies in each State, and the United States Forest Service may accept responsibility for preparing and presenting to the compact administrators its recommendations with respect to the regional fire plan. Representatives of any Federal agency engaged in forest fire prevention and control may attend meetings of the compact administrators.

"Article VIII

"The provisions of articles IV and V of this compact which relate to mutual aid in combating, controlling or preventing forest fires shall be operative as between any State party to this compact and any other State which is party to a regional forest fire protection compact in another region: *Provided,* That the legislature of such other State shall have given its assent to such mutual aid provisions of this compact.

"Article IX

"This compact shall continue in force and remain binding on each State ratifying it until the legislature or the Governor of such State, as the laws of such State shall provide, takes action to withdraw therefrom. Such action shall not be effective until 6 months after notice thereof has been sent by the chief executive of the State desiring to withdraw to the chief executives of all States then parties to the compact."

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

"MIDDLE ATLANTIC INTERSTATE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION COMPACT

"Article I

"The purpose of this compact is to promote effective prevention and control of forest fires in the Middle Atlantic region of the United States by the development of integrated forest fire plans, by the maintenance of adequate forest fire fighting services by the member States, and by providing for mutual aid in fighting forest fires among the compacting States of the region and with States which are party to other regional forest fire protection compacts or agreements.

"Article II

"This compact shall become operative immediately as to those States ratifying it whenever any two or more of the States of Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia which are contiguous have ratified it and Congress has given consent thereto.

"Article III

"In each State, the State forester or officer holding the equivalent position who is responsible for forest fire control shall act as compact administrator for that State and shall consult with like officials of the other member States and shall implement cooperation between such States in forest fire prevention and control.

"The compact administrators of the member States shall organize to coordinate the services of the member States and provide administrative integration in carrying out the purposes of this compact.

"The compact administrators shall formulate and, in accordance with need, from time to time, revise a regional forest fire plan for the member States.

"It shall be the duty of each member State to formulate and put in effect a forest fire plan for that State and take such measures as may be necessary to integrate such forest fire plan with the regional forest fire plan formulated by the compact administrators.

"Article IV

"Whenever the State forest fire control agency of a member State requests aid from the State forest fire control agency of any other member State in combating, controlling or preventing forest fires, it shall be the duty of the State forest fire control agency of that State to render all possible aid to the requesting agency which is consonant with the maintenance of protection at home.

"Article V

"Whenever the forces of any member State are rendering outside aid pursuant to the request of another member State under this compact, the employees of such State shall, under the direction of the officers of the State to which they are rendering aid, have the same powers (except the power of arrest), duties, rights, privileges, and immunities as comparable employees of the State to which they are rendering aid.

"No member State or its officers or employees rendering outside aid pursuant to this compact shall be liable on account of any act or omission on the part of such forces while so engaged, or on account of the maintenance or use of any equipment or supplies in connection therewith.

"All liability, except as otherwise provided hereinafter, that may arise either under the laws of the requesting State or under the laws of the aiding State or under the laws of a third State on account of or in connection with a request for aid, shall be assumed and borne by the requesting State.

"Any member State rendering outside aid pursuant to this compact shall be reimbursed by the member State receiving such aid for any loss or damage to, or expense incurred in the operation of any equipment answering a request for aid, and for the cost of all materials, transportation, wages, salaries, and maintenance of employees and equipment incurred in connection with such request: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent any assisting member State from assuming such loss, damage, expense, or other cost or from loaning such equipment or from donating such services to the receiving member State without charge or cost.

"Each member State shall provide for the payment of compensation and death benefits to injured employees and the representatives of deceased employees in case employees sustain injuries or are killed while rendering outside aid pursuant to this compact, in the same manner and on the same terms as if the injury or death were sustained within such State.

"For the purposes of this compact the term employee shall include any volunteer or auxiliary legally included within the forest fire fighting forces of the aiding State under the laws thereof.

"The compact administrators shall formulate procedures for claims and reimbursement under the provisions of this article, in accordance with the laws of the member States.

"Article VI

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to authorize or permit any member State to curtail or diminish its forest fire fighting forces, equipment, services or facilities, and it shall be the duty and responsibility of each member State to maintain adequate forest fire fighting forces and equipment to meet demands for forest fire protection within its borders in the same manner and to the same extent as if this compact were not operative.

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit or restrict the powers of any State ratifying the same to provide for the prevention, control and extinguishment of forest fires, or to prohibit the enactment or enforcement of State laws, rules, or regulations intended to aid in such prevention, control, and extinguishment in such State.

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to affect any existing or future cooperative relationship or arrangement between the United States Forest Service and a member State or States.

"Article VII

"The compact administrators may request the United States Forest Service to act as the primary research and coordinating agency of the Middle Atlantic interstate forest fire protection compact in cooperation with the appropriate agencies in each State, and the United States Forest Service may accept the initial responsibility in preparing and presenting to the compact administrators its recommendations with respect to the regional fire plan. Representatives of the United States Forest Service may attend meetings of the compact administrators.

"Article VIII

"The provisions of articles IV and V of this compact which relate to mutual aid in combating, controlling, or preventing forest fires shall be operative as between any State party to this compact and any other State which is party to a regional forest fire protection compact in another region: *Provided*, That the legislature of such other State shall have given its assent to such mutual aid provisions of this compact.

"Article IX

"This compact shall continue in force and remain binding on each State ratifying it until the legislature or the governor of such State takes action to withdraw therefrom. Such action shall not be effective until 6 months after notice thereof has been sent by the chief executive of the State desiring to withdraw to the chief executives of all States then parties to the compact."

On page 13, after line 19, to strike out:

SEC. 2. Without further submission of the compact, the consent of Congress is given to any State to become a party to it in accordance with its terms.

And, at the beginning of line 23, to change the section number from "3" to "2", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent and approval of Congress is hereby given to the Middle Atlantic Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact, as hereinafter set out. Such compact reads as follows:

"MIDDLE ATLANTIC INTERSTATE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION COMPACT

"Article I

"The purpose of this compact is to promote effective prevention and control of forest fires in the Middle Atlantic region of the United States by the development of integrated forest fire plans, by the maintenance of adequate forest fire fighting services by the member States, and by providing for mutual aid in fighting forest fires among the compacting States of the region and with States which are party to other regional forest fire protection compacts or agreements.

"Article II

"This compact shall become operative immediately as to those States ratifying it whenever any two or more of the States of Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia which are contiguous have ratified it and Congress has given consent thereto.

"Article III

"In each State the State forester or officer holding the equivalent position who is responsible for forest fire control shall act as compact administrator for that State and shall consult with like officials of the other member States and shall implement cooperation between States in forest fire prevention and control.

"The compact administrators of the member States shall organize to coordinate the services of the member States and provide administrative integration in carrying out the purposes of this compact.

"The compact administrators shall formulate and, in accordance with need, from time to time, revise a regional forest fire plan for the member States.

"It shall be the duty of each member State to formulate and put in effect a forest fire plan for that State and take such measures as may be necessary to integrate such forest fire plan with the regional forest fire plan formulated by the compact administrators.

"Article IV

"Whenever the State forest fire control agency of a member State requests aid from the State forest fire control agency of any other member State in combating, controlling, or preventing forest fires, it shall be the duty of the State forest fire control agency of that State to render all possible aid to the requesting agency which is consonant with the maintenance of protection at home.

"Article V

"Whenever the forces of any member State are rendering outside aid pursuant to the request of another member State under this compact, the employees of such State shall, under the direction of the officers of the State to which they are rendering aid, have the same powers (except the power of arrest), duties, rights, privileges, and immunities as comparable employees of the State to which they are rendering aid.

"No member State or its officers or employees rendering outside aid pursuant to this compact shall be liable on account of any act or omission on the part of such forces while so engaged, or on account of the maintenance or use of any equipment or supplies in connection therewith.

"All liability, except as otherwise provided hereinafter, that may arise either under the laws of the requesting State or under the laws of the aiding State or under the laws of a third State on account of or in connection with a request for aid, shall be assumed and borne by the requesting State.

"Any member State rendering outside aid pursuant to this compact shall be reimbursed by the member State receiving such aid for any loss or damage to, or expense incurred in the operation of any equipment answering a request for aid, and for the cost of all materials, transportation, wages, salaries, and maintenance of employees and equipment incurred in connection with such request: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent any assisting member State from assuming such loss, damage, expense, or other cost, or from loaning such equipment, or from donating such services to the receiving member State without charge or cost.

"Each member State shall provide for the payment of compensation and death benefits to injured employees and the representatives of deceased employees in case employees sustain injuries or are killed while rendering outside aid pursuant to this compact, in the same manner and on the same terms as if the injury or death were sustained within such State.

"For the purposes of this compact the term 'employee' shall include any volunteer or auxiliary legally included within the forest fire fighting forces of the aiding State under the laws thereof.

"The compact administrators shall formulate procedures for claims and reimbursement under the provisions of this article, in accordance with the laws of the member States.

"Article VI

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to authorize or permit any member State to curtail or diminish its forest fire fighting forces, equipment, services or facilities, and it shall be the duty and responsibility of each member State to maintain adequate forest fire fighting forces and equipment to meet demands for forest fire protection within its borders in the same manner and to the same extent as if this compact were not operative.

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit or restrict the powers of any State ratifying the same to provide for the prevention, control, and extinguishment of forest fires, or to prohibit the enactment or enforcement of State laws, rules, or regulations intended to aid in such prevention, control, and extinguishment in such State.

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to affect any existing or future cooperative relationship or arrangement between the United States Forest Service and a member State or States.

"Article VII

"The compact administrators may request the United States Forest Service to act as the primary research and coordinating agency of the Middle Atlantic Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact in cooperation with the appropriate agencies in each State, and the United States Forest Service may accept the initial responsibility in preparing and presenting to the compact administrators its recommendations with respect to the regional fire plan. Representatives of the United States Forest Service may attend meetings of the compact administrators.

"Article VIII

"The provisions of Articles IV and V of this compact which relate to mutual aid in combating, controlling, or preventing forest fires shall be operative as between any State party to this compact and any other State which is party to a regional forest fire protection compact in another region: *Provided,* That the legislature of such other State shall have given its assent to such mutual aid provisions of this compact.

"Article IX

"This compact shall continue in force and remain binding on each State ratifying it until the legislature or the governor of such State takes action to withdraw therefrom. Such action shall not be effective until 6 months after notice thereof has been sent by the chief executive of the State desiring to withdraw to the chief executives of all States then parties to the compact."

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a short explanation of S. 3032.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill grants the consent of Congress to a compact for cooperation in preventing and suppressing forest fires among Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia. Somewhat similar compacts have been approved by Congress for the northeastern, southeastern, and south central regions.

The committee amendments make technical corrections in the bill. As introduced the bill set out the compact (which has already been agreed to by three of the States) incorrectly, and provided for consent of Congress to additional States to become parties to the compact. The committee amendments set out the compact correctly and, since the compact itself does not provide for additional States becoming parties to it, the section giving congressional consent to such States is stricken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NOTICE UNDER ANIMAL QUARANTINE LAWS—BILL PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (S. 3046) to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, and the act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1264), as amended, to eliminate the requirement of certain notices thereunder, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, in view of the fact that we have no report on the bill, I ask that it go over.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wonder whether we could have the bill go to the foot of the calendar. We now have the report on it. It is a very short bill.

Mr. PURTELL. We have just now been handed a copy of the report. Let me make it perfectly clear that at this point we are objecting to the bill only because we have no report on it. That is in accordance with the policy of our calendar committee. Between now and the time the Senate considers bills passed to the foot of the calendar we shall try to study the bill and the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut ask that the bill go to the foot of the calendar?

Mr. PURTELL. Yes; with the understanding that we shall read the report on the bill, which is a brief bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. The bill would save the Government some money in advertising fees, by providing that notices under the animal quarantine laws shall be published in the Federal Register, instead of in newspapers and by written notice to individuals. I hope we can take it up later when we consider bills placed at the foot of the calendar.

Mr. PURTELL. We hope so also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

FARM INCOME DATA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3145) to require the Bureau of the Census to develop farm income data by economic class of farm, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments at the beginning of line 6, to change the section number from "146" to "147", and at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "In conducting current population surveys, the Secretary shall include and publish" and insert "The Secretary shall collect", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted etc., That subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 13 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 147. Farm income data: The Secretary shall collect annually money and nonmoney income data relating to per capita and family farm income by economic class of farm."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of S. 3145 be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill requires the annual collection of money and nonmoney farm income data by economic class of farm. It is hoped that this information will be of great use to the Congress and to the executive branch, as well as others, in determining farm policies. The committee amendments would permit the Bureau of the Census to use the most efficient available method of collecting the required data, permit it to withhold its publication if it does not appear sufficiently reliable, and correct the section designation. The bill contemplates, of course, that the data would be published as soon as reliable data is developed.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared in support of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

BY SENATOR WATKINS

Income statistics which lump all classes of farms together are not adequate guides for the formulation of public agricultural policies, as I shall discuss in more detail in a moment.

The Congress must have at its disposal more meaningful, reliable, and current agricultural income data than it now has, if it is to develop programs which effectively meet the problems of different economic classes of farms. S. 3145 is designed to correct this situation.

Agricultural economists have long recognized this problem, and several called it to the attention of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report during the Committee's extensive 1955 hearings. Speaking of those two-thirds of our farmers who produce only 15 percent of the marketable crop value, and who cannot therefore, benefit very much from the price-support programs, Dr. William S. Nichols, professor of agricultural economics at Vanderbilt University, told the committee, as I noted in my supplemental views to the 1955 committee report:

"Unfortunately, given the unsatisfactory nature of national employment statistics, such people are considered 'fully employed' although at best their employment is part time and very unproductive. Their inclusion among America's farmworkers also pulls down the farm income per worker or per capita to levels which compare very unfavorably with nonfarm income, lending support to public farm policies which help them hardly at all while concealing the need for a positive public program, largely nonagricultural in nature, to alleviate their low state of productivity and income" (p. 63).

The National Planning Association rather dramatically pointed out the same thing in its publication, underemployment in Agriculture:

"Simple arithmetic will show what happens. Add the income of a group of 'medical science workers': $20,000 for a doctor; $8,000 for a laboratory technician; $4,000 for a nurse; $2,000 for a janitor. The average income for these 'Medical service workers' is $8,500. Now by using this average, the facts are distorted in two ways: (a) the doctor's salary appears to be much lower than it really is; and (b) the low income at the bottom of the group is glossed over.

"Thus, when national averages involving all farmers are used, the commercial farmers are made out to have much lower incomes than they actually have, and the real poverty of the low-income group is technically covered up. Yet this system of averages has been the common practice" (p. 5).

In my minority views to the 1956 report of the Joint Economic Committee, I observed that "as long as the Congress continues to ignore these cleavages within agriculture, involving great extremes in the size and types of farms, it probably will continue to legislate inappropriate policies which merely treat the effects rather than the causes of these diverse income and production problems. * * * However, if the Congress will enact realistic legislation tailored to meet the separate needs of the owners and operators, according to the 1954 Agricultural Census, or our (1) 2 million commercial farms who can benefit from price-support programs, since they produce 85 percent of the annual marketable crop value and receive 80 percent of net farm income; and (2) 2.7 million residential and part-time farms, who benefit but very little from price-support programs, since they produce only 15 percent of the annual marketable crop value, and receive but 20 percent of net farm income, I have no doubt but what in a comparative short period of time solutions can be found to the unique and difficult problems of both of these distinct groups of farmers" (pp. 50–60).

This belief and concern prompted me, therefore, to introduce S. 3145 on January 16, 1956. The Department of Commerce in its favorable report of April 19, 1956, on this

bill expresses this same concern. In part the report reads:

"The Department of Commerce agrees that data now available on farm income are inadequate. Agricultural policy determinations are frequently based on the farm income situation. Since the incomes of commercial and noncommercial farmers and on large and small farms may differ substantially, information about income by economic class of farm is needed. The Department believes that positive, immediate action should be taken to supply these data."

Also the Department of Agriculture in its favorable report of April 26, 1956, observed that other benefits as well would result from this bill's passage. In fact, the report states:

"The bill will make it possible to obtain more adequate farm income information by economic class of farms. This identification of farms by economic classes will be very helpful in many respects in dealing with the problems of agriculture. In fact, as indicated by the President's message to Congress on January 9, 1956, some of the most difficult farm problems are with low-income farms. This measure would be helpful in identifying this class of farms. * * * In getting the income material which this bill would make possible, there also could be obtained enough information identifying the farm population as to aid substantially in keeping track of the farm manpower situation and other related developments. This would be especially valuable in case of a national-defense emergency."

Mr. President, S. 3145, as introduced, would require the Bureau of the Census, in conducting its current population surveys, to include and publish annually money and nonmoney income data relating to per capita and family farm income by economic class of farm. As amended by the Agriculture Committee, it now provides that "the Secretary [of Commerce] shall collect annually money and nonmoney income data relating to per capita and family farm income by economic class of farm."

Thus it eliminates, and I have no objection, the provision of the bill as introduced, which requires that such data must be obtained and published as part of the annual population survey. At the time of introduction, it seemed to be the best way of obtaining this data by merely expanding the farm section of this annual survey. However, as the Department of Agriculture pointed out in its report:

"Since economic class is a census of agriculture concept, the farm segment of the current population survey would have to be tied in some way to census of agriculture definitions and possibly a special sample would need to be developed for this purpose. And finally, there would be some difficulty in collecting information on nonmoney income since the current population survey income questions have hitherto been confined to money income."

In effect, this amendment, as the committee report points out, "would permit the Bureau of the Census to use the most efficient available method of collecting the required data" (p. 1).

The committee also eliminated the compulsory publishing requirement of the bill as introduced. This was done with an eye toward economy, since it may take a couple of trial samples to develop a reliable and effective method of obtaining this data and it simply would not pay to publish the collected data if it does not appear sufficiently reliable. This the report also points out. I have no objection to this amendment as long as it is understood that annual publication is to be made as soon as a reliable survey technique is developed. This is contemplated by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

BASIC DATA

1. Number of farms: 4.7 million in 1954, a decline of 600,000, or 11 percent, since 1950 (5.3 million).

2. Number of farm operators: 4.6 million in 1954, a decline of 568,000 since 1950.

Of these, 1.3 million are part-time farm operators who work more than 100 days off the farm. This is an increase of 110,000 such part-time operators since 1950.

3. Farms by economic class, 1954 census:

(a) Class I and class II farms (those producing over $25,000 and between $10,000 and $24,999 worth of crops respectively) increased in number as follows:

	1954	1950	Increase
(1) Class I	134,041	105,536	28,505
(2) Class II	448,771	386,423	62,348

(b) All other classes of farms decreased in number.

4. Who benefits under price-support programs: (a) 2 million largest commercial farms, mostly family type, since they produce about 85 percent of annual crop value.

(1) To get a nonrecourse loan, a farmer must have produced something to sell.

(b) 2.7 million smaller family-type commercial farms, part-time and residential farms, cannot benefit from price support very much because they produce only 15 percent of annual crop value.

(1) Price support at 100 percent of parity, 90 or 75 percent, will not help these people very much.

(2) Nor will price support at 90 or 100 percent of parity narrow the gap between average per capita farm and nonfarm incomes; the former being about one-half of the latter (1955 farm, $856; nonfarm, $1,629) for the same reason.

5. Analysis of average family and per capita farm incomes by economic class of farms: 1950 census data:

(a) 1.2 million or 22 percent of commercial farms—classes I, II and III—produced 74 percent of our crops. They provided their operators and families—5 million people—with average family incomes of $5,143 in terms of 1949 prices. This was nearly twice the $2,650 which represented the average of all farm family incomes. 2.5 million farms or 47 percent of the commercial farms—classes IV, V, and VI—produced only 24 percent of our crops. The average family incomes of 10.3 million persons on these farms was only $1,741:

(1) Some $3,352 less than the average of families on farms in the first three classes of farms.

(2) Some $859 less than the average family income of all farm families.

(3) 1.6 million part-time and residential farms—some 31 percent of all farms—produced only 2 percent of our crops.

6. Part-time farmers better off than full-time commercial farmers in V and VI economic class of farms.

(a) The average family incomes of the 2.5 million people living on 639,230 such farms were $2,400. This was only $250 less than the average family income of all farm families.

(b) Their average family incomes were $500 more than those of 3.8 million persons living on 901,316 full-time family farms in the 5th class of commercial farms; and $1,425 more than those of the 2.7 million persons living on 717,201 full-time family-type farms in the 6th class of commercial farms.

Economic classes of farms: 1950 census

Commercial farms	3,706,412
Class I, those farms which sold produce valued at $25,000 or more	103,231
Class II, those farms which sold produce valued at between $10,000 and $24,999	381,151
Class III, those farms which sold produce valued at between $5,000 and $9,999	721,211
Class IV, those farms which sold produce valued at between $2,500 and $4,999	882,302
Class V, those farms which sold produce valued at between $1,200 and $2,499	901,316
Class VI, those farms which sold produce valued at between $250 and $1,199	717,201
Other farms	1,668,622
Part-time	639,230
Residential	1,029,392
Total farms	5,375,034

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is an agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXCHANGE OF PROPERTIES BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE CITY OF CAPE GIRARDEAU, MO.

The bill (H. R. 7913) authorizing the Administrator of General Services to effect the exchange of properties between the United States and the city of Cape Girardeau, Mo., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for the RECORD I should like to make a very brief statement of my understanding of the bill, so no question will be raised later as to whether it complied with the Morse formula. It is my understanding that all that the bill would do would be to establish the status quo with respect to a land exchange agreement entered into in 1940, which was never consummated. It is my understanding that the Federal Government is not giving up anything of value by the enactment of the bill. I should like to know from a member of the committee whether that is a correct interpretation of the bill.

Mr. ERVIN. As I understand, the city of Cape Girardeau made an exchange of property with the Federal Government in 1940, but the agreement has never been consummated. In other words, both sides have since concluded that perhaps they had been cheated, and they would like to reexchange the properties involved.

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IN EXCHANGE FOR OTHER LAND

The bill (S. 3723) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey certain land in the county of Alameda, Calif., and to accept other land in exchange therefor, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question about the bill. Am I correct in understanding that this is another land exchange bill, and that the ratio is really favorable to the Federal Government and that the Federal Government is not losing anything of value, and that, perhaps, here again a pretty good job is being done, and that, as the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] stated with respect to another bill, the Federal Government is perhaps making a good exchange, for a change?

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator is correct. An independent appraisal was made of the property, and it showed that the property which the Government is to receive is valued at $116,000, whereas the property the city of Alameda will receive is valued at $98,000. Therefore the Government is getting the best of the bargain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement on the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of S. 3723 is to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to exchange lands between the Department of the Navy and the State of California in order to enable construction of another traffic tube under the estuary between Oakland and Alameda, Calif.

The Navy owns approximately a 76-acre tract in this area upon which it plans to establish a naval supply annex to support the Naval Air Station at Alameda. For some time the city of Alameda, Calif., has been desirous of obtaining approximately 8.5 acres of Government land for the purpose of constructing thereon the entrance to a second underwater tube beneath the causeway connecting Oakland and Alameda in order to relieve a serious traffic congestion. The city proposes to exchange with the Federal Government a parcel of land approximately 13.2 acres in size as compensation for the 8.5 acres.

Independent appraisal estimates that the fair market value of the 8.5 acres of Government land is approximately $98,000 and that the fair market value of the 13.2 acres of State-owned land is approximately $116,000. Therefore it appears that dollarwise the transfer would result in substantial benefit to the Government. In addition, the State has further agreed to relocate certain naval improvements and facilities at no cost to the Government and to grant the necessary easements for rights-of-way, for roadways, and certain utility lines. No cost to the Government is involved in this bill. The Department of the Navy and the Bureau of the Budget have no objection to the passage of this bill.

Inasmuch as the acreage that would be transferred to the Navy under the provisions of this bill exceeds the value of the land desired by Alameda and in view of the fact that a difficult traffic situation would be solved by enactment of this bill, I urge that the bill be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, reading the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2452) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the State of Wisconsin, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment on page 2, line 6, after the word "gas", to strike out "the right of reentry and use by the United States in the event of need therefor during a national emergency; and such other reservations, restrictions, terms, and conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary to properly protect the interests of the United States" and insert "the right of reentry and use without payment of rent or other compensation by the United States in the event of need therefor during a national emergency declared by the Congress or the President of the United States; and such other reservations, restrictions, terms, and conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary to properly protect the interests of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is another one of those conveyances involving the operation of the National Guard by a State as to which we have decided in many cases heretofore that there is a great Federal interest involved, and the Federal Government is well repaid, in service, in connection with our defense program, for any property which is transferred under such a bill. I not only have no objection to the consideration of the bill, but commend the committee for reporting it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STENNIS

The purpose of this bill is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey to the State of Wisconsin all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the La Crosse National Guard target range, La Crosse County, Wis., Camp Williams Army Airfield, and Camp Williams Army Airfield radio range, in Juneau County, Wis., for use by the Wisconsin National Guard.

These properties, totaling approximately 1,480 acres, have been used by the State National Guard almost continuously since the end of World War II. Actually, the guard has used the target range since 1912. Because of the National Guard's continuing requirement for these properties, favorable action on this proposed legislation will be consistent with prior action by the Senate.

The committee has suggested one amendment to the bill which provides for recapture rights in the event of a national emergency declared either by the Congress or the President of the United States and also insures that in the event of recapture the Government would not have to pay rental or other compensation for its use.

The bill has the usual proviso that in the event the States does not use it for National Guard or military purposes, the land will revert to the Federal Government.

The Department of the Army and the Bureau of the Budget have no objection to this legislation and no cost to the Government is involved.

GRANTING MILITARY LEAVE OF ABSENCE WITH PAY TO SUBSTITUTE EMPLOYEES IN THE POSTAL FIELD SERVICE

The bill (H. R. 3744) to amend an act of July 1, 1947, to grant military leave of absence with pay to substitute employees in the postal field service was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSFER OF OFFICERS OF THE NAVY NURSE CORPS

The bill (H. R. 9838) to authorize transfer of officers of the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve to the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement concerning the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT

H. R 9838 would affect about 75 members of the Nurse Corps of the Navy. These are nurses who have developed a second specialty as either dietitian, physical therapist or occupational therapist.

The purpose of this bill is to provide permissive authority whereby these nurses upon application may transfer to the Navy Medical Service Corps without loss of precedence.

Under existing law appointments can be made in the Medical Service Corps only for those who are not above the grade of lieutenant, junior grade, and not above age 32. All of the nurses who developed a second specialty have a permanent grade above lieutenant, junior grade, and all are more than 32 years of age.

The necessity for this bill arises from the fact that the Department of Defense policy now requires that members of the Nurse Corps should be utilized only in nursing duties. While some of the nurses who developed 1 of the 3 specialties might go back to general nursing duties, there are others who would undoubtedly resign if they could not continue in their specialty. This bill would prevent the Navy from losing these highly valued specialists by permitting them to transfer to the Medical Service Corps where they would continue in their specialty.

This bill would involve no cost to the Government.

DEFENSE PLANT AND MOBILIZATION CONSTRUCTION

The bill (H. R. 8709) to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF GUSTAF E. LAMBERT IN THE YELLOW FEVER EXPERIMENTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5590) to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Gustaf E. Lambert, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments, on page 2, line 5, after the word "filed", to insert "with the Veterans' Administration", and in line 6, after the word "act", to insert "and payment of any such benefits shall be made by the Veterans' Administration."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 11319) making appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over for the reason that it is not a bill to be considered in connection with the call of the consent calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Presiding Officer please announce the bills which have been passed to the foot of the calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first bill which was passed to the foot of the calendar is Calendar No. 2092, Senate bill 3958, to assist in increasing the number of adequately trained professional practical nurses.

The next is Calendar No. 2171, Senate bill 3363, for the relief of Miroslav Slovak.

The next is Calendar No. 2180, Senate bill 3669, to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act; and

The last is Calendar No. 2183, Senate bill 3046, to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, and the act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1264), as amended, to eliminate the requirement of certain notices thereunder, and for other purposes.

EXPRESSION OF HOPE FOR SPEEDY RECOVERY OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am confident that all the Members of the Senate shared a common concern over the weekend because of the illness of the President of the United States. The concern on both sides of the aisle, as we have talked about it in the cloakrooms, is a pretty good lesson, demonstrating not only to the people of the United States, but to the people of the world, that in every hour of crisis, in every moment of great national concern, the citizens of America stand together unitedly. We are a remarkable people, Mr. President, with respect to our deep devotion to human values and spiritual values. We are a remarkable people in our ability to shuffle off very quickly partisan differences when it comes to human factors in our relationships one with another. One could not spend the time listening to the radio and watching the television, as I am sure each one of us did, over the weekend, without recognizing that there is tremendous strength in our body politic, in our nonpartisanship, in the last anaylsis, when there is cause to be concerned about the health of any leader of our country, no matter to which party he may belong.

When our present majority leader was stricken many months ago, I remember the unanimity of concern which existed in the Senate, and, for that matter, across the Nation, over his well-being.

We are all praying for the quick recovery of President Eisenhower. Partisan differences over issues vanish, as they should, when a national leader is stricken. The strength of democracy rests upon difference of opinion in the political field. It also rests upon putting into practice Christian compassion and sympathy for the misfortunes of others including those with whom we may not agree when it comes to political issues.

Therefore, Mr. President, I should like to send to the desk an exceedingly brief resolution around which I know we can rally in complete unanimity. It is a resolution which very simply sets forth—

That the Senate hereby expresses its sincere hope that the President may have a complete and speed recovery from his recent illness which necessitated surgical attention.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit to the President a copy of this resolution.

Mr. President, I think it is particularly fitting that someone on this side of the aisle express to the American people such a resolution in behalf of the Senate, because it is well known that I have great differences with the President on political issues, but I have none when it comes to spiritual value.

I think, Mr. President, the resolution is a fitting one, and I send it to the desk and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be received, and will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 280), as follows:

That the Senate hereby expresses its sincere hope that the President may have a complete and speedy recovery from his recent illness which necessitated surgical attention.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit to the President a copy of this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It now being past the hour of 2 o'clock, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business which is the bill (S. 3581) to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service.

The Chair will state the parliamentary situation is that the unfinished business is now before the Senate. Prior to the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, which occurred when the absence of a quorum was noticed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senate was proceeding to the consideration of four items on the calendar which had been moved to the foot of the calendar at the request of one of the calendar committees.

The Senator from Oregon then made a unanimous-consent request that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a resolution which he then sent to the desk, and the resolution was read for the information of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, for the immediate consideration and adoption of my resolution wishing President Eisenhower a complete and speedy recovery.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have the resolution restated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be restated.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate hereby expresses its sincere hope that the President may have a complete and speedy recovery from the recent illness which necessitated surgical attention.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit to the President a copy of this resolution.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have no objection to consideration of the resolution, provided it can lie on the table in order that other Members of the Senate may have an opportunity to join the Senator from Oregon in sponsoring it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think that is an excellent suggestion, and I am delighted to accept it. I hope the resolution will be adopted and then placed at the clerk's desk for signature by as many Senators as can to cosponsor it. I think it should be transmitted to the President sometime before the end of the day, for I think the President should be advised promptly of the Senators good wishes. So I think the resolution should be acted on without undue delay.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the resolution should lie on the table until the end of the day, so that other Senators who desire to join in sponsoring it may be able to do so. That will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. MORSE. I also wish to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that

an arrangement should be made so that the absence of a Senator's name from the resolution can be explained on the basis of his absence from the Senate today. I do not think any Member of the Senate should be embarrassed in any way because of the fact that he was not present and thus was not able to join in sponsoring the resolution In that event, I imagine that such a Senator would send a note to the President, to explain that he was not present, and thus could not join in sponsoring the resolution.

Mr. BRIDGES. Of course, I think the idea behind the resolution is a good one. I hope the concern the distinguished Senator from Oregon has for the President's illness will continue during the remainder of the year, and will not be merely a momentary act on his part.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from New Hampshire was not present when I made a statement at the time when I submitted the resolution. When the Senator from New Hampshire reads the statement I made, he will, I am sure, understand the spirit which motivated the Senator From Oregon in submitting the resolution. Although, as I said, I thought the resolution should come from this side of the aisle, and although I thought it particularly fitting that the resolution should come from a Member who has disagreed on a great many issues with the President, yet I wanted it made plain that my disagreement with the President on many political issues had nothing to do—and should have nothing to do, it seems to me—with the spirit which permeates our democracy whenever illness overtakes a great leader of either political party. I think it is very typical of us, as a people, that as such an hour of sadness, we give expression to the Christian and religious principles which should motivate us, and which, I am happy to say do motivate us. I see that demonstrated every Wednesday morning when a group of us from both parties meet for breakfast and exchange our points of view in regard to the spiritual obligations which confront us as Members of the Senate.

It is only in that spirit, I say to the Senator from New Hampshire, that I have submitted the resolution. I hope the time will never come when partisanship will prevent any of us from expressing our sincere sympathy and concern when a President of the United States is stricken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair correctly understand that the Senator from Oregon has now withdrawn his unanimous consent request, with the understanding that the resolution is to lie on the table so as to allow an opportunity for all Members of the Senate to join the Senator from Oregon in sponsorship of the resolution, in hope that it may be brought up for consideration later?

Mr. MORSE. No, Mr. President, I do not withdraw my request for immediate action on my resolution. I did not understand that the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire was that the resolution be not agreed to, but that it be acted upon and then be placed at the desk for Members of the Senate to sign. I think it is particularly fitting that the resolution be formally adopted by the Senate, and that it remain at the desk for signatures of Members of the Senate this afternoon. I certainly think it is particularly fitting that the resolution be adopted and become a matter of historic record in the Senate. I did not understand that the Senator from New Hampshire meant that the resolution should not be adopted. I understood him to say that the resolution should be agreed to, and left at the desk to be signed by Members of the Senate and, at the close of business today, transmitted to the President. Am I mistaken in my understanding?

Mr. BRIDGES. I desired to have it fully understood that the resolution should be adopted, and that various Members of the Senate should be permitted to cosponsor it, as authors.

Mr. MORSE. That is my understanding.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not wish any action to be taken by the Senate which would preclude Senators from becoming cosponsors of the resolution.

Mr. MORSE. That was my understanding. I understand that the resolution will be agreed to, and will lie on the desk for the remainder of the day, in order that Members of the Senate may sign it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Oregon for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 280?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, there are certain Members of the Senate who have personal policies against cosponsorship. There is now on the calendar a resolution to modify the practice with respect to cosponsorship.

I shall gladly vote for the resolution, but, as one who does not practice cosponsorship, my name will not appear on the resolution as a cosponsor.

This is one further illustration of why the Senate should act on the resolution which is on the calendar, and which was submitted by the late Senator Alben W. Barkley. As the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has pointed out, some Senators are absent today. Their names will not appear. Senators will be asked to explain why 40 Senators cosponsored the resolution expressing sympathy for the President of the United States in his illness, while others did not. I shall not object to the proposed procedure today. I hope, however, the Senate will soon approve the Barkley resolution, and put an end to this kind of procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for the consideration of Senate Resolution 280.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will remain at the desk for the remainder of the day for the benefit of Senators who wish to join as cosponsors.

Subsequently, under the order which had been previously entered, the names of Senators AIKEN, ALLOTT, ANDERSON, BARRETT, BEALL, BENDER, BENNETT, BIBLE, BRICKER, BRIDGES, BUSH, BUTLER, BYRD, CAPEHART, CARLSON, CASE of New Jersey, CASE of South Dakota, CHAVEZ, CLEMENTS, COTTON, CURTIS, DIRKSEN, DOUGLAS, DUFF, DWORSHAK, EASTLAND, ELLENDER, ERVIN, FLANDERS, FREAR, FULBRIGHT, GEORGE, GOLDWATER, GREEN, HAYDEN, HENNINGS, HICKENLOOPER, HILL, HRUSKA, HUMPHREY, IVES, JACKSON, JENNER, JOHNSON of Texas, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, KEFAUVER, KENNEDY, KERR, KNOWLAND, KUCHEL, LAIRD, LANGER, LEHMAN, LONG, MAGNUSON, MALONE, MANSFIELD, MARTIN of Iowa, MARTIN of Pennsylvania, MCCARTHY, MCCLELLAN, MCNAMARA, MILLIKIN, MONRONEY, MUNDT, MURRAY, NEELY, NEUBERGER, O'MAHONEY, PASTORE, PAYNE, POTTER, PURTELL, ROBERTSON, SALTONSTALL, SCHOEPPEL, SCOTT, SMATHERS, SMITH of Maine, SMITH of New Jersey, SPARKMAN, STENNIS, SYMINGTON, THYE, WATKINS, WELKER, WILEY, WILLIAMS, WOFFORD, and YOUNG were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 280.

CONSIDERATION OF BILLS PASSED TO FOOT OF CALENDAR

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the four bills which were passed to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if that is done, will there be an opportunity for the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] to speak for a few minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator that the moment the Senate proceeds to the consideration of the bills passed to the foot of the calendar, which are four in number, the usual procedure will be followed. Five minutes will be available to any Senator while any of such bills is under consideration.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Senator from Idaho was informed by the acting majority leader that at the conclusion of the call of the calendar he would make a motion to proceed to the consideration of the four bills passed to the foot of the calendar. Consequently I object to invoking the 5-minute rule in connection with these bills, especially the mining bill, which is of such vast importance, and involves so much money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not the understanding of the Chair that the mining bill to which the Senator refers is one of the bills which was passed to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that consideration of the bill to which the Senator refers was objected to on the ground that it was not an appropriate bill for consideration on a call of the calendar.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I understand that there is no objection to the four bills which were passed to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from North Carolina that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the four bills which were passed to the foot of the calendar?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator from North Carolina yield to me immediately following action upon his unanimous consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator that during the proceedings in connection with items on the call of the calendar, any Senator has the right to speak for 5 minutes at any time on any bill under consideration.

Mr. BUTLER. I should like to have half a minute before the unanimous consent request is acted upon, or immediately thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILL PASSED OVER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first order of business passed to the foot of the calendar, which is Calendar No. 2092, Senate bill 3958.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3958) to assist in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and practical nurses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, at least two Senators have stated that they would like to make a few remarks on the bill. The distinguished acting majority leader has advised me that he will move later to take up the bill. Therefore I ask that it be passed over at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next order of business passed to the foot of the calendar.

MIROSLAV SLOVAK

The bill (S. 3363) for the relief of Miroslav Slovak was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Communications Commission is authorized to issue a license to Miroslav Slovak as an operator under subsection (L) of section 303 of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1082), notwithstanding the requirement of such subsection with respect to citizenship.

THEFT OR CONVERSION OF THE SECURITY FOR PRICE-SUPPORT LOANS

The bill (S. 3669) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment on page 1, line 9, after the word "for", to strike out "an" and insert "a", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (c) of section 15 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, as amended (15 U. S. C. 714m (c)), is amended to read as follows: "Whoever shall willfully steal, conceal, remove, dispose of, or convert to his own use or to that of another any property owned or held by, or mortgaged or pledged to, the Corporation, or any property mortgaged or pledged as security for a promissory note, or other evidence of indebtedness, which the Corporation has guaranteed or is obligated to purchase upon tender, shall, upon conviction thereof, if such property be of an amount or value in excess of $500, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both, and, if such property be of an amount or value of $500 or less, be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill, which was requested by the Department of Agriculture, would amend the criminal law dealing with wilful theft or conversion of property owned by or pledged to the Commodity Credit Corporation by (1) extending it to cover property pledged to secure obligations which the Corporation has guaranteed or is obligated to purchase; and (2) reducing the offense to a misdemeanor where the value of the property involved is $500 or less.

The committee amendment corrects a grammatical error by changing "an" to "a."

NOTICE UNDER ANIMAL QUARANTINE LAWS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secertary will state the next bill passed to the foot of the calendar.

The bill (S. 3046) to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, and the act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1264), as amended, to eliminate the requirement of certain notices thereunder, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments on page 2, line 22, after the word "deems", to strike out "appropriate"." and insert "appropriate." "; and on page 3, line 9, after the word "deems", to strike out "appropriate"." and insert "appropriate." ", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted etc., That section 7 of the act of May 29, 1884, as amended (23 Stat. 32, 45 Stat. 59, 21 U. S. C. 117), is hereby further amended by deleting the first clause of such section reading: "That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture to notify, in writing, the proper officials or agents of any railroad, steamboat, or other transportation company doing business in or through any infected locality, and by publication in such newspapers as he may select, of the existence of said contagion" and inserting the following clause in lieu thereof "That notice of the existence of said contagion in any infected locality shall be published in the Federal Register and the Secretary of Agriculture may publish notice thereof in such other manner as he deems appropriate."

SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1905, as amended (33 Stat. 1264, 45 Stat. 59; 21 U. S. C. 123), is hereby further amended by deleting the second clause of such section reading: "; and the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to give written or printed notice of the establishment of quarantine to the proper officers of railroad, steamboat, or other transportation companies doing business in or through any quarantined State or Territory or the District of Columbia, and to publish in such newspapers in the quarantined State or Territory or the District of Columbia, as the Secretary of Agriculture may select, notice of the establishment of quarantine" and by adding the following sentence at the end of such section: "Such determination and quarantine shall be published in the Federal Register and the Secretary of Agriculture may publish notice thereof in such other manner as he deems appropriate."

SEC. 3. Section 3 of said Act of March 3, 1905, as amended (33 Stat. 1265, 45 Stat. 59; 21 U. S. C. 125), is hereby further amended by deleting the second clause of such section reading: "; and the Secretary of Agriculture shall give notice of such rules and regulations in the manner provided in section two of this Act for notice of establishment of quarantine" and by adding the following sentence at the end of such section: "Such rules and regulations shall be published in the Federal Register and the Secretary of Agriculture may publish notice thereof in such other manner as he deems appropriate."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill provides for the giving of certain notices under the animal quarantine laws by publication in the Federal Register (instead of publication in newspapers and written notice to individuals). Publication in the Federal Register is already required by the Administrative Procedure Act, and that notice is considered sufficient by the Department.

The committee amendments correct the punctuation by inserting periods at the end of two sentences.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RETIRED PAY OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE FORMER LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the call of the calendar.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 3581.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3581) to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service.

WITHHOLDING BY PRIVATE EMPLOYERS OF FEDERAL INCOME TAX OR SOCIAL SECURITY TAX DEDUCTIONS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to remind the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], that the other day the distinguished Senator from Delaware called the attention of the Senate and of the country to the fact that one of the subcontractors on the New Senate Office Building had failed to pay a substantial amount of back taxes to the Federal Government.

This raised a question in the minds of many people. I should like to have developed on the floor of the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], who has the honor of being Chairman of the New Senate Office Building Commission, and the Senator from Delaware, the exact status of the matter, so that it may be on record for the benefit of all concerned.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I am pleased to follow the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. I was not on the floor of the Senate when the discussion took place the other day. However, as I understand, there was some question raised as to one of the subcontractors and his status so far as the Internal Revenue Service is concerned. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will yield, I shall be glad to read from the exact statement I made. It is a situation which I thought was already clear in the RECORD. The statement I made on May 31 was a correct statement, and it is my understanding that no one has successfully challenged any of the facts outlined on that date.

I quote from these remarks:

> It should be pointed out that in awarding the contract for the New Senate Office Building, the bids were first awarded to a prime contractor, who placed a bond guaranteeing performance. This prime contractor then sublet certain contracts to smaller operators; and it was as one of these subcontractors that Reliable was the successful bidder, apparently using these Government funds to underbid its competitors and finance its operations.

Immediately preceding that quotation I have said that one of those subcontrators, the Reliable Plastering Corp., of Philadelphia, during the past 4 years had withheld from its employees $432,763.97 in withholding income tax and social security tax, but that it had not sent these withheld funds to the Federal Government, instead it had kept and used them in its own business.

I incorporated in the RECORD a letter from the Treasury Department confirming these figures.

Also I made the charge that this tax delinquent had underbid all competitors and been awarded a subcontract on the New Senate Office Building.

This latter charge likewise cannot be denied.

The reason the controversy arose was that the prime contractor, Mr. Hyman, later made the statement that he had no subcontract with the Reliable Plastering Corp. That denial was not true, and everyone now admits it cannot be supported by the facts. Under date of October 7, 1955, Mr. Hyman, as the prime contractor, notified the Architect of the Capitol that he had awarded a subcontract to the Penn-Jersey Plastering Corp., which company he described as an affiliated company of the Reliable Plastering Corp., of Philadelphia, Pa. This letter of Mr. Hyman's repudiates his denial.

I pointed out at the time, and I repeat, that the criticism was not of the awarding of the contract on the part of the General Services Administration or on the part of the Architect of the Capitol; so far as the procedure they followed is concerned, they followed the law. They had no way of knowing that the Reliable Plastering Corp. was not paying its taxes. But that does not excuse the Treasury Department, who recommended approval of the contract. They knew that the Reliable Plastering Corp. was not sending in their withholding taxes and, knowing that, they should not approve them for a Government contract. The law plainly states that in awarding a contract, it must be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder, but a tax dodger is not a responsible bidder. The lowest responsible bidder is defined as the one who can submit the lowest bid and at the same time show a record of past performance which is acceptable, and is able to put up a bond issued by a reliable bonding company, under which the performance of work is guaranteed to the Government.

As far as the Architect of the Capitol could know the Reliable Plastering Corp. was a responsible bidder since they had been approved by both the Treasury Department and Justice Department.

How they got that approval of the Treasury and Justice Departments with such a record of tax delinquency is the $64 question.

My criticism was directed against the Treasury Department for noncollection of the taxes.

I hope the Senator from Connecticut will further clarify any question in his mind, because I do not believe there is any misunderstanding but that the Reliable Plastering Corp. was to participate in the work of building the new Senate Office Building.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, am I to understand the Senator from Delaware to say that no criticism is being leveled at all at the Architect of the Capitol or at the Commission charged with the building of the new Senate Office Building?

Mr. WILLIAMS. At no point in my remarks on May 31 or anywhere else will the Senator find such criticism. I did not even mention him so how could there be.

I do say this: namely, that I do think the Treasury Department was grossly negligent in discharging its responsibilities when they approved this contract.

The Treasury Department should make sure that any corporation receiving a Government contract remits the withholding tax taken from the pay envelopes of its employees.

Certainly the Senator from Connecticut will agree with me upon that point.

You must also remember that this delinquency took place in the Philadelphia Office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. That office has been under severe criticism not only of the Senator from Delaware but also they were severely criticized last January by a Federal grand jury.

In fact the Federal grand jury went further than I in their criticism, they charged the officials of the office with having been "criminally negligent" in discharging their official duties.

I do not believe there was any justification on the part of the Treasury for having allowed this subcontractor to withhold this amount of money for such a long period of time.

Mr. PURTELL. I should like to say to the Senator from Delaware that, so far as the New Senate Office Building Commission is concerned, the law specifically states that the contract shall be let by the Architect of the Capitol, and the Commission itself has nothing to do with the actual letting of any contract. It is true that two of the associated subcontractors were the Miller Mason Studios and the Reliable Plastering Corp. The prime contractor was the George Hyman Co. It is also true that one of the subcontractors of the Hyman Co. was the Penn-Jersey Plastering Corp., a joint venture with the Miller Mason Studios and the Reliable Plastering Corp.

Let me say further to the Senator from Delaware——

Mr. WILLIAMS. If I may interrupt the Senator at that point, I should like to point out again that there is no misunderstanding, and that the Reliable Plastering Corp. did participate in the work.

Mr. PURTELL. The Senator is correct beyond any question. Reliable was an associate subcontractor.

Let me say this about the contractor. Certain laws regulate the placing of these contracts. The Architect of the Capitol followed the letter and the spirit of the law relating to the letting of the contract. First, the contracts must be approved by the Department of Justice for legality. Such contracts must also be approved by the Treasury Department, so far as the validity of the bond involved is concerned. A performance bond was given in the amount of $8,600,000, covering the performance of the prime contractor in erecting the building according to the plans submitted by the Senate Office Building Commission and placed as a contract by the Architect of the Capitol. There is also a so-called corporate surety bond in the

amount of $2,500,000, to cover the contracts of the subcontractors. So, the Government, so far as the building is concerned, is amply covered with performance bonds, both as to the prime contractor and the subcontractors.

The Architect of the Capitol followed the law. He checked into the work done by the three associate subcontractors, and he found that they had previously done excellent work, and that their work had been recommended by many firms for whom they had done such work. Therefore, according to the law, he had no choice but to permit Mr. Hyman to give that contract to the lowest bidder, and that happened to be the three companies associated together.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know the Senator will agree that at no point in my remarks did I say otherwise.

Mr. PURTELL. I am happy to know that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I talked with the Architect of the Capitol prior to making my statement on the floor, and I told him that in my opinion he had properly discharged his responsibilities in carrying out his duties. I did say this—and I repeat it now—I do criticize the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department for having approved these contracts with this tax delinquent. It seems inexcusable to me that the Treasury Department should have approved the contracts when at the same time their records showed that this subcontractor, the Reliable Plastering Corp., had for the past several years withheld over $400,000 from their employees and had then kept this money for their own use rather than send it in to the Federal Treasury as other employers are required to do.

Since 1951 the Reliable Plastering Corp. of Philadelphia deducted over $400,000 from the pay envelopes of their employees which they did not turn in to the Government and now we find them with a lucrative contract on the New Senate Office Building being built across the lawn.

If that case does not merit criticism then I say we have lost our sense of justice.

There has been some inexcusable negligence in the matter of collecting these taxes. As of last December, employers throughout the country were over $284,000,000 delinquent in turning these taxes over to the Federal Treasury.

Seventeen thousand nine hundred and eighteen employers in Philadelphia alone have withheld $17,060,134.24 from their employees and which amount has not been forwarded to the Government.

This is decidedly unfair to the employees involved since their tax has been deducted from their pay envelope but then not sent in to the Treasury. The employers have kept their tax money for their own use.

I again point out that these are not income taxes or corporation taxes concerning which there may be an area of dispute as to the amount. This represents taxes which are withheld from the employees of the firms—social-security taxes and income taxes—and there can be no dispute about the fact that every dime withheld belongs to the United States Government. No company has a right to use these funds for its own purposes.

I think the Senator from Connecticut and I are in complete agreement on that point.

Mr. PURTELL. We are.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a breakdown of delinquent employment taxes. This report includes social security and income taxes withheld by employers throughout the United States as of December 31, 1955, broken down by districts. They total $284,803,237.04.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Delinquent employment tax (includes social security and income tax withheld) as of Dec. 31, 1955

Region	Number	Amount
Atlanta:		
Atlanta	5,889	$3,572,771.07
Birmingham	3,655	1,965,215.06
Columbia	3,318	822,119.84
Greensboro	4,318	1,998,267.92
Jackson	1,526	596,553.02
Jacksonville	8,239	4,996,151.87
Nashville	3,181	1,601,697.63
Total	30,126	15,552,776.41
Boston:		
Augusta	1,119	489,363.35
Boston	11,122	10,000,411.94
Burlington	441	145,096.27
Hartford	5,079	3,298,977.26
Portsmouth	840	310,676.22
Providence	1,259	894,222.10
Total	19,860	15,138,747.14
Chicago:		
Chicago	22,891	15,915,033.71
Detroit	16,325	10,808,182.55
Milwaukee	3,781	2,087,500.52
Springfield	3,381	1,627,535.26
Total	46,378	30,438,252.04
Cincinnati:		
Cincinnati	3,630	1,947,441.26
Cleveland	8,720	5,523,283.73
Columbus	1,290	657,347.06
Indianapolis	4,767	2,953,720.13
Louisville	2,934	1,228,281.32
Parkersburg	2,257	1,376,158.66
Richmond	5,147	2,663,135.29
Toledo	785	393,421.06
Total	29,530	16,742,788.51
Dallas:		
Albuquerque	1,994	853,894.55
Austin	6,580	2,702,774.57
Dallas	6,816	3,608,220.71
Little Rock	1,259	319,961.69
New Orleans	4,261	2,260,578.68
Oklahoma City	3,123	1,825,878.19
Total	24,033	11,571,308.39
New York City:		
Albany	4,770	3,454,402.53
Brooklyn	37,482	24,523,884.76
Buffalo	4,756	2,916,655.39
Lower Manhattan	25,952	20,573,162.41
Puerto Rico	1,853	252,580.38
Syracuse	2,565	1,664,304.71
Upper Manhattan	31,922	32,691,187.54
Total	109,300	86,076,177.72
Omaha:		
Aberdeen	604	248,973.89
Cheyenne	727	256,547.69
Denver	3,056	1,642,399.55
Des Moines	1,596	749,072.00
Fargo	578	217,937.13
Kansas City	2,030	1,146,641.36
Omaha	638	480,083.97
St. Louis	2,686	1,323,248.26
St. Paul	3,110	2,093,897.27
Wichita	2,912	1,018,508.27
Total	17,937	9,177,309.39

Delinquent employment tax (includes social security and income tax withheld) as of Dec. 31, 1955—Continued

Region	Number	Amount
Philadelphia:		
Baltimore	9,577	$5,773,385.50
Camden	3,684	2,657,984.25
Newark	23,673	22,244,526.78
Philadelphia	17,918	17,060,134.24
Pittsburgh	6,651	5,079,938.43
Scranton	1,743	2,324,223.08
Wilmington	683	327,924.93
Total	63,929	55,468,117.21
San Francisco:		
Boise	1,099	472,819.51
Helena	831	333,265.41
Honolulu	1,196	876,086.14
Los Angeles	22,429	19,706,004.78
Phoenix	2,059	1,327,348.74
Portland	3,950	2,281,809.97
Reno	1,195	1,470,181.47
Salt Lake City	1,491	809,124.82
San Francisco	17,509	11,951,569.42
Seattle	6,417	5,409,549.97
Total	58,176	44,637,760.23
Grand total	399,269	284,803,237.04

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I think this is inexcusable. These workingmen, who have been paying their taxes to their employers, at the end of the year have to file their tax returns, and if they owe a little extra money they must pay it. If not, I venture to say they will not be allowed to go 4 or 5 years before the money is collected. There is ofttimes the ridiculous situation where the Treasury Department is making a refund to someone whose money was withheld but which they had not received. There is no excuse for having permitted this thing to run on since 1951.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator tell us why it was done?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know why it was done, but it was done. Why they have been permitted to run over this long period of time I do not know.

I have done my best to alert the Senate to the problem but with little success.

We must not overlook the fact that this administration was elected in 1952 partly because the American people were repudiating the scandalous conditions uncovered during the past administration. The Revenue Service was then one of the most severely criticized agencies and now it is not good that we still find these lax conditions being discussed here today.

They should be corrected.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. Then, the fact of the matter is that it is rather unfortunate that with reference to the matter which the Senator brings before the Senate—and I concur with him in saying that something should be done about it—the law imposes no other penalty than an interest charge of 6 percent. But, in bringing before us this group of cases it is unfortunate that the contracts let by the Architect of the Capitol were brought in, because they have nothing to do with it in any manner, shape, or form.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Except this, that for 4 years I have been trying to alert the Senate to these conditions. I spoke about it in January of this year at which time I itemized these delinquent accounts. I put in comparable figures in April of 1954, to show the situation existing at that time. For 4 years I have been trying to get Congress to investigate the condition in the Philadelphia regional area. Just a short time ago I called attention to the fact that there have been two embezzlers discovered in the Philadelphia area during the past 5 years. One of them went to the penitentiary; neither of them was dismissed until after I exposed them. The second will not be prosecuted, because the statute of limitations has run. But both of those embezzlers were known by one of the present top officials in the Treasury Department in the Philadelphia area long before their exposure yet he did nothing about it except cover it up. It is time Congress wakes up to some of the things which are going on. That official is still on the Treasury payroll.

I am glad the Senate Office Building was involved, because, now the United States Senate is at long last expressing some interest. The fact that it involves us as Members of the Senate means that more attention will be paid to it than has previously been the case. We are rapidly approaching the time when the American people will demand that we do something about it. I was glad for an opportunity to offer this case involving a contract on the Senate Office Building as an example, and I do not apologize for it.

Mr. PURTELL. The Senator does not mean that the Architect of the Capitol is involved, does he?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly not. But I do think that the Members of the United States Senate while not directly responsible for this particular contract, do have a responsibility for the conditions which allowed it to happen.

Unless we assure the American people that our tax laws are being administered impartially and that all citizens are being required to make the same tax payments, then our whole tax collecting system will collapse.

The case cited here today is in my opinion indefensible and one which should have been called to the attention of every American taxpayer.

This happened to be the case I found and used as an example. Had there been more cases pointed out it would have been embarrassing to someone else. I am glad the Senator left out the names of prior projects which were completed by this company. It would serve no purpose to include them here. They were not involved. But in each case taxes were deducted from the compensation of the workingmen by the plastering company and not turned in to the Treasury Department. We are in complete agreement that this is wrong and as a Member of the United States Senate, not as a member of the Commission, I hope the Senator from Connecticut and all other Senators will join in helping to get the answer to some of these questions.

Mr. PURTELL. I assure the Senator that I shall join him. I have already so indicated. But I should like to have the Senator from Delaware tell me whether any question of laxity has been raised or charged against either the Senate Office Building Commission or the Architect of the Capitol by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator has read my statement. Did he find anything in it which in any way indicated that the Architect of the Capitol or the members of the Building Commission were improperly involved?

Mr. PURTELL. I did not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is the answer. I assure the Senator from Connecticut that whenever I try to criticize anyone it will be in language that is understandable.

Mr. PURTELL. There was no other course which the Architect could have taken, under the law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. To my knowledge the Senator from Connecticut is the only man who has raised any question. Certainly I did not intend to do so in any of my remarks. I have always been a stanch supporter of the principle that all contracts should be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder. That is the law in this case and it should be the law in all cases.

However, I repeat, that does not excuse the Treasury Department for having approved this contractor as being responsible when at the same time their own records showed him to be a tax delinquent. Remember that, in addition to keeping over $400,000 of the funds withheld from the pay envelopes of their employees, this outfit had not even been paying their own income taxes since 1951.

The Architect of the Capitol could not have known this but the Treasury Department did.

If these conditions are allowed to continue, we may find other employers taking the money they withhold, putting it into their pocket, rather than forwarding it to the United States Government. This must be stopped.

Mr. PURTELL. I agree with the Senator, and I shall join him in any action he suggests, so that something may be done to collect the money and penalize the guilty persons for such type of actions.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON OF TEXAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10721) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 11, and 26 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement of the Senate numbered 19 to the bill, and concurred therein, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3957) for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FORRESTER, Mr. DONOHUE, and Mr. MILLER of New York were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

INCREASE IN RETIRED PAY OF CERTAIN FORMER MEMBERS OF THE LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3581) to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. What is the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business is Senate bill 3581.

The clerk will state the amendments.

The amendments were, on page 1, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "prior to January 1, 1955,"; and on page 2, line 1, after the word "act", to strike out "by 10 per centum." and insert "in accordance with the following schedule:

If retired pay commences between—	Retired pay not in excess of $1,500 shall be increased by—	Retired pay in excess of $1,500 shall be increased by—
Jan. 20, 1918, and June 30, 1955	12 per centum	8 per centum
July 1, 1955, and Dec. 31, 1955	10 per centum	7 per centum
Jan. 1, 1956, and June 30, 1956	8 per centum	6 per centum
July 1, 1956, and Dec. 31, 1956	6 per centum	4 per centum
Jan. 1, 1957, and June 30, 1957	4 per centum	2 per centum
July 1, 1957, and Dec. 31, 1957	2 per centum	1 per centum

Such annual increase in retired pay shall not exceed the sum necessary to increase such retired pay to $4,104. The monthly installment of each retired payment so increased shall be fixed at the nearest dollar", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the annual rate of retired pay of each person retired under sec-

tion 6 of the act of June 20, 1918, as amended and supplemented, shall be increased, effective on the first day of the first calendar month following the date of enactment of this act, in accordance with the following schedule:

If retired pay commences between—	Retired pay not in excess of $1,500 shall be increased by—	Retired pay in excess of $1,500 shall be increased by—
Jan. 20, 1918, and June 30, 1955	12 per centum	8 per centum
July 1, 1955, and Dec. 31, 1955	10 per centum	7 per centum
Jan. 1, 1956, and June 30, 1956	8 per centum	6 per centum
July 1, 1956, and Dec. 31, 1956	6 per centum	4 per centum
Jan. 1, 1957, and June 30, 1957	4 per centum	2 per centum
July 1, 1957, and Dec. 31, 1957	2 per centum	1 per centum

Such annual increase in retired pay shall no exceed the sum necessary to increase such retired pay to $4,104. The monthly installment of each retired payment so increased shall be fixed at the nearest dollar.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3581) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10721) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Friday, June 8, 1956, pp. 10071–10072.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a comparative statement on the State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies appropriation bill, for the fiscal year 1957.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies appropriation bill, 1957 (H. R. 10721)

SUMMARY OF BILL

Agencies	Appropriations (adjusted) 1956	Budget estimates, 1957	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
State	$150,948,695	$182,142,285	$171,506,737	$176,125,872	$175,065,872
Justice	211,072,000	235,880,000	215,965,000	219,451,910	216,043,650
The Judiciary	33,915,910	37,582,535	35,395,635	37,193,735	36,321,435
U. S. Information Agency	87,336,630	135,000,000	110,000,000	115,000,000	113,000,000
Funds appropriated to the President (refugee relief)	15,000,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
Total	498,273,235	599,104,820	541,367,372	556,271,517	548,930,957

DISTRIBUTION OF BILL, BY APPROPRIATIONS

Agency and appropriations	Appropriations (adjusted) 1956	Budget estimates, 1957	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
DEPARTMENT OF STATE (TITLE I)					
Salaries and expenses	[1] $78,676,339	$92,210,000	$90,000,000	$91,210,000	$90,500,000
Representation allowances	[2] 620,000	1,000,000	700,000	1,000,000	800,000
Acquisition of buildings abroad	[3] 9,188,661	21,962,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000
Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service	[4] 1,150,000	2,900,000	1,000,000	1,150,000	1,000,000
Foreign Service retirement and disability fund	1,236,000	1,304,000	1,304,000	1,340,000	1,304,000
Extension and remodeling, State Department Building	1,800,000				
Contributions to international organizations	[5] 32,165,695	34,159,285	33,830,875	33,859,285	33,859,285
Missions to international organizations	1,118,000	1,257,000	1,257,000	1,257,000	1,257,000
International contingencies	2,300,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:					
Salaries and expenses	532,000	506,000	506,000	506,000	506,000
Operation and maintenance	1,239,000	1,463,000	1,400,000	1,463,000	1,463,000
American sections, international commissions	298,000	296,000	296,000	296,000	296,000
Passamaquoddy tidal power survey		935,000		935,000	935,000
International fisheries commissions	455,000	650,000	542,862	645,587	645,587
International educational exchange activities	18,170,000	20,000,000	18,170,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
Rama Road, Nicaragua	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Total, title I	150,948,695	182,142,285	171,506,737	176,125,872	175,065,872
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (TITLE II)					
Legal activities and general administration:					
General administration, salaries and expenses	2,743,000	2,950,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	2,900,000
General legal activities, salaries and expenses	9,800,000	10,420,000	10,020,000	10,320,000	10,320,000
Antitrust Division, salaries and expenses	3,464,000	4,265,000	4,265,000	3,526,910	3,593,650
United States attorneys and marshals, salaries and expenses	18,959,000	19,225,000	19,000,000	19,225,000	19,000,000
Special temporary attorneys and assistants	300,000	300,000	100,000	300,000	300,000
Fees and expenses of witnesses	1,450,000	1,600,000	1,450,000	1,450,000	1,450,000
Claims of persons of Japanese ancestry, salaries and expenses	800,000	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000
Total legal activities and general administration	37,516,000	38,970,000	37,945,000	37,931,910	37,773,650
Federal Bureau of Investigation: Salaries and expenses	93,826,000	95,510,000	95,510,000	95,510,000	95,510,000
Immigration and Naturalization Service: Salaries and expenses	45,995,000	49,000,000	47,550,000	47,550,000	47,550,000
Federal Prison System:					
Bureau of Prisons, salaries and expenses	30,135,000	30,900,000	30,735,000	30,735,000	30,735,000
Buildings and facilities	875,000	18,500,000	1,425,000	4,925,000	1,675,000
Support of United States prisoners	2,725,000	3,000,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
Total, Federal Prison System	33,735,000	52,400,000	34,960,000	38,460,000	35,210,000
Office of Alien Property	(2,800,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)
Total, title II	211,072,000	235,880,000	215,965,000	219,451,910	216,043,650

[1] Includes comparative transfer of $7,055,000 from "Government in occupied areas" and excludes comparative transfer of $188,661 to "Acquisition of buildings abroad."
[2] Includes comparative transfer of $45,000 from "Government in occupied areas."
[3] Includes comparative transfers of $188,661 from "Salaries and expenses" and $500,000 from "Government in occupied areas."
[4] Includes comparative transfer of $150,000 from "Government in occupied areas."
[5] Includes a comparative transfer of $3,700,000 from "Contributions to North Atlantic Treaty Organization, executive."

State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies appropriation bill, 1957 (H. R. 10791)—Continued

DISTRIBUTION OF BILL, BY APPROPRIATIONS—continued

Agency and appropriations	Appropriations (adjusted) 1956	Budget estimates, 1957	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
THE JUDICIARY (TITLE III)					
Supreme Court:					
Salaries	$1,121,400	$1,181,600	$1,181,600	$1,181,600	$1,181,600
Printing and binding reports	91,200	91,200	91,200	91,200	91,200
Miscellaneous expense	50,850	55,150	55,150	55,150	55,150
Care of buildings and grounds	367,400	194,000	194,000	194,000	194,000
Automobile for the Chief Justice	5,835	5,835	5,835	5,835	5,835
Total, Supreme Court	1,636,685	1,527,785	1,527,785	1,527,785	1,527,785
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals: Salaries and expenses	275,755	284,850	284,850	284,850	284,850
Customs Court: Salaries and expenses	678,270	633,000	625,000	625,000	625,000
Court of Claims:					
Salaries and expenses	662,700	693,000	693,000	693,000	693,000
Repairs and improvements	12,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000
Total, Court of Claims	674,700	702,000	702,000	702,000	702,000
Courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services:					
Salaries of judges	8,406,000	8,406,000	8,406,000	8,406,000	8,406,000
Salaries of supporting personnel	14,825,000	16,701,000	16,250,000	16,701,000	16,475,500
Fees of jurors and commissioners	4,275,000	4,250,000	4,250,000	4,250,000	4,250,000
Travel and miscellaneous expenses	2,501,750	2,824,400	2,650,000	2,793,600	2,721,800
Administrative office, salaries and expenses	642,750	753,500	700,000	753,500	753,500
Air conditioning		1,500,000		1,150,000	575,000
Total, courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services	30,650,500	34,434,900	32,256,000	34,054,100	33,181,800
Referees in bankruptcy:					
Salaries of referees	(1,229,775)	(1,233,500)	(1,233,500)	(1,233,500)	(1,233,500)
Expenses of referees	(1,762,000)	(1,968,600)	(1,874,200)	(1,874,200)	(1,874,200)
Total, referees in bankruptcy	(2,991,775)	(3,202,100)	(3,107,700)	(3,107,700)	(3,107,700)
Total, title III	33,915,910	37,582,535	35,395,635	37,193,735	36,321,435
U. S. INFORMATION AGENCY (TITLE IV)					
Salaries and expenses	87,336,630	135,000,000	110,000,000	115,000,000	113,000,000
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT (TITLE V)					
Refugee relief	15,000,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
Federal Prison Industries, Inc. (title VI)	(865,000)	(950,000)	(950,000)	(950,000)	(950,000)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is somewhat difficult to identify the precise decisions of the conference committee, because the amendments are numbered, and without having the bill before me, it is not quite clear to what items the numbered amendments refer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator from Illinois will tell me the item in which he is interested, perhaps I can answer his question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to know about the appropriation for the enforcement of the antitrust provisions of the Interstate Oil compact.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The House agreed to the provision which was adopted by the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 10721, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 11, 1956.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate No. 8, 11, and 26 to the bill entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes," and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 19, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"For preparation of plans and study of sites of a maximum-custody penitentiary and a western youth-guidance center, $250,000: *Provided*, That no site shall be selected until further action by the Congress."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 19.

The motion was agreed to.

HEALTH AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 2092, Senate bill 3958, to assist in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and practical nurses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3958) to improve the health of the people by assisting in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and practical nurses and professional public health personnel, assisting in the development of improved methods of care and treatment in the field of mental health, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from South Dakota, in order that he may have an item printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Alabama there may be printed in the RECORD the transcript of the news conference with the doctors who attended the President, as reported by the Associated Press.

In view of the fact that the Senate is discussing a bill dealing with the public health, I think the interesting account of the conference between the press and the doctors attending the President will be of general, as well as historical, interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

There being no objection, the account of the conference was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the pending bill was unanimously reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The bill contains several different items. Each of these is the result of very thorough and extensive hearings, after which the committee sought consultation with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and after which representatives of that Department sat around the table with the

Subcommittee on Health, of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. All are agreed on the proposals and items embodied in the bill.

So, Mr. President, as I have said, the bill comes before the Senate with the unanimous approval of the committee, and with the support of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The bill contains five titles. It is an important bill to every man, woman, and child in the United States, because it affects the health of all our people.

The first title of the bill provides an additional means of stimulating the training of more professional public health personnel, by authorizing traineeship awards to qualified persons. The program is designed to provide advanced training in addition to the basic professional training which physicians, nurses, sanitary engineers, and other public-health specialists receive. To appreciate its importance we need only consider the situation which existed a few years ago, to recall the many diseases which plagued and baffled our people. In that connection let me refer to such diseases as malaria, typhoid fever, diphtheria, scarlet fever, smallpox, pellagra, and hookworm. When we consider that situation, we realize the tremendous strides which have been made in the field of preventive medicine, so as to almost eliminate these diseases from our country. We are advised that in the United States today there are many fine, outstanding young doctors who have never even seen a case of typhoid fever. The diseases I have mentioned have largely been relegated to the limbo of the past, because of the work done in the field of preventive medicine, in the field of public health.

Today there is a very critical shortage of doctors, nurses, engineers, and other personnel in public-health work. The number of individuals being trained in public health has been declining for several years. From a high of more than 900 persons trained in 1947, there has been such a decrease that only 400 persons were trained in 1955.

Furthermore, it is estimated that between 600 and 700 trained people leave the public-health field annually and are no longer available for public health work. Thus, a much higher level of training must be achieved in order to keep pace with the turnover of trained personnel and in order to overcome the backlog of presently unmet needs and to train the additional personnel needed in order to meet the requirements of our growing population, to put into operation the new research discoveries, and to handle new public-health problems.

The second title of the bill provides for advanced training of professional nurses. The 600 graduate nurses who last year completed their preparation for teaching positions barely balance the annual attrition. That number is insufficient even to fill the present vacancies and falls far short of the additional needs imposed by expanding school enrollments. The trainee authorizations of title II are needed if we are to begin to cope with the acute shortage of nurses qualified to teach and train the students who we hope will be recruited to meet the nursing needs of the Nation in future years and the equally acute shortage of nurses qualified by advanced training to fill key administrative and supervisory positions in our 6,000 hospitals and 4,000 public health nursing agencies.

So, Mr. President, title II of the bill authorizes grants to institutions providing advanced training of professional nurses, so as to increase the number qualified to teach in the various fields of nursing, and to fill key administrative and supervisory positions in our hospitals and other public-health agencies.

Title III of the bill makes provision for extension of the Federal-State program of vocational education, by authorizing and earmarking $5 million a year for practical-nurse training. This title is designed to increase the number of graduates from public vocational-training programs from 5,000 a year to approximately 15,000 a year by the end of the 5-year period. The program is for 5 years.

Mr. President, as all of us know, under our vocational-education program, today there are four principal categories. We train our people in agricultural work; we train them in trade and industry; we train them in home economics; and we train them in what we term distributive occupations. This title of the bill provides for training practical nurses under the vocational-education program. It simply adds that fifth category to the vocational-education program, in order to obtain the nurses who today are needed so badly.

The next title of the bill extends the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, as amended, for an additional 2 years. The present act will expire on June 30, 1957. The act should be extended at this time, in order that local communities, the States, and other governmental subdivisions may go forward with their plans to carry on the program for the construction of hospitals. As we know, this program has been under way for some 8 or 9 years; but there is still an acute shortage of hospital beds and an acute shortage of health centers and health facilities.

Title V of the bill authorizes a new program of Federal grants in the field of mental health, with special emphasis on projects designed to improve the operation of State institutions. As we know, today half the hospital beds in the United States are occupied by patients suffering from some form of mental illness. Today approximately 750,000 hospital beds in the United States are occupied by patients who suffer from mental illness. Last year, mental illness cost the taxpayers—not to mention the human suffering and misery, separation from family and loved ones, and the heartaches that such illness causes—more than $1,853,000,000.

In that connection, as Senators will recall, a large part of that expenditure fell upon the Federal Government, because of the care of mentally ill veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict. Of course, as Senators know, the Federal Government pays compensation to many of these veterans because of their mental illness. Today no problem in the field of health is more distressing, or imposes a greater economic burden or a greater economic loss on our country, than mental disease.

Title V would provide for what may be termed experimental projects in the battle against mental disease, in the battle to try to restore to sanity some of the thousands of people suffering from mental illness and to rehabilitate and return them to normal, useful lives. There would be provided such projects as the investigation of possible substitutes for hospital care, such as out-patient facilities and foster homes for certain classes of patients; studies and experiments with so-called day care hospitals, where patients could come during the day from their homes to receive therapy, returning to their homes at night; experimentation with intensive treatment of newly admitted patients to mental hospitals, as a means of decreasing the length of treatment required, and studies of feasibility of new types of institutional care for the senile aged. As Senators know, in the past 5 or 6 years the life span of the average American has been lengthened some 4 or 5 years. The more the life span is lengthened, naturally the more problems arise in the case of the aged.

As I stated in the beginning, this is a most important piece of legislation, affecting the life and health of all our people. The proposed legislation, according to overwhelming testimony before the committee, should bring most beneficial results. It is legislation which is unanimously supported by the committee and strongly supported by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I have been asked by the American Hospital Association whether, in connection with the operations of title II of this bill, it will be possible for the Surgeon General to appoint a subcommittee of technical persons with a particular responsibility of studying the training programs for nurse supervisors and administrators and reporting to the Surgeon General on such matters as well as making any recommendations to them with respect to the development of training programs for nurse supervisors and administrators.

There is no question in my mind, and I have had this confirmed through the office of the Surgeon General, but that the subjects for inquiry and recommendation referred to by the American Hospital Association would quite properly come within the purview of the expert advisory committee created by the bill. The committee itself could study these problems and make recommendations thereon or, if it so desired, could appoint a subcommittee to inquire into and make recommendations back to the committee on those matters. The answer to the American Hospital Association's questioning is therefore in the affirmative though it would be the committee itself, rather than the Surgeon General, acting as Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, which could undertake this task if it deemed it desirable.

In subsection (d) of section 306 of the bill provision is made for the ap-

pointment of an expert advisory committee. Reference is also made therein to the compensation to which members of that committee "who are not otherwise in the employ of the United States" shall be entitled. This is standard language which appears in many of the statutes already enacted by the Congress. It is not meant to imply that most members of such a committee or even that any members of such a committee will be persons regularly employed by the United States. As a matter of fact, it is the committee's understanding and intent that the great majority, if not all, of the members of such a committee will not be regularly employed by the United States.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 10, 1956]

TEXT OF DOCTORS' NEWS CONFERENCE REPORT ON IKE

(Here is a transcript of the news conference in which Maj. Gen. Leonard D. Heaton, Commandant of Walter Reed Hospital, discussed President Eisenhower's operation, as reported by the Associated Press:)

JAMES C. HAGERTY (White House press secretary). As you know, ladies and gentlemen, the doctors have been up for some time—have had very little sleep. Dr. Snyder has had less than all of us. But they did all want to come down here and discuss the President's case with you.

I must remind you that they are doctors and not politicians.

In introducing them, on my left is Dr. Isidor Ravdin, John Ray Barton professor of surgery, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, chairman of the board of regents of the American College of Surgeons and a member of the American Surgical Association.

On my right is Maj. Gen. Leonard D. Heaton, commanding officer of Walter Reed and the only Army surgeon in the United States that is a member of the American Surgical Association, which is composed of 235 surgeons.

On my extreme right, Maj. Gen. Howard Snyder, the President's personal physician and a fellow of the American College of Surgeons since 1922.

HEATON READS STATEMENT

I will now turn this meeting over to the doctors, and Dr. Heaton has a statement which he will read slowly.

Dr. HEATON. Ladies and gentlemen, the postoperative condition of the President is excellent, and we have every expectation of a normal convalescence. We look for a rapid and complete recovery and feel that he will return to his good health in a short period of time.

During the coming week he should be able to sign official papers and carry on those functions of the Government which are necessary.

We should like to establish here that his cardiac condition had no relationship to this present illness. We do not expect his heart in any way to affect his convalescence.

You ladies and gentlemen know as well as I that there is no relationship between ileitis and malignant disease. I want you to know that there was nothing suggesting a malignant disease found at the operation.

Ileitis is a nonspecific inflammatory disease of the ileum of unknown origin. This disease is more commonly found in younger-aged groups. It is a fairly common disorder and is probably much more common than is diagnosed.

Dr. Burrill Crohn, after whom this disease is sometimes called, has stated, and we agree, that "it is not a dangerous disorder."

Dr. Crohn has also stated that when necessary, and this occurs infrequently, the disease can be readily circumvented by surgery.

During the preoperative observation of the President here at Walter Reed, every opportunity was given this condition to correct itself. And it also gave us an opportunity during this interim to restore his electrolyte and fluid balance.

Question. How did you do it?

Mr. HAGERTY. Let the doctor continue reading the full statement and then we will go to questions.

NO OTHER COMPLICATIONS

Dr. HEATON. The third series of X-rays of the abdomen, which were taken about 1 a. m. this morning, demonstrated continuing and unrelieved intestinal obstruction, despite all corrective measures.

Therefore surgery was decided upon.

At operation, the preoperative diagnosis of ileitis with obstruction was confirmed.

No other complications were present.

The involved area of about 10 inches of the terminal ileum was bypassed, thus relieving the obstruction.

I will illustrate what I mean by this, after I finish the next report.

The abdomen was closed without drainage. The President's cardiac condition remained normal throughout the procedure and he left the operating table in excellent condition and has remained so, as previously reported.

Question. That is the end of the statement?

Dr. HEATON. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAGERTY. That is the end of the statement.

USES DIAGRAM

Dr. HEATON (at the blackboard, with a diagram already sketched out). This diagram will show you what we found upon opening the President's abdomen.

This [indicating] is the terminal ileum, going into the large intestine which starts here [indicating]. This terminal ileum, as I stated, was involved for approximately 10 inches with this disease. Therefore, a bypass was effected of this diseased area which was left in situ—in place—by connecting the small intestine, which was normal in every way, to the right half of the large intestine, thus giving us this vent or bypass, as you see here [indicating].

Question. Nothing was removed, doctor?

Dr. HEATON. Nothing was removed.

Question. How large is the abdominal opening, sir?

Dr. HEATON. This opening between the small intestine?

Question. Before the operation?

Question. The incision?

Dr. HEATON. The incision? Approximately—Oh, 6 inches.

Question. Would you trace the alimentary movement now, instead of what it was before?

Dr. HEATON. The alimentary movement before was in this direction, you see [indicating] the movement now.

Question. What happens to the bad 10 inches?

Dr. HEATON. This will—this area here [indicating] will, of course, not be used.

Question. Will it ever have to come out, sir?

Dr. HEATON. We do not believe so. It is the considered opinion of the surgeons at the table, and also some leading gastroenterologists of this country, that this procedure is adequate.

Question. Doctor, could you trace in red the—what the original walls of the small and large intestine were before you made the vent? [Heaton did so.]

Question. What is the advantage of leaving it in? I should think it would be just a troublemaker.

LIKE "HARD RUBBER HOSE"

Dr. HEATON. Because, as I previously stated, it has been found that particularly in this age group, the overage group, this segment, when left in, will not cause trouble.

Question. Doctor, what caused the disease in the diseased 10 inches, do you know?

Dr. HEATON. The origin, as I mentioned in the first report, is unknown.

Question. Doctor, what did it look like—inflamed, scars, or what?

Dr. HEATON. It was markedly contracted, inflamed, and had the consistency of a hard rubber hose.

Question. Doctor, were there any indications of earlier attacks of this disease?

Dr. HEATON. As we saw here at the time?

Question. Previous to this examination and operation—before the operation?

Question. Had the President ever had an attack of ileitis before, that you know of?

Dr. HEATON. Dr. Snyder will answer that question. (Later.)

Question. Was the obstruction caused by the contraction or by some object or growth?

CAUSED BY CONTRACTION

Dr. HEATON. The obstruction was caused by the contraction of this bowel [indicating] through edema and inflammation.

Question. What is edema?

Answer. It is the watery swelling process of inflammation, compromising the opening through this bowel to a very narrow passage.

Question. Is there any indication that the President's earlier operation, his appendectomy, might have had some effect on the present condition?

Dr. HEATON. No, sir; it is not.

Question. Doctor, is there any indication that a circulatory difficulty could have led to the inflammation of the ileum?

Dr. HEATON. We do not believe so.

Question. Are you having tests in that respect now, sir, with the tissue—take any tissue out, even though you left the ileum in?

Dr. HEATON. We took no tissue for examination.

Question. Doctor, can you tell me, this portion that was bypassed, was inflamed and was afflicted by this disease—when you bypass it, does that, at that point guarantee that that inflamed portion—you cannot spread the disease further up the lining of the canal? What happens? Does it atrophy, or what happens, do you know?

Dr. HEATON. You are using a term that we can throw right back—atrophy of disuse; in other words, a subsidence of the inflammation by not being put in use by nature. In other words, we presume that nature will use this vent through here [indicating] and not through here. We couldn't use this vent anyway because of obstruction over this whole length here, you see. And nature, now that she is using this vent, this will not be used, and we look for a subsidence of the inflammatory action.

EFFECT ON DIGESTION

Question. There is no effect on the digestive process, no loss of digestive capacity?

Dr. HEATON. Yes, there is, in this respect: The right colon—this is the right side of the large intestine (indicating)—is the absorptive side—absorbs water. For the time being until the new part here—the new opening—becomes in use, nature will take over and transfer this watery absorptive mechanism of the right large intestine to the part through here (indicating). Compensatory.

Question. Yes. The question that I really am getting at is, is there a permanent loss in any way of the digestive——

Dr. HEATON. None whatsoever. None whatsoever.

Question. Do you know how large is that vent that you spoke of? How large an opening is the vent or bypass?

Dr. HEATON. About—we made it about 4 centimeters.

Question. If I understood you correctly, in your statement you said that ileitis was of unknown origin. But ileitis, is it not true, is not necessarily accompanied with an intestinal block? If this is correct, do you have an explanation of what caused the intestinal block, what came behind the inflammation and the rubber hose condition in the ileum?

Dr. HEATON. The only cause we have—and you are right, it doesn't on that—it is not ordinarily accompanied by a severe intestinal obstruction. It is due in this case, or in case of where it does happen, we feel under such a marked degree of inflammation—swelling—that the opening through—the normal opening through the bowel contour is irreparably compromised—clamped down upon and markedly lessened.

Question. Is scar tissue involved, Doctor?

Dr. HEATON. Scar tissue? Yes. In the wall of the bowel.

Question. Actually cut that off, Doctor, or just bypass it? Do you try to close off that portion?

Dr. HEATON. We do not close it off. It was done in continuity.

Question. Does this condition ever result from some malfunctioning of the circulatory process?

Dr. HEATON. Not to our knowledge.

Question. Did you find anything wrong with the circulation or was it totally in the digestive tract?

Dr. HEATON. Are you referring to nourishment? In this segment of the bowel by blood supply, is that what you mean?

Question. No, sir. I just wondered whether you found any evidence of circulatory ailment that might be connected with this, or might not be.

Dr. HEATON. We did not.

Question. Was there a biopsy?

Dr. HEATON. No biopsy.

Question. Could you tell us why? What the decision was affected by not making that examination?

Dr. HEATON. Well, grossly, when you have it in your hand, it becomes such a typical picture that through past experience, with the surgeons around the table, we are, we were, of one mind that this was the only possible diagnosis that faced us.

Question. Doctor, it is possible that this——

Dr. HEATON. Diagnosis was made on gross pathology.

Question. Doctor, is it possible that this illness could be caused by any emotional upset, or is it purely a physical matter?

Dr. HEATON. Well, I don't think you can put your finger on any one particular aspect of emotion. I don't know about that.

Question. Doctor, you mentioned edema. Is that not associated with a heart condition?

Dr. HEATON. No; that is the process in the inflammatory change of events.

Question. Why wouldn't this have shown up in the barium examination less than a month ago?

"FOUR TO SIX WEEKS" RECOVERY

Dr. HEATON. Dr. Snyder will answer that question. (Later.)

Question. Doctor, can you estimate the length of time in days of the President's convalescence?

Dr. HEATON. He will be here, say—figure if he continues a normal convalescence, for approximately 15 days.

Question. And then what, sir, after that?

Dr. HEATON. Convalescence from here to a place, of course, of his choosing, and he should be able to return to full duties at the White House, 4 to 6 weeks.

Question. Doctor, how long does it take for the rest——

Question. Four to six?

Question. You said 4 to 6 weeks from the time he starts the post-Walter Reed convalescence, or from now?

Dr. HEATON. From now.

Question. Doctor, how long does it take for the rest of the colon to take up this water absorption?

Dr. HEATON. Mrs. Craig, I can't answer that definitely.

Question. That is quite a while, isn't it?

Dr. HEATON. Not necessarily so; no, ma'am.

Question. Doctor, are there any changes in diet or activities required as a result of this illness over a long period of time?

Dr. HEATON. I do not think so.

Question. Doctor, is the President being fed now?

Dr. HEATON. The President is being fed intravenously.

Question. How long will that go on?

Dr. HEATON. It will go on approximately—around the fourth postoperative day we will start giving him liquids by mouth.

Question. Has he been given any additional blood, any plasma, or anything like that?

Dr. HEATON. No.

Question. Does this operation affect the President's life expectancy in any way?

Dr. HEATON. Certainly do not think so.

Question. Doctor, does it improve it?

Dr. HEATON. We think it improves it.

Question. Would you outline the complete treatment, including what happens, for instance, with his anticoagulant therapy? Is he still receiving that?

Dr. HEATON. We have discontinued the anticoagulant therapy for the time being.

Question. How long was the anticoagulant discontinued before the operation?

Dr. HEATON. We discontinued it yesterday.

Question. Did they give transfusions to offset it?

Dr. HEATON. No, ma'am.

Question. Dr. Heaton, on the 14th day of February, following the coronary, a panel of doctors said that as far as they were concerned medically, the President was satisfactory to go ahead for reelection. Now, only talking about this ailment on which you and Dr. Ravdin are the experts, would you agree that this ailment has not affected that?

Dr. HEATON. Would you please repeat that question?

Question. On the 14th of February, during the winding up of the coronary, you might say, a panel of doctors who had been treating him for his heart trouble said they saw no reason that he should not run for reelection medically. I would like to ask you and Dr. Ravdin, having treated him, do you see any reason, based on this, why he can't run for reelection?

Dr. HEATON. I certainly do not.

Question. Dr. Heaton, would you estimate how much the closure of the small intestine—how much it narrows down to? Was there still an opening the size of a pencil, say?

Dr. HEATON. About the diameter of a lead pencil—the lead in a pencil.

Question. You said that this would improve his life expectancy. Would you explain why you think so?

Dr. HEATON. I think it will improve his life expectancy because of the bypassing of this diseased area.

Question. That implies it has been diseased for some time. Is that so, doctor?

Dr. HEATON. We will discuss that later.

BUSINESS RIGHT AWAY

Question. How soon can he see members of his staff to conduct business?

Dr. HEATON. If everything goes as we expect—Monday or Tuesday—first part of the week.

Question. Does your reply with respect to the President's physical condition, as to whether or not he should run again, include all the doctors at the table, or only your own opinion?

Dr. HEATON. I am sure I speak for all the doctors at the table.

Question. What are you feeding him intravenously?

Dr. HEATON. At present he is given glucose and water.

Question. Doctor, will he have to wear a supporter or a girdle or something, for a time? [Laughter.]

Dr. HEATON. No, ma'am. We hope not.

Question. They do.

Question. Have you tried to eliminate this obstruction before the operation?

Dr. HEATON. We tried to eliminate—cause the obstructing segment to resume activity by placing through the stomach a Levine tube connected with a Wangensteen suction apparatus which is put through the nose down to the stomach and acts very effectively in certain cases as a decompressing mechanism.

Question. Does it go only into the stomach?

Dr. HEATON. Yes, ma'am.

Question. How long was that tube in for?

Dr. HEATON. It was inserted approximately 12 hours.

Question. Did you use relaxing drugs with it?

CONDITION BEFORE SURGERY

Dr. HEATON. No, ma'am.

Question. Were you partially successful or not at all successful with that method?

Dr. HEATON. We were not at all successful.

Question. Could you expand on the President's condition after midnight until the time it was decided to make the operation? I ask that for this reason: Before midnight, if my facts are correct, we were told that he had no fever, he had stopped vomiting and he required no sedation and his pulse was normal. Now has there been something—did something begin to deteriorate quickly that caused you to operate suddenly at 3 o'clock in the morning on a man of his age?

Dr. HEATON. The abdominal distention became more progressive. The bowel sounds disappeared—were no longer heard. And in this report, as I noted, the third X-ray of the abdomen showed progressing and unremitting obstruction.

Question. General Heaton, what would have happened if you had not operated, in your opinion?

Dr. HEATON. In these cases one faces the possibility of a compromise of the bowel proximo to the obstruction which if unrelieved will or can produce gangrene of the bowel, which in turn is a very serious situation.

Question. What does the word "compromise" mean there—compromise of the bowel?

Dr. HEATON. Compromise of the bowel means that the circulation to the bowel becomes dangerously lessened in volume.

CALLED OUT OF DANGER

Question. Doctor, we were told yesterday that you had rejected the word "critical" as descriptive of the President's condition; how, looking back on it now, how seriously ill would you say he is? How would you describe it—as a layman?

Dr. HEATON. Well, any intestinal obstruction we regard as serious until it is relieved.

Question. You would say now he is out of danger, or how would you characterize it?

Dr. HEATON. I would say that at this time.

Question. What is the past history of complications in similar cases—instances, or something—at this stage?

Dr. HEATON. At this stage?

Question. This stage, yes, sir.

Dr. HEATON. This stage? None of any note.

Question. General Heaton, may I ask another question regarding the condition of the diseased area? By just looking at it and without taking a piece of tissue for laboratory examination, could you tell positively how important—could you tell positively that there was no tumorous condition or no circulatory defect of any kind in the area?

Dr. HEATON. We have held our share of these lesions in our hands—all of us at the

operating table—and it is an unmistakable lesion upon gross examination.

Question. Doctor, some internists contend that the administration of anticoagulants can produce a condition which can bring on such a lesion. Is that correct?

Dr. HEATON. That has not been our experience.

Question. Just where was the incision, Doctor?

Dr. HEATON. It was a right paramedian incision.

Dr. SNYDER (aside). Just to the right side of your navel—below the ribs.

Question. That would be inside the appendectomy scar?

Dr. HEATON. Yes, on the inside of the appendectomy scar. You are right.

Question. Would you estimate the recurrence chances, the possibility of its becoming chronic, further up on other parts of the bowel?

Dr. HEATON. In this age group we do not look for any further extension of this disease process.

Question. Could this be characterized as an emergency operation, in view of what you said about the dangers?

Dr. HEATON. In view of my previous remarks about the dangers of intestinal obstruction, unrelieved, this certainly was an emergency procedure.

Question. Dr. Heaton, does a gangrenous bowel usually cause death?

Dr. HEATON. Unrelieved, a gangrenous bowel will cause death.

Question. It is correct to say, sir, that this was a final and not a local operation? In other words, taking what you said earlier, there is no expectation that there will be another operation needed?

Dr. HEATON. We have just that expectation, that there will be no further surgery as necessary.

Question. Dr. Heaton—there were four doctors on your so-called operating team, and I believe there were others who were looking on. Do I understand that you assume that everything you have said here—all seven of you—are in agreement on it?

Dr. HEATON. Yes, sir.

Question. Who actually performed the surgery?

Dr. RAVDIN. I will answer that. General Heaton performed the surgery.

OPERATION LASTED 2 HOURS

Question. How long did it take, doctor, the actual surgery?

Dr. HEATON. About 2 hours.

Question. How would you classify this one, in your own personal experience, your most difficult, the easiest, or how?

Dr. HEATON. This certainly was not the most difficult. It went, I would say, quite smooth.

Question. Dr. Heaton, would you tell us—there are two questions to answer, on electrolyte and what was the anesthesia you used?

Dr. HEATON. We used general anesthesia, intratracheal—gas—oxygen—ether—induced by pentothal sodium, intravenously, and augmented by curare.

Question. What is the curare for?

Dr. HEATON. Induced relaxant.

Question. Thank you.

Question. General, when you say the President should be able to return to his full duties at the White House in from 4 to 6 weeks, does that include as full a campaign schedule as he has presumably intended to carry on?

Mr. HAGERTY. Doctor, nobody has announced the President's campaign schedule.

Question. Do you put any limitations—any limitations on his physical exertion that weren't there before the operation? Can he continue to play golf?

Dr. HEATON. I would think so—yes—reasonable convalescence—provided we get a solid wound, which we look for.

Question. Would you be in favor of starting the anticoagulants again at some date in the future?

Dr. HEATON. Oh, yes.

Question. When?

Dr. HEATON. Well, depends on how he does, and I mean postoperative days—certainly by the middle of next week.

Question. How is the President feeling now, and how long will he have pain?

Dr. HEATON. He is feeling very well now—quite responsive—and naturally is suffering some distress.

Question. Doctor, I was looking down and didn't hear. Did you answer that question as to whether you would put any limit on his activities that were not there before; that is, after this 6-week convalescent period?

Dr. HEATON. The only limit I would put on is athletic activity, due to the recent abdominal incision.

CAN GOLF IN AUGUST

Question. How soon would he be able to resume athletic activities?

Dr. HEATON. Well, of course, his athletic activity is centered on golf; isn't it? And swimming. Middle of August.

Question. By the middle of August? Golf?

Dr. HEATON. About the middle of August.

Question. No golf, no swimming in between?

Dr. HEATON. Within limitations, golf, taking a club around, but no marked swinging, of course.

Question. Can you tell us the name of this operation?

Dr. HEATON. Yes, sir; iliotransverse colostomy.

Question. Have you ever performed this exact operation before? [Laughter.]

Dr. HEATON. Yes, sir.

Question. How many of them, Doctor?

Dr. HEATON. Well——

Question. Hundred, or——

Dr. HEATON. Oh, no.

Question. Tens——

Dr. HEATON. Not in the hundreds; well, over several score, say.

Question. General Heaton, could you estimate how long this condition has been building up in the ileum—a matter of days or weeks or months?

Dr. HEATON. No, that is impossible. I couldn't.

Question. Will this require any special diet from now on, different from before?

Dr. HEATON. No, sir.

Mr. HAGERTY. Dr. Heaton has been on his feet for quite some time now—are we finished?

Dr. HEATON. Except the question on the electrolyte—meaning sodium potassium ions. We restore these ions to their normal value by the injection through the vein of intravenous—of substances containing these necessary ions. That is what we mean by the restoration of the electrolyte balance.

Question. Thank you.

Mr. HAGERTY. There were two questions, I believe——

Question. I have one——

Mr. HAGERTY. Addressed to Dr. Snyder.

Question. Dr. Snyder, do you as the President's physician recommend that he leave Washington to recuperate after leaving this hospital——

Dr. SNYDER. No.

Question. And if so, where might he go?

Dr. SNYDER. No, he would not need to. He could go from this hospital to his home and make a complete convalescence. He can go to Gettysburg, wherever he is more comfortable and can carry on his duties most successfully.

SUFFERED ILEITIS BEFORE

Question. Doctor, is there any reason to believe before this attack that he had a tendency toward ileitis?

Dr. SNYDER. Yes.

Question. What were the indications?

Dr. SNYDER. He had had ileitis before.

Question. When was that?

Dr. SNYDER. Probably carries back a great many years.

Question. Does that mean, sir, that he is likely to get it again?

Dr. SNYDER. I think not, with the correction that this operation affords.

Question. Was the last time, the time he spoke to the editors in April 1953, was that the last case, or has there been any since?

Dr. SNYDER. That was—those were very transient attacks. This condition usually resolves itself without surgery, and it is normally treated that way.

Question. I think one of the questions reserved for you was why this did not show up in the recent head-to-toe physical examination?

Dr. SNYDER. Because in recent head-to-toe examination, there was no inflammation in the ileum.

Question. Dr. Snyder, have they used this Levine tube treatment on him before?

Dr. SNYDER. Never.

Question. Is that a painful thing, sir, the insertion through the nose into the stomach?

Dr. SNYDER. No.

Question. But that only lasted some 12 hours, was it?

Dr. SNYDER. Yes.

Question. Jim, can we assume that Dr. Ravdin agrees with everything?

Mr. HAGERTY. May I just say it's getting hot in here, gentlemen.

Dr. RAVDIN. Well, I came here to support my good friend General Heaton and General Snyder. I agree with everything that General Heaton has said.

Question. Your understanding, sir, is that all the other doctors do, too?

RAVDIN. Every doctor at the operating table agreed without exception or without reservation on the operation that was done.

This was ileitis. Any surgeon that knows anything about this disease doesn't need a biopsy, and a biopsy would have caused increased hazards of cutting into the bowel to take a piece out to establish the diagnosis. There is no question at all about the diagnosis.

Question. Because of streptococcus?

Dr. RAVDIN. I don't understand what you mean.

DANGER OF INFECTION

Question. If they had to cut into the bowel, would there have been increased danger of infection?

Dr. RAVDIN. There would be increased danger of infection from the colon bacilli and certain of the streptococci.

Question. Doctor, is it your understanding that all 13 doctors agree with the——

Dr. SNYDER. Don't use that term—there were more than 13 around.

Dr. RAVDIN. I was at the operating table—the other side of the table from General Heaton—there were no complications associated with this disease affecting this small terminal portion of the bowel. The obstruction is relieved. I see no reason why the President should not make a complete recovery and go ahead and carry on his normal activities.

Question. Dr. Ravdin, could you put in your own words your assessment of the possibility of the President's being in a better physical condition, now that this condition has been eliminated?

Dr. RAVDIN. Well, gentlemen, you must realize that I have not been in intimate touch with the President's condition prior to this. But General Snyder has just told you that the President did have previous attacks of abdominal pain and cramps, and in which I agree with him, that this undoubtedly was due to some constriction of the bowel in association with ileitis. From this point of view he should not again have these attacks, and therefore, from the standpoint of any abdominal complaint, he should be better off now than he was previously.

Question. Thank you very much.

Dr. RAVDIN. This disease, contrary to what * * * one of your people made the statement that certain doctors said this was due to cardiac disease * * * is not true. I do not think any reputable physician in this country ever has ascribed ileitis as an aftermath of coronary disease. It nearly traditionally occurs in young people.

Question. Doctor, isn't there a danger to a man's heart when he has had a heart attack, and he is 65 years old, to undergo the strain of a major operation like this?

Dr. RAVDIN. Adequately prepared for operation, and adequately taken care of during operation, the very best cardiologists in this country now agree that patients can go through extensive major operations with considerable safety.

Question. Jim, could we break this up?

Mr. HAGERTY. Thank you.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield

Mr. LANGER. May I inquire whether, under the terms of the bill, mental care of Indians is also included?

Mr. HILL. The program under this bill will be administered by the Public Health Service, so I am positive that any American Indians unfortunate enough to suffer from mental illness will have the benefit of these experimental projects.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Alabama.

I ask the Senator if my understanding is correct, that what is done in title I and title II is to grant open-end authorizations of no stated sum, such authorizations to be later implemented by appropriations recommended by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct. I may say in that connection that when the bill was originally discussed, we considered certain specific sums. After consultation with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, more particularly with Dr. L. T. Coggeshall, special assistant to the Secretary for Health and Medical Affairs, we came to the conclusion that it would be better to enact the bill as it is now written.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Under title III, which provides for practical nurse training, there is an authorization of $5 million a year.

Mr. HILL. Yes. That is in addition to the vocational education program; and those funds will be matched by the States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Title V is also an open-end authorization, is it not?

Mr. HILL. That is correct. It falls in the same category as titles I and II.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As I understand, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama is chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which deals with the budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Alabama happens to be chairman of that subcommittee at this time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore I assume that these authorizations will receive very sympathetic treatment when they reach the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator makes no mistake in his assumption.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We have here a unique situation. Frequently committees authorize appropriations, but when the authorizations reach the Appropriations Committee, there are no funds made available to carry out the programs. Here we have an example of a thoroughly integrated procedure, in which the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which handles appropriations for that department. Therefore he knows what was in the minds of the drafters of the legislation, and sympathetic treatment will be accorded to the authorization.

Mr. HILL. Members of the legislative committee—both those on this side of the aisle and those on the other side—have given strong support to the proposed legislation. The Senator from Alabama is chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and as such he will be conscious of that strong support, and of the desire of his colleagues on the legislative committee that this legislation be properly implemented with adequate appropriations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an observation?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator from Alabama is greatly to be congratulated for the public-health measure which he is sponsoring. The Senator from Alabama is the son of one of the most distinguished doctors and surgeons in the United States. His father studied under Joseph Lister, the founder of antiseptic surgery. The Senator from Alabama is the godson of Joseph Lister, and bears the name Lister. He is a worthy son of one great physician, and a godson of another.

I sometimes feel that the Senator from Alabama has not been sufficiently appreciated by the general public. We appreciate him on the floor of the Senate as an indefatigable worker, as a perfect gentleman, and as a great humanitarian. But he is so modest and moves so smoothly and effortlessly that frequently the general public does not know of his work.

As all of us are aware, he, together with former Senator Burton, now Justice Burton of the Supreme Court, fathered the Hill-Burton Act, for Federal aid to hospital construction, which has greatly improved the hospital facilities of the country.

The Senator from Alabama has been the author of any number of other public health and welfare measures which he has been too modest to claim as his own. In connection with the latest measure, the Senator from Alabama characteristically gives credit to everyone but himself.

The Senator from Alabama and I do not always agree on all subjects—particularly one very burning subject—but, except for occasional aberrations, I regard the Senator from Alabama as one of the finest Members ever to grace this Chamber. I think it is highly important that we from the North and West who differ with the Senator on some issues should pay tribute to him for the great work he does in the field of health and social welfare. The Senator is a worthy exemplar of the principles of his noble father and of his godfather, Lord Lister.

Mr. HILL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois for his most generous and gracious words. I assure him that I deeply appreciate them.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am happy to join the distinguished Senator from Illinois in paying tribute to the chairman of our committee.

We began this fight with the consideration of a handful of bills of various kinds in the health field. The Senator from Alabama, as chairman of the committee, and I, as ranking minority member, agreed that we would try to deal with the entire subject in a strictly nonpartisan manner, not only in discussions among ourselves, but especially in our contacts with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in considering the best way to handle the legislation. That led to a number of conferences with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Also the committee staff worked with the staff of the Department in drafting an omnibus bill which would represent the thinking, not only of the Department leadership, but also of Members on both sides of the aisle.

The distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is present, and I wish to say a word about him. While the party on the other side of the aisle has had the chairmanship of the committee, he has been for some time the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, and he has contributed both in previous years and during this year to the building up of this proposed legislation, which I believe to be one of the most important pieces of legislation in the field of health ever presented to the Congress.

I agree entirely with what the Senator from Alabama has said. I take pride in the fact that my father was a physician—as was also the father of the Senator from Alabama—and perhaps for that reason I have a special interest in the health problems of our country, as does the Senator from Alabama. We have brought to the floor of the Senate a bill with the unanimous vote of the committee. There was not one dissenting vote when the issues were explained, and after our staffs had gotten together and ironed out whatever differences there were in existence.

I wish to pay a special tribute to the staff of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and to the subcommittee staff.

Mr. President, I am very happy to endorse the bill S. 3958, which the chairman of our committee, the Senator from Alabama, has so ably described as an important measure to improve the health of the American people. This is a significant legislative proposal embodying several of the recommendations President Eisenhower has made to the Congress. In 1955, and again this year, the President in his comprehensive mes-

sages to the Congress on the health of the American people, recommended legislation to establish traineeships for graduate nurses wishing to prepare themselves for careers in administration, teaching, and research. He also has twice recommended the establishment of traineeships in public health specialties. The provisions of this bill would carry out these recommendations, and its enactment will result in filling important gaps in the Nation's health services. Only with an adequate supply of well-trained health personnel can we possibly expect to continue our advances in controlling disease and improving the public health.

The section of the bill that provides for vocational training of practical nurses will also result in developing an adequate supply of much-needed personnel to care for the sick. We have previously enacted legislation to provide adequate facilities for the care of the sick, and the 1954 amendments to the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, the so-called Hill-Burton Act—also recommended by President Eisenhower—provided for intensifying efforts under that successful program to give Federal financial assistance to the States in constructing public and nonprofit diagnostic and treatment centers, chronic disease hospitals, nursing homes, and rehabilitation facilities. Now, in the legislation before us today, we are planning to take a logical step to continue this program through 1959, and also we are moving ahead to help train manpower to provide essential services in the facilities being built.

I am also pleased to point out that the bill includes provision for strengthening present aid to State and community programs for improving the quality of care in mental institutions. These mental health special project grants over the years should result in finding ways to reduce the length of stay and the necessity for institutional care in as many cases as possible of mental illness. They will make possible also the improvement of the quality of care in mental institutions and the administration of the institutions themselves.

This legislation is vitally important and should be carefully considered and promptly enacted by the Congress. The President, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee are all convinced of the need for the legislation and are agreed that its enactment will result in strengthening our continuing fight on disease and disability. I am glad to join in sponsoring the bill and in cooperating with the chairman of the committee in connection with it.

I desire to pay a special tribute to the chairman of our committee, the Senator from Alabama. His cooperation, his earnest desire to see this and the other health bills that we are taking up today approved by the Congress, and his willingness to follow a give-and-take attitude with the members of the committee on this side of the aisle, are largely responsible for our success in getting these measures before the Senate this year. He deserves a great deal of credit and praise for the progress we are making in the field of health legislation.

At the same time, Mr. President, I want to call attention to the fact that the President has also recommended other legislation in the health field in his outstanding message on the health of the people of the Nation, transmitted to the Congress on January 26, 1956.

The President, in that health message of last January, asked the Congress to—

First. Increase appropriations for medical research.

Second. Authorize a 5-year $250 million program of Federal matching grants for construction of medical research and training facilities.

Third. Provide a 5-year program of grants for training practical nurses.

Fourth. Provide traineeships for graduate nurses.

Fifth. Provide traineeships for public health specialists.

Sixth. Strengthen medical care for the indigent.

Seventh. Establish a health insurance program for Federal employees.

Eighth. Strengthen medical care for military dependents.

Ninth. Establish a continuing program to collect data on sickness and disability.

Tenth. Extend the hospital survey and construction program.

Eleventh. Authorize Federal guaranties of private mortgage loans for construction of health facilities.

Twelfth. Authorize construction of sanitary facilities for our Indian population.

Thirteenth. Establish a new program of mental health special project grants.

Fourteenth. Strengthen authority for water pollution control.

Fifteenth. Extend the Poliomyelitis Vaccination Assistance Act of 1955.

I have enumerated the recommendations in one place at this point in the RECORD, so that there will be before us the projects we have been considering, and to indicate the progress which has been made toward accomplishing the wonderful program submitted by the President.

The bill before us includes five of these proposals—the training of practical nurses, of graduate nurses, and of public health specialists; the extension of the hospital survey and construction program; and the authorization of mental health special project grants. We have previously passed bills that carry out four of the President's other recommendations—i. e., to strengthen the medical care program for military dependents; to establish a program for continuing collection of statistics on sickness and disability; to extend and strengthen the water pollution control program; and to extend the Poliomyelitis Vaccination Assistance Act.

It remains for us to act on the following Presidential recommendations to—

First. Authorize Federal guaranties of mortgage loans.

Second. Strengthen the program of medical care for the indigent.

Third. Establish a health insurance program for Federal employees.

Fourth. Authorize the construction of sanitary facilities for our Indian population.

Although last year we passed a bill to provide Federal matching grants for construction of medical research facilities, we have not acted on the President's recommendation to provide matching grants also for the construction of medical teaching facilities. I understand that the need for medical teaching facilities is, if anything, more pressing than those for medical research facilities. If the great increase in research appropriations recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee is approved in conference, the need for additional medical teaching and training facilities will be even greater.

We have had before us for 3 years now a recommendation from the President for legislation to strengthen voluntary health insurance. Although extensive hearings were held in 1954 and we reported a bill that would establish a limited Federal health reinsurance program, we had no floor action on that proposal. Subsequently, at the very beginning of the 84th Congress, the President once again recommended a health reinsurance program. Mr. President, it is my hope that these and other proposals in this new field will receive the careful consideration of the Congress before adjournment this year.

I am not critical, Mr. President, of the progress which has been made, indeed, I think progress made thus far has been wonderful—but I wish to point out that we have not completed the job, and I think that before adjournment the Congress will want to carry out the other recommendations of our great President whose interest in the health of the American people is so well known.

Mr. President, it seems particularly appropriate at this time, when we are so much concerned about the health of our beloved President, that we should be considering a measure which he himself has recommended, to bring about better health and living conditions for the American people. I am happy indeed to endorse Senate bill 3958, and I hope it will be passed promptly by the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF SUBSECTION (2), SECTION 654, TITLE VI OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT—BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I had prepared an amendment to offer to the bill. I say I had prepared it. I shall explain my proposal. However, first I wish to read the amendment. I propose to amend subsection (e) of section 654 of title VI of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "or (3) a nonprofit corporation or association having contractual affiliation with a nonprofit hospital (as defined in section 631 (g)) approved for intern or resident training."

Mr. President, in my amendment, I am joined by the Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. COTTON], and the Senators from Maine [Mrs. SMITH and Mr. PAYNE].

I wish to say a word or two about the purposes of the suggested amendment.

The President, in his message to the Congress on January 18, 1954, included recommendations for the broadening of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act. These recommendations and the original proposal—H. R. 7341, 83d Congress, 2d session—contained no limitations as to eligibility for assistance to hospital construction under the act other than the fact that the prospective applicant would have to be a nonprofit corporation or a governmental agency. The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in reporting out a clean bill, included the limitation now contained in the law that the applicant must be either governmental or a corporation or association which owns and operates a nonprofit hospital. This version of the bill H. R. 8149 was considered by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as well as its own original version, S. 2456, which contained the broad recommendations of the President.

The Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare endorsed the broad provisions of the original Senate bill. Mrs. Hobby stated:

> There are situations, particularly in rural areas, where construction or maintenance of a hospital may not be feasible, but where the health needs of the community could be better met if adequate diagnostic or treatment centers were available for physicians practicing in the area. The House bill would limit the opportunities to provide such centers in such situations.

However, the Senate committee reported out the more limiting wording of the House bill.

Because of the great cost of modern medical equipment, rural doctors are handicapped by the initial heavy investment in establishing practice in rural areas. If they could combine efforts so that several doctors could use a small diagnostic treatment facility, they would then have available modern medical aid now far beyond the individual doctors' means. Many small towns through interested citizen groups have shown a willingness to assist in backing such a venture by their doctors. Many hospitals have shown a willingness to assist in the more difficult jobs which would even be beyond the facilities of a small rural clinic. However, the Public Health Service Act as it now stands, for all practical purposes, precludes any Federal assistance to their construction.

We are informed that in New England attempts were made under the act as it stands, to create rural diagnostic and treatment clinics. These would have had to be actually owned by the hospitals. This the hospitals were unwilling to undertake because of the very complicated financial and legal responsibilities. Therefore, a group of northern New England doctors known as the Regional Medical Needs Commitee composed of the officials of the State Medical Societies of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont, the three commissioners of health from these States, and the deans of the Medical Schools of Dartmouth and the University of Vermont, worked out the following idea as a compromise between the very broad provisions originally recomended by the President, but turned down by Congress, and the very restricted provisions of the bill as it now stands.

The Hill-Burton Act would be broadened to allow its assistance to extend to the construction of rural diagnostic treatment facilities where they are a nonprofit corporation, or association having contractual affiliations with a nonprofit hospital. This contractual affiliation would be spelled out in regulations of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department so that not only would the extensive laboratory and advisory facilities of the main hospital be available to the local diagnostic treatment facility, but the hospital would also have some responsibility for the standards maintained. However, the hospital would not have the total financial and legal responsibility of which they are so afraid. It was felt that flexible arrangements of this sort would be workable.

The AMA has refrained from giving an official opinion until after their legislative committee meets in early June.

We have received excellent cooperation from the congressional liaison of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in working up this amendment. They sent to assist in perfecting the wording a representative from their General Counsel's Office, and the Assistant Chief of their Division of Hospital Facilities. However, the Department is not ready to accept this as an amendment to the bill.

In consultation with the chairman and ranking members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I found them very much averse to opening up the bill to this rather important amendment at this time. Not wishing to delay the progress of legislation, I finally came to the conclusion that I could best proceed on this exceedingly important matter by introducing this measure as a separate bill, and I am grateful for this opportunity of introducing it during the discussion of the pending bill.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that, as one of those who joined with him in sponsoring the proposed amendment, I wish again to associate myself with him in introducing the bill to which he has referred. I regret exceedingly that the Department and the committee—although I quite understand the reasons, and my statement is not in any sense a criticism of them—could not see their way clear to incorporating the amendment in the bill, because it would, I think, open the way for much needed medical service in some of the small and isolated communities in our States. I cannot help but be of the opinion that there must be other States as well as the three northern New England States mentioned which would have similar needs and which would enjoy benefits from this amendment.

But I understand the reasons, and I join in commending the Senator from Alabama for a fine bill. I understand the reason why the amendment cannot be incorporated in the pending bill, but I wish to reiterate my support of the measure, and I commend the Senator from Vermont for offering the amendment and for introducing the bill. I express to him the hope that we can ultimately have the amendment made a part of the law.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to join with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire and the distinguished Senator from Vermont in the statements which they have made. Many persons in Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Idaho are very anxious in rural areas to have the benefit of the amendment which the Senator has discussed and which is represented in the bill now before us. I hope I may have the honor of being a cosponsor of the proposed legislation.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator from North Dakota. I shall be glad to add the Senator's name as a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. President, at no time did the medical group of the three northern New England States who encouraged us to have the amendment drawn up suppose that it would be for the benefit of those three New England States alone, because they felt certain, as we all feel certain, that the rural areas of the entire Nation would benefit from it.

Evidently the same thought was in the minds of the President of the United States and Mrs. Hobby, when she was Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I earnestly hope, therefore, that the bill, as a bill, will have the serious consideration of the committee to which it will be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4033) to amend subsection (e) of section 654 of title VI of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. Flanders, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed at this point in the RECORD the following communications which have been addressed to me:

A telegram from Mr. and Mrs. Burt P. Holland, Jr.; a telegram from Elaine and George Biggs; a telegram from Virginia Gould Rheuby, M. D.; a telegram from George A. Wolfe, Jr., M. D., dean of the College of Medicine of the University of Vermont; and a telegram from Leon R. Lezer, M. D., director of health studies, College of Medicine, University of Vermont.

Also, a letter from the Honorable Stanley C. Wilson, a former Governor of Vermont, who lives in Chelsea, Vt., a town which is not situated on a railroad. Mr. Wilson has used his own funds to establish a nonprofit organization of the type we have been discussing, and for which no public money is available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The communications ordered to be printed in the RECORD are as follows:

CORINTH, VT., *June 4, 1956.*

Senator RALPH FLANDERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Have just wired Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH as follows: "Three-town area, 2,000 people, without resident physician. Funds urgently needed for medical center. Urge you support Flanders proposed amendment, act of 1956, S. 3958, title 6, of Hospital Construction Act, giving rural areas equal benefit with urban."

Mr. and Mrs. BURT P. HOLLAND, Jr.

WOODSTOCK, VT., *June 5, 1956.*

Senator RALPH FLANDERS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

So rural areas may have equal benefits with urban areas, urge support of Senator FLANDERS' proposed amendment to Health Bill Act, 1956, S. 3958, title of Hospital Construction Act for diagnostic treatment centers to become available to rural areas. Without these amendments rural areas are discriminated against in favor of urban centers in Federal benefits.

Respectfully,

ELAINE and GEORGE BIGGS.

WOODSTOCK, VT., *June 5, 1956.*

Senator RALPH FLANDERS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

So rural areas may have equal benefits with urban areas, urge support of Senator FLANDERS' proposed amendment to Health Bill Act, 1956, S. 3958, title of Hospital Construction Act, for diagnostic treatment centers to become available to rural areas. Without these amendments, rural areas are discriminated againts in favor of urban centers in Federal benefits.

Respectfully,

VIRGINIA GOULD RHEUBY, M. D.

BURLINGTON, VT., *June 2, 1956.*

Senator RALPH FLANDERS,
Senate Office Building.

Rural areas are not reached because of technicality in application for diagnostic treatment centers. Needs are for facilities to attract physicians to areas without hospitals. Urge support of Flanders proposed amendment to Health Amendment Act of 1956, S. 3958, title VI of Hospital Construction Act for diagnostic treatment centers to become available to rural areas. This amendment will provide equity in benefits to both rural and urban areas.

GEORGE A. WOLFE, Jr., M. D.,
Dean, College of Medicine, University of Vermont.

BURLINGTON, VT., *June 2, 1956.*

Senator RALPH FLANDERS,
Senate Office Building.

Public Law 482 of last Congress provided much needed benefits toward better health for America. Technicality of restricted applicants has prevented rural areas from receiving benefit of last appropriation for diagnostic treatment centers. Need in real rural areas is for facilities to attract young, competent, family physicians. Urge support of Flanders proposed amendment to Health Amendment Act of 1956, S. 3958, title VI, of Hospital Construction Act for diagnostic treatment centers to become available to rural areas. Northeast Regional Medical Needs Committee endorses this need. Citizens of small, rural towns work together to help themselves but should have benefit of applicants as nonprofit corporation to receive same Federal benefits as urban areas. Flanders amendment reaches all real rural areas throughout America.

LEON R. LEZER, M. D.,
Director of Health Studies, College of Medicine, University of Vermont.

CHELSEA HEALTH CENTER, INC.,
Chelsea, Vt., June 2, 1956.

DEAR SENATOR FLANDERS: Have just sent telegram to Senator ALEXANDER SMITH, as follows:

"Just learned of and favor FLANDERS' proposed amendment to Health Amendment Act of 1956, S. 3958, title VI, of Hospital Construction Act for diagnostic and treatment centers. Present law now discriminates against real rural areas that need Federal aid most to supplement local endeavors to protect rural health.

"STANLEY C. WILSON,
"President, Chelsea Health Center."

I understand your amendment would do away with the provision whereby no diagnostic and treatment centers can receive any benefit unless owned by or connected with a full-fledged hospital, which bars all local endeavors that are of our type. We run under our own power but it is hard sledding, though we are happy with results.

Yours truly,

STANLEY.

No stenog available tonight but my information is that action may be soon so wanted to get word to somebody.

HEALTH AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3958) to improve the health of the people by assisting in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and practical nurses and professional public-health personnel, assisting in the development of improved methods of care and treatment in the field of mental health, and for other purposes.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in urging the passage of the proposed legislation. This is an important bill, a bill of which I am pleased to be a consponsor.

I pay my tribute to the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for the splendid work they have done, not only this year, but in the past 4 years during which I have been associated with them on matters pertaining to health, education, welfare, and labor in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PURTELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HILL. The distinguished Senator from Connecticut will recall that during the 83d Congress he was the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. PURTELL. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. The distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] was the chairman of the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Both Senators have been deeply interested in legislation relating to health.

I feel certain the Senator from Connecticut appreciates the contribution which both he and the Senator from New Jersey made to the writing of the bill now under consideration. No members of the committee were more interested in putting the bill in such form that it could be reported to the Senate and in trying to assure the benefits which the bill will bring to the American people than were the distinguished Senator from Connecticut and the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. PURTELL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I, too, thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, although the bill before us covers a wide range of health problems, I want particularly to discuss title V, which deals with a new grant program to improve the care of the mentally ill. This title parallels in substance title VI of the administration's omnibus health bill submitted to the Congress and introduced last year.

Mr. President, ever since I came to the Senate I have had a sincere interest in extending the fight on mental illness. This may be natural, since I come from the State which is generally considered to have been the birthplace of modern mental health work. I myself have introduced proposed legislation in this field, and last year supported the mental health proposal which finally became law. Under the terms of that act a vast study of mental illness in the United States is already under way. The Commission on Mental Illness, I feel certain, will make many recommendations, and its work will set the stage for further advances in this field.

We do not need to wait, however, for any further findings before beginning a significant attack on the diagnosis, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of mental illness. The special project grants authorized in title V of the bill will permit the establishment of an orderly program for the development of new techniques for the diagnosis and care of the mentally ill and will permit demonstrations of improved methods. I am continually impressed with the fact that unless something more is done to prevent and control mental illness, 1 out of every 12 children born today will spend part of his life in a mental hospital. More than $1 billion a year is being spent for the care of the mentally ill in hospitals and for benefits to veterans with mental disorders. This cost is rising at the rate of $100 million a year.

Title V of the bill before the Senate would establish a program of pilot studies and demonstrations to improve the care and treatment of patients in mental hospitals. The studies would be concentrated on institutional care and the information developed by these studies would be widely disseminated among mental hospitals and institutions.

The proposed special project grants have the important characteristic that they will encourage studies of substitutes for hospitalization of the mentally ill. They will encourage imaginative approaches, many of which should suggest real improvements in the way in which mental patients can be handled.

The bill embodies a variety of health activities. It carries out several of the recommendations of the President with respect to health legislation, has the solid endorsement of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and deserves the full support of the Senate.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise not only to support the bill, but also to compliment the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, for work which has been superlatively well done. I have had the honor—and I consider it to be a very great honor—to serve under the Senator from Alabama as a member of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee of Labor and Public Welfare. As a matter of fact, I was chairman of that subcommittee for some time several years ago.

I think very few persons realize the tremendous progress which has been made in the field of medical care and research at this session of Congress due largely to the wise leadership of the senior Senator from Alabama. He has shown his leadership not only as the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, but also as chairman of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which deals with health matters.

At this session of Congress, the Senate has approved authorizations and appropriations for various types of medical research and medical study and for the care of the sick which are of a character and a size which should bring us very great satisfaction.

In many instances, such as in cancer research, research with respect to the mentally ill, research in arthritis, and research in the various respiratory and circulatory diseases, the appropriations which were recommended by the subcommittee headed by the senior Senator from Alabama, and approved last week by the Senate, were from 60 to 80 and, in 1 or 2 instances, nearly 100 percent greater than in any previous year.

I have a special interest in this bill, although I am also deeply interested in all similar bills, because it deals with the mentally ill. During the years I was the Governor of my State, I came constantly into close contact with the problems affecting the mentally ill. The State of New York today has 110,000 patients in its mental hospitals. New York State spends more than $150 million a year for their care. That is the largest single item in the State budget, save those items which deal with State aid for education and similar activities. We in New York have been able to see the great progress which has been made in research through expenditures carefully made under the wise guidance of the executive and our research staffs.

So that today for the first time, I believe, in the memory of any living man, we do see substantial hope, that in an ever-increasing number, our mentally ill may be cured, or, if not completely cured, will at least be greatly benefited and helped back to useful occupations and useful family life again.

I do not know of anything in the years I have spent in the Senate that has brought me as great satisfaction as the progress that has been attained this year in research and in the study of the causes that serve to affect adversely the lives of so many of our people who are either presently ill or threatened with one or more of the dread diseases.

I want to express my strong support of this and the other health bills which are before the Senate today, and which affect the well-being of our people. Again, I consider it a real privilege and honor to be able to congratulate the senior Senator from Alabama, LISTER HILL.

Mr. HILL. I want to thank my distinguished colleague from New York for his very kind words. He not only serves as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, but on the Subcommittee on Health, and he is the former distinguished chairman of that subcommittee. Certainly there is no member of the full committee or the Subcommittee on Health who makes greater contributions to the cause of health than does the Senator from New York. He is always present at its meetings, always active, always tireless, and always devoted in his efforts for the betterment of the health of the people.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. PAYNE. I, too, want to commend the distinguished chairman of the committee for what has been brought forth in the way of constructive legislation. With respect to one particular part of the proposed legislation, namely, that which extends the Hill-Burton Hospital Survey and Construction Act, I happened to become aware of a situation which confronts at least the people of my State, and I believe possibly those of other States.

I simply wish to ask unanimous consent that I may have the privilege of having printed in the RECORD at this point a statement, and to express the hope that the distinguished chairman of the committee, along with other members of the committee, will have an opportunity to read the statement to see if there is any justification for the thesis I have set forth, having to do with the method of allocation based upon census reports, because there is a question as to their accuracy as they apply to all States.

I ask unanimous consent to have the statement I have prepared printed as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

Title IV of S. 3958, the pending bill, would extend the Hill-Burton Hospital Survey and Construction Act for 2 years. Let me take this opportunity to state that I am wholeheartedly in support of the Hill-Burton Act and of the extension provided by the bill under consideration. The Hospital Survey and Construction Act has been of untold benefit to the entire Nation and should be continued until the needs of the people for this type of facility have been adequately met.

At this point, however, I wish to point out what I consider to be a rather serious deficiency in the Hill-Burton Act. Under the provisions of that law, funds are apportioned to the States by the Surgeon General according to a formula which uses the population of each State as one of its elements. Section 631 (c) of the act (Public Law 725, 70th Cong.) defines population as follows: "The population of the several States shall be determined on the basis of the latest figures certified by the Department of Commerce."

In practice an accurate count of the people of this Nation is made by the Census Bureau every 10 years. For the years in between the Census Bureau makes an estimate of population changes, and every 2 years the Bureau certifies these figures. Therefore allocations of funds to States under the Hill-Burton Act are based on the decennial census during the 2 years immediately following the census, and thereafter are based on Census Bureau estimates of the population. This provision could well have an adverse effect on any State since for the majority of the time allocations are based on Census Bureau estimates of population. While these biennial estimates of the population of the United States serve many useful purposes, I do not believe they are sufficiently reliable to be used as a basis for fund allocations under the Hill-Burton Act. As an indication of this let me cite the situation that has arisen with regard to my own State of Maine. As of July 1, 1954, the Census Bureau estimated that the population of Maine had declined some 25,000 since the census of 1950. At the same time the Maine Bureau of Vital Statistics estimated that the State's population had increased about 25,000 during the same period. On looking into the matter it was determined that the two agencies had used different indexes in arriving at their estimates. Through correspondence with the two agencies it became clear that population estimates are extremely sensitive and that a very slight inconsistency in the data series used to estimate net migration will be multiplied many times in the final estimate.

Early this year the Census Bureau released its estimates of population as of July 1, 1955. This revealed that the Bureau estimated that Maine's population had declined about 9,000 since the census of 1950. If the 1954 estimate were accepted as accurate, it would mean that between 1950 and 1954 Maine lost 25,000 people, but that between 1954 and 1955 Maine had a population increase of some 16,000 people.

Most observers of Maine are very doubtful that any such drastic population fluctuations have in fact occurred in Maine during the period covered by these estimates. It would certainly seem then that this illustration amply demonstrates the unreliability of population estimates for a matter as important as allocation of funds for hospital construction.

Using population estimates as a basis of fund allocation can have far-reaching effects. In the case of the Maine, which I have used as an illustration, it is obvious that under the 1954 estimate of a substantial decline in population Maine would receive a proportionately reduced allocation. This result, though serious, would generally affect only the State concerned. However, let us assume that the estimate for a large State was substantially in error on the side of overestimating an increase in population. Such a State would then receive a disproportionately large allocation. Since one large sum is appropriated for the administration of the act, it must be divided among all of the States. If one State receives more than its fair share, all the other States would necessarily receive less. This is an oversimplified example, but it serves to point up the inequities that could result when population estimates are used as the basis of fund allocations.

It would seem to me that the act should provide that for purposes of the formula for fund allocation population of the States shall be taken from the latest decennial census. I

have no knowledge as to whether the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has given this matter any consideration, but it is my hope that it will do so in the future.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I desire to say that the Chairman of the Committee and the committee have done a very great service in developing legislation of this type.

I thank the senior Senator from Alabama for yielding to me, and I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] a few moments ago in connection with the bill he introduced, because the State of Maine, as well as the State of Vermont, is largely a rural State. We, of course, feel that we will benefit considerably by the bill which has been introduced by the Senator from Vermont, I am very sure it will receive every consideration by the Senate.

Mr. HILL. I assure the Senator from Maine that not only will I read with interest the statement he has placed in the RECORD, but I shall read it with very real sympathy.

Mr. President, on page 17, line 14, the word "Public" was left out. The reference is to the Public Health Service Act, which, of course, is the act we have had on our statute books for many years.

I offer an amendment on page 17, at the end of line 14, to insert the word "Public."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 17, line 14, at the end of the line, to insert the word "Public."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Health Amendments Act of 1956."

TITLE I—GRADUATE TRAINING OF PROFESSIONAL PUBLIC HEALTH PERSONNEL

Traineeships

SEC. 101. Title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A, subch. II) is amended by adding after section 304 the following new section:

"Traineeships for professional public health personnel

"SEC. 305. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for each of the next four fiscal years, such sums as the Congress may determine, to cover the cost of traineeships for graduate or specialized training in public health for physicians, engineers, nurses, and other professional health personnel.

"(b) Traineeships under this section may be awarded by the Surgeon General either (1) directly to individuals whose applications for admission have been accepted by the public or other nonprofit institutions providing the training, or (2) through grants to such institutions.

"(c) Payments under this section may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, and at such intervals and on such conditions, as the Surgeon General finds necessary. Such payments to institutions may be used only for traineeships, and payments under this section with respect to any traineeship shall be limited to such amounts as the Surgeon General finds necessary to cover the cost of tuition and fees, and a stipend and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) for the trainee.

"(d) The Surgeon General shall appoint an expert advisory committee, composed of persons representative of the principal health specialties in the fields of public health administration and training, to advise him in connection with the administration of this section, including the development of program standards and policies. Members of such committee who are not otherwise in the employ of the United States, while attending meetings of the committee or otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but not exceeding $50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(e) The Surgeon General shall, between June 30, 1958, and December 1, 1958, call a conference broadly representative of the professional and training groups interested in and informed about training of professional public health personnel, and including members of the advisory committee appointed pursuant to subsection (d), to assist him in appraising the effectiveness of the traineeships under this section in meeting the needs for trained public health personnel; in considering modifications in this section, if any, which may be desirable to increase its effectiveness; and in considering the most effective distribution of responsibilities between Federal and State governments with respect to the administration and support of public health training. The Surgeon General shall submit to the Congress, on or before January 1, 1959, a report of such conference, including any recommendations by it relating to the limitation, extension, or modification of this section.

"(f) Except as otherwise provided in this section, nothing contained in this section shall be construed as authorizing any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the personnel or curriculum of any training institution."

Effective date

SEC. 102. The amendment made by this title shall become effective July 1, 1956.

TITLE II—ADVANCED TRAINING OF PROFESSIONAL NURSES

Traineeships

SEC. 201. Title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A, subch. II) is amended by adding after section 305 (added by section 101 of this act) the following new section:

"Traineeships for advanced training of professional nurses

"SEC. 306. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for each of the next four fiscal years, such sums as the Congress my determine, to cover the cost of traineeships for the training of professional nurses to teach in the various fields of nurse training (including practical nurse training) or to serve in an administrative or supervisory capacity.

"(b) Traineeships under this section shall be awarded by the Surgeon General through grants to public or other nonprofit institutions providing the training.

"(c) Payments to institutions under this section may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, and at such intervals and on such conditions as the Surgeon General finds necessary. Such payments may be used only for traineeships and shall be limited to such amounts as the Surgeon General finds necesseary to cover the costs of tuition and fees, and a stipend and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) for the trainees.

"(d) The Surgeon General shall appoint an expert advisory committee, composed of persons from the fields of nursing and nurse training, hospital administration, and medicine, to advise him in connection with the administration of this section, including the development of program standards and policies. Members of such committee who are not otherwise in the employ of the United States, while attending meetings of the committee or otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and welfare, but not exceeding $50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 73v-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(e) The Surgeon General shall, between June 30, 1958, and December 1, 1958, call a conference broadly representative of the professional and training groups interested in and informed about the advanced training of professional nurses, and including members of the advisory committee appointed pursuant to subsection (d), to assist him in appraising the effectiveness of the traineeships under this section in meeting the needs for professional nurses in teaching, administrative, and supervisory positions and in considering modifications in this section, if any, which may be desirable to increase its effectiveness, including possible means of stimulating State participation in the administration and financing of advanced training of professional nurses through Federal matching grants to States for the support of traineeships or related training activities, or otherwise. The Surgeon General shall submit to the Congress, on or before January 1, 1959, a report of such conference, including any recommendations by it relating to the limitation, extension, or modification of this section.

"(f) Except as otherwise provided in this section, nothing contained in this section shall be construed as authorizing any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the personnel or curriculum of any training institution."

Effective date

SEC. 202. The amendment made by this title shall become effective July 1, 1956.

TITLE III—PRACTICAL NURSE TRAINING

Amendments to Vocational Education Act

SEC. 301. The Vocational Education Act of 1946, as amended (20 U. S. C. 15i-15m, 15o-15q), is amended by inserting:

"TITLE I—VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN AGRICULTURE, HOME ECONOMICS, TRADES AND INDUSTRY, AND DISTRIBUTIVE OCCUPATIONS"

immediately above the heading of section 1 of such act, by changing the words "this Act" wherever they appear in such act to read "this title", and by adding immediately after section 9 the following new title:

"TITLE II—VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN PRACTICAL NURSE TRAINING

"Authorization of appropriations

"SEC. 201. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending

June 30, 1957, and for each of the next four fiscal years a sum not to exceed $5 million, for grants to States with State plans to extend and improve practical nurse training approved pursuant to section 203.

"Grants to States for extension and improvement of practical nurse training

"SEC. 202. (a) From the sums appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to section 201, each State shall be entitled to an allotment of an amount bearing the same ratio to such sums as the total of the amounts apportioned under title I and the act of March 18, 1950 (20 U. S. C. 31–33) to such State for such year bears to the total of the amounts so apportioned to all the States for such year. The allotment to any State under the preceding sentence for a fiscal year which is less than $10,000 (or, in the case of the Virgin Islands, which is less than $5,000) shall be increased to that amount, the total of the increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the allotments to each of the remaining States under the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than that amount.

"(b) The amount of any allotment to a State under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the State certifies to the Commissioner will not be required for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this title, shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for such year. Any amount so reallotted to a State shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a).

"(c) From each State's allotment under this section for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall pay to such State a portion of the cost of carrying out the State plan approved under this title. To the extent permitted by the State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year, the portion of the cost of carrying out the State plan paid under this section shall be 75 percent of such cost in the case of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and 50 percent of such cost in the case of each of the next 3 fiscal years.

"State plans

"SEC. 203. (a) To be approvable under this title, a State plan to extend and improve practical nurse training shall—

"(1) designate the State board as the sole agency for the administration of the plan or for the supervision of administration of the plan by local educational agencies:

"(2) provide that the individual supervising the functions of the State board under the plan shall be a registered professional nurse or shall have the consultative services of a registered professional nurse available to him;

"(3) show the plans, policies, and methods to be followed in extending and improving practical nurse training under the State plan, and in administering and supervising the administration of the plan, and provide such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the plan;

"(4) contain minimum qualifications for teachers, teacher-trainees, supervisors, and directors; and

"(5) provide that the State board will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title, and comply with such provisions as he may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve any plan which he finds fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of the State plan approved under this section, finds that—

"(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with a requirement of subsection (a) of this section; or

"(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with such a requirement; the Commissioner shall notify such State agency that no further payments will be made to the State from its allotments under section 202 (or, in his discretion, that further payments will not be made to the State for parts of the State plan affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until he is so satisfied the Commissioner shall make no further payments to such State from its allotments under section 202 (or shall limit payments to parts of the State plan in which there is no such failure).

"(d) (1) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's action under subsection (c) of this section, such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States.

"(2) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence.

"(5) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"Method of making and computing payments

"SEC. 204. The method of computing and paying amounts pursuant to section 202 shall be as follows: The Commissioner shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by him, estimate the amount to be paid to each State under the provisions of such section for such period; and shall pay to the State, from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by him for such period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, my any sum (not previously adjusted under this section) by which he finds that his estimate of the amount to be paid the State for any prior period under such section was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State for such prior period under such section. Such payments shall be made in such installments as the Commissioner may determine.

"Administration

"SEC. 205. (a) In carrying out his duties under this title, the Commissioner shall—

"(1) make studies, investigations, and reports with respect to matters relating to practical nurse training;

"(2) cooperate with and render technical assistance to States in matters relating to practical nurse training; and

"(3) disseminate information as to the studies, investigations, and reports referred to in paragraph (1) and other matters relating to practical nurse training.

"(b) The Commissioner is authorized to make rules and regulations governing the administration of this title and to delegate to any officer or employee of the Office of Education such of his powers and duties, except the making of rules and regulations, as he finds necessary.

"Advisory committees

"SEC. 206. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to appoint an advisory committee or committees to advise him on matters of general policy in connection with the administration of this title.

"(b) Members of any such committee who are not otherwise in the employ of the United States, while attending meetings or conferences of their committee or otherwise serving at the request of the Commissioner, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but not exceeding $50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Affect on other laws

"SEC. 207. Nothing in this title shall in any way affect the availability for practical nurse training of amounts paid the States under the act of February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 929), as amended and extended, or title I of this act, as amended and extended.

"Reports

"SEC. 208. The Commissioner shall include in his annual report a full report of the administration of this title.

"Authorization of appropriations for administration

"SEC. 209. There are hereby authorized to be included for each fiscal year in the appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as are necessary to administer the provisions of this title.

"Definitions

"SEC. 210. For purposes of this title—

"(a) The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Education.

"(b) The term 'practical nurse training' means training of less than college grade which is given in schools or classes (including field or laboratory work incidental thereto) under public supervision and control and is conducted as part of a program designed to fit individuals, engaged in or preparing to engage in employment as practical nurses, for such employment. The term includes also training of a similar nature, which is of less than college grade and is given and conducted as provided above, designed to fit individuals engaged or preparing to engage in other health occupations in hospitals or other health agencies, for such occupations. In addition, the term includes vocational guidance in connection with any such program and the in-service training of teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, and directors for any such program, but does not include courses which have only incidental relationship to the specialized training needed by an individual for useful employment as a practical nurse or in such other health occupations.

"(c) The term 'practical nurse' means a person who is trained to care for subacute, convalescent, and chronic patients under the direction of a licensed physician or under the supervision of a registered nurse, or to assist a registered nurse in the care of acute illness.

"(d) The term 'local educational agency' means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having

administrative control and direction of public secondary schools in a county, township, independent, or other school district, or having such control and direction over vocational education in such schools.

"(e) The term 'State' includes Alaska, Hawaii, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

"(f) The term 'State board' means the State board of vocational education, or the State board primarily responsible for the supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, as designated in the State plan.

"(g) The cost of administration of a State plan for practical nurse training may not include any portion of the cost of the purchase, preservation, erection, or repair of any building or buildings or the purchase or rental of any land."

TITLE IV—EXTENSION OF THE HOSPITAL SURVEY AND CONSTRUCTION ACT

SEC. 401. The first sentence of section 621 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out "seven" and inserting in lieu thereof "nine."

SEC. 402. Section 651 of such act is amended by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "four."

TITLE V—MENTAL HEALTH

Special project grants

SEC. 501. Section 303 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C. 242a) is amended to read as follows:

"Mental health

"SEC. 30. (a) In carrying out the purposes of section 301 with respect to mental health, the Surgeon General is authorized—

"(1) to provide training and instruction and to establish and maintain traineeships, in accordance with the provisions of section 433 (a);

"(2) to make grants to State or local agencies, laboratories, and other public or nonprofit agencies and institutions, and to individuals for investigations, experiments, demonstrations, studies, and research projects with respect to the development of improved methods of diagnosing mental illness, and of care, treatment, and rehabilitation of the mentally ill, including grants to State agencies responsible for administration of State institutions for care, or care and treatment, of mentally ill persons for developing and establishing improved methods of operation and administration of such institutions.

"(b) Grants under paragraph (2) of subsection (a) may be made only upon recommendation of the National Advisory Mental Health Council. Such grants may be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Surgeon General; and shall be made on such conditions as the Surgeon General finds necessary."

Technical amendment

SEC. 502. The heading of section 304 of such act (42 U. S. C. 242b) is amended to read: "Mental Health Study Grants."

Effective date

SEC. 503. The amendments made by this title shall become effective July 1, 1956.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2093, Senate bill 3430.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3430) to promote the progress of medicine and to advance the national health and welfare by creating a National Library of Medicine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with an amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in 1836 Col. James Lovell, the then Surgeon General of the United States Army, established a library for the Medical Corps of the Army of the United States.

In 1865, Col. John Shaw Billings, became Surgeon General of the Army. For 30 years he labored and built this library into one of greatness and of immeasurable value.

Colonel Billings was a very exceptional man, a very great American, one of whom we can be proud. He was called upon by the city of New York many years ago when that city decided to establish the great New York Public Library. He was also called upon to plan the campus and hospitals and to assemble the brilliant faculty of Johns Hopkins University when that university first came into being.

Colonel Billings labored through the years to build this library for the Medical Corps of the Army. As a result of his labors, as a result of the magnificent foundations he laid, and as a result of the vision and the labors of his successors, that library is now the greatest medical library in all the world. It is now known as the Armed Forces Medical Library, because a few years ago, when Congress passed the bill creating the Department of Defense, the name of the library was changed from the Army Medical Library to the Armed Forces Medical Library.

No amount of money could replace that library. It contains volumes, pamphlets, data, and material which, once lost, could never be found on this earth again.

Now, strange and rather shocking to say, this library is housed in a building which was constructed in 1887, a building which was condemned 30 years ago. At any time some terrible catastrophe could happen, and the library could be destroyed by fire or by storm.

When Senate bill 3430 was pending before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, there came before us as brilliant an array of witnesses as I have ever seen before a committee of Congress in all my long years of service in the House and Senate. Some of the leading men in the medical world appeared and urged us to pass the bill to provide adequate housing and safe housing for this marvelous collection.

The representative of the American College of Surgeons who appeared before our committee was Dr. J. S. Ravdin, the doctor who, as Senators will recall, came from the University of Pennsylvania Medical School, at Philadelphia, to be present the other night and to assist when the President of the United States was operated upon.

Passage of this bill is urged by the American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, the American Hospital Association, the American Public Health Association, the American Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, the American Drug Manufacturers Association, the United States Pharmacopoeial Convention, and many other organized groups representing the medical profession, such as the American College of Surgeons, the American College of Physicians, the American Academy of Obstetrics and Gynecology, the American Surgical Association, the Medical Societies of New York and of the District of Columbia, the American Library Association, the American Legion, the National Society for the Prevention of Blindness, and the National Tuberculosis Association. Enactment of legislation of this character was strongly urged by the Medical Task Force of the Hoover Commission.

It is estimated that a building designed to house properly the library will cost approximately $6 million.

The bill changes the name of the library from the Armed Forces Medical Library to the National Library of Medicine, and creates a board of regents to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to advise and counsel with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, in the administration of the library. The library is put under the United States Public Health Service, so that it may be with an agency whose great concern and interest are with the problems of the health of the American people.

The Surgeon Generals of our armed services support the bill. The Department of Defense supports the bill. In fact, there is no opposition to the bill.

All parties who have had any interest in this matter had representatives before our committee, and they urged that the bill be passed without delay.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the distinguished Senator from Alabama tell us how many volumes will be housed in the new building?

Mr. HILL. I am not sure. I dare say that some of the volumes are stored at this time in such a way that without doing a herculean job, they cannot be counted. They have been accumulated during the past 120 years. So I do not know exactly how many volumes there are. It has been at least 50 years, I suppose, since the late Dr. William Osler, later Sir William Osler, professor of medicine at Johns Hopkins University, wrote his monumental 14-volume work on the practice of medicine, and stated that he never could have written that monumental work but for this very library.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let me say to my distinguished friend that I fully agree about the merits of the bill, and I am supporting it fully.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

I think I can make this statement, in answer to the Senator's question:

The Armed Forces Medical Library contains almost a million books. Besides

its outstanding collections of historical works, it also holds thousands of medical theses—and let me say that sometimes medical theses are extremely important. When a person in France, Italy, or elsewhere makes an important discovery, he often writes a thesis on it. The thesis will be published, and thus will be made available to the entire world. Therefore, a medical thesis may be more important than a medical textbook.

The library also houses portraits and photographs of medical men, and its unique section of American and foreign Government and statistical documents, the completeness of its volumes of periodicals make it a fountainhead of information surpassed by few other scientific research libraries. Over 10,000 serial publications are currently received, and altogether about 100,000 journals and monographic pieces are acquired yearly, representing literature on medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, and allied sciences, in all languages and of all times.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I submit an amendment to section 376 of the bill, dealing with the location of the library. The amendment is as follows:

In line 12, strike out the words "in or near the District of Columbia," and substitute therefore the words "in the city of Chicago, Ill."

Mr. President, again I wish to congratulate the Senator from Alabama for sponsoring this measure. But I think he has made a great mistake in yielding to certain forces and in providing that the library be located in the District of Columbia.

When the bill was originally introduced, the phrase used in regard to the location of the library was that it be in a location suitable for the purpose of enabling persons most concerned with the health affairs of the Nation to have ready access thereto. That phrase, which was general in nature, has disappeared, and in its place there has been substituted a specific requirement that the library be located in or near the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, when our Republic was founded, the District of Columbia was in approximately the geographical and population center of the country. The population of the country was confined to a narrow band of territory along the North Atlantic Ocean, and the District of Columbia was about midway between the North and the South. However, as all of us know—although many easterners are unwilling to admit the fact—since then, the center of population has moved steadily westward, moving at the rate of approximately 30 miles a decade. It is now located in southern Illinois.

So if we wish to have a location which is central, we certainly should not locate the library in the District of Columbia, but we should locate it somewhere in the Middle West.

There is another reason for locating the library in the Middle West. In this connection, let me say that I hope the doctors and medical schools of the District of Columbia will not take it amiss when I say that with all the great merits of the District of Columbia, it has never been noted as a center of medical research. Its medical schools are competent, but are not distinguished, I would say. So, in a sense, to locate this library in the District of Columbia would be to put the books in places where they could not best be used.

Mr. President, it is well known that the people of Chicago and of my State of Illinois are essentially modest in their public statements and do not exaggerate the assets of their own communities. However, I think perhaps the Members of the Senate will pardon me if I speak the sober truth about the merits of Chicago—conquering the natural tendency of all Chicagoans not to overstate matters and not to exaggerate.

Speaking the sober truth, Chicago is the medical center of the country. It has four great medical schools. On the west side of Chicago, in the district graced by the dean of the Illinois delegation in the House of Representatives, Representative O'BRIEN, who now sits beside me on the floor of the Senate, we have what will be the greatest medical center in the world. That is a correct statement. It will be built around the medical school of the University of Illinois. It will consist of a battery of hospitals to deal with virtually every ailment under the sun.

My own university, the University of Chicago, has a distinguished medical school. The same is true of Northwestern University, and of Loyola. So the city of Chicago is the health center and the medical center of the country. I urge Senators whose views do not often extend beyond the Appalachians to come out and see for themselves.

It is also true that Chicago is the center of the great medical organizations. The American Medical Association, which has done so much to improve the health of the people of the country, has its center in Chicago. The same is true of the American Dental Association. The American Hospital Association has its headquarters in Chicago. The American College of Physicians, and the International College of Surgeons have their headquarters in Chicago.

So I very much hope that the Senator from Alabama will see the merits of the amendment which my colleague and I are submitting, and that he will be convinced, and will agree that westward the star of medical progress should take its way. I hope very much that the Senator from Alabama will accept the amendment; and I think I speak for my colleague in saying that this is a joint measure.

I think I should add that we are ready, in the city of Chicago, to donate land. At the West Side Medical Center free land would be available for locating the library. Both Northwestern University and the University of Chicago have made similar offers. So there would be no expense connected with locating the library in Chicago, so far as the land is concerned. It would be greatly to the advantage of the medical profession to have the library located there.

Sometimes we think that in the course of a century or two the Capital of the United States will be moved westward, and that it will be located on the shores of Lake Michigan. We will postpone that for the time being, and merely have the library of the medical profession located there. I hope my dear friend and colleague is willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, although I greatly love the Senator from Illinois, and although he has been very generous toward me in his remarks on the bill——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I had hoped I could soften up the Senator from Alabama [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. The Senator spoke of yielding. I know of no one to whom it would give me greater pleasure to yield than the Senator from Illinois. I am afraid that in this case, if there has been any yielding, it has been yielding on the part of my distinguished friend from Illinois to his good constituents back home. I fully understand his situation. I know what a message from Alabama means to the Senator from Alabama, and I can fully understand what a message from the great State of Illinois means to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

I note the presence in the Chamber of three distinguished Members of the other body representing districts in the State of Illinois. I am delighted to see that we are honored by the presence of three Members of the House of Representatives from Illinois. We rejoice to have them with us. They are all my friends, and they are able, devoted public servants. I only wish it were possible for me to agree and to yield to the petitions from Illinois.

But, Mr. President, we are not establishing a new library. We are not bringing into being something new. What we are doing is merely providing adequate housing for a library which has been established for 120 years and has been established here in the Nation's capital for all those 120 years. So it is not a question of establishing something new and finding a location for the new establishment. We are merely proposing to house properly an institution which has been in existence through many years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Alabama think it is a wise thing to concentrate so many governmental functions in one place? Is it not better to obtain a good deal of geographical decentralization?

Mr. HILL. I think it is good to decentralize, but I do not think we should take off a man's arm or leg and call it decentralizing. He needs his arm, and he needs his leg. If the Senator will be patient, I will tell him what that means in terms of this library.

The library is an integral part of what we might call the medical center and the medical services of the Government of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is meant to serve the people of the United States.

Mr. HILL. Certainly it serves the people, through the services of the Government of the United States. It is an integral part of the services of the Federal Government to the people of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In times past we in the Middle West have thought that the people of New York were parochial in thinking that all financial, business, and publishing activities should clear there. I think we have just cause for complaint about the parochialism attached to the city of Washington and the District of Columbia, in the belief that all governmental functions must be performed here. Mints are located in Philadelphia and in Denver. A great deal of the work of the Department of the Interior is conducted from Denver. Denver is really a subcapital of the country.

Why should not the library follow the cream of the medical profession and go to Chicago, instead of being confined to the District of Columbia, which has never had an unusually distinguished record in the field of medicine?

Mr. HILL. As I stated in my opening remarks, this library was originally established as a library of the Army of the United States, for the benefit of the Medical Corps of the Army. Then it became the Armed Forces Medical Library. The library serves the Medical Corps of the United States Army, the Medical Corps of the United States Navy, and the Medical Corps of the United States Air Force. It is also an important part of the health work of the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is primarily intended to serve the doctors and the people.

Mr. HILL. It serves the people by serving the various agencies of the Government, and it also serves our doctors. It serves the people by serving agencies of the Government. We have here in Washington the United States Public Health Service. At Bethesda we have the great National Institutes of Health. As the Hoover task force report stated, the preservation of this library is of the utmost importance to our medical research programs. We have established the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda for research in cancer, heart disease, and mental illness, as well as in neurological diseases, blindness, arthritis, metabolic diseases, and many other dread ailments. The library is an integral part of the work we are doing in research at Bethesda.

At Walter Reed Hospital we have the Army Institute of Pathology. The library serves that Institute. It serves the great Walter Reed Hospital. It serves the great Naval Medical Center. It serves our Veterans' Administration. It serves all the many activities which promote the heatlh of the people of the United States. It is a part of the service of the Government of the United States. It is an agency or instrumentality for such service.

I have before me a strong letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense emphasizing this very point. The Defense Department, having built this great library, I am sure, would be very loath to see this library made a national library in any way whatever, if such a move were to involve losing the services of the library by reason of its being removed from the city of Washington.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Defense Department the master or the servant of the people of the United States?

Mr. HILL. The Defense Department is the servant of the people of the United States; and in order to meet its duties and responsibilities as a servant of the people of the United States, the Defense Department needs this library. It must have this library, and it must have it here.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my good friend from Alabama that when the bill was introduced and when it was considered by his committee it contained the provision that the library shall be situated "in a location suitable for the purpose of enabling persons most concerned with the health affairs of the Nation to have ready access thereto. For such purpose the board is authorized to acquire land by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, or to accept the transfer of any land for a site from any executive department, independent establishment, or other Federal agency," and so forth.

It was left to the board to locate the library. We were perfectly ready to present our case before the board, confident that our claims were so well founded that the library would be located in Chicago.

However, when the bill was reported by the committee, the provision I have read was not in the bill, but it contained the provision that the library shall be located in the District of Columbia.

I do not say that we have been "had." However, I do say that our trust has been sadly disappointed.

Mr. HILL. Let me say to my good friend from Illinois, as one of the authors of the bill I had no intention that the library should be located anywhere but in the District of Columbia.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator did not say so in his bill.

Mr. HILL. What the provision to which the Senator has referred means is merely that the board shall acquire land from an executive department, independent establishment, or other Federal agency. The board would not be permitted to get the land from anyone outside the Government. It was not our intention that the library should be established anywhere else. Such a library is already established in Washington, and it is rendering a great service to the medical activities of the Government. It is an integral part of the machinery of the medical services. Surely, if the committee were to consider the city of Chicago, it would also have to consider other cities besides Chicago.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly. Would the Senator be willing to restore the original wording of the bill, that the library shall be located at some place which is suitable for the purpose of enabling persons most concerned with the health affairs of the Nation to have ready access to it?

Mr. HILL. No.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator be willing to change the wording so as to permit land to be donated not only by the Federal Government but by a local organization, for example?

Mr. HILL. No; we are not going to put up the library on auction or treat it as political loot, or anything like that. This is the most precious medical library in all the world. We will house it and keep it where it will render the greatest possible service to the people of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I invite my good friend to come to the Middle West and visit us, and perhaps spend a day or two in our medical schools and clinics. We would like to have him visit the American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, the American Hospital Association, the American College of Surgeons, and the International College of Surgeons, and other organizations. If he were to do that, I am certain that some of the astigmatism which now seems to characterize him, and which is his one blind spot—I should say the second blind spot—in an otherwise estimable character, would be corrected.

Mr. HILL. I may say to my distinguished friend from Illinois that the Senator from Alabama may have many blind spots, but he has no blind spots with reference to the pending bill. The very organizations to which the Senator from Illinois has referred came before our committee and made no suggestion that the library be located anywhere but in the city of Washington.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand they approved the bill, but that they did not approve of the location of the library in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HILL. No; they had no suggestion to make about Chicago. Representatives of the American Medical Association, which has its headquarters in Chicago, appeared before the committee in behalf of the bill, and they testified that, of course, the library should stay where it has been for the past 120 years, namely, in the city of Washington.

As I said, I have never seen a more brilliant array of witnesses appear before any committee than appeared before our committee in connection with this bill. There was Dr. Henry K. Beecher, who is a professor at Harvard University and is connected with the Massachusetts General Hospital.

Mr. DOUGLAS. He is from the Atlantic seaboard.

Mr. HILL. Then there was Dr. Lowell T. Coggeshall, of Chicago, special assistant to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator say that Dr. Coggeshall recommended that the librray be located in Washington?

Mr. HILL. The doctor will tell the Senator that it ought to be located in Washington. Of course he is sure it ought to be located here. Then there was Dr. Michael E. DeBakey, professor of surgery, Baylor University College of Medicine, at Houston, Tex. Witnesses came from all over the United States in behalf of the bill and asked that we properly house this library.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Everyone wants to see the library properly housed, but I do not believe the Senator will find the unanimity he speaks of when it comes to the question of locating the library in Washington. What the Senator is doing,

with the best of intentions, is taking the testimony on the original bill with respect to a suitable location for the library and saying that it means that all these witnesses want the library located in Washington.

Mr. HILL. Let me say to my good friend from Illinois that I congratulate Chicago on the fact that it has five excellent medical libraries. I rejoice in the fact that Chicago now has five excellent and splendid libraries.

At the same time, I do not believe that that means that Chicago should have this library also. This great library in Washington is now an integral part of the agencies of the Federal Government which serve the health needs of the people of the United States. In Washington there is located the Veterans' Administration, serving the veterans of the United States. The chief medical officer of the Veterans' Administration insisted that this library be located in Washington. If it were not, the Government would have to provide another library for the Veterans' Administration, for the Armed Forces Medical Corps, and so on.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama a few questions about the development of this proposed legislation. As I recall, two or three bills on this subject were introduced. One was introduced by me on the recommendation of the Hoover Commission.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey It was felt that in order to get the most efficient use of such a library it should be located where it would perform the greatest service, and it was originally recommended that it be located in the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The distinguished Senator will remember that we discussed that matter very fully, and it seemed to us that, in the last analysis, the library ought to be in the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Mr. HILL. Yes; that is what the administration recommended.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is true.

Mr. HILL. The committee weighed the matter very carefully. There was never any question as to whether the library should be in Washington or out of Washington. It was decided to have the library in Washington, but the only question was as to where in Washington it should be located.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. And where it could function most effectively. Section 373 of the bill establishes in the Public Health Service a Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine. That board is to consist of the Surgeons General of the Public Health Service, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, the Assistant Director for Biological and Medical Sciences of the National Science Foundation, and the Librarian of Congress.

It was felt that a library of that character should be located here. It never occurred to me, I will say to the Senator from Alabama, that such a library would be located anywhere else than in the District of Columbia, where it would be available to the various governmental agencies concerned with the health of our people. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator whether he did not have the same feeling about it.

Mr. HILL. I never had any other thought about it. The Senator from New Jersey has referred to the Library of Congress. As he knows, there is a close relationship between the Library of Congress and the Medical Library. The cataloging for the Medical Library is done by the Library of Congress. They both belong to the Federal Government; they both serve the people; they are both tied closely together, and work together.

The Library of Congress, as we all know, gets certain books under the copyright laws. Some of them are turned over to the Medical Library. The institutions are tied closely together in their operations.

To move the library somewhere outside of Washington would be as unwise as to move the Library of Congress away from Washington.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. We know that there is a great concentration of medical knowledge in New York as well as in Chicago. I do not think there has been any attempt by the medical profession to take this library away from the District of Columbia and place it anywhere else.

Mr. HILL. Would not the Senator say that if any consideration were to be given to moving the Medical Library from Washington, after it has been here for 120 years, taking it away from the medical agencies and institutions at Bethesda, the National Institutes of Health, the Army, Navy, Air Force, Walter Reed Hospital, other places should be considered? But it should not be removed. It should remain where it has been rendering the great service it has rendered for the past 120 years.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I naturally think of the institutions of higher learning located in my State, but I waive that because I feel that the Medical Library is properly located in Washington, and it could not do any better service in New Jersey than it can do here where there are so many Government bureaus and departments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to respond to my disinguished friend from Alabama with reference to the location of the Medical Library.

First of all, I notice in the terminology of the bill that it provides for a national library of medicine.

I may be mistaken, of course, but I have always labored under the apprehension that the State of Illinois was part of the national area. I thought the sun-drenched valleys of California, whence our distinguished minority leader comes, were within the national orbit. I thought the great orchards and rose gardens of the great Northwest were part of it. I thought the all-inclusive term "national" covered the whole Nation. So, Mr. President, I believe we proceed in perfect good faith when we address ourselves to the hope that the National Library of Medicine might very conceivably be located in one of the greatest metropolitan centers in the whole wide world, the one on the banks of Lake Michigan.

So, as we address ourselves to the subject, there are some things which I believe we can point out that should be persuasive upon the Senate.

In the first place, it is going to be a mail-order library; let no one be mistaken about that. How many doctors from Walter Reed Hospital and the Naval Center at Bethesda will go to the Library? They will lift the telephone receiver and say, "Do you have a volume on thus and so? Do you have a thesis on heebie jeebies, or on hocus of the pocus?"

[Laughter.]

It will operate precisely as the Library of Congress operates in reference to the Senate. How many Members of the Senate who were in the Chamber this afternoon have been to the Library of Congress during the year? It is not necessary to go there. We call up the Reference Service and say, "Get me this," or "Get me that," and by special messenger, it arrives within an hour or two, unless, perchance, we ask them to prepare a rather long historical speech for which we have no time to assemble the necessary data.

But the language of the bill indicates what will happen. This library, among other things, will publish and make available the catalogs, indexes, and bibliographies referred to in clause (2).

It will make available, through loans, photographic or other copying procedures or otherwise, such materials in the library as are appropriate. It will provide reference and research assistance. Most of it, of course, will be done by telephone.

After all, if it is national in scope, let us place it in the middle of the country. Let us put it a little closer to the home of my distinguished friend from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] whose State is graced by a great metropolitan center like Denver. Or let us put it a little closer to the domain of my distinguished friend from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who has on many occasions assailed government on the ground that North Dakota is too often forgotten in the selection of ambassadors, ministers plenipotentiary, and others who are fitted into the governmental structure. Or let us place it a little closer to one of the greatest medical institutions not only in the United States but in the whole wide world, namely, the Mayo Clinic at Rochester, Minn. Place it close to such institutions as that which are doing so much for the well-being, the health and the physical benefit of mankind. Let us consider an institution like the Mayo Foundation, supporting great hospitals. It is only an hour and 50 minutes by plane from the city of Rochester, Minn., to the great city of Chicago.

I think, Mr. President, we are in a good position to present our case.

When reference is made to the millions of books and theses and tomes on all

the ills to which the flesh is heir, I think, Mr. President, about the time many years ago when the University of Edinburgh, in Scotland, inducted a new president. After he was shown all the classrooms and facilities for instruction, he was shown the library. When he had inspected the library he took the librarian aside and said, "Take every book that is over 10 years of age and put it into the basement."

We are thinking about a modern library in Chicago, certainly. We are thinking of a modern structure which, of course, would comport with the tremendous strides which have been made in the field of medicine.

I wish to point out to my distinguished friend from Alabama that this is not an Army library. It is not essentially for the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, unless the terminology in the title of the bill is wrong. The language is "National Library of Medicine."

The first section of the bill provides as follows:

> In order to assist the advancement of medical and related sciences, and to aid the dissemination and exchange of scientific and other information important to the progress of medicine and to the public health.

And so forth. We are subject to all the ills of the flesh in the corn country as well as in the Free State of Maryland or in the District of Columbia. People become ill in Illinois, in California, in Fargo, N. Dak., and in Pueblo, Colo.

So, it seems to me, Mr. President, that if we locate the library in Chicago we will be locating it at the very center of the incidence of all the maladies to which this medical library will address itself. This is not to be a medical library for the armed services. It is to be for the health and well-being of all the public.

Now I wish to make another point. I remember all the efforts made years ago toward a dispersion of Government facilities. During the period of the war, the Patent Office was sent to Richmond, Va. The Securities and Exchange Commission was sent to Philadelphia. The Railroad Retirement Board was moved to Chicago. The Government went for dispersion in a great big way.

Now it is claimed that Congress should appropriate tons of money for civilian defense, on the ground that somehow, because the country has not reacted to it, something must be done to formulate a plan which will get the people out of areas of large concentrations of population.

But now, I see, we are getting back into the same old rut of constant concentration in Washington, which only augments the danger, if there is a danger, in that kind of procedure. So I think we would kill 2 birds with one stone if the suggestion we respectfully make were adopted that the library be located in Chicago.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, when I have finished my thought.

Obviously, some personnel will be needed for the staffing of a library of this kind; and in proportion as the number of personnel in the District of Columbia is diminished, I think, of course, the dispersal pattern which was followed a long time ago will be served. I am confident that that dispersal idea will receive some emphasis from the Civilian Defense Administraiton before too long. They are unhappy already because Congress has not paid too much attention to them. Yet they want vast sums of money and want to do their work on a nationwide basis. This may be only a small contribution, but it is at least that much of a contribution.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Some of us have been thinking about the argument presented on both sides of the aisle concerning who would use the library. I should think that the answer to that question would help to determine where the library should be placed. Would it be primarily persons located in Washington who would want to use these volumes; or is the Senator in a position to assure us that the use of these volumes would be nationwide?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The very purpose of the establishment is the dissemination and exchange of scientific and other information important to the progress of medicine and public health.

Consider for a moment what has been done by the University of California and related institutions in that field. Is it the idea that if their representatives want to make personal visits, they must come all the way across the continent, or only halfway across? Would not the physicians at the Mayo Foundation take as much interest in the library as the Surgeon General or the military doctors or the Naval physicians at Walter Reed and Bethesda? Is not this a national undertaking; and as such should it not be located in an area where it would be most accessible to those who would have a right to use it, because all the country will pay for it, and it will be on a national basis?

In that connection, when we speak about the volumes which have already been acquired, it is my understanding that a great many of the volumes are already located in Cleveland. I do not know how they are stored or housed there, but that is the information which has come to me. The distance from Cleveland to Chicago is not very great. For the price of the freight rate, which will be required to send the other books to Chicago, the movement could be made at no great addition to the expense which might be involved in locating the library there.

Finally, as my distinguished colleague has pointed out, the Chicago medical group is prepared to offer the land. It is not every day that the Government gets something free, and particularly if it is land of value, as I have reason to believe it is.

So let us look at what is on the side of Chicago: A donation or bequest of free land; the veritable center of population; an area which sort of fans out and embraces some of the great medical institutions of the country; and, of course, probably the greatest airplane center and the most utilized airports in the United States of America, where material can quickly be put upon a plane and transported into every city, hamlet, village, and metropolis in the Nation.

Here, then, are the reasons why I think the library ought to be located in Chicago. And so I heartily and with great pleasure concur in the amendment which has been endorsed to locate the National Medical Library in Chicago, because it is the center of the Nation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I desire to add just a word to what has been said. The whole subject of the library was considered very carefully by the committee. There never was any thought given to locating the library anywhere but in Washington, where are located the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the various Armed Services headquarters.

The study which was made of the question, the study by the Hoover Commission, and the study by our committee, never considered the question of moving the library elsewhere. I have no doubt that many areas would desire to have this library.

It was the recommendation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which means the present administration, that the library be located in Washington for the benefit among others of the different groups I have previously mentioned, the Public Health Service, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and the Veterans' Administration.

It seems to me the whole purpose of the library is to make the different departments of Government more effective, as the Hoover Commission pointed out, by bringing together these books and papers in one national library. It has been recommended that in that way we shall get the best possible governmental approach to the problem.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not desire to delay the Senate longer, but I wish to emphasize what the distinguished Senator from New Jersey has said. The library is essential to the medical activities of the health services of the Government located in or near the District of Columbia. It is the library which is used by the Medical Corps of the Army. It is the library used by the Medical Corps of the Navy. It is the library used by the Medical Corps of the Air Force. It is the library used by the Veterans' Administration. It is the library used by the National Institutes of Health, at Bethesda, where enormously important research work is going on.

The fact is that the task force of the Hoover Commission, in speaking of the library, emphasized its importance to the research work at the National Institutes of Health, in Bethesda.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. If the library were moved from Washington, would there be other libraries in Washington which could supply the needs of hospitals in Washington and nearby areas?

Mr. HILL. There would not be. If the library, which has been in existence for 120 years, and has served the public

interest, were moved from Washington, the Government would have to provide another library. The library is integrated with the Library of Congress. It is a part of our medical setup. It is the medical library for the Government of the United States and its agencies here, and it serves all the people. It is available for service throughout the country, but it is particularly the library for the agencies of Government located in Washington.

Mr. LONG. Are we to understand that the works of this great library, which is presently situated here in Washington, are not otherwise available in the Library of Congress or in any of the other medical libraries located in the District of Columbia?

Mr. HILL. No; they are not available at all. The books, periodicals, information, or knowledge contained in the library are not to be found anywhere in this particular area. As the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration made clear, and as the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health and Medical Affairs pointed out, if the library were moved from Washington, the Government would have to establish another library to serve the agencies of government. The library came into being to serve the Medical Corps of the Army. After that it served the Navy. Then it served the Air Force, when the Air Force came into being. It serves the Veterans' Administration; the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda; the great naval hospital at Bethesda; the Army's Walter Reed Hospital and the great pathological institute there; and it is integrated with the great Library of Congress, in the cataloging of its books. This is the library which serves so many agencies at the center of our Government. If the library were to be located at Chicago or somewhere else, another library would have to be established in Washington. I am advised, and I think I am correctly advised, that Chicago has five splendid medical libraries.

Mr. LONG. Are we to understand that the works and textbooks which are needed from day to day are already located in Chicago, but that if the library were moved from Washington the works and textbooks would not be available in Washington?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct; they would not be available here. This is not merely a question of moving the library somewhere. It is a question of following the recommendations of the task force of the Hoover Commission, the American Medical Association, the American College of Surgeons, the American College of Physicians, and the American Academy of Obstetrics and Gynecology. It is a question of adequately housing the library—which happens to be the greatest medical library in the world—in Washington.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in support of what the distinguished Senator from Alabama says, I should like to read from page 4 of the committee report:

Dr. Frank B. Berry, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health and Medical Affairs, speaking for himself and the Surgeons General of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, indicated his strong belief that the National Library of Medicine should be located in or near the District. Dr. William S. Middleton, Chief Medical Director, Veterans' Administration, took a similar position. It was pointed out that if the National Library of Medicine is not located in the Washington area it will be necessary to construct and maintain other large medical libraries in or near the District of Columbia to service the military and civilian agencies mentioned above that now rely on the Armed Forces Medical Library.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly right. If the library were moved away, another library would have to be built; just as if the Library of Congress were to be moved away, another one would have to be built.

Mr. LONG. If the library were moved, not only would another library have to be built here in the District of Columbia, but books would have to be bought for it. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. Books would have to be purchased for it. There would be involved not merely the question of physically constructing the building, but the question of supplying the books and materials for the library.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for himself and the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, to the committee amendment, I submit the following amendment: On page 10, in line 15, after the words "public health," insert the words "hospital administration." This amendment is submitted to the committee amendment in order to carry out the intent of the committee, as embodied in the original draft of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 10, in line 15, after the words "public health," it is proposed to insert "hospital administration."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is a coauthor of the bill. He is very much distressed that, because of public business, it is impossible for him to be here today. He has a very deep interest in the bill, and he feels that it is a most important piece of legislation. He has made many fine contributions to the writing of the bill and many fine contributions to bringing the bill to its present state in connection with its passage. I, for one, regret that he cannot be here today. But I wish to express his deep interest in the bill and his many fine contributions to it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense; a letter from the Chief Medical Director, Department of Medicine and Surgery, of the Veterans' Administration; and a letter from the Library of Congress.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., May 22, 1956.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: During the past week it has come to my attention that recommendations have been submitted from various quarters advocating that the new building for the National Library of Medicine, as provided for in bills now under consideration by your committee, should be constructed on a site in a metropolitan center at a considerable distance from the seat of Government. I would like to offer my views on this question, and in doing so I feel certain that I reflect the sentiments of the three medical services of this Department.

When I was privileged to present my views before your committee on April 10, 1956, I stated that "the Department of Defense and the three Surgeons General regret that it appears unwise to attain this objective within the Department." But nevertheless we supported transfer of the Library outside the Department of Defense because in so doing we believed that establishment as the National Library of Medicine would bring this great institution the adequate and continuing support necessary for its best development in the interests of American medicine. Naturally, all of us took it for granted that the National Library of Medicine would be built in or in the close vicinity of Washington. Had there been any inkling otherwise I am sure I can speak for the Surgeons General when I say that all of us would have opposed such a proposition. If, however, any move is to be considered, I believe the whole matter should be reappraised.

The great medical research centers of the Armed Forces are located here in the Washington area. The Armed Forces Institute of Pathology, the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, and the Naval Medical Research Institute, as well as our two great military hospitals, have over the years used the Armed Forces Medical Library's collections constantly, as a working library as well as a reference and research library. I believe this is true also of the various components of the Public Health Service and the National Institutes of Health, the Food and Drug Ad-

ministration, and the Veterans' Administration to some extent.

Our three local medical schools are almost wholly dependent upon it for their library needs. If the National Library of Medicine were to be removed from Washington, I do not think it is too much to say that the construction of other large medical libraries within this locality would be an absolute requirement.

It has often been stated that the Armed Forces Medical Library is largely a "mail order" library, and so it is. It has also been stated that this "mail order" operation could be successfully carried on from any point within the United States, and so it could. But I would point out that in every area in which large medical centers are located there is need for a strong local library resource to support daily operations, and on occasion to be supplemented by the national library resource; in Washington these two resources are centered in one institution, the Armed Forces Medical Library. Should the library be removed from Washington, its role as a strong local resource would go with it, and in turn our national institutions here would have to go on a "mail order" basis.

Therefore, I most strongly urge that, when reported out by your committee, the bill will not contain any provision which will call for the removal of the library from the Washington area.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK B. BERRY, M. D.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 18, 1956.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: When I was privileged to testify before your committee, relative to the National Library of Medicine, as embodied in S. 3430, S. 2408, and S. 2482, I stressed the pressing requirements of the Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery for library facilities such as are found within the Armed Forces Medical Library. I indicated that, if the same were not available, it would be necessary for the Veterans' Administration to duplicate the central library, which would be extravagant and difficult of consummation. You may recall that I related my personal experiences in recalling requests for help from the Armed Forces Medical Library. In a subsequent letter of April 12 (p. 78 of the hearing), I indicated that "somewhat in excess of 20,000 requests from the field cleared through this office to the Armed Forces Medical Library in 1 year."

To amplify my position, may I indicate that the Central Office of the Veterans' Administration Library Service, located in Washington, acts as a clearinghouse for our 173 small working libraries of the field. Specific inquiries regarding medical literature which cannot be supplied from our own system are referred to the Armed Forces Medical Library. Hence, our library representatives in Central Office must be in daily contact with the staff of the Armed Forces Medical Library. Such details are frequently facilitated by phone call or messenger.

Obviously, the close liaison maintained in the discharge of our nationwide responsibilities would be materially impaired in any location for the National Library of Medicine outside the Washington area. Needless delays and duplication would result through an interruption of our present easy channels of communication. Furthermore, the effectiveness of our Central Office of the Veterans' Administration Library Service would be sacrificed by the same token.

If the library requirements of the Veterans' Administration are consulted in the matter of the location of the National Library of Medicine, I would strongly recommend that the proposed bill emerging from your committee should contain no stipulation requiring a movement of this surpassing function from the metropolitan Washington area.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM S. MIDDLETON, M. D.,
Chief Medical Director.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C., June 8, 1956.

The Honorable LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
United States Senate,
Washington D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: As you know, I have already endorsed, in my testimony before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on April 11, 1956, the proposal for a National Library of Medicine. I am, therefore, in accord with the general objectives of S. 3949, upon which you have requested my comment.

Although there is much to be said in favor of independent status for such a national library, I believe that there would be more advantages in associating it with an agency, such as the Public Health Service, whose interests and responsibilities are in the same field.

Relations between the Library of Congress and the National Library of Medicine would be greatly complicated if the latter were not located near enough for the frequent conferences necessitated by our many cooperative efforts. For example, we print the catalog of the Armed Forces Medical Library as a supplement to our own catalog in book form and this requires that the two institutions work closely together. Also, as you know, we supply the Armed Forces Medical Library with copies of medical works that we receive through the operation of the copyright law and with foreign medical publications that we obtain through exchange and gift; these transfers would be more difficult and costly if the two institutions were not in the same area.

The Armed Forces Medical Library is not only the national library in the field of medicine but it is also the regional library for the Washington area, serving especially the various research institutes of the armed services and of the Public Health Service located in the vicinity. The Library of Congress could not take the place of the Armed Forces Medical Library if it were moved from this region because we have neither the collections nor the staff for rendering the specialized services required.

These comments on the organizational and geographical location of the National Library of Medicine constitute the two main points I would like to make about S. 3949.

Sincerely yours,

L. QUINCY MUMFORD,
Librarian of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 3430) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title III of the Public Service Act (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A, subch. II) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART H—NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

"PURPOSE AND ESTABLISHMENT OF LIBRARY

"SEC. 371. In order to assist the advancement of medicinal and related sciences, and to aid the dissemination and exchange of scientific and other information important to the progress of medicine and to the public health, there is hereby established in the Public Health Service a National Library of Medicine (hereinafter referred to in this part as the 'Library').

"FUNCTIONS OF THE LIBRARY

"SEC. 372. (a) The Surgeon General, through the Library and subject to the provisions of subsection (c), shall—

"(1) acquire and preserve books, periodicals, prints, films, recordings, and other library materials pertinent to medicine;

"(2) organize the materials specified in clause (1) by appropriate cataloging, indexing, and bibliographical listing;

"(3) publish and make available the catalogs, indexes, and bibliographies referred to in clause (2);

"(4) make available, through loans, photographic or other copying procedures or otherwise, such materials in the Library as he deems appropriate;

"(5) provide reference and research assistance; and

"(6) engage in such other activities in furtherance of the purposes of this part as he deems appropriate and the Library's resources permit.

"(b) The Surgeon General may exchange, destroy, or otherwise dispose of any books, periodicals, films, and other library materials not needed for the permanent use of the Library.

"(c) The Surgeon General is authorized, after obtaining the advice and recommendations of the Board (established under section 373), to prescribe rules under which the Library will provide copies of its publications or materials, or will make available its facilities for research or its bibliographic, reference, or other services, to public and private agencies and organizations, institutions, and individuals. Such rules may provide for making available such publications, materials, facilities, or services (1) without charge as a public service, or (2) upon a loan, exchange, or charge basis, or (3) in appropriate circumstances, under contract arrangements made with a public or other nonprofit agency organization, or institution.

"BOARD OF REGENTS

"SEC. 373. (a) There is hereby established in the Public Health Service a Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine (referred to in this part as the 'Board') consisting of the Surgeons General of the Public Health Service, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, the Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, the Assistant Director for Biological and Medical Sciences of the National Science Foundation, and the Librarian of Congress, all of whom shall be ex officio members, and ten members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The ten appointed members shall be selected from among leaders in the various fields of the fundamental sciences, medicine, dentistry, public health, hospital administration, pharmacology, or scientific or medical library work, or in public affairs. At least six of the appointed members shall be selected from among leaders in the fields of medical, dental, or public health research or education. The Board shall annually elect one of the appointed members to serve as Chairman until the next election. The Surgeon General shall designate a member of the Library staff to act as executive secretary of the Board.

"(b) It shall be the duty of the Board to advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Surgeon General on important matters of policy in regard to the Library, including such matters as the acquisition of materials for the Library, the scope, content and organization of the Library's services, and the rules under which its materials, publications, facilities, and services shall be made available to various kinds of users, and the Surgeon General shall include in his annual report to the Congress a statement covering the recommendations made by the Board and the disposition thereof. The Surgeon General is authorized to use the services of any

member or members of the Board in connection with matters related to the work of the Library, for such periods, in addition to conference periods, as he may determine.

"(c) Each appointed member of the Board shall hold office for a term of four years, except that (A) Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (B) the terms of the members first taking office after the date of enactment of this part shall expire as follows: three at the end of four years after such date, three at the end of three years after such date, two at the end of two years after such date, and two at the end of one year after such date, as designated by the President at the time of appointment. None of the appointed members shall be eligible for reappointment within one year after the end of his preceding term.

"(d) Appointed members of the Board who are not otherwise in the employ of the United States, while attending conferences of the Board or otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but not exceeding $50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"GIFTS TO LIBRARY

"SEC. 374. The provisions of section 501 shall be applicable to the acceptance and administration of gifts made for the benefit of the Library or for carrying out any of its functions, and the Surgeon General shall make recommendations to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare relating to establishment within the Library of suitable memorials to the donors.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 375. For purposes of this part the terms 'medicine' and 'medical' shall, except when used in section 373, be understood to include preventive and therapeutic medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, hospitalization, nursing, public health, and the fundamental sciences related thereto, and other related fields of study, research, or activity.

"LIBRARY FACILITIES

"SEC. 376. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated sums sufficient for the erection and equipment of suitable and adequate buildings and facilities for use of the Library in carrying out the provisions of this part. The Administrator of General Services is authorized to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, donation, or otherwise, a suitable site or sites, selected by the Surgeon General after consultation with the Board, in or near the District of Columbia for such buildings and facilities and to erect thereon, furnish, and equip such buildings and facilities. The sums herein authorized to be appropriated shall include the cost of preparation of drawings and specifications, supervision of construction, and other administrative expenses incident to the work. The Administrator of General Services shall prepare the plans and specifications, make all necessary contracts, and supervise construction.

"TRANSFER OF ARMED FORCES MEDICAL LIBRARY

"SEC. 377. All civilian personnel, equipment, library collections, other personal property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations and other funds (available or to be made available), which the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine to relate primarily to the functions of the Armed Forces Medical Library, are hereby transferred to the Service for use in the administration and operation of this part. Such transfer of property, funds, and personnel, and the other provisions of this part, shall become effective on the first day, occurring not less than thirty days after the date of enactment of this part, which the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines to be practicable."

SEC. 2. This act may be cited as the "National Library of Medicine Act."

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act, and for other purposes."

WAR ORPHANS' EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1956

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2085, House bill 9824.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9824) to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability or disease incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean conflict.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, House bill 9824, the War Orphan's Educational Assistance Act, would establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability or disease incurred in line of duty during World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict.

Approximately 156,000 orphans, whose average age today is 10 to 14 years, would be covered by the provisions of the bill. Each orphan would be entitled to 36 months of education and training in an approved educational institution, with monthly monetary benefits ranging from $50 to $110, depending upon whether the training is pursued half-time, three-quarters time, or full time.

Assistance could be furnished, with some exceptions, to eligible persons only during the period beginning on his or her 18th birthday or completion of high school, whichever comes first, and ending on the 23d birthday.

The objective is to aid the orphans of these deceased veterans in "attaining the educational status which they might normally have aspired to and obtained but for the death of such parent."

As originally passed by the House, the bill did not cover orphans of World War I veterans. That coverage was added by the Senate committee. It is estimated that there are 4,000 orphans in this category.

It is estimated that the total cost of the bill over a long period of years will be approximately $222 million. Of course the cost of the bill would increase each year, and the peak of the cost would probably be reached in 1961. It has been estimated that the highest cost of the program in any one year would be $15 million.

Mr. President, I strongly urge that the bill be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments to the bill will be stated.

The amendments of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were on page 2, line 4, after the word "during", to insert "World War I,"; in line 5, after the word "War", to strike out "II" and insert "II,"; after line 10, to insert:

(1) The term "World War I" means the period beginning on April 6, 1917, and ending on November 11, 1918.

At the beginning of line 13, to strike out "(1)" and insert "(2)"; at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "(2)" and insert "(3)"; at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "(3)" and insert "(4)"; in line 22, after the word "during", to insert "World War I,", and in the same line, after the word "War", to strike out "II" and insert "II,"; on page 3, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "(4)" and insert "(5)"; at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "(5)" and insert "(6)"; at the beginning of line 13, to strike out "(6)" and insert "(7)"; at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "(7)" and insert "(8)"; on page 4, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "(8)" and insert "(9)"; at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "(9)" and insert "(10)"; at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "(10)" and insert "(11)"; at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "(11)" and insert "(12)"; at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "(12)" and insert "(13)"; on page 24, line 2, after the word "payments", to strike out "by reason of the proviso to paragraph VI, Veterans Regulation Numbered 10, as amended, or the proviso to section 3 (c), Public, Numbered 484, 73d Congress, as amended, of compensation or pension to an eligible person over the age of 18, or of increased rates, or additional amounts, of compensation or pension because of such a person" and insert "of compensation or pension under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration based on the death of a parent to an eligible person over the age of 18 by reason of pursuing a course in an educational institution, or of increased rates, or additional amounts, of compensation or pension under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration because of such a person."; and on page 30, after line 6, to insert:

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 513. The appropriations for the Veterans' Administration under the headings "General Operating Expenses" and "Readjustment Benefits" are hereby made available for expenditures necessary to carry out the provisions of this act and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amounts as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to establish an educational assistance program for children of serv-

icemen who died as a result of a disability or disease incurred in line of duty during World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict."

DISPOSAL OF TIN SMELTER AT TEXAS CITY, TEX.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2158, House Joint Resolution 607.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 607) to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I believe that the committee report explains the joint resolution rather thoroughly.

This measure provides for the continued operation of the Government tin smelter at Texas City, Tex. My understanding of the problem is that although it has been recommended that the smelter be sold, it is the view of many persons that the Government will not realize a fair price for the smelter, if it sells it after closing it down, and that its operation should be continued until the smelter can be disposed of in an orderly manner.

Therefore, in order to protect the Government's investment, it is recommended that operation of the smelter be continued for a period of 7 months during which it will be offered for sale by the Federal Facilities Corporation. At the end of this period, if the plant has not been sold as a going concern, it will be declared excess property and disposed of under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on the joint resolution.

I shall vote for the joint resolution in the Senate, although in the committee I voted against it in the hope that it could be improved in the committee.

Mr. President, there is no question about the fact that I have favored the sale of the smelter. But I felt three things should be done in order to give us a little greater protection than I think the pending joint resolution affords.

First, I feel that we should face the fact that we are pretty much at the mercy of an international tin cartel, although we have a very large stockpile of tin at the present time. I will say no more on that subject, for obvious security reasons. Nevertheless, it is within the realm of possibility that if we should get into a long war, we might very well wish that we still had the smelter at Texas City available to us. I believe, however, that the American people are reasonably protected from the standpoint of our present tin stockpile.

That leads me to the second point. How far should we go in connection with a cartel problem, in making certain that we have done everything possible to protect our people, from the standpoint of competitive factors, from the monopolistic ravages of an international cartel? In theory it certainly would be very desirable to maintain a tin smelter in this country. As Members of the Senate know, we have a couple of allies who will control the supply of tin in the world so far as smelting is concerned, once we lose the smelter at Texas City. It stood us in good stead during the war, when submarines were making it very difficult for us to get strategic minerals into the country. The testimony I have heard with regard to this smelter, not only when I was a member of the Armed Services Committee, but later, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, is that it really paid for itself many, many times over from the standpoint of the service it rendered to us during the war period alone.

I am concerned lest if this smelter should be sold and go out of operation, it would not be used by the cartel for the smelting of any ore in the United States. That would place our people at a considerable disadvantage, indeed. In a sense, we would be even more at the mercy of the international tin cartel, which has not been noted for its economic gentleness. It is not a cartel which has hesitated to charge all the traffic would bear.

I recall the time when the distinguished majority leader of the Senate [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas], a member of the Armed Services Committee, was chairman of our Preparedness Subcommittee, of which I was a member. He rendered a great service for the American people, in regard to the tin cartel. Had it not been for the services of the Senator from Texas I think the American people would have been—I was about to say cheated; I think the better expression is that there would have been extorted from the pockets of the American taxpayers many millions of dollars, which extortion we prevented as a result of the single investigation and report by the Johnson subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. So I was concerned about that aspect of the matter when this resolution was before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

I was concerned about another matter. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations I was concerned about the effect of this proposal upon Bolivia. In our committee it was said that Bolivia has been on notice as to our contemplated disposal of this smelter. However, as the transcript of the record will show, I made the observation in committee that it is pretty difficult for Bolivia to adjust to the fact of the sale until the joint resolution is passed. I think the Bolivians have hoped against hope that this smelter would be maintained in operation. The impact of the discontinuance of its operation will be terrific upon the economy of Bolivia, because, to a greater extent than many people realize, the economy of Bolivia is based upon tin. I think it can still be said of Bolivia that, as tin goes, so the economy of Bolivia goes.

The pending joint resolution would provide for an extension of operation for 7 months. I should like to have counsel for the committee, who is present in the Chamber, follow my remarks very carefully, because I am speaking from recollection, and I wish to have my remarks corrected in the RECORD if I do not recall with complete accuracy.

My recollection is that under the terms of the joint resolution, as it was finally recommended by our committee, the extension period for operation would be 7 months. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, who is at present in the Chamber, will recall that I offered an amendment to extend the period to a year. I thought Bolivia ought to have at least a year to make the necessary economic adjustment. My amendment lost in committee. I still think a year would be a better time period than 7 months. Yet I have canvassed the situation, and I feel that if I could not win in committee, under all the circumstances I should not offer the amendment on the floor of the Senate.

We should face the fact that we have a great stake in the stability of the economy of Bolivia. I am fearful lest, as a result of the course of action we take this afternoon, there may be some upset of the economy of Bolivia. I hope this will not be the case. Let me say, as chairman of the Subcommittee on South American Relations of the Foreign Relations Committee, that I shall be back here at some time in the future urging consideration of some economic assistance to Bolivia if, as a result of this joint resolution, it develops that there is a direct cause-to-effect relationship between it and some disruption of the economy of Bolivia in respect to its chief source of income, namely, tin.

I am concerned further because I believe that this plant, with the great investment of tax dollars in it, ought to be operated on some basis. I would not like to see it dismantled, although here again, let me say, as was pointed out in committee, a 5-year standby period of time, and the cost of keeping the plant in standby condition, would add up to a sum of money which, after 5 years, might very well pay for most of the cost of a new plant which would be more serviceable to our economy than the expenditure of funds for maintaining this plant in standby condition.

I was greatly impressed by that argument. I think the plant should not be kept in idleness for 5 years. We ought to use it for some purpose. I was rather impressed by the information given to our committee to the effect that perhaps it could be used for the production of tin alloys, or for other ores, or for the development of some of the substitutes for tin which are beginning to feel their way into the market.

As I listened to those arguments and to the information given us, to the effect that, after all, probably only 2 or 3 concerns would be apt to be interested in this plant for tin-smelting purposes, and that they are foreign concerns, I felt that, when the joint resolution got to the floor

of the Senate, it ought to be passed, although I again say I believe we are making a mistake in not providing for a 12-month rather than a 7-month period of operation before it is finally and completely liquidated, unless some other smelting company purchases it in the meantime.

My argument can be pretty well summarized by asking unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point certain excerpts from committee report No. 2135 on the joint resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that these excerpts be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

Some days ago when the Senate was considering a bill which had been reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I asked unanimous consent to have the very brief committee report on the bill made a part of my argument on the bill. It was not made a part of my argument, although that report contained a letter I had written to the committee setting forth my position on the bill, and that letter was the reason I asked that the brief report on the bill be made a part of the RECORD, in order to save the time of the Senate by not reading it verbatim on the floor.

On that occasion I ran into what is apparently a printing rule, that material from committee reports cannot be printed in the RECORD. Then I discovered that apparently the rule goes only to the matter of printing a complete committee report, not to excerpts from a report.

With that understanding, Mr. President, that the excerpts from the committee report, which I shall select, shall be made a part of the RECORD at this point, without taking the time to read them—which I shall be glad to do if there is any question about my right to do it—I shall close my argument on the subject, expressing again, as I did in committee, the hope that we can get some new competition in the tin-smelting business and that we can find some great American mineral company, such as Alcoa or Reynolds or Kaiser, or some other company, which is working in somewhat related fields, to evince some interest in going into the tin-smelting business, or at least some interest in obtaining this plant for use in some related smelting field.

And I urge the Federal Facilities Corporation, when proposals for sale are being considered, to give full weight to all the elements which go to make up the interests of the United States in this matter—our national security, our foreign policy, and the needs of the domestic tin-consuming industries.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the committee report (No. 2135) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Texas City tin smelter is a large and efficient plant. Operating at full capacity on high-grade alluvial ores, it could produce 90,000 tons of tin a year. It is the only smelter in the world which can handle, in volume, either these high-grade alluvial ores, averaging above 70 percent tin, or the lower-grade Bolivian ores, averaging 20 to 60 percent tin and containing many impurities difficult to remove.

Annual production has varied with the type and grade of ores and concentrates available. The highest was recorded in 1946, with approximately 43,450 long tons. From the beginning of operations in 1942 to June 1955 the total production has been 420,000 tons.

During recent years, the smelter has operated well below capacity, using substantial quantities of Bolivian ores. In fiscal year 1955 for example, 52 percent of the ore used was Bolivian, averaging about 38 percent tin, and 23,000 tons of tin were produced. Even on this basis, the cost of the tin produced was only about 2 cents a pound higher than the average cost of Straits tin on the futures market in New York.

The Government owned and operated facilities at Texas City include both a tin smelter and a waste-acid plant.

As of June 10, 1955, the Government's original investment in the property, plant, and equipment of the smelter, plus additional capital expenditures, was $9,547,287.79. The depreciated value was $4,182,639.74.

As of June 30, 1955, the Government's original investment in the property, plant, and equipment of the waste-acid plant, plus additional capital expenditures, was $3,605,435.65. The depreciated value was $2,247,541.75.

The smelter and acid plant combined employ about 500 people at the present rate of operations. At full capacity, some 900 persons are employed.

In April 1955, Senate Concurrent Resolution 26 was adopted. This expressed the sense of the Congress that the Texas City smelter should be continued in operation up to June 30, 1956, and that the President should investigate and report to Congress on the most feasible methods of maintaining a permanent domestic tin-smelting industry in the United States. In addition, the President was requested to apprise the public of the possible availability of the smelter for sale.

In accordance with this resolution, a brochure was prepared and distributed by the Federal Facilities Corporation, describing the plant in considerable detail. The committee understands that interest has been expressed in the plant, if the Congress should authorize a sale. If the plant were to operate on high-grade ores, or if it were used to produce alloys instead of pure tin, production costs would be reduced to such an extent that the plant might be able to compete very effectively.

On March 29, 1956, the President transmitted an interagency report recommending disposal of the Texas City plant to private enterprise.

B. CONCLUSIONS

Major conclusions are: That the determination as to the practicability of establishing a permanent tin-smelting industry in this country should be left to private enterprise; that Government participation in the tin business should terminate and Government operation of the Texas City smelter should cease not later than June 30, 1956; and that announcement of the termination of Government activities in this field should provide the impetus for serious consideration by private enterprise of the feasibility of establishing such an industry independently. More specifically:

1. Neither the United States defense nor the national economy nor relations with other friendly countries require the Government's continued participation in a domestic tin-smelting industry in the United States:

(a) The minimum stockpile objective for primary tin metal has been fulfilled, and the long-term objective is expected to be fulfilled by June 30, 1956. These will more than adequately offset the currently estimated deficit in a wartime emergency.

(b) Should a wartime demand arise for domestic smelting facilities as a result of unforeseen developments, an up-to-date and efficient smelter could be built quickly, as in World War II. Ores and concentrates could be contracted for and held in readiness for the smelter, and stockpile metal could supply industry until the new flow of domestic production began.

(c) The national economy has not been dependent upon a domestic tin-smelting industry. Industrial requirements for primary tin are now being met through imports alone.

(d) Countries that have supplied material to the Texas City smelter and to the stockpile have been apprised to the probable discontinuance of the smelter and the impending cessation of stockpile purchases in ample time to find other markets. Their dependence upon the United States as a market has been a relatively recent development and should not be considered unalterable. However, should a tin-smelting industry be established in this country by private enterprise, obviously there would continue to be a market for foreign ores and concentrates since the domestic raw material supply is negligible.

(e) Some advantages would accrue to relations between the United States and countries supplying ores and concentrates if the smelter were to remain in operation. However, these are not of such significance that the decision concerning its future operation should hinge on them.

2. The establishment of a domestic tin-smelting industry should be left to private enterprise on a free-enterprise basis.

(a) Government participation in the tin business should be terminated and the operation of the Texas City tin smelter by the Government should cease no later than June 30, 1956. An announcement to this effect and of the terms of disposal of the Texas City smelter should be made promptly, while the smelter is still in operation. Continued Government operation discourages interest of private enterprise in operating a domestic tin smelter.

(b) Government assistance, other than aid to a private operator in negotiations with foreign governments, should not be depended upon for maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry. Government subsidy in any form, for other than national defense, national economy, or foreign relations reasons, would be considered unwarranted competition with friendly foreign suppliers and with domestic importers, would be burdensome to taxpayers, and might result in additional expense to domestic tin consumers.

3. Government maintenance of a smelter in standby status is not practicable.

4. A domestic tin-smelting industry does not contribute fundamentally to this country's independence of foreign supplies; there are no known appreciable tin deposits in the United States or in contiguous countries.

5. A domestic tin-smelting industry would not remove the vulnerability of this country to restrictive actions on the part of producers of ores, concentrates, or metal acting in concert.

H. R. 607 would carry out these recommendations, allowing an additional 7 months of operation in order to make possible sale or lease of the plant as a going concern, in accordance with the suggestion of the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

The committee wishes to emphasize the importance of having a stockpile of tin adequate for any contingency. With so vital a material as tin, where the Nation is entirely dependent on distant sources, and where circumstances now permit the establishment and fulfillment of as large a stockpile as may be considered desirable, the United States has an opportunity to achieve a position of full protection and security. The previous increases in the size of the stockpile objec-

tive show the need for careful attention to changing requirements.

The committee and the Congress cannot undertake to determine what the stockpile objective should be. The President and the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization must undertake the full responsibility for assuring the national security in this field.

The committee noted that the report took the position that relations with friendly foreign nations did not require continued operation of the smelter by the Government. This is a matter which, under the Constitution, is peculiarly within the responsibility of the President. It is, therefore, appropriate that the Congress should rely fully on this assurance by the President that friendly foreign nations will not suffer from this action.

The sale or lease shall be made in such manner and on such terms and conditions as the FFC determines will best promote the interests of the United States. The committee views these interests as including the national security, the foreign policy, and the interests of United States tin-consuming interests, in addition to the financial results of the sale.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I have considerable sympathy with the view expressed by the senior Senator from Oregon. I may say that the bill before the Senate resulted from a concurrent resolution adopted by Congress last year, Senate Concurrent Resolution 26, which was reported by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], from the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Banking and Currency.

At that time it was recommended that a study be made by the President and that appropriate arrangements be made so that the Texas City plant and facilities, as well as nonsecurity information concerning them, should be shown to interested private persons and Government agencies, looking toward a sale of those facilities.

Furthermore, it was stated that an investigation should be made by the President to determine the feasibility of continuing these operations by the Government.

Mr. President, the legislation to continue these operations will expire on June 30 of this year. I have before me the study made by the President of the feasibility of maintaining the domestic tin smelting industry in the United States. Also before me is an advertisement dated August 31, 1955, notifying private industry that these facilities would be available for sale, subject, of course, to further action and approval by the Congress.

The principal purpose of the proposed legislation is to continue the plant in operation, in order that it may be sold to private industry as a going operation, and the Government's investment may be protected.

Therefore, Mr. President, I believe this proposed legislation is desirable.

With regard to the monopolistic aspects the committee also points out in its report, it looks to the President and his advisers to inform the Congress promptly if developments not anticipated in the report should result in undue price increases and shortages, imposing excessive hardship on United States tin-consuming industries, particularly small businesses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 607) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRODUCTION OF TUNGSTEN, ASBESTOS, FLUORSPAR, AND COLUMBIUM-TANTALUM

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2169, H. R. 3982.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3982) to provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should state that it is not anticipated that the pending bill will be voted on today. It is the plan of the leadership to have the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock on Wednesday. Furthermore, the leadership wishes to place the Senate on notice that in addition to the unfinished business, the public works appropriation bill will probably be called up for consideration on Wednesday when the Senate meets.

A PROGRAM TO ALLEVIATE UNEMPLOYMENT CONDITIONS IN CERTAIN ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS—AMENDMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and myself, I submit for appropriate reference an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the bill, S. 2663, to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas.

The original bill, S. 2663, was referred to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and extensive hearings were conducted and concluded by the Labor Subcommittee while I was chairman both in Washington and in some of the areas where the problem sought to be relieved by the bill exists. The need for this type of legislation was, in the opinion of the cosponsors of this amendment, conclusively established by the hearings. Many constructive suggestions for the improvement of the bill were also received. As a result of the hearings, therefore, the desirability of certain changes in the original bill became apparent, and this amendment in the nature of a substitute was drafted to meet those needs and suggestions.

I am introducing it today for the further study and consideration of the subcommittee, on which I am no longer serving.

Under this amendment of S. 2663, which was originally called the depressed areas bill, it now will be entitled "The Area Redevelopment Act." It will establish programs not only to help relieve chronic unemployment in areas of substantial and prolonged labor surpluses, but also to assist areas of excessive underemployment. The purpose of the bill, of course, is to help all these areas help themselves.

The amended bill provides for closer cooperation by Government agencies and private industry in the effort to work out a real solution to this problem.

As it became apparent that the problem is not one of mere unemployment, but also underemployment, we have brought these two factors together in the amended bill by authorizing the Administrator to denominate and assist industrial redevelopment areas and rural redevelopment areas as well. Definitions of these areas are now more clearly spelled out and expanded.

Uses of the loans to be made upon recommendation of the local committees have been enlarged to include those things—land, buildings, and machinery—found to be necessary for the communities to do the job of relieving unemployment and underemployment.

Local financial participation is required.

Assistance to public facilities has been retained in the amended bill both by loans and grants. The loan funds have been set up on a revolving basis.

Additional safeguards have been included in the revised bill to prevent migration of industry or transfer of work by a borrower from one area to another which would have the effect of merely shifting unemployment from one section of the country to another.

Retraining subsistence payments have been authorized in place of extended unemployment compensation.

The problems of areas of chronic unemployment and underemployment are still very much present. Current labor statistics show little, if any, real change in employment in these areas from that existing 1 year ago. Efforts of these areas, unsuccessful in large part, to solve their own problems were graphically exhibited to the Labor Subcommittee, and representatives from the areas vividly described the need for legislation of this type to bring a real solution to their problems. The recent layoffs in the auto and farm machinery manufacturing industries will substantially aggravate the problems, as many of the individuals affected had originally migrated into these more prosperous industrial areas and now must return to their homes in economically plagued areas.

Mr. President, this bill is designed to help these needy areas pull themselves up by a little more than their own bootstraps. It is my hope, Mr. President, despite the lateness of the session, that Congress will recognize the need and will find that this revised bill is a constructive

way to help these areas and will take favorable action on this legislation. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an abstract of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, together with the text of the revised bill itself.

There being no objection, the abstract and the text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIGEST OF DOUGLAS-NEELY-KENNEDY AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT—AMENDMENT IN NATURE OF SUBSTITUTE TO S. 2663

1. PURPOSE

To provide assistance to communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals in areas needing redevelopment to enable them to expand and adjust their productive activity to alleviate excessive unemployment and underemployment within such areas by providing new employment opportunities and developing and expanding existing facilities and resources without reducing employment in other areas of the United States.

2. ORGANIZATION

1. Creates Area Redevelopment Administration with Administrator.

2. Creates Advisory Committees—meet twice a year—To assist Administrator.

(a) Government Advisory Committee consisting of heads of major Federal bureaus.

(b) National Public Advisory Committee consisting of heads of business, labor and agriculture.

3. DEPRESSED AREAS DEFINED

(a) Industrial redevelopment areas are defined as "those within the United States in which Administrator determines that there has existed excessive unemployment for an extended period of time."

Areas shall be so designated where unemployment is:

1. Not less than 12 percent for 12 month period.

2. Not less than 8 percent for 15 months of 18 month period.

3. Not less than 6 percent for 8 months in each of 2 years.

(b) Rural redevelopment areas are defined as "those rural areas within United States (not exceeding at any one time 15 counties in any State or 300 counties in United States) in which he determines that there exist the largest number and percentage of low income farm families, and a condition of substantial and prolonged underemployment."

4. LOCAL COMMITTEES

Once a redevelopment area is determined, local redevelopment committee is appointed by Administrator consisting of at least 7 residents of area. Local committee to represent: management, labor, commercial, industrial development, and agricultural groups. Submit plans for alleviating unemployment and underemployment.

Administrator may appoint Regional Committee on same basis as above within areas to represent two or more redevelopment areas.

Funds for local committees: Not more than $1,500,000 available to Administrator, to aid regional and local committees for administrative-expenses only salaries, and traveling expenses excluded.

5. LOANS

(a) May make loans to assist in financing (1) purchase or development of land for industrial usage; (2) construction, rehabilitation, or alteration of industrial plants or other manufacturing, commercial, or processing facilities; (3) purchase of machinery or equipment.

Need established by findings showing:

1. Construction of facility reasonably calculated to alleviate unemployment or underemployment.

2. Funds for construction not otherwise available on reasonable terms.

3. Amount of loan plus private funds available are adequate to insure completion.

4. Borrower will not transfer business operations to such plant so as to effect a reduction in employment in any other area within the United States.

5. Facility constructed will provide more than temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment.

(b) No loan shall be in excess of 75 percent of aggregate cost nor longer than 40 years.

(c) Administrator shall require not less than 10 percent or more than 25 percent of aggregate cost to be supplied by (1) States and subdivisions thereof; or (2) local interests. Federal lien has first status. Financial condition of area to determine amount of local contribution to cost.

(d) Loan shall be conditioned upon contract provision effective during life loan prohibiting borrower from transferring or relocating business operations to redevelopment area so as to cause unemployment elsewhere.

(e) "Borrower" includes successors in interest, lessees, subcontractors, or persons or firms under common control.

(f) One hundred million dollars authorized for making industrial redevelopment loans. Revolving fund created. Fifty million dollars appropriated for rural redevelopment loans (with limitation of $2,500,000 any one State). Revolving fund created.

6. ASSISTANCE TO PUBLIC FACILITIES

1. Loans for public facilities:

(a) Upon application of any State or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, private or public organization, Administrator is authorized to make loans to assist in financing purchase or development of land for public facility usage, construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion or improvement of public facilities in redevelopment areas.

Need established by findings of:

(1) Project provides more than temporary alleviation of unemployment and will tend to improve opportunities in areas for successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities.

(2) Funds requested are not otherwise available on reasonable terms.

(3) Amount of loan plus amount of funds from State or local or private sources are adequate to insure completion.

(b) No loan shall be in excess of 75 percent of aggregate cost, or for longer than 40 years.

(c) Administrator shall require not less than 10 percent or more than 25 percent of aggregate cost to be supplied by (1) State or political subdivision, or (2) a loan. Financial condition of areas to determine amount of local contribution to cost. Federal lien has first position.

(d) One hundred million dollars appropriated for public facility loans. Revolving fund creates.

2. Grants for public facilities:

(a) Administrator shall conduct continuing studies of needs and probable costs in redevelopment areas for needed land acquisition for public facility usage and for construction, alterations, expansion, or improvement of useful public facilities. Receive proposals from States, Indian tribes, etc., showing costs and contributions to be made to proposal and Administrator may make grants where he finds:

(1) Proposal will provide more than temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment and proposal will tend to improve opportunities of area for establishment or expansion of industrial plants and facilities.

(2) Local groups contribute to cost of project proportionate to ability to contribute.

(3) Project will fill a pressing need of area and little probability project could otherwise be undertaken. Grant, with other funds available, will not exceed amount needed to insure completion.

(b) Administrator provide supervision to prevent waste of Federal funds.

(c) Appropriations authorized not to exceed $50 million annually for making grants.

7. FUNDS FOR INDUSTRIAL PLANTS AND PUBLIC FACILITIES

Administrator with approval of President issues notes and obligations not exceeding $250 million. Secretary of the Treasury may purchase and sell such notes.

8. ESTABLISHMENT OF REVOLVING FUNDS

Creates revolving funds for industrial and rural redevelopment loans and public facility loans. (See separate loan sections for amounts.)

9. PROCUREMENT BY GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

(a) Each department of the Federal Government engaged in procurement of supplies shall—

1. Use best efforts to award negotiated procurements to contractors in redevelopment areas.

2. Where deemed appropriate set aside portions of procurements for negotiation with firms in redevelopment areas.

3. Provides bid matching procurements means.

4. Assures that firms in redevelopment areas are bidders on list and get notices.

5. In event of tie bids, all other things being equal, award contract to firm in redevelopment area.

6. Encourage prime contractors to award subcontracts to firms in redevelopment areas.

7. Cooperate with other departments and agencies of Federal Government to achieve objectives set forth.

(b) Administrator shall furnish all departments and agencies of Federal Government with list of areas designated as redevelopment areas and with list of services and supplies available in each of such areas.

10. INFORMATION

Administrator shall aid redevelopment areas by furnishing assistance, technical information, market research, advice, etc., obtainable from Federal Government agencies. Administrator shall also supply Federal procurement agencies with names and addresses of redevelopment area firms desirous of obtaining contracts from United States Government.

11. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Administration authorized to provide technical assistance to redevelopment areas. Includes studies of need, potentials, etc., and may be provided by use of staff of Administrator or by contract with individuals or institutions locally.

12. POWERS OF ADMINISTRATION

1. Hold hearings, take testimony.

2. Request from Federal agencies, information, suggestions, statistics.

3. Sell, assign, rent, improve, etc., any properties or security for collecting loans and otherwise pursue to final collection all loans made under act.

13. VOCATIONAL TRAINING

(a) Secretary of Labor shall:

1. Provide suitable training for unemployed persons in such areas in need of training, retraining, or reemployment or vocational education.

2. Cooperate with existing retraining facilities of Federal and State governments by contract on reimbursable basis or make contracts with private institutions.

14. RETRAINING SUBSISTENCE PAYMENTS

(a) Secretary of Labor shall:

1. Enter into agreements with States whereby the States as agent of the Federal Government make weekly retraining payments to unemployed individuals not entitled to unemployment compensation (exhaustions or not insured) certified by Secretary of Labor.

2. Make retraining payments to such individuals for not more than 13 weeks in amounts equal to average unemployment compensation payments payable in State making payments.

15. ANNUAL REPORT

Administrator shall make a comprehensive and detailed annual report to Congress.

16. APPROPRIATIONS

Authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out provisions of the act.

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That this act may be cited as the 'Area Redevelopment Act.'

"FINDINGS OF FACT

"SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the maintenance of the national economy at a high level of prosperity and employment is vital to the best interests of the United States and that the present existence of excessive unemployment or underdevelopment in certain areas of the Nation is jeopardizing the health, standard of living, and general welfare of the Nation. It is therefore the purpose of this act to provide assistance to communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals in areas needing redevelopment to enable them to expand and adjust their productive activity to alleviate excessive unemployment or underemployment within such areas by providing new employment opportunities and developing and expanding existing facilities and resources without reducing employment in other areas of the United States.

"AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 3. In order to carry out the purposes of this act, there is hereby established, within the executive branch of the Government, an Area Redevelopment Administration. Such Administration shall be under the direction and control of an Administrator (hereinafter referred to as 'the Administrator') who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall be compensated at the rate of $ per annum.

"ADVISORY COMMITTEES

"SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established a Government Advisory Committee on Area Redevelopment which shall be composed of the following members: The Administrator, as Chairman, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, the Administrator of General Services, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. Such Committee, or any duly established subcommittee thereof, shall from time to time make recommendations to the Administrator relative to the carrying out of his duties under this act, and the Administrator shall, in carrying out such duties, consult with such committee, or any duly established subcommittee thereof. Such Committee shall hold meetings at the call of the Chairman, and such meetings shall be held at least twice during each calendar year.

"(b) The Administrator shall appoint a National Public Advisory Committee on Area Redevelopment which shall consist of 12 members and which shall be composed of representatives of labor, management, agriculture, and the public in general. From the members appointed to such Committee the Administrator shall designate a Chairman. Such Committee, or any duly established subcommittee thereof, shall from time to time make recommendations to the Administrator relative to the carrying out of his duties under this act. Such Committee shall hold not less than two meetings during each calendar year.

"(c) The Administrator is authorized from time to time to call together and confer with representatives of the various parties in interest from any industry in which employment has dropped substantially over an extended period of years and which in consequence has been a primary source of high levels of unemployment in several areas designated by the Administrator as redevelopment areas. Conferences convened under authority of this subsection shall consider with and recommend to the Administrator plans and programs with special reference to any such industry to carry out the purposes of this act.

"REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

"SEC. 5. (a) The Administrator shall designate as 'industrial redevelopment areas' those industrial areas within the United States in which he determines that there has existed excessive unemployment for an extended period of time. Any such industrial area in which there has existed unemployment of not less than (1) 12 percent of the labor force for the 12-month period immediately preceding the date on which an application or recommendation for assistance is made under this act, (2) 8 percent of the labor force during at least 15 months of the 18-month period immediately preceding such date, or (3) 6 percent of the labor force during at least 8 months in each of the 2 years immediately preceding such date, shall be designated an 'industrial redevelopment area.'

"(b) In addition to those areas designated under subsection (a), the Administrator shall designate as 'rural redevelopment areas' those rural areas within the United States (not exceeding at any 1 time 15 counties in any 1 State or 300 counties in the United States) in which he determines that there exist the largest number and percentage of low-income farm families, and a condition of substantial and prolonged underemployment. In making the designations under this subsection, the Administrator shall consider among other relevant factors the number of low-income farm families in the various rural areas of the United States, the proportion that such low-income families are to the total farm families of each of such areas, the relationship of the income levels of the farm families in each such area to the general levels of income in the same area, the current and prospective employment opportunities in each such area, and the availability of farm manpower in each such area for supplemental employment.

"(c) In making the determinations provided for in this section, the Administrator shall be guided, but not conclusively governed, by pertinent studies made, and information and data collected or compiled, by (1) departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, (2) State and local governments, (3) universities and land-grant colleges, and (4) private organizations.

"(d) Upon the request of the Administrator, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Director of the Bureau of the Census are respectively authorized to conduct such special studies, obtain such information, and compile and furnish to the Administrator such data as the Administrator may deem necessary or proper to enable him to make the determinations provided for in this section.

"LOCAL AND REGIONAL COMMITTEES

"SEC. 6. (a) The Administrator, upon determining that any area is a redevelopment area, shall appoint a local redevelopment committee (hereinafter referred to as a 'local committee'), to be composed of not less than seven residents of such area who, as nearly as possible, are representative of labor, management, commercial, industrial development, and agricultural groups, and of the residents generally of such area. Each local committee shall prepare plans and cost estimates, to the extent deemed desirable by it, for (1) the development of the resources of, and processing and marketing facilities in, the area which such committee represents, (2) the construction, rehabilitation, and alteration of industrial plants or other industrial and commercial facilities in such area, and (3) the purchase of machinery or equipment for use in such area, with a view to attracting new industries thereto and otherwise to stimulate economic activity therein. Each local committee shall enlist the support of local residents and private and public lending agencies in financing the carrying out of such plans. The Administrator shall, at the request of any local committee, make available to such committee such professional, technical, and other experts as may be necessary to enable such local committee properly to discharge its functions under this act.

"(b) The Administrator may establish regional committees to represent two or more redevelopment areas when he finds that the establishment of such committees will facilitate the carrying out of the purposes of this act. The members of the regional committees shall be appointed by the Administrator on the same basis as are members of local committees, and such regional committees shall cooperate with, and, to the extent possible, coordinate the activities of, the local committees within the regions represented by such regional committees.

"(c) Of the sums appropriated to carry out the purposes of this act, not to exceed $1,500,000 shall be available to the Administrator for the purpose of assisting the local or regional committees established under this section to defray their administrative expenses, but no part thereof shall be available for the purpose of paying salaries or traveling expenses of the members of such committees.

"LOANS

"SEC. 7. (a) Upon the recommendation of any local committee, the Administrator is authorized to make loans to assist in financing the purchase or development of land for industrial usage within the redevelopment area represented by such committee, and the construction, rehabilitation, or alteration of industrial plants, or other manufacturing, commercial, or processing facilities, and the purchase of machinery or equipment for use, in such area, if he finds that—

"(1) the project for which financial assistance is sought is reasonably calculated to alleviate unemployment or underemployment within the redevelopment area wherein it is, or will be, located;

"(2) the funds requested for such project are not otherwise available on reasonable terms;

"(3) the amount of the loan plus the amount of private funds available for such

project are adequate to insure the completion thereof;

"(4) the borrower will not cause a transferral to, or relocation in, any plant or facility, the construction, rehabilitation, or alteration of which is assisted under this section, of business operations otherwise conducted by such borrower so as to effect a reduction in employment in any other area within the United States; and

"(5) the construction, rehabilitation, or alteration, of any such plant or facility will provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment.

"(b) No loan under this section shall be for an amount in excess of 75 percent of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made. The maturity date of any such loan shall be not later than 40 years after the date such loan was made.

"(c) In making any loan under this section, the Administrator shall require that not less than 10 percent, or more than 25 percent, of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made shall be supplied (1) by the State (including any agency, instrumentality, or political subdivision thereof) within which such project is to be located, or (2) by one or more community or area organizations, or persons, firms or corporations within the redevelopment area in which such project is to be located, as equity capital, or as a loan repayable only after the financial assistance provided under this section has been repaid in full, and, if such loan is secured, its security shall be subordinate to the lien or liens securing the financial assistance provided under this section. In determining the amount of participation required under this subsection with respect to any particular project, the Administrator shall give consideration to the financial condition of the State or local government, and to the per capita income of the residence of the redevelopment area, within which such project is to be located.

"(d) In making any loan under this section with respect to the construction, rehabilitation, or alteration of any plan or facility, the Administrator shall include in the loan agreement a provision that during the life of the loan the borrower shall not cause a transferal to, or relocation in, such plant or facility of business operations otherwise conducted by such borrower so as to effect a reduction in employment in any other area within the United States. Such loan agreement shall further authorize the Administrator, in the event of a violation of the foregoing provision, to declare the unpaid balance of any such loan immediately due and payable, and, in default of payment, to proceed forthwith to enforce such loan agreement and the security thereon.

"(e) As used in this section, the term 'borrower' includes any successor in interest to the borrower, or any agent, lessee or operating subcontractor thereof, or any person, firm, or corporation which directly or indirectly controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with, the borrower by reason of voting stock interest, common officers, directors or stockholders, voting trusts, or by any other direct or indirect means.

"LOANS FOR BUBLIC FACILITIES

"SEC. 8. (a) Upon the application of any State, or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or private or public organization or association representing any development area or part thereof, the Administrator is authorized to make loans to assist in financing the purchase or development of land for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within any redevelopment area, if he finds that—

"(1) the project for which financial assistance is sought will provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment in the redevelopment area wherein such project is, or will be, located, and will tend to improve the opportunities in such area for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities;

"(2) the funds requested for such project are not otherwise available on reasonable terms; and

"(3) the amount of the loan plus the amount of public funds from State or local sources or private funds or both, available for such project are adequate to insure the completion thereof.

"(b) No loan under this section shall be for an amount in excess of 75 percent of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made. The maturity date of any such loan shall be not later than 40 years after the date such loan is made.

"(c) In making any loan under this section, the Administrator shall require that not less than 10 percent, nor more than 25 percent, of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made shall be supplied (1) by the State (including any political subdivision thereof) within which such project is to be located as equity capital, or as a loan repayable only after the financial assistance provided under this section has been repaid in full, and, if such loan is secured, its security shall be subordinate to the lien or liens securing the financial assistance provided under this section. In determining the amount of participation required under this subsection with respect to any particular project, the Administrator shall give consideration to the financial condition of the State or local government, and to the per capita income of the residents of the redevelopment area, within which such project is to be located.

"GRANTS FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES

"SEC. 9. (a) The Administrator shall conduct continuing studies of needs in the various redevelopment areas throughout the United States for, and the probable cost of, land acquisition or development for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvemen of useful public facilities within such areas, and may receive proposals from any State, or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or private or public organization or association representing any redevelopment area, or part thereof, relating to land acquisition or development for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within any such area. Any such proposal shall contain plans showing the project proposed to be undertaken, the cost thereof, and the contributions proposed to be made to such cost by the entity making the proposal. The Administrator, in consultation with such entity, is authorized to modify all or any part of such proposal.

"(b) The Administrator, pursuant to a proposal received by him under this section, or on his own initiative, may make grants to any State, or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or private or public organization or association representing any redevelopment area, or part thereof, for land acquisition or development for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within a redevelopment area, if he finds that—

"(1) the project for which financial assistance is sought will provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment in the redevelopment area wherein such project is, or will be, located, and will tend to improve the opportunities in such area for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities;

"(2) the entity requesting the grant proposes to contribute to the cost of the project for which such grant is requested in proportion to its ability so to contribute; and

"(3) the project for which a grant is requested will fulfill a pressing need of the area, or part thereof, in which it is, or will be, located, and there is little probability that such project can be undertaken without the assistance of a grant under this section. The amount of any grant under this section for any such project shall not exceed the difference between the funds which can be practicably obtained from other sources (including a loan under section 8 of this act) for such project, and the amount which is necessary to insure the completion thereof.

"(c) The Administrator shall by regulations provide for the supervision of the carrying out of projects with respect to which grants are made under this section so as to insure that Federal funds are not wasted or dissipated.

"(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $50,000,000 annually for the purpose of making grants under this section.

"FUNDS FOR LOANS

"SEC. 10. To obtain funds for loans under this Act, the Administrator may, with the approval of the President, issue and have outstanding at any one time notes and obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not to exceed $250,000,000. Such notes or other obligations shall be in such forms and denominations, have such maturities, and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations issued under this section and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such Act are extended to include any purchases of such notes and other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated in every respect as public debt transactions of the United States.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF REVOLVING FUNDS

"SEC. 11. Of the funds raised under section 10 of this act, not more than (1) $100 million shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans for projects within industrial redevelopment areas; (2) $50 million shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans for projects within rural redevelopment areas, but the principal amount of loans from such fund which are outstanding at any one time within any one State shall not exceed $2,500,000; and (3) $100 million shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans for public facilities. Receipts arising from the repayment of any such loans shall be deposited in the fund from which such loan

was made and shall be utilized for the purpose for which such fund was established.

"PROCUREMENT BY GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

"SEC. 12. (a) Each department, agency, or other instrumentality of the Federal Government engaged in the procurement of any supplies or services for use by or on behalf of the United States shall—

"(1) use its best efforts to award negotiated procurement contracts to contractors located within redevelopment areas to the extent procurement objectives will permit;

"(2) where deemed appropriate, set aside portions of procurements for negotiation exclusively with firms located in redevelopment areas, if a substantial proportion of production on such negotiated contracts will be performed within redevelopment areas and if such firms will contract for such portions of the procurement at such prices;

"(3) where deemed appropriate and consistent with procurement objectives, after the expiration of the period during which bids for any procurement are permitted to be submitted and if the lowest of such bids was submitted by a firm in an area other than a redevelopment area, negotiate with firms in redevelopment areas with a view to ascertaining whether any such firm will furnish the services or supplies with respect to which bids were theretofore submitted for an amount equal to, or less than, the amount of the lowest bid theretofore submitted for the furnishing of such services or supplies, and if any such firm can be found, award the contract for the furnishing of such services or supplies to such firm;

"(4) assure that firms in redevelopment areas which are on appropriate bidders' lists will be given the opportunity to submit bids or proposals on all procurements for which they are qualified and on which small business joint-determinations have not been made, but whenever the number of firms on a bidders' list is exclusive, there shall be included a representative number of firms from redevelopment areas;

"(5) in the event of tie bids on offers on any procurement, award the contract to the firm located in a redevelopment area, other things being equal;

"(6) encourage prime contractors to award subcontracts to firms in redevelopment areas; and

"(7) cooperate with other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government in achieving the objectives set out in this subsection.

"(b) The Administrator shall furnish all departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government with a list of areas which he has designated as redevelopment areas under this act, together with a list of the services and supplies which are most abundantly available in each of such areas.

"INFORMATION

"SEC. 13. The Administrator shall aid depressed areas by furnishing to interested individuals, communities, industries, and enterprises within such areas any assistance, technical information, market research, or other forms of assistance, information, or advice which are obtainable from the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government and which would be useful in alleviating conditions of excessive unemployment or underemployment within such areas. The Administrator shall furnish the procurement divisions of the various departments, agencies, and other instrumentalities of the Federal Government with a list containing the names and addresses of business firms which are located in redevelopment areas and which are desirous of obtaining Government contracts for the furnishing of supplies or services, and designating the supplies and services such firms are engaged in providing.

"TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 14. In carrying out his duties under this act, the Administrator is authorized to provide technical assistance to areas which he has designated as redevelopment areas under this act. Such assistance shall include studies evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, economic growth of such areas. Such assistance may be provided by the Administrator through members of his staff or through the employment of private individuals or institutions under contracts entered into for such purpose.

"POWERS OF ADMINISTRATOR

"SEC. 15. In performing his duties under this act, the Administrator is authorized to—

"(1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as he may deem advisable;

"(2) request directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics needed to carry out the purposes of this act; and each department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Administrator;

"(3) under regulations prescribed by him, assign or sell at public or private sale, or otherwise dispose of for cash or credit, in his discretion and upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any evidence of debt, contract, claim, personal property, or security assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of loans made under this act, and collect or compromise all obligations assigned to him in connection with the payment of such loans until such time as such obligation may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

"(4) deal with, complete, renovate, improve, modernize, insure, rent, or sell for cash or credit, upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any real or personal property conveyed to, or otherwise acquired by, him in connection with the payment of loans made under this Act;

"(5) pursue to final collection, by way of compromise or other administrative action, prior to reference to the Attorney General, all claims against third parties assigned to him in connection with loans made under this act, and the power to convey and to execute in the name of the Administrator deeds of conveyance, deeds of release, assignments and satisfactions of mortgages, and any other written instrument relating to real or personal property or any interest therein acquired by the Administrator pursuant to the provisions of this act may be exercised by the Administrator or by any officer or agent appointed by him for that purpose;

"(6) in addition to any powers, functions, privileges, and immunities otherwise vested in him, take any and all actions, including the procurement of the services of attorneys by contract, determined by him to be necessary or desirable in making, servicing, compromising, modifying, liquidating, or otherwise administratively dealing with or realizing on loans made under this act; and

"(7) establish such rules, regulations, and procedures as he may deem appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this act.

"VOCATIONAL TRAINING

"SEC. 16. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall—

"(1) prescribe and provide suitable training for unemployed individuals residing in redevelopment areas who are in need of training, retraining, or reemployment or vocational education;

"(2) enter into agreements with other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, and with agencies maintained by joint Federal and State contributions whereby the existing facilities of such departments, agencies, and instrumentalities may be utilized, on a reimbursable basis, in carrying out the purposes of this section; and

"(3) by agreement or contract with public or private institutions or establishments, provide for such additional training facilities as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this section.

"(b) The Secretary of Labor shall cooperate with existing Federal, State, and local agencies and officials in charge of existing programs relating to training, retraining, and reemployment and vocational education for the purpose of coordinating his activities with those of such agencies and officials.

"RETRAINING SUBSISTENCE PAYMENTS

"SEC. 17. The Secretary of Labor shall, on behalf of the United States, enter into agreements with States in which redevelopment areas are located under which the Secretary shall make payments to such States for the purpose of enabling such States, as agents of the United States, to make weekly retraining payments to unemployed individuals residing within such redevelopment areas who are not entitled to unemployment compensation (either because their unemployment compensation benefits have been exhausted or because they were not insured for such compensation) and who have been certified by the Secretary of Labor to be undergoing training for a new job. Such payments shall be made for a period not exceeding 13 weeks, and the amounts of such payments shall be equal to the amount of the average weekly unemployment compensation payment payable in the State making such payments.

"ANNUAL REPORT

"SEC. 18. The Administrator shall make a comprehensive and detailed annual report to the Congress of his operations under this act for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957. Such report shall be printed, and shall be transmitted to the Congress not later than January 3, of the year following the fiscal year with respect to which such report is made. Such report shall show, among other things, the number and size of Government contracts for the furnishing of supplies and services placed with business firms located in redevelopment areas, and the amount and duration of employment resulting therefrom.

"APPROPRIATION

"SEC. 19. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment in the nature of a substitute, submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. KENNEDY) to the bill (S. 2663) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas, will be received, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and printed.

HOW STRONG IS RUSSIA? AND HOW WEAK?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Times Magazine for June 10, 1956, entitled "How Strong Is Russia? And How Weak?," based on an address by our former colleague, Hon. William Benton, publisher of the Encyclopaedia Britannica,

before the Institute for the Study of the U. S. S. R. Both in public office and out, Senator Benton has been one of our most thoughtful observers and students of the basic facts and developments of international relations, and I believe many people will be helped in their understanding and Congress will be aided in its consideration of all our foreign policy programs by his thoughtful analysis of our primary antagonist in the struggle to keep the world free.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW STRONG IS RUSSIA? AND HOW WEAK?

(By William Benton)

The Iron Curtain is being cranked up a few notches, thanks to the growing revelations about Stalin. The glimpses we have been given, it seems to me, show that we Americans have been guilty of both overestimation and underestimation of the Soviet Union.

I suggest that the balance of our past errors is heavily weighted: we have grievously underestimated the U. S. S. R. and its capabilities. Today, however, I think it quite possible that the pendulum may be swinging too far in the other direction, toward overestimation. The assumption is now being made in some quarters that the "new Soviet man" is indeed 10 feet high—and is incorruptible and unselfish as well—and that the Soviet Government can perform any feat it decrees. Perhaps one of the most difficult feats it faces is the destruction and replacement of the Stalin myth.

Before examining this new assumption, let me describe three errors of underestimation.

Most obvious have been our bad guesses about Soviet science and technology. Here the evidence seems crystal clear. The American people were astonished by the appearance of the Soviet atom bomb; we were startled by the Soviet hydrogen bomb; and recently we have been amazed by high-class Soviet jet fighters and bombers and passenger planes. Even responsible United States Government officials did not expect such Soviet triumphs until years later.

Yet Senator SYMINGTON has warned us of Soviet progress in guided and ballistic missiles for a long time. Recently from London we had the ballistic and intercontinental warnings of Khrushchev himself. We should not ignore these warnings. On my trip to the U. S. S. R. last fall I decided that although the Russian leaders don't always mean what they say, they often do, and the area in which they most often do is military technology.

Successful Soviet security measures are partly responsible for our habit of underestimating Soviet science and technology. The habit, however, has deeper roots than this. Until very recently we Americans have tended to think of Soviet citizens as ignorant peasants—illiterate and incapable of handling machinery or grappling with advanced scientific ideas. We forgot the existence of such great Russian technological talents as De Seversky's and Sikorsky's, even though they were at work in the United States. We ignored the enormous Soviet effort to train technicians and scientists, to funnel the best brains of the U. S. S. R. into the manufacture of the most deadly military equipment. Moreover, we fed our disdain for Soviet science with such aberrations as the Lysenko fantasy. We comforted ourselves with the belief that political interference with Soviet science doomed it to sterility. We failed to remind ourselves that, in the field of military production, results were valued by the Soviet leaders above ideology.

A second example of underestimation is our evaluation of Soviet economic progress. Only 11 years ago the Soviet Union lay nearly prostrate, much of its industry and many of its most productive cities ravaged. Who in our Government dreamed the damage could be repaired so soon, with annual production soaring to record highs?

The U. S. S. R. has, indeed, achieved its economic progress through the abysses of revolution, tyranny, disaster, and war. This story of progress through catastrophe reminds me of a luncheon I attended in August of 1943 in Manchester, England. This was at the peak of the nightly obliteration bombings of German industry. Said a worried British manufacturer, "Just think of those efficient and modern new factories the Germans will build in Hamburg after Air Marshal Harris has pulverized them into cinders and ashes."

He was prophetic, as we now know. After the war the Germans didn't have to worry about amortization allowances, and neither do the Russians today.

The Soviet leaders predict 68 million tons of steel by 1960, and these are metric tons, 10 percent heavier than ours. From the standpoint of national security and their past record of success, we must accept the likelihood that this prediction will be realized. Moreover, when we compare Russian steel production with ours, let us not console ourselves overmuch because ours is larger. Would we not be wiser to recall how much of our own steel goes into gadgets and refrigerators and Cadillacs? Soviet steel goes into armaments and heavy industry; it isn't diverted to the more joyous and pleasurable outlets.

Americans have, in fact, put too much emphasis on the low Soviet standard of living, on the chronic Soviet housing crisis, and the high prices of consumer goods. When we read that Secretary Mitchell says that "the United States worker produces 2½ times more than his Soviet counterpart," we pat ourselves on the back and conclude there is little reason to worry. Yet, at the same time, and in the same paper, a British expert tells us that a Soviet steelworker produces as much per man as a British steelworker, though he is paid only half as much.

One reason why we have underestimated Russia's capacity for industrial progress is our failure to appreciate the capacity of a totalitarian regime to drive its people mercilessly toward its objectives. We have not grasped the peculiar Soviet admixture of pressure, incentive, and propaganda. Especially, we have not understood the talent for propaganda of the Soviet leaders and the power of their propaganda to incite the people. From our own experience in a democratic society, we have found it hard to understand the terrible disproportions which are a key to the Soviet economy. That a country can invest in gigantic new steel mills and new machinery plants while its people are ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed has seemed incredible to many of us.

Now for the third example of underestimation: our failure to pay tribute to the technical efficiency of Soviet leadership. This failure comes about partly because we are blinded by the economic and political ideas of these leaders, which to us seem naive, irrational, and indeed cockeyed. Until recently the figure of Stalin dominated our thoughts about leadership within the Soviet Union. We knew that he had destroyed thousands in the blood purges of the 1930's and that leaders who survived had lived in deadly fear. What we failed to recognize was the high order of ability of these new men at the top.

The most vivid impression of my recent trip to the U. S. S. R. is of the caliber of the Soviet leaders I met. The 40 or 50 with whom I visited from 90 minutes to 3 hours seemed to me not only competent but vital, relaxed, confident of themselves and of their objectives. If these men were Americans, they would be among our big corporation presidents, our leading financiers, our top politicians, and, I believe, they might well serve democracy as ably as they now serve communism.

Soviet society has been and is highly competitive for the individual. In one of my several exposures to Washington, I publicly remarked that the personal competition in Washington made what goes on within or between Sears, Roebuck and Montgomery Ward, or General Motors and Ford, look like a game of dominoes.

Personal competition within the U. S. S. R., greatly intensified over anything we know in the United States—it reaches a point which literally involves life and death—has been the mother's milk of the present crop of Soviet officials. The old ruling class and the old bureaucracy were wiped out in 1917. Opportunities thus opened up everywhere. In the middle 1930's, the purges vacated thousands of top posts. Hundreds of thousands of subsidiary jobs opened up. Over and above these revolutionary annihilations of those in power, the steady and continuous expansion of the Soviet economy has developed a constant new supply of opportunities. To fill these, an expanding school system—for the old and aging as well as the young—has trained ever greater numbers.

Not only have there been ample opportunities for the new men. There have been incentives for them. The able Soviet citizen is richly rewarded, relative to Soviet standards, even though such rewards make a mockery of socialism's original egalitarian ideas. The system of promotion is based upon a cruel demand for performance. The manager who overfulfills the plan is well paid and promoted. The manager who underfulfills faces the threat of prison or even of execution for sabotage. A hard system this is, but most surely its bitter competitive quality pays off. Why should we then be surprised that it has brought able leaders to many top positions This is not the first revolution so to do.

In Russia today, the leaders whom I met seem to me to be the strong, the tough, the dominant. They represent the survival of the fit, even though almost certainly not of the fittest. They terrify me by their quiet confidence, as they do by their profound ignorance of western civilization. Let us look at the backgrounds of some of these top men: Bulganin, son of a white-collar worker; Kaganovich, son of poor working-class parents; Khrushchev, son of a coal miner; Malenkov, petty bourgeois background, father may have been a petty official; Mikoyan, son of a worker; Molotov, son of fairly prosperous bourgeois parents; Peruvkhin, son of a blacksmith; Saburov, son of a miner; Voroshilov, son of a railroad watchman; Zhukov, son of a poor peasant.

Does this list dramatize the barriers these remarkable men had to break through? Does it help explain why I cite as a third area of error of underestimation our failure to appreciate the talent of the leadership that has surged to the top in this competitive society? I could develop a fourth area or a fifth, but I think the three I have cited illustrate how we of the West, in our judgment of the policy and potential of the U. S. S. R., have too often been influenced by obsolete ideas and by wishful thinking and by our intense dislike for totalitarianism.

One of our main difficulties has been an inability to appreciate the heavy worldwide impact of the Soviet international propaganda. I startled some of my colleagues in the United States Senate when I argued on

the Senate floor that China fell to Red propaganda rather than to Red arms. I shall never forget a statement I heard General Marshall make early in 1947, shortly after he returned from China. He said, "China might have been saved by the massive use of radio and motion pictures, on a scale hitherto undreamed of." At that time, this statement was unrealistic, of course—as he very well knew. The battle of ideas in China had by then been lost. The United States exported armaments instead of radios or movies. But the Communists, years before, had sent into China thousands of Moscow-trained agitators and propagandists, village by village, using the propaganda themes they knew would be effective.

Now let me turn to some of our errors in overestimating Soviet strength and capabilities. These I think are far less serious. Civilizations (like businesses) destroy themselves by underestimating their competition rather than by overestimating it.

Yet this second area of error can still betray us in today's world. It can betray us in our domestic budget as well as in our expenditures overseas. It can upset our economic stability. The voices urging it upon us grow stronger daily. Soviet offers of capital equipment abroad have led to exaggerated expectations that the Soviet Union may be about to conquer so-called uncommitted billions by delivering massive amounts of economic aid. A British economist has suggested that as early as 1963 the Soviet Union may attain the 1955 level of American industrial production. Some persons feel that the Soviet peoples are so devoted to their regime and their way of life that all Western or satellite hopes of disunity are senseless. In such views can lie a road to disaster for American policy.

These are the dangerous aspects of our tendency of overestimation.

First, there is the overestimation of the link between the present Soviet regime and its people. If anything is plain in the dispatches from Russia, it is the evidence of the widespread discontent that exists there. How deep and politically significant this is we cannot tell, but we know at least that the Soviet leaders have responded to this discontent and that it is far from assuaged.

I'm not too hopeful in this area because I am too impressed and too terrified by the successes of the Communist propaganda. But I have some hope. I like a phrase of Allen Dulles'. He writes me of his "cautious optimism," and I wonder if we cannot find grounds for such an approach in examination of the Russian high command's present cynical reversal on Stalin.

The anti-Stalin campaign is shaking Russia psychologically in a way it has not been shaken in the 38 years of the Soviet regime. For decades, the people of the U. S. S. R. were told that Stalin was the wisest, the kindest, the sweetest, the greatest man who ever lived; in a word, that he was infallible. Ever since World War II that theme has been hammered into the capitive peoples of East Europe. Now the word is that he was a maniac. He was also a murderer and a monster. His victims are being released from jail, or posthumously rehabilitated. The books, movies, plays, poems, and pictures produced during his lifetime must now be scrapped. Yesterday's white is today's black.

Can and should we now assume that the Soviet people are so stupid that they will not draw conclusions from the evidence given them by their own leaders, presented to them each week, of how a madman deceived them, of how he lied to them and of how he even killed their brothers and sisters, their fathers and mothers?

For an American parallel we have to try to imagine how Americans would have felt in 1789, the year of our Constitution, if they had suddenly found out that George Washington was a British spy and Benedict Arnold a patriotic American whom Washington had framed.

The men in the Kremlin are concerned about this shock. Look how slowly and carefully they are trying to release the news to their people.

Can it be that because of the tremendous successes of the Communist propaganda since 1917 and even before—can it be that the Soviet leaders have now at last overestimated the power of their propaganda? When they tell the youth of Russia about Stalin, when they tell the youth of Russia that Stalin was not infallible—may they not be sowing the seeds of unbelief in the Soviet propaganda? From such seeds as the present cynical reversal on Stalin, may we not hope that future disbelief and discord may develop?

It must be clear to many Russians that the full story of Stalin's crimes has not been told, even by Khrushchev. Khrushchev and his associates will doubtless try to preserve part of Stalin's past reputation in order to hang on to Soviet material gains which Stalin's crimes made possible. Moreover, they have a personal interest in preserving part of Stalin's reputation: they were his protégés who might be nothing today if it were not for Stalin.

This new propaganda effort presents a historic opportunity to the United States. Because Soviet leaders would today hesitate to withhold from the Russian people a direct message from the President of the United States, President Eisenhower could now tell them that Stalin committed not only the crimes Khruschev admits, but also many that Khrushchev has not admitted, and that it is this great bundle of crimes which forced us to arm in self-defense and to create overseas bases and defensive alliances. As never before, the President's messages to the enslaved peoples of the world can carry conviction, because even the Soviet people have at long last been set to thinking, to questioning and doubting. Because they already have been told that Stalin bamboozled them, and have had a partial documentation, they are prepared to hear more.

Now let me turn to a second present danger of overestimation of Soviet progress. This is exactly the reverse of a point I made earlier when I argued that we tend to underestimate Soviet economic progress. Now let me argue that we are overestimating the strength of the U. S. S. R. as it applies to the immediate future. Its recent industrial progress has been so impressive and so disquieting that we can easily be overwhelmed by the shadow of the future. But must we assume that the ambitious goal of 1960, as announced, will be carried out and in the time planned?

Skepticism in this area would seem to be justified. To achieve the announced goals of 68 million metric tons of steel and 600 million tons of coal—these are among the goals set up under the 6th 5-year plan—millions of workers will have to be sent to now uninhabited regions of Siberia, Kazakhstan and central Asia. Great new cities will have to be built. Huge investment funds are required. Soviet leaders have never before projected such a vast program. Never have they seemed so bewitched by gigantomania, so fascinated by huge projects seemingly simply for the sake of hugeness. We should not assume that they have miscalculated, but most surely we should not assume they have not.

How does Soviet agriculture fit into the picture? Shall we overestimate its progress while we underestimate its difficulties? Suppose the rains do not come in Kazakhstan again as they failed to come last year? What if there is drought in the Ukraine after las year's fabulous harvest? Again, how strong may the peasants' reaction be against Khrushchev's plans for cutting down their private gardens and depriving them even of the family cow? I ask these questions merely to suggest the serious gambles being taken by the so-called collective leadership. I'm willing to agree that the odds are on their side when they bet on their collective farms and agricultural productivity, about which they have much more knowledge than have I. But I must also calculate that even the professional gamblers can back the wrong horse.

And what of the Soviet youth, those new millions who are about to get 10 years of compulsory schooling and who then—in most cases, but by no means all—are to be asked to become workers like their fathers and mothers? The Soviet cartoons show the 17-year-old girl graduating with her disdainful nose sky-high while her parents humbly and beseechingly follow her, begging her to work. Khrushchev is deeply concerned about these white collared young and we can hope that he may have cause for concern.

Will this new youth be willing to put up with the needless hardship and exploitation suffered by the peasant masses of yesterday? I happen to think that the Soviet rulers are too smart to ask it to do so. I think they will use not only the stick, but the carrot. Here I pause and bow to Allen Dulles. Mr. Dulles finds grounds for hope in the rapidly accelerating standards of Russian education. He thinks a Russian with schooling and education is more likely to think independently. For myself, I wish I had found more evidence, from my quick look at the U. S. S. R., to support this thesis.

What I now warn against as I ask for an examination of the areas in which we may overestimate the U. S. S. R. is too mechanical a judgment, too automatic a projection of past trends into the future. If a nation's productivity is tiny, it is not too much of a trick to double it in a 5-year plan. But if its production is huge, then the doubling of it can be far more difficult. In their current 5-year plan the Soviet rulers are promising a 70-percent stepup by 1960.

I would conclude my comments on the possibility of overestimating Soviet progress by saying that such an attitude is not without its advantages. If we overestimate the Soviet program, this may be so much the better for us. In the field of education, for example, this may only stimulate us to do some of the things we should do anyway, in pursuit of our own American dream.

But as an optimist and a Democrat, I choose to think that it is reasonable to assume that the aspirations and desires of the Soviet people for a better life, for decent housing, for more leisure, will not forever be frustrated. I am sure that these aspirations will remain vital. That they must be served is the great hope and goal which the free world shares with the people of the U. S. S. R.

CRITICISM OF ORDER OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION CONCERNING REPORTS TO BE FILED BY INDEPENDENT PRODUCERS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, all consumers of natural gas and Members of Congress who have been hoping that the Federal Power Commission would proceed with the effective regulation of the interstate sales of independent producers must have been greatly disappointed by the plainly inadequate order of the Commission on May 11, concerning the reports to be filed by these independent producers.

These reports will have no data in them about producers' production, gas reserves, capital or operating costs. Yet this information is essential to the Commission's job of regulation.

How the Commission can make bricks without straw is not clear. I can only regretfully conclude that the Commission apparently does not intend to make bricks.

I want to set forth briefly for the information of members some events leading up to this order, which indicate that the vital omissions were not inadvertent.

On August 18, 1955, I asked the Commission what steps it had taken to secure reports from the independent, or nontransporting, natural gas producers which would disclose their production, reserves, capital and operating costs. I urged the Commission to take steps to secure such data, both to assist Congress in its consideration of natural gas legislation and to assist the Commission in the exercise of its authority under the Natural Gas Act.

Two months later, in a letter dated October 19, 1955, the Commission informed me that their staff was developing a report form designed to obtain information of this nature.

As all members are doubtless aware, however, no such form was developed, and no such information was supplied by the Commission in time to be of any assistance in the Senate debate on the Harris-Fulbright bill or at any later time.

Subsequent to the Senate action on the bill in early February, the Commission finally announced on March 13, 1956, its proposed rulemaking—Docket No. R–152—in reference to independent producers' reports of financial and other data. It proposed to use a form for independent producers that would require such producers to list only the volume of sales and revenues under FPC rate schedules and total revenues and sales volumes not under FPC schedules.

On March 27, 1956, I protested to the Commission over this shockingly inadequate proposal, which required no data at all in reference to reserves of natural gas, capital or operating costs, and urged that the proposed report form be enlarged in scope to secure this additional information, which is necessary to evaluate producer claims for nonregulation and to determine the reasonableness of their proposed charges.

By Order No. 187, issued May 11, 1956, I now learn that the Commission has not included in these report forms any requirement for the filing of such additional data. Commissioner Digby dissented from the order requesting the meager information on sales, holding that it would impose an unnecessary hardship on the producer. My minimum request for the Commission to secure this very relevant information from the producers has thus been denied.

I think it is important for Members of Congress to be informed about this action of the Commission, which I regard as a serious refusal to carry out the duty given to it by the Natural Gas Act and clearly spelled out in the decisions of the United States Supreme Court. I think we must now ask the Commission whether despite the provisions of the law and the Court decisions clearly giving it the responsibility for regulating the interstate sales prices of natural gas producers, it is now trying to tie its own hands by refusing to secure the essential economic data? Is the Commission unwilling to inform itself on independent producer production, gas reserve ownership, and cost factors or even to try to carry on the same regulation of independent producer prices that it has already applied to the pipeline company producers of natural gas?

The Commission has for years been regulating pipeline producers on a cost, or prudent investment, basis. Surely it is now time, 2 years after the decision in the Phillips case, for the Commission to get on with the job of independent producer price regulation that is given to it by law. I would not like to think it is yielding or bending to the kind of industry pressures which were so evident during the debate on the natural gas bill in Congress and which are opposed both to the public interest and the clear duty of the Commission under the law. But the results—so favorable to the industry, and so harmful to consumers—speak for themselves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of my letter of March 27, 1956, to Chairman Jerome K. Kuykendall of the Federal Power Commission, together with his brief reply of April 2, 1956, and a copy of the report form No. 301 which the Commission's order of May 11, 1956, requires to be filed by the independent producers.

We can only hope that the Commission will review this issue further and prescribe additional forms in the future which will secure the information needed by the Commission to do its job and needed by the Congress to give it full information about developments in this important field.

There being no objection, the correspondence and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER FROM SENATOR DOUGLAS TO FPC CHAIRMAN KUYKENDALL

MARCH 27, 1956.

Hon. JEROME K. KUYKENDALL,
Chairman, Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am greatly disturbed by the total inadequacy of the report form No. 301 which the Commission has announced in its proposed rule-making (docket No. R–152) that it plans to use for independent producers of natural gas. May I remind you and the members of the Commission of the background of my concern in this matter?

An August 18, 1955, I wrote asking you what steps the Commission had taken to secure reports from the so-called independent natural gas producers which would disclose their production, reserves, capital, and operating costs.

I urged such action, if it had not already been taken, so that the information might be available for Congress as it considered natural-gas legislation, and because such data was so obviously essential for the Commission itself in the exercise of its authority under the Natural Gas Act.

Two months later, on October 19, you advised me that the Commission staff was developing a report form designed to obtain information of this nature. No such action was taken in time to be of any assistance in the Harris-Fulbright bill debate, although I do acknowledge that my extensive requests for other data which the Commission has in its files were honored and your information was most helpful. It was still short of what we needed, however, in order to have the full picture.

Now, almost 7 months after my original request, the forms that the Commission is proposing to use call only for the volume of sales and revenues under FPC rate schedules, to be listed in detail, and total revenues and sales volumes not under FPC rate schedules. No data as to reserve, capital, or operating costs will be required in these forms. And the information concerning sales under FPC rate schedules is already available in the Commission files in the companies' annual reports on form No. 2.

This seems to me a shockingly inadequate proposal for the Commission to bring forward after all these months. It will provide no assistance to the Commission in determining the reasonableness of the producer rates.

I wish to urge therefore that the Commission enlarge the scope of the proposed report form in order to secure the information needed to appraise producer claims for nonregulation as well as to determine the reasonableness of their charges—and incidentally to secure data that will be helpful to Congress in its further consideration of natural gas legislation.

If the Commission staff under Chairman Buchanan could secure cost data that enabled them to propose a rate base in the Phillips case some 5 or 6 years ago, and if the Commission for years has been regulating pipeline producers on a cost basis, surely the Commission will not seriously assert that it cannot do the same analysis of independent producers.

I am reluctant to believe that despite the provisions of the law and the court decisions which after lengthy litigation clearly lay the responsibility on the Commission, you would now once again decide to tie your own hands by failing to secure the necessary factual data.

I would be grateful if you would bring my request for a more adequate report form to the attention of the Commission.

Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

REPLY FROM CHAIRMAN KUYKENDALL

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, April 2, 1956.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: This will acknowledge your comments on the notice of proposed rulemaking, Docket No. R–152, involving the request for information from independent producers having on file with this Commission rate schedules for the sale of natural gas in interstate commerce.

You may be assured that your comments will be made available to other members of the Commission and given every consideration together with the comments of other interested parties at the time this matter is presented to the Commission for its final determination.

Sincerely yours,

JEROME K. KUYKENDALL,
Chairman.

FPC Form No. 301 adopted by order of May 11, 1956

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION
INDEPENDENT PRODUCERS OF NATURAL GAS
Report of natural gas transactions for year ended December 31, 1955

Budget Bureau No. 54-5601
Approval Expires June 30, 1956

TWO COMPLETED COPIES OF THIS FORM SHOULD BE RETURNED TO THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION, WASHINGTON 25, D. C., BY JUNE 30, 1956. OTHER COPIES ARE FOR RESPONDENT'S USE

Name and address of respondent (please verify)

Person to whom communications regarding this report should be sent.

Name_____
Title_____

1. Natural gas sales and revenues for the calendar year ended December 31, 1955:
Total sales under FPC gas rate schedules:_____ Mcf at _____psia pressure base; revenues $_____(omit cents)
2. Sales under FPC gas rate schedules

Listed below are your FPC Gas Rate Schedules on file with the Commission as of December 31, 1955. The data shown in column (a) are numerical codes for machine processing by the FPC. Do not use column (a) or make any changes in the figures shown therein. Where corrections to listed items in columns (b) or (c) are necessary, draw a line through the incorrect item and enter the correct information immediately above or in column (i) on the same line with the data corrected. In column (e) show, in cents per Mcf to two decimal places (5.00, 11.18, etc.), the total rate for natural gas sales effective on December 31, 1955 under each schedule. This rate should include the base rate plus all additional charges such as those for taxes, dehydration, gathering or related services. In column (f) show the pressure base at which the rate in column (e) and the volume in column (g) are stated. In column (g) show totals for the calendar year 1955 for each rate schedule. In column (h) show the State (name abbreviated) and the county or parish in which the natural gas is produced. If any of your FPC gas rate schedules which were in effect during the year are omitted please add such schedules at the end of the list and insert all data required to complete the form, columns (b) though (h).

(a) This column for FPC use only — Do not change these numbers	(b) Purchaser of natural gas	(c) Field in which natural gas is produced	(d) FPC gas rate schedule number	(e) Rate —¢ per Mcf gas delivered on Dec. 31, 1955	(f) Pressure base, psia	(g) 1955 sales		(h) Natural gas is produced in—		(i) Remarks
						Mcf	Revenues (omit cents)	State	County or parish	

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we believe the Federal Power Commission should go on with its job and not shirk it any longer.

IMMEDIATE NEED OF SOCIAL SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to proceed for a few minutes today on the subject of the immediate need of social security improvements. We are about to open a very important debate on what I consider to be one of the paramount legislative obligations owed by the Senate to the American people at this session of the Congress. There is before us a report of the Finance Committee on the social security issue. I speak respectfully when I say that, in my judgment, it is a report which is not satisfactory in many particulars. The recommendations of the Finance Committee should, and I think, must be, improved on the floor of the Senate by full debate and some very much needed amendments.

In 1935, Mr. President, the people spoke. They spoke against hardship and deprivation. They spoke in favor of protecting and enhancing the latter years of life through a national system of contributory insurance. And the Social Security Act, one of the greatest achievements of the 20th Century, became law.

In 1938, the people spoke again, and a program of survivors insurance also became law.

In 1956, Mr. President, the voice of the people rings once more through the land. And we, in the Senate of the United States, must answer.

We must, if we are to keep faith with those who elected us to serve them, answer by restoring to this bill two provisions which were eliminated by the Finance Committee: a provision to make social security benefits payable to permanently and totally disabled persons at age 50, and a provision to allow women optional retirement under social security at age 62. We must also amend this bill to provide increased Federal contributions to the States for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

Mr. President, it is my view that the age of 62 which will be proposed by way of amendment is not satisfactory. I shall vote for it if I cannot get something better. I think the age ought to be 60.

I also think the proposal to modify the report so as to provide for social-security benefits to permanently and totally disabled persons at age 50 is not satisfactory. I shall vote for it, if I cannot get anything better. I recognize that here, once again, we are confronted with a problem, legislatively speaking, of passing the most desirable measure for which we can get the one vote over the 50 percent needed to break a tie.

But what I find very difficult to understand is the hesitancy and reluctance to adopt what I consider to be a true disability benefit payment amendment. I have never been able to justify the criterion of an age factor in the problem of disability. Consider a young worker aged 38, who is the head of a family. He has small children. He is totally disabled. Why should he have to wait until he is 50 to get benefits? I know the arguments, but they are not arguments which contain very much humane consideration.

We are talking about a humane law, a law which, in my judgment, is based upon a recognition on the part of the American people that our economy is vital enough, sound enough, and in keeping with our concepts of economical and political freedom, and our faith in those concepts, to call upon us as a population to take care, by way of disability payments, of totally disabled persons irrespective of age.

An interesting point is that the 38-year-old man whom I am using in my hypothetical situation may need the disability payments very much more than will a man of 60, because the years of potential earning power of my 38-year-old hypothetical case are still ahead of him, and he is already disabled. He has young children, whom he must support and educate. True, he has not built up a backlog of social-security payments. But is the philosophy of the proposed legislation based upon a mercenary approach or a humane approach? Is it based upon the idea that in a democracy, which is supposedly dedicated to the consideration of great humane values, such a biblical teaching as that we are our brother's keeper must be modified into a proposal that we are our brother's keeper if he has already paid enough to keep himself? I find difficulty in reconciling myself to that interpretation of a moral obligation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wish the Senator from Oregon to know that he is making an excellent speech and that I agree with his argument, although I may vote for the proposal which starts the disability insurance payments at age 50, as the House provision stipulates. If I should do so, it would be only because we might not be able to get anything better.

For my part, I introduced a bill sometime ago which stated that a person would be insured under social security for disability whenever he was disabled, regardless of age.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. I completely agree with him. I, too, shall vote for the so-called age 50 amendment, because it appears that it is the best we can get, and because it will be a start. If we can have established the principle for which we are working in this session of Congress,

then it seems to me we shall be in a much better position to change the law in future years. So I shall go along with the age 50 amendment, although, let me say, I think it is important that the argument for the sounder ideal be expressed in the RECORD, as I am doing tonight, and as the Senator from Louisiana himself has done previously.

I may say also that I am very appreciative of the fact that the Senator from Louisiana is the acting majority leader and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is the presiding officer of the Senate as I make this speech, because to those two Senators we owe much. I think if we were to name the top half dozen experts on social security in this country, from the standpoint of economic theory, it would be necessary to name the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] among the six. He is a man having a record of great accomplishment in the economics of social security.

I mean no flattery of the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] when I say that if we were to name the top five Members of Congress who have made great contributions of statesmanship in the field of social security, it would be necessary to name him. The fact that he is coming from the committee of which he is a member to the floor of the Senate with amendments to the bill that represent his defeat in committee does not indicate any defeat in his determination to make certain that justice shall be done with respect to social-security benefits. The Senator from Louisiana is deserving of the commendation I am now paying him. I have been in committee situations where I have taken my licking in committee, only to say, "Gentlemen, I will meet you on the floor of the Senate, because I do not intend to stop pressing for what I think is right."

It is not easy to do this, but it is a part of our duty, and the junior Senator from Louisiana is fulfilling his duty in respect to the proposed legislation. I am appreciative of it. I have the feeling that before we get finished with the debate, if we will merely take the time to get the facts before our colleagues in the Senate and before the country, so that the country can react to the proposed legislation before the final vote is taken in the Senate, some of the Long amendments will be written into the bill.

The two points I have just made are very important ones. I think the age limit must be lowered. I believe there must be something specific in the bill with regard to the payment of disability benefits, at least at the age of 50.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Oregon is most gracious, and I appreciate his very kind compliment. In my judgment he has always been most sound in advocating the things which should be done for the welfare and security of our people.

It seems strange to me that in the view of some persons there is absolutely no limit to which the Nation can go in its spending in various and sundry categories. But when we consider the welfare of the working masses of the people, those who produce all the wealth which makes possible the vast expenditures of the Government for so many purposes, some persons immediately feel that at that point we cannot afford to pay for the essential needs of the working classes. This is the case even though in many instances the working people are willing to pay for the entire program so far as it will benefit themselves.

It was only about a year ago that representatives of the medical profession came before the committee and testified on behalf of favored tax treatment for professional groups who would take out insurance policies for their own retirement, and also for disability, in case such a misfortune should befall them.

Then when some of us analyzed the proposal, we felt that while it might have merit, it would mean, in effect, that the Federal Government would bear about 50 percent of the expense of the doctors and lawyers insuring themselves against disability. Still, we thought perhaps the provision might have considerable merit. I myself was willing to consider it and study it to see what might be done about it.

After the doctors felt they should have favored tax treatment in order to buy such insurance for themselves from private companies, the doctors sent a representative from almost every medical association in the United States to testify against disability insurance for working people.

What some of us cannot understand is that if such a program is good for the doctors, why is it not good for the workers? If a doctor should feel encouraged to protect himself against disability, would it not be well for the workers to have the same protection?

Furthermore, it is difficult for some of us to understand how the American Medical Association some years ago, at its convention, could have been in favor of disability insurance, but has now completely changed its mind and has sent a representative of almost every medical group in the United States to testify against disability insurance for working people. Many of us feel that if we provide disability insurance for working people, it will help the medical profession, because many working people are the patients of doctors. Many of them are unable to pay their doctors because they have no income. I for one was most disappointed at the position taken by the American Medical Association, and I am frank to say that I cannot believe that is the view of the majority of doctors in this country. Perhaps when the American Medical Association calls on State associations to send representatives, they respond. With all due deference, I believe even the fine doctors who appeared from the State of Louisiana did not begin to state the point of view of the majority of doctors in the State I have the honor in part to represent.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to have the views of the Senator from Louisiana added to my speech on this subject. I express my agreement with him, and I wish to say that my enthusiasm for improvements in the social-security system is due to the fact that I have more faith in our free economy than the critics of social-security legislation seem to have. I happen to believe that under a free economy, under this capitalistic order of ours, on the retention of which our political freedoms are to no small extent dependent, an adequate social-security program is the best guaranty we have in the fight against communism.

The Communists brag about their interest in the individual, but to a large extent it is merely language; it is largely semantics. Here is a demonstration of the superiority of the capitalistic system in protecting the welfare of the individual. Here is proof that under a system of political and economic freedom, which are inseparably hitched together in a free society such as ours, we take care of the economic well-being of the person, but on the basis of a program which strengthens rather than weakens the capitalistic economy.

I say to some of the critics of the program we are going to fight for in the debate about to take place in the Senate on social security legislation, that if they look at it only from the standpoint of strengthening the purchasing power of persons in their old age, of persons who have become disabled, if they look at it only from the standpoint of pouring back into the cash registers of the businessmen of America an increase in purchasing power, they will have an unanswerable argument in support of this proposed legislation.

There has been much criticism in years gone by of a great advocate of old-age pensions, Dr. Townsend. I never endorsed the Townsend plan, but I do say Dr. Townsend was very far ahead of most of us in his recognition of the importance of helping to build up the purchasing power of the aged. Mr. President, the economy of this country is not helped by having poorhouses; it is not helped by maintaining a considerable segment of our population living under substandard conditions in their old age, dependent upon charity or dependent upon relatives and members of their families, who frequently do not have the economic wherewithal to support aged relatives. I think Townsend at least succeeded in creating a great public interest on the point that in our society we have the economic wherewithal to give the aged a decent standard of living in their declining years. I pay tribute to Dr. Townsend, because I think that it was good for us to have him and the members of his movement goading legislators year by year into doing better for the aged. When the history of social security legislation is written, I believe credit will have to be given to some of the pioneers in the social-political field, such as Dr. Townsend, who were trying to write into the law at least some actuarially sound legislation which would give what we can call a respectable standard of living to people in their declining years.

Mr. LONG. Of course, I think also the principle of spreading the burden should be applied. That particularly applies to disability. There is not 1 in 10 of those working today who will be totally disabled. Yet all workers must take the chance that they may be disabled, either by some disabling disease or by industrial accident.

It makes good sense that we should spread the burden, so that we can provide for everyone in this great Nation. The burden is not too great for all of us to carry, provided we spread it by having all the workers contribute. On the other hand, if we insisted that only the person who would directly benefit should carry the entire cost, the burden would be too heavy for him. We can provide all the people in this great Nation against disasters which may occur to individuals, provided each person is willing to make a contribution to the system. I have not heard of any workingman who is not willing to make a contribution, despite all the testimony of the medical witnesses.

I have discussed this matter in my weekly broadcast over 20 stations in the the State of Louisiana on 3 or 4 occasions, and I did not receive a single letter against the proposal from a workingman who would have to pay for the insurance by contributing to it. Instead, the only objections I received were from doctors who wrote because perhaps the American Medical Association or the local medical society urged him to write a letter.

I suppose that has some connection with the fact that some years ago it was proposed that the Federal Government should pay the health bills of the people of the Nation. At that time it seems that the American Medical Association may have taken the position that they were going to oppose any further extension of the Social Security Act, because it was feared that there might eventually be a compulsory health insurance law. They apparently placed themselves in the position of opposing any improvement or liberalization of the social security program.

I believe the American Medical Association is making a mistake in taking that position, because there is some danger that they might be pictured in the minds of the working people as being against that which is good for the workingman. I think the association could do no greater disservice to themselves or to the medical profession at large than to convey the impression, erroneous though it would be, that it was against the aspirations and hopes of the workingman.

Mr. MORSE. I will say to the Senator from Louisiana I am convinced that the American people want the type of legislation he and I are working for, and they are going to get it. They are going to get it sooner or later, and I think it will be sooner than the reactionary forces believe. I am very happy to raise my voice in support of what I am satisfied the American people want from their Congress in the field of social security legislation.

Why, Mr. President, are the people of this country demanding that these three improvements be made in H. R. 7225 as it was reported by the Finance Committee? Because, in the words of the three members of the committee who submitted a dissenting minority report, they "afford a modest measure of relief for our neediest citizens in a manner both humane and practical."

1. DISABILITY BENEFITS ARE URGENTLY NEEDED

Disability payments have been recommended by every advisory group which has ever studied the question. As late as March of this year, participants in a Washington meeting of State public assistance and welfare directors unanimously approved a provision in H. R. 7225 in the form it passed the House, permitting the payment of retirement benefits at age 50 to those regular workers who are forced into premature retirement because of disability. Witness after witness before the Senate Finance Committee testified in support of that provision. There is, of course, opposition. But I am struck by the fact that it comes chiefly from individuals and groups who have fought every improvement in social security legislation; indeed, who fought the original Social Security Act 21 years ago.

These opponents say that a disability program is unworkable. Just 2 brief years ago they said the same thing about proposals for a disability "freeze." Yet the disability freeze has operated admirably.

They also say that disability payments would encourage malingering, and prevent the proper functioning of the vocational rehabilitation program. What they fail to admit, however, is that there is absolutely no evidence, based on the experience of various retirement programs which do provide disability payments, to support the first contention. As for the second, although there appear to be inconclusive data on the effects of vocational rehabilitation for workers between 50 and 65 years of age, evidence at hand indicates that only about 25 percent of disabled persons in that age bracket have been restored to active employment through such a program. What happens to the other 75 percent? Here our critics are strangely silent. They know, but they do not say, that the lot of these thousands of worthy men and women, many of whom have contributed for years to the social security trust fund, is harsh to the point of being cruel. Many of them die before reaching the appointed age of 65. Even if they do live until 65, they must exist, and maintain their families, through as many long, forlorn, lean years as separate their time of disability and their 65th year.

Where are our hearts, that we should allow such conditions to prevail? Where is our sense of justice, that a man who has contributed to an insurance program to protect him during his years of retirement should be precluded from receiving benefits simply because he has been forced to retire prematurely?

2. WOMEN SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO RETIRE AT 62

Similarly, Mr. President, I think omission from the reported bill of the House-approved provision lowering the eligibility age for women to age 62 is a weakness which we should correct. In fact, I think the age should be lower than that, and that is why I have joined as one of the cosponsors of an amendment offered by my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER] to lower the age to 60.

The committee, of course, is to be commended for recommending that widows be eligible for benefits at age 62. But studies show that the need is almost as acute for single or married women as it is for those who have lost their husbands. The overwhelming number of women between 60 and 65 are not gainfully employed. Women between those ages have more difficulty getting and holding jobs than men of the same age; and it is hard enough for the men. In many retirement systems, both public and private, retirement before age 65 is compulsory, despite the fact that if such persons are also covered by OASI they must endeavor to live on their private pension, if any, until they reach 65 and can qualify for OASI payments.

For married women whose husbands also are covered by OASI, the present eligibility age is particularly burdensome. Statistics show that women between 60 and 65 are, on the average, 3 years younger than their husbands. We permit our men to retire at age 65. But how can they, if they must support their wives and themselves for 3 or more years before OASI benefits for their wives become payable, or else retire and leave their wives working? A man with the highest possible earnings credit of $350 a month receives only $108.50 monthly in OASI benefits upon retirement. Can he support his wife and himself on that amount? Hardly, when studies indicate that for the country as a whole $1,900 is the bare minimum required to support 2 persons over 65. And if a man with the highest earnings credit cannot sustain himself and his wife, what chance of avoiding bankruptcy has a family with less OASI credit?

Much has been said, Mr. President, about the need for preserving the family structure in this country. Yet because many older couples are forced to delay their retirement plans until the wife has also reached 65, some of the best years of their lives are postponed or forfeited.

Last year, Senators may recall, my colleague the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and I introduced a bill providing for reducing the eligibility age for women to age 60. Despite my continued feeling that this would be an equitable and reasonable improvement in the law, I shall support an amendment to this bill making all women under OASI eligible for retirement at age 62 as the best that is obtainable at this time.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he leaves that point?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I interject to suggest that many of those who are opposing the disability features of the bill are among those who are opposing the lowering of the retirement age for women. When we combine the two features, as oftentimes happens in the case of many families, we see what great hardship is occasioned.

In many families, both husband and wife attempt to work and provide for their families. The husband may be stricken by some form of disease—perhaps a stroke, a heart attack, or one of the various forms of arthritis. He becomes unable to work. The wife then has the burden of trying to care for the husband and carry on her household

duties, as well as helping with the children, if there are children, while at the same time working on the outside to try to provide income for the family.

If there is no lowering of the retirement age for women, and there is no provision for disability, a wife is unable to draw retirement benefits. Many women are not able to bear up under the strain, with the result that eventually the family becomes a public welfare case. If the bill is passed as some of us would amend it, men would be eligible for disability benefits of perhaps $100 a month; and if the wife were no longer able to carry the burden after 62, she could retire and help with the family situation.

The Senator knows as well as I know, and as well as every other Member of this body knows, that if a woman loses her job after age 62, she has very little chance of finding further employment. As a matter of fact, we find that 90 percent of wives above the age of 62 are not in the labor force, and only a very small percentage of women who lose their jobs after age 62 are able to obtain further employment.

For some reason the committee refused to consider that point of view, although it was willing to recognize the fact that widows at age 62, who had never worked outside the home, would not be able to find additional employment.

The committee ignored the case in which the need of a widow who might be eligible to draw benefits might not be nearly so great as that of the wife who worked inside the home, and whose husband was disabled making it necessary for her to try to find employment. She might never have had any experience working outside the home. In addition to the burden of household duties and nursing her husband, she would have the responsibility of trying to provide income for the family. Why such a person would not be in as much need as a widow at age 62, with only herself to support, I cannot understand.

Mr. MORSE. I cannot understand it either. I think the argument the Senator makes in behalf of the amendment we are going to support is unanswerable.

3. INCREASE IN PUBLIC ASSISTANCE FUNDS ARE URGENT

The third weakness of this bill is its failure to provide increased Federal contributions to the States for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled. Such a move has been recommended by an overwhelming number of public welfare and social workers, welfare specialists, State and local officials, and voluntary agencies, and was incorporated into an amendment by the Senator from Louisiana, cosponsored by 3 other members of the Finance Committee, as well as by 43 other Senators.

I am delighted to be one of the cosponsors of this amendment. Under it, Mr. President, almost 3 million Americans would be assisted to live more secure and dignified lives.

I refuse to believe that $54 a month is a reasonable contribution toward the cost of life for anyone over 65, and yet this was the average monthly payment throughout the United States for old-age assistance during February of this year. How can a disabled person, who is deprived of health, even mobility, be expected to survive on a token payment of $58 a month, or a blind person on $56, both of which were national averages in February? In the case of the disabled it is even more shocking that seven States, containing nearly a fifth of the Nation's population, have not yet established programs for aid to this peculiarly needy and deserving sector of our citizenry.

Our amendment would provide no extravagant expenditure of Federal funds. Rather, it would provide moderate increases in Federal contributions to these State-administered programs, in a manner consistent with recent increases in benefits under the old-age and survivor's insurance system, as well as with the need for equalizing benefits under public assistance in States with varying levels of income.

The Long-George amendment, Mr. President, would also make another important improvement in existing law. Senators will recall that following 1954 increases in Federal contributions to public assistance, many States took advantage of the opportunity thus offered to reduce their own contributions. This, of course, had the effect of nullifying the action taken by Congress. In order to prevent a recurrence of this unfortunate crossing of purposes, the amendment contains a so-called passalong provision which stipulates that increased Federal contributions will be made available only to those States which will maintain at least their 1955 level of contribution from State funds. This is a change which will further strengthen the public-assistance program. I feel it is indicative of the careful consideration which the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Georgia have given to the formulation of their proposal.

4. THE CALLOUS DISREGARD OF THE ADMINISTRATION

Finally, Mr. President, I must express my concern and dismay over the failure of the present administration to conform to the legitimate interests of the people of the United States. I often wonder what kind of yardstick policymakers in the Eisenhower administration use to measure the Nation's general welfare. In this particular instance their callous disregard for preponderant opinion would seem to indicate that they did not seek to understand the desires and interests of the public, and act accordingly.

Testifying only on the last day of Senate hearings, after many delays, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Folsom revealed once again the gap between words and action which we have come to expect from the administration during the last 4 years. He opposed lowering the eligibility age for women to 62. He opposed disability benefits at age 50. He opposed increases in Federal contribution to public assistance. He said nothing about extending benefits of disabled children beyond age 18. One wonders, Mr. President, how sincere the administration is about being "liberal" in its relation to people and their needs. One also wonders about Mr. Folsom himself. Has he been forced to swallow his own convictions, or was his support for 60-year eligibility for women and disability benefits at age 55 in the years before he became a member of the President's Cabinet something he would like to forget now?

Senators may recall the old story about the poor fellow whose father had been hung on the gallows, and who was embarrassed each time he had to explain this unseemly end. He finally solved his problem, however, by replying, "My late and lamented parent died in consequence of injuries suffered when the floor of a platform gave way during a public ceremony in which he was taking a prominent part." The administration may seek, in its opposition to the three urgently needed improvements in our social security system about which I have been speaking, to couch its argument in language which will hide its basic opposition toward a liberal public-assistance program, as well as toward social insurance flexibility based on need. But a hanging is a hanging, no matter how it is described. The unfortunate thing is that this time the noose is around the necks of the needy.

Therefore I wish to say that the time has come to hold this administration to an accounting for its oft-repeated platitude that it is liberal when it comes to human relations. If it is liberal when it comes to human relations, then its opposition to the kind of social security reform for which the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Georgia are fighting cannot be reconciled with its claims.

I think it is most unfortunate that this administration has not come forward with a more liberal social security program. It now becomes incumbent upon the Senate to pass such a bill and to put it on the President's desk. Then let him tell the American people whether he is in fact liberal when it comes to human relations, or whether he is going to continue down the road with the reactionary forces which have dominated his administration ever since he took his oath of office in 1953.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I agree with the Senator's suggestion. I for one would welcome a great deal more Republican help than we have had in trying to improve the social security program of our country, to take care of disability, to lower the retirement age, and to provide a more liberal welfare matching so far as the Federal Government is concerned.

The Senator knows that the administration opposed this program very vigorously in the House of Representatives through its spokesman, the then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby. Nevertheless, the bill passed in the House by an overwhelming vote. I assume that a majority of the Republicans in the House voted for it on the floor of the House, with almost all the Democrats voting for it.

The bill came to the Senate last year. It has been almost a year now since the bill came before our committee. The administration spokesman at that time, Mrs. Hobby, came before our committee and asked for delay. The bill was de-

layed the better part of a year. Then the administration, through its new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Folsom, proceeded to testify, not only for delay but in opposition to every significant improvement in the bill. It also proceeded to testify against any liberalized public-welfare program.

I predict that the bill will pass and that when it passes it will contain a substantial number of the provisions for which we have fought so hard. I also predict that after it is passed and goes to the President's desk the President will sign the bill despite the fact that his administration has spent more than a year in fighting the bill and in fighting every major provision it contains. I also predict that the President, running for reelection, will proceed to say that this is one of the great accomplishments of his administration.

Mr. MORSE. I agree also with those observations of the Senator from Louisiana.

I close my discussion of this subject by saying to the Senator from Louisiana that I am proud to stand shoulder to shoulder with him in the days immediately ahead in our fight for improving the social security bill. The people of the United States are deserving of a better bill than the one which has been reported by the Committee on Finance.

I agree with the Senator from Louisiana that our chances are very good that we will get such a bill if in the next few days the people of the Nation make clear that the Senators hear their will.

Mr. President, I now turn my attention to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

TAXES IN THE UTILITY FIELD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had intended to speak briefly on another subject, the issue of taxes in the public utility field. A great deal of distorted and false propaganda is being circularized in the country by the private utility lobby.

We read such propaganda almost weekly in some of our weekly periodicals in the form of advertisements. It is also interesting to note how frequently the editorial policy of a periodical will conform to the false propaganda printed in the private utilities' advertisements.

However, Mr. President, what I would have said on the subject is very well summarized in an editorial which appeared in the June 9 issue of the newspaper Labor under the title "Setting Record Straight on Taxes in the Utility Field." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point. I have edited the editorial only in one respect, and that is to make certain that it conforms to rule XIX of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SETTING RECORD STRAIGHT ON TAXES IN UTILITY FIELD

Power Trust propagandists have stepped up a campaign to hoodwink the American people into believing that only private utility companies pay taxes and public-owned power systems don't.

In a new example of this strategy, the trust's chief propaganda mouthpiece—the so-called America's Independent Light and Power Companies—published another full-page magazine advertisement based on this tax theme. This particular ad says the taxpayers will save $465 million because the Idaho Power Co., instead of the Government, will dam the Snake River in Hells Canyon.

The ad further listed the alleged amounts of taxes the people in each of the 48 States will save as the result of substituting the private Hells Canyon project for the public one.

Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, Washington, and Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat of Oregon pointed out that a Government dam in Hells Canyon would be "part of the great public-owned Bonneville power system in the Pacific Northwest—and that system has turned into the United States Treasury $300 million in power revenues."

Like Bonneville, the Tennessee Valley Authority and other public power systems, a Government dam in Hells Canyon, NEUBERGER said, would more than pay for itself, and thus actually lighten the taxpayers' burden in the long run.

Meanwhile, TVA this week reported that, in the year soon ending on June 30, the TVA power system is paying $11 million taxes to State, county, and municipal governments, in its seven-State area.

Numerous other pertinent figures are provided in a new booklet entitled "Facts About TVA Operations, 1956," put out by the Tennessee Valley Authority at Knoxville, Tenn.

The booklet points out that the TVA system is paying 200 percent more State, county, and local taxes than private power companies used to pay in its region, while, in the same period, such taxes paid by private power concerns in other parts of the country have increased only 185 percent.

Also, the booklet tells how TVA is earning Uncle Sam an average of 4 percent profit on his investment in that public power system, and has turned $151 million into the United States Treasury with more to come.

However, as the booklet says, the meaning of TVA goes further and deeper than dollars and taxes. It is "realizing the dream of the late Senator George W. Norris of Nebraska." TVA "has made the Tennessee River and its tributaries the most completely useful stream on the globe today." Not only by developing its full electric power potential, but also by such inspiring achievements as these:

Controlling floods and opening new waterways. Planting and protecting forests. Helping farmers by producing improved fertilizers and encouraging better land use and management. Wiping out malaria and otherwise bettering the people's health and raising their standard of living.

TVA does all this, the booklet explains, by real cooperative partnership with "State and local agencies and private enterprise." That's very different from the Administration's "partnership" policy under which Uncle Sam puts up most of the money and private Power Trust companies get all the profit.

As a matter of fact, neither private nor public power systems really pay any taxes. Just stop and think a moment and you'll see why. Where does any power system get all its income? From the people who buy and consume the power. They provide the money which pays the taxes. The public or private company merely collects the tax dollars and passes them along to the Federal, State, and local governments.

Remember that the next time you read propaganda about "the taxpaying private utility companies."

Mr. MORSE. I yield the floor.

RECESS TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Wednesday, June 13, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 11, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, humbly and reverently we are turning unto Thee in the sacred attitude of prayer for we have needs and longings which Thou alone canst supply and satisfy.

We earnestly implore Thee to endue us with insight and inspiration that we may interpret wisely and understand correctly all the events and experiences of this new day.

Inspire us with that sense of moral dignity and feeling of spiritual freedom which are begotten of simple faith in Thee and faithful service to needy humanity.

Hear us as we continue our supplications and intercessions for our President. We beseech Thee, in Thy great mercy, to share Thy wisdom with the doctors and nurses enabling them, in their ministry, to know what to do for his complete recovery.

We bring our petition in the name of our Blessed Lord, the Great Physician. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 8, 1956, was read and approved.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 62]

Allen, Ill.	George	McConnell
Andersen, H. Carl	Gray	Miller, Calif.
Bell	Gwinn	Miller, Nebr.
Blitch	Hale	Morrison
Bray	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Hara, Minn.
Brown, Ohio	Hope	Pfost
Cannon	Horan	Powell
Carnahan	Johnson, Calif.	Prouty
Cederberg	Jones, Mo.	Thompson, La.
Diggs	Judd	Wickersham
Dowdy	Keating	Wier
Eberharter	Kelley, Pa.	Wilson, Calif.
Fernandez	Lane	
	Lankford	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 388 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin moves that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Affairs for further study.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 52, noes 142.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 275, nays 122, answered "present" 2, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

YEAS—275

Addonizio	Chiperfield	Flood
Albert	Christopher	Fogarty
Allen, Calif.	Chudoff	Forand
Andresen, August H.	Clark	Ford
	Cooley	Forrester
Anfuso	Cooper	Frazier
Arends	Corbett	Frelinghuysen
Ashley	Coudert	Friedel
Aspinall	Cramer	Fulton
Auchincloss	Cretella	Gamble
Avery	Cuuningham	Garmatz
Ayres	Curtis, Mass.	Gary
Baker	Curtis, Mo.	Gathings
Baldwin	Dague	Gordon
Barrett	Davidson	Green, Oreg.
Bass, N. H.	Davis, Ga.	Green, Pa.
Bates	Davis, Tenn.	Gregory
Becker	Dawson, Ill.	Griffiths
Bennett, Fla.	Dawson, Utah	Gubser
Bentley	Deane	Hagen
Blatnik	Delaney	Halleck
Boggs	Denton	Harden
Boland	Derounian	Hardy
Bolling	Devereux	Harris
Bolton, Frances P.	Diggs	Hays, Ark.
	Dingell	Hays, Ohio
Bolton, Oliver P.	Dixon	Hayworth
	Dodd	Healey
Bowler	Dollinger	Hébert
Boykin	Dolliver	Heselton
Boyle	Donohue	Hill
Brooks, Tex.	Donovan	Hillings
Brown, Ga.	Dorn, N. Y.	Hinshaw
Broyhill	Doyle	Holifield
Buckley	Durham	Holland
Burnside	Eberharter	Holmes
Bush	Edmondson	Holtzman
Byrd	Elliott	Hope
Byrne, Pa.	Ellsworth	Hosmer
Byrnes, Wis.	Engle	Huddleston
Canfield	Evins	Hull
Carrigg	Fallon	Hyde
Celler	Fascell	Ikard
Chatham	Feighan	Jackson
Chelf	Fenton	James
Chenoweth	Fino	Jarman
Jenkins	Mumma	Scott
Johnson, Calif.	Murray, Ill.	Scudder
Johnson, Wis.	Murray, Tenn.	Seely-Brown
Jones, Ala.	Natcher	Selden
Karsten	Norblad	Shelley
Kean	O'Brien, Ill.	Sheppard
Kearney	O'Brien, N. Y.	Sieminski
Kearns	O'Hara, Ill.	Simpson, Pa.
Kee	O'Neill	Sisk
Kelly, N. Y.	Osmers	Smith, Miss.
Keogh	Ostertag	Spence
Kilburn	Patterson	Springer
Kilday	Pelly	Staggers
King, Calif.	Perkins	Steed
Kirwan	Pfost	Sullivan
Klein	Philbin	Taber
Kluczynski	Pilcher	Taylor
Knutson	Pillion	Teague, Calif.
Lanham	Poff	Thompson, N. J.
Latham	Powell	Thompson, Tex.
LeCompte	Preston	Tollefson
Lesinski	Price	Trimble
McCarthy	Priest	Tumulty
McCormack	Quigley	Udall
McDowell	Rabaut	Vanik
Macdonald	Radwan	Van Zandt
Machrowicz	Rains	Velde
Mack, Ill.	Ray	Vinson
Madden	Rees, Kans.	Vorys
Magnuson	Reuss	Vursell
Mahon	Rhodes, Ariz.	Wainwright
Mailliard	Rhodes, Pa.	Walter
Marshall	Richards	Watts
Martin	Riehlman	Westland
Matthews	Riley	Widnall
Meader	Rivers	Wigglesworth
Merrow	Roberts	Williams, N. J.
Metcalf	Robsion, Ky.	Williams, N. Y.
Miller, Md.	Rodino	Wilson, Calif.
Miller, N. Y.	Rogers, Colo.	Wolverton
Minshall	Rogers, Mass.	Wright
Mollohan	Rooney	Yates
Morano	Roosevelt	Young
Morgan	Sadlak	Younger
Morrison	St. George	Zablocki
Moss	Schenck	Zelenko
Multer	Schwengel	

NAYS—122

Abbitt	Gavin	O'Konski
Abernethy	Gentry	Passman
Adair	Grant	Patman
Alexander	Gray	Poage
Alger	Gross	Polk
Andrews	Haley	Reece, Tenn.
Ashmore	Hand	Reed, N. Y.
Bailey	Harrison, Nebr.	Robeson, Va.
Barden	Harrison, Va.	Rogers, Fla.
Bass, Tenn.	Harvey	Rogers, Tex.
Baumhart	Henderson	Rutherford
Beamer	Herlong	Saylor
Belcher	Hess	Scherer
Bennett, Mich.	Hiestand	Scrivner
Berry	Hoeven	Sheehan
Betts	Hoffman, Mich.	Short
Blitch	Holt	Shuford
Bonner	Jennings	Sikes
Bosch	Jensen	Siler
Bow	Johansen	Simpson, Ill.
Brooks, La.	Jonas	Smith, Kans.
Brownson	Jones, N. C.	Smith, Va.
Budge	Kilgore	Smith, Wis.
Burdick	King, Pa.	Talle
Burleson	Knox	Teague, Tex.
Carlyle	Krueger	Thomas
Chase	Laird	Thompson, Mich.
Church	Landrum	
Clevenger	Lipscomb	Thomson, Wyo.
Colmer	Long	Tuck
Coon	Lovre	Utt
Crumpacker	McCulloch	Van Pelt
Davis, Wis.	McDonough	Weaver
Dempsey	McGregor	Wharton
Dies	McMillan	Whitten
Dondero	McVey	Williams, Miss.
Dorn, S. C.	Mack, Wash.	Willis
Fisher	Mason	Wilson, Ind.
Fjare	Mills	Winstead
Flynt	Moulder	Withrow
Fountain	Nicholson	Wolcott

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Cole Phillips

NOT VOTING—33

Allen, Ill.	Gwinn	Miller, Calif.
Andersen, H. Carl	Hale	Miller, Nebr.
	Hoffman, Ill.	Nelson
Bell	Horan	Norrell
Bray	Jones, Mo.	O'Hara, Minn.
Brown, Ohio	Judd	Prouty
Cannon	Keating	Thompson, La.
Carnahan	Kelley, Pa.	Thornberry
Cederberg	Lane	Wickersham
Dowdy	Lankford	Wier
Fernandez	McConnell	
George	McIntire	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Prouty for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.

Mr. Carnahan for, with Mr. Bell against.

Mr. Jones of Missouri for, with Mr. McIntire against.

Mr. Keating for, with Mr. Miller of Nebraska against.

Mr. Hale for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.

Mr. Horan for, with Mr. Dowdy against.

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Phillips against.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Cole for, with Mr. Bray against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Cannon with Mr. McConnell.

Mr. Lankford with Mr. George.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.

Mr. Wier with Mr. Gwinn.

Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Springer.

Mr. Norrell with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Cederberg.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. JUDD. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. BRAY. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 7, this House adopted my amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1956, H. R. 11356, increasing defense support to Latin America from $32 million to $37 million. I want to make perfectly plain the legislative intent in connection with the adoption of the amendment so that there will be no misunderstanding.

My amendment increases defense support assistance to Guatemala by an additional $5 million. Since the Foreign Affairs Committee had already increased the amount for Guatemala by $5 million, the total effect of House Foreign Affairs Committee action and action taken here on June 7 is to increase defense support to Guatemala by $10 million in addition to the amount I am now at liberty to disclose of $5 million requested by the executive branch. Thus the total authorization for defense support for Guatemala is $15 million.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have permission to sit during general debate in the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

TO STRENGTHEN THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT AND AMEND THE ANTITRUST LAW PROHIBITING PRICE DISCRIMINATION

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 521 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1840) to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill H. R. 1840, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit. After the passage of the bill H. R. 1840, it shall be in order to move to strike out the number H. R. 1840 and title and provisions thereof and to substitute in lieu thereof the number H. R. 11 and the title and provisions thereof: *Provided, however,* That such motion shall not be debatable.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule making in order the consideration of H. R. 1840, which is an amendment to strengthen the original Robinson-Patman Act. It provides for 3 hours of general debate.

The rule is, as I said, an open rule, but it varies from the general open rule in that it has an extra provision which would make in order at the conclusion of debate and the adoption of the bill a motion to substitute H. R. 11, the original Patman bill, that was introduced for this purpose. I might say in that connection that there is very little difference between H. R. 11 and H. R. 1840, H. R. 11 being the Patman bill, and H. R. 1840 being the Rogers of Colorado bill. The only difference is in the number and in the title, the preamble to the bill.

As the House will recall, a petition was signed discharging the committee from further consideration of the bill H. R. 11. Frankly, as one who supports the bill, I did not sign that discharge petition. I do not sign discharge petitions. I think it is rather a bad way to legislate, although I agree with the purposes of the bill. But the Committee on Rules felt that since the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] was a cosponsor of the original Robinson-Patman bill, and since he had filed this original H. R. 11, he was entitled to some consideration in the matter and therefore in order to give the House an opportunity to work its will in that matter, it provided that this method of substitution would be resorted to.

Since coming on the floor, I understand that may not be necessary; that some adjustment may be worked out between the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and the members of the committee so that that will not be necessary. But, at any rate, that is the machinery provided for in the rule.

Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, I favor this legislation. I think this is a proper method for its consideration. I hope the rule will be adopted, and, as I said, I shall support the legislation.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it will be noted that this rule makes in order striking out the number, H. R. 1840 and the title and provisions thereof and substiting in lieu thereof the number H. R. 11 and the title and provisions thereof.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has explained the problem which was presented to the Committee on Rules which resulted in that language being incorporated in the resolution which is now before us. The provisions and language of the main body of the two bills, as I understand, are substantially identical; in fact, I believe they are identical. There is a difference between the two bills in that the bill, H. R. 11, has a rather long title and preamble, while the bill H. R. 1840 contains just the ordinary simple title and no preamble.

The bill, H. R. 11, for the information of the membership of the House, is the bill about which most of us have received a great deal of mail. It has generally been favored pretty much over the entire country, especially by smaller units of business.

The passage of H. R. 1840 would have the same effect as the passage of H. R. 11. I am not familiar with the terms of any arrangement that may be made for working out the matter as described by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER]. However, there will be 3 hours of general debate if the rule is adopted. The situation can be fully clarified during that period of debate.

We have no opposition on this side in the Commmittee on Rules. I am very much in favor of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time on this side.

I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1840) to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1840, with Mr. DOYLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 18 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to take a moment to review the relationship between H. R. 1840, the bill now under consideration under the rule that has just been adopted, and H. R. 11, the bill which might be before the House today under a petition to discharge which was signed by 218 Members. In this way the reason for the amendment I have offered will become completely clear.

I introduced H. R. 11 on the opening day of the last session of this Congress on behalf of myself and 47 cosponsors. After that time several other Members introduced identical bills, and others introduced bills which are quite similar. All of these were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

In May of last year the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary opened hearings on the general subject of antitrust problems. Several witnesses were invited to appear and discuss whatever antitrust problems they considered to be important. I was honored with one of these invitations. Consequently I appeared before the subcommittee on May 10, 1955, and read a prepared statement in which I discussed several antitrust problems which seemed to be pressing. On that occasion I dealt at great length with the particular problem which seems most pressing, namely, the problem which H. R. 11 was intended to alleviate, and I discussed H. R. 11 in complete detail. Clearly H. R. 11 would merely reaffirm and restore a law which Congress had passed previously, after long and thorough investigations and hearings, and it was equally clear that the bill would do no more than restore a law which had been nullified by a very bad misinterpretation of the law by the Supreme Court. Under these circumstances, and because of the rapid destruction of small business which was taking place as a result of the Supreme Court's decision, I had rather thought that we might get quick consideration of the bill.

Later in the present session of Congress, however, it began to look as though the Committee on the Judiciary might not report the bill in time for the House to act on it during this Congress, if indeed the committee reported the bill at all. Consequently, on March 8, 1956, I filed a petition to discharge the committee and call up H. R. 11.

On Monday, May 21, 1956, the discharge petition was completed; on that day the 218th signature was placed on the petition; the petition and the names of the signers appeared in the RECORD for that day.

On the next day, May 22, 1956, the Committee on the Judiciary met and reported another bill, namely, H. R. 1840, which is now up for debate.

The situation is this: The original intent of the law was to grant equality of opportunity to small merchants and independent businessmen. The object was to prohibit the larger concerns from getting preferential discounts, secret rebates, under-the-counter deals which were discriminatory to the hometown merchants. All in the world the original law was intended to do was to give the little man equality of opportunity. And the purpose of this bill is to make that intention effective.

Remember, this law does not apply to the sale of merchandise by the local concern. It does not apply at all. It applies only where there is interstate commerce. This law is intended to guarantee to that man who buys his goods for resale that he will get the same price from the supplier that this supplier grants to his competitors under the same terms and conditions.

Remember that the law itself states that there can be a difference in the prices which the seller charges different buyers, to the extent that the seller has a difference in the cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery. If the supplier who supplies both the big man and the little man can show that he sells the big man in such huge quantities or delivers to him the goods sold in such a way that there is an actual saving to the supplier in serving the big man, that much of a discrimination is justified and is authorized by law. That is as it should be. If there is a difference in the cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery, that difference in cost can be reflected in the seller's prices. Nobody objects to that. The little man does not object to it. The independent merchant does not object to it. It is perfectly all right.

May I impress upon you Members of this House my firm conviction that independent business in this country and small business will have all the security they need, if they can buy right and fairly and not be discriminated against. In other words, I believe the little man is just as efficient as the big man.

There is no danger of the little man being forced out of business. The smallest merchant in the country can meet the competition of the greatest chain if the golden rule in business prevails. That is all we ask—equality of opportunity. That is all that this bill does. It gives the little man equality of opportunity. It does not apply, I repeat, to the retailer selling at retail and not in interstate commerce. This law does not touch him at all. So it is a good law. It has worked out well. For 20 years it has been on the statute books. I am told that a great number of independent businesses would not be in business today, if it were not for this law. I am sure that is correct. It has saved many of them. The Supreme Court, in a closely divided decision, placed a loophole in this law which really discriminates against the little man again; and the only object and intention of this bill before you today is to restore the law to its original intent. Remember, in 1936 when the original bill was before the House, and it came to a vote 290 Members of the House stood up, on a division, for the bill; and only 16 voted against it. In the other body, the vote was unanimous. The majority opinion of the Supreme Court in *Standard Oil Co. (Indiana)* v. *FTC* (340 U. S. 231), put a loophole in the law which had worked so well for 20 years, and the object of this bill is to restore the law to its original intent.

Mr. FULTON. Would the gentleman comment as to the effect of this bill on the matter of the defense of good faith in meeting competitive prices?

Mr. PATMAN Of course, it restores it to its original intent. Well, we will take the Standard Oil case. That is the one that placed the loophole in the law. In Detroit, Mich., there was a case there, you know, where there were Standard Oil stations in a certain area in the city of Detroit. In that area there was a distributor selling off-brand gasoline. That brand of gasoline was being sold at a price lower than Standard's price, Standard came in and selected 4 customers and gave them a price that would equal the off-brand distributor's price. But, Standard did not give the same price to the other competitors in that same area. If it had, that would have been all right. A seller has a right in good faith to meet competition, but he has no right to destroy competition in doing so. That was an instance where Standard Oil had selected certain stations in that area to sell Standard Oil products. Standard Oil is not required to sell to any particular buyer. No supplier is required to supply a customer. Under the law, the supplier can select or not select any customer he wants to. Standard Oil did not have to select these retail buyers, to sell their products, but they did. After they selected them, however, this bill requires Standard Oil to treat them fairly, and to treat them right, but not to discriminate among them. It is all right to meet competition, but the seller should treat all of his customers the same.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Was this the Standard Oil Co. itself or was this a jobber handling Standard Oil products?

Mr. PATMAN. I am not familiar enough to be able to answer exactly.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. There is a great deal of difference between the operation of the Standard Oil Co. as such and a jobber who might be handling Standard Oil products.

Mr. PATMAN. In this case, I do not think it would make any difference because it involved Standard Oil Co. products and the retail stations were in competition in and among themselves. I do not think it makes any difference.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. It would make a difference in the policy under which it was adopted, the policy under which they operated.

Mr. PATMAN. The law applies to the jobber the same as it does to the producing company.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. FORD. I have gathered from the remarks of the gentleman that this legislation has a rather strict interpretation, as affecting retail businessmen cases rather than others. I ask this question because it does involve a number of industries in my district. Does this legislation have anything to do with a delivered price or freight absorption?

Mr. PATMAN. It does not directly deal with that question at all. Neither did the original act. Necessarily, that question comes into the problem incidentally, where a seller uses a delivered price, a basing point price, as a means of making a price discrimination. In other words, there is a big man and a little man in the same town. As long as the seller sells to each of them at the same price, under the same terms and conditions, where the situation is comparable, it is all right. If the seller, under the guise of delivered price, gives preferential treatment to one customer as against that customer's competitors, the bill would come into play, but only to that extent.

Mr. FORD. May I ask another question: Take this hypothetical case: A community in Michigan has a number of steel fabricators. They are able to buy steel products from the Gary, Ind., mills. They can also buy steel from the Pittsburgh mills. The prices are identical, but the freight from Gary, Ind., to this community in Michigan is cheaper than the freight from Pittsburgh to this community in Michigan. Is there anything in this bill that would preclude a mill in Pittsburgh from absorbing some of the freight charges in the delivery of this product, so that that mill in Pittsburgh could compete with the mill in Gary, Ind.?

Mr. PATMAN. There is nothing in this bill that would prohibit meeting that price, provided the seller gave all other customers in that area the same price, and did not substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. In other words, a seller could not pick out one and say, "We are going to give you a favored price, but we will not give a favored price to the other customers." As long as the seller treats the customers equally, under the same terms and conditions, there would be no objection to meeting the price.

Mr. FORD. Suppose they had only one customer, this Pittsburgh mill, in that particular area, and they were seeking to meet the competition of the Gary, Ind., mill so that they could get their business and they were willing to absorb some of the freight.

Mr. PATMAN. They would be allowed to absorb the freight.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman is aware that the rule provides, among other things, the following:

After the passage of the bill H. R. 1840, it shall be in order to move to strike out the number H. R. 1840 and title and provisions thereof and to substitute in lieu thereof the number H. R. 11 and the title and provisions thereof.

The gentleman from Texas and I have a sort of understanding.

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct.

Mr. CELLER. That understanding involves the following: That I have no objection to the gentleman offering as an amendment to H. R. 1840 the preamble of his bill in haec verba; certainly the gentleman from Texas would not move to substitute, in lieu of H. R. 1840, H. R. 11. Is that correct?

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct. Here is the way it is: In H. R. 11 there is a declaration of purpose and policy. We think that is vital to the bill, we believe that it is. It sets forth our intent.

It has been proclaimed throughout the length and breadth of the land that the original act would destroy competition. That is not true.

This declaration of policy states that it is to preserve competition, and sets forth the true intention of the act. We believe it is vital in a court case, and we want it in. I will state the agreement, and I hope those who have signed that petition will concur in my action. I know the independent merchants throughout this country and small business concerns throughout America appreciate the fact that you signed the petition that made it possible for this legislation to be considered. I am not blaming those Members who have conscientious reasons for not signing that petition. I do not criticize any Member for not signing the petition; that is up to the individual Member, but those of us sponsoring this legislation appreciate your signing the petition that made it possible for this bill to come up and be considered.

I hope that the 218 Members who signed the petition will consider that it was all right for me to make this agreement which I have made. The Committee on the Judiciary had some very fine hearings, and I will state that they gave us some good hearings; they went into this matter thoroughly, and I appreciate it; but after the petition was signed, the committee reported H. R. 1840, that is by Mr. ROGERS. His bill is identical with H. R. 11, except it does not have the declaration of purpose and policy.

Now, I have assumed the power to agree with the gentleman from New York and his committee, that we would offer an amendment to put the declaration of purpose and policy of H. R. 11 into H. R. 1840; so that the bills will be identical, and being identical, we will not then make an issue of authorship or bill number; we want the legislation; we want the bill passed; and it will be perfectly satisfactory with me, and I hope it will be satisfactory with all the Members who are signers of the petition, that we make this bill, H. R. 1840, by Mr. ROGERS, the law; and if it is passed that way, I will not offer any motion to substitute.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a hypothetical question: Suppose you have two drugstores in the same community; one drugstore buys a thousand alarm clocks from a manufacturer and the other buys ten. Under the provisions of this bill would it be mandatory that the supplier give those two drugstores the same price?

Mr. PATMAN. No; it is not mandatory at all in the law. It states there can be a difference in price according to the difference in the seller's cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery. In manufacturing a thousand alarm clocks, there would probably be a lesser cost, and finding a difference in cost, it would be permissible under the law to reflect that difference in prices.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Would the burden of proof be on the manufacturer that there was a differentiation?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, it would, because he would have the information that outsiders would not have.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. If the gentleman's amendment to restore the declaration of policy is defeated, will he tell me how he expects to vote on the bill?

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, I do not expect it to be defeated, but we have another remedy if that should happen.

Mr. MORANO. Would that be a motion to recommit?

Mr. PATMAN. No; we have another bill which is up here on petition.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Supplementing the questions asked by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] I would like to inquire whether or not this bill would make unlawful the delivery of steel in Detroit, Mich., at the same price the steel was delivered at the factory in Pittsburgh?

Mr. PATMAN. No, it would not.

Mr. McCULLOCH. It could have no effect on that kind of transaction whatsoever?

Mr. PATMAN. Not so long as it did not substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

WHY WE NEED THE DECLARATION OF PURPOSE AND POLICY

Now why do we need a declaration of purpose? I believe this will be understood best by considering first how the need for the bill arose, and what the bill does.

HOW THE NEED FOR THE BILL AROSE

The need for the bill grows out of the majority opinion of the Supreme Court in 1951 in *Standard Oil Company (Indiana)* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (340 U. S. 231). That opinion interprets subsection 2 (a) of the Clayton Antitrust Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act and subsection 2 (b) of this act. Subsection 2 (a) of the act forbids a seller to discriminate in the prices at which he sells goods of like grade and quality to different buyers, where the effect of such discrimination is deleterious to competition in ways more specifically enumerated in the act. This section contains however, certain absolute exemptions from the prohibition. For example, a seller may change his prices from time to time as often as he likes—just so long as he is not making price changes from time to time as a cloak to try to conceal favoritism to particular buyers. As another example, there is an absolute exemption for a discrimination which is justified by differences in the seller's costs of serving the different buyers.

Section 2 (b) of the act contains another defense to a charge of an illegal price discrimination. For reasons which are not clear this is commonly referred to as the "good faith" defense.

Now what were the facts which gave rise to the Standard of Indiana case?

Standard of Indiana is a giant corporation. It is the principal marketer of gasoline in some 12 or 14 Midwestern States. In the city of Detroit, Standard had, among other competitors, a local distributor of an off-brand gasoline. This distributor, whose name was Red Indian, sold its gasoline at tank-wagon prices which were 2 cents less per gallon than Standard's advertised gasoline. There were certain buyers, sometimes called jobbers, in Detroit, who were in a particularly favorable position to handle and distribute Red Indian's gasoline. Some of these 4 so-called jobbers sold gasoline only at retail, some sold both at retail through their own stations, and also supplied other retail stations; and perhaps 1 or 2 supplied other retail stations and had no stations of their own. But they all had certain characteristics in common. They had storage capacity and credit standing which would permit them to buy in bulk from a refiner or a distributor who had no local distribution system of its own. Standard had a local distribution system in the city of Detroit and delivered gasoline by tank wagon to its retail customers.

Standard charged one price to all of its retail buyers in Detroit, except the four favored customers which could have handled Red Indian's gasoline. In the case of these customers Standard reduced its price to meet Red Indian's price. Naturally Standard did not want Red Indian to make greater encroachments in the Detroit market, and it took the means which were least costly to Standard to prevent that. It met Red Indian's price to those buyers that could have handled Red Indian's gasoline and held its price up to all the other buyers. The result of this method of blocking Red Indian out of the market was of course that the favored buyers reduced their prices to consumers and took a volume of business away from Standard's other retail dealers, who were trying to do business in the same neighborhoods. There was no cost justification for Standard's discrimination in price. This question was explored fully in the hearings before the Federal Trade Commission, and by the time the case was appealed to the Court, Standard gave up the idea of even trying to make a cost justification.

The inevitable effect on the retail dealers who could not get Standard's lower price was that they were greatly

injured. The complaints from these retail dealers to the Federal Trade Commission were first made in 1937 and 1938. We had sworn testimony before the House Small Business Committee recently which was to the effect that in those years Standard's unfavored retail dealers were so sorely pressed that some of the station operators who tried to hang on to their business had to move their families, their wives, and children, into their gasoline stations in order to have shelter.

When this case reached the Supreme Court the majority of the Court ruled that the 2 (b) defense justifies the seller in discriminating to meet the lower price of a competitor, irrespective of the effects upon competition. Consequently, the Supreme Court remanded this case to the Federal Trade Commission to make a finding of fact whether or not Standard's business practices met the conditions and circumstances which the Court said would justify a continuation of the discrimination. The Federal Trade Commission ruled "no." The Commission said that Standard had not behaved in "good faith." In arriving at this conclusion, the Commission seemed to be trying to interpret "good faith" according to some of the previous interpretations made by the Supreme Court of the Robinson-Patman Act, rather than in accordance with the interpretation made in the Standard of Indiana case. In any event, the Commission's finding on this question was appealed, and on May 3, 1956, the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit handed down a decision overturning the Commission's finding. Without going into a long discussion of this matter, I could simply summarize by saying that the nub of the thinking, as it seems to me, is that Standard was doing no more than the Supreme Court said it could do under the law. And moreover, it was doing what the Court's opinion regarded as a wholesome and constructive thing in the interest of competition. Consequently, the lower court could find no reason why Standard should be in bad faith in doing precisely what the Court said it could do. In summary, the vague phrase "good faith" seems to have no practical meaning and use, other than to confuse the issue when it is being debated.

WHAT THE BILL DOES

The bill therefore says simply this: that where the effect of the discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly, the 2 (b) defense shall not be a justification for the discrimination. Thus the bill makes a distinction between two broad classes of injury specified in section 2 (a). In the terms of section 2 (a), discriminations in the first instance are prohibited where the effect is to "injure," "destroy" or "prevent competition," or "substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly." The 2 (b) defense would still be a complete justification for discriminations which merely injure, destroy, or prevent competition. The 2 (b) defense however would not be a complete defense and would not justify a discrimination which has the more substantial and pervasive effect of substantially lessening competition or tending to create a monopoly. There is, I believe, no distinction in kind as between these two classes of deleterious effects, but rather a difference in degree or substantiality.

WHY WE NEED A DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

Why then do we need a declaration of purpose? There are many occasions where the congressional purpose of a particular bill is not manifest to the Court. In these instances it is helpful, sometimes even essential, for the courts to have an understanding of the legislation, to have an explanation, or a declaration of purpose, of the legislation. The courts, like ourselves, are too busy or overlook reading the committee's reports on the bill; and moreover, it is commonplace that committee reports slip by without an adequate declaration of purpose, or they contain explanations and statements which are contrary to the intent of the Members voting on the bill. In any case, it is common practice to have a declaration of purpose where there is any possibility of doubt as to what the congressional purpose is.

The present legislation needs the declaration of purpose if any of your legislation ever did. In the case of this legislation, we are facing a situation where the courts have clearly misinterpreted and mistaken the congressional purpose, as well as the whole philosophy underlying the act which we are now proposing to amend. Indeed, it is for the very reason, and for no other reason, than that the Supreme Court made a completely erroneous assumption concerning the very purpose of the Robinson-Patman Act that an amendment to that act is now needed.

What was the purpose of the Robinson-Patman Act?

With the passage of the Clayton Antitrust Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act in 1914, Congress adopted the principle that practices in commerce which are inherently unfair, and which suppress or destroy competition and bring about monopoly, will be outlawed. The purpose was to meet a clear need of supplementing the philosophy and intent of the Sherman Act, and help to preserve competition where the Sherman Act had largely failed.

THE PURPOSE AND EFFECT OF THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT WAS TO PRESERVE COMPETITION

One of these practices which had long been recognized to be inherently unfair was the practice of price discrimination. The reason is quite simple. In practically every industry, and in every line of business, we have in fact competitors of widely different sizes. They supply widely different proportions of the national market for a given product.

We have small competitors, we have medium-size competitors, we have large competitors, and at the top we usually have one or more giant competitors. As every businessman knows that where you have a regime of price discrimination, the larger competitors destroy or squeeze out the smaller competitors, irrespective of efficiency. This is true even where all of the competitors start on an absolutely equal basis, pay the same prices for their goods and raw materials, and have identical costs per unit of goods manufactured, distributed, or sold. The medium-size sellers destroy, or gradually win out over the small sellers; the larger sellers destroy or gradually squeeze out the medium-size sellers; and the giant sellers destroy or gradually squeeze out the large sellers.

More than that, every business firm is both buyer and seller. Even those integrated firms in the manufacturing field have raw materials to buy. Furthermore, where you have a regime of discriminatory selling, the bigger buyers inevitably receive unearned advantages over the smaller buyers. These unearned advantages increase and graduate throughout the whole size range of buyers. The biggest buyers receive the greatest unearned advantages and the smallest buyers pay the highest prices. We are not taking into account here the fact that a seller frequently has cost savings in supplying a big buyer as compared to a small buyer. The law allows any such cost savings to be passed along in price differentials. What we are talking about are those discriminations which go beyond the cost savings and these constitute the unearned advantages which the big buyers receive over the small buyers.

There are many reasons why in a regime of discriminatory selling the bigger the buyer the bigger the unearned price advantages he received. In the first place, competition is always stronger around the door of the bigger buyer than at the door of the smaller buyer. There are many small suppliers without any distribution systems of their own, and no budgets for national advertising, who cannot as a practical matter reach the small buyers. In these circumstances, the big suppliers naturally prefer to meet the competition where they find it, which means taking the business of the big buyers at a low price, while at the same time exacting a higher, discriminatory price from the smaller buyers who are not so favored by vigor of competition. In the second place, as our hearings and investigations in 1935 and 1936 showed, the big buyers are frequently in a position to coerce and intimidate the suppliers in those situations where the supplier segment of the business is made up of smaller and weaker business units. In these instances, the big buyer can extract from the suppliers a price discrimination by threatening to channel its business to some small offbrand supplier, or by threatening to enter the supplier phase of the business itself.

Discriminatory selling then results in a double-barreled advantage to the bigger competitors over the smaller competitors. It is in essence an abuse of power which is also a terrific centripetal force destroying and squeezing out always the smaller competitors, and centralizing business into the hands of an ultimate monopoly. Short of the monopoly stage moreover, we have the situation of an extremely soft competition, in which the smaller sellers have in practice no price independence. At best they are confronted with a certainty that any price reduction they make can and will easily be met by the bigger sellers, so the practical result is, long before monopoly is

reached, we have in fact only the top man in the industry, the giant corporation, deciding on what the price will be and all of the other suppliers having to follow that price.

It is perhaps too late to try to preserve competition in most of the manufacturing segments of industry. It is not too late however, to try to preserve a competitive structure in the distribution fields. My primary hope for this legislation is therefore simply this: That wherever manufacturers or suppliers raise prices or reduce prices, that they will either raise or reduce prices throughout the particular market area where there are wholesalers or retailers trying to compete with one and another in the sale of that product. In other words, all this law will say to the manufacturer or supplier is that he must treat his customers fairly. He is not obligated to select or sell to any particular customer, but once having selected that customer, he must give him reasonably equal treatment under the same terms and conditions as he gives his competitors.

THE SUPREME COURT THINKS THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT IS ANOTHER NRA

In contrast to the purpose of the Robinson-Patman Act which I have stated the Supreme Court had in mind, and has clearly described a completely different purpose. More than that, the Supreme Court missed the whole point of the legislation. In place of the congressional findings of fact which have been made on the subject of price discrimination, going back over the years to 1914, the Court injected certain economic theories of its own, or at least adopted, or throught it was adopting, the economic theories of certain writers who have purported to explain both the purpose of the legislation and its effects. First of all the majority opinion in the Standard of Indiana case makes it clear that the Court was proceeding on the assumption that the law is not an antitrust law, as it actually is, but some kind of undesirable exemption from the antitrust laws.

It happens that the act was passed in 1936, shortly after the NRA was declared unconstitutional, and the Supreme Court had an idea that the Act was intended to be a kind of bypass, or substitute, for the NRA. One of the Justices during the course of the oral arguments before the Court, did in fact, refer to the act as embracing the NRA theory, and as being in conflict with the Sherman Act. Counsel supporting Standard's arguments before the Court was moreover, quick to assure the Court that the act is no more or less than the NRA theory. Furthermore, the arguments and briefs over issues arising under this act are invariably in such terms as "cutting prices," "reducing prices," "meeting competitors' prices," and so forth. Consequently, the Court was of the view, and this notion is now fixed by the Court's opinion, that the law is intended to prohibit price reductions. Indeed, the Court's opinion uses the terms price reduction and price cutting as synonymous with discrimination, and it also uses the term "competition" as synonymous with "discrimination."

Having started with the premise that the Robinson-Patman Act is in conflict with the Sherman Act, the Court announced it as its duty to reconcile the two. And having started with the premise that the Robinson-Patman Act is anticompetitive, the only way the Court could reconcile the two, in its mind, was in the way in which it did reconcile, which was largely to destroy the Robinson-Patman Act.

Much of all this has resulted from the Court's getting its law, congressional intent, and economic theories from the law and economic journals. I do not mean by this to imply any criticism of the present Court. This is no new thing. The members of the courts have always read and been influenced by writings appearing in the professional journals and by books referred to in those writings. And wherever there has been an economic issue at stake, big business and big interests have always managed to load these journals with writing favoring their particular point of view, of leading a law down a path where they want it led in court decisions. Small business people on the other hand are not smart enough and don't have the influence to see that their side of an argument gets such complete presentation and repetition in the professional literature.

As matters now stand, the Supreme Court has said a great deal that is wrong, both about the purpose of the act and about its practical economic effects. This is now being picked up, and has been picked up, by the lower courts, and is setting the premise in thinking by which these courts set about to resolve any issue arising under the Act. More particularly, the lower courts have taken a cue from the Standard of Indiana opinion in which the Court declared it was its duty to reconcile the Robinson-Patman Act with other antitrust statutes; and they, too, are proceeding to make reconciliations which are eroding away the law.

The purpose of the declaration of purpose therefore is simply this. It is to remind the courts that they are here dealing with an antitrust statute and not an NRA exemption to the antitrust statutes. Its purpose is, furthermore, to remind the courts that if they wish to adopt and inject economic theories, they should go back to the legislative findings on these issues.

For these reasons the declaration of purpose is extremely important to the way in which the law will work out, as a practical matter. The careful students of this law and legislation all know that, and they know in fact that this declaration of purpose is to put the courts back on the right track and it will have a practical effect perhaps greater than the amendment to the law itself. And it is for this reason that we are getting great opposition to this declaration of purpose. Those giant corporations that don't want any effective restraints over abuses of power, and want the courts to remain under an erroneous understanding of the purpose of the law clearly do not want this declaration of purpose. Indeed, some of the big business journals have been propagandizing against the declaration of purpose solely, without even making any objection to the substantive amendments to the law. For example, the New York Journal of Commerce recently ran a feature editorial critizing and confusing this declaration of purpose, without even raising any objection to the substantive portions of the bill at all. Clearly, however, we must have a declaration of purpose. If this declaration of purpose does not express the intent of the Members in passing this bill; if it is the intent of the Members to install a kind of NRA theory; or if the Members believe that the Robinson-Patman Act is anticompetitive in its effects and is in conflict with the Sherman Act, then let us write a declaration of purpose which fits those beliefs. On the other hand, if the Members believe that it is good antitrust law to place some checks on abuses of size, so that small firms can survive and compete on the basis of efficiency, then I say let us adopt the declaration of purpose stated in H. R. 11.

Coming now to a more detailed explanation of how the substantive provisions of the bill will apply, I should like to call attention to my statement to the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary on April 20, 1956, which refers to the questions raised by the subcommittee and my answers to those questions:

Question: One of the members of the committee asked for a brief statement of what H. R. 11 does. For purposes of clarity, it would seem well to begin the answers with this particular question. Precisely, the question is stated as follows:

"Mr. KEATING. I would appreciate it if you would outline, if you can, briefly what H. R. 11 does, how it changes existing law, and what the effect is" (p. 144).

Answer: Section 2 (a) of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, makes it unlawful for a seller to discriminate in prices between different purchasers of commodities of like grade and quality under certain conditions. These conditions are as stated in the statute:

"Where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, or to injure, destroy, or prevent competition with any person who either grants or receives the benefit of such discrimination, or with customers of either of them."

Section 2 (a) also contains certain exemptions, limitations, and justifications under which a price discrimination is justified, such, for example, as discrimination which is justified by difference in the seller's cost. But none of these are involved in the present legislation, and need not be discussed here.

Section 2 (b) of the act reads as follows:

"Section (b). Upon proof being made at any hearing on a complaint under this section that there has been discrimination in price of services or facilities furnished, the burden of rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing justification shall be upon the person charged with the violation of this section, and unless justification shall be affirmatively shown, the Commission is authorized to issue an order terminating the discrimination: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained shall prevent a seller rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing that his lower price, or the furnishing of services or facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor,

or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor."

H. R. 11 arose because of a problem created by the majority opinion of the Supreme Court in *Standard Oil (Indiana) v. FTC* (340 U. S. 231). In that case the Court ruled that a seller showing that his discrimination in price was made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor serves not merely as a rebuttal to a prima facie case made out by the Federal Trade Commission, but rather that such a showing is an absolute and complete defense against a charge of illegal price discrimination, and the defense therefore serves as a bar to a Federal Trade Commission cease-and-desist order.

In the case before the Court the Federal Trade Commission had made a finding of fact not only that standards of price discriminations may have the specified adverse effects upon competition described in section 2 (a) of the statute, but that Standard's discriminations had in fact already had those adverse effects, including the effect of substantially lessening competition or tending to create a monopoly. Nevertheless, the Court's rule was that a discrimination in good faith, to meet the lower price of a competitor justifies the discrimination, irrespective of the adverse effects upon competition.

In this ruling the Court also made a construction of what constitutes the good-faith defense which is crucial to the issue here. Without, at this point, going into the peculiarities of the Court's construction of the good-faith defense, however, it may be stated that we believe that had the Court constructed the good-faith defense properly rather than as it did construct the good-faith defense, there would be no need for H. R. 11.

For the sake of simplicity, and in order to utilize the language the meaning of which is already established in the law, H. R. 11 makes an exception to the good-faith justification in the following circumstances: Specifically, H. R. 11 would continue the good-faith defense as a complete justification for price discrimination, except and unless "the effect of the discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly."

Thus the full purpose or the whole effect of H. R. 11 will be to overturn the Court's ruling in the Standard (Indiana) case in those factual situations where the effect of the discrimination "may be to substantially lessen competition and tend to create a monopoly."

The reason for adopting the above-quoted language as the ultimate standard for an illegal price discrimination is that this same language describes the illegal exclusive-dealing contracts and tie-in sales which are prohibited under section 3 of the Clayton Act and the same language describes an illegal merger prohibited by section 7 of the act.

Under H. R. 11, the plantiff would have the burden of proving that the discrimination in question meets the test of illegality as to the substantial lessening of competition or tendency to create monopoly. It would not be the defendant's burden to show that the discrimination does not have the prohibited effects although, of course, the defendant may introduce evidence to rebut the plaintiff's evidence on this question.

There is also a question whether the good-faith defense would continue to be a complete defense against a charge of illegal price discrimination which has certain of the adverse effects specified in section 2 (a) of the law—namely, where the effect of the discrimination may be to "injure, destroy, or prevent competition"—but does not have the stated effects as to a substantial lessening of competition or a tendency to create a monopoly.

Question:

"Mr. McCULLOCH. If the effect of the discrimination is to injure, destroy, or prevent competition and it is done in good faith, is that a complete defense on the part of the person who does it?" (p. 134).

Answer. Yes, if the effect of the discrimination does not go further and be of a nature which may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly, the good-faith defense will be complete.

The author of the bill understands that the difference between the variously stated adverse effects is a difference of degree, and not a qualitative difference. In other words, the effects of a discrimination may be of the kind which prevents competition, but if the effects are of sufficient severity and substantiality, the courts may well rule that the effect substantially lessens competition.

Such prevention of competition comes within the standard of a substantial lessening of competition under sections 3 and 7 of the act, and likewise, has been held in certain circumstances to contravene the Sherman Act.

The reason for adopting the less severe standard of an adverse effect on competition in H. R. 11, is that the opponents of an antiprice-discrimination law have made violent objections to proposals to give each individual business firm a right of redress for injuries sustained as a result of a monopolistic practice. These opponents have loudly proclaimed that the present Robinson-Patman Act seeks to protect competitors rather than to protect competition. It occurred to the author of the bill, therefore, that more fairminded executives of big business would not object to a law which prohibits, in the last resort, a discrimination which substantially lessens competition or tends to create a monopoly, and that perhaps the present heads of the enforcement agencies would not object to such a law.

Question:

"Mr. MALETZ. Is it not correct that the sole purpose of your bill would be to eliminate good faith as a complete defense where the effect of the discrimination is to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly?"

Answer. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask a question at that point.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Could not the Sherman Act be availed of if it created a monopoly?

Mr. PATMAN. After it is actually created. But you see, we are trying to prevent monopoly before it actually reaches the point where it would be illegal under the Sherman Act. The trouble about the Sherman Act is that it comes into play long after many people have been driven out of business. The Clayton Act and the Robinson-Patman Act are trying to approach the problem with a prevention of illness rather than with a cure for illness after it has reached a critical stage.

The CHAIRMAN. Couldn't there be an injunction?

Mr. PATMAN. You can get injunctions under the Sherman Act, but only against practices which would be violative of the Sherman Act, and the Sherman Act is certainly incomplete so far as reaching the problem we have in mind.

Mr. MALETZ. Mr. Patman, suppose a seller was acting in good faith in meeting a competitor's price, but was discriminating, and the effect of that discrimination was to tend to create a monopoly, would the Government be able to enjoin those discriminations under section 2 of the Sherman Act on the basis that they constitute an attempt to monopolize that particular area?

Mr. PATMAN. I don't think that would be possible unless the Government could show intent to monopolize.

Mr. MALETZ. They would have to show——

Mr. PATMAN. Intent to monopolize.

Mr. MALETZ. Would good faith, then, be a defense under section 2 of the Sherman Act?

Mr. PATMAN. I don't believe it would, that is my answer, but we may be talking about different definitions of good faith.

May I continue?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. The next question was as follows:

"Mr. MALETZ. Your bill, then, recognizes that good faith under certain circumstances where the effect of the discrimination is to injure or destroy competition should be a complete defense" (p. 163.)

Answer: The author of the bill recognizes that under the bill good faith would be a complete defense under certain circumstances where the effect of the discrimination is to injure or destroy competition.

Question:

"Mr. KEATING. Why wouldn't the same objective be achieved by your bill if that is the legislative desire to strike out the proviso about good faith?" (p. 163).

Answer. It is not the intention of the bill to remove good faith as a defense for all adverse effects upon competition. As already indicated, the author of the bill recognizes a distinction in degree between an injury to competition and a substantial lessening of competition or a tendency to create a monopoly.

Question. Referring to a discrimination which merely has the effect of injuring, destroying, or preventing competition and does not have the further effect of substantially lessening competition, Mr. McCULLOCH asked:

"Why should that be a complete defense if the intent is to do it, yet it is not a defense if it is only to substantially lessen competition?" (p. 164).

Answer: The question of the seller's intent does not enter into the prohibition set out in section 2 (a) of the act. It is the intention of the act to place the standards of illegality as much as possible upon the effects of the discriminatory practice, rather than upon what may be in the mind of the corporation engaged in the discriminatory practice.

The matter of intent may, however, enter into the question of whether or not good faith is shown—this is difficult to say—the matter of what constitutes good faith has become greatly confused and different people inevitably have widely different ideas about it.

Question: Mr. Keating raised a series of questions concluding with the question:

"Whether there would be objection to repealing the good-faith proviso altogether?" (p. 167).

Answer: If the good faith proviso were repealed, then a price discrimination which merely has the effect of injuring, destroying, or preventing competition would be illegal, even though the section 2 (b) defense could be made out, as would discriminatory practices which have the more severe effect of substantially lessening competition or tending to create a monopoly. Thus to repeal the defense would be to make a more severe law against discriminatory practices than H. R. 11 provides.

As has been stated before, there have been violent objections to giving small business that much protection; and it is felt that a bill which goes that far would have less chance of becoming law.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean to imply from your answer that if the bill were to eliminate good faith it would be too broad?

Mr. PATMAN. No. Personally, I would favor it, but to be practical, I know it is going to be hard enough to get our version through, and this is substantially less than removing the 2 (b) defense altogether.

The CHAIRMAN. You are a realist.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right, we are trying to be realists, and we are asking for half a loaf. That would be a whole loaf. We think we would probably have a very difficult time getting it through.

The CHAIRMAN. Beyond that I don't know what the repercussions would be if you would eliminate good faith entirely.

Mr. PATMAN. It would require hearings of probably weeks of time before this committee. But on this question we feel that it shouldn't require much time, because it has been pretty well explained and discussed in the past.

Counsel raised a question concerning the interpretation placed on the section 2 (b) defense by the late Walter B. Wooden, Associate General Counsel of the Federal Trade Commission, and he read a portion of a statement filed by Mr. Wooden with the Temporary National Economic Committee in 1941, which portion of Mr. Wooden's statement was quoted in the majority opinion in the Standard Oil (Indiana) case (footnote 12, p. 246, 34 U. S.), as follows:

"The amended act now safeguards the right of the seller to discriminate in price in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, but he has the burden of proof on that question. This right is guaranteed by statute and could not be curtailed by any mandate or order of the Commission. The right of self-defense against competitive price attacks is as vital in a competitive economy as the right of self-defense against personal attack."

All authorities seem to agree that the 2 (b) defense was intended to be a self-defense procedure. The majority of the Court in the Standard Oil (Indiana) case referred to it as "self-defense." The report of the House conferees on the Robinson-Patman bill filed by Representative Utterback (which the Court had previously taken as the primary and almost exclusive authority for the meaning of the 2 (b) defense) also described it as a self-defense procedure.

The disagreement is, however, over what set of business facts constitute justifiable self-defense. This point involves the crux of our objection, and the whole scope of our objection, to the Standard Oil (Indiana) opinion.

The House report filed by Representative Utterback said:

"As in any case of self-defense, while the attack against which the defense is claimed may be shown in evidence, its competency as a bar depends also upon whether it was a legal or illegal attack" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 74th Cong., 2d sess., June 15, 1936).

Since it would be difficult to find a precedent in law where lawful conduct on the part of one person justifies the unlawful conduct of another, it would normally be assumed that the report meant by "as in any case of self-defense" that the section 2 (b) defense would justify a violation of the prohibition of the bill only in self-defense against an unlawful attack, and in the presence of other circumstances which would justify a resort to the unlawful means of self-defense.

Similarly, since Mr. Walter Wooden drew an analogy between self-defense against a price attack and the "right of self-defense against personal attack," it would normally be reasonable to assume that he likewise understood a justifiable violation of the law to the one in self-defense against an unlawful attack.

The construction of self-defense in the majority opinion in Standard Oil (Indiana) however, contains two novel elements.

First, the Court declared that a competitor's lawful price justifies a seller in making a discrimination contrary to the prohibition of the statute.

Here the Court declared:

"There is also a suggestion in the debates, as well as in the remarks of this Court in the Staley case, supra, that a competitor's lower price, which may be met by a seller under the protection of section 2 (b), must be a lawful price" (340 U. S., p. 248).

The second novel element in the Court's construction of the defense appears in the idea that a seller is justified in violating the law in order to "retain a customer." It was this idea of "retaining a customer," moreover, which seemed to satisfy the Court's mind that it was constructing the 2 (b) defense according to notions of self-defense.

The idea that a seller has a right to the continuing patronage of any particular customer is, however, contrary to all competitive principles, which heretofore have held that the business of any buyer should at all times be available to the seller who can produce the goods and sell them at the lowest price.

The very purpose of H. R. 11, and the Robinson-Patman Act before, and the Clayton Act before that, was to eliminate a monopolistic practice which thwarts competitive processes.

Neither the law nor H. R. 11 objects to competition or to sellers losing customers. On the contrary, the law and the bill object to a particular method of competition, which is the discriminatory method. And the reason for objecting to this method is that it results not in the sellers who can produce and sell at the lowest price getting the business, but in the biggest sellers getting the business.

At page 150, counsel raised a question about what he called "this kind of factual situation."

A small manufacturer A is doing business in a limited area and selling his product at the price of $1. Manufacturer B is a giant in the same industry who sells a comparable product for 90 cents.

"This giant manufacturer now decides that he will invade A's market. Now one of A's largest customers states that he will be obliged to switch his account to manufacturer B unless A can meet the price of 90 cents."

The question is then whether under H. R. 11, if the giant manufacturer offers a 90-cent price to one of the small manufacturer's customers, would the small manufacturer violate the bill by discriminating to meet the 90-cent price to that particular customer? Members of the committee have expressed concern over the effect of the bill upon the small manufacturer.

Counsel has presented a hypothetical situation which is somewhat unrealistic and represents a factual situation in the competitive process which at best would be extremely transitory.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a very fair reproduction of the question that was put to you. What is your answer to that?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir. As a practical matter, neither the Federal Trade Commission nor private plaintiffs have brought suits on transitory discriminations; on the contrary suits have been brought against rigid and unyielding practices which have prevailed over a period of years. In practice, the discriminatory practice has been long standing before the Federal Trade Commission receives a complaint; thereafter it normally takes the FTC months to years to get around to making an investigation, and ultimately preparing a suit. Finally, if by the time the Federal Trade Commission gets around to filing a complaint the discrimination has ceased, then it normally considers that no public interest would be served by pressing suit, or contrariwise, the proposed respondent is normally willing to agree to a consent order.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the question also involves this: If the small manufacturer had to reduce his price to 90 cents, and he had also, in order to avoid entanglement with the statute, reduce it to all his other customers, he might operate at such a loss as to be forced into bankruptcy.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, there is a difference there in the competitive area in all customers in that particular instance, I think.

The CHAIRMAN. I mean, when you figure out the cost of everything.

Mr. PATMAN. You are talking about nationwide, and I am talking about the competitive area.

The CHAIRMAN. It doesn't have to be nationwide; it may be in the county, city, or State. He fixes his cost at 90 cents in order to make a net profit. The big fellow doesn't have to figure that way; he can make a profit at 90 cents anyway.

Now, if the little fellow was forced to sell at 90 cents at a loss, and has to do that all along the line, of course he would be out of business.

Mr. PATMAN. I don't consider the little fellow would have to sell at a loss, because if the big man can do it for 90 cents, the little man can do it for 90 cents, because they are just as efficient as the big man, sometimes more so.

The CHAIRMAN. But you are changing the kind of situation we assumed.

Say that A would be the small man and B the giant, and that A could not operate at 90 cents and make a profit. What would you do under those circumstances?

Mr. PATMAN. Let me read you the whole thing. It will answer it.

The question is whether under H. R. 11, if the giant manufacturer, selling at 90 cents, offers this price to one of the small manufacturer's customers, would the small manufacturer violate the bill by discriminating to meet the 90-cent price to that particular customer? Members of the committee have expressed concern over the effect of the bill upon the small manufacturer.

To answer the purely legal question first, the answer is "yes"—if the small manufacturer's discriminations in price are such that the probable effects of the discriminations will be a substantial lessening of competition or tendency to create a monopoly, the bill would be violated.

As for the practical effect of the bill on the small manufacturer, however, certain obvious conclusions can be drawn.

In the first place, the small manufacturer's discrimination to meet the 90-cent price to 1 customer would relieve his problem only momentarily at best. Since the giant manufacturer invading his territory is selling his product universally at 90 cents, the normal presumption is that as soon as this manufacturer has open capacity he will offer the 90-cent price to other customers of the small manufacturer. Moreover, should the small manufacturer avert the loss of the first customer, by a discrimination, the presumption is that manufacturer B will then have sufficient of his product available for offer to A's other customers, at the 90-cent price, and will, in turn, drive the small manufacturer's price down to 90 cents to all of his customers.

As a practical matter, neither the Federal Trade Commission nor private plaintiffs have brought suits against transitory discriminations.

There may be factual situations where the small seller, such as described in the hypothetical example, would enjoy an advantage in competing with his larger rivals, when there is unlimited freedom for discrimination; but these would be as rare as those instances where discriminations result in the small buyer receiving an unearned advantage over the big buyer as a result of suppliers' discriminations.

As an almost unvarying rule, discriminations—either to meet or to undercut a competitor's price—result in unearned advantages to the big manufacturer seller over the small manufacturer seller. The exceptions are where the big manufacturer voluntarily refrains from using his advantage, and sells at a uniform price, as in the hypothetical case described by counsel.

Consider, for example, the plight of small manufacturer A after his price has been driven down to 90 cents. The probability is that he has lost some of his customers at the 90-cent price to giant manufacturer B, and with a fixed overhead his average costs have gone up. A reasonable business desire would then be to reduce his price, say to 80 cents, in order to take back his former volume of sales.

Under the Standard Oil (Indiana) ruling, however, the giant manufacturer B is justified in meeting the 80-cent price in A's territory while continuing his 90-cent price in all other territories. And so it would be if the small manufacturer reduced to 70 cents, or 60 cents, or to any other price. In point of fact, under the Standard Oil ruling, there would be nothing to prevent giant manufacturer B from charging $1.10, $1.20, or whatever other price he chose, in other areas where competition is absent or weak, and then using this income to sustain his competition in the small manufacturer's territory.

Insofar as manufacturers are concerned—or any other sellers—the difference in the size of the competitors—that is, the difference in their sales volume—enters into the competitive contest the moment there is any discrimination at all; absolute equality in the competitive contest could be attained only if all discriminations were eliminated.

Question: Mr. Maletz asked for comments on certain aspects of the Federal Trade Commission's letter. Specifically he asked for comment on the following:

"First, the Commission states that since the Standard of Indiana decision by the Supreme Court in 1951, there has been no further Trade Commission case decided either by the Commission or in court in which the good-faith defense has been sustained" (p. 173).

Answer: The Federal Trade Commission claims to have decided against respondents in seven cases in which respondents claim the good-faith defense. As yet no court has sustained the Commission in any of its findings against the good-faith defense of respondents, not even in the Standard Oil (Indiana) case.

Moreover, the Commission's findings against good faith in the Standard case appear to be at variance with what the Supreme Court said that respondents may do. While the Supreme Court did not attempt to set out situations in which defendants would succeed in making out the good-faith defense, the Court's decision in that case seems clearly to state that a seller may discriminate in prices to meet the lower price of a competitor where the competitor's price is a lawful one, and the discrimination is made for the purpose of "retaining a customer." In these circumstances there would thus seem to be no further content to the phrase "good faith," and good faith would be automatic unless there was some additional intent or activity which would be violative of some other law.

Question: Mr. Maletz also asked for comment on the following statement:

"The Federal Trade Commission has also stated that it has not found a substantial basis for believing that section 2 (b) as interpreted by the Supreme Court in the Standard of Indiana would hamper enforcement of the Robinson-Patman Act."

Answer: It is very probably true that the Federal Trade Commission has not found that the Standard Oil (Indiana) case interpretation hampers enforcement of the Robinson-Patman Act as the Commission conceives that the act should be enforced.

Perhaps the best answer to this question is contained in my statement where I have shown that the Commission has received complaints from independent gasoline retailers complaining of the same practices which were involved in the Standard (Indiana) case, and in fact, the same practices carried on by the same company.

In response to some of these complaints the Commission made investigations, and the investigators found good faith merely upon investigation; and in response to other of these complaints, the Federal Trade Commission's chief investigator, Mr. Babcock, wrote the gasoline dealers stating that the discriminations complained of were justified by the 2 (b) defense as interpreted in the Standard Oil (Indiana) decision, even though no investigation had been made.

Mr. MALETZ. Mr. Patman, I believe Chairman Gwynne yesterday was asked about the Babcock letter, and I think he indicated that the Federal Trade Commission in February of this year changed its policy from that indicated in the letter.

Mr. PATMAN. Didn't Judge Gwynne say that he had personally issued instructions to the staff to investigate the matters, and that the Commission has not passed upon it?

Mr. MALETZ. I think you are entirely correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Wouldn't that be a very important change of policy?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, I suspect so; I suspect it would be. In fact, I know it would be.

Mr. MALETZ. I take it your point, however, would be this: That at least until February 1956 the Commission has not been conducting investigations where good faith has been alleged as a defense—and I have particular reference to the retail gasoline situation. Would that be a fair statement?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right; yes, sir.

Mr. MALETZ. That is right?

Mr. PATMAN. You haven't heard of any complaints being issued or actions taken since February 1.

Mr. MALETZ. Judge Gwynne introduced into the record, at page 313, a copy of the letter which the Commission had sent to Senator Humphrey.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you familiar with that?

Mr. PATMAN. I am not familiar with this. Is it in the transcript?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, if it is in the transcript, we should have it.

What page is it?

Mr. MALETZ. I don't believe it has been inserted in your transcript.

Mr. PATMAN. We would like to have a copy.

The CHAIRMAN. We will have a copy furnished you.

Mr. PATMAN. Thank you.

May I continue, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. I hope before the committee concludes its hearings it will consider the testimony which other small-business people have given the House Small Business Committee concerning complaints which have been made to the Federal Trade Commission about price discriminations, and the Commission's inactions on these complaints.

Question:

"Mr. MALETZ. In short, would you say that under the Supreme Court's decision, good faith is a defense only in individual competitive situations rather than in a general system of competition?"

Answer: In the Corn Products, Staley and Cement decisions the Supreme Court drew a distinction between "individual competitive situations" and industrywide, nationwide basing-point formulas of pricing. It is difficult to say how much the Standard Oil (Indiana) opinion may have upset the Court's earlier concept of an "individual competitive situation."

In the Staley opinion, where this matter was treated at greatest length, the Court seemed to have in mind that a discrimination would be justified in self-defense against an unlawful attack, and in the presence of other circumstances which would justify the discrimination. A discrimination made in self-defense against an unlawful attack would imply that the seller knew who was making the unlawful attack, that he did no more than was necessary to meet the attack, and that he continued his discriminations no longer than reasonably necessary to get legal relief—such are the usual requirements for self-defense justification.

In Standard (Indiana) opinion, however, the Court took an opposite turn from the earlier decisions just mentioned. Whereas the earlier decisions had tended to eliminate discrimination, the Standard opinion tends to allow the maximum. More than this, when the Court declared that a seller may discriminate to meet a competitor's lawful price, it removed any legal means for terminating the discrimination. If the seller is justified in discriminating to meet a lawful price to retain a customer once, he would seem to be justified in continuing to discriminate to meet a lawful price as long as the lawful price exists. And, of course, there is no provision in the law for terminating the competitor's lawful price.

Similarly, if a seller is justified in discriminating to meet a competitor's lawful price offer to one customer, he would seem to be justified in discriminating to meet similar offers to all customers to whom the lower offer was available.

Question:

"Mr. MALETZ. Now, would you say this is a correct statement, that under the Standard of Indiana decision a seller cannot use a sales system which constantly results in his getting more money for like goods from some of his customers than he does from the others?" (p. 177).

Answer: That was the gist of the holding in the Staley and Cement decisions when an industrywide basing-point system was involved. Referring to the word "system," I cannot say that the Standard (Indiana) decision authorizes a sales system which constantly results in the seller getting more money for like goods from some customers than he does from others.

But when the Court held in Standard Oil that self-defense justifies the seller in violating the law to meet the lawful price, the effect is, I think, that the discrimination may be continued indefinitely, without respect to the question whether there is a system involved, the seller may constantly take more money for like goods from some customers than he does from others.

Mr. MALETZ. Mr. Patman, suppose that the Federal Trade Commission should take the position that a seller, in order to meet the good-faith defense, would have the absolute burden of showing that the competitor's price was lawful, then as a practical matter would it be possible for many sellers who are respondents in Federal Trade Commission cases to meet that burden of proof?

Mr. PATMAN. That is rather speculative.

Mr. MALETZ. Yes, it certainly is.

Mr. PATMAN. Let's pass it off as that, if you please.

Question:

"Mr. MALETZ. Is it or is it not correct that under the Standard of Indiana ruling, a seller can avail himself of a meeting-of-competition defense only in meeting a lawful price of a specific competitor?" (pp. 177 and 178).

Answer: That seems to have been the intent of the Court's opinion. I think, however, the intended distinction between meeting the price of one competitor and meeting prices of several competitors will, under the Court's interpretation of good faith, be of little significance and no safeguard to the competitive processes.

Question:

"Mr. MALETZ. Is it or is it not correct that the proviso of the present section 2 (b) could not be used to justify a price reduction to meet competition generally?" (p. 178).

Answer: I would assume that in order to make out the defense the seller would have

to have evidence which would lead a reasonable man to believe, as stated in Staley, that at least one lower price offer was available to the customer. I would not think, however, that the presence of two or more lower price offers would invalidate the defense.

Question:

"Mr. MALETZ. Does the Standard of Indiana decision mean that it is legal, say, for a manufacturers who lowers his price to one customer, to keep that customer from going to a competing manufacturer, to maintain his usual price to the other customers?" (p. 178).

Answer: Yes, even though the effect of the discrimination is to substantially lessen competition or create a monopoly.

Question:

"Mr. MALETZ. Wouldn't it be quite a problem for the Commission under H. R. 11 to ascertain whether on the one hand the effect of the discrimination is substantially to lessen competition, or on the other hand to ascertain whether the effect of the discrimination is to injure, destroy, or prevent competition?" (p. 179).

Answer: The Commission appears to have difficulty finding any place where there is a substantial lessening of competition or a tendency to create monopoly—under the antimerger law, under section 3 of the Clayton Act, as well as under the Robinson-Patman Act.

The language of H. R. 11 is well known to the courts, however, and they have the Standard Stations case as a model. Consequently, I should hope that the bill could be enforced by private litigants in the courts.

Question:

"Mr. MALETZ. The legality or illegality under H. R. 11 would depend upon whether the effect is to substantially lessen competition, or whether the effect is to destroy or prevent competition, would it not?" (p. 179).

Answer: If the good-faith defense is made out, yes; the illegality would hinge upon that distinction.

Question: Mr. Keating asked the question whether the distinctions referred to in the preceding question would be wiped out if the good-faith proviso were eliminated.

"Mr. KEATING. There wouldn't be any such question raised if we struck out completely the proviso about good faith, would there?" (p. 179).

Answer: No.

Question: Mr. Maletz raised the question concerning a statement made by Mr. Patman during the debate on the Robinson-Patman bill which was quoted in the majority opinion in the Standard (Indiana) case, at page 260 of 340 United States, as follows:

"Mr. PATMAN. It means they might meet competition, but not cut down the price below cost. It means an equally low price, but not below that."

Answer: This statement was made in the specific context of what a retail chain may do in its prices to consumers when there is no effect of creating inequalities among buyers for resale. The full part of the statement by the Supreme Court is as follows:

"Mr. PATMAN. If the Senate amendment should be adopted, it would really destroy the bill. It would permit the corporate chains to go into a local market, cut the price down so low that it would destroy local competitors, and make up for their losses in other places where they had already destroyed their competitors. One of the objects of the bill is to get around that phrase and prevent the large corporate chains from selling below cost in certain localities, thus destroying the independent merchants, and making it up at other places where their competitors have already been destroyed. I hope the gentleman will not insist on the Senate amendment, because it would be very destructive of the bill. The phrase 'equally low price' means the corporate chain will have the right to compete with the local merchants. They may meet competition, which is all right, but they cannot cut down the price below cost for the purpose of destroying the local man.

"Mr. COOPER of Ohio. What does the gentleman's proviso mean?

"Mr. PATMAN. It means they may meet competition, but not cut down the price below cost. It means an equally low price, but not below that. It permits competition, but it does not permit them to cut the price below cost in order to destroy their competitors. I hope the gentleman will not insist on the Senate amendment."

Question:

"Mr. KEATING. * * * Is not there danger that this legislation, if that is the effect of it, would tend to put a lot of little people out of business [referring to the effect of the bill upon small manufacturers]" (p. 155).

And also:

"Mr. MCCULLOCH. Does the author of this bill conceive of any examples whereby it could be the ruination of the suppliers?" (p. 160).

Answer: Under the Standard of Indiana decision, there is extremely wide freedom for sellers to discriminate in prices. This being true, big manufacturers and big suppliers of all kinds are enjoying unfair advantages over their smaller competitors.

And may I ad lib, Mr. Chairman, on just this particular thing?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly. I want to say this, Mr. PATMAN: This statement is very well drawn up, and it indicates a great deal of care and research, and I want to thank you and the members of the staff who may have helped prepare it.

Mr. PATMAN. The members of the staff are entitled to most of the credit; we worked yesterday and early this morning on it.

There is a tremendous bounty offered for the destruction of the independent merchant. That sounds like a terrible statement, but it is true.

Congress didn't intend it so, but Congress did it, and we are to blame—all of us are to blame. It comes about under our tax laws, not under any laws passed by this committee.

Now, a local merchant is in competition with a national chain across the street, and this chain starts selling below cost to put the independent out of business.

Say the chain during 1955 lost $100,000 doing this, and the independent merchant also lost $100,000. The result was that the local merchant had to go out of business. He was a local corporation, but he lost everything. Well, the big national chain can deduct that as an expense, and will save $52,000 by doing it. In other words, its $100,000 loss, after taxes, amounts to only $48,000. Then the national chain can buy out the competitor that has been destroyed, and the national chain can also deduct that $100,000 that the independent lost and get a tax deduction equal to $52,000 in cash. In other words, it gets back the remaining $52,000 of its $100,000 loss.

In addition to that, let's say the independent had an original paid-in capital of $100,000. Then the chain can refund its stockholders by that amount, as a return of capital, which is an income to stockholders that is exempt from individual income taxes. In summary, there are three bounties offered for destroying the independent merchants of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no doubt that our tax laws are faulty in that regard and many other regards. But is your premise correct—if there was price discrimination and selling below cost, wouldn't that be a violation of the Robinson-Patman Act?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. But it takes a little time to get around to enforcing the law, particularly if it is necessary to prove purpose to destroy a competitor.

Mr. MALETZ. Is there any provision in the Robinson-Patman Act which would prohibit selling below cost?

The CHAIRMAN. If it is done deliberately to destroy a competitor, that would be a violation, wouldn't it?

Mr. PATMAN. The question of intent would have to be shown.

Mr. MALETZ. But is it a violation of the Robinson-Patman Act as such specifically, or is it a violation of the Sherman Act?

The CHAIRMAN. If its intent is to destroy.

Mr. PATMAN. The case is pending now in Fort Worth, where the Department of Justice caused the indictment of a national chain for just that very thing——

Mr. MALETZ. That is the Safeway case, I understand.

Mr. PATMAN. And that is under section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, which became a part of the act in the Senate. Senator Borah offered the amendment, and it has put into the criminal statute everything that we have done in the civil statute. I mean that that was the intent of it, and it is under that section that the indictments were returned at Fort Worth within the last year and are now pending. I don't think there have been any trials.

Shall I continue, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. PATMAN. The effect of H. R. 11 will be to narrow the latitude for price discriminations. Hence, the advantages which big suppliers now enjoy over their smaller competitors will tend to be contracted; and the competition between suppliers will be more a question of which suppliers can produce and sell at the lowest average cost. Consequently, big manufacturers and big suppliers of all kinds who are relatively inefficient and high cost could conceivably be hurt by smaller, more efficient competitors.

For example, under the Standard Oil (Indiana) opinion, let us say that a small manufacturer of some unknown brand of breakfast food, with no distribution system of his own, goes to A. & P. and offers A. & P. his total output at a low price. Then General Foods would be justified in meeting that low price to A. & P. without at the same time giving A. & P.'s competitors the low price. This, then, would have the effect of foreclosing the market to a small manufacturer and, at the same time, creating inequalities among the retail buyers, so that A. & P. would have an advantage over the smaller buyers.

Under H. R. 11, however, if it could be proved that General Foods' discriminations substantially lessen competition or tended to create a monopoly, then the discrimination would be illegal. Consequently, the effect of H. R. 11 will tend to remove a coercive practice against small manufacturers as well as reduce unjustified inequities among retail buyers.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. PATMAN, I would like to ask this question for clarification, without indicating views pro or con on this important matter—and it is a very important matter.

As I understand it presently, there are a number of absolute defenses even where there are differentials in price charged by the seller. For example the seller can defend successfully by showing the differences in price were for due allowances in the difference of cost of manufacture.

Mr. PATMAN. Manufacture, sale, or delivery; that is written into the law.

The CHAIRMAN. Manufacture, sale, or delivery. Another successful defense could be that the differential was caused by the changing conditions affecting the market. And another defense could be the selection of customers.

Mr. PATMAN. Provided it is not used as a cloak to try to hide a price discrimination; that is, the seller may change his price at any time if he offers it to all customers alike.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right. But those justifications are regardless of good faith.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; it couldn't be any other way.

The CHAIRMAN. They are absolute defenses?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. They are absolute defenses even if they substantially lessen competition in a given area?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, I think that would be correct, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is right.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir; I think it is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, my question, then, is this: Why should there be a distinction between the good faith defense—and you have it in your proviso—and the other defenses available to the seller?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, under section 7 of the merger act, 2 large concerns, or 1 large and 1 small, can merge without being guilty of violating the law, even though the merger substantially lessens competition, if it is done for investment purposes.

Now, in this case it is a congressional phrase that was put in here about good faith that has caused us all this trouble. And we don't want to strike it out entirely; we are not asking to strike it out entirely. Not that we wouldn't favor it, we would, but because we know we couldn't expect to get the bill through in a reasonable length of time—and these independent merchants are screaming, and they have a right to scream. It has been 5 years, and there is no change in this law.

It should be done quickly and immediately, and we are not willing to ask for too much.

The CHAIRMAN. Those are extraneous observations.

Mr. PATMAN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I wonder if you could answer specifically why other defenses are available but not good faith even though the adverse effect on competition is the same?

Mr. PATMAN. In the merger statute?

The CHAIRMAN. No; in the sections that I referred to.

In other words, we have various absolute defenses we have just referred to including good faith. Now, you make a distinction and use good faith as a defense.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, if they had properly interpreted the self-defense, I don't think this question would be involved.

The CHAIRMAN. If who hadn't?

Mr. PATMAN. The Supreme Court.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, they have interpreted it in that way.

Mr. PATMAN. I say "properly interpreted it."

The CHAIRMAN. We can't change that.

Mr. PATMAN. We can by law if we pass this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't know whether you are doing it or not.

Mr. PATMAN. We will risk it.

The CHAIRMAN. I wonder whether you will actually do it.

Mr. PATMAN. We think so.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Any other observations?

Mr. PATMAN. We are finished, Mr. Chairman.

May I state just an observation, that Mr. Keating—I am sorry he is not here—spoke yesterday about the discharge petition, which I hope is not important. The main thing is passing a bill if it is justified, and the question of procedure is not the point.

But may I say in answer to Mr. Keating's statement that a discharge petition is a way to stop a bill, that only one bill has ever been passed by Congress through a discharge petition.

Well, I happened to have some personal knowledge of that. You know there is what was called an adjusted service certificate debt that was owed to veterans of World War I, sometimes called the bonus.

I offered a bill to pay that in cash. And three times that bill came before the House by a discharge petition. On the first two occasions the petition required only one-third of the members, 145; and they changed the rule to make it 218, thinking it would be impossible for us to get that many signers on the petition to bring it up the third time. But we brought it up the third time with 218.

Now, that petition was effective the early part of January 1936. That petition, being there and effective, so that the bill could be called up very soon after the Congress met, caused the Ways and Means Committee to get up a bill of its own, which bill did all that I wanted done, consequently, we didn't pass the bill under the petition, but we did pass a bill because the petition was there.

Now, there is a case where the petition itself didn't pass that particular bill, but it caused the passage of a bill which accomplished the same purpose. And there have been many other cases just like that one.

The CHAIRMAN. I might say this: The filing of a discharge petition or the status of a discharge petition at this moment has no effect whatsoever as far as my judgment is concerned.

Mr. PATMAN. That is fine. And I hope that the committee will give the same consideration as they would have given if the discharge petition had not been filed.

The CHAIRMAN. I am quite sure you will find that the committee will do that.

Mr. PATMAN. I understand—I believe in a Member using every parliamentary device that is legal and honorable that he can use to get consideration of a bill which he believes to be in the public interest. And that is the reason I used the petition in this instance.

I want to invite your attention to the fact that other bills have been made law the same way, like a bill introduced by Mr. ROGERS of Florida, an accumulated bill by petition; a bill of Mr. CROSSER of Ohio, on railroad retirement; and a bill of Mr. MILLER of California, on providing additional benefits for postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal service, and so forth.

A number of bills have been enacted into law by reason of the discharge petition route, and although not all of them, and very few of them, were enacted just that way, they were enacted by reason of the existence of the petition, because of the existence of the petition the laws were actually passed.

Now, I hope, Mr. Chairman, that you will give every consideration to this. Time is of the essence. There are many people, more small men going into bankruptcy today than ever before in recent history, and there are fewer new businesses organizing. What you might call the Captain Kidd's in business are having a field day since that Standard Oil decision in 1951, every day causes additional losses of small businesses and causes the big fellows to gain more toward monopoly.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. PATMAN, you probably know that we sat all day yesterday and the day before that. We probably will have to sit all day Monday, and I don't know how many other days, because we have fully a score of other witnesses.

Mr. PATMAN. I ask just one thing, Mr. Chairman: That you not mix this up with the other bills that require a lot more hearings. I hope you give us early consideration on this bill, because the small-business people of the Nation have centered on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. I couldn't very well refuse to hear the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, Mr. Barnes, or the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, or the Empire State Petroleum——

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, the Small Business Administration may be expected to be just like the other administrative agencies, and that I can't understand, because this is something that will help small business; why they are opposed to it I don't understand. And the Democrats are to blame, too.

The CHAIRMAN. Most of these businesses are representatives of wholesale and retail organizations.

Mr. PATMAN. I was talking about the Small Business Administration.

Now, the Democrats are on the spot here. We are always talking about big business and about the Republicans being big business minded, but we are here, we have a chance to help little business, just big business won't get the job done for the Democrats, we have to do something for the little fellows.

I hope the committee gets a chance to pass a bill that will do something for the little fellows.

The CHAIRMAN. If there were a Republican here he would answer that, but we try to keep politics out of this.

Mr. PATMAN. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration will give you a speech on this; I know what he will have to say. I have heard him before. I am not condemning him as a person; I know it is because of the party he is in.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I can throw any light on this particular subject, but I would like to have your attention for just a moment to try. Each and every one of us here favors the idea of small business.

One of the largest small-business operations in the United States today is that of the gasoline service stations and it is probably because of the gasoline service stations that this subject comes to us today for discussion. I do not want to do anything, and I am sure you gentlemen here do not want to do anything, to in any way hinder the operation of the small business known as the gasoline service station. I am not exactly familiar with the case as it has been brought to us today but I believe I know how it came about.

There was a jobber in Detroit that set this particular price which was considered discrimination. There are several different ways of getting at a price. The question that was brought to this particular jobber in establishing the price was that he had a better price than did his competitor. His competitor who probably was selling the same kind of commodity, which was a standard gasoline, was buying from a marketer of the Standard Oil Co. He as a jobber, because he was handling the product, keeping the books, making deliveries to his own service station, had a cent or a cent and a half better price to his service stations than the man who bought the commodity from the marketer who would make the delivery. For that reason it was held to be discriminatory.

If I understand correctly the thing this legislation does is to make it impossible for the marketer or for the oil company to meet the price of the so-called cut-rate gasoline stations. That is the particular thing that I want to clear up. This happens in each and every town in the United States where there are major oil companies. Having been connected with a major oil company for the last 20 years, I know something about how they operate.

They sell their product at an established tank-wagon price that is posted

at their bulk plant. That is sold to all of the particular dealers in a given area at that price. If some other outfit comes in, known as a cut-rate company, and undersells their price, the only way that this dealer can meet that price is to get permission from his supplier, which in this case is the Standard Oil Co. If he does not get that permission he cannot meet the price of the so-called cut-rate service station. As I understand it, this law would not give to the supplier, the Standard Oil Co. in this case, the right to meet the particular price.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman has a misconception. The right the Standard Oil Co. may have in that particular instance is this: If the Standard Oil Co. wants to reduce its price to all of those in that market, it could do so. What this bill says in effect is if they reduce it to one of its customers without justifiable reason, and this does affect interstate commerce and tends to create a monopoly, then the only manner in which it could avoid illegal discrimination would be to sell to all others at the same price. That would be a perfect defense. Now, the Standard Oil Co. or any other company is not prohibited from selling at any price that they want to. They are prohibited, however, from selecting one customer and discriminating against him. Now, there is nothing to prevent the Standard Oil Co. or any other company from fairly engaging and meeting competition.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. I do not think that we have made this quite clear.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. First of all, I believe the gentleman made the statement that it would prohibit the Standard Oil Co. from meeting a competitor's price.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. That is right. It is my understanding, that if station Q here happens to handle a so-called off-brand gasoline and sells it for 2 or 3 or 4 cents less than the Standard Oil Co., which has established a business across the street, through a dealer, they may not come in and protect the man who is operating that service station.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. There is nothing in the pending bill, or in the Robinson-Patman Act, that would prohibit the Standard Oil Co. from coming in and protecting its own retail dealer if they wanted to do so.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Let me ask this question. What brings this particular subject up for debate here today?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It is brought about because the Supreme Court in 1951, by a 5 to 3 decision, which was in essence a 5 to 4 decision, because Justice Minton who sat on the circuit court did not participate, held that the Standard Oil Co. was not in violation of the Robinson-Patman Act after the Federal Trade Commission had issued a cease and desist order where the company had gone into an area in Detroit, Mich., and had given to certain of its preferred customers a differential or advantage that was not extended to others. When good faith was asserted as a defense, the Supreme Court held in effect that regardless of how commerce may be affected or how the practice complained of may tend to create a monopoly, that the defense must prevail. This legislation is to set aside that decision and to reinstate, we think, what was intended by the Robinson-Patman Act, in the first instance; that is to say, to prohibit discrimination. Now, this legislation is aimed at that decision. We now say to these people, "When you come into an area you can charge anything you want; however, you cannot discriminate. If you seek to interpose the good-faith defense that you acted in good faith to meet competition, then you had better insure that you made the same price available to all your customers in that area; in that event, you will never be before the Federal Trade Commission."

And, we go one step further: If the discrimination does not substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly, good faith is a valid defense.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Let me ask this question and clear this up. Let us determine what is discrimination in this particular case. Now, this particular gasoline dealer here is buying from a so-called marketer at a certain price. Now, it may be that the jobber owns his own service station.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman probably is confusing the question.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. No; I am not confusing the question. I am trying to define discrimination.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Let me tell the gentleman what the discrimination was.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Are they selling at the same price?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. No; that is what the difficulty was. They gave to one customer a preferential price that they did not give to the other, and that results in discrimination and a violation of the Robinson-Patman Act, as it was originally written.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HARRISON] has again expired.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. I want to establish here that the Standard Oil Co. in this particular case was the supplier for all of these service stations and the particular service station that we are bringing our case against was a legitimate dealer of the Standard Oil Co. Having been associated with major oil companies for almost 20 years, I think I know something about how they operate. They do not discriminate against the dealers in a particular area. I think the case we have in point here is a case where this particular service station was being supplied by a jobber that gave him a little better price than he would have gotten had he been buying the same merchandise from the so-called marketer. For that reason we call this discrimination, when the truth is that he probably sold himself gasoline at a tank-wagon price, but he gets a better price because he takes care of the gasoline, the bookkeeping, makes his own deliveries, et cetera. Therefore, it is called discrimination.

I do not think we should eliminate this fellow who wants to go into business for himself and probably operate his own bulk plant and his own service station at the same time. I have been in that particular end of the business, where I operated the so-called bulk plant and operated the service station at the same time. I think the discrimination that is being talked of here is not the case in point. In no case do any of the oil companies that I know anything about, and I think I know something about most of them, operate as has been suggested here, that is, have preferred customers in a particular area where they show discrimination for one as against the other.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I cannot now take the time of the House to read the Supreme Court decision. But as we interpret it, a complaint was filed by the Federal Trade Commission because of a differential given to one that was not given to the other. The Federal Trade Commission concluded that this constituted discrimination.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. For the sake of the argument, let us make sure that we are talking about the same thing. I do not think there is any discrimination. If there is a kind of discrimination as the gentleman suggests, I am for eliminating that also.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Surely.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. But in the operation of these two service stations I think there is probably reason for this so-called discrimination that we are talking of.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. What we are trying to get at is this: The Standard Oil Co. offered in good faith to cut its price to one individual in order to meet the competitive situation. The Federal Trade Commission, on examining the facts, arrived at the conclusion that the company's action substantially lessened competition and tended to create a monopoly. Accordingly, the Commission issued a cease and desist order. The circuit court, on review, upheld the order of the Federal Trade Commission.

The Supreme Court upheld the contention of the company to the effect that the supplier's good faith purpose in meeting competition afforded an absolute defense regardless of the competitive consequences.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. And they still may do that in good faith?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. No. According to the interpretation of some, the decision virtually eliminates the Robinson-Patman Act because all a man would have to do under the Supreme Court decision would be to come in and say, "I did this in good faith to meet a competitive situation. I can discriminate because I have a customer here I want to sell to." In this particular instance that is what it was. "So I will discriminate in his favor because I have done it in good faith to meet a competitive situation, and I can violate section 1 (a) of the Robinson-Patman Act."

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. This eliminates the good-faith portion of this particular legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. No, no.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. We want to make it clear that we still have in fact good faith.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. You can sell for any price you want under the Robinson-Patman Act although you cannot discriminate, but even under certain conditions you may sell at a different price and still not be in violation.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. I merely want to establish that the supplier here, whoever it may be, may go in and establish a price to meet in good faith the price of some station that is selling at a cut rate. He may do that. He also may be a supplier and a dealer, too, in establishing his price on the merchandise that he buys.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It makes no difference. He can go in and establish any price he wants to and he is not in violation of the law.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. The gentleman is talking about the selling price. I am talking about the buying price. If he is a jobber, can he still buy at a less price and also operate a service station?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. This bill has nothing to do with the situation where he may be a jobber and a retailer at the same time.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Somewhere along the line you have to establish the discrimination.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes, but good faith is still a defense; but if it substantially lessens competition or tends to create a monopoly, and then the discrimination does that, then it is no longer a defense. If it is an isolated instance and has nothing to do with interstate commerce, then it is still all right.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. If I may address my remarks to the gentleman from Colorado, my understanding is that you must sell to everyone who is similarly situated. Regardless of whether you are selling to a jobber or to the retailer you must give the same price to everyone that is in the same situation, but you must not sell one jobber at less than you sell another, or you must not sell one retailer at a less price than you sell another, that is, in the same trade area.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Section 2 (a) of the Robinson-Patman Act prohibits this discrimination. Section 2 (b) is the good-faith setup. You plead good faith as a defense. If you have sold equally to everybody, no discrimination would be present and hence the law would not be violated.

Mr. BELCHER. As I understand it, the gentleman from Nebraska is concerned here with whether you would have to sell to a retailer at the same price you would have to sell to a jobber. That is not required. If you are selling to a jobber, then all jobbers must receive the same price. If you are selling to a retailer, then each retailer must receive the same price. There would be no discrimination selling a jobber at a less price than you would sell a retailer. Is that not the gentleman's question?

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. The answer is that this bill would not eliminate a functual discount of a jobber. The functional part of it he is entitled to. It does not do that.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. I want to refer to the gentleman's question where he asked if the defense of good faith was knocked out by this new proposed law now before us. The existing law, Mr. Chairman, provides that in these cases it is a defense to show that the lower price was made in order to meet competition in good faith when necessary. Now, I submit, Mr. Chairman, the present bill knocks out that defense of good faith entirely. It says that good faith shall be a defense unless the charge is that there is a substantial lessening of competition. A case never comes up at all unless there is a question of substantially lessening competition. So, I say that for all practical purposes, this bill knocks out entirely the defense of good faith which is now in the law.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. That is my understanding and if that is the case, I think everyone should vote against this particular bill.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. I must say to the gentleman that I have a contrary interpretation of the provision of this act as compared to the interpretation just given by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS]. Good faith is continued as a defense, but good faith is not continued as a complete defense. Good faith may be pleaded, but there may be other factors brought into the case such as tending towards a monopoly or whether there is such damage as will injure competition. If those factors are brought in, then good faith is no defense. In other words, good faith as a defense is continued, but it is not a complete defense since other factors may be brought in and considered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this debate clearly indicates that this bill is not a simple one.

In order that there may be a clearer understanding of the pros and cons of this bill, I should like to unfold to you the thoughts of the Committee on the Judiciary as to both sides of this question.

The pending bill, H. R. 1840, amends section 2 (b) of the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936 which reads, and I quote:

(b) Upon proof being made, at any hearing on a complaint under this section, that there has been discrimination in price or services or facilities furnished, the burden of rebutting the prima-facie case thus made by showing justification shall be upon the person charged with a violation of this section, and unless justification shall be affirmatively shown, the Commission is authorized to issue an order terminating the discrimination: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained shall prevent a seller rebutting the prima-facie case thus made by showing that his lower price or the furnishing of services or facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor.

The bill would amend the section's proviso so that unless the effect of a discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, it shall be a complete defense for a seller charged with discrimination to show that his lower price was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor.

The purpose of the bill is to modify a 5 to 3 decision of the Supreme Court in the 1951 case of *Standard Oil Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (340 U. S. 231) which held that regardless of the injurious effect on competition, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for a seller to show that his differential was made in good faith to meet a lawful and equally low price of a competitor. Stated another way, a majority of the Court construed section 2 (b) as meaning that a seller is justified in carrying on a discriminatory pricing practice if the discrimination is made in good faith to retain a customer who would otherwise purchase supplies from a competing seller who offers, on a lawful basis, a price lower than the seller who discriminates in his prices.

Against this background, the bill removes good faith (in meeting an equally low price of a competitor) as a defense to a charge of discrimination upon proof by the complainant that the effect of the discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce. It is important to note, however, that the good faith provision of section 2 (b) is still preserved as a complete defense to a charge of discrimination when the effect of the discrimination falls short of the requisite substantial lessening of competition. Good faith, for instance, would still be a complete defense to a discrimination where the effect of the activity may be to injure, destroy, or prevent competition with any person who either grants or knowingly receives the benefit of such discrimination, or with customers of either of them.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CELLER. I prefer not to until I get my entire statement on the record.

Virtually every small-business organization throughout the country has stressed the urgent need for passage of this measure. On the other hand, the Department of Justice and every other Government agency concerned with the matter, with the exception of the Federal Trade Commission, has registered opposition to the bill. The Federal Trade Commission by a 4 to 1 vote originally opposed the bill; subsequently two commissioners reversed their position as a result of which the Commission by a 3 to 2 vote now favors passage.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I will have to yield first to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS]. I do not want to be guilty of discrimination.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. I understood the gentleman from New York to say that the good faith defense would still exist if the charge was that the practice complained of prevented competition, but the bill itself says that the good faith defense is knocked out if the practice complained of substantially lessened competition. If the practice prevents competition, does it not follow that it substantially lessens competition, and therefore that the good faith defense would be knocked out under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. CELLER. No. I do not think that is exactly the situation. Good faith is still a defense where the effect of the discrimination is to, and I quote the words that are used in section 2 (a), "injure, destroy, and prevent competition with any person." But when the effect may be to substantially lessen competition in a given area, then good faith is not a defense under the bill. Good faith may still be applicable as a defense where the injury is to an individual competitor but not to the vigor of competition.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HYDE. The gentleman mentioned opposition to this bill by the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, and other officials of this administration. Is it not equally true that this proposal has been opposed by previous administrations, the Secretary of Commerce under the previous administration, the Attorney General under a previous administration, and the President under a previous administration?

Mr. CELLER. I believe that some departments of the previous administration did voice opposition.

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. In face of this sharp difference of opinion the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, which held hearings on the pending measure, has endeavored to give both proponents and opponents the fullest opportunity to present their views. Our subcommittee made every effort to develop the facts by examining witnesses on both sides of the issue. Beyond that, the purpose and effects of the bill were analyzed from every possible point of view. Because of this divergence of opinion I think it would be very helpful to Members of this body to be apprised of the point of view of those favoring the bill as well as the point of view of those opposed, as manifested in the hearings before our committee.

Before I do that I want to give you my own personal opinion. There is good and there is bad in this bill; there are equities and there are inequities, advantages and disadvantages; but who am I to pit my views against the very rich talent of the proponents represented by the score of retail organizations who are directly affected by this bill? And I would say that the balance as between the good and the bad is in favor of the good, and because the balance is in favor of the good I shall vote for this bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman stated a while ago that a previous administration had voiced opposition to this bill. May I remind the gentleman that the bill was signed by one previous administration, by Mr. Roosevelt, on June 19, 1936; and then there was a bill that would have injured——

Mr. CELLER. I was not talking about the original Robinson-Patman Act.

Mr. PATMAN. I am just leading on down through the historical steps to the point I want to bring out. There was a bill that would have injured, that would have had something to do with this very provision of law that passed Congress and Mr. Truman vetoed it on June 16, 1950. So prior administrations have really been in favor of the bill that we are now sponsoring instead of being against it.

Mr. CELLER. Was that not the basing point bill?

Mr. PATMAN. It was.

Mr. CELLER. The basing point problem has no relation to this bill.

Mr. PATMAN. It does not except when used as a guide under the guise of price discrimination or could lead to price discrimination.

Mr. CELLER. I think this bill does not disturb existing law on the basing point pricing system.

Mr. PATMAN. Not at all except when that method is used as a method of price discrimination.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. As the gentleman knows, I asked the gentleman from Texas about the effect this legislation might have on the basing point or other pricing systems. I have asked the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York, his views on it and I would appreciate what he believes to be the case on this question. Does or does not this legislation involve the basing point or other pricing systems?

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman did ask me that question. The answer is that this bill has no relation to the so-called basing point pricing system, and it does not disturb the existing law as to basing point pricing as enunciated in two cases: *Federal Trade Commission* v. *The Cement Institute* (333 U. S. 735); and *Federal Trade Commission* v. *A. E. Staley Manufacturing Company* (324 U. S. 746). In the testimony given by Judge Barnes, head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, there is noted the following at page 185 of the hearings:

In the Staley case the Court had said:

"But 2 (b) does not concern itself with pricing systems or even with all the seller's discriminatory prices to buyers. It speaks only of the seller's 'lower' price and of that only to the extent that it is made 'in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor.' The act thus places emphasis on individual competitive situations, rather than upon a general system of competition."

Mr. FORD. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I will proceed with what I have determined to be the arguments advanced by the proponents of the bill.

Those urging passage of the bill testified that as a result of the Standard of Indiana decision the Robinson-Patman Act is in a seriously weakened condition for the reason that good faith justification is allowed to permit discrimination between different purchasers notwithstanding the fact that the discrimination may injure competition substantially or tend to create a monopoly. Accordingly, the decision, it was stated, has had the effect of reestablishing an infirmity in the original Clayton Act of 1914, which Congress thought it had rectified by passage of the Robinson-Patman Act. This infirmity consisted of the provision in the original Clayton Act that a seller could absolve himself from a charge of price discrimination by showing that his lower price was offered in good faith to meet competition. That provision largely nullified original section 2 of the Clayton Act and was one of the principal reasons for enactment of the Robinson-Patman amendment. Unless this loophole is now plugged, a seller can engage in the very kinds of practices that necessitated enactment of the Robinson-Patman amendment. Under present law as determined by the Supreme Court a supplier is free to discriminate in favor of a customer who has been offered a lower price by a competing supplier, irrespective of the injury that such discrimination may inflict on his other customers. To mention a concrete situation, assume that a large national merchandiser with thousands of stores across the country purchases the entire output of a small independent canner. The large merchandiser receives a lower unit price because, among other reasons, the canner has no promotion costs since it is selling its entire output to one large buyer. The merchandiser takes the price quotation given by the small canner to a large canner of the same product who markets under a well-known name brand, and asks to be given the same price. Since the small independent canner is in competition with a name brand canner in supplying the large merchandiser with a product of like grade and quality, the large canner may, under present law, meet the small canner's price to the chain while charging its other customers in competition with the large merchandiser a much higher price.

As another illustration, under present law it is entirely possible for a seller of nationally distributed goods to discriminate, with impunity, in favor of a large retail chain by giving that chain a price lower than that charged to small competing retailers and then completely justify this discrimination by showing that the large retailer had first obtained the same low price from a local low-cost producer of competitive goods.

What is more, by permitting an absolute defense in meeting competition, the

favored buyer has every incentive to hold his resale price to that prevailing in the market since he can thereby enjoy a larger margin of profit. It was argued that it is false to assume that when a price discrimination favors a particular buyer, that he will pass this advantage on to the consumer by reducing his resale price. On the contrary, the favored buyer is under less economic compulsion to reduce his resale price, for the simple reason that his competitors have not received the same preferential treatment.

Those testifying for the bill note that the argument has been made that if to meet a competitor's lower price a seller must lower his prices to all of his customers in the pertinent market, the seller may not reduce his prices at all and the consumer will be deprived of the benefits of competition. This contention is stated to be unsound since it is more reasonable to assume that to resist vigorous price competition the seller will be forced to lower his price to all in the market, a circumstance which is far more advantageous to the consuming public.

Proponents of the measure also point out that under section 3 of the Clayton Act, and under the Celler-Kefauver amendment to section 7 of the Clayton Act, mergers are prohibited where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. This presents a strange anomaly since section 2 of the Clayton Act permits discriminations having the same injurious effect. If it is in the public interest to protect the competitive economy from injuries arising out of harmful mergers and exclusive dealing arrangements, it should be equally in the public interest to prevent discriminations having the same undesirable effect.

Finally, according to the proponents the bill is hardly premature and it is incorrect that no defendant charged with discrimination has been successful in justifying his action on the grounds of meeting competition. For one thing, last October the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in the Balian Ice Cream Co., Inc., against Arden Farms Co. upheld a lower court finding that a seller's prices were made in good faith to meet competition. Just this last month the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit overruled the Federal Trade Commission in the Standard of Indiana proceeding and held that Standard had met the good-faith defense. Apart from that, there is an overriding need to protect the economy against discriminations which injure competition substantially; it simply makes no sense to wait until maximum damage is done by so-called good-faith discriminations before the statute is amended.

I turn now to the arguments of the opponents.

Opponents of the bill testified that the Standard of Indiana decision correctly interpreted the legislative history of the Robinson-Patman amendments and merely restated what most people thought the law already was. In their view the Supreme Court did nothing more than hold that a seller can reduce his price in good faith to meet a lower price offered by a competitor to his customer in order not to lose that particular account.

More basically, opponents of the measure take the position that the Standard of Indiana decision is consonant with the Nation's antitrust policy. They stress that a seller's right to meet a competitor's price by granting price differentials to some customers without reducing his prices to all must remain an essential qualification to any anti-price discrimination law. For a seller required by law to reduce prices to some only at the cost of reducing prices to all may well end by reducing them to none. As the Federal Trade Commission stated in 1953:

"The right to meet a lower price which a competitor is offering to a customer, when this is done in good faith, is the essence of competition and must be permitted in a free competitive economy." Anything less would move the price discrimination statute into irreconcilable conflict with the Sherman Act. This was aptly stated by Mr. Justice Jackson who observed during the oral argument in the Standard of Indiana case, "The whole philosophy of the Sherman Act is to go out and compete, get business, fight for it." Now, the whole philosophy we are asked to enforce here is that you really must not; you should let this business go and not meet the competition. I have difficulty in knowing where we are with this.

Additionally, it was testified that the bill might be harmful to small manufacturers and other small enterprises selling to buyers for resale who might have to reduce prices to one or more customers to meet price competition of large manufacturers and other large sellers. For example, assume A is a small manufacturer doing business in a limited area. He sells his product for a price of $1. Manufacturer B is a giant in the same industry who sells a comparable product for 90 cents. However, in the past, manufacturer B has not sold in the area serviced by A. B, the giant manufacturer, now decides that he will invade A's market and try to get A's largest customer. This customer states that he will be obliged to switch his account to manufacturer B unless A can meet the price of 90 cents. If H. R. 1840 becomes law, A in order to retain this one customer would have to reduce his price to all his customers to 90 cents. In situations such as this, if small sellers are required to reduce their price to all their customers in order to retain one account, they might well be forced out of business as a result.

Opponents also testified that the Standard of Indiana decision has not adversely affected enforcement of section 2 (a) of the Clayton Act; indeed, since the case was decided the Commission has issued a cease and desist order in every one of the six cases reaching it in which the good faith defense was raised. Consequently, any recommendation for a change in the law at this time is premature.

Another objection raised is that H. R. 1840 would make the good faith defense inapplicable whenever the effect of the discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition but would leave the defense still available when there would be an injury to competition with any person. The difficulty is that the courts have never distinguished between a substantial lessening of competition and an injury to competition with any person. In fact, in every case that has dealt with the Robinson-Patman amendment since it was passed in 1936, the courts have assumed that the two phrases were synonymous. Since nobody has ever attempted to distinguish these two phrases, the effect of the bill would be to eliminate the 2 (b) proviso of good faith from the statute altogether. This, the opponents have stated, would place the seller in a virtual strait-jacket and deny him the fundamental right to meet competition which is essential in our free enterprise economy.

I have given you as best I can the views of those in favor of the bill and the views of those opposed to the bill. You must cast the ballot of decision. I have given serious consideration to the matter and as I indicated before, this bill has many hidden meanings; it presents many problems. I may be wrong, though I doubt it, but it is very much like an iceberg. You can see one-fourth of the iceberg, but possibly three-fourths of that iceberg is submerged and hidden. There are many things in this bill which may take many Supreme Court decisions to clarify, for example the distinction between the injury clauses of section 2 (a) which are crucial in determining whether the good faith defense is applicable. However, in view of what the proponents have pointed out, and in view of the importance of this bill in protecting the economy against discriminations, particularly the small business segment of the economy, I shall vote for the bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. First, I should like to commend the gentleman on his very enlightening presentation of the arguments for and against the bill. Since I have been a Member of this House I think it is the finest example of a chairman of a committee coming before Congress and explaining the pros and cons of a bill. The gentleman is to be commended. I certainly think the Members of the House owe him a debt of gratitude.

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. SAYLOR. I should like to ask the gentleman a question because this has been raised by some of the people from my district in the gasoline business. How will this bill if passed prevent the gasoline wars that have taken place in the past? Is there anything in the bill that will prevent that?

Mr. CELLER. I do not think it will prevent some of the wars. It may alleviate and, shall I say, "reduce a bit of the swelling."

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Ohio, the Member on this side who is handling this legislation, what his interpretation of this legislation is as it affects delivered pric-

ing, freight absorption or basing-point matters?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I do not know if I have any opinion concerning basing-point matters. However, I have no hesitancy in saying that I think this legislation has nothing to do whatsoever with delivered prices or freight absorption. If this statement is not correct, I should like to have any member of the Committee on the Judiciary who is present in the Committee of the Whole correct me. It is also my understanding that no member of the subcommittee thought this proposed legislation had any effect on the law as it now is with respect to delivered prices or freight absorption. It is also my understanding that no member of the entire Judiciary Committee when the legislation was being considered was of the opinion that it affected delivered prices or freight absorption.

Mr. FORD. I greatly appreciate the views of the gentleman from Ohio. It seems to me from the remarks made by the gentleman from Texas, the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the full committee, and the gentleman from Ohio, that this legislation as we have it here today will have no impact on freight absorption, delivered pricing, or the basing-point problem. In view of these assurances, Mr. Chairman, I believe this legislation should be enacted.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of H. R. 1840.

Along with fellow members of the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have had occasion over the past several years to hear a succession of witnesses on fundamental aspects of price discrimination. This testimony reflected serious thought and the crystallization of mature judgment on the central issue raised by H. R. 1840, which I introduced in January 1955. And I would emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Representative CELLER, conducted the recent hearings on this bill in a manner best calculated to develop the facts and the full implications of this measure; to permit full exploration of arguments on both sides of the issue; and, in short, to provide adequate opportunity for every pertinent point of view to be heard. I also want to compliment the Chairman on the excellent report issued by the Committee on the pending bill.

This bill seeks to reaffirm and restore the original intendment of the Robinson-Patman Act which, as an amendment to the Clayton Act, has been on our statute books for at least two decades. I share the conviction of those who assert that the original force of the Robinson-Patman Act has been blunted by comparatively recent judicial interpretation, which now imposes a formidable roadblock to effective administration and enforcement.

As the Members of this House well know, the original purpose of the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936 was to protect the independent merchant in the competitive race for survival. At that time, it will be recalled, small business was in serious straits. The price concessions and favoritism afforded the large buyer threatened the survival of the smaller concern, regardless of its efficiency. This was made abundantly clear by a series of investigations into widespread practices by large distributors who extracted from manufacturers and processors substantial buying preferences in the form of rebates, discriminatory discounts, false brokerage payments, and similar unearned allowances.

To eliminate these evils, the Robinson-Patman Act made it illegal for a seller to discriminate in price where differentials were not justified—by such factors as the difference in cost of serving various purchasers—and would substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

The Robinson-Patman amendment is simply a specific expression of a general principle that underlies the whole body of our antitrust and trade regulation, namely, that certain forms of discrimination are inconsistent with healthy and fair competition. It is common knowledge that the big corporation can destroy its local competition by local price cutting. When price discrimination is used as a weapon of bigness, the small merchant has little chance of survival. The Robinson-Patman Act merely gives assurance to businesses, whether they be large or small, that they will receive even-handed treatment; that is to say, they may buy from manufacturers and suppliers under the same terms and conditions. The law does not require a seller-manufacturer or supplier to do business with a particular retail dealer or to avoid changes in price, but having selected small concerns and large concerns as distributors, the seller must then treat them fairly and not discriminate against either. In other words, the law is concerned only with a seller charging different buyers different prices at the same time.

I think it is fair to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Robinson-Patman Act was designed to protect the competitive opportunity of small business by prohibiting all price discriminations other than those which could be justified by cost-saving. It is well to point out in this connection that the act does not make all differences in price illegal. First of all, it does not attempt to outlaw price discrimination from which no competitive harm may result. And, if a seller has a cost-saving in supplying one buyer as against a competing buyer, then the seller is perfectly free to discriminate between its two buyers to the extent of the cost-savings. Thus the statute draws a line that rules out price discrimination stemming from the dominant position of a buyer or seller; it does not prevent market efficiencies and economy from being reflected in lower prices to purchasers. I might add that none of these provisions are altered by H. R. 1840.

Next, and this is a change about which the present controversy centers, the Robinson-Patman amendment corrected a fundamental weakness in the Clayton Act under which a seller, charged with illegal price discrimination, could always fall back on the defense that the lower price was offered in good faith to meet competition. While this defense could still be interposed procedurally, the corrective legislation, which the Congress enacted in 1936, made it clear that it could no longer be used as an escape hatch for the concerns who sought to escape the consequences of their use of price discrimination as an instrument to achieve monopoly power. On this important point, frequent reference has been made to the all important explanation by Mr. Utterback, chairman of the House managers, in reporting the conference version of the Robinson-Patman bill to the House; it bears repeating here. Judge Utterback stated:

> It is also provided that a seller may show that his lower price was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or that his furnishing of services or facilities was made in good faith to meet those furnished by a competitor * * * that this does not set up the meeting of competition as an absolute bar to a charge of discrimination under the bill. It merely permits it to be shown in evidence. This provision is entirely procedural. It does not determine substantive rights, liabilities, and duties.
>
> This procedural provision cannot be construed as a carte blanche exemption to violate the bill so long as a competitor can be shown to have violated it first, nor so long as that competition cannot be met without the use of oppressive discriminations in violation of the obvious intent of the bill.
>
> • • • • •
>
> If this proviso were construed to permit the showing of a competing offer as an absolute bar to liability for discrimination, then it would nullify the act entirely at the very inception of its enforcement, for in nearly every case mass buyers receive similar discriminations from competing sellers of the same product. One violation of law cannot be permitted to justify another.

In line with this clear declaration of principle the Federal Trade Commission as well and the reviewing court in a landmark case, rejected the plea of the Standard Oil Company of Indiana that the good faith meeting of a competitor's price establishes a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination regardless of the injury to competition that may have resulted. However, and this was in 1951, a closely divided Supreme Court upset all this. The majority of the Supreme Court upheld the contention of the Standard Oil Co. that the suppliers' good faith purpose in meeting competition is the touchstone of the law and affords an absolute defense in a price discrimination suit regardless of competitive consequences. Thus, the Court ruled that our law enforcement agencies have no power to stop a discriminatory practice even though it substantially lessens competition and tends to create a monopoly, provided only that the supplier can demonstrate that he was acting in good faith to meet the lawful and equally low price of a competitor.

Mr. Chairman, it is my considered judgment, that if this interpretation remains as the controlling case law on the subject, we are thrown back to the days before the Robinson-Patman Act was passed and the door is left wide open for the seller to engage in the very practices which the Congress sought to eliminate. Indeed, the dissenting justices in the

Standard Oil case went so far as to say that the interpretation put upon the Robinson-Patman Act by the majority of the Court "means that no real change has been brought about by the amendment."

I must agree with the dissenting justices who pointed out that the majority opinion defeats the congressional purpose which I have already outlined. I am deeply disturbed if the decision is relied upon, as the dissent suggests, to "permit a seller of nationally distributed goods to discriminate in favor of large chain retailers, for the seller could give to the large retailer a price lower than that charged to small retailers, and then could completely justify its discrimination by showing that the large retailer had first obtained the same low price from a local low-cost producer of competitive goods."

We are faced with the very real danger that big business may again take advantage of its superior size and engage in the kind of pricing that will eliminate small suppliers and small retailers from the competitive scene.

Do the Members of this House wish to permit sellers to discriminate with impunity in the sale of goods as between buyers located on opposite corners in their city? If not, H. R. 1840 provides a workable solution to the problem. Under this bill, it would be illegal, without regard to any question of good faith or bad faith, for the supplier to discriminate in his prices where the effect of such discrimination may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. However, as the Report of the Judiciary Committee on this bill makes clear, the good faith provision of section 2 (b) of the Clayton Act, to which I referred earlier, would still be an absolute defense where the effect of the discrimination may not substantially lessen competition but merely affects competition with a person who either grants or knowingly receives the benefits of such discrimination, or with customers of either the buyer or the seller. Moreover, the other qualifications presently contained in the Robinson-Patma Act would not be disturbed. A supplier may discriminate to the full extent justified by costs savings; and he may, of course, change his prices at will provided that the new price is made available to all customers.

There are those who argue that we should follow the opposite course and permit sellers to meet competition by means of discrimination. Otherwise, they warn, the seller is placed in an "economic straitjacket," may not reduce its prices at all, and the consumer will suffer. On the basis of both logic and experience this argument must be rejected as unsound. Is it not more reasonable to assume that vigorous price competition—which revitalization of the Robinson-Patman Act will help insure—would compel the concern in question to make its price reductions available to all competing buyers in the market? This, I would emphasize, is the only reliable method for protecting the interests of the consumer.

It is false to assume that when price discrimination favors a particular buyer-distributor, he will pass this advantage on to the consumer by reducing the resale price of the commodity. The fact is that he is under less economic compulsion to reduce his resale price because his competitors have not received the same preferential treatment. Indeed, the favored buyer has an incentive to hold his price to that prevailing in the market and thereby enjoy a wider margin of profit.

The assumption that consumers benefit from price discrimination as a matter of course was discredited in the Automatic Canteen Co. case where evidence was introduced by the Federal Trade Commission to show that prices were quoted this company that in some instances were 33 percent lower than prices quoted other competing candy purchasers. Nevertheless, comparable reductions in prices were not offered the consumer. Instead, the Federal Trade Commission found that the company had used its discriminatory advantage to help attain a dominant position in the market.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress has good reason to be aware of the current trend of corporate mergers and the growing domination of the market place by larger corporations. In a recent report by the Senate Small Business Committee, Congress was reminded that "in an economic atmosphere which makes it possible for the Nation's mammoth corporations to reap record profits, the general run of small enterprises are worse off than they were 3 years ago." In these circumstances, we would do well to provide the modest assistance which small business seeks when it urges our endorsement of H. R. 1840.

Nor can there be any question as to the position adopted by those who form the vital small-business segment of our economy. Small-business men throughout the Nation speak with one voice in support of this bill. Indeed, the Small Business Administration has felt obliged to inform this subcommittee of the many complaints it has received from small-business groups about the state of affairs which H. R. 1840 is designed to remedy. This unanimity of feeling shows the significance attached to the enactment of this measure by small business from the standpoint of its own existence and well-being. I think it is urgent that we now heed this plea and reaffirm the congressional policy against price discrimination in the Nation's markets.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. I thank the gentleman. I want to say I understand a statement was made here that the Committee on the Judiciary was hesitant as to whether this bill should be brought to the floor of the House. I want to say that never at any time have I, as a member of that committee, been hesitant about this bill. I have been for it every step of the way. I am for it now. I believe the gentleman will agree that at each one of our meetings I would inquire and want to know what has happened to the bill H. R. 11 and when it would come before the subcommittee. I also believe that my statement reflects a large majority of that of the committee, and that the bill was reported out of committee by an overwhelming vote. That is true, is it not?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I am delighted to verify the fact that I was seated next to the gentleman in the committee, and in a number of instances he has expressed his great interest in this legislation.

Mr. FORRESTER. I think this is a very salutary bill. It may not give to the small-business men all that he wants or needs, but it will be a great improvement over what we have now. I certainly hope the bill will be passed.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. I am speaking of the gasoline situation particularly, because that is what I am interested in most. If a company moves in and establishes a price lower than that of the regular standard oil prices, would it then be imposed upon the dealer to establish this price if he wanted to be competitive, and would it be in good faith if he did so?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Let me see if I understand your problem. You have a supplier in a certain area and in that area another supplier comes into the area——

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. No, not a supplier, but a dealer. Most of your gasoline wars do not start with suppliers. They start with dealers.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. A dealer comes into a territory and establishes a lower price. Now the gentleman's question is, Is the dealer who is in the territory and maintains a higher price——

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. And who is a part of a major oil company. He has a service station that is the property of a major oil company, and his price is established by the tank wagon price. Would he be permitted, under the guise of a fair price, to meet the price of this other fellow without being prosecuted?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Would the supplier be permitted to meet him in meeting the price to protect this man?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The supplier could do anything he wanted to, as long as he did not discriminate against those in that area. If he gave it to one and did not give it to the other, and it had its effect on competition, or tended to create a monopoly, then he would be in jeopardy and would be in violation, if this became law.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. But the proof is on the second supplier.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The proof is upon the one charged with violating the law.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I wonder if the gentleman can clear this situation up for me. Let us say that Blank, a refiner, sells to a marketer and distributor who has a big investment in a large bulk storage plant and gas stations and has facilities to distribute to maybe 8 or 10 or more stations that he may operate and that he buys in 10 or 15 tank-car lots.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The fellow who has this big investment.

Mr. GAVIN. Yes. He is a marketer, distributor, and retailer; he has a big investment in his bulk storage plant, and in his equipment to market and retail. In the same area in which he operates is a small retailer who buys maybe 5,000 or 10,000 gallons every 3 days or weekly, and it is delivered to him by tank truck which increases his cost and selling price.

Is the refinery compelled to give the same price to the small retailer who buys in 5,000 to 10,000 gallon lots that he gives to the man who buys in 10 or 15 tank-car lots, who is also a marketer, distributor, and retailers?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The answer is "No."

Mr. GAVIN. The answer is "No"?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The refiner is not compelled to sell to the small dealer at the same price. However, if he is brought before the Federal Trade Commission for discrimination he must then show that the functional operation was such that it constituted a saving to him, in order to justify the difference. if he is ever called before the Commission.

Mr. GAVIN. If he is ever called up.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. GAVIN. But he may be called up at any time.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then if he is he can come in and show that the difference in the price that was given to the large buyer represented a saving in functional operation over the deliveries to the small buyer.

Mr. GAVIN. Let us take this angle of it: Here is the man who buys in 10 or 15 tank-car lots who is also a marketer, distributor, and retailer; he buys in large quantities, has a big investment in his business and because of his quantity buying may be able to secure a price in the original purchase low enough to enable him to sell at retail at a lower price, especially if he operated his business economically and soundly. Suppose he lowered his price a cent a gallon. The small independent retailer who buys in not more than 5,000 or 10,000 gallon lots every 3 days may object that the large operator is making competition difficult for him.

The point I am trying to get at is, Will this bill as written compel this big operator who is a marketer, distributor, and retailer, to sell at the same price as the little operator who buys in very much smaller quantities?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I will direct the gentleman's attention to the Robinson-Patman Act, section 1–A. It recognizes quantity buying. Where the refiner in this instance who is selling to the jobber or the fellow that you say is passing things on, can show that it constitutes a saving to him to sell in a large amount and he is therefore justifiable in reducing the price, then he is not in violation of the Robinson-Patman Act.

Mr. GAVIN. Right at that point, he does that and the marketer, distributor and retailer buys it and establishes his price. That price may be lower than this small dealer that you are talking about who is only buying 5 or 10 thousand gallons. The small dealer says: "Here is a man here in the same area"—we are talking about the same area—"is marketing and retailing for a cent less than I can sell it at, and therefore it is discrimination."

It might not be discrimination because this man has a tremendous investment, he is buying in large quantities, operating economically therefore he can retail at a less price than the small dealer. Should the small dealer come in and say: "Here, you cannot sell at that price because you are cutting the price, you are discriminating against me. You must stop."

The marketer goes back to the refiner. In every case does he have to come into court and testify his position? I presume if he does he will be in court justifying himself every time an occasion arises where he is accused of discrimination. Therefore, this whole thing, as our friend says, is not quite clear. It ought to be clear so people will know what they can do and what they cannot do.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I do not know whether the gentleman was present when it was stated that the Supreme Court by a decision of 5 to 3, upset the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals. When you get as many lawyers on each side is difficult to determine all the facts and apply it to law.

Mr. GAVIN. Or you get many Congressmen on each side, they possibly do not agree with the decisions that are reached.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is right.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman understands that.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Therefore, it would be impossible for the gentleman or I, who could sit up until midnight debating this, to reach a decision.

Mr. GAVIN. That is exactly what I am driving at. Is this proposed legislation so confused that a lot of people in business who should be applying themselves to their business will have to stay up until midnight to determine what they can or cannot do? Will it restrict, regulate, and regiment and confuse the petroleum industry? What I would like to see is a clear-cut piece of legislation that is understandable that will permit people who are operating a business to know what they can or cannot do. This legislation should spell out exactly what can and cannot be done so business can operate satisfactorily and efficiently. This legislation, in my opinion, is quite confusing.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Well, if the gentleman will tell me what affects or tends to affect interstate commerce or tends to create a monopoly, if you can spell that out in a piece of legislation so that in every given state of facts there is a specific answer, that is the thing to do. But so long as we deal with the words "interstate commerce tends to create a monopoly in interstate commerce or affects trade in interstate commerce" that is all we can do. Those are the words that have to be applied by the court. We only have jurisdiction from the fact it is interstate commerce. Recognizing that fact, that is why they have lots of lawyers trying to interpret it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, suppose a refinery has an oversupply of gasoline. Maybe it has many millions of gallons. Weather conditions have affected the market, people are not traveling and they run into a big inventory. They want to move it. The refinery is operating around the clock, so they have to sell it. They have to move it. They move in and they drop the market price down maybe 1 or 2 cents a gallon. Now, referring to the small operator, he may have 10 or 15 thousand gallons on hand which he bought at a higher price. The refiner moves in and sells to his market or to his distributor at a cent or 2 under the market to move the oversupply and reduce his inventories, and the dealers then drop their prices accordingly. But, the fellow who is sitting over here now who had bought 10,000 or 15,000 gallons at a higher price says, "You cannot cut the price. Wait a minute here. You are discriminating. You are cutting down this price. I paid a higher price for my supply." Would not this have a terrific impact on the whole operational system so that they could not move any degree of flexibility and they would be restricted in situations that might arise in the area and create a difficult marketing situation. Suppose one dealer had exhausted his supply just about the time that this cent or 2 went off. He buys 5 or 10 tank cars and he sells at a price which is in conformity with the regular profits on the sale of gasoline but buys at a cent or 2 lower than the other dealer. The other dealer would say, "You cannot cut this price. I got this high-priced material, and until I get rid of it you will have to maintain the price structure until I can dispose of my present supply." This thing is really confusing.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I may say to the gentleman if they had that kind of a conversation, it would be a violation.

Mr. GAVIN. Well, I recognize that first they cannot have a conversation of that kind, because if they do, they are accused of monopoly.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Monopoly and violating the Sherman antitrust law.

Mr. GAVIN. Then, straighten us out on this legislation and clear these matters up as to what he can and cannot do. The chairman here said, "Well, you could be for it. There are some good things about it and there are some

things that are not so good." But, how are people in business going to understand this legislation unless it is made clear to them as to what they can or cannot do?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, as one of the original 49 Members of the House who cosponsored the provisions of H. R. 11, I am pleased to urge favorable action on H. R. 1840, a bill introduced by my colleague from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

The purpose of this legislation is to amend the Robinson-Patman Act to make it clear that all discriminatory pricing which destroys small businesses and substantially lessens competition is illegal. The passage of this measure will plug a loophole in the law which was not intended when the basic statute was enacted in 1936 by an overwhelming majority in the House and by a unanimous vote in the other body.

Mr. Chairman, the Robinson-Patman Act has been considered as the magna carta for small-business men and the passage of this legislation will strike at the very root of inequality in small business and will bring about a more healthy, stable, and secure atmosphere for the small-business men of our country.

Mr. Chairman, if small business is to survive, the evils of price discrimination, which cause thousands of business failures each year, must be effectively prohibited. One of the most important steps to preserve small business against these destructive practices is through enactment of this legislation.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I have heard this measure discussed exhaustively in the subcommittee and in the full committee of the Committee on the Judiciary. There are certain areas of possible confusion that I think have been cleared up in the debate. I intend to support the bill as desirable and in the interest of small business generally.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO].

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of H. R. 11 I rise to urge enactment of H. R. 1840.

This bill has one single purpose. That is to amend and strengthen section 2 (b) of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, by making the so-called good-faith defense inapplicable to a charge of discrimination where the effect of the discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

This bill would close a loophole in section 2 (b) which has nullified effective enforcement of the Robinson-Patman Act. That loophole resulted from a 5 to 3 decision of the Supreme Court in the Standard of Indiana case, which allows any supplier to discriminate in favor of a customer who has been offered a lower price by the competitor notwithstanding the extent of the injury the discrimination may cause to the supplier's other customers or to competition generally.

Mr. Chairman, this interpretation not only prevents effective enforcement of the Robinson-Patman Act, it allows the private interest of a price discriminator to outweigh the public interest in preserving competitive opportunity at all levels of business activity.

In essence what this bill does is reassert that the public interest in protecting the economy against discriminations which may substantially lessen competition or tend to create monopoly must prevail over the private interest of a discriminator.

Make no mistake about it. Price discriminations favoring preferred buyers present a danger to the competitive enterprise system. Those who want an effective antiprice discrimination statute, those who are concerned with discriminatory practices that have and are eliminating small business from the competitive scene must vote without exception for this bill.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I think it is apparent from the statements thus far that this bill is one that involves considerable controversy. However, I think the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has well stated that on balance the merits are in favor of enacting this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, approval of the pending bill will mean an important step forward in that the measure is designed to plug a loophope in the Clayton Antitrust Act. I shall certainly vote for and support the pending measure which has been properly referred to as an equality of opportunity bill. I urge my colleagues to support the measure. It is a piece of legislation that independent businesses of the Nation greatly desire. The operator of the corner drug store, the groceryman, the independent gasoline station operator and all segments of independent and small business hope for early passage of this bill.

As we all know, the Robinson-Patman Act is known as the magna carta of small business. The Robinson-Patman Act was passed a number of years ago to aid and protect small business against unfair and destructive competition from the growing and powerful chain store organizations. Throughout the years, this law has been successfully administered by the Federal Trade Commission.

Although the legislation is considered complicated it has worked well and successfully.

The Federal Trade Commission, as we know, is an arm of the Congress and, as an independent agency, charged with the duty of enforcing laws passed by the Congress, has been performing an excellent service in many areas. The Commission is charged with the duty of enforcing the Federal Trade Commission Act, which is designed to prevent unfair methods of competition; to suppress the growth of monopoly and promote fair competition in the public interest.

The Commission is also empowered to enforce certain provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act, the Clayton Antitrust Act, and, as indicated, the Robinson-Patman Act, which in effect is an amendment to the Clayton Act.

Section 2 (a) of the Robinson-Patman Act prohibits injurious price discrimination. Price reductions are permitted if such discriminations are made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor.

Section 2 (b) of the Robinson-Patman Act is commonly referred to as the "good faith" clause of this act.

Section 2 (c) regulates the payment of brokerage commissions. This section, basically, prohibits the collection of brokerage fees from both buyer and seller and the granting and receiving of brokerage payments which, in reality, amount to a price discrimination or a price discount or a rebate. This section is not involved.

Section 2 (d) and (e) require that payments such as advertising allowances and services be granted to all customers on proportionately equal terms. Basically, sections 2 (d) and (e) provide that in the event a manufacturer grants an advertising allowance or performs a service for one of its customers that such manufacturer must grant a proportionate advertising allowance or service to other customers. This is an additional section designed to aid and protect small business from discrimination of unfair price and service concessions granted to large competing chain organizations. These sections are not involved.

Proceeding under section 2 (a)—the price-discrimination provision of the act—the Federal Trade Commission issued a cease-and-desist order against Standard Oil Company of Indiana in an action arising in Detroit, Mich. In this case, Standard Oil was engaged in the practice of selling gasoline at a cent and a half per gallon less to certain favored customers than granted to its other customers in the same market or trade territory. The Commission held that this practice, under the circumstances, constituted a violation of the price-discrimination provision of the Robinson-Patman Act, inasmuch as it was shown that substantial injury was done to competition; that substantial injury was felt and the record developed disclosed that very substantial evidence of discrimination had the effect of lessening competition at the retail level.

The Standard Oil Co. attempted to justify its action on the basis that the price discrimination was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor. The Commission issued its injunctive order and this decision was upheld by the United States circuit court of appeals, following which certiorari was granted by the United States Supreme Court where arguments were again made and the Court, in a 5-to-4 decision, reversed the Commission and held for the Standard Oil Co.

The basic issue at stake was whether or not the price discrimination was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor—whether or not this defense constitutes an absolute defense in such a case or whether or not

the Court should have considered, as did the Commission and the circuit court of appeals, that the degree and extent of injury to competition should have been considered.

There is no doubt that under the Clayton Act, before its amendment by the Robinson-Patman Act, this evidence of meeting competition would have established a complete defense to a charge of unlawful price discrimination. It was because of this very condition that the Robinson-Patman Act was adopted to amend the Clayton Act.

The Clayton Act, as thus amended, narrowed the price-discrimination section. I repeat, the avenue of escape given price discriminators was narrowed in the meeting competition laws. This was the very heart and purpose of the Robinson-Patman Act. The interpretation of the act by the Supreme Court in the Standard Oil case leaves the seller where he existed prior to this enactment—with provision for price discrimination as wide open as before.

Section 2 (a) of the Robinson-Patman Act certainly permits certain types of price discrimination but the act outlaws and prohibits monopolistic price discrimination and damaging price discrimination—price descrimination which, in effect, would "substantially lessen competition, or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce." Price discrimination is not permitted where the masked effect of which is to destroy competition by selling locally at low cost—a weapon which is progressively destructive in the hands of the more powerful, and certainly most deadly to the competitor of limited resources, whatever his merit and efficiency.

So, Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the Robinson-Patman Act was to strengthen the Clayton Act in the area of unlawful and monopolistic price discrimination. The Supreme Court by its decision in the Standard Oil case, has, in effect, nullified this section of the Robinson-Patman Act and the purpose of the pending bill is to reassert the congressional intent that monopolistic price discrimination is unlawful. The purpose of this measure is also to reverse the improper decision of the Supreme Court and to reassert that price concession to meet competition alone is not an absolute defense to a charge of unlawful price discrimination.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Trade Commission is an expert agency of the Government. The Federal Trade Commission is best equipped to determine the issues in each individual case of this nature. The Commission is an arm of the Congress and should be entrusted with authority to proceed in these matters. The Congress left to the Commission the determination of fact each case as to whether a person charged with making price discrimination in the field of commerce acted in good faith to meet a competitor's equally low price. The determination of facts in such cases, based upon the evidence, is for the Commission to determine.

As indicated, the Commission has been doing an expert job, in this field, and this pending measure should be passed to plug the loophole in the Clayton Anti-Trust Act and thus again prohibit monopolistic price discrimination—in the aid of small and independent business enterprise, the consumer and in the public interest.

As recently as 1952 there was submitted to the Congress a report prepared by the staff of the Federal Trade Commission entitled "Monopolistic Practices and Small Business." I would like to quote a few words from that report:

> When large sellers are not permitted to discriminate in price between purchasers located in different communities in order to smother a small seller operating in only one of them, or to discriminate between large and small buyers competing in the same community to stifle the small buyer, the most effective kind of competition will result—the kind of competition which forces sellers to lower prices generally in order to sell at all, as they would have to do if in fact they were dealing in the kind of market which makes a market price in the only real meaning of that term. To permit sellers to substantially lessen competition through price discriminations promotes monopolistic conditions.
>
> Price discrimination has been a weapon of sellers who have some degree of monopoly power and can be effectively employed only by those who have such power.

Previously the Federal Trade Commission at the direction of the Congress made a 6-year investigation of the practices of chain stores. That investigation cost several hundred thousand dollars. It was thorough and complete. The Commission reported to the Congress on its investigation in December 1934. It recommended legislation to strengthen our laws against price discrimination. Following that the House conducted an investigation through a special committee of which our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], was chairman. That investigation developed evidence showing the evils of destructive price discrimination. That committee also recommended legislation.

In 1936 the Congress acted, and, as indicated, passed the Robinson-Patman Act, which was approved June 19, 1936. In passing that act Congress thought it was passing a law which could be used effectively to stop price discriminations. It is a good law, and the Federal Trade Commission has utilized it and so have private parties in proceeding against destructive price discriminations in many instances. However, in 1951 the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Standard Oil Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (340 U. S. 231), held that a loophole exists in the law. In effect the Court held that a large seller, such as the Standard Oil Co., may discriminate in price even where the effect may be to substantially lessen competition and tend to create a monopoly. In other words, that it was meeting competition in good faith.

The equality of opportunity bill before us for our consideration today is a simple and modest bill. It was designed to help close that loophole by declaring that the good faith meeting of competition shall not be a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination, when it is shown that such discrimination may be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. In other words, we will simply be saying that we do not want monopoly created in this country through the practice of price discrimination whether that monopoly is brought about in bad faith or in good faith.

Notwithstanding the wealth of factual information heretofore considered by the Congress concerning the practical and economic significance of the practice of price discrimination, much argument has been advanced, recently with vigor, to the effect that the practice of price discrimination is a competitive practice and should be encouraged. Some of that argument has impressed persons in high places. The argument has provided a basis for the proposition that legislation against price discrimination is legislation against competition, and therefore contrary to the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act and the national policy to protect price competition. As I pointed out earlier, those contentions appear to be at issue with the national public policy as expressed in our antimonopoly laws and the legislative history concerning them. In reality they are not in conflict. In that connection I would like to observe that we have traced much of that argument back to those who have been defending parties who have violated our antimonopoly laws by using the practice of price discrimination.

I am happy to note that the Committee on the Judiciary which recently held extensive hearings dealing with the significance of the practice of price discrimination, in reporting on the equality of opportunity bill rejected the fallacious arguments which had been presented by the defenders of monopoly. On page 5 of the report on H. R. 1840, the committee stated:

> Price discriminations favoring preferred buyers present a danger to the competitive-enterprise system which is inconsistent with the policy of the price-discrimination statute. Firms can abuse their superior market position and engage in discriminatory practices that eliminate small suppliers and small retailers from the competitive scene. In practical effect the law as presently construed allows the private interests of a discriminator to outweigh the public interest in preserving competitive opportunity at all levels of business activity. H. R. 1840 would reassert that the public interest in protecting the economy against discriminations which may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly must prevail over private interests served by discrimination.

Likewise the House Small Business Committee through its hearings dealing with the practice of price discriminations, developed similar findings and conclusions. The monumental record of those hearings consisted of more than 1,200 pages. That record evidences a thorough study of the practice of price discrimination and its effect upon small business and the competitive-enterprise system. The testimony of the many witnesses appearing in that record also refutes the fallacious arguments which have been made by the defenders of monopoly. That record supports, as does the record of the hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary, the statement I have quoted from the Judiciary Committee report of H. R. 1840 concerning the significance of destructive, monopolistic price discrimination.

Therefore, I urge the passage of the equality of opportunity bill, not only that small business be enabled to survive with less difficulty but also to assist in maintaining competition in the public interest.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. I support the legislation, but wish to ask one question: Is the problem of what constitutes "substantially to lessen competition" as used in the proposed legislation left to the Federal Trade Commission to decide?

Mr. EVINS. The question of fact would be a question for the Commission to determine in each individual case. Good faith may be used as a defense, but if there are other factors involved, if there is a lessening of competition, if there is substantial evidence of injury to competition tending toward monopoly, then in that event good faith would not be a defense.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, this is the orderly, the lawful, the constitutional method to change Supreme Court decisions. Such decisions cannot be changed by attacking the Court or the members thereof.

What we are doing here today is to test whether the Congress agrees with a court decision and if not to change the law to conform to our thinking.

The proposed legislation we are considering today is designed to strengthen the Federal antitrust laws against the practice of price discrimination. The particular bill we are considering is commonly designated as the "equality of opportunity bill." The declaration of purpose and policy of this proposed legislation is made clear and unmistakable in the preamble of H. R. 11 introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] at the beginning of the first session of this Congress. It states that the purpose of the bill is to reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, which among other things prohibit price discrimination. By passing this bill Congress will reaffirm that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to secure equality of opportunity of all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields.

Of what importance is that statement of congressional intent and declaration of purpose and public policy? Ordinarily it is of little importance to so clearly and emphatically state in a preamble of a bill the congressional intent, purpose and declaration of public policy. However, on occasion we are faced with exceptional and special situations which do make it important for Congress to state clearly and emphasize its intent and the purpose of the legislation it enacts. I believe we have before us today such a situation.

For a number of years defenders of monopoly and monopolistic practices have combined their forces to "reeducate" all of us. It has been their objective to teach us that many of the things we learned long ago in school and more recently through our experiences about monopoly and its tools are not true. They have sought to convince us that some of the practices which have been recognized as monopolistic in character throughout the period since the industrial revoluation are not in fact monopolistic. One of the practices which has received particular attention has been the practice of price discrimination.

In the past literature in the field of economics reflected the observations and experiences of those who indulged in business pursuits and who gave close study to the behavior of others who had carried on business pursuits. From all of those observations, experiences, and studies a conclusion emerged concerning the economic significance of price discrimination. That conclusion became a keystone in economic literature. It is in effect restated as follows: Price discrimination has been a weapon of sellers who have some degree of monopoly power, and can be employed effectively only by those who have such power. It was considered that the most effective kind of competition is that produced when sellers are not permitted to discriminate in price between purchasers located in different communities, or to discriminate between purchasers competing in the same community.

The economic literature to that effect was supplemented and reinforced by legislative findings made by the Congress of the United States as a result of investigations it has made of discriminatory pricing practices since 1875. Following reports made by the Bureau of Corporations concerning the effects of discriminations and rebates during the period from 1910 to 1912, the 63d Congress directed its attention specifically to discriminatory pricing. It made investigations of that practice for the purpose of determining whether it should legislate or not concerning the practice. The investigations developed that discriminatory pricing existed; they developed that the practice was widespread and was used principally by large, powerful sellers with damaging effect upon smaller, weaker competitors, and with the result of substantially lessening competition and tending to create monopolies. Therefore, it was concluded that the use of the practice threatened the free competitive enterprise system which the Sherman Antitrust Act was designed to protect. Hence, the Clayton Antitrust Act was approved in 1914. The House Judiciary Committee in reporting on the bill, which was introduced by Mr. Clayton in 1914, referred to the facts concerning price discriminations brought to its attention, and in that connection stated:

> In seeking to enact section 2 into law we are not dealing with an imaginary evil or just ancient practices long since abandoned, but are attempting to deal with a real, existing, widespread, unfair and unjust trade practice that ought at once to be prohibited insofar as it is within the power of Congress to deal with the subject.

The law that was enacted at that time was found to be inadequate to stop price discrimination.

In 1934 the Federal Trade Commission reported to the Congress the results of a 6-year investigation it had made at a cost of several hundred thousand dollars concerning price discrimination practices. In that report the Commission pointed out several deficiencies in the Clayton Antitrust Act and recommended that it be amended to strengthen its provisions against price discrimination. A special House committee under the leadership of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] also studied the problem in 1935. It reached a conclusion no different from that reported by the Federal Trade Commission. Thereupon, Mr. PATMAN, Senator ROBINSON and others introduced proposed legislation designed to meet the need for stronger laws against price discrimination. In 1936 the Congress approved the Robinson-Patman Act. Mr. Utterback in reporting on that legislation for the House Committee on the Judiciary stated:

> The purpose of this proposed legislation is to restore as far as possible, equality of opportunity in business by strengthening antitrust laws and by protecting trade in commerce against unfair trade practices and unlawful price discrimination, and also against restraint and monopoly for the better protection of consumers, workers, and independent producers, manufacturers, merchants, and other businessmen.

On that occasion the House Committee on the Judiciary reported that the evidence was overwhelming that price discrimination existed to such an extent that the survival of independent businessmen was seriously imperiled and that remedial legislation was necessary.

Under the Robinson-Patman Act, as it was approved in 1936, the Federal Trade Commission made valiant efforts to enforce the law. In a number of instances it won a signal success. However, its success was short lived.

In 1948 the defenders of monopoly gave loud voice to their plans and programs to reeducate us. Notwithstanding the wealth of factual information which had theretofore been considered by the Congress concerning the practical and economic significance of the practice of price discrimination, the defenders of monopoly undertook to build a new body of literature on the subject. They hired prominent professors of economics in a number of our large and fine educational institutions to appear in cases and testify in the behalf of law violators. Elaborate testimony was developed defending the practice of price discrimination. That long time evil and monopolistic practice through that testimony appeared in a new dress. The new dress gave it an appearance of respectability. It was described as a "competitive" practice. It was argued that the opportunity to discriminate was necessary to afford interpenetration of markets. It was also argued that it was only through the use of the practice of price dis-

crimination that one could hold forth any hope that erosion of high level pricing structures could be brought about.

The Federal Trade Commission, courts, and other tribunals which have been assigned the responsibility under the law to hear controversies on such problems and to make findings of facts, found against the arguments of the defenders of monopoly concerning the economic significance of price discrimination. Those tribunals found that the only "erosion" that appeared in situations where price discrimination was practiced was the erosion of price competition. In one famous case, namely, the Cement Institute case, the Federal Trade Commission disposed of the argument about interpenetration of markets by pointing to its findings of facts that those accused of price discrimination in that instance were holding high the price level, while they operated under that umbrella to swap business by shipping into each other's territory at the high-level prices they had fixed between and among themselves. The Commission described that practice as mutual and reciprocal cross-shipping into each other's territory.

Although the testimony of the economists who had been hired to appear and defend price discrimination in the cases did not serve to acquit the accused, the public relations programs designed and prepared by the defenders of monopoly were expanded and refined. At page 478 of the printed record of the hearings before the House Small Business Committee dealing with the problem of price discrimination, the Robinson-Patman Act, and related matters, there appears a statement of one of the most amazing plans for the development of public relations and the molding of public opinion to favor practices which had been found by the Federal Trade Commission to be violative of the Robinson-Patman Anti-discrimination Act. It was asserted in that statement:

> The keystone of the entire program is adequate, well-planned, and well-executed public relations, not only with the general public but with all organized groups representing segments of the public such as individual businessmen, business organizations, labor organizations, agricultural groups, consumer groups, professional groups, and regional interests.

One of the authors of that public-relations program subsequently turned up as a member of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws. He and a number of other lawyers who had been representing violators of our antitrust laws participated in the writing of the report of that committee. On page 333 of that report appears the statement:

> Some types of price discrimination may stimulate effective competition.

On the succeeding pages of the report are descriptions of "workable" and "effective" competition. Those descriptions provide for the inclusion of what that committee considered a "reasonable" amount of price discrimination. Through such lines of reasoning that report developed what it termed "economic indicia of competition and monopoly." The report was given wide distribution, even being sent by the Attorney General to all Federal judges. Likewise articles to the same effect prepared by individual members of that committee have appeared in law reviews and in economic reviews which also have been widely distributed.

Through such means and methods the defenders of monopoly are developing a new body of economic literature. It is not just a new look. This new body of economic literature is presented not only in a new dress to attract and secure respectability, it is presented as the real thing. It is presented as the gospel on this subject. If we should believe the economic concepts presented in this new body of economic literature, then we must reverse the conclusion we have held to so long that the practice of price discrimination is evil and monopolistic. It would become logical for us in believing this new gospel to fight with all of our might against any law or any curb in any form which would interfere with the use of the practice of price discrimination.

Unfortunately this new body of economic literature has secured a degree of respectability by virtue of the decision by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Standard Oil Company of Indiana* v. *Federal Trade Commisison* in 1951 (340, U. S. 231). The Court there initiated an order of the Federal Trade Commission which was designed to prohibit the Standard Oil Company of Indiana from continuing its course of price discrimination. In so doing the Court indicated the existence of a large loophole in the Robinson-Patman Act. That loophole permits the Standard Oil Company of Indiana, or any other large seller, to continue to discriminate in price when it does so in good faith, even though the effect of such discriminations may be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. If that decision stands we are back almost where we started from when we undertook to legislate in the first instance to specifically prohibit the practice of price discrimination.

Fortunately for those of us who believe in and are willing to fight for the maintenance of our free competitive enterprise system, your House Small Business Committee and your Committee on the Judiciary have studied this problem. They have seen and recognized the fallacy of the reeducational program of the defenders of monopoly. On page 5 of Report No. 2202, submitted by the Committee on the Judiciary May 24, 1956, as its report to accompany H. R. 1840, is the stated conclusion that price discriminations present a danger to the competitive enterprise system and are inconsistent with our public policy. There also the Committee on the Judiciary recommends a reassertion of our public policy through the passage of the equality of opportunity legislation under consideration here today "for the public interest in protecting the economy against discriminations which may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly." The Committee on the Judiciary pointed out that the public interest in protecting the economy "must prevail over private interests served by discrimination."

Why is the public interest served by curbing price discrimination? It is served because curbs on price discrimination protect small businesses from predatory practices of their larger competitors. That does not mean that small businesses need that protection because of anything relating to the question of efficiency. Many small businesses are more efficient than their big brothers. Therefore a certain number of small businesses can by greater efficiency and ingenuity survive a competitive struggle even when there are many lawful advantages on the side of bigness. However, we can hardly base our public policy or our hope of maintaining a free competitive enterprise system on that simple truism. I say that because price discrimination is a pretty deadly weapon by which the big destroy the small without respect to efficiency or ingenuity. Since business firms are both buyers and sellers, price discrimination therefore becomes, in fact, a double-barreled weapon and both barrels are deadly.

The old Standard Oil Co., which was subdivided by the Supreme Court in 1912, started out as only 1 of 30 refineries at Cleveland, Ohio. In the course of about 35 years it built a 90-percent monopoly of all refined petroleum products in the whole country. The history of its methods and its practices are too well known to require restatement in any great detail. It first combined with a few of its competitors to gain a large size advantage over the remaining competitors. It then abused its size advantage by cutting prices in one market at a time until its competitors in that market were driven into merger or out of business. Standard Oil also abused its size advantage by demanding and receiving discriminations in favor of the prices it paid those it dealt with—including the railroads. Thus, it was assisted in its march to monopoly by the discriminations and rebates it received from its suppliers as a buyer in the market. It utilized the same deadly weapon of price discrimination in making sales in the many different markets in which it operated.

Today we face a test. That test calls upon us to answer whether we desire to make efficiency, not size, the determinant of who wins out in the competitive struggle. How we measure up to that test could well decide on how effective we will be in our efforts to maintain a free and competitive enterprise system in this country.

Let us not forget that the Robinson-Patman Act as it stands now and as it will stand after it is amended by the equality of opportunity bill we are considering today, permits price discriminations when they are accounted for by differences in costs. Therefore the Robinson-Patman Act makes full alowance for and protection of the different degrees of efficiency in the operations of different sellers.

I join with my colleagues in supporting this equality of opportunity legislation, because I believe it helps to strip the dress of respectability from the new body of economic literature which has been created by, for, and on the behalf of monopoly and its defenders.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of H. R. 11, it is most gratifying to see this exactly similar bill approach passage in the House. One of the unfair practices of big suppliers has been unfair, injurious price discrimination against independent, small dealers and distributors because of a loophole in the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936. This loophole will now be closed. It should, however, be recognized that this is not the cure-all of the problems facing small business. It is a big step forward. But its real benefits will depend on vigorous enforcement. Failing this the small-business man still will need a helping hand to secure for himself the protection the law now gives him. Unless the law is enforced by the executive branch of the Government the law's protection will be available only to the wealthy.

I want finally, Mr. Chairman, to pay my tribute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. It is he who has led the fight to advance this legislation. He has answered the objections, united the forces of small business, and advanced the basic ideals of democracy that depend upon the prevention of monopoly.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] will, I hope and I am sure, receive the thanks he so well deserves.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of H. R. 11 and as a signer of the petition to bring that bill to the floor of the House, I am pleased to say that I shall support the legislation now before us because I understand that it will conform in every detail to H. R. 11, including the important preamble which spells out the policy and intent of Congress.

In my district and indeed in my State, I have found a great interest in this proposed amendment to the Robinson-Patman Act.

Small-business men in Connecticut are worried and troubled and distressed.

It has been suggested in the debate here this afternoon that this bill is not perfect, that it has some good parts and some parts not so good. I am firmly convinced that it will be good for the small, independent businessmen of the United States, and what is good for them is good enough for me.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this criticism can be made of almost every piece of legislation that comes before this House. It is a rare occasion indeed when a legislative proposal can be said to be completely good in every last respect.

What is important to me is that by passing this bill today, we will be closing a gap that the courts have created in the Robinson-Patman Act which will permit price discrimination and economic advantage for certain powerful economic interests in the United States of America.

It is my belief that economic democracy is essential to political democracy, and this legislation will move us further along the road toward complete economic democracy, which in simple language means equal opportunity under our economic system.

I wish to particularly compliment our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. WRIGHT PATMAN, for his leadership in this field, and I think the result of this day's debate and the credit for the legislation which I am sure we will pass will be his more than that of any other man.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, as sponsor of H. R. 2850, which is identical with H. R. 11, I am in favor of the bill under discussion today.

Having had many years of experience as a small-business man whose business depended on the retailing of nationally known brand name merchandise, I am aware of the need to protect small-business men against unfair competition.

Discriminatory prices charged by a common source supplier can favor one retailer at the disadvantage of another retailer in the same market area. This has occurred many times and has forced many small retailers out of business.

The large retailer has, by virtue of his superior buying power, obtained secret rebates and lower prices on identical retail articles. This advantage has, in many instances, enabled the large retailer to undersell the small retailer until the small retailer failed in business.

After the elimination of competition it has frequently been the procedure for the large retailer to raise his price in a specified market area, above the original competitive price and continue to not only make extra profits, but also take advantage of the consumers for a substantial time.

In such cases, the public interest has been violated, independent small-business men have been forced into bankruptcy and semimonopolistic prices have been charged.

It is because of my personal knowledge of the plight of small-business men when faced with discriminatory prices by a common supplier in a specified market area, that I am a strong supporter of the original objectives of the Robinson–Patman Act.

Today's bill will, in my opinion, strengthen the original objectives and help to overcome the Supreme Court decision's weakening effect. I strongly urge the passage of H. R. 1840 which will be thereafter superseded by the text of my bill H. R. 2580 and Mr. PATMAN's bill H. R. 11.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Chairman, as cosponsor of H. R. 11 and as member of the House Judiciary Committee, I wish to point out to the House the need for passage of H. R. 1840, a bill to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination.

The reason for the enactment of the Clayton Act in 1914 was to curb unjust price discrimination. The rationale underlying the passage of the Robinson-Patman Act was to clarify and strengthen the provisions of the Clayton Act which, by administrative rulings and court decisions, saw the legislative intent of the act circumvented.

In 1951, in the case of *Standard Oil* v. *The Federal Trade Commission* (340 U. S. 231), the Court by a 5 to 3 decision—with Justice Minton abstaining by reason of the fact that he had featured in the case as judge in the Seventh Circuit Court. The Court held that good faith was an absolute and complete defense to price discrimination, even though it might or would result in monopoly or restraint of trade. The effect and end result of this decision was in the minds of many to extract the very teeth from the litigation.

If small business is to survive, it must have protection aginst unjust price discrimination, appreciating always, of course, that there will be a benefit accruing to mass or volume buying. This litigation seeks to correct a situation which obtains where people, firms or businesses similarly situated are victims of unjust and unsupportable price differentials. In the Balian Ice Cream Co., Inc., against Arden Farms Co. et al., decided by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals the court could see no unfair injury in the fact that certain local producers of ice cream in the Los Angeles area lost revenue, because the Court said the large interstate competitor was also taking a revenue loss on its sales in that particular market. The Balian Case, for which the Supreme Court denied a writ of certiorari, held that the large interstate competitor acted in "good faith" when it had in its discrimination in price not merely met a low price of a local competitor but had undercut its competitors. The large interstate competitor made out its "good faith" defense even though it had discriminated in price to eliminate a great many of the "chiseling cuts" of its competitors in the Los Angeles area.

It is the purport of the legislation before us today, the amendment of section 2 (b) as provided for in H. R. 1840, to close the loopholes which the court decision have driven into the Robinson-Patman Act. The recent decisions with their refinements of interpretation and adjudication have made it imperative that some curative legislation be enacted promptly.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I am rising in support of this legislation which, to my mind, merely

permits the interposition of the defense of good faith in all cases except where unjust price discrimination and monopoly and the restraint of trade will result.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. As a cosponsor of H. R. 11 I have been very much interested in it. I feel it will help small-business men who are having a most difficult time in this era of big business. We need badly to take steps to curb unfair and discriminatory monopoly and to preserve the competitive, free enterprise system. This legislation is aimed to prohibit unfair price discrimination and give the small dealer a chance to compete with the larger retailer. Recent large increases in bankruptcy of smaller business enterprises are alarming. They clearly show the need for this legislation. This bill has won the interest and approval of small business people in my district and I join in their urgent request that you act favorably on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support this proposed legislation. I also was one of the sponsors of H. R. 11.

Mr. Chairman, as one of the 47 Members who joined Congressman Patman as cosponsor of H. R. 11 and who also signed the Discharge Petition, I have been very much interested in the problems covered by the proposed legislation affecting the welfare of thousands of small business enterprises in the country.

I have no objections to the substantive provisions of H. R. 1840, for they are the same as contained in H. R. 11. However, I do feel that the preamble contained in H. R. 11—and which is not in H. R. 1840—spells out the legislative intent of Congress in terms that require its inclusion in the bill. Therefore, I shall vote in support of an amendment to H. R. 1840 to include the preamble of H. R. 11.

As far as I have been able to determine, the small-business men of my district are in favor of legislation to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act. When the Robinson-Patman Act was passed in 1936, it was thought that small business had obtained the desired legislation to protect small business and give it equality of opportunity in competition with growing monopoly.

In 1951 the Supreme Court rendered a decision that nullified much of the protection against price discrimination that we thought we had placed in the Robinson-Patman Act for the protection of small business. That is why Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN—one of the authors of the original law—introduced H. R. 11. That is also why many of us, including myself, joined with Mr. PATMAN as a cosponsor of H. R. 11 to remedy an inequity and strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act.

We need legislation to strengthen our antitrust laws—particularly section 2 of the Clayton Antitrust Act. Price discrimination practices of big business in the 1920's and early 1930's made it necessary to pass the Robinson-Patman Act. Big business was destroying small business at an alarming rate without regard to the efficiency or merits of small business enterprises. If this trend had been permitted to continue, there would have been left few if any small business enterprises on the main streets of our large and small cities.

Big sellers and big distributors—selling to big markets—were destroying small business through price discrimination and other advantages. The Robinson-Patman Act put a halt to this trend until the Supreme Court decision of 1951. The Supreme Court decision moved us back to the days prior to the Robinson-Patman Act insofar as equality of opportunity for small-business institutions.

If the Robinson-Patman Act is not strengthened by passage of the present legislation—embodying all of the features of H. R. 11—big business and monopoly will be in the saddle again and small business will have its back against the wall. Big business with its price discrimination machinegun will again mow small business down in the same way that it did in the 1920's and 1930's.

Small business organizations are in favor of this legislation, as is testified to by the partial list of national organizations which I list as follows:

National Association of Retail Druggists.

National Association of Retail Grocers.

National Association of Wholesale Grocers.

National Food Brokers Association.

National Congress of Petroleum Retailers.

National Association of Independent Tire Dealers.

United States Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association.

National Council of Agricultural Coops.

National Farmers Union.

Cooperative League of the U. S. A.

National Federation of Independent Businesses.

The International Association of Machinists.

I urge my colleagues in the House to support this legislation and give the small business institutions of the country the equality of opportunity they deserve. Small-business men are not asking for unfair legislation—they are only asking for an even break to compete on even terms. Small business is essential to the economic welfare of the country and for the benefit of consumers.

Mr. McCULLOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, just to set the record straight, I want to refer to the statement which was just made by the last speaker that the defense of good faith will be retained in the act even if the Congress passes the bill now before us. I believe that statement results from a misapprehension.

I am referring to the proviso in paragraph (b) of the existing law, found in section 13 of title 15 of the United States Code, which states that if sales are made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, that shall constitute a defense.

What does the bill now before us say? It says that such facts shall be a defense only in cases where there is no substantial lessening of competition. But, as these situations arise only where there is a substantial lessening of competition, you might just as well repeal the whole good-faith defense as pass the bill now before us.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. Is the gentleman directing his question to me or to the chairman of the committee?

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. I am not directing a question, although I referred to a statement made by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. Chairman, in support of the view which I have just expressed, I quote a paragraph from the opinion of the Deputy Attorney General, William P. Rogers, which is to be found on page 79 of the record of the hearings. He says:

> Inasmuch as a prima facie case of price discrimination would include proof that the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly or to injure competition, the proposed amendment of the proviso of section 2 (b) to provide that good faith is a defense only if competition is not affected would render the proviso practically meaningless. The defense would appear to be available only in those instances in which the effect of the discrimination is "to injure, destroy or prevent competition with any person who either grants or knowingly receives the benefits of such discrimination or with customers of either of them." Since this effect rarely appears as a basis for a complaint involving price discrimination the same result might for all intents and purposes be achieved more directly by repeal of the proviso in section 2 (b).
>
> This Department, however, does not recommend the repeal of that proviso. While we recognize the competitive problems which arise when one purchaser obtains advantages denied to other purchasers, we do not believe the solution of the problem lies in denying sellers the opportunity to make sales in good faith competition with other sellers.

This was in a letter to the committee chairman, dated March 6, 1956, and signed by the Deputy Attorney General, William P. Rogers.

Mr. Chairman, I am in doubt as to what is in the best interests of the public and in the best interests of the small-business man. I think the passage of this bill may bring certain disadvantages to the small-business man who needs this good faith defense occasionally as against the big businessman. I would rather see us proceed in a more direct manner and simply repeal the good faith defense, than go ahead in this uncertain way, where the claim is made that the

defense of good faith still exists, when, in my opinion, and in the opinion of the Deputy Attorney General for all practical purposes it does not.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAYWORTH] such time as he may care to use.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the economic distress of agriculture is of great concern to all the Nation because it is widespread, severe and dramatic. Not so widely discussed, but almost as widespread and almost as tragic is the disaster confronting small business. The rate of failure in small business today is three times what it was in 1947, and is going up all the time.

I am sure the mail of other Members, like my own, is filled with the urgent pleas of small-business men that we do something to help them. This is no artificial, planned campaign. It comes from the heart. I have had letters, as have others, from grocers, druggists, automobile dealers, operators of gas stations, small manufacturers and many others, begging for consideration. Most of them, in one way or another, claim they are victims of pressure from huge industrial enterprises—big business.

Neither they nor I want to destroy, or harm, or even curtail the activities of big business. I want General Motors to be big, and Western Electric, and Phillips Petroleum. I would want them to increase production and earn such dividends as will encourage investment. But I do not want them to take advantage of those hundreds of thousands of small businesses that service and sell their products.

It seems obvious that today big business is often unfair and unreasonable with small business, even despite the fact that it is through this same small business that big business sells its product. Automobile dealers are well nigh desperate. Leading manufacturers demand that their dealers knuckle down to unreasonable demands—take cars that they can't sell, or else lose their franchises.

Big oil companies are guilty of similar practices in pushing their byproducts, or in granting price favors to certain retailers. The Retail Gasoline Dealers Association asks in pleading tones for legislation comparable to that before us today. They point out that last year 60,000 gasoline dealers over the country failed in business.

The National Association of Retail Grocers reminds me of the fact that before the Robinson-Patman Act, now threatened by court decision, many retailers were penalized and forced out of business by secret rebates and price concessions. They point out that unless we pass this amendment they will have to fight this battle over again.

Druggists have invited me to their meetings to discuss this problem. Individual druggists, meeting me for the first time, pose as their initial question, "What can you do about fair-trade laws?" And next they want the Robinson-Patman Act bolstered.

The giant oil corporations need gas stations. Small business must live if big business is to live. We may well remind General Motors and Ford and Chrysler that there is no method, for the present at least, of selling and repairing cars, except by small business. It is shortsighted and unworkable to expect big profits for the makers of automobiles but bankruptcy for the dealers.

This is not an occasional failure of an isolated and inefficient crossroads operator or of a drugstore that opened up in the wrong location. This is a disease that is attacking our whole economy. The Federal Trade Commission reports the hard facts that between 1952 and 1955 the profits after taxes of all firms with assets under a million dollars have declined 13 percent. The profits of firms with assets over a million increased 45 percent. The smaller the companies, the greater the decline in profits—the larger the companies, the greater the increase in profits. Companies under $250,000 saw their profits decrease 28 percent. Those over a hundred millions saw their profits increase 61 percent.

Free enterprise is not a state of nature. Free enterprise is an economic condition in which individual effort is entitled, so far as humanly possible, to its regard in proportion to the values society derives from that effort. Free enterprise is diametrically opposed to monopoly, or any other kind of economic condition in which one part of the company gets a stranglehold over any other group.

Today small business is being put through the wringer. It is once again the duty of this body, of the entire legislative branch and of the administration, so to adjust the rules of the game that we can come somewhat closer to a true system of free enterprise. One step in that direction is the enactment of the bill now under consideration.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to clear up some misunderstanding perhaps about the support of this legislation or legislation of similar effect.

The chairman of our committee admitted upon a question which I directed to him that this legislation had been opposed by Attorneys General and Secretaries of Commerce under previous administrations. As a matter of fact, it was opposed by Attorney General Clark and Attorney General McGrath. It was also opposed by the former Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sawyer, as well as the present Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Weeks. The Council of Economic Advisers under both Mr. Truman and President Eisenhower refused to approve this legislation. The administration of both former President Truman and the present Chief Executive at one time looked with favor upon diametrically opposite proposals. The proposal of the legislation referred to by the gentleman from Texas involving the basing point principle is not involved in this legislation. It came up during the 81st Congress, which was before the Supreme Court decision. The Supreme Court decision occurred during the 82d Congress. Therefore, what the gentleman from Texas was talking about was an entirely different proposition, which occurred before the Supreme Court decision, which gave rise to the legislation we are now considering.

That is the point I would like to have cleared up in the RECORD, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to make inquiry of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], who was chairman of the subcommittee which dealt with the discriminatory practice against retail gasoline operators, to ask the gentleman whether or not if this bill is passed it will eliminate the price wars which have been going on in the gasoline business.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would say to the gentleman that I think it might have some effect on the price wars in the retail gasoline business, to this extent: that there is a practice today amongst some of the suppliers in giving so-called rebates to certain dealers within certain areas and not giving them to other dealers. It is alleged, and I think reasonably proved, that on occasions these practices have resulted in price wars. Those would be eliminated. However, it should be pointed out that there are many other things that begin price wars, some amongst dealers themselves, and some amongst suppliers, and some of the retail trade which falls directly on the retailer. Those will not be touched by this legislation, and therefore we think it would be an exaggeration to say that price wars will be eliminated just by the passage of this legislation.

Mr. SAYLOR. I thank the gentleman for that contribution.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may need, and I hasten to assure the members of the committee that I will not need much time.

At the very outset, I would like to say that I am of the opinion that the able and fair chairman of our committee made a clear statement of the arguments for and against the proposed legislation. He was just as fair in this presentation as he always is in our committee.

I think you have come to the conclusion by this time that this proposal is not a simple one. There are some arguments for the proposed legislation and some against it. In view of the fact that there have been so many statements on this proposal, at the risk of oversimplification, and not saying enough, I would like to say what, in my opinion, the present law is, and what the law would be if this legislation were enacted.

Under present law, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, regardless of the injurious effect on competition, it is a perfect or a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that his low price was made in good faith to meet a lawfully and equally low price of a competitor.

Under the proposed legislation such a good faith defense, or attempted defense, is not a real defense if the effect of the discriminatory price may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create monopoly.

It is also my opinion, and I am now repeating what I said earlier in this debate, that this proposed legislation does not in any way affect existing law with respect to delivered prices or with respect to the existing law on freight absorption.

I agree with my very able chairman, on balance, that the House today should pass this legislation, notwithstanding the fact that there are several clauses in the important proviso section which are not words of the act, and which have never been defined by any court. Notwithstanding that fact, on balance I am glad to join with my chairman in supporting the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I have studied H. R. 11 as closely as I have studied any bill which has come before this body in this session. I have had serious doubts as to whether this bill will accomplish the things which small-business men of this country believe it will accomplish. The debate on this bill, while informed and erudite, seems to do little to dispel this doubt.

The main provision of this bill is to remove good faith as an absolute defense against a charge of price discrimination. This is done so by a provision which makes this defense unavailable if "the effect of the discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly." I draw the attention of the committee to the qualifying words "substantially" and "tend to." It seems very likely that because of the use of these words this act may be administered about as the Federal Trade Commission desires to administer it. The effect of court decisions, which will undoubtedly arise from cases under this act, may be to put the small-business man in substantially the same position that he assumed after the Standard Oil case.

There is no group of individuals who deserve our help and our solicitude any more than does the small-business man. His contribution to the economy of the country is so obvious that I need not elaborate on it. More than that however he is the main bulwark of the independent spirit of America and the rugged individualism which we prize so highly. It is my hope that small business will grow and prosper, because as it does these American virtues will continue to be safe.

I did not sign the discharge petition to H. R. 11 because of the doubts I have previously expressed. It has been my hope that a bill could be reported which would more nearly assure the small-business man of a fair competitive atmosphere. It is still my hope that future Congresses will perfect the act to accomplish this result. However, I intend to support this bill because I feel that if administered in a manner sympathetic to the small-business man, the results may be beneficial. I hope and expect that this will be the result of our action today.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity while we are debating a bill which will render greater protection to small business concerns in the highly competitive markets of today, to comment on the commendable record made by the Small Business Administration in its efforts to assist small business.

The economic position of the small business concerns in our economy is improving. While profits are not as high as the wartime years of 1951 and 1952, the decline which followed that period has been arrested. It is true that considerable disparity still exists between profits of large firms as compared to those of small business and that small firms still encounter obstacles in securing adequate financing and in dealing with Government procurement offices. This administration, however, has made a great effort to overcome these obstacles and to assure small business fair and equitable treatment whether they are dealing with the Government or in the civilian markets.

In the 83d Congress we established the Small Business Administration and authorized certain programs whereby assistance could be rendered to this segment of our economy. Of primary importance perhaps is the financial assistance program whereby the SBA will make business loans to small firms which cannot secure such credit from private financial institutions. Of course, the Congress stipulated that such loans could not be made unless there was reasonable assurance of repayment and adequate collateral to support the loan.

Since the inception of this lending program the SBA has approved through April 1956, 2,880 business loans for a total of $138,312,000. A majority of these loans have been made in participation with private banks. This means that through repayment of the loan a small business can establish a line of credit with his local bank for future financing. We will all agree, I am sure, that while a Government agency is certainly necessary to fill what we might call the credit gap, the preponderance of lending to small firms must be handled by our private banks.

In addition to making credit available to small firms, the SBA financial specialists spend a great deal of their time counseling small business. Frequently such advice has permitted a would-be SBA loan applicant to rearrange his affairs so that a loan is no longer needed or has permitted the firm to secure financing from a local bank.

The Small Business Administration is also empowered to make disaster loans when sudden catastrophes, such as hurricanes or floods, strike our local communities. The work of SBA in this area has been most commendable. Every area of the country where such assistance has been rendered has been outspoken in its praise of the long hours worked by SBA personnel and of the consideration given to the needs of those homeowners and business concerns experiencing losses as a result of these disasters. Since the organization of SBA, and again through April 1956, 4,250 disaster loans have been approved for over $50 million.

The Small Business Administration is constantly endeavoring, through its own programs and by advice and consultation with other agencies, to increase the number of contracts going to small business. Of greatest importance is the SBA joint set-aside program whereby all or certain portions of Government procurements are set aside for exclusive bidding by small concerns. In this way, small business is assured of an opportunity to participate in particular procurements.

Such agreements for set-aside have been established with the Department of Defense, the GSA, the Department of Agriculture, the Veterans' Administration and other agencies. To date over $1 billion in set-asides have been agreed to by the agencies cooperating under this program.

Frequently a small firm will be low bidder on a military procurement but will be declared by the procurement officer to be unable to receive the award because of financial or technical shortcomings. In such an instance, this low bidder may appeal to the SBA for what is called a certificate of competency. An investigation will be made by SBA and if all factors are favorable SBA will issue such a certificate thereby permitting the small firm in question to receive the contract award. This program again is designed to assure small business of every opportunity to compete.

As in the financial assistance program, SBA procurement specialists spend considerable time in counseling individual concerns on their procurement problems. Considerable time and effort is spent assisting small concerns to get on bidders lists, to secure specifications and drawings and to assist in other procurement areas where an understandable lack of knowledge exists among concerns desiring to sell to the Government.

On a policy level the Small Business Administration consults with all agencies of the Government which have a procurement function. Such discussion has during the past two years developed a much better understanding by such agencies of the small business potential. This consultation has also brought about positive programs designed to secure for small business a fair share of Government purchases. I firmly believe that the efforts by SBA in the field of procurement have been of immeasurable assistance to small business.

Virtually every study of the problems of small business has revealed that one of their biggest difficulties in remaining competitive is the lack of the latest management and technical information. Small firms are generally limited in their resources to secure and remain abreast of such information and developments. For this reason the Small Business Administration has devoted considerable effort to establishing a source of such information. Now, literature is available on production and

marketing techniques. Detailed information may be acquired on subjects such as cost accounting, business insurance, inventory procedures and other related subjects. Here again, small firms have been most praiseworthy in the information and counsel provided by SBA personnel.

While I have not attempted to cover in detail every aspect of the Small Business Administration's activities, nor have I attempted to relate all its accomplishments, I do believe the SBA has done a good job. At the direction of Congress it has developed programs which are of the greatest importance to the small business concerns in our economy.

It is most significant that SBA has had the wholehearted support of the Eisenhower administration. This interest on the part of President Eisenhower was again exemplified in the establishment of a Cabinet Committee with Mr. Arthur Burns of the Council of Economic Advisers as Chairman. This Committee will make recommendations for administrative and legislative action which will strengthen the economic position of small business and which will develop small business opportunities in our progressing economy. We can rest assured that every effort is being made by the Eisenhower administration to improve the position of small business and to strengthen our free competitive enterprise system in every possible way.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 11, because I favor the preservation of free and fair competition. Today, when American industry is expanding so rapidly, when the difficulties inherent in preventing the growth of monopolies and cartels are multiplying so tremendously, the task of protecting the rights of the small-business man becomes extremely difficult.

Big businesses are becoming bigger by extending their activities more and more, and entering fields entirely unrelated to their original purpose and incorporation. Such organizations are not necessarily monopolies within the meaning of the law, but their positions of dominance and control in their industries place small businesses with whom they are in competition in a precarious position. Small companies are suddenly confronted by competition from large corporations which invade the business and begin to undersell them. Any losses which are suffered in this line of activity may be easily absorbed in other profitable operations of the corporation.

This bill attempts to help the small-business man remain in competition under such circumstances. This bill helps him stay alive and avoid being hammered into submission by a ruthless competitor. This bill seeks to bolster the opportunity for fair competition and deserves approval.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to give my support to H. R. 1840 designed to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act. This bill makes it illegal for a seller to discriminate in his price policy against buyers where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly, irrespective of the question whether or not the discriminations were made "in good faith."

We all know that the Robinson-Patman Act was hailed as the Magna Carta of small business. It reversed a 15-year trend of the disappearance of small, independent businesses by the tens of thousands. The disastrous march toward the complete monopolization of the distribution business in this country was stopped. The Supreme Court, in *Standard Oil Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (340 U. S. 231 (1951)), however, enunciated the doctrine that, regardless of the injurious effect on competition, it is a complete defense to a charge of discrimination for a seller to show "good faith" in meeting a lawful and equally low price of a competitor. We have now closed the loophole which resulted from this 5–3 decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of H. R. 11, by Mr. PATMAN, and this bill bears number H. R. 1840 by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. They both have in mind the same purpose: namely, to improve the position of the small-business man throughout the United States, and this small-business man needs assistance at the present time.

When I was at home recently I had the opportunity of talking before the Louisiana State Pharmaceutical Association annual convention, which is one of the oldest occupational association conventions in the State of Louisiana. At that time I expressed myself most forcefully in reference to H. R. 11, and for the information of everyone I quote a portion of this speech dealing directly with H. R. 11:

> I have received a number of letters regarding H. R. 11, by Mr. PATMAN. This bill would provide further assistance in the fight against monopolies. Since I know of your own interest in the status of this bill, I wish to state that Mr. PATMAN filed a petition for the discharge of the legislative committee of further consideration of his bill. In the meantime, as he obtained signatures on his discharge petition, the Judiciary Committee began to study H. R. 11, and kindred legislation. They have now reported an almost identical bill favorably to the floor of the House of Representatives and the Rules Committee has issued a rule on this bill. It is scheduled to come up on the floor of the House on June 11, and, at that time, if there are any vital differences between the reported bill and the Patman bill, H. R. 11, Mr. PATMAN will have the opportunity to substitute his bill for the committee-approved bill. It looks to me as if the committee has reported a measure which may be acceptable to Mr. PATMAN and others of us who believe further strength should be given to those who oppose harmful monopolies in the United States.
>
> At any rate, this promises to be a fight which will soon be out of the way and the bill should be well on its way toward the United States Senate for further consideration.

I quote from the speech made in Louisiana regarding my position on the bill. I was in Louisiana during a large part of the time when the petition on H. R. 11 was filed and was pending. Since I was at home and the rule required the petition to be signed on the floor of the House when the House is in session, I did not sign it. I, nonetheless, communicated my ideas to the members of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives and urged them to report H. R. 11, or a similar bill, which may be reported to the House. In either event, I felt it was to the interest of this legislation that action be taken by the proper legislative committee, if such was possible, within a limited time. The committee has now come forward with H. R. 1840, and I understand that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and the Judiciary Committee are very much together on their ideas regarding this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this is good legislation—in the interest of the small-business man. I have always supported the small-business man in his efforts to make a living, and while this bill may not accomplish what some of us hope for it, it is nonetheless worth a try and perhaps will correct some evils and alleviate some conditions which presently exist, making the financial position of the small-business man difficult, at times in the extreme.

Of course, bankruptcies and business failures always alarm me. As these figures increase and as financial conditions slowly tighten throughout the country, the number of failures among the small-business people increase. This is a most proper time to consider the whole subject of legislation for the small-business man.

The present bill simply shifts the burden of proof onto the corporation charged with violating the laws relating to small business, and as such it makes it possible to prove the case after charges are filed with greater ease and more assurance of getting judgments. I, therefore, hope that this measure will pass by heavy vote.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, there is a momentous need for passage of the legislation under consideration, if we are to protect small business and if we are to preserve our competitive processes, and moreover, if we are to avert returning to the business conditions that preceded the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act in 1936.

A prime purpose in passing the Robinson-Patman Act in 1936 was to remove unfortunate experiences under the Clayton Act of 1914, which excused price discriminations when "made in good faith to meet competition." The prevailing business climate at that time permitted large buyers to exact substantial privileges from their suppliers, in the form of rebates, quantity discounts and reductions, extra commissions and fees, special services or facilities, and many other unfair advantages. As enacted in 1936 the pertinent provision of the Robinson-Patman Act, section 2 (b), provides, as follows:

> (b) Upon proof being made, at any hearing on a complaint under this section, that there has been discrimination in price or services or facilities furnished, the burden

of rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing justification shall be upon the person charged with a violation of this section, and unless justification shall be affirmatively shown, the Commission is authorized to issue an order terminating the discrimination: *Provided, however,* that nothing herein contained shall prevent a seller rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing that his lower price or the furnishing of services or facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor.

As a result of the interpretation which has been placed upon the above-quoted provision, we are now back to where we started. In *Standard Oil Co. (Indiana) v. Federal Trade Commission* (340 U. S. 231), the Supreme Court of the United States ruled that if a seller could show that his price differential was made in good faith to meet the lawful and equally low price of a competitor he could establish a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination to one of his customers, regardless of the injury caused to other customers who are denied the lower price. In effect, the Supreme Court ruled that the discriminating pricing is legal if the competitor's price is a lawful one and if the supplier is trying to retain a customer. The application of the ruling is evident in the example which follows. A large supplier markets his product through a single giant merchandiser and through a number of small independent retailers. These two outlets are in competition with one another; however, the circumstances are such that the price differential does not interfere with the independents. Then, one day the giant merchandiser is offered a much lower price by a new supplier. Using good business acumen, he accepts the offer. What happens? The first supplier if he wants to keep the account must cut his price to meet that competition. What is the consequence? The differential now created between the giant merchandiser and the independents acts as a squeeze on the independents who ultimately are forced out of business.

The bill under consideration would correct the situation and give independent business the protection it needs. It merely clarifies and reasserts the intent of the Congress in its effort to carry out the purpose of the Robinson-Patman Act, which is the elimination of discriminatory price practices which can lead to restraints of trade, the creation of monopolies, and the stifling of competition. The proposed legislation would assure the intention of the act, namely, the protection of the public by promoting free competition and preventing undue restriction of trade and commerce through preservation of legitimate competition. It would reassert this intent by making clear that when proof has been made of a discrimination that is prohibited in section 2 (a) of the act, the seller has the burden to rebut the prima facie case so made. The seller under the proposed legislation may justify his discrimination; however, if the justification in prices or facilities furnished is based upon the seller's "good faith" to meet an equally low price or services or facilities furnished by a competitor, in order for such justification to be a complete defense, the seller must also prove that the effect of such discrimination may not substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce.

It should be emphasized that the bill does not amend the good-faith defense; it merely states what the law has always been, namely, that the good-faith defense shall continue to be a complete justification for a discriminatory price practice unless the effect of the discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. In other words, the proposed amendment refines the procedural provisions of the act which were nullified by the Supreme Court's decision and thus will permit proper enforcement of the substantive provisions which prohibit discriminatory practices.

As a former small-business man myself, I know the problems that confront this segment of our economy. I know, too, that the small-business men of my congressional district, generally speaking, have voiced strong support of this bill. I therefore urge, Mr. Chairman, that the bill be passed.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended (15 U. S. C. 13 (b)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. (b) Upon proof being made, at any hearing on a complaint under this section, that there has been discrimination in price or services or facilities furnished, the burden of rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing justification shall be upon the person charged with a violation of this section, and unless justification shall be affirmatively shown, the Commission is authorized to issue an order terminating the discrimination: *Provided, however,* That unless the effect of the discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce it shall be a complete defense for a seller to show that his lower price or the furnishing of services or facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DOYLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1840) to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination pursuant to House Resolution 521, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Indiana withhold his request for a moment?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. No; I insist upon the point of order.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 64]

Allen, Ill.	Hale	Mason
Andersen, H. Carl	Halleck	Miller, Calif.
Bell	Hoffman, Ill.	Miller, Nebr.
Bray	Hope	Nelson
Brown, Ohio	Horan	O'Hara, Minn.
Buckley	Jones, Mo.	Phillips
Cannon	Judd	Powell
Carnahan	Keating	Prouty
Dawson, Ill.	Kelley, Pa.	Thompson, La.
Dowdy	Lane	Thornberry
Eberharter	Lankford	Wickersham
Fernandez	McConnell	Wier
George	McDowell	
	McIntire	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall, 391 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

TO STRENGTHEN THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT AND AMEND THE ANTITRUST LAW PROHIBITING PRICE DISCRIMINATION

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 394, nays 3, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

YEAS—394

Abbitt	Boggs	Christopher
Abernethy	Boland	Chudoff
Adair	Bolling	Church
Addonizio	Bolton, Frances P.	Clark
Albert	Bolton, Oliver P.	Clevenger
Alexander	Bonner	Colmer
Alger	Bosch	Cooley
Allen, Calif.	Bow	Coon
Andresen, August H.	Bowler	Cooper
Andrews	Boykin	Corbett
Anfuso	Boyle	Coudert
Arends	Brooks, La.	Cramer
Ashley	Brooks, Tex.	Cretella
Ashmore	Brown, Ga.	Crumpacker
Aspinall	Brownson	Cunningham
Auchincloss	Broyhill	Curtis, Mass.
Avery	Buckley	Curtis, Mo.
Ayres	Budge	Dague
Bailey	Burdick	Davidson
Baker	Burleson	Davis, Ga.
Baldwin	Burnside	Davis, Tenn.
Barden	Bush	Davis, Wis.
Barrett	Byrd	Dawson, Ill.
Bass, N. H.	Byrne, Pa.	Dawson, Utah
Bass, Tenn.	Byrnes, Wis.	Deane
Bates	Canfield	Delaney
Baumhart	Carlyle	Dempsey
Beamer	Carrigg	Denton
Becker	Cederberg	Derounian
Belcher	Celler	Devereux
Bennett, Fla.	Chase	Dies
Bennett, Mich.	Chatham	Diggs
Bentley	Chelf	Dingell
Berry	Chenoweth	Dixon
Betts	Chiperfield	Dodd
Blatnik		Dollinger
		Dolliver

Dondero	Kearney	Rhodes, Pa.
Donohue	Kearns	Richards
Donovan	Kee	Riehlman
Dorn, N. Y.	Kelly, N. Y.	Riley
Dorn, S. C.	Keogh	Rivers
Doyle	Kilday	Roberts
Durham	Kilgore	Robeson, Va.
Edmondson	King, Calif.	Robsion, Ky.
Elliott	King, Pa.	Rodino
Ellsworth	Kirwan	Rogers, Colo.
Engle	Klein	Rogers, Fla.
Evins	Kluczynski	Rogers, Mass.
Fallon	Knox	Rogers, Tex.
Fascell	Knutson	Rooney
Feighan	Krueger	Roosevelt
Fenton	Laird	Rutherford
Fernandez	Landrum	Sadlak
Fino	Lanham	St. George
Fisher	Latham	Saylor
Fjare	LeCompte	Schenck
Flood	Lesinski	Scherer
Flynt	Lipscomb	Schwengel
Fogarty	Long	Scott
Forand	Lovre	Scrivner
Ford	McCarthy	Scudder
Forrester	McCormack	Seely-Brown
Fountain	McCulloch	Selden
Frazier	McDonough	Sheehan
Frelinghuysen	McDowell	Shelley
Friedel	McGregor	Sheppard
Fulton	McMillan	Short
Gamble	McVey	Shuford
Garmatz	Macdonald	Sieminski
Gary	Machrowicz	Sikes
Gathings	Mack, Ill.	Siler
Gavin	Mack, Wash.	Simpson, Ill.
Gentry	Madden	Simpson, Pa.
Gordon	Magnuson	Sisk
Grant	Mahon	Smith, Kans.
Gray	Mailliard	Smith, Miss.
Green, Oreg.	Marshall	Smith, Va.
Green, Pa.	Martin	Smith, Wis.
Gregory	Matthews	Spence
Griffiths	Meader	Springer
Gross	Merrow	Staggers
Gubser	Metcalf	Steed
Gwinn	Miller, Md.	Sullivan
Hagen	Miller, N. Y.	Taber
Haley	Mills	Talle
Halleck	Minshall	Taylor
Hand	Mollohan	Teague, Calif.
Harden	Morano	Teague, Tex.
Hardy	Morgan	Thomas
Harris	Morrison	Thompson, Mich.
Harrison, Nebr.	Moss	
Harrison, Va.	Moulder	Thompson, N. J.
Harvey	Multer	Thompson, Tex.
Hays, Ark.	Mumma	Thomson, Wyo.
Hays, Ohio	Murray, Ill.	Tollefson
Hayworth	Murray, Tenn.	Trimble
Healey	Natcher	Tuck
Hébert	Nicholson	Tumulty
Henderson	Norblad	Udall
Herlong	Norrell	Utt
Heselton	O'Brien, Ill.	Vanik
Hess	O'Brien, N. Y.	Van Pelt
Hiestand	O'Hara, Ill.	Van Zandt
Hill	O'Konski	Velde
Hillings	O'Neill	Vinson
Hoeven	Osmers	Vorys
Hoffman, Mich.	Ostertag	Vursell
Holifield	Passman	Wainwright
Holland	Patman	Walter
Holmes	Patterson	Watts
Holt	Pelly	Weaver
Holtzman	Perkins	Westland
Hope	Pfost	Wharton
Hosmer	Philbin	Whitten
Huddleston	Pilcher	Widnall
Hull	Pillion	Wigglesworth
Hyde	Poage	Williams Miss.
Ikard	Poff	Williams, N. J.
Jackson	Polk	Williams, N. Y.
James	Powell	Willis
Jarman	Preston	Wilson, Calif.
Jenkins	Price	Wilson, Ind.
Jennings	Priest	Winstead
Jensen	Quigley	Withrow
Johansen	Rabaut	Wolverton
Johnson, Calif.	Radwan	Wright
Johnson, Wis.	Rains	Yates
Jonas	Ray	Young
Jones, Ala.	Reece, Tenn.	Younger
Jones, N. C.	Rees, Kans.	Zablocki
Karsten	Reuss	Zelenko
Kean	Rhodes, Ariz.	

NAYS—3

Cole	Kilburn	Wolcott

NOT VOTING—35

Allen, Ill.	Bray	Eberharter
Andersen, H. Carl	Brown, Ohio	George
	Cannon	Hale
Bell	Carnahan	Hinshaw
Blitch	Dowdy	Hoffman, Ill.
Horan	McConnell	Phillips
Jones, Mo.	McIntire	Prouty
Judd	Mason	Reed, N. Y.
Keating	Miller, Calif.	Thompson, La.
Kelley, Pa.	Miller, Nebr.	Thornberry
Lane	Nelson	Wickersham
Lankford	O'Hara, Minn.	Wier

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Keating.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Reed of New York.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Lankford with Mr. McConnell.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. McIntire.

Mr. Wier with Mr. George.

Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Hale.

Mr. Jones of Missouri with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.

Mrs. Blitch with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Cannon with Mr. Miller of Nebraska.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PATMAN moves that the title of H. R. 1840 be amended to read as follows:

"DECLARATION AND PURPOSE OF POLICY

"To reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which among other things prohibit price discrimination; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to secure equality of opportunity of all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment to the title.

The amendment to the title was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

REREFERENCE OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 643

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 643, to provide for an investigation of the need for a geophysical institute in the Territory of Hawaii, that it be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and that this action not be considered as a precedent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day set for the call of the Private Calendar. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

P. R. MARKLEY, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5691) for the relief of P. R. Markley, Inc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROBERTS and Mr. JARMAN objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TRUCK & AXLE MANUFACTURING CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4037) for the relief of Truck & Axle Manufacturing Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $52,248.47 to Truck and Axle Manufacturing Co., of Oakland, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses sustained as the result of carrying out five contracts for the repair of certain motor vehicles for the Benicia Arsenal, Ordnance Corps, Department of the Army: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the figures "$52,248.47", and insert in lieu thereof "$34,555.72."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALE OF PUBLIC LANDS AT KANEOHE BAY, OAHU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7890) to authorize the commission of public lands to sell public lands located at Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, to certain persons.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, any provision of section 3 of the Hawaiian Organic Act or laws of Hawaii relating to public lands to the contrary notwithstanding, the commissioner of public lands, with the approval of

the Governor and two-thirds of the members of the board of public lands, in his discretion, may transfer and convey by quitclaim deeds to the owner or owners of lots 15 to 27, both inclusive, as shown on map 2 filed in the office of the assistant registrar of the land court of the Territory of Hawaii with land court application 1002, the following-described parcel of land:

Being a portion of the tidelands of Kaneohe Bay, same being artificial accretion, abutting lots 27, 26, 25, 24, 23, 22, 21, 20, 19, 18, 17, 16, and 15 (map 2), land court application 1002. Situate in Kaneohe Bay, Koolaupoko, Oahu, T. H.

Beginning at the south corner of this piece of land, near the common corner of lots 27 and 28 (map 2), land court application 1002, the true azimuth and distance to said common corner being: 332 degrees 20 minutes 1.66 feet, and thence running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. 152 degrees 20 minutes 123.61 feet along lots 27, 26, and 25 (map 2), land court application 1002;

2. 168 degrees 40 minutes 150.00 feet along lots 25, 24, 23, and 22 (map 2), land court application 1002;

3. 195 degrees 50 minutes 190.00 feet along lots 21, 20, 19, 18, and 17 (map 2), land court application 1002;

4. 184 degrees 20 minutes 97.00 feet along lots 17, 16, and 15 (map 2), land court application 1002;

5. 204 degrees 40 minutes 51.54 feet along lot 15 (map 2), land court application 1002;

Thence following channel, along new high water mark, Kaneohe Bay, for the next five courses, the direct azimuths and distances being:

6. 359 degrees 46 minutes 30 seconds 109.12 feet;

7. 14 degrees 20 minutes 30 seconds 167.94 feet;

8. 338 degrees 51 minutes 54.09 feet;

9. 321 degrees 08 minutes 158.32 feet;

10. 340 degrees 39 minutes 40.83 feet;

11. 47 degrees 24 minutes 72.56 feet along stone masonry, along Kaneohe Bay;

12. 32 degrees 26 minutes 30 seconds 58.94 feet along the stone masonry, along Kaneohe Bay, to the point of beginning and containing area of 31,206 square feet or 0.716 acre.

In the event of sale as herein authorized the commissioner shall divide the parcel of land in such manner as he deems fair and equitable into 13 lots so that each of the lots above mentioned may have access to Kaneohe Bay.

The commissioner may reserve such portions of the area for roadways and other rights-of-way as he deems to be in the public interest.

SEC. 2. Each lot in the area shall be conveyed for a fair and reasonable price, which price shall be determined by a disinterested appraiser or appraisers but not more than three, which shall be appointed by the Governor, and all structures, buildings, and other such improvements shall be valued at $1.

SEC. 3. The commissioner shall prior to executing such quitclaim deeds require the lot owners to release all claims for compensation, damages, or otherwise which they or any of them have or may have against the United States of America, Territory of Hawaii, or the city and county of Honolulu, by reason of acts or omissions of any of said governments, or for which any of said governments are claimed to be responsible, done or omitted in connection with the filing of the area herein authorized to be sold.

SEC. 4. The term "owner" or "owners" shall have the same meaning given to it under section 73 (a) (4) of the Hawaiian Organic Act.

SEC. 5. This act shall take effect upon its approval.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 615) for the relief of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mother Marie Maestre Marcos, Mother Bernarda Clemente Cosqui, Sister Mary Coronita Dacanay, Vera Bruno (Sister M. Susan), Lucia Guarino (Sister M. Gennarina), Maria Leanza (Sister M. Immacolata), Giovanna Leo (Sister M. Louisa), Francesca Terzulli (Sister M. Teresina), Giovannina Verde (Sister M. Rodolfa), Stanley Bronuis Mazintas, Sister Guiseppina Bucci, and Jan Mruz shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residencet as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gino Filippelli shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaken, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

SEC. 3. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in sections 1 and 2 of this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

SEC. 4. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, the warrants of arrest, and bonds which may have issued in the case of Gertrude Riley-Sexton. From and after the date of the enactment of this act, the said Gertrude Riley-Sexton shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued.

SEC. 5. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, John Maurice Lamont, Georgina Mercedes Llera, John Caplan (Giovanni Tuan), Dykeman Hank Smith, Yaeko Nishizawa, and Kreis Krzyztof, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, upon payment of the required visa fees.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, after the name "Cosqui", strike out the name "Sister Mary Coronita Dacanay."

On page 1, line 8, strike out the name "Louisa" and substitute in lieu thereof the name "Luisa."

On page 1, line 10, strike out the name "Sister Guiseppina Bucci" and substitute the name "Giuseppina Bucci (Sister Yolanda)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 616) for the relief of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Soterios Othon Nasiopoulos, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Sam P. Vournas, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Joyce Delores Evans, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mrs. Epifania Emilita Ramsey Reddie, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of sections 203 (a) (3) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Caterina Lueder, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Guda Lueder, a lawful resident of the United States.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Andrea Failla, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Joseph Tymowicz, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 5. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Vilma Ramuscak, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Clarence J. Brenner and Barbara Ann Brenner, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 6. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Estera Morovic, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Elizabeth and Grga Morovich, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 7. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Slobadan N. Stefanovic shall be held and considered to be the minor alien child of Darinka Chittum, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 8. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Robert Jose Hunter y Montilla shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor child of Redford B. Hunter, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 9. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dora Claire Lynch shall be held and considered to be the minor alien child of Jasper Ferguson Lynch, citizen of the United States.

SEC. 10. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Jude Anthony Branch (Koji Aoyagi), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Helena G. Branch, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 11. For the purposes of sections 203 (a) (3) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Joao Maria Vieira, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Maria do Ceu Vieira Evaristo, a lawful resident of the United States.

SEC. 12. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Nobuyuki Tsunomori, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mrs. Nobu Tsunomori, citizen of the United States.

SEC. 13. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Reuben Bautista shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor son of Antonio M. Bautista, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 14. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Milica Ebenspanger, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Nikola J. Fuchs, citizen of the United States.

SEC. 15. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Gerald Seckl, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of John F. Drinkwater, citizen of the United States.

SEC. 16. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Teresina N. Feola, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Theresa Feola, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 17. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Abdo A. B. Abi Aoun Peters, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor child of George and Alta W. Peters, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 18. For the purposes of sections 203 (a) (3) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Gertraud Anna Giulio, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Augusta Giulio Horak, a lawful resident of the United States.

SEC. 19. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Sueko Oshiro, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Robert P. Landau, citizen of the United States.

SEC. 20. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) and 505 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Elizabeth Chivilo, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Lemmo, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 21. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Sharon Elizabeth Branch (Yumi Ishiki), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Helena G. Branch, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 22. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Emiliano Robante shall be held and considered to be the natural-born minor alien child of Mrs. Isidora Robante Torculas, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 23. For the purposes of sections 203 (a) (3) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Maria Knaziewicz, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born child of Ivan and Teckla K. Makar, legally admitted alien residents of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, strike out lines 21, 22, 23, and 24.

On page 2, line 25, strike out "SEC. 8." and substitute "SEC. 7."

On page 3, line 5, strike out "SEC. 9" and substitute "SEC. 8."

On page 3, line 9, strike out "SEC. 10." and substitute "SEC. 9."

On page 3, line 14, strike out "SEC. 11." and substitute "SEC. 10."

On page 3, line 19, strike out "SEC. 12." and substitute "SEC. 11."

On page 3, line 24, strike out "SEC. 13." and substitute "SEC. 12."

On page 4, line 4, strike out "SEC. 14." and substitute "SEC. 13."

On page 4, line 9, strike out "SEC. 15." and substitute "SEC. 14."

On page 4, line 14, strike out "SEC. 16." and substitute "SEC. 15."

On page 4, line 19, strike out "SEC. 17." and substitute "SEC. 16."

On page 4, line 24, strike out "SEC. 18." and substitute "SEC. 17."

On page 5, line 4, strike out "SEC. 19." and substitute "SEC. 18."

On page 5, line 9, strike out "SEC. 20." and substitute "SEC. 19."

On page 5, line 14, strike out "SEC. 21." and substitute "SEC. 20."

On page 5, line 19, strike out "SEC. 22." and substitute "SEC. 21."

On page 5, line 24, strike out "SEC. 23." and substitute "SEC. 22."

The committee amendments were agreed to:

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVING CERTAIN SUBSECTIONS OF SECTION 212 (a) IN BEHALF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 617) to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hector Mokhtarian, Andrea Ferrara, Eduardo Orefice, Adolfo Morciano, Mrs. Bitten Frandsen Bello, Mrs. Johanna Maier Rose, Stephen Parnetta, Francesco Fiore, Mrs. Phyllis Shuster, Mrs. Maria Pallotto Iacobucci, Nunzio Isgro, Hertha Stammler Brumbaugh, Irmgard Hornauer Russo, Carmen Leokadia Kondrup, Mrs. Elizabeth Orf Reynolds, and Olive Markley may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 2. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anna Maria Beck, the fiance of Robert J. Stephens, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of three months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Anna Maria Beck is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Robert J. Stephens and that she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act other than the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of that act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Anna Maria Beck, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Anna Maria Beck, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Anna Maria Beck as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

SEC. 3. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Annemarie Moeller, the fiance of Charles Klinkhammer, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Annemarie Moeller is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Charles Klinkhammer and that she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act other than the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of that act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Annemarie Moeller, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Annemarie Moeller, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Annemarie Moeller as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

SEC. 4. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Helen Hranisavljevic, the fiance of James Yecko, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Helen Hranisavljevic is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said James Yecko and that she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act other than the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of that act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Helen Hranisavljevic, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Helen Hranisavljevic, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Helen Hranisavljevic, as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

SEC. 5. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Marguerita Willer, the fiance of D. E. Butz, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Marguerita Willer is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said D. E. Butz and that she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act other than the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of that act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Marguerita Willer, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Marguerita Willer, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission of the said Marguerita Willer for permanent residence as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

SEC. 6. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Emma Basili Osorowitz and Hildegard Savner may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 7. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pasquale Andriola may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 8. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (31) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio Colantonio may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 9. The exemptions provided for in this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 10, strike out the name "Elizabeth" and substitute in lieu thereof the name "Elisabeth."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LINO PEREZ MARTINEZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 910) for the relief of Lino Perez Martinez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lino Perez Martinez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARGARET DOWS THYBERG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5041) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Dows Thyberg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Mrs. Margaret Dows Thyberg, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 401 (e) of the Immigration Act of 1940, may be naturalized by taking, prior to 1 year after the effective date of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 337 of the said act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Mrs. Margaret Dows Thyberg shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVING PROVISION OF SECTION 212 (a) (6) IN BEHALF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 618) to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Theresia Handler, Marie Giuseppe Giordano, Margot Wartenberger, Karoline Berner (nee Katz), Alexander Golubintsev, Irene Ryzev, Ursula Gerlinde Reinhardt Meinz, Rabbi Baruch Goldstein, Francesco Occhiuzzi, Grazia Schipani, Carla Corsi DiGloria, and Lydia Stack (Stachulski) may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare may deem necessary to impose: *Provided,* That suitable and proper bonds or undertakings, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

SEC. 2. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yvette Nedelec, the fiance of John Irish, a citizen of the United States, and her minor child, Laura Nedelec, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors and may be admitted to the United States for a period of three months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Yvette Nedelec is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said John Irish and that they are otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, except that the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall not apply to the said Yvette Nedelec and she may be admitted to the United States under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of that Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within three months after the entry of the said Yvette Nedelec and her minor child, Laura Nedelec, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Yvette Nedelec and her minor child, Laura Nedelec, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Yvette Nedelec and her minor child, Laura Nedelec, as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, strike out the name "Giuseppe" and substitute in lieu thereof the name "Giuseppa."

On page 1, line 9, after the name "Lydia", insert the name "Marie."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: On page 1, line 4, after the words "Nationality Act" insert the following: "Gilbert C. Nee."

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 620) for the relief of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elly Akilloglou, Ioannis Korkodilos, Miriam Leser, Bertha Rossin, and Max Luming shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this section of this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lorenzo Cesare Caprioglio shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

On page 1, line 5, strike out the name "Bertha Rossin."

On page 2, at the end of the joint resolution add a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bonds which may have issued in the case of Bertha Rossin. From and after the date of the enactment of this act the said Bertha Rossin shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 621) to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (1), (4), and (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Arnold Rosenthal may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

SEC. 2. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ludmilla Maria

Anderwald, the fiance of Sfc. Robert M. Cornwell, a citizen of the United States, and her minor child, Richard Anderwald, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Ludmilla Maria Anderwald is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Robert M. Cornwell and that she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act other than the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of that act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Ludmilla Maria Anderwald and Richard Anderwald, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Ludmilla Maria Anderwald and Richard Anderwald, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Ludmilla Maria Anderwald and Richard Anderwald as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Hertha Irmgard Hentsdel Barrett may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Marinus Everhardus Bos may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Charlotte M. Budde may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That her marriage to her United States citizen fiance, Raymond Richard Cook, takes place within 6 months after the enactment of this act.

SEC. 6. The exemptions provided for in this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN TRACTS OF LAND IN MISSISSIPPI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8452) to authorize and direct the conveyance of certain tracts of land in the State of Mississippi to Richard C. French, Lewis M. French, and Ruth French Hershey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue a patent to Richard C. French, Lewis M. French, and Ruth French Hershey, of Claiborne County, Miss., subject to the conditions provided for in section 2 of this act, conveying all right, title, and interest of the United States, including mineral rights, in and to the following-described tracts of land situate in the State of Mississippi: Lots 1, 3, and 4 of section 22, township 11 north, range 1 east, Washington meridian, Mississippi, as shown by supplemental plat accepted June 16, 1955.

SEC. 2. The tracts of land authorized to be transferred by the first section of this act shall be conveyed upon the payment of the said Richard C. French, Lewis M. French, and Ruth French Hershey of the appraised value of the lands as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, if payment is made within 1 year after the Secretary has notfied the said Richard C. French, Lewis M. French, and Ruth French Hershey of the appraised price of the lands. The appraised price shall not include any increased value resulting from the development or improvement of the lands by the applicants or their predecessors in interest, but the Secretary shall consider and give full effect to all of the equities of the applicants.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 7, after "Interior", insert "but not less than $1.25 per acre."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 626) to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Barbara Mary Atkins may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That suitable and proper bond or undertaking approved by the Attorney General be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lieselotte Toomey and Agada Fedele Turowski may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Annunziata Spatt may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Celso Telle may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Bernardo Hoz and Liu Gun Cheung may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 6. The exemptions provided for in this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 627) for the relief of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Panagiotis Kousounis, Athena Kousounis, Kam-Kwan Kwok, Chin-Lin Kwok, Rosa Yushang Kiang Kwok, Jeanette Chin-Ming Kwok, Eftalia G. Stathis, and Ariadni Vassiliki G. Stathis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Brigitte Koehler shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

SEC. 3. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bonds, which may have issued in the cases of Rosa Ehrlich, Irma Fontanini Citti, and Hesna Hun. From and after the date of the enactment of this act, the said Rosa Ehrlich, Irma Fontanini Citti, and Hesna Hun shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued: *Provided*, That in the case of Hesna Hun a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Kiang" and insert "Liang."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF GERTRUDE I. KEEP

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5868) for the relief of the estate of Gertrude I. Keep.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,793.10 to the estate of Gertrude I. Keep, Lockport, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States, representing a refund of estate tax erroneously collected from the said estate for the year 1948 by the Bureau of Internal Revenue: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appro-

priated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERNEST C. ST. ONGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7400) for the relief of Ernest C. St. Onge.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ernest C. St. Onge, of Springfield, Mass., the sum of $100. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Ernest C. St. Onge against the United States arising from the fact that he was required to settle a claim for damages in the amount of $100, which claim arose from a collision on March 24, 1953, in which a private automobile was damaged by a United States Post Office Department truck being operated by him on official business: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES E. DRISCOLL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7515) for the relief of James E. Driscoll.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James E. Driscoll, Worcester Mass., the sum of $177.40. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said James E. Driscoll against the United States arising from the fact that he was required to pay a judgment in the amount of $177.40 rendered against him by reason of an automobile accident in Worcester, Mass., on November 28, 1953, in which a private automobile was damaged by a United States Post Office Department vehicle being operated by the said James E. Driscoll on official business: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROY CLICK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10010) for the relief of Roy Click.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to pay, out of money heretofore made available for the eradication of the disease vesicular exanthema in swine, to Roy Click, Route 2, Box 190, Wichita Falls, Tex., the sum of $836. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Roy Click against the United States arising out of the destruction, in July of 1953, of swine owned by him because of the infection and exposure of such swine to the contagious disease vesicular exanthema. Such sum represents 50 percent of the amount of losses incurred by the said Roy Click by reason of the destruction of such swine, 50 percent of the amount of such losses having been heretofore paid to him by the State of Texas: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committtee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. FORRESTER:

Page 1, line 7, after the figures "$836", strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof, "and to pay the sum of $566.12 to Charlie Gardener Ford of Huntsville, Tex."

Page 1, line 8, after the name "Click", insert "and Charlie Gardener Ford."

Page 2, line 2, after the name "Click", insert "and Charlie Gardener Ford."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JESS GARY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10011) for the relief of Jess Gary.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to pay, out of money heretofore made available for the eradication of the disease vesicular exanthema in swine, to Jess Gary, Route 2, Box 191, Wichita Falls, Tex., the sum of $3,398.14. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Jess Gary against the United States arising out of the destruction, in July of 1953, of swine owned by him because of the infection and exposure of such swine to the contagious disease vesicular exanthema. Such sum represents 50 per centum of the amount of losses incurred by the said Jess Gary by reason of the destruction of such swine, 50 percent of the amount of such losses having been heretofore paid to him by the State of Texas: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or receivd by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A. O. NISSEN AND DON NISSEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10199) for the relief of A. O. Nissen and Don Nissen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to pay, out of money heretofore made available for the eradication of the disease vesicular exanthema in swine, to A. O. Nissen and Don Nissen, San Antonio, Tex., the sum of $14,250.32. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said A. O. Nissen and Don Nissen against the United States arising out of the destruction, in January, April, and May of 1953, of swine owned by them because of the infection and exposure of such swine to the contagious disease vesicular exanthema. Such sum represents 50 percent of the amount of losses incurred by the said A. O. Nissen and Don Nissen by reason of the destruction of such swine, 50 percent of the amount of such losses having been heretofore paid to them by the State of Texas: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, after "January", strike out the comma and the words "April, and May."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAM BERGESEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 872) for the relief of Sam Bergesen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any contractual provision relating to a thirty-day limitation for filing an appeal contained in contract numbered C8ca–3694 entered into between Sam Bergesen of Tacoma, Wash., and the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce, for the construction of a very high frequency repeater station at North Nenana, Alaska, the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics is authorized and directed, upon application filed with the Civil Aeronautics Administration within six months after the date of the enactment of this act, to review any claim of the said Sam Bergesen resulting from the assessment of liquidated damages, against him under such contract.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TIBOR HORVATH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1067) for the relief of Tibor Horvath.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Tibor Horvath the sum of $1,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for refund of the amount of the bonds posted with the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice in the case of Tibor Horvath and his wife, Agnes B. Horvath, and declared breached by such Service when the said Tibor Horvath and Agnes B. Horvath failed to depart in accordance with the terms of such bonds although they were subsequently granted permanent residence in the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH KELSCH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1221) for the relief of Joseph Kelsch.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury, upon receipt and redemption of United States Savings Bonds of series E in the amount of $4,300 (maturity value), registered in the name of Joseph Kelsch, of Coalinga, Calif., now deceased, payable on death to the Treasurer of the United States, and after the payment of any gift or inheritance taxes in accordance with the provisions of section 24 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended by the Act of April 3, 1945 (59 Stat. 48; 31 U. S. C. 757e), is authorized and directed, notwithstanding any other provisions of that section, to apply the remaining proceeds, or so much thereof as may be necessary, in payment of all just claims of the creditors of the estate of Joseph Kelsch (including persons who may have paid such claims out of their own funds) which may be judicially determined or otherwise established to the satisfaction of the Secretary and for the payment of which there are no available assets in the estate.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COL. JOHN A. O'KEEFE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2984) for the relief of Col. John A. O'Keefe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Col. John A. O'Keefe (O–277514), retired, the sum of $1,653.00 in full satisfaction of all claims of the said John A. O'Keefe against the United States for compensation for the services performed by him as Adjutant General of the District of Columbia National Guard in the grade of colonel for the period from October 10, 1949, to December 13, 1949, inclusive, no compensation having been received by him for such services because of the unavailability of appropriated funds for such purpose: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "pay", strike out "out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated" and insert in lieu thereof "out of the funds of the District of Columbia."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "United States" and insert in lieu thereof "District of Columbia."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SALE OF PUBLIC LANDS AT WELIWELI, ISLAND OF KAUAI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7888) to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands located at Weliweli, island of Kauai, to certain claimants.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any provision of section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, or of the laws of Hawaii relating to public lands, to the contrary notwithstanding, the commissioner of public lands, with the approval of the Governor and two-thirds of the members of the board of public lands, in his discretion, may transfer and convey by quitclaim deeds to claimants who are citizens of the United States, or who have legally declared their intentions to become citizens of the United States and upon becoming such, and who claim under color of title any portion of the tract of land described as follows:

PORTION OF THE GOVERNMENT LAND OF WELIWELI AT WELIWELI, KONA, KAUAI

Being portion of the Government land of Weliweli occupied and claimed by various persons as portions of grant 1408 to Kauaihewa and grant 1416 to Eke Opunui.

Beginning at a pipe in ahu at the northwest corner of this parcel of land and on the boundary between the lands of Koloa and Weliweli, said pipe in ahu marking the end of course 40 of land court application 956 and being the initial point of lot A of land court application 1188, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "LAAUKAHI" being 23,298.80 feet south and 2,361.40 feet east, and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. 261 degrees 57 minutes 30 seconds 328.40 feet along land court application 1188 to a pipe;

2. 14 degrees 22 minutes no seconds 573.10 feet along grant 1408 to Kauaihewa to a pipe set in top of stonewall;

3. 117 degrees 30 minutes no seconds 46.10 feet along R. P. 3750, L. C. Aw. 3359, Apana 1 to Niihau to a pipe;

4. 348 degrees 30 minutes no seconds 102.90 feet along R. P. 3750, L. C. Aw. 3359, Apana 1 to Niihau to a pipe;

5. 14 degrees 22 minutes no seconds 86.36 feet along grant 1408 to Kauaihewa and grant 1416 to Eke Opunui;

6. 105 degrees 35 minutes no seconds 21.81 feet along land court application 1373;

7. 8 degrees 33 minutes no seconds 112.00 feet along land court application 1373 to seashore at high-water mark;

Thence along seashore at high-water mark for the next three courses, the direct azimuths and distances between points at seashore being:

8. 68 degrees 56 minutes 30 seconds 117.28 feet;

9. 74 degrees 53 minutes no seconds 54.75 feet;

10. 65 degrees 18 minutes no seconds 173.90 feet; thence

11. 193 degrees 27 minutes 932.00 feet along the boundary between the lands of Koloa and Keliweli to the point of beginning and containing a gross area of 260,235 square feet after deducting and excluding therefrom the following-described parcel of land being the present Kuai and Poipu Roads and additional areas required for widening said roads to a width of 50 feet:

Beginning at the west corner of this parcel of land, on the new south side of Poipu Road and on the boundary between the lands of Koloa and Weliweli, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to as Government Triangulation Station "LAAUKAHI" being 23,902.35 feet south and 2,217.06 feet east, and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. 193 degrees 27 minutes no seconds 50.03 feet along the boundary between the lands of Koloa and Weliweli;

2. 285 degrees 33 minutes no seconds 96.98 feet along the new north side of Poipu Road;

3. Thence on a curve to the left with a radius of 20.00 feet, the chord azimuth and distance being: 239 degrees 55 minutes 30 seconds 28.59 feet;

4. 194 degrees 18 minutes no seconds 565.43 feet along the new west side of Kuai Road;

5. Thence along the west side of Kuai Road, on a curve to the left with a radius of

829.00 feet, the chord azimuth and distance being: 192 degrees 58 minutes 04 second 38.55 feet;

6. 261 degrees 57 minutes 30 seconds 52.91 feet along land court application 1188;

7. Thence along the new east side of Kuai Road, on a curve to the right with a radius of 879.00 feet, the chord azimuth and distance being: 12 degrees 23 minutes 13 seconds 58.69 feet;

8. 14 degrees 18 minutes no seconds 567.39 feet along the new east side of Kuai Road;

9. Thence on a curve to the left with a radius of 20.00 feet, the chord azimuth and distance being: 329 degrees 55 minutes 30 seconds 27.97 feet;

10. 285 degrees 33 minutes no seconds Poipu Road;

11. 14 degrees 22 minutes no seconds 39.81 feet along grant 1416 to Eke Opunui;

12. 105 degrees 33 minutes no seconds 21.81 feet along land court application 1373;

13. 8 degrees 33 minutes no seconds 10.28 feet along land court application 1373;

14. 105 degrees 33 minutes no seconds 272.98 feet along the new south side of Poipu Road to the point of beginning and containing an area of 46,410 square feet.

Reserving also to the Territory of Hawaii in perpetuity an easement fifteen feet wide for storm drain purposes upon and across that portion of the government land of Weliweli occupied by the B. D. Baldwin Trust Estate, running from the new south side of Poipu Road to the sea, described as follows:

Being a strip of land 15.00 feet wide, extending for 7.50 feet on each side of the centerline described as follows:

Beginning at the north end of this right-of-way on the new south side of Poipu Road, at a point which is 105 degrees, 33 minutes, no seconds, 131.49 feet from the end of course 13 of the road exclusion as described above, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "LAAUKAHI" being 23,940.28 feet south and 2,353.37 feet east, and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. 359 degrees 19 minutes no seconds 178.00 feet to seashore at highwater mark.

SEC. 2. The lot claimed shall be conveyed for a fair and reasonable price, which price shall be determined by a disinterested appraiser or appraisers, but not more than three to be appointed by the Governor, and all improvements thereon shall be valued at $1.

SEC. 3. The commissioner may, prior to executing such quitclaim deeds, require that claimants quitclaim to the Territory any claim they may have in and to the roadways hereinabove described, and the easement hereinabove referred to.

SEC. 4. This Act shall take effect on and after the date of its approval.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STANDING ROCK RESERVATION, N. DAK.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8005) to provide for the conveyance to the Mathew American Horse American Legion Post, No. 259, Cannon Ball, N. Dak., of certain lands upon the Standing Rock Reservation, N. Dak., for use as a site for the erection of a memorial monument in honor of soldiers killed in battle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the Mathew American Horse American Legion Post, No. 259, Cannon Ball, N. Dak., for use as a site to erect a memorial monument, all the right, title, and interest of the United States and the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe of Indians to the parcel of land within the Standing Rock Reservation, N. Dak., described as the east half of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 26, township 134 north, range 79 west, fifth principal meridian, consisting of one and one-quarter acres more or less, subject to a reservation of all rights, to oil, gas, and other mineral deposits in such described land and the right to develop such mineral deposits in any manner that will not interfere with the use of the land as a memorial monument site, and subject to the condition that in the event the Secretary of the Interior determines that the land has ceased to be used as a memorial monument site the title to the land shall revert to the United States to be held in the same manner it was held prior to such conveyance.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To provide for the conveyance to the Mathew American Horse American Legion Post, No. 259, Cannon Ball, N. Dak., of certain lands upon the Standing Rock Reservation, N. Dak., for use as a site for the erection of a memorial monument in honor of members of the Armed Forces killed in battle."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXEMPTING FROM TAXATION CERTAIN PROPERTY OF AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11489) to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Institute of Architects in the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That certain property in the District of Columbia described as lot numbered 833 in square numbered 170 together with the improvements thereon, known as the Octagon House and outbuildings, and the furniture, furnishings, and other personal property therein, owned by the American Institute of Architects, a nonprofit corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York, to be exempt from taxation, national and municipal, so long as the same is owned by said American Institute of Architects and is not used for commercial purposes, subject to the provisions of sections 2, 3, and 5 of the act entitled "An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia," approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1091; D. C. Code, secs. 47–801b, 47–801c, and 47–801e).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS TO BUSINESS PROPERTY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4993) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to business property in the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to permit the erection, construction, alteration, conversion, maintenance, and use of such buildings and other improvements on square 1928, lot numbered 800 (southeast corner of the intersection of Wisconsin and Massachusetts Avenues NW.), situated in the District of Columbia, as the Commissioners may deem appropriate for the purpose of conducting the businesses which are being conducted on such lands on the date of enactment of this act. This act shall further provide that any buildings constructed on said lot 800 shall blend in and coincide with the buildings at the National Cathedral and at Saint Alban's School.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the calendar be dispensed with since we have received no reports on the remaining bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

PAULINE H. CORBETT

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3957) for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett, with an amendment of the Senate thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. FORRESTER, DONOHUE, and MILLER of New York.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized.

TRANSFER OF ACTIONS FROM UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT TO MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 8149) to amend the first sentence of paragraph (a) of section 756 of title 11 of the District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition—paragraph (a) of section 5 of the act of April 1, 1942, ch. 207, 56 Stat. 193—relating to the transfer of actions from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, and I ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That if, in any action, other than an action for equitable relief, pending on the effective date of this subchapter, as amended, or thereafter commenced in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, it shall appear to the satisfaction of the court at any time prior to trial thereof that the action will not justify a judgment in excess of $3,000, the court may certify such action to the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia for trial.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, existing law provides for the transfer of any action, other than an action for equitable relief, from the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to the municipal court for the District of Columbia, if it appears to the satisfaction of the district court, in any pretrial hearing, that the action will not justify a judgment in excess of $1,000.

The primary purpose of the amendment is to increase the limitations on actions to be transferred to $3,000, and to permit transfer at any time prior to trial, instead of limiting transfers to cases involving not more than $1,000, and providing for transfer only at the pretrial hearing, which is the stage immediately preceding the actual trial.

The amendment was recommended first by the Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia Circuit and then by the Judical Conference of the United States at a special meeting held March 24–25, 1955. The proposed amendment also changes the title of the District Court to its present title in accordance with the revision of the Judicial Code in 1948 and adds the words "as amended" following the word "subchapter" on the fourth line of the proposed amendment since subsequent to its adoption in 1942 the subchapter has been amended.

Civil jurisdiction of the municipal court for the District of Columbia now extends to matters involving not more than $3,000. The existing statute, in effect, requires that actions originally filed in the district court must be tried in the district court, when it appears that the action will justify a recovery of more than $1,000 and less than $3,000, although the municipal court has exclusive jurisdiction of this type of case by statute. Dual jurisdiction of this nature should be corrected whenever possible. In addition, the amendment will have the salutary effect of relieving the present district court calendar congestion by permitting transfer of a limited number of cases involving relatively small amounts, and will be of substantial assistance to the court in expediting the dispatch of many long and difficult cases, which are a significant factor in the congestion of the civil calendar.

A public hearing was held before the Judiciary Subcommittee of the House District Committee on April 30, 1956, at which time the Commissioners appeared and testified in favor of the legislation.

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago there was a rollcall vote on the small-business bill. I was unavoidably detained and arrived on the floor right after the result of the vote was announced and could not be recorded. I would like to be recorded now as saying that had I been present I would have voted "aye." I even signed a petition to have the bill brought out for consideration. I am very strongly in favor of it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BLITCH. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I saw the gentlewoman come into the well of the House right after the rollcall was announced by the Speaker. The statement made by the gentlewoman from Georgia is absolutely correct in every respect.

Mrs. BLITCH. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (H. R. 10670) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act so as to extend the coverage of such act to employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia employed in District of Columbia institutions located in Maryland and Virginia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the bill dealing with longshoremen and harbor workers?

Mr. McMILLAN. No; this applies only to employees of the District of Columbia.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 (b) (8) of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, approved August 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 946), as amended (title 46, ch. 3, D. C. Code; 68 Stat. 988), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(iii) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection 1 (b) (2) of this act, service performed in the employ of the municipal government of the District of Columbia but not localized within the District may, if said government elects, be covered employment."

SEC. 2. This amendatory act shall take effect as of 12:01 antemeridian on the first day of the next succeeding calendar quarter following the enactment of this amendatory act.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to permit employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, if their employment be "localized" within the District of Columbia, to be covered by the provisions of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act. At the present time, however, the District government has approximately 1,595 employees in District institutions located in Maryland and Virginia. These employees, because their employment is "localized" within those States, cannot be covered by the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, nor is their employment subject to the respective unemployment compensation acts of Maryland and Virginia because the laws of those States treat the District of Columbia as a sovereignty not subject to tax, although both States do contain provisions in their laws which would permit the District of Columbia to elect voluntarily to have its employees located in those States covered by the State unemployment compensation law. Any such election, however, would be to the disadvantage of the District of Columbia, inasmuch as the District would be required to file the numerous reports required of private employers and to pay the unemployment taxes levied by such States.

The more acceptable alternative to this problem is to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act so as to provide that employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia whose employment is localized outside the District, may nevertheless be covered by the District Unemployment Compensation Act, if the District government so elects.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia recommended this legislation which would authorize the District of Columbia to elect to cover under the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, those employees whose employment is not localized within the District.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTROL OF NARCOTICS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], to handle the next bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill H. R. 11320, to amend certain laws affecting the control of narcotics in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Narcotic Control Act for the District of Columbia."

TITLE I—TREATMENT OF NARCOTIC USERS

SEC. 101. The act entitled "An act to provide for the treatment of users of narcotics

in the District of Columbia," approved June 24, 1953 (67 Stat. 77), is amended to read as follows:

"Short title

"SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the 'Hospital Treatment for Drug Addicts Act for the District of Columbia.'

"Purpose

"SEC. 2. The purpose of this act is to protect the health and safety of the people of the District of Columbia from the menace of drug addiction and to afford an opportunity to the drug user for rehabilitation. The Congress intends that Federal criminal laws shall be enforced against drug users as well as other persons, and this act shall not be used to substitute treatment for punishment in cases of crime committed by drug users.

"Definitions

"SEC. 3. For the purpose of this act—

"(a) The term 'drug user' means any person, including a person under 18 years of age, notwithstanding the provisions of the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia, as amended, who uses any habit-forming narcotic drugs so as to endanger the public morals, health, safety, or welfare, or who is so far addicted to the use of such habit-forming narcotic drugs as to have lost the power of self-control with reference to his addiction.

"(b) The term 'narcotic drugs' shall have the same meaning as that given to such term by section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"(c) The term 'patient' means any person ordered to appear before the Commissioners, pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of this act.

"(d) The term 'Commissioners' means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, sitting as a Board, or their designated agent or agents.

"Order of examination

"SEC. 4. (a) Whenever the Commissioners have probable cause to believe that any person within the District of Columbia, other than a person referred to in subsection (b) hereof, is a drug user, they forthwith shall order any law enforcement officer of the District of Columbia to bring that person before them, to conduct a preliminary examination, and if they find sufficient evidence of addiction, as hereinbefore defined, they shall cause that person to be placed in an institution to be designated by them for an examination by physicians pursuant to section 5 of this act.

"(b) The Commissioners shall not order any person brought before them if the said person is charged with a criminal offense, whether by indictment, information, or otherwise, or if the said person is under sentence for a criminal offense, whether he is serving the sentence, or is on probation or parole, or has been released on bond pending appeal.

"Examination by physician

"SEC. 5. (a) Whenever the Commissioners order a patient into an institution pursuant to the provisions of section 4 hereof, they shall immediately appoint two qualified physicians, one of whom shall be a psychiatrist, to examine the said patient, and within 5 days after such appointment, each physician shall file with the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, a written report of such examination, which shall include a statement of his conclusion as to whether the patient is a drug user.

"(b) The United States attorney for the District of Columbia shall review the facts and circumstances of each case submitted to him and present by petition those in which he feels justification exists in the public interest to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for determination and disposition, or dismiss the patient from custody. A copy of such petition shall be served on the patient in open court, at which time the court shall set a hearing date and advise the patient of his right to counsel and his right to demand within 5 days a trial by jury.

"When hearing is required

"SEC. 6. If, in a report filed pursuant to section 5 of this act, either of the examining physicians states that the patient is a drug user, or that he is unable to reach any conclusion by reason of the refusal of the patient to submit to thorough examination, the court shall conduct a hearing upon petition of the United States attorney in the manner provided in section 8 of this act.

"Right to counsel

"SEC. 7. (a) A patient shall have the right to the assistance of counsel at every stage of the judicial proceeding under this act, and the court shall assign counsel to represent him if the patient is unable to obtain counsel.

"(b) The counsel for a patient may inspect the reports of the examination made pursuant to the authority contained in section 5 of this act. No such report and no evidence resulting from such personal examination or evidence offered by the patient shall be admissible against him in any judicial proceeding except a proceeding under this act.

"(c) The patient may, prior to the examination made pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of this act or prior to the hearing provided for by section 8 of this act, waive his rights to an examination, to counsel, or to such hearing, and voluntarily submit himself to commitment pursuant to the provisions of this act.

"Hearing

"SEC. 8. (a) Upon the evidence introduced at a hearing held for that purpose the court shall determine whether the patient is a drug user. The hearing shall be conducted without a jury unless, before such hearing and within 5 days after the date on which the petition is filed pursuant to section 5 of this act, a jury is demanded by the patient or by the United States attorney for the District of Columbia. Each patient concerning whom a report is filed shall be detained at such place as the Commissioners may designate until the completion of such hearing or until released as provided in section 5 (b) hereof.

"(b) The rules of evidence applicable in civil judicial proceedings shall be applicable to hearings pursuant to this section, including the right of the patient to present evidence in his own behalf and to subpena and cross-examine witnesses. However, no patient examined pursuant to the provisions of this act, shall be permitted at any hearing ordered pursuant to this section to object to the submission of testimony concerning such examination on the ground of privilege.

"Confinement of patient

"SEC. 9. If the court finds the patient to be a drug user, it may commit him to a hospital designated by the patient or the Commissioners and approved by the court, to be confined there for rehabilitation until released in accordance with section 10 of this act. In the event a patient elects to designate a hospital to which he wishes to be committed, he shall be required to satisfy the court that such hospital has medical, rehabilitation, and security facilities comparable to the institutions designated by the Commissioners and, in addition, the cost of such hospitalization shall be borne by the patient. The head of the hospital shall submit written reports within such periods as the court may direct, but no longer than 6 months after the commitment and for successive intervals of time thereafter, and state reasons why the patient has not been released.

"Release of patient

"SEC. 10. (a) When the head of the hospital to which the patient is committed finds that the patient appears to be no longer in need of confinement for treatment purposes, or has received maximum benefits, he shall give notice to the judge of the committing court, and said patient shall be delivered to the said court for such further action as the court may deem necessary and proper under the provisions of this act.

"(b) The court, upon petition of the patient after confinement for 1 year, shall inquire into the refusal or failure of the head of the hospital to release him. If the court finds that the patient is no longer in need of care, treatment, guidance, or rehabilitation, or has received maximum benefits, it shall order the patient released, in accordance with the provisions of section 11 of this act.

"Periodic examination of released patients

"SEC. 11. (a) For 2 years after his release, the patient shall report to the Commissioners at such times and places as required, for a physical examination to determine whether the patient has again become a drug user. If the Commissioners determine that the person examined is a drug user, they shall then order the patient into an institution in accordance with the provisions of this act.

"(b) Upon the failure of any patient to report in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) hereof, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia shall be notified of such failure, and a statement of such failure to report shall be filed with the court. The court shall issue an attachment for the patient and order him confined forthwith for examination and such further action as the court may deem necessary and proper under the provisions of this act.

"Patient not deemed a criminal

"SEC. 12. The patient in any proceedings under this act shall not be deemed a criminal and the commitment of any such patient shall not be deemed a conviction."

TITLE II—REGULATION AND CONTROL OF CERTAIN DRUGS

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "Dangerous Drug Act for the District of Columbia."

Definitions

SEC. 202. For the purposes of this title—

(1) The term "dangerous drug" means any drug unsafe for self-medication or treatment except upon a physician's prescription; and the term "dangerous drug" further means all drugs having harmful or habit-forming properties, including—

(A) amphetamine, desoxyephedrine, or compounds or mixtures thereof, except preparations intended for use in the nose and unfit for internal use;

(B) barbituric acid, also known as malonylurea, and its salts and derivatives, and compounds, preparations, and mixtures thereof;

(C) other drugs or compounds, preparations, or mixtures thereof which the Commissioners shall find and declare by rule or regulation duly promulgated after reasonable public notice and opportunity for a hearing to be harmful or to have a hynotic or somnifacient effect on the body of a human or animal;

(D) any drug which bears the legend: "Caution: Federal law prohibits dispensing without prescription," or words of like import, or any derivative, compound, or mixture thereof, except that the term "dangerous drug" shall not include any drug the manufacture or delivery of which is regulated by Federal narcotic drug laws, or by the narcotic drug laws of the District of Columbia.

(2) The terms "delivery" and "furnish" mean the selling, dispensing, giving away, sampling, or supplying in any other manner.

(3) the term "patient" means, as the case may be—

(A) the individual for whom a dangerous drug is prescribed, administered, or supplied in the course of profesisonal practice for a legitimate medical purpose; or

(B) the owner or the agent of the owner of the animal for whom a dangerous drug is prescribed or to which or on which a dangerous drug is administered or used in the course of professional practice for a legitimate medical purpose.

(4) The term "person" includes any corporation, partnership, association, or one or more individuals, acting either as principal or agent.

(5) The term "practitioner" means any person duly licensed by appropriate authority and, in conformance with the law, licensed to prescribe dangerous drugs, and to administer and use dangerous drugs in the course of his professional practice.

(6) The term "pharmacist" means a person duly licensed pursuant to the act approved May 7, 1906, as amended (title 2, ch. 6, D. C. Code, 1951 ed.).

(7) The term "prescription" means a written or oral order by a practitioner to a pharmacist for a dangerous drug (including amphetamines and barbiturates) for a particular patient, which specifies the date of issue, the name and address of the patient (and, in the case of prescription for an animal, the species of such animal), the name and quantity of the dangerous drug prescribed, the directions for use of such drug, and in case of a written order, the signature and office address of such practitioner, and in the case of an oral order, the District of Columbia or State registration number and office address of such practitioner (and if the practitioner be a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, then he shall give his rank, serial number, and station). Each oral order by a practitioner for a dangerous drug must be promptly reduced to writing by the pharmacist.

(8) The term "hospital" means an institution or dispensary or clinic for the care and treatment of the sick and injured, approved by the Commissioners as proper to be entrusted with the custody of dangerous drugs and the professional use of dangerous drugs under the direction of a physician, dentist, or veterinarian.

(9) The term "laboratory" means a laboratory approved by the Commissioners as proper to be entrusted with the custody of dangerous drugs and their use for medical and scientific purposes, and for purposes of instruction.

(10) The term "manufacturer" means a person or persons, other than pharmacists who manufacture dangerous drugs, and includes persons who prepare such drugs in dosage forms by mixing, compounding, encapsulating, entableting, or other process.

(11) The term "wholesaler" means a person or persons engaged in the business of distributing dangerous drugs to persons included in any of the classes named in subdivisions (A) and (D), inclusive, of section 205.

(12) The term "drug salesman" or "manufacturer's representative" means any person who, acting in the course of his regular duties, calls upon or visits practitioners or pharmacists in the interest of demonstrating, selling, or detailing the use and sale of dangerous drugs.

(13) The term "warehouseman" means a person who, in the usual course of business, stores drugs for others lawfully entitled to possess them, and who has no control over the disposition of such drugs except for the purpose of such storage.

(14) The term "Commissioners" means the Commissioners for the District of Columbia, sitting as a board, or their designated agent or agents.

Prohibited acts

SEC. 203. (a) Except as otherwise provided by sections 204 and 205 of this title, the following acts, the failure to act as hereinafter set forth, and the causing of any such act or failure are hereby declared unlawful:

(1) The delivery of any dangerous drug (including amphetamines and barbiturates) unless—

(A) such dangerous drug is delivered by a pharmacist, upon a prescription, and there is affixed to the immediate container of such or in which such drug is delivered a label bearing (i) the name and address of the owner of the establishment from which such drug was delivered; (ii) the date on which the prescription for such drug was filed; (iii) the number of such prescription as filed in the prescription files of the pharmacist who filled such prescription; (iv) the name of the practitioner who prescribed such drug; (v) the name and address of the patient, and if such drug was prescribed for an animal, a statement of the species of the animal; and (vi) the directions for the use of the drug, as contained in the prescription; or

(B) such dangerous drug is delivered to a practitioner by a pharmacist for his professional use in his practice; in which case the pharmacist may deliver the drug without affixing any additional label to the original package of such drug and must immediately record such sale and delivery by filing a suitable record of such sale and delivery in the prescription file as maintained for prescriptions for such drugs; or

(C) such dangerous drug is delivered by a manufacturer's representative or drug salesman to a practitioner in the course of calling upon the practitioner; in which case the manufacturer's representative or drug salesman shall immediately record, in a suitable bound notebook (i) the name and quantity of the drug delivered, (ii) the date such drug was delivered, and (iii) the name and address of the practitioner to whom the drug was delivered; or

(D) such dangerous drug is delivered by a practitioner in the course of his practice and the immediate container in which such drug is delivered bears a label on which appears the directions for use of such drug, the name and address of such practitioner, the name and address of the patient, and, if such drug is prescribed for an animal, a statement of the species of the animal.

(2) The refilling of any prescription for a dangerous drug except as designated on the prescription, or by the consent of the practitioner.

(3) The delivery of a dangerous drug upon prescription unless the pharmacist who filled such prescription files and retains it as required by section 206 of this title.

(4) The possession of a dangerous drug by any person, unless such person obtained such drug on the prescription of a practitioner or in accordance with subparagraph (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(5) The making or uttering by any person of any false or forged prescription, or false or forged written order for the purpose of obtaining any dangerous drug.

(6) The delivery of any dangerous drug to any person in the District of Columbia not lawfully entitled to receive such drug.

(7) The willful making of or concealment of any material false statement or representation in any prescription, order, report, or record required by this title.

(8) The refusal to make available and to accord full opportunity to check any record or file as required by section 207 of this title.

(9) The failure to keep records as required by subsections (a) and (b) of section 206 of this title.

(10) The using by any person to his own advantage, or the revealing, other than to any officer of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia in the performance of his official duties, the Commissioners, acting pursuant to authority vested in them, or to a court when relevant in a judicial proceeding under this title, of any information required under the authority of section 207, concerning any method or process which as a trade secret is entitled to protection.

(b) Nothing in this section shall be construed to relieve any person with respect to dangerous drugs, (including amphetamines and barbiturates) from any requirement prescribed by or under the authority of sections 502 and 503 (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (52 Stat. 1040; 21 U. S. C. 352, 353 (b)).

Exemptions

SEC. 204. Nothing in this title shall apply to a compound, mixture, or preparation which is sold in good faith for the purpose for which it is intended and not for the purposes of evading the provisions of this title if—

(1) such compound, mixture, or preparation of barbituric acid, its salts and derivatives shall be found and declared by rule or regulation duly promulgated by the Commissioners after reasonable public notice and opportunity for hearing to have or to contain no harmful, or habit-forming properties or to produce no hypnotic or somnifacient effect on the body of a human or animal.

(2) such compound, mixture, or preparation of amphetamine or amphetamine type or desoxyephedrine drug, or its salts or derivatives, is intended for use as a spray or gargle or for external application and contains, in addition to such drug or its salts and derivatives, some other drug or drugs rendering it unfit for internal administration, and which the Commissioners have found and declared by rule or regulation duly promulgated after reasonable public notice and opportunity for hearing to have no harmful properties or effect when used for the purpose intended.

Exemption of persons

SEC. 205. The provisions of paragraphs (1) and (4) of section 203 (a) of this title shall not be applicable (1) to the delivery of dangerous drugs to persons included in any of the classes hereinafter named, or to agents or employees of such persons, for use in the normal or usual course of their business or practice or in the performance of their official duties, as the case may be; or (2) to the possession of dangerous drugs by such persons or their agents or employes for such use:

(A) Pharmacists

(B) Practitioners

(C) Persons who procure dangerous drugs (including barbiturates or amphetamines) (i) for handling by or under the supervision of pharmacists or practitioners, or (ii) for the purpose of lawful research, teaching, or testing and not for resale.

(D) Hospitals which procure dangerous drugs for lawful administration or use by practitioners.

(E) Laboratories which procure dangerous drugs for lawful medical and scientific purposes.

(F) Officers or employees of appropriate enforcement agencies of Federal, State, District of Columbia, or local governments, pursuant to their duties in enforcing this title.

(G) Manufacturers and wholesalers.

(H) Manufacturers' representatives and drug salesmen.

(I) Carriers and warehousemen.

Records

SEC. 206. (a) Persons (other than carriers and practitioners) to whom the provisions

of section 205 of this title are applicable shall—

(1) make biennially, beginning within 30 days from the date of enactment of this title, a complete record of all stocks of amphetamines and barbiturates on hand, such records to be held for a period of 2 years, and

(2) retain all such commercial or other records, including invoices, relating to dangerous drugs (including amphetamines and barbiturates) received or maintained by them in the course of their business or occupation, or as required by this title, for not less than 2 calendar years immediately following the date of such record.

(b) Pharmacists shall, in addition to complying with the provisions of subsection (a) hereof, retain each prescription or notation of sale to practitioner for a dangerous drug received by them, for not less than 2 calender years immediately following the date of the filling of the order or prescription and a complete record of each refilling of such prescription.

Inspection

SEC. 207. Prescriptions, orders, and records, required by section 206 of this title, and stocks of dangerous drugs shall be opened for inspection—

(1) upon written request, to any officer or employee duly designated by the Commissioners at all reasonable hours for the purpose of inspection and copying; and, any person upon whom such request is served shall accord to such officer or employee full opportunity to check the correctness of such files or records, including the opportunity to make inventory of all stocks of dangerous drugs on hand; and it shall be unlawful for any such person to fail to make such files or records available or to accord such opportunity to check their correctness, or

(2) to Federal and District of Columbia officers whose duty it is to enforce the laws of the District of Columbia, or of the United States, relating to dangerous drugs. No officer having knowledge by virtue of his office of any such prescription, order, or record shall divulge such knowledge, except in connection with a prosecution or proceeding in court or before a licensing or registration board or officer, in which such prescriptions, orders, or records may be pertinent.

Regulations

SEC. 208. The Commissioners are hereby authorized to promulgate necessary regulations for the administration and enforcement of this title.

Penalties

SEC. 209. (a) Any person violating any provision of this title, or of any regulation made by the Commissioners under the authority of this title shall upon conviction be punished, for the first offense, by a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $1,000, or by imprisonment for not exceeding 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment; and for any subsequent offense by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $5,000, or by imprisonment for not exceeding 10 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(b) The conviction of any person for a violation of this title, or of any regulation made under the authority of this title, involving any dangerous drug shall constitute ground for suspension or revocation or denial of renewal of the professional license of such person. Proceedings for such suspension or revocation or denial of renewal shall be had in accordance with the statutes relating to the issuance, revocation, suspension, and denial of renewal of such licenses and in accordance with statutes relating to judicial review of administrative action in connection with the revocation, suspension, or denial of renewal of such licenses.

(c) As used in this section the term "professional license" means a license issued under the following acts: (1) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia", approved February 27, 1929 (45 Stat. 1326), as amended; (2) the act entitled "An act to amend the act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto; approved June 6, 1892, and acts amendatory thereof, approved July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 716), as amended; (3) the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved May 7, 1906 (34 Stat. 175), as amended; and (4) the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia", approved February 1, 1907 (34 Stat. 870), as amended;

Search Warrants

SEC. 210. (a) A search warrant may be issued upon probable cause, supported by affidavit particularly describing the property to be seized and place to be searched, by any judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia or by the United States Commissioner for the District of Columbia, to any officer of the Metropolitan Police Department when any dangerous drugs are manufactured, possessed, prescribed, and delivered in violation of the provisions of this title, and any such dangerous drugs and any other property designed for use in connection with such unlawful manufacturing, posssession, prescribing, or delivery, may be seized thereunder and shall be subject to such disposition as the court may make thereof, and such dangerous drugs may be taken on the warrant from any house or other place in which they are concealed.

(b) Any search warrant issued in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section may be served at any time in the day or night and must be executed and returned to the issuing authority within 10 days after its date.

Arrests Without Warrant

SEC. 211. (a) Arrests without a warrant, and searches of the person and seizures pursuant thereto, may be made for a violation of any of the provisions of section 203 of this title by police officers, as in the case of a felony, upon probable cause that the person arrested is violating such section at the time of his arrest.

(b) No evidence discovered in the course of any such arrest, search, or seizure authorized by this section shall be admissible in any criminal proceeding against the person arrested, unless at the time of such arrest he was violating section 203 of this title.

Forfeiture

SEC. 212. Any dangerous drug seized pursuant to any lawful search or which may have come into the custody of any peace officer, the lawful possession of which cannot be established or the title to which cannot be ascertained, shall be forfeited and destroyed in the same manner provided for narcotic drugs in section 17 of the Uniform Narcotic Drug Act, approved June 20, 1938 (52 Stat. 794; D. C. Code, title 33–417), as amended.

Separability Clause

SEC. 213. If any provision of this title is declared unconstitutional or the applicability thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the constitutionality of the remainder of the act and the applicability thereof to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

Amendments to Uniform Narcotic Drug Act

SEC. 301. (a) (1) The first section of the Uniform Narcotic Drug Act approved June 20, 1938 (52 Stat. 785; D. C. Code, sec. 33–401), is amended by amending subsections (n) and (o) to read as folows:

"(n) 'Narcotic drugs' means cocoa leaves, opium, cannabis, isonipecaine, and opiate, and every substance not chemically distinguishable from them, and any compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, or preparation of coca leaves, opium, cannabis, isonipecaine, or opiate, whether produced directly or indirectly by extraction from substances of vegetable origin, or independently by means of chemical synthesis, or by a combination of extraction and chemical synthesis.

"(o) 'Federal narcotic laws' means the laws of the United States and the regulations promulgated thereunder relating to opium, coca leaves, cannabis, and other narcotic drugs."

(2) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(t) 'Isonipecaine' and 'opiate' shall have the same meaning as that given to such terms by section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954."

(b) Section 2 of such act is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 2.", and (2) by adding at the end of such section the following new subsections:

"(b) Arrests without a warrant, and searches of the person and seizures pursuant thereto, may be made for a violation of subsection (a) hereof by police officers, as in the case of a felony, upon probable cause that the person arrested in violating such subsection at the time of his arrest.

"(c) No evidence discovered in the course of any such arrest, search, or seizure authorized by subsection (b) hereof, shall be admissible in any criminal proceeding against the person arrested unless at the time of such arrest he was violating the provision of this section."

(c) Section 5 of such act is amended (1) by striking out in the fourth sentence of the first paragraph thereof "in section 1041, title 26, U. S. Code", and inserting in lieu thereof "in section 4702 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954" and (2) by striking out in the first sentence of the second paragraph thereof "at a cost not to exceed $1 a hundred", and inserting in lieu thereof "at cost", and (3) by amending the last paragraph thereof to read as follows:

"It shall be deemed a compliance with this section if the parties to the transaction have complied with the Federal narcotic laws respecting official order forms if such order forms are authorized and required by Federal laws, or, if no such order form is required by Federal law and if no such order form is available for purchase as provided in the preceding paragraph of this section, then the parties to the transaction shall comply with the rules and regulations made pursuant to this Act respecting official order forms and such other records as may be required."

(d) Section 8 of such act is amended (1) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as (d) and (e), respectively, and (2) by striking out in subsection (a) thereof the last two sentences and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) An apothecary, in good faith, may sell and dispense on oral prescription of a physician, dentist, or veterinarian such narcotic drugs or compounds thereof as are found by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate, pursuant to section 4705 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to possess relatively little or no addiction liability. The oral prescription shall be reduced to a written record by the apothecary before filling, with said written record containing the same information as is required by law or regulation in the case of a written prescription except for the requirement of the written signature of the prescribed.

"(c) A written prescription or a written record of an oral prescription shall be retained on file by the proprietor of the pharmacy in which it is filled for a period of 2 years, so as to be readily accessible for inspection by any public officer or employee engaged in the enforcement of this act. The prescription shall not be refilled."

(e) Section 9 (a) of such act is amended (1) by striking out in the first sentence thereof "may prescribe in writting" and inserting in lieu thereof "may prescribe by a written or oral prescription," (2) by striking out in the second sentence thereof "Such a prescription" and inserting in lieu thereof "Each written prescription:", and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In issuing an oral prescription, the physician or dentist shall furnish the apothecary with the same information as is required by law or regulation in the case of a written prescription for narcotic drugs and compounds, except for the requirement of the written signature of the prescriber."

(f) Section 9 (b) of such act is amended (1) by striking out in the first sentence thereof "may prescribe in writing" and inserting in lieu thereof "may prescribe by a written or oral prescription", (2) by striking out in the second sentence thereof "Such a prescription" and inserting in lieu thereof "Each written prescription", and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In issuing an oral prescription, the veterinarian shall furnish the apothecary with the same information as is required by law in the case of a written prescription for narcotic drugs and compounds, except for the written signature of the prescriber."

(g) Section 9 of such act is further amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and inserting immediately after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) Nothing contained in subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be construed as authorizing an oral prescription to be furnished by the physician, dentist, or veterinarian to the apothecary, for a narcotic drug or compound other than those narcotic drugs or compounds determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, or his delegate, pursuant to the provisions of section 4705 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to possess little or no addiction liability."

(h) Section 10 of such act is amended—

(1) by inserting immediately before the period at the end of subsection (a) thereof, a comma and the following:

"(5) not more than one-sixth of a grain of dihydrocodeinone or any of its salts";

(2) by inserting immediately after subsection (b) thereof, the following new subsection:

"(c) Prescribing, administering, dispensing, or selling at retail of any medicinal preparation containing not in excess of 25 percent paregoric, in combination with some drug or drugs which confer upon it medicinal properties other than those possessed by paregoric."; and

(3) by striking out in the third sentence of the last paragraph thereof "without a prescription" and inserting in lieu thereof "without a written prescription."

(i) Subsection (e) of section 11 of such act is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof.

(j) (1) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 12 of such act is amended by striking out "a prescription" and inserting in lieu thereof "a written or oral prescription."

(2) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 12 of such act is amended (A) by striking out "a prescription" and inserting in lieu thereof "a written or oral prescription", and (B) by striking out "affix to" and inserting in lieu thereof "affix to or place in."

(k) Section 14 (h) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(h) The judge or commissioner shall insert a direction in the warrant that it may be served at any time in the day or night."

(l) Such act is further amended by inserting after section 16 of the following new section:

"SEC. 16A. Vagrancy—Narcotic Drug User—Penalties—Conditions Imposed.

"(a) The purpose of this section is to protect the public health, welfare, and safety of the people of the District of Columbia by providing safeguards for the people against harmful contact with narcotic drug users who are vagrants within the meaning of this section and to establish, in addition to the Hospital Treatment for Drug Addicts Act for the District of Columbia, further procedures and means for the care and rehabilitation of such narcotic drug users.

"(b) For the purpose of this section—

"(1) the term 'vagrant' shall mean any person who is a narcotic drug user or who has been convicted of a narcotic offense in the District of Columbia or elsewhere and who—

"(A) having no lawful employment or visible means of support realized from a lawful occupation or source, is found mingling with others in public or loitering in any park or other public place and fails to give a good account of himself; or

"(B) is found in any place, abode, house, shed, dwelling, building, structure, vehicle, conveyance, or boat, in which any illicit narcotic drugs are kept, found, used, or dispensed; or

"(C) wanders about in public places at late or unusual hours of the night, either alone or in the company of or association with a narcotic drug user or convicted narcotic law violator, and fails to give a good account of himself; or

"(D) is included within one of the classes of persons defined in paragraphs (1) through (9), inclusive, of section 5 of the act of December 17, 1941 (55 Stat. 808; D. C. Code, sec. 22-3302), as amended;

"(2) the term 'narcotic drug user' shall mean any person who takes or otherwise uses narcotic drugs, except a person using such narcotic drug as a result of sickness or accident or injury, and to whom such narcotic drugs are being furnished, prescribed, or administered in good faith by a duly licensed physician in the course of his professional practice.

"(c) Whenever any law-enforcement officer has probable cause to believe that any person is a vagrant within the meaning of this section, he is authorized to place that person under arrest and to confine him in any place in the District of Columbia designated by the Commissioners thereof.

"(d) Pending arraignment and without delay the person arrested as a vagrant within the meaning of this section shall have the opportunity to be examined by a physician designated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, who shall determine whether there is evidence of narcotic drug usage.

"(e) If the physician designated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia is satisfied that the person examined is not a narcotic drug user, or if there is insufficient evidence of narcotic drug usage, the United States Attorney shall, if the said person is not otherwise chargeable as a vagrant within the meaning of this section, bring such matter to the attention of the Corporation Counsel for the District of Columbia for determination as to whether there shall be a prosecution under the provisions of the act of December 17, 1941 (55 Stat. 808; D. C. Code, sec. 23-3302), as amended.

"(f) Upon affirmative determination that the person arrested is a narcotic drug user, or if the person has been convicted of a narcotic offense in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, and if such person is also a vagrant as hereinbefore defined, he shall be charged with the offense of vagrancy within the meaning of this section and arraigned in the United States branch of the municipal court, where the prosecution shall be conducted in the name of the United States by the United States attorney.

"(g) Any person convicted of being a vagrant under the provisions of this section shall be punished by fine of not more than $500 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"(h) The court, in sentencing any person found guilty under the provisions of this section, may in its own discretion or upon the recommendation of the probation officer, impose conditions upon the service of any such sentence. Conditions thus imposed by the court may include submission to medical and mental examination, and treatment by proper public health and welfare authorities; confinement at such place as may be designated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and such other terms and conditions as the court may deem best for the protection of the community and the punishment, control, and rehabilitation of the defendant.

"(i) In all prosecutions under the provisions of this section, the burden of proof shall be upon the defendant to show that he has lawful employment or has lawful means of support realized from a lawful occupation or source."

(m) Section 17 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 17. All narcotic drugs, the lawful possession of which is not established or the title to which cannot be ascertained, which come into the custody of a peace officer, shall be delivered promptly to the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate for disposal in accordance with the provisions of section 4733 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, except that narcotic drugs which may be needed as evidence in any criminal or administrative proceeding pursuant to the provisions of this act or the provisions of any Federal narcotic law shall, upon delivery to the Secretary of the Treasury, not be so disposed of until the United States attorney for the District of Columbia or any assistant United States attorney shall certify that such narcotic drugs are no longer needed as evidence."

(n) Section 23 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 23. Any person violating any provision of this act, or any regulation made by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, under authority of its sections, for which no specific penalty is otherwise provided, shall upon conviction be punished, for the first offense, by a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $1,000, or by imprisonment for not exceeding 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment, and for any subsequent offense by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $5,000, or by imprisonment for not exceeding 10 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

Amendments to Public Health Service Act

SEC. 302. (a) Section 341 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Upon the admittance to, and departure from, a hospital of the Service of a person who voluntarily submitted himself for treatment pursuant to the provisions of this act and who at the time of his admittance to such hospital was a resident of the District of Columbia, the Surgeon General shall furnish to the Director of Public Health of the District of Columbia the name, address, and such other pertinent information as may be useful in the rehabilitation to society of such person."

(b) Section 344 (d) of such act is amended by striking out "shall be confidential" and

inserting in lieu thereof "shall, except as otherwise provided by this act, be confidential".

(c) The second sentence of section 345 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows: "No such addict shall be admitted unless (1) at the time of commitment, the number of persons in hospitals of the Service who have been admitted pursuant to this subsection is less than one hundred; and (2) suitable accommodations are available after all eligible addicts convicted of offenses against the United States have been admitted."

Amendment to Public Law 355, 83d Congress

SEC. 303. Section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the care and treatment at facilities of the Public Health Service of narcotic addicts committed by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved May 8, 1954 (68 Stat. 79), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1. In order to afford the District of Columbia the facilities required to carry out the act of June 24, 1953 (Public Law 76, 83d Congress), as amended, and to help it meet its responsibility for the detention, care, and treatment of noncriminal narcotic addicts, it is hereby declared to be the purpose of this act to authorize the limited use of suitable Public Health Service facilities at the expense of the District of Columbia for such detention, care, and treatment."

Mr. ABERNETHY (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill may be dispensed with, the bill to be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a statement in explanation of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to greatly strengthen enforcement, prosecution, and treatment and rehabilitation programs in Washington of the Narcotic Control Act for the District of Columbia.

TITLE I

Title I relates to the treatment of narcotic users, corrects the manifold weaknesses in the present addict law, and insures swift and certain commitment for drug addicts who show promise of benefiting from hospital treatment and rehabilitation—chronic addicts, and others who offer little hope, are to be apprehended and confined under new provisions which appear in title III. The act includes the following improvements:

First. Juveniles are specifically included among those subject to the provisions of the act.

Second. Physical custody of the individual is maintained from the time he is apprehended until he is committed or released as a nonaddict. Custody is complete and remains unbroken throughout the proceedings.

Third. Procedures are streamlined: The act provides for both voluntary commitment and involuntary commitment; the United States attorney and the court are relieved of preliminary processing of the suspected addict and he is not brought to their attention unless he is declared an addict by means of a physical examination conducted by two qualified physicians under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; if a hearing is required, the individual may demand a jury trial to determine the issue of his addiction, and he has the right to counsel at all states of the judicial proceedings.

Fourth. During probation following hospitalization, the addict must report to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia as often as required for a period of 2 years. Any addict who again resorts to drugs or becomes addicted, can be recommitted without instituting de novo proceedings. He can be apprehended and recommitted forthwith.

TITLE II

This title is completely new law, including penal provisions, to regulate and control the sale and use of certain drugs other than narcotics.

The possession of any amphetamines, desoxyephedrine, compounds or mixtures thereof without a prescription; false representation or concealment of a material fact in obtaining the prescription; or delivery of a dangerous drug to any person not entitled to receive it are punishable by fine and imprisonment.

Amphetamines, barbiturates, and other dangerous drugs shall be dispensed only upon written or oral prescription of a physician. In the case of a prescription by telephone, the physician must give his District of Columbia registration number, which will be checked immediately against a confidential list provided the pharmacists.

Within 30 days following the enactment of this act, pharmacists, manufacturers, wholesalers, warehousemen, manufacturers' representatives, and drug salesmen must establish and thereafter maintain a biennial inventory of all amphetamines, barbiturates, and other dangerous drugs. Prescriptions, invoices, records, and inventories will be subject to inspection at all times by local officials. Failure to maintain such records is punishable by a fine and imprisonment.

Fifth. For violation of any of the provisions of this section, the following penalties are provided:

(a) First offense: Fine of not less than $100 nor more than $1,000, or imprisonment up to 1 year, or both such fine and imprisonment.

(b) Second offense: Fine of not less than $500 nor more than $5,000 or imprisonment up to 10 years, or both such fine and imprisonment.

Sixth. Search warrants, obtained on probable cause that there is a violation of provisions of this act, can be served at any time of the day or night. "Positiveness" in obtaining a night search warrant has been eliminated.

Seventh. Arrests without a warrant can be made as in the case of a felony upon probable cause that the person to be arrested is violating a provision of the act at the time of his arrest.

Eighth. All dangerous drugs seized and forfeited shall be disposed of in the same manner as narcotic drugs.

TITLE III

Title III of the bill amends the Uniform Narcotic Drug Act to provide the following:

A. First. Arrests without a warrant can be made as in the case of a felony on probable cause that the person to be arrested is violating a provision of this act at the time of his arrest.

Second. Search warrants, issued on probable cause, may be served at any time of the day or night. The additional requirement of positiveness for obtaining a night search warrant has been eliminated.

Third. Synthetic drugs are included in this act.

Fourth. Physicians, dentists, and veterinarians may dispense certain narcotic compounds upon oral prescription subject to the same restrictions provided in section 4705 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Fifth. Provides for disposal of all seized and forfeited narcotic drugs in same manner provided in section 4733 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Sixth. Drug addicts, whether employed or unemployed may be arrested, prosecuted, and punished by a fine up to $500 or imprisonment up to 1 year, or both such fine and imprisonment. This section also defines and punishes as a vagrant a narcotic drug user, who, first, has no visible means of support and is found mingling in public; or, second, is found in any place where illicit narcotic drugs are found, used, or dispensed; or, third, wanders about at unusual hours of the night alone or in the company of or association with a narcotic addict or convicted narcotic violator. The court in sentencing an addict may order, first, submission to mental and medical examination; second, treatment by proper public health and welfare authorities; and, or, third, imprisonment.

B. This legislation would also amend the Public Health Service Act which would require the Surgeon General to furnish to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or their designated agent, the name, address, and other pertinent information of any resident drug addict of the District of Columbia who voluntarily submits himself for treatment.

C. Also amends Public Law 355 of the 83d Congress which increases to 100 the number of patients who can be admitted at any 1 time from the District of Columbia to public health hospitals for treatment.

It also extends indefinitely the authority of the District of Columbia to send narcotic addicts to Lexington or to other Public Health Service hospitals for treatment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, there are several committee amendments. I ask unanimous consent that

the amendments may be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

On page 8, following line 21, insert the following:

SEC. 102. This title shall take effect 30 days after the date of its enactment.

On page 9, line 2, after the word "drugs" insert the following: "other than narcotics."

On page 9, line 7, after the word "means" strike lines 7 through 14 inclusive and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(A) amphetamine, desoxyephedrine, or compounds of mixtures thereof, including all derivatives of phenelethylamine or any of the salts thereof which have a stimulating effect on the central nervous system, except preparations intended for use in the nose and unfit for internal use;."

On page 10, line 1, strike the words "harmful or to have a" and insert in lieu thereof "habit-forming, excessively stimulating, or to have a dangerously toxic, or."

On page 10 strike the following:

"(D) any drug which bears the legend: 'Caution: Federal law prohibits dispensing without prescription', or words of like import, or any derivative, compound, or mixture thereof;".

On page 11, line 7, before the word "pursuant," insert "as a pharmacist."

On page 11, line 11, strike out "(including amphetamines and barbiturates)."

On page 12, line 10, after "pharmacists" insert "and practitioners."

On page 12, line 13, after "process", insert ", or who repackage such drugs."

On page 13, line 4, strike out "for" and insert in lieu thereof "of."

On page 13, lines 11 and 12 strike out "(including amphetamines, and barbiturates)."

On page 13, line 19, strike out "filed" and insert in lieu thereof "filled."

On page 15, lines 11 and 12, strike out "(B), (C), or."

On page 16, lines 13 and 14, strike out ", (including amphetamines and barbiturates)."

On pages 16 and 17, strike out "SEC. 204" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 204. Nothing in this title shall apply to a compound, mixture, or preparation which is delivered or acquired in good faith for the purpose for which it is intended and not for the purpose of evading the provisions of this title if—

"(1) such compound, mixture, or preparation of barbituric acid, its salts and derivatives shall be declared by rule or regulation duly promulgated by the Commissioners after reasonable public notice and opportunity for hearing to have or to contain no habit-forming properties and not to have a dangerously toxic or hypnotic or somnifacient effect on the body of a human or animal.

(2) such compound, mixture, or preparation of amphetamine, desoxyephedrine, phenelethylamine, or their salts or derivatives, shall be found and declared by rule or regulation duly promulgated by the Commissioners after reasonable public notice and opportunity for hearing to contain in addition to such drug or its salts and derivatives some other drugs causing it to possess other than an excessively stimulating effect upon the central nervous system and to have no habit-forming properties or dangerously toxic effect upon the body of a human or animal."

On page 17, strike line 18 and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 205. The provisions of subparagraphs (1) (A) and (D) and paragraph (4) of."

On page 18, line 16, before the word "duties," insert "official" and strike "in enforcing this title."

On page 18, line 23, strike "to whom the provisions" and insert in lieu thereof "listed in paragraphs (A) through (I)."

On page 18, line 24, strike "are applicable."

On page 19, strike lines 1 and 2 and insert in lieu therof the following:

"(1) make, within 30 days after the effective date of this title, and biennially thereafter, a complete."

On page 19, line 3, strike "amphetamines and barbiturates" and insert in lieu thereof the following "dangerous drugs."

On page 19, lines 7 and 8, strike "(including amphetamines and barbiturates)."

On page 19, line 14, strike "practitioner", and insert in lieu thereof practitioners."

On page 20, line 10, strike "Federal and."

On page 22, line 7, strike "and."

On page 22, line 10, strike the period and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following:

"(5) the act entitled 'An act to define the term of "registered nurse" and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia', approved February 9, 1907 (34 Stat. 837), as amended; and

"(6) the act entitled 'An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia', approved May 23, 1918 (40 Stat. 560), as amended."

On page 24, following line 10, insert the following:

"SEC. 214. This title shall take effect ninety days after the date of its enactment."

On page 25, line 16, strike "in" and insert in lieu thereof "is".

Page 25, strike out line 24, and insert the following: "section 6 of the act of Congress approved December 17, 1914, entitled 'An act to provide for the registration of, with collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or coca leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes', as amended, and inserting in lieu."

On page 35, lines 13 and 14, strike "Director of Public Health of the District of Columbia" and insert in lieu thereof "Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or their designated agent."

On page 36, following line 19, add the following:

"SEC. 304. Subsection 1 of section 301 of this title shall take effect thirty days after the date of its enactment."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to amend the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABERNETHY: Amend the title of the bill to read: "A bill to effect the control of narcotics, barbiturates, and dangerous drugs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LICENSING PAWNBROKERS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill H. R. 11002, to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman be kind enough to allow this bill to go over until next District Day?

Mr. MCMILLAN. Yes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING COMMISSIONERS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO DESIGNATE EMPLOYEES TO PROTECT LIFE AND PROPERTY

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 1275) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to designate employees of the District to protect life and property in and on the buildings and grounds of any institution located upon property outside of the District of Columbia acquired by the United States for District sanatoriums, hospitals, training schools, and other institutions be withdrawn from consideration at this time.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING COMMISSIONERS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO FIX RATES OF COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF CERTAIN EXAMINING AND LICENSING BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 1739) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix rates of compensation of members of certain examining and licensing boards and commissions, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) notwithstanding the provisions set forth in the acts mentioned in section 2 of this act, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and empowered to determine from time to time the honorariums to be paid to the members of the boards, commissions, and committees appointed and established by authority of such acts, such authority to include the power to determine the total amount per annum of any such honorarium.

(b) The funds (including bonds or other securities referred to in section 10 of the act approved December 20, 1944, as amended July 5, 1952) derived from fees and charges for examinations, licenses, certificates, registrations, or for any other service rendered by any such board, commission, or commit-

tee, remaining after the payment, or provision made for payment of all obligations of the respective boards, commissions, and committees outstanding as of June 30, 1954, shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia and on and after the effective date of this act all moneys collected for such fees and charges shall be paid into the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia.

(c) Notwithstanding the limitation of any other law or regulation to the contrary, any person heretofore or hereafter appointed as a member of any such board, commission, or committee may receive his honorarium as well as any retired pay, retirement compensation, or annuity to which such member may be entitled on account of previous service rendered to the United States or District of Columbia Governments.

(d) As used in this act, "honorarium" means the fee, per diem, compensation, or any amount paid to any member of any such board, commission, or committee for service as such member. Such service shall not be deemed to be service within the meaning of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

SEC. 2. This act shall apply to the boards, commissions, and committees and the members thereof, respectively, established pursuant to the following acts:

(a) The act entitled "An act to regulate steam engineering in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1887 (24 Stat. 427, ch. 272), as amended (title 2, ch. 15, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(b) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 7, 1906 (34 Stat. 175, ch. 2084), as amended (title 2, ch. 6, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(c) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia," approved February 1, 1907 (34 Stat. 870, ch. 442; title 2, ch. 8, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(d) The act entitled "An act to define the term of 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," approved February 9, 1907 (34 Stat. 887, ch. 913), as amended (title 2, ch. 4, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(e) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia," approved May 23, 1918 (40 Stat. 560, ch. 82), as amended (title 2, ch. 7, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(f) The act entitled "An act to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 17, 1923 (42 Stat. 1261, ch. 94), as amended (title 2, ch. 9, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(g) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia," approved May 28, 1924 (43 Stat. 177, ch. 202; title 2, ch. 5, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(h) The act entitled "An act to provide for the examination and registration of architects and to regulate the practice of architecture in the District of Columbia," approved December 13, 1924 (43 Stat. 713, ch. 9), as amended (title 2, ch. 10, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(i) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929 (45 Stat. 1326, ch. 352), as amended (title 2, ch. 1, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(j) The act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and license real estate brokers, business chance brokers, and real estate salesmen; to create a Real Estate Commission in the District of Columbia; to protect the public against fraud in real estate transactions; and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1937 (50 Stat. 787, ch. 760), as amended (title 45, ch. 14, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(k) The act entitled "An act to provide for the examination and licensing of those engaging in the practice of cosmetology, in the District of Columbia," approved June 7, 1938 (52 Stat. 611, ch. 321; title 2, ch. 13, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(l) The act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1938 (52 Stat. 620, ch. 322), as amended (title 2, ch. 11, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(m) The act entitled "An act to amend the act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto, approved June 6, 1892, and acts amendatory thereof," approved July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 716, ch. 513; title 2, ch. 3, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(n) The act entitled "An act to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 823, ch. 612), as amended (title 2, ch. 12, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(o) The act entitled "An act defining and regulating the practice of the profession of engineering and creating a Board of Registration for Professional Engineers in the District of Columbia," approved September 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 854, ch. 953, title 2, ch. 18, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(p) Section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, approved July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 622, ch. 1352), as amended and supplemented (title 47, ch. 23, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(q) The first section of the act entitled "An act to grant additional powers to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 819, ch. 611), as amended (sec. 1-244, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(r) The act entitled "An act to regulate plumbing and gas fitting in the District of Columbia," approved June 18, 1898 (30 Stat. 477, ch 467), as amended (title 2, ch. 14, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

SEC. 3. Any fee or charge paid for an examination, license, certificate or registration pursuant to any act mentioned in section 2 of this act shall, if not earned, be refunded upon application therefor: *Provided*, That application for refund is made not later than the end of the third fiscal year following the fiscal year in which such fee or charge was made.

SEC. 4. The Commissioners are authorized, after a public hearing, to fix and change from time to time the period for which any license, certificate or registration authorized by any act set forth in section 2 of this act may be issued. Upon change of a license, certificate or registration period, the fee for any such license, certificate, or registration shall be prorated on the basis of the time covered.

SEC. 5. Whenever any board, commission, or committee, other than the Commissioners, is mentioned in this act, such board, commission, or committee shall be deemed to be the board, commission, or committee or other agency succeeding to the functions of the board, commission, or committee, so mentioned, pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952.

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia such sums as may be necessary to pay the expenses of administering the acts listed in section 2 of this act, including the expenses of the Department of Occupations and Professions established pursuant to authority contained in Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is set forth by sections as follows:

Section 1 would authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix the rate of compensation or honorarium to be paid to members of examining and licensing boards, commissions, and committees—now incorporated in the Department of Occupations and Professions; to cause all funds collected by such boards, commissions, and committees for holding examinations and issuing licenses to be deposited to the credit of the District of Columbia, and would allow any member of such board, commission, or committee to receive his honorarium as well as any retired pay, retirement compensation, or annuity to which such member may be entitled on account of previous service rendered to the United States or the District of Columbia Governments.

Section 2 sets forth the acts under which the boards, commissions, and committees have been established to which this bill shall apply, and such boards, commissions, and committees are as follows:

Board of Accountancy.

Board of Barber Examiners for the District of Columbia.

Board of Dental Examiners.

Board of Examiners and Registrars of Architects.

Board of Examiners of Steam and Other Operating Engineers.

Board of Examiners of Veterinary Medicine.

Board of Optometry.

Board of Pharmacy.

Board of Podiatry Examiners.

Commission on Licensure To Practice the Healing Art in the District of Columbia.

District of Columbia Board of Cosmetology.

District of Columbia Board of Registration of Professional Engineers.

District Boxing Commission.

Electrical Examining Board.

Motion Picture Operators' Examining Board.

Nurses' Examining Board.

Plumbing Board.

Real Estate Commission.

Undertakers' Examining Committee.

Section 3 provides for refund of license, certificate, or registration fees upon application therefor. There have been cases when an applicant has paid his fee, and while waiitng to sit for an examination has been called into the armed service. Under existing law, the fee could not be refunded.

Section 4 authorizes the Commissioners to fix and change the license period. This is an administrative expedient which would permit flexibility by the Department of Occupations and Professions and allow the Department to stagger the period so as not to have too many of them fall due at one time.

Section 5 is clarifying language to conform to Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952.

Section 6 authorizes appropriations out of District revenues of amounts necessary to administer the acts under

which the several boards, commissions, and committees were established.

The rates of compensation which are now being paid to the members of these boards, commissions, and committees are not on a comparable basis. For example, the members of the Board of Barber Examiners receive $20 a day; the members of the Board of Dental Examiners receive $14.23 a day; the members of the District of Columbia Board of Registration for Professional Engineers receive $25 a day, and the members of the Board of Examiners and Registrars of Architects receive $10 a day.

The requirement of the bill that all funds collected for examinations and issuance of licenses by the boards and commissions be deposited to the credit of the District and that funds necessary for the expenses of administering the acts will make possible better control and facilitate accounting for receipts and expenditures.

The bill was requested by and has the approval of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as we view the world today, it is very apparent that our country and the free world is on the defensive. It is important that we get back on the affirmative.

Without ignoring certain danger spots throughout the world, there is one crisis, if adjusted, that would play an important part in putting us back on the affirmative. That is Cyprus and the early solution of that problem. The people of Greece and Cyprus are western-minded. The great majority of their people are strong opponents of communism, and yet the longer the present situation exists in Cyprus the more difficult it becomes of solution and the more results will develop to the advantage of the Communists. It is not that the people of Greece or Cyprus will turn toward communism, but it enables the Communists to capitalize human feelings and the disillusionments and disappointments that exist, and the feeling that those who should be their friends have let them down. It also makes it more difficult to arrive at a solution at a later date, than it would at an early date.

The quick settlement of the Cyprus crisis would be most helpful in the West regaining the affirmative. The people of Greece and of Cyprus who are our friends are interlinked in this grave question. To them it is one question that deeply concerns the people of Greece and the great majority of the people of Cyprus.

Our country should take a firm position in trying to solve this serious problem.

It is not a British question alone. It involves the whole free world. Cyprus is an important link in the chain of circumstances and those situations that exist throughout the world where we are on the defensive. The breaking of this link through a quick settlement might well contribute to a solution of other trying situations and place the Soviet Union on the defensive, enabling us to take the affirmative again on a worldwide scale. We must bear in mind the people of Greece and Cyprus are not a backward people incapable of self-government and of conducting responsible government. They are an advanced people. So the argument of being incapable of assuming the responsibility of self-government and of self-determination, does not apply to Cyprus and its people.

The responsible people of Cyprus have always recognized the position and importance of Cyprus as a bastion of defense of the free world from further Communist penetration. They have always been willing to make agreements recognizing this fact. They want to be free men and women. They are opposed to Communism. They know their place and future—as does Greece—is with the free world. But being human, they also resent the oppressive measures employed to frustrate their national aspirations.

Sooner or later the problem must be solved. There is no question of this fact. The longer oppressive measures are used by Britain, the more difficult it will be to make a settlement and the greater the results of bitterness.

There is no question but what our country could make a marked contribution in the solution of this situation.

The exercise of the great powers of our Government would be on the side of international justice, and our Government should be on that side. It is also in our own national interest to have the Cyprus situation solved as quickly as possible.

We are told that our dealings with some dictators and others who are not grateful are in the national interest of our country on the ground of expediency. The solution of the Cyprus situation is in our national interest on the ground of friendship, of time-honored principles for which our country stands, and of international justice.

The present administration and our Government should with vision and courage take steps to contribute to an immediate solution of this situation.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. I want to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts with respect to Cyprus. Over a year ago I introduced a resolution which proposed, in effect, that this issue be brought before the General Assembly so that there could be discussion and debate in the United Nations. If that resolution had been adopted and debate begun in the United Nations, perhaps we would have avoided a lot of bloodshed that has taken place over in Cyprus.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. I am aware of his keen and constructive interest in this question for a long period of time. My remarks are directed to the point that the powers of our Government should be used in its contribution toward an early solution of this tense situation, and if we solve it, it might make a marked contribution toward solving other problems throughout the world.

Mr. MORANO. My resolution provided the same sense and objective that the gentleman is expressing now.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's resolution is along that line. In addition there may be other avenues that our Government could pursue as well.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Is not the present position merely a postponement of the inevitable with regard to the granting of freedom to four-fifths of the population of Cyprus?

Mr. McCORMACK. In my opinion, the gentleman is correct, and I made reference to that in my remarks that sooner or later this situation has got to be solved; that circumstances are going to compel it. You cannot hold back a people who try to obtain their national aspirations and objectives, particularly a people that are as advanced as the people of Cyprus are. The gentleman's observation is completely consistent with the view I entertain.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, does not the gentleman agree with me that if we had begun to debate in the United Nations toward the objective of trying to find a solution, a proper solution, mutually satisfactory to everyone, that we would have avoided all this bloodshed and perhaps found a solution?

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the gentleman that that should have been done. But I say that we should not confine ourselves to that alone, but to other efforts that might be made in a solution of the problem. The fact is that it should be solved as quickly as possible. They are friends of ours; they want to continue to be friends; we ought to retain their friendship; and it is vitally important that the matter be solved. In other words, I agree with the gentleman except that I say that in addition, if there are other avenues in addition to that, we should employ them.

Mr. MORANO. The gentleman introduced a similar resolution, I believe.

Mr. McCORMACK. On colonialism and against Communist imperialism.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I wish to compliment the gentleman for the excellent statement he has made. He is showing the usual keen analysis of these problems, and I think this is most important to the well being of this troubled world.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank my friend.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman introduced a resolution which was reported unanimously from the Committee on Foreign Affairs and adopted by this House unanimously.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the other body.

Mr. MORANO. And the other body?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. MORANO. It was assumed that the resolution had a bearing on the question of Cyprus.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly; not confined to that, but it had Cyprus in mind.

Mr. MORANO. It was assumed that perhaps on the basis of the resolution something would be done with respect to Cyprus.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. MORANO. If something had been done, we could have avoided the bloodshed, and if something is not done pretty soon, there will be a lot more bloodshed, I am afraid.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. I am not in disagreement. I am in complete agreement with what my friend said. The United Nations should be resorted to, but if there are other efforts that can be resorted to in addition to the United Nations, it is in the national interest of our country and the best interests of the free world that they are, and this situation be solved as quickly as possible.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNSIDE. It is appropriate here to state, Mr. Speaker, that the flame of the 19th century reforms in government was ignited in historic Greece. If any nation can lay claim to the title of the cradle of democracy, certainly that nation is Greece. Since all of the democratic nations of the world are indebted to Greece for so much, let us do a little today to repay that great debt. I think we should go much further, and urge, as members of this House, as the great Floor Leader Mr. McCORMACK has done, that the present administration should contact the British Government and urge an immediate solution of the Cyprus question. This is not an insurmountable task. A conflict at this most vulnerable spot could very readily lead to a spark that would ignite a world war. Mr. Speaker, we know the course of liberty for the Greeks in Cyprus, or any other people or anywhere else, is never smooth. All free peoples must be ever vigilant and Greece has been often threatened, and sometimes defeated, but never dispirited or broken. This fight reminds me of the eternal monument to the courage of man in the historic resistance of the small Greek Army against the Fascists, against Mussolini's hordes. Led by the heroic kilted Evzones, the commandos of Greece, a small but dauntless Grecian Army routed the taunted and mechanized Fascist legions of Il Duce. Only tremendously superior numerical forces and the most modern technical equipment, then availabe, enabled Hitler to count Greece among its subject nations for the short time.

Stalin was foolish enough to attempt to overthrow Greece from within, using the same insidious and brutal techniques which succeeded in neighboring countries. Thousands upon thousands of innocent children were kidnaped and carried to Russia to be indoctrinated in the Communist manner. They were to be returned to spread the Communist line throughout their native land. Some were returned. Many have never been heard from. But all the weapons in the Communist arsenal could not drown the flame of democracy which burned brightly in Greece and with the aid of the United States the Greek Government brought to bay and defeated the Communist aggressors. Today Greece stands as a friend of the free, firmly united with the many nations who stand opposed to the Communist menace. Side by side, with troops from the United States and other nations of the free world, men from Greece fought freedom's cause in Korea.

I think the United States and Greece are particularly close because they have so much in common. To quote from the Legacy from Greece by R. W. Livingstone:

> Without Greece we should have neither our religion, nor our philosophy, nor our science, nor our literature, nor our education, nor our politics.

Greece as the headwater of Christianity is a new concept to some. But the very name of Christ our Saviour is Greek, Christos, the anointed. Not only the New Testament, which, of course, was written in Greek, but for many centuries even the Old Testament was preserved only in Greek, the Septuagint.

Moreover, as you here so well know, for the first three centuries after Christ all Christian writings were in Greek. St. Paul, though born a Jew, belonged, of course, to the history of Greek culture. It was he, who, in his journeys to Greece, sowed the good seed which, at first, so quickly withered elsewhere. And, of course, much of the New Testament tells how the churches all over Greece flourished.

It was to the Athenians that Paul preached his great sermon, standing in the midst of Areopagos, after he had come upon an Athenian altar reared to the unknown god—a sermon which not only nurtured the seed he had planted, but which, today, if the world will but listen, could save the civilization which flows from the Greek headwater, but which is threatened now by those who profane the God who created them.

"Him declare I unto you," said Paul, "Him who hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth."

It was the brotherhood of man, which Paul preached. And this is the doctrine which has flowed to us from the Greek headwater. It is the doctrine without which men cannot be saved from themselves.

These immortal names shall stand forever like the stars in the firmament. As long as there are men to know them Aristotle, Plato, Socrates, Demosthenes, Pericles, Alexander the Great, shall not be forgotten. To Aristotle, we owe the basis for our modern science. Plato's works on government are studied in every college and university in the world. The orations of Demosthenes have been unequaled by the attempts of the greatest orators who have succeeded him.

We here have attempted to repay our debt to Greece through our aid to Greece against the Communists, through the Marshall plan, the ECA, and point 4 technical assistance.

My good friend, Ambassador Puerifoy, worked hard in Greece and he did a magnificent job in helping them and in helping our Nation help the Greeks meet a menace to the free world. As Governor Williams pointed out at the banquet in Washington, "The present moment in Greece is not a happy one, and we cannot permit ourselves to become so lost in the glories that were that we ignore the travail that is." Of course, Greece has known perils in the past. Today there is a renewed claim from the people of Cyprus to enjoy the right of self-determination which is a tradition in our own Nation and which stems directly from its inauguration in the writings and in the practices of the ancient Greeks. Everything for which our Nation stands demands that we support the extension of freedom to people in any nation in the world who seek it.

The great Woodrow Wilson declared in his famous fourteen points that all people should have the right to determine for themselves their own destiny.

Naturally, all of us here have a profound feeling of sympathy for the patriots in Cyprus. Naturally, all of us here would, if we had the power, grant the people of Cyprus the right of self-determination. The alliance between the United States and England, however, is well known and the interests of the British in Cyprus for military or defense purposes is also well known. The United States is in the position of choosing between two horns of a dilemma, both of which are very near to us. On the one hand we have at stake the rights of a freedom loving people and on the other we have the military interests of the western nations. I for one do not believe that the problem is impossible. I think that if the United States will promote negotiations between the British and the Cypriots, we can easily protect our military interests in the Mediterranean through the United Nations or through NATO, and at the same time liberate the people of Cyprus from a rule with which they are dissatisfied.

I want to here and now declare myself for Woodrow Wilson's principle of free self-determination. I hope that our foreign policy can prove adequate to the task which faces it. I hope that through the leadership of this country we can assure this right to the people of Cyprus.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Strike out the balance of line 2, all of line 3 and the balance of the sentence on line 4 and insert:
>
> "The United States Civil Service Commission, upon recommendation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, is authorized to exclude from the operation of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, any officer or employee or group of officers or employees within the purview of this act whose services are intermittent and tenure of office is of limited duration."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 11488) to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (j) of section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925 (43 Stat. 1121), as amended (Sec. 40–603 (j), D. C. Code), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) New motor vehicles acquired from dealers as replacements for defective vehicles purchased new not more than 60 days prior to the date of such replacement, except that if the fair market value of any replacement vehicle is greater than that of the vehicle which it replaces, then the tax imposed by this section shall be paid on such difference in value. If the fair market value of any replacement vehicle is less than that of the vehicle which it replaces, then the Commissioners or their designated agent are authorized to refund to the owner of the replacement vehicle an amount equal to the difference between the excise tax paid on the defective vehicle and the excise tax paid on the replacement vehicle."

SEC. 2. The second sentence of paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of section 7 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended (sec. 40–301 (a) (2), D. C. Code), as amended, is amended by striking the word "District".

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect 30 days after its approval.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under existing law, there is levied against the issuance of a certificate of title for a motor vehicle or trailer an excise tax of 2 percent of the value of such vehicle or trailer. On occasion, however, a person may purchase a motor vehicle, acquire title, and pay the necessary 2 percent excise tax, only to discover a short time later that the car is defective to the extent that the dealer from whom the car was purchased will replace it with another vehicle. Under existing law, the 2-percent excise tax must also be paid on the fair market value of the replacement vehicle. This has the effect of requiring the unfortunate motor vehicle owner who has purchased a "lemon" to pay double the amount of excise which ordinarily would be paid on such vehicle. The proposed amendment of the Traffic Act would furnish relief to any such motor vehicle purchased by requiring him to pay in connection with his purchase of a defective motor vehicle which requires replacement, only that amount which is equal to a 2-percent tax on the fair market value of the replacement vehicle, so that in effect he is relieved from paying the excise tax on the defective vehicle which was returned to the dealer.

Another change the proposed bill would make in the Traffic Act is the elimination of the word "District" in the second sentence of paragraph No. (2) of subsection (a) of section 7. The presence of the word "District" in existing law makes it illegal for the holder of a learner's permit to operate a motor vehicle when accompanied only by a person holding a valid Maryland or Virginia motor-vehicle operator's permit, or a permit issued by another State. The elimination of the word "District" would allow the holder of a learner's permit to operate a motor vehicle when accompanied by the holder of a valid motor vehicle operator's permit issued by another jurisdiction.

The Commissioners recommend the enactment of the proposed bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 14, after the word "effect", insert the word "thirty."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING ACT ENTITLED "AN ACT TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA"

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 11487) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved August 17, 1937, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of title IV of the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved August 17, 1937 (50 Stat. 680), as amended (sec. 40–102, D. C. Code), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) Notwithstanding the provisions of this act, any two-wheel semitrailer owned by a nonresident owner which is offered for lease for a period not in excess of 1 year to operators of private motor vehicles for the purpose of transporting the lessee's personal property and which does not exceed (1) a maximum unladen weight of 1,500 pounds, (2) a maximum gross vehicular weight of 3,000 pounds, and (3) a maximum outside width of 84 inches, shall be exempt from registration and registration fees in the District of Columbia if such trailer is registered in the State, Territory, Province, or country in which the owner has his residence."

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 3 of title IV of said act approved August 17, 1937 (50 Stat. 681), as amended (sec. 40–103 (b), D. C. Code), is amended by striking class C of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"CLASS C. For each trailer, when the manufacturer's shipping weight of the chassis, plus the weight of the body, is less than 500 pounds, $8; 500 pounds or more but less than 1,000 pounds, $12; 1,000 pounds or more but less than 1,500 pounds, $20; 1,500 pounds or more but less than 2,500 pounds, $32; 2,500 pounds or more but less than 3,500 pounds, $46; 3,500 pounds or more but less than 6,000 pounds, $60; 6,000 pounds or more but less than 8,000 pounds, $74; 8,000 pounds or more but less than 10,000 pounds, $92; 10,000 pounds or more but less than 12,000 pounds, $122; 12,000 pounds or more but less than 16,000 pounds, $152; 16,000 pounds or more, $182: *Provided*, That in determining the total weight of a trailer subject to the provisions of this class C, there shall be excluded, in computing such weight, the weight of any special equipment which is subject to taxation as tangible personal property under subsection (e) of this section."

SEC. 3. Subsection (b) of section 3 of title IV of said act approved August 17, 1937 (50 Stat. 681), as amended (sec. 40–103 (b), D. C. Code), is amended by inserting between classes D and F the following:

"CLASS E. For each motor vehicle classified by the Commissioners or their designated agent as an antique motor vehicle on the basis of a finding that such vehicle was manufactured prior to January 1, 1930, and is owned solely as a collector's item, with its use limited to participation in club activities, exhibits, tours, parades, and similar uses, but in no event for general transportation, $5."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, section 2 of the act of August 17, 1937—Thirtieth United States Statutes at Large, page 680; section 40–102, District of Columbia Code—among other things requires that no trailer—with the exception of trailers owned by nonresidents—shall be operated in the District of Columbia unless it be registered in the District. A new development in the automotive field is the small, two-wheel trailer rental service under which a person may rent a trailer in one jurisdiction, attach it to his private motor vehicle, travel to another jurisdiction, and surrender the trailer to the local branch of the rental service. It may thus happen that a trailer registered in another jurisdiction will terminate a trip in the District of Columbia. Such a trailer cannot, under existing law legally be operated within, or into or out of the District, by a District resident, unless it bears a District registration tag. Inasmuch as this type of service is a convenient and practical service for persons moving small quantities of personal property, the Commissioners believe that the provision in existing law prohibiting the operation by District residents of trailers registered elsewhere than in the District should be qualified. The first section of the bill would accomplish this objective.

Section 3 of title IV of the act of August 17, 1937, as amended by the act approved May 18, 1954—Sixty-eighth United States Statutes at Large, page 101; section 40–103 (b), District of Columbia Code—contains, in class C of such section, a schedule of annual registration fees for trailers. The fees for the small, two-wheel trailers used principally to carry luggage and other personal belongings range from $12 to $26. The $26 fee, however, is greater than the $22 fee required for the registration of a passenger motor vehicle weighing up to 3,500 pounds. In view of this, the $26 fee for a small trailer would appear excessive. Accordingly, the Commissioners recommend the amendment of the act of August 17, 1937, so as to reduce the fee for a small trailer to an amount more in

keeping with the size and character of the vehicle.

The bill also contains a provision which would amend the act of August 17, 1937, in such manner as to relieve the owner of an antique motor vehicle from the payment of the usual motor vehicle fee of $22 or $32, as the case may be, and substitute in lieu thereof a fee of $5. This would be accomplished by inserting a class E in subsection (b) of section 3 of title IV of the act of August 17, 1937, establishing a fee of $5 for a motor vehicle found to be manufactured prior to January 1, 1930, and owned solely as a collector's item, with its use limited to participation in club activities, exhibits, tours, parades, and similar uses, but in no event for general transportation.

The Commissioners recommend the enactment of the attached proposed bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 10721), making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2288)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10721) "making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 6, 16, 18, 24, 27.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 17, 22, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$90,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,593,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$16,475,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,721,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$575,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$113,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 8, 11, 19, and 26.

JOHN J. ROONEY,
PRINCE H. PRESTON
DON MAGNUSON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
FREDERIC R. COUDERT, Jr.
FRANK T. BOW,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
CARL HAYDEN,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
EARLE C. CLEMENTS,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
MIKE MANSFIELD,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
JOE MCCARTHY,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MARGARET SMITH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10721) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Administration of foreign affairs

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 1: Deletes Senate proposal to insert language.

Amendment No. 2: Permits purchase of 7 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of 6 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $90,500,000 instead of $90 million as proposed by the House and $91,210,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Provides a limitation of $5,000 each on the purchase of 11 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,600 as proposed by the House.

Representation Allowances

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $800,000 instead of $700,000 as proposed by the House and $1 million as proposed by the Senate.

Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $1 million as proposed by the House instead of $1,150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

International organizations and conferences

Contributions to International Organizations

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $33,859,285 as proposed by the Senate instead of $33,830,875 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 8: Reported in disagreement.

International commissions

International Boundary and Water Commissions, United States and Canada

Amendment No. 9: Deletes the words "fence or" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $1,463,000 for "Operation and maintenance" as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Passamaquoddy Tidal Power Survey

Amendment No. 11: Reported in disagreement.

International Fisheries Commissions

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $645,587 as proposed by the Senate instead of $542,862 as proposed by the House.

Educational exchange

International Educational Exchange Activities

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $18,170,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal activities and general administration

Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $10,320,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $10,020,000 as proposed by the House.

Salaries and Expenses, Antitrust Division

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $3,593,650 instead of $4,265,000 as proposed by the House and $3,526,910 as proposed by the Senate.

Salaries and Expenses, United States Attorneys and Marshals

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $19,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $19,225,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Special Temporary Attorneys and Assistants

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $300,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House.

Immigration and Naturalization Service

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 18: Restores House language relating to the compensation of assistant commissioners and district director.

Federal Prison System

Buildings and Facilities

Amendment No. 19: Reported in disagreement.

TITLE III—THE JUDICIARY

Courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services

Salaries of Supporting Personnel

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $16,475,500 instead of $16,250,000 as proposed by the House and $16,701,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Travel and Miscellaneous Expenses

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $2,721,800 instead of $2,650,000 as proposed by the House and $2,793,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Administrative Office of the United States Courts

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $753,500 as propsed by the Senate instead of $700,000 as proposed by the House.

Airconditioning Courtrooms, Etc.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $575,000 instead of $1,150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE IV—UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Salaries and expenses

Amendment No. 24: Restores House language providing caps for personnel employed abroad.

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $113,000,000 instead of $110,000,000 as proposed by the House and $115,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 27: Provides not to exceed $50,000 for representation abroad as proposed by the House instead of $100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

JOHN J. ROONEY,
PRINCE H. PRESTON,
DON MAGNUSON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
FREDERIC R. COUDERT, Jr.,
FRANK T. BOW,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, as this bill, H. R. 10721, making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, comes back to the House for consideration of the conference report thereon, the amount agreed upon unanimously by the conferees is but $7,563,585 above the total figure at the time it passed the House in April. That must be some kind of a record.

The total amount of the budget estimates originally submitted by President Eisenhower was $599,104,820. The amount carried in this conference report as agreed upon by the conferees is $548,930,957, a savings of $50,173,863 in the total amount of the budget estimates.

With regard to the request for $17 million contained in the original budget estimates for a maximum-custody penitentiary and western youth-guidance center for the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, when the time comes, I shall move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate which allowed $3,500,000 of this amount and concur with an amendment which would provide $250,000 for preparation of plans and study of sites for these proposed institutions, provided that no site would be selected until further action by the Congress. This, in effect, will give the Bureau of Prisons the opportunity to prepare their plans and study sites until the opening of the 85th Congress. I have been assured by the Department of Justice that no site or sites shall be announced until after January 1, 1957.

The conference between the two Houses also provides $935,000 to permit the initiation in fiscal year 1957 of a number of component projects under the Passamaquoddy Tidal Power Survey authorized by Public Law 401, 84th Congress, 2d session, approved January 31, 1956. That law authorized the appropriation of not to exceed $3 million for a final survey to be made by the International Joint Commission, first, to determine the cost of construction of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project at Passamaquoddy Bay in the State of Maine, United States of America, and the Province of New Brunswick, Dominion of Canada; second, to determine whether or not such cost would allow hydroelectric power to be produced at a price that is economically feasible; and third, also to determine what contribution such project would make to the national economy and the national defense.

The amount agreed upon by the conferees for the International Fisheries Commission, Department of State, would include $102,725 additional for the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission.

The full amount of the orginal budget estimate, to wit: $20 million has been allowed under the terms of the pending conference report for international educational exchange activities.

The following table may be of interest:

	State	Justice	Judiciary	USIA	Refugee relief	Total
Budget estimate	$182, 142, 285	$235, 880, 000	$37, 582, 535	$135, 000, 000	$8, 500, 000	$599, 104, 820
Passed House	171, 506, 737	215, 965, 000	35, 395, 635	110, 000, 000	8, 500, 000	541, 367, 372
Passed Senate	176, 125, 872	219, 451, 910	37, 193, 735	115, 000, 000	8, 500, 000	556, 271, 517
Conference	175, 065, 872	216, 043, 650	36, 321, 435	113, 000, 000	8, 500, 000	548, 930, 957
Conference amount below budget estimate	7, 076, 413	19, 836, 350	1, 261, 100	22, 000, 000		50, 173, 863

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of this conference report which has been unanimously agreed upon.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I realize there is little that can be done after an agreement is made by a conference committee, especially the powerful Appropriations Committee. I do think, however, the committee has made a grave mistake by increasing the so-called entertainment fund by $100,000. The allocation of $700,000 for this fund, most of which is spent for liquor and other strong drinks, is clearly out of order. Then to increase it by spending another $100,000 is, in my opinion, inexcusable.

It is claimed, of course, that the serving of liquor by our representatives abroad is required in order that we may have more friendly relations. It is my contention that if our representatives are expected to resort to the use of liquor in order to become more friendly or in order to negotiate agreements, our methods in attempting to solve important matters between our country and other countries falls to a rather low level. I realize that some funds are required for legitimate entertainment, but, in my judgment, not as much as is included in this bill, especially when so much of it goes for intoxicating drinks.

ONE MILLION DOLLARS FOR ENTERTAINMENT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House should know that this bill as it comes from the conference committee has been increased by several million dollars, but one of the worst features is that it now contains approximately $1 million for what is known as representation allowances.

This means that under the guise of representation allowances, the taxpayers of this country will cough up $1 million to be spent by the State Department and various subsidiary organizations in the international field for entertainment and that in turn means bigger and better cocktail parties.

Last year, Congress appropriated to the State Department some $575,000 for cocktail parties, but that was not enough despite the fact that liquor comes cheap in foreign countries since it is tax free to our striped-pants crowd. This year the State Department gets $800,000; another $100,000 is planted in the appropriation for international contingencies; another $50,000 for the United States Information Agency, and it appears that the representatives to NATO will have some $40,000 to spend for this purpose.

So it appears that everyone in the Foreign Service corps and a substantial number of foreigners ought to be in mellow mood during the coming fiscal year. From London to Paris, Rome, Tokyo, and way points, the guzzlers ought to have a field day, beginning with the new fiscal year, and with the good old American taxpayer footing the bill.

Oh, yes, the State Department does admit that it will spend about $5,000 out of its $800,000 for flowers and ceremonial wreaths.

It seems to me that these foreign countries, after rising the backs of American taxpayers for more than $60 billion since the end of World War II, ought to be able to take care of the entertainment of our free-wheeling spenders. Let the record show that I am opposed to this bill and this conference report. I can only hope

that Congress will come to its senses and stop this brand of fantastic spending before all of Mr. John Q. Public's pockets have been completely picked.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 7, line 12, insert the following: "of which $28,410 shall be for contribution to the Inter-American Radio Office for the calendar years 1951–1955."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 12, line 20, insert:

"PASSAMAQUODDY TIDAL POWER SURVEY

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the act of January 31, 1956 (Public Law 401), including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and expenses of attendance at meeting concerned with the purpose of this appropriation; $935,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: On page 24, line 10, insert:

"For preparation of plans, acquisition of sites, and commencing construction of a maximum-custody penitentiary and a western youth-guidance center, $3,500,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert:

"For preparation of plans and study of sites of a maximum-custody penitentiary and a western youth-guidance center, $250,000: *Provided*, That no site shall be selected until further action by the Congress."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 26: Page 36, line 2, insert: "and of which sum not less than $350,000 shall be available by contracts with one or more private international broadcasting licensees for the purpose of developing and broadcasting under private auspices, but under the general supervision of the United States Information Agency, radio programs to Latin America, Western Europe, Africa, as well as other areas of the free world, which programs shall be designed to cultivate friendship with the peoples of the countries in those areas, and to build improved international understanding:"

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

THE ADMINISTRATION RECORD

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, Howard Pyle, Deputy Assistant to the President, was out "politicking" again and came into my district where he made an attack on Democrats in the Congress for blocking the President's program. While Pyle asked his audience to "equip themselves with the unvarnished facts," he proceeded with the most fantastic distortions. He accused the Democratic Congress of blocking the President's attempt to aid labor. Supporters of social-security improvements were labeled as irresponsible.

Pyle is the man who only a few weeks ago, while speaking in Detroit, where heavy unemployment exists, wisecracked that "the right to suffer is one of the joys of a free economy." In that statement Pyle was expressing the true philosophy of those who today dominate the administration in Washington. These people shout inflation at every effort to lift the living level of the average citizen, to improve wage standards, to increase social security and other retirement benefits, and to provide proper educational opportunities for the Nation's youth. Pyle and his associates fear an expanded economy. They fear full employment and push curtailment policies which limit job opportunities and adversely affect the average citizen, the farmer, and the small-business man.

It would be interesting to know just what Pyle's job in Washington is other than to go around the country spreading confusion, deception, and the kind of political philosophy that was rejected in 1932 with the rebuke of former President Hoover.

On the very day that Mr. Pyle was in Reading advocating the election of a Republican Congress, the Republican Members in the House of Representatives were rejecting the President's mutual-security program, while my vote and that of other liberal Democrats supported the President.

Certainly I will not support the administration in its present determined effort to emasculate the social security bill passed by the House last year. Administration Senate leaders are seeking to defeat the Democratic proposal to lower the age requirement for social security benefits for women from 65 to 62 years and to make benefits available to totally disabled workers at age 50.

I also opposed the administration when I voted against the gas bill. But it was intellectually dishonest for Mr. Pyle to inform his audience that Democrats like myself are blocking the President in his efforts to help labor. No deception and doubletalk can fool the American people into believing that the present administration is a friend of the little fellow and a friend of the working man as Pyle claimed. The record of handouts to big business is one that no amount of deception can hide. Tax writeoffs, raids on natural resources and the public domain, breakdown of regulatory commissions and the raises in interest rates give evidence of this fact. I am sure that the people in Berks County will not be taken in by Pyle's deceptive remarks or by the philosophy he is attempting to sell as a member of the White House staff.

LAST HOPE FOR ELECTION REFORM LEGISLATION

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, 3 months ago it was a foregone conclusion that the Senate would pass legislation overhauling our archaic Corrupt Practices Act. Indeed, the talk in early March was that the Senate would probably act before the Easter recess.

These opinions rested on a sound foundation. In an unprecedented move, 85 Senators had signed up as cosponsors of the clean elections bill put forward by the majority and minority leaders. The majority leader had issued a statement: "We are going to have a strong election bill this session"; and the minority leader, with equal candor, was quoted as saying: "I would like to see something accomplished before the 1956 elections."

Now, 90 days later—with adjournment scarcely more than a month away—the whole matter rests in status quo ante. Nothing has been done to further, this legislation, and recent press notices assert it is considered dead.

Mr. Speaker, the House is looking to the Senate for leadership on this legislation, just as the Senate is awaiting initial action by our body on the school aid bill, and I cannot believe these reports are accurate. Such near-unanimous sponsorship of the clean election bill indicates a consensus that action should be taken now—action which will be a ringing retort to the ugly questions raised by the disclosures made earlier this year by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The differences which have cropped up—over inclusion of primary elections, and other provisions in the stronger Hennings bill (S. 636) which was reported favorably to the Senate 1 year ago this week—can be voted up or down in the old tradition. The immediate need is the passage of some kind of compromise measure, since our present law

is not a statute at all but a legal loophole which deserves no respect.

One might ask if Congress can afford to finish its work this summer without writing an election code that will stifle the suspicions and charges which will otherwise fill the air during the great contest this fall.

I fear that if we do not act we will give new strength to the false myth—too widely mistaken for truth in our country—that politics is a "dirty business," and politicians have no desire to have it otherwise.

Will the Congress act? The country is awaiting the answer.

TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I have today sent identical telegrams to the United States Tariff Commission and to the White House, urging the Tariff Commission to invoke the peril point and escape clause provisions of the Trade Agreements Act, as amended.

A copy of this telegram is inserted at this point:

Hon. EDGAR B. BROSSARD,
Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, Tariff Commission Building, Washington, D. C.:

Reference manufactured textile products, I respectfully and urgently request Tariff Commission to invoke peril-point and escape-clause provisions of Trade Agreements Act provided for in sections 6 and 7, Public Law 50, 82d Congress, 1st session, and further provided in section 5, Public Law 86, 84th Congress, 1st session, which provides for substantial relief to industries adversely affected by excessive imports. Many major segments of the American textile industry are suffering and require prompt remedial action.

Representatives of textile industry have twice requested administrative relief under section 22 of Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, which requests have been denied by the Department of Agriculture and by the White House.

Industry components representing manufacturers of velveteens, blouses, printed cloths, pillow cases, and ginghams have previously applied to your Commission for substantial relief. I urge favorable consideration of these applications.

I am reliably informed that imports of cotton velveteens increased from 64,000 square yards in 1954 to 5,754,000 in 1955. Imports of cotton sheets and pillow cases increased from 1,322,000 in 1954 to 11,726,000 in 1955 and this present rate of increase over 1954 is continuing into 1956. Cotton wearing apparel increased in dollar volume from $1,315,200 in 1953–54 to a projected dollar volume of $44,055,600 in 1956. Imports of handkerchiefs increased from 139,200 dozen in 1953–54 to a projected figure of 1,208,400 dozen in 1956. Overall imports of cotton cloth into the United States increased from 30,666,000 square yards in 1953 to 99,534,000 square yards in 1955 and a projected figure of 243,756,000 square yards in 1956.

If this rate of increase continues unchecked American textile industry will be drastically crippled or even destroyed. Many cotton textile plants in New England States and in Southern States are closing permanently; others are suspending operations indefinitely; and practically all of remaining plants going on short time and reduced forces. Foreign-made textile imports far exceeding previous forecasts.

Continued high-level operation and production by American textile plants and continued employment of American textile employees require immediate and positive action by Tariff Commission under peril-point and escape-clause provisions.

The vital importance of the textile industry to our national economy cannot be overlooked. If textile industry is further damaged in event of national emergency this Nation might find itself short of one of principal strategic materials and stripped of its potential to adequately produce.

JOHN J. FLYNT, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
Fourth District of Georgia.

Information is reaching me every day of curtailment of employment, shorter hours of employment, suspension of operations, and permanent plant closings over a widespread area in the textile industry. These reports have come in from the Fourth District of Georgia, which I have the honor to represent. They have also come in from adjoining districts in my State. From the daily press and the news magazines I learn that this condition is not limited or restricted to the State of Georgia and Georgia's Fourth District, but that the situation is widespread and applies equally to New England, North and South Carolina, Virginia, and probably to every other textile manufacturing area and State in this country.

When H. R. 1 was being debated on the floor of this House early in 1955 we were assured by the advocates and proponents of that legislation that there were adequate safeguards contained in the bill to prevent any serious damage to the textile industry or to other industries similarly situated.

We were further assured that those provisions were adequate and could be and would be invoked whenever they were needed to prevent serious injury to American employment and to American industry.

The conditions which now confront the American textile industry are grave, indeed, they are critical. This industry has not kept abreast in expansion and in profits with many other industries in this country. The profits accruing to this industry and particularly to the small companies which make it up have been reduced to the point where the textile industry has not been able to grant wage increases anywhere near comparable with wage-scale increases generally. This is especially borne out by many instances, both in New England and in the Southern States, where employees and employee groups have voluntarily refrained from making demands for wage increases, and in some instances have taken voluntary wage reductions because they knew and because they realized such wage reductions were necessary if the employing company were to remain in business.

For the past several months many cotton-textile plants have closed permanently; others have suspended operations indefinitely, and practically all of the remaining plants are going on short time, reduced employment, or both.

Only last week the Springs Mills, Inc., in South Carolina, a landmark in textiles and a major cotton-cloth producer, postponed a $10 million expansion program and cut back production substantially.

Col. Elliott W. Springs, president of Springs Mills, Inc., disclosed the curtailment and attributed it and the postponement of the expansion program to "throat-cutting competition of imports from abroad":

Some 740,000 spinning spindles are in operation at the Springs' mills, but 50,000 of them are being removed from production because of unbalanced yarn and fabric output. Expansion plans had involved additional weaving facilities at the company's plants to bring yarn and fabric production into balance. Installation of new looms is postponed indefinitely, Colonel Springs said, until "the public decides that our textile industry is not part of foreign aid."

"We have always been able to meet competition without tears," the Springs president added. "But we can't lick the State Department, the Secretary of Agriculture, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the Organization for Trade Cooperation, and the $64 billion giveaway program while Congress twists our arm."

What is true in this plant unfortunately is true industrywide and unless the necessary action is taken by the administration and by the United States Tariff Commission, this can well become the forerunner of a major and devastating economic depression. To those of you who are not concerned with textiles, or with the employment of textile employees within your own district, take heed and note with caution, for this same situation can happen to you, to your area, and to your people.

Never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee.

NIAGARA POWER

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent rock fall at Niagara Falls wiped out an estimated $100 million worth of hydroelectric power in the wink of an eye. It virtually destroyed the biggest hydroplant on this side of the Niagara border. Following as it did the recent power blackout which rendered the whole Niagara frontier as helpless as a newborn baby, we have in effect had two very recent, very dramatic, and very tragic examples of what redevelopment of power at Niagara Falls means to us all. It is as if some superior power were trying to get through to those who have made a political and ideological football of this terribly important project for the past 6 years.

The matter of power development of the Niagara River is a matter of the most burning importance to all of us on the Niagara frontier and one of the most troublesome issues before Congress. Since the newspapers have been full of the subject lately, I will review it only briefly. A bill sponsored by Senator LEHMAN has recently passed the Senate. It calls for construction of new power

facilities by the State of New York. This is the so-called public power bill, and it contains certain preference clauses favoring rural cooperatives, which are deemed highly objectionable by many leaders in this metropolitan area.

During the last Congress, a bill permitting development of new power facilities by the private power companies passed the House by a large margin. This leads many to predict that the public power bill just passed by the Senate does not stand much of a chance of passing the House. By the same token, the Senate, having just passed a public power bill, is not likely to favor private power.

And so this vicious political dispute goes into its sixth year, robbing the Niagara frontier of this much-needed electricity. In the 6 years since we have been authorized by treaty to develop this additional power, Canada has completed its project and can now use our share of the water until we are ready to use it. Over $360 million worth of this liquid gold, representing our share of the power, has run to waste over the falls since 1950. Another $300 million worth will run off in the 5 years it would take before our project would be completed if it were started today. Yet there isn't a chance of its being started today, because of this suicidal controversy.

No one has said with certainty whether the recent power blackout could have been prevented had this new power been available. We may never know. But one thing is certain. Everyone agrees we need this additional power desperately. Our Nation needs it for its defense. The State of New York needs it to regain some of the ground we have lost in power development in the past 20 years. And we in Buffalo and on the Niagara frontier need it if we are to fulfill the wonderful predictions everyone is making about the growth of our area in the next 10 years.

The destruction of the huge Schoellkopf plant is far more tragic because it it is permanent. If the new facilities were now completed, as they easily could have been, it would have been a spectacular but relatively minor loss, because the outmoded Schoellkopf plant could probably have been abandoned with the opening of the new facilities. Instead of that, we are now faced with the loss of a huge segment of our power for at least 5 years and at a time when we need far more, not far less power.

Recently both public and private power advocates have been acknowledging the value of a compromise. Nothing would make me happier than to see a sensible and final compromise worked out. But it should be worked out this session. And if complete settlement fails this session, the Radwan bill offers the only solution which would "get this show on the road" while details are being worked out in a subsequent Congress. I sincerely feel this is a must, and am humbly grateful for the support this position has received lately in the local press. There comes a time when we can no longer afford the luxury of arguing—and this is it.

The politically neutral bill which I introduced over a year ago calls for immediate construction of the project by a neutral construction agency such as the United States Army Corps of Engineers, with the issues of ownership and operation to be settled while the project is being built. This bill may not be a compromise, but it was introduced and is now being supported with only one consideration in mind and that is, the public interest, because it would save or gain 4 or 5 years' time and about $300,000,000. Thus the project would be finished when the controversy between the public and private power exponents is settled and not just beginning. It was a bill of critical and urgent importance when it was introduced in March 1955. Who can deny its importance now?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to Mr. HINSHAW, for the balance of today, on account of highly important personal business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. DONDERO, to vacate the special orders granted him for today and tomorrow, and to address the House for 45 minutes on Thursday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN to revise and extend his remarks in Committee and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. ROONEY) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENSEN.

Mr. PHILBIN in two instances, in one to include a speech recently made by him and in one instance to include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

At the request of Mr. ROONEY, permission was granted to:

Mr. TUCK and to include an address by Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON.

Mr. RUTHERFORD.

Mr. FLOOD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIS.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 8, 1956:

H. R. 2840. An act to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas.

H. R. 4363. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the State of New Mexico;

H. R. 5237. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ella Madden and Clarence E. Madden; and

On June 11, 1956:

H. R. 5516. An act to amend title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide that service as an Army field clerk, or as a field clerk, Quartermaster Corps, shall be counted for purposes of retirement under title III of that act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6274. An act to provide that no fee shall be charged a veteran discharged under honorable conditions for furnishing him or his next of kin or legal representative a copy of a certificate showing his service in the Armed Forces; and

H. R. 9536. An act making appropriations for the Executitve Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 12, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1955. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to certain plans for works of improvement which have been prepared, pursuant to the authority vested in the President by section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 667) and delegated to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget by Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1956. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 5 of the Air Commerce Act of 1926 to authorize the sale of goods and services by any department or independent establishment to the owner of an aircraft or his agent in an emergency, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1957. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of certain laws enacted by the Third Guam Legislature, 1956, pursuant to section 3 of the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1958. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting the report of the Attorney General on the administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, for the calendar year 1955, pursuant to the Foreign Agents Registration Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1959. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, relative to an order entered in the case of Carlis Stender, also known as Karlis Stenders and Corlis Anderson, A–2180275, relating to rescission of adjustment of status granted this individual under section 244 (a) (1) of the act (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)), pursuant to section 246 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U. S. C. 1256 (a)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MULTER: Select Committee on Small Business. Report of Subcommittee No. 2 on urban renewal projects and slum clearance; without amendment (Rept. No. 2303). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6940. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an additional contract with the Yuma County Water Users' Association with respect to payment of construction charges on the Valley division, Yuma reclamation project, Arizona, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2304). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7726. A bill to authorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon; with amendment (Rept. No. 2305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 10535. A bill to include the present area of Zion National Monument within Zion National Park, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 11558. A bill to relinquish any right, title, and interest which the United States may have in and to certain land located in Forrest County, Miss.; in order to clear the title to such land; without amendment (Rept. No. 2307). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 11683. A bill to authorize permanent appointments in the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2308). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. House Concurrent Resolution 246. Concurrent resolution approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 2309). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 11695. A bill to extend until June 30, 1958, the programs of financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities under the provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, and to make certain other changes in such provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 11696. A bill to authorize the conveyance of homestead allotments to Indians, Aleuts, or Eskimos in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 11697. A bill to provide that all revenues received by the United States from mineral leases located on wildlife refuges established by the United States shall be expended solely for the purpose of purchasing and maintaining wildlife refuges; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 11698. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital of 1,000 beds at Bay Pines, Fla.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 11699. A bill to facilitate the control and eradication of certain animal diseases, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural and related programs, to facilitate the agricultural attaché program, to facilitate the operations of the Farmers' Home Administration, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and the Forest Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 11700. A bill to amend section 607 of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 to include employees in the Motor Vehicle Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 11701. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the deletion, from the records of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, of any entries showing wages paid for service as an employee of the Communist Party; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 11702. A bill to provide for the sale of lands in reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army for cottage site development and use; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 11703. A bill to establish on public lands of the United States a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, to provide for the protection and administration of the areas within this System by existing Federal agencies and for the gathering and dissemination of information to increase the knowledge and appreciation of wilderness for its appropriate use and enjoyment by the people, to establish a National Wilderness Preservation Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. Con. Res. 248. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to print 30,000 additional copies of the hearings of the Research and Development Subcommittee on "Shortage of Scientific and Engineering Manpower"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Con. Res. 249. Concurrent resolution proposing an Atlantic Exploratory Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 250. Concurrent resolution proposing an Atlantic Exploratory Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 534. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 transmitted to Congress by the President on May 16, 1956; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 535. Resolution to amend clause 20, rule 11, of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 11704. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Poliszczuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 11705. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel and/or Emanuel J. Papapanayiotou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H. R. 11706. A bill for the relief of Kim Chung Hi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 11707. A bill for the relief of Phillis Guyadeen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1125. By Mr. BOW: Petition of Thomas Thomas and others, of Stark, Columbiana, Carroll, and Harrison Counties, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1126. Also, petition of Verle E. Baker and others, of Tuscarawas County, Ohio for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1127. By Mr. DONOVAN: Petition of Thomas Smith, commander, Port of New York Longshoremen Post, 7095, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1128. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Mrs. Oren Davis, of Marshfield, Mo., and other ladies of Builder Circle No. 1 from the First Baptist Church, of Marshfield, Mo., urging the approval of S. 923 and H. R. 4627; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1129. Also, petition of Mrs. Chloe Lane, of Marshfield, Mo., and other citizens of Webster County, Mo., urging the passage of S. 923 and H. R. 4627, which would prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages on radio, television, and in national magazines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1130. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of Mrs. Leonard Dorman, president, Snover WCTU, Snover, Mich., and 381 others, residents of the Seventh District of Michigan, urging support of the Langer bill, S. 923, and the Siler bill, H. R. 4627, both bills to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1131. Also, petition of Mr. Donald T. Hayes, post commander, Almont American Legion Post, No. 479, Almont, Mich., and 37 others residents of the Seventh District of Michigan, urging support of the veterans' security bill, H. R. 7886; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1132. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Laura L. Rodarty, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that Senate bill 2875 be enacted so as to restore the rights to wives and survivors of involuntarily separated civil-service employees, etc.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1133. Also, petition of second deputy county clerk, county of Hawaii, Hilo, T. H., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting passage of public works appropriation bill with an expenditure of $1,700,000 for a deepwater harbor at Kawaihae, T. H.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Congressman Ben F. Jensen, of Iowa, Takes a Look at the Record on the Farm Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, during the past year or more hundreds of my constituents have written me expressing their great concern about the welfare of our farmers. Businessmen, as well as farmers, wrote and called on me, because all business is tied to agriculture. Many said give us about the right amount of rain and sunshine and all will be well without a farm program, while others talk about feed distribution, feed costs, feed supplies, credit, transportation, machine costs, and high taxes. Many complained about hog and cattle prices, and said they felt politics was entering into all proposed farm legislation. Let us take a look at the record.

The Democrat Party was in full power in both the White House and in Congress in 1951 when the President's handpicked Director of the Office of Price Stabilization announced on February 19, 1951, that he would soon roll back the price of cattle 10 percent with President Truman's approval. At the same time he announced that was only the beginning—because said he, "I'm going to roll back cattle prices another 4½ percent on August 1, and another 4½ percent on December 1, because said he, cattle prices are too high." We Congressmen from cattle producing areas took up the fight and were able to stop all except the 10 percent rollback, but the damage was done—cattle prices, as you well know, started on the toboggan the day after his dictatorial announcement, which also pulled other farm prices down and down. Now we hope the present increased prices of livestock will hold, and they will hold unless the packers decide otherwise. We are still waiting for the packers to explain the low hog prices in 1955 in face of the fact that the American people ate more pork in 1955 than the farmers marketed as shown by the Department of Agriculture records.

The House of Representatives passed a bill amending the Agricultural Act on May 5, 1955, to strengthen the farm economy, but the Democrat-controlled Senate committee pigeonholed the bill, and then the Democrat bigwigs began trying to blame the farmers' troubles on the Republican administration. That was the worst kind of politics, and at the expense of our farmers. Their time would have been better spent cooperating with the Congressmen from the farm States who asked nothing more than fair and equal treatment for the farmer with other segments of our people. Then in order to give quick help to many financially distressed farmers President Eisenhower and all the Republicans, and a few Democrats, in Congress, worked hard to get this present Democrat-controlled Congress to put a provision in the soil-bank bill to pay 50 percent of the soil-bank benefits this year to farmers who would agree to comply next year with the soil-bank provision in the bill; but the Democrats screamed politics to the end that section was knocked out of the bill.

Now let us take a look back at the record. Total farm income was less during the Democrat 8-year period, 1933 to 1940, than it was during the preceding Republican 8-year period. Take a look at hog prices for instance—long after the New Dealers plowed under corn, wheat, and cotton, and destroyed little pigs, and spent over $19 billion trying to prime the pump—the highest price paid for hogs at the Omaha market in 1940 was $7.30 in August, the low was $5.25 in February. Please note below price chart compiled from the Omaha market, also please note hog prices for years 1947, 1948, 1953, and 1954, when the Republicans were in control of Congress:

Top prices for hogs by months

Year	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Year
1956	15.25	15.00											
1955	18.75	18.00	18.75	18.50	19.00	22.25	20.50	17.85	17.25	16.35	13.75	12.00	22.25
1954	27.35	27.25	27.90	28.65	28.25	27.00	26.00	24.50	21.50	19.75	19.75	18.85	28.65
1953	19.25	21.75	22.25	24.65	25.25	26.00	27.50	27.25	26.00	24.75	24.00	27.00	27.50
1952	18.35	18.10	18.25	17.85	22.25	21.25	23.50	23.75	21.60	20.75	17.60	19.25	23.75
1951	22.00	23.75	22.75	22.25	22.25	23.00	23.25	23.50	21.65	22.50	19.60	18.75	23.75
1950	17.75	17.85	18.00	17.75	20.50	21.75	25.75	26.50	24.50	20.75	19.25	20.75	26.50
1949	21.50	21.75	22.50	21.75	22.25	22.25	23.00	23.60	22.75	19.50	17.00	16.00	23.60
1948	28.75	26.50	25.25	23.50	26.00	29.50	30.50	32.25	30.00	27.50	25.35	22.75	32.25
1947	25.25	29.50	29.25	28.00	25.25	25.25	28.75	28.75	32.00	30.00	25.85	28.75	32.00
1946	14.50	14.50	14.50	14.50	14.50	14.50	22.85	24.00	15.90	27.50	25.25	25.00	27.50
1945	14.45	14.45	14.45	14.45	14.45	14.45	14.45	14.45	14.45	14.50	14.50	14.50	14.50
1944	13.45	13.55	14.10	13.75	13.45	13.50	14.45	14.45	14.45	14.45	14.45	14.45	14.45
1943	15.00	15.35	15.40	15.50	14.50	14.15	13.90	14.00	15.10	14.65	14.15	13.50	15.50
1942	11.85	13.00	13.65	14.50	14.20	14.40	14.50	14.70	15.00	15.30	14.10	14.75	15.30
1941	8.85	7.75	8.10	9.10	9.35	10.90	11.60	12.15	12.30	11.35	10.50	11.15	12.30
1940	5.65	5.25	5.50	6.35	6.00	5.40	6.75	7.30	7.25	6.40	6.10	6.85	7.30
1939	7.70	8.20	8.00	7.00	6.90	7.00	7.15	6.65	9.25	7.15	6.50	5.75	9.25
1938	8.50	8.85	9.35	8.60	8.65	9.00	10.05	9.80	9.15	8.60	7.90	7.45	10.05
1937	10.50	10.00	10.45	10.15	11.60	11.50	12.60	13.10	12.25	11.40	9.25	8.35	13.10
1936	10.75	10.75	10.55	10.60	10.10	10.50	10.75	11.40	11.00	10.15	9.55	10.35	11.40

In the year 1940 after 8 years of new dealism when the Democrats were in full control, both in the White House and in Congress, over 10 million Americans were out of work, but World War II solved that problem for them by giving jobs to 14 million Americans in uniform—then, of course, all prices, including farm prices, went up and up. But thinking Americans want no more of that kind of business.

By honorable, peaceful means—without the stimulant of war and its heartaches—the Republican peace party will earnestly strive, and will succeed in leading the way to genuine prosperity. That is our sacred pledge to the American people. So, I am proud to continue to cast my lot with the Grand Old Party.

Future Business Leaders of America Meet in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciated and enjoyed very much a visit made to my office by a number of young folks from Louisiana and their sponsors who are in Washington for a convention of the Future Business Leaders of America. This organization is sponsored by the United Business Education Association, a department of the National Education Association, and is made up of students who are specializing in business subjects, particularly secretarial science and bookkeeping. Its purpose is to sponsor activities that provide opportunity for development of the proper attitudes and leadership among boys and girls interested in the field of business.

Louisiana leads the Nation in the number of chapters of the Future Business Leaders of America and in participation in the national conventions. The program in Louisiana is incorporated in the State department of education, under the supervision of Superintendent Shelby M. Jackson.

The group which I had the pleasure of greeting included: L. C. Cambre, Paula Mackey, Janelle Savoy, Dolores Hebert, Betty LeBlanc, Tracy Trahan and Susan Phillips, from Lafayette Senior High School and their sponsor, Mrs. F. J. Nugent; Jerry Meaux, Ruth Pellerin, Geraldine Duhon, Jane LeBlanc and Amos Trahan, sponsor, Judice High School; Jeannette Smith, Annette Smith, Lucille Breaux, Madeline Brewer, Paul Steve Benoit, Sue Ann Broussard, Dolores Breaux, Carline Prejean, Sylvia Brasseaux, Nina Breaux, Velver Roger, Thomas Hutchinson, Judy Hutchinson, Tyrona Devalcourt, Carencro High School, accompanied by Mrs. Russel Hutchinson, chaperon, and Mr. and Mrs. W. W. Devalcourt, the latter being sponsor for the group from Carencro; James Wilkins, Washington; Paul Blanchard, University High School, Baton Rouge, with his sponsor, Mrs. Louise H. Beard; Eloise Allen, Janelle Brussard, Istrouma High School, Baton Rouge, and their sponsor, Mrs. E. W. Graves.

Memorial Day Address of Hon. Philip J. Philbin of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein excerpts of speeches I made at Memorial Day exercises at Clinton and Gardner in my district:

CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN'S REMARKS IN PART AT THE DEDICATORY EXERCISES AT CLINTON, MASS.

The beautiful placque which we dedicate today on Memorial Day to those who died in World War II and the Korean conflict will fittingly commemorate the valiant service and supreme sacrifice of these great heroes. We thank the veterans of Clinton for establishing this lasting memorial to their names.

We could never adequately express our gratitude, but their noble deeds will live in the hearts of our fellow citizens forever.

To their families and loved ones, we again tender deepest sympathy. From the immortal sacrifices of these boys, and boys like them, our people will ever take inspiration and courage. Their memory will ever be sacred to us.

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN AT CLINTON AND GARDNER, MASS., MEMORIAL DAY, MAY 30, 1956

Speaking at Memorial Day services at Clinton and Gardner yesterday, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, declared that "the honored dead of all American wars set a stirring example of courage and devotion to the principles of freedom which the people of this generation must emulate, if we are to guard our way of life against the evil designs of potential enemies."

"These gallant heroes never hesitated when the call came to defend the Nation," he said. "Many of them paid the supreme sacrifice. Others were completely disabled and lie in hospital beds keeping the lonely vigil of liberty. All those who served us so nobly—those who died, and those who were willing to die, symbolize the spirit of America. They best exemplify the spirit of American freedom. They have won the undying gratitude of the Nation. Their memory is imperishable. They will ever inspire our youth and our people in loyal devotion and willing sacrifice for our cause."

"Today as we recall their illustrious deeds and reverently send up our prayers of gratitude for their unselfish devotion, it is fitting that we should repledge our own loyalty to the great cause of human liberty for which they gave their all."

"In this troubled world, never so upset before, we are threatened with military aggression, poisonous propaganda and stealthy infiltration openly designed to accomplish the undermining and collapse of our great democracy. These evil movements are not confined to this Nation alone. They extend to virtually every part of the world. Their declared aim is to destroy democracy and conquer the world for communism. They are moving toward that aim with unbending purpose and great cunning."

"Through treason and espionage they have stolen our most previous military and scientific secrets. They now pose a threat of deadly hydrogen warfare over the heads of all nations.

"Behind the Iron Curtain, they hold millions in cruel bondage. Outside of the Iron Curtain, they skillfully move to impose slavery on the peoples of the earth.

"But this Nation must not flinch. This Nation is strong in its arms, strong in its terrible weapons of war, strong in its trained men and women and in its invincible spirit to protect our shores and our Government, come what may, against possible aggressors and those who scheme, conspire, and work to destroy us.

"The world situation is profoundly serious. But we have faced serious situations before. Our Nation was born in a struggle against oppression. It has been guarded against oppression by generations of Americans who were determined to protect their liberties. Inspired by the sacrifices of the past and by the great faith of religion, democracy, and freedom which guides our destinies, the American people of this generation are also determined to defend their liberties. They will not let the threats of Marxist communism and its evil works, or the hydrogen bomb, or any other devilish weapons swerve or dissuade them one iota from guarding and protecting this great democracy and this great Nation. The American people will not be intimated or terrorized by the machinations of any earthly power.

"Peace we must have, and peace we must work for. Let it be clear that this great Nation, devoted to the welfare of free men and women, would never in any sense take responsibility for starting a great war that might spell the doom of civilization. Only complete fanatics could take such a step. Soviet leaders know as well as we do what the dire consequence would be, not only to other nations but to themselves, because, whatever destruction were wrought elsewhere, they well realize that the greatest devastation of all would be visited upon the territory behind the Iron Curtain. God forbid this should ever happen.

"In the memory of these heroes, liberation of oppressed peoples should be a foremost aim of the free world. We should insist in the United Nations and in all our foreign relations, upon freedom for all peoples, the present pitiful captives of stupid diplomatic concessions, as well as the age-long victims of colonial tyranny. And we should try our best to end the myth once and for all, that any race of people living in this world is superior before the law merely because of its color, its origin or its status. Equality of justice, equality of opportunity and the precious civil rights of the individual should be zealously safeguarded and protected. The dignity of every human soul must be acknowledged and recognized."

"If we could lift the shadows of doubt, fear and suspicion, end aggressive threats and poisonous infiltration, this Nation and the world could move forward to a veritable golden age. In the name of our hollowed dead whose blood consecrates our sacred cause, let us resolve today to strive to our utmost for peace. Let us keep our Nation possessed of that strength, vigor and spirit which are vitally needed to guard and develop our way of life. But so long as danger lurks, let us be calm, steadfast, and courageous—prepared to meet every test, every sacrifice, that may be called for to keep inviolate our country, our Constitution, our Bill of Rights, our free institutions and the safety and security of our homes and our people.

"If we achieve these things in our day, we will be contributing best to the future of our great Nation as well as to a peaceful world. We will thus justify the glorious patriotism, the unselfish service and indomitable loyalty of those whom we honor today from our grateful hearts."

PHILBIN said that Memorial Day has become a great national holiday "dedicated to our honored dead, and to the remembrance of loved ones who have gone to join their Maker in that great land from whose 'bourne no traveler ever returns'. With the beautiful flowers of spring and fervent prayers, we recall their love, their useful lives and their contributions to our country. If we measure up to their God-fearing devotion, this Nation need have no fears for the future."

Until Lithuania Is Free, the United States and the United Nations Have Not Discharged Their Moral Obligation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to include the address I delivered at a meeting on June 10, 1956, sponsored by the Lithuanian Community Committee of Worcester, Mass., protesting the illegal and unjust Russian occupation of Lithuania. One of the resolutions unanimously adopted at the meeting called upon the United States Government to use its influence "to the end that the armed forces of the Soviet Union be withdrawn from Lithuania and the other occupied countries."

The chairman of the community group was Mr. Pranas Pauliukonis with the following members of the general committee: Mikolas Zemaitaitis, Jonas Dvareckas, Jonas Palubeckas, Albina Grazulis, Stasys Raudonis, Mrs. Maria Vaisnoriene and Julius Svikla; Anthony J. Miller was master of ceremonies.

The address follows:

It is a high tribute to the Christian tradition of your forefathers that you are holding these exercises in commemoration of the countless number of heroic Lithuanians who have died in defiance of Russian tyranny. I am privileged to take part in this ceremony.

It is particularly fitting that we specially pray for and publicly honor the more than 40,000 innocent Lithuanian men, women and children who were deported by Soviet order to the Siberian labor camps 16 years ago. Only God knows how many of these tragic souls have died under conditions of barbaric brutality in these slave camps or continue to live under constant torture and terror. The terrible mass murders and inhuman deportations of these thousands of unfortunate Lithuanians by the Soviets in June of 1940 stand out among the blackest pages of world history.

It is a fearful reminder and warning to us of the evil depths to which the Communist leaders will descend in their devilish determination to wipe out the Christian liberties of free peoples everywhere and eventually enslave the whole world. Although the Communist leaders have most recently been making faint gestures of apparent desire to cooperate for peace, we must wisely beware of their treachery. In the light of their inhuman persecution of Lithuania, and so many other unholy aggressions against small defenseless nations, we would be foolish indeed to place any confidence in their mere words.

We must remind ourselves and remind them also that actions speak louder than words, and there are actions within their power to take that would prove their sincerity. One of the most convincing and

happiest actions they could take tomorrow would be to liberate Lithuania and the other small nations that they unjustly hold in subjugation under the iron heel. Until the Communist leaders give back the God-given freedom they stole from Lithuania and the other subjugated nations, we can have no faith in the new Russian propaganda policy of apparent repentance and reform into a peaceful world neighbor. In remembrance of the heroic Lithuanians who were annihilated and deported in 1940, we shall never relax our efforts until Russia has restored liberty to their homeland.

The slavish tyranny still being forced upon Lithuania and the other oppressed nations by Russian domination is a constant challenge to the moral conscience of this Nation and the United Nations to reestablish the great basic principles of Christian freedom and liberty for all peoples. In assuming leadership for justice in the world, our Government must perseveringly request and insist that the Lithuanian people be granted back the inalienable right to govern themselves as they see fit without Communist interference.

The major allies and the United States engaged in two great world wars and the Korean War for the Christian objective of liberty throughout a free world. Although the wars were won, the objective has not yet been accomplished.

The other world powers and this country still remain unhappy partners in the disgraceful betrayal of the smaller nations like Lithuania, while they continue to allow them to be cruelly suppressed by the Soviet imperialism which defies every concept of Christian democracy. The deaths of our World War and Korean war heroes will not be vindicated until Lithuania is free.

Although we have good cause to be sorrowful today about present Lithuanian subjugation, we have no cause to despair; quite the contrary. We can be certain that the Lithuanian people themselves will never cease their efforts to throw off the Communist yoke of slavery. Repeatedly through her history, Lithuania has proven that her people can eventually overcome any temporary defeat of oppressors. The Christian faith which in 1399 emerged triumphantly over the Tartar invasion and saved all Europe from barbarism is still with her today. It still gives her the spiritual vigor to outlive any ungodly dictatorship.

From my own friendship with and knowledge of my fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent, I know that deep in the heart of every Lithuanian is that passion for liberty and freedom which never dies. There is no power that can forever enslave a people who remain ever determined to be free.

Let us, then, pray for the souls of the Lithuanian patriots who have heroically died in defiance of Russian persecution and oppression. In memory of their sacrifices, let us dedicate ourselves to perseveringly work together until Lithuanian independence is restored.

May God grant that we can meet again soon in joyous celebration of the return of freedom to Lithuania and the other persecuted nations throughout the world.

The Candle of the Lord

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on May 29 it was my privilege to address the overseas breakfast of the general assembly of the Presbyterian Church at Philadelphia, Pa. I had been urged to discuss the world situation and what atomic energy might do to improve it.

I ask unanimous consent to include the text of that address, entitled "The Candle of the Lord," in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My pastor gently chides the members of his congregation who come to church only on Easter Sunday. Perhaps he makes a mental exception in my case, because Washington is a far journey from Albuquerque. Yet last Easter morning our family was at his service, well rewarded by his sermon.

The glory of the Gospels is that they grow as our lives grow, that their lessons take on new meaning as our tasks expand and our experiences broaden. A Bible story that we heard as youngsters in Sunday school may have a wholly different meaning when we hear it at the baptism of the children of our children.

How many times I have heard the story of the resurrection. Yet this past Easter, against the background of a contemplated trip to the far Pacific to watch the air burst of a hydrogen bomb, it changed color like a chameleon and was seen anew. The trip itself was later abandoned, but the setting for the sermon remained.

My pastor was sounding again the declaration of Christian faith: that Christ was risen, that "He ascended into Heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty * * *"

Then came these words: "Without the resurrection, Christ would be a good man but only a good man. Without the resurrection the Christian plan of salvation would be a beautiful theory, but only a theory."

Through my mind ran the conviction that he was right. Without the resurrection, without the power to roll away the stone and arise from the dead, there could be no Christian faith. But my thought went to the atolls around Eniwetok, to the atomic blasts I had seen, and to this question: If the world die, can it live again? Would it, too, need to experience disaster and rise phoenix-like from ashes in order that in the end it might find salvation?

Eleven years have passed since the first atomic explosion at Alamogordo, 11 years since a group of noted scientists went into an unpopulated section of New Mexico to wait in that cold dawn behind hastily constructed bunkers to find out if the monstrous thing which they had concocted would finally go off.

How had we come to that momentous point of modern day history? Scientists had speculated for generations that the atom could be split. Yet it remained for Albert Einstein on August 2, 1939 to send a letter to President Roosevelt suggesting that recent work by Fermi and Szilard which he had seen in manuscript had led him to expect that the element uranium might be turned, as he put it, "into a new and important source of energy in the immediate future." It might become possible, he thought, to set up a nuclear chain reaction in a large mass of uranium by which vast amounts of power and large quantities of new radium-like elements would be generated. Then came his hint which altered the course of history. This new phenomenon, he said, would also lead to the construction of bombs, and that it was conceivable though much less certain that extremely powerful bombs of a new type might thus be constructed.

We can pass over the preliminary experiments leading to the first atomic pile and the first chain reaction. The actual work toward a bomb got under way in April of 1943.

Dr. Robert Oppenheimer, who then headed the effort, has since described to me a week-long series of meetings during that month. They were held at what then was known as site Y—the mountain camp famous ever since as Los Alamos, birthplace of the atomic bomb.

Beginning each day at 9 o'clock, 30 men were cloistered in a brand new but windowless building, a strange structure to fit into that mountain setting of singular beauty. For 3 hours they would discuss their undertaking, break up for lunch, put in a whole afternoon again and then following their evening meal, continue informally until late at night. They literally breathed, ate and slept the nuclear possibilities of their task. They were driven by the white heat of war, constantly prodded by the idea that our enemies might achieve this new weapon ahead of us and that we would thereby emerge from worldwide conflagration as the vanquished instead of the victors. All through the bitterness of Dunkirk, the bombing of London, the slow, difficult fighting in the far Pacific, this fear that they would not be in time was to drive them to long hours of unprecedented endeavor.

Military men were later to label this new type of bomb as a "decision in a packet," and our scientists were determined to claim the decision.

Finally they had a chance to test their potential weapon. Slowly the seconds to zero could be counted off—5, 4, 3, 2, 1—then the brilliant flash, the light which could be seen for hundreds of miles, the roar that rumbled and thundered against the mountain peaks of my home State. Then there was silence, and a chance for men to reflect that the instrument which they devised in their effort to free men from the yoke of oppression in all parts of the earth might equally well constitute the instrument of man's eventual destruction.

Dr. Oppenheimer, in whose hands had been placed the responsibility for the creation of this newest of all weapons, was among the watchers. He, like the others, had been reasonably sure that the device would explode. And yet, on that cold grey morning when he saw and heard the evidence of the correctness of all their calculations, he could experience no sense of exultation, no rapturous ecstasy that success had crowned their efforts. He could think only of two lines from Bhagavad-Gita: "I am become death, the shatterer of worlds."

My hope this morning is that we may sketch briefly the world scene and attempt to discover how atomic energy may affect it, that we may consider what spiritual significance atomic energy may have over the world today, that we may ask, in other words, what atomic energy and atomic power mean as we try to build a Christian civilization.

First of all, then, what does a layman see on the horizon? Are there spots that give us concern? Is there a tenseness in the air? Do we live in a troubled and restless world?

Obviously time does not permit a careful review of world conditions even if I were competent to make it. But we might take a few quick glances to see if forces of integration, of community, of peace are drawing us more surely together than diverse forces are pushing us apart.

We have placed great faith in NATO—the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Today it is in a state of disintegration, and the most recent meeting of NATO Ministers was, in effect, an added failure. I could hardly speak disparagingly of Three Wise Men before a church gathering, and yet, despite the creation of a commission of three wise men who are supposed to explore the totality of NATO to see in what field it can

be broadened, the fact remains that NATO was never in a more dangerous state than at present, nor is it prepared to become stronger in the future.

In the book of Proverbs there are these words: "The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord." If the spirit of man can bring into being a candle which will shine its light into this problem of NATO, then we may hope that this international effort may not head toward eventual disintegration but instead may find increasing strength.

But let me mention the little things—the clouds no larger than a man's hand—which threaten to set aside our high hopes for the future of mankind. For example, the United States has been asked by the Icelandic Parliament to withdraw from our air bases there, even though we came in initially at the request of Iceland itself and have spent there over $200 million in projects.

In the middle of NATO, the French have withdrawn practically all their divisions assigned to NATO to handle the trouble in Algeria.

On the eastern anchor of NATO, we have the trouble in Cyprus which involves Great Britain, Greece and Turkey. Britain's only remaining major base in the Near East is Cyprus which she must maintain to protect the oil of the Middle East, on which England and Western Europe depend for 90 percent of their needs. In the Middle East there is 70 percent of the known world reserve in oil. Cyprus has a world importance all out of proportion to its size.

The Arab-Israeli question has been accentuated by the penetration, economically and politically, of the Soviet Union and its satellites into that area. The Soviet Union is, for the first time, in both the Middle East and Africa, and in to stay.

In south Asia, Nehru is facing tremendous difficulties internally. In Thailand there is a shift away from its alliance with us and toward neutralism.

In southeast Asia, Cambodia has indicated, as Indonesia has so pointedly announced, that it will receive help from any quarter. Vietnam still has a long and difficult road to travel.

Singapore may well be on the verge of being lost to Great Britain, and it would not be surprising, unless there is a drastic turn of event, that this Crown Colony might go Communist.

The importance of the Bandung Conference of April 1955 cannot be overestimated because out of this conference came the Afro-Asian bloc, which is becoming more unified and stronger as time goes on—especially in its voting capacity in the United Nations.

Hong Kong is being held only on sufferance. Taiwan and Korea are being maintained largely through United States help, and Ceylon, as the result of recent elections, is shifting away from the West and toward closer relations with the Communist states.

I am one of those who is persuaded that the two most important areas of the world at the present time are Germany at one end of the Soviet Empire and Japan at the other. I share this morning's program with the moderator of the United Church of Christ in Japan and hope that his impressions of this assembly will be that America in official and unofficial life senses the great importance to the peace of the world of the 90 million people who live in his land.

I hope that the people of the United States will continue to appreciate that Japan's population is increasing at the rate of 2 million a year and that this poses an extremely difficult problem for her with not more than 16 percent of her land arable and with many resources missing that her economy sorely needs. Japan, I would think, faces three choices: (1) Increased trade with the world; (2) trade where she can find it and continued assistance from the United States; or (3) going Communist. If the first two fail or falter, the third result may well happen, not because of any sympathy for the Communist ideology, but because of economic necessity.

Germany, on the other hand, is interested primarily in unification. The Western World has placed great reliance on rehabilitation, reconstruction, and the possible rearming of the Western German army. The Soviet Union, to look at the other side of the coin, has the power to compel Eastern Germany to unify with Western Germany; she can offer the return of lands which she and the Poles have taken from the Germans; she can persuade Czechoslovakia to effect a Sudetenland settlement; she can offer trade and economic opportunities to the East; and she might well ask in return a treaty of neutrality and a German withdrawal from NATO. While Adenauer may refuse, we have a right to wonder what the German people would do.

Africa is in a state of turmoil, and nationalism is on the rise. In Latin America there are strong indications that the Soviet Union is seeking to extend its way economically.

Thus we can call a partial roll of trouble spots. The list, though not complete, may suffice for this discussion.

If you are willing to accept my belief that the world we live in is troubled and restless, then we may ask why that condition is particularly perilous now. The world has been at war before, has been divided between alliances of great powers, has seen the areas of conflict grow until nearly all the civilized world became involved, but has come at last to the day of armistice and peace when the wounds of war could be slowly bound up and the scars of a hundred battles could disappear. Is this experience unique?

Yes, it is unique, without parallel in history. If man could destroy his fellowmen in the past, such destruction was limited. But we have come a long way from the days when the walls of Jericho came tumbling down. We passed through the age of gunpowder, through the conflict between the trench and the tank, through the terrific pounding of aerial bombardment and the menace of the submarine that lurked in the sea. Now we are not content with airplanes that sweep through skies at several times the speed of sound, not made safe by automatic antiaircraft missiles that can track an attacking bomber and explode it and its cargo, not satisfied with submarines propelled by nuclear fuel that may lurk in deep waters month on end. Why, the crew of the *Nautilus* jokingly guarantees that their ship need surface only to let its crew members reenlist. But with it all, we do have enough.

Now we study and design and test for the ultimate weapon, if such there be. We want the tools for a push-button war. We will have guided missiles with atomic warheads that will be able to fly at thousands of miles an hour, far above the range of defense guns, and hit a target 5,000 miles away with deadly accuracy. We will have bombs that will plunge into the far depths of the ocean and wipe out a nest of submarines. We will have power to fill the stratosphere with atomic particles so dangerously charged that airplane crews cannot pilot their craft. So we will find what we may then call "safety" in these arsenals of annihilation—on land, in the sky, and deep in the bosom of the sea. Only—these will not bring safety, and we will not know peace.

We have had before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of this Congress a long parade of witnesses outlining the latest plans for the military application of atomic energy. These top military leaders were competent and convincing. They have not only paraded their weapons and explained their plans, they have estimated the capability of the enemy and then played the game of war with different sets of assumptions as to which combatant has taken the initiative.

From all their testimony, there seems to me but one conclusion: That we and the enemy become, as one scientist said, like two scorpions in a bottle. Each scorpion has the power to inflict the sting of death. Naturally, he seeks to maneuver himself into a position where, if he sees the need, he may destroy the other without harm to himself. But, being scorpions, each recognizes that to close with his opponent means the risk of a deadly counterstroke. And so we sit in uneasy stalemate, realizing that war with atomic and thermonuclear weapons means not only the destruction of the active participants but could easily mean the end of civilization itself.

Of course, we could remove ourselves from the bottle, and so could our opponents, merely by dismantling totally and forever all manner of atomic arms. But that brings only partial relief. The intelligence that taught us to make the bomb may tell us how to fashion new devices not banned by rules of war but equally destructive.

For man has reached to the very source of the energies resident in the cosmos—atomic energy. In doing so he binds to his will a force that seems without limit by the finite standards of men—yet puny in contrast to the infinite power of God.

Latent in this almost unbounded source of energy are immense possibilities for both life and death—death because no man can hope for immunity from the worldwide contamination of earth and atmosphere that would result from all-out nuclear war. Yet every day brings stories of how the split atom may be used to bring new standards of health, wealth, and happiness to the peoples of the earth.

Near Chicago is an isotope farm where plants and animals can be raised in an atmosphere of radioactive carbon dioxide. From this work can come the tools for the investigation of biochemical mechanisms. We will soon begin to learn more about how our bodies work, what throws them out of gear, and what therapy may set them right again.

Near New York City is a laboratory where radioactive isotopes are being applied to the problems of agriculture. These tracers can be followed through a growing plant like a man carrying a lighted lantern down a dark street at night. We see how a plant uses its food, and what foods best suit the digestive systems of different plants. We have not yet learned why a red cow eats green grass and gives white milk, but we learn how to trace tiny particles from the roots of a plant to its branches and leaves, how to produce disease-resistant varieties of grains and fiber, and how to grow more and better food.

I am ready to concede that here in America where agricultural surpluses are a perpetual headache to Congress and the farmer, this science may be of no immediate value; but there are hungry mouths in many parts of the world where we might go, not to be ministered unto but to minister. After all, with world population increasing 50 million persons each year, the day of food surpluses may not last forever—even in America.

The atom, then, has possibilities for life or death. Of itself, atomic energy knows nothing of these ends to which it may be put. It is in the truest sense a neutral. The decision to use it for one purpose or another rests with man himself.

Indeed, if atomic energy presented only the issue of life or death it might be in no way different from all the material means at man's disposal. But there is a difference which is made evident by the orders of magnitude of what the new power does. A week ago a hydrogen-type bomb was exploded in the Pacific. It was not nearly as powerful as we know how to make bombs, but it had the TNT equivalent of all the firepower this Nation used in World War II—in rifles, in field artillery, in naval shells, and in the rain of

bombs that poured from our airplanes. It was a one-shot atomic war . What if a hundred such bombs should fall?

Perhaps as we think of that grim possibility, our reflections will permit us to penetrate beyond the issues of life and death to those that are really decisive. For beyond them are to be found the larger issues of justice and injustice, of right and wrong. In the last analysis, this breakfast assembly might regard these as the true alternatives between which a choice must be made. Life or death remain but the consequences of that choice.

The making of a right choice in these matters will involve courses of action that are many and varied. The possibility of physical destruction must be a matter of personal concern for each and every one of us. It cannot be otherwise when all-out nuclear warfare could mean the annihilation of human life on this planet. Consciousness of this fact should serve to demonstrate anew the moral solidarity of mankind. It should likewise serve to demonstrate that every man is responsible to all men and for all men. The problem we face is to make all men feel this responsibility that is theirs.

How do I intend to exercise my responsibility? That question is asked to illustrate that each of us must find the work best suited to our hands.

First of all, I shall not rely on the powers of destruction. That does not mean that my voice or vote will be used to cripple the defense of my country or to stop the development of its weapons. On the contrary, I shall favor its programs of defense as a deterrent to the horror of an atomic war. But I shall know that there will be no victor in a nuclear conflict, and I shall want mankind to survive.

Second, I shall seek to encourage at home and abroad an understanding of the basic issues confronting mankind today.

Only a few days ago President Sukarno, of Indonesia, addressed a joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress. He told us that he had come to the United States to see our country with his own eyes, to confirm or to modify the impressions of this land which he had collected from afar over a period of many years. But most of all, he had come to learn something from America—not merely as a nation, but as a state of mind.

That, in my judgment, is the part of his address that appealed most to the Congress—this concept that the visitor from abroad must study not only the physical characteristics of our country, must count not only the dollars we may spend in our programs of military and economic aid to the free peoples of the earth, but must know the state of mind which exists in America itself. This understanding of us and our problems—and our appreciations of theirs—may in the long run persuade the uncommitted people of the earth to cast their lot with us and our allies in the worldwide cause of freedom and right. Without it, they may turn to some other land which may offer less in material goods but more in sympathetic understanding.

Third, I shall recognize in atomic energy an instrument that may be useful in the endeavor to find peace. To do that, it may be necessary to cast off the bonds of materialism and practice the ancient and noble Christian virtue of sacrifice, but the goal is worthy of it.

This morning, when I fly back to Washington, my first obligation is to return to hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the subject of the Nation's reactor program. We have been taking testimony for more than a week, considering every facet of the subject.

Through the testimony—like a red thread woven into a dull blanket—has been the showing that here in America the development of cheap atomic power is not urgent. As a nation, we have large supplies of power generated by falling water—and we are about to add the power of Niagara to our supply. We have inexhaustible supplies of coal from which electricity might be generated, and we have a reasonable supply of gas and oil. We may not need a new source of energy, but 20 years of population growth with a heavy drain on other resources may alter that story.

Then, too, the presently planned atomic power plants will not be competitive with conventional plants using fossil fuels. Therefore, their construction in America now would impose a double burden: (a) The current would be higher in cost and a subsidy for its use thereby required, and (b) the plants would be outmoded and hence need to be substantially modified when a later round of atomic powerplants with lower power costs could be constructed.

But there are areas of the earth where power costs are high and where atomic power is soon to be cheaper than conventional power. Hence England has already turned the electricity from its first plant into its national grid, and Russia will be building its first atomic plants in its European areas where power is high and not in Siberia where coal is abundant. Likewise, atomic power is already attractive to many sections of South America, to Turkey, and to parts of Africa.

Do we like the threat that godless Russia now poses in atomic science? Shall we permit a communistic country to occupy the areas that we leave open? Russia will build an atomic plant in East Germany, is pushing atomic development in Red China, has her eyes on Egypt, and will undoubtedly expand her atomic penetration whenever and wherever the chance may come.

So what can we do to help atomic energy build a Christian civilization? Presbyterians are at work in 34 countries, and in many of these lands, the very thing that they can use now is the power of the atom.

To these friendly lands and to the uncommitted peoples of the earth, I would send the evidences of our purpose to use the atom for peace, not just the nuclear fuel which the President has already promised, but the vessels in which it is to burn. Thereby we would test the most promising types of reactors, revise and rework them under actual operating conditions and thus have them ready for our use at home when the cost of their electricity became competitive with the energy we now have in abundance. Such a program could cost us as a nation a billion dollars in 5 years, a large sum to be sure, but only a small part of what is now contemplated in military aid. I think it would pay far greater dividends both in security and satisfaction. Actually the House of Representatives seems to feel that the cost of foreign aid might be cut a billion dollars this year—enough for a whole program of international atomic aid.

Then what we did would speak clearly to the world of what we are—a nation devoted to peace, working through Christian faith toward the goal of worldwide justice and welfare.

If "the spirit of man is the candle of the Lord" then the candle would shine in these far fields where humble people need this blessing of modern science poured out to them.

First, in many cases they need such a program in research and in building up adequate numbers of trained scientists, engineers, and technicians. We are training foreign scientists and engineers at State universities and at our great atomic installations at Oak Ridge and the Argonne National Laboratory. We must encourage these activities; and the moral influence of the church can help to enlist new trainees and potential scientists from the lands across the seas.

Second, they need it in medicine—and we have medical research reactors scheduled for use in friendly countries. There the people understand medical purposes. Most of what they have heard of us in atomic matters is the bomb—the messenger of death. Now they see the beneficent side of the atom, the medical research reactor—the giver of life.

Third, they need it in food. Here again we are not dealing with the agriculture of the United States. The world has never had enough to eat, and in many of these 34 lands, the skills developed by atomic research would be very welcome.

Fourth, they need it for power. At the Geneva Conference on peaceful uses of atomic energy last August, I heard Dr. Homi Bhabha describe the energy problem of India where 75 percent of their power comes from cow dung. With population on the march, India needs new sources of power. Where will she turn? I hope: To this Christian land. Surely the sacrifices we will require in our own program will be nothing compared to the benefits we will bring to them.

"The candle of the Lord"—how will it shine around the earth? The decisions now being made in America on these problems of atomic power may determine how far it will throw its light. For these decisions with regard to the use of atomic energy are shaped by a very few men. The spiritual problems of the multitudes are pressing ones, indeed. But still more pressing are the problems of these leaders of the people in this day of atomic crisis. It is a spiritual and moral problem of the greatest moment.

From my post of observation in the Senate of the United States and as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the Congress, I have no doubt whatever about the material strength of this Nation. Yours is the responsibility to see that the spiritual strength is not lacking to the end that our people and our leaders may continue to discharge their responsibilities to all mankind and prove this truly to be a "nation under God."

Disposal of Land Along the Inland Waterway in North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KERR SCOTT
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that the Federal Government is planning to dispose of some 4,858 acres of land it now owns along the inland waterway in North Carolina.

According to the General Services Administration, the land lies along the waterway between the North Carolina-Virginia line and Beaufort Harbor.

In response to inquiries by me, the GSA says it has just let a contract to appraise the property, and the appraisal report is due to be completed September 1, 1956. The GSA says further that immediately after the appraisal report is approved, the property will be advertised for sale to the general public.

The Federal Government bought the land, mostly from individuals, to cut portions of the inland waterway through North Carolina. It was purchased in much the same way as right-of-way is

bought for highways. The first purchase was made in 1908, and the Government continued buying land adjoining the waterway through 1947.

It now says that it no longer needs the land and wants to sell it.

To me, there seems to be a serious question of what will happen to the land in respect to soil erosion. Recent hurricanes and floods have taught us that conservation practices are precious factors in all coastal areas.

I think the Government ought to consider seriously offering to the State any surplus it has for use as State parks and the like before taking competitive bids. I should dislike to see selfish interests come in, buy the land for a song, and then sell valuable timber from it at a handsome profit. There is a large amount of first-class timber on some of the property, and every precaution should be taken to avoid windfall profit schemes devised by persons who have no interest in the waterway or the land adjoining it.

If there is no public use for the land, the Federal Government ought to give the original owners the first opportunity to buy it back.

I understand that plans to sell the land have been under way since last October, but until now the GSA has failed to offer any information about what is going on in the matter.

To me, this seems to be a poor way to do business. At least, the GSA could have let the public know what it has in mind. Both Congress and North Carolina State officials should have been advised, if not consulted. It is, in short, another case of not letting the right hand know what the left hand is doing.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD letters concerning this matter which I have received from Edward J. Fanflik, Acting Assistant Chief of Engineers for Real Estate, and Frank J. O'Gara, Regional Director of the General Services Administration, Atlanta, Ga.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. W. KERR SCOTT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SCOTT: Reference is made to your informal request to this office on May 29, 1956, for information as to the status of excess lands along the Intracoastal Waterway from the Virginia State line to Beaufort Inlet, N. C., and of the disposal proceedings in connection therewith.

On October 28, 1955, the district engineer, Corps of Engineers, at Wilmington, N. C., reported certain lands acquired by the Government for the Intracoastal Waterway to the Regional Director, General Services Administration, at Atlanta, Ga., for further utilization by other Government agencies or disposal, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, 81st Cong.) and implementing regulations of the General Services Administration. The lands so reported comprise the following sections and acreages of the waterway:

Section	Acreage	Holding agency No.	GSA control No.
North Carolina Cut, N. C.	592.51	WILM-2(56)	D-NC-432
Alligator River to Pungo River, N. C.	2,591.08	WILM-3(56)	D-NC-433
Goose Creek to Bay River, N. C.	443.50	WILM-4(56)	D-NC-434
Neuse River to Beaufort Harbor, N. C.	1,231.70	WILM-5(56)	D-NC-435

Brig. Gen. Henry J. Hoeffer, the Division Engineer, Corps of Engineers, at Atlanta, Ga., informs me that he has recently obtained informal information from the Regional Director, General Services Administration, that the contract for the required appraisal of the aforementioned property was awarded on or about May 15, 1956, and that the appraisal work is scheduled for completion around the middle of August. The property is scheduled to be advertised in September 1956, and it is anticipated that disposal action will be completed by December 1, 1956.

In connection with the operation and maintenance of the Intracoastal Waterway, it is considered necessary that certain easement rights in the aforementioned property be retained by the United States. A copy of the reservation recommended by the Department of the Army for inclusion in any conveyance of these lands by the General Services Administration is inclosed for your information.

Inasmuch as the General Services Administration is the disposal agency of the Government in this instance, it is suggested that further information regarding disposal of the property be obtained from the Regional Director, General Services Administration, 50 Seventh Street NE., Atlanta, Ga. In any communication to the Regional Director of General Services Administration concerning these lands, a citation to the holding agency numbers and/or the GSA control numbers indicated above will be of assistance to the Regional Director in expediting a reply.

I trust that the foregoing information is satisfactory for your purposes.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. FANFLIK,
Acting Assistant Chief of Engineers for Real Estate.

AMENDED RESERVATION CLAUSE

Each instrument or deed of conveyance shall include the following:

"Whereas in the River and Harbor Act of Congress approved July 25, 1912, and subsequent amendments thereto, provision was made for the constructing, improving, and maintaining an intracoastal waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C., in accordance with a project set forth in House Document (or River and Harbors Committee Document) No. 391, 62d Congress, and pursuant thereto, an intracoastal waterway has been constructed over, across, or adjacent to the land herein conveyed, there is excepted from this conveyance the said Intracoastal Waterway as a part of the navigable waters of the United States, and there is reserved to the Government and its assigns the perpetual right and easement to maintain the said Intracoastal Waterway and to enter upon, dig or cut away, and remove any or all the hereinbefore described tract of land as may be required at any time in the prosecution of the aforesaid work of improvement, or any enlargement thereof, and maintain the portion so cut away and removed as a part of the navigable waters of the United States; and the further right to maintain the aids to navigation presently established by the United States on the land herein described with the rights of ingress and egress thereto; and the further perpetual right and easement to enter upon, occupy and use any portion of said tract of land, not so cut away and converted into public navigable waters as aforesaid, for the deposit of dredged material, and for the placement thereon of such aids to navigation deemed necessary by the Government, and for such other purposes as may be needful in the preservation and maintenance of said work of improvements: *Provided, however,* That the grantee, his heirs and assigns shall enjoy all such rights and privileges in said tract of land as may be used and enjoyed without interfering with or abridging the exceptions and reservations herein contained."

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Atlanta, Ga., June 5, 1956.

The Honorable W. KERR SCOTT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SCOTT: At the request of Mr. Cochrane, of your office, furnished below is information regarding the property known as the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, N. C. The property was turned over to us for disposal by the Corps of Engineers and is divided into four reports, as follows:

Location	Case No.	Acreage
Currituck County	D-NC-432	592.51
Hyde and Tyrell Counties	D-NC-433	2,590.63
Pamlico County	D-NC-434	443.50
Carteret and Craven Counties.	D-NC-435	1,231.78

We have just let a contract to appraise this property and the appraisal report should be received in this office on or about September 1, 1956. Immediately after the appraisal report is approved, the property will be advertised on a tract basis to the general public, with sealed bids to be returned to this office on a specified date.

In reporting the property to us, the Corps of Engineers reserved the right to maintain and, if necessary, enlarge the waterway and in so doing, dig away or remove any portion of the land considered necessary for this operation. This restriction might indicate that sale of the property might have to be made at rather low prices; however, there is considerable interest in the property and we believe that its sale will reflect an adequate return to the Government.

We propose to offer the property in tracts, as acquired.

If additional information is desired, it will be a pleasure to furnish it upon request.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK J. O'GARA,
Regional Director.

Address of Congressman Philip J. Philbin at Graduation Exercises, Cushing Academy, Ashburnham, Sunday, June 10, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a speech which I delivered yesterday at the graduation exercises of the class of 1956 in the

81st year of Cushing Academy at Ashburnham, Mass.

These exercises, which were held at Cowell chapel of Cushing, were largely attended and most impressive.

This commencement marked the final official appearance of the outstanding headmaster of the school, Mr. Clarence P. Quimby, who is retiring this year after 23 years of most conspicuous service.

During his administration, Cushing had made great progress. Its physical plant, its enrollment, and its curriculum had all been extended and greatly improved. Under his direction, the school achieved highest ranking among the secondary schools of the Nation.

Mr. Quimby leaves a tremendously vital, incomparable legacy, which would be impossible to excel. He has profoundly influenced the educational processes of his time and our generation, and his contributions, not only to Cushing, but to the cause of improved, progressive education will certainly be difficult to equal, if not impossible to excel.

The popular and famous headmaster retires at a time when he is virtually in the prime of his intellectual powers and professional fitness, and it is ardently to be hoped that he may be persuaded to pursue his activities in some broad educational field commensurate with his great ability, long experience, and inspired zeal. Cushing Academy and its many friends may not only be proud, but exceedingly grateful to this illustrious headmaster, who, out of the goodness of his heart, tenacity of his purpose, integrity of his dedication, and exceptional talents has forged such a remarkable record in the educational world.

The address follows:

Doctor Quimby, distinguished guests, members of the board of trustees, members of the faculty, members of the graduating class, parents, and friends:

This is indeed a day of fulfillment, a day of vital tasks successfully finished, a day mingled with feelings of joy of achievement and the sorrow of parting. I am greatly honored to be with you. I come, not only as Congressman of this great district, but a genuine admirer of Cushing and its outstanding headmaster, Dr. Quimby. And I come as a friend who has, for the past 3 years, had an excellent opportunity to observe the class which we honor today and as a proud parent with a lovely daughter just completing her junior year at this fine institution.

First of all, let me heartily congratulate each and every one of you, your parents, and teachers, on your graduation. I am exceedingly pleased with the splendid record which the members of this class have made at Cushing. The completion of your course here marks an important step in your personal advancement. It is an accomplishment of which you can be justly proud. If you had not worked sincerely and intelligently, you would not have been able to reach the cherished goal which we all take joy in celebrating in these impressive exercises, and which bring to this happy ending your secondary school careers. But actually, it is just the beginning. The wide world opens before you. Boundless opportunities of a promising and successful future await each and every one of you—await the impact of your aspirations, energy, and ability.

In every sense of the word, you are the beneficiaries of a noble tradition. You were blessed by providence with the favored destiny of being raised and educated in this great free country of ours—the most powerful, the richest, the most prosperous, and the happiest democracy the sun has ever shone upon. It has been your happy privilege and good fortune to be educated here in the atmosphere of a beautiful historic New England town, in a select institution of learning typified by an abundance of patriotism, idealism, constructively balanced living and genuine American culture. You have been fortunate enough to live in an atmosphere of tolerance where men and women are judged for what they are, what they achieve, and what they strive for, and not alone for their success, for the circumstance of their birth, their race, their religion, or their national origin. It would be difficult for me, indeed, in this brief talk, to recite the merits, the virtues, the reputation, and the immeasurable contributions of Cushing Academy, its great leaders and its able teachers. The vital thing to recall here and to remember henceforth is the wonderful atmosphere of opportunity, tolerance, pride in accomplishment, incentive, scholarship, and inspiration which has been engendered in this place and which you have been so fortunate to share.

We must remember that it has taken well nigh a century to fuse the basic elements of our American culture, outlook, and institutions into the comprehensive traditions of learning and useful citizenship that rightfully belong to Cushing and its graduates.

We must take note of the fact that the deep spirituality of the early American founders combining with their practical vision and love of freedom, merging with the enthusiasm, unbounded energy, and willingness to sacrifice for advancement under personal liberty which characterizes the many people who comprise this Nation, is mainly responsible for the dynamic, stimulating atmosphere of the school of which you may be so proud to be graduates today.

As years go by, you will place higher and higher value upon the advantage given you of living here during your formative years and you will come increasingly to appreciate the broad, spiritual, God-fearing patterns which have formed the secure foundation for so many of its other favorable characteristics.

You have been fortunate also in the extreme of being educated under such high minded, able leadership by such devoted, capable and conscientious teachers. There is background and patient development and rich traditions associated with your school. Its contemporary leaders and teachers are admirably carrying out and implanting the ideals of the great leaders and teachers of the past and when history is written, the names of men like Clarence Quimby as well as individual members of the faculty will be ranked with those of past generations whose devoted and unselfish work has helped so immeasurably in laying the groundwork and advancing the high aims of Cushing Academy.

In this connection there is a special sadness associated with this occasion in that it marks the last official commencement appearance of Headmaster, Quimby, whose rugged character, high ideals and unflagging devotion have been indelibly impressed upon this institution and the educational history of our times. Please bear with me a moment while I recount for you a brief excerpt appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of recent date concerning the service of your beloved and unxcelled headmaster. I quote:

"It would be a happy circumstance indeed, if every institution in the land could be infused with the spirit of patriotism, love of humanity, enthusiasm for work, unselfish devotion to students, school, and Nation, which Clarence Quimby has exemplified at Cushing.

"A true patriot in thought, word, and action, he is never given to narrow provincialism, hysterical fanfare or eccentric theory. His powerful influence for good will long be felt in the field in which he worked.

"The Nation that has men like Clarence Quimby among its leaders, working for the enlightenment and advancement of its youth, need have no fears for the future.

"I extend to him and to his devoted helpmate, Mrs. Quimby, who has been loyally and magnificently by his side in all his endeavors, my heartiest congratulations for their very many contributions to the educational, cultural and business and civic life of my district and State and wish them both many years of continued constructive effort and happiness."

And I tender to the new and able headmaster every wish for a most successful administration. He is well equipped for his tasks and will have the wholehearted cooperation of all.

I know that this afternoon as you meet officially with your teachers for the last time that your hearts are filled with deepest gratitude for all they have done for you. Future years, let me assure you, will serve only to heighten your feelings of appreciation for their labors in your behalf, and they will serve to bring into focus as an inspiring force in your lives the many unparalleled advantages and benefits that you have enjoyed under their leadership as students of this school.

There is another group this afternoon to whom you owe an indefinable debt for your present success. I know you will recognize that as a parent myself I speak in a very personal sense and, like all the other parents here, I am exceedingly proud at this time for the events which transpire here in which you play the principal role as graduates.

For I am sure that you are even more anxious than I am to emphasize in your own hearts and minds and in every fiber of your being the truly infinite value of the love, devotion, loyalty, and in all so many instances, the real sacrifice, which your loving parents have displayed in furthering your interests and welfare without which this happy result we all rejoice in would never have materialized.

Your parents seek no encomiums. They are patient and long suffering, let me assure you as one who knows. But I think I can speak for all the parents when I say that what they have done, they have done gladly and willingly, yes, with the eagerness born of true affection—and they seek no reward or commendation of any sort, save that which is worth more than anything else—continued goodness of character, renewed devotion to duty and future contributions in the form of good living, good works, and constructive activity by all our graduates for and in behalf of their families, their commmunity, their Nation, and their Creator.

In brief, parents ask nothing more of you than that you adhere to the ideals which you have been taught in your homes, your churches, and your school; that you continue honestly and wholeheartedy to do the best you can in whatever work you undertake; that you recognize your responsibilities to yourselves, to your families, to the people as a whole and to the country; that you work, live and strive as good industrious, God-fearing, self-respecting Americans contributing in every way you can to the building of good citizenship, wholesome family life, loyal friendships and the building of a better America and a peaceful world.

For parents this afternoon, there is a real pride and happiness for your success up to this time. But this occasion also brings remembrance and reminiscence. Parents, too, have come this very path years ago. They know the joys and sorrows of life, the trials, adversities, and problems.

From personal experience we parents know the obstacles, the pitfalls, the difficulties which you will have to face. Yes, my friends, we came this way ourselves. And if we were to close our eyes today we would find ourselves again in the bright sunlight and flower-decked fields of other years.

We would see before us the smiling faces of dear loved ones who made our way easier, who made our progress possible. We would

feel again the affectionate touch of their hand upon our shoulder, we would hear their words of counsel, advice, and courage.

We would recall the love and help they so unselfishly gave us; their look of disappointment when we lost; their unrestrained joy when we won; their never-ending concern for us; their loyalty and steadfastness. These are precious memories which will always live in our minds. Because those were days when family ties bound us together like hoops of steel, more tightly perhaps than in this modern day.

And now the vision dims, the bright sunlight of those happy years fades, the faces of those dear ones disappear and we are back again in the prosaic world of the present.

And so it will be with you, my young friends. Opportunity is beckoning. It knocks on your door. It may knock but once. It is up to you to embrace it. It is up to you to remember your noble heritage, to treasure and sustain your high ideals and let nothing swerve you from them. We will all be pulling for you in your every undertaking.

Many of you will go out into the realistic, practical, everyday world of work. Some of you will go to higher institutions of learning to seek further training for higher fields of endeavor. But all of you will have to face the same essential problems—how can you fulfill your highest destiny—how can you meet the responsibilities you have as educated men and women living in this fast-moving, rapidly changing atomic and hydrogen age with its quantum mechanics, nuclear physics, and theory of relativity.

You are finishing the happiest but at once a most vital and important period of your lives. You have made a fine start. As a class and as individuals you have made a great record here. Your class has distinguished itself in the classroom, on the athletic field and in every other school activity. You have all recorded a significant accomplishment in your school work. By your training and your character, you are well equipped for the future. If you have the will, ambition and determination, you can go on to finer achievements.

You can go on to service to your own aims, and service also to the Nation and humanity, to the task which faces every one of us today more than ever before of protecting, preserving, maintaining, enriching and perfecting the great institutions of our country which have given you, and so many others, priceless, incomparable advantages of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

If you but will it, if you courageously persevere in your aims, you can reach your goal and you can make your contribution worthwhile. Whatever that contribution is, make sure that it is your very best. Make sure that it represents the very best effort of which you are capable. Make sure that it is sincere, earnest and conscientious. Make sure that you work diligently at the tasks at hand. But no matter what your gains in material wealth and position, never take yourself too seriously.

Remember that you are human and finite. Never let failure deter you from another and still another try. Remember the words of a great philosopher, "There is no such word as failure in the lexicon of a bright youth." Keep your courage high, because you may score a touchdown on the next play. Be humble of your talents and accomplishments, and never gloat over the reverses or misfortunes of others. Tomorrow they may rise to success.

Distinguish between confidence in yourself and vainglory. Keep it in mind that "pride goeth before a fall," and that vanity casts doubt upon your real worth. Be generous, kindly and just—always ready to lend a helping hand, particularly to your less favored brethren. Respect the judgment of your elders because their experience can guide you safely away from the shoals. One is wise who learns from his own mistakes. One is a genius who learns from the mistakes of others.

Be interested in the civic and political affairs of your town, your State and your Government. Democracy can be destroyed by nonparticipation of the average citizen and the activity of minority pressure groups. The Nation and the world are faced by many grave problems. Your generation will necessarily have to play a large part in solving them. They cannot be solved without your active help.

You and those who will work with you will be the leaders of the future. What kind of a future—slave or free? Upon you the Nation will depend for its freedom and security. To you and other young Americans the whole world will one day look for guidance and inspiration in the struggle for peace and democracy. It will be your major task and duty to defend our liberty and save it from destruction by tyrants who are, if the facts were known, case problems for the psychologists, but who are preaching poisonous class hatred and intolerance and seeking by force or stealth the destruction of individual liberty and the enslavement of mankind.

My friends, there is no magic formula to prepare you for these great tasks, no open sesame to success. But there are some guides and signposts you can follow. First, remember that there is no substitute for hard work in the life of an individual or a nation. The able-bodied individual who strives to avoid or evade his responsibility, who turns to the government at some level to solve his personal problems, or to provide him with a means of livelihood, is foredoomed to failure. Similarly, that nation which turns its back on the dignity and worth of the individual and pursues the wraith of collectivism and socialism will soon suffer the same fate as all the other nations throughout history which have departed from the basic values of life ordained to us by the Almighty and exemplified so brilliantly by the unmatched glories and achievements of our Nation.

Remember that this Nation is not a static organism. To stand still is to retrogress. We must work for a dynamic, forward-looking, forward-moving democracy. But at the same time we cannot ignore or discard the solid, constructive values of the past. Industry, thrift, preparation for rainy days, above all, the deep spiritual values, and wholesome home and family life are the enduring basis of any worthwhile, well-ordered government.

Do not be led astray or swerved from your chosen course by current despotic doctrines as old as Methuselah or the Corn laws of Rome that there is any easy road to personal success, governmental stability or national prosperity. A nation, like an individual, must zealously protect its freedom, or it will crumble through soft living, inertia, moral decay and spiritual degeneration, like so many other nations of the past, into the dust of oblivion. All the experience of mankind and all the lessons of recorded history indisputably prove that fact.

Let me reemphasize: Be true to yourselves and the ideals you have learned in your own homes, your churches and this school. Be confident of your abilities and aim high. Remember the words of the poet "Not failure, but low aim, is crime." Be proud of your heritage and never betray it. Stand by your principles and your convictions. Respect yourselves and others will respect you.

Live like your fathers and mothers have tried to live—loyal to God and country, loyal to every worthy institution, loyal to your friends. Strive to advance yourself, and live, not by selfishness or vanity or materialism. "To thine own self be true and it must follow as the night the day thou canst not then be false to any man," is something to remember, if you place beside it "Love thy neighbor as thyself" and the injunction of the Golden Rule, "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you." And when you are right, fear no one but God, because the truth will make you free and freedom will make you strong.

It always tugs at the heart to leave dear friends—the young and the old. But time waits for no one. Like all those who have gone before you, now you must move forward—always forward—to the broader opportunities and achievements of the future. You part today but you will be together again, I know, together in these fine warm friendships you have formed here, together in the spirit of these noble teachings and ideals, together in the company of all those who strive to keep our high faith in America and all she stands for, the eternal faith which by the blood and sacrifice of her sons we have sworn to uphold to the end.

Years ago in a similar setting as this I had the high privilege of rendering my own class ode and the closing lines of it went something like this:

"But now as we start on life's battle, let us be brave and heed the words of our own class motto, 'Every day some noble deed.'"

And I think today, my friends, that the last line of that song may well be kept in mind by all of us, young and old: "Every day some nobler deed."

Let me again congratulate you, your parents and teachers, upon this great, memorable, unforgettable day in your lives, so full of deep meaning for them and for you.

And let me wish you all, and let me wish for my dear friend, Clarence Quimby, your great headmaster, all the very best of health, success, prosperity and happiness in the future, whatever may be your chosen way of life.

May the good Lord of hosts continue to shower his richest, choicest blessings upon all of you.

God love you.

Senator Lehman's Sixth Radio Report to the People of New York State on the Work of Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a monthly radio report which I made to the people of New York State on Sunday, June 10, 1956.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORKER'S REPORT ON THE NATION

(Text of Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN's sixth radio report to the people of New York State during the 2d session, 84th Cong.)

Fellow New Yorkers, the past 4 weeks in the United States Senate have been busy and productive. I am pleased to report to you that since my last broadcast, the Senate has passed four major pieces of legislation on which I have been working for some time—the Niagara power bill, the flood disaster insurance program, a broad Federal housing program, and an extension of the GI home-loan program.

This has certainly been my most productive legislative month in the Senate, Each of these four major legislative achievements are matters of vital interest to the people of New York and I am sure you would like to hear something about them.

The bill providing for the public development of the Niagara Falls power resources by the New York State Power Authority passed the Senate on May 16 by a vote of

48 to 39. As the primary sponsor of this bill, I was most gratified by the size of the favorable vote in the Senate. The chief issue in the debate on the Senate floor was whether Niagara power should be developed by the State of New York, for the benefit of all the people of the State, or whether the Niagara resource should be given away by the Congress, despite the laws of New York State, to a private power monopoly headed by the Niagara Mohawk Power Co.

The people of New York State are the direct beneficiaries of this victory over the advocates of the giveaway of Niagara power. The Senate action in passing my bill was a great step forward in achieving early development of this single greatest undeveloped hydroelectric site in the United States.

My colleague, Senator IVES, attempted to have this bill sent back to the Public Works Committee for what he called further study even though we have been studying it for years. This move would have killed the bill. Fortunately, his proposal was defeated and now the day is closer at hand when all the people of New York State will reap the benefits of two great hydroelectric developments—the St. Lawrence, presently under construction, and the Niagara.

Practically speaking, what does this mean for the people of New York State? It means that low-cost hydroelectric power will attract more industry to New York and that employment opportunities will thus be increased in our State and it means cheaper rates of electricity for home and business consumers.

Under the terms of the Niagara bill, as it passed the Senate, this will all be accomplished without cost to the taxpayers of New York State or of the Nation.

Now we must all push ahead to achieve the same type of victory in the House of Representatives. This is your fight. Passage of the Niagara bill in the House is going to be difficult. I am confident, however, that with the same widespread citizen support for the public development of Niagara power which I received during the Senate debate, we can achieve affirmative action in the House, and the great Niagara power development can proceed to become a reality in the next several months.

The Senate also enacted a Federal flood-disaster insurance program on which I have been working since the disastrous floods in our Northeastern States last fall. As acting chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee considering the flood-disaster insurance program, I held extensive hearings in New York State and in other States on the east coast. Over the decades our Nation has been intermittently plagued with floods. Almost no State has escaped their devastation.

The Northeastern States, and the Atlantic Seaboard States have suffered terrible losses in recent years from floods following hurricanes. We all remember the destruction wrought by hurricanes Diane and Connie. The losses to homeowners and businessmen amounted to hundreds of millions of dollars.

Since private insurance companies will not write flood insurance, I conducted hearings on this subject for the Banking and Currency Committee, and the Senate, on May 10, passed my bill providing for the establishment of a Federal program of flood-disaster insurance. I am sure that those of you who have been hit by floods will understand the importance of this legislation. It, too, is now before the House and I am extremely hopeful that favorable action will be taken on the disaster insurance program before the closing of Congress.

The last two major legislative achievements of the past month which I want to tell you about are in the field of housing. The great volume of mail which I have received from citizens of New York State has made me more keenly aware that the question of adequate housing for our citizens is at the top of the list of unresolved problems confronting our Nation today.

With this in mind, I introduced a bill proposing a major overhaul of our Federal housing program. As a member of the Housing Subcommittee I heard the testimony of experts on housing needs and of representatives of the housing industry. From these hearings, and subsequent studies by the committee, we drew up and sent to the Senate a good housing bill. This housing bill was passed by the Senate. It goes further than the scanty program proposed by the administration but I would have liked to see it go even further in several respects, especially in the area of providing middle-income housing for persons unable to qualify for low-cost public housing but who are unable to meet the high cost of sale and rental housing being built by the housing industry today.

The housing legislation passed by the Senate authorizes 135,000 public housing units for each of the next 3 years, as against the meager 35,000 units for each of 2 years requested by the administration. This legislation provides a greatly expanded program of urban renewal and slum clearance assistance to our cities struggling with the growing problem of our slums.

But that isn't all that this housing bill accomplishes. We have also made provision for 15,000 units annually of public housing for elderly people, and instituted a program of special financial assistance to housing enterprises designed to meet the needs of our elderly families which are unable to find adequate apartments or homes.

This elderly housing program was a great victory for those of us who have witnessed the real needs of our senior citizens. It is a good start and it is a firm basis on which to build and expand a program for housing for the elderly in the years to come.

While my proposal for a full-scale middle-income housing program was defeated in the Senate Banking and Currency Committee by a tie vote, the Senate agreed to direct the staff of the Housing Subcommittee to make a complete study of middle-income housing needs and to report back to the Banking and Currency Committee the full facts of the crisis in middle-income housing. I am proud of the progress we made this year in laying the groundwork for positive legislation in this field and I am also proud of the overall housing bill which the Senate passed and sent to the House for action.

Still on the housing bill, I was the sponsor of an amendment which the Senate adopted extending the GI housing loan program for another year. When the Veterans' Administration announced its plan to stop receiving applications for home loans as of next January, I felt it would be a tragedy to let this program expire before some 11 million veterans throughout the Nation—and many hundreds of thousands in New York—could avail themselves of their rights for these Veterans' Administration guaranteed home loans. I therefore proposed to the Senate, and the Senate unanimously passed, a 1-year extension of the GI home-loan program. I am confident that the House of Representatives will take similar action before the end of the session.

So much for our recent victories in the Senate.

In my remaining time I want to tell you about another important subject now being debated on the floor of the Senate—a proposed liberalization and revision of the social-security program.

Among the changes being proposed to the social-security program, there are two particular amendments I want to discuss with you. These deal with the payments of benefits to totally and permanently disabled workers at the age of 50 if they were, before their disability, employed in jobs covered by social security—and the lowering of the retirement age for women from 65 to 62.

The bill which is now under discussion passed the House of Representatives last summer by an overwhelming vote. It contained the two provisions to which I have just now referred. However, the Senate Finance Committee accepted the arguments of the administration and various pressure groups and eliminated the disability provision completely and made the lower retirement age for women applicable only to widows.

A group of my colleagues and I are now carrying on a fight to have the two original provisions restored. There is nothing complicated about these proposals. They do not deal with involved legal questions or abstract theories. They deal with people—their human needs and wants.

The Senate Finance Committee also decided that the reduction in retirement age for women should be made effective only for widows. To me this is an outrageous example of discrimination. The problems of the older woman do not depend on her marital status.

Of course I am concerned about the woman who finds herself a widow at the age of 60 or 62—a woman without skills, training, or job experience. But, I am also concerned about the woman in her early sixties who loses her job and is unable to find another because of the reluctance of employers to hire women over 60. And I am concerned about the woman who has no children to support her, no insurance or other source of income to fall back on.

By lowering the retirement age for all women to 62, we can give them something to look forward to—we can make their advanced years years of brightness and hope—we can make them secure in the knowledge that they will not be dependent on others—that they will be self-sufficient, instead of charity cases.

I have touched only on the high points of the social-security debate. I am confident that you share my views—that you hope and pray, as I do, that the United States Senate will promptly approve these pending amendments that mean so much to the people of this Nation.

All of my time has expired. I will be back on this station in 4 weeks with another report to you on my work in the United States Senate.

America and the World's Debt to Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to include the address I delivered on April 29, 1956, at the annual convention of the Worcester County Association of Polish-American Citizens' Clubs.

The committee in charge of convention arrangements was headed by Mrs. Stella A. Ciborowski, association president, assisted by Mrs. Stella A. Recko, Mrs. Anna Kowiako, Mrs. Adeline Petriewicz, Mrs. Stephania M. Paterak, and Miss Amelia Gutowski.

The address follows:

SPEECH BY HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE, OF MASSACHUSETTS, AT CONVENTION OF WORCESTER COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF POLISH-AMERICAN CITIZENS' CLUBS, WORCESTER, MASS., APRIL 29, 1956

I am very grateful for the cordial invitation to visit with you this afternoon and very happy I was able to accept your hospitality because I know I am among good friends.

Another good reason is that I feel right at home here. As perhaps most of you know, I was born and lived for many years within a few blocks of this building. As a schoolboy, I went to school in this area and played in the streets of this neighborhood. It was in those early years I first learned by observation about the high and noble qualities of the Polish-American people because I lived among you. All of those early Polish associates are still among the closest friends I have.

No one can live among the Poles without seeing that they are honest, hard-working, God-fearing people. They are devoted to their families, quietly courageous, and possessed of intense loyal patriotism. They have never hesitated and will never cease to be ready to fight and even die for the Christian principles and democratic freedoms. Without having to refer to the pages of the noble history of your native land, we have the impressive truth and proof of your willing heroism in the war records of America. Such names as Pulaski and Kosciusko are immortally associated with the origin of our own liberty. During the Civil War, the documents demonstrate that several thousands of Poles fought to preserve the Union. In the First World War, tens of thousands of Polish-Americans served with our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. In the Second World War, several hundred thousand fought and died to maintain American freedom, and the battle awards and distinctions they achieve are legion.

The contribution to the beginning and development of this Nation by your people is universally recognized with the deepest gratitude by your fellow Americans all over the country. Is it any wonder, then, here in our own vicinity, that every citizen of our area knows about the substantial part your Worcester County Association of Polish-American Citizens' Clubs has played and is playing in advancing all the civic and patriotic objectives of this community and this country. They respect and admire you for it. They realize that your combined activities in explaining the standards of good American citizenship to your members and your persistent urging of the acceptance and fulfillment of the individual responsibilities of good citizenship is vitally needed for the preservation of this blessed Nation in these hectic times. It is, then, not only a pleasure, but, indeed, a public duty for me as Congressman to compliment you for your wholesome and inspiring example of the highest patriotism.

There is another reason why I personally have the highest regard and admiration for the Polish-American. It is because no people have a greater concern or any greater loyalty to the old folks than you do. In the best Christian spirit, you are devoted to your own families, you are courteous and respectful to the aged and truly charitable in providing for their needs. A good Christian heart is your heritage and you, and your fathers and mothers before you, brought that good heart to America to add to the culture and progress of every city and State, in which Polish-Americans live.

It is, indeed, because of your Christian heritage that you recognize better than most Americans the grave danger threatening us and the free world in this fierce struggle against the barbaric atheism of Communist tyranny. Because of the experience of your beloved native country and because in some cases of unfortunate family experience, you have a clear understanding of the terrible fierceness, the relentless cruelty, and the devilish determination of the Soviet leaders in their plans to conquer and subjugate the free world into slavery. Because you are intensely aware of the godless nature of communism, you are intensely concerned with the universal promotion and practice of good citizenship without which America cannot expect to escape Communist subjection and consequent suppression of all the fundamental liberties we enjoy.

Because of your Christian heritage, you appreciate better than most what these liberties are and what they mean to you and your families and to all Americans. You realize very well that here in America we have the privilege of casting votes as our conscience dictates without any dictatorial interference. Here our Government leaders do not seek to impose their will upon us, our homes cannot be searched without a warrant, our property is not subject to unlawful confiscation, our families are not put in danger of bodily harm or imprisonment because of our convictions, our choice of schools to which we send our children is unlimited, and our privilege of worshiping God is unrestricted. These are blessed freedoms of a blessed land. You Polish-Americans know very well just how blessed they are, and you also realize very well how easily they might be lost.

Other unfortunate peoples all over the world almost overnight have lost the rights and the privileges and the freedoms that had taken hundreds of years to gain. Under Communist inspiration, events are constantly occurring around this current world which are a grim reminder to all Americans that we must not and cannot take our freedoms for granted. All Americans today must earnestly realize, as you people do, that the struggle for freedom never ends and that the greatest danger to our present freedom is to take our democratic liberty for granted.

It is not enough ever, but more especially in these dangerous days, to merely enjoy the privileges and the liberties of a democracy; we must accept the responsibilities of citizenship to maintain our freedoms. The Communist leaders stand ever ready to take quick advantage of any wide neglect in or retreat from acceptance of the responsibilities of American citizenship. We, then, must remain ever ready to make the sacrifices necessary to prevent such a terrible catastrophe.

Your native land gave us the best modern example of such sacrifice in that serious engagement with the Communists in 1920. The Polish people proved then to the world that they were among the very, very few who early recognized the planned Communist objective of reducing the free world to tyrannical slavery. Would that we had wisely learned from their example, and the recent years of too much appeasement and too often retreats, of developing world confusion, and of increasing turmoil might well have been avoided.

The debt that the free world owes to heroic Poland for her courageous struggle against the Communist horde 36 years ago still remains unpaid and it still remains as a blot upon the moral integrity of this country and the United Nations.

It is not, however, thank God, too late to save America and to vindicate our honor by continuing to demand liberation and freedom from Communist tyranny of Poland and the other enslaved nations. America is today the outstanding single force preventing the final success of Communist propaganda, intrigue, and even forceful aggression. It would appear that they fear our military strength and so are content to wait and watch, hoping that we will become weak from within. They hesitate to openly attack us because they know we have great military resources; they are not so sure and they doubt that we possess the greater and more enduring strength of moral character as a nation and a people.

We must, then, give a resounding and convincing answer to that particular challenge. We must demonstrate to them that the great majority of Americans do possess the moral capacity to make personal sacrifices for the common welfare. We must show them that the great majority of Americans are willing to govern their private ambitions for the general good. We must thoroughly convince them that they could wait until doomsday before the great majority of Americans will ever betray their neighbors, become disloyal to their country or accept the false and unholy appeal of Communist propaganda.

The only way we can do that is by individually and wholly accepting and carrying out our responsibilities as good American citizens. The foundation of good citizenship is to live our daily lives among our fellows with Christian self-restraint and in accord with the laws of God and duly constituted authority. In my opinion, the continuing demonstration of the great moral strength of the Christian unity among the American people will provide the greatest discouragement to the Kremlin leaders and will eventually force them to abandon their pagan plans to enslave the world.

You members of the Worcester County Association of Polish-American Citizens Clubs have provided us with an inspiring example of how that Christian unity and moral strength is achieved. If the rest of the American people will imitate and persevere in your patriotic example, I hope and believe that, with the help of God, all of us will live to soon see the dawn of a new era of peace for America and freedom for Poland and the rest of the Christian world.

The Dangers of Oil Importation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. T. RUTHERFORD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years those of us ever mindful of the threat constituted by continued high importation of foreign oil have worked in various ways to curtail this dangerous practice. Although we have worked long and hard, we have little to show for our labors. The Neely amendment, which would have curtailed such importation to an extent, was not adopted by the Congress. Although the President has authority under the provisions of H. R. 1 to curtail imports of any commodity which might threaten the security of the United States or endanger our domestic market in any given field, the law has not been properly applied to the importation of foreign oil.

It is my sincere opinion that every American should be warned of the dangers of continued high foreign oil import quotas. The President, his Advisory Cabinet Committee, the Congress of the United States and all persons in a position to do something about these excessive imports should combine their efforts to right the wrongs and eliminate the dangers brought about as a result of this folly.

Import quotas are provided on a large number of commodities including cattle, fish, wheat, nuts, barley, sugar, tobacco and furs. Yet, there is no legal restriction on most foreign oil production and none whatever on foreign oil imports. Wells in the Middle East run as high as 6,000 barrels of oil daily, while the average well production in my own State of Texas is only 19 barrels. The foreign wells, owned mostly by a few major oil companies, produce oil every day while in Texas, largest producing State in our Nation, production is often shut down to 15 days per month.

I would like to ask the Members of this body, Mr. Speaker, if they know of any other industry that would not be severely crippled should it be forced to work on a part-time basis? Is there a man among us who could properly feed and clothe his family, and meet his other financial obligations, if he should be forced to restrict his earning capacity by working only 2 of every 4 weeks? Yet, this is the situation that has been thrust upon our domestic oil producers by foreign oil imports.

Since 1946, oil imports have increased almost 200 percent, or 5 times as rapidly, percentagewise, as domestic production. Before World War II, imports averaged about 5 percent of domestic demand. In 1946 to 1951 they averaged about 10 percent of consumption in this country. Today, foreign oil supplies more than 15 percent of our requirements.

The independents in this industry own little or no foreign oil. They have been damaged by excessive imports. Yet, the real threat lies not in what has happened, but what can happen in the future. Our own country, among the major free world powers, is alone blessed with ample oil resources and productive ability to assure fulfillment of our needs for both war and peace. We must guard that position at any and all costs. I believe that can be done without disrupting our trade relationships, and certainly without disturbing our friends in oil-producing countries in the Western Hemisphere. We want their trade and can use some of their oil, but it should bear a realistic relation to our domestic production and requirements.

The United States has today the heavy responsibility of leadership to maintain throughout the world. Never has there been a more urgent need to expand the Nation's productive facilities that insure our economic well-being and our military preparedness. No material is more essential to national welfare and security than petroleum. This Nation must have access at all times to sources of enough oil to meet the requirements of any emergency. This requires substantial and continuing expansion of the capacity to produce, process, transport, and distribute crude oil and its products.

Prior to World War II, the petroleum industry in the United States had developed a reserve-producing capacity that exceeded the then current level of oil consumption by about a million barrels per day. The importance of that reserve cannot be exaggerated. It meant the difference between victory and defeat.

Today, we are in a far less fortunate position in terms of petroleum productive capacity. Our ability to produce liquid fuels provides no margin of safety over present requirements.

The reason for this lack of reserve is all too obvious: it comes from idle wells in the United States, and from lack of speculation by many of our domestic producers. We cannot expect these producers to invest and risk their capital in extensive exploration and drilling, if they know any strike made will be restricted to half-time production while foreign oil continues to come into the country in increasing abundance. We cannot expect them to invest in ventures which only pay dividends on a part-time basis.

The petroleum industry in the United States is one of the greatest bulwarks to our general economy. All but 18 of our 48 States now produce oil or gas, or both. Others are being explored, and are hopeful of being added to the producing ledger. In 11 of our States including my own State of Texas, crude petroleum ranks first in value of all minerals produced. It is obvious that the health of the domestic oil-producing industry is of primary importance to these States. In Texas, for example, taxes on oil production amount to 67 percent of all business and property taxes. Oil pays 45 percent of the cost of public education in Texas, and 44.9 percent of the cost of higher education. When production is slashed, our State budget is denied funds for schools, highways, colleges, and other essential public projects.

The Cabinet committee on oil imports has reached certain conclusions, with which I find fault. I think they should be reconsidered. The conclusions would permit total crude oil imports for the year 1956 to exceed their 1954 relationship to domestic oil production by an average of 234,000 barrels per day. The conclusions would permit increase in crude oil imports during 1956 over 1954 of 1,300 percent from Canada, 36 percent from the Middle and Far East and 26 percent from Venezuela, as compared with an increase of 10 percent in United States crude-oil production. The conclusions would permit the United States west coast to become increasingly dependent on Eastern Hemisphere crude oil. The conclusions would permit total imports of crude oil and refined products to take over 20 percent of the United States market in 1956 as compared with 18.3 percent in 1955 and 16.6 percent in 1954—the largest increase in this ratio since 1950, which would inevitably lead to inadequate domestic supplies and increasing dependency on foreign oil.

The Independent Petroleum Association of America, and other persons realizing the dangers to the oil industry and our Nation as a result of excessive imports, have asked the Advisory Cabinet Committee and the Office of Defense Mobilization to take another look at the recommendations, and reach a more realistic conclusion; a conclusion which will be more in keeping with our national interests and with a strong sense of justice and fair play.

I pledge my efforts to aid in this fight, Mr. Speaker, and I urge each Member of this body to study the facts and join in the battle to curtail these dangerous, excessive, foreign oil imports.

Influence of the College of William and Mary on 18th Century America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 10, 1956, the Honorable A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, JR., Virginia's distinguished junior United States Senator, delivered a most interesting and inspiring address at the annual graduation exercises of the College of William and Mary at Williamsburg, Va.

Since obtaining its charter in 1693, thus becoming the second college to be established in America, the College of William and Mary has maintained a continuous period of proud and honorable operation. It has exerted great influence for good in the life of our Nation. I am pleased to count myself among its alumni.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following text of Senator ROBERTSON'S address:

INFLUENCE OF THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY ON 18TH CENTURY AMERICA

(Remarks of Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON at the annual graduation exercises of the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va., June 10, 1956)

In selecting for discussion today the influence of William and Mary on 18th century America, I planned to emphasize the importance in human affairs of intangible values but my preparation has reminded me of the fact that intangibles are not as readily perceived or as easily defined as tangibles. Take my own experience with William and Mary for example. I had tangible contacts with William and Mary athletes on the football field in the falls of 1905, 1906, and 1907 but long prior to that I had unrecognized intangible contacts through attending public schools of Lynchburg, headed by E. C. Glass, an LL.D. of William and Mary and a member of its board of visitors, a high school in Rocky Mount of which the principal was J. Taylor Thompson, a William and Mary graduate, and classes in English at Richmond College, under another William and Mary man, Dr. J. A. C. Chandler, father of your present president.

In attempting to recall something of the tangible influence of William and Mary on the early life of our Nation, I shall mention as illustrations only a few of the many personalities involved.

Two years ago, when I delivered the commencement address at another Virginia institution, often referred to as "Mr. Jefferson's university," I started out by saying: "The longer I live, the more convincing proof I see of the fact that Thomas Jefferson was our greatest political philosopher." Naturally, therefore, I want to say something about Jefferson today, since he was one of the men trained at William and Mary who influenced the thinking and course of events not only in our country but in the entire world. But I also want to emphasize the cumulative importance of other graduates, less widely known, whose accomplishments some of you may duplicate.

In recent years, more people from other States and more people from foreign nations have become acquainted with the physical plant of William and Mary and the wonderful restoration of Colonial Williamsburg than any other historic spot in our State. And in the celebration next year of the first settlement in nearby Jamestown, hundreds of thousands will come to Williamsburg to visit that spot which, as Daniel Webster said "cradled and defended the infancy of our Republic." Some of these visitors may learn that William and Mary was the first institution of higher learning projected for America and the second actually to be established; that William and Mary is unique in receiving a charter directly from the crown of England and a Coat of Arms from the College of Heralds in London; that this college was the first in the United States to have a full faculty of professors, first to adopt the lecture system and the elective and honor systems, first to widen its scope

to that of a university, first to establish courses in municipal and constitutional law, modern languages, political economy and history and first to organize a Greek letter Intercollegiate Fraternity, the Phi Beta Kappa Society, a membership in which I highly cherish.

Some of them may also learn that men trained at William and Mary in the latter part of the 17th century and the early part of the 18th century accounted for 7 out of 11 members of the Committee on Intercolonial Correspondence, 6 out of 11 members of the Virginia Committee of Safety which was the real governing body of Virginia after the iniquitous Lord Dunmore took refuge on a British gunboat, 4 of the 7 Virginia signers of the Declaration of Independence including its author, Thomas Jefferson, 15 of the 33 Virginia members of the Continental Congress, including Peyton Randolph, the first President of that Congress, 2 of the 3 Virginia members of the Annapolis Convention of 1786 to frame a new Constitution and 4 of the 7 Virginia members of the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention of 1787, including Edmund Randolph who opened the proceedings by presenting the Virginia plan on which so much of our charter of American liberty was framed. We could also tell them about one-half of the Governors of Virginia from 1776 to 1800, 6 of 8 United States Senators from Virginia and 3 of the 7 Virginia-born Presidents being trained at William and Mary.

All those things would fall in the realm of the tangible but it is more important for the members of this graduating class and for the thousands of visitors who annually come here, to have a clear conception of the intangible influence of William and Mary not only upon 18th century America, which is my primary topic, but upon more than 300 years of our history.

William Wirt Henry wrote in 1891 that William and Mary "trained and gave to the world during the Revolutionary period a host of statesmen whose names are indelibly impressed on the pages of American history." It was that type of training that caused Thomas Jefferson to say that his beloved science teacher, Dr. William Small, had probably fixed the destinies of his life.

Woodrow Wilson said in a commencement address shortly after he left the University of Virginia that those who are leaders must lead their own generation. William and Mary had an important influence on 18th century America because the college was adapted to the needs of its day.

Historians have pointed out that two great movements were born and flowered in the 18th century. One was the movement among the intellectual classes referred to as "The enlightenment," which meant self-emancipation from prejudice, conversion and tradition and assertion of the right of individuals to give their intellects free rein rather than be curbed by established dogmas. The other 18th century movement was the democratic revolution among the middle and lower classes, involving all human activities, and leading to development of two of our most cherished political principles. One of these was that all men are born equal, meaning, as John Adams explained to his wife, Abigail, when she wrote that he knew this could not be true, that the phrase in the Declaration of Independence meant all men were born men and not some men and some whales. The second principle was that there were certain cherished rights which were not derived from kings or potentates but were inherited by man from his Creator and could, therefore, be designated as inalienable rights of which he could not justly be deprived by any form of government. How well these principles were absorbed by Thomas Jefferson and others of his generation who attended William and Mary is suggested by the epitaph Jefferson selected for his tomb indicating the three forms of freedom he had championed: Freedom of the body, as spelled out in his Declaration of Independence, freedom of religion, as spelled out in Virginia's Statute of Religious Freedom and embraced in the first amendment to the Federal Constitution, and freedom of the mind, as exemplified by a system of public education capped by the university at Charlottesville which he sponsored.

Jefferson once wrote that all the manna in heaven could not make a mammoth out of a mouse. He obviously was of superior clay to start with, but there is much evidence to show that the training he received at William and Mary increased his stature enormously.

Looking back 60 years after leaving the college, Jefferson vividly remembered his teacher of natural philosophy, William Small. He spoke of Dr. Small's enlarged and liberal mind and said, "Most happily for me," he became "attached to me and made me his daily companion, * * *and from his conversation I got my first views of the expansion of science and of the system of things in which we are placed."

It was through Small that Jefferson met George Wythe, with whom he studied law and whom Jefferson later had appointed as the first teacher of law in the college, and this friendship continued throughout his life.

Recently I asked Dr. Julian P. Boyd, the distinguished editor of Jefferson's papers, for his comment on what William and Mary did for Jefferson, and he told me this: "Jefferson was a man of clearly defined aims and a practical sense of what was possible as well as what was proper. One thing we can be sure of is that his teachers did not try to instill in him the idea that this was the best of all possible worlds, or that colonial Virginia was a stable, orderly society incapable of improvement. William and Mary prepared him for a world of change. Small and Wythe gave Jefferson a sense of man's endless possibilities. They showed what man might become if he went on improving himself and his institutions under the general reign of reason and justice. They helped to prepare him to be both a revolutionary and a founder."

We can trace these influences through Jefferson's career. He assumed changes were natural and inevitable but accepted this as a challenge and an obligation to control the change rather than be controlled by it. He believed in an aristocracy not of wealth or power but of character, intelligence and accomplishment. He believed it was the duty of this aristocracy to make issues clear but that the ultimate power of choice and decision must lie with the whole people.

But the system of things that Jefferson and his contemporaries learned at William and Mary did not include the belief that the people were automatically right. What he learned, and what his whole life teaches, is that the citizen in a free society faces an exacting and heavy responsibility. Free enterprise to Jefferson meant freedom of opportunity and equality before the law, but it did not mean freedom from responsibility.

Applying his principles to his own life, Jefferson confessed that music was his great passion, science was his delight, agriculture his cherished occupation and the beloved Monticello the end of all his private dreams. But these things he subordinated whenever the higher duty demanded. These things he laid aside when his obligations as a citizen required him to do so.

On the 200th anniversary of the establishment of William and Mary a brilliant alumnus, J. Allen Watts, of Roanoke, after discussing the contribution of William and Mary's alumni to the birth of a new nation, said of those priceless principles of political and economic freedom that were born of the brain and purchased with the blood of the Founding Fathers: "The chief danger that menaces this country of ours is the danger that these principles may be forgotten, or may be cast aside as antiquated and of no value in these latter days. Hoping and believing as I do in the great destiny of this country, I feel that our safety depends upon our keeping before us for emulation the names and deeds of our colonial and revolutionary sires, whose lofty intellects, dauntless wills, and unquestionable love of true liberty—liberty regulated by law—enabled them to gain a foothold in this country, wrest it first from the savage and then from England, and found the first true republic the world has ever seen, and under whose care the common property, the common liberty, and the common future of all were to be protected."

Many of you will recall that William and Mary was established as a church school and while the first instructors in theology did not teach separation of church and state they did teach many fundamental principles of the Bible as found in the King James version and the Bible is filled with references to property ownership. "Thou shalt not steal"; "the Lord loveth a cheerful giver"; King Ahab coveted Naboth's vineyard; the good and faithful servant was he who prudently invested the funds left in his care by the master. And how little meaning would there be in the words "pursuit of happiness" if they did not include the right to own and enjoy property, the fruit of one's own labor. William and Mary had a part in teaching the framers of a unique experiment in self-government that it must rest upon the teachings of the Bible.

It is the fundamental principles of our democracy for which William and Mary trained the leaders of the 18th century which are being challenged today by the anti-God ideology of communism. In recent years it has been my privilege to visit most of the countries in Europe that are not behind the Iron Curtain and some of the countries in the Orient, and the more I see of the spread of socialism in other parts of the world, to say nothing of communism, the more convinced I am that it is folly to assume that there can be a separation of property rights from personal rights. They are the root and branch of the same tree, and when you kill one, both will die. Yet that vital principle is being challenged by sponsors of the welfare state as well as Communists who would overthrow our Government by force. On neither front can we afford to let down our guard.

On the home front a willingness to take some hard knocks is implicit in any system of private enterprise. Who carried an ax in one hand and a rifle in the other? Those who carved an empire out of a wilderness. And one hundred and sixty-eight years after the first humble start at Jamestown those settlers were willing to fight a world power to protect their property and political rights. They believed those rights stemmed from the teachings of the Bible and that God would be on their side. "And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice," said Franklin at the Constitutional Convention, "is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?"

Russian leaders have repudiated Stalin but not Lenin who dedicated his revolution to the destruction of all capitalist countries. We cannot afford to accept words in lieu of deeds as proof of the fact that the present leaders of the Politburo have abandoned Lenin's plan for world conquest. As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, I have had access to confidential information concerning the relative military power of Russia as compared with our own and it is disturbing.

Since the end of World War II we have invested $60 billion of gifts and loans in a program intended to strengthen our allies and stop the march of communism. While the purpose of that program was sound, it was organized on too lavish a scale and the results have been disappointing. The European Defense Community failed, and inter-

national military organization called NATO is only a skeleton of what it was supposed to be and European politicians have invested our funds in socialistic schemes helpful to themselves.

In August of last year when I met with representatives of some 35 nations attending a meeting of the Interparliamentary Union in Helsinki I was impressed by the obvious lack of appreciation of our efforts and the fact that other free nations receiving our aid were taking at face value Russia's assurances of peaceful coexistence and using it as an excuse to ease their own tax burden for military spending.

I was shocked, therefore, to read in the press when I returned to Washington that some unidentified spokesman for the administration had predicted we would cut appropriations for our Air Force by a billion dollars and I wrote a strong letter of protest to the President, urging him not to reduce our capacity for defense while Russia was continuing to increase her offensive power with hydrogen bombs and other weapons of mass destruction.

Fortunately the President decided to put adequate defense above a balanced budget and a tax cut and the suggested cut in the Air Force was not proposed. My position as to our defense needs was further supported this year when the President, after sending us the defense budget, sent a supplemental estimate of $500 million to speed our production of strategic bombers and guided missiles. But there still are doubts among those of us who daily hear testimony from top military experts as to whether our projected defense program will give us a superiority in the air which the Russian leaders can both understand and respect.

I believe defense spending must be geared to a sound economy in the United States but we must have an Air Force commensurate with our needs. Therefore, if a choice must be made as to allocation of funds, and there is not enough money for both, I shall vote to cut foreign aid to allies of uncertain dependability and to step up our production of strategic bombers and guided missiles. The time may come when the rank and file of the Russian people will recognize our viewpoint and our superior manner of life. The time may come when they will listen again to the sound of bells coming across the fields and comprehend and reverence the symbolism of the cross.

But until such time as God in his omnipotence and loving kindness sees fit to change the hearts of men and teach us how to build a temple of peace dedicated to the victory of moral force, the duty of every young American should be crystal clear. He must be willing to support at home American constitutional liberty which includes, of course, the American system of free competitive enterprise and he must be ready, able, and willing to defend it with his life if need be against any foreign aggressor.

In this behalf there is a job for all to do. "If we go out into a cloudless night and glance skyward, we observe the eternal stars and constellations; we call some of them by their name—Venus, Mars, Saturn, Jupiter, Neptune, the Pleiades, and the Milky Way. If there be no moon, we believe that the visible stars shed the light upon our pathway, and indeed they do, but astronomers who peer through remote spaces of the universe tell us that more than one-half of all of the blended radiance of the skies that falls upon our pathway comes from stars we never see. They are invisible; they have no name on earth; they seem to have no place in heaven; yet they light us on our way. Thus it is with human life and human destiny; a few persons may become bright particular stars in the political, financial, social, or economic sky, but we all may be, if we will, a part of that invisible host of stars that serenely shed their kindly lights on the paths of all mankind.

Address of Hon. Daniel J. Flood, of Pennsylvania, at San Souis Park, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., Sunday, June 10, 1956, at 20th Anniversary Catholic Slovak Sokol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered on June 10, 1956, at the 20th anniversary Catholic Slovak Sokol, in Wilkes-Barre, Pa.:

Members of the Slovak Catholic Sokols, I get a real thrill in addressing this fine gathering of members of group 7 of the Slovak Catholic Sokols, and particularly today, when you are celebrating your 20th anniversary. We are blessed with just the kind of day this splendid organization thrives on when it takes to the wide-open spaces. And the outstanding gymnastic exhibition put on today has shown the kind of mettle Slovak-American boys and girls are made of.

Fine physical condition has always been an important factor in Slovak life, whether in the United States of America or in the great historical richness of its European background. Building the body as well as the mind and spirit, comes before good, useful lives can be led. I have always admired the Sokol motto: "A healthy spirit in a healthy body." Let us not forget that he who has health has hope, and he who has hope has everything.

Certainly, such an attitude of optimism toward life cannot be overestimated, in a day when the threat of war always hangs over our heads. Each day, the newspapers tell us about military plans to provide new defensive measures. We here in America, need more of what the Sokols stand for, optimism, hope for the future. But above all, we first need health. I believe it is the obligation of every American citizen both to himself and to his fellow citizens to keep his body so physically trim, that when he comes to the necessary tasks of making decisions about government, who to vote for, what civic programs to support, he will not be burdened by a tired body. He will not be handicapped with a rundown system. His mind, correspondingly, will not be taxed with longing for unnecessary stimulant.

History is full of great programs for physical fitness. The Nazis have their Jugend (youth movement), the Fascists also stress gymnastic work, and the Soviets too, have striven to impress the importance of physical culture on their young people, and similarly the Sokols aim to cultivate the benefits of excellent physical shape by developing its program on a group basis. But here the comparison ends, for the Slovak Catholic Sokol aims much higher than the creation of firm flesh for civil reasons. True to American ideals, a good Slovak Catholic Sokol does not hold that the state is the most important item in current affairs.

The Sokol, like the Declaration of Independence, advocates the right of each American to pursue happiness as he sees fit. But because it is a fraternal organization dedicated to principles of improving human relations—as well as man's relation with his God—the Sokol goes one step further. It wants to guide young Americans of Slovak Catholic heritage into a way of life which will bring them greater happiness because of their harmony with both God and Nation.

Mindful of the good the future can bring, the Sokol also wants its members to know the good given by its great traditions which found birth in that wonderful land of the Tatars in Europe.

I believe that an important aspect of the athletic program of the Sokols, is the cooperation taught. We Americans are proud of the spirit of assistance we frequently employ, particularly when it comes to someone in definite distress. Recall the constant flood of CARE packages sent by private citizens to starving and needy people all over the world. Your organization, as one of the outstanding fraternal societies in America, has always been in the vanguard of mutual help. And that should not be surprising when it is realized that the founders of the Slovak Catholic Sokols here in the United States sought to develop a better relationship with one's fellow man.

For over 50 years your organization has been instructing its youth on how to get along with one another. Your founders built exceedingly well when they insisted that tolerance and good will among men cannot be overemphasized.

If we are to meet the challenge of totalitarianism, we shall need this faith in this basic principle. For the real strength of America lies not in her present wealth, her luxuries, but in the spirit of the people who produced them—the kind of spirit shown by the grandparents and great-grandparents of these fine boys and girls here this afternoon. These oldtimers had the indomitable courage and the longing for liberty, which easily enabled them to become an integral part of our great country. I count it as one of the great advantages of my life, to have been privileged to grow up with them back in North Wilkes-Barre, to have attended school with their children, and to count so many of them as personal friends. Who could not be but impressed after a 5-minute conversation with the late Msgr. John Sobota, who could not be but amazed at the versatility and genius of that great wireless inventor, Father Murgas, and who would not be stirred in reading the life stories of men like Father Jankola, Father Furdek, and a host of other great Slovak pioneers in the United States.

You boys and girls who have performed so magnificently here this afternoon have a great heritage. You have the stuff of great Americans. You are a final link of a great chain of an indomitable tradition. It is a pleasure for me, as a Member of the United States Congress to speak with you and salute you. You have been brought up in the high standards of the Slovak Catholic Sokols and you are blessed with the strength, the health, the educational opportunities, and the great heritage of freedom that will fit you for leadership in this age of great crisis. It is my earnest plea to you boys and girls this afternoon, that you realize the importance of continuing to remain faithful Sokols in this wonderful effort to fit yourselves for important service to God and country.

Never in history has there been so much opportunity available. One needs faith in both God and the future. Yours can be the faith to guarantee that while the America of tomorrow may be different from the America of today, it will remain a free and democratic America.

Zdar Boh—God bless you.

American-Italian Educational Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, 1956, it was my privilege to deliver a

lecture under the auspices of the Institute of Italian Culture in the United States on the theme American-Italian Educational Relations. In the course of my address, I offered a 10-point program calling for the improvement and expansion of the cultural and educational relations between America and Italy.

In recent days I have been informed by the institute that my address has been received with considerable interest in American and Italian educational and cultural circles. The institute is now arranging for a translation of the address into the Italian language and copies will subsequently be submitted to authorities in the Italian Ministry of Education, to the foreign minister, and other leading officials of the government, to Members of Parliament, to the heads of universities, technical schools and normal schools, and others interested in the field of education or in American-Italian relations.

Mr. Speaker, in view of this wide interest and for the benefit of further improving American-Italian relations, I am inserting the text of my address into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the Members of both houses of Congress and the American public generally may have the opportunity to learn of my proposals.

The text of the address is as follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO ON AMERICAN-ITALIAN EDUCATIONAL RELATIONS, INSTITUTE OF ITALIAN CULTURE IN THE UNITED STATES, FRIDAY, JUNE 1, 1956, AT INSTITUTE OF DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Mr. Chairman, Professor Gerig, my good friend Ugo Cecchini, ladies and gentlemen, it is with considerable trepidation that I have accepted your kind invitation to speak to you this evening, under the auspices of the Institute of Italian Culture in the United States. May I say at the outset that the objectives of the institute are most praiseworthy. The dissemination of Italian culture in America and the intercultural relationship between the people of Italy and the people of America can in time, if properly developed, form the basis of a great cultural partnership of tremendous importance. The mingling of our two cultures holds vast promise for the future, and for this reason I want to extend my congratulations to all who are laboring in this vineyard of civilization.

I am very happy to be here with you and to have this opportunity to share some thoughts with you. My topic for discussion is "American-Italian Educational Relations." I am not an educator or pedagogue as are some of my distinguished listeners here this evening, but education is a field in which I have always found a great deal of interest as a parent, as a jurist on the bench, and as a legislator in the Halls of Congress. The educational relationship between the land of my forefathers and the land of my adoption is of particular interest to me because of very obvious reasons.

At this stage, however, I must ask you to bear in mind that what I am going to say to you tonight are the thoughts and views of one who is trained primarily in the fields of law and politics. Above all, do not regard this as political oratory.

The story is told in Washington about a Congressman whom a constituent of his was trying to reach. An important debate was going on then on the House floor, but the constituent nevertheless sent in a page boy to call the Congressman off the floor. When the Congressman came into the cloakroom, the constituent started to apologize for taking him away from the debate.

"Oh, that's all right," said the Congressman. "I am glad to have an excuse to come out here. This cloakroom is the best shelter we have from oratorical fallout."

Well, I don't know about the oratorical part of my effort here, but I am hoping that there will be a fallout of ideas which might prove stimulating as far as the educational and cultural relations of Italy and America are concerned. This is a field of endeavor which requires more than mere stimulation—it requires inspiration.

You have heard the story of Michelangelo and the piece of marble. He was strolling one day with a friend of his in Florence and came upon this block of marble half buried with dirt and rubbish. He cleared away the debris and lifted it from the mire. His friend, in surprise, asked what he wanted with such a worthless piece of rock anyway, whereupon Michelangelo replied, "Oh, there is an angel in that stone and I must bring it out."

He brought the piece of marble to his studio. There he worked on it patiently, lovingly, and finally brought out the hidden glory that was to inspire others for generations to come.

Not many of us can have the talents and the inspiration of a Michelangelo. But all of us, I dare say, can do our share in bringing out that which is true, and good and inspiring in human nature. And I know of no field where this can be done at its best than the educational and cultural relations of Italy and the United States.

Back in March of this year, you will recall, the President of Italy, the Honorable Giovanni Gronchi, came to these friendly shores on an official visit to the United States. It was an appropriate occasion for the highest representatives of both countries to acknowledge again the strong links between our two cultures, the bond between our two nations. Today, perhaps as never before in our relationships, the United States and Italy recognize that the bonds joining our two countries are much stronger and deeper than the ones resulting from a military pact, or an economic-aid program, or a program of student exchange. The bonds are those of continuous reciprocal contributions, of mutual respect between two great peoples, of genuine friendship for one another, and the desire to bring out the hidden glory of our two cultures—as Michelangelo did with that block of marble several centuries ago.

My friends, the bridge of understanding between Italy and the United States was not constructed overnight. It is a process which is at least as old as the United States, and in fact goes back to colonial days. I do not wish to go into a discourse on Italian-American history or the contributions of Italian Americans toward the growth and progress of this country. That is not my purpose tonight. But I do want to make a few references in order to point up my general subject.

During the colonial period of United States history, small but significant numbers of Italians joined the waves of early explorers and settlers that came to these shores. These Italians fitted themselves comfortably into the American social structure of that era, but interestingly enough they always retained a part of that color and sparkle which personifies the Italian. You know their names as well as I, beginning with Columbus, Giovanni Caboto (John Cabot) and his son Sebastian from Genoa, the Florentine Giovanni Verrazano, who discovered the harbor of New York, and Amerigo Vespucci after whom America was named.

But let me mention a few names, perhaps not so well known, but no less significant from a cultural standpoint. There was Philip Mazzei, who settled in Virginia and became an intimate friend of Thomas Jefferson. According to historians, Mazzei's letters had a tremendous impact on Jefferson's political philosophy.

There was Philip Tragetta, a musician and composer from Venice, who later became a friend of Presidents James Madison and James Monroe. Tragetta established the American Conservatorio in Philadelphia, probably the first institution of its kind in the New Yorld.

There was Father Gregorio Mengarini, a missionary and educator from Rome, who established the first collegiate institution on the Pacific coast, the College of Santa Clara.

There was Father Benedict Sistini, who pioneered the teaching of algebra, geometry, and trigonometry in this country with his outstanding treatises on these subjects.

There was Prof. Vincenzo Botto, who taught Italian and literature at the University of the City of New York and was a friend of such literary luminaries as Horace Greeley, William Cullen Bryant, and Edgar Allan Poe. Professor Botto established the first important literary salon in the history of American letters.

These and many others too numerous to mention have made lasting contributions to our American heritage over the many and long years. The imprint of their contribution to American life and culture is visible all over our land.

Coming down closer to our own times, in the period after 1880 when large numbers of Italians immigrated to the United States, we find that they became a vibrant and meaningful asset to American democracy. We must not forget that the Italian immigrant came to this country through choice and with a burning determination to improve his lot. He believed in the "American dream" long before he left his native land. Political unrest and religious persecution played no effective role in the mass immigration of Italians, as it did in the case of immigrants from other parts of Europe. The Italian came to America in order to improve his human desire for advancement, for a better life for himself and his family, for opportunities which he did not have in his native land because it lacked the material resources.

The optimism with which the Italian immigrant greeted his newly adopted land was reflected in all his endeavors and throughout all his pursuits in this country. In the field of culture the contributions are practically inexhaustible. In art, for example, the works of Cappellano, Persico, Valperti and, of course, Brumidi, all exude the warmth and depth of meaning with which the Italian artist is known to imbue his art.

Over the years the bonds of blood, understanding and admiration between the two countries continued to grow. Academies and cultural institutes—and I want to single out this fine institute under whose auspices I am speaking here this evening—have become familiar phenomena in American life. In Italy, of course, these institutes contributed to the spread of culture and they helped to disseminate knowledge abroad of Italian intellectual life.

During World War II, America "rediscovered" Italy. In the inter-war period between the two World Wars, the attraction of Italy to the American tourist and the connoisseur never lessened, but somehow those visitors did not always have the proper appreciation for the more subtle and sophisticated phases of Italian life and ways. With World War II, however, there was almost a rediscovery of the finer facets of Italian culture. Since then this movement has been gaining momentum.

What has brought about this increased interest? Cultural exchange and development programs have accentuated the community of interests between Italy and the United States. Under the Fulbright Act, for example, good will and understanding between the two countries have been furthered through the exchange of students, teachers, university lecturers, and research scholars. The resounding ovation given

recently in Italy to American performers with the opera troupe of Porgy and Bess, demonstrated the basic pool of good will and appreciation for the finer things produced in America. Italians and Americans accord each other's motion pictures a high degree of prestige and recognition. Italy, the universally recognized birthplace of the melodrama, spontaneously acclaimed the popular music and the artists of America.

This common link between the cultures of the two nations was recently emphasized by David E. Finley, the director of the National Gallery of Art, in Washington, D. C., when he said: "We owe much that is best in our culture and our ideas of freedom * * * to such nations as Italy." The cultural interchange in art, music, education, and other facets of life, has forged links in a chain of understanding that must stay strong and untarnished.

Turning now more specifically to American-Italian educational relations, you will remember that during World War II many educational institutions in Italy were severely damaged. The universities of Bologna, Cagliari, Florence, Genoa, Milan, Naples, Pisa, Turin, and the Catholic University of Milan were so badly damaged that for a time it seemed the damage was irreparable. Whole buildings were destroyed, others were sacked of valuable equipment by the Nazis; some were requisitioned as hospitals or troop quarters, and some were even used as defense points in battle. There was also widespread destruction or deterioration of scientific equipment and libraries.

After the war, the Government was faced not only with the problem of rebuilding and reequipping the universities, but also how to cope with the large number of war veterans who sought to gain admittance to the universities. It was at this time that the United States stepped in with aid from Marshall plan funds and also from private contributions, which were used for the restoration of buildings and equipment. Of course, the Italian Government also allocated funds for these purposes and, in addition, provided assistance to many students (former partisans, prisoners of war, etc.). It is now a matter of record that this Marshall plan aid was most efficiently used, and today we find that Italy's universities—at least in their physical aspects—have made a complete recovery, thanks to this generous aid from America.

At this point, I want to make brief reference to the School Reform which was decreed in 1949. I do not want to go into a detailed discussion of this reform, other than to say that it is based fundamentally on Article 33 of the Italian Constitution which states emphatically: "The arts and the sciences are free and free must be the teaching of them." The reforms, though gradual and experimental, also underscored the principle of education for all. This is a relatively new concept in Italy, where for generations both secondary and higher education were a privilege enjoyed only by the few, rather than by the masses as in this country. Make no mistake about it: the distinction between popular education and education for the elite has not yet been eliminated, but progress in that direction is being made. Today, the literacy rate in Italy stands at 92 percent, compared with 97 percent in the United States, 99 percent in Britain, 93 percent in France, and only 54 percent in Spain.

One of the achievements in this country which has a great impact on the people of Italy is the belief that "everyone in the United States goes to college." Such sweeping generalizations are always a bit exaggerated, just as is that other mythical assumption that "in America everyone has a car." But if this American impact helps to raise the goals of the Italian people in their educational endeavors and it encourages them to broaden their educational scope, then I feel it constitutes an influence for the good.

More and more one finds that educational circles in Italy, particularly the more progressive and more democratic elements, look to the United States for guidance and contact and specialization in every field of endeavor. Scholars and students in Italy manifest an ever-increasing desire to avail themselves of the vast educational resources of American universities, especially in science and technology. However, to date this thirst for knowledge and experience has not been fully utilized. It should be vastly expanded on a scale to benefit our two countries.

The questions remain: What is to be done? How is it to be done? And by whom? This is where I want to inject a few ideas and proposals. In full modesty, I urge you not to look upon this as a blueprint or even a specific plan. I prefer to regard it more in the nature of a set of ideas and suggestions toward the improvement and expansion of the cultural and educational relationship between America and Italy. These ideas should be weighed by experts, and those which are practicable and capable of realization should be developed fully. I can only indicate an outline for a plan.

First, I should like to suggest the establishment of an American House in Rome. This is not a novel idea. Our good friend, Prof. Vincenza Rivera, is the head of an organization of scholars at the University of Rome which aims to establish such a house. It is visualized as an educational link or as a clearinghouse between the universities in Italy and the universities in this country. In its beginnings, however, it would of necessity have to be on a very modest scale and on an experimental basis.

In this respect, we can perhaps learn from the experience of our fellow Americans of Scandinavian extraction, who maintain a foundation which over the years has proved itself to be of exceptional character and achievement. Suffice it to say that more than 500 American students attend institutions of higher learning in Sweden each year. This is an achievement of which Scandinavian-Americans can be justly proud, for it is one of the best and wisest methods in cementing the ties between two cultures.

Surely, we can do as well. We have the human resources in this country for a project of this kind. An American House in Rome would channel the placement of American students in every university in Italy, in every faculty of instruction, in every field of endeavor. One thousand American students in Italian universities each year would be a thousand American ambassadors of good will there, and a thousand ambassadors of friendship for Italy after their return to this country. Repeated year after year, you can visualize for yourself the enormous possibilities for close cultural and educational cooperation between the two countries. Its scope is unlimited. I am sure of that, with millions of Americans of Italian descent and many fine Italian-American organizations in this country, it would be possible to underwrite the establishment of an American House. It would be an act of patriotism in the interests of both countries. As you can see, I am interested in an American House that will help American-Italian relations, not one that will exploit either country.

Second, I suggest the establishment of several cultural agencies in this country whose purpose it shall be to maintain and develop intellectual relations with Italy. These agencies are to be set up in various geographical localities throughout the country, perhaps a half dozen at the start. Where possible, they should be established in conjunction with a leading university, preferably on or near the campus. They are to serve as a clearinghouse for Italian students studying in this country, for Italian educators and intellectuals visiting here; they are to be centers for the dissemination of Italian culture, for the study of the Italian language, for lectures on every phase on Italian creativity of the past and the present. They are to be a center of attraction for young Americans, who are to be encouraged to familiarize themselves with Italy, its people, and its great cultural heritage.

Third, I should like to see a much larger educational exchange program than the one we have now. Educational exchange projects offer an effective way to enlarge the areas of common interests between two nations. By bringing together people of different countries and enabling them to share their knowledge and skills, to learn from each other, and to study common problems, we are helping to develop mutual understanding and respect.

How big has been this educational exchange in recent years? Let me cite to you some figures for the year 1954. In that year the State Department's exchange program, which applies to students, teachers, research scholars, and certain specialists, records a total of 419 persons, 232 coming from Italy to the United States and 187 Americans going there. It may interest you to know that in the same year the exchange program with Germany involved 1,338 persons (more than three times the size of the Italian exchange program), for England it was 762, and for France 643.

I should like to see this program considerably expanded, both in an official and private capacity. I think, for example, that trips to Italy should be arranged for Members of Congress and also for legislators and administrators in our State and municipal governments. It is important that as many American newspapermen as possible visit Italy, and that Italian newspapermen have an opportunity to work for a while on American newspapers. There should be an organized program of exchanges to include such groups as industrial leaders, professionals, people who are active in communal affairs, labor leaders, the heads of women's organizations, and other groups. But, above all, the exchange of students, teachers, and scholars should be increased to much larger proportions.

This exchange program should be established on a basis of mutuality of interests. It should be planned and developed to broaden and deepen the community of interests between the United States and Italy, if we are earnest in achieving greater understanding and solidarity between the two nations. When people of different countries have the opportunity to live and work together and to be in daily contact, they must develop feelings of friendliness and respect for each other, just as they are sure to lose the feelings of fear and suspicion of each other.

Fourth, I propose the establishment of more Chairs of American Studies in Italian universities, and Chairs of Italian Studies in American universities. Such studies should become a part of the regular curricula of the universities in both countries. Here, too, something has been done, but not quite enough. I visualize not only chairs which offer courses in the Italian language in our universities, but full educational programs which are to stress Italian civilization and culture, of the past and contemporary period, in American universities; simultaneously, such chairs in Italian universities should present courses in American history and contemporary life in this country in all its aspects, including the political, the economic, the social, and the cultural.

Fifth, I want to impress upon you the urgent need for adequate library facilities in Italy on all levels, from the university on down to the elementary schools in the villages. Let me read to you a few lines from an article by an American scholar who was in Italy on a Fulbright scholarship in 1954. This is what he says:

"Library facilities in Italian universities are shocking to the American observer. Not only are resources poor, especially in current acquisitions, but they are also inaccessible because of archaic cataloging and inefficient systems of circulation. Some libraries are

rich in manuscripts, incunabula, and periodicals, but these are very difficult for the student to get at and study efficiently. There is little concept of library services in Italy; comfortable and well-lighted reading rooms, the so-called 'tools' of library research, open shelves, and well-trained and available librarians familiar to even the smallest college libraries in the United States are virtually unknown in Italy."

Now, if this is the situation in the university libraries, how much different or how better could it be in the relatively few existing public libraries? The fact is that existing library facilities are not generally used effectively or to capacity. The universities spend very little for the acquisition of new books, and if this attitude is pursued for another decade or two the libraries of Italy will eventually lose their value as centers of research. It will hurt the universities and the entire educational system of Italy, and indirectly affect every aspect of Italian life and activity.

Here, then, is a field where a real job can be done—and it should be done fast. A project can be undertaken in this country to build up the libraries of Italian universities through acquisitions of books and manuscripts from this country, or making funds available to them for their own purchases. Let each large community of Italian-Americans in this country sponsor the rehabilitation of a library at some Italian university. But that is not all. I should like to see the establishment of an American library in every major city in Italy. These are to contain books for adults and children on every manifestation of life in America and Italy, from adventure to zoology.

At the same time, I believe that in many parts of this country it would be logical to approach public libraries to set up special sections, rooms or even shelves on Italian culture and civilization. Both in Italy and here, these library projects could serve as a profitable educational accomplishment.

Sixth, I should like to see an exchange program to include all phases of the arts, music, the theater, opera, radio and television, and of course, the painters and the sculptors, etc. Sponsorship could be for individuals, groups or whole companies. It could be under public or private auspices. But it must be the best and the finest in the arts and artistry of both countries. It must be an exchange on the highest artistic level which will be to the credit of both countries and to the benefit of both nations.

An American artist from Virginia, who studied painting at the Academy of Fine Arts in Rome on a Fulbright scholarship, had this to say of what he called his "Italian experience":

"The American artist who comes to Italy for a period of study and work has much to gain from many sources. The variety and richness of the Italian landscape, the ruins of ancient cities and temples, the warmth of the Italian people themselves, and constant contact with the Italian artists, all fuse into an experience, vivid and inspiring. Italian artists have been eager to communicate their ideas and have taken a great interest in the work and ideas of the visiting American artist. This healthy interchange has provided a stimulus which, together with the richness of other impressions, forms an integral part of the Italian experience."

What has been done in this single instance, I am sure, can be done in thousands of other instances to stimulate the cultural interchange of ideas and experiences between America and Italy.

Seventh, I should like to recommend an exchange, not of people, but of documents. I have in mind particularly the translation of important American documents into the Italian language and made available to the Italian people through their universities, schools, libraries, etc. This is a field which has been almost completely neglected. Do you know, for example, that the first Italian translation of the famous Federalist Papers of Hamilton, Jay, and Madison, which have played such a significant part in American history, was published only a few months ago, in October 1955? Here is what an Italian scholar who read these early American essays had to say:

"Many reviewers are astonished that American thought of the 18th century could be so alive, original, and profound."

I believe that scholars in this country and in Italy could be interested in the participation of similar projects for the translation of other worthwhile documents, manuscripts, literary works of the past and the present of the two countries. This, in itself, could be a wonderful way for the promotion of educational and cultural relations between the two countries.

Eighth, I must express utter surprise that to this day there is no American University in Rome. American universities are functioning in Istanbul, in Beirut, in Cairo, and in other places. Why is it that no such institution has ever been established in Rome, which has so much to offer to American students and scholars?

I should like to see such an educational institution established, but on the basis of American standards and the American system of instruction, rather than the European system of university instruction. This is to be an American institution aiming to diffuse American culture and an appreciation of the American way of life and democratic ideals. I am sure that many Italian-American groups in this country would gladly underwrite scholarships for deserving students in Italy to attend this university.

Ninth, another field which should come under consideration, though it is indirectly related to education, is social welfare. I am thinking particularly of social-welfare institutions designed to aid children, such as nurseries, clinics, homes and schools for handicapped and delinquent children, and the like. This is another field where considerable work could be done, and should be done as soon as possible.

About 3 or 4 years ago, an Italian woman came to this country on a Smith-Mundt grant to study public health, juvenile delinquency, and other rehabilitation problems in this country. What were the things that impressed her most? Not the skyscrapers, the slick cars, or the numerous gadgets which have become indispensable to our daily living. She was impressed by the fact (and I quote) "that the streets of the United States were not swarming with ragged and begging children, that school buildings were adequately lighted, heated, and stocked with books."

I believe that with the aid of certain specialized agencies of the United Nations, church groups, women's organizations, and other voluntary groups in this country various institutions could be set up to aid such children through programs for health and education, to keep them off the streets and prevent them from becoming chronic beggars, to help them avoid the degradation of illiteracy and moral delinquency. There is much that we can offer in the form of advice and material assistance in helping the people of Italy to alleviate the conditions of these underprivileged children and give them new hope and a new lease on life.

My tenth and final proposal concerns the expansion of tourism between the United States and Italy. I would like to see tourism established on a large and organized scale, to encourage Americans of all walks of life to visit Italy. Perhaps courses could be set up in various parts of the country to acquaint Americans with Italy, its people and climate, its cultural heritage and its historical significance. Groups in larger and smaller number could be organized for a visit to Italy. Italian-Americans should be among the first to participate on a large scale. Perhaps we should undertake a campaign where every American of Italian descent should at least once in his lifetime visit the land of his ancestors. This would be a great educational experience for them and for the people in Italy, too. Incidentally, it would also be of tremendous economic importance to Italy.

Some 200 years ago, the sagacious Dr. Samuel Johnson once remarked that "A man who has not been in Italy is always conscious of an inferiority." For many centuries people from many lands found that Italy was a source of inspiration because of its treasure house of past glories and the vitality of the genius of the Italian people. It can truly be said that the creative spirits of almost the entire world have turned to Italy, and in every instance the contact has been rewarding. I have no doubt that it would be equally rewarding to many Americans who would go to Italy, and that is why tourism should be an important part of American-Italian educational relations.

Such is the program I am proposing to you today. It is in a sense an educational point 4 program, aimed as a two-way avenue of educational and cultural relationship between two great nations of the Western World. A combination of this sort would be unparalleled in the sphere of cultural relations, perhaps unequaled in the annals of human affairs of all time because of the vast and unlimited possibilities it entails for intellectual creativity and educational accomplishments.

It has been said that "economic cooperation, political cooperation and military cooperation may break down under the strain of crisis, unless there is much more than superficial understanding of one another's cultures, problems and aspirations." That is very true, and that is the very purpose of my 10-point program. It is designed to bring about closer unity and fuller understanding of the cultures of our two peoples.

At the beginning of my address I stated that the bridge of understanding between Italy and the United States was not constructed overnight. I am not so naive as to believe that the program I have just outlined to you can be realized overnight. It is not a project for a year or two, but a painstaking endeavor which may require a decade or a whole generation. But it is practicable. It is realizable. Some of those points could be started immediately, others would require study and preparation.

This much I want to tell you: It is imperative that our cultural and educational relations with Italy be strengthened and extended. It is true, there are problems of an economic and military nature to be solved, but the cultural relations are no less important for both nations. A great American scholar has observed that "you can subtract Italian culture from civilization only by destroying that civilization." The future progress of democratic America depends, in a large measure, on reinforcing the cultural and other bonds with nations like Italy.

I can visualize the coming years as the period in which this cultural partnership may reach full fruition, a partnership which has so much to offer to the progress of mankind. Perhaps it may some day become known as the "Golden Era of American-Italian Relations." We can initiate that era. We can help to create it and to build it through bold action, and thus gain the everlasting appreciation of future generations in this country and in Italy.

Nearly a century ago, the English essayist, John Ruskin, said:

"When we build, let us think that we build forever. Let it not be for present delight, nor for present use alone; let it be such work as our descendants will thank us for, and let us think, as we lay stone on stone, that a time is come when these stones will be held sacred because our hands have touched them, and that men will say as they look upon the labor and wrought substance of them: 'See this our fathers did for us.'"